

Entropy along the Mandelbrot set

Giulio Tiozzo University of Toronto

André Aisenstadt Lecture – Montréal, 15th October, 2021



1. What is... (topological) entropy?

- 1. What is... (topological) entropy?
- 2. Entropy in dynamical systems

- 1. What is... (topological) entropy?
- 2. Entropy in dynamical systems
- 3. A crash course in complex dynamics

- 1. What is... (topological) entropy?
- 2. Entropy in dynamical systems
- 3. A crash course in complex dynamics
- 4. Definition of core entropy

- 1. What is... (topological) entropy?
- 2. Entropy in dynamical systems
- 3. A crash course in complex dynamics
- 4. Definition of core entropy
- 5. The quadratic case

- 1. What is... (topological) entropy?
- 2. Entropy in dynamical systems
- 3. A crash course in complex dynamics
- 4. Definition of core entropy
- 5. The quadratic case
- 6. The higher degree case

You are a spy, and you intercept two messages: one of them is in English, and another is just a random sequence of letters.

You are a spy, and you intercept two messages: one of them is in English, and another is just a random sequence of letters. Which one is the English one?

You are a spy, and you intercept two messages: one of them is in English, and another is just a random sequence of letters. Which one is the English one? Unfortunately, both messages are encrypted by substituting letters with numbers....

You are a spy, and you intercept two messages: one of them is in English, and another is just a random sequence of letters. Which one is the English one? Unfortunately, both messages are encrypted by substituting letters with numbers....

Text A

1, 14, 4, 27, 20, 8, 5, 14, 3, 5, 27, 23, 5, 27, 9, 19, 19, 21, 5, 4, 27, 6, 15, 18, 20, 8, 27, 20, 15, 27, 19, 5, 5, 27, 1, 7, 1, 9, 14, 27, 20, 8, 5, 27, 19, 20, 1, 18, 19

You are a spy, and you intercept two messages: one of them is in English, and another is just a random sequence of letters. Which one is the English one? Unfortunately, both messages are encrypted by substituting letters with numbers....

Text A

1, 14, 4, 27, 20, 8, 5, 14, 3, 5, 27, 23, 5, 27, 9, 19, 19, 21, 5, 4, 27, 6, 15, 18, 20, 8, 27, 20, 15, 27, 19, 5, 5, 27, 1, 7, 1, 9, 14, 27, 20, 8, 5, 27, 19, 20, 1, 18, 19

Text B

25, 18, 9, 10, 5, 4, 11, 20, 17, 20, 9, 15, 27, 3, 18, 6, 26, 17, 11, 6, 6, 18, 26, 14, 16, 21, 7, 17, 21, 9, 13, 17, 18, 27, 20, 6, 4, 25, 8, 22, 2, 3, 26, 11, 19, 6, 12, 5, 23

Idea: natural languages have redundancies

Idea: natural languages have redundancies

Th_ art_st is __e creato_ of be_t_ful th_ng_. To revea_ a_t and con_ea_ the _rtist _s art'_ a_m. The cr_t_c is he wh__an tra_slat_ into ano_he_ manner or a n_w mate_ial hi_ impre_sio_ of b_a_tiful_h_ngs.

(Osc__ Wil__, The Picture _____)"

in 1948, Shannon came up with an idea:

in 1948, Shannon came up with an idea:

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

in 1948, Shannon came up with an idea:

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

Text A

1, 14, 4, 27, 20, 8, 5, 14, 3, 5, 27, 23, 5, 27, 9, 19, 19, 21, 5, 4, 27, 6, 15, 18, 20, 8, 27, 20, 15, 27, 19, 5, 5, 27, 1, 7, 1, 9, 14, 27, 20, 8, 5, 27, 19, 20, 1, 18, 19

in 1948, Shannon came up with an idea:

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

Text A

1, 14, 4, 27, 20, 8, 5, 14, 3, 5, 27, 23, 5, 27, 9, 19, 19, 21, 5, 4, 27, 6, 15, 18, 20, 8, 27, 20, 15, 27, 19, 5, 5, 27, 1, 7, 1, 9, 14, 27, 20, 8, 5, 27, 19, 20, 1, 18, 19 h = 2.52095

in 1948, Shannon came up with an idea:

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

Text A

1, 14, 4, 27, 20, 8, 5, 14, 3, 5, 27, 23, 5, 27, 9, 19, 19, 21, 5, 4, 27, 6, 15, 18, 20, 8, 27, 20, 15, 27, 19, 5, 5, 27, 1, 7, 1, 9, 14, 27, 20, 8, 5, 27, 19, 20, 1, 18, 19 h = 2.52095

Text B

25, 18, 9, 10, 5, 4, 11, 20, 17, 20, 9, 15, 27, 3, 18, 6, 26, 17, 11, 6, 6, 18, 26, 14, 16, 21, 7, 17, 21, 9, 13, 17, 18, 27, 20, 6, 4, 25, 8, 22, 2, 3, 26, 11, 19, 6, 12, 5, 23 h = 3.06246

in 1948, Shannon came up with an idea:

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

Text A

1, 14, 4, 27, 20, 8, 5, 14, 3, 5, 27, 23, 5, 27, 9, 19, 19, 21, 5, 4, 27, 6, 15, 18, 20, 8, 27, 20, 15, 27, 19, 5, 5, 27, 1, 7, 1, 9, 14, 27, 20, 8, 5, 27, 19, 20, 1, 18, 19 h = 2.52095

Text B

25, 18, 9, 10, 5, 4, 11, 20, 17, 20, 9, 15, 27, 3, 18, 6, 26, 17, 11, 6, 6, 18, 26, 14, 16, 21, 7, 17, 21, 9, 13, 17, 18, 27, 20, 6, 4, 25, 8, 22, 2, 3, 26, 11, 19, 6, 12, 5, 23 h = 3.06246 (Random selection: log 27 = 3.29...)

