

A NEW INVARIANT FOR A CYCLE OF AN INTERVAL MAP

SOURAV BHATTACHARYA

ABSTRACT. We propose a new invariant for a cycle of an interval map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, called its *unfolding number*.

1. INTRODUCTION

In his 1964 legendary paper [19] (see [20] for English Translation), O.M. Sharkovsky unveiled an elegant *rule* governing the *co-existence* of *periods of periodic orbits* (also known as *cycles*) of a *continuous interval map*. He introduced the following *order* among all *natural numbers*:

$$3 \succ 5 \succ 7 \succ \dots \succ 2 \cdot 3 \succ 2 \cdot 5 \succ 2 \cdot 7 \succ \dots \\ \succ \dots \succ 2^2 \cdot 3 \succ 2^2 \cdot 5 \succ 2^2 \cdot 7 \succ \dots \succ 8 \succ 4 \succ 2 \succ 1$$

and proved the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1 ([19,20]). *If $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \succ n$, then if a continuous mapping $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ has a cycle of period m , then f must also have a cycle of period n .*

Theorem 1.1 reveals an intricate and *concealed combinatorial* framework that *governs* the *disposition* of *cycles* of a *continuous interval map* and led to the inception of a new direction of research in the theory of *dynamical systems* called *combinatorial dynamics*.

Future research stemming from Theorem 1.1 could branch out in numerous directions. For instance, one might *replace* the *interval* with a more *general space* or *replace periodic orbits* with more *general orbits* (e.g., *homoclinic trajectories*). Additionally, one could strive to discover a more “*refined*” *rule* for the *coexistence* of *periodic orbits* in a given *continuous interval map* than that provided by Theorem 1.1. For an extensive list of references and a comprehensive survey of the *evolution* of Theorem 1.1, its historical context, subsequent advancements, and implications in the *theory of dynamical systems*, one could refer to the books [1] and [11] and the paper [9].

In this paper, we pursue the latter mentioned approach for *refining* Theorem 1.1. Let us discuss in details. Observe that Theorem 1.1 elucidates how certain “*type*” of *dynamical behaviour* (here *period*) once exhibited by a map, *forces* some other “*type*” (*period*) and thus, the

Date: June 4, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 37E05, 37E10, 37E15; Secondary 37E45.

Key words and phrases. Sharkovsky Theorem, rotation numbers, ergodicity, unfolding numbers .

question of “*co-existence*” among “*types*” becomes a question of “*forcing*” among “*types*”. However, “*periods*” offer only a coarse depiction of a *cycle*, as numerous *cycles* share the same *period*. A more nuanced approach to characterizing *cycles*, involves examining their *cyclic permutations*: *cyclic permutation* we get when we look at how the map acts on the points of the *cycle*, ordered from the *left to the right*; we *identify cycles* having the *same* underlying *cyclic permutations* and call the corresponding *equivalence classes*: *patterns*.

As it turns out (see [3]), the *rule* for *co-existence* using this “*type*” is rather too *detailed* and doesn’t allow for a transparent description. This motivates one to look for a, middle-of-the-road way of describing cycles: *rotation theory*, a way not as *crude* as *periods* but not as fine as *permutations*, which would still allow for a *transparent description*.

The concept of *rotation numbers* was historically first introduced by Poincaré for *circle homeomorphisms* (See [18]). It was extended to *circle maps* of *degree one* by Newhouse, Palis and Takens (see [17]), and then studied, e.g., in [2,4,12,14–16]. In a general setting, *rotation numbers* can be defined as follows: Let X be a *compact metric space* with a Borel σ -algebra, $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a *bounded measurable function* (often called an *observable*) and $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a *continuous map*. Then for any $x \in X$ the set $I_{f,\phi}(x)$, of all *sub-sequential limits* of the sequence $\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \phi(f^i(x))\}$ is called the ϕ -*rotation set* of x . If $I_{f,\phi}(x) = \{\rho_\phi(x)\}$ is a singleton, then the number $\rho_\phi(x)$ is called the ϕ -*rotation number* of x . It is easy to see that the ϕ -*rotation set*, $I_{f,\phi}(x)$ is a closed interval for all $x \in X$. The *union* of all ϕ -*rotation sets* of all points of X is called the ϕ -*rotation set* of the map f and is denoted by $I_f(\phi)$. If x is an f -*periodic point* of period n , then its ϕ -*rotation number* $\rho_\phi(x)$ is well-defined, and a related concept of the ϕ -*rotation pair* of x can be introduced: the pair $(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \phi(f^i(x)), n)$ is the ϕ -*rotation pair* of x .

The use of *rotation theory* in the study of *dynamical systems* is useful when our *rotation theory* is *complete*. This means that:

- (1) *rotation set* is *convex*;
- (2) *rotation number* of a *cycle* of *period* n is of the form $\frac{m}{n}$ where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (3) if $\frac{m}{n}$ belongs to the *interior* of the *rotation set*, then there exists a *cycle* of *period* kn and *rotation pair* (km, kn) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Another way of looking at *rotation theory* is through *ergodic invariant measures* ([13], [1]). If P is a *cycle* of $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we can look at the *ergodic measure* μ_P , *equidistributed* on P , that is, such that $\mu_P(\{x\}) = \frac{1}{n}$ for all $x \in P$, where n is the *period* of P . Let us call μ_P , a *CO-measure* [13] (comes from “**c**losed **o**rbit”). Recall that for *Borel measures* on *compact spaces* one normally considers their *weak topology* defined by the *continuous functions* [13]. The following result follows:

Theorem 1.2 ([6]). *Suppose that $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a continuous interval map or a circle map with non-empty set of periodic points. Then any invariant probability measure μ for whom there exists a point*

x with $\mu(\omega_f(x)) = 1$, where $\omega_f(x)$ denotes omega limit set of x under f can be approximated by CO-measures arbitrary well. In particular, CO-measures are dense in the set of all ergodic invariant measures of f .

If the *dynamics* of f and the *observable* ϕ are related we can further deduce additional informations about ϕ -rotation sets, for instance, in the case of *circle degree one* case (see [15], [1]). Consider the circle $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with the *natural projection* $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$. If $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ is *continuous*, then there is a *continuous map* $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_f \circ \pi = \pi \circ f$. Such a map F_f is called a *lifting* of f . It is unique up to translation by an integer. An integer d with $F_f(X + 1) = F_f(X) + d$ for all $X \in \mathbb{R}$ is called the *degree* of the map f and is independent of the choice of F . *Conversely*, maps $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $G(X + 1) = G(X) + d$ for every real X are said to be *maps of the real line of degree d* , can be defined independently, and are *semi-conjugate* by the same map $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ to the *circle maps of degree d* . In this paper we consider both *maps of the circle* and *maps of the real line of degree one*. Denote by \mathcal{L}_1 the set of all *liftings* of *continuous degree one self-mappings* of \mathbb{S} endowed with the *sup norm*.

Given, a *continuous map*, $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, consider its *lifting* $F_f \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Define an *observable* $\phi_f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that $\phi_f(x) = F_f(X) - X$ for any $x \in \mathbb{S}$ and $X \in \pi^{-1}(x) \in \mathbb{R}$; then ϕ_f is well-defined, the *classical rotation set* of a point $x \in \mathbb{S}$ is simply the ϕ_f -*rotation set* $I_{f, \phi_f}(x) = I_f(x)$. It is easy to see that $I_f(x) = \left\{ \overline{\rho_{F_f}}(X), \underline{\rho_{F_f}}(X) \right\}$ where $\overline{\rho_{F_f}}(X) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_f^n(X) - X}{n}$ and $\underline{\rho_{F_f}}(X) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_f^n(X) - X}{n}$. The *numbers*: $\overline{\rho_{F_f}}(X)$ and $\underline{\rho_{F_f}}(X)$ are respectively called *upper* and *lower rotation numbers* of $X \in \mathbb{R}$ under $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (equivalently of $x \in \mathbb{S}$ under $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$). If $\overline{\rho_{F_f}}(X) = \underline{\rho_{F_f}}(X) = \rho_{F_f}(X)$, we write $\rho_{F_f}(X)$, the *rotation number* of X under F_f (equivalently of x under $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$).

