

q -therm ostatistics and the analytical treatm ent of the ideal Ferm i gas

S. Mart nez, F. Pennini, A. Plastino and M. Portesi
Instituto de F sica La Plata (IFLP),
Universidad Nacional de La Plata (UNLP) and CONICET,
C.C. 727, 1900 La Plata, Argentina

Abstract

We discuss relevant aspects of the exact q -therm ostatistical treatm ent for an ideal Ferm i system. The grand canonical exact generalized partition function is given for arbitrary values of the nonextensivity index q , and the ensuing statistics is derived. Special attention is paid to the mean occupation numbers of single-particle levels. Limiting instances of interest are discussed in some detail, namely, the therm odynam ic limit, considering in particular both the high- and low-temperature regimes, and the approximate results pertaining to the case $q \rightarrow 1$ (the conventional Ferm i-Dirac statistics corresponds to $q = 1$). We compare our findings with previous Tsalis' literature.

PACS: 05.30.-d, 05.30.Ch, 05.30.Fk

KEYWORDS: Tsalis' generalized statistics, Optim ized Lagrange multipliers approach, Therm odynam ics, Ideal Ferm i gas

I. INTRODUCTION

Nonextensive thermodynamics [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] constitutes a new paradigm for statistical mechanics. It is based on Tsallis' nonextensive information measure [7]

$$S_q = k_B \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{n=1}^W p_n^q; \quad (1)$$

where $\{p_n\}$ is a set of normalized probabilities and k_B stands for Boltzmann constant ($k_B = 1$ hereafter). The real parameter q is called the index of nonextensivity, the conventional Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics being recovered in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$.

The new theory comes in several flavors, though. Within the literature on Tsallis' thermodynamics, three possible choices are considered for the evaluation of expectation values in a nonextensive scenario. As a set of (nonextensive) expectation values are always regarded as constraints in the associated q -MaxEnt approach [8], three different generalized probability distributions ensue. Let p_n ($n = 1; \dots; W$) stand for the microscopic probability that a system is in the n -th microstate, and consider the (classical) physical quantity O that in the microstate n adopts the value o_n . The first choice [7] for the expectation value of O , used by Tsallis in his seminal paper, was the conventional one: $\sum_{n=1}^W p_n o_n$. The second choice [9], $\sum_{n=1}^W p_n^q o_n$, was regarded as the canonical definition until quite recently and is the only one that is guaranteed to yield, always, an analytical solution to the associated MaxEnt variational problem [10]; notice, however, that the average value of the identity operator is not equal to one. Elaborate studies of the so-called q -Fermi gas problem, which will constitute the focus of our attention here, have been performed using this "Tsallis flavor" [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. Nowadays most authors consider that the third choice [6, 16], usually denoted as the Tsallis-Mendes-Pastino (TMP) one,

$$\langle O \rangle_q = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^W p_n^q o_n}{\sum_{n=1}^W p_n^q} \quad (2)$$

is the most appropriate definition.

We employ the latter choice in order to accommodate the available a priori information and thus obtain the pertinent probability distribution via Jaynes' MaxEnt approach [17, 18], extremizing the q -entropy S_q subject to normalization $\sum_{n=1}^W p_n = 1$ and prior knowledge of a set of M nonextensive expectation values $\{\langle O_j \rangle_q; j = 1; \dots; M\}$. As usual the constrained extremization is accomplished by introducing $M + 1$ Lagrange multipliers; in practice two (equivalent) procedures can be followed to do this. First, the variational procedure followed by Tsallis-Mendes-Pastino in Ref. [16] gives the Tsallis' probability distribution in the form

$$p_n = \frac{f_n^{1=(1-q)}}{Z_q} \quad (3)$$

where [16]

$$f_n = 1 - \frac{(1-q)^{\sum_{j=1}^M \langle O_j \rangle_q o_{jn}}}{\sum_{n=1}^W p_n^q} \quad (4)$$

is the so-called configurational characteristic, and $Z_q = \sum_{n=1}^W f_n^{1=(1-q)}$ represents a "pseudo" partition function (in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$ it goes to $Z_1 = e^{\sum_{j=1}^M \langle O_j \rangle}$ instead of Z_1). f_n should be

positive (otherwise $f_n = 0$) in order to guarantee that probability p_n be real for arbitrary q (Tallis' cutoff condition [8, 19]); as a consequence, the sum in Z_q is restricted to those states for which f_n is positive.

Notice that the expression obtained for p_n following the TMP recipe is explicitly self-referential. This fact often leads to numerical difficulties in concrete applications (see, for instance, Ref. [20]); more important, it obscures the underlying physics because the concomitant Lagrange multipliers lose their traditional physical meaning [21]. Martinez et al. [22] devised a way to circumvent these problems by recourse to the introduction of new, putatively optimal Lagrange multipliers (OLM) for the Tallis' variational problem. The idea is to extremize the q -entropy with centered mean values (a legitimate alternative procedure) which entails recasting the constraints in the fashion

$$\sum_{n=1}^M p_n^q \log_{j,q} h_{j,i_q} = 0 \quad j = 1, \dots, M \quad (5)$$

The ensuing microscopic probabilities are formally given by Eq. (3), where now

$$f_n = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^M (1 - q) \log_{j,q} h_{j,i_q} \quad (6)$$

In this way, the configurational characteristic obtained with the OLM recipe does not depend explicitly on the set of probabilities f_n .

It is obvious that the solution of a constrained extremizing problem via the celebrated Lagrange method depends exclusively on the functional form one is dealing with as well as on the constraints, the Lagrange multipliers being just auxiliary quantities to be eliminated at the end of the process. As a consequence, TMP and OLM results should coincide. However their manipulation is, in the latter instance, considerably simpler (notice that the OLM variational procedure [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] solves directly for the optimized Lagrange multipliers). Comparing then the TMP and OLM approaches for a given problem, one realizes that the resultant probabilities (as well as the pseudo partition functions) are identical if

$$p_j = \frac{Z_q^{q-1}}{\sum_{n=1}^M p_n^q} = Z_q^{q-1} p_j^{(TMP)} \quad j = 1, \dots, M \quad (7)$$

where use has been made of the relation $\sum_{n=1}^M p_n^q = Z_q^{1-q}$ [16, 22] which is valid under the assumption of the knowledge available a priori.

