

Deciding the point-to-fixed-point problem for skew tent maps on an interval

Peer-reviewed author version

KUIJPERS, Bart (2021) Deciding the point-to-fixed-point problem for skew tent maps on an interval. In: JOURNAL OF COMPUTER AND SYSTEM SCIENCES, 115 , p. 113 -120.

DOI: 10.1016/j.jcss.2020.07.005

Handle: <http://hdl.handle.net/1942/32814>

# Deciding the point-to-fixed-point problem for skew tent maps on an interval

Bart Kuijpers<sup>1</sup>

*Databases and Theoretical Computer Science, Hasselt University, Belgium*

---

## Abstract

We consider a family of skew tent maps  $f_a$  on the unit interval, determined by the parameter  $a$ , with  $0 < a < 1$ . We give a decision procedure, that on input  $a$  and a point  $x_0$  in the unit interval, determines whether or not the sequence  $x_0, f_a(x_0), f_a^2(x_0), \dots$  of iterates of  $f_a$  on  $x_0$  reaches one of the two fixed points of  $f_a$  after a *finite* number of iterations.

*Keywords:* Dynamic systems, Decision algorithm, Fixed points

---

## 1. Introduction

We consider a family of skew tent maps  $f_a$  on the unit interval, determined by the parameter  $a$  ( $0 < a < 1$ ) and defined as  $f_a(x) = \frac{x}{a}$  for  $0 \leq x \leq a$  and  $f_a(x) = \frac{1-x}{1-a}$  for  $a < x \leq 1$  (illustrated, further on, in Figure 1). The maps in this family have two fixed points (that is, points for which  $f_a(x) = x$ ). One question about the dynamics of such maps concerns the decidability of the so-called *point-to-fixed-point* problem. This question asks for an algorithm to determine, on input  $a$  and a point  $x_0$  in the unit interval, whether or not the sequence  $x_0, f_a(x_0), f_a^2(x_0), \dots$  of iterates of  $f_a$  on  $x_0$  reaches one of the two fixed points of  $f_a$  after a *finite* number of iterations. The main contribution of this paper is a decision algorithm for this problem for rational input values  $a$  and  $x_0$ .

This decision problem originates from dynamical system theory (Blondel et al. (2001a,b); Koiran et al. (1994)) but is also relevant to database theory (Geerts and Kuijpers (2005)). In this context, iterates of functions

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: [bart.kuijpers@uhasselt.be](mailto:bart.kuijpers@uhasselt.be)

$f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$  (by  $\mathbf{R}$  we denote the real numbers) are studied and the decidability of properties such as “mortality”, “nilpotency”, “termination” and “point-to-fixed-point” is investigated.

A function  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$  is called *mortal* if  $f(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$  and if for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^n$  there exists a natural number  $k \geq 1$  such that  $f^k(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$  (here  $\mathbf{0}$  denotes the origin of  $\mathbf{R}^n$ ) and a function  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$  is called *nilpotent* if  $f(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$  and if there exists a natural number  $k \geq 1$  such that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $f^k(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$  (Blondel et al. (2001b)). Mortality and nilpotency are known to be undecidable for piecewise affine functions from  $\mathbf{R}^2$  to  $\mathbf{R}^2$  and for functions from  $\mathbf{R}$  to  $\mathbf{R}$  the (un)decidability of these properties is open (Blondel et al. (2001b)).

The transitive closure of the graph of a function  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ , viewed as a binary relation over  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , can be computed by determining iteratively the  $2n$ -ary relations  $TC_1(f), TC_2(f), TC_3(f), \dots$ , where  $TC_1(f) = \text{graph}(f)$  and  $TC_{i+1}(f) := TC_i(f) \cup \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \mid (\exists \mathbf{z}) ((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \in TC_i(f) \wedge f(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{y})\}$ . We call a function  $f$  *terminating* if there exists a  $k \geq 1$  such that  $TC_{k+1}(f) = TC_k(f)$ . Termination of functions from  $\mathbf{R}^2$  to  $\mathbf{R}^2$  is undecidable but termination of continuous semi-algebraic functions from  $\mathbf{R}$  to  $\mathbf{R}$  is decidable (Geerts and Kuijpers (2005)). The decidability of this problem has implications in the area of database theory, where it is used to obtain extensions of first-order logics with recursion, based on a transitive-closure operator (Geerts and Kuijpers (2005)) for constraint databases (Kuper et al. (2000)).

The *point-to-fixed-point problem* is another decision problem in this context, which asks whether for a given algebraic point  $\mathbf{x}$  and a given piecewise affine function  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ , the sequence  $\mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x}), f^2(\mathbf{x}), f^3(\mathbf{x}), \dots$  reaches a fixed point, i.e., whether there exists a  $k \geq 1$  such that  $f^k(\mathbf{x}) = f^{k+1}(\mathbf{x})$  (Blondel et al. (2001a); Koiran et al. (1994)). As in the case of mortality and nilpotency, the point-to-fixed-point problem is undecidable for piecewise affine functions from  $\mathbf{R}^2$  to  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . The decidability of the point-to-fixed-point problem is open for in dimension 1, even for piecewise linear functions with only two non-constant pieces (Blondel et al. (2001a); Koiran et al. (1994)). The problem we address in this paper should be seen in this context and we propose a solution for a particular subclass of this problem in dimension 1. We study this problem in the more convenient setting of functions on an interval. A general solution for arbitrary linear functions with two pieces remains open. This is also the case for functions with three or more linear pieces. The decidability of the point-to-fixed-point problem has also implications in database theory. The termination of query evaluation

in certain extensions of first-order logic with transitive closure operations depends on this problem (Geerts and Kuijpers (2005)).

