

Abstract topological dynamics involving set-valued functions

Good, Chris; Greenwood, Sina; Uresin, Nazli

DOI:

[10.1016/j.topol.2020.107240](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2020.107240)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Good, C, Greenwood, S & Uresin, N 2020, 'Abstract topological dynamics involving set-valued functions', *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 279, 107240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2020.107240>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

ABSTRACT TOPOLOGICAL DYNAMICS INVOLVING SET-VALUED FUNCTIONS

CHRIS GOOD, SINA GREENWOOD, AND NAZLI URESIN

ABSTRACT. Continuous functions over compact Hausdorff spaces have been completely characterised. We consider the more general problem: given a set-valued function T from an arbitrary set X to itself, does there exist a compact Hausdorff topology on X with respect to which T is upper semicontinuous? We give conditions that are necessary for T to be upper semicontinuous and point-closed if X is a compact Hausdorff space. We show that it is always possible to provide X with a compact T_1 topology with respect to which T is lower semicontinuous, and consequently, if $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a function, then it is always possible to provide X with a compact T_1 topology with respect to which T is continuous.

Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a function on a nonempty set X and let \mathcal{P} be some topological property. A fundamental and natural question, tracing back to Ellis [4], asks whether one can endow X with a topology that satisfies \mathcal{P} and with respect to which T is continuous.

For metric spaces the minimal conceivable conditions are required for a positive answer. De Groot and De Vries [12] show that if X is infinite, then there is always a non-discrete metrizable topology on X with respect to which T is continuous. Good and Greenwood [6] show that the existence of a separable metrizable topology on X with respect to which T is continuous depends only on the cardinality of the set X ; there is such a topology precisely when the cardinality of X is no greater than \mathfrak{c} , the cardinality of the continuum, which is the maximum cardinality of any separable metric space [5]. In [1] continuous functions on the space of rational numbers are characterized: for countable X , there is a topology on X with respect to which f is continuous and X is homeomorphic to \mathbb{Q} if and only if finite intersections of sets of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\{y : f^k(y) = x\}, \text{ where } x \in X \text{ and } 0 \leq k, \text{ or} \\ &\{x : f^m(x) = f^n(x)\}, \text{ where } 0 \leq m, n \end{aligned}$$

have either infinite or empty complements.

For compact, Hausdorff spaces one needs to work somewhat harder. The *full orbits* of T are the equivalence classes of the relation \sim , where $x \sim y$ if and only if $T^m(x) = T^n(y)$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. A full orbit is said to be: an *n-cycle*, if it contains a point x for which $x = T^n(x)$ and $x, T(x), \dots, T^{n-1}(x)$ are distinct; a *\mathbb{Z} -orbit* if it contains distinct $x_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $T(x_{i-1}) = x_i$; and an *\mathbb{N} -orbit* if it is neither an *n-cycle* nor a *\mathbb{Z} -orbit*. Good et al. [7] show that there is a compact Hausdorff topology on X with respect to which T is continuous if and only if $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) = T(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)) \neq \emptyset$ and one of the following holds:

- (1) the total number of \mathbb{Z} -orbits and cycles is at least \mathfrak{c} ; or

Date: April 23, 2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 37B99, 54A10, 54B99, 54C05, 54C08, 54E99, 54H20.

Key words and phrases. dynamical system, topological dynamical system, compact, Hausdorff, upper semicontinuous, lower semicontinuous, T_1 .

- (2) there is at least one \mathbb{Z} -orbit and one cycle; or
- (3) there are $n_i, i \leq k$ such that T has an n_i -cycle for each n_i and whenever T has an n -cycle, some n_i divides n ,
- (4) the restriction of T to $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)$ is not 1-1.

In [7] they also show that if $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a bijection then there is a compact metrizable topology on X with respect to which T is a homeomorphism if and only if one of the following holds:

- (1) X is finite.
- (2) X is countably infinite and either:
 - (a) T has both a \mathbb{Z} -orbit and a cycle; or
 - (b) there are $n_i, i \leq k$ such that T has an n_i -cycle for each n_i and whenever T has an n -cycle, some n_i divides n .
- (3) X has the cardinality of the continuum and the number of \mathbb{Z} -orbits and the number of n -cycles, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is finite, countably infinite, or has the cardinality of the continuum.

