

ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE KNEADING SPACE OF BIMODAL DEGREE ONE CIRCLE MAPS

LL. ALSEDA

*Departament de Matemàtiques
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès
Spain
E-mail: alseda@mat.uab.cat*

A. FALCÓ

*Departamento de Ciencias, Físicas, Matemáticas y de la Computación
Universidad CEU Cardenal Herrera
San Bartolome 55, 46115 Alfara del Patriarca, Valencia
Spain
E-mail: afalco@uch.ceu.es*

Dedicated to the memory of Valery S. Melnik

In this paper we introduce an index space and two \star -like operators that can be used to describe bifurcations for parameterized families of degree one circle maps. Using these topological tools we give a description of the kneading space, that is, the set of all dynamical combinatorial types for the class of all bimodal degree one circle maps considered as dynamical systems

Keywords: Kneading Theory, Degree one circle maps, Bifurcation space.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2000): 35B40

1. Introduction and statement of Main Theorem

For continuous maps on the interval with finitely many monotonicity intervals, the kneading theory developed by Milnor and Thurston [MT] gives a symbolic description of the dynamics of these maps. This description is given in terms of the kneading invariants which essentially consist on the symbolic orbits of the turning points of the map under consideration. Moreover, this theory also gives a classification of all such maps through these invariants. For

continuous bimodal degree one circle maps similar invariants were introduced by Alsedà and Mañosas [AM]. In that paper, the first part of the program just described was carried through, and relations between the circle maps invariants and the rotation interval were elucidated. Later on, in [AF; Theorem A] the set of all these kneading invariants (the *kneading space*) was characterized. The main goal of this paper is to give a description of the kneading space of the bimodal degree one circle maps using some self-similarity operators which allow us to identify certain subsets with known structure. To

state this description we need the appropriate notation. This paper is, in some sense, a continuation of [AF] and we use heavily the notation and results from that paper. Although we have tried to make this paper self-contained in the introduction we have repeated certain definitions from [AF] for readability.

As it is usual, instead of working with the circle maps themselves we will rather use their liftings to the universal covering space \mathbb{R} . To this end, we introduce the following class \mathcal{A} of maps. First we define \mathcal{L} to be the class of all continuous maps F from \mathbb{R} into itself such that $F(x + 1) = F(x) + 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. That is, \mathcal{L} is the class of all liftings of degree one circle maps. Then we will say that $F \in \mathcal{A}$ if (see Figure 1):

- (1) $F \in \mathcal{L}$.
- (2) There exists $c_F \in (0, 1)$ such that F is strictly increasing in $[0, c_F]$ and strictly decreasing in $[c_F, 1]$.

We note that every map $F \in \mathcal{A}$ has a unique local maximum and a unique local minimum in $[0, 1)$. To define the class \mathcal{A} we restricted ourselves to the case in which F has the minimum at 0. Since each map from \mathcal{L} is conjugate by a translation to a map from \mathcal{L} having the minimum at 0, the fact that in (2) we fix that F has a minimum in 0 is not restrictive.

For a map $F \in \mathcal{A}$ one can define the *kneading pair* denoted by $\mathcal{K}(F)$ (see Definition 2.4) which captures all dynamics of the map F (see [AM; Proposition A]). The kneading space is a subset of the product space $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon \times \mathcal{E}_\delta$ where both \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ are totally ordered spaces equipped with the order topology (see Subsection 2.1). Also, the set of all kneading pairs will be called the *kneading space*. Now, we introduce the following index space. It will be used to characterize a class of basic subsets from each component of the kneading space.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{J} be the index space whose elements are sequences $\underline{x} = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ with terms in $[0, 1] \cup \{\delta, \epsilon\}$, where $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and either $n < \infty$, $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$ and $x_n \in \{0, 1, \delta, \epsilon\} \cup \{(0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}\}$ or $n = \infty$ and $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$.

Consider the set \mathcal{J} endowed with the lexicographical ordering induced by the usual ordering of the real numbers and the following ordering:

$$\delta < 0 < 1 < \epsilon.$$

The ordering of \mathcal{J} will denoted by \prec . Let \mathcal{J}^∞ be the subset of \mathcal{J} which contains all the infinite sequences in \mathcal{J} , and let \mathcal{J}_ϵ^* (respectively, \mathcal{J}_δ^*) be the set of all finite sequences in \mathcal{J} ending with an irrational number union the finite sequences which do not end with δ (respectively, ϵ). Finally, set $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon = \mathcal{J}^\infty \cup \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^*$ and $\mathcal{J}_\delta = \mathcal{J}^\infty \cup \mathcal{J}_\delta^*$. Note that \mathcal{J}_ϵ (respectively, \mathcal{J}_δ) has as maximum the finite sequence ϵ (respectively, 1) and as minimum 0 (respectively, δ). Also we denote by \mathcal{I} the set of all finite sequences which do not end with $0, 1, \epsilon$ or δ , union the empty sequence.

Now we are ready to state the main result of this paper. A crucial observation to the next theorem is that all maps appearing in it are defined in a constructive way using four symbolic operators to be defined in Section 3.

Main Theorem For $F \in \mathcal{A}$ there exist $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \leq b$, and two closed intervals $Q_\epsilon(a)$ in \mathcal{E}_ϵ and $Q_\delta(b)$ in \mathcal{E}_δ such that $\mathcal{K}(F) \in Q_\epsilon(a) \times Q_\delta(b)$. Moreover, the numbers a and b are the endpoints of the rotation interval of F . and the following statements hold.

1. There exists $p_{\epsilon,a} : \mathcal{J}_\epsilon \rightarrow Q_\epsilon(a)$ which is non-decreasing, maps the endpoints of \mathcal{J}_ϵ into the endpoints of $Q_\epsilon(a)$ and if $a \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ then $p_{\epsilon,a}$ is one-to-one. Moreover,


$$\text{Imp}_{\epsilon,a} = Q_\epsilon(a) \setminus \bigcup_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}} (p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}1), p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}\epsilon)).$$

2. There exists

$$\mathcal{P}_\epsilon(a) \subset \bigcup_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}} [p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}1), p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}\epsilon)]$$

with the following property. For each $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon(a)$ there is an $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}$ and a bijective strictly monotone map $u_{\underline{\alpha}}^\epsilon$ from the kneading space of all unimodal maps on the interval to a closed subinterval of $[p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}1), p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}\epsilon)]$ which contains $\underline{\alpha}$ as an endpoint. Moreover, for each $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}$ there exists $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon(a)$ such that $\max(\text{Im}u_{\underline{\alpha}}^\epsilon) = p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}\epsilon)$.

3. There exists $p_{\delta,b} : \mathcal{J}_\delta \rightarrow Q_\delta(b)$ which is non-decreasing, maps the endpoints of \mathcal{J}_δ into the


 Fig. 1. An example of a map F in class \mathcal{A} .

endpoints of $Q_\delta(b)$ and if $b \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ then $p_{\delta,b}$ (respectively, $is one-to-one. Moreover,$

$$\text{Imp}_{\delta,b} = Q_\delta(b) \setminus \bigcup_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}} (p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}\delta), p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}0))$$

$$K_{\delta,b} = \text{Imp}_{\delta,b} \cup \left(\bigcup_{\underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{P}_\delta(b)} \text{Im}u_{\underline{\beta}} \right)$$

4. There exists

$$\mathcal{P}_\delta(b) \subset \bigcup_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}} [p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}\delta), p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}0)]$$

with the following property. For each $\underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{P}_\delta(b)$ there is an $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}$ and a bijective strictly monotone map $u_{\underline{\beta}}^\delta$ from the kneading space of all unimodal maps on the interval to a closed subinterval of $[p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}\delta), p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}0)]$ which contains $\underline{\beta}$ as an endpoint. Moreover, for each $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}$ there exists $\underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{P}_\delta(b)$ such that $\min(\text{Im}u_{\underline{\beta}}^\delta) = p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}\delta)$.

Thus, the above theorem effectively gives a decomposition of the space $Q_\epsilon(a)$ (respectively, $Q_\delta(b)$) into a set

$$K_{\epsilon,a} = \text{Imp}_{\epsilon,a} \cup \left(\bigcup_{\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon(a)} \text{Im}u_{\underline{\alpha}} \right)$$

whose points are completely characterized, and the open intervals in the complement of this set (which are gaps where we have not been able to characterize the sequences in their interior). The role of the above gaps in $Q_\epsilon(a)$ (respectively, $Q_\delta(b)$) is to deal with the first (respectively, second) component of the kneading pairs containing unbounded symbols (see Figure 2 and compare with [HH; Figure 5]). These unbounded symbols appear in the kneading sequences due to the fact that b (respectively, a) can be arbitrarily far from a (respectively, b).

Another feature of the above decomposition theorem is the following one. Assume that we know the first (respectively, second) component of the kneading pair of a given map from class \mathcal{A} having a (respectively, b) as a left (respectively, right) endpoint of the rotation interval up to a given fine length n . Then, from the above theorem we can obtain the minimal interval in $Q_\epsilon(a)$ (respectively, $Q_\delta(b)$) with endpoints in $K_{\epsilon,a}$ (respectively, $K_{\delta,b}$) containing all the first (respectively, second) components of kneading pairs which coincide with




Fig. 2. The description of the closed interval $Q_\epsilon(a)$ using the map $p_{\epsilon,a}$. Note that the gaps also contain the sequences with unbounded symbols.




Fig. 3. The kneading space and its description using the index space and the map given in the Main Theorem.

the given one in the first n symbols (see Figures 3 and 2). Thus, the study of the dynamics (periodic points, topological entropy, ...) of maps associated to the endpoints on these intervals should allow us to bound the dynamics of the given map by using the standard tools arising from kneading theory. In particular, this theorem gives some basic topological tools that we can use to describe bifurcations in parametrized families of bimodal degree one circle maps (see Hockett and Holmes [HH]).

The paper is organized as follows. Unfortunately, the definitions of the $*$ -like operators and the statements of the results using to prove the Main Theorem are rather technical and require a good deal of notation. In particular, before these definitions and statements, for completeness, we need to make a survey on Kneading Theory for maps in \mathcal{A} and to fix the notation we will use when talking about unimodal interval maps (see Section 2). In Section 3 we introduce the four operators to state the results that we use in Section 4 to prove the Main Theorem. Finally, in Sections 5 and 6 we shall prove the results stated in Section 3.

2. A survey on kneading theory for maps in \mathcal{A} and unimodal maps

This section is divided into two sections. The first one it is essentially a survey of the papers by Alsedà and Mañosas [AM] and Alsedà and Falcó [AF]. The second one we will recall basic concepts of the kneading theory of unimodal maps.

2.1. Kneading theory for maps in \mathcal{A}

We start by recalling the notion of itinerary of a point. For $F \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$s(x) = \begin{cases} R & \text{if } D(x) \in (c_F, 1), \\ C & \text{if } D(x) = c_F, \\ L & \text{if } D(x) \in (0, c_F), \\ M & \text{if } D(x) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and $d(x) = E(F(x)) - E(x)$.

Then the *reduced itinerary* of x , denoted by $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)$, is defined as follows. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, set $s_i = s(F^i(x))$ and $d_i = d(F^{i-1}(x))$. Then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)$ is de-

finied by

$$\begin{cases} d_1^{s_1} d_2^{s_2} \dots & \text{if } s_i \in \{L, R\} \text{ for all } i \geq 1, \\ d_1^{s_1} d_2^{s_2} \dots d_n^{s_n} & \text{if } s_n \in \{M, C\} \\ & \text{and } s_i \in \{L, R\} \text{ for all} \\ & i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \end{cases}$$

Note that since $F \in \mathcal{L}$ we have that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x+k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $D(x) \neq D(y)$. We say that x and y are *conjugate* if and only if $F(D(x)) = F(D(y))$. Note also that if x and y are conjugate then they have the same reduced itinerary.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{M, L, C, R\}$ and let $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_0 \alpha_1 \dots$ be a sequence of elements $\alpha_i = d_i^{s_i}$ of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{S}$. We say that $\underline{\alpha}$ is *admissible* if one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

- Definition 2.1.**
1. $\underline{\alpha}$ is infinite, $s_i \in \{L, R\}$ for all $i \geq 1$ and there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|d_i| \leq k$ for all $i \geq 1$.
 2. $\underline{\alpha}$ is finite of length n , $s_n \in \{M, C\}$ and $s_i \in \{L, R\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Notice that any reduced itinerary is an admissible sequence. Now we shall introduce some notation for admissible sequences (and hence for reduced itineraries).

The cardinality of an admissible sequence $\underline{\alpha}$ will be denoted by $|\underline{\alpha}|$ (if $\underline{\alpha}$ is infinite we write $|\underline{\alpha}| = \infty$).

We denote by S the shift operator which acts on the set of admissible sequences of length greater than one as follows : $S(\underline{\alpha}) = \alpha_2 \alpha_3 \dots$ if $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 \dots$. We will write S^k for the k -th iterate of S . Obviously S^k is only defined for admissible sequences of length greater than k . Clearly, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $S^n(\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(F^n(x))$ if $|\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)| > n$.

Let $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n$ and $\underline{\beta} = \beta_1 \beta_2 \dots$ be two sequences of symbols in $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{S}$. We shall write $\underline{\alpha} \underline{\beta}$ to denote the concatenation of $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\underline{\beta}$ (i. e. the sequence $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n \beta_1 \beta_2 \dots$). We also shall use the symbols $\underline{\alpha}^n$ to denote $\overbrace{\underline{\alpha} \underline{\alpha} \dots \underline{\alpha}}^{n \text{ times}}$ and $\underline{\alpha}^\infty$ to denote $\underline{\alpha} \underline{\alpha} \dots$.

Let $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n$, be a sequence of symbols in $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{S}$. Set $\alpha_i = d_i^{s_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We say that $\underline{\alpha}$ is *even* if $\text{Card}\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} | s_i = R\}$ is even. Otherwise we say that $\underline{\alpha}$ is *odd*.