$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

Text A

"and thence we issued forth to see again the stars" h = 2.52095

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

Text A

"and thence we issued forth to see again the stars" h = 2.52095

Text B

"yrijedktqtio crfzqkffrznpugquimqr tfdyhvbczksflew" h = 3.06246

$$h := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{subsequences of length } n \}}{n}$$

Text A

"and thence we issued forth to see again the stars" h = 2.52095

Text B

"yrijedktqtio crfzqkffrznpugquimqr tfdyhvbczksflew" h = 3.06246 (Random selection: log 27 = 3.29...)

English or Chinese?



From: R. Takahira, K.Tanaka-Ishii, L. Debowski (2016)

Let
$$f(x) = x^2 + c$$
.

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}, I_1 = \{x > 0\}$.

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:



Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:



 $\Sigma=1$

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:



$$\Sigma = 10$$

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:



$$\Sigma = 101$$

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:



 $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}=1010$

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:



 $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}=10100$

Let $f(x) = x^2 + c$. Let us introduce the partition $I = I_0 \cup I_1$ where $I_0 = \{x \le 0\}$, $I_1 = \{x > 0\}$. For each *x*, we can produce a binary sequence by looking at the orbit of *x*:



 $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}=101000100$

Topological entropy of real interval maps

Thus, we have a map $\Sigma: I \to \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$

starting point $x \mapsto \Sigma(x)$ infinite binary code.
Thus, we have a map $\Sigma: I \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$

starting point $x \mapsto \Sigma(x)$ infinite binary code.

 $\Sigma(x) = 101000100$

Thus, we have a map $\Sigma: I \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$

```
starting point x \mapsto \Sigma(x) infinite binary code.
```

 $\Sigma(x) = 101000100$ How many different sequences can I obtain?

Thus, we have a map $\Sigma: \textbf{\textit{I}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$

```
starting point x \mapsto \Sigma(x) infinite binary code.
```

 $\Sigma(x) = 101000100$ How many different sequences can I obtain? The topological entropy of *f* is the quantity

Thus, we have a map $\Sigma: \textbf{\textit{I}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$

```
starting point x \mapsto \Sigma(x) infinite binary code.
```

 $\Sigma(x) = 101000100$ How many different sequences can I obtain? The topological entropy of *f* is the quantity

$$h_{top}(f) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{admissible codes of length } n \}}{n}$$

Thus, we have a map $\Sigma: \textbf{\textit{I}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$

```
starting point x \mapsto \Sigma(x) infinite binary code.
```

 $\Sigma(x) = 101000100$ How many different sequences can I obtain? The topological entropy of *f* is the quantity

$$h_{top}(f) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \# \{ \text{admissible codes of length } n \}}{n}$$

<u>Note</u>: For quadratic maps $h_{top}(f) \leq \log 2$.

Let $f : I \rightarrow I$, continuous, piecewise monotone. A lap of *f* is a maximal interval on which *f* is monotone.

Let $f : I \rightarrow I$, continuous, piecewise monotone. A lap of f is a maximal interval on which f is monotone. The topological entropy of f also equals

Let $f : I \rightarrow I$, continuous, piecewise monotone. A lap of f is a maximal interval on which f is monotone. The topological entropy of f also equals

$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$

Let $f : I \rightarrow I$, continuous, piecewise monotone. A lap of f is a maximal interval on which f is monotone. The topological entropy of f also equals

$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{laps(f^n)\}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



Let $f : I \rightarrow I$, continuous, piecewise monotone.

$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$



Agrees with general definition for maps on compact spaces using open covers (Misiurewicz-Szlenk)

 $f: I \rightarrow I$ is postcritically finite if the forward orbits of the critical points of *f* are finite.

 $f: I \rightarrow I$ is postcritically finite if the forward orbits of the critical points of *f* are finite. Then the entropy is the logarithm of an algebraic number.



 $f: I \rightarrow I$ is postcritically finite if the forward orbits of the critical points of *f* are finite. Then the entropy is the logarithm of an algebraic number.



 $\begin{array}{rrr} A & \mapsto & A \cup B \\ B & \mapsto & A \end{array}$

 $f: I \rightarrow I$ is postcritically finite if the forward orbits of the critical points of *f* are finite. Then the entropy is the logarithm of an algebraic number.



 $\begin{array}{ccc} A & \mapsto & A \cup B \\ B & \mapsto & A \end{array} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right)$

 $f: I \rightarrow I$ is postcritically finite if the forward orbits of the critical points of *f* are finite. Then the entropy is the logarithm of an algebraic number.