Iwanik [16] had earlier given a characterization of continuous bijections on compact Hausdorff spaces and Sherman [23] has characterized homeomorphisms of the Cantor set.

Recently there has been considerable interest in the dynamics of set-valued functions. In 2004, Mahavier [21] introduced the notion of inverse limits of set-valued functions, or generalised inverse limits. Ingram posed a number of questions in [14] which has motivated a growing number of researchers to work in the area. A list of articles can be found in [13]; more recent examples include [11, 17, 18, 19]. Standard inverse limits in a dynamical setting have been extensively used in areas such as dynamical systems and continua theory [2, 8, 9, 10]. They have also found applications in disciplines such as economics [20, 22]. Inverse limits of set-valued functions provide greater scope for application and examples are emerging. Inverse limits of simple set-valued functions on simple spaces can be used, for example, to construct complex examples, such as Kennedy and Nall's construction of λ -dendroids from inverse limits of interval maps with graphs that are the union of two straight lines [19].

In this paper we consider Ellis's question for upper and lower semicontinuous set-valued functions. Conditions ensuring the existence of a compact Hausdorff topology with respect to which such a function is upper or lower semicontinuity seems to be a hard question. One can say something sensible in the case of compact T_1 topologies, however, and we address that question here.

Our notation and terminology are standard, as found in [5]. A space is T_1 provided singleton sets are closed. If $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a set-valued function and $A \subseteq X$, we define the image, lower preimage and upper preimage of A respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} T(A) &= \bigcup \{T(x) : x \in A\}, \\ T_-^{-1}(A) &= \{x \in X : T(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}, \\ T_+^{-1}(A) &= \{x \in X : T(x) \subseteq A\}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the following lemma is routine.

Lemma 1. *Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a set-valued function and let \mathcal{A} be a collection of subsets of X .*

- (1) $T_+^{-1}(X \setminus A) = X \setminus T_-^{-1}(A)$.
- (2) $T_-^{-1}(\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A) = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} T_-^{-1}(A)$.

$$(3) T_+^{-1}(\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A) = \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} T_+^{-1}(A).$$

A set-valued function $T : X \rightarrow X$ is *upper semicontinuous* at the point x if for every open set V containing $T(x)$, there is an open set U containing x such that for every $y \in U$, V contains $T(y)$. T is *lower semicontinuous* at x if for each open set V that meets $T(x)$, there is an open set U containing x such that for every $y \in U$, V meets $T(y)$. T is *upper* (respectively, *lower*) semicontinuous if it is upper (respectively, lower) semicontinuous at each $x \in X$. T is lower semicontinuous [3] if and only if, for any open set V , the set $T_-^{-1}(V) = \{x : T(x) \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ is open if and only if, for any closed set C , the set $T_+^{-1}(C)$ is closed. Similarly, T is upper semicontinuous if and only if, for any open set V , the set $T_+^{-1}(V) = \{x : T(x) \subseteq V\}$ is open if and only if, for any closed set C , the set $T_-^{-1}(C)$ is closed. It is this difference between the lower and upper inverses and their behaviour under unions and intersections that makes it relatively easy to construct topologies making T lower semicontinuous, but hard to construct topologies making T upper semicontinuous.

We first consider lower semicontinuity.

Defining the topology τ : For a set-valued function $T : X \rightarrow X$, we define a topology τ on X by defining the collection \mathcal{C} of its basic closed sets. Let \mathcal{C}_0 be the collection of all finite subsets of X . Given the collection \mathcal{C}_n , let \mathcal{C}_{n+1} be the collection of all sets of the form

$$T_+^{-1}(C_1) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(C_j) \cup C_{j+1} \cup \dots \cup C_k,$$

where each $C_j \in \mathcal{C}_n$. Let $\mathcal{C} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}_n$.

