A POLYNOMIAL BOUND FOR THE LAP NUMBER

MATHIEU BAILLIF

ABSTRACT. In this note, we show a polynomial bound for the growth of the lap number of a piecewise monotone and piecewise continuous interval map with finitely many periodic points. We use Milnor and Thurston's kneading theory with the coordinates of Baladi and Ruelle, which are useful for extending the theory to the non continuous case.

We say that $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is piecewise strictly monotone piecewise continuous (PSMC) if there is a finite number of so-called *critical points* $c_1 < \cdots < c_r \in (0,1)$ such that f is continuous and strictly monotone on (c_i, c_{i+1}) and on $(0, c_1)$ and $(c_r, 1)$. The composition of two PSMC maps is also PSMC, usually with a different set of critical points. We denote by $C_f = \{c_i | i = 1 \cdots r\}$ the set of critical points of f (we choose C_f to be minimal in the obvious sense) and by $p_f(n)$ the minimal number of intervals in which f^n $(= f \circ \cdots \circ f \ n$ times) is continuous and strictly monotone. We call $p_f(n)$ the *lap number* of f^n. Clearly, $p_f(n) = \#C_{f^n} + 1$.
We say that $x \in [0,1]$ is *periodic* with period $m = m(x)$ if $f^m(x) = x$. It is *repelling* if there is $\delta > 0$ such that for $|x - y| < \delta$ and $0 \leq m(x)$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} f^{-(n+\ell)} y = f^\ell x$, where f^{-1} denotes the local inverse branch of f.
Set $\epsilon : [0,1] \to \{0, \pm 1\}$ by $\epsilon(x) = 0$ if $x \in C_f$, and $\epsilon(x) = \pm 1$ depending on whether f is increasing or decreasing at $x \notin C_f$. Let $\nu = 0$ if $\epsilon((0, c_1)) \cdot \epsilon((c_r, 1)) = -1$, and 1 otherwise.
In this note, we prove the following proposition:

Theorem 1. *Let $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ be a PSMC map, with a finite number of periodic points. Then, $p_f(n) \leq Cst \cdot n^s$, where $s = r + \ell + \nu + 1$, $r = \#C_f$, $\ell = \#\{$repelling periodic orbits of $f\}$, and Cst is a constant depending only on s and the number of periodic points of f.*

The error term ν is probably an artifact of the proof and does not seem natural. We will use Milnor and Thurston's kneading theory [5] with the coordinates introduced by Baladi and Ruelle [2]. Since most of the proof can be easily derived from [5] (see [6] for another account), we will pass rather quickly over the details.

Proof of Theorem 1: Let $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ be PSMC, c_i $i = 1 \cdots r$ its critical points. For $1 \leq k \leq r$ and $i \geq 0$, we define (as in [5]) the set:

$$E_k^i = \{x \in [0,1] \quad | \quad f^i(x) = c_k, \quad f^j(x) \notin C_f \text{ for } 0 \leq j < i\},$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37E05.

I would like to thank Jérôme Buzzi and Pascal Hubert who introduced this problem to me during L'odyssée Dynamique, Marseille, 2001. I also thank the organisers of this meeting, Viviane Baladi and David "metal" Cimasoni.

and introduce the power series $P(t) = \sum_{n\geq 0} p_f(n)\cdot t^n$ and $\Gamma_k(t) = \sum_{n\geq 0} \#E_k^n \cdot t^n$. Let us study $\Gamma_k(t)$ using kneading theory.
We define the *address* α of a point $x \in [0,1]$ is a vector in $\{0,\pm 1\}^r$ defined by $(\alpha(x))_i = sgn(x-c_i)$ (where sgn denotes the sign function). If H is a function defined on the interval, we write $H(x+)$ for $\lim\limits_{y\to x, y>x} H(y)$, and similarly for $H(x-)$ (if these limits exits).

