

Arnold diffusion for smooth systems of two and a half degrees of freedom

V. Kaloshin*, K. Zhang†

October 30, 2018

*Dedicated to the memory of John Mather:
a great mathematician and a remarkable person*

Abstract

In the present paper we prove a strong form of Arnold diffusion. Let \mathbb{T}^2 be the two torus and B^2 be the unit ball around the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 . Fix $\rho > 0$. Our main result says that for a “generic” time-periodic perturbation of an integrable system of two degrees of freedom

$$H_0(p) + \epsilon H_1(\theta, p, t), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{T}^2, p \in B^2, t \in \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z},$$

with a strictly convex H_0 , there exists a ρ -dense orbit $(\theta_\epsilon, p_\epsilon, t)(t)$ in $\mathbb{T}^2 \times B^2 \times \mathbb{T}$, namely, a ρ -neighborhood of the orbit contains $\mathbb{T}^2 \times B^2 \times \mathbb{T}$.

Our proof is a combination of geometric and variational methods. The fundamental elements of the construction are usage of crumpled normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders from [13], flower and simple normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds from as well as their kissing property at a strong double resonance. This allows us to build a “connected” net of 3-dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds. To construct diffusing orbits along this net we employ a version of Mather variational method [58] proposed by Bernard in [11]. This version is equipped with weak KAM theory [35].

*University of Maryland at College Park (vadim.kaloshin gmail.com)

†University of Toronto (kzhang math.utoronto.edu)

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Statement of the result	5
1.2	Discussions of the result	9
1.3	Scheme of diffusion	13
1.4	Three regimes of diffusion	16
2	Forcing relation	17
2.1	Sufficient condition for Arnold diffusion	17
2.2	Diffusion mechanisms via forcing equivalence	19
2.3	Invariance under the symplectic coordinate changes	20
2.4	Normal hyperbolicity and Aubry-Mather type	22
3	Normal forms and cohomology classes at single resonances	24
3.1	Resonant component and non-degeneracy conditions	24
3.2	Normal form	25
3.3	The resonant component	29
4	Double resonance: geometric description	30
4.1	The slow system	31
4.2	Non-degeneracy conditions for the slow system	32
4.3	Normally hyperbolic cylinders	34
4.4	Local maps and global maps	36
5	Double resonance: choice of cohomology and forcing equivalence	38
5.1	Choice of cohomologies for the slow system	38
5.2	Aubry-Mather type at a double resonance	41
5.3	Connecting to Γ_{k_1, k_2} and $\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$	43
5.3.1	Connecting to the double resonance point	43
5.3.2	Connecting single and double resonance	45
5.4	Jump from non-simple homology to simple homology	47
5.5	Forcing equivalence at the double resonance	48
6	Weak KAM theory and forcing equivalence	49
6.1	Periodic Tonelli Hamiltonians	50
6.2	Weak KAM solution	52
6.3	Pseudographs, Aubry, Mañe and Mather sets	53
6.4	The dual setting, forward solutions	54
6.5	Peierls barrier, static classes, elementary solutions	55

6.6	The forcing relation	56
7	Perturbative Weak KAM theory	56
7.1	Semi-continuity	57
7.2	Continuity of the barrier function	59
7.3	Lipschitz estimates for nearly integrable systems	60
7.4	Estimates for nearly autonomous systems	61
7.5	Semi-concavity of viscosity solutions	63
8	Cohomology of Aubry-Mather type	65
8.1	Aubry-Mather type and diffusion mechanisms	65
8.2	Weak KAM solutions are unstable manifolds	71
8.3	Regularity of the barrier functions	75
8.4	Bifurcation type	77
9	Aubry-Mather type at the single resonance	79
9.1	Normally hyperbolicity and localization of Aubry/Mañe sets in the single maximum case	79
9.2	Aubry-Mather type at single resonance	81
9.3	Bifurcations in the double maxima case	82
9.4	Hyperbolic coordinates	84
9.5	Normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder	86
9.6	Localization of the Aubry and Mañe sets	89
10	Normally hyperbolic cylinders at double resonance	91
10.1	Normal form near the hyperbolic fixed point	91
10.2	Shil'nikov's boundary value problem	92
10.3	Properties of the local maps	95
10.4	Conley-McGehee isolating blocks	99
10.5	Periodic orbit in simple homologies	100
10.6	Periodic orbits for non-simple homology	103
10.7	Normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders for the slow mechanical system	104
10.8	Cyclic concatenations of simple geodesics	105
11	Aubry-Mather type at the double resonance	107
11.1	High energy case	107
11.2	Simple non-critical case	110
11.3	Simple critical case	111
11.3.1	Proof of Aubry-Mather type using local coordinates	111
11.3.2	Construction of the local coordinates	114

12 Forcing equivalence between kissing cylinders	117
12.1 Variational problem for the slow mechanical system	118
12.2 Variational problem for original coordinates	121
12.3 Scaling limit of the barrier function	124
12.4 The jump mechanism	125
A Generic properties of mechanical systems on the two-torus	129
A.1 Generic properties of periodic orbits	129
A.2 Generic properties of minimal orbits	135
A.3 Non-degeneracy at high energy	139
A.4 Unique hyperbolic minimizer at very high energy	141
A.5 Proof of Proposition 4.5	143
B Derivation of the slow mechanical system	144
B.1 Normal forms near double resonances	144
B.2 Affine coordinate change, rescaling and energy reduction	153
B.3 Variational properties of the coordinate changes	158
C Variational aspects of the slow mechanical system	164
C.1 Relation between the minimal geodesics and the Aubry sets	164
C.2 Characterization of the channel and the Aubry sets	167
C.3 The width of the channel	170
C.4 The case $E = 0$	172
D Notations	176
D.1 Formulation of the main result	176
D.2 Weak KAM and Mather theory	177
D.3 Single resonance	178
D.4 Double resonance	179

1 Introduction

The famous question called the ergodic hypothesis, formulated by Maxwell and Boltzmann, suggests that for a typical Hamiltonian on a typical energy surface all, but a set of zero measure of initial conditions, have trajectories dense in this energy surface. However, KAM theory showed that for an open set of (nearly integrable) Hamiltonian systems there is a set of initial conditions of positive measure with almost periodic trajectories. This disproved the ergodic hypothesis and forced to reconsider the problem.

A quasi-ergodic hypothesis, proposed by Ehrenfest [34] and Birkhoff [17], asks if a typical Hamiltonian on a typical energy surface has a dense orbit. A definite answer whether this statement is true or not is still far out of reach of modern dynamics. There was an attempt to prove this statement by E. Fermi [37], which failed (see [38] for a more detailed account). To simplify the problem, Arnold [4] asks:

Does there exist a real instability in many-dimensional problems of perturbation theory when the invariant tori do not divide the phase space?

For nearly integrable systems of two degrees (resp. of one and a half) of freedom the invariant tori do divide the phase space and an energy surface respectively. This implies that instability do not occur. We solve a weaker version of this question for systems with two and a half and 3 degrees of freedom. This corresponds autonomous perturbations of integrable systems with three degrees of freedom (resp. time-periodic perturbations of integrable systems with two degrees of freedom).

1.1 Statement of the result

Let $(\theta, p) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times B^2$ be the phase space of an integrable Hamiltonian system $H_0(p)$ with \mathbb{T}^2 being 2-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2 \ni \theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ and B^2 being the unit ball around 0 in \mathbb{R}^2 , $p = (p_1, p_2) \in B^2$. H_0 is assumed to be strictly convex with the following uniform estimate: there exists $D > 1$ such that

$$D^{-1}I \leq \partial_{pp}^2 H_0 \leq DI, \quad |H_0(0)|, \quad \|\partial_p H_0(0)\| \leq D.$$

where I is the 2×2 identity matrix.

Consider a smooth time periodic perturbation

$$H_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) = H_0(p) + \epsilon H_1(\theta, p, t), \quad t \in \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{T}.$$

We study Arnold diffusion for this system, namely,

topological instability in the p variable.

Arnold [5] proved existence of such orbits for an example and conjectured that they exist for a typical perturbation (see e.g. [4, 6, 7]).

Denote $\mathbb{Z}_*^3 = \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus (0, 0, 1)\mathbb{Z}$, then integer relations $k \cdot (\partial_p H_0, 1) = 0$ with $k = (\vec{k}_1, k_0) \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3$ and \cdot being the inner product define a *resonant submanifold*. The strict convexity of H_0 implies that $\partial_p H_0 : B^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism and each resonant line defines a smooth curve embedded into action space

$$S_k = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : k \cdot (\partial_p H_0, 1) = 0\}.$$

If curves S_k and $S_{k'}$ are given by two linearly independent resonances vectors $\{k, k'\}$, they either have no intersection or intersect at a single point in B^2 . We call a resonance




Figure 1.1: Resonant net

S_k space irreducible if the greatest common divisor of components of \vec{k}_1 is one. Notice that space irreducible resonances are dense.

Consider a finite collection of tuples:

$$\mathcal{K} = \{(k, \Gamma_k) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3, \Gamma_k \subset S_k \cap B^2\},$$

where k is space irreducible,¹ and $\Gamma_k \subset S_k$ is a closed segment. We say \mathcal{K} defines a diffusion path if

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{(k, \Gamma_k) \in \mathcal{K}} \Gamma_k$$

is a connected set. We would like to construct diffusion orbits along the path \mathcal{P} (see Figure 1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{P} \subset B^2$ be a diffusion path, $5 \leq r < +\infty$, and U_1, \dots, U_N be open sets such that $U_i \cap \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then there exist:*

- a C^r open and dense set $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}) \subset \mathcal{S}^r$ depending on \mathcal{P} ,
- a nonnegative lower semi-continuous function $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(H_1)$ with $\epsilon_0|_{\mathcal{U}} > 0$ and
- a “cusp” set

$$\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{U}, \epsilon_0) := \{\epsilon H_1 : H_1 \in \mathcal{U}, 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0(H_1)\},$$

- a C^r open and dense subset of $\epsilon H_1 \in \mathcal{W} \subsetneq \mathcal{V}$

¹This condition is not really necessary, we assume it as it helps simplify the presentation for single resonances.




Figure 1.2: Description of generic perturbations

such that for each $\epsilon H_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ there is an orbit $(\theta, p)(t)$ of H_ϵ and times $0 < T_1 < \dots < T_N$ with the property

$$p(T_i) \in U_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Remark 1.1. The condition that ϵ_0 is lower semi-continuous implies the set \mathcal{V} is open.

Remark 1.2. Note that the notion of genericity we use is not standard. We show that in a neighborhood of perturbations of H_0 the set of good directions \mathcal{U} is open dense in S^r . Around each exceptional (nowhere dense) direction we remove a cusp and call the complement \mathcal{V} . For this set of perturbations we establish connected collection of invariant manifolds. Then in the complement to some exceptional perturbations \mathcal{W} in \mathcal{V} we show that there are diffusing orbits “shadowing” these cylinders. Mather calls it *cuspl residual*. See Figure 1.2.

Consider $(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}) \in \mathcal{K}$, for $\lambda > 0$, in section 3.1 we define a quantitative nondegeneracy hypothesis relative to the resonant segment Γ_{k_1} .

$$SR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda) = [SR1_\lambda] - [SR3_\lambda]$$

Let us denote by $\mathcal{U}_{SR}^\lambda(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1})$ the set of H_1 which satisfy $SR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$.

Suppose H_1 satisfies the conditions $SR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$, we define a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}_*^3 called the *strong additional resonances*. In Theorem 3.1 we define a large constant $K = K(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$, and call $k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3$ *strong* if:

- either there is $(k_2, \Gamma_{k_2}) \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\Gamma_{k_1} \cap \Gamma_{k_2} \neq \emptyset$;
- or $|k_2| \leq K(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$ and $S_{k_2} \cap \Gamma_{k_1} \neq \emptyset$.

We emphasize that strong additional resonances are taken from the set \mathbb{Z}_*^3 , not just the space irreducible ones. Denote the set of strong additional resonances $\mathcal{K}^{st}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$. If k_2 is strong, then it defines a unique double resonance $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2} = \Gamma_{k_1} \cap S_{k_2}$.

For each double resonance Γ_{k_1, k_2} , we associate non-resonance conditions of two types:

- high energy $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$ (section 4.2),
- low energy $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$ (section 4.2).

For each pair $k_2 \in \mathcal{K}^{st}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$ consider the set of H_1 which satisfy the above conditions and denote it by $\mathcal{U}_{DR}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, k_2)$.

Remark 1.3. All our non-degenerate conditions at a double resonance is stated relative to a single resonance. Namely, the condition $DR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, k_2)$ may differ from the condition $DR(k_2, \Gamma_{k_2}, k_1)$.

The following theorem is immediate given that:

- (Proposition 3.2) Each $\mathcal{U}_{SR}^\lambda(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1})$ is open and the union $\bigcup_{\lambda>0} \mathcal{U}_{SR}^\lambda(k_1)$ is dense;
- (Proposition 4.3) The set $\mathcal{U}_{DR}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, k_2)$ is open and dense.

Theorem 1.2. *The set*

$$\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}) := \bigcup_{\lambda>0} \bigcap_{(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}) \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\mathcal{U}_{SR}^\lambda(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}) \cap \bigcap_{k_2 \in \mathcal{K}^{st}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)} \mathcal{U}_{DR}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, k_2) \right)$$

is open and dense in \mathcal{S}^r .

As a corollary of Theorem 1.1, we obtain:

Theorem 1.3 (Almost Density Theorem). *For any $\rho > 0$ there are*

- an open dense set $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\rho) \subset \mathcal{S}^r$,
- a nonnegative lower semi-continuous function $\epsilon_0 : \mathcal{S}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\epsilon_0|_{\mathcal{U}} > 0$,
- a cusp set $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{U}, \epsilon_0) := \{\epsilon H_1 : H_1 \in \mathcal{U}, 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0(H_1)\}$,
- an open dense subset $\mathcal{W} \subsetneq \mathcal{V}$

all depending on ρ such that for any $\epsilon H_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ there is a ρ -dense orbit on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times B^2 \times \mathbb{T}$.

Proof. Given a vector $(\omega, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, let us call ω being ρ -irrational if there exists $T > 0$ such that $\{t(\omega, 1) : t \in [-T, T]\} \subset \mathbb{T}^3$ is ρ -dense, and let $T(\omega)$ be the smallest such T . Using the fact that $\dot{p} = O(\epsilon)$, $\dot{\theta} = \nabla H_0(p) + O(\epsilon)$, there is $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on ρ and $T(\omega)$ such that if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$

$$B_{2\rho} \left(\bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_{H_\epsilon}^t(\theta_0, p_0, t_0) \right) \supset \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_\rho(p_*) \times \mathbb{T}, \quad (1.1)$$

for all $p_0 \in B_\rho(p_*)$, $(\theta_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}$.

Any vector that is not ρ -irrational (called ρ -rational) must be resonant: namely $k \cdot (\omega, 1) = 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3$. Moreover, there are only finitely many resonances that corresponds to ρ -rational vectors. Since there are infinitely many space irreducible resonances, there is a diffusion path \mathcal{P} such consisting only of $\rho/2$ -irrational resonances. Moreover, we may choose the path \mathcal{P} to be $\rho/2$ -dense in B^2 , since space irreducible resonances are dense.

We now apply Theorem 1.1 to the path \mathcal{P} , and pick p_i , $i = 1, \dots, N \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $(\nabla H_0(p_i), 1)$ is $(\rho/2)$ -irrational, and such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^n B_{\rho/2}(p_i) \supset B^2$. According to our theorem, there is an orbit whose p component visit every $B_\rho(p_i)$. Then the orbit must be ρ -dense in view of (1.1). \square

1.2 Discussions of the result

Relation with Mather's approach

Theorem 1.1 was announced by Mather in [60], where he proposed a plan to prove it. Some parts of the proof are written in [61]. Our work realizes Mather's general plan using weak KAM theory and Hamiltonian point of view. New techniques and tools are introduced, below we summarize them.

- We utilize Bernard's forcing relation to simplify the construction of diffusion orbit. This allows a more Hamiltonian treatment of the variational concepts, and allows us to reduce the main theorem to local forcing equivalence of cohomology classes.
- We use Hamiltonian normal forms to construct a collection of normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders along the chosen diffusion path. We obtain precise control of the normal forms (via an anisotropic C^2 norm) at both single and double resonances. Mather's method uses mostly the Lagrangian point of view.

- We introduce the concept of *Aubry-Mather type*, which generalizes the work done in Bernard–Kaloshin–Zhang [13] to a more abstract setting, applicable to both single and double resonances. Heuristically, this means the Aubry sets behaves like Aubry-Mather sets in twist maps. Our approach can be seen as a generalization of the variational technique for a priori unstable systems from [11, 13, 25].
- One important obstacle is the problem of regularity of barrier functions (see section 8.3), which outside of the realm of twist maps is difficult to overcome. Our definition of Aubry-Mather type allows proving this statement in a general setting. It is our understanding that Mather [55] handles this problem without proving existence of invariant cylinders.
- In a double resonance we also construct normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders. This leads to a fairly simple and explicit structure of minimal orbits near a double resonance. In particular, in order to switch from one resonance to another we need *only one jump* (see section 5.5 for the formulation of the statement).
- It is our understanding that Mather’s approach [55] requires an implicitly defined number of jumps. His approach resembles his proof of existence of diffusing orbits for twist maps inside a Birkhoff region of instability [56].

Other results on a priori stable systems

In [23], Theorem 5.1 a weaker result to Theorem 1.1 is stated. The set of admissible perturbations \mathfrak{R}_a in Theorem 5.1 is residual, while our set of admissible perturbations \mathcal{U} is open and dense. The size of admissible perturbation a_P from Theorem 5.1 is analog of ϵ_0 in Theorem 1.1. Regularity of dependence of the size of admissible perturbation a_P on P is not discussed. Therefore, the genericity of perturbations from Theorem 5.1 is up to the reader’s interpretation. Notice that the proof in [23] is variational and, as well as our proof, fundamentally relies on Mather’s ideas.

In [53] (see also [42, 52]), Theorem 1 is nearly identical to Theorem 1.1. A slight difference is a higher regularity requirement. This proof is geometrical and does not use variational methods.

An earlier version of the current paper was available ([49]) since 2012, the current version is a thorough revision. We introduce a more general concept of Aubry-Mather type, propose a different way to perform normal forms, and also use a different method to handle the transition from single to double resonances.

In [45] we propose a way to prove Arnold diffusion in the same setting as in the present paper, namely, for generic time-periodic perturbations of integrable systems of three degrees of freedom with strictly convex unperturbed H_0 . The key element

of the construction is to find a diffusion path such that at every strong resonance the associated averaged mechanical system is dominant. For dominant systems we introduce dimension reduction and prove existence of 3-dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders. Moreover, we show existence of families of Aubry sets of Aubry-Mather type (see section 2.4 for a definition). Finally, we use these sets to construct diffusing orbits.

In [46] for dominant mechanical systems in any dimension we prove analogous statement on existence of 3-dimensional cylinders carrying a family of Aubry-Mather type sets.

Autonomous version

Let $n = 3$, $\tilde{p} = (\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \tilde{p}_3) \in B^3$, and $\tilde{H}_0(p)$ be a strictly convex Hamiltonian. Fix $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and a regular value a of \tilde{H}_0 . Since \tilde{H}_0 is strictly convex, there is only one critical value of \tilde{H}_0 . Consider a convex connected open set W in the region $\partial_{p_i} H_0 > \rho > 0$ for some $\rho > 0$ and two open sets U and U' in W intersecting the same energy surface $S_a = \{\tilde{H}_0^{-1}(a)\}$. Then for a cusp generic (autonomous) perturbation $\tilde{H}_0(\tilde{p}) + \epsilon \tilde{H}_1(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{p})$ there is an orbit $(\tilde{\theta}_\epsilon, \tilde{p}_\epsilon)(t)$ on the energy surface S_a connecting U with U' , namely, $\tilde{p}_\epsilon(0) \in U$ and $\tilde{p}_\epsilon(t) \in U'$ for some $t = t_\epsilon$.

This can be shown using energy reduction to a time periodic system of two and a half degrees of freedom (see e.g. [8, Section 45]).

Generic instability of resonant totally elliptic points

In [47] stability of resonant totally elliptic fixed points of symplectic maps in dimension 4 is studied. It is shown that generically a convex, resonant, totally elliptic point of a symplectic map is Lyapunov unstable.

Non-convex Hamiltonians

In the case the Hamiltonian H_0 is non-convex or non-strictly convex for all $p \in B^2$, for example, $H_0(p) = p_1^2 + p_2^3$, the problem of global Arnold diffusion is wide open. Some results for the Hamiltonian $H_0(p) = p_1^2 - p_2^2$ are in [16, 20].

To apply variational approach one faces another deep open problem of extending Mather theory and weak KAM theory beyond convex Hamiltonians or developing a new technique to construct diffusing orbits.

Other diffusion mechanisms

Here we would like to give a short review of other diffusion mechanisms. In the case $n = 2$ Arnold proposed the following example

$$H(q, p, \phi, I, t) = \frac{I^2}{2} + \frac{p^2}{2} + \epsilon(1 - \cos q)(1 + \mu(\sin \phi + \sin t)).$$

This example is a perturbation of the product of a one-dimensional pendulum and a one-dimensional rotator. The main feature of this example is that it has a 3-dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder. There is a rich literature on Arnold example and we do not intend to give extensive list of references; we mention [2, 9, 14, 15, 76], and references therein. This example gave rise to a family of examples of systems of $n + 1/2$ degrees of freedom of the form

$$H_\epsilon(q, p, \phi, I, t) = H_0(I) + K_0(p, q) + \epsilon H_1(q, p, \phi, I, t),$$

where $(q, p) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $I \in \mathbb{R}$, $\phi, t \in T$. Moreover, the Hamiltonian $K_0(p, q)$ has a saddle fixed point at the origin and $K_0(0, q)$ attains its strict maximum at $q = 0$. For small ϵ a 3-dimensional NHIC \mathcal{C} persists. Several geometric mechanisms of diffusion have evolved:

- In [29, 30, 31, 41] the authors carefully analyze two types of dynamics induced on the cylinder \mathcal{C} . These two dynamics are given by so-called inner and outer maps. In [33], [32], these techniques are applied to a general perturbation of Arnold's example.

- In [72, 73, 74, 28] a return (separatrix) map along invariant manifolds of \mathcal{C} is constructed. A detailed analysis of this separatrix map gives diffusing orbits.

- In [22, 43, 48] for an open set of perturbations of Arnold's example, one constructs a probability measure μ in the phase space such that the pushforward of μ projected onto the I component in the proper time scale weakly converges to the stochastic diffusion process. This, in particular, implies existence of diffusing orbits.

- In [40], the authors treat the a priori chaotic setting, but prove diffusion in the real analytic category, which is much more difficult. A different mechanism related to the slow-fast system is given by the same authors in [39].

As we mentioned on several other occasions the other two groups [11, 24, 25] are inspired and influenced by Mather variation method [56, 57, 58] and build diffusing orbits variationally. Recently a priori unstable structure was established for the restricted planar three body problem [36]. It turns out that for this problem there are no large gaps.

A multidimensional diffusion mechanism of different nature, but also based on existence and persistence of a 3-dimensional NHIC \mathcal{C} is proposed in [20].

We start with an outline of our proof with a sufficient condition for Arnold diffusion.

1.3 Scheme of diffusion

For all $\epsilon \leq 1$, the Hamiltonian H_ϵ satisfy the Tonelli property of superlinearity, strict convexity, and completeness (see Section 6). Mather theory ([35], [58]) implies that for each cohomology class $c \in \mathbb{R}^2 \simeq H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$, the Hamiltonian H_ϵ admits families of invariant sets of the Hamiltonian flow on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}$, called the Mather, Aubry, and Mañe sets, satisfying

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{H_\epsilon}(c) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}(c) \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{C\sqrt{\epsilon}}(c) \times \mathbb{T},$$

where C is a constant depending only on D (see Corollary 7.7). We use $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ to denote their intersection with the section $\{t = 0\}$, which are invariant under the time-1-map. Throughout the paper, we may switch between the two equivalent settings: either consider continuous invariant sets of the flow, or discrete invariant sets under the time-1-map.

Our main strategy is then to pick a subset $\Gamma_* \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of cohomologies very close to the diffusion path \mathcal{P} , then find an orbit that shadows a sequence of Aubry sets $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, $c_i \in \Gamma_*$. This requires the existence of non-degenerate *heteroclinic connections* between the Aubry sets, the family of invariant sets with heteroclinic connections is called a *transition chain* by Arnold [5]. To do this, we show that the cohomologies satisfy one of the four *diffusion mechanisms*.

We give a general introduction to these mechanisms below, and refer to Section 2.1 for precise definitions.

Mather mechanism

For a twist map, it is known since Birkhoff that a region free of essential invariant curves is unstable, namely there exists orbits that drifts from one boundary of the region to another. Mather ([58]) gave a conceptual description of this phenomenon, and generalized it into higher dimension.

We say that the pair (H_ϵ, c) satisfy the *Mather mechanism* if

$$\pi_\theta \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c) \subset \mathbb{T}^2$$

is contractible. (Note in the twist map case this means $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}^0(c)$ is not a rotational invariant curve.) Mather proved that in this case, $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ admits a heteroclinic connecting orbit to $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c')$ if c, c' are close.

Arnold mechanism

In Arnold's original paper [5], Arnold showed the existence of a family of invariant tori, whose own stable and unstable manifolds intersects transversally. In our setting, the




Figure 1.3: Diffusion along a cylinder

tori are the Aubry sets $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c)$ contained in a *normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder*². To consider homoclinic connections, we lift the system to a double covering map, then the homoclinic connections becomes *heteroclinic* connections between the two copies.

We say that the pair (H_ϵ, c) satisfy the *Arnold mechanism* if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ is an invariant curve, and there exists a symplectic double covering map $\Xi : \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, such that the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon \circ \Xi}^0(\Xi^*c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon \circ \Xi}^0(\Xi^*c)$$

is totally disconnected. If $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ is a smooth invariant curve with transversal intersection of stable and unstable manifolds, then the above set is discrete.

Bifurcation mechanism

This is technically similar to the Arnold mechanism, but happens when the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c)$ is contained in two disjoint normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders.

We say that the pair (H_ϵ, c) satisfy the *Bifurcation mechanism* if the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$$

is totally disconnected.

Normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders

The three mechanisms given do not apply to all cases, even after a generic perturbation. The main observation is that they do apply to cohomologies that satisfy:

²More precisely, these cylinders are weakly invariant, i.e. the associated vector field is tangent to them, but orbits may escape through the boundary

1. (2D NHIC) The Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ is contained in a two-dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder.
2. (1D Graph Theorem) The Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ is contained in a Lipschitz graph over the circle \mathbb{T} .

In this case, we say that the pair (H_ϵ, c) is of *Aubry-Mather type*.

Under these assumptions, the Aubry set resembles the *Aubry-Mather sets* for twist maps, and in particular, generically we have the following dichotomy: either $\pi\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ is contractible, or $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}^0(c)$ is a Lipschitz invariant curve. In the latter case, we can show that Arnold mechanism applies after an additional perturbation. Since either Mather or Arnold mechanism applies, we conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c)$ is connected to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c')$ for c, c' close. Moreover, this argument can be continued if c' is also of Aubry-Mather type. Dynamically, the orbit is either diffusing along the heteroclinic orbits of invariant curves, or diffusing in a Birkhoff region of instability within the cylinder. See Figure 1.3. We now briefly describe the non-degeneracy conditions.

While a cohomology of Aubry-Mather type is robust, namely it can be extended along a continuous curve, in a one-parameter family one may encounter a bifurcation where the Aubry set jumps from one cylinder to another one. At the bifurcation, the Aubry set is contained in both cylinders. We say that the pair (H_ϵ, c) is of *Bifurcation Aubry-Mather type* if the Aubry set is possibly contained in two cylinders.

Technically we have to involve a different bifurcation type, called *asymmetric bifurcation type*. This is very similar to the bifurcation Aubry-Mather type, the main difference is on one side of the bifurcation, the Aubry set is a Aubry-Mather type set contained in a invariant cylinder, while the other side we have a hyperbolic periodic orbit. This happens when we cross double resonance, see Definition 8.3.

Forcing relation

The rigorous formulation of the three diffusion mechanisms will be given using the concept of *forcing equivalence* defined by Bernard in [11] (which is generalization of a equivalence relation defined by Mather, see [58]). If c, c' are forcing equivalent (denoted $c \dashv\vdash c'$), then there is a heteroclinic orbit connecting the associated Aubry sets. Moreover, there exists orbit shadowing an arbitrary sequence of cohomologies, as long as they are all equivalent. See Section 2.1 for more details.

The main theorem reduces to Theorem 2.1, which proves forcing equivalence of a net of cohomologies, called Γ_* . The set Γ_* consists of finitely many smooth curves. On each of the smooth curves, we prove the cohomologies are of Aubry-Mather type, and therefore one of the three mechanisms apply.

We prove forcing equivalence of different connected components directly, using the definition of the forcing relation. We call this the **Jump mechanism**.

1.4 Three regimes of diffusion

Recall that our plan is to choose a net Γ_* of cohomology classes, and prove their forcing equivalence, by first proving they are of Aubry-Mather type or Bifurcation Aubry-Mather type. This is done in three distinct regimes.

Single resonance

Let $(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}) \in \mathcal{K}$ be one of the single resonant component, and let $\mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$ be the collection of the strong additional resonances. Then for p in a $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ -neighborhood of the set

$$\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, \lambda) := \Gamma_{k_1} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{k_2 \in \mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)} B_{M\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(\Gamma_{k_1, k_2}) \right),$$

where M is a large parameter, the system admits the normal form

$$N_\varepsilon^{SR} = H_0 + \varepsilon Z(\theta^s, p) + O(\varepsilon\delta), \quad (\theta^s, \theta^f, t) \in \mathbb{T}^3.$$

where how small δ depends on how many double resonances we exclude. Under the non-degeneracy conditions $SR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$, the above system admits three dimensional (for the flow) normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders, and one can prove each $c \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, \lambda)$ is of AM or of Bifurcation AM type.

Double resonance, high energy

Let $p_0 = \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}$ be a double resonance. On the set

$$B_{M\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(p_0), \quad p_0 = \Gamma_{k_1} \cap \Gamma_{k_2},$$

we perform a normal form transformation, and then the p variable via $I = (p - p_0)/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. One can show that the system is conjugate to:

$$\frac{1}{\beta} (K(I) - U(\varphi) + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})),$$

where $K : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a positive quadratic form and $U : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $\beta > 0$ is a constant depending only on k_1, k_2 . The system $H^s = K(I) - U(\varphi)$ is a two degrees of freedom mechanical system. Below we use the shifted energy $E := H^s(\varphi, I) + \min U(\varphi)$ as a parameter.

When the shifted energy E is not too close to 0, we are in the *the high energy regime*. By imposing the conditions $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$, one shows existence of two-dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders associated to the shortest loops for the associated Jacobi metric, with the shifted energy as a parameter. This cylinder persists under perturbation, and one can show that the associated cohomologies are of Aubry-Mather type.

Double resonance, low energy

As the energy decreases, the cylinder constructed in the high energy may not persist. Under the non-degeneracy conditions $DR(k_1, k_2)$, we distinguish two separate cases:

1. Simple cylinder: in this case the cylinder extends across zero shifted energy to negative shifted energy. In this case one can still show the associated cohomologies are of Aubry-Mather type.
2. Non-simple cylinder: In this case the cylinder may be destroyed before the shifted energy becomes zero. However, we show the existence of two simple cylinders near the non-simple one, and one can “jump” from one cylinder to another one.

This is the only case where the **Jump mechanism** is used.

2 Forcing relation

2.1 Sufficient condition for Arnold diffusion

Recall that we will utilize the concept of forcing equivalence, denoted $c \dashv\vdash c'$. The actual definition will not be important for the current discussions, instead, we state its main application to Arnold diffusion.

Proposition 2.1 ([11], Proposition 0.10). *Let $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a sequence of cohomology classes which are forcing equivalent. For each i , let U_i be neighborhoods of the discrete Mather sets $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_H^0(c_i)$, then there is a trajectory of the Hamiltonian flow visiting all the sets U_i .*

Let $\sigma > 0$ and $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(H)$ denote the σ neighborhood of H in the space $C^r(\mathbb{T}^2 \times B^2 \times \mathbb{T})$ with respect to the natural C^r topology. The following statement is a “local” version of our main theorem, where we state that given $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, we can:

- (1) Choose ϵ_0 to be locally constant on a neighborhood of H_1 ;
- (2) Prove forcing equivalence on a residual subset of a neighborhood of H_ϵ .

Theorem 2.1. *Let \mathcal{P} be a diffusion path and U_1, \dots, U_N be open sets intersecting \mathcal{P} . Then there is an open and dense subset $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}) \subset \mathcal{S}^r$, and for each $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P})$, there are $\delta = \delta(H_0, H_1) > 0$, $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(H_0, H_1) > 0$ such that for each*

$$H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1), \quad 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1,$$

there is a subset $\Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying

$$\Gamma_* = \Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1) \cap U_i \neq \emptyset, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

with the property that there is $\sigma = \sigma(\epsilon, H_0, H_1) > 0$, and a residual subset $\mathcal{R}_\sigma(H_0 + \epsilon H_1) \subset \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_0 + \epsilon H_1)$, such that for each $H' \in \mathcal{R}$, with respect to the Hamiltonian H' , all the $c \in \Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1)$ are forcing equivalent.

Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 2.1 imply our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First of all, let us define the lower semi-continuous function ϵ_0 . For each $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, define

$$\epsilon_2^{H_1}(\cdot) = \epsilon_1(H_0, H_1) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)}(\cdot)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}$ denote the indicator function of \mathcal{V} . An indicator function of an open set is lower semi-continuous by definition. For $H_1 \in \mathcal{S}^r \setminus \mathcal{U}$, let $\epsilon_2^{H_1} \equiv 0$. We then define

$$\epsilon_0(\cdot) = \sup_{H_1 \in \mathcal{S}^r} \epsilon_2^{H_1}(\cdot),$$

which is lower semi-continuous, being an (uncountable) supremum of lower semi-continuous function. Note that ϵ_0 is positive on each $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ since $\epsilon_2^{H_1}(H_1) = \epsilon_1(H_0, H_1) > 0$.

Consider now $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0(H_1)$ as defined above. Let $\Gamma_*(\epsilon_0, H_0, H_1)$ be as in Theorem 2.1. Let $c_i \in U_i \cap \Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1)$. For any $\|H - H_0\|_{C^r} \leq \epsilon$, there is $C > 0$ depending only on D such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_H^0(c) \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{C\sqrt{\epsilon}}(c)$. As a result, reducing ϵ_0 if necessary (note that minimum of an lower semi-continuous function and a constant is still lower semi-continuous), we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_H^0(c_i) \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times U_i$. Since c_i are all forcing equivalent by Theorem 2.1, Proposition 2.1 implies the existence of an orbit visiting each neighborhood $\mathbb{T}^2 \times U_i$.

Since the above discussion applies to all $H \in \mathcal{R}_\sigma(H_0 + \epsilon H_1)$ where $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0(H_1)$, we conclude that for a dense subset of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{U}, \epsilon_0)$ (as defined in Theorem 1.1), there is an orbit visiting each $\mathbb{T}^2 \times U_i$. Since this property is open due to the smoothness of the flow, it holds on an open and dense subset \mathcal{W} of \mathcal{V} . \square

The set $\Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1)$ will be chosen to be the union of finitely many smooth curves, and will coincide with \mathcal{P} except on finitely many neighborhoods of size $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ of strong double resonances.

2.2 Diffusion mechanisms via forcing equivalence

We reformulate the diffusion mechanisms introduced in Section 1.3 using forcing equivalence. We start with Mather mechanism.

Proposition 2.2 ([11], Theorem 0.11). *Suppose*

$$\mathcal{N}_H^0(c) \text{ is contractible.} \quad (\mathbf{Ma})$$

as a subset of \mathbb{T}^2 , then there is $\sigma > 0$ such that c is forcing equivalent to all $c' \in B_\sigma(c)$.

To define the Arnold mechanism, we consider a finite covering of our space. Let

$$\xi : \mathbb{T}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$$

be a linear double covering map, for example: $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \mapsto (2\theta_1, \theta_2)$. Then ξ lifts to a symplectic map

$$\Xi : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \Xi(\theta, p) = (\xi\theta, \xi^*p),$$

where $\xi^*(p)$ is defined by the relation $\xi^*(p) \cdot v = p \cdot d\xi(v)$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For example, if $n = 2$ and $\xi(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (2\theta_1, \theta_2)$ we have $\xi^*(p_1, p_2) = (p_1/2, p_2)$. This allows us to consider the lifted Hamiltonian $H \circ \Xi$.

Lemma 2.3. ([11], Section 7) *We have*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) = \Xi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \supset \Xi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c).$$

Moreover, $\xi^*c \vdash \xi^*c'$ relative to $H \circ \Xi$ implies $c \vdash c'$ relative to H .

The Aubry set can be decomposed into disjoint invariant sets called *static classes*, which gives important insight into the structure of the Aubry set. In particular, when there is only one static class, then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c) = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$. In the case $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c) \neq \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$, the difference $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ consists of heteroclinic orbits from one static class to another ([11]). Using Lemma 2.3, when $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c) = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$, it may happen that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \subsetneq \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c)$, and the difference provides additional heteroclinic orbits to the Aubry set that is not contained in the Mañé set before the lifting. This can be exploited to create diffusion orbits.

Proposition 2.4 ([11], Theorem 9.2, Proposition 7.3). *Suppose, either:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c) \text{ has two static classes, and } \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c) \text{ is totally disconnected,} \quad (\mathbf{Bif})$$

or:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c) \text{ has one static class, and } \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \text{ is totally disconnected.} \quad (\mathbf{Ar})$$

Then there is $\sigma > 0$ such that c is forcing equivalent to all $c' \in B_\sigma(c)$.

