

# RETURN TIMES OF POLYNOMIALS AS META-FIBONACCI NUMBERS

NATHANIEL D. EMERSON

ABSTRACT. For a complex polynomial with a disconnected Julia set and exactly one critical point with bounded orbit, we show that certain closest return times of the critical point with bounded orbit are meta-Fibonacci numbers. We give a condition on these meta-Fibonacci numbers that implies that the Julia set of such a polynomial is a Cantor set with (absolute) area zero. We give another condition that implies the Julia set has a connected component contained in a nested sequence of annuli with finite total modulus. We give a sufficient condition for a sequence of meta-Fibonacci numbers to be realizable as return times of a complex polynomial. This condition shows that the combinatorics of complex polynomials are strictly more general than the combinatorics of unimodal polynomials.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

An important part of understanding the dynamics of a complex polynomial is understanding the structure of its Julia set. When the Julia set is disconnected, we often ask under what conditions is it a Cantor set? and under what conditions does it have zero area? A classical result of Fatou and Julia is that the Julia set of a polynomial with no critical points with bounded is an area zero Cantor set. H. Brodin showed that there are polynomials that have critical points with bounded orbit whose Julia set is an area zero Cantor set [Bro]. More recently the work of B. Branner and J. Hubbard [BH] provides answers to these questions for all cubic polynomials and some higher degree polynomials. They also construct polynomials for which the structure of the Julia set cannot be determined by their techniques.

In this paper we mainly consider complex polynomials with a disconnected Julia set and exactly one *persistent* critical point, that is exactly one critical point with bounded orbit. Although some results apply to all polynomials with disconnected Julia sets. For a polynomial with a disconnected Julia set and exactly one persistent critical point, we show that certain return times of the persistent critical point are a new type of meta-Fibonacci numbers (see [C]). We give a condition on these meta-Fibonacci numbers, which implies the Julia set of such a polynomial is an (absolute) area zero Cantor set. We give another condition, which implies the Julia set of the polynomial has a component, which is contained in a nested sequence of annuli with finite total modulus. These Julia sets are similar to an example of Branner and Hubbard ([BH] Ex. 12.4) for which the structure of the Julia set is not understood. We give a sufficient condition for a sequence of these meta-Fibonacci numbers to be realizable as the return times of a polynomial.

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37F10, 37F50, 11B39; Secondary 37E05 37F20.

*Key words and phrases.* Julia set, return times, meta-Fibonacci numbers, unimodal map.

We use techniques introduced in [E]. We canonically code the dynamics of a polynomial with a disconnected Julia set by the combinatorial system of a *tree with dynamics*, due to R. Pérez-Marco [PM]. The return times of any persistent critical points of the polynomial are expressed in its tree with dynamics. We show that they are meta-Fibonacci numbers.

**Theorem (3.8).** *Let  $P$  be a complex polynomial with disconnected Julia set and a persistent critical point  $\omega$  (of any multiplicity). Then certain of closest return times  $(n_k)$  of  $\omega$  have the form  $n_k = 1$  for  $k \leq 1$ , and for each  $k > 1$  there exists  $r(k) \geq 1$  such that*

$$n_k = \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j}.$$

We call the  $(n_k)$  (extended) variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers generated by  $r(k)$ .

The numbers  $r(k)$  influence the structure of the Julia set of  $P$ . With an additional technical assumption, that the returns are associated with a *simple return chain* (see Definition 4.2), we obtain:

**Theorem (5.1).** *Let  $P$  be a complex polynomial with disconnected Julia set and a persistent critical point  $\omega$ . Let the return times of  $\omega$  be  $(n_k)$  generated by  $r(k)$  and assume the return times are associated with a simple return chain. Let  $D = 1 +$  (multiplicity of  $\omega$ ).*

- (a) *If  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} r(k) \geq D$  and  $\omega$  is the only persistent critical point of  $P$ , then the Julia set of  $P$  is a Cantor set with absolute area zero (see [AS]).*
- (b) *If  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} r(k) < D$ , then the Julia set of  $P$  has connected components that are nested inside a sequence of annuli with finite total modulus.*

We give sufficient condition for a sequence of meta-Fibonacci numbers to occur as the return times of a complex polynomial. We say a sequence of variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers  $(n_k)$  satisfies the *growth condition* if

$$n_{k-r(k)+1} > n_{k-r(k)} \quad \text{when } 1 < r(k) < k.$$

Let  $P$  be a polynomial that satisfies the *uniform escape condition* (see Definition 4.5) and has a unique persistent critical point. The return times of the persistent critical point of  $P$  satisfy the growth condition. Moreover for any sequence  $(n_k)$  of variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers that satisfies the growth condition, there is a polynomial with disconnected Julia set and exactly one persistent critical point, which realizes the given  $(n_k)$  as the return times of the persistent critical point. Sequences that satisfy the growth condition can naturally be regarded as generalizations of sequences  $(q_i)$  that satisfy the *continued fraction recursion*:

$$q_{i+1} = a_i q_i + q_{i-1} \quad a_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

The return times of a circle rotation are well known to satisfy this type of recursion. A sufficiently regular unimodal map, for instance an  $S$ -unimodal map or a unimodal polynomial, is topologically conjugate to a circle rotation [MS], so their return times also satisfy this type of recursion. Therefore the combinatorics of complex polynomials is strictly more general than the combinatorics of unimodal polynomials.

There is a considerable body of work on Fibonacci combinatorics for real polynomials. There are real polynomials of the form  $x^{2d} + c$  for all  $d > 1$  (see [HK] and

[LM]), with return times the usual Fibonacci numbers. It has been shown that some unimodal maps with Fibonacci return times have *wild attractors* [BKNS]—their metric and topological attractors do not coincide, see [M]. Fibonacci polynomials with connected Julia sets are considered plausible candidates to have a Julia set with positive area [SN].

A disconnected polynomial Julia set is a Cantor set if and only if each of its components is a single point. Branner and Hubbard show that for a polynomial with a disconnected Julia set and exactly one persistent critical point (counted by multiplicity), the Julia set is a Cantor set unless the component of the filled Julia set that contains the persistent critical point is periodic [BH].

In the opposite vein, Branner and Hubbard show there exists a class of polynomials for which a particular type of return times are the ordinary Fibonacci numbers [BH]. When the multiplicity of the persistent critical point is at least 2, the structure of the Julia sets of these so-called “Fibonacci polynomials” is not understood, but may have interesting properties. It is not known if the area of the Julia set is zero or positive; nor is it known whether the Julia set of such a polynomial is a Cantor set. Even though no critical points are periodic, the Julia set has components that are nested inside a sequence of nested conformal annuli with finite total modulus (see [AS] and [McM]). While this is a necessary condition for the component to be larger than a single point, it is not sufficient (see [SaNa] for a detailed discussion).

It is known that the key technical issue in determining the structure of a disconnected polynomial Julia set is the ratio of the number of pre-images of a first return map  $\Phi$  (see Definition 2.6) to the multiplicity of the persistent critical point [BH]. The number of pre-images of  $\Phi$  is always at least 2. This estimate is sharp, in the Fibonacci example the number of pre-images of  $\Phi$  is exactly 2. In order to construct the examples with the nest of annuli with finite total modulus, they choose the multiplicity of the persistent critical point at least 2. We give a condition that controls the number of pre-images of  $\Phi$ ; by choosing the multiplicity of the persistent critical point appropriately, we can obtain a new class of examples having a nest of annuli with finite total modulus.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some background on trees with dynamics. In Section 3, we show that certain combinatorial return times are variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers. In Section 4, we derive some additional necessary conditions on return times. With some additional assumptions, many of these conditions are also sufficient for realization. In Section 5, we give conditions in terms of these meta-Fibonacci numbers that control the number of pre-images under  $\Phi$ . We then give estimates for the modulus of a branch based on the ratio of pre-images under  $\Phi$  to the degree of the branch. Finally in Section 6, we show that a sequence of variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers that satisfies the growth condition can be realized by a polynomial.

## 2. BACKGROUND

The basic mathematical object in this paper is a *tree with dynamics* ([E]), see Figure 2. Associated to every polynomial with a disconnected Julia set is a tree with dynamics. We construct it by decomposing the basin of attraction of infinity into nested annuli using the critical equipotentials of Green’s function. These annuli have a natural tree structure, and the polynomial induces dynamics on the tree.

The dynamics of any critical points of the polynomial are encoded by its tree with dynamics. We can also construct a tree with dynamics axiomatically. A tree with dynamics that satisfies the *infinite modulus condition* (see Definition 2.10) is realizable as the tree with dynamics of a polynomial ([E] Thm. 9.4). Thus, we can construct polynomials with certain specified return times of their critical points.

We recall the basic properties of a tree with dynamics. A tree with dynamics may have *critical branches*, which correspond to persistent critical points. We develop some machinery to track the dynamics of the critical branches, most importantly the first return map  $\Phi$  (Definition 2.6). We define the *modulus* of every vertex of a tree with dynamics. The sum of moduli along branches of a tree influences the structure of the Julia set of any polynomial associated with a tree with dynamics. We give some results that allow us to estimate sums of moduli.

The trees that we consider are infinite trees with certain structural restrictions.

**Definitions 2.1.** A tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is a tree with root  $A_0$  adjoined with  $\{A_{-l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$  so that  $A_l$  is the immediate predecessor of  $A_{l+1}$  for  $l < 0$ . For a vertex  $A$  let  $A^P$  denote the parent of  $A$  and  $A^C$  denote a child of  $A$ . Define  $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{A_0\}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{l+1} = \{A \in \mathcal{T} : A^P \in \mathcal{T}_l\}$ . We require that every vertex  $a$  of tree, except for  $\{A_{-l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ , have at least two and only finitely many children. Our convention in drawing trees is that a parent is above its children; so  $A^P$  is above  $A$  and any  $A^C$  is below  $A$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree. A map  $F : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  is children preserving if for all  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  the image of a child of  $A$  is a child of  $F(A)$ . Symbolically,  $F(A^C) = F(A)^C$ . In this paper we also require that  $F : \mathcal{T}_l \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{l-1}$ .

A more complete discussion of the axioms can be found in [E]. The first axiom says that  $A$  has no more critical points inside it than its children. The second axiom says that  $F$  is locally a branched cover. For completeness sake we give all the axioms below, although Axioms D3 and D4 are not used in this paper.

**Definition 2.3.** A tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with dynamics  $F$  is a tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , a children-preserving map  $F : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ , and a function  $\deg : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ , such that:

(D1) (Monotonicity.) For all  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  we have

$$\deg A - 1 \geq \sum_{\{A^C\}} (\deg A^C - 1)$$

(D2) (Local Cover Property.) For all  $A \in \mathcal{T}$ , for each child  $F(A)^C$  of  $F(A)$  we have

$$\sum_{\{F(A^C)=F(A)^C\}} \deg A^C = \deg A,$$

(D3) There exists  $L$  such that for all  $l \geq L$  if  $A \in \mathcal{T}_l$ , then  $\deg A = \deg_A F$ , where  $\deg_A F$  is the topological degree of  $F$  at  $A$  (see [E] Def. 4.3–4.5)..

(D4) We have  $\deg A_0 = \deg A_{-l}$ , for all  $l \geq 1$ .

Since  $A_0$  has at least two children, which are mapped to  $A_0$ , it follows from (D2) that  $\deg A_0 > 1$ . Throughout this paper, let  $\deg A_0 = d$ . We say that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a tree with dynamics of degree  $d$ . We note the basic properties of a tree with dynamics.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics  $F$ . Then the following hold:

(1) The degree is monotone; for all  $A, A' \in \mathcal{T}$ , if  $A'$  is a descendant of  $A$ , then  $\deg A' \leq \deg A$ .

- (2) If  $\deg A = \deg A^C \geq 2$  for some child  $A^C$  of  $A$  and  $F(A) = V$ , then for each child  $V^C$  of  $V$  either  $F(A^C) = V^C$ , or  $A$  has exactly  $(\deg A)$  children  $A^{C_i}$  such that  $\deg A^{C_i} = 1$  and  $F(A^{C_i}) = V^C$ .

We say that  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  is *critical* if  $\deg A > 0$ . When drawing trees we denote non-critical vertices by  $\bullet$  and a vertex of degree  $D$  by  $\textcircled{D}$ .




FIGURE 1. A tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with dynamics  $F$ . For clarity most of the dynamics from level 3 are not shown.

