Naudts-like duality and the extreme Fisher information principle
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We show that using Frieden and Soffer’s extreme information principle [Phys. Rev. E 52, 2274 (1995)] with a Fisher measure constructed with escort probabilities [C. Beck and F. Schloegl, Thermodynamics of Chaotic Systems (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1993)], the concomitant solutions obey a type of Naudts’s duality (e-print cond-mat/990470) for nonextensive ensembles [C. Tsallis, in Nonextensive Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, Lecture Notes in Physics, edited by S. Abe and Y. Okamoto (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, in press)].
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I. INTRODUCTION

We will be concerned in what follows with the workings of two information measures that have received much attention lately, those of Fisher [1,5] and Tsallis [4,6,7]. Our goal is to show that their interplay naturally yields a type of Naudts’s duality [3].

Fisher’s information measure (FIM) [1,5] had already been advanced in the 1920s, well before the advent of information theory (IT), being conventionally designated with the symbol \( I \) [see Eq. (2.1) below for the pertinent definition]. Much interesting work has been devoted to the physical applications of FIM in recent times (see, for instance, [1,5,8,9] and references therein). Frieden and Soffer [1] have shown that Fisher’s information measure provides one with a powerful variational principle, the extreme physical information (EPI) principle, that yields the canonical Lagrangians of theoretical physics [1,5]. Additionally, \( I \) has been shown to provide an interesting characterization of the “arrow of time,” alternative to the one associated with Shannon’s \( S \) [8–10].

Tsallis’s measure is a generalization of Shannon’s. Notice that IT was created by Shannon in the 1940s [11,12]. One of its fundamental tenets is that of assigning an information content (Shannon’s measure) to any normalized probability distribution. The whole of statistical mechanics can be elegantly reformulated by extremization of this measure, subject to the constraints imposed by the \( a \) \( priori \) information one may possess concerning the system of interest [12]. It is shown in [4,6,7] that a parallel process can be undertaken with reference to Tsallis’s measure, giving rise to what is called Tsallis’s thermostatistics, responsible for the successful description of an ample variety of phenomena that cannot be explained by appeal to the conventional formulation (that of Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon) [4,6,7].

II. A BRIEF FISHER PRIMER

Fisher’s information measure \( I \) is of the form

\[
I = \int dx f(x, \theta) \left[ \frac{1}{f(x, \theta)} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} \right]^2,
\]

where \( x \) is a stochastic variable and \( \theta \) a parameter on which the probability distribution \( f(x, \theta) \) depends. The Fisher information measure provides a lower bound for the mean-square error associated with the estimation of the parameter \( \theta \). No matter what specific procedure we choose in order to determine it, the associated mean-square error \( e^2 \) has to be larger than or equal to the inverse of the Fisher measure [5]. This result, i.e., \( e^2 \geq 1/I \), is referred to as the Cramer-Rao bound, and constitutes a very powerful statistical result [5].

The special case of translation families deserves special mention. These are monoparametric families with distributions of the form \( f(x - \theta) \) which are known up to the shift parameter \( \theta \). Following Mach’s principle, all members of the family possess identical shape (there are no absolute origins), and here Fisher’s information measure adopts the appearance

\[
I = \int dx \frac{1}{f} \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right]^2.
\]
The parameter $\theta$ has dropped out. $I = I[f]$ becomes then a function of $f$.

At this point we introduce the useful concept of escort probabilities (see [2] and references therein), which one defines in the fashion

$$F_q(x) = \frac{f(x)^q}{\int f(x)^q dx},$$

where $q$ is any real parameter, $\int F_q(x) dx = 1$, and, of course, for $q = 1$ we have $F_1 = f$. The concomitant “escort-FIM” becomes

$$I_q = \int dx f(x) (1 - \frac{1}{F_q(x)}) \frac{\partial F_q(x)}{\partial x}^2,$$

which, in terms of the original $f(x)$ acquires the aspect

$$I_q = q^2 \int dx f(x)^{q-2} \left( \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} \right)^2.$$

We shall denote by $I_q$ the escort FIM

$$I_q = \int dx f(x)^{q-2} \left( \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} \right)^2.$$

(Notice that for $q = 0$ the integration range must be finite in order to avoid divergences in the denominator.)

