

Monotone gradient dynamics and location of stationary (p, q) -configurations

Emilia Petrisor

Abstract. Exploiting the monotone property of the gradient dynamics of the Frenkel–Kontorova model, we locate in the space of (p, q) -configurations the ordered and unordered stationary states, as well as forbidden regions for such states. Moreover we show that some generalized Frenkel–Kontorova models (associated to multiharmonic standard maps) can have ordered (p, q) -configurations that are neither action minimizing nor maximimizing, and give their location with respect to the set of (p, q) -minimizers and maximimizers.

AMS classification scheme numbers: 37E40

1. Introduction

Area preserving twist maps have been extensively studied as being typical examples of dynamical systems which exhibit a full range of behaviour, from regular to chaotic motions. Their study is mainly concerned with the existence/breakup of rotational invariant circles (RICs). These invariant sets are barrier to transport and their breakup leads to loss of stability. A criterion that gives conditions ensuring that no RIC of given rotation number can exist or no RIC can pass through a point or region of the phase space is called converse KAM criterion [12]. A survey of the known converse KAM criteria to date can be found in [6].

One of the first such criteria was formulated by Boyland–Hall [4], [5]. It states that if a twist map has an unordered periodic orbit, \mathcal{O} , then there are no invariant circles whose rotation number belongs to the rotation band of \mathcal{O} .

The search for unordered periodic orbits using classical methods can be difficult due to the instability of the system in the region of the phase space where they lie. It is much more simple to detect them looking for their representatives in the space of (p, q) -configurations, i.e. as zeros of the periodic action gradient.

The gradient of the action functional of an area preserving twist map of the infinite annulus (cylinder) is in fact the gradient of the energy of the Frenkel–Kontorova (FK) model, studied in solid–state physics [7], [8]. The standard FK model is associated to an infinite one-dimensional chain of atoms connected by harmonic springs and subjected to an external potential [2], [8]. If the potential is multiharmonic, then the corresponding FK model is a also called generalized FK model.

Using an interplay between the variational approach to the dynamics of area preserving twist maps, and the gradient dynamics of the periodic action we locate the regions in the space of (p, q) -configurations where ordered or unordered stationary states of the action gradient can lie, respectively the forbidden regions for such states. More precisely, we show that if \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' , are two consecutive (p, q) -minimizers, and \mathbf{y} is a (p, q) -minimaximizer, such that $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{x}'$, then no other stationary (p, q) -configuration can belong to the intervals $[[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]]$, $[[\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}']]$ (Proposition 2.3), but in the complement of the set $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \cup [\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}']$, with respect to the interval $[[x, x']]$ there can exist ordered (p, q) -stationary configurations. We give an example of three harmonic standard map, exhibiting an ordered $(1, 2)$ -orbit which is neither minimizing nor maximimizing, and whose corresponding configuration lies in such a complement. As far as we know no such periodic orbit was revealed in the theoretical and numerical investigations of the twist maps, reported in the literature.

Location of the (p, q) -stationary states has both a theoretical and practical importance. In an attempt to implement the Hall–Boyland criterion, first of all we need to know where in the space of (p, q) -configurations it is advisable to look for stationary states, and then to decide whether an identified such a configuration is ordered or not.

A general presentation of the gradient dynamics of the Frenkel–Kontorova model can be found in [7], [3]. Angenent [1] was the first who exploited the monotonicity of this gradient semiflow in the study of periodic orbits of twist maps. Golé [10], Mramor&Rinky [15] and Slijepčević [17] have also used the monotonicity of the gradient semiflow of the FK-model to prove the existence of ghost circles, respectively to prove the existence of Mather’s shadowing orbits of twist maps.

We consider an exact C^r -area preserving positive twist diffeomorphism ($r \geq 1$), f , of the infinite annulus $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$, represented by a lift, F (for basic properties of such maps the reader is referred to [10]). Denote by $\pi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ the covering projection.

Dynamics of F has a variational formulation. Its orbits are in a one-to-one correspondence with the critical points of an action.

