

Noisy fixed points: stability of the invariant distribution of the random logistic map

Kimberly Ayers^{1*} and Ami Radunskaya^{2†}

^{1*}Department of Mathematics, California State University San Marcos,
333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Rd., San Marcos, 92096, CA, USA.

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Pomona College, 610
College Ave., Claremont, 91711, CA, USA.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): kayers@csusm.edu;
Contributing authors: aradunskaya@pomona.edu;

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

The full family of discrete logistic maps has been widely studied both as a canonical example of the period-doubling route to chaos, and as a model of natural processes. In this paper we present a study of the stochastic process described by iterations of the logistic map with a random parameter. In addition to bringing together previously known results, we present a proof that the unique invariant measure of the process in the chaotic regime is asymptotically stable.

Keywords: stochastic quadratic map; discrete chaos; Markov process; asymptotic stability

1 Introduction

The discrete logistic map is well known as a model of self-limiting population growth, whose dynamic properties are described in the early review paper by Robert May [1]. In this highly influential paper (over 6,600 citations as of November, 2023), May

states that, while the fine structure of the bifurcation diagrams in unimodal maps are fascinating, what is more important in practice is the statistical properties of these maps. In his opinion, “What is called for is an effectively stochastic description of the dynamics”, and that these descriptions of evolving continuous densities will still capture some salient features of the maps themselves. One way to see beyond the micro-structure created by evolving parameter values in the deterministic setting is to make these parameters random variables. To reflect what might happen in practice, where parameter values representing growth rates might fluctuate over some specific range, the support of these random variables might be a small interval. Since May’s remarks appeared, many models of this sort have appeared in the ecology, biology and economics literature. In [2], the authors address the Neubert conjecture by looking at a stochastically-perturbed Beverton-Holt model of population growth. A continuous version of the stochastic logistic model is studied in [3], where they show that these systems can be used to describe experimental results on microbial growth. Three different economic models described by randomly perturbed deterministic maps are studied in [4], [5] and [6]. These examples are by no means exhaustive: they do give a sense of the ubiquity and impact of these models. In most cases, the goal is to first show that the map has a unique invariant measure, since the uniqueness of this measure is essential if one is to say something about the long-term behavior of the system.

Along these same lines, Kolmogorov suggested starting with a deterministic dynamical system, and adding a stochastic perturbation in such a way that the resulting process has a unique invariant measure. This stochastic version of the original deterministic system is sometimes called the *Kolmogorov measure* of the dynamical system [7].

In this paper we present a study of the stochastic process described by iterations of the logistic map with a randomly-varying parameter. In addition to bringing together

previously known results, we present a proof that the unique invariant measure of the process is asymptotically stable.

2 Background and Definitions

Given a state space S , one can consider either a deterministic or a stochastic (or random) discrete dynamical system on S . A deterministic dynamical system is given by a function $f : S \rightarrow S$, where, given an initial state $x_0 \in S$, one can compute future states recursively:

$$x_{n+1} = f(x_n).$$

Because, given x_n , the value of x_{n+1} can be computed exactly, this is a *deterministic* process, and the set of iterates, $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots = \{x_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, is called the *trajectory* of the initial value x_0 under the dynamical system given by the function f . A natural question is: given an initial value, x_0 , what is the long-term behavior of the sequence x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots ? If the sequence converges to a finite value, it must be a fixed point, i.e. a value x^* that satisfies $x^* = f(x^*)$. So one of the first questions a dynamicist asks when encountering a dynamical system is: where are the fixed points? Other questions of interest include determining the stability of fixed points - whether nearby trajectories converge toward, or away from, fixed points - and looking at the limiting behavior of non-fixed points.

In a stochastic dynamical system, we consider a sequence of random variables: $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. Given a value for the random variable X_n in the state space, the value of X_{n+1} can not be determined exactly because the law of evolution is subject to some noise. We are then interested in the sequence of distributions of these random variables. In particular, we are interested in the existence of an *invariant distribution*: a distribution of X_n such that X_{n+1} has the same distribution. If such a distribution

exists, we are also interested in its stability; that is, whether other distributions converge to this invariant distribution in some manner. We define the random logistic map and the notions of invariant measures and stability more precisely below.

