

# Symplectic Homogenization

CLAUDE VITERBO

DMA, UMR 8553 du CNRS

École Normale Supérieure, 45 Rue d'Ulm

75230 Paris Cedex 05, France

viterbo@dma.ens.fr \*

02/12/2024 at 22:06:16

## Abstract

Let  $H(q, p)$  be a Hamiltonian on  $T^*T^n$ . We show that the sequence  $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$  defined by  $H_k(q, p) = H(kq, p)$  converges in the  $\gamma$ -topology defined in [V1] to an integrable continuous Hamiltonian  $\bar{H}(p)$ . This is extended to the case of non-autonomous Hamiltonians, and the more general setting in which only some of the variables are homogenized: we consider the sequence  $H(kx, y, q, p)$  and prove it has a  $\gamma$ -limit  $\bar{H}(y, q, p)$ , thus yielding an “effective Hamiltonian”. The goal of this paper is to prove convergence of the above sequences, state the first properties of the homogenization operator, and give some applications to solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, construction of quasi-states, etc... We also prove that when  $H$  is convex in  $p$ , the function  $\bar{H}$  coincides with Mather’s  $\alpha$  function defined in [Ma] and associated to the Legendre dual of  $H$ . This gives a new proof of its symplectic invariance first discovered by P. Bernard [Bern 2].

---

\*Part of this work was done while the author was at Centre de Mathématiques Laurent Schwartz, UMR 7640 du CNRS, École Polytechnique - 91128 Palaiseau, France. Supported also by Agence Nationale de la Recherche projects GRST, Symplexe and Floer Power, by the NSF under agreement DMS-0635607 and DMS-0603957. Any opinion, findings and conclusions or recommendation expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of these institutions.

Keywords: Homogenization, symplectic topology, Hamiltonian flow, Hamilton-Jacobi equation, variational solutions. AMS Classification: primary: 37J05, 53D35 secondary: 35F20, 49L25, 37J40, 37J50.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Notations</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Note . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>A crash course on generating function metric</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Generating functions, the calculus of critical values and the $\gamma$ -metric . . . . .	7
3.2	Variational solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations . . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Statement of the main results</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Standard homogenization. . . . .	15
4.2	Partial homogenization . . . . .	17
4.3	Homogenized Hamilton-Jacobi equations . . . . .	19
<b>5</b>	<b>Proof of the main theorem.</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1	Reformulating the problem and finding the homogenized Hamiltonian. . . . .	21
5.2	The Main steps of the proof. . . . .	30
<b>6</b>	<b>Proof of proposition 5.13.</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Proof of proposition 5.14.</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 4.1</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Proof of theorem 4.2.</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Proof of the partial homogenization case</b>	<b>52</b>
10.1	Resolution in the $(q_2, P_1)$ variables . . . . .	55
10.2	Generating functions for $H(kx, y, q, p)$ . . . . .	56
10.3	The case of $\ell$ terms . . . . .	57
<b>11</b>	<b>Proof of proposition 4.6</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Non compact-supported Hamiltonians and the time dependent case</b>	<b>61</b>
12.1	The coercive case . . . . .	61

12.2 Non-autonomous Hamiltonians . . . . .	63
12.3 A non-coercive example . . . . .	66
<b>13 Homogenization in the <math>p</math> variable</b>	<b>67</b>
13.1 Connection with Mather $\alpha$ function . . . . .	69
<b>14 Some examples and applications</b>	<b>70</b>
14.1 Homogenization of $H(t, q, p)$ in the variable $t$ . . . . .	70
14.2 The one dimensional case: $\frac{1}{2} p ^2 - V(x)$ . . . . .	71
14.3 A special “geometric” example . . . . .	71
14.4 Homogenized metric and the Thurston-Gromov norm . . . . .	73
<b>15 More computational tools</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>16 Further questions</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>A Appendix : Capacity of completely integrable systems</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>B Appendix: Some “classical” inequalities.</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>C Appendix: Some other type of homogenization.</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>D Appendix: Generating function for Euler-Lagrange flows.</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>87</b>

## 1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to define the notion of homogenization for a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism of  $T^*T^n$ . In other words, given a compact supported Hamiltonian  $H(t, q, p)$  on  $S^1 \times T^*T^n$ , we shall study whether the sequence  $H_k$  defined by  $H_k(t, q, p) = H(kt, kq, p)$  converges for the symplectic metric  $\gamma$ , defined in [V1] (see also Section 3.1), to some Hamiltonian  $\overline{H}$ , necessarily of the form  $\overline{H}(q, p) = \overline{h}(p)$ .

The convergence of  $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$  to  $\overline{H}$  should be understood as the convergence for the symplectic metric  $\gamma$ , of the flow of  $H_k$ ,  $\varphi_k^t$  to the flow of  $\overline{H}$ ,  $\overline{\varphi}^t$ . This convergence is necessarily rather weak, since for example  $C^0$ -convergence for the flows does not hold in general.

However, such  $\gamma$ -convergence implies convergence of the variational solution (see [O-V] for the definition) of Hamilton-Jacobi equations.

$$(HJ_k) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, q) + H(k \cdot t, k \cdot q, \frac{\partial}{\partial q} u(t, q)) = 0 \\ u(0, q) = f(q) \end{cases}$$

to the variational solutions of

$$(\overline{HJ}) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, q) + \overline{H}(\frac{\partial}{\partial q} u(t, q)) = 0 \\ u(0, q) = f(q). \end{cases}$$

It is important to stress that this notion of convergence **does not** imply any kind of pointwise or almost everywhere convergence<sup>1</sup>, but is rather related to variational notions of convergence, for example  $\Gamma$ -convergence (see [de G], [Dal M]), that were already used in homogenization theory for studying viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Homogenization using these method was for example used in the work of Lions-Papanicolaou and Varadhan (see [L-P-V] and also [Ev], [Fathi1]), or the rescaling of metrics on  $T^n$  (see [Ac-Butt] and [Gr]).

All the above-mentioned papers can be considered as special cases of “symplectic homogenization” that is presented here. We believe some of the advantages of this unified treatment are

- (1) The removal of any convexity or even coercivity assumption on  $H$  in the  $p$  direction (as required in [L-P-V] and [Ev, Fathi1, Fathi2]), usually needed to define  $\overline{H}$  because of the use of minimization techniques for the Lagrangian. In fact our homogenization is defined on compactly supported objects, and then extended to a number of non-compact supported situations.
- (2) The natural extension of homogenization to cases where  $H$  has very little regularity (less than continuity is needed).
- (3) A well defined and common definition of the convergence of  $H_k$  to  $\overline{H}$  or  $\varphi_k$  to  $\overline{\varphi}$  that applies to flows, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, etc.

---

<sup>1</sup>however  $C^0$  convergence of the flows implies  $\gamma$ -convergence as we proved in [V1], we refer to Humilière’s work in [Hu] for stronger statements, i.e. weaker assumptions.

- (4) The symplectic invariance of the homogenized Hamiltonian extending the invariance results proved in [Bern 1] for Mather’s  $\alpha$  function, making his constructions slightly less mysterious.
- (5) The geometric properties of the function  $\overline{H}$  (see proposition 4.2, (5)), yielding computational methods extending those obtained in the one-dimensional case in [L-P-V] or in other cases (see for example [Conc]).

This paper will address these fundamental questions, some other applications will be dealt with in subsequent papers (see for example [V7] for an approach to Mather’s theory in the non-convex setting).

## 2 Notations

$\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$	: compactly supported time-dependent Hamiltonians, i.e. elements in $C_c^\infty([0, 1] \times T^*M, \mathbb{R})$ .
$\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$	: set of time one maps of Hamiltonians in $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$ .
$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*M)$	: completion for the metric $\gamma$ of $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$ .
$\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*M)$	: completion for the metric $\gamma$ of $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$ .
G.F.Q.I.	: Generating function quadratic at infinity.
$\mathcal{L}(T^*M)$	: the set of images of the zero section under the action of the diffeomorphisms in $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$ .
$c(\alpha, S), c(\alpha, L)$	: critical value obtained by minimax on $S$ with the homology class $\alpha$ .
$c(1(x) \otimes \alpha, S)$	: the number $c(\alpha, S_x)$ where $S_x(q; \xi) = S(x, q; \xi)$ .
$f(A)$	: for $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $A \subset X$ is defined as $\sup_{x \in A} f(x)$

## Acknowledgements

This paper originated in the attempt to understand the physical phenomenon of self-adaptative oscillators described in [B-C-B], that the author learned about in a paper by A. Boudaoud, published in “Images de la Physique” (see [Bou]). We hope to be able to explain in a future publication the connection between Symplectic homogenization and self-adaptative phenomena in vibrating structures. We wish to thank not only the authors of [B-C-B] for writing the paper and its popularized version [Bou], but also CNRS for maintaining journals like “Images de la physique”.

I wish to thank Franco Cardin, Sergei Kuksin, and Pierre Pansu for useful discussions. Martino Bardi helped me to improve the bibliography (I am solely responsible for remaining omissions), Vincent Humilière for answering many questions concerning properties of the completions of Hamiltonian functions and maps, and pointing out several inaccuracies and finally an anonymous referee for his careful reading of the manuscript, and his extremely detailed and helpful report. I am grateful to the University of Beijing for hospitality during the preparation of this work, to the organizers of the Yashafest in Stanford, and the Conference on symplectic topology in Kyoto for giving me the opportunity to present preliminary versions of this work. I also warmly thank Claudine Harmide for her efficient and speedy typing.

## 2.1 Note

Previous versions of this paper crucially used the following

**Conjecture 1.** *There exists a constant  $C_n$  such that any Lagrangian submanifold,  $L$  of  $T^*T^n$  contained in the unit disc bundle  $\{(q, p) \in T^*T^n \mid \|p\| \leq 1\}$  is Hamiltonianly isotopic to the zero section satisfies  $\gamma(L) \leq C_n$ .*

At the moment the conjecture is not proved. The content of section 7 replaces the use of this conjecture in the proof of the main theorem.

## 3 A crash course on generating function metric

This section is devoted to defining the metric  $\gamma$ , stating some of its main properties and explaining the relationship with Hamilton-Jacobi equations. The reader may skip this section and start directly from section 4, possibly returning here for reference.

### 3.1 Generating functions, the calculus of critical values and the $\gamma$ -metric

Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -dimensional closed manifold,  $L$  be a Lagrangian submanifold in  $T^*M$  Hamiltonian isotopic to the zero section  $0_M$  (i.e. such that there is a Hamiltonian isotopy  $\varphi_t$  such that  $\varphi_1(0_M) = L$ ).

**Definition 3.1.** The smooth function  $S : M \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a generating function quadratic at infinity (G.F.Q.I. for short) for  $L$  if:

- (1) there is a non-degenerate quadratic form  $B$  on  $\mathbb{R}^k$  such that

$$|\nabla_{\xi} S(q; \xi) - \nabla B(\xi)| \leq C$$

- (2) zero is a regular value of the map

$$(q; \xi) \mapsto \frac{\partial S}{\partial \xi}(q; \xi)$$

- (3) by (1) and (2),  $\Sigma_S = \{(q; \xi) \mid \frac{\partial S}{\partial \xi}(q; \xi) = 0\}$  is a compact submanifold in  $M \times \mathbb{R}^k$ . The map

$$\begin{aligned} i_S : \Sigma_S &\rightarrow T^*M \\ (q; \xi) &\mapsto (q, \frac{\partial S}{\partial q}(q; \xi)) \end{aligned}$$

sends diffeomorphically  $\Sigma_S$  to  $L$ .

*Remarks 3.2.* (1) Throughout this paper, we shall use a semicolon to separate the “base variables”  $q$  from the “fiber variables”,  $\xi$ , and we shall abbreviate “generating function quadratic at infinity” by “G.F.Q.I.”.

- (2) When  $k = 0$ , i.e. there are no fiber variables,  $L$  is just the graph of the differential  $dS(q)$ .

When  $L$  is Hamiltonian isotopic to the zero section, any two G.F.Q.I. of  $L$  are equivalent by the equivalence relation generated by the following three elementary operations associating  $S_1$  to  $S_2$  (see [The], theorem 3.2, page 254, [V1], prop 1.5, page 688):

- (1) (Stabilization)  $S_2(x, \xi, \eta) = S_1(x, \xi) + q(\eta)$  where  $q$  is a non-degenerate quadratic form.
- (2) (Diffeomorphism)  $S_2(x, \xi) = S_1(x, \varphi(x, \xi))$  where  $(x, \xi) \rightarrow (x, \varphi(x, \xi))$  is a fiber-preserving diffeomorphism.
- (3) (Translation)  $S_2(x, \xi) = S_1(x, \xi) + C$ .



Moreover, an elementary computation shows that denoting by  $S^\lambda$  the set

$$\{(q; \xi) \in M \times \mathbb{R}^k \mid S(q; \xi) \leq \lambda\}$$

we have for  $c$  large enough that

$$H^*(S^c, S^{-c}) \simeq H^*(M) \otimes H^*(D^-, \partial D^-)$$

where  $D^-$  is the unit disc of the negative eigenspace of  $B$ . In the sequel we denote by  $S^\infty$ , (resp.  $S^{-\infty}$ ) the set  $S^c$  (resp.  $S^{-c}$ ) for  $c$  large enough. Therefore, to each cohomology class  $\alpha$  in  $H^*(M) - \{0\}$  we may associate the image of  $\alpha \otimes T$  ( $T$  is a chosen generator of  $H^*(D^-, \partial D^-) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ ) in  $H^*(S^\infty, S^{-\infty})$ , and by homological minimax, a critical level  $c(\alpha, S)$  (see [V1] section 2, page 690-693).

Note that according to [V1], if  $S_1, S_2$  are related by (1) or (2), then  $H^*(S_1^\mu, S_1^\lambda) = H^*(S_2^\mu, S_2^\lambda)$ , while if they are related by (3), we have  $H^*(S_1^\mu, S_1^\lambda) = H^*(S_2^{\mu+C}, S_2^{\lambda+C})$ . As a result the minimax critical levels are well-defined up to a constant shift (i.e. a shift by a constant independent from the cohomology class).

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $L$  be Hamiltonian isotopic to the zero section,  $S$  a G.F.Q.I. for  $L$ . For any non-zero cohomology class  $\alpha$  we define

$$c(\alpha, S) = \inf\{\lambda \mid \text{the image of } T \otimes \alpha \text{ in } H^*(S^\lambda, S^{-\infty}) \text{ is non-zero}\}.$$

We denote by  $1$  the generator of  $H^0(M)$ ,  $\mu$  the generator of  $H^n(M)$  and set

$$\begin{aligned} c_-(S) &= c(1, S) \\ c_+(S) &= c(\mu, S) \\ \gamma(L) &= c(\mu, S) - c(1, S) \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.4.* 1) Note that translating  $S$  by a constant shifts  $c(\alpha, S)$  by the same constant, so that, provided we normalized  $S$  in some way,  $c(\alpha, L)$  is now well defined as the common value of  $c(\alpha, S)$  for  $S$  a G.F.Q.I. for  $L$ . For example, if we specify the Hamiltonian  $H$  yielding the isotopy between the zero section and  $L$ , we may normalize  $S$  by requiring that its critical values coincide with the critical values of the action  $A_H$  defined on  $\mathcal{P} = \{\gamma : [0, 1] \mapsto T^*M \mid \gamma(t) = (q(t), p(t)), p(1) = 0\}$  by

$$A_H(\gamma) = \int_0^1 [p(t)\dot{q}(t) - H(t, q(t), p(t))] dt$$

Thus  $c_{\pm}(H)$  is well defined. When  $\varphi^1$  is generated by some compactly supported Hamiltonian, we may normalize the G.F.Q.I. so that the fixed point at infinity, which is a critical point of  $S$ , has critical value zero. We may thus define  $c_{\pm}(\varphi)$  for  $\varphi \in \mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n)$

2) We shall sometimes deal with the case  $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then we need quadraticity of  $S$  both in the  $\xi$  and  $x$  variable, so that (1) in Definition 3.1 should be replaced by

(1') there exists a quadratic form  $B(x, \xi)$  on  $M \times \mathbb{R}^k (= \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k)$  such that

$$|\nabla S(q; \xi) - \nabla B(q; \xi)| \leq C .$$

The map  $\gamma$  is well defined on the set  $\mathcal{L}(T^*T^n)$  of Lagrangian submanifolds Hamiltonian isotopic to the zero section, where the Hamiltonian is assumed to be compactly supported.

It follows from [V1], that  $\gamma$  defines a metric on  $\mathcal{L}(T^*T^n)$  by setting

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be G.F.Q.I. for  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  in  $\mathcal{L}(T^*T^n)$ . Then  $\gamma(L_1, L_2) = c(\mu, S_1 \ominus S_2) - c(1, S_1 \ominus S_2)$  where  $(S_1 \ominus S_2)(q; \xi_1, \xi_2) = S(q; \xi_1) - S(q; \xi_2)$ . The function  $\gamma$  defines a metric on  $\mathcal{L}(T^*T^n)$ .

That this is indeed a metric on  $\mathcal{L}$  is a consequence of Lusternik-Shnirelman's theory (see [V1]). Note that  $\gamma(L) = \gamma(L, 0_M)$  so our use of  $\gamma$  is an abuse of notation, which should however be of no consequence.

Our goal is to define a metric on  $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M) = C_c^\infty([0, 1] \times T^*T^n, \mathbb{R})$  the set of compactly supported, time dependent Hamiltonian isotopies of  $T^*M$ , and on  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$  the group of time-one maps of Hamiltonians in  $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$ . In general, we may set

**Definition 3.6.** We define

$$\widehat{\gamma}(\varphi) = \sup\{\gamma(\varphi(L), L) \mid L \in \mathcal{L}\} .$$

$$\widehat{\gamma}(\varphi, \psi) = \widehat{\gamma}(\varphi\psi^{-1}).$$

*Remarks 3.7.* (1) It follows from [V3] (Proposition 2.13, page 452) that  $\widehat{\gamma}$  is a metric.

(2) For  $M = T^n$ , the graph of  $\varphi$ ,

$$\Gamma(\varphi) = \{(z, \varphi(z)) \mid z \in T^*T^n\}$$

is a Lagrangian submanifold of  $T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n}$  (where  $\overline{T^*M}$  is  $T^*M$  with the symplectic form of opposite sign :  $-dp \wedge dq$ ).

But  $T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n}$  is covered by  $T^*(\Delta_{T^*T^n})$  where  $\Delta_{T^*T^n}$  is the diagonal, by the symplectic map of  $T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n}$  to  $T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} j : T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n) &\longrightarrow T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n} \\ (u, v, U, V) &\longrightarrow (u - V, v, u, v - U) \end{aligned}$$

Here  $(q, p) \in T^*T^n$ ,  $(Q, P) \in \overline{T^*T^n}$ , the symplectic form being

$$dp \wedge dq - dP \wedge dQ,$$

while  $(u, v) \in T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $(u, v, U, V) \in T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  with symplectic form  $dU \wedge du + dV \wedge dv$ .

In other words, the inverse of  $j$ ,

$$(q, p, Q, P) \longrightarrow (Q, p, p - P, Q - q) = (u, v, U, V)$$

is not well-defined –  $Q, q$  being only defined modulo  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ , so is  $V$  – it is thus multivalued.

We may then lift  $\Gamma(\varphi)$  to  $\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi) = j^{-1}(\Gamma(\varphi))$ , which is now a Lagrangian submanifold in  $T^*(\Delta_{T^*T^n})$ .

When  $\varphi$  has compact support, we may compactify both  $\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)$  and  $\Delta_{T^*T^n}$  and we get a Lagrangian submanifold  $\bar{\Gamma}(\varphi)$  in  $T^*(S^n \times T^n)$ . We may then set

**Definition 3.8** ([V1], page 697). For  $M = T^n$ , the maps  $c_-, c_+$  and  $\gamma$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} c_-(\varphi) &= c(1 \otimes 1, \bar{\Gamma}(\varphi)) \\ c_+(\varphi) &= c(\mu_{T^n} \otimes \mu_{S^n}, \bar{\Gamma}(\varphi)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\gamma(\varphi) = \gamma(\bar{\Gamma}(\varphi)) = c(\mu_{T^n} \otimes \mu_{S^n}, \bar{\Gamma}(\varphi)) - c(1 \otimes 1, \bar{\Gamma}(\varphi)) .$$

Theorem B.2 from Appendix B immediately implies that  $\widehat{\gamma}(\varphi) \leq \gamma(\varphi)$ . Since  $\gamma(\varphi)$  is finite, the same holds for  $\widehat{\gamma}(\varphi)$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** (see [V3], prop. 2.11, page 451 and 2.13 page 452 )

The map  $\widehat{\gamma}$  defines a bi-invariant metric on  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$  since

- (1) it is nondegenerate  $\widehat{\gamma}(\varphi) = 0 \iff \varphi = id$
- (2) it is invariant by conjugation  $\widehat{\gamma}(\psi\varphi\psi^{-1}) = \widehat{\gamma}(\varphi)$  for any  $\psi$  in  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$ .
- (3) it satisfies the triangle inequality

$$\widehat{\gamma}(\varphi\psi) \leq \widehat{\gamma}(\varphi) + \widehat{\gamma}(\psi)$$

for any  $\varphi, \psi$  in  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$ .

The above properties also hold for  $\gamma$  instead of  $\widehat{\gamma}$  when  $M = T^n$ .

*Proof.* We only deal with  $M = T^n$  and the metric  $\gamma$ . Then according to [V3], proposition 2.11,  $\gamma$  is a distance on the set of Lagrangian Hamiltonianly diffeomorphic to the zero section. We apply this to  $\overline{\Gamma}(\varphi) \subset T^*(S^n \times T^n)$ . Property (1) follows from the non-degeneracy of the metric on  $\mathcal{L}(T^*(S^n \times T^n))$ . Property (2) from the fact that  $\psi \times \psi$  extends to  $T^*(S^n \times T^n)$  as a Hamiltonian map isotopic to the identity and preserving the zero section (corresponding to the diagonal in  $T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n}$ ), so that according to proposition 3.5 p. 695 of [V1], we have  $\gamma((\psi \times \psi)(\overline{\Gamma}(\varphi))) = \gamma(\overline{\Gamma}(\varphi))$  but,  $(\psi \times \psi)(\overline{\Gamma}(\varphi)) = \overline{\Gamma}(\psi \circ \varphi \circ \psi^{-1})$ , so we conclude that  $\gamma(\psi \circ \varphi \circ \psi^{-1}) = \gamma(\varphi)$ . The last property follows easily from the triangle inequality from corollary 3.6 page 696 of [V1]. □

Let  $\lambda = pdq$  be the Liouville form on  $T^*M$ . A vector field  $Z$  is called a Liouville vector field, if  $Z = Z_\lambda + X_H$  where  $X_H$  is Hamiltonian, while  $i_{Z_\lambda}\omega = \lambda$  (hence  $i_Z\omega = \lambda + dH$ ). In particular  $Z$  is conformal (i.e. the flow  $\psi_t$  of  $Z$  satisfies  $\psi_t^*\omega = e^t\omega$ ) and we have, according to [V1] (corollary 4.3 page 698)

$$(3.1) \quad \gamma(\psi_t\varphi\psi_t^{-1}) = e^t\gamma(\varphi) .$$

On the set  $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$  the metric  $\widehat{\gamma}$  is defined as follows<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Remember that elements of  $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$  are time-dependent Hamiltonians.

**Definition 3.10.** Let  $H(t, z)$  be a Hamiltonian in  $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$  with flow  $\varphi_H^t$ . We denote by

$$\widehat{\gamma}(H, K) = \sup \{ \widehat{\gamma}(\varphi_H^t \circ (\varphi_K^t)^{-1}) \mid t \in [0, 1] \}$$

and similarly

$$\gamma(H, K) = \sup \{ \gamma(\varphi_H^t \circ (\varphi_K^t)^{-1}) \mid t \in [0, 1] \}$$

Finally we state two convergence criteria for the  $\gamma$ -metric.

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let  $M = \mathbb{R}^n$  or  $T^n$ .*

*Let  $\varphi_H, \varphi_K$  be the time-one flows associated to  $H, K$  in  $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$ . We have*

$$\gamma(H, K) \leq \|H - K\|_{C^0([0,1] \times T^*M, \mathbb{R})}.$$

*As a result, if the sequence  $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$  of Hamiltonians on  $T^*M$  with fixed support,  $C^0$ -converges to  $H$ , then  $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$  converges, in the metric  $\gamma$ , to  $H$ .*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from [V1] (Proposition 4.6, page 699 and Proposition 4.14 page 707). It is stated explicitly for example as proposition 2.15 in [V3] or in [Hu] p. 378 proposition 2.4, d). □

We may therefore define the completion  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*M)$  of  $\mathcal{H}_c(T^*M)$  for  $\gamma$ , as Humilière did (see [Hu], section 4, page 388). By the above proposition we deduce that a sequence of Hamiltonians  $C^0$ -converging uniformly on compact sets will be a Cauchy sequence for  $\gamma$ , hence defines an element in  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(T^*M)$ . We thus get

**Proposition 3.12** (see [Hu], proposition 1.3). *There is a continuous inclusion map*

$$C_c^0([0, 1] \times T^*M, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*M)$$

*Similarly if  $\mathcal{HD}_c^0(T^*M)$  is the  $C^0$ -closure of  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M)$  we have a continuous inclusion*

$$\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*M) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*M)$$

Finally, we claim that the spectral numbers  $c(\alpha, L)$  are well defined on the  $\gamma$ -completions of the above metric spaces, for example in  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*M)$ .

**Proposition 3.13.** *For any non-zero cohomology class  $\alpha$ , the map  $L \mapsto c(\alpha, L)$  defined on  $\mathcal{L}(T^*M)$  uniquely extends to a continuous map defined on  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(T^*M)$ . Similarly, the map  $\varphi \mapsto c(\alpha, \varphi)$  uniquely extends as a continuous map defined on  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}(T^*T^n)$ .*

*Proof.* This is just an application of the general statement that a Lipschitz map defined on a metric space has a unique extension to its completion. Now  $|c(\alpha, L) - c(\alpha, L')| \leq \gamma(L, L')$  according to Appendix B, Proposition B.3. Thus  $L \mapsto c(\alpha, L)$  is Lipschitz for  $\gamma$ , which proves the first claim. The second one follows immediately from the definition.  $\square$

## 3.2 Variational solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations

Let us consider the symplectic covering of  $T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n}$  by  $T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} j : T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n) &\longrightarrow T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n} \\ (u, v, U, V) &\longrightarrow (u - V, v, u, v - U) \end{aligned}$$

In other words,  $j^{-1}$  resolves the indeterminacy of

$$(q, p, Q, P) \longrightarrow (Q, p, p - P, Q - q) = (u, v, U, V)$$

Let  $\varphi^t$  be the Hamiltonian flow of  $H(q, p)$ , and  $\widetilde{\Gamma}(\varphi^t)$  the lift of its graph in  $T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ . Let  $S_t(q, P, \xi)$  be a G.F.Q.I. for  $\widetilde{\Gamma}(\varphi^t)$ . We define  $S_{t,q,P}(\xi) = S_t(q, P; \xi)$  and define  $c(1(q, P), S_t) = c(1, S_{t,q,P})$ . Then  $u_t(q, P) = c(1(q, P), S_t)$  is, by definition, the variational solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_t(q, P) + H(q, P + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_t(q)) = 0 \\ u_0(q, P) = 0. \end{cases}$$

We refer to [O-V] and [C-V] for more information on variational solutions, in particular the fact that it does not depend on the choice of  $S$ .