As implied by the labeling, the first item is called the bifurcation mechanism, and the second the Arnold mechanism. We obtain the following immediate corollary:

Corollary 2.5 (Mather-Arnold mechanism). *Suppose $\Gamma \subset B^2$ is a continuous curve, and for each $c \in \Gamma$ one of the diffusion mechanisms **(Ma)**, **(Bif)**, or **(Ar)** holds. Then all $c \in \Gamma$ are forcing equivalent.*

Recall that $\Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1)$ can be chosen as a union of finitely many smooth curves.

- We will later show that for $c \in \Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1)$ in Theorem 2.1, one of the two applies: Proposition 2.2 or Proposition 2.4.

As a result, each connected component of $\Gamma_*(\epsilon, H_0, H_1)$ consists of equivalent c 's.

- We prove the forcing equivalence between different connected components using directly the definition of forcing relation. We call this *the “jump” mechanism*.

2.3 Invariance under the symplectic coordinate changes

A diffeomorphism $\Psi = \Psi(\theta, p) : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is called exact symplectic if $\Psi^*\lambda - \lambda$ is an exact one-form, where $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i d\theta_i$ is the canonical form. We say $\Phi : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$ is *exact symplectic* if

$$\Phi(\theta, p, t) = (\Phi_1(\theta, p, t), t),$$

and there is $\tilde{E} = \tilde{E}(\theta, p, t)$, such that

$$\Psi(\theta, p, t, E) = (\Phi(\theta, p, t), E + \tilde{E}(\theta, p, t))$$

(called the autonomous extension of Φ) is exact symplectic. The new term $\tilde{E}(\theta, p, t)$ is defined up to adding a function $f'(t)$, where $f(t)$ is periodic in t . Let us assume $\tilde{E}(0, 0, t) \equiv 0$, therefore the choice of \tilde{E} is unique.

Let $H = H(\theta, p, t)$, and Φ is exact symplectic with extension Ψ . Then for $G(\theta, p, t, E) = H(\theta, p, t) + E$, we define

$$\Phi^*H = \Psi^*H = G \circ \Psi(\theta, p, t, E) - E = H \circ \Phi + \tilde{E}(\theta, p, t). \quad (2.1)$$

The Aubry, Mather, Mañe sets are invariant under exact symplectic coordinate change in the following sense.

Proposition 2.6 ([10], [65]). *Suppose H and Φ^*H are Tonelli, and let Ψ be the extension of Φ . Let $(c, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \simeq H^1(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, and let $\Psi^*(c, \alpha) = (c^*, \alpha^*)$*

be the push forward of the cohomology class via the identification $H^1(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}) \simeq H^1(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Then

$$\alpha = \alpha_H(c) \iff \alpha^* = \alpha_{\Phi^*H}(c^*).$$

Let us denote

$$(\Phi_H^*c, \alpha^*) = \Psi^*(c, \alpha_H(c)),$$

then

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_H(c) = \Phi \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\Phi^*H}(\Phi_H^*c) \right), \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c) = \Phi \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\Phi^*H}(\Phi_H^*c) \right), \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c) = \Phi \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\Phi^*H}(\Phi_H^*c) \right).$$

Note in the particular case when Φ is homotopic to identity, $\Phi_H^*c = c$ and $\alpha_{\Phi^*H}(c) = \alpha_H(c)$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let Φ be an exact symplectic coordinate change. The tuple (H, c) satisfies **(Bif)** or **(Ar)** if and only if (Φ^*H, Φ_H^*c) satisfies the same conditions. The property **(Ma)** with the additional condition that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c) = \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$ is also invariant under exact symplectic coordinate changes.*

Proof. Since our symplectic coordinate changes are always identity in the t components, the invariance of Aubry and Mañe sets imply the invariance of their zero section under the map $\Phi(\cdot, \cdot, 0)$. The invariance of **(Bif)** follows. For the invariance of **(Ma)**, note that due to the graph property, $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ is contractible in $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_H^0(c)$ is contractible in \mathbb{T}^2 . Therefore the contractibility of Aubry set is invariant, and since the Aubry set coincide with the Mañe set by assumption, **(Ma)** is invariant.

For **(Ar)**, let Ψ be the extension of Φ , and let us extend Ξ trivially to $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$ or $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ without changing its name. Let Φ_1 be an exact symplectic change homotopic to Φ , with extension Ψ_1 , such that

$$\Phi \circ \Xi = \Xi \circ \Phi_1, \quad \Psi \circ \Xi = \Xi \circ \Psi_1.$$

Let us note Ξ^*c , defined as the push forward of $H^1(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ under the identification with $H^1(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, is identical to ξ^*c . We have:

$$\Psi_1^*(\Xi^*c, \alpha_{H \circ \Xi}(\Xi^*c)) = \Psi_1^*\Xi^*(c, \alpha_H(c)) = \Xi^*\Psi^*(c, \alpha_H(c)).$$

Since Ξ is independent of t , Ξ^* is identity in the last component. We conclude that $(\Phi_1)_{H \circ \Xi}^* \Xi^*c = \Xi^*(\Phi_H^*c)$. Moreover,

$$(\Phi \circ \Xi)^*H = (\Phi^*H) \circ \Xi, \quad (\Xi \circ \Phi_1)^*H = \Phi_1^*(H \circ \Xi).$$

Then

$$\Phi_1 \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{(\Phi \circ \Xi)^*H}((\Phi \circ \Xi)^*c) \right) = \Phi_1 \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\Phi_1^*(H \circ \Xi)}((\Phi_1)_{H \circ \Xi}^* \Xi^*c) \right) = \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}(\Xi^*c)$$

and

$$\Phi_1 \left(\Xi^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\Phi^* H}(\Phi_H^* c) \right) = \Xi^{-1} \Phi \left(\Xi^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\Phi^* H}(\Phi_H^* c) \right) = \Xi^{-1} \left(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c) \right),$$

therefore

$$\Phi_1 \left(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{(\Phi^* H) \circ \Xi}(\Xi^*(\Phi_H^* c)) \setminus \Xi^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\Phi^* H}(\Phi_H^* c) \right) = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}(\Xi^* c) \setminus \Xi^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c).$$

This implies invariance of **(Ar)** after considering the zero section of the above equality. \square

Our definition of exact symplectic coordinate change for time-periodic system is somewhat restrictive, and in particular, it does not apply directly to the linear coordinate change performed at the double resonance. In that setting, we will prove invariance of Mather, Aubry and Mañe set directly.

2.4 Normal hyperbolicity and Aubry-Mather type

Call a two dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder *symplectic* if the restriction of the canonical form for this cylinder is non-degenerate on the domain of definition. Loosely speaking, a pair (H_*, c_*) is called of *Aubry-Mather type* (AM type for short, refer to Definition 8.1 for details) if:

1. The discrete Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_*}^0(c_*)$ is contained in *two dimensional* normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder, the restriction of the symplectic form is non-degenerate on the cylinder.
2. There is $\sigma > 0$ such that the following holds for $c \in B_\sigma(c_*)$ and $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$:
 - (a) The discrete Aubry set satisfies the graph property under the local coordinates of the cylinder.
 - (b) When the Aubry set is an invariant graph, then locally the unstable manifold of the Aubry set is a graph over the configuration space \mathbb{T}^2 .

This definition gives an abstract version of the setting seen in the *a priori unstable* systems.

Theorem 2.2 (See Theorem 8.1). *Suppose $H_* \in C^r$, $r \geq 2$ and (H_*, c_*) is of Aubry-Mather type, $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth curve containing c_* in the relative interior. Then there is $\sigma > 0$ such that for all $c \in \overline{B_\sigma(c_*)} \cap \Gamma$, the following dichotomy holds for a C^r -residual subset of $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$:*

1. *Either the projected Mañe set $\mathcal{N}_H^0(c)$ is contractible as a subset of \mathbb{T}^2 (Mather mechanism **(Ma)**);*

2. Or there is a finite covering map Ξ such that the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \setminus \Xi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$$

is totally disconnected (Arnold mechanism **(Ar)**).

We say (H_*, c_*) is of *bifurcation Aubry-Mather type* if there exists two normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders, such that the *local Aubry set* restricted to each cylinder satisfy the conditions of Aubry-Mather type. The precise definition is given in Definition 8.2.

We will also consider a particular (and simpler) bifurcation. We say (H_*, c_*) is of *asymmetric bifurcation type* if there exists one normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder, and a hyperbolic periodic orbit, such that the Aubry set is either contained in the union of the cylinder (and of Aubry-Mather type), and the periodic orbit, see Definition 8.3.

We state the consequence of these definitions in terms of diffusion.

Theorem 2.3 (See Theorem 8.2). *Suppose $H_* \in C^r$, $r \geq 2$ and (H_*, c_*) is of bifurcation Aubry-Mather type or asymmetric bifurcation type, and $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth curve containing c_* in the relative interior. Then there is $\sigma > 0$ and an open and dense subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$ such that for each $H \in \mathcal{R}$ and each $c \in \Gamma \cap B_\sigma(c_*)$, **(Bif)** holds on at most finitely many c 's, and for all other c 's either **(Ma)** or **(Ar)** holds.*

The following Proposition is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3.

Proposition 2.8. *Suppose $\Gamma \subset B^2$ is a piecewise smooth curve of cohomologies such that for each $c \in \Gamma$, such that the pair (H_*, c) is of Aubry-Mather type, bifurcation AM type or asymmetric bifurcation type. Then there is $\sigma > 0$ and a residual subset $\mathcal{R}_\sigma(H_*) \subset \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$, such that either **(Ma)**, **(Bif)**, or **(Ar)** holds for each $H \in \mathcal{R}_\sigma(H_*)$ and each $c \in \Gamma$.*

Proof. For a piecewise smooth $\Gamma = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \Gamma_i$, we can extend each Γ_i to Γ'_i smoothly, such that Γ_i is contained in the relative interior of Γ'_i . We then apply Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3 to each $c \in \Gamma_i$ relative to the smooth curve Γ'_i , to get the conclusion of our proposition for $c' \in B_{\sigma(c)}(c)$, and $H \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma(c)}(H_*) \subset \mathcal{V}_{\sigma(c)}(H_*)$. The proposition then follows by considering a finite covering of Γ by $B_{\sigma(c_j)}(c_j)$, and taking finite intersection of residual subsets $\mathcal{R}_{\sigma(c_j)}(H_*)$. \square

We now describe the selection of cohomologies and prove AM type in each of the two regimes. Single resonance is covered in Section 3, and double resonance is split into two sections, Section 4 covers the geometrical part, while Section 5 covers the variational part.

3 Normal forms and cohomology classes at single resonances

3.1 Resonant component and non-degeneracy conditions

Let $(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}) \in \mathcal{K}$ be a resonant segment in the diffusion path. Define the resonant component of H_1 relative to the single resonance k_1 as follows:

$$[H_1]_{k_1}(\theta, p, t) = \sum_{k \in k_1 \mathbb{Z}} h_k(p) e^{2\pi i k \cdot (\theta, t)},$$

where h_k are the Fourier coefficients of $H_1(\theta, p, t)$. Since $[H_1]_{k_1}$ only depends on the variables $k_1 \cdot (\theta, t)$ and p , we define

$$Z_{k_1} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad Z_{k_1}(k_1 \cdot (\theta, t), p) = [H_1]_{k_1}(\theta, p, t).$$

For $p_0 \in \Gamma_k$, define the following conditions:

[SR1 $_\lambda$] For all $p \in B_\lambda(p_0)$, the function $Z_{k_1}(\cdot, p)$ achieves a global maximum at $\theta_*^s(p) \in \mathbb{T}$, and

$$Z_{k_1}(\theta^s, p) - Z_{k_1}(\theta_*^s(p), p) < \lambda d(\theta^s, \theta_*^s(p))^2.$$

[SR2 $_\lambda$] For all $p \in B_\lambda(p_0)$, there exists two local maxima $\theta_1^s(p)$ and $\theta_2^s(p)$ of the function $Z_{k_1}(\cdot, p)$ in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\theta^s}^2 Z_{k_1}(\theta_1^s(p), p) < \lambda I \quad , \quad \partial_{\theta^s}^2 Z_{k_1}(\theta_2^s(p), p) < \lambda I, \\ Z_{k_1}(\theta^s, p) < \max\{Z_{k_1}(\theta_1^s(p), p), Z_{k_1}(\theta_2^s(p), p)\} - \lambda (\min\{d(\theta^s - \theta_1^s), d(\theta^s - \theta_2^s)\})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.1. We say that H_1 satisfy the condition $SR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$ if for each $p_0 \in \Gamma_{k_1}$, at least one of [SR1 $_\lambda$] and [SR2 $_\lambda$] holds for the function $Z_{k_1}(\theta^s, p)$.

Proposition 3.2. *The set of $H_1 \in \mathcal{S}^r$ such that $SR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$ holds for some $\lambda > 0$ is open and dense.*

Proof. It suffices to show that a generic one-parameter family $f(x, a)$, $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $a \in [a_1, a_2]$ the function $f(\cdot, a)$ has unique non-degenerate maximum, with the exception of up to finitely many a 's for which there are two non-degenerate maxima. We can first show that the following property is open and dense: any local maxima in x is non-degenerate ($\partial_{xx}^2 f(x) < 0$). The main observation is that it's implied by a co-dimension two condition: we require whenever $\partial_x f = 0$, and $\partial_{xx} f = 0$, we have $\partial_{xxx} f \neq 0$. Then any degenerate critical point cannot be a maxima.

We obtain a finite family of local minima. We then can “slide” them against each other so that they intersect transversally. \square




Figure 3.1: Single resonance after removing punctures

Let K be a large parameter, recall the strong additional resonances are defined by

$$\mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, K) = \{k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3 : |k_2| \leq K, \Gamma_{k_1} \cap S_{k_2} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We show generic forcing equivalence on each connected components of Γ_{k_1} minus $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ -neighborhoods of the strong double resonances, called *punctures*. The following theorem is the main result of this section, the proof is given in Section 3.3 assuming propositions proved in the later sections. For $M, K > 0$ denote

$$\Gamma_{k_1}^{\text{SR}}(M, K) := \Gamma_{k_1} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{k_2 \in \mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, K)} B_{2M\sqrt{\epsilon}}(\Gamma_{k_1, k_2}) \right). \quad (3.1)$$

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose H_1 satisfy the condition $\text{SR}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$ on Γ_{k_1} . Then there is $K = K(D, k_1, \lambda)$, $M = M(D, k_1, \lambda)$, $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(D, k_1, \lambda) > 0$, $\sigma = \sigma(k_1, H_0, \epsilon, H_1) > 0$, and for every $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$, a residual subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_0 + \epsilon H_1)$, such that the following hold for all $H \in \mathcal{R}$: for each $c \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{\text{SR}}(M, K)$ the associated Aubry or Mañe sets satisfy either **(Ma)**, **(Bif)** or **(Ar)**. As a result, each connected components of $\Gamma_{k_1}^{\text{SR}}(M, K)$ is contained in one forcing equivalent class.*

Refer to Figure 3.1 for an illustration.

3.2 Normal form

Then the classical partial averaging theory indicates that after a coordinate change, the system has the normal form $H_0 + \epsilon Z_{k_1} + h.o.t$ away from punctures. In order to state the normal form, we need an anisotropic norm adapted to the perturbative

nature of the system. Define

$$\|H_1(\theta, p, t)\|_{C_I^r} = \sup_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq r} \epsilon^{\frac{|\beta|}{2}} \sup |\partial_{(\theta,t)}^\alpha \partial_p^\beta H_1(\theta, p, t)|, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\alpha \in (\mathbb{Z}_+)^3, \beta \in (\mathbb{Z}_+)^2$ are multi-indices and $|\cdot|$ denote the sum of the indices. The rescaled norm is similar to C^r norm, but replace the p derivatives by the derivatives in $I = p/\sqrt{\epsilon}$, hence the name.

Theorem 3.2 (See end of this section). *With the notations above there is $C = C(D, k_1) > 1$ such that the following hold. Let $\delta > 0$ be a small parameter and set $K = 1/\delta^2$ and $M = K^2$. Then for any $c \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, K)$ there exists $p_c \in \Gamma_{k_1}$ such that*

$$c \in B_{CK\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_c), \quad (3.3)$$

and an C^∞ exact symplectic coordinate change homotopic to the identity

$$\Phi_\epsilon : \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{CK\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_c) \times \mathbb{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{CK\sqrt{\epsilon}}(p_c) \times \mathbb{T}$$

such that:

1.
$$(\Phi_\epsilon)^* H = H_0 + \epsilon[H_1]_{k_1} + \epsilon R, \quad \|R\|_{C_I^2} \leq C\delta. \quad (3.4)$$
2.
$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_\epsilon - Id)\|_{C_I^2} \leq C\delta^4 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Pi_p(\Phi_\epsilon - Id)\|_{C_I^2} \leq C\delta^4\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Here the C_I^2 norm is evaluated on the set $\mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{CK\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_c) \times \mathbb{T}$.

Remark 3.1. The C^∞ coordinate change is obtained by approximating a coordinate change that is only C^{r-1} , see Appendix B.1. The reason this can be done is that we only need C^2 estimates of the coordinate change.

We use the idea of Lochak (see for example [51]) to cover the action space with double resonances. A double resonance $p_0 = S_{k_1} \cap S_{k_2}$ corresponds to a periodic orbit of the unperturbed system H_0 . More precisely, we have $\omega_0 = \Omega_0(p_0) := \nabla H_0(p_0)$ which satisfies $\mathbb{R}(\omega, 1) \cap \mathbb{Z}^3 \neq \emptyset$. Denote by $T_{\omega_0} = \min\{t > 0 : t(\omega_0, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^3\}$ the minimal period.

The resonant lattice for p_0 is $\Lambda = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{k_1, k_2\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^3$, and the resonant component is

$$[H_1]_{k_1, k_2} = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} h_k(p) e^{2\pi i k \cdot (\theta, t)}.$$

We have the following general normal form theorem, the proof is given at the end of Section B.1.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $p_0 = \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}$, $T = T_{\omega_0(p_0)}$. Then for a parameter $C_1 > 1$, there exists $C = C(r, C_1) > 1$, $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(r) > 0$ such that if $K_1 > C$ satisfies*

$$T < \frac{C_1}{K_1^2 \sqrt{\epsilon}},$$

then for each $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ there exists a C^∞ exact symplectic map

$$\Phi : \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{K_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}/2} \times \mathbb{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{K_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}} \times \mathbb{T}$$

such that

$$(\Phi)^* H_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon [H_1]_{k_1, k_2} + \epsilon R_1,$$

where

$$\|R_1\|_{C^2} \leq CK_1^{-1},$$

and

$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi - Id)\|_{C^2} \leq CK_1^{-2}, \quad \|\Pi_p(\Phi - Id)\|_{C^2} \leq CK_1^{-2} \sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Let us denote $\Lambda_1 = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{k_1\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^3$ and $\Lambda_2 = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{k_1, k_2\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^3$.

Lemma 3.4. *There is an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that if*

$$\min\{|k| : k \in \Lambda_2 \setminus \Lambda_1\} \geq K > 0,$$

we have

$$\|[H_1]_{k_1, k_2} - [H_1]_{k_1}\|_{C^2} \leq CK^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. First let us note that there is an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that for each two dimensional lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^3$, we have

$$\sum_{k \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-2-\frac{1}{2}} < C.$$

To see this, we can bound the sum above using the integral $\int_{|z| \geq 1, z \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda} |z|^{-2-\frac{1}{2}} dA$. Then using the fact that $\|h_k\|_{C^2} \leq |k|^{2-r} \|H_1\|_{C^r}$, we have

$$\|[H_1]_{k_1, k_2} - [H_1]\|_{C^2} \leq \sum_{k \in \Lambda_2 \setminus \Lambda_1} |k|^{2-r} \leq K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{k \in \Lambda_2 \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{2+\frac{1}{2}-r} < CK^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

The following lemma is an easy consequence of the Dirichlet theorem (see [51]).

Lemma 3.5. *There is $C = C(D, k_1) > 0$ such that for each $Q_1 > 1$ and each $c \in S_{k_1}$, there is a double resonance p_0 with $T_{\omega_0} < CQ_1$, and $\|c - p_0\| < C(T_{\omega_0}Q_1)^{-1}$, where $\omega_0 = \nabla H_0(p_0)$.*

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Denote $\tau = K^2\sqrt{\epsilon}$. First we apply Lemma 3.5 using the parameter $Q_1 = C\tau^{-1}$, then each $c \in S_{k_1}$ is contained in the $\frac{\tau}{T(p_c)} \leq K^2\sqrt{\epsilon}$ neighborhood of a double resonance p_c , whose period $T(\omega_c)$ is at most CQ_1 , $\omega_c = \nabla H_0(p_c)$. Note that for c in the set (3.1) (with $M = K^2$), we have

$$p_c \notin \mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, K).$$

Let $p_c = \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}$, necessarily $\Lambda_2 \setminus \Lambda_1$ (see Lemma 3.4) contains only vectors larger than K , in this case we have $T_{\omega_c} \geq C^{-1}K$ where C may depend on k_1 . This lead to a better estimate

$$\|p_c - c\| \leq \frac{K^2\sqrt{\epsilon}}{T_{\omega_c}} \leq CK\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Moreover, from Lemma 3.4,

$$\|[H_1]_{k_1, k_2} - [H_1]_{k_1}\|_{C^2} < CK^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let $K_1 = CK$, we have $T_{\omega_c} \leq \frac{C}{K^2\sqrt{\epsilon}} = \frac{C^3}{K_1^2\sqrt{\epsilon}}$, therefore Proposition 3.3 applies with the parameter $C_1 = C^3$ and $K_1 = CK$, we obtain, for a different constant C_2

$$\|R_1\|_{C_1^2} \leq C_2K_1^{-1} = C_2C^{-1}K^{-1},$$

therefore

$$H_\epsilon \circ \Phi = H_0 + \epsilon[H_1]_{k_1} + \epsilon R,$$

where

$$\|R\|_{C_1^2} = \|\epsilon([H_1]_{k_1, k_2} - [H_1]_{k_1}) + \epsilon R_1\|_{C_1^2} \leq C_2C^{-1}K^{-1} + CK^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2CK^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

if K is large enough. Moreover,

$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_1^2} \leq C_2K_1^{-2} \leq K^{-2} \leq C_2\delta^4,$$

$$\|\Pi_p(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_1^2} \leq C_2K_1^{-2}\sqrt{\epsilon} \leq C_2\delta^4\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

□

3.3 The resonant component

Using the fact that $k_1 = (k_1^1, k_1^0) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{Z}$ is space irreducible, there is $k_2 = (k_2^1, k_2^0)$ such that $B_0^T := \begin{bmatrix} k_1^1 \\ k_2^1 \end{bmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$.³ Define:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} (k_1)^T \\ (k_2)^T \\ [0 \ 0 \ 1] \end{bmatrix} \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z}),$$

and

$$\Phi_L(\theta, p, t) = (\theta^s, \theta^f, p^s, p^f, t), \quad \begin{bmatrix} \theta^s \\ \theta^f \\ t \end{bmatrix} = B \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} p^s \\ p^f \end{bmatrix} = (B_0^T)^{-1} p.$$

One verifies that Φ_L is a linear exact symplectic coordinate change. Note that $\theta^s = k_1 \cdot (\theta, t)$ and $[H_1]_{k_1} \circ \Phi_L$ depends only on θ^s, p^s, p^f . Let us write

$$N_\epsilon = (\Phi_\epsilon^* H_\epsilon) \circ \Phi_L = H_0(p^s, p^f) + \epsilon Z(\theta^s, p^s, p^f) + \epsilon R(\theta^s, \theta^f, p^s, p^f, t), \quad (3.5)$$

where we abused notation by keeping the name of H_0 and R after the coordinate change. Let us also abuse notation by writing $\theta = (\theta^s, \theta^f)$ and $p = (p^s, p^f)$. Let us note that N_ϵ is defined on the set

$$\mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{K_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}}(p_1) \times \mathbb{T}, \quad \text{where} \quad K_1 = \frac{2K}{\|B^{-1}\|}, \quad p_1 = (B_0^T)^{-1} p_0.$$

and the resonant segment Γ_{k_1} is represented by $\Gamma^s = \{p : \partial_{p^s} H_0 = 0\}$ in the new coordinates.

Let us consider the following set:

$$\mathcal{R}(\epsilon, \delta, p_1) = \left\{ N_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon Z(\theta^s, p) + \epsilon R(\theta, p, t), \quad \|R\|_{C_I^2(\mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{K_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}}(p_1) \times \mathbb{T})} < \delta \right\}.$$

We show that the system N_ϵ admits a three dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder of the type

$$(\theta^s, p^f) = (\Theta^s, P^s)(\theta^f, p^f, t).$$

and if we consider the discrete Aubry set, it is a graph over θ^f component. The details will be given in Section 9, here we state the consequences of those results:

³This is the only part where the space irreducibility of resonance is used.

Proposition 3.6 (See Theorem 9.3). *Assume that $Z(\theta^s, p)$ satisfies condition $[SR1_\lambda]$ at $p_1 \in \Gamma^s$. Then there is $\delta_0, \epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on D, λ such that if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, for each $N \in \mathcal{R}(\epsilon, \delta, p_1)$, each $c \in B_{K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_1) \cap \Gamma^s$ the pair (N, c) is of Aubry-Mather type.*

Proposition 3.7 (See Theorem 9.4). *Consider N_ϵ as in Proposition 3.6, and assume that $Z(\theta^s, p)$ satisfies condition $[SR2_\lambda]$ at $p_2 \in \Gamma^s$. Then there is $\delta_0, \epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on D, λ such that if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, there is an open and dense subset $\mathcal{R}_1 \subset \mathcal{R}(\epsilon, \delta, p_1)$, such that each $c \in B_{K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_1) \cap \Gamma^s$ the pair (N, c) is of bifurcation Aubry-Mather type.*

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Choose $K_0 = 1/\delta_0$. Let Γ be a connected component of (3.1), and consider $c_0 \in \Gamma$. Then there is $p_0 \in \Gamma_k$ such that $c_0 \in B_{K_2\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_0)$ (this is possible by choosing Q large in (3.3)), where $K_2 = K/\|B^{-1}\|^2$. After the coordinate change, c is mapped to $c_1 = (M_0^T)^{-1}(c)$ which is contained in $B_{K_1/2}(p_1)$ with $K_1 = K/\|B^{-1}\|$. We now apply either Proposition 3.6 or 3.7 depending on the condition, and conclude that on the curve $B_{K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_1) \cap \Gamma^s$, each c is of Aubry-Mather or bifurcation AM type, relative to N_ϵ . We now apply Proposition 2.8, to conclude that either **(Ma)**, **(Bif)**, or **(Ar)** holds for each $c \in B_{K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_1) \cap \Gamma^s$, on a C^r -residual subset $\mathcal{R}_\sigma(N_\epsilon)$ of $N \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(N_\epsilon)$, for some $\sigma > 0$.

We now revert the coordinate change. The fact that the coordinate change is C^∞ implies the mapping $H_\epsilon \mapsto (\Phi_L \circ \Phi_\epsilon)^*H_\epsilon =: \Phi^*H_\epsilon$ is a homeomorphism between C^r spaces, and in particular, open neighborhoods and residual subsets are preserved between coordinate changes. As a result, there is $\sigma' > 0$ and a residual subset $\mathcal{R}_{\sigma'}(H_\epsilon)$ of $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma'}(H_\epsilon)$, such that $H \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma'}(H_\epsilon)$ implies $\Phi^*H_\epsilon \in \mathcal{R}_\sigma(N_\epsilon)$. Then Lemma 2.7 (invariance of diffusion mechanism under symplectic coordinate changes) implies for each $c \in B_{K_2\sqrt{\epsilon}/2}(p_0) \cap \Gamma$, and for each $H \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma'}(H_\epsilon)$, one of **(Ma)**, **(Bif)**, or **(Ar)** hold.

We now apply the above argument to each $c \in \Gamma$, and establish **(Ma)**, **(Bif)**, or **(Ar)** for an neighborhood $B_{\sigma(c)}(c)$ of c , on a C^r residual subset \mathcal{R}_c of $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma(c)}(H)$. By compactness, Γ can be covered by finitely many $B_{\sigma(c_i)}(c_i)$'s, then by taking intersections over \mathcal{R}_{c_i} , we conclude that our conditions hold on all $c \in \Gamma$, over a residual subset of $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma_0}(H_\epsilon)$, where $\sigma_0 = \min \sigma(c_i)$. The theorem follows. \square

4 Double resonance: geometric description

In this section we describe the non-degeneracy condition at the double resonance. We then describe the normally hyperbolic cylinders in this regime. In next section, we will return to variational setting, define the cohomology classes and prove their forcing equivalence.

4.1 The slow system

We now consider one of the strong double resonance. Let $k \in \mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma, K)$, and denote $p_0 = \Gamma_{k_1, k}$, and $\omega_0 = \nabla H_0(p)$. Define

$$\Lambda = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{k_1, k\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^3,$$

and choose $k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3$ such that $\Lambda = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\{k_1, k_2\}$. It is always possible to choose $|k_2| \leq |k_1| + K$.

Given $H_1 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} h_k(p) e^{2\pi i k \cdot (\theta, t)}$, we define

$$[H_1]_{\Lambda} = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} h_k(p) e^{2\pi i k \cdot (\theta, t)}.$$

Then after a symplectic coordinate change defined on the set $K\sqrt{\epsilon}$ (see Theorem B.1), the system has the normal form:

$$N_{\epsilon} = \Phi_{\epsilon}^* H_{\epsilon} = H_0 + \epsilon [H_1]_{\Lambda} + O(\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}).$$

The system is conjugate to a two degrees of freedom mechanical system after a coordinate change and an energy reduction. The details are given in Appendix B, here we give a brief description. Let $k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ be such that

$$B^T = [k_1 \quad k_2 \quad k_3] \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z}).$$

To define a symplectic coordinate change, we consider the corresponding autonomous system $N_{\epsilon}(\theta, p, t) + E$, and consider the coordinate change

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta, p, t, E) &= \Phi_L(\varphi, I, \tau, F), \\ \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix} &= B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi \\ \tau/\sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} p - p_0 \\ E + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} = B^T \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon} I \\ \epsilon F \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

One checks that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}, \quad d\theta \wedge dp + dt \wedge dE) \\ &\xrightarrow{\Phi_L} \left(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(d\varphi \wedge dI + d\tau \wedge dF) \right) \end{aligned}$$

is an exact symplectic coordinate change. The transformed Hamiltonian $(N_{\epsilon} + E) \circ \Phi_L$ is no longer Tonelli in the standard sense, however by using a standard energy reduction on the energy level 0, with τ as the new time takes the system to

$$\frac{1}{\beta} (K(I) - U_0(\varphi) + \sqrt{\epsilon} P(\varphi, I, \tau)), \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{T}^2, I \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tau \in \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T},$$

where

$$\beta = k_3 \cdot (\omega_0, 1), \quad K(I) = \frac{1}{2} (B_0 \partial_{pp}^2 H_0(p_0) B_0^T), \quad B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} k_1^T \\ k_2^T \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$U(k_1 \cdot (\theta, t), k_2 \cdot (\theta, t)) = -[H_1]_\Lambda(\theta, p_0, t).$$

The system

$$H^s(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi) = K - U \tag{4.2}$$

is called the slow mechanical system, and the non-degeneracy conditions at the double resonance p_0 is stated for this system.

4.2 Non-degeneracy conditions for the slow system

We consider the (shifted) energy as a parameter. For each $E > 0$, by the Maupertuis principle, the Hamiltonian dynamics on the energy surface $\mathcal{S}_E := \{(\varphi, I) : H^s(\varphi, I) + \min U(\varphi) = E\}$, is the time change of the geodesic flow for the Jacobi metric

$$g_E(\varphi)(v) = 2(E + U(\varphi)) K^{-1}(v),$$

where $K^{-1}(v) = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{II}^2 K)^{-1} v \cdot v$ is the Lagrangian associated to the Hamiltonian $K(I)$.

We will be interested in a special homology class $h = (0, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \simeq H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$. They represent classes of the original system satisfying $k_1 \cdot (\theta, 1) = 0$, i.e. orbits that travel close to the resonance Γ_{k_1} . We assume the following non-degeneracy conditions:

[DR1^h] For each $E \in (0, \infty)$, each shortest closed geodesic (called a loop) of g_E in the homology class h is a hyperbolic orbit of the geodesic flow.

[DR2^h] At all but finitely many bifurcation values, there is only one g_E -shortest loop. At each bifurcation value E , there are exactly two shortest g_E loops denoted γ_h^E and $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$.

[DR3^h] At bifurcation value E_* ,

$$\frac{d(\ell_E(\gamma_h^E))}{dE} \Big|_{E=E_*} \neq \frac{d(\ell_E(\bar{\gamma}_h^E))}{dE} \Big|_{E=E_*},$$

where ℓ_E denote the g_E length of a loop.

We now discuss the conditions at the critical shifted energy $E = 0$. The Jacobi metric g_0 becomes degenerate at one point $\varphi_* = \operatorname{argmin}_\varphi U(\varphi)$. By performing a translation, we may assume $\varphi_* = 0$. Let γ_h^0 be a shortest loop of g_0 in the homology h . Consider the following cases:

1. $0 \in \gamma_h^0$ and γ_h^0 is not self-intersecting. Call such homology class h *simple critical* and the corresponding geodesic γ_h^0 *simple loop*.
2. $0 \in \gamma_h^0$ and γ_h^0 is self-intersecting. Call such homology class h *non-simple* and the corresponding geodesic γ_h^0 *non-simple*.
3. $0 \notin \gamma_h^0$, then γ_h^0 is a regular geodesic. Call such homology class h *simple non-critical*.

Mather [63] proved that generically only these three cases occur (see below for the precise claim).

Lemma 4.1. *Let h be a non-simple homology class. Then for a generic potential U the curve γ_h^0 is the concatenation of two simple loops, possibly with multiplicities. More precisely, given $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ generically there are simple homology classes $h_1, h_2 \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^s, \mathbb{Z})$ and integers $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that the corresponding minimal geodesics $\gamma_{h_1}^0$ and $\gamma_{h_2}^0$ are simple and $h = n_1 h_1 + n_2 h_2$.*

We call γ_h^0 extensible if there exists a family of shortest curves γ_h^E converging to it in the Hausdorff topology. Consider the lift of γ_h^E to the universal cover \mathbb{R}^2 , then as $E \rightarrow 0$ it converges to a periodic curve in \mathbb{R}^2 consists of concatenation of $\gamma_{h_1}^0$ and $\gamma_{h_2}^0$. Let $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \{0, 1\}^N$ be the order that $\gamma_{h_i}^0$ are traced.

Lemma 4.2 (See Section 10.8). *Assume that γ_h^0 is extensible, then the sequence $(\sigma_n, \dots, \sigma_n)$, as described, is uniquely determined up to cyclic permutation. We write*

$$\gamma_h^E \rightarrow \gamma_{h_{\sigma_1}}^0 * \dots * \gamma_{h_{\sigma_n}}^0, \quad \text{as } E \rightarrow 0.$$

We note that $(0, 0)$ is a fixed point of the Hamiltonian flow $H^s(\varphi, I)$ which is hyperbolic if $\partial_{\theta\theta}^2 U(0) > 0$. Any simple g_0 -shortest loop corresponds to a homoclinic orbit of the fixed point $(0, 0)$. We impose the following non-degeneracy conditions:

- [DR1^c] $(0, 0)$ is a hyperbolic fixed point with distinct eigenvalues $-\lambda_2 < -\lambda_1 < 0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Let v_1^\pm, v_2^\pm be the eigendirections for $\pm\lambda_1, \pm\lambda_2$.
- [DR2^c] There is a unique g_0 -shortest loop in the homology h . If it is non-simple, then it is the concatenation of two simple loops $\gamma_{h_1}^0$ and $\gamma_{h_2}^0$.
- [DR3^c] If γ_h^0 is simple critical, then it is *not* tangent to the $\langle v_2^+, v_2^- \rangle$ plane. If γ_h^0 is non-simple, then each of $\gamma_{h_1}^0$ and $\gamma_{h_2}^0$ are not tangent to the $\langle v_2^+, v_2^- \rangle$ plane.
- [DR4^c]
 - If γ_h^0 is simple non-critical, then γ_h^0 is hyperbolic.
 - If γ_h^0 is simple critical, then γ_h^0 is non-degenerate in the sense that it is the transversal intersection of the stable and unstable manifolds of $(0, 0)$.

- If γ_h^0 is non-simple, then each of $\gamma_{h_1}^0$ and $\gamma_{h_2}^0$ is non-degenerate.

The genericity of these conditions are summarized in the following statement.

Proposition 4.3. *The conditions $[DR1^h - DR3^h]$ and $[DR1^c - DR4^c]$ hold on an open and dense set of potentials $U \in C^r(\mathbb{T}^2)$, for $r \geq 2$.*

4.3 Normally hyperbolic cylinders

Conditions $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$ ensures that for each $E_0 > 0$, the set

$$\bigcup_{E \in (E_0 - \delta, E_0 + \delta)} \eta_h^E$$

is a normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder. This cylinder does not necessarily extend to the shifted energy $E = 0$. The following statement ensures existence of cylinders near critical energy, using the conditions $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$.

Recall that γ_h^0 is a shortest curve in the critical energy. The corresponding set in the phase space is called η_h^0 . Due to the symmetry of the system, we also have the shortest curve γ_{-h}^0 which coincide with γ_h^0 but has a different orientation.

Theorem 4.1 (See Section 10). *Suppose that H^s satisfies conditions $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$.*

1. *If γ_h^0 is simple, then there is $e > 0$ depending on H^s such that:*
 - (a) *For each $0 < E < e$, there exist periodic orbits η_h^E and η_{-h}^E , such that the projections $\gamma_h^E \rightarrow \gamma_h^0$ and $\gamma_{-h}^E \rightarrow \gamma_{-h}^0$ in the Hausdorff topology.*
 - (b) *For each $-e < E < 0$, there exists a periodic orbit η_c^E which shadows the concatenation of η_h^0 and η_{-h}^0 .*

Then the union

$$\bigcup_{0 < E < e} (\eta_h^E \cup \eta_{-h}^E) \cup \eta_h^0 \cup \eta_{-h}^0 \cup \bigcup_{-e < E < 0} \eta_c^E$$

is a C^1 normally hyperbolic invariant manifold containing the homoclinics $\eta_{\pm h}^0$.