In this paper, we consider the state space $S = [0, 1]$, and the parameter space $\Lambda = (3.87, 4)$. Let $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denote the Borel sigma-algebra on S . We consider the logistic Markov process

$$X_{n+1} = \lambda_{n+1}X_n(1 - X_n), \quad (1)$$

where $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ are independent, Λ -valued random variables, independent of X_n with identical distribution Q . The initial state X_0 is an S -valued random variable, independent of the λ 's. Let $A \subset S$. Then $\{X_n\}$ is an S -valued Markov process with a continuous state space, S , and transition probabilities

$$\text{Prob}\{X_1 \in A | X_0 = x\} = p(x, A) = Q\left(\frac{A}{x(1-x)}\right).$$

In words: the probability that X_1 is in a given set A , given $X_0 = x$, is the probability of the set of λ -values that map x to a point in A . The measure p is called a (one-step) *transition probability* on the state space, S , and we can write $p(x, A) = \int_S \mathbf{1}_A p(x, dy)$.

Similarly, we write the n th order transition probability as

$$\text{Prob}\{X_n \in A | X_0 = x\} = p^n(x, A).$$

Suppose we have a distribution, μ , on the state space, S . When we apply the process (1) to subsets of S , we induce a new distribution, $P\mu$ on the state space as follows. If $A \subset S$, then we define

$$P\mu(A) = \int_S p(x, A)\mu(dx). \quad (2)$$

So the operator P maps probability measures on S to probability measures on S . We can now define an *invariant measure* under the operator, P , which corresponds to a fixed point in the deterministic case.

Definition 1. *If $P\mu(A) = \mu(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ then μ is an invariant measure under the operator P .*

We can iterate the operator P a positive number m times, which we denote by P^m : if X_0 has distribution μ then X_m has distribution $P^m\mu$. This leads us the analog to stability in the stochastic context.

Definition 2. *A sequence of probability measures $P^n (n \geq 1)$ on S converges weakly to a probability measure P on S if, for any continuous, bounded function $h : S \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S h dP^n = \int_S h dP$$

In the deterministic case, we know that, if the iterates of x_0 under a continuous function, f , converge to a point, x , then x must be a fixed point of f . This result follows from the continuity of f . We can get a similar result in the stochastic setting, but we first need to define a notion of continuity. Suppose we have a Markov process on S with transition probabilities given by $p(x, dy)$.

Definition 3. *The transition probability $p(x, dy)$ is weakly continuous or has the Feller property if, for every continuous and bounded function $h : S \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, the function*

$$x \mapsto \int_S h(y)p(x, dy)$$

is continuous.

Using weak continuity we get the following result ([8], Theorem 11.1).

Proposition 1. *Suppose $p(x, dy)$ is a transition probability on S with the Feller property.*

1. If there is an $x \in S$, a sequence of integers $1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ and a probability measure π_x on S such that

$$\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{m=0}^{n_k-1} p^{(m)}(x, dy) \text{ converges weakly to } \pi_x \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

then π_x is an invariant measure for p .

2. If the limit above exists for all $x \in S$ and is independent of x then $\pi = \pi_x$ is the unique invariant probability for p .

We can state this in terms of the operator P given in Equation (2). Suppose a process has the Feller property and we have a measure μ on S . If we have weak convergence in terms of the average to a measure, π :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} P^m \mu(A) \rightarrow \pi(A)$$

then π is an invariant measure under the operator P , i.e. $P\pi(A) = \pi(A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}(S)$. Furthermore, if Condition 2 holds in Proposition 1, then this invariant measure is unique.

What we'd like is the *asymptotic stability* of the (unique) invariant measure, π . In other words, for any probability measure μ on S , when is it the case that

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(S)} |P^n \mu(A) - \pi(A)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty?$$

To answer this question, we need the notions of *irreducibility* and *aperiodicity*.

The following definitions of irreducibility and recurrence are from [8], Def. 9.2

Definition 4. Let $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denote the Borel subsets of S .

A Markov process $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is Harris irreducible with reference measure ν (or ν -irreducible for short) if, for every $x \in S$ and every $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ with $\nu(B) > 0$, there is $n \geq 1$ such that $P^n(x, B) > 0$.