For the sake of completeness, let us write down [26] the set of equations that constitute the basic information-theory relations in Jaynes' version of statistical mechanics [17, 18]:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial h_{j,i_q}} \ln Z_q = \log_{j,q} h_{j,i_q} \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \log_{j,q} h_{j,i_q}} (\ln Z_q) = h_{j,i_q} \quad (9)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, M$. Here the partition function Z_q is defined by [22] $\ln Z_q = \ln \sum_{j=1}^M h_{j,i_q}$. While the above OLM equations involve ordinary logarithms, the analogous TMP relations [16] employ the so-called q -logarithms, $\ln_q x = (1 - x^{1-q})/(q-1)$, thus in the latter case the basic Jaynes' relations are not recovered and the physical sense becomes somewhat obscured.

Our goal

Motivated by the success of the OLM procedure, and in view of some recent and quite interesting applications of the quantum distributions (see, for instance, Ref. [28] for anomalous behaviors in thermodynamic quantities for ideal Fermi gases below two dimensions), we wish to address here with such a technique the non-interacting Fermi-Dirac gas. The Tsallis generalized treatment of such system was originally advanced in Ref. [11] using the Curado-Tsallisavor. Buyukklc et al. further investigated [12] the generalized distribution functions employing an approximation to deal with nonextensive quantum statistics called the Factorization Approach (FA). This approach, which comes out to give approximate results in the region $q \rightarrow 1$, is valid for a dilute gas ignoring the correlations between particles and regarding the states of different particles as statistically independent. Most succeeding works on the nonextensive treatment of quantum systems are based on these approximate generalized distribution functions. The nonextensive fermion distribution was further analyzed in Ref. [14] in the context, again, of the second choice, but without recourse to that sort of approximations. It was seen there that the FA faces some difficulties. Other interesting studies on the subject have been presented by Ubriaco [13] and, quite recently, by Aragao-Rêgo et al. [29], employing the third-choice expectation values along the TMP lines. The latter work focuses attention upon the thermodynamic limit and provides elegant analytical results.

The Fermi gas problem is rather cumbersome to treat using the TMP algorithm. We will show here that the OLM approach allows for an exact treatment of Fermi distributions in a nonextensive scenario, in a simpler way. This, in turn, will make it possible to re-discuss the nature of the approximation scheme of Buyukklc et al. The paper is organized as follows: in Sec. II we sketch the quantum version of the OLM technique. Sec. III is devoted specially to the grand-canonical description of quantum gases in a nonextensive framework. Our main results concerning Fermi systems are developed in Sec. IV, where a careful study of the mean occupancy of discrete single-particle levels is given. Next we present approximate results for values of q close to unity, and compare them with previous works on the subject. The thermodynamic limit is addressed in Sec. VI, by appealing to integral transform methods that are summarized in the Appendix. Finally, some conclusions are drawn.

II. THE OLM PROCEDURE IN QUANTUM LANGUAGE

Since we are going to address the ideal Fermi gas, we have to adapt our nonextensive OLM-Tsallis statistical language to a quantal environment. Our main tool will be the equilibrium density operator $\hat{\rho}$, that can be obtained by recourse to the Lagrange multipliers' method. Within the nonextensive framework one has to extremize the information measure [2, 3, 7]

$$S_q[\hat{\rho}] = \frac{1}{q-1} \text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}^q) \quad (10)$$

subject to the normalization requirement and the assumed a priori knowledge of the generalized expectation values of, say M , relevant observables, namely

$$\langle \hat{O}_j \rangle_q = \frac{\text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}^q \hat{O}_j)}{\text{Tr}(\hat{\rho}^q)} \quad j = 1, \dots, M \quad (11)$$

In the quantum version of the OLM instance the constraints are recast in the manner

$$\text{Tr } \hat{\rho} = 1 \quad (12)$$

$$\text{Tr } \hat{\rho}^q \hat{O}_j = 0 \quad j = 1, \dots, M \quad (13)$$

where the q -expectation values $\langle \hat{O}_1 \rangle_q, \dots, \langle \hat{O}_M \rangle_q$ constitute the external a priori information. Performing the constrained extremization of Tsallis entropy one obtains [22]

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{\hat{f}_q^{1=(1-q)}}{Z_q} \quad (14)$$

where the quantal configurational characteristic has the form

$$\hat{f}_q = \hat{1} \prod_{j=1}^M (1 - q) \hat{O}_j \quad (15)$$

if the quantity in the right-hand side is positive definite, otherwise $\hat{f}_q = 0$ (cuto condition [16, 19]). Here f_1, \dots, f_M stands for the set of optimal Lagrange multipliers, and we have denoted for brevity the generalized deviation as ${}_q \hat{O} = \hat{O} - \langle \hat{O} \rangle_q$. The normalizing factor in Eq. (14) corresponds to the OLM generalized partition function which is given, in analogy with the classical situation, by [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]

$$Z_q = \text{Tr } \hat{f}_q^{1=(1-q)} = \text{Tr } e_q \prod_{j=1}^M (1 - q) \hat{O}_j \quad (16)$$

where the trace evaluation is to be performed with due caution in order to account for Tsallis' cuto, and

$$e_q(x) = [1 + (1 - q)x]^{1=(1-q)} \quad (17)$$

is a generalization of the exponential function, which is recovered when $q \rightarrow 1$. Let us remark that the density operator a la OLM is not self-referential.

It is to be pointed out that within the TMP framework one obtains from the normalization condition on the equilibrium density operator $\hat{\rho}$ the following relation that the OLM approach inherits [16, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27], namely,

$$\text{Tr } \hat{f}_q^{1=(1-q)} = \text{Tr } \hat{f}_q^{q=(1-q)} \quad (18)$$

Making use of this relation, one can obtain the value of the extremized q -entropy as

$$S_q = \ln_q Z_q \quad (19)$$

For the sake of completeness, we can write down the generalized mean value of a quantum operator \hat{O} in terms of the quantal configurational characteristic as

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_q = \frac{\text{Tr } \hat{f}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{O}}{\text{Tr } \hat{f}_q^{q=(1-q)}} \quad (20)$$

We recapitulate in the Appendix how to employ a quite useful method for calculating the generalized partition function and expectation values of relevant operators, by recourse to suitable integral representations. The procedure, which is based on the definition of the Euler gamma function, has been used in the literature by many authors [23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33] as it enables to express q -generalized quantities in terms of the conventional ($q = 1$) ones, thus providing an alternative analytic approach.

