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#### Abstract

Let $I=[0,1]$ and let $P$ be a partition of $I$ into a finite number of intervals. Let $\tau_{1}, \tau_{2} ; I \rightarrow I$ be two piecewise expanding maps on $P$. Let $G$ $\subset I \times I$ be the region between the boundaries of the graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$. Any $\operatorname{map} \tau: I \rightarrow I$ that takes values in $G$ is called a selection of the multivalued map defined by $G$. There are many results devoted to the study of the existence of selections with specified topological properties. However, there are no results concerning the existence of selection with measure-theoretic properties. In this paper we prove the existence of selections which have absolutely continuous invariant measures (acim). By our assumptions we know that $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ possess acims preserving the distribution functions $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$. The main result shows that for any convex combination $F$ of $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ we can find a map $\eta$ with values between the graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ (that is, a selection) such that $F$ is the $\eta$-invariant distribution function. Examples are presented. We also study the relationship of the dynamics of our multivalued maps to random maps.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Multivalued maps have application in economics [3], modeling, and rigorous numerics [8] and in dynamical systems [1, 2]. The objective of this note is to study multivalued maps whose graphs are defined by single valued maps $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$, which are in the class $\mathcal{T}$ of piecewise expanding, piecewise $C^{2}$ maps from $I$ into $I$. We refer to $\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}$ as the lower and upper boundaries of the graph $G \subset I \times I$. Since $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ are in $\mathcal{T}$, they possess acims with probability density functions (pdf), $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$. Any map $\tau: I \rightarrow I$ that takes values in $G$ is called a selection of the multivalued map defined by $G$. There has been much research devoted to the study of the existence of selections with specified topological properties. However, the existence of selections with acims has not been studied. In this paper we prove the existence of such selections.

Motivating examples are presented in Section 2. The first example shows that if the class of transformations is restricted only to the graphs of the lower and upper

[^0]boundary maps $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$, that is, $G$ consists only of the graphs of these two maps, then there is no transformation that has pdf equal to a convex combination of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$. In the second example, we construct a selection with desired properties in the case where the upper and lower boundary maps are piecewise linear.

In Section 3 we describe the construction of selections with acims when the boundary maps of $G$ are tent like. In Section 4 we present the main result. We assume that the lower and upper boundary maps are in $\mathcal{T}$ and have invariant distribution functions $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$. If, for $0<\lambda<1$, the convex combination $F=\lambda F^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}$ is a homeomorphism of the unit interval, then there exists a piecewise monotonic selection $\eta, \tau_{1} \leq \eta \leq \tau_{2}$, preserving the distribution function $F$.

In Section 5 we present an approach to finding selections based on conjugation: if $\tau_{1}$ is piecewise linear and the $\tau_{2}$ is conjugated to $\tau_{1}$ then, for any convex combination $f$ of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ we can find a map $\tau$ with values between the graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ such that $f$ is the invariant pdf associated with $\tau$. In fact, $\tau$ is also a conjugacy of $\tau_{1}$. In Section 6 we study the relationship between the dynamics of multivalued maps and random maps. In particular, we consider a multivalued map consisting of two graphs, and show that in general the statistical long term behaviour of an arbitrary selection of the multivalued map cannot be achieved by a position dependent random map based on the maps defining the multivalued map. A number of positive examples are also presented.

## 2. Motivating examples

Let us consider a multivalued map $T$ with lower boundary map $\tau_{1}$ and upper boundary map $\tau_{2}$ as in Figure 1. If $\tau_{1}$ preserves a density $f_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ preserves a density $f_{2}$, then we ask whether for any convex combination $f=\lambda \cdot f_{1}+(1-\lambda) \cdot f_{2}$, $0<\lambda<1$, we can find a selection of $T$ which preserves the density $f$. We present a counterexample showing that if $T=\left\{\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}\right\}$ ( $T$ is two-valued), then it may be impossible.

## Example 1.

Let

$$
\tau_{1}(x)= \begin{cases}\frac{4}{3} x, & 0 \leq x<\frac{3}{8} \\ 4 x-1, & \frac{3}{8} \leq x<\frac{1}{2} \\ -4 x+3, & \frac{1}{2} \leq x<\frac{5}{8} \\ -\frac{4}{3} x+\frac{4}{3}, & \frac{5}{8} \leq x \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
\tau_{2}(x)= \begin{cases}3 x, & 0 \leq x<\frac{1}{6} \\ \frac{3}{2} x+\frac{1}{4}, & \frac{1}{6} \leq x<\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{3}{2} x+\frac{7}{4}, & \frac{1}{2} \leq x<\frac{5}{6} \\ -3 x+3, & \frac{5}{6} \leq x \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

The invariant densities are $f_{1}=\frac{3}{2} \chi_{[0,1 / 2]}+\frac{1}{2} \chi_{[1 / 2,1]}$ and $f_{2}=\frac{2}{3} \chi_{[0,1 / 2]}+\frac{4}{3} \chi_{[1 / 2,1]}$, correspondingly. Thus, the Lebesgue measure density is a convex combination of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}, 1=\frac{2}{5} \cdot f_{1}+\frac{3}{5} \cdot f_{2}$. In order for a two branch map $\tau$ to leave Lebesgue measure invariant, it is necessary to satisfy

$$
\left|\tau_{1}^{\prime-1}(x)\right|+\left|\tau_{2}^{\prime-1}(x)\right|=1
$$



Figure 1. Two valued map of Example 1
at the preimages $\tau_{1}^{-1}(x)$ and $\tau_{2}^{-1}(x)$ of every point $x$, which is impossible.