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we give the necessary definitions and state the main result. Preliminary considerations and properties are given in Section 3. A decision procedure for the point-to-fixed-point problem for skew tent maps is described in Section 4. In Section 5, we end this paper with a discussion of possible extensions of the proposed methods.

## 2. Definitions, notations, and main result

Let  $a$  be a number, with  $0 < a < 1$ , and let the function  $f_a : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be defined as

$$f_a(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{x}{a} & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq a, \\ \frac{1-x}{1-a} & \text{if } a < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

The function  $f_a$  is a *skew tent map* (where the adjective “skew” can be dropped only when  $a = \frac{1}{2}$ ) with top at  $(a, 1)$ . We use the abbreviations  $\ell_a(x) := \frac{x}{a}$  and  $r_a(x) := \frac{1-x}{1-a}$  for the left and right part of the function  $f_a$ . If  $f_a(x) = x$  for some  $x \in [0, 1]$ , we call  $x$  a *fixed point* of the function  $f_a$ . The function  $f_a$  has two fixed points, namely  $\varphi_1^a = 0$  and  $\varphi_2^a = \frac{1}{2-a}$ . Figure 1 gives an illustration of the graph of the function  $f_a$  along with its two fixed points.

We denote the set of the natural numbers by  $\mathbf{N}$  and the set of the real numbers by  $\mathbf{R}$ . We use the notation  $f_a^0(x) := x$ , and  $f_a^{i+1}(x) := f_a(f_a^i(x))$ , for  $i \in \mathbf{N}$ , to denote the iterates of  $f_a$  on  $x \in [0, 1]$ . We also use the notions of forward and backward orbit, as follows: for  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ , the *forward orbit* of  $x$  (under  $f_a$ ), denoted  $\text{Orb}^+(f_a, x)$ , is the set  $\{f_a^n(x) \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$  and the *backward orbit* of  $y$  (under  $f_a$ ), denoted  $\text{Orb}^-(f_a, y)$ , is the set  $\{x \in [0, 1] \mid \text{there is an } n \in \mathbf{N} \text{ such that } f_a^n(x) = y\}$ . If  $x \in \text{Orb}^-(f_a, y)$ , we say “ $x$  reaches  $y$  (under  $f_a$ )” or “ $f$  reaches  $y$  from  $x$ ”. For an overview of such concepts, we refer to (Alesdà et al. (1993); Preston (1983, 1988)).

For example, the point  $x_0$ , shown in Figure 1, reaches the fixed point  $\varphi_2^a$  after two iterations of  $f_a$ , that is,  $f_a^2(x_0) = \varphi_2^a$ .

In this paper, we are interested in algorithmically deciding whether a point  $x_0 \in [0, 1]$  reaches a fixed point of  $f_a$  after a *finite* number of iterations of  $f_a$  on  $x_0$ . This decision problem can be viewed as deciding the language PtoFP (abbreviating “*point-to-fixed-point*”), with

$$\text{PtoFP} = \{\langle a, x_0 \rangle \mid 0 \leq x_0 \leq 1 \text{ and } 0 < a < 1 \text{ and}$$

$$x_0 \in \text{Orb}^-(f_a, \varphi_1^a) \cup \text{Orb}^-(f_a, \varphi_2^a)\},$$

where  $\langle a, x_0 \rangle$  represents a finite encoding of the numbers  $a$  and  $x_0$ . For reasons of finite representability, we assume  $a$  and  $x_0$  to be rational numbers. We agree that a rational number  $A$  is encoded as pair  $(p, q)$ , with  $p, q \in \mathbf{N}$  (given in binary),  $q \neq 0$ ,  $p$  and  $q$  relatively prime and  $A = \frac{p}{q}$ . Obviously, other encodings may be considered.

The main result of this paper is summarised in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *There is a decision procedure that, on input two rational numbers  $a$  and  $x_0$  (encoded as described before), decides whether  $\langle a, x_0 \rangle \in \text{PtoFP}$ .*

□




Figure 1: The graph of the skew tent map  $f_a$ , with the graph of  $\ell_a$  in red and the graph of  $r_a$  in blue. The two fixed points of  $f_a$ ,  $\varphi_1^a$  or  $\varphi_2^a$ , are indicated and  $x_0$  is an example of a number for which  $f_a^2(x_0) = \varphi_2^a$ .

