$C \text{ om } m \text{ ent } on \ C \text{ ritigue } of q \text{ entropy for therm al statistics" by M . N auenberg$

C.Tsallis

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rua X avier Sigaud 150, 22290-180 Rio de Janeiro - RJ, Brazil

(April 14, 2024)

Pacs N um bers: 05.70.-a, 05.20.-y, 05.90.+m

It was recently published [1] a quite long list of objections about the physical validity for therm al statistics of the theory som etim es referred to in the literature as nonextensive statistical mechanics. This generalization of Boltzm ann-G lobs (BG) statistical mechanics is based on the following expression for the entropy:

$$S_{q} = k \frac{1 \frac{P_{i=1}}{p_{i}} p_{i}^{q}}{q 1} \quad (q 2 R; S_{1} = S_{BG} k \frac{X}{p_{i}} \ln p_{i})$$
(1)

The author of [1] already presented orally the essence of his arguments in 1993 during a scienti cmeeting [2]. I am replying now simultaneously to the just cited paper, as well as to the 1993 objections (essentially, the violation of \findam ental therm odynam ic concepts", as stated in the Abstract of [1]). The list of objections and critical statements being extremely long, it is perhaps not really necessary at the present stage to reply to all the points. For time and space economy, I will therefore address here only a few selected points, hopefully the m ost relevant ones, physically and/or logically speaking.

About the nonextensivity of the entropy S_q :

The entropy S_q is nonextensive for independent systems (see Eq. (6) of [1]), which by no means implies that it cannot be extensive in the presence of correlations at all scales. Nowhere in [1] is there clear evidence of taking this fact into account in what concerns the validity of the q-therm ostatistics. It is nevertheless of crucial importance, as we illustrate now for the simple case of equiprobability (i.e., $p_i = 1=W$; 8i). In such simple situation, Eq. (1) becomes

$$S_q = k \ln_q W$$
 $(\ln_q x (x^{1 q} 1) = (1 q); \ln_1 x = \ln x)$:
(2)

If a system constituted by N elements is such that it can be divided into two orm ore essentially independent subsystem s (e.g., independent coins or dices, or spins interacting through short-range coupling), we generically have $W = {}^{N}$ (> 1). Consequently, $S_q = k = \ln_q = {}^{N}$. There

is an unique value of q, namely q = 1, for which we obtain the usual result S_q / N . But if the system is such that N (> 0), then $S_q = k$ we have W ln_qN. Once again, there is a unique value of q, namely q = 1 1= for which, S_{α} / N. This fact is well known to many scientists working on nonextensive statistical mechanics, and has been published in the special volum e dedicated to the subject indicated in Refs. [5, 6, 14] of paper [1]. The same property holds in fact for S $_{\rm (q)}$, $\,$ (q) being any smooth function of q such that (1) = 1 (e.g., = 1=q, or = 2 q). For the correlated case, we have S $_{(q)}$ / N only for q satisfying (1 (q)) = 1. The relevance of this property (S / N) for therm odynam ics needs, we believe, no further com m ents.

About the concept of \weak coupling" in [1]:

Much of the criticism in [1] involves the concept of \weak coupling". To make this point clear through an illustration, let us think of the ground state of a H am iltonian many-body classical system whose elements are localized on a d-dimensional lattice and have two-body interactions am ong them . Let us further assum e that the (attractive) coupling constant is given by $C_{ij} = c = r_{ij}$ (c > 0,0, and $r_{ij} = 1; :::$). The potential energy U (N) per particle generically satis es U (N)=N / $\begin{array}{c} P \\ c \\ i \in j \end{array} 1 = r_{ij} \prime \quad c \\ 1 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} R_N \\ 1 \\ r^{i-d} \\ r^{d-1} \\ r \end{array}$ $C\frac{N^{1} = d 1}{1 = d}$. / Therefore, for =d > 1 (short-range interactions in the present context), we have that $\lim_{N \leq 1} U(N) = N$ is nite, and BG statistical mechanics certainly provides the appropriate answer for the stationary state (therm al equilibrium) of the system . In this case, all the usual prescriptions of therm odynam ics are satis ed, as well known [3]. If the interactions are, however, long-range (i.e., 0 =d 1), then $\lim_{N \leq 1} U(N) = N$ diverges, and the case needs further discussion. It m ight well happen that, dynamically speaking, the N ! 1 and the t ! 1 lim its do not commute. If so, only the $\lim_{N \leq 1} \lim_{t \leq 1}$ ordering corresponds to the BG stationary state, whereas the opposite ordering, $\lim_{t \ge 1} \lim_{N \ge 1}$, might be a com plex one, di erent from the BG state, and in some occasions possibly related to the one obtained within the q-form alism . It is clear then that, if we have long-range

