

Directional complexity and entropy for lift mappings

V. Afraimovich

Instituto de Investigación en Comunicación Óptica, Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí,

Karakorum 1470, Lomas 4a 78220, San Luis Potosi, S.L.P.

`valentin@cactus.iico.uaslp.mx`

M. Courbage

Laboratoire Matière et Systèmes Complexes (MSC), UMR 7057 CNRS et Université Paris 7-Denis Diderot

10, rue Alice Domon et Léonie Duquet 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France

`maurice.courbage@univ-paris-diderot.fr`

L. Glebsky

Instituto de Investigación en Comunicación Óptica, Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí,

Karakorum 1470, Lomas 4a 78220, San Luis Potosi, S.L.P.

`glebsky@cactus.iico.uaslp.mx`

Abstract

We introduce and study the notion of a directional complexity and entropy for maps of degree 1 on the circle. For piecewise affine Markov maps we use symbolic dynamics to relate this complexity to the symbolic complexity. We apply a combinatorial machinery to obtain exact formulas for the directional entropy, to find the maximal directional entropy, and to show that it equals the topological entropy of the map.

Keywords: Rotation interval; Space-time window; Directional complexity; Directional entropy;

Introduction

There are problems where the behavior of orbits in a compact phase space is determined by the dynamics of a system generated by the lift map on the universal cover. The classical one is a classification of rotation of the circle by using the Poincaré rotation number. Such problems possess space-temporal features, where the universal cover serves as “the space”. One can study average speed of diffusion, transport properties, etc, and relate them to the dynamics on the original compact phase space.

This approach was profitable enough in the past and, as seems to us, is far from being completely exhausted. Our article follows this way. We shall exploit notion of the ϵ -separability

introduced by Kolmogorov and Tikhomirov [KT] in the context of [AZ]. A notion of space-time window introduced in [M86, M88] for cellular automata and used in [ACFM, AMU, CK] for lattice dynamical systems we apply here for maps on \mathbb{R}^1 that are lifts for maps of the circle of degree 1. If such a map generates the dynamical system with non-zero topological entropy then, very often, it has a rotation interval different from a single point. It implies the existence of trajectories with different rotation numbers, i.e. with different spatio-temporal features. We suggest here to measure the amount of trajectories with a given rotation number using the notion of a directional entropy. Roughly speaking if X is a subset of a the circle such that the trajectories going through X have the rotation number, say, $\cot \theta$, then the (ϵ, n) -complexity of X behaves asymptotically ($n \gg 1$) as $\exp(n\mathcal{H}_\theta)$. We call the number \mathcal{H}_θ the directional entropy in the direction θ . The greater \mathcal{H}_θ the greater the rate of instability manifested by trajectories with the rotation number $\cot \theta$. But one has to be careful. It can happen (and occurs for mixing systems) that for any fixed rotation number $\cot \theta$ inside the rotation interval the set of initial points, say X_θ , corresponding to this rotation number is dense in the circle. So, the topological entropy on X_θ coincide with the topological entropy of the whole system. To avoid it we approximate X_θ by sets of initial points which trajectories stay in a space-time window, calculate the entropy on this window, and obtain \mathcal{H}_θ as the limit of these entropies.

In this article we study mainly piecewise affine Markov maps of the circle. For such maps it is possible to replace the calculation of the (ϵ, n) -complexity by that of the symbolic complexity of some subsets of a corresponding topological Markov chain (TMC). The TMC is determined by the Markov partition of the circle and the subsets – by the admissibility condition formulated according to the value of the rotation number. After that the problem becomes purely combinatorial. We use the approach of [PW1, PW2] adjusted for our situation to obtain the explicit formulas for H_θ . The formulas depend only on the entries of the transition matrix of the TMC and on the weights of the edges of the corresponding oriented graph, where the weights are determined by the Markov partition and the lift map.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 1 we give the definitions of the directional complexity and the directional entropy H_θ . In Section 2 we show that $H_\theta \neq 0$ only if $\cot \theta$ belongs to the rotation interval. In Section 3 we define piecewise affine Markov maps and show how to calculate the (ϵ, n) -complexity in terms of symbolic dynamics. Section 4 is devoted to the description of the combinatorial machinery. In Section 5 we describe a specific example where all can be explicitly seen. In Section 6 we construct some invariant probabilistic measures for which measure theoretical entropies coincide with the directional entropies. By using this we show that the topological entropy coincides with a directional entropy for some specific direction. We present a formula for this direction. Section 7 contains some concluding remarks.

1 Definitions

Let $f : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$, $S^1 = \{x \bmod 1\}$ be a continuous mapping of degree one, i.e. there is a lift mapping $F : \mathbb{R}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$ of the form

$$F(x) = x + w + h(x), \tag{1}$$

where h is 1-periodic function such that $\int_0^1 h(x)dx = 0$. Thus, $f(x) = x + w + h(x) \bmod 1$.

Given $l_1 < l_2$, $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ let

$$W = W(l_1, l_2, \theta) = \{(x + t \cos \theta, t \sin \theta) \mid 0 \leq t, l_1 \leq x \leq l_2\}$$

be the “window” in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$. Denote by \mathbf{e} the vector $(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$.

Definition 1. [AZ]

- 1) Two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ are (ϵ, W, T) -separated if $(F^n x, n) \cup (F^n y, n) \subset W$ for each $n \leq T$, and there exists $0 \leq n \leq T$ such that $|F^n x - F^n y| \geq \epsilon$.
- 2) A set $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ is (ϵ, W, T) -separated if any pair x, y in X , $x \neq y$, is (ϵ, W, T) -separated.
- 3) The number

$$C_\epsilon(W, T) = \max\{\text{card } X, X \text{ is } (\epsilon, W, T) \text{ - separated}\},$$

is called the directional ϵ -complexity in the direction \mathbf{e} with respect to the window W . Here, $\text{card } X$ is the cardinality (the number of points) of X .

- 4) The number

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\ln C_\epsilon(W, T)}{T} = \mathcal{H}_\theta(l_1, l_2),$$

is called the directional entropy in the direction \mathbf{e} with respect to the interval $[l_1, l_2]$. The limit

$$\mathcal{H}_\theta = \lim_{\substack{l_1 \rightarrow -\infty \\ l_2 \rightarrow \infty}} \mathcal{H}_\theta(l_1, l_2)$$

is called the directional entropy in the direction \mathbf{e} .

Roughly speaking, C_ϵ and \mathcal{H}_θ are quantities reflecting the number of orbits “moving” with the velocity $\cot \theta$ along the circle. Indeed, to be in the window W , the point $(F^n x, n)$ must satisfy the inequality

$$l_1 + n \cot \theta \leq F^n x \leq l_2 + n \cot \theta, \quad (2)$$

thus the “velocity” $\frac{F^n x}{n}$ is approximately $\cot \theta$ if $n \gg 1$.