Now we endow the set of admissible sequences with a total ordering. First set $M < L < C < R$. Then we extend this ordering to $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{S}$ lexicographically. That is, we write $d^s < t^m$ if and only if either $d < t$ or $d = t$ and $s < m$. Let now $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots$ and $\underline{\beta} = \beta_1 \beta_2 \dots$ be two admissible sequences such that $\underline{\alpha} \neq \underline{\beta}$. Then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_n \neq \beta_n$ and $\alpha_i = \beta_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. We write $\underline{\alpha} < \underline{\beta}$ if either $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_{n-1}$ is even and $\alpha_n < \beta_n$ or $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_{n-1}$ is odd and $\alpha_n > \beta_n$.

Let $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 \dots$ be an admissible sequence. We say that $\underline{\alpha}$ is *periodic of period n* if $S^n(\underline{\alpha}) = \underline{\alpha}$ and $S^i(\underline{\alpha}) \neq \underline{\alpha}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. We note that if $\underline{\alpha}$ is a periodic sequence of period n , then $|\underline{\alpha}| = \infty$ and there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathcal{S}$ such that $\underline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n)^\infty$. We also note that if x is a periodic (mod 1) point of F such that $|\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)| = \infty$, then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)$ is periodic (recall that $S^n(\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(F^n(x))$) but their periods are not necessarily equal.

The following results show that the above ordering of reduced itineraries is, in fact, the ordering of points in $[0, c_F]$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then*

- (a) *If $x, y \in [0, c_F]$, and $x < y$ then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x) \leq \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(y)$.*
- (b) *If $x, y \in [c_F, 1)$, and $x < y$ then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x) \geq \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(y)$.*

Corollary 2.3. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0) \leq \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x) \leq \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F)$.*

To define the kneading pair of a map $F \in \mathcal{A}$ we introduce the following notation. For a point $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we define the sequences $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^+)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^-)$ as follows. For each $n \geq 0$ there exists $\delta(n) > 0$ such that $d(F^{n-1}(y))$ and $s(F^n(y))$ take constant values for each $y \in (x, x + \delta(n))$ (resp. $y \in (x - \delta(n), x)$). Denote these values by $d(F^{n-1}(x^+))$ and $s(F^n(x^+))$ (resp. $d(F^{n-1}(x^-))$ and $s(F^n(x^-))$). Then we set

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^+) = d(x^+)^{s(F(x^+))} d(F(x^+))^{s(F^2(x^+))} \dots$$

and

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^-) = d(x^-)^{s(F(x^-))} d(F(x^-))^{s(F^2(x^-))} \dots$$

Clearly, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^+)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^-)$ are infinite admissible sequences and, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^+) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F((x+k)^+)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^-) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F((x+k)^-)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, if $x \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and $|\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x)| = \infty$ then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^-) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(x^+)$.

Definition 2.4. Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. The pair $(\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+), \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^-))$ will be called *the kneading pair of F* and will be denoted by $\mathcal{K}(F)$.

From [AM; Proposition A] it follows that $\mathcal{K}(F)$ characterizes the set of reduced itineraries (and hence the dynamics) of a map $F \in \mathcal{A}$.

Let \mathcal{AD} denote the set of all infinite admissible sequences.

Note that for each $F \in \mathcal{A}$ we have that $\mathcal{K}(F) \in \mathcal{AD} \times \mathcal{AD}$. To characterize the pairs in $\mathcal{AD} \times \mathcal{AD}$ that can occur as a kneading pair of a map from \mathcal{A} we will define a subset \mathcal{E} of $\mathcal{AD} \times \mathcal{AD}$ which turns to be the set of all kneading pairs of all maps from \mathcal{A} (see [AF]). To this end we introduce the following notation.

Let $\underline{\alpha} = d_1^{s_1} \alpha_2 \dots$, be an admissible sequence. We will denote by $\underline{\alpha}'$ the sequence $(d_1 + 1)^{s_1} \alpha_2 \dots$. Note that since for $F \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $d(F(0^+)) = d(F(0^-)) - 1$ we can write $(\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+))' = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^-)$.

We will denote by \mathcal{E}^* the set of all pairs $(\underline{\nu}_1, \underline{\nu}_2) \in \mathcal{AD} \times \mathcal{AD}$ such that the following conditions hold:

- (1) $\underline{\nu}'_1 < \underline{\nu}_2$.
- (2) $\underline{\nu}_1 \leq S^n(\underline{\nu}_i) \leq \underline{\nu}_2$ for all $n > 0$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- (3) If for some $n \geq 0$, $S^n(\underline{\nu}_i) = d^R \dots$, then $S^{n+1}(\underline{\nu}_i) \geq \underline{\nu}'_1$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

We note that condition (2) says, in particular, that $\underline{\nu}_1$ and $\underline{\nu}_2$ are minimal and maximal, respectively, according the following definition. Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{AD}$, we say that $\underline{\alpha}$ is *minimal* (respectively *maximal*) if and only if $\underline{\alpha} \leq S^n(\underline{\alpha})$ (respectively $\underline{\alpha} \geq S^n(\underline{\alpha})$) for all $n \in \{1, 2, \dots \mid |\underline{\alpha}| - 1\}$.

As we will see, the above set contains (among others) the kneading pairs of maps from \mathcal{A} with non-degenerate rotation interval. To deal with some special kneading pairs associated to maps with degenerate rotation interval we introduce the following definitions.

For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we set $\epsilon_i(a) = E(ia) - E((i-1)a)$ and $\delta_i(a) = \tilde{E}(ia) - \tilde{E}((i-1)a)$. Also, we set

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = \epsilon_1(a)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_n(a)^L \dots$$

and

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) = \delta_1(a)^L \delta_2(a)^L \dots \delta_n(a)^L \dots$$

Let $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) = (\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a))'$ and let $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)$ denote the sequence that satisfies $(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a))' = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a)$. Let $a = p/q$ with $(p, q) = 1$. We denote by $\widehat{\underline{I}}_R(a)$ the sequence

$$(\delta_1(a)^L \dots \delta_{q-1}(a)^L \delta_q(a)^R)^\infty$$

and by $\widehat{\underline{I}}_R^*(a)$ the sequence which satisfies $(\widehat{\underline{I}}_R^*(a))' = \widehat{\underline{I}}_R(a)$.

To simplify the use of the above sequences the following lemma will be helpful (see [AM; (4.1)–(4.3)]).

Lemma 2.5. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (a) *If $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$ then $\delta_1(a) = \epsilon_1(a) + 1$. Furthermore, if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ then $\delta_i(a) = \epsilon_i(a)$ for all $i > 1$. That is, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$. If $a = p/q$ with $(p, q) = 1$ and $q > 1$ then $\epsilon_i(a) = \delta_i(a)$ for $i = 2, \dots, q-1$, $\delta_q(a) = \epsilon_q(a) - 1$ and, $\epsilon_{i+q}(a) = \epsilon_i(a)$ and $\delta_{i+q}(a) = \delta_i(a)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- (b) *If $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $\epsilon_i(a) = \delta_i(a) = a$ for all $i > 0$.*

Now, for each $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\mathcal{E}_a = \begin{cases} \{(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a)), (\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a)), (\widehat{\underline{I}}_R^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_R(a))\} \\ \text{if } a = p/q \in \mathbb{Q}, \text{ with } (p, q) = 1, \\ \{(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a))\} \text{ if } a \notin \mathbb{Q}. \end{cases}$$

Finally we denote by \mathcal{E} the set $\mathcal{E}^* \cup (\cup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{E}_a)$. The following two results, given by Alsedà and Falcó [AF; Theorem A], characterizes the kneading pairs of the maps from class \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 2.6. *For $F \in \mathcal{A}$ we have that $\mathcal{K}(F) \in \mathcal{E}$. Conversely, for each $(\underline{\nu}_1, \underline{\nu}_2) \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists $F \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{K}(F) = (\underline{\nu}_1, \underline{\nu}_2)$.*

To define the ambient space of the set \mathcal{E} we introduce the following two sets. Let

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon = \{\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{AD} : \exists \underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{AD} \text{ such that } (\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{E}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta = \{\underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{AD} : \exists \underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{AD} \text{ such that } (\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

The following result characterizes the sets \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ (see [F; Theorem 3.1.1]).

Proposition 2.7. *The following statements hold.*

- (a) *$\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ if and only if it is minimal and satisfies that if for some $n \geq 0$, $S^n(\underline{\alpha}) = d^R \dots$ then $S^{n+1}(\underline{\alpha}) \geq \underline{\alpha}'$.*
- (b) *$\underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$ if and only if it is maximal.*

We consider \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ endowed with the order topology and let $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon \times \mathcal{E}_\delta$ be with the product topology. We note that \mathcal{E} is strictly contained in $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon \times \mathcal{E}_\delta$. To see this consider for example the set $A = \{(0^L)^\infty, (1^L)^\infty\}$ of admissible sequences. Since $((-1^L)^\infty, (0^L)^\infty), ((0^L)^\infty, (1^L)^\infty), ((1^L)^\infty, (2^L)^\infty) \in \mathcal{E}$,

we have that $A \subset \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and $A \subset \mathcal{E}_\delta$. In consequence $\{((0^L)^\infty, (1^L)^\infty), ((1^L)^\infty, (0^L)^\infty)\} \subset \mathcal{E}_\epsilon \times \mathcal{E}_\delta$. However, $((0^L)^\infty, (1^L)^\infty) \in \mathcal{E}$ but $((1^L)^\infty, (0^L)^\infty) \notin \mathcal{E}$.

For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we define $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(a)$ as $[\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)] \subset \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\delta(a) = [\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a)] \subset \mathcal{E}_\delta$ (recall that from Theorem 2.6 $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$). From Lemma 2.5(a) we have that if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ then $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(a)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\delta(a)$ are closed intervals degenerated to a point.

The next result gives a characterization of the rotation interval by using the kneading pair (see [AM; Theorem B]). To see this we recall that for $F \in \mathcal{L}$ the rotation interval R_F is defined to be the set

$$\{\rho_F(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

where

$$\rho_F(x) = \rho(x) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n(x) - x}{n}.$$

It is well known (see [I]) that the set R_F is a closed interval, perhaps degenerate to a single point. Also, if $F \in \mathcal{L}$ is a non-decreasing map then

$$R_F = \left\{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F^n(x) - x}{n} \right\}.$$

Theorem 2.8. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $R_F = [a, b]$ if and only if*

$$\mathcal{K}(F) \in \mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(a) \times \mathcal{Q}_\delta(b) = [\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)] \times [\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(b), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(b)].$$

2.2. Kneading theory for unimodal maps

In the last step of this survey we introduce the notation we shall use for the kneading theory of unimodal interval maps. Let I be a closed interval and let $f : I \rightarrow I$ be a continuous map. We say that f is *unimodal* if

1. $f(\max I) = f(\min I) \in \partial I$
2. There exists $c \in \text{Int}(I)$ such that the maps $f|_{[\min I, c]}$ and $f|_{[c, \max I]}$ are homeomorphisms.

The set of all unimodal maps from I to itself will be denoted by $U(I)$. A map $f \in U(I)$ will be called *positive* if $f|_{[\min I, c]}$ is increasing. Otherwise, f will be called *negative*.

Let $f \in U(I)$ and let $x \in I$. We associate with x a finite or infinite sequence of the symbols L, C, R called its itinerary. To do it we introduce the following notation. Let $f : I \rightarrow I$ be continuous. We will say that f is *locally increasing* (respectively *decreasing*) at $x \in I$ if there exists an open (in I) neighborhood V of x such that $f|_V$ is increasing (respectively decreasing). Now, we define the i -th address of a point x , that we denote by $\theta_i(x)$, as follows:

$$\theta_i(x) = \begin{cases} L & \text{if } f^i \text{ is locally increasing at } x. \\ C & \text{if } f^i(x) = c, \\ R & \text{if } f^i \text{ is locally decreasing at } x. \end{cases}$$

We define the itinerary of x denoted by $\underline{\theta}_f(x)$ as follows

1. $\underline{\theta}_f(x) = \theta_0(x)\theta_1(x)\dots\theta_n(x)\dots$ if $\theta_i(x) \in \{L, R\}$ for all $i \geq 0$.
2. $\underline{\theta}_f(x) = \theta_0(x)\theta_1(x)\dots\theta_n(x)$ if $\theta_n(x) = C$, and $\theta_i(x) \in \{L, R\}$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in I$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\theta_n(y)$ takes constant value L or R in the interval $(x, x + \delta)$. We denote this value by $\theta_n(x^+)$. In a similar way we can define $\theta_n(x^-)$. With this notation we set $\underline{\theta}_f(x^+) = \theta_1(x^+)\theta_2(x^+)\dots$ and $\underline{\theta}_f(x^-) = \theta_1(x^-)\theta_2(x^-)\dots$. We note that if $\underline{\theta}_f(x)$ is infinite then $\underline{\theta}_f(x) = \underline{\theta}_f(x^+) = \underline{\theta}_f(x^-)$.

The sequence $\underline{\theta}_f(f(c)^+)$ is called the *kneading sequence of f* . We will denote it by $k(f)$.

Let $\underline{A} = A_0A_1\dots$ be a sequence of elements $A_i \in \{L, C, R\}$. We say that \underline{A} is *admissible* if one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

1. $\underline{A} = A_0A_1\dots A_n\dots$ if $A_i \in \{L, R\}$ for all $i \geq 0$.
2. $\underline{A} = A_0A_1\dots A_n$ if $A_n = C$, and $A_i \in \{L, R\}$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Now, we introduce an ordering in the set of all admissible sequences. We set $L < C < R$ and we extend this ordering lexicographically to the set of all admissible sequences as follows. Let $K_0K_1\dots K_n$ be a finite (or empty) sequence of symbols L, R . We say that $K_0K_1\dots K_n$ is even (respectively odd) if it has an even (respectively odd) number of R 's. Assume that $\underline{K} = K_0K_1\dots$ and $\underline{K}' = K'_0K'_1\dots$ are admissible sequences such that $\underline{K} \neq \underline{K}'$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $K_i = K'_i$ for $i < n$ and $K_n \neq K'_n$. Then we say that $\underline{K} < \underline{K}'$ if either

1. $K_n < K'_n$ and $K_0K_1\dots K_{n-1}$ is even.
2. $K_n > K'_n$ and $K_0K_1\dots K_{n-1}$ is odd.

