

ON A WEAK FORM OF WEAK QUASI-CONTINUITY

C. W. BAKER

Received 12 September 2001

A weak form of weak quasi-continuity, which we call subweak quasi-continuity, is introduced. It is shown that subweak quasi-continuity is strictly weaker than weak quasi-continuity. Subweak quasi-continuity is used to strengthen several results in the literature concerning weak quasi-continuity. Specifically, results concerning the graph, graph function, and restriction of a weakly quasi-continuous function are extended slightly. Also, a result concerning weakly quasi-continuous retractions is strengthened.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 54C10.

1. Introduction. Weakly quasi-continuous functions were introduced by Popa and Stan [9]. Recently, weak quasi-continuity has been developed further by Noiri [5, 6] and Park and Ha [8]. Due to a result by Noiri [5], weak quasi-continuity is equivalent to the weak semicontinuity developed by Arya and Bhamini [1]. The purpose of this note is to introduce the concept of subweak quasi-continuity, which we define in terms of a base for the topology on the codomain. We establish that this condition is strictly weaker than weak quasi-continuity and we use it to strengthen some of the results in the literature concerning weak quasi-continuity. For example, we show that the graph of a subweakly quasi-continuous function with a Hausdorff codomain is semiclosed. We also show that, if the graph function is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the usual base for the product space, then the function itself is weakly quasi-continuous, and that, if a function is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{B} , then the restriction to a preopen set is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the same base. These results strengthen slightly the comparable results for weakly quasi-continuous functions. Finally, we extend a result concerning weakly quasi-continuous retractions and investigate some of the basic properties of subweakly quasi-continuous functions.

2. Preliminaries. The symbols X and Y denote topological spaces with no separation axioms assumed unless explicitly stated. All sets are considered to be subsets of topological spaces. The closure and interior of a set A are signified by $\text{Cl}(A)$ and $\text{Int}(A)$, respectively. A set A is semiopen (preopen, α -open) provided that $A \subseteq \text{Cl}(\text{Int}(A))$ ($A \subseteq \text{Int}(\text{Cl}(A))$, $A \subseteq \text{Int}(\text{Cl}(\text{Int}(A)))$). A set is semiclosed (preclosed, α -closed) provided that its complement is semiopen (preopen, α -open). The collection of all semiopen sets in a space X is denoted by $\text{SO}(X)$ and the collection of all semiopen sets in X containing a fixed point x is denoted by $\text{SO}(X, x)$. The intersection of all semiclosed sets containing a set A is called the semiclosure of A and denoted by $\text{sCl}(A)$. The

semi-interior of a set A , denoted by $s\text{Int}(A)$, is the union of all semiopen sets contained in A . The preclosure of A , denoted by $p\text{Cl}(A)$, is the intersection of all preclosed sets containing A . Finally, if an operator is used with respect to a proper subspace, a subscript is added to the operator. Otherwise, it is assumed that the operator refers to the entire space.

DEFINITION 2.1 (Popa and Stan [9]). A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be weakly quasi-continuous if for every $x \in X$, every open set U in X containing x , and every open set V in Y containing $f(x)$, there exists a nonempty open set W in X such that $W \subseteq U$ and $f(W) \subseteq \text{Cl}(V)$.

DEFINITION 2.2 (Arya and Bhamini [1]). A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be weakly semicontinuous if for every $x \in X$ and every open set V in Y containing $f(x)$, there exists $U \in \text{SO}(X, x)$ for which $f(U) \subseteq \text{Cl}(V)$.

The following result by Noiri [5] shows that weak quasi-continuity and weak semicontinuity are equivalent.

THEOREM 2.3 (Noiri [5, Theorem 4.1]). *A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly quasi-continuous if and only if for every $x \in X$ and every open set V containing $f(x)$, there exists $U \in \text{SO}(X, x)$ for which $f(U) \subseteq \text{Cl}(V)$.*

DEFINITION 2.4. A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be subweakly continuous (Rose [10]) (subalmost weakly continuous (Baker [2])) if there is an open base \mathcal{B} for the topology on Y such that $\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$ ($p\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$) for every $V \in \mathcal{B}$.