Suppose $f^n(y) = y$, $y \in \mathbb{S}$, that is, y is a *periodic point* of $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ of *period n* . Then, for any $Y \in \pi^{-1}(y)$, $F_f^n(Y) = Y + m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence $\overline{\rho_{F_f}}(Y) = \underline{\rho_{F_f}}(Y) = \frac{m}{n}$. We call $\frac{m}{n}$, the *rotation number* of $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ under $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (equivalently of $y \in \mathbb{S}$ under $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$) and (m, n) the *rotation pair* of $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ under $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (equivalently of $y \in \mathbb{S}$ under $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$).


Rotation pairs can be represented in an interesting way using the notations used in [8]. We represent the *rotation pair* $rp(x) = (mp, mq)$ with p, q coprime and m being some natural number as a pair (t, m) where $t = \frac{p}{q}$. We call the later pair a *modified-rotation pair* (mrp) and write $mrp(x) = (t, m)$. We then think of the real line with a *prong* attached at each rational point and the set $\mathbb{N} \cup \{2^\infty\}$ marked on this prong in the *Sharkovsky ordering* \succ_s with 1 *closest* to the *real line* and 3 *farthest* from it. All points of the *real line* are marked 0; at irrational points we can think of degenerate prongs with only 0 on them. The union of all *prongs* and the *real line* is denoted by \mathbb{M} . Thus, a *modified*

rotation pair (t, m) corresponds to the specific element of \mathbb{M} , namely to the number m on the *prong* attached at t . However, no *rotation pair* corresponds to $(t, 2^\infty)$ or to $(t, 0)$. Then, for (t_1, m_1) and (t_2, m_2) , in \mathbb{M} , the *convex hull* $[(t_1, m_1), (t_2, m_2)]$ consists of all *modified rotation pairs* (t, m) with t strictly between t_1 and t_2 or $t = t_i$ and $m \in Sh(m_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$ (See Figure 1).

Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Let $mrp(F)$ be the set of *modified rotation pairs* of all *lifted cycles* of F . Clearly, $mrp(F) \subset \mathbb{M}$. The following theorem holds:

Theorem 1.3 ([15]). *Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Then there are elements (t_1, m_1) and (t_2, m_2) of \mathbb{M} such that $mrp(F) = [(t_1, m_1), (t_2, m_2)]$ and if t_i is rational, then $m_i \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, for any set of the above form there exists $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$ with $mrp(F)$ equal to this set.*

FIGURE 1. Pictorial representation of the convex hull (shown in blue) $[(t_1, m_1), (t_2, m_2)]$ of the modified rotation pairs (t_1, m_1) and (t_2, m_2) where $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$



Results similar to Theorem 1.3 were also proven for maps of intervals in [7] when a version of *rotation numbers* for *interval maps* called *over-rotation numbers* was introduced using a special *observable* χ . Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a *continuous interval map*, $Per(f)$ be its set of *periodic points*, and $Fix(f)$ be its set of *fixed points*. It is easy to see that if $Per(f) = Fix(f)$, then the *omega limit set*, $\omega(y)$ is a *fixed point* for any y . So, we can assume that $Per(f) \neq Fix(f)$. Now, define:

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } (f(x) - x)(f^2(x) - f(x)) \leq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } (f(x) - x)(f^2(x) - f(x)) > 0. \end{cases}$$

For any non-fixed periodic point y of period $p(y)$, the integer $l(y) = \sum_{i=0}^{p(y)-1} \chi(f^i(y))$ is at most $\frac{p(y)}{2}$ and is the same for all points from the orbit of y . The quantity $\frac{l(y)}{p(y)} = orn(y)$ is called the *over-rotation number* of y and the pair $orp(y) = (l(y), p(y))$ is called the *over-rotation pair* of y . In an *over-rotation pair* (p, q) , p and q are integers and $0 < \frac{p}{q} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Like before, we can transform all *over-rotation pairs* of cycles of a given

map f into *modified over-rotation pairs* of f and denote the *modified over-rotation pair* of a cycle P and the set of all *modified over-rotation pairs* of cycles of f by $mop(P)$ and $mop(f)$ respectively. Then, again $mop(f) \subset \mathbb{M}$ and the following theorem holds:

Theorem 1.4 ([7]). *If $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a continuous interval map with a non-fixed periodic point, then $mop(f) = [(t_1, m_1), (\frac{1}{2}, 3)]$ for some $(t_1, m_1) \in \mathbb{M}$. Moreover, for every $(t_1, m_1) \in \mathbb{M}$, there exists a continuous map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $mop(f) = [(t_1, m_1), (\frac{1}{2}, 3)]$.*

Given an interval map f , denote by I_f , the closure of the union of over-rotation numbers of f -periodic points, and call I_f the *over-rotation interval* of f . By Theorem 1.1, any map f with a non-fixed periodic points has a cycle of period 2 and such as cycle has over-rotation number $\frac{1}{2}$; by Theorem 1.4, if $\rho(P) = \frac{p}{q}$ for a cycle P then $[\frac{p}{q}, \frac{1}{2}] \subset I_f$; hence for any interval map f there exists a number r_f , $0 \leq r_f < \frac{1}{2}$, such that $I_f = [r_f, \frac{1}{2}]$. A cycle P is called *over-twist* if it does not force other cycles with the same over-rotation number. They are the analogues of *twist cycles* for interval maps. By [7] and by properties of forcing relation, for any $\frac{p}{q} \in (r_f, \frac{1}{2})$, f has an over-twist cycle of over-rotation number $\frac{p}{q}$. We call a pattern π , an *over-twist pattern* if any cycle which exhibits it is an over-twist cycle. Now we discuss our plans for the paper.

In the papers [5] and [10], an algorithm to find out over-rotation interval of an interval map of modality less than or equal to 2 was concocted and the complete description of the dynamics of unimodal and bimodal over-twist patterns was corroborated. However, the task of determining the over-rotation interval for an interval map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with modality greater than or equal to 3, along with elucidating over-twist patterns of the same modality, presents significant challenges.

This maneuvered us to develop a new invariant for a cycle of an interval map, amalgamating the essence of over-rotation theory of interval maps and rotation theory of degree one circle maps. We call this new invariant: *unfolding numbers*. The basic idea is as follows. Given a continuous map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we construct the map $g_f : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ which is conjugate to the map f via the linear contraction $\lambda : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ defined by $\lambda(x) = \frac{x}{2}$. We call g_f , the *miniature model map* corresponding to the map f . We fold the unit square $[0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ containing the graph of g_f vertically across the line $y = \frac{1}{2}$. This yields a map p_f in $[0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. The unit square $[0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ is now folded horizontally across $x = \frac{1}{2}$ to obtain a map q_f in $[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Finally, the unit square $[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ is folded vertically across $y = 1$ to obtain a map r_f in $[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \times [1, \frac{3}{2}]$. Selecting parts of graph of the maps: g_f , p_f , q_f and r_f yields a degree one map $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the real line (for details see Section 3). The unfolding number of a periodic orbit P of the map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is defined to be rotation number of the lifted periodic orbit P' of F_f corresponding to P . We begin study of unfolding numbers for interval maps in this paper.