## Example 2.

Again, consider the two maps of Example 1. If we allow at least one of the branches of the map $\tau$ to be between the maps $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$, then we can achieve the invariance of Lebesgue measure. For example, the map given below preserves Lebesgue measure. Its graph is shown in Figure 1 using dashed lines.

$$
\tau(x)= \begin{cases}\tau_{2}(x), & 0 \leq x<\frac{1}{2} \\ -3 x+\frac{5}{2}, & \frac{1}{2} \leq x<\frac{4}{6} \\ -\frac{3}{2} x+\frac{3}{2}, & \frac{4}{6} \leq x \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

## 3. Selections for special case of tent-Like maps

We assume that both maps $\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}$ are increasing on $[0,1 / 2]$ and decreasing on $[1 / 2,1]$ and have values 0 at 0 and 1,1 at $1 / 2$. We do not assume that the lower map $\tau_{1}$ is conjugated to the upper map $\tau_{2}$. Let us assume that $\tau_{1}$ preserves measure $\mu_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ preserves measure $\mu_{2}$, not necessarily absolutely continuous. Let $F^{(1)}, F^{(2)}$ be the distribution functions of measures $\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}$, respectively $\left(F^{i}(x)=\mu_{i}([0, x])\right.$, $i=1,2)$. Let $\mu=\lambda \mu_{1}+(1-\lambda) \mu_{2}, 0<\lambda<1$, and let $F$ be the distribution function of $\mu$ :

$$
F(x)=\mu([0, x])
$$

We are looking for a map $\eta$ satisfying $\tau_{1} \leq \eta \leq \tau_{2}$ that preserves the distribution function $F$ (or equivalently measure $\mu$ ).

We introduce the function $s:[0,1 / 2] \rightarrow[1 / 2,1]$, which relates the branches $\eta_{1}, \eta_{2}$ of $\eta$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta_{2}(x)=\eta_{1}\left(s^{-1}(x)\right) . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The Frobenius-Perron operator of $\eta$ is given by

$$
\left(P_{\eta} F\right)(x)=F\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F\left(\eta_{2}^{-1}(x)\right) .
$$

Thus the fixed point of this operator is given by

$$
F(x)=F\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F\left(\eta_{2}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

or

$$
F\left(\eta_{1}(z)\right)=F(z)+1-F(s(z))
$$

or

$$
F(s(z))=1+F(z)-F\left(\eta_{1}(z)\right),
$$

which allows us to find $s$ once $\eta_{1}$ is given:

$$
\begin{equation*}
s(z)=F^{-1}\left(1+F(z)-F\left(\eta_{1}(z)\right)\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, once we construct $\eta_{1}$ satisfying $\tau_{1,1} \leq \eta_{1} \leq \tau_{2,1}$ we obtain $\eta_{2}$ and have to check if it satisfies the required inequalities. We will show that $\eta_{1}$ can be chosen in such a way that the graph of $\eta_{2}$ is between the graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$.

Let us assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{2,1}^{-1} \leq \eta_{1}^{-1} \leq \tau_{1,1}^{-1} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is equivalent to $\tau_{1,1} \leq \eta_{1} \leq \tau_{2,1}$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=\lambda F^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The fixed points of the Frobenius-Perron operators for $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F^{(1)}(x)=F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right) \\
& F^{(2)}(x)=F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

or

$$
\begin{align*}
F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right) & =F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F^{(1)}(x) \\
F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)\right) & =F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F^{(2)}(x)  \tag{5}\\
F\left(\eta_{2}^{-1}(x)\right) & =F\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F(x)
\end{align*}
$$

where we have also included the foregoing fixed point equation for $\eta$. We want to show that

$$
\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x) \leq \eta_{2}^{-1}(x) \leq \tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)
$$

or, equivalently, that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\eta_{2}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

First, we will show that it is possible to choose $\eta_{1}$ in such a way that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\eta_{2}^{-1}(x)\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (4) and (5) we obtain the following inequalities, all of which are equivalent to (7).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F(x) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lambda\left[F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-F^{(1)}(x)\right]+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right)  \tag{9}\\
& \quad \leq \lambda F^{(1)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+1-\lambda F^{(1)}(x)-(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}(x), \\
& \quad \lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right) \\
& \quad \leq \lambda F^{(1)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)-(1-\lambda)\left[F^{(2)}(x)-1\right] . \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Using (5), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right)  \tag{11}\\
& \quad \leq \lambda F^{(1)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)-(1-\lambda)\left[F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)-F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

