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#### Abstract

Increasing the num ber $N$ of elem ents of a system typically $m$ akes the entropy to increase. The question arises on what particular entropic form we have in $m$ ind and how it increases with N. Therm odynam ically speaking it $m$ akes sense to choose an entropy which increases linearly w ith N for large N , i.e., which is extensive. If the N elem ents are probabilistically independent (no interactions) or quasi-independent (e.g., short-range interacting) pit is known that the entropy which is extensive is that of Boltzm ann-G ibbs-Shannon, $S_{B G} \quad k{ }_{k}{ }_{i=1}^{w} p_{i} \ln p_{i}$. If they are how ever globally correlated (e.g., through long-range interactions), the answer depends on the particular nature of the correlations. T here is a large class of correlations (in onew ay or an other related to scale-  based, i.e., $S_{q} \quad k \frac{1_{i=1}^{P} p_{i}^{q}}{q 1}\left(S_{1}=S_{B G}\right)$, where $q$ is determ ined by the speci c correlations. We brie y review and illustrate these ideas through sim ple exam ples of occupation of phase space. A very sim ilar scenario em erges w ith regard to the central lim it theorem (C LT ). If the variables that are being sum $m$ ed are independent (or quasi-independent, in the sense that they gradually becom e independent if N ! 1 ), tw o basic possibilities ex ist: if the variance of the random variables that are being com posed is nite, the N ! 1 attractor in the space of distributions is a G aussian, whereas if it diverges, it is a Levy distribution. If the variables that are being sum $m$ ed are how ever globally correlated, there is no reason to expect the usualC LT's to hold. TheN! 1 attractor is expected to depend on the nature of the correlations. $T$ hat class of correlations (or part of it) that $m$ akes $S_{q}$ to be extensive for $q \in 1$ is expected to have a $q_{R}-G$ aussian as its N ! 1 attractor, where $q_{k}$ depends on $q\left[q_{e}(q)\right.$ such that $\left.q_{e}(1)=1\right]$, and where $q_{e}-G$ aussians are proportionalto $\left.\left.\left[\begin{array}{llll}1 & (1 & q_{e}\end{array}\right) x^{2}\right]^{1=(1)} q_{e}\right)$ ( $>0 ; q_{e}<3$ ). We present som e num erical indications along these lines. The full clari cation of such a possible connection would have considerable interest: it would help qualifying the class of system $s$ for which the nonextensive statistical concepts are applicable, and, concom itantly, it would en lighten the reason for which q-exponentials are ubiquitous in $m$ any natural and arti cial system $s$.


PACS num bers:

## 1-ON THEEXTENSIVITYOFSq

A surface is a geom etric ob ject which has a nite m easure for dim ensionality $d=2$, zero $m$ easure for any $d>2$, and in nite $m$ easure for any $d<2$. A fractalhas a nite $m$ easure only for $d=d_{f}$, where the fractal dim ension $d_{f}$ is som e real num ber, zero $m$ easure for $d>d_{f}$, and in nite $m$ easure for $d<d_{f}$. Generically $d_{f}$ is a noninteger num ber (an exception is constituted by the so called fat fractals, which have an integer $d_{f}$ ). For exam ple, a triadic $C$ antor set constructed on a segm ent of length 10 cm has a $m$ easure of $10^{d_{f}} \mathrm{am}^{\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{f}}} \mathrm{w}$ th $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{f}}=\ln 2=\ln 3=0: 63:::$, i.e., $4: 27 \mathrm{~cm}^{0: 63}$.

In total analogy w ith the above, an entropy $S$ is said extensive if $\lim _{\mathrm{N}}$ ! $1 \mathrm{~S}(\mathbb{N})=\mathrm{N}$ is nite. Let us focus on the basis of nonextensive statistical m echanics [ill

[^0][iver,
$w$ th $S_{1}=S_{B G} \quad k{ }^{\mathrm{P}} \underset{i=1}{\mathrm{w}} p_{i} \ln p_{i}$. There are system s , constituted by N elem ents, whose probabilistic sets are such that $\lim _{N}!1 S_{q}(\mathbb{N})=N$ is nite for $q=q_{s e n}$, vanishes for $q>q_{\text {sen }}$, and diverges for $q<q_{\text {sen }}$ (sen stands for sensitivity: see $[\underline{4}, \underline{1}, \underline{-1}]$ ] and references therein). W e shall here illustrate both norm al (i.e., $\mathrm{q}_{\text {sen }}=1$ ) and anom alous (i.e., Glsen $^{1}$ ) system s .