The paper is divided into 8 *sections*. The manuscript “*unfolds*” as follows:

- (1) Section 1, serves as the *introductory segment* of the paper, providing an initial *overview* and context for the subsequent content.
- (2) Section 2, lays the groundwork with essential *preliminaries*.
- (3) In Section 3, we define *unfolding numbers* and enact the *consistency* of the *theory*.
- (4) In Section 4, we portray that, that the *closure* of the set of *unfolding numbers* of *periodic orbits* of a given *interval map* f forms an interval of the form $Unf(f) = [u_f, \frac{1}{2}]$ for some $u_f \geq 0$, called its *unfolding interval*. The *existence* of a *point* $z \in [0, 1]$ such that the map f *restricted on* the *omega limit set* $Z_f = \omega_f(z)$ of z is *strictly ergodic*, and such that for any point $y \in Z_f$, the *unfolding number* of y under f coincides with u_f is also revealed.
- (5) It is a natural question to ask: can we characterize the *dynamics* of a *periodic orbit* of f given its *unfolding number*? For this, at the outset it is vital to see whether *unfolding number* of P can be read directly from the *combinatorics* of P without the need to construct the map F_f . We take precisely these *questions* in Section 5.
- (6) In Section 6, we introduce the idea of *forced unfolding interval*. We elucidate *patterns* for whom the *forced unfolding interval* is $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.
- (7) In Section 7, we forge *comparison* between *unfolding numbers* and *over-rotation numbers*: we show that while these two *rotation numbers* are *disparate* in flavor, there exists *special patterns* π_s called *sheer patterns*, for whom *unfolding numbers* equals *over-rotation numbers*!

From the *form* of *unfolding interval* $Unf(f)$, of a given *interval map* f , it is evident that a *single number*, u_f , encapsulates concealed information about the *dynamical complexity* of f . Further u_f can be computed using a straightforward algorithm for interval maps of any *modality*. Thus, *unfolding numbers* provides a “new” effective means of computing the *dynamical complexity* of an *interval map* which is *invariant* under *topological conjugacy*.

Acknowledgment. The author is thankful to his teacher, Professor Alexander Blokh from University of Alabama at Birmingham, USA with whom the problem was first discussed.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notations. In this paper, we specifically consider *continuous maps* $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ characterized by a *unique point* of *absolute maximum*, denoted by M_f , and a *unique point* of *absolute minimum*, denoted by m_f . Moreover, for any *periodic orbit* P of f , its *leftmost endpoint* is

represented by $le(P)$ and its *right end point* is denoted by $ri(P)$. Furthermore, for any *point* x and a map g , the *trajectory* of x under g , that is, the set $\{x, g(x), g^2(x), \dots\}$ is symbolized as $T_g(x)$. Clearly, if $T_g(x)$ is *finite* with q *elements*, x is *periodic* under g with *period* q and $P = T_g(x)$ is its *periodic orbit*. For a set A , let \bar{A} denotes its *closure*. Additionally, given a map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $g_f : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, respectively signify *miniature model map* and *heaved map* corresponding to the map f (as defined in Section 3).

2.2. Forcing among patterns.

Definition 2.1. A *pattern* A *forces* pattern B if every continuous map having a *cycle* of *pattern* A has a *cycle* of *pattern* B . By [3], *forcing among patterns* is a *partial ordering*.

A useful *algorithm* allows one to describe all *patterns forced* by a given *pattern* A . Namely, consider a *cycle* P of *pattern* A ; assume that *leftmost* and *rightmost points* of P are a and b respectively. Every *component* of $[a, b] \setminus P$ is said to be a *P -basic interval*. Extend the map from P to the interval $[a, b]$ by defining it *linearly* on each *P -basic interval* and call the resulting map f_P , the *P -linear map*. The following result follows:

Theorem 2.2 ([1,3]). *The patterns of all cycles of f_P are exactly the patterns forced by the pattern of P*

2.3. Loops of intervals.

Definition 2.3. Let $\{I_n\}$, $n \geq 0$ be a *sequence of closed intervals* such that $f(I_j) \supset I_{j+1}$ for $j \geq 0$; then we say that $\{I_n\}$, $n \geq 0$ is an *f -chain* or simply a *chain of intervals*. If a *finite chain of intervals* $\alpha = \{I_0, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1}\}$ is such that $f(I_{k-1}) \supset I_0$, then we call $\alpha = \{I_0, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1}\}$, an *f -loop* or simply a *loop of intervals*.

Lemma 2.4 ([1]). *Let $\alpha = \{I_0, I_1, \dots, I_{k-1}\}$ be a loop of intervals. Then there is a periodic point $x \in I_0$ such that $f^j(x) \in I_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ and $f^k(x) = x$. $Q = \{x, f(x), f^2(x), \dots, f^{k-1}(x)\}$ is called the periodic orbit associated with the loop α .*

2.4. Results on Degree one circle maps. Let's examine some properties of *degree one circle maps* that are pertinent to our discussion in this paper. Let \mathcal{L}_1 represents the *collection of all liftings of continuous degree one self-mappings* of \mathbb{S} under the *sup norm*, while $\mathcal{L}'_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_1$ consists of *non-decreasing elements* of \mathcal{L}_1 . Subsequently, the ensuing result follows:

Theorem 2.5 ([1,15]). *If $F_f \in \mathcal{L}'_1$ is a lifting of a circle map $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ then $\rho_{F_f}(x)$ exists for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and is independent of x . Moreover, it is rational if and only if $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ has a periodic point.*

This *number* is called the *rotation number* of the map F_f and denoted by $\rho(F_f)$. Further, we can show:

Lemma 2.6 ([1,15]). *The function $\chi : \mathcal{L}'_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\chi(F) = \rho(F)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{L}'_1$ is continuous.*

Definition 2.7 ([1,15]). For $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$, we define maps $F_l, F_u \in \mathcal{L}'_1$ by “pouring water” from *below* and *above* respectively on the *graph* of F respectively as follows: $F_l(x) = \inf\{F(y) : y \geq x\}$ and $F_u(x) = \sup\{F(y) : y \leq x\}$. We call the *maps*: F_l and F_u , *lower bound map* and *upper bound map*, corresponding to the *degree one map* F respectively.

Let $Const(G)$ be the union of all *open intervals* on which G is *constant*.

Theorem 2.8 ([1,15]). *Then the following statements are true:*

- (1) *Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Then, $F_l(x) \leq F(x) \leq F_u(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$.*
- (2) *Let $F, G \in \mathcal{L}_1$ with $F \leq G$, then $F_l \leq G_l$ and $F_u \leq G_u$.*
- (3) *Let $F \in \mathcal{L}'_1$. Then, $F_l = F_u = F$.*
- (4) *The maps $F \mapsto F_l$ and $F \mapsto F_u$ are Lipschitz continuous with constant 1 in the sup norm.*
- (5) *If $F_l(x) \neq F(x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $x \in Const(F_l)$; similarly for F_u ,*
- (6) *$Const(F) \subset Const(F_l) \cap Const(F_u)$*

Definition 2.9. Given, a *continuous map*, $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, its *lifting* $F_f \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and *point* $y \in \mathbb{S}$, *periodic* with *rotation number* $\frac{m}{n}$ and *rotation pair* (m, n) , the set $P' = \pi^{-1}(P) \subset \mathbb{R}$, where $P \subset \mathbb{S}$ is the *periodic orbit* of $y \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ is the *natural projection*, is called *lifted periodic orbit* of P (equivalently of $y \in \mathbb{S}$) under $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We call $\frac{m}{n}$ and (m, n) respectively *rotation number* and *rotation pair* of $P \subset \mathbb{S}$ under $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ (equivalently of P' under $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$).

Conversely, *lifted periodic orbits* can also defined independently: a set $Q' \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a *lifted periodic orbit* of a *degree one map* F with *period* q and *rotation number* $\frac{p}{q}$ if for any $z \in Q'$, $F^q(z) = z + p$. In such a case, there always exists a *periodic orbit* $Q \subset \mathbb{S}$ of $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ *period* q and *rotation number* $\frac{p}{q}$ such that: $Q' = \pi^{-1}(Q)$.

