

Ergodicity and Algebraicity of the Fast and Slow Triangle Maps

Thomas Garrity*

Jacob Lehmann Duke†

Abstract

Our goal is to show that both the fast and slow versions of the triangle map (a type of multi-dimensional continued fraction algorithm) in dimension n are ergodic, resolving a conjecture of Messaoudi, Nogueira and Schweiger [23]. This particular type of higher dimensional multi-dimensional continued fraction algorithm has recently been linked to the study of partition numbers, with the result that the underlying dynamics has combinatorial implications.

MSC2020: 11K55, 11J70, 11R04, 28D99

Keywords:

1 Introduction

The triangle map is a special type of multi-dimensional continued fraction algorithm. Multidimensional continued fraction algorithms, of which there are many, are, in general, attempts to generalize the many wonderful properties of traditional continued fractions, such as for finding excellent rational approximations for a vector of real numbers and as for describing algebraic numbers via periodic sequences of integers (the Hermite Problem). (For more general information about multi-dimensional continued fractions, see Schweiger [25] or Karpenkov [19].) Now, traditional continued fractions stem from the Gauss map, a map from the unit interval to itself. Gauss realized that understanding the dynamics of this map is important. Not surprisingly, once one has a multi-dimensional continued fraction algorithm, its associated dynamics is almost immediately studied. In 2009, Messaoudi, Nogueira, and Schweiger [23] showed that the triangle map in dimension two is ergodic, and posed the problem of showing that higher dimensional analogs would also be ergodic. Proving this conjecture is the main goal of this paper.

In [23], the authors state in the abstract that “As far as we know, it is the first example of a 2-dimensional algorithm where a surprising diophantine phenomenon happens: there are sequences of nested cells whose intersections is a segment, although no vertex is fixed.” We strongly conjecture the analog holds for the triangle map in general, meaning that for the n -dimensional algorithm, there are sequences of nested cells whose intersections are various simplices with possible dimension ranging from 1 to $n - 1$, still with no vertex fixed.

There is another motivating reason to study the dynamics of the triangle map. Recently in [3, 4], the triangle map has been shown to be linked with the classical combinatorial subject of partition numbers, unlike all other known multi-dimensional continued fraction algorithms. Further, there is strong evidence that the underlying dynamics of the triangle map shapes the structure on the space of all partitions. That was the prime motivation for us to try to show ergodicity in higher dimensions.

Our overall approach for showing that the triangle map is ergodic follows the outline of [23]. The key in the work of Messaoudi, Nogueira, and Schweiger is in showing that a certain nested sequence of cells converge to a single point, almost everywhere. As standard in the rhetoric of these types of arguments, they show that for the $n = 2$ triangle map, whenever infinite many of the terms in the triangle sequence are zero, then there is weak convergence.

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Williams College, Williamstown, MA 01267, USA. Email: tgarrity@williams.edu

†Department of Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA. Email: jacob.lehmann.duke.gr@dartmouth.edu

Then they show that infinitely many of the terms of the triangle sequence are zero almost everywhere. This is no longer a strong enough condition in general. In Section 3 we show that to have weak convergence we need infinitely many blocks of length $n - 1$ in the triangle sequence to be bounded by a constant. Then in Section 4, we show that this happens almost everywhere. Key are two combinatorial identities, shown in Subsection 4.4 and Subsection 4.5. We view the need and the proof of these two identities are what makes our proof of ergodicity not straightforward from the work in [23].

In Section 2, we review the basics of the triangle map. In Subsection 2.1, we give the original definition of the triangle map (at least for dimension two), which is the version needed for partition theory. In Subsection 2.2, we give another version of the triangle map, switching the map from an iteration of an n dimensional simplex to itself to a map that is the iteration of a cone over an n dimensional simplex to itself. This is a standard type of move in multi-dimensional continued fractions, allowing us to translate the maps to the language of $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrices. In Subsection 2.3, we look at the version of the triangle map used in [23]. This version is not directly useful in the study of partition numbers but is the version best suited for proofs of ergodicity.

In Section 3, we discuss what it means for an algorithm to weakly converge at a given point. It is in this section that the behavior of the algorithm on the vertices of subcells is worked out. Section 4 contains the technical heart of the paper, and is what makes this paper not merely a straightforward generalization of [23]. Here we show that the triangle map converges weakly almost everywhere. Key is a first combinatorial identity in Subsection 4.4 and a second combinatorial identity in Subsection 4.5.

The goal of the first paper on the triangle map [13] was in showing (in the dimension three case) that if the triangle sequence for a point (α_1, α_2) is eventually periodic, then α_1 and α_2 are in the same number field of degree less than or equal to three. With the work done in Section 3, we show in Section 5 that if the triangle sequence for a point $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is eventually periodic, then $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are in the same number field of degree less than or equal to n .

In Section 6, we use our earlier work to prove that the triangle map in any dimension is ergodic. In Section 7, we find the invariant measure for the triangle map in each dimension.

Traditional continued fractions can be studied either via the Gauss map or by the Farey map. The Gauss map is often also called the multiplicative version or the fast version of the map. The Farey map can go by the name of the additive version or the slow version. There is a natural interplay between the Gauss map and the Farey map. The triangle map defined in Section 2 is a direct generalization of the Gauss map. In Section 8, we look at the slow version (or the additive version or the Farey version, if you prefer) of the triangle map. It is this slow version that is best suited to study partition numbers. Hence this section, in which we prove that the slow version is also ergodic.

In Section 9, we quickly discuss why the generalization of the triangle map given in this paper is “more correct” than the version in [13, 23]. Finally, in Section 10, we discuss further questions.

We would like to thank J. Fox, L. Pedersen and C. Silva for helpful conversations.

2 Background on the Triangle Map

The triangle map is a generalization of classical continued fractions. The $n = 2$ case was originally described in [13, 2], where the concern was the number-theoretic Hermite problem. As mentioned in the introduction, Messaoudi, Nogueira, and Schweiger [23] showed that the $n = 2$ map is ergodic. Our main goal is to generalize this to higher dimensions. As mentioned in [3], “further dynamical properties were discovered by Berthé, Steiner and Thuswaldner [6] and by Fougeron and Skripchenko [11]. Bonanno, Del Vigna and Munday [8] and Bonanno and Del Vigna [9] recently used the \mathbb{R}^3 slow triangle map to develop a tree structure of rational pairs in the plane. In a recent preprint, Ito [18] showed that the fast map is self-dual (in section three of that paper). These papers are all primarily motivated by questions from dynamics. For general background in multidimensional continued fraction algorithms, see Karpenkov [19] and Schweiger [25]”.

2.1 Non-homogeneous Triangle Map

Fix the simplex

$$\Delta = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1 \geq x_1 \cdots \geq x_n \geq 0\}.$$

Partition this simplex into sub-simplices

$$\Delta_b = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta : 1 - x_1 - bx_n \geq 0 > 1 - x_1 - (b+1)x_n\}$$

Here

$$b = \left\lfloor \frac{1 - x_1}{x_n} \right\rfloor$$

Definition 2.1. The triangle map

$$T : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$$

is defined as

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \left(\frac{x_2}{x_1}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_1}, \frac{1 - x_1 - bx_n}{x_1} \right)$$

for any $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Delta_b$.

When $n = 1$, this is the classical Gauss map.

Definition 2.2. The triangle sequence for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta$ is a sequence

$$(b_0, b_1, \dots)$$

of non-negative integers such that

$$\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{b_0}, T(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_1}, T^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_2}, \dots$$

For any $x \in [0, 1]$, its triangle sequence encodes the classical continued fraction expansion of x .

In turn, this suggests

Definition 2.3. For any sequence of non-negative integers

$$(b_0, b_1, \dots),$$

the corresponding cylinder is

$$\Delta(b_0, \dots, b_k) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{b_0} : T(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_1}, T^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_2}, \dots, T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_k}\}.$$

2.2 Homogeneous Triangle Map

Here we start with the cone

$$\Delta^H = \{(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x_0 > x_1 > \dots > x_n > 0\}.$$

The superscript H stands for ‘‘homogeneous.’’ We partition this cone into sub-cones

$$\Delta_b^H = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta : x_0 - x_1 - bx_n \geq 0 > x_0 - x_1 - (b+1)x_n\}$$

Then

Definition 2.4. The (homogeneous) triangle map

$$T : \Delta^H \rightarrow \Delta^H$$

is defined as

$$T(x_0, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, x_0 - x_1 - bx_n)$$

for any $(x_0, \dots, x_n) \in \Delta_b^H$.

When we need to distinguish this map T from the T in the previous Subsection 2.1, we will use T^H .

If we write each $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ as a column vector, we can describe the map T via matrix multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{x}) &= T_b \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} && \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_b^H \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ & & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -b \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} && \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_b^H \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \\ x_0 - x_1 - bx_n \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The link between the homogeneous and the non-homogeneous triangle maps is the following. We have a projection

$$P : \Delta^H \rightarrow \Delta$$

given by

$$P(x_0, \dots, x_n) = \left(\frac{x_1}{x_0}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_0} \right).$$

It is straightforward to show that $P : \Delta_b^H \rightarrow \Delta_b$ is onto. What is key is that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta^H & \xrightarrow{T} & \Delta^H \\ \downarrow P & & \downarrow P \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow{T} & \Delta \end{array}$$

We have the embedding

$$i : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta^H$$

given by

$$i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (1, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

This allows us to translate calculations for the non-homogeneous triangle map into calculations for the homogeneous triangle map, which in turn allows us to use simple linear algebraic tools.

Finally, we have

Definition 2.5. The triangle sequence for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta^H$ is a sequence

$$(b_0, b_1, \dots)$$

of non-negative integers such that

$$\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{b_0}, T(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_1}, T^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_2}, \dots$$

Definition 2.6. For any sequence of non-negative integers

$$(b_0, b_1, \dots),$$

the corresponding cylinder is

$$\Delta^H(b_0, \dots, b_k) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{b_0}^H : T(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_1}^H, T^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_2}^H, \dots, T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_k}^H\}$$

2.3 The sliced non-homogeneous triangle map

(While all of this is standard, our nomenclature of using the term “slice” is not.) For any vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$, denote its ℓ_1 norm as

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| = |x_0| + \dots + |x_n|.$$

Set

$$\Delta^S = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta^H : \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1\}.$$

(We are using the superscript “S” for slice, as $\Delta^S = \Delta^H \cap \{\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1\}$.) This is an n-dimensional simplex. We have the natural projection

$$P^S : \Delta^H \rightarrow \Delta^S$$

given by

$$P^S(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|}.$$

We set

$$\Delta_b^S = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta^S \cap \Delta^H\}.$$

Definition 2.7. The sliced non-homogeneous triangle map

$$T : \Delta^S \rightarrow \Delta^S$$

is

$$T(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{T^H(\mathbf{x})}{\|T^H(\mathbf{x})\|},$$

where the map T^H on the right-hand-side is the homogeneous triangle map.

