



CHORUS

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Anomalous Diffusion in Random Dynamical Systems

Yuzuru Sato and Rainer Klages

Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 174101 — Published 29 April 2019

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.174101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.174101)

Anomalous diffusion in random dynamical systems

Yuzuru Sato^{1,2,*} and Rainer Klages^{3,4,5,†}

¹RIES / Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University,
N20 W10 Kita-ku, Sapporo, 0010020 Hokkaido, Japan

²London Mathematical Laboratory, 14 Buckingham Street, London WC2N 6DF, UK

³Queen Mary University of London, School of Mathematical Sciences, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK

⁴Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Berlin, Hardenbergstraße 36, 10623 Berlin, Germany

⁵Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, Zùlpicher Straße 77, 50937 Cologne, Germany

(Dated: April 1, 2019)

Consider a chaotic dynamical system generating Brownian motion-like diffusion. Consider a second, non-chaotic system in which all particles localize. Let a particle experience a random combination of both systems by sampling between them in time. What type of diffusion is exhibited by this *random dynamical system*? We show that the resulting dynamics can generate anomalous diffusion, where in contrast to Brownian normal diffusion the mean square displacement of an ensemble of particles increases nonlinearly in time. Randomly mixing simple deterministic walks on the line we find anomalous dynamics characterised by ageing, weak ergodicity breaking, breaking of self-averaging and infinite invariant densities. This result holds for general types of noise and for perturbing nonlinear dynamics in bifurcation scenarios.

Many diffusion processes in nature and society were found to behave profoundly different from Brownian motion, which describes the random-looking flickering of a tracer particle in a fluid [1–8]. Brownian dynamics provided a long-standing powerful paradigm to understand spreading in terms of *normal diffusion*, where the mean square displacement (MSD) of an ensemble of particles increases linearly in the long time limit, $\langle x^2 \rangle \sim t^\alpha$ with $\alpha = 1$. *Anomalous diffusion* is characterized by an exponent $\alpha \neq 1$ [1–4]. Subdiffusion with $\alpha < 1$ is commonly encountered in crowded environments as, e.g., for organelles moving in biological cells and single-file diffusion in nanoporous material [5, 6]. Superdiffusion with $\alpha > 1$ is displayed by a variety of other systems, like animals searching for food and light propagating through disordered matter [7, 8].

Experimental data exhibiting anomalous diffusion is often modelled successfully by advanced concepts of stochastic theory, most notably subdiffusive continuous time random walks, superdiffusive Lévy walks, generalized Langevin equations, or fractional Fokker-Planck equations [1–8]. In these stochastic models the mechanisms generating anomalous diffusion are put in by hand on a coarse grained level, either via non-Gaussian probability distributions or via power law memory kernels. While this *stochastic* approach to anomalous diffusion has matured impressively, anomalous diffusion in *deterministic* dynamical systems is yet poorly understood. In nonlinear deterministic equations of motion there are only few mechanisms known to generate anomalous diffusion [3]: stickiness of orbits to KAM tori in Hamiltonian dynamics [1, 2, 9, 10], marginally unstable fixed points in dissipative Pomeau-Manneville-like maps [11–15] and non-trivial topologies exhibited by polygonal billiards [16]. In this Letter we introduce a simple hybrid system at the interface between deterministic and stochastic

dynamics. We show that it yields another generic mechanism for anomalous diffusion based on stochastic chaos in random dynamical systems [17, 18]. This sheds new light on the microscopic origin of anomalous dynamics. Similar models have been used to understand the convection of particles in flowing fluids [21] including fractal clustering [22] and path coalescence [23], the localisation transition in continuum percolation problems [24], intermittency in nonlinear electronic circuits [25] and random attractors in stochastic climate dynamics [26]. Accordingly, we expect fruitful applications of our approach to these problems.