In words: a Markov process is Harris irreducible if every element in the state space eventually gets mapped to any set of positive probability.

We will also use a “local” version of irreducibility:

Definition 5. Let $J \subset S$ be a set of positive measure. We say that $\{X_n\}$ is ν -irreducible on J if, for all $x \in S$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(J)$ with $\nu(B) > 0$, then there is an $n \geq 1$ such that $P^n(x, B) > 0$.

The Krylov-Bogolubov theorem [9] tells us that a stochastic dynamical system obtained from a continuous function on a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d with independent parametric noise always has an invariant distribution:

Theorem 1 (Krylov-Bogolubov). A Feller continuous, stationary Markov process on a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d has an invariant distribution.

The theorem applies to more general settings, but this more specific version is all we need here. Harris irreducibility can then be used to show that this invariant distribution is unique.

Theorem 2. [10] If a Markov process is Harris irreducible and has an invariant probability μ^* , then μ^* is the unique invariant probability and, for any probability measure μ on S :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(S)} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n P^m \mu(A) - \mu^*(A) \right| = 0$$

Thus, if a Markov process is Harris irreducible, we know that any measure converges to a unique invariant measure, μ^* , under the operator, P “in the sense of Césaro”, i.e. the average of the sequence of measures converges to μ^* . To get asymptotic stability of the invariant measure without this average, we need one more condition: aperiodicity.

Definition 6. A Markov process is said to be strongly aperiodic if there is a set $A_0 \subset S$ with $\nu(A_0) = 1$ and an $\alpha > 0$ such that for all $x \in A_0$, A a measurable subset of S , one has

$$p(x, A) \geq \alpha \nu(A)$$

Theorem 3 ([8], Theorem C9.2). If a Markov process is Harris irreducible and strongly aperiodic with invariant measure μ^* then, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{B}(S)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta(P^n \mu, \mu^*) = 0$$

where δ is the total variation distance

$$\delta(P, Q) = \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} |P(B) - Q(B)|.$$

As an example of the ideas presented in this section, let us consider a version of the stochastic logistic map as examined in [11]. In this paper, Bhattacharya and Rao consider the stochastic logistic map

$$X_{n+1} = \lambda_{n+1} X_n (1 - X_n)$$

where λ is distributed according to a Bernoulli distribution, and takes two possible values, α and β (where $\alpha < \beta$). Thus, the process switches randomly between two quadratic maps. Bhattacharya and Rao demonstrate that if $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 1$, then δ_0 , the Dirac measure supported on 0, is the unique invariant probability on $[0,1]$. If $1 < \alpha < \beta \leq 2$ then there is a unique invariant probability on $(0,1)$, and this probability is nonatomic. If $2 < \alpha < \beta < 1 + \sqrt{5}$ and $\alpha \in [8/\beta(4 - \beta), \beta)$, then there exists a unique invariant probability on $(0,1)$ which is nonatomic and has its support

contained in $[1/2, \lambda/4]$.

3 Proof of the asymptotic stability of the invariant measure in the chaotic regime.

In section 2, we outlined results that give conditions for the existence of an invariant distribution of the stochastic logistic map, and for the stability of this invariant distribution. In this section we use these results to prove that, when parameters are supported in the chaotic regime, the random logistic map has a unique asymptotically stable invariant measure.

Recall that the logistic family: $f_\lambda(x) = \lambda x(1 - x)$ undergoes a period-doubling cascade as λ increases from 1 to approximately 3.56995. For higher values of λ , the family exhibits stable periodic orbits of odd period, following the Sarkowski sequence, culminating with a stable period-3 orbit when $\lambda = 1 + \sqrt{8}$. When λ is greater than this value the maps exhibit chaotic behavior on a Cantor set of parameter values. In this section, we are interested in randomly perturbing the values of λ in this chaotic regime: $\lambda \in (1 + \sqrt{8}, 4)$. The logistic family is well-studied in the literature, and more details on its dynamics can be found in, for example, [12]

In [13], Athreya and Dai consider the stochastic logistic map and show that if $E(\log \lambda_1) > 0, E(\log(4 - \lambda_1)) < \infty$, and if the process is Harris irreducible, then the probability distribution converges in the sense of Césaro to a unique probability distribution on $(0,1)$. They also demonstrate that the Markov process $\{X_n\}$ is Feller continuous, which guarantees the existence of the invariant distribution (but not its stability) by Theorem 1. We shall consider the case when $\lambda \sim \mathcal{U}(3.87, 4)$.

