

Jose S. Cánovas

Distributional chaos on tree maps: the star case

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 42 (2001), No. 3, 583--590

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119273>

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2001

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

## Distributional chaos on tree maps: the star case

JOSE S. CÁNOVAS

*Abstract.* Let  $\mathbb{X} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z^n \in [0, 1]\}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  be a continuous map having the branching point fixed. We prove that  $f$  is distributionally chaotic iff the topological entropy of  $f$  is positive.

*Keywords:* distributional chaos, topological entropy, star maps

*Classification:* 37B40, 37E25, 37D45

### 1. Introduction

Let  $(X, d)$  be a compact metric space and let  $C(X)$  be the set of continuous maps  $f : X \rightarrow X$ . The pair  $(X, f)$  is called a discrete dynamical system. For any  $x \in X$ , the sequence  $(f^i(x))_{i=0}^\infty$  is called the *trajectory of  $x$*  (also *orbit of  $x$* ). For  $x, y \in X$ , denote  $\delta_{x,y}(i) = d(f^i(x), f^i(y))$  for  $i \geq 0$ . This paper deals with several notions of chaos for discrete dynamical systems. All these notions are closely related to  $\delta_{x,y}(i)$  for  $x, y \in X$ .

The first notion we introduce is distributional chaos. For any set  $B$  we denote by  $\text{Card}(B)$  its cardinality. As usual,  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  denote the sets of positive integers and real numbers, respectively. For any  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$\xi(x, y, t, n, f) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \chi_{[0,t)}(\delta_{x,y}(i)) = \text{Card}(\{i : 0 \leq i \leq n - 1 \text{ and } \delta_{x,y}(i) < t\}),$$

where  $\chi_{[0,t)}$  is the characteristic function of the interval  $[0, t)$ . Let us define the upper and lower distribution functions as:

$$F_{x,y}^*(t) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \xi(x, y, t, n, f)$$

and

$$F_{x,y}(t) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \xi(x, y, t, n, f).$$

Both  $F_{x,y}$  and  $F_{x,y}^*$  are non-decreasing functions satisfying  $F_{x,y}^*(t) = F_{x,y}(t) = 0$  for all  $t < 0$  and  $F_{x,y}^*(t) = F_{x,y}(t) = 1$  for all  $t > \text{diam}(X)$ , where  $\text{diam}(X)$

---

This paper has been partially supported by the grant D.G.I.C.Y.T. PB98-0374-C03-01.

denotes the diameter of  $X$ . We identify distribution functions which are indistinguishable in the  $L^1$  metric. So, we can choose  $F_{x,y}^*$  and  $F_{x,y}$  to be left-continuous. A function  $f \in C(X)$  is said to be *distributionally chaotic* if there are  $x, y \in X$  such that  $\chi_{(0,\infty)} = F_{x,y}^* > F_{x,y}$  (see [17]). We will use capital letters to denote distribution functions.

A more common definition of chaos can be given as follows (see [13] or [18]). A subset  $S \subset X$  is called *scrambled* for  $f$  if for any  $x, y \in S, x \neq y$ , it holds that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{x,y}(n) > 0$  and  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{x,y}(n) = 0$ . We say that  $f$  is *chaotic in the sense of Li-Yorke* if there is an uncountable scrambled set for  $f$ .

There is another way of measuring different behavior of trajectories. This measure is given by *topological entropy* (see [1] or [2]). For each positive integer  $n$  and for any pair of points  $x$  and  $y$  we denote  $d_n(x, y) = \max\{\delta_{x,y}(i) : 0 \leq i \leq n - 1\}$ . A finite set  $E$  is called  $(n, \epsilon)$ -separated if for all  $x, y \in E, x \neq y$ , it holds that  $d_n(x, y) > \epsilon$ . Let  $s_n(f, \epsilon)$  be the maximal cardinality of an  $(n, \epsilon)$ -separated set. The *topological entropy* of  $f$  is defined by

$$h(f) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log s_n(f, \epsilon).$$

When one-dimensional maps ( $X = I = [0, 1]$ ) are concerned, the relationship between distributional chaos and topological entropy is stated by the following result (see [17]).