The parameter $q$ can be identified with Tsallis’s nonextensivity index [13–15], which allows one to speak of “Fisher measures in a nonextensive context.” Their main properties have been discussed in [16].

III. EXTREME PHYSICAL INFORMATION PRINCIPLE (EPI)

The principle of extreme physical information is an overall physical theory that is able to unify several subdisciplines of physics [1,5]. In Ref. [1] Frieden and Soffer (FS) show that Lagrangians in physics arise out of a mathematical game between an intelligent observer and nature (which FS personalize in the appealing figure of a “demom,” reminiscent of the celebrated Maxwell’s demon). The game’s payoff introduces the EPI variational principle, which determines simultaneously the Lagrangian and the physical ingredients of the concomitant scenario.

FS [1] envision the following situation, involving Fisher’s information for translation families: some physical phenomenon is being investigated so as to gather suitable, pertinent data. Measurements must be performed. Any measurement of physical parameters appropriate to the task at hand initiates a relay of information $I$ (or $I_q$) in a nonextensive environment from nature (the demon) into the data. The observer acquires information, in this fashion, that is precisely $I$ (or $I_q$). FS assume that this information can be elicited via a pertinent experiment. Nature’s information is called, say, $J$ [1,5].

Assume now that, due to the measuring process, the system is perturbed, which in turn induces a change $\delta I$. It is natural to ask ourselves how the data information $I_q$ will be affected. Enters here FS’s EPI: in its relay from the phenomenon to the data no loss of information should take place. The ensuing new conservation law states that $\delta I = \delta I_q$, or, rephrasing it,

$$\delta(I_q - J) = 0.$$

so that, defining an action $A_q$

$$A_q = I_q - J,$$

the EPI principle asserts that the whole process described above extremizes $A_q$. FS [1,5] conclude that the Lagrangian for a given physical environment is not just an ad hoc construct that yields a suitable differential equation. It possesses an intrinsic meaning. Its integral represents the physical information $A_q$ for the physical scenario. On such a basis some of the most important equations of physics can be derived for $q = 1$ [1,5]. For an interesting quantum mechanical derivation see [17]. A cosmological application of the nonextensive ($q \neq 1$) conservation law (3.1) is reported in [18]. Mechanical analogs that can be built up using this law are discussed in [19]. Notice, however, that the last two references use an old Tsallis normalization procedure (advanced in [13,14]) that cannot be assimilated within the framework of the escort distribution concept.

IV. SOLUTIONS TO THE VARIATIONAL PROBLEM

According to the EPI principle, $J$ is fixed by the physical scenario [5]. We adopt here a more modest posture by assuming that $J$ embodies only the normalization constraint, and say nothing regarding a specific physical scenario. $J$ is just

$$J = \lambda \int f(x) dx,$$

where $\lambda$ is the pertinent Lagrange multiplier. Such a $J$ has been successfully employed in [17] with reference to a quantum mechanical problem. Playing the Frieden-Soffer game, i.e., performing the variation (3.1), then leads to

$$2f\ddot{f} + (q - 2)f^2 + qI_q f^2 + \lambda Q f^{3-q} = 0,$$

a $q$-dependent, nonlinear differential equation that should yield our “optimal” probability distribution $f$ (we set $Q = \int f^q dx$). Now, one should demand that, for $q = 1$, Eq. (4.2) becomes identical to the differential equation that arises in such circumstances (see that equation in [17], for instance, and denote by $\lambda'$ the concomitant Lagrange multiplier used there). This requirement is fulfilled if we set $\lambda = \lambda' - qI_q$.

The $q = 1$ expression then becomes

$$2f\ddot{f} + f^2 + \lambda' f^2 = 0,$$

where, of course, one has $Q = 1$. The solution of Eq. (4.3) is of the form
where \( k \) is a constant to be determined below and \( A, x_0 \) are arbitrary integration constants.