2. *If γ_h^0 is non-simple: Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ be the sequence determined in Lemma 4.2, $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$ ensures γ_h^0 is extensible. More precisely, there is $e > 0$ such that for each $0 < E < e$, there is a periodic orbit γ_h^E such that $\gamma_h^E \rightarrow \gamma_{h_{\sigma_1}}^0 * \dots * \gamma_{h_{\sigma_n}}^0$. Moreover, each γ_h^E is hyperbolic.*




Figure 4.1: Extension of homoclinics to periodic orbits, simple and non-simple.

Theorem 4.1 allows us to prove Proposition 4.3 together with the following statements.

Theorem 4.2 (See Appendix A). *Fix two parameters $0 < e_0 < \bar{E}$, then the set of potentials U such that $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$ hold on the smaller interval $E \in [e_0, E]$ is open and dense in $C^r(\mathbb{T}^2)$, for $r \geq 2$.*

The following statement is proved in Section A.4.

Proposition 4.4. *The set of potentials $U \in C^r(\mathbb{T}^2)$ such that all γ_h^E for $E \geq \bar{E}$ is unique and hyperbolic is open and dense for $r \geq 2$.*

The following statement is proved in Section A.5.

Proposition 4.5. *The set of potentials U such that $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$ hold is open and dense in $C^r(\mathbb{T}^2)$, for $r \geq 2$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Proposition 4.5 implies the set of potentials which satisfy $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$ is open and dense. By Theorem 4.1 the set of potentials \mathcal{U}_{crit} such that there is $e_0 > 0$ such that all γ_h^E are unique and hyperbolic for all $0 < E < e_0$ is open and dense.

The set \mathcal{U}_{High} of U 's such that there exists $\bar{E} > 0$ such that all γ_h^E are unique and hyperbolic is open and dense by Proposition 4.4. By Theorem 4.2 the set of potentials $\mathcal{U}_{med}^{e_0, \bar{E}}$ such that for given $0 < e_0 < \bar{E}$, $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$ holds on $E \in [e_0, E]$

⁴Note that we do not assume $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$

is also open and dense. As a result the set of potentials, where $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$ holds on $E \in (0, \infty)$ is

$$\mathcal{U}_{crit} \cap \bigcup_{0 < e_0 < \bar{E}} \mathcal{U}_{med}^{e_0, \bar{E}} \cap \mathcal{U}_{high}$$

which is open and dense. □

Diffusion across a double resonance: a geometric description

The diffusion across a double resonance may be described heuristically as follows:

- If h is a simple homology, then the cylinder extends to the shifted energy $E < 0$ and connecting with the homology $-h$. As a result, the family of periodic orbits γ_h^E , $E \geq 0$ and γ_{-h}^E , $E \geq 0$ are all contained in a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold. This corresponds to a continuous curve of cohomologies that are of Aubry-Mather type. Moreover, this picture survives small perturbations of H^s .
- If h is non-simple, then the cylinder “pinches” at $E = 0$. In particular, after considering the perturbation $H^s + \sqrt{\epsilon}P$ of the slow system, the cylinder may not survive the perturbation for E sufficiently close to 0. However, for each simple homology h_1, h_2 , there exists a simple cylinder due to Theorem 4.1, item 1. The two simple cylinders are tangent to the weak stable/unstable directions plane at the fixed point $(0, 0)$. See Figure 4.2.

To diffuse across a double resonance, we “jump” from the cylinder for homology h to the cylinder with homology h_1 , then diffuse across to homology $-h_1$ since h_1 is now simple, then jump back to homology $-h$. All of these are realized by choosing the appropriate cohomology curves the lie on these cylinders. This construction is detailed in Section 5. See also Figure 5.1.

4.4 Local maps and global maps

In this section we outline the basic approach to proving Theorem 4.1, based on ideas of Shil’nikov and others ([18], [70], [75]). The full proofs are given in Section 10.

Let us describe the simple homology case first. Let $\eta^+ = \eta_h^0$ be the homoclinic orbit to the hyperbolic fixed point $O = (0, 0)$, and $\eta^- = \eta_{-h}^0$ its time-reversal. Condition $[DR2^c]$ ensures that η^\pm are not tangent to the strong stable/unstable directions, which implies they must be tangent to the weak stable/unstable directions.

Consider four (three dimensional) sections

$$\Sigma_\pm^u, \quad \Sigma_\pm^s$$




Figure 4.2: Hyperbolic invariant manifolds with kissing property

transverse to the weak stable and unstable eigen-directions, sufficiently close to the origin O , on each side of the equilibrium (see (10.5)). Up to renaming, we may assume that $\Sigma_+^{s/u}$ is transverse to η^+ , and $\Sigma_-^{s/u}$ is transverse to η^- . We then define four local maps:

$$\Phi_{\text{loc}}^{ij} : U_i (\subset \Sigma_i^s) \longrightarrow \Sigma_j^u, \quad i, j \in \{+, -\}$$

as the Poincaré map between the corresponding sections. Note that these maps are *not defined on the whole section*, in particular, they are undefined along the (full) stable/unstable manifolds $W^{s/u}(O)$. However, they are defined on open sets. Moreover, we have a pair of global maps

$$\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ : \Sigma_+^u \longrightarrow \Sigma_+^s, \quad \Phi_{\text{glob}}^- : \Sigma_-^u \longrightarrow \Sigma_-^s$$

which are the Poincaré maps along the orbits η^+ and η^- . These maps are well defined from a neighborhood of $\Sigma_{\pm}^u \cap \eta^{\pm}$ to a neighborhood of $\Sigma_{\pm}^s \cap \eta^{\pm}$. See Figure 4.3.

The periodic orbits obtained in Theorem 4.1 corresponds to the fixed points of compositions of local and global maps, when restricted to the suitable energy surfaces. More precisely:

- The orbits η_h^E , $E > 0$ correspond to the fixed point of $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}|_{S_E}$, where S_E denote the energy surface $\{H^s + \min U(\varphi) = E\}$, and similarly for η_{-h}^E .
- The orbits η_c^E , $E < 0$ correspond to the fixed point of $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{-+} \circ \Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{+-}|_{S_E}$.




Figure 4.3: A local map and a global map

In the non-simple case, we similarly consider two homoclinics $\eta_1 = \eta_{h_1}$ and $\eta_2 = \eta_{h_2}$, and assume that both crosses the sections $\Sigma_+^{s/u}$. Then we have the same local maps, and different global maps $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^{1/2}$. The periodic orbit η_h^E corresponds to the fixed point of

$$\prod_{i=n}^1 (\Phi_{\text{glob}}^{\sigma_i} \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++})|_{S_E},$$

where σ_i is the sequence in Lemma 4.2.

5 Double resonance: choice of cohomology and forcing equivalence

5.1 Choice of cohomologies for the slow system

As in the case of single resonance, our strategy is to choose a continuous curve in the cohomology space, and prove forcing equivalence up to a residual perturbation. To do this, we need to use the duality between homology and cohomology.

Let L be the Lagrangian associated to the Hamiltonian H , and let μ denote an invariant measure of the Euler–Lagrange flow. The rotation vector of μ is given by $\rho(\mu) = \int v d\mu(\theta, t, t)$. Then Mather’s alpha and beta functions are defined as:

$$\alpha_H(c) = -\inf_{\mu} \int (L(\theta, v, t) - c \cdot v) d\mu, \quad \beta_H(\rho) = \inf_{\rho(\mu)=\rho} \int L(\theta, v, t) d\mu.$$

A measure reaching the minimum in the definition of $\alpha_H(c)$ is called c -minimal. Then

α and β are both convex and Fenchel dual of each other:

$$\beta_H(\rho) = \sup\{\rho \cdot c - \alpha_H(c)\}.$$

The Legendre-Fenchel transform of β is defined as

$$\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_H}(\rho) = \{c \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \beta_H(\rho) = \rho \cdot c - \alpha_H(c)\}.$$

Geometrically,

$$\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_H}(\rho) = \text{conv} \{c : \text{there is a } c\text{-minimal } \mu \text{ such that } \rho(\mu) = \rho\}$$

where *conv* denotes the convex hull.

Let γ_h^E be a shortest loop for the Jacobi metric g_E . Let $T(\gamma_h^E)$ denotes its period under the Hamiltonian flow, and if γ_h^E is unique, we define

$$\lambda_h^E = 1/T(\gamma_h^E).$$

If H^s satisfies $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$, then there are at most finitely many E 's such that there are two shortest loops γ_h^E and $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$. We will show that the set $\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_{H^s}}(\lambda_h^E h) = \mathcal{LF}_{\beta_{H^s}}(\bar{\lambda}_h^E h)$, and, therefore, the set $\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_H^s}(\lambda_h^E h)$ is independent of the choice of γ_h^E .

Each $\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_H^s}(\lambda_h^E h)$ is a segment of nonzero length parallel to h^\perp , and depends continuously on E . We call the union

$$\bigcup_{E>0} \mathcal{LF}_{\beta_{H^s}}(\lambda_h^E h) \tag{5.1}$$

the *channel* associated to the homology h , and we will choose a curve of cohomologies in the *interior* of this channel. The channel is connected at the bottom to the set $\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_H}(0)$, which is a convex set with non-empty interior. The following proposition summarizes the channel picture and the relation to the Aubry sets.

Proposition 5.1 (See Section C). *Assume that H^s satisfies the conditions $[DR1^h - DR3^h]$ and $[DR1^c - DR4^c]$. Then each $\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_{H^s}}(\lambda_h^E h)$ is a segment of non-zero length orthogonal to h , which varies continuously with respect to E .*

For $\bar{E} > 0$, let $\bar{c}_h : (0, \bar{E}] \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{T}^s, \mathbb{R})$ be a C^1 function such that $\bar{c}_h(E)$ is in the relative interior of $\mathcal{LF}_{\beta_H}(\lambda_h^E h)$. The following hold.

1. *If E is not a bifurcation energy, then $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E)) = \gamma_h^E$.*
2. *If E is a bifurcation energy, $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E)) = \gamma_h^E \cup \bar{\gamma}_h^E$.*
3. *If h is simple, then the limit $\lim_{E \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{LF}_{\beta_{H^s}}(\lambda_h^E h)$ contains a segment of non-zero width. We assume, in addition, that $\bar{c}_h(0)$ is in the relative interior of this segment.*




Figure 5.1: Choice of cohomology for H^s . Left: simple case; right: non-simple case

(a) If h is simple critical, then $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0)) = \gamma_h^0$; for each $0 \leq \lambda < 1$, $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\lambda\bar{c}_h(0)) = \{\varphi = 0\}$.

(b) If h is simple non-critical, then $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0)) = \gamma_h^0 \cup \{\varphi = 0\}$; for each $0 \leq \lambda < 1$, $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\lambda\bar{c}_h(0)) = \{\varphi = 0\}$.

4. If h is non-simple, then the limit $\lim_{E \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}\mathcal{F}_{\beta_{H^s}}(\lambda_h^E h)$ is a single point.

Let us also note that due to symmetry of the system, $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{F}_{\beta_H}(-\lambda h) = -\mathcal{L}\mathcal{F}_{\beta_H}(\lambda h)$. Denote $\bar{c}_{-h}(E) = -\bar{c}_h(E)$. We now choose the cohomology classes for H^s as follows: if h is simple (either critical or non-critical), we choose

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Gamma}_h &= \bar{\Gamma}_h(\bar{E}) = \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq E \leq \bar{E}} \bar{c}_h(E) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \lambda \bar{c}_h(0) \right), \\ \bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR} &= \bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR}(\bar{E}) = \bar{\Gamma}_h \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{-h} = \bar{\Gamma}_h \cup (-\bar{\Gamma}_h). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The curve $\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR}$ is a continuous curve connecting $\bar{c}_h(\bar{E})$, 0, and $\bar{c}_{-h}(\bar{E})$.

If h is non-simple, then $h = n_1 h_1 + n_2 h_2$ is a combination of simple homologies h_1 and h_2 . Let $0 < \mu < e$ be parameters. Define

$$\bar{\Gamma}_h^e = \bigcup_{e \leq E \leq \bar{E}} \bar{c}_h(E). \quad (5.3)$$

Since h_1 is simple critical, we choose a continuous curve $\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E)$ such that

$$\|\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(0) - \bar{c}_h(0)\| < \mu.$$

We then define

$$\bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e,\mu} = \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq E \leq e+\mu} \bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \lambda \bar{c}_{h_1}(0) \right). \quad (5.4)$$

$\bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e,\mu}$ is a continuous curve connecting $\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(e+\mu)$ with 0 (see Fig. 5.1, right). We then define

$$\bar{\Gamma}_h = \bar{\Gamma}_h^e \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e,\mu}, \quad \bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR} = \bar{\Gamma}_h \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{-h}. \quad (5.5)$$

Let us note that the set $\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR}$ consists of three connected component, $\bar{\Gamma}_h^e$, $\bar{\Gamma}_{-h}^e$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e,\mu} \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{-h_1}^{e,\mu}$. Since the mechanisms we described so far can only prove forcing equivalence along a connected set, we will use a different mechanism called ‘‘jump’’ to prove forcing-equivalence of different connected components.

5.2 Aubry-Mather type at a double resonance

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose $H^s = K(I) - U(\varphi)$ satisfies the non-degeneracy assumptions. Given $C > 0$, there is $\epsilon_0, \delta > 0$ depending on H^s and C such that for each $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, if $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$ and $\|P\|_{C^2} < C$, then for*

$$H_\epsilon^s = \frac{1}{\beta} (K(I) - U'(\varphi) + \sqrt{\epsilon}P(\varphi, I, \tau)).$$

each $\bar{c} \in \bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR}$ is of one of fours types: Aubry-Mather type, bifurcation Aubry-Mather type, asymmetric bifurcation type, or $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}$ is a hyperbolic periodic orbit. Note that this applies to all types of homologies: simple critical, simple non-critical, and non-simple.

Proof. We prove our proposition by referring to technical statement proved in later sections.

(1) *Simple, critical homology.* Denote $c_0 = \bar{c}_h(0)$. Theorem 11.3 states that there exists $\epsilon_0, \epsilon, \delta > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$, and $c \in B_\epsilon(c_0)$, the pair H_ϵ^s, c is of Aubry-Mather type. The same theorem also states $H_\epsilon^s, \lambda c_0$ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ is of Aubry-Mather type. This covers the cohomologies:

$$c \in \bigcup_{0 \leq E \leq e} \bar{c}_h(E) \cup \bigcup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \lambda \bar{c}_h(0).$$

The cohomologies $\bigcup_{e \leq E \leq \bar{e}} \bar{c}_h(E)$, is covered in Theorem 11.1, which states that for each $e > 0$, for there is ϵ, δ as in our proposition, such that with respect to H_ϵ^s , the cohomology $\bar{c}_h(E)$, $E \geq e$ is of Aubry-Mather type if γ_h^E is the unique shortest curve, and of bifurcation Aubry-Mather type if there are two shortest curves. As a result, all cohomologies in $\bar{\Gamma}_h$ are of AM or bifurcation AM type, and by symmetry, so does $\bar{\Gamma}_{-h}$. This proves our proposition in the simple homology case, see (5.2).

(2) *Non-simple homology.* In the non-simple case, the cohomology curve $\bar{\Gamma}_h$ is the disjoint union of two parts, namely

$$\bar{\Gamma}_h^e = \bigcup_{e \leq E \leq \bar{E}} \bar{c}_h(E), \quad \bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e,\mu} = \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq E \leq e+\mu} \bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \lambda \bar{c}_{h_1}(0) \right).$$

We note that h_1 is a simple homology and therefore each $c \in \bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e,\mu}$ are of AM type in the same way as in case (1). On the other hand, each homology in $\bar{\Gamma}_h^e$ is of AM or bifurcation AM type since Theorem 11.1 applies the same way to simple and non-simple homology. We conclude that our Proposition holds in the non-simple case.

(3) *Simple, non-critical homology.* The high energy case follows from Theorem 11.1 in the same way as before. The critical energy follows from Theorem 11.2, the main difference is that the critical energy is an asymmetric bifurcation (see Definition 8.3). For $c = \lambda \bar{c}_h(0)$ where $0 \leq \lambda < 1$, the Aubry set is a single periodic orbit as a perturbation of the hyperbolic fixed point $(0, 0)$. \square

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose H_ϵ^s is from Proposition 5.2, then there is $\sigma > 0$ and a residual subset \mathcal{R} of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_\epsilon^s)$, such that if $H' \in \mathcal{R}$, then each $\bar{c} \in \bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR}$ satisfies one of the diffusion mechanisms **(Ma)**, **(Bif)** and **(Ar)**.*

Proof. Note that Proposition 2.8 applies when c is either Aubry-Mather type, bifurcation Aubry-Mather type, asymmetric bifurcation type. Then Using Proposition 5.2, we only need to show the same conclusion hold if we add a fourth case, when the Aubry set is a single hyperbolic periodic orbit. However, in this case, $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^0 = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0$ is discrete, so **(Ma)** applies. \square

We now revert to the original coordinate system. Denote $p_0 = \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}$ the double resonance point. For a given cohomology class $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we consider the pair c, α defined by the equality

$$\begin{bmatrix} c - p_0 \\ -\alpha + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} = M^T \begin{bmatrix} \bar{c} \sqrt{\epsilon} \\ \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) \epsilon \end{bmatrix} \quad (5.6)$$

then $\alpha = \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c)$ (compare to (4.1)). If (5.6) is satisfied, we denote

$$(c, -\alpha) = \Phi_L^*(\bar{c}, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})), \quad c = \Phi_{L, H_\epsilon^s}^*(\bar{c}).$$

Moreover, let us consider the autonomous version of the Aubry set:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s + F}(\bar{c}) = \{(\varphi, I, \tau, -H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau)) : (\varphi, I, \tau) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})\},$$

and similarly define $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. Then by Proposition B.7

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon + E}(c) = \Phi_L \left(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s + F}(\bar{c}) \right), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon + E}(c) = \Phi_L \left(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon^s + F}(\bar{c}) \right). \quad (5.7)$$

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose c, \bar{c} are related by (5.6). Then with respect to N_ϵ , c satisfies one of the diffusion mechanisms **(Ma)**, **(Bif)** and **(Ar)** if and only if \bar{c} does the same with respect to H_ϵ^s .*

Proof. The main issue here is that **(Ma)**, **(Bif)** and **(Ar)** are defined for the zero section $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^0$, but the symplectic coordinate change Φ_L does not preserve the zero section. However, the property that there *exists* a global section of the Hamiltonian flow such that one of **(Ma)**, **(Bif)** or **(Ar)** applies to the intersection of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ or $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ with the section, is invariant under the coordinate change Φ_L , due to (5.7). Since any two global sections are related by the Poincare map, any topological properties of invariant sets are equivalent across different sections. \square

5.3 Connecting to Γ_{k_1, k_2} and $\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$

At this point it is natural to consider the cohomology class

$$\Phi_{L, H_\epsilon^s}^* (\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR}) := \pi_c (\{\Phi_L^* (\bar{c}, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})) : \bar{c} \in \Gamma_h^{DR}\}) \quad (5.8)$$

(see (5.6)) where π_c denote the projection $(c, -\alpha) \mapsto c \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We note that α is automatically determined by c via the relation $\alpha = \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c) = \alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c)$.

We would like to choose the cohomology $\Phi_{L, H_\epsilon^s}^* (\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR})$ for the original system, but due to the ϵ dependence of the map, the new set does not necessarily contain the double resonance point Γ_{k_1, k_2} , nor does it connect to the cohomology $\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$ already chosen at single resonance. To solve this problem, we will add three pieces of “connectors” to the set: Γ_0^{con} is used to connect to Γ_{k_1, k_2} , and Γ_\pm^{con} to connect to Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{SR} . Then

$$\Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}(\epsilon, H_1) = \Phi_{L, H_\epsilon^s}^* (\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR}) \cup \Gamma_0^{\text{con}} \cup \Gamma_-^{\text{con}} \cup \Gamma_+^{\text{con}}. \quad (5.9)$$

See Figure 5.2.

5.3.1 Connecting to the double resonance point

We define

$$c_0 = \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}, \quad c_0^\epsilon = \Phi_{L, H_\epsilon^s}^* (0, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(0)), \quad \Gamma_0^{\text{con}} = \bigcup_{s \in [0, 1]} \{s c_0 + (1-s) c_0^\epsilon\}$$

and define h to be the homology class corresponding to k_1 .

Notice that we add a small segment to connect directly to Γ_{k_1, k_2} .

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose H_1 satisfies the conditions $[DR1^h - DR3^h]$ and $[DR1^c - DR4^c]$ at the double resonance Γ_{k_1, k_2} relative to Γ_{k_1} . Then there is*




Figure 5.2: Cohomology curve at double resonance, with connectors

$\epsilon_0, \delta > 0$ depending only on H^s such that for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)$ and $0 \leq s \leq 1$, for $H'_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon H'_1$:

$$\mathcal{N}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(sc_0 + (1-s)c_0^\epsilon) = \mathcal{A}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(sc_0 + (1-s)c_0^\epsilon) = \mathcal{A}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(c_0) = \mathcal{A}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(c_0^\epsilon)$$

is contractible in \mathbb{T}^2 . As a result the cohomologies in Γ_0^{con} are forcing equivalent.

Proof. Consider $\bar{c}_0^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\bar{\alpha}_0^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ defined by the formula

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{c}_0^\epsilon \sqrt{\epsilon} \\ \bar{\alpha}_0^\epsilon \epsilon \end{bmatrix} = M^{-T} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c_0) + H_0(c_0) \end{bmatrix},$$

then according to (5.6), $\Phi_{L, H_\epsilon}^*(\bar{c}_0, \bar{\alpha}_0) = c_0$. According to Lemma 7.9, we have $\|\alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c_0) - H_0(c_0)\| \leq C\epsilon$ for some C depending only on H_0 , therefore $\|\bar{c}_0^\epsilon\| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}$.

Recall that $O = (0, 0)$ is a hyperbolic fixed point of the system H^s , and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(0) = O$. By standard perturbation theory of hyperbolic sets, there is a neighborhood $V \ni O$, such that the system $H'_\epsilon = K - U' + \sqrt{\epsilon}P$ with $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$ and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, H'_ϵ admits a unique hyperbolic periodic orbit O_ϵ contained in V . Moreover, using the upper semi-continuity of the Aubry set Corollary 7.2, by possibly choosing δ and ϵ_0 smaller, we ensure for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H'_\epsilon}(\lambda \bar{c}_0^\epsilon) \subset V$, and therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H'_\epsilon}(\lambda \bar{c}_0^\epsilon) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H'_\epsilon}(0) = O_\epsilon$. We note that in this case the Aubry set has a unique static class, hence Aubry set coincides with the Mañe set, also the discrete Aubry set is finite and therefore contractible. We now apply symplectic invariance (5.7) to get the same for the original system. \square




Figure 5.3: Left: cohomology curves, right: rotation vectors.

5.3.2 Connecting single and double resonance

Recall that the single resonance cohomologies $\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, K)$ is defined in (3.1). For each double resonance Γ_{k_1, k_2} , $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2, \pm}^{SR}$ be the two connected component of (3.1) adjacent to Γ_{k_1, k_2} . We define connectors $\Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{con}}$ which connect the double resonance cohomology curve $\Phi_L^*(\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR})$ to $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2, \pm}^{SR}$, respectively.

Let $c \in \mathbb{R}^2 \simeq H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ be a cohomology, and let $\rho_H(c)$ denote the convex hull of rotation vectors of all c -minimal measures. This coincides with the Legendre-Fenchel transform relative to the alpha function

$$\rho_H(c) = \mathcal{LF}_{\alpha_H}(c) \subset \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Note that $\rho_H(c)$ is a set valued function taking values in convex sets. A common feature of the cohomology classes we've chosen is that they stay on the rational line

$$\Omega_{k_1} = \{\omega : k_1 \cdot (\omega, 1) = 0\}.$$

Let us also denote $\Omega_{k_1, k_2} = \Omega_{k_1} \cap \Omega_{k_2}$, $c_0 = \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}$, and $\omega_0 = \Omega_{k_1, k_2}$.

The main observation is that the rotation vector of the curve $\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, K)$ and Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} overlap on the line Ω_{k_1} , see Figure 5.3. To prove this statement, we show that the rotation vector of $c \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, K)$ is $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ close to ω_0 at its nearest point, while the rotation vector of $c \in \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}$ is $C^{-1}E\sqrt{\epsilon}$ away from ω_0 when E is sufficiently large. Since both sets lie on the same line, they have to overlap.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2, \pm}^{SR}$ and Γ_{k_1, k_2} be as before. Suppose H_1 the conditions $[DR1^h - DR3^h]$ and $[DR1^c - DR4^c]$ relative to Γ_{k_1} . Then there is $\epsilon_0, \delta > 0$ depending only on H^s such that for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ such that if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, and $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)$, for $H'_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon H'_1$:*

1. For each $c \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, K)$, $\rho_{H'_\epsilon}(c)$ is a single point contained in Ω_{k_1} . The function $\rho_{H'_\epsilon}(c)$ is continuous on $\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$, and there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho_{H'_\epsilon}(c) - \omega_0\| \leq C\|c - c_0\|, \quad \forall c \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, K).$$

2. Let $c_h(E) = \Phi_L^*(\bar{c}_h(E)) \in \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}$. Then each $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(c_h(E))$ is a single point contained in Ω_{k_1} , and there are $C, E_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho_{H_\epsilon}(c_h(E)) - \omega_0\| \geq C^{-1}E\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad E \geq E_0.$$

As a result, there exists $\bar{E} > 0$ such that for $E > \bar{E}$, the rotation vectors $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(c_h(E))$ coincide with one of $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(\Gamma_{k_1, k_2, \pm}^{SR})$, see Figure 5.3. Similarly, for E sufficiently large, the rotation vectors $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(c_{-h}(E))$ coincide with one of $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(\Gamma_{k_1, k_2, \pm}^{SR})$ (which are not covered in the first case).

Proof. In the single resonance regime, after a linear coordinate change (Section 3.3) the system is converted to $H_0 + \epsilon Z(\theta^s, p) + \epsilon R(\theta^s, \theta^f, p^s, p^f, t)$, where the invariant cylinder is given by $(\theta^s, p^s) = (\Theta^s, P^s)(\theta^f, p^f, t)$, and the Aubry set for any $c \in \Gamma^s = \{(\partial_p H_0(0), 1) \cdot (1, 0, 0) = 0\}$ is a graph over (θ^f, t) (see Theorem 9.1, Theorem 9.2). This implies that any c admits a unique rotation vector, as different rotation vectors will result in intersecting minimizing orbits, which violates the graph theorem. By reverting the coordinate change, we also obtain $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(c) \in \Omega_{k_1}$. We then apply Corollary 7.8, to get (in general)

$$\|\rho_{H_\epsilon}(c) - \nabla H_0(c)\| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon},$$

while

$$\|\nabla H_0(c) - \omega_0\| = \|\nabla H_0(c) - \nabla H_0(c_0)\| \leq C\|c - c_0\|$$

and recall that $\|c - c_0\| \geq K\sqrt{\epsilon}$ for any $c \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$, item (1) follows.

In the double resonance case, the cohomology curve $\bar{c}_h(E)$ at high energy are of Aubry-Mather type corresponding to the homology class $h = (1, 0)$. The same arguments as in the single resonance case implies $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(c)$ is unique, and contained in the line $\omega_1 = 0$. Again by reverting the coordinate change, we obtain the desired property for $\rho_{H_{-\epsilon}}(c)$. For the inequality, note that if any point (φ, I, t) in the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c)$ satisfies $H^s(\varphi, I) \geq E_0$, we have $K(I) \geq H^s(\varphi, I) - \|U\|_{C^0} \geq \frac{1}{2}H^s(\varphi, I)$ if $E_0 \geq 2\|U\|_{C^0}$. As a result

$$\min_{(\varphi, I, \tau) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(\bar{c}_h(E))} \|I\| \geq C^{-1} \min_{(\varphi, I, \tau) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(\bar{c}_h(E))} \sqrt{K(I)} \geq C^{-1}\sqrt{E}$$

for a suitable $C > 1$. Reverting the coordinate change Φ_L implies

$$\min_{(\theta, p, t) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c_h(E))} \|p - p_0\| \geq C^{-1}\|I\|\sqrt{\epsilon} \geq C^{-1}\sqrt{E}\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Finally, we apply Corollary 7.8 again to get our inequality. \square

We have the following lemma:

Lemma 5.7 ([54], Proposition 6). *Let $c_1, c_2 \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ and $\rho \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\rho_H(c_1) = \rho_H(c_2) = \rho$, and both c_1, c_2 lie in the relative interior of $\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\rho)$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c_1) = \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c_2)$.*

Proposition 5.8. *Suppose H_1 satisfies the conditions $[DR1^h - DR3^h]$ and $[DR1^c - DR4^c]$ relative to Γ_{k_1} . Then there is $\epsilon_0, \delta > 0$ depending only on H^s such that for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and a residual subset $\mathcal{R}_\delta(H_1)$ of $\mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)$, for each $H'_1 \in \mathcal{R}_\delta(H_1)$, there is $c_1^\pm \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}(M, K)$ and $c_2^\pm \in \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}$, such that for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and $H'_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon H'_1$*

$$\mathcal{N}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(\lambda c_1^\pm + (1 - \lambda)c_2^\pm) = \mathcal{A}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(\lambda c_1^\pm + (1 - \lambda)c_2^\pm) = \mathcal{A}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(c_1^\pm) = \mathcal{A}_{H'_\epsilon}^0(c_2^\pm)$$

is contractible in \mathbb{T}^2 . As the result both cohomology curves

$$\Gamma_+^{\text{con}} = \bigcup_{s \in [0,1]} \{s c_1^+ + (1 - s)c_2^+\}, \quad \Gamma_-^{\text{con}} = \bigcup_{s \in [0,1]} \{s c_1^- + (1 - s)c_2^-\}$$

are contained in a single forcing equivalent class.

Proof. Proposition 5.6 implies the curves $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR})$ and $\rho_{H_\epsilon}(\Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR})$ overlap on an interval contained in Ω_{k_1} , for all $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)$. In particular, there must be $c_1 \in \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$ and $c_2 \in \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}$ where they both have rational rotation vectors. We now assume that $H'_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon H'_1$ satisfies the residual condition that all Aubry sets with rational rotation vector is supported on a hyperbolic periodic orbit, in this setting $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{N}$, c_1, c_2 are contained in the relative interior of $\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\rho)$. Lemma 5.7 now implies all the Aubry sets $\mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon}(\lambda c_1 + (1 - \lambda)c_2)$, $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ coincide, which implies **(Ma)** applies to the whole segment. The proposition follows. \square

5.4 Jump from non-simple homology to simple homology

As described, when h is not a simple homology, the cohomology class Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} as chosen is not connected. More precisely, Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} consists of three connected components (see also (5.3) and (5.9)):

$$\Phi_L^* \bar{\Gamma}_h^e \cup \Gamma_+^{\text{con}}, \quad \Phi_L^* \bar{\Gamma}_{-h}^e \cup \Gamma_-^{\text{con}}, \quad \Phi_L^* (\bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e, \mu} \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{-h_1}^{e, \mu}) \cup \Gamma_0^{\text{con}}.$$

We will show forcing equivalence of the components by the following:

Theorem 5.1 (Section 12). *Suppose the slow system H^s satisfies the conditions $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$, and that the associated homology $h = n_1 h_1 + n_2 h_2$ is non-simple. Then there exists $e, \mu, \epsilon_0, \delta > 0$ depending on H^s , such that there is a residual subset $\mathcal{R}_\delta(H_1)$ of $\mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)$, and for each $H'_1 \in \mathcal{R}_\delta(H_1)$, there is $E_1, E_2 \in (e, e + \mu)$ such that*

$$\Phi_L^* (\bar{c}_h(E_1)), \quad \Phi_L^* (\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E_2))$$

are forcing equivalent, with respect to $H_0 + \epsilon H'_1$. The same conclusions apply when h, h_1 are replaced with $-h, -h_1$.

See the dashed line in Figure 5.2.

5.5 Forcing equivalence at the double resonance

We summarize all of our constructions in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose H_1 satisfies all non-degeneracy conditions of Γ_{k_1} and Γ_{k_1, k_2} . Then there is $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(H_0, H_1) > 0$, $\delta = \delta(H_0, H_1) > 0$, such that for all $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)$, and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$, there is a subset $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} = \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}(H_0, H'_1, \epsilon)$ satisfying:*

1. $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2} \subset \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}$;
2. Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} intersects both $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2, +}^{SR}$ and $\Gamma_{k_1, k_2, -}^{SR}$;

there is $\sigma = \sigma(H_0, H_1, \epsilon) > 0$ and a residual subset $\mathcal{R}_\sigma(H_0 + \epsilon H'_1)$ of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_0 + \epsilon H'_1)$, such that for all $H \in \mathcal{R}_\sigma(H_0 + \epsilon H'_1)$, all of Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} are forcing equivalent.

Proof. The two properties of Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} hold by construction. During the proof, we say a property hold “after a residual perturbation” if it holds on an residual subset of a neighborhood of the corresponding Hamiltonian. Note that if several properties each hold after a residual perturbation, then they hold simultaneously after a residual perturbation. Moreover, if a property holds after a residual perturbation, and is invariant under coordinate changes, then it also holds in the new coordinate after a residual perturbation, provided the coordinate change is smooth enough. This is the case for our system since all coordinate changes are C^∞ .

Let δ be the smallest parameter depending on H^s such that all of Corollary 5.3, Proposition 5.5 and Proposition 5.8 holds.

Let $\delta_1 = \delta_1(H_0, H_1)$ be such that for any $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{\delta_1}(H_1)$, the associated slow system is in $\mathcal{V}_\delta(H^s)$. Then for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, Lemma B.5 implies the system $H_0 + \epsilon H'_1$ is reduced to a system $(G^s + \sqrt{\epsilon}P)/\beta$ satisfying the conclusions of Corollary 5.3. Moreover, by Proposition 5.4, relative to the the normal form system N_ϵ , one of the three diffusion mechanisms hold for $\Phi_L^*(\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR})$, after taking a residual perturbation. By Lemma 2.7, the same holds for relative to the original system $H_0 + \epsilon H'_1$.

Recall that (see 5.9) Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} consists of the set $\Phi_L^*(\bar{\Gamma}_h^{DR})$ and the connector sets Γ_0^{con} and Γ_\pm^{con} . Proposition 5.5 and 5.8 implies forcing equivalence of the connectors after a residual perturbation. This implies each connected component of Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} are forcing equivalent.

Finally, Theorem 5.1 implies all three components of Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} are equivalent to each other after a residual perturbation. \square

Assuming all the propositions and theorems formulated thus far, we prove Theorem 2.1 which implies our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, which means that H_1 satisfies $SR(k_1, \lambda)$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and all $k_1 \in \mathcal{K}$, and that for all the strong double resonances $k_2 \in \bigcup_{k_1 \in \mathcal{K}} \bigcup \mathcal{K}^{st}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$, H_1 satisfies the non-degeneracy conditions $DR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, k_2)$.

For each k_1 , Theorem 3.1 applies. Therefore, there exists $\epsilon_1^{k_1}(H_0, \lambda) > 0$ such that the theorem applies for each $H_0 + \epsilon H_1$ with $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$. Since $SR(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$ is an open condition, there exists $\delta^{k_1} = \delta^{k_1}(H_0, H_1)$ such that the conclusion of the theorem to all $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{\delta^{k_1}}(H_1)$.

For each k_1, k_2 , the conclusion of Theorem 5.2 holds to all $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{\delta^{k_1, k_2}}(H_1)$ and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1^{k_1, k_2}(H_0, H_1)$. Define

$$\epsilon_1(H_0, H_1) = \min \left\{ \min_{k_1, k_2} \epsilon_1^{k_1, k_2}, \min_{k_1} \epsilon_1^{k_1} \right\}, \quad \delta(H_0, H_1) = \min \left\{ \min_{k_1, k_2} \delta^{k_1, k_2}, \min_{k_1} \delta^{k_1} \right\}.$$

Then the conclusion of both theorems apply to $H'_1 \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(H_1)$ and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$.

Define

$$\Gamma_*(H_0, H'_1, \epsilon) = \bigcup_{k_1 \in \mathcal{K}} \left(\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR} \cup \bigcup_{k_2 \in \mathcal{K}^{st}(k_1, \lambda)} \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} \right).$$

For each single resonance k_1 , the union

$$\Gamma_*^{SR}(k_1) = \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR} \cup \bigcup_{k_2 \in \mathcal{K}^{st}(k_1, \lambda)} \Gamma_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}$$

are contained in a single equivalent class, since each Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR} are forcing equivalent, and they connect all the disconnected pieces from $\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$. If two single resonances Γ_{k_1} and $\Gamma_{k'_1}$ intersect at Γ_{k_1, k'_1} , then $\Gamma_*^{SR}(k_1)$ and $\Gamma_*^{SR}(k'_1)$ also intersect at Γ_{k_1, k'_1} , since Γ_{k_1, k'_1} is contained in both Γ_{k_1, k'_1}^{DR} and $\Gamma_{k'_1, k_1}^{DR}$. As a result, the entire $\Gamma_*(H_0, H'_1, \epsilon)$ is contained in a single forcing equivalent class.

Finally, if U_1, \dots, U_N are open sets which intersect \mathcal{P} , by setting ϵ_0 small enough, they also intersect $\bigcup_{k_1 \in \mathcal{K}} \Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$, since the said union is obtained from \mathcal{P} by removing finitely many neighborhoods of size $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$. Therefore, U_1, \dots, U_N also intersect $\Gamma_*(H_0, H'_1, \epsilon)$. \square

6 Weak KAM theory and forcing equivalence

In this section we give an introduction to weak KAM theory and forcing relation. Most of the presentation follow [11] and [35].