- 5) Given a window W , an (ϵ, W, T) -separated set X is optimal if $\text{card } X = C_\epsilon(W, T)$.

2 Rotation intervals and directional entropy

The ratio $\frac{F^n x}{n}$ is not only the velocity but also is related to the rotation number of the orbit going through the point x .

Definition 2. [NPT],[I]. The set

$$\bigcup_{x \in [0,1]} \overline{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n x}{n}} = I,$$

i. e., the set of all points of accumulation for all initial points $x \in [0, 1]$ (the upper topological limit), is called the rotation interval of f .

It is known ([I],[NPT],[BMPT]) that the rotation interval is a closed interval and for every $\mu \in I$ there is $x \in [0, 1]$ such that there is $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n x}{n} = \mu$.

Theorem 1. *The entropy $\mathcal{H}_\theta = 0$ if $\cot \theta \notin I$.*

Proof. Denote by a (b) the left (right) endpoint of the segment I . It is known (see [ALM]) that there are functions $F_1, F_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:

i) $F_{1,2}$ are weakly monotone, i.e. the inequality $x < y$ implies $F_{1,2}(x) \leq F_{1,2}(y)$;

ii) there exist limits

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_1^n(x)}{n} = a, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_2^n(x)}{n} = b$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$;

iii) for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ one has $F_1(x) \leq F(x) \leq F_2(x)$.

The properties i) and ii) imply that

$$F_1^n(x) \leq F^n(x) \leq F_2^n(x) \tag{3}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Assume now that $H_\theta > 0$ and $\cot \theta > b$. It means that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and $l_1 < l_2$ such that $H_\theta(l_1, l_2) > b + \epsilon$. Therefore there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the inequalities (2) hold for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The inequalities (2) and (3) imply that

$$F_2^n(x) \geq l_1 + n \cot \theta \geq l_1 + n(b + \epsilon)$$

or

$$\frac{F_2^n(x)}{n} \geq \frac{l_1}{n} + (b + \epsilon).$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain a contradiction. In the same way we prove that H_θ cannot be positive if $\cot \theta < a$. \square

3 Piecewise affine Markov maps

In this section we consider arbitrary piecewise affine Markov maps on the circle. For that, we represent S^1 as $\{x, \text{mod } 1, x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ or as the interval $[0, 1]$ with the identified endpoints. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{d_0 = 0, d_1, \dots, d_p = 1\}$, $d_i < d_{i+1}$, $i = 0, \dots, p-1$, be an ordered collection of points on S^1 . We introduce the following class of maps $f : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$:

- (i) f is a continuous map of degree 1,
- (ii) $f(\mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{D}$,
- (iii) f is an affine map on each interval $[d_i, d_{i+1}]$: $f(x) = a_i x + b_i$, $i = 0, \dots, p-1$, $a_i \neq 0$, so, in particular f is one-to-one on $[d_j, d_{j+1}]$

(iv) $|f'(x)| > 1$, $x \notin \mathcal{D}$, or $|a_i| > 1$, $i = 0, \dots, p-1$.

Remark that the condition (ii) says that the points \mathcal{D} determine a Markov partition for f on S^1 , and the condition (iv) claims that f is expanding on each element of this partition. Let us emphasize that this class of maps is interesting and large enough: first of all, Markov maps are dense in the space of expanding maps endowed with the topology of uniform convergence, and second, any Markov expanding map is semi-conjugated to a piecewise affine Markov map (is conjugated in the transitive case), see, for instance, [ALM].

Given f of this class, let us choose the lifting map $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(0) \in [0, 1]$, $F(1) \in [1, 2]$. Since f is of degree 1, such a lift always exists.

Let $\xi_i = [d_i, d_{i+1})$ be the i -th element of the Markov partition ξ , $i = 0, \dots, p-1$. Without loss of generality one may assume that $\text{diam } F(\xi_i) < 1$, $i = 0, \dots, p-1$. If it is not so, one may consider the dynamical refinement $\xi^{(n)} = \xi \cap f^{-1}\xi \cap \dots \cap f^{-n+1}\xi$. Because of the condition (iv), the diameter of an element $\xi^{(n)}$ goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so one may find out n_0 , such that $\text{diam } F(\xi_j^{n_0}) < 1$ for every element $\xi_j^{n_0} \in \xi^{n_0}$ and treat $\xi^{(n)}$ as the original partition ξ . Because of that, one may see that, first, if $f(\text{int } \xi_i) \cap \text{int } \xi_j \neq \emptyset$ then $f(\text{int } \xi_i) \supset \text{int } \xi_j$ ($\text{int } \xi_i = (d_i, d_{i+1})$, the open interval), and, second, for $x \in \xi_j$ the set $f^{-1}x \cap \xi_i$ consists of exactly one point if $f(\text{int } \xi_i) \cap \xi_j \neq \emptyset$, and $f^{-1}x \cap \xi_i = \emptyset$ if $f(\text{int } \xi_i) \cap \xi_j = \emptyset$.

As usual, we identify the elements ξ_i with the symbols i , consider the $p \times p$ -matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, $a_{ij} = 1$ iff $f(\text{int } \xi_i) \cap \text{int } \xi_j \neq \emptyset$, and introduce the one-sided topological Markov chain (Ω_A, σ) where $\Omega_A = \{\underline{\omega} = (\omega_0 \omega_1 \dots \omega_k \dots), \omega_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}, \omega_k \text{ can follow } \omega_{k-1} \text{ iff } a_{\omega_{k-1}\omega_k} = 1, k = 1, \dots\}$. We endow Ω_A with the distance

$$d(\underline{\omega}, \underline{\omega}') = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{|\omega_k - \omega'_k|}{p^k},$$

so, the shift map $\sigma : \Omega_A \rightarrow \Omega_A$, $(\sigma\underline{\omega})_k = \omega_{k+1}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, will be continuous. The coding map $\chi : \Omega_A \rightarrow S'$ is well-defined in such a way that, for $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_0 \omega_1 \dots) \in \Omega_A$

$$\chi(\underline{\omega}) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \Delta_{\omega_0 \dots \omega_{n-1}}$$

where $\Delta_{\omega_0 \dots \omega_{n-1}} = \xi_{\omega_0} \cap f^{-1}\xi_{\omega_1} \cap \dots \cap f^{-n+1}\xi_{\omega_{n-1}}$. Since, for $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega_A$, $\text{diam } \Delta_{\omega_0 \dots \omega_{n-1}} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} |a_{\omega_k}^{-1}| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\chi(\underline{\omega})$ consists of the only one point.

