

ON THE STABILISATION OF RATIONAL SURFACE MAPS

RICHARD A. P. BIRKETT

ABSTRACT. The dynamics of a rational surface map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ are easier to analyse when f is ‘algebraically stable’. Here we investigate when and how this condition can be achieved by conjugating f with a birational change of coordinate. We show that if this can be done with a birational morphism, then there is a minimal such conjugacy. For birational f we also show that repeatedly lifting f to its graph gives a stable conjugacy. Finally, we give an example in which f can be birationally conjugated to a stable map, but the conjugacy cannot be achieved solely by blowing up.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be a rational map on a smooth projective surface over an algebraically closed field. Studying f as a dynamical system is complicated by the fact that f need not be continuously defined on all points of X . For example a rational map f induces a natural pullback operator on curves $f^* : \text{Pic}(X) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(X)$, but this operator may not iterate well. We say f is *algebraically stable* iff $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} (f^*)^n = (f^n)^*$. This is equivalent to the geometric condition that f has no *destabilising orbits* [DF01]; i.e. an orbit of (closed) points $p, f(p), \dots, f^n(p)$ in X , for which $f^{-1}(p)$ and $f(f^n(p))$ are curves. It is natural to hope that by blowing up the points in such an orbit will improve the situation. The main theme of this paper is to discuss the extent to which this actually works.

Assume for the rest of the paper that all surfaces are projective varieties over an algebraically closed field, and unless explicitly stated, also smooth. We write $\phi : X \dashrightarrow Y$ to indicate that f is a rational map between surfaces, and we use a solid arrow $f : X \rightarrow Y$ when f is a morphism.

Definition 1. We write $\phi : (g, Y) \dashrightarrow (f, X)$ to indicate that $\phi : Y \dashrightarrow X$ is a birational map conjugating $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ to $g = \phi^{-1} \circ f \circ \phi : Y \dashrightarrow Y$. When $g : Y \dashrightarrow Y$ is algebraically stable, we say that ϕ *stabilises* f .

Diller-Favre [DF01] proved that for a birational map (f, X) there is always a morphism $\pi : (g, Y) \rightarrow (f, X)$ which stabilises f . Not all (non-invertible) rational maps can be stabilised, however. Favre [Fav03] showed for example that many monomial maps on \mathbb{P}^2 cannot be stabilised by any birational conjugacy.

In any case the arguments in Diller-Favre, and the evidence of particular examples of rational maps [BK06, BKT⁺08, BK10, Fav03] support the idea that blowing up destabilising orbits is a good approach to achieving algebraic stability. We show that when stability can be achieved via birational morphism, then this is essentially the only way.

Let us call a destabilising orbit *minimal* when it does not contain any shorter ones.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ is a rational map on a surface. Let $p, f(p), \dots, f^{n-1}(p)$ be a minimal destabilising orbit for f and $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$ be the birational morphism blowing up of each p_j . Then any birational morphism $\rho : (g, Y) \rightarrow (f, X)$ stabilising (f, X) factors as $\rho = \pi \circ \nu$ for some birational morphism $\nu : Y \rightarrow X'$.*

Definition 2 (Minimal Stabilisation Algorithm). Given a rational surface map $f_0 : X_0 \dashrightarrow X_0$ we define a (possibly finite) sequence $\pi_m : (f_{m+1}, X_{m+1}) \rightarrow (f_m, X_m)$ for $m \geq 0$ as follows

- (i) If f_m is algebraically stable, stop.
- (ii) If not, then pick a minimal destabilising orbit p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n and blowup each of the p_j to produce $\pi_m : (f_{m+1}, X_{m+1}) \rightarrow (f_m, X_m)$.

If this sequence terminates at $f_M : X_M \dashrightarrow X_M$, write $\pi = \pi_1 \circ \dots \circ \pi_{M-1} : X_M \rightarrow X$. Then (f_M, X_M) is algebraically stable and we call $\pi : (f_M, X_M) \rightarrow (f, X)$ a *minimal stabilisation* of (f, X) (by blowups) when it exists.

This terminology is justified by the next theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be a rational map on a surface. If there exists a birational morphism $\rho : (g, Y) \rightarrow (f, X)$ stabilising f then any instance of the Minimal Stabilisation Algorithm terminates in a minimal stabilisation $\pi : (\hat{f}, \hat{X}) \rightarrow (f, X)$ such that $\rho = \pi \circ \nu$ for some $\nu : Y \rightarrow \hat{X}$. It follows that the minimal stabilisation (\hat{f}, \hat{X}) is unique for (f, X) .*

Corollary 3. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be a birational map on a surface. Then there exists a unique minimal stabilisation $\pi : (\hat{f}, \hat{X}) \rightarrow (f, X)$.*

Proof. By [DF01], there exists a birational morphism $\rho : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ which makes $\tilde{f} = \rho^{-1} \circ f \circ \rho$ algebraically stable on \tilde{X} . By Theorem 2, the minimal stabilisation $\hat{f} : \hat{X} \dashrightarrow \hat{X}$ via $\pi : \hat{X} \rightarrow X$ exists (uniquely and factors ρ). \square

Theorem 2 and the results of [Fav03] may lead the reader to believe that if a rational map f admits a stabilisation $\phi : (g, Y) \dashrightarrow (f, X)$, then in fact we can achieve algebraic stability through blowups alone, i.e. ϕ can be chosen to be a *morphism* $\phi : (\hat{f}, \hat{X}) \rightarrow (f, X)$. This turns out to be false.

Theorem 4. *Let X be the first Hirzebruch surface Let $f : \mathbb{C}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ be given by*

$$(x, y) \longmapsto (x^2, x^4 y^{-3} + y^3) = \left(x^2, \frac{x^4 + y^6}{y^3} \right).$$

The f extends to an algebraically stable rational map $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ of a Hirzebruch surface X . If however $\sigma_0 : (f_0, X_0) \rightarrow (f, X)$ is the point blowup of $(0, 0) \in X$, then there does not exist any birational morphism $\pi : (g, Y) \rightarrow (f_0, X_0)$ which stabilises f_0 .

We conclude the introduction on a somewhat different note, giving an alternative approach to the theorem of Diller-Favre for stabilising birational maps $f : X \dashrightarrow X$. In this approach one focuses on the graph of f , rather than on any of the destabilising orbits of f .

