

ON THE ERGODIC THEORY OF IMPULSIVE SEMIFLOWS

S. M. AFONSO, E. BONOTTO, AND J. SIQUEIRA

ABSTRACT. We consider impulsive semiflows and establish sufficient conditions to the existence of invariant measures. Namely, the impulsive set and its image are both submanifolds of codimension one that are transversal to the flow direction. Moreover, we show that under the same conditions a Variational Principle holds.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Main results	2
2.1. Topological entropy for non-continuous flows	3
3. The special strong tube condition	4
4. The quotient approach	9
5. Examples	11
References	13

1. INTRODUCTION

The evolution in time of several phenomena studied by the sciences presents, at certain moments, abrupt changes of state, where the duration of the disturbances is null or negligible compared to the duration of the phenomenon. These abrupt changes are called impulses and they can be observed in phenomena in physics, biology, economics, control theory and information science, see [14] and [16].

Impulsive dynamical systems (IDS) can be interpreted as suitable mathematical models of real world phenomena that display abrupt changes in their behavior as mentioned above. More precisely, an IDS is described by three objects: a continuous semiflow on a space X ; a set D contained in X where the flow experiments sudden perturbations; and an impulsive function from D to X , which determines the change in the trajectory each time it collides with the impulsive set D . In spite of their great range of applications, IDS have started being studied from the viewpoint of ergodic theory only recently in the work [1] and subsequently [2], [3], [5], [11]. A key challenge, inherent to the dynamics, is that in general, an impulsive semiflow is not continuous, therefore one can not, a priori, even to guarantee the existence of invariant measures. Throughout the years the ergodic theory has shown to be a useful way to obtain features of dynamical systems. Describing the behavior of the orbits of a dynamical system can be a challenging task, especially for systems that have a complicated topological and geometrical structure therefore studying its behavior via invariant probability measures

is a useful tool. For instance, Birkhoff's Ergodic Theorem shows that almost every initial condition in each ergodic component of an invariant measure has the same statistical distribution in space.

In the pioneer work [1] the authors studied sufficient conditions to the existence of invariant measures. In the present work we aim to provide sufficient conditions for the existence of invariant measures, that imply the ones given by Alves and Carvalho in [1], and are somewhat easier to verify. Moreover, we show that the Variational Principle established in [2] holds under the same conditions without needed of the *contraction* condition on the impulsive map. Our main goal in simplifying the conditions for the existence of invariant measures of impulsive semiflows is to allow and invite other works in the ergodic theory viewpoint allowing a future use of the ergodic theory in its all power.

The paper is organized as follows. In the second section we state precisely our main theorems. In Section 3 we prove Theorem I by using the Special Strong tube condition as the main tool. In Section 4 we push further the use of the quotient approach to prove Theorem II, removing the contraction condition on the impulsive map. Finally, in Section 5 we provide some examples for which our theorems hold.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Let M be a compact manifold endowed with the Riemannian metric d . Consider a continuous semiflow $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times M \rightarrow M$, a nonempty compact set $D \subset M$ and a continuous map $I : D \rightarrow M$ such that $I(D) \cap D = \emptyset$. Under these conditions, we say that (M, φ, D, I) is an *impulsive dynamical system* or IDS for short.

We may suppose that the semiflow φ is the flow associated to the differential equation

$$\dot{x} = f(x),$$

where $f : M \rightarrow M$ is a smooth function.

An impulsive dynamical system generates a semiflow as follows. We start by defining the sequence of hitting times at the impulsive set D . The first visit of each φ -trajectory to D is given by the function $\tau_1 : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$, defined as

$$\tau_1(x) = \begin{cases} \inf \{t > 0 : \varphi_t(x) \in D\}, & \text{if } \varphi_t(x) \in D \text{ for some } t > 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The *impulsive trajectory* γ_x and the subsequent *impulsive times* $\tau_2(x), \tau_3(x), \dots$ (possibly finitely many) of a given point $x \in M$ are defined according to the following rules: for $0 \leq t < \tau_1(x)$ we set $\gamma_x(t) = \varphi_t(x)$.

Assuming that $\gamma_x(t)$ is defined for $t < \tau_n(x)$ for some $n \geq 2$, we set

$$\gamma_x(\tau_n(x)) = I(\varphi_{\tau_n(x) - \tau_{n-1}(x)}(\gamma_x(\tau_{n-1}(x)))).$$

Defining the $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$ impulsive time of x as

$$\tau_{n+1}(x) = \tau_n(x) + \tau_1(\gamma_x(\tau_n(x))),$$

for $\tau_n(x) < t < \tau_{n+1}(x)$, we set

$$\gamma_x(t) = \varphi_{t - \tau_n(x)}(\gamma_x(\tau_n(x))).$$

We define the *time duration* of the trajectory of x as $\Upsilon(x) = \sup_{n \geq 1} \{\tau_n(x)\}$.

We point out that the assumption $I(D) \cap D = \emptyset$ implies that the time duration of each trajectory is infinite, see [1, Remark 1.1].