*Remark 3.14.* Since the restriction of  $S$  to the fiber over  $(q, P)$  is a function on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  quadratic at infinity, we may apply our minimax procedure in the situation where  $M$  is the singleton  $\{(q, P)\}$ . Since  $H^*(\{(q, P)\})$  is generated by a single element denoted 1, and to remember the point  $(q, P)$ , we denote the minimax applied to  $S_{q,P}$  as  $c(1(q, P), S)$ . More generally, let  $S(x, y; \xi)$  be a G.F.Q.I. the notation  $c(\alpha \otimes 1(y), S)$  denotes  $c(\alpha, S_y)$  where  $S_y(x, \xi) = S(x, y, \xi)$ .

## 4 Statement of the main results

We shall first give our results in the case of homogenization with respect to all variables, then present the case of partial homogenization, and finally the applications to variational solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations.

### 4.1 Standard homogenization.

**Theorem 4.1** (Main theorem).

*Let  $H(t, q, p)$  be a compactly supported,  $C^2$ -Hamiltonian, 1-periodic in  $t$  on  $T^*T^n$ . Then the following holds:*

- (1) *There exists a Hamiltonian  $\bar{H} \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$  such that the sequence  $H_k(t, q, p) = H(kt, kq, p)$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\bar{H}(t, q, p) = \bar{H}(p)$ .*
- (2) *The function  $\bar{H}$  only depends on  $\varphi^1$ , the time-one map associated to  $H$  (i.e. it does not depend on the isotopy  $(\varphi^t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ ).*
- (3) *The map*

$$\mathcal{A} : C_c^2([0, 1] \times T^*T^n, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$$

*defined by  $\mathcal{A}(H) = \bar{H}$  extends to a nonlinear projector (i.e. satisfying  $\mathcal{A}^2 = \mathcal{A}$ ) with Lipschitz constant 1*

$$\mathcal{A} : \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*T^n) \rightarrow C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$$

*where the metric on  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c$  is given by  $\gamma$ , and the metric on  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$  is the  $C^0$  metric.*

The next theorem states some properties of the homogenization map  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Theorem 4.2** (Main properties of symplectic homogenization).

The map  $\mathcal{A}$  defined in the above theorem satisfies the following properties:

- (1) It is monotone, i.e. if  $H_1 \leq H_2$ , then  $\mathcal{A}(H_1) \leq \mathcal{A}(H_2)$ .
- (2) It is invariant under the action of a Hamiltonian symplectomorphism:  $\mathcal{A}(H \circ \psi) = \mathcal{A}(H)$  for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n)$ .
- (3) We have  $\mathcal{A}(-H) = -\mathcal{A}(H)$ .
- (4) The map  $\mathcal{A}$  extends to a map (still denoted by  $\mathcal{A}$ ) between  $\mathcal{P}(T^*T^n)$ , the set of subsets of  $T^*T^n$ , to  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the set of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . This map is bounded by the symplectic shape of Sikorav (see [Be, Sik2, El]), i.e.

$$\text{shape}(U) = \{p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists \psi \in \mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n), \psi(T^n \times \{p_0\}) \subset U\} \subset \mathcal{A}(U).$$

- (5) If  $L$  is a Lagrangian Hamiltonianly isotopic to  $L_{p_0} = \{(q, p_0) \in T^*T^n\}$  and  $H(L) \geq h$  (resp.  $\leq h$ ) we have  $\mathcal{A}(H)(p_0) \geq h$  (resp.  $\leq h$ ).
- (6) We have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} c_+(\varphi^k) = \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} \overline{H}(p)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} c_-(\varphi^k) = \inf_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} \overline{H}(p).$$

- (7) Given any Radon measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  the map

$$\zeta(H) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{A}(H)(p) d\mu(p)$$

is a **symplectic quasi-state** (cf. [E-P] for the definition and properties of this notion, based on an earlier work by [Aar]). In particular we have  $\mathcal{A}(H + K) = \mathcal{A}(H) + \mathcal{A}(K)$  whenever  $H$  and  $K$  Poisson-commute (i.e.  $\{H, K\} = 0$ ).

*Remarks 4.3.* • In (1) the assumption could be replaced by the property that  $H_1 \preceq H_2$  in the sense of [V1] (i.e.  $c_-(\varphi_{H_2}^1 \circ \varphi_{H_1}^1) = 0$ , see [V1], definition 4.9, page 701).



- As a result of (5) if  $u$  is a smooth subsolution of the stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation, that is  $H(x, p + du(x)) \leq h$ , then  $\overline{H}(p) \leq h$ . Similarly if  $u$  is a smooth supersolution, that is  $H(q, p + du(q)) \geq h$ , then  $\overline{H}(p) \geq h$ .
- From (5), we get the following statement: let

$$E_c^+ = \{p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists L \text{ Hamiltonian isotopic to } L_{p_0}, H(L) \geq c\}$$

$$E_c^- = \{p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists L \text{ Hamiltonian isotopic to } L_{p_0}, H(L) \leq c\}$$

As a result, if  $p \in \overline{E}_c^+ \cap \overline{E}_c^-$ , we have  $\overline{H}(p) = c$ .

Symplectic quasi-states have been defined for compact manifolds in [Aar] and [E-P]. Here we satisfy all properties, except for the property  $\zeta(1) = 1$ , which needs a suitable interpretation, since  $\zeta$  is only defined on compact supported functions. However, we are able to prove that for sequences of non-negative compact supported functions,  $(H_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , such that in the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets,  $\lim_n H_n = 1$ , we have  $\lim_n \zeta(H_n) = 1$ .

## 4.2 Partial homogenization

We now consider the case of a Hamiltonian defined on  $T^*T^n \times M$ , where  $M$  is some symplectic manifold. We shall only deal with the case where  $M = T^*T^m$ , but the general case can be easily adapted. Indeed, notice that it is enough to define the homogenization for  $\varphi^t$  for small  $t$ . But the graph of  $\varphi_k^t$  for  $t$  small is in a neighborhood of  $T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n) \times \Delta_M$ , hence in  $T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n) \times T^*\Delta_M$ . Since the graph lives in a cotangent bundle, we shall see that it can again be described, using the theory of generating functions<sup>3</sup>.

**Theorem 4.4** (Main theorem, partial homogenization case). *Let  $H(t, x, y, q, p)$  be a Hamiltonian on  $T^*T^{n+m}$ . Then*

- (1) *The sequence  $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$  defined by*

$$H_k(t, x, y, q, p) = H(kt, kx, y, q, p)$$

*$\gamma$ -converges to a continuous function  $\overline{H}$  of the form  $\overline{H}(y, q, p)$ .*

---

<sup>3</sup>Indeed, the main advantage of  $T^n$  over general closed manifolds, is that  $T^*T^n \times \overline{T^*T^n}$  is covered by  $T^*\Delta$ , while for general  $M$  this only holds in a neighborhood of the diagonal.

(2) The map

$$\mathcal{A}_x : C_c^2([0, 1] \times T^*T^{n+m}, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^0(\mathbb{R}^n \times T^*T^m, \mathbb{R})$$

given by  $\mathcal{A}_x(H) = \overline{H}$  extends to a projector (i.e. it satisfies  $\mathcal{A}_x^2 = \mathcal{A}_x$ ) with Lipschitz constant 1

$$\mathcal{A}_x : \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(T^*T^{n+m}) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{R}^n \times T^*T^m)$$

where the metric on  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$  is  $\gamma$ .

(3) If  $H_{(q,p)}(x, y) = H(x, y, q, p)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{A}_x(H)(y, q, p) = \mathcal{A}(H_{(q,p)})(y)$$

Thus partial homogenization is obtained by freezing the non-homogenized variables.

*Remarks 4.5.* (1) The Hamiltonian  $\overline{H}(y, q, p)$  is called the effective Hamiltonian. In case it is smooth, its flow is given by  $\overline{\Phi}(x_0, y_0, q_0, p_0) = (x(t), y(t), q(t), p(t))$

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= y_0, \quad x(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \overline{H}}{\partial y}(y_0, q(t), p(t)) dt, \\ \dot{q}(t) &= \frac{\partial \overline{H}}{\partial p}(y_0, q(t), p(t)), \quad \dot{p}(t) = -\frac{\partial \overline{H}}{\partial q}(y_0, q(t), p(t)) \end{aligned}$$

(2) It is not true anymore that  $\overline{H}$  depends only on the time-one map of  $H$ . It however only depends on the family of time-one maps of  $H_{(q,p)}$ .

(3) More generally, using (3), we may we may prove properties of  $\mathcal{A}_x$  analogous to the properties of  $\mathcal{A}$  stated in Theorem 4.1. The projector  $\mathcal{A}_x$  is not invariant by symplectic maps. It is however invariant by fiber-preserving Hamiltonian symplectic maps: if  $\psi(x, y, q, p) = (\psi_{(q,p)}(x, y), \psi_2(q, p))$  we have

$$\mathcal{A}_x(H \circ \psi)(y, q, p) = \mathcal{A}_x(H)(y, \psi_2(q, p))$$

### 4.3 Homogenized Hamilton-Jacobi equations

Our theorem has some interesting applications to generalized solutions of evolution Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Consider the equation:

$$(HJ) \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, q) + H(t, q, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u(t, x)) = 0 \\ u(0, q) = f(q) . \end{cases}$$

where  $t \in \mathbb{R}, q \in T^n$  and  $H$  is periodic in time.

Smooth solutions to such equations are only defined for  $t$  less than some  $T_0$  : in general, solutions exhibit shocks:  $|\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}|_{C^0([0, T] \times T^n, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})}$  blows-up as  $t$  goes to  $T_0$ .

There are essentially two types of generalized solutions for such equations : viscosity solutions (cf. [C-L]) and variational solutions (cf. [Sik], [Ch1], [O-V]). These two solutions do not coincide in general, with one notable exception: when the Hamiltonian is convex in  $p$  (cf. [Zh 2]).

From [L-P-V] it follows that if  $H$  is coercive in  $p$ , and  $u_k$  is the viscosity solution<sup>4</sup> of

$$(HJ_k) \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_k(t, q) + H(kt, kq, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u_k(t, q)) = 0 \\ u_k(0, q) = f(q) . \end{cases}$$

the sequence  $(u_k)_{k \geq 1}$  converges to  $\bar{u}$ , the viscosity solution of

$$(\overline{HJ}) \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{u}(t, q) + \overline{H}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \bar{u}(t, q)) = 0 \\ \bar{u}(0, q) = f(q) . \end{cases}$$

Our theorem, together with results by Humilière (cf. [Hu] section 6, in particular Proposition 6.1) implies that this extends to the non-coercive case, provided  $u_k$  is the variational solution and  $\overline{H}$  is given by our main theorem. We now state the more general proposition, yielding the analog of [L-P-V] :

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $H \in C^0(T^*T^{n+m}, \mathbb{R})$  be either coercive (i.e.  $\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} H(x, p) = +\infty$ ) or compactly supported,  $f \in C^0(T^{n+m}, \mathbb{R})$  and  $u_k$  the variational solution of  $(HJP_k)$ :*

$$(HJP_k) \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_k(t, x, q) + H(kx, q, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u_k(t, x, q), \frac{\partial}{\partial q} u_k(t, x, q)) = 0 \\ u_k(0, x, q) = f(x, q) . \end{cases}$$

---

<sup>4</sup>We refer to [L-P-V] for the definition of viscosity solutions.

Then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} u_k(t, x, q) = \bar{u}(t, x, q)$  where convergence is uniform on  $T^n \times [0, T]$  compact time intervals and  $\bar{u}$  is the variational solution of  $(\overline{HJP})$ :

$$(\overline{HJP}) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \bar{u}(t, x, q) + \overline{H}(q, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \bar{u}(t, x, q), \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \bar{u}_k(t, x, q)) = 0 \\ \bar{u}(0, x, q) = f(x, q). \end{cases}$$

More precisely, there is a sequence  $\varepsilon_k$  going to zero, such that for all  $t \geq 1$

$$|u_k(t, x, q) - \bar{u}(t, x, q)| \leq \varepsilon_k t.$$

The next three sections will be devoted to the proof of our main theorem, first in the “standard case”, then in the “partial homogenization” setting.

## 5 Proof of the main theorem.

Let us introduce the reader to the main steps of the proof. We denote by  $\varphi_k^t$  the flow of  $H_k(t, q, p) = H(kt, kq, p)$ . In the first part of subsection 5.1, we shall construct a G.F.Q.I. of the graph of the  $\varphi_k^t$ , starting from a G.F.Q.I. of the graph of the flow  $\varphi^t = \varphi_1^t$ .

Our proof will then be split in two parts:

- Finding a candidate  $\bar{\varphi}^t$  for the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $\varphi_k^t$ , or equivalently a candidate  $\overline{H}$  for the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $H_k$
- Showing that the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $\varphi_k^t$  is indeed  $\bar{\varphi}^t$ .

The first step goes along the following lines: if  $H$  does not depend on  $q$ , then  $c(\mu_q \otimes 1(p), \varphi^1) = H(p)$ , so<sup>5</sup>. Thus if  $H_k$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\overline{H}$ , we must have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} c(\mu_q \otimes 1(p), \varphi_k^1) = \overline{H}(p)$$

We shall thus try to define  $\overline{H}$  using this formula, and we shall first prove that this limit exists. This is the object of the second part of subsection 5.1 and is proved in proposition 5.9. We thus get a candidate  $\bar{\varphi}^1$  for the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $\varphi_k^1$ .

---

<sup>5</sup>Remember that according to Proposition 3.13, spectral numbers are well defined on  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$ .

The second step is more delicate, and is dealt with in subsection 5.2. The formula obtained for the G.F.Q.I. of  $\varphi_k^t$  yields the following inequality valid for any Hamiltonian map  $\alpha$

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} c(\mu \otimes 1, \varphi_k \alpha) \leq c(\mu \otimes 1, \bar{\varphi} \alpha)$$

and proved in proposition 5.13.

We must then prove the reverse inequality. This requires us to use the previous inequality with  $\varphi^{-1}$  instead of  $\varphi$ , the difficulty being that we do not know *a priori* that  $\overline{\varphi^{-1}} = \bar{\varphi}^{-1}$ . The proof that this equality indeed holds follows from section 7.

Finally note that we do not know<sup>6</sup>, in general, whether the convergence of a sequence of Hamiltonians  $(H_k)_{k \geq 1}$  follows from the convergence of the sequence of flows  $(\varphi_k^t)_{k \geq 1}$ . Indeed, it could happen that in the completion  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$ , the same family of maps  $\bar{\varphi}^t$ , is obtained from two different Hamiltonians i.e. is the image of two different elements of  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*T^n)$  by the extension to the completions of the exponential map  $H \rightarrow \varphi_H^t$ . However, two continuous integrable Hamiltonians  $H_1(p), H_2(p)$  cannot have the same flow, as is proved in corollary A.2 in Appendix A.

## 5.1 Reformulating the problem and finding the homogenized Hamiltonian.

First of all, we shall assume we are dealing with a compact supported autonomous Hamiltonian. We shall see in section 12, subsection 12.2 that the general case reduces to this one.

Let  $\varphi^t$  be the flow associated to  $H$ , and  $\varphi = \varphi^1$ .

Similarly let  $\varphi_k^t$  be the flow associated to  $H_k(q, p) = H(kq, p)$ , and  $\varphi_k = \varphi_k^1$ . We first compute  $\varphi_k^t$  as a function of  $\varphi^t$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\rho_k(q, p) = (kq, p)$ , then  $\varphi_k^t = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \rho_k$ .*

*Proof.* The map  $\rho_k$  is conformally symplectic, hence

$$\begin{aligned} dH_k(z)\xi &= dH(\rho_k(z))d\rho_k(z)\xi = \omega(X_H(\rho_k(z)), d\rho_k(z)\xi) \\ &= (\rho_k^* \omega)(d\rho_k^{-1}(z)X_H(\rho_k(z)), \xi) \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>6</sup>In the case of continuous Hamiltonians and flows, i.e. the case of the group *Hameo*, this is proved in [V6]. I owe this remark to Vincent Humilière and Nicolas Vichery.

Since  $\rho_k^* \omega = k\omega$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} X_{H_k}(z) &= k((\rho_k)_* X_H)(z) \\ &= (\rho_k)_*(kX_H)(z) \end{aligned}$$

The flow of  $kX_H$  is  $\varphi^{kt}$ , hence the flow of  $(\rho_k)_*(kX_H)$  is  $\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^{kt}\rho_k$ .  $\square$

We are thus looking for the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k$ .

**Remark :** The map  $\rho_k^{-1}$  is not well-defined on  $T^*T^n$ , so that *a priori* the lemma only makes sense on  $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ . However given a continuous path  $z(t)$  from  $z_0$  to  $z_1$  in  $T^*T^n$ , and  $u_0$  such that  $ku_0 = z_0$ , we may find a unique continuous path  $u(t)$  such that  $u(0) = u_0$  and  $ku(t) = z(t)$ . Therefore, to an isotopy  $\psi^t$  starting at the identity, corresponds a unique lift  $\tilde{\psi}^t$  such that  $\rho_k\tilde{\psi}^t = \psi^t$ . Moreover the map  $\tilde{\psi}^1$  only depends on  $\psi^1$  and not on the choice of the Hamiltonian isotopy.

Note also that we may replace  $\varphi = \varphi^1$  by  $\varphi^{1/r}$  for some fixed integer  $r$ . Indeed, if  $\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^{k/r}\rho_k$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\psi$ , we have that

$$\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k = \rho_r(\rho_{kr}^{-1}\varphi^{kr/r}\rho_{kr})\rho_r^{-1}$$

$\gamma$ -converges to  $\rho_r\psi\rho_r^{-1}$ . If our theorem is proved for  $\varphi^{1/r}$ ,  $\psi$  will be generated by a Hamiltonian depending only on the  $p$  variable. We easily check that in this case

$$\rho_r\psi\rho_r^{-1} = \psi^r.$$

In other words,  $\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\psi^r$ .

We assume for simplicity in the sequel that  $\varphi$  is  $C^1$ -close to the identity, so that it lifts to a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism  $\tilde{\varphi}$  of  $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $C^1$ -close to the identity. The graph of the map  $\tilde{\varphi}$  has a generating function

$$\widehat{S}(Q, p) = \langle p, Q \rangle + S(Q, p)$$

that is

$$\tilde{\varphi}\left(\frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial p}(Q, p), p\right) = \left(Q, \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial Q}(Q, p)\right)$$

where  $S$  is defined and compactly supported on  $T^*T^n$ , and we identify  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with its projection in  $T^n$ , and  $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . By abuse of notation, we shall still denote by  $S$  the lift of  $S$  to  $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ .

The function  $S$  defines  $\tilde{\varphi}$  by the relation

$$\tilde{\varphi} \left( Q + \frac{\partial S}{\partial p}(Q, p), p \right) = \left( Q, p + \frac{\partial S}{\partial Q}(Q, p) \right)$$

This means that the graph  $\bar{\Gamma}(\tilde{\varphi})$  of  $\tilde{\varphi}$  in  $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \times \overline{T^*\mathbb{R}^n} \simeq T^*\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}}$ , has the generating function  $S(q, p)$  that is the lift of a compactly supported function defined on  $T^*T^n$ .

In other words, if  $\tilde{\varphi}(q, p) = (Q, P)$  we have

$$\begin{cases} P - p = \frac{\partial S}{\partial Q}(Q, p) \\ q - Q = \frac{\partial S}{\partial p}(Q, p) \end{cases}$$

*Remark 5.2.* In the sequel  $(q_j, p_j) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ , even though, by our usual abuse of notations, we identify  $q_j$  with its projection on  $T^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$ . Note however that for  $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , we have that  $\Sigma_k$  and  $S_k = \widehat{S}_k - \langle p_k, q_1 \rangle$  are invariant by  $(q_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n} \rightarrow (q_j + \nu)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ . We emphasize that the  $q_j$  and  $p_j$  are vector coordinates (i.e. each  $q_j$  and each  $p_j$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ )

We now give the composition law for generating functions, due to Chekanov (cf. [Che]).

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  be Hamiltonian maps having  $S_1, S_2$  as generating functions, compactly supported functions on  $T^*T^n$ . Then  $\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$  has the generating function*

$$\begin{aligned} S(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1) &= S_1(q_1, p_1) + S_2(q_2, p_2) + \langle p_1, q_1 \rangle + \langle p_2, q_2 \rangle - \langle p_1, q_2 \rangle - \langle p_2, q_1 \rangle. \\ &= S_1(q_1, p_1) + S_2(q_2, p_2) + \langle p_1 - p_2, q_1 - q_2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

where  $q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n, q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Remark 5.4.* (1) Note that the above  $S$  is a GFQI, since the sum of two functions (in different variables) with derivatives at bounded distance from the derivative of a quadratic form is at bounded distance from the derivative of a quadratic form. Note that according to Brunella ([Bru], see also [V3], prop. 1.6),  $S$  may be deformed to a generating function that is equal to a quadratic form outside a compact set.

(2) Note that in the above lemma,  $q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is identified with its projection on  $T^n$ . We may remark that if we set  $p_2 = p_1 - v, q_2 = q_1 + u$ , we have

$$S(q_1, p_2; q_1 + u, p_2 + v) = S_1(q_1, p_2 + v) + S_2(q_1 + u, p_2) - \langle v, u \rangle$$

so that  $S$  is a G.F.Q.I., and is the lift of a function defined on  $T^*T^n \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  ( $q_1 \in T^n, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ).

*Proof.* This is a simple computation. The lemma is equivalent to the equality<sup>7</sup>

$$\widehat{S}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1) = \widehat{S}_1(q_1, p_1) + \widehat{S}_2(q_2, p_2) - \langle p_1, q_2 \rangle,$$

so we must prove that  $\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$  maps

$$\left( \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial p_2}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1), p_2 \right) = \left( \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_2}{\partial p_2}(q_2, p_2), p_2 \right)$$

to

$$\left( q_1, \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial q_1}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1) \right) = \left( q_1, \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_1}{\partial q_1}(q_1, p_1) \right)$$

where  $(q_1, p_1, q_2, p_2)$  are constrained by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial p_1}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1) = 0 & \text{i.e. } q_2 = \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_1}{\partial p_1}(q_1, p_1) \\ \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial q_2}(q_1, p_2, q_2, p_1) = 0 & \text{i.e. } p_1 = \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_2}{\partial q_2}(q_2, p_2). \end{cases}$$

These last two equations are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_2 \left( \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_2}{\partial p_2}(q_2, p_2), p_2 \right) &= \left( q_2, \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_2}{\partial q_2}(q_2, p_2) \right) \\ &= (q_2, p_1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\varphi_1(q_2, p_1) = \varphi_1 \left( \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_1}{\partial p_1}(q_1, p_1), p_1 \right) = \left( q_1, \frac{\partial \widehat{S}_1}{\partial q_1}(q_1, p_1) \right)$$

and thus

$$\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \left( \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial p_2}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1), p_2 \right) = \left( q_1, \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial q_1}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1) \right)$$

---

<sup>7</sup>Remember that variables before the semicolon are base variables, those after the semicolon are fiber variables, and the  $q_j, p_j$  are vector coordinates.



where  $(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1)$  are constrained by

$$\frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial q_2}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1) = \frac{\partial \widehat{S}}{\partial p_1}(q_1, p_2; q_2, p_1) = 0.$$

□

More generally, we get:

**Lemma 5.5.** *The map  $\widetilde{\varphi}^k$  has the generating function*

$$\widehat{S}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, p_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) = \Sigma_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, p_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) + \widehat{B}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, p_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k)$$

where

$$\Sigma_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, p_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) = \sum_{j=1}^k S(q_j, p_j)$$

and

$$\widehat{B}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \langle p_j - p_{j+1}, q_j - q_{j+1} \rangle + \langle p_k, q_1 \rangle$$

*Proof.* The proof follows immediately by induction from the previous lemma. □

Note that  $\widehat{B}_k$  could be rewritten as

$$\widehat{B}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \langle p_j, q_j - q_{j+1} \rangle + \langle p_k, q_k \rangle.$$

Again,  $\Sigma_k$  is defined on  $(T^*T^n)^k$ , while  $\widehat{B}_k$  is defined on  $(T^*\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ . Finally we have

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $\varphi$  a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism of  $T^*T^n$  generated by  $S(q, p)$ . Then  $\varphi_k = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k$  is generated by  $\widehat{F}_k$  given by*

$$\widehat{F}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) = \frac{1}{k} \Sigma_k(kq_1, p_k; p_1, \dots, kq_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, kq_k) + \widehat{B}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k)$$

*Proof.* Indeed it is a general fact that if  $S(q, p; \xi)$  is a generating function for  $\psi : T^*\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ , we have that  $\rho_k^{-1}\psi\rho_k$  is generated by  $\frac{1}{k}S(kq, p; \xi)$ .

Thus in our case, we expect the generating function

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{G}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) = \\ \frac{1}{k} \widehat{\Sigma}_k(kq_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) \\ + \frac{1}{k} \widehat{B}_k(kq_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) . \end{aligned}$$

But the fiber preserving change of variable  $q_j \mapsto kq_j$  ( $j \geq 2$ ) sends  $\widehat{G}_k$  to

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{F}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) = \\ \frac{1}{k} \widehat{\Sigma}_k(kq_1, p_k; p_1, kq_2, \dots, kq_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) \\ + \frac{1}{k} \widehat{B}_k(kq_1, p_k; p_1, kq_2, \dots, kq_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) . \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that the last term is equal to

$$\widehat{B}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) .$$

□

**Definition 5.7.** We set to simplify our notations

$$x = q_1, y = p_k, \xi = (p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) .$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned} F_k(x, y; \xi) = \widehat{F}_k(q_1, p_k; p_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_k) - \langle p_k, q_1 \rangle = \\ \frac{1}{k} \left[ S(kx, p_1) + \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} S(kq_j, p_j) + S(kq_k, y) \right] + \widehat{B}_k(x, y, \xi) - \langle y, x \rangle = \\ \frac{1}{k} \left[ S(kx, p_1) + \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} S(kq_j, p_j) + S(kq_k, y) \right] + B_k(x, y, \xi) \end{aligned}$$

where  $B_k(x, y, \xi) = \widehat{B}_k(x, y, \xi) - \langle y, x \rangle$ . We then set  $h_k(y) = c(\mu_x, F_{k,y}) = c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), F_k)$  where  $F_{k,y} = F_k(x, y; \xi)$ .

*Remarks 5.8.* **(1)** As long as we write  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), S)$  for a generating function  $S$ , there is no ambiguity. However, if  $\Lambda$  is the Lagrangian associated to  $S$ , and we write an expression like  $c(\mu, (\Lambda)_y)$ , one should be careful since  $S$  is only defined up to a constant, and this constant yields a coherent choice of a G.F.Q.I. for  $(\Lambda)_y$  for each  $y$ , so that the  $c(\mu, \Lambda_y)$  are well-defined up to the same constant for all values of the parameter  $y$ , and not up to a function of  $y$  as one could expect.

