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It was recently published [1] ] a quite long list of objections about the physical validity for them al statistics of the theory som etim es referred to in the literature as nonextensive statistical $m$ echanics. This generalization of B oltzm ann-G ibbs (BG) statisticalm echanics is based on the follow ing expression for the entropy:


The author of [ili] already presented orally the essence
 I am replying now sim ultaneously to the just cited paper, as well as to the 1993 ob jections (essentially, the violation of \fundam entaltherm odynam ic concepts", as stated in the A bstract of [1] [1]). The list of ob jections and critical statem ents being extrem ely long, it is perhaps not really necessary at the present stage to reply to all the points. For tim e and space econom y, I w ill therefore address here only a few selected points, hopefully the m ost relevant ones, physically and/or logically speaking.

A bout the nonextensivity of the entropy $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{q}}$ :
The entropy $S_{q}$ is nonextensive for independent system $s$ (see Eq. (6) of [i] $]_{1}^{1}$ ), which by no $m$ eans im plies that it cannot be extensive in the presence of correlations at all scales. N ow here in [1] [1] is there clear evidence of taking this fact into account in what concems the validity of the $q$-them ostatistics. It is nevertheless of crucial im portance, as we ilhustrate now for the sim ple case of equiprobability (i.e., $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{i}}=1=\mathrm{W}$; 8i). In such sim ple situation, Eq. (1) becom es
$S_{q}=k \ln _{q} W \quad\left(\ln _{q} x \quad\left(x^{1} q \quad 1\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & q\end{array}\right) ; \ln _{1} x=\ln x\right):$

If a system constituted by N elem ents is such that it can be divided into two orm ore essentially independent subsystem s (e.g., independent coins or diges, or spins interacting through short-range coupling), we generically have $\mathrm{W} \quad{ }^{\mathrm{N}} \quad(\quad 1)$. C onsequently, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{q}}=\mathrm{k} \quad \ln _{\mathrm{q}}{ }^{\mathrm{N}}$. There
is an unique value of $q$, nam ely $q=1$, forw hich we obtain the usual result $S_{q} / \mathrm{N}$. But if the system is such that we have W $N \quad(>0)$, then $S_{q}=k \quad \ln _{q} N$. O nce again, there is a unique value of $q$, nam ely $q=1 \quad 1=$ for which, $S_{q} / N$. This fact is well know $n$ to $m$ any scientists working on nonextensive statisticalm echanics, and has been published in the special volum e dedicated to the sub ject indicated in Refs. [5, 6, 14] of paper [1] [1] . $T$ he sam e property holds in fact for $S$ (q), (q) being any sm ooth 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 ( $1 \quad(\mathrm{q})$ ) $=1$. The relevance of this property ( $S / N$ ) for therm odynam ics needs, we believe, no further com $m$ ents.

A bout the concept of \weak coupling" in [1] [1] :
M uch of the criticism in [in] involves the concept of \weak coupling". To $m$ ake this point clear through an illustration, let us think of the ground state of a H am itonian $m$ any-body classical system whose elem ents are localized on a d-dim ensional lattice and have two-body interactions am ong them. Let us further assum e that the (attractive) coupling constant is given by $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ ( $c>0,0$, and $r_{i j}=1 ;:::$ ). The potential energy $U(\mathbb{N}$ ) per particle generically satis es $U(\mathbb{N})=N$ / $C_{i j_{j}} 1=r_{i j}, \quad C_{1}^{R_{N}}{ }_{1=d} d r r^{d 1} r / C \frac{N^{1}=d_{1}}{1}=d_{1}$. $T$ herefore, for $=d>1$ (short-range interactions in the present context), we have that $\lim { }_{N}!1 U(\mathbb{N})=N$ is nite, and BG statisticalm echanics certainly provides the appropriate answ er for the stationary state (therm al equilibrium ) of the system. In this case, all the usual prescriptions of them odynam ics are satis ed, as wellknown [3]1]. If the interactions are, how ever, long-range (i.e., $0 \quad=\mathrm{d} 1)$, then $\lim _{\mathrm{N}}!1 \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{N})=\mathrm{N}$ diverges, and the case needs further discussion. It $m$ ight w ell happen that, dynam ically speaking, the N ! 1 and thet! 1 lim its do not commute. If so, only the $\lim _{\mathrm{N}}$ ! $1 \lim _{\mathrm{t} \text { ! } 1}$ ordering corresponds to the BG stationary state, whereas the opposite ordering, $\lim _{t!} 1 \lim _{N!1}, m$ ight be a com plex one, di erent from the BG state, and in som e occasions possibly related to the one obtained w thin the q-form alism. It is clear then that, if we have long-range

