

# MONOTONICITY OF THE OVER-ROTATION INTERVALS FOR BIMODAL MAPS

SOURAV BHATTACHARYA AND ALEXANDER BLOKH

ABSTRACT. We show that the connectedness of the set of parameters for which the *over-rotation interval* of a bimodal interval map is constant. In other words, the over-rotation interval is a monotone function of a bimodal interval map.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One-dimensional combinatorial dynamics started when O. M. Sharkovsky proved his theorem on the coexistence of periods of cycles for interval maps. To state it, we recall the (transitive) *Sharkovsky order* of the set natural numbers:

$$3 \succ 5 \succ 7 \succ \dots \succ 2 \cdot 3 \succ 2 \cdot 5 \succ 2 \cdot 7 \succ \dots \succ 2^2 \cdot 3 \succ 2^2 \cdot 5 \succ 2^2 \cdot 7 \succ \dots \succ 2^2 \succ 2 \succ 1.$$

In what follows by the *period* we mean the *minimal* period. Below  $I$  always denotes a closed interval.

t:shar

**Theorem 1.1** ([11] and [12] for English translation). *If  $g : I \rightarrow I$  is continuous,  $m \succ n$  and  $m$  is the period of cycle of  $g$  then  $n$  is also the period of a cycle of  $g$ .*

Theorem 1.1 inspired a lot of developments. One of them is the discovery of *over-rotation numbers*, a combinatorial tool used for classifying interval cycles and invariant under topological conjugacy of interval maps. It can be defined as follows.

Let  $I$  be the unit interval, let  $f : I \rightarrow I$  be a continuous interval map, let  $P$  be a periodic orbit of  $f$  of period  $q > 1$ , and let  $m$  be the number of points  $x \in P$  such that  $f(x) - x$  and  $f^2(x) - x$  have different signs. Call the pair  $(\frac{m}{2}, q) = \text{orp}(P)$  the *over-rotation pair* of  $P$  and denote it by  $\text{orp}(P)$ ; call  $\frac{m}{2q} = \rho(P)$  the *over-rotation number* of  $P$ . An over-rotation pair  $(p, q)$  is *coprime* if  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime. The set of *over-rotation pairs* of all cycles of  $f$  is denoted by  $ORP(f)$ . Since the number  $0 < m \leq \frac{q}{2}$  is even, then, in an *over-rotation pair*  $(p, q)$ ,  $p$  and  $q$  are integers and  $0 < \frac{p}{q} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . The number  $p$  can be interpreted as the number of times  $f(x)$  goes around  $x$  as we move along the orbit of the “vector”  $\overrightarrow{xf(x)}$ . If  $f$  has a unique fixed point  $a$ , then  $f(x) > x$  if  $x < a$

*Date:* March 5, 2021.

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

*Key words and phrases.* Over-rotation pair, over-rotation number, pattern, periodic orbit.

and  $f(x) < x$  if  $x > a$ , and  $p$  is the number of points to the right of  $a$  which are mapped to the left of  $a$  (or vice versa).

overrotation:pairs

**Theorem 1.2** ([8]). *Suppose that  $(p, q)$  and  $(r, s)$  are over-rotation pairs. Moreover, suppose that one of the following holds.*

- (1)  $\frac{p}{q} < \frac{r}{s}$ .
- (2)  $\frac{p}{q} = \frac{r}{s}$  so that for a coprime over-rotation pair  $(k, l)$  we have  $p/k = q/l = u$  and  $r/k = s/l = v$  are integers, and  $u \succ_{\mathbb{R}} v$ .

*Then any interval map with a cycle of over-rotation pair  $(p, q)$  has a cycle of over-rotation pair  $(r, s)$ .*

Definition 1.3 is based upon Theorem 1.2; to rule out trivial cases we will from now on assume that we consider only maps with non-fixed periodic points (otherwise orbits of all points converge to a fixed point).

d:orient

**Definition 1.3.** Given an interval map  $f$ , denote by  $I_f$  the closure of the union of over-rotation numbers of  $f$ -periodic points, and call  $I_f$  the *over-rotation interval* of  $f$ .

By Theorem 1.1, any map  $f$  with non-fixed periodic points has a cycle of period 2 with over-rotation number  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; by Theorem 1.2 if  $\frac{p}{q} = \rho(P)$  for a cycle  $P$  then  $[\frac{p}{q}, \frac{1}{2}] \subset I_f$ ; hence for any interval map  $f$  there exists a number  $r_f, 0 \leq r_f < \frac{1}{2}$ , such that  $I_f = [r_f, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

A continuous map  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is said to have a *horseshoe* if there exist subintervals  $I$  and  $J$  of  $[0, 1]$  disjoint except perhaps a common endpoint, such that  $f(I) \cap f(J) \supset I \cup J$ . By [8], if  $f$  has a horseshoe then  $I_f = [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

A map is *piecewise-monotone* if the interval  $I$  can be partitioned into finitely many intervals (*laps*) on which  $f$  is *strictly monotone*. If the smallest number of such intervals is 2, then  $f$  is said to be *unimodal*; in this case  $f$  has one turning point. If the smallest number of such intervals is 3, then  $f$  is said to be *bimodal*; in this case  $f$  has two turning point. In this paper we *always* consider *only* piecewise-monotone maps that are increasing on their leftmost laps.

Every cycle  $P$  of a map  $f$  induces a cyclic permutation  $\Pi$  obtained by looking at how the map  $f$  acts on the points of  $P$  ordered from the left to the right. One can introduce a relation  $\sim$  on the family of all cycles such that for two cycles  $P$  and  $Q$ ,  $P \sim Q$  iff  $P$  and  $Q$  induce the same permutation;  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation whose equivalence classes are called *patterns*. If an interval map  $f$  has a cycle  $P$  from a *pattern*  $\pi$  associated with permutation  $\Pi$ , say that  $P$  is a *representative* of  $\pi$  (in  $f$ ) and  $f$  *exhibits*  $\pi$  (on  $P$ ). A permutation  $\pi$  forces a permutation  $\theta$  if any continuous interval map  $f$  which exhibits  $\pi$  also exhibits  $\theta$ . By [2], *forcing* is a partial ordering.