Indeed, a choice of  $S$ , a G.F.Q.I. for  $L$  defines a G.F.Q.I. for  $(L)_y$ , by  $S_y = S(y, \bullet)$ .

- (2)** Note also that for  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k) = (\nu_1, \bar{\nu}) \in \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}^{k-1}$ , we have  $F_k(x, y; \xi) = F_k(x + \nu_1, y, \xi + \bar{\nu})$ , where  $\xi + \bar{\nu} = (p_1, q_2 + \nu_2, \dots, p_{k-1}, q_k + \nu_k)$ . Indeed, this periodicity is obvious for the terms inside brackets, and the quadratic term can be rewritten as

$$Q_k(q_1, p_k; p_2, \dots, q_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \langle p_j, q_j - q_{j+1} \rangle + \langle p_k, q_k - q_1 \rangle$$

remembering that  $x = q_1, y = p_k$ . So writing  $\zeta = (p_1, q_2 - q_1, \dots, p_{k-1}, q_k - q_1)$ , we may write  $F_k(x, y; \xi) = F_k(x, y; \zeta)$  with  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{(k-1)2n}$  and  $x \in T^n$ .

- (3)** Note that since  $\varphi_k^t$  equals the identity outside a compact set of the cotangent bundle, the function  $\xi \mapsto F_k(x, y, \xi)$  will have for  $y$  large enough a single critical point with critical value equal to zero (by normalization). According to remark 5.4, (1), we could deform  $F_k$  to be exactly quadratic for  $y$  large enough, but this is not really useful, since for such values of  $y$  topologically there is no way to distinguish  $\xi \mapsto F_k(x, y, \xi)$  from a quadratic form (the topology of the sublevels will coincide).
- (4)** The analogue of the above formula still holds if  $\varphi$  is not assumed to be  $C^1$  small. Then its graph has a generating function  $S(q, p; \zeta)$ , and  $\varphi_k^1$  has generating function

$$F_k(x, y; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k, \xi) = \frac{1}{k} \left[ S(kx, p_1, \zeta_1) + \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} S(kq_j, p_j, \zeta_j) + S(kq_k, y, \zeta_k) \right] + B_k(x, y, \xi)$$

**Proposition 5.9.** *The sequence  $(h_k)_{k \geq 1}$  is a precompact sequence for the  $C^0$  topology.*

The proposition will follow from Ascoli-Arzelà's theorem, once we prove the following

**Lemma 5.10.** *The sequence  $(h_k)_{k \geq 1}$  is equicontinuous.*

*Proof.* Indeed let  $\tilde{\varphi}$  be the lift of  $\varphi_k = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k$  to  $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ . It has support in some tube

$$T_A^*\mathbb{R}^n = \{(q, p) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^n \mid |p| \leq A\} .$$

Now remember from [V1] (section 2, pages 690-693) that  $c(\alpha, F_{k,p})$  is a critical value of  $F_{k,p}$ . Thus for each  $p$  there exists  $q(p), \xi(p)$  such that

$$\frac{\partial F_k}{\partial q}(q(p), p; \xi(p)) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial \xi}(q(p), p, \xi(p)) = 0$$

$$F_k(q(p), p, \xi(p)) = h_k(p) .$$

Moreover, for generic  $\varphi$ , the map  $p \mapsto (q(p), \xi(p))$  is smooth on the complement of some codimension one subset. Thus for  $p$  in this complement,

$$\begin{aligned} dh_k(p) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial p} F_k(q(p), p, \xi(p)) \\ &= q(p) - Q_k(q(p), p) \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_k$  is defined by

$$\tilde{\varphi}_k(q, p) = (Q_k(q, p), P_k(q, p)) .$$

The quantity  $q(p) - Q_k(q(p), p)$  can be estimated as follows : the first coordinate of the flow  $\tilde{\varphi}_k^t$  satisfies

$$\dot{q}_k(t) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(kq_k(t), p_k(t))$$

hence  $|\dot{q}_k(t)|$  is bounded by  $C = \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(q, p) \right| \mid (q, p) \in T^*T^n \right\}$  which is finite since  $H$  is compactly supported. This implies that  $|q - Q_k(q, p)| \leq C$  and from this we get the inequality

$$|dh_k(p)| = \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial p} F_k(q(p), p, \xi(p)) \right| \leq C$$

and since  $h_k$  is continuous, it is  $C$ -Lipschitz. □

From Ascoli-Arzelà and the above lemma, we see that the sequence  $(h_k)_{k \geq 1}$  is relatively compact. In other word it has a converging subsequence, and so does any of its subsequence. Our approach is now as follows. Consider a subsequence  $(h_{k_\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}$  of  $(h_k)_{k \geq 1}$  converging to  $h_\infty$ . We are going to prove that  $(\varphi_{k_\nu}^1)_{\nu \geq 1}$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\bar{\varphi}_\infty$ , the time-one flow of  $h_\infty$ . We still need to prove that the whole sequence  $(\varphi_k^1)_{k \geq 1}$  converges to  $\bar{\varphi}_\infty$ , but this follows from the following :

**Lemma 5.11.** *If a subsequence of  $(\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k)_{k \geq 1}$  has a  $\gamma$ -limit  $\bar{\sigma}$ , then any other  $\gamma$ -converging subsequence has the same  $\gamma$ -limit.*

*Proof.* We first claim that the following two properties hold for any  $\varphi, \psi$  in  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n)$ :

$$(5.1) \quad \gamma(\varphi^k\psi^k) \leq k\gamma(\varphi\psi)$$

$$(5.2) \quad \gamma(\rho_k^{-1}\varphi\rho_k) = \frac{1}{k}\gamma(\varphi) .$$

Indeed, we may write

$$\varphi^k\psi^k = \varphi\psi (\psi^{-1}(\varphi\psi)\psi) (\psi^{-2}(\varphi\psi)\psi^2) \dots (\psi^{-(k-1)}(\varphi\psi)\psi^{k-1})$$

Since each factor is conjugate to  $\varphi\psi$ , and we have  $k$  factors, property (5.1) follows immediately from conjugation invariance of  $\gamma$  and the triangle inequality. Property (5.2) follows from the scaling property of  $\gamma$  by conformal conjugation (see equation (3.1) in section 3).

Now it will be enough to prove that  $\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k$  can not have two distinct limit points. Indeed, let us assume we have two infinite sets of integers,  $A, B$  such that there exists  $\bar{\sigma}_1 \neq \bar{\sigma}_2$ , and a sequence  $\varepsilon_k$  converging to 0, such that

$$\lim_{k \in A} \gamma(\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k, \bar{\sigma}_1) \leq \varepsilon_k$$

$$\lim_{k \in B} \gamma(\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k, \bar{\sigma}_2) \leq \varepsilon_k$$

Now let  $k$  be some integer in  $A$ , so that  $\gamma(\rho_k^{-1}\varphi^k\rho_k, \bar{\sigma}_1)$  is less than  $\varepsilon_k$ . Then for any integer  $q$ ,

$$\gamma(\rho_{kq}^{-1}\varphi^{kq}\rho_{kq}, \bar{\varphi}) = \gamma(\rho_q^{-1}(\rho_q^{-1}\varphi^q\rho_q)^q\rho_q(\rho_q^{-1}\bar{\varphi}^{-q}\rho_q))$$

since

$$\bar{\varphi} = \rho_q^{-1} \bar{\varphi}^q \rho_q$$

But using (5.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\rho_{kq}^{-1} \varphi^{kq} \rho_{kq}, \bar{\varphi}_1) &= \gamma(\rho_q^{-1} (\rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k)^d \rho_q (\rho_q^{-1} \bar{\varphi}_1^{-q} \rho_q)) = \gamma(\rho_q^{-1} ((\rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k)^q \bar{\varphi}_1^{-q}) \rho_q) \leq \\ &\frac{1}{q} \gamma((\rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k)^q \bar{\varphi}_1^{-q}) \leq \frac{1}{q} q \gamma(\rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k \bar{\varphi}_1^{-1}) \leq \varepsilon_k \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we get that for  $k$  in  $B$ , and any  $q$ , we have

$$\gamma(\rho_{kq}^{-1} \varphi^{kq} \rho_{kq}, \bar{\varphi}_2) \leq \varepsilon_k$$

As a result, for  $k \in A, m \in B$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\rho_{km}^{-1} \varphi^{km} \rho_{km}, \bar{\varphi}_1) &\leq \varepsilon_k \\ \gamma(\rho_{km}^{-1} \varphi^{km} \rho_{km}, \bar{\varphi}_2) &\leq \varepsilon_m \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $\gamma(\varphi_1, \bar{\varphi}_2) \leq \varepsilon_m + \varepsilon_k$  and since the right hand side goes to zero with  $k, m$ , we get that  $\bar{\varphi}_1 = \bar{\varphi}_2$  and this concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 5.2 The Main steps of the proof.

In the previous section we obtained a continuous function  $h_\infty(p)$ , as the limit of some subsequence  $h_{k_\nu}(p)$ . Since  $h_\infty$  is continuous, according to Humilière (cf. our proposition 3.12 above, or [Hu] proposition 1.3) it has a “generalized flow” that is, for each  $t$ , an element in  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*T^n)$ . In other words for each fixed  $t$ , the map  $H \rightarrow \varphi_H^t$  extends to a map between the  $\gamma$ -completions,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*T^n) \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$$

Note that  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$  inherits the group structure of  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n)$ . We denote by  $\bar{\varphi}_\infty^t$  the “generalized flow” associated to  $h_\infty$ . Note that the element  $\bar{\varphi}_\infty^t$  is not a map: it is only an element in  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n)$ .

**Proposition 5.12.** *For all  $t \geq 0$ , the element  $\bar{\varphi}_\infty^t$  is the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $(\varphi_k^t)_{k \geq 1}$  defined by  $\varphi_k^t = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \rho_k$  : we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(\varphi_k^t, \bar{\varphi}_\infty^t) = 0 .$$

From now on we assume  $t = 1$ , and denote  $\varphi_k = \varphi_k^1$ , and  $\bar{\varphi}_\infty = \bar{\varphi}_\infty^1$ . The proof of 5.12 will be based on the following two propositions

**Proposition 5.13.** *There exists a sequence  $(\ell_\nu)_{\nu \geq 1}$  such that for any  $\alpha$  in  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$ , we have*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} c_+(\varphi_{\ell_\nu} \alpha) \leq c_+(\bar{\varphi}_\infty \alpha)$$

**Proposition 5.14.** *Consider a subsequence of  $(\varphi_{k_\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}$  such that*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} c(\mu \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{k_\nu}) = \lim_{\nu} h_{k_\nu}(p) = h_\infty(p)$$

Then we have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} c(\mu \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{k_\nu}^{-1}) = -h_\infty(p)$$

*Remark 5.15.* Note that this means that if we define  $\mathcal{A}(H) = h_\infty$ , the operator  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies  $\mathcal{A}(-H) = -\mathcal{A}(H)$ . This is a statement that typically does not hold in the case of viscosity solutions, since if  $u(t, x)$  is a viscosity solution associated to  $H$ ,  $u(-t, x)$  is not in general a viscosity solution associated to  $-H$ .

*Proof that Proposition 5.13 and 5.14 imply proposition 5.12.* Indeed take  $\alpha = \bar{\varphi}_\infty^{-1}$ , where  $\bar{\varphi} = \bar{\varphi}^1$  is the limit associated by the previous subsection to some subsequence  $(k_\nu)_{\nu \geq 1}$ . By Proposition 5.13, we get

$$\lim_{\nu} c_+(\varphi_{k_\nu} \bar{\varphi}_\infty^{-1}) \leq c_+(\text{Id}) = 0.$$

and since for all  $\beta$  in  $\mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n)$ ,  $c_+(\beta) \geq 0$  we get,

$$\lim_{\nu} c_+(\varphi_{k_\nu} \bar{\varphi}_\infty^{-1}) = 0$$

Now we must prove  $\lim_{\nu} c_-(\varphi_{k_\nu} \bar{\varphi}_\infty^{-1}) = 0$ , and it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{\nu} c_-(\varphi_{k_\nu} \alpha) \geq c_-(\bar{\varphi}_\infty \alpha)$$

for any  $\alpha$  in  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*T^n)$ .

But according to [V1] (2) of proposition 4.2 page 697) and invariance by conjugation of  $c$  (see [V1], corollary 4.3 page 698)

$$c_-(\varphi_{k\nu}\alpha) = -c_+(\alpha^{-1}\varphi_{k\nu}^{-1}) = -c_+(\varphi_{k\nu}^{-1}\alpha^{-1}) .$$

We may then apply proposition 5.13 to the sequence  $(\varphi_{k\nu}^{-1})$  since according to proposition 5.14

$$\lim_k c(\mu \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{k\nu}^{-1}) = -h_\infty(p)$$

and according to Appendix A, Corollary A.2,  $-h_\infty(p)$  has flow  $\overline{\varphi}_\infty^{-1}$  in the completion  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$ .

As a result

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_k c_-(\varphi_{k\nu}\alpha) &= -\lim_k c_+(\varphi_{k\nu}^{-1}\alpha^{-1}) \\ &\geq -c_+(\overline{\varphi}_\infty^{-1}\alpha^{-1}) = c_-(\overline{\varphi}_\infty\alpha) . \end{aligned}$$

We thus proved that if the sequence  $h_{k\nu}(p) = c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{k\nu})$   $C^0$ -converges to  $h_\infty$ , then  $(\varphi_{k\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\overline{\varphi}$ . Note that conversely, if  $(\varphi_{k\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\overline{\varphi}$ , by continuity of  $\psi \mapsto c(\alpha, \psi)$ , we have that  $h_{k\nu}(p) = c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{k\nu})$   $C^0$ -converges to  $h_\infty$ .

Now assume there are two subsequences,  $(\varphi_{k\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}, (\varphi_{l\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}$  such that  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{k\nu})$   $C^0$ -converges to  $h_\infty^1$ , while  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{l\nu})$   $C^0$ -converges to  $h_\infty^2$ . Then we find two subsequences of  $(\varphi_k)_{k \geq 1}$   $\gamma$ -converging respectively to  $\overline{\varphi}_1$  and  $\overline{\varphi}_2$  (where  $\overline{\varphi}_1^t$  is the flow of  $h_\infty^1$  while  $\overline{\varphi}_2^t$  is the flow of  $h_\infty^2$ ). But according to lemma 5.11, two  $\gamma$ -converging subsequences of  $(\varphi_k)_{k \geq 1}$  must have the same limit, thus  $\overline{\varphi}_1 = \overline{\varphi}_2$  and thus, using again the continuity of  $\psi \mapsto c(\alpha, \psi)$  for  $\gamma$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_\infty^1(p) &= \lim_\nu c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{k\nu}) = c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \overline{\varphi}_1) = \\ &c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \overline{\varphi}_2) = \lim_\nu c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \varphi_{l\nu}) = h_\infty^2(p) \end{aligned}$$

As a result we proved that

- the sequence  $(\varphi_k)_{k \geq 1}$  has a converging subsequence.
- any two converging subsequences of  $(\varphi_k)_{k \geq 1}$  have the same limit
- then  $(\varphi_k)_{k \geq 1}$  converges, and its limit is  $\overline{\varphi} = \overline{\varphi}_\infty$ , the flow of  $h_\infty$  defined by  $h_\infty(p) =: \lim_k c(\mu_x \otimes 1(p), \varphi_k)$

This concludes our proofs of 5.12, modulo the proofs of 5.13 and 5.14.  $\square$



We note the following

**Corollary 5.16.** *For  $t$  in  $[0, 1]$ , the  $\gamma$ -convergence of  $\varphi_k^t$  to  $\varphi_\infty^t$  is uniform in  $t$ . In other words the sequence of functions  $t \mapsto \gamma(\varphi_k^t \bar{\varphi}^{-t})$  converges uniformly to 0.*

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the fact that if  $\|H\|_C^0 \leq C$  then  $\|H_k\| \leq C$  and thus  $\gamma(\varphi_k^t \varphi_k^{-s}) \leq C|t - s|$ . Now if a sequence  $f_k$  of functions defined on  $[0, 1]$  and uniformly Lipschitz converges simply to a function  $f$ , then the convergence is uniform. Indeed, the sequence  $f_k$  is equicontinuous and by Ascoli's theorem, one can find a uniformly converging subsequence, but the limit of the subsequence is necessarily  $f$ . And since all converging subsequences have the same limit, the sequence is uniformly converging to  $f$ .  $\square$

## 6 Proof of proposition 5.13.

First of all, it is enough to deal with the case where  $\alpha \in \mathcal{HD}_c(T^*T^n)$  (i.e. not in its completion), as one easily sees from a density argument. Now we may assume  $S(x, y; \eta)$  is a G.F.Q.I. of  $\alpha$ , with  $\eta$  belonging to some vector space  $V$ , so that  $\varphi_k \alpha$  has the G.F.Q.I.

$$G_k(u, v; x, y, \eta, \xi) = S(x, v; \eta) + F_k(u, y; \xi) + \langle y - v, u - x \rangle$$

where  $F_k$  was defined in Definition 5.7,  $u \in T^n, v \in \mathbb{R}^n, x - u \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \xi \in E_k, \eta \in V$ , and  $E_k$  is the space  $\mathbb{R}^{2n(k-1)}$  as in definition 5.7.

Note that by definition of  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k) = h_k(y)$ , for each  $y$ , there is a relative cycle<sup>8</sup>  $C^-(y)$  homologous to  $T_x^n \times \{y\} \times E_k^-$  ( $x$  lives in  $T^n$ ,  $\xi$  in  $E_k$ , and  $E_k^-$  is the negative eigenspace for the quadratic part  $B_k$  of  $F_k$ ) in  $H_*(G_{k,(x,v,\eta)}^\infty, G_{k,(x,v,\eta)}^{-\infty}) = H_*(F_k^\infty, F_k^{-\infty})$  such that

$$F_k(y, C^-(y)) \leq h_k(y) + \varepsilon .$$

(we denote by  $(y, C^-(y))$  the set of  $(u, y, \xi)$  such that  $(u, \xi) \in C^-(y)$ ). Unfortunately we may not get such an estimate if we simultaneously require that  $C^-(y)$  is to depend continuously on  $y$ . However, let us first assume such a continuous dependence can be achieved and  $(h_k)_{k \geq 1}$  converges to  $h_\infty$ . Set

$$\bar{G}_k(u, v; x, y, \eta) = S(x, v; \eta) + h_k(y) + \langle y - v, u - x \rangle$$

---

<sup>8</sup>By relative cycle we mean a chain with boundary in  $F_k^{-\infty}$  (i.e. in  $F_k^{-c}$  for  $c$  large enough).

defined on  $T_u^n \times \mathbb{R}_v^n \times \mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_y^n \times V$  ( $V$  is the vector spaces where  $\eta$  lives).

By definition, we may find a (relative) cycle  $\Gamma$  in  $T_u^n \times \mathbb{R}_v^n \times (\mathbb{R}_x^n) \times (\mathbb{R}_y^n) \times V$  in the homology class of  $T_{(u,v)}^n \times \Delta_{x,y} \times V^-$ , where  $V^-$  is the negative eigenspace of the quadratic part<sup>9</sup> of  $S$ , such that

$$\overline{G}_k(\Gamma) \leq c(\mu, \overline{G}_k) + \varepsilon = c(\mu, \overline{\varphi}_k \alpha) + \varepsilon$$

Let now  $\Gamma \times_Y C^-$  be the (relative) cycle

$$\Gamma \times_Y C^- = \{(u, v, x, y, \xi, \eta) \mid (u, v, x, y, \eta) \in \Gamma, (u, \xi) \in C^-(y)\} .$$

We claim that

(1)

$$G_k(\Gamma \times_Y C^-) \leq \overline{G}_k(\Gamma) + \varepsilon$$

(2)  $\Gamma \times_Y C^-$  is a cycle in  $H_*(G_k^\infty, G_k^{-\infty})$  homologous to

$$T_u^n \times \mathbb{R}_v^n \times \Delta_{x,y} \times E_k^- \times V^-$$

so that

$$c(\mu, \varphi_k \alpha) = c(\mu, G_k) \leq G_k(\Gamma \times_Y C^-) \leq \overline{G}_k(\Gamma) + \varepsilon \leq c(\mu, \overline{G}_k) + \varepsilon \leq c(\mu, \overline{\varphi}_k \alpha) + \varepsilon$$

Indeed, for (1) we have

$$G_k(\Gamma \times_Y C^-) = \sup\{S(x, v; \eta) + F_k(u, y, \xi) + \langle y - v, u - x \rangle \mid (u, v, x, y, \eta) \in \Gamma, (u, \xi) \in C^-(y)\}$$

but  $F_k(u, y, \xi) \leq h_k(y) + \varepsilon$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(\Gamma \times_Y C^-) &\leq \\ \sup\{S(x, v; \eta) + h_k(y) + \langle y - v, u - x \rangle \mid (u, v, x, y, \eta) \in \Gamma\} + \varepsilon &\leq \\ \overline{G}_k(\Gamma) + \varepsilon & \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>9</sup>Notice that  $\Delta_{x,y}$ , the diagonal in  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_y^n$ , is the negative eigenspace of  $\langle y, -x \rangle$ .

For (2), we use the fact that  $\Gamma$  is homologous to  $T_{(u,v)}^n \times \Delta_{x,y} \times V^-$  and  $C^-(y)$  is homologous to  $T^n \times \{y\} \times E_k^-$ , we have that  $\Gamma \times_Y C^-$  is homologous<sup>10</sup> to  $(T_{(u,v)}^n \times \Delta_{x,y} \times V^-) \times_Y (T^n \times \{y\} \times E_k^-)$  that is  $T_u^n \times \mathbb{R}_v^n \times \Delta_{x,y} \times E_k^- \times V^-$ .

Let us now try to establish the above inequality in the general case, that is without the assumption that  $C^-(y)$  can be chosen to be continuous and we only have a subsequence  $(h_{k_\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}$  converging to  $h_\infty$ . We will see that we may find a continuous family  $C^-(y)$  such that for  $k = k_\nu$  and  $\nu$  large enough, the estimate

$$F_k(y, C^-(y)) \leq h_k(y) + \varepsilon .$$

holds for  $y$  outside of a subset  $U_{2\delta}$  where  $U_\delta$  is a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of some grid in  $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$  (see figure 1), while inside  $U_{2\delta}$ ,  $F_k(y, C^-(y)) \leq a$  for some constant  $a$ .

The existence of  $C^-(y)$  is a consequence of the following general result. We remind the reader that a function  $F$  satisfies the Palais-Smale condition if any sequence such that  $F(x_n)$  is bounded and  $F(x_n)$  converges to zero has a converging subsequence.

This implies that the flow of  $\frac{\nabla F}{|\nabla F(x)|^2}$  is defined for all time outside a neighborhood of the critical points (which moreover form a compact set). In particular, classes in  $H^*(F^b, F^a)$  are represented by linear combinations of unstable manifolds of critical points (see for example [Laud]). As usual we denote by  $F^\infty$  (resp.  $F^{-\infty}$ ) the set  $F^c = \{x \mid F(x) \leq c\}$  for  $c$  large.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $F(u, x)$  be a smooth function on the product  $V \times X$  of two oriented manifolds. We moreover assume both  $F$  and its restriction  $F_u$  to a fiber  $\{u\} \times X$  satisfy the Palais Smale condition and  $F_u$  does not depend on  $u$  for  $u$  outside a compact set.*

*Let  $f \in C^0(V, \mathbb{R})$  be such that for each  $u \in V$ , there exists a cycle  $C(u)$  representing a class in  $H_d(F_u^{+\infty}, F_u^{-\infty})$  with  $F(u, C(u)) \leq f(u)$ . Moreover we assume that  $H_k(F_u^\infty, F_u^{-\infty})$  vanishes for  $k \geq d + 1$ .*

*Then for any positive  $\varepsilon$  and any subset  $U$  in  $V$ , such that each connected component of  $V \setminus U$  has sufficiently small diameter, there exists a cycle  $C$  in  $H_{d+\dim(V)}(F^\infty, F^{-\infty})$  and a constant  $a$  such that if we denote by  $\tilde{C}(u)$  the*

---

<sup>10</sup>The general fact that if we have two fibrations,  $p_X : X \rightarrow Z, p_Y : Y \rightarrow Z$  and two cycles  $A, B$  in  $X, Y$  respectively, then the homology class of  $A \times_Z B$  only depends on the homology classes of  $A$  and  $B$  follows from the fact that, denoting  $p = (p_X, p_Y) : (X \times Y) \rightarrow Z$ , then  $A \times_Z B = (A \times B) \cap p^{-1}(\Delta_Z)$  so represents the class  $j_!([A \times B])$  where  $j : X \times_Z Y \rightarrow X \times Y$  is the inclusion, and  $j_!$  the umkehr map.

slice  $\tilde{C} \cap \pi^{-1}(u)$  ( $\pi : V \times X \rightarrow X$  is the first projection)

$$F(u, \tilde{C}(u)) \leq f(u) + a\chi_U(u) + \varepsilon$$

where  $\chi_U$  is the characteristic function of  $U$ .

*Proof.* Our assumptions imply that the critical points of  $F_u$  are contained in some bounded interval (independent from  $u$ ),  $[-a/2, a/2]$ . We may assume  $V$  is triangulated and  $U$  contains a neighborhood of the  $(n-1)$  cells ( $n = \dim(V)$ ). In other words  $V - U$  is contained in the union of the top dimensional cells. We denote by  $V^p$  the  $p$ -skeleton of  $V$ , and by  $W^p(\delta)$  a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $V^p$ . Continuity of  $F$  implies that if we take  $\tilde{C}(u)$  to be constant (i.e. independent from  $u$ ) in each connected component of  $V^n - W^{n-1}(\delta)$ , containing  $V \setminus U$ , the inequality will be satisfied there. We need to extend  $\tilde{C}(u)$  for all  $u$  in  $V$ , so that the union of the  $\tilde{C}(u)$  makes a cycle. For this we proceed by induction on the skeleton of  $V$ , so that we are going to extend  $\tilde{C}(u)$  for  $u \in V \setminus W^p(\delta_p)$ . For the first step, we need to glue the  $\tilde{C}(u)$  so that they yield a cycle over the union of  $n$  and  $n-1$  cells (outside a neighborhood of  $(n-2)$ -cells). For this we need to look at what happens on an  $n-1$ -dimensional cell,  $T_{i,j}$  intersection of the  $n$ -cells  $T_i$  and  $T_j$  where we have *a priori* two conflicting definitions of  $\tilde{C}(u)$ , that we denote by  $\tilde{C}_i(u), \tilde{C}_j(u)$  obtained by taking for  $\tilde{C}(u)$  the constant value it has on each of the two  $n$ -cells,  $T_i, T_j$ . Let us write  $\tilde{C}_i(u) - \tilde{C}_j(u) = \partial\Gamma_{i,j}(u)$  which is of course possible since  $\tilde{C}_i(u)$  and  $\tilde{C}_j(u)$  are homologous chains in  $H_d(F_u^{+\infty}, F_u^{-\infty})$  on  $T_i \cap T_j$ . Then we may glue these together to

$$\bigcup_{u \in \mathring{T}_i} \tilde{C}_i(u) \cup \bigcup_{u \in \mathring{T}_j} \tilde{C}_j(u) \cup \bigcup_{u \in \mathring{T}_{i,j}} \Gamma^{i,j}(u)$$

Note that this is indeed a manifold of dimension  $n + \dim(\tilde{C}_i(u))$ , since  $\dim(T_i) = \dim(T_j) = n$ ,  $\dim(\Gamma^{i,j}) = \dim(\tilde{C}_i(u)) + 1$ ,  $\dim(T_{i,j}) = n - 1$ . Thus each of the three pieces has dimension  $n + \dim(\tilde{C}_i) = n + \dim(\tilde{C}_j)$ .