Remark 1. Let $\lambda_i \sim \mathcal{U}(3.87, 4)$. Then we claim that $E(\log \lambda_1) > 0$ and $E(\log(4 - \lambda_1)) < \infty$. Notice that if $\lambda_1 \sim \mathcal{U}(3.87, 4)$, then $E(\lambda_1) = 3.935 > 0$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} E(\log(4 - \lambda)) &= \int_{3.87}^4 \frac{1}{0.13} \lambda \log(4 - \lambda_1) d\lambda \\ &\approx -12, \end{aligned}$$

the last step computed numerically via Mathematica. Thus $E(\log(4 - \lambda_1))$ is finite.

This remark implies that if the process $\{X_n\}$ is Harris irreducible, then there exists a unique probability distribution on $(0, 1)$ to which other probability distributions converge to in the sense of Cesaro.

The following results prove the Harris irreducibility and aperiodicity of the Markov process, which then gives the asymptotic stability of the invariant measure. Lemmas 1 and 2 build toward Theorem 4, which is a local irreducibility result. Next, we present Theorem 5, which gives the Harris irreducibility of the Markov process, and finally Theorem 6, which shows that the process is strongly aperiodic and, hence, has a unique asymptotically stable invariant measure.

Lemma 1. Let $\lambda_i \sim \mathcal{U}(3.87, 4)$ for all $i \geq 1$, α a fixed element in $(3.87, 4)$, and x^* such that $x^* = \alpha x^*(1 - x^*)$. (Equivalently, $x^* = 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}$.) Then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $x \in I = (x^* - \eta, x^* + \eta)$ and $A \subset I$ with $m(A) > 0$, then

$$p(x, A) = \text{Prob}\{X_1 \in A \mid X_0 = x\} > 0.$$

That is, there is a neighborhood I around the fixed point for which every $x \in I$ has a positive probability of visiting each subset of I of positive measure.

Proof. Fix $\alpha \in (3.87, 4)$, and let $x^* \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\alpha x^*(1 - x^*) = x^*$. Notice that for any $\eta > 0$, $x \in S$ and $A \subset I \equiv (x^* - \eta, x^* + \eta)$,

$$\sup \left\{ \frac{A}{x(1-x)} \right\} \leq \frac{x^* + \eta}{\inf \{x(1-x) | x \in I\}} \equiv a(\eta)$$

and

$$\inf \left\{ \frac{A}{x(1-x)} \right\} > \frac{x^* + \eta}{\sup \{x(1-x) | x \in I\}} \equiv b(\eta)$$

Since $h(x) = x(1-x)$ is continuous at x^* and $\alpha h(x^*) = x^*$, it follows that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $a(\eta) < 4$ and $b(\eta) > 3.87$. Thus, $\frac{A}{x(1-x)} \subset (3.87, 4)$, and since A has positive measure, so does $\frac{A}{x(1-x)}$, and therefore $P(x, A) > 0$.

□

Remark 2. Note that while we take the distribution of λ on $(3.87, 4)$ to be uniform, the same result will hold if we replace the uniform distribution with a distribution that has non-vanishing absolutely continuous part.

Lemma 2. Let I be defined as in Lemma 1. For each $x \in (0, 1)$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and a finite sequence $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subset (3.87, 4)$ such that $Y_n \in I$, $Y_0 = x$, and $Y_{j+1} = f(Y_j, \alpha_{j+1})$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. (That is, all $x \in (0, 1)$ can get into I within a finite number of steps.)