**Definitions 2.5.** A branch of  $\mathcal{T}$  is a sequence  $B = (B_l)_{l=0}^\infty$ , where  $B_l \in \mathcal{T}_l$  and  $B_{l+1}$  is a child of  $B_l$  for all  $l$ . Note that a children preserving map takes branches to branches, so  $F(B)$  is well defined. We define the degree of a branch  $B = (B_l)_{l=0}^\infty$ , by  $\deg B = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \deg B_l$ . If  $\deg B > 1$ , then  $B$  is called a critical branch.

For a tree with dynamics of a polynomial, a branch corresponds to a connected component of the filled Julia set of the polynomial; with a critical branch corresponding to the component of a persistent critical point.

**Definition 2.6.** For  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  define the first return time of  $A$ ,  $\nu_1(A)$ , as the least positive integer such that  $F^{\nu_1(A)}(A)$  is critical. Define the first return map  $\Phi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  by

$$\Phi(A) = F^{\nu_1(A)}(A).$$

Notice that for all  $A \in \mathcal{T}_l$  with  $l > 0$ ,  $F^l(A) = A_0 = C_0$  and  $\deg A_0 = d > 1$ . Thus  $\nu_1(A)$  and  $\Phi(A)$  are well defined. In section 5, we examine the first return map in more detail

**Definition 2.7.** For  $A \in \mathcal{T}_l$  define the first return level of  $A$  by

$$\varphi(A) = l - \nu_1(A).$$

Equivalently,  $\Phi(A)$  is in level  $\varphi(A)$  of the tree, so  $\Phi(A) \in \mathcal{T}_{\varphi(A)}$ . A basic technical difficulty is that in general neither  $\Phi$  nor  $\varphi$  are monotone; it is easy to construct examples where a child returns above its parent. But we do have a type of Intermediate Value Property:

**Lemma 2.8** ([E] Lem. 5.11). *For a branch  $B$ , if  $l_1 < l_2$ ,  $k_1 < k_2$ , and  $\varphi(B_{l_i}) = k_i$ , then for all  $k$  with  $k_1 < k < k_2$  there exists an  $l$  such that  $l_1 < l < l_2$  and  $\varphi(B_l) = k$ .*

We define a combinatorial modulus, which is closely related to the geometric modulus of a conformal annulus, see [E] Prop 8.2.

**Definition 2.9.** *Define the modulus of vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$  by  $\text{mod } A_0 = 1$ , and for  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  recursively define*

$$\text{mod } A = (\deg A)^{-1} \text{mod } \Phi(A).$$

**Definition 2.10.** *For  $B$  a branch, define  $\text{mod } B = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \text{mod } B_l$ . If the modulus of all branches of  $\mathcal{T}$  is infinite, then we say  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies the infinite modulus condition.*

The infinite modulus condition is a purely combinatorial condition that implies that the Julia set of a polynomial is a Cantor set; it shows that the complement of the filled Julia set is an  $O_{AD}$  Riemann surface. There is a modular test to determine if a Riemann surface is  $O_{AD}$  ([AS] §IV.4) due to L. Sario. We use a variant of this test for planar  $O_{AD}$  Riemann surfaces of Branner and Hubbard ([BH] Prop. 5.5) and C. McMullen ([McM] Thm. 2.12). For the relationship between a tree with dynamics and a planar Riemann surface see [E] §3 and §9.

**Proposition 2.11** ([E] Prop. 8.2). *Any polynomial whose tree with dynamics satisfies the infinite modulus has a Julia set that is an absolute area zero Cantor set.*

If the modulus of some branch is finite, then the above test gives no information; in fact, the converse of the above proposition may well be false. For a polynomial with disconnected Julia set, the basin of attraction of infinity is a Riemann surface  $\mathcal{S}$ , which is decomposed into annuli by the dynamics ([BH] §2.4). The tree with dynamics gives a combinatorial description of  $\mathcal{S}$  ([E] §9). This proposition gives a sufficient condition for  $\mathcal{S}$  to be an  $O_{AD}$  Riemann surface (see [AS] or [SaNa]). Equivalently, it shows that  $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{C} \setminus K$  is  $O_{AD}$ , where  $K$  is the filled Julia set of a polynomial. Modular  $O_{AD}$  tests will never work in all circumstances; we can always find bad decompositions of a Riemann surface into annuli with finite total modulus ([Sa] Thm. 2). Hence, the question we must ask is: does the dynamical decomposition ever result in a bad decomposition? The answer to this question is not known. Even when the dynamical decomposition has a nest of annuli with finite total modulus, it may well be that there is another decomposition of the surface to which Proposition 2.11 applies. Thus the Julia set of a polynomial whose tree with dynamics has a branch of finite modulus may or may not be a Cantor set, additionally it may or may not have zero area. Moreover, these properties are independent ([BH] §12).

It follows from [BH] Thm. 4.3(b) that for  $\mathcal{T}$  with unique critical branch  $C$ , the modulus of  $C$  is infinite if and only if  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies the infinite modulus condition. Hence we are only concerned whether or not the modulus of  $C$  is infinite.

**Definition 2.12.** *Let  $C$  be the unique critical branch of a tree with dynamics. We call  $C$  recurrent if  $\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(C_l) = \infty$ . We call  $C$  persistently recurrent if  $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(C_l) = \infty$ .*

This definition of persistently recurrent is equivalent the one of J.-C. Yoccoz (see [B] 8.1.2). It is not hard to see that a critical branch is persistently recurrent if and only if it is recurrent and no vertex is the first return of infinitely many critical vertices. Combinatorially persistent recurrence is a mild condition; since if there is a critical vertex  $C_L$  that is the first return of infinitely many critical vertices, then by Definition 2.9 there are infinitely many vertices whose modulus is bounded below by  $\text{mod } C_L(\text{deg } C_0)^{-1} > 0$ , so the modulus of  $C$  is infinite. It is straightforward to check that if the critical branch is periodic, that is  $F^n(C) = C$  for some  $n$ , then it has finite modulus ([BH] Thm. 4.3(a)). Hence our main interest is in the case where  $C$  is aperiodic and persistently recurrent. A useful technical consequence of recurrence is that the first return map is a surjection.

**Lemma 2.13** ([E] Lem. 5.12). *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics with a unique critical branch  $C$ . If  $C$  is recurrent, then for all  $l \geq 0$  and all  $n \geq 0$  there exists  $C_k \in \Phi^{-n}(C_l)$ .*

From an observation of Yoccoz it follows that for a tree with dynamics with a unique critical branch, which is recurrent but aperiodic, every vertex of the critical branch is the first return of at least two critical vertices. The following lemma was originally proved by Branner and Hubbard ([BH] Lem. 4.6) using *tableaux*. It is straightforward to modify the proof for a tree with dynamics. Let  $\#S$  denote the cardinality of a set  $S$ .

**Lemma 2.14.** *If  $\mathcal{T}$  has a unique critical branch  $C$  and  $C$  is recurrent but aperiodic, then for all  $l$  sufficiently large*

$$\# [\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \geq 2.$$

*Additionally, if  $\text{deg } C_l = \text{deg } C_1$  for  $l \geq 2$  and  $\text{deg } A = 1$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{T} \setminus C$ , then the conclusion is true for all  $l \geq 0$ . (These additional conditions are satisfied by all tableaux, see [BH] §4.3).*

Informally we say that each  $C_l$  is *hit at least twice* by  $\Phi$ . We are interested in condition that allow us to estimate how many times vertices of  $C$  are hit. For a tree with dynamics with a unique critical branch  $C$  we obtain:

$$\text{mod } C \geq (\text{mod } C_L) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{2}{\text{deg } C} \right)^n$$

for some  $L$  sufficiently large (compare to [BH] Rem. 12.5). If  $\text{deg } C = 2$ , the series diverges, so we will always satisfy the infinite modulus condition. This corresponds to polynomials with exactly one persistent critical point (counted by multiplicity). However when  $\text{deg } C > 2$ , that is the critical point is not simple, the series might converge. Our goal is to find conditions that control the number of pre-images so as to give the right balance of hits to degree to make the series converge or diverge as desired.

### 3. FIBONACCI RETURN TIMES

We describe the meta-Fibonacci numbers that occur as return times of polynomials. In a tree with dynamics we mark certain vertices of the critical branch to form a *return chain*. Essentially this allows us to consider a “one-dimensional” system. We show that the return times of a return chain are meta-Fibonacci numbers.

These meta-Fibonacci numbers can naturally be regarded as satisfying generalized continued fraction recursion. This shows there is a relationship between the return times of polynomials and certain unimodal maps.

We define a new type of *meta-Fibonacci numbers*, by which we mean that the recursion at the  $k^{\text{th}}$  stage depends on some function of  $k$ , see [C]. The Fibonacci numbers are of course obtained by adding the previous two terms of a sequence:  $n_k = n_{k-1} + n_{k-2}$ . If we add the previous three terms we obtain the *Tribonacci numbers*. If we add the previous  $r$  terms we obtain the  *$r$ -generalized Fibonacci numbers* (“ *$r$ -bonacci numbers*”), see [Mi]. Now let  $r$  vary with  $k$ . We call the resulting sequence *variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers* (“*variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers*”). In order to describe the dynamics we need to allow the  $r(k)$  to be arbitrarily large, so we define  $n_k = 1$  for all  $k \leq 0$ . Then for all  $k \geq 1$  we can choose  $r(k) \geq 1$ , and possibly larger than  $k$ , to obtain a sequence  $(n_k)$ .

**Definitions 3.1.** Define  $n_k = 1$  for  $k \leq 0$  and let  $r : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ . For  $k \geq 1$  define

$$n_k = \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j}.$$

If  $r(k) \leq k$  for all  $k$ , we call the sequence  $(n_k)$  variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers. If we allow the possibility that  $r(k) > k$  for some  $k$ , we call the sequence  $(n_k)$  extended variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers. In either case, we say that the sequence  $(n_k)$  is generated by  $r(k)$ .

The return times of any return chain are extended variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers (Theorem 3.8). See Figure 3 for an example where the return times are the standard Fibonacci numbers 1, 2, 3 . . . . The principle behind this result is that the dynamics of the critical branch up to some time constrain the later dynamics. Particularly the dynamics of a vertex constrain the dynamics of its descendants.

**Example 3.2.** Let  $r(k) = k$  for all  $k$ . By an easy inductive argument we find,  $n_k = 2^{k-1}$ . Recall, if  $N_{r,k}$  is the  $k^{\text{th}}$   $r$ -bonacci number, then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} N_{r,k+1}/N_{r,k} = \alpha_r$ , where  $1 < \alpha_r < 2$  [Mi].

**Example 3.3.** Let  $(q_i)$  be a sequence of integers satisfying the continued fraction recursion:  $q_1 = 1$ ,  $q_2 = a_2 > 1$  and

$$q_{i+1} = a_i q_i + q_{i-1} \quad \text{where } a_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

for  $i > 2$ . The closest return times of a circle rotation and the convergents of the continued fraction expansion of an irrational number are well-known to satisfy this type of recursion (see for instance [MS]). We define a sequence of variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers  $(n_k)$ , which has a strictly increasing subsequence  $(n_{k(i)})$  such that  $q_i = n_{k(i)}$  as follows. Let  $n_1 = n_{k(1)} = 1 = q_1$ . Inductively assume that we have defined  $n_{k(1)}, \dots, n_{k(i)}$ , such that  $q_j = n_{k(j)}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, i$  and if  $k(j) \leq k < k(j+1)$ , then  $n_k = n_{k(j)}$ . Let  $r(k) = 1$  for  $k = k(i) + 1, \dots, k(i) + a_i - 1$ ; so  $n_k = n_{k(i)}$  for  $k = k(i), \dots, k(i) + a_i - 1$ . Let  $K = k(i) + a_i$  and  $r(K) = 1 + a_i$ , so  $n_K = \sum_{j=1}^{1+a_i} n_{K-j} = a_i n_{k(i)} + n_{k(i)-1} = a_i n_{k(i)} + n_{k(i-1)}$ . Let  $n_{k(i+1)} = N_K$ , then  $n_{k(i+1)} = q_{i+1}$ . Note that the  $n_{k(i)}$  are the canonical strictly increasing subsequence of  $(n_k)$  defined by:  $k(1) = 1$  and  $k(i)$  is least such that  $n_{k(i)} > n_{k(i-1)}$ .