Now of course, the maximum of  $F$  over  $\bigcup_{u \in T_i} \tilde{C}_i(u) \cup \bigcup_{u \in T_j} \tilde{C}_j(u) \cup \bigcup_{u \in T_{i,j}} \Gamma_{i,j}(u)$  has increased outside  $V \setminus U$ , but we can always assume that  $\Gamma_{i,j} \subset F^a$ . If this was not the case, we could push  $\Gamma_{i,j}$  down using the gradient of  $F_u$ , and since there is no critical value above  $a/2$ , we can push it below  $a$ . As a result we have defined a cycle over the  $(n-1)$ -skeleton contained in  $F^a$ .

Now we look at the next inductive step, that is extending to the  $n - 2$ -skeleton. Consider then for  $T_\alpha$  an  $(n - 2)$ -simplex, that is in the boundary of the  $T_\beta$  for  $\beta$  in some set of  $n - 1$  simplices. For each  $\beta$  we have a  $\Gamma^\beta$  obtained in the previous step. We claim that at any point of the  $n - 2$  simplex  $T_\alpha$  we have  $\sum_{T_\alpha \in \partial T_\beta} \partial \Gamma_\beta = 0$ . Indeed by definition  $\partial \Gamma_\beta = \tilde{C}_{i_\beta}(u) - \tilde{C}_{j_\beta}(u)$  where  $T_\beta$  is bounded by  $T_{i_\beta}$  and  $T_{j_\beta}$ , and in the above sum each index will appear twice (of course we need oriented simplices, and the above is correct provided they are oriented in a compatible way: this is made possible by the orientability of  $V$ ).

Now, we claim that  $\sum_{T_\alpha \in \partial T_\beta} \Gamma_\beta$ , which is closed by the above argument is in fact a boundary  $\partial \Gamma_\alpha$ . Indeed, over each fiber,  $u$ , this is a  $d + 2$ -cycle, and the homology of the fiber  $H_k(F_u^{+\infty}, F_u^{-\infty})$  vanishes for  $k \geq d + 2$ . Therefore in this dimension, any cycle is a boundary, and we may find  $\Gamma_\alpha$  such that

$$\partial \Gamma_\alpha = \sum_{T_\alpha \in \partial T_\beta} \Gamma_\beta$$

Now  $\Gamma_\alpha$  is contained in  $F^c$  and we get

$$\bigcup_{u \in \dot{T}_i} \tilde{C}_i(u) \cup \bigcup_{u \in \dot{T}_j} \tilde{C}_j(u) \cup \bigcup_{u \in \dot{T}_{i,j}} \Gamma_{i,j}(u) \cup \bigcup_{u \in \dot{T}_\alpha} \Gamma_\alpha(u)$$

is a cycle over the  $n - 2$ -skeleton and contained in  $H_k(F^a, F^{-\infty})$ . We must then do the same for the  $n - 3, \dots, 0$  skeleton.  $\square$

We then apply the lemma to  $F_k$ , which clearly satisfies the assumptions. We then get that  $F_k(y, C^-(y)) \leq h_k(y) + a\chi^\delta(y) + \varepsilon$  where  $\chi^\delta$  is a smooth function with values in  $[0, 1]$ , equal to one on  $U_\delta$  and to zero outside  $U_{2\delta}$ ,  $a$  is some constant, and  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrarily small.

Let  $k_\nu$  be a sequence such that  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_{k_\nu})$  converges to  $h_\infty(y)$ . We replace  $G_k$  by  $G_{\ell,k}$  where  $F_k$  is replaced by the explicit formula for  $F_{\ell k}$  obtained as in lemma 5.6,

$$G_{\ell,k}(u, v; \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}, \eta) = S(x_1, v, \eta) + \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} F_k(\ell x_j, y_j, \xi_j) + B_\ell(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \langle y_\ell - v, u - x_1 \rangle$$

and  $u \in T^n, v \in \mathbb{R}^n, \bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^\ell, \bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_\ell) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^\ell, \bar{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell) \in (E_k)^\ell, \eta \in V$ .

We may now “spread our error terms”  $a\chi^\delta(y)$  by translating them. More precisely, for  $j$  from 1 to  $\ell$ , let us choose different  $U_j^\delta$  yielding  $\chi_j^\delta$  (with  $\text{supp}(\chi_j^\delta) \subset U_j^\delta$ ), so that




Figure 1: The sets  $U_j^\delta$

- (1) the connected components of  $\mathbb{C}U_j^\delta$  have diameter less than  $\delta$
- (2) any  $(n + 1)$  distinct  $U_j^\delta$  have empty intersection.

The possibility to find such  $U_j^\delta$  follows by taking for  $U_j^\delta$  the neighborhood of  $S_j = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists k, x_k \in \mathbb{Z} + r_j\}$ , where  $r_1, \dots, r_\ell$  are distinct elements of  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ . Clearly since the  $r_j$  are non-congruous modulo  $\mathbb{Z}$ , we have  $S_1 \cap S_2 \cap \dots \cap S_n \cap S_{n+1} = \emptyset$  and so the same holds for their neighborhood:  $U_1^\delta \cap U_2^\delta \cap \dots \cap U_n^\delta \cap U_{n+1}^\delta = \emptyset$

We now have

$$F_k(y, C_j(y)) \leq h_k(y) + a_k \chi_j^\delta(y) + \varepsilon$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{G}_{\ell,k}(u, v; \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \eta) = \\ & S(x_1, v; \eta) + \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (h_k(y_j) + a_k \chi_j^\delta(y_j)) + B_\ell(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \langle y_\ell - v, u - x_1 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Then, let  $\Gamma$  be a cycle in the homology class of  $T_{(u,v)}^n \times \Delta_{x,y} \times V^-$ , such that

$$\overline{G}_{\ell,k}(\Gamma) \leq c(\mu, \overline{G}_{\ell,k}) + \varepsilon$$

and let  $(\Gamma \times_Y C^-[\ell])$  be defined as

$$(\Gamma \times_Y C^-[\ell]) = \Gamma \times_Y (C_1^- \times \dots \times C_\ell^-) =$$

$$\{(u, v; \overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{\xi}, \eta) \mid (u, v, \overline{x}, \overline{y}, \eta) \in \Gamma, (\ell x_j, \xi_j) \in C_j^-(y_j)\} .$$

Now  $(\Gamma \times_Y C^-[\ell])$  is in the homology class of  $T_{(u,v)}^n \times \Delta_{x,y} \times (E_k^-)^\ell \times V^-$  and we may thus infer that

$$c(\mu, \varphi_k \alpha) = c(\mu, G_{\ell,k}) \leq G_{\ell,k}(\Gamma \times_Y C^-[\ell])$$

and  $G_{\ell,k}((\Gamma \times_Y C^-[\ell])) \leq \overline{G}_{\ell,k}(\Gamma)$ . We may conclude that

$$c(\mu, G_{\ell,k}) \leq c(\mu, \overline{G}_{\ell,k}) + 2\varepsilon$$

Finally, we must show

**Lemma 6.2.** *For each  $k$  there is a constant  $A_k$  such that the following inequality holds for all  $\ell$ :*

$$c(\mu, \overline{G}_{\ell,k}) \leq c(\mu, \overline{G}_k) + \frac{A_k}{\ell}$$

*Proof.* Indeed  $\overline{G}_{\ell,k}$  is the generating function of  $\psi_{k,\delta,\ell} \alpha$  where

$$\psi_{k,\delta,\ell} = \rho_\ell^{-1} (\psi_{k,\delta}^1 \circ \dots \circ \psi_{k,\delta}^\ell) \rho_\ell$$

where  $\psi_{k,\delta}^j$  is the time-one flow of  $h_k(y) + a_k \chi_j^\delta(y)$ .

But since the Hamiltonians  $h_k(y) + a_k \chi_j^\delta(y)$  depends only on  $y$ , their flows commute, and we may conclude that  $\psi_{k,\delta,\ell}$  is the time-one flow of

$$K_{k,\delta,\ell}(y) = \frac{1}{\ell} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_k(y) + a_k \chi_j^\delta(y) \right) .$$

Now since  $(n+1)$  sets  $U_j^\delta$  have empty intersection, we have that  $\left| \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \chi_j^\delta(y) \right| \leq n$  hence

$$|K_{k,\delta,\ell}(y) - h_k(y)| \leq \frac{na_k}{\ell}$$

As a result, using the inequality between  $\gamma$  and the  $C^0$ -norm of the Hamiltonian from Proposition 3.11, (1), we get

$$\gamma(\psi_{k,\delta,\ell}, \psi_k) \leq \frac{na_k}{\ell} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{A_k}{\ell}$$

where  $\psi_k$  is the time-one flow of  $h_k(y)$  hence

$$\gamma(\psi_{k,\delta,\ell}\alpha, \psi_k\alpha) \leq \frac{A_k}{\ell}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mu, \overline{G}_{\ell,k}) &\leq c(\mu, \psi_{k,\delta,\ell}\alpha) \\ &\leq c(\mu, \psi_k\alpha) + \frac{A_k}{\ell} \\ &\leq c(\mu, \overline{\varphi}_k\alpha) + \frac{A_k}{\ell} \end{aligned}$$

□

Since by assumption, as  $\nu$  goes to infinity  $(\psi_{k_\nu})_{\nu \geq 1}$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\overline{\varphi}$  we get for  $k = k_\nu$

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mu, \varphi_{k_\nu}\alpha) &= c(\mu, G_{\ell,k}) \leq \\ c(\mu, \overline{G}_{\ell,k}) + \varepsilon &\leq c(\mu, \overline{G}_k) + \varepsilon + \frac{a_k}{\ell} \end{aligned}$$

and since this holds for any positive  $\varepsilon$  we have

$$\leq c(\mu, \overline{\varphi}\alpha) + \frac{A_k}{\ell}$$

Taking  $\ell$  large enough, we see that there is a sequence  $\ell_\nu$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\nu} c(\mu, \varphi_{\ell_\nu \cdot k_\nu}\alpha) \\ \leq c(\mu, \overline{\varphi}\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

as announced. This concludes the proof of Proposition 5.13.

*Remark 6.3.* It is important to notice that here

$$\overline{G}_{\ell,k} = S(x_1, v; \eta) + \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (h_k(y_j) + a\chi_j^\delta(y_j)) + B_\ell(\overline{x}, \overline{y}) + \langle y_\ell - v, u - x_1 \rangle$$



cannot be bounded from above by

$$S(x_1, v; \eta) + \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_k(y_j) + B_\ell(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \langle y_\ell - v, u - x_1 \rangle + \frac{a}{\ell}$$

as it is obvious by choosing  $(y_1, \dots, y_\ell)$  such that each  $y_j$  is in  $U_j^\delta$ . Our proof makes crucial use of the commutation property of the  $h_k(y) + a\chi_j(y)$  and would not hold if we replaced  $\chi_j^\delta(y)$  by an analogous function  $\chi_j^\delta(x, y)$ .

## 7 Proof of proposition 5.14.

Let  $\Gamma_\varphi$  be the graph of  $\varphi$ , where  $\varphi$  is written in coordinates  $\varphi(x, y) = (X(x, y), Y(x, y))$

$$\Gamma_\varphi = \{(X(x, y), y, y - Y(x, y), X(x, y) - x) \mid (x, y) \in T^*T^n\}$$

Then the reduction of  $\Gamma_\varphi$  at  $y = y_0$  is

$$(\Gamma_\varphi)_{y_0} = \{(X(x, y_0), y_0 - Y(x, y_0)) \mid x \in T^n\}$$

that is  $L_{y_0} - \varphi(L_{y_0})$  where

$$L_{y_0} = \{(x, y_0) \mid x \in T^n\}$$

Now  $c(\alpha_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi) = c(\alpha_x \otimes 1(y), \Gamma_\varphi) = c(\alpha, (\Gamma_\varphi)_y) = c(\alpha, L_y - \varphi(L_y))$ .

*Remarks 7.1.* **(1)** Note that by  $L_1 - L_2$  we do not really mean the set  $\{(q, p_1 - p_2) \mid (q, p_1) \in L_1, (q, p_2) \in L_2\}$  (see [V1], definition 3.1 page 693). We shall only use  $L_1 - L_2$  in the expression  $c(\alpha, L_1 - L_2)$  in which case this is defined to be  $c(\alpha, S_1 \ominus S_2)$  where  $S_j$  is a GFQI for  $L_j$ , and we define  $(S_1 \ominus S_2)(x, \xi, \eta) = S_1(x, \xi) - S_2(x, \eta)$ . Notice that if the  $L_j$  are Hamiltonian isotopic to the zero section,  $S_j$  is unique up to equivalence, so  $c(\alpha, S_1 \ominus S_2)$  is well defined. Here  $L_y$  and  $\varphi(L_y)$  do not have a generating function, but denoting  $\tau_y(q, p) = (q, p - y)$ , we have  $\tau_y^{-1}(L_y) = 0_{T^n}$  and  $\tau_y^{-1}(\varphi(L_y))$  is Hamiltonianly isotopic to the zero section. Thus  $\tau_y^{-1}(\varphi(L_y))$  has an essentially unique GFQI,  $S_{\varphi, y}$  and finally,  $c(\alpha, L_y - \varphi(L_y))$  is defined as  $c(\alpha, -S_{\varphi, y})$ .

**(2)** We refer to remark 5.8 and remind the reader once again of the extra care that has to be taken when using expressions such as  $c(\mu, \Lambda_y)$ . Here  $c(\mu, (\Gamma_\varphi)_y)$  is well-defined for all  $y$ , once we choose a G.F.Q.I. for  $\Gamma_\varphi$ .

**Lemma 7.2.** *We have*

$$c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k) = c(\mu, L_y - \varphi_k(L_y)) = -c(1, L_y - \varphi_k^{-1}(L_y)) = -c(1_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k^{-1})$$

*Proof.* Indeed,  $c(\mu, L_y - \varphi_k(L_y)) = c(\mu, \varphi_k^{-1}(L_y) - L_y)$  by symplectic invariance<sup>11</sup> of  $c(\mu, L_1 - L_2)$ . Moreover  $c(\mu, \varphi_k^{-1}(L_y) - L_y) = -c(1, L_y - \varphi_k^{-1}(L_y))$  by corollary 2.8 page 693 of [V1].  $\square$

Denoting  $\widehat{h}_k(y)$  the number  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k^{-1})$ , it is thus enough to prove that  $\widehat{h}_k(y) = c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k^{-1}) = -c(1_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k)$  differs from  $-c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k) = -h_k(y)$  by a term of the size  $O(1/k)$ , or in other words that

**Proposition 7.3.** *We have  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k) - c(1_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k) = O(1/k)$ .*

Indeed the above proposition implies

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{h}_k(y) &= c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k^{-1}) = -c(1_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k) = \\ &= -c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \varphi_k) + O(1/k) = -h_k(y) + O(1/k) \end{aligned}$$

Since by definition  $c(\alpha, \varphi_k) = c(\alpha, F_k)$  we have to prove that  $c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), F_k) - c(1_x \otimes 1(y), F_k) = O(1/k)$ . Note also that if  $f$  is defined on an  $n$ -dimensional orientable manifold, and  $\alpha \in H^q(f^b, f^a)$  and  $a \in H_{n-q}(f^b, f^a)$  are Poincaré dual classes, i.e. such that  $\int_X \alpha \wedge \beta = \langle \beta, a \rangle$  for any  $\beta \in H^{n-q}(f^b, f^a)$ , we have  $c(a, f) = c(\alpha, f)$ . We shall in the sequel replace cohomology classes by homology classes using this property.

*Proof of Proposition 7.3.* First of all, let  $a$  be a homology class in  $H_d(T^n)$  represented by a map  $A : X \rightarrow T^n$  and  $b \in H_1(T^n)$  be represented by a loop  $B : S^1 \rightarrow T^n$  and denote by  $a \cdot b$  the class represented by  $C : (\theta, x) \rightarrow B(\theta) \cdot A(x)$ . Here  $x \cdot y$  is the product in the group  $T^n$  and  $a \cdot b \in H_{k+1}(T^n)$  is then well defined, i.e. does not depend on the choice of the representatives of  $a$  and  $b$ . This is the Pontryagin product of  $a$  and  $b$ . Moreover it is easy to see that if  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  form a basis of  $H_1(T^n)$ , then  $b_1 \cdot b_2 \cdot \dots \cdot b_n$  is a nonzero multiple of the fundamental class<sup>12</sup>,  $\mu$ . Since we must compare  $c(1, F_k)$  and  $c(\mu, F_k)$  our proposition will follow from

<sup>11</sup>, that is  $c(\alpha, L_1 - L_2) = c(\alpha, \varphi(L_1) - \varphi(L_2))$ , the proof is the same as in [V1] page 695, proof of Proposition 3.5.

<sup>12</sup>by abuse of language, we denote by  $\mu$  both the fundamental homology class and the fundamental cohomology class. This should cause no confusion

**Proposition 7.4.** *Let  $A : V \rightarrow T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times E_k$  representing the class  $a \times [\{y\} \times E_k^-] \in H_{d+n(k-1)}(F_k^c, F_k^{-\infty})$ , and  $b \in H_1(T^n)$ . Then there exists  $C' : S^1 \times V \rightarrow T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times E_k$  representing  $a \cdot b \times [\{y\} \times E_k^-] \in H_{d+n(k-1)}(F_k^{c'}, F_k^{-\infty})$  where*

$$c' \leq c + O(1/k)$$

*Proof.* In the proof we shall assume  $b$  is represented by the path  $s \mapsto s\nu$  where  $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . All degree one classes on the torus can be represented in such a way. The first step will be to modify  $C$  to a cycle  $\tilde{C}$  in the same homology class. We denote by  $K$  a number such that

$$K > \max \left\{ \sup_{(q,p) \in T^*T^n} |S(q,p)|, \sup_{(q,p) \in T^*T^n} |dS(q,p)| \right\}$$

**Lemma 7.5.** *There exists a cycle  $\tilde{C}$  homologous to  $C$  in  $H_d(F_k^c, F_k^{-\infty})$  such that we have*

$$(i) \quad \tilde{C} \subset (\{(q,p) \mid \max_j |p_j| \leq M\} \cup F_k^{-4K}) \cap F_k^c$$

$$(ii) \quad \tilde{C} \cap F_k^{-3K} \subset T^n \times \{y\} \times E_k^-$$

*Proof.* Let us first satisfy the condition (i). We shall follow the vector field  $Z$ , associated to the differential equation

$$\dot{q}_j = -\chi(|p_j|)(p_j - p_{j-1}) = X_j(q,p), \quad \dot{p}_j = 0$$

where  $\chi(|p_j|)$  vanishes for  $|p_j| \leq 1$ . As a result if  $\psi^t$  is the flow of  $Z$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} F_k(\psi^t(q,p))|_{t=0} &= \langle dF_k(q,p), Z(q,p) \rangle = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial q} F_k(q,p), X(q,p) \right\rangle = \\ &= - \sum_j \chi(|p_j|) \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial q} F_k(q,p), (p_j - p_{j-1}) \right\rangle = \\ &= \sum_j \chi(|p_j|) \left( -|p_j - p_{j-1}|^2 + \left\langle \frac{\partial S}{\partial q_j}(k \cdot q_j, p_j), (p_j - p_{j-1}) \right\rangle \right) = \\ &= - \sum_j \chi(|p_j|) |p_j - p_{j-1}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

since  $S$  vanishes on the support of  $\chi(|p|)$ . Note that the  $p_j$  are integrals of the flow of  $Z$ , that  $F_k$  is decreasing along the flow of  $Z$  and that since

$p_k = y$  is fixed, if  $\max_j |p_j| \geq M$ , for  $M$  large enough with respect<sup>13</sup> to  $y$ , the quantity  $\sum_j \chi(|p_j|) |p_j - p_{j-1}|^2$  is bounded from below by some constant  $c_k > 0$  (note that  $c_k = O(1/k)$ , but we don't care). Thus outside the region  $\{\max_j |p_j| \leq 2\}$ ,  $Z$  is a pseudo-gradient for  $F_k$ , and since the flow is complete (it is bounded by a linear quantity), it satisfies the following properties

- (1) Setting  $\psi^t(q, p) = (Q, P)$  we have  $p = P$ .
- (2) For  $(q, p) \notin \{(q, p) \mid \max_j |p_j| \leq M\}$  we have  $F_k(\psi^t(q, p)) \leq F_k(q, p) - c_k t$

As a result, if  $(q, p) \in F_k^c$  we have  $\psi^{\frac{c+4K}{c_k}}(q, p) \in (\{\max_j |p_j| \leq M\} \cup F_k^{-4K}) \cap F_k^c$  (see Figure 2 and 3).

Now we obtained a cycle  $\tilde{C}_1 = \psi^{\frac{c+4K}{c_k}}(C)$  satisfying (i). We now deform  $\tilde{C}_1$  to  $\tilde{C}$  as follows. Since  $\|F_k - Q_k\| \leq K$  we have the inclusions

$$F_k^{-4K} \subset Q_k^{-3K} \subset F_k^{-2K} \subset Q_k^{-K}$$

In particular  $-K \leq c \leq K$ . Thus  $\tilde{C}_1 \in H_d(F_k^{+\infty}, F_k^{-\infty}) = H_d(Q_k^{+\infty}, Q_k^{-\infty})$  and  $Q_k^{-\infty} \simeq Q_k^{-K}$ , and  $[\tilde{C}_1] = [A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-]$  in  $H_d(Q_k^{+\infty}, Q_k^{-\infty})$  for some cycle  $A$  representing the class  $a$ . As a result,  $[\tilde{C}_1 \cap Q_k^{-3K}] = [(A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-) \cap Q_k^{-3K}]$  in  $H_d(Q_k^{-3K})$ . This means there is a cycle  $D$  in  $Q_k^{-3K}$  such that  $\partial D \cap Q_k^{-3K} = [\tilde{C}_1 \cap Q_k^{-3K}] - [(A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-) \cap Q_k^{-3K}]$  and then  $\partial(D \cap Q_k^{-3K}) \subset \{Q_k = -3K\} \cup (\tilde{C}_1 \cup A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-) \cap Q_k^{-3K}$ . Thus in  $Q_k^{-3K}$  we may replace  $\tilde{C}_1$  by the homologous cycle  $A \times \{y\} \times E_k^- \cap Q_k^{-3K} \cup D'$  where  $D' \subset \{Q_k = -3K\}$ . But then  $D' \cap F_k^{-4K} = \emptyset$  so

$$(A \times \{y\} \times E_k^- \cap Q_k^{-3K} \cup D') \cap F_k^{-4K} = A \times \{y\} \times E_k^- \cap Q_k^{-3K} \cap F_k^{-4K}$$

Then the cycle

$$\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}_1 \cap \{Q_k \geq -3K\} \cup D' \cup ((A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-) \cap Q_k^{-3K})$$

is homologous to  $\tilde{C}_1$ .

---

<sup>13</sup>This is where the proof would fail if we did not fix  $y$ , and wanted to prove the incorrect statement  $\frac{1}{k}\gamma(\varphi^k) \rightarrow 0$ .




Figure 2: on the left: The cycles  $\tilde{C}_1$ ,  $A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-$  and bounding cycle  $D$




Figure 3: The cycle  $\tilde{C}$

Now, since

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{F_k(q, p) \mid (q, p) \in D' \cup ((A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-) \cap Q_k^{-3K})\} \leq \\ \sup\{F_k(q, p) \mid Q_k(q, p) \leq -3K\} \leq -2K \end{aligned}$$

we may conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{F_k(q, p) \mid (q, p) \in \tilde{C}\} \leq \\ \max\{\sup\{F_k(q, p) \mid (q, p) \in \tilde{C}_1\}, \sup\{F_k(q, p) \mid (q, p) \in D' \cup (A \times \{y\} \times E_k^-) \cap Q_k^{-3K}\}\} \leq \\ \max\{c, -2K\} = c \end{aligned}$$

Finally  $\tilde{C}$  satisfies both (i), (ii).  $\square$

Now we set

$$\tau_j^s(q_1, \dots, q_k, p_1, \dots, p_k) = (q_1, \dots, q_{j-1}, q_j + s\nu, q_{j+1}, \dots, q_k, p_1, \dots, p_k)$$

and  $\tau^{(s_1, \dots, s_k)} = \tau_k^{s_k} \circ \dots \circ \tau_1^{s_1}$  and  $\tau^s = \tau^{(s, s, \dots, s)}$ .

Then  $C'_1 = \bigcup_{s \in [0, 1]} \tau^s(\tilde{C})$  is a cycle representing  $a \cdot b \times \{y\} \times E_k^-$ . More generally for any continuous path  $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ , such that  $\sigma(0) = (0, \dots, 0)$  and  $\sigma(1) = (1, \dots, 1)$  we have, since all such paths are homotopic, that  $C' = \bigcup_{s \in [0, 1]} \tau^{\sigma(s)}(\tilde{C})$  is homologous to  $C'_1$ .

We now define the paths  $\sigma_k(s) = (1/k, \dots, 1/k, s - j/k, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$  for  $s \in [j/k, (j+1)/k]$  where there are  $j$  components equal to  $1/k$ , and

$$\sigma(s) = (l/k, \dots, l/k) + \sigma_k(k \cdot s - l)$$

for  $s \in [l/k, (l+1)/k]$  for  $0 \leq l \leq k-1$ .

Since  $F_k(\tau^{1/k}(q, p)) = F_k(q, p)$  as follows clearly from the fact that  $q_j \mapsto S(q_j, p_j)$  is  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -periodic and the formula

$$F_k(q, p) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k S(k \cdot q_j, p_j) + B_k(q, p)$$

where

$$B_k(q, p) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \langle p_j, q_j - q_{j+1} \rangle + \langle p_k, q_k - q_1 \rangle$$

remembering that  $x = q_1, y = p_k$ .

Since

(1)  $\sigma$  sends  $[0, 1]$  in  $[0, 1]^n$ .

(2)  $\sigma(l/k) = (l/k, \dots, l/k)$

and  $\tau^{l/k}(\tilde{C})$  still satisfies (i) and (ii) from Lemma 7.5, it is enough to prove that for any such  $\tilde{C}$ , we have  $\bigcup_{s \in [0, 1/k]} \tau^{\sigma(s)}(\tilde{C}) = \bigcup_{s \in [0, 1]} \tau^{\sigma_k(s)}(\tilde{C}) \subset F_k^{c'}$  with  $c' \leq c + O(1/k)$ .