tsallis@ cbpf.br

interactions and N >> 1 (say of the order of the Avogadro number), it m ight very well happen that the BG equilibrium is physically inaccessible, and the only physically relevant stationary or quasi-stationary (m etastable) state is a non-G ibbsian one. Such situation is indeed found in [4], as discussed below.

We can now address the manner used in [1] to refer to \weak coupling". It applies essentially in the simple manner stated in [1] only for = d > 1, being conceptually =d much more subtle for 0 1. For example, if =d < 1, U (N) = N diverges as $N^{1} = d (N ! 1)$ for 0 any nonvanishing value of c, even for c corresponding to ... 10¹⁰ eV ! Consistently, the generic use, without further considerations (such as the (N;t) ! (1;1) limits, and the range of =d), of relations such as Eqs. (5) and (7) of [1] seems irreducibly unjusti ed; as they stand, they trivially yield to no other possibility than q = 1. In fact, this point has already been transparently addressed by Ferm i in 1936 [5].

About the determ ination of the value of q for a given system :

The entropic param eterq is referred in [1] as an \underedeterm ined param eter". Moreover, the author claim s having proved that $\langle q m ust be a universal constant, just like the Boltzm ann constant k...". I have di culty in unam biguously nding in the paper whether this kind of statem ent would only apply to Ham iltonian system s, or perhaps also to dissipative ones; to system s whose phase space is high-dimensional, or perhaps also to the low – dimensional ones. By \underedeterm ined", it remains not totally clear whether the expression is used in the sense that q is \underedeterm inable", or in the sense of \not yet determ ined". However, if we put all this together, one m ight suspect that what is claim ed in [1] is that it can be determ ined it to necessarily be <math>q = 1$.

To make this point transparent, we may illustrate the factual nonuniversality of q by addressing the logisticlike fam ily of m aps $x_{t+1} = 1$ a $jx_t j$, whose usefulness in physics can hardly be contested (at least for z = 2). As conjectured since 1997 [6], num erically exhibited in m any occasions (e.g., in [7{10]), and analytically proved recently [11,12] on renorm alization group grounds, q does depend on z, and is therefore not universal, in neat contrast with what is claim ed in [1]. Its value for z = 2 (i.e., the standard logistic map), as given by the sensitivity to the initial conditions, is q = 0.244487... at the edge of chaos (e.g., a = 1:401155:...), whereas it is q = 1 for all values of a for which the Lyapunov exponent is positive (e.g., for a = 2). We have illustrated the nonuniversality of q for nonlinear dynam ical system s with its value at the edge of chaos of the logistic map. It is perhaps worthy to notice that, since it has been proved to be analytically related to the Feigenbaum universal constant $_{\rm F}$ [1=(1 q) = ln $_{\rm F}$ = ln 2], and since this constant is already known with not less than 1018 digits, we actually

know this particular value of q with the sam e num ber of digits. Such a precision is self-explanatory with regard to the fact that q can be determ ined from st principles and that it can be di erent from unity (see also [13,14]).

A second illustration of the nonuniversality of q can be found in the three-component Lotka-Volterram odel in a d-dimensional hypercubic lattice [15]. This illustration is quite interesting because this model is a many-body problem. The corresponding grow th of drop lets has been shown to yield, through imposition of the niteness of the entropy production per unit time, q = 1 1=d for d = 1;2 [16]. This law has also been checked for d = 3;4[17]. It is of a rather simple nature, essentially related to the fact that the grow th of the bulk regions of this speci c m odel is characterized by the droplet linear size linearly increasing with time [17]. A similar law is obtained for a quite di erent model, namely a Boltzm ann d-dimensional lattice model for the incompressible uid Navier-Stokes equations. Indeed, an unique entropy, namely Sg, with an unique value of q, is mandated by the imposition of the most basic Galilean invariance of the equations. For the single-speed single-mass model it is q = 1 2=d [18]. Form ore sophisticated models q is determined by a transcendental equation [19]. These examples show how the entropy Sq enables to put on equal grounds situations that are physically quite disparate.