Call a unimodal map *linearizable* if it is topologically conjugate to a rotation of the circle. The above result shows we can consider the return times of a linearizable

unimodal map as a special case of variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers. Since every  $S$ -unimodal map is linearizable and topologically conjugate to a polynomial of the form  $x^{2d} + c$  ([MS]), it is not surprising that their return times are related to the return times of more general polynomials.

We want to estimate the number of hits by the first return map, so we will use the first return map to decompose the critical branch. We introduce a simple combinatorial object, a *return chain*. It is closely related to the *critical staircase* of a tableau ([BH] p. 265). It is also a special case of a  $\varphi$ -chain ([E] Def. 6.1).

**Definitions 3.4.** *Let  $C$  be a recurrent critical branch. A return chain is a sequence  $(C_{l(k)})_{k=0}^\infty$  of vertices of  $C$  such that  $C_{l(0)} = C_0$  and for all  $k \geq 1$*

$$\Phi(C_{l(k)}) = C_{l(k-1)}.$$

*A return chain is called (eventually) minimal if for all  $k$  (sufficiently large)  $l(k)$  is the least index of any vertex in  $\Phi^{-1}(C_{l(k-1)}) \cap C$ . Define the return times  $(n_k)$  of a return chain by*

$$n_k = \nu_1(C_{l(k)})$$

*for  $k \geq 0$  and  $n_k = 1$  for  $k < 0$  (note that  $\nu_1(A_k) = 1$  for all  $k \leq 0$ ).*




FIGURE 2. A critical branch with a return chain marked.

In a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with dynamics with a unique critical branch that is recurrent, there is a eventually minimal return chain containing any critical vertex of  $\mathcal{T}$ . We can construct the return chain as follows: Pick  $C_L$  with  $L \geq 0$ . Since  $F^L(C_L) = C_0$ , we have  $\Phi^N(C_L) = C_0$  for some  $N$ . For  $k = 0, \dots, N$  let  $C_{l(k)} = \Phi^{N-k}(C_L)$ . We do not necessarily satisfy the minimality condition for  $C_{l(0)}$  to  $C_{l(N)}$ . Recursively, for  $k \geq N$ ,  $C_{l(k)}$  is the first return of at least one critical vertex by Lemma 2.13. Choose the critical vertex in  $\Phi^{-1}(C_{l(k)})$  with least index and call it  $C_{l(k+1)}$ . For  $k > N$  we do satisfy the minimality condition.

We note some basic properties of return chains. The proofs follow from the definitions and easy inductive arguments.

**Lemma 3.5.** *For any  $k \geq 1$  and any  $s$  with  $1 \leq s \leq k - 1$ , the following hold.*

$$(1) \quad l(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n_{k-j} = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i.$$

$$(2) \quad l(k) - \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} n_{k-j} = l(k-s).$$

$$(3) \quad \Phi^s(C_{l(k)}) = C_{l(k-s)}.$$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics and let  $A \in \mathcal{T}_1$ , then  $\nu_1(A) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.4 we know that  $A_0$  is the only vertex at level 0 of the tree. Thus,  $F(A) = A_0$  and 1 is certainly the least such iterate.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.** *If  $(C_{l(k)})$  is a minimal return chain with return times  $(n_k)$ , then  $C_{l(1)} = C_1$  and  $n_1 = 1$ .*

We now state our main theorem.

**Theorem 3.8.** *The return times of any return chain are extended variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers.*

Before we prove Theorem 3.8, we discuss some of its consequences.

In some sense,  $r(k)$  measures how “close” a recurrent branch is to being periodic: The smaller  $r(k)$  is, the “closer” the branch is to being periodic. Note that  $r(k)$  is eventually 1 if and only if  $C$  is periodic. Branches with small  $r(k)$  share properties with periodic branches. Roughly,  $r(k)$  controls how many times a critical vertex is hit by  $\Phi$ , large  $r(k)$  causes many hits, small  $r(k)$  causes few hits, see Propositions 5.2 and 5.3. This in turn controls the modulus of  $C$ ; many hits means a large modulus and few hits mean a small modulus, see Propositions 5.6 and 5.7 (recall, the modulus of a periodic critical branch is finite).

Theorem 3.8 applies to polynomials with several persistent critical points, but it is not necessarily useful. It says that if  $\{\omega_i\}$  are persistent critical points of a polynomial, and we consider closest returns of some  $\omega_i$  near *itself*, these return times are variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers. However, the more natural return times to consider are returns of  $\omega_i$  near *any*  $\omega_j$ . The results of this paper do not apply directly to these more general type of return times. However, it seems that it should be possible to generalize the results in this section to polynomials with several persistent critical points.

The return times  $(n_k)$  are not just combinatorial, they are a type of closest return times. For real polynomials of the form  $f(x) = x^{2d} + c$  we have  $|f^{n_k}(0)| < |f^n(0)|$  for all  $1 \leq n < n_k$ , see [LM]. For a complex polynomial  $P$  with disconnected Julia set and a unique persistent critical point  $\omega$  we can canonically define a sequence of annuli  $(A_i)$  such that for all  $i$ :  $\omega$  is nested inside  $A_i$  and  $A_{i+1}$  is nested inside  $A_i$ , (these are the *critical annuli*, see [BH] p. 241). In some sense, points in  $A_{i+1}$  are “closer” to  $\omega$  than points in  $A_i$ . We define the closest return times of  $\omega$  by marking return times and annuli. We let  $A(1) = A_0$  and recursively define  $n_k$  as the least positive integer such that

$$P^{n_k}(A_i) = A(k) \quad \text{for some } i.$$

Finally, let  $A(k+1) = A_i$  and continue the recursion.

We now give a sequence of results leading to the proof of Theorem 3.8. First we consider the first return time  $\nu_1$ . We describe its basic behavior; as we move from parent to child,  $\nu_1$  is non-decreasing.

**Lemma 3.9.** *If  $A, A' \in \mathcal{T}$  with  $A'$  a descendant of  $A$ , then  $\nu_1(A) \leq \nu_1(A')$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $A \in \mathcal{T}$ , by Lemma 2.4.1  $\deg A \geq \deg A^C$ , so if  $A^C$  is critical, then so is  $A$ . We can apply this principle to  $F^{\nu_1(A)}(A)$ . The lemma follows by induction.  $\square$

In particular, for any branch  $B = (B_l)_{l=0}^\infty$ : if  $l \leq k$ , then  $\nu_1(B_l) \leq \nu_1(B_k)$ .

If we iterate a vertex fewer times than its first return time, then the first return time is an additive function.

**Lemma 3.10.** *For any  $A \in \mathcal{T}$ , if  $0 \leq n < \nu_1(A)$ , then*

$$\nu_1(A) = n + \nu_1(F^n(A)).$$

*Proof.* Since  $F^{\nu_1(A)}(A) = F^{\nu_1(A)-n}(F^n(A))$ , we have  $\nu_1(A) - n = \nu_1(F^n(A))$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.11.** *Let  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $R \geq 1$ . Define  $\nu_R(A)$ , the  $R^{\text{th}}$  return time of  $A$ , so that*

$$F^{\nu_R(A)}(A) = \Phi^R(A) = \Phi(F^{\nu_{R-1}(A)}(A)).$$

Combinatorially  $\nu_R$  is well behaved.

**Lemma 3.12.** *If  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $R, S \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , then*

$$\nu_{R+S}(A) = \nu_R(A) + \nu_S(\Phi^R(A)).$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\nu_{R+S}(A)}(A) &= \Phi^{R+S}(A) \\ F^{\nu_{R+S}(A)-\nu_R(A)}(F^{\nu_R(A)}(A)) &= \Phi^S(\Phi^R(A)) \\ F^{\nu_{R+S}(A)-\nu_R(A)}(\Phi^R(A)) &= F^{\nu_S(\Phi^R(A))}(\Phi^R(A)) \end{aligned}$$

therefore,  $\nu_{R+S}(A) - \nu_R(A) = \nu_S(\Phi^R(A))$ .

$\square$

Any return time of  $A$  is the sum of first return times of iterates of  $A$  under  $\Phi$ .

**Corollary 3.13.** *For any  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  and any  $R \geq 1$ ,*

$$\nu_R(A) = \sum_{j=0}^{R-1} \nu_1(\Phi^j(A)).$$

*Proof.* We will use induction on  $R$ . If  $R = 1$ , the result is trivial. For  $R > 1$ , by Lemma 3.12 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_R(A) &= \nu_1(A) + \nu_{R-1}(\Phi(A)) \\
&= \nu_1(A) + \sum_{k=0}^{R-2} \nu_1(\Phi^k(\Phi(A))) \quad \text{by induction,} \\
&= \nu_1(A) + \sum_{k=0}^{R-2} \nu_1(\Phi^{k+1}(A)) \\
&= \nu_1(\Phi^0(A)) + \sum_{j=1}^{R-1} \nu_1(\Phi^j(A))
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let  $A, A' \in \mathcal{T}$  with  $A'$  a descendant of  $A$ . The first return time of  $A'$  is some return time of  $A$ ; that is for some  $R \geq 1$*

$$\nu_1(A') = \nu_R(A).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\nu = \nu_1(A')$ , so  $F^\nu(A')$  is critical. By monotonicity (Lemma 2.4.1)  $F^\nu(A)$  is also critical. That is,  $F^\nu(A)$  is some return of  $A$ . Thus,  $\nu = \nu_R(A)$  for some  $R \geq 1$ . □

**Proposition 3.15.** *Let  $A, A' \in \mathcal{T}$ . If  $A'$  is a descendant of  $A$ , then*

$$\nu_1(A') = \sum_{j=0}^R \nu_1(\Phi^j(A)).$$

for some  $R \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.14 we can say that  $\nu_1(A') = \nu_{R+1}(A)$  for some  $R \geq 0$ . By Corollary 3.13,  $\nu_{R+1}(A)$  is the sum of the first return times of iterates of  $A$  under  $\Phi$ . □

We are now ready to show that the return times of a return chain are variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers.

*Proof of Theorem 3.8.* Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a return chain. Fix  $k$  and apply Proposition 3.15 with  $A = C_{l(k-1)}$  and  $A' = C_{l(k)}$ , to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) &= \sum_{j=0}^R \nu_1(\Phi^j(C_{l(k-1)})) && \text{for some } R = R(k) \geq 0, \\
\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) &= \sum_{j=1}^{R+1} \nu_1(C_{l(k-j)}) && \text{since } \Phi^j(C_{l(i)}) = C_{l(i-j)}, \\
n_k &= \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} && \text{since } \nu_1(C_{l(i)}) = n_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $r(k) = R + 1$ . Note that it is possible that  $r(k) > k$  for some  $k$ . □

**Remark 3.16.** *The term “Fibonacci polynomial” seems inappropriate for the example of Branner and Hubbard ([BH] § 12.3) and its relatives, since as we have just shown, all polynomials with disconnected Julia set are in some sense Fibonacci polynomials.*

#### 4. CONDITIONS ON RETURN TIMES

In this section, we give some conditions on trees with dynamics. The conditions we give should be thought of as restrictions on the dynamics of critical points. These conditions have two main purposes. They allow us to estimate the modulus of the critical branch, see §5. They also lead to conditions the types of variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers can occur as return times. Many of the conditions on return times are sufficient for realization, see §6.

The first condition, that a return chain is *simple*, essentially says that the dynamics of a persistent critical point are not too complicated. The other conditions we give are restrictions on the escaping critical points. The *uniform escape condition* says that all the escaping critical points escape together. The *simple escape condition* says that there is only one escaping critical point, counted by multiplicity. The return times of polynomials that satisfy the simple escape condition are strictly more limited than the return times of polynomials that do not satisfy the condition.

We begin by describing the partition of a critical branch given by a return chain.

**Definition 4.1.** *Let  $C$  be a critical branch and  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a return chain. Define  $(S_k)$  the return segments of  $(C_{l(k)})$  by*

$$S_k = \{C_l : l(k-1) < l \leq l(k)\}.$$

For any recurrent  $C$ , we have  $C = \bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} S_k$ .

A return chain is a partition of the critical branch obtained by using  $\Phi$ ; we mark a vertex and then use  $\Phi^{-1}$  to define the next marked vertex. An alternative partition could be defined using  $\nu_1$ ; mark a vertex and then mark the first vertex below it where  $\nu_1$  increases. The following definition says that these two methods of decomposition are compatible.