**Lemma 7.6.** *We have*

(1)  $F_k(\tau_j^s(q, p)) = F_k(q, p) + \frac{1}{k} (S(kq_j + ks\nu, p_j) - S(kq_j, p_j)) + s\langle p_j - p_{j-1}, \nu \rangle$

(2)  $F_k(\tau_{j-1}^{1/k} \circ \dots \circ \tau_1^{1/k}(q, p)) = F_k(q, p) + \frac{1}{k} \langle p_{j-1} - p_1, \nu \rangle$

(3)  $F_k(\tau_j^s \circ \tau_{j-1}^{1/k} \circ \dots \circ \tau_1^{1/k}(q, p)) \leq F_k(q, p) + \frac{K}{k} + \frac{|\nu|}{k} (|p_j - p_{j-1}| + |p_{j-1} - p_1|)$

*Proof.* This is checked immediately for (1). Then (2) follows immediately from the fact that  $S(q_j + \nu, p_j) = S(q_j, p_j)$ . Finally (3) follows immediately from (2). □

As a result for  $(q, p) \in \tilde{C}$  satisfying properties (i) and (ii), remembering that  $\tau_k(s)$  is of the form  $\tau_j^t \circ \tau_{j-1}^{1/k} \circ \dots \circ \tau_1^{1/k}$  for  $0 \leq t \leq 1/k$ , we have

(1) If  $(q, p) \in \{\max_j |p_j| \leq M\}$  we have using (3) of the above lemma

$$F_k(\tau^{\sigma_k(s)}(q, p)) \leq F_k(q, p) + \frac{K + 4M|\nu|}{k} \leq c + O(1/k)$$

(2) If  $(q, p) \in F_k^{-4K}$  and  $(q, p) \in T^n \times \{y\} \times E_k^-$  we have  $p_j = -(q_j - q_{j-1})$  hence  $F_k(q, p) = -\sum_j p_j^2 + \frac{1}{k} \sum_j S(kq_j, p_j)$  thus

$$\begin{aligned} F_k(\tau_j^{\sigma_k(s)}(q, p)) &\leq -\sum_j p_j^2 + \frac{1}{k} \sum_j S(kq_j, p_j) + \frac{1}{k} (|p_j - p_{j-1}| + |p_{j-1} - p_1|) \leq \\ &\quad -\sum_j p_j^2 + \frac{1}{k} (|p_j| + 2|p_{j-1}| + |p_1|) + K \end{aligned}$$

But since  $-3K \geq F_k(q, p) \geq Q_k(q, p) - K$  we get  $Q_k(q, p) \leq -2K$  so  $\sum_j p_j^2 \geq 2K$  and using standard inequalities

$$\sum_j p_j^2 - \frac{1}{k} (|p_j| + 2|p_{j-1}| + |p_1|) - K \geq M - \frac{\sqrt{6M}}{k} - K \geq K$$

for  $M$  large enough. And this implies

$$F_k(\tau^{\sigma_k(s)}(q, p)) \leq -K + O(1/k) \leq c + O(1/k)$$

We thus proved that for any  $(q, p) \in \tilde{C}$  and  $s \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$F_k(\tau^{\sigma_k(s)}(q, p)) \leq c' = c + O(1/k)$$

This concludes our proof and the proof of proposition 5.14. □

□

*Remarks 7.7.* **(1)** The above method of proof, in the case of variational problems for closed geodesics, is related to the “passing the obstacles one at the time” that can be found in the paper by [Ban] page 87, as well as to Gromov’s book [Gr] sections 2.26 and 2.27. I wish to thank V. Bangert for the reference.

- (2)** Since  $\varphi_k = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k$ , and we proved  $\gamma(\varphi_k(L_y) - L_y)$  converges to zero, so for  $y = 0$ , we get  $\frac{1}{k} \gamma(\varphi^k(0_{T^n}))$  converges to zero. This is much weaker than Conjecture 1.

## 8 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We are now going to prove Theorem 4.1 in the time-independent case. The general case could be proved along the same lines, but we shall show in Section 12 Subsection 12.2, how to deduce it formally from the time-independent case.

Thus far we showed that some subsequence of  $\varphi_k^t$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\overline{\varphi}_\infty^t$ . On the other hand, we proved in lemma 5.11 that this implies the convergence of the sequence itself to  $\overline{\varphi}_\infty^t$ . We may finally conclude that  $\varphi_k^t$  converges (uniformly for  $t \in [0, 1]$ ) to  $\overline{\varphi}_\infty^t$ , and thus that the sequence  $H(kq, p)$  converges to  $\overline{H} = \mathcal{A}(H)$  for the  $\gamma$ -metric (remember that  $\overline{H}$  is continuous, so belongs to  $\mathcal{H}(T^*T^n)$ , the  $\gamma$ -completion of  $C^2([0, 1] \times T^*T^n)$ ). Clearly  $\overline{H}(q, p) = h_\infty(p)$  defined in the previous subsection Proposition 5.9, which proves the first statement of the main theorem.



End of the proof of theorem 4.1 (for time independent Hamiltonians). Assertion (2) follows from the fact that  $\overline{\varphi}_\infty^1$  determines  $\overline{H}$  (see Appendix A, Corollary A.2), and that

$$\overline{\varphi}_\infty^1 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k$$

which only depends on  $\varphi = \varphi^1$ .

We finally prove assertion (3). We have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{k,1}(y) - h_{k,2}(y)| &\leq |c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_1^k \rho_k) - c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y), \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_2^k \rho_k)| \leq \\ &\gamma((\rho_k^{-1} \varphi_1^k \rho_k)^{-1} \circ \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_2^k \rho_k) \leq \gamma(\rho_k^{-1} \varphi_1^{-k} \varphi_2^k \rho_k) \leq \frac{1}{k} \gamma(\varphi_1^{-k} \varphi_2^k) \leq \gamma(\varphi_1^{-1} \varphi_2) \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality follows from (1) of the proof of Lemma 5.11. Therefore, using the the  $C^0$  norm and the norm  $\gamma$  we get that the map  $\mathcal{A}$  is Lipschitz, with Lipschitz constant one. It thus extends to a Lipschitz map from  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(T^*T^n)$  to  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ . the last inequality being a consequence of (5.1) and (5.2) of proposition 5.11.

Since if  $H$  only depends on  $p$ , we have  $\overline{H} = H$ , we get that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a projector.

This concludes our proof of theorem 4.1 for the time-independent case.  $\square$

## 9 Proof of theorem 4.2.

We assume again to be in the time-independent situation. In order to prove (1) of theorem 4.2, we need to prove that if  $H_1 \leq H_2$  then  $h_{\infty,1} \leq h_{\infty,2}$ . This would follow immediately from the fact that we may choose  $S_1, S_2$  such that<sup>14</sup>  $S_1(q, p) \leq S_2(q, p)$  hence,  $F_{k,1} \leq F_{k,2}$  and therefore

$$h_{k,1}(y) = c(\mu \otimes 1(y), F_{k,1}) \leq c(\mu \otimes 1(y), F_{k,2}) = h_{k,2}(y)$$

As a result,  $h_{\infty,1}(y) \leq h_{\infty,2}(y)$ .

However there is the following more general and simpler proof, assuming only that  $H_1 \preceq H_2$  so that  $\varphi_1^1 \preceq \varphi_2^1$  and

$$\rho_k^{-1} \varphi_1^1 \rho_k \preceq \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_2^1 \rho_k$$

<sup>14</sup>This is automatically the case if  $S_j$  is a finite dimensional reduction of the action functional, as described in [Ch2, Lau-Sik].

then by going to the limit,  $\bar{\varphi}_1 \preceq \bar{\varphi}_2$ . Now  $\bar{\varphi}_1$  and  $\bar{\varphi}_2$  are the flows of  $\bar{H}_1$  and  $\bar{H}_2$  which depend only on  $p$ . Therefore, according to Appendix A, Corollary A.2, they commute, and our assertion follows from the

**Lemma 9.1.** *If  $\varphi^1$ , the time-one flow of the compact supported integrable Hamiltonian  $H(p)$ , satisfies  $\text{Id} \preceq \varphi^1$  then  $H$  is positive.*

*Proof.* Remember that  $\text{Id} \preceq \varphi$  means  $c_-(\varphi) = 0$ . In Appendix A we prove that  $c_-(\varphi^1) = \inf_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} H(p)$ . Therefore if  $c_-(\varphi^1)$  vanishes,  $H$  must be non-negative.  $\square$

To prove (2), we have to compare  $\mathcal{A}(H \circ \psi)$  to  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ . Note that the flow associated to  $H \circ \psi$  is  $\psi^{-1} \circ \varphi^t \circ \psi$ . Thus  $\mathcal{A}(H \circ \psi)$  is associated to the  $\gamma$ -limit of

$$\rho_k^{-1} \psi^{-1} \varphi^k \psi \rho_k = (\rho_k^{-1} \psi^{-1} \rho_k) (\rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k) (\rho_k^{-1} \psi \rho_k)$$

But  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(\rho_k^{-1} \psi^{-1} \rho_k) = 0$ , that is  $\rho_k^{-1} \circ \psi^{-1} \circ \rho_k$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\text{Id}$ . Hence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k^{-1} \psi^{-1} \varphi^k \psi \rho_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k^{-1}$$

Similarly for property (3), we have to compare  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^{-k} \rho_k$ . Clearly, if the limits exist, they must be inverses of each other, that is they are given by  $\bar{\varphi}_\infty$  and  $(\bar{\varphi}_\infty)^{-1}$ . Now it follows from [Hu] or (since we are in the situation of Hamiltonians depending on  $p$ ) from Appendix A corollary A.2 that two integrable autonomous continuous compactly supported Hamiltonians  $H, K$  in  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c$ , such that their flows satisfy  $\varphi\psi = \text{Id}$  in  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$ , must satisfy  $H = -K$ .

We now prove property (4). We limit ourselves to the case  $U$  is closed, since otherwise we can set  $\mathcal{A}(U) = \mathcal{A}(\bar{U})$ . Let us consider a decreasing sequence of smooth functions  $H_\nu$  such that  $\bigcap_\nu \text{supp}(H_\nu) = U$ , and  $\lim_\nu H_\nu = \chi_U$ , where  $\chi_U$  is the characteristic function of  $U$ , the limit being here a pointwise limit. Then  $\bar{H}_\nu$  is also a decreasing sequence, and therefore has a limit  $\bar{H}_\infty$ , and we denote by  $\mathcal{A}(U)$  the support of  $\bar{H}_\infty$ . Since for any other sequence  $K_\nu$  decreasing to  $\chi_U$ , we may find, for each  $\nu$ , a  $\mu$  such that  $K_\mu \leq H_\nu$ , we have  $\bar{K}_\infty \leq \bar{H}_\infty$ . By symmetry, we get  $\bar{K}_\infty = \bar{H}_\infty$  hence the support of  $\bar{K}_\infty$  coincides with the support of  $\bar{H}_\infty$ . This support defines  $\mathcal{A}(U)$ .

Assume now  $L$  is a Lagrangian submanifold Hamiltonian isotopic to  $L_{y_0}$ . By the Hamiltonian invariance we just proved,  $\mathcal{A}(L) = \mathcal{A}(L_{y_0})$ . Now it is easy to show that

$$\mathcal{A}(L_{y_0}) = \{y_0\}$$

Since  $\text{shape}(U)$  contains  $p$  if and only if  $U$  contains a Lagrangian  $L$ , Hamiltonian isotopic to  $L_p$ , we get that for  $p \in \text{shape}(U)$ , we must have  $p_0 \in \text{shape}(U)$ . This concludes the proof of (4).

As for property (5), it is an easy consequence of the above. Indeed, assume first  $H(L) \geq h$  where  $L$  is Hamiltonian isotopic to  $L_{p_0}$ . Let  $\kappa_{p_0}$  be a function on  $(\mathbb{R})^n$  equal to 1 near  $p_0$ , very negative in a neighborhood of the  $p$ -projection of the support of  $H$ , and compact supported. Then if  $\psi(L_{p_0}) = L$ , we have

$$H \geq h \cdot (\kappa_{p_0} \circ \psi)$$

hence

$$\overline{H} \geq h \cdot \overline{(\kappa_{p_0} \circ \psi)} = h \cdot \overline{\kappa_{p_0}} = h \cdot \kappa_{p_0}$$

As a result,

$$\overline{H}(p_0) \geq h \kappa_{p_0}(p_0) = h$$

Changing  $H$  to  $-H$ , and using (3) we get the second statement.

Property (6) follows from the fact that  $c_{\pm}(\rho_k^{-1} \varphi^k \rho_k) = \frac{1}{k} c_{\pm}(\varphi^k)$  and the fact that  $c_{\pm}$  are continuous for the  $c$ -topology.

Finally, to show that  $\zeta$  is a quasi-state, it is enough to deal with the case where  $\mu$  is a Dirac mass at  $p$ . We must then prove

- (1) (Monotonicity)  $H_1 \leq H_2$  implies  $\overline{H}_1 \leq \overline{H}_2$ . This follows from (1) of theorem 4.2
- (2) (Quasi-linearity) If  $H, K$  Poisson commute, then  $\overline{(H + K)}(p) = \overline{H}(p) + \overline{K}(p)$ . this follows from the fact that if  $H, K$  commute, with respective flows  $\varphi^t, \psi^t$ , then  $H + K$  has flow  $\psi^t \varphi^t$  and then  $\mathcal{A}(H + K)$  corresponds to

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \psi^{kt} \rho_k^{-1} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\rho_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \rho_k) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\rho_k^{-1} \psi^{kt} \rho_k) = \overline{\varphi}^t \circ \overline{\psi}^t$$

and this corresponds to  $\mathcal{A}(H)(p) + \mathcal{A}(K)(p)$  according to Corollary A.2 of Appendix A

- (3) (Normalization)  $\zeta(1) = 1$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is only defined for compact supported functions, this means that for any sequence  $H_n$  of compact supported functions such that  $\lim_n H_n = 1$ , where the limit is uniform on any compact set, we have  $\lim_n \mathcal{A}(H_n) = 1$

Let us define  $\mathbf{1}_{[-R,R]}$  to be the characteristic function of  $[-R, R]$ , and  $K_R(q, p) = \mathbf{1}_{[-R,R]}(|p|)$ , and let  $H_n$  be a sequence of compact supported functions converging uniformly on compact sets to 1, with the extra requirement that for any  $n$ , there exist sequences  $(R_n)_{n \geq 1}, (R'_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 1}$  such that  $\lim_n R_n = \lim_n R'_n = +\infty$ ,  $\lim_n \varepsilon_n = 0$  and  $K_{R_n} - \varepsilon_n K_{R'_n} \leq H_n \leq K_{R_n} + \varepsilon_n K_{R'_n}$ . Since  $K_R$  only depends on  $p$  we have that  $K_R, K_{R'}$  commute and  $\mathcal{A}(K_R) = K_R$ . This implies that

$$\lim_n (K_{R_n} - \varepsilon_n K_{R'_n}) \leq \lim_n \mathcal{A}(H_n) \leq \lim_n (K_{R_n} - \varepsilon_n K_{R'_n})$$

Since  $\lim_n K_{R_n} = 1$  this implies that  $\lim_n \mathcal{A}(H_n) = 1$ .

This concludes the proof of theorem 4.2 in the time independent case.

## 10 Proof of the partial homogenization case

We here consider the case of the sequence  $H(kx, y, q, p)$  and prove that it  $\gamma$ -converges to  $\overline{H}(y, q, p)$  obtained by performing the above homogenization, on the variables  $(x, y)$  and freezing the  $(q, p)$  variables.

The flow of  $H(kx, y, q, p)$  is given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} H(k \cdot x, y, q, p) \\ \dot{y} = -k \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H(k \cdot x, y, q, p) \\ \dot{q} = \frac{\partial}{\partial p} H(k \cdot x, y, q, p) \\ \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial q} H(k \cdot x, y, q, p) \end{cases}$$

Set

$$x_k(t) = k \cdot x\left(\frac{t}{k}\right), y_k(t) = y\left(\frac{t}{k}\right), q_k(t) = q\left(\frac{t}{k}\right), p_k(t) = p\left(\frac{t}{k}\right)$$

We shall consider the flow  $\varphi_k^t$  associated to the Hamiltonian equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{x}_k = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} H(x_k, y_k, q_k, p_k) \\ \dot{y}_k = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} H(x_k, y_k, q_k, p_k) \\ \dot{q}_k = \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} H(x_k, y_k, q_k, p_k) \\ \dot{p}_k = -\frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} H(x_k, y_k, q_k, p_k) \end{array} \right.$$

Then our map is generated by  $\rho_k^{-1} \varphi_k^{kt} \rho_k$  where

$$\rho_k(x, y, q, p) = (k \cdot x, y, q, p)$$

Let  $S_k(x, y, q, p, \xi)$  be a generating function for the flow above. The candidate for the homogenization is again given by  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \overline{H}_k$  where

$$\overline{H}_k(y, q, p) = c(\mu_x \otimes 1(y) \otimes 1(q, p), S_k)$$

is obtained by freezing the  $(q, p)$  variables and performing homogenization as in the previous section. The precompactness of the sequence is proved as in proposition 5.9. Let us reformulate the problem by considering the symplectic form  $\sigma_k$  on  $T^*T^{m+n}$  given by  $dy \wedge dx + k dp \wedge dq$ . For a Hamiltonian  $H(x, y, q, p)$  its flow for  $\sigma_k$  is defined by the equations

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{x} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(x, y, q, p), \quad \dot{y} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(x, y, q, p) \\ \dot{q} = \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(x, y, q, p), \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial H}{\partial q}(x, y, q, p) \end{array} \right.$$

Now to the above Hamiltonian map  $C^1$ -close to the identity, we may associate the function  $S(x, Y, q, P)$  on  $T^*(T^{n+m})$  given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} X - x = \frac{\partial S}{\partial Y}(x, Y, q, P), \quad y - Y = \frac{\partial S}{\partial x}(x, Y, q, P) \\ Q - q = \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S}{\partial P}(x, Y, q, P), \quad p - P = \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S}{\partial q}(x, Y, q, P) \end{array} \right.$$

Indeed this amounts to the identification of  $T^*(T^{m+n}) \times T^*(T^{m+n})$  endowed with the symplectic form  $\sigma_k \ominus \sigma_k$  (i.e.  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  denoting the projections

on the first and second  $T^*T^n$  factor,  $\sigma_k \ominus \sigma_k$  is defined as  $(\pi_1^* \sigma_k - \pi_2^* \sigma_k)$ , with  $T^*(T^{n+m} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+m})$  endowed with the standard form by

$$(x, y, q, p, X, Y, Q, P) \longrightarrow (x, Y, q, P, y - Y, X - x, k(p - P), k(Q - q))$$

Note that  $S$  depends from  $k$ , even though it is not apparent in the notation. Two such transformations are composed by the following formula: If  $S_1(x_1, Y_1, q_1, P_1), S_2(x_2, Y_2, q_2, P_2)$  are the generating functions for  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$ , we will have the generating function of  $\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$  given by

$$S(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q_2, P_1) = S_1(x, Y_1, q, P_1) + S_2(x_2, Y, q_2, P) - \langle x - x_2, Y_1 - Y \rangle - k \langle P_1 - P, q - q_2 \rangle$$

Indeed, the constraining equations are

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_2} = 0 \iff \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial x}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) - Y + Y_1 = 0 \\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial Y_1} = 0 \iff \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial y}(x, Y_1, q, P_1) + -x + x_2 = 0 \\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial q_2} = 0 \iff \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial q}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) + k(P - P_1) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial S}{\partial P_1} = 0 \iff \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial p}(x, Y_1, q, P_1) + k(q - q_2) = 0 \end{array} \right.$$

and the map  $\varphi$  is given by

$$\left( x, Y + \frac{\partial S}{\partial x}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q_2, P_1), q, P + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S}{\partial q}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q_2, P_1) \right) \longrightarrow \left( x + \frac{\partial S}{\partial Y}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q_2, P_1), Y, q + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S}{\partial P}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q_2, P_1), P \right)$$

that is

$$\left( x, Y + \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial x}(x, Y_1, q, P_1), q, P + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial q}(x, Y_1, q, P_1) \right) \longrightarrow \left( x + \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial Y}(x_2, Y, q_2, P), Y, q + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial P}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) \right)$$

Now the map  $\varphi_1$  sends

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( x, Y_1 + \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial x}(x, Y_1, q, P_1), q, P_1 + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial q}(x, Y_1, q, P_1) \right) \longrightarrow \\ & \left( x + \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial Y_1}(x, Y_1, q, P_1), Y_1, q + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial P_1}(x, Y_1, q, P_1), P_1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and the map  $\varphi_2$  sends

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( x_2, Y + \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial x_2}(x_2, Y, q_2, P), q, P + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial q_2}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) \right) \longrightarrow \\ & \left( x_2 + \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial Y}(x_2, Y, q_2, P), Y, q_2 + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial P}(x_2, Y, q_2, P), P \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Y = Y_1 + \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial x}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) \\ x = x_2 + \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial y}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) \\ P = P_1 + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial q}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) \\ q = q_2 + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial p}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) \end{array} \right.$$

we may infer

$$\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$$

## 10.1 Resolution in the $(q_2, P_1)$ variables

For  $j = 1, 2$ , let the functions

$$\frac{\partial S_j}{\partial P_1}(x_2, Y, q_2, P), \quad \frac{\partial S_j}{\partial q_2}(x_2, Y, q_2, P)$$

be  $C^1$  bounded, and assume  $k$  is large. We may then solve

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial q}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) + k(P - P_1) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial P}(x, Y_1, q, P_1) + k(q - q_2) = 0 \end{array} \right.$$

in

$$(q_2, P_1) = (q_2(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1), P_1(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1))$$

This requires the following matrix to be invertible:

$$\begin{pmatrix} I - \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 S_2}{\partial q \partial p}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) & \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 S_2}{\partial q^2}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) \\ \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 S_1}{\partial p \partial q}(x_2, Y, q_2, P) & I - \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 S_1}{\partial p^2}(x, Y_1, q, P_1) \end{pmatrix}$$

We thus get a new generating function

$$\widehat{S}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1) = S(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q_2(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1), P_1(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1))$$

Note that

$$\|q_2(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1) - q\|_{C^1} = O(1/k), \quad \|P_1(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1) - P\|_{C^1} = O(1/k)$$

hence

$$\|\widehat{S}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1) - S(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q, P)\|_{C^1} = O(1/k)$$

where

$$S(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q, P) = S_1(x, Y_1, q, P) + S_2(x_2, Y, q, P) - \langle x - x_2, Y_1 - Y \rangle$$

Note that the left-hand side of all these equations depend on  $k$ , since  $S$  itself depends on  $k$ .

## 10.2 Generating functions for $H(kx, y, q, p)$

Suppose now that  $S_1$  is a function of  $(x_1, Y_1, q_1, P_1, \xi_1)$  and  $S_2$  of  $(x_2, Y_2, q_2, P_2, \xi_2)$

Then

$$S(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q_2, P_1, \xi_1, \xi_2) = S_1(x, Y_1, q, P_1, \xi_1) + S_2(x_2, Y, q_2, P, \xi_2) - \langle x - x_2, Y_1 - Y \rangle - k \langle P_1 - P, q - q_2 \rangle$$

The conditions defining  $\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$  are then given by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial q_2}(x_2, Y, q_2, P, \xi_2) + k(P - P_1) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial P_1}(x, Y_1, q, P_1, \xi_1) + k(q - q_2) = 0 \end{cases}$$



and for  $k$  large enough we may write, as in the previous section

$$(q_2, P_1) = (q_2(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, \xi_1, \xi_2), P_1(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, \xi_1, \xi_2))$$

We then set

$$\widehat{S}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, \xi_1, \xi_2) = S_1(x, Y_1, q, P_1(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, \xi_1, \xi_2), \xi_1) + S_2(x_2, Y, q_2(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, \xi_1, \xi_2), P, \xi_2) - \langle x - x_2, Y_1 - Y \rangle - k \langle P_1 - P, q - q_2 \rangle$$

Again, we have, as above

$$\|\widehat{S}(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, \xi_1, \xi_2) - S(x, Y, q, P; x_2, Y_1, q, P, \xi_1, \xi_2)\|_{C^1} = O(1/k)$$

### 10.3 The case of $\ell$ terms

Let  $\varphi_k^t$  be the flow associated to  $H(x, y, q, p)$  for the symplectic form  $\sigma_k$ , the flow  $\Psi_k^t$  associated to  $H(kx, y, q, p)$  for  $\sigma_1$  is given by

$$\Psi_k^t = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_k^{kt} \rho_k$$

Indeed  $\Psi_k^t$  is defined by the equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(kx, y, q, p), & \dot{y}(t) = -k \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(kx, y, q, p) \\ \dot{q}(t) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(kx, y, q, p), & \dot{p}(t) = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}(kx, y, q, p) \end{cases}$$

and setting  $kx = u$ , we get

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}(t) = k \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(u, y, q, p), & \dot{y}(t) = -k \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(u, y, q, p) \\ \dot{q}(t) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(u, y, q, p), & \dot{p}(t) = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}(u, y, q, p) \end{cases}$$

and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_k^t(x(0), y(0), q(0), p(0)) &= (x(t), y(t), q(t), p(t)) = \left(\frac{1}{k}u(t), y(t), q(t), p(t)\right) = \\ &= \rho_k^{-1}(u(t), y(t), q(t), p(t)) = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_k^{kt}(u(0), y(0), q(0), p(0)) \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\Psi_k^t = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_k^{kt} \rho_k$$

This is not surprising, since  $\Psi_k^t$  is Hamiltonian for  $\sigma_1$  (hence it is  $\sigma_1$ -symplectic) while  $\varphi_k^t$  is Hamiltonian for  $\sigma_k$  (hence is  $\sigma_k$ -symplectic) and  $\rho_k^* \sigma_k = k\sigma_1$ .

Let  $F_k(x, Y, q, P, \xi)$  be a generating function associated to the time-one flow of  $H(x, y, q, p)$ , for the symplectic form  $\sigma_k$ . We then have

$$F_{k,\ell}(x, Y, q, P; \bar{x}, \bar{Y}, \bar{q}, \bar{P}, \bar{\xi}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} F_k(x_j, Y_j, q_j, P_j, \xi_j) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \langle x_j - x_{j+1}, Y_j - Y_{j+1} \rangle - k \langle q_j - q_{j+1}, P_j - P_{j+1} \rangle$$

Here

$$x_1 = x, q_1 = q, P_\ell = P, Y_\ell = Y, \\ \bar{x} = (x_2, \dots, x_\ell), \bar{q} = (q_2, \dots, q_\ell), \bar{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_{\ell-1}), \bar{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{\ell-1}), \bar{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell)$$

The condition for solving the constrains  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \bar{q}} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial \bar{P}} = 0$  in  $(\bar{q}, \bar{P})$  is the invertibility of the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} kI - \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial \bar{q} \partial \bar{P}}(\bar{x}, Y, \bar{q}, P) & \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial \bar{q}^2}(\bar{x}, Y, \bar{q}, P) \\ \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial \bar{P} \partial \bar{q}}(\bar{x}, Y, \bar{q}, P) & I - \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial P^2}(x, \bar{Y}, q, \bar{P}) \end{pmatrix}$$

This amounts to the inequality

$$(\star) \quad \frac{1}{k} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial q_2 \partial P} (x, Y, q, P) & \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial q^2} (x, Y, q, P) \\ \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial P \partial q} (x, Y, q, P) & \frac{\partial^2 F_k}{\partial P^2} (x, Y, q, P) \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq \varepsilon$$

since a matrix of the type .

$$\begin{pmatrix} I + A & C & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ B & I + A & C & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I + A & C & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & B & I + A & C \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & B & I + A \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible provided  $\|A\|, \|B\|, \|C\|$  are small enough<sup>15</sup>.

