

Ergodicity in the linked twist map with oppositely oriented shears.

Aritro Pathak

July 18, 2023

Abstract

We reduce the earlier known optimal shear parameter for which ergodicity is established in the linked twist map with two linear shears in opposite sense, in the most general setting. Further, here we obtain ergodicity with possibly only one-fold twists in either lobe, while earlier results only applied for twist parameters at least 2. Almost hyperbolicity is easily established for shear parameters greater than 2, while in the most general setting of the linked twist map with both shears of equal magnitude, ergodicity was earlier established in the most general setting by Przytycki for shear parameters greater than 4.15 with at least two-fold twists in each lobe. Here we reduce this optimal shear parameter to 3.47 in the general setting. These techniques can be effected to make further improvements when additional assumptions are made on the dimensions of the strips or when the linked twist map is modified in other natural ways.

1 Introduction:

The linked twist map is a classical and well studied dynamical system that exhibits hyperbolic behavior, like the Arnold’s cat map or geodesic flow on a negative curvature surface; see [Spr08],[Prz83],[Bur80],[Woj80], [Dev78] and the references therein. We significantly extend earlier techniques of Przytycki based on Pesin theory for singularities as modified by Katok and Strelcyn, to extend the range of shear parameters for which ergodicity is established for the classical linked twist map in a general setting, with twists in the two lobes that are in opposite sense, while the twist parameters k, m defined below are any non-zero integers but of opposite sign. ⁽¹⁾

As we show below, hyperbolicity (or “almost hyperbolicity” in the language of [Prz83]) is achieved for all shear parameters $\alpha > 2$, and one typically expects ergodicity for the map to also be established for all $\alpha > 2$. This has not yet been shown to be true. Upon markedly extending the methods of [Prz83] for this setting, we extend the set of shear parameters for which ergodicity is established.

The methods established in [Prz83] using Pesin theory are canonical for the case where the two separate shearing tracks individually are homeomorphic to the set $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] / \sim$ where each point $(x, 0)$ is identified with $(x, 1)$ for each $x \in [0, 1]$. These two shearing tracks are then linked with each other. In other words, we have the case shown in the Fig. 1.

⁽¹⁾When the shears reinforce each other, the question has been dealt with by Burton and Easton [Bur80], as well as Wojtowski [Woj80]. Also see the Introduction of [Liv95] for a discussion of this situation.




Figure 1: The linked twist map shown in the figure. The horizontal track is the region $H = \{(0 \leq x \leq 1) \times (y_0 \leq y \leq y_1)\}$, the vertical track is the region $V = \{(x_0 \leq x \leq x_1) \times (0 \leq y \leq 1)\}$. The map is linked on the central square region S , by the shear map F on H and a vertical shear map G on V . The points A, B, C, D delimit the central square S . The pairs $(P, P'), (Q, Q'), (R, R'), (S, S')$ are identified and thus the segments $PQ, P'Q'$ are identified together and so are the segments $SR, S'R'$. The shear on the horizontal strip is denoted by F and that on the vertical strip is denoted by G , although the underlying map is the same. The picture on the right shows the local shears near the boundary in the central square region S .

The dynamics can then be described as a product of two successive shears, one horizontally which we term as F , and the other vertical shear which we call G , so that the map becomes, with $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$, in the domain $H = \{(x, y) : x \in [0, 1], y \in [y_0, y_1]\}$ for F and the domain $V = \{(x, y) : x \in [x_0, x_1], y \in [0, 1]\}$ for G :

$$\mathbf{F} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y - y_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y - y_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{G} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x - x_0 \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\beta & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x - x_0 \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

The map \mathbf{F} is the identity when $y \in [0, 1], y \notin [y_0, y_1]$ and G is the identity when $x \in [0, 1], x \notin [x_0, x_1]$. Further, we take the $\alpha(y_1 - y_0) = k$ and $\beta(x_1 - x_0) = m$ for some integers k, m . Following [Prz83], we call the maps \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G} respectively (k, α) and (m, β) twists.

We call the product $\Phi = \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}$. All the maps $\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}, \Phi$ preserve Lebesgue measure on $H \cup V$.

While we only deal with the linear case, the methods present here can approximate the case where:

$$\mathbf{F}(x, y) = (x + f(y), y) \text{ for } (x, y) \in H, \quad \mathbf{G}(x, y) = (x, y + g(x)), \text{ for } (x, y) \in V,$$

with $f : [y_0, y_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, g : [x_0, x_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ both C^2 functions with $f(y_0) = g(x_0) = 0, f(y_1) = k, g(x_1) = m$, with

$$\frac{df}{dy} \neq 0, \text{ and } \frac{dg}{dx} \neq 0,$$

for every $y \in [y_0, y_1]$ and $x \in [x_0, x_1]$. In this case one can define corresponding α and β parameters as one of the extremum values taken by these derivatives of f and g on these closed intervals. For convenience, we only deal with the linear case, but the essential dynamics in the above case is also the same.

In ongoing work,[Pat22] a flow arising after a Dehn-type surgery on the unit tangent bundle of a genus two surface $\mathbb{S}M$ is constructed, where the original flow prior to surgery consists of a simple periodic flow along each of the fibers of the unit tangent bundle, and upon a Dehn surgery along an annulus around a curve C on $\mathbb{S}M$ where C projects to a closed self intersecting geodesic on M , we can project the flow to a linked twist map where the identification of the boundaries is such that the right edge of the horizontal track is identified with the top edge of the vertical track, and the bottom edge of the vertical track is identified with the left edge of the horizontal track. Here we have shears that are uniform C^0 at the boundary, and we have to modify the arguments of the original setting of [Prz83] because of this altered boundary identification.⁽²⁾

In this paper, we deal only with the well-studied canonical boundary identifications of the linked twist map as in Fig. 1, and improve the value of the critical parameter α_0 so that ergodicity is established, in this most general setting, for all $\alpha > \alpha_0$.⁽³⁾

Theorem 1. *Consider a linked twist map $\Phi = \mathbf{G} \circ \mathbf{F}$ composed of a (k, α) horizontal twist denoted by F and a (m, β) vertical twist denoted by G , where k and m are any non-zero integers which have opposite signs, and $\alpha\beta \geq 12.04$, then Φ is ergodic.*

Henceforth, we deal with the case where $\alpha = \beta$, without loss of generality, and our critical parameter $\alpha_0 = 3.47$.

Our method establishes ergodicity; we are not able to establish the Bernoulli property for this reduced critical parameter. However, we are able to remove the restriction in the hypothesis of [Prz83] that $|k|, |m| \geq 2$.

For the case of shears having opposite signs, and where $\alpha\beta > 4$, we get hyperbolicity for the map Φ .

$$D\Phi = D\mathbf{G} \circ D\mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\beta & 1 \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ -\beta & 1 - \alpha\beta \end{pmatrix}$$

In this case, the eigenvalues are:

$$\frac{(2 - \alpha\beta) \pm \sqrt{(\alpha\beta)^2 - 4\alpha\beta}}{2},$$

which shows hyperbolicity is achieved for $\alpha\beta > 4$.

Without loss of generality, we can take the shears in the two lobes to be of equal magnitude, i.e. $|\alpha| = |\beta|$, since otherwise, we can rescale one of the two variables by a factor of $\sqrt{\alpha/\beta}$ so that in the subsequent analysis, the shears in both the lobes are of magnitude $\sqrt{\alpha\beta}$ and of opposing signs.⁽⁴⁾

⁽²⁾See [Fou13],[Fou21] for some background information on this question.

⁽³⁾A similar analysis could be done for the case of maps linked several times, or where the identifications of the boundary are as in the Dehn-surgered problem in the upcoming manuscript [Pat22], by adopting and extending the same idea used here.

⁽⁴⁾While effecting this change of variables, the product $\alpha\beta$ remains constant and so does the eigenvalues and eigenvectors above.

In case both the shear parameters are of the same magnitude $|\alpha| = |\beta|$, the statement of the theorem reduces to saying that the above critical parameter is $\sqrt{12.04} = 3.47$. Henceforth we make this assumption of the two shears having the same magnitude.

As noted in [Prz83], the expanding eigenvector (ξ_1, ξ_2) satisfies:

$$\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} = -\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)^2 - 1},$$

and henceforth, we call this number L_α . As explained in the next section, the line in \mathbb{R}^2 with slope $1/L_\alpha$, and the vertical line, together delimit the vertical cone under consideration.

In several places it can be seen why the critical value for the optimal shear of 3.47 is around the best possible with our refinements. We refer the reader to Figure 5. Here it would be enough to require $|\overline{JA}|$ to be around $(2/3)l_v(\gamma)$ and also $\alpha \gtrsim 3.3$: in this case $|\overline{BE}|$ is either at least $l_v(\gamma)$ and we are done, and otherwise $|\overline{EF}| = |L_\alpha||\overline{BE}| \lesssim (1/3)l_v(\gamma)$ and then $|\overline{FP}| \geq |\overline{JA}| - |\overline{EF}| \gtrsim (1/3)l_v(\gamma)$. In this case we have the possibility of having $|\overline{GK}| \approx (1/3)l_v(\gamma)(3.3 - 0.3) \approx l_v(\gamma)$ or the segment gets cut off by the upper edge of S , and our argument continues. The same argument holds for the segments that enter S while being cut-off by the right edge of S as well and further on similar considerations apply in the analysis for Figure 8.

2 Proof of Theorem 1:

We use Pesin theory for maps having singularities. For reference, check the Appendix of [Prz83], and [Kat06]. Note that Lebesgue almost every point of S returns to S with positive frequency. We need to verify for all such points $x, y \in S$, given the local unstable manifold $\gamma^u(x)$ through x and the local stable manifold $\gamma^s(y)$ through y , that there exist integers m, n large enough such that $\Phi^m(\gamma^u(x)) \cap \Phi^{-n}(\gamma^s(y)) \neq \emptyset$.

It is enough to work in Subsections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, on the dynamics of the forward iterate of $\gamma^u(x)$ for almost every x in the square, and the corresponding analysis for the backward iterates of $\gamma^s(y)$ is similar.