Under the hypotheses on f it follows that the lift F admits a C^2 -generating function $h : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (unique up to additive constants), such that $h_{12}(x, x') = \partial h / \partial x \partial x' < 0$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , and $F(x, y) = (x', y')$ iff $y = -h_1(x, x')$, $y' = h_2(x, x')$ ($h_1 = \partial h / \partial x$, $h_2 = \partial h / \partial x'$).

For p, q coprime integers, $q > 0$, the F -orbit of a point $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is called a (p, q) -type orbit, and its projection onto annulus a (p, q) -periodic orbit if $F^q(x_0, y_0) = (x_0 + p, y_0)$.

We denote by \mathcal{X}_{pq} , the space of (p, q) -type configurations, i.e. sequences of real numbers, $\mathbf{x} = (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, such that $x_{n+q} = x_n + p$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Being an affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{q+1} = \{(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_q)\}$, of equation $x_q = x_0 + p$, \mathcal{X}_{pq} can be identified with \mathbb{R}^q .

The generating function h defines the action W_{pq} , on the space \mathcal{X}_{pq} of (p, q) -configurations:

$$W_{pq}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=0}^{q-1} h(x_k, x_{k+1})$$

By Aubry–Mather theory, [2],[14], for each pair of relative prime integers (p, q) , $q > 0$, F has at least two orbits of type (p, q) . One corresponds to a non-degenerate minimizing (p, q) -configuration of the action. Associated to such an orbit there is a second one, corresponding to a mini-maximizing configuration. The corresponding F -orbits and f -orbits are called in the sequel (p, q) -minimizing, respectively (p, q) -minimaximizing orbits. These orbits are well ordered.

More precisely, an invariant set M of a positive twist map, f , is well ordered if for every $(x, y), (x', y)' \in \pi^{-1}(M)$, we have $x < x'$ iff $F_1(x, y) < F_1(x', y')$, where F_1 is the first component of the lift F .

A well-ordered (p, q) -orbit is also called Birkhoff orbit, while a badly-ordered orbit is called non-Birkhoff or unordered orbit.

An appropriate framework to study the order properties of periodic orbits is defined as follows.

The space \mathcal{X}_{pq} of (p, q) -configurations is partially ordered with respect to an order relation inherited from $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. $\mathbf{x} = (x_k), \mathbf{y} = (y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ are related, and we write:

$$\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y} \Leftrightarrow x_k \leq y_k, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (1)$$

One also defines:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y} &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}, \text{ but } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y} &\Leftrightarrow x_k < y_k, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

If $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y}$ one says that \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are *weakly ordered*, while if $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y}$ one says that they are *strictly ordered*. (\mathcal{X}_{pq}, \leq) is a lattice.

To each configuration $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$ one associates the positive order cone $V_+(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq} \mid \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}\}$, respectively the negative order cone $V_-(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq} \mid \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{x}\}$. Any two (p, q) -configurations, $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$, comparable with respect to the relation \leq , or \prec , define respectively the intervals:

$$[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq} \mid \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{y}\}, \quad [[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]] = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq} \mid \mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{z} \prec \mathbf{y}\}$$

Let $\tau_{ij} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the translation map defined by:

$$(\tau_{ij}\mathbf{x})_k = x_{k+i} + j, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = (x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}, i, j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$$

\mathcal{X}_{pq} is invariant to any integer translation, τ_{ij} .

A (p, q) -configuration, \mathbf{x} , such that:

$$\forall i, j \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{ either } \mathbf{x} \leq \tau_{ij}\mathbf{x} \quad \text{or} \quad \tau_{ij}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x} \quad (3)$$

is called cyclically ordered, as well as the corresponding (p, q) -orbit of F :

$$(x_k, y_k) = (x_k, -h_1(x_k, x_{k+1})), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (4)$$

Let \mathbf{x} be a (p, q) -configuration. The piecewise affine function that interpolates linearly the points $(k, x_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called Aubry function.