[^0]interactions and $N \gg 1$ (say of the order of the A vogadro num ber), 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 $\left[\begin{array}{ll}{[4]}\end{array}\right]$, as discussed below.

W e can now address the $m$ anner used in [1] $[1]$ to refer to \weak coupling". It applies essentially in the sim ple m anner stated in [1] $[1]$ only for $=\mathrm{d}>1$, being conceptually m uch m ore subtle for $0 \quad=\mathrm{d}$ 1. For exam ple , if $0 \quad=d<1, U(\mathbb{N})=N$ diverges as $N^{1}=d \quad(\mathbb{N}$ ! 1 ) for any nonvanishing value of $c$, even for c corresponding to ... $10^{10} \mathrm{eV}$ ! C onsistently, the generic use, w ithout further considerations (such as the $(\mathbb{N} ; \mathrm{t})!(1 ; 1)$ lim its, and the range of $=d$ ), of relations such as Eqs. (5) and (7) of [1] $\left.\underline{I}^{1}\right]$ seem $s$ irreducibly unjusti ed; as they stand, they trivially yield to no other possibility than $q=1$. In fact, th is point has already been transparently addressed by Ferm i in 1936 [్ర1].

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

T he entropic param eter $q$ is referred in []َ] as an \undeterm ined param eter". M oreover, the author claim s having proved that \q must 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 H am iltonian system s , or perhaps also to dissipative ones; to system swhose phase space is high-dim ensional, or perhaps also to the low dim ensional ones. By \undeterm ined", it rem ains not totally clear whether the expression is used in the sense that $q$ is \undeterm inable", or in the sense of \not yet determ ined". H ow ever, if we put all this together, one m ight suspect that $w$ hat is claim ed in [1] $[1]$ is that it can be determ ined from rst principles, and that the author has determ ined it to necessarily be $q=1$.

To $m$ ake this point transparent, we $m$ ay ilhustrate the factual nonuniversality of $q$ by addressing the logisticlike fam ily of $m$ aps $x_{t+1}=1$ ajं ${ }_{t}{ }^{\jmath}$, whose usefiulness in physics can hardly be contested (at least for $z=2$ ). A s con jectured since 1997 [ [i6]], num erically exhibited in $m$ any occasions (e.g., in $\left[\bar{T}_{1}\{[1][])\right.$, and analytically proved recently $\left[11^{1} 1,12{ }^{2}\right]$ on renom alization group grounds, $q$ does depend on $z$, and is therefore not universal, in neat contrast $w$ ith $w$ hat is claim ed in [1] $[1]$. Its value for $z=2$ (i.e., the standard logistic $m \mathrm{ap}$ ), 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 $\mathrm{a}=2$ ). W e have illustrated the nonuniversalty of $q$ for nonlinear dynam ical system $s w$ ith its value at the edge of chaos of the logistic m ap. It is perhaps w orthy to notioe that, since it has been proved to be analytically related to the Feigenbaum universal constant
F $\left[1=\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & q\end{array}\right)=\ln \quad F=\ln 2\right]$, and since th is constant is already know $n$ w th not less than 1018 digits, we actually
know this particular value of $q$ w the sam e num ber of digits. Such a precision is selfeexplanatory w th regard to the fact that $q$ can be determ ined from rst principles