A useful algorithm allows one to describe all patterns forced by a pattern  $\pi$ . Consider a cycle  $P$  of pattern  $\pi$ , and denote the leftmost point of  $P$  by  $a$  and the rightmost point of  $P$  by  $b$ . Every component of  $[a, b] - P$  is called a  *$P$ -basic interval*. Extend this map from  $P$  to  $[a, b]$  by defining it linearly on each  $P$ -basic interval and call the resultant map  $f_P$  the  *$P$ -linear map*. Then, the patterns of all cycles of  $f_P$  are exactly the patterns forced by the pattern of  $P$  (see [1] and [2]).

Over-rotation pairs and numbers for patterns are defined just like for an interval map. Denote the *over-rotation pair* and *over-rotation number* of a pattern  $\pi$  by  $\text{orp}(\pi)$  and  $\rho(\pi)$ , resp. If  $P$  is a periodic orbit of pattern  $\pi$ , call the over-rotation interval  $I_\pi = [r_\pi, \frac{1}{2}]$  of the  $P$ -linear map  $f_P$  the *over-rotation interval of  $\pi$* .

**Definition 1.4.** A pattern  $\pi$  is called *over-twist* if it does not force any other pattern of the same over-rotation number.

By Theorem 1.2, an over-twist pattern has a *coprime over-rotation pair* (i.e., an over-rotation pair  $(p, q)$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime); in particular, over-twists of over-rotation number  $\frac{1}{2}$  are of period 2, so from now on we consider *over-twists* of *over-rotation number* distinct from  $\frac{1}{2}$ . By [8] and by properties of forcing relation, for any  $\frac{p}{q} \in (r_f, \frac{1}{2})$ , an over-twist pattern of over-rotation number  $\frac{p}{q}$  is exhibited by a cycle of  $f$ ; over-twists are patterns that are *guaranteed* to a map  $f$  if the interior of  $I_f$  contains the appropriate *over-rotation number*. This can be sharpened if  $f$  is piecewise-monotone.

t:sharp

**Theorem 1.5** ([5], [6], [7]). *If  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a piecewise monotone continuous map with over-rotation interval  $[r_f, \frac{1}{2}]$ , then for any  $\frac{p}{q} \in [r_f, \frac{1}{2}]$ , there exists a periodic orbit  $P$  which exhibits over-twist pattern of over-rotation number  $\frac{p}{q}$ .*

The over-rotation interval of an over-twist pattern  $\pi$  is  $[\rho(\pi), \frac{1}{2}]$  so that  $r_\pi = \rho(\pi)$  holds. In [3] the following version of the opposite statement is proven: a pattern  $\pi$  with *coprime over-rotation pair* is *over-twist* if and only if  $r_\pi = \rho(\pi)$ .

In [9], it was proven that for a given rational number  $\frac{p}{q}$  there exists a unique unimodal over-twist pattern  $\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}$  of over-rotation number  $\frac{p}{q}$ ; moreover, the dynamics of  $\gamma_{\frac{p}{q}}$  was described. It was also shown that the over-rotation interval is a monotone function of a map considered on a wide variety of one-parameter families of unimodal maps. The goal of the present paper is to extend this result onto the family of truncations of bimodal interval maps. It is known (see, e.g., [10]) that any bimodal interval map can be modeled by a truncation of a bimodal horseshoe map. So, we parameterize the family of all truncations of a bimodal horseshoe map and then show that the set of the parameters which correspond to a particular to a fixed over-rotation interval is a connected subset of the parameter space. For this we will use the explicit description of all *bimodal* over-twist patterns obtained in a recent paper [4]. We discuss our plans in details below.

A *bimodal horseshoe map* is a *bimodal* map  $H_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  defined by the following formula

$$H_2(x) = \begin{cases} 3x & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{3} \\ 2 - 3x & \text{if } \frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq \frac{2}{3} \\ 3x - 2 & \text{if } \frac{2}{3} \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases}$$


Evidently,  $H_2$  has cycles that exhibit all bimodal patterns.

For  $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$  with  $\alpha \geq \beta$ , we call the interval  $\xi_\alpha^{max} = [\frac{\alpha}{3}, \frac{2}{3} - \frac{\alpha}{3}]$  where  $H_2(x) \geq \alpha$  the *level  $\alpha$  max flat spot* and the interval  $\xi_\beta^{min} = [\frac{2}{3} - \frac{\beta}{3}, \frac{2}{3} + \frac{\beta}{3}]$  where  $H_2(x) \leq \beta$  the *level  $\beta$  min flat spot*. The map  $H_{\alpha, \beta} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  defined by:

$$H_{\alpha, \beta}(x) = \begin{cases} H(x) & \text{if } x \notin \xi_\alpha^{max} \cup \xi_\beta^{min} \\ \alpha & \text{if } x \in \xi_\alpha^{max} \\ \beta & \text{if } x \in \xi_\beta^{min} \end{cases}$$

is called the *bimodal truncation* of  $H$  with parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Figure 1 shows the graphs of  $H_2$  and  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ .

FIGURE 1. The graphs of the maps  $H_2$  and  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$  with the latter shown in bolder lines




bimodal:truncation

Recall that by [10] any bimodal map can be modeled by some  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_{\alpha, \beta} : \alpha, \beta \in [0, 1] \text{ \& } \alpha \geq \beta\}$  be the family of all truncations of  $H_2$ . Denote the *over-rotation interval* of  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$  by  $I_{\alpha, \beta}$ . It is easy to see that if  $\alpha = \beta$ ,  $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , or  $\beta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , then all periodic points of  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$  are fixed. Hence, the  $\omega$ -limit set  $\omega(x)$  is a fixed point for every  $x$ , and we are not considering such maps. Excluding these parameters, we define the *parameter space* as  $\mathcal{P} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1] : \alpha \geq \frac{1}{2} \geq \beta\}$ ;  $\mathcal{P}$  is a *rectangle* with vertices  $(1, 0)$ ,  $(1, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ . We will study  $\mathcal{P}$  using the Euclidian metric.

Let us use the following terminology to describe  $\mathcal{P}$  throughout the paper. The *points*  $(1, 0)$  and  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$  in the *parameter plane*  $\mathcal{P}$  are called the *focal point*  $\mathcal{F}$  and the *vertex*  $\mathcal{V}$  respectively. Let us call the set  $\mathcal{B} = \{(x, \frac{1}{2}) | \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq 1\} \cup \{(\frac{1}{2}, y) | 0 \leq y \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$  the *base set*. Similarly, call the set  $\mathcal{S} = \{(x, 0) | \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq 1\} \cup \{(1, y) | 0 \leq y \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$  the *side arm*.