or,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lambda\left[F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)-F^{(1)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)\right]+(1-\lambda)\left[F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)-F^{(2)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)\right]  \tag{12}\\
& \quad \leq(1-\lambda)\left[F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)\right)-F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

which is also equivalent to (7). Since $\tau_{2,2}^{-1} \geq \tau_{1,2}^{-1}$ the right hand side of (12) is positive, independent of the choice of $\eta_{1}$. Since $\tau_{2,1}^{-1} \leq \eta_{1}^{-1} \leq \tau_{1,1}^{-1}$, the first term on the left hand side is positive (and zero for $\eta_{1}=\tau_{1,1}$ ) and the second term is negative. This shows that there is an interval $I_{1}(x)$ touching $\tau_{1,1}(x)$ such that if we choose $\eta_{1}(x)$ in this interval, then the inequality (12) and thus (7) will be satisfied.

Now, we will show the second part of (6), i.e., that it is possible to choose $\eta_{1}$ in such a way that

$$
\begin{equation*}
F\left(\eta_{2}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

As above, we manipulate (13) to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
(1-\lambda) & {\left[F^{(2)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)-F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)\right]+\lambda\left[F^{(1)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)-F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)\right] }  \tag{14}\\
& \leq \lambda\left[F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{2,2}^{-1}(x)\right)-F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,2}^{-1}(x)\right)\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\tau_{2,2}^{-1} \geq \tau_{1,2}^{-1}$ the right hand side is positive, independent of the choice of $\eta_{1}$. Since $\tau_{2,1}^{-1} \leq \eta_{1}^{-1} \leq \tau_{1,1}^{-1}$, the first term on the left hand side is positive (and zero for $\eta_{1}=\tau_{2,1}$ ) and the second term is negative. This shows that there is an interval $I_{2}(x)$ touching $\tau_{2,1}(x)$ such that if we choose $\eta_{1}(x)$ in this interval, the inequality (14) and thus (13) will be satisfied.

Now, we will show that there exists an $\eta_{1}$ satisfying inequalities (3), (12) and (14). Note that the left hand size of (12) is equal to minus the left hand side of (14), while both right hand sides are positive. We choose $\eta_{1}$ such that the left hand side of (12) ( and also of (14)) is 0 . Then, both inequalities are satisfied. This is possible, at least if we assume that $F^{(1)}, F^{(2)}$ are continuous.

We now solve for $\eta_{1}$ as follows:

$$
\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)=(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right),
$$

which implies that

$$
F\left(\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)\right)=(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

or,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta_{1}^{-1}(x)=F^{-1}\left((1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)\right) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

assuming $F$ is strictly increasing.
Now we show that $\eta_{1}(x)$ defined by equation (15) satisfies assumption (3), i.e., the graph of $\eta_{1}$ is located between the graphs of $\tau_{1,1}$ and $\tau_{2,1}$. First,

$$
\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x) \leq \eta_{1}^{-1}(x)
$$

is equivalent to

$$
\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x) \leq F^{-1}\left((1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)\right)
$$

thus,

$$
F\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

or

$$
\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

or

$$
F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

which is true since $\tau_{2,1}(x) \geq \tau_{1,1}(x)$ and both are increasing. On the other hand,

$$
\eta_{1}^{-1}(x) \leq \tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)
$$

is equivalent to

$$
F^{-1}\left((1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)\right) \leq \tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)
$$

or

$$
(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

or

$$
(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq \lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

or

$$
F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(x)\right) \leq F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(x)\right)
$$

which is true by the same reason as in the first case.
Note that $\eta_{1}(x)$, defined by equation (15), is increasing and continuous since all the functions defining $\eta_{1}(x)$ are increasing and continuous. Also,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\eta_{1}^{-1}(0)=F^{-1}\left((1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(0)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(0)\right)\right)=F^{-1}(0)=0 \\
\eta_{1}^{-1}(1)=F^{-1}\left((1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left(\tau_{2,1}^{-1}(1)\right)+\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\tau_{1,1}^{-1}(1)\right)\right)=F^{-1}(F(1 / 2))=1 / 2
\end{gathered}
$$

Actually, for the tent like map we are considering, it is not necessary to assume that the maximum is achieved at $1 / 2$, it can be any point in $(0,1)$.

## 4. Main result

Our main result is the following theorem.
Theorem 1. Let us consider a multivalued map from the unit interval into itself whose lower and upper boundary maps $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ are piecewise monotonic, their invariant distribution functions $F^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ are continuous, and for any $0<\lambda<$ 1, the convex combination $F=\lambda F^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}$ is a homeomorphism of the unit interval. Then, there exists a piecewise monotonic selection $\eta, \tau_{1} \leq \eta \leq \tau_{2}$, preserving the distribution function $F$.

Proof. We assume that the partition points for $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ are the same: $a_{0}=0<$ $a_{1}<a_{2}<\cdots<a_{m}=1$. Let $I_{j}=\left[a_{j-1}, a_{j}\right], j=1,2,3, \ldots, m$. On each interval $I_{j}$, $\tau_{1, j}:=\left.\tau_{1}\right|_{I_{j}}$ and $\tau_{2, j}:=\left.\tau_{2}\right|_{I_{j}}$ share the same monotonicity, where we understand $\tau_{1, j}$ and $\tau_{1, j}$ as the natural extensions of branches of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$, respectively.