A second illustration of the nonuniversality of q can be found in the three-com ponent Lotka-Volterra m odel in a $d$-dim ensional hypercubic lattice ["-1]. This illustration is quite interesting because this $m$ odel is a $m$ any-body problem. The corresponding grow th ofdroplets has been shown to yield, through im position of the niteness of the entropy production per unit tim $e, q=1 \quad 1=d$ for $d=1 ; 2[1]$. $T$ his law has also been checked for $d=3 ; 4$ [ $\left.1 \overline{1}_{1} 1\right]$. It is of a rather sim ple 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 w ith time [1]. A sim ilar law is obtained for a quite di erentm odel, nam ely a Boltzm ann d-dim ensional lattice $m$ odel for the incom pressible uid $N$ avier-Stokes equations. Indeed, an unique entropy, nam ely $S_{q}$, w ith an unique value of $q$, is $m$ andated by the im position of the $m$ ost basic $G$ alilean invariance of the equations. For the single-speed single-m ass $m$ odel it is $\left.q=1 \quad 2=d[1]{ }_{1}^{1} 1\right]$. Form ore sophisticated $m$ odels $q$ is determ ined by a transcendental equation $\left[\begin{array}{l}-1 \\ 1\end{array}\right]$. T hese exam ples show how the entropy $S_{q}$ 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 $m$ any-body $H$ am ir tonian system s, q tumed out to be a nonuniversal index essentially characterizing what we may consider as nonextensivity universality classes (in totalanalogy with the universality classes that em erge in the theory of critical phenom ena). M ore precisely, one expects $q=1$ for short-range interactions ( $=d>1$ in the exam ple we used earlier), and q depending on ( d ; ) (perhaps only on
$=d$ ) for long-range interactions (i.e., $0 \quad=d<1$ ), in the physically $m$ ost im portant ordering $\lim \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{t}} 1 \lim _{\mathrm{N}}!1$. A though expected, the uncontestable evidence has not yet been provided. It is not hard for the reader to im agine the analytic and com putational di culties that are involved. H ow ever, suggestive results are accum ulating w hich point tow ards the applicability ofnonexten sive statistical $m$ echanics for such long-range $H$ am iltonian system $s$. A lthough we shall later com e back onto this problem, let us already $m$ ention the follow ing points.
(i) T he onebody m arginal distribution of velocities during the well known longstanding quasi-stationary ( $m$ etastable) state of the isolated classical inertial X Y ferrom agnetically coupled rotators localized on a d-dim ensional lattice can be anom alous (iee., nonM axwellian). Indeed, it approaches, for a non-zerom easure class of initial conditions of the $=0$ ( 8 d ) m odel and not too high velocities, a q-exponential distribution (we rem ind that $e_{q}^{x} \quad\left[\begin{array}{lll}1+(1 & q) x\end{array}\right]^{1=(1)}$ q), hence $e_{1}^{x}=e^{x}$ ) with $q>1$ [it]. If the energy distribution follow ed BG statistics, the one-body marginal distribution of velocities ought to be quasi-M axw ellian
(strictly M axw ellian in the N ! 1 lim it since then the m icrocanonical-ensem ble necessary cuto in velocities diverges), but it is not. As speci cally discussed in '["[ ] ], the num erical results are incom patible w th BG statistics. H ow ever, they do not yet prove that the one-body distribution ofvelocities precisely is, for the canonicalensemble, the one predicted by nonextensive statistics. Indeed, considering the appropriate $\lim$ 辻 ( $\mathbb{N} ; \mathrm{M} ; \mathrm{N}=\mathrm{M}$ ) ! ( $1 ; 1 ; 1$ ) $\mathbb{N}$ being the num ber of rotators of the isolated system, and $M$ being that of a relatively sm all subsystem of it) is crucial. W ork along this line is in progress.
(ii) In the sam e model, at high total energy, the largest Lyapunov exponent vanishes like $1=\mathrm{N}$ where depends on $=d$ [ state, the largest Lyapunov exponent vanishes, this tim e like $1=\mathrm{N}=3$ [2].]. It is clear that, $w$ ith a vanishing Lyapunov spectrum, the system will be seriously prevented from satisfying Boltzm ann's \m olecular chaos hypothesis", hence the \equal probability" occupation of phase space.
(iii) In the longstanding regim e of the $=0$ ( 8 d ) m odel, there is aging [ [2] ${ }^{2}$ ], som ething which is totally incom patible w ith the usual notion of therm al equilibrium . T he correlation functions depend on the $\backslash w$ aiting tim e", and are in all cases given by q-exponential functions. Even at high total energy, where the one-body distribution of velocities is $M$ axw ellian, and where there is no aging, the tim e correlation functions are still given by $q$ exponentials w ith $q>1$, instead of exponentials, which is the standard expectation in BG statistics.
(iv) T he tem perature (/ m ean kinetic energy per particle) relaxes, after the quasistationary state observed in the one-dim ensional $0<1 \mathrm{~m}$ odel, tow ards the BG tem perature through a $q$-exponential function $w$ th $q>1$

