

# Classical no-cloning theorem under Liouville dynamics by non-Csiszár f-divergence

T. YAMANO<sup>1 (a)</sup> and O. IGUCHI<sup>1 (b)</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Physics, Ochanomizu University, 2-1-1 Otsuka, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-8610, Japan*

PACS 05.20.Gg – Classical ensemble theory

PACS 05.90.+m – Other topics in statistical physics, thermodynamics, and nonlinear dynamical systems

PACS 89.70.-a – Information theory and communication theory

**Abstract.** - The Csiszár f-divergence, which is a class of information distances, is known to offer a useful tool for analysing the classical counterpart of the cloning operations that are quantum mechanically impossible for the factorized and marginality classical probability distributions under Liouville dynamics. We show that a class of information distances that does not belong to this divergence class also allows for the formulation of a classical analogue of the quantum no-cloning theorem. We address a family of nonlinear Liouville-like equations, and generic distances, to obtain constraints on the corresponding functional forms, associated with the formulation of classical analogue of the no-cloning principle.

---

**Introduction.** - The search for classical analogues of the processes that are quantum mechanically impossible allows one to identify those aspects that are purely quantum mechanical. Along this line, a classical analogue of the quantum entanglement has been discussed, namely, secret classical correlations [1]. Moreover, it has been reported that principles of quantum no-cloning [2, 3] and no-deleting operations [4] under unitary dynamics possess classical analogues [5]. The existence of parallelism between classical and quantum copying processes has been demonstrated via contradictions between the behaviors of relative entropies. That is, the relative entropy calculated from statistical ensemble distributions changes upon copying, which is in conflict with the time invariance of that measure under Liouville dynamics.

The relative entropy of the probabilities defined by Kullback and Leibler  $D_{KL}(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) = \int dx \mathcal{P}_1 \ln(\mathcal{P}_1/\mathcal{P}_2)$  is constant in time when the probabilities obey the common Liouville dynamics [5, 6]. This implies that the Kullback-Leibler distance, i.e., the relative entropy, remains the same as that given by the initial probabilities with which the original system is prepared. The Csiszár f-divergence [7] measures the distance between two probability distributions  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  by the form  $\mathcal{F} = \int dx \mathcal{P}_1 f(\mathcal{P}_2/\mathcal{P}_1)$ , where  $f$  is a convex function satisfying  $f(1) = 0$ . Then, the Kullback-Leibler distance is found to be a special case of the

---

<sup>(a)</sup>E-mail: yamano@amy.hi-ho.ne.jp

<sup>(b)</sup>E-mail: osamu@phys.ocha.ac.jp

f-divergence ( $f = -\ln[\mathcal{P}_2/\mathcal{P}_1]$ , [8]).

As an extended proof of the classical no-cloning theorem along the line in [5], Plastino and Daffertshofer [9] have showed that the same contradictory situation upon copying a source system arises when employing a wider class of distance measures, i.e., the Csiszár f-divergence. Under the Liouville dynamics, the conservation of the f-divergence is incompatible with a change in the distance during the copying process, where the following three different reasonable premises for the input and output distributions are made:

(i) For the initial distributions, the state of a system is expressed by a product of distribution functions of three components as  $\mathcal{P}_j = \mathcal{P}_j^{(o)}\mathcal{P}^{(a)}\mathcal{P}^{(r)}$ . This reads as follows: the state of the original system ( $o$ ) is copied to the target system (replica) ( $r$ ) [10] with the help of an ancillary copying machine ( $a$ ). The index  $j$  specifies the different initial conditions. The coordinates  $\vec{x}^{(\cdot)}$  comprise the support of each distribution, i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}^{(\cdot)}(\vec{x}^{(\cdot)})$ . This implies that the original system to be copied is prepared in such a way that its state is statistically independent of the machine and the replica.

(ii) The successful cloning in (i) yields the final distribution as  $\mathcal{Q}_j = \mathcal{P}_j^{(o)}\mathcal{Q}^{(a)}\mathcal{P}_j^{(o)}$ . During the copying process, the machine interacts with both the original system and its replica, and it functions as a reader and a writer. As a result, it changes its states from  $\mathcal{P}^{(a)}$  to  $\mathcal{Q}^{(a)}$ .

(iii) The marginalization for the final distribution  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  with respect to the coordinates of the machine is used:  $\int d\vec{x}^{(a)}\mathcal{Q}_j = \mathcal{P}_j^{(o)}(\vec{x}^{(o)})\mathcal{P}_j^{(o)}(\vec{x}^{(r)})$ .