3.1 Estimates from above

We introduce an oriented graph Γ_A having p vertices such that there exists an edge starting at the vertex i and ending at j iff $a_{ij} = 1$. By L_Γ^* we denote all Γ -admissible finite words (paths: $(\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}) \in L_\Gamma^*$ iff (ω_{j-1}, ω_j) is a Γ -edge for all $j = 1, \dots, n-1$). As the graph Γ is

normally fixed we sometimes omit the subscript Γ . We relate a weight $k_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ to every edge (i, j) of the graph Γ_A as follows: $k_{ij} = s$ iff $F(\xi_i) \supset \xi_j + s$ where $\xi_j + s = \{x + s, x \in \xi_j\}$. Since F is continuous, the collection $\{k_{ij}\} = \{s_0, s_0 + 1, \dots, s_0 + \rho\}$, $s_0 \leq 0$. Now we want to estimate $C_\epsilon(W, T)$ through the cardinality of different sets of words generated by Γ_A . Let us start with some notation and definitions. For a finite word $w = w_0 \dots w_{n-1} \in L_\Gamma^*$ we denote:

- $|w| = n$, the length of the sequence.
- $w[i : j] = w_i w_{i+1} \dots w_j$; $w[: j] = w_0 \dots w_j$.
- $v(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} k_{(w[i-1, i])}$, the weight of w .
- $L^n = \{w \in L_\Gamma^* \mid |w| = n\}$, the collection of all admissible words of length n .
- $L_m^n = \{w \in L^n \mid v(w) = m\}$, the collections of admissible n -words of the weight m .
- For any $w \in L^n$ let $[w] \subseteq \Omega_A$ be the corresponding cylinder, i.e. $[w] = \{\underline{\omega} \in \Omega_A \mid \omega[: n-1] = w\}$.

Lemma 1. *Given $w \in L^n$, for any $x \in \chi([w]) = \Delta_{w_0 \dots w_{n-1}}$ one has*

$$m \leq F^{n-1}x \leq m + 1, \quad (4)$$

where $m = v(w)$

Proof. In fact, the statement directly follows from the definition of k_{ij} . Indeed, if $0 \leq x \leq 1$ then $Fx \in [k_{w_0 w_1}, k_{w_0 w_1} + 1]$ and so on. \square

Proposition 1. *If, for $x \in [0, 1]$, the inequality (4) is satisfied then $x \in \chi([w])$, $w \in L_{m-1}^n \cup L_m^n \cup L_{m+1}^n$.*

Proof. Since the images of the cylinders $\{\chi([w]) \mid w \in L^n\}$ form a partition of the interval $[0, 1]$ then $x \in \chi([w])$, $w = w_0 \dots w_{n-1}$. Let $q = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} k_{w_j w_{j+1}}$. If $q > m + 1$ ($q < m - 1$) then, because of Lemma 1, $F^{n-1}x \geq q > m + 1$ ($F^{n-1}x \leq q + 1 < m$), the contradiction with (4). \square

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $r, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $B_{n, \alpha, r} = \{w \in L^n \mid \forall j = 1, \dots, n-1 \alpha j - r \leq v(w[: j]) \leq \alpha j + r\}$. The following proposition is an easy implication of the definition of $B_{n, \alpha, r}$.

Proposition 2. *Let $|w| = n$. Then $w \in B_{n, \alpha, r}$ if and only if for any $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ one has*

$$w[: j] \in \bigcup_{m=[\alpha j] - r}^{[\alpha j + r]} L_m^{j+1}.$$

Let $\alpha := \cot \theta$. We want to estimate $C_\epsilon(W(\theta, [-r, r]), n)$ using the cardinalities of the sets $B_{n, \alpha, r+1}$.

Let \mathcal{P} be a an (ϵ, W, n) -separated optimal set.

Theorem 2. *The following estimate holds*

$$|\mathcal{P}| = C_\epsilon(W(\theta, [-r, r]), n) \leq \left\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right\rceil |B_{n,\alpha,r+1}| \quad (5)$$

Proof. By definition, if $x \in \mathcal{P}$ then $(t-1)\alpha - r \leq F^{t-1}x \leq (t-1)\alpha + r$ for $t = 1, \dots, n$. Now, $x \in \chi([w])$ where $w = w_0 \dots w_{t-1}$. Because of Proposition 1,

$$w \in \bigcup_{m=\lfloor (t-1)\alpha \rfloor - r - 1}^{\lfloor (t-1)\alpha \rfloor + r + 1} L_m^t.$$

So, by Proposition 2, $x \in \Delta_w$ with $w \in B_{n,\alpha,r+1}$. Since F^{n-1} is one-to-one on $\Delta_{w_0 \dots w_{n-1}}$ and $|F'(y)| > 1$ then the inequality $|F^{t-1}x - F^{t-1}y| \geq \epsilon$ for some $t < n$ and $x, y \in \Delta_{w_0 \dots w_{n-1}}$, implies the inequality $|F^{n-1}x - F^{n-1}y| \geq \epsilon$.

Since $F^{n-1}\Delta_{w_0 \dots w_{n-1}}$ is an interval of the length less than 1, the number of points of \mathcal{P} inside $\Delta_{w_0 \dots w_{n-1}}$ doesn't exceed $\left\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right\rceil$. Thus

$$|\mathcal{P}| = C_\epsilon(W) \leq \left\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right\rceil |B_{n,\alpha,r+1}|.$$

□

3.2 An estimate from below

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The set $\{\Delta_w \mid w \in L^m\}$ is a partition of $[0, 1]$ by intervals. Let ϵ_m be the minimal length of the intervals Δ_w , $w \in L^m$.