Let us consider N distinguishable binary random variables w hose joint probabilities are denoted by $f p_{1}^{A} ; p_{2}^{A} g$ $\mathrm{fp} ; 1 \mathrm{pg}$ for $N=1, \mathrm{fp}_{11}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}} ; \mathrm{p}_{12}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}} ; \mathrm{p}_{21}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}} ; \mathrm{p}_{22}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{g}$ (w ith $p_{11}^{A+B}+p_{12}^{A+B}+p_{21}^{A+B}+p_{22}^{A+B}=1$ ) for $N=2$, and so on. See Table I for $N=3$. For arbitrary $N$ we will have a N -dim ensional hypercube within which we can represent the associated $W=2^{\mathrm{N}}$ joint probabilities. The $N=2 \mathrm{~m}$ arginal probabilities are given by $p_{1}^{A}=$ $p_{11}^{A+B}+p_{12}^{A+B}, p_{2}^{A}=p_{21}^{A+B}+p_{22}^{A+B}, p_{1}^{B}=p_{11}^{A+B}+p_{21}^{A+B}$, and $p_{2}^{B}=p_{12}^{A+B}+p_{22}^{A+B}$. A nalogously we can construct
the $m$ arginal probabilities associated $w$ ith arbitrary N .

| ${ }_{\text {A }} \mathrm{n}^{\text {B }}$ | 1 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | P $\mathrm{p}_{111}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}$ [ $\left.\mathrm{p}_{112}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}\right]$ | $\begin{aligned} & \left\|\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{p}_{121}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} \\ \mathfrak{p}_{122}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} \end{array}\right\| \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | $\left.\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{p}_{211}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} \\ \mathfrak{p}_{212}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{p}_{221}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} \\ & \left.\mathfrak{p}_{222}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}\right] \end{aligned}$ |

TA B LE I: Joint probabilities associated with $N=3$, the subsystem s being $A, B$ and $C$. The probabilities out of and w ithin brakets respectively correspond to states 1 and 2 of subsystem C. It is $p_{111}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{p}_{112}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{p}_{121}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}+\mathrm{p}_{122}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}+$ $p_{211}^{A+B+C}+p_{212}^{A+B+C}+p_{221}^{A+B+C}+p_{222}^{A+B+C}=1$.

Let us introduce now an im portant notion, nam ely scale-invarianc, basis of techniques such as renorm alization group [ [G]. W e shall say that our system is scaleinvariant if the m arginal probabilities of the N - system coincide w ith the joint probabilities of the ( $\mathbb{N} 1$ )-system, $8 \mathrm{~N} . \mathrm{T}$ his strong property im plies, for instance, that $p_{1}^{A}=p_{1}^{A}, p_{2}^{A}=p_{2}^{A}, p_{1}^{B}=p_{1}^{B}$, and $p_{2}^{B}=p_{2}^{B}$.