With this background, we ask in this Letter: is the proof of the existence of the classical no-cloning theorem specific for the choice of the relative entropy? There may be other relative distance measures that also display a conflict under Liouville dynamics. To answer this question we investigate the case of non f-divergence-type distances with which, if valid, we can provide robustness to the delineation of the classical counterpart of the quantum process. We show that the combination of the f-divergence-type distance for measuring probabilities and the Liouville dynamics is a strong requirement for establishing the classical counterpart. We exemplify it by considering non f-divergence distances under a Liouville type equation incorporating a power law nonlinearity. In the next section, we first introduce a simple class of distance measures that do not belong to the f-divergence class. In section III, we show the discrepancy that leads to the equivalent conclusion given in [5,9]. In section IV, we consider nonlinearities in the Liouville equation for two types of distance measures, before closing with a summary and concluding remarks.

**A distance of non-Csiszár f-divergence type.** – We consider the continuous Chernoff  $\alpha$ -distance [11] between two distinct probability distributions under phase space dynamics  $\vec{x}_t$ ,

$$C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1(\vec{x}_t), \mathcal{P}_2(\vec{x}_t)) \equiv -\log \left[ \int d\vec{x}_t \mathcal{P}_1^\alpha(\vec{x}_t) \mathcal{P}_2^{1-\alpha}(\vec{x}_t) \right]. \quad (1)$$

We exclude the situation  $\mathcal{P}_1^\alpha \mathcal{P}_2^{1-\alpha} = 0$ , that is, the two distributions do not have a common support, where the distance is not well defined. From an inequality  $a^\alpha b^{1-\alpha} \geq \min\{a, b\}$  for  $(0 \leq \alpha \leq 1)$ , the positivity  $C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) \geq 0$  is assured allowing for using it as a distance. Similarly, it is asymmetric with respect to  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  for general value of  $\alpha$ . The distance is zero if and only if  $\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P}_2$  holds for a fixed value of  $\alpha$ . When  $\mathcal{P}_1 \neq \mathcal{P}_2$ , then  $C_0(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) = C_1(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) = 0$  holds. The Kullback-Leibler distance is generated from the differential coefficient, e.g.,  $D_{KL}(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) = -[dC_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)/d\alpha]_{\alpha=1}$  and  $D_{KL}(\mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_1) = [dC_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)/d\alpha]_{\alpha=0}$ . A particular choice  $\alpha = 1/2$  provides the Bhattacharyya distance [12],  $C_{1/2}(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) = -\log [\int d\vec{x}_t \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{P}_2}]$ .

**Proof of the no-cloning theorem.** – Our probability distribution  $\mathcal{P}(\vec{x}_t)$  is assumed to evolve according to the Liouville equation  $\partial_t \mathcal{P} + \nabla \cdot (\vec{v} \mathcal{P}) = 0$ , where  $\vec{v} = d\vec{x}_t/dt$  denotes the velocity associated with the generalized coordinates in the phase space. Then, the

derivative of  $C_\alpha$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dC_\alpha}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{z} \int d\vec{x}_t \left( \alpha \mathcal{P}_1^{\alpha-1} \mathcal{P}_2^{1-\alpha} \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}_1}{\partial t} + (1-\alpha) \mathcal{P}_1^\alpha \mathcal{P}_2^{-\alpha} \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}_2}{\partial t} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{z} \int d\vec{x}_t \left[ \alpha \left( \frac{\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{P}_1} \right)^{1-\alpha} \nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}_1) + (1-\alpha) \left( \frac{\mathcal{P}_1}{\mathcal{P}_2} \right)^\alpha \nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}_2) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{z} \left\{ \int d\vec{x}_t \nabla \left( \vec{v} \left( \frac{\mathcal{P}_1}{\mathcal{P}_2} \right)^\alpha \mathcal{P}_2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int \vec{v} \left[ \alpha \nabla \left( \frac{\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{P}_1} \right)^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{P}_1 + (1-\alpha) \nabla \left( \frac{\mathcal{P}_1}{\mathcal{P}_2} \right)^\alpha \mathcal{P}_2 \right] d\vec{x}_t \right\} \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

where we put  $z = \int d\vec{x}_t \mathcal{P}_1^\alpha \mathcal{P}_2^{1-\alpha}$ . In the second line, we substituted  $\partial_t \mathcal{P}_j = -\nabla \cdot (\vec{v}\mathcal{P}_j)$ , ( $j = 1, 2$ ). The first term in the last line vanishes due to the Gauss theorem. Further, the calculations show that the second term vanishes. Therefore, the time derivative vanishes, i.e.  $dC_\alpha/dt = 0$ . Following the line of argument addressed in [5, 9, 13], we discuss the particular forms of states before and after the cloning process. We need to consider a tri-partite system whose distribution function is assumed to be factorized into component distributions as mentioned in (i). By the definition provided in Eq.(1), for the two factorized distributions for systems  $a$  and  $b$ , the total distance between two probability distributions  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  satisfying Eq.(1) is equivalent to the sum of the distances between the two systems  $a$  and  $b$ ,