Let M_{pq} be the subset of (\mathcal{X}_{pq}, \leq) consisting in all W_{pq} -globally minimizing configurations. Any $\mathbf{x} \in M_{pq}$ is cyclically ordered. By Aubry–Mather theory [14] M_{pq}

is a completely ordered subset \mathcal{X}_{pq} . In the sequel the elements in M_{pq} are referred to as (p, q) -minimizers.

$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in M_{pq}$ are called consecutive if $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{x}'$ and there is no $\mathbf{x}'' \in M_{pq}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{x}'' \prec \mathbf{x}'$.

Besides the variational interpretation, the (p, q) -orbits of the twist map F can be also associated to the stationary states (equilibrium points) of the gradient of the action, ∇W_{pq} . If the second derivative of the generating function h of the twist map F is bounded, then the system of differential equations $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\nabla W_{pq}$ is a cooperative dynamical system on (\mathcal{X}_{pq}, \leq) (in fact \mathcal{X}_{pq} is invariant to the semiflow of the minus gradient of the energy of the Frenkel–Kontorova model; for details see [10], [3]). Its C^1 -semiflow, ξ_t , $t \geq 0$, commutes with the group of translations $\{\tau_{ij} \mid i, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Any stationary state, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$, is a critical (p, q) -configuration of the action and the linearized gradient at \mathbf{x} , $D^2W_{pq}(\mathbf{x})$, is the Hessian of W_{pq} at \mathbf{x} .

An important property of the gradient of the action relevant for our approach is that the semiflow of the minus gradient is strictly monotone ([10], [3]), i.e.

$$\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \xi_t \mathbf{x} \prec \xi_t \mathbf{y}, \forall t > 0 \quad (5)$$

With these results in mind, in the next section we detect the regions in the space of (p, q) -configurations where no stationary state can lie, respectively where cyclically ordered or unordered (p, q) -stationary states is possible to be located.

2. Location of stationary (p, q) -configurations

We denote by $\mathcal{S}_{pq} = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq} \mid \nabla W_{pq}(\mathbf{z}) = 0\}$ the set of stationary states in the space of (p, q) -configurations.

Proposition 2.1 *Let \mathbf{x} be a minimizer or a maximizer of W_{pq} . Then no stationary state $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$, $\mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}$, can belong to the boundaries of the cones $V_{\pm}(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof: Suppose $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{S}_{pq}$, $\mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}$, and $\mathbf{z} \in \partial V_+(\mathbf{x})$ (boundary of $V_+(\mathbf{x})$). This means that $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{z}$ and from the strict monotonicity of the flow it follows that $\xi_t \mathbf{x} \prec \xi_t \mathbf{z}$. But the last relation is impossible because $\xi_t \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$, $\xi_t \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}$, $\forall t \geq 0$. Similarly one shows that $\mathbf{z} \notin \partial V_-(\mathbf{x})$.

Proposition 2.2 *If $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{S}_{pq} \setminus M_{pq}$ then there exist two consecutive (p, q) -minimizers, $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{x}'$, such that $x_0 < z_0 < x'_0$. If $\mathbf{z} \in \text{Int}(V_+(\mathbf{x}) \cap V_-(\mathbf{x}')) = [[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']]$, then \mathbf{z} is cyclically ordered, while if $\mathbf{z} \in \text{Int}(V_+(\mathbf{x})) \setminus V_-(\mathbf{x}')$ or $\mathbf{z} \in \text{Int}(V_-(\mathbf{x}')) \setminus V_+(\mathbf{x})$, then \mathbf{z} is unordered.*

Proof: Since to each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_{pq}$ one associates the F -orbit of the point $(x_0, -h_1(x_0, x_1)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, it is obvious the existence of the two consecutive minimizers as stated.

