

A PROBABILISTIC TAKENS THEOREM

KRZYSZTOF BARAŃSKI, YONATAN GUTMAN, AND ADAM ŚPIEWAK

ABSTRACT. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Borel set, μ a Borel probability measure on X and $T : X \rightarrow X$ Lipschitz and injective. Assume that $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is strictly greater than the (lower box-counting) dimension of X . We prove that if the sets of p -periodic points for $p = 1, \dots, k-1$ are of sufficiently small dimension, then for a typical polynomial perturbation \tilde{h} of a given Lipschitz map $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the k -delay coordinate map $x \mapsto (\tilde{h}(x), \tilde{h}(Tx), \dots, \tilde{h}(T^{k-1}x))$ is injective on a set of full measure μ . This is a probabilistic version of the Takens delay embedding theorem as proven by Sauer, Yorke and Casdagli. We also provide both dynamical and non-dynamical probabilistic embedding theorems involving the Hausdorff dimension. The non-dynamical version strengthens a previous result by Alberti, Bölcskei, De Lellis, Koliander and Riegler. In both cases, the key differences with the non-probabilistic counterparts are the reduction of the number of required measurements from $2 \dim(X)$ to $\dim(X)$ and the fact that one can consider the Hausdorff dimension instead of the box-counting dimension.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider an experimentalist observing a certain physical system modeled by a discrete time *dynamical system* (X, T) , where $T : X \rightarrow X$ is the evolution rule and the phase space X is a subset of Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^N . It is often the case that, instead of an actual sequence of states x, Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^kx , the observer has access only to values $h(x), h(Tx), \dots, h(T^kx)$ of a certain real-valued *observable* $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. It is natural to ask, to what extent the original system can be reconstructed from the measurements $h(x), h(Tx), \dots, h(T^kx)$. This question inspired a sequence of mathematical results (known as Takens' theorems) establishing that reconstruction of (X, T) is possible for certain h , as long as $h(x), h(Tx), \dots, h(T^kx)$ are known for k large enough and *all* $x \in X$. The assumption of being able to perform measurements for every $x \in X$ is clearly unrealistic, however it enables theoretical solutions to the problem, giving justification to actual procedures used by experimentalists (see e.g. [KY90, HGLS05, SM90]). Note that one cannot expect a reliable reconstruction of the system based on the values of an *a priori given* observable h , as it may fail to distinguish well the states of the system (e.g., h is a constant function). It is therefore necessary (and rather realistic) to assume that the experimentalists are able to *perturb* the observable with which they are working. The first result in this direction was the celebrated theorem of Takens for smooth systems on manifolds [Tak81, Theorem 1]. Let us recall its extension due to Sauer, Yorke and Casdagli [SYC91]. In their setting it is assumed that the perturbation can be taken as

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37C45 (Dimension theory of dynamical systems), 28A78 (Hausdorff and packing measures), 28A80 (Fractals).

Key words and phrases. Takens delay embedding theorem, probabilistic embedding, Hausdorff dimension, box-counting dimension.

a polynomial of degree high enough. It turns out that the number k of measurements per initial point x must be greater than twice the upper box-counting dimension of the phase space X (denoted by $\overline{\dim}_B(X)$; for its definition see Section 2). The following formulation is a special case of [Rob11, Theorem 14.5].

Theorem 1.1. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a compact set and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be Lipschitz and injective. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2\overline{\dim}_B(X) < k$ and $2\overline{\dim}_B(\{x \in X : T^p x = x\}) < p$ for every $p = 1, \dots, k-1$. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function and let $h_1, \dots, h_m : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a basis of degree $2k$ polynomials. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denote by $h_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the transformation*

$$h_\alpha(x) = h(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j h_j(x).$$

Under the above assumptions, the transformation

$$X \ni x \mapsto \phi_\alpha^T(x) = (h_\alpha(x), h_\alpha(Tx), \dots, h_\alpha(T^{k-1}x)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

is injective on X for Lebesgue almost every $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

The map ϕ_α^T is called the *delay-coordinate map*. Note that the above theorem applies to any compact set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, not necessarily a manifold. This is a desirable feature, as it can be of interest to consider sets with a complicated geometrical structure (such as fractal sets arising as attractors in chaotic dynamical systems, see e.g. [ER85]). Moreover, the upper box-counting dimension of X can be strictly smaller than the dimension of any smooth manifold containing it, hence Theorem 1.1 requires fewer measurements than its smooth counterpart from [Tak81].

As it was alluded to above, the experimentalist may only perform a finite number of observations of the form $(h(T^i x_j))_{i=0}^k$, for some $x_1, \dots, x_L \in X$. We believe it is realistic to assume there is an (explicit or implicit) *random* process which governs which initial states x_i are accessible to the experimentalist. Thus in this work we are interested in the question of reconstruction in the presence of such a process. This corresponds to fixing a probability measure μ on X and asking whether the delay-coordinate map ϕ_α^T is injective *almost surely* with respect to μ . Since in this setting we are allowed to neglect sets of probability zero, it is reasonable to ask if a smaller number of measurements than $2 \dim(X)$ is sufficient for the reconstruction of the system. Our main result states that indeed this is the case and the number of measurements can be reduced by half for *any* (Borel) probability measure. The following theorem is a simplified version of Theorem 4.3. For full version and proof see Section 4. Let $\dim_H(\cdot)$ denote the Hausdorff dimension and let $\underline{\dim}_B(X)$ denote the lower box-counting dimension (for definitions see Section 2). In the following theorem, which is the main result of the paper, one may replace $\dim(\cdot)$ by any one of $\dim_H(\cdot)$, $\underline{\dim}_B(X)$, $\overline{\dim}_B(X)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Borel set, let μ be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R}^N such that $\mu(X) = 1$ and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be Lipschitz and injective. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\dim(X) < k$ and $\dim(\{x \in X : T^p x = x\}) < p$ for every $p = 1, \dots, k-1$. Let $h_1, \dots, h_m : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a basis of degree $2k$ polynomials. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz*

function. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denote by $h_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the transformation

$$h_\alpha(x) = h(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j h_j(x).$$

Under the above assumptions, for Lebesgue almost every $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ there exists a Borel set $X_\alpha \subset X$ such that $\mu(X_\alpha) = 1$ and the transformation

$$X \ni x \mapsto \phi_\alpha^T(x) = (h_\alpha(x), h_\alpha(Tx), \dots, h_\alpha(T^{k-1}x)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

is injective on X_α .