Definition 2.1. *A probability measure μ on the Borel sets of a metric space M is called **invariant** under a semiflow ϕ if*

$$\mu(\phi_t^{-1}(A)) = \mu(A) \quad \text{for every Borel set } A \subset M \text{ for all } t \geq 0.$$

Recall that a continuous semiflow on a compact metric space always admit an invariant measure. However, in the lack of continuity, which is the case of impulsive semiflows, one can not guarantee it. Our first main result provides sufficient conditions for the existence of invariant measures under impulsive semiflows.

Theorem I. *Let $\varphi : M \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow M$ be a smooth semiflow, D a smooth compact submanifold and $I : D \rightarrow M$ a continuous function. Let ψ be the impulsive semiflow generated by (M, φ, D, I) .*

If D and $I(D)$ are submanifold of codimension one that are transversal to the flow direction, then there exists at least an invariant measure under the impulsive semiflow ψ .

As mentioned in the introduction, in [1] the authors provided conditions to the existence of invariant measures. Here, we replace their conditions for the above ones which are more topological and somewhat easier to check.

2.1. Topological entropy for non-continuous flows. We aim to show that the same conditions in Theorem I are enough to guarantee that a Variational Principle holds. We start recalling a suitable definition of topological entropy in the context of impulsive semiflows.

The topological entropy is a number that measures how chaotic is a system: it computes the exponential growth of the trajectories of the system.

Moreover, two equivalent systems, namely topologically conjugated, have the same topological entropy. Thus, the topological entropy is a useful tool in the classification of systems.

There are different ways for defining topological entropy, some of them are equivalent in the setting of continuous flows on compact manifolds [See [17]]. In the absence of continuity, the classical definitions are not suitable. In order to overpass it, in [2] the authors defined the following concept.

Let $\phi : M \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow M$ be a semiflow, not necessarily continuous.

Consider a function τ assigning to each $x \in X$ a sequence $(\tau_n(x))_{n \in A(x)}$ of nonnegative numbers, where either $A(x) = \mathbb{N}$ or $A(x) = \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that τ is *admissible* if there exists $\eta > 0$ such that, for all $x \in X$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n+1 \in A(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad & \tau_{n+1}(x) - \tau_n(x) \geq \eta; \\ \text{(ii)} \quad & \tau_n(\psi_t(x)) = \begin{cases} \tau_n(x) - t, & \text{if } \tau_{n-1}(x) < t < \tau_n(x); \\ \tau_{n+1}(x), & \text{if } t = \tau_n(x). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For each admissible function τ , $x \in X$, $t > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \eta/2$, we define

$$J_{t,\delta}^\tau(x) = [0, t] \setminus \bigcup_{j \in A(x)}]\tau_j(x) - \delta, \tau_j(x) + \delta[.$$

When $\tau_1(x) > t$, one has $J_{t,\delta}^\tau(x) = [0, t]$.

The τ -dynamical ball of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ and length T centered at x is defined as

$$B^\tau(x, \psi, T, \varepsilon, \delta) = \{y \in X : d(\psi_t(x), \psi_t(y)) < \varepsilon, \forall t \in J_{T,\delta}^\tau(x)\}.$$

A set $E \subset M$ is said to be $(\psi, \tau, T, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -separated set if, for each $x \in E$, whenever $y \in B^\tau(x, \psi, T, \varepsilon, \delta)$, we have $y = x$.

We define $s^\tau(\psi, T, \varepsilon, \delta) = \sup\{\#E : E \text{ is a finite } (\psi, \tau, T, \varepsilon, \delta)\text{-separated set}\}$ where $\#E$ is the number of elements of E . And define the exponential growth rate as

$$h^\tau(\psi, \varepsilon, \delta) = \limsup_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \log s^\tau(\psi, T, \varepsilon, \delta),$$

where we assume that $\log \infty = \infty$.

Then take the limit as ε goes to zero

$$h^\tau(\psi, \delta) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} h^\tau(\psi, \varepsilon, \delta).$$

Finally, we take the limit as δ goes to zero to define the τ -topological entropy as

$$h_{top}^\tau(\psi) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} h^\tau(\psi, \delta).$$

Observe that the concept is well defined since the limits above exist because the functions $\varepsilon \mapsto h^\tau(\psi, \varepsilon, \delta)$ and $\delta \mapsto h^\tau(\psi, \delta)$ are decreasing.

The τ -topological entropy is a suitable concept for non-continuous semiflow in the sense that the definition coincide with the classical one when the semiflow is continuous [Theorem A, [2]].

We point out that, since the work [2], other notions were defined [11] [12]. We also refer to [5] where the authors compare all the previous notions with the ones that they define.

Here we establish conditions for which the variational principle holds for the τ -topological entropy.

Theorem II. *Let $\varphi : M \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow M$ be a smooth semiflow, D a compact submanifold of codimension one and $I : D \rightarrow M$ a continuous function.*

If D and $I(D)$ are transversal to the flow direction, then the impulsive semiflow ψ generated by the impulsive dynamical system (M, φ, D, I) satisfies

$$h_{top}^\tau(\psi) = \sup_{\mu} \{h_\mu(\psi)\},$$

where the supremum is taken over all μ invariant probability measure under ψ and $h_\mu(\psi)$ stands for the measure theoretical entropy of ψ .