When we need to distinguish this map T from the T in the previous Subsection 2.1 or from T^H , we will use T^S .

Definition 2.8. The triangle sequence for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta^S$ is a sequence

$$(b_0, b_1, \dots)$$

of non-negative integers such that

$$\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{b_0}^S, T(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_1}^S, T^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_2}^S, \dots$$

The composition of

$$P^S \circ i : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta^S$$

gives us

$$(x_1, x_2, \dots) \xrightarrow{i} (1, x_1, x_2, \dots) \\ \xrightarrow{P^S} \left(\frac{1}{1 + x_1 + \dots + x_n}, \frac{x_1}{1 + x_1 + \dots + x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{1 + x_1 + \dots + x_n} \right)$$

Definition 2.9. For any sequence of non-negative integers

$$(b_0, b_1, \dots),$$

the corresponding cylinder is

$$\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_k) = \{ \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{b_0}^S : T(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_1}^S, T^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_2}^S, \dots, T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{b_k}^S \}$$

We have

Lemma 2.10. For all non-negative integers b_0, b_1, b_2 , the map

$$\Delta(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k) \xrightarrow{P^S \circ i} \Delta(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k)$$

is a continuous, one-to-one, onto map.

3 Weak Convergence

This is the start of the key technical results for this paper. From our theorem about when the higher dimensional triangle map does and does not exhibit weak convergence, we will be able to show, via fairly standard arguments, that the triangle map is ergodic and that eventual periodicity implies degree n irrationality.

3.1 Definition of weak convergence

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta$ have triangle sequence (b_0, b_1, \dots) . We say the the triangle map weakly converges to \mathbf{x} if

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bigcap_{k=0}^m \Delta(b_0, \dots, b_m) = \{ \mathbf{x} \}.$$

By lemma 2.10, we have that the triangle map will weakly converge to $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta$ precisely when

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bigcap_{k=0}^m \Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_m) = \{ P^S \circ (\mathbf{x}) \}.$$

We will be doing most of our work on convergence in the world of Δ^S and Δ^H .

In the $n = 1$, and hence the classical continued fraction case, there is weak convergence for all \mathbf{x} . As discussed in [13, 2, 23], this is not the case for $n = 2$, when the limit $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bigcap_{k=0}^m \Delta(b_0, \dots, b_m)$ can be an entire line segment. But the key technical part of the work of Messaoudi, Nogueira and Schweiger was their Theorem 1.1, where they show that weak convergence does happen if infinitely many of the b_k we have $b_k = 0$. Coupled with their Theorem 1.2, which states that almost every point $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta$, with respect to Lebesgue measure, has infinitely many of their $b_k = 0$, allows them to prove ergodicity in the $n = 2$ case.

For higher dimensions, the convergence of $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \cap_{k=0}^m \Delta(b_0, \dots, b_m)$ appears that it can be any simplex up to dimension $n - 1$. Further, just requiring infinitely many of the $b_k = 0$ is no longer a strong enough condition to guarantee weak convergence.

One of our main technical goals is

Theorem 3.2. *In the dimension n case, let $u \in \Delta^S$. If at infinitely many points in the triangle sequence for u , we have $n - 1$ zeros in a row, then the triangle sequence is weakly convergent at u .*

This theorem will follow from our true technical goal, which will take some work:

Theorem 3.3. *Let B be a constant. In the dimension n case, let $u \in \Delta^S$. If at infinitely many points in the triangle sequence for u , we have $n - 1$ terms in a row being bounded by the constant B , then the triangle sequence is weakly convergent at u .*

In Corollary 4.2 we will show that this happens almost everywhere with respect to Lebesgue measure, which in turn will allow us to finally prove ergodicity.

3.2 Vertices of the subcells

This part is, relatively speaking, a straightforward generalization of section 4 of [2] and of the introduction of [23].

Fix a sequence (b_0, b_1, \dots) of non-negative integers. Denote the vertices of $\Delta^H(b_0, \dots, b_m)$ as

$$A_0(m), \dots, A_n(m).$$

Then the vertices of $\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_m)$ are

$$\frac{A_0(m)}{\|A_0(m)\|}, \dots, \frac{A_n(m)}{\|A_n(m)\|}.$$

The goal of Theorem 3.2 is now equivalent to showing that the distances between the vertices of $\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_m)$ approach zero:

Lemma 3.4. *For a sequence (b_0, b_1, \dots) of non-negative integers, we have that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \cap_{k=0}^m \Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_m)$ is a single point if and only if, for all i and j ,*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{A_i(m)}{\|A_i(m)\|} - \frac{A_j(m)}{\|A_j(m)\|} \right|_2 = 0.$$

Building on work in [2, 23], we can recursively define the vertices of each $\Delta^H(b_0, \dots, b_m)$. We have

Lemma 3.5.

$$\begin{aligned} A_i(m+1) &= A_{i+1}(m) \text{ for } i \in \{0, 2, \dots, n-2\} \\ A_{n-1}(m+1) &= b_{m+1}A_0(m) + A_n(m) \\ A_n(m+1) &= (b_{m+1} + 1)A_0(m) + A_n(m). \end{aligned}$$

For the dimension n case, the vertices of each $\Delta^H(b_0, \dots, b_m)$ are vectors in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . The initial simplex Δ^H has vertices


$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, A_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

giving us that the vertices of $\triangle^H(b_0)$ are

$$A_0(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, A_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, A_{n-2}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_{n-1}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} b_0 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, A_n(0) = \begin{pmatrix} b_0 + 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

As a schematic diagram, we can think of this as



Let $m > n$. Suppose that there is a constant B such that

$$b_{m-(n-2)}, b_{m-(n-3)}, \dots, b_m \leq B.$$

For notational convenience, set

$$b_{m-(n-1)} = b,$$

where b could be any nonnegative integer. Finally, again for notational convenience, denote the

$$A_i(m - n) = A_i.$$

Then we have

Lemma 3.6.

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0(m) &= bA_0 + A_n \\
A_1(m) &= b_{m-(n-2)}A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_n \\
A_2(m) &= b_{m-(n-3)}A_2 + (b_{m-(n-2)}+1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_n \\
A_3(m) &= b_{m-(n-4)}A_3 + (b_{m-(n-3)}+1)A_2 + (b_{m-(n-2)}+1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_n \\
&\vdots \\
A_{n-2}(m) &= b_{m-1}A_{n-2} + (b_{m-2}+1)A_{n-3} + \dots + (b_{m-(n-2)}+1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_n \\
A_{n-1}(m) &= b_m A_{n-1} + (b_{m-1}+1)A_{n-2} + (b_{m-2}+1)A_{n-3} \\
&\quad + \dots + (b_{m-(n-2)}+1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_n \\
A_n(m) &= (b_m+1)A_{n-1} + (b_{m-1}+1)A_{n-2} + (b_{m-2}+1)A_{n-3} \\
&\quad + \dots + (b_{m-(n-2)}+1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_n
\end{aligned}$$

3.3 The n=3 example

Just to ground the above in a concrete example, set $n = 3$. This means that each simplex

$$\Delta^H(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_m)$$

has 4 vertices.

Suppose $m > 4$, set

$$b_{m-2} = b,$$

and suppose that there is a constant B so that

$$b_{m-1}, b_m \leq B.$$

Denote the vertices of $\Delta^H(b_0, \dots, b_{m-3})$ by

$$A_0, A_1, A_2, A_3.$$

Then in our notation we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0(m-3) &= A_0 \\
A_1(m-3) &= A_1 \\
A_2(m-3) &= A_2 \\
A_3(m-3) &= A_3
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0(m-2) &= A_1(m-3) \\
&= A_1 \\
A_1(m-2) &= A_2(m-3) \\
&= A_2 \\
A_2(m-2) &= b_{m-2}A_0(m-3) + A_3(m-3) \\
&= bA_0 + A_3 \\
A_3(m-2) &= (b_{m-2} + 1)A_0(m-3) + A_3(m-3) \\
&= (b+1)A_0 + A_3
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0(m-1) &= A_1(m-2) \\
&= A_2 \\
A_1(m-1) &= A_2(m-2) \\
&= bA_0 + A_3 \\
A_2(m-1) &= b_{m-1}A_0(m-2) + A_3(m-2) \\
&= b_{m-1}A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_3 \\
A_3(m-1) &= (b_{m-1} + 1)A_0(m-2) + A_3(m-2) \\
&= (b_{m-1} + 1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_3
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0(m) &= A_1(m-1) \\
&= bA_0 + A_3 \\
A_1(m) &= A_2(m-1) \\
&= b_{m-1}A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_3 \\
A_2(m) &= b_mA_0(m-1) + A_3(m-1) \\
&= b_mA_2 + (b_{m-1} + 1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_3 \\
A_3(m) &= (b_m + 1)A_0(m-1) + A_3(m-1) \\
&= (b_m + 1)A_2 + (b_{m-1} + 1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_3
\end{aligned}$$

This gives us the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1(m) &= b_{m-1}A_1 + A_0 + A_0(m) \\
A_2(m) &= b_mA_2 + (b_{m-1} + 1)A_1 + A_0 + A_0(m) \\
A_3(m) &= (b_m + 1)A_2 + (b_{m-1} + 1)A_1 + A_0 + A_0(m)
\end{aligned}$$

3.4 Control of growth of vertices

We need to understand how the vertices $A_i(m)$ grow in their ℓ_1 norm. From the recursive formula and from that all of the b_i are non-negative, we have

Lemma 3.7. *For all m , we have*

$$\|A_0(m)\| < \|A_1(m)\| < \cdots < \|A_n(m)\|$$

and for all i ,

$$\|A_i(m)\| \leq \|A_i(m+1)\|.$$

But we also have that the ratios of the

$$\|A_k(m)\|$$

cannot grow too quickly, under assumptions of control on the size of the various b_k .

Lemma 3.8. *Let $m > n$. Suppose that there is a constant B such that*

$$b_{m-(n-2)}, b_{m-(n-3)}, \dots, b_m \leq B.$$

Then for all $i < j$ we have

$$\frac{\|A_i(m)\|}{\|A_j(m)\|} \geq \frac{1}{(B+1)(n+1)}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|A_i(m)\|}{\|A_j(m)\|} &\geq \frac{\|A_0(m)\|}{\|A_n(m)\|} \\ &= \frac{\|bA_0 + A_n\|}{\|(b_m + 1)A_{n-1} + \dots + (b_{m-(n-2)} + 1)A_1 + (b+1)A_0 + A_n\|} \\ &\quad \text{using Lemma 3.6 and its notation} \\ &\geq \frac{\|bA_0 + A_n\|}{\|(B+1)(bA_0 + A_n) + \dots + (B+1)(bA_0 + A_n) + bA_0 + A_n\|} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(B+1)(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

3.5 Weak convergence: proof of Theorem 3.2

We need a little more notation. Given two non-zero vectors U and V in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, define a distance function

$$D(U, V) := \left\| \frac{U}{\|U\|} - \frac{V}{\|V\|} \right\|_2.$$

We have

$$D(U, U+V) = \left\| \frac{U}{\|U\|} - \frac{V}{\|U+V\|} \right\|_2 = \frac{\|V\|}{\|U+V\|} D(U, V), \quad (1)$$

which is straightforward, with a lower dimensional case originally proven in [23].