If $\mathbf{z} \in [[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']]$, then for any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\tau_{ij} \mathbf{x} \prec \tau_{ij} \mathbf{z} \prec \tau_{ij} \mathbf{x}'$. Since \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' are consecutive elements in M_{pq} , it follows that no translation, $\tau_{k\ell}$, can exist, such that $\tau_{k\ell} \mathbf{x} \in [[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']]$ or $\tau_{k\ell} \mathbf{x}' \in [[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']]$. Thus except for $i = 0, j = 0$ the intervals $[[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']]$, $[[\tau_{ij} \mathbf{x}, \tau_{ij} \mathbf{x}']]$ have

no point in common. Hence $\mathbf{x} \leq \tau_{ij}\mathbf{x}$ implies $\mathbf{z} \leq \tau_{ij}\mathbf{z}$, and analogously $\tau_{ij}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}$ implies $\tau_{ij}\mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{z}$. Since \mathbf{x} is cyclically ordered it follows that \mathbf{z} is also cyclically ordered. One also says that \mathbf{z} is cyclically ordered with respect to M_{pq} .

If $\mathbf{z} \notin [\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']$, but $x_0 < z_0 < x'_0$, then either $\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}$ or $\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}'$ does not have coordinates of the same sign. Since the Aubry functions associated to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' are monotone, it follows that the Aubry function of \mathbf{z} is not monotone, and as a consequence \mathbf{z} cannot be cyclically ordered.

Corollary 2.1 *A stationary state $y \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$ which is ordered with respect to M_{pq} is comparable with each $x \in M_{pq}$, while an unordered one is incomparable with at least a (p, q) -minimizer.*

Remark 2.1 *From Aubry–Mather theory we know that the (p, q) -minimaximizing configurations are cyclically ordered with respect to elements in M_{pq} [14]. More precisely, if the action W_{pq} is a Morse function (all its critical points are nondegenerate), then for any consecutive (p, q) -minimizers, $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{x}'$, there exists a minimaximizing sequence $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{x}'$ and from the above Proposition it follows that it is cyclically ordered with respect to M_{pq} .*

We are wondering whether besides the (p, q) -minimaximizers there can exist other cyclically ordered (p, q) -stationary states with respect to M_{pq} . In order to give an answer let us first analyze where a cyclically ordered stationary state, different from a (p, q) -minimaximizer can lie within an interval $[[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']]$, of ends \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' that are consecutive (p, q) -minimizers.

Proposition 2.3 *If \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' are two consecutive (p, q) -minimizers and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$ a minimaximizer, such that $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{x}'$, then no stationary state of the gradient semiflow, ξ_t , can belong to the intersection of order cones $V_+(\mathbf{x}) \cap V_-(\mathbf{y})$, $V_+(\mathbf{y}) \cap V_-(\mathbf{x}')$.*

Proof: The derivative $-D^2W_{pq}$ at \mathbf{x}' has q negative eigenvalues, while at \mathbf{y} , one positive eigenvalue. Thus the unstable manifold of \mathbf{y} is one-dimensional. Moreover, it is a strictly ordered heteroclinic connection, γ , between the two hyperbolic equilibria (an arc of ghost circle) [10], [15] [9]) (a detailed proof of the existence of this heteroclinic connection is given in [15], Lemma 8.7). For every $\mathbf{v} \in \gamma$, $\xi_t\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}'$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Suppose that there is a (p, q) -stationary state $\mathbf{z} \in V_+(\mathbf{y}) \cap V_-(\mathbf{x}')$. Since \mathbf{z} cannot belong to the boundaries of the two cones, it is interior to $V_+(\mathbf{y}) \cap V_-(\mathbf{x}')$, and we can choose a point $\mathbf{v} \in \gamma$ such that $\mathbf{v} < \mathbf{z}$. It follows that $\xi_t\mathbf{v} \prec \xi_t\mathbf{z}$, $\forall t > 0$, which is impossible because $\xi_t\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}'$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and $\xi_t\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}$, $\forall t \geq 0$. Similarly one shows that \mathbf{z} cannot belong to the intersection $V_+(\mathbf{x}) \cap V_-(\mathbf{y})$.