Let us also introduce a sym $m$ etry property, nam ely commutativity. A $N$-system will be said commutative if we can freely interchange its subsystem s for every speci c N -state. This property implies, for instance, that $p_{12}^{A+B}=p_{21}^{A+B}$ for $N=2$, and $p_{112}^{A+B+C}=$ $p_{121}^{A+B+C}=p_{211}^{A+B+C}$ and $p_{122}^{A+B+C}=p_{212}^{A+B+C}=p_{221}^{A+B+C}$ for $N=3$. It does not imply $p_{11}^{A+B}=p_{22}^{A+B}$ for $\mathrm{N}=2$, nor $\mathrm{p}_{111}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}=\mathrm{p}_{222}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}$ or $\mathrm{p}_{112}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}=$ $p_{221}^{A+B+C}$ for $N=3$. If a system is com $m$ utative for all $N$, it adm its a representation sim pler that the N -dim ensional hypercubes m entioned before. It ad$m$ its, $m$ ore precisely, a triangular representation as indicated in Table II, w ith the convention ( $r_{20} ; r_{21} ; r_{22}$ ) $\left(p_{11}^{A+B} ; p_{12}^{A+B} ; p_{22}^{A+B}\right)$ for $N=2$, $\left(r_{30} ; r_{31} ; r_{32} ; r_{33}\right)$ $\left(\mathrm{p}_{111}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} ; \mathrm{p}_{121}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} ; \mathrm{p}_{212}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}} ; \mathrm{p}_{222}^{\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}}\right.$ ) for $\mathrm{N}=3$, and so on for increasing $N$. P robability norm alization im plies of course
$(\mathbb{N}=0)$
( $\mathrm{N}=1$ )
(1;1)
( $\mathrm{N}=2$ )
(1; $r_{10}$ ) (1; $\left.r_{11}\right)$
( $\mathrm{N}=3$ )
$\left(1 ; r_{20}\right) \quad\left(2 ; r_{21}\right) \quad\left(1 ; r_{22}\right)$
( $\mathrm{N}=4$ )
$\left(1 ; r_{30}\right) \quad\left(3 ; r_{31}\right) \quad\left(3 ; r_{32}\right) \quad\left(1 ; r_{33}\right)$
( $1 ; r_{40}$ ) ( $4 ; r_{41}$ ) ( $6 ; r_{42}$ ) ( $4 ; r_{43}$ ) ( $\left.1 ; r_{44}\right)$
TABLE II:M ost general form of a com $m$ utative system composed by binary random variables. The left (right) com ponent ofeach couple corresponds to the P ascal triangle elem ent (the probability).

Scale-invariance and com m utativity are totally independent properties. If they are, how ever, sim ultaneously


FIG.1: $S_{q}(\mathbb{N})$ for (a) the Leibnitz triangle, (b) $p=1=2$ independent subsystem $s$, and (c) $r_{N} ; 0=(1=2)^{N^{1=2}}$. Only for $q=1$ we have a nite value for $\lim _{N}!1 \quad S_{q}(\mathbb{N})=N$; it vanishes (diverges) for $q>1(q<1)$.
satis ed, then the system can be represented as in Table II w ith the follow ing supplem entary property :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{n}}+\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{n}+1}=\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{N}} \quad 1 ; \mathrm{n}: \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This property is from now on referred to as the \Leib-
 brated Leibnitz triangle [10].]. The Leibnitz rule goes \upwards", in contrast w ith the P ascal triangle rule, which goes \dow nw ards". A triangle such as that of Table II, and also satisfying Leibnitz rule, is fully determ ined by giving one probability for each value of $N$, e.g., by giving $f r_{\mathrm{N}} \circ \mathrm{g}(8 \mathrm{~N})$. Leibnitz triangle itself is entirely deter$m$ ined by $r_{N} 0=1=\left(\mathbb{N}+1\right.$ ) (hence $r_{N}=\frac{1}{N+1} \frac{(\mathbb{N} n)!n!}{N!}$ ).

Let us now give three $q_{s e n}=1$ exam ples, all of them satisfying Leibnitz rule. T hey are indicated in F ig. 1, and correspond to the Leibnitz triangle itself, $N$ independent binary random variables (i.e., $r_{N} 0=p^{N}$, hence $r_{N n}=$ $p^{N} \quad{ }^{n}(1 \quad p)^{n}$ w th $\left.0 \quad p \quad 1\right)$, and a streched-exponential system respectively. B oth the Leibnitz triangle and the streched-exponentialsystem involve correlations, but not global enough to take the system out from the $q_{s e n}=1$ universality class. In other words, the entropy which is extensive is $S_{B G}$, the B oltzm ann-G ibbs one.

