Acta Math. Univ. Comenianae
Vol. LXXXII, 2 (2013), pp. 219–230

PRE-IMAGE ENTROPY FOR MAPS ON NONCOMPACT TOPOLOGICAL SPACES

LEI LIU

Abstract. We propose a new definition of pre-image entropy for continuous maps on noncompact topological spaces, investigate fundamental properties of the new pre-image entropy, and compare the new pre-image entropy with the existing ones. The defined pre-image entropy generates that of Cheng and Newhouse. Yet, it holds various basic properties of Cheng and Newhouse's pre-image entropy, for example, the pre-image entropy of a subsystem is bounded by that of the original system, topologically conjugated systems have the same pre-image entropy, the pre-image entropy of the induced hyperspace system is larger than or equal to that of the original system, and in particular this new pre-image entropy coincides with Cheng and Newhouse's pre-image entropy for compact systems.

1. Introduction

The concepts of entropy are useful for studying topological and measure-theoretic structures of dynamical systems, that is, topological entropy (see [**1, 3, 4**]) and measure-theoretic entropy (see [**8, 13**]). For instance, two conjugate systems have the same entropy and thus entropy is a numerical invariant of the class of conjugated dynamical systems. The theory of expansive dynamical systems has been closely related to the theory of topological entropy [**6, 12, 19**]. Entropy and chaos are closely related, for example, a continuous map of interval is chaotic if and only if it has a positive topological entropy [**2**].

In [**10**], Hurley introduced several other entropy-like invariants for noninvertible maps. One of these, which Nitecki and Przytycki [**16**] called pre-image branch entropy (retaining Hurley's notation), distinguishes points according to the branches of the inverse map. Cheng and Newhouse [**7**] further extended the concept of topological entropy of a continuous map and gave the concept of pre-image entropy for compact dynamical systems. Several important pre-image entropy invariants, such as pointwise pre-image, pointwise branch entropy, partial pre-image entropy, and bundle-like pre-image entropy, etc., have been introduced and their relationships with topological entropy have been established. Zhang, Zhu and He [**22**] extended

Received August 24, 2012.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 54H20, 28D20.
Key words and phrases. Pre-image entropy; Locally compact space; Alexandroff compactification; Hyperspace dynamical system.
Supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Henan Province (122300410427), PR China.

and studied some entropy-like invariants for the non-autonomous discrete dynamical systems given by a sequence of continuous self-maps of a compact topological space as mentioned above.

This paper investigates a more general definition of pre-image entropy for continuous maps defined on noncompact topological spaces and explore the properties of such pre-image entropy. This definition generalizes that of Cheng and Newhouse's. Moreover, we have proved that the pre-image entropy defined in this paper holds most properties of the pre-image entropy under Cheng and Newhouse's definition, for example, for compact systems, this new pre-image entropy coincides with the pre-image entropy defined by Cheng and Newhouse's, the defined pre-image entropy (over noncompact topological spaces) either retains the fundamental properties of pre-image entropy (over compact topological spaces) or has similar properties, the pre-image entropy of a subsystem is bounded by that of the original system, topologically conjugated systems have the same pre-image entropy, the pre-image entropy of an autohomeomorphism from R onto itself is 0, and the pre-image entropy of the induced hyperspace map is at least that of the original mapping.

2. The new definition of pre-image entropy and its general properties

Let (X, d) be an arbitrary metric space and $f\colon X \to X$ be a continuous mapping. Then the pair (X, f) is said to be a topological dynamical system. If X is compact, (X, f) is called a compact dynamical system. Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of all positive integers and let $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Definition 2.1 ([**7**])**.** Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and $f\colon X \to X$ be a continuous map and let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup \frac{1}{n} \log \sup_{x\in X, k\geq n} r(n, \varepsilon, f^{-k}(x), f)$$

is called the pre-image entropy of f, where $r(n, \varepsilon, f^{-k}(x), f)$ is the maximal cardinality of (n, ε)-separated subsets of $f^{-k}(x)$.

Note that if f is a homeomorphism, then $h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f) = 0$. When X needs to be explicitly mentioned, we write $h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f, X)$ instead of $h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$.

Now, we begin our process to introduce our new definition of pre-image entropy. Let (X, f) be a topological dynamical system, where X is an arbitrary topological space with metric d and f is a continuous self-map of the metric space (X, d). Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define the metric $d_{f,n}$ on X by

$$d_{f,n}(x, y) = \max_{0\leq j<n} d(f^j(x), f^j(y)).$$

A set $E \subseteq X$ is an $(n, \varepsilon)-$separated set if for any $x \neq y$ in E, one has $d_{f,n}(x, y) > \varepsilon$. Given a subset $K \subseteq X$, we define the quantity $r(n, \varepsilon, K, f)$ to be the maximal cardinality of (n, ε, K, f)-separated subset of K. A subset $E \subseteq K$ is an (n, ε, K)-spanning set if for every $x \in K$, there is a $y \in E$ such that $d_{f,n}(x, y) \leq \varepsilon$.