III. QUANTUM GAS IN A GENERALIZED GRAND CANONICAL ENSEMBLE

It is our aim here that of developing formally the statistical description of quantum systems, particularly fermions, in a generalized framework. For this purpose, we will make use of the OLM-Tsallis version of nonextensive statistics. The Hamiltonian of the system is assumed to be of the form

$$\hat{H} = \sum_k \epsilon_k \hat{n}_k$$

while the number operator exhibits the appearance $\hat{N} = \sum_k \hat{n}_k$, where ϵ_k and \hat{n}_k denote, respectively, the energy and occupation number operator of the k -th single-particle (s.p.) level for a discrete-energy spectrum, with $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2 < \dots$

Following a grand-canonical-ensemble description, the configurational characteristic is given by

$$\hat{f}_q = \hat{1} - (1 - q) \hat{H} - U_q - (1 - q) \hat{N} - N_q \quad (21)$$

where the Lagrange multipliers β and μ are related to the temperature and chemical potential of the system, respectively, and we have designated the generalized mean values of \hat{H} and \hat{N} by U_q and N_q , respectively. The OLM generalized grand partition function for this ideal quantum gas is obtained by inserting the last expression into Eq. (16).

In order to simplify the notation we now define $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_k$ and the Legendre transform ("free energy") $\hat{H} = \hat{H} - \hat{N} = \sum_k \epsilon_k \hat{n}_k$. The quantities whose mean value is assumedly known, i.e. the internal energy and the particle number, are then combined in the fashion

$$h\hat{H} - i_q = U_q - N_q - U_q \quad (22)$$

This notation allows one to treat the grand canonical ensemble as if it were the canonical one, but with grand canonical traces. In terms of the new ("star") quantities, the configurational characteristic reads

$$\hat{f}_q = \hat{1} - (1 - q) \hat{H} - U_q - \frac{1}{q} \hat{g}_q \quad (23)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{1 + (1 - q) U_q} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\hat{g}_q = \hat{1} - (1 - q) \hat{H} \quad (25)$$

are auxiliary quantities. (It will be seen below that $\frac{1}{q}$ corresponds to the inverse temperature, while \hat{g}_q to the configurational characteristic, in a Curado-Tsallis treatment [11, 12, 13, 14, 15].)

Our partition function can therefore be written as

$$\begin{aligned} Z_q &= \frac{1}{q} \text{Tr} \hat{g}_q^{1/(1-q)} \\ &= e_q(U_q) \text{Tr} e_q(-\frac{1}{q} \hat{H}) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the last expression resembles the form of this function in conventional statistics. Once again, the trace entails the cutoff restriction which now reads: $(\frac{1}{q} - q) \hat{g}_q$ should be positive

definite. From Eqs. (20) and (23), the scalar quantity U_q becomes

$$U_q = \frac{\text{Tr } \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{H}}{\text{Tr } \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)}} \quad (27)$$

Similar expressions hold for U_q and N_q separately, employing the corresponding operator inside the upper trace. A comparison of these generalized mean values with the concomitant Curado-Tallis results [11, 12, 13, 14, 15] allows the identification of the auxiliary quantity q with the inverse temperature defined in the unnormalized context.

The generalized heat capacity is defined as

$$C_{V,q} = \frac{\partial U_q}{\partial T} \bigg|_{N_q, V} = 2 \frac{\partial U_q}{\partial} \bigg|_{N_q, V} \quad (28)$$

After some algebra we can give it formally in the following fashion

$$C_{V,q} = \frac{1}{1-q} \frac{q \sum_i \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{H} i_q - \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{H} \sum_i \hat{N} i_q \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{N} i_q = \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} (\hat{N})^2 i_q]}{q \sum_i \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{H} i_q - \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{H} \sum_i \hat{N} i_q \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} \hat{N} i_q = \ln \hat{G}_q^{q=(1-q)} (\hat{N})^2 i_q]} \quad (29)$$

IV. IDEAL FERMION GAS RESULTS

In this section we present our fundamental results related to the nonextensive description of fermion systems, emphasizing the consequences of dealing with a discrete single-particle energy spectrum. We start by reminding that in the conventional statistical treatment of an ideal Fermi-Dirac (FD) gas, the grand partition function reads [34, 35]

$$Z_1 = \text{Tr } e^{-\hat{H}} = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\{n_k\}} e^{-\sum_k \epsilon_k n_k} \quad (30)$$

where the n_k 's take just two values (0 or 1) and the primed summation means that they add up to N . This fermionic partition function can be expanded as

$$Z_1 = 1 + \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_{k_i}} \quad (31)$$

in a form that, on the one hand, emphasizes the contribution of each possible value of N and, on the other, illustrates the manner of performing the trace operation. Note that, if the number of sp. levels is finite, say K , both in finite sums in Eq. (31) nicely terminate when one reaches $k_i = K$ and $N = K$. This way of performing the pertinent sums, which is not the typical textbook procedure to deal with thermodynamic quantities in the case of Fermi systems, is of a general quantal (fermionic) character, no matter what the summands' content is. One could have, for instance

$$\text{Tr } e^{-\hat{H}} = 1 + \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_{k_i}} \quad (32)$$

involving an arbitrary analytical function $'$. If $'$ is a generalized q -exponential we obtain Eq. (33) below. Indeed, in the framework of the q -therm ostatistics one deals with the sam e sort of expansion, with a crucial di fference: one faces, instead of the trace of ordinary exponentials, the trace of q -exponentials. W ithout recourse to the integral transform m ethods discussed in the Appendix, one can easily circum vent the m ain problem of the generalized T sallis' treatm ent: the fact that q -exponentials do not follow the distributive law with respect to sum s over states, an im portant result of the present endeavor.

U sing the above considerations one thus recasts the T sallis trace in Eq. (26) in the fashion

$$Z_q = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(1-q)^{k_i}} \quad (33)$$

where, however, one has to take proper account of the cuto requirement. Let us analyze this im portant point with som e detail.