The forcing relation is introduced by Bernard ([11]). It generalizes a similar equivalence relation defined by Mather ([58]), using the point of view of Fathi ([35]), see also [50]. This approach frees us from needing to construct a variational principle

for the global diffusion orbit, as the approaches in [57, 56, 59, 60, 24, 25] requires. Another advantage is that Mather's approach works only on continuous curves of cohomologies, as the his definition is local. The forcing relation allows disconnected pieces of cohomology as long as we prove the forcing relation by definition, enabling the *jump mechanism*.

6.1 Periodic Tonelli Hamiltonians

A C^2 Hamiltonian

$$H : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is called (time-periodic) Tonelli if it satisfies:

1. (Periodicity) There is $0 < \varpi = \varpi_H$ such that $H(\theta, p, t + \varpi) = H(\theta, p, t)$.
2. (Convexity) $\partial_{pp}^2 H(x, p, t)$ is strictly positive definite as a quadratic form.
3. (Superlinearity) $\lim_{\|p\| \rightarrow \infty} H(x, p, t) / \|p\| \longrightarrow \infty$.
4. (Completeness) The Hamiltonian vector field generates a complete flow on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. We denote by $\phi_H^{s,t}$ the flow from time s to time t , and by ϕ_H the flow $\phi_H^{0,1}$.

We will denote by

$$L = L_H(\theta, v, t) = \sup\{p \cdot v - H(\theta, p, t)\}$$

its Legendre transform. For the most part, we will restrict to Hamiltonians with $\varpi = 1$, namely, defined on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$, but near double resonances we need to consider Hamiltonians that are $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ -periodic.

It is helpful to consider a family of Hamiltonians which satisfy these properties uniformly. For $D > 0$, consider

$$\mathbb{H}(D) = \left\{ H \in C^2(\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}) : \right. \\ \left. \varpi_H \leq 1, \quad D^{-1}I \leq \partial_{pp}^2 H \leq DI, \quad \|H(\cdot, 0)\|_{C^0}, \|\partial_p H(\cdot, 0)\|_{C^0} \leq D. \right\}$$

We then check that each $H \in \mathbb{H}(D)$ is Tonelli, and it satisfy a list of uniform estimates called *uniform family* in [11]. In particular, if $H_0 \in \mathbb{H}(D)$, then $H_\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}(2D)$ for all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(D)$.

Given $C > 0$, we say a function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C semi-concave if for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there is a linear function $l_x : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$u(y) - u(x) \leq l_x(y - x) + C\|y - x\|^2, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The linear form l_x is called a super-differential at x . The set of all super-differentials at x is denoted $\partial^+u(x)$. It is easy to see if u is differentiable at x , then $\partial^+u(x) = \{du(x)\}$. A function $u : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is semi-concave if it's semi-concave as a function on \mathbb{R}^n .

Lemma 6.1. ([11]) *If $u : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C semi-concave, then it is $C\sqrt{n}$ -Lipschitz. The super-differential set $\partial^+u(x) \subset \{\|p\| \leq C\sqrt{n}\}$.*

Given $s < t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^n$, we define the Lagrangian action

$$A(x, s, y, t) = \inf_{\gamma(s)=x, \gamma(t)=y} \int_s^t L_H(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) d\tau, \quad (6.1)$$

where the infimum is taken over all absolutely continuous γ . We outline a series of useful results:

Proposition 6.2. *Let $H \in \mathbb{H}(D)$, then:*

1. (Tonelli Theorem) ([57], Appendix 2) *The infimum in (6.1) is always reached. It is then C^2 , which solves the Euler-Lagrange equation. Such a γ is called a minimizer.*
2. (A priori compactness) ([11], Section B.2) *Let $\delta > 0$, then there is a constant $C_\delta > 0$ depending only on δ and D , such that for $t - s > \delta$, any minimizer of $A(s, x, t, y)$ satisfies $\|\dot{\gamma}\| \leq C_\delta$.*
3. (Uniform semi-concavity) ([11], Theorem B.7, see also Proposition 7.12) *For $t - s > \delta$, the function $A(s, x; t, y)$ is C_δ semi-concave in (x, s) and (y, t) . Moreover, if $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ is a minimizer, then*

$$\begin{aligned} (p(s), -H(\gamma(s), p(s), s)) &\in -\partial_{(x,s)}^+ A(x, s, y, t), \\ (p(t), -H(\gamma(t), p(t), t)) &\in -\partial_{(y,t)}^+ A(x, s, y, t), \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

where $p(\tau) = \partial_v L_H(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau)$.

Remark 6.1. For item 3 of Proposition 6.2, [11] only treated the semi-concavity in x . A proof that also include time-dependence can be obtained from Proposition 7.12 by choosing a non-small ϵ .

For each $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define

$$L_{H,c}(\theta, v, t) = L_H(\theta, v, t) - c \cdot v,$$

and denote $A_{H,c} = A_{L_{H,c}}$. Then (6.2) becomes

$$(p(t) - c, -H(\gamma(t), p(t), t)) \in \partial_{(y,t)} A_{H,c}(x, s, y, t)$$

and similarly for s .

6.2 Weak KAM solution

We now define the (continuous) Lax-Oleinik semi-group $T_c^{s,t} : C(\mathbb{T}^n) \longrightarrow C(\mathbb{T}^n)$ via the formula

$$T_c^{s,t}u(x) = \min_{z \in \mathbb{T}^n} \{u(z) + A_{H,c}(z, s; x, t)\}.$$

For a ϖ -periodic Hamiltonian, the associated discrete semi-group is generated by the operator: $T_c u = T_c^{0,\varpi} u$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\{u_\zeta\}_{\zeta \in Z}$ be a (possibly uncountable) family of C -semi-concave functions $\mathbb{T}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $v = \inf_{\zeta \in Z} u_\zeta$ is bounded, then $\inf_{\zeta \in Z} u_\zeta$ is also C semi-concave.*

Moreover, suppose for $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, the infimum $v(x_0)$ is reached at $u_{\zeta_0}(x_0)$, then $\partial^+ u_{\zeta_0}(x_0) = \partial^+ v(x_0)$.

Using Proposition 6.2, the functions $T_\eta^n u$ are C semi-concave with the constant depending only on uniform family.

Proposition 6.4 (Mañé's critical value, see [11], Proposition 3.1). *There is a unique $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $T_c^n u(x) + n\alpha$ stays bounded for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This value coincides with Mather's alpha function:*

$$\alpha_H(c) = - \inf_{\mu} \left\{ \int L_{H,c}(\theta, v, t) d\mu(\theta, v, t) \right\} \quad (6.3)$$

where the infimum is taken over all invariant probability measure of the Euler-Lagrange flow on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}_{\varpi}$.

Let us also point out an alternative definition of the alpha function (see [71]), namely, we can replace the class of minimal measures with the class of *closed measures*, which satisfies

$$\int df(\theta, t) \cdot (v, 1) d\mu(\theta, v, t) = 0$$

for every C^1 function $f : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $f(\theta, t + \varpi) = f(\theta, t)$.

A function $w : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}_{\varpi} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a *weak KAM solution* if

$$T_c^{s,t}w(\cdot, s) + \alpha_H(c)(t - s) = w(\cdot, t), \quad s < t \in \mathbb{R},$$

i.e. the family $w(\cdot, t)$ is invariant under the semi-group up to a linear drift. The function $u(\theta) = w(\theta, 0)$ is then a fixed point of the operator $T_c + \varpi \alpha_H(c)$.

Proposition 6.5 (Existence of weak KAM solution, [11], Proposition 3.2). *For $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_0 \in C(\mathbb{T}^n)$, the function*

$$w(\theta, t) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow -\infty} (T_c^{t-N\varpi,t} u_0 + N\varpi \alpha(c)), \quad N \in \mathbb{N}$$

is a ϖ -periodic weak KAM solution.

The following is a easy consequence of Lemma 6.3.

Lemma 6.6. *Weak KAM solutions are uniformly semi-concave over all $H \in \mathbb{H}(D)$.*

A function $w : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *dominated* by $L_{H,c}, \alpha$ if

$$w(y, t) - w(x, s) \leq A_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) + (t - s)\alpha, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{T}^n, \quad t < s.$$

$\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$, where I is an interval in \mathbb{R} is called *calibrated* by w if

$$w(\gamma(t), t) - w(\gamma(s), s) = A_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) + (t - s)\alpha.$$

Proposition 6.7 ([35], Proposition 4.1.8). *$w : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a weak KAM solution if and only if it is dominated by $L_c, \alpha_H(c)$ and for every (y, t) there is a calibrated curve $\gamma : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ such that $\gamma(t) = y$.*

6.3 Pseudographs, Aubry, Mañe and Mather sets

Let $u : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be semi-concave. By the Radamacher theorem, u is differentiable almost everywhere. For $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the (overlapping) pseudograph

$$\mathcal{G}_{c,u} = \mathcal{G}_{c,H,u} = \{(x, c + \nabla u(x)), \quad \nabla u(x) \text{ exists}\}.$$

In the one-dimensional case, at every discontinuity of the function $du(x)$, the left limit is larger than the right limit. In the time-dependent setting if $w : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is semi-concave, we write

$$\mathcal{G}_{c,w} = \{(x, c + \partial_x u(x, t), t) : \quad \partial_x u \text{ exists}\}.$$

The evolution by the Lax-Oleinik semi-group generates an evolution operator on the pseudograph. The following statement outline its relation with the Hamiltonian dynamics.

Proposition 6.8 ([11]). *For each $s < t$, we have*

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}_{c, T_c^{s,t} u}} \subset \phi_H^{s,t}(\mathcal{G}_{c,u}),$$

here $\phi_H^{s,t}$ denotes the Hamiltonian flow.

Corollary 6.9. *Suppose $w(\theta, t)$ is a (time-periodic) weak KAM solution of $L_{H,c}$, then*

$$(\phi_H^{s,t})^{-1} \overline{\mathcal{G}_{c,w(\cdot,t)}} \subset \mathcal{G}_{c,w(\cdot,s)}.$$

In particular, $(\phi_H^{-1}) \overline{\mathcal{G}_{c,u}} \subset \mathcal{G}_{c,u}$, where $u = w(\cdot, 0)$ and $\phi_H = \phi_H^{0,\varpi}$ is the associated discrete dynamics.

Let $w = w(\theta, t)$ be a continuous weak KAM solution for L_c . Then Corollary 6.9 implies the set

$$\mathcal{G}_{c,w} = \{(\theta, p) : (\theta, p) \in \mathcal{G}_{c,w(\cdot,t)}\}$$

is backward invariant under the flow $\phi_H^{s,t}$. We then define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, w) = \left\{ (\theta, p, t) : (\theta, p) \in \bigcap_{s < t} (\phi_H^{s,t})^{-1} \overline{\mathcal{G}_{c,w(\cdot,t)}} \right\},$$

in other words, $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, w)$ is the invariant set generated by the family of pseudographs $\mathcal{G}_{c,w(\cdot,t)}$, in the extended phase space $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}_\varpi$.

The Aubry and Mañé sets admit the following equivalent definitions:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c) = \bigcap_w \tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, w), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(c) = \bigcup_w \tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, w),$$

where $w : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_\varpi$ is taken over all L_c continuous-time weak KAM solutions. The Mather set $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(c)$ is then the support of all $\phi_H^{s,t}$ invariant measures contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c)$. Note that if we consider a discrete weak KAM solution $u : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then the analogous definitions give us $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^0$.

6.4 The dual setting, forward solutions

There is a dual setting which corresponds to forward dynamics (as apposed to the backward invariant sets obtained before). Define

$$\check{T}_c^{s,t} u(x) = \max_z \{u(z) - A_c(x, s; z, t)\},$$

and note the following:

1. $\alpha = \alpha_H(c)$ is the unique number such that a weak KAM solution may exist.
2. $-\check{T}_c^{s,t} u$ are uniformly semi-concave (if $t - s > \tau$), fixed points of $\check{T}_c^{s,t} - \alpha$ exists, and are called forward weak KAM solution.
3. For a semi-concave function u , we define $\check{\mathcal{G}}_{c,u} = \{(\theta, c + \nabla_x u(\theta))\}$, and call it an anti-overlapping pseudographs.
4. Analogs of the previous section apply with appropriate changes.

Let $w(\theta, t)$ be a weak KAM solution for $L_{H,c}$, and w^+ a forward weak KAM solution. We say that w, w^+ are conjugate if they coincide on the set $\mathcal{M}_H(c)$.

Proposition 6.10 ([35], Theorem 5.1.2). *For each weak KAM solution w , there exists a forward solution w^+ conjugate to w satisfying $w^+ \geq w$, and*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, w) = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, w^+) = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, w, w^+) := \{(x, c + \partial_x w(x, t), t) : w(x, t) = w^+(x, t)\}.$$

6.5 Peierls barrier, static classes, elementary solutions

We define

$$h_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} A_{H,c}(x, s, y, t + N\varpi) + N\varpi \alpha_H(c)$$

called the Peierls barrier by Mather ([58]). The projected Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_H(c)$ has the following alternative characterization:

$$\mathcal{A}_H(c) = \{(x, s) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}_\varpi : h_{H,c}(x, s, x, s) = 0\}.$$

We will also consider the discrete barrier:

$$h_{H,c}(x, y) = h_{H,c}(x, 0, y, 0), \quad (6.4)$$

then $\mathcal{A}_H^0(c) = \{x : h_{H,c}(x, x) = 0\}$.

On the set $\mathcal{A}_H(c)$ we define the Mather semi-distance:

$$\bar{d}(x, s, y, t) = h_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) + h_{H,c}(y, t, x, s),$$

then the condition $\bar{d}(x, s, y, t) = 0$ defines an equivalence relation $(x, s) \sim (y, t)$ on $\mathcal{A}_H(c)$. The equivalence classes of this relation are called the *static classes*. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}_H(c)$ be a static class, it corresponds uniquely to an invariant set in the phase space:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \pi_{(x,t)}^{-1} \Big|_{\mathcal{A}_H(c)} \mathcal{S}.$$

For $(\zeta, \tau) \in \mathcal{S}$, the function

$$h_{H,c}(\zeta, \tau, \cdot, \cdot)$$

is a weak KAM solution for $L_{H,c}$, called the *elementary solution*. The elementary solution is independent of the choice of $(\zeta, \tau) \in \mathcal{S}$, up to an additive constant.

We have the following useful statements concerning elementary solutions.

Proposition 6.11. 1. (Representation formula, see [35], Theorem 8.6.1 and [27], Theorem 7) Let $w(x, t)$ be an $L_{H,c}$ weak KAM solution. Then

$$w(x, t) = \min_{(\zeta, \tau) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)} \{w(\zeta, \tau) + h_{H,c}(\zeta, \tau, x, t)\}.$$

2. (See [11], Proposition 4.3) Every orbit in the Mañé set $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c)$ is a heteroclinic orbit between two static classes $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2$. We have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c) = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c)$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ has only one static class.

6.6 The forcing relation

Definition 6.12. Let $u : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be semi-concave, and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that $\mathcal{G}_{c,u} \vdash_N c'$, if there exists a semi-concave function $v : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}_{c',v}} \subset \bigcup_{k=0}^N \phi_H^k(\mathcal{G}_{c,u}).$$

We say the $c \vdash c'$ if there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathcal{G}_{c,u} \vdash_N c'$$

for every pseudograph $\mathcal{G}_{c,u}$. We say $c \dashv\vdash c'$ if $c \vdash c'$ and $c' \vdash c$.

In view of Proposition 6.8, we always have $c \vdash c$. The relation is transitive by definition. Therefore $\dashv\vdash$ defines an equivalence relation.

We summarize the property of the forcing relation below.

- (Proposition 2.1)

Let $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a sequence of cohomology classes which are forcing equivalent. For each i , let U_i be neighborhoods of the discrete Mather sets $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_H^0(c_i)$, then there is a trajectory of the Hamiltonian flow ϕ^t of H visiting all the sets U_i .

- (Mather mechanism, Proposition 2.2)

Suppose $\mathcal{N}_H^0(c)$ is contractible as a subset of \mathbb{T}^2 , then there is $\sigma > 0$ such that c is forcing equivalent to all $c' \in B_\sigma(c)$.

- (Arnold and Bifurcation mechanism, Proposition 2.4)

Suppose, either: $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ has only two static classes and $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c) \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ is totally disconnected, or $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ has only one static class, and there is a symplectic double covering map ξ such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \setminus \Xi^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$ is totally disconnected, then there is $\sigma > 0$ such that c is forcing equivalent to all $c' \in B_\sigma(c)$.

7 Perturbative Weak KAM theory

By perturbative weak KAM theory, we mean two things:

- How do the weak KAM solutions and the Mather, Aubry, Mañe sets respond to limits of the Hamiltonian;

- How do the weak KAM solutions change when we perturb a system, in particular, what happens when we perturb (1) completely integrable systems, and (2) autonomous systems.

In this section, we state and prove results in both aspects, as a technical tool for proving forcing equivalence.

7.1 Semi-continuity

Let $\mathbb{H}(D)$ be the uniform family defined before, note that they are periodic of period $0 < \varpi_H \leq 1$, but not necessarily of the same period. It is known that in the case that all periods are fixed at 1, the weak KAM solutions are upper semi-continuous (see precise statements below) under C^2 convergence over compact sets ([12]). The results generalize to the case when the periods are not the same, as we now show.

Let us remark that if $H_n \in \mathbb{H}(D)$ is a family of Hamiltonians, and $H_n \rightarrow H$ uniformly over compact sets on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, then H is necessarily periodic of *some* period, and therefore $H \in \mathbb{H}(D)$.

We define the upper limit \limsup for a sequence of sets A_n to be the set of all accumulation points of all sequences $x_n \in A_n$.

Lemma 7.1 ([12], Lemma 7). *Suppose Hamiltonians $H_k \in \mathbb{H}(D)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are a family of periodic Tonelli Hamiltonians. Suppose $H_n \rightarrow H$ in C^2 over compact sets, $c_k \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $\alpha_{H_k}(c_k) \rightarrow \alpha_H(c)$. If $w_k : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a sequence of weak KAM solution of H_k, c_k which converges uniformly to $w : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then w is a weak KAM solution of H, c .*

Moreover, we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}_{c_k, H_k, w_k} \subset \mathcal{G}_{c, H, w}, \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{H_k}(c_k, w_k) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_H(c, w), \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_k}(c_k) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c).$$

Proof. The proof is an elaboration of [12], Lemma 7. First, note that if $H_k \in \mathbb{H}$ and c_k uniformly bounded, then $\alpha_{H_k}(c_k)$ is uniformly bounded ((6.3)). By restricting to a subsequence, we may assume $\alpha_{H_k}(c_k) \rightarrow \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then taking limit in

$$w_k(\gamma(t), t) - w_k(\gamma(s), s) \leq \int_s^t L_{H_k}(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) - c_k \cdot \dot{\gamma}(\tau) + \alpha_{H_k}(c_k) d\tau$$

we obtain

$$w(\gamma(t), t) - w(\gamma(s), s) \leq \int_s^t L_H(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) - c \cdot \dot{\gamma}(\tau) + \alpha d\tau,$$

implying $\alpha \geq \alpha_H(c)$, using the definition of the α -function (6.3).

Now given $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\gamma_k : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$ be a L_{H_k, c_k} , w_k calibrated curve, then Proposition 6.2 implies γ_k are uniformly Lipschitz. Then γ_k has a subsequence that converges in C_{loc}^1 to a limit $\gamma(t)$, which is $L_{H, c} + \alpha$, u calibrated. This implies both $\alpha_H(c) = \alpha$ and that u is a H, c weak KAM solution.

We now prove the ‘‘moreover’’ part. Denote

$$\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{G}_{c_k, H_k, w_k}, \quad \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{c, H, w} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_k = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_H(c_k, w_k), \quad \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_H(c, w).$$

then if $(x_k, p_k, t_k) \in \mathcal{G}_k$, then there exists L_{H_k, c_k} , w_k calibrated curves $\gamma_k : (-\infty, t_k] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$ with $\gamma_k(t_k) = x_k$ and $\partial_p H_k(x_k, p_k, t_k) = \dot{\gamma}_k$. Then by the same argument, after restricting to a subsequence, γ_n converges in C_{loc}^1 to $\gamma : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$, and γ is a $L_{H, c}$, w calibrated curve. This implies $(t, x, p) \in \mathcal{G}$.

For the set \mathcal{I} , let us prove for each fixed T , we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{H_k}^{-T} \mathcal{G}_k \subset \phi_H^{-T} \mathcal{G}.$$

Indeed, for any $(x_k, p_k, t_k) \in \phi_{H_k}^{-T} \mathcal{G}_k$, there exists L_{H_k, c_k} , w_k calibrated curves $\gamma : (-\infty, t_k + T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$ such that $\gamma(t_k) = x_k$, $\partial_p H_k(x_k, p_k, t_k) = \dot{\gamma}(t_k)$. Then exactly the same argument as before implies γ_n accumulates to a $L_{H, c}$, u calibrated curve $\gamma : (-\infty, t + T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$, and implying $(t, x, p) \in \phi_H^{-T} \mathcal{G}$. We obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_n \subset \tilde{\mathcal{I}}.$$

Finally, since

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_k}(c_k) = \bigcup_w \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_H(c_k, w),$$

where the union is over all L_{H_k, c_k} weak KAM solutions. For $(x_k, p_k, t_k) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_k}(c_k)$, there exists u_k such that $(x_k, p_k, t_k) \in \mathcal{G}_{c_k, H_k, u_k}$. Since all w_k are equi-continuous and equi-bounded (see e.g. (A.3), [11]), there exists a subsequence that converges to u uniformly on the interval $\mathbb{T}^d \times [0, K]$. Since all w_k 's are periodic with period bounded by 1, this implies $w_k \rightarrow w$ on $\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ as well. We then apply the semi-continuity of \mathcal{G} sets to get semi-continuity of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. \square

The theory built in [12] allows one to pass from semi-continuity of pseudographs to semi-continuity of Aubry set under a condition called the *coincidence hypothesis*. A sufficient condition for this hypothesis is when the Aubry set has finitely many static classes.

Corollary 7.2. *Suppose $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ has at most finitely many static classes. Then if $H_n \in \mathbb{H}(D)$ C^2 converges to H over compact sets, and $c_n \rightarrow c$, we have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_n}(c_n) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$$

as subsets of $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. The proof follows in the same way as the proof of Theorem 1 in [12]. We also refer to [46], Section 6.2 where this is carried out in detail. \square

7.2 Continuity of the barrier function

In general, the barrier function $h_{H,c}$ may be discontinuous with respect to H and c . However, the continuity properties hold in the particular case when the limiting Aubry set contains only one static class.

Proposition 7.3. *Assume that a sequence $H_k \in \mathbb{H}(D)$ converges to H in C^2 over compact sets, and $c_k \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that the projected Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_H(c)$ contains a unique static class. Let $(x_k, s_k) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_k}(c_k)$ with $(x_k, s_k) \rightarrow (x, s)$, then the barrier functions $h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k; \cdot, \cdot)$ converges to $h_{H,c}(x, s; \cdot, \cdot)$ uniformly.*

Similarly, for $(y_k, t_k) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_k}(c_k)$ and $(y_k, t_k) \rightarrow (y, t)$, the barrier functions $h_{H_k, c_k}(\cdot, \cdot; y_k, t_k)$ converges to $h_{H,c}(\cdot, \cdot; y, t)$ uniformly.

Proposition 7.4. *Assume that a sequence H_n converges to H in C^2 over compact sets, $c_k \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_H(c)$ contains a unique static class.*

1. *For any $(x, s) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(y,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} |h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k; y, t) - h_{H,c}(x, s; y, t)| = 0$$

uniformly over $(x_k, s_k) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_k}(c_k)$ and $(y, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$.

2. *For any $l_k \in \partial_y^+ h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k; y, t)$ and $l_k \rightarrow l$, we have $l \in \partial_y^+ h_{H,c}(x, s; y, t)$. Moreover, the convergence is uniform in the sense that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{l_k \in \partial_y^+ h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k; y, t)} d(l_k, \partial_y^+ h_{H,c}(x, s; y, t)) = 0$$

uniformly in $(x, s) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)$, $(x_k, s_k) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_k}(c_k)$.

The following statement follows easily from the representation formula (Proposition 6.11).

Lemma 7.5. *Assume that $\mathcal{A}_H(c)$ has a unique static class. Let $(x_1, t_1) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)$, then any weak KAM solution differs from $h_{H,c}(x_1, t_1; \cdot, \cdot)$ by a constant.*

Proof of Proposition 7.3. We prove the second statement. By Proposition 6.2, all functions $h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k; \cdot, \cdot)$ are uniformly semi-concave, and hence equi-continuous. By Arzela-Ascoli, any subsequence contains a uniformly convergent subsequence, whose limit is

$$h_{H,c}(x, s; \cdot, \cdot) + C$$

due to Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.5. Moreover,

$$h_{H,c}(x_k, s_k; x, s) \longrightarrow h_{H,c}(x, s; x, s) = 0,$$

so $C = 0$. It follows that $h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k; \cdot, \cdot)$ converges to $h_{H,c}(x, s; \cdot, \cdot)$ uniformly.

Statement 1 follows from the definition of the projected Aubry set

$$\mathcal{A}_H(c) = \{(x, s) \in M \times \mathbb{T} : h_{H,c}(x, s; x, s) = 0\}$$

and statement 2. □

Proof of Proposition 7.4. Part 1. We argue by contradiction. Assume that there exist $\delta > 0$, and by restricting to a subsequence,

$$\inf_{C \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{(y,t)} |h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k, y, t) - h_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) - C| > \delta.$$

By compactness, and by restricting to a subsequence again, we may assume that $(x_k, s_k) \longrightarrow (x^*, s^*)$, $(y_k, t_k) \longrightarrow (y, t)$. Using Proposition 7.3, take limit as $n \longrightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\sup_{(y,t)} |h_{H,c}(x^*, s^*, y, t) - h_{H,c}(x, s, y, t)| > \delta.$$

By Lemma 7.5, the left hand side is 0, which is a contradiction.

Part 2. $h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k, \cdot, t)$ converges to $h_{H,c}(x, s, \cdot, t)$ uniformly. Convergence of super-differentials follows directly from Proposition 6.2. It suffices to prove uniformity. Assume, by contradiction, that by restricting to a subsequence, we have $(x_k, s_k) \longrightarrow (x, s) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)$, $l_k \in \partial_y^+ h_{H_k, c_k}(x_k, s_k, y, t)$ and $(x, s) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \longrightarrow \infty} l_k \notin \partial_y^+ h_{H,c}(x, s, y, t).$$

By Proposition 6.2, $l_n \longrightarrow l \in \partial_y^+ h_{H,c}(x^*, s^*, y, t)$, but we also have $\partial_y^+ h_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) = \partial_y^+ h_{H,c}(x^*, s^*, y, t)$ since the functions differ by a constant using Lemma 7.5. This is a contradiction. □

7.3 Lipschitz estimates for nearly integrable systems

In this section we record uniform estimates for the nearly integrable system

$$H_\epsilon = H_0(p) + \epsilon H_1(\theta, p, t), \quad (\theta, p, t) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T},$$

with the assumptions $H_0 \in \mathbb{H}(D)$, $\|H_1\|_{C^2} \leq 1$.

Proposition 7.6 (Proposition 4.3, [13]). *For H_ϵ as given, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, any $L_{H_\epsilon, c}$ weak KAM solution $u(x, t)$ is $6D\sqrt{\epsilon}$ -semi-concave and $6D\sqrt{d\epsilon}$ -Lipschitz in x .*

Corollary 7.7. *For any $L_{H_\epsilon, c}$ weak KAM solution $u : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\gamma(-\infty, t_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ be a calibrated curve. Then for any $t \in (-\infty, t_0)$,*

$$p(t) := \partial_v L_{H_\epsilon}(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t), t)$$

satisfies $\|p(t) - c\| \leq 6D\sqrt{n\epsilon}$.

Moreover, any $(x, p, t) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}(c)$ satisfies the same estimate $\|p - c\| \leq 6D\sqrt{n\epsilon}$.

Proof. $p(t) - c$ is a super gradient of $u(\cdot, t)$ at $\gamma(t)$. The conclusion follows from the fact that $u(\cdot, t)$ is $6D\sqrt{n\epsilon}$ -Lipschitz. The statement for $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ follows from the fact that any $(x, p, t) \in \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{N}$ is the end point of a calibrated curve. \square

Corollary 7.8. *Let μ be any c -minimal measure of H_ϵ , then there is $C > 0$ depending only on H_0 such that*

$$\|\rho(\mu) - \nabla H_0(c)\| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Proof. Recall that μ is a measure on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, invariant under the Euler-Lagrange flow. By considering the Legendre transform \mathbb{L} , we obtain

$$\rho(\mu) = \int v d\mu(\theta, v, t) = \int \partial_p H_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) d\mathbb{L}_*\mu(\theta, p, t).$$

By Corollary 7.7, we have $\partial_p H_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) = \nabla H_0(c) + O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ for all

$$(\theta, p, t) \in \text{supp } \mathbb{L}_*\mu \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c),$$

therefore, $\rho(\mu) = \nabla H_0(c) + O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$. \square

7.4 Estimates for nearly autonomous systems

The goal of this section is to derive a special Lipschitz estimate of weak KAM solutions for perturbations of autonomous systems. More precisely, consider

$$H_\epsilon(x, p, t) = H_1(x, p) + \epsilon H_2(x, p, t).$$

Assume that $H_1 \in \mathbb{H}(D/2)$ and $\|H_2\|_{C^2} = 1$. Then for ϵ small enough all $H_\epsilon \in \mathbb{H}(D)$. Let L_ϵ denote the associated Lagrangian.

We first state an estimate for the alpha function.

Lemma 7.9. *There is $C > 0$ depending only on $\|H_1\|_{C^2}$ and D , such that*

$$\|\alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c) - \alpha_{H_1}(c)\| < C\epsilon.$$

Proof. Let C always denote a generic constant depending on $\|H_1\|_{C^2}$. Let L_1 be the Lagrangian for H_1 , then $\|L_\epsilon - L_1\|_{C^0} \leq C\epsilon$. As a result, the functionals

$$\int (L_\epsilon - c \cdot v) d\mu, \quad \int (L - c \cdot v) d\mu,$$

defined on the space of closed probability measures, differ by at most $C\epsilon$. The lemma follows immediately using the closed measure version for the definition of the alpha function, see Section 6.2. \square

Let $u(x, t)$ be a weak KAM solution to $L_\epsilon - c \cdot v$, and $w(x, t)$ a forward weak KAM solution conjugate to u . Recall that

$$\mathcal{I}_{u,w}(c) = \operatorname{argmin}_{(x,t)}(u - w), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{u,w}(c) = \{(x, t, c + d_x u(x, t)) : (x, t) \in \mathcal{I}_{u,w}\}.$$

Theorem 7.1. *Let u, w be conjugate pair of weak KAM solutions to $L_\epsilon - c \cdot v$, then there is C depending only D and $\|c\|$ such that*

$$|H_\epsilon(x_1, p_1, t_1) - H_\epsilon(x_2, p_2, t_2)| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon} \|(x_2 - x_1, t_2 - t_1)\|, \quad (x_i, p_i, t_i) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{u,w}.$$

In particular, the above estimates holds on the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{L_\epsilon}(c)$.

The proof relies on semi-concavity of weak KAM solution, following Fathi ([35]). However to get an improved estimate we need a notion of semi-concavity that is “stronger” in the t direction.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open convex set. Let A be a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. We say that $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is A -semi-concave if for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there is $l_x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$f(y) - f(x) - l_x \cdot (y - x) \leq \frac{1}{2} A(y - x)^2, \quad x, y \in \Omega$$

where Ax^2 denotes $Ax \cdot x$. These definitions generalizes the standard semi-concavity, as A -semi-concave functions are $\frac{1}{2}\|A\|$ -semi-concave. We say f is A -semi-convex if $-f$ is A -semi-concave. The following lemma follows from a direct computation.

Lemma 7.10. *f is A -semi-concave if and only if $f_A(x) = f(x) - \frac{1}{2}Ax^2$ is concave.*

The following lemma is proved in [77].

Lemma 7.11 (See [77], Lemma 3.2). *Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is B -semi-concave and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $(-A)$ -semi-convex, and $S = B - A$ is positive definite. Suppose $f(x) \geq g(x)$ and M is the set on which $f - g$ reaches its minimum.*

Then for all $x_1, x_2 \in M$, we have

$$\|df(x_2) - df(x_1) - \frac{1}{2}(A + B)(x_2 - x_1)\|_{S^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x_2 - x_1\|_S,$$

where $\|x\|_S = \sqrt{Sx^2}$.

7.5 Semi-concavity of viscosity solutions

Recall that the action function $A_L(x, t, y, s)$ is the minimal Lagrangian action of curves with end points $\gamma(t) = x$, $\gamma(s) = y$. The goal of this section is to prove:

Proposition 7.12. *For the Hamiltonian H_ϵ , there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on D such that if $1/(2\sqrt{\epsilon}) \leq s - t \leq 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$, the action function $A(x, t, y, s)$ is S_ϵ -semi-concave in (x, t) and (y, s) , where*

$$S_\epsilon = C \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id}_{n \times n} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Our proposition follows directly from the following technical lemma by choosing $1/(2\sqrt{\epsilon}) \leq T \leq 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$.

Lemma 7.13. *There is a constant C depending D such that if $\gamma : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ is an extremal curve with $T = t_1 - t_0 > 1$, then for $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Delta T \in [-T/2, T/2]$, $p(t) = \partial_v L_\epsilon(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t), t)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & A(\gamma(t_0), t_0, \gamma(t_1) + h, t_1 + \Delta T) - A(\gamma(t_0), t_0, \gamma(t_1), t_1) \\ & \leq p(t_1) \cdot h + H_\epsilon(\gamma(t_1), p(t_1), t_1) \cdot (\Delta T) + C\|h\|^2 + C \left(\frac{1}{T} + \epsilon T \right) (\Delta T)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We omit the subscript in L_ϵ within the proof. Moreover, by considering the Lagrangian $L(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot + t)$, it suffices to consider $t = 0$, $s = T$.

Let $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ be an extremal curve, write $\lambda = \Delta T/T$ and define

$$\gamma_h^\lambda : [0, T + \Delta T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n,$$

$$\gamma_h^\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma\left(\frac{t}{1+\lambda}\right), & t \in [0, (T-1)(1+\lambda)]; \\ \gamma\left(\frac{t}{1+\lambda}\right) + \left(\frac{t}{1+\lambda} - T + 1\right)h, & t \in [(T-1)(1+\lambda), T(1+\lambda)]. \end{cases}$$

The curve is obtained by adding a linear drift in x on the time interval $[T-1, T]$, then reparametrize time to the interval $[0, T + \Delta T]$, see Figure 7.1.

Let C denote an unspecified constant. Note that $\|\dot{\gamma}\| \leq C$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A}_L(\gamma_h^\lambda) &= \int_0^{(1+\lambda)T} L(\gamma_h^\lambda, \dot{\gamma}_h^\lambda, t) dt \\ &= (1+\lambda) \int_0^{T-1} L\left(\gamma(s), \frac{1}{1+\lambda} \dot{\gamma}(s), (1+\lambda)s\right) ds \\ &\quad + (1+\lambda) \int_{T-1}^T L\left(\gamma(s) + (s-T+1)h, \frac{1}{1+\lambda} (\dot{\gamma}(s) + h), (1+\lambda)s\right) ds, \end{aligned}$$




Figure 7.1: Defining the curve γ_h^λ

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{A}_L(\gamma_h^\lambda) &\leq (1 + \lambda) \int_0^T L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, s) ds + \int_0^{T-1} (-\lambda \partial_v L \cdot \dot{\gamma} + (1 + \lambda) \partial_t L \cdot \lambda s) ds + \\
&(1 + \lambda) \int_{T-1}^T \left(\partial_x L \cdot (s - T + 1)h + \frac{1}{1 + \lambda} \partial_v L \cdot (-\lambda \dot{\gamma} + h) + \partial_t L \cdot \lambda s \right) ds \\
&+ CT (\|\partial_{vv}^2 L\| + \|\partial_{vt}^2 L\|T + \|\partial_{tt}^2 L\|T^2) \lambda^2 + C \|\partial_{(x,v)^2}^2 L\| (\|h\|^2 + |\lambda| \|h\| + \lambda^2) \\
&+ C (\|\partial_{xt} L\| |\lambda| T \|h\| + \|\partial_{vt} L\| (|\lambda| + \|h\|) \lambda T + \|\partial_{tt} L\| \lambda^2 T^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Using $\|\partial^2 L\| \leq C$, $\|\partial_{(x,v,t)}^2 L\| \leq C\epsilon$, and plug in $\Delta T = \lambda T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{A}_L(\gamma_h^\lambda) - \mathbb{A}_L(\gamma) &\leq \lambda \int_0^T (L - \partial_v L \cdot \dot{\gamma} + \partial_t L) ds + \int_0^1 (\partial_x L \cdot sh + \partial_v L \cdot h) ds \\
&+ C \left(\frac{1}{T} + \epsilon T \right) (\Delta T)^2 + C \left(\|h\|^2 + \frac{1}{T} |\Delta T| \|h\| + \frac{1}{T^2} (\Delta T)^2 \right) \\
&+ C\epsilon (|\Delta T| \|h\| + (\Delta T)^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Euler-Lagrange equation, we have for $p(t) = \partial_v L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}(-tH) &= \frac{d}{dt}(t(L - \partial_v L \cdot \dot{\gamma})) = (L - \partial_v L \cdot \dot{\gamma}) + t \partial_t L, \\
\frac{d}{dt}(p \cdot th) &= \frac{d}{dt}(\partial_v L \cdot th) = \partial_v L \cdot h + \partial_x L \cdot th,
\end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{A}_L(\gamma_h^\lambda) - \mathbb{A}_L(\gamma) &\leq \lambda(-tH)\Big|_0^T + (p(T-1+t) \cdot ht)\Big|_0^1 \\
&\quad + C\|h^2\| + C\left(\frac{1}{T} + \epsilon\right)|\Delta T|\|h\| + C\left(\frac{1}{T} + \epsilon T\right)(\Delta T)^2 \\
&\leq H(\gamma(T), p(T), T)(\Delta T) + p(T) \cdot h + 2C\|h\|^2 + 2C\left(\frac{1}{T} + \epsilon T\right)(\Delta T)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Let $u(x, t)$ be a weak KAM solution to $L_\epsilon - c \cdot v$, and $w(x, t)$ a forward weak KAM solution conjugate to u . Then Proposition 7.12 implies that u is S_ϵ -semi-concave, while w is $(-S_\epsilon)$ -semi-convex.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Note that for each $(x, p, t) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{u,w}$, $-H(x, p, t) + \alpha_{L_\epsilon}(c) = \partial_t u(x, t)$. Apply Proposition 7.12 and Lemma 7.11, we obtain

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} p_2 - p_1 \\ H(x_2, p_2, t_2) - H(x_1, p_1, t_1) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} C(x_2 - x_1) \\ C\sqrt{\epsilon}(t_2 - t_1) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{S_\epsilon^{-1}} \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x_2 - x_1 \\ t_2 - t_1 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{S_\epsilon},$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} |H(x_2, p_2, t_2) - H(x_1, p_1, t_1) - C\sqrt{\epsilon}(t_2 - t_1)| \\
&\leq C\|x_2 - x_1\| + C\|t_2 - t_1\|,
\end{aligned}$$

the proposition follows. □

8 Cohomology of Aubry-Mather type

8.1 Aubry-Mather type and diffusion mechanisms

Let

$$H : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a C^r Tonelli Hamiltonian with $r \geq 2$ contained in the family $\mathbb{H}(D)$.