In Fig.1 is illustrated a part of the space of $(1, 2)$ configurations. \mathbf{x} and its integer translates τ_{i0} , $i = 1, 2$, are $(1, 2)$ -minimizers, \mathbf{y} and $\tau_{10}(\mathbf{y})$ are minimaximizers. The gray semilines starting from these points are boundaries for the associated order cones. The semilines as well as the gray regions cannot contain other stationary $(1, 2)$ -configurations. In green regions, theoretically one can find ordered $(1, 2)$ -stationary states, while in the white regions, unordered ones.




Figure 1. The space of $(1, 2)$ -configurations. Details in text.

In Fig.2 is given the contour plot of the action W_{12} , associated to the generating function $h(x, x') = \frac{1}{2}(x - x')^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{(2\pi)^2} \cos(2\pi x)$ of the standard map. The red points are $(1, 2)$ -minimizers, those colored in blue are $(1, 2)$ -minimaximizers, while lateral points are unordered $(1, 2)$ -stationary configurations. One can observe that all these points have relative position as we have deduced above.




Figure 2. The contour plot of the action W_{12} defined by the generating function of the standard map, corresponding to $\epsilon = 12$, and ordered and unordered $(1, 2)$ -stationary configurations.

We note that in $\mathcal{X}_{pq}/\tau_{0,1} := \mathcal{X}_{pq}/G$ (G is a group isomorphic with \mathbb{Z} , generated by the translation τ_{01}) there exist at least q minimizers. If a positive twist map exhibits only a (p, q) -minimizing orbit (this is a case of the classical standard map) then in $\mathcal{X}_{pq}/\tau_{0,1}$ there exist exactly q minimizers. Actually if $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$ is a (p, q) -minimizer

then there exist q pairs $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(\tau_{ij}\mathbf{x})_0 \in [0, 1)$. Fig.1 is representative for such a case.

Computer experiments reveal that a multiharmonic standard map, i.e. a twist map defined by a generating function:

$$h(x, x') = \frac{1}{2}(x - x')^2 + \epsilon V(x), \quad V(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \frac{a_k}{(2\pi k)^2} \cos(2\pi kx), \quad a_k \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \ell \geq 2,$$

can exhibit in some range of parameters two (p, q) -minimizing orbits. Such maps are reversible i.e. there exists an involution R such that $f^{-1} = R \circ f \circ R$. f factorizes as $f = I \circ R$, where I is also an involution. The fixed point sets of the two involutions consist in two components. $\text{Fix}(R) = \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma'_0$, $\text{Fix}(I) = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma'_1$, where:

$$\Gamma_0 : x = 0, \quad \Gamma'_0 : x = 1/2, \quad \Gamma_1 : x = y/2 \pmod{1}, \quad \Gamma'_1 : x = (y - 1)/2 \pmod{1}$$

Symmetric (p, q) -periodic orbits (i.e. orbits that intersect $\text{Fix}(R)$) of a reversible twist map can undergo a Rimmer bifurcation [13]. Namely, if for fixed a_k , $k = \overline{1, \ell}$, at some threshold $\epsilon = \epsilon_r$, one of the two symmetric (p, q) -orbit changes its extremal type either from minimizing to minimaximizing or conversely, and two asymmetric (p, q) -orbits are born, then for ϵ in an interval (ϵ_r, ϵ_c) the corresponding twist map has two minimizing and two minimaximizing (p, q) -orbits. To each of the two (p, q) -minimizing orbits starting at (x_0, y_0) , respectively at (x'_0, y'_0) , corresponds a (p, q) -minimizer, $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$, respectively $\mathbf{x}' = (x'_0, x'_1, \dots, x'_{q-1}) \in \mathcal{X}_{pq}$. The set of (p, q) -minimizers is in this case the union of two completely ordered subsets of \mathcal{X}_{pq} , $M_{pq} = \{\tau_{ij}(\mathbf{x}), i, j \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{\tau_{k\ell}(\mathbf{x}'), k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. The elements in the second subset interlace those of the first subset. Thus in $\mathcal{X}_{pq}/\tau_{01}$ there exist $2q$ minimizers. Between two consecutive (p, q) -minimizers there exists a (p, q) -minimaximizer.