The cuto condition can be stated in the follow ing m anner

$$q < 1 : \quad \sum_{i=1}^N k_i < \frac{1}{(1-q)} + U_q \quad (34)$$

$$q > 1 : \quad \sum_{i=1}^N k_i > \frac{1}{(1-q)} + U_q \quad (35)$$

for every possible (ordered) con guration $(k_1; \dots; k_N)$, and for all $N = 1; \dots; K$. In other words, those con gurations not ful lling the above inequalities do not contribute to the trace, i.e., the concom itant con gurational characteristic is set to zero. Notice that the right side of both inequalities is nothing but $[(1-q)_q]^{-1}$ and, in principle, could have positive or negative sign. Nevertheless, it can be easily seen that the requirement of positive probabilities {cuto condition} is straightforwardly ful lled by negative-de nite "displaced" ham iltonians (whose spectrum is k) in the case $q < 1$ with $U_q > [(1-q)_q]^{-1}$, and by positive-de nite ones for $q > 1$ with $U_q < [(q-1)_q]^{-1}$. In these two cases one can be sure that all con gurations contribute with non-zero probability; but any other situation should be handled with som e care. It is interesting to notice that the sam e sort of conditions are found in Ref. [33] in the context of integral transform m ethods for the un-norm alized (second avor), canonical-ensem ble problem. However, let us stress that in the present situation the analytic calculations can be fully im plem ented, with no other hardship than properly accounting for T sallis cuto as already m entioned, in sum m ing over states in Z_q (and other therm odynam ic quantities).

Let us now introduce, for the sake of brevity, the auxiliary scalar quantity

$$g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(1-q)^{k_i}} \quad (36)$$

which corresponds to the eigenvalue of the operator \hat{g}_q for the state with N occupied levels: $n_{k_1} = \dots = n_{k_N} = 1$, otherwise $n_k = 0$. In term s of these new scalars the partition function reads

$$Z_q = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{(1-q)^{k_i}} g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N) \quad (37)$$

Moreover, one can obtain U_q from Eq. (27), evaluating the traces as exemplified with reference to Z_q . Thus

$$U_q = \frac{\prod_{N=1}^P \prod_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} \prod_{i=1}^N g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N)^{q^{(1-q)}}}{1 + \prod_{N=1}^P \prod_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N)^{q^{(1-q)}}} \quad (38)$$

Again, U_q and N_q will also be given by similar expressions, replacing k_i by either k_i or i , respectively. One easily ascertains that U_q becomes $U_1 = U_1$ in the extensive limit, and $U_1 = \partial \ln Z_1 / \partial \beta$. Let us comment that in the case one wishes to determine, for instance, the dependence of the q -energy with temperature, one should consistently work out the above expressions in order to solve for the desired thermodynamic quantity.

We tackle finally the evaluation of the q -mean value of the occupation number operator, $\hat{n}_{1,q}$. To such an effect we, again, evaluate the traces in the form indicated above and obtain an exact expression for the generalized fermion occupation numbers

$$\hat{n}_{1,q} = \frac{\prod_{N=1}^P \prod_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} \prod_{i=1}^N g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N)^{q^{(1-q)}}}{1 + \prod_{N=1}^P \prod_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N)^{q^{(1-q)}}} \quad (39)$$

This expression can be further worked out employing a property of the auxiliary quantities $g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N)$, which are not altered under a permutation of indices. Thus, we obtain

$$\hat{n}_{1,q} = \frac{g_q(1)^{q^{(1-q)}} + \prod_{N=2}^P \prod_{k_1 < \dots < k_{N-1} (k_i \notin 1)} g_q(k_1; \dots; k_{N-1}; 1)^{q^{(1-q)}}}{1 + \prod_{N=1}^P \prod_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N)^{q^{(1-q)}}} \quad (40)$$

Notice that $\hat{n}_{1,q}$ depends on the generalized internal energy U_q through q .

V. APPROXIMATE RESULTS FOR $q \rightarrow 1$: COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS WORK

Since the exact results discussed above exhibit a rather formidable appearance, and in order to gain a better grasp of the nonextensive thermostatistics of the Fermi gas, it is useful to consider the situation $q \rightarrow 1$. It is obligatory in this context to cite the pioneer work of Buyukcelik et al. [12], in which quantum gases are tackled in approximate fashion. They evaluate the partition function by recourse to the so-called Factorization Approach (FA), whose essential feature is that of ignoring interparticle correlations for the case of a dilute quantum gas. In other words, this is equivalent to treat the q -exponentials (17) as if they were ordinary exponentials, what is approximately true when $q \rightarrow 1$. The ensuing average occupation numbers have been widely employed in the literature [1]. It is to be stressed that these FA results were developed for the unnormalized second Tsalis-avormentioned in the introduction, namely, the Curado-Tsalis formulation (recently, some of us have brought this approximation up to date using the OLM recipes and applied the ensuing results to the black-body problem [27]).

Since we are here in possession of exact results for the Fermi gas, we can indeed perform a check on the accuracy of the Factorization Approach. If we treat the q -exponentials as if they were ordinary exponentials we have

$$g_q(k_1; \dots; k_N)^{1=(1-q)} \prod_{i=1}^N g_q(k_i)^{1=(1-q)}$$

Strictly speaking, we are making use of an approximation for the q -exponential of a sum of entities in the form

$$e_q \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right) \approx \prod_{i=1}^N e_q(x_i)$$

which is valid for q sufficiently close to 1 such that the following inequality holds: $(1-q)(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2$. In our case, $x_i = q^{-k_i}$.

Therefore we obtain, from Eq. (39), the following FA-inspired approximate expression

$$\ln_q i_q \approx \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \ln_q \left(\sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} q^{-k_1 - \dots - k_N} \right)}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \ln_q \left(\sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_N} q^{-k_1 - \dots - k_N} \right)} \quad (41)$$

that can be cast as

$$\ln_q i_q \approx \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\sum_{k \notin \mathbb{N}} q^{-k} \right]^{q^{(1-q)}}}{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\sum_{k \notin \mathbb{N}} q^{-k} \right]^{q^{(1-q)}} + 1} \quad (42)$$

leading straightforwardly to

$$\ln_q i_q \approx \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\sum_{k \notin \mathbb{N}} q^{-k} \right]^{q^{(1-q)}}} \quad (43)$$

which is the Factorization Approach result of Ref. [12], except that the power $1 = (1-q)$ in the result under an unnormalized context is changed to $q^{(1-q)}$ under OLM strictures. It is clear then that the FA approximation is reasonably consistent in the $q \rightarrow 1$ limit.