(v) In Lennard-Jones clusters of up to $\mathrm{N}=14$ atom s , the distribution of the num ber of links per site has been num erically com puted [25] where two local minim a of the $m$ any-body potentialenergy are \linked" if and only if they are separated by no $m$ ore than one saddle-point. This distribution is a q-exponentialw th $q^{\prime}$ 2, as can be checked through direct tting. T he possible connection $w$ ith our present discussion com es from the fact that the average diam eter of the cluster is (in units of atom ic size) of the order of $14^{1=3}$, $2: 4$. C onsequently, although the Lennard-Jones interaction is not a long-range one therm odynam ically speaking (indeed, $=\mathrm{d}=6=3=2>1$ ), it can e ectively be considered as such for sm all clusters, since all the atom s substantially interact $w$ ith all the others.
(vi) The distribution of the num ber of links per node for the A lbert-B arabasigrow th m odel [2G] yielding scalefree netw orks is analytically established to be, in the stationary state, a q-exponentialw ith $q=[2 m(2 r)+1$
$\left.p r]=\left[\begin{array}{llll}m & 2 r\end{array}\right)+1 \quad p \quad r\right] \quad 1$, where $(m ; p ; r)$ are $m i-$ croscopic param eters of the $m$ odel. Ifwe associate to this netw ork an $=0$ interaction per link, the just $m$ entioned distribution also represents the distribution of energies
per node. A though this is not the sam e distribution as that of the energy of $m$ icroscopic states associated $w$ ith a H am ittonian, it is neither very far from it.
(vii) A though not being $m$ any-body problem $s$, let us $m$ ention at this point som e results that have been obtained w th the $d=2$ standard $m$ ap and with a $d=4$ set of two coupled standard $m$ aps. Both system $s$ are conservative and sim plectic, having therefore the dynam ical setup of a standard $H$ am ittonian. The $d=4$ system has A mold 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 (w e $m$ ay say that $a_{c}=0$ ). The structure is $m$ ore com plex 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 K AM regions em erge in the problem. The rem ark that we wish to do here is that, in strong analogy w ith the $m$ any-body long-range H am iltonian cases we have been discussing, both the $d=2$ and the $d=4 \mathrm{~m}$ aps present a longstanding quasistationary states before crossing over to the stationary ones. The crossover time $t_{\text {crossover }}$ diverges when a approaches $a_{c}$ from above. This is very sim ilar to what happens with the above $(\mathrm{d}$; ) H am iltonian, for which strong num ericalevidence exists $[42,26]$ suggesting that $t_{\text {crossover }}$ diverges as $\left(\mathbb{N}^{1}=\mathrm{d}\right)^{-1}=(\overline{1}=\mathrm{d})$ when N ! 1 .

A though none of the (seven) factual argum ents 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 $m$ any-body $H$ am ittonians $m$ ight be intim ately connected to the nonextensive statistics, $w$ ith $q$ depending on basic $m$ odel param eters such as $d$ and . The entropic index $q$ would then characterize universality classes of nonextensivity, the $m$ ost fam ous of them being naturally the $q=1$, extensive, universality class. Such view point is also consistent with the discussion about non -ib ibsian statistics presented in ${ }_{2}^{\prime}{ }_{1}^{1}$. Last but by no m eans least, it is consistent $w$ ith $E$ instein's 1910 criticism [301] of the Boltzm ann principle $S=k \ln W$ (lengthily com $m$ ented in Ref. [6] of [1] ] 1 ).