We refer the reader to [17] for the definition measure theoretical entropy.

3. THE SPECIAL STRONG TUBE CONDITION

In this section we prove Theorem I. The key concept in the proof is the special strong tube condition. We start with some definitions.

For $t \geq 0$ and $x \in M$, we define $F(t, x) = \{y \in M : \varphi(t, y) = x\}$ and, for $\Delta \subset [0, \infty)$ and $Y \subset M$, we define


$$F(\Delta, Y) = \bigcup \{F(t, x) : t \in \Delta \text{ and } x \in Y\}.$$

A point $x \in M$ is called an *initial point*, if $F(t, x) = \emptyset$ for all $t > 0$.

Definition 3.1. A closed subset $S \subset M$ containing $x \in M$ is called a *section* through x if there exist $\lambda > 0$ and a closed subset L of M such that:

- (a) $F(\lambda, L) = S$;
- (b) $F([0, 2\lambda], L)$ contains a neighborhood of x ;
- (c) $F(\nu, L) \cap F(\zeta, L) = \emptyset$, if $0 \leq \nu < \zeta \leq 2\lambda$.

The set $F([0, 2\lambda], L)$ is called a λ -tube and the set L is called a *bar*.



Definition 3.2. Let (M, φ, D, I) be an IDS. We say that a point $x \in D$ satisfies the strong tube condition (STC), if there exists a section S through x such that $S = F(L, [0, 2\lambda]) \cap D$. Furthermore, a point $x \in D$ satisfies the special strong tube condition (SSTC) if it satisfies STC and the λ -tube $F([0, 2\lambda], L)$ is such that $F([0, \lambda], L) \cap I(D) = \emptyset$.

If every point in D satisfy the SSTC, then we say that D satisfies SSTC.

Definition 3.3. Let S be a codimension one submanifold of a manifold M . We say that a S is transversal at $p \in S$ if $f(p) \notin T_p M$. If $f(p) \notin T_p M$ for all $p \in S$, then S is said to be transversal to the flow direction.

In the next proposition we prove that, under general topological conditions, the impulsive set and its image satisfy the SSTC.

Proposition 3.4. If D is a smooth submanifold of M of codimension 1 which is transversal to the direction of the flow, then D and $I(D)$ both satisfy the special strong tube condition.

The last proposition is an extension of [7, Theorem 9]. Here we consider general manifolds in opposite to the subsets of Euclidean spaces considered in [7]. We will follow closely the ideas of the proof present in [7]. First we will need to state a couple of lemmas from Classical Differential Topology. The reader can consult the proofs in [13].

Lemma 3.5. [13, Proposition 5.16] Let S be a subset of a smooth m -manifold M . Then S is an embedded k -submanifold of M if and only if every point of S has a neighborhood U in M such that $U \cap S$ is a level set of a smooth submersion $\Phi : U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m-k}$.

Lemma 3.6. [13, Proposition 5.38] *Suppose M is a manifold and $S \subset M$ is an embedded submanifold. If $\Phi : U \mapsto N$ is any local defining map for S , then $T_p S = \text{Ker} d\Phi_p : T_p M \mapsto T_{\Phi(p)} N$ for each $p \in S \cap U$.*

Now we can proceed to the proof of the Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $x \in D$. By Lemma 3.5, there exists a neighborhood U in M , with $x \in U \cap D$, such that $U \cap D$ is a level set of a smooth submersion $\Phi : U \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, that is, there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $U \cap D = \Phi^{-1}(c)$.

Claim 1: There exists $\epsilon_x > 0$ such that $\varphi((0, \epsilon_x), x) \cap D = \emptyset$ and $F(x, (0, \epsilon_x)) \cap D = \emptyset$.

Indeed, suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence of positive real numbers $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $t_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0$ such that $\varphi(t_n, x) \in D$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\varphi([0, \delta], x) \subset U$. We may assume that $t_n \in [0, \delta]$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $h : [0, \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $h(t) = \Phi(\varphi(t, x)) - c$. Note that $h(0) = h(t_n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and, by the Rolle Theorem, there exists $\tau_n \in (0, t_n)$ such that

$$h'(\tau_n) = \nabla \Phi(\varphi(\tau_n, x)) f(\varphi(\tau_n, x)) = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain $\nabla \Phi(x) f(x) = 0$. By Lemma 3.6, we conclude that $f(x) \in T_x D$ which is a contradiction since D is transversal to the flow direction.

Analogously, if there exists a sequence $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$, $t_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0$, such that $F(t_n, x) \cap D \neq \emptyset$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then we can also assume that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $F([0, \delta], x) \subset U$ and $t_n < \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $y_n \in F(t_n, x) \cap D$ and define the mapping $h_n : [0, t_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $h_n(t) = \Phi(\varphi(t, y_n)) - c$. Using again the Rolle Theorem we obtain $\tau_n \in (0, t_n)$ with $h'_n(\tau_n) = 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, that yields $\nabla \Phi(x) f(x) = 0$ which is a contradiction.

Claim 2: If $t > 0$ is such that $\varphi((0, t], x) \subset U \setminus D$ and $\varphi([-t, 0), x) \subset U \setminus D$ then $(\Phi(\varphi(t, x)) - c)(\Phi(\varphi(-t, x)) - c) < 0$.