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $f \in C(I)$ .*

- (a) *If  $h(f) = 0$ , then  $F_{x,y} = F_{x,y}^*$  for all  $x, y \in I$ . Moreover, if  $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{x,y}(i) = 0$  then  $F_{x,y} = \chi_{(0,\infty)}$ .*
- (b) *If  $h(f) > 0$ , then there exist  $x, y$  and  $t$  in  $I$  such that  $\chi_{(0,\infty)} = F_{x,y}^*(t) > F_{x,y}(t)$ .*

Additionally, if  $f \in C(X)$  is distributionally chaotic, then it is chaotic in the sense of Li-Yorke (see e.g. [17]). In the interval case, Li-Yorke chaotic maps with zero topological entropy, and hence non-distributionally chaotic, can be found in [18].

In the setting of two-dimensional maps the situation is more complicated. In general, Theorem 1 does not hold. More precisely, it was shown in [10] and [11] that there are distributionally chaotic maps with zero topological entropy. Even more, there is a wider definition of distributional chaos and there is a two-dimensional map which is distributionally chaotic in this new sense and non-chaotic in the sense of Li-Yorke [5] (both definitions of distributional chaos are equivalent for interval maps [17]).

For circle maps Theorem 1 holds (see [15]). Additionally, following [12], there are Li-Yorke chaotic circle maps which are not distributionally chaotic. So, the one dimensional case remains open. More precisely, does Theorem 1 hold for continuous maps defined on finite graphs?

In this paper we consider the  $n$ -star  $\mathbb{X} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z^n \in [0, 1]\}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Continuous maps of the  $n$ -star have been studied in the literature (see [3], [4] or [6]) from the point of view of topological dynamics. Let  $0 \in \mathbb{C}$  be the *branching point* of  $\mathbb{X}$ . Let  $\mathbf{X}_0 := \{f \in C(\mathbb{X}) : f(0) = 0\}$ . The aim of this paper is to prove the following result:

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $f \in \mathbf{X}_0$ .*

- (a) *If  $h(f) = 0$ , then  $F_{x,y} = F_{x,y}^*$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ . If, in addition,  $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{x,y}(i) = 0$  then  $F_{x,y} = \chi_{(0,\infty)}$ .*
- (b) *If  $h(f) > 0$ , then there are  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $\chi_{(0,\infty)} = F_{x,y}^*(t) > F_{x,y}(t)$ .*

The paper is organized as follows. Below we introduce additional basic notation and definitions. Section 2 is devoted to prove useful technical results which are used in the last section, where the main result is proved.

Recall that a point  $x \in X$  is *periodic* if  $f^i(x) = x$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\text{Per}(f)$  denote the set of periodic points of  $f$ . For  $x \in X$ , let  $\omega(x, f)$  denote the set of limit points of the sequence  $(f^i(x))_{i=0}^\infty$ .  $\omega(x, f)$  is called the *omega limit set* of  $f$  at  $x$ . Let  $\omega(f) = \bigcup_{x \in X} \omega(x, f)$  be the *omega limit set* of  $f$ .

Before proving our results, we need some information on  $n$ -star maps. The components  $\mathbb{X} \setminus \{0\}$  are called *branches* of  $\mathbb{X}$ . We denote them by  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n$ . Clearly, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the closure of  $B_i$  fulfills  $\overline{B}_i = B_i \cup \{0\}$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  we denote its modulus by  $|x|$ . For  $x, y \in \overline{B}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $|x| < |y|$ , we define the *interval*  $[x, y]$  by  $[x, y] := \{z \in \overline{B}_i : |x| \leq |z| \leq |y|\}$ . Similarly we define the intervals  $(x, y)$ ,  $(x, y]$  and  $[x, y)$ . If  $x, y \in \overline{B}_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $|x| < |y|$  (resp.  $|x| \leq |y|$ ), we will write  $x < y$  (resp.  $x \leq y$ ). Notice that  $\overline{B}_i$  is an interval for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Consider the following metric on  $\mathbb{X}$ . For any  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ , let  $d(x, y) = |x - y|$  if  $x$  and  $y$  lie in the same branch and let  $d(x, y) = |x| + |y|$  if  $x$  and  $y$  do not lie in the same branch.

