

Large deviations, condensation, and giant response in a statistical system

Federico Corberi¹

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica “E. R. Caianiello”, and INFN,
Gruppo Collegato di Salerno, and CNISM, Unità di Salerno,
Università di Salerno, via Giovanni Paolo II 132, 84084 Fisciano (SA), Italy.*

We study the probability distribution P of the sum of a large number of non-identically distributed random variables n_m . Condensation of fluctuations, the phenomenon whereby one of such variables provides a macroscopic contribution to the global probability, is discussed and interpreted in analogy to phase-transitions in Statistical Mechanics. A general expression for P is derived, and its sensitivity to the details of the distribution of a single n_m is worked out.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a, 64.60.Bd

Condensation is the phenomenon whereby a finite fraction of some quantity, e.g. a particle density, concentrates into a small region of phase-space, as in the paradigmatic example of a vapor transforming into a liquid when crossing a phase-transition. Despite the prominent role played by molecular interactions in this case, condensation can also be observed in *non-interacting* systems as, for instance, in a quantum Bose-Einstein condensate [1] or in classical models such as the zero-range process and others [2]. It occurs here because the condensing quantity – a particle number in the former examples – is conserved. This *constraint* acts like an *effective* interaction among the constituents bringing about the transition [3].

A different manifestation of condensation is observed when probability distributions of a fluctuating collective variable \mathcal{N} , such as the number of particles in a thermodynamic system, are considered. In this case, a fluctuation $\mathcal{N} = N$ well above the typical value is necessarily associated to a condensed configuration of the system [3–5]. This phenomenon, referred to as *condensation of fluctuations*, is not restricted to the particle number \mathcal{N} but was observed for quantities as diverse as energy, exchanged heats, particles currents etc... [3–5]. In non-interacting systems condensation of fluctuations occurs because, from the mathematical point of view, asking for a specific value $\mathcal{N} = N$ constraints the system similarly to what a conservation law does [3].

In this Letter we study the probability distribution P of the sum \mathcal{N} of M non-identically distributed random variables. We discuss how an interpretation can be provided, along the guidelines of Statistical Mechanics, in terms of a phase-transition between a *normal* phase with a vanishing order parameter ρ_ℓ and a condensed one with $\rho_\ell > 0$. A general expression for the probability P is found and the radically different behaviors of this quantity in the normal and in the condensed phase are discussed and illustrated by the solution of some specific models. In particular, in the condensed phase, the notable phenomenon of the *giant response* – a dramatic change of P as the statistical properties of a single random variable is modified – is found.

In order to set the stage, let us consider the variables

n_m ($m = 1, M$) subject to a probability $p_m(n_m; K)$, where K is a set of parameters. This probabilistic setup is suited to describe at a simple level a variety of systems ranging from physics to chemistry, biology and social sciences. For instance, one can consider M receptors where n_m ligand particles, like those of a pollutant, can be adsorbed, or n_m electrons populating M atomic levels. One can also think of M individuals, or agents, collecting n_m *resources* with a certain probability p_m . In the former examples the temperature can be one of the control parameters K but, in general, other can be present.

We fix the language by speaking of M *receptors* hosting a total number $\mathcal{N} = \sum_{m=1}^M n_m$ of *particles*, with an average value $\langle \mathcal{N} \rangle = \sum_{m=1}^M \langle n_m \rangle$, where $\langle n_m \rangle = \sum_n n p_m(n; K)$. For ease of notation the dependence on K will be often dropped, and M will be considered large.

We are interested in the probability to observe a total number $\mathcal{N} = N$ of particles

$$\begin{aligned} P(N, M) &= \sum_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_M} p_1(n_1) p_2(n_2) \cdots p_M(n_M) \delta_{\mathcal{N}, N} = \\ &= \oint dz e^{M[\ln Q(z, M) - \rho \ln z]}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where, for discrete variables, we used the representation $\delta_{\mathcal{N}, N} = \oint dz z^{-(N - \mathcal{N} + 1)}$, with $Q(z, M) = \left[\prod_{m=1}^M \sum_{n_m} p_m(n_m) z^{n_m} \right]^{\frac{1}{M}}$ and $\rho = \frac{N-1}{M} \simeq \frac{N}{M}$ is the particles density.