FIGURE 2. The Parameter space  $\mathcal{P}$



parameter:plane:figure

Define a map  $\psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  with  $\psi(\alpha, \beta) = \rho(I_{\alpha,\beta})$ . Observe that at the *focal point* the value of  $\psi$  is the *least* namely 0, while at any point in the *base*  $\mathcal{B}$ , the value of  $\psi$  is the *greatest* namely,  $\frac{1}{2}$ . We will call the set  $\psi^{-1}(\nu) = \psi_\nu = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{P} : \psi((\alpha, \beta)) = \nu\}$  the *Bimodal Iso-over-rotation-tract* corresponding to  $\nu$  or the  $\nu$ -*Bimodal Iso-over-rotation-tract*. The main objective of our paper is to show that for any  $\nu \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  the  $\nu$ -*Bimodal Iso-over-rotation-tract* is a *connected set*. In other words the map  $\psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  is a *monotone map*.

We divide our paper into three sections. Section 1 is our Introduction. Section 2 contains some preliminary ideas. Section 3 is the main section of the paper where we prove that *Bimodal Iso-over-rotation-tracts* are connected.

s:prelim

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Kneading Sequences.** Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a bimodal map with turning points  $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 1$ . Call  $\mathcal{S} = \{I_0, C_1, I_1, C_2, I_2\}$  where  $I_0 = [0, c_1)$ ,  $C_1 = \{c_1\}$ ,  $I_1 = (c_1, c_2)$ ,  $C_2 = \{c_2\}$  and  $I_2 = (c_2, 1]$  the *symbolic set* of  $f$ . Order its elements as  $I_0 < C_1 < I_1 < C_2 < I_2$ . Define a *location function*  $\mathcal{L} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  which assigns to each point  $x \in [0, 1]$ , its unique *location*  $\mathcal{J}(x) \in \mathcal{S}$  defined by  $x \in \mathcal{J}(x)$ . Observe that if  $x < y$ , then  $\mathcal{J}(x) < \mathcal{J}(y)$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the set of all infinite sequences of symbols  $(\mathcal{J}_0, \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_3, \dots)$  where  $\mathcal{J}_i \in \mathcal{S}$  for every  $i$ .

Define a function  $\mathcal{I} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$  which associates with each point  $x \in [0, 1]$ , the unique sequence  $\mathcal{I}(x) = (\mathcal{J}(x), \mathcal{J}(f(x)), \mathcal{J}(f^2(x)), \dots) \in \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . We call  $\mathcal{J}(x)$ , the *itinerary* of the point  $x$ . Let  $\sigma : \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the *shift map* defined by  $\sigma(\mathcal{J}_0, \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_3, \dots) = (\mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_3, \mathcal{J}_4, \dots)$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{I} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$  conjugates the map  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  to the *shift map*  $\sigma : \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . This allows one to model the dynamics of the map  $f$  using the properties of the *itineraries*.

Define a *sign* function  $\Theta : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$  as follows: for any  $j$ ,  $\Theta(I_j) = +1$  if  $f$  is *increasing* on  $I_j$ ,  $\Theta(I_j) = -1$  if  $f$  is *decreasing* on

$I_j$ , and  $\Theta(C_j) = 0$  for any  $j$ . Define a partial order  $\succ$  on all *itineraries* as follows. Let  $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{J}_0, \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_3, \dots)$  and  $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{K}_0, \mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \mathcal{K}_3, \dots)$  be two *itineraries*. Let  $\kappa = \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \mathcal{J}_i \neq \mathcal{K}_i\}$ , and set  $\theta(\kappa - 1) = \prod_{i=1}^{\kappa-1} \Theta(\mathcal{J}_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{\kappa-1} \Theta(\mathcal{K}_i)$ . Then say  $\mathcal{J}$  is *stronger* than  $\mathcal{K}$  and write  $\mathcal{J} \succ \mathcal{K}$  iff  $\mathcal{J}_\kappa > \mathcal{K}_\kappa$  (if  $\theta(\kappa - 1) = +1$ ) or  $\mathcal{K}_\kappa > \mathcal{J}_\kappa$  (if  $\theta(\kappa - 1) = -1$ ). If  $\theta(\kappa - 1) = 0$  then  $\succ$  is *not defined*. Theorem 2.1 follows from [10].

compare:itinerary

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  with  $x > y$ . Then  $\mathcal{I}(x) \succeq \mathcal{I}(y)$ . Conversely, if for  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $\mathcal{I}(x) \succ \mathcal{I}(y)$ , then  $x > y$ .*

The *itineraries*  $\mathcal{K}_j = \mathcal{I}(f(c_j)) \in \mathcal{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$  of the *critical points*  $c_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$  are called the *kneading sequences* of the map  $f$ . The vector  $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f)} = (\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2)$  is called the *kneading vector* of the map  $f$ .

In this paper we will use Theorem 2.1 to pinpoint the distribution of the periodic orbits corresponding to different bimodal over-twist patterns on a bimodal horseshoe map  $H_2$  by comparing the itineraries of the points of absolute maxima and minima of these orbits.

**2.2. Some results on Degree one Circle Maps.** Recall some results on circle maps that we need (see [1] for detail). Consider the unit circle  $\mathbb{S}$  and the natural projection  $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ . If  $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$  is continuous, then there is a continuous map  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $F \circ \pi = \pi \circ f$ . Such a map  $F$  is called a *lifting* of  $f$ . It is unique up to translation by an integer. An integer  $d$  with  $F(x + 1) = F(x) + d$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  is called the *degree* of the map  $f$  and is independent of the choice of  $F$ .

Let us denote by  $\mathcal{L}_1$  the set of all liftings of continuous degree one maps of  $\mathbb{S}$  onto itself. Let  $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$ . We define *upper and lower rotation numbers* of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$  as  $\overline{\rho}_F(x) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n(x) - x}{n}$  and  $\underline{\rho}_F(x) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n(x) - x}{n}$  respectively. If the numbers  $\overline{\rho}_F(x)$  and  $\underline{\rho}_F(x)$  are equal the common value is called the *rotation number* of  $f$  for  $F$  and is denoted by  $\rho_F(x)$ .

t:lift1

**Theorem 2.2** ([1]). *If  $F \in \mathcal{L}'_1$  is a lifting of a circle map  $f$  then  $\rho_F(x)$  exists for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and is independent of  $x$ . Moreover, it is rational if and only if  $f$  has a periodic point.*

We will call this number the rotation number of  $F$  and is denoted by  $\rho(F)$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *The function  $\rho : \mathcal{L}'_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous.*