The outcome is that, for any $x \in S$, either of the following two cases happen:

1. Either a horizontal segment through S in some iterate $F \circ \Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$, or a vertical segment through S in some iterate Φ^{m_0} and these cases are shown in Figure 2(b) and 2(c).
2. A contiguous union of a countable infinity of segments, each of which touch two adjacent sides as shown in Fig. 2(a). We enumerate these segments as $\gamma_{i_1}, \gamma_{i_2}$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, \infty\}$, and such that $\gamma_{i_2} \subset \mathbf{F}(\gamma_{i_1}), \gamma_{(i+1)_1} \subset \mathbf{G}(\gamma_{i_2})$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \infty\}$.

There are two corresponding cases for the backward iterates of the unstable manifold.

In subsection (2.4), we combine the above two situations coming from each of the cases of the forward iterates of the unstable manifold along with the backward iterates of the stable manifold, to get the following four possibilities:

- a. Situation 1 for the forward iterate of the unstable manifold $\gamma^u(x)$, and also situation 1 for the backward iterate of the stable manifold $\gamma^s(y)$, which means either a horizontal segment through S belonging to $\mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$, or a vertical segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$, and either a horizontal segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$ or a vertical segment belonging to $\mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$.




Figure 2: The dynamics for the forward iterates of the unstable manifold. In part(a), for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, we have a sequence of segments $\gamma_{i1}, \gamma_{i2} \subset \Phi^{m_i}, F \circ \Phi^{m_i}$ respectively, each of which intersect two adjacent edges of S ; the segments γ_{12}, γ_{21} belong to $\mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m_0+1}(\gamma^u(x)), \Phi^{m_0+2}(\gamma^u(x))$ and so on. In part (b), we have a horizontal segment $\gamma_1 \subset \mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$ through S and then subsequent vertical segments $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4 \subset \Phi^{m_0+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ and in part (c), we have a vertical segment γ_1 belonging to $\Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$ through S , for some positive integer m_0 , in which case we are done.

- b. Situation 2 for the forward iterates of the unstable manifold and situation 1 for the backward iterates of the stable manifold.
- c. Situation 1 for the forward iterates of the unstable manifold and situation 2 for the backward iterates of the stable manifold.
- d. Situation 2 for both the forward iterate of the unstable manifold and backward iterates of the stable manifold.

In each of these four contingencies above, we will show that above the critical shear parameter, there is a vertical segment belonging to $\Phi^m(\gamma^u(x))$ for some large enough m that intersects a horizontal segment belonging to $\Phi^{-n}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some large enough n , thus establishing ergodicity for the linked twist map above the critical shear parameter.

2.1 Initial argument

We reproduce the argument of [Prz83] with a more detailed exposition, with reference to the two diagrams in Fig. 4, and start our argument after this. Following [Prz83], we denote the first return to S under the maps $\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}, \Phi$ respectively as $\mathbf{F}_s, \mathbf{G}_s, \Phi_s$, and then fixing any segment $\gamma \in \Phi_s^r(\gamma^u(x))$ in the r 'th iterate of the first return map Φ_s , which lies within the specified cone, it is enough to focus on the first return to S under the horizontal shear map of an initial segment $\gamma \in S$ that lies within its permissible cone, i.e. on $\mathbf{F}_s(\gamma)$ the first time $m_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ that $\mathbf{F}^{m_1}(\gamma) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

We also use the terminology of identifying the slope of a segment within the cone in which it lies; this is illustrated and explained in Fig. 3.

We have the following four cases:

- (i) $\mathbf{F}^{m_1}(\gamma)$ contains a horizontal segment. The analysis here is subsumed in the analysis done for Case (ii) below.
- (ii) The right side of $\mathbf{F}^{m_1}(\gamma)$ intersects S but we do not have a horizontal segment. This case is shown in Fig. 4(a).



Figure 3: The slope of the dotted segment in the vertical Cone C in the left is taken as $-\tan \theta_1$ and the slope of the dotted segment in the horizontal Cone C' on the right is taken as $-\tan \theta_2$. Whenever we speak of the slope of the segment in the cone in which the segment lies, we understand from context whether the cone is horizontal or vertical. We have uniform bounds of $L_\alpha \leq L \leq 0$ for the slope L of the segment within the cone, with $L_\alpha = -\frac{\alpha}{2} + \sqrt{(\frac{\alpha}{2})^2 - 1}$.

- (iii) The left side of $\mathbf{F}^{m_1(\gamma)}$ intersects S but we do not have a horizontal segment. This case is entirely analogous to the above one, and we will only discuss the above case.
- (iv) Both sides of $\mathbf{F}^{m_1(\gamma)}$ intersect S , which is depicted in Fig. 4(b).

We first deal with the Case (ii) above. As what turns out to be the canonical approach as in [Prz83], we divide $\mathbf{F}^{m_1(\gamma)} \setminus S$ into three intervals I_1, I_2, I_3 which will be described later. Also, we denote $\mathbf{F}^{m_1} \cap S = I_4$.

We identify a point $p \in I_2$ that has a periodic orbit under F with distance between points of orbit being d . We define the distance d as follows with reference to the segments shown in Fig. 4: look for the unique integer q such that $1/q < \alpha l_v(I_2)$ and $1/(q-1) \geq \alpha l_v(I_2)$, which is $q = \lfloor \frac{1}{\alpha l_v(I_2)} + 1 \rfloor$. Given the segment I_2 , let the vertical endpoints of I_2 be y_1 , and $y_2 = y_1 + l_v(I_2)$. Under a forward iterate of the map, one endpoint moves forward by a distance of αy_1 and the other endpoint moves forward by a distance $\alpha(y_1 + l_v(I_2))$. We seek a point on I_2 such that this point moves under this iteration of the map by a rational amount of t/q with $\alpha y_1 \leq t/q < \alpha(y_1 + l_v(I_2))$, with $q = \lfloor \frac{1}{\alpha l_v(I_2)} + 1 \rfloor$ as above. Clearly such a point would exist. The period of such a orbit, depending on whether we find t, q coprime, is some divisor of q and the distance between successive points of the orbit of t is some multiple of $d = \frac{1}{\lfloor \frac{1}{\alpha l_v(I_2)} + 1 \rfloor}$ and thus at least this value. While we could have chosen a larger value of q , that would have made the distance d smaller, which would need a stronger shear. Henceforth the orbit of t under the map \mathbf{F} is denoted by $\text{Orb}_F(t)$.

The last point of $\text{Orb}_F(t)$ just to the left of the right edge RE of S , as shown in Fig 4(a) is denoted by p_1 , and the point just to the right of RE is denoted by p_2 . We denote by $m_2 > 0$ the first time the when $F^{m_2}(p)$ lies between p and RE . This cannot include the point p since then by definition $\text{Orb}_F(t)$ is disjoint from S , but which is a contradiction since $F^{-m_1} \in \gamma \subset S$.

Now consider the segment $\mathcal{J}_0 = I'' \cup I_3$, and then further on, $\mathcal{J}_m = \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{J}_{m-1} \setminus S)$ for all $m = 1, \dots, m_2$, i.e. at each stage up to the m_2 'th, we consider the forward iterate of the previous segment after the portion of this previous segment already intersecting S is excised.

Then for each $m = 1, 2, \dots, m_2$, we have

$$l_h(\mathcal{J}_m) \geq \min(d + l_h(I_2'' \cup I_3), l_h(I_2'' \cup I_3) + \alpha l_v(I_2'' \cup I_3)). \quad (3)$$

For any fixed $1 \leq m < m_2$, first term on the right comes from the case where $F^{w+1}(p)$ is actually the point of $\text{Orb}_F(t)$ just to the left of p and where the segment $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{J}_m) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. In that case, $\mathcal{J}_m \setminus S$ is cut off by LE and has length exactly $(d + l_h(I_2'' \cup I_3))$, and $\mathcal{J}_{m+1} = \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{J}_m \setminus S)$ is larger than this length.⁽⁵⁾ On the other hand, when $\mathcal{J}_m \cap S = \emptyset$, then we get a segment of horizontal length at least $l_h(I_2'' \cup I_3) + \alpha l_v(I_2'' \cup I_3)$ in \mathcal{J}_{m+1} ⁽⁶⁾.

When $\mathbf{F}^{m_2}(p)$ lies between p and LE , we must have a horizontal length at least d being inserted into S in the m_2 'th iterate, and so $l_h(\mathcal{J}_{m_2} \cap S) \geq d$. That this is possible is easily verified from Eq. (3). In fact there is going to be a horizontal inserted length bigger than d which we cannot quantify accurately, and so we work with a lower bound of d . Furthermore, in this case this inserted segment $\mathcal{J}_{m_2} \cap S$ touches the left edge LE . Further, if $\mathbf{F}^{m_2}(p) = S \setminus \{p_1\}$, then we have:

$$l_h(\mathcal{J}_{m_2} \cap S) \geq \max(d, l_h(I_2'' \cup I_3) + \alpha l_v(I_2'' \cup I_3)) \quad (4)$$

Here the first term comes from the contingency where $\mathbf{F}^{m_2}(p)$ is a point in S just to the left of p_1 and p_1 is arbitrarily close to RE , and $\mathcal{J}_{m_2} \cap S$ touches RE . Otherwise there is a segment of length $l_h(I_2'' \cup I_3) + \alpha l_v(I_2'' \cup I_3)$ within S , not necessarily touching the side RE .

Now assume that $\mathbf{F}^{m_2}(p) = p_1$, and following [Prz83], denote the distance of p_1 to RE by $\tau \cdot d$. So if Eq. (4) is not satisfied, we have $l_h(\mathcal{J}_{m_2} \cap S) = \tau \cdot d$ and $\mathcal{J}_{m_2} \cap S$ touches RS .

Define $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_0 = I_1 \cup I_2'$ and then $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_m = \mathbf{F}(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{m-1} \setminus S)$ for $m = 1, 2, \dots, m_2$. In this case, we have either

$$l_h(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{m_2} \cap S) \geq \max((1 - \tau) \cdot d, l_h(I_1 \cup I_2') + \alpha l_v(I_1 \cup I_2')), \quad (5)$$

or $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{m_2} \cap S$ touches LS with its left end, where the number $(1 - \tau) \cdot d$ is used since we might have a case where for some $0 < m < m_2$, we have $F^m(p) = p_2$ and the segment on the outside of S gets cut off by LE at this m 'th step.⁽⁷⁾ Since in this Case(ii), we don't assume a horizontal segment, from the above two contingencies, we can have either one of:

- $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{m_2} \cap S$ touches LE with its left end and also Eq. (4) is true.
- $l_h(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{m_2} \cap S) = \tau \cdot d$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{m_2} \cap S$ touches RE and also Eq. (5) is true.