G iven the preceding illustrations of dissipative system s, and m any others existing in the literature, it could hardly be a big surprise if, also for many-body Ham iltonian systems, q turned out to be a nonuniversal index essentially characterizing what we may consider as nonextensivity universality classes (in total analogy with the universality classes that em erge in the theory of critical phenomena). More precisely, one expects q = 1for short-range interactions (=d > 1) in the example we used earlier), and q depending on (d;) (perhaps only on =d) for long-range interactions (i.e., 0 =d < 1), in the physically most important ordering $\lim_{t \ge 1} \lim_{N \ge 1}$. A lthough expected, the uncontestable evidence has not yet been provided. It is not hard for the reader to in agine the analytic and computational di culties that are involved. However, suggestive results are accumulating which point tow ards the applicability of nonextensive statistical mechanics for such long-range Ham iltonian system s. A lthough we shall later com e back onto this problem, let us already mention the following points.

(i) The one-body marginal distribution of velocities during the well known longstanding quasi-stationary (metastable) state of the isolated classical inertial X Y ferrom agnetically coupled rotators localized on a d-dimensional lattice can be anomalous (i.e., non-Maxwellian). Indeed, it approaches, for a non-zeromeasure class of initial conditions of the = 0 (8d) model and not too high velocities, a q-exponential distribution (we remind that e_q^x [1 + (1 q)x]^{1=(1 q)}, hence $e_1^x = e^x$) with q > 1 [4]. If the energy distribution followed BG statistics, the one-body marginal distribution of velocities ought to be quasi-Maxwellian (strictly M axwellian in the N ! 1 limit since then the microcanonical-ensemble necessary cuto in velocities diverges), but it is not . As specifically discussed in [4], the numerical results are incompatible with BG statistics. However, they do not yet prove that the one-body distribution of velocities precisely is, for the canonical ensemble, the one predicted by nonextensive statistics. Indeed, considering the appropriate limit (N; M; N=M) ! (1;1;1) (N being the number of rotators of the isolated system , and M being that of a relatively small subsystem of it) is crucial. W ork along this line is in progress.

(ii) In the same model, at high total energy, the largest Lyapunov exponent vanishes like 1=N where depends on =d [20,21]. Also during the lonstanding state, the largest Lyapunov exponent vanishes, this time like 1=N⁼³ [22]. It is clear that, with a vanishing Lyapunov spectrum, the system will be seriously prevented from satisfying Boltzm ann's \modecular chaos hypothesis", hence the \equal probability" occupation of phase space.

(iii) In the longstanding regime of the = 0 (8d) m odel, there is aging [23], som ething which is totally incompatible with the usual notion of therm al equilibrium. The correlation functions depend on the \waiting time", and are in all cases given by q-exponential functions. Even at high total energy, where the one-body distribution of velocities is M axwellian, and where there is no aging, the time correlation functions are still given by qexponentials with q > 1, instead of exponentials, which is the standard expectation in BG statistics.

(iv) The tem perature (/ m ean kinetic energy per particle) relaxes, after the quasistationary state observed in the one-dimensional 0 < 1 m odel, towards the BG tem perature through a q-exponential function with q > 1[24].

(v) In Lennard-Jones clusters of up to N = 14 atom s, the distribution of the number of links per site has been numerically computed [25], where two local minima of the many-body potential energy are \linked" if and only if they are separated by no more than one saddle-point. This distribution is a q-exponential with q' 2, as can be checked through direct tting. The possible connection with our present discussion comes from the fact that the average diameter of the cluster is (in units of atom ic size) of the order of $14^{1=3}$ ' 2:4. Consequently, although the Lennard-Jones interaction is not a long-range one therm odynamically speaking (indeed, =d = 6=3 = 2 > 1), it can e ectively be considered as such for small clusters, since all the atom s substantially interact with all the others.