It is easy to show that Eq. (4.2) has, as a first integral,
\[
J f^2 + I f^2 + \lambda Q f^{3 - q} = c f^{2 - q},
\]
where \( c \) is an integration constant. This equation involves Fisher’s generalized information for translation families. We must solve it having Eq. (2.6) in mind. In order to establish the consistency between Eqs. (4.5) and (2.6) we introduce a set of normalized variables
\[
z = \int \sqrt{I_q} \, dx, \quad \tilde{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda}{I_q}, \quad \tilde{c} = \frac{c}{I_q}
\]
(4.6)
(the integral is an indefinite one), in terms of which Eqs. (2.6), (4.1), (4.2), and (4.5) are transformed into
\[
1 = \frac{\int f^q - 2 f^2 dz}{\int f^q dz}, \tag{4.7}
\]
\[
J_q = \tilde{\lambda} \frac{I_q}{f^q dz} \int f(z) dz
\]
(4.8)
(an indefinite integral),
\[
2 f f'' + (q - 2) f' f^2 + q f^2 + \tilde{\lambda} f^{3 - q} = 0,
\]
and
\[
f' f'^2 + f^2 + \tilde{\lambda} f^{3 - q} = \tilde{c} f^{2 - q}.
\]
Inserting Eq. (4.10) into Eq. (2.6) we conclude that the integration constant acquires the aspect
\[
\tilde{c} = \frac{2 \lambda + \tilde{\lambda}}{x_2 - x_1},
\]
(4.11)
where \( x_2 \) and \( x_1 \) are the integration limits, to be fixed by the remaining parameters of the theory. A quite interesting point is that the general solution of Eq. (f) can be given in closed form as
\[
\int \frac{f'^2 - 1}{\sqrt{\tilde{c} - \tilde{\lambda} f - f^q}} \, df,
\]
where the constants \( \tilde{c} \), and \( \tilde{\lambda} \) must be of such a nature that a real \( f \) ensues.

V. SYMMETRY PROPERTIES OF THE EPI PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION

We start by changing variables in Eq. (4.9) to
\[
u = \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)} \tag{5.1}
\]
and obtaining
\[
u'' + \alpha \nu' + \beta u^3 + \gamma u = 0,
\]
with
\[
\alpha = (2q - 1), \quad \beta = \frac{1}{2} q(q - 1), \quad \gamma = \beta.
\]

A complete study of the properties of Eq. (5.2) is found in [20]. Further, we effect the transformation
\[
f \to 1/f,
\]
so that
\[
u \to -u, \quad u' \to -u', \quad u'' \to -u''.
\]
If we require that Eq. (5.2) be invariant under this transformation, the parameters \( \alpha, \beta, \) and \( \gamma \) must change according to \( \alpha \to -\alpha, \beta \to -\beta, \) and \( \gamma \to -\gamma, \) respectively. This entails that the parameter \( q \), which characterizes the degree of non-extensivity of the system, transform as \( q \to 1 - q \). A property of this type has been called “duality” by Naudts [3], although in his case the relationship is of the form \( q \to 1/q \) (duality between \( q > 1 \) and \( q < 1 \) statistics). In our case, the duality arises between two \( q \) values whose sum adds up to unity.