By using Eq. (43) one arrives to (formally) simple expressions for both the number of particles and the internal energy,

$$N_q \approx \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{\left[\sum_{k \notin \mathbb{N}} q^{-k} \right]^{q^{(1-q)}} + 1} \quad (44)$$

$$U_q \approx \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{k}{\left[\sum_{k \notin \mathbb{N}} q^{-k} \right]^{q^{(1-q)}} + 1} \quad (45)$$

similar to the ones obtained using the FA. We dare say that the present treatment is simpler than the one found in Ref. [11]. The simple appearance we are emphasizing here is deceptive, though. In order to perform any practical calculation one has to solve a coupled system due to the presence of q . This problem, in turn, can be overcome by noticing that q satisfies the approximate relation

$$\frac{1}{q} \approx 1 + (1-q) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{k}{\left[\sum_{k \notin \mathbb{N}} q^{-k} \right]^{q^{(1-q)}} + 1} \quad (46)$$

which allows one to obtain q in terms of N_q and, as a consequence, to decouple Eqs. (44) and (45).

In this context, which we recall is valid for $q \rightarrow 1$, we will now discuss the thermodynamic limit inspired in calculations performed by Ubriaco [13]. We consider a system of massive

spinless particles in a volume V at temperature T . Going over to the thermodynamic limit in Eqs. (44) and (45) we find that

$$N_q = \frac{V}{\lambda_T^3} \frac{1}{q} f_{3=2}^{3=2}(z;q) \quad (47)$$

and

$$U_q = \frac{3}{2} T \frac{V}{\lambda_T^3} \frac{1}{q} f_{5=2}^{5=2}(z;q) \quad (48)$$

where $\lambda_T = h/\sqrt{2\pi m T}$ is the usual thermal wavelength and z is the fugacity. We have introduced the following Fermi-like integral

$$f_n(z;q) = \frac{1}{(n)} \int_0^{\infty} dx \frac{x^{n-1}}{[1 + (q-1)x + (q-1)^2 \ln z]^{(q-1)+1}} \quad (49)$$

Using the definition of Eq. (17), the first term in the denominator can be re-expressed as $[e_q(x + (q-1)\ln z)]^q$ so that

$$f_n(z;q) = \frac{1}{(n)} \int_0^{\infty} dx \frac{x^{n-1}}{[e_q(x + (q-1)\ln z)]^q + 1} \quad (50)$$

and in this form it is easy to see that it gives the expected result $z^{-1}e^x$ when $q = 1$.

The ratio U_q/N_q can be obtained from the thermodynamic limit of Eq. (46) as

$$\frac{U_q}{N_q} = \frac{1}{1 + (q-1) \frac{V}{\lambda_T^3} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{q} f_{5=2}^{5=2}(z;q)} \ln z \frac{1}{q} f_{3=2}^{3=2}(z;q) \quad (51)$$

Making use of the approximate results in Eqs. (47) and (48) we can express it in the fashion

$$\frac{U_q}{N_q} = \frac{1 + (q-1) N_q \ln z}{1 + (q-1) N_q \frac{3}{2} \frac{f_{5=2}(z;q)}{f_{3=2}(z;q)}} \quad (52)$$

Then, we can write down the generalized energy per particle $u_q = U_q/N_q$ in a useful form as

$$u_q = \frac{3}{2} T \frac{f_{5=2}(z;q)}{f_{3=2}(z;q)} \frac{1 + (q-1) N_q \ln z}{1 + (q-1) N_q \frac{3}{2} \frac{f_{5=2}(z;q)}{f_{3=2}(z;q)}} \quad (53)$$

that resembles the conventional result.

Let us discuss the behavior of the generalized specific heat per particle in the present context. We have computed it following the usual procedure, by taking the temperature derivative of u_q keeping the volume as well as N_q fixed. The resulting expression {not given here} for $C_{V,q}=N_q$ is somewhat involved; it can be written in terms of $q-1$, N_q , $\ln z$ and the Fermi-like integrals $f_n(z;q)$ with $n = 1, 2, 3$ and $5/2$. An interesting study is to compare this generalized result against its conventional counterpart, $C_V=N$, to which it approaches when $q \rightarrow 1$. We have accomplished this comparison assuming that the value of the non-extensivity parameter q was close enough to 1 that we were allowed to use Taylor expansions for all the generalized quantities involved, up to first order in $q-1$. We therefore define

$$C_{V,q}=N_q = C_V=N [1 + (q-1) C^{(1)} + O(q-1)^2] \quad (54)$$

and obtained the relative first-order correction $C^{(1)}$ as a (rather complicated) function of z and N . In order to see the effects of non-extensivity on the specific heat for an ideal Fermi gas, we have considered the two extreme regimes of very low and very high temperatures. Our main conclusions are that: (i) $C_{V,q}(T=0) = 0$ for arbitrary q ; (ii) when $T \ll 0$ (in which case $\ln z$ is of the order of $\epsilon_F/T \gg 1$, where ϵ_F stands for the Fermi energy), $C^{(1)}$ represents a positive contribution that behaves as $N \ln z$ plus smaller terms, then $C_{V,q} \approx N_q \gg C_V \approx N$ for $q \gg 1$; and (iii) when $T \gg 1$ (in which case z is approximately $\frac{3}{T} N = V^{-1}$), $C^{(1)}$ represents a negative contribution that also behaves mainly as $N \ln z$, then $C_{V,q} \approx N_q \ll C_V \approx N$ for $q \gg 1$ {in the case $q \ll 1$, the same finding is reported by Ubriaco [13]}.

Finally, let us point out the differences between the present results and the calculations of Ref. [13]. They manifest in the presence of powers of $(= q)$ in Eqs. (47), (48), and (49). These differences are ultimately due to the definition one chooses for the generalized mean values. As discussed in the previous sections, instead of using unnormalized mean values we work here within a normalized Tsalis framework, in its OLM version. Moreover, we compute, for consistency, the q -generalized expectation value for the number operator instead of dealing simply with \hat{N}_{i_1} .

