# N onconcave entropies in multifractals and the therm odynam ic form alism

Hugo Touchette and Christian Becky

School of M athem atical Sciences, Queen M ary, University of London, London E1 4NS, UK

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

We discuss a subtlety involved in the calculation of multifractal spectra when these are expressed as Legendre-Fenchel transforms of functions analogous to free energy functions. We show that the Legendre-Fenchel transform of a free energy function yields the correct multifractal spectrum only when the latter is wholly concave. If the spectrum has no de nite concavity, then the transform yields the concave envelope of the spectrum rather than the spectrum itself. Some mathematical and physical examples are given to illustrate this result, which lies at the root of the nonequivalence of the microcanonical and canonical ensembles. On a more positive note, we also show that the impossibility of expressing nonconcave multifractal spectra through Legendre-Fenchel transforms of free energies can be circum vented with the help of a generalized free energy function, which relates to a recently introduced generalized canonical ensemble. A nalogies with the calculation of rate functions in large deviation theory are nally discussed.

PACS num bers: 05.45 D f, 64.60 A k, 65.40 G r

Invariant m easures generated by nonlinear and com plex dynamical systems often show striking scaling and self-sim ilar features that are rem in iscent of fractals. How ever, contrary to ordinary fractals, whose geometric structure is characterized by a single num ber (the fractal or Hausdor dimension [1]), the scaling and self-sim ilar properties of m easures are usually not captured by a single dimension, say, but by an in nite set of fractal or singularity dimensions that de nes the so-called spectrum of singularities f (), also known as the multifractal spectrum [2, 3]. The word \multifractal" has been coined [4] in this context precisely to suggest that a measure having multiscaling properties can be pictured abstractly as a superposition of many \pure" fractals, each having a dimension and a corresponding  $\weight$ " f() in the superposition.

To be more specic, consider a measure de ned on a d-dimensional space X. Generalizing the approach followed in fractal geometry, we proceed to partition or \coarse-grain" the space X in smallboxes of equal size " and volume "<sup>d</sup>. The measure contained in each box is

Z

$$p_{";i} = d(x); \qquad (1)$$

and from this quantity, a local fractal dimension  $_{\rm i}$ , also called a crowding index, is de ned by using the fact that  $p_{\rm ",i}$  is expected to scale as  $p_{\rm ",i}$  "  $^{\rm i}$  in the limit where the boxes' size " goes to zero. Now, to account for the fact that  $_{\rm i}$  is not constant over the partition but varies in general from one box to another, we count the number  $n_{\rm "}$ () of boxes in the partition whose local dimension is equal to . From n  $_{\rm "}$ (), them ultifractal spectrum f() is then simply de ned through another scaling relationship, namely  $n_{\rm "}$ () "  $^{\rm f()}$  as "! 0.

The multifractal spectrum f () is not a quantity which is easily calculated analytically or num erically, since it requires the enum eration of all the boxes in the partition of X having a crowding index lying in some interval [; + ]. A more manageable quantity which can be related to f() is the so-called free energy function (q) de ned by the scaling relationship  $Z_{"}(q) = {(q), "! 0, where}$ 

$$Z_{*}(q) = \begin{array}{ccc} X & X \\ p_{*,i}^{q} & {}^{q} & {}^{i} \\ & {}^{i} & {}^{i} \end{array}$$
(2)

is the partition function associated with the partition X of (the sum above runs over all the boxes of the partition with  $p_{r,i} \notin 0$  since q can be negative). The calculation of (q) parallels the calculation of free energies in statistical mechanics in that, if f() is known, then (q) can be calculated as the Legendre-Fenchel (LF) transform of f() [2]; in symbols,

$$(q) = \inf_{2R} fq \quad f()g:$$
 (3)

The result that we shall study in this paper is the inverse result, namely that if (q) is known, then f() can be calculated from (q) by taking the LF transform of the latter function; in symbols,

$$f() = \inf_{q^2 R} fq \qquad (q)g:$$
 (4)

This result rst appeared in Refs. [4, 5], and has been used extensively since then to calculate the multifractal spectrum of many phenomena, including turbulence [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11], geophysical processes, such as cloud formation and rain precipitations [12, 13, 14], and uctuations in nancial time series [3, 15], among many others [16]. Unfortunately, there is one aspect of Eq.(4) which is often overlooked when deriving it and applying it, namely that it can only produce concave multifractal spectra, since LF transforms can only yield concave functions. This basic property of LF transforms does not a ect, as such, the calculation of (q) from f() because it can be proved that (q) is an always concave function of q. For calculating the multifractal spectrum, how ever,



FIG.1: (a) Multifractal spectrum f() for the invariant density of the Ulam map. (b) Corresponding free energy function (q). (c) Legendre-Fencheltransform of (q).

there is a problem because f() need not be concave, which means that f () cannot always be calculated as the LF transform of (q).