 $\begin{array}{ccc} A & \mapsto & A \cup B \\ B & \mapsto & A \end{array} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2} \end{array}$

 $f: I \rightarrow I$ is postcritically finite if the forward orbits of the critical points of *f* are finite. Then the entropy is the logarithm of an algebraic number.



 $\begin{array}{ccc} A & \mapsto & A \cup B \\ B & \mapsto & A \end{array} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda = \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2} = e^{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})} \end{array}$

$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$

Consider the real quadratic family

$$f_c(z) := z^2 + c$$
 $c \in [-2, 1/4]$

$$h_{top}(f,\mathbb{R}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \#\{ \operatorname{laps}(f^n) \}}{n}$$

Consider the real quadratic family

$$f_c(z) := z^2 + c$$
 $c \in [-2, 1/4]$

How does entropy change with the parameter c?

► is continuous

▶ is continuous and monotone (Milnor-Thurston, 1977).

- ▶ is continuous and monotone (Milnor-Thurston, 1977).
- ▶ $0 \le h_{top}(f_c, \mathbb{R}) \le \log 2.$

- ▶ is continuous and monotone (Milnor-Thurston, 1977).
- ▶ $0 \le h_{top}(f_c, \mathbb{R}) \le \log 2.$



- ▶ is continuous and monotone (Milnor-Thurston, 1977).
- ▶ $0 \le h_{top}(f_c, \mathbb{R}) \le \log 2.$



- ▶ is continuous and monotone (Milnor-Thurston, 1977).
- ▶ $0 \le h_{top}(f_c, \mathbb{R}) \le \log 2.$



Question : Can we extend this theory to complex polynomials?

- ▶ is continuous and monotone (Milnor-Thurston, 1977).
- ▶ $0 \le h_{top}(f_c, \mathbb{R}) \le \log 2.$



<u>Remark.</u> If we consider $f_c : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ entropy is constant $\overline{h_{top}(f_c, \hat{\mathbb{C}})} = \log 2$. (Lyubich 1980)

Mandelbrot set

The Mandelbrot set M is the connectedness locus of the quadratic family $f_c(z) := z^2 + c$.

$$\mathcal{M} = \{ \pmb{c} \in \mathbb{C} \; : \; f^{n}_{\pmb{c}}(\pmb{0})
ightarrow \infty \}$$


Since $\hat{\mathbb{C}}\setminus\mathcal{M}$ is simply-connected, it can be uniformized by the exterior of the unit disk

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}: \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathcal{M}$$

Since $\hat{\mathbb{C}}\setminus\mathcal{M}$ is simply-connected, it can be uniformized by the exterior of the unit disk

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}: \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathcal{M}$$



Since $\hat{\mathbb{C}}\setminus\mathcal{M}$ is simply-connected, it can be uniformized by the exterior of the unit disk

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}: \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathcal{M}$$

Since $\hat{\mathbb{C}}\setminus\mathcal{M}$ is simply-connected, it can be uniformized by the exterior of the unit disk

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}: \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathcal{M}$$

The images of radial arcs in the disk are called external rays. Every angle $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ determines an external ray

$$R(\theta) := \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\{\rho e^{2\pi i\theta} : \rho > 1\})$$

Since $\hat{\mathbb{C}}\setminus\mathcal{M}$ is simply-connected, it can be uniformized by the exterior of the unit disk

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}: \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathcal{M}$$

The images of radial arcs in the disk are called external rays. Every angle $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ determines an external ray

$$\boldsymbol{R}(\theta) := \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\{\rho \boldsymbol{e}^{2\pi i \theta} : \rho > 1\})$$

An external ray $R(\theta)$ is said to land at x if

$$\lim_{\rho\to 1} \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho e^{2\pi i\theta}) = x$$

Since $\hat{\mathbb{C}}\setminus\mathcal{M}$ is simply-connected, it can be uniformized by the exterior of the unit disk

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}: \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathcal{M}$$

The images of radial arcs in the disk are called external rays. Every angle $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ determines an external ray

$$\boldsymbol{R}(\theta) := \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\{\rho \boldsymbol{e}^{2\pi i \theta} : \rho > 1\})$$

An external ray $R(\theta)$ is said to land at x if

$$\lim_{\rho \to 1} \Phi_{\mathcal{M}}(\rho e^{2\pi i \theta}) = x$$



If $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, then the external ray $R(\theta)$ lands and determines a postcritically finite quadratic polynomial f_{θ} .

If $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, then the external ray $R(\theta)$ lands and determines a postcritically finite quadratic polynomial f_{θ} .

Conjecture (Douady-Hubbard, MLC)

All rays land, and the boundary map $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \partial \mathcal{M}$ is continuous.

If $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, then the external ray $R(\theta)$ lands and determines a postcritically finite quadratic polynomial f_{θ} .

Conjecture (Douady-Hubbard, MLC)

All rays land, and the boundary map $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \partial \mathcal{M}$ is continuous.

As a consequence, the Mandelbrot set is homeomorphic to a quotient of the closed disk

If $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, then the external ray $R(\theta)$ lands and determines a postcritically finite quadratic polynomial f_{θ} .

Conjecture (Douady-Hubbard, MLC)

All rays land, and the boundary map $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \partial \mathcal{M}$ is continuous.