Theorem 2.10 ([1,15]). *If $F \in \mathcal{L}'_1$ is a lifting of a circle map $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ and $\rho(F) = \frac{k}{n}$ for coprime integers k, n , then f has a cycle P of period n such that the lifted cycle $\pi^{-1}(P)$ of F is disjoint from $Const(F)$.*

Theorem 2.11 ([1,15]). *Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$.*

Define: $F_\mu = (\min(F, F_l + \mu))_u$, for $\mu \in [0, \lambda]$ and $\lambda = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (F - F_l)(x)$.

Then the following results follow:

- (1) $F_\mu \in \mathcal{L}'_1$ for all $\mu \in [0, \lambda]$,
- (2) $F_0 = F_l$ and $F_\lambda = F_u$
- (3) the map $\mu \mapsto F_\mu$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant 1,
- (4) the map $\mu \mapsto \rho(F_\mu)$ is continuous,
- (5) if $\mu \leq \lambda$, then $F_\mu \leq F_\lambda$,
- (6) each F_μ coincides with F outside $Const(F_\mu)$,
- (7) $Const(F) \subset Const(F_\mu)$ for each μ .

Definition 2.12 ([1,15]). Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Then, define *upper-rotation set* of F by $\overline{Rot}(F) = \{\rho_F(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$; *lower-rotation set* of F by $\underline{Rot}(F) = \{\rho_F(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Also, define *rotation set* of F by $Rot(F) =$

$\{\rho_F(x) : x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \overline{\rho_F(x)} = \underline{\rho_F(x)} = \rho_F(x)\}$ are respectively the *lower bound map* and *upper bound map* corresponding to the *degree one map* F .

Theorem 2.13 ([1,15]). *Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Then, $\overline{\text{Rot}(F)} = \text{Rot}(F) = \text{Rot}(F) = [\rho(F_\ell), \rho(F_u)]$ where $F_\ell(x) = \inf\{F(y) : y \geq x\}$ and $\overline{F_u(x)} = \sup\{F(y) : y \leq x\}$*

Corollary 2.14 ([1,15]). *The endpoints of $\text{Rot}(F)$ depend continuously on $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$.*

3. UNFOLDING NUMBERS: DEFINITION AND CONSISTENCY

We begin by defining *unfolding numbers* in details. Consider a *continuous map* $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with a *unique point of absolute maximum* M_f and a *unique point of absolute minimum* m_f with $f(M_f) = 1$ and $f(m_f) = 0$; assume for definiteness that $M_f < m_f$. Observe that from the standpoint of *co-existence of cycles of interval maps*, this is the most important case. Indeed, $m_f > M_f$ implies that there exists two disjoint *open intervals* whose *closures contain their union in their images* (“1-dimensional horseshoe”), f has the *entropy* at least $\ln 2$, *cycles of all periods*. So, f is a *chaotic map*. Thus, the case $M_f < m_f$ is the only interesting case (*even though our construction stated below works in the case $M_f > m_f$ too*).

Consider the *map* $g_f : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, which is *conjugate* to the map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ via the *linear contraction* $\lambda : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, defined by $\lambda(x) = \frac{x}{2} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. We call g_f , the *miniature model map* corresponding to the map f . Let $g_f(0) = c_g$, $g_f(\frac{1}{2}) = d_g$. Then, the map g_f also has a *unique point of absolute maximum* M_g and a *unique point of absolute minimum* m_g with $f(M_g) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $f(m_g) = 0$; also $M_g < m_g$ (See Figure 2).

Define $p_f : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ by $p_f(x) = 1 - g_f(x)$. Clearly, $p_f(0) = 1 - c_g$, $p_f(M_g) = \frac{1}{2}$, $p_f(m_g) = 1$, $p_f(\frac{1}{2}) = 1 - d_g$. The *graph* of $p_f(x)$ is obtained by *reflecting vertically*, the *graph* of $g_f(x)$ with the respect with the line $y = \frac{1}{2}$.

Define $q_f : [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \rightarrow [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ by $q_f(x) = p_f(1 - x) = 1 - f(1 - x)$. Clearly, $q_f(\frac{1}{2}) = 1 - d_g$, $q_f(1 - m_g) = 1$, $q_f(1 - M_g) = \frac{1}{2}$, $q_f(1) = 1 - c_g$. The *graph* of $q_f(x)$ is obtained by *reflecting horizontally*, the *graph* of $p_f(x)$ across the line $x = \frac{1}{2}$.


Define $r_f : [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \rightarrow [1, \frac{3}{2}]$ by $r_f(x) = 2 - q_f(x) = 1 + f(1 - x)$. Clearly, $r_f(\frac{1}{2}) = 1 + d_g$, $r_f(1 - m_g) = 1$, $r_f(1 - M_g) = \frac{3}{2}$, $r_f(1) = 1 + c_g$. Thus, the *graph* of r_f is obtained from the *graph* of $q_f(x)$ by *reflecting vertically* across the line $y = 1$.

We now *construct* a map $F_f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [1, \frac{3}{2}]$ as follows (See Figure 2):

$$F_f(x) = \begin{cases} g_f(x) & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq M_g \\ p_f(x) & \text{if } M_g \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ q_f(x) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq 1 - m_g \\ r_f(x) & \text{if } 1 - m_g \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $F_f(1) = F_f(0) + 1$. Extend $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F_f(x+1) = F_f(x) + 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We shall call the map F_f , the *heaved map* corresponding to the map f . By construction $F_f(x)$ is a *degree one map* of the real line (See Figure 2).

FIGURE 2. Graph of F_f shown in *dotted line*



Definition 3.1. For $x \in [0, 1]$, the *upper unfolding number* of x under $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, denoted by $\overline{u_f(x)}$, is defined as the *upper rotation number* of $\lambda(x) = \frac{x}{2} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ under $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that is, $\overline{u_f(x)} = \overline{\rho_{F_f}(\lambda(x))} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n(\lambda(x)) - \lambda(x)}{n}$.

Similarly, the *lower unfolding number* of $x \in [0, 1]$ under $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, denoted by $\underline{u_f(x)}$, is defined as the *lower rotation number* of $\lambda(x) = \frac{x}{2} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ under $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that is, $\underline{u_f(x)} = \underline{\rho_{F_f}(\lambda(x))} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n(\lambda(x)) - \lambda(x)}{n}$.

Clearly, $\underline{u_f(x)} \leq \overline{u_f(x)}$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. The set $\mathcal{U}_f(x) = \{\underline{u_f(x)}, \overline{u_f(x)}\}$ is called the *unfolding set* of x under $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. If $\underline{u_f(x)} =$

$\overline{u_f(x)} = u_f(x)$ for some $x \in [0, 1]$, we call: $u_f(x)$, the *unfolding number* of $x \in [0, 1]$ under $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Definition 3.2. Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Then, define *upper-unfolding set* of f by $\overline{Unf(f)} = \{\overline{u_f(x)} : x \in [0, 1]\}$; *lower-unfolding set* of f by $\underline{Unf(f)} = \{\underline{u_f(x)} : x \in [0, 1]\}$. Also, define *unfolding set* of f by $Unf(f) = \{u_f(x) : x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \overline{u_f(x)} = \underline{u_f(x)} = u_f(x)\}$.