Figure 1 gives our recipe to combine two deterministic dynamical systems D and L randomly in time. Here D generates normal diffusion while L yields localization of particles. We sample randomly between both systems with probability p of choosing L at discrete time step $t \in \mathbb{N}$, respectively probability $1 - p$ of choosing D . For $p = 0$ we thus recover the dynamics of D while for $p = 1$ we obtain the one of L . This implies that there must exist a transition between these two different dynamics under variation of p . Our central question is: For $0 < p < 1$, what type of diffusive dynamics emerges in the resulting *random dynamical system* R ? Here we model deterministic diffusion by chaotic random walks on the line [16, 27–29] defined by the equation of motion $x_{t+1} = M_a(x_t)$, where

$$M_a(x) = \begin{cases} ax & , \quad 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2} \\ ax + 1 - a & , \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq x < 1 \end{cases} , \quad a > 0, \quad (1)$$

is a piecewise linear map lifted onto \mathbb{R} by $M_a(x + 1) = M_a(x) + 1$, cf. the inset in Fig. 2(a). For $a > 2$ this model exhibits normal diffusion with a Lyapunov exponent calculated to (see Sec. 1 in our Supplement [30], which includes Refs. [31–36]) $\lambda(a) = \ln a$ [16, 37–39]. The sample trajectory in the upper left of Fig. 1 was obtained from




FIG. 1: Diffusion generated by a random dynamical system. The three time series in space-time plots display the position $x_t \in \mathbb{R}$ of a point particle at discrete time $t \in \mathbb{N}$. The trajectory in the upper left is generated by the equation of motion $x_{t+1} = D(x_t)$ using a deterministic dynamical system D that yields normal diffusion. The trajectory in the upper right is from $x_{t+1} = L(x_t)$ for a deterministic dynamical system L where all particles localize in space. The *random dynamical system* R mixes these two types of dynamics at time t based on flipping a biased coin: The position x_{t+1} of the particle at the next time $t+1$ is determined by choosing with probability $1-p$ the diffusive system D while L is picked with probability p . The trajectory generated by $x_{t+1} = R(x_t)$ displays *intermittency*, where long regular phases alternate randomly with irregular-looking, chaotic motion.

$D = M_4(x)$, where the dynamics is chaotic according to $\lambda(4) = \ln 4 > 0$. The trajectory in the upper right of Fig. 1 corresponds to $L = M_{1/2}(x)$, where the dynamics is non-chaotic due to $\lambda(1/2) = -\ln 2 < 0$. Here all particles contract onto stable fixed points at integer positions $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. For defining the *random map* R the slope a becomes an independent and identically distributed, multiplicative random variable: At any time step t we choose for our map $R = M_a(x)$ with probability $p \in [0, 1]$ the slope $a = 1/2$ while with probability $1-p$ we pick $a = 4$. The sequence of random slopes may or may not depend on the individual particle if we consider an ensemble of them [40], as we explore below. Random maps of this type are also called iterated function systems [41, 42]. They have been studied by both mathematicians and physicists in view of their measure-theoretic [42–44] and statistical physical properties [21, 40, 45, 46].

One can show straightforwardly that the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda(p)$ of the random map R is zero at probability $p_c = 2/3$ [30]. Since $\lambda(p) > 0$ for $p < p_c$ the map R should generate normal diffusion in this regime while $p > p_c$