Definition 8.1. We say that the pair (H_*, c_*) is of *Aubry-Mather type* if it satisfies the following conditions:

1. There is an embedding

$$\chi : \mathbb{T} \times (-1, 1) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

such that $\mathcal{C}(H) = \chi(\mathbb{T} \times (-1, 1))$ is a normally hyperbolic weakly invariant cylinder under the time-1-map Φ^H . We require $\mathcal{C}(H)$ is *symplectic*, i.e. the restriction of the symplectic form ω to $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is non-degenerate.

2. There is $\sigma > 0$, such that the following holds for all

$$\mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*) := \{\|H - H_*\|_{C^2}\} < \sigma \quad , \quad B_\sigma(c_*) := \{\|c - c_*\| < \sigma\}.$$

(We then say that the property below holds robustly at (H_*, c_*) .)

(a) The discrete Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(c) \subset \mathcal{C}(H)$. Moreover, the pull back of the Aubry set is contained in a Lipschitz graph, namely, the map

$$\pi_x : \chi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0_H(c) \subset \mathbb{T} \times (-1, 1) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}$$

is bi-Lipschitz.

(b) If $\chi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0_H(c)$ projects onto \mathbb{T} , then there is a neighborhood V^0 of $\mathcal{A}^0_H(c)$ such that the strong unstable manifold $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0_H(c)) \cap \pi_\theta^{-1}V^0$ is a Lipschitz graph over the θ component.

If (H_*, c_*) is of Aubry-Mather type, let $h \in \mathbb{Z}^n \simeq H_1(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{Z})$ be the homology class of the curve $\chi(\mathbb{T} \times \{0\})$.

Remark 8.1. The definition of Aubry-Mather type includes a much simpler case, that is when the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ is a hyperbolic periodic orbit, still contained in a NHIC \mathcal{C} . The condition 2(a) is satisfied since $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0_H(c)$ is discrete. Condition (b) is vacuous since the $\chi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0_H(c)$ never projects onto \mathbb{T} . This holds, in particular, at double resonance when the energy is critical.

Definition 8.2. We say that the pair (H_*, c_*) is of *bifurcation Aubry-Mather type* if there exist $\sigma > 0$ and open sets $V_1, V_2 \subset \mathbb{T}^n$ with $\overline{V_1} \cap \overline{V_2} = \emptyset$, and a smooth bump function

$$f : \mathbb{T}^n \longrightarrow [0, 1], \quad f|_{V_1} = 0, \quad f|_{V_2} = 1,$$

such that for all $c \in \overline{B_\sigma(c_*)}$ and $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$:

1. Each of the Hamiltonians $H^1 = H - f$ and $H^2 = H - (1 - f)$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{A}_{H^1}(c) \subset V_1 \times \mathbb{T}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{H^2}(c) \subset V_2 \times \mathbb{T}.$$

It follows that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}(c)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}(c)$ are both invariant sets of H , called *the local Aubry sets*.

2. (H^1, c_*) (resp. (H^2, c_*)) are of Aubry-Mather type, with the invariant cylinders \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 . Moreover, they have the same homology class h .

3. The Aubry set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}(c) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}(c).$$

According to item (3) above, the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ may be contained in one of the local component, or both.

There is another type of bifurcation which happens at double resonance, when the homology h is simple non-critical (i.e. the shortest geodesic loop does not contain the saddle fixed point). We call this an asymmetric bifurcation.

Definition 8.3. We say that the pair (H_*, c_*) is of *asymmetric bifurcation type* if there exist $\sigma > 0$ and open sets $V_1, V_2 \subset \mathbb{T}^n$ with $\overline{V_1} \cap \overline{V_2} = \emptyset$, and a smooth bump function

$$f : \mathbb{T}^n \longrightarrow [0, 1], \quad f|_{V_1} = 0, \quad f|_{V_2} = 1,$$

such that for all $c \in \overline{B_\sigma(c_*)}$ and $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$:

1. Item 1 of Definition 8.2 holds.

2. (H^1, c_*) is of Aubry-Mather type, with the invariant cylinder \mathcal{C}_1 . The Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}(c_*)$ is a single hyperbolic periodic orbit.

3. The Aubry set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}(c) \cup \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}(c).$$

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose a pair (H_*, c_*) is of Aubry-Mather type, and let $\Gamma \ni c_*$ be a smooth curve in \mathbb{R}^2 . Then there are $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$ such that for all $c \in \Gamma_1 := \overline{B_{\sigma_1}(c_*)} \cap \Gamma$, we have the following dichotomy for a residual subset of $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$:*

1. *The projected Mañé set $\mathcal{N}_H^0(c)$ is contractible as a subset of \mathbb{T}^n ;*

2. *There is a double covering map Ξ such that the set*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \setminus \Xi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$$

is totally disconnected.

Theorem 8.2. *Suppose (H_*, c_*) is of either*

- *bifurcation AM type, or*
- *asymmetric bifurcation type,*

and $c_* \in \Gamma$, where Γ is a smooth curve in \mathbb{R}^2 , then there is $\sigma > 0$ and an open and dense subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$ such that for $c \in B_\sigma(c_*) \cap \Gamma$ and $H \in \mathcal{R}$, either:

1. $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ has a unique static class, and one of the following holds.
 - (a) The projected Mañe set $\mathcal{N}_H^0(c)$ is contractible as a subset of \mathbb{T}^n ;
 - (b) There is a double covering map Ξ such that the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \setminus \Xi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$$

is totally disconnected.

2. Or $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ has two static classes, and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$$

is a discrete set.

Analogous result in the a priori unstable setting is due to Mather and Cheng-Yan ([24], [25]). Our definition is more general and applies, as will be seen, to both single and double resonant settings. The prove is base on the result of [13], which applies to our setting with appropriate changes. Here we describe the changes needed for the proof in [13] to apply.

If (c_*, H_*) is of Aubry-Mather type, let $h \in \mathbb{Z}^n \simeq H_1(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{Z})$ be its homology class. Then any minimal measure contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(c)$ must have rotation vector λh , $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, similar to the case of twist map, all such measures has the same rotation vector λh . We say the rotation vector is rational/irrational if λ is rational/irrational.

The following proposition is a consequence of the Hamiltonian Kupka-Smale theorem, see for example [69].

Proposition 8.4. *There are $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$, and a residual subset \mathcal{R}_1 of the ball $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma_2}(H_*)$, such that for all $c \in \Gamma_1 := \overline{B_{\sigma_1}(c_*)} \cap \Gamma$, $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$, if c has rational rotation vector, then $\pi\chi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(c) \neq \mathbb{T}$.*

Let $1 \leq j \leq n$ be such that $e_j \nparallel h$, define the covering map $\xi : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ by

$$\xi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) = (\theta_1, \dots, 2\theta_j, \dots, \theta_n).$$

- For $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$, define

$$\Gamma_*(H) = \{c \in \Gamma_1 : \pi\chi^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_H^0(c)) = \mathbb{T}\}. \quad (8.1)$$

Proposition 8.4 implies that each $c \in \Gamma_*(H)$ has an irrational rotation vector, and the Aubry set has a unique static class, and $\mathcal{A}_H^0(c) = \mathcal{N}_H^0(c)$. Each $\Gamma_*(H)$ is compact due to upper semi-continuity of the Mañe set.

- For $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$ and $c \in \Gamma_*(H)$, the lifted Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) = \Xi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ has two static classes, denote them $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2$ (and projections $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$).

We have the decomposition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c) = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{12} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{21},$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{ij}$ consists of heteroclinic orbits from $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_j$. We will use the notation $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i(H, c), \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(H, c)$ to show dependence on the pair (H, c) , and \mathcal{H}_{ij} for projection of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{ij}$.

- For $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$ and $c \in \Gamma_*(H)$, consider the (discrete) Peierl's barrier (see (6.4))

$$h(\zeta_1, \cdot), h(\zeta_2, \cdot), h(\cdot, \zeta_1), h(\cdot, \zeta_2), \quad \zeta_i \in \mathcal{S}_i, i = 1, 2,$$

where $h = h_{H \circ \Xi, \xi^*c}$. These functions are independent of the choice of ζ_i except for an additive constant. We define

$$b_{H,c}^-(\theta) = h(\zeta_1, \theta) + h(\theta, \zeta_2) - h(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$$

and $b_{H,c}^+$ by switching ζ_1, ζ_2 . The functions $b_{H,c}^\pm$ are non-negative and vanish on $\mathcal{H}_{12} \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$ and $\mathcal{H}_{21} \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$, respectively.

- Consider small neighborhoods V_1, V_2 of $\mathcal{S}_1(H_*, c_*)$, $\mathcal{S}_2(H_*, c_*)$, and define $K = \mathbb{T}^n \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)$. By semi-continuity of the Aubry set, for sufficiently small σ_1, σ_2 , K is disjoint from $\mathcal{S}_i(H, c)$ for all $c \in \Gamma_1$ and $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$. Moreover, $\pi^{-1}K$ intersect every orbit of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{12}(H, c)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{21}(H, c)$.

Lemma 8.5 ([13], Lemma 5.2). *For each $(H, c) \in \mathcal{R}_1 \times \Gamma_1$, the set*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H \circ \Xi}(\xi^*c) \setminus \Xi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c)$$

is totally disconnected if and only if

$$\mathcal{N}_{H \circ \Xi}(\xi^*c) \cap K = (\mathcal{H}_{12} \cup \mathcal{H}_{21}) \cap K$$

is totally disconnected.

We will show that the set of $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$ with the following property contains a dense G_δ set: for each $c \in \Gamma_*(H)$, $\mathcal{N}_{H \circ \Xi}(\xi^*c) \cap K$ is totally disconnected. The following lemma implies the G_δ property.

Lemma 8.6 ([13], Lemma 5.3). *Let $K \subset \mathbb{T}^n$ be compact, then the set of $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$ such that for all $c \in \Gamma_*(N)$, the set $\mathcal{N}_{H \circ \Xi}(\xi^*c)$ is totally disconnected, is a G_δ set.*

The following proposition allows local perturbations of $b_{H,c}^\pm$ *simultaneously* for all c 's in a small ball. Let $B_\sigma(x)$ denote the ball of radius σ at x in a metric space.

Proposition 8.7 ([13], Proposition 5.2). *Let $H_* \in \mathcal{R}_1$, $c_* \in \Gamma_*(H)$, and $K \cap \mathcal{A}_{H \circ \Xi}(\xi^*c) = \emptyset$. Then there is $\sigma > 0$ such that for all*

$$H \in \mathcal{R}_1 \cap B_\sigma(H_*), \quad \theta_0 \in K \cap \mathcal{H}_{12}(H_*, c_*), \quad \varphi \in C_c^r(B_\sigma(\theta_0)) \text{ with } \|\varphi\|_{C^r} < \sigma,$$

there is a Hamiltonian H_φ such that:

1. *For all $c \in B_\sigma(c_*)$, the Aubry sets $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\varphi \circ \Xi}(\xi^*c)$ coincides with $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H \circ \Xi}(\xi^*c)$ with the same static classes. In particular, $B_\sigma(c_*) \cap \Gamma_*(H) = B_\sigma(c_*) \cap \Gamma_*(H_\varphi)$.*
2. *For all $c \in B_\sigma(c_0) \cap \Gamma_*(H)$, there exists a constant $e \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$b_{H_\varphi, c}^+(\theta) = b_{H, c}^+(\theta) + \varphi(\theta) + e, \quad \theta \in B_\sigma(\theta_0). \quad (8.2)$$

The same holds for $\theta_0 \in K \cap \mathcal{H}_{21}(H_, c_*)$, with b^+ replaced with b^- in (8.2). Moreover, for each $H \in \mathcal{R}_1 \cap B_\sigma(H_*)$, $\|H_\varphi - H\|_{C^r} \rightarrow 0$ when $\|\varphi\|_{C^r} \rightarrow 0$.*

We will use Proposition 8.7 to locally perturb the functions $b_{H,c}^\pm$, therefore, perturbing

$$\mathcal{H}_{12}(H, c) \cap B_\sigma(\theta_0) = \operatorname{argmin} b_{H,c}^+ \cap B_\sigma(\theta_0).$$

Similarly for b^- . However, as observed by Mather and Cheng-Yan, this requires additional information on how $b_{H,c}^\pm$ depends on c .

Proposition 8.8 (Section 8.3). *There is $\beta > 0$ such that each $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$, the maps $c \mapsto b_{H,c}^\pm$ from $\Gamma_*(H)$ to $C^0(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R})$ are β -Hölder.*

As a result, the set $\{b_{H,c}^\pm : c \in \Gamma_*(H)\}$ has Hausdorff dimension at most $1/\beta$ in $C^0(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R})$. The following lemma allows us to take advantage of this fact.

Lemma 8.9 ([13], Lemma 5.6). *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset C^0([-1, 1]^n, \mathbb{R})$ be a compact set of finite Hausdorff dimension. The following property is satisfied on a residual set of functions $\varphi \in C^r(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ (with the uniform C^r norm):*

For each $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the set of minima of the function $f + \varphi$ on $[-1, 1]^n$ is totally disconnected.

As a consequence, for each open neighborhood Ω of $[-1, 1]^n$ in \mathbb{R}^n , there exists arbitrarily C^r -small compactly supported functions $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying this property.

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Let (H_*, c_*) be of Aubry-Mather type, and let $\sigma > 0$ be as in Definition 8.1. Let K be as in Lemma 8.5 and denote $\Gamma_1 = B_\sigma(c_*) \cap \Gamma$. Let $\mathcal{R}_2 \subset \mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$ be the set of Hamiltonians such that for all $c \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_*(H)$, the

set $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H^*o\Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$ is totally disconnected. According to Lemma 8.6, this set is G_δ , we will to show that it is dense on $\mathcal{V}_{\sigma_2}(H_*)$ for some $0 < \sigma_2 < \sigma$.

Consider $c \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_*(H_*)$, let $\sigma_c > 0$ be small enough so that Proposition 8.7 applies to to the pair (H_*, c) on the set K . For each $\theta_0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H^*o\Xi}^0(\xi^*c) \cap K$, define

$$D_{\sigma_c}(\theta_0) = \{\theta : \max_i |\theta^i - \theta_0^i| \leq \sigma_c / (2\sqrt{n})\} \subset B_{\sigma_c}(\theta_0).$$

Proposition 8.8 implies that the family of functions the family of functions

$$b_{H,c}^\pm, c \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_*(N)$$

has Hausdorff dimension at most $1/\beta$, therefore we can apply Lemma 8.9 on the cube $D_{\sigma_c}(\theta_0)$ for each $H \in \mathcal{R}_1$. We find arbitrarily small functions φ compactly supported in $D_{\sigma_c}(\theta_0)$ and such that each of the functions

$$b_{N,c}^\pm + \varphi, c \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma^*(N)$$

have a totally disconnected set of minima in $D_{\sigma_c}(\theta_0)$. We then apply Proposition 8.7 to get Hamiltonians H_φ approximating H . We obtain:

- The set of Hamiltonians H such that $\mathcal{N}_{H^*o\Xi}(\xi^*c) \cap D_{\sigma_c}(\theta_0)$ is totally disconnected for each $c \in \Gamma_*(H)$ is dense in $\mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{V}_{\sigma_c}(H_*)$. By Lemma 8.6, it is also G_δ , therefore residual.

Since K is compact, there is a finite cover $K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^k D_{\sigma_i}(\theta_i)$, such hat

- For a residual set $\mathcal{R}^i(c)$ of $H \in B_{\sigma_c}(H_*)$, the set $\mathcal{N}_{H^*o\Xi}(\xi^*c) \cap D_{\sigma_c}(\theta_i)$ is totally disconnected for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $c \in \Gamma_*(H)$.

Take $\mathcal{R}_c = \bigcap_i \mathcal{R}^i$, then for $H \in \mathcal{R}_c$, the set $\mathcal{N}_{H^*o\Xi}(\xi^*c) \cap K$ is totally disconnected. Finally, we consider a finite covering $\Gamma_1 \subset \bigcup_j B_{\sigma_{c_j}}(c_j)$ and repeat the above argument. \square

The next two sections are dedicated to proving Proposition 8.8.

8.2 Weak KAM solutions are unstable manifolds

An important consequence of the Aubry-Mather type is that the local unstable manifold coincide with an elementary weak KAM solution.

Proposition 8.10. *Suppose (H_*, c_*) is of Aubry-Mather type. Then for each $(H, c) \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*) \times B_\sigma(c_*)$ such that $\chi^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ projects onto \mathbb{T} , we have*

$$W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)) \cap \pi_\theta^{-1}V^0 = \{(\theta, c + \nabla u(\theta)) : \theta \in V^0\},$$

where $u(\theta) = h_{H,c}(\zeta, \theta)$ for some $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}_H^0(c)$.

Proposition 8.10 follows from the following general statement (for the continuous Aubry sets).

Lemma 8.11. *Assume that:*

1. $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ is a partially hyperbolic set of the dynamics.
2. There is a neighborhood $V \supset \mathcal{A}_H(c) \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}$ such that (strong) unstable manifold $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)) \cap \pi_{(\theta,t)}^{-1}V$ is a Lipschitz graph over $V \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}$.

Then there is a function $u : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ solving the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$u_t + H(\theta, c + \nabla u, t) = \alpha_H(c),$$

and $(\theta, \nabla u(\theta, t), t) = W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c))$ for all $(\theta, t) \in V$.

Assume, in addition, that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ has a unique static class. Then there is $C \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(\zeta, \tau) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)$ such that

$$u(\theta, t) = h_{H,c}(\zeta, \tau, \theta, t) + C, \quad (\theta, t) \in V.$$

The idea of the Lemma is that the unstable manifold is a backward invariant Lagrangian manifold, which can be used to construct a solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. The proof is a standard application of the method of characteristics.

Proof. By considering the Hamiltonian $H(\theta, c + p) - \alpha$ instead of H , we can always assume $c = 0$ and $\alpha_H(c) = 0$.

let $z = z_{\vartheta,s} \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$ be the unique point such that $z \in W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c))$ and $\pi_{(x,t)}z = (\vartheta, s)$ (Since $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c))$ is locally a graph over (θ, t)), and let $\gamma_{\vartheta,s}, p_{\vartheta,s} : (-\infty, s] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ be the backward orbit of z . Let $z' = z'_{\vartheta,s} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ be the unique such point with $z_{\vartheta,s} \in W^u(z'_{\vartheta,s})$, and let $\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}, p'_{\vartheta,s} : (-\infty, s] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ be the backward orbit of z' . See Figure 8.1.

Let w be an arbitrary weak KAM solution for H at cohomology 0. We then define

$$u_T(\vartheta, s) = w(\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T), -T) + \int_{-T}^0 L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t))dt,$$

where $d\gamma(t) = (\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, t)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} u_T(\vartheta, s) &= \int_{-T}^0 L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)) - L(d\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(t))dt + w(\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T), -T) + \int_{-T}^0 L(d\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(t))dt \\ &= \int_{-T}^0 L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)) - L(d\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(t))dt + w(\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(s), s), \end{aligned}$$




Figure 8.1: Proof of Lemma 8.11

where the second line is due to the fact that $(\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) \in \mathcal{A}_H(c)$. Since the first integral converges since $\text{dist}(d\gamma_z(t), d\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(t)) \rightarrow 0$ exponentially fast, the limit

$$u(\vartheta, s) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} u_T(\vartheta, s)$$

converges exponentially fast. Consider $-T_1 < s$, then

$$\begin{aligned} u(\vartheta, s) - u(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(-T_1), -T_1) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} u_T(\vartheta, s) - \lim_{T-T_1 \rightarrow \infty} u_{T-T_1}(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(-T_1), -T_1) \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left(w(\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T), -T) + \int_{-T}^0 L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)) dt \right) \\ &\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left(w(\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T), -T) + \int_{-T}^{T_1} L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)) dt \right) \\ &= \int_{T_1}^T L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, each curve $\gamma_{\vartheta,s} : (-\infty, s] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ is (u, L_c) -calibrated. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\vartheta}u(\vartheta, s) &= d_{\vartheta}w(\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T), -T) + d_{\vartheta} \int_{-T}^0 L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)) dt \\ &= \partial_v L(d\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T)) \cdot \frac{\partial \gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T)}{\partial \vartheta} + \left(\partial_v L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)) \cdot \frac{\partial \gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t)}{\partial \vartheta} \right) \Big|_{t=-T}^0, \end{aligned}$$

assuming the derivatives exist. The fact that $\gamma'_{\vartheta,s}(-T)$ and $\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(-T)$ are exponentially close to each other uniformly in ϑ, s implies

$$\nabla u(\vartheta, s) := d_{\vartheta}u(\vartheta, s) = \partial_v L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(0)),$$

and as a result

$$\nabla u(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) = \partial_v L(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) = p_{\vartheta,s}(t) - c.$$

We now compute

$$\begin{aligned} L(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) &= \frac{d}{dt} u(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) = \nabla u(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) \cdot \dot{\gamma}_{\vartheta,s}(t) + u_t(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) \\ &= u_t(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) + p_{\vartheta,s}(t) \cdot \dot{\gamma}_{\vartheta,s}(t), \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) &= L(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) - p_{\vartheta,s}(t) \cdot \dot{\gamma}_{\vartheta,s}(t) \\ &= -H(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), p_{\vartheta,s}(t), t) = -H(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), \nabla u(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(t), t), t) \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

We now prove the “moreover” part. Consider a subsequence $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(-T_n) \rightarrow (\zeta, \tau) = (\zeta_{\vartheta,s}, \tau_{\vartheta,s}) \in \mathcal{A}_H(0)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} u(\vartheta, s) &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(\gamma_{\vartheta,s}(-T_n), -T_n) + \int_{T_n}^s L(d\gamma_{\vartheta,s}) dt \\ &\geq u(\zeta, \tau) + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_H(\gamma_{y,s}(-T_n), -T_n, \vartheta, s) = u(\zeta, \tau) + h_H(\zeta, \tau, \vartheta, s). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, according to Proposition 4.1.8 of [35], when u solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, u is dominated by L_c , namely for any absolutely continuous curve $(\theta_1, t_1), (\theta_2, t_2) \in V$, we have $u(\theta_2, t_2) - u(\theta_1, t_1) \leq A_H(\theta_1, t_1, \theta_2, t_2)$. As a result,

$$u(\vartheta, s) \leq u(\zeta, \tau) + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_H(\gamma_{y,s}(-T_n), -T_n, \vartheta, s)$$

which implies $u(\vartheta, s) = u(\zeta, \tau) + h_H(\zeta, \tau, \vartheta, s)$. Notice that we have not proven what’s needed since $(\zeta, \tau) = (\zeta_{\vartheta,s}, \tau_{\vartheta,s})$ depends on (ϑ, s) . However when there is only one static class we have

$$h_H(\zeta_1, \tau_1, \vartheta, s) = h_H(\zeta_1, \tau_1, \zeta_2, \tau_2) + h_H(\zeta_2, \tau_2, \vartheta, s), \quad (\zeta_1, \tau_1), (\zeta_2, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{A}_H(0),$$

which allows a consistent choice of (ζ, τ) for all (ϑ, s) . □

Proof of Proposition 8.10. By converting Definition 8.1, (2)(b), to its continuous counterpart, the condition of Lemma 8.11 is satisfied for $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$. The proposition follows by taking the zero section of the weak KAM solution. □




Figure 8.2: Local coordinates in the configuration space near \mathcal{S}_1 .

8.3 Regularity of the barrier functions

In this section we prove Proposition 8.8. Let $c_* \in \Gamma_*(H_*)$, $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$ and $c \in B_\sigma(c_*) \cap \Gamma_*(H)$, then according to our assumption, the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ is contained in the cylinder \mathcal{C} , and has a unique static class.

Let us now consider the lift $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H \circ \Xi}^0(\xi^*c)$, which has two components $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_2$. The cylinder \mathcal{C} lifts to two disjoint cylinders $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$. For the rest of the discussion, we will consider only the static class $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1$ as the other case is similar.

Definition 8.1 ensures that there is a Lipschitz function $y = g(x) \in (-1, 1)$, $x \in \mathbb{T}$, such that $\{\chi(x, g(x)) : x \in \mathbb{T}\} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c)$.

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c) = \{\chi(x, f(x)) : x \in \mathbb{T}\} =: \{F_c(x) = (F_c^\theta(x), F_c^p(x)) : x \in \mathbb{T}\} \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Now suppose $c, c' \in \Gamma_*(H) \cap B_\sigma(c_*)$, first we have:

Lemma 8.12. *There is $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_x \|F_c(x) - F_{c'}(x)\| \leq C \|c - c'\|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. The proof is the same as the one in Lemma 5.8, [13] where the proof only used the symplecticity of the cylinder. The main idea is that $\sup_x \|F_c(x) - F_{c'}(x)\|$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ Hölder with respect to the area between the two invariant curves restricted to the cylinder, while the latter is equivalent to the symplectic area by assumption. A direct calculation shows the symplectic area is bounded by $\|c' - c\|$. \square

Let us now denote

$$u_c(\theta) = h_{H \circ \Xi, \xi^*c}(\zeta_1, \theta), \quad \zeta_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1(H, c).$$

Before moving forward, we define a convenient local coordinate system near \mathcal{S}_1 . According to Proposition 8.10, the graph $(\theta, \nabla u_c(\theta))$ locally coincides with $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c))$. The (strong) unstable bundle $E^u(z)$ of $z \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c)$ is tangent to $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c))$ at every point, and transverse to the tangent cone of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c)$. Since $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c))$ is a Lipschitz graph over \mathbb{T}^n , the projection $N^u(z) := d\pi_\theta E^u(z)$ forms a non-zero section of the normal bundle to $\mathcal{S}_1(H, c) = \pi_\theta \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c)$ within the configuration space \mathbb{T}^n . By choosing an orthonormal basis $e_1(z), \dots, e_{n-1}(z)$, $N^u(z)$ naturally defines a coordinate system $(x^f, x^s) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ on the tubular neighborhood of \mathcal{S}_1 :

$$\iota(x^f, x^s) = F_c^\theta(x^f) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e_i(F_c^\theta(x^f))x_i^s.$$

See Figure 8.2. We note that the coordinate system is only Hölder since the unstable bundle is only Hölder a priori. Therefore, we consider C^∞ functions that approximate F_c^θ and e_i in the C^0 sense, the new coordinate system is still well defined near \mathcal{S}_1 , and the x^s coordinate projects onto the unstable direction. In the sequel, we fix such a coordinate system using $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H_*, c_*))$. Due to semi-continuity, for (H, c) close to (H_*, c_*) , the coordinate system is defined in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}_1(H, c)$.

By assumption, the foliation to $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_1(H, c))$, $c \in \Gamma_*(H)$ by strong unstable manifold is β_0 -Hölder for some $\beta_0 > 0$ (see [68]). As a result, we obtain the following regularity:

Lemma 8.13. *There is $\sigma > 0$ such that for $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$, $c, c' \in \Gamma_*(H) \cap B_\sigma(c_*)$, $\theta \in B_\sigma(\mathcal{S}_1(H, c_*))$, there is $\beta > 0$, $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

1. $|\nabla u_c(\theta) - \nabla u_{c'}(\theta)| \leq C_1 \|c - c'\|^\beta$;
2. $|u_c(\theta) - u_{c'}(\theta) - C_2| \leq C_1 \|c - c'\|^\beta$.

Moreover, the same holds with \mathcal{S}_1 replaced with \mathcal{S}_2 .

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as Lemma 5.9 in [13]. Let σ_1 be small enough such that the local coordinates (x^f, x^s) is defined for $|x^s| < \sigma$. We then consider the weak KAM solution $u_c \circ \iota(x^f, x^s)$ instead, which we still denote as $u_c(x^f, x^s)$, abusing the notation.

Let $|x^s| < \sigma_1$, let $y = (x^f, x^s, \nabla u_c(x^f, x^s))$, and let $z \in \mathcal{S}_1(H, c)$ be such that $y \in W^u(z)$. We then define $z' \in \mathcal{S}_1(H, c)$ be the unique such point with $x^f(z') = x^f(z)$. Finally define $y' \in W^u(z')$ be such that $x^s(y') = x^s(y)$, which is possible since $W^u(z')$ is a graph over the x^s coordinates. See Figure 8.3.

We note that within the center unstable manifold $W^u(\mathcal{C}_1)$, the NHIC \mathcal{C}_1 on one hand, and $x^s = x^s(y)$ on the other hand serves as two transversals to the strong




Figure 8.3: Proof of Lemma 8.13

unstable foliation $\{W^u(\cdot)\}$. Since the foliation is β_0 -Hölder, there exists $C > 0$ (throughout the proof, C denotes a generic constant) such that

$$\|y - y'\| \leq C\|z - z'\|^{\beta_0} \leq C\|c - c'\|^{\frac{\beta_0}{2}}.$$

Denote $w = (x, \nabla u_{c'}(x))$, and noting $y' \in W^u(\mathcal{S}_1(N, c')) = \{(x, \nabla u_{c'}(x))\}$ which is locally a C^1 graph, we get for $C > 0$

$$\|w - y'\| \leq C\|\pi_x(w) - \pi_x(y')\| = C\|\pi_x(y) - \pi_x(y')\| \leq C\|y - y'\|,$$

therefore

$$\|\nabla u_c(x) - \nabla u_{c'}(x)\| \leq \|w - y'\| \leq \|w - y'\| + \|y - y'\| \leq C\|y - y'\| \leq C\|c - c'\|^{\frac{\beta_0}{2}}.$$

We now revert the local coordinate ι to obtain item 1 with $\beta = \beta_0/2$, and possibly changing σ and C_1 . Item 2 is obtained from item 1 by direct integration. \square

8.4 Bifurcation type

We prove Theorem 8.2 in this section. Suppose (H_*, c_*) is of bifurcation type, let H^1, H^2 be the Hamiltonians as defined in Definition 8.2, then there exists cylinders $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ containing the local Aubry sets $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}(c)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}(c)$.

Let us denote $\alpha_H^i(c) = \alpha_{H^i}(c)$, called the local alpha functions. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$ has two static classes if and only if $\alpha_H^1(c) = \alpha_H^2(c)$. Moreover, for each c , the rotation vector $\rho_{H^i}(c)$ is uniquely defined, as a result, α_H^i is a C^1 function.

Proposition 8.14. *Let H_*, c_* be of bifurcation AM type. There is $\sigma > 0$ such that for an open and dense subset of $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$, such that there are at most finite many $c \in \overline{B_\sigma(c_*)} \cap \Gamma$ for which $\alpha_H^1(c) = \alpha_H^2(c)$.*

For each such (bifurcation) c , we have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}^0(c), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}^0(c)$ are both supported on hyperbolic periodic orbits. Moreover, $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ is a discrete set.

Proof. Let σ be as in Definition 8.2. For the rest of the proof, we refer to $\overline{B_\sigma(c_*)} \cap \Gamma$ as Γ to simplify notations.

Consider the family of Hamiltonians $H_\lambda = H(\theta, p, t) - \lambda f$ (f is the mollifier function in Definition 8.2). Then we have

$$\alpha_{H_\lambda}^1(c) = \alpha_H^1(c) + \lambda, \quad \alpha_{H_\lambda}^2(c) = \alpha_H^2(c).$$

By Sard's theorem, there exists a full Lebesgue measure set E of regular values λ of the function $\alpha_H^1 - \alpha_H^2$, which implies for $\lambda \in E$, 0 is a regular value of $\alpha_{H_\lambda}^1 - \alpha_{H_\lambda}^2(c)$ which implies the equation has only finitely many solutions on Γ , and at each solution, α^1 and α^2 has different derivatives when restricted to Γ . Note that this property is open in H , which implies the claim of our proposition is an open property. We only need to prove density.

Let $c_i(\lambda) \in \Gamma, i = 1, \dots, N$ be the set on which $\alpha_{H_\lambda}^1 = \alpha_{H_\lambda}^2$, then since $\frac{d}{d\lambda} \alpha_{H_\lambda}^1(c_i) \neq \frac{d}{d\lambda} \alpha_{H_\lambda}^2(c_i)$, each $c_i(\lambda)$ is locally a monotone function in λ .

We now impose the assumption that H is a Kupka-Smale system, namely, all periodic orbits are non-degenerate. Then in this setting, all invariant measures of rational rotation vectors are supported on hyperbolic periodic orbits, by a further perturbation, we can ensure for each c there is only one minimal periodic orbit. Since the Aubry set is upper semi-continuous when there is only one static class, and the hyperbolic periodic orbit is structurally stable, we obtain that each hyperbolic periodic orbit is the Aubry set for an open set of c 's. Let us denote by $R(H, \Gamma)$ the set of all $c \in \Gamma$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ is a hyperbolic periodic orbit, then $R(H^1, \Gamma)$ and $R(H^2, \Gamma)$ are both open and dense in Γ . Then for each c_i , there is $d_i > 0$ and an open and dense subset of $\lambda \in B_{d_i}(0)$ such that $c_i(\lambda) \in R(H^1, \Gamma) \cap R(H^2, \Gamma)$. Let $d = \min d_i$, then there is an open and dense set of $\lambda \in B_d(0)$ such that for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, $c_i(\lambda) \in R(\Gamma)$. For these c_i 's, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}^0(c_i), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}^0(c_i)$ are both hyperbolic periodic orbits. Using the Kupka-Smale theorem again, it is an open and dense property such that the stable and unstable manifolds of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}^0(c_i)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}^0(c_i)$ intersect transversally. Due to dimension considerations, the intersection is a discrete set. Since each orbit in $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c_i) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c_i)$ is a heteroclinic orbit between $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}^0(c_i)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}^0(c_i)$, it is also a discrete set.

We have now proven the claim of our proposition holds for an arbitrarily small perturbation H_λ of H , and hence is dense on $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$. \square

An analogous statement holds for the asymmetric bifurcation case:

Proposition 8.15. *Let H_*, c_* be of asymmetric bifurcation type, then there is $\sigma > 0$ such that for an open and of $H \in \mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$, such that there a unique $c \in \overline{B_\sigma(c_*)} \cap \Gamma$ for which $\alpha_H^1(c) = \alpha_H^2(c)$. Moreover, at such (bifurcation) c , we have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}^0(c), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}^0(c)$ are both supported on hyperbolic periodic orbits. Moreover, $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ is a discrete set.*

Proof. The proof is nearly identical to Proposition 8.14 with the simplification that for σ small enough, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}^0(c)$ is always the same hyperbolic periodic orbit, and $\alpha_{H^2}(c)$ is a linear function. Since $\alpha_{H^1}(c)$ is convex on Γ , there is at most one bifurcation. The rest of the proof is identical. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.2. Case 1: Let H_*, c_* be of bifurcation AM type, and let $\sigma > 0$ be such that Proposition 8.14 holds on a open and dense subset \mathcal{R}_1 of $\mathcal{V}_\sigma(H_*)$. Then on $\Gamma \cap B_\sigma(c_*)$ there are at most finitely many bifurcations $c_i, i = 1, \dots, N$. Moreover, for each bifurcation value c_i , there is $\sigma_i > 0$ such that for $c \in \overline{B_{\sigma_i}(c_i)}$, the local Aubry sets are hyperbolic periodic orbits. This means that for each (non-bifurcation) $c \in \overline{B_{\sigma_i}(c_i)} \setminus c_i$, the sets $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ are contractible (in fact finite). At the bifurcation values, the set $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c_i) \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c_i)$ is discrete.

We now consider the set

$$\left(\Gamma \cap \overline{B_\sigma(c_*)} \right) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N B_{\sigma_i}(c_i)$$

which is compact with finitely many connected components. On each of the components $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c)$ has a unique static class. We apply Theorem 8.1 to get there is $\sigma' > 0$ such that the dichotomy of Theorem 8.1 holds for a residual subset \mathcal{R}_2 of $H \in \mathcal{V}_{\sigma'}(H_*)$ on each of the connected components. The theorem follows by taking the intersection of \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 as well as the smaller value of σ and σ' .