For  $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$  we define maps  $F_l, F_u \in \mathcal{L}'_1$  as follows:  $F_l(x) = \inf\{F(y) : y \geq x\}$  and  $F_u(x) = \sup\{F(y) : y \leq x\}$ .

degree:one:results

**Theorem 2.4** ([1]). *Then the following statements are true:*

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

- (6) If  $F_l(x) \neq F(x)$ , then  $x \in \text{Const}(F_l)$  where  $\text{Const}(F_l)$  denotes the union of all open intervals on which  $F_l$  is constant.
- (7) Let  $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$  be a lifting of a circle map  $f$ . Then the set of all rotation numbers of points is equal to the interval  $[\rho(F_l), \rho(F_u)]$ . Moreover, for each rational  $a$  from this interval there is a point  $x$  such that  $\pi(x)$  is periodic for  $f$  and  $\rho_F(x) = a$ . The interval  $[\rho(F_l), \rho(F_u)]$  is called the rotation interval of  $F$ . We will denote it by  $\text{Rot}(F)$ .
- (8) The endpoints of  $\text{Rot}(F)$  depend continuously on  $F \in \mathcal{L}_1$ .

**2.3. Results on over-rotation numbers of bimodal maps [4].**

The article [4] relates the *over-rotation numbers* of bimodal interval maps and the classical rotation numbers of degree one circle maps of the real line. This yields a description of dynamics of *bimodal over-twist patterns*. Namely, given an over-rotation number  $\frac{p}{q}$  there are  $q - 2p + 1$  *bimodal over-twist patterns*  $\Gamma_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  with this over-rotation number; each of them can be characterized by a value of  $r \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, q - 2p\}$ . The patterns with  $r = 0$  and  $r = q - 2p$  are *unimodal* while the remaining  $q - 2p - 1$  patterns are *strictly bimodal*. Denote the permutation of the over-twist pattern  $\Gamma_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  by  $\Pi_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$ . By [4]  $\Pi_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  is as follows.

$$\Pi_{r, \frac{p}{q}} = \begin{cases} j + p & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq r \\ q - j + r + 1 & \text{if } r + 1 \leq j \leq r + p \\ 2p - j + r + 1 & \text{if } r + p + 1 \leq j \leq r + 2p \\ j - p & \text{if } r + 2p + 1 \leq j \leq q \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Let  $P_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  be a periodic orbit of a map  $f$  which exhibits the pattern  $\Gamma_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$ . Number its  $q$  points in *spatial labelling* as  $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_q$  and partition them into 4 disjoint parts.

The first  $r$  points  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r$  are called *red points* and are denoted by  $\mathcal{R}_1^r, \mathcal{R}_2^r, \mathcal{R}_3^r, \dots, \mathcal{R}_r^r$ . Under the action of  $f$  the *red points* are shifted to the right by  $p$  points.


The next  $p$  points  $x_{r+1}, x_{r+2}, \dots, x_{r+p}$  are called *green points* and are denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_1^r, \mathcal{G}_2^r, \mathcal{G}_3^r, \dots, \mathcal{G}_p^r$ . The *green points* map onto the last  $p$  points  $x_{q-p+1}, \dots, x_{q-1}, x_q$  of the orbit with a *flip*, that is orientation is reversed but without any expansion.

The next  $p$  points  $x_{r+p+1}, x_{r+p+2}, \dots, x_{r+2p}$  are called *pink points* and are denoted by  $\mathcal{P}_1^r, \mathcal{P}_2^r, \mathcal{P}_3^r, \dots, \mathcal{P}_p^r$ . The *pink points* map onto the first  $p$  points  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$  of the orbit with a *flip* but with no expansion.

The last  $q - 2p - r$  points are called *blue points* and are denoted by  $\mathcal{B}_1^r, \mathcal{B}_2^r, \mathcal{B}_3^r, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{q-2p-r}^r$ . They are shifted to the *left* by  $p$  points.

If  $r = 0$ , we have no *red points*; if  $r = q - 2p$ , we have no *blue points*. For all other values of  $r$ , we have points of all colors.

The dynamics of  $P_{3, \frac{3}{11}}$  is depicted in the Figure 3.

FIGURE 3. The Bimodal over-twist pattern  $\Gamma_{3, \frac{3}{11}}$ 

f:bimodal-2

**2.4. Some results from Algebraic Topology.** We assume knowledge of basic concepts such as connectedness and path-connectedness of topological spaces.

If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  are two continuous functions then  $f$  and  $g$  are said to be *homotopic* if there exists a continuous function  $H : (X, [0, 1]) \rightarrow Y$  such that  $H(x, 0) = f(x)$ ,  $H(x, 1) = g(x)$ . Then we write  $f \cong g$ ; the map  $H$  is called a *homotopy* between  $f$  and  $g$ . Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $A \subset X$ . A *retraction* of  $X$  onto  $A$  is a continuous map  $r : X \rightarrow A$  such that  $r|_A = id_A$ . If such a map  $r$  exists then  $A$  is called a *retract* of  $X$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $A \subset X$ . We say that  $A$  is a *deformation retract* of  $X$  if there exists a homotopy between the identity map on  $X$  and the map that carries all of  $X$  onto  $A$  such that each point of  $A$  remains fixed during the homotopy.

In other words, there is a homotopy  $H : X \times I \rightarrow X$  such that:

- (1)  $H(x, 0) = id_X \forall x \in X$ .
- (2)  $H(x, 1) \in A$
- (3)  $H(a, t) = a \forall t \in I$  and  $\forall a \in A$ .

The map  $r : X \rightarrow A$  defined by  $r(x) = H(x, 1)$  is a retraction of  $X$  onto  $A$  and  $H$  is a homotopy between  $id_X$  and the map  $j \circ r$  where  $j : A \rightarrow X$  is the inclusion map defined by  $j(a) = a$  for all  $a \in A$ .

**Theorem 2.6.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a path-connected space and let  $A \subset X$  be a deformation retract of  $X$ . Then,  $A$  is path-connected.

*Proof.* Take  $a, b \in A$ . Since  $(X, \tau)$  is path-connected, then there exists a continuous map  $\xi : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  with  $\xi(0) = a$  and  $\xi(1) = b$ . Since  $A$  is a deformation retract of  $X$ , there exists a continuous map  $H : (X, [0, 1]) \rightarrow X$  such that  $H(x, 0) = id_X$  and  $H(x, 1)|_A = id_A$ . Define  $r : X \rightarrow A$  such that  $r(x) = H(x, 1)$ . Then  $r|_A = id_A$ .