Set

$$d(k) = \max_{i,j} D(A_i(k), A_j(k)).$$

Then $d(k)$ is the diameter of the simplex

$$\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_k).$$

We have

$$d(0) \geq d(1) \geq d(2) \geq \dots$$

We will have weak convergence precisely when

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(k) = 0.$$

Let $m > n$ and assume that there is a constant B such that

$$b_{m-(n-2)}, b_{m-(n-3)}, \dots, b_m \leq B.$$

We will show that

$$d(m) \leq \frac{Bn + B + n}{Bn + B + n + 1} d(m - n).$$

As there are infinitely many such m with corresponding bounds $b_{m-(n-2)}, b_{m-(n-3)}, \dots, b_m \leq B$, we will have our limit.

One last point, before setting up the needed string of inequalities. For all $j > i$, using Lemma 3.6, we know that both $A_i(m)$ and $A_j(m) - A_i(m)$ are in the simplex $\Delta^H(b_0, \dots, b_{m-n})$, which gives us

$$D(A_i(m), A_j(m) - A_i(m)) \leq d(m - n).$$

For $i < j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(A_i(m), A_j(m)) &= D(A_i(m), A_i + (A_j(m) - A_i(m))) \\ &= \frac{\|A_j(m) - A_i(m)\|}{\|A_j(m)\|} D(A_i(m), A_j(m) - A_i(m)) \\ &\leq \frac{\|A_j(m) - A_i(m)\|}{\|A_j(m)\|} d(m - n) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\|A_i(m)\|}{\|A_j(m)\|}\right) d(m - n) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{(B + 1)(n + 1)}\right) d(m - n) \\ &= \frac{Bn + B + n}{Bn + B + n + 1} d(m - n). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.2 is true.

4 Bounds on triangle sequence almost everywhere

4.1 Key Theorem on convergence almost everywhere

This section is needed preliminaries for Section 6, where we will finally show that the triangle map is ergodic.

Here we show

Theorem 4.1. *Fix any non-negative number B . For Lebesgue-almost-every $x \in \Delta$, the triangle sequence for x contains an infinite number of strings of b_i of length $n - 1$ bounded by the constant B .*

We will actually prove a subset of the above also happens almost everywhere:

Theorem 4.2. *For Lebesgue-almost-every $x \in \Delta$, the triangle sequence for x contains an infinite number of strings of $n - 1$ zeroes.*

This will give us

Corollary 4.3. *For Lebesgue-almost-every $u \in \Delta_{n-1}$, the triangle sequence is weakly convergent at u .*

Proof. This follows immediately from the combination of Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 4.2. Note that even though with probability 1 a random point will be uniquely specified by its triangle sequence, we strongly conjecture that there are examples of triangle sequences that converge to a line segment, a triangle, or a simplex of any dimension up to $n - 2$. The key point, though, is that the set of all points falling into one of these special examples has Lebesgue measure zero. \square

Proving Theorem 4.2 will take work and is the most technical part of this paper.

4.2 Key Proposition for weak convergence almost everywhere

We will throughout assume that $m > n$, where n is the dimension of the triangle map.

Proposition 4.4. *Let b_0, \dots, b_{m-n} be any sequence of non-negative integers. Let*

$$R = \cup_{b_i > 0} \Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{m-n}, \underbrace{b, 0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-1 \text{ zeroes}}).$$

Then

$$\frac{\lambda(R)}{\lambda(\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{m-n}))} > \frac{1}{(n-1)(n)(n+1) \cdots (2n-2)n^{n-1}}$$

where λ is Lebesgue measure.

The proof of this proposition will take some work, spread out over the next few subsections.

Let us first, though, see why this proposition will imply Theorem 4.2

Proof of Theorem 4.2 assuming Proposition 4.4

Every cell $\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{m-n})$ has at least $\frac{1}{(n-1)(n)(n+1)(n+2) \cdots (2n-2)n^{n-1}}$ of its total area consisting of points such that of the next n elements of the triangle sequence, the last $n - 1$ of them are sequential zeros. Since this is a positive percentage, the theorem follows. This is for the same reason as the fact that for any positive integer s , if we flip a biased coin an infinite number of times, we will get an infinite number of strings of tails of length s with probability 1 no matter the bias of the coin (provided of course the probability of landing on tails is nonzero).

4.3 Preliminary Lemma on Volume

We will be using the notation as in Section 3.2. In particular, let b_0, \dots, b_{n-4} be any sequence of non-negative integers. Let A_0, \dots, A_n be the column vectors in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} that define the cone $\Delta^H(b_0, \dots, b_{n-4})$, as described earlier. Then

$$\left\{ \frac{A_0}{\|A_0\|}, \dots, \frac{A_n}{\|A_n\|} \right\}$$

are the vertices of the simplex $\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{n-4})$. We will need to use the following lemma (which is already known, though not quite in this language).

Lemma 4.5. *We have*

$$\lambda(\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{m-4})) = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)! \|A_1\| \|A_2\| \cdots \|A_n\|}.$$

Let $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Then

$$\lambda(\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{m-4}, b, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-2 \text{ zeroes}}))$$

is

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)! \|bA_1 + A_n\| \|(b+1)A_1 + A_n\| \|(b+1)A_1 + A_2 + A_n\| \cdots \|(b+1)A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_n\|}.$$

Proof. The first part of the lemma is proven in [23] in their Lemma 3.2 on their page 292. We simply have to consider the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix whose columns are A_0, \dots, A_n , and observe that this matrix is the product of the matrices of the form T_{b_k} , as defined in Subsection 2.2, each of which has determinant ± 1 .

As seen in Lemma 3.6, the vertices of the cell $\Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{m-4}, b, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-2 \text{ zeroes}})$ are

$$A_1^n = bA_1 + A_n, A_2^n = A_1^n + A_1, A_3^n = A_2^n + A_2, \dots, A_n^n = A_{n-1}^n + A_{n-1}.$$

Thus plugging in for these vertices, we have the result. □

4.4 First Combinatorial Identity

Our goal is to show that points with $n-1$ zeroes in a row early in their triangle sequence occupy an appreciable proportion of each cell. Our proof of this requires a pair of strictly combinatorial lemmas, which we present in this subsection and in the next. In addition to their relevance to the ergodicity result, they are interesting in their own right.

Lemma 4.6. *For any integers $0 \leq j \leq n$, the following holds:*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \frac{\binom{n-2}{j} (-1)^j}{(j+1)x+y} = \frac{(n-2)! \cdot x^{n-2}}{(x+y)(2x+y)(3x+y) \cdots ((n-1)x+y)}.$$

The $n = 4$ example: Before proving this strange lemma, we give an explicit example of what it is claiming. Plugging in $n = 4$ on the left hand side, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\binom{2}{0}(-1)^0}{x+y} + \frac{\binom{2}{1}(-1)^1}{2x+y} + \frac{\binom{2}{2}(-1)^2}{3x+y} \\
&= \frac{1}{x+y} + \frac{-2}{2x+y} + \frac{1}{3x+y} \\
&= \frac{2x+y-2(x+y)}{(x+y)(2x+y)} + \frac{1}{3x+y} \\
&= \frac{-y}{(x+y)(2x+y)} + \frac{1}{3x+y} \\
&= \frac{-y(3x+y) + (x+y)(2x+y)}{(x+y)(2x+y)(3x+y)} \\
&= \frac{-3xy - y^2 + 2x^2 + 2xy + xy + y^2}{(x+y)(2x+y)(3x+y)} \\
&= \frac{2x^2}{(x+y)(2x+y)(3x+y)},
\end{aligned}$$

which matches the expression on the right hand side of the lemma.

Proof. We prove this by induction, with thanks to L. Pedersen, who suggested the proof strategy. First, factor out the y from the denominators in the sum and perform the substitution $u = x/y$ to yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \frac{(-1)^j \binom{n-2}{j}}{(j+1)x+y} \\
&= \frac{\binom{n-2}{0}}{x+y} - \frac{\binom{n-2}{1}}{2x+y} + \frac{\binom{n-2}{2}}{3x+y} - \dots + (-1)^{n-2} \frac{\binom{n-2}{n-2}}{(n-1)x+y} \\
&= \frac{1}{y} \left[\frac{\binom{n-2}{0}}{1+u} - \frac{\binom{n-2}{1}}{1+2u} + \frac{\binom{n-2}{2}}{1+3u} - \dots + (-1)^{n-2} \frac{\binom{n-2}{n-2}}{1+(n-1)u} \right] \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

We now study the bracketed expression. Note that when $n = 3$, the expression is $\frac{1}{1+u} - \frac{1}{1+2u}$, which equals $\frac{u}{(1+u)(1+2u)}$. For our inductive base case, we'll need something slightly stronger, which is that this expression holds for any pair of consecutive positive integer multiples of u , not just u and $2u$. Let r be the starting value. Our base case is

$$\frac{1}{1+ru} - \frac{1}{1+(r+1)u} = \frac{u}{(1+ru)(1+(r+1)u)}. \tag{3}$$

Now suppose that for some positive integer $k \geq 3$, we have that for any positive integer r ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\binom{k-2}{0}}{1+ru} - \frac{\binom{k-2}{1}}{1+(r+1)u} + \frac{\binom{k-2}{2}}{1+(r+2)u} - \dots + (-1)^{k-2} \frac{\binom{k-2}{k-2}}{1+(r+k-2)u} \\
&= \frac{(k-2)! \cdot u^{k-2}}{(1+ru)(1+(r+1)u) \cdots (1+(r+k-2)u)} \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall Pascal's identity, namely $\binom{n}{k-1} + \binom{n}{k} = \binom{n+1}{k}$. Applying this down the columns in the following equation subtraction, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\binom{k-2}{0}}{1+ru} - \frac{\binom{k-2}{1}}{1+(r+1)u} + \frac{\binom{k-2}{2}}{1+(r+2)u} - \dots + (-1)^{k-2} \frac{\binom{k-2}{k-2}}{1+(r+k-2)u} \\
& - \left[\frac{\binom{k-2}{0}}{1+(r+1)u} - \frac{\binom{k-2}{1}}{1+(r+2)u} + \dots + (-1)^{k-3} \frac{\binom{k-2}{k-3}}{1+(r+k-2)u} + (-1)^{k-2} \frac{\binom{k-2}{k-2}}{1+(r+k-1)u} \right] \\
\hline
& \frac{\binom{k-1}{0}}{1+ru} - \frac{\binom{k-1}{1}}{1+(r+1)u} + \frac{\binom{k-1}{2}}{1+(r+2)u} - \dots + (-1)^{k-2} \frac{\binom{k-1}{k-2}}{1+(r+k-2)u} + (-1)^{k-1} \frac{\binom{k-2}{k-2}}{1+(r+k-1)u}
\end{aligned}$$

By (4), we know the first line in the subtraction equals $\frac{(k-2)! \cdot u^{k-2}}{(1+ru)(1+(r+1)u) \cdots (1+(r+k-2)u)}$ and the second equals $\frac{(k-2)! \cdot u^{k-2}}{(1+(r+1)u)(1+(r+2)u) \cdots (1+(r+k-1)u)}$. Subtracting these yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& (k-2)! \cdot u^{k-2} \frac{(k-1)u}{(1+ru)(1+(r+1)u) \cdots (1+(r+k-1)u)} \\
& = \frac{(k-1)! \cdot u^{k-1}}{(1+ru)(1+(r+1)u) \cdots (1+(r+k-1)u)}. \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus if (4) holds for k , it holds for $k+1$, so since we have the base case $k=3$ for all r , we know that (4) holds for any r and all $k \geq 3$.