As a consequence, the Mandelbrot set is homeomorphic to a quotient of the closed disk (hence locally connected).

Define $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ on \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} if $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together.

Define $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ on \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} if $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together. The closure of this equivalence relation defines a **lamination** on the disk

Define $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ on \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} if $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together. The closure of this equivalence relation defines a **lamination** on the disk



Define $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ on \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} if $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together. The closure of this equivalence relation defines a **lamination** on the disk



The quotient \mathcal{M}_{abs} of the disk by the lamination is a (locally connected) model for the Mandelbrot set, and homeomorphic to it if MLC holds.

Julia sets

Let $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$. Then the <u>filled Julia set</u> of f_c is the set of points which do not escape to infinity under forward iteration:

 $K(f_c) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : f_c^n(z) \text{ is bounded } \}$

Julia sets

Let $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$. Then the <u>filled Julia set</u> of f_c is the set of points which do not escape to infinity under forward iteration:

 $K(f_c) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : f_c^n(z) \text{ is bounded } \}$

and the Julia set is its boundary:

 $J(f_c) := \partial K(f_c)$

Julia sets

Let $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$. Then the <u>filled Julia set</u> of f_c is the set of points which do not escape to infinity under forward iteration:

 $K(f_c) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : f_c^n(z) \text{ is bounded } \}$

and the Julia set is its boundary:

 $J(f_c) := \partial K(f_c)$



The complex case: Hubbard trees

The Hubbard tree T_c of a quadratic polynomial is a forward invariant, connected subset of the filled Julia set which contains the critical orbit.

The complex case: Hubbard trees

The Hubbard tree T_c of a quadratic polynomial is a forward invariant, connected subset of the filled Julia set which contains the critical orbit.



Complex Hubbard trees

The Hubbard tree T_c of a quadratic polynomial is a forward invariant, connected subset of the filled Julia set which contains the critical orbit.



Complex Hubbard trees

The Hubbard tree T_c of a quadratic polynomial is a forward invariant, connected subset of the filled Julia set which contains the critical orbit. The map f_c acts on it.



Let *f* be a polynomial whose Julia set is connected and locally connected

Let f be a polynomial whose Julia set is connected and locally connected (e.g. a postcritically finite f).

Let f be a polynomial whose Julia set is connected and locally connected (e.g. a postcritically finite f). Then the core entropy of f

Let f be a polynomial whose Julia set is connected and locally connected (e.g. a postcritically finite f). Then the core entropy of f is the entropy of the restriction

Let f be a polynomial whose Julia set is connected and locally connected (e.g. a postcritically finite f). Then the core entropy of f is the entropy of the restriction

$$h(f) := h(f \mid_{T_f})$$

Let f be a polynomial whose Julia set is connected and locally connected (e.g. a postcritically finite f). Then the core entropy of f is the entropy of the restriction

$$h(f) := h(f \mid_{T_f})$$

where T_f is the Hubbard tree of f.





$$A \rightarrow B$$



$$egin{array}{c} A
ightarrow B \ B
ightarrow C \end{array}$$





$$\begin{array}{l} A \rightarrow B \\ B \rightarrow C \\ C \rightarrow A \cup D \\ D \rightarrow A \cup B \end{array}$$






The core entropy - example

 $h(f) := h(f \mid_{T_f})$



The core entropy

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then the external ray at angle θ lands, and determines a postcritically finite quadratic polynomial f_{θ} , with Hubbard tree T_{θ} .

The core entropy

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then the external ray at angle θ lands, and determines a postcritically finite quadratic polynomial f_{θ} , with Hubbard tree T_{θ} .

Definition (W. Thurston)

The core entropy of f_{θ} is

$$h(\theta) := h(f_{\theta} \mid_{T_{\theta}})$$

The core entropy

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then the external ray at angle θ lands, and determines a postcritically finite quadratic polynomial f_{θ} , with Hubbard tree T_{θ} .

Definition (W. Thurston)

The core entropy of f_{θ} is

$$h(\theta) := h(f_{\theta} \mid_{T_{\theta}})$$

Question: How does $h(\theta)$ vary with the parameter θ ?

Core entropy as a function of external angle (W. Thurston)



Core entropy as a function of external angle (W. Thurston)



Core entropy as a function of external angle (W. Thurston)



Question Can you see the Mandelbrot set in this picture?

Observation.

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

Let us take two rays θ_1 landing at c_1 and θ_2 landing at c_2 .

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

Let us take two rays θ_1 landing at c_1 and θ_2 landing at c_2 . Then we define $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$ if c_1 lies on the arc $[0, c_2]$.

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

Let us take two rays θ_1 landing at c_1 and θ_2 landing at c_2 . Then we define $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$ if c_1 lies on the arc $[0, c_2]$.

Theorem (Li Tao; Penrose; Tan Lei; Zeng Jinsong) If $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$, then

 $h(\theta_1) \leq h(\theta_2)$

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

Let us take two rays θ_1 landing at c_1 and θ_2 landing at c_2 . Then we define $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$ if c_1 lies on the arc $[0, c_2]$.

Theorem (Li Tao; Penrose; Tan Lei; Zeng Jinsong) If $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$, then

 $h(\theta_1) \leq h(\theta_2)$

In fact, entropy determines the lamination.

