

# Problem Set Number 07, (18.353/12.006/2.050)j

## MIT (Fall 2023)

Rodolfo R. Rosales (MIT, Math. Dept., room 2-337, Cambridge, MA 02139)

November 29, 2023

Due December 5, 2023 (turn it in via the canvas course website).

I may add one more problem before Friday December 1, noon. Check to see.

### Contents

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Liapunov exponents for 1-D maps #02      | 1 |
| 2 | Newton's method in the complex plane #01 | 2 |

## 1 Liapunov exponents for 1-D maps #02

### Statement: Liapunov exponents for 1-D maps #02

Compute the Liapunov exponent, and produce a figure analog to figure 10.5.2 in Strogatz's book (see example 10.5.3 there) for the 1-D maps  $x_{n+1} = f(x_n)$  below. In all the cases, given the range of  $r$  selected, justify the selected range for  $x$ .

Meaning of "justify". Show that the  $x$ -region is such that it may contain an attractor, because either: (a) It is trapping; an orbit starting there stays there; or (b) Orbits starting outside the region diverge to infinity, so that any attractor has to be inside.

1. The cosine map  $f(x) = r \cos(x)$ , with  $-5 \leq r \leq 5$  and  $-5 \leq x \leq 5$ .
2. The quartic map  $f(x) = r(1 - (2x - 1)^4)$ , with  $0 \leq r \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ .
3. The cusp075 map  $f(x) = r(1 - z^\mu)$ , with  $0 \leq r \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ , where  $z = |2x - 1|$  and  $\mu = 3/4$ .  
**Important.**  $df/dx$  for this map involves  $z^{\mu-1}$ . To avoid a potential division by zero, when calculating use  $z = |2x - 1| + \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon$  is very small; e.g.:  $\epsilon = 10^{-200}$ .

In all cases, plot not just the region listed above, but do a detail of the  $r$ -ranges where the exponent transitions from negative to positive. See also the optional task below, after the hints.

#### Hints and related.

- h1. The process to follow to calculate the Liapunov exponent is explained in example 10.5.3 of Strogatz book [also in the lectures]. At any rate, see the *sample/sketch MatLab script* at the end of the problem statement.
- h2. If you use MatLab, "vectorize" the operation, so that you do all the  $r$ 's simultaneously.
- h3. In MatLab the command "print -dpng FigureName" added to the script will save the figure as a small png file — it is also more reliable saving the figure using the GUI in the figure window. Please be careful with the figure sizes, do not upload monster size answers. Just to give you a reference: in my answer the pictures take about 30kb each.

**Optional task.** For the case of the cusp075 map, plot the Liapunov exponent versus  $r$  for the region where the Liapunov exponent transitions from negative to positive — this is, roughly  $0.52 < r < 0.68$ . Use for this a program following the outline of the "sample/sketch MatLab script" below. Run the program a few times (without changing any parameters) and do a few plots. What do you see? (you should be seeing something that "should not" be, remember that you are looking at a deterministic system). Explain why you see what you see. Note: The explanation is simple and clean. If you find yourself making convoluted arguments, you are on the wrong track!

**Hints:** (i) Do an orbit/bifurcation diagram for the map. (ii) Initialize the iterations that compute the Liapunov exponent with  $x_0 = 0.51$ . (iii) Initialize the iterations that compute the Liapunov exponent with  $x_0 = 0.01$ .

**Sample/sketch MatLab script.** These are the parameters that you will need to assign values to:

r1 = Lower value of the parameter r range to explore.

r2 = Upper value of the parameter r range to explore.

N = Number of r-values to use between r1 and r2. Because the Liapunov exponent as a function of r can be very “wiggly”, take N large, say: N = 1000, or larger.

x1 = Lower value of x considered.

x2 = Upper value of x considered.

nb = Number of map iterations before the calculation starts. This should be a fairly large number, say nb = 5000, to allow the iterates to settle on the attractor.

np = Number of iterations used to calculate the Liapunov exponent. Again, a fairly large number, to obtain an accurate calculation. Note that the size of the error is, typically,  $O(1/np)$ !

In addition, **you will need two sub-scripts**,  $y = \text{Fun}(r, x)$  and  $y = \text{dFun}(r, x)$ , which compute the function  $f(x)$ , and the absolute value of its derivative,  $|df/dx|$ . The basic script is then:

```
r = r1 + (r2 - r1)*(0:N)/N;
x = x1 + (x2 - x1)*rand(size(r)); % This initializes the iteration.
for j=1:nb; x = Fun(r, x); end; % Iterate nb times to approach the attractor.
nf = nb + np;
le = zeros(size(r)); % Will contain the Liapunov exponent for each value in the array r.
for j=(nb+1):nf
    x = Fun(r, x);
    le = le + (1/np)*log(dFun(r, x));
end
```

Now all that remains to do is plot le versus r.

## 2 Newton's method in the complex plane #01

### Statement: Newton's method in the complex plane #01

Suppose that you want to solve an equation,  $g(x) = 0$ . Then you can use *Newton's method*, which is as follows:

Assume that you have a “reasonable” guess,  $x_0$ , for the value

of a root. Then the sequence  $x_{n+1} = f(x_n)$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , where

$$f(x) = x - \frac{g(x)}{g'(x)}, \quad (2.1)$$

converges (very fast) to the root.