**Definitions 4.2.** *We say a collection of return segments  $(S_k)$  are simple if for all  $k$ ,  $C_l \in S_k$  implies that  $\nu_1(C_l) = n_k$ . We say a return chain is simple if the return segments it defines are.*

Simple return chains have three main purposes in this paper. We can sometimes estimate the modulus of a critical branch that is partitioned into one. Combined with another condition, they give a necessary and sufficient condition for a sequence of variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers to be realizable as return times of a polynomial. Finally, simple return chains are easy to construct, see §6.

In a simple return chain,  $\Phi$  is one-to-one on every segment.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $(S_k)$  be a set of simple return segments of a critical branch  $C$ . For any  $k$ ,  $\Phi|_{S_k}$  is one-to-one.*

*Proof.* Fix  $k$  and let  $C_l \in S_k$ . Since the  $S_k$  are simple, we have  $\nu_1(C_l) = n_k$ . Thus

$$\varphi(C_l) = l - n_k,$$

which is a one-to-one function of  $l$  since  $n_k$  is fixed. The lemma follows. □

A consequence of the above lemma is that for simple return chains,  $r(k)$  tells us roughly how many previous segments  $S_k$  covers under  $\Phi$ . Thus, for a critical branch that is partitioned into simple return segments, we can estimate the modulus using  $r(k)$ , see Propositions 5.2 and 5.3. The argument we use is rather delicate, and cannot obviously be generalized. Certainly there are return chains that are not simple. In fact, it is easy to construct a tree with dynamics so that  $\nu_1$  increases an arbitrarily large number of times in some return segment  $S_k$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *If  $(C_{l(k)})$  is a simple return chain, then it is minimal.*

*Proof.* Fix  $k \geq 0$ , we will show that  $l(k+1)$  is the least index such that  $\Phi(C_l) = C_{l(k)}$ . For  $l = 1, \dots, l(k)$ ,  $\Phi(C_l) \neq C_{l(k)}$ , since  $C_l$  is above (or equal to)  $C_{l(k)}$ . From Lemma 4.3 we know  $\Phi|_{S_{k+1}}$  is one-to-one. By definition,  $\Phi(C_{l(k+1)}) = C_{l(k)}$ . So no other vertex of  $S_{k+1}$  is mapped to  $C_{l(k)}$ ; that is  $\Phi(C_l) \neq C_{l(k)}$  for  $l = l(k) + 1, \dots, l(k+1) - 1$ . Therefore,  $l(k+1)$  is the least index.  $\square$

We now restrict the types of escaping critical point that we will consider. Analyzing the behavior of polynomials with multiple critical points is difficult, even multiple critical points that escape to infinity. So will restrict ourselves to polynomials with essentially one escaping critical point. The following definition expresses this property in terms of the tree with dynamics.

**Definition 4.5.** *We say that  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies the uniform escape condition if*

- (1) *If  $A \notin C$  for some critical branch  $C$ , then  $\deg A = 1$ .*
- (2) *For any critical branch  $C = (C_l)$ , we have  $\deg C_l = \deg C_1$  for all  $l > 1$ .*

We note which polynomials the above condition applies to.

**Definition 4.6.** *Let  $P$  be a polynomial. Let  $\Omega_0(P)$  denote the persistent critical points of  $P$ . Let  $\Omega_\infty(P)$  denote the critical points of  $P$  that escape to infinity under iteration.*

The tree with dynamics of a polynomial  $P$  satisfies the uniform escape condition if and only if for all  $\omega_i, \omega_j \in \Omega_\infty(P)$

$$G_P(\omega_i) = G_P(\omega_j),$$

where  $G_P$  is *Green's function* of  $P$ . The most natural example of a polynomial satisfying this condition is when  $\Omega_\infty(P)$  contains a single critical point. Since we only consider polynomials with a single persistent critical point, we should think of polynomials  $P$  such that:

$$P'(z) = (z - \omega_0)^{m_0} (z - \omega_1)^{m_1} \quad \text{some } m_0, m_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+,$$

where  $\omega_0 \in \Omega_0(P)$  and  $\omega_1 \in \Omega_\infty(P)$ . The tree with dynamics of such a  $P$  has a unique critical branch and satisfies the uniform escape condition.

There is a necessary condition on the return times of a simple return chain from a tree with dynamics that satisfies the uniform escape condition.

**Definition 4.7.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be a sequence of variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers generated by  $r(k)$ . We say the  $(n_k)$  satisfy the growth condition if whenever  $2 \leq r(k) < k$ , then*

$$n_{k-r(k)+1} > n_{k-r(k)}.$$

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics that satisfies the uniform escape condition and has a unique critical branch  $C$ . If  $(C_{l(k)})$  is a simple return chain of  $C$ , then the return times of  $(C_{l(k)})$  satisfy the growth condition.*

The growth condition generalizes a dynamical property of unimodal maps. Recall, a unimodal map is *linearizable* if it is conjugate to a rotation of the circle. Hence, the closest return times  $(q_i)$  of linearizable unimodal map satisfy the continued fraction recursion  $q_1 = 1$ ,  $q_2 = a_2 > 1$  and

$$q_{i+1} = a_i q_i + q_{i-1} \quad \text{for some } a_i \geq 1.$$

We can replace  $(n_k)$  with a strictly increasing sequence  $(n_{k(i)})$  by setting  $n_{k(1)} = n_1$  and choosing  $k(i)$  least such that  $n_{k(i)} > n_{k(i-1)}$ , see Example 3.3. If we let  $a_i = \#\{n_k : n_k = n_{k(i)}\}$ , then Proposition 4.8 implies the  $(n_{k(i)})$  satisfy a *generalized continued fraction recursion*:

$$n_{k(i+1)} = a_i n_{k(i)} + a_{i-1} n_{k(i-1)} + \cdots + a_{i-R(i)+1} n_{k(i-R(i)+1)} + n_{k(i-R(i))}$$

for some  $R(i) \geq 2$ . By Theorem 6.1, all sequences of variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers that satisfy the growth condition occur as the return times of a polynomial. Therefore, in terms of return times, the dynamics of polynomials are strictly more general than those of linearizable unimodal maps.

We now start proving the results we need to prove Proposition 4.8. The following lemma is Tableau Axiom  $c$  ([BH] Prop. 4.1c) translated into the language of a tree with dynamics.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics  $F$ , which has a unique critical branch  $C$ . Let  $\deg C_l = \deg C_k$  for  $0 < l < k$ . Let  $C_l$  be a  $C_l^C$  be a non-critical child of  $C_l$ . If  $\nu_1(C_l) = \nu_1(C_k)$ , then  $\nu_1(C_l^C) \geq \nu_1(C_l) + \nu_1(\Phi(C_l))$ .*

*Proof.* First note that  $\deg C_l = \deg C_{l+1}$ . Lemma 3.9 implies  $\nu_1(C_l) \leq \nu_1(C_{l+1}) \leq \nu_1(C_k)$ , so by assumption  $\nu_1(C_l) = \nu_1(C_{l+1})$ . Let  $N = \nu_1(C_l)$ . By Lemma 2.4.2  $F(C_l^C) \neq F(C_{l+1})$ . We can apply this argument inductively to  $F^n(C)$ ,  $F^n(C_l^C)$  and  $F^n(C_{l+1})$  with  $1 \leq n \leq N$ , to conclude that  $F^N(C_l^C) \neq F^N(C_{l+1})$ . Therefore  $\nu_1(C_l^C) \geq \nu_1(C_l) + \nu_1(\Phi(C_l))$  by Lemma 3.10.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics with a unique critical branch which satisfies the uniform escape condition. Let  $A, A^C \in \mathcal{T}$  with  $A^C$  a child of  $A$ . If*

$$\nu_1(A^C) = \sum_{j=0}^R \nu_1(\Phi^j(A))$$

for some  $R \geq 1$  and  $\Phi^R(A)$  is below  $A_0$ , then

$$\nu_1(\Phi^{R-1}(A)) > \nu_1(\Phi^R(A)).$$

*Proof.* Referring to Figure 4 will make this proof easier to follow. The dynamics go up the tree, so  $\Phi^{R-1}(A)$  is a descendant of  $\Phi^R(A)$ . Hence, by Lemma 3.9,  $\nu_1(\Phi^{R-1}(A)) \geq \nu_1(\Phi^R(A))$ , so we need only show that  $\nu_1(\Phi^{R-1}(A)) \neq \nu_1(\Phi^R(A))$ . Let  $N = \nu_1(A^C) - \nu_1(\Phi^R(A))$ , then  $N < \nu_1(A^C)$ . By Lemma 3.10  $\nu_1(F^N(A^C)) = \nu_1(\Phi^R(A))$ . Since  $F$  is a children-preserving map,  $F^N(A^C)$  is a child of  $F^N(A) = \Phi^R(A)$ . If  $\nu_1(\Phi^R(A)) = \nu_1(\Phi^{R-1}(A))$ , we could apply Lemma 4.9 to get the contradiction

$$\nu_1(F^N(A^C)) > \nu_1(\Phi^R(A)).$$

Therefore,  $\nu_1(\Phi^R(A)) \neq \nu_1(\Phi^{R-1}(A))$ .  $\square$

Proposition 4.10 is closely related to a result of Branner and Hubbard ([BH] proof of Thm. 4.3). The essence of both results is that when the return time increases, the increase must be large.




FIGURE 3. The returns of  $A$  and  $A^C$  from Proposition 4.8.

For the return times of a simple return chain, Proposition 4.10 implies they satisfy the growth condition.

*Proof of Theorem 4.8.* Fix  $k$  such that  $1 < r(k) \leq k$ . Let  $L = 1 + l(k-1)$ . Since the return chain is simple  $\nu_1(C_L) = \nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ . Since  $r(k) > 1$  we have  $n_k > n_{k-1}$ . So

$$n_k = \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j}$$

$$\nu_1(C_L) = \sum_{i=0}^{r(k)-1} \nu_1(\Phi^i(C_{l(k-1)}))$$

Apply Proposition 4.8 with  $A = C_{l(k-1)}$  and  $A^C = C_L$  to get

$$\nu_1(\Phi^{r(k)-2}(C_{l(k-1)})) > \nu_1(\Phi^{r(k)-1}(C_{l(k-1)})).$$

That is,

$$n_{k-r(k)-1} > n_{k-r(k)},$$

since  $\Phi^i(C_{l(j)}) = C_{l(j-i)}$  by Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

Simple return chains satisfy another necessary condition, their return times are not *extended* variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers.

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a return chain. For any  $k \geq 1$*

$$\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) \leq \sum_{j=0}^k n_{k-j}.$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + l(k) - \sum_{j=0}^k n_{k-j} &= 1 + l(k) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n_{k-j} - n_0 \\ &= 1 - n_0 \quad \text{by Lemma 2,} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus if we let  $N = \sum_{j=0}^k n_{k-j}$ , then  $F^N(C_{1+l(k)}) = C_0$ . Therefore,  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) \leq N$ . □

**Proposition 4.12.** *If  $(C_{l(k)})$  is a simple return chain, then  $r(k) \leq k$  for all  $k > 0$ . That is, the return times  $(n_k)$  are not extended variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers.*

*Proof.* Fix  $k > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} n_k &= \nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) && \text{since the return chain is simple,} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n_{k-1-j} && \text{by Lemma 4.11,} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k n_{k-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $r(k) \leq k$ . □

Finally, we give another condition on the escaping critical points: that there in only one of them, counted by multiplicity. Surprisingly, this condition shows leads to restrictions on the returns of persistent critical points. The author is not aware of any other instance where the dynamics of escaping critical points of a polynomial have been shown to influence the dynamics of persistent critical points. This condition was inspired by the work of D. Harris on tableaux [Ha].

**Definition 4.13.** *We say a tree with dynamics satisfies the simple escape condition, if for some child  $A_0^C$  of  $A_0$  we have*

$$\deg A_0 = 1 + \deg A_0^C.$$

For a polynomial, the simple escape condition means that exactly one critical point, counted by multiplicity, escapes to infinity. So a polynomial  $P$  that satisfies the simple escape condition and exactly one persistent critical point satisfies

$$P'(z) = (z - \omega_0)^m (z - \omega_1) \quad \text{for some } m \geq 1,$$

where  $\omega_0 \in \Omega_0(P)$  and  $\omega_1 \in \Omega_\infty(P)$ .




FIGURE 4. A tree with dynamics satisfying simple escape condition and one with a non-simple escape.