$$C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1(a)\mathcal{P}_1(b), \mathcal{P}_2(a)\mathcal{P}_2(b)) = C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1(a), \mathcal{P}_2(a)) + C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1(b), \mathcal{P}_2(b)). \quad (3)$$

Therefore, for the initial ensemble  $\mathcal{P}_j = \mathcal{P}_j^{(o)} \mathcal{P}^{(a)} \mathcal{P}^{(r)}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ), the distance is attributed to the distance between the original states

$$C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) = C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1^{(o)}, \mathcal{P}_2^{(o)}), \quad (4)$$

because we have  $C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}^{(a)}, \mathcal{P}^{(a)}) = 0$  and  $C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}^{(r)}, \mathcal{P}^{(r)}) = 0$ . The two premises (ii) and (iii) mentioned in Introduction provide the contradiction in question. Indeed, the final distance in the form,  $\mathcal{Q}_j = \mathcal{P}_j^{(o)} \mathcal{Q}^{(a)} \mathcal{P}_j^{(o)}$ , becomes

$$C_\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2) = 2C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1^{(o)}, \mathcal{P}_2^{(o)}) + C_\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_1^{(a)}, \mathcal{Q}_2^{(a)}). \quad (5)$$

This leads to a negative value of  $C_\alpha$  if we require that  $C_\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2) = C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)$  should hold. This, however, is in conflict with the positivity property of  $C_\alpha$ .

Further, when we evaluate the  $C_\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2)$  based on the premise (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C_\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2) &\geq -\log \left( \int d\vec{x}^{(o,r)} \left[ \int d\vec{x}_t^{(a)} \mathcal{Q}_1 \right]^\alpha \left[ \int d\vec{x}_t^{(a)} \mathcal{Q}_2 \right]^{1-\alpha} \right) \\
&= -2 \log \left( \int d\vec{x}_t^{(o)} (\mathcal{P}_1^{(o)})^\alpha (\mathcal{P}_2^{(o)})^{1-\alpha} \right) \\
&= 2C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2) \quad (6)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the Hölder's inequality; the second, from (iii); and the last line, from Eq.(4). The distance between two different states after copying becomes larger than or equal to the twice of the initial one. Hence, in either case, we could show the contradiction with Eq.(2) as long as  $\mathcal{P}_1 \neq \mathcal{P}_2$  holds for all values of  $\alpha$ . In the present setting, the Liouville dynamics can not allow for classically copying an unknown original state to another system without destroying the original system.

**Consideration of distance form in terms of a Liouville-like nonlinear evolution equation.** – The Liouville equation must be linear and governs the evolution of a probability density that describes a statistical ensemble (in the sense of Gibbs) of dynamical systems, all evolving according to the same equations of motion. Such a time-dependent ensemble probability density always evolves according to a linear equation (e.g. [14]). Starting from the Liouville theorem, which states the conservation of the probability distribution function along the orbit in the phase space, the derived Liouville equation cannot have powered probabilities such as  $\mathcal{P}^q$ , where  $q$  may be relevant to deviation from linearity. However, it has been pointed out that the linearity of the Liouville equation does not preserve statistical independence when the linear combinations of probability distributions  $\mathcal{Q} = \sum_j c_j \mathcal{Q}_j$  are applied to the associated final states with the marginality property [5]. In order to gain more insights into the relation between the dynamics of the classical statistical ensemble distribution in copying process and the distance we measure, we here consider two cases whose dynamics evolve according to a *Liouville-like nonlinear evolution equation*. The same reasoning for the classical no-cloning consideration should provide constraints for the functional form of the distances and the parameter of the dynamics upon copying.