Such a case is shown in Fig.4, which illustrates the contour plot of the action W_{12} defined by the generating function corresponding to $\epsilon = 1.2$, and the three-harmonic potential:

$$V(x) = \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{a_k}{(2k\pi)^2} \cos(2k\pi x), \quad a_1 = 1, a_2 = -0.3, a_3 = 0.2$$

The corresponding twist map exhibits two $(1, 2)$ -minimizing asymmetric orbits, respectively two $(1, 2)$ -minimaximizing symmetric orbits (Fig.3).

The red, respectively dark red crosses in Fig.4, represent distinct $(1, 2)$ -minimizers \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' , and a few of their integer translates, while blue and lightblue points are the interlacing distinct $(1, 2)$ -minimaximizers.

The asymmetric (p, q) -configurations present interest and are also studied in condensed-matter physics [18].

From Proposition 2.3 it follows that if \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' are two consecutive (p, q) -minimizers and \mathbf{y} is a minimaximizer, $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{x}'$, then any stationary state, \mathbf{z} , ordered with respect to M_{pq} , and different from \mathbf{y} can lie only within $[[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']] \setminus ([\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \cup [\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}'])$.




Figure 3. The four $(1, 2)$ -periodic orbits of a three-harmonic standard map after a Rimmer bifurcation.




Figure 4. The contour plot of the action W_{12} associated to a generating function defined by a three harmonic potential. The associated twist map has four $(1, 2)$ -minimizers and four $(1, 2)$ -minimaximizers within $\mathcal{X}_{12}/\tau_{01}$.

In many theoretical and numerical investigations of the standard map and the two-harmonic standard map reported in the literature, no ordered (p, q) -orbit different from the minimizing and maximimizing orbit was revealed. This is due to the fact that the main tool used to decide the stability type of a (p, q) -periodic orbit is its residue. In [16] it was pointed out through a few examples that residue can be a misleading quantity in the characterization of a periodic orbit. It allows only to deduce the stability type of a periodic orbit (regular hyperbolic, elliptic or inverse hyperbolic) but not the right extremal type of the (p, q) -stationary state corresponding to that orbit. Instead the twist number of a periodic orbit is much more relevant. The twist number measures the average rotation of tangent vectors under the action of the derivative of the twist map along a periodic orbit [16].

In the following we show that the three harmonic standard map from the Example 4 [16] has a $(1, 2)$ -periodic orbit starting at a point $(0, 0.5)$, whose corresponding $(1, 2)$ -configuration $\mathbf{z} = (z_0, z_1)$ is ordered with respect to M_{12} and it is not a minimaximizer.

The generating function that defines the map of interest has the potential:

$$V(x) = -\frac{0.18}{2\pi} \cos(2\pi x) + \frac{0.42}{4\pi} \cos(4\pi x) + \frac{0.11}{6\pi} \cos(6\pi x)$$

The associated three harmonic standard map has four ordered $(1, 2)$ -orbits: a minimizing one which is symmetric of twist number $\tau = 0$, two asymmetric minimaximizing orbits of twist number $\tau = -1/2$ (they are inverse hyperbolic orbits) and a symmetric orbit of twist number -1 (for details see [16]). Connecting this three harmonic standard map with the integrable map one has deduced in [16] that the minimaximizing orbit intersecting Γ_0 undergoes a sequence of bifurcations that leads to the decrease of its twist number. The last bifurcation is a Rimmer-type bifurcation. At the bifurcation threshold it turns from an orbit of $\tau \in (-1, -1/2)$ into an orbit of $\tau = -1$, and two asymmetric orbits of $\tau = (-1, -1/2)$ are born. This means that one of the two classical scenarios of Rimmer bifurcation illustrated in Fig.5 a) occurs in our case as in Fig.5 b). Moreover the asymmetric orbits bifurcates further from $\tau \in (-1, -1/2)$ to $\tau = -1/2$. Each bifurcation is a bifurcation of an ordered orbit and thus after each threshold the old and the new born orbits are also ordered.