A bout them alcontact between system swith di erent val ues of $q$ and the $0^{\text {th }}$ principle of them odynam ics:
_ We focus now on a strong and crucial statem ent in [1]1], nam ely "... a B oltzm ann-G ibbs therm om eter w ould not be able to $m$ easure the tem perature of a $q$-entropic system, and the law s of them odynam ics would therefore fail to have general validity." [1]1]. W e shall present here the results [39] of $m$ olecular-dynam ical sim ulations (using only $\mathrm{F}=\mathrm{m}$ a as m icroscopic dynam ics) which will precisely exhibit what is claim ed in [11] to be im possible. W e shall illustrate this w ith the isolated $=0 \mathrm{~m}$ odel of planar rotators, and proceed through tw o steps.

W e rst show ( F ig. 1) how the \tem perature" (de ned as tw ice 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 regim e (where the system hasbeen de nitely show $n$ to be non-Boltzm annian, and where it $m$ ight well be described by the q-statistics). W e verify that the rest of the system acts for a generic sm all part of itself as a \them ostat", in total analogy w ith what happens in BG them alequilibrium. This is quite rem arkable if we think that the system is in a state so di erent from them al equilibrium that it even has aging!

W e then show ( F ig. 2) how a BG them om eter (its intemal degrees of freedom are those of rst-neighborcoupled inertial rotators, hence de nitively a $q=1$ system ) does $m$ easure the \tem perature" of the in nitely-range-coupled inertial rotators during their quasistationary state, hence where the statistics is de nitely nonB oltzm annian. At the light of this evidence, it appears that the $0^{\text {th }}$ principle of them odynam ics is even $m$ ore general than the already im portant role that B G statisticalm echanics reserves for it. $N$ aturally, the uctuations that we observe in both gures are expected to disappear in the $(\mathbb{N} ; \mathrm{M} ; \mathrm{N}=\mathrm{M})$ ! (1;1;1) lim it.
$T$ he facts that we have $m$ entioned up to this point heavily disqualify the essence of the critique presented in [1]1]. I believe, nevertheless, that it is instructive to further analyze it.

About the existing $m$ athem atical foundations of nonextensive statisticalm echanics:

It is essentially claim ed in [ill that it can be proved, from the very foundations of statistical $m$ echanics, that the only physically adm issible one is that of BG. It is how ever intriguing how such a strong statem ent $m$ ay be done without clearly pointing the $m$ athem atical errors that should then exist in the available proofs of the $q$ exponentialdistribution. Such proofs have been provided
 tually consistent, and generalize the well know n proofs done, for BG statistics, by D arw in Fow ler (in 1922), $K$ hinchin (in 1949) and Balian-Balazs (in 1987), respectively using the steepest-descent $m$ ethod $[311]$, the law $s$ of large num bers $\left[32_{1}^{\prime}\right]$, and the counting for the $m$ icrocanonicalensem ble [ $[3] 3]$. A ll these proofs are ignored in $[11]$. The critique therein developed outcom es severely dim in ished.

Sim ilarly, no $m$ ention at all is $m$ ade in [1] [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 m echanics since they prove under what conditions $S_{B G}$ is unique. These two q-generalizations $[3$ the necessary and su cient conditions associated $w$ ith the uniqueness of $S_{q}$.

Finally, no $m$ ention at all is $m$ ade of the fact that $S_{q}$ $(8 q>0)$ sharesw th $S_{B G}$ three rem arkablem athem atical properties that are quite hard to satisfy, especially sim ul taneously. These three properties are concavity (Ref. [1] of $[\underline{1}[1])$, stability $\left.\left[\bar{\beta}_{1}^{-}\right]_{1}\right]$, and niteness of entropy production
 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 $q>\overline{0}$.

It is perhaps for not paying due attention to all these theorem s that the cyclic argum ent involving Eqs. (2226) of [11] has been included in the critique. Indeed, that argum ent 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, im mediately after Eq. (26) we read \provided $\mathrm{f}(1)=\mathrm{f}(0)=0$, which corresponds to the requirem ent that the entropy vanishes at $T=0 "$. It is in fact only $\mathrm{f}(1)=0$ 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 $S\left(p_{1} ; p_{2} ;::: ; p_{W} ; 0\right)=S\left(p_{1} ; p_{2} ;::: ; p_{W}\right)$.

