What We've Got Here Is Failure to Conjugate

Dr. LaLonde

UT Tyler Math Club

November 29, 2017



(日) (월) (문) (문) (문)

Consider the following two sequences of numbers:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

and

Consider the following two sequences of numbers:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

and

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Which one is random?

Consider the following two sequences of numbers:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

and

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Which one is random? The first one.

How can we tell?

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

 $\begin{array}{l} 0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, \\ 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, \\ 0.9186, 0.1632, {\color{black}0.3264}, {\color{black}0.6528}, {\color{black}0.6944}, {\color{black}0.6112}, \ldots \end{array}$

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

 $\begin{array}{l} 0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, \\ 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, \\ 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, \ldots \end{array}$

In other words, it **avoids** the pattern 321.

How can we tell? The first sequence contains three consecutive numbers in decreasing order:

0.0802, 0.7935, 0.2920, 0.6989, 0.5616, 0.3179, 0.4768, 0.9410, 0.2647, 0.3910, 0.1524, 0.1557, 0.1296, 0.3831, 0.0216, 0.0226, 0.4050, 0.1193, 0.0811, 0.7926, ...

The second sequence does not:

 $\begin{array}{l} 0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, \\ 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, \\ 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, \ldots \end{array}$

In other words, it **avoids** the pattern 321. A truly random sequence should eventually contain **all** patterns!

Our sequence is actually **deterministic**—it is generated by applying a single function repeatedly.

Our sequence is actually **deterministic**—it is generated by applying a single function repeatedly. We used the **tent map**:

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} 2x & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2} \\ 2(1-x) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \le 1 \end{cases}$$

Our sequence is actually **deterministic**—it is generated by applying a single function repeatedly. We used the **tent map**:

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} 2x & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2} \\ 2(1-x) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \le 1 \end{cases}$$



Our sequence is actually **deterministic**—it is generated by applying a single function repeatedly. We used the **tent map**:

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} 2x & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2} \\ 2(1-x) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \le 1 \end{cases}$$





Suppose we have a map $f : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$. The process of iterating f, i.e., choosing a point $x \in [0,1]$ and computing

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x) = f(f(x)), f^{3}(x), \ldots$$

is an example of a (discrete) dynamical system.

Suppose we have a map $f : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$. The process of iterating f, i.e., choosing a point $x \in [0,1]$ and computing

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x) = f(f(x)), f^{3}(x), \ldots$$

is an example of a (discrete) dynamical system.

Definition

Let $f : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ and $x \in [0,1]$. The **pattern** of f at x with length n, denoted by Pat(x, f, n), is the permutation of the set $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$ that is in the same relative order as the numbers

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x), f^{3}(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x).$$

Patterns of dynamical systems

Let's look back at the sequence generated by the tent map:
0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

 $0.3299 \quad 0.6598 \quad 0.6804 \quad 0.6392$

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

0.3299 0.6598 0.6804 0.6392 \downarrow 1

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

Thus Pat(0.3299, T, 4) = 1342.

Patterns of dynamical systems

Let's look back at the sequence generated by the tent map:

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

Thus Pat(0.3299, T, 4) = 1342. Similarly,

Pat(0.4544, T, 6) =

Patterns of dynamical systems

Let's look back at the sequence generated by the tent map:

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392, 0.7216, 0.5568, 0.8864, 0.2272, 0.4544, 0.9088, 0.1824, 0.3648, 0.7296, 0.5408, 0.9186, 0.1632, 0.3264, 0.6528, 0.6944, 0.6112, ...

Then the relative order of the first four terms is:

Thus Pat(0.3299, T, 4) = 1342. Similarly,

Pat(0.4544, T, 6) = 361254

The patterns realized by a map f are called **allowed patterns**, collectively denoted by Allow(f).

Fact: If *f* is piecewise monotone, then it has forbidden patterns.

Fact: If f is piecewise monotone, then it has forbidden patterns.

Questions:

Fact: If f is piecewise monotone, then it has forbidden patterns.

Questions:

• Which patterns are allowed/forbidden for a given map f?

Fact: If f is piecewise monotone, then it has forbidden patterns.

Questions:

- Which patterns are allowed/forbidden for a given map f?
- What is the "smallest" forbidden pattern?