Recall the the following inequalities for any Borel set X :

$$(1.1) \quad \dim_H(X) \leq \underline{\dim}_B(X) \leq \overline{\dim}_B(X).$$

Since the inequalities in (1.1) may be strict, using the Hausdorff dimension instead of the box-counting dimension(s) may reduce the required number of measurements.

It is an interesting question whether sufficiency of $k > \dim(X)$ observations (instead of $k > 2 \dim(X)$) for the (almost sure) recovery of the underlying system has been noticed experimentally.

Takens type theorems can be seen as dynamical versions of *embedding* theorems. Indeed, under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, the delay-observation map ϕ_α^T is (for a typical α) an embedding of X into \mathbb{R}^k . Embedding theorems in various categories have been studied extensively (see Section 3 for more detailed discussion). Recently, Alberti, Bölcskei, De Lellis, Koliander and Riegler proved a probabilistic embedding theorem involving the modified lower box-counting dimension [ABDL⁺18, Theorem II.1]. We are able to improve upon this result by considering the Hausdorff dimension. The following theorem is a simplified version of Theorem 3.2 and can be seen as non-dynamical counterpart of Theorem 1.2. For full version and proof see Section 3.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Borel set and let μ be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R}^N such that $\mu(X) = 1$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $k > \dim_H(X)$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be a Lipschitz function. Then for Lebesgue almost every linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ there exists a Borel set $X_L \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\mu(X_L) = 1$ and $\phi_L = \phi + L$ is injective on X_L .*

Organization of the paper The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce notation, definitions and preliminary results. Section 3 contains the proof of the probabilistic embedding theorem involving Hausdorff dimension (Theorem 3.2) and Section 4 contains the proof of the probabilistic Takens theorem (Theorem 4.3).

Acknowledgements We are grateful to Erwin Riegler for helpful discussions. Y. G. and A. Ś. were partially supported by the National Science Center(Poland) grant 2016/22/E/ST1/00448.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Consider the space \mathbb{R}^N for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, with the standard (Euclidean) norm $\|\cdot\|$. The open δ -ball around a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is denoted by $B_N(x, \delta)$. By $|A|$ we will denote the diameter of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. For $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $s > 0$, the s -**dimensional (outer) Hausdorff measure** of A is given as

$$\mathcal{H}^s(A) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |A_i|^s : A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i, |A_i| \leq \delta \right\}.$$

The **Hausdorff dimension** of a set A is given as

$$\dim_H(A) = \inf\{s > 0 : \mathcal{H}^s(A) = 0\} = \sup\{s > 0 : \mathcal{H}^s(A) = \infty\}.$$

For $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $N(A, \varepsilon)$ denote the minimal number of balls of diameter at most ε required to cover A . The **lower and upper box-counting (Minkowski) dimensions** of A are defined as

$$\underline{\dim}_B(A) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N(A, \varepsilon)}{\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\dim}_B(A) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N(A, \varepsilon)}{\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}.$$

The **lower and upper modified box-counting dimensions** of A are defined as

$$\underline{\dim}_{MB}(A) = \inf \left\{ \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \underline{\dim}_B(K_i) : A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} K_i, K_i \text{ compact} \right\},$$

$$\overline{\dim}_{MB}(A) = \inf \left\{ \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\dim}_B(K_i) : A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} K_i, K_i \text{ compact} \right\}.$$

With this notation, the following inequalities hold:

$$(2.1) \quad \dim_H(A) \leq \underline{\dim}_{MB}(A) \leq \overline{\dim}_{MB}(A) \leq \overline{\dim}_B(A)$$

and

$$\dim_H(A) \leq \underline{\dim}_{MB}(A) \leq \underline{\dim}_B(A) \leq \overline{\dim}_B(A).$$

For more on the dimension theory in Euclidean spaces see [Fal04, Mat95, Rob11]. To verify the measurability of the sets occurring in subsequent proofs, we will use two elementary lemmas. Recall that a σ -compact set is a countable union of compact sets.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Borel set and let μ be a finite Borel measure on X . Then there exists a σ -compact set $K \subset X$ such that $\mu(K) = \mu(X)$.*

Proof. Follows directly from the fact that a Borel measure in \mathbb{R}^N is regular (see e.g. [Bil99, Theorem 1.1]). \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{A} be metric spaces and let $\pi_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a projection given by $\pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x, a) = x$. Then the following hold.*

- If $K \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$ is σ -compact, then so is $\pi_{\mathcal{X}}(K)$. In particular, $\pi_{\mathcal{X}}(K)$ is Borel,
- If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{A} are σ -compact and $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is continuous, then the set

$$\{(x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} : \exists_{y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}} f(x, a) = f(y, a)\}$$

is σ -compact and hence Borel.