The corresponding $(1, 2)$ -configurations are shown in Fig.6. To the symmetric orbit of twist number $\tau = -1$ corresponds the dark red $(1, 2)$ -configurations. One can see that such a configuration that lies in an interval $[[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}']]$ having as ends two consecutive $(1, 2)$ -minimizers (the red points), is incomparable with the $(1, 2)$ -minimaximizers (colored in blue and green).




Figure 5. Rimmer bifurcation that leads to the birth of two asymmetric orbits. In a) is the classical Rimmer bifurcation, and in b) a Rimmer type-bifurcation in which are involved orbits of large absolute twist.

We note that the existence of such unusual ordered (p, q) -configurations is ensured by the property of the analyzed three-harmonic standard map, namely it is a two-component strong folding region map [16].

All properties deduced in this note are illustrated in the space \mathcal{X}_{12} , because it has small dimension and the stationary states can be easily visualized.

The space of $(1, 2)$ -configurations is somewhat particular because if $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1)$ is a stationary configuration, then both semilines of the lines $X_0 = x_0$, $X_1 = x_1$ (in the system of coordinates (X_0, X_1)), starting from \mathbf{x} are boundaries for one of the order cones $V_{\pm}(\mathbf{x})$. For $q > 2$ this is not the case, and only a part from a hyperplan $X_i = x_i$, $i = \overline{0, q-1}$ is a boundary for an order cone.




Figure 6. The contour plot of the action W_{12} associated to a generating function defined by a three harmonic potential. The corresponding twist map exhibits an ordered $(1, 2)$ -periodic orbit different from the minimizing and maximimizing $(1, 2)$ -orbits.

More precisely if $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$ is a stationary state then the boundary of the cones $V_{\pm}(\mathbf{x})$ is the union of the sets:

$$B_i(\pm) = \{\mathbf{z} = (z_0, \dots, z_{i-1}, x_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_{q-1}) \mid z_j - x_j \geq 0, \text{ for } V_+, z_j - x_j \leq 0 \text{ for } V_-, j \neq i\}$$

$$i = \overline{0, q-1}.$$

This remark is exploited in the following Proposition that gives a sufficient condition ensuring that a (p, q) -periodic orbit is unordered.

Proposition 2.4 *Let (x_i, y_i) , $i = \overline{0, q-1}$, be a (p, q) -minimizing orbit of a positive twist map f . If there is another (p, q) -periodic orbit that intersects one of the vertical lines $x = x_j$, $j = \overline{0, q-1}$, then that orbit is unordered.*

Proof: Let $\mathbf{x}' = (x'_0, x'_1, \dots, x'_{q-1})$ be a (p, q) -minimizer in \mathcal{X}'_{pq} with $x'_0 = x_j$, and $\mathbf{z} = (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{q-1})$, $z_0 = x_j$ a stationary state associated to the second orbit. \mathbf{z} belongs to the hyperplane of equation $X_j = x_j$, but by Proposition 2.1 $\mathbf{z} \notin V_{\pm}(\mathbf{x}')$. Hence \mathbf{z} is unordered.

Corollary 2.2 *If f is a multi-harmonic standard map having a (p, q) -orbit that intersects the symmetry line Γ_0 or Γ_1 that is also intersected by the (p, q) -minimizing orbit, then it is unordered.*

3. Conclusions

Using the duality between an area preserving twist map of the infinite cylinder, and the FK model we deduced the location of stationary (p, q) -configurations in the space

of all such configurations. We exploited the strict monotone property of the semiflow of the action gradient in order to locate the regions where no equilibrium point of the gradient can lie. Moreover we pointed out through an example that a twist map can exhibit ordered periodic orbits whose corresponding stationary configurations are neither action minimizing nor maximimizing. As far as we know no such an orbit was identified before in the dynamics of a twist map.