To be precise, we write $\Gamma_f \subset X \times X$ for the graph of f , and we call its minimal smooth desingularisation, Σ_f , the *smooth graph* of f . Equivalently $\alpha : \Sigma_f \rightarrow X$ is the birational morphism found by blowing up X (minimally) until the lift $\beta : \Sigma_f \rightarrow X$ is a morphism.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \Sigma_f & \\ \alpha \swarrow & & \searrow \beta \\ X & \overset{f}{\dashrightarrow} & X \end{array}$$

Theorem 5. *Let $f_0 : X_0 \dashrightarrow X_0$ be a birational map on a surface. Suppose the sequence $\alpha_m : (f_{m+1}, X_{m+1}) \rightarrow (f_m, X_m)$ is defined recursively by $X_{m+1} = \Sigma_{f_m}$, and $\alpha_m : \Sigma_{f_m} \rightarrow X_m$ is the first projection from the smooth graph. Then*

- (i) $\forall m > 0$ $X_{m+1} = \Sigma_{f_m} = \Gamma_{f_m}$, i.e. the graph Γ_{f_m} is smooth, and
- (ii) $\exists M \in \mathbb{N} \forall m \geq M$ the map f_m is algebraically stable.

A key ingredient of this proof is the observation that the lift f_1 on Σ_f , is *untangled*, that is whenever a curve C in Σ_f is contracted to a point by f_1 , then C contains no indeterminate points.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. §2 provides notation for this article and recalls useful concepts for birational maps. §3 provides the proof of Theorem 2. In §4 we describe some interesting properties of untangled birational maps and also prepare for the proof of Theorem 5, which constitutes §5. We end the article with the example and computations for Theorem 4 in §6.

In closing we mention that there is another recent proof of the theorem in [DF01] based on geometric group theory by Lonjou and Urech [LU21]. We also note that in the context of integrable systems, the failure of algebraic stability is related to the *singularity confinement property*, see [GRP91] etc.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor Jeffrey Diller for his encouragement, helpful discussions, and expert advice on the exposition of this document. I also thank Claudiu Raicu for his excellent question asking whether the method given in Definition 2 (originally proved otherwise for birational maps) is indeed the ‘minimal’ stabilisation method.

2. BACKGROUND

For the rest of this article, assume all surfaces are smooth projective over an algebraically closed field, and rational maps are dominant. An account of most of the facts below can be found in [Har77, §V].

Let X, Y be surfaces and $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ a rational map. Let U be the largest (open) set on which $f : U \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism, then we define the *indeterminate set* as $I(f) = X \setminus U$. Alternatively, these are the finitely many points at which f cannot be continuously defined. These are often also called *fundamental points*.

An irreducible curve $C \subset X$ is *exceptional* iff $f(C \setminus I(f))$ is a point in Y . We define the *exceptional set*, $\mathcal{E}(f)$, of f to be the union of all (finitely many) irreducible exceptional curves in X . Denote by $\mathfrak{e}(f)$ the number of irreducible components in $\mathcal{E}(f)$.

Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a rational map of surfaces. The *graph* of f is the subvariety

$$\Gamma_f = \overline{\{(x, f(x)) \in X \setminus I(f) \times Y\}} \subset X \times Y$$

along with projections $\alpha : \Gamma_f \rightarrow X$ onto the first factor and $\beta : \Gamma_f \rightarrow Y$ onto the second factor which are proper. Γ_f is irreducible because $X \setminus I(f)$ is.

$I(f)$ is the set of points where π_1 does not have a local inverse. $\alpha^{-1} : X \setminus I(f) \rightarrow \Gamma_f$ is an isomorphism. For $p \notin I(f)$ we have $\beta(\alpha^{-1}(p)) = f(p)$. In general for any set of points $S \subseteq X$, we may define the *total transform* of S by f as $f(S) = \beta(\alpha^{-1}(S))$. When $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq I(f)$ this image has dimension 1. $\mathcal{E}(f) \subset X$ is the α projection of the set of points where β is not finite.

Γ_f need not be smooth and it will be more convenient to work with the minimal smooth desingularisation Σ_f of Γ_f . Abusing notation slightly, we denote the lifted projections as $\alpha : \Sigma_f \rightarrow X$ and $\beta : \Sigma_f \rightarrow Y$. Equivalently $\alpha : \Sigma_f \rightarrow X$ is the birational morphism found by recursively blowing up the indeterminate set $I(f)$ until the lift of f becomes a morphism $\beta : \Sigma_f \rightarrow Y$. When $Y = X$ and f is birational, β is also a birational morphism, and one can deduce that $\mathfrak{e}(\alpha) = \mathfrak{e}(\beta) = \text{rk NS}(\Sigma_f) - \text{rk NS}(X)$.

Remark 1 (Warning). Σ may contain curves which appear neither in the domain X or the codomain Y , meaning both α and β map the curve to a point. This issue will be rectified in Prop 8 and Cor 10.

Proposition 6. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a birational morphism of surfaces. Then f can be written as a composition of $\mathfrak{e}(f)$ point blowups.*

Suppose $p \in I(f^{-1})$ and $\pi : Y' \rightarrow Y$ be the point blowup of p . Then f factors as $\pi \circ f'$ where $f' : X \rightarrow Y'$ is a birational morphism with $\mathfrak{e}(f') = \mathfrak{e}(f) - 1$.

Otherwise if $p \notin I(f^{-1})$ and $\rho : X' \rightarrow X$ is the point blowup of $f^{-1}(p)$. Then f lifts to a birational morphism $f' = \pi^{-1} \circ f \circ \rho$ with $\mathfrak{e}(f') = \mathfrak{e}(f)$

Definition 3. Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be rational maps on surfaces. We say an irreducible curve $C \subset X$ is a *destabilising curve* for the composition $g \circ f$ iff

$f(C \setminus I(f)) = y \in I(g)$. Equivalently $C \subseteq f^{-1}(y)$ and $g(y) \supseteq C'$ for some irreducible curve $D \subset Z$, we call D an *inverse destabilising curve*.