Define  $\chi : [0, 1] \rightarrow A$  by  $\chi = r \circ \xi$ . Then  $\chi(0) = a$  and  $\chi(1) = b$  and  $\chi$  is continuous. Thus,  $\chi$  is a path in  $A$  connecting  $a$  and  $b$ . So,  $A$  is a path-connected.  $\square$

deformation:connected

### 3. CONNECTEDNESS OF BIMODAL ISO-OVER-ROTATION-TRACTS

bimodal:trunc

Let us outline our approach. Given a rational number  $\frac{p}{q}$ , we first describe the set  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  of all points  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in the parameter space  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) = \frac{p}{q}$  and one of the flat spots  $\xi_{\alpha}^{\max}$  and  $\xi_{\beta}^{\min}$  exhibits an over-twist pattern of over-rotation number  $\frac{p}{q}$ ; this set is a continuous broken line (a *staircase*) in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then we show that  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  partitions  $\mathcal{P}$  into two path-connected components: a component  $\mathcal{G}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  where  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) \geq \frac{p}{q}$  and a component  $\mathcal{U}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  where  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) < \frac{p}{q}$ . Then we show that the  $\frac{p}{q}$ -Bimodal Iso-over-rotation-tract  $\mathcal{I}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is a deformation retract of the component  $\mathcal{G}_{\frac{p}{q}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is path-connected, then, by Theorem 2.6,  $\mathcal{I}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is path-connected. Finally we prove that  $\psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  is continuous and then use it to prove connectedness of  $\mu$ -Bimodal Iso-over-rotation-tract for an irrational number  $\mu \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

For two sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $d(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A \text{ \& } y \in B\}$ .

distance:pairs

**Lemma 3.1.** *If  $(\alpha, \beta)$  and  $(\gamma, \delta)$  are points in  $\mathcal{P}$  co-linear with the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $d(\mathcal{F}, (\alpha, \beta)) \geq d(\mathcal{F}, (\gamma, \delta))$  then  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) \geq \psi((\gamma, \delta))$ .*

*Proof.* Since,  $(\alpha, \beta)$  and  $(\gamma, \delta)$  are points in  $\mathcal{P}$  co-linear with the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $d(\mathcal{F}, (\alpha, \beta)) \geq d(\mathcal{F}, (\gamma, \delta))$ , it follows that  $\gamma \geq \alpha$  and  $\delta \leq \beta$ . Thus  $\xi_{\gamma}^{\max} \subseteq \xi_{\alpha}^{\max}$ ,  $\xi_{\delta}^{\min} \subseteq \xi_{\beta}^{\min}$ , and hence  $I_{(\alpha, \beta)} \subseteq I_{(\gamma, \delta)}$  and  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) \geq \psi((\gamma, \delta))$  as desired.  $\square$

leading:set:rational

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\frac{p}{q}$  be a given rational number where  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime. The leading set  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is the collection of points  $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{P}$  which satisfies the following:

- (1) at least one of flatspots  $\xi_{\alpha}^{\max}$  and  $\xi_{\beta}^{\min}$  exhibits an over-twist pattern with over-rotation number  $\frac{p}{q}$ .
- (2)  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) = \frac{p}{q}$ .

We now describe the structure of the leading set  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  for a given rational number  $\frac{p}{q}$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime. For this we first study the distribution of the bimodal over-twist periodic orbits in a bimodal horseshoe map  $H_2$ .

For any rational  $\frac{p}{q}$  with coprime  $p$  and  $q$ , there are  $q - 2p$  bimodal over-twist patterns  $\Gamma_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  for  $r \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, q - 2p\}$ . Out of these the patterns  $\Gamma_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$  and  $\Gamma_{q-2p, \frac{p}{q}}$  are unimodal and the remaining  $q - 2p - 2$  patterns are strictly bimodal. Recall that in the context of the map  $H_2$  we have  $I_0 = [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ ,  $I_1 = [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$ ,  $I_2 = [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$ .

The map  $H_2$  has a unique cycle  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$  such its point of absolute maximum  $M_0$  and its point of absolute minimum  $m_0$  lies in  $I_1$ . Similarly,  $H_2$  has a unique periodic orbit  $P_{q-2p, \frac{p}{q}}$  such its point of absolute maximum  $M_{q-2p}$  and its point of absolute minimum  $m_{q-2p}$  lies in  $I_1$ .

Finally, for each  $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, q - 2p - 1\}$ ,  $H_2$  has a unique periodic orbit  $P_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  such its point of absolute maximum  $M_r$  lies in  $I_1$  and its point of absolute minimum  $m_r$  lies in  $I_2$ .

Let  $\mathcal{P}_q^p$  be the collection of these  $q - 2p + 1$  cycles. Let us study the location of these cycles on  $H_2$ . For this we introduce a *partial ordering*  $\triangleleft$  in  $\mathcal{P}_q^p$  as follows. For  $r_1, r_2 \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, q - 2p\}$ , write  $P_{r_2, \frac{p}{q}} \triangleleft P_{r_1, \frac{p}{q}}$  and say  $P_{r_2, \frac{p}{q}}$  *floats above*  $P_{r_1, \frac{p}{q}}$  in  $H_2$  iff  $H_2(M_{r_2}) > H_2(M_{r_1})$  and  $H_2(m_{r_2}) > H_2(m_{r_1})$  where  $M_{r_1}$  and  $M_{r_2}$  are the points of *absolute maximum* and  $m_{r_1}$  and  $m_{r_2}$  be the points of *absolute minimum* of these orbits respectively.

Given a periodic orbit  $P_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  it is easy to see that that all its *red* points (if any) lies in the lapse  $I_0$ , all its *green* and *pink* points lies in the lapse  $I_1$  and all its *blue* points (if any) lies in the lapse  $I_2$ .

floating:above:1

**Lemma 3.3.** *For every  $1 \leq k \leq q - 2p - 2$ ,  $P_{k, \frac{p}{q}} \triangleleft P_{k+1, \frac{p}{q}}$ .*

*Proof.* Since,  $1 \leq k \leq q - 2p - 2$ , both  $P_{k, \frac{p}{q}}$  and  $P_{k+1, \frac{p}{q}}$  contains points of all colors. Let us compare the itineraries of  $m_k$  and  $m_{k+1}$ . They are both *pink* points in their respective orbits. On application of  $H_2$  both of these points will map to the first red point  $\mathcal{R}_1^k$  and  $\mathcal{R}_1^{k+1}$  of their respective orbits, then to a *green point*, then to a *blue point* and then finally to another *pink point* of their respective orbits. Let us call this one *round* of its orbit.