The knowledge of forbidden subsets for stationary states as well as the subsets where ordered or unordered configurations can lie is useful in numerical search for zeros of the action gradient, because the success of a numerical method for detecting zeros of a vector field depends on the appropriate choice of the initial condition. The existence of ordered stationary (p, q) -configurations, whose associated periodic orbits have large absolute twist number can also be of physical interest from the point of view of the theory of commensurate-incommensurate phase transitions

The numerical assessment of the Boyland–Hall criterion [11] led to the conclusion that it is not as successful as other converse KAM criteria, because unordered periodic orbits of small period were detected only for large values of the perturbation parameter, for which other methods ensured the breakup of all invariant circles of the standard map. In our theoretical and numerical study of uni-component and two-component strong folding region twist maps, started in [16], it appears that just after the breakdown of an invariant circle, the nearby unordered orbits have large period, not small. Thus one expects that this criterion can work well if we look for unordered periodic orbits of large period. In order to confirm and illustrate this behaviour we need to know where in the space of (p, q) -configurations we must look for unordered stationary configurations.

References

- [1] S. B. Angenent, The periodic orbits of an area preserving twist map, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 115 (1988) 353-374.
- [2] S. Aubry, P. Y. Le Daeron, The discrete Frenkel-Kontorova model and its extensions, *Physica D* 8 (1983) 381-422.
- [3] C. Baesens, Spatially extended systems with monotone dynamics (continuous time), in *Dynamics of coupled map lattices and of related spatially extended systems*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 671 (2005) 241-263.
- [4] P. L. Boyland, G R Hall, Invariant circles and the order structure of periodic orbits in monotone twist maps, *Topology* 26 (1987) 21-35.
- [5] P. L. Boyland, Invariant circles and rotation bands in monotone twist maps, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 113 (1987) 67-77.
- [6] R. Calleja, R. de la Llave, A numerically accessible criterion for the breakdown of quasi-periodic solutions and its rigorous justification, *Nonlinearity* 23 (2010) 2029- 2058.
- [7] L.M. Floría, J.J. Mazo, Dissipative dynamics of the Frenkel-Kontorova model, *Advances in Physics* 45 (1996) 505-598
- [8] L. M. Floría, C. Baesens, J.Gómez-Gardeñes, The Frenkel-Kontorova model, in *Dynamics of coupled map lattices and of related spatially extended systems*, Lecture Notes in Physics, 671 (2005) 209-240.

- [9] G. Fusco, W. M. Oliva, Transversality between invariant manifolds of periodic orbits for a class of monotone dynamical systems, *J. Dynamics and Diff. Equations*, 2 (1990) 1-17.
- [10] C. Golé, *Symplectic Twist Maps*, *World Scientific*, Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics, Vol. 18, 2001.
- [11] I. Leage, R.S. Mackay, Badly ordered periodic orbits of the standard map, *Phys.Lett. A*, 118 (1986) 274278.
- [12] R. S. MacKay, I. C. Percival, Converse KAM: theory and practice. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 98 (1985) 469512.
- [13] R. S. MacKay, *Renormalization in area preserving maps*, *World Scientific*, Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics, Vol. 6, 1993.
- [14] J.N. Mather, A criterion for non-existence of invariant circles, *Publ. Math IHES* 63 (1986) 153–204.
- [15] B. Mramor, B. Rinky, Ghost circles in lattice Aubry-Mather theory, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 252 (2012) 3163-3208.
- [16] E Petrisor, Twist number and order properties of periodic orbits, *Physica D* 263 (2013) 57–73.
- [17] S. Slijepčević, Monotone gradient dynamics and Mather's shadowing, *Nonlinearity* 12 (1999) 969-986.
- [18] K. Sasaki, L.M. Floría, Symmetry-breaking commensurate states in generalized Frenkel–Kontorova models. *J. of Phys: Condensed Matter* 1 (1989) 2179-2198.