Proof. The first part follows from the fact that $\pi_{\mathcal{X}}$ is continuous, and a continuous image of a compact set is also compact. To show the second part, let $\pi_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$ denote the projection $\pi_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}}(x, a, y) = (x, a)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(x, a) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} : \exists_{y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}} f(x, a) = f(y, a)\} \\ &= \pi_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}} \left(\{(x, a, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} : f(x, a) = f(y, a)\} \cap ((\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X}) \setminus \Delta) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta = \{(x, a, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} : x = y\}$. By the first part of the lemma, it suffices to prove that the sets $\{(x, a, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} : f(x, a) = f(y, a)\}$ and $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X}) \setminus \Delta$ are σ -compact. The first one is σ -compact as a closed subset of the σ -compact space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X}$. For the second one observe that

$$(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X}) \setminus \Delta = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ (x, a, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} : d(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{n} \right\},$$

where d is the metric on \mathcal{X} . It is enough to note that each set $\{(x, a, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{X} : d(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{n}\}$ is σ -compact as a closed subset of a σ -compact space. \square

3. A PROBABILISTIC EMBEDDING THEOREM INVOLVING HAUSDORFF DIMENSION

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let E_k^N be the space of all linear transformations $L : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ given by $Lx = (\langle l_1, x \rangle, \dots, \langle l_k, x \rangle)$, where $l_1, \dots, l_k \in \overline{B_N}(0, 1)$. Obviously, the space E_k^N can be identified with $(\overline{B_N}(0, 1))^k$. With this identification, let η_k be the probability measure on E_k^N given by $\eta_k = \bigotimes_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{\kappa} \text{Leb}|_{\overline{B_N}(0, 1)}$, where Leb is the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R}^N and $\kappa = \text{Leb}(\overline{B_N}(0, 1))$. With this notation, we have the following geometrical inequality. It is the key ingredient of the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Lemma 3.1. [Rob11, Lemma 4.1] *For any $z \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\eta_k(\{L \in E_k^N : \|Lx + z\| \leq \varepsilon\}) \leq cN^{k/2} \frac{\varepsilon^k}{\|x\|^k},$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Borel set such that $\mathcal{H}^k(X) = 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let μ be a Borel probability measure on X and let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be a Lipschitz transformation. Then for η_k -almost every $L \in E_k^N$ there exists a Borel set $X_L \subset X$ such that $\mu(X_L) = 1$ and the map $\phi_L = \phi + L$ is injective on X_L .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, we can assume that X is σ -compact. Set

$$A = \{(x, L) \in X \times E_k^N : \exists_{y \in X \setminus \{x\}} \phi_L(x) = \phi_L(y)\}.$$

By Lemma 2.2, A is Borel. For $x \in X$ and $L \in E_k^N$, denote by A_x and A^L , respectively, the sections

$$A_x = \{L \in E_k^N : (x, L) \in A\}, \quad A^L = \{x \in X : (x, L) \in A\}.$$

The sets A_x and A^L are Borel as sections of a Borel set. Observe first, that in order to prove the theorem it is enough to show that $\eta_k(A_x) = 0$ for every $x \in X$, since then by Fubini's Theorem, $\eta_k \otimes \mu(A) = 0$ and, consequently, $\mu(A^L) = 0$ for η_k -almost every $L \in E_k^N$. Since ϕ_L is injective on $X \setminus A^L$, we obtain the desired result.

To show $\eta_k(A_x) = 0$ for a point $x \in X$, it suffices to prove

$$\eta_k(\{L \in E_k^N : \exists_{y \in K_\delta} \phi_L(x) = \phi_L(y)\}) = 0$$

for every $\delta > 0$, where $K_\delta = \{y \in X : \|x - y\| \geq \delta\}$. Take $\delta > 0$ and fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\mathcal{H}^k(K_\delta) \leq \mathcal{H}^k(X) = 0$, there exists a collection of balls $B_N(y_i, \varepsilon_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, for some $y_i \in K_\delta$, $\varepsilon_i > 0$, such that

$$(3.1) \quad K_\delta \subset \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B_N(y_i, \varepsilon_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_i^k \leq \varepsilon.$$

Assume now that $L \in E_k^N$ is such that there exists $y \in K_\delta$ with $\phi_L(x) = \phi_L(y)$. Then $y \in B_N(y_i, \varepsilon_i)$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\|L(y_i - x) + \phi(y_i) - \phi(x)\| = \|\phi_L(y_i) - \phi_L(x)\| = \|\phi_L(y_i) - \phi_L(y)\| \leq M\varepsilon_i,$$

where $M = \sup\{\text{Lip}(\phi_L) : L \in E_k^N\}$ and Lip denotes the Lipschitz constant of a transformation. Note that M is finite, since ϕ is Lipschitz and E_k^N is compact in the operator norm. This shows that

$$\{L \in E_k^N : \exists_{y \in K_\delta} \phi_L x = \phi_L y\} \subset \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \{L \in E : \|L(y_i - x) + \phi(y_i) - \phi(x)\| \leq M\varepsilon_i\}.$$

By Lemma 3.1 and (3.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_k(\{L \in E_k^N : \exists_{y \in K_\delta} \phi_L(x) = \phi_L(y)\}) &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k(\{L \in E : \|L(y_i - x) + \phi(y_i) - \phi(x)\| \leq M\varepsilon_i\}) \\ &\leq cN^{k/2} \frac{M^k}{\delta^k} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_i^k \leq \varepsilon cN^{k/2} \frac{M^k}{\delta^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we obtain $\eta_k(\{L \in E : \exists_{y \in K_\delta} \phi_L(x) = \phi_L(y)\}) = 0$. \square

Remark 3.3. Note that the assumption $\mathcal{H}^k(X) = 0$ is fulfilled if $\dim_H(X) < k$, so Theorem 3.2 is indeed a Hausdorff dimension embedding theorem. However, it may happen that $\mathcal{H}^k(X) = 0$ and $\dim_H(X) = k$.