Proof. Fix $\alpha \in (3.87, 4)$; recall then that the logistic map with parameter α is *topologically transitive*; that is, there exists an orbit $\{y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots\}$ that is dense in $(0, 1)$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \min\{\alpha - 3.87, 4 - \alpha\}$. We claim that, given $x \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\alpha^* \in (3.87, 4)$ and $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(\alpha^*, x) = y_{N_1}$. In order for this to happen, we need

$$\alpha^* = \frac{\alpha y_{N_1-1}(1 - y_{N_1-1})}{x(1-x)}$$

By the denseness of the orbit $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, for all $\delta > 0$ there is some $N_\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x - y_{N_\delta}| < \delta$. We can guarantee that $\alpha^* \in (3.87, 4)$ by making an appropriate choice for δ , and letting $N_1 = N_\delta$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\alpha^* - \alpha| &= \left| \frac{\alpha y_{N_1-1}(1 - y_{N_1-1})}{x(1-x)} - \alpha \right| \\
&= \alpha \left| \frac{y_{N_1-1}(1 - y_{N_1-1})}{x(1-x)} - 1 \right| \\
&< \alpha \left| \frac{(x + \delta)(1 - (x - \delta))}{x(1-x)} - 1 \right| \\
&= \alpha \left| \frac{x(1-x)}{x(1-x)} + \delta \left(\frac{1 + \delta}{x(1-x)} \right) - 1 \right| \\
&= \alpha \delta \left| \frac{1 + \delta}{x(1-x)} \right|
\end{aligned}$$

which can thus be made arbitrarily small (and in particular, less than ε) by taking δ sufficiently small.

Because I has positive measure, the dense orbit $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ must visit I infinitely often. Therefore, there exists $N_2 \geq N_1$ such that $y_{N_2} \in I$. Thus, the sequence $\{\alpha^*, \alpha, \alpha, \dots, \alpha\}$ will map $x \in (0, 1)$ into I within a finite $(N_2 - N_1 + 1)$ number of iterations. \square

Theorem 4. $\{X_n\}$ is m -irreducible on I where m is Lebesgue measure.

Proof. Fix $x \in (0, 1)$ and let $A \subset I$ with $m(A) > 0$. By continuity of f and by Lemma 2, for all $x \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as given in Lemma 2, if $|\lambda_i - \alpha_i| < \varepsilon$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, where $X_0 = x$, $X_{j+1} = f(X_j, \lambda_{j+1})$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, then $X_n \in I$. Notice then that

$$p(X_n \in I | X_0 = x) \geq \prod_{i=1}^n p(|\lambda_i - \alpha_i| < \varepsilon) > 0.$$

By Lemma 1, $p(X_{n+1} \in A | X_n \in I) > 0$. Thus,

$$p(X_{n+1} \in A | X_0 = x) = p(X_{n+1} \in A | X_n \in I) \cdot p(X_n \in I | X_0 = 0) > 0.$$

Therefore $\{X_n\}$ is m -irreducible on I . \square

Remark 3. We can equivalently think of $\{X_n\}$ as Harris irreducible on S with reference measure $\phi(\cdot) = m(\cdot \cap I)$, where m is Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 5. As above, let $S = [0, 1]$.

$$X_{n+1} = \lambda_{n+1}X_n(1 - X_n), \quad n \geq 0$$

with $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ being i.i.d., $\lambda_i \sim \mathcal{U}(3.87, 4)$, and X_0 an independent S -valued r.v. Then $\{X_n\}$ is irreducible with respect to the Lebesgue measure m on S .

Proof. By a result of Graczyk and Swiatek [14], the set of all λ in $(0, 4)$ such that $f(\cdot, \lambda)$ has a stable periodic orbit is dense. Thus, there is a $\alpha \in (3.87, 4)$ and $0 < p < 1$ such that x^* is a stable periodic point for $f(x, \alpha) = \alpha x(1 - x)$. Let δ be such that $(\alpha - \delta, \alpha + \delta) \subset (3.87, 4)$.

Let $K = \{x \in (0, 1) \mid \omega_\alpha(x) = \gamma(x^*)\}$, where ω_α is the limit set of the orbit of x under $f(\cdot, \alpha)$ and $\gamma(x^*)$ is the orbit of the periodic point x^* . In [15] (Chapter V, Theorem 1.3) de Melo and van Strien have shown that $m(K) = 1$ for unimodal maps, where m is Lebesgue measure. Thus let $I = (x^* - \eta, x^* + \eta)$ as given by Theorem 1. Then, for all $x \in K$, $f^{(n)}(x, \alpha) \in I$ for some large n . Thus, by continuity of f ,

$$p_x(X_n \in I \text{ for some } n \geq 1) > 0 \tag{3}$$

for all $x \in K$.