In either case, whenever the optimum length inserted inside S is lower bounded by d , this length necessarily touches either of the LE or RE .

Note also that $\mathbf{F}^{m_1}(\gamma) \cap S$ which we denote by I_4 touches the LE as well.

The improvements in this paper concern with these above two contingencies where we have segments entering S while necessarily touching either of the LE or RE . We show that these segments that enter S touching either of the left or the right sides, do not need to have a horizontal projection length as long as $\delta l_v(\gamma)$ for some $\delta > 1$ arbitrarily close to 1 as was needed in [Prz83].⁽⁸⁾, and can instead have lengths some $\beta_i l_v(\gamma)$, ($i = 1, 2$), with β_i large

⁽⁵⁾It will be arbitrarily larger depending on the strength of the shear α .

⁽⁶⁾This length could be significantly longer if we have a set of indices J where the segments \mathcal{J}_w do not intersect S , for any w belonging to J .

⁽⁷⁾Again we actually have a longer segment than this within S which we can't quantify, and so work with a lower bound of $(1 - \tau) \cdot d$.

⁽⁸⁾See Eq (3),(4),(5) on Page 350 in [Prz83]




Figure 4: Reproduction of the diagrams of [Prz83] relevant to the dynamics in our problem. We denote the union of the segments $I_2' \cup I_2'' = I_2$. These same segments are depicted again in Fig. 5 below and labelled, and those labelings are used in the paper throughout.

enough to be determined later, but still $\beta_i < 1, (i = 1, 2)$, and upon iterating successively with the maps \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G} further, we eventually get a segment within S long enough of length $\delta l_v(\gamma)$ with now $\delta > 1$, or we get a contiguous set of segments that touches all four edges, as shown in Fig. 2(a,b)⁽⁹⁾. In the second case we are done, while in the first case, we keep on iterating the procedure to get longer segments that enter S as each stage, until we also reach the second case, in which case we are done.

It would thus be enough to require all of:

$$d \geq \delta \beta_2 \cdot l_v(\gamma) \quad (6)$$

$$\alpha \cdot l_v(I_3) + l_h(I_3) \geq \delta \cdot l_v(\gamma) \quad (7)$$

$$\alpha \cdot l_v(I_1) + l_h(I_1) \geq \delta \cdot l_v(\gamma) \quad (8)$$

or we would be also done if:

$$l_h(I_4) \geq \delta \beta_1 \cdot l_v(\gamma). \quad (9)$$

2.2 Part 1

Below, we find optimum lower bounds on the parameters β_1, β_2 , and use them to find the optimal parameter α . Later, we work with Case(iv) and find the optimal value coming from the constraints there, which will be seen to be lower than the one coming from Case(ii) in the general case.

Below, in Fig. 5, we redraw Fig. 4(a) according to our convenience, and where the segment γ is shown to be in S but in a separate component in the lift of H to \mathbb{R}^2 . We have that $\overrightarrow{AB} = I_4$ and also $\overrightarrow{BC} = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3$.

⁽⁹⁾As will be clear in the ensuing argument, we wish to ensure the case shown in Fig. 2(a) appears, while if we do end up getting a complete horizontal or vertical segment in one more iteration of the map Φ , we have the situation in the case shown in Fig. 2(b).




Figure 5: Let $\vec{\gamma} = \vec{A'C'}$ be the initial segment within the square S . With m_1 the least positive integer such that $\mathbf{F}^{m_1}(\vec{\gamma}) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ again, and $\mathbf{F}^{m_1}(\vec{\gamma}) = \vec{CA}$. For the sake of clarity, we lift to \mathbb{R} and this segment is depicted as intersecting S on the right, corresponding to Case(ii). Note that $|L_1| \leq |L_\alpha| = |-\frac{\alpha}{2} + \sqrt{(\frac{\alpha}{2})^2 - 1}|$. Also note that $\vec{JA} = \beta_1 l_v(\vec{\gamma})$.

We see from Fig. 5 that $y = |\vec{EF}|$, $|\vec{JB}| = \theta l_v(\vec{\gamma})$, $|\vec{BD}| = (1 - \theta)l_v(\vec{\gamma})$, $l_h(\mathbf{F}^m(\vec{\gamma})) = |\vec{JA}| + |\vec{CD}| = (L_1 + \alpha)l_v(\vec{\gamma})$, $x = |\vec{JA}| = |\vec{E'F'}|$, and with elementary geometry that:

$$x = |\vec{JA}| = \theta l_v(\vec{\gamma})(L_1 + \alpha) = \beta_1 l_v(\vec{\gamma}) \quad (10)$$

$$y(L_2 + \alpha) = |\vec{BE}| \quad (11)$$

Here θ is some number between 0 and 1, we defined $\beta_1 = \theta(L_1 + \alpha)$, L_1 defined in the figure is the slope of $\vec{A'C'}$ within the cone C in which it lies. Further, $L_2^{(10)}$ gives the slope of the segment \vec{AB} within the cone in which it lies.

The segment \vec{BF} is the image of \vec{BA} under the map \mathbf{G} as shown in Fig. 5; in this case it has been sheared vertically upon entering the square S . In Fig. 5, this vertically sheared segment is shown to be cut-off at the lower edge of the square S .

If this segment was not cut-off, then $\mathbf{G}(\vec{BA}) \cap S = \vec{BF'}$, and then Fig. 5 would be modified to include the entire segment $\vec{BF'}$ in the square S , and we would have

$$l_v(\vec{BF'}) = |\vec{BE'}| = x(L_2 + \alpha) = \beta_1 l_v(\vec{\gamma})(L_2 + \alpha), \quad (12)$$

Let $\delta > 1$ be a constant to be optimized later.

If from the above, $|\vec{BE'}| = x(L_2 + \alpha) = \beta_1 l_v(\vec{\gamma})(L_2 + \alpha) > \delta l_v(\vec{\gamma})$, i.e.,

⁽¹⁰⁾Here too, as usual, we have $L_2 \geq L_\alpha$.

$$\beta_1(L_2 + \alpha) > \delta, \quad (13)$$

we have a segment within S satisfying the required property, and we would be done.

In case the segment $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF'})$ gets cut off and $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF'}) \cap S = \overrightarrow{BF}$, we have the following two possibilities:

- $|\overrightarrow{BE}| = y(L_2 + \alpha) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$, we would be done.
- If not, we would have that $y \leq \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{L_2 + \alpha}$. In this case, we have further two possibilities:
 - The segment $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF})$ intersects the right edge of S . In this case, we have that

$$l_h(\overrightarrow{FG}) > (x - y) > \beta_1 l_v(\gamma) - \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{L_2 + \alpha} = l_v(\gamma) \left(\beta_1 - \frac{\delta}{L_2 + \alpha} \right). \quad (14)$$

Further in that case, we have a total length of

$$l_v(\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{FG})) = l_h(\overrightarrow{FG})(L_4 + \alpha) > l_v(\gamma) \left(\beta_1 - \frac{\delta}{L_2 + \alpha} \right) (L_4 + \alpha), \quad (15)$$

in case this lay completely within the square S , or otherwise, we would have $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{FG})$ intersecting the top edge of S . Here L_4 gives the slope of \overrightarrow{FG} within its cone. If we enforce that

$$l_v(\gamma) \left(\beta_1 - \frac{\delta}{L_2 + \alpha} \right) (L_3 + \alpha) > \delta l_v(\gamma), \quad (16)$$

we would be done, otherwise we now have both a complete horizontal and vertical segment within the square, in which case we would also be done.

- The segment $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF})$ does not intersect the right edge of S . In this case, we ensure that $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF}) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ and we would be also done⁽¹¹⁾: but this follows from the following dichotomy:

- * Either the segment $\overrightarrow{BE} = l_v(\overrightarrow{BF}) > \overrightarrow{BD}$ is long enough that $l_h(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF})) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$.
- * Or the segment \overrightarrow{BD} is sufficiently short that consequently by virtue of the first horizontal shear of γ to the segment $l_h(\overrightarrow{AC})$, the segment $\overrightarrow{JA} = l_h(\overrightarrow{AB}) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ and we would be done then itself.

We have either $|\overrightarrow{JA}| = l_v(\overrightarrow{AB}) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ in which case we are done, otherwise, with some basic geometry, we verify that we have:

$$|\overrightarrow{BE}| \geq |\overrightarrow{BD}| = l_v(\gamma) - \frac{|\overrightarrow{JA}|}{L_1 + \alpha} \geq l_v(\gamma) \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{L_1 + \alpha} \right). \quad (17)$$

In this case, it is enough to ensure that

⁽¹¹⁾In this case as well, Fig. 5 would need to be modified.

$$(L_3 + \alpha)l_v(\gamma)\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{L_1 + \alpha}\right) > \delta l_v(\gamma), \quad (18)$$

since we have that $l_h(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF})) = (L_3 + \alpha)l_v(\gamma)\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{L_1 + \alpha}\right)$, which forces $l_h(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BF})) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$.

Here, L_3 is the slope of the segment \overrightarrow{BF} within the cone in which it lies.

Further, assume that we have not already found a segment above that has vertical or horizontal length at least $l_v(\gamma)$, otherwise we would be done.

We ensure in this case that either $\mathbf{F}(\overline{GH}) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ or that $\mathbf{F}(\overline{GH})$ touches the left end of the square S . Note that $l_h(\overline{FG}) \leq \delta l_v(\gamma)$, and thus that $|L_4|l_h(\overline{FG}) \leq |L_4|\delta l_v(\gamma)$. Further we clearly have that $|\overline{KP}| > l_v(\gamma)$, and thus $l_v(\overline{GH}) > l_v(\gamma) - |L_4|\delta l_v(\gamma) = (1 - |L_4|)l_v(\gamma)$. In this case, either we have that

$$\mathbf{F}(\overline{GH}) > (L_5 + \alpha)(1 - \delta|L_4|)l_v(\gamma),$$

or that $\mathbf{F}(\overline{GH})$ touches the left edge of S . With the above, we note that the sufficiency of $(L_5 + \alpha)(1 - \delta|L_4|)l_v(\gamma) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ is equivalent to Eq. (18) for our further optimization of α later on, and this is not a new restriction on α . Further on, if $l_v(\overline{HG}) < \delta l_v(\gamma)$, then $|\overline{HK}| < \delta|L_5|l_v(\gamma)$ where L_5 is the slope of the segment \overline{HG} within its cone. Further, we have assumed that the horizontal length of S which is $|\overline{EP}|$, satisfies $|\overline{EP}| > |\overline{JA}| = \beta_1 l_v(\gamma)$. In this case, we have that $l_h(\overline{MH}) > \beta_1 l_v(\gamma) - \delta|L_5|l_v(\gamma)$, and then

$$\mathbf{G}(\overline{HM}) > (L_6 + \alpha)(\beta_1 - \delta|L_5|)l_v(\gamma),$$

or that $\mathbf{G}(\overline{HM})$ touches the bottom edge of the square S . Here L_6 is the slope of the segment \overline{HM} within its cone. Again with the above, we will note that the sufficiency of the condition $(L_6 + \alpha)(\beta_1 - \delta|L_5|)l_v(\gamma) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ is equivalent to Eq. (16) above.