Theorem 3.

$$C_{\epsilon_m}(W(\theta, [-r, r]), km) \geq 3^{-k} |B_{km,\alpha,r}|$$

Proof. Let $S \subset L^m$ satisfy the following property:

$$\forall w, v \in S, w \neq v \exists 0 \leq j < k : \Delta_{v[jm:(j+1)m]} \text{ and } \Delta_{w[jm:(j+1)m]} \text{ are different and not successive.}$$

Fix a maximal S satisfying this property. One can check that $x \in \Delta_w$ and $y \in \Delta_v$ are (ϵ, W, km) -separated for $w, v \in S$ and $w \neq v$. So, $C_{\epsilon_m}(W(\theta, [-r, r]), km) \geq |S|$. We only need to estimate $|S|$. For $w \in B_{km,\alpha,r}$ let $U(w) =$

$$\{v \in B_{km,\alpha,r} \mid \forall 0 \leq j < k \text{ the intervals } \Delta_{v[jm:(j+1)m]} \text{ and } \Delta_{w[jm:(j+1)m]} \text{ are equal or successive}\}$$

Observe that $|U(w)| \leq 3^k$ and $B_{km,\alpha,r} = \bigcup_{w \in S} U(w)$ due to the maximality of S . The estimate follows. □

Corollary 3.1. *Let*

$$e_{\alpha,r} = \ln \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|B_{n,\alpha,r}|}.$$

Then the entropy

$$\mathcal{H}_\theta = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e_{\cot \theta, r}. \quad (6)$$

Proof. Let

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln C_\epsilon(W(\theta, [-r, r]), n)}{n} = \mathcal{H}_\theta(\epsilon, r).$$

Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 together say that

$$3^{-k} |B_{km, \cot(\theta), r}| \leq C_\epsilon(W(\theta, [-r, r]), km) \leq \left\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right\rceil |B_{n, \cot(\theta), r+1}|,$$

for $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_m$. Taking $\ln(\sqrt[km]{\cdot})$ from all parts of the above inequality and directing $k \rightarrow \infty$ one gets

$$-\frac{1}{m} \ln(3) + e_{\cot(\theta), r} \leq \mathcal{H}_\theta(\epsilon, r) \leq e_{\cot(\theta), r+1}.$$

The smaller ϵ is the larger m can be taken ($\epsilon \leq \epsilon_m \rightarrow 0$ when $m \rightarrow \infty$). So,

$$e_{\cot(\theta), r} \leq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\theta(\epsilon, r) \leq e_{\cot(\theta), r+1}.$$

Finally we obtain the formula (6) □

Remark 1. We believe that formula (6) can be obtained by using the technique developed by M. Misiurewicz (see, for instance [ALM]). But, since we deal generally with non-invariant sets, this technique should be adjusted to the “non-invariant situation”. So, we decided to make a direct proof here.

4 Combinatorial part.

Let

$$e_\alpha = \log \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|L_{\alpha n}^n|}.$$

The aim of this subsection is to show that

$$e_\alpha = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e_{\alpha, r} = \mathcal{H}_\theta \quad (\alpha = \cot \theta)$$

and to explain how to calculate e_α .

Let $D \subset L^*$ be finite subset. Let the matrix $M(D) \in \text{Mat}_{p \times p}(\mathbb{N})$ be such that $M(D)_{ij}$ is the number of words in D starting from i and ending by j . Given $X, Y \subset L^*$ and $B \in \text{Mat}_{p \times p}\{0, 1\}$ let $X \overset{B}{\times} Y = \{uv \mid u = u_1 \dots u_n \in X, v_1 \dots v_m \in Y, B(u_n, v_1) = 1\}$. The following proposition is a direct corollary of the above definitions.

Proposition 3.

$$M(X \overset{B}{\times} Y) = M(X)BM(Y)$$

Recall that L^n is the set of admissible words related to matrix A . It is known that $M(L^n) = A^{n-1}$, see, for instance, [AH]. Let us represent the matrix A in the form

$$A = \sum_{s \in S} A_s$$

according to weight of the edges of Γ . Precisely, $A_s \in \text{Mat}(\{0, 1\})$, $A_s(i, j) = 1$ if and only if $k_{ij} = s$. Here the set S is the set of all possible weights.

Proposition 4. i) $M(L_0^1) = E$ and $M(L_m^1) = 0$ if $m \neq 0$.

ii) For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ the following equality holds

$$M(L_m^{n+1}) = \sum_{s \in S} M(L_{m-s}^n) A_s,$$

Proof. By definition $L^1 = \{1, \dots, p\}$. Any word of length $n+1$ has a form wj , where w is a word of length n and $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $v(wj) = v(w) + v(w_{n-1}j)$. So, one has

$$L_m^{n+1} = \bigcup_{s \in S} L_{m-s}^n \times^{A_s} \{1, \dots, p\}.$$

So, Proposition 3 implies the statement. □

The following proposition is a consequence of definition of $B_{n,\alpha,r}$ and L_m^n .

Proposition 5.

$$B_{n,\alpha,r} \subset \bigcup_{m=\lfloor (n-1)\alpha \rfloor - r}^{\lfloor (n-1)\alpha \rfloor + r} L_m^n, \quad (7)$$

For $B_j \in \text{Mat}_{p \times p}\{0, 1\}$ we use below the notation $(X_1 \times^{B_1} \cup X_2 \times^{B_2})Y = X_1 \times^{B_1} Y \cup X_2 \times^{B_2} Y$.

Proposition 6. Fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough ($r > (t-1) \cdot (\max\{|s-\alpha| \mid s \in S\})$), $m_j = \lfloor jt\alpha \rfloor - \lfloor (j-1)t\alpha \rfloor$. Then for any $c \in \mathbb{N}$ one has:

$$\left(\bigcup_{s \in S} L_{m_1-s}^t \times^{A_s} \right) \left(\bigcup_{s \in S} L_{m_2-s}^t \times^{A_s} \right) \dots (L_{m_c}^t) \subset B_{ct,\alpha,r}. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, $m_j = \lfloor j\alpha \rfloor$ or $m_j = \lfloor j\alpha \rfloor + 1$ for $j = 0, 1 \dots c$.

Proof. The words of the set $B_{ct,\alpha,r}$ are the words such that the weights of their initial subwords are in the $[-r,r]$ -strip with slope α . In the words from l.h.s. of the equation (8) we fix the weights of the initial subwords with the length being multiple of t . Because r is large enough the weights have no chance to leave the $[-r,r]$ -strip. Now we make the corresponding calculations. Let w be in l.h.s. of the inclusion. It means that $v(w[:t]) = m_1$, $v(w[t:2t]) = m_2$. Generally, $v(w[(j-1)t:jt]) = m_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, c-1$, and $v(w[(c-1)t:ct-1]) = m_c$. So, $v(w[:jt]) = m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_j = \lfloor jt\alpha \rfloor$. Now, $|v(w[:jt+k]) - \alpha(jt+k)| < 1 + \max_s |s - \alpha|k$. Here $k \leq t-1$, so $w \in B_{ct,\alpha,r}$. □

For two matrices M, N of the same size over \mathbb{Z} we write $M \leq N$ if $M_{ij} \leq N_{ij}$ for all admissible indexes. The equations (7) (8) imply the following inequalities for M -matrices:

$$\left(\sum_{s \in S} M(L_{m_1-s}^t) A_s \right) \left(\sum_{s \in S} M(L_{m_2-s}^t) A_s \right) \dots M(L_{m_c}^t) \leq M(B_{ct,\alpha,r}) \leq \sum_{m=\lfloor (ct-1)\alpha \rfloor - r}^{\lfloor (ct-1)\alpha \rfloor + r} M(L_m^{ct}) \quad (9)$$

Applying Proposition 4 to this inequality we obtain

Proposition 7.

$$M(L_{m_1}^{t+1})M(L_{m_2}^{t+1}) \dots M(L_{m_{c-1}}^{t+1})M(L_{m_c}^t) \leq M(B_{ct,\alpha,r}) \leq \sum_{m=\lfloor (ct-1)\alpha \rfloor - r}^{\lfloor (ct-1)\alpha \rfloor + r} M(L_m^{ct}),$$

where $m_j = \lfloor jt\alpha \rfloor - \lfloor (j-1)t\alpha \rfloor$. Moreover, $m_j = \lfloor t\alpha \rfloor$ or $m_j = \lfloor t\alpha \rfloor + 1$.