3. Subweakly quasi-continuous functions. The following characterization of weak quasi-continuity is due to Noiri [5].

THEOREM 3.1 (Noiri [5, Theorem 4.3(d)]). *A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly quasi-continuous if and only if $s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$ for every open set V in Y .*

We define a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to be subweakly quasi-continuous provided that there is an open base \mathcal{B} for the topology on Y for which $s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$ for every $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Obviously, weak quasi-continuity implies subweak quasi-continuity. The following example shows that these concepts are not equivalent.

EXAMPLE 3.2. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ have the usual topology and $Y = X$ have the discrete topology. The identity mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base consisting of the singleton sets in Y . However, f is not weakly quasi-continuous because for $V = (0, 1) \cup (1, 2)$, $s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \not\subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$.

Since $s\text{Cl}(A) = A \cup \text{Int}(\text{Cl}(A))$ for every set A , we have the following characterization of subweak quasi-continuity.

THEOREM 3.3. *A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous if and only if there is an open base \mathcal{B} for the topology on Y for which $\text{Int}(\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V))) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$ for every $V \subseteq \mathcal{B}$.*

Since $s\text{Cl}(A) \subseteq \text{Cl}(A)$ for every set A , obviously, subweak continuity implies subweak quasi-continuity. The following example shows that the converse implication does not hold.

EXAMPLE 3.4. Let $X = [1/2, 3/2]$ have the usual relative topology, $Y = \{0, 1\}$ have the discrete topology, and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be the greatest integer function. Kar and Bhattacharya [3] showed that f is weakly quasi-continuous (their term is weakly semicontinuous) but not weakly continuous. Obviously, the function f is also not subweakly continuous.

The following two examples establish that subweak quasi-continuity is independent of subalmost weak continuity.

EXAMPLE 3.5. Let X be an indiscrete space with at least two elements and let $Y = X$ have the discrete topology. Since $p\text{Cl}(\{x\}) = \{x\}$ for every $x \in X$, the identity mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is subalmost weakly continuous with respect to the base consisting of the singleton sets in Y . However, since singleton sets in X are dense, f is not subweakly quasi-continuous.

EXAMPLE 3.6. Let $X = \{a, b, c\}$ have the topology $\tau = \{X, \emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{a, b\}\}$ and $Y = X$ have the discrete topology. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be the identity mapping. The function f is not subalmost weakly continuous, since any base for Y must include $V = \{a\}$ and $p\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \not\subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$. However, f is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base of singleton subsets of Y .

4. Graph related properties. Recall that the graph of a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is the subspace $G(f) = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in X\}$ of the product space $X \times Y$.

Park and Ha [8] proved that the graph of a weakly quasi-continuous function with a Hausdorff codomain is semiclosed. We show that weak quasi-continuity can be replaced by subweak quasi-continuity.

THEOREM 4.1. *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous and Y is Hausdorff, then the graph of f , $G(f)$, is semiclosed.*

PROOF. Let \mathcal{B} be an open base for Y such that $s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$ for every $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $(x, y) \in X \times Y - G(f)$. Since $y \neq f(x)$, there exists disjoint open sets V and W with $f(x) \in W$, $y \in V$, and $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $x \notin f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$, and, since $s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$, $x \notin s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V))$. Therefore $(x, y) \in (X - s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V))) \times V \subseteq X \times Y - G(f)$. Since $s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V))$ is semiclosed, $X - s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V))$ is semiopen. Since finite products of semiopen sets are semiopen, $(X - s\text{Cl}(f^{-1}(V))) \times V$ is semiopen. Finally, since unions of semiopen sets are semiopen, it follows that $X \times Y - G(f)$ is semiopen and that $G(f)$ is semiclosed. \square

COROLLARY 4.2 (Park and Ha [8, Corollary 4.2]). *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly quasi-continuous and Y is Hausdorff, then the graph of f , $G(f)$, is semiclosed.*

By the graph function of a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ we mean the function $g : X \rightarrow X \times Y$ given by $g(x) = (x, f(x))$ for every $x \in X$.