Fact: If f is piecewise monotone, then it has forbidden patterns.

Questions:

- Which patterns are allowed/forbidden for a given map f?
- What is the "smallest" forbidden pattern?
- Can we say anything about the allowed patterns of two closely related dynamical systems?



Definition

Suppose $f, g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We say that the associated dynamical systems are **conjugate** if there is a homeomorphism $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$f=h^{-1}\circ g\circ h.$$

We call h a conjugacy.

Definition

Suppose $f, g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We say that the associated dynamical systems are **conjugate** if there is a homeomorphism $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$f=h^{-1}\circ g\circ h.$$

We call h a conjugacy.

We need h to be continuous, one-to-one, and onto, and h^{-1} must be continuous.

Definition

Suppose $f, g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We say that the associated dynamical systems are **conjugate** if there is a homeomorphism $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$f=h^{-1}\circ g\circ h.$$

We call h a conjugacy.

We need h to be continuous, one-to-one, and onto, and h^{-1} must be continuous.

Since $h: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$, it's enough for h to be strictly increasing or strictly decreasing and onto.

The tent map and the logistic map are known to be conjugate.

The tent map and the logistic map are known to be conjugate.



The tent map and the logistic map are known to be conjugate.



The conjugacy is

$$h(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \cos \pi x \right).$$

< ∃ >

э







The conjugacy is

 $h(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \cos \pi x \right).$



The conjugacy is

 $h(x) = \frac{1}{2} (1 - \cos \pi x).$



Let's look at the tent map and a "skew" tent map.

Let's look at the tent map and a "skew" tent map.



Let's look at the tent map and a "skew" tent map.



Let's look at the tent map and a "skew" tent map.



These maps are actually conjugate.

The conjugacy is h =

< ∃ >

The conjugacy is h =



The conjugacy is h =



What function is this?

We need a function h that satisfies h(T(x)) = S(h(x)) for all x.

() <) <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <)
() <

We need a function *h* that satisfies h(T(x)) = S(h(x)) for all *x*.

• First assume h maps the interval $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$ to $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
Conjugacy: a weirder example

We need a function h that satisfies h(T(x)) = S(h(x)) for all x.

- First assume h maps the interval $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$ to $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
- If $0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2}$, then S(h(x)) = 4h(x) and h(T(x)) = h(2x)so $h(x) = \frac{1}{4}h(2x)$.

Conjugacy: a weirder example

We need a function h that satisfies h(T(x)) = S(h(x)) for all x.

- First assume h maps the interval $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$ to $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
- If $0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2}$, then S(h(x)) = 4h(x) and h(T(x)) = h(2x)so $h(x) = \frac{1}{4}h(2x)$. • If $\frac{1}{2} < x \le 1$, then $S(h(x)) = \frac{4}{3}(1 - h(x))$ and h(T(x)) = h(2(1 - x))so $h(x) = 1 - \frac{3}{4}h(2(1 - x))$.

Conjugacy: a weirder example

We need a function h that satisfies h(T(x)) = S(h(x)) for all x.

• First assume h maps the interval $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$ to $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

• If
$$0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2}$$
, then
 $S(h(x)) = 4h(x)$ and $h(T(x)) = h(2x)$
so $h(x) = \frac{1}{4}h(2x)$.
• If $\frac{1}{2} < x \le 1$, then
 $S(h(x)) = \frac{4}{3}(1 - h(x))$ and $h(T(x)) = h(2(1 - x))$
so $h(x) = 1 - \frac{3}{4}h(2(1 - x))$.

Thus h satisfies the functional equation

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}h(2x) & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 - \frac{3}{4}h(2(1-x)) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \le 1 \end{cases}$$

The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.

The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



The functional equation tells us that h is invariant under a certain sequence of transformations.



Now we'll repeat the process with our new picture:



Now we'll repeat the process with our new picture:



Now we'll repeat the process with our new picture:



Now we'll repeat the process with our new picture:



Now we'll repeat the process with our new picture:



Now we'll repeat the process with our new picture:



Now we'll repeat the process with our new picture:



Keep going:



Keep going:



Keep going:



Keep going:



Keep going:









Keep going:















Compare to the graph from earlier:



How could we use this process to build h?

< ∃ >
• Start with a function $h_0: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$. (Any function!)