We note that if $x < y$ and $f \in U(I)$ then $\underline{\theta}_f(x) \leq \underline{\theta}_f(y)$ if f is positive and $\underline{\theta}_f(x) \geq \underline{\theta}_f(y)$ if f is negative.

The *shift operation* S on admissible sequences is defined as follows. If $\underline{K} = K_0K_1\dots$ then we set $S(\underline{K}) = K_1K_2\dots$ which is also an admissible sequence. If $K_0 = C$, then S is undefined. We write S^n to denote the n -th iterate of S . Note that for each $x \in I$ and $f \in U(I)$ we have $S(\underline{\theta}(x)) = (\underline{\theta}(f(x)))$.

An admissible sequence \underline{K} will be called *maximal* if and only if $S^n(\underline{K}) \leq \underline{K}$ for each $n < |\underline{K}|$, where $|\underline{K}|$ denotes the length of \underline{K} . We note that for each $f \in U(I)$ (independently of the fact that f is positive or negative), $k(f)$ is maximal and admissible with length infinite. Given $\underline{K} = K_0K_1\dots$, an admissible sequence, we will write $\widehat{\underline{K}}$ to denote $\widehat{K}_0\widehat{K}_1\dots$ where $\widehat{L} = R$, $\widehat{R} = L$ and $\widehat{C} = C$. We note that \underline{K} is maximal if and only if $\widehat{\underline{K}}$ is minimal; that is, $S^n(\widehat{\underline{K}}) \geq \widehat{\underline{K}}$ for each $n < |\underline{K}|$.

From [CE], it follows that for each admissible infinite maximal sequence \underline{K} there exist $f, g \in U(I)$, f positive and g negative, such that $k(f) = k(g) = \underline{K}$. We shall denote by \mathcal{K} the set of all admissible infinite maximal sequences.

3. Self-similarity operators

In this section first we state the results that we will use to prove the Main Theorem. In Subsection 3.1

we define the \star -operators and we state the main result about this operators. In Subsection 3.2 we define the \odot -operators and state the result which studies them.

3.1. The \star -operators

The aim of this subsection is to characterize the sets of sequences which appear as the first (respectively second) component of the kneading pair of a map $F \in \mathcal{A}$ for which there exist $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a closed interval J containing c_F (respectively 0) such that $(F^q - p)|_J$ is a unimodal map. We make this study at a symbolic level by using a \star -operator which relates certain subsets of the symbolic spaces \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ with the space of kneading sequences of unimodal maps. Moreover, we will show how the “unimodal symbolic space” is embedded into \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ .

We start by introducing some notation. Let Ξ denote the set of all finite sequences with symbols in $\mathbb{Z} \times \{L, R\}$ (of course we consider the empty sequence as an element of Ξ).

Now we consider the set of sequences which occur as reduced itineraries of periodic critical points. Indeed we will denote by \mathcal{P}_ϵ (respectively \mathcal{P}_δ) the set of all minimal sequences of the form $\underline{\beta}d^M$ with $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying that if for some $n \in \{1, \dots, |\underline{\beta}|\}$, $S^{n-1}(\underline{\beta}d^M) = t^R \dots$ then $S^n(\underline{\beta}d^M) > \underline{\beta}'d^M$ (respectively the set of all maximal sequences of the form $\underline{\beta}d^C$) and such that if $\underline{\beta}$ is not empty then $\{(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty, \underline{\beta}(d-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty\} \subset \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ (respectively $\{(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty, (\underline{\beta}d^R)^\infty\} \subset \mathcal{E}_\delta$).

We are now ready to define the \star -operators. We start by defining the operator $\star_\delta : \mathcal{P}_\delta \times \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{AD}$ as follows. Let $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta}d^C \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$ and $\underline{K} = K_1K_2 \dots \in \mathcal{K}$. Then we define

$$\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta \underline{K} = \begin{cases} \underline{\beta}d^{K_1}\underline{\beta}d^{K_2}\underline{\beta} \dots & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is even,} \\ \underline{\beta}d^{\widehat{K}_1}\underline{\beta}d^{\widehat{K}_2}\underline{\beta} \dots & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Now we define $\star_\epsilon : \mathcal{P}_\epsilon \times \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{AD}$. Let $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$ and $s \in \{L, R\}$. We set

$$\chi(s, \underline{\beta}) = \begin{cases} \underline{\beta} & \text{if } s = L, \\ \underline{\beta}' & \text{if } s = R. \end{cases}$$

Also, for $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ we set

$$\varphi(s, d) = \begin{cases} d^L & \text{if } s = L, \\ (d-1)^R & \text{if } s = R. \end{cases}$$

Let $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta}d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$ and $\underline{K} = K_1K_2 \dots \in \mathcal{K}$. Then we define $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}$ as follows. If $\underline{\beta}$ is not empty then

$$\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} = \begin{cases} \underline{\beta}\varphi(K_1, d)\chi(K_1, \underline{\beta})\varphi(K_2, d)\chi(K_2, \underline{\beta}) \dots & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is even,} \\ \underline{\beta}\varphi(\widehat{K}_1, d)\chi(K_1, \underline{\beta})\varphi(\widehat{K}_2, d)\chi(K_2, \underline{\beta}) \dots & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

If $\underline{\beta}$ is empty then $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} = d_1^{K_1}d_2^{K_2} \dots$ where, if $K_1 = L$ then $d_i = \underline{d}$ for all $i \geq 1$ and if $K_1 = R$ then $d_1 = \underline{d} - 1$ and

$$d_i = \begin{cases} \underline{d} + 1 & \text{if } K_{i-1}K_i = RL, \\ \underline{d} & \text{if } K_{i-1}K_i \in \{LL, RR\}, \\ \underline{d} - 1 & \text{if } K_{i-1}K_i = LR, \end{cases}$$

for $i \geq 2$.

The main result of this subsection which studies the properties of the \star -operators is the following.

Theorem A *Let $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta}d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$, $\underline{\alpha} = \underline{\beta}d^C \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$ and $\underline{K} \in \mathcal{K}$. Then $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and $\underline{\alpha} \star_\delta \underline{K} \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$. If $\underline{\beta}$ is even then $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon$ is order reversing and $\underline{\alpha} \star_\delta$ is order preserving. Otherwise, $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon$ is order preserving and $\underline{\alpha} \star_\delta$ is order reversing. Moreover $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K}$ and $\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta \mathcal{K}$ are connected in \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ respectively.*

Theorem A will be proved in Section 5. It characterizes at a symbolic level the “unimodal boxes” in the spaces \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ . Indeed, if we consider the set \mathcal{K} endowed with the order topology (that is, $\mathcal{K} = [L^\infty, RL^\infty]$) then, from Theorem A, we see that if $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta}d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$ (respectively $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta}d^C \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$), then

$$\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K} = \begin{cases} [\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon RL^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty] & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is even,} \\ [\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon RL^\infty] & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

(respectively

$$\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta \mathcal{K} = \begin{cases} [\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta RL^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\delta L^\infty] & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is odd,} \\ [\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta L^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\delta RL^\infty] & \text{if } \underline{\beta} \text{ is even} \end{cases})$$

where, given two sequences $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{AD}$ with $\underline{\alpha} \leq \underline{\beta}$, $[\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}]$ denotes the set of all admissible sequences lying between $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\underline{\beta}$.

The set $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K}$ will be called the ϵ -unimodal box of $\underline{\gamma}$ and the set $\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta \mathcal{K}$ will be called the δ -unimodal box of $\underline{\gamma}$.

3.2. The \odot -operators

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. We denote by Σ_k the set of sequences in $\{k^L, (k+1)^L\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $\underline{\alpha} = d_1^L d_2^L \dots$ and $\underline{\beta} = t_1^L t_2^L \dots$ be two sequences in Σ_k . We consider in Σ_k the topology defined by the metric $d(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{-i} |d_i - t_i|$.

With this topology, Σ_k is a compact metric space. Let $S_k : \Sigma_k \rightarrow \Sigma_k$ denote the usual shift transformation restricted to Σ_k . Clearly, S_k is continuous. Let $\pi_k : \Sigma_k \rightarrow \Sigma_0$ be the order preserving homeomorphism defined by $\pi_k(d_1^L d_2^L \dots) = (d_1 - k)^L (d_2 - k)^L \dots$. Clearly, $S_0 \circ \pi_k = \pi_k \circ S_k$.

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define the sets $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(k) = \Sigma_k \cap \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{B}_\delta(k) = \Sigma_k \cap \mathcal{E}_\delta$. We note that the sets \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ are invariant under "translations". That is, if $d_1^{s_1} d_2^{s_2} \dots$ is a sequence in \mathcal{E}_ϵ (respectively in \mathcal{E}_δ) then $(d_1 + k)^{s_1} (d_2 + k)^{s_2} \dots$ also belongs to \mathcal{E}_ϵ (respectively \mathcal{E}_δ). Therefore, $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(k) = \pi_k^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0))$ and $\mathcal{B}_\delta(k) = \pi_k^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_\delta(0))$. From Proposition 2.7 we have that $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(k)$ (respectively $\mathcal{B}_\delta(k)$) are the minimal (respectively maximal) sequences in Σ_k .

For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we will denote $a - \tilde{E}(a)$ by $\tilde{D}(a)$. Also, $\mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ will be denoted by \mathbb{Q}^* .

We note that from Lemma 2.5, if $a = p/q \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ with $(p, q) = 1$ and $q \neq 2$ then the finite sequences $\epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L$ and $\delta_2(a)^L \dots \delta_{q-1}(a)^L$ are equal. We will denote this finite sequence by $\underline{r}(a)$ (we take the empty sequence as $\underline{r}(1/2)$).

Now we are ready to define the \odot -operators.

For $\alpha = d^L$ with $d \in \{0, 1\}$ we set $\hat{\alpha} = (1-d)^L$. Then for $a \in (0, 1]$ and $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$ we define

$$a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = \begin{cases} 0^L \underline{r}(a) \alpha_1 \hat{\alpha}_1 \underline{r}(a) \alpha_2 \hat{\alpha}_2 \dots & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Q}^*, \\ \hat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) & \text{if } a \notin \mathbb{Q}^* \\ & \text{and } \underline{\alpha} = (1^L)^\infty, \\ \hat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) & \text{if } a \notin \mathbb{Q}^* \\ & \text{and } \underline{\alpha} \neq (1^L)^\infty. \end{cases}$$

We extend the above definition to each $a \in \mathbb{R}$ by setting $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = \pi_{\tilde{E}(a)}^{-1}(\tilde{D}(a) \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha})$.

Now, we define the \odot_δ version of the \odot -operator as follows. Let $a \in [0, 1)$ and $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)$ be. Then we set

$$a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha} = \begin{cases} 1^L \underline{r}(a) \alpha_1 \hat{\alpha}_1 \underline{r}(a) \alpha_2 \hat{\alpha}_2 \dots & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Q}^*, \\ \hat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) & \text{if } a \notin \mathbb{Q}^* \\ & \text{and } \underline{\alpha} = (0^L)^\infty, \\ \hat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) & \text{if } a \notin \mathbb{Q}^* \\ & \text{and } \underline{\alpha} \neq (0^L)^\infty. \end{cases}$$

and we extend the above definition to each $a \in \mathbb{R}$ by $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha} = \pi_{\tilde{E}(a)}^{-1}(\tilde{D}(a) \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha})$.

The next result which we will be proved in Subsection 6.1 gives a first motivation to the \odot -operators.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $a \odot_\epsilon (0^L)^\infty = \hat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)$, $a \odot_\epsilon (1^L)^\infty = \hat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$, $a \odot_\delta (0^L)^\infty = \hat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a)$ and $a \odot_\delta (1^L)^\infty = \hat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a)$.*

From the above proposition we see that the fundamental boxes can be written as $\mathcal{Q}_\epsilon(a) = [a \odot_\epsilon (0^L)^\infty, a \odot_\epsilon (1^L)^\infty]$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\delta(a) = [a \odot_\delta (0^L)^\infty, a \odot_\delta (1^L)^\infty]$. The next theorem is the main result of this subsection.

For $\underline{\alpha} \in \Sigma_k$, $\underline{\alpha} = d_1^L d_2^L \dots$ we define the *symbolic rotation number* of $\underline{\alpha}$ as

$$\rho(\underline{\alpha}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i.$$

Theorem B *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$. Then the following statements hold:*

- Let $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$ with $\underline{\alpha} < \underline{\beta}$. Then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} \leq b \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta}$. Moreover if $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} < a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta}$.
- Let $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)$ with $\underline{\alpha} < \underline{\beta}$. Then $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha} \leq b \odot_\delta \underline{\beta}$. Moreover if $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ then $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha} < a \odot_\delta \underline{\beta}$.
- Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$. Then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\tilde{E}(a)) \subset \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and $\rho(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) = a$.
- Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)$. Then $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\tilde{E}(a)) \subset \mathcal{E}_\delta$ and $\rho(a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}) = a$.
- Let $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ and $(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \times \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)$ be such that $\underline{\alpha} \neq (1^L)^\infty$ and $\underline{\beta} \neq (0^L)^\infty$. If $S^n(\underline{\alpha}) \leq \underline{\beta}$ and $S^n(\underline{\beta}) \geq \underline{\alpha}$ for all $n \geq 0$, then $(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}, a \odot_\delta \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{E}^* \subset \mathcal{E}$.