FIG. 2: Mean square displacement (MSD) and waiting time distribution (WTD) for randomized deterministic diffusion. The two deterministic dynamical systems that are randomly sampled in time with probability p by applying the recipe of Fig. 1 are illustrated in the inset of (a). All symbols are generated from computer simulations. (a) MSD $\langle x_t^2 \rangle$ for $p = 0.6, 0.63, 0.663, 2/3, 0.669, 0.68, 0.7$ (top to bottom) for an ensemble of particles, where each particle experiences a different random sequence. There is a characteristic transition between normal diffusion and localization via subdiffusion at a critical $p_c = 2/3$. (b) MSD at p_c by starting the computations after different ageing times $t_a = 0, 10^2, 10^3, 10^4$ (top to bottom). The MSD displays ageing similar to analytical results from continuous time random walk (CTRW) theory [13] (bold lines). (c) WTD $\eta(t)$ at p_c for particles leaving a unit interval at the same ageing times t_a as in (b). The bold lines are again analytical results from CTRW theory [13]. (d) MSD at the critical probability p_c for different types of averaging over the random variable. For the straight black line with matching symbols each particle experiences a *different* random sequence (called uncommon noise), cf. Fig. 2(a). The other four lines depict MSDs obtained from applying the *same* sequence of random variables to all particles (called common noise). In these four cases the MSD becomes a random variable breaking self-averaging.

with $\lambda(p) < 0$ should lead to localization for long times. In Fig. 2 we test this conjecture by comparing numerical with analytical results. For our simulations we used $\sim 10^5$ iterations of R with $\sim 10^5$ initial points, which were distributed randomly and uniformly in the unit interval $[0, 1]$. Here each particle experienced a different sequence of random slopes. We used an arbitrary precision algorithm with up to 10^{10000} decimal digits. Figure 2(a) depicts the MSD $\langle x_t^2 \rangle$ under variation of p by confirming the diffusion scenario conjectured above. However, passing through p_c the dynamics displays a subtle transition: Right at p_c we obtain long-time subdiffusion, $\langle x^2(t) \rangle \sim t^{1/2}$, while around p_c this dynamics survives for long transient times. Figures 2(b) and (c) reveal that right at p_c R exhibits *ageing* [47, 48] in both the MSD and the waiting time distribution (WTD). The latter is




FIG. 3: Subdiffusion for different types of randomness. (a) Sample trajectories at p_c corresponding to 30 different initial conditions with uncommon noise. (b) Same as (a) with common noise. The envelopes in (a) and (b) correspond to the subdiffusive spreading for uncommon noise shown in Fig. 2(d). (b) displays jump time synchronization of all particles. The inset in (a) yields in double-logarithmic plot the infinite invariant density within a unit cell for uncommon noise for the map $R \bmod 1$.

the probability distribution $\eta(t)$ of the times t it takes a particle to escape from a unit interval of R . In both (b) and (c) there is good agreement with analytical results from continuous time random walk (CTRW) theory for long times, $\langle x_t^2 \rangle \sim (t+t_a)^\alpha - t_a^\alpha$ and $\eta(t) \sim t_a^\alpha / [(t+t_a)t^\alpha]$, where t_a is the ageing time [13]. This theory furthermore predicts that for long times a WTD of $\eta(t) \sim t^{-\gamma}$ implies a MSD of $\langle x^2(t) \rangle \sim t^{\gamma-1}$ [11–15]. For R this relation is fulfilled with $\gamma = 3/2$. An exponent of the WTD of $3/2$ yields a diverging mean waiting time. This as well as the existence of ageing imply *weak ergodicity breaking* of the dynamics [47–49].

However, our map R generates dynamics that goes beyond conventional CTRW theory. This becomes apparent by looking at different types of averaging over the random variables shown in Fig. 2(d): While in Fig. 2(a)-(c) each particle experienced a *different* sequence of random slopes, as reproduced by the straight line with matching symbols for the MSD in Fig. 2(d), for all the other MSDs in (d) the corresponding random sequences are the *same* for all particles. Accordingly, we call the former type of randomness *uncommon noise*, the latter *common noise*. Crucially, while in Fig. 2(a), based on uncommon noise, the MSD is well-defined for all p , Fig. 2(d) shows that for common noise sequences it becomes a random variable at p_c **in the long time limit** that completely depends on the random sequence chosen. This bears strong similarity to what is called *breaking of self-averaging* for random walks in quenched disordered environments [50], which also implies weak ergodicity breaking [51].

