



# Mean Ergodic Shadowing: relation with other shadowing

Ali Darabi\*

Department of mathematics, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we study mean ergodic shadowing property and obtain some results in relation with other partial shadowing. We show that mean ergodic shadowing implies  $\bar{d}$ -shadowing property, and any minimal system with mean ergodic shadowing does not have  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing property. In addition, by giving some examples, we show that the shadowing property and mean ergodic shadowing are different.

**Keywords:** Shadowing, mean ergodic shadowing,  $\bar{d}$ -shadowing

**AMS Mathematics Subject Classification [2020]:** 37C50, 54H20

## 1. Introduction

A pair  $(X, f)$ , where  $(X, d)$  is a metric space and  $f : X \rightarrow X$  is a continuous map is called a *topological dynamical system*. The shadowing theory is an important part of the global and stability theory of dynamical systems [?, 5]. The shadowing property means that near a pseudo-orbit (numerically computed orbit) there exists an exact orbit. In other words, numerical computations reflect the real dynamical behavior of  $f$ . Throughout the study  $(X, d)$  is a compact metric space. We use  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  for the set of non-negative integers.

Given  $\delta > 0$  a sequence  $\xi = \{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \subset X$  with the property

$$d(f(x_i), x_{i+1}) < \delta, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

is called a  $\delta$ -pseudo-orbit for  $f$ , and if

$$\underline{d}(\{i \geq 0 : d(f(x_i), x_{i+1}) < \delta\}) = 1,$$

where  $\underline{d}(A)$  is the *lower density* of the set  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$  defined by

$$\underline{d}(A) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}|}{n},$$

is called a  $\delta$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit of  $f$  [3]. If we replace  $\liminf$  with  $\limsup$  in the above formula we get  $\bar{d}(A)$ , the *upper density* of  $A$ . We say the set  $A$  has density zero if  $\bar{d}(A) = 0$ . A sequence  $\xi = \{x_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  is said to be  $\epsilon$ -shadowed by a point  $z \in X$  if

$$d(f^i(z), x_i) < \epsilon, \quad \forall i \geq 0.$$

\*Speaker. Email address: adarabi@scu.ac.ir,

A map  $f : X \rightarrow X$  is said to have *shadowing property* (POTP, for short) if for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  in which every  $\delta$ -pseudo-orbit  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  can be  $\epsilon$ -shadowed by some point in  $X$ .

DEFINITION 1.1. A  $\delta$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit  $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$  is said to be  $\epsilon$ -ergodic shadowed by some point  $z$  in  $X$  if

$$\underline{d}(\{i \geq 0 : d(f^i(z), x_i) < \epsilon\}) = 1.$$

A dynamical system  $(X, f)$  has *ergodic shadowing property* if for any given  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$  in which that any  $\delta$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit of  $f$  can be  $\epsilon$ -ergodic shadowed by some points in  $X$  [3].

A set  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$  is called *syndetic* if it has bounded gaps, i.e., there is  $k > 0$  such that  $A \cap \{i, i+1, \dots, i+k-1\} \neq \emptyset$  for each  $i \geq 0$ . The family of syndetic sets is denoted by  $\mathcal{F}_s$ .

DEFINITION 1.2. If for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $\delta$ -pseudo-orbit  $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  there is a point  $z \in X$  in which

$$\{i : d(f^i(z), x_i) < \epsilon\} \in \mathcal{F}_s,$$

then we say  $f$  has  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing property.

Analogously, we denote  $\mathcal{F}_d$  for the family of subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  with positive lower density, and define  $\mathcal{F}_d$ -shadowing property similarly.

DEFINITION 1.3.  $(X, f)$  has  *$\underline{d}$ -shadowing property* if for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $\delta$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit  $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  there is a point  $z \in X$  such that

$$\underline{d}(\{i : d(f^i(z), x_i) < \epsilon\}) > 0.$$

Similarly, if  $\bar{d}(\{i : d(f^i(z), x_i) < \epsilon\}) > \frac{1}{2}$  it is said  *$\bar{d}$ -shadowing property* (see [1, Definition 2.1]).

Recently, Das et al. [2] introduced a new type of average shadowing named mean ergodic shadowing and studied some aspects of it. We bring the following definition from [2].