Both  $m_k$  and  $m_{k+1}$  will keep on performing such *rounds* and their itineraries will remain the same until the auspicious moment when  $m_{k+1}$  hits the last *red point*  $\mathcal{R}_k^{k+1}$  of its orbit. Since the number of *red points* in  $P_{k, \frac{p}{q}}$  is one less than that of  $P_{k+1, \frac{p}{q}}$ , at that moment  $m_k$  will hit the first green point  $\mathcal{G}_1^k$  of its orbit. Observe that  $P_{k, \frac{p}{q}}$  attains its absolute maximum at  $\mathcal{G}_1^k$ , that is,  $M_k = \mathcal{G}_1^k$ . So, on the next step while  $m_{k+1}$  will hit a green point with corresponding symbol  $I_1$ ,  $m_k$  will hit the last *blue point*  $\mathcal{B}_{q-2p-k}^k$  with symbol  $I_2$ .

Finally, observe that in each *round* both  $m_k$  and  $m_{k+1}$  reach the decreasing lapse  $I_2$  of  $H_2$  an even number of times. So, it follows that the itinerary  $\mathcal{I}(H_2(m_k))$  is *stronger* than that of  $\mathcal{I}(H_2(m_{k+1}))$ . So, by Theorem 2.1 it follows that  $H_2(m_{k+1}) > H_2(m_k)$ .

Similarly, it can be seen that the itinerary of  $H_2(M_{k+1})$  is *stronger* than for  $H_2(M_k)$  and hence by Theorem 2.1 the result follows.  $\square$

floating:above:2

**Lemma 3.4.**  $\Gamma_{0, \frac{p}{q}} \triangleleft \Gamma_{1, \frac{p}{q}}$ .

*Proof.*  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$  has no red points. Comparing the itineraries of  $m_0$  and  $m_1$ , it is easy to see that  $\mathcal{I}(H_2(m_0)) = (I_1, I_2, \dots)$  while  $\mathcal{I}(H_2(m_1)) = (I_0, I_1, \dots)$ . Thus, clearly  $\mathcal{I}(H_2(m_0))$  is *stronger* (in the sense of  $\succ$ ) than  $\mathcal{I}(H_2(m_1))$ . Thus, by Theorem 2.1,  $H_2(m_0) > H_2(m_1)$ .

The *itineraries* of  $M_0$  and  $M_1$  will remain the same till the moment  $M_0$  hits the first *blue point* from the left in the spatial labelling  $\mathcal{B}_1^0$  of its orbit  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$ . At that point the point  $M_1$  maps to the last pink point  $\mathcal{P}_q^1$  of its orbit  $P_{1, \frac{p}{q}}$  in the spatial labelling. Next application of  $H_2$  maps  $M_0$  to some *pink point* of its orbit while  $M_1$  maps to the first *red point*  $\mathcal{R}_1^1$  of its orbit. Arguing as in Lemma 3.3 it follows that  $H_2(M_0) > H_2(M_1)$   $\square$

Similarly we can prove that:

floating:above:3

**Lemma 3.5.**  $\Gamma_{q-2p-1, \frac{p}{q}} \triangleleft \Gamma_{q-2p, \frac{p}{q}}$

Using Lemma 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 we can describe the configuration of the *leading set*  $L_{\frac{p}{q}}$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ . For this we need the following definition:

staircase

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $A = [a, b] \times [a, b]$  where  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $P_1 = \{a = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1} = b\}$  and  $P_2 = \{a = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n+1} = b\}$  be two *partitions* of  $[a, b]$ .

By a *n-staircase*  $\mathcal{S}_n$  in  $A$  with  $2n$  steps denoted by  $S_n$  we mean:

- (1) A set of  $n$  *vertical line segments* :  $\{x_1\} \times [y_1, y_2], \{x_2\} \times [y_2, y_3], \dots, \{x_n\} \times [y_n, y_{n+1} = b]$  (*called rises*).
- (2) A set of  $n$  *horizontal line segments* :  $[a = x_0, x_1] \times \{y_1\}, [x_1, x_2] \times \{y_2\}, \dots, [x_{n-1}, x_n] \times \{y_n\}$  (*called treads*).

$x_1 - x_0$  is called the length of the *initial tread* while  $y_{n+1} - y_n$  is called the length of the *final rise*. The lengths  $\Delta x_i = x_{i+1} - x_i$  and  $\Delta y_i = y_{i+1} - y_i$  are called the lengths of the *ith tread* and *ith rise* respectively for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

A staircase  $\mathcal{S}_n$  is said to be *symmetrical* if  $\Delta x_{i-1} = \Delta y_{n+1-i}$  for every  $i \in \{1, 2 \dots n + 1\}$ .

L:structure:rational

**Theorem 3.7.**  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is a *symmetrical staircase* with  $2(q - 2p + 1)$  steps in  $\mathcal{P}$  with *initial tread* and *final rise* lying in the side arm  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* The location of the points  $m_r$  and  $M_r$  of the over-twist periodic orbits  $P_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  in  $H_2$  is elucidated by Lemma ???. To describe  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  we take an arbitrary point  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  and waggle it in  $\mathcal{P}$  and look for moments when at least one of  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  and  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  is part of  $P_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$  for some  $r$ . First we take  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ . At this point the map  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$  has no *non-fixed periodic* point and hence its *dynamics* is not interesting. Now, we slowly *decrease* the value of  $\beta$  keeping  $\alpha$  fixed at 1. There will be some unique value  $\beta_0$  of  $\beta$  when  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  will hit  $H_2(m_0)$ . At this moment  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  is part of the orbit  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$  while  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  is not. Now, we fix  $\beta = \beta_0$  and slowly decrease  $\alpha$ . For some time only  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  will be part of  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$ , but then we will encounter some unique value  $\alpha = \alpha_0$  of  $\alpha$  when  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  hits  $H_2(M_0)$ . At the point  $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$  both  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  and  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  will be part of  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$ . Now, we keep  $\alpha = \alpha_0$  and slowly decrease  $\beta$ . As  $\beta$  moves away from  $\beta_0$ ,  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  will no longer be part of  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$  and only  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  will remain part of  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$ . This will continue for some time. Then for some  $\beta = \beta_1$ ,  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  will hit  $H_2(m_0)$ . At that moment  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  and  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  will both be periodic but parts of different orbits. While  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  is now part of  $P_{1, \frac{p}{q}}$ ,  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  will remain part of  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$ . Now, keeping  $\beta$  fixed at  $\beta_1$  we decrease  $\alpha$  from  $\alpha_0$ . Now, the orbit  $P_{0, \frac{p}{q}}$  is completely cut off from our map  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$  and for some time only  $\xi_{\beta}^{min}$  will remain part of  $P_{1, \frac{p}{q}}$  until for some value of  $\alpha_1$  of  $\alpha$ ,  $\xi_{\alpha}^{max}$  hits  $H_2(M_1)$  and both *flat spots* become part of  $P_{1, \frac{p}{q}}$ . Repeating the process  $q - 2p + 1$  times (for each of the  $q - 2p + 1$  *over-twist periodic orbits*  $P_{r, \frac{p}{q}}$ ), it is easy to see that  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is a *staircase* with  $2(q - 2p + 1)$  steps. The *symmetry* of the *staircase* follows from the *symmetry* of  $H_2$ .  $\square$