Indeed, note that $(\Phi(\varphi(t, x)) - c)(\Phi(\varphi(s, x)) - c) > 0$ for all $0 < s \leq t$, because if there exists $0 < s < t$ such that

$$(\Phi(\varphi(t, x)) - c)(\Phi(\varphi(s, x)) - c) < 0,$$

then one can obtain $\tau \in (s, t)$ such that $\Phi(\varphi(\tau, x)) = c$, that is, $\varphi(\tau, x) \in D$ which is a contradiction. Analogously, we have

$$(\Phi(\varphi(-t, x)) - c)(\Phi(\varphi(-s, x)) - c) > 0 \quad \text{for all } 0 < s \leq t.$$

Now, suppose the opposite, i.e., that $(\Phi(\varphi(x, t)) - c)(\Phi(\varphi(x, -t)) - c) > 0$. Then, either $\Phi(\varphi(x, [-t, 0) \cup (0, t])) > c$ or $\Phi(x, \varphi([-t, 0) \cup (0, t])) < c$ which implies that $\nabla \Phi(x) f(x) = 0$ and gives also a contradiction.

Claim 3: D satisfies STC.

We may assume that $U \cap D = \Phi^{-1}(c)$ is connected. Using the same argument as in **Claim 1**, we may obtain a compact set $S \subset U \cap D$, $x \in S$, and $\lambda > 0$ be such that $\varphi((0, 2\lambda], S) \subset U \setminus D$ and $F((0, 2\lambda], S) \subset U \setminus D$. Define $L = \varphi(\lambda, S)$. We are going to show that $F([0, 2\lambda], L)$ is a λ -tube through x .

It is clear that $F(\lambda, L) = S$. Now, suppose by contradiction that $F([0, 2\lambda], L)$ does not contain a neighborhood of x , i.e., there exists a sequence $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} x$ such that $x_n \notin F([0, 2\lambda], L)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Claim 2 implies that there exists $0 < s < \lambda$ such that

$$(\Phi(\varphi(s, x)) - c)(\Phi(\varphi(-s, x)) - c) < 0.$$

Therefore, there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\varphi([-s, s], x_n) \subset U \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi(\varphi(s, x_n)) - c)(\Phi(\varphi(-s, x_n)) - c) < 0$$

for all $n \geq n_0$.

Thus, for $n \geq n_0$, there is $\tau_n \in (-s, s)$ such that $\Phi(\varphi(\tau_n, x_n)) = c$, that is, $\varphi(\tau_n, x_n) \in D$, which gives a contradiction.

To finish the proof we show that $F(\alpha, L) \cap F(\beta, L) = \emptyset$ for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 2\lambda$. Suppose, again by contradiction, that there exists $y \in F(\alpha, L) \cap F(\beta, L) = \emptyset$ for some $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 2\lambda$. Then $a = \varphi(y, \alpha - \lambda) \in D$ and $b = \varphi(y, \beta - \lambda) \in D$. Consequently, $\varphi(a, \beta - \alpha) = b \in M$ and this is a contradiction since $a \in D$ and $\varphi(S, (0, 2\lambda]) \cap D = \emptyset$. This completes the proof. \square

The special strong tube condition provides an useful property to the impulsive semiflow.

Proposition 3.7. [7, Proposition 2.6] *Let (M, φ, D, I) be an IDS such that $I(D) \cap D = \emptyset$ and assume that D satisfy SSTC with λ -tube $F([0, 2\lambda], L)$. Then $\psi_t(D \cap F([0, \lambda], L)) = \emptyset$ for $t > \lambda$.*

We recall that given a semiflow $\phi : M \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow M$, not necessarily continuous, a point $x \in M$ is said to be **non-wandering** if, for every neighborhood U of x and any $T > 0$, there exists $t \geq T$ such that

$$\phi_t^{-1}(U) \cap U \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $\Omega_\phi = \{x \in X : x \text{ is non-wandering for } \phi\}$ be the non-wandering set. The compactness of M implies that the non-wandering set is also compact. In the case that the semiflow is continuous, the non-wandering set is also invariant under the semiflow, that is,

$$\phi_t(\Omega_\phi) \subset \Omega_\phi \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

The invariance of the non-wandering set is not true in general. However, the following characterization for an impulsive semiflow allows us to obtain an invariance outside of the impulsive set.

First, for $x \in M$, the set

$$J(x) = \{y \in M : \text{there are sequences } \{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset M \text{ and } \{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+\}$$

$$\text{such that } x_n \rightarrow x, \quad t_n \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } \psi(t_n, x_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} y\}$$

denotes the prolongation of the positive limit set of x with respect to ψ .