Let us say that the *rank* of a basic closed set $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is 0 if C is finite and is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if $C \in \mathcal{C}_n \setminus \mathcal{C}_{n-1}$. Then, if C has rank $n + 1$, we can write

$$C = T_+^{-1}(C_1) \cup T_+^{-1}(C_2) \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(C_{k-1}) \cup C_k^*,$$

where:

- C_1 has rank n and C_k^* has rank 0 (so is finite, possibly empty);
- for each $i \leq k - 1$, C_i has rank at most n and $T_+^{-1}(C_i)$ is infinite (otherwise it can be absorbed into C_k^*).

Note that this representation of C need not be unique. For clarity, *rank 0 sets are marked with $*$* .

Each C_i is also of this form, but of a lower rank. Therefore, associated with C , we have a finite collection of basic closed sets indexed by finite sequences of natural numbers such that the set $C_{\underline{i}}$, indexed $\underline{i} = i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k-1}$, is either rank 0 and finite or can be written as a finite union

$$C_{\underline{i}} = T_+^{-1}(C_{\underline{i} \frown 1}) \cup T_+^{-1}(C_{\underline{i} \frown 2}) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(C_{\underline{i} \frown (n_{\underline{i}}-1)}) \cup (C_{\underline{i} \frown n_{\underline{i}}}^*)$$

for some $n_{\underline{i}} > 0$, where each $C_{\underline{i} \frown j}$ has rank less than that of $C_{\underline{i}}$ and $C_{\underline{i} \frown n_{\underline{i}}}^*$ is finite (as usual $i_1 i_2 \dots i_{n-1} \frown i_n = i_1 \dots i_{n-1} i_n$). There is, therefore, a finite tree Γ associated with C whose nodes are the basic closed sets $C_{\underline{i}}$. The root of Γ is C , if $C_{\underline{i}}$ is finite, then it has no successors, otherwise the successors of $C_{\underline{i}}$ are the nodes $C_{\underline{i} \frown j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n_{\underline{i}}$. Let us refer to the finite nodes as *leaves*, so that a *branch* in Γ is a maximal chain starting at C and ending in a leaf of Γ , see Figure 2 for an example.

It is clear that, although there may be more than one tree associated with a given C in this way, the tree order together with the leaves determine C . Given a tree Γ associated with the closed set C , the number of branches is the number of leaves.




FIGURE 1. An example of a tree associated with the set $C = T_+^{-1}(C_1) \cup T_+^{-1}(C_2) \cup C_3^*$. C has rank 4 and leaves C_{1111}^* , C_{1112}^* , C_{121}^* , C_{211}^* , C_{22}^* and C_3^* .

By Lemma 1, if

$$C = T_+^{-1}(C_1) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(C_{k-1}) \cup C_k^* \text{ and}$$

$$D = T_+^{-1}(D_1) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(D_{m-1}) \cup D_m^*,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} C \cap D &= T_+^{-1}(C_1 \cap D_1) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(C_1 \cap D_{m-1}) \\ &\quad \cup T_+^{-1}(C_2 \cap D_1) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(C_2 \cap D_{m-1}) \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad \cup T_+^{-1}(C_{k-1} \cap D_1) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(C_{k-1} \cap D_{m-1}) \\ &\quad \cup C^* \end{aligned}$$

where C^* is some subset of $C_k^* \cup D_m^*$. Therefore, $C \cap D$ can be written in the form

$$C \cap D = T_+^{-1}(E_1) \cup \dots \cup T_+^{-1}(E_{\ell-1}) \cup E_\ell^*,$$

where each E_i , $i < \ell$, is a subset of some C_j , $T_+^{-1}(E_i)$ is infinite and E_ℓ^* is a finite set.

Now suppose that D is a subset of C and that we have fixed a tree, Γ , associated with C . It follows from the previous paragraph that there is a tree, Δ , associated with D and an order-preserving function $\phi : \Delta \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that for each node $D_{\underline{j}}$, $\underline{j} = j_1 \dots j_k$, of Δ :

- $\phi(D_{\underline{j}}) = C_{\underline{i}}$ for some $\underline{i} = i_1 \dots i_k$ with the same length as \underline{j} ;
- $D_{\underline{j}} \subseteq C_{\underline{i}}$;
- the rank of $D_{\underline{j}}$ is at most the rank of $C_{\underline{i}}$;
- if $k' < k$, then $\phi(D_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_{k'}}) = C_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k'}}$.