### 3. Preliminary considerations and properties

Our decision procedure is called  $\text{PtoFP}(a, x_0)$  and it is described in Section 4. Obviously, the order conditions  $0 \leq x_0 \leq 1$  and  $0 < a < 1$  are easily checked by comparing the natural numbers that encode these two rational numbers. So, we focus on the non-trivial part, namely, deciding the existence of a  $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$  such that  $f_a^n(x_0)$  is a fixed point of  $f_a$ .

Our approach is, given an input  $\langle a, x_0 \rangle$ , to establish an *upper bound*  $M$  for the values of  $n$  for which  $f_a^n(x_0)$  can be a fixed point of  $f_a$ . Once this upper bound  $M$  is determined, it remains to be checked whether one of the numbers  $f^1(x_0), f^2(x_0), \dots, f^M(x_0)$  actually is a fixed point of  $f$ . The determination of the upper bound  $M$  depends on the uniqueness of a particular form in which a rational number can be written. This form is derived by observing that, when  $f_a$  is repeatedly applied to  $x_0$ , this repetition involves alternating applications of powers of  $\ell_a$  and  $r_a$  and our results rely on the general form that such an alternation of applications of  $\ell_a$  and  $r_a$  can produce. An iteration  $f_a^n(x)$  of  $f_a$  on some  $x \in [0, 1]$  is therefore of the form

$$r_a^{j_k} \ell_a^{i_k} r_a^{j_{k-1}} \ell_a^{i_{k-1}} \dots r_a^{j_1} \ell_a^{i_1}(x),$$

for some  $k \in \mathbf{N}_0$ , where  $i_1 > 0$  if  $0 \leq x \leq a$  and  $i_1 = 0$  if  $a < x \leq 1$ ,  $j_k \geq 0$ ,  $j_1, i_2, j_2, \dots, i_{k-1}, j_{k-1} > 0$  and  $i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_k + j_k = n$ .

In this section, we give an explicit formula for such an alternating application of two affine functions on some real point. Throughout this paper, we use the notation  $[A]^i$ , to abbreviate the sum  $1 + A + A^2 + \dots + A^{i-1}$ , for  $A \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $i \in \mathbf{N}$ . This means that

$$[A]^i = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } A = 1 \text{ and} \\ \frac{1-A^i}{1-A} & \text{if } A \neq 1, \end{cases}$$

for  $i \in \mathbf{N}$ .

Now, we introduce some abbreviations for sums of exponents, that are used throughout this paper.

**Notation 1.** Let  $i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots$  and  $j_0, j_1, j_2, \dots$  be two sequences of natural numbers. and let  $n, m \in \mathbf{N}$ . For  $n \leq m$ , we define  $I_n^m := i_n + i_{n+1} + \dots + i_m$  and  $J_n^m := j_n + j_{n+1} + \dots + j_m$ . For  $m < n$ , we define  $I_n^m := 0$  and  $J_n^m := 0$ .  $\square$

The following property gives the general form of an alternated application of powers of two linear functions  $F$  and  $G$  on some real point  $x$ . Its straightforward induction proof is given, for completeness, in the Appendix.

**Property 1.** Let  $A, B, C, D \in \mathbf{R}$ . Let  $F : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} : x \mapsto Ax + B$  and  $G : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} : x \mapsto Cx + D$  be affine functions. If  $k \in \mathbf{N}_0$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_k, j_1, \dots, j_k \in \mathbf{N}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
G^{j_k} F^{i_k} G^{j_{k-1}} F^{i_{k-1}} \dots G^{j_1} F^{i_1}(x) = \\
A^{I_1^k} C^{J_1^k} x + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ A^{I_{\nu+1}^k} C^{J_{\nu+1}^k} (B[A]^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} + D[C]^{j_\nu}) \right\}. \tag{\dagger_1}
\end{aligned}$$

□

We remark that, for  $j_k = 0$ , the equality  $(\dagger_1)$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{i_k} G^{j_{k-1}} F^{i_{k-1}} \dots G^{j_1} F^{i_1}(x) = \\
A^{I_1^k} C^{J_1^{k-1}} x + \sum_{\nu=1}^{k-1} \left\{ A^{I_{\nu+1}^k} C^{J_{\nu+1}^{k-1}} (B[A]^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} + D[C]^{j_\nu}) \right\} + B[A]^{i_k}. \tag{\dagger_2}
\end{aligned}$$

#### 4. A decision procedure for the point-to-fixed-point problem

In this section, we describe the decision procedure  $\text{PtoFP}(a, x_0)$ , which accepts the input  $(a, x_0)$ , when  $f_a$  reaches  $\varphi_1^a$  from  $x_0$  or  $f_a$  reaches  $\varphi_2^a$  from  $x_0$ . The first test is described in Section 4.1 and the second is described in Section 4.2.

##### 4.1. The points that reach the fixed point $\varphi_1^a = 0$

The backward orbit of  $\varphi_1^a = 0$  contains infinitely many points besides 0 and 1 since  $f_a(a) = 1$  and  $f(a^2) = a$ ,  $f(1 - a + a^2) = a$ , etc. In fact,  $\text{Orb}^-(f_a, \varphi_1^a)$  certainly contains  $a, a^2, a^3, \dots$ , which reach  $a$  under  $\ell_a$ , besides infinitely many points (like  $1 - a + a^2$ ) from the domain of  $r_a$ .