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

Let us take two rays θ_1 landing at c_1 and θ_2 landing at c_2 . Then we define $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$ if c_1 lies on the arc $[0, c_2]$.

Theorem (Li Tao; Penrose; Tan Lei; Zeng Jinsong) If $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$, then

 $h(\theta_1) \leq h(\theta_2)$

In fact, entropy determines the lamination.

Proposition If $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

Let us take two rays θ_1 landing at c_1 and θ_2 landing at c_2 . Then we define $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$ if c_1 lies on the arc $[0, c_2]$.

Theorem (Li Tao; Penrose; Tan Lei; Zeng Jinsong) If $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$, then

 $h(\theta_1) \leq h(\theta_2)$

In fact, entropy determines the lamination.

Proposition If $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$ and $h(\theta) > h(\theta_1)$ for all $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$,

<u>Observation.</u> If $R_M(\theta_1)$ and $R_M(\theta_2)$ land together, then $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$.

Monotonicity still holds along veins.

Let us take two rays θ_1 landing at c_1 and θ_2 landing at c_2 . Then we define $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$ if c_1 lies on the arc $[0, c_2]$.

Theorem (Li Tao; Penrose; Tan Lei; Zeng Jinsong) If $\theta_1 <_M \theta_2$, then

 $h(\theta_1) \leq h(\theta_2)$

In fact, entropy determines the lamination.

Proposition If $h(\theta_1) = h(\theta_2)$ and $h(\theta) > h(\theta_1)$ for all $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, then $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$.

Rays landing on the real slice of the Mandelbrot set



Harmonic measure

Given a subset A of ∂M , the harmonic measure ν_M is the probability that a random ray lands on A:

 $u_{\mathcal{M}}(A) := \operatorname{Leb}(\{\theta \in S^1 : R(\theta) \text{ lands on } A\})$

Harmonic measure

Given a subset *A* of ∂M , the harmonic measure ν_M is the probability that a random ray lands on *A*:

$$u_{\mathcal{M}}(A) := \operatorname{Leb}(\{\theta \in S^1 : R(\theta) \text{ lands on } A\})$$

For instance, take $A = \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbb{R}$ the real section of the Mandelbrot set.

Harmonic measure

Given a subset *A* of ∂M , the harmonic measure ν_M is the probability that a random ray lands on *A*:

$$u_{\mathcal{M}}(A) := \operatorname{Leb}(\{\theta \in S^1 : R(\theta) \text{ lands on } A\})$$

For instance, take $A = M \cap \mathbb{R}$ the real section of the Mandelbrot set. How common is it for a ray to land on the real axis?



Real section of the Mandelbrot set Theorem (Zakeri, '00) The harmonic measure of the real axis is 0.

Real section of the Mandelbrot set

Theorem (Zakeri, '00)

The harmonic measure of the real axis is 0. However,

Real section of the Mandelbrot set

Theorem (Zakeri, '00)

The harmonic measure of the real axis is 0. However, the Hausdorff dimension of the set of rays landing on the real axis is 1.

Real section of the Mandelbrot set

Theorem (Zakeri, '00)

The harmonic measure of the real axis is 0. However, the Hausdorff dimension of the set of rays landing on the real axis is 1.



Given $c \in [-2, 1/4]$, we can consider the set of external rays which land on the real axis to the right of *c*:

Given $c \in [-2, 1/4]$, we can consider the set of external rays which land on the real axis to the right of *c*:



Given $c \in [-2, 1/4]$, we can consider the set of external rays which land on the real axis to the right of *c*:



Given $c \in [-2, 1/4]$, we can consider the set of external rays which land on the real axis to the right of *c*:



Given $c \in [-2, 1/4]$, we can consider the set of external rays which land on the real axis to the right of *c*:



$$P_c := \{ \theta \in S^1 : R(\theta) \text{ lands on } \partial \mathcal{M} \cap [c, 1/4] \}$$

 $c \mapsto \mathsf{H.dim} \ P_c$



$$P_c := \{ \theta \in S^1 : R(\theta) \text{ lands on } \partial \mathcal{M} \cap [c, 1/4] \}$$

 $c \mapsto \mathsf{H.dim} \ P_c$



$$P_c := \{ \theta \in S^1 : R(\theta) \text{ lands on } \partial \mathcal{M} \cap [c, 1/4] \}$$

 $c \mapsto \mathsf{H.dim} \ P_c$



$$P_c := \{ \theta \in S^1 : R(\theta) \text{ lands on } \partial \mathcal{M} \cap [c, 1/4] \}$$

 $c \mapsto \mathsf{H.dim} \ P_c$



Entropy formula, real case Theorem (T.) Let $c \in [-2, 1/4]$. Then

 $\frac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ P_c$


$$\frac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ P_c$$

$$rac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2}=\mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ P_c$$

It relates dynamical properties of a particular map to the geometry of parameter space near the chosen parameter.

$$rac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2}=\mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ P_c$$

- It relates dynamical properties of a particular map to the geometry of parameter space near the chosen parameter.
- Entropy formula: relates dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponent (Manning, Bowen, Ledrappier, Young, ...).