**Lemma 4.14.** *Suppose we satisfy the simple escape condition,  $\nu_1(C_2) > 1$ , and  $\deg C_1 = \deg C_2$ . If  $C_1^C$  is any non-critical child of  $C_1$ , then*

$$\nu_1(C_1^C) = 1.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.4  $A_0 = C_0$  has exactly  $\deg A_0$  children, counted by degree. Since  $\deg A_0 = 1 + \deg C_1$ , the children of  $A_0$  are precisely  $A_1$  and  $C_1$ , where  $\deg A_1 = 1$ . Now  $F$  maps  $C_2$  to either  $C_1$  or  $A_1$ , but since  $\nu_1(C_2) > 1$ , we have  $F(C_2) = A_1$ . Again by Lemma 2.4 counted by degree,  $C_1$  has exactly  $\deg C_1$  children mapped to every child of  $F(C_1) = A_0$ . Since  $\deg C_2 = \deg C_1$ , no other child of  $C_1$  can map to  $A_1$ , thus all of the  $\deg C_1$  other children  $C_1^C$  of  $C_1$  are non-critical and

$$F(C_1^C) = C_1.$$

□

The following lemma is Tableau Axiom  $d$ , see [Ha], translated into the language of a tree with dynamics.

**Corollary 4.15** (Tableau Axiom  $d$ ). *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics  $F$  satisfying the simple escape condition. Let  $C$  be a critical branch of  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\nu_1(C_2) > 1$  and  $\deg A_0 = 1 + \deg C_1 = 1 + \deg C_2$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $A^C$  be some child of  $A$ . If  $F^n(A) = C_1$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , then either  $F^n(A^C) = C_2$  or  $F^{n+1}(A^C) = C_1$ .*

*Proof.* Certainly  $F^n(A^C)$  is some child of  $C_1$ . If it is  $C_2$  we are done. Otherwise, since  $\deg C_1 = \deg C_2$ , by Definition 2.3.1 we know that  $C_2$  is the only non-critical child of  $C_1$ . So Lemma 4.14 applies to  $F^n(A^C)$  and  $F^{n+1}(A^C) = F(F^n(A^C)) = C_1$ . □

**Lemma 4.16.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics satisfying the simple escape condition and  $\nu_1(C_2) > 1$ . Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a simple return chain. For all  $k > 2$ ,*

$$\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n_{k-j}.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $k > 2$ . By Lemmas 3.5.2 and 3.6 we have

$$l(k) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} n_{k-j} = n_1 = 1. \quad 1$$

Let  $N = \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} n_{k-j}$ .

$$F^N(C_{l(k)}) = \Phi^{k-1}(C_{l(k)}) = C_{l(1)} = C_1.$$

Hence by Corollary 4.15, either  $F^N(C_{1+l(k)}) = C_2$  or  $F^{N+1}(C_{1+l(k)}) = C_1$ . In the first case  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) \leq N$ , and in the second case  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) \leq N + 1$ .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) &\leq 1 + N \\ &= 1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} n_{k-j} \\ &= n_1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} n_{k-j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} n_{k-j} \end{aligned}$$

□

A tree with dynamics satisfying the simple escape condition has restrictions on its return times. This result implies that the dynamics of polynomials satisfying the simple escape are strictly more limited than those with uniform escapes.

**Proposition 4.17.** *Suppose we satisfy the simple escape condition and  $\nu_1(C_2) > 1$ . Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a simple return chain. Then  $r(k) < k$  for all  $k > 2$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $k > 2$

$$\begin{aligned} n_k &= \nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) && \text{by uniformity,} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} n_{k-1-j} && \text{by Lemma 4.16,} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_{k-j}. \end{aligned}$$

□

In fact, for simple return chains the conditions in this section are also sufficient. For a sequence of (non-extended) variable  $r$ -bonacci numbers  $(n_k)$  generated by  $r(k)$ , there is a simple return chain whose return times are  $(n_k)$  if and only if  $(n_k)$  satisfies the growth condition. For polynomials with only one escaping critical point, counted by multiplicity, the conclusion of Proposition 4.17 are sufficient. Details of the construction are in Section 6.

## 5. ESTIMATES OF MODULUS

In this section, we give a criterion to ensure that a tree with one critical branch of high degree satisfies the infinite modulus condition. Our criterion guaranties that the ratio of pre-images of critical vertices to the degree of the critical branch is greater than 1. There are two main steps in proving our criterion. First, we show that for simple return chains, the number of pre-images of a critical vertex under

$\Phi$  can be estimated from  $r(k)$ . Second, we give estimates on the modulus of the critical branch in terms of the number of pre-images of  $\Phi$ .

In general the return times of a critical branch of high degree are no larger than one of degree two, but in the cases when they are larger we can prove the modulus critical branch diverges. Specifically, the conditions are:

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  a tree with dynamics with a unique critical branch  $C$ , which is persistently recurrent. Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a simple return chain with return times  $(n_k)$  generated by  $r(k)$ .*

- (a) *If  $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} r(k) \geq \deg C$ , then  $C$  has infinite modulus.*
- (b) *If  $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} r(k) < \deg C$  and  $C$  satisfies the uniform escape condition, then  $C$  has finite modulus.*

The minimal example of a tree satisfying condition 5.1.b is given by the Fibonacci tableau ([BH] Ex. 12.4). In this example,  $r(k) = 2$  for all  $k \geq 2$ , so the  $(n_k)$  are the usual Fibonacci numbers.

The proof of Theorem 5.1 in both cases is based on a series of estimates. For the first case, we show that when  $r(k)$  is large, there are many hits by  $\Phi$  (Proposition 5.2), which in turn implies that the modulus of  $C$  is large (Proposition 5.6). The second case is similar: when  $r(k)$  is small, there are few hits by  $\Phi$  (Proposition 5.3), thus the modulus of  $C$  is finite (Proposition 5.7). It takes a fair number of preliminary results to prove Theorem 5.1. The key propositions follow.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $(S_k)$  be a simple set of return segments of  $C$ . Suppose  $r(k) \geq R$  for all  $k \geq K$ . If  $C_l \in S_k$  for some  $k \geq K$ , then*

$$\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \geq R.$$

In the opposite vein, if the  $r(k)$  are small, then no vertex is hit too many times by  $\Phi$ . This is because, the  $r(k)$  control how high in the critical branch a vertex can return.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $(S_k)$  be a simple set of return segments of  $C$ . Suppose  $r(k) \leq R$  for all  $i \geq I$ . If  $C_l \in S_k$  for some  $i \geq I$ , then*

$$\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \leq R.$$

We will now start the process of proving Propositions 5.2 and 5.3.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $(S_k)$  be a set of simple return segments. Let  $l = 1 + l(k - 1)$ , for some  $k > 0$ . Then*

$$\varphi(C_l) = 1 + l(k - r(k) - 1).$$

*Proof.* First note that  $C_l$  is the top vertex in  $S_k$ . What we show here is that  $C_l$  is sent to or above the top vertex of  $S_{k-r(k)}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(C_l) &= l - \nu_1(C_l) \\ &= l - n_k && \text{by } S_k \text{ simple,} \\ &= 1 + l(k - 1) - \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} \\ &= 1 + l(k - r(k) - 1) && \text{since } l(i) - n_i = l(i - 1). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $(S_k)$  be a set of simple return segments. For any  $k$*

$$\Phi(S_k) = \bigcup_{j=k-r(k)}^{k-1} S_j.$$

*Proof.* We will determine where the top and bottom vertices of  $S_k$  are sent by  $\Phi$ . The rest of  $S_k$  will be sent rigidly between these images. We must be careful, because  $\Phi$  does not preserve children in general. However, since  $S_k$  is simple, we have  $\Phi|_{S_k} = F^{n_k}$ . Since  $F$  is children preserving, it follows that  $F^{n_k}$  is also children preserving.

For the top return, from Lemma 5.4 we know that  $\varphi(C_{1+l(k-1)}) = 1+l(k-r(k)-1)$ . The bottom return is easy, since by definition  $\varphi(C_{l(k)}) = l(k-1)$ .

For the left inclusion, let  $C_l \in S_k$ . Since  $S_k$  is simple, we have

$$1+l(k-r(k)-1) \leq \varphi(C_l) \leq l(k-1).$$

Thus,  $\Phi(C_l) \in S_j$  for some  $j = k-r(k), \dots, k-1$ .

For the right inclusion, fix  $C_l \in S_j$  with  $j = k-r(k), \dots, k-1$ , so  $1+l(k-r(k)-1) \leq l \leq l(k-1)$ . That is,  $\varphi(C_{1+l(k-1)}) \leq l \leq \varphi(C_{l(k)})$ . We can apply the Intermediate Value Property 2.8, to find  $m$  such that

$$C_m \in S_k \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(C_m) = C_l.$$

□

We are now ready to prove Propositions 5.2 and 5.3.

*Proof of Proposition 5.2.* Say that  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} r(k) = R$ . So there is an  $K$  such that  $r(k) \geq R$  for all  $k > K$ . Fix  $l > l(K)$ , so  $C_l \in S_j$  for some  $j > K$ . By Lemma 5.5,  $C_l$  has at least one pre-image under  $\Phi$  in each of  $S_{j+1}, \dots, S_{j+R}$ . Therefore,

$$\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \geq R.$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 5.3.* Say that  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} r(k) = R$ . So there is an  $K$  such that  $r(k) \leq R$  for all  $k > K$ . Fix  $l > l(K)$ , so  $C_l \in S_k$  for some  $k > K$ . Suppose that  $j > k+R$ , then

$$\Phi(S_j) = \bigcup_{i=j-r(j)}^{j-1} S_i \subset \bigcup_{i=j-R}^{j-1} S_i.$$

Hence,  $\Phi(S_j) \cap S_k = \emptyset$ . Thus all pre-images of  $C_l$  lie in the segments  $S_{k+1}, \dots, S_{k+R}$ . By Lemma 4.3 there is at most pre-image of  $C_l$  in each of these segments. Thus,

$$\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \leq R.$$

□

We now look at the ratio of hits by  $\Phi$  to the degree of the critical branch. The number of times a critical vertex is hit by  $\Phi$  controls the modulus of the critical branch. It is relatively easy to see if there are many hits, we have infinite modulus. It takes a little more work to show that if there are few hits, then the modulus is finite. The essential idea in this section is that the modulus of the critical branch is given by the ratio of hits by  $\Phi$  to the degree of the critical branch.

If the number of first returns of critical vertices to all critical vertices is at least as large as the degree of the critical branch, then we have the infinite modulus condition. Branner and Hubbard ([BH] Thm. 12.6) proved a version of the following theorem for  $\deg C = M = 2$ .

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics with a unique critical branch  $C$  and  $C$  persistently recurrent. Let  $M \geq \deg C$ . If for some  $L$  for all  $l \geq L$  the number of critical pre-images of  $C_l$  under  $\Phi$  is at least  $M$ , then  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies the infinite modulus condition.*

If we have fewer first returns than the degree of the critical branch, then we have finite modulus. Branner and Hubbard proved this in the case when there are exactly two hits, that is when  $M = 2$ .

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics, which has a persistently recurrent critical branch  $C$ . Let  $M < \deg C$ . If there is an  $L$  such that for all  $l \geq L$  the number of critical pre-images of  $C_l$  under  $\Phi$  is no more than  $M$ , then  $C$  has finite modulus.*

We cannot assume that there are more than two hits in general. However, we give conditions that control how many hits we have. We obtain the following theorem for polynomials. This result is more general than [BH] Thm. 12.6, in that we allow the polynomial to have any number of escaping critical points.

**Theorem 5.8.** *If  $P$  is a complex polynomial with disconnected Julia set such that  $\Omega_0(P) = \{\omega\}$  and  $\omega$  is a simple critical point, then  $J(P)$  is an Cantor set with zero area if and only if the connected component of  $J(P)$  containing  $\omega$  is not periodic under  $P$ .*

The estimate in Lemma 2.14 is sharp. The Fibonacci tableau ([BH] Ex. 12.4) implies there is a tree with dynamics for which every critical vertex is the first return of precisely two critical vertices. However, we can take  $\deg C \geq 3$ , so the modulus of  $C$  is finite [BH] §12. The structure of the Julia set of such a polynomial is not understood. In particular, it is not known if the Julia set is a Cantor set, nor whether the area of the Julia set is zero. Polynomials with these combinatorics and connected Julia sets are plausible candidates to have a Julia set with positive area, see [SN].

We can use  $\Phi$  to get upper and lower bounds on the modulus of a critical vertex.