A similar result to Theorem 3.2 was obtained recently in [ABDL⁺18]. The authors introduced the notion of the **description complexity** of a Borel probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^N , defined as

$$K(\mu) = \inf\{\dim_{MB}(X) : X \subset \mathbb{R}^N, X \text{ is Borel}, \mu(X) = 1\}$$

and proved an embedding theorem in its terms:

Theorem 3.4. [ABDL⁺18, Theorem II.1] *Let μ be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R}^N . Let $k \in N$ be such that $k > K(\mu)$. Then for Lebesgue almost every linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ there exists a Borel set $X_L \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\mu(X_L) = 1$ and L is injective on X_L .*

In particular, the above theorem holds if there exists a Borel set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\underline{\dim}_B(X) < k$ and $\mu(X) = 1$. Note that (2.1) implies that Theorem 3.2 is stronger than Theorem 3.4.

Non-probabilistic embedding theorems were first obtained in topological and smooth categories. Menger-Nöbeling embedding theorem ([HW41, Theorem V.2]) states that for a compact metric space X with Lebesgue covering dimension at most n , a generic continuous transformation $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$ is injective (and hence a homeomorphism between X and $\phi(X)$). The dimension $2n + 1$ is known to be optimal. Generic means here that the set of injective transformations $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$ is a dense G_δ subset of $C(X; \mathbb{R}^{2n+1})$ endowed with the supremum metric. The corresponding result in the category of smooth manifolds is the Whitney embedding theorem ([Whi36]): for a given n -dimensional C^r -manifold M , a generic C^r transformation from M to \mathbb{R}^{2n+1} is a C^r embedding (i.e. an injective immersion of class C^r). Let us compare Theorem 3.2 to non-probabilistic embedding theorems for box-counting dimension. One of the first results in this direction was a theorem of Mañé [Mn81, Lemma 1.1]. We present a formulation following [SYC91, Theorem 4.6] and [Rob11, Theorem 6.2] (originally, Mañé proved that topologically generic linear transformation is injective on X).

Theorem 3.5. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a compact set. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $k > \overline{\dim}_B X$ or $k > \dim_H(X - X)$. Then Lebesgue almost every linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is injective on X .*

Remark 3.6. As noticed by Mañé and communicated in [ER85, p. 627], his original statement in [Mn81] is incorrect. Namely, he assumed $k > 2\dim_H(X) + 1$ instead of $k > \dim_H(X - X)$. This is however known to be insufficient for the existence of a linear embedding of X into \mathbb{R}^k . [SYC91, Appendix A] contains an example due to Kan of a set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\dim_H(X) = 0$ and such that any linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ fails to be injective on X . It turns out that the assumption $k > 2\dim_H(X)$ is insufficient, while $k > \overline{\dim}_B(X)$ is sufficient. This stems from the fact that the proof of Theorem 3.5 requires working with the set $X - X$ rather than X . The property required for the proof is indeed $k > \dim_H(X - X)$. The upper box-counting dimension satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad \overline{\dim}_B(A \times B) \leq \overline{\dim}_B(A) + \overline{\dim}_B(B),$$

hence

$$\dim_H(X - X) \leq \dim_H(X \times X) \leq \overline{\dim}_B(X \times X) \leq 2\overline{\dim}_B X$$

(note that this calculation shows that $k > 2\overline{\dim}_B X$ is a stronger assumption than $k > \dim_H(X - X)$). On the other hand (3.2) does not hold for the Hausdorff dimension (nor for the lower box-counting dimension), hence $\dim_H(X)$ does not control $\dim_H(X - X)$. The fact that we can work with the Hausdorff dimension in Theorem 3.2 comes from applying Fubini's theorem: after doing so it suffices to consider covers of the set X instead of $X - X$.

Theorem 3.5 is also true for subsets of a general Banach space \mathfrak{B} for a prevalent set of linear transformations $L : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ (see [Rob11, Chapter 6] for details).

Note that it is not true, that a linear embedding from Theorem 3.2 preserves the dimension of X . Indeed, the Hausdorff dimension and box-counting dimensions are invariants for bi-Lipschitz transformations, yet inverse of a linear transformation on a compact set does not have to be Lipschitz. Therefore, we are only guaranteed that $\dim(\phi_L(X)) \leq \dim(X)$ (see [Rob11, Proposition 2.8.iv and Lemma 3.3.iv]) and the inequality can be strict. For an example, let $\phi \equiv 0$ and let $X = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in [0, 1]\}$ be a graph of a (Hölder continuous) function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\dim_H(X) > 1$. Then the linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $L(x, y) = x$ satisfies $1 = \dim(L(X)) < \dim_H(X)$. It turns out that in the non-probabilistic setting, one can obtain α -Hölder continuity of the inverse map for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ small enough (see [BAEFN93, EFNT94, HK99] and [Rob11, Chapter 4]):

Theorem 3.7. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a compact set. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $k > 2\overline{\dim}_B X$ and let α be such that $0 < \alpha < 1 - \frac{2\overline{\dim}_B(X)}{k}$. Then Lebesgue almost every linear transformation $L : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is injective on X with α -Hölder continuous inverse.*

This is however not true in the case of Theorem 3.2:

Remark 3.8. We cannot claim that in general $\phi_L|_{X_L}$ in addition to being injective has a Hölder continuous inverse. If that would be the case, then we can extend $f = \phi_L^{-1}$ from $\phi_L(X_L)$ to \mathbb{R}^k preserving the Hölder continuity ([Ban51, Theorem IV.7.5], see also [Min70]). Then $Y = \{x \in X : f \circ \phi_L(x) = x\}$ is a closed subset of X with $\mu(Y) = 1$, hence $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset Y$. For a compact X , if $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$ (each compact set supports a probability measure of full support), then $f \circ \phi_L(x) = x$ for every $x \in X$ and ϕ_L is a homeomorphism between X and $\phi_L(X) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. It is well known that there are examples of compact sets $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ which do not embed topologically into $\mathbb{R}^{\dim_H(X)+1}$ (take any example showing the optimality of the bounds in the Menger-Nöbling theorem [HW41, Theorem V.2] and such that its topological dimension is equal to the Hausdorff dimension).