Proposition 7. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \dashrightarrow Z$ be birational maps. Then*

$$g(f(x)) \supseteq (g \circ f)(x)$$

with equality iff x is not contained in a destabilising curve. Moreover $z \in g(f(x)) \iff z \in (g \circ f)(x)$ or $\exists y \in I(g) \cap I(f^{-1})$ with $z \in f(y)$ and $x \in f^{-1}(y)$ destabilising the composition $g \circ f$.

Definition 4. Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be a rational map. An irreducible curve C is a *destabilising curve* for f iff there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(C \setminus I(f)) = p$ is a closed point, and there is an n such that $f^{n-1}(p) \ni q$ and $q \in I(f)$. The *destabilising orbit* here is $p, f(p), \dots, f^{n-1}(p)$ and its *length* is n . Then we call any irreducible component of $f(q)$ an *inverse destabilising curve* of f . Finally, we say $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ is *algebraically stable* iff there are no destabilising curves for f .

When f is birational, the roles of destabilising and inverse destabilising curve will swap when you replace f with f^{-1} .

3. MINIMAL STABILISATION

Definition 5. We say that a destabilising orbit $p, f(p), \dots, f^{n-1}(p)$ is *minimal* iff the $p_j = f^{j-1}(p)$ are all distinct closed points where for $1 \leq j < n$ we have $p_j \notin I(f)$ and for $1 < j \leq n$ we have $p_j \notin I(f^{-1})$.

Equivalently, the points of a minimal destabilising orbit do not contain any shorter destabilising orbits. One can show that any destabilising orbit of minimum length n is *minimal*, so these must always exist when f is not algebraically stable.

Proof of Prop 1. First note that by applying Prop 6 (n times), if ρ blows up all the p_j at least once, then we get a new birational morphism ν which provides the factorisation $\rho = \pi \circ \nu$. Therefore we will proceed to show that ρ does indeed blowup the p_j .

Suppose not; then there is a largest $m \leq n$ such that $\hat{p}_m = \rho^{-1}(p_m)$ is a closed point in Y , so we claim this is indeterminate for g . Say $m = n$ and $f(p_n) = D \subset X$, then $\hat{p}_n \in I(g)$ if $g(\hat{p}_n)$ is a curve. It is enough to show that $\rho(g(\hat{p}_n))$ is a curve. The composition $\rho \circ g$ is stable since $I(\rho) = \emptyset$, therefore

$$\rho(g(\hat{p}_n)) = \rho \circ g(\hat{p}_n) = f \circ \rho(\hat{p}_n) = f(p_n) = D$$

which is a curve; note that the last step is because ρ is locally an isomorphism at \hat{p}_n . If $m < n$ then $p_m \notin I(f)$, so the composition $\rho^{-1} \circ f$ is locally stable, as is $\rho^{-1} \circ f \circ \rho = g$ near \hat{p}_m . Therefore

$$g(\hat{p}_m) = \rho^{-1}(f(\rho(\hat{p}_m))) = \rho^{-1}(p_{m+1})$$

which is also a curve by assumption.

Suppose that $k \leq m$ is minimal such that p_k, \dots, p_m are not blown up by ρ and either $k = 1$ or $k - 1$ is blown up by ρ . Using Prop 6 one sees that $\hat{p}_k \mapsto \hat{p}_{k+1} \mapsto \dots \mapsto \hat{p}_m$. To

show that this is a destabilising orbit for g , we only need to show that $g^{-1}(p_k)$ is a curve. This is very similar to the case of p_m above.

ρ is locally an isomorphism near \hat{p}_k . So it is enough to show that $\rho^{-1} \circ f^{-1}(p_k)$ is a curve. Say $k = 1$ and $f^{-1}(p_1) = C \subset X$, then $\rho^{-1} \circ f^{-1}(p_1)$ contains at least $\rho^{-1}(C \setminus I(f))$ which is a (most of) a curve. Otherwise $k > 1$, so $p_{k-1} \notin I(f)$ and the composition $f \circ \rho$ is algebraically stable over $\rho^{-1}(p_{k-1})$ which is a curve \hat{C} . We get that $\rho^{-1} \circ f^{-1}(p_k) = \hat{C}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \overset{g}{\dashrightarrow} & Y \\ \rho \downarrow & & \downarrow \rho \\ X & \overset{f}{\dashrightarrow} & X \end{array}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. Given that $g : Y \dashrightarrow Y$ dominates f via $\rho : Y \rightarrow X = X_1$ we may proceed inductively on m with the hypothesis that $g : Y \dashrightarrow Y$ dominates $f_n : X_m \dashrightarrow X_m$ via $\nu_m : Y \rightarrow X_m$.

If f_m is algebraically stable we are done, otherwise Prop 1 says that because π_m blows up a minimal destabilising orbit we have a $\nu_{m+1} : Y \rightarrow X_{m+1}$ which factors ν_m as $\nu_m = \pi_m \circ \nu_{m+1}$.


$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{m+1} & \overset{\nu_{m+1}}{\longleftarrow} & Y \\ \pi_m \downarrow & \swarrow \nu_m & \\ X_m & & \end{array}$$

Clearly there is no limit to the number of times we can do this if f_m is never algebraically stable for $m \geq 1$. However overall we have shown that

$$\rho = \nu_1 = \pi_1 \circ \nu_2 = \pi_1 \circ \pi_2 \circ \nu_3 = \cdots = \pi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \pi_m \circ \nu_{m+1} = \pi \circ \nu_{m+1}$$

meaning that $\mathfrak{e}(\rho) \geq m$. Therefore $\{m \in \mathbb{N} : f_m \text{ is not AS}\}$ is in fact bounded and so on the final value $m = M$, f_M is algebraically stable. Moreover, $\rho = \pi \circ \nu$ where we define $\nu = \nu_M$.

We have shown that π factors any birational morphism stabilising f , and to finish we apply this to get uniqueness of (\hat{f}, \hat{X}) . Suppose we proceed in the minimal stabilisation algorithm in two different ways which produce two (potentially different) models, namely $\hat{f}_1 : \hat{X}_1 \dashrightarrow \hat{X}_1$ via $\pi_1 : \hat{X}_1 \rightarrow X$ and $\hat{f}_2 : \hat{X}_2 \dashrightarrow \hat{X}_2$ via $\pi_2 : \hat{X}_2 \rightarrow X$. By the above we have that $\pi_1 = \pi_2 \circ \nu_1$ and $\pi_2 = \pi_1 \circ \nu_2$. We deduce that ν_1, ν_2 are inverse morphisms to each other, providing an isomorphism not only of surfaces but dynamical systems $\nu_1 : (\hat{f}_1, \hat{X}_1) \leftrightarrow (\hat{f}_2, \hat{X}_2)$.