Let $s(n,\varepsilon,K,f)$ be the minimal cardinality of any (n,ε,K,f)-spanning set. Uniform continuity of f^j for $0 \leq j < n$, guarantees that $r(n,\varepsilon,K,f)$ and $s(n,\varepsilon,K,f)$ are both finite for all $n,\varepsilon > 0$. It is a standard that for any subset $K \subseteq X$,

$$s(n,\varepsilon,K,f) \leq r(n,\varepsilon,K,f) \leq s\left(n,\frac{\varepsilon}{2},K,f\right). \tag{2.1}$$

Next, using techniques as in Bowen [**5**], we have the following.
If $n_1, n_2, l \in \mathbb{N}$ with $l \geq n_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} r(n_1+n_2,\varepsilon,f^{-l}(K),f) &\leq s\left(n_1,\frac{\varepsilon}{2},f^{-l}(K),f\right) s\left(n_2,\frac{\varepsilon}{2},f^{-l+n_1}(K),f\right) \\ &\leq r\left(n_1,\frac{\varepsilon}{2},f^{-l}(K),f\right) r\left(n_2,\frac{\varepsilon}{2},f^{-l+n_1}(K),f\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

By $K(X,f)$, denote the set of all f-invariant nonempty compact subsets of X, that is, $K(X,f) = \{F \subseteq X : F \neq \emptyset, F \text{ is compact and } f(F) \subseteq F\}$. If X is compact, it follows from $f(X) \subseteq X$ that $K(X,f) \neq \emptyset$. However, when X is noncompact, $K(X,f)$ could be empty. The translation $f\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $x \mapsto x+1$ is such an example. Another example is $f\colon (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$, where $f(x) = 2x$ and $(0,\infty)$ has the subspace topology of $\mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.2. Let (X,f) be a topological dynamical system, where (X,d) is a metric space and let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $F \in K(X,f)$,

$$h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{1}{n}\log\sup_{x\in F,k\geq n} r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_F)^{-k}(x),f|_F)$$

is called the pre-image entropy of f on F, where $f|_F\colon F \to F$ is the induced map of f, that is, for any $x \in F$, $f|_F(x) = f(x)$.

Remark 1. By Definition 2.2, if $F \in K(X,f)$ and $x \in F$, then $f(F) \subseteq F$ and $(f|_F)^{-k}(x) \subseteq F$. Furthermore, we have $f|_F\colon F \to F$ is a uniformly continuous mapping. Hence, $r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_F)^{-k}(x),f|_F)$ is finite for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, by Definition 2.1, we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F) = h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F)$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let (X,f) be a topological dynamical system where (X,d) is a metric space. For $F_1, F_2 \in K(X,f)$ with $F_1 \subseteq F_2$, the inequality $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_1},F_1) \leq h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_2},F_2)$ holds.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and n, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq n$, and let $x \in F_1$ and $E \subseteq (f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x)$ be an $(n,\varepsilon,f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x),f|_{F_1})$-separated subset with the maximal cardinality. Let $\mathrm{card}(E) = m$, that is, $r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x),f|_{F_1}) = m$. Since $x \in F_1$ and $F_1 \subseteq F_2$, then $x \in F_2$ and $(f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x) \subseteq F_1$. Furthermore, we have $(f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x) \subseteq (f|_{F_2})^{-k}(x)$ and $(f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x) \subseteq F_2$. Hence, E is an $(n,\varepsilon,f|_{F_2})^{-k}(x),f|_{F_2})$-separated subset of $(f|_{F_2})^{-k}(x)$. Therefore, $r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_{F_2})^{-k}(x)) \geq m$, that is,

$$r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x),f|_{F_1}) \leq r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_{F_2})^{-k}(x),f|_{F_2}).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{1}{n}\log\sup_{x\in F_1,k\geq n} r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_{F_1})^{-k}(x),f|_{F_1})\\&\leq \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{1}{n}\log\sup_{x\in F_2,k\geq n} r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_{F_2})^{-k}(x),f|_{F_2}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_1},F_1)\leq h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_2},F_2)$. □

Definition 2.3. Let (X,f) be a topological dynamical system, where (X,d) is a metric space. When $K(X,f)\neq\emptyset$, define

$$h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)=\sup_{F\in K(X,f)}\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F)\},$$

where the supremum is taken over F of $K(X,f)$. When $K(X,f)=\emptyset$, define $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)=0$. $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ is called the pre-image entropy of f.