4. A PROBABILISTIC TAKENS THEOREM INVOLVING HAUSDORFF DIMENSION

In this section we present the proof of the probabilistic Takens theorem. It turns out that linear perturbations are insufficient for Takens type theorems (Remark 4.5). As observed in [SYC91], one can take perturbations from the space of polynomials of degree $2k$. This can be easily extended to more general families of functions.

Definition 4.1. A family of locally Lipschitz transformations $h_1, \dots, h_m : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a **k -interpolating family** if for every collection of distinct points $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and every vector $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ there exists a vector $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j h_j(x_l) = \xi_l$ for each $l = 1, \dots, k$. In other words, the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} h_1(x_1) & \dots & h_m(x_1) \\ h_1(x_2) & \dots & h_m(x_2) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_1(x_k) & \dots & h_m(x_k) \end{bmatrix}$$

is of full rank as a transformation from \mathbb{R}^m to \mathbb{R}^k . Note that it follows that the same is true for any collection of q distinct points with $q \leq k$.

Note that any basis h_1, \dots, h_m of degree at most k polynomials on \mathbb{R}^N is a k -interpolating family. For a matrix A denote by $\sigma_k(A)$ its k -th largest singular value (eigenvalue of the matrix A^*A). Instead of Lemma 3.1 we will use the following one.

Lemma 4.2. [Rob11, Lemma 14.3] *Let $A : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be a linear map. Let $r \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and assume that $\sigma_r(A) > 0$. Then for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$*

$$\frac{\text{Leb}(\{\alpha \in B_m(0, \rho) : \|A\alpha + z\| \leq \varepsilon\})}{\text{Leb}(B_m(0, \rho))} \leq C_{m,k} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma_r \rho}\right)^r.$$

For a transformation $T : X \rightarrow X$ define

$$\text{Per}_p(T) = \{x \in X : T^p x = x\} \text{ and } H_p(T) = \text{Per}_p(T) \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{p-1} \text{Per}_n(T).$$

Define also the **grand orbit** of $x \in X$ as

$$\text{Orb}(x) = \{T^n x : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{y \in X : \exists_{n \geq 0} T^n y = x\}.$$

Note that if T is injective, then $\text{Orb}(x)$ is countable any two grand orbits $\text{Orb}(x)$ and $\text{Orb}(y)$ are either equal or disjoint.

Let μ and ν be measures on a measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$. μ is called **singular** with respect to ν if there exist a measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{X} \setminus A) = \nu(A) = 0$. We denote this fact by $\mu \perp \nu$. By $\mu|_A$ we denote the restriction of μ to the set $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a Borel set, let μ be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R}^N such that $\mu(X) = 1$ and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be Lipschitz and injective. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\mathcal{H}^k(X) = 0$ and $\mu|_{H_p(T)} \perp \mathcal{H}^p$ for every $p = 1, \dots, k-1$. Let $h_1, \dots, h_m : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a $2k$ -interpolating family. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denote by $h_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the transformation*

$$h_\alpha(x) = h(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j h_j(x).$$

Under the above assumptions, for Lebesgue almost every $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in B_m(0, 1)$ there exists a Borel set $X_\alpha \subset X$ such that $\mu(X_\alpha) = 1$ and the transformation

$$X \ni x \mapsto \phi_\alpha^T(x) = (h_\alpha(x), h_\alpha(Tx), \dots, h_\alpha(T^{k-1}x)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

is injective on X_α .

Proof. We proceed similarly as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, but instead of Lemma 3.1 we will use Lemma 4.2 together with suitable rank estimates (see Claim below). Let $\eta_m = \frac{1}{\kappa} \text{Leb}|_{B_m(0,1)}$, where $\kappa = \text{Leb}(B_m(0, 1))$. Applying Lemma 2.1, to the (possibly zero) measures $\mu|_{H_p(T)}$, we conclude that there exist disjoint σ -compact sets $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{k-1} \subset X$ such that

$$X_p \subset H_p(T), \quad \mu(X_p) = \mu(H_p(T)) \text{ and } \mathcal{H}^p(X_p) = 0 \text{ for } p = 1, \dots, k-1, .$$

Similarly, there exists a σ -compact set $X_k \subset X \setminus \bigcup_{p=1}^{k-1} H_p(T)$ such that

$$\mu(X_k) = \mu(X \setminus \bigcup_{p=1}^{k-1} H_p(T)) \text{ and } \mathcal{H}^k(X_k) = 0.$$

Let $X_\mu = \bigcup_{i=1}^k X_k$. Then $X_\mu \subset X$ is a σ -compact set with $\mu(X_\mu) = 1$. Define the set

$$A = \{(x, \alpha) \in X_\mu \times B_m(0, 1) : \exists_{y \in X_\mu \setminus \{x\}} \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\}.$$

It is Borel by Lemma 2.2. For $x \in X_\mu$ and $\alpha \in B_m(0, 1)$, denote by A_x and A_α the Borel sections

$$A_x = \{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \exists_{y \in X_\mu \setminus \{x\}} \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\}, \quad A_\alpha = \{x \in X_\mu : \exists_{y \in X_\mu \setminus \{x\}} \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\}.$$

Observe first, that it is enough to prove $\eta_m(A_x) = 0$ for μ -a.e $x \in X_\mu$, since then by Fubini $\eta_m \otimes \mu(A) = 0$ and consequently $\mu(A_\alpha) = 0$ for η_m -a.e. $\alpha \in B_m(0, 1)$. Since ϕ_α^T is injective on $X_\mu \setminus A_\alpha$, we obtain the desired result.