$$\frac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ \mathsf{P}_c$$

- It relates dynamical properties of a particular map to the geometry of parameter space near the chosen parameter.
- Entropy formula: relates dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponent (Manning, Bowen, Ledrappier, Young, ...).
- It does not depend on MLC.

$$\frac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ \mathsf{P}_c$$

- It relates dynamical properties of a particular map to the geometry of parameter space near the chosen parameter.
- Entropy formula: relates dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponent (Manning, Bowen, Ledrappier, Young, ...).
- It does not depend on MLC.
- If $B_c := \{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : \theta \text{ biaccessible for } f_c \}$

$$rac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2}=\mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ P_c$$

- It relates dynamical properties of a particular map to the geometry of parameter space near the chosen parameter.
- Entropy formula: relates dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponent (Manning, Bowen, Ledrappier, Young, ...).
- It does not depend on MLC.
- If B_c := {θ ∈ ℝ/ℤ : θ biaccessible for f_c} = L_c ∩ ∂D (see e.g. Zakeri, Smirnov, Zdunik, Bruin-Schleicher ...) then also

$$\frac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ \mathsf{P}_c$$

- It relates dynamical properties of a particular map to the geometry of parameter space near the chosen parameter.
- Entropy formula: relates dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponent (Manning, Bowen, Ledrappier, Young, ...).
- It does not depend on MLC.
- If B_c := {θ ∈ ℝ/ℤ : θ biaccessible for f_c} = L_c ∩ ∂D (see e.g. Zakeri, Smirnov, Zdunik, Bruin-Schleicher ...) then also

$$rac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2}=\mathsf{H}.\ \mathsf{dim}\ B_c$$

$$\frac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\ \mathsf{P}_c$$

- It relates dynamical properties of a particular map to the geometry of parameter space near the chosen parameter.
- Entropy formula: relates dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponent (Manning, Bowen, Ledrappier, Young, ...).
- It does not depend on MLC.
- If B_c := {θ ∈ ℝ/ℤ : θ biaccessible for f_c} = L_c ∩ ∂D (see e.g. Zakeri, Smirnov, Zdunik, Bruin-Schleicher ...) then also

$$rac{h_{top}(f_c,\mathbb{R})}{\log 2}=\mathsf{H}.\ \mathsf{dim}\ B_c$$

It can be generalized to non-real veins.

Entropy formula along complex veins

A vein is an embedded arc in the Mandelbrot set.



Entropy formula, complex case

A vein is an embedded arc in the Mandelbrot set.



Given a parameter *c* along a vein, we can look at the set P_c of parameter rays which land on the vein between 0 and *c*.

Entropy formula along complex veins Theorem (T.; Jung)

Let v be a vein in the Mandelbrot set, and let $c \in v$.

Entropy formula along complex veins

Theorem (T.; Jung)

Let v be a vein in the Mandelbrot set, and let $c \in v$. Then

 $\frac{h(f_c)}{\log 2} =$

Entropy formula along complex veins

Theorem (T.; Jung)

Let v be a vein in the Mandelbrot set, and let $c \in v$. Then

$$\frac{h(f_c)}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\;B_c$$

Entropy formula along complex veins Theorem (T.; Jung)

Let v be a vein in the Mandelbrot set, and let $c \in v$. Then

$$\frac{h(f_c)}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\; B_c = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\; P_c$$

Entropy formula along complex veins Theorem (T.; Jung)

Let v be a vein in the Mandelbrot set, and let $c \in v$. Then

$$rac{h(f_c)}{\log 2} = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\; B_c = \mathsf{H}.\mathsf{dim}\; P_c$$





The core entropy as a function of external angle

Question (Thurston, Hubbard): Is $h(\theta)$ a continuous function of θ ?



The Main Theorem: Continuity

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy function $h(\theta)$ extends to a continuous function from \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} to \mathbb{R} .



In fact:

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy is locally Hölder continuous at θ if $h(\theta) > 0$, and not locally Hölder at θ where $h(\theta) = 0$.

In fact:

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy is locally Hölder continuous at θ if $h(\theta) > 0$, and not locally Hölder at θ where $h(\theta) = 0$.



In fact:

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy is locally Hölder continuous at θ if $h(\theta) > 0$, and not locally Hölder at θ where $h(\theta) = 0$.

In fact:

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy is locally Hölder continuous at θ if $h(\theta) > 0$, and not locally Hölder at θ where $h(\theta) = 0$.

Theorem (T.)

Let $h(\theta)$ be the entropy of the <u>real</u> quadratic polynomial with external ray θ .

In fact:

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy is locally Hölder continuous at θ if $h(\theta) > 0$, and not locally Hölder at θ where $h(\theta) = 0$.

Theorem (T.)

Let $h(\theta)$ be the entropy of the <u>real</u> quadratic polynomial with external ray θ . Then the local Hölder exponent $\alpha(h, \theta)$ of h at θ satisfies

In fact:

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy is locally Hölder continuous at θ if $h(\theta) > 0$, and not locally Hölder at θ where $h(\theta) = 0$.

Theorem (T.)

Let $h(\theta)$ be the entropy of the <u>real</u> quadratic polynomial with external ray θ . Then the local Hölder exponent $\alpha(h, \theta)$ of h at θ satisfies

$$\alpha(h, \theta) := \frac{h(\theta)}{\log 2}$$

In fact:

Theorem (T.)

