

Comment on 'Temporal scaling at Feigenbaum points and non-extensive thermodynamics'

In a recent letter [1], P. Grassberger addresses the very interesting issue of the applicability of  $q$ -statistics to the renowned Feigenbaum attractor. However several points are not in line with our current knowledge, nor are the interpretations that he advances.

To begin with, contrary to the statement in [1] there is a simple relation linking the constants in Eqs. (3) and (4). This is  $\lambda = d_f \log_2$ , where  $d_f$  is the fractal dimension of the attractor. The neglect of oscillations due to the multifractal nature of the attractor (his Ref. [31]) in the rate  $\lambda_n(1)$  leads to the above equality. The derivation of Eq. (3) for  $z > 1$  is given in [2] so there is no need to reproduce it in [1].

A more important issue lies behind the Author's comment that Eq. (3) holds only for special values of time  $n$ . This is true as it is also true that there are many other special values of  $n$  that satisfy Eq. (3) exactly, all with the same value of  $q$ . See Ref. 36 in [1] and [3]. Altogether these sequences cover all  $n$ . Is there any key meaning behind this? As explained [3], the dynamical organization within the attractor is difficult to resolve from a simple time evolution: starting from an arbitrary position  $x_0$  on the attractor and recorded at every  $n$ . What is observed are strong fluctuations that persist in time with a scrambled pattern structure. Conversely, unsystematic averages over  $x_0$  and/or  $n$  would rub out the details of the multiscale properties. However, if specific initial positions with known location within the multifractal are chosen, and subsequent positions are observed only at pre-selected times, when the trajectories visit another region of choice, a well-defined  $q$ -exponential sensitivity appears, with  $q$  and the associated Lyapunov spectrum  $\lambda(x_0)$  determined by the attractor universal constants.

Another point in case is the suggestion in [1] of adopting Eq. (4) as focal point for the natural generalization of the Lyapunov exponent. This has already been considered in Refs. [28] and [29] in [1], although, yet again, before taking a time average so that dynamical detail is preserved. A straightforward calculation shows that

$$(\lambda_{x_0} = 1) \quad \frac{1}{\ln n} \ln \frac{dg}{dx_0} = \frac{1}{n} \ln_q \frac{dg}{dx_0} = \log_2 ;$$

where  $(1 - q)^{-1} = \log_2$ , and  $\ln_q y$  is the  $q$ -logarithm, the inverse of the  $q$ -exponential. So, the earlier definition for the generalized  $\lambda$  is equivalent to that given for the same quantity by the  $q$ -statistics. The meaning of the index  $q$  is given by the above equalities. It is the degree of 'q-deformation' of the ordinary logarithm that makes finite for large  $n$ . The physical origin of  $q$  is associated to the occurrence of dynamical phase transitions, of the so-called Mori's  $q$ -phase type, as demonstrated in [3].

The identity derived in Ref. [36] of [1] between the rate of  $q$ -entropy change and the generalized Lyapunov exponent is not the identity  $(S_n - S_0)n^{-1} = \lambda_n^{-1}$  in [1] (the zero identity for  $n \rightarrow 1$ ) but refers to  $\lambda(x_0)$

as above. Of course it considers an instantaneous entropy rate  $K(x_0)$  (comparable in the sense of [4] to the  $q$ -generalized KS entropy studied in Ref. [14] of [1]). The identity  $K(x_0) = \lambda(x_0)$  holds for  $n \rightarrow 1$  as the interval length (around  $x_0$ ) vanishes. It does fluctuate, but as explained, we look for the detailed dependence on both  $x_0$  and  $n$ . In contrast to the chaotic case there is not one identity but many, and the argument in [1] that averages are needed for applications of Pesin's identity seems not to be useful for nonergodic and nonmixing trajectories. Our results may not be insignificant as these can be reproduced [5] combining the arguments in Ref. [14] of [1] regarding the  $q$ -KS entropy with the results in [3]. One obtains the same equalities as for  $\lambda(x_0 = 1)$  above, with  $\lambda(x_0 = 1)$  and  $\lambda = dx_0$  replaced by  $K(x_0 = 1)$  and  $\lambda_n(x_0)$ , respectively, where  $\lambda_n(x_0) = Z_n^{1-1/q}$  and where  $Z_n$  is Mori's partition function [3]. On the contrary, the Renyi entropies  $H_n^q$  in [1] from symbolic dynamics do not sense the universal constant and/or the nonlinearity  $z$ .

On the subject of the 'rich zoo' of  $q$  values, there is a well-defined family of these within the attractor, determined by the discontinuities of the universal trajectory scaling function [3]. There is a corresponding family of Mori's  $q$ -phase transitions, each associated to orbits that have common starting and finishing positions at specific locations of the attractor. The special values for  $q$  in the sensitivity are equal to those of the variable  $q$  in the formalism of Mori et al at which the dynamical transitions take place [3]. Since the discontinuities' amplitudes diminish rapidly, there is a hierarchical structure in this family. The dominant discontinuity of  $\lambda$  is associated to the most crowded and most sparse regions in the attractor, and this alone provides a reasonable description of the dynamics for which the above expressions for  $\lambda$  and  $K$  belong. About generality, a very similar picture has been recently obtained for another multifractal critical attractor, that of the quasiperiodic route to chaos [6].

A strong reason for preferring a  $q$ -exponential to a power law does not concern small arguments but the presence of a time scale factor (the generalized  $\lambda$ ) absent (or hidden) in the power law. This useful quantity can be immediately 'read' from the anomalous sensitivity just like the ordinary  $\lambda$  in chaotic dynamics. It is worth mentioning that the (renormalization group) fixed-point map for intermittency, the other route to chaos, is rigorously given by a  $q$ -exponential map. (See Ref. [19] in [1]).

Alberto Robledo,\*

Instituto de Física, UNAM,

Apartado Postal 20-364,

México 01000 D.F., México

\*Electronic address: robledo@fisica.unam.mx

[1] P. Grassberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 140601 (2005).

[2] E. M. Ayoral, A. Robledo, Physica A 340, 219 (2004).

[3] E. M. Ayoral, A. Robledo, Phys. Rev. E 72, 026209 (2005).

[4] V. Latora, M. Baranger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 520 (1999).

[5] H. Hernandez-Saldana, A. Robledo, in preparation.

[6] H. Hernandez-Saldana, A. Robledo, cond-mat/0507624.