THEOREM 4.3. *Let $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be a function and let \mathcal{B} be an open base for σ . Let $\mathcal{C} = \{U \times V : U \in \tau, V \in \mathcal{B}\}$. The function f is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{B} if and only if the graph function of f , $g : X \rightarrow X \times Y$, is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{C} .*

PROOF. Assume that $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{B} for σ . Let $U \times V \in \mathcal{C}$, where $U \in \tau$ and $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $sCl(g^{-1}(U \times V)) = sCl(U \cap f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq sCl(U) \cap sCl(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq Cl(U) \cap f^{-1}(Cl(V)) = g^{-1}(Cl(U) \times Cl(V)) = g^{-1}(Cl(U \times V))$. Thus g is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{C} .

Assume that $g : (X, \tau) \rightarrow X \times Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{C} for $X \times Y$. If $V \in \mathcal{B}$, then $sCl(f^{-1}(V)) = sCl(g^{-1}(X \times V)) \subseteq g^{-1}(Cl(X \times V)) = g^{-1}(X \times Cl(V)) = f^{-1}(Cl(V))$. Therefore, f is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{B} . \square

In [Theorem 4.3](#), if we take \mathcal{B} to be σ , the topology on Y , then we have the following result.

COROLLARY 4.4. *If the graph function $g : X \rightarrow X \times Y$ of a function f is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the usual base for the product space, then the function f is weakly quasi-continuous.*

COROLLARY 4.5 (Noiri [5, The “only if” part of Theorem 6.3.4]). *If the graph function $g : X \rightarrow X \times Y$ of a function f is weakly quasi-continuous, then the function f is weakly quasi-continuous.*

5. Additional properties

DEFINITION 5.1 (Kar and Bhattacharya [4]). A space X is said to be semi- T_1 provided that for every pair of distinct points x and y in X there exist sets $U \in SO(X, x)$ and $V \in SO(X, y)$ such that $y \notin U$ and $x \notin V$.

THEOREM 5.2. *If Y is Hausdorff and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a subweakly quasi-continuous injection, then X is semi- T_1 .*

PROOF. Let x_1 and x_2 be distinct points in X and let \mathcal{B} be an open base for Y such that $sCl(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(Cl(V))$ for every $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Since Y is Hausdorff and $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$, there exist disjoint open sets U and V in Y with $f(x_1) \in U$ and $f(x_2) \in V$, and $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Then, since $f(x_1) \notin Cl(V)$, we have $x_1 \in X - f^{-1}(Cl(V)) \subseteq X - sCl(f^{-1}(V))$ which is semiopen and does not contain x_2 . Therefore X is semi- T_1 . \square

The function in [Example 3.6](#) is a subweakly quasi-continuous injection with a Hausdorff codomain and a non- T_1 -domain. Therefore, the conclusion that X is semi- T_1 in [Theorem 5.2](#) cannot be strengthened to T_1 .

Since the restriction of the function f in [Example 3.6](#) to the set $A = \{a, c\}$ is not subweakly quasi-continuous, we see that the restriction of a subweakly quasi-continuous function can fail to be subweakly quasi-continuous. Noiri [5] proved that the restriction of weakly quasi-continuous function to an open set is weakly quasi-continuous and Arya and Bhamini [1] extended this result to α -open sets. Finally, Park and Ha [8]

extended the result further to preopen sets. In what follows, we establish the analogous result for subweakly quasi-continuous functions.

THEOREM 5.3. *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{B} for Y and A is a preopen set in X , then $f|_A : A \rightarrow Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{B} .*

PROOF. Let $V \in \mathcal{B}$, then using (Noiri [7, Lemma 3.3]) we see that $sCl_A(f|_A^{-1}(V)) = A \cap sCl(f|_A^{-1}(V)) = A \cap sCl(f^{-1}(V) \cap A) \subseteq A \cap sCl(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq A \cap f^{-1}(Cl(V)) = f|_A^{-1}(Cl(V))$. Therefore, $f|_A : A \rightarrow Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous with respect to the base \mathcal{B} . \square

In [Theorem 5.3](#), if we let \mathcal{B} be the topology, then we have the following result.

COROLLARY 5.4 (Park and Ha [8, Theorem 3.8]). *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly quasi-continuous and A is an preopen set in X , then $f|_A : A \rightarrow Y$ is weakly quasi-continuous.*

THEOREM 5.5. *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is subweakly quasi-continuous and A is an open set in Y containing $f(X)$, then $f : X \rightarrow A$ is subweakly quasi-continuous.*

PROOF. Let \mathcal{B} be an open base for Y for which $sCl(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(Cl(V))$ for every $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $\mathcal{C} = \{V \cap A : V \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is an open base for the relative topology on A . Let $V \cap A \in \mathcal{C}$, where $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $sCl(f^{-1}(V \cap A)) = sCl(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(Cl(V)) = f^{-1}(Cl(V) \cap A)$. The proof is completed by establishing that $Cl(V) \cap A \subseteq Cl_A(V \cap A)$.