□

4. UNTANGLED MAPS


Definition 6. Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a birational map. We say f is *untangled* iff

$$\mathcal{E}(f) \cap I(f) = \emptyset.$$

The following results are auxiliary to Theorem 5 but also of independent interest.

Proposition 8. Suppose $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ is a birational map with smooth graph Σ_f as in the diagram below. Then f is untangled if and only if $\mathcal{E}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{E}(\beta) = \emptyset$. In this case the following additional properties hold

- (a) $\alpha : \mathcal{E}(\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(f)$ and $\beta : \mathcal{E}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(f^{-1})$ are isomorphisms;
- (b) $\mathfrak{e}(f) = \mathfrak{e}(\beta)$ and $\mathfrak{e}(f^{-1}) = \mathfrak{e}(\alpha)$;
- (c) $\Gamma_f \cong \Sigma_f$ is smooth.




We leave the proof as an exercise to the reader. The next lemma gives another equivalent formulation of untangledness which requires a little more argument.

Lemma 9. Let $f : X \dashrightarrow Y$ be a birational map. Suppose f can be written as $h^{-1} \circ g$ where $g : X \rightarrow Z$, $h : Y \rightarrow Z$ are birational morphisms, then f is untangled.

Moreover $\mathcal{E}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(g)$ and $\mathcal{E}(f^{-1}) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(h)$ with equality if and only if the composition $h^{-1} \circ g$ has no destabilising curves. Conversely an untangled f always has such a decomposition.

Proof. We prove first and second part by induction; the converse is left as a further exercise. We claim that if $h^{-1} \circ g$ has a destabilising curve then we can blowup Z by $\pi : Z' \rightarrow Z$ to get a simpler decomposition $h'^{-1} \circ g'$ where $\mathfrak{e}(g') = \mathfrak{e}(g) - 1$ and $\mathfrak{e}(h') = \mathfrak{e}(h) - 1$. This produces a destabilising curve C such that C is mapped to a curve D by f (proper transform) and vice versa. When $f = h^{-1} \circ g$ has no destabilising curves, we conclude that f is untangled. This process terminates because $\mathfrak{e}(g), \mathfrak{e}(h)$ cannot decrease below 0.


Suppose we have such a destabilising curve, meaning $p \in Z$ such that $g^{-1}(p)$ and $h^{-1}(p)$ are curves. Now we blowup $p \in Z$ by $\pi : Z' \rightarrow Z$ with exceptional curve $E = \pi^{-1}(p)$. By Prop 6, g factors as $\pi \circ g'$ with $\mathfrak{e}(g') = \mathfrak{e}(g) - 1$ and h factors as $\pi \circ h'$ with $\mathfrak{e}(h') = \mathfrak{e}(h) - 1$.



The proper transform of E , $C = \overline{g'^{-1}(E \setminus I(g'^{-1}))} \subset X$, is an irreducible curve; or more simply we have $g'(C) = E$. Similarly there is an irreducible curve D such that $h'(D) = E$. Whence D is the proper transform of C by $f = h'^{-1} \circ g'$. This completes the claim.

It remains to show that if the decomposition $f = h^{-1} \circ g$ has no destabilising curves then f is untangled, plus $\mathcal{E}(g) = \mathcal{E}(f)$ and $\mathcal{E}(h) = \mathcal{E}(f^{-1})$. Let $C \subset \mathcal{E}(g)$ be a curve, then $g(C) = p \in Z$ is a closed point. If $p \notin I(h^{-1})$ then clearly $f = h^{-1} \circ g$ is continuous on C with a closed point as an image, therefore $I(f) \cap C = \emptyset$ and $C \subseteq \mathcal{E}(f)$. Otherwise if p is indeterminate, then we know there is a curve $D \subseteq h^{-1}(p) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(h)$; whence C is a destabilising curve which pairs with the inverse destabilising curve D , contradicting our assumption. Thus $C \subseteq \mathcal{E}(f)$. Conversely, if $f(C \setminus I(f))$ is a closed point then certainly $g(C)$ is a closed point since $\mathcal{E}(h^{-1}) = \emptyset$; so $C \subseteq \mathcal{E}(g)$. We have shown that $\mathcal{E}(g) = \mathcal{E}(f)$; a similar argument shows that $\mathcal{E}(h) = \mathcal{E}(f^{-1})$, absent destabilising curves. \square

Corollary 10. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be a birational map and let \hat{f} be the lift of f defined by the following commutative diagram, where Σ_f is the smooth graph of f . Then \hat{f} is untangled.*



Proof. \hat{f} is untangled due to Lemma 9 because $\hat{f} = \alpha^{-1} \circ \beta$. \square

Corollary 11. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be an untangled birational map and let \hat{f} be the lift of f defined as above. Then $\alpha : \mathcal{E}(\hat{f}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}(f)$ and $\beta : \mathcal{E}(\hat{f}^{-1}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}(f^{-1})$ are injections, which are surjective if and only if f has no length 1 destabilising orbits.*

Proof. By Lemma 9 $\mathcal{E}(\hat{f}) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\hat{f}^{-1}) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(\alpha)$ with equality iff $\alpha^{-1} \circ \beta$ has no destabilising curves; on the other hand Prop 8 says that $\alpha : \mathcal{E}(\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(f)$ and $\beta : \mathcal{E}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(f^{-1})$ are isomorphisms. Therefore to conclude we only need to show that the composition $\alpha^{-1} \circ \beta$ has a destabilising curve \hat{C} and inverse destabilising curve \hat{D} if and only if the composition $f \circ f$ has a destabilising curve $C = \alpha(\hat{C})$ and inverse destabilising curve $D = \beta(\hat{D})$. Indeed, by Prop 8 C is a curve and $f(C) = p$ if and only if \hat{C} is a curve and $\beta(\hat{C}) = p$; similarly D is a curve and $f^{-1}(D) = p$ if and only if \hat{D} is a curve and $\alpha(\hat{D}) = p$. \square

5. STABILISATION THROUGH GRAPHS

Definition 7. Let $\mathcal{D}(X, f)$ be the set of all triples (C, D, n) such that C is a destabilising curve for $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ with an orbit of length n and inverse destabilising curve D .