For a positive sequence a_n we call $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{a_n}$ the exponent of a_n (if exists). The relation between exponents of D_n and $M(D_n)$ is clear: $\lim \sqrt[n]{|D_n|} = \max_{ij} \{ \lim \sqrt[n]{m_{ij}(n)} \}$, where m_{ij} are matrix entries of $M(D_n)$. Using this fact and estimates of Proposition 7 one gets $e_{\alpha,r} \leq \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \{e_\beta \mid \beta \in [\alpha - \epsilon, \alpha + \epsilon]\}$. So, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 2. *If e_α depends continuously on α , then $e_{\alpha,r} \leq e_\alpha$.*

The estimates from below may be more tricky to obtain. We overcome this difficulty by imposing a rather general sufficient condition.

Lemma 3. *Let $M(L_{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor}^n)$ have a diagonal entry with exponent e_α then $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e_{\alpha,r} \geq e_\alpha$.*

Proof. Let $M(L_{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor}^n)_{jj}$ be a diagonal entry with exponent e_α . Let $d(t) = \min\{(M_{\lfloor \alpha t \rfloor + b}^{t+a})_{jj} \mid a, b = 0, 1\}$. Then Proposition 7 implies the inequality

$$d(t)^c \leq M_{jj}(B_{ct,\alpha,r}).$$

Applying $\sqrt[t]{\cdot}$ and allowing $c \rightarrow \infty$ one gets

$$\sqrt[t]{d(t)} \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} e_{\alpha,r},$$

But $\sqrt[t]{d(t)} \rightarrow e_\alpha$ by our assumptions. □

In the next subsection we explain how to calculate $M(L_{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor}^n)$.

4.1 Generating function.

Let $S = \{s_0, s_0 + 1, \dots, s_0 + \rho\}$. We define the matrix generating function for $M(L_m^n)$ as

$$G(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=(n-1)s_0}^{(n-1)(s_0+\rho)} M(L_m^n) x^{n-1} y^{m-(n-1)s_0}.$$

We chose this type of generating function to avoid negative powers and to keep track of the number of total transitions.

Lemma 4. $G(x, y) = (E - x(A_{s_0} + yA_{s_0+1} + \dots + y^i A_{s_0+i} + \dots + y^\rho A_{s_0+\rho}))^{-1}$

Proof. Taking into account the formula $(E - X)^{-1} = E + X + X^2 \dots$ it suffices to show that

$$(A_{s_0} + yA_{s_0+1} + \dots + y^i A_{s_0+i} + \dots + y^\rho A_{s_0+\rho})^n = \sum_{m=n s_0}^{n(s_0+\rho)} M(L_m^{n+1}) y^{m-n s_0}.$$

We prove it by induction on n . For $n = 0$ the equality holds by the statement **i)** of Proposition 4. Supposing the equality for $n - 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (A_{s_0} + yA_{s_0+1} + \dots + y^i A_{s_0+i} + \dots + y^\rho A_{s_0+\rho})^n = \\ & \left(\sum_{m=(n-1)s_0}^{(n-1)(s_0+\rho)} M(L_m^n) y^{m-(n-1)s_0} \right) (A_{s_0} + yA_{s_0+1} + \dots + y^i A_{s_0+i} + \dots + y^\rho A_{s_0+\rho}) = \\ & \left(\sum_{m=n s_0}^{n s_0 + (n-1)\rho} M(L_{m-s_0}^n) y^{m-n s_0} \right) (A_{s_0} + yA_{s_0+1} + \dots + y^i A_{s_0+i} + \dots + y^\rho A_{s_0+\rho}) = \\ & \sum_{m=n s_0}^{n s_0 + n\rho} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\rho} M(L_{m-s_0-j}^n) A_{s_0+j} \right) y^{m-n s_0}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality we use the simple fact that $L_m^n = \emptyset$ for $m < (n-1)s_0$ and $m > (n-1)(s_0+\rho)$. The induction step follows because of Proposition 4. \square

Let $H(x, y) = \det(E - x \sum_{j=0}^{\rho} y^j A_{s_0+j})$. It follows from the formula of an inverse matrix that HG is a polynomial matrix. In order to calculate the asymptotics we need to study the zeros of H , particularly, we need the so called minimal solutions, see [PW1, PW2, PW3].

Definition 3. Let $f(x, y)$ be a \mathbb{C} -polynomial. Consider the equation

$$f(x, y) = 0 \tag{10}$$

A solution $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ of (10) is said to be minimal if equation (10) has no solution (x, y) satisfying $|x| < |x_0|$ and $|y| < |y_0|$. A solution $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ of the equation (10) is said to be strictly minimal if the inequalities $|x| \leq |x_0|$ and $|y| \leq |y_0|$ for any solution (x, y) imply $x = x_0$, $y = y_0$.

The following proposition describes the minimal solutions for

$$H(x, y) = 0 \tag{11}$$

Proposition 8. *Let A be a primitive matrix. Let $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$, $y_0 \neq 0$ be a minimal solution of the equation (11). Then the maximal (by the absolute value) eigenvalue of the matrix $A(x_0, y_0) = x_0 \sum_j y_0^j A_{s_0+j}$ is 1. Moreover, if $\text{rank of } (A(1, e^{i\phi})) > 1$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ then $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and (x_0, y_0) is strictly minimal.*

Proof. Clearly, $H(x_0, y_0) = 0$ iff 1 is an eigenvalue of $A(x_0, y_0)$. If λ is an eigenvalue of $A(x_0, y_0)$ with $|\lambda| > 1$ then $H(x_0/\lambda, y_0) = 0$, a contradiction with the minimality of (x_0, y_0) .