VI. THE THERMODYNAMIC LIMIT

Let us discuss the thermodynamic limit in a more general context, and present our results for the internal energy and specific heat of an ideal fermion gas in the thermodynamic limit for any $q > 1$ -value (in the $0 < q < 1$ case we encounter a serious convergence problem on account of the cutoff condition. It is only easily tractable in the $q \ll 1$ case). Following usual practice, in the limit of large volume (coordinate space) we can convert summations over discrete single-particle levels into integrations in phase space. If the energy spectrum of a particle in the gas is of the form $\epsilon(p) = A p^b$ with degeneracy g , we can write these integrals in terms of continuous single-particle energies. In doing so we need the density of states, given by

$$D(\epsilon) d\epsilon = g \frac{L^d}{h^d} \frac{2^{d-2}}{(d-2)!} \frac{1}{A} \frac{1}{\epsilon^{d/2-1}} d\epsilon \quad (55)$$

where we have assumed that the gas is contained in a hypercube of volume L^d in a d -dimensional space. In the case of massive spinless particles in 3D, one has $a = 2$, $V(2m)^{3/2} = h^3$ and $b = 3/2$; while for electrons in the ultra-relativistic limit one has $a = 8$, $V(hc)^3$ and $b = 3$. The conventional ($q = 1$) grand partition function for an ideal fermion gas whose density of states is of the form (55), is given by [34, 35]

$$\ln Z_1(f; g; V \gg 1) = a(b) \frac{f_{b+1}(e^{-f})}{b} \quad (56)$$

with $f > 0$ and $b > 0$. The function f_n stands for the usual FD integral, which in terms of the fugacity $z = e^{-f}$ reads

$$f_n(z) = \frac{1}{(n)!} \int_0^{\infty} dx \frac{x^{n-1}}{z^{-1} e^x + 1} = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{l-1} \frac{z^l}{l^n}$$

One can now write down the generalized grand partition function Z_q making use of an integral representation (see Appendix). We consider here the real representation (Hilhorst

transform) of Eq. (A 3). To this end, the function Z_1 is evaluated for the transformed Lagrange multipliers $\beta_0 = \beta(q-1)$ and $\beta_1 = \beta(q-1)$. Thus, in the thermodynamic limit we find, for any index q greater than one (and provided that the grand-canonical configurational characteristic is positive definite), the following exact expression

$$Z_q = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{q-1}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{q-1}} dt t^{\frac{1}{q-1}-1} \exp \left[-\beta [I_q - (q-1)I] + a - (b) \frac{f_{b+1}(e^{-\beta(q-1)})}{\beta(q-1)} \right] \quad (57)$$

where I_q stands for $U_q + N_q = U_q$, from which one gets $1 - (q-1)I = \frac{1}{q}$.

A . Classical limit

Let us consider now the case of sufficiently small values of z , which corresponds to the classical limit. In such a case, the FD integrals that appear in the different thermodynamic quantities of interest can be expanded in the fugacity, up to second order, as $f_n(z) \sim z - \frac{z^2}{2^n}$. The ensuing OLM generalized partition function becomes then

$$\begin{aligned} Z_q = e_q(I_q) + a \frac{(b) \frac{1}{q-1} - b}{\frac{1}{q-1}} e_q(I_q) + \frac{1 - (q-1)(\frac{1}{q-1})^b}{(q-1)} \\ + \frac{a}{2} \frac{(b) \frac{1}{q-1} - b}{\frac{1}{q-1}} e_q(I_q - 2) + \frac{1 - (q-1)(\frac{1}{q-1})^{2b}}{2(q-1)} \\ + a^2 \frac{(b)^2 \frac{1}{q-1} - 2b}{\frac{1}{q-1}} e_q(I_q - 2) + \frac{1 - (q-1)(\frac{1}{q-1})^{2b}}{(q-1)} + \dots \quad (58) \end{aligned}$$

In the process we must take care of some restrictions on the parameters that arise from the use of the definition of the gamma function Eq. (A 1). They are: i) $q > 1$, ii) $1 - (q-1)I > 0$, and iii) $1 - (q-1) - 2b > 0$. As a consequence, the present findings are valid within the region $1 < q < \min(1 + \frac{1}{1-2b}; 1 + \frac{1}{I_q})$. We can also obtain U_q and N_q in this case, in the form prescribed in Eq. (A 4). Keeping only terms up to first order in the fugacity, we are able to express the ratio between the generalized mean energy and particle number in the fashion

$$u_q = \frac{U_q}{N_q} \sim \frac{1}{bT} \frac{(q-1)[U_q + (N_q - 1)]}{1 - (q-1)b} \quad (59)$$

from which we can obtain

$$u_q \sim \frac{1}{bT} \frac{(q-1)(N_q - 1)}{1 + (q-1)b(N_q - 1)} \quad (60)$$

where one can easily recognize the appropriate result for the classical energy per particle when $q = 1$. In the present situation we also find $I_q = (b+1)N_q = [1 + (q-1)b(N_q - 1)]$. The implicit relation between $\beta \hat{N} i_q$ and its corresponding Lagrange multiplier can be cast in the

following way

$$N_q = \frac{1}{1} \frac{(q-1)(N_q-1)}{(q-1)(N_q+b)} \frac{1 + (q-1)b(N_q-1)^{b-1}}{1} = a(b) \frac{\frac{1}{q-1} b}{\frac{1}{q-1}} e_q(b) \frac{1}{b^{b-1}} \quad (61)$$

from which one could, in principle, solve for a as a function of N_q . Introducing this result into the expression given above for u_q , one finally would obtain the generalized mean energy per particle as a function of temperature (and of N_q). Therefore, in this limit we are able to overcome the eventual possible complications introduced, within the OLM formalism, by the presence of the term $I_q = \sum_{j=1}^M \log_{j,q}$ in the expressions for the generalized partition function and other thermodynamic quantities.

B. Low temperature limit

Let us face now the particular situation in which the fugacity is extremely large:

$$z \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \beta \mu \rightarrow 0$$

which corresponds to the low temperature limit with finite chemical potential. Notice that, in this case, the transformed variable $e^{\beta(q-1)\mu}$ becomes very large as well. We can make use of Sommerfeld's lemma [34, 36]

$$f_n(z) = \frac{(\ln z)^n}{(n+1)!} \left[1 + \frac{1}{6} n(n-1) \frac{1}{(\ln z)^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\ln z)^4}\right) \right] \quad (62)$$

which gives an asymptotic expansion of the FD integrals for $z \rightarrow 1$. As can be seen, the dominant term in the expansion is of order $(\ln z)^n$. We can evaluate the integral in Eq. (57) up to this order, getting an expression valid for all $q > 1$ in the low temperature limit:

$$Z_q' = e_q(I_q) \frac{a}{b(b+1)} \frac{1}{b^{b-1}} \quad (63)$$

Additional quantities evaluated up to the same order are

$$U_q' = \frac{a}{b+1} b^{b+1} \quad \text{and} \quad N_q' = \frac{a}{b} b^b \quad (64)$$

independently of the value of q , in agreement with previous results obtained using the OLM formalism [22]. Using the above relations we can derive the Fermi potential as $\mu_F = (N_q b = a)^{1/b}$; and we can also identify the Fermi temperature as $T_F = \mu_F = (N_q b = a)^{1/b}$. Besides, it is easy to obtain $I_q^{(0)}$ and then simplify the expression for Z_q , leading to

$$Z_q' = e_q(2I_q^{(0)}) = e_q \frac{2a}{b(b+1)} b^{b+1} \quad (65)$$

It is worth pointing out that the mean energy per particle in the OLM-Tallis framework does not depend explicitly on the value of q . Indeed, in the limit under consideration we have $U_q^{(0)} = N_q = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{1}{b+1}$.