Proposition 2.1. *$h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ is independent of the choice of metric on X.*

Proof. We only prove that $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F)$ is independent of the choice of metric on X for every $F\in K(X,f)$. Let d_1 and d_2 be two metrics on X. Then, by compactness of F and $f|_F\colon F\to F$, for every $\varepsilon>0$, there is $\delta>0$ such that for all $x,y\in F$, if $d_1(x,y)<\delta$, then $d_2(x,y)<\varepsilon$. It follows that $r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_F)^{-k}(x),f|_F,d_2)\leq r(n,\delta,(f|_F)^{-k}(x),f|_F,d_1)$ for all $x\in F$, $\varepsilon>0$ and for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$ with $k\geq n$. This shows that $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,\varepsilon,d_2)\leq h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,\delta,d_1)$. Letting $\delta\to 0$, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,\varepsilon,d_2)\leq h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,d_1)$ holds. Now, letting $\varepsilon\to 0$, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,d_2)\leq h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,d_1)$ hols. Interchanging d_1 and d_2, it gives the opposite inequality, proving that $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,d_1)=h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F,d_2)$. □

The next theorem indicates the concept of pre-image entropy $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ defined above, generating that of Cheng and Newhouse [**7**], that is, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ coincides with $h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ when X is compact. Recall that $h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ is defined for compact dynamical systems only while in the preceding section, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ is defined for arbitrary topological spaces.

Theorem 2.2. *Let (X,f) be a compact topological dynamical system, where (X,d) is a metric space. Then $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)=h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)$.*

Proof. Since X is compact and $f(X)\subseteq X$, we have $X\in K(X,f)$ implying $K(X,f)\neq\emptyset$. Thus from Definition 2.3, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)=\sup_{F\in K(X,f)}\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F)\}$. By Theorem 2.1, for any $F\in K(X,f)$, it holds $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F)\leq h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)$, that is, the supremum is achieved when $F=X$. Recall the definitions of $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)$ and $h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)=h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_X,X)&=\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{1}{n}\log\sup_{x\in X,k\geq n} r(n,\varepsilon,(f|_X)^{-k}(x),f|_X)\\&=\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{1}{n}\log\sup_{x\in X,k\geq n} r(n,\varepsilon,f^{-k}(x),f)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)=\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{1}{n}\log\sup_{x\in X,k\geq n} r(n,\varepsilon,f^{-k}(x),f).$$

Hence, we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)=h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)$. So, from the previous proved equality $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)=h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)$, we conclude $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)=h_{\mathrm{pre}}(f,X)$. □

From Definition 2.3, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$ may be $+\infty$. The following example is given.

Example 2.1. Let $(\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+},\sigma)$ be one-sided infinite symbolic dynamics, $\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+}=\{x=(x_n)_{n=0}^{\infty} : x_n\in\mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ for every } n\}$, $\sigma(x_0,x_1,x_2,\dots)=(x_1,x_2,\dots)$. Then $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma)$ is $+\infty$.

Considering $\mathbb{Z}_+$ as a discrete space and putting product topology on $\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$, an admissible metric ρ on the space $\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ is defined by

$$\rho(x,y)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{d(x_n,y_n)}{2^n},$$

where

$$d(x_n,y_n)=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if } x_n=y_n,\\ 1 & \text{if } x_n\neq y_n\end{cases}$$

for $x=(x_0,x_1,\dots)$, $y=(y_0,y_1,\dots)\in\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$. Then $\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a noncompact metric space.

Let $p\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_p=\{x=(x_n)_{n=0}^{\infty} : x_n\in\{0,1,\dots,p-1\} \text{ for every } n\}$. Then we have $\sum_p\subseteq\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+}$. By Robinson [**18**] and Zhou [**23**], $\sum_p$ is a compact space and $\sigma(\sum_p)\subseteq\sum_p$. Hence $\sum_p\in K(\sum_{\mathbb{Z}_+},\sigma)$. Furthermore, we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma)\geq h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma|_{\sum_p},\sum_p)$ from Definition 2.3.

By Nitecki [**17**] and Cheng-Newhouse [**7**], $h_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma|_{\sum_p})=\log p$. By Definition 2.3, we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma|_{\sum_p},\sum_p)=h_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma|_{\sum_p})$. Hence, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma)\geq\log p$. Since p is an arbitrary positive integer, it implies $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\sigma)=+\infty$.