**Lemma 5.9.** *Let  $C$  be the unique critical branch of some tree with dynamics. There are positive constants  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , such that for each  $n \geq 0$  if  $C_l \in \Phi^{-n}(C_0)$ , then*

$$\alpha(\deg C)^{-n} \leq \text{mod } C_l \leq \beta(\deg C)^{-n}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $C_l \in \Phi^{-n}(C_0)$ , it follows that  $\text{mod } C_l = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} [\deg \Phi^j(C_l)]^{-1}$ . The issues here are that for some  $j$ , it may happen that  $\Phi^j(C_l) \notin C$  or  $\deg \Phi^j(C_l) > \deg C$ . This requires a critical vertex that is not in  $C$  or an  $L$  such that  $\deg C_L > \deg C$ . However, there are only finitely many vertices where one of the above situations happens, say  $k$  of them. Let  $D = \deg C$  and  $d = \deg A_0$ . Since for any  $A$  we have  $2 \leq \deg \Phi(A) \leq d$ , we can take  $\alpha = (D/d)^k$  and  $\beta = (D/2)^k$ . The lemma follows by an easy inductive argument.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.10.** *Let  $C$  be the unique critical branch of a tree with dynamics. Then for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  as above, we have*

$$\alpha \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C]}{(\deg C)^n} \leq \text{mod } C \leq \beta \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C]}{(\deg C)^n}.$$

*Proof.* First note that for all  $l \geq 0$ , we have  $F^l(C_l) = C_0$ . Hence,  $\Phi^n(C_l) = C_0$  for some  $n \geq 0$ . Thus, we can express  $\text{mod } C$  in terms of the modulus of the pre-images of  $C_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mod } C &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \text{mod } C_l \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\{C_l \in \Phi^{-n}(C_0)\}} \text{mod } C_l. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.9, for each  $n \geq 0$ , when  $C_l \in \Phi^{-n}(C_0)$ , we have

$$\alpha(\deg C)^{-n} \leq \text{mod } C_l \leq \beta(\deg C)^{-n}.$$

Thus, for each  $n \geq 0$

$$\alpha \frac{\#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C]}{(\deg C)^n} \leq \sum_{\{C_l \in \Phi^{-n}(C_0)\}} \text{mod } C_l \leq \beta \frac{\#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C]}{(\deg C)^n}.$$

The Corollary follows by summing over  $n$ . □

From this result we see  $\text{mod } C$  is finite if and only if  $\sum \#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C](\deg C)^{-n}$  is finite. So, we need to estimate the number of iterated pre-images of  $C_0$ . It turns out that if the number of pre-images of each critical vertex is large, then so is the number of iterated pre-images of  $C_0$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $C$  be persistently recurrent. If there is an  $L > 0$  such that for all  $l > L$*

$$\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \geq M,$$

*then there is a positive constant  $\gamma$  such that for all  $n \geq 0$*

$$\#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C] \geq \gamma M^n.$$

*Proof.* Since for all  $l$ ,  $F^l(C_l) = C_0$ , there is an integer  $N$  such that for  $l = 1, \dots, L$

$$\Phi^n(C_l) = C_0 \quad \text{for some } n \leq N.$$

That is,  $N$  is the maximum number of iterates of  $\Phi$  required to get any of  $C_1, \dots, C_L$  to  $C_0$ . Therefore, there is a  $\gamma > 0$  such that for  $n = 1, \dots, N + 1$

$$\#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C] \geq \gamma M^n.$$

We claim in fact, that for all  $k \geq 1$  we have  $\#[\Phi^{-(N+k)}(C_0) \cap C] \geq \gamma M^{N+k}$ . The  $k = 1$  case is true by choice of  $\gamma$ . Inductively, suppose it is true for some  $k \geq 1$ . If  $C_l \in \Phi^{-(N+k)}(C_0)$ , then  $l > L$ , by definition of  $N$ . By assumption  $\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \geq M$ . Hence,

$$\#[\Phi^{-(N+k+1)}(C_0) \cap C] \geq M \#[\Phi^{-(N+k)}(C_0) \cap C] \geq \gamma M^{N+k+1}.$$

□

We can easily modify the proof of the above lemma to obtain the opposite inequality: if the number of pre-images of each critical vertex is small, then the number of iterated pre-images of  $C_0$  is small.

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $C$  be persistently recurrent. If for all  $l > L$*

$$\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_l) \cap C] \leq M,$$

*then there is a positive constant  $\gamma'$  such that for all  $n \geq 0$*

$$\#[\Phi^{-n}(C_0) \cap C] \leq \gamma' M^n.$$

We now combine the above estimates to prove Proposition 5.6.

*Proof of Proposition 5.6.* We estimate the modulus of  $C$  and obtain a geometric series.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mod } C &\geq \alpha \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\#[\Phi^{-1}(C_0) \cap C]}{(\deg C)^n} && \text{by Corollary 5.10} \\ &\geq \alpha \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma M^n}{(\deg C)^n} && \text{by Lemma 5.11} \\ &= \alpha \gamma \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{M}{\deg C} \right)^n \\ &= \infty && \text{since } M \geq \deg C. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 5.7.* The proof of Proposition 5.7 is similar, but the geometric series converges since  $M < \deg C$ . □

## 6. REALIZATION

We now turn to the question of which sequences of variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers can be realized as the return times of a polynomial. We show that every sequence of extended variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers  $(n_k)$  with  $n_1 = 1$  that satisfy the growth condition can be realized as the closest return times of a persistent critical point of a polynomial. We construct a tree with dynamics satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1 that realizes the  $(n_k)$  as the return times of a minimal return chain. If the tree satisfies the infinite modulus condition, then it is realizable by a polynomial ([E] Thm. 9.4). If the tree does not satisfy the infinite modulus condition, we generate a tableau from the tree, which is realizable by a polynomial ([BH] Thm. 4.1).

Whether or not we can realize a sequence that violates the growth condition is a subtle question, which we do not address in this paper. We can certainly violate the condition finitely many times, by considering polynomials with several escaping critical points. However, the author does not know exact conditions on return times of a polynomial with several escaping critical points.

The results in this section show that the dynamics of polynomials with a single persistent critical point are richer than the return times of linearizable unimodal maps. We already noted in Example 3.3 that every sequence  $(q_i)$  that satisfies the continued fraction recursion can be obtained as a canonical strictly increasing subsequence of some sequence of variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers. In particular, Proposition 6.3 shows that there are complex polynomials whose return times do not

satisfy the continued fraction recursion. Thus, the set of return times that occur for linearizable unimodal maps is strictly contained in the set of return times that occur for polynomials satisfying the simple escape condition and a single persistent critical point.

Let  $(n_k)$  be a sequence of variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers with  $n_1 = 1$  that satisfy the growth condition. We construct a tree with dynamics, which has a return chain  $(C_{l(k)})$  with return times the given  $(n_k)$ . The construction proceeds one level at a time. A tree of *finite length* is a tree with root  $A_0$  such that the maximum distance from  $A_0$  is finite. We inductively construct a tree of finite length with dynamics, which has a *finite return chain* with return times  $n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}$ ; that is a set  $C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(k-1)}$  with  $\nu_1(C_{l(j)}) = n_j$  and  $\Phi(C_{l(j)}) = C_{l(j-1)}$ . We then extend the tree several times and add a critical vertex  $C_{l(k)}$  with  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ . The interested reader will find the details of this process in [E] §7.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be a sequence of extended variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers generated by  $r(k)$  with  $n_1 = 1$  that satisfy the growth condition. Then there is a polynomial with exactly one persistent critical point  $\omega$ , and the closest return times of  $\omega$  are  $(n_k)$ . Moreover, we can choose the multiplicity of  $\omega$  to be any  $m \geq 1$  and we may choose the degree of the polynomial to be any  $d \geq m + 3$ .*

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be a sequence of variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers generated by  $r(k)$ , which satisfy the growth condition and  $n_1 = 1$ . For any  $m \geq 1$ , there is a polynomial of degree  $d = m + 2$  with exactly one persistent critical point  $\omega$ , and return times of  $\omega$  are  $(n_k)$  and the multiplicity of  $\omega$  is  $m$  if and only if  $n_2 = 1$  or  $n_2 > 1$  and  $r(k) < k$  for all  $k > 2$ .*

The above results follow from the following proposition about trees with dynamics.

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be sequence of extended variable- $r$  meta-Fibonacci numbers with  $n_1 = 1$  that satisfy the growth condition. Let  $d$  and  $D$  be integers with  $d \geq D + 2$  and  $D \geq 2$ . Then there exists a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with dynamics  $F$  of degree  $d$  such that*

- (1) *There is a unique critical branch  $C$ , and  $\deg C_l = D$  for all  $l \geq 1$ .*
- (2) *There is a minimal return chain  $(C_{l(k)})$  with return times the given  $(n_k)$ .*
- (3) *For all  $A \in \mathcal{T} \setminus C$  we have  $\deg A = 1$ .*

Note that any polynomial which realizes a tree in the above proposition will have a unique persistent critical point and satisfy the uniform escape condition.

**Corollary 6.4.** *In Proposition 6.3, if  $r(k) \leq k$  for all  $k$ , then we can take  $(C_{l(k)})$  as a simple return chain.*

**Corollary 6.5.** *In Proposition 6.3, if either of the following conditions is satisfied,*

- (1)  $n_2 = 1$ ,
- (2)  $n_2 > 1$  and  $r(k) < k$  for all  $k > 2$ ,

*then we can take  $(C_{l(k)})$  as a simple return chain and  $d = D + 1$ .*

Note that Theorem 5.1 applies to a tree with dynamics constructed using the above corollaries. So it may be possible to determine certain properties of the Julia set of the corresponding polynomial.

When constructing a tree with dynamics, we have to consider finite trees. Most concepts associated an infinite tree with dynamics, such as first return, make sense for a finite tree, and we will use them without comment.

**Definition 6.6.** *A tree of length  $L$  with dynamics is a tree with levels  $\mathcal{T}_0, \dots, \mathcal{T}_L$ , which satisfies all tree axioms 2.3, except that the vertices of  $\mathcal{T}_L$  have no children. We also refer to such a tree as a tree of finite length.*

**Definition 6.7.** *Given two trees with dynamics:  $\langle \mathcal{T}, F, \deg \rangle$  of length  $L$  and  $\langle \mathcal{T}', F', \deg' \rangle$  of length  $K > L$ , we say that  $\mathcal{T}'$  is an extension of  $\mathcal{T}$  if  $\mathcal{T}_l = \mathcal{T}'_l$  for  $l = 0, \dots, L$ ,  $F'|_{\mathcal{T}} = F$  and  $\deg A = \deg' A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{T}$ .*

We will always construct extensions where we add one level to a tree. Our main concern is to extend return chains.

**Definitions 6.8.** *Let  $C$  be a critical branch of a tree with dynamics of finite length. A finite return chain is a collection of marked vertices of  $C$ ,  $C_0 = C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(K)}$ , such that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = C_{l(k-1)}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . A finite return chain  $C'_{l(0)}, \dots, C'_{l(J)}$  is called an extension of  $C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(K)}$  if  $C_{l(k)} = C'_{l(k)}$  for  $k = 0, \dots, K$ .*

In order to prove Proposition 6.3, we will construct a sequence of trees of finite length each an extension of the previous one. At each stage the tree will contain a finite return chain which realizes an initial segment of the given  $(n_k)$ . We then construct an extension of the tree which realizes the next return time  $n_k$ . The major issue in the extension is controlling the dynamics of the critical vertex we add; particularly we need to control its first return time.

The following lemma is the key step in the proof of Proposition 6.3. Suppose that we are given a sequence  $(n_k)$  that we wish to realize as return times, and we have constructed a tree with dynamics of finite length that realizes  $n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}$ . We wish to extend the tree in such a way as to realize  $n_k$ . We have to extend the tree several times, but the first extension is the most important. We need to extend in such a way that  $C_{l(k-1)}$  gets a critical child  $C_{1+l(k-1)}$  with  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)})$  compatible with  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ . In most cases, we can extend in such a way that  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) = n_k$ . We can then easily extend several times without changing the first return time of the critical vertices we add. The following lemma gives conditions when a compatible extension is possible. Note that it is always possible if  $r(k) < k$ , but if  $r(k) \geq k$ , there are restrictions. In the case when  $r(k) > k$ , we have to increase the first return time several times in several extensions.