We will next show that for any $x \in (0, 1)$, $P_x(X_1 \in K) > 0$. $x \in (0, 1)$ implies $\alpha x(1 - x) \in (0, 1)$, and since $m(K) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} m\left(\frac{K}{h(x)} \cap (3.87, 4)\right) &\geq m([0, \alpha] \cap (3.87, 4)) \\ &\geq \delta > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$p\left(\lambda_1 \in \frac{K}{h(x)} \cap (3.87, 4)\right) \geq \frac{\delta}{0.13} > 0$$

and

$$p_x(X_1 \in K) = p\left(\lambda_1 \in \frac{K}{h(x)}\right) \geq p\left(\lambda_1 \in \frac{K}{h(x)} \cap (3.87, 4)\right) > 0,$$

establishing irreducibility. \square

We now have that, since $E(\lambda) > 0$ and $E(\log(4 - \lambda)) < \infty$, and the process is Harris irreducible, by [13], the process $\{X_i\}$ has a unique invariant measure that other measures converge to in the sense of Cesaro. We conclude this section by demonstrating that the process is strongly aperiodic, and thus the invariant distribution is asymptotically stable with respect to the total variation norm.

Theorem 6. *Let $S = [0, 1]$.*

$$X_{n+1} = \lambda_{n+1}X_n(1 - X_n), \quad n \geq 0$$

with $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ being i.i.d., $\lambda_i \sim \mathcal{U}(3.87, 4)$, and X_0 an independent S -valued r.v. Then $\{X_n\}$ is strongly aperiodic, and thus has an asymptotically stable invariant distribution.

Proof. Let $\lambda_{min} = 3.87$, and let $A_0 = (1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_{min}}, 1 - \frac{1}{4})$ (that is, A_0 is the set of fixed points for the deterministic systems corresponding to the possible parameter λ values of the logistic map). Let L be the length of A_0 (that is, $L_1 = (1 - \frac{1}{4}) - (1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_{min}})$)

and let L_2 be the length of interval $(\lambda_{min}, 4)$. Let ν be normalized Lebesgue measure on A_0 . Then A_0 , by definition, has measure 1, and the only sets of positive measure are those that overlap A_0 in a set of positive Lebesgue measure. Thus, notice that

$$\nu(A) = \frac{1}{L_1} \int_{y \in A} dy$$

Fix $x \in A_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} p(x, A) &= p\left(\lambda \in \frac{A}{x(1-x)}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{L_2} \int_{\frac{A}{x(1-x)}} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{L_2} \int_A \frac{1}{x(1-x)} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{L_2} \frac{1}{x(1-x)} \int_A dy \\ &= \frac{1}{L_2} \cdot \frac{1}{x(1-x)} \cdot L_1 \nu(A) \\ &\geq 4 \cdot \frac{L_1}{L_2} \nu(A), \end{aligned}$$

since $x(1-x) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Thus, letting $\alpha = 4 \cdot \frac{L_1}{L_2}$ gives us the desired result. Therefore, the process $\{X_n\}$ is strongly aperiodic, and has an asymptotically stable invariant distribution. \square

4 Simulations and Discussion

Suppose X is a random variable taking values in $[0, 1]$. If $Pr\{X \leq x\} = Pr\{f(X) \leq x\}$ then we say that the distribution of X is *invariant under f* . In this way, we can discuss invariant distributions for the deterministic logistic map, by looking at distributions invariant under $f_\lambda(x) = \lambda x(1-x)$. In [16], Ulam and von Neumann proved that the




Fig. 1 Histogram of the beta distribution with $\alpha = \beta = 0.5$. The solid line shows the theoretical distribution given in Equation (4); the bars are a histogram generated by sampling 100,000 initial values uniformly on $(0, 1)$

continuous invariant distribution for the deterministic logistic map with $\lambda = 4$ is a beta distribution with $\alpha = \beta = 0.5$. This function is symmetric on the interval $(0,1)$, and goes to infinity at the endpoints of its support. Thus, the invariant distribution when $\lambda = 4$ is given by the function

$$f^*(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{x(1-x)}} & 0 < x < 1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

See Figure 1 for a comparison of this beta density and an empirical distribution.