3. Fundamental properties and main results of the pre-image entropy

Proposition 3.1. *Let (X,d) be a metric space and* id *be the identity map from X onto itself. Then for the dynamical system (X,id), we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\mathrm{id})=0$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon>0$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. For any $F\in K(X,\mathrm{id})$ and $x\in F$, $k\geq n$, we have $r(n,\varepsilon,(\mathrm{id}\,|_F)^{-k}(x),\mathrm{id}\,|_F)=r(n,\varepsilon,\{x\},\mathrm{id}\,|_F)$. Hence, $r(n,\varepsilon,(\mathrm{id}\,|_F)^{-k}(x),\mathrm{id}\,|_F)\leq 1$. Then

$$h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\mathrm{id}\,|_F,F)=\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup\frac{1}{n}\log\sup_{x\in F,k\geq n} r(n,\varepsilon,(\mathrm{id}\,|_F)^{-k}(x),\mathrm{id}\,|_F)=0.$$

It follows from Definitions 2.3 that $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\mathrm{id})=\sup_{F\in K(X,f)}\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\mathrm{id}\,|_F,F)\}=0.$ □

Let (X, f) and (Y, g) be two topological dynamical systems. Then, (X, f) is an extension of (Y, g), or (Y, g) is a factor of (X, f) if there exists a surjective continuous map $\pi\colon X \to Y$ (called a factor map) such that $\pi \circ f(x) = g \circ \pi(x)$ for every $x \in X$. If further, π is a homeomorphism, then (X, f) and (Y, g) are said to be topologically conjugate and the homeomorphism π is called a conjugate map.

Let (X, f) and (Y, g) be two topological dynamical systems, where (X, d_1) and (Y, d_2) are metric spaces. For the product space $X \times Y$, define a map $f \times g\colon X \times Y \to X \times Y$ by $(f \times g)(x, y) = (f(x), g(y))$. This map $f \times g$ is continuous and $(X \times Y, f \times g)$ forms a topological dynamical system. Given $X \times Y$, the metric

$$d((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = \max\{d_1(x_1, x_2), d_2(y_1, y_2)\}.$$

Theorem 3.1. ([**7**, Theorem 2.1]) *Let $f\colon X \to X$ and $g\colon Y \to Y$ be continuous self-maps of the compact metric spaces X, Y, respectively. Then*

(1) *(power rule) for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $h_{\text{pre}}(f^m) = m \cdot h_{\text{pre}}(f)$;*

(2) *(product rule) $h_{\text{pre}}(f \times g) = h_{\text{pre}}(f) + h_{\text{pre}}(g)$;*

(3) *(topological invariance) if f is topologically conjugate to g, then $h_{\text{pre}}(f) = h_{\text{pre}}(g)$.*

Let $F_x \in K(X, f)$ and $F_y \in K(Y, g)$. By Definition 2.1, we have $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_{F_x}, F_x) = h_{\text{pre}}(f|_{F_x})$ and $h^*_{\text{pre}}(g|_{F_y}, F_y) = h_{\text{pre}}(g|_{F_y})$. Furthermore, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $f\colon X \to X$ and $g\colon Y \to Y$ be continuous self-maps of the metric spaces X, Y, respectively. Let $F_x \in K(X, f)$ and $F_y \in K(Y, g)$. Then*

(1) *(power rule) for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m|_{F_x}, F_x) = m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_{F_x}, F_x)$;*

(2) *(product rule) $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f \times g|_{F_x \times F_y}, F_x \times F_y) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_{F_x}, F_x) + h^*_{\text{pre}}(g|_{F_y}, F_y)$;*

(3) *(topological invariance) if f is topologically conjugate to g and π is their conjugate map, then $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_{F_x}, F_x) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(g|_{\pi(F_x)}, \pi(F_x))$.*

Proposition 3.2. *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m) \geq m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)$. When $K(X, f) = K(X, f^m)$, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m) = m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)$.*

Proof. If $K(X, f) = \emptyset$, then $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f) = 0$, thus $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m) \geq m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)$. If $K(X, f) \neq \emptyset$, then $K(X, f) \subseteq K(X, f^m)$. For any $F \in K(X, f)$, thus $F \in K(X, f^m)$. By Corollary 3.1 (1), $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m|_F, F) = h^*_{\text{pre}}((f|_F)^m, F) = m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m) &= \sup_{L \in K(X, f^m)} \{h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m|_L, L)\} \\ &\geq \sup_{F \in K(X, f)} \{h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m|_F, F)\} = m \cdot \sup_{F \in K(X, f)} \{h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F)\} \\ &= m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m) \geq m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)$. Next, we show that when $K(X, f) = K(X, f^m)$, the equality holds, that is, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m) = m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)$. Consider two cases.

Case 1. $K(X, f) = K(X, f^m) = \emptyset$. By applying Definition 2.3, we have $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f^m) = m \cdot h^*_{\text{pre}}(f) = 0$.