Our goal here is to illustrate these observations with a num ber of basic examples, and to state the precise conditions, based on convex analysis, that ensure that f () can be calculated as the LF transform of (q). These conditions will be discussed in the context of four physicallyrelevant multifractal models: one related to turbulence, another related to di usion-lim ited aggregates, and two others related to chaotic system s. In an attempt to o er a workable solution to the problem of calculating nonconcave multifractal spectra, we shall also study a recently introduced generalized canonical ensemble to show that nonconcave spectra can be obtained from a modi ed version of the LF transform. This part will actually provide an explicit calculation of a nonconcave spectrum f() which uses this modi ed LF transform . We shall com ment nally, in the concluding section of the paper, on analogies between nonconcave multifractal spectra, nonconcave entropies in statistical mechanics, and large deviation theory.

# II. TW O SIM PLE EXAM PLES

W e begin by considering two explicit examples of m easures whose multifractal spectra are not given by LF transform softheir free energy functions. The rst exam ple was previously discussed in R ef. [17] (see also R ef. [2]), and will serve here as a starting point to our discussion of the validity of the LF transform of (4). The measure or, rather, the density in this case that we consider is given by

$$(x) = -\frac{1}{1 - x^2};$$
 (5)

where x 2 [ 1;1]. This density arises as the invariant density of the U lam map and the T chebysche maps. Applying a partition of size " on the interval [ 1;1], it can be seen that the two boxes of the partition located near the boundary points x = 1 have measure  $p_{r,i} =$ "(x)  $^{1=2}$ , so that f() = 0 at = 1=2. All the other boxes have measure  $p_{i}$ ; ", so that f() = 1 at = 1,

as there are approximately  $n_{*}$  () " <sup>1</sup> of these boxes. Combining the two results, and setting  $n_{*}() = 0$  for  $2 \pm f1=2;1q$ , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} 8 \\ < 0 \\ = 1 = 2 \\ f() = 1 \\ : 1 \\ : 1 \\ : 1 \\ : 0 \\ : 1 \\ : 0 \\ : 1 \\ : 0 \\ :$$

This spectrum is shown in Fig. 1(a).

At this point, we go on to prove that f () cannot be expressed as the LF transform of (q) by direct calculation. Starting from the asymptotic ("! 0) expression of the partition function

$$Z_{\pi}(q) = \sum_{i}^{X} p_{\pi;i}^{q} \qquad \pi^{q=2} + \pi^{-1} \pi^{q}; \qquad (7)$$

we rst nd

α2

$$(q) = m \inf q$$
 1;  $q=2g =$   $\begin{array}{c} q=2 & q > 2 \\ q & 1 & q & 2 \end{array}$  (8)

Then keeping track of the two separate regions q > 2 and q 2, we nd

$$\inf_{q^{2}R} fq \quad (q)g = \inf_{q^{2}R} q(\frac{1}{2}) q > 2$$
$$= \begin{array}{c} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & \text{otherw ise.} \end{array}$$
(9)

Comparing this result with Eq.(6), we see that f () corresponds to the LF transform of (q) for  $\geq$  (1=2;1) only; see Figs. 1 (a) and 1 (c). For 2 (1=2;1), the LF transform of (q) is nite, while the true spectrum f () is form ally equal to 1, as there is no box in the partition of (x) with local exponent in the range (1=2;1).

This example can be generalized to illustrate another problem when trying to obtain f() from (q). Consider a dynam ical system in d-dim ensions whose invariant density is everywhere nite, so that p<sub>i;"</sub> "<sup>d</sup>, except at a " i = "<sup>d</sup> i nite num berk of singular points where pi;" with 1; 2; :::; k < 1. The partition function for this density is

$$Z_{n}(q) = \sum_{i}^{X} p_{i}^{q} = u^{d} u^{dq} + u^{d} q^{q} + u^{d} + u^{d} q^{q} + u^{d} q^{q} + u^{d} + u^{d} q^{q} + u^{d} + u^{d} q^{q} + u^{d} + u^{d}$$

so that

$$(q) = m \inf (q \ 1) d; d_1 q; d_2 q; \dots; d_k qg;$$
 (11)

The minimum can be calculated explicitly and yields

$$(q) = \begin{array}{ccc} d(q \ 1) & q & (1 \ )^{1} \\ d & q & q & (1 \ )^{1}; \end{array}$$
 (12)

where = m in<sub>i</sub> i. We see here that the function (q) \overlooks" all the singularities i, except for the sm allest one. Therefore, any perturbation of the singularities i that keeps invariant will change f() but not (q), which implies that the mapping of (q) to f() must be indeterm inate as there is an in nite number of spectra associated with the same free energy. Physically, this also implies that (q) does not o er the most complete description of the dynam ical system, since this function overbooks, as we said, all but one singularity. To really obtain a complete picture of all the singularities of the system, one must resort to calculate f() and not just (q).