Under the above assumption  $(\star)$ , we have that

$$\|F_{k,\ell}(x, Y, q, P; \bar{x}, \bar{Y}, \bar{q}, \bar{P}, \bar{\xi}) - \widehat{F}_{k,\ell}(x, Y, q, P; \bar{x}, \bar{Y}, \bar{\xi})\|_{C^1} \leq C\ell \frac{1}{k}$$

where

$$\widehat{F}_{k,\ell}(x, Y, q, P; \bar{x}, \bar{Y}, \bar{\xi}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} F_k(x_j, Y_j, q, P, \xi_j) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \langle x_j - x_{j+1}, Y_j - Y_{j+1} \rangle$$

Now let us for typographical convenience revert to  $(x, y, q, p)$  notation instead of  $(x, Y, q, P)$ . Let the generating function associated to  $\Psi_k^1$  be given by

$$F_k(x, y, q, p; \bar{\xi})$$

We thus have according to proposition 5.13 for each fixed value of  $(q, p)$ , a function  $h_k(y, q, p)$  and a cycle  $\Gamma(y, q, p)$  with the proper homology class such that

$$F_k(y, q, p; \Gamma(y, q, p)) \leq h_k(q, y, p) + \varepsilon_k$$

where  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k(y, q, p) = h_\infty(y, q, p)$ .

Moreover  $\Gamma(y, q, p)$  may be allowed to depend continuously on  $(y, q, p)$  provided we allow the weaker inequality

$$F_k(y, q, p; \Gamma_j(y, q, p)) \leq h_k(q, y, p) + a\chi_j^\delta(q, p)$$

where now  $\chi_j^\delta$  is supported in  $W_j^\delta$ , a  $\delta$ -neighborhood of a grid in the  $(q, p)$  variables. The procedure here is the same as in the proof of proposition 5.13. Note that we used proposition 5.13, in order to get rid of the  $y$  dependence of the  $\chi_j^\delta$ .

Then

$$\widehat{F}_{k,\ell}(x, y, q, p; \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}) = \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} F_k(x_j, y_j, q, p, \xi_j) - \langle y_j - y_{j+1}, x_j - x_{j+1} \rangle$$

---

<sup>15</sup>It holds independently from the number of blocks: this follows from Gershgorin's theorem, stating that if  $R$  bounds the sum on any line of the off diagonal terms, the eigenvalues of the matrix are at distance less than  $R$  from the diagonal terms.

will satisfy on

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{k,\ell} = \{(x_j, y_j, q, p, \xi_j) \mid (x_j, \xi_j) \in \Gamma_j(y_j, q, p)\}$$

the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{F}_{k,\ell}(x, y, q, p; \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\xi}) \leq \\ & \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} h_k(y, q, p) + \frac{a}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \chi_j(q, p) - \langle x_j - x_{j+1}, y_j - y_{j+1} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

As before we choose the  $W_j^\delta$  so that the intersection of  $2m + 1$  distinct  $W_j^\delta = \text{supp}(\chi_j)$  is empty.

Thus  $\widehat{F}_{k,\ell}$  is bounded by the generating function of  $h_k(y, q, p)$  up to  $\frac{2ma}{\ell}$ . We therefore get for all  $\alpha$ , that

$$c(\mu, \Psi_{k\ell}^1 \alpha) \leq c(\mu, \bar{\Psi}_k^1 \alpha) + \frac{2ma}{\ell}$$

hence  $\lim_k c(\mu, \Psi_{k,\ell}^1 \alpha) \leq c(\mu, \bar{\Psi}_\infty^1 \alpha)$

Finally, we may conclude the proof of theorem 4.4 as we did in the standard case, noting that the proof of Proposition 7.4 extends to the situation where we have parameters  $(q, p)$  without any notable modification.

## 11 Proof of proposition 4.6

We shall limit ourselves to the case where homogenization is done on all variables.

According to proposition B.1 from Appendix B, if  $u_1, u_2$  are given by  $c(1(q), L_1)$  and  $c(1(q), L_2)$  respectively, we have

$$|c(1(q), L_1) - c(1(q), L_2)| \leq \gamma(L_1, L_2)$$

Thus if  $L_1 = \varphi_1(\Lambda)$  and  $L_2 = \varphi_2(\Lambda)$ , we have

$$\gamma(L_1, L_2) \leq \gamma(\varphi_1 \varphi_2^{-1})$$

In our case,  $L = (\text{Id} \times \varphi_k^t) \Delta$ ,  $\bar{L} = (\text{Id} \times \bar{\varphi}^t) \Delta$ , and therefore we get

$$|u_k(t, q) - \bar{u}(t, q)| \leq \gamma(\varphi_k^t \bar{\varphi}^{-t})$$

Now using the estimate (5.1) in the proof of lemma 5.11, we see that

$$\gamma(\varphi_k^{mt}\bar{\varphi}^{-mt}) \leq m\gamma(\varphi_k^t\bar{\varphi}^{-t})$$

Taking the supremum over  $t$  in  $[0, 1]$ , we get, since the flow is autonomous,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, m]} \gamma(\varphi_k^t\bar{\varphi}^{-t}) \leq m \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \gamma(\varphi_k^t\bar{\varphi}^{-t})$$

thus implying

$$\sup_{t \in [0, m]} |u_k - \bar{u}| \leq \gamma(L_k, \bar{L}) \leq m\varepsilon_k$$

where  $\varepsilon_k = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \gamma(\varphi_k^t, \bar{\varphi}^{-t})$ . This concludes the proof of proposition 4.6.

## 12 Non compact-supported Hamiltonians and the time dependent case

### 12.1 The coercive case

Assume first that the autonomous  $H(q, p)$  defined on  $T^*T^n$  is not compactly supported, and that  $H$  is coercive, that is

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} H(q, p) = +\infty$$

Then let  $\rho_A : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a truncation function, that is

- (1)  $0 \leq \rho_A \leq 1$
- (2)  $\rho_A$  is supported in  $[-2A, 2A]$
- (3)  $\rho_A = 1$  on  $[-A, A]$

We then consider  $\rho_A(|p|)H(q, p) = K(q, p)$ , and denote by  $\varphi^t$  the flow of  $H$ , and by  $\psi^t$  the flow of  $K$ . Since  $\varphi^t$  preserves  $H$ , we have that if  $a(\lambda), b(\lambda)$  are defined by  $a(\lambda) = \inf\{|p| \mid H(q, p) \leq \lambda\}$  and  $b(\lambda) = \sup\{|p| \mid H(q, p) \leq \lambda\}$ , so that

$$W^{a(\lambda)} = \{(q, p) \mid |p| \leq a(\lambda)\} \subset \{(q, p) \mid H(q, p) \leq \lambda\} \subset \{(q, p) \mid |p| \leq b(\lambda)\} = W^{b(\lambda)}$$

then  $\varphi^t$  sends  $W^{a(\lambda)}$  into  $W^{b(\lambda)}$  thus, for  $A \geq b(\lambda)$ , we have  $\psi^t = \varphi^t$  on  $W^{a(\lambda)}$ . Since  $\rho_k$  preserves  $W^\lambda$ , we get that  $\varphi_k^t = \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \rho_k$  sends also  $W^{a(\lambda)}$  into  $W^{b(\lambda)}$  and moreover coincides with  $\psi_k^t$  on  $W^{a(\lambda)}$ .

We want to conclude that the homogenizations  $\overline{\varphi}^t = \lim_k \varphi_k^t$  and  $\overline{\psi}^t = \lim_k \psi_k^t$  coincide on  $W^{a(\lambda)}$ . This is given by the following result based on the ideas of [Hu], section 4.4. First we shall say that  $\overline{\psi}^t = \overline{\varphi}^t$  on  $U$  if and only if  $(\overline{\psi}^t)^{-1} \overline{\varphi}^t$  has support in the complement of  $U$  (in the sense of [Hu] section 4.4 or [Hu2] definition 2.24, page 51).

**Definition 12.1** ([Hu] section 4.4 or [Hu2] definition 2.24, page 51). Let  $H \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*T^n)$ . We define  $\text{supp}(H)$  to be the intersection of closed sets  $F$ , such that there exists a sequence  $H_n$  of Hamiltonians supported in  $F$ , such that  $\gamma - \lim_n H_n = H$ . One similarly defines  $\text{supp}(\varphi)$  for  $\varphi \in \widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*M)$  as the intersection of the closed sets,  $F$ , such that there exists a sequence  $\varphi_n$  converging to  $\varphi$  such that  $\text{supp}(\varphi_n) \subset F$ .

**Lemma 12.2.** *Let  $\varphi_k^t, \psi_k^t$  be two sequences of smooth Hamiltonian flows, with support contained in a compact independent of  $k$ . Let  $U \subset V$  such that for any  $t$ ,  $\varphi_k^t(U) \subset V$ ,  $\psi_k^t(U) \subset V$  and  $\varphi_k^t = \psi_k^t$  on  $V$ . Then if  $\gamma - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k^t = \varphi_\infty^t$  and  $\gamma - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_k^t = \psi_\infty^t$  and  $H_\infty, K_\infty$  generate  $\varphi_\infty^t, \psi_\infty^t$ , then we may conclude that*

$$H_\infty = K_\infty$$

*is constant on  $U$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $H_k(t, z), K_k(t, z)$  be the compact supported Hamiltonians generating  $\varphi_k^t, \psi_k^t$ . For  $x \in V$ , we have  $\psi_k^t(x) = \varphi_k^t(x)$ , hence  $\psi_k^t$  and  $\varphi_k^t$  coincide. Then  $((\psi_k^t)^{-1} \circ \varphi_k^t)|_V = \text{Id}_V$ , so the Hamiltonian generating this flow,  $L_k(t, z) = (H_k - K_k)(t, \psi_k^t(z))$  vanishes on  $V$ . Now by assumption  $L_k$   $\gamma$ -converges to a Hamiltonian generating  $(\overline{\psi}^t)^{-1} \circ \overline{\varphi}^t$ , thus  $\text{supp}_1((\overline{\psi}^t)^{-1} \circ \overline{\varphi}^t) \cap U = \emptyset$ . This flow being generated by  $\overline{H} - \overline{K}$  which is continuous, we have according to [Hu2] (proposition 2.25 page 52), that  $\overline{H} - \overline{K}$  is constant on  $U$ .  $\square$

Now if  $a(\lambda) \leq A \leq B$ , setting  $H_A = H \cdot \chi_A$  (resp.  $H_B = H \chi_B$ ), we have  $\overline{H}_A = \overline{H}_B$  (up to constant that can be adjusted) on  $W^{a(\lambda)}$  hence we may set

**Definition 12.3.** Let  $H$  be an autonomous coercive Hamiltonian on  $T^*T^n$ . Then the limit  $\overline{H} = \lim_{A \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{H}_A$  is well defined up to constant.

Thus any **autonomous** coercive Hamiltonian can be homogenized:

**Proposition 12.4.** *The map  $\mathcal{A}$  from  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}am}(T^*T^n)$  to  $C^0(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$  extends to a map defined on the set of autonomous coercive Hamiltonians, i.e. such that  $\lim_{|p| \rightarrow +\infty} H(q, p) = +\infty$*

*Proof.* This follows from lemma 12.2 applied to the sequence  $(H_N)_{N \geq 1}$ .  $\square$

## 12.2 Non-autonomous Hamiltonians

Consider now a compactly supported 1-periodic Hamiltonian  $H(t, q, p)$  on  $T^*T^n$  and consider the Hamiltonian  $K(t, \tau, q, p) = \tau + H(t, q, p)$ . This new Hamiltonian, defined on  $T^*(T^{n+1})$  is not compactly supported, but, considering the function  $\chi_A$  as defined above, the Hamiltonian  $K_A(t, \tau, q, p) = \chi_A(\tau + H(t, q, p))(\tau + H(t, q, p))$  is compactly supported and autonomous. Its flow preserves the subsets  $\{(t, \tau, q, p) \mid -\lambda \leq \tau + H(t, q, p) \leq \lambda\}$  for  $\lambda \leq A - \|H\|$  and as above we may find  $a(\lambda), b(\lambda)$  such that setting  $W^a = \{(t, \tau, q, p) \mid |\tau + H(t, q, p)| \leq a\}$ , we have

$$W^{a(\lambda)} \subset \{(t, \tau, q, p) \mid -\lambda \leq \tau + H(t, q, p) \leq \lambda\} \subset W^{b(\lambda)}$$

Then  $K_A$  can be homogenized, and same argument as above shows that that  $\overline{K}_A = \overline{K}_B$  for  $a(\lambda) \leq A \leq B$  on  $\tau \leq a(\lambda)$ . Moreover  $\overline{K} = \lim_{A \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{K}_A$  is of the form  $\tau + \overline{H}(p)$  on  $|\tau| \leq A$ : in other words,  $\overline{K}(\tau, p) - \tau$  is independent from  $\tau$  (and denoted by  $\overline{H}(p)$ ).

**Proposition 12.5.** *Let  $H(t, q, p)$  be a Hamiltonian on  $T^*T^n$ , 1-periodic in time and compactly supported in  $(q, p)$ . Then  $\lim_{A \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{K}_A = \overline{K}(\tau, p)$  is well defined and there exists  $\overline{H}(p)$  such that  $\overline{K}(\tau, p) = \tau + \overline{H}(p)$ . The function  $\overline{K}$  satisfies the properties of theorems 4.1 and 4.2.*

*Proof.* Being of the form  $L(t, \tau, q, p) = a\tau + L_0(t, q, p)$  is equivalent to the property that  $\varphi_L^s$  and  $\varphi_\tau^s$  commute, where  $\varphi_\tau$  is the flow of  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ . But then consider for  $\rho_k(t, \tau, q, p) = (kt, \tau, kq, p)$

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\overline{K}}^s \varphi_\tau^s &= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_K^{ks} \rho_k \varphi_\tau^s = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \rho^{-1} \varphi_K^{ks} \varphi_\tau^{ks} \rho_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_\tau^{ks} \varphi_K^s \rho_k = \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_\tau^s \rho_k^{-1} \varphi_K^{ks} \rho_k = \varphi_\tau^s \varphi_{\overline{K}}^s \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\varphi_{\overline{K}}^s$  and  $\varphi_\tau^s$  commute, therefore  $\overline{K}(t, \tau, q, p) = a\tau + \overline{H}(p)$  for some constant  $a$ . The following lemma implies  $a = 1$ .

**Lemma 12.6.** *Let  $K(t, \tau, q, p) = \tau + H_n(t, q, p)$ , with flow  $\varphi_n^s$ , and let  $\psi^s(t, \tau, q, p) = (t, \tau+s, q, p)$ . Then  $\varphi^s \psi^\sigma \varphi^{-s} \psi^{-\sigma}$  is generated by  $L_\sigma(s, t, \tau, q, p) = K(t, \tau, q, p) - K(\psi^{-\sigma} \varphi^{-s}(t, \tau, q, p)) = \sigma$*

*Proof.* This is just the translation, using [C-V], of the fact that  $\{K, t\} = 1$ .  $\square$

As a result, if we have a sequence  $K_n = \tau + H_n(t, q, p)$   $\gamma$ -converging to  $K_\infty$ , we shall have  $\gamma(\varphi_n^s \psi^\sigma \varphi_n^{-s} \psi^{-\sigma}) = \sigma$ , hence

$$\gamma(\varphi_\infty^s \psi^\sigma \varphi_\infty^{-s} \psi^{-\sigma}) = \sigma$$

and this implies  $K_\infty(t, \tau, q, p) = \tau + H_\infty(t, q, p)$ . Note that even after truncation, we have  $L_\sigma = \sigma$  over a large compact set, and  $|L_\sigma| \leq \sigma$ , so that  $\gamma(\varphi_\infty^s \psi^\sigma \varphi_\infty^{-s} \psi^{-\sigma}) = \sigma$ .  $\square$

*Remark 12.7.* We could have taken a direct approach to the non-autonomous problem. For this one can replace in subsection 5.1 the generating function  $S(q, P)$  for  $\varphi^{1/r}$  by a generating function  $S(q, P, \xi)$  for  $\varphi$ . All formulas for the generating function of  $\varphi_k^1$  translate immediately, and the proofs of section 5.

Finally, we may consider the case of a non-autonomous, coercive Hamiltonian. Note that if  $H$  is a Hamiltonian equal to a constant  $c$  outside a compact set, we may still define  $\overline{H}$  as  $c + \overline{(H - c)}$ .

*Proof of Theorems 5.1 and 5.3 for non-autonomous Hamiltonians.* The proof of theorems 5.1 and 5.3 for general Hamiltonians now follows easily from the autonomous case and Proposition 12.5. Note that in Proposition 5.3 only (1) (2) (3) (6) involve the non-autonomous case.  $\square$

Now we may even extend homogenization to the coercive situation. Let  $f_r$  such that  $f_r(x) = x$  for  $x \leq r$  and  $f_r(x) = r$  for  $x \geq r$ . We then set

**Definition 12.8.** Let  $H(t, q, p)$  be a coercive non-autonomous Hamiltonian. Then we set

$$\overline{H}(p) = \limsup_{K \leq H, K \in C_c^0([0,1] \times T^*T^n, \mathbb{R})} \overline{K}(p) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \overline{f_r(H)}$$

*Remarks 12.9.* **(1)** Because  $H(t, q, p) \leq h(p)$  for some function  $h$ , we have  $\overline{H} \leq h$ , so  $\overline{H}$  is locally bounded. What is not clear is that  $\overline{H}$  should be continuous.



(2) Note that we may also use the distance  $\widehat{\gamma}$  defined by

$$\widehat{\gamma}(\varphi, id) = \sup\{\gamma(\varphi(L), L) \mid L \in \mathcal{L}\}$$

and we may also define the weak limit as  $\varphi = \lim_k \varphi_k$  if and only if for any  $L$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  we have

$$\lim_k \gamma(\varphi_k(L), \varphi(L)) = 0.$$

Note that this is different from convergence for  $\widehat{\gamma}$ , which would require that the above convergence is uniform in  $L$ .

We may now consider applications of the non-compact situation to homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Indeed, let us consider a Hamiltonian  $H(t, q, p)$  on  $T^*T^n$ ,  $\varphi^t$  its flow, and  $f$  a  $C^1$  function defined on  $T^n$ . Since the graph of  $df$  is bounded, for any positive time  $T$ , we may replace  $H$  by  $K_A$  for  $A$  large enough, in such a way that  $\varphi^t(\Gamma_{df})$  is unchanged. Thus  $H$  is now compactly supported, we get a function  $u_f(t, x)$ , and we get that the solutions  $u_{k,f}(t, x)$  of

$$(HJ_k) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_k(t, q) + H(kt, kq, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u_k(t, q)) = 0 \\ u_k(0, q) = f(q) \end{cases}$$

converge to the solution  $\bar{u}_f$  of

$$(\overline{HJ}) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, q) + \overline{H}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} u(t, q)) = 0 \\ u(0, q) = f(q) \end{cases}$$

We may now extend the convergence to the case of a  $C^0$  function,  $f$ .

**Corollary 12.10.** *Assume  $f$  is  $C^0$ , and we have a sequence  $f_\nu$  converging uniformly to  $f$ , then  $\bar{u}_{f_\nu}$  converges to a function denoted  $\bar{u}_f$ .*

*Proof.* Indeed, we have the estimate:

**Lemma 12.11.**

$$|\bar{u}_f - \bar{u}_g|_{C^0} \leq |f - g|_{C^0}$$

*Proof.* Indeed, let  $\Psi$  be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism of  $T^*N$  such that  $\Psi(\Lambda_f) = \Lambda_g$ , where  $\Lambda_f = \{(x, df(x)) \mid x \in N\}$ , and such that  $\gamma(\Psi) \leq$

$|f - g|_{C^0}$ . We may take for  $\Psi^t$  a truncation to a compact domain of the isotopy  $\Psi^t(x, p) = (x, p + td(g - f)(x))$ .

Then the function  $u_f$  is obtained as  $c(1(x), \varphi^t(\Lambda_f))$ , and we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c(1(x), \varphi^t(\Lambda_f)) - c(1(x), \varphi^t(\Lambda_g))| &= |c(1(x), \varphi^t(\Lambda_f)) - c(1(x), \varphi^t\Psi(\Lambda_f))| \leq \\ &|c(1(x), \varphi^t(\Lambda_f) - \varphi^t\Psi(\Lambda_f))| \leq |c(1(x), \Lambda_f - \Psi(\Lambda_f))| \leq \gamma(\Lambda_f, \Psi(\Lambda_f)) \leq \\ &\gamma(\Psi) \leq |f - g|_{C^0} \end{aligned}$$

□

Now this implies, denoting by  $u_{k, f_\nu}$  the sequence of variational solutions of the equation obtained by replacing  $f$  by  $f_\nu$  in  $(HJ_k)$

$$|u_{k, f_\nu} - u_{k, f_\mu}| \leq |f_\nu - f_\mu|_{C^0}$$

and

$$|\bar{u}_{f_\nu} - \bar{u}_{f_\mu}| \leq |f_\nu - f_\mu|_{C^0}$$

hence the sequences  $(u_{k, f_\mu})_{\mu \geq 1}$  and  $(\bar{u}_{f_\mu})_{\mu \geq 1}$  are Cauchy, hence have limits denoted  $u_{k, f}$  and  $\bar{u}_f$ .

Given a positive  $\varepsilon$ , choose  $\nu$  large enough, so that  $|f - f_\mu| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $\mu \geq \nu$ , and  $l$  large enough so that for  $k \geq l$  we have  $|u_{k, f_\nu} - \bar{u}_{f_\nu}| \leq \varepsilon$  we get

$$|u_{k, f_\mu} - \bar{u}_{f_\mu}| \leq |u_{k, f_\mu} - u_{k, f_\nu}| + |u_{k, f_\nu} - \bar{u}_{f_\nu}| + |\bar{u}_{f_\nu} - \bar{u}_{f_\mu}| \leq 3\varepsilon.$$

As a result, letting  $\mu$  go to infinity, we get  $|u_{k, f} - \bar{u}_f| \leq 3\varepsilon$  hence  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_{k, f} = \bar{u}_f$ . □

### 12.3 A non-coercive example

Assume for example that

$$H(x_1, x_2, p_1, p_2) = h(p_1, p_2)$$

outside a compact set. Notice that the Poisson brackets,  $\{H, p_1\} = \{H, p_2\} = 0$  outside a compact set, therefore  $\{H, |p_1|^2 + |p_2|^2\} = 0$  outside a compact set. The flow  $\varphi^t$  of  $H$  will then remain inside a bounded domain  $W^\lambda$  for  $\lambda$  large enough. We may then use the same truncation method as above, and infer that we may homogenize  $H$ :

**Proposition 12.12.** *Let  $H(x_1, x_2, p_1, p_2) = h(p)$  outside a compact set. Then we have a homogenization operator  $\mathcal{A}$  with the same properties as in the compactly supported case.*

**Corollary 12.13.** *Assume  $u_k$  is a variational solution of Hamilton-Jacobi equation  $(HJ_k)$ . Then the sequence  $u_k$  converges uniformly to a solution  $\bar{u}$  of  $(\bar{H}\bar{J})$ .*

*Remark 12.14.* By an approximation method, this will work for any Hamiltonian such that

$$\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} |H(q, p) - h(p)| = 0$$

### 13 Homogenization in the $p$ variable

This problem corresponds to the singular perturbation or penalization problem, studied in recent years by several authors (see for example [Alv-Bar1, Alv-Bar2]).

Let us consider the sequence defined by  $H_k = H(x, k \cdot p)$ . Its flow is given by

$$\psi_k^t = \zeta_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \zeta_k$$

where  $\zeta_k(q, p) = (q, k \cdot p)$ .

Note that here  $\zeta_k$  is a *bona fide* map on  $T^*T^n$ , so that we do not have to invoke covering arguments. Since  $\zeta_k$  satisfies  $\zeta_k^* \omega = k\omega$ , we get, that

$$\gamma(\zeta_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \zeta_k) = \frac{1}{k} \gamma(\varphi^{kt})$$

There is *a priori* no limit for the sequence  $\zeta_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \zeta_k$ : indeed if  $\varphi^t$  is the flow of  $H(p)$ ,  $\zeta_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \zeta_k$  will be the flow of  $H(kp)$ . However let us write  $\tau_k(q, p) = (k \cdot x, \frac{p}{k})$ , then

$$\psi_k^t = \zeta_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \zeta_k = \tau_k^{-1} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi^{kt} \rho_k \tau_k = \tau_k^{-1} \varphi_k^t \tau_k$$

Now

$$\gamma(\varphi_k^t \bar{\varphi}^{-t}) \leq \varepsilon_k t$$

thus

$$\gamma((\tau_k^{-1} \varphi_k^t \tau_k)(\tau_k^{-1} \bar{\varphi}^{-t} \tau_k)) = \gamma(\tau_k^{-1} (\varphi_k^t \bar{\varphi}^{-t}) \tau_k) = \gamma(\varphi_k^t \bar{\varphi}^{-t}) \leq \varepsilon_k t$$

Now since  $\tau_k^{-1} \bar{\varphi}^t \tau_k$  is generated by  $\bar{H}(k \cdot p)$ , we do not get a limit for  $H(x, k \cdot p)$  but we get:

**Proposition 13.1.**

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(H(x, k \cdot p), \overline{H}(k \cdot p)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(\psi_k^t(\overline{\varphi})^{-t}) = 0$$

In spite of the fact that  $\overline{H}(k \cdot p)$  has no limit as  $k$  goes to infinity, the above proposition has a number of applications. First, let us consider the standard parabolic Hamilton-Jacobi equations

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, q) + H(q, \frac{\partial}{\partial q} u(t, q)) = 0 \\ u(0, q) = f(q). \end{cases}$$

Set  $v_k(t, q) = \frac{1}{k} u(k \cdot t, q)$ . This is now a solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} v_k(t, q) + H(q, k \frac{\partial}{\partial q} v_k(t, q)) = 0 \\ v_k(0, q) = \frac{1}{k} f(kq). \end{cases}$$

and since  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(H(q, k \cdot p), \overline{H}(k \cdot p)) = 0$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} f(kq) = 0$  we get that  $v_k$  is approximated by  $w_k$ , variational solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_k(t, q) + \overline{H}(k \frac{\partial}{\partial q} w_k(t, q)) = 0 \\ w_k(0, q) = 0. \end{cases}$$

that is  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |w_k - v_k| = 0$ . Now, it is clear that  $w_k(t, q) = -t \overline{H}(0)$ , so that we get the following result, which had been proved in [L-P-V] in the  $p$ -convex one-dimensional case,

**Proposition 13.2.** *Let  $u$  be a variational solution of*

$$(HJ) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, q) + H(q, \frac{\partial}{\partial q} u(t, q)) = 0 \\ u(0, q) = f(q) \end{cases}$$

then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} u(t, q) = -\overline{H}(0)$$

### 13.1 Connection with Mather $\alpha$ function

The  $\alpha$  function has been defined by Mather for a Lagrangian  $L(t, x, \xi)$ , 1-periodic in  $t$  and strictly convex in  $p$ , as

$$\alpha(p) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \inf \left\{ \int_0^T L(t, q(t), \dot{q}(t)) dt - \langle p, x_1 - x_0 \rangle \mid q(0) = x_0, q(T) = x_1 \right\}$$

As a special case, we may show

**Proposition 13.3.** *Let  $H$  be the Legendre dual of the Lagrangian  $L$ , i.e.  $H$  is strictly convex in  $p$  and*

$$L(t, x, \xi) = \sup \{ \langle p, \xi \rangle - H(t, q, p) \}.$$

Then

$$\bar{H}(p) = \alpha(p) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T L(t, q(t), \dot{q}(t)) dt - \langle p, x_1 - x_0 \rangle \mid q(0) = x_0, q(T) = x_1 \right\}$$

*Proof.* It is enough to consider the case  $p = 0$ . Then let

$$\mathcal{P}_t = \{ q : [0, t] \rightarrow M \}$$

and  $\pi : \mathcal{P}_t \rightarrow M$  the map  $q \mapsto q(t)$ . Let

$$E_t(q) = \int_0^t L(q(s), \dot{q}(s)) ds$$

be defined on  $\mathcal{P}_t$ , and consider<sup>16</sup>  $E_t$  as a G.F.Q.I. . We shall write  $(x_1, q)$  instead of  $q$  to remind the reader that  $\pi(q) = q(t) = x_1$ .