(vi) The distribution of the number of links per node for the A lbert-B arabasigrow th model [26] yielding scalefree networks is analytically established to be, in the stationary state, a q-exponential with q = [2m (2 r) + 1 p r] = [m (3 2r) + 1 p r] 1, where (m; p; r) are m icroscopic parameters of the model. If we associate to this network an = 0 interaction per link, the just mentioned distribution also represents the distribution of energies per node. A lthough this is not the sam e distribution as that of the energy of m icroscopic states associated with a H am iltonian, it is neither very far from it.

(vii) A lthough not being m any-body problem s, let us mention at this point some results that have been obtained with the d = 2 standard m ap and with a d = 4set of two coupled standard maps. Both systems are conservative and sim plectic, having therefore the dynam ical setup of a standard H am iltonian. The d = 4 system has Arnold di usion as soon as the nonlinear coupling constant a is di erent from zero; this guarantees a chaotic sea which is singly connected in phase space (we m ay say that $a_c = 0$). The structure is more complex for the d = 2 case because no such di usion is present; consistently, unless a is su ciently large, disconnected chaotic \lakes" are present in the phase space; below $a_c = 0.97$..., closed KAM regions em erge in the problem. The remark that we wish to do here is that, in strong analogy with the many-body long-range Ham iltonian cases we have been discussing, both the d = 2 and the d = 4 m aps present a longstanding quasistationary states before crossing over to the stationary ones. The crossover time t_{crossover} diverges when a approaches a_c from above. This is very similar to what happens with the above (d;) Ham iltonian, for which strong num erical evidence exists [4,22,28] suggesting that t_{crossover} diverges as (N 1 =d 1)=(1 =d)whenN!1.

A libough none of the (seven) factual arguments that we have just presented constitutes a proof, the set of them does provide, in our undestanding, a quite strong suggestion that the longstanding quasistationary states existing in long-range many-body H am iltonians might be intimately connected to the nonextensive statistics, with q depending on basic model parameters such as d and . The entropic index q would then characterize universality classes of nonextensivity, the most famous of them being naturally the q = 1, extensive, universality class. Such view point is also consistent with the discussion about non-G ibbsian statistics presented in [29]. Last but by no means least, it is consistent with Einstein's 1910 criticism [30] of the Boltzm ann principle $S = k \ln W$ (lengthily commented in Ref. [6] of [1]).

About therm alcontact between system s with di erent values of q and the 0^{th} principle of therm odynam ics:

We focus now on a strong and crucial statement in [1], namely "... a Boltzm ann-G ibbs therm om eter would not be able to measure the temperature of a q-entropic system, and the laws of therm odynamics would therefore fail to have general validity." [1]. We shall present here the results [39] of molecular-dynamical simulations (using only F = ma as microscopic dynamics) which will precisely exhibit what is claimed in [1] to be impossible. We shall illustrate this with the isolated = 0 m odel of planar rotators, and proceed through two steps.

We rst show (Fig. 1) how the \tem perature" (de ned as twice the instantaneous kinetic energy per particle) of

a relatively sm all part of a large system relaxes onto the \tem perature" of the large system while this is in the quasistationary regime (where the system has been de nitely shown to be non-Boltzm annian, and where it m ight well be described by the q-statistics). We verify that the rest of the system acts for a generic sm all part of itself as a \therm ostat", in total analogy with what happens in BG therm al equilibrium. This is quite rem arkable if we think that the system is in a state so di erent from therm al equilibrium that it even has aging!

We then show (Fig. 2) how a BG therm on eter (its internal degrees of freedom are those of rst-neighborcoupled inertial rotators, hence de nitively a q = 1 system) does measure the \tem perature" of the in nitelyrange-coupled inertial rotators during their quasistationary state, hence where the statistics is de nitely non-Boltzm annian. At the light of this evidence, it appears that the 0th principle of therm odynam ics is even m ore general than the already in portant role that BG statisticalm echanics reserves for it. Naturally, the uctuations that we observe in both gures are expected to disappear in the (N; M; N=M)! (1;1;1) lim it.

The facts that we have mentioned up to this point heavily disqualify the essence of the critique presented in [1]. I believe, nevertheless, that it is instructive to further analyze it.