Lemma 3.8. [8, Theorem 3.5] *Let (X, φ, D, I) be IDS and let ψ be the impulsive semiflow. A point $x \in \Omega_\psi$ if and only if $x \in J(x)$.*

Lemma 3.9. *Let (X, φ, D, I) be an impulsive system such that each point on D satisfies the SSTC. If $x \in \Omega_\psi \cap D$ then $I(x) \in \Omega_\psi$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \Omega_\psi \cap D$. By Lemma 3.8 there are sequences $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $z_n \rightarrow x$, $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$w_n = \psi(t_n, z_n) \rightarrow x.$$

Since D satisfies SSTC, it follows from Proposition 3.7 that

$$\psi(t_n, z_n) \in F((\lambda, 2\lambda], L) \quad \text{for } n \text{ sufficiently large.}$$

Consequently, $\tau_1(\psi(t_n, z_n)) \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\psi(t_n + \tau_1(\psi(t_n, z_n)), z_n) \rightarrow I(x).$$

Hence, $I(x) \in \Omega_\psi$. □

Since we assume that $I(D) \cap D = \emptyset$, according to the last lemma we have that $I(\Omega_\psi \cap D) \subset \Omega_\psi \setminus D$. Thus [1, Theorem B] can be rewritten as follows.

Proposition 3.10. *Given the impulsive semiflow ψ generated by the IDS (M, φ, D, I) we have*

$$\psi_t(\Omega_\psi \setminus D) \subset \Omega_\psi \setminus D \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

The last result establishes that outside of the impulsive set the non-wandering set is invariant under the semiflow.

Given $\xi > 0$ we define

$$D_\xi = \bigcup_{x \in D} \{\varphi_t(x) : 0 < t < \xi\} \quad \text{and} \quad X_\xi = X \setminus (D_\xi \cup D).$$

Since D is compact, I is continuous and $I(D) \cap D = \emptyset$, for ξ small enough we have $I(D) \cap D_\xi = \emptyset$. Therefore, the set X_ξ is invariant under ψ , that is

$$\psi_t(X_\xi) \subseteq X_\xi, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

We consider the function

$$\tau_\xi^* : X_\xi \cup D \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$$

defined as

$$\tau_\xi^*(x) = \begin{cases} \tau_1(x), & \text{if } x \in X_\xi; \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in D. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 3.11. *The function τ_ξ^* is continuous on $X_\xi \cup D$.*

Proof. According to [9, Theorem 3.8], τ_ξ^* is continuous on X_ξ . Now, let $x \in D$ and $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X_\xi \cup D$ be a sequence such that $x_n \rightarrow x$.

Let $\epsilon_x > 0$ be such that $F((0, \epsilon_x), x) \cap D = \emptyset$ and $\varphi((0, \epsilon_x), x) \cap D = \emptyset$. Since $x \in D$ satisfies the condition STC, there exists a tube $F([\lambda, 2\lambda], L)$ through x given by a section $S \subset D$ such that $\lambda < \epsilon_x$. Note that, $x_n \in F([\lambda, 2\lambda], L)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\lambda_n \in [\lambda, 2\lambda]$ be such that $\varphi(\lambda_n, x_n) \in L$. Since $F(\lambda, L) = S$, we have

$$\varphi(\lambda_n - \lambda, x_n) \in S \subset D. \tag{1}$$

Let $\{\lambda_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a subsequence of $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We may assume, up to a subsequence, that $\lambda_{n_k} \rightarrow t_0 \in [\lambda, 2\lambda]$. If $t_0 \neq \lambda$ we obtain using (1)

$$\varphi(t_0 - \lambda, x) \in D$$

and $\tau_\xi^*(x) = t_0 - \lambda < \epsilon_x$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\lambda_{n_k} \rightarrow \lambda$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In conclusion, the sequence $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to λ . Since $\varphi(\lambda_n - \lambda, x_n) \in D$, we get

$$\tau_\xi^*(x_n) = \lambda_n - \lambda \rightarrow 0 = \tau_\xi^*(x).$$

Hence, τ_ξ^* is continuous on $X_\xi \cup D$. \square

Now the proof of Theorem I follows immediately by [1, Theorem A], where the continuity of τ_ξ^* and the invariance of the non-wandering set, up to the impulsive set, are required. Here we obtain that the regularity of the IDS implies the aforementioned conditions, according to Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 3.10.

4. THE QUOTIENT APPROACH

Once we guarantee the existence of invariant measures it is desired to extend the study of the Ergodic Theory of impulsive semiflows. In [1], the authors developed the following approach to study impulsive semiflows: consider a suitable quotient topology on M then project the impulsive semiflow on this space generating a continuous semiflow which is dynamically *similar* to the original impulsive semiflow. Besides this approach have been successfully carried out in subsequent works [2], [3], the method generates an undesirable condition: the impulsive function should be Lipschitz with constant smaller or equal than one. It means that either the impulsive function is a contraction or a isometry. However, it is known that *expansiveness* generates richer dynamics. Here we show that this condition is not necessary to apply this approach.

Next we describe the quotient topology. We point out that similar ideas of the quotient approach appear prior to [1] in [10].

Let (M, φ, D, I) be an impulsive dynamical system as before. We define the equivalence relation \sim on M by

$$x \sim y \iff x = y, \quad y = I(x), \quad x = I(y) \quad \text{or} \quad I(x) = I(y). \quad (2)$$

Let \widetilde{M} denote the quotient space, $[x]$ the equivalence class of a point $x \in M$ and $\pi : M \rightarrow \widetilde{M}$ the natural projection. Since the projection is a onto map it generates the quotient topology on \widetilde{M} .