The following theorem implies a decision procedure to establish whether a point  $x_0 \in [0, 1]$  is in  $\text{Orb}^-(f, \varphi_1^a)$ , as we explain following its proof.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $f_a$  be a skew tent map, as before. Let  $a = \frac{p}{q}$ , with  $p, q \in \mathbf{N}_0$ ,  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$  and  $0 < p < q$ . Then  $f_a$  reaches its fixed point  $\varphi_1^a = 0$  from  $x_0 \in [0, 1]$  if and only if  $x_0 = 0$  or if there exists an  $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$  such that  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  is of the form  $\frac{N}{q^n}$ , with  $N \in \mathbf{N}_0$  and  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$  and  $f_a^n(x_0) = 0$ .

**Proof.** Let  $a = \frac{p}{q}$ , with  $p, q \in \mathbf{N}_0$ ,  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$  and  $0 < p < q$ . Let  $f_a$  be a skew tent map with left part  $\ell_a$  and right part  $r_a$ , as explained in Section 2. Therefore, we have

$$f_a(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{qx}{p} & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq a, \\ \frac{q(1-x)}{q-p} & \text{if } a < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

We first prove the only-if direction. Since  $f_a(0) = \ell_a(0) = 0$ , we do not have to consider  $x_0 = 0$  any further. We remark that also for  $x_0 = 1$ ,  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  is of the requested form  $\frac{N}{q^k}$  with  $N = 2q - p$  and  $k = 1$ , since  $\gcd(2q - p, q) = 1$  follows from the assumption  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ . The same holds for  $x_0 = a$ , in which case  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0 = \frac{(2q-p)p}{q^2}$  and we have  $N = (2q - p)p$  and  $k = 2$ . Also here,  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$  implies  $\gcd((2q - p)p, q) = 1$ .

Assume that  $x_0 \in \text{Orb}^-(f_a, 0)$  and  $x_0 \notin \{0, 1, a\}$ . Then there exists an  $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$ , with  $n > 2$ , such that  $f_a^n(x_0) = 0$ . This implies that there exists a  $k \in \mathbf{N}_0$  and  $i_1, j_1, \dots, i_k, j_k \in \mathbf{N}$  such that

$$r_a^{j_k} \ell_a^{i_k} r_a^{j_{k-1}} \ell_a^{i_{k-1}} \dots r_a^{j_1} \ell_a^{i_1}(x_0) = 0,$$

where  $i_1 > 0$  if  $0 \leq x \leq a$  and  $i_1 = 0$  if  $a < x \leq 1$  and  $i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_k + j_k = n$  and  $j_1, i_2, \dots, i_k, j_k > 0$ . Since 0 can only be reached via  $a$  and 1 (that is,  $r_a(\ell_a(a)) = r_a(1) = 0$ ), we also know that  $j_k = 1$  and  $i_k \geq 1$ .

If then we apply  $(\dagger_1)$  from Property 1, with  $A = \frac{1}{a}$ ,  $B = 0$ ,  $C = \frac{1}{a-1}$  and  $D = \frac{-1}{a-1}$ , we obtain

$$\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^{I_1^k} \left(\frac{1}{a-1}\right)^{J_1^k} x_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^{I_{\nu+1}^k} \left(\frac{1}{a-1}\right)^{J_{\nu+1}^k} \left(\frac{-1}{a-1} \left[\frac{1}{a-1}\right]^{j_\nu}\right) \right\} = 0.$$

When we substitute  $\frac{p}{q}$  for  $a$ , the above equation becomes

$$\left(\frac{q}{p}\right)^{I_1^k} \left(\frac{q}{p-q}\right)^{J_1^k} x_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ \left(\frac{q}{p}\right)^{I_{\nu+1}^k} \left(\frac{q}{p-q}\right)^{J_{\nu+1}^k} \left(\frac{-q}{p-q} \left[\frac{q}{p-q}\right]^{j_\nu}\right) \right\} = 0.$$

We remark that  $\frac{q}{p-q} \neq 1$ . Indeed, if we assume  $\frac{q}{p-q} = 1$ , we get  $2q = p$ , which is impossible, since  $p < q$  (or  $a < 1$ ). Therefore,  $\frac{-q}{p-q} \left[\frac{q}{p-q}\right]^{j_\nu} = \frac{-q}{2q-p} \frac{q^{j_\nu} - (p-q)^{j_\nu}}{(p-q)^{j_\nu}}$ . If we use this fact, then the above equality, after dividing both sides by  $\left(\frac{q}{p}\right)^{I_1^k} \left(\frac{q}{p-q}\right)^{J_1^k}$ , becomes

$$\frac{2q-p}{q} x_0 = \frac{1}{q^{I_1^k + J_1^k}} \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ q^{I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^k} p^{I_1^\nu} (p-q)^{J_1^{\nu-1}} (q^{j_\nu} - (p-q)^{j_\nu}) \right\}$$

or  $\frac{2q-p}{q} x_0 = \frac{N}{q^{I_1^k + J_1^k}}$  with

$$N = \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ q^{I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^k} p^{I_1^\nu} (p-q)^{J_1^{\nu-1}} (q^{j_\nu} - (p-q)^{j_\nu}) \right\}.$$