There can be two immediate generalizations of the Liouville equation that break its linearity,  $\partial_t \mathcal{P}^q + \nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}) = 0$  and  $\partial_t \mathcal{P} + \nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}^q) = 0$ . These forms are reminiscent of the nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations, where the probability  $\mathcal{P}$  is powered for terms in the equations [15]. Since the former is equivalent to the latter by a transform  $\mathcal{P}^q \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ , we use the latter in the following consideration. It would be worth mentioning the differences between the standard Liouville equation and its nonlinear forms. The Liouville-like nonlinear equations may govern the behavior of a time-dependent *density* describing a set of real, interacting systems instead of an evolution of a probability density associated with a statistical ensemble. Indeed, the nonlinearity in the evolution equation for the density constitutes an effective description of the interaction between the systems and has relevant applications (e.g. [16]). In this sense, the nonlinear Liouville-like equations in our consideration are akin, for instance, to the Vlasov-Poisson equation (e.g. [17] and references therein). In spite of this difference, we believe that the use of the nonlinear Liouville-like equation in the followings serves as a supporting tool for our present discussion.

First, we consider a distance  $G_1$  defined by the following form

$$G_1 = \int d\vec{x}_t \mathcal{P}_1^\alpha h(\eta), \tag{7}$$

where  $h$  is a function of the ratio of two different distributions  $\eta = \mathcal{P}_2/\mathcal{P}_1$ . When  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $G_1$  reduces to the Csiszár's f-divergence type, which has already been considered in [9]. We are interested in how the exponent  $\alpha$  governs the form  $h$  when  $\alpha \neq 1$  and  $\alpha \neq 0$ . Under the evolution, which can be described by a nonlinear generalization of the ordinary Liouville equation,

$$\partial_t \mathcal{P} + \nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}^q) = 0, \tag{8}$$

where  $q$  is not equal to unity, we consider the constraint on the functional form of  $h$  that makes the distance  $G_1$  time independent. We have

$$\frac{dG_1}{dt} = \int d\vec{x}_t \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}_1^\alpha}{\partial t} h + \mathcal{P}_1^\alpha h' \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} \right) \tag{9}$$

where  $h'$  means the derivative with respect to  $\eta$ . Putting the time derivative of  $\mathcal{P}_j$  as  $-\nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}_j^q)$  from Eq.(8) and from the Gauss theorem, we obtain the following expression

$$\frac{dG_1}{dt} = - \int d\vec{x}_t \mathcal{P}_1^{\alpha-1} [(\alpha h - \eta h') \nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}_1^q) + h' \nabla(\vec{v}\mathcal{P}_2^q)]$$

$$= \int \bar{v} [\mathcal{P}_1^q \nabla [\mathcal{P}_1^{\alpha-1} (\alpha h - \eta h')] + \mathcal{P}_2^q \nabla (\mathcal{P}_1^{\alpha-1} h')] d\bar{x}_t. \quad (10)$$

For the rhs. of Eq.(9), we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \bar{v} [(\alpha - 1) \mathcal{P}_1^{\alpha-2} \{ \alpha \mathcal{P}_1^q h - h' (\eta \mathcal{P}_1^q - \mathcal{P}_2^q) \} \nabla \mathcal{P}_1 \\ & + \mathcal{P}_1^{\alpha-1} \{ (\alpha - 1) \mathcal{P}_1^q h' - (\eta \mathcal{P}_1^q - \mathcal{P}_2^q) h'' \} \nabla \eta] d\bar{x}_t. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Because the coefficients of  $\nabla \mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\nabla \eta$  have to vanish, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \mathcal{P}_1^q h = (\eta \mathcal{P}_1^q - \mathcal{P}_2^q) h' \\ (\alpha - 1) \mathcal{P}_1^q h' = (\eta \mathcal{P}_1^q - \mathcal{P}_2^q) h'' \end{cases}. \quad (12)$$

Simultaneous satisfaction of both relations in Eq.(12) leads to the ordinary differential equation  $h' = ch^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$  with the integral constant  $c$ , which is of the Bernoulli type and can be solved by the change of variables  $z = h^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$ . Together with the condition  $h(1) = 0$ , we have

$$h(\eta) = \left( \frac{c}{1-\alpha} \right)^{1-\alpha} (\eta - 1)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (13)$$

Note that the nonlinear parameter of the dynamics  $q$  does not enter into the functional expression. Conversely, Eq.(13) must satisfy Eq.(12). Substituting Eq.(13), e.g., into the first equation of Eq.(12), we have for any  $\eta$

$$\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} = \frac{\eta - \eta^q}{\eta - 1}, \quad (14)$$

therefore, we can conclude  $q = 0$  and  $\alpha = 1/2$ . This case, however, is trivial, indicating that the combination of Eq.(7) and Eq.(8) may be applicable only to the case  $q = 1$ .