Case 2. $K(X,f)=K(X,f^m)\neq\emptyset$. For any $F\in K(X,f)=K(X,f^m)$, we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f^m|_F,F)=h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}((f|_F)^m,F)=m\cdot h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f^m)&=\sup_{F\in K(X,f^m)}\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f^m|_F,F)\}=\sup_{F\in K(X,f)}\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f^m|_F,F)\}\\&=m\cdot\sup_{F\in K(X,f)}\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_F,F)\}=m\cdot h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f).\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.1. ([**14**]) *Let (X,f) and (Y,g) be two topological dynamical systems. Let $P_x\colon X\times Y\to X$ and $P_y\colon X\times Y\to Y$ be the projections on X and Y, respectively. If $F\in K(X\times Y,f\times g)$, then $P_x(F)\in K(X,f)$, $P_y(F)\in K(Y,g)$ and $F\subseteq P_x(F)\times P_y(F)$.*

Proposition 3.3. *Let (X,f) and (Y,g) be two topological dynamical systems, where X and Y are two metric spaces. If $K(X\times Y,f\times g)\neq\emptyset$, then $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g)=h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)+h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g)$.*

Proof. Recall the projections $P_x\colon X\times Y\to X$ and $P_y\colon X\times Y\to Y$. Since $K(X\times Y,f\times g)\neq\emptyset$, then for any $F\in K(X\times Y,f\times g)$, by Lemma 3.1, $P_x(F)\in K(X,f)$, $P_y(F)\in K(Y,g)$ and $F\subseteq P_x(F)\times P_y(F)$. Denote $P_x(F)$ by F_x and $P_y(F)$ by F_y. By Theorem 2.1, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_F,F)\le h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_{F_x\times F_y},F_x\times F_y)$. From Corollary 3.1 (2), we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_{F_x\times F_y},F_x\times F_y)=h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_x},F_x)+h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g|_{F_y},F_y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g)=&\ \sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_F,F):F\in K(X\times Y,f\times g)\}\\\le&\ \sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_{F_x\times F_y},F_x\times F_y):\ F_x\in K(X,f)\text{ and }F_y\in K(Y,g)\}\\\le&\ \sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_x},F_x):F_x\in K(X,f)\}\\&\ +\sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_y},F_y):F_y\in K(Y,g)\}\\=&\ h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)+h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g).\end{aligned}$$

We prove the converse inequality. Let $F_x\in K(X,f)$ and $F_y\in K(Y,g)$. By Corollary 3.1 (2), $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_{F_x\times F_y},F_x\times F_y)=h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_x},F_x)+h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g|_{F_y},F_y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g)=&\ \sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_F,F):F\in K(X\times Y,f\times g)\}\\\ge&\ \sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f\times g|_{F_x\times F_y},F_x\times F_y):\ F_x\in K(X,f)\text{ and }F_y\in K(Y,g)\}\\=&\ \sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_x},F_x)\\&\ +h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g|_{F_y},F_y):\ F_x\in K(X,f)\text{ and }F_y\in K(Y,g)\}\\=&\ \sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_x},F_x):F_x\in K(X,f)\}\\&\ +\sup\{h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f|_{F_y},F_y):F_y\in K(Y,g)\}\\=&\ h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)+h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g).\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 3.1. Let (X, f) be a topological dynamical system. If $\Lambda \subseteq X$ and $f(\Lambda) \subseteq \Lambda$, then $(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda)$ is said to be a topological subsystem of (X, f), or simply a subsystem of (X, f).

Remark 2. In above definition, Λ is not necessarily compact or closed. In the literature of dynamics, many authors assume subsystems to be compact or closed.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda)$ be a subsystem of (X, f), where X is a metric space. Then $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_\Lambda) \leq h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)$.*

Proof. If $K(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda) = \emptyset$, it follows from Definition 2.3 that $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_\Lambda) = 0$, thus $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_\Lambda) \leq h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)$. If $K(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$, then $K(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda) \subseteq K(X, f)$. For any $F \in K(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda)$, we have $h^*_{\text{pre}}((f|_\Lambda)|_F, F) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_\Lambda) &= \sup_{F \in K(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda)} h^*_{\text{pre}}((f|_\Lambda)|_F, F) = \sup_{F \in K(\Lambda, f|_\Lambda)} h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F) \\ &\leq \sup_{F \in K(X, f)} h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(f). \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.3. *Let (X, f) and (Y, g) be two topological dynamical systems, where X, Y are two metric spaces. If (X, f) and (Y, g) are topologically conjugate, that is, there exists a continuous map $\pi\colon X \to Y$ satisfying $\pi \circ f = g \circ \pi$, then $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(g)$.*

Proof. Consider two cases.