Since,  $j_k = 1$  and  $i_k \geq 1$ , we have, for  $\nu < k$ , that  $I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^k \geq i_k + j_k \geq 2$  and thus  $q \mid q^{I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^k}$  (and even  $q^2 \mid q^{I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^k}$ ). From this observation follows that  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ . Indeed, let  $d \in \mathbf{N}$  be a common divisor of  $q$  and  $N$  (that is,  $d \mid q$  and  $d \mid N$ ), then  $d \mid p^{I_1^k} (p - q)^{J_1^{k-1}} (q^{j_k} - (p - q)^{j_k})$  and thus  $d \mid p^{I_1^k + J_1^k}$ . From  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ ,  $d \mid q$  and  $d \mid p^{I_1^k + J_1^k}$ ,  $d \mid 1$  follows. So, we can conclude that  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ .

We see that from the assumption  $f_a^n(x_0) = 0$ , it follows that  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0 = \frac{N}{q^{I_1^k + J_1^k}} = \frac{N}{q^n}$ , with  $N \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ .

The if-direction is clear.  $\square$

To see that this theorem implies a decision procedure to test whether 0 can be reached from a given point  $x_0 \in (0, 1]$ , we need the following property on the unique expression of some rational numbers.

**Property 2.** Let  $q \in \mathbf{N}$  with  $q > 1$ . If  $\alpha$  is a rational number, then there exists at most one  $k \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $\alpha = \frac{N}{q^k}$  with  $N \in \mathbf{N}_0$  and  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\alpha$  be a rational number. If  $\alpha$  cannot be expressed in the form  $\frac{N}{q^k}$  (for instance, when  $\alpha$  is 0 or negative), then the statement is true. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction that  $\alpha = \frac{N}{q^k}$  and  $\alpha = \frac{N'}{q^{k'}}$ , with  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ ,  $\gcd(q, N') = 1$ . In the case  $k = k'$ , we have  $N = N'$  which gives uniqueness. For  $k < k'$ , we obtain  $q^{k'-k}N = N'$  from these two equalities. Since  $k' - k \geq 1$ , this implies that  $q \mid N'$ . But then  $\gcd(q, N') = q > 1$ , contradicting the assumption  $\gcd(q, N') = 1$ . So, in all cases  $\alpha$  can be expressed in at most one way as a fraction of the form  $\frac{N}{q^k}$ .  $\square$

Equivalently, the Theorem 2 says that if  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  cannot be written in the form  $\frac{N}{q^n}$  for some  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $N \in \mathbf{N}_0$ , with  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ , then  $x_0$  does not reach the fixed point 0 of  $f_a$ .

On the other hand, if, for  $x_0 \neq 0$ ,  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  can be written in the form  $\frac{N}{q^n}$  for some  $n, N \in \mathbf{N}$  with  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ , then by Property 2, this  $n$  is unique and it suffices to check whether  $f_a^n(x_0)$  equals 0. Indeed, we know that if  $f^{n'}(x_0) = 0$  for an  $n' > n$ , then  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  can also be written as  $\frac{N'}{q^{n'}}$  for some  $n' \in \mathbf{N}$ ,  $N' \in \mathbf{N}_0$  with  $\gcd(q, N') = 1$ , contradicting Property 2.

This concludes the description of the part of  $\text{PtoFP}(a, x_0)$  that tests whether  $x_0$  reaches  $\varphi_1^a$  under  $f_a$ .

4.2. *The points that reach the fixed point  $\varphi_2^a = \frac{1}{2-a}$*

The following theorem implies a decision procedure to establish whether a point  $x_0 \in (0, a)$  reaches  $\varphi_2^a$  under  $f_a$ , as we explain following its proof. There, we also explain, how this procedure can be extended to  $x_0 \in [0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 3.** Let  $f_a$  be a skew tent map, as before. Let  $a = \frac{p}{q}$ , with  $p, q \in \mathbf{N}_0$ ,  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$  and  $0 < p < q$ . Then  $f_a$  reaches its fixed point  $\varphi_2^a = \frac{1}{2-a}$  from  $x_0 \in (0, a)$  if and only if there exists an  $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$  such that  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  is of the form  $\frac{N}{q^n}$ , with  $N \in \mathbf{N}_0$  and  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$  and  $f_a^n(x_0) = \varphi_2^a$ .

**Proof.** Let  $a = \frac{p}{q}$ , with  $p, q \in \mathbf{N}_0$ ,  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$  and  $0 < p < q$ . Let  $f_a$  be a skew tent map with left part  $\ell_a$  and right part  $r_a$ , as explained in Section 2. Let  $x_0 \in (0, a)$ .