The following proposition is the heart of Theorem 5.

Proposition 12. Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be an untangled birational map and $\hat{f} : \Sigma_f \dashrightarrow \Sigma_f$ be the lift described above in Cor 10. Then there exists a well defined injection

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : \mathcal{D}(\Sigma_f, \hat{f}) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(X, f) \\ (\hat{C}, \hat{D}, n) &\longmapsto (\alpha(\hat{C}), \beta(\hat{D}), n+1). \end{aligned}$$

If ι is surjective (a bijection) then $\mathfrak{e}(\hat{f}) = \mathfrak{e}(f)$. If ι isn't surjective then $\mathfrak{e}(\hat{f}) < \mathfrak{e}(f)$.

Proof. To justify that ι is well defined, we claim that every destabilising orbit upstairs descends to one downstairs; to be precise, if $(\hat{C}, \hat{D}, n) \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma_f, \hat{f})$ then $(C, D, n+1) \in \mathcal{D}(X, f)$ where $C = \alpha(\hat{C})$ and $D = \beta(\hat{D})$.

Assume \hat{C} is a destabilising curve, $\hat{f}(\hat{C}) = \hat{p}$, $\hat{f}^{n-1}(\hat{p}) \ni \hat{q} \in I(\hat{f})$ and $\hat{f}(\hat{q}) \supseteq \hat{D}$. Let $D = \beta(\hat{D})$, $C = \alpha(\hat{C})$; as shown in Cor 11 $C \subseteq \mathcal{E}(f)$ with $f(C) = p = \alpha(\hat{p})$, and $D \subseteq \mathcal{E}(f^{-1})$ with $q = \beta(\hat{q}) = f^{-1}(D)$. To complete the claim we need to show that $f^n(p) \ni q$. Indeed consider the composition $f^n = \beta \circ \hat{f}^{n-1} \circ \alpha^{-1}$; $\mathcal{E}(\alpha^{-1}) = \emptyset$ and $I(\beta) = \emptyset$ therefore by Prop 7 the total transforms are functorial. We also know that $\alpha^{-1}(p) \ni \hat{p}$ and $\beta(\hat{q}) = q$.

$$f^n(p) = \beta(\hat{f}^{n-1}(\alpha^{-1}(p))) \supseteq \beta(\hat{f}^{n-1}(\{\hat{p}\})) \supseteq \beta(\{\hat{q}\}) = \{q\}$$

Injectivity follows from the injectivity given in Cor 11 and the simple fact that $\iota(\hat{C}, \hat{D}, m) = (C, D, n)$ implies $m = n - 1$.

For the surjectivity, we claim that ι is surjective if and only if we can find a length 1 destabilising orbit for f , that is $(C, D, 1) \in \mathcal{D}(X, f)$. Then Cor 11 finishes the proof since we know $\mathfrak{e}(\hat{f}) \leq \mathfrak{e}(f)$ with equality if and only if we can find a length 1 destabilising orbit for f .

Clearly, if $(C, D, 1) \in \mathcal{D}(X, f)$ then $(C, D, 1)$ cannot have a preimage under ι since no destabilising orbit has length $1 - 1 = 0$. Conversely we show in the remainder of this proof that when $\mathcal{D}(X, f)$ has no such triples we can find a preimage for $(C, D, n) \in \mathcal{D}(X, f)$. Write $\hat{C} = \alpha^{-1}(C)$, $\hat{D} = \beta^{-1}(D)$, $f(C) = p$, and $q = f^{-1}(D)$. By Cor 11, $\hat{C} \subseteq \mathcal{E}(f)$, $\hat{D} \subseteq \mathcal{E}(f^{-1})$, $p \notin I(f) = I(\alpha^{-1})$, and $q \notin I(f^{-1}) = I(\beta^{-1})$. Write $\hat{p} = \hat{f}(\hat{C}) = \alpha^{-1}(p)$ and $\hat{q} = f^{-1}(\hat{D}) = \beta^{-1}(q)$, both closed points.

We wish to show that $\hat{f}^{n-2}(\hat{p}) \ni \hat{q}$ given that we know $f^{n-1}(p) \ni q$. Recall that $p \notin I(\alpha^{-1})$ and $q \notin I(\beta^{-1})$, so by Prop 7 the total transform of composition $\hat{f}^{n-2} = \beta^{-1} \circ f^{n-1} \circ \alpha$ is functorial at \hat{p} in the following way.

$$\hat{f}^{n-2}(\hat{p}) = \beta^{-1} \circ f^{n-1}(\alpha(\hat{p})) = \beta^{-1} \circ f^{n-1}(p) \supseteq \beta^{-1}(\{q\}) = \{\hat{q}\}.$$

Therefore $(\hat{C}, \hat{D}, n-1) \in \mathcal{D}(\Sigma_f, \hat{f})$. □

Proof of Theorem 5. First, note that by Prop 8 X_m is smooth for all $m \geq 1$, then by Cor 10, f_m is untangled for $m \geq 1$; assume that (X_1, f_1) is not algebraically stable.

If f_m is not algebraically stable then we may choose $(C, D, n) \in \mathcal{D}(X_m, f_m)$. By Prop 12, $\mathfrak{e}(f_{m+1}) \leq \mathfrak{e}(f_m)$ and either we have strict inequality or all destabilising orbits lift to strictly shorter destabilising orbits. Since lengths of orbits must be positive, eventually we find an $m' \leq m + n$ such that $\mathfrak{e}(f_{m'}) < \mathfrak{e}(f_m)$.