The same dynamics iterates further on, till we get either a vertical or a horizontal segment that has length greater than $\delta l_v(\gamma)$ and we are done, or we get segments with successively the slopes

$$L_{i+1} = -\frac{1}{L_i + \alpha}, \quad (19)$$

and we note that as $i \rightarrow \infty$, these slopes L_i converge to L_α .

One way to see this is to consider the function $f(x) = x(x + \alpha)$ when restricted to values of $L_\alpha \leq x \leq 0$. This function is seen to be increasing whenever $x \geq \alpha/2$ which is true in the above domain for x and that $f(0) = 0, f(L_\alpha) = -1$. In this case, if for a given $x \in [L_\alpha, 0]$ we have that $f(x) = x(x + \alpha) = -t_1$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, then $-(1/(x + \alpha)) = x/t < x$, and plugging in $1/(x + \alpha)$ in place of x and doing the analysis again yields $t_2 > t_1$ with which the above repeats again, with the $t_i \rightarrow 1$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, and that finally the sequence of values converge to L_α .

Thus in the limit, we would have sequences of four connected segments that converge as shown in part (a) of Fig. 2. We note that given any such S , there is a unique way to have four connected segments in the above manner so that each has slope L_α within its cone, and our segments converge to this limiting sequence.

2.3 Part 2

Next we consider the cases where a segment $\tilde{\gamma}$ of horizontal length at least d that enters in the square S . There are two possibilities:

1. the segment $\tilde{\gamma}$ touches the left edge of S and lies above the line on which the rational orbit lies (to explain later in reference to the figure to be drawn again). In this case, we ensure that the vertical length of the segment $I_1 \cup I'_2$ is long enough that there is a sufficiently long vertical distance below the line of the rational orbit to the bottom layer of S . After this we employ an argument similar to the one employed above for the case of the segment I_4 , as will be clear from the argument that follows.
2. This segment $\tilde{\gamma}$ touches the right edge of S . In this case this segment could be arbitrarily close to the top or bottom edge of S .

Both of these above situations involve arguments analogous to the one already dealt with. In addition, when in the second case the segment under consideration is arbitrarily close to the top edge of S , we must deal with the contingency that within S we do not end up with either a long enough segment under two successive iterations of \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{G} , nor a combined segment consisting of both a v-segment and an h-segment. We then iterate further under the maps \mathbf{F} , \mathbf{G} successively outside the square S to eventually find a long enough segment.

Consider Fig. 6(b), where F now acts vertically and G acts horizontally, and where $l_v(\overrightarrow{AB}) = \beta_2 l_v(\gamma)$ with $0 < \beta_2 < 1$ to be later optimized to be as small as possible. Let L_5 be the slope of the segment \overrightarrow{AB} within its cone. Under the map Φ , we have either of the following three cases:

- $l_h(\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{AB})) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ and $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{AB})$ does not touch the right edge of S , in which case we are done.
- $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{AB})$ touches the right edge of S but we still have $l_h(\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{AB}) \cap S) = l_h(\overrightarrow{BC}) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ in which case we are also done. With some elementary geometry, referring to Fig. 6(b), we have that

$$\frac{|\overrightarrow{CX}|}{l_h(\overrightarrow{BC})} = \frac{1}{(L_5 + \alpha)}. \quad (20)$$

Thus in this instance, we must have $l_v((\overrightarrow{BC})) = |\overrightarrow{CX}| > \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(L_5 + \alpha)}$.

- $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{AB})$ touches the right edge of S , but now

$$l_v((\overrightarrow{BC})) \leq \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(L_5 + \alpha)} \quad (21)$$

In this case, we must have either of the two following cases:

– $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BC})$ touches the top edge in Fig. 6(b) ⁽¹²⁾. In this case, using Eq. (21), we have clearly:

$$|\overrightarrow{CY}| = l_v(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BC})) \geq l_v(\overrightarrow{AB}) - l_v(\overrightarrow{BC}) > \beta_2 l_v(\gamma) - \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(L_5 + \alpha)} = l_v(\gamma) \left(\beta_2 - \frac{\delta}{(L_5 + \alpha)} \right) \quad (22)$$

In this case, if $l_v(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BC})) > l_v(\gamma)$, we are done. Let L_7 be the slope of the segment \overrightarrow{CE} within its cone. In this case, we then have that either,

* $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{CE})$ touches the left edge of S in Fig. 6(b). In this case, we further have to ensure that $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{EJ})$ either touches the bottom edge of S in Fig. 6(b), or else that we have a segment $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{EJ})$ whose vertical length is greater than $\delta l_v(\gamma)$. If the slope of the segment \overrightarrow{EJ} is L_7 within its cone, it is clear that in Fig. 6(b), analogous to the previous case, that the horizontal length of S is at least $l_v(\gamma)$, and also since $l_v(\overrightarrow{CE}) < \delta l_v(\gamma)$, that $l_h(\overrightarrow{CE}) < |L_8| \delta l_v(\gamma)$ where L_8 is the slope of the segment \overrightarrow{CE} within its cone. Thus we have that $l_h(\overrightarrow{EJ}) > l_v(\gamma)(1 - |L_8| \delta)$, and thus further, that $l_v(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{EJ})) > (\alpha + L_9) l_v(\gamma)(1 - |L_8| \delta)$ where $L_9 = 1/(L_8 + \alpha)$ is the slope of the segment \overrightarrow{JK} within its cone.

Thus, the following condition

$$(\alpha + L_9)(1 - |L_8| \delta) > \delta, \quad (23)$$

is sufficient to get a long enough segment \overrightarrow{JK} or that \overrightarrow{JK} touches the bottom edge of S . In case this segment is cut off by the bottom edge of S and is of length $< \delta l_v(\gamma)$, further on, note that the vertical length of S is at least $\beta_2 l_v(\gamma)$ and that $l_v(\overrightarrow{JK}) > \beta_2 l_v(\gamma) - |L_8| \delta l_v(\gamma) = (\beta_2 - |L_8| \delta) l_v(\gamma)$ and thus we have that either $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{JK})$ is cut off by the right edge of S or that the horizontal length $l_h(\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{JK}))$ is at least $(L_9 + \alpha)(\beta_2 - |L_8| \delta) l_v(\gamma)$ and thus the following condition is sufficient,

$$(L_9 + \alpha)(\beta_2 - |L_8| \delta) > \delta \quad (24)$$

to get a long enough segment if $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{JK})$ doesn't get cut off by the right edge of S . Further on, with requirements of the same form as the above two conditions Eqs. (23) and (24), we can ensure that successively we have segments such as in Figure 2(a) or that we have a segment of horizontal or vertical length at least $l_v(\gamma)$ in which case we are done.

* Otherwise, $\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{CE})$ does not intersect the left edge of S , in which case it will be enough to ensure that:

$$l_h(\mathbf{G}(\overrightarrow{CE})) \geq (L_7 + \alpha) l_v(\gamma) \left(\beta_2 - \frac{\delta}{(L_5 + \alpha)} \right) > \delta l_v(\gamma). \quad (25)$$

We note for later that the requirement from this above equation is going to be for our purposes identical to the requirement from Eq. (24).

⁽¹²⁾Note that, as drawn, the left edge of S in Fig. 6 is the top edge of S in Fig. 6, and so forth. The horizontal lengths in Fig. 6(a) also become the vertical lengths in Fig. 6(b), and so forth. The references to the figure and edges, and the horizontal and vertical directions will be made clear from context.

– $\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BC})$ lies entirely within S , but does not touch the top edge of S in Fig. 6(b), in which case we have the following two possibilities:

* We have $l_v(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BC})) > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ in which case we are done.

If the slope of the segment \overrightarrow{BC} is L_6 within its cone ⁽¹³⁾, then we have, referring to Fig. 6(b), it happens that,

$$l_v(\mathbf{F}(\overrightarrow{BC})) = (L_6 + \alpha)l_h(\overrightarrow{BC}) = (L_6 + \alpha)|\overrightarrow{BX}| > \delta l_v(\gamma) \quad (26)$$

* If this fails to happen, then we have:

$$|\overrightarrow{BX}| = l_h(\overrightarrow{BC}) \leq \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(L_6 + \alpha)} \quad (27)$$

Further, in this case, we also have:

$$|\overrightarrow{CX}| = |L_6| \cdot l_h(\overrightarrow{BC}) \leq \frac{|L_6|\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(L_6 + \alpha)} \quad (28)$$

Thus in this case, we have

$$\eta = \frac{l_v(\overrightarrow{AB})}{|\overrightarrow{CX}|} = \frac{\beta_2 l_v(\gamma)}{|\overrightarrow{CX}|} \geq \frac{\beta_2(L_6 + \alpha)}{|L_6|\delta} \quad (29)$$

In this case, we consider the orbit $G^k(C)|_{k=1}^\infty$ of the point C under the horizontal shear G , as shown in the lift of the track in Fig. 6(c).

Note that as a result of one horizontal shear G in Fig. 6(c), we have $C = \mathbf{G}(C')$ and in particular, $d(C', C) < D_1$. Under a further horizontal shear, the point C moves again a distance $d(C', C)$ which is also at most D_1 . This distance is also equal to $|\overrightarrow{CC'}| = d(C, \mathbf{G}(C)) = (\beta_2 l_v(\gamma)\alpha)/\eta$. Also, since $D_2 > 0$, it is easy to see that $\mathbf{G}(C)$ cannot lie to the right of RE_2 .