Finally, we recall the notion of horseshoe (see [16]). Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say that  $f$  has a  $k$ -*horseshoe* if there is a closed interval  $J$  and  $k$  closed subintervals  $J_i \subset J$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , with pairwise disjoint interiors and such that  $J \subseteq f(J_i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

**2. Preliminary results**

We begin with the following lemma partially proved in [15]. For each  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $[x]$  denotes the greatest integer such that  $[x] \leq x$ . Lemma 3 can be found in [9]. Since it is an unpublished reference, we include the proof.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a compact metric space and let  $f \in C(X)$ . Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x, y \in X$ . Then,  $F_{x,y} < F_{x,y}^* = \chi_{(0,\infty)}$  iff  $(F^k)_{x,y} < (F^k)_{x,y}^* = \chi_{(0,\infty)}$ .*

PROOF: The sufficiency condition was proved in Lemma 3.3 from [15]. So, we

must prove the necessity condition. To this end, fix  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Since

$$\xi(x, y, t, n, f) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \xi(f^i(x), f^i(y), t, [n/k] + 1, f^k),$$

it follows from the definitions that  $1 \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (F^k)_{f^i(x), f^i(y)}^*(t)$ . This gives us

$$(F^k)_{f^i(x), f^i(y)}^*(t) = 1$$

for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$ . On the other hand, assume that  $(F^k)_{x,y}(t) = 1$  for all  $t > 0$ . Since  $f$  is uniformly continuous, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $\delta > 0$  ( $\delta \leq \varepsilon$ ) such that  $d(x, y) < \delta$  implies  $\delta_i(x, y) < \varepsilon$  for  $1 \leq i < k$ . Then  $(F^k)_{x,y}(\delta) = 1$  implies  $F_{x,y}(\varepsilon) = 1$ , which leads us to a contradiction. Thus  $(F^k)_{x,y} < 1$  and the proof concludes.  $\square$

We start with the  $n$ -star case by formulating the following two results. Their proofs are immediate.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $f \in C(\mathbb{X})$  and let  $[x, y] \subset \overline{B}_i \subset \mathbb{X}$  be an interval,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . If  $f(x), f(y) \in \overline{B}_i$  and either  $f(x) < x$  and  $y < f(y)$  or  $x < f(x)$  and  $f(y) < y$ , then there is  $z \in [x, y]$  such that  $f(z) = z$ .*

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $f \in \mathbf{X}_0$ . Assume there is  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $z \leq f(z) \in \overline{B}_i$  for all  $z \in \overline{B}_i$ . Then there are at least two fixed points in  $\overline{B}_i$ .*

We assign a code to any  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  as follows; let  $s(x) := (s_i)_{i=0}^\infty \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}^\mathbb{N}$  be defined by  $s_i := j$  iff  $f^i(x) \in B_j$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and  $s_i := 0$  iff  $f^i(x) = 0$ . We say that  $s(x)$  is *eventually constant* if there is  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $s_i = s_k$  for all  $i \geq k$ ; if  $k = 0$  then we say that  $s(x)$  is *constant*. We say that  $f \in \mathbf{X}_0$  has property P if  $s(x)$  is a constant code for any  $x \in \text{Per}(f)$ .

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $f \in \mathbf{X}_0$  have property P. Let  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  be such that  $s(x)$  is not eventually constant. Then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^k(x) = 0$ , that is,  $\omega(x, f) = \{0\}$ .*

PROOF: For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $\mathcal{A}_i := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : f^j(x) \in B_i\}$ . Notice that given  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_i$  can be finite or empty for some  $i$ .