For any interval $[a, b] \subseteq[0,1]$, given a monotone continuous function $h:[a, b] \rightarrow$ $[0,1]$ (not necessarily onto), we define its extended inverse as follows. Let

$$
h^{\max }=\max \{h(x) \mid x \in[a, b]\}
$$

and

$$
h^{\min }=\min \{h(x) \mid x \in[a, b]\} .
$$

If $h$ is increasing, then its extended inverse is defined as

$$
\overline{h^{-1}}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
a, \text { for } x \in\left[0, h^{\min }\right] \\
h^{-1}(x), \text { for } x \in\left[h^{\min }, h^{\max }\right] \\
b, \text { for } x \in\left[h^{\max }, 1\right]
\end{array}\right.
$$

If $h$ is decreasing, then its extended inverse is defined as

$$
\overline{h^{-1}}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
b, \text { for } x \in\left[0, h^{\min }\right] \\
h^{-1}(x), \text { for } x \in\left[h^{\min }, h^{\max }\right] \\
a, \text { for } x \in\left[h^{\max }, 1\right]
\end{array}\right.
$$

We define the extended inverse of each branch of $\eta$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}(x)=F^{-1}\left(\lambda F^{(1)} \overline{\left(\tau_{1, j}^{-1}\right.}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)} \overline{\left(\tau_{2, j}^{-1}\right.}(x)\right)\right), \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $j=1,2,3, \ldots, m$. The function $\eta$ defined in this way, after the vertical segments are removed, has the same number of branches as $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$, and each branch of it has the same monotonicity as the corresponding branches of the boundary maps.

First, we show that the graph of $\eta$ is located between the graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$. For some $j \in\{1,2, \ldots, m\}$, we will show this for the case when $\tau_{1, j}$ and $\tau_{2, j}$ are increasing. The proof for the case when $\tau_{1, j}$ and $\tau_{2, j}$ are decreasing is similar. We need to show:

$$
\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}(x) \leq \overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}(x) \leq \overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}(x)
$$

which is equivalent to

$$
F\left(\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}(x)\right) \leq F\left(\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}(x)\right)
$$

or, using (16),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda F^{(1)}\left(\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}(x)\right)+ & \left.(1-\lambda) F^{(2)} \overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}(x)\right) \\
& \left.\left.\leq \lambda F^{(1)} \overline{\left(\tau_{1, j}^{-1}\right.}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)} \overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}(x)\right) \\
& \left.\left.\leq \lambda F^{(1)} \overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)} \overline{\left(\tau_{1, j}^{-1}\right.}(x)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

which is true, because $\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}(x) \leq \overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}(x)$ since $\tau_{1, j}$ and $\tau_{2, j}$ are increasing.
Now, for any $x \in[0,1]$, using the previous notation, we have

$$
\overline{\eta^{-1}}([0, x])=\bigcup_{j=1}^{m}\left[{\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x),{\left.{\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right], ~ \text {, }}^{r}\right.
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\overline{\tau_{1}^{-1}}}^{([0, x])=\bigcup_{j=1}^{m}\left[{\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x),{\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right], ~, ~, ~} \\
& {\overline{\tau_{2}^{-1}}}^{([0, x])=\bigcup_{j=1}^{m}\left[{\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x),{\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right], ~, ~, ~}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the bars over inverses of maps $\eta^{-1}, \tau_{1}^{-1}$ and $\tau_{2}^{-1}$ imply that the extended inverses are used for each branch. Note that all the three maps have the same monotonicity for each corresponding branch. Moreover, for some $x$, the intervals appearing on the right hand side of the above preimages may only contain one point. For example, if $x \in\left[0, \tau_{1, j}^{\mathrm{min}}\right]$, where $j \in\{1,2, \ldots, m\}$, then ${\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)={\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)=$ $a_{j-1}$ when $\tau_{1, j}$ is increasing.

For the maps $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$, the Frobenius-Perron equation implies
$i=1,2$.
Using (16) and the fact that $\eta, \tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ have the same monotonicity on each interval $I_{j}, j \in\{1,2, \ldots, m\}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
F\left({\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right)-F\left({\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right)= & \lambda F^{(1)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left({\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right) \\
& -\left[\lambda F^{(1)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}\left({\overline{\tau_{2, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right)\right] \\
= & \lambda\left[F^{(1)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right)-F^{(1)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right)\right] \\
& +(1-\lambda)\left[F^{(2)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right)-F^{(2)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, denoting the measure corresponding to $F$ by $\mu$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu\left(\eta^{-1}([0, x])\right)= & \sum_{j=1}^{m} F\left({\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right)-F\left({\overline{\eta_{j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right) \\
= & \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[F^{(1)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right)-F^{(1)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right)\right] \\
& +(1-\lambda) \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[F^{(2)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{r}(x)\right)-F^{(2)}\left({\overline{\tau_{1, j}^{-1}}}^{l}(x)\right)\right] \\
= & \lambda F^{(1)}(x)+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}(x)=F(x),
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies that the map $\eta$ defined in (16) preserves $F$. This completes the proof.