Let $y \in Cl(V) \cap A$ and let $W \subseteq A$ be open in A with $y \in W$. Since A is open in Y , W is open in Y . Because $y \in Cl(V)$, $W \cap V \neq \emptyset$. Therefore $W \cap (V \cap A) \neq \emptyset$, which proves that $y \in Cl_A(V \cap A)$. Thus $Cl(V) \cap A \subseteq Cl_A(V \cap A)$.

Now, it follows that $f : X \rightarrow A$ is subweakly quasi-continuous. \square

Park and Ha [8] defined a function $f : X \rightarrow A$, where $A \subseteq X$, to be a weakly quasi-continuous retraction provided that f is weakly quasi-continuous and $f|_A$ is the identity on A . It is then proved (Park and Ha [8, Theorem 3.15]) that, if $f : X \rightarrow A$ is a weakly quasi-continuous retraction and X is Hausdorff, then A is semiclosed in X . We prove the following comparable result for subweakly quasi-continuous functions.

THEOREM 5.6. *Let $A \subseteq X$ and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a subweakly quasi-continuous function such that $f(X) = A$ and $f|_A$ is the identity on A . If X is Hausdorff, then A is semiclosed.*

PROOF. Assume A is not semiclosed. Let $x \in sCl(A) - A$. Let \mathcal{B} be an open base for the topology on X such that $sCl(f^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f^{-1}(Cl(V))$ for every $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $x \notin A$, $x \neq f(x)$. Because X is Hausdorff, there exist disjoint open sets V and W such that $x \in V$, $f(x) \in W$, and $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $U \in SO(X, x)$. Then $x \in U \cap V$, which is semiopen in X (Noiri [7]). Since $x \in sCl(A)$, $(U \cap V) \cap A \neq \emptyset$. So there exists $y \in (U \cap V) \cap A$. Since $y \in A$, $f(y) = y$ and therefore $y \in f^{-1}(V)$. Thus $U \cap f^{-1}(V) \neq \emptyset$ and we see that $x \in sCl(f^{-1}(V))$. However, $f(x) \in W$, which is open and disjoint from V . Hence $f(x) \notin Cl(V)$ or $x \notin f^{-1}(Cl(V))$, which contradicts the assumption that f is subweakly quasi-continuous. \square

LEMMA 5.7. *If $A \subseteq Y$ and $f : X \rightarrow A$ is weakly quasi-continuous, then $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly quasi-continuous.*

PROOF. If V is an open set in Y , then $\text{sCl}(f^{-1}(V)) = \text{sCl}(f^{-1}(V \cap A)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}_A(V \cap A)) = f^{-1}(A \cap \text{Cl}(V \cap A)) = f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V \cap A)) \subseteq f^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$. \square

Thus a weakly quasi-continuous retraction satisfies the hypothesis of [Theorem 5.6](#) and we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 5.8 (Park and Ha [8, Theorem 3.15]). *If $f : X \rightarrow A$, where $A \subseteq X$, is a weakly quasi-continuous retraction and X is Hausdorff, then A is semiclosed.*

THEOREM 5.9. *Let Y be a Hausdorff space, $f_1 : X \rightarrow Y$ continuous, and $f_2 : X \rightarrow Y$ subweakly quasi-continuous. Then $\{x \in X : f_1(x) = f_2(x)\}$ is semiclosed.*