Let  $k, l \in \mathcal{A}_i$ ,  $k < l$ , be such that  $f^{k+1}(x) \notin B_i$ . We claim that  $f^l(x) < f^k(x)$ . Assume the contrary and denote

$$A := \{z \in \overline{B}_i : z < f^k(x) \text{ and } f(z) \in \overline{B}_i\}$$

and

$$B := \{z \in \overline{B}_i : f^k(x) < z \text{ and } f(z) \in \overline{B}_i\}.$$

Since  $0 \in A \neq \emptyset$ , let  $a := \sup A$ . It is clear that  $a < f^k(x)$  and  $f(a) = 0$ . We distinguish two cases:  $a \neq 0$  and  $a = 0$ . First assume that  $a \neq 0$ . Since  $f^{l-k}(a) = 0 < a$  and  $f^k(x) < f^l(x) = f^{l-k}(f^k(x))$ , by Lemma 4, there is  $z \in (a, f^k(x))$  such that  $f^{l-k}(z) = z$ . Since  $f((a, f^k(x))) \cap \overline{B}_i = \emptyset$ ,  $f(z) \notin \overline{B}_i$  and this leads us to a contradiction because  $z$  would be a periodic point with  $s(z)$  not constant. Secondly, assume that  $a = 0$ . Again we distinguish two cases:  $B \neq \emptyset$  and  $B = \emptyset$ . If  $B \neq \emptyset$  let  $b := \inf B$ . Similarly to the previous case,  $f^k(x) < b$  and  $f(b) = 0$ . Since  $f^{l-k}(b) = 0 < b$  and  $f^k(x) < f^l(x) = f^{l-k}(f^k(x))$ , again by Lemma 4, there is  $z \in (f^k(x), b)$  such that  $f^{l-k}(z) = z$ , which also provides a contradiction. Finally, assume  $B = \emptyset$ , which implies  $\text{Per}(f) \cap B_i = \emptyset$ . If  $f^{l-k}(y) < y$  for some  $y \in B_i$ , we get again by Lemma 4 a fixed point  $z \in (y, f^k(x))$  or  $z \in (f^k(x), y)$ , a contradiction. So  $y \leq f^{l-k}(y)$  for all  $y \in B_i$ . Now, by Lemma 5, there is  $z \in B_i$  such that  $f^{l-k}(z) = z$ , which again provides a contradiction.

Now, let  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  be such that  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is infinite. Let  $(a_j^i)_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{A}_i$  be such that  $f^{a_j^i+1}(x) \notin \overline{B}_i$ . Then  $(f^{a_j^i}(x))_{j=1}^\infty$  is decreasing and therefore it converges. Let  $y_i = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f^{a_j^i}(x)$  (notice also that  $y_i = \lim_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{A}_i \\ j \rightarrow \infty}} f^j(x)$ ). Clearly,  $\omega(x, f) = \{y_i : \mathcal{A}_i \text{ is infinite}\}$ . Then  $\omega(x, f)$  is a periodic orbit. Since  $f$  has no periodic orbits contained in more than one branch, we conclude that  $\omega(x, f) = \{0\}$ , which completes the proof. □

Let  $f \in \mathbf{X}_0$ . Define  $f_i : \overline{B}_i \rightarrow \overline{B}_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , by

$$f_i(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } f(x) \in \overline{B}_i; \\ 0 & \text{if } f(x) \notin \overline{B}_i. \end{cases}$$

Note  $f_i$  is conjugate to an interval map  $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $p(0) = 0$  (recall that  $f_i$  is conjugate to  $p$  if there is a homeomorphism  $\phi : \overline{B}_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $p \circ \phi = \phi \circ f_i$ ). For  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $i < j$ , define  $f_{i,j} : \overline{B}_i \cup \overline{B}_j \rightarrow \overline{B}_i \cup \overline{B}_j$  by

$$f_{i,j}(x) = \begin{cases} f_i(x) & \text{if } x \in \overline{B}_i; \\ f_j(x) & \text{if } x \in \overline{B}_j. \end{cases}$$

Notice that  $f_{i,j}$  is conjugate to an interval map  $g : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  with  $g(0) = 0$ . Define  $\tilde{f} \in \mathbf{X}_0$  by  $\tilde{f}(x) = f_i(x)$  if  $x \in \overline{B}_i$ .