DEFINITION 1.4. [2] A map  $f$  has *mean ergodic shadowing property* if for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$  in which that any  $\delta$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit of  $f$  can be  $\epsilon$ -shadowed in average by some points in  $X$ . In other words, there exists  $z \in X$  such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d(f^i(z), x_i) < \epsilon.$$

It is well known that mean ergodic shadowing is a weaker form of ergodic shadowing property [2, Proposition 4.2].

**1.1. Topological dynamical systems.** A finite  $\delta$ -pseudo-orbit  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^b$  is called a  $\delta$ -chain from  $x_0$  to  $x_b$ . A dynamical system  $(X, f)$  is called *chain transitive* if for any two points  $x, y \in X$  and any  $\delta > 0$  there exists a  $\delta$ -chain from  $x$  to  $y$ . If for any  $\delta > 0$  and any  $x, y \in X$  there is  $N > 0$  so that for every  $n > N$  there is a  $\delta$ -chain from  $x$  to  $y$  of length  $n$ , we say  $f$  is *chain mixing*. It is known that  $f$  is chain mixing if and only if  $f^n$  is chain transitive for every  $n > 0$  [6].

For two nonempty open sets  $U, V \subset X$ , define  $N(U, V) := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : f^n(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ . In this regard,  $f$  is called *topological transitive* if for any two nonempty open sets  $U, V \subset X$ ,  $N(U, V) \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover, if  $\mathbb{N} \setminus N(U, V)$  is finite set  $f$  is called *topological mixing*.

## 2. Main results

First of all it is easy to see that mean ergodic shadowing is independent of choosing an equivalent metric. In fact, suppose  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are two equivalent metric, and  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary. Take  $0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon$  so that for each  $x \in X$

$$B_{d_1}(x, \epsilon_1) \subset B_{d_2}(x, \epsilon).$$

Note that this holds due to compactness of  $(X, d)$ . Let  $\delta_1 > 0$  be corresponding to  $\epsilon_1$  for  $f$  in definition of mean ergodic shadowing. Again choose  $\delta_2 > 0$  in which

$$B_{d_2}(x, \delta_2) \subset B_{d_1}(x, \delta_1)$$

holds for every  $x \in X$ . Now, let  $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  be a  $\delta_2$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit for  $f$  with respect to  $d_2$ . So,

$$\bar{d}(\{i : d_2(f(x_i), x_{i+1}) \geq \delta_2\}) = 0.$$

By choosing  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  we also have

$$\bar{d}(\{i : d_1(f(x_i), x_{i+1}) \geq \delta_1\}) = 0.$$

Note that the latter set is subset of the former set. Hence, the sequence  $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  is a  $\delta_1$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit for  $f$  with respect to  $d_1$ . It follows there exists  $z \in X$  such that  $\bar{d}(E_1) < \epsilon_1$ , where

$$E_1 = \{i : d_1(f^i(z), x_i) \geq \epsilon_1\}.$$

Easily, by putting

$$E_2 = \{i : d_2(f^i(z), x_i) \geq \epsilon\},$$

we obtain  $\bar{d}(E_2) < \epsilon$ , because  $E_2 \subset E_1$ .

In the following, we show that mean ergodic shadowing is invariant of conjugacy.

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be two compact metric spaces, and let  $f$  and  $g$  be two continuous maps on  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  resp. If  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  is a homeomorphism (conjugacy) between  $f$  and  $g$ , then  $g = h \circ f \circ h^{-1}$  has mean ergodic shadowing if and only if  $f$  has mean ergodic shadowing property.*

**PROOF.** Suppose that  $f$  has mean ergodic shadowing, and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Take  $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$  by uniform continuity of  $h$ , i.e.,  $d_X(x, y) < \epsilon'$  implies  $d_Y(h(x), h(y)) < \epsilon$ . Suppose  $\delta > 0$  is given for  $\epsilon'$  by mean ergodic shadowing for  $f$  and  $\delta'$  be given for  $\delta$  by uniform continuity of  $h^{-1}$ , i.e.  $d_Y(x, y) < \delta'$  implies  $d_X(h^{-1}(x), h^{-1}(y)) < \delta$ . Let  $\{y_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a  $\delta'$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit for  $g = h \circ f \circ h^{-1}$ , i.e.  $\bar{d}(E) = 0$ , where  $E = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d_Y(h \circ f \circ h^{-1}(y_i), y_{i+1}) \geq \delta'\} \supset \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d_X(f \circ h^{-1}(y_i), h^{-1}(y_{i+1})) \geq \delta\}$ . This shows that  $\{h^{-1}(y_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a  $\delta$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit for  $f$ . So there is  $z \in X$  by mean ergodic shadowing such that  $\bar{d}(E') < \epsilon'$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} E' &= \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d_X(f^i(z), h^{-1}(y_i)) \geq \epsilon'\} \supset \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d_Y(h \circ f^i(z), y_i) \geq \epsilon\} \\ &= \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d_Y(g^i(h(z)), y_i) \geq \epsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