We construct an example as follows. Let $\varphi_{1}$ and $\varphi_{2}$ be homeomorphisms of $[0,1]$ onto itself defined by

$$
\varphi_{1}(x)= \begin{cases}2 x^{2}, & \text { for } 0 \leq x<1 / 2 \\ 1-2(1-x)^{2}, & \text { for } 1 / 2 \leq x \leq 1\end{cases}
$$



Figure 2. Invariant distribution functions $F^{(1)}, F^{(2)}$ and $F$.

$$
\varphi_{2}(x)= \begin{cases}-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1+16 x}, & \text { for } 0 \leq x<1 / 2 \\ \frac{1}{2}\left(x^{2}+\frac{1}{2}(x+1)\right), & \text { for } 1 / 2 \leq x \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

Define the maps $\tau_{1}=\varphi_{1}^{-1} \circ S \circ \varphi_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}=\varphi_{2}^{-1} \circ S \circ \varphi_{2}$, where $S$ is the tent map. The graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ are shown in Figure 3. The invariant distribution function for $\tau_{1}$ is $F^{(1)}=\varphi_{1}$, and the invariant distribution function for $\tau_{2}$ is $F^{(2)}=\varphi_{2}$ (Corollary 1). Let $\lambda=3 / 4$ and $F=\lambda F^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) F^{(2)}$. The distribution functions are shown in Figure 2. In Figure 3 we show the selection $\eta$ constructed using formula (16).

## 5. ANOTHER METHOD OF PARTIALLY SOLVING THE PROBLEM

In this section we generally assume that lower and upper boundary maps $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ are conjugated and use this conjugation to construct a selection. The following result is well known.

Proposition 1. Let $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ be interval $[0,1]$ maps preserving densities $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$, correspondingly, and conjugated by a diffeomorphism (or at least absolutely continuous homeomorphism) $h$ :

$$
\tau_{2}=h^{-1} \circ \tau_{1} \circ h
$$

Then,

$$
f_{2}=\left(f_{1} \circ h\right) \cdot\left|h^{\prime}\right|
$$



Figure 3. Transformations $\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}$ and $\eta$.

Corollary 1. If $\tau_{1}$ is the tent map, then

$$
f_{2}=\left|h^{\prime}\right|
$$

or equivalently

$$
h(x)= \pm \int_{0}^{x} f_{2}(t) d t
$$

Proposition 2. Let $\tau_{1}$ be a piecewise linear Markov map of $[0,1]$ onto itself preserving density $f_{1}$. (This means that there is a partition $\mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{P}=\left\{I_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$ and $\tau_{1}\left(I_{j}\right)$ is a union of consecutive elements of $\mathcal{P}$ for any $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then, $f_{1}$ is piecewise constant $f_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} \chi_{I_{i}}$ [4].) Let $\tau_{2}$ be a map conjugated to $\tau_{1}$ by a diffeomorphism (or at least an absolutely continuous homeomorphism) $h$ preserving the partition $\mathcal{P}$,

$$
\tau_{2}=h^{-1} \circ \tau_{1} \circ h
$$

Then, $\tau_{2}$ preserves the density

$$
f_{2}=\left|h^{\prime}\right| \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} \chi_{I_{i}}
$$

and

$$
\left|h^{\prime}\right|=f_{2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{c_{i}} \chi_{I_{i}} .
$$

Proof. We have

$$
f_{2}=\left(f_{1} \circ h\right) \cdot\left|h^{\prime}\right|=\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} \chi_{I_{i}} \circ h \cdot\left|h^{\prime}\right|=\left|h^{\prime}\right| \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} \chi_{I_{i}}
$$



Figure 4. Piecewise linear Markov map $\tau_{1}$ and the conjugated $\operatorname{map} \tau_{2}$.

Let us now consider a more general multivalued map $T$ with lower boundary map $\tau_{1}$ and upper boundary map $\tau_{2}$ as in Figure 4. The map $T$ is typically infinitely valued: $T(x)=\left[\tau_{1}(x), \tau_{2}(x)\right], x \in[0,1]$. If $\tau_{1}$ preserves a density $f_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ preserves a density $f_{2}$, then we ask if, for any convex combination $f=\lambda \cdot f_{1}+(1-\lambda) \cdot f_{2}$, $0<\lambda<1$, we can find a selection of $T$ which preserves the density $f$. We give conditions under which this holds.

Theorem 2. Let $\tau_{1}$ be a piecewise linear Markov map (on partition $\mathcal{P}$ ) of $[0,1]$ onto itself preserving the density $f_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{i} \chi_{I_{i}}$. Let $\tau_{2}$ be a map conjugated to $\tau_{1}$ by an increasing absolutely continuous homeomorphism $h$ preserving the partition $\mathcal{P}$, that is,

$$
\tau_{2}=h^{-1} \circ \tau_{1} \circ h
$$

Let the density $f_{2}$ be $\tau_{2}$ invariant. Then, for any convex combination $f=\lambda \cdot f_{1}+$ $(1-\lambda) \cdot f_{2}, 0<\lambda<1$, we can find a selection of $T$ which preserves the density $f$.