Introducing now into Eq. (4.9) the new variable
\[
h = \frac{1}{f},
\]
we get
\[
2 h h'' + (q + 2) h'^2 - h^2 - \tilde{\lambda} h^{q + 1} = 0,
\]
which under the substitution \( q \to 1 - q \) becomes
\[
2 h h'' + (q - 3) h'^2 + (q - 1) h^2 - \tilde{\lambda} h^{q - 2} = 0.
\]
This equation can be rewritten, if we first define
\[
w(q) = (- h^{' 2} - h^2 - \tilde{\lambda} h^{q - 2} + \tilde{c} h^{3 - q}),
\]
as
\[
2 h h'' + (q - 2) h'^2 + q h^2 - \tilde{\lambda} h^{q - 2} + w(q) = 0,
\]
where the terms in \( w(q) \) correspond to the (transformed) first integral of Eq. (4.9),
\[
f'^2 + f^2 + \tilde{\lambda} f^{3 - q} = \tilde{c} f^{2 - q},
\]
which under Eq. (5.6) becomes
\[
h^{' 2} + h^2 + \tilde{\lambda} h^{q - 2} = \tilde{c} h^{3 - q}.
\]
As a consequence, \( w(q) \) in Eq. (5.10) vanishes and Eq. (4.9), under the transformation (5.6), turns out to retain its form, changing \( q \to 1 - q \) and \( \tilde{c} \to -\tilde{\lambda} \). It is convenient at this point to effect a slight change of notation and denote by \( f_q \)
the solution to Eq. (4.9) that obtains when the nonextensivity index is \( q \). The above symmetry argument entails

\[
f_q(\overline{c}, \overline{\lambda}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{f_{1-q}(-\overline{\lambda}, -\overline{c})}.
\]  
\[
(5.13)
\]

Using this symmetry property we can reobtain the probability distribution (4.4) for \( q = 1 \), i.e., the \textit{ordinary, extensive one}, in term of the probability distribution for \( q = 0 \), which can easily be calculated from Eq. (4.10):

\[
f'(\overline{c}) = (\overline{c} - 1) f^2 - 2 \overline{\lambda} f, \quad q = 0.
\]  
\[
(5.14)
\]

The solutions are

\[
f_0(z) = \frac{\overline{c} - 1}{\overline{\lambda}} \left\{ 1 - \tanh^2 \frac{\sqrt{\overline{c} - 1}}{2} (z-z_0) \right\}, \quad \overline{c} > 1,
\]  
\[
(5.15)
\]

and

\[
f_0(z) = \frac{\overline{c} - 1}{\overline{\lambda}} \left\{ 1 + \tanh^2 \frac{\sqrt{\overline{c} - 1}}{2} (z-z_0) \right\}, \quad \overline{c} < 1,
\]  
\[
(5.16)
\]

where the latter solution must be normalized in a finite interval. The symmetry transformation (5.13) now yields the general solution for \( q = 1 \),

\[
f(\overline{c}, \overline{\lambda}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{f_0(-\overline{\lambda}, -\overline{c})}.
\]  
\[
(5.17)
\]

This is to be compared with the result (4.4). We start with Eq. (5.16), effect the transformation (5.17), and reach

\[
f_{1}(z) = \frac{\overline{c}}{1 + \overline{\lambda}} \cos^2 \frac{\sqrt{1 + \overline{\lambda}}}{2} (z-z_0),
\]  
\[
(5.18)
\]

which, after a little algebra that involves also going back to the \( x \) variable adopts indeed the form (4.4) with \( A^2 = c/\overline{\lambda} \) and \( k = \sqrt{\overline{\lambda}/2} \). A similar analysis can be performed for Eq. (5.15).

We have thus found the general solution for the (extensive) EPI variational treatment corresponding to a \( J \) that entails just normalization of the probability distribution. Notice that, within the context of Naudts’s effort [3], the extensive thermostatistics \( q = 1 \) is self-dual. Instead, according to the present Fisher framework, the self-dual instance obtains for \( q = 1/2 \).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that the EPI principle, used in conjunction with a Fisher measure constructed with escort distributions that depend upon the Tsallis index \( q \), renders a probability distribution endowed with a remarkable symmetry: a Naudts’-like duality [3]. Tsallis’s enthusiasts had thought, before the advent of Naudts’s work [3], that a different statistics obtains for each different value of the nonextensivity index \( q \). The duality concept is thus important because it ascribes the same statistics to a given pair of (suitably related) \( q \) values. We have shown here that such a pair can be selected in two distinct manners, i.e., in the style of Naudts or of Fisher, and have detailed the prescription corresponding to the latter choice. Finally, we have also ascertained the general (normalized) probability distribution that extremizes the physical information.
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