For brevity we will say that Δ follows Γ and a branch

$$D, D_{i_1}, D_{i_1 i_2}, \dots, D_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}, D_{i_1 \dots i_k}^*$$

in Δ follows the branch $C, \phi(D_{i_1}), \phi(D_{i_1 i_2}), \dots, \phi(D_{i_1 \dots i_k}^*)$ in Γ .

In Figure 2, we give an example of a tree associated with a set $D \subsetneq C$ which follows the tree pictured in Figure 1.

Lemma 2. *Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a set-valued function and equip X with the topology τ defined above. Let $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$, let D be a proper subset of C , and let Γ and Δ be trees associated with C and D respectively, such that Δ follows Γ . Then there is a*




FIGURE 2. An example of a tree associated with a set D which follows the tree associated with the set C from Figure 1.

branch A in Γ such that for every branch B in Δ , if B follows A then either B has shorter length than A or the leaf of B is a proper subset of the leaf of A .

Proof. Let $x \in C \setminus D$. Recall that C and D are the roots of the trees Γ and Δ respectively. Either x is in the finite leaf successor C_k^* of C and not in the finite leaf successor D_k^* of D . Or there is a non-leaf successor C_1 of C such that $T(x) \subseteq C_1$, and for every infinite successor D_j of D , $T(x) \not\subseteq D_j$ and hence $C_1 \setminus D_j \neq \emptyset$. Thus by induction there is a branch $C, C_1, \dots, C_{k-1}, C_k^*$ in Γ such that if $D, D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{k'-1}, D_{k'}^*$ is a branch in Δ that follows $C, C_1, \dots, C_{k-1}, C_k^*$, $k' \leq k$ and for every $j \leq k'$, D_j is a proper subset of C_j . Thus if $k = k'$ then the leaf D_k^* is a proper subset of C_k^* . \square

Theorem 3. *Let X be an infinite set and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be any set-valued function such that $T(x) \neq \emptyset$ for each $x \in X$. There is a compact T_1 topology on X with respect to which T is lower semicontinuous.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}_n$ is closed under finite unions and contains all finite sets, it is the basis for the closed sets of a T_1 topology τ on X . Moreover, if D is a closed set under the topology τ , then D is an intersection, $D = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{D}} C$, for some $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. But then, by Lemma 1, $T_+^{-1}(D) = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{D}} T_+^{-1}(C)$. By definition, each $T_+^{-1}(C)$ is in \mathcal{C} , so $T_+^{-1}(D)$ is closed. Hence T is lower semicontinuous with respect to τ .

It remains to show that τ is compact. To do this we take a collection of basic closed sets with empty intersection and show that a finite subcollection also has empty intersection.

Let $\mathcal{D} = \{D_n \subseteq X : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a collection of nonempty basic closed sets such that each D_{n+1} is a proper subset of D_n . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let Γ_n be a tree associated with D_n . By Lemma 2, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m > n$, there is a branch C, C_1, \dots, C_k^* in Γ_n such that if $E, E_1, E_2, \dots, E_{k'}^*$ is any branch in Γ_m that follows C, C_1, \dots, C_k^* , then $k' \leq k$ and for each $i \leq k'$, E_i is a proper subset of C_i .

Since each tree has only finitely many branches, there is a value $m_1 > 1$ such that either, for some k , $1 < k \leq m_1$ there is a branch B in Γ_1 and every branch in Γ_k that follows B is shorter in length, or the leaf of every branch in Γ_{m_1} is a singleton. If the latter holds, then for every branch B in Γ_1 , every branch in Γ_{m_1+1} that follows B has shorter length than B .

By a similar argument, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $m_n > n$ and a branch B in Γ_n , such that every branch in Γ_{m_n} that follows B has shorter length than B . Although Γ_{m_n} may have a greater number of branches than Γ_n , the number is finite. Clearly then, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every branch in Γ_n is shorter than the branch in Γ_1 that it follows, and hence for some $n > 1$, every branch in D_n has only one

member and hence is a finite subset of D_n , a contradiction. Thus any collection of closed subsets of X with empty intersection is finite and so τ is compact. \square

If $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a function, then $T_+^{-1}(A) = T_-^{-1}(A) = T^{-1}(A)$, so that the same proof yields the following.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a function. There is a compact T_1 topology on X with respect to which T is continuous.*

The question of characterising the existence of a compact T_1 topology on X with respect to which a set-valued function $T : X \rightarrow X$ is upper semicontinuous seems to be harder. Certainly not every set-valued function has such a topology.