That is,  $h(z)$   $\epsilon$ -shadowed  $\{y_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  in average, so  $g$  has mean ergodic shadowing. The remaining part is similar.  $\square$

In [2, Theorem 4.1] it is proved that in the presence of shadowing property the followings are equivalent for surjective dynamical system  $(X, f)$ :

- (1)  $f$  is totally transitive,
- (2)  $f$  has almost average shadowing,
- (3)  $f$  has mean ergodic shadowing,

(4)  $f$  has  $\underline{d}$ -shadowing.

We can also equalize specification property and topologically mixing with others, because by the above hypothesis totally transitivity implies chain mixing...

**COROLLARY 2.2.** *Under the hypothesis of [2, Theorem 4.1] the followings are equivalent:*

- (1)  $f$  is totally transitive,
- (2)  $f$  is topological mixing,
- (3)  $f$  has almost average shadowing,
- (4)  $f$  has mean ergodic shadowing,
- (5)  $f$  has  $\underline{d}$ -shadowing,
- (6)  $f$  has specification property.

We go on with the relation between  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing and mean ergodic shadowing property. We prove the following result:

**COROLLARY 2.3.** *The  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing property does not imply mean ergodic shadowing.*

**PROOF.** Because every Morse-Smale diffeomorphism has shadowing property so clearly has  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing property, but they are not chain mixing and therefore by Corollary 2.2 do not have mean ergodic shadowing property. Refer to Example 3.1 as another example.  $\square$

**THEOREM 2.4.** *Mean ergodic shadowing implies  $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{d}}$ -shadowing property.*

**PROOF.** It is well known that  $\underline{d}$ -shadowing implies  $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{d}}$ -shadowing property. So, [2, Proposition 4.4] completes the proof. Alternatively, without loss of generality, let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  be given and  $\delta > 0$  corresponds to  $\epsilon$  in mean ergodic shadowing. Suppose  $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  is a  $\delta$ -psuedo-orbit for  $f$ , obviously, it is also a  $\delta$ -ergodic psuedo-orbit for  $f$ . There exists  $z \in X$  so that  $\bar{d}(E) < \epsilon$ , where  $E = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid d(f^i(z), x_i) \geq \epsilon\}$ . By the equality  $\underline{d}(E^c) = 1 - \bar{d}(E)$  we obtain  $\underline{d}(E^c) > 1 - \epsilon > 0$ . That is  $f$  has  $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{d}}$ -shadowing property.  $\square$

In the following, we also prove that mean ergodic shadowing follows  $\bar{d}$ -shadowing property.

**PROPOSITION 2.5.** *If  $f$  has mean ergodic shadowing, then it has  $\bar{d}$ -shadowing property.*

**PROOF.** By inspiring of the proof of [?, Theorem 5], suppose  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, and  $f$  has mean ergodic shadowing. Let  $\delta > 0$  be correspond to  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$  in the definition of mean ergodic shadowing property for  $f$ . Take any  $\delta$ -ergodic pseudo-orbit  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  so there exists  $z \in X$  such that  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -shadowed  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  in average. Let  $A = \{i : d(f^i(z), x_i) < \epsilon\}$  then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\epsilon}{2} &> \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d(f^i(z), x_i) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon}{n} (n - \#A \cap \{0, \dots, n-1\}) \\ &\geq \epsilon - \epsilon \bar{d}(A), \end{aligned}$$

so  $\bar{d}(A) > \frac{1}{2}$ .  $\square$

**COROLLARY 2.6.** *Every minimal dynamical system with mean ergodic shadowing does not have  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing property.*

**PROOF.** It is well known that mean ergodic shadowing implies chain mixing. By [?, Theorem 16] every chain mixing minimal dynamical system with at least two points, does not have  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing property. So, every minimal dynamical system with mean ergodic shadowing does not have  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -shadowing property.  $\square$

QUESTION 2.7. *Is there any minimal system with mean ergodic shadowing property?*

COROLLARY 2.8. *The asymptotic average shadowing property (AASP, for short) implies mean ergodic shadowing, but not vice versa.*

PROOF. By [?, Theorem 4.3] AASP implies almost average shadowing property, and by [2, Proposition 4.3] almost average shadowing property in turn implies mean ergodic shadowing. However, the next example shows the converse does not hold.  $\square$

EXAMPLE 2.9. By the statement of Example 5.4 from [?] we construct the map  $\varphi$  on interval  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\varphi(x) > x$  if and only if  $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . It is easy to see that  $\varphi$  has mean ergodic shadowing, but by [4, Theorem 3.1, Remark 1] it does not have AASP.