Case 2: If (H_*, c_*) is of asymmetric bifurcation type, the proof is the same with Proposition 8.15 replacing Proposition 8.14. \square

9 Aubry-Mather type at the single resonance

9.1 Normally hyperbolicity and localization of Aubry/Mañé sets in the single maximum case

In this section we consider the Hamiltonian system

$$N_\epsilon = H_0(p) + \epsilon Z(\theta^s, p) + \epsilon R(\theta, p, t),$$

where $\theta = (\theta^s, \theta^f) \in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{T}$ and $p = (p^s, p^f) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. Consider the resonant curve

$$\Gamma = \{p \in B^n : \partial_{p^s} H_0(p) = 0\} = \{p_*(p^f) = (p_*^s(p^f), p^f) : p^f \in [a_-, a_+]\}.$$

We first consider the case where $p \in \Gamma$ satisfy the condition $[SR1_\lambda]$, namely for each $p \in B_\lambda(p_0) \cap \Gamma$, $Z(\theta^s, p_*(p^f))$ has a unique global maximum at $\theta_*^s(p^f)$, and

$$D^{-1}I \leq \partial_{pp}^2 H_0 \leq DI, \quad \|Z\|_{C^3} \leq 1, \quad \lambda I \leq -\partial_{\theta^s \theta^s}^2 Z(\theta_*^s(p^f), p_*(p^f)) \leq \lambda I,$$

and that for $K > 0$, and $p_0 = p_*(a_0) \in \Gamma$,

$$\|R\|_{C_I^2(\mathbb{T}^n \times B_{K\sqrt{\epsilon}}(p_0) \times \mathbb{T})} \leq \delta,$$

note that we are using the rescaled norm C_I^2 (see (3.2)). We then set $K_1 = K/D$ and consider the local segment

$$\Gamma(\epsilon, p_0) = \{p_*(p^f) : p^f \in [a_0 - K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}, a_0 + K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}]\} \subset \Gamma \cap B_{K\sqrt{\epsilon}}(p_0),$$

which is contained in $B_\lambda(p_0) \cap \Gamma$ if ϵ_0 is small enough depending on K . Throughout this section, we write $f = O(g)$ if $|f| \leq C|g|$ for $C > 0$ that may depend only on D, λ and n .

Theorem 9.1 (Proof in Section 9.4 and Section 9.5, see also [13], Theorem 3.1). *Assume that $K_1 > 2$. There is $\delta_0, \epsilon_0 > 0$ and $C = C(D, \lambda, n) > 1$, such that if $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and $0 < \epsilon < \max\{\epsilon_0, \sqrt{\delta}\}$, there is a C^2 map*

$$(\Theta^s, P^s)(\theta^f, p^f, t) : \mathbb{T} \times [a_0 - K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/2, a_0 + K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/2] \times \mathbb{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1},$$

such that $\mathcal{C} = \{(\theta^s, p^s) = (\Theta^s, P^s)(\theta^f, p^f, t)\}$ is weakly invariant in the sense that the vector field is tangent to \mathcal{C} . \mathcal{C} is contained in the set

$$V = \{(\theta, p, t) : \|\theta^s - \theta_*^s(p^f)\| \leq C^{-1}, \quad \|p^s - p_*^s(p^f)\| \leq C^{-1}\}$$

and it contains all the invariant set contained in V . Moreover, we have

$$\|\Theta^s(\theta^f, p^f, t) - \theta_*^s(p^f)\| \leq C\delta, \quad \|P^s(\theta^f, p^f, t) - p_*^s(p^f)\| \leq C\delta\sqrt{\epsilon},$$

$$\|\partial_{p^f} \Theta^s\| \leq C\sqrt{\delta/\epsilon}, \quad \|\partial_{(\theta^f, t)} \Theta^s\| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad \|\partial_{p^f} P^s\| \leq C, \quad \|\partial_{(\theta^f, t)} P^s\| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

The cylinder \mathcal{C} is normally hyperbolic with its stable/unstable bundle projects onto the θ^s direction.

Theorem 9.2 (Proof is in Section 9.6, see also [13], Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.2). *There is $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\lambda, n, D) > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\lambda, n, D, \delta)$ such that if $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, the Mañé set of the cohomology c satisfies*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{N_\epsilon}(c) \subset B_{\delta^{1/5}}(\theta_*^s) \times \mathbb{T} \times B_{\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta^{1/16}} \times \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}.$$

If u is a weak KAM solution of N_ϵ at c , then the set $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(u, c) \subset \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is contained in a $18\sqrt{D\epsilon}$ -Lipschitz graph above \mathbb{T}^n .

The theorems as stated are analogous to the cited theorems in [13]. The main difference is that we now assume the much weaker assumption $\|R\|_{C_T^2} \leq \delta$. Nevertheless, we now check that the method in [13] applies in the same way, and leading to the estimates as stated.

9.2 Aubry-Mather type at single resonance

Theorem 9.3. *Let $c = p_*(p^f)$ with $p^f \in [a_0 - K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/4, a_0 + K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}/4]$, there there is $\epsilon_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for $N_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon Z + \epsilon R$ with $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\delta < \delta_0$, then N_ϵ, c is of Aubry-Mather type with the hyperbolic cylinder given by the embedding*

$$\chi(\theta^f, p^f) = (\Theta^s, P^s)(\theta^f, p^f, 0)$$

where Θ^s, P^s is from Theorem 9.1.

We need the following statement.

Lemma 9.1 ([13], Proposition 4.11). *Let u be a (discrete) weak KAM solution for N_ϵ at cohomology c , let*

$$\mathcal{G}_{c,u} = \{(\theta, c + \nabla u(\theta))\}$$

be the associated pseudograph. Then there is $C > 0$ depending only on n, D such that for any $k \geq 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$, $(\theta_1, p_1), (\theta_2, p_2) \in \phi^{-k}\mathcal{G}_{c,u}$, we have

$$\|p_2 - p_1\| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}\|\theta_2 - \theta_1\|.$$

We prove Theorem 9.3 assuming Theorem 9.1 and 9.2.

Proof of Theorem 9.3. Let us denote \mathcal{C} the cylinder in Theorem 9.1 and $\mathcal{C}^0 = \mathcal{C} \cap \{t = 0\}$.

Let δ_0, ϵ_0 be small enough such that Theorem 9.1 and 9.2 applies for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $0 < \delta < \delta_0$. In particular, these statements holds on a open set N_ϵ and c , as required by Definition 8.1. The embedding as described is a weakly normally hyperbolic invariant

cylinder. Moreover, Theorem 9.1 implies that for any two tangent vectors $v, v' \in T_z\mathcal{C}^0$, we have $|d\Theta^s \wedge dP^s(v, v')| \leq C\sqrt{\delta}|d\theta^f \wedge dp^f(v, v')|$, and therefore for δ small enough

$$|(d\Theta^s \wedge dP^s + d\theta^f \wedge dp^f)(v, v')| \geq (1 - C\sqrt{\delta}) \geq \frac{1}{2}|d\theta^f \wedge dp^f(v, v')|.$$

Since the form $d\theta^f \wedge dp^f$ is non-degenerate on \mathcal{C}^0 , the symplectic form $d\theta^s \wedge dp^f + d\theta^f \wedge dp^f$ is non-degenerate when restricted to \mathcal{C}^0 .

Theorem 9.2 implies that for δ small enough, the Mañe set $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{N_\epsilon}(c)$ is contained in the neighborhood V described in Theorem 9.1. Since the Mañe set is invariant, it must be contained in the cylinder \mathcal{C} . Therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{N_\epsilon}^0(c) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{N_\epsilon}^0(c) \subset \mathcal{C}^0$.

We now show that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{N_\epsilon}^0$ is a Lipschitz graph over θ^f . Let $(\theta_1, p_1), (\theta_2, p_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{N_\epsilon}^0(c)$, then by Theorem 9.2 we have

$$\|p_2 - p_1\| \leq 18D\sqrt{\epsilon}\|\theta_2 - \theta_1\| \leq 18D\sqrt{\epsilon} \left(\|\theta_2^s - \theta_1^s\| + \|\theta_2^f - \theta_1^f\| \right).$$

By Theorem 9.1,

$$\|\theta_2^s - \theta_1^s\| \leq C(1 + \sqrt{\delta/\epsilon}) \left(\|\theta_2^f - \theta_1^f\| + \|p_2 - p_1\| \right). \quad (9.1)$$

Combine everything, we get for some constant C_1 depending on n, D ,

$$\left(1 - C_1(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sqrt{\delta})\right) \|p_2 - p_1\| \leq C_1(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sqrt{\delta})\|\theta_2^f - \theta_1^f\|.$$

Which implies $\|p_2 - p_1\| \leq \|\theta_2^f - \theta_1^f\|$ if δ, ϵ is small enough depending only on C_1 . Combine with (9.1) we get $\|(\theta_2, p_2) - (\theta_1, p_1)\| \leq 2\|\theta_2^f - \theta_1^f\|$ if ϵ, δ is small enough.

Finally, let u be a weak KAM solution for N_ϵ at cohomology c , and assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{N_\epsilon}^0(c)$ projects onto θ^f component. Since the strong unstable manifold depends C^1 on the base point, the unstable manifold $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c))$ is a Lipschitz manifold. Moreover, since the strong unstable direction projects onto the θ^s direction, $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c))$ is locally a graph over $\theta = (\theta^f, \theta^s)$. This verifies (2)(b) of Definition 8.1. We have verified all conditions in Definition 8.1 and therefore N_ϵ, c is of Aubry-Mather type. \square

9.3 Bifurcations in the double maxima case

In this section we assume that for the Hamiltonian

$$N_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon Z + \epsilon R,$$

where Z satisfies the condition $[SR2_\lambda]$, namely for all $p \in B_\lambda(p_0) \cap \Gamma$, there exists two local maxima $\theta_1^s(p)$ and $\theta_2^s(p)$ of the function $Z(\cdot, p)$ in \mathbb{T}^{n-1} satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\theta^s}^2 Z(\theta_1^s(p), p) &< \lambda I \quad , \quad \partial_{\theta^s}^2 Z(\theta_2^s(p), p) < \lambda I, \\ Z(\theta^s, p) &< \max\{Z(\theta_1^f(p), p), Z(\theta_2^f(p), p)\} - \lambda(\min\{d(\theta^s - \theta_1^s), d(\theta^s - \theta_2^s)\})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f : \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bump function satisfying the following conditions:

$$f|_{B_\lambda(\theta_1^s(p_0))} = 0, \quad f|_{B_\lambda(\theta_2^s(p_0))} = 1,$$

and $0 \leq f \leq 1$ otherwise. Define

$$Z_1 = Z - f, \quad Z_2 = Z - (1 - f),$$

then $Z_1(\cdot, p_0)$ has a unique maximum at $\theta_1^s(p_0)$, while $Z_2(\cdot, p_0)$ has a unique maximum at $\theta_2^s(p_0)$. There is $\kappa > 0$ depending only on λ such that the same holds for $p \in B_\kappa(p_0)$. To the Hamiltonian

$$N_\epsilon^i = N + \epsilon Z_i + \epsilon R, \quad i = 1, 2$$

we may apply Theorem 9.1 and 9.2 to obtain existence of the NHIC \mathcal{C}_i which contains the local Aubry sets $\mathcal{A}^i(c)$ for $c \in B_{\kappa/2}(p_0)$. Moreover, we may define the local alpha functions $\alpha^i(c) = \alpha_{N_\epsilon^i}(c)$ similar to Section 8.4. The cohomology $c \in \Gamma \cap B_{\kappa/2}(p_0)$ is of bifurcation type if and only if $\alpha^1(c) = \alpha^2(c)$, and is of Aubry-Mather type if and only if $\alpha^1(c) \neq \alpha^2(c)$.

Moreover, in this case we have the following analog of Theorem 9.2.

Theorem 9.4 (Proof is in Section 9.6, see also [13], Theorem 4.5). *If $\delta = \delta(\lambda, n, D) > 0$ is small enough and if $\epsilon < \epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\lambda, n, D, \delta)$ is small enough, for $c \in B_{\kappa/2}(p_0) \cap \Gamma$ the Aubry set at cohomology c of the Hamiltonian N_ϵ satisfies*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c) \subset (B(\theta_1^s, \delta^{1/5}) \cup B(\theta_2^s, \delta^{1/5})) \times \mathbb{T} \times B(c, \sqrt{\epsilon} \delta^{1/16}) \times \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}.$$

If, moreover, the projection $\theta^s(\mathcal{A}^0(c)) \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ is contained in one of the (disjoint) balls $B(\theta_i^s, \delta^{1/5})$, then the projection $\theta^s(\mathcal{N}^0(c)) \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1}$ of the Mañ set is contained in the same ball $B(\theta_i^s, \delta^{1/5})$.

Theorem 9.5. *Suppose Z satisfies condition $SR2_\lambda$ at $p = c_*$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0, \delta_0 > 0$, such that if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, such that if $N_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon Z + \epsilon R$ with $\|R\|_{C_7^2} < \delta$, N_ϵ, c_* is of bifurcation Aubry-Mather type.*

Proof. Let $V_1 = B_\lambda(\theta_1^s(p_0)) \times \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{T}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{T}$, and $V_2 = B_\lambda(\theta_2^s(p_0)) \times \mathbb{T}$. We check that the functions N_ϵ^1 and N_ϵ^2 both satisfies the conditions of Theorem 9.3, and as a result, conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 8.2 are satisfied. It suffices to check item (3). \square

9.4 Hyperbolic coordinates

The Hamiltonian flow admits the following equation of motion :

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\theta}^s = \partial_{p^s} H_0 + \epsilon \partial_{p^s} Z + \epsilon \partial_{p^s} R \\ \dot{p}^s = -\epsilon \partial_{\theta^s} Z - \epsilon \partial_{\theta^s} R \\ \dot{\theta}^f = \partial_{p^f} H_0 + \epsilon \partial_{p^f} Z + \epsilon \partial_{p^f} R \\ \dot{p}^f = -\epsilon \partial_{\theta^f} R \\ \dot{t} = 1 \end{cases} \quad . \quad (9.2)$$

The Hamiltonian structure of the flow is not used in the following proof.

The system (9.2) is a perturbation of

$$\dot{\theta}^s = \partial_{p^s} H_0, \quad \dot{p}^s = -\epsilon \partial_{\theta^s} Z, \quad \dot{\theta}^f = \partial_{p^f} H_0, \quad \dot{p}^f = 0, \quad \dot{t} = 1$$

which admits a normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder

$$\{(\theta_*^s(p^f), \theta^f, p_*^s(p^f), p^f, t) : \theta^f, t \in \mathbb{T}, \}.$$

Set

$$B(p^f) := \partial_{p^s p^s}^2 H_0(p_*(p^f)), \quad A(p^f) := -\partial_{\theta^s \theta^s}^2 Z(\theta_*^s(p^f), p_*(p^f)),$$

then as in [13], there is a positive definite matrix $T(p^f)$ such that

$$\Lambda(p^f) = T(p^f)A(p^f)T(p^f) = T^{-1}(p^f)B(p^f)T^{-1}(p^f).$$

We lift the equation to the universal cover, and consider the change of variable

$$\begin{aligned} x &= T^{-1}(p^f)(\theta^s - \theta_*^s(p^f)) + \epsilon^{-1/2} T(p^f)(p^s - p_*^s(p^f)) \\ y &= T^{-1}(p^f)(\theta^s - \theta_*^s(p^f)) - \epsilon^{-1/2} T(p^f)(p^s - p_*^s(p^f)), \\ I &= \epsilon^{-1/2}(p^f - a_0), \quad \Theta = \gamma \theta^f, \end{aligned} \quad (9.3)$$

where $0 < \gamma < 1$ is a parameter to be determined.

Lemma 9.2 ([13], Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2). *For each $p^f \in [a_-, a_+]$, we have $\Lambda(p^f) \geq \sqrt{\lambda/DI}$. We also have the following estimates:*

$$\|T\|_{C^2}, \|T^{-1}\|_{C^2}, \|\partial_{p^f} \theta_*^s\|_{C^0}, \|p_*^s\|_{C^2} = O(1), \quad \|\theta^s - \theta_*^s\|_{C^0} \leq O(\rho), \quad \|p^s - p_*^s\|_{C^0} \leq O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\rho),$$

where $\rho = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$.

Note we are using the regular C^2 norm in Lemma 9.2 since T depends only on H_0 and Z which are bounded in the regular norm.

Lemma 9.3. *The equation of motion in the new variables takes the form*

$$\dot{x} = \sqrt{\epsilon}\Lambda(a_0 + \sqrt{\epsilon}I)x + \sqrt{\epsilon}O(\delta + \rho^2), \quad \dot{y} = -\sqrt{\epsilon}\Lambda(a_0 + \sqrt{\epsilon}I)y + \sqrt{\epsilon}O(\delta + \rho^2),$$

and $\dot{I} = O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta)$.

Proof. The last equation is straight forward. We only prove the equation for \dot{x} as the calculations for \dot{y} are the same. In the original coordinates, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}^s &= B(p^f)(p^s - p_*^s(p^f)) + O(\|p^s - p_*^s(p^f)\|^2) + O(\delta\sqrt{\epsilon}), \\ \dot{p}^s &= \epsilon A(p^f)(\theta^s - \theta_*^s(p^f)) + O(\epsilon\|\theta^s - \theta_*^s(p^f)\|^2) + O(\epsilon\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|\partial_p R\| = \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\partial_I R\| = O(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta)$. Differentiate (9.3), use $\dot{p}^f = O(\epsilon\delta)$, Lemma 9.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= T^{-1}\dot{\theta}^s + \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}T\dot{p}^s + O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) \\ &= \sqrt{\epsilon}T^{-1}BT^{-1} \cdot \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}T(p^s - p_*^s(p^f)) + \sqrt{\epsilon}TAT \cdot T^{-1}(\theta^s - \theta_*^s) + O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta + \sqrt{\epsilon}\rho^2) \\ &= \sqrt{\epsilon}\Lambda(p^f)x + \sqrt{\epsilon}O(\delta + \rho^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 9.4. *Suppose $\sqrt{\epsilon} \leq \delta$, then in the new coordinates (x, y, Θ, I, t) the linearized system is given by*

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon}\Lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{\epsilon}\Lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \sqrt{\epsilon}O(\delta\gamma^{-1} + \rho + \gamma),$$

where $\rho = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$.

Proof. In the original coordinates, the linearized equation is given by the matrix

$$\tilde{L} = \begin{bmatrix} O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & B + O(\delta) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & \partial_{p^f p^s}^2 H_0 + O(\delta) & 0 \\ \epsilon A + O(\epsilon\rho) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & 0 & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & 0 \\ O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & O(1) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & O(1) & 0 \\ 0 & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & 0 & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + O(\epsilon\delta).$$

The coordinate change matrix is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial(\theta^s, p^s, \theta^f, p^f, t)}{\partial(x, y, \Theta, I, t)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T/2 & T/2 & 0 & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}) & 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}T^{-1}/2 & -\sqrt{\epsilon}T^{-1}/2 & 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon}\partial_{p^f p^s}^2 H_0 + O(\epsilon\rho) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The product is

$$\tilde{L} \left[\frac{\partial(\theta^s, p^s, \theta^f, p^f, t)}{\partial(x, y, \Theta, I, t)} \right] = O(\epsilon\delta\gamma^{-1} + \epsilon\rho) + \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon}BT^{-1}/2 + O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & -\sqrt{\epsilon}BT^{-1}/2 + O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta\gamma^{-1}) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) & 0 \\ \epsilon AT/2 & \epsilon AT/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ O(\sqrt{\epsilon}) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta\gamma^{-1}) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Most of the computations are straightforward, with the exception of the fourth row, first column, which contains the following cancellation:

$$\partial_{p^s p^f}^2 H_0 \partial_{p^f} p_*^s + \partial_{p^f p^f}^2 H_0 = \partial_{p^f} (\partial_{p^f} H_0(p_*(p^f))) = 0$$

since $\partial_{p^f} H_0(p_*(p^f)) = 0$ for every p^f by definition.

The differential of the inverse coordinate change is

$$\left[\frac{\partial(x, y, \Theta, I, t)}{\partial(\theta^s, p^s, \theta^f, p^f, t)} \right] = \begin{bmatrix} T^{-1} & \epsilon^{-1/2}T & 0 & O(\epsilon^{-1/2}\lambda^{-1/4}) & 0 \\ T^{-1} & -\epsilon^{-1/2}T & 0 & O(\epsilon^{-1/2}\lambda^{-1/4}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon^{-1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally, the new matrix of the linearized equation is

$$L = \left[\frac{\partial(x, y, \Theta, I, t)}{\partial(\theta^s, p^s, \theta^f, p^f, t)} \right] \tilde{L} \left[\frac{\partial(\theta^s, p^s, \theta^f, p^f, t)}{\partial(x, y, \Theta, I, t)} \right] = O(\sqrt{\epsilon}(\delta\gamma^{-1} + \rho)) + \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon}\Lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{\epsilon}\Lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\gamma) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\gamma) & O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\gamma) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

□

9.5 Normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder

We state the following abstract statement for existence of normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds, given in [13].

Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a C^1 vector field. We split the space \mathbb{R}^n as $\mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_s} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$, and denote by $z = (u, s, c)$ the points of \mathbb{R}^n . We denote by (F_u, F_s, F_c) the components of F :

$$F(x) = (F_u(z), F_s(z), F_c(z)).$$

We study the flow of F in the domain

$$\Omega = B^u \times B^s \times \Omega^c$$

where B^u and B^s are the open Euclidean balls of radius r_u and r_s in \mathbb{R}^{n_u} and \mathbb{R}^{n_s} , and $\Omega^c = \Omega^{c_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{c_2}$ is a convex open subset of \mathbb{R}^{n_c} . We denote by

$$L(z) = dF(z) = \begin{bmatrix} L_{uu}(z) & L_{us}(z) & L_{uc}(z) \\ L_{su}(z) & L_{ss}(z) & L_{sc}(z) \\ L_{cu}(z) & L_{cs}(z) & L_{cc}(z) \end{bmatrix}$$

the linearized vector field at point z . We assume that $\|L(z)\|$ is bounded on Ω , which implies that each trajectory of F is defined until it leaves Ω . We denote by $W^c(F, \omega)$ the union of all full orbits contained in Ω , $W^{sc}(F, \Omega)$ the set of points whose positive orbit remains inside Ω , and by $W^{uc}(F, \Omega)$ the set of points whose negative orbit remains inside Ω .

Let us further consider a positive parameter $b > 0$, and consider the set $\Omega_b^{c_2} = B_b(\Omega^{c_2})$ and $\Omega_b^c = \Omega^{c_1} \times \Omega_b^{c_2}$.

Proposition 9.5 ([13], Proposition A.6). *Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_s} \times \Omega_b^c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_s} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ be a C^2 vector field. Assume that there exists $\alpha, m, \sigma > 0$ such that*

- $F_u(u, s, c) \cdot u > 0$ on $\partial B^u \times \bar{B}^s \times \bar{\Omega}_b^c$.
- $F_s(u, s, c) \cdot s < 0$ on $\bar{B}^u \times \partial B^s \times \bar{\Omega}_b^c$.
- $L_{uu}(z) \geq \alpha I$, $L_{ss}(z) \leq -\alpha I$ for each $x \in \Omega_b$ in the sense of quadratic forms.
- $\|L_{us}(z)\| + \|L_{uc}(z)\| + \|L_{ss}(z)\| + \|L_{sc}(z)\| + \|L_{cu}(z)\| + \|L_{cs}(z)\| + \|L_{cc}(z)\| \leq m$ for each $x \in \Omega_b$.
- $\|L_{us}(z)\| + \|L_{uc}(z)\| + \|L_{ss}(z)\| + \|L_{sc}(z)\| + \|L_{cu}(z)\| + \|L_{cs}(z)\| + \|L_{cc}(z)\| + 2\|F_{c_2}(z)\|/b \leq m$ for each $z \in \Omega_b - \Omega$.

Assume furthermore that

$$K := \frac{m}{\alpha - 2m} \leq \frac{1}{8},$$

then there exist C^2 maps

$$w^{sc} : B^s \times \Omega_b^c \rightarrow B^u, \quad w^{uc} : B^u \times \Omega_b^c \rightarrow B^s, \quad w^c : \Omega_b^c \rightarrow B^u \times B^s$$

satisfying the estimates

$$\|dw^{sc}\| \leq K, \quad \|dw^{uc}\| \leq K, \quad \|dw^c\| \leq 2K,$$

the graphs of which respectively contain $W^{sc}(F, \Omega), W^{uc}(F, \Omega), W^c(F, \Omega)$. Moreover, the graphs of the restrictions of w^{sc}, w^{uc} and w^c to, respectively, $B^s \times \Omega^c, B^u \times \Omega^c$ and Ω^c , are tangent to the flow.

There exists an invariant C^1 foliation of the graph of w^{uc} whose leaves are graphs of K -Lipschitz maps above B^u . The set $W^{uc}(F, \Omega)$ is a union of leaves : it has the structure of an invariant C^1 lamination. Two points x, x' belong to the same leaf of this lamination if and only if $d(x(t), x'(t))e^{t\alpha/4}$ is bounded on \mathbb{R}^- .

If in addition there exists a group G of translations of $\mathbb{R}^{n_{c1}}$ such that $F \circ (id \otimes id \otimes g \otimes id) = F$ for each $g \in G$, then the maps w^* can be chosen such that

$$w^{sc} \circ (id \otimes g \otimes id) = w^{sc}, \quad w^{uc} \circ (id \otimes g \otimes id) = w^{uc}, \quad w^c \circ (g \otimes id) = w^c \quad (9.4)$$

for each $g \in G$. The lamination is also translation invariant.

Proof of Theorem 9.1. Consider the equation of N_ϵ in the (x, y, θ^f, p^f, t) coordinates, and set $B^u = \{\|x\| < \rho\}$, $B^s = \{\|y\| < \rho\}$, $\Omega^{c2} = \{\|I^f\| \leq K_1/2\}$, $\Omega^{c1} = \{(\theta^f, t)\}$ with the group translation \mathbb{Z}^2 , $\alpha = \sqrt{\lambda/4D}$, $b = 1 < K_1/2$. Note that our choice of b implies $\Omega_b^{c2} \subset \{\|I^f\| < K_1\}$. We fix $\gamma = \sqrt{\delta}$

According to Lemma 9.2 and Lemma 9.3, we have for $\|x\| = \rho$,

$$\dot{x} \cdot x \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\alpha\rho^2 - \rho\sqrt{\epsilon}O(\delta + \rho^2) = \sqrt{\epsilon}\rho(\rho - O(\delta + \rho^2)) > 0$$

as long as $\rho \geq C\delta$ for C large enough. This verifies the first bullet point assumption. The second assumption is verified in the same way.

By Lemma 9.4, we have for $C_1 > 1$ depending on λ, D, n ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|L_{us}(z)\| + \|L_{uc}(z)\| + \|L_{ss}(z)\| + \|L_{sc}(z)\| + \|L_{cu}(z)\| + \|L_{cs}(z)\| + \|L_{cc}(z)\| \\ &= \sqrt{\epsilon}O(\delta\gamma^{-1} + \rho + \gamma) \leq C_1\sqrt{\epsilon}(\sqrt{\delta} + \rho) =: m/2, \end{aligned}$$

and $L_{uu} \geq (2\alpha - m)I \geq \alpha I$ as long as $m < \alpha$. This is possible as long as $\epsilon, \delta, \rho < C_1^{-1} < \alpha$. Finally, we check that if $z \in \Omega_b \setminus \Omega$, $\|F_{c2}(z)\| = O(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta) \leq C_1\sqrt{\epsilon}(\sqrt{\delta} + \rho)/2 = m/4$ if C_1 is chosen large enough. These estimates ensure all the bullet point conditions are satisfied. By choosing C_1 even smaller, we can ensure $m < \alpha/10$ which implies $K = m/(\alpha - 2m) \leq 1/8$.

To summarize, we have shown all conditions of Proposition 9.5 is satisfied if $0 < \epsilon < C_1^{-1}$, $0 < \delta < C_1^{-1}$, $C\delta \leq \rho \leq C_1^{-1}$. We apply the Proposition twice, once for $\rho = C_1^{-1}$ and once for $\rho = C\delta$. The first application shows the invariant cylinder is

the maximal invariant set in the set $\Omega^c = \{\|x\|, \|y\| \leq C_1^{-1}\}$. The second application shows that the cylinder is in fact contained in the set $\{\|x\|, \|y\| \leq C\delta\}$. Moreover, in the second application, we get the estimate $m = O(\sqrt{\epsilon\delta})$, which allows the estimate $K = O(\sqrt{\epsilon\delta})$.

We now return to the original coordinates using the formula

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta^s(\theta^f, p^f, t) &= \theta_*^s(p^f) + \frac{1}{2}T(p^f) \cdot (w_u^c + w_s^c)(\gamma\theta^f, a_0 + \epsilon^{-1/2}p^f, t) \\ P^s(\theta^f, p^f, t) &= p_*^s(p^f) + \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{2}T^{-1}(p^f) \cdot (w_u^c - w_s^c)(\gamma\theta^f, a_0 + \epsilon^{-1/2}p^f, t).\end{aligned}\tag{9.5}$$

All the estimates stated in Theorem 9.1 follow directly from these expressions, and from the fact that $\{\|x\|, \|y\| \leq C\delta\}$, $\|dw^c\| \leq 2K = O(\sqrt{\epsilon\delta})$. \square

9.6 Localization of the Aubry and Mañe sets

Let $D_1 = 2D$, the Hamiltonian N_ϵ satisfies the following estimates if δ is small enough depending only on D :

$$D_1^{-1}I \leq \partial_{pp}^2 N_\epsilon \leq DI, \quad \|\partial_{\theta p}^2 N_\epsilon\| \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad \|\partial_{\theta\theta}^2 N_\epsilon\| \leq 3\epsilon.$$

Let $L(\theta, p, t)$ be the Lagrangian associated to N_ϵ , and L_0 the Lagrangian of H_0 .

Lemma 9.6. *The following estimates holds for the Lagrangian L .*

1. ([13], Lemma 4.1) *For $K > 0$, the image of the set $\mathbb{T}^n \times B_{K\sqrt{\epsilon}} \times \mathbb{T}$ under the diffeomorphism $\partial_p N_\epsilon$ contains the set $\mathbb{T}^n \times B_{K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}}(c) \times \mathbb{T}$, where $K_1 = K/(4D_1)$.*
2. ([13], Lemma 4.2) *The estimates*

$$\|\partial_{\theta v}^2 L\|_{C^0} \leq 2D_1\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad \|\partial_{\theta\theta}^2 L\|_{C^0} \leq 3\epsilon$$

holds on $\mathbb{T}^n \times B_{K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}}(c) \times \mathbb{T}$.

3. ([13], Lemma 4.3) *For $v \in B_{K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}}(c)$, we have*

$$|L(\theta, v, t) - (L_0(v) - \epsilon Z(\theta^s, c))| \leq 2\epsilon\delta.$$

4. ([13], Lemma 4.4) *The alpha function $\alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c)$ satisfies*

$$|\alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c) - (H_0(c) + \epsilon \max Z(\cdot, c))| \leq 2\epsilon\delta.$$

5. ([13], Lemma 4.5) There is $C > 1$ depending only on D such that if $\epsilon < C^{-1}\delta$, we have the estimates

$$L(\theta, v, t) - c \cdot v + \alpha(c) \geq \|v - \partial H_0(c)\|^2 / (4D_1) - \epsilon \hat{Z}_c(\theta^s) - 4\epsilon\delta \quad (9.6)$$

$$L(\theta, v, t) - c \cdot v + \alpha(c) \leq D_1 \|v - \partial H_0(c)\|^2 - \epsilon \hat{Z}_c(\theta^s) + 4\epsilon\delta \quad (9.7)$$

for each $(\theta, v, t) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, where $\hat{Z}_c(\theta^s) := Z(\theta^s, c) - \max_{\theta^s} Z(\theta^s, c)$.

Proof. We remark that in [13] it is assumed that $\|\partial_{\theta^s}^2 N_\epsilon\| \leq 2\epsilon$ instead of $2\sqrt{\epsilon}$ as we assumed. However the same calculations as given in the cited lemmas prove Lemma 9.6, once appropriate changes are made. \square

Proposition 9.7. For each $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the weak KAM solution u of cohomology c is $3\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}/2$ -semi-concave.

Proof of Theorem 9.2. The proofs of Theorem 4.1 and 4.2 in [13] relies on the estimates (3)(4)(5) in Lemma 9.6, as well as Proposition 9.7. We have arrived at the same estimates using weaker assumption, the only change is we replaced the constant D with $D_1 = 2D$. The rest of the proofs are exactly identical. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.4. This is similar to Theorem 9.2. The proof of Theorem 4.5, [13] applies once we taking into account Lemma 9.6 and Proposition 9.7. \square

10 Normally hyperbolic cylinders at double resonance

We prove Theorem 4.1 in these sections. Recall that the theorem deals with two cases:

1. (Simple critical homology) In this case we show the homoclinic curve $\eta_{\pm h}^0$ can be extended to periodic orbits both in positive and negative energy. The union of these periodic orbits form a C^1 normally hyperbolic invariant manifold.
2. (Non-simple homology) In this case we show that for positive energy, there exists periodic orbits shadowing $\eta_{h_1}^0$ and $\eta_{h_2}^0$ in a particular order.

Our strategy is to prove existence of these periodic orbits as hyperbolic fixed points of composition of local and global maps. A main technical tool to prove existence and uniqueness of these fixed points is the Conley-McGehee isolation block ([66]). The plan of this section is as follows.

In section 10.1 we state a standard normal form near the hyperbolic fixed point.

In section 10.2 we study the property of the Shil'nikov boundary value problem.

In section 10.3, we apply results of Section 10.2 to establish strong hyperbolicity of the local map Φ_{loc}^* as well as existence of unstable cones. Since the global maps Φ_{glob}^* have bounded time, they have bounded norms and the linearization of the proper compositions $\Phi_{glob}^* \Phi_{loc}^*$ are dominated by the local component.

In section 10.4 we give definition and derive simple properties of isolating blocks of Conley-McGehee [66].

In section 10.5, under non-degeneracy conditions $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$, we construct isolating blocks for the proper compositions of $\Phi_{glob}^* \Phi_{loc}^*$.

In section 10.6 we extend this analysis to $\Phi_{glob}^* \Phi_{loc}^* \cdots \Phi_{glob}^* \Phi_{loc}^*$. This would imply existence of families of shadowing orbits in non-simple case.

In section 10.7 we complete the proof of Theorem 4.1 by showing that periodic orbits constructed in the previous two sections, forms a normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder. Moreover, they coincide with the shortest geodesics for the Jacobi metric.

In Section 10.8 we prove Lemma 4.2 which describes in the non-simple case, the order at which the simple periodic orbits are shadowed.

10.1 Normal form near the hyperbolic fixed point

We describe a normal form near the hyperbolic fixed point (assumed to be $(0, 0)$) of the slow Hamiltonian $H^s : \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For the rest of this section, we drop the superscript s to abbreviate notations. In a neighborhood of the origin, there exists a a

symplectic linear change of coordinates under which the system has the normal form

$$H(u_1, u_2, s_1, s_2) = \lambda_1 s_1 u_1 + \lambda_2 s_2 u_2 + O_3(s, u).$$

Here $s = (s_1, s_2)$, $u = (u_1, u_2)$, and $O_n(s, u)$ stands for a function bounded by $C|(s, u)|^n$. By taking a standard straightening coordinate change, we get:

Lemma 10.1. *After an C^{r-1} symplectic coordinate change Φ , the Hamiltonian takes the form*

$$N = H \circ \Phi = \lambda_1 s_1 u_1 + \lambda_2 s_2 u_2 + \sum_{i,j=1,2} s_i u_j O_1(s, u),$$

and the equation is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{s} \\ \dot{u} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\Lambda s + s O_1(s, u) \\ \Lambda u + u O_1(s, u) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10.1)$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$.

Proof. Since $(0, 0)$ is a hyperbolic fixed point, for sufficiently small $r > 0$, there exists stable manifold $W^s = \{(u = U(s), |s| \leq r)\}$ and unstable manifold $W^u = \{s = S(u), |u| \leq r\}$ containing the origin. All points on W^s converges to $(0, 0)$ exponentially in forward time, while all points on W^u converges to $(0, 0)$ exponentially in backward time. These manifolds are Lagrangian; as a consequence, the change of coordinates $s' = s - S(u)$, $u' = u - U(s') = u - U(s - S(u))$ is symplectic. Under the new coordinates, we have that $W^s = \{u' = 0\}$ and $W^u = \{s' = 0\}$. We abuse notation and keep using (s, u) to denote the new coordinate system.

Under the new coordinate system, the Hamiltonian has the form

$$H(s, u) = \lambda_1 s_1 u_1 + \lambda_2 s_2 u_2 + H_1(s, u),$$

where $H(s, u) = O_3(s, u)$ and $H_1(s, u)|_{s=0} = H_1(s, u)|_{u=0} = 0$. The Hamiltonian and the vector field takes the desired form under this coordinate. \square

10.2 Shil'nikov's boundary value problem

Recall the definition of the local map (Section 4.4). We will define the sections Σ_{\pm}^s to be a subset of the section $s_1 = \pm\delta$, and the sections Σ_{\pm}^u to be contained in $u_1 = \pm\delta$. In this section, we study the properties of the local map via the Shil'nikov boundary value problem.

Proposition 10.2 (Shil'nikov [70], Lemma 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). *There exists $C > 0$, $\delta_0 > 0$ and $T_0 > 0$ such that for each $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, any $s^{\text{in}} = (s_1^{\text{in}}, s_2^{\text{in}})$, $u^{\text{out}} = (u_1^{\text{out}}, u_2^{\text{out}})$ with $\|(s, u)\| \leq \delta$ and any large $T > T_0$, there exists a unique solution $(s^T, u^T) : [0, T] \rightarrow$*

$B_{C\delta}$ of the system (10.1) with the property $s^T(0) = s^{in}$ and $u^T(T) = u^{out}$. Moreover, we have

$$\|s^T(t)\| \leq C\delta e^{-\lambda_1 t/2}, \quad \|u^T(t)\| \leq C\delta e^{-\lambda_1(T-t)/2},$$

and

$$\left\| \frac{\partial s^T(t)}{\partial s^{in}} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial u^T(t)}{\partial s^{in}} \right\| \leq C e^{-\lambda_1 t/2}, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial s^T(t)}{\partial u^{out}} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial u^T(t)}{\partial u^{out}} \right\| \leq C e^{-\lambda_1(T-t)/2}.$$

Consider the space of all smooth curves $(s, u) : [0, T] \rightarrow B_{C\delta}$, define a map

Corollary 10.3. *Let (s^T, u^T) be the solution in Proposition 10.2 with fixed boundary values s^{in}, u^{out} . Then*

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dT}(s^T(t), u^T(t)) \right\| \leq C e^{-\lambda_1(T-t)/2}, \quad \left\| \frac{d}{dT}(s^T(T-t), u^T(T-t)) \right\| \leq C e^{-\lambda_1 t/2}, \quad (10.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=T} (s^\tau(T), u^\tau(T)) &= -X_N(s^T(T), u^T(T)) + O(e^{-\lambda_1 T/2}), \\ \frac{d}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=T} (s^\tau(T-\tau), u^\tau(T-\tau)) &= X_N(s^T(0), u^T(0)) + O(e^{-\lambda_1 T/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (10.3)$$

where X_N denote the Hamiltonian vector field of N .