Taking $r=1$ and $k=n$ in (4), we can now substitute back into (2) to yield that our original summation equals

$$\frac{1}{y} \left[\frac{(n-2)! \cdot u^{n-2}}{(1+u)(1+2u) \cdots (1+(n-1)u)} \right]$$

Now substituting back in for $u = x/y$, the $k-1$ factors of $1/y$ in the bracketed denominator cancel with the $k-2$ factors of $1/y$ in the numerator and the extra in front, leaving us with

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \frac{\binom{n-2}{j} (-1)^j}{(j+1)x+y} = \frac{(n-2)! \cdot x^{n-2}}{(x+y)(2x+y)(3x+y) \cdots ((n-1)x+y)}$$

as desired. □

4.5 Second Combinatorial Identity

The second of the combinatorial lemmas is more difficult to state, so we introduce it with the help of a diagram. The relevant coefficients will arise naturally in our ergodicity proof, but we can more easily envision deriving them as follows.

Recall that the multinomial $\binom{n}{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m}$ is defined as the way, given n items and m boxes total, to choose k_i items to put into each box i . We are interested particularly in the case where every item is placed into a box, meaning $\sum_{i=1}^m k_i = n$. Note that $\binom{n}{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m} = \frac{n!}{k_1! k_2! \cdots k_m!}$.

Definition 4.7. A composition of a positive integer n is a way of summing positive integers to yield n , where, unlike a partition, the order of the parts is taken into account. Thus $4 = 2 + 1 + 1$, $4 = 1 + 2 + 1$, and $4 = 1 + 1 + 2$ are all distinct compositions of 4, although they all count as the same partition, namely $\{2, 1\} \times [1, 2]$. [1]




Figure 1: First Five Rows of Multinomial Tree

There are 2^{n-1} compositions of n . We define their standard order to be lexicographic order with higher numbers coming first. Thus the standard order for compositions of 3 is $\{3\}, \{2, 1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 1, 1\}$.

Given the composition $\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m\}$, we naturally have a multinomial that corresponds, namely

$$\binom{k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_m}{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m}.$$

We can arrange all such multinomials into a binary tree as follows: let row n contain all multinomials corresponding to compositions of n . Beginning with $\binom{1}{1}$ at the top, every node $\binom{n}{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m}$ has left child

$$\binom{n+1}{k_1+1, k_2, \dots, k_m}$$

and right child

$$\binom{n+1}{1, k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m}.$$

We will now assign signs to the tree entries as follows: assign to $\binom{1}{1}$ a $+$ and then as we move down the tree, sign each left child the same as its parent and each right child the opposite. Note that since left children have the same number of composition parts as their parents and right children have one more, this rule is the same as signing $\binom{n}{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m}$ by $(-1)^{m-1}$. See Figure 1 for the first five rows of the tree with the signs corresponding to each entry labeled. Now the following strange property emerges, which we will first state in terms of the tree, then more formally with reference only to the standard order. For any $0 \leq k \leq n$, the sum of the first 2^k signed entries in row $n+1$ equals $(-1)^k \binom{n}{k}$.

As an example, take $k=3$ and $n=4$, which means we are looking at the sum of the first 8 signed entries in row 5. These are $1 - 5 - 10 + 20 - 10 + 30 + 30 - 60 = -4$, which is $\binom{4}{3}(-1)^3$, as predicted.

Let $C_{n,i}$ be the i -th composition in standard order of the positive integer n , and $|C_{n,i}|$ be the number of parts in $C_{n,i}$. Thus, for example, $C_{5,7} = \{2, 1, 2\}$ and $|C_{5,7}| = 3$. Finally, let $\binom{n}{C_{n,i}}$ be the value of the multinomial corresponding to the composition $C_{n,i}$, so $\binom{5}{C_{5,7}} = \binom{5}{2,1,2} = \frac{5!}{2!1!2!} = 30$.

For clarity, Figure 2 shows the same tree from Figure 1, just rewritten with the new notation.

We can now state the lemma without reference to the tree.




Figure 2: First Five Rows of Multinomial Tree with New Notation

Lemma 4.8. For $n, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ with $k \leq n$,

$$\sum_{i \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{n-k}}} \binom{n+1}{C_{n+1,i}} (-1)^{|C_{n+1,i}|-1} = \binom{n}{k} (-1)^k.$$

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction, returning to the tree for intuition. Let S_n be the sum of the multinomials corresponding to compositions of n with their signs as listed in the tree. Equivalently,

$$S_n := \sum_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}} \binom{n}{C_{n,i}} (-1)^{|C_{n,i}|-1}.$$

As a base case, note that $S_1 = \binom{1}{1} = 1$. Now suppose that for some $r \geq 0$, the lemma holds for row $r+1$ of the tree as well as all rows above it, meaning for any $0 \leq k \leq n \leq r$, we have

$$\sum_{i \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{n-k}}} \binom{n+1}{C_{n+1,i}} (-1)^{|C_{n+1,i}|-1} = \binom{n}{k} (-1)^k.$$

The key thing to note is that every time we move right down the tree, we fix the last composition part size for all descendants of that node. Thus the entire right half of the tree consists of multinomials corresponding to compositions ending in 1, the second quarter of the tree from the left consists of multinomials corresponding to compositions ending in 2, and in general the second $\frac{1}{2^j}$ -th of the tree from the left consists of multinomials corresponding to compositions ending in j . Thus in row $r+1$, where we have 2^r entries in the tree, we see that reading them from left to right, we encounter first 1 multinomial corresponding to a composition ending in $r+1$ (the odd one out in a sense, since it isn't the second unit in any binary division), then 1 multinomial corresponding to a composition ending in r , then 2 multinomials corresponding to a composition ending in $r-1$, and so on, with 2^j compositions corresponding to multinomials ending $r-j$. These compositions correspond to the ways to place $j+1$ items into boxes, since we have $r+1$ items total but are committing to having $r-j$ of them in our last box. Since there are only 2^j compositions of $j+1$, their corresponding multinomials must all appear in row $r+1$, each with a final part of size $r+1-(j+1) = r-j$ tacked on. In fact, our tree rules are such that those multinomials appear in the same order in row $r+1$ that they did originally in row $j+1$, just each with the extra part added to make the components sum to $r+1$. Thus reading the compositions from each multinomial across the tree at row $r+1$, we get first the

entry $r + 1$, then what is essentially a copy of row 1, just with an r tacked on, then a copy of row 2 with an $r - 1$ tacked on to each entry, then a copy of row 3 with an $r - 2$ tacked on to each entry, and so on.

Since we are adding an entry to each composition, all the signs swap from how they appear in row $j + 1$ to how they appear in row $r + 1$. The effects of replacing the sum from row $j + 1$ with the copy of row $j + 1$ that appears in row $r + 1$ are as follows: first, the multinomial now has us picking from $r + 1$ items instead of $j + 1$ items, so the $(j + 1)!$ in the numerator of the value in row $j + 1$ is replaced by an $(r + 1)!$, for a net effect of multiplying by $\frac{(r+1)!}{(j+1)!}$. Second, the tacked on $r - j$ contributes an $(r - j)!$ to the denominator of the version of the multinomial that appears in row $r + 1$. And third, as noted, the signs all swap from row $j + 1$ to the copy of row $j + 1$ embedded in row $r + 1$. Thus the overall effect is that reading from left to right along row $r + 1$, we have that the entries from number $2^{j-1} + 1$ to number 2^j sum to $-S_j \frac{(r+1)!}{(j+1)! (r-j)!}$, or equivalently, to $-S_j \binom{r+1}{j+1}$. Since $j < r + 1$, we have by our inductive assumption that $S_j = (-1)^{j-1}$. We now have that the sums of chunks of increasing size reading along row $r + 1$ are as follows:

- The first entry, which is $\binom{r+1}{r+1} = 1$
- The second entry, which is $-S_1 \binom{r+1}{1}$
- The third and fourth entries, which sum to $-S_2 \binom{r+1}{2}$
- Entries 5-8, which sum to $-S_3 \binom{r+1}{3}$
- And so on, with entries $2^{j-1} + 1$ to 2^j summing to $-S_j \binom{r+1}{j}$

Now we plug in for $S_n = (-1)^{n-1}$ and add up the items above. Writing the initial 1 as $\binom{r}{0}$, we have that by Pascal's identity, the sum of the first two entries in row $r + 1$ is $\binom{r}{0} - \binom{r+1}{1} = -\binom{r}{1}$. Then the sum of the first four entries is $-\binom{r}{1} + \binom{r+1}{2} = \binom{r}{2}$. Continuing, we see that the sum of the first 2^j entries in row $r + 1$ is $\binom{r}{j} (-1)^j$. Taking $j = r$, we get that the sum of the entire row, S_{r+1} , is equal to $\binom{r}{r} (-1)^r = (-1)^r$, allowing us to use this in the simplification for future rows, as desired. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

4.6 A lower bound

To prove the key Proposition 4.4 for weak convergence, we will need

Lemma 4.9. *Using the notation of Proposition 4.4, we have*

$$\sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \lambda(\cup_{b>0} \Delta^S(b_0, \dots, b_{m-n}, b, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-1 \text{ zeroes}}))$$

is strictly greater than

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!(n-1)\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\| \|2A_0 + A\| \cdots \|(n-1)A_0 + A\|} \right),$$

where $A := A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_n$.