We first prove the only-if direction. We assume that  $x_0 \in \text{Orb}^-(f_a, \varphi_2^a)$ . Then there exists an  $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$ , such that  $f_a^n(x_0) = \varphi_2^a$ . This implies that there exists a  $k \in \mathbf{N}_0$  and  $i_1, j_1, \dots, i_k \in \mathbf{N}_0$  such that

$$\ell_a^{i_k} r_a^{j_{k-1}} \ell_a^{i_{k-1}} \dots r_a^{j_1} \ell_a^{i_1}(x_0) = \varphi_2^a,$$

where  $i_1 + j_1 + \dots + i_k = n$ . We remark that  $i_1 > 0$  because  $x_0 \in (0, a)$  and that  $i_k > 0$  because  $\varphi_2^a$  can only be reached via  $\ell_a$ .

If then we apply  $(\dagger_2)$  from Property 1, with  $A = \frac{1}{a}$ ,  $B = 0$ ,  $C = \frac{1}{a-1}$  and  $D = \frac{-1}{a-1}$ , we obtain

$$\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^{I_1^k} \left(\frac{1}{a-1}\right)^{J_1^{k-1}} x_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{k-1} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^{I_{\nu+1}^k} \left(\frac{1}{a-1}\right)^{J_{\nu+1}^{k-1}} \left(\frac{-1}{a-1} \left[\frac{1}{a-1}\right]^{j_\nu}\right) \right\} = \varphi_2^a.$$

Since  $a \neq 2$ ,  $\frac{-1}{a-1} \left[\frac{1}{a-1}\right]^{j_\nu} = -\varphi_2^a \left(\left(\frac{1}{a-1}\right)^{j_\nu} - 1\right)$  and thus the above equality, using  $a = \frac{p}{q}$ , becomes

$$\left(\frac{q}{p}\right)^{I_1^k} \left(\frac{q}{p-q}\right)^{J_1^{k-1}} x_0 = \varphi_2^a \left(1 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{k-1} \left\{ \left(\frac{q}{p}\right)^{I_{\nu+1}^k} \left(\frac{q}{p-q}\right)^{J_{\nu+1}^{k-1}} \left(\frac{q^{j_\nu} - (p-q)^{j_\nu}}{(p-q)^{j_\nu}}\right) \right\}\right).$$

After dividing both sides by  $\left(\frac{q}{p}\right)^{I_1^k} \left(\frac{q}{p-q}\right)^{J_1^{k-1}}$  and by  $\varphi_2^a = \frac{q}{2q-p}$ , we obtain

$$\frac{2q-p}{q} x_0 = \frac{N}{q^{I_1^k + J_1^{k-1}}}$$

with

$$N = p^{I_1^k} (p - q)^{J_1^{k-1}} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{k-1} \left\{ q^{I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^{k-1}} p^{I_1^\nu} (p - q)^{J_1^{\nu-1}} (q^{j_\nu} - (p - q)^{j_\nu}) \right\}.$$

Since,  $I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^{k-1} \geq i_k > 0$  for all  $\nu \leq k - 1$ , we see that  $q \mid q^{I_{\nu+1}^k + J_{\nu+1}^{k-1}}$ . From this observation follows that  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ . Indeed, let  $d \in \mathbf{N}$  be a common divisor of  $q$  and  $N$ , then  $d \mid p^{I_1^k} (p - q)^{J_1^{k-1}}$  and thus  $d \mid p^{I_1^k + J_1^{k-1}}$ . From  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ ,  $d \mid q$  and  $d \mid p^{I_1^k + J_1^{k-1}}$ ,  $d \mid 1$  follows. So, we can conclude that  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ .

We see that from the assumption  $f_a^n(x_0) = \varphi_2^a$ , it follows that  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0 = \frac{N}{q^{I_1^k + J_1^k}} = \frac{N}{q^n}$ , with  $N \in \mathbf{N}_0$  and  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ .

The if-direction is clear.  $\square$

Theorem 3 implies a decision procedure to test whether  $\varphi_2^a$  can be reached from a given point  $x_0 \in (0, a)$ . Indeed, equivalently, this theorem says that if  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  cannot be written in the form  $\frac{N}{q^n}$  for some  $n, N \in \mathbf{N}$ , with  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ , then  $x_0$  does not reach  $\varphi_2^a$ .

On the other hand, if, for  $x_0 \in (0, a)$ ,  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  can be written in the form  $\frac{N}{q^n}$  for some  $n, N \in \mathbf{N}$  with  $\gcd(q, N) = 1$ , then by Property 2, this  $n$  is unique and it suffices to check whether  $f_a^n(x_0)$  is  $\varphi_2^a$ . Indeed, we know that if  $f_a^{n'}(x_0) = \varphi_1$  for an  $n' > n$ , then  $\frac{2q-p}{q}x_0$  can also be written as  $\frac{N'}{q^{n'}}$  for some  $n' \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $N' \in \mathbf{N}_0$ , with  $\gcd(q, N') = 1$ , contradicting Property 2.

We already know that  $0$ ,  $a$  and  $1$  reach  $0$  (and thus do not reach  $\varphi_2^a$ ) and that  $\varphi_2^a$  reaches itself. Therefore, what remains is to give a procedure to determine whether  $x_0 \in (a, 1) \setminus \{\varphi_2^a\}$  reaches  $\varphi_2^a$ .