Also, using Equations (27) and (28), we see that

$$|\overrightarrow{CC'}| = |\overrightarrow{BX}| + |L_5||\overrightarrow{CX}| \leq \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(L_6 + \alpha)} (1 + |L_5 L_6|) \quad (30)$$

Further, we have that

$$|\overrightarrow{AA''}| = |\overrightarrow{BX}| + |L_5|\beta_2 l_v(\gamma) \leq \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{L_6 + \alpha} + |L_5|\beta_2 l_v(\gamma) \quad (31)$$

⁽¹³⁾In this case this cone is oriented horizontally.

Suppose that $\mathbf{G}(C)$ lies in S_2 , in between LE_2 and RE_2 (including possibly on either of the edges). Thus, in particular, $d(RE_1, LE_2) < |CC'|$. Also note that in this case, $d(A, \mathbf{G}(A)) = \alpha\beta_2 l_v(\gamma)$.

In this case the Figure 6(c) is not to scale and we would have A' lying to the right of LE_2 , and unless we get a horizontal segment through S_2 and we are done, we have using Equations (27) and (28):

$$l_h(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}(C'A)} \cap S_2) = \alpha\beta_2 l_v(\gamma) - d(RE_1, LE_2) - |\overrightarrow{AA''}| \quad (32)$$

$$\implies l_h(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}(C'A)} \cap S_2) > \alpha\beta_2 l_v(\gamma) - |\overrightarrow{CC'}| - |\overrightarrow{AA''}| \quad (33)$$

$$\implies l_h(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}(C'A)} \cap S_2) > l_v(\gamma) \left(\alpha\beta_2 - \frac{\delta(2 + |L_5 L_6|)}{L_6 + \alpha} - \beta_2 |L_5| \right) \quad (34)$$

Thus we will be done if:

$$\left(\alpha\beta_2 - \frac{\delta(2 + |L_5 L_6|)}{L_6 + \alpha} - \beta_2 |L_5| \right) > \delta \quad (35)$$

Now suppose that $\mathbf{G}(C)$ lies between RE_1 and LE_2 .

In this case, suppose there are m many points of the orbit of $G^k(C)$ in the region between RE_1 and LE_2 , inclusive of C . Let t be the least integer with $1 \leq t \leq m$, for which $G^t(A) \in S_2$. For this we look at Fig. 7:

In this case, if $|\overrightarrow{Q_1 Q_2}| > \delta l_v(\gamma)$ we are done, otherwise we assume that $|\overrightarrow{Q_1 Q_2}| \leq \delta l_v(\gamma)$, and we have with some elementary geometry that

$$\frac{r_1}{r_2} = \frac{|\overrightarrow{Q_1 Q_2}|}{|\overrightarrow{P_1 P_2}|} \leq \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{t(1 - \frac{1}{\eta})\beta_2 \alpha l_v(\gamma) - |L_5|(1 - \frac{1}{\eta})\beta_2 l_v(\gamma) - \delta l_v(\gamma)} \quad (36)$$

$$\leq \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(1 - \frac{1}{\eta})(\alpha - |L_5|)\beta_2 l_v(\gamma) - \delta l_v(\gamma)} \quad (37)$$

We also have, looking at Fig. 7, that $r_1 + r_2 = (1 - 1/\eta)\beta_2 l_v(\gamma)$. With some elementary calculations, we can verify that:

$$r_1 \leq (r_1 + r_2) \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{(1 - \frac{1}{\eta})(\alpha - |L_5|)\beta_2 l_v(\gamma)} = \frac{\delta l_v(\gamma)}{\alpha - |L_5|} \quad (38)$$

Thus, we have

$$|\overrightarrow{MN}| = \beta_2 l_v(\gamma) - r_1 \geq l_v(\gamma) \left(\beta_2 - \frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_5|} \right) \quad (39)$$

Thus in the $(t+1)$ 'th iteration, we have either a segment of length $\alpha|\overrightarrow{MN}| = \alpha l_v(\gamma) (\beta_2 - \delta/(\alpha - |L_5|))$ within the square S_2 or there is a horizontal segment within S_2 . Thus we would be done if we require:

$$\alpha \left(\beta_2 - \frac{\delta}{(\alpha - |L_5|)} \right) > \delta. \quad (40)$$




Figure 6: In part (a), we lift to \mathbb{R} and denote the successive lifts of the square S as S_1 and S_2 as in the figure. Part (b) shows an enlarged picture of the square S_2 , rotated by $\pi/2$, and the case where under iterations of the shear, the segment \overrightarrow{BC} has a long enough shear in the square S . In part (c) the black dots represent the points of the orbit of C under the successive 'horizontal' shears in this figure, with the three successive squares shown as S_1, S_2, S_3 in this figure. (The part (c) is not up to scale.)




Figure 7: The case outlined when $\overrightarrow{G^t(AC)}$ intersects S_2 for the first time, when considering the dynamics outlined in Fig. 6(c). The point P_1 coincides with $G^t(C')$ while the point Q_1 coincides with $G^t(A)$.

We also have remaining the case where a segment of length at least d enters the square S and touches the left edge, as opposed to the above case where the segment d touched the right edge of S . But here the situation is essentially identical to the one already considered, and it is easily verified that the analysis above covers this case, and the same parameter β_2 used above suffices for this case. Thus the same uniform lower bound of $\beta_2 l_v(\gamma)$ can be used for the two lower bounds on d coming from these two cases in the subsequent analysis.

2.4 Part 3

We have the following four contingencies outlined in the beginning of Section 2.

2.4.1 Case a.

1. A horizontal segment through S belonging to $\mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$. In this case we get either a vertical segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{m_0+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ or otherwise if there is also a horizontal segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$ then we can guarantee a point of intersection between segments belonging to $\Phi^{m_0+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ and $\Phi^{-n_0-1}(\gamma^s(y))$ in which case we are done.

‡₁ : All the variables used are defined in the diagram in Fig. 8(a). We have a modification of the argument from the previous section, and a situation analogous to part (c) of Fig. 6 is dealt with here. Initially with a symmetric upper bound on l_1, l_2 , we set up analogues of Eq. (35) and Eq. (40), in order to ensure a vertical segment through S . When either one of l_1 or l_2 violates this upper bound, we then follow a modified argument.

Consider a parameter κ to be determined later, so that both $l_1, l_3 \leq \kappa l$. We also note from the geometry that $l_2 \leq |L_\alpha|l$.

With elementary geometry, we note that $|CC'| \leq l_1(1 + |L_\alpha|^2)$, and $|\overline{AA''}| = l_1 + l_2 \leq (\kappa + |L_\alpha|)l$. Note that the analog of Eq. (35), when $\mathbf{G}(C)$ again lies within a lift of

S itself⁽¹⁴⁾, gives us

$$l_h(\mathbf{G}(\overline{C'A}) \cap S) \geq \alpha l - |\overline{CC'}| - |\overline{AA''}| \geq \alpha l - l_1(1 + |L_\alpha|^2) - (\kappa + |L_\alpha|)l,$$

and thus,

$$l_h(\mathbf{G}(\overline{C'A}) \cap S) \geq \alpha l - \kappa(1 + |L_\alpha|^2)l - (\kappa + |L_\alpha|)l = l(\alpha - \kappa(1 + |L_\alpha|^2) - (\kappa + |L_\alpha|)) \quad (41)$$

In this case, if we require that

$$(\alpha - \kappa(1 + |L_\alpha|^2) - (\kappa + |L_\alpha|)) > (2\kappa + |L_\alpha|) \Rightarrow \alpha > 4\kappa + \kappa|L_\alpha|^2 + 2|L_\alpha|, \quad (42)$$

then from the above, we get that

$$l_h(\mathbf{G}(\overline{C'A}) \cap S) \geq l_1 + l_2 + l_3,$$

and thus in fact we have a vertical segment through S . Now the argument goes onto the item 2 below.

The second case concerns the analogs of Eqs. (39) and (40); in this case we need, while noting that $L_{\overline{AB}}$ is the slope of the segment \overline{AB} in the cone in which it lies, that

$$l - \frac{(l_1 + l_2 + l_3)}{(\alpha - |L_{\overline{AB}}|)} > \frac{(l_1 + l_2 + l_3)}{\alpha} \Rightarrow l > (l_1 + l_2 + l_3) \left(\frac{1}{(\alpha - |L_{\overline{AB}}|)} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right)$$

Thus as before, if we have

$$1 > (2\kappa + |L_\alpha|) \left(\frac{1}{(\alpha - |L_{\overline{AB}}|)} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right),$$

then the previous inequality is satisfied.

Thus with the above, it is enough to require that:

$$1 > (2\kappa + |L_\alpha|) \left(\frac{1}{(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right). \quad (43)$$

‡₂ : On the other hand, if one of the two lengths l_1, l_2 is greater than κl , and without loss of generality we consider that

$$l_1 > \kappa l,$$

then consider Fig. 8(b) where we consider a segment $\overline{RP} \subset \Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s((x))$. If either $\overline{RP} \cap \overline{JA}$ or $\overline{RP} \cap \overline{BC}$ then we are done.

If not, we have that R is above B in Fig. 8(b) and it is seen that $l_4 \geq l_1 - |L_\alpha|l > (\kappa - |L_\alpha|)l$. In this case, we have two possibilities:

⁽¹⁴⁾In reference to Fig. 6, this means that $\mathbf{G}(C) \in S_2$.