Figure 3 displays space-time plots of 30 trajectories starting at different initial points for (a) uncommon noise and (b) common noise. While in (a) the different trajectories look rather irregular yielding a spreading front that matches to the subdiffusion depicted in Fig. 2(d) for uncommon noise, (b) shows ‘temporal clustering’ in the form of jump time synchronization, i.e., all particles eventually jump from unit cell to unit cell at the same time step. This matches to the fact that the MSD does

not converge for common noise as seen in Fig. 2(d). The inset in (a) represents the invariant density of the map $R \bmod 1$, i.e., within a unit cell, with uncommon noise. We see that it decays on average like $\rho(x) \sim x^{-1}$. This result and the stepwise structure of $\rho(x)$ are in agreement with analytical calculations [43, 44]. At zero Lyapunov exponent uncommon noise thus leads to a weak spatial clustering [22] and path coalescence [23] of particles at integer positions $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. In contrast, for common noise an invariant density does not exist, and we do not find any spatial clustering.

We now explore the origin of this type of anomalous dynamics in terms of dynamical systems theory. As exemplified by the trajectory shown at the bottom of Fig. 1, around p_c the dynamics of R is *intermittent* [52] meaning long regular phases alternate randomly with irregular-looking, chaotic motion. A paradigmatic intermittent dynamical system is the Pomeau-Manneville map $P_{z,b}(x) = x + bx^z$, $b \geq 1$, $x \in [-1/2, 1/2)$. Defining its equation of motion in the same way as for M_a above it generates subdiffusion characterized by a MSD and a WTD that in suitable scaling limits match to the predictions of CTRW theory with $\gamma = z/(z-1)$ [11, 12, 15]. As shown above, for the map R CTRW theory correctly predicts the relation between the long-time MSD and the WTD by using $\gamma = 3/2$. Trying to understand the random map R in terms of $P_{z,b}$ thus suggests to choose $z = 3$. One should now compare the invariant densities $\rho(x)$ of the two maps mod 1: For $P_{z,b} \bmod 1$ it is known that $\rho(x) \sim x^{1-z}$, $x \gg 0$, which for $z \geq 2$ becomes a non-normalizable, infinite invariant density [53, 54]. But for $z = 3$ this yields $\rho(x) \sim x^{-2}$ while for $R \bmod 1$ we have $\rho(x) \sim x^{-1}$, see the inset of Fig. 3(b) [56]. Hence, the intermittency displayed by R is not of Pomeau-Manneville type but of a fundamentally different microscopic dynamical origin. This might relate to deviations between CTRW theory, which on a coarse-grained level works well for the Pomeau-Manneville map, and our numerical results for R on short time scales in the MSD and the WTD

of Fig. 2. It would be interesting to further explore such differences, e.g., by the approach outlined in Ref. [55].

However, there is another type of intermittency in dynamical systems that is profoundly different from Pomeau-Manneville dynamics, called *on-off intermittency* [57–62]. It was first reported for two-dimensional coupled maps

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= (1 - \epsilon)f(x_t) + \epsilon f(y_t) \\ y_{t+1} &= (1 - \epsilon)f(y_t) + \epsilon f(x_t) \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $x_{t+1} = f(x_t)$ is chaotic with positive Lyapunov exponent and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ [57, 58]. When ϵ is large, the possibly chaotic dynamics is trapped on the synchronization manifold $x_t = y_t$. By decreasing ϵ to a critical parameter $\epsilon = \epsilon^*$ trajectories start to escape from this manifold into the full two-dimensional space. This is called a *blowout bifurcation* and the associated intermittency on-off intermittency [63]. In subsequent works Eqs. (2) were boiled down to more specific two-dimensional maps [21, 44, 57, 59–62, 64]. The simplest ones are piecewise linear [44, 61, 64], such as [44]