# III. THEORY OF LF TRANSFORM S

The results of the two previous exam ples are very simple and show at once that f () cannot in general be expressed as the LF transform of (q), contrary to what is claimed in most if not all references on the subject. The problem, as was mentioned, is that LF transforms can only yield concave functions, which means that these transforms cannot be used to calculate nonconcavem ultifractal spectra, including those of the two exam ples considered before. To make this observation more rigorous, we introduce in this section a few concepts and results of convex analysis, beginning with the concept of supporting lines. (A llthe de nitions and theorem s discussed here can be found in Ref. [18]; see also Chapter V I of Ref. [19] and Appendix A of Ref. [20].)

De nition 1. A function f:R ! R admits a supporting line at if there exists a constant such that

$$f() f() + ()$$
 (13)

forall 2 R.

This de nition means graphically that we can draw a line on top of the graph of f() that does not go under that graph (see Fig. 2); hence the word \supporting." W ith this picture in mind, it is easily seen that, if f admits a supporting line at and is di erentiable at , then the slope of the supporting line must be such that  $f^0() = .$ 

The importance of supporting lines comes from their association with LF transforms, and from the fact, more precisely, that they determ ine whether such transforms are involutive, that is, whether they are their own inverse. In the context of f() and (q), this means precisely the



 $\alpha_h$ 

FIG.2: (a) A generic nonconcave multifractal spectrum f() (full line) together with its concave envelope f() (dashed line). The two functions coincide outside the open interval  $(_1;_h)$ . The point a of the multifractal spectrum admits a supporting line (concave point), while the point b does not (nonconcave point).

 $\alpha_{\min}$ 

 $\alpha_l$ 

following. First, recall that (q) can always be expressed as the LF transform off (), so Eq.(3) is always valid independently of the shape off (). This follows essentially from the fact that (q) is an always concave function of q [2], a fact that can be proved using H older's inequality. The inverse transform shown in (4), how ever, is not generally valid, and this is where supporting lines become important, as expressed in the next theorem.

Theorem 2. If f adm its a supporting line at , then f at can expressed as the LF transform of (q) as in Eq.(4). In this case, we say that f is concave at . On the other hand, if f does not adm it a supporting line at , then f at does not equal the LF transform of (q). In this case, we say that f is nonconcave at .

The two complementary results expressed in the theorem above are usually rephrased in convex analysis by de ning the function

$$f() = \inf_{q^2 B} fq(q) g:$$
 (14)

In term s of f (), we then have the following result.

Theorem 3.f() = f () if and only if f adm its a supporting line at .

For the remaining, it is useful to note that f() corresponds in general to the smallest concave function satisfying f() f() for all 2 R. For this reason, f() is called the concave envelope or concave hull of f(). This implies, in particular, that if f() adm its no supporting lines over some open interval, say  $(_{1; h})$  as in Fig. 2, then f() must be a ne over that interval, by which we mean that f() has a constant slope over that interval. This last property, which is related to the M axwell construction [21, 22], is illustrated in Fig. 2.

All of the properties of f() and f () in relation to LF transform s can be veried for the two examples considered previously. In the case of the invariant density

 $\alpha_{\max}$ 

 $\mathbf{O}$ 

of the U lam map, for example, the concave hull of f() is the function displayed in (9); it is obviously such that f() f() and is concave contrary to f(). Moreover, it is easily veri ed from Fig. 1 that the two points = 1=2 and = 1 adm it a supporting line, which explains why f() = f() there. These two points adm it in fact an in nite number of supporting lines. For the point = 1=2, for example, all lines attached to (1=2;0) with slope in the interval [2;1 ) are supporting in the sense of (13). For = 1, the supporting lines have slopes in the interval (1;2].

We can go further in our analysis of f ( ) and  $\$  (q) by calling attention to the fact that

$$(q) = \inf_{2R} fq f ()g;$$
 (15)

Therefore, (q) is not only the LF transform of f(), as stated in Eq.(3), but also the LF transform of f(). This result is general: it holds for any function f() and its concave envelope f() de ned as in Eq.(14) as the double LF transform of f() or, more compactly, as

$$f = = (f);$$
 (16)

where the star stands for the LF transformation. To summarize, we then have = f, = (f) = f and () = (f) = f = . This chain of equalities can be expressed in a more transparent way using the following diagram:

which makes obvious the fact that there may be more than one spectrum related the same free energy. In fact, all f() having the same concave envelope lead to the same (q), as can be veried in the second example considered before. Finally, note that the chain of equalities reduces to = f and = f, or equivalently to

when f() = f() for all 2 R, that is, when f() is everywhere concave.

Having listed all the relationships that exist between f(), (q) and f(), we can now fully address the main issue of this paper, which is to determ ine when f() can safely and completely be calculated as the LF transform of (q). From the chain of equalities and diagram s show n above, this am ounts to determ ine when the LF transform is involutive; that is to say, under which conditions does the diagram (17) reduce to the diagram of (18)?