Before we prove this lemma, we give an example for the $n = 5$ case that illustrates the strategy. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A_5\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A_5\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A_1 + A_5\| \cdots \|(b+1)A_0 + A_1 + \dots + A_5\|} \\
& > \frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A\| \|(b+2)A_0 + A\| \cdots \|(b+4)A_0 + A\|} \\
& = \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A\|} - \frac{1}{\|(b+1)A_0 + A\|} \right) \frac{1}{\|(b+2)A_0 + A\| \|(b+3)A_0 + A\| \|(b+4)A_0 + A\|} \\
& = \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left[\frac{1}{2\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A\|} - \frac{1}{\|(b+2)A_0 + A\|} \right) - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+1)A_0 + A\|} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{\|(b+2)A_0 + A\|} \right) \right] \cdot \frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\| \|(b+4)A_0 + A\|} \\
& = \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left[\frac{1}{2\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{3\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A\|} - \frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} \right) - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+2)A_0 + A\|} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} \right) \right) - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{2\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+1)A_0 + A\|} - \frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+2)A_0 + A\|} - \frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} \right) \right) \right] \cdot \frac{1}{\|(b+4)A_0 + A\|} \\
& = \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left[\frac{1}{2\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{3\|A_0\|} \left[\frac{1}{4\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A\|} - * \right) - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} - * \right) \right] \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left[\frac{1}{2\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+2)A_0 + A\|} - * \right) - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} - * \right) \right] \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{2\|A_0\|} \left[\frac{1}{3\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+1)A_0 + A\|} - * \right) - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} - * \right) \right] \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left[\frac{1}{2\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+2)A_0 + A\|} - * \right) - \frac{1}{\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|(b+3)A_0 + A\|} - * \right) \right] \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } * := \frac{1}{\|(b+4)A_0 + A\|}$$

Thus when we take the sum over all b from 1 to ∞ , the tails cancel in each difference, leaving us with only a few leading terms in each set of parentheses. Factoring the $\frac{1}{\|A_0\|^4}$ common to all the terms, we have that the sum equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\|A_0\|^4} \left[\frac{1}{24} \left(\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\|} + \frac{1}{\|2A_0 + A\|} + \frac{1}{\|3A_0 + A\|} + \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right) - \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right) \right. \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\|3A_0 + A\|} + \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right) \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{1}{\|2A_0 + A\|} + \frac{1}{\|3A_0 + A\|} + \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\|3A_0 + A\|} + \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right) - 1 \left(\frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\|A_0\|^4} \left[\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\|} \left(\frac{1}{24} \right) + \frac{1}{\|2A_0 + A\|} \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{1}{6} \right) + \frac{1}{\|3A_0 + A\|} \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \left(\frac{1}{24} - \frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - 1 \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{24\|A_0\|^4} \left[\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\|} (1) + \frac{1}{\|2A_0 + A\|} (1 - 4) + \frac{1}{\|3A_0 + A\|} (1 - 6 - 4 + 12) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} (1 - 4 - 6 + 12 - 4 + 12 + 12 - 24) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{24\|A_0\|^4} \left(\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\|} - \frac{3}{\|2A_0 + A\|} + \frac{3}{\|3A_0 + A\|} - \frac{1}{\|4A_0 + A\|} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

at which point the application of Lemma 4.6 establishes the desired result. We now turn to the general case.

Proof of Lemma 4.9. From Lemma 4.5, we know the sum of interest is $\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!}$ times the sum taken over all integer b from $b = 1$ to ∞ of

$$\frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A_n\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A_n\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A_1 + A_n\| \cdots \|(b+1)A_0 + A_1 + \dots + A_n\|}.$$

Equivalently, let $D_0 := A_n + bA_0$ and $D_k := A_n + bA_0 + A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_{k-1} + A_k$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. Then we are interested in

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!} \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \|D_k\|} \tag{6}$$

Ignoring the summation and the constant in front for now, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A_n\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A_n\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A_1 + A_n\| \cdots \|(b+1)A_0 + A_1 + \dots + A_n\|} \\
& > \frac{1}{\|bA_0 + A_1 + \dots + A_n\| \|(b+1)A_0 + A\| \|(b+2)A_0 + A\| \cdots \|(b+n-1)A_0 + A\|},
\end{aligned}$$

since $b \geq 0$ and each $\|A_i\| \geq 0$, so we are only increasing the denominator by replacing the first line with the second.

Using this inequality and a repeated partial fractions decomposition to produce telescoping differences, we claim that the sum in Expression 6 exceeds

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!} \frac{1}{(n-1)! \|A_0\|^{n-1}} \left(\frac{\binom{n-2}{0}}{\|A_0 + A\|} - \frac{\binom{n-2}{1}}{\|2A_0 + A\|} + \frac{\binom{n-2}{2}}{\|3A_0 + A\|} - \dots + (-1)^{n-2} \frac{\binom{n-2}{n-2}}{\|(n-1)A_0 + A\|} \right).$$

The case for higher n starts out the same way as $n = 5$ but requires more steps of the partial fraction decomposition. After the final step, the number of terms we get when we cancel the tails in each set of parentheses equals the coefficient on the $\|A_0\|$ in the innermost denominator. This follows from the fact that

$$\frac{1}{\|rA_0 + A\| \|(r+s)A_0 + A\|} = \frac{1}{\|sA_0 + A\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|rA_0 + A\|} - \frac{1}{\|(r+s)A_0 + A\|} \right).$$

When we take the sum over all r from 1 to ∞ , we get that the terms with coefficient $r + s$ or higher on the A_0 cancel, leaving exactly s terms, namely $\frac{1}{\|rA_0 + A\|}$, $\frac{1}{\|(r+1)A_0 + A\|}$, \dots , and $\frac{1}{\|(r+s-1)A_0 + A\|}$.

Clearly any time the term $\frac{1}{\|rA_0 + A\|}$ appears for some integer $r < n - 1$, we will also get the terms $\frac{1}{\|(r+1)A_0 + A\|}$, \dots , $\frac{1}{\|(n-1)A_0 + A\|}$. This is because the innermost set of parentheses always has $\frac{1}{\|b+(n-1)A_0 + A\|}$ subtracted, so $\frac{1}{\|(n-1)A_0 + A\|}$ appears in every difference, possibly along with a sequence of consecutive coefficients on A_1 terms leading up to it.

In fact, the pattern is such that we get a second term exactly half the time, a third term a quarter of the time, and so on, with induction showing that the coefficients on the $\frac{1}{\|(n-1)A_0 + A\|}$ terms are the multinomial coefficients for compositions appearing in their standard order (OEIS Sequence A124774) [27]. The signs on each term correspond to how many levels of negatives appear in front, which in turn correspond to how many parts a given composition has, with an odd number getting a positive sign and an even number getting a negative sign.

Once we have the coefficients for the $\frac{1}{\|(n-1)A_0 + A\|}$ term in order, ascertaining the coefficients for the other terms is easy, since every other coefficient also appears with $\frac{1}{\|(n-2)A_0 + A\|}$, every fourth with $\frac{1}{\|(n-3)A_0 + A\|}$, every eighth with $\frac{1}{\|(n-4)A_0 + A\|}$, etc, all the way down to $\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\|}$, which appears with only the first coefficient, which is always $\binom{n}{n} = 1$.

Now the use of Lemma 4.8 is apparent, since the coefficients are exactly the sums we have already examined in that proof.

Thus in the general case, still taking $A := A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_n$, we have by Lemma 4.8 that the sum over all b from 1 to ∞ exceeds

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!} \frac{1}{(n-1)! \|A_0\|^{n-1}} \left(\frac{\binom{n-2}{0}}{\|A_0 + A\|} - \frac{\binom{n-2}{1}}{\|2A_0 + A\|} + \frac{\binom{n-2}{2}}{\|3A_0 + A\|} - \dots + (-1)^{n-2} \frac{\binom{n-2}{n-2}}{\|(n-1)A_0 + A\|} \right).$$

By Lemma 4.6, taking $x = \|A_0\|$ and $y = \|A\|$, we can simplify the above to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!} \frac{1}{(n-1)\|A_0\|^{n-1}} \left(\frac{(n-2)! \cdot \|A_0\|^{n-2}}{\|A_0 + A\| \|2A_0 + A\| \cdots \|(n-1)A_0 + A\|} \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!(n-1)\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\| \|2A_0 + A\| \cdots \|(n-1)A_0 + A\|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

What actually matters going forward is just that this quantity, though very small, is clearly positive for any given value of n . \square

4.7 Proof of Key Proposition 4.4

Proof. As before, let $A := A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_n$. By Lemmas 4.5 and 4.9, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda(R)}{\lambda(C)} &> \frac{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!(n-1)\|A_0\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|A_0 + A\| \|2A_0 + A\| \cdots \|(n-1)A_0 + A\|} \right)}{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{(n-1)!\|A_0\| \|A_1\| \cdots \|A_n\|}} \\ &= \frac{\|A_1\| \|A_2\| \cdots \|A_n\|}{(n-1) (\|A_0 + A\| \|2A_0 + A\| \cdots \|(n-1)A_0 + A\|)} \\ &> \frac{\|A_1\|^{n-1}}{(n-1) (\|nA_n\| \|(n+1)A_n\| \cdots \|(2n-2)A_n\|)} \\ &> \frac{\|A_1\|^{n-1}}{(n-1) (\|n^2A_1\| \|(n+1)nA_1\| \cdots \|(2n-2)nA_1\|)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(n-1)(n^2)[(n+1)n][(n+2)n] \cdots [(2n-2)n]} \\ &= \frac{1}{(n-1)(n)(n+1)(n+2) \cdots (2n-2)n^{n-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 in the third and fourth lines. Since for any starting n , this value is a small positive constant, we know that R occupies an appreciable portion of the cell C . \square

5 Algebraicity via Periodicity

As mentioned in the introduction, one of the prime motivating questions for the development of multi-dimensional continued fraction algorithms is to find the correct generalization of the fact that a number is quadratic irrational if and only if its traditional continued fraction algorithm is eventually periodic. This is the Hermite problem.

Thus the natural question to ask is if the periodicity of the triangle map will determine something about the algebraic properties of the point $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let*

$$(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

have an eventually periodic triangle sequence. Then $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are all in the same algebraic number field whose degree is less than or equal to n .

This theorem was the main goal in the $n = 3$ case in [13, 2].

Proof. If the triangle sequence (b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots) is eventually periodic, then certainly the sequence is bounded. Hence the cells $\Delta(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_m)$ will converge to a single point. Then the arguments in [13] for the $n = 2$ case immediately apply, giving us the result.

□

As a sketch for why this theorem is true, consider the purely periodic case. The weak convergence, coupled with the matrices that arise in the homogeneous triangle map, lead to the vector

$$(1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

being an eigenvector of a matrix in $SL(n+1, \mathbb{Z})$, which is enough to get the result.

The meat of the Hermite question is the converse. If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are all in the same algebraic number field whose degree is less than or equal to n , must it be the case that the corresponding triangle sequence is eventually periodic. We have no idea, though we suspect that this is not true.

In general, even for the cubic case, this is the difficult direction to try to prove. There has recently been quite a bit of progress, though, in the cubic case by Karpenkov [20, 21].