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= \begin{cases} ax_t & (x_t < 1, 0 \leq y_t \leq p) \\ \frac{1}{a}x_t & (x_t < 1, p < y_t \leq 1) \\ 1 + b(1 - x_t) & (x_t \geq 1) \end{cases} \\ y_{t+1} &= \begin{cases} \frac{y_t}{p} & (0 \leq y_t \leq p) \\ \frac{y_t - p}{1 - p} & (p < y_t \leq 1) \quad , \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with symmetry $y \rightarrow -y$ and parameters $a > 0, b \in \mathbb{R}, p \in (0, 1)$. Due to its skew product form this system can be understood as a one-dimensional map $x_{t+1} = f(x_t)$ with multiplicative randomness generated by $y_{t+1} = g(y_t)$ [21, 57, 59, 60, 62, 64]. In a next step one might replace the deterministic chaotic dynamics of y_t by stochastic noise. If we now consider the dynamics of x_t in Eqs. (3) on the unit interval only by choosing $a = 2$, taking the map mod 1 and choosing dichotomic noise, we obtain a simple piecewise linear map with multiplicative randomness that is **qualitatively** identical to our model R mod 1 [21, 43, 44]. For this class of systems it has been shown numerically and analytically that at a critical p_c the invariant density of $x = x_t$ decays like $\rho(x) \sim x^{-1}$ [44, 58, 60, 62, 64–66] and that a suitably defined waiting time distribution between chaotic ‘bursts’ obeys $\eta(t) \sim t^{-3/2}$ [44, 62, 64–66]. In Refs. [65, 66] different diffusive models driven by on-off intermittency have been studied, and for two of them [66] subdiffusion with a MSD of $\langle x^2(t) \rangle \sim t^{1/2}$ has been obtained by matching simulation results to CTRW theory. We thus conclude that our model R exhibits anomalous diffusion generated by on-off intermittency. We emphasize, however, that the mechanism underlying our model depicted in Fig. 1 is more general than this particular type of intermittent dynamics.

In order to check for the generality of our results, in the Supplement [30] we first replace the dichotomic noise by

physically more realistic continuous noise distributions choosing 1. uniform noise on a bounded interval, and 2. a non-uniform unbounded log-normal distribution. Figures 1 and 2 in Secs. 2 and 3 of [30], respectively, show that our mechanism is very robust under variation of the type of noise. We may thus conjecture that our scenario of subdiffusion generated by random maps holds for any generic type of noise. We also tested whether the strong localisation due to contraction onto a stable fixed point can be replaced by a weaker chaotic localisation to a sub-region in phase space. However, in this case the distinction between diffusive and localised dynamics is entirely different without displaying any subdiffusion, cf. Fig. 3 in Sec. 4 of [30]. As a general principle, one must thus mix expansion with contraction to generate anomalous dynamics. Finally, in Sec. 5 of [30] we study a simple nonlinear map that exhibits different types of diffusion in different parameter regions of a bifurcation scenario generating chaotic and periodic windows. Randomizing this map according to Fig. 1 yields again subdiffusion with a MSD of $\langle x_t^2 \rangle \sim t^{1/2}$ and a WTD of $\eta(t) \sim t^{-3/2}$, cf. Fig. 4 in [30] which includes Refs [67–69]. This demonstrates that the basic mechanism generating anomalous diffusion which we propose is also robust in a nonlinear setting.

In summary, we have shown that anomalous dynamics emerges if we randomly mix chaotic diffusion and non-chaotic localisation with a sampling probability yielding a zero Lyapunov exponent of the randomized dynamics. Interestingly, our basic mechanism bears similarity with the famous problem of a protein searching for a target at a DNA strand [70]: Here the protein randomly switches between (normal) diffusion in the bulk of the cell and moving along the DNA. This is called *facilitated diffusion*, as the random switching between different modes may decrease the average time to find a target [70–72]. We are not aware, however, that for this problem any emergence of anomalous diffusion as an effective dynamics representing the whole diffusion process has been discussed. Along these lines, one might speculate that using our framework for combining normal diffusion with constant velocity scanning [71] could yield a kind of Lévy walk [8], which poses an interesting open problem.