For a vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we write $u \geq v$ if $u_i \geq v_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p$. We write $u > v$ if $u \geq v$ and $u \neq v$. Let $(x_0, y_0) \notin \mathbb{R}^2$ and $A(x_0, y_0)\xi = \xi$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^p$. Define $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ as $v_i = |\xi_i|$. Observe that $A(|x_0|, |y_0|)v \geq v$. If $A(|x_0|, |y_0|)v > v$ then the maximal real eigenvalue of $A(|x_0|, |y_0|)$ is greater than 1 by Proposition 9 (see below) and (x_0, y_0) is not minimal, a contradiction. Assume now that $A(|x_0|, |y_0|)v = v$ and $A(x_0, y_0) = \{a_{jk}\}$. It follows that $\arg(a_{jk}\xi_k) = \arg(\xi_j)$, or, the same, $\arg(a_{jk}) = \arg(\xi_j) - \arg(\xi_k)$. In our situation it means that $A(1, e^{i\phi})_{jk} = e^{i(\phi_0 + \phi_j - \phi_k)}$, where $\phi_0 = \arg(y_0)$ and $\phi_j = \arg(\xi_j)$. So, $\text{rank}(A(1, e^{i\phi})) = 1$, a contradiction. \square

Proposition 9. *Let $b(A)$ be the greatest real eigenvalue of a matrix A . Let A be primitive and $Av > v$ for some $v > 0$. Then $b(A) > 1$.*

Proof. There exists n such that all entries of A^n are positive. Observe that if $u > v$ then $(A^n u)_i > (A^n v)_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p$. Observe also that $A^n v > v$. Thus, there exists $\beta > 1$ such that $A^{2n} v > \beta A^n v$. Inductively, $A^{kn} v > \beta^{k-1} A^n v$. Recall that $b(A) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[m]{\|A^m\|}$. So, $b(A) \geq \sqrt[n]{\beta} > 1$. \square

4.2 Asymptotics for 2-variable generating functions.

In this section we suppose that A is primitive and the rank condition of Proposition 8 is satisfied. All entries of $G(x, y)$ have the form $\frac{f(x, y)}{H(x, y)}$, where f is a polynomial. We are interesting in asymptotics of $a_{n, [\alpha n]}$ where $a_{n, m}$ are the coefficients of the expansion

$$\frac{f(x, y)}{H(x, y)} = \sum a_{n, m} x^n y^m$$

We estimate $a_{n, m}$ using the Wilson-Pemantle technique [PW1, PW2]. The asymptotics depend on minimal points. Under the conditions of Proposition 8 all minimal points are strictly minimal and we may adapt Theorem 3.1 of [PW1] (see also [PW3, PW2]) as follows

Theorem 4. *Let $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ be the unique (in \mathbb{R}_+^2) solution of*

$$\begin{cases} H = 0 \\ \alpha x \partial_x H = y \partial_y H \end{cases}, \quad (12)$$

such that 1 is a maximal eigenvalue of $A(x_0, y_0)$. Then (x_0, y_0) is a strictly minimal solution of the equation (11) and the following asymptotics takes place:

$$a_{n, [\alpha n]} \sim \frac{f(x_0, y_0)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} x_0^{-n} y_0^{-\alpha n} \sqrt{\frac{-x \partial_x H(x_0, y_0)}{n Q(x_0, y_0)}},$$

where $Q(x, y) = -x H_x (y H_y)^2 - y H_y (x H_x)^2 - y^2 x^2 [(H_y)^2 H_{xx} + (H_x)^2 H_{yy} - 2 H_x H_y H_{xy}]$. Particularly, it implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(a_{n, [\alpha n]})}{n} = -\ln(x_0) - \alpha \ln(y_0),$$

if $f(x_0, y_0) \neq 0$ and $Q(x_0, y_0) \neq 0$.

This theorem with Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 imply

Theorem 5. *Let $\alpha = \cot(\theta) - s_0$, (x_0, y_0) be the unique in \mathbb{R}_+^2 solution of the system (12). Let the polynomial matrix HG have a non-zero diagonal entry evaluated at (x_0, y_0) and $Q(x_0, y_0) \neq 0$. Then $\mathcal{H}_\theta = e_\alpha = -\ln(x_0) - \alpha \ln(y_0)$.*

5 Important example

In this section we consider an example that, in fact, contains all main features of systems on the circle possessing a Markov partition.

Consider the map f for which

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3} + 2x, & 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{3}, \\ \frac{4}{3} - x, & \frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq \frac{2}{3}, \\ -\frac{2}{3} + 2x, & \frac{2}{3} \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

The map f has the Markov partition ξ of 3 intervals: $\xi_1 = [0, \frac{1}{3}]$, $\xi_2 = [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$, $\xi_3 = [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$ (see Fig. 5), and the corresponding topological Markov chain is determined by the transition matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, corresponding to the graph G (see Fig. 5).




Figure 1: The graph of F and the Markov partition.

One can see that the transition $(3, 1)$ corresponds to the change of the integer part of F . So, we represent the transition matrix $A = A_0 + A_1$ where A_0 corresponds to all transitions without (31) and A_1 corresponds to (31):

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$




Figure 2: The oriented graph G for the map F and the partition ξ .

We calculate the generating function:

$$G(x, y) = (E - xA_0 - xyA_1)^{-1} = \frac{1}{-x^3y - x^2y - x + 1} \begin{pmatrix} -x + 1 & -x^2 + x & x^2 + x \\ x^2y & -x^2y - x + 1 & x \\ xy & x^2y & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now we can find the asymptotics using Theorem 4. Let $H = -x^3y - x^2y - x + 1$ We have to find positive solutions of the system

$$\begin{cases} H = 0 \\ \alpha x H_x = y H_y \end{cases}$$

Using SAGE (see [SA]) we have found:

$$x = \frac{(\alpha \pm \sqrt{5\alpha^2 - 4\alpha + 1})}{(2\alpha - 1)}.$$

In this example α is a fraction of (31)-transition (A_1 -transition). If $\alpha > 1/2$ then 2 consecutive A_1 transitions should appear. But there is no word with consecutive (31)-transition. So, we have to consider the interval $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$ only. The positive branch for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ is

$$x = \frac{(\alpha - \sqrt{5\alpha^2 - 4\alpha + 1})}{(2\alpha - 1)}.$$

Equation $H = 0$ implies

$$y = \frac{1 - x}{x^3 + x^2}.$$

The dependence of the entropy on α is given by the formula $h = -\ln(x) - \alpha \ln(y)$ shown on the figure 3. One can see that our case satisfies Theorem 5, so, $\mathcal{H}(\theta) = h(\theta)$.