Lemma 4.1. *The equivalence classes of the relation \sim are compact sets on M .*

Proof. Given $x \in M$ it is straightforward to check that there are two possibilities for its equivalence class:

$$\begin{aligned} i) [x] &= \{x \cup I(x) \cup I^{-1}(x) \cup I^{-1}(I(x))\} \quad \text{if } x \in D; \\ ii) [x] &= \{x \cup I^{-1}(x)\} \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Since M is endowed the Riemannian metric, a unitary set is closed. Moreover, the continuity of the impulsive map I guarantees that $[x]$ is a finite union of closed spaces, and therefore, it is closed. Since M is compact, $[x]$ is compact. \square

We point out that the non-wandering set Ω_ψ of an impulsive semiflow ψ is a compact set. Therefore by the last lemma, equivalence classes contained in Ω_ψ are also compact.

Let d be the metric induced on Ω_ψ . We can define a metric on $\pi(\Omega_\psi)$ considering the distance between two equivalence classes as the distance of it as sets on Ω_ψ . Since by Lemma 4.1 the classes are compact sets it defines a metric. Precisely, we define the following metric on $\pi(\Omega_\psi)$:

$$\tilde{d}([x], [y]) = \inf \{d(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}); \text{for some } \tilde{x} \in [x] \text{ and } \tilde{y} \in [y]\}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *The metric \tilde{d} induces the quotient topology on $\pi(\Omega_\psi)$.*

Proof. We show that $\mathcal{U} = \{B_{\tilde{d}}(\tilde{x}, r), r > 0\}$ is a basis for the quotient topology on $\pi(\Omega_\psi)$. First note that each ball is open in the quotient topology.

Indeed, given $y \in \pi^{-1}(B_{\tilde{d}}(\tilde{x}, r))$ we have that $d(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x}) = \tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x}) < r$. Thus, for $0 < \varepsilon < r$ there exist $y_0 \in \tilde{y}$ and $x_0 \in \tilde{x}$ such that $d(y_0, x_0) = r - \varepsilon$.

Given $z \in B_d(y, \varepsilon)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{x}) &\leq \tilde{d}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) + \tilde{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x}) = d(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) + d(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x}) \\ &\leq d(z, y) + d(y_0, x_0) < \varepsilon + (r - \varepsilon) = r, \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\pi(z) = \tilde{z} \in B_{\tilde{d}}(\tilde{x}, r)$ and thus $z \in \pi^{-1}(B_{\tilde{d}}(\tilde{x}, r))$.

Therefore $B_d(y, \varepsilon) \subset \pi^{-1}(B_{\tilde{d}}(\tilde{x}, r))$, and then, $B_{\tilde{d}}(\tilde{x}, \delta)$ is an open set in the quotient topology.

Let $U \subset \pi(\Omega_\psi)$ be an open set in the quotient topology and take $[x] \in U$. Since $\pi^{-1}(U)$ is open we have that $\Omega_\psi \setminus \pi^{-1}(U)$ is a closed subset of Ω_ψ . By the compactness of the class $[x]$, there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $d([x], \Omega_\psi \setminus \pi^{-1}(U)) = \lambda$. Then

$$\bigcup_{\tilde{x} \in [x]} B_d(\tilde{x}, \lambda/2) \subset \pi^{-1}(U).$$

It is straightforward to check that $B_{\tilde{d}}([x], \lambda/2) \subset U$. \square

In [2] and [3] the Lipschitz condition of the impulsive map is used precisely to guarantee that in [2, Lemma 4.1] hold. This is a key lemma since it allows us to recuperate dynamical properties from the continuous dynamics on the quotient space to the impulsive dynamics on the non-wandering set. We have now proved that the lemma still holds in the absence of the Lipschitz condition.

Lemma 4.3. *For all $[x], [y] \in \pi(M)$ there exist $p, q \in M$ such that*

$$p \in [x], q \in [y] \quad \text{and} \quad d(p, q) \leq \tilde{d}([x], [y]).$$

In order to prove Theorem II, we will apply the following result.

Theorem 4.4 (Alves, Carvalho, Vásquez). *Let ψ be the semiflow of an impulsive dynamical system (X, M, D, I) such that $I(D) \cap D = \emptyset$, I is a 1-Lipschitz function, D satisfies a half-tube condition, $I(D)$ is transverse to the direction flow and τ^* is continuous then*

$$h_{top}^\tau(\psi) = \sup_{\mu} \{h_\mu(\psi)\}.$$

As aforementioned, the Lipschitz condition on the impulsive map is not necessary. Moreover, in the last section we prove that the hypothesis of Theorem II imply the continuity of τ^* (Proposition 3.11) and thus, by the last result, Theorem II holds.

5. EXAMPLES

In this section we describe some examples of systems for which we can apply our results.

Example 5.1. *As a first example, we revisit Example 2.1 of [1]. Consider the annulus $M = \{(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 \leq r \leq 2, \theta \in [0, 2\pi]\}$ and the smooth vector field on M*

$$\begin{cases} r' &= 0 \\ \theta' &= 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that the semiflow $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times M \rightarrow M$ of this vector field have trajectories that are circles spinning around zero counterclockwise.