Proof. Consider two solutions (s^{T_1}, u^{T_1}) and (s^{T_2}, u^{T_2}) of the boundary value problem, we extend the definition of the solutions to \mathbb{R} by solving the ODE. We note that $(s^{T_1}, u^{T_1}) : [0, T_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ satisfies the boundary condition s^{in} and $u^{T_1}(T_2)$ on $[0, T_2]$, and by Corollary 10.3,

$$\|(s^{T_1}, u^{T_1})(t) - (s^{T_2}, u^{T_2})(t)\| \leq C e^{\lambda_1(T_2-t)/2} \|u^{T_1}(T_2) - u^{out}\|.$$

Note that

$$\lim_{T_2 \rightarrow T_1} \frac{u^{T_1}(T_2) - u^{out}}{T_2 - T_1} = \lim_{T_2 \rightarrow T_1} \frac{u^{T_1}(T_2) - u^{T_1}(T_1)}{T_2 - T_1} = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=T_1} u^{T_1}(t),$$

and as a result,

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dT} \Big|_{T=T_1} (s^T, u^T)(t) \right\| \leq C e^{\lambda_1(T_1-t)}.$$

This proves the first half of (10.2) while the second half is similar.

For (10.3), note

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=T} (s^\tau(T), u^\tau(T)) = \frac{d}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=T} (s^\tau(\tau), u^\tau(\tau)) - \frac{d}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=T} (s^T(\tau), u^T(\tau)),$$

the first half of (10.3) follows. The second half is similar. \square

Let $(v_{s_1}, v_{s_2}, v_{u_1}, v_{u_2})$ denote the coordinates for the tangent space induced by (s_1, s_2, u_1, u_2) . For $K > 0$ and $x \in B_r$, we define the *strong unstable cone* by

$$C_K^u(x) = \{K^2|v_{u_2}|^2 > |v_{u_1}|^2 + |v_{s_1}|^2 + |v_{s_2}|^2\} \quad (10.4)$$

and the *strong stable cone* to be

$$C_K^s = \{K^2|v_{s_2}|^2 > |v_{s_1}|^2 + |v_{u_1}|^2 + |v_{u_2}|^2\}.$$

The following statement follows from the hyperbolicity of the fixed point O via standard techniques.

Lemma 10.4 (See for example, [44]). *For any $0 < \kappa < \lambda_2 - \lambda_1$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\kappa, K)$ and $C = C(\kappa, K) > 1$ such that the following holds:*

- *If $\phi_t(x) \in B_{4\delta}(O)$ for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$, then $D\phi_t(C_K^u(x)) \subset C_K^u(\phi_t(x))$ for all $0 \leq t \leq t_0$. Furthermore, for any $v \in C_K^u(x)$,*

$$|D\phi_t(x)v| \geq C^{-1}e^{(\lambda_2 - \kappa)t}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq t_0.$$

- *If $\phi_{-t}(x) \in B_{4\delta}(O)$ for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$, then $D\phi_{-t}(C_K^s(x)) \subset C_K^s(\phi_{-t}(x))$ for all $0 \leq t \leq t_0$. Furthermore, for any $v \in C_K^s(x)$,*

$$|D\phi_{-t}(x)v| \geq C^{-1}e^{(\lambda_2 - \kappa)t}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq t_0.$$

Lemma 10.5. *For any $\kappa > 0$ there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, $|s_1^{in}| = |u_1^{out}| = \delta$, and $|s_2^{in}|, |u_2^{out}| \leq \kappa\lambda_1\delta/(2\lambda_2)$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{d}{dT}u_2^T(0) \right| \leq \kappa \left| \frac{d}{dT}u_1^T(0) \right|, \quad \left| \frac{d}{dT}s_2^T(T) \right| \leq \kappa \left| \frac{d}{dT}s_1^T(T) \right|.$$

Moreover, by integrating in T , we get

$$|u_2^T(0)| \leq \kappa|u_1^T(0)|, \quad |s_2^T(T)| \leq \kappa|s_1^T(T)|.$$

Proof. Given $\kappa > 0$ we can choose δ_0 small enough such that the backward flow $D\phi_{-t}$ preserves the cone

$$(C_K^u)^c = \{\|v_{u_2}\| \leq K^{-1}\|(v_{s_1}, v_{s_2}, v_{u_1})\|\},$$

where $K = \kappa^{-1}$. Note that

$$\frac{d}{dT}(s^T(0), u^T(0)) = D\phi_{-T} \frac{d}{dT} \Big|_{\tau=T} (s^\tau(T), u^\tau(T)).$$

Since the vector

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=T} (s^\tau(T), u^\tau(T)) &= -X_N(s^T(T), u^T(T)) + O(e^{-\lambda_1 T/2}) \\ &= (\lambda_1 s_1^T(T), \lambda_2 s_2^T(T), \lambda_1 u_1^T(T), \lambda_2 u_2^T(T)) + O(\delta^2) + O(e^{-\lambda_1 T/2}) \\ &= (0, 0, \lambda_1 \delta, \lambda_2 u_2^{out}) + O(\delta^2) + O(e^{-\lambda_1 T/2}) \in (C_K^u)^c \end{aligned}$$

if $|u_2^{out}| \leq \kappa \lambda_1 \delta / (2\lambda_2)$, δ is small and T large enough. It follows that $\frac{d}{dT}(s^T(0), u^T(0)) \in (C_K^u)^c$. Keep in mind that $\frac{d}{dT}s^T(0) = 0$, the first half of our estimate follows. The second half is proven in a symmetric way. \square

10.3 Properties of the local maps

Recall that γ^+ is a non-degenerate homoclinic orbit, and γ^- is its time-reversal. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_+^s &= \{(\delta, s_2, u_1, u_1) : |s_2|, |u_1|, |u_2| \leq \delta\}, \\ \Sigma_+^u &= \{(s_1, s_2, \delta, u_1) : |s_2|, |u_1|, |u_2| \leq \delta\}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.5}$$

Denote $q^+ = \gamma^+ \cap \{s_1 = \delta\} = \{(\sigma, s_2^+, 0, 0)\}$, and $p^+ = \gamma^+ \cap \{u_1 = \delta\} = \{(0, 0, \delta, u_2^+)\}$. Let $\kappa > 0$ be a parameter to be defined in Proposition 10.6. Since γ^+ is tangent to the s_1, u_1 axes, we can choose $\delta > 0$ such that $|s_2^+|, |u_2^+| < \kappa\delta$, therefore q^+, p^+ are contained Σ_+^s and Σ_+^u respectively. Define

$$\begin{aligned} l^s &= \{(\delta, s_2, 0, 0) : -\kappa\delta \leq s_2 \leq \kappa\delta\} \subset W^s(O) \cap \Sigma_+^s, \\ l^u &= \{(0, 0, \delta, u_2) : -\kappa\delta \leq u_2 \leq \kappa\delta\} \subset W^u(O) \cap \Sigma_+^u. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\Sigma_+^{s,E} = \Sigma_+^s \cap \{N(s, u) = E\}, \quad \Sigma_+^{u,E} = \Sigma_+^u \cap \{N(s, u) = E\}$$

be restriction of the sections to an energy E close to 0. We would like to study the domain of the restricted local map $\Phi_{loc}^{++} : \Sigma_+^{s,E} \longrightarrow \Sigma_+^{u,E}$.

A rectangle R is a diffeomorphic image of the Euclidean rectangle in \mathbb{R}^2 . Let us label the vertices by 1, 2, 3, 4 in clockwise order, and call the four sides $l_{12}, l_{34}, l_{14}, l_{23}$.

Proposition 10.6. *There is $e, \kappa > 0$ such that for each $0 < E < e$, there is a rectangle $R^{++}(E) \subset \Sigma_+^{s,E}$ with sides $l_{ij}(E)$, such that:*

1. Φ_{loc}^{++} is well defined on $R^{++}(E)$, and its image $\Phi_{loc}^{++}(R^{++}(E))$ is also a rectangle, it's four sides denoted $l'_{ij}(E)$.
2. As $E \longrightarrow 0$, both $l_{12}(E)$ and $l_{34}(E)$ converges to l^s in Hausdorff metric. Similarly, both $l'_{14}(E)$ and $l'_{23}(E)$ converges to l^u .




Figure 10.1: Rectangles mapped under Φ_{loc}^{++}

3. If $(s, u) \in \Sigma_+^{s,E}$, $(s', u') \in \Sigma_+^{u,E}$ is such that $\Phi_{loc}^{++}(s, u) = (s', u')$, with $(s, u) \in B_{\kappa\delta}(q^+)$ and $(s', u') \in B_{\kappa\delta}(p^+)$, then $(s, u) \in R^{++}(E)$.

See Figure 10.1.

In order to do this, we prove a version of Proposition 10.2 using E as a parameter.

Proposition 10.7. *There is $e, \kappa > 0$ such that for each $0 < E < e$, s^{in} and u^{out} satisfies*

$$|s_2^{in}|, |u_2^{out}| \leq \frac{\lambda_1}{2\lambda_2} \kappa \delta, \quad s_1^{in} = u_1^{out} = \delta,$$

then there is $T = T_E > 0$, and a unique orbit $(s^E, u^E) : [0, T_E] \rightarrow B_{4\delta}(O)$, such that

$$s^E(0) = s^{in}, \quad u^E(T_E) = u^{out}.$$

Proof of Proposition 10.7. Let S_E denote the energy surface $\{N(s, u) = E\}$. Given s^{in} and s^{out} and $T > T_0$, Proposition 10.2 implies the existence of a solution (s^T, u^T) solving the boundary value problem. Moreover, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, $(s^T, u^T)(0) \rightarrow (s^{in}, 0) \in S_0$. Writing $E(T)$ the energy of the orbit (s^T, u^T) , we have $E(T) \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Claim: (1) $E(T)$ is positive and strictly monotone, therefore $E(T)$ is one-to-one and onto for $T \in [T_0, \infty)$; (2) There is $e > 0$ such that uniformly over all s^{in}, u^{out} , we have $0 < E(T) < e$ if $T \geq T_0$, and therefore the inverse T_E is well defined for $E \in (0, e]$.

By Lemma 10.5 $|u_2^T(0)| \leq \kappa |u_1^T(0)|$. We first show $N(s^T(0), u^T(0)) > 0$.

Let us consider the energy function $N(s_1, u_1, s_2, u_2) = \lambda_1 s_1 u_1 + \lambda_2 s_2 u_2 + H_1(s, u)$ with $H_1|_{s=0} = H_1|_{u=0} = 0$. Recall that the section $\Sigma^+ = \{(s, u) : s_1 = \delta, |(s, u)| \leq \delta\}$. We consider the submanifold $\Sigma \cap \{N(s, u) = 0\}$. Since

$$\partial_{u_1} N(\delta, u_1, s_2, u_2) = \lambda_1 \delta + \partial_{u_1} H_1 = \lambda_1 \delta + O(\delta^2) > 0,$$

by implicit function theorem, for $|(s, u)| \leq \delta$ the surface $\Sigma \cap \{N = 0\}$ is given by a graph $u_1 = u_1^c(s_2, u_2)$. We conclude that Σ is divided by the graph $u_1 = u_1^c(s_2, u_2)$ into two components, and:

- $N(s, u) > 0$ whenever $u_1 > u_1^c(s_2, u_2)$, and $N(s, u) < 0$ when $u_1 < u_1^c(s_2, u_2)$.

Moreover, $u_1^c|_{u_2=0} = 0$, and by differentiating the implicit function, we get $|\partial_{u_2} u_1^c| \leq C$ where C is a constant depending on $\|N\|_{C^2}$. Therefore $|u_1^c(s_2, u_2)| \leq C|u_2|$. This implies if $(\delta, u_1, s_2, u_2) \in \Sigma$ satisfies $u_1 > C|u_2| \geq |u_1^c|$, we have $N(\delta, u_1, s_2, u_2) > 0$. In particular, this is satisfied for $(s^T(0), u^T(0))$ if $\kappa < C^{-1}$.

$E(T)$ is a continuous function defined on $T \geq T_0$, and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E(T) = 0$. We now prove that it is monotone. Using Lemma 10.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dT} E(T) &= \frac{d}{dT} N(s^T(0), u^T(0)) = \nabla N \cdot \left(0, 0, \frac{d}{dT} u_1^T(0), \frac{d}{dT} u_2^T(0) \right) \\ &= (\lambda_1 s_1^{in} + O_2(s, u)) \frac{d}{dT} u_1^T(0) + (\lambda_2 s_2^{in} + O_2(s, u)) \frac{d}{dT} u_2^T(0) \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

if κ is sufficiently small. Since we have proved $E(T) > 0$, claim (1) follows. Finally, Proposition 10.2 implies

$$0 < E(T) \leq C\delta^2 e^{-\lambda_1 T/2},$$

claim (2) follows. □

Proof of Proposition 10.6. Let $\kappa > 0$ be small enough such that Proposition 10.7 applies, and let us rename $\lambda_1 \kappa / (2\lambda_2)$ into κ . Consider two parameters $a \in [-\kappa\delta, \kappa\delta]$ and $b \in [-\kappa\delta, \kappa\delta]$, and then there exist unique orbits $s_{a,b}^E$ solving the boundary value problem

$$s_{a,b}^E(0) = (\delta, a), \quad s_{a,b}^E(T_{a,b}(E)) = (\delta, b),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} R^{++}(E) &= \{(s_{a,b}^E(0), u_{a,b}^E(0)) : a, b \in [\delta/2, \delta/2]\}, \\ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(R^{++}(E)) &= \{(s_{a,b}^E(T_{a,b}(E)), u_{a,b}^E(T_{a,b}(E))) : a, b \in [\delta/2, \delta/2]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that two sides of the rectangle $R^{++}(E)$ are graphs over $s_2 \in [-\kappa\delta, \kappa\delta]$, since the u_1, u_2 component converge to 0 exponentially fast as $T \rightarrow \infty$ (and $E \rightarrow 0$),




Figure 10.2: Local map and global map in s_2, u_2 coordinates

we conclude that these two sides converge to l^s . The same can be said about the rectangle $\Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(R^{++}(E))$ and l^u .

Finally, note that by definition, $R^{++}(E)$ contains the initial point of all orbits $(s, u) : [0, T] \rightarrow S_E$ such that $s_1(0) = \delta$, $|s_2(0)| \leq \kappa\delta$, $u_1(T) = \delta$, $|u_2(T)| \leq \kappa\delta$, which contains the orbits such that $(s, u)(0) \in B_{\kappa\delta}(p)$ and $(s, u)(T) \in B_{\kappa\delta}(p^+)$. \square

For each of the other symbols $--$, $+-$ and $-+$, analogous statements to Proposition 10.6 hold, after making appropriate changes. We only make the remark that for symbol $--$, the range is energy is also $0 < E < e$, while for the symbol $+-$ and $-+$, the energy for Proposition 10.6 is $-e < E < 0$.

We now turn to the global map. We have $p^+ \in l^u$, $q^+ \in l^s$, and $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+(p^+) = q^+$. Moreover, condition $[DR4]^c$ imply that $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+(l^u)$ intersects l^s transversally in the energy surface S_E . Let us note that the return time for the Poincaré map Φ_{glob}^+ is uniformly bounded, the restricted map $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+|_{S_E}$ depends smoothly on E . As a result, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 10.8. *There exists $e > 0$ such that, the following hold.*

1. *For $0 < E < e$, $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(R^{++}(E))$ intersects $R^{++}(E)$ transversally. This means, the images of l_{12} and l_{34} intersect l_{12} and l_{34} transversally, and the images of γ_{14} and γ_{23} does not intersect $R^{++}(T)$.*
2. *For $0 < E < e$, $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{--}(R^{--}(T))$ intersects $R^{--}(T)$ transversally.*
3. *For $-e < E < 0$, $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{+-}(R^{+-}(E))$ intersect $R^{+-}(E)$ transversally, and $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{-+}(R^{-+}(E))$ intersect $R^{-+}(E)$ transversally.*

See Figure 10.2 for a demonstration.

10.4 Conley-McGehee isolating blocks

The rectangles as constructed form isolation blocks of Conley and McGehee ([66]).

A rectangle $R = I_1 \times I_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k$, $I_1 = \{\|x_1\| \leq 1\}$, $I_2 = \{\|x_2\| \leq 1\}$ is called an *isolating block* for the C^1 diffeomorphism Φ , if the following hold:

1. The projection of $\Phi(R)$ to the first component covers I_1 .
2. $\Phi|_{I_1 \times \partial I_2}$ is homotopically equivalent to the identity restricted on the set $I_1 \times (\mathbb{R}^k \setminus \text{int } I_2)$.

If R is an isolating block of Φ , then the set

$$W^+ = \{x \in R : \Phi^k(x) \in R, k \geq 0\}$$

$$\text{(resp. } W^- = \{x \in R : \Phi^{-k}(x) \in R, k \geq 0\})$$

projects onto I_1 (resp. onto I_2) (see [66]). If some additional cone conditions are satisfied, then W^+ and W^- are in fact C^1 graphs. Note that in this case, $W^+ \cap W^-$ is the unique fixed point of Φ on R .

As usual, we denote by $C_K^u(x) = \{c\|v_1\| \leq \|v_2\|\}$ the unstable cone at x . We denote by $\pi C_K^u(x)$ the set $x + C_K^u(x)$, which corresponds to the projection of the cone $C_K^u(x)$ from the tangent space to the base set. The stable cones are defined similarly. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k$ be an open set and $\Phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k$ a C^1 map. Denote $D\Phi_x$ the linearization of Φ at x .

- C1. $D\Phi_x$ preserves the cone field $C_K^u(x)$, and there exists $\Lambda > 1$ such that $\|D\Phi(v)\| \geq \Lambda\|v\|$ for any $v \in C_K^u(x)$.
- C2. Φ preserves the projected restricted cone field πC_K^u , i.e., for any $x \in U$,

$$\Phi(U \cap \pi C_K^u(x)) \subset C_K^u(\Phi(x)) \cap \Phi(U).$$

- C3. If $y \in \pi C_K^u(x) \cap U$, then $\|\Phi(y) - \Phi(x)\| \geq \Lambda\|y - x\|$.

The unstable cone condition guarantees that any forward invariant set is contained in a Lipschitz graph.

Proposition 10.9 (See [66]). *Assume that Φ and U satisfies [C1]-[C3], then any forward invariant set $W \subset U$ is contained in a Lipschitz graph over \mathbb{R}^k (the stable direction).*

Similarly, we can define the conditions [C1]-[C3] for the inverse map and the stable cone, and refer to them as “stable [C1]-[C3]” conditions. Note that if Φ and U satisfies both the isolating block condition and the stable/unstable cone conditions, then W^+ and W^- are transversal Lipschitz graphs. In particular, there exists a unique intersection, which is the unique fixed point of Φ on R . We summarize as follows.

Corollary 10.10. *Assume that Φ and U satisfies the isolating block condition, and that Φ and U (resp. Φ^{-1} and $U \cap \Phi(U)$) satisfies the unstable (resp. stable) conditions [C1]-[C3]. Then Φ has a unique hyperbolic fixed point in U .*

10.5 Periodic orbit in simple homologies

We now apply the isolating block construction to the maps and rectangles obtained in Corollary 10.8.

Proposition 10.11. *There exists $e > 0$ such that the following hold.*

- For $0 < E < e$, $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}$ has a unique fixed point $p^+(E)$ on $\Sigma_+^s \cap R^{++}(E)$;
- For $0 < E < e$, $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{--}$ has a unique fixed point $p^-(E)$ on $\Sigma_-^s \cap R^{--}(E)$;
- For $-e < E < 0$: $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{-+} \circ \Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{+-}$ has a unique fixed point $p^c(E)$ on $R^{+-}(E) \cap (\Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{+-})^{-1}(R^{++}(E))$.

To prove Proposition 10.11, we notice that the rectangle $R^{++}(T)$ has C^1 sides, and there exists a C^1 change of coordinates turning it to a standard rectangle. It's easy to see that the isolating block conditions are satisfied for the following maps and rectangles:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++} \quad \text{and} \quad R^{++}(E), \quad \Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{--} \quad \text{and} \quad R^{--}(E), \\ & \Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{-+} \circ \Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{+-} \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi_{\text{glob}}^- \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{+-})^{-1}R^{++}(E) \cap R^{+-}(E). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to prove the stable and unstable cone conditions [C1]-[C3] for the corresponding return map and rectangles. Given $z = (s, u) \in S_E$, let us define the restricted cones

$$C_K^{u,E}(z) = C_K^u \cap T_z S_E, \quad C_K^{s,E} = C_K^s \cap T_z S_E.$$

Lemma 10.12. *For each orbit $(s, u)(t)$ associated to orbits of the local map, the restricted cones $C_K^{u,E}$ and $C_K^{s,E}$ are non-empty.*

Proof. We only prove the statement for $C_K^{u,E}$ since the stable one is completely symmetric. Moreover, observe that if we prove the cone $C_K^{u,E}$ is non-empty at $(s, u)(0)$, the same holds for the entire orbit, since the unstable cone is invariant under the forward dynamics.

Note that

$$\nabla N = (\lambda_1 u_1 + u O_1, \lambda_2 u_2 + u O_1, \lambda_1 s_1 + s O_1, \lambda_2 s_2 + s O_1),$$

and $\|u(0)\|$ is exponentially small in T , we have $\nabla N \sim (0, 0, \lambda_1 s_1, \lambda_2 s_2)$. Since $|s_2| \leq \delta = |s_1|$ on Σ_+^s , we have the angle between ∇N and u_1 axis is bounded from below. As a consequence, there exists $K > 0$, such that $C^{u,K}$ has nonempty intersection with the tangent direction of S_E (which is orthogonal to ∇N). The lemma follows. \square

We will only prove the [C1]-[C3] conditions for the unstable cone $C_E^{u,c}$, the map $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}$ and the rectangle $R^{++}(T)$; the proof for the other cases can be obtained by making obvious changes to the case covered.

Lemma 10.13. *There exists $T_0 > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that the following hold. Assume that $U \subset \Sigma_+^s \cap B_r$ is a connected open set on which the local map Φ_{loc}^{++} is defined, and for each $x \in U$,*

$$\inf\{t \geq 0 : \varphi_t(x) \in \Sigma_+^u\} \geq T_0.$$

Then the map $D(\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++})$ preserves the cone field C_K^u , and the inverse $D(\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++})^{-1}$ preserves the non-empty C_K^s . Moreover, the projected cones $\pi C_K^u \cap U$ and $\pi C_K^s \cap V$ are preserved by $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}$ and its inverse, where $V = \Phi_{\text{glob}}^+ \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(U)$.

The same set of conclusions hold for the restricted version. Namely, we can replace C_K^u and C_K^s with $C_K^{u,E}$ and $C_K^{s,E}$, and U with $U \cap S_E$.

Recall that $l^u \ni p^+$ is the intersection of the unstable manifold $W^u(O)$ with the section Σ_+^u . Let T^u be the tangent vector to l^u at p^+ , and T^s the tangent vector to T^s at q^+ . We will show that if $\Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}|_{S_E}(x) = y$, then the image of the unstable cone $D\Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(x)C_K^u$ is very close to T^u . This happens because the flow of tangent vector is very close to that of a linear flow.

Assume that ϕ_t is a flow on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k$, and x_t is a trajectory of the flow. Let $v(t) = (v_1(t), v_2(t))$ be a solution of the variational equation, i.e. $v(t) = D\phi_t(x_t)v(0)$.

Lemma 10.14. *With the above notations assume that there exists $b_2 > 0$, $b_1 < b_2$ and $\sigma, \delta > 0$ such that the variational equation*

$$\dot{v}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} A(t) & B(t) \\ C(t) & D(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_1(t) \\ v_2(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

satisfy $A \leq b_1 I$ and $D \geq b_2 I$ as quadratic forms, and $\|B\| \leq \sigma$, $\|C\| \leq \delta$.

Then for any $c > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $0 < \delta, \sigma < \delta_0$, we have

$$(D\phi_t)C_K^u \subset C^{u, \beta_t}, \quad \beta_t = ce^{-(b_2 - b_1 - \kappa)t} + \sigma / (b_2 - b_1 - \kappa).$$

Proof. Denote $\gamma_0 = c$. The invariance of the cone field is equivalent to

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\beta_t^2 \langle v_2(t), v_2(t) \rangle - \langle v_1(t), v_1(t) \rangle) \geq 0.$$

Compute the derivatives using the variational equation, apply the norm bounds and the cone condition, we obtain

$$2\beta_t (\beta_t' + (b_2 - \delta\beta_t - b_1)\beta_t - \sigma) \|v_2\|^2 \geq 0.$$

We assume that $\beta_t \leq 2\gamma_0$, then for sufficiently small δ_0 , $\delta\beta_t \leq \kappa$. Denote $b_3 = b_2 - b_1 - \kappa$ and let β_t solve the differential equation

$$\beta_t' = -b_3\beta_t + \sigma.$$

It's clear that the inequality is satisfied for our choice of β_t . Solve the differential equation for β_t and the lemma follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 10.13. We will only prove the unstable version. By Assumption 4, there exists $c > 0$ such that $D\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+(q^+)T^{uu}(q^+) \subset C_K^u(p^+)$. Note that as $T_0 \rightarrow \infty$, the neighborhood U shrinks to p^+ and V shrinks to q^+ . Hence there exists $\beta > 0$ and $T_0 > 0$ such that $D\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+(y)C^{u, \beta}(y) \subset C_K^u$ for all $y \in V$.

Let $(s, u)(t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ be the trajectory from x to y . By Proposition 10.2, we have $\|s\| \leq e^{-\lambda_1 T/4}$ for all $T/2 \leq t \leq T$. It follows that the matrix for the variational equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} A(t) & B(t) \\ C(t) & D(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} + O(s) & O(s) \\ O(u) & \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} + O(u) \end{bmatrix} \quad (10.6)$$

satisfies $A \leq -(\lambda_1 - \kappa)I$, $D \geq (\lambda_1 - \kappa)I$, $\|C\| = O(\delta)$ and $\|B\| = O(e^{-(\lambda_1 - \kappa)T/2})$. As before $C_K^u(x) = \{\|v_s\| \leq c\|v_u\|\}$, Lemma 10.14 implies

$$D\phi_T(x)C_K^u(x) \subset C^{u, \beta_T}(y),$$

where $\beta_T = O(e^{-\lambda' T/2})$ and $\lambda' = \min\{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 - \kappa, \lambda_1 - \kappa\}$. Finally, note that $D\phi_T(x)C_K^u(x)$ and $D\Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(x)C_K^u(x)$ differs by the differential of the local Poincaré map near y . Since near y we have $|s| = O(e^{-(\lambda_1 - \kappa)T})$, using the equation of motion, the Poincaré map is exponentially close to identity on the (s_1, s_2) components, and is

exponentially close to a projection to u_2 on the (u_1, u_2) components. It follows that the cone $C^{u, \beta T}$ is mapped by the Poincaré map into a strong unstable cone with exponentially small size. In particular, for $T \geq T_0$, we have

$$D\Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(x)C_K^u(x) \subset C^{u, \beta}(y),$$

and the first part of the lemma follows. To prove the restricted version we follow the same arguments. \square

Conditions [C1]-[C3] follows, and this concludes the proof of Proposition 10.11.

10.6 Periodic orbits for non-simple homology

In the case of the non-simple homology, there exist two rectangles R_1 and R_2 , whose images under $\Phi_{\text{glob}} \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}$ intersect themselves transversally, providing a “horseshoe” type picture.

Proposition 10.15. *There exists $e > 0$ such that the following hold:*

1. *For all $0 < E \leq e$, there exist rectangles $R_1(E), R_2(E) \in \Sigma_+^{s, E}$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^i \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(R_i)$ intersects both $R_1(E)$ and $R_2(E)$ transversally.*
2. *Given $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$, there exists a unique fixed point $p^\sigma(E)$ of*

$$\prod_{i=n}^1 (\Phi_{\text{glob}}^{\sigma_i} \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++})|_{R_{\sigma_i}(E)} \quad (10.7)$$

on the set $R_{\sigma_1}(E)$.

3. *The curve $p^\sigma(E)$ is a C^1 graph over the u_1 component with uniformly bounded derivatives. Furthermore, $p^\sigma(E)$ approaches p^{σ_1} and for each $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$,*

$$\prod_{i=j}^1 (\Phi_{\text{glob}}^{\sigma_i} \circ \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++})(p^\sigma(E))$$

approaches $p^{\sigma_{j+1}}$ as $E \rightarrow 0$.

The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 10.11 and we omit it.

10.7 Normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders for the slow mechanical system

We prove Theorem 4.1 in this section.

Proof. Non-simple case. If the homology h is non-simple, then $h = n_1 h_1 + n_2 h_2$ with h_1, h_2 being simple homologies. Let $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ be the sequence determined by Lemma 4.2. Apply Proposition 10.15, we obtain the fixed points $p^\sigma(E)$ for all $0 < E < e$. The fixed points corresponds to hyperbolic periodic orbits that we call η_h^E . Let γ_h^E be the projection of η_h^E to the configuration space, we now prove that they must be identical to the shortest curve in Jacobi metric g_E , after a reparametrization. According to the condition $[DR3^c]$, γ_h^0 is the unique shortest curve for the Jacobi metric g_0 , and there exist c_0 such that $\eta_h^0 = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(c_0) = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H^s}(c_0)$. Any g_E shortest curve γ'_E corresponds to Aubry set of cohomology c_E , which lifts to an orbit η'_E in phase space. Using semi-continuity, η'_E must be contained in a neighborhood of η_h^0 in the phase space. In particular, it must intersect the sections Σ_+^s and Σ_+^u sufficiently close to q^+ and p^+ . According to Proposition 10.7, item 3, the intersection with Σ_+^s must be contained in the rectangle $R^{++}(E)$. Since the fixed point $p^\sigma(E)$ is the unique fixed point for the map (10.7), we conclude that $\eta'_E = \eta_h^E$.

Simple critical case. The existence the periodic orbits follows from Proposition 10.11 in the same way as the non-simple case. Also, by the same reasoning, we know that the orbits η_h^E, η_{-h}^E must coincide with the minimal geodesics of the Jacobi metric. It suffices to show that

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{0 < E < e} (\eta_h^E \cup \eta_{-h}^E) \cup \eta_h^0 \cup \eta_{-h}^0 \cup \bigcup_{-e < E < 0} \eta_c^E$$

form a C^1 normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder.

Denote

$$l^+(p^+) = \{p^+(E)\}_{0 < E \leq E_0}, \quad l^+(p^-) = \{p^-(E)\}_{0 < E \leq E_0},$$

$l^+(q^+) = \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{++}(l^+(p^+))$ and $l^+(q^-) = \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{--}(l^+(p^-))$. Note that the superscript of l indicates positive energy instead of the signature of the homoclinics. We denote

$$l^-(p^+) = \{p^c(E)\}_{-E_0 \leq E < 0}$$

$l^-(q^-) = \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{+-}(l^-(p^+))$, $l^-(p^-) = \Phi_{\text{glob}}^-(l^-(q^-))$ and $l^-(q^+) = \Phi_{\text{loc}}^{-+}(l^-(p^-))$. An illustration of \mathcal{M} the curves l^\pm are included in Figure 10.3.

$l(p^+)$ and $l(p^-)$ are both graphs over the u_1 variable. By considering the image $\bigcup_{t>0} \phi_t(l(p^+))$ and $\bigcup_{t>0} \phi_t(l(p^-))$, using Lemma 10.5, the projection of \mathcal{M} to $s_1 u_1$ plane contains a neighborhood of 0. Standard cone arguments implies it must be a Lipschitz graph over $s_1 u_1$ near 0. Finally, standard arguments in partial hyperbolicity




Figure 10.3: Invariant manifold \mathcal{M} near the origin

(see [44]) implies the manifold \mathcal{M} is $C^{1+\alpha}$, where α depends on the ratio between the central and hyperbolic exponents.

Finally, note that all the arguments applies to the normal form system (10.1). The same conclusions hold for small C^2 perturbation to the Hamiltonian (which leads to a small C^1 perturbation of the normal form). \square

10.8 Cyclic concatenations of simple geodesics

We provide the proof of the auxilliary result Lemma 4.2 before proceeding to the next section.

Denote $\gamma_1 = \gamma_0^{h_1}$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_0^{h_2}$ and $\gamma = \gamma_0^0$. Recall that γ has homology class $n_1 h_1 + n_2 h_2$ and is the concatenation of n_1 copies of γ_1 and n_2 copies of γ_2 . Since h_1 and h_2 generates $H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$, by introducing a linear change of coordinates, we may assume $h_1 = (1, 0)$ and $h_2 = (0, 1)$.

Given $y \in \mathbb{T}^2 \setminus \gamma \cup \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$, the fundamental group of $\mathbb{T}^2 \setminus \{y\}$ is a free group of two generators, and in particular, we can choose γ_1 and γ_2 as generators. (We use the same notations for the closed curves γ_i , $i = 1, 2$ and their homotopy classes). The curve γ determines an element

$$\gamma = \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_{\sigma_i}^{s_i}, \quad \sigma_i \in \{1, 2\}, s_i \in \{0, 1\}$$

of this group. Moreover, the translation $\gamma_t(\cdot) := \gamma(\cdot + t)$ of γ determines a new element

by cyclic translation, i.e.,

$$\gamma_t = \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_{\sigma_{i+m}}^{s_{i+m}}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where the sequences σ_i and s_i are extended periodically. We claim the following:

There exists a unique (up to translation) periodic sequence σ_i such that $\gamma = \prod_{i=1}^n \gamma_{\sigma_{i+m}}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, independent of the choice of y . Note that in particular, all $s_i = 1$.

The proof of this claim is split into two steps.

Step 1. Let $\gamma_{n_1/n_2}(t) = \{\gamma(0) + (n_1/n_2, 1)t, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. We will show that γ is homotopic (along non-self-intersecting curves) to γ_{n_1/n_2} . To see this, we lift both curves to the universal cover with the notations $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_1/n_2}$. Let $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $pn_1 - qn_2 = 1$ and define

$$T\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \tilde{\gamma}(t) + (p, q).$$

As T generates all integer translations of $\tilde{\gamma}$, γ is non-self-intersecting if and only if $T\tilde{\gamma} \cap \tilde{\gamma} = \emptyset$. Define the homotopy $\tilde{\gamma}_\lambda = \lambda\tilde{\gamma} + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{\gamma}_{n_1/n_2}$, it suffices to prove $T\tilde{\gamma}_\lambda \cap \tilde{\gamma}_\lambda = \emptyset$. Take an additional coordinate change

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} n_1 & p \\ n_2 & q \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix},$$

then under the new coordinates $T\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \tilde{\gamma}(t) + (1, 0)$.

Under the new coordinates, $T\tilde{\gamma} \cap \tilde{\gamma} = \emptyset$ if and only if any two points on the same horizontal line has distance less than 1. The same property carries over to $\tilde{\gamma}_\lambda$ for $0 \leq \lambda < 1$, hence $T\tilde{\gamma}_\lambda \cap \tilde{\gamma}_\lambda = \emptyset$.

Step 2. By step 1, it suffices to prove that $\gamma = \gamma_{n_1/n_2}$ defines unique sequences σ_i and s_i . Since $\tilde{\gamma}_{n_1/n_2}$ is increasing in both coordinates, we have $s_i = 1$ for all i . Moreover, choosing a different y is equivalent to shifting the generators γ_1 and γ_2 . Since the translation of the generators is homotopic to identity, the homotopy class is not affected. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.2.

11 Aubry-Mather type at the double resonance

We consider the system

$$H^s(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi).$$

Given the homology $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$, there is a curve $\bar{c}_h : (0, \bar{E}] \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\bar{c}_h(E)$. There are two regimes, the “high energy regime”, where we consider the cohomologies $\bar{c}_h(E)$ with $e \leq E \leq \bar{E}$ where e is a small parameter; and the critical regime, where c is in a small neighborhood of $\bar{c}_h(0)$.

11.1 High energy case

First we consider the “non-critical energy case”, and show that the cohomologies as chosen are of Aubry-Mather type. For each $E > 0$, there are two possible behavior:

1. The Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E)) = \gamma_h^E$, where γ_h^E is the unique shortest geodesic in homology E . Let us denote the corresponding Hamiltonian orbit $\eta_h^E = (\varphi, I) : [0, T_E] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$.
2. (Bifurcation) The Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E)) = \gamma_h^E \cup \bar{\gamma}_h^E$, where $\gamma_h^E, \bar{\gamma}_h^E$ are the two shortest geodesic in homology E . Let us denote the corresponding Hamiltonian orbit $\eta_h^E, \bar{\eta}_h^E$.

Theorem 11.1. *Given any $e > 0$, there is $\epsilon_0, \delta > 0$ depending only on H^s and e such that the following holds for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and all $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$ (in the space $C^r(\mathbb{T}^2)$), the Hamiltonian*

$$H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) = K(I) - U'(\varphi) + \sqrt{\epsilon}P, \quad \|P\|_{C^2} \leq 1,$$

satisfies the following properties:

1. *Suppose $E \geq e$ is such that $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E))$ is a unique hyperbolic orbit, then $(H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}_h(E))$ is of Aubry-Mather type.*
2. *Suppose $E \geq e$ is such that $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E))$ is the union of two hyperbolic orbits, then $(H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}_h(E))$ is of bifurcation Aubry-Mather type.*

We first discuss the non-bifurcation case, and the bifurcation case will be a simple corollary.