Example 5. Let X be an infinite set and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be the set-valued function defined by $T(x) = X \setminus \{x\}$. Under any T_1 topology on X , the set $X \setminus \{x\}$ would be open. But $T_+^{-1}(X \setminus \{x\}) = \{x\}$, so if T were upper semicontinuous, X would have the discrete topology.

It is easy enough to define a T_1 topology on X with respect to which the set-valued function $T : X \rightarrow X$ is upper semicontinuous.

Defining a minimal topology σ : We define a T_1 topology σ on X with respect to which T is upper semicontinuous, and such that if σ' is a T_1 topology on X with respect to which T is upper semicontinuous, then $\sigma \subseteq \sigma'$.

Since points are closed sets, any T_1 topology must contain the cofinite topology σ_0 . Given topologies σ_β for all $\beta < \alpha$ such that $\sigma_0 \subseteq \sigma_\gamma \subseteq \sigma_\beta$ for all $0 \leq \gamma \leq \beta$, let σ_α be the topology generated by the collection of sets of the form

$$T_+^{-1}(U_1) \cap \cdots \cap T_+^{-1}(U_m) \cap U_{m+1} \cap \cdots \cap U_n,$$

where $m < n$ and if $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $U_i \in \sigma_\beta$ for some $\beta < \alpha$. Since T_+^{-1} respects intersections, this is equivalent to saying that elements of σ_α are arbitrary unions of sets of the form $T_+^{-1}(U) \cap V$ for $U, V \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \sigma_\beta$. For some δ , we have $\sigma_\delta = \sigma_{\delta+1}$ and we let $\sigma = \sigma_\delta$. It is easy to see that T is upper semicontinuous with respect to σ and that any T_1 topology with respect to which T is upper semicontinuous must contain σ . Hence there is a compact T_1 topology on X with respect to which T is upper semicontinuous if and only if σ is compact. Conditions on T making σ compact, however, appear elusive.

In characterizing the existence of a compact Hausdorff topology with respect to which a function is continuous [7], two key tools are the existence of an amenable orbit structure and the fact that $T(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) \neq \emptyset$. For set-valued mappings the equivalence relation corresponding to the notion of a full orbit of a function is given by the connected components of the graph generated on X by placing an edge between x and y if and only if $y \in T(x)$ or $x \in T(y)$. In this case, an orbit might contain a number of cycles x_1, \dots, x_n , such that for each $i < n$, $x_{i+1} \in T(x_i)$ and $x_1 \in T(x_n)$, or \mathbb{Z} -sequences $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, such that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x_{n+1} \in T(x_n)$, or some combination of both, or neither. This means that there is no useful classification of orbits for set-valued mappings.

One can say something about the set $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)$ in certain circumstances. A set-valued mapping $T : X \rightarrow X$ is *point-closed* if $T(x)$ is closed for each $x \in X$. It follows from [15, Theorem 2.1] that, if T is upper semicontinuous and point-closed, then $T(D)$ is closed for every closed subset $D \subseteq X$. For such mappings we have the following, which is analogous to [7, Theorem 4.1].

Theorem 6. *If X is an infinite compact Hausdorff space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a point-closed upper semicontinuous set-valued function, then*

$$T\left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)\right) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) \neq \emptyset.$$

It follows that $T \upharpoonright_{\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)}$ is onto and each of its full orbits contains a cycle or a \mathbb{Z} sequence.

Proof. Since T is point-closed and upper semicontinuous, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T^n(X)$ is a closed set. Thus, since $\emptyset \neq T^{n+1}(X) \subseteq T^n(X)$, if X is compact Hausdorff then $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose $x \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)$. Let $D_0 = T^{-1}(x)$, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $C_n = T_-^{-(n+1)}(x)$ and $D_n = T^n(C_n) \cap D_{n-1}$. Thus $\langle D_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ is a decreasing (i.e. non-increasing) sequence of closed compact nonempty subsets of the compact set D_0 , and hence has nonempty intersection. If $y \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D_n$, then $x \in T(y)$, and hence $x \in T(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X))$. \square

In the following two examples the set-valued function given is not point-closed. These examples show that if $T : X \rightarrow X$ is an upper semicontinuous set-valued function but is not point-closed, then Theorem 6 does not hold in general.