We note that if $(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{E}$, by Theorem 2.6 and Proposition 4.3 of [AF] we have that $\underline{\alpha}' \leq \underline{\beta}$, $S^n(\underline{\alpha}) \leq \underline{\beta}$ and $S^n(\underline{\beta}) \geq \underline{\alpha}$ for all $n \geq 0$. Thus from Theorem B(e) we have the following.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ and let $(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}) \in (\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \times \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)) \cap \mathcal{E}$ be such that $\underline{\alpha} \neq (1^L)^\infty$ and $\underline{\beta} \neq (0^L)^\infty$. Then $(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}, a \odot_\delta \underline{\beta}) \in \mathcal{E}^* \subset \mathcal{E}$.*

We will prove Theorem B in Subsection 6.2.

We recall that in Subsection 3.1 we have defined the unimodal box of a periodic sequence $\underline{\gamma}$ from \mathcal{P}_ϵ (respectively \mathcal{P}_δ) as $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K} = \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon [L^\infty, RL^\infty]$ (respectively $\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta \mathcal{K} = \underline{\gamma} \star_\delta [L^\infty, RL^\infty]$). Thus, in order that the unimodal boxes of $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ and $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}$ are defined, it is necessary that these sequences are periodic. The next result characterizes the periodic sequences of the form $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ and $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}$. It will be proved in Subsection 6.3.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. The following statements hold.*

- (a) *Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \setminus \{(0^L)^\infty\}$ be periodic. If $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ is not periodic. If $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ is periodic if and only if $\underline{\alpha} = (1^L)^\infty$. Moreover, $a^M \in P_\epsilon$ and $a \odot_\epsilon (1^L)^\infty = a^M \star_\epsilon L^\infty$. If $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ is periodic. Moreover, there exists $\underline{\beta d^M} \in P_\epsilon$ such that $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = \underline{\beta d^M} \star_\epsilon L^\infty$.*
- (b) *Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \setminus \{(0^L)^\infty\}$ be periodic. If $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ then $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}$ is not periodic. If $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}$ is periodic if and only if $\underline{\alpha} = (0^L)^\infty$. Moreover, $a^C \in P_\delta$ and $a \odot_\delta (0^L)^\infty = a^C \star_\delta L^\infty$. If $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ then $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}$ is periodic. Moreover, there exists $\underline{\beta d^C} \in P_\delta$ such that $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha} = \underline{\beta d^C} \star_\delta L^\infty$.*

Now we can define the *unimodal box* of a sequence of the form $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ as follows. Let $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \setminus \{(0^L)^\infty\}$ be periodic. Then, with the notation of Proposition 3.3(a), we set

$$\mathcal{U}_\epsilon(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) = \begin{cases} \underline{\beta d^M} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K} & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Q}^*, \\ a^M \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K} & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \underline{\alpha} = (1^L)^\infty. \end{cases}$$

Let now $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \setminus \{(0^L)^\infty\}$ be periodic. With the notation of Proposition 3.3(b), we set

$$\mathcal{U}_\delta(a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}) = \begin{cases} \underline{\beta d^C} \star_\delta \mathcal{K} & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Q}^*, \\ a^C \star_\delta \mathcal{K} & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \underline{\alpha} = (0^L)^\infty. \end{cases}$$

4. Proof of Main Theorem

Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $R_F = [a, b]$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$. By using Theorem 2.8 it follows the first statement of the Main Theorem.

Now, we will define the map $p_{\epsilon,a} : \mathcal{J}_\epsilon \rightarrow Q_\epsilon(a)$ (respectively, $p_{\delta,a} : \mathcal{J}_\delta \rightarrow Q_\delta(a)$) in two steps. First, we will introduce the notation that will allow us to speak about iterated \odot -operators.

Let $x_1, x_2 \in (0, 1]$ and $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$. We note that if $\underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$ then, by Theorem B(c) and the definition of \odot_ϵ , $x_i \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta}$ also lies in $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$. Therefore, the sequence

$$x_1 \odot_\epsilon (x_2 \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha})$$

is well defined. Now we take $x_1, x_2 \in (k, k+1]$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and we extend the notation to this case as follows. Let

$$x_1 \odot_\epsilon (x_2 \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) = \pi_k^{-1}(\tilde{D}(x_1) \odot_\epsilon (\tilde{D}(x_2) \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha})).$$

In a similar way let $x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1)$ and $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0)$. Then, by using Theorem B(d), the sequence

$$x_1 \odot_\delta (x_2 \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha})$$

is well-defined. If $x_1, x_2 \in [k, k+1)$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ then we set

$$x_1 \odot_\delta (x_2 \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}) = \pi_k^{-1}(D(x_1) \odot_\delta (D(x_2) \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha})).$$

In the first step we define $p_{\epsilon,a}$ from \mathcal{J}_ϵ^* (respectively, \mathcal{J}_δ^*) into $Q_\epsilon(a)$ (respectively, $Q_\delta(a)$). Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\underline{x}\omega \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^*$ (respectively, $\underline{x}\omega \in \mathcal{J}_\delta^*$). Assume that $\underline{x} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1} \in \mathcal{I}$, if $n = 1$ (i.e. \underline{x} is the empty sequence) we set

$$p_{\epsilon,a}(\omega) = \begin{cases} a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(0) & \text{if } \omega = 0, \\ a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \notin (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}, \\ a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(1) & \text{if } \omega = 1, \\ a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(1) & \text{if } \omega = \epsilon \end{cases}$$

(respectively,

$$p_{\delta,a}(\omega) = \begin{cases} a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(0) & \text{if } \omega = \delta, \\ a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(0) & \text{if } \omega = 0, \\ a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \notin (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}, \\ a \odot_\epsilon \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(1) & \text{if } \omega = 1. \end{cases}$$

Otherwise, if $n \geq 2$ we set $p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}\omega) = a \odot_\epsilon p_{\epsilon,x_1}(x_2 x_3 \cdots x_{n-1} \omega)$ (respectively, $p_{\delta,a}(\underline{x}\omega) = a \odot_\delta p_{\delta,x_1}(x_2 x_3 \cdots x_{n-1} \omega)$).

Recall that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(1) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(1) = (1^L)^\infty$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(0) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(0) = (0^L)^\infty$. From Proposition 3.1 and Theorem B(a)–(b) it follows the following.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the maps $p_{\epsilon,a} : \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^* \rightarrow Q_\epsilon(a)$ and $p_{\delta,a} : \mathcal{J}_\delta^* \rightarrow Q_\delta(a)$ are non-decreasing. Moreover, if $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ then $p_{\epsilon,a}$ and $p_{\delta,a}$ are strictly increasing.*

To extend the definition of $p_{\epsilon,a}$ and $p_{\delta,a}$ to \mathcal{J}^∞ , respectively, we introduce the following notation. For $\underline{x} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{J}$ we set $\lambda_0^n(\underline{x}) = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n 0$ and $\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}) = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for each $\underline{x} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{J}^\infty$ we have that*

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))] \in B_\epsilon(\tilde{E}(a)) \text{ and} \\ \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [p_{\delta,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\delta,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))] \in B_\delta(E(a)).$$

To prove this proposition we shall use the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))) = 0 \text{ and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_{\delta,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\delta,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))) = 0$$

Proof. Let $a = p/q \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, with $(p, q) = 1$. Without loss of generality may assume that $\tilde{E}(a) = 0$. If $p_{\epsilon,x_1}(0) = d_{1,1}^L d_{1,2}^L \cdots$ and $p_{\epsilon,x_1}(1) = t_{1,1}^L t_{1,2}^L \cdots$ are two sequences in $B_\epsilon(0)$ then, since

$$p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^1(\underline{x})) = a \odot_\epsilon p_{\epsilon,x_1}(0) \\ = 0^L \underline{r}(a) d_{1,1}^L \widehat{d}_{1,1}^L \underline{r}(a) d_{1,2}^L \widehat{d}_{1,2}^L \underline{r}(a) \cdots \\ \text{and} \\ p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^1(\underline{x})) = a \odot_\epsilon p_{\epsilon,x_1}(1) \\ = 0^L \underline{r}(a) t_{1,1}^L \widehat{t}_{1,1}^L \underline{r}(a) t_{1,2}^L \widehat{t}_{1,2}^L \underline{r}(a) \cdots,$$

we have that

$$d(p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^1(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^1(\underline{x}))) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \left(2^{-qi} |d_{1,i} - t_{1,i}| + 2^{-(q+1)i} |\widehat{d}_{1,i} - \widehat{t}_{1,i}| \right).$$

Because the differences between these two sequences occur at the positions $q, q+1, 2q, 2q+1, \dots$. Finally, by using the fact that $|d_{1,i} - t_{1,i}| = |\widehat{d}_{1,i} - \widehat{t}_{1,i}|$, we obtain

$$d(p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^1(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^1(\underline{x}))) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \left(2^{-qi} + 2^{-(qi+1)} \right) |d_{1,i} - t_{1,i}| \\ = \frac{3}{2} \sum_{i=1}^\infty 2^{-qi} |d_{1,i} - t_{1,i}| \\ < \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 - 2^{-q}} - 1 \right).$$

Now, assume that $x_1 = p_1/q_1$, with $(p_1, q_1) = 1$, $p_{\epsilon,x_2}(0) = d_{2,1}^L d_{2,2}^L \cdots$ and $p_{\epsilon,x_2}(1) = t_{2,1}^L t_{2,2}^L \cdots$, then

$$p_{\epsilon,x_1}(x_2 0) = x_1 \odot_\epsilon p_{\epsilon,x_2}(0) \\ = 0^L \underline{r}(x_1) d_{2,1}^L \widehat{d}_{2,1}^L \underline{r}(x_1) d_{2,2}^L \widehat{d}_{2,2}^L \underline{r}(x_1) \cdots \\ \text{and} \\ p_{\epsilon,x_1}(x_2 1) = x_1 \odot_\epsilon p_{\epsilon,x_2}(1) \\ = 0^L \underline{r}(x_1) t_{2,1}^L \widehat{t}_{2,1}^L \underline{r}(x_1) t_{2,2}^L \widehat{t}_{2,2}^L \underline{r}(x_1) \cdots$$

Note that in this case the differences between these two sequences appear at the positions $q_1 q_1 + 1, 2q_1, 2q_1 + 1, \dots$. Since $p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_i^2(\underline{x})) = a \odot_\epsilon p_{\epsilon,x_1}(x_2 i)$ for $i = 0$ and 1 and by using some similar arguments as above, it is not difficult to prove that the differences between the two sequences will take place at the $qq_1, qq_1 + 1, 2qq_1, 2qq_1 + 1, \dots$ positions. Thus,

$$d(p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^2(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^2(\underline{x}))) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \left(2^{-qq_1 i} + 2^{-(qq_1 i + 1)} \right) |d_{2,i} - t_{2,i}| \\ < \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 - 2^{-qq_1}} - 1 \right).$$

Proceeding inductively, set $x_i = p_i/q_i$, with $(p_i, q_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, $p_{\epsilon,x_n}(0) = d_{n,1}^L d_{n,2}^L \cdots$ and $p_{\epsilon,x_n}(1) = t_{n,1}^L t_{n,2}^L \cdots$ then

$$d(p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \left(2^{-qq_1 \cdots q_{n-1} i} + 2^{-(qq_1 \cdots q_{n-1} i + 1)} \right) |d_{n,i} - t_{n,i}| \\ < \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 - 2^{-qq_1 \cdots q_{n-1}}} - 1 \right).$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))) = 0,$$

because $q_i, q \geq 2$, and then the first equality follows. The second one can be computed in a similar way ■

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.2. We only prove the first statement, the second one is given in a similar way. First at all we remark that $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\tilde{E}(a))$, the minimal sequences in two symbols, is a closed invariant set of $\Sigma_{\tilde{E}(a)}$, because the shift map is continuous.

Let $\underline{x} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{J}^\infty$, if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}^*$ then by the definition of \odot_ϵ we have that $p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})) = p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x})) = \widehat{I}_\delta^*(a) \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\widetilde{E}(a))$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and the proposition follows. Now, assume that $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$. By using the fact that

$$\lambda_0^n(\underline{x}) \prec \lambda_0^{n+1}(\underline{x}) \prec \lambda_1^{n+1}(\underline{x}) \prec \lambda_1^n(\underline{x}),$$

from Lemma 4.1 we have that $[p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^{n+1}(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^{n+1}(\underline{x}))]$ is strictly contained in $[p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))] \subset \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\widetilde{E}(a)) \subset \Sigma_{\widetilde{E}(a)}$. Then, $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))] \neq \emptyset$, because $\Sigma_{\widetilde{E}(a)}$ is a compact set. Moreover, by using Lemma 4.3 and the fact that $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\widetilde{E}(a))$ is a closed set in $\Sigma_{\widetilde{E}(a)}$, we have that $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))] \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\widetilde{E}(a))$ and the proposition follows. ■

Now, let $a \in \mathbb{R}$ then, by using Proposition 4.2, we can define $p_{\epsilon,a} : \mathcal{J}^\infty \rightarrow Q_\epsilon(a)$ by

$$p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}) = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\epsilon,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))]$$

and $p_{\delta,a} : \mathcal{J}^\infty \rightarrow Q_\delta(a)$ by

$$p_{\delta,a}(\underline{x}) = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [p_{\delta,a}(\lambda_0^n(\underline{x})), p_{\delta,a}(\lambda_1^n(\underline{x}))].$$

We note that for $\underline{x} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{J}^\infty$ we have that

$$p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}) \notin (p_{\epsilon,a}(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n 1), p_{\epsilon,a}(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \epsilon))$$

and

$$p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}) \notin (p_{\delta,a}(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \delta), p_{\delta,a}(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n 0))$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By the construction of $p_{\epsilon,a}$ and $p_{\delta,a}$ we obtain the following corollary, it resumes all said above and gives the proof of statements 1 and 3 of our Main Theorem.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (a) *The map $p_{\epsilon,a} : \mathcal{J}_\epsilon \rightarrow Q_\epsilon(a)$ is non-decreasing, maps the endpoints of \mathcal{J}_ϵ into the endpoints of $Q_\epsilon(a)$ and if $a \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ then $p_{\epsilon,a}$ is one-to-one. Moreover,*

$$\text{Imp}_{p_{\epsilon,a}} = Q_\epsilon(a) \setminus \bigcup_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}} (p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}1), p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}\epsilon)).$$

- (b) *The map $p_{\delta,b} : \mathcal{J}_\delta \rightarrow Q_\delta(a)$ is non-decreasing, maps the endpoints of \mathcal{J}_δ into the endpoints of $Q_\delta(b)$ and if $a \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ then $p_{\delta,b}$ is one-to-one. Moreover,*

$$\text{Imp}_{p_{\delta,b}} = Q_\delta(a) \setminus \bigcup_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{I}} (p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}\delta), p_{\delta,b}(\underline{x}0))$$

Remark 4.5. It is not difficult to see that in the case that $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ and $\underline{x} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{J}^\infty$ is such that $x_i = a$ for all $i \geq 1$. Then we have that $a \odot_\epsilon p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}) = p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x})$ and $a \odot_\delta p_{\delta,a}(\underline{x}) = p_{\delta,a}(\underline{x})$. That is, the sequences $p_{\epsilon,a}(\underline{x}) \in Q_\epsilon(a)$ and $p_{\delta,a}(\underline{x}) \in Q_\delta(a)$ are, respectively, fixed points of the operators $a \odot_\epsilon : \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \rightarrow Q_\epsilon(a)$ and $a \odot_\delta : \mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \rightarrow Q_\delta(a)$, respectively.