**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $(n_k)$  be a sequence of extended variable- $r$ -bonacci numbers generated by  $r(k)$  and let  $l(i) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} n_j$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree of length  $l(k-1)$  with dynamics  $F$  of degree  $d$ . Let  $C$  be a finite critical branch of  $\mathcal{T}$  and let  $C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(k-1)}$  be a finite return chain, such that if  $n_{i+1} > n_i$ , then  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(i)}) > n_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k-2$ .*

- (1) *If  $r(k) = 1$ , then there is an extension of the tree to length  $l(k)$  with an extension of the return chain so that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ .*
- (2) *If  $1 < r(k) < k$ , then there is an extension of the tree to length  $l(k)$  with an extension of the return chain so that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ . Moreover, we can take  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) = n_k$ .*
- (3) *If  $r(k) = k$  and either  $n_2 = 1$  or  $d \geq D + 2$ , then there is an extension of the tree to length  $l(k)$  with an extension of the return chain so that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ . Moreover, we can take  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) = n_k$ .*

- (4) If  $r(k) > k$  and either  $n_2 = 1$  or  $d \geq D + 2$ , then there is an extension of the tree to length  $l(k)$  with an extension of the return chain so that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ . Moreover, we can take  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) > n_{k-1}$ .

We will defer the proof of Lemma 6.9. Assuming it is true for the moment, we are ready to prove Proposition 6.3.

*Proof of Proposition 6.3.* We will construct the first few levels of the tree explicitly and then start an inductive procedure. The tree will satisfy the following conditions at each stage of the construction: There is a unique critical branch  $C$ ,  $\deg C_0 = d$ ,  $\deg C_l = D$  for  $l \geq 1$ ,  $\deg A = 1$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{T} \setminus C$ . If  $\mathcal{T}$  is of length  $l(K)$ , then there is a finite return chain  $C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(K)}$  with return times  $n_0, \dots, n_K$ . Additionally, if  $n_{k+1} > n_k$ , then  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) > n_k$ , for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ .

Define  $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{A_0 = C_0\}$  with  $\deg A_0 = d$ . We do not need to define dynamics on  $A_0$ .

Define  $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{C_1, A^{C_1}, \dots, A^{C_{d-D}}\}$  with  $\deg C_1 = D$ ,  $\deg A^{C_i} = 1$  and  $F(A) = A_0$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{T}_1$ . By assumption  $d - D \geq 2$ , so  $C_0$  has at least two non-critical children  $A^C$  such that  $\nu_1(A^C) = 1 = n_0$ . This fact allows us to apply Proposition 6.19 to  $C_0$ . We have  $\nu_1(C_1) = 1 = n_1$  since  $r(1) = 1$  and  $n_0 = 1$ . Thus,  $C_{l(0)} = C_0$ ,  $C_{l(1)} = C_1$  is a finite return chain.




FIGURE 5. The first two levels of the tree.

Inductively assume we have constructed  $\mathcal{T}$  up to level  $l(k-1)$  with  $C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(k-1)}$  a finite return chain realizing  $n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}$ . There are 4 cases for  $r(k)$ :  $r(k) = 1$ ,  $1 < r(k) < k$ ,  $r(k) = k$  and  $r(k) > k$ . Each of these cases is covered by Lemma 6.9, so we can extend the tree to length  $l(k)$  and the return chain to  $C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(k-1)}, C_{l(k)}$ . Moreover, if  $n_k > n_{k-1}$ , that is  $r(k) > 1$ , then we can take  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) > n_{k-1}$ . □

*Proof of Corollary 6.5.* This is essentially the same as the proof of Proposition 6.3. The differences are in the definition of  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and in the inductive step. We can construct levels  $\mathcal{T}_0, \dots, \mathcal{T}_3$  explicitly. Figure 2 shows a tree of length 3 with dynamics, with  $n_1 = 1$ ,  $n_2 = 2$ ,  $d = 3$  and  $D = 2$ . By adding more non-critical vertices, we can increase  $d$  and  $D$  without changing the dynamics we have already defined. We note that  $A_0 = C_{l(0)}$  has only one critical child, thus we cannot apply

Lemma 6.17 to  $C_{l(0)}$ . But since  $r(k) < k$  for  $k > 2$ , we never need to. Therefore the inductive step of the construction goes through.  $\square$

We now give a series of results about extending a tree with dynamics with the goal of proving Lemma 6.9. The following is the basic lemma for extending a tree; we can extend a tree without making any substantial changes. In most cases we extend once to get  $\nu_1(C_{1+l(k-1)}) = n_k$  (using a more powerful lemma), and then apply the following lemma  $n_k - 1$  times to get  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_k$ .

**Lemma 6.10** ([E] Cor. 7.8). *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree of length  $L$  with dynamics  $F$  with  $A \in \mathcal{T}_L$ . There is an extension of  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $L + 1$  with  $A^C$  child of  $A$  such that  $\deg A^C = \deg A$  and  $\nu_1(A^C) = \nu_1(A)$ .*

A tree with dynamics has a second tree structure given by the dynamics. We declare there is a (directed) edge between  $A, A' \in \mathcal{T}$  if  $F(A) = A'$ . Considering paths with respect to this new tree structure makes the extension process easier to follow. We will frequently use the fact that path connectivity is a transitive relation.

**Definition 6.11.** *Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{T}$ . We say there is an  $F$ -path of length  $N$  from  $B$  to  $A$  if  $F^N(B) = A$  for some  $N \geq 1$ . We say that an  $F$ -path is clear if  $F^n(B)$  is non-critical for  $1 < n < N$ .*

It immediately follows that  $\Phi(B) = A$  if and only if there is a clear  $F$ -path from  $B$  to  $A$  and  $A$  is critical. The main purpose of  $F$ -paths is to give a geometric interpretation of the extension process. The following lemma says that an  $F$ -path from  $B$  to  $A$  can be extended to an  $F$ -path between their children.

**Lemma 6.12** ([E] Lem. 7.13). *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree of length  $L$  with dynamics  $F$ . Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{T}_L$  with a (clear)  $F$ -path of length  $N$  from  $B$  to  $A$ . If  $A^C$  is a child of  $A$ , then there is an extension of  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $L + 1$  with  $B^C$  a child of  $B$ ,  $\deg B^C = D$  for any  $D$  with  $1 \leq D \leq \deg B$ , and a (clear)  $F$ -path of length  $N$  from  $B^C$  to  $A^C$ .*

We give a series of results that provide conditions for there to be an  $F$ -path from  $B$  to  $A$ . We only consider the case where  $B$  is critical. An important technical condition is that  $B$  have at least two non-critical children  $B^C$  with an  $F$ -path from  $B^C$  to  $A^C$ . Intuitively, this means that there are two paths to our destination. So if one path becomes unusable, we can use the other one.

**Lemma 6.13.** *Let  $C = (C_l)$  be a critical branch of a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  (possibly of finite length) with dynamics  $F$ . Assume there is a (clear)  $F$ -path of length  $N$  from  $C_l$  to  $A$  such that  $\deg C_l = \deg C_{l+1}$  for some  $l \geq 1$ . If  $A^C$  is a child of  $A$  such that  $F^n(C_{l+1}) \neq A^C$ , then  $C_l$  has at least two non-critical children  $C_l^C$  such that there is a (clear)  $F$ -path of length  $N$  from  $C_l^C$  to  $A^C$ .*

*Proof.* Refer to Figure 6. We will use induction on  $N$ . For  $N = 1$ , there are  $\deg C_l \geq 2$  non-critical children  $C_l^C$  of  $C_l$  such that  $F(C_l^C) = A^C$ , by Lemma 2.4.2. For  $N > 1$ , we have  $F$  maps children onto children, so  $A^C = F(B)$ , for some child  $B$  of  $F^{N-1}(C_l)$ . Note that  $F^{N-1}(C_{l+1}) \neq B$ . Inductively, there are at least two non-critical children  $C_l^C$  of  $C_l$  such that  $F^{N-1}(C_l^C) = B$ . Hence,

$$F^N(C_l^C) = F(B) = A^C.$$

$\square$




FIGURE 6. Lemma 6.13

In the above lemma, we usually will take  $A$  critical. There are two cases for the type of children of  $A$  we want to consider: critical and non-critical. First the critical case.

**Corollary 6.14.** *Let  $C$  be a critical branch. Let  $\Phi(C_l) = C_j$  for some  $l > k \geq 0$  such that  $\deg C_l = \deg C_{l+1}$ . If  $\nu_1(C_l) < \nu_1(C_{l+1})$ , then there are at least 2 non-critical children  $C_l^c$  of  $C_l$  with a clear  $F$ -path of length  $\nu_1(C_l)$  from  $C_l^c$  to  $C_{j+1}$ .*

*Proof.* Apply Lemma 6.13 with  $A = C_j$  and  $A^c = C_{k+1}$ . □

We restate the above corollary in terms of return chains.

**Corollary 6.15.** *Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a (finite) return chain. If  $n_k < \nu_1(C_{1+l(k)})$  and  $\deg C_{l(k)} = \deg C_{1+l(k)}$  for some  $k$ , then  $C_{l(k)}$  has at least 2 non-critical children  $C_{l(k)}^c$  with  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}^c) = n_k$ .*

*Proof.* Apply Corollary 6.14 with  $C_l = C_{l(k)}$  and  $C_j = C_{l(k-1)}$ . □

We now consider the case when we want an  $F$ -path to a non-critical child.

**Corollary 6.16.** *Let  $(C_l)$  be a critical branch. Let  $\Phi(C_l) = C_k$ , and  $\deg C_l = \deg C_{l+1}$  for some  $l > k$ . If  $C_k$  has two non-critical children  $A$  and  $B$ , with  $\Phi(A) = \Phi(B)$ , then  $C_l$  has at least 2 non-critical children  $C_l^c$  with a clear  $F$ -path of length  $\nu_1(C_l) + \nu_1(A)$  from  $C_l^c$  to  $\Phi(A)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $N = \nu_1(C_l)$ . It may be that  $F^N(C_{l+1}) = B$ , that is the  $F$ -path to  $B$  is “obstructed”. However, we may assume that  $F^N(C_{l+1}) \neq A$ . There is a clear  $F$ -path of length  $N$  from  $C_l$  to  $C_k$ . By Lemma 6.13 there are two non-critical children  $C_l^c$  of  $C_l$  with a clear  $F$ -path of length  $N$  from  $C_l^c$  to  $A$ . Thus, there is an  $F$ -path from  $C_l^c$  to  $\Phi(A)$  by transitivity of paths. Since  $A$  is non-critical,  $\nu_1(C_l^c) = N + \nu_1(A) = \nu_1(C_l) + \nu_1(A)$  by Lemma 3.10, and the  $F$ -path is clear. Notice that  $\Phi(C_l^c) = \Phi(A)$ . 1

□

We now apply the above results several times to get a sequence of  $F$ -paths, which we join together to form a long  $F$ -path. Given an  $F$ -path from two non-critical children of some  $C_{l(k)}$  from a return chain, we can extend it to an  $F$ -path from non-critical children of any marked vertex  $C_{l(k+s)}$ , further down the branch.

**Lemma 6.17.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree (possibly of finite length) with dynamics that satisfies the uniform escape condition. Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a (finite) return chain with return times  $(n_k)$ . Assume that  $C_{l(k)}$  has two non-critical children  $C_{l(k)}^C$  such that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}^C) = n_k$  for some  $k \geq 1$ . If  $\deg C_{l(k+s)} = \deg C_{l(k+s-1)}$  for some  $s \geq 0$ , then  $C_{l(k+s)}$  has two non-critical children  $C_{l(k+s)}^C$  such that*

$$\nu_1(C_{l(k+s)}^C) = \sum_{j=0}^s n_{k+j}.$$

*Proof.* We will use induction on  $s$ . If  $s = 0$ , then by assumption  $C_{l(k)}$  has two non-critical children  $C_{l(k)}^C$  such that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}^C) = n_k = \sum_{j=0}^0 n_{k+j}$ . Inductively assume that  $C_{l(k+s-1)}$  has two non-critical children  $C_{l(k+s-1)}^C$  such that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k+s-1)}^C) = \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} n_{k+j}$ . By the uniform escape condition, we have that the first return of these two children is the same. We can apply Corollary 6.16, to show that  $C_{l(k+s)}$  has two non-critical children  $C_{l(k+s)}^C$  with a clear  $F$ -path from  $C_{l(k+s)}^C$  to  $\Phi(C_{l(k+s-1)}^C)$ . It follows from Lemma 3.10 that

$$\nu_1(C_{l(k+s)}^C) = \sum_{j=0}^s n_{k+j}.$$

□




FIGURE 7.

Even when  $C_0$  does not have two non-critical children, a similar result is sometimes true.