- The point C lies to the left of the point Q on the bottom edge of S . In this case, it will be enough to ensure that $\mathbf{F}^{-1}(P)$ lies to the left of the left edge of S , and for that it is enough from above to ensure that

$$\alpha(\kappa - |L_\alpha|) > 1, \quad (44)$$

in which case we can guarantee an intersection point between the segments \overline{TQ} and \overline{BC} ; this is true in the case that $l_4 < l_1$ since then the vertical height of $\mathbf{F}^{-1}(P)$ is also less than the vertical height of B . If the point P lies above A on the right edge of S then we are again done, and so it remains to deal with the case where P is below A and $l_4 \geq l_1$. In this case, with an analysis similar to that of Fig. 7, we can verify that,

$$|\overline{TB'}| = \frac{l_4 |\overline{B'Q}|}{\alpha l_4 - |\overline{QA''}|} < \frac{l_4 l}{\alpha l_4 - l}.$$

In this case, it is enough to ensure that,

$$\frac{l_4 l}{\alpha l_4 - l} < l_1 \Rightarrow \left(\sqrt{\alpha} l_1 - \frac{l}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \left(\sqrt{\alpha} l_4 - \frac{l}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) > \frac{l^2}{\alpha}. \quad (45)$$

This is ensured by taking,

$$\left(\sqrt{\alpha} l_1 - \frac{l}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \geq \frac{l}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \Rightarrow l_1 > \frac{2}{\alpha} l \quad (46)$$

Thus combining the earlier estimate, it is enough to require that

$$\kappa \geq \frac{2}{\alpha}. \quad (47)$$

- The point C lies to the right of Q .⁽¹⁵⁾ For this to happen, at least one of $|\overline{B'C}|$ or $|\overline{QA''}|$ is greater than or equal to $l/2$. In case $|\overline{QA''}| \geq l/2$, then we also have $l_4 \geq l/(2|L_\alpha|)$. From the hypothesis, this also means that $l_1 \geq l/(2|L_\alpha|) - |L_\alpha|l$. In case $|\overline{B'C}| \geq l/2$, we get by the same reasoning that $l_1 \geq l/(2|L_\alpha|)$ and then by hypothesis that $l_4 \geq l/(2|L_\alpha|) - |L_\alpha|l$. In this case, either $l_4 \leq l_1$, or $l_4 > l_1$ and $l_1 \geq l/(2|L_\alpha|) - |L_\alpha|l$. In this latter case, we cut off the segment \overline{QP} up-to the vertical height of l_1 and subsequently call this cut off segment of height l_1 as \overline{QP} itself.

Now again, we look at the equivalents of Eq. (35) and Eq. (40) for the segment \overline{QP} which ensures that we get a horizontal segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{-n_1}(\gamma^s(y))$ and further because of the restriction imposed in the previous paragraph, this horizontal segment must intersect the segment \overline{BC} and then we are done.

For the analog of Eq. (35), in this case it is enough to ensure that,

⁽¹⁵⁾This case is not shown in the figure.

$$\alpha \left(\frac{1}{2|L_\alpha|} - |L_\alpha| \right) l - 2l > l \Rightarrow \alpha > \frac{3}{\left(\frac{1}{2|L_\alpha|} - |L_\alpha| \right)}. \quad (48)$$

Here we are crudely bounding by l , from above, the distances of the points P, Q from the left edge of S in Fig. 8. ⁽¹⁶⁾

Further, the argument in this case corresponding to the one preceding that of equation Eq. (40), requires us to ensure:

$$\left(\frac{1}{2|L_\alpha|} - |L_\alpha| \right) l - \frac{l}{(\alpha - L_{\overline{PQ}})} > \frac{l}{\alpha} \Rightarrow \left(\frac{1}{2|L_\alpha|} - |L_\alpha| \right) > \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{(\alpha - |L_{\overline{PQ}}|)},$$

where $L_{\overline{PQ}}$ is the slope of the segment PQ within the cone in which it lies. Thus because of the above, it is enough to ensure that,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2|L_\alpha|} - |L_\alpha| \right) > \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)}. \quad (49)$$

2. A vertical segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$. If now we also have a horizontal segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some integer n_0 , then we are done with an intersection point. Otherwise we assume that there is a vertical segment through S belonging to $\mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$. Now the situation is entirely analogous to the two cases \ddagger_1, \ddagger_2 before and the bounds on α that we get are exactly the same as those obtained from these two earlier cases \ddagger_1, \ddagger_2 : we can either obtain a horizontal segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{-n_0-1}(\gamma^s(y))$ similar to the case \ddagger_1 , or in the remaining case find an intersection point analogous to the argument in \ddagger_2 above.

2.4.2 Case b.

In the limiting case, there is a unique sequence of segments under consideration. To see this, refer to Fig. 9. We note that under sufficiently many iterations, our four successive segments will be arbitrarily close the segments of the rectangle \overline{ABCD} . Without loss of generality, from now on, we assume that the four successive segments in consideration are precisely $\overline{AB}, \overline{BC}, \overline{CD}, \overline{DA}$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} l_7 + l_8 &= l_3 + l_4 \\ \Rightarrow l_6 |L_\alpha| + \frac{l_1}{|L_\alpha|} &= |L_\alpha| l_2 + \frac{l_5}{|L_\alpha|} \\ \Rightarrow l_6 |L_\alpha|^2 + l_1 &= |L_\alpha|^2 l_2 + l_5 \\ \Rightarrow l_1 - l_5 &= |L_\alpha|^2 (l_2 - l_6) \end{aligned}$$

⁽¹⁶⁾The horizontal distance of P from the left edge of S and the horizontal distance of T from the straight line \overline{PQ} correspond to the quantities that appear in Eq. (35).




Figure 8: A horizontal segment $\overline{BC} \subset \mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m_0}(\gamma^u(x))$ through S in part (a). Part(b) shows a segment $\overline{RP} \subset \Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$. Further, the segment $\overline{PQ} \subset \mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$ and $\overline{TQ} \subset \Phi^{-n_0-1}(\gamma^s(y))$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{also, } l_1 + l_2 &= l_5 + l_6 \\ \Rightarrow l_1 - l_5 &= -(l_2 - l_6). \end{aligned}$$

This forces us to conclude that in Fig. 9,

$$(|L_\alpha|^2 + 1)(l_2 - l_6) = 0 \implies l_2 = l_6, \text{ and further, } l_1 = l_5.$$

A similar argument lets us conclude that

$$l_8 = l_4, \quad l_7 = l_3,$$

and further since the ratios of $l_i/l_{i-1} = |L_\alpha|$ for $i = 1, 3, 5, 7$ (and identifying $l_0 \equiv l_8$), we are forced to have a unique configuration of such segments.

Now we have either a horizontal segment through S , belonging to $\Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some integer n_0 , or we have a vertical segment through S , belonging to $\mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some integer n_0 (this latter case is not shown in Fig. 9). One situation corresponding to the first case is shown in Fig. 9.

- In the first case, referring to Fig. 9, if the segment \overline{PQ} intersects either one of the ‘vertical’ segments $\overline{AB}, \overline{CD}$, then we are done. Otherwise, we have the case actually shown in the figure. In this case, we have the point C is above the point Q on the right edge of S and the point P is above A on the left edge of S . In this case, the maximum vertical separation between the points P, Q is $(l_1 + l_2)|L_\alpha|$, and this means that

$$l_8 > l_3 > l_8 - (l_1 + l_2)|L_\alpha|$$

From here we get $l_8 < l_3 + (l_1 + l_2)|L_\alpha|$ and thus $l_1/|L_\alpha| < (l_1 + 2l_2)|L_\alpha|$ from which we get

$$l_2 > l_1 \frac{(1 - |L_\alpha|^2)}{2|L_\alpha|^2}. \quad (50)$$

Relative to the top edge of S , we look at the position of the segment \overline{BC} . Under certain restriction on α , we will be able to ensure a vertical segment through S belonging to $\Phi^{m_1}(\gamma^u(x))$ for some integer m_1 .

For the analog of Eq. (35) in this situation, it is enough to ensure (noting that $l_8 = l_4$),

$$\alpha l_2 - (1 + |L_\alpha|^2)l_4 - (l_3 + l_4) > (l_3 + l_4) \Rightarrow \alpha l_2 > (3 + |L_\alpha|^2)l_8 + 2l_3.$$

Also noting that $l_3 = |L_\alpha|l_2$, from the above we have the requirement of,

$$(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|)l_2 > (3 + |L_\alpha|^2)l_8. \quad (51)$$

Along with Eq. (50) and the fact that $l_1 = |L_\alpha|l_8$ and the above, it is enough to require that:

$$(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|)(1 - |L_\alpha|^2) > 2|L_\alpha|(3 + |L_\alpha|^2). \quad (52)$$

For the analog of Eq. (40) in this situation, we have, if not a vertical segment through S , the requirement of

$$\alpha \left(l_2 - \frac{l_3 + l_8}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right) > (l_3 + l_8) \Rightarrow l_2 > \left(\frac{l_3 + l_8}{\alpha} \right) + \left(\frac{l_3 + l_8}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right).$$

Noting again that $l_3 = |L_\alpha|l_2$ and $l_1 = |L_\alpha|l_8$, we get from the above with a bit of algebra that

$$\begin{aligned} |L_\alpha|\alpha(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)l_2 &> (|L_\alpha|^2 l_2 + l_1)(2\alpha - |L_\alpha|) \\ \Rightarrow l_2 &> l_1 \left(\frac{2\alpha - |L_\alpha|}{\alpha^2 |L_\alpha| - 3\alpha |L_\alpha|^2 + |L_\alpha|^3} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Along with Eq. (50), it is enough to require that:

$$\frac{(1 - |L_\alpha|^2)}{2|L_\alpha|} > \left(\frac{2\alpha - |L_\alpha|}{\alpha^2 - 3\alpha |L_\alpha| + |L_\alpha|^2} \right) \quad (53)$$




Figure 9: For the forward iterates of $\gamma^u(x)$ we have the successive segments which approach in the limit the rectangle \overline{ABCD} , with the ‘vertical’ segments $\overline{AB} \subset \Phi^{m_1}(\gamma^u(x))$, $\overline{CD} \subset \Phi^{m_1+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ and the ‘horizontal’ segments $\overline{BC} \subset \mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m_1}(\gamma^u(x))$, $\overline{AD} \subset \mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m_1+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ for some integer m_1 . Further, we have the segment $\overline{PQ} \subset \Phi^{-n}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some integer n .

- Now we have remaining the case of a vertical segment \overline{PQ} through S , belonging to $\mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_0}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some integer n_0 . This case is shown in the figure Fig. 10. If any of the ‘horizontal’ segments \overline{TP} or \overline{SV} intersects any one of the vertical segments \overline{AB} or \overline{CD} , then we are done.