Y.S. is funded by the Grant in Aid for Scientific Research (C) No. 18K03441, JSPS, Japan. R.K. thanks Prof. Krug from the U. of Cologne and Profs. Klapp and Stark from the TU Berlin for hospitality as a guest scientist as well as the Office of Naval Research Global for financial support. Y.S. and R.K. acknowledge funding from the London Mathematical Laboratory, where they are External Fellows, and thank two anonymous referees for very helpful comments.

-
- * Electronic address: ysato@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp
† Electronic address: r.klages@qmul.ac.uk
- [1] M.F. Shlesinger, G.M. Zaslavsky, and J. Klafter. *Nature*, 363:31, 1993.
- [2] J. Klafter, M. F. Shlesinger, and G. Zumofen. *Phys. Today*, 49:33, 1996.
- [3] R. Klages, G. Radons, and I.M. Sokolov, editors. *Anomalous transport: Foundations and Applications*. Wiley-VCH, Berlin, 2008.
- [4] R. Metzler et al. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 16:24128, 2014.
- [5] F. Höfling and T. Franosch. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 76:046602, 2013.
- [6] Y. Meroz and I.M. Sokolov. *Phys. Rep.*, 573:1, 2015.
- [7] G.M. Viswanathan et al. *The Physics of Foraging*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.
- [8] V. Zaburdaev, S. Denisov, and J. Klafter. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 87:483, 2015.
- [9] A. Zacherl et al. *Phys. Lett.*, 114A:317, 1986.
- [10] G.M. Zaslavsky. *Phys. Rep.*, 371:461, 2002.
- [11] T. Geisel and S. Thomae. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 52:1936, 1984.
- [12] G. Zumofen and J. Klafter. *Phys. Rev. E*, 47:851, 1993.
- [13] E. Barkai. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90:104101, 2003.
- [14] N. Korabel et al. *Europhys. Lett.*, 70:63, 2005.
- [15] N. Korabel et al. *Phys. Rev. E*, 75:036213, 2007.
- [16] R. Klages. *Microscopic chaos, fractals and transport in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2007.
- [17] D. Faranda et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 119:014502, 2017.
- [18] Y. Sato et al. preprint arXiv:1811.03994, 2019.
- [19] W. Bauer and G. F. Bertsch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 65: 2213 (1990).
- [20] P. Gaspard, *Chaos, scattering, and statistical mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
- [21] L. Yu, E. Ott, and Q. Chen. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 65:2935, 1990.
- [22] M. Wilkinson et al. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 85:18, 2003.
- [23] M. Wilkinson and B. Mehlig. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68:040101, 2003.
- [24] F. Höfling, T. Franosch, and E. Frey. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:165901, 2006.
- [25] P. W. Hammer et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 73:1095, 1994.
- [26] M. Chekroun, E. Simonnet, M. Ghil, *Physica D*, 240:1685, 2011.
- [27] H. Fujisaka and S. Grossmann. *Z. Physik B*, 48:261, 1982.
- [28] T. Geisel and J. Nierwetberg. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 48:7, 1982.
- [29] M. Schell, S. Fraser, and R. Kapral. *Phys. Rev. A*, 26: 504, 1982.
- [30] See Supplemental Material for details.
- [31] E. Ott, *Chaos in Dynamical Systems* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [32] C. Robinson, *Dynamical Systems* (CRC Press, London, 1995).
- [33] K.T. Alligood, T.S. Sauer, and J.A. Yorke, *Chaos - An introduction to dynamical systems* (Springer, New York, 1997).
- [34] J.R. Dorfman, *An introduction to chaos in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