6 Ergodicity of the Triangle Map

6.1 Basics of Ergodic Theory

We briefly introduce the ideas from ergodic theory that will be necessary to this paper. For more complete background, see Billingsley [7], Dajani and Kraaikamp [10], Kesseböhmer, Munday and Stratmann [22], and Silva [26].

Given a space X endowed with measure μ , we say a property holds **almost everywhere** if it fails only on a subset of measure 0.

A transformation $T : X \rightarrow X$ is said to be a **non-singular** transformation on the system (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) if for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mu(B) = 0$ if and only if $\mu(T^{-1}(B)) = 0$. Note that the Farey, Gauss, Slow Triangle, and Triangle maps are all non-singular.

We say a function $T : X \rightarrow X$ is **measure-preserving**, or preserves the measure μ , if for all measurable $A \subseteq X$, $\mu(A) = \mu(T^{-1}(A))$.

We say a function $T : X \rightarrow X$ is **ergodic** if whenever $T^{-1}(A) = A$, where A is a measurable subset of X , then either $\mu(A) = 0$ or $\mu(X \setminus A) = 0$.

Given two measures μ and ν on the same space, we say ν is **absolutely continuous with respect to** μ if $\mu(A) = 0 \implies \nu(A) = 0$, where $A \subseteq X$. We denote this $\nu \leq \mu$. If $\nu \leq \mu$ and $\mu \leq \nu$, then we say the two measures are **equivalent** and write $\mu \sim \nu$. We say equivalent measures are part of the same *measure class* [22].

If two sets X and Y are equal up to a set of measure 0 using a given measure μ , i.e., if $\mu(X \setminus Y) = 0$ and $\mu(Y \setminus X) = 0$, then we write $X = Y \pmod{\mu}$.

It is classical that the Gauss map on the unit interval is ergodic. Besides the above reference, see Hensley [15] and Rockett and Szűsz [24]

6.2 The jump transformation g

For the rest of this section, all the maps and domains will be in the sliced version. Thus when we write T and Δ , we mean T^S and Δ^S , respectively.

This subsection is a straightforward generalization of the first three paragraphs of Section 4.1 in [23].

In keeping with [23], we introduce the jump transformation g . This will be useful because it allows us to jump to the points in the triangle sequence where our guaranteed cell shrinkage (i.e., our strings of zeros) occurs. And as a reminder, the original triangle map T is ergodic if and only if the sliced triangle map T^S is ergodic.

First define

$$\mathcal{B}_m = \{ \Delta(b_1, \dots, b_m) : \text{the first appearance of a string of } n-1 \text{ zeros in the sequence of } b_j \text{'s ends at } b_m; i = 1, 2, \dots, n \}$$

and

$$B_m = \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{B}_m} E.$$

Thus \mathcal{B}_m is the set of all subcells of Δ consisting of points whose triangle sequences have the first string of $n - 2$ consecutive zeros being $b_{m-(n-2)} = 0, b_{m-(n-3)} = 0, \dots, b_m = 0$, and B_m is the cell consisting of their union. For these definitions to make sense, we need $m \geq n - 2$. By Corollary 4.2, we have that

$$\bigcup_m B_m = \Delta \pmod{\lambda}.$$

Note that mod λ , the sets E such that $E \in \bigcup_m B_m$ form a partition $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}$ of Δ . We now define

$$g : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta, \quad g(u) = f^k(u) \text{ if } u \in B_k$$

We now look at finer and finer partitions of Δ , defined inductively as follows. Once we have a partition $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ defined, we define $\mathcal{P}^{(k+1)}$ as the partition consisting of all intersections of sets $H \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ and sets $g^{-1}(G) = \bigcup_m (f^{-m}(G) \cap B_m), G \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$.

In more plain language, $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}$ is the set of all

$$\Delta(b_0, \dots, b_{m-n}, b_{m-(n-1)}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-1 \text{ zeroes}}).$$

where all of the b_i are positive, $\mathcal{P}^{(2)}$ is the set of all

$$\Delta(b_0, \dots, b_m, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-1 \text{ zeroes}}, c_0, \dots, c_0, \dots, c_k, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-1 \text{ zeroes}}),$$

where all of the b_i and c_j are positive, $\mathcal{P}^{(2)}$ is the set of all corresponding cones with three ‘‘patches’’ of $n - 2$ zeros in a row, etc.

The key for us is that for all $\Delta(b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \mathcal{B}_m$, we have that not only is

$$g(\Delta(b_1, \dots, b_m)) = \Delta,$$

but that the map g is one-to-one and onto. This will mean that for any cone $C \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$,

$$g(C) = \mathcal{P}^{(k-1)}, g^{(2)}(C) = \mathcal{P}^{(k-2)}, \dots, g^{(k-1)}(C) = \mathcal{P}^{(1)}, g^{(k)}(C) = \Delta.$$

We have that

$$\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{P}^k} C = \Delta \pmod{\lambda}.$$

As k increases, we have by Theorem 3.2 that the diameter of all the relevant cells tends to 0. Thus $\mathcal{C}^{(k)} \uparrow \mathcal{B}$ where \mathcal{B} is the Borel algebra and the up arrow means $\mathcal{C}^{(k)}$ is an increasing sequence of sets whose limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ is \mathcal{B} .

We will be needing the following critical fact. If A is a subset with positive Lebesgue measure in Δ , then there is k and a cone $C \in \mathcal{P}^k$ so that

$$\lambda(C \cap A) = \lambda(C),$$

meaning that C is contained in A almost everywhere.

To show ergodicity of T , all we need do is to show that the jump transformation g is ergodic, by:

Lemma 6.1. *If g is ergodic then T is ergodic.*

Proof. We will show that if g is ergodic then T is ergodic.

This follows from the fact that $g^{-1}(\Omega) = \bigcup_m ((T)^{-m}(\Omega) \cap B_m)$. Thus any measurable set that is its own preimage under f would also be its own preimage under g , hence if T were not ergodic, g could not be either. By contrapositive, then, if g is ergodic, T must be as well. \square

6.3 The jump transformation is ergodic

This is a straightforward generalization of Lemma 4.1 in [23].

We want to show that $g : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ is ergodic with respect to Lebesgue measure λ .

Start with a measurable set Ω of Δ with

$$g^{-1}(\Omega) = \Omega, a.e.$$

We want to show that

$$\lambda(\Omega) = 0 \text{ or } \Omega = \Delta, a.e.$$

We will assume that $\lambda(\Omega) \neq 0$, as otherwise we would be done. Suppose $\Omega \neq \Delta, a.e.$ Then we must have that the complement has positive measure:

$$\lambda(\Delta - \Omega) > 0.$$

All of our previous work in showing that the elements of the partitions $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ approach single points as $k \rightarrow \infty$ will mean that there must be a k and an element of $C \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ so that C is contained in $\Delta - \Omega, a.e.$ Thus we must have that there is a $C \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ for some k with

$$\lambda(\Omega \cap C) = 0.$$

The next step is to show that for every $C \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$ for any k , we must have

$$\lambda(\Omega \cap C) > 0,$$

giving us our needed contradiction.

Start with some $C \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}$. As Ω is an invariant set, we have

$$\Omega \cap C = g^{(-1)}\Omega \cap C = \dots = g^{(-k)}\Omega \cap C.$$

We know then that

$$g^{(k)}(\Omega \cap C) = g^{(k)}\left(g^{(-k)}\Omega\right) \cap g^{(k)}(C) = \Omega.$$

Thus

$$\lambda(\Omega \cap C) = \int_{\Omega} \text{Jac}(g^{(k)}) d\lambda.$$

Luckily the Jacobian $\text{Jac}(g^{(k)})$ is not hard to calculate, as is discussed, again, in [23]. Let $A = (A_0, \dots, A_n)$ be the

matrix describing the cone C . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(\Omega \cap C) &= \int_{\Omega} \text{Jac}(g^{(k)}) d\lambda \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \frac{d\lambda}{(\|A_0\|x_0 + \|A_1\|x_1 + \dots + \|A_n\|x_n)^{n+1}} \\
&\geq \frac{\lambda(\Omega)}{\|A_{\max}\|^{n+1}} \\
&> 0.
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|A_{\max}\| := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|A_i\|$.

We have our contradiction, meaning that the map g is indeed ergodic.

7 Invariant Measures

7.1 Invariant measures

We now know that the triangle map $T : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$, given by

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \left(\frac{x_2}{x_1}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_1}, \frac{1 - x_1 - bx_n}{x_1} \right)$$

for any $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Delta_b$ is ergodic with respect to Lebesgue measure. But this is not an invariant measure, as for almost any set A of Δ , we have that

$$\lambda(A) \neq \lambda(T^{-1}(A)).$$

The natural question is to find an invariant measure that is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, a question both asked and answered by Gauss in the $n = 1$ case, and known for $n = 3$ [14]. Our goal for this section is

Theorem 7.1. *The invariant measure for the triangle map T in dimension n is*

$$\frac{d\lambda}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)}.$$

We will prove this using the rhetoric of the transfer operator. Recall that for a dynamical system with the map $T : X \rightarrow X$, the **transfer operator**, denoted \mathcal{L} or \mathcal{L}_T , sends measurable functions on X to measurable functions on X such that for all measurable subsets A of X , we have

$$\int_{T^{-1}(A)} f(x) dx = \int_A \mathcal{L}_T f(x) dx.$$

The transfer operator is a common tool for verifying candidate invariant measures, because an invariant measure must be an eigenfunction with largest eigenvalue 1 for the transfer operator corresponding to a given map. (For more on background of transfer operators, see Hensley [15], Iosifescu and Kraaikamp [17], Kesseböhmer, Munday and Stratmann [22] and Schweiger [25], and for more general background, see Baladi [5].)

Definition 7.2. The transfer operator \mathcal{L} for any differentiable map T acting on a measurable real-valued function f is

$$\mathcal{L}(f)(p) = \sum_{q:T(q)=p} \frac{1}{|\text{Jac}(T(q))|} f(q). \quad [14]$$

This section is a straightforward generalization of the $n = 2$ case given in [14]. Hence we simply must calculate the transfer operator for the n -dimensional Triangle map and then verify that our candidate function is an invariant measure. Since it does not require creative new ideas, we omit some of the background from dynamical systems.

We can directly calculate that

$$T^{-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \left(\frac{1}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n}, \frac{x_1}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n} \right)$$

(The method is to look at the homogeneous version of the triangle map, giving us that T^H can be described as an $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix. Then the inverse of T^H is simply the inverse of this matrix. To get T^{-1} , we simply then “dehomogenize,” which in this case means divide by the first coordinate, giving us the above T^{-1} .)

Then we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}f(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n)^{n+1}} f \left(\frac{1}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n}, \frac{x_1}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(Again, while the calculations are straightforward, though a bit messy, but they are completely analogous to the $n = 2$ case that is worked out in [14].) Now for the proof of Theorem 7.1 .