Finally, statements 2 and 4 follow from the definition of $\mathcal{P}_\epsilon, \mathcal{P}_\delta$ and the \star -operators given in Section 3.1 and Proposition 6.3. This ends the proof of the Main Theorem.

5. Proof of Theorem A

This section is organized as follows. In Subsection 5.1 we give some technical results and in Subsection 5.2 we prove Theorem A. Lastly, in Subsection 5.3, we give some remarks to Theorem A.

5.1. Preliminary results

In this subsection we study the itineraries of the critical points when they are periodic and some of the basic properties of the \star -operators. We start with the following technical lemmas and definitions.

Let $F \in \mathcal{L}$ and let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the set $\{y \in \mathbb{R} : y = F^n(x) \pmod{1} \text{ for } n = 0, 1, \dots\}$ will be called the *(mod. 1) orbit* of x by F . We stress the fact that if P is a (mod. 1) orbit and $x \in P$, then $x + k \in P$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let P be a (mod. 1) orbit of a map $F \in \mathcal{L}$. We say that P is a *twist orbit* if F restricted to P is increasing. If a periodic (mod. 1) orbit is twist then we say that P is a *twist periodic orbit*.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (a) *Assume that 0 is a periodic (mod 1) point of period n . Then there exist $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $\widehat{I}_F(0^+)$ is either $(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ with $\underline{\beta}$*

even or $\underline{\beta}d^R(\underline{\beta}'d^R)^\infty$ with $\underline{\beta}$ odd. Moreover, if $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = (\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ then $\underline{\beta}(d-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ and if $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = \underline{\beta}d^R(\underline{\beta}'d^R)^\infty$ then $(\underline{\beta}(d+1)^L)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$.

(b) Assume that c_F is a periodic (mod 1) point of period n . Then there exist $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^-)$ is either $(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ with $\underline{\beta}$ even or $(\underline{\beta}d^R)^\infty$ with $\underline{\beta}$ odd. Moreover, if $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^-) = (\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ then $(\underline{\beta}d^R)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$ and if $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^-) = (\underline{\beta}d^R)^\infty$ then $(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$.

Proof. We start proving statement (a). Assume first that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0) = \underline{\beta}t^M$ for some $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$ of length $n-1$ even. If $x > 0$ is sufficiently close to 0 we have that $F^n|_{[0,x]}$ is increasing and $F^n(x)$ is also close to $F^n(0) = 0$. Therefore, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = \underline{\beta}t^L\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+)$. So $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = (\underline{\beta}t^L)^\infty$. Now, assume that $\underline{\beta}$ is odd. Take $x < 0$ sufficiently close to 0. Then $F^n|_{[x,0]}$ is increasing and $F^n(x)$ is also close to $F^n(0)$. Thus $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^-) = \underline{\beta}'(t-1)^R\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^-)$. Therefore $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^-) = (\underline{\beta}'(t-1)^R)^\infty$ and, in consequence, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = \underline{\beta}(t-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(t-1)^R)^\infty$.

To prove the second statement of (a) in this case we only need to show that there exists $G \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_G(0^+) = \underline{\beta}(t-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(t-1)^R)^\infty$ if $\underline{\beta}$ is even or $\widehat{\underline{I}}_G(0^+) = (\underline{\beta}t^L)^\infty$ if $\underline{\beta}$ is odd. We note that the proof of Lemma 5.4 of [AF] does not depend on the fact that the orbit under consideration is twist. So, if $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0) = \underline{\beta}t^M$ the statement follows from Lemma 5.4 of [AF] and the part of (a) already proven.

Now, assume that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0) = \underline{\gamma}k^C$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F) = \underline{\nu}t^M$ where $\underline{\gamma}, \underline{\nu} \in \Xi$, $\underline{\gamma}$ has length n_1-1 , $\underline{\nu}$ has length n_2-1 and $n_1+n_2=n$. If $x > 0$ is sufficiently close to 0 then $F^{n_1}(x)$ is close to c_F . If $\underline{\gamma}$ is even then $F^{n_1}|_{[0,x]}$ is strictly increasing and, hence, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = \underline{\gamma}k^R\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^+)$. Otherwise, if $\underline{\gamma}$ is odd, $F^{n_1}|_{[0,x]}$ is strictly decreasing and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = \underline{\gamma}k^L\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^-)$. Let now $x > c_F$ be sufficiently close to c_F . If $\underline{\nu}$ is even, then $F^{n_2}|_{[c_F,x]}$ is strictly decreasing and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^+) = \underline{\nu}(t-1)^R\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^-)$. Otherwise, if $\underline{\nu}$ is odd, $F^{n_2}|_{[c_F,x]}$ is strictly increasing and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^+) = \underline{\nu}t^L\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+)$. We recall that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^+) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F^-)$ and

that if $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^-) = (\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+))'$. Hence, if we set

$$\underline{\beta} = \begin{cases} \underline{\gamma}k^R\underline{\nu} & \text{if } \underline{\gamma} \text{ is even,} \\ \underline{\gamma}k^L\underline{\nu} & \text{if } \underline{\gamma} \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

we get

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0^+) = \begin{cases} \underline{\beta}(t-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(t-1)^R)^\infty & \text{if } \underline{\nu} \text{ is even,} \\ (\underline{\beta}t^L)^\infty & \text{if } \underline{\nu} \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

This ends the proof of the first part of statement (a).

Now, we prove the second part of statement (a) in this case. Let P be the (mod. 1) orbit of 0 by F . Then $0, c_F \in P$. Let $x_0 = \min(P \cap (c_F, 1])$, $x_1 = \max(P \cap (0, c_F))$ and $J = (c_F, x_0)$ if $\underline{\gamma}$ is even and $J = (x_1, c_F)$ if $\underline{\gamma}$ is odd. Let $G \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ be close enough to F such that $c_G \in J$, $G|_{[0,1] \setminus J} = F|_{[0,1] \setminus J}$ and $G(c_G) \in (F(c_F), \min(P \cap (F(c_F), \infty)))$. Thus, clearly, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_G(0) = \underline{\beta}k^M$. From the proof of the previous case, since $\underline{\beta}$ has always different parity than $\underline{\nu}$, we get

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_G(0^+) = \begin{cases} (\underline{\beta}t^L)^\infty & \text{if } \underline{\nu} \text{ is odd} \\ & (\underline{\beta} \text{ even}), \\ \underline{\beta}(t-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(t-1)^R)^\infty & \text{if } \underline{\nu} \text{ is even} \\ & (\underline{\beta} \text{ odd}), \end{cases}$$

and the proof of (a) follows by using G instead of F . Statement (b) follows in a similar way. \blacksquare

The next lemma gives some properties of the sequences in \mathcal{P}_ϵ and \mathcal{P}_δ .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\underline{\beta} = \beta_1 \dots \beta_{n-1} \in \Xi$. The following statements hold.*

(a) *If $\underline{\beta}d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$. Then $(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ and $(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty$ are periodic of period n .*

(b) *If $\underline{\beta}d^C \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$. Then $(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ and $(\underline{\beta}d^R)^\infty$ are periodic of period n .*

Proof. By the minimality of $\underline{\beta}d^M$ we have that $S^j(\underline{\beta}d^M) > \underline{\beta}d^M$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Assume that $(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ is periodic of period $k < n$ and set $m = n/k$. Then $\underline{\beta}d^L = (\beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1}d^L)^m$ and, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1}d^L)^{m-1} \beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1}d^M \\ &= \underline{\beta}d^M < S^{n-k}(\underline{\beta}d^M) = \beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1}d^M. \end{aligned}$$

In consequence $\beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1}$ is even and so

$$\beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1} d^L > \beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1} (d-1)^R.$$

Since $\underline{\beta} d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$ then

$$\beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1} d^L (\underline{\beta}(d-1)^R) (\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon.$$

Hence, by Proposition 2.7(a), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1} d^L)^{m-1} \beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1} (d-1)^R (\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty \\ & \leq \beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1} (d-1)^R \dots \\ & = S^{n-k} (\underline{\beta}(d-1)^R (\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty); \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. The proof of statement (a) in the case $(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty$ and statement (b) follow in a similar way. \blacksquare

The next lemma studies the relation between the periodic sequences in \mathcal{E}_ϵ and \mathcal{E}_δ and their shifts.

Lemma 5.3. *The following statements hold.*

- (a) Let $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1 \dots \beta_n)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$. Then $S^j(\underline{\beta}) > \underline{\beta}^*$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ where $\underline{\beta}^*$ is either $\underline{\beta}$ if $\beta_j = d^L \dots$ or $\underline{\beta}'$ if $\beta_j = d^R \dots$.
- (b) Let $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1 \dots \beta_n)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$. Then $S^j(\underline{\beta}) < \underline{\beta}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. We prove (a). Statement (b) follows in a similar way. Let $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$. If $\beta_{j-1} = d^L$ for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ then, by Proposition 2.7, since $S^{j-1}(\underline{\beta}) \geq \underline{\beta}$ and $S^{j-1}(\underline{\beta}) \neq \underline{\beta}$ the lemma follows in an obvious way. If $\beta_{j-1} = d^R$ for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $S^{j-1}(\underline{\beta}) \geq \underline{\beta}'$. Assume that $S^{j-1}(\underline{\beta}) = \underline{\beta}'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \overbrace{\beta_j \beta_{j+1} \dots \beta_n \beta_1 \dots \beta_{j-1}}^n \overbrace{\beta_j \dots \beta_n \beta_1 \dots \beta_{j-1}}^n \dots \\ & = \beta'_1 \beta_2 \dots \beta_n \beta_1 \dots \beta_n \dots \end{aligned}$$

and, hence, $\beta'_1 = \beta_j = \beta_1$; a contradiction. This ends the proof of (a). \blacksquare

The proof of the following lemma follows by direct computation.

Lemma 5.4. *The following statements hold.*

- (a) Let $f \in U(I)$ be negative. If $f(c) \geq c$, then $k(f) = L^\infty$. Otherwise $k(f) = RS(k(f))$ and there exists $c_- < c < c_+$ with $f(c_-) = f(c_+) = c$. Then the following statements hold.

- (a.1) $\underline{\theta}(x) = RL \dots$ if and only if $x \in [\inf I, c_-)$.
- (a.2) $\underline{\theta}(x) = RR \dots$ if and only if $x \in (c_-, c)$.
- (a.3) $\underline{\theta}(x) = LR \dots$ if and only if $x \in (c, c_+)$.
- (a.4) $\underline{\theta}(x) = LL \dots$ if and only if $x \in (c_+, \sup I]$.

- (b) Let $f \in U(I)$ be positive. If $f(c) \leq c$, then $k(f) = L^\infty$. Otherwise $k(f) = RS(k(f))$ and there exists $c_- < c < c_+$ with $f(c_-) = f(c_+) = c$. Then the following statements hold.

- (b.1) $\underline{\theta}(x) = LR \dots$ if and only if $x \in (c_+, \sup I]$.
- (b.2) $\underline{\theta}(x) = RR \dots$ if and only if $x \in (c, c_+)$.
- (b.3) $\underline{\theta}(x) = LR \dots$ if and only if $x \in (c_-, c)$.
- (b.4) $\underline{\theta}(x) = LL \dots$ if and only if $x \in [\inf I, c_-)$.

Let $I, J \subset \mathbb{R}$ be two closed intervals. Let $f : I \rightarrow I$ and $g : J \rightarrow J$ be two continuous maps. We say that f is *topologically conjugate* to g if there exists a homeomorphism $h : I \rightarrow J$ such that $h \circ f = g \circ h$. From [CE] (see also [dMvS]) we have that if $f \in U(I)$ and $g \in U(J)$ are topologically conjugate then $k(f) = k(g)$.

The next proposition justifies the definition of the \star -operators in the case $\underline{\beta}$ empty.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\underline{K} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (a) There exist $F \in \mathcal{A}$ and $J \subset \mathbb{R}$, a closed interval containing 0, such that $(F-d)|_J$ is unimodal with $k((F-d)|_J) = \underline{K}$ and $\widehat{I}_F(0^+) = d^M \star_\epsilon \underline{K}$.
- (b) There exists $F \in \mathcal{A}$ and $J \subset \mathbb{R}$, a closed interval containing c_F , such that $(F-d)|_J$ is unimodal with $k((F-d)|_J) = \underline{K}$ and $\widehat{I}_F(c_F^-) = d^C \star_\delta \underline{K}$.