Case 1. $K(X, f) = \emptyset$. We claim $K(Y, g) = \emptyset$. If not, assume $K(Y, g) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $F \in K(Y, g) \neq \emptyset$ satisfying $g(F) \subseteq F$. As $\pi\colon X \to Y$ is a conjugate map, that is, $\pi \circ f = g \circ \pi$, the inverse π^{-1} is a conjugate map from (Y, g) and (X, f), that is, $\pi^{-1} \circ g = f \circ \pi^{-1}$. Note that $\pi^{-1}(F)$ is a nonempty compact subset of X and $f(\pi^{-1}(F)) = \pi^{-1}(g(F)) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(F)$. Hence, $\pi^{-1}(F) \in K(X, f)$, which contradicts $K(X, f) = \emptyset$. Therefore, $K(X, f) = \emptyset$ implies $K(Y, g) = \emptyset$. Similarly, we can prove that $K(Y, g) = \emptyset$ implies $K(X, f) = \emptyset$. So we have proved that $K(X, f) = \emptyset$ if and only if $K(Y, g) = \emptyset$, and thus by Definition 2.3, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(g)$.

Case 2. $K(X, f) \neq \emptyset$. We prove that for every $F \in K(X, f)$, $2^\pi\colon K(X, f) \to K(Y, g)$, $2^\pi(F) = \pi(F)$ is a one-to-one correspondence between $K(X, f)$ and $K(Y, g)$. Recall $\pi\colon X \to Y$ is a conjugate map, that is, $\pi \circ f = g \circ \pi$. Since $2^\pi(F) = \pi(F)$ and $g(\pi(F)) = \pi(f(F)) \subseteq \pi(F)$, so we have $\pi(F) \in K(Y, g)$. Hence, 2^π is well definite. Furthermore, for any $F_1, F_2 \in K(X, f)$ and $F_1 \neq F_2$, we have $2^\pi(F_1) = \pi(F_1)$, $2^\pi(F_2) = \pi(F_2)$ and $\pi(F_1) \neq \pi(F_2)$, thus $2^\pi(F_1) \neq 2^\pi(F_2)$. Moreover, for any $F \in K(Y, g)$, we have $\pi^{-1}(F) \in K(X, f)$ and $2^\pi(\pi^{-1}(F)) = \pi(\pi^{-1}(F)) = F$. Therefore, $2^\pi\colon K(X, f) \to K(Y, g)$ is bijective. We consider $F \in K(X, f)$, then $\pi\colon F \to \pi(F)$ is a conjugate map, that is, $\pi \circ f|_F = g|_{\pi(F)} \circ \pi$. By Corollary 3.1 (3), we have $h_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F) = h_{\text{pre}}(g|_{\pi(F)}, \pi(F))$. Furthermore, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(g|_{\pi(F)}, \pi(F))$. Hence,

$$h^*_{\text{pre}}(f) = \sup_{F \in K(X, f)} h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F) = \sup_{F \in K(X, f)} h^*_{\text{pre}}(g|_{\pi(F)}, \pi(F)).$$

Since $2^\pi\colon K(X,f)\to K(Y,g)$ is a one-to-one correspondence, we have

$$\sup_{F\in K(X,f)} h^*_{\text{pre}}(g|_{\pi(F)},\pi(F)) = \sup_{F'\in K(Y,g)} h^*_{\text{pre}}(g|_{F'},F') = h^*_{\text{pre}}(g).$$

Therefore, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(g)$. □

4. Pre-image entropies of locally compact spaces and induced hyperspaces

Let R denote the one-dimensional Euclidean space and X denote a (noncompact) locally compact metrizable space, if not indicated otherwise. From Kelley's result [**11**], the Alexandroff compactification (that is, one-point compactification) $\omega X = X\cup\{\omega\}$ of X is also metrizable.

Definition 4.1 ([**14**])**.** Let $f\colon X\to X$ be a continuous map.

(1) If there exists an $a\in X$ such that for every sequence x_n of points of X, $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(x_n) = a$ holds whenever x_n does not have any convergent subsequence in X, then f is said to be convergent to a at infinity.
(2) If for every sequence x_n of points of X, x_n does not have any convergent subsequence in X, $f(x_n)$ does not have any convergent subsequence, then f is said to be convergent to infinity at the infinity.
(3) If (1) or (2) hold, f is said to be convergent at the infinity.

Theorem 4.1 ([**21**])**.** *A continuous map $f\colon X\to X$ is convergent at the infinity if and only if f can be extended to a continuous map $\bar f$ on the Alexandroff compactification ωX.*

Theorem 4.2. *Let (X,f) be a dynamical system. If f can be extended to a continuous map on the Alexandroff compactification ωX, that is, f is convergent at the infinity and $\bar f(\omega)=a$ or $\bar f(\omega)=\omega$ (refer to Definition 4.1), then $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)\le h^*_{\text{pre}}(\bar f)$.*

Proof. By the assumption, $(\omega X,\bar f)$ is a topological dynamical system and (X,f) is a subsystem of $(\omega X,\bar f)$ (by a clear embedding). Hence, from Theorem 3.2, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)\le h^*_{\text{pre}}(\bar f)$. □

Example 4.1. Let $f\colon\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, $f(x)=2x$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$. Then $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)=0$.