6 Measures and entropy

In this section we construct a measure on the subshift generated by the matrix A such that it's measure theoretical entropy coincides with \mathcal{H}_θ . This measure turns out to be a Markov measure




Figure 3: The graph of $h(\alpha)$, $\alpha = \cot \theta$

constructed using the matrix $A(x_0, y_0) = x_0 \sum_j y_0^j A_{s_0+j}$ with $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ being the solution of system (12) satisfying the condition of Theorem 4. First of all, we construct a stochastic matrix Π and measure μ_Π , as it is described, for example, in [KH]. Then we show by direct computation that μ_Π -entropy ($h(\mu_\Pi)$) of the subshift coincides with the directional entropy \mathcal{H}_θ , where $\alpha + s_0 = \cot \theta$ and α is the parameter of the system (12).

6.1 Construction of the measure.

Recall, that under the conditions of Theorem 4 the matrix $A(x_0, y_0)$ has 1 as the greatest simple eigenvalue. Let l be a row-vector (r be a column-vector) such that $lA(x_0, y_0) = l$ ($A(x_0, y_0)r = r$). By the Perron-Frobenius theorem l and r are positive. Normalize l and r such that $lr = 1$. Let $A(x_0, y_0) = \{a_{jk}\}$. Define (see [KH]) the matrix $\Pi = \Pi(x_0, y_0)$ as $\Pi_{jk} = \frac{a_{jk}r_k}{r_j}$. Let $q_j = l_j r_j$ and $q = q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p$. Observe that Π is a stochastic matrix and q is its left 1-eigenvector. The measure μ_Π of the cylinder $[w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n]$ is defined as

$$\mu_\Pi([w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n]) = q_{w_1} \Pi_{w_1 w_2} \Pi_{w_2 w_3} \dots \Pi_{w_{n-1} w_n}.$$

The entropy of the subshift with respect to μ_Π can be calculated by the formula

$$h(\mu_\Pi) = - \sum_{jk} q_j \Pi_{jk} \ln(\Pi_{jk}), \quad (13)$$

see [KH].

6.2 $h(\mu_\Pi) = H_\theta$

We are going to show that $h(\mu_\Pi) = \ln(x_0) + \alpha \ln(y_0)$. In our situation the equation (13) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} -h(\mu_\Pi) &= \sum_{ik} l_i a_{ik} r_k \ln\left(\frac{a_{ik} r_k}{r_i}\right) = \sum_{ik} l_i a_{ik} r_k \ln(a_{ik}) + \\ &\quad \sum_{ik} l_i a_{ik} r_k \ln(r_k) - \sum_{ik} l_i a_{ik} r_k \ln(r_i). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the last line of the equation is 0. (Indeed, evaluating the first sum over i and the second one over k and taking into account that l (r) is a left (right) 1-eigenvector of A we obtain that $\sum_k l_k r_k \ln(r_k) - \sum_i l_i r_i \ln(r_i) = 0$.) Let $\mathcal{A}_j = \{(i, k) \mid (A_{s_0+j})_{ik} = 1\}$. Now we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} -h(\mu_\Pi) &= \sum_j \sum_{(i,k) \in \mathcal{A}_j} l_i r_k x_0 y_0^j \ln(x_0 y_0^j) = \\ &= \ln(x_0) \sum_j \sum_{(i,k) \in \mathcal{A}_j} l_i r_k x_0 y_0^j + \ln(y_0) \sum_j \sum_{(i,k) \in \mathcal{A}_j} l_i r_k x_0 j y_0^j = \end{aligned}$$

$$\ln(x_0)(lA(x_0, y_0)r) + \ln(y_0)(l\tilde{A}(x_0, y_0)r) = \ln(x_0) + \ln(y_0)(l\tilde{A}(x_0, y_0)r),$$

where $\tilde{A}(x_0, y_0) = y_0 A_y(x_0, y_0) = \sum_j j x_0 y_0^j A_{s_0+j}$. So, in order to prove the equality $\mathcal{H}_\theta = h(\mu_\Pi)$

we should show that $(l\tilde{A}(x_0, y_0)r) = \alpha$, of course, under the condition that $lA(x_0, y_0) = l$, $A(x_0, y_0)r = r$, $lr = 1$, (x_0, y_0) is the solution of the system (12) satisfying the condition of Theorem 4.

To this end we need the following result (recall that $H(x, y) = \det(E - A(x, y))$).

Proposition 10. *Let $B \in \text{Mat}(\mathbb{C})$, $\det(B) = 0$ and 0 be a simple spectral point of B . Let l be a vector-row and r be a vector-column such that $lB = 0$, $Br = 0$, and $lr = 1$. Let $\beta = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{p-1}$ be the product of all non-zero eigenvalues of B (counted with multiplicity). Then the Frechet derivative $D\det(B)$ of $\det(B)$ (applied to an arbitrary matrix X) is equal to*

$$D(\det(B))(X) = \beta(lXr)$$

Proof. The multilinearity of $\det(\cdot)$ implies that

$$\det(B + \epsilon X) = \epsilon \sum_{ij} \tilde{B}_{ij} X_{ij} + O(\epsilon^2),$$

where $\tilde{B} = \{\tilde{B}_{ij}\}$ is the matrix of the cofactors of B . Because of the equalities $B\tilde{B}^T = \tilde{B}^T B = \det(B)E = 0$, the columns (rows) of \tilde{B} are proportional to l (r). Thus, $\tilde{B}_{ij} = \gamma l_i r_j$ for some γ . Observe that $\gamma = \text{trace}(\tilde{B})$. Let $D = \text{diag}(-1, 1, -1, 1, \dots, (-1)^p)$. The matrix $D^{-1}\tilde{B}D$ is the matrix of the minors of B . By a theorem due to Kronecker (see [Gan]) the eigenvalues of $D^{-1}\tilde{B}D$ (as well as of \tilde{B}) are products of $p - 1$ eigenvalues of B . So, $\text{trace}(\tilde{B}) = \beta$, the unique non-zero eigenvalue of \tilde{B} . \square

Take $B = E - A(x_0, y_0)$ in Proposition 10. Then the last equation of the system (12) may be rewritten as $\alpha\beta(lA(x_0, y_0)r) = \beta(l\tilde{A}(x_0, y_0)r)$. But $lA(x_0, y_0)r = 1$ and we prove the following

Theorem 6. $h(\mu_\Pi) = \mathcal{H}_\theta$, where $\Pi = \Pi(x_0, y_0)$ and (x_0, y_0) is the minimal solution of the system (12) with $\alpha + s_0 = \cot \theta$.

