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## The Mountain Climbers' Problem and the Complexity of Real Continuous Functions

The first part of this talk investigated the following problem:
Two mountain climbers begin at sea level, at opposite ends of a (twodimensional) chain of mountains. Can they find routes along which to travel, always maintaining equal altitudes, until they eventually meet?

If we now select a point of maximum altitude and reparametrize, we can formulate it as follows:

Problem 1) Let $f$ and $g$ be continuous functions mapping $[0,1]$ to $[0,1]$ with $f(0)=g(0)=0$ and $f(1)=g(1)=1$. Are there continuous functions $k$ and $h:[0,1] \rightarrow[0,1]$ satisfying $k(0)=h(0)=0, k(1)=$ $h(1)=1$ and $f \circ k=g \circ h$ ?
J. V. Whittaker showed in [2] that the answer is "yes" if $f$ and $g$ are piecewise monotone but " $n o$ " in general. It is easy to construct a counter-example: let $f$ be a monotone function which is constant in an interval, and let $g$ be a function which oscillates around this value.

However, typical countinuous functions are climbable. If we assume that neither $f$ nor $g$ have an interval of constancy then the answer for Problem 1) is "yes". This is the main result ${ }^{1}$ and in the talk we sketched the elementary proof. (The theorem and the proof are going to appear in [1].)

The talk also considered the following situation.
Let $\mathcal{F}=\{f \mid f:[0,1] \rightarrow[0,1]$ continuous, $f(0)=0, f(1)=1$ and $f$ has no interval of constancy \}. Let $f$ and $g \in \mathcal{F}$. We will say that $g$ is more complex than $f$ or $f$ is simpler than $g$ (notation: $f \preceq g$ ) if there exists an $h \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $g=f \circ h$. We say that $f$ is equivalent to $g$

[^0]if $f \preceq g$ and $g \preceq f$. (This is the case when $h$ is strictly increasing.)
The $\preceq$ relation is a partial ordering over these equivalence classes.
The main result of the first part shows that any two element have a common upper bound. It is obvious that any two elements have a common lower bound, namely the identity function is simpler than any function in $\mathcal{F}$.

Problem 2) What else can we say about this quite natural structure? Is there least upper and (or) greatest lower bound for any 2 elements? In other words: is this a lattice?
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