A rst obvious answer to this question is given by recalling what we have just mentioned about the diagram of (18), namely that if f() is everywhere concave, then the multifiactal spectra f() can completely be calculated as the LF transform of the free energy function (q). As such, this answer is complete but not very practical because it is based on f() and so presupposes that we know f(). A more useful criterion can be stated from



FIG.3: Free energy function (q) associated with the multifractal spectrum f() shown in Fig. 2. The LF transform of the concave envelope f () of f() yields the same free energy function.

the point of view of (q) alone by using a result of convex analysis connecting nonconcave or a ne regions of f() with nondi erentiable points of (q). This result is stated next without a proof; see [18] form ore details (see especially Theorem s 23.5 and 26.3).

Theorem 4. Suppose that f() is nonconcave over som e open interval  $(_1;_h)$  (Fig. 2) or that f() is concave but a ne over  $(_1;_h)$ . Then (q) is nondi erentiable at som e critical value  $q_c$  corresponding to the slope of f() over the interval  $(_1;_h)$ . M oreover, the left- and right-derivatives of (q) at  $q_c$  equal  $_h$  and  $_1$ , respectively (Fig. 3).

From this result, we arrive at our criterion by taking the contrapositive: if (q) is everywhere di erentiable, then f() is concave everywhere with no a ne parts. Thus, from the point of view of (q), f() can completely be calculated as the LF transform of (q) if the latter function is everywhere di erentiable. Taking the view that nondi erentiable points of (q) represent rst-order phase transitions for multifractals [23, 24, 25, 26, 27], this is equivalent to saying that f() can completely be calculated as the LF transform of (q) in the absence of

rst-order phase transitions. If there is a rst-order phase transition, then either f() is nonconcave som ewhere, in which case  $f \in ($ , or else f() is a ne som ewhere, in which case f = . Unfortunately | and this is an important point | there is no way to distinguish the two cases from the sole know ledge of (q) (see Figs. 2 and 3). Thus, if (q) has one or more nondi erentiable points and if there is no reason to think that f() is concave, then one must resort to calculate f() by means which do not rely on (q).

## IV . A P P L IC A T IO N S

We now revisit some examples of multifractal models that have been discussed in the physics literature, and point out where and how our results of the previous section apply.

# A. Multifractal turbulence models

One of the rst eld of study for which multifiactal models have been developed is fully developed hydrodynamic turbulence [4, 7]. The basis of these models is that, in the turbulent ow, velocity increments  $v(l) = jv(x + l) \quad v(x)j$  at a given distance l scale with local exponents h, which are distributed on a fractal set with fractal dimension D (h). This notation is taken from B enziet al. [7], and can be translated to our notation using the follow ing identi cations:

$$h = 1 = "$$

$$3 D (h) = f ()$$

$$p = q$$

$$p = (q): (19)$$

Here  $_{\rm p}$  denote the scaling exponents of m om ents of velocity increments in the inertial range,

$$h(v)^{p}i l^{p}:$$
 (20)

In multifiactal turbulence models, the probability to observe a local exponent h is given by

$$P_1(h) l^{3 D(h)};$$
 (21)

which is equivalent to our notation  $n_{*}()$  " f(). M oreover, for the scaling exponents p one has

$$p = \min_{h} fhp + 3 D(h)g;$$
 (22)

which is equivalent to the LF transform of Eq.(3). In practice, one extracts D (h) from the scaling exponents  $_{\rm p}$ , which can be measured in experiments. In our notation, this means that one determ ines f () by the LF transform of the experimentally measured (q).

In view of all the results derived before, we can notice that multifractal turbulence models in their current form can only deal with the convex hull of the spectrum of singularities. The true spectrum D (h) of a turbulent ow is fully determ ined by the underlying dynam ics, i.e., the Navier-Stokes equation, and there is a priori no reason to think that this spectrum should be a concave function of h. Our arguments of the previous section now allow for an experimental check of the concavity of D (h): if the experimentally-measured  $_{p}$  is diementiable within the precision allowed by the experiment, then D (h) is concave and therefore given by the LF transform of  $_{\rm p}$  . If one observes that p is nondi erentiable, then either D (h) is nonconcave or else is a ne. Both cases are consistent with the fact that p is nondi erentiable, but there is no way to tell from  $\ _{\rm p}$  which one of the two spectra is the actualone.

The exponents  $_{p}$  have been measured in m any experiments; see, e.g., Refs. [8, 9]. W ithin the experimental uncertainties, they are usually described by a smooth

function of p, although one cannot fully exclude the existence of phase transitions. The data found in Refs. [8, 9], for example, show a relatively strong change of slope near p = 3. If the existence of such transitions were con m ed(e.g., via the study of theoretical models of turbulence), then one would have to check that the underlying spectrum D (h) is either nonconcave or concave but a ne som ewhere. If D (h) is a ne (see, e.g., Ref. [28]), then that spectrum is correctly given by the LF transform of  $_{\rm p}$ . If D (h) is nonconcave, then that spectrum is not fully given by the LF transform of  $_{\rm p}$ . In this case,  $_{\rm p}$ cannot provide a com plete description of the turbulent ow, since all the local exponents h in the nonconcave region of D (h) are \overlooked," in the spirit of the two simple examples discussed before, by  $_{\rm p}$  . In short, these exponents are described by D (h) but not by  $_{\rm p}$ .