The core entropy is locally Hölder continuous at θ if $h(\theta) > 0$, and not locally Hölder at θ where $h(\theta) = 0$.

Theorem (T.)

Let $h(\theta)$ be the entropy of the <u>real</u> quadratic polynomial with external ray θ . Then the local Hölder exponent $\alpha(h, \theta)$ of h at θ satisfies

$$lpha(\pmb{h}, \pmb{ heta}) := rac{\pmb{h}(\pmb{ heta})}{\log 2}$$

(Conjectured by Isola-Politi, 1990)

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together),

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

 $\theta_{\star} := \{ x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal} \}$

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

$$\theta_{\star} := \{ x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal} \}$$

 $\underline{\text{E.g.}}: \theta_1 = 1/7, \theta_2 = 2/7,$

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

$$\theta_{\star} := \{ x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal} \}$$

<u>E.g.</u>: $\theta_1 = 1/7, \theta_2 = 2/7, \theta_* = 1/4$

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

$$\theta_{\star} := \{x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal}\}$$

E.g.: $\theta_1 = 1/7, \theta_2 = 2/7, \theta_* = 1/4$ (Carminati-T. for continued fractions)

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

$$\theta_{\star} := \{x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal}\}$$

<u>E.g.</u>: $\theta_1 = 1/7, \theta_2 = 2/7, \theta_* = 1/4$ (Carminati-T. for continued fractions)

Conjecture (T.)

Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

$$\theta_{\star} := \{x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal}\}$$

<u>E.g.</u>: $\theta_1 = 1/7, \theta_2 = 2/7, \theta_* = 1/4$ (Carminati-T. for continued fractions)

Conjecture (T.)



Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

$$\theta_{\star} := \{x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal}\}$$

<u>E.g.</u>: $\theta_1 = 1/7, \theta_2 = 2/7, \theta_* = 1/4$

Conjecture (T.)



Given $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ with $\theta_1 \sim_M \theta_2$ (= landing together), define their pseudocenter θ_* as the dyadic rational in $[\theta_1, \theta_2]$ of lowest complexity

$$\theta_* := \{x = p/2^q : x \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], q \text{ minimal}\}$$

<u>E.g.</u>: $\theta_1 = 1/7, \theta_2 = 2/7, \theta_* = 1/4$

Theorem (Dudko-Schleicher)



The core entropy for cubic polynomials



The core entropy for cubic polynomials




The unicritical slice



 $f(z)=z^3+c$

The symmetric slice



 $f(z) = z^3 + cz$

Continuity in higher degree, combinatorial version

For polynomials of degree d, the analog of the circle at infinity for the Mandelbrot set is the set PM(d) of primitive majors.





Theorem (W. Thurston)

 $PM(d) \cong K(B_d, 1)$

where B_d is the <u>braid group</u> on d strands.



Theorem (W. Thurston)

 $PM(d) \cong K(B_d, 1)$

where B_d is the <u>braid group</u> on d strands. (see Baik, Gao, Hubbard, Lindsey, Tan, D. Thurston)



Theorem (W. Thurston)

 $PM(d) \cong K(B_d, 1)$

where B_d is the <u>braid group</u> on d strands. (see Baik, Gao, Hubbard, Lindsey, Tan, D. Thurston) **Example.** $\pi_1(PM(3)) = \langle x, y : x^2 = y^3 \rangle$

Continuity in higher degree, combinatorial version Theorem (T. - Yan Gao)

Fix $d \ge 2$. Then the core entropy extends to a continuous function on the space PM(d) of primitive majors.

Continuity in higher degree, combinatorial version Theorem (T. - Yan Gao)

Fix $d \ge 2$. Then the core entropy extends to a continuous function on the space PM(d) of primitive majors.



Continuity in higher degree, analytic version

Define \mathcal{P}_d as the space of monic, centered polynomials of degree *d*.

Continuity in higher degree, analytic version

Define \mathcal{P}_d as the space of monic, centered polynomials of degree *d*. One says $f_n \to f$ if the coefficients of f_n converge to the coefficients of *f*.

Continuity in higher degree, analytic version

Define \mathcal{P}_d as the space of monic, centered polynomials of degree *d*. One says $f_n \rightarrow f$ if the coefficients of f_n converge to the coefficients of *f*.

Theorem (T. - Yan Gao)

Let $d \ge 2$. Then the core entropy is a continuous function on the space of monic, centered, postcritically finite polynomials of degree d.

1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3?

1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- 2. Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space?

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- 3. Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points (where the Mandelbrot set is self-similar! (Tan Lei))

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points (where the Mandelbrot set is self-similar! (Tan Lei))
- 4. Can we us core entropy to define transverse measures on the lamination?