About the existing mathematical foundations of nonextensive statistical mechanics:

It is essentially claim ed in [1] that it can be proved, from the very foundations of statistical mechanics, that the only physically admissible one is that of BG. It is however intriguing how such a strong statement may be done without clearly pointing the mathematical errors that should then exist in the available proofs of the qexponential distribution. Such proofs have been provided by Abe and Rajagopal [31{34}; they are multiple, mutually consistent, and generalize the well known proofs done, for BG statistics, by Darwin-Fowler (in 1922), K hinchin (in 1949) and Balian-Balazs (in 1987), respectively using the steepest-descent method [31], the laws of large num bers [32], and the counting for the microcanonicalensem ble [33]. A ll these proofs are ignored in [1]. The critique therein developed outcom es severely diminished.

Similarly, no mention at all is made in [1] of the q-generalizations of Shannon 1948 theorem, and of K hinchin 1953 theorem, which are universally considered as part of the foundations of BG statistical mechanics since they prove under what conditions S_{BG} is unique. These two q-generalizations [35,36] analogously exhibit the necessary and su cient conditions associated with the uniqueness of S_{q} .

F inally, no m ention at all is made of the fact that S_q (8q > 0) shares with S_{BG} three remarkable m athem atical properties that are quite hard to satisfy, especially sim ultaneously. These three properties are concavity (R ef. [1] of [1]), stability [37], and niteness of entropy production

per unit time (see [38], am ong others). The di culty of having such agreable m athem atical features can be m easured by the fact that Renyi entropy (Eq. (19) of [1]), for instance, satis es none of them for abitrary q > 0.

It is perhaps for not paying due attention to all these theorems that the cyclic argument involving Eqs. (22-26) of [1] has been included in the critique. Indeed, that argument uses Eq. (22) to \prove" Eq. (26). Such a consistency can hardly be considered as surprising since the distribution in Eq. (22) is currently established precisely using the BG entropy, i.e., the form of Eq. (26). By the way, immediately after Eq. (26) we read \provided f(1) = f(0) = 0, which corresponds to the requirement that the entropy vanishes at T = 0". It is in fact only f(1) = 0 which is related to the vanishing entropy at T = 0. The property f(0) = 0 has in general nothing to do with it; it is instead related to the expansibility of the entropy, i.e., the fact that S (p₁; p₂; :::; p_W; 0) = S (p₁; p₂; :::; p_W).

About existing exact solutions of anomalous Fokker-Planck and Langevin equations:

The standard d = 1 Langevin equation (with a drift and an additive noise), and the standard coe cient d = 1 Fokker-Planck equation adm it as exact solutions the Gaussian distribution, and are usually considered as paradigm atic m esoscopic descriptions associated with BG statistical mechanics. They can be naturally generalized by also including a multiplicative noise (with amplitude M) in the Langevin equation, and by considering the so called \porous m edium equation", i.e., a nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation where the Laplacian operator applies to the power of the distribution. The exact solutions of these two nontrivial (nonlinear) equations are q-G aussians, with q = (3M +) = (M +) 1for the form er [40], and q = 2< 3 for the latter [41]. These suggestive m athem atical facts are ignored in [1].

M iscellanous

The precise form ulation of nonextensive statistical mechanics has, since 1988, evolved along time in what concerns the way of imposing the auxiliary constraints under which S_q is optimized (see Refs. [1-3] of [1]). The paradigmatic case occurs for the canonical ensemble, where one must decide how to generalize the traditional energy constraint. The correct manner is now adays accepted to be that indicated in Ref. [3] of [1], i.e., Eq. (3) of [1], namely

$$\frac{P_{W}}{P_{j=1}^{i=1} p_{j}^{q}} = U_{q}$$
(3)

This particular writing of the energy constraint has various interesting features. Let us mention here three of them (further convenient features can be found in Ref. β] of [1]). (i) It is precisely this form which emerges naturally within the steepest-descent proof [31] of the q-statistics. It is a trivial consequence of the fact that $de_q^x = dx = (e_q^x)^q$.