From assumption, the only invariant compact subset of f is $\{0\}$, that is, $K(\mathbb{R},f)=\{\{0\}\}$. Denote $F=\{0\}$. We prove $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F,F)=0$. In fact, $f\colon F\to F$ is a homeomorphism from compact space F onto itself. Hence, $h_{\text{pre}}(f|_F)=0$. As $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F,F)=h_{\text{pre}}(f|_F)$, which implies $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F,F)=0$. Therefore, by Definition 2.3, we have $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)=0$.

If $\mathbb{R}$ is replaced by $(0,\infty)$ which is equipped with the subspace topology of $\mathbb{R}$, $K((0,\infty),f)=\emptyset$. It follows from Definition 2.3 that $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)=0$.

Theorem 4.3. *If $f\colon\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is an autohomeomorphism, then $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f)=0$.*

Proof. Let x_n be a sequence of points of $\mathbb{R}$ that does not have any convergent subsequence in $\mathbb{R}$. As f is a homeomorphism, the sequence $f(x_n)$ does not have any convergent subsequence in $\mathbb{R}$ neither. By Theorem 4.1, f can be extended to a continuous map $\bar{f}\colon \omega\mathbb{R} \to \omega\mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{f}(\omega) = \omega$. Clearly, $\bar{f}$ is also an autohomeomorphism. On the other hand, ωR is homeomorphic to the unit circle S^1. Let $\pi\colon \omega\mathbb{R} \to S^1$ be such a homeomorphism. Define $g\colon S^1 \to S^1$ by $g = \pi \circ \bar{f} \circ \pi^{-1}$. Then, g is a homeomorphism and π gives the conjugace between $(\omega\mathbb{R}, \bar{f})$ and (S^1, g). Hence, it follows from Theorem 3.3 that $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\bar{f}) = h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g)$. Now, from the result given in Walters book [**20**], $h(g) = 0$, where $h(g)$ denotes topological entropy of g. By [**7**], $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g) \le h(g)$, which implies $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(g) = 0$. Hence, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\bar{f}) = 0$. From Theorem 4.2, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f) \le h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(\bar{f})$. Therefore, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f) = 0$. $\square$

We investigate the pre-image entropy relation between a topological dynamical system and its induced hyperspace topological dynamical system. The hyperspace is employed with the Vietoris topology. Notice that if X is a noncompact metric space, the Vietoris topology is non-metrizable [**15**].

The Vietoris topology on 2^X, the family of all nonempty closed subsets of X, is generated by the base

$$\upsilon(U_1, U_2, \cdots, U_n) = \left\{ F \in 2^X : F \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} U_i \text{ and } F \cap U_i \ne \emptyset \text{ for all } i \le n \right\},$$

where $U_1, U_2, \cdots, U_n$ are open subsets of X [**9**].

Let (X, f) be a topological dynamical system, where $f\colon X \to X$ is a closed mapping. The hyperspace map $2^f\colon 2^X \to 2^X$ is induced by f as follows: for every $F \in 2^X$, $2^f(F) = f(F)$. When f is a closed and continuous map, 2^f is well defined and it is continuous [**11, 15**], thus ensuring that $(2^X, 2^f)$ forms a topological dynamical system, i.e., the induced hyperspace topological dynamical system of (X, f).

By Michael's results [**15**], we have the following facts.

Fact 1: If X is compact, then 2^X is compact.

Fact 2: If X is compact and Hausdorff, then 2^X is compact and Hausdorff.

Fact 3: $\pi\colon X \to 2^X$ defined by $\pi(x) = \{x\}$ for $x \in X$, is continuous. If X is compact and Hausdorff, then π is homeomorphic embedding and (X, f) and $(\pi(X), 2^f)$ are topologically conjugate.

Theorem 4.4. [**14**] *Let (X, f) be a topological dynamical system, where X is Hausdorff and f is a closed map. If $F \in K(X, f)$, then $2^F \in K(2^X, 2^f)$. Hence, $(2^F, 2^f)$ is a subsystem of $(2^X, 2^f)$.*

Theorem 4.5. *Let (X, f) be a topological dynamical system, where X is Hausdorff and f is a closed map. Then $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(2^f) \ge h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$.*

Proof. Case 1. $K(X, f) = \emptyset$. By Definition 2.3, we have $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f) = 0$. Hence, $h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(2^f) \ge h^*_{\mathrm{pre}}(f)$.