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points (where the Mandelbrot set is self-similar! (Tan Lei))
- Can we us core entropy to define transverse measures on the lamination? Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points (where the Mandelbrot set is self-similar! (Tan Lei))
- 4. Can we us core entropy to define transverse measures on the lamination?
 Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure
 Sullivan dictionary: Teichmüller theory ⇔ complex dynamics

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points (where the Mandelbrot set is self-similar! (Tan Lei))
- Can we us core entropy to define transverse measures on the lamination? Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure Sullivan dictionary: Teichmüller theory ⇔ complex dynamics (Answer: Yes! [T. '21])

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points (where the Mandelbrot set is self-similar! (Tan Lei))
- Can we us core entropy to define transverse measures on the lamination? Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure Sullivan dictionary: Teichmüller theory ⇔ complex dynamics (Answer: Yes! [T. '21])
- 5. What about the other eigenvalues of the transition matrix?

- 1. What are the local maxima of the core entropy in d > 3? How many are there?
- Can you use core entropy in higher degree case to define a hierarchical structure of parameter space? (Compare veins for d = 2)
- Jung's conjecture: self-similarity of entropy graph near Misiurewicz points (where the Mandelbrot set is self-similar! (Tan Lei))
- 4. Can we us core entropy to define transverse measures on the lamination? Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure Sullivan dictionary: Teichmüller theory ⇔ complex dynamics (Answer: Yes! [T. '21])
- 5. What about the other eigenvalues of the transition matrix? (Bray-Davis-Lindsey-Wu, ...)



Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a lamination \mathcal{L}_{θ} on the disk such that

Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a lamination \mathcal{L}_{θ} on the disk such that $\theta_1 \sim \theta_2$ if $R(\theta_1)$ and $R(\theta_2)$ "land" at the same point.

Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a lamination \mathcal{L}_{θ} on the disk such that $\theta_1 \sim \theta_2$ if $R(\theta_1)$ and $R(\theta_2)$ "land" at the same point.



Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a lamination \mathcal{L}_{θ} on the disk such that $\theta_1 \sim \theta_2$ if $R(\theta_1)$ and $R(\theta_2)$ "land" at the same point.



Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a lamination \mathcal{L}_{θ} on the disk such that $\theta_1 \sim \theta_2$ if $R(\theta_1)$ and $R(\theta_2)$ "land" at the same point.



Also Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure

Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a lamination \mathcal{L}_{θ} on the disk such that $\theta_1 \sim \theta_2$ if $R(\theta_1)$ and $R(\theta_2)$ "land" at the same point.



Also Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure Sullivan dictionary: Teichmüller theory \Leftrightarrow complex dynamics

Theorem (W. Thurston)

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a lamination \mathcal{L}_{θ} on the disk such that $\theta_1 \sim \theta_2$ if $R(\theta_1)$ and $R(\theta_2)$ "land" at the same point.



Also Thurston: surface laminations (Teichmüller theory) carry a transverse measure Sullivan dictionary: Teichmüller theory \Leftrightarrow complex dynamics Question. Can we define a transverse measure on \mathcal{L}_{θ} ?

Question. Can we define a transverse measure on \mathcal{L}_{θ} ?

Theorem (T. '21)

There exists a transverse measure m_{θ} on \mathcal{L}_{θ} such that

 $f_{\theta}^{\star}(m_{\theta}) = \lambda_{\theta} m_{\theta}$

Question. Can we define a transverse measure on \mathcal{L}_{θ} ? Theorem (T. '21)

There exists a transverse measure m_{θ} on \mathcal{L}_{θ} such that

$$f_{\theta}^{\star}(m_{\theta}) = \lambda_{\theta} m_{\theta}$$

and $h(\theta) = \log \lambda_{\theta}$.
Laminations

Question. Can we define a transverse measure on \mathcal{L}_{θ} ? Theorem (T. '21)

There exists a transverse measure m_{θ} on \mathcal{L}_{θ} such that

$$f_{\theta}^{\star}(m_{\theta}) = \lambda_{\theta} m_{\theta}$$

and $h(\theta) = \log \lambda_{\theta}$.

Such a measure induces a semiconjugacy between $f_{\theta}: T_{\theta} \to T_{\theta}$ and a piecewise linear model with slope λ_{θ} .

Laminations

Question. Can we define a transverse measure on \mathcal{L}_{θ} ? Theorem (T. '21)

There exists a transverse measure m_{θ} on \mathcal{L}_{θ} such that

$$f^{\star}_{\theta}(m_{\theta}) = \lambda_{\theta} m_{\theta}$$

and $h(\theta) = \log \lambda_{\theta}$.

Such a measure induces a semiconjugacy between $f_{\theta}: T_{\theta} \to T_{\theta}$ and a piecewise linear model with slope λ_{θ} . (Compare: Milnor-Thurston, Baillif-deCarvalho, Sousa-Ramos, ...)



Let $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ two leaves, and τ a transverse arc connecting them.



Let $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ two leaves, and τ a transverse arc connecting them. Then we define

$$\mu(\tau) := h(f_{c_2}) - h(f_{c_1})$$



Let $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ two leaves, and τ a transverse arc connecting them. Then we define

$$\mu(\tau) := h(f_{c_2}) - h(f_{c_1})$$

It gives \mathcal{M}_{abs} (rather, a quotient) the structure of a metric tree.



Let $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ two leaves, and τ a transverse arc connecting them. Then we define

$$\mu(\tau) := h(f_{c_2}) - h(f_{c_1})$$

It gives $\mathcal{M}_{\textit{abs}}$ (rather, a quotient) the structure of a metric tree.

"Combinatorial bifurcation measure"?