We now establish the *consistency* of the theory of *unfolding numbers*. We begin with a simple *lemma*:

Lemma 3.3. *Given any $z \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that $F_f^n(x) = z$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Construction of the map F_f reveals that for any $\ell \in [n\frac{\pi}{2}, (n+1)\frac{\pi}{2}]$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists $\ell' \in [(n-1)\frac{\pi}{2}, n\frac{\pi}{2}]$ such that $F_f(\ell') = \ell$. Hence, the result follows. \square

Definition 3.4. Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. The *trajectories* $T_F(y)$ and $T_F(z)$ are said to be *coincident*, if $F^i(y) = F^i(z)$ for all $i \geq 0$, and *eventually coincident* if $F^i(y) = F^i(z)$ for all $i \geq n_0$ for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following *result* follows easily and its *proof* is left to the reader:

Lemma 3.5. *Let $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose the trajectories $T_F(y)$ and $T_F(z)$ are coincident or eventually coincident, then the following holds:*

- (1) $\overline{\rho_F(y)} = \overline{\rho_F(z)}$ and $\underline{\rho_F(y)} = \underline{\rho_F(z)}$.
- (2) *if the trajectories $T_F(y)$ and $T_F(z)$ are lifted periodic orbits under F , they have the same period, same rotation pair and same modified rotation pair.*

Theorem 3.6. *If P is a periodic orbit of $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of period q , then the unfolding number of each point of P is same and is of the form $\frac{p}{q}$ for $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let $x \in P$. Then, $\lambda(x) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is *periodic* under $g_f : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ with same *period* q . Construction of the map $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then implies that, the *trajectory* $T_{F_f}(\lambda(x))$ of $\lambda(x)$ under F_f is a *lifted periodic orbit* of F_f of the same *period* q . Suppose the *rotation number* of $\lambda(x)$ under F_f is $\frac{p}{q}$, then, definition 3.1, implies that, the *unfolding number* of x under f is $\frac{p}{q}$, and hence the result follows. \square

Definition 3.7. We call $\frac{p}{q}$, $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ (from Theorem 3.6), the *unfolding number* of the *periodic orbit* $P = T_f(x)$ of f and the *ordered pair* (p, q) , the *unfolding pair* of P ; we write: $un(P) = \frac{p}{q}$ and $up(P) = (p, q)$. If $\frac{p}{q} = \frac{r}{s}$, where r and s are *coprime* and $\frac{r}{r} = \frac{q}{s} = m \in \mathbb{N}$, then we call the *ordered pair* $(\frac{r}{s}, m)$, the *modified unfolding pair* of P (similar to *rotation theory for degree one circle maps*, see Section 1); we write $mup(P) = (\frac{r}{s}, m)$. Let $mup(f)$ be the set of all *modified unfolding pairs* of *cycles* of f .

Theorem 3.8. *The set of modified unfolding pairs of cycles of the interval map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is equal to the set of modified rotation pairs of lifted cycles of the degree one circle map $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that is, $mup(f) = mrp(F_f)$.*

Proof. Let P be a cycle of $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with period mq with unfolding number $\frac{p}{q}$, with p, q co-prime and modified unfolding pair $(\frac{p}{q}, m)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $x \in P$. Then, $\lambda(x) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is a periodic point of $g_f : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ of same period mq . Construction of the map $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then stipulates that the trajectory $T_{F_f}(\lambda(x))$ of $\lambda(x)$ under F_f is a lifted periodic orbit of F_f . Moreover, definitions 3.1 and 3.7 entails that modified rotation pair of $T_{F_f}(\lambda(x))$ is $(\frac{p}{q}, m)$. Hence, $(\frac{p}{q}, m) \in mrp(F_f)$.

Conversely, suppose $(\frac{p}{q}, m)$ be the modified rotation pair of a lifted cycle P' of F_f . Choose $z \in P'$. By Lemma 3.3, there exists $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F_f^n(x) = z$. Since, the trajectories $T_{F_f}(z)$ and $T_{F_f}(x)$ are eventually coincident, by Lemma 3.5, the modified rotation pair of $T_{F_f}(x)$ is also $(\frac{p}{q}, m)$. Connection between the maps $g_f : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, warrants that $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is a periodic point of g_f of period mq and hence, $\lambda^{-1}(x) = y \in [0, 1]$ is a periodic point of f of the same period mq . Definitions 3.1 and 3.7, now yields that, the modified unfolding pair of $P = T_f(y)$ is equal to $(\frac{p}{q}, m)$, and hence $(\frac{p}{q}, m) \in mup(f)$ establishing the reverse inclusion. \square

Theorem 3.9. *There exists $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $mup(f) = [(t_1, m_1), (t_2, m_2)]$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.3, there exists modified rotation pairs (t_1, m_1) and (t_2, m_2) where $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the set of all modified rotation pairs of cycles of the degree one map $F_f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $mrp(F_f) = [(t_1, m_1), (t_2, m_2)]$. Now, the result follows from Theorem 3.8. \square

Theorems 3.6 and 3.9 guarantees the completeness of the unfolding numbers.

4. UNFOLDING INTERVAL AND ITS REALIZATION

In this section, we analyze the structure of the set of unfolding numbers of points under a given interval map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a given continuous interval map. Then,*

$\overline{Unf(f)} = \underline{Unf(f)} = Unf(f) = [u_f, \frac{1}{2}]$, where $u_f = \rho((F_f)_\ell)$ where $(F_f)_\ell$ represents the lower bound map corresponding to the degree one map F_f .

Proof. We begin by showing: $\overline{Unf(f)} = \underline{Rot}(F_f)$. Choose $x \in [0, 1]$ and $\underline{u_f}(x) \in \underline{Unf}(f)$. Then, $\lambda(x) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and hence, by definition 3.1, $\underline{u_f}(x) = \underline{\rho_{F_f}}(\lambda(x)) \in \underline{Rot}(F_f)$, and hence $\underline{Unf}(f) \subseteq \underline{Rot}(F_f)$. Now, take $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\underline{\rho_{F_f}}(y) \in \underline{Rot}(F_f)$. By Lemma 3.3, there exists a point

$z \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that $F_f^n(z) = y$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the *trajectories* $T_{F_f}(z)$ and $T_{F_f}(y)$ are *eventually coinciding* and hence, by Lemma 3.5: $\rho_{F_f}(y) = \rho_{F_f}(z)$. Let $\lambda^{-1}(z) = x \in [0, 1]$. Then, by Definition 3.1, $\overline{\rho_{F_f}(y)} = \overline{\rho_{F_f}(z)} = \overline{u_f(x)} \in \overline{Unf(f)}$ implying the reverse inclusion.

Similarly, it can be shown that: $\overline{Unf(f)} = \overline{Rot(F_f)}$. Now, Theorem 2.13 and Definition 3.2, yields that: $\overline{Unf(f)} = \overline{Unf(f)} = Unf(f) = [\rho((F_f)_\ell), \rho((F_f)_u)]$, where $(F_f)_\ell$ and $(F_f)_u$ are respectively the *lower bound map* and *upper bound map* corresponding to the *degree one map* F_f . It remains to show $\rho((F_f)_u) = \frac{1}{2}$.

It is easy to see that $(F_f)_u(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ in $[0, M_g]$, $(F_f)_u(x) = F_f(x)$ in $[M_g, m_g]$ and $(F_f)_u(x) = 1$ in the interval $[m_g, 1 - m_g]$. It follows that $(F_f)_u(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $(F_f)_u(\frac{1}{2}) = 1$ and hence the *trajectory*: $T_{(F_f)_u}(0)$ of 0 under the map $(F_f)_u$, has *rotation number* $\frac{1}{2}$. Hence, the result follows. \square

Definition 4.2. The *interval* $Unf(f) = [u_f, \frac{1}{2}]$ from Theorem 4.1 is called the *unfolding interval* of the interval map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Definition 4.3. Given a map $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, a set $A \subset [0, 1]$ and a point $y \in [0, 1]$, we define:

- (1) $\eta_A(y) = \sup\{x \in A : f(x) = f(y)\}$
- (2) $\xi_A(y) = \inf\{x \in A : f(x) = f(y)\}$
- (3) $Y_f = \eta_{[0, M_f]}([0, M_f]) \cup \eta_{[0, 1]}([M_f, m_f]) \cup \xi_{[0, 1]}([M_f, m_f]) \cup \eta_{[m_f, 1]}([m_f, 1])$.

Let us denote by \mathcal{C} , the set of *open subsets* of \mathbb{R} where the *lower bound function*: $(F_f)_\ell(x)$ is *constant* and let \mathcal{U} to be the *union of open intervals* from \mathcal{C} .