Defining the impulsive set by $D = \{(r, \theta) \in M : 1 \leq r \leq 2\}$ and the impulsive function on D by $I(r, \theta) = \left(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}r, \theta\right)$, we note that D is the segment connecting the points $(1, 0)$ and $(2, 0)$ while $I(D)$ is the segment connecting the points $(-3/2, 0)$ and $(-1, 0)$.

Therefore, it is straightforward to check that D and $I(D)$ are both transversal to the direction of the flow φ , and thus the impulsive semiflow ψ generated by (M, φ, D, I) admits at least one invariant probability measure and, moreover, a variational principle holds.

Example 5.2. *It is known that prey-predator phenomena have many important applications in many different fields such as Biology, Ecology, Economics, and other sciences. Let us consider the three species prey-predator system which consists of two competing preys and one predator described in [4] by*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{dT} &= r_1 x (1 - k_1^{-1} x - k_1^{-1} c_2 y) - \Phi_1(x, y) z \\ \frac{dy}{dT} &= r_2 y (1 - k_2^{-1} c_1 x - k_2^{-1} y) - \Phi_2(x, y) z \\ \frac{dz}{dT} &= e_1 \Phi_1(x, y) z + e_2 \Phi_2(x, y) z - \alpha z, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha, k_1, k_2, r_1, r_2, c_1, c_2, e_1$ and e_2 are the model parameters, which are positive values. Moreover,

- *the variables x and y represent the densities of the two prey species and the variable z represents the density of the predator species;*
- *the parameters e_1 and e_2 represent the conversion rates of the preys x, y to predator z ;*
- *the functions Φ_1 and Φ_2 represent a functional response of predator to preys.*

The predator z consumes the preys x, y according to the response functions

$$\Phi_1(x, y) = \frac{a_1 x}{1 + b_1 x + b_2 y} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_2(x, y) = \frac{a_2 y}{1 + b_1 x + b_2 y},$$

where a_1 and a_2 are the search rates of a predator for the preys x, y respectively, $b_1 = h_1 a_1$ and $b_2 = h_2 a_2$ with h_1 and h_2 denote the expected handling times spent with the preys x, y , respectively. See [15] for more details.

By using the transformations

$$x_1 = k_1^{-1}x, \quad x_2 = k_2^{-1}y, \quad x_3 = k_2^{-1}z \quad \text{and} \quad t = r_1 T,$$

it is possible to rewrite system (3) in the non-dimensional form:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx_1}{dt} = x_1(1 - x_1 - \alpha_2 x_2) - \frac{\alpha_1 x_1 x_3}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} \\ \frac{dx_2}{dt} = \gamma_2 x_2(1 - x_2 - \gamma_1 x_1) - \frac{\nu_2 x_2 x_3}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} \\ \frac{dx_3}{dt} = \frac{\nu_1 x_1 x_3 + \mu_2 x_2 x_3}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} - \mu_1 x_3, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_1 = a_1 k_1 r_1^{-1}$, $\alpha_2 = c_1 k_2 k_1^{-1}$, $\beta_1 = b_1 k_1$, $\beta_2 = b_2 k_2$, $\gamma_1 = c_2 k_1 k_2^{-1}$, $\gamma_2 = r_2 r_1^{-1}$, $\nu_1 = \alpha_1 e_1$, $\nu_2 = \alpha_2 k_1 r_1^{-1}$, $\mu_1 = \alpha r_1^{-1}$ and $\mu_2 = e_2 k_2 \nu_2^{-1} k_1^{-1}$.

In [4], the authors study the adaptive control of the three species prey-predator system by using nonlinear feedback control approach. They consider system (4) with control inputs as present the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx_1}{dt} = \frac{x_1(1 - x_1 - \alpha_2 x_2)(1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2) - \alpha_1 x_1 x_3 + u_1}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} \\ \frac{dx_2}{dt} = \frac{\gamma_2 x_2(1 - \gamma_1 x_1 - x_2)(1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2) - \nu_2 x_2 x_3 + u_2}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} \\ \frac{dx_3}{dt} = \frac{x_3(\nu_1 x_1 + \mu_2 x_2) - \mu_1 x_3(1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2) + u_3}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2}, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where u_1, u_2 and u_3 are the control inputs. By using the nonlinear feedback controllers

$$\begin{cases} u_1 = x_1[(\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2)(\alpha_2 x_2 + x_1 - 1) + \alpha_2 x_2 - 1] \\ u_2 = \gamma_2 x_2[(\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2)(x_2 + \gamma_1 x_1 - 1) + \gamma_1 x_1 - 1] \\ u_3 = \mu_1(\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2)x_3 - (\nu_1 x_1 + \mu_2 x_2)x_3, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

system (5) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx_1}{dt} = \frac{-(x_1 + \alpha_1 x_3)x_1}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} \\ \frac{dx_2}{dt} = \frac{-(\gamma_2 x_2 + \nu_2 x_3)x_2}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} \\ \frac{dx_3}{dt} = \frac{-\mu_1 x_3}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Since the densities $x_1(t)$, $x_2(t)$ and $x_3(t)$ are non-negative, we consider the phase space $M = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, x_3 \geq 0\}$ which is invariant. Thus (7) define a dynamical system (M, ϕ) on M .