Now

$$DE_t(x_1, q) = \int_0^t \left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial x}(q(s), \dot{q}(s)) - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \xi}(q(s), \dot{q}(s)) \right] \delta q(s) ds + \frac{\partial L}{\partial \xi}(q(t), \dot{q}(t)) \delta q(t) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial \xi}(q(0), \dot{q}(0)) \delta q(0)$$

---

<sup>16</sup>As Frol Zapolsky pointed out, one must first do a finite dimensional reduction of  $E_t$ , for example using a broken geodesic method see [Ch2]. This is done in Appendix D.

Setting

$$p(t) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \xi}(q(t), \dot{q}(t))$$

we get  $(x_1, \frac{\partial E_t}{\partial x_1}) = (x_1, p_1) = \varphi^t(x_0, 0)$ . Therefore  $E_t$  is a G.F.Q.I. of  $\varphi^t(0_N)$ , and since

$$\inf\{E_t(x, q) \mid q \in \mathcal{P}, q(1) = x\} = c(1(x), E_t) = u_{L,t}(x)$$

is a variational solution of  $HJ$ , we proved in Proposition 13.2

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} u_L(t, x) = -\overline{H}(0).$$

□

## 14 Some examples and applications

### 14.1 Homogenization of $H(t, q, p)$ in the variable $t$

Applying the above in the case of partial homogenization, we see that we may associate to a  $T$ -periodic Hamiltonian  $H(t, q, p)$  defined on  $T^*T^n$  an autonomous Hamiltonian  $\overline{H}(q, p)$ . However, this is nothing else than

$$\overline{H}(q, p) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T H(t, q, p) dt$$

Indeed, if  $H(kt, q, p)$  has flow  $\varphi_k^t$ , we have, by the fundamental theorem of classical averaging (see [B-M] page 429, [S-V] theorem 3.2.10 page 39):

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k^t = \overline{\varphi}^t$$

in the  $C^0$  topology, where  $\overline{\varphi}^t$  is the flow of

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T X_H(t, q, p) dt = X_{\overline{H}}(q, p).$$

Since according to [V1](proposition 4.15, page 703),  $C^0$ -convergence implies  $\gamma$ -convergence<sup>17</sup>, our claim follows.

---

<sup>17</sup>This is proved in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  in the quoted reference, but is easily extended to the torus case. Indeed the proof is based on the lemma, page 703, which states the existence of a compact supported Hamiltonian diffeomorphism such that each point of the unit disc bundle is displaced by at least  $\varepsilon$ . This can be constructed by taking the Hamiltonian flow associated to the Hamiltonian  $H(q, p) = \chi(|p|)\langle p, \xi(q) \rangle$ , where  $\chi$  is a cutoff function,  $\xi(q)$  a non-vanishing vector field on  $T^n$ .

## 14.2 The one dimensional case: $\frac{1}{2}|p|^2 - V(x)$

In [L-P-V], the computation of  $\overline{H}$  in the case  $H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 - V(x)$  and for  $V$  bounded from below is explicitly dealt with. Indeed, assuming  $V \geq 0$  is one-periodic and vanishes at least at one point, we have

$$(\star) \quad \begin{cases} \overline{H}(p) = 0 & \text{if } |p| \leq \int_0^1 (V(x))^{1/2} dx \\ \overline{H}(p) = \lambda & \text{where } \lambda \text{ solves } |p| = \int_0^1 (V(x) + \lambda)^{1/2} dx \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, according to theorem 4.2 property (5), if we can find a curve  $L$  in  $T^*S^1$  such that  $|p|^2 - V(x) \leq h$  on  $L$  and  $\int_L p dx = v$  then  $\overline{H}(v) \leq h$ . Since  $H(x, p) \leq h$  contains  $L_v = \{(x, p(x)) \mid p = (V(x) + h)^{1/2}\}$  and this is the graph of a Lagrangian submanifold with integral of the Liouville class

$$v = \int_0^1 (V(x) + h)^{1/2} dx$$

we get that  $\overline{H}(v) \leq h$ . But the Lagrangian,  $\{(x, p) \mid p = (V(x) + h)^{1/2} + \varepsilon\}$  is contained in  $H(x, p) \geq h$ , hence  $\overline{H}(v) \geq h$ . By the monotonicity property (1) of theorem 4.2)  $\overline{H}(v) \geq 0$ , and this proves  $(\star)$ .

In higher dimension, since  $\{(x, p + du(x)) \mid x \in T^n\}$  is Lagrangian and Hamiltonian isotopic to  $L_p$ , the fact that if  $u(x)$  is a smooth function such that  $H(x, p + du(x)) \leq h$  then  $\overline{H}(p) \leq h$  is a useful piece of information in estimating  $\overline{H}$ .

## 14.3 A special “geometric” example

We now give an example of a Hamiltonian that is the characteristic function of a domain in  $T^*T^1$ . The Homogenized Hamiltonian is well-defined according to Theorem 4.2 (2).




Figure 4: The Hamiltonian  $H(q, p)$  vanishes on the checkered set and equals 1 in the white region.




Figure 5: The Hamiltonian  $H(k \cdot q, p)$  (for  $k = 3$ ) vanishes on the checkered set and equals 1 in the white region.

We let  $H$  be a Hamiltonian on  $T^*T^1$ , vanishing on the checkered set in figure 2, and equal to one in the complement. We claim that  $\overline{H}(p) = 1$  for  $p$  in  $[-2, 2]$ , while  $\overline{H}(p) = 0$  for  $|p| \geq 2$ .

Indeed, we may find an embedded curve isotopic to the zero section, contained in the white region of figure 3 (where  $H(k \cdot q, p) = 1$ ), with any given Liouville class having integral in  $[-1, 1]$ . Thus, the curve yields an  $L \in \mathcal{L}_p$  contained in  $H_k = 1$  for any  $p$  in  $[-1, 1]$ . As a result,  $\overline{H}(p) \geq 1$  for any  $p$  in  $[-1, 1]$ . Since obviously,  $\overline{H}(p) = 1$  for  $|p| \in [1, 2]$ , we get  $\overline{H}(p) = 1$  on  $[-2, 2]$  while  $\overline{H}(p) = 0$  for  $|p| \geq 2$ .

*Remarks 14.1.* **(1)** Note that here  $H$  is not continuous, so it is not surprising that  $\overline{H}$  isn't either.



- (2) The above example can be easily adapted to get homogenized Hamiltonians taking more than two values.

## 14.4 Homogenized metric and the Thurston-Gromov norm

First consider the case where  $H$  generates the geodesic flow of  $g$ : even though  $H(q, p) = |p|_g^2$  is not compactly supported, it is coercive, so we may define its homogenization according to Proposition 12.4. Then  $H_k$  generates the geodesic flow of the rescaled metric by the covering map

$$\begin{aligned} T^n &\longrightarrow T^n \\ q &\longrightarrow kq \end{aligned}$$

of degree  $k^n$ .

It is well-known that if  $d$  is the distance defined by  $g$  (i.e.  $d(x, y)$  is the length of the shortest geodesic for  $g$  connecting  $x$  to  $y$ ) and  $d_k$  the one defined by  $g_k$  (corresponding to  $H_k$ ), we have

$$d_k(x, y) = \frac{1}{k} d(kx, ky)$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d_k(x, y) = \bar{d}(x, y)$$

where  $\bar{d}$  is the distance associated to some flat Finsler metric  $\bar{g}$  (see [Ac-Butt], Theorem III.1). It is also well known that  $g_k$  does not converge to  $\bar{g}$  in any reasonable sense, except for the convergence of minimizers of the associated energy functional

$$E(\gamma) = \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}(t)|_g^2 dt$$

This phenomenon is connected to the notion of  $\Gamma$ -convergence (cf. [Dal M], [Br]). In particular we easily see that  $\ell_k(\alpha)$ , the length for  $d_k$  of the shortest closed geodesic in the homotopy class  $\alpha$  (in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ ),  $\ell_k(\alpha)$ , converges to  $\bar{\ell}(\alpha)$ , the length for  $\bar{d}$  of the shortest closed geodesic in the homotopy class  $\alpha$ ,  $\bar{\ell}(\alpha)$ .

Indeed,

$$\ell_k(\alpha) = \inf \{ d_k(x, x + \alpha) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n \}$$

and since  $d_k(x, x + \alpha)$  converges uniformly to  $\bar{d}(x, x + \alpha)$ , and  $x$  needs only to vary in a fundamental domain  $[0, 1]^n$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we get that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \ell_k(\alpha) = \bar{\ell}(\alpha) .$$

The class  $\alpha$  contains at least a second closed geodesic, obtained by a minimax procedure (see [Birk], page 133). It has length

$$\ell_k(\alpha, \beta) = \inf \{ \sup \{ d_k(x(t), x(t) + \alpha) \mid t \in [0, 1] \} \mid [x(t)] = \beta \text{ in } \pi_1(T^n) \} .$$

and similarly for  $\bar{\ell}(\alpha, \beta)$ . it is thus reasonable to ask whether

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \ell_k(\alpha, \beta) = \bar{\ell}(\alpha, \beta) ?$$

The methods of our theorem imply a positive answer, since

$$\ell_k(\alpha, \beta) = c(\beta \cdot \alpha, E)$$

that is  $\ell_k(\alpha, \beta)$  is the homological minimax level associated to the 1-dimensional homology class of the free loop space that is the image of  $S^1$  by  $\theta \mapsto \beta(\theta) \cdot \alpha$  where “ $\cdot$ ” denotes the addition law on the torus.

Note that the analogous statement cannot hold for the whole length spectrum of  $g_k$  (i.e. the set of lengths of closed geodesics), as it is easy to construct examples for which the length spectrum of  $g_k$  becomes dense as  $k$  goes to infinity i.e. for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\delta > 0$  there is  $k_0$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $k \geq k_0$ ,  $\text{Spec}(g_k) \cap [\lambda - \delta, \lambda + \delta] \neq \emptyset$  (just add lots of small “blisters” to a flat metric), while the spectrum of  $\bar{g}$  is discrete.

Remember also that the Thurston-Gromov norm associated to  $g$  is defined as follows. For each homology class  $c$  in  $H_1(T^n, \mathbb{R}) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ , let us define  $\|c\|_{TG}$  as follows. For  $c$  rational, that is  $m \cdot c \in H_1(T^n, \mathbb{Z})$  for some integer  $m$ ,  $\|c\|_{TG} = \frac{1}{m} \ell(m \cdot c)$  The norm is then extended by density of the rationals.

The proof of the following result is then left to the reader:

**Proposition 14.2.** *The Thurston-Gromov norm coincides with the symplectic homogenization of the metric.*

## 15 More computational tools

Let  $H$  be a compact supported Hamiltonian, and  $\varphi$  the time one map of its flow. Assume we know how to compute the quantity

$$\bar{c}_-(H) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} c_-(\varphi^k)$$

we can then compute  $\min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} \overline{H}(p) = \bar{c}_-(H)$  according to Proposition A.1. Can we then compute  $\overline{H}(p)$  for all  $p$ ? To achieve this, let us consider the Hamiltonian  $f(p)$  with flow  $\psi^t$ . Then the flow  $t \rightarrow \varphi^t \circ \psi^{-t}$  is given by the Hamiltonian

$$H_f(t, x, p) = H(t, x - tf'(p), p) - f(p)$$

Then obviously  $\overline{H}_f(p) = \overline{H}(p) - f(p)$  and  $\bar{c}_-(H_f) = \min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\overline{H}(p) - f(p))$ . But the knowledge of this last quantity for all  $f$ , yields the value of  $\overline{H}$ , since for any function continuous function  $g$ , we have

$$g(p_0) = \sup\{f(p_0) \mid \min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} (g(p) - f(p)) \geq 0\}$$

Note that when  $H$  is convex in  $p$ ,  $\overline{H}$  is also convex in  $p$ , hence it is enough to consider the linear maps  $f_\xi(p) = \langle \xi, p \rangle$ . Then setting  $H_\xi(t, x, p) = H_{f_\xi}(t, x, p) = H(t, x - t\xi, p) - \langle \xi, p \rangle$  we get that  $\bar{c}_-(H_\xi) = (\overline{H})^*(\xi)$  where for a convex function  $g$ ,  $g^*$  denotes the Fenchel dual of  $g$ , that is

$$g^*(\xi) = \min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} (g(p) - \langle \xi, p \rangle).$$

## 16 Further questions

Sergei Kuksin pointed out that the homogenization or averaging described here is a “dequantized averaging”, in the sense that the traditional homogenization is concerned with the limit of the “quantized Hamiltonian”,  $H(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, D_x)$  as  $\varepsilon$  goes to zero. By this we mean a Partial differential operator with principal symbol  $H(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, p)$  operating on the set of smooth functions on  $T^n$  or  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Here, on the other hand, we deal directly with the “classical Hamiltonian”  $H(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, p)$ . It is natural to ask whether there is a connection between quantized and dequantized averaging, or to use a simpler language, between the homogenization of an operator, and the symplectic homogenization of its symbol. We may already consider the simple case of the previous section: according to the classical theory of  $\Gamma$ -convergence (see [de G, de G-F] [Br]), the limiting operator of the Laplacians associated to the metric  $g_k$  converges to some elliptic operator, denoted  $\Delta_\infty$ . But  $\Delta_\infty$  is not in general equal to the Laplacian of the metric  $g_\infty$ . First of all  $g_\infty$  is not Riemannian, but only Finslerian. Moreover, it seems that  $g_\infty$  detects changes in the metric on small sets: typically a three-dimensional torus with a metric made small along three geodesic circles in three orthogonal directions will have a much

smaller  $g_\infty$  than one without such “short directions“. But the Laplacian will not detect this, since the Brownian motion will not see such lines. So the only reasonable question is whether the metric  $g_\infty$  determines the Laplacian  $\Delta_\infty$ .

One may ask a more general question, that is

*Question 16.1.* Assume  $H_\nu$  converges to  $H$  for the  $\gamma$ -topology. Does the spectrum- or some quantity defined using the spectrum- of the operators  $H_\nu(x, D_x)$  converge to the spectrum - or some quantity defined using the spectrum - of  $H(x, D_x)$ ?

Finally in a forthcoming publication, we shall explain the connection between the above homogenization and the self-tuning of oscillators.

## A Appendix : Capacity of completely integrable systems

Our goal is to prove the following

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $\varphi^1$  be the time-one flow associated to the continuous, compact supported Hamiltonian,  $h(p)$ , defined on  $T^*\mathbb{T}^n$ . Then*

$$c_+(\varphi^1) = \sup_p h(p) \quad , \quad c_-(\varphi^1) = \inf_p h(p)$$

$$\gamma(\varphi^1) = c_+(\varphi^1) - c_-(\varphi^1) = \operatorname{osc}_p h$$

*As a result, a continuous compact supported and integrable Hamiltonian has generalized flow equal to Id if and only if it is identically zero.*

*Proof.* We shall only consider smooth Hamiltonians, the general case follows by density of compact supported smooth Hamiltonians for the  $\gamma$ -topology in the set of continuous compact supported ones (since density already holds for the  $C^0$  metric). Set  $\varphi^t(q, p) = (Q_t(q, p), P_t(q, p))$ , then the graph of  $\varphi_t$  defines a Lagrangian submanifold  $\Gamma_t$  in  $T^*(T^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  as the image of  $(q, P) \mapsto (\frac{q+Q_t}{2}, \frac{p+P_t}{2}, p - P_t, Q_t - q)$ . Note that even though  $Q_t$  is in  $T^n$ ,  $Q_t - q$  has a unique lift to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  which is continuous in  $t$  and equals 0 for  $t = 0$ . The same argument allows us to define  $\frac{q+Q_t}{2} = q + \frac{Q_t - q}{2}$ .

Moreover, if we set  $x = \frac{q+Q_t}{2}$ ,  $y = \frac{p+P_t}{2}$ ,  $\xi = p - P_t$ ,  $\eta = Q_t - q$ , the symplectic form is given by  $d\xi \wedge dx + d\eta \wedge dy$ . In our situation, we have

$$x_t = q + \frac{t}{2}h'(p) \quad y_t = p \quad \xi_t = 0 \quad \eta_t = h'(p)$$

Thus if we set  $f_t(x, y) = t h(y)$ , we have

$$\xi_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f_t(x, y) \quad , \quad \eta_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f_t(x, y)$$

that is  $f_t$  is a generating function of  $\Gamma_t$  with no “fiber variables”. It is then easy to see that

$$c_+(\varphi^t) = \sup f_t \quad , \quad c_-(\varphi^t) = \inf f_t$$

$$\gamma(\varphi^t) = \sup_{(x,y)} f_t - \inf_{(x,y)} f_t$$

Since  $f_1(x, y) = h(y)$  this proves our proposition. □

The following applies the ideas of [Hu] section 4.4 page 390 and [Hu2] section 3.3. For a continuous Hamiltonian,  $H$ , we define its “generalized flow” to be the image of  $H$  by the extension of  $H \mapsto \varphi_H^1$  as a map from  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_c(T^*M)$  to  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*M)$ .

**Corollary A.2.** (1) *If  $h_1(p)$  and  $h_2(p)$  are compact supported, continuous, and have the same “generalized” time-one flow (in  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$ ) then  $h_1 = h_2$ .*

(2) *If  $h_1(p), h_2(p)$  are continuous and compact-supported, and have generalized flows (in  $\widehat{\mathcal{HD}}_c(T^*T^n)$ )  $\varphi_1^t, \varphi_2^t$ , then  $h_1(p) + h_2(p)$  has generalized flow  $\varphi_1^t \circ \varphi_2^t$ . As a consequence  $\varphi_1^t \circ \varphi_2^t = \varphi_2^t \circ \varphi_1^t$ . In particular if  $\varphi^t$  is the flow associated to  $h(p)$ ,  $\varphi^{-t}$  is the flow associated to  $-h(p)$ .*

*Proof.* Proof of (1).

Indeed, according to the above Proposition, we have

$$\gamma(\varphi_1^t(\varphi_2^t)^{-1}) = t \operatorname{osc}_p(h_1 - h_2)$$

since according to the above proposition this is true for smooth  $h_1, h_2$ , and we conclude by density of compact supported smooth functions in the set of compact supported continuous functions. Therefore  $\varphi_1^1 = \varphi_2^1$  implies  $h_1 = h_2$ .

Proof of (2).

Let  $h_{k,1}(p), h_{k,2}(p)$  be smooth sequences  $C^0$ -converging to  $h_1(p), h_2(p)$  respectively. This implies that these sequences  $\gamma$ -convergence. Now the corresponding time-one flows,  $\varphi_{k,1}^1, \varphi_{k,2}^1$  commute so that  $h_{k,1}(p) + h_{k,2}(p) = h_k(p)$  has flow  $\varphi_{k,1}^1 \circ \varphi_{k,2}^1$ , and since the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $\varphi_{k,1}^1 \circ \varphi_{k,2}^1$  is  $\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2$ , we get that  $h(p) = h_1(p) + h_2(p)$ . The commutativity of the addition, implies the commutativity of the flows. Finally, the flow of the zero Hamiltonian being the identity, the last claim follows.  $\square$

## B Appendix: Some “classical” inequalities.

Our goal here is to prove the following results:

**Proposition B.1.** *Let  $S_1(x, \xi), S_2(x, \eta)$  be two GFQI and  $S_{1,x}(\xi) = S(x, \xi), S_{2,x}(\eta) = S_2(x, \eta)$ .*

*Then*

$$|c(1_x, S_{1,x}) - c(1_x, S_{2,x})| \leq \gamma(S_1, S_2).$$

**Proposition B.2.** *For a Hamiltonian isotopy  $\varphi^t$  on  $T^*T^n$ , and  $L$  Hamiltonianly isotopic to the zero-section, we have*

$$\gamma(\varphi^1(L), L) \leq \gamma(\varphi).$$

Note that the isotopy may be assumed to be compact supported, since we may truncate the Hamiltonian outside the compact set  $\bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \varphi^t(L)$ .

**Proposition B.3.** *Assume  $\alpha$  is a homology class in  $H_k(M)$ . Then*

$$c(u, L) = \inf\{c(\alpha, L) \mid \alpha \in H_k(M) \langle u, \alpha \rangle \neq 0\}.$$

*As a result, we have for any nonzero  $u$  in  $H^*(M)$ ,*

$$|c(u, L_1) - c(u, L_2)| \leq \gamma(L_1, L_2).$$

*Proof of proposition B.1.* It is important to notice that all formulas or inequalities we shall use in the proof are established in [V1] for any GFQI, and not only those associated to an embedded Lagrangian submanifold.

Indeed, we have according to [V1], prop. 3.3, p. 693 the formula

$$c(u \cdot v, S_1 \# S_2) \geq c(u, S_1) + c(v, S_2)$$

where  $F_1 \# F_2(x, \xi_1, \xi_2) = F_1(x, \xi_1) + F_2(x, \xi_2)$ . We then apply this inequality to the generator  $u = v = 1_x$  of  $H^0(\{x\})$  (which is its own Poincaré dual) and we get

$$c(1_x, S_{1,x} - S_{2,x}) \geq c(1_x, S_{1,x}) + c(1_x, -S_{2,x})$$

But by [V1], prop. 2.7, p. 692, we have

$$c(1_x, -S_{2,x}) = -c(1_x, S_{2,x})$$

thus

$$c(1_x, S_{1,x} - S_{2,x}) \geq c(1_x, S_{1,x}) - c(1_x, S_{2,x})$$

hence

$$|c(1_x, S_{1,x} - S_{2,x})| \geq |c(1_x, S_{1,x}) - c(1_x, S_{2,x})|$$

Now by the reduction inequality, [V1], prop. 5.1 p. 705 we have

$$c(1_x, S_{1,x} - S_{2,x}) \leq \gamma(S_1 \ominus S_2) = \gamma(L_1, L_2)$$

hence our claim follows. □

*Proof of proposition B.2.* Indeed,  $\varphi(0_{T^n})$  is the symplectic reduction of

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi) = \{(q, p, Q, P) \mid (Q, P) = \varphi(q, p)\}$$

by the coisotropic submanifold,  $N_p = \{p = 0\}$ . The symplectic map

$$(q, p, Q, P) \longrightarrow (Q, p, p - P, Q - q) = (u, v, U, V)$$

sends  $N_p$  to  $N_v = \{v = 0\}$ . The reduction inequality in [V1] (prop. 5.1, page 705) and the fact that  $\varphi(L) = \tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi) \cap N_v / N_v^\omega$ , then implies

$$\gamma(\varphi(L)) \leq \gamma(\tilde{\Gamma}(\varphi)) = \gamma(\varphi)$$

Now if  $L = \rho(0_{T^n})$ , we have

$$\gamma(\varphi(L), L) = \gamma(\varphi(\rho(0_{T^n})), \rho(0_{T^n})) = \gamma(\rho^{-1}\varphi\rho(0_{T^n})) \leq \gamma(\rho^{-1}\varphi\rho) = \gamma(\varphi)$$

where the second and last equality follow by symplectic invariance of  $\gamma$ , while the inequality has been proved above.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition B.3.* Let us denote by  $T$  the Thom isomorphism, and by  $T^*$  its homological counterpart. Let  $\alpha$  in  $H_k(M)$  and  $T^*\alpha$  its image in  $H_{k+d}(E^{+\infty}, E^{-\infty})$ . Similarly,  $u \in H^k(M)$  and  $Tu$  its image in  $H^{k+d}(E^{+\infty}, E^{-\infty})$ . Now, considering the  $(k+d)$ -cohomology group as the dual of the  $(k+d)$ -homology group (we work with coefficients in a field), we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{k+d}(E^\lambda, E^{-\infty}) & \xrightarrow{i_\lambda} & H_{k+d}(E^{+\infty}, E^{-\infty}) \\ & \searrow i_\lambda^*(Tu) & \downarrow Tu \\ & & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

and we have  $i_\lambda^*(Tu) \neq 0$  if and only if there is  $T^*\alpha \in \text{Im}(i_\lambda)$  such that  $\langle Tu, T^*\alpha \rangle \neq 0$ .

Since  $\langle Tu, T^*\alpha \rangle = \langle u, \alpha \rangle$  we have the inequality  $\lambda \geq c(\alpha, L)$  if and only if there exists  $u$  such that  $\langle u, \alpha \rangle \neq 0$ , and  $\lambda \geq c(u, L)$ . In other words this means that

$$c(\alpha, L) = \sup\{c(u, L) \mid \langle u, \alpha \rangle \neq 0\}$$

This proves the first statement.

Now by [V1] (prop. 2.7, page 692), if  $\alpha \in H_{n-k}(M)$ ,  $u \in H^k(M)$  are Poincaré dual classes, we have the identity  $c(u, L) = -c(\alpha, \bar{L})$ . Moreover from the same paper (prop. 3.3 page 693) we see that  $c(u \cdot v, L_1 \ominus L_2) \geq c(u, L_1) + c(v, \bar{L}_2)$ .