### B. Di usion-lim ited aggregates

For the second example, we consider multifractals as generated by di usion-lim ited aggregates (DLA) [29, 30, 31]. Jensen et al. [31] provide convincing evidence that the function (q) calculated for the harm onic measure of their DLA cluster exhibits a rst-order phase transition at q = 0.23 0.05 (see their Fig. 3). From this result, all that can be said about their f () spectrum obtained by LF-transforming (g) (shown in their Fig. 4) is that it is the concave hull f () of the true f() spectrum. Note that the spectrum displayed in Fig. 4 of Ref. [31] does show an a ne part, so it is consistent with the fact that (q) has a nondi erentiable point. However, there is a priori no reason why DLA clusters should possess a concave spectrum of singularities, so that the part where f() is seen to be a ne could just as well be nonconcave. Therefore, at this point we may conclude that the true f () spectrum of the DLA cluster studied by Jensen et al. is as yet unknown.

It should be remarked that, although Jensen et al. provide evidence to the e ect that (q) possesses a nondifferentiable point, the (q) which is calculated in practice is actually always analytic if one deals with nite-size D LA clusters. The spectrum f () which is calculated from (q) is, in this case, necessarily concave and has no a ne parts. The nondi erentiable point of (q) and the concom itanta ne part of f () appear, form ally speaking, only in the \therm odynam ic" lim it of in nitely large clusters.

# C. Chaotic system s

Multifractal spectra have been calculated for many examples of chaotic dynamical systems, including the Henon map [32] (see also Ref. [33]), and the driven damped pendulum [34]. The particularity of these two examples is that they seem to give rise to rst-orderphase transitions, which are also referred to as q-phase transitions. A coordingly, the question arises as to whether these phase transitions emerge out of a nonconcave f() or an a ne f().

The question, as it stands, is not resolved in the papers that treat these examples because they assume that f() is always the LF transform of (q), which means that they implicitly assume that f () is always concave. It must be observed that som e of the reported spectra appear to be a ne (see, e.g., Fig. 2 in Ref. [32]), so they are not problem atic they satisfy the concavity assumption. How ever, som e other spectra are clearly nonconcave; see, e.g., Fig. 1 in Ref. [32] and Figs. 2 and 3 in Ref. [34]. For these, we must be careful because the observed nonconcavity could be a nite-size e ect inherent to the fact that f () is computed num erically for a nite coarse-graining resolution ". Thus it could be that the nonconcavity of f () observed for "> 0 disappears as "! 0. To verify this, one would need to perform a nite-size analysis of the data by computing f () for decreasing values of " and study the convergence of the results. Sim ilar nite-size analyses have been perform ed in the context of num erical calculations of the m icrocanonical entropy function; see Refs. [35, 36, 37].

#### D. Spectrum of dynam ical indices

F irst-order phase transitions have also been studied in the context of chaotic system s at the level of an entropylike quantity referred to as the spectrum of dynam ical indices or expansion-rate spectrum [2, 33, 38, 39]. These phase transitions typically occur for nonhyperbolic dynam ical system s.

It would take us too far to explain the notion of dynam ical indices and the many examples for which this quantity has been studied. Let us only mention that the spectrum of dynam ical indices is a dynam ical analog of f (), and that a ne and nonconcave spectra of dynam ical indices have been reported in the literature; see, e.g., Refs. [33, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43]. Most of these references, unfortunately, share the same problem as those discussed so far: they assume that the spectrum of dynam ical indices can alw ays be calculated as the LF transform of a dynam ical analogue of the free energy function (q). Most of them assume this even when reporting the computation of nonconcave spectra; see Y oshida and M iyazaki [43] for a noticeable exception.

# V. GENERALIZED FREE ENERGY FUNCTIONS

At this point, we have emphasized more than once that a nonconcave multifractal spectrum cannot be calculated as the LF transform of its corresponding free energy function. Our goal in this section is to o er a practical solution to this problem by illustrating a method for obtaining nonconcave spectra through LF transform s of a generalized form of free energy function. The method was proposed recently in Refs. [20, 44] in the context of nonconcave entropies within the microcanonical ensem – ble, and will be illustrated here in the context of the rst example considered in Sec. II.