Theorem 4.4. Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a continuous map with *unfolding interval* $[u_f, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then for any point $y \in [0, 1]$ whose *trajectory* is contained in Y_f , the *unfolding set*, $\mathcal{U}_f(y) = \{u_f\}$.

Proof. Construction of the maps g_f and F_f reveals that for $y \in [0, 1]$, if the *trajectory* $T_f(y)$ of y under f is *disjoint* from Y_f , then the *trajectory* $T_{F_f}(\lambda(y))$ of $\lambda(y)$ under F_f is *disjoint* from \mathcal{U} . From Theorem 2.8(5), this means that, the *trajectory* $T_{F_f}(\lambda(y))$ of $\lambda(y)$ under F_f and the *trajectory* $T_{(F_f)_\ell}(\lambda(y))$ of $\lambda(y)$ under the *lower bound map* $(F_f)_\ell$ are *coincident*. So, Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 3.5, entails that *rotation number* of $\lambda(y)$ under F_f *exists* and equals u_f : the *rotation number* of $\lambda(y)$ under the *lower bound map* $(F_f)_\ell$. Finally, definition 3.1, furnishes that the *unfolding set* $\mathcal{U}_f(y)$ of y is precisely equal to $\{u_f\}$. \square

By a *minimal set* of a map h of a compact space to itself, we mean an *invariant compact set* Z all of whose points have *dense trajectories* in Z (thus, a *compact invariant subset* of Z *coincides* with Z). Let us call a *maximal (in terms of set inclusion) open set* where a continuous function h is *constant*, a *flat spot* of h . The following result follows:

Theorem 4.5. Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a continuous map with *unfolding interval* $[u_f, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then, there exists a *minimal f -invariant set* $Z_f \subset Y_f$ such that for any point $y \in Z_f$, we have $\mathcal{U}_f(y) = \{u_f\}$ and there are two possibilities :

- (1) u_f is rational, Z_f is a periodic orbit, and $f|_{Z_f}$ is canonically conjugate to the circle rotation by u_f restricted on one of its cycles.
- (2) u_f is irrational, Z_f is a Cantor set, and $f|_{Z_f}$ is canonically semi-conjugate to the circle rotation by u_f .

Proof. The natural projection map $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ monotonically semi-conjugates $(F_f)_\ell$ to a degree one map $\tau_f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$. Further, since $(F_f)_\ell$ is monotonically non-decreasing, $\tau_f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ preserves cyclic orientation in the non-strict sense. From Theorem 2.10, it follows that there exists a point $z \in \mathbb{R}$, such that, the trajectory $T_{F_f}(z)$ of z under F_f is disjoint from \mathcal{U} , (that is, the trajectories $T_{F_f}(z)$ and $T_{(F_f)_\ell}(z)$ are coincident), such that $\rho_{F_f}(z) = \rho_{(F_f)_\ell}(z) = \rho((F_f)_\ell) = u_f$. We have two cases here:

- (1) If $u_f = \frac{p}{q}$ is rational, then $\pi(z) \in \mathbb{S}$ is periodic under τ_f of period q . If P_f be the orbit of $\pi(z)$, under τ_f , then the map τ restricted on P_f acts as circle rotation by angle $\frac{p}{q}$.
- (2) If u_f is irrational, then $\pi(z) \in \mathbb{S}$ belongs to the omega limit set $\omega_{\tau_f}(\pi(z)) = Q_f \subset \mathbb{S}$ of $\pi(z)$ under τ_f . It is minimal (that is, τ_f -orbits of all points of Q_f are dense in Q_f) such that collapsing arcs of \mathbb{S} complementary to Q_f , we can semi-conjugate $\tau_f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ to irrational rotation of \mathbb{S} by the angle u_f . In this case, clearly, Q_f is a cantor set.

We need to now find the appropriate f -invariant set $Z_f \subset [0, 1]$ whose existence is claimed in the theorem. The correspondence between the maps involved in our construction, Lemma 3.3, implies the existence of a continuous conjugacy $\psi_f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ between the maps $\tau : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ and $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ applicable outside $\pi(\overline{\mathcal{U}}) \subset \mathbb{S}$.

If u_f is irrational, then clearly, we can easily find a point $y \in Q_f \subset \mathbb{S}$ such that $T_{\tau_f}(y) \cap \pi(\overline{\mathcal{U}}) = \emptyset$. Then, it follows that there is a continuous conjugacy between $\tau|_{T_{\tau_f}(y)}$ and $f|_{Z_f}$ where Z_f is the omega limit set $\omega_f(\psi_f(y))$ of $\psi_f(y)$ under f . It is then easy to see that Z_f is a Cantor Set and has all the desired properties.

Suppose $u_f = \frac{p}{q}$ is rational. Since, by definition, $T_{F_f}(z) \cap \mathcal{U} = \emptyset$, it follows that, $P_f \cap \pi(\mathcal{U}) = \emptyset$, but, it is not guaranteed that $P_f \cap \pi(\overline{\mathcal{U}}) = \emptyset$. However, as we now show, the specifics of the construction helps us to elude this problem. If $P_f \cap \pi(\overline{\mathcal{U}}) = \emptyset$, then we are done by the arguments similar to the ones from the previous paragraph. Suppose that P_f passes through an endpoint η of a flat spot of τ_f . Choose a point y very close to η avoiding flat spots of τ_f . Then, the finite segment of the τ_f orbit of y consisting of points $y, \tau_f(y), \dots, \tau_f^q(y) \approx y$ is transformed by ψ_f into a finite segment $\psi_f(y), f(\psi_f(y)), \dots, f^q(\psi_f(y)) \approx \psi_f(y)$ which converges to an f -periodic orbit as $y \rightarrow \eta$. The limit periodic orbit Z_f consisting of $\psi_f(y), f(\psi_f(y)), \dots, f^q(\psi_f(y)) \approx \psi_f(y)$ has all the desired properties. □

Theorem 4.5 leads us to the following result:

Theorem 4.6. *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a continuous map with unfolding interval $[u_f, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then, there exists a point $z \in [0, 1]$ such that the map $f|_{Z_f}$ where $Z_f = \omega_f(z)$ is strictly ergodic.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4.5, that there exists a point $z \in [0, 1]$ such that the map $f|_{Z_f}$ where $Z_f = \omega_f(z)$ has a unique invariant measure μ_f such that the measure μ_f can be transformed in a canonical fashion to a specific invariant measure related to circle rotation by angle u_f . If u_f is rational, the measure μ_f is simply the CO-measure concentrated on the f -periodic orbit of z (see Section 1) whereas if u_f is irrational, μ_f corresponds in a canonical fashion to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{S} invariant under irrational rotation on angle u_f . Hence, the result follows. \square

5. CHARACTERIZING DYNAMICS OF A CYCLE WITH A GIVEN UNFOLDING NUMBER

As demonstrated in Section 3, computing *unfolding number* of a *periodic orbit* P typically requires first constructing, the *heaved map* F_f , where f is the P -linear map corresponding to the *periodic orbit* P . In this section, we reveal that *unfolding number* of a *periodic orbit* P can be read directly from the *combinatorics* of the *permutation* corresponding to P eliminating need to construct F_f .

We commence by introducing a few notions which would be used throughout this section: Let P be a *periodic orbit* of *period* q . Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a P -linear map such that the *left-end point* and *right-end point* of P are $le(P) = 0$ and $ri(P) = 1$ respectively. Let m_f and M_f be points of *absolute minimum* and *absolute maximum* of f such that $f(m_f) = 0$ and $f(M_f) = 1$. Likewise, m_g and M_g are points of *absolute minimum* and *absolute maximum* of the *miniature model map* g_f , corresponding to f , such that $f(m_g) = 0$ and $f(M_g) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Definition 5.1. By *unfolding index set* of P , we mean the *maximal* (in terms of set inclusion) set $\mathcal{N}(P) = \{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k\}$ of *non-negative integers* satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $0 \leq n_i < n_{i+1} < q$, for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$.
- (2) n_1 is the *smallest non-negative integer* such that $f^{n_1-1}(0) < m_f$ and $f^{n_1-2}(0) > M_f$.
- (3) n_{i+1} is the *smallest non-negative integer, greater than or equal to $n_i + 2$* but strictly less than q such that: $f^{n_{i+1}-1}(0) < m_f$ and $f^{n_{i+1}-2}(0) > M_f$, for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$.