Let us now consider the case  $\alpha = 1$  in terms of another possible distance measure. We see that  $dG/dt = 0$  can be achieved robustly under the ordinary Liouville equation  $\partial_t \mathcal{P} + \nabla(\bar{v}\mathcal{P}) = 0$  by investigating the following combination:

$$G_2 = \int d\bar{x}_t \mathcal{P}_1 f(\eta), \quad \eta = \frac{\mathcal{P}_2^\beta}{\mathcal{P}_1} \quad (15)$$

where  $\beta$  is kind of a weighting parameter for the second probability distribution. The similar calculation for this provides the result

$$dG_2/dt = \int \bar{v} \left[ \beta(\beta - 1) \mathcal{P}_2^{q+\beta-2} (\nabla \mathcal{P}_2) f' + (\beta \mathcal{P}_2^{q+\beta-1} - \eta \mathcal{P}_1^q) f'' \nabla \eta \right] d\bar{x}_t. \quad (16)$$

The necessary conditions of  $dG_2/dt = 0$  are  $\beta = 0$  or  $\beta = 1$  from the first term. However,  $\beta = 0$  implies that  $G_2$  does not contain  $\mathcal{P}_2$ , which should be excluded from the present consideration. From the vanishing second term, we obtain a relation  $\beta = (\mathcal{P}_2/\mathcal{P}_1)^{1-q}$ . Therefore, as long as  $\mathcal{P}_1 \neq \mathcal{P}_2$  holds,  $\beta = 1$  yields  $q = 1$ .

**Summary and concluding remarks.** – We have shown that the universal cloning machines are incompatible with the conservation of information distance that is different from the Csiszár's f-divergence under the Liouville dynamics. The Chernoff  $\alpha$ -divergence provides an example that makes the cloning under that dynamics infeasible. That is  $dC_\alpha/dt = 0$  holds in spite of  $C_\alpha(\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2) \neq C_\alpha(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)$  before and after the copying process. One question still needs to be answered: to what extent the present argument is valid? We answer it as follows. Since a general form  $\mathcal{G} = \int d\bar{x}_t \mathcal{P}_1 f(\mathcal{P}_2/\mathcal{P}_1)$  satisfies  $d\mathcal{G}/dt = 0$  under

the usual Liouville dynamics [9], we can see that the discussion developed here is also true for the more generic distance measure  $G = G(\mathcal{G})$  because it immediately provides

$$\frac{dG}{dt} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial t} \frac{\partial G}{\partial \mathcal{G}} = 0. \quad (17)$$

From this perspective, the Chernoff  $\alpha$ -distance we employed is only a special case (when the function  $G$  is logarithmic) that makes the classical counterpart of the quantum no-cloning theorem hold.

\* \* \*

The author TY acknowledges the hospitality and the visiting grant at the Aston University, where the final version of the manuscript was accomplished. The authors thank referees for useful comments upon revision. The main part of this paper was presented at the Summer School on Mathematical Aspect of Quantum Computing held at Kinki University, 27<sup>th</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> August 2007.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] COLLINS D. and POPESCU S., *Phys. Rev. A*, **65** (2002) 032321.
- [2] WOOTTERS W.K. and ZUREK W.H., *Nature*, **299** (1982) 802.
- [3] D. DIEKS, *Phys. Lett. A*, **92** (1982) 271.
- [4] PATI A.K. and BRAUNSTEIN S.L., *Nature*, **404** (2000) 164.
- [5] DAFFERTSHOFER A., PLASTINO A.R. and PLASTINO A., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **88** (2002) 210601.
- [6] MACKEY M.C., *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **61** (1989) 981.
- [7] CSISZÁR I., *Studia Math. Hungarica*, **2** (1967) 299.
- [8] KULLBACK S. and LEIBLER R.A., *Ann. Math. Stat.*, **22** (1951) 79.
- [9] PLASTINO A.R. and DAFFERTSHOFER A., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **93** (2004) 138701.
- [10] In general, we need not to suppose the system that receives the information of the original as *blank*, though the device need to erase extra information that the target system already possessed.
- [11] CHERNOFF H., *Ann. Math. Stat.*, **23** (1952) 493.
- [12] BHATTACHARYYA A., *Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc.*, **35** (1943) 99.
- [13] PLASTINO A.R., *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.*, **162** (2006) 173.
- [14] VAN KAMPEN N.G., *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry 3rd ed.* (North Holland) 2007.
- [15] FRANK T.D., *Nonlinear Fokker-Planck Equation* (Springer) 2005.
- [16] FRANK T.D., DAFFERTSHOFER A., PEPPER C.E., BEEK P.J., and HAKEN H., *Physica D*, **144** (2000) 62.
- [17] PLASTINO A.R., GIORDANO C., PLASTINO A., and CASAS M., *Physica A*, **336** (2004) 376.