The following recurrency relation holds

$$P(N, M) = \sum_{n=0}^N \pi(n, N, M) \quad (2)$$

where

$$\pi(n, N, M) = P(N - n, M - 1) p_M(n) \quad (3)$$

is the probability that, when the M -th *receptor* is added to the previous $M - 1$, n particles are stored in it.

Let us discuss the basic mechanisms whereby the recurrence (2) works to build up the full probability $P(N, M)$.

Denoting with $\bar{N} = M\bar{\rho}$ the value of N where P is maximum, the largest $P(N - n, M - 1)$ in Eq. (3) is the one with $n = N - \bar{N}$. Notice that this term is present in Eq. (2) only if $N \geq \bar{N}$. Then, for $N \leq \bar{N}$, π has a maximum at a value $n = n_g$ which is microscopic and does not scale with M (see the inset of Fig.1 for a specific example with $n_g = 0$, to be discussed below). This is because the quantities $P(N - n, M - 1)$ in Eq. (3) lower with n (i.e. moving from the maximum) and the same is true for $p_M(n)$, for sufficiently large $n > n_g$ (being $p_M(n)$ normalized). If the p_m 's are monotonously decreasing, it is $n_g = 0$. A similar situation, with π peaked at a microscopic n_g , is found also for $N > \bar{N}$, when the largest probability $P(\bar{N}, M - 1)$ is contained in the sum on the r.h.s. of Eq. (3), but its maximum is tamed by the microscopic probabilities, i.e. $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} P(\bar{N}, M - 1)p_M(N - \bar{N}) = 0$.

Let us illustrate these behaviors by considering a specific example with power-law distribution

$$p_m(n) = c(n+1)^{-K_m}, \quad (4)$$

where $K_m > 1$ and c is a normalization.

We start with the simplest case where $K_m \equiv K$ does not depend on m [5]. In the inset of Fig.1, π is plotted for $K = 3/2$ and different choices of N . Here one observes a sharp peak in $n = n_g \equiv 0$, as expected.




FIG. 1: The quantity $\pi(n, N, M)$ is plotted against n for the model with probabilities (4) with a uniform $K_m = K = 3 > K_c$, for $M = 246$ and the values of N indicated in the key. The location of n_{gl} is indicated with a bold vertical segment. In the inset the same plot is made for $K_m = K = 3/2 < K_c$.

The situation with π peaked in $n = n_g$ is physically intuitive: It expresses the fact that, when M is large, the occupancy π of the new receptor (the M -th) is microscopic. We will denote this situation, with a uniformly small occupation, the *normal* (or *gas*) phase.

In the *gas* phase, P can be determined in the large- M limit by a steepest-descent evaluation [3, 5, 6] of the

integral on the r.h.s. of Eq. (1), leading to

$$P(N, M) \simeq e^{-MR(\rho)}, \quad (5)$$

with an M -independent rate-function

$$R(\rho) = -\ln Q[z^*(\rho)] + \rho \ln z^*(\rho), \quad (6)$$

where $z^*(\rho)$ is given by the saddle-point equation

$$z^*(\rho) \frac{Q'[z^*(\rho)]}{Q[z^*(\rho)]} = \rho. \quad (7)$$

For the specific example above, this equation can be cast as $\frac{Li_{K-1}(z^*)}{Li_K(z^*)} = \rho + 1$, where $Li_K(z)$ is the polylogarithm (Jonquière's function). It admits a solution with $z < 1$ for any finite value of ρ if $K \leq K_c = 2$. P is then expressed by Eqs. (5,6) with $Q(z^*) = Li_K(z^*)$. The rate-function $R(\rho)$ obtained in this way is plotted with a black heavy dashed line in Fig.2. In the same picture the quantity $\mathcal{R}(\rho, M) = -\frac{1}{M} \ln P(M\rho, M)$ obtained from Eq. (1) by exact enumeration, is shown for different choices of M . One observes a convergence, as M increases, towards the asymptotic M -independent form $R(\rho)$.