For $x, y \in X$ define the following matrix $D_{x,y} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$

$$D_{x,y} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1(x) - h_1(y) & h_2(x) - h_2(y) & \dots & h_m(x) - h_m(y) \\ h_1(Tx) - h_1(Ty) & h_2(Tx) - h_2(Ty) & \dots & h_m(Tx) - h_m(Ty) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ h_1(T^{k-1}x) - h_1(T^{k-1}y) & h_2(T^{k-1}x) - h_2(T^{k-1}y) & \dots & h_m(T^{k-1}x) - h_m(T^{k-1}y) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that

$$(4.1) \quad \phi_\alpha^T(x) - \phi_\alpha^T(y) = D_{x,y}\alpha + w_{x,y}, \text{ where } w_{x,y} = \begin{bmatrix} h(x) - h(y) \\ \vdots \\ h(T^{k-1}x) - h(T^{k-1}y) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^k.$$

Fix $x \in X_\mu$. We begin the proof of $\eta_m(A_x) = 0$ by making the following claim:

Claim: For $x, y \in X$, $x \neq y$ we have $\text{rank}(D_{x,y}) \geq 1$ and moreover

- (i) if $y \notin \text{Orb}(x)$ and $y \notin \bigcup_{p=1}^{k-1} H_p(T)$, then $\text{rank}(D_{x,y}) \geq k$,
- (ii) if $y \notin \text{Orb}(x)$ and $y \in H_p(T)$ for some $p \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, then $\text{rank}(D_{x,y}) \geq p$.

Before proving the above claim, let us demonstrate how it implies the theorem. Decompose

$$A_x = A_{\text{orb}} \cup \bigcup_{p=1}^k A_p,$$

where

$$A_{\text{orb}} = \{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \exists_{y \in (X_\mu \cap \text{Orb}(x)) \setminus \{x\}} \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\},$$

$$A_p = \{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \exists_{y \in X_p \setminus \{x\}} \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\}, \quad p = 1, \dots, k.$$

A_{orb} is Borel as

$$(4.2) \quad A_{\text{orb}} = \bigcup_{y \in (X_\mu \cap \text{Orb}(x)) \setminus \{x\}} \{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\}$$

and the union is at most countable (by injectivity of T). A_p are Borel by Lemma 2.2. It is enough to show that each of these sets have measure η_m zero. For $\eta_m(A_{\text{orb}}) = 0$ observe that since the sum in (4.2) is at most countable, it is enough to show that for a fixed $y \neq x$ we have $\eta_m(\{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\}) = 0$. By (4.1) we have

$$\{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\} = \{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : D_{x,y}\alpha = -w_{x,y}\}.$$

By the Claim $\text{rank}(D_{x,y}) \geq 1$, hence the above set is a subset of an affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^m with codimension at least 1. Consequently, it is of Lebesgue measure zero. For A_p fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define

$$X_{p,n} = (X_p \setminus \{x\}) \cap \{y \in X : \sigma_p(D_{x,y}) \geq \frac{1}{n}\}, \quad p = 1, \dots, k.$$

$$A_{p,n} = \{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \exists_{y \in X_{p,n}} \phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)\}, \quad p = 1, \dots, k.$$

Sets $A_{p,n}$ are Borel by the Lemma 2.2 (we used here continuity of the singular value of a given order, see [GVL13, Corollary 8.6.2]). We have

$$A_p \setminus A_{\text{orb}} \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_{p,n} \setminus A_{\text{orb}}, \quad p = 1, \dots, k,$$

since by the Claim, every $y \in X_p \setminus \text{Orb}(x)$ satisfies $\text{rank}(D_{x,y}) \geq p$, hence $\sigma_p(D_{x,y}) > 0$. Consequently, it is enough to prove $\eta_m(A_{p,n} \setminus A_{\text{orb}}) = 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p = 1, \dots, k$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\mathcal{H}^p(X_{p,n} \setminus \text{Orb}(x)) \leq \mathcal{H}^p(X_p) = 0$, there exists a collection of balls $B_N(y_i, \varepsilon_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(4.3) \quad y_i \in X_{p,n} \setminus \text{Orb}(x) \text{ for each } i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad X_{p,n} \setminus \text{Orb}(x) \subset \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B_N(y_i, \varepsilon_i) \text{ and } \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \varepsilon_i^p \leq \varepsilon$$

Pick $\alpha \in A_{p,n} \setminus A_{\text{orb}}$ and let $y \in X_{p,n} \setminus \text{Orb}(x)$ be such that $\phi_\alpha^T(x) = \phi_\alpha^T(y)$. Then for y_i such that $y \in B(y_i, \varepsilon_i)$ we have

$$(4.4) \quad \|D_{x,y_i}\alpha + w_{x,y_i}\| = \|\phi_\alpha^T(x) - \phi_\alpha^T(y_i)\| = \|\phi_\alpha^T(y) - \phi_\alpha^T(y_i)\| \leq M\varepsilon_i,$$

where $M = \sup\{\text{Lip}(\phi_\alpha^T) : \alpha \in B_m(0, 1)\}$. M is finite, since $\phi, T, \dots, T^{k-1}, h_1, \dots, h_m$ are Lipschitz on X and α is taken from a bounded set. From (4.4) we have

$$A_{p,n} \setminus A_{\text{orb}} \subset \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \{\alpha \in B_m(0, 1) : \|D_{x,y_i}\alpha + w_{x,y_i}\| \leq M\varepsilon_i\}.$$

Since for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds $\sigma_p(D_{x,y_i}) \geq \frac{1}{n}$, we can apply Lemma 4.2 and (4.3) to obtain

$$\eta_m(A_{p,n} \setminus A_{\text{orb}}) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} C_{m,k} \frac{M^p \varepsilon_i^p}{\frac{1}{n^p}} \leq \varepsilon C_{m,k} M^p n^p.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $\eta_m(A_{p,n} \setminus A_{\text{orb}}) = 0$.

It remains to prove the Claim. For (i), it suffices to observe that, the first row of $D_{x,y}$ is non-zero as long as $x \neq y$ and therefore $\text{rank}(D_{x,y}) \geq 1$. Indeed, otherwise we would have $h_j(x) = h_j(y)$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$ what would contradict the fact that h_1, \dots, h_m is an interpolating family.