PROOF. Let $A = \{x \in X : f_1(x) = f_2(x)\}$ and let $x \in X - A$. Let \mathcal{B} be an open base for the topology on Y for which $\text{sCl}(f_2^{-1}(V)) \subseteq f_2^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V))$ for every $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Since Y is Hausdorff and $f_1(x) \neq f_2(x)$, there exist disjoint open sets V and W in Y for which $f_1(x) \in V$, $f_2(x) \in W$, and $V \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $f_2(x) \notin \text{Cl}(V)$, we have $x \in X - f_2^{-1}(\text{Cl}(V)) \subseteq X - \text{sCl}(f_2(V))$. Therefore $x \in f_1^{-1}(V) \cap (X - \text{sCl}(f_2^{-1}(V))) \subseteq X - A$. Since $f_1^{-1}(V)$ is open, $X - \text{sCl}(f_2^{-1}(V))$ is semiopen, and the intersection of an open set and a semiopen set is semiopen (Noiri [7]), we see that $X - A$ is semiopen and that A is semiclosed. \square

COROLLARY 5.10. *Let Y be Hausdorff, $f_1 : X \rightarrow Y$ continuous, and $f_2 : X \rightarrow Y$ subweakly quasi-continuous. If f_1 and f_2 agree on a dense subset of X , then $f_1 = f_2$.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. The author gratefully acknowledges the support of Indiana University Southeast in the publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. P. Arya and M. P. Bhamini, *Some weaker forms of semicontinuous functions*, Ganita 33 (1982), no. 1-2, 124-134.
- [2] C. W. Baker, *On a weak form of almost weakly continuous functions*, Demonstratio Math. 33 (2000), no. 4, 865-872.
- [3] A. Kar and P. Bhattacharya, *Weakly semicontinuous functions*, J. Indian Acad. Math. 8 (1986), no. 2, 83-93.
- [4] ———, *Some weak separation axioms*, Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc. 82 (1990), no. 5, 415-422.
- [5] T. Noiri, *Properties of some weak forms of continuity*, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. 10 (1987), no. 1, 97-111.
- [6] ———, *Weakly α -continuous functions*, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. 10 (1987), no. 3, 483-490.
- [7] ———, *On θ -semi-continuous functions*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. 21 (1990), no. 5, 410-415.
- [8] J. H. Park and H. Y. Ha, *A note on weakly quasi-continuous functions*, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. 19 (1996), no. 4, 767-772.
- [9] V. Popa and C. Stan, *On a decomposition of quasi-continuity in topological spaces*, Stud. Cerc. Mat. 25 (1973), 41-43 (Romanian).
- [10] D. A. Rose, *Weak continuity and almost continuity*, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. 7 (1984), no. 2, 311-318.

C. W. BAKER: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTHEAST, NEW ALBANY, IN 47150, USA

E-mail address: cbaker@ius.edu

Special Issue on Modeling Experimental Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaotic Scenarios

Call for Papers

Thinking about nonlinearity in engineering areas, up to the 70s, was focused on intentionally built nonlinear parts in order to improve the operational characteristics of a device or system. Keying, saturation, hysteretic phenomena, and dead zones were added to existing devices increasing their behavior diversity and precision. In this context, an intrinsic nonlinearity was treated just as a linear approximation, around equilibrium points.

Inspired on the rediscovering of the richness of nonlinear and chaotic phenomena, engineers started using analytical tools from "Qualitative Theory of Differential Equations," allowing more precise analysis and synthesis, in order to produce new vital products and services. Bifurcation theory, dynamical systems and chaos started to be part of the mandatory set of tools for design engineers.

This proposed special edition of the *Mathematical Problems in Engineering* aims to provide a picture of the importance of the bifurcation theory, relating it with nonlinear and chaotic dynamics for natural and engineered systems. Ideas of how this dynamics can be captured through precisely tailored real and numerical experiments and understanding by the combination of specific tools that associate dynamical system theory and geometric tools in a very clever, sophisticated, and at the same time simple and unique analytical environment are the subject of this issue, allowing new methods to design high-precision devices and equipment.

Authors should follow the Mathematical Problems in Engineering manuscript format described at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	December 1, 2008
First Round of Reviews	March 1, 2009
Publication Date	June 1, 2009

Guest Editors

José Roberto Castilho Piqueira, Telecommunication and Control Engineering Department, Polytechnic School, The University of São Paulo, 05508-970 São Paulo, Brazil; piqueira@lac.usp.br

Elbert E. Neher Macau, Laboratório Associado de Matemática Aplicada e Computação (LAC), Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, 12227-010 São Paulo, Brazil ; elbert@lac.inpe.br

Celso Grebogi, Center for Applied Dynamics Research, King's College, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 3UE, UK; grebogi@abdn.ac.uk