Definition 1. *Set* $\epsilon^{(i)}(x) = \prod_{0<k<i}\epsilon(f^k x)$. *The invariant coordinate of* $x\in[0,1]$ *is the vector of power series*

$$\theta_f(x)(t) = \sum_{i\geq 0} t^i \cdot \epsilon^{(i)}(x)\cdot \alpha(f^n x). \tag{1}$$

The kneading matrix $K(t)$ *is given by the rows* $K_\ell(t) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\theta_f(c_\ell+)(t) - \theta_f(c_\ell-)(t)\big)$ *(*$\ell = 1\cdots r$*).*

This definition comes from [2] and was inspired by [5]. Notice that if $x \in E_\ell^i$ then $\alpha(f^j x+) = \alpha^j(f^j x-)$ and $\epsilon^{(j)}(x+) = \epsilon^{(j)}(x-)$ for $0<j<i$. Therefore,

$$x\in E_\ell^i \Rightarrow \frac{1}{2}[\theta_f(x+)(t) - \theta_f(x-)(t)] = t^i\cdot K_\ell(t) \tag{2}$$

The equality (2) enables us to derive, as in [5] (with slightly different coordinates), that

$$\frac{1}{2}[(\theta_f(1-)(t) - \theta_f(0+)(t))] = \sum_{\ell=1}^{r}\Gamma_\ell(t)\cdot K_\ell(t) \tag{3}$$

and, using (3),

$$\Gamma_k(t) = \sum_{m=1}^{r}\frac{1}{2}[(\theta_f(1-)(t) - \theta_f(0+)(t))]_m \cdot M_{mk}(t) \tag{4}$$

where $[\cdot]_m$ denotes the mth coordinate, and $M(t) = (M_{ij}(t))$ is the inverse matrix of $K(t)$ (by Cramer's rule, $K(t)$ has a formal inverse, which is in fact meromorphic since $K(0)$ is the identity matrix). Detailed computations with our coordinates can be found in [1] (where the notation is slightly different since [1] deals with tree maps). See also [6].

For $k = 1,\cdots,r$, we now define the set

$$R(k) = \{i\in\mathbb{N} \quad | \quad f^i(c_k+) = f^i(c_k-) \text{ and } \prod_{j<i}\epsilon(f^j(c_k+)) = \prod_{j<i}\epsilon(f^j(c_k-))\}.$$

We thus have $c_k \in C_{f^n} \Leftrightarrow n\notin R(k)$. Hence, x is a critical point of f^n if and only if there is $0\leq j<n$ and $1\leq k\leq r$ such that $f^j(x) = c_k$ and $n-j\notin R(k)$. Therefore,

$$p_n(f) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\delta_k^{n-j}\cdot\#E_k^j \tag{5}$$

where $\delta_k^i = 1$ if $i\notin R(k)$, and $\delta_k^i = 0$ otherwise. Letting $\delta_k(t) = \sum_{j\geq 0}\delta_k^j t^j$, we immediately get from (5) the relation:

$$P(t) = \frac{1}{1-t} + t\cdot\sum_{k=1}^{r}\delta_k(t)\Gamma_k(t). \tag{6}$$

Then, from (6) and (4) follows

$$(7) \qquad P(t) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{1-t}}_{A} + \sum_{k,m=1}^{r} \underbrace{t \cdot \delta_k(t)}_{B} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}[(\theta_f(1-)(t) - \theta_f(0+)(t))]_m}_{C} \cdot \underbrace{M_{mk}(t)}_{D}.$$

If one wants to study the growth of the lap number $p_f(n)$, it is enough to study the terms A, B, C, D of (7). We will use the following remark:

Remark 2. *If $\Omega(t) = \Omega_1(t) \cdot \Omega_2(t) \cdots \Omega_s(t)$ where $\Omega_i(t)$ are power series with coefficients in $\{0, \pm 1\}$, then the coefficients of Ω cannot grow faster than those of $\frac{1}{(1-t)^s}$.*

So, let us study A, B, C and D.
A is $(1+t+t^2+t^3+\cdots)$, so its contribution to $p_f(n)$ is just 1. B and C are power series with coefficients in $\{0, \pm 1\}$. D is an entry of the inverse of $K(t)$, hence it is a $r-1$-minor of $K(t)$ divided by $\Delta_f(t)$ =det$(K(t))$. Since the entries of $K(t)$ have coefficients $0, \pm 1$, a minor is 'at worse' (by remark 2) $c \cdot (1+t+t^2+t^3+\cdots)^{r-1}$ (with for instance $c = (r-1)!$). Therefore, the terms B, C and D bring at most a contribution of $c \cdot (1+t+t^2+t^3+\cdots)^{r+1} \cdot \frac{1}{\Delta_f(t)}$ and multiplying the constant by r^2 gets rid of the sum.
Denote by Per(f) the set of periodic *orbits* of f (a periodic orbit of period m is a set $\{x, f(x), \cdots, f^{m-1}\}$ where x is a periodic point of period m). If $\gamma \in$ Per(f), we write $\pi(\gamma)$ for its period. Baladi and Ruelle proved the following theorem for PSMC maps:

Theorem 2. *(Baladi-Ruelle 1994)*

$$(8) \qquad \frac{1}{\Delta_f(t)} = \frac{\zeta_f^R(t)}{Q(t)}$$

where $Q(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon(0+) + \epsilon(1-)) \cdot t$ and $\zeta_f^R(t)$ is the reduced zeta-function of f, which can be written as:

$$(9) \qquad \zeta_f^R(t) = \prod_{\gamma \in Per(f)} F(\gamma)$$

$F(\gamma)$ being a polynomial of degree $\pi(\gamma)$ if γ is an non-repelling orbit, and a power series $1 \pm t^{\pi(\gamma)} \pm t^{2\pi(\gamma)} \pm t^{3\pi(\gamma)} \cdots$ if γ is repelling.

(See [2], Theorem 1.1 page 625.) In the continuous case, Milnor and Thurston [5] have proven a similar result (with a different definition of the zeta function, which is almost equivalent to the above one). Notice that if $\nu = 0$ then $Q(t) = 1$. If $\nu = 1$, $Q(t) = 1 \pm t$. Therefore, since f has a finite number of periodic orbits (it is the only place where we use this assumption), $\frac{1}{\Delta_f(t)}$ brings at most a contribution of $Cst' \cdot (1+t+t^2+t^3+\cdots)^{\ell+\nu}$, where ℓ is the number of repelling periodic orbits of f, and $Cst' - 1$ is the number of non-repelling periodic orbits of f. Theorem 1 follows from the fact that the coefficients a_n of $(1+t+t^2+\cdots)^s$ are a polynomial of degree s in n. $\square$

Unfortunately, this method does not enable us to obtain directly a better upper bound or a lower bound, the entries of the kneading matrix being hard to control. In particular, we cannot answer (positively or negatively) the following conjecture:

Conjecture : (Boshernitzan et Kornfeld [3]) Let f be PSMC, without periodic points. Then, $p_f(n)$ grows linearly.

Let us finish by pointing out that (7) shows that $P(t)$ is meromorphic in the unit disk, which is the main step toward building a semi-conjugacy between any PSMC map with entropy $h > 0$ and a piecewise linear piecewise continuous map with slope $\pm e^h$. (Notice that $h > 0$ is not compatible with a finite number of periodic orbits.) This has already been done by Milnor and Thurston [5] for continuous maps, and by Preston [6] for PSMC maps. Both proofs use the same argument but use different coordinates to show that $P(t)$ is meromorphic. We have shown here that the proof can also be done with our coordinates. We could then build the semi-conjugacy using $P(t)$, as in Preston's paper [6].
In the case $h = 0$, Buzzi and Hubert [4] obtain similar results using Hofbauer's tower extension's approach. They also get our Theorem 1 (without the term ν) as a corollary, in a slightly restricted case.

References

1. M. Baillif and A. de Carvalho, *Piecewise linear model for tree maps*, to appear in International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos, 2001.
2. V. Baladi and D. Ruelle, *An extension of the theorem of Milnor and Thurston on the zeta functions of interval maps*, Ergodic theory Dynam. Syst. **14** (1994), 621–32.
3. M. Boshernitzan and I. Kornfeld, *Interval translation mappings*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **15** (1995), 821–832.
4. J.Buzzi and P. Hubert, *Piecewise monotonic maps without periodic points: invariant measures, rigidity, complexity*, To appear, 2001.
5. J. Milnor and W. Thurston, *Iterated maps of the interval*, Dynamical Systems (J.C. Alexander, ed.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1342, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
6. C. Preston, *What you need to know to knead*, Adv. Math. **78** (1989), 192–252.

Section de Mathématiques, 2-4 rue du Lièvre, CH-1211 Genève 24, Switzerland
E-mail address: mathieu.baillif@math.unige.ch