Otherwise, it is enough to consider a case as shown in Fig. 10, with the segment $\overline{PQ} \subset \mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_1}(\gamma^s(y))$ and with $\overline{TP} \subset \Phi^{-n_1-1}(\gamma^s(y))$ and where T is above A on the left edge of S and further that the point Q lies to the right of D . In this case we will find a vertical segment $\overline{RS} \subset \mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_2}(\gamma^s(y))$, for some integer $n_2 > n_1$, through S and where S on the top edge lies to the left of the point D . This will either force a point of intersection between the segments \overline{SZ} and \overline{DC} or Z lies below C on the right edge of S , and then further onwards we can get a segment $\overline{EF} \subset \Phi^{m_2}(\gamma^u(x))$ which will intersect at least one of \overline{TP} or \overline{SZ} and we would be done.

Since T lies above A on the left edge of S in Fig. 10, we have, with $L_{\overline{PQ}}$ being the slope of \overline{PQ} within it’s cone, that $l_4(\alpha - |L_\alpha|) \leq |\overline{TX}|(\alpha + L_{\overline{PQ}}) = |\overline{PX}| \leq (l_1 + l_2)$, and thus also noting that $l_1 = |L_\alpha|l_4$, we have

$$l_4(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|) \leq l_2. \quad (54)$$

Now using the segment \overline{TP} relative to the top edge of S , we employ a modified argument preceding Eq. (35) in order to ensure that we have the requisite vertical segment \overline{RS} through S . First note that clearly

$$|\overline{PX}| \geq (l_2 - |L_\alpha|(l_3 + l_4)).$$




Figure 10: The segments constituting the rectangle \overline{ABCD} are as in Fig. 9. Now we are considering a segment $\overline{PQ} \subset \mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_1}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some positive integer n_1 . We further have $\overline{TP} \subset \Phi^{-n_1-1}(\gamma^s(y))$ and then we get a segment $\overline{RS} \subset \mathbf{G}^{-1} \circ \Phi^{-n_2}(\gamma^s(y))$ for some integer $n_2 > n_1$, in such a way that the segment $\overline{SZ} \subset \Phi^{-n_2-1}(\gamma^s(y))$ either intersects $\overline{CD} \subset \Phi^{m_1+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ or else we will find a vertical segment through $\overline{EF} \subset \Phi^{m_2}(\gamma^u(x))$ through S which is now guaranteed to intersect at least one of the segments $\overline{TP}, \overline{SZ}$ and we would be done.

In this case, it is enough to ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(l_2 - |L_\alpha|(l_3 + l_4)) - (l_3 + l_4) - l_3(1 + |L_\alpha|^2) &> (l_3 + l_4) \\ \Rightarrow \alpha(l_2 - |L_\alpha|(l_3 + l_4)) &> l_3(3 + |L_\alpha|^2) + 2l_4. \end{aligned}$$

Also noting that, $l_3 = |L_\alpha|l_2$, the above reduces to requiring

$$l_2 \left(\alpha(1 - |L_\alpha|^2) - |L_\alpha|(3 + |L_\alpha|^2) > l_4(2 + \alpha|L_\alpha|) \right) \quad (55)$$

Thus combining Eq. (54), it is enough to require that

$$(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|) > \frac{(2 + \alpha|L_\alpha|)}{\left(\alpha(1 - |L_\alpha|^2) - |L_\alpha|(3 + |L_\alpha|^2) \right)}. \quad (56)$$

Further, using an argument similar to the one preceding Eq. (40) in this case, it is easily seen that we will be done with a further requirement that:

$$\alpha \left(|\overline{PX}| - \frac{(l_3 + l_4)}{(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)} \right) > (l_3 + l_4)$$

and thus it is enough to require that:

$$\begin{aligned} (l_2 - |L_\alpha|(l_3 + l_4)) &> \frac{(l_3 + l_4)}{(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)} + \frac{(l_3 + l_4)}{\alpha} \\ \Rightarrow l_2 \left(1 - \frac{|L_\alpha|}{(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)} - \frac{|L_\alpha|}{\alpha}\right) &> l_4 \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} + |L_\alpha|\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus combining with Eq. (54), it will be enough to ensure that:

$$(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|) > \frac{(\alpha - |L_\alpha|) + \alpha + |L_\alpha|\alpha(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)}{\alpha(\alpha - |L_\alpha|) - \alpha|L_\alpha| - (\alpha - |L_\alpha|)|L_\alpha|}. \quad (57)$$

We note that as a result we have the vertical segment \overline{RS} , and that the point S lies to the right of D on the top edge of the square. By looking at the position of the segment \overline{BC} relative to the top edge, with arguments similar to those preceding Eqs. (35) and (40), we ensure for strong enough shears that there is the vertical segment $\overline{EF} \subset \Phi^{m_2}(\gamma^u)(x)$ for some integer $m_2 > m_1$.

With an analog of the argument preceding Eq. (35), it is enough to require that:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha l_2 - (l_3 + l_4) - l_4(1 + |L_\alpha|^2) &> (l_3 + l_4), \\ \alpha l_2 &> 2(l_3 + l_4) + l_4(1 + |L_\alpha|^2), \\ (\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|)l_2 &> l_4(3 + |L_\alpha|^2), \end{aligned}$$

and thus with Eq. (54), it is enough to require that

$$(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|)^2 > (3 + |L_\alpha|^2) \quad (58)$$

Further, for an analog of the argument preceding Eq. (40), we either have the vertical segment through the square in which case we are done, otherwise it is enough to have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(l_2 - \frac{(l_3 + l_4)}{(\alpha - |L_\alpha|)}\right) &> \frac{(l_3 + l_4)}{\alpha} \\ \Rightarrow l_2(\alpha^2 - 3\alpha|L_\alpha| + |L_\alpha|^2) &> l_4(2\alpha - |L_\alpha|) \end{aligned}$$

Along with Eq. (54), it is enough to ensure that

$$(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|) > \frac{(2\alpha - |L_\alpha|)}{(\alpha^2 - 3\alpha|L_\alpha| + |L_\alpha|^2)}. \quad (59)$$

Lastly we need to ensure that the segment \overline{EF} does intersect at least one of the segments \overline{TP} or \overline{SZ} ; for which it is enough to ensure that the magnitude of the slope of the line segment \overline{SP} is greater than $|L_\alpha|$.

In this case, we note that the horizontal separation of the points S, P is clearly bounded from below by $(l_1 + l_2) - 2(l_1 + |L_\alpha|(l_3 + l_4))$ and thus it is enough to require that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{l_2 - l_1 - 2|L_\alpha|(l_3 + l_4)}{(l_3 + l_4)} &\geq |L_\alpha| \\ \Rightarrow l_2 - l_1 &\geq 3|L_\alpha|(l_3 + l_4), \end{aligned}$$

and noting that $l_1 = |L_\alpha|l_4$ and $l_3 = |L_\alpha|l_2$, the above gives

$$l_2(1 + 3|L_\alpha|^2) > 4l_4|L_\alpha|.$$

Combining with Eq. (54), it is enough to require that

$$(\alpha - 2|L_\alpha|)(1 + 3|L_\alpha|^2) > 4|L_\alpha|. \quad (60)$$

2.4.3 Case c.

This case is entirely analogous to the previous Case b and all the bounds on α that we get here would be exactly the same as in the Case b.

2.4.4 Case d.




Figure 11: For the forward iterates of $\gamma^u(x)$ we have the successive segments which approach in the limit the rectangle \overline{ABCD} , with the ‘vertical’ segments $\overline{AB} \subset \Phi^m(\gamma^u(x))$, $\overline{CD} \subset \Phi^{m+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ and the ‘horizontal’ segments $\overline{BC} \subset \mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^m(\gamma^u(x))$, $\overline{AD} \subset \mathbf{F} \circ \Phi^{m+1}(\gamma^u(x))$ for some integer m . The rectangle \overline{XTUV} in the figure represents the corresponding set of sequences for the backward iterates of $\gamma^s(y)$.

In this case, we have four successive segments within S belonging to forward iterates of $\gamma^u(x)$ and four successive segments within S belonging to backward iterates of $\gamma^s(y)$. Further, these two limiting rectangles are reflections of each other about a vertical line through the middle of S .

We refer to Fig. 11. In this case, as noted earlier, we have $|\overline{RC}| \leq |\overline{PD}|$. In case we have strictly $|\overline{RC}| < |\overline{PD}|$, then we also necessarily have $|\overline{UD}| < |\overline{PD}|$ and that U is actually below P , when the rectangle \overline{XTUV} is taken to be the limiting set of four segments for the backward iterates of the stable manifold $\gamma^s(y)$. Thus after sufficiently many iterates, when the segments belonging to the forward iterates of the unstable manifold $\gamma^u(x)$ and the segments belonging to the backward iterates of the stable manifold $\gamma^s(y)$ are sufficiently close respectively to the rectangles \overline{ABCD} and \overline{XTUV} then we are forced to get requisite points of intersection between the segments $\overline{PQ}, \overline{TU}$ and also the segments $\overline{VX}, \overline{SR}$.

The only case that remains is when $|\overline{RC}| = |\overline{PD}|$. This can in any case correspond to a Lebesgue measure zero set of points $\{(x, y) \in S^2\}$ and thus makes no difference to the argument. Even then we can guarantee a requisite point of intersection in this case. In this case, we assume without loss of generality that the four forward iterates of $\gamma^u(x)$ are arbitrarily close to the segments of the rectangle \overline{PQRS} . Further suppose, as in Fig. 11, that the segment \overline{XT} belongs to some backward iterate of $\gamma^u(x)$ and that further, the point X lies above R and then also the point U lies above P , in which case we will be then forced to have a point of intersection between \overline{SR} and \overline{VX} and we would be done. Note that in this instance, the set of segments of \overline{XTUV} as shown in Fig. 11 do not constitute the limiting rectangle. In fact, this may actually not even be a proper rectangle and the image of U under \mathbf{F}^{-1} will not in general coincide with X but we will have $|\overline{BX}| \leq |\overline{AU}|$. If the point X lies above R and the point U lies below P , then we have a requisite point of intersection between the segments \overline{TU} and \overline{PQ} and we are done.

In the remaining case, if X lies below R then again we are forced to have a point of intersection between \overline{TU} and \overline{PQ} and we are also done.

2.5 Optimization in Case(ii).

In the end we have to optimize the parameters β_1, β_2 , and also take into account the several constraints on α , arising from Eqs. (13), (16), (18), (23), (25), (35) and (40) from Section 2.3(Part 2), along with Eqs. (42) to (44), (47), (48), (52), (53) and (56) to (60) from Section 2.4(Part 3). We require the parameters β_1, β_2 to be the minimum possible so that there exists a $\delta > 1$ so that the inequalities from Section 2.3 hold, and also ensure the shear parameter satisfies the constraints imposed by the further inequalities of Section 2.4.