The form of generalized free energy that we shall consider is based on a generalization of the partition function given by

$$Z_{n}(q;q) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} n_{q_{i}+q_{i}}(q;q) ; \qquad (23)$$

where  $_{\rm i}$  represents the local fractal exponent associated with the probability  $p_{\rm r;i}$ , and g is an arbitrary sm ooth function. This new form generalizes the standard canon-ical partition function, in the sense that

$$Z_{*}(q; q = 0) = Z_{*}(q) = \sum_{i=1}^{X} u^{q_{i}}$$
 (24)

For de niteness, we shall adopt the choice g() =  $(2 \times 1)^2$  with 2 R. Therefore, the generalized partition function that we consider is

$$Z_{n}(q; ) = \prod_{j=1}^{N} \prod_{j=1}^{N} \prod_{j=1}^{2} \prod_{j=1}^{2} \prod_{j=1}^{N} \prod_{$$

W e call this partition function the Gaussian partition function; its corresponding free energy function

$$(q; ) = \lim_{"! 0} \frac{\ln Z_{"}(q; )}{\ln "}$$
(26)

is called the Gaussian free energy. Note that this new free energy is a function of two realparam eters, q and , and that (q; = 0) = (q).

The rationale for generalizing the standard free energy function (q) to (q; ) is that it modiles the structure of the LF transform which connects (q) with f(), and thus modiles the conditions which ensure that f() can be written as the LF transform of a free energy function. We spare the reader with the details of this modil cation which can be found in Refs. [20, 44]. For our purpose, we shall only note the generalized versions of the LF transform s that connect (q; ) and f(); they are given by

$$(q;) = inffq + {}^{2} f()g$$
 (27)

and

$$f() = \inf_{q;} fq + {}^{2} (q;) g:$$
 (28)

The rst LF transform holds, like its standard version (=0), for any spectrum f(), be it concave or not. The suprising virtue of the second LF transform is that it also holds true for basically any f(), contrary to the standard version (=0) which applies only when f() is concave. R ather than proving this result, we shall verify that it is valid for the nonconcave multifractal spectrum shown in Fig.1(a). That is, we shall obtain that nonconcave spectrum by inverting, in the manner of Eq.(28), its associated G aussian free energy (q; ).

First, we calculate (q; ) starting from  $Z_{*}(q; )$ :

$$Z_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{r}) = \begin{bmatrix} X & & \\ & \mathbf{n}^{q_{1}} + & \frac{2}{1} & \mathbf{n}^{q=2+} = 4 + \mathbf{u}^{1} \mathbf{u}^{q+} : \\ & \mathbf{r} \end{bmatrix}$$
(29)

Taking the lim it "! 0 yields

$$(q;) = m \inf q = 2 + = 4; q + 1g:$$
 (30)

The solution of the m inimum can be found explicitly; it has the form

$$(q; ) = \begin{array}{c} q=2 + =4 & q & q \\ q+ & 1 & q < q ; \end{array}$$
(31)

where q = 3 = 2 + 2. Next, we apply formula (28) using this solution for (q; ). This leads us to solving the following variational problem :

$$I = \inf_{q;} q + \frac{2}{q + 2} q = 2 = 4 q q : (32)$$

G rouping the variables together, this is equivalent to

$$I = \inf_{q;} q(1=2) + (2 = 1=4) q q : (33)$$

Let  $f_1$  (;q; ) denote the top expression in the brackets and  $f_2$  (;q; ) the lower one. W ith this notation, it can be noted that, for = 1=2,

$$f_2 (1=2;q;) > f_1 (1=2;q;) = 0$$
 (34)

for all q < q and 2 R. Therefore,

$$\inf_{1 \le q} f_2(;q;) = f_1 = 0; \quad (35)$$

and I = 0 at = 1=2. Sim ilarly, for = 1, we have

$$f_1(1;q;)$$
  $f_2(1;q;) = 1$  (36)

for all q and 2 R, so that  $I = f_2 = 1$  at = 1. For all other values of , it is possible to set q and in such a way that I = 1. At the end, we are left with

which is the precise expression of f(), as given in Eq.(6). Therefore, we have shown that this nonconcave spectrum can be expressed as in Eq.(28) as a modil ed LF transform of a generalized free energy.

The same m ethod can be applied to calculate other nonconcave spectra. In fact, it has been conjectured that the m ethod can be used to calculate any nonconcave spectrum (viz., nonconcave entropy function) as the LF transform of a properly-chosen generalized free energy. M ore details about this universality property can be found in Refs. [20, 44].

# VI. CONCLUSION

W e have shown in this paper that one must be careful when calculating the singularity spectrum of multifractals as the LF transform of its corresponding free energy, since LF transforms can only yield concave functions. This word of caution has im plications for most of the studies published so far on multifractals, including those on multifractalm odels of turbulence, as they have taken for granted that the multifractal spectrum is the LF transform of the free energy no matter what the spectrum looks like. This, as we have seen, is only true if the spectrum is concave; if it is nonconcave, then one must resort to calculate it directly from its de nition. A nother possibility is to use a generalization of the canonical ensem ble which can be used to extract nonconcave entropies from a generalized version of the free energy function. This way of doing was sketched here in the context of a simple example of nonconcave multifractal spectrum, and is presented in full details in Refs. [20, 44].