Let us nally ilhustrate the $\mathrm{q}_{\text {sen }} 1$ case $w$ th a triangle in which m ost states have zero probability. Only a (left-side) strip whose width is $d+1$ ( $d=1 ; 2$; :::) has nonvanishing probabilities (see details in [i] []). The num ber of states w th nonvanishing probabilities increases like a pow er of $N$, whereas the total num ber of states increases like $2^{N}$. The $d=1 ; 2$ instances are presented in Table III. T he entropies of the $d=1 ; 2 ; 3$ instances are show $n$ in $F$ ig. 2. The correlations are now global enough to drive the system out of the $\mathrm{q}_{\text {sen }}=1$ universality class. The entropy which is extensive now is $\mathrm{S}_{1} \quad(1=\mathrm{d})$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbb{N}=0) \quad(1 ; 1) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=1) \quad(1 ; 1=2) \quad(1 ; 1=2) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=2) \quad(1 ; 1=2) \quad(2 ; 1=4) \quad(1 ; 0) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=3) \quad(1 ; 1=2) \quad(3 ; 1=6) \quad(3 ; 0) \quad(1 ; 0) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=4) \quad(1 ; 1=2) \quad(4 ; 1=8) \quad(6 ; 0) \quad(4 ; 0) \quad(1 ; 0) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=0) \quad(1 ; 1) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=1) \quad(1 ; 1=2) \quad(1 ; 1=2) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=2) \quad(1 ; 1=3) \quad(2 ; 1=6) \quad(1 ; 1=3) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=3) \quad(1 ; 3=8) \quad(3 ; 5=48) \quad(3 ; 5=48) \quad(1 ; 0) \\
& (\mathbb{N}=4) \quad(1 ; 2=5)(4 ; 3=40)(6 ; 3=60) \quad(4 ; 0) \quad(1 ; 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

TABLE III: A nom alous probability sets: $d=1$ (top), and $d=$ 2 (bottom). T hey satisfy the Leibnitz rule only asym ptotically, i.e., for N ! 1 .


F IG . 2: $S_{q}(\mathbb{N})$ for anom alous system $s:$ (a) $d=1$, (b) $d=2$, and (c) $d=3$. Only for $q=1 \quad(1=d)$ we have a nite value for $\lim _{\mathrm{N}}$ ! $1 \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{q}}(\mathbb{N})=\mathrm{N}$; it vanishes (diverges) for $\mathrm{q}>1+(1=\mathrm{d})$ $(\mathrm{q}<1+(1=\mathrm{d})$ ).
$2-O N$ A $\quad$-GENERALIZED CENTRALLIM IT THEOREM

Let us consider the follow ing generalized Fokk $P$ lanck equation:

$$
\frac{@ p(x ; t)}{@ t}=D \frac{@[p(x ; t)]^{2} q_{e}}{@ j j} \quad\left(0<\quad 2 ; q_{e}<3\right):
$$

The di usion coe cientD can alw aysbe englobed w ith tim et. C onsequently, this equation is essentially char terized by only two param eters, nam ely and $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{e}}$ : Fig. 3.

If ( $\left.\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{E}} ;\right)=(1 ; 2)$, we have the celebrated Fourier ht equation, and the exact solution (assum ing $p(x ; 0)$
$(0))$ is a Gaussian. This point of $F$ ig. 3 is to be sociated w ith the standard or G aussian Central Lin Theorem (G CLT). W ithin this theorem one ess tially considers the sum of $N$ independent random variables, each of them satisfying a probability distribution whose variance is nite. Then the N! 1 attractor in the space of the distributions is, after appropriate scaling, a G aussian distribution. $N$ plays in the theorem the sam e role as t in Eq. (4).

If $q_{e}=1$ and $0 \ll 2$, we still have a linear equation whose exact solution (assum ing $p(x ; 0)=(0))$ is a Levy distribution the index of which coincides with. This line off ig. 3 is to be associated w ith the Levy-G nedenko CLT (L CLT). W thin this theorem, once again one considers the sum of N independent random variables, each of them satisfying a probability distribution whose variance now diverges. Then the N ! 1 attractor in the space of the distributions is, after appropriate scaling, a Levy distribution.