Example 7. Let $X = \{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{1\}$ with the usual topology inherited from \mathbb{R} so that X is compact Hausdorff. Define a set-valued function $T : X \rightarrow X$ by $T(1) = \{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T(1 - \frac{1}{n}) = \{1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\}$. Then T is upper semicontinuous and $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) = \emptyset$.

Example 8. Let $X = \{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{1\} \cup \{2 - \frac{1}{n} : n \geq 2\} \cup \{2\}$ with the usual topology inherited from \mathbb{R} so that X is compact Hausdorff. Let $A = \{2 - \frac{1}{k} : k \geq 1\}$. Define a set-valued function $T : X \rightarrow X$ by:

$$T(y) = \begin{cases} \{1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\} & \text{if } y = 1 - \frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N} \\ \{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} & \text{if } y = 1 \\ \{2 - \frac{1}{n-1}\} & \text{if } y = 2 - \frac{1}{n}, n \geq 2 \text{ and } y \notin A \\ \{1\} & \text{if } y \in A \\ \{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{1\} \cup \{2 - \frac{1}{n} : n \geq 2\} & \text{if } y = 2. \end{cases}$$

Then T is upper semicontinuous,

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) = \left\{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\} \cup \{1\} \neq \left\{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\} = T\left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)\right)$$

and $T \upharpoonright_{\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)}$ consists of a single orbit which does not contain a cycle or a \mathbb{Z} sequence.

Theorem 6 does not hold in general for lower semicontinuous set-valued functions that are not point-closed.

Example 9. Let $X = \{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup [1, 2]$ with the topology inherited from \mathbb{R} , so that X is compact Hausdorff. Let $\{D_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a partition of $[1, 2]$ such that each set D_n is dense in $[1, 2]$. Define $T : X \rightarrow X$ by:

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} [1, 2] \cup \{1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\} & \text{if } x = 1 - \frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N} \\ D_{n+1} & \text{if } x \in D_n, n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Suppose $U \subseteq X$ is open. If $[1, 2] \cap U \neq \emptyset$, then $[1, 2] \subset T^{-1}(U)$. If $[1, 2] \cap U = \emptyset$, then $T^{-1}(U)$ is a subset of $\{1 - \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. In either case $T^{-1}(U)$ is open and so T is lower semicontinuous. However,

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) = [1, 2] \neq [1, 2] \setminus D_1 = T\left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)\right).$$

Moreover $T \upharpoonright_{[1, 2]}$ is lower-semicontinuous, has a single orbit which does not contain a cycle or a \mathbb{Z} sequence and $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (T \upharpoonright_{[1, 2]})^n([1, 2]) = \emptyset$.

In Example 9, neither T nor $T \upharpoonright_{[1,2]}$ are point-closed. The function T in each of the following two examples is point-closed and lower semicontinuous.

Example 10. Let X be the space from Example 7. Let $A = \{1 - \frac{1}{2^k} : k \geq 2\} \cup \{1\}$. Define a set-valued function T as follows:

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} \{\frac{1}{2}\}, & \text{if } x \in A \\ \{1 - \frac{1}{n-1}, 1\}, & \text{if } x = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \notin A \text{ and } n > 1 \\ \{0\}, & \text{if } x = 0, \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Then T is point-closed and lower semicontinuous, $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) = \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ and

$$T\left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)\right) = \{0\}.$$

Example 11. Let X be the space from Example 7. Let $A = \{1 - \frac{1}{2^k} : k \geq 1\} \cup \{1\}$ and $B = \{1 - \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} : k \geq 3\}$. Define a set-valued function T as follows:

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{6}{7}, & \text{if } x \in A \cup \{1\} \\ \{1 - \frac{1}{2n+3}\}, & \text{if } x = 1 - \frac{1}{2n+1} \in B \\ \{1 - \frac{1}{n-2}, 1\}, & \text{if } 0 \neq x = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \notin (A \cup B). \end{cases}$$