However, invariant densities for other values of λ are not, in general, symmetric. In [17], Hall and Wolff provided numerical estimations for the invariant distributions for the deterministic logistic map for various values of λ . They demonstrated that any continuous invariant density will have poles (singularities) at the boundary of its support, as well as additional poles at the interior of the support in the case $\lambda < 4$. They also show that these invariant distributions were not symmetric. Figure 2 shows numerical approximations to these deterministic invariant densities for $\lambda = 3.87$ and $\lambda = 3.95$. These numerical approximations are histograms of 100,000 sampled initial values iterated 2,000 times. They indicate the singularities in the theoretical densities




Fig. 2 Histogram of the simulated invariant distribution for the deterministic logistic map with $\lambda = 3.87$ (left) and $\lambda = 3.935$ (right) for 100,000 sampled values.

described in Remark 5 of [17]. These singularities, or poles, correspond to the orbit of the critical point, $f_\lambda(1/2)$. In addition, Hall and Wolff observed that the invariant density will be supported on the interval $(\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4}), \frac{1}{4}\lambda)$. This is due to the fact that any point in the interval $(\frac{1}{4}\lambda, 1)$ will be mapped into the interval $(0, \frac{1}{4}\lambda^2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4}))$, and any point in $(0, \frac{1}{4}\lambda^2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4}))$ will be mapped to a point in $[\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4}), \frac{1}{4}\lambda]$. Therefore, after finitely many iterations, any point $x \in (0, 1)$ must be mapped into $[\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4}), \frac{1}{4}\lambda]$, and so the invariant density must be supported on this subinterval. Note that as $\lambda \rightarrow 4$, $\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4}) \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{1}{4}\lambda \rightarrow 1$, so the interval of support widens as λ approaches 4.

To numerically explore convergence to the invariant distribution in the stochastic case, we ran several simulations with 100,000 initial values sampled randomly according to a variety of distributions:

1. A discrete distribution supported on the set $\{0.11, 0.33, 0.55, 0.6, 0.78\}$ with probabilities $\{0.196, 0.140, 0.233, 0.322, 0.107\}$ respectively (Figure 3, left).
2. A discrete distribution supported on $\{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ each with probability $1/3$.
3. A truncated exponential distribution on $(0, 1)$ with parameter $r = 1.2$ (Figure 3, right).
4. A truncated gamma distribution on $(0, 1)$ with shape parameter 3 and scale parameter 1.

5. A truncated normal distribution on $(0,1)$ with mean 0.5 and standard deviation 0.3.
6. A truncated t -distribution on $(0,1)$ with 1 degree of freedom.
7. A uniform distribution on $(0,1)$ (Figure 3, center).

In each case, after 2,000 iterations, we obtained a histogram very similar to that presented in Figure 4: a bi-modal, asymmetric distribution that appears to be supported on the entirety of the unit interval, without singularities (poles) in the interior. This is noteworthy, particularly because we simulated using both continuous and discrete starting distributions. We examined distributions that were left-skewed, right-skewed, and symmetric. Each simulated initial distribution appears to converge to the same distribution after 2,000 iterations, aligning with the global asymptotic stability of the invariant distribution established theoretically earlier in this paper. We also note that, while the distribution demonstrates peaks toward the sides of the interval, it does not exhibit the poles at the boundary of the interval in the same manner that the invariant distributions for the deterministic maps do. However, this seems reasonable, as the interval of support of the invariant distribution is dependent on λ , as discussed above, and relatively fewer values of λ will map points into ranges closer to 0 and 1, so it makes sense that the distribution will decrease near the boundary of $[0, 1]$




Fig. 3 Starting distributions of 100,000 starting values sampled on the set $\{0.11, 0.33, 0.55, 0.6, 0.78\}$ with probabilities $\{0.196, 0.140, 0.233, 0.322, 0.107\}$ respectively (left), the uniform distribution on $(0,1)$ (middle), and the truncated exponential distribution with parameter $r = 1.25$ (right).