Hereto, we define the sequence  $\alpha_i := r_a^{-i}(a)$ , for  $i \in \mathbf{N}$ . The following property gives an expression for  $\alpha_i$ .

**Property 3.** For  $i \in \mathbf{N}$ , we have  $\alpha_i = (a - 1)^i (a - \varphi_2^a) + \varphi_2^a$ .

**Proof.** Clearly, we have  $r_a^{-1}(x) = (a - 1)x + 1$ . By Lemma 2, we obtain that  $r_a^{-i}(x) = (a - 1)^i x + [a - 1]^i$ . Since  $\varphi_2^a = \frac{1}{2-a}$  we have  $[a - 1]^i = -\varphi_2^a((a - 1)^i - 1)$ . So, we get  $r_a^{-i}(x) = (a - 1)^i x - \varphi_2^a((a - 1)^i - 1) = (a - 1)^i (x - \varphi_2^a) + \varphi_2^a$ . This implies that  $\alpha_i = r_a^{-i}(a) = (a - 1)^i (a - \varphi_2^a) + \varphi_2^a$ .  $\square$

Since  $a < \varphi_2^a$ , we derive  $\alpha_{2i} < \varphi_2^a$  and  $\varphi_2^a < \alpha_{2i+1}$ , for  $i \in \mathbf{N}_0$ , from this property. Also from this property and the observation that  $0 < (a - 1)^2 < 1$

for  $0 < a < 1$ , a straightforward calculation gives the following ordering of the  $\alpha_i$ :

$$a < \alpha_2 < \alpha_4 < \alpha_6 < \cdots < \varphi_2^a < \cdots < \alpha_5 < \alpha_3 < \alpha_1 < 1.$$

We observe that all  $\alpha_i$  eventually reach  $a$  and thus 0 under  $f_a$  and will never reach  $\varphi_2^a$ . For the other  $x_0 \in (a, 1)$ , we first determine between which values in the above ordering  $x_0$  is situated to test whether  $x_0$  reaches  $\varphi_2^a$ . If  $x_0 \in (\alpha_1, 1)$ , then  $f_a(x_0) = r_a(x_0) \in (0, a)$ . Therefore,  $x_0 \in (\alpha_1, 1)$  reaches  $\varphi_2^a$  if and only if  $f_a(x_0)$  reaches  $\varphi_2^a$ . If  $x_0 \in (a, \alpha_2)$ , then  $f_a(x_0) = r_a(x_0) \in (\alpha_1, 1)$  and this case reduces to the previous one. If  $x_0 \in (\alpha_{2n}, \alpha_{2n+2})$ , then  $f_a^{2n}(x_0) = r^{2n}(x_0) \in (a, \alpha_2)$  and if  $x_0 \in (\alpha_{2n+3}, \alpha_{2n+1})$ , then  $f_a^{2n+2}(x_0) = r^{2n+2}(x_0) \in (\alpha_1, 1)$  and these cases also reduce to the previous ones.

These observations complete the description of the part of PtoFP( $a, x_0$ ) that tests whether  $x_0$  reaches  $\varphi_2^a$  under  $f_a$ .

## 5. Discussion

We discuss some possible extensions of the proposed methods. Another class of tent maps that can be considered is the family of skew tent maps  $f_{a,b}$  defined by  $f_{a,b}(x) = \frac{bx}{a}$  for  $0 \leq x \leq a$  and  $f_a(x) = \frac{b(1-x)}{1-a}$  for  $a < x \leq 1$ , with an extra parameter  $b$ . In this paper, we discuss the case  $b = 1$ . On the unit interval, the interesting case occurs when  $a < b \leq 1$ . The techniques of this paper can also be used in this setting, when  $a = \frac{p}{q}$ ,  $b = \frac{u}{v}$ , with  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ ,  $\gcd(u, v) = 1$  and the denominators  $q$  and  $v$  have not too many factors in common. When  $\gcd(q, v) < q$  our techniques still work (using an extension of Property 2), but when (a power of)  $q$  divides  $v$ , this is no longer clear. A decision procedure for point-to-fixed-point problem for the family of skew tent maps  $f_{a,b}$  would bring us closed to a solution for arbitrary linear functions with two pieces, since many cases can be reduced to this case via topological conjugacy (Alesdà et al. (1993); Preston (1983, 1988)). The one-dimensional case for functions with three or more linear pieces remains open.

In this paper, we describe a decision procedure for the case where  $a$  and  $x_0$  are rational. The restriction to rational takes care of the finite representability of the input. Obviously a wider class of real numbers in the unit interval can be encoded in a finite way. We can think of the Turing-computable real numbers or the more restricted class of the algebraic real numbers. It is not obvious how the techniques of this paper can be extended to these settings.