(ii) This particular form makes the theory to be, in what concerns the energy distribution, valid up to a single value of q, namely precisely that determ need by the trivial constraint $\prod_{i=1}^{W} p_i = 1$. Let us illustrate this in the continuum limit, for a typical example where the density of states g() / for ! 1 (2 R). Since $m_{e} e w \sinh p()$ to be normalizable, we must in pose that constant d g()p(). Since p() / ^{1=(1 q)} for ! 1, it must be + 1=(1 q) > 1, hence

$$q < (2 +) = (1 +);$$
 (4)

 $(q < 2 \text{ for the simple case of an asymptotically constant density of states, i.e., = 0). The niteness of constraint (3) imposes _______ d g() [p()] to be nite, which, interestingly enough, yields the same upper bound as before, namely Eq. (4). In other words, this makes the theory to have both constraints (norm and energy) m athematically well de ned (i.e., given by nite num bers) all the way up to a single upper bound for q.$

(iii) This structure (based on escort distributions [42]) for the energy constraint allows the construction of a quite general entropic form [43] which is extrem ized by the Beck-Cohen superstatistics [44], and which, quite rem arkably, is stable [45] (like S_q , and in variance with R enyientropy).

Since 1988, many applications have been proposed for the nonextensive statistics. Some of these have been elaborated within the 1988 way of writing the energy constraint (Ref. [1] of [1]), others have been elaborated within the 1991 way of writing this constraint (Ref. [2] of [1]), and nally others with the 1998 way (Ref. [3] of [1]). It is unfortunate that the 1998 way was not found from the very beginning in 1988, but this is the way it did happen (for a variety of reasons that are essentially commented in Ref. [3] of [1]). Consistently, it seems fair to now adays restrict possible criticism to applications indeed using the 1998 version. Unfortunately, all types of applications are criticized in [1] independently from what particularm anner have the author (s) adopted for the energy constraint. An intriguing example of such procedure is the criticism of som e 1995–1996 papers (Refs. [19–21] of [1]) on the possible q-generalization of the black-body radiation law. They indeed satisfy, as they should and as claimed in [1], the T⁴ Stefan-Boltzmann law (explicitly written in Eq. (18) of Ref. [19] of [1]). Nevertheless, they do not escape the criticism ! It is argued in [1] that errors have been done in these three papers, and that, if these errors had not been done, the papers would have violated the T 4 law , and therefore they also deserve criticism . In addition to this som ew hat courageous com m ent, no remarks are done about the fact that all three were published up to three years before the need for re-w riting the energy constraint became clear. More signi cantly,

this speci c criticism is indeed intriguing since it can be trivially shown that the T⁴ proportionality law remains the same for all energy statistical distributions (hence not only the BG one) as long as the m icroscopic energy scales linearly with the tem perature (i.e., for photons, as long as the distribution depends on the light frequency and the appropriate tem perature T, only through =T). Only the proportionality coe cient of the T⁴ law depends on the speci c statistics.

The author of [1] claims to have delivered the epistem ological coup de grâce to nonextensive statistical m echanics. Indeed, expressions like \unphysical", \m anifestly incorrect", \devoid of any physical meaning", \do not have any physicalm eaning", \disregarding such basic considerations", \nonsensical", \failure of this form alism ", \inconsistencies", \inconsistent with the fundam ental principles of therm odynam ics and statistical mechanics", \absolutely no physical justi cation has been given", and analogous ones, have been profusely used in [1]. We have essentially argued here that what we are facing is rather the opposite, in the sense that it is precisely the basis of the critique in [1] which appears to be deeply inconsistent with very many, and by now well established, physical and m athem atical facts. W e have only addressed the main mispaths and inadvertences in [1]. There are several more, but the full consideration of them all would dem and an appreciable e ort which, at the present moment, does not seem worthy. Our overall conclusion is that, although several important and/or interesting points related to nonextensive statistical mechanics still need further clari cation, this theory undoubtedly exhibits now adays a sensible num ber of physically and mathematically consistent results. Of course, as it has always been, only time will establish its degree of scienti c utility in theoretical physics and elsew here.

ACKNOW LEDGM ENTS

M.N auenberg communicated to me an early version of his arguments prior to publication, and asked for comments. Although he adopted basically none of those which I made on physical grounds, his gentle communication certainly was a polite attitude which I gladly acknow ledge here.

^[1] M .Nauenberg, Phys.Rev.E 67, 036114 (2003).

^[2] First International Conference on Complex Systems in Computational Physics (18-22 October 1993, Buenos Aires). Nauenberg heard, possibly for the rst time (in any case, for the rst time from me), about the nonextensive form alism in that occasion, where I presented a talk on the subject. Im mediately after the Session Chairm an

opening the talk for discussion, N auenberg presented to the audience the objections he has now developed in [1].