FIG. 2: $\mathcal{R}(\rho, M)$ is plotted against ρ for the model with probabilities (4) with a uniform $K_m = K = 3/2 < K_c$, for different values of M in the key. The heavy dashed line is the asymptotic (for $M \rightarrow \infty$) expression $R(\rho)$ obtained from Eqs. (6,7) with $Q(z) = Li_K(z)$.

A radically different situation occurs for $N > \bar{N}$, when $P(\bar{N}, M - 1)$ grows fast enough to give $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} P(\bar{N}, M - 1)p_M(N - \bar{N}) \neq 0$. For the choice (4) with $K_m = K$, this occurs when $K > K_c$.

In this case the sum in Eq. (2) does not only take contributions around the microscopic value n_g , since π can be non-negligible up to a certain $n = n_\ell$ of order M . This is because π is triggered by the maximum of $P(N - n, M - 1)$ at a value $n = N - \bar{N}$ which, for given ρ , is of order M itself. Fig.1 show this for the model (4)

with $K = 3$: π develops a second peak at $n = n_\ell$ and only for $n > n_\ell$ it drops down to negligible values.

The physical interpretation is that, when a value of N larger than the typical one \bar{N} is attempted, n_M can be either microscopic or macroscopic. Then, together with the uniformly scarcely populated gas phase, a *liquid*, or *condensed* phase coexists characterized by a single receptor hosting a finite fraction of the N particles.

From the previous considerations a close resemblance emerges with the problem of a gas-liquid transition, with N being a control parameter playing the role of the volume, $\rho_\ell = n_\ell/M$ an order-parameter and $\mathcal{H} \sim -\ln \pi$ an energetic landscape. Notice that the amount of *condensed* vs *normal* fluctuations, described by ρ_ℓ , depends on N : The fraction of condensate is absent at $N = \bar{N}$, and increases with N .

We want now to determine the form of $P(N, M)$ when condensation occurs. Starting from equally distributed variables, $p_m(n) \equiv p(n)$, Eq. (2) can be cast as

$$P(N, M) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{n_{gl}} \pi(n, N, M) + \sum_{n=n_{gl}}^N \pi(n, N, M), \quad (8)$$

where n_{gl} is the value of n where π is minimum (see Fig.1). For $N \gg \bar{N}$ the peak around N_ℓ becomes sharper and a saddle point evaluation of the second term gives $\sum_{n=n_{gl}}^N \pi \simeq P(N_\ell, M-1)p(N-N_\ell)\sigma$, where $N_\ell = N - n_\ell$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{2\pi[(\partial^2 \ln \pi / \partial n^2)_{n=N_\ell}]^{-1}}$. Notice that $\sum_{n=0}^{n_{gl}} N\pi$ - the number of particles in the gas phase - is of order M suggesting that also the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (8) is of the same order. Therefore, for $N \gg \bar{N}$, Eq. (8) admits a solution with $P(N, M) \simeq bM p(N - N_\ell)$ ($b = \text{const.}$), $\sum_{n=0}^{n_{gl}} \pi \simeq aP$ and $P(N_\ell, M-1)\sigma \simeq b(1-a)M$. Since $N_\ell \rightarrow \bar{N}$ as $N \rightarrow \bar{N}$ one can write

$$P(N, M) \simeq bM p(N - \bar{N}), \quad \forall N \gg \bar{N}. \quad (9)$$

Let us illustrate all the above by considering again the distribution (4) with $K > K_c$. It is easy to show that the saddle point solution to Eq. (7) exists only for $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ defined by $\bar{\rho} = \frac{Li_{K-1}(1)}{Li_K(1)} - 1$ ($\bar{\rho} \simeq 0.368433$ for $K = 3$). For $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ only the normal phase exists, the steepest descent evaluation of the integral in Eq. (1) is appropriate, and one arrives at Eqs. (6,7). The rate function obtained in this way is shown in Fig.3 together with the behavior of $\mathcal{R}(\rho, M)$ which, for $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$, approaches $R(\rho)$ for large M .