-∢ ≣ →

- Start with a function $h_0:[0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$. (Any function!)
- Apply the same series of transformations that we applied to Dr. Milan to get a new function h_1 .

- Start with a function $h_0:[0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$. (Any function!)
- Apply the same series of transformations that we applied to Dr. Milan to get a new function h_1 .
- Repeat the process with h_1 and build a sequence of functions

 $h_0, h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots$

- Start with a function $h_0: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$. (Any function!)
- Apply the same series of transformations that we applied to Dr. Milan to get a new function h_1 .
- Repeat the process with h_1 and build a sequence of functions

$$h_0, h_1, h_2, h_3, \ldots$$

• This sequence converges uniformly to a function

$$h(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} h_n(x)$$

by the Banach Fixed Point Theorem.

How does this help us study allowed patterns?

How does this help us study allowed patterns?

Example

Recall that T(x) and L(x) are conjugate via $h(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \pi x)$.

How does this help us study allowed patterns?

Example

Recall that T(x) and L(x) are conjugate via $h(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \pi x)$. By iterating T starting with x = 0.3299, we got

 $0.3299, \, 0.6598, \, 0.6804, \, 0.6392$

How does this help us study allowed patterns?

Example

Recall that T(x) and L(x) are conjugate via $h(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \pi x)$. By iterating T starting with x = 0.3299, we got

 $0.3299,\, 0.6598,\, 0.6804,\, 0.6392$

If we plug into h, we get

 $0.2453,\, 0.7406,\, 0.7684,\, 0.7118$

How does this help us study allowed patterns?

Example

Recall that T(x) and L(x) are conjugate via $h(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \pi x)$. By iterating T starting with x = 0.3299, we got

 $0.3299, \, 0.6598, \, 0.6804, \, 0.6392$

If we plug into h, we get

0.2453, 0.7406, 0.7684, 0.7118

But h(T(x)) = L(h(x)), so these are the same numbers we get if we iterate L starting at $h(0.3299) \approx 0.2453!$

How does this help us study allowed patterns?

Example

Recall that T(x) and L(x) are conjugate via $h(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \pi x)$. By iterating T starting with x = 0.3299, we got

0.3299, 0.6598, 0.6804, 0.6392

If we plug into h, we get

0.2453, 0.7406, 0.7684, 0.7118

But h(T(x)) = L(h(x)), so these are the same numbers we get if we iterate L starting at $h(0.3299) \approx 0.2453!$ Hence

Pat(0.2453, L, 4) = 1342 = Pat(0.3299, T, 4).

If our conjugacy is strictly increasing, then it preserves order.

If our conjugacy is strictly increasing, then it preserves order. Thus

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x)$$

is in the same relative order as

$$h(x), h(f(x)), h(f^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(f^{n-1}(x)),$$

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x)$$

is in the same relative order as

$$h(x), h(f(x)), h(f^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(f^{n-1}(x)),$$

which equals

$$h(x), g(h(x)), g^{2}(h(x)), \ldots, g^{n-1}(h(x)).$$

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x)$$

is in the same relative order as

$$h(x), h(f(x)), h(f^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(f^{n-1}(x)),$$

which equals

$$h(x), g(h(x)), g^{2}(h(x)), \dots, g^{n-1}(h(x)).$$

Hence $Pat(h(x), g, n) = Pat(x, f, n).$

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x)$$

is in the same relative order as

$$h(x), h(f(x)), h(f^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(f^{n-1}(x)),$$

which equals

$$h(x), g(h(x)), g^{2}(h(x)), \ldots, g^{n-1}(h(x)).$$

Hence Pat(h(x), g, n) = Pat(x, f, n). We can do the same thing with h^{-1} , so:

$$x, f(x), f^{2}(x), \ldots, f^{n-1}(x)$$

is in the same relative order as

$$h(x), h(f(x)), h(f^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(f^{n-1}(x)),$$

which equals

$$h(x), g(h(x)), g^{2}(h(x)), \ldots, g^{n-1}(h(x)).$$

Hence Pat(h(x), g, n) = Pat(x, f, n). We can do the same thing with h^{-1} , so:

Theorem

If f and g are conjugate, then Allow(f) = Allow(g).

