

Comment on “Incomplete Equilibrium in Long-Range Interacting Systems”

In a recent paper [1], Baldovin and Orlandini have presented molecular dynamics numerical results for the HMF model in contact with a thermal bath. They conclude that the energy distribution in its QSS (*quasi-stationary state*) is of the Boltzmann-Gibbs (BG) form. In view of their own numerical results, we cannot agree with their conclusion. We present three points that are relevant for the interesting question raised in [1].

(i) *The nature of canonical QSS is different from that of the microcanonical ones :*

It has been demonstrated that, already in the microcanonical ensemble, the anomalous dynamics (glassy nature, hierarchical structures, velocity correlations, aging, etc), and therefore the statistical description of the QSS, is strongly dependent on the initial conditions [2]. *A fortiori*, it is thus not at all justified to extrapolate the conclusions for the canonical QSS studied in [1,3] to the microcanonical ones. Although the authors themselves state in [3] that the canonical QSS's are only *reminiscent* of the microcanonical ones (in fact they differ in the lifetimes, the relaxation times, and, most probably, also in the correlations), they neglect it in [1].

(ii) *The energy distribution cannot be of the Boltzmann-Gibbs exponential form:*

As clearly seen in Fig. 1(a) of [1], the one-body momentum distribution is *non-Gaussian*. This excludes the BG exponential form as the energy distribution in full phase space Γ , as proved (*by reduction to the absurd*) in what follows. The theorem can easily be enlarged to n -dimensional rotators, $n > 1$: $n = 1, 2, d$, and ∞ correspond respectively to the Ising, XY, Heisenberg, and spherical models; we illustrate it, however, for $n = 2$, the case addressed in [1].

Theorem: Let $H = K + V$ be the Hamiltonian of a M -body classical system, where the kinetic energy is $K = \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{l_i^2}{2I}$, $I > 0$, and the potential energy V contains arbitrary *integrable* one-body, two-body, three-body,... terms, concerning (isotropic or anisotropic) rotators localized at a (irregular or regular d -dimensional) lattice (each term might be characterized by a distance-dependent coupling constant, which can be summable or not in the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit). And let the one-momentum marginal probability distribution $p(l_1) \equiv \int dl_2 dl_3 \dots dl_M d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \dots d\theta_M p(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_M, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_M)$ associated with the joint distribution $p(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_M, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_M)$ be *non-Gaussian*. Then $p(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_M, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_M)$ can *not* be proportional to $e^{-\beta H(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_M, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_M)}$, $\beta > 0$.

Proof: Assume $p(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_M, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_M) = \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{\int e^{-\beta H}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{then } p(l_1) &= \frac{\int dl_2 dl_3 \dots dl_M d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \dots d\theta_M e^{-\beta H}}{\int dl_1 dl_2 dl_3 \dots dl_M d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \dots d\theta_M e^{-\beta H}} = \\ &= \frac{\int dl_2 dl_3 \dots dl_M e^{-\beta K} \int d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \dots d\theta_M e^{-\beta V}}{\int dl_1 dl_2 dl_3 \dots dl_M e^{-\beta K} \int d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \dots d\theta_M e^{-\beta V}} = \\ &= \frac{e^{-\beta l_1^2/2I} \prod_{i=2}^M \int dl_i e^{-\beta l_i^2/2I}}{\prod_{i=1}^M \int dl_i e^{-\beta l_i^2/2I}} = \frac{e^{-\beta l_1^2/2I}}{\int dl_1 e^{-\beta l_1^2/2I}}, \text{ which is a} \end{aligned}$$

Gaussian, thus contradicting the hypothesis. *Q.E.D.* Hence, the Central Limit Theorem verification exhibited in [1] refers to a necessary but insufficient property.

(iii) *The Baldovin-Orlandini results do not exclude the nonextensive statistical mechanical q -exponential form:*

Contrary to what is stated in [1], q -statistics [4] cannot be excluded on the basis of what they exhibit in their Fig. 3(d): see the Caption of the present Fig. 1.

We acknowledge useful discussions with F. Baldovin.




FIG. 1: The statistical weights corresponding to BG statistics (circles), and to a typical example of nonextensive statistics ($q = 1.5$; solid line), for the $M = 1000$ example exhibited in Fig. 3(d) of [1]. We used nearly the same number of points of Fig. 3(d) in the interval $E_{HMF} \in [664, 720]$, which covers 4% around its central value 692. The linear correlation is $r = -0.99996$ ($r = -0.99997$ in [1] for a similar analysis). The remarkable closeness of the $q = 1$ and $q = 1.5$ examples comes from two facts: $e_q^x \equiv [1 + (1 - q)x]^{1/(1-q)} = e^x [1 + \frac{1}{2}(q - 1)x^2 + \dots]$, $x \rightarrow 0$, (notice the absence of the *linear* term), and the spread around the central value 692 is very small. Notice also that we rescaled $T = 0.38$ by a factor M , which corresponds to multiplying the Hamiltonian (1) of [1] by M and then rescaling time in the kinetic energy (see [5]). This makes the *microscopic* two-body interaction of the model *independent* from the *macroscopic* quantity M , as desirable.

[1]F. Baldovin and E. Orlandini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 100601 (2006).

[2] A. Rapisarda and A. Pluchino, Europhys.News **36**, 202 (2005) and refs. therein.

[3]F. Baldovin and E. Orlandini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 240602 (2006).

[4]C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. **52**, 479 (1988); M. Gell-Mann and C. Tsallis, eds., *Nonextensive Entropy - Interdisciplinary Applications* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2004); J.P. Boon and C. Tsallis, eds., Europhys. News **36** (6) (2005).

[5]C. Anteneodo and C. Tsallis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5313 (1998).

Constantino Tsallis¹, Andrea Rapisarda², Alessandro Pluchino² and Ernesto P. Borges³

¹Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rua Xavier Sigaud 150, 22290-180 Rio de Janeiro-RJ, Brazil

²Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia and InfN, Università di Catania, Via S. Sofia 64, I-95123 Catania, Italy

³Escola Politécnica, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Rua Aristides Novis 2, 40210-630 Salvador-BA, Brazil