Proof. Let $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)}$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}f(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n)^{n+1}} \left[\frac{(1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n)^{n-1}}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-2}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{x_{n-1}}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n)^{n+1}} \left[\frac{(1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n)^{n-1}}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-2}} \cdot \frac{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n + x_{n-1}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n} \left[\frac{1}{1 + (k + 1)x_{n-1} + x_n} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x_{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + kx_{n-1} + x_n} - \frac{1}{1 + (k + 1)x_{n-1} + x_n} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + x_n} - \frac{1}{1 + x_{n-1} + x_n} + \frac{1}{1 + x_{n-1} + x_n} - \dots \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)} \\ &= f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, we conclude that $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)}$ is an eigenfunction for the transfer operator, hence this is the invariant measure for the n -dimensional triangle map on the simplex Δ with the $n+1$ vertices $(0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$, $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $(1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $(1, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, \dots , and $(1, 1, \dots, 1, 1)$. \square

7.2 Normalizing Constant

For the simplex Δ in \mathbb{R}^n , we have that

$$\int_{\Delta} \frac{d\lambda}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)} \neq 1.$$

This subsection finds for each n ,

$$C_n = \int_{\Delta} \frac{d\lambda}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)}.$$

In the $n = 1$ case (the Gauss map), we have the classical

$$C_1 = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{1+x} dx = \log(2).$$

Theorem 7.3. For $n \geq 2$, the normalizing constant for the invariant measure of the Triangle map in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} is

$$C_n = \frac{2^{n-1} - 1}{2^{n-1}} \zeta(n),$$

where $\zeta(n)$ is the Riemann zeta function.

As an aside, we were mildly surprised to see the zeta function appear in these calculations.

Before we prove this, we recall that if we define

$$\zeta_{\text{even}}(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k)^n},$$

then

$$\zeta_{\text{even}}(n) = \frac{1}{2^n} \zeta(n).$$

(This is a simple calculation.)

Proof. We need to calculate

$$C_n = \int_{\Delta} \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)} dx_n dx_{n-1} \cdots dx_1.$$

Parametrizing Δ , this is equivalent to

$$C = \int_0^1 \int_0^{x_1} \int_0^{x_2} \cdots \int_0^{x_{n-1}} \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)} dx_n dx_{n-1} \cdots dx_1. \quad (7)$$

Using the Taylor series expansion $\frac{1}{1+x_n} = 1 - x_n + x_n^2 - x_n^3 + x_n^4 - \dots$, we have

$$C = \int_0^1 \int_0^{x_1} \int_0^{x_2} \cdots \int_0^{x_{n-1}} \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1}} (1 - x_n + x_n^2 - x_n^3 + x_n^4 - \dots) dx_n dx_{n-1} \cdots dx_1. \quad (8)$$

We proceed by induction. For our inductive hypothesis, we will take a close relative of the statement of the theorem, namely that

$$\int_0^{x_1} \int_0^{x_2} \cdots \int_0^{x_{n-1}} \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)} dx_n dx_{n-1} \cdots dx_2 = 1 - \frac{x_1}{2^{n-1}} + \frac{x_1^2}{3^{n-1}} - \frac{x_1^3}{4^{n-1}} + \dots$$

For the base case, let $n = 2$. Then the integral from (8) is just

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{x_1} \frac{1}{x_1} (1 - x_2 + x_2^2 - x_2^3 + x_2^4 - \dots) dx_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{x_1} \left[x_2 - \frac{x_2^2}{2} + \frac{x_2^3}{3} - \frac{x_2^4}{4} + \dots \right]_0^{x_1} \\
&= \frac{1}{x_1} \left(x_1 - \frac{x_1^2}{2} + \frac{x_1^3}{3} - \frac{x_1^4}{4} + \dots \right) \\
&= 1 - \frac{x_1}{2} + \frac{x_1^2}{3} - \frac{x_1^3}{4} + \dots
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this matches the statement of the inductive hypothesis for $n = 2$, concluding our base case. Now suppose the statement holds for some integer $n = k \geq 2$. That means

$$\int_0^{x_1} \int_0^{x_2} \dots \int_0^{x_{k-1}} \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \dots x_{k-1} (1 + x_k)} dx_k dx_{k-1} \dots dx_2 = 1 - \frac{x_1}{2^{k-1}} + \frac{x_1^2}{3^{k-1}} - \frac{x_1^3}{4^{k-1}} + \dots \quad (9)$$

Taking the integral of both sides with respect to x_1 over the interval from 0 to a new variable x_0 and multiplying both integrands by $\frac{1}{x_0}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{x_0} \int_0^{x_1} \int_0^{x_2} \dots \int_0^{x_{k-1}} \frac{1}{x_0 x_1 \dots x_{k-1} (1 + x_k)} dx_k dx_{k-1} \dots dx_2 dx_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{x_0} \int_0^{x_0} \left(1 - \frac{x_1}{2^{k-1}} + \frac{x_1^2}{3^{k-1}} - \frac{x_1^3}{4^{k-1}} + \dots \right) dx_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{x_0} \left[x_1 - \frac{x_1^2}{2^k} + \frac{x_1^3}{3^k} - \frac{x_1^4}{4^k} + \dots \right]_{x_1=0}^{x_0} \\
&= 1 - \frac{x_0}{2^k} + \frac{x_0^2}{3^k} - \frac{x_0^3}{4^k} + \dots
\end{aligned}$$

This matches our inductive hypothesis for $n = k + 1$ if we relabel each x_i with x_{i+1} . Thus the inductive hypothesis holds for all integers ≥ 2 .

Now taking the integral of both sides of Equation (9) as x_1 ranges over the unit interval, we get that for any

$n \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^1 \int_0^{x_1} \int_0^{x_2} \cdots \int_0^{x_{n-1}} \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} (1 + x_n)} dx_n dx_{n-1} \cdots dx_2 dx_1 \\
&= \int_0^1 1 - \frac{x_1}{2^{n-1}} + \frac{x_1^2}{3^{n-1}} - \frac{x_1^3}{4^{n-1}} + \cdots dx_1 \\
&= \left[x_1 - \frac{x_1^2}{2^n} + \frac{x_1^3}{3^n} - \frac{x_1^4}{4^n} + \cdots \right]_{x_1=0}^1 \\
&= 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} + \frac{1}{3^n} - \frac{1}{4^n} + \cdots \\
&= \zeta(n) - 2\zeta_{\text{even}}(n) \\
&= \zeta(n) - 2\frac{1}{2^n}\zeta(n) \\
&= \frac{2^{n-1} - 1}{2^{n-1}}\zeta(n).
\end{aligned}$$

By this and Equation (7), we conclude that

$$C_n = \frac{2^{n-1} - 1}{2^{n-1}}\zeta(n),$$

completing the proof. □

8 The slow triangle map

Our interest in the triangle map stems from three streams: finding algebraic numbers (the Hermite Problems section 5), dynamical properties, and its links to partition numbers [3, 4]. It is the third stream that requires the use of the slow triangle map, which is why we have this section in this paper.

8.1 Definition of the slow triangle map

We again start with

$$\Delta = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1 \geq x_1 \cdots \geq x_n \geq 0\}.$$

We now partition this simplex into two sub-simplices:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_0 &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta : 1 < x_1 + x_n\} \\
\Delta_1 &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta : x_1 + x_n < 1\}
\end{aligned}$$

Definition 8.1. The slow triangle map

$$t : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$$

is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} t(\mathbf{x}) &= \begin{cases} t_0(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_0 \\ t_1(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_1 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \left(\frac{x_2}{x_1}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_1}, \frac{1-x_1}{x_1} \right) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_0 \\ \left(\frac{x_2}{1-x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{1-x_n} \right) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta_1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

When $n = 1$, this is the classical Farey map.

Definition 8.2. The slow triangle sequence for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta$ is a sequence

$$(i_0, i_1, \dots)$$

of integers i_k , each of which is zero or one, such that

$$\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{i_0}, t(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{i_1}, t^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta_{i_2}, \dots$$

There is an easy way to pass from the slow triangle sequence for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta$ to the (fast) triangle sequence given in Definition 2.8. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_b$, we have

$$T(\mathbf{x}) = t_0 \circ t_1^{(b)}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Thus to go from a slow triangle sequence (i_0, i_1, \dots) to the (fast) triangle sequence we simply need to concatenate the 1's and add one to the number of 1's. Thus a slow triangle sequence

$$(1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, \dots)$$

is the same as the fast triangle sequence

$$(3, 4, 1, 1, 3, \dots).$$

8.2 The invariant measure for the slow case

As in Section 7, there is an invariant for the map t . As the arguments are similar to that earlier section, we will only sketch the results.

Proposition 8.3. *The measure*

$$d\nu = \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n} d\lambda.$$

is an invariant measure for the slow triangle map t . Hence for all measurable sets A in Δ , we have

$$\nu(A) = \int_A d\nu = \int_{t^{-1}A} d\nu = \nu(t^{-1}(A)).$$

We need to show that the function $1/(x_1 \cdots x_n)$ is an eigenfunction with eigenvalue one of the transfer operator

$$\mathcal{L}f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = |\det J_0| f(T_0^{-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)) + |\det J_1| f(T_1^{-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

By direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}f(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{(1+x_n)^{n+1}}f(T_0^{-1}(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{(1+x_n)^{n+1}}f(T_1^{-1}(\mathbf{x})). \\ &= \frac{1}{(1+x_n)^{n+1}}f\left(\frac{1}{1+x_n}, \frac{x_1}{1+x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}}{1+x_n}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(1+x_n)^{n+1}}f\left(\frac{x_1}{1+x_n}, \frac{x_2}{1+x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{1+x_n}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Testing $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}f(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \frac{1}{(1+x_n)^{n+1}} \left[f\left(\frac{1}{1+x_n}, \frac{x_1}{1+x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}}{1+x_n}\right) + f\left(\frac{x_1}{1+x_n}, \frac{x_2}{1+x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{1+x_n}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{(1+x_n)^{n+1}} \left[\frac{(1+x_n)^n}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{n-1}} + \frac{(1+x_n)^n}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{(1+x_n)} \left[\frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n} (x_n + 1) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n} \\ &= f(x_1, \dots, x_n)\end{aligned}$$

□

We cannot find the normalizing constant for this measure, as it is infinite on Δ_1 . This is reflected, for example, in the $n = 1$ case (the Farey map), which has an indifferent fixed point at the origin. Similarly, the origin is an indifferent fixed point for the slow triangle map in any dimension, and that the invariant measure is infinite on all of the Δ_1 . This should lead to many interesting technical problems and issues.