Let us assume now that $y \notin \text{Orb}(x)$. Then $\text{Orb}(y) \cap \text{Orb}(x) = \emptyset$, since T is injective. Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be the cardinality of the set $\{x, Tx, \dots, T^{k-1}x, y, Ty, \dots, T^{k-1}y\}$. Note that $1 \leq l \leq 2k$ and the upper inequality can be strict, as x or y may be periodic. Enumerate $\{x, Tx, \dots, T^{k-1}x, y, Ty, \dots, T^{k-1}y\} = \{z_1, \dots, z_l\}$ with z_1, \dots, z_l distinct. The matrix $D_{x,y}$ can be decomposed as

$$D_{x,y} = J_{x,y} V_{x,y}, \quad J_{x,y} : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k, \quad V_{x,y} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$$

where

$$V_{x,y} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1(z_1) & \dots & h_m(z_1) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ h_1(z_l) & \dots & h_m(z_l) \end{bmatrix}$$

and $J_{x,y}$ is a matrix whose all entries belong to $\{0, 1, -1\}$. Since z_1, \dots, z_l are distinct and h_1, \dots, h_m is a $2k$ -interpolating family, the matrix $V_{x,y}$ is of full rank, hence $\text{rank}(D_{x,y}) = \text{rank}(J_{x,y})$. Note that since orbits of x and y are distinct, matrices $J_{x,y}$ and $V_{x,y}$ can be always taken of the form $J_{x,y} = [J_1 \mid J_2]$, where J_1 consists only of 0's and 1's and J_2 consists only of 0's and -1 's. Assume first that $y \notin \bigcup_{p=1}^k H_p(T)$. Then we can take

$$V_{x,y} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1(x) & \dots & h_m(x) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ h_1(T^{q-1}x) & \dots & h_m(T^{q-1}x) \\ h_1(y) & \dots & h_m(y) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ h_1(T^{k-1}y) & \dots & h_m(T^{k-1}y) \end{bmatrix}, \quad J_{x,y} = [J_1 \mid -\text{Id}_{k \times k}],$$

where $q \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $J_1 : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ depend on the period of x and $\text{Id}_{k \times k}$ is the identity matrix. Clearly $\text{rank}(J_{x,y}) \geq k$ in this case. Similarly, assume that $y \in H_p(T)$, $1 \leq p \leq k$. Then we can take

$$V_{x,y} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1(x) & \dots & h_m(x) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ h_1(T^{q-1}x) & \dots & h_m(T^{q-1}x) \\ h_1(y) & \dots & h_m(y) \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ h_1(T^{p-1}y) & \dots & h_m(T^{p-1}y) \end{bmatrix}, \quad J_{x,y} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} J_1 & -\text{Id}_{p \times p} \\ \hline J_2 & J_3 \end{array} \right],$$

where again $q \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, J_1 and J_2 depend on the period of x . In this case we obtain $\text{rank}(J_{x,y}) \geq p$. \square

The original theorem of Takens states that given a finite dimensional C^2 manifold M , for a generic pair of C^2 diffeomorphism $T : M \rightarrow M$ and C^2 map $h : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the corresponding delay-coordinate map $\phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ given by $\phi(x) = (h(x), h(Tx), \dots, h(T^{k-1}x))$ is a C^2 embedding (i.e. an injective immersion) as long as $k > 2 \dim(M)$. It was followed by the box-counting dimension version of Sauer, Yorke and Casdagli (Theorem 1.1) and subsequently by the infinite-dimensional result of [Rob05] (see also [Rob11, Section 14.3]). See [NV18] for a version of Takens' theorem with a fixed observable and perturbation performed on the dynamics. Takens' theorem involving Lebesgue covering dimension on compact metric spaces and a continuous observable was given in [Gut16]. See [GQS18] for a detailed proof.

Having injectivity of ϕ_α^T in Theorem 4.3, it is natural to consider a model of the dynamical system (X, T) embedded in \mathbb{R}^k , i.e. the system $(\phi_\alpha^T(X_\alpha), \phi_\alpha^T \circ T \circ (\phi_\alpha^T)^{-1})$. However, in order for $\phi_\alpha^T \circ T \circ (\phi_\alpha^T)^{-1}$ to be well defined, the set X_α shall be T -invariant, i.e. satisfying $T(X_\alpha) \subset X_\alpha$. This does not have to be the case in general, yet it can be guaranteed as long as the measure μ is itself T -invariant:

Corollary 4.4. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, μ and $T : X \rightarrow X$ fulfil the assumptions of Theorem 4.3. If μ is additionally T -invariant (i.e. it satisfies $\mu(A) = \mu(T^{-1}A)$ for every Borel set $A \subset X$), then the sets X_α can be taken to be T -invariant, i.e. satisfying $T(X_\alpha) \subset X_\alpha$.*

Proof. The proof follows from the fact that every Borel set $A \subset X$ of a full measure has a T -invariant subset of full measure. Indeed, let $B = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} T^{-n}(X \setminus A)$. Then $\mu(B) = 0$ and it is easy to see that $A \setminus B$ is T -invariant. \square