For values of the density larger than $\bar{\rho}$ the steepest-descent evaluation of the integral in (1) breaks down because P is not exponentially small in M as required by Eq. (6) and, instead, the solution (9) applies. In order to see this, in the inset of Fig.3 we plot $M^{-1}P(N, M)$, since according to Eq. (9) this quantity ought to be independent of M and proportional to $p(N - \bar{N})$. As expected,




FIG. 3: The function $\mathcal{R}(\rho, M)$ is plotted against ρ for the model with probabilities (4) with a uniform $K_m = 3 > K_c$, for the values of M in the key. The heavy-dotted black line is this quantity for $M \rightarrow \infty$, which coincide with $R(\rho)$ obtained from Eqs. (6,7) for $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ and is identically zero for $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}$. In the upper inset $M^{-1}P$ is plotted against $N - \bar{N}$. The heavy dotted turquoise line is the law $(N - \bar{N})^{-3}$, i.e. Eq.(9). In the lower inset P is plotted for $M = 333$ and the three different choices i) continuous brown, ii) green dashed with a square and iii) dotted moroon with a circle (see text).

for $\rho \gg \bar{\rho}$ the form (9) describes the probability with great accuracy.

Now we turn to non-identically distributed variables. Eq. (2) can be re-written as

$$P(N, M) = \frac{1}{M!} \sum_{\{labels\}} \sum_{n=0}^N \pi(n, N, M) \quad (10)$$

where the first sum is over the $M!$ equivalent labelings of the n_m 's. This is dominated by the term where $p_M(n_\ell)$ is larger. In the example (4), it is the one with the smaller K_m . Denoting \bar{m} this term [i.e. $p_{\bar{m}}(n_\ell) > p_m(n_\ell) \forall m \neq \bar{m}$] and following the route to Eq. (9), one arrives at

$$P(N, M) \simeq bM p_{\bar{m}}(N - \bar{N}). \quad (11)$$

This is the main results of this paper. It must be stressed that the solutions (9,11) are totally different from the one (5), in particular concerning the dependence on M . Indeed, while (5) is exponentially small for large M and transforms into a $\delta(N - \bar{N})$, Eqs. (9,11) are linear in M , signaling the presence of anomalously large fluctuations. Related to that, an extreme sensitivity of the macroscopic probability P to the details of the microscopic ones p_m arises. In fact, Eq. (11) clearly shows that the distribution of the single variable \bar{m} fully determines the global quantity P . Introducing a *susceptibility* χ - the shift of the macroscopic probability due to the

variation of a microscopic one – from Eq. (11) one has

$$\chi(N, m) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta P(N, M)}{\Delta p_m(N)} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{gas} \\ BM \delta_{m, \bar{m}}, & \text{condens.} \\ & (N \gg \bar{N}), \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where B is a constant. This giant response can be illustrated using again the probabilities (4) with m -dependent K_m 's. The simplest non-trivial choice is when all the K_m 's are equal except one, namely $K(1) = K_1$ and $K_m = K, \forall m > 1$. In the lower inset of Fig.3 we compare P for the three cases i) $K_1 = K = 3$, ii) $K_1 = K = 6$ and iii) $K_1 = 3, K = 6$. One sees that the curves relative to the choices ii) and iii) coincide for $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$. This is because in this region there is no condensation and the macroscopic probability is insensitive to a single p_m , Eq. (12). However, for $\rho > \bar{\rho}$ the two curves become totally different and instead case iii) behaves as i), apart from a vertical displacement due to the different value of the constant b in Eq. (11). This shows that a single variable can strongly influence the collective behavior producing a macroscopic response.