Proof. By Proposition 2 we have $\left|h^{\prime}\right|=f_{2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{c_{i}} \chi_{I_{i}}$. Assuming that $h$ is increasing

$$
h(x)=\int_{0}^{x} f_{2}(t) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{c_{i}} \chi_{I_{i}}(t) d t .
$$

Using Proposition 2 again, if we define the following conjugation

$$
\begin{aligned}
g(x) & =\int_{0}^{x} f(t) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{c_{i}} \chi_{I_{i}}(t) d t=\int_{0}^{x}\left(\lambda \cdot f_{1}(t)+(1-\lambda) \cdot f_{2}(t)\right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{c_{i}} \chi_{I_{i}}(t) d t \\
& =\int_{0}^{x}\left(\lambda \cdot 1+(1-\lambda) \cdot\left(f_{2}(t) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{c_{i}} \chi_{I_{i}}(t)\right)\right) d t=\lambda \cdot x+(1-\lambda) \cdot h(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

then $\tau=g^{-1} \circ \tau_{1} \circ g$ preserves the density $f$. Note, $g$ is also increasing.
We will prove that $\tau_{1} \leq \tau \leq \tau_{2}$. Consider $x \in I_{i} \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $\beta=1-\lambda$. The function $\tau_{1}$ is piecewise linear on $I_{i}$, so $\tau_{1}(\lambda x+\beta y)=\lambda \tau_{1}(x)+\beta \tau_{1}(y), x, y \in I_{i}$. First, we will prove that $\tau_{1} \leq \tau$ or equivalently $g \circ \tau_{1} \leq \tau_{1} \circ g$. For $x \in I_{i}$ we have

$$
g\left(\tau_{1}(x)\right)=\lambda \tau_{1}(x)+\beta h\left(\tau_{1}(x)\right) \leq \lambda \tau_{1}(x)+\beta \tau_{1}(h(x))=\tau_{1}(g(x))
$$

We used the inequality $h \circ \tau_{1} \leq \tau_{1} \circ h$ which is equivalent to $\tau_{1} \leq h^{-1} \circ \tau_{1} \circ h=\tau_{2}$.
Now, we prove that $\tau \leq \tau_{2}$ or that $g^{-1} \circ \tau_{1} \circ g \leq \tau_{2}$ or, equivalently, that $\tau_{1} \circ g \leq g \circ \tau_{2}$. Again, we consider $x \in I_{i}$ :

$$
\tau_{1}(g(x))=\tau_{1}(\lambda x+\beta h(x))=\lambda \tau_{1}(x)+\beta \tau_{1}(h(x)) .
$$

We also have

$$
g\left(\tau_{2}(x)\right)=\lambda \tau_{2}(x)+\beta h\left(\tau_{2}(x)\right)=\lambda \tau_{2}(x)+\beta h\left(h^{-1}\left(\tau_{1}(h(x))\right)\right)=\lambda \tau_{2}+\beta \tau_{1}(h(x))
$$

Since $\tau_{1} \leq \tau_{2}$ the proof is complete.

## Example 3.

In this example we show existence of a selection $\tau$ in a situation when the lower boundary map is not onto. Let us consider the tent map

$$
\tau_{2}(x)=1-2|x-1 / 2|
$$

and

$$
\tau_{1}(x)= \begin{cases}4 x^{2} & , \text { for } 0 \leq x<1 / 4 \\ 2 x-1 / 4 & , \text { for } 1 / 4 \leq x<1 / 2 \\ -2 x+7 / 4 & , \text { for } 1 / 2 \leq x<3 / 4 \\ 4(1-x)^{2} & , \text { for } 3 / 4 \leq x \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

shown in Figure 5.
The invariant densities are $f_{2}=1$ for $\tau_{2}$ and $f_{1}=2 \chi_{[1 / 4,3 / 4]}$ for $\tau_{2}$. For any $0<\lambda<1$ their convex combination is

$$
f=\lambda f_{1}+(1-\lambda) f_{2}=(1-\lambda) \chi_{[0,1 / 4] \cup[3 / 4,1]}+(1+\lambda) \chi_{[1 / 4,3 / 4]} .
$$

We are looking for the selection $\tau$ satisfying $\tau_{1} \leq \tau \leq \tau_{2}$ and preserving $f$. We must have $\tau(0)=\tau(1)=0$ since both $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ satisfy these conditions. We also must have $\tau(1 / 2)=1$ since $f$ is supported on the whole $[0,1]$. We will look for a symmetric map $\tau$.