These two theorem s basically cover all possible situations whenever the random variables are independent. $T$ he situation $m$ ight change dram atically if the $N$ variables are collectively correlated for all values of $N$, even when N diverges. O ne such case is the one indicated in F ig. 3 by the $=2$ line w th $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{e}} 1$. The equation is then nonlinear, and its exact solution [13, "1] (assum ing
 the distributions that are proportional to $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{q}_{e}}{ }^{B} \mathrm{x}^{2}$ w ith $B>0$, where $\left.e_{q_{e}}^{\mathrm{x}} \quad\left[1+\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & q_{e}\end{array}\right) \mathrm{x}\right]^{1=(1} \mathrm{q}_{e}\right)$, and $\left.e_{1}^{\mathrm{x}}=e^{\mathrm{x}}\right)$; nom alizability of the distribution im poses $q_{E}<3$; the second $m$ om ent is nite for $q_{e}<5=3$, and diverges for $5=3 \quad q_{e}<3 . W$ e expect this fam ily of solutions (quite com $m$ on indeed for certain classes ofcom plex system s) to correspond to som e form of generalized C LT (from now referred to as $q$ CLT). In other words, we expect that a certain class of globally correlated system s w ould have as their N ! 1 attractor, and after som e appropriate scaling, precisely a q-G aussian.

The C LT and its possible extensions have a long and fascinating history, clearly justi ed by the crucial role this theorem plays in theory of probabilities, statistical


FIG. 3: Localization in the ( $q_{1}$; )-space of the standard and Levy-G nedenko CLT's, as well as of the con jectural qgeneralized CLT (based on $[22]$. T he schem atic dashed lines are curves that share the $\operatorname{sam}^{-} \bar{e}^{-} \exp$ onent of the pow er-law behavior that em erges in the $\lim \operatorname{it} \dot{j} j!1$. At the $q_{e}=1$ axis we have Levy distributions which asym ptotically decay as $1=\dot{\operatorname{j}} \mathfrak{j}^{+}$, and at the $=2$ axiswe have $q_{e}-G$ aussians which decay as $1=\dot{x} \hat{j}^{f}=\left(q_{e} 1\right)$. The connection is therefore given by $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{E}}=(+3)=\left(\mathrm{I}_{1}+1\right)$ for $2 \gg 0$, hence $5=3<\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{e}}<3$ (see [11], based on [12]). For instance, the dashed line which joins the $\left(q_{e} ;\right)$ points $(1 ; 1)$ and $(2 ; 2)$ schem atically indicates those solutions of Eq. (4) which asym ptotically decay as $1=x^{2}$, and the dashed line joining $(1 ; 1=2)$ and $(7=3 ; 2)$ indicates those solutions which decay as $1=\dot{j} \mathcal{j}^{\beta=2}$. T he dot slightly to the right of the point $(5=3 ; 2)$ is joint to the point slightly below $(1 ; 2)$.
$m$ echanics, and elsew here. In som e sense it all started with A. de M oivre, who in 1733 obtained (apparently for the rst time ( 1 nection w th the binom ial distribution, P ascal triangle and alike. It continued w th P S. de Laplace, who reobtained the nom aldistribution in 1774, and then w ith R . Adrain in 1808. Finally, in 1809 C F.G auss published his celebrated form alization of the theory of errors. It is presum ably because of this achievem ent that it becam e to be known now adays as Gaussian. In the 1930's, P. Levy and B.V.G nedenko developed the extended theorem yielding Levy distributions. $M$ any studies have been dedicated to variations of these theorem s. E orts have been also done addressing the in uence of correlations
 references therein).

The possibility of existence of a generalized CLT whose attractors w ould be q-G aussians w as considered in
 [2Z], in particular in connection w ith deform ed products

dressed in $\left[\begin{array}{c}23 \\ \hline 10\end{array}\right]$ in term sofstochastic processes. A related theorem, also based in deform ed products, w as recently presented as well $\left[{ }_{2}^{2}{ }_{-}^{\prime}\right]$.
$W$ e focus now onto som e recent num erical indications
 tractors, at least for the $q_{s} 1$ branch of the $=2$ line of F ig. 3. M ore precisely, we are going to generalize the binom ialdistribution by introducing a global correlation (betw een $N$ random variables) through a speci c scaleinvariant procedure. $W$ e then check what is the N ! 1 attractor. The absence of such correlations w ill provide a Gaussian attractor ( $q_{e}=1$ ), which is usually referred to as the de M oivre-Laplace theorem. In other w ords, we intend to generalize here that theorem in the presence of a speci c classs of global correlations. W e follow [30 ${ }^{1}$