Fig. 4 Empirical distribution of $\{X_n\}$ after $n = 2,000$ iterations, where 100,000 initial values were sampled from an exponential distribution with parameter $r = 1.25$. Similar results were obtained using other initial distributions (results not shown).

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, we have illustrated that the stochastic logistic map, characterized by parameter values uniformly distributed in the chaotic regime, exhibits Harris irreducibility. Consequently, the previously established invariant distribution stands as the unique invariant distribution. This result also implies that all initial distributions converge to the invariant distribution in the Cesàro sense. Moreover, we have demonstrated the strong aperiodicity of the stochastic logistic map, indicating that initial distributions converge to the invariant distribution with respect to the total variation distance—a more robust and rigorous result. We conducted simulations of the stochastic logistic map to visualize the invariant distribution. Remarkably, the empirically derived invariant distribution exhibits qualitative distinctions when compared to the invariant distributions of the deterministic logistic map for values of λ in the chaotic regime. In particular, the simulated distribution does not appear to have a pole at $x = 0$, which contrasts with the work in [17], which demonstrates that the deterministic invariant density will have a pole at the boundary of its support.

It should be noted that this work does not seem to depend on the λ values being uniformly distributed on $(3.87, 4)$ and indeed, it appears that the results will hold for any absolutely continuous distribution on $(3.87, 4)$.

In future work, we plan to provide a theoretical basis for these empirical observations. In particular, we hope to better describe the asymptotically stable invariant distribution in the case that the λ -values are uniformly distributed (the case illustrated in Figure 4). We also plan to provide similar theoretical results when the parameter has other distributions, such as an exponential or discrete distribution.

References

- [1] May, R.M.: Simple mathematical models with very complicated dynamics. *Nature* **261**, 459–467 (1976)
- [2] Haskell, C., Sacker, R.J.: The stochastic beverton-holt equation and the m. neubert conjecture. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations* **17**(4), 825–844 (2005)
- [3] Descheemaeker, L., Buyl, S.: Stochastic logistic models reproduce experimental time series of microbial communities. *eLife* **9**, 55650 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.55650>
- [4] Satoh, D., Yamada, S.: Discrete equations and software reliability growth models. In: *Proceedings 12th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering*, pp. 176–184 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSRE.2001.989471>
- [5] Nishimura, K., Stachurski, J., et al.: Discrete time models in economic theory (2004)
- [6] Bhattacharya, R., Majumdar, M.: Stability in distribution of randomly perturbed quadratic maps as Markov processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **14**(4),

- 1802–1809 (2004) <https://doi.org/10.1214/105051604000000918>
- [7] Kifer, Y.: Ergodic Theory of Random Transformations. Birkhauser, Boston, Basel, Stuttgart (1986)
 - [8] Bhattacharya, R., Majumdar, M.: Random Dynamical Systems. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2007)
 - [9] Lasota, A., Mackey, M.C.: Chaos, Fractals, and Noise, 2nd edn. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (1994)
 - [10] Nummelin, E.: Miscellaneous limit theorems for Harris recurrent Markov chains. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, pp. 126–140. Cambridge University Press, ??? (1984). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511526237.008>
 - [11] Bhattacharya, R.N., Rao, B.V.: Random Iterations of Two Quadratic Maps, pp. 13–22. Springer, New York, NY (1993). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-7909-0_3 . https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-7909-0_3
 - [12] Holmgren, R.: A First Course in Discrete Dynamical Systems, 2nd edn. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (1996)
 - [13] Athreya, K.B., Dai, J.: Random logistic maps. i. Journal of Theoretical Probability **13**, 595–608 (2000)
 - [14] Graczyk, J., Świątek, G.: Generic hyperbolicity in the logistic family. Annals of Mathematics **146**(1), 1–52 (1997). Accessed 2023-10-07
 - [15] Melo, W., Strien, S.: One-dimensional Dynamics. Springer, ??? (1993)
 - [16] Ulam, S.M., Neumann, J.: On combination of stochastic and deterministic processes. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **53**, 1120 (1947)

- [17] Hall, P., Wolff, R.C.L.: Properties of invariant distributions and lyapunov exponents for chaotic logistic maps. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* **57**(2), 439–452 (1995). Accessed 2023-11-11