- [3] M E.Fisher, Arch.Rat.Mech.Anal. 17, 377 (1964), J. Chem.Phys.42, 3852 (1965), and J.M ath.Phys.6, 1643 (1965); M E.Fisher and D.Ruelle, J.M ath.Phys.7, 260 (1966); M E.Fisher and JL.Lebow itz, Commun.M ath. Phys.19, 251 (1970).
- [4] V.Latora, A.Rapisarda and C.Tsallis, Phys. Rev. E 64, 056134 (2001).
- [5] E.Fem i, Them odynam ics (1936) [\The entropy of a system composed of several parts is very often equal to the sum of the entropies of all the parts. This is true if the energy of the system is the sum of the energies of all the parts and if the work perform ed by the system during a transform ation is equal to the sum of the amounts of work perform ed by all the parts. Notice that these conditions are not quite obvious and that in some cases they may not be ful lled. Thus, for example, in the case of a system com posed of two hom ogeneous substances, it will be possible to express the energy as the sum of the energies of the two substances only if we can neglect the surface energy of the two substances where they are in contact. The surface energy can generally be neglected only if the two substances are not very nely subdivided; otherwise, it can play a considerable role."].
- [6] C.T sallis, A.R.P lastino and W.M. Zheng, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals 8, 885 (1997).
- [7] U M S.Costa, M L.Lyra, A R. Plastino and C.Tsallis, Phys. Rev. E 56, 245 (1997).
- [8] M L.Lyra and C.T sallis, Phys.Rev.Lett.80, 53 (1998).
- [9] F A B F. de Moura, U. Timakli and M L. Lyra, Phys.
- Rev.E 62,6361 (2000).
 [10] E P. Borges, C. Tsallis, G F J. Ananos and P M C.
 O liveira, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89, 254103 (2002).
- [11] F. Baldovin and A. Robledo, Europhys. Lett. 60, 518 (2002).
- [12] F.Baldovin and A.Robledo, Phys. Rev. E 66, R045104 (2002).
- [13] A.Plastino, Science 300, 250 (2003).
- [14] V. Latora, A. Rapisarda and A. Robledo, Science 300, 250 (2003).
- [15] A. Provata, G. N icolis and F. Baras, J. Chem. Phys. 110, 8361 (1999); G. A. T sekouras and A. Provata, Phys. Rev. E 65, 016204 (2002).
- [16] G A. Tsekouras, A. Provata and C. Tsallis, condm at/0303104.
- [17] C.Anteneodo (2003), private communication.
- [18] B M .Boghosian, P J.Love, P V. Coveney, IV. Karlin, S. Succi and J.Yepez, cond-m at/0211093 (2002).
- [19] B M. Boghosian, P.J. Love and J. Yepez, Galileaninvariant multi-speed entropic lattice Boltzmann models, preprint (2003).
- [20] C. Anteneodo and C. Tsallis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 5313 (1998).
- [21] A.Campa, A.Giansanti, D.Moroni and C.Tsallis, Phys. Lett. A 286, 251 (2001).
- [22] B J.C.Cabraland C.T sallis, Pys.Rev.E 66,065101(R) (2002).
- [23] M A.M ontem urro, F.Tam arit and C.Anteneodo, Phys. Rev.E 67, 031106 (2003); A.Pluchino, V.Latora and

A.Rapisarda, cond-m at/0303081.