- Alsedà, L., Llibre, J., Misiurewicz, M., 1993. Combinatorial Dynamics and Entropy in Dimension One. Vol. 5 of Advances Series in Nonlinear Dynamics. World Scientific.
- Blondel, V. D., Bournez, O., Koiran, P., Papadimitriou, C. H., Tsitsiklis, J. N., 2001a. Deciding stability and mortality of piecewise affine dynamical systems. *Theoretical Computer Science* 255 (1-2), 687–696.
- Blondel, V. D., Bournez, O., Koiran, P., Tsitsiklis, J. N., 2001b. The stability of saturated linear dynamical systems is undecidable. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 62 (3), 442–462.
- Geerts, F., Kuijpers, B., 2005. On the decidability of termination of query evaluation in transitive-closure logics for polynomial constraint databases. *Theoretical Computer Science* 336 (1), 125–151.
- Koiran, P., Cosnard, M., Garzon, M. H., 1994. Computability with low-dimensional dynamical systems. *Theoretical Computer Science* 132 (2), 113–128.
- Kuper, G. M., Libkin, L., Paredaens, J. (Eds.), 2000. *Constraint Databases*. Springer.
- Preston, C. (Ed.), 1983. *Iterates of Maps on an Interval*. Vol. 999 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag.
- Preston, C. (Ed.), 1988. *Iterates of Piecewise Monotone Mappings on an Interval*. Vol. 1347 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag.

## Appendix

In this appendix, we give the proof of Property 1. We start with two straightforward lemmas. The first lemma follows directly from the definition.

**Lemma 1.** *We have  $[A]^0 = 0$  and  $[A]^{i+1} = A[A]^i + 1$ , for  $A \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $i \in \mathbf{N}$ .* □

The following lemma gives an expression for the result of iterating a linear function  $F$   $i$  times on a point  $x$ .

**Lemma 2.** Let  $F : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} : x \mapsto Ax + B$ , with  $A, B \in \mathbf{R}$ , be an affine function. For  $i \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbf{R}$ , we have  $F^i(x) = A^i x + B[A]^i$ .  $\square$

**Proof.** We prove this by induction on  $i$ . For  $i = 0$ , we have  $F^0(x) = x$  and  $A^0 x + B[A]^0 = x$ . For the induction step, we have  $F^{i+1}(x) = F(F^i(x))$ , which equals  $A(A^i x + B[A]^i) + B$  by the induction hypothesis. This equals  $A^{i+1} x + B(A[A]^i + 1)$  and this is  $A^{i+1} x + B[A]^{i+1}$  by Lemma 1. This concludes the induction proof.  $\square$

We are now ready for the proof of Property 1.

**Proof of Property 1.** We prove this lemma by induction on  $k$ . For  $k = 1$  and  $j_1 = 0$ , clearly,  $F^{i_1}(x) = A^{i_1} x + B[A]^{i_1}$  by Lemma 2 and this is the desired expression, since the empty sum in  $(\dagger_2)$  equals zero. For  $k = 1$  and  $j_1 > 0$ , we get  $G^{j_1} F^{i_1}(x) = G^{j_1}(F^{i_1}(x)) = C^{j_1}(A^{i_1} x + B[A]^{i_1}) + D[C]^{j_1} = A^{i_1} C^{j_1} x + B[A]^{i_1} C^{j_1} + D[C]^{j_1}$ , again using Lemma 2. Since  $A^{i_1} C^{j_1} = A^0 C^0 = 1$ , this is the desired expression.

For the induction step, we assume that the property holds for  $k \geq 1$  and we have, for  $j_{k+1} = 0$ ,  $F^{i_{k+1}} G^{j_k} F^{i_k} \dots G^{j_1} F^{i_1}(x) = F^{i_{k+1}}(G^{j_k} F^{i_k} \dots G^{j_1} F^{i_1}(x))$  which, using Lemma 2 and the induction hypothesis  $(\dagger_1)$ , is  $A^{i_{k+1}} \left( A^{i_k} C^{j_k} x + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ A^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} (B[A]^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} + D[C]^{j_\nu}) \right\} \right) + B[A]^{i_{k+1}}$ . This expression equals  $A^{i_{k+1}} C^{j_k} x + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ A^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} (B[A]^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} + D[C]^{j_\nu}) \right\} + B[A]^{i_{k+1}}$ , which is  $(\dagger_2)$  for the value  $k + 1$ .

For  $j_{k+1} > 0$ , we have, using the previous expression and Lemma 2, that  $G^{j_{k+1}} F^{i_{k+1}} G^{j_k} F^{i_k} \dots G^{j_1} F^{i_1}(x)$ , which equals  $G^{j_{k+1}}(F^{i_{k+1}} G^{j_k} F^{i_k} \dots G^{j_1} F^{i_1}(x))$  is equal to

$$C^{j_{k+1}} \left( A^{i_{k+1}} C^{j_k} x + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ A^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} (B[A]^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} + D[C]^{j_\nu}) \right\} + B[A]^{i_{k+1}} \right) + D[C]^{j_{k+1}}.$$

This expression equals

$$A^{i_{k+1}} C^{j_{k+1}} x + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \left\{ A^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} (B[A]^{i_\nu} C^{j_\nu} + D[C]^{j_\nu}) \right\} + B[A]^{i_{k+1}} C^{j_{k+1}} + D[C]^{j_{k+1}}.$$

Since  $A^{i_{k+1}} C^{j_{k+1}} = 1$ , we get  $(\dagger_1)$  for the value  $k + 1$ . This is the desired result and the induction proof is finished.  $\square$