Performing calculations up to the next order of approximation we arrive, after a little algebra, at the following results which are valid for any $q > 1$:

$$N_q = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{1}{b+1} + \frac{T^2}{6(b+1)} \frac{I^2}{1-(q-1)} + \dots \quad (66)$$

where the quantity $I^2 = 1 - (q-1) \int_0^1 \frac{U_q - a/b}{a/b} g = 1 - (q-1) (I_q - I_q^{(0)})$ is very close to unity. Actually, the second term in I vanishes if one keeps just terms corresponding to the lowest-order approximation, which eliminates the term I_q introduced by the OLM procedure (see Eqs. (13), (15), and (21)). For the chemical potential we find

$$\mu_q^{(2)} = \frac{a}{b+1} - \frac{T^2}{6(b+1)} \frac{I^2}{T_F} \frac{1}{1-(q-1)} \quad (67)$$

whereas the generalized mean energy becomes

$$U_q^{(2)} = \frac{a}{b+1} + \frac{T^2}{6(b+1)} \frac{I^2}{T_F} \frac{1}{1-(q-1)} \quad (68)$$

From this expression we derive the generalized specific heat at constant volume

$$C_{V,q}^{(2)} = N_q \frac{T^2}{3} \frac{1}{T_F} \frac{1}{1-(q-1)} \quad (69)$$

where we have assumed $I^2 = 1$. Notice the linear behavior of the specific heat with temperature and that the only difference with the conventional results (see, e.g., Ref. [34]) comes through a factor $1/(2-q)$ which goes to unity in the limit $q \rightarrow 1^+$.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this communication we have presented an exact statistical treatment for the ideal Fermi system in the generalized, nonextensive thermodynamics framework of the third Tallis-avor, the TMP one. Our main innovation is that of employing the OLM approach to nonextensivity [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27], which allows one to obtain analytical results unavailable if one uses other algorithms that revolve around the concept of Tallis' entropy.

Additionally, we have i) solved in exact fashion the Fermi-TMP equations, ii) introduced a method for evaluating traces that bypasses the use of the Gamma representation, iii) devised a rather simple treatment of $q \rightarrow 1$ instances, and iv) studied interesting limiting situations. More specifically, the exact generalized partition function in the grand canonical ensemble has been given, and we derived the ensuing statistics for arbitrary positive values of the nonextensivity index q . Several limit instances of interest were here discussed in some detail:

1. the thermodynamic limit,

2. the case $q \rightarrow 1$ ($q = 1$ corresponds to the conventional Fermi-Dirac statistics),
3. the low temperature regime, where we obtained results that are independent of the specific q -values.

In writing down the generalized expectation value for the occupation number operator we were able to explicitly display the correlation among the occupations of different levels, which is a typical nonextensive effect. Indeed, the distinct mean occupation numbers are seen to disentangle from each other as one approaches the conventional $q = 1$ statistics. Finally, we discussed the limits of validity of the Factorization Approach of Buyukcelik et al. [12].

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge financial support from CONICET (Argentina). M.P. acknowledges also a grant from Fundacion Antorchas (Argentina).

-
- [1] A periodically updated bibliography on nonextensive thermostatistics can be found in the URL <http://tsallis.cat.cbpf.br/biblio.htm>
 - [2] C. Tsallis, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals 6 (1995) 539; Physics World 10 (July 1997) 42
 - [3] C. Tsallis, Braz. J. Phys. 29 (1999) 1, and references therein
 - [4] S. Abe and Y. Okamoto, Nonextensive Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, Lecture Notes in Physics 560 (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2001)
 - [5] A. Plastino and A.R. Plastino, Braz. J. Phys. 29 (1999) 50; *ibidem* 79
 - [6] F. Pennini, A.R. Plastino and A. Plastino, Physica A 258 (1998) 446
 - [7] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. 52 (1988) 479
 - [8] A.R. Plastino and A. Plastino, Phys. Lett. A 177 (1993) 177
 - [9] E.M.F. Curado and C. Tsallis, J. Phys. A 24 (1991) L69; Corrigenda: 24 (1991) 3187 and 25 (1992) 1019
 - [10] A. Plastino and A.R. Plastino, Phys. Lett. A 226 (1997) 257
 - [11] F. Buyukcelik and D. Demirhan, Phys. Lett. A 181 (1993) 24
 - [12] F. Buyukcelik, D. Demirhan and A. Gulec, Phys. Lett. A 197 (1995) 209
 - [13] M.R. Ubriaco, Phys. Rev. E 60 (1999) 165
 - [14] F. Pennini, A. Plastino and A.R. Plastino, Physica A 234 (1996) 471
 - [15] D.F. Torres and U. Timakli, Physica A 261 (1998) 499
 - [16] C. Tsallis, R.S. Mendes and A.R. Plastino, Physica A 261 (1998) 534
 - [17] E.T. Jaynes, in: Statistical Physics, ed. W.K. Ford (Benjamin, NY, 1963), p. 181
 - [18] A. Katz, Principles of Statistical Mechanics, The Information Theory Approach (Freeman and Co., San Francisco, 1967)
 - [19] A.R. Plastino and A. Plastino, Phys. Lett. A 193 (1994) 251
 - [20] R.P. Di Sisto, S. Martnez, R.B. Orellana, A.R. Plastino and A. Plastino, Physica A 265 (1999) 590
 - [21] M. Casas, S. Martnez, F. Pennini and A. Plastino, Physica A 305 (2002) 41
 - [22] S. Martnez, F. Nicolas, F. Pennini and A. Plastino, Physica A 286 (2000) 489
 - [23] S. Martnez, F. Pennini and A. Plastino, Phys. Lett. A 278 (2000) 47