Proof. Let $f \in U(I)$ be negative such that $k(f) = \underline{K}$. Take $\epsilon > 0$ and $J = [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$, and let $h : I \rightarrow J$ be the unique increasing map such that $h(c) = 0$ and h is affine in $[\min I, c]$, $[c, \max I]$. Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $F(x) = h \circ f \circ h^{-1}(x) + d$ for each $x \in J$. Clearly, $(F-d)|_J$ is topologically conjugate

to f . Then $k((F-d)|_J) = k(f) = K_1K_2\dots$. We observe that since $(F-d)$ maps J into itself we have that $F(J) \subset J+d$. Since $F \in \mathcal{L}$ we have that for all $j \geq 1$, $F^j(J) \subset J+jd$. On the other hand, since $s((F-d)^j(0^+)) = s(F^j(0^+))$ we get that for all $j \geq 1$, $s(F^j(0^+)) = K_j$. Assume that $(F-d)(0) \geq 0$, then $f(c) \geq c$ and, from Lemma 5.4, we have that $k(f) = L^\infty$. Since $F(0) \geq d$ we have that $F^j(0) \in [0, \epsilon] + jd$ for all $i \geq 0$. Then for all $i \geq 1$ we have $d(F^j(0^+)) = jd - (j-1)d = d$ and $\widehat{L}_F(0^+) = d^M \star_\epsilon \underline{K}$. Now, assume that $(F-d)(0) < 0$. Then $f(c) < c$ and, from Lemma 5.4(a), we have that $K_1 = R$. Since $F(0) < d$ we obtain that $F(0) \in [-\epsilon, 0] + d$. Then $d(0^+) = d-1$ and so $\widehat{L}_F(0^+) = (d-1)^R \dots$. Let $j \geq 2$. Assume that $K_{j-1}K_j = RL$. Then $S^{j-2}(k(f)) = \underline{\theta}(f^{j-2}(x)) = RL\dots$ for $x > f(c)$, close enough to $f(c)$. From Lemma 5.4 (a.1) we have that $f^{j-1}(c) \in [\min I, c_-)$ and, hence, $F^{j-1}(0) \in [-\epsilon, h(c_-)] + (j-1)d$. Moreover $F^j(0) \in (0, \epsilon] + jd$. Then $d(F^{j-1}(0^+)) = jd - ((j-1)d-1) = d+1$. If $K_{j-1}K_j = LL$, then, $F^{j-1}(0) \in (h(c_+), \epsilon] + (j-1)d$ and $F^j(0) \in (0, \epsilon] + id$. So $d(F^{j-1}(0^+)) = jd - (j-1)d = d$. If $K_{j-1}K_j = RR$, then $F^{j-1}(0^+) \in (h(c_-), 0) + (j-1)d$ and $F^j(0^+) \in [-\epsilon, 0] + jd$. Thus, $d(F^{j-1}(0^+)) = (jd-1) - ((j-1)d-1) = d$. Finally, if $K_{j-1}K_j = LR$ then $F^{j-1}(0) \in (0, h(c_+)) + (j-1)d$, $F^j(0) \in [-\epsilon, 0] + jd$. Therefore, $d(F^{j-1}(0^+)) = (jd-1) - (j-1)d = d-1$. From the definition of \star_ϵ we have that $\widehat{L}_F(0^+) = d^M \star_\epsilon \underline{K}$. Statement (b) follows in a similar way. \blacksquare

5.2. Proof of Theorem A

We only will prove Theorem A for \star_ϵ . The proof for \star_δ follows in a similar way. Let $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta}d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$ and $\underline{K} \in \mathcal{K}$. We only will prove the statement in the case $\underline{\beta}$ even. The case $\underline{\beta}$ odd follows analogously. First we are going to prove that $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$. If $\underline{\beta}$ is empty then this follows from Proposition 5.5(a), the definition of \mathcal{E}_ϵ and Theorem 2.6. Assume now that $\underline{\beta}$ is not empty. We note that $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty = (\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty$ and $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon R^\infty = \underline{\beta}(d-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty$. Since $\underline{\beta}d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$ these two sequences belong to \mathcal{E}_ϵ and we are done. Thus we can assume that $\underline{K} \notin \{L^\infty, R^\infty\}$. From Collet and Eckmann [CE] we have that $\underline{K} = RL\dots$. Let $\underline{\beta} = \beta_1\beta_2\dots\beta_{n-1}$, $\underline{K} = K_1K_2\dots$ and $j = nm$ with $m \geq 0$. Then we have $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} = \underline{\beta}\varphi(K_1, d)\chi(K_1, \underline{\beta})\varphi(K_2, d)\chi(K_2, \underline{\beta})\dots$. It is not difficult to see that, since \underline{K} is maximal, then $\varphi(K_1, d)\varphi(K_2, d)\dots \in \mathcal{AD}$ is minimal. Therefore,

if $K_{m-1} = L$ then

$$\begin{aligned} S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) &= \underline{\beta}\varphi(K_m, d)\chi(K_m, \underline{\beta})\varphi(K_{m+1}, d)\dots \\ &\geq \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) &= \underline{\beta}'\varphi(K_m, d)\chi(K_m, \underline{\beta})\varphi(K_{m+1}, d)\dots \\ &\geq (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})' \end{aligned}$$

and, by Proposition 2.7(a), we are done. So, take now $j = nm + p$ with $m \geq 0$, $1 \leq p < n$. Then we have to compare

$$\begin{aligned} S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) &= \underline{\beta}_{p+1}\dots\beta_{n-1}\varphi(K_m, d)\chi(K_m, \underline{\beta})\varphi(K_{m+1}, d)\dots \\ &= \underline{v}\varphi(K_m, d)\chi(K_m, \underline{\beta})\varphi(K_{m+1}, d)\dots, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} &= \beta_1\dots\beta_{n-p-1}\beta_{n-p}\dots\beta_{n-1}\varphi(K_1, d)\dots \\ &= \underline{v}\beta_{n-p}\dots\beta_{n-1}\varphi(K_1, d)\dots \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Set

$$\underline{v}^* = \begin{cases} \underline{v} & \text{if } \beta_p = t^L, \\ \underline{v}' & \text{if } \beta_p = t^R, \end{cases}$$

where $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})^* = \underline{v}^*\beta_{n-p}\dots\beta_{n-1}\varphi(K_1, d)\dots$. By Proposition 2.7(a) we have to show that $S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) \geq (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})^*$. Since $\underline{\beta}d^M \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$, $\underline{\beta}(d-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty, (\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$. Therefore, by Proposition 2.7(a) and Lemma 5.3(a), for all $1 \leq p < n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{v}(d-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty &\geq \underline{v}^*\beta_{n-p}\dots\beta_{n-1}(d-1)^R(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and

$$\underline{v}d^L(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty > \underline{v}^*\beta_{n-p}\dots\beta_{n-1}d^L(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty. \tag{4}$$

Clearly if $\underline{v} \neq \underline{v}^*$ then $S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) > (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})^*$ and we are done. So assume that $\underline{v} = \underline{v}^*$. First we consider the case \underline{v} even. If $\varphi(K_m, d) = d^L$ then either $d^L > \beta_{n-p}$ and, from (1) and (2), we see that $S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) > (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})^*$ or $d^L = \beta_{n-p}$. In the latter, since $\underline{v}d^L$ is even, from (4) we have that

$$(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty > \beta_{n-p+1}\dots\beta_{n-1}d^L(\underline{\beta}d^L)^\infty;$$

a contradiction with Lemma 5.3(a). Now, let $\varphi(K_m, d) = (d-1)^R$. From (3) we have

$$\beta_{n-p} \leq (d-1)^R.$$

If $\beta_{n-p} < (d-1)^R$, then $S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) > (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})^*$ by (1) and (2). So, assume that $\beta_{n-p} = (d-1)^R$. Then $\underline{\nu}(d-1)^R = \underline{\nu}^*(d-1)^R$ is odd and, from (3), we have that

$$(\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty \leq \beta_{n-p+1} \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R (\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty.$$

We note that $S^{n-p}((\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty) = (\beta_{n-p+1} \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \beta_1' \dots \beta_{n-p})^\infty$. Therefore, if

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_1' \beta_2 \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \\ &= \beta_{n-p+1} \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \beta_1' \dots \beta_{n-p} \end{aligned}$$

then, $S^{n-p}((\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty) = (\underline{\beta}'(d-1)^R)^\infty$ which is a contradiction by Lemma 5.2(a). In consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_1' \beta_2 \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \\ & < \beta_{n-p+1} \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \beta_1' \dots \beta_{n-p} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and, by (1) and (2), $S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) > (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})^*$ if $\varphi(K_{m+1}, d) = (d-1)^R$ (recall that $\varphi(K_1, d) = (d-1)^R$). Now, assume that $\varphi(K_{m+1}, d) = d^L$. If

$$\beta_1' \beta_2 \dots \beta_{n-1} < \beta_{n-p+1} \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \beta_1' \dots \beta_{n-p-1}$$

then we also have $S^j(\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}) > (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K})^*$. Otherwise, since $\underline{\beta}'$ is even, from (5), we have that

$$\beta_1' \beta_2 \dots \beta_{n-1} = \beta_{n-p+1} \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \beta_1' \dots \beta_{n-p-1}$$

and $\beta_{n-p} \geq d^L$. If $\beta_{n-p} > d^L$ then the statement follows as above. Hence, $\beta_{n-p} = d^L$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_1' \beta_2 \dots \beta_{n-1} d^L \\ &= \beta_{n-p+1} \dots \beta_{n-1} (d-1)^R \beta_1' \dots \beta_{n-p-1} \beta_{n-p}. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction because the left hand side of the above equation has different parity than the right hand side. The case $\underline{\nu}$ odd is handled by analogy. This ends the proof of the first statement of the theorem.

Now, we are going to prove that $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon$ is order reversing. Let $\underline{K}, \underline{K}' \in \mathcal{K}$ be such that $\underline{K} < \underline{K}'$. Set $\underline{K} = K_1 K_2 \dots$ and $\underline{K}' = K_1' K_2' \dots$. Then there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $K_1 \dots K_{n-1} = K_1' \dots K_{n-1}'$ and $K_n < K_n'$ if $K_1 \dots K_{n-1}$ is even and $K_n > K_n'$ if $K_1 \dots K_{n-1}$ is odd. We will only consider the case $K_1 \dots K_{n-1}$ even. The proof in the case odd follows similarly. Then we have $K_n = L < R = K_n'$. Assume that $\underline{\beta}$ is not the empty sequence. Then $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} = \underline{\beta} d_1^{K_1} \chi(K_1, \underline{\beta}) d_2^{K_2} \dots \chi(K_{n-1}, \underline{\beta}) d_n^{K_n} \dots$ and

$$\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}' = \underline{\beta} t_1^{K_1'} \chi(K_1, \underline{\beta}) t_2^{K_2'} \dots \chi(K_{n-1}, \underline{\beta}) t_n^{K_n'} \dots$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \underline{\beta} d_1^{K_1} \chi(K_1, \underline{\beta}) d_2^{K_2} \dots \chi(K_{n-1}, \underline{\beta}) \\ &= \underline{\beta} t_1^{K_1'} \chi(K_1, \underline{\beta}) t_2^{K_2'} \dots \chi(K_{n-1}, \underline{\beta}), \end{aligned}$$

$d_n^{K_n} = d^L, t_n^{K_n'} = (d-1)^R$ and $\underline{\beta} d_1^{s_1} \chi(K_1, \underline{\beta}) d_2^{s_2} \dots \chi(K_{n-1}, \underline{\beta})$ is even. Then, clearly, $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}' < \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}$. Now, assume that $\underline{\beta}$ is the empty sequence. Then

$$\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K} = d_1^{K_1} \dots d_{n-1}^{K_{n-1}} d_n^{K_n} \dots$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}' &= t_1^{K_1'} \dots t_{n-1}^{K_{n-1}'} t_n^{K_n'} \dots \\ &= d_1^{K_1} \dots d_{n-1}^{K_{n-1}} t_n^{K_n'} \dots \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows as in the case $\underline{\beta}$ not empty. From the assumptions only one of the following two possibilities can occur: either $K_{n-1} K_n = RL$ and $K_{n-1}' K_n' = RR$, or $K_{n-1} K_n = LL$ and $K_{n-1}' K_n' = LR$. Assume that $K_{n-1} K_n = RL$ and $K_{n-1}' K_n' = RR$. Then $d_n^{K_n} = (d+1)^L$ and $t_n^{K_n'} = d^R$ and $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}' < \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}$. Now, let $K_{n-1} K_n = LL$ and $K_{n-1}' K_n' = LR$. Then $d_n^{K_n} = d^L$ and $t_n^{K_n'} = (d-1)^R$ and also, $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}' < \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \underline{K}$. This concludes the proof of the second statement.

The third statement follows from Theorem II.2.7 of [CE]. \blacksquare

5.3. Remarks to Theorem A

In the preceding subsection we have shown that the unimodal boxes $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K}$ and $\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta \mathcal{K}$ are connected. However, the topological structure of the spaces

$$\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(\underline{\gamma}) = (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K}) \times \mathcal{E}_\delta$$

(respectively

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta(\underline{\gamma}) = \mathcal{E}_\epsilon \times (\underline{\gamma} \star_\delta \mathcal{K})$$

is much more complicated. We illustrate this fact with the following examples. Let $\underline{\gamma} = 0^L 1^M$. Then $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty = (0^L 1^L)^\infty$ and $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon RL^\infty = 0^L 0^R 1^L 1^L (0^L 1^L)^\infty$. Therefore, $\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K} = [(0^L 1^L)^\infty, 0^L 0^R 1^L 1^L (0^L 1^L)^\infty]$.