**Corollary 6.18.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree (possibly of finite length) with dynamics. Let  $(C_{l(k)})$  be a (finite) return chain with return times  $(n_k)$ . If  $n_2 = 1$ , then for any  $s \geq 0$ , then  $C_{l(s)}$  has at least two non-critical children  $C_{l(s)}^C$  such that*

$$\nu_1(C_{l(s)}^C) = \sum_{j=0}^s n_{s-j} = \sum_{j=0}^s n_j.$$

*Proof.* We will use induction on  $s$ . The inductive step is similar to the one in the above lemma, so we need only consider the case when  $s = 1$ . We know that  $C_0$  has at least one non-critical child  $C_0^C$ , by construction. Since  $n_2 = 1$ , we must have that  $F(C_2) = C_1 \neq C_0^C$ . Since  $\deg C_1 \geq 2$ ,  $C_1$  must have at least two non-critical children  $C_1^C$  with  $F(C_1^C) = C_0^C$ . Thus,  $\nu_1(C_1^C) = 2 = n_1 + n_0 = \sum_{j=0}^1 n_j$ .  $\square$

The following is the key step in the proof of Lemma 6.9. It is a partial converse to Theorem 3.8. Necessarily the return time of a child of  $C_{l(k)}$  is one of  $n_k, n_k + n_{k-1}, \dots, \sum_{j=0}^k n_{k-j}$ . The following proposition provides sufficient conditions for a particular one of these times to occur.

**Proposition 6.19.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree of length  $l(k)$  with dynamics  $F$ . Let  $C_{l(0)}, \dots, C_{l(k)}$  be a finite return chain. Let  $C_{l(k-r)}$  have two non-critical children  $C_{l(k-r)}^C$  such that  $\nu_1(C_{l(k-r)}) = n_{k-r}$  for some  $r \geq 0$ . If  $n_k > 1$ , then there is an extension of  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $1 + l(k)$  with  $C_{1+l(k)} = C_{l(k)}^C$ ,  $\deg C_{1+l(k)} = \deg C_{l(k)}$  and*

$$\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) = \sum_{j=0}^r n_{k-j}.$$

*Proof.* Apply Lemma 6.17 to  $C_{l(k-r)}$  with  $s = r - 1$ . We get a non-critical child  $C_{l(k-1)}^C$  of  $C_{l(k-1)}$  such that

$$\nu_1(C_{l(k-1)}^C) = \sum_{i=0}^s n_{k-r+i} = \sum_{j=1}^r n_{k-j}.$$

Since  $F$  sends children onto children, there is a child  $A$  of  $F(C_{l(k)})$  so that  $F^{n_k-1}(A) = C_{l(k-1)}^C$ . Since  $n_k > 1$ , we have  $\nu_1(F(C_{l(k)})) = n_k - 1$  and  $\nu_1(A) \geq n_k - 1$ . Now  $F^{n_k-1}(A) = C_{l(k-1)}^C$ , which is by definition non-critical, so  $\nu_1(A) = n_k - 1 + \nu_1(C_{l(k-1)}^C)$  by Lemma 3.10.

Apply Lemma 6.12 to  $C_{l(k)}$  and  $A$ , to get an extension with  $C_{1+l(k)} = C_{l(k)}^C$ ,  $\deg C_{1+l(k)} = \deg C_{l(k)}$  and  $F(C_{1+l(k)}) = A$ . Since  $A$  is non-critical, by Lemma 3.10 we have

$$\nu_1(C_{1+l(k)}) = 1 + \nu_1(F(C_{1+l(k)})) = n_k + \sum_{j=1}^r n_{k-j} = \sum_{j=0}^r n_{k-j}.$$

$\square$

We have now proved all the results which we need for the proof of Lemma 6.9.

*Proof of Lemma 6.9.* Case 1,  $r(k) = 1$ . Apply Lemma 6.10  $n_k$  times. Then  $\nu_1(C_{l(k)}) = n_{k-1} = n_k$ .

Case 2,  $1 < r(k) < k$ . Since  $k - r(k) > 0$ ,  $C_{l(k-r(k))} \neq C_0$ . By the growth condition,  $n_{k-r(k)} < n_{k-r(k)+1}$ . It follows from Corollary 6.15 that  $C_{l(k-r(k))}$  has

at least 2 non-critical children with return time  $n_{k-r(k)}$ . By Lemma 6.17,  $C_{l(k-2)}$  has at least two non-critical children  $C_{l(k-2)}^C$  with  $\nu_1(C_{l(k-2)}^C) = \sum_{j=2}^{r(k)} n_{k-j}$ . Use Lemma 6.12 to get an extension of  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $C_{l(k-1)}^C$  a child of  $C_{l(k-1)}$  such that  $\deg C_{l(k-1)}^C = \deg C_{l(k-1)}$  and  $F^{n_{k-1}} = C_{l(k-2)}^C$ . By Lemma 3.10 we have

$$\nu_1(C_{l(k-1)}^C) = n_{k-1} + \sum_{j=2}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} = \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j}.$$

Use Lemma 6.10  $n_k - 1$  times to complete the extension.

Case 3,  $r(k) = k$ . There are two subcases:  $d \geq D + 2$  and  $n_2 = 1$ . If  $d \geq D + 2$  and  $n_2 = 1$ , then  $C_0$  has two non-critical children with return time  $1 = n_0$ . We can proceed as in Case 2. Otherwise,  $n_2 = 1$ . Apply Corollary 6.18, to get  $C_{l(k-2)}^C$ , a non-critical child of  $C_{l(k-2)}$ , with  $\nu_1(C_{l(k-2)}^C) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} n_i$ .

Use Lemma 6.12 to get an extension of  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $C_{l(k-1)}^C$  a child of  $C_{l(k-1)}$  such that  $\deg C_{l(k-1)}^C = \deg C_{l(k-1)}$  and  $F^{n_{k-1}} = C_{l(k-2)}^C$ . By Lemma 3.10 we have

$$\nu_1(C_{l(k-1)}^C) = n_{k-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} n_i = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} n_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j}.$$

Use Lemma 6.10  $n_k - 1$  times to complete the extension.

Case 4,  $r(k) > k$ . The first extension is the same as Case 3. This gives an extension with  $\Phi(C_{1+l(k-1)}) = C_0$ . By construction,  $C_0$  has a non-critical child  $A$ . Apply Lemma 6.12  $r(k) - k - 1$  times. Each time the return time increases by 1. So we get a sequence of extensions of length  $j + l(k-1)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r(k) - k - 1$ , with a critical vertex  $C_{j+l(k-1)}$ ,  $\Phi(C_{j+l(k-1)}) = C_0$ , and

$$\nu_1(C_{j+l(k-1)}) = j + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} n_i.$$

Since we have  $n_i = 1$  for  $i < 0$ , it follows

$$n_k = \sum_{j=1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} = \sum_{j=1}^k n_{k-j} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{r(k)} n_{k-j} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} n_i + [r(k) - (k+1)].$$

Therefore  $\nu_1(C_{r(k)-k-1+l(k-1)}) = n_k$ . Use Lemma 6.10  $l(k-1)$  times to complete the extension.  $\square$

We show that every tree with dynamics constructed by Proposition 6.3 is realizable by a polynomial. We show this simply by applying existing realization results. Every tree with dynamics that satisfies the infinite modulus condition and the uniform escape condition is realizable by a polynomial ([E] Thm.s 9.4 and 10.1). It is not known if every tree with dynamics that has a branch with finite modulus is realizable. However, every tableau is realizable by a polynomial ([BH] Prop. 12.8). So we need only show a tree with dynamics with exactly one critical branch and no other critical vertices defines a tableau.

**Proposition 6.20.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with dynamics  $F$  with a unique critical branch  $C$ , such that  $\deg C_l = \deg C_1$  for all  $l > 1$  and  $\deg A = 1$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{T} \setminus C$ . Define*

a marked grid  $\{a_{m,n}\}$  by

$$a_{m,n} \text{ is critical if and only if } F^n(C_{m+n}) \in C.$$

Then  $\{a_{m,n}\}$  is a tableau.

*Proof.* There are four tableau axioms to check (see [BH] Prop. 4.1 for the first three axioms and [Ha] Prop. 2.1 for the fourth axiom in the case when we satisfy the simple escape condition). Axioms (a and b) follow from Definition 2.3.1. Axiom c was proved in Lemma 4.9. Finally, axiom d was proved as Corollary 4.15.  $\square$

**Remark 6.21.** *A tree with dynamics that satisfies the uniform escape condition, which has a unique critical branch  $C$  generates a parapattern. If  $\deg C = D$  and  $\deg A_0 = d$ , then the parapattern is of bi-degree  $(d - D + 1, D)$ , see [BH] §12.1.*

In closing we pose some further questions. Is there a sharp condition for the return times of a polynomial with exactly one persistent critical point? What are the conditions on the return times of a polynomial with multiple persistent critical points? Do the return times of polynomials with connected Julia sets also satisfy a meta-Fibonacci condition?

#### REFERENCES

- [AS] Lars V. Ahlfors and Leo Sario, *Riemann surfaces*, Princeton UP, 1960. MR 0114911 (22 #5729).
- [BH] Bodil Branner and John Hubbard, *Iteration of cubic polynomials, part II: Patterns and parapattern*, Acta Math. **169** (1992), 229–325. MR **1194004** (94d:30044).
- [BKNS] H. Bruin, G. Keller, T. Nowicki, and S. van Strien, *Wild Cantor attractors exist*, Ann. of Math. **143** (1996), no. 1, 97–130. MR **1370759** (96m:58145).
- [B] Bodil Branner, *Puzzles and para-puzzles of quadratic and cubic polynomials*, in *Complex dynamical systems* (Robert L. Devaney, ed.), Proc. Sympos. Appl. Math., vol. 49, AMS, 1994, pp. 31–67. MR 1315533.
- [Bro] Hans Brolin, *Invariant sets under iteration of rational functions*, Ark. Mat. **6** (1965), 103–144. MR 0194595 (33 #2805).
- [C] B. W. Conolly, *Meta-Fibonacci sequences*, ch. XII of *Fibonacci & Lucas Numbers, and the Golden Section* by S. Vajda, Ellis Horwood, 1989, pp. 127–138. MR **1015938** (90h:11014).
- [MS] Wellington de Melo and Sebastian van Strien, *One-dimensional dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993. MR **1239171** (95a:58035).
- [E] Nathaniel D. Emerson, *Dynamics of polynomials with disconnected Julia sets*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **9** (2003), no. 4, 801–834. MR **1975358** (2004m:37083).
- [Ha] David M. Harris, *Turning curves for critically recurrent cubic polynomials*, Nonlinearity **12** (1999), 411–418. MR **1677771** (2000a:37028).
- [HK] F. Hofbauer and G. Keller, *Some remarks on recent results about  $S$ -unimodal maps*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor. **53** (1990), 413–425. MR **1096100** (92m:58077).
- [LM] Mikhail Lyubich and John Milnor, *The Fibonacci unimodal map*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **6** (1993), no. 2, 425–457. MR **1182670** (93h:58080).
- [McM] Curtis T. McMullen, *Complex dynamics and renormalization*, Princeton UP, 1994. MR **1312365** (96b:58097).
- [Mi] E. P. Miles, Jr., *Generalized Fibonacci numbers and associated matrices*, Amer. Math. Monthly **67** (1960), no. 8, 745–752. MR 0123521 (23 #A846).
- [M] John Milnor, *On the concept of attractor*, Commun. Math. Phys. **99** (1985), 177–195. MR **0790735** (87i:58109a)
- [PM] Ricardo Pérez-Marco, *Degenerate conformal structures*, Manuscript, 1999.
- [Sa] Leo Sario, *Modular criteria on Riemann surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **20** (1953), 279–286. MR 0054726 (14,969f).
- [SaNa] Leo Sario and Mitsuru Nakai, *Classification theory of Riemann surfaces*, Springer, 1970. MR 0264064 (41 #8660).

- [SN] Sebastian van Strein and Tomasz Nowicki, *Polynomial maps with a Julia set of positive Lebesgue measure*, Stony Brook IMS preprint 94-3, 1994 (<http://www.math.sunysb.edu/>). This paper was withdrawn.

*Acknowledgements.* This paper is based in part on the author's Ph. D. thesis. I am greatly indebted to Ricardo Pérez-Marco for his guidance.

*E-mail address:* `Nathaniel.Emerson@csuci.edu`

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS, ONE UNIVERSITY DRIVE, CAMARILLO, CALIFORNIA 93012-8599