If  $(\alpha, \beta) \in Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ , then by definition  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) = \frac{p}{q}$ . The next illustrates what happens if  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) = \frac{p}{q}$  but  $(\alpha, \beta) \notin Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ :

**kappa**

**Lemma 3.8.** *If  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) = \frac{p}{q}$  but  $(\alpha, \beta) \notin Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ , then there exists  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \geq 0$  such that  $(\alpha - \kappa_1, \beta + \kappa_2) \in Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ .*

*Proof.* Since,  $\psi(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{p}{q}$ , so  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$  has a periodic orbit  $P$  which exhibits an over-twist pattern corresponding to over-rotation number  $\frac{p}{q}$ . Also, since,  $(\alpha, \beta) \notin Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ , so  $P$  lies in the interior of  $[0, 1] - (\xi_{max}^{\alpha} \cup \xi_{min}^{\beta})$ . Thus, there exists  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \geq 0$  such that one of the flat spots  $\xi_{max}^{\alpha - \kappa_1}$  and  $\xi_{min}^{\beta + \kappa_2}$  hits a point  $P$  while the other flat spot stays outside all points of  $P$ . Thus,  $(\alpha - \kappa_1, \beta + \kappa_2) \in Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ .  $\square$

**adding:order:rational**

**Lemma 3.9.** *If  $\frac{p}{q}, \frac{r}{s} \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $g.c.d(p, q) = g.c.d(r, s) = 1$  and  $\frac{p}{q} < \frac{r}{s}$ , then  $d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{p}{q}}) < d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{r}{s}})$ .*

*Proof.* We first note that  $\frac{p}{q} \neq \frac{r}{s}$ , so  $Z_{\frac{p}{q}} \cap Z_{\frac{r}{s}} \neq \emptyset$ , since otherwise  $\psi$  would become multi-valued at the point of intersection. So, either  $d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{p}{q}}) < d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{r}{s}})$  or  $d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{p}{q}}) > d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{r}{s}})$ . Suppose if possible  $d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{p}{q}}) > d(\mathcal{F}, Z_{\frac{r}{s}})$ . Choose a point  $(\alpha, \beta) \in Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  and  $(\gamma, \delta) \in Z_{\frac{r}{s}}$  such that the points  $(\alpha, \beta)$ ,  $(\gamma, \delta)$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  are *co-linear*. Then,  $d(\mathcal{F}, (\alpha, \beta)) > d(\mathcal{F}, (\gamma, \delta))$ . By Lemma 3.1  $H_{\alpha, \beta}$  forces  $H_{\gamma, \delta}$ . Hence,  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) = \frac{p}{q} \geq \psi((\gamma, \delta)) = \frac{r}{s}$  which is a contradiction.  $\square$

To show that the  $\frac{p}{q}$ -*Iso-over-rotation-tract*  $\mathcal{I}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is connected, we define two more sets:

**Definition 3.10.** Let  $\mathcal{G}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  be the set of all points  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in the parameter plane  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) \geq \frac{p}{q}$ .

**Definition 3.11.** Let  $\mathcal{U}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  be the set of all points  $(\alpha, \beta)$  in the parameter plane  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\psi((\alpha, \beta)) < \frac{p}{q}$ .

**loc**

**Theorem 3.12.**  *$\mathcal{U}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is precisely the component of  $\mathcal{P} - Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  containing the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(x, y)$  be any point in the component of  $\mathcal{P} - Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  containing the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then clearly,  $d((x, y), \mathcal{F}) < d(Z_{\frac{p}{q}}, \mathcal{F})$ . So, for every  $(s, t) \in Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ , we have  $d((s, t), \mathcal{F}) > d((x, y), \mathcal{F})$ . Hence,  $\psi((x, y)) \leq \frac{p}{q}$ . If  $\psi((x, y)) = \frac{p}{q}$  and  $(x, y) \notin Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ , then by Lemma 3.8, there exists  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \geq 0$  such that  $(x - \kappa_1, y + \kappa_2) \in Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$ . Now, clearly,  $d((x - \kappa_1, y + \kappa_2), \mathcal{F}) < d((x, y), \mathcal{F})$  which is a contradiction. Thus,  $\psi((x, y)) < \frac{p}{q}$ .

Now, suppose that for some  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{P}$  we have  $\psi((x, y)) < \frac{p}{q}$ . We claim that  $d((x, y), \mathcal{F}) < d(Z_{\frac{p}{q}}, \mathcal{F})$ . By way of contradiction, suppose  $d((x, y), \mathcal{F}) > d(Z_{\frac{p}{q}}, \mathcal{F})$ . Then, there exists  $(w, z) \in Z_{\frac{p}{q}}$  such that  $d((x, y), \mathcal{F}) > d((w, z), \mathcal{F})$ . But,  $\psi((x, y)) < \frac{p}{q} = \psi((w, z))$  which contradicts Lemma 3.1. This proves the theorem.  $\square$

**lower:limit**

**Corollary 3.13.**  *$\mathcal{U}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  is path-connected.*

*Proof.* From Theorem 3.12 it follows that  $\mathcal{U}_q^p$  is precisely the component of  $\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{Z}_q^p$  containing the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since,  $\mathcal{P}$  is path-connected and from Theorem 3.7 it follows that  $\mathcal{Z}_q^p$  is path-connected, so  $\mathcal{U}_q^p$  is path-connected.  $\square$

upper:limit

**Lemma 3.14.**  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$  is path-connected.

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\mathcal{G}_q^p = \mathcal{P} - \mathcal{U}_q^p$  and from Corollary 3.13  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$  is path-connected. Hence, the result follows.  $\square$

From Theorem 2.6, it follows that to show that the *Iso-over-rotation-tract*  $\mathcal{I}_q^p$  is connected, it is sufficient to show that  $\mathcal{I}_q^p$  is a deformation retract of  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$ . This is exactly what we will show next.

greater:deformation

**Theorem 3.15.** For a given rational number  $\frac{p}{q}$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime,  $\mathcal{I}_q^p$  is a deformation retract of  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$ .