- [24] C. Tsallis, A. Rapisarda, V. Latora and F. Baldovin, in Dynamics and Thermodynamics of Systems with Long Range Interactions, eds. T. Dauxois, S. Ru o, E. Arimondo, M. W ilkens, Lecture Notes in Physics 602 (Springer, Berlin, 2002).CONTROLAR
- [25] JPK.Doye, Phys.Rev.Lett. 88, 238701 (2002).
- [26] R. A Ibert and A L. Barabasi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 5234 (2000).
- [27] F. Baldovin, E. Brigatti and C. Tsallis, condmat/0302559.
- [28] A. Campa, A. G iansanti and D. M oroni, Physica A 305, 137 (2002).
- [29] A C D . van Enter, R . Fernandez and A D . Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. 72, 879 (1993).
- [30] A. E instein, Annalen der Physik 33, 1275 (1910) [\U sually W is put equal to the number of com plexions... In order to calculate W, one needs a com plete (m olecularmechanical) theory of the system under consideration. Therefore it is dubious whether the Boltzmann principle has any meaning without a com plete molecularmechanical theory or some other theory which describes the elementary processes. S = $\frac{R}{N} \log W$ + const: seem s without content, from a phenom enological point of view, without giving in addition such an Elementartheorie." (Translation: A braham Pais, Subtle is the Lord..., Oxford University Press, 1982)].
- [31] S.Abe and A K.Rajagopal, J.Phys. A 33, 8733 (2000).
- [32] S. Abe and A K. Rajagopal, Europhys. Lett. 52, 610 (2000).
- [33] S. Abe and A K. Rajagopal, Phys. Lett. A 272, 341 (2000), and Europhys. Lett. 55, 6 (2001).
- [34] S.Abe and A.K.Rajagopal, Science 300, 249 (2003).
- [35] R.J.V. Santos, J.M ath. Phys. 38, 4104 (1997).
- [36] S.Abe, Phys. Lett. A 271, 74 (2000).
- [37] S.Abe, Phys.Rev.E 66, 046134 (2002).
- [38] V. Latora, M. Baranger, A. Rapisarda and C. Tsallis, Phys. Lett. A 273, 97 (2000). See also the qgeneralization of Pesin theorem, conjectured in [6], and recently proved by F. Baldovin and A. Robledo, condm at/0304410.
- [39] L.G. Moyano, F. Baldovin and C. Tsallis, (preprint) (2003), to be published.
- [40] C.Anteneodo and C.T sallis, cond-m at/0205314.
- [41] A R. Plastino and A. Plastino, Physica A 222, 347 (1995); C. T sallis and D J. Bukm an, Phys. Rev. E 54, R2197 (1996).
- [42] C. Beck and F. Schlogl, Them odynamics of Chaotic System s (C am bridge University Press, C am bridge, 1993).
- [43] C. T sallis and A M C. Souza, Phys. Rev. E 67, 026106 (2003).
- [44] C.Beck and E.G.D.Cohen, Physica A 321 (2003).
- [45] A M C. Souza and C. T sallis, cond-m at/0301304.



FIG.1. T in e evolution of the tem perature $T_{m \ icrocanon \ ical}$ 2K (N)=N (K (N) total kinetic energy) of one isolated system started with waterbag initial conditions at (conveniently scaled) energy per particle equal to 0:69 (N = 5000 rotators; green line), and of the tem perature $T_{canon \ ical}$

2K (M)=M (K (M) subsystem total kinetic energy) of a part of it (M = 500 rotators; blue line). The M rotators were chosen such that their temperature $T_{canon\,ical}$ was initially below (a) or above (b) that of the whole system. It is particularly interesting the fact that, in case (b), the temperature of the subsystem of M rotators crosses the BG temperature T_{BG} = 0:476 without any particular detection of it.



FIG.2. T in e evolution of the tem perature $T_{\text{therm ostat}}$ 2K (N)=N (K (N) therm ostat total kinetic energy) of one in nitely-range-coupled large system (therm ostat) started with waterbag initial conditions (N = 100000 rotators; green line) and of the temperature $T_{\text{therm om eter}}$ 2K (M)=M (K (M) therm om eter total kinetic energy) of one rst-neighbor-coupled relatively small system (therm om eter) started at Maxwellian equilibrium at a temperature below that of the therm ostat (M = 50 rotators; blue and red lines). The large system is in the quasistationary state (where it is aging!); its (conveniently scaled) energy per particle equals 0:69. The therm om eter-therm ostat contact is assured by only one bond per therm on eter rotator, and starts at time $t_{contact}$. The intra-therm ostat and intra-therm om eter coupling constants equal unity; the therm ostat-therm om eter coupling constant equals 0:001. The therm alization of the therm om eter occurs at the therm ostat tem perature, and up to time 10⁵, exhibits no detection of the BG equilibrium t = 3tem perature $T_{B G} = 0.476$. The same phenom enon with the therm om eter initial tem perature being larger than that of the therm ostat is not shown, because our num erical results suggest that the N >> M >> 1 $\lim it$ has to be satis ed in an even more stringent manner due to the relatively large uctuations of $T_{\text{therm om eter}}$. For clarity, not all the points of the curves have been represented, but they have been instead logarithm ically decim ated.