About existing exact solutions of anom alous Fokker$P$ lanck and Langevin equations:
$T$ he standard $d=1$ Langevin equation (w ith a drift coe cient and an additive noise), and the standard $d=1$ Fokker $P$ lanck equation adm it as exact solutions the Gaussian distribution, and are usually considered as paradigm atic $m$ esoscopic descriptions associated $w$ ith BG statistical mechanics. They can be naturally generalized by also including a multiplicative noise (w ith am plitude $M$ ) in the Langevin equation, and by considering the so called \porous m edium equation", i.e., a nonlinear Fokker $P$ lanck equation where the Laplacian operator applies to the power of the distribution. The exact solutions of these tw o nontrivial (nonlinear) equations are $q-G$ aussians, w th $q=(3 M+)=(M+)_{\ldots} 1$



## M iscellanous

The precise form ulation of nonextensive statisticalm echanics has, since 1988, evolved along tim e in what concems the way of im posing the auxiliary constraints under which $S_{q}$ is optim ized (see Refs. [1-3] of [1] $[1]$ ). The paradigm atic case occurs for the canonical ensemble, where one $m$ ust decide how to generalize the traditional energy constraint. T he correct $m$ anner is now adays accepted to be that indicated in Ref. [3] of $\overline{11}]$, i.e., E q. (3) of $[\underline{12}]$, nam ely

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{P_{W}^{W} P_{i=1}^{q} P_{i}^{q}}{\underset{j=1}{W} p_{j}^{q}}=U_{q} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This particular writing of the energy constraint has various interesting features. Let us $m$ ention here three of them (further convenient features can be found in Ref . [3] of [1] [1]
(i) It is precisely this form which em erges naturally $w$ th in the steepest-descent proof [3] [1] of the $q$-statistics. It is a trivialconsequence of the fact that $d e_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{x}}=\mathrm{dx}=\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{x}}\right)^{\mathrm{q}}$.
(ii) $T$ his particular form $m$ akes the theory to be, in what concems the energy distribution, valid up to a single value of $q$, nam ely precisely that determ ined by the trivial constraint ${ }_{i=1}^{W} p_{i}=1$. Let us ilhustrate this in the continuum lim it, for a typical exam ple where the density of states $g() /$ for ! 1 ( 2 R). Since $\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{w}$ ish $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{)}$ to be nom alizable, we m ust im pose that $N_{1}$ constant $d g() p()$. Since $p() /{ }^{1=(1 q)}$ for ! 1 , it must be $+1=\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & q\end{array}\right)>1$, hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
q<(2+\quad)=(1+\quad) ; \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

( $q<2$ for the sim ple case of an asym ptotically constant density of states, iRR. $_{1}=0$ ). The niteness of constraint (3) im poses constant $d g() \quad[p(F]$ to be nite, which, interestingly enough, yields the sam e upperbound as before, nam ely Eq. (4). In otherw ords, thism akes the theory to have both constraints (norm and energy) m athem atically well de ned (ie., given by nite num bers) all the way up to a single upper bound for $q$.
 for the energy constraint allows the construction of a quite general entropic form [43'] which is extrem ized by the Beck-C ohen superstatistics [441], and which, quite rem arkably, is stable [451] (like $S_{q}$, and in variance w ith Renyientropy).

Since 1988, m any applications have been proposed for the nonextensive statistics. Som e of these have been elaborated w ithin the 1988 way of writing the energy constraint (Ref. [1] of [1] ]), others have been elaborated w ithin the 1991 way of w riting this constraint ( $R$ ef. [2] of $\left.{ }_{12} 1\right]$ ), and nally others with the 1998 way (Ref. [3] of $\left[\left[_{1}^{\prime}\right]\right]$ ). It is unfortunate that the 1998 w ay w as not found from the very beginning in 1988, but this is the way it did happen (for a variety of reasons that are essentially com $m$ ented in Ref. [3] of [1] ]). C onsistently, it seem s fair to now adays restrict possible criticism to applications indeed using the 1998 version. U infortunately, all types of applications are criticized in ${ }_{[1]}^{[1]}$ independently from what particularm anner have the author(s) adopted for the energy constraint. A $n$ intriguing exam ple of such procedure is the criticism of som e 1995-1996 papers (Refs. [19-21] of [1] [1]) on the possible q-generalization of the black-body radiation law. T hey indeed satisfy, as they should and as claim ed in [in], the $\mathrm{T}^{4}$ Stefan Boltzm ann law (explicitly written in Eq. (18) of $R$ ef. [19] of [11] ]). N evertheless, 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 rem arks are done about the fact that all three were published up to three years before the need for re-w riting the energy constraint becam e clear. M ore signi cantly,
this speci c criticism is indeed intriguing since it can be trivially shown that the $T^{4}$ proportionality law rem ains the sam e for allenergy statisticaldistributions (hence not only the B G one) as long as the m icroscopic energy scales linearly $w$ th 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 $=T$ ). O nly the proportionality coe cient of the $T^{4}$ law depends on the speci c statistics.