- We first deal with the constraints of Section 2.3.

From Eq. (25), we have the requirement:

$$\beta_2 > \frac{\delta}{L_5 + \alpha} + \frac{\delta}{L_7 + \alpha}. \quad (61)$$

From Eq. (40), we have the requirement:

$$\beta_2 > \frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_5|} + \frac{\delta}{\alpha}. \quad (62)$$

From Eq. (35), we have the requirement:

$$\beta_2 > \frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_5|} \left(1 + \frac{2 + |L_5 L_6|}{(L_6 + \alpha)} \right). \quad (63)$$

From Eq. (13), we have the requirement:

$$\beta_1 > \frac{\delta}{L_2 + \alpha}. \quad (64)$$

From Eq. (16), we have the requirement:

$$\beta_1 > \frac{\delta}{L_3 + \alpha} + \frac{\delta}{L_2 + \alpha}. \quad (65)$$

From Eq. (18), we have the following constraint on α :

$$(L_3 + \alpha) > \delta \left(1 + \frac{L_3 + \alpha}{L_1 + \alpha} \right) \quad (66)$$

For the above to hold, for some $\delta > 1$, note that it is enough to have $(L_3 + \alpha)(L_1 + \alpha) > L_1 + L_3 + 2\alpha$, and since we have $(L_3 + \alpha)(L_1 + \alpha) > (L_\alpha + \alpha)^2 > 2\alpha > L_1 + L_3 + 2\alpha$, it is enough to require that:

$$(L_\alpha + \alpha)^2 > 2\alpha. \quad (67)$$

We note that Eq. (67) is true when $\alpha > 2.783$.

We note that the constraint from Eq. (23) is the same as the one above from Eq. (18).

Noting that we have uniformly $L_\alpha \leq L_i \leq 0$, for all $i = 1, \dots, 9$, to require Eqs. (62) and (63) it is enough to require that:

$$\beta_2 \geq \max \left(\frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} + \frac{\delta}{\alpha}, \frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \left(1 + \frac{2 + L_\alpha^2}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right), \frac{2\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right) \quad (68)$$

$$= \max \left(\frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \left(1 + \frac{2 + L_\alpha^2}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right), \frac{2\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right) \quad (69)$$

On the right hand side above, we have accordingly as $\alpha \gtrsim 2.66$, (subject to slight change) that:

$$\frac{2\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \gtrsim \frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \left(1 + \frac{2 + L_\alpha^2}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right) \quad \left(\Rightarrow \alpha - |L_\alpha| \gtrsim (2 + L_\alpha^2) \right).$$

Also, to ensure Eqs. (64) and (65), it is enough to require that:

$$\beta_1 \geq \max \left(\frac{\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|}, \frac{2\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \right) = \frac{2\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|} \quad (70)$$

First we restrict to $\alpha \geq 2.66$, and take the parameters β_1 and β_2 to be the minimum possible allowable values; thus, we take:

$$\beta_2 = \beta_1 = \frac{2\delta}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|}, \quad (71)$$

Note that we would here get a δ^2 term in place of the δ prefactors in [Prz83], and without loss of generality, can take the $\delta = 1$ above for the purpose of this calculation,

$$\beta_2 = \beta_1 = \frac{2}{\alpha - |L_\alpha|}, \quad (72)$$

Note that whenever $\alpha > 2.783$, we can alter the $\delta > 1$ as necessary to get that $(1 - \delta \cdot l_v(\gamma)) > 0$, since in the most general case we can verify that $l_v(\gamma) < \frac{2}{(L_\alpha + \alpha)} < 1$, since $2 < L_\alpha + \alpha$ when $\alpha > 2.783$, and we restrict to this range now. As noted earlier, $L_\alpha = -(\alpha/2) + \sqrt{(\alpha/2)^2 - 1}$.⁽¹⁷⁾

Thus following [Prz83], it is enough to require:

$$l_v(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^4 l_v(I_i) > l_v(\gamma) \left(\frac{\beta_2}{\alpha(1 - l_v(\gamma))} + \frac{2}{2\alpha + L_\alpha} + \frac{\beta_1}{\alpha + L_\alpha} \right), \quad (73)$$

and thus it is enough to have,

$$1 > \left(\frac{\beta_2}{\alpha(1 - \frac{2}{\alpha + L_\alpha})} + \frac{2}{2\alpha + L_\alpha} + \frac{\beta_1}{\alpha + L_\alpha} \right), \quad (74)$$

with β_1, β_2 being given by Eq. (72). The optimal parameter is $\alpha_0 = 3.47$ in this case, consistent with our earlier assumption that $\alpha > 2.783$ to begin with.

- Next we verify that the constraints arising in Section 2.4 are all satisfied for the optimal shear parameters $\alpha > \alpha_0$.

For the constraints Eqs. (42) to (44) and (47) involving κ , we a-priori use an estimate of $\kappa = 2/3$, and verify that the corresponding inequalities are true for $\alpha > \alpha_0 = 3.47$. We verify that Eq. (42) is satisfied for $\alpha > 2.69$, Eq. (43) is satisfied for $\alpha > 3.46$, Eq. (44) is satisfied for $\alpha > 3.17$, Eq. (47) is satisfied for $\alpha > 3$.

For the remaining constraints, we check that Eq. (48) is satisfied for $\alpha > 3.07$, Eq. (52) is satisfied for $\alpha > 3.20$, Eqs. (53) and (56) are always satisfied, Eq. (57) is satisfied for $\alpha > 2.75$, Eq. (58) is satisfied for $\alpha > 3.33$, Eq. (59) is satisfied for $\alpha > 2.54$, and Eq. (60) is satisfied for $\alpha > 2.31$.⁽¹⁸⁾

2.6 Case (iv)

We now deal with the simpler Case(iv) outlined in Section 2.1 for the first return having two components each intersecting S , as depicted by Fig. 4(b). For this, either of the following three is enough:

⁽¹⁷⁾Note, as in [Prz83], that the condition $2/(L_\alpha + \alpha) < 1$ follows from requiring that we are not already done with having a horizontal segment through S

⁽¹⁸⁾All these inequalities were verified with Mathematica 13.1

- $l_h(I_1) \geq \delta\beta_1 l_v(\gamma)$,
- $l_h(I_1) \geq \delta\beta_1 l_v(\gamma)$,
- $l_h\mathbf{F}(I_2) - l_h(I_2) \geq \delta \cdot l_v(\gamma)$.

Here the constant β_1 from the analysis of Case(ii) is used in the first two equations since these situations can be easily seen to be analogous to the corresponding analysis in Case(ii). The bounds obtained in Case (iv) are better than those obtained from Case (ii), the critical shear is determined by the best possible improvement in Case(ii), and we don't work on improving the third equation above, and only require: $l_h\mathbf{F}(I_2) - l_h(I_2) \geq \delta \cdot l_v(\gamma)$.

In this case, following Equation (13) in [Prz83] and the earlier arguments, it is enough to require that:

$$1 > \frac{2\beta_1}{\alpha + L_\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha}. \tag{75}$$

The optimal value from the above is $\alpha = 2.95$.

Thus combining Case(ii) (and hence also Case(iii)) along with Case(iv), we get that in the most general case, $\alpha = 3.47$ is the optimal shear parameter.

3 Conclusion:

All the extensions to the arguments of [Prz83] here involve segments that touch one end of the central square S .

The methods used here can be extended to deal with usual modifications of the linked twist map, such as those discussed in Section 2 of [Prz83], or in [Spr08]; cases with more than one linked region. Further, one might make an assumption of the shearing regions being small, in which case one can assume that $l_v(\gamma)$ is negligible, and thus alter Eq. (73) for getting the optimal parameter from Case(ii).

Further, in the analysis of determining the lower bound on the β_2 parameter, we can make adjustments in several places if one assumes that the regions $H \setminus S$ and $V \setminus S$ are large compared with S itself, or imposes certain other restrictions for the parameters D_1, D_2 in Figure 6, this would improve the lower bound for β_2 .

Also, if one works with boundary identifications where the top edge of the unit square is identified with the left or the right edge, as happens in [Pat22], then again these methods can be suitably altered to improve the optimal shear parameter for which ergodicity is achieved.

4 Acknowledgements:

The author is thankful to Feliks Przytycki for useful feedback on this question and to Manu Mannattil for help with setting up some of the diagrams.

References

[Bur80] Burton, Robert, and Robert W. Easton. "Ergodicity of linked twist maps." *Global Theory of Dynamical Systems*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1980. 35-49.

- [Dev78] Devaney, Robert L. "Subshifts of finite type in linked twist mappings." *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 71.2 (1978): 334-338.
- [Fou13] Foulon, Patrick, and Boris Hasselblatt. "Contact Anosov flows on hyperbolic 3-manifolds." *Geometry and Topology* 17.2 (2013): 1225-1252.
- [Fou21] Foulon, Patrick, Boris Hasselblatt, and Anne Vaugon. "Orbit growth of contact structures after surgery." arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14357 (2019)
- [Kat06] Katok, Anatole, and Jean-Marie Strelcyn. "Invariant manifolds, entropy and billiards. Smooth maps with singularities." Vol. 1222. Springer, 2006.
- [Liv95] Liverani, Carlangelo, and Maciej P. Wojtkowski. "Ergodicity in Hamiltonian systems." *Dynamics Reported: Expositions in Dynamical Systems* (1995): 130-202.
- [Pat22] Pathak, Aritro. "Ergodicity of surgered flow on unit tangent bundle of hyperbolic surface.", (Submitted).
- [Pes77] Pesin, Ya B. "Characteristic Lyapunov exponents and smooth ergodic theory." *Russian Mathematical Surveys* 32, no. 4 (1977): 55.
- [Prz83] Feliks, Przytycki. "Ergodicity of toral linked twist mappings." *Annales scientifiques de l'Ecole normale supérieure*. Vol. 16. No. 3. 1983.
- [Spr08] Springham, James. "Ergodic properties of linked-twist maps." arXiv preprint arXiv:0812.0899 (2008).
- [Woj80] Wojtkowski, Maciej. "Linked twist mappings have the K-property." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 357.1 (1980): 65-76.