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In the 1980’s, Bill Thurston began to study complex polynomials from a topological viewpoint.
Topological Polynomials

In the 1980’s, Bill Thurston began to study complex polynomials from a topological viewpoint.

A topological polynomial is any orientation-preserving branched cover

$$f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

with finitely many branch points.

In analogy with polynomials, we refer to the branch points as critical points, and their images as critical values.
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1. $f(M) \subset M$, and

2. $M$ contains the critical values of $f$.

**Basic Question:** Which marked topological polynomials $(f, M)$ are topologically equivalent to polynomials?
We can specify \((f, M)\) up to isotopy by drawing

1. Any tree \(T\) containing \(M\), and

2. The mapping \(f^{-1}(T) \rightarrow T\).
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Thurston Equivalence

Two marked topological polynomials are *Thurston equivalent* if there is a homeomorphism conjugating one to the other.
Theorem (W. Thurston, 1982)

Let \((f, M)\) be a marked topological polynomial. Then exactly one of the following holds:

1. \((f, M)\) is Thurston equivalent to a polynomial, which is unique up to affine conjugacy.

2. \((f, M)\) has a \textit{Thurston obstruction}.

This is an existence result only. It doesn’t tell us how to find the polynomial (in case 1) or Thurston obstruction (in case 2).
Main Result

We have developed a simple geometric algorithm that solves these problems.

Given an \((f,M)\), the algorithm produces either

1. The Hubbard tree for a polynomial equivalent to \((f,M)\), or
2. The canonical Thurston obstruction for \((f,M)\).
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Goal: The Hubbard Tree

Every polynomial $f$ (with marked set $M$) has a special tree called its **Hubbard tree**.

Any map that’s Thurston equivalent to a polynomial has a **topological Hubbard tree**.

**Idea:** Use topology to recover the topological Hubbard tree.

**Note:** Once the Hubbard tree is found, there are known algorithms (e.g. Hubbard–Schleicher) to recover the coefficients of $f$. 
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The preimage $f^{-1}(T)$ of a tree in $(\mathbb{C}, M)$ is not an allowed tree in $(\mathbb{C}, M)$.

The *lift* of $T$ is the subtree of $f^{-1}(T)$ spanned by $M$. 
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Lifting Trees

Lifting under $f$ defines a function

$$\lambda_f : \text{trees in } (\mathbb{C}, M) \rightarrow \text{trees in } (\mathbb{C}, M)$$

**Fact:** The (topological) Hubbard tree is a fixed point for $\lambda_f$.

This is because the Hubbard tree $T$ satisfies

$$T \subset f^{-1}(T).$$

**Basic Algorithm:** Iterate $\lambda_f$ and hope to hit the Hubbard tree.
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Let \( f(z) \approx z^2 - 1.755 \) be the airplane polynomial.

second lift \( T_2 \)

third lift \( T_3 \)
Iterated Lifting for the Airplane
Example: A Twisted Rabbit

This is the *rabbit polynomial* \( f(z) \approx z^2 - 0.12 + 0.74i \).
Example: A Twisted Rabbit

Composing with a Dehn twist gives a "twisted rabbit".
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
Example: A Twisted Rabbit
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It’s an airplane!
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A Complication

Unfortunately, you don’t always hit the Hubbard tree.

Theorem (BLMW 2019)

Every marked polynomial has a finite nucleus of trees that are periodic under $\lambda_f$. Iterated lifting always lands in the nucleus.

So the algorithm must include a resolution procedure to find the Hubbard tree once we land in the nucleus.
Dynamics of $\lambda_f$
The Tree Complex
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Collapsing Subforests

Let $T$ be a tree in $(\mathbb{C}, M)$, and let $e$ be an edge of $T$ whose endpoints do not both lie in $P$.

Then collapsing $e$ to a point yields another tree $T/e$ in $(\mathbb{C}, M)$.

More generally, we can collapse any subforest of $T$ as long as no pair of marked points are identified.
The tree complex has:

- One vertex for each tree in $(C, M)$, and
- A directed edge $T \rightarrow T'$ for each forest collapse.
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Any forest collapse $T \rightarrow T'$ lifts to $f^{-1}(T)$.

preimage $f^{-1}(T')$  \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{collapsed tree} \ T'

It follows that either

$$\lambda_f(T) \rightarrow \lambda_f(T') \quad \text{or} \quad \lambda_f(T) = \lambda_f(T').$$
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So $\lambda_f$ induces a non-expanding map on the tree complex. This is the *lifting map*.

**Theorem (BLMW 2019)**

If $f$ is a polynomial, then every tree in $(\mathbb{C}, M)$ is either periodic or pre-periodic under $\lambda_f$.

**Proof.**

Since the Hubbard tree $T$ is fixed and $\lambda_f$ is non-expanding, each ball in the complex centered at $T$ maps into itself. Such a ball has finitely many trees. □
The Tree Complex

So $\lambda_f$ induces a non-expanding map on the tree complex. This is the \textit{lifting map}.

**Theorem (BLMW 2019)**

If $f$ is a polynomial, then every tree in $\left(\mathbb{C}, M\right)$ is either periodic or pre-periodic under $\lambda_f$. 
The Tree Complex

So $\lambda_f$ induces a non-expanding map on the tree complex. This is the *lifting map*.