*Proof.* Take any point  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{G}_q^p$ . Then  $\psi((x, y)) \geq \frac{p}{q}$ . We consider the path  $\Phi_{(x,y)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  defined by  $\Phi_{(x,y)}(t) = (x(1-t) + t, y(1-t))$  (which is the directed line segment in  $\mathcal{P}$  joining  $(x, y)$  to the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$ ). We now start to move the point  $(x, y)$  along the path  $\Phi_{(x,y)}(t)$  towards the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$  a study happens with the value of  $\psi$  as we move along. By Lemma 3.1 it follows that the value of  $\psi$  decreases monotonically as we move along the path  $\Phi_{(x,y)}$  towards the focal point  $\mathcal{F}$ . So, the set  $\mathcal{T}_q^p = \{t \in [0, 1] \mid \psi(\Phi_{(x,y)}(t)) = \frac{p}{q}\}$  is non-empty and bounded below. Let  $\tau_q^p = \inf \mathcal{T}_q^p$ .

Consider the function  $\mathcal{D}_q^p : \mathcal{G}_q^p \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_q^p$  defined by:

$$\mathcal{D}_q^p((x, y), t) = \begin{cases} \Phi_{(x,y)}(t) & \text{if } t < \tau_q^p \\ \Phi_{(x,y)}(\tau_q^p) & \text{if } t \geq \tau_q^p \end{cases}$$

$\mathcal{D}_q^p$  is clearly continuous and is thus a deformation retract of  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$  onto  $\mathcal{I}_q^p$ .  $\square$

rational:connected

**Corollary 3.16.** For a given rational number  $\frac{p}{q}$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime, the *Iso-over-rotation-tract*  $\mathcal{I}_q^p$  is connected.

*Proof.*  $\mathcal{I}_q^p$  is a deformation retract of  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$  From Theorem 3.15, for a given rational number  $\frac{p}{q}$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime,  $\mathcal{I}_q^p$  is a deformation retract of  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$ . Also, from Lemma 3.14  $\mathcal{G}_q^p$  is path-connected. Thus, from Theorem 2.6 the result follows.  $\square$

Consider the map  $\psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Combining results Theorem 2.4 and [4] we have:

psi:continuous

**Theorem 3.17.** The map  $\psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  is continuous.

From Corollary 3.16 for each rational number  $\frac{p}{q} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ ,  $\psi^{-1}(\frac{p}{q})$  is connected.

Now, take an irrational number  $\mu \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . We now show that  $\psi^{-1}(\mu)$  is also connected.

irrational:connected

**Theorem 3.18.** *For each irrational number  $\mu \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  the Iso-over-rotation-tract  $\mathcal{I}_\mu = \psi^{-1}(\mu)$  is connected.*

*Proof.* Consider the sets  $\mathcal{G}_\mu = \bigcup_{\frac{p}{q} > \mu} \mathcal{G}_{\frac{p}{q}}$  and  $\mathcal{U}_\mu = \bigcup_{\frac{p}{q} < \mu} \mathcal{U}_{\frac{p}{q}}$ . It follows from Theorem 3.13 and Corollary 3.14 that the sets  $\mathcal{G}_\mu$  and  $\mathcal{U}_\mu$  are connected. Hence,  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P} - (\mathcal{G}_\mu \cup \mathcal{U}_\mu)$  is connected. From Theorem 3.17 it readily follows that  $\mathcal{A}$  is precisely the set of points  $(x, y)$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\psi((x, y)) = \mu$  and hence the result follows.  $\square$

From Corollary 3.16 and Theorem 3.18 we finally have the main result of this paper:

main:result

**Corollary 3.19.** *The map  $\psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  is monotone.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ll. Alsedà, J. Llibre and M. Misiurewicz, *Combinatorial Dynamics and Entropy in Dimension One*, Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics (2nd edition) **5** (2000), World Scientific Singapore (2000)
- [2] S. Baldwin, *Generalisation of a theorem of Sharkovsky on orbits of continuous real valued functions*, Discrete Math. **67** (1987), 111–127.
- [3] S. Bhattacharya, A. Blokh, *Very badly ordered cycles of interval maps*, Journal of Difference Equations and Applications **26** (2020), 1067-1084
- [4] S. Bhattacharya, A. Blokh, *Over-rotation intervals of bimodal interval maps*, Journal of Difference Equations and Applications **26** (2020), 1085-1113
- [5] A. Blokh, *On Rotation Intervals for Interval Maps*, Nonlinearity **7**(1994), 1395–1417.
- [6] A. Blokh, *The Spectral Decomposition for One-Dimensional Maps*, Dynamics Reported **4** (1995), 1–59.
- [7] A. Blokh, *Rotation Numbers, Twists and a Sharkovsky-Misiurewicz-type Ordering for Patterns on the Interval*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **15**(1995), 1–14.
- [8] A. Blokh, M. Misiurewicz, *A new order for periodic orbits of interval maps*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Sys. **17**(1997), 565-574
- [9] A. Blokh, K. Snider, *Over-rotation numbers for unimodal maps*, Journal of Difference Equations and Applications **19**(2013), 1108–1132.
- [10] J. Milnor and W. Thurston, *On Iterated Maps on the Interval*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin **1342**(1988), 465–520.
- [11] A. N. Sharkovsky, *Coexistence of the cycles of a continuous mapping of the line into itself*, Ukraine Mat. Zh. **16**(1964), 61–71 (Russian).
- [12] A. N. Sharkovsky, *Coexistence of the cycles of a continuous mapping of the line into itself*, Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos Appl. Sci. Engrg. **5** (1995), 1263–1273.

(Sourav Bhattacharaya and Alexander Blokh) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,  
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM, BIRMINGHAM, AL 35294

*Email address:* Sourav Bhattacharya :sourav@uab.edu

*Email address:* Alexander Blokh :ablokh@math.uab.edu