Case 2. $K(X, f) \ne \emptyset$. For $F \in K(X, f)$, it follows from Theorem 4.4 that $2^F \in K(2^X, 2^f)$. Define $\pi\colon F \to 2^F$ by $\pi(x) = \{x\}$, $x \in F$. From Fact 3 in the preceding paragraph of Theorem 4.4, (F, f) and $(\pi(F), 2^f)$ are topologically conjugate. From Cheng and Newhouse's result [**7**], $h_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F) = h_{\text{pre}}(2^f|_{\pi(F)}, \pi(F))$. By Remark 1, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f, F) = h_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F)$ and $h^*_{\text{pre}}(2^f, \pi(F)) = h_{\text{pre}}(2^f|_{\pi(F)}, \pi(F))$, which imply $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f, F) = h^*_{\text{pre}}(2^f, \pi(F))$. Again, by the Fact 3, $\pi(F)$ is a compact subset of 2^X. On the other hand, from $2^f(\pi(F)) = \pi(f(F))$ and $f(F) \subseteq F$, we have $2^f(\pi(F)) = \pi(f(F)) \subseteq \pi(F)$, thus $\pi(F) \in K(2^X, 2^f)$. Furthermore, it follows from Definition 2.3 that $h^*_{\text{pre}}(2^f, \pi(F)) \le h^*_{\text{pre}}(2^f)$ implying $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f, F) \le h^*_{\text{pre}}(2^f)$. Therefore, $h^*_{\text{pre}}(f) = \sup\limits_{F \in K(X,f)} \{h^*_{\text{pre}}(f|_F, F)\} \le h^*_{\text{pre}}(2^f)$. □

Acknowledgment. The author is very grateful to the referee for her or his careful reading of this manuscript and helpful comments on this work.

References

1. Adler R. L., Konheim A. G. and McAndrew, M. H. *Topological entropy*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **114** (1965), 309–319.

2. Block L. S. and Coppel W. A., *Dynamics in One Dimension.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1513, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

3. Bowen R., *Topological entropy and axiom A*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math, Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (1970), 23–42.

4. ______, *Entropy for group endomorphisms and homogeneous spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **153** (1971), 401–414.

5. ______, *Entropy-expansive maps*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **164** (1972), 323–333.

6. Bowen R. and Walters P., *Expansive one-parameter flows*, J. Differ. Equat. **12** (1972), 180–193.

7. Cheng W. and Newhouse S. E., *Pre-image entropy*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. **25** (2005), 1091–1113.

8. Cornfeld I. P., Fomin S. V. and Sinai Y. G., *Ergodic theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1982.

9. Engelking R., *General topology.* PWN, Warszawa, 1977.

10. Hurley M., *On topological entropy of maps*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. **15** (1995), 557–568.

11. Kelley J. L., *General topology*, Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1989.

12. Keynes H. B. and Sears M., *Real-expansive flows and topological dimensions*, Ergod. Theor. Dyn. Syst. **1** (1981), 179–195.

13. Kolmogorov A. N. and Tihomiorov Y. M., *ε-Entropy and ε-capacity of sets in function spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (1961), 277–364.

14. Liu L., Wang Y. and Wei G., *Topological entropy of continuous maps on topological spaces*, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals. **39** (2009), 417–427.

15. Michael E., *Topologies on spaces of subsets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **71** (1951), 152–182.

16. Nitecki Z. and Przytycki F., *Preimage entropy for mappings*, Int. J. Bifurcation Chaos **9** (1999), 1815–1843.

17. Nitecki Z., *Topological entropy and the preimage structure of maps*, Real Anal. Exchange. **29** (2003/2004), 7–39.

18. Robinson C., *Dynamical systems: stability, symbolic dynamics, and chaos.* 2^{nd} ed. Boca Raton, FL: CRc Press Inc, 1999.

19. Thomas R. F., *Some fundamental properties of continuous functions and topological entropy*, Pacific. J. Math. **141** (1990), 391–400.

20. Walters P., *An introduction to ergodic theory.* Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1982.

21. Wang Y., Wei G., Campbell W. H. and Bourquin S., *A framework of induced hyperspace dynamical systems equipped with the hit-or-miss topology*, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals **41** (2009), 1708–1717.

22. Zhang J., Zhu Y. and He L., *Preimage entropies of nonautonomous dynamical systems*, Acta Mathematica Sinica **48** (2005), 693–702. (in Chinese)

23. Zhou Z. L., *Symbolic dynamical systems*. Shanghai Scientific and Technological Education Publishing House, Shanghai, 1997. (in Chinese)

Lei Liu, School of Mathematics and Information Science, Shangqiu Normal University, Shangqiu, Henan 476000, PR China, *e-mail*: `mathliulei@163.com`