**Theorem (BLMW 2019)**

If $f$ is a polynomial, then every tree in $(\mathbb{C}, M)$ is either periodic or pre-periodic under $\lambda_f$.

**Theorem (BLMW 2019)**

Every periodic tree lies in the ball of radius 2 centered at the Hubbard tree.
Example: The Rabbit Nucleus

The nucleus for the rabbit is the 1-neighborhood of the Hubbard tree.
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The tree complex is actually the spine of a certain simplicial subdivision of Teichmüller space (discovered by Penner).
What’s Going On?

Each tree corresponds to an open simplex. Different points in the simplex correspond to different metrics on the tree.
What’s Going On?

The lifting map $\lambda_f$ seems to be a combinatorial version of Thurston’s pullback map $\sigma_f : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. 
Finding the Hubbard Tree
The Story So Far

**So far:** We can iterate lifting until we find a periodic tree.

This gets us within 2 of the Hubbard tree.

Questions

1. How do we get to the Hubbard tree itself?
2. How would we even recognize the Hubbard tree if we found it?
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Invariant Trees

A tree $T$ in $(\mathbb{C}, M)$ is invariant if $\lambda_f(T) = T$. Up to isotopy, such a tree satisfies

$$T \subset f^{-1}(T).$$

Note that periodic trees are invariant for $f^k$.

**Question**

How do we tell whether an invariant tree $T$ is the Hubbard tree?

**Answer**

By the Alexander method, it suffices for there to exist any polynomial with Hubbard tree $T$ (and corresponding preimage).
Poirier’s Conditions

Alfredo Poirier completely classified possible Hubbard trees in 1993.

Theorem (Poirier’s Conditions)
An invariant tree $T$ for $(f, M)$ is a topological Hubbard tree if and only if

1. (Angle Condition) $T$ has an invariant angle assignment, and

2. (Expanding Condition) Every forward-invariant subforest of $T$ contains a critical point.
The Angle Condition

Here is an *angle assignment* for a tree $T$. 

$T$
The Angle Condition

We can *lift* the angle assignment to $\lambda_f(T)$.

\[
\begin{align*}
T & \quad \begin{array}{c}
3/4 \\
1/4
\end{array} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
1
\end{array} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
1
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
f^{-1}(T) & \quad \begin{array}{c}
1 \\
1/8 \\
3/8
\end{array} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
1
\end{array} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
1
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_f(T) & \quad \begin{array}{c}
1 \\
5/8 \\
3/8
\end{array} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
1
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]
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An invariant tree satisfies the *angle condition* if there exists an angle assignment that lifts to itself.

Theorem (BLMW 2019)

Every invariant tree is adjacent to an invariant tree that satisfies the angle condition.
The Expanding Condition

Let $T$ be an invariant tree for $(f, M)$.

A proper, nonempty subforest $S \subset T$ is forward invariant if $f(S) \subset S$.

We say that $T$ satisfies the expanding condition if every forward invariant subforest of $T$ contains a critical point.

Theorem (BLMW 2019)
Every invariant tree that satisfies the angle condition is adjacent to the Hubbard tree.
The Algorithm

So given an \((f, M)\), the algorithm is as follows:

1. Start with any tree in \((\mathbb{C}, M)\) and iterate lifting until you find a periodic tree \(T\).

2. Check if \(T\) satisfies the angle condition. If it doesn’t, move to an adjacent tree \(T'\) that does.

3. Check if \(T'\) satisfies the expanding condition. If it doesn’t, move to an adjacent tree \(T''\) that does.

Then \(T''\) is the topological Hubbard tree.
The Obstructed Case
The Canonical Obstruction

Every obstructed \((f, M)\) has a special collection of curves called the *canonical obstruction*. 
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Pilgrim (2001) proved that the canonical obstruction is fully invariant under \(f\), and is a Thurston obstruction.
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The Canonical Obstruction

Every obstructed \((f, M)\) has a special collection of curves called the \textit{canonical obstruction}.

We call this the \textit{Hubbard bubble tree} for the obstructed map.

When \((f, M)\) is obstructed, we can use the tree lifting algorithm to find the Hubbard bubble tree.
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Normal Form

Incidentally, each bubble has:

- Points of $M$ in the interior, and
- Points on the boundary where it touches the tree.

So we can think of each bubble as a marked disk.

Maps between bubbles are homeomorphisms and branched covers that send marked points to marked points.

The Hubbard bubble tree together with these maps is a complete description of $(f, M)$ up to isotopy. We call it the normal form.
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Finding the Hubbard Bubble Tree

In general, a **bubble tree** consists of:

1. Finitely many essential curves in \((\mathbb{C}, M)\) with disjoint interiors.

2. A tree on the exterior of these curves.

Bubble trees can be obtained from trees by collapsing subforests. This defines the **augmented tree complex**.

**Theorem (BLMW 2019)**

For an obstructed \((f, M)\), the sequence of lifts eventually lands in the 2-neighborhood of the Hubbard bubble tree in the augmented complex.
The End