The sequence $k(f_m) \geq 0$ must stabilise as m increases with $\mathfrak{e}(f_m) = \mathfrak{e}(f_M)$ for all $m \geq M$. Then $\mathcal{D}(X_m, f_m) = \emptyset$ for all such m , otherwise we could decrease $\mathfrak{e}(f_m)$ further as above. \square

Prop 12 and the theorem admit a shorter proof, ignoring $\mathfrak{e}(f_m)$ when $\mathcal{D}(X, f)$ is finite. With a little more work, one can show that a length n destabilising orbit on Σ_f proves the existence of a length $n + 1$ orbit on X , even if it's not given by ι as in Prop 12. This gives the following bound.

Corollary 13. *Let $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ be a birational map and the sequence (X_m, f_m) be as given in Theorem 5. Suppose that N is an upper bound on lengths of a destabilising orbit for f . Then $\forall m \geq N$, f_m is algebraically stable.*

6. AN EXAMPLE

6.1. Intro. The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 4. This demonstrates that there are rational maps which can be stabilised by a birational conjugacy but not by blowups of the surface alone. Recall that $f : \mathbb{C}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ is given by

$$(x, y) \mapsto (x^2, x^4 y^{-3} + y^3) = \left(x^2, \frac{x^4 + y^6}{y^3} \right)$$

Let us initially compactify $(f, \mathbb{C}^2) \dashrightarrow (\tilde{f}, \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)$ in the obvious way, by adding a point at infinity to each factor. Unfortunately, $\{x = \infty\}$ is a destabilising curve for \tilde{f} . One may check that $\tilde{f}(\{x = \infty\})$ is the indeterminate point (∞, ∞) . However if we modify this fibre to create X , the first Hirzebruch surface, then $f : X \dashrightarrow X$ is algebraically stable.

Proposition 14. *Let $\psi : (\tilde{f}, \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1) \dashrightarrow (f, X)$ be the birational transformation obtained by blowing up (∞, ∞) and then blowing down the proper transform of $\{x = \infty\}$. Then the exceptional set, $E(f)$, is $E_\infty = \phi(\infty, \infty)$, and $f(E_\infty) \notin I(f)$ is a fixed point. In particular, f is algebraically stable.*

This proposition can be verified by local coordinate computations which we leave to the reader.

We define $E_0 = E_{\frac{0}{1}}$ to be $\{x = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{P}^1 \subset X$. Next we define the blowup $\sigma_0 : (f_0, X_0) \rightarrow (f, X)$ centred on $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \subset X$ and let $E_1 = E_{\frac{1}{1}} = E(\sigma_0)$ be the exceptional curve. A consequence of our proof will be that f_0 is not algebraically stable, but we will also see this directly from Prop 16, later.

The method we provide in the next two subsections is elementary, however analysing these examples on Berkovich space is much faster and more informative. The reader who is familiar with Berkovich theory may skip to subsection 6.5.

6.2. Satellite Blowups. Before analysing f further, we introduce a convenient bookkeeping system for blowups over the origin (see [Jon15, §15.1] and [DL16, appx] for precedents).

Definition 8. A birational morphism $\phi : Y \rightarrow X_0$ is *satellite (relative to E_0 and E_1)* iff $\phi = \sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2 \circ \cdots \circ \sigma_n$ ($n \geq 1$) and for every $1 \leq j \leq n$ we have that σ_j is the blowup of the point of intersection between two curves in the list $E_0, E_1, E(\sigma_1), E(\sigma_2), \dots, E(\sigma_{j-1})$.

Note that in this definition and throughout this section we will adopt the convention that if $\phi : Y \rightarrow Z$ is a birational morphism between surfaces and $C \subset Z$ is a curve then C will also denote the proper transform $\phi^{-1}(C) \setminus \mathcal{E}(\phi)$ of C in Y .

Now given any birational morphism $\phi : Y \rightarrow X_0$ which is *satellite*, as above, we proceed to index the exceptional curves of ϕ , by rational numbers $\frac{a}{b} \in (0, 1)$ in lowest terms as follows. For each $j \geq 1$, if σ_j blows up the intersection $E_{\frac{a}{b}} \cap E_{\frac{c}{d}}$ of two previously indexed curves from among $E_0, E_{\frac{1}{1}}, E(\sigma_1), E(\sigma_2), \dots, E(\sigma_{j-1})$, then we declare $E(\sigma_j) = E_{\frac{a+c}{b+d}}$. Note that the Farey sum $\frac{a+c}{b+d} \in (\frac{a}{b}, \frac{c}{d})$ is a rational number in lowest terms.

Let $0 = r_0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_n = 1$ be the full list of rational indices for the curves E_{r_j} as above. The *dual graph* for ϕ , with vertices $\{E_{r_j} : 0 \leq j \leq n\}$ and edges $\{E_{r_j} E_{r_k} : E_{r_j} \cap E_{r_k}\}$, then becomes

$$E_{r_0} \text{ --- } E_{r_1} \text{ --- } \cdots \text{ --- } E_{r_{n-1}} \text{ --- } E_{r_n}$$

In particular blowing up $E_{\frac{a}{b}} \cap E_{\frac{c}{d}}$ corresponds to inserting a vertex as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \text{---} & E_{\frac{a}{b}} & \text{---} & E_{\frac{c}{d}} & \text{---} & \cdots \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \\ & & & & E_{\frac{a+c}{b+d}} & & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \\ \cdots & \text{---} & E_{\frac{a}{b}} & \text{---} & E_{\frac{a+c}{b+d}} & \text{---} & E_{\frac{c}{d}} \text{ --- } \cdots \end{array}$$

We caution however that the ordering of the dual graph does not match the ordering of the σ_j , i.e. $E_{r_j} \neq E(\sigma_j)$ in general.

The curves $E_{\frac{a}{b}}$ can be seen as ‘degenerations’ of embeddings of the complex torus $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ into Y . For any $\frac{a}{b}$ we define the map $\gamma_{\frac{a}{b}} : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \dashrightarrow Y$ given on $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}} : \mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^* &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^* \subset Y \\ (s, t) &\longmapsto (t^b, st^a). \end{aligned}$$

More generally, we say that a rational map $\gamma : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \dashrightarrow Y$ is asymptotic to $\gamma_{\frac{a}{b}}$, or $\gamma \sim \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}}$, if and only if on $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ we have

$$(s, t) \longmapsto (t^d + o(t^d), R(s)t^c + o(t^c))$$

where $\frac{c}{d} = \frac{a}{b}$ and R is a non-constant rational function on \mathbb{P}^1 .