W e consider again the N distinguishable binary variables that were introduced previously (see Table II). They can be associated w th a row of a triangle of probabilities $f r_{N ; n} g(n=0 ; 1 ; 2 ;:: ; N)$ that satisfy Eq. (2).
 (3). W e rem ind that this rule is a speci c form of scaleinvariance which guarantees that the $m$ arginal probabilities of the $N$-system coincide w the joint probabilities of the ( $\mathbb{N} \quad 1$ )-system . T he probabilistic system is fully determ ined if we also provide one elem ent of each row of the triangle, say $f r_{N} ; 0 g(8 N)$. If we im pose $r_{N} ; 0=p^{N}$ w ith 0 p 1, we precisely recover the binom ial distribution, which leads to the de M oivre-Laplace theorem. W e shall im pose a global correlation by using the q-product [-6] de ned as follow s:

$$
\left.x \text { qY } \quad\left[x^{1} q+y^{1} q \quad 1\right]^{1=(1} q\right) \quad(x ; y \quad 1 ; q \quad 1):(5)
$$

$T$ his generalised product has the follow ing properties: (i) $x \quad 1 y=x y$; (ii) $x \quad{ }_{q} 1=x$; (iii) $\ln _{q}(x \quad q y)=\ln _{q} x+\ln _{q} y$, $w$ th $\ln _{q} x \quad \frac{x^{1} q 1}{1 q}\left(\ln _{1} x=\ln x\right)$ being the inverse of $e_{q}^{x}$; (iv) $\frac{1}{x{ }_{q Y}}=\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \quad 2 \mathrm{q}\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)$. If the probability distribution in phase space is uniform $w$ ithin a volum ew, the entropy $S_{q}$ is given by $S_{q}=\ln _{q} W$. Property (iii) can then be interpreted as $S_{q}(A+B)=S_{q}(A)+S_{q}(B)$ where $A$ and $B$ are subsystem $s$ that are not independent but rather satisfy $W_{A+B}=W_{A} \quad{ }_{q} W_{B}$. The possibility of a correspondence between this $q$ product $w$ ith a $q-C$ LT has already been con jectured [22], and som ee orts along this line already exist in the literature [ $\left[_{[1} \overline{7}_{1}\right]$.

The global correlation is introduced by im posing

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(1=\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{N}} ; 0\right)=(1=\mathrm{p}) \quad \mathrm{q}(1=\mathrm{p}) \quad \mathrm{q}(1=\mathrm{p}) \quad \mathrm{q}::: \quad \mathrm{q}(1=\mathrm{p}) ; \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\left.=1=\mathbb{N} p^{q 1} \quad(\mathbb{N} \quad 1)\right]^{1=(1} \quad q\right): \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

For $0<p<1$ we see that $r_{N} ; 0=p^{N}=e^{N \ln (1=p)}$ if $q=1$, whereas $r_{N} ; 0 \quad \frac{1}{\left[(1=p)^{1} q \quad 1\right]^{1=(1 \quad q)}} \frac{1}{N^{1=(1 ~ q)}} /$


FIG. 4: $\ln _{4=3} \frac{p(x)}{p(0)}$ vs $x^{2}$ for $(q ; p)=(3=10 ; 1=2)$, and $N=$ 200. T w o branches are observed due to the asym m etry em erging from the fact that we have im posed the q-product on the $\backslash$ left" side of the triangle; we could have done otherw ise. T he $m$ ean value of the tw o branches is indicated in dashed line. It is through this $m$ ean line that we have num erically calcu lated $q_{\mathrm{E}}(\mathrm{q})$ as indicated in F ig. 5. Inset: Linear-linear representation of $p(x)$.


F IG. 5: $\ln _{4=3} \frac{p(x)}{p(0)}$ vs $x^{2}$ for $(q ; p)=(3=10 ; 1=2)$ and various system sizes N. Inset: N -dependence of the (negative) slopes of the $\ln _{q_{e}}$ vs $x^{2}$ straight lines. $W$ e nd that, for $p=1=2$ and $N \gg 1, h(n \quad h n i)^{2} i \quad N^{2}=(N) \quad a(q) N+b(q) N^{2}$. For $\mathrm{q}=1 \mathrm{we}$ nd $\mathrm{a}(1)=1$ and $\mathrm{b}(1)=0$, consistent w ith nom al di usion as expected. Forq<1we nd a $(q)>0$ and $b(q)>0$, thus yielding ballistic di usion. T he linear correlation factor of the q logversusx ${ }^{2}$ curves range from 0.999968 up to near 0.999971 when $N$ increases from 50 to 1000. T he very slight lack of linerarity that is observed is expected to vanish in the $\lim$ it $N$ ! 1 , but at the present stage this rem ains a num erically open question.


