

In defense of Tsallis' original probability distribution

A. Plastino¹ and M. C. Rocca¹

¹ La Plata National University and Argentina's National Research Council
(IFLP-CCT-CONICET)-C. C. 727, 1900 La Plata - Argentina

August 1, 2018

Abstract

Tsallis' pioneer q -probability distribution

$$P_i = \frac{[1 + \beta(1-q)U_i]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}}{Z}$$

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^n [1 + \beta(1-q)U_i]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}$$

[J. of Stat. Phys., **52** (1988) 479] has been recently attacked in arXiv:1705.01752, in a Reply to our arXiv: 1704.07493 publication.

We show here that such an attack is groundless.

Keywords: MaxEnt, Tsallis' functional variation, q -statistics.

1 The Tsallis' probability distribution

We reply here to reference (arXiv:1705.01752) of Oikonomou and Bagci (OB by short) [1]. Under the pretense of replying to our reference [2], they question our variational procedure in such paper, but in so doing they are really attacking Tsallis' original probability distribution (PD) [3]. Let us see first how we proceeded in [2]. The pertinent variational equation is (OB's Eq. (1))

$$\left(\frac{q}{1-q}\right) P_i^{q-1} + \lambda_1 U_i + \lambda_2 = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

and OB call this PD \mathcal{P} by the name PR1. Of course, Eq. (1.1) is the Tsallis' Euler-Lagrange one of [3].

To make things transparent, we revisit now the procedure given in [2]. One first gives the Lagrange multipliers λ_1 and λ_2 a prescribed *form* in terms of a (thus far unknown) quantity Z :

$$\lambda_1 = \beta q Z^{1-q}, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{q}{q-1} Z^{1-q}, \quad (1.3)$$

and then has

$$P_i = \frac{[1 + \beta(1-q)U_i]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}}{Z}, \quad (1.4)$$

so that normalization demands for Z

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^n [1 + \beta(1-q)U_i]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}. \quad (1.5)$$

The ensuing PD is (curiously) called PR2 by OB [1].

It is obvious that PR1 and PR2 are one and the same PD! However, OB claim that they are different. OB try to validate such strange statement with a graph of three curves.

They introduce still a third PDF that they call OB, and hypothetically follows from their own variational equation (called by them Eq. (5)). In such Eq. (5) they inadvisedly FIX the energy-Lagrange multiplier as β , with disastrous consequences, as we will presently show. From their variational equation one obtains for the PD:

$$(P_i)_{OB} = \left[\left(\frac{1-q}{q}\right)(\beta U_i + \gamma)\right]^{1/(q-1)}, \quad (1.6)$$

so that OB's normalization entails

$$\sum_i (P_i)_{OB} = 1 = \sum_i \left[\left(\frac{1-q}{q}\right)(\beta U_i + \gamma)\right]^{1/(q-1)}, \quad (1.7)$$

and one immediately appreciates the sad fact that γ cannot be obtained in closed form. This makes normalization a difficult task, particularly in the

continuum limit. OB preposterously claim that their $(P_i)_{OB}$ is identical to PR1, which is patently absurd.

In order to get out of this conundrum OB state(see below their graph) that things are remedied by setting their Lagrange multipliers β, γ equivalent to ours λ_1, λ_2 via

$$\beta = -\lambda_1; \quad \gamma = -\lambda_2. \quad (1.8)$$

But then, PR1 becomes identical to $(P_i)_{OB}$! These two PDFs cannot yield different results, as OB enthusiastically and with absolute confidence claim.

2 The Renyi probability distribution

It is asserted in [4] that Renyi's probability distribution (PD) is

$$P_i = \frac{[1 + \beta(1 - q)(U_i - \langle U \rangle)]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}}{Z}, \quad (2.1)$$

with

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^n [1 + \beta(1 - q)(U_i - \langle U \rangle)]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}. \quad (2.2)$$

It is erroneously stated in [1] that, in the limit $q \rightarrow 1$, the above partition function Z becomes

$$Z = e^{\beta \langle U \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n e^{-\beta U_i}. \quad (2.3)$$

This happens because the authors of [1] did not bother to take the limit of the complete PD. Indeed, from

$$P_i = \frac{[1 + \beta(1 - q)(U_i - \langle U \rangle)]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}}{\sum_{i=1}^n [1 + \beta(1 - q)(U_i - \langle U \rangle)]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}}, \quad (2.4)$$

one deduces that for $q \rightarrow 1$ one has

$$P_i = \frac{e^{-\beta(U_i - \langle U \rangle)}}{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{-\beta(U_i - \langle U \rangle)}}, \quad (2.5)$$

or, equivalently,

$$P_i = \frac{e^{\beta\langle U \rangle} e^{-\beta U_i}}{e^{\beta\langle U \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n e^{-\beta U_i}}. \quad (2.6)$$

Thus,

$$P_i = \frac{e^{-\beta U_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{-\beta U_i}}, \quad (2.7)$$

and then

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{-\beta U_i}. \quad (2.8)$$

We see that (2.3) from [1] is not correct.

3 Conclusion

In view of these considerations, one concludes that reference [1] has no logical support.

References

- [1] T. Oikonomou and G. B. Bagci, arXiv: 1705.01752.
- [2] A. Plastino, M. C. Rocca, arXiv: 1704.07493v.
- [3] C. Tsallis, J. of Stat. Phys., **52** (1988) 479.
- [4] A. Plastino, M Rocca, F. Pennini: Phys. Rev E **94** (2016) 121451.