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $f \in \mathbf{X}_0$  have property P. Then for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\omega(f) \cap B_j = \omega(f_j)$ . In particular,  $\omega(f) = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \omega(f_j)$ .*

**PROOF:** Let  $y \in \mathbb{X}$ . If  $s(y)$  is not eventually constant, then  $\omega(y, f) = \{0\}$  and there is nothing to prove. So, assume that  $s(y)$  is eventually constant, that is, there are  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $s_i = s_k = j$  for any integer  $i \geq k$ .

Let  $y_k := f^k(y) \in B_j$ . Clearly  $(f^i(y_k))_{i=0}^\infty \subset B_j$  and hence  $f^i(y_k) = f_j^i(y_k)$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\omega(y, f) = \omega(y_k, f) = \omega(y_k, f_j)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $f \in \mathbf{X}_0$  have property P. Let  $f_{i,j}$  and  $f_i$  be the maps defined above. If  $h(f) = 0$ , then  $h(f_{i,j}) = h(f_i) = 0$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .*

PROOF: By [2, Chapter 4], it holds that  $h(f_{i,j}) = \max\{h(f_i), h(f_j)\}$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . So, we must prove that  $h(f_i) = 0$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . On the other hand, it follows by [8, Corollary DG2] and Lemma 7 that

$$h(f_i) = \sup_{x \in B_i} h(f_i|_{\omega(x, f_i)}) \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} h(f|_{\omega(x, f)}) = h(f) = 0,$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. Main result

**Proof of Theorem 2.** (a). Assume that  $h(f) = 0$ . Following the proof of Theorem 1.5 from [4] we see that  $f^N$  has property P for  $N = n!(n - 1)! \dots 2!$ . Additionally, by [2, Chapter 4],  $h(f^N) = Nh(f) = 0$ . Due to Lemma 3, we can assume without loss of generality that  $f$  has any periodic orbit contained in one branch, that is,  $f$  has property P.

Now, fix  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $x \neq y$ . According to Lemmas 6 and 7, we distinguish three cases: (a1)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(y) = 0$ ; (a2)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(x) = 0$  and there is an  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $f^n(y) \in B_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ; (a3) there is an  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $f^n(y) \in B_i$  and  $f^n(x) \in B_j$  for some  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . If (a1) happens, then clearly  $F_{x,y} = \chi_{(0, \infty)}$ . If (a3) happens, then it is easy to check that  $F_{x,y} = F_{f^{n_0}(x), f^{n_0}(y)} = (F_{i,j})_{f^{n_0}(x), f^{n_0}(y)}$  and  $F_{x,y}^* = F_{f^{n_0}(x), f^{n_0}(y)}^* = (F_{i,j})_{f^{n_0}(x), f^{n_0}(y)}^*$ . This, together with Lemma 8 and Theorem 1, give us  $F_{x,y} = F_{x,y}^*$ . So, assume that (a2) holds and fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By Lemma 8,  $h(f_i) = 0$ . Then by [17, Lemma 4.2], there is a periodic point of  $f_i$ ,  $p \in \overline{B}_i$ , such that  $F_{y,p}(t) = F_{f^{n_0}(y), p}(t) > 1 - \varepsilon$  for  $t \geq \varepsilon$ . On the other hand, it is clear that  $F_{0,x}^*(t) = F_{0,x}(t) = 1 > 1 - \varepsilon$ . Then, following the proof of Proposition 4.3 from [17], we see that  $F_{x,y} = F_{x,y}^*$ .

Now assume that  $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{x,y}(i) = 0$  and let us prove  $F_{x,y} = \chi_{(0, \infty)}$ . By Lemmas 6 and 7, we distinguish two possibilities: (p1)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(y) = 0$ ; (p2) there is an  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$   $f^n(y) \in B_i$ , and  $f^n(x) \in B_i$  with  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . If (p1) happens, then clearly  $F_{x,y} = \chi_{(0, \infty)}$ . If (p2) happens, then notice that  $F_{x,y} = F_{f^{n_0}(x), f^{n_0}(y)} = (F_i)_{f^{n_0}(x), f^{n_0}(y)} = \chi_{(0, \infty)}$  by Lemma 8 and Theorem 1.