In the end, it should be noted that the results that we have discussed in this paper are not special to multifractals, but apply actually to any eld of investigation which uses LF transform s. In statistical mechanics, for example, the LF transform that connects the entropy function of the microcanonical ensemble with the free energy function of the canonical ensemble becomes noninvolutive when the entropy is nonconcave. When this happens, we say that there is nonequivalence of ensem bles [45, 46], since one is then unable to obtain the true entropy function of the microcanonical ensemble solely from the knowledge of the free energy of the canonical ensemble. The notion of generalized canonical ensemble has been developed precisely in this context.

Sim ilarly, in large deviation theory, it has been known for some time that nonconvex rate functions cannot be calculated by m eans of LF transform s of functions analogous to free energy functions [47, 48, 49, 50]. A multifractal spectrum is in essence an entropy function, and an entropy function is in essence a rate function [51, 52, 53, 54], so there is actually a deep connection with what we have presented here and what is known in large deviation theory [50]. For example, the result relating the di erentiability of (q) and the (strict) concavity of f() can be put in correspondence with a result of large deviation theory known as the Gartner-Ellis Theorem [19, 49, 55]. Furtherm ore, the result stating that the LF transform off() always yields (q) (see Sec. III) can be put in correspondence with a large deviation result known as Varadhan Theorem; see Refs. [19, 55].

From these correspondences, it is but a small step to conjecture that nonconcave entropies or, more generally, nonconvex rate functions should show up in other physical theories in which large deviations are at play. One such theory that comes to mind is the therm odynamic formalism of dynamical systems [2, 56]; another is nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. We have already alluded to the rst theory when discussing the spectrum of dynam ical indices in Sec. IV. Concerning nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, the reader will nd an example of nonconvex rate function in a recent paper by Im parato and Peliti [57] (see their Fig. 12). This paper discusses therm odynam ic uctuations in systems driven out of equilibrium. A large deviation result in that context is referred to as a uctuation theorem, whereas a rate function is called a uctuation function.

#### A ddendum

Since this paper was submitted for publication, we became aware of two recent papers by Testud [58, 59] and

E lectronic address: htouchet@ alum m it.edu

- $^{\rm y}$  E lectronic address: c.beck@qmulac.uk
- K. Falconer, Fractal Geometry: M athematical Foundations and Applications (W iley, New York, 1990).
- [2] C.Beck and F.Schlogl, Therm odynamics of Chaotic Systems (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [3] B.B.M andelbrot, Multifractals and 1=f Noise (Springer, New York, 1999).
- [4] U.Frisch and G.Parisi, in Turbulence and Predictibility of Geophysical Flows and Climate Dynamics, edited by M.Ghil, R.Benzi, and G.Parisi (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985).
- [5] T.C.Halsey, M.H.Jensen, L.P.Kadano, I.Procaccia, and B.I.Shraim an, Phys. Rev. A 33, 1141 (1986).
- [6] R.Benzi, G.Paladin, G.Parisi, and A.Vulpiani, J.Phys. A 17, 3521 (1984).
- [7] R. Benzi, L. Biferale, G. Paladin, A. Vulpiani, and M. Vergassola, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 2299 (1991).
- [8] R.Benzi, S.Ciliberto, R.Tripiccione, C.Baudet, F.Massaioli, and S.Succi, Phys. Rev. E 48, 29 (1993).
- [9] G. Stolovitzky, K. R. Sreenivasan, and A. Juneja, Phys. Rev. E 48, 3212 (1993).
- [10] D.Schertzer and S.Lovejoy, Phys.Chem.Hydrodyn.J. 6,623 (1985).
- [11] D. Schertzer, S. Lovejoy, F. Schmitt, Y. Chigirinskaya, and D. Marsan, Fractals 5, 427 (1997).
- [12] D. Schertzer and S. Lovejy, J. Geophys. Res. 92, 9693 (1987).
- [13] D. Schertzer and S. Lovejoy, in Fractals: Physical Origin and Consequences, edited by L.Pietronero (Plenum, New York, 1989), p. 49.
- [14] D. Schertzer and S. Lovejy, eds., Scaling, Fractals and Non-Linear Variability in Geophysics (K luwer, Boston, 1991).
- [15] F.Schm itt, D.Schertzer, and S.Lovejoy, Appl. Stochastic M odels D ata Anal. 15, 29 (1999).
- [16] G. Paladin and A. Vulpiani, Phys. Rep. 156, 147 (1987).
- [17] E.Ott, W.D.W ithers, and J.A.Yorke, J.Phys.Stat. 36, 687 (1984).
- [18] R.T.Rockafellar, Convex Analysis (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970).
- [19] R. S. Ellis, Entropy, Large Deviations, and Statistical Mechanics (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985).
- [20] M . Costeniuc, R. S. Ellis, H. Touchette, and B. Turking-

one by Riedi [60] in which examples of nonconcave multifractal spectra are discussed.