What if f and g have "similar" dynamics, but they're not conjugate?

A B M A B M

What if f and g have "similar" dynamics, but they're not conjugate?



What if f and g have "similar" dynamics, but they're not conjugate?



What if f and g have "similar" dynamics, but they're not conjugate?



These maps are **not** conjugate.

 $T \circ h = h \circ S$.

 $T \circ h = h \circ S$.

We call such a function a **commuter**.

$$T \circ h = h \circ S.$$

We call such a function a **commuter**.

Bollt and Skufca (who called this setup "mostly conjugacy") described how to build commuters iteratively.

$$T \circ h = h \circ S.$$

We call such a function a **commuter**.

Bollt and Skufca (who called this setup "mostly conjugacy") described how to build commuters iteratively.

As in our earlier example, h must satisfy the functional equation

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}h(\frac{3}{2}x) & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 - \frac{1}{2}h(\frac{3}{2}(1-x)) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \le 1 \end{cases}$$

Start with $h_0(x) = x$:

э





Start with $h_0(x) = x$: 1.0 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.0 0.4

Start with $h_0(x) = x$:



Scott LaLonde Conjugacy and Allowed Patterns







Start with $h_0(x) = x$:



Scott LaLonde Conjugacy and Allowed Patterns





Start with $h_0(x) = x$:



Scott LaLonde Conjugacy and Allowed Patterns
Constructing the commuter

Start with $h_0(x) = x$:



Constructing the commuter

Start with $h_0(x) = x$:



Scott LaLonde Conjugacy and Allowed Patterns

Constructing the commuter

Start with $h_0(x) = x$:



Scott LaLonde Conjugacy and Allowed Patterns

Notice that h isn't continuous or onto, but it is strictly increasing.

Notice that h isn't continuous or onto, but it is strictly increasing. Thus

$$h(x), h(S(x)), h(S^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(S^{n-1}(x))$$

is in the same relative order as

$$x, S(x), S^{2}(x), \ldots, S^{n-1}(x),$$

Notice that h isn't continuous or onto, but it is strictly increasing. Thus

$$h(x), h(S(x)), h(S^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(S^{n-1}(x))$$

is in the same relative order as

$$x, S(x), S^{2}(x), \ldots, S^{n-1}(x),$$

so

$$Pat(h(x), T, n) = Pat(x, S, n).$$

Notice that h isn't continuous or onto, but it is strictly increasing. Thus

$$h(x), h(S(x)), h(S^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(S^{n-1}(x))$$

is in the same relative order as

$$x, S(x), S^{2}(x), \ldots, S^{n-1}(x),$$

so

$$Pat(h(x), T, n) = Pat(x, S, n).$$

Therefore,

$$\operatorname{Allow}(S) \subsetneq \operatorname{Allow}(T)$$
.

Notice that h isn't continuous or onto, but it is strictly increasing. Thus

$$h(x), h(S(x)), h(S^{2}(x)), \ldots, h(S^{n-1}(x))$$

is in the same relative order as

$$x, S(x), S^{2}(x), \ldots, S^{n-1}(x),$$

so

$$Pat(h(x), T, n) = Pat(x, S, n).$$

Therefore,

$$\operatorname{Allow}(S) \subsetneq \operatorname{Allow}(T)$$
.

But we can't go the other way, since h isn't onto.

The End

Some reading materials for those who are interested:

- K. T. ALLIGOOD, T. D. SAUER, AND J. A. YORKE, *Chaos: An Introduction to Dynamical Systems*, Springer, New York, 1996.
- K. ARCHER AND S. M. LALONDE, Allowed patterns of symmetric tent maps via commuter functions, SIAM J. Discrete Math, 31 (2017), pp. 317–334.
- S. ELIZALDE AND Y. LIU, On basic forbidden patterns of functions, Discrete Appl. Math, 159 (2011), pp. 1207–1216.
- S. ELIZALDE AND K. MOORE, Characterizations and enumerations of patterns of signed shifts, arXiv:1711.05213v1, (2017).
- J. D. SKUFCA AND E. M. BOLLT, A concept of homeomorphic defect for defining mostly conjugate dynamical systems, Chaos, 18 (2008).



(Courtesy of xkcd)

イロト 人間ト イヨト イヨト

э