(b). Now, assume that  $h(f) > 0$ . By [16], there is an  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f^l$  has a  $k$ -horseshoe. Since  $h(f^l) = lh(f) > 0$ , by Lemma 3 we may assume that  $l = 1$ . There is an invariant compact subset  $Y$  included in at most two branches such

that  $f|_Y$  is semiconjugate to a shift map defined on  $\Sigma = \{(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} : x_n \in \{0, 1\}\}$  (see e.g. [7, Chapter 2]). Then, following [14] or [15], it is easy to see that  $f|_Y$  is distributionally chaotic.  $\square$

**Corollary 9.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  be such that  $0 \in \text{Per}(f)$ . Then  $f$  is distributionally chaotic iff  $h(f) > 0$ .*

PROOF: Just apply Lemma 3 and Theorem 2.  $\square$

**Acknowledgment.** I wish to thank the referee for his/her careful reading and his/her suggestions, which helped me to improve the paper, in particular, for his/her remarks on background and the improvements suggested in Lemmas 3 and 6 and Theorem 2 (b2).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Adler R.L., Konheim A.G., McAndrew M.H., *Topological entropy*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **114** (1965), 309–319.
- [2] Alseda L., Llibre J., Misiurewicz M., *Combinatorial Dynamics and Entropy in Dimension One*, World Scientific Publishing, 1993.
- [3] Alseda L., Moreno J.M., *Linear orderings and the full periodicity kernel for the  $n$ -star*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **180** (1993), 599–616.
- [4] Alseda L., Ye X., *Division for star maps with the branching point fixed*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenian. **62** (1993), 237–248.
- [5] Babilonová M., *Distributional chaos for triangular maps*, Ann. Math. Sil. **13** (1999), 33–38.
- [6] Baldwin S., *An extension of Sarkovskii's Theorem to the  $n$ -od*, Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems **11** (1991), 249–271.
- [7] Block L.S., Coppel W.A., *Dynamics in one dimension*, Lecture Notes in Math. Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [8] Blokh A., *The spectral decomposition for one-dimensional maps*, Dynamics Reported (Jones et al, eds.) **4**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [9] Cánovas J.S., Ruíz-Marín M., Soler-López G., *Distributional chaos in duopoly games*, preprint, 2000.
- [10] Forti G.L., Paganoni L., *A distributionally chaotic triangular map with zero topological sequence entropy*, Math. Pannon. **9** (1998), 147–152.
- [11] Forti G.L., Paganoni L., Smítal J., *Dynamics of homeomorphisms on minimal sets generated by triangular mappings*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **59** (1999), 1–20.
- [12] Hric R., *Topological sequence entropy for maps of the circle*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **41** (2000), 53–59.
- [13] Li T.Y., Yorke J.A., *Period three implies chaos*, Amer. Math. Monthly **82** (1975), 985–992.
- [14] Liao G., Fan Q., *Minimal subshifts which display Schweizer-Smítal chaos and have zero topological entropy*, Science in China **41** (1998), 33–38.
- [15] Málek M., *Distributional chaos for continuous mappings of the circle*, Ann. Math. Sil. **13** (1999), 205–210.
- [16] Llibre J., Misiurewicz M., *Horseshoes, entropy and periods for graph maps*, Topology **32** (1993), 649–664.



- [17] Schweizer B., Smítal J., *Measures of chaos and a spectral decomposition of dynamical systems on the interval*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **344** (1994), 737–754.
- [18] Smítal J., *Chaotic functions with zero topological entropy*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **297** (1986), 269–282.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA Y ESTADÍSTICA, UNIVERSIDAD POLITÉCNICA DE CARTAGENA, PASEO DE ALFONSO XIII, 30203 CARTAGENA (MURCIA), SPAIN

*E-mail:* Jose.Canovas@upct.es

(Received November 22, 2000, revised February 21, 2001)