Example 1: the space $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(\underline{\gamma})$ contains ‘‘accumulating’’ holes in \mathcal{E} consisting of ‘‘horizontal lines’’. Let

$\underline{\alpha} = (3^L)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$. Clearly $[\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon RL^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty] \times \{\underline{\alpha}\} \subset \mathcal{E}^* \subset \mathcal{E}$. Let now $\underline{\alpha}_n = (3^L)^n (-1^L)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$. Then $\underline{\alpha}_n < \underline{\alpha}_{n+1} < \underline{\alpha}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $S^{n-1}(\underline{\alpha}_n) = (-1^L)^\infty < \underline{\omega}$ for all $\underline{\omega} \in \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K}$ we have that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $[\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon RL^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty] \times \{\underline{\alpha}_n\} \notin \mathcal{E}$. We also note that $d(\underline{\alpha}_n, \underline{\alpha})$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 2: the “accumulating” holes in \mathcal{E} consisting of “horizontal lines” are intertwined with “horizontal lines” inside \mathcal{E} . Let $\underline{\beta} = (3^L)^n (2^L)^\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $[\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon RL^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty] \times \{\underline{\beta}_n\} \subset \mathcal{E}$ but $d(\underline{\alpha}_n, \underline{\beta}_n) = \sum_{i=n+1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^i} = \frac{1}{2^n}$ which tends to 0 when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 3: there exists “rectangles” in

$$\mathcal{E} \cap (\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon \mathcal{K} \times \underline{\beta} \star_\delta \mathcal{K}).$$

Let $\underline{\beta} = 3^M$. Then $\underline{\beta} \star_\delta L^\infty = (3^L)^\infty$ and $\underline{\beta} \star_\delta RL^\infty = 3^R (3^L)^\infty$. It is not difficult to see that $[\underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon RL^\infty, \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty] \times [\underline{\beta} \star_\delta L^\infty, \underline{\beta} \star_\delta RL^\infty] \subset \mathcal{E}$.

6. Proof of Theorem B

In Subsection 6.1 we give some preliminary results and prove Proposition 3.1 and in Subsection 6.2 we prove Theorem B.

6.1. Preliminary results

We start by introducing some technical results about the sequences $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a)$. The following lemma is due to Alsedà and Mañosas [AM].

Lemma 6.1. *The following statements hold:*

- (a) *If $a = p/q$ with $(p, q) = 1$ then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a)$ are periodic with period q (i.e. $S^q(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$ and $S^q(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a)) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a)$).*
- (b) *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$. Then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) < \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(b)$, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) < \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(b)$, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) < \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(b)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) < \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(b)$.*

From Theorem 2.6 and Proposition 2.7 we have the following.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) \in \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$ are minimal and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) \in \mathcal{E}_\delta$ are maximal.*

Lemma 6.3. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\epsilon_1(a) \leq \epsilon_i(a) \leq \epsilon_1(a) + 1$ and $\delta_1(a) - 1 \leq \delta_i(a) \leq \delta_1(a)$ for all $i \geq 1$.*

Proof. We recall that $\epsilon_i(a) = E(ia) - E((i-1)a) = E(a + (i-1)a) - E((i-1)a)$. Then, from the fact that $E(x) + E(y) \leq E(x+y) \leq E(x) + E(y) + 1$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we have that $\epsilon_1(a) \leq \epsilon_i(a) \leq \epsilon_1(a) + 1$ for all $i \geq 1$. In a similar way we can prove that $\delta_1(a) - 1 \leq \delta_i(a) \leq \delta_1(a)$ for all $i \geq 1$. ■

The next lemma follows by direct computation.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $\epsilon_i(a) = \delta_i(a) = a$ for all $i > 0$.*

Lemma 6.5. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) \in \Sigma_{\widehat{E}(a)}$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) \in \Sigma_{E(a)}$.*

Proof. From Lemmas 6.1(a) and 2.5, the fact that $\epsilon_1(a) = \delta_1(a) - 1 = E(a) = \widehat{E}(a)$ if $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and Lemma 6.3 the statement follows when $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$. If $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, then from Lemma 6.4 we have that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) = (a^L)^\infty$, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) = (a+1)^L (a^L)^\infty$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) = (a-1)^L (a^L)^\infty$. Since $E(a) = a$ and $\widehat{E}(a) = a - 1$ the statement follows also in this case. ■

We now have the following corollaries which will be useful in the next section.

Corollary 6.6. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(\widehat{E}(a))$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a), \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(E(a))$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 6.5 and 6.2. ■

Corollary 6.7. *Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = \pi_{\widehat{E}(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(\widehat{D}(a)))$, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) = \pi_{\widehat{E}(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(\widehat{D}(a)))$, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) = \pi_{E(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(D(a)))$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) = \pi_{E(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(D(a)))$.*

Proof. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i(a) &= E(ia) - E((i-1)a) \\ &= E(i(D(a) + E(a))) - E((i-1)(D(a) + E(a))) \\ &= E(iD(a)) + iE(a) - E((i-1)D(a)) - (i-1)E(a) \\ &= E(iD(a)) - E((i-1)D(a)) + E(a) \\ &= \epsilon_i(D(a)) + E(a). \end{aligned}$$

If $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$, since $\widehat{E}(a) = E(a)$ and $\widehat{D}(a) = D(a)$ we have that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = \pi_{\widehat{E}(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(\widehat{D}(a)))$. Otherwise, by Lemma 6.4, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = (E(a)^L)^\infty$ and since $\widehat{D}(a) = 1$ and $\widehat{E}(a) = E(a) - 1$ we get $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) =$

$\pi_{E(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(\widehat{D}(a)))$. Also, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) = \pi_{E(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(D(a)))$ if $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Otherwise, $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) = (E(a) + 1)^L (E(a)^L)^\infty = \pi_{E(a)}^{-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(D(a)))$. The other two cases follow in a similar way. ■

Lemma 6.8. *Let $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ be with $(p, q) = 1$. Then $\epsilon_q(a) = \epsilon_1(a) + 1$.*

Proof. If $\epsilon_q(a) \neq \epsilon_1(a) + 1$ then, by Lemma 6.3, we can assume that $\epsilon_q(a) = \epsilon_1(a)$. Then, by Lemma 6.1(a), $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = (\epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L)^\infty$. By Lemma 6.2,

$$S^{q-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)) = (\epsilon_1(a)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a))^\infty \geq \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a).$$

Thus, by Lemma 6.3, $\epsilon_2(a) = \epsilon_1(a)$ and, proceeding inductively, we obtain that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = (\epsilon_1(a)^L)^\infty$; a contradiction by Lemma 6.1(a). ■

Remark 6.9. In view of Lemmas 2.5 and 6.8, for $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) &= \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a))^\infty, \\ \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) &= (\epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L)^\infty, \\ \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta(a) &= ((\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L)^\infty \quad \text{and} \\ \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a) &= (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) ((\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a))^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The above observation already allow us to prove Proposition 3.1.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1. We will only prove that $a \odot_\epsilon (1^L)^\infty = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$. The proof of the other three statements follows similarly. From Corollary 6.7 and the definition of \odot_ϵ we can assume that $a \in (0, 1]$. Now, the statement follows directly from the definitions if $a \notin \mathbb{Q}^*$. If $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ the statement follows from Remark 6.9 and the fact that $\epsilon_1(a) = 0$. ■

6.2. Proof of Theorem B

We start with a technical lemma.

Lemma 6.10. *Let $a = p/q \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ be with $(p, q) = 1$, Then*

$$(a) \quad \epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) > \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L.$$

(b) *For $1 < j \leq q - 1$ we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \\ &\epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \\ &> \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \\ &(\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \\ &> \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L. \end{aligned}$$

(c)

$$(\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) < (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L.$$

(d) *For $1 < j \leq q - 1$ we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \\ &(\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \\ &< (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \\ &\epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \\ &< (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since, by Remark 6.9 and Lemma 6.2,

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) = \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a))^\infty$$

and is a minimal sequence we have

$$\epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) \geq \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L.$$

If

$$\epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) = \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) &= \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \dots \\ &> \epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L \dots \\ &= S^{q-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)); \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction with the minimality of $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)$. This ends the proof of (a). Now, we prove (b). Again by the minimality of $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)$, for $1 < j \leq q - 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \\ &(\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \\ &\geq \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L. \end{aligned}$$

If in the above inequality the equality holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &S^{j-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)) \\ &= \epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \\ &(\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \\ &= \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \dots \\ &< \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) \dots = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a); \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \\ & (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \\ & > \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \epsilon_1(a)^L. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we prove the second part of statement (b). Since by Remark 6.9 and Lemma 6.2

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = (\epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L)^\infty$$

is a periodic minimal sequence of period q then, for $1 < j \leq q - 1$, we have that $S^{j-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)) > \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \\ & (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \epsilon_1(a)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{j-1}(a)^L \\ & > \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, the equality holds and so $S^{j-1}(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$ with $j < q$; a contradiction. This concludes the proof of statement (b). By using the sequences $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)$ instead of $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon^*(a)$, statements (c) and (d) follow in a similar way. ■

PROOF OF THEOREM B. We start by proving (a). Assume that $\widetilde{E}(a) = k < \widetilde{E}(b)$. From the definition of \odot_ϵ it follows that $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} \in \Sigma_k$ and $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta} \in \Sigma_{\widetilde{E}(b)}$. Then, if $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = k^L \dots$, clearly, $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} < a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta}$. If $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = (k+1)^L \dots$ then, from the definition of \odot_ϵ it follows that $a \notin \mathbb{Q}^*$. Moreover, from the definition of $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$ and $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)$ (see also Lemma 6.4) it follows that $a = k+1$ and $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(k+1) = ((k+1)^L)^\infty$. Clearly, $((k+1)^L)^\infty < \underline{\gamma}$ for each $\underline{\gamma} \in \Sigma_m$ with $m > k$. This proves statement (a) in this case. So, assume that $\widetilde{E}(a) = \widetilde{E}(b)$. By the definition of \odot_ϵ , Corollary 6.7 and the fact that $\pi_{\widetilde{E}(a)}$ is order preserving we may assume that $\widetilde{E}(a) = \widetilde{E}(b) = 0$ (that is, $a, b \in (0, 1]$). We consider first the case $a = b$. If $a \notin \mathbb{Q}^*$ then, from Theorem 2.8, we have that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) \leq \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$. Hence, for each $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \setminus \{(1^L)^\infty\}$, $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) \leq \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) = a \odot_\epsilon (1^L)^\infty$. Therefore, $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} \leq a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta}$ for each $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$. Take now $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ and set $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots$ and $\underline{\beta} = \beta_1 \beta_2 \dots$. Since $\underline{\alpha} < \underline{\beta}$, there exists $k \geq 1$ such that $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{k-1} = \beta_1 \dots \beta_{k-1}$ and $\alpha_k < \beta_k$. Then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} < a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta}$ directly from the definition. This ends the proof of statement (a) in the case $a = b$. We note that in particular, from Proposition 3.1, we have proved that

$$\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a) = a \odot_\epsilon (0^L)^\infty \leq a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} \leq a \odot_\epsilon (1^L)^\infty = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)$$

for each $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$. Now we assume that $a \neq b$. Take $c \in (a, b)$ irrational. Then since $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(c) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(c)$ (see Lemma 2.5), from Lemma 6.1(b) we get that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) < \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(c) = \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(c) < \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(b)$. So, from above we have

$$a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} \leq \widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a) < \widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(b) \leq b \odot_\epsilon \underline{\beta}.$$

This concludes the proof of statement (a). Statement (b) follows in a similar way.

Now, we prove the first statement of (c). Without loss of generality we may assume that $a \in (0, 1]$. If $a \notin \mathbb{Q}^*$ then the statement follows from the definition of \odot_ϵ and Lemma 6.2. Now, assume that $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$. From Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 6.2 we also have that $a \odot_\epsilon (0^L)^\infty, a \odot_\epsilon (1^L)^\infty \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \subset \mathcal{E}_\epsilon$. Therefore, we may assume that $\underline{\alpha} \notin \{(0^L)^\infty, (1^L)^\infty\}$. Since $\underline{\alpha}$ is minimal, we have $\underline{\alpha} = 0^L \dots$. Indeed, otherwise we have $S^n(\underline{\alpha}) \geq \underline{\alpha} = 1^L \dots$ for each $n \geq 0$. Hence $\underline{\alpha} = (1^L)^\infty$; a contradiction. Consequently, $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = 0^L \underline{r}(a) 0^L 1^L \dots$. To end the proof of the first statement of (c) we have to prove that $S^j(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) \geq a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ for each $j \geq 1$. Let $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots$ and $a = p/q$ with $(p, q) = 1$ and $m \geq 1$. Then

$$S^{qm}(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) = \widehat{\alpha}_m \underline{r}(a) \alpha_{m+1} \widehat{\alpha}_{m+1} \dots$$

If $\alpha_m = 1^L$, then $\widehat{\alpha}_m = 0^L$ and, since $\underline{\alpha}$ is minimal, we have $S^{qm}(\underline{\alpha} \odot_\epsilon a) \geq a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$. If $\alpha_m = 0^L$ and $\widehat{\alpha}_m = 1^L$ then clearly, we are done. Now we look at

$$S^{mq-1}(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) = \alpha_m \widehat{\alpha}_m \underline{r}(a) \alpha_{m+1} \widehat{\alpha}_{m+1} \dots$$

If $\alpha_m = 1^L$, obviously $S^{mq-1}(\underline{\alpha} \odot_\epsilon a) \geq a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$. Assume that $\alpha_m = 0^L$. Then $\alpha_m \widehat{\alpha}_m = 0^L 1^L$ and the desired inequality follows from Lemma 6.10(a) (recall that we are assuming that $a \in (0, 1]$ and $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$; that is $\epsilon_1(a) = 0$). Now, assume that $1 < j \leq q - 1$. Then

$$S^{(m-1)q+j-1}(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) = \epsilon_j(a)^L \dots \epsilon_{q-1}(a)^L \alpha_m \widehat{\alpha}_m \dots$$

and, from Lemma 6.10(b), we get $S^{(m-1)q+j-1}(\underline{\alpha} \odot_\epsilon a) \geq a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$. This ends the proof of the first statement of (c). The fact that $\rho(\underline{\alpha} \odot_\epsilon a) = a$ follows straightforwardly from the definition of \odot_ϵ and the fact that $\rho(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\epsilon(a)) = \rho(\widehat{\underline{I}}_\delta^*(a)) = a$. This ends the proof of (c). Statement (d) follows in a similar way.