Let  $\beta$  and  $v$  be Poincaré dual classes, then for all  $u$ , we have  $\langle u, \beta \rangle = \langle u \cdot v, [M] \rangle$ . We may thus write, for  $\alpha$  Poincaré dual to  $u$

$$\begin{aligned} c(u, L_1) - c(u, L_2) &= c(u, L_1) + c(\alpha, \bar{L}_2) \leq \\ c(u, L_1) + \sup\{c(v, \bar{L}_2) \mid \langle v, \alpha \rangle \neq 0\} &= \sup\{c(u, L_1) + c(v, \bar{L}_2) \mid u \cdot v \neq 0\} \leq \\ \sup\{c(u \cdot v, L_1 \ominus L_2) \mid u \cdot v \neq 0\} & \end{aligned}$$



Since  $u \in H^k(M)$ ,  $v \in H^{n-k}(M)$ ,  $u \cdot v \neq 0$  implies that  $u \cdot v$  is a multiple of the orientation class  $\mu$ , hence, the last term in the above equals to  $c(\mu, L_1 \ominus L_2)$ . We finally proved

$$c(u, L_1) - c(u, L_2) = c(u, L_1) + c(v, \bar{L}_2) \leq c(u \cdot v, L_1 \ominus L_2) = c(\mu, L_1 \ominus L_2)$$

Using the fact that  $c(\mu, L_2 \ominus L_1) = -c(1, L_1 \ominus L_2)$ , we get that

$$c(u, L_1) - c(u, L_2) = c(u, L_1) + c(v, \bar{L}_2) \geq c(1, L_1 \ominus L_2)$$

so that finally

$$|c(u, L_1) - c(u, L_2)| \leq c(\mu, L_1 \ominus L_2) - c(1, L_1 \ominus L_2) = \gamma(L_1, L_2).$$

□

## C Appendix: Some other type of homogenization.

As has been pointed out to me by M. Bardi and F. Cardin, the Hamilton-Jacobi homogenization is often applied to the sequence  $H(x, \varepsilon^{-1}x, p)$ : we seek the limit as  $\varepsilon$  goes to zero of

$$(HJ_\varepsilon) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) + H(x, \varepsilon^{-1}x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u(t, x)) = 0 \\ u(0, x) = f(x) . \end{cases}$$

This seems to be more general than the case we deal with. However we prove here that this problem can be reduced to the case we studied.

Let indeed  $K(x, y, p_x, p_y)$  be the Hamiltonian on  $T^*(T^n \times T^n)$  defined by  $K(x, y, p_x, p_y) = H(x, y, p_x + p_y)$ .

We claim that the equation

$$(1) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) + H(x, x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u(t, x)) = 0$$

is satisfied by  $u(t, x) = v(t, x, x)$  where  $v$  is the variational solution of

$$(2) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} v(t, x, y) + K(x, y, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(t, x, y), \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(t, x, y)) = 0.$$

Indeed this can be rewritten for  $x = y$  as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}v(t, x, x) + H(x, x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x}v(t, x, x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}v(t, x, x)) = 0$$

and since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}u(t, x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}v(t, x, x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}v(t, x, x)$$

this proves our claim.

Now we may replace  $K$  by

$$K_\varepsilon(x, y, p_x, p_y) = H(x, \frac{y}{\varepsilon}, p_x + p_y) = H_\varepsilon(x, y, p_x + p_y)$$

and we shall get solutions of the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u_\varepsilon(t, x) + H(x, \varepsilon^{-1}x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x}u_\varepsilon(t, x)) = 0.$$

However we have to prove that

**Proposition C.1.** *If  $v$  is a variational solution of (2), then  $u(t, x) = v(t, x, x)$  is variational solution of (1).*

*Proof.* Indeed it is enough to prove that if  $L$  is a Lagrangian submanifold containing the isotropic submanifold

$$I_f = \{(t, -K(x, y, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}), \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y})\}$$

and such that  $L$  is contained in

$$\{(t, \tau, x, y, p_x, p_y) \mid \tau + K(t, x, y, p_x, p_y) = 0\}$$

then its symplectic reduction by  $x = y$  is a Lagrangian submanifold,  $L_\Delta$ , contained in

$$\{(t, \tau, x, p_x) \mid \tau + H(t, x, x, p_x) = 0\}$$

and  $L_\Delta$  contains

$$I_g = \{(t, -H(x, x, \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x)), \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x))\}$$

where  $g(x) = f(x, x)$ .

This is rather straightforward to check, and is a consequence of the commutation relation  $\{x - y, p_x + p_y\} = 0$ .

Finally we notice that if  $S(t, x, y, \xi)$  is a GFQI for  $L$ , then  $v(t, x, y) = c(1_{t,x,y}, S)$ , while the reduction  $L_\Delta$  of  $L$  by  $x = y$  has for GFQI the function  $S_\Delta = S(x, x, \xi)$ , so that  $u(t, x) = c(1_{t,x}, S_\Delta) = c(1_{t,x,x}, S) = v(t, x, x)$ . This concludes our proof.  $\square$

**Corollary C.2.** *Let  $H(x, y, p)$  be a compact supported function on  $T^n \times T^n \times (\mathbb{R})^n$ . Set  $K(x, y, p_x, p_y) = H(x, y, p_x + p_y)$ , and let  $\overline{K}(x, p_x, p_y)$  be the homogenization of  $K$  with respect to the  $y$  variable (i.e.  $\overline{K}(x, p_x, p_y)$  is the  $\gamma$ -limit of  $K_\varepsilon(x, y, p_x, p_y) = K(x, \frac{y}{\varepsilon}, p_x, p_y)$ ). Then  $\overline{H}(x, p) = \overline{K}(x, p, 0)$  is such that a sequence  $(v_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$  of variational solutions of*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} v(t, x) + H(x, \varepsilon^{-1}x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(t, x)) = 0$$

*$C^0$ -converges to a variational solution of*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} v(t, x) + \overline{H}(x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(t, x)) = 0$$

*Proof.* The only missing fact is to show that  $\overline{K}(x, p_x, p_y)$  can be written as  $\overline{H}(x, p_x + p_y)$  (if this is the case, we recover  $\overline{H}$  by  $\overline{H}(x, p) = \overline{K}(x, p, 0)$ ). We claim that this amounts to proving that the  $x_j$  being coordinates on the first torus, and  $y_j$  the same coordinate on the second torus, the function  $x_j - y_j$  commutes<sup>18</sup> with  $\overline{K}$ , knowing it commutes with  $K_\varepsilon$ . The result follows from the fact that this commutation relation goes to the  $\gamma$ -limit. If  $\varphi_j^t$  is the flow of  $x_j - y_k$ , and  $\psi_\varepsilon^t$  the flow of  $K_\varepsilon$ , the relation  $\psi_\varepsilon^t \circ \varphi_j^t \circ \psi_\varepsilon^{-t} = \varphi_j^t$  implies for  $\overline{\psi}^t = \gamma - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \psi^t$  that  $\overline{\psi}^t \circ \varphi_j^t \circ \overline{\psi}^{-t} = \varphi_j^t$ .  $\square$

**Lemma C.3.** *Let  $H$  be a compact supported smooth Hamiltonian and  $(K_j)_{j \geq 1}$  a sequence of Hamiltonians commuting with  $H$  and  $\gamma$ -converging to a continuous Hamiltonian  $K_\infty$ . Then  $H$  and  $K_\infty$   $\gamma$ -commute in the following sense*

$$K_\infty(\varphi_H^t) = K_\infty$$

*where  $\varphi_H^t$  is the flow of  $H$ . In particular if the  $K_j$  commute with the functions  $x_j - y_j$  then so does  $K_\infty$ , and  $K_\infty(x, p_x, p_y)$  only depends on  $(x, p_x + p_y)$ .*

---

<sup>18</sup>Of course  $x_j - y_j$  is only defined in  $S^1$ , but this is equivalent to claiming that for any function  $f$  on  $S^1$ ,  $f(x_j - y_j)$  commutes with  $\overline{K}$ , provided it commutes with  $K_\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* Indeed, the flow of  $K_j$  being  $\psi_j^t$  we have that  $\varphi_H^t \psi_j^s \varphi_H^{-t}$   $\gamma$ -converges to  $\varphi_H^t \psi_\infty^s \varphi_H^{-t}$ , hence our first result. Now the flow of  $x_j - y_j$  is given by

$$(x, y, p_x, p_y) \longrightarrow (x, y, p_x + te_j, p_y + te_j)$$

Now a continuous Hamiltonian commuting with the functions  $x_j - y_j$  only depends on  $p_x + p_y$ . Indeed it is easy to show that for all  $t$ ,  $K_j(x, y, p_x + te_j, p_y - te_j) = K_j(x, y, p_x, p_y)$  hence  $\gamma$ -converges to both  $\overline{K}(x, p_x + te_j, p_y - te_j)$  and  $\overline{K}(x, p_x, p_y)$ . Thus by uniqueness of the limit, for all  $t$  and  $j$ ,  $\overline{K}(x, p_x, p_y) = \overline{K}(x, p_x + te_j, p_y - te_j)$ . This is equivalent to the property that  $\overline{K}$  is a function of  $(x, p_x + p_y)$ .  $\square$

## D Appendix: Generating function for Euler-Lagrange flows.

Let  $N$  be a compact manifold. The goal of this appendix is to prove that if the Hamiltonian  $H(t, q, p)$  is strictly convex in  $p$  and its flow is complete, then  $\varphi^t(0_N)$  has a GFQI equal to a positive definite quadratic form at infinity. The same property holds for the graph of  $\varphi^t$ . We remind the reader that using the Legendre transform, the flow of  $H$  can be identified with the Euler-Lagrange flow associated to the Legendre dual of  $H$ ,  $L(t, q, \xi)$ , where

$$L(t, q, \xi) = \sup\{\langle p, \xi \rangle - H(t, q, p) \mid p \in T_q^*N\}.$$

The Lagrangian  $L(t, q, \xi)$  is said to be a Tonelli Lagrangian if it is strictly convex and coercive, that is  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} L(t, q, \xi) > \varepsilon \text{Id}$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and the Euler-Lagrange flow defined on  $TN$  by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} L(t, q, \xi) - \frac{\partial}{\partial q} L(t, q, \xi) = 0$$

is complete. Of course this means that the flow  $\varphi^t$  of the corresponding Hamiltonian is also complete.

**Proposition D.1.** *Let  $L(t, q, \xi)$  be a Tonelli Lagrangian defined on  $\mathbb{R} \times TN$ , 1-periodic in  $t$ . Let  $\varphi^t$  be the flow of the corresponding Hamiltonian  $H(t, q, p)$  defined on  $\mathbb{R} \times T^*N$ . Then  $L = \varphi^1(0_N)$  has a generating function equal to a positive definite quadratic form outside a compact set. As a consequence, if we denote by  $S(q, \xi)$  this function, we have  $c(1_q, L) = \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^q} S(q, \xi)$  and  $c(1, L) = \inf_{(q, \xi) \in T^n \times \mathbb{R}^q} S(q, \xi)$ .*

*Proof.* Using Brunella's idea of embedding  $T^*N$  into  $T^*T^n$  (cf. [Bru]) we only need to prove this for a Lagrangian defined on the torus (this is the only case we use here anyway).

Thus consider a general Lagrangian  $L(t, q, \xi)$  and the corresponding Hamiltonian  $H(t, q, p)$ . If we look for intersection points  $\varphi^1(0_N) \cap 0_N$ , we can modify  $H$  outside a compact set, so that  $\widehat{H}(t, q, p) = C|p|^2$  outside a compact set,  $\widehat{H}$  is still strictly convex and for  $t$  in  $[0, 1]$ ,  $\varphi^t(0_N)$  is unchanged. There is thus a corresponding "truncated" Lagrangian  $\widehat{L}$ . We still denote by  $L$  the truncated Lagrangian in the sequel. Note that this is automatically a Tonelli Lagrangian.

Consider the set  $W = \{(q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n\} / \simeq$  where  $(q_1, q_2) \simeq (q_1 + \nu, q_2 + \nu)$  for  $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and we have the projection  $W \rightarrow T^n$  on the first component, with fiber  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We sometimes denote by  $(q, x)$  an element in  $W$  with projection  $q$ , and  $x = q_2 - q_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  which is well defined in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Consider for  $(q_1, q_2) \in W$

$$A(q_1, q_2) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 L(s, q(s), \dot{q}(s)) dt \mid q : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, q(0) = q_1, q(1) = q_2 \right\}$$

The existence of a critical point of the energy  $E(q) = \int_0^1 L(s, q(s), \dot{q}(s)) dt$  on the set  $\mathcal{P}(q_1, q_2) = \{q : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \mid q(0) = q_1, q(1) = q_2\}$  of paths connecting  $q_1, q_2$  is equivalent, by the standard methods of the calculus of variations, to the existence of a point in  $\varphi^1(\{q_1\} \times \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \{q_2\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $L(t, q, p) = L^0(t, q, p) = \frac{C}{2}|p|^2$ , the corresponding maps is given by  $\varphi_0^1(q, p) = (q + Cp, p)$ , hence  $\varphi_0^1(\{q_1\} \times \mathbb{R}^n) = \{(q_1 + Cp, p) \mid p \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  and this intersects transversally at a unique point all other  $\{q_2\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . This will still hold for a  $C^1$ -small compact supported perturbation of  $\varphi_0^1$ , hence for a general  $L$  as above, provided  $t$  is small enough, the minimizer realizing  $A(q_1, q_2)$  is unique.

**Lemma D.2.** *Let  $L$  be a Lagrangian such that  $L(t, q, \xi) = C|\xi|^2$  for  $\xi$  large enough. Then for  $t$  small enough, we have that for any  $q_1, q_2$ , the function  $E_t(\gamma) = \int_0^t L(s, q(s), \dot{q}(s)) dt$  has a unique critical point  $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , depending continuously on  $(q_1, q_2)$ . Moreover this unique critical point is a minimum and for  $|q_2 - q_1|$  large enough, the critical value  $A_t(q_1, q_2) = \frac{C}{2t}|q_2 - q_1|^2$  is quadratic positive definite in  $q_2 - q_1$ .*

The existence of a minimum of  $E_t$  on  $\mathcal{P}(q_1, q_2)$  implies that if uniqueness and transversality hold, the only critical point of  $E$  is a minimum, and  $A_t$  is a smooth function of  $(q_1, q_2)$ .

*Proof.* For simplicity we may assume  $C = 1$ . Let  $\varphi^t$  be the flow associated to  $H$ , the Legendre dual of  $L$ , and  $\pi : T^*\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be the projection. We claim that for  $t$  small enough,  $\zeta^t = \pi \circ \varphi^t : \{q\} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a diffeomorphism. Indeed, we claim that

- (1) For  $|p|$  large enough (independently of  $t$ ),  $\varphi^t(q, p) = q + tp$
- (2) For  $t$  small enough  $D\zeta^t(q, p)$  is invertible.

The first claim is clear: if  $H(t, q, p) = |p|^2$  for  $|p| \geq r$ , then for  $|p| \geq r$ , we have  $\varphi^t(q, p) = q + tp$ . The second claim only needs to be checked for  $|p| \leq r$ . Let us compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(D\varphi^t(q, p))|_{t=t_0} &= D\left(\frac{d}{dt}\varphi^t(q, p)\right)|_{t=t_0} = D(X_H(\varphi^{t_0}(q, p))) = \\ &DX_H(\varphi^{t_0}(q, p))D\varphi^{t_0}(q, p) \end{aligned}$$

so if  $L(t) = D\varphi^t(q, p)$  we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}L(t) = DX_H(\varphi^{t_0}(q, p))L(t)$$

and

$$D(\pi \circ \varphi^t)(q, p)|_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} = D\pi(\varphi^t(q, p))D\varphi^t(q, p)|_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} = D\pi \circ L(t)|_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n}$$

Now

$$L(t) = L(0) + tDX_H(q, p) + o(t)$$

and  $X_H(q, p) = \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}, -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}\right)$  so that

$$DX_H(q, p) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p \partial q} & -\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q^2} \\ \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p^2} & -\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p \partial q} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$D\pi \circ DX_H(q, p)|_{\{q\} \times \mathbb{R}^n} = \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p^2}$$

As a result, denoting  $S(t) = D\pi \circ L(t)|_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n}$  we get

$$S(t) = S(0) + t\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p^2}(q, p) + o(t)$$

and since  $S(0) = 0$  and the reminder  $o(t)$  is uniform on any set bounded in  $p$  (since it will be bounded, by Taylor's formula by higher derivatives of  $H$  which are periodic in  $q$ ), we get that for  $t$  small enough,  $S(t)$  will be invertible for  $|p| \leq r$ . This concludes the proof of (2).

We thus know that the map  $\pi \circ \varphi^t$  is equal to  $q+t \cdot \text{Id}$  outside a compact set, and has invertible differential. It is a classical calculus exercise to conclude that such a map is a diffeomorphism. This means that given  $q_1$  for every  $q_2$  there is a unique critical point of  $\gamma \mapsto E_t(\gamma)$ , which is necessarily a minimum, since we know by the Tonelli condition implies that there is a minimum. Moreover the map  $q_2 \mapsto P(q_1, q_2)$  where  $P(q_1, q_2)$  is the unique point such that  $\pi \varphi^t(q_1, P(q_1, q_2)) = q_2$ . Finally for  $q_2 - q_1$  large enough, the path  $q(t) = q_1 + \frac{t}{\tau}(q_2 - q_1)$  is a critical point of  $E$  on  $\mathcal{P}(q_1, q_2)$ . □

Now let  $N$  be chosen large enough so that  $\varphi^{\frac{k+1}{N}} \varphi^{-\frac{k}{N}}$  satisfy the conclusions of the above lemma (i.e.  $t = 1/N$  is small enough in the sense of the previous lemma). Let  $A_k(q, q')$  be the minimum of the energy corresponding to  $L(t, q, \xi)$  for  $t \in [\frac{k}{N}, \frac{k+1}{N}]$ . Then, consider the function

$$S(q_1; q_2, q_3, \dots, q_N) = A_0(q_1, q_2) + A_1(q_2, q_3) + \dots + A_{N-1}(q_{N-1}, q_N).$$

One easily checks that  $S$  is a generating function for  $\varphi^1(0_{T^n})$ . Moreover it is asymptotically quadratic in the sense that it satisfies the assumptions of proposition 1.6 page 441 of [V3], and this proves that  $S$  can be deformed into a GFQI equal to a positive definite quadratic form generating the same Lagrangian (see loc. cit. prop 1.6 and the proof of theorem 1.7). □

## References

- [Aar] J.F. Aarnes, Quasi-states and quasi-measures. *Adv. Math.*, vol. 86 (1) (1991), pp. 41-67.
- [Ac-Butt] E. Acerbi and G. Buttazzo, On the limits of periodic Riemannian metrics. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*. vol. 43(1983), Number 1, pp. 183-201, DOI: 10.1007/BF02790183
- [Alv-Bar1] O. Alvarez, and M. Bardi, Viscosity solutions methods for singular perturbations in deterministic and stochastic control. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 40 (2001/02), no. 4, pp. 1159–1188

- [Alv-Bar2] O. Alvarez, and M. Bardi, Singular perturbations of nonlinear degenerate parabolic PDEs: a general convergence result. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, vol. 170 (2003), no. 1, pp. 17–61
- [Ban] V. Bangert, Closed Geodesics on Complete Surfaces. *Math. Ann.*, vol. . 251 (1980), pp 83–96.
- [Be] V. Benci, *Exposé au Workshop de Géométrie Symplectique*. M.S.R.I., Berkeley (Californie, USA), août-septembre 1988.
- [Bern 1] P. Bernard, The action spectrum near positive definite invariant tori. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, vol. . 131(2003), pp. 603-616.
- [Bern 2] P. Bernard, Symplectic aspects of Aubry Mather Theory. *Duke Math. Journal*, vol. 136 (2007) no. 3, 401-420
- [Birk] G.D. Birkhoff, *Dynamical Systems*. Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications, 1927 (reprinted 1966)
- [B-M] N. N. Bogoliubov and Y. A. Mitropolski, *Asymptotic methods in the theory of nonlinear oscillations*. Moscow, 1958. English translation, Gordon and Breach, New York, 1964.
- [B-C-B] A. Boudaoud, Y. Couder and M. Ben Amar, A self-adaptative oscillator. *The European Physical Journal B*, vol. . 9 (1999), pp. 159-165.
- [Bou] A. Boudaoud, De la corde au film de savon: de l'auto-adaptation dans les systèmes vibrants. *Images de la Physique*, 2002, pp. 78-83. Available from <http://www.cnrs.fr/publications/imagesdelaphysique/2002.htm>
- [Br] A. Braides, *Gamma-convergence for Beginners*. Oxford University Press, 2002
- [Bru] M. Brunella, On a theorem of Sikorav. *L'Enseignement Mathématique*, vol. 37 (1991), pp. 83-87.
- [C-V] F. Cardin et C. Viterbo, Commuting Hamiltonians and multi-time Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Duke Math Journal*, vol. 144, (2008), pp. 235-284.



- [Ch1] M. Chaperon, Lois de conservation et géométrie symplectique. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Série I, Math.*, 312 (1991), pp.345-348.
- [Ch2] M. Chaperon, Une idée de type “géodésiques brisées” pour les systèmes Hamiltoniens. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I*, vol. 298(1984), pp.293-296.
- [Che] Y. Chekanov, *Critical points of quasifunctions and generating families of legendrian manifolds. Functional Analysis and its Applications*, Volume 30(1996), Number 2, pp.118-128, DOI: 10.1007/BF02509451. (Translated from *Funktsional’nyi Analiz i Ego Prilozheniya*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 56–69, April–June, 1996.)
- [Conc] M. Concordel, *Periodic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations: Additive eigenvalues and variational formula Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, vol. 45(1996), pp. 1095-1118.
- [C-L] M.G. Crandall and P.-L. Lions, Viscosity solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 277:1–43, 1983.
- [Dal M] G. Dal Maso, *An introduction to  $\Gamma$ -convergence*. Birkhäuser, 1993.
- [de G] E. de Giorgi, Sulla convergenza di alcune successioni di integrali del tipo dell’area. *Rend. Mat.*, vol. . 8(1975), pp 277-294.
- [de G-F] E. de Giorgi and T. Franzoni, Su un tipo di convergenza variazionale. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei. Rend. CI. Sc. Fis. Mat. Natur.*, vol. 58 (1975), 842-850.
- [El] Y. Eliashberg, New Invariants of Open Symplectic and Contact Manifolds. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. . 4, No. 3. (1991), pp. 513-520.
- [E-P] M.Entov and L. Polterovich, Quasi-states and symplectic intersections. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, vol. 81, 2006, pp 75-99.
- [Ev] L.C.Evans, The perturbed test function method for viscosity solutions of nonlinear PDE. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, vol. 111 (1989), no. 3-4, 359–375.

- [Fathi1] A. Fathi, Théorème KAM faible et théorie de Mather sur les systèmes Lagrangiens C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I vol. 324 (1997) pp. 1043-1046.
- [Fathi2] A. Fathi, Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian Dynamics. Version préliminaire 10. Available from <http://www.math.u-bordeaux1.fr/~pthieull/Recherche/KamFaible/> // Publications/Fathi2008\_01.pdf
- [Fl1] A. Floer, The unregularized gradient flow of the symplectic action. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, vol. 41 (1988), 775–813.
- [Fl2] A. Floer, Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections. *J. Differential Geom.*, vol. 28 (1988), no. 3, 513–547.
- [Gr] M. Gromov, *Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian Spaces*. Birkhäuser, 1999 (3rd ed. 2007).
- [Hofer] H. Hofer, On the topological properties of symplectic maps. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, vol. 115 (1990), pp. 25–38.
- [Hu] V. Humilière, On some completions of the space of Hamiltonians maps. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, vol. 136 (2008), pp. 373-404.
- [Hu2] V. Humilière, *Ph D dissertation*. Ecole polytechnique, July 2008.
- [K-B] N. M. Krylov and N. N. Bogoliubov, *Introduction to nonlinear mechanics*. Moscow,1937. English translation, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1947.
- [Laud] F. Laudenbach, On the Thom-Smale complex. Appendix to J.-M. Bismut and W. Zhang. An extension of a theorem by Cheeger and Müller. *Astérisque*, vol. 205 (1992) pp. 219 - 233.
- [Lau-Sik] F. Laudenbach and J.-C. Sikorav, Persistance d’intersection avec la section nulle au cours d’une isotopie hamiltonienne dans un fibré cotangent., *Inventiones Math.* vol. 82 (1985) pp. 349-357.

- [L-P-V] P. L. Lions, G. C. Papanicolaou and S. R. S. Varadhan, *Homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations*. Preprint, 1988.
- [Ma] J. Mather, Action minimizing measures for positive definite Lagrangian systems. *Math. Z.*, vol. 207 (1991) 169–207.
- [O-V] A. Ottolenghi, C. Viterbo, *Solutions d'équations d'Hamilton-Jacobi et géométrie symplectique*, Preprint, 1995  
<http://math.polytechnique.fr/cmat/viterbo/Semi.HJ.dvi>.
- [P-P-S] G. P. Paternain, L. Polterovich, K.F. Siburg, Boundary rigidity for Lagrangian submanifolds, non-removable intersections, and Aubry-Mather theory. *Moscow Math. J.* vol. 3 (2003), pp. 593-619.
- [S-V] J. A. Sanders and F. Verhulst, *Averaging methods in nonlinear dynamical systems*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, no. 59, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.
- [Sik] J.-C. Sikorav, Talk given at Paris 7 seminar. (1990).
- [Sik2] J.-C. Sikorav Rigidity symplectique dans le cotangent de  $T^n$ . *Duke Math. J.*, vol. 59, Number 3 (1989), pp. 759-763.
- [The] David Théret. A complete proof of Viterbo's uniqueness theorem on generating functions. *Topology Appl.*, 96(3):249–266, 1999.
- [Tr] L. Traynor, Symplectic Homology via Generating Functions. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, vol. . 4, No. 6, 1994, pp. 718-748.
- [V1] C. Viterbo, Symplectic topology as the geometry of generating functions. *Mathematische Annalen*, vol. 292, (1992), pp. 685–710.
- [V2] C. Viterbo, *Functors and Computations in Floer cohomology II*. Preprint 1996 (revised in 2003) available from [www.math.polytechnique.fr/cmat/viterbo/Prepublications.html](http://www.math.polytechnique.fr/cmat/viterbo/Prepublications.html)

- [V3] C. Viterbo, *Symplectic topology and Hamilton-Jacobi equations*. "Morse theoretic methods in nonlinear analysis and in symplectic topology. Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute, Montreal, Canada, July 2004." NATO Science Series II: Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry 217. Dordrecht: Springer, 2006.
- [V6] C. Viterbo, On the uniqueness of generating Hamiltonian for continuous limits of Hamiltonian flows *International Mathematics Research Notices* (2006), 9 pages, doi:10.1155/IMRN/2006/34028 and Erratum 4 pages, doi:10.1155/IMRN/2006/38784.
- [V7] C. Viterbo, *Non-convex Mather theory*. In preparation.
- [Zh] T. Zhukovskaya, *Singularités de minimax et solutions faibles d'Equations aux dérivées partielles*. Thèse de Doctorat, Université de Paris 7, 1993.
- [Zh 2] T. Zhukovskaya, *Metamorphoses of the Chaperon-Sikorav weak solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations* *J. Math. Sci.* 82 (1996), no. 5, 3737–3746 (Translated from *Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki, Seriya Sovremenaya Matematika i Ee Prilozheniya. Tematicheskie Obzory*. Vol. 20, Topologiya-3, 1994.).