### A cknow ledgm ents

H.T.was supported by NSERC (Canada), the Royal Society ofLondon, and FCAR (Quebec) during the initial phase of this work. C B. is supported by a Springboard Fellow ship from EPSRC (UK).

- ton, J. Stat. Phys. 119, 1283 (2005), cond-m at/0408681.
- [21] K. Huang, Statistical Mechanics (W iley, New York, 1987).
- [22] R.S.Ellis, H.Touchette, and B.Turkington, Physica A 335, 518 (2004).
- [23] A.-M.S.Tremblay, Phys. Lett. A 116, 329 (1986).
- [24] B.Fourcade and A.M.S.Tremblay, Phys. Rev. A 36, 2352 (1987).
- [25] P. Szepfalusy, T. Tel, A. Csordas, and Z. Kovas, Phys. Rev. A 36, 3525 (1987).
- [26] A. C sordas and P. Szepfalusy, Phys. Rev. A 39, 4767 (1989).
- [27] M. H. Jensen, in Universalities in Condensed Matter, edited by R. Jullien, L. Peliti, R. Rammal, and N. Boccara (Springer, Heidelberg, 1988), pp.233{235.
- [28] H. Xu, N. Ouellette, and E. Bodenschatz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 114503 (2006).
- [29] T.A.W itten and L.M. Sander, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 1400 (1981).
- [30] T. C. Halsey, P. Meakin, and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 854 (1986).
- [31] M.H.Jensen, A.Leverm ann, J.M athlesen, and I.Procaccia, Phys. Rev. E 65, 046109 (2002).
- [32] H. Hata, T. Horita, H. Mori, T. Morita, and K. Tom ita, Prog. Theoret. Phys. 81, 11 (1989).
- [33] H. Mori, H. Hata, T. Horita, and T. Kobayashi, Prog. Theoret. Phys. Suppl. 99, 1 (1989).
- [34] H. Tom inaga, H. Hata, T. Horita, H. Mori, and K. Tom ita, Prog. Theoret. Phys. 84, 18 (1990).
- [35] M. Kastner, Ph.D. thesis, Universitat Erlangen-Numberg (2000).
- [36] M. Pleim ling, H. Behringer, and A. Huller, Phys. Lett. A 328, 432 (2004).
- [37] H. Behringer, M. Pleim ling, and A. Huller, J. Phys. A 38, 973 (2005).
- [38] M. Sano, S. Sato, and Y. Sawada, Prog. Theoret. Phys. 76, 945 (1986).
- [39] H. Hata, T. Horita, H. Mori, T. Morita, and K. Tom ita, Prog. Theoret. Phys. 80, 809 (1988).
- [40] T. Horita, H. Hata, H. Mori, T. Morita, K. Tom ita, S. Kuroki, and H. O kam oto, Prog. Theoret. Phys. 80, 793 (1988).
- [41] K. Tom ita, H. Hata, T. Horita, H. Mori, and T. Morita, Prog. Theoret. Phys. 80, 953 (1988).

- [42] K. Tom ita, H. Hata, T. Horita, H. Mori, T. Morita, H. O kam oto, and H. Tom inaga, Prog. Theoret. Phys. 81, 1124 (1989).
- [43] T.Yoshida and S.M iyazaki, Prog.Theoret.Phys.Suppl. 99, 64 (1989).
- [44] M. Costeniuc, R.S.Ellis, H. Touchette, and B. Turkington, Phys. Rev. E 73, 026105 (2006).
- [45] R.S.Ellis, K.Haven, and B.Turkington, J.Stat. Phys. 101, 999 (2000).
- [46] H. Touchette, R. S. Ellis, and B. Turkington, Physica A 340, 138 (2004).
- [47] I.H.D inwoodie and S.L.Zabell, Ann. Prob. 20, 1147 (1992).
- [48] D. Io e, Stat. Prob. Lett. 18, 297 (1993).
- [49] R.S.Ellis, Scand. Actuarial J.1, 97 (1995).
- [50] H. Touchette, PhD. thesis, M cG ill University (2003).

- [51] D. Plachky and J. Steinebach, Per. M ath. Hung. 6, 343 (1975).
- [52] O.E.Lanford, in Statistical Mechanics and Mathematical Problem s, edited by A.Lenard (Springer, Berlin, 1973), vol. 20 of Lecture Notes in Physics, pp.1{113.
- [53] G.Zohar, Stoc. Proc. Appl. 79, 229 (1999).
- [54] D. Veneziano, Fractals 10, 117 (2002).
- [55] Y.Oono, Prog. Theoret. Phys. Suppl. 99, 165 (1989).
- [56] D. Ruelle, Thermodynamic Formalism (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004), 2nd ed.
- [57] A. Imparato and L. Peliti, Phys. Rev. E 72, 046114 (2005).
- [58] B. Testud, C. R. A cad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 340, 653 (2005).
- [59] B. Testud, Nonlinearity 19, 1201 (2006).
- [60] R.Riedi, J.Math. Anal. Appl. 189, 462 (1995).