Proposition 15. *Suppose that $\gamma \sim \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}} : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \dashrightarrow Y$. Let Z be the proper transform of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \{0\}$ under γ . Then either*

- (i) $\frac{a}{b} = r_j$ and Z is the curve $E_{\frac{a}{b}}$; or
- (ii) $r_j < \frac{a}{b} < r_{j+1}$ and Z is the closed point $E_{r_j} \cap E_{r_{j+1}}$.

6.3. Mapping Exceptional Curves. Now we compute the images of the curves E_{r_j} under g , using Prop 15. The rough idea is that the point or curve represented by $\gamma_{\frac{a}{b}}$ is mapped to the point or curve represented by $f \circ \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}} \tilde{\gamma}_{\frac{c}{d}}$. We now compute $\frac{c}{d}$ in terms of $\frac{a}{b}$

$$f \circ \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}}(s, t) = f(t^b, st^a) = (t^{2b}, s^{-3}t^{4b-3a} + s^3t^{3a})$$

In the case where $4b - 3a > 3a$ we get by looking at lowest order terms that $f \circ \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}} \sim \gamma_{\frac{3a}{2b}}$. In the case where $4b - 3a < 3a$ we get that $f \circ \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}} \sim \gamma_{\frac{4b-3a}{2b}}$. Finally in the special case that $4b - 3a = 3a$ we get $f \circ \gamma_{\frac{a}{b}}(s, t) = (t^{2b}, (s^{-3} + s^3)t^{3a}) \sim \gamma_{\frac{3a}{2b}}(s, t)$. In short $f \circ \gamma_q \sim \gamma_{T_f(q)}$, where

$$T_f : \frac{a}{b} \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{3a}{2b} & \frac{a}{b} \leq \frac{2}{3} \\ 2 - \frac{3a}{2b} & \frac{a}{b} > \frac{2}{3} \end{cases}$$

Example 1. We can now see that $f_0 : X_0 \dashrightarrow X_0$ is not algebraically stable. E_0 is fixed by f_0 since $T_f(0) = 0$. However $T_f(1) = \frac{1}{2} \in (0, 1) = (r_0, r_1)$, therefore $f_0(E_1) = E_0 \cap E_1 = P$. This point is indeterminate with $f_0(P) = E_1$ because $T_f((0, 1)) = (0, 1] \ni 1$.

Proposition 16. *Let $f, g : Y \dashrightarrow Y$ and ϕ be as above and the irreducible curves of the fibre $\{x = 0\}$ indexed by rational (Farey) parameters*

$$0 = r_0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_n = 1.$$

Let $T_f : \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ be such that $g \circ \gamma_q = \gamma \sim \gamma_{T_f(q)}$ for every $q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$.

Then the dynamics over $\{x = 0\}$ is determined by the following:

- (i) *if $q = r_j$ and $T_f(q) = r_k$ for some $0 \leq j, k \leq n$, then $g_*(E_q) = E_{T_f(q)}$;*
- (ii) *if $q = r_j$ and $r_k < T_f(q) < r_{k+1}$ for some $0 \leq j, k \leq n$, then $g : E_q \mapsto E_{r_k} \cap E_{r_{k+1}}$;*
- (iii) *if $T_f((r_j, r_{j+1})) \subset (r_k, r_{k+1})$, then $g(E_{r_j} \cap E_{r_{j+1}}) = E_{r_k} \cap E_{r_{k+1}}$; otherwise*
- (iv) *if $[r_k, r_l] \subseteq T_f((r_j, r_{j+1}))$ with k minimal and l maximal, then we have*

$$g(E_{r_j} \cap E_{r_{j+1}}) = E_{r_k} \cup \cdots \cup E_{r_l}.$$

6.4. Dynamics of Exceptional Curves. Suppose for contradiction we have a birational morphism $\pi : (g, Y) \rightarrow (f_0, X_0)$ which stabilises f . Then by Theorem 2 we may assume that $\pi : (g, Y) = (\hat{f}, \hat{X}) \rightarrow (f_0, X_0)$ is the minimal stabilisation. Consider precisely how π blows up X_0 with the Minimal Stabilisation Algorithm.

Lemma 17. *The Minimal Stabilisation Algorithm on (f_0, X_0) only creates curves which are satellite relative to E_0 and E_1 .*

Hence we can assume that $E(\pi) = E_{r_1} \cup \dots \cup E_{r_{n-1}}$, $r_j \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Note that the interval $[0, 1]$ is forward invariant for T_f , as is $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. The rest of the proof will hinge on T_f being topologically mixing on this interval. In the Berkovich theory, this lemma also corresponds to the similar fact that $[\zeta(0, 1), \zeta(0, |x|)]$ is forward invariant.

Proof. The only possible destabilising curve for f_0 is E_1 . Any destabilising orbit beginning at E_1 must remain in the fibre $\{x = 0\}$ which is fixed by f_0 , and the same applies for every exceptional curve of π created by the algorithm.

At the first step of the algorithm we only have E_0, E_1 . Proceeding inductively, suppose we have an intermediate surface $\pi' : (g, Y) \rightarrow (f_0, X_0)$ generated by the algorithm which is satellite relative to E_0 and E_1 , with $E(\pi') = E_{r'_1} \cup \dots \cup E_{r'_m}$. On one hand, a destabilising curve must be one of the $E_{r'_j}$, but on the other hand, Prop 16 says that a minimal destabilising orbit consists of finitely many points of the form $E_{r'_j} \cap E_{r'_{j+1}}$. Blowing up all of these points leads to a further map which is satellite relative to E_0 and E_1 . \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Consider the orbit of 1 under T_f .

$$1 \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \mapsto \frac{3}{4} \mapsto \frac{7}{8} \mapsto \frac{11}{16} \mapsto \dots$$

Indeed, suppose that $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{a}{2^n}$ with a odd, then

$$\frac{a}{2^n} \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{3a}{2^{n+1}} & \frac{a}{2^n} < \frac{2}{3} \\ 2 - \frac{3a}{2^{n+1}} = \frac{2^{n+2}-3a}{2^{n+1}} & \frac{a}{2^n} > \frac{2}{3}. \end{cases}$$