- [24] Sumiyoshi Abe, S. Mart nez, F. Pennini and A. Plastino, Phys. Lett. A 278 (2001) 249
- [25] S. Mart nez, F. Pennini and A. Plastino, Physica A 295 (2001) 246
- [26] S. Mart nez, F. Pennini and A. Plastino, Physica A 295 (2001) 416
- [27] S. Mart nez, F. Pennini, A. Plastino and C. J. Tessone, Physica A 309 (2002) 85
- [28] M. G rether, M. de Llano and M. A. Sol s, preprint (2002) [cond-mat/0212465]
- [29] H. H. Arag ao-Rêgo, D. J. Soares, L. S. Lucena, L. R. da Silva, E. K. Lenzi and Kwok Sau Fa, Physica A 317 (2003) 199
- [30] C. Tsalis, in: New trends in magnetism, magnetic materials and their applications, eds. J.L. Moran-Lopez and J.M. Sanchez (Plenum Press, NY, 1994) p. 451
- [31] D. Prato, Phys. Lett. A 203 (1995) 165
- [32] E. K. Lenzi and R. S. Mendes, Phys. Lett. A 250 (1998) 270
- [33] M. R. C. Solis and J. P. H. Esquerre, preprint (2003) [cond-mat/0302094]
- [34] R. K. Pathria, Statistical Mechanics (Pergamon Press, Exeter, 1993)
- [35] K. Huang, Statistical Mechanics (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1987)
- [36] A. Sommerfeld, Z. Physik 47 (1928) 1
- [37] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, Table of Integrals, Series and Products (Academic Press, San Diego, 2000) 6th ed.

APPENDIX A : INTEGRAL REPRESENTATIONS

In this appendix we summarize a practical method for calculating the generalized partition function (16) and expectation values (20) of relevant observables, by recourse to integral representations based on the definition of the Euler gamma function. We start with the identity

$$\int_0^{\infty} dt t^{q-1} e^{-t} = \frac{\Gamma(q)}{\Gamma(q)} \quad (A1)$$

for $q > 0$ and $\Gamma(q) > 0$ (see for instance Ref. [37], page 342). One can then write

$$\hat{f}_q^{1=(1-q)} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{q-1}} \int_0^{\infty} dt t^{\frac{1}{q-1}-1} e^{-t \hat{f}_q} \quad (A2)$$

with the restrictions that i) \hat{f}_q be positive (which is indeed always complied with because of Tsalis' cutoff condition [19]), and ii) $q > 1$. The usefulness of the transformation becomes evident, as the power-law form is converted into an exponential factor.

Evaluating the trace of the above expression {see *see* comments below} and introducing the OLM quantal configurational characteristic, one arrives at an integral representation (Hilhorst transform [30]) for the OLM generalized partition function (16) of index $q > 1$, in the form

$$Z_q = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{q-1}} \int_0^{\infty} dt t^{\frac{1}{q-1}-1} e^{-t[1+(1-q) \sum_k^P h_k \hat{\sigma}_k^i]} Z_1(f_i^0/g) \quad (A3)$$

Here the integrand contains the corresponding conventional partition function Z_1 evaluated for the set of transformed Lagrange multipliers $f_i^0(t) = t(q-1) \hat{\sigma}_i$; $i = 1, \dots, M$ g. Notice that this transformation preserves the sign of the Lagrange parameters (this fact is used in the text). The generalized expectation values (11) can be expressed, for $q > 1$, in terms of

integrals involving Z_1 and its derivative with respect to the associated Lagrange multiplier. Indeed, one realizes that

$$\hat{h}_{ji_q} = \frac{\int_0^1 dt t^{\frac{1}{q-1}} e^{t[1+(1-q)\sum_k h_k i_q]} \partial Z_1(f_i^0 g) = \partial_j^0}{\int_0^1 dt t^{\frac{1}{q-1}} e^{t[1+(1-q)\sum_k h_k i_q]} Z_1(f_i^0 g)} \quad (A 4)$$

Let us mention that one can obtain alternative integral representations for Z_q and \hat{h}_{ji_q} in the range $0 < q < 1$ by recourse, for instance, to the following complex representation of the Euler gamma function

$$Z_1 = \int_1^\infty dt (t + it) e^{-(t+it)} = 2^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \quad (A 5)$$

for $\gamma > 0$, $\psi(\gamma) > 0$ and $\psi'(\gamma) > 0$ ([37], p. 343). In this case (that may be called the Prato-Lenzi transform [31, 32]) the partition function can be written as

$$Z_q = \frac{1}{2} \frac{q-2}{q-1} \int_1^\infty dt (1+it)^{\frac{1}{q-1}-1} e^{(1+it)[1+(1-q)\sum_k h_k i_q]} Z_1(f_i^0 g) \quad (A 6)$$

where $\tilde{f}_i(t) = (1+it)(1-q)i$ for each $i = 1; \dots; M$, and the region of validity is $q < 1$ or $q > 2$. The associated mean values take the form

$$\hat{h}_{ji_q} = \frac{\int_1^\infty dt (1+it)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} e^{(1+it)[1+(1-q)\sum_k h_k i_q]} \partial Z_1(f_i^0 g) = \partial_j^0}{\int_1^\infty dt (1+it)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} e^{(1+it)[1+(1-q)\sum_k h_k i_q]} Z_1(f_i^0 g)} \quad (A 7)$$

for $j = 1; \dots; M$ and $q < 1$.

Some additional remarks are necessary. A quite detailed analysis concerning integral representations for the q -thermodynamic statistics can be found in the recent preprint [33] by Solis and Esquerro, who pay special attention to practical details of the representations discussed above. One has to make sure that all states are contributing to the evaluation of the trace (in the sense that there is no cutoff in order to get Z_1 on the r.h.s. of Eqs. (A 3) or (A 6)). Solis and Esquerro point out that this fact has not been taken into account in the majority of Tsalis-related works (see, for instance, [29]). In our particular case, the condition to be imposed in order to ensure that the Hilhorst-type representation can be safely used can be stated in the following terms: \hat{f}_q as given by Eq. (21) should be positive definite for all states, i.e., the lowest energy eigenvalue (or the greatest lower bound of the Hamiltonian) should be greater than or equal to $(\hat{N} - N_q) + U_q - 1 = [(q-1)]$. (Notice that the simpler requirement given in Ref. [33], namely that \hat{H} be greater than $-1 = [(q-1)]$, originates in the fact that a canonical-ensemble description is performed and also that unnormalized, Curado-Tsalis mean values are employed.)