For $x \in[0,1 / 4]$, we have

$$
(1-\lambda)=\frac{(1-\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}+\frac{(1-\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(2)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}
$$



Figure 5. Maps $\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}$ and map $\tau$ we are looking for.
or

$$
1=\frac{1}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}+\frac{1}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(2)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}
$$

Thus, by symmetry of $\tau$ :

$$
\left|\tau^{\prime}(x)\right|=2, \text { for } x \in\left[0, \tau_{(1)}^{-1}(1 / 4)\right] \cup\left[1-\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(1 / 4), 1\right] .
$$

For $x \in[1 / 4, \tau(1 / 4)]$, we have

$$
(1+\lambda)=\frac{(1-\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}+\frac{(1-\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(2)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}
$$

which, by symmetry of $\tau$, implies

$$
\left|\tau^{\prime}(x)\right|=2(1-\lambda) /(1+\lambda), \text { for } x \in\left[\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(1 / 4), 1 / 4\right] \cup\left[3 / 4,1-\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(1 / 4)\right]
$$

For $x \in[\tau(1 / 4), 3 / 4]$, we have

$$
(1+\lambda)=\frac{(1+\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}+\frac{(1+\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(2)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}
$$

which, by symmetry of $\tau$, implies

$$
\left|\tau^{\prime}(x)\right|=2, \text { for } x \in\left[1 / 4, \tau_{(1)}^{-1}(3 / 4)\right] \cup\left[1-\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(3 / 4), 3 / 4\right]
$$



Figure 6. $\operatorname{Map} \tau$ for $\lambda=1 / 2$.

For $x \in[3 / 4,1]$, we have

$$
(1-\lambda)=\frac{(1+\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}+\frac{(1+\lambda)}{\left|\tau^{\prime}\left(\tau_{(2)}^{-1}(x)\right)\right|}
$$

which, by symmetry of $\tau$, implies

$$
\left|\tau^{\prime}(x)\right|=2(1+\lambda) /(1-\lambda), \text { for } x \in\left[\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(3 / 4), 1-\tau_{(1)}^{-1}(3 / 4)\right]
$$

In Figures 6 and 7 we present graphs of $\tau$ for $\lambda=1 / 2$ and $\lambda=1 / 10$. The slopes are $2,2 / 3,2,6$ for the first and $2,18 / 11,2,22 / 9$ for the second.

## 6. Multivalued Maps and Random Maps

We define a random map to be a finite collection of maps as follows: let $R=$ $\left(\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}, \ldots, \tau_{K} ; p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{K}\right)$, where $\tau_{k}$ are maps of an interval, $p_{k}$ are position dependent probabilities which are assumed to be measurable, $p_{k}(x) \geq 0$ for $k=$ $1,2, \ldots, K$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_{k}(x)=1$. At each step, the random map $R$ moves the point $x$ to $\tau_{k}(x)$ with probability $p_{k}(x)$. For fixed $\left\{\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}, \ldots, \tau_{K}\right\}, R$ can have different invariant probability density functions, depending on the choice of the (weight) functions $\left\{p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{K}\right\}$. Let $f_{k}$ be an invariant density of $\tau_{k}, k=1, \ldots, K$. It is shown in $[5,7]$ that for any positive constants $a_{k}, k=1, \ldots, K$, satisfying $\sum_{k=1}^{K} a_{k}=1$, there exists a system of weight probability functions $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{K}$ such


Figure 7. Map $\tau$ for $\lambda=1 / 10$.
that the density $f=a_{1} f_{1}+\cdots+a_{K} f_{K}$ is invariant under the random map $R=$ $\left\{\tau_{1}, \ldots, \tau_{K} ; p_{1}, \ldots, p_{K}\right\}$, where

$$
p_{k}=\frac{a_{k} f_{k}}{a_{1} f_{1}+\cdots+a_{K} f_{K}} \quad, \quad k=1,2, \ldots, K
$$

(It is assumed that $0 / 0=0$.)
Let us now consider a multivalued map consisting of a lower boundary map $\tau_{1}$ and an upper boundary map $\tau_{2}$, with density functions $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$, respectively. Let $f$ be any convex combination of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$. Then, by the foregoing result, we can construct a position dependent random map on the graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ whose unique pdf is $f$.

A related problem is to consider a piecewise expanding selection having density function $f$; can we find a probability function $p(x)$ such that the resulting random $\operatorname{map} R=\left(\tau_{1}, \tau_{2} ; p, 1-p\right)$ has $f$ as its density function?

In general this problem does not have a positive solution (see Example 4 below). However, in many cases the solution can be found. A simple example of this situation can be shown from $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ of Example 1. Let us consider the triangle map, $\tau$, whose graph fits in between the graphs of $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$. It can be shown that $R=\left(\tau_{1}, \tau_{2} ; 0.75,0.25\right)$ has Lebesgue measure as its invariant measure.

Another, more general result in this direction can be established by considering $\tau_{1}$ to be a piecewise linear Markov map where $\tau_{2}$ is conjugated to $\tau_{1}$ by $g(x)=$ $\lambda x+(1-\lambda) h(x)$, where $h$ conjugates the upper map $\tau_{2}$ to the lower map $\tau_{1}$. Then $\tau$
has pdf $f$ which is a convex combination of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$. Hence by the main result of [7], we know that there exists a position dependent random map $R=\left(\tau_{1}, \tau_{2} ; p, 1-p\right)$ which has $f$ as its pdf.