Remark 4.5. It turns out that linear perturbations are not sufficient for Theorems 1.1 and 4.3, i.e. it may happen that $\phi_L = (\phi(x) + Lx, \dots, \phi(T^{k-1}x) + LT^{k-1}x)$ is not (almost surely) injective for generic linear map $L : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For an example, let $X = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|z\| \leq 1\}$. Fix $a \in (0, 1)$ and define $T : X \rightarrow X$ as

$$T(z) = az.$$

Then T is a Lipschitz injective transformation on the unit disc X with zero being the unique periodic point. We claim that there is no linear observable $L : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which makes the delay map injective, i.e. for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the transformation $x \mapsto \phi_v^T(x) = (\langle x, v \rangle, \langle Tx, v \rangle, \dots, \langle T^{k-1}x, v \rangle) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is not injective on X . This follows from the fact that for each one dimensional linear subspace $W \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ the set $W \cap X$ is T -invariant, hence $\phi_v^T = 0$ on an infinite set $\text{Ker}(\langle \cdot, v \rangle) \cap X$. For the probabilistic case, let μ be the Lebesgue measure on X . Note that for $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the segment $W_c = \{z \in X : \langle z, v \rangle = c\}$ satisfies $T(W_c) \subset W_{ac}$, hence all points on W_c will have the same observation vector $(\langle x, v \rangle, \langle Tx, v \rangle, \dots, \langle T^{k-1}x, v \rangle) = (c, ac, a^2c, \dots, a^{k-1}c)$. Hence the set $X_v \subset X$ on which ϕ_v^T is injective can only have one point on each of the parallel segments W_c contained in X , but such a set X_v cannot be of full measure. The above example can be easily modified to make T a homeomorphism.

REFERENCES

[ABDL⁺18] Giovanni Alberti, Helmut Bölcskei, Camillo De Lellis, Günther Koliander, and Erwin Riegler. Lossless analog compression. *Preprint. arxiv.org/abs/1803.06887*, 2018. 1, 3, 3.4

- [BAEFN93] A. Ben-Artzi, A. Eden, C. Foias, and B. Nicolaenko. Hölder continuity for the inverse of Mañé’s projection. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 178(1):22–29, 1993. 3
- [Ban51] Stefan Banach. *Wstęp do teorii funkcji rzeczywistych (Polish) [Introduction to the theory of real functions]*. Monografie Matematyczne. Tom XVII.]. Polskie Towarzystwo Matematyczne, Warszawa-Wrocław, 1951. 3.8
- [Bil99] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. 2
- [EFNT94] A. Eden, C. Foias, B. Nicolaenko, and R. Temam. *Exponential attractors for dissipative evolution equations*, volume 37 of *RAM: Research in Applied Mathematics*. Masson, Paris; John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1994. 3
- [ER85] J.-P. Eckmann and D. Ruelle. Ergodic theory of chaos and strange attractors. *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 57(3, part 1):617–656, 1985. 1, 3.6
- [Fal04] Kenneth Falconer. *Fractal geometry: mathematical foundations and applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004. 2
- [GQS18] Yonatan Gutman, Yixiao Qiao, and Gábor Szabó. The embedding problem in topological dynamics and Takens’ theorem. *Nonlinearity*, 31(2):597–620, 2018. 4
- [Gut16] Yonatan Gutman. Taken’s embedding theorem with a continuous observable. In *Ergodic theory*, pages 134–141. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2016. 4
- [GVL13] Gene H. Golub and Charles F. Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, fourth edition, 2013. 4
- [HGLS05] Chih-hao Hsieh, Sarah M Glaser, Andrew J Lucas, and George Sugihara. Distinguishing random environmental fluctuations from ecological catastrophes for the north pacific ocean. *Nature*, 435(7040):336–340, 2005. 1
- [HK99] Brian R. Hunt and Vadim Yu. Kaloshin. Regularity of embeddings of infinite-dimensional fractal sets into finite-dimensional spaces. *Nonlinearity*, 12(5):1263–1275, 1999. 3
- [HW41] Witold Hurewicz and Henry Wallman. *Dimension Theory*. Princeton Mathematical Series, v. 4. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1941. 3, 3.8
- [KY90] Eric J. Kostelich and James A. Yorke. Noise reduction: finding the simplest dynamical system consistent with the data. *Phys. D*, 41(2):183–196, 1990. 1
- [Mat95] Pertti Mattila. *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces*, volume 44 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. Fractals and rectifiability. 2
- [Min70] George J Minty. On the extension of Lipschitz, Lipschitz-Hölder continuous, and monotone functions. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 76(2):334–339, 1970. 3.8
- [Mn81] Ricardo Mañé. On the dimension of the compact invariant sets of certain nonlinear maps. In *Dynamical systems and turbulence, Warwick 1980 (Coventry, 1979/1980)*, volume 898 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 230–242. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981. 3, 3.6
- [NV18] Raymundo Navarrete and Divakar Viswanath. Prevalence of delay embeddings with a fixed observation function. *Preprint*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.07529>, 2018. 4
- [Rob05] James C. Robinson. A topological delay embedding theorem for infinite-dimensional dynamical systems. *Nonlinearity*, 18(5):2135–2143, 2005. 4
- [Rob11] James C. Robinson. *Dimensions, embeddings, and attractors*, volume 186 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. 1, 2, 3.1, 3, 3, 4.2, 4
- [SM90] George Sugihara and Robert May. Nonlinear forecasting as a way of distinguishing chaos from measurement error in time series, 1990. 1
- [SYC91] Tim Sauer, James A. Yorke, and Martin Casdagli. Embedology. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 65(3-4):579–616, 1991. 1, 3, 3.6, 4

- [Tak81] Floris Takens. Detecting strange attractors in turbulence. In *Dynamical systems and turbulence, Warwick 1980 (Coventry, 1979/1980)*, volume 898 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 366–381. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981. 1, 1
- [Whi36] Hassler Whitney. Differentiable manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 37(3):645–680, 1936. 3

K. BARAŃSKI: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW, UL. BANACHA 2, 02-097 WARSZAWA, POLAND

E-mail address: `baranski@mimuw.edu.pl`

Y. GUTMAN: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, UL. ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-656 WARSZAWA, POLAND

E-mail address: `y.gutman@impan.pl`

A. ŚPIEWAK: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW, UL. BANACHA 2, 02-097 WARSZAWA, POLAND

E-mail address: `a.spiewak@mimuw.edu.pl`