The examples considered insofar were based on the fat-tailed probabilities (4). However, the features above are more general and not restricted to this case. We show this by considering the exponential form $p_m(n) = c \exp[-K_m \cdot n^{\kappa_m}]$, where $K_m = \beta \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^2$ (β and c are constants). Starting with a uniform exponent $\kappa_m \equiv \kappa = 1$, Fig.4 shows a pattern of behavior similar to the case (4) with $K > K_c$: for $N \leq \bar{N}$, \mathcal{R} approaches the form (5) with a rate function given by Eqs. (6,7), whereas for $N \gg \bar{N}$ the determination (11) holds (with $\bar{m} = 1$), implying $M^{-1}P(N, M) \sim e^{-\frac{(N-\bar{N})}{M^2}}$, as shown in the upper inset. The phenomenon of the giant susceptibility is illustrated by comparing the case above with the one where we change the distribution of n_1 as to have $\kappa_1 = 0.95$ and all the remaining ones are left untouched. The inset of Fig.4 shows that, while in the normal phase $N \leq \bar{N}$ this does not alter P , a dramatic change is produced in the condensed region $N > \bar{N}$.

In this paper we have discussed the general problem of evaluating the probability distribution $P(N, M)$ of the sum N of a large number M of micro-variables, not necessarily identically distributed. The recurrence relation (2) provides an analogy with a thermodynamic system where a condensation transition occurs and the identification of an order parameter ρ_ℓ . It also allows the derivation of a rather general expression for P [Eq. (11)] which is valid, when condensation occurs, for finite values of M . From this expression, computing the susceptibility (12), the extreme sensitivity of P to the distribution of even a single variable was explicitly shown. These noteworthy features are not expected to be only relevant to the large deviations of \mathcal{N} , but also to those of different macrovariables, and to apply to a large class of problems in Physics and other areas.




FIG. 4: The function $\mathcal{R}(\rho, M)$ is plotted against ρ for the model with exponential probabilities (see text) with $\beta = 1$, $\kappa(m) = \kappa \equiv 1$, for the values of M in the key. The heavy-dotted black line is this quantity for $M \rightarrow \infty$, which coincide with $R(\rho)$ obtained from Eqs. (6,7) for $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}$ and is identically zero for $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}$. In the upper inset $M^{-1}P$ is plotted against $(N - \bar{N})/M^2$. The heavy dotted turquoise line is the law $e^{-(N-\bar{N})/M^2}$, i.e. Eq.(11). In the lower inset the P of the main figure with $M = 61$ (continuous violet) is compared with the case (dotted green) with $\kappa_1 = 0.95$, $\kappa_m \equiv \kappa = 1 \forall m > 1$.

Acknowledgments F. Corberi acknowledges financial support by MURST PRIN 2010HXAW77-005.

-
- [1] K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics*, John Wiley and Sons, New York 1967.
 - [2] C. Castellano, F. Corberi, and M. Zannetti, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 4973 (1997). M.R. Evans. Braz. J. Phys. **30**, 4257 (2000). M.R. Evans, and T.Hanney J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, R195 (2005). S.N. Majumdar, M.R. Evans, and R.K.P.Zia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 180601 (2005). C. Godrèche, Lect. Notes Phys. **716**, 261 (2007). M.R. Evans and B. Waclaw, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 095001 (2014). L. Ferretti, M. Mamino, G. Bianconi, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 042810 (2014).
 - [3] M. Zannetti, F. Corberi, and G. Gonnella, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 012143 (2014); Commun. Theor. Phys. **62**, 555 (2014).
 - [4] R.J. Harris, A. Rákos, and G.M. Schuetz, J. Stat. Mech. **P08003** (2005). N. Merhav, and Y. Kafri, J. Stat. Mech. **P02011** (2010). F. Corberi and L.F. Cugliandolo, J. Stat. Mech. P11019 (2012). F. Corberi, G. Gonnella, A. Piscitelli and M. Zannetti, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 042001 (2013). J. Szavits-Nossan, M. R. Evans and S. N. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 020602 (2014).
 - [5] M. Filiassi, G. Livan, M. Marsili, M. Peressi, E. Vesselli, and E. Zarinelli, J. Stat. Mech.: Theory and Experiment, P09030 (2014).

[6] H. Touchette, Phys. Rep. **478**, 1 (2009).