**Remark 2.1 (The idea).** Assume an approximate solution  $g(x_a) \approx 0$ . Then write  $x_b = x_a + \delta x$  to improve it, where  $\delta x$  is small. Then  $0 = g(x_a + \delta x) \approx g(x_a) + g'(x_a) \delta x \Rightarrow \delta x \approx -\frac{g(x_a)}{g'(x_a)}$ , and (2.1) follows.

**Of course, if  $x_0$  is not close to a root, the method may not converge. Even if it converges, it may converge to a root that is far away from  $x_0$ , not necessarily the closest root.** In this problem **we investigate the behavior of Newton's method in the complex plane, for arbitrary starting points.** ♣

Consider iterations of the map generated by Newton's method for the roots of  $z^3 - 1 = 0$ . i.e.:

$$z_{n+1} = f(z_n) = \left( \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3z_n^3} \right) z_n, \quad n \geq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $0 < |z_0| < \infty$  is arbitrary, and the  $z_n$  are

**complex numbers.**

Note that

$$\zeta_1 = 1, \quad \zeta_2 = e^{i2\pi/3} = \frac{1}{2}(-1 + i\sqrt{3}), \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_3 = e^{i4\pi/3} = \frac{1}{2}(-1 - i\sqrt{3}), \quad (2.3)$$

are the roots

of  $z^3 = 1$ .

**Your tasks:** Write a computer program to calculate the orbits  $\{z_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ . Then, for every initial point  $z_0$ , draw a colored dot at the position of  $z_0$ , where **the colors are picked as follows:**

$$z_n \rightarrow \zeta_1, \text{ green.} \quad z_n \rightarrow \zeta_2, \text{ red.} \quad z_n \rightarrow \zeta_3, \text{ blue.} \quad \text{No convergence, black.} \quad (2.4)$$

**What do you see? Do blow ups of the limit regions between zones.**

**Hints and practical numerical considerations.**

- h1.** Divide the region where the initial data  $z_0$  will be picked [I suggest the square  $-2 \leq \text{Re}(z_0), \text{Im}(z_0) \leq 2$ ] into pixels, then pick a  $z_0$  at the center of each pixel, and color the pixel according to (2.4).
- h2.** If you use MatLab, **do not plot points**. As suggested in item **h1** plot pixels — use the command `image(x, y, C)` to plot, where  $x = \text{Re}(z_0)$  and  $y = \text{Im}(z_0)$ . **Why?** Because using points leaves a lot of unpainted space in the figure, and **gives huge file sizes** if you use enough pixels to get a good picture.
- h3. Deciding convergence.** Deciding that the sequence converges is easy: once  $z_n$  gets “close enough” to one of the roots, then the very design of Newton’s method guarantees convergence. Thus, given a  $z_0$ , compute  $z_N$  for some large  $N$ , and check if  $|z_N - \zeta_j| < \delta$  for one of the roots and some “small” tolerance  $\delta$  — which does not have to be very small, in fact  $\delta = 0.25$  is good enough. If this criteria is not satisfied for any of the roots, then classify the sequence starting at  $z_0$  as “non-convergent”.

You can get reasonable pictures with  $N = 50$  iterations on a  $150 \times 150$  grid — a larger  $N$  is needed when refining near the boundary between zones. For the answer I used a  $500 \times 500$  grid and  $N = 100$  iterations — which I increased to  $N = 200$  and  $N = 300$  for the blow ups of details.

- h4. Compute in parallel.** If you use MatLab, make sure to do all the sequences (one for each pixel) in parallel, using vector/matrix operations. This is much faster than a “for loop”.
- h5. Avoid division by zero.** Note that (2.2) ceases to make sense if  $z_n = 0$  — classify this as non-convergence. This can cause a problem if you are computing all the sequences in parallel, because this requires all of them to be computed from  $z_0$  to  $z_N$ . One way to get around this (in MatLab) is as follows: Place all the iterates in a complex matrix  $\mathbf{Zn}$ , where the entry  $(p, q)$  corresponds to  $z_n$  for the sequence starting in the  $(p, q)$  pixel. Then, before computing the next iterate, execute:  $\mathbf{Zn} = \mathbf{Zn} + \text{del} * (\mathbf{Zn} == 0)$ , where  $\text{del} = 1e-30$ .<sup>†</sup> After this sequences with  $z_n = 0$  will produce a very large  $z_{n+1}$ , which is guaranteed not return to the vicinity of the roots  $\zeta_j$  for many iterations (more than 300), resulting in “effective” non-convergence.<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup> This replaces zero entries in  $\mathbf{Zn}$  by  $\text{del}$ , because the logical operator  $(\mathbf{Zn} == 0)$  yields zero for all non-zero entries in  $\mathbf{Zn}$ , and one for zero entries.

<sup>‡</sup> The result will be  $z_{n+1} \approx (1/3)10^{60}$ , while for  $z_n$  large (2.2) reduces to  $z_{n+1} \approx (2/3)z_n$ . Hence returning to  $z_{n+M} = O(1)$  requires, roughly,  $(2/3)^M 10^{60} = O(1)$ .

---

**THE END.**