Then T is point-closed and lower semicontinuous, $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X) = B$ and

$$T\left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)\right) = B \setminus \left\{\frac{6}{7}\right\},$$

and $T \upharpoonright_{\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^n(X)}$ has an orbit which has no cycles or \mathbb{Z} sequences.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ahmed and C. Good, *Continuity on the rational world*, preprint.
- [2] R. D. Anderson and G. Croquet, *A plane continuum no two of whose non-degenerate subcontinua are homeomorphic: An application of inverse limits*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 10, (1959), 347–353.
- [3] Yu. G. Borisovich, B. D. Gel'man, A. D. Myshkis and V. V. Obukhovskii, *Multivalued mappings*, J. Math. Sci., (6), 24, (1984), 719–791.
- [4] D. Ellis, *Orbital topologies*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford, (2), 4, (1953), 117–119.
- [5] R. Engelking, *General topology*, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, 6, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [6] C. Good and S. Greenwood, *Continuity in separable metrizable and Lindelöf spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., (2), 138, (2010), 577–591.
- [7] C. Good, S. Greenwood, R. W. Knight, D. W. McIntyre and S. Watson, *Characterizing functions on compact spaces*, Adv. Math., 206, (2006), 695–728.
- [8] C. Good and J. Meddaugh, *Shifts of finite type as fundamental objects in the theory of shadowing*, Invent. Math. (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-019-00936-8>.
- [9] C. Good, J. Mitchell and J. Thomas, *Preservation of shadowing in discrete dynamical systems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 485, (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2019.123767>.
- [10] C. Good and B. E. Raines, *Continuum many tent map inverse limits with homeomorphic postcritical -limit sets*, Fund. Math. 191, (2006), 1-21.
- [11] S. Greenwood, and R. Suabedissen, *2-manifolds and inverse limits of set-valued functions on intervals*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A, (11), 37, 5693–5706, 2017.
- [12] J. de Groot and H. de Vries, *Metrization of a set which is mapped into itself*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford, (2), 9, (1958), 144–148.
- [13] W. T. Ingram, *An Introduction to Inverse Limits with set-valued Functions*, Springer, New York, 2012.
- [14] W. T. Ingram, *Inverse limits with upper semicontinuous bonding functions: Problems and some partial solutions*, Topology Proc., 36, (2010), 353–373.
- [15] W. T. Ingram and W. S. Mahavier, *Inverse limits of upper semicontinuous set-valued functions*, Houston Journal of Mathematics, 32, (2006), 119–130.

- [16] A. Iwanik, *How restrictive is topological dynamics?*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin., 38, (1997), 563–569.
- [17] H. Kato, *On dimension and shape of inverse limits with set-valued functions*, Fund. Math., 236, (2017), 83–99.
- [18] J. P. Kelly and J. Meddaugh, *Convergence of sequences of inverse limits*, Topology Appl., 184, (2015), 29–40.
- [19] J. A. Kennedy and V. Nall, *Dynamical properties of shift maps on Inverse limits with a set-valued map*, Ergod. Theor. Dyn. Syst., (4), 38, (2018), 1499–1524.
- [20] J. A. Kennedy, D. R. Stockman, J. A. Yorke, *The inverse limits approach to chaos*, J. Math. Econom., 44, (2008), 423–444.
- [21] W. S. Mahavier, *Inverse limits with subsets of $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$* , Topology Appl., 141, (2004), 225–231.
- [22] A. Medio and B. E. Raines *Backward dynamics in economics. The inverse limit approach*, J. Econom. Dynam. Control, 31, (2007), 1633–1671.
- [23] C. Sherman, *Characterizing orbit structures of homeomorphisms on Cantor sets*, Fund. Math., 245, (2019), 1–24.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM, BIRMINGHAM, UK
Email address: c.good@bham.ac.uk

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, PRIVATE BAG 92019, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND
Email address: sina@math.auckland.ac.nz

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, PRIVATE BAG 92019, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND
Email address: n.uresin@math.auckland.ac.nz