The points $f^{n_i}(0) \in P$, $n_i \in \mathcal{N}(P)$ are called *unfolding points* of P .

Theorem 5.2. *If P has p unfolding points, then, the unfolding number of P is $\frac{p}{q}$.*

Proof. Definition of $\mathcal{N}(P)$ coupled with the construction of the maps g_f and F_f reveals that the trajectory of 0 under g_f and trajectory of 0 under F_f are the same till the first $n_1 - 2$ iterates, that is, $g_f^i(0) = F_f^i(0)$, for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n_1 - 2\}$. Furthermore, since $f^{n_1-2}(0) > M_f$, we have: $g_f^{n_1-2}(0) = F_f^{n_1-2}(0) > M_g$. Consequently, $F_f^{n_1-1}(0) > \frac{1}{2}$.

Moreover, since, $f^{n_1-1}(0) < m_f$, we must have: $g_f^{n_1-1}(0) < m_g$. So, $1 - m_g < F_f^{n_1-1}(0) < 1$ and hence, $F_f^{n_1}(0) \geq 1$.

The above mentioned scheme persists with $F_f^i(0) \in (1, 2)$, for $n_1 < i \leq n_2 - 1$ and $F_f^{n_2}(0) \geq 2$; then, $F_f^i(0) \in (2, 3)$ for $n_2 < i \leq n_3 - 1$ and $F_f^{n_3}(0) \geq 3$, and so forth, leading to $F_f^{n_p}(0) \geq p$. We assert that $F_f^q(0) = 0 + p$. Indeed, since $T_f(0) = P$ is a *periodic orbit* of f of period q , $T_{F_f}(0)$ is a *lifted periodic orbit* of 0 of same period q . Thus, $F_f^q(0) = 0 + \ell$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Since, $n_p \leq q$, it follows that, $\ell \geq p$. If $\ell \geq p + 1$, then there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}, m > n_p$ such that $F_f^m(0) > 1$. However, this is feasible only if, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}, m > n_p$ such that $f^{m-1}(0) < m_f$ and $f^{m-2}(0) > M_f$, contradicting the *maximality* of $\mathcal{N}(P)$. Thus, $\ell = p$, establishing the result. \square

Theorem 5.2 enables us to define *unfolding numbers* in a manner reminiscent of the traditional approach used for defining *rotation numbers*, as expounded in Section 3. We define an *observable* $\Phi : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ define:

$$\Phi(f^i(0)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{N} \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{N} \end{cases}$$

Then the following easily follows from Theorem 5.2.

Corollary 5.3. *The unfolding number of P is $\frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q \Phi(f^i(0))$ and the unfolding pair of P is: $(\sum_{i=1}^q \Phi(f^i(0)), q)$.*

6. FORCED UNFOLDING INTERVAL

In this section we introduce the idea of *forced unfolding interval*. We define: *unfolding number*, *unfolding pair* and *modified unfolding pair* of a *pattern* π to be the *unfolding pair*, *unfolding pair* and *modified unfolding pair* of any *cycle* P which exhibits π . The *unfolding number*, *unfolding pair* and *modified unfolding pair* of a *pattern* π are respectively denoted by $un(\pi)$, $up(\pi)$ and $mup(\pi)$. We now introduce the notion of *forced unfolding interval*:

Definition 6.1. We say that a *pattern* π *forces* the *unfolding interval* U_π , if $U_\pi = [u_\pi, \frac{1}{2}]$ is the *unfolding interval* of the P -linear map f where P exhibits π .

It follows that: if $\rho(\pi)$ is the *unfolding number* of π , then, $u_\pi \leq \rho(\pi)$.

Definition 6.2. We call a *cycle* P *divergent* (or the *pattern* π it exhibits) if there are points x, y, z of P such that:

- (1) $x < y < z$
- (2) $f(x) < x$, $f(y) \geq z$ and $f(z) \leq x$.

where f is the P -linear map. We call a *pattern* π *divergent*, if any *cycle* P which exhibits it is *divergent*.

It is well known that if a *pattern* π is *divergent* then for any *cycle* P of this *pattern*, the P -linear map f has a *horseshoe* and has *cycles* of

all possible *periods*. We show that in fact, in such a case, f has *cycles* of all possible *unfolding pairs*.

A cycle P (or the *pattern* π it *exhibits*) is called *convergent*, if it is not *divergent*. There is another equivalent way to define *convergent pattern*. Namely, let \mathcal{U} be the *family* of all *interval maps* with a *unique fixed point*. If f is a P -linear map for a cycle P , then P is *convergent* if and only if $f \in \mathcal{U}$.

Theorem 6.3. *If f has a divergent cycle, then the unfolding interval of f is $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$.*

Proof. Let x, y, z be defined as in Definition 6.2. Then, there exists a *fixed point* a between x and y and a *fixed point* b between y and z . Also, there exists a point c between a and y such that $f(c) = b$. Let $J = [a, c]$, $K_1 = [c, y]$, $K_2 = [y, b]$ and $L = [b, z]$. Then, the interval J f -covers the interval J, K_1 and K_2 ; the interval K_1 f -covers L ; the interval K_2 f -covers L and the interval L f -covers J, K_1, K_2 . Consider the loop $\alpha : J \rightarrow J \rightarrow \dots J \rightarrow K_2 \rightarrow L \rightarrow J \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow L \rightarrow J \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow L \rightarrow J \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow L \rightarrow \dots L \rightarrow J \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow L \rightarrow J$ consisting of $q - 3p - 3$ J 's followed by K_2 , then p blocks $L \rightarrow J \rightarrow K_1$, then the block $L \rightarrow J$. Let Q be the *periodic orbit* associated with α (Lemma 2.4). From the *location* of the *intervals*: J, K_1, K_2 and L , it is clear that the point of *absolute minimum* m_Q of Q , lies in the interval L and the point of *absolute maximum* M_Q of Q , lies in $K_1 \cup K_2$. Let us start at the *left end point* $le(Q)$ of Q and travel along the loop α . Clearly, $le(Q) \in J$. Construction of the loop α reveals that, during our *motion* along the loop: α , the only time we can possibly encounter an *unfolding point* is when we *pass* through the block $L \rightarrow J \rightarrow K_1$ in α ; also, each time we pass through the block $L \rightarrow J \rightarrow K_1$, we confront *one* "new" *unfolding point*. It follows, that the number of *unfolding points* of Q is p . Thus, from Theorem 5.2, the *unfolding number* of Q is $\frac{p}{q}$ and the *unfolding pair* of Q is (p, q) . Since, p and q are arbitrary, f has *cycles* of all possible *unfolding pairs* and hence the result follows. \square

7. COMPARISON WITH OVER-ROTATION NUMBERS

From Theorem 6.3, it is evident that, for the purpose of studying *co-existence* of *cycles* with different *unfolding pairs*, it is sufficient to study *convergent patterns*, and hence only consider maps $f \in \mathcal{U}$. Further as discussed in the beginning of Section 3, it is sufficient to consider the case $m_\pi > M_\pi$, where m_π and M_π are the *points* of *absolute minimum* and *absolute maximum* of π . We begin this section by providing an example to illustrate that, in general, *over-rotation numbers* and *unfolding numbers* are different entities (See Figure 3).

Example 7.1. Consider the *trimodal pattern* characterised by the *permutation* $\Pi = (1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 3, 6, 8, 9, 4, 11)$. It has *over-rotation number* $\frac{3}{11}$, but *unfolding number* $\frac{5}{11}$ (See Figure 3).