8.3 The induced system

Our goal is to show that the slow triangle map $t : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ is ergodic for any dimension. No doubt we could prove this directly, mimicking all the work that we did earlier. But instead we will show how the ergodicity of the triangle map T will imply the ergodicity of the map t . We will overwhelmingly be following the argument given in Chapter 2 of Kessebömer, Munday and Stratmann [22], where they show that the ergodicity of the Gauss map (the $n = 1$ triangle map) implies the ergodicity of the Farey map (the $n = 1$ slow triangle map).

By Definition 2.2.12 [22], the set $\Delta_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \Delta : 1 < x_1 + x_n\}$ will be a *sweep-out* set if $\nu(\Delta_0) < \infty$ and

$$\nu(\Delta - \cup_{k=0}^{\infty} T^{(-k)}(\Delta_0)) = 0.$$

Lemma 8.4. *The set Δ_0 is a sweep-out set.*

Proof. It is a calculation that

$$\nu(\Delta_0) = \int_{\Delta_0} \frac{1}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n} dx_1 \cdots dx_n$$

is finite.

Now, is straightforward to show that both $t_0 : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ and $t_1 : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ are onto maps. By direct calculation, we have that

$$t_1^{(-1)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \left(\frac{x_1}{1+x_n}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{1+x_n} \right).$$

We know that the vertices of Δ_0 are

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= (1, 0, \dots, 0) \\ v_2 &= (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \\ &\vdots \\ v_{n-1} &= (1, 1, \dots, 1, 0) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= (1/2, 1/2, \dots, 1/2) \\ w_2 &= (1, 1, \dots, 1) \end{aligned}$$

We have that $t_1^{(-1)}$ acting on any of the vertices v_i leaves v_i alone. But

$$\begin{aligned} t_1^{(-1)}(w_1) &= (1/3, 1/3, \dots, 1/3) \\ t_1^{(-1)}(w_2) &= (1/2, 1/2, \dots, 1/2) \end{aligned}$$

In general, $t_1^{(-k)}(v_i) = v_i$ and

$$\begin{aligned} t_1^{(-k)}(w_1) &= (1/(k+2), 1/(k+2), \dots, 1/(k+2)) \\ t_1^{(-k)}(w_2) &= (1/(k+1), 1/(k+1), \dots, 1/(k+1)) \end{aligned}$$

This shows that Δ_0 is a sweep-out set. □

Definition of 2.4.25 [22] in the context of the slow triangle map leads to

Definition 8.5. The induced map of the slow triangle map t on Δ_0

$$t_{\Delta_0} : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \Delta_0$$

is

$$t_{\Delta_0}(x) := t^{\varphi(x)}(x).$$

where in turn

$$\varphi(x) = \inf\{k \geq 1 : n^k(x) \in \Delta_0\}.$$

With the eventual goal of ergodicity for t , we have

Proposition 8.6. *If t is both conservative and non-singular, then $t : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ is ergodic if and only if the induced map $t_{\Delta_0} : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \Delta_0$ is ergodic.*

This is simply Proposition 2.4.28 in [22].

Now, the triangle map t is non-singular (Definition 2.2.4 [22]) if for all measurable sets A with measure zero we have that the measure of $t^{(-1)}(A)$ also has measure zero. But this follows from the existence of the invariant measure ν .

The map t is conservative follows from t_{Δ_0} being conservative, which follows immediately from Proposition 2.2.23 [22], and from Proposition 2.4.27 [22].

8.4 Ergodicity of induced map

Thus we have to show that $t_{\Delta_0} : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \Delta_0$ is ergodic.

We need to link the induced system to the original triangle map T , which we know to be ergodic.

Proposition 8.7. *The dynamical system*

$$t_{\Delta_0} : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \Delta_0$$

with invariant measure $\nu|_{\Delta_0}$ is measure-theoretically isomorphic to the dynamical system

$$T : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$$

with invariant measure μ .

This will immediately give us that the slow triangle map is ergodic.

As to measure theoretically isomophic, this means the following. We have to construct a map

$$\psi : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \Delta$$

so that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta_0 & \xrightarrow{t_{\Delta_0}} & \Delta_0 \\ \psi \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow{T} & \Delta \end{array}$$

is commutative and so that, for all measurable sets B in Δ , we have

$$\nu|_{\Delta_0} \circ \psi^{-1}(B) = \mu(B).$$

Proof. Simply define

$$\psi = t_0.$$

Then the argument is the same as that given in the proof of Proposition 2.4.31 in [22], which is for the $n = 1$ case. □

9 On our generalization of the triangle map

The triangle map in Section 2.1 agrees with the Gauss map for $n = 1$ and with the map in [13] for $n = 2$ (and also up to conjugacy with the map in [23]). It is not the generalization in higher dimensions that was proposed in [13] and briefly discussed in [23]. But that earlier generalization was not the “right” one, for at least two reasons.

First, the triangle map in this paper has a natural interplay with a slow version, as seen in Section 8. As a good multi-dimensional continued fraction algorithm should be a generalized continued fraction algorithm, there should be such a natural interplay between fast and slow versions.

Second, the slow version in Section 8 is precisely the version that seems to be particularly compatible with the study of partition numbers [3, 4]. Much of our motivation for trying to understand the dynamics of this triangle in higher dimensions is in an attempt to link its dynamics with partition theory, work that is ongoing.

10 Conclusion and Questions

We have shown that the triangle map (both the fast and the slow version) is ergodic in every dimension. Key is in showing that we have weak convergence almost everywhere, as shown in Section 4.

There are of course many questions left. For example, once we have ergodicity, what other stronger dynamical properties does the triangle map have, such as mixing.

In Section 7 we found the transfer operator for the triangle map in each dimension. There is a rich tradition and many wonderful papers studying the spectrum the transfer operator for the Gauss map [15, 17, 22, 25, 5]. In [14], the spectrum of the transfer operator for the $n = 2$ triangle map was studied. More needs to be done, as little is known about the spectrum of the higher dimensional triangle maps.

As mentioned in the introduction, a large part of our motivation for this paper is the link between the triangle map and integer partitions. It appears that the dynamics of the triangle map gives us information about integer partitions, and symmetries in integer partitions tell us information about the triangle map. This is being explored in [12].

We have shown that the cells $C(b_1, b_2, \dots)$ converge to points almost everywhere. But we need the phrase “almost everywhere.” While in the classical case of the Gauss map ($n = 1$), every cell does converge to an isolated point, this is not the case for $n = 2$. In [2], an explicit description of the growth rate of the b_1, b_2, \dots is given for when the cells converge not to a point but to a line segment. What happens in higher dimensions? We strongly conjecture that in the dimension n case, the cells could converge to any k -simplex, for $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Further, what are the conditions needed on the triangle sequence b_1, b_2, \dots to have the corresponding cell converge to a k -simplex?

References

- [1] G. Andrews, *The Theory of Integer Partitions*, Cambridge University Press, (first edition 1976), 1998.
- [2] Assaf, Sami, Li-Chung Chen, Tegan Cheslack-Postava, Benjamin Cooper, Alexander Diesl, Thomas Garrity, Mathew Lepinski, and Adam Schuyler. A Dual Approach to Triangle Sequences: A Multidimensional Continued Fraction Algorithm. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorial Number Theory*, 5 (2005), A08. www.emis.de/journals/INTEGERS/papers/f8/f8.pdf.
- [3] Baalbaki, Wael; Bonanno, Claudio; Del Vigna, Alessio; Garrity, Thomas; Isola, Stefano, On integer partitions and continued fraction type algorithms, *Ramanujan J.* 63 (2024), no. 3, 873-915.
- [4] Baalbaki, Wael; Garrity, Thomas, Generating new partition identities via a generalized continued fraction algorithm, *Electron. J. Combin.* 31 (2024), no. 1, Paper No. 1.20, 28 pp.
- [5] V. Baladi, *Positive Transfer Operators and Decay of Correlation* (Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics), World Scientific, 2000.
- [6] V. Berthé, W. Steiner and J. Thuswaldner, “On the second Lyapunov exponent of some multidimensional continued fraction algorithms”, *Math. Comp.*, **90** (2021), no. 328, 883–905.
- [7] Billingsley, Patrick. *Ergodic Theory and Information*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1965.
- [8] C. Bonanno, A. Del Vigna and S. Munday, “A slow triangle map with a segment of indifferent fixed points and a complete tree of rational pairs”, *Monatsh. Math.*, **194** (2021), no. 1, 1–40.
- [9] C. Bonanno and A. Del Vigna, “Representation and coding of rational pairs on a Triangular tree and Diophantine approximation in \mathbb{R}^2 ”, *Acta Arith.*, **200** (2021), no. 4, pp. 389-427.
- [10] Dajani, Karma and Cor Kraaikamp. *Ergodic Theory of Numbers*. The Mathematical Association of America, 2002.
- [11] C. Fougeron and A. Skripchenko, “Simplicity of spectra for certain multidimensional continued fraction algorithms, *Monatsh. Math.*, **194** (2021), no. 4, 767–787.
- [12] J. Fox and T. Garrity, “Tree Structures on Integer Partitions and the Natural Extension of the Triangle Map,” in preparation.
- [13] Garrity, Thomas. On periodic sequences for algebraic numbers, *Journal of Number Theory*, (2001), Vol. 88, pp. 86-103.
- [14] Garrity, Thomas, On Gauss-Kuzmin Statistics and the Transfer Operator for a Multidimensional Continued Fraction Algorithm: the Triangle Map, *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen* 101(2022), no.3-4, 263-280.
- [15] Hensley, Doug, *Continued Fractions*, World Scientific , 2006.
- [16] C. Hermite, Letter to C.D.J. Jacobi, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Vol. 40 (1848), p. 286.
- [17] Iosifescu, M and Kraaikamp, C, *Metrical Theory of Continued Fractions*, Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 547, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [18] H. Ito, Self-duality of multidimensional continued fractions, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.07887>, 2022.
- [19] Karpenkov, O., *Geometry of continued fractions* Second edition Algorithms Comput. Math., 26 Springer, Berlin, [2022], 2022. xx+451 pp

- [20] Karpenkov, O., On Hermite's problem, Jacobi-Perron type algorithms, and Dirichlet groups. *Acta Arith.* 203(2022), no.1, 27-48.
- [21] Karpenkov, O., On a periodic Jacobi-Perron type algorithm, arXiv:2101.12627.
- [22] Kesseböhmer, Marc, Sara Munday, and Bernd Otto Stratmann, *Infinite Ergodic Theory of Numbers*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin, 2016.
- [23] Messaoudi, Ali, Arnaldo Nogueira, and Fritz Schweiger. Ergodic properties of triangle partitions. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, (2009), 157. 283-299.
- [24] Rockett, Andrew and Szűsz, Peter, *Continued Fractions*, World Scientific, 1992.
- [25] Schweiger, Fritz. *Multidimensional Continued Fractions*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [26] Silva, C. F., *Invitation to Ergodic Theory*, Student Mathematical Library, Vol. 42, American Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [27] Sloane, N.J.A. Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, <https://oeis.org/A124774>.