Thus with every iterate the denominator multiplies by 2 (since $2^{n+2} - 3a$ is also odd). In particular, the sequence $(T_f^m(1))$ is infinite and there exists a smallest $m = m_1$ such that $T_f^{m-1}(1) = q \in \{r_0, \dots, r_n\}$, but $T_f(q) \in (r_j, r_{j+1})$. Thus by Prop 16(i, ii), $\hat{f}(E_q) = E_{r_j} \cap E_{r_{j+1}} = P$. We claim that for some smallest $m = m_2$, $T_f^m((r_j, r_{j+1})) \ni r_k$ for some $0 \leq k \leq n$. Then by Prop 16(iii, iv) we have that for $P, \hat{f}(P), \dots, \hat{f}^{m_2-1}(P) = Q$ are closed points with $\hat{f}(Q) \supset E_k$. Therefore $\hat{f} : \hat{X} \dashrightarrow \hat{X}$ still has the minimal destabilising orbit $P, \hat{f}(P), \dots, \hat{f}^{m_2-1}(P) = Q$, contradiction.

Proof of claim: Suppose not, then for every m, k , $r_k \notin T_f^m((r_j, r_{j+1}))$. Since $T_f(\frac{2}{3}) = 1 = r_n$ it follows that $\forall m, \frac{2}{3} \notin T_f^m((r_j, r_{j+1}))$. Because T_f is continuous, $T_f^m((r_j, r_{j+1}))$ is an interval $(p, q) \subset [0, 1] \setminus \{0, \frac{2}{3}, 1\}$. Suppose $(p, q) \subseteq (0, \frac{2}{3})$, then by the formula for T_f we have $T_f((p, q)) = (\frac{3p}{2}, \frac{3q}{2})$, i.e. the interval expanded by a factor of $\frac{3}{2}$. Similar goes for when $(p, q) \subseteq (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$. We find that the length of $T_f^m((r_j, r_{j+1}))$ is $(r_{j+1} - r_j) (\frac{3}{2})^m$, but on the other hand $T_f^m((r_j, r_{j+1})) \subseteq T_f^m([0, 1]) = [0, 1]$. Clearly this is impossible. \square

6.5. The Berkovich Alternative. Here we provide some details about another approach to the bookkeeping using the Berkovich projective line, $\mathbb{P}_{\text{an}}^1(K)$. We work over the field, K , of Puiseux series on the variable x (the same x as above) with \mathbb{C} coefficients. There is a straightforward correspondence between Type II points of the form $\zeta(0, |x|^q)$ with $q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ and exceptional curves E_q which can be obtained from satellite blowups between E_0 and E_1 . The curves E_{r_j} ($0 \leq j \leq n$) correspond to finitely many marked Type

II points in $[\zeta(0, 1), \zeta(0, |x|)]$, and the intersection point $E_{r_j} \cap E_{r_{j+1}}$ corresponds to the Berkovich annulus bounded by the $\zeta(0, |x|^{r_j})$ and $\zeta(0, |x|^{r_{j+1}})$.

We see that f induces a map on \mathbb{P}_{an}^1 . This maps $\zeta(0, r)$ to $\zeta(0, R)$, where R is the radius given by the magnitude of the Laurent series $x^4y^{-3} + y^3$ at $|y| = r$. The Weierstrass degree is -3 when $R = |x|^4r^{-3} = |x^4y^{-3}| > |y^3| = r^3$ and 3 when $|x|^4r^{-3} = |x^4y^{-3}| < |y^3| = r^3 = R$. This means that

$$\zeta(0, r) \mapsto \begin{cases} \zeta(0, r^3) & r > |x|^{\frac{2}{3}} \\ \zeta(0, |x|^4r^{-3}) & r < |x|^{\frac{2}{3}} \end{cases}$$

The effect of $x \mapsto x^2$ is to replace each diameter with its square root. The map T_f constructed in subsection 6.3 describes the dynamics on $(0, \infty) \subset \mathbb{P}_{\text{an}}^1$ with each $T_f(q) = r$ corresponding to $f(\zeta(0, |x|^q)) = \zeta(0, |x|^r)$.

$$T_f : q \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2}q & q \leq \frac{2}{3} \\ 2 - \frac{3}{2}q & q > \frac{2}{3} \end{cases}$$

Example 2. Consider the map

$$f : (x, y) \mapsto ((1 - x)x^2, (1 - x)(x^4y^{-3} + y^3))$$

as defined on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then f is not algebraically stable after *any* birational conjugation.

Unfortunately to elaborate on this example would use the full power of new machinery developed for dynamics on Berkovich space, which will appear in the author's thesis.

REFERENCES

- [BK06] Eric Bedford and Kyounghee Kim. Periodicities in linear fractional recurrences: degree growth of birational surface maps. *Michigan Math. J.*, 54(3):647–670, 2006.
- [BK10] Eric Bedford and Kyounghee Kim. Continuous families of rational surface automorphisms with positive entropy. *Math. Ann.*, 348(3):667–688, 2010.
- [BKT⁺08] Eric Bedford, Kyounghee Kim, Tuyen Trung Truong, Nina Abarenkova, and Jean-Marie Mailard. Degree complexity of a family of birational maps. *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.*, 11(1):53–71, 2008.
- [DF01] Jeffrey Diller and Charles Favre. Dynamics of bimeromorphic maps of surfaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123:1135–1169, 12 2001.
- [DL16] Jeffrey Diller and Jan-Li Lin. Rational surface maps with invariant meromorphic two-forms. *Math. Ann.*, 364(1-2):313–352, 2016.
- [Fav03] Charles Favre. Les applications monomiales en deux dimensions. *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 51(3):467–475, 2003.
- [GRP91] B. Grammaticos, A. Ramani, and V. Papageorgiou. Do integrable mappings have the painlevé property? *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 67:1825–1828, Sep 1991.
- [Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*. Springer, 1977.
- [Jon15] Mattias Jonsson. Dynamics of Berkovich spaces in low dimensions. In *Berkovich spaces and applications*, volume 2119 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 205–366. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [LU21] Anne Lonjou and Christian Urech. Actions of cremona groups on $\text{cat}(0)$ cube complexes. Accepted for publication in the *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 2021.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IN 46656

Email address: `rbirkett@nd.edu`