In the end, we now portray the existence of a peculiar *patterns* for which *over-rotation number* equals *unfolding number*!

Definition 7.2. A convergent pattern π is called *sheer*, if it is convergent and is decreasing in $[M_\pi, m_\pi]$.

Theorem 7.3. Let π be a convergent pattern with over-rotation number $orn(\pi)$ and unfolding number $un(\pi)$. Then, $orn(\pi) \leq un(\pi)$. Further, if π is sheer, $orn(\pi) = un(\pi)$.

Proof. Let P be any cycle which exhibits π and let $f \in \mathcal{U}$ be the P -linear map with unique fixed point a_f . Let m_f and M_f be points of absolute minimum and absolute maximum of f . We assume $M_f < a_f < m_f$ and thus points of P to the left of a_f map to the right of itself while points of P to the right of a_f map to the left of itself. Let the over-rotation number of P be $\frac{p}{q}$, indicating that there are exactly p points to the right of the fixed point a_f which are mapped to the left of a_f . Let these p points be denoted as: $x_1 > x_2 > x_3 > \dots > x_p$. It's easy to see that for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, precisely one of $f^2(x_i)$ and $f(x_i)$ is an unfolding point: let us denote this unfolding point by ξ_i , $\xi_i \in \{f^2(x_i), f(x_i)\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$. This indicates that the number of unfolding points of P is at-least p . Theorem 5.2, now yields that unfolding number of P is at-least $\frac{p}{q}$, establishing the first result.

Let us now assume that π is *sheer*. With this assumption, let us exhibit that number of unfolding points of P is precisely p . By way of contradiction, let's entertain the possibility of an unfolding point η of P such that: $\eta \notin \{\xi_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$. We can then encounter four potential cases:

- (1) $f(m_f) \leq M_f \leq f^{-2}(\eta) \leq a_f \leq f^{-1}(\eta) \leq m_f \leq f(M_f)$.
- (2) $f(m_f) \leq M_f \leq f^{-2}(\eta) \leq f^{-1}(\eta) \leq a_f \leq m_f \leq f(M_f)$.
- (3) $f(m_f) \leq M_f \leq f^{-1}(\eta) \leq a_f \leq f^{-2}(\eta) \leq f(M_f)$.
- (4) $f(m_f) \leq M_f \leq a_f \leq f^{-1}(\eta) \leq f^{-2}(\eta) \leq f(M_f)$ and $f^{-1}(\eta) \leq m_f$

We illustrate, that all these four cases leads us to a contradiction. Let's first examine the *first case*. We claim $a_f \leq \eta \leq f^{-1}(\eta)$. Indeed, $\eta \leq a_f$ means that $f^{-1}(\eta) \in \{x_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$, and hence $\eta \in \{f(x_i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$ contradicting the fact that $\eta \notin \{\xi_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$. Consequently, $a_f \leq \eta \leq f^{-1}(\eta)$. But, this in turn means, f first decreases in the interval $[M_f, a_f]$, then increases in the interval $[a_f, f^{-1}(\eta)]$ and then decreases in $[f^{-1}(\eta), m_f]$ which contradicts the fact that π is a sheer pattern.


In the *second case*, since, $\eta \geq f^{-1}(\eta)$, f first decreases in the interval $[M_f, f^{-2}(\eta)]$, then increases in the interval $[f^{-2}(\eta), f^{-1}(\eta)]$, and finally decreases in $[f^{-1}(\eta), m_f]$, again contradicting the assumption that π is a sheer pattern.

In the *third case*, $f^{-2}(\eta) \in \{x_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$ and hence, $\eta \in \{f^2(x_i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$ again, contradicting the fact that $\eta \notin \{\xi_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$. Lastly, the arguments for the *fourth case* exactly mirror that of the *first*. Thus, number of unfolding points of P is precisely p and hence from Theorem 5.2, unfolding number of P is $\frac{p}{q}$. \square

Notice, that every unimodal or bimodal pattern π inherently qualifies as a sheer pattern, leading us to the subsequent corollary:

Corollary 7.4. *If π has modality less than or equal to 2, then over-rotation number of $\pi =$ unfolding number of π .*

FIGURE 3. A trimodal pattern having over-rotation number: $\frac{3}{11}$ but unfolding number: $\frac{5}{11}$.



REFERENCES

- [1] Ll. Alsedà, J. Llibre and M. Misiurewicz, *Combinatorial Dynamics and Entropy in Dimension One*, Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics (2nd edition) **5** (2000), World Scientific Singapore (2000)
- [2] Ll. Alsedà, J. Llibre, F. Mañosas and M. Misiurewicz, *Lower bounds of the topological entropy for continuous maps of the circle of degree one*, *Nonlinearity* **1**(1988), 463–479.
- [3] S. Baldwin, *Generalisation of a theorem of Sharkovsky on orbits of continuous real valued functions*, *Discrete Math.* **67** (1987), 111–127.
- [4] L. Block, J. Guckenheimer, M. Misiurewicz and L.-S. Young, *Periodic points and topological entropy of one-dimensional maps*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics **819** (1980), 18–34.
- [5] S. Bhattacharya, A. Blokh, *Over-rotation intervals of bimodal interval maps*, *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications* **26** (2020), 1085–1113
- [6] A. Blokh, *The Spectral Decomposition for One-Dimensional Maps*, *Dynamics Reported* **4** (1995), 1–59.
- [7] A. Blokh, M. Misiurewicz, *A new order for periodic orbits of interval maps*, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Sys.* **17**(1997), 565–574
- [8] A. Blokh, M. Misiurewicz, *Rotation numbers for certain maps of an n -od*, *Topology and its Applications* **114** (2001), 27–48
- [9] A. Blokh, M. Misiurewicz, *Evolution of the Sharkovsky Theorem*, *Ukrains'kyi Matematychnyi Zhurnal* **76** (2024), 48–61
- [10] A. Blokh, K. Snider, *Over-rotation numbers for unimodal maps*, *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications* **19**(2013), 1108–1132.
- [11] A. Blokh, O.M Sharkovsky, *Sharkovsky Ordering*, Springer Briefs in Mathematics, (2022).
- [12] A. Chenciner, J.-M. Gambaudo and C. Tresser *Une remarque sur la structure des endomorphismes de degré 1 du cercle*, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér I Math.* **299** (1984), 145–148.
- [13] M. Denker, C. Grillenberger, K. Sigmund, *Ergodic theory on compact spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **527**(1976) Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York.
- [14] R. Ito, *Rotation sets are closed*, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **89**(1981), 107–111.
- [15] M. Misiurewicz, *Periodic points of maps of degree one of a circle*, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **2**(1982) 221–227.

- [16] M. Misiurewicz, *Formalism for studying periodic orbits of one dimensional maps*, European Conference on Iteration Theory (ECIT 87), World Scientific Singapore (1989), 1–7.
- [17] S. Newhouse, J. Palis, F. Takens *Bifurcations and stability of families of diffeomorphisms*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **57**(1983), 5–71.
- [18] H. Poincaré, *Sur les courbes définies par les équations différentielles*, Oeuvres complètes, **1** 137–158, Gauthier-Villars, Paris (1952).
- [19] O. M Sharkovsky, *Coexistence of the cycles of a continuous mapping of the line into itself*, Ukrains'kyi Matematychnyi Zhurnal **16**(1964), 61–71 (Russian).
- [20] O. M Sharkovsky, *Coexistence of the cycles of a continuous mapping of the line into itself*, Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos Appl. Sci. Engrg. **5** (1995), 1263–1273.

(Dr. Sourav Bhattacharya) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VISVESVARAYA
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY NAGPUR, NAGPUR, MAHARASHTRA 440010,
INDIA

Email address: `souravbhattacharya@mth.vnit.ac.in`