Remark 2. The direct computation shows that $\int_{\Omega_A} v(w[: 1])d\mu_\Pi(w) = \alpha + s_0$ (the function $v(\cdot)$ is defined in Section 3.1). With shift invariance of μ_Π it probably implies that the support of μ_Π consist of initial words with rotation number $\cot \theta$.

6.3 When $\mathcal{H}_\theta = h_{top}$.

Theorem 6 implies that $\mathcal{H}_\theta = h_{top}$ if μ_Π is the measure of the maximal entropy. Observe that $A(x, 1) = xA$. So, our construction of μ_Π in the case of $y_0 = 1$, in fact, coincides with the construction of the measure of maximal entropy in [KH]. Substituting $y_0 = 1$ to the system (12), we can find $\alpha = \cot \theta - s_0$ and x_0 . It is clear that, in fact, $x_0 = e^{-h_{top}}$, the inverse value of the greatest eigenvalue of A since $A(x_0, 1) = x_0A$. We can formulate the procedure of finding the angle, corresponding the topological entropy in the form of the following

Theorem 7. *Let λ be the greatest eigenvalue of A ; l (r) be its left (right) λ -eigenvector. Let*

$$\cot \theta = \frac{lA(1, 1)r}{l\tilde{A}(1, 1)r} + s_0, \quad \frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

Then $H_\theta = h_{top}$.

In our example. $A = A_0 + A_1$, where

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Denote by λ the maximal eigenvalue of A . Let l be a left λ -eigenvector of A and r be a right λ -eigenvector of A . Calculations show that $\lambda \approx 1.839$, $l \approx (1, 0.5436890126920763, 1.839286755214161)$ and $r \approx (1, 0.647798871261043, 1.191487883953119)$ (because of cancellation we do not need normalization here). Now let $\cot \theta_{max} = \alpha_{max}$ be such that $H_{\theta_{max}} = h_{top}$. We can calculate:

$$\alpha_{max} = \frac{lAr}{lA_1r} \approx 0.2821918053244515$$

and the angle $\theta = \text{arccot } \alpha_{max}$ is the direction in which the rate of instability of trajectories is maximal.

7 Concluding remarks

Following ideas of Milnor [M86, M88] and also [AZ, ACFM, AMU, CK] we have introduced and studied the directional complexity and entropy for dynamical systems generated by degree one maps of the circle. In particular, we have considered the maps that admit a Markov partition and have positive topological entropy. For them we have reduced the calculation of the (ϵ, n) -complexity on a set of initial points having a prescribed rotation number to that of symbolic complexity of admissible cylinders of a topological Markov chain (TMC). The admissibility of the cylinders is constructively determined by the rotation number. To calculate the symbolic complexity we have used a combinatorial machinery developed in [PW1, PW2] adjusted to our situation. As a result we have obtained exact formulas for the directional entropy corresponding to every rotation number. Using these formulas we have shown that the directional entropy coincides with the measure-theoretic entropy related to a Markov measure (different for different direction). In particular, we have proved that the measure of maximal entropy determines the direction in which the directional entropy equals the topological entropy of the original dynamical system and, also, we have found an exact formula for this direction.

Acknowledgement. V.A. and L.G. were partially supported by PROMEP, UASLP CA-21.

References

- [ACFM] V. Afraimovich, M. Courbage, B. Fernandez and A. Morante, Directional entropy in lattice dynamical systems, in: *Mathematical Problems of Nonlinear Dynamics*, edited by L.M. Lerman and L.P. Shilnikov, Nizhny Novgorod University Press, Nizhny Novgorod, Nizyny Novgorod (2002), 9-30.
- [AH] V. Afraimovich, S. B. Hsu, Lectures on Chaotic Dynamical Systems, *AMS Studies in Advance Mathematics*, **28** Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, (2003).
- [AJ] Alekseev, V. M.; Yakobson, M. V. Symbolic dynamics and hyperbolic dynamic systems. *Phys. Rep.* **75** (1981), no. 5, 287325
- [ALM] L. Aseda, J. Llibre and M. Misiurewicz, Combinatorial Dynamics and Entropy in Dimension One, Second Edition, *World Scientific* (2000) ISBN: 981-02-4053-8
- [AMU] V. Afraimovich, A. Morante, E. Ugalde, On the density of directional entropy in lattice dynamical systems, *Nonlinearity*, **17** (2004) 105-116
- [AZ] V. Afraimovich and G.M. Zaslavsky, Space-time complexity in Hamiltonian dynamics, *Chaos* **13** (2003), 519-532.
- [BMPT] R. Bawon, I.P. Malta, M.J. Pacifico and F. Takens, Rotation intervals of endomorphisms of the circle, *Erg. Th. Dyn. Syst.* **4** (1984), 493-498.
- [CK] M. Courbage, B. Kaminski, Density of measure-theoretical directional entropy for lattice dynamical systems, *Int. Journal of bifurcation and Chaos* **18** (2008), 161-168
- [G] S. Galatolo, Complexity, initial condition sensitivity, dimensions and weak chaos in dynamical systems, *Nonlinearity* **16** (2003), 1214-1238.
- [Gan] Gantmacher, Felix (1959), Theory of matrices, AMS Chelsea publishing
- [I] R. Ito, Rotation sets are closed, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **89** (1981), 107-111.
- [KH] A. Katok, B. Hasselblatt, Introduction to the Morden Theory of Dynamical Systems, *Cambridge University Press, London-New York* (1995).
- [KT] A.N. Kolmogorov and V.M. Tikhomirov, ϵ -entropy and ϵ -capacity of sets in functional spaces, *Usp. Mat. Nauk* **14** (1959), 3-86.
- [M86] J. Milnor, Directional entropy of cellular automaton maps, in *Systems and Biological Organization*, Berlin: Springer, 1986, 113-115
- [M88] J. Milnor, On the entropy geometry of cellular automata, *Complex Syst.* **2** (1988), 357-385
- [NPT] S. Newhouse, J. Palis and F. Takens, Bifurcations and stability of families of diffeomorphisms, *Inst. Hantes Études Sci Publ. Math.* **57** (1983), 5-71.
- [PW1] R. Pemantle, M. Wilson, Asymptotics of multivariate sequences, I. Smooth points of the singular variety. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **97** (1), 129-161, 2002

- [PW2] R. Pemantle, M. Wilson, Asymptotics of multivariate sequences, II. Multiple points of the singular variety. *Combin. Probab. Comput*, **13**, 735-761, 2004
- [PW3] R. Pemantle, M. Wilson, Twenty combinatorial examples of asymptotics derived from multivariate generating functions, *Preprint*
- [SA] SAGE is an open source mathematics software. See <http://www.sagemath.org/> .