Consider the impulsive set $D = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in M : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = \xi_i\}$ and $I(D) = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in M : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = \eta_j\}$, where ξ_i, η_j are positive numbers for $i = 1, \dots, p$, $j = 1, \dots, q$, with $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $\xi_i \neq \eta_j$ for all i and j . Thus, we have D and $I(D)$ are submanifold of codimension one with $I(D) \cap D = \emptyset$.

Define $L_\alpha(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 - \alpha$, with $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in M$ and $\alpha \in \{\xi_i, \eta_j : i = 1, \dots, p, j = 1, \dots, q\}$. Set

$$F(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left(\frac{-(x_1 + \alpha_1 x_3)x_1}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2}, \frac{-(\gamma_2 x_2 + \nu_2 x_3)x_2}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2}, \frac{-\mu_1 x_3}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} \right),$$

for all $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in M$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla L_\alpha(x_1, x_2, x_3), F(x_1, x_2, x_3) \rangle = \\ - \frac{(x_1 + \alpha_1 x_3)x_1}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} - \frac{(\gamma_2 x_2 + \nu_2 x_3)x_2}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} - \frac{\mu_1 x_3}{1 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2} < 0, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that D and $I(D)$ are transversal to the flow direction. Consequently, by Theorem I, there exists at least an invariant measure under the impulsive semiflow ψ generated from (7), D and I . Let μ be an invariant measure under ψ . Then, Poincaré Recurrence Theorem guarantees that μ -almost every initial condition is recurrent.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. F. Alves, M. Carvalho Invariant Probability and Non-wandering Sets for Impulsive Semiflows *J. Stat Phys*, 157:1097–1113, 2014.
- [2] J. F. Alves, M. Carvalho, and C. H. Vásquez. A variational principle for impulsive semiflows. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 259:4229–4252, 2015.
- [3] J. F. Alves, M. Carvalho, and J. Siqueira. Equilibrium states for impulsive semiflows *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 451 (2): 839–857
- [4] A. El-Gohary and A. S. Al-Ruzaiza, Chaos and adaptive control in two prey, one predator system with nonlinear feedback. *Chaos Solitons and Fractals* 34: 443–453, 2007.
- [5] L. Backes and F. B. Rodrigues. Topological pressure for discontinuous semiflows and a variational principle for impulsive dynamical systems, *Preprint. https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.08455v1*
- [6] E. M. Bonotto, M. C. Bortolan, T. Caraballo, R. Collegari, Impulsive surfaces on dynamical systems, *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 150 (1), 209–216, 2016.
- [7] E. M. Bonotto, M. C. Bortolan, A. N. Carvalho, R. Czaja, Global attractors for impulsive dynamical systems - a precompact approach *J. Diff. Equations*, 2602–2625, 2015.
- [8] E. M. Bonotto, M. Federson Poison stability for impulsive semidynamical systems, *Nonlinear Analysis*, 71, 6148–6156, 2009.
- [9] K. Ciesielski, On semicontinuity in impulsive dynamical systems, *Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math.*, 52: 71–80, 2004.
- [10] K. Ciesielski, On time reparametrizations and isomorphisms of impulsive dynamical systems, *Annales Polonici Mathematici*, 84(1), 2004.
- [11] N. Jaque, B. San Martín. Topological entropy for discontinuous semiflows, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 266, (6), 2019.
- [12] N. Jaque, B. San Martín. Topological entropy and metric entropy for regular impulsive semiflows, *Preprint. https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.09897v1*
- [13] J. Lee, Introduction to Smooth Manifolds, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer New York, 2012.
- [14] Li, Y. Periodic solutions of non-autonomous cellular neural networks with impulses and delays on time scales. *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information*, 31(2):273–293, 2014.

- [15] Y. Kuang, Basic properties of mathematical population models, *Biomathematics*, 17 (2002), 129-142.
- [16] G. T. Stamov, A. G. Stamov. On almost periodic processes in uncertain impulsive delay models of price fluctuations in commodity markets. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 219(10):5376–5383, 2013.
- [17] Viana, M., Oliveira, K. Foundations of Ergodic Theory *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, 2016

SUZETE MARIA AFONSO, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL PAULISTA (UNESP), INSTITUTO DE GEOCIÊNCIAS E CIÊNCIAS EXATAS, CÂMPUS DE RIO CLARO, AVENIDA 24-A, 1515, BELA VISTA, RIO CLARO, SÃO PAULO, 13506-900, BRAZIL

Email address: `s.afonso@unesp.br`

EVERALDO BONOTTO, INSTITUTO DE CIÊNCIAS MATEMÁTICAS E DE COMPUTAÇÃO, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO, CAMPUS DE SÃO CARLOS, 13560-970, SÃO CARLOS SP, BRAZIL

Email address: `ebonotto@icmc.usp.br`

JAQUELINE SIQUEIRA, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO, CAIXA POSTAL 68530, RIO DE JANEIRO, RJ 21945-970, BRAZIL

Email address: `jaqueline@im.ufrj.br`