- [35] R. Klages (2007), lecture notes, see <http://www.maths.qmul.ac.uk/~klages/teaching/mas424>.
- [36] R. Klages, in *Dynamical and complex systems*, edited by S. Bullett, T. Fearn, and F. Smith (World Scientific, Singapore, 2017), vol. 5 of *LTCC Advanced Mathematics Serie*, pp. 1–40.
- [37] R. Klages and J.R. Dorfman. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 74:387–390, 1995.
- [38] R. Klages and J.R. Dorfman. *Phys. Rev. E*, 59:5361, 1999.
- [39] J. Groeneveld and R. Klages. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 109:821, 2002.
- [40] T. Bódai, E.G. Altmann, and A. Endler. *Phys. Rev. E*, 87:042902, 2013.
- [41] M. Barnsley, *Fractals Everywhere* (Academic Press Professional, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA, 1988), ISBN 0-12-079062-9.
- [42] N. Abbasi, M. Gharaei, and A.J. Homburg. *Nonlinearity*, 31:3880, 2018.
- [43] S. Pelikan. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 281:813–825, 1984.
- [44] P. Ashwin, P.J. Aston, and M. Nicol. *Physica D*, 111:81, 1998.
- [45] R. Klages. *Europhys. Lett.*, 57:796, 2002.
- [46] A. Lipowski et al. *Physica A*, 339:237, 2004.
- [47] J.-P. Bouchaud. *J. Phys. I*, 2:1705 (1992).
- [48] R. Metzler. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser.* 7, 36:156000 (2015).
- [49] G. Bel and E. Barkai. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2, 94:24060 (2005).
- [50] J.-P. Bouchaud and A. Georges. *Phys. Rep.*, 195:127 (1990).
- [51] M. Dentz, A. Russian, and P. Gouze. *Phys. Rev. E*, 93: 010101, 2016.
- [52] O. Bénichou et al. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 83:81, 2011.
- [53] M. Thaler. *Israel J. Math.*, 46:67, 1983.
- [54] N. Korabel and E. Barkai. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:050601, 2009.
- [55] T. Albers and G. Radons, *Europhys. Lett.* 102:711, 2013.
- [56] [We have computed the infinite invariant density starting from a normalised uniform initial distribution of \$N = 10^5\$ points by iterating for \$n = 10^5\$ time steps, which yields the right scaling in \$x\$ \[54\], by not showing the cutoff at small \$x\$.](#)
- [57] A.S. Pikovsky. *Z. Physik B*, 55:149, 1984.
- [58] H. Fujisaka and T. Yamada. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 74:918, 1985.
- [59] H. Fujisaka and T. Yamada. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 75:1087, 1986.
- [60] A.S. Pikovsky and P. Grassberger. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 24:4587, 1991.
- [61] N. Platt, E.A. Spiegel, and C. Tresser. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70:279, 1993.
- [62] J.F. Heagy, N. Platt, and S.M. Hammel. *Phys. Rev. E*, 94:1140, 1994.
- [63] E. Ott and J.C. Sommerer. *Phys. Lett. A*, 188:39, 1994.
- [64] H. Hata and S. Miyazaki. *Phys. Rev. E*, 55:5311, 1997.
- [65] T. Harada, H. Hata, and H. Fujisaka. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 32:1557, 1999.
- [66] S. Miyazaki, T. Harada, and A. Budiyo. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 106:1051, 2001.
- [67] P. Bak, T. Bohr, and M.H. Jensen, *Physica Scripta* T9:531, 1985.
- [68] N. Korabel and R. Klages, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89:214102, 2002.
- [69] N. Korabel and R. Klages, *Physica D* 187:66, 2004.
- [70] O.G. Berg, R.B. Winter, and P.H. von Hippel, *Biochem-*

- istry*, 20:6929, (1981).
- [71] Y. Meroz, I. Eliazar, and J. Klafter, *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.*, 42:434012 (2009).
- [72] M. Bauer and R. Metzler, *Biophys. J.*, 102:2321 (2012).