## Example 4.

We consider the semi-Markov ([6]) piecewise linear maps
$\tau_{1}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}\frac{4}{3} x, & \text { for } 0 \leq x<\frac{3}{20} ; \\ 16 x-\frac{11}{5}, & \text { for } \frac{3}{20} \leq x<\frac{1}{5} ; \\ 5 x(\bmod ) 1, & \text { for } \frac{1}{5} \leq x \leq 1,\end{array} \quad \tau_{2}(x)= \begin{cases}16 x, & \text { for } 0 \leq x<\frac{1}{20} ; \\ \frac{4}{3} x+\frac{11}{15}, & \text { for } \frac{1}{20} \leq x<\frac{1}{5} ; \\ 5 x(\bmod ) 1, & \text { for } \frac{1}{5} \leq x \leq 1,\end{cases}\right.$
whose graphs are shown in Figure 8. For the selection $\tau$ we choose the map $\tau(x)=$ $5 x(\bmod 1)$ preserving Lebesgue measure.


Figure 8. Boundary maps in the counterexample

We will show that there is no solution, i.e., there is no position dependent random map based on $\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}$ that preserves Lebesgue measure.

Let us consider $p_{1}(x)$, non-constant, on $[0,1 / 5]$ (the values on $[1 / 5,1]$ are not important). Let $\phi_{1}=\tau_{1}^{-1}$ on $[0,1 / 5], \psi_{1}=\tau_{2}^{-1}$ on $[0,1 / 5], \phi_{i}=\tau_{1}^{-1}=\tau_{2}^{-1}$ on $[(i-1) / 5, i / 5], i=2,3,4,5$. The Frobenius-Perron operator of $R$ is

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(P_{R} f\right)(x) & =\frac{3}{4} p_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) f\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[0,1 / 5]}+\frac{1}{16}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right)\right) f\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[0,1 / 5]}  \tag{17}\\
& +\frac{1}{16} p_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) f\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[1 / 5,4 / 5]}+\frac{1}{16}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right)\right) f\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[1 / 5,4 / 5]} \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{16} p_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) f\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[4 / 5,1]}+\frac{3}{4}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right)\right)\right) f\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[4 / 5,1]} \\
& +\frac{1}{5}\left(f\left(\phi_{2}(x)\right)+f\left(\phi_{3}(x)\right)+f\left(\phi_{4}(x)\right)+f\left(\phi_{5}(x)\right)\right)
\end{align*}
$$



Figure 9. Maps $\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}$ on interval $[0,1 / 5]$ (not to scale).

If we assume that $f=1$ is preserved by $P_{R}$, then equation (17) reduces to

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{5} & =\frac{3}{4} p_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[0,1 / 5]}+\frac{1}{16}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right)\right) \chi_{[0,1 / 5]} \\
& +\frac{1}{16} p_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[1 / 5,4 / 5]}+\frac{1}{16}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right)\right) \chi_{[1 / 5,4 / 5]}  \tag{18}\\
& \left.+\frac{1}{16} p_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right) \chi_{[4 / 5,1]}+\frac{3}{4}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right)\right)\right) \chi_{[4 / 5,1]}
\end{align*}
$$

We introduce a map $\tau_{21}:[0,1 / 5] \rightarrow[0,1 / 5], \tau_{21}=\tau_{2}^{-1} \circ \tau_{1}$, (see Fig. 10) defined by

$$
\tau_{21}(y)= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{12} x, & \text { for } 0 \leq x<\frac{3}{20} \\ x-\frac{11}{80}, & \text { for } \frac{3}{20} \leq x<\frac{15}{80} \\ 12 x-\frac{11}{5}, & \text { for } \frac{15}{80} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{5}\end{cases}
$$

We assume that the solution $p_{1}$ exists and is a probability, i.e., its values are between 0 and 1. In particular it is defined on the interval $[1 / 80,4 / 80]$ and on interval $[12 / 80,15 / 80]$. Let us consider equation (18) for $x \in[1 / 5,4 / 5]$. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{5}=\frac{1}{16} p_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(x)\right)+\frac{1}{16}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}(x)\right)\right), \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 10. The map $\tau_{21}$ on $[0,1 / 5]$.
or, substituting $x=\phi_{1}^{-1}(y), y \in[12 / 80,15 / 80]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{5}=\frac{1}{16} p_{1}(y)+\frac{1}{16}\left(1-p_{1}\left(\psi_{1}\left(\phi_{1}^{-1}(y)\right)\right)\right) . \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the equality $\tau_{21}=\psi_{1} \circ \phi_{1}^{-1}$, this can be rewritten as

$$
p_{1}(y)=\frac{11}{5}+p_{1}\left(\tau_{21}(y)\right)
$$

Note that $\tau_{21}([12 / 80,15 / 80])=[1 / 80,4 / 80]$. Whatever are the values of $p_{1}$ on [ $1 / 80,4 / 80]$, this implies that the values on $[12 / 80,15 / 80]$ are strictly larger than 1. This contradicts the assumptions on $p_{1}$.
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