The author of $\left.{ }_{[1]}^{11}\right]$ claim s 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 for$m$ 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 profiusely used in $\left[\begin{array}{ll}{[1]}\end{array}\right]$. W e 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 [[]] which appears to be deeply inconsistent with very $m$ any, and by now well established, physical and $m$ athem atical facts. $W$ e have only addressed the m ain m ispaths and inadvertences in [112]. There are several $m$ ore, but the full consideration of them all would dem and an appreciable e ort which, at the present $m$ om ent, does not seem worthy. O ur overall conclusion is that, although several im portant and/or interesting points related to nonextensive statisticalm echanics still need further clari cation, this theory undoubtedly exhibits now adays a sensible num ber of physically and $m$ athem atically consistent results. Of course, as it has always been, only time will establish its degree of scienti cutility in theoretical physics and elsew here.
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F IG .1. T im e evolution of the tem perature $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}}$ icrocan on ical $2 \mathrm{~K}(\mathbb{N})=\mathrm{N} \quad(\mathrm{K}(\mathbb{N}) \quad$ total kinetic energy) of one isolated system started w ith waterbag initial conditions at (conveniently scaled) energy per particle equal to 0:69 (N = 5000 rotators; green line), and of the tem perature $\mathrm{T}_{\text {can on ical }}$
2K (M) $=\mathrm{M} \quad(\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{M}) \quad$ subsystem total kinetic energy) of a part of it ( $M=500$ rotators; blue line). The $M$ rotatorswere chosen such that their tem perature $\mathrm{T}_{\text {canonical }} \mathrm{w}$ as in itially below (a) or above (b) that of the whole system. It is particularly interesting the fact that, in case (b), the tem perature of the subsystem of $M$ rotators crosses the BG tem perature $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{B} G}=0: 476 \mathrm{w}$ ithout any particular detection of it.


FIG.2. Tim e evolution of the tem perature $T_{\text {therm ostat }}$ $2 \mathrm{~K}(\mathbb{N})=\mathrm{N} \quad(\mathrm{K}(\mathbb{N}) \quad$ therm ostat total kinetic energy) of one in nitely-range-coupled large system (therm ostat) started w ith waterbag in itial conditions $(\mathbb{N}=100000$ rotators; green line) and of the tem perature $\mathrm{T}_{\text {therm om eter }} \quad 2 \mathrm{~K}(\mathrm{M})=\mathrm{M}$ ( $K(M) \quad$ therm om eter total kinetic energy) of one rst-neighbor-coupled relatively sm all system (them om eter) started at M axw ellian equilibrium at a tem perature below that of the therm ostat ( $M=50$ rotators; blue and red lines). $T$ he large system is in the quasistationary state (w here it is aging!); its (conven iently scaled) energy per particle equals $0: 69$. T he them om eter-them ostat contact is assured by only one bond per them om eter rotator, and starts at tim e tontact. $T$ he intra-therm ostat and intra-therm om eter coupling constants equalunity; the them ostat-therm om eter coupling constant equals 0:001. The them alization of the therm om eter occurs at the therm ostat tem perature, and up to tim e $t=310^{5}$, exhibits no detection of the BG equilibrium tem perature $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{C}=0: 476$. T he sam e phenom enon w th the them om eter in itial tem perature being larger than that of the them ostat is not show $n$, because our num erical results suggest that the $N \gg M \gg 1$ lim it has to be satis ed in an even $m$ ore stringent $m$ anner 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.
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