Now, we prove (e). Assume that $a = p/q$ with $(p, q) = 1$ and set $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots$ and $\underline{\beta} = \beta_1 \beta_2 \dots$. Since $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ we have that $E(a) = \widetilde{E}(a) = \epsilon_1(a)$. Hence,

$$a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = \epsilon_1(a)^L \underline{r}(a) \alpha_1 \widehat{\alpha}_1 \underline{r}(a) \alpha_2 \widehat{\alpha}_2 \dots$$

and

$$a \odot_\delta \underline{\beta} = (\epsilon_1(a) + 1)^L \underline{r}(a) \beta_1 \widehat{\beta}_1 \underline{r}(a) \beta_2 \widehat{\beta}_2 \dots$$

Since $\underline{\alpha} \neq (1^L)^\infty$ is minimal and $\underline{\beta} \neq (0^L)^\infty$ is maximal, in a similar way as before we obtain that $\underline{\alpha} = 0^L \dots$ and $\underline{\beta} = 1^L \dots$. Therefore $\underline{\alpha} < \underline{\beta}$ and $(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha})' < a \odot_\delta \underline{\beta}$. Moreover, since $S^n(\underline{\alpha}) \leq \underline{\beta}$, we obtain $S^n(a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}) \leq a \odot_\delta \underline{\beta}$ in a similar way as above by using Lemma 6.10(c) instead of Lemma 6.10(a) and Lemma 6.10(d) instead of Lemma 6.10(b). On the other hand, from $S^n(\underline{\beta}) \geq \underline{\alpha}$ and Lemma 6.10(a)–(b) we obtain $S^n(a \odot_\delta \underline{\beta}) \geq a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$. Then statement (d) follows from the definition of $\mathcal{E}^* \subset \mathcal{E}$. \blacksquare

6.3. Proof of Proposition 3.3

We need three preliminary results. The next lemma follows easily.

Lemma 6.11. *Let $\underline{\alpha} = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots, \underline{\beta} = \alpha_1 \beta_2 \dots \in \mathcal{AD}$ be such that $\underline{\alpha} < \underline{\beta}$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (a) *If $\alpha_1 = d^L$ then $S(\underline{\alpha}) < S(\underline{\beta})$.*
- (b) *If $\alpha_1 = d^R$ then $S(\underline{\alpha}) > S(\underline{\beta})$.*

The following proposition characterizes the sequences in \mathcal{P}_ϵ and \mathcal{P}_δ .

Proposition 6.12. *The following statements hold.*

- (a) *Let $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$ be such that $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta} d^M$ is minimal satisfying that if $S^{j-1}(\underline{\gamma}) = d^R \dots$ for some $j = 0, 1, \dots, |\underline{\gamma}| - 1$, then $S^j(\underline{\gamma}) \geq \underline{\gamma}'$. Then there exists $F \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0) = \underline{\gamma}$. Moreover $\underline{\gamma} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$.*
- (b) *Let $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$ be such that $\underline{\gamma} = \underline{\beta} d^C$ is maximal. Then there exists $F \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(c_F) = \underline{\gamma}$. Moreover $\underline{\gamma} \in \mathcal{P}_\delta$.*

Proof. We will prove statement (a). Statement (b) follows similarly. The strategy of the proof will be to construct effectively a map $F \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\widehat{\underline{I}}_F(0) = \underline{\gamma}$. We proceed as follows. Set $\underline{\gamma} = d_1^{s_1} d_2^{s_2} \dots d_{n-1}^{s_{n-1}} d_n^{s_n}$ with $s_n = M$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $\max\{|d_i| : i = 1, \dots, n\} < k$ and let $c \in (0, 1)$. Now, for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, we choose points $x(S^j(\underline{\gamma})) \in [0, 1)$ such that

1. $x(\underline{\gamma}) = 0$,
2. if for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ we have $S^{j-1}(\underline{\gamma}) = d_j^L \dots$ (respectively $S^{j-1}(\underline{\gamma}) = d_j^R \dots$) then $x(S^j(\underline{\gamma})) \in (0, c)$ (respectively $x(S^j(\underline{\gamma})) \in (c, 1)$),
3. if for $i \neq j, i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ we have $x(S^i(\underline{\gamma})), x(S^j(\underline{\gamma})) \in [0, c)$ (respectively $x(S^i(\underline{\gamma})), x(S^j(\underline{\gamma})) \in (c, 1)$), then $x(S^i(\underline{\gamma})) < x(S^j(\underline{\gamma}))$ if and only if $S^i(\underline{\gamma}) < S^j(\underline{\gamma})$ (respectively $S^i(\underline{\gamma}) > S^j(\underline{\gamma})$).

We note that, by the minimality of $\underline{\gamma}$, we have $x(\underline{\gamma}) < x(S^j(\underline{\gamma}))$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Therefore we can write

$$\begin{aligned} x(\underline{\gamma}) &< x(S^{j_1}(\underline{\gamma})) < \dots \\ &< x(S^{j_k}(\underline{\gamma})) < c < x(S^{j_{k+1}}(\underline{\gamma})) < \dots \\ &< x(S^{j_{n-1}}(\underline{\gamma})). \end{aligned}$$

Then we set $j_0 = 0$ and we take $F \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $F(c) = k$, $F(x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma}))) = x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma})) + d_{j_{t+1}}$ if $j_t \neq n-1$, $F(x(S^{n-1}(\underline{\gamma}))) = d_n$ and F is affine in $[x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma})), x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma}))]$ for $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{k\}$ and in $[x(S^{j_k}(\underline{\gamma})), c]$ and $[c, x(S^{j_{k+1}}(\underline{\gamma}))]$. Now, we claim that $F \in \mathcal{A}$. To prove it note that $F(c) = k > F(x(S^j(\underline{\gamma})))$ for $j = 0, \dots, n-1$. Then $F|_{[x(S^{j_k}(\underline{\gamma})), c]}$ is strictly increasing and $F|_{[c, x(S^{j_{k+1}}(\underline{\gamma}))]}$ is strictly decreasing. Let t be such that $[x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma})), x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma}))] \subset [0, c)$. We have $S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma}) = d_{j_t+1}^{s_{j_t+1}} \dots < d_{j_{t+1}+1}^{s_{j_{t+1}+1}} \dots = S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma})$. If either $d_{j_t+1} < d_{j_{t+1}+1}$ or $d_{j_t+1} = d_{j_{t+1}+1}$ and $s_{j_t+1} < s_{j_{t+1}+1}$, then clearly $F(x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma}))) < F(x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma})))$. Now, assume $d_{j_t+1}^{s_{j_t+1}} = d_{j_{t+1}+1}^{s_{j_{t+1}+1}}$. From Lemma 6.11 we have that either $S^{j_t+1}(\underline{\gamma}) < S^{j_{t+1}+1}(\underline{\gamma})$ if $s_{j_t+1} = L$ or $S^{j_t+1}(\underline{\gamma}) > S^{j_{t+1}+1}(\underline{\gamma})$ if $s_{j_t+1} = R$. In both cases $x(S^{j_t+1}(\underline{\gamma})) < x(S^{j_{t+1}+1}(\underline{\gamma}))$ and, in consequence, $F(x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma}))) < F(x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma})))$. Thus $F|_{[x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma})), x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma}))]}$ is strictly increasing. In a similar way we can prove that if $[x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma})), x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma}))] \subset (c, 1)$ then $F|_{[x(S^{j_t}(\underline{\gamma})), x(S^{j_{t+1}}(\underline{\gamma}))]}$ is strictly decreasing. To end the proof of the claim we have to prove that $F(x(S^{j_{n-1}}(\underline{\gamma}))) > F(1)$. Since $x(S^{j_{n-1}}(\underline{\gamma})) \in (c, 1)$ we have that $S^{j_{n-1}-1}(\underline{\gamma}) = d_{j_{n-1}}^R \dots$. Then $S^{j_{n-1}}(\underline{\gamma}) > \underline{\gamma}'$. If either $d_{j_{n-1}+1} > (d_1 + 1)$ or $d_{j_{n-1}+1} = (d_1 + 1)$ and $s_{j_{n-1}+1} = R > L = s_1$ then, since $F(1) = F(0) + 1 = x(S(\underline{\gamma})) + d_1 + 1$ and

$F(x(S^{j_{n-1}}(\gamma))) = x(S^{j_{n-1}+1}(\gamma)) + d_{j_{n-1}+1}$, we have that $F(x(S^{j_{n-1}}(\gamma))) > F(1)$. On the other hand, assume that $d_{j_{n-1}+1}^{s_{j_{n-1}+1}} = (d_1 + 1)^{s_1}$. We obtain that $F(x(S^{j_{n-1}}(\gamma))) > F(1)$ as above by using Lemma 6.11. This ends the proof of the claim. Lastly, we have $\widehat{I}_F(0) = \underline{\gamma}$ by construction. Also, from Lemma 5.1(a) we have that $\underline{\gamma} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$. This ends the proof of the proposition. ■

The next lemma characterizes the periodic sequences in $\mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\delta(0)$.

Lemma 6.13. *The following statements hold.*

- (a) Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \setminus \{(0^L)^\infty, (1^L)^\infty\}$ be periodic. Then $\underline{\alpha} = (0^L \underline{\beta} 1^L)^\infty$ for some $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$.
- (b) Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(0) \setminus \{(0^L)^\infty, (1^L)^\infty\}$ be periodic. Then $\underline{\alpha} = (1^L \underline{\beta} 0^L)^\infty$ for some $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$.

Proof. Clearly $\underline{\alpha}$ is of the form $(d_1^L \underline{\beta} d_n^L)^\infty$ with $\underline{\beta} \in \Xi$. Assume that $d_1 = 1$. Since $\underline{\alpha}$ is minimal we have that $\underline{\alpha} = 1^L \dots \leq S^j(\underline{\alpha})$ for all j . Then $S^j(\underline{\alpha}) = 1^L \dots$ for all j and, in consequence, $\underline{\alpha} = (1^L)^\infty$; a contradiction. Hence $d_1 = 0$. Now, assume that $d_n = 0$. Then $\underline{\alpha} = (0^L \underline{\beta} 0^L)^\infty$. If $\underline{\beta}$ is the empty sequence then $\underline{\alpha} = (0^L)^\infty$; a contradiction. Now assume that $\underline{\beta}$ is not the empty sequence and set $\underline{\beta} = \beta_2 \dots \beta_{n-1}$. Since $\underline{\alpha}$ is minimal $\underline{\alpha} = 0^L \beta_2 \dots \leq 0^L 0^L \beta_2 \dots = S^{n-1}(\underline{\alpha})$. Thus $\beta_2 = 0^L$. Proceeding inductively we obtain that $\beta_i = 0^L$ for $i = 2, \dots, n-1$. Thus $\underline{\alpha} = (0^L)^\infty$; a contradiction. This ends the proof of (a). Statement (b) follows in a similar way. ■

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.3. We will only prove statement (a). Statement (b) follows in a similar way. The fact that $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha}$ is not periodic when $a \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and when $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ is periodic if and only if $\underline{\alpha} = (1^L)^\infty$ follows from the definitions of \odot_ϵ and of the sequences $\widehat{I}_\delta^*(a)$ and $\widehat{I}_\epsilon(a)$. The third statement follows directly from the definitions. Now we prove the last two statements. Assume that $a \in \mathbb{Q}^*$. If $\underline{\alpha} = (1^L)^\infty$ then $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha}$ is periodic by Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 6.1(a). Moreover if $a = p/q$ with $(p, q) = 1$ then $a \odot_\delta \underline{\alpha} = (\epsilon_1(a)^L \epsilon_2(a)^L \dots \epsilon_q(a)^L)^\infty$. Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon(0) \setminus \{(1^L)^\infty\}$. By Lemma 6.13(a) we get $\underline{\alpha} = (0^L \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_{n-1} 1^L)^\infty$. Without loss of generality assume that $\widehat{E}(a) = 0$. Then

$$a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = (0^L \underline{r}(a) 0^L 1^L \underline{r}(a) \alpha_2 \dots \underline{r}(a) \alpha_{n-1} \widehat{\alpha}_{n-1} \underline{r}(a) 1^L)^\infty$$

is periodic. Now, let

$$\underline{\gamma} = 0^L \underline{r}(a) 0^L 1^L \underline{r}(a) \alpha_2 \dots \underline{r}(a) \alpha_{n-1} \widehat{\alpha}_{n-1} \underline{r}(a) 1^M.$$

Clearly, $a \odot_\epsilon \underline{\alpha} = \underline{\gamma} \star_\epsilon L^\infty$. Since, from Proposition 4.6(b) of [AF], $0^L \underline{r}(a) 1^M$ is a minimal sequence, by using Lemma 6.10(a)–(b), we have that $\underline{\gamma}$ is a minimal sequence (note that $\epsilon_1(a) = 0$). Then by Proposition 6.12 (a) we have that $\underline{\gamma} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$. ■

References

- Alsedà Ll., Falcó A., *A characterization of the kneading pair for bimodal degree one circle maps*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **47** (1997), 273–304.
- Alsedà Ll., Mañosas F., *Kneading theory and rotation interval for a class of circle maps of degree one*, Nonlinearity **3** (1990), 413–452.
- Collet P. Eckmann J. P., *Iterated maps on the interval as dynamical systems*, Progress in Physics, Birkhäuser, 1980
- Falcó A., *Bifurcations and symbolic dynamics for bimodal degree one circle maps: The Arnol'd tongues and the Devil's staircase*, Ph. D. Thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1995.
- Hockett K., Holmes P., *Bifurcations to badly ordered orbits in one parameter families of circle maps or Angels fallen from the Devil's staircase*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **102** (1988), 1031–1051.
- Ito R., *Rotation sets are closed*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **89** (1981), 107–111.
- de Melo W., van Strien S., *One dimensional dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- Milnor J. Thurston P., *On iterated maps on the interval*, I, II, "Dynamical Systems", Lecture Notes in Math **1342**, Springer, 1988.