Easily it can be shown that the analogous of [1, Theorem 4.2] holds in case of mean ergodic shadowing.

COROLLARY 2.10. *Any transitive sofic subshift  $\sigma$  with mean ergodic shadowing is mixing.*

PROOF.  $\square$

### 3. Examples

In this section, we bring two examples show that the shadowing property does not imply the mean ergodic shadowing property and vice versa. Also, we bring a class of maps without mean ergodic shadowing property.

EXAMPLE 3.1. The permutation of two points does not have the mean ergodic shadowing property, but has shadowing property.

PROOF. Let  $X = \{a, b\}$ ,  $f(a) = b$ ,  $f(b) = a$ . Without loss of generality suppose that  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{d(a,b)}{4}$  is given and let  $\delta > 0$  be arbitrary. If  $\{m_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  is a sequence of natural numbers defined by  $m_i = 2^i$ , it is obvious that  $\{m_i\}$  has density zero. Now, let  $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^\infty = \{a; a, b; b, a; a, b, a, b; b, a, \dots\}$  be such that  $x_{m_i} = x_{m_{i+1}}$  for each  $i \geq 0$  and  $\{x_{m_i+1}, \dots, x_{m_{i+1}}\}$  is a finite  $\delta$ -chain for each  $i$ . We show that the sequence  $\{x_i\}$  can't be  $\epsilon$ -shadowed in average. Indeed, for  $z = a$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^{2n}-1} d(f^i(z), x_i) &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{i=2^{2n-2}+1}^{2^{2n}-1} d(f^i(z), x_i) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{2n-2}}{2^{2n}} d(a, b) = \frac{1}{4} d(a, b) > \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for  $z = b$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{i=0}^{2^{2n}-1} d(f^i(z), x_i) &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{2n}} \sum_{i=2^{2n-1}+1}^{2^{2n}-1} d(f^i(z), x_i) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{2n-1}}{2^{2n}} d(a, b) = \frac{1}{2} d(a, b) > \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it doesn't have the mean ergodic shadowing. However, it is an easy exercise to check that the permutation of two points has the shadowing property.  $\square$

The following provides an example indicating mean ergodic shadowing does not imply the shadowing property.

EXAMPLE 3.2. [?, Example 3.13]  $f : \mathbb{S}^1 \ni e^{2\pi i x} \mapsto e^{2\pi i x^2} \in \mathbb{S}^1$  (where  $x \in [0, 1)$  and  $\mathbb{S}^1$  is the unit circle) has the AASP, and hence mean ergodic shadowing property by [?] and [2, Proposition 4.3], but obviously does not have the shadowing property.

EXAMPLE 3.3. The circle rotations do not have mean ergodic shadowing.

PROOF. □

#### 4. Conclusion

In this paper we show that mean ergodic shadowing is a dynamical property, and study its relation with other type of partial shadowing.

#### Acknowledgement

The author was supported by grant agreement No. SCU.MM1400.418 from SCU (Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz) in Iran.

Please cite your relevant papers but at most total 6 papers/books.

#### References

1. D. Ahmadi Dastjerdi and M. Hosseini, *Sub-shadowings*, Nonlinear Analysis. 72(9-10) (2010), 3759–3766.
2. P. Das and T. Das, *Mean ergodic shadowing, distality and minimality*, arXiv:1907.02913v1. (2019).
3. A. Fakhari and F. H. Ghane, *On shadowing: ordinary and ergodic*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 364 (2010), 151–155.
4. M. Kulczycki and P. Oprocha, *Exploring the asymptotic average shadowing property*, Journal of Difference Equations and Applications. 6(10) (2010), 1131–1140.
5. S. Pilyugin, *Shadowing in dynamical systems*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1706, Springer-Verlag, (1999).
6. D. Richeson and J. Wiseman, *Chain recurrence rates and topological entropy*, Topology Appl. 156 (2008), 251–261.