FIG. 6: Relation between the index $q$ from the $q-p r o d u c t$ de nition, and the index $q_{e}$ resulting from the num erically calculated probability distribution. T he agreem ent w ith the analytical con jecture $q_{e}=2 \quad \frac{1}{q}$ is rem arkable. Inset: $D$ etail for the range $0<q_{E}<1$.
$\left.1=\mathbb{N}^{1=(1} q\right)(\mathbb{N}!1)$ for $q<1$. We shall from now on focus on $p=1=2$, and $0 \quad q \quad 1 . W$ e can check that $q=1$ recovers the triangle on which de M oivre and Laplace based their historic theorem. W e can also check that $q=0$ yields $r_{N} ; 0=1=(\mathbb{N}+1)$, i.e., we recover the Leibnitz triangle [1d].

By introducing a conveniently centered and rescaled variable, nam ely $x \quad \frac{n(\mathbb{N}=2)}{N=2}$, we can check that, for increasing $N$, our set of probabilities approaches (see Figs. 4 and 5) a double-branched $q_{k}-G$ aussian probabillity $p(x) / e_{q_{e}} x^{2} w$ th

$$
\begin{equation*}
q_{e}=2 \quad \frac{1}{q}: \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

See Fig. 6. W e verify that $q=1$, hence $q_{e}=1$, reproduces the de M oivre-Laplace theorem. For q decreasing from unity to zero, $q_{e}$ decreases from unity to $m$ inus innity. By double-branched we m ean that what we get is tw o branches of $q_{k}-G$ aussian $w$ th slightly di erent coe cients on the right and left sides of it. This asym $m$ etry com es from the fact that we have introduced the correlations by im posing Leibnitz rule on the \left" side of the triangle, not, for instance, at its center.

Transform ation (8) is a com position of $m$ ultiplicative duality ( $q$ \$ $1=q$, whose xed point is $q=1$ ), and additive duality ( $q$ \$ 2 q, whose xed point once again is $q=1$ ). $T$ hese two transform ations, alone or com bined, appear in fact very frequently in the literature of nonextensive statisticalm echanics.

$$
3-\mathrm{C} O N \mathrm{C} \text { LU S IO N S }
$$

It is well known that, if we have a system constituted by $N$ elem ents that are (either exactly or nearly exactly)
independent in the probabilistic sense, then (i) the entropy which is extensive is $S_{B G}(\mathbb{N})$, and (ii) the attractor, in the sense of a central lim it theorem, is a G aussian (Levy) distribution if the variance of the single distribution that is being convoluted is nite (in nity).

We have shown here that special gbobal correlations (which are either exactly or asym ptotically scaleinvariant) am ong these $N$ elem ents can $m$ ake that (i) the value of $q$ for which $S_{q}(\mathbb{N})$ is extensive di ens from unity, and (ii) the attractor, in the sense of a central lim it theorem, not only di ers from both a Gaussian or a Levy distribution, but can even precisely be a q-G aussian distribution (w hich in fact extrem izes $S_{q}$ under appropriate constraints).

It rem ains as an im portant open question the understanding of what are the precise classes of global correlations that induce one or the other of these anom alies. It is in principle possible that one of these two classes contains the other one, or that none of them fully contains the other one, having nevertheless a nontrivial intersection. O r even | the sim plest of all possibilities | they could coincide. If they do, is it (asym ptotic) scaleinvariance a su cient and necessary condition for both anom alies to em erge sim ultaneously? The exact answ er to this and related questions would deeply en lighten the reason for which q-exponentials appear so frequently in $m$ any natural and arti cial system $s$. It would of course also qualify the classes of situations for which the concepts em erging in nonextensive statisticalm echanics (and in its generalizations and its variations) are applicable.
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