Given $E_0 \geq 0$, denote $c_0 = \bar{c}_h(E_0)$. Suppose $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c_0) = \gamma_h^E$ consists of a unique shortest curve, then there exists $E_1 < E_0 < E_2$ such that each η_h^E for $E \in (E_1, E_2)$ is a hyperbolic periodic orbit. Then

$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \bigcup_{E \in (E_1, E_2)} \eta_h^E \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$$

is a normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder. In order to give a proper parametrization for \mathcal{C}_0 , we consider a transversal section to $\eta_h^{E_0}$, which is also transversal to η_h^E , $E \in (E_1, E_2)$ if E_1, E_2 are close enough to E_0 . Denote $z^E = \eta_h^E \cap \Sigma$, then Z^E , $E \in (E_1, E_2)$ is a smooth function of E . We now define

$$\chi : \mathbb{T} \times (E_1, E_2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \chi(s, E) = \phi_{H^s}^{sT_E}(z^E), \quad (11.1)$$

where $\phi_{H^s}^t$ is the Hamiltonian flow of H^s and T_E is the period of η_h^E .

Lemma 11.1. *There is $\delta > 0$ depending on K, U, E_1, E_2 such that for all $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$ and $H^s = K - U'$, χ is a smooth embedding and $\chi(\mathbb{T} \times (E_1, E_2)) = \mathcal{C}_0$. \mathcal{C}_0 is normally hyperbolic, and for each E , $W^u(\eta_h^E)$ is a smooth graph over θ component on a neighborhood of γ_h^E .*

Proof. The fact that γ_h^E is a unique non-degenerate shortest geodesic is robust, therefore χ is well defined for all $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$, where δ depends on K, U, E_1, E_2 .

The fact that χ is smooth and that the image is \mathcal{C}_0 follows directly from definition. Since $H^s(\chi(s, E)) = E$ by definition, have $\nabla H^s(\chi(s, E)) \cdot \partial_E \chi(s, E) = 1$. On the other hand, $\partial_s \chi(s, E) = X_{H^s}(\chi(s, E))$, where X_{H^s} is the Hamiltonian vector field of H^s . Since $\nabla H^s \cdot X_{H^s} = 0$, we conclude that $\partial_s \chi, \partial_E \chi$ are linearly independent over $(s, E) \in \mathbb{T} \times [E_1, E_2]$.

To see that the local stable-unstable manifolds are graphs over the θ component, we invoke the concept of Green bundles \mathcal{G}_\pm . These invariant bundles are defined for all orbits of the Aubry sets, and are Lipschitz graphs over the θ components. The Lipschitz constant is uniform over all $E > 0$. According to [3], for hyperbolic periodic orbits, the bundle \mathcal{G}_- is the sum of the vector field direction and the unstable direction. As a result, the unstable bundle of η_h^E projects onto a bundle transversal to γ_h^E , and the unstable manifold projects onto the θ component. \square

We now consider the Hamiltonian

$$H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) = H^s(\varphi, I) + \sqrt{\epsilon} P(\varphi, I, \tau), \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{T}^2, I \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tau \in \mathbb{T}_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}. \quad (11.2)$$

Proposition 11.2. *Given any $\kappa > 0$, $0 < e < \bar{E}$ there is $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on H^s, e, κ and $\kappa > 0$ depending only on H^s, e ; such that for all $E_0 \in [e, \bar{E}]$, there is $E_1 < E_0 < E_2$, such that for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, there is an embedding*

$$\chi_\epsilon(x, y, \tau) : \mathbb{T} \times (E_1, E_2) \times \mathbb{T}_{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}, \quad \pi_\tau \chi_\epsilon = id$$

such that C_ϵ is a weakly invariant normally hyperbolic cylinder for the Hamiltonian flow of H_ϵ^s (see (11.2)). Moreover, we have

$$\|\chi_\epsilon(\varphi, I, \tau) - \chi_0(\varphi, I)\|_{C^1} < \kappa,$$

and \mathcal{C}_ϵ contains all the invariant sets in

$$V = B_\kappa(\mathcal{C}_0) \times \mathbb{T}_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}.$$

Since $\|\sqrt{\epsilon}P\|_{C^2} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}$, this is a *regular perturbation* of the vector field, compared to the *singular perturbation* we see in Section 9. The proof follows from standard theory, see for example [68], [29].

We will denote by $\chi_\epsilon^0(x, y) = \chi_\epsilon(\varphi, I, 0)$ the zero-section of the embedding, and

$$\chi_\epsilon^0(\mathbb{T} \times (E_1, E_2)) = \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^0$$

which is invariant under the time- $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ map $\phi = \phi_{H_\epsilon^s}^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$.

We have the following Lipschitz estimate for weak KAM solutions of H_ϵ^s .

Proposition 11.3 (Follows from Theorem 7.1). *Given $R > 0$, there is $C > 0$ depending only on $\|\partial^2 K\|$, $\|H^s\|_{C^2}$ and R , such that if u is any weak KAM solution of H_ϵ^s at cohomology c with $\|c\| \leq R$, then for any*

$$(\varphi_1, I_1), (\varphi_2, I_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, u) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \phi^{-n}(\mathcal{G}_{c, u}),$$

we have

$$|H^s(\varphi_1, I_1) - H^s(\varphi_2, I_2)| \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|.$$

As a result, the same Lipschitz property holds on the sets $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(c, u)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0$.

Proof of Theorem 11.1. Part (1): Let $c_0 = \bar{c}_h(E_0)$, and $\gamma_h^{E_0}$ is the unique shortest curve, we show (H_ϵ^s, c_0) is of AM type. By Proposition 11.2, for sufficiently small ϵ , we have $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c_0) \subset B_\kappa(\mathcal{C}_0) \times \mathbb{T}_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$. Due to semi-continuity, the same holds for $c \in \overline{B_\sigma(c_0)}$ for some $\sigma > 0$. As a result, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c) \subset \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$.

We now prove the graph property. Suppose

$$(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in (\chi_\epsilon^0)^{-1}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c))$$

where $c \in \overline{B_\sigma(c_0)}$. Observe that $H^s \circ \chi_0(x, y) = y$. Then due to Proposition 11.3,

$$\|H^s \circ \chi_\epsilon^0(x, y) - y\|_{C^1} = \|H^s \circ \chi_\epsilon^0 - H^s \circ \chi_0\| \leq \|H^s\|_{C^2} \|\chi_\epsilon^0 - \chi_0\|_{C^1} \leq C\delta,$$

where C will be used to denote a generic constant. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_2 - y_1\| &\leq \|H^s \circ \chi_\epsilon^0(x_2, y_2) - H^s \circ \chi_\epsilon^0(x_1, y_1)\| + C\delta \|(x_2 - x_1, y_2 - y_1)\| \\ &\leq C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \|\pi_\varphi \circ \chi_\epsilon^0(x_2, y_2) - \pi_\varphi \circ \chi_\epsilon^0(x_1, y_1)\| + C\delta \|(x_2 - x_1, y_2 - y_1)\| \\ &\leq C(\delta + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}) \|(x_2 - x_1, y_2 - y_1)\| \end{aligned} \quad (11.3)$$

For ϵ, δ small enough, we have $\|y_2 - y_1\| \leq 2C(\delta + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}})\|x_2 - x_1\|$.

Finally, assume that $(\chi_\epsilon^0)^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c)$ project onto the x component, we will show that $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c))$ is a graph over the θ component. According to Lemma 11.1, $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c))$ is a smooth graph over θ component, and the projection of the unstable bundle is normal to γ_h^E . Let us note that (11.3) implies $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0$ is close to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}^0(c)$ in Lipschitz norm, and the unstable bundle depends smoothly on perturbation. Therefore the unstable bundle of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c)$ is also transversal to $\mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c)$, implying (2)(b) of Definition 8.1.

Part (2): Suppose $c_0 = \bar{c}_h(E_0)$ is such that $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c) = \gamma_h^{E_0} \cup \bar{\gamma}_h^{E_0}$ are two shortest curves. Let V_1, V_2 be neighborhoods of $\gamma^{E_0}, \bar{\gamma}^{E_0}$ such that $\pi_\varphi \eta^E \subset V_1, \pi_\varphi \bar{\eta}^E \subset V_2$ for all $E \in (E_0 - \delta, E_0 + \delta)$, and let

$$f : \mathbb{T}^n \longrightarrow [0, 1], \quad f|_{V_1} = 0, \quad f|_{V_2} = 1,$$

be a smooth bump function. Then for

$$H^1 = H^s - f, \quad H^2 = H^s - (1 - f),$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^1}(c_0) = \gamma^{E_0}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^2}(c_0) = \bar{\gamma}^{E_0}$. We then apply part (1) to obtain that for each $i = 1, 2$, $H^i + \sqrt{\epsilon}P, c_0$ is of Aubry-Mather type. This implies H_ϵ^s, c_0 is of bifurcation Aubry-Mather type (see Definition 8.2). \square

11.2 Simple non-critical case

Suppose h is a simple non-critical homology, which means that for the energy $E = 0$, there is a unique shortest curve γ_h^0 in the homology h corresponding to a hyperbolic periodic orbit η_h^0 of the Hamiltonian system. In this case, however, we have, for $c_0 = \bar{c}_h(0)$

$$\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c_0) = \gamma_h^0 \cup O,$$

where O is the origin (which is where U attains its minimum). If we consider V_1, V_2 disjoint open sets containing γ_h^0 and 0 respectively, and define the local Aubry sets $\mathcal{A}_{H^1}(c)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{H^2}(c)$. It follows that $\mathcal{A}_{H^1}(c) = \gamma_h^0$ and $\mathcal{A}_{H^2}(c) = O$.

Theorem 11.2. *Suppose h is simple non-critical, and let $c_0 = \bar{c}_h(0)$. Then there is $\epsilon_0, \delta > 0$ depending only on K, U such that for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$, for*

$$H_\epsilon^s = K(I) - U'(\varphi) + \sqrt{\epsilon}P, \quad \|P\|_{C^2} \leq 1,$$

the pair (H_ϵ^s, c_0) is of asymmetric bifurcation type.

Proof. The fact that H^1, c_0 is of Aubry-Mather type follows the same proof as Theorem 11.1. On the other hand, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(c_0)$ is a hyperbolic periodic orbit, which is robust under perturbation. Therefore Definition 8.3 is satisfied. \square

11.3 Simple critical case

11.3.1 Proof of Aubry-Mather type using local coordinates

Theorem 11.3. *Suppose $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ is a simple homology for H^s , and consider the cohomology class $c_0 = \bar{c}_h(0)$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0, e, \delta > 0$ depending only on H^s, h such that for each $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $U' \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(U)$ and $c \in B_\epsilon(c_0)$, the pair (H_ϵ^s, c) is of Aubry-Mather type.*

Moreover, the same holds for $(H^s, \lambda c)$ for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$.

We have the following (See Section 10):

- $\eta_h^0 = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(c_0)$ contains the hyperbolic fixed point $(0, 0)$, and is a homoclinic orbit to $(0, 0)$.
- $(0, 0)$ admits eigenvectors $-\lambda_2 < -\lambda_1 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Let $v_1^{s/u}$ and $v_2^{s/u}$ denote the eigendirections of the eigenvalues $\pm\lambda_1, \pm\lambda_2$. Let $\text{Inv}(\varphi, I) = (\varphi, -I)$ denote the involution of the Hamiltonian system. Since the flow is time-reversible, we have $\text{Inv}(v_i^s) = \pm v_i^u$, $i = 1, 2$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\text{Inv}(v_i^s) = v_i^u$. As result, there exists $v_i, w_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$v_i^s = (v_i, w_i), \quad v_i^u = (v_i, -w_i), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

- There is a C^1 normally hyperbolic invariant manifold \mathcal{M} containing η_h^0 . In particular, \mathcal{M} must contain $(0, 0)$ and its tangent to the plane $\text{Span}\{v_1^s, v_1^u\} = \mathbb{R}v_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}w_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ at $(0, 0)$.

The projection $\pi_\varphi \eta_h^0 = \gamma_h^0$ then is a C^1 curve in \mathbb{T}^2 , since $0 \in \mathbb{T}^2$ is the only possible discontinuity of the tangent direction, but at 0 the curve is tangent to $v_1 = \pi_\varphi v_1^s = \pi_\varphi v_1^u$. Let $\pi_{v_1} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\pi_{w_1} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the orthogonal projections to v_1, w_1 directions.

We also need the following analog of Lemma 11.1.

Lemma 11.4. *$W^u(\eta_h^0)$ is a Lipschitz graph over θ component on a neighborhood of γ_h^0 .*

Proof. In the proof of Lemma 11.1, the Lipschitz constant of the Green bundles is uniform over all energy E . The lemma follows by taking limit $E \rightarrow 0$ in the space of Lipschitz graphs. \square

We require a suitable parametrization of the cylinder $\mathcal{C}(H^s)$ near the homoclinic η_h^0 . An illustration of the parametrization is given in Figure 11.1.




Figure 11.1: Coordinates near the homoclinic orbit: green lines indicate the level curves of the x coordinate.

Proposition 11.5. *For each $\kappa > 0$ there exists $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$, and a smooth embedding*

$$\chi_0 = \chi_0(x, y) : \mathbb{T} \times (-\delta_2, \delta_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

such that the following hold:

1. $\mathcal{C}(H^s) := \chi_0(\mathbb{T} \times (-\delta_2, \delta_2)) \supset \eta_h^0$. We use the notation \mathcal{C} since the image of χ_0 is a cylinder.
2. The cylinder $\mathcal{C}(H^s)$ is symplectic.
3. χ_0 is “almost vertical” near $x = 0$, namely $\pi_\varphi \circ \chi_0(x, y)$ is κ -Lipschitz in y for all $|x| < \delta_1$.
4. The vertical coordinate is given by the energy function away from $x = 0$, namely for all $|x| \geq \delta_1/2$ we have $H^s(\chi_0(x, y)) = y$.

We now prove Theorem 11.3 assuming Proposition 11.5.

Proof of Theorem 11.3. Let us consider the system

$$H_\epsilon^s = K(I) + U'(\varphi) + \sqrt{\epsilon}P.$$

where $\|P\|_{C^2} \leq 1$ and $\|U - U'\|_{C^2} \leq \delta$. Then for ϵ_0, δ small enough depending only on K, U , standard perturbation theory implies H_ϵ^s admits a normally hyperbolic weakly invariant manifold $\mathcal{C}(H_\epsilon^s)$, let us denote by \mathcal{C}_ϵ its zero section. Then \mathcal{C}_ϵ is invariant under the time- $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ map $\Phi = \Phi_{H_\epsilon^s}^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$, and it admits a parametrization

$\chi_\epsilon : \mathbb{T} \times (-\delta_2, \delta_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$, and $\|\chi_\epsilon - \chi_0\|_{C^1} = o(1)$ as $\epsilon, \delta \longrightarrow 0$. The cylinder is symplectic since symplecticity is open under perturbations. Moreover, for $e > 0$ small enough, the set $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H^s}(c) \subset \mathcal{C}(H^s)$ for all $c \in B_e(c_0)$, and since $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ is upper semi-continuous under Hamiltonian perturbations, $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c)$ is close to $\mathcal{C}(H_\epsilon^s)$ for small ϵ . Since $\mathcal{C}(H_\epsilon^s)$ contains all the invariant sets in its neighborhood, we conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c) \subset \mathcal{C}(H_\epsilon^s)$.

We now show $\chi_\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c)$ is a Lipschitz graph for $c \in B_e(c_0)$. Let $(\varphi_i, I_i) = \chi_\epsilon(x_i, y_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ be two points in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(c)$.

The proof consists of two cases. In the first case we use the almost verticality of the cylinder, and the idea is similar to the proof of Theorem 9.3. In the second case we use the strong Lipschitz estimate for the energy H^s , and the idea is similar to the proof of Theorem 11.1.

Case 1. $|x_1|, |x_2| < \delta_1$. In this case, we apply the *a priori* Lipschitz estimates for the Aubry sets: there is $C > 0$ depending only $\partial^2 K$, $\|H^s\|_{C^2}$ such that

$$\|I_2 - I_1\| \leq C\|\varphi_2 - \varphi_1\|.$$

Let κ be as in Proposition 11.5, and let ϵ_0 be small enough such that $\pi_\varphi\chi_\epsilon(x, y)$ is 2κ -Lipschitz in y . Since χ_0 is an embedding, there is $C > 1$ depending only on H^s such that for all ϵ_0 small enough,

$$\|\varphi_2 - \varphi_1\| + \|I_2 - I_1\| \geq C^{-1}(\|x_2 - x_1\| + \|y_2 - y_1\|).$$

Let $(\varphi_3, I_3) = \chi_\epsilon(x_2, y_1)$, then

$$\|\varphi_3 - \varphi_2\| \leq \|\chi_\epsilon(x_2, y_1) - \chi_\epsilon(x_2, y_2)\| \leq 2\kappa\|y_2 - y_1\|,$$

$$\|\varphi_3 - \varphi_1\| \leq \|\chi_\epsilon(x_2, y_1) - \chi_\epsilon(x_1, y_1)\| \leq C\|x_2 - x_1\|,$$

combine all estimates, we get

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1}(\|x_2 - x_1\| + \|y_2 - y_1\|) &\leq (1 + C)\|\varphi_2 - \varphi_1\| \\ &\leq (1 + C)(2\kappa\|y_2 - y_1\| + C\|x_2 - x_1\|), \end{aligned}$$

or

$$(C^{-1} - 2(1 + C)\kappa)\|y_2 - y_1\| \leq (C^{-1} + (1 + C)C)\|x_2 - x_1\|$$

which is what we need if $\kappa < 1/(4C(1 + C))$.

Case 2. $|x_1|, |x_2| > \delta_1/2$. In this case we apply Proposition 11.3, to get

$$\|H^s(\varphi_2, I_2) - H^s(\varphi_1, I_1)\| \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\varphi_2 - \varphi_1\|.$$

Assume that ϵ is small enough such that $\|\chi_\epsilon - \chi_0\|_{C^1} < \kappa$. Then a computation identical to (11.3) implies $\|y_2 - y_1\| \leq 2C(\kappa + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}})\|x_2 - x_1\|$ if ϵ, κ is small enough depending only on C .

We obtain the Lipschitz property of $\chi_\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c)$ after combining the two cases.

Finally, we show $W^u(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c))$ is a graph over φ when $\chi_\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c)$ projects onto the x component. It suffices to check that the unstable bundle E^u is uniformly transverse to the projection $\mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c)$. In case 1, the almost verticality of the cylinder implies $\mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c)$ differs from $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c_0) = \gamma_h^0$ by $O(\kappa)$ in Lipschitz norm. Given that the tangent vector of γ_h^0 is close to the weak directions $v_1^{s/u}$ in case 1, while the projection of E^u is close to $v_2^{s/u}$, the desired transversality holds. In case 2, similar to the proof of Theorem 11.1, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}^0(c)$ is also close to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(c_0)$ in Lipschitz norm (for a different reason, i.e (11.3)). The claim follows, similar to the proof of Theorem 11.1, using Lemma 11.4. \square

11.3.2 Construction of the local coordinates

This is done separately near the hyperbolic fixed point (local) and away from it (global). Furthermore, the local coordinate requires a preliminary step.

Lemma 11.6. *For each $\kappa > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$, and a smooth embedding*

$$\chi_{\text{pre}} = \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, y) : (-\delta, \delta) \times (-\delta, \delta) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \cap B_{2\delta}(0, 0) \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2,$$

satisfying

$$\|\chi_{\text{pre}} \circ (\pi_{v_1}, \pi_{w_1}) - \text{id}\|_{C^1} < \kappa. \quad (11.4)$$

There is $0 < \delta_1 < \delta$ such that the curve $\chi_{\text{pre}}^{-1}\eta_h^0 \cap \pi_x^{-1}\{(-\delta_1, \delta_1)\}$ is given by a Lipschitz graph $\{(x, g(x)) : x \in (-\delta_1, \delta_1)\}$.

Proof. The existence of the local coordinate follows from $T_{(0,0)}\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}v_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}w_1$, the fact that \mathcal{M} is C^1 , and the implicit function theorem. Since $\gamma_h^0 = \pi_\varphi\eta_h^0$ is a C^1 curve tangent to v_1 at $0 \in \mathbb{T}^2$, γ_h^0 can be reparametrized using its projection to v_1 direction. Since η_h^0 is a Lipschitz graph over γ_h^0 , the second claim follows. \square

Lemma 11.7. *For each $\kappa > 0$ there is $\delta_1 > \delta_2 > 0$, a smooth embedding*

$$\chi_{\text{loc}} = \chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y) : (-\delta_1, \delta_1) \times (-\delta_1, \delta_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \cap B_{2\delta}(0, 0),$$

a neighborhood V of the local homoclinic $\eta_h^0 \cap \pi_x^{-1}\{(-\delta_1, \delta_1)\}$ on which the cylinder is “almost vertical” in the sense that there is $C > 0$ such that

$$\pi_\varphi\chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y) \text{ is } C\kappa - \text{Lipschitz in } y.$$

The pull back $\chi_{\text{loc}}^{-1}\eta_h^0 \cap \pi_x^{-1}\{(-\delta_1, \delta_1)\}$ is a Lipschitz graph over x , and in addition,

$$H^s(\chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y)) = y, \quad \text{for all } \delta_1/2 < |x| < \delta_1, |y| < \delta_2. \quad (11.5)$$

The manifold $\chi_{\text{loc}}(-\delta_1, \delta_1) \times (-\delta_1, \delta_1)$ is symplectic.

Proof. First we show the image of χ_{pre} is symplectic. To see this, note that $H^s(\varphi, I) = \frac{1}{2}AI \cdot I - \frac{1}{2}B\varphi \cdot \varphi + O_3(I, \varphi)$, where $A = \partial_{II}^2 K$ and $B = \partial_{\varphi\varphi}^2 U(0)$ are both positive definite. Moreover, we have $\lambda_1 w_1 = Av_1$ and $\lambda_1 v_1 = Bw_1$. From (11.4), we have

$$\partial_x \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, y) = v_1 + O(\kappa), \quad \partial_y \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, y) = w_1 + O(\kappa),$$

As a result, let ω be the standard symplectic form, we have

$$\omega(\partial_x \chi_{\text{pre}}, \partial_y \chi_{\text{pre}}) = \omega((v_1, 0), (0, w_1)) + O(\kappa) = \lambda_1 v_1 \cdot Aw_1 + O(\kappa)$$

is uniformly bounded away from 0 if κ is small enough.

Let $\delta, \delta_1, \chi_{\text{pre}}$ and g be from Lemma 11.6. We claim that after possibly shrinking δ_1 , there is $\delta_2 > 0$ and $C > 1$ such that for all $(x, g(x) + y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $|y| < \delta_2$, $\delta_1/2 < |x| < \delta_1$ we have

$$C\delta_1 > |\partial_y (H^s \circ \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, g(x) + y))| > C^{-1}\delta_1 > 0.$$

We will only prove it for the case $\delta_1/2 < x < \delta$ as the other half is symmetric.

Since η_h^0 is tangent to the stable/unstable vectors $v_1^{s/u}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, g(x)) &= xv_1^u + O(x^2) = x(v_1, w_1) + O(x^2), \\ \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, g(x) + y) &= x(v_1, w_1) + O(x^2) + O(y), \quad x > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_y (H^s \circ \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, g(x) + y)) &= (x(Bv_1, Aw_1) + O(x^2) + O(y)) \cdot (w_1 + O(\kappa)) \\ &= xAw_1 \cdot w_1 + O(x^2) + O(y) + O(\kappa(|x| + |y|)) \\ &\geq 4C^{-1}\delta_1 + O(x^2) + O(y) + O(\kappa(|x| + |y|)) > C^{-1}\delta_1, \end{aligned}$$

if $8C^{-1} = \|Aw_1 \cdot w_1\|$, $\delta_1/2 < x < \delta_1$, $\delta_1 < C^{-1}$, $|y| < \delta_2 < C^{-1}\delta_1$, and $\kappa < C^{-1}/2$. The upper bound can be obtained similarly. This proves our claim.

We consider the function

$$F = F(x, y) = \frac{\delta_1^{-1}}{\partial_y (H^s \circ \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, g(x) + y))}, \quad \delta_1/2 < |x| < \delta_1, |y| < \delta_2.$$

and for each fixed x , let $Y_F(x, y)$ denote the solution to the ODE

$$\frac{d}{dy} Y_F = F(x, y), \quad Y_F(0) = g(x),$$

then $\partial_y H^s \circ \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, Y_F(x, y)) = 1$, therefore $H^s \circ \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, Y_F(x, y)) = y$.




Figure 11.2: Construction of local coordinate

Finally, let us define the vector field $G(x, y)$ via

$$G(x, y) = \begin{cases} (0, F(x, y)), & \delta_1/2 < |x| < \delta_1, |y| < \delta_2; \\ (0, 1), & |x| < \delta_1/4, \text{ or } |y| > 2\delta_2; \end{cases}$$

and smoothly interpolated (keeping the first coordinate 0) in between. Since $C^{-1} < |F_1| < C$, this can be done keeping $\|G\|_{C^1} = O(\delta_1^{-1})$. Let $g_1(x)$ be a mollified version of g such that $g_1(x) = g(x)$ for all $|x| \geq \delta_1/4$, and $|g_1(x) - g(x)| \leq \delta_1/2$. Finally define

$$\chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y) = \chi_{\text{pre}} \circ \Phi_G^y(x, g_1(x)),$$

where $\Phi_G(x_0, y_0)$ is the time- y -flow of $G(x, y)$. The modification g_1 is to ensure the coordinate system is smooth. See Figure 11.2.

We have:

- $\chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y) = \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, g_1(x) + y)$ when $|x| < \delta_1/4$ and $|y| > 2\delta_1$.
- $H^s \circ \chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y) = H^s \circ \chi_{\text{pre}}(x, Y_F(x, y)) = y$ when $\delta_1/2 < |x| < \delta_1$ and $|y| < \delta_2$.
- The function χ_{pre} is κ -Lipschitz in y (see (11.4)). Therefore (11.5) holds when $|x| < \delta_1/4$ and $|y| > 2\delta_1$.

Moreover, given that the flow Φ_G^y is vertical: $\pi_x \Phi_G^y(x_0, y_0) = x_0$, and $|\partial_{y_0} \Phi_G^y| \leq 1 + |y| \cdot \|G\|_{C^1} = 1 + O(\delta_1^{-1}|y|)$. Therefore

$$|\partial_y(\pi_\varphi \chi_{\text{pre}}) \circ \Phi_G^y(x, g_1(x))| \leq \|\partial_y(\pi_\varphi \chi_{\text{pre}})\| \cdot (1 + O(\delta_1^{-1}|y|)) \leq 2\kappa$$

if $|y| < \delta_2$ is sufficiently small. As a result, (11.5) holds on the set $V := \{|y| < \delta_2\}$ which is the gray area in Figure 11.2.

- The curve $\eta_h^0 = \{\chi_{\text{pre}}(x, g(x)) : |x| < \delta_1\}$ coincide with $\chi_{\text{loc}}(x, 0)$ when $|x| \geq \delta_1/4$ and coincides with $\chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y - g_1(x) + g(x))$ when $|x| \leq \delta_1/4$, and therefore is a Lipschitz graph under χ_{loc}^{-1} .

□

Proof of Proposition 11.5. Consider the χ_{loc} coordinate system as constructed. By construction, the sections $\Sigma_{\pm} = \chi_{\text{loc}}(\{|y| \leq \delta_2, x = \pm\delta_1\})$ are transversal to the Hamiltonian flow, and therefore there is a Poincare map $\Phi : \Sigma_+ \rightarrow \Sigma_-$. Moreover, we must have $\chi_{\text{loc}}^{-1} \circ \Phi \circ \chi_{\text{loc}}(\delta_1, y) = (-\delta_1, y)$, since the flow preserves energy. Let $T(y)$ denote the time it takes for $\phi_{H^s}^t$ to flow from $\chi_{\text{loc}}(\delta_1, y)$ to $\chi_{\text{loc}}(-\delta_1, y)$.

We now define

$$\chi(x, y) = \begin{cases} \chi_{\text{loc}}(x, y), & 0 \leq x < \delta_1; \\ \chi_{\text{loc}}(x - 1, y), & 1 - \delta_1 \leq x \leq 1; \\ \phi_{H^s}^{s(x, y)}(\delta_1, y), & s(x, y) = \frac{x - \delta_1}{1 - 2\delta_1} T(y), \quad \delta_1 \leq x \leq 1 - \delta_1. \end{cases}$$

Then $\chi(x, y)$ is an embedding $\mathbb{T} \times (-\delta_2, \delta_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying item (1)(3)(4) of Proposition 11.5.

It remains to prove (2), namely symplecticity. For $|x| \leq \delta_1$, this is covered in Proposition 11.5. For $|x| \geq \delta_1$, note that the tangent plane to the cylinder is spanned by two vector fields, one being X_{H^s} and the other is $\partial_y \chi$. We have $\omega(X_H, \partial_y \chi) = \nabla H \cdot \partial_y \chi = 1$ by construction, therefore the manifold is symplectic. □

12 Forcing equivalence between kissing cylinders

In this section we prove Theorem 5.1. We assume that h is a non-simple homology class which satisfies $h = n_1 h_1 + n_2 h_2$, where h_1, h_2 are simple homologies. They are associated with curves $c_h(E)$ and $c_{h_1}^\mu(E)$ in the corresponding channels, where we assume

$$\|c_h(0) - c_{h_1}^\mu(0)\| < \mu.$$

Our goal is to prove forcing equivalence of the cohomologies $\Phi_L^*(c_h(E_1))$ and $\Phi_L^*(c_{h_1}^\mu(E_2))$ for some $E_1, E_2 \in (e, e + \mu)$, where $e > 0$ is sufficiently small.

We will construct a variational problem which proves forcing equivalence for the original Hamiltonian H_ϵ using definition (Definition 6.12). The proof consists of four steps.

1. We construct a special variational problem for the slow mechanical system H^s . A solution of this variational problem is an orbit “jumping” from one homology class h to the other h_1 . The same can be done with h and h_1 switched.

2. We modify this variational problem for the fast time-periodic perturbation of H^s , i.e. for the perturbed slow system $H_\epsilon^s(\varphi^s, I^s, \tau) = K(I^s) - U(\varphi^s) + \sqrt{\epsilon}P(\varphi^s, I^s, \tau)$ with $\tau \in \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T}$. This is achieved by applying the perturbative results established in Section 7.

Recall the original Hamiltonian system H_ϵ near a double resonance can be brought to a normal form $N_\epsilon = H_\epsilon \circ \Phi_\epsilon$ and this normal form, in turn, is related to the perturbed slow system through coordinate change and energy reduction (see section B). The variational problem for H_ϵ^s can then be converted to a variational problem for the original H_ϵ .

3. Using this variational problem we prove forcing relation between $c_h(E_1)$ and $c_{h_1}^\mu(E_2)$.

12.1 Variational problem for the slow mechanical system

The slow system is given by $H^s(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi)$ where we assumed that the minimum of U is achieved at 0. Given $m \in \mathbb{T}^2$, $a > 0$ and a unit vector $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$, define

$$S(m, a, \omega) = \{m + \lambda\omega : \lambda \in (-a, a)\}.$$

$S(m, a, \omega)$ is a line segment in \mathbb{T}^2 and we will refer to it as a *section* (see Figure 12.1).

Given $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we say that c_1, c_2 has a non-degenerate connection for H^s , at the section $S(m, a, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^2$, such that the following conditions hold.

[N1A] ⁵

$$(c_1 - c_2) \perp S, \quad \alpha_H(c_1) = \alpha_H(c_2).$$

[N2a] There exists a compact set $K \subset S_0$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_H(c_1)$ and $z \in \mathcal{A}_H(c_2)$, the minimum of the variational problem

$$\min_{y \in \overline{S}} \{h_{H^s, c_1}(x, y) + h_{H^s, c_2}(y, z)\}$$

is never achieved outside of K .

[N3A] Suppose the above minimum is achieved at y_0 , let $p_1 - c_1$ be any super-differential of $h_{H^s, c_1}(x, \cdot)$ at y_0 , and $-p_2 + c_2$ a super-differential of $h_{H^s, c_2}(\cdot, z)$ at y_0 , then

$$\partial_p H^s(y_0, p_i) \cdot S^\perp, \quad i = 1, 2$$

have the same signs, here S^\perp denote a normal vector to S .

⁵The ‘‘A’’ in [N1A]-[N3A] stands for ‘‘autonomous’’.




Figure 12.1: Jump from one cylinder to another in the same homology

Remark 12.1. Conditions of the type [N1A]-[N3A] are common in variational construction of shadowing orbits, called the “no corners” conditions (see for example [15]). They imply that the minimizers of the $h_{H^s, c_1}(x, y)$ and $h_{H^s, c}(y, z)$ concatenates to a smooth trajectories of the Euler-Lagrange equation. We take advantage of this fact to prove forcing relation using the definition.

Recall that the cohomology classes $\bar{c}_h(E)$, $\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E)$ are chosen in the channels of h and h_1 , i.e. $\mathcal{LF}(\lambda_h^E h)$ and $\mathcal{LF}(\lambda_{h_1}^E h_1)$. Since h is non-simple Proposition C.8 implies the channel will pinch to a point, and $\bar{c}_h(0)$ is uniquely chosen. The channel of h_1 as positive width at $E = 0$, and $\bar{c}_h(0)$ is at the boundary of this segment. In particular, since the channel for h_1 is parallel to h_1^\perp , we always have

$$\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(0) - \bar{c}_h(0) \perp h_1. \quad (12.1)$$

We will choose $\bar{c}_{h_1}(0)$ sufficiently close to $\bar{c}_h(0)$ according to the following proposition.

Proposition 12.1. *Suppose the slow mechanical system H^s satisfies conditions [A0]-[A4] Then there is $\mu > 0$ depending only on H^s such that if $|\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(0) - c_h(0)| < \mu$, we have: There exists a section $S(0) = S(m(0), a(0), \omega(0))$, such that conditions [N1A]-[N3A] is satisfied for $\bar{c}_{h_1}(0)$, $\bar{c}_h(0)$ and section $S(0)$.*

Moreover, the same holds with $\bar{c}_{h_1}(0)$, $\bar{c}_h(0)$ switched.

Proof. We first show that [N1A]-[N3A] are satisfied when $c_1 = c_2 = \bar{c}_h(0)$, then use perturbation arguments. Note that [N1A] is trivially satisfied when $c_1 = c_2$.

Recall that $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0)) = \gamma_{h_1}^0 \cup \gamma_{h_2}^0$, and the curves $\gamma_{h_1}^0$ and $\gamma_{h_2}^0$ are tangent to a common direction at m_0 , which we will call v_0 . By the choice of h_1 , v_0 is not parallel

to h_1 . We now choose $\omega(0) = \frac{h_1}{\|h_1\|}$, $m(0)$ sufficiently close to 0, and $a(0) = a > 0$, such that $S(m(0), \omega(0), a(0))$ intersect $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$ transversally and is disjoint from 0 (see Figure 12.1).

The Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$ supports a unique minimal measure, and therefore has a unique static class. Since for any $x, z \in \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$, the function

$$h_{\bar{c}_h(0)}(x, \cdot) + h_{\bar{c}_h(0)}(\cdot, z)$$

reaches its global minimal at $\mathcal{N}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$, which coincides with $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$. Hence the minimum in

$$\min_{y \in S(0)} \{h_{\bar{c}_h(0)}(x, y) + h_{\bar{c}_h(0)}(y, z)\} \quad (12.2)$$

is reached at $S(0) \cap \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$, which is compactly contained in $S(0)$. This implies [N2a] is satisfied for $c_1 = c_2 = \bar{c}_h(0)$ along the section $S(0)$.

Moreover, for any y_0 reaching the minimum in (12.2), then according to the above analysis y_0 also reaches the global minimum of $h_{\bar{c}_h(0)}(x, \cdot) + h_{\bar{c}_h(0)}(\cdot, z)$. Then using Proposition 6.2, the associated super-gradients $p_1 - \bar{c}_h(0)$ and $-p_2 + \bar{c}_h(0)$ (in [N3A]) satisfies $p_1 = p_2$, and $\partial_p H^s(y_0, p_1) = \partial_p H^s(y_0, p_2)$ is the velocity of the unique backward minimizer at y_0 . To show that [N3A] holds, we only need to show $\partial_p H^s(y_0, p_1) \neq 0$. This is the case because 0 is the only equilibrium in $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$, and $S(0)$ is disjoint from 0.

We now perturb c_1 away from $\bar{c}_h(0)$ while keeping $c_2 = \bar{c}_h(0)$. We choose $c_1 = \bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(0)$ at the bottom of the h_1 channel, then (12.1) and $\omega(0) = h_1$ means [N1A] is still satisfied. Proposition 7.4 implies that [N2a] and [N3A] are both robust under the perturbation of c_1 , therefore [N1A]-[N3A] holds if $\|\bar{c}_{h_1}(0) - \bar{c}_h(0)\|$ is small enough.

To prove the same with $\bar{c}_{h_1}(0)$, $\bar{c}_h(0)$ switched, we perform the same perturbation argument keeping $c_1 = \bar{c}_h(0)$ and $c_2 = \bar{c}_{h_1}(0)$. \square

We now perform one more step of perturbation by taking $E > 0$.

Proposition 12.2. *Suppose the slow mechanical system H^s satisfies conditions [DR1^c] – [DR4^c], then there exists $e > 0$ such that the following hold. For each $0 \leq E \leq e$, there exists a section $S(E) := S(m(E), a(E), \omega(E))$, with $S(E) \rightarrow S(0)$ in Hausdorff distance, and the condition [N1A]-[N3A] are satisfied for $\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E)$, $\bar{c}_h(E)$ at $S(E)$.*

Moreover, the same conditions are satisfied with $\bar{c}_h(E)$ and $\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E)$ switched.

Proof of Proposition 12.2. Since the Aubry sets $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_{h_1}(0))$ and $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(0))$ has a unique static class, Proposition 7.4 implies that [N2a] and [N3A] are both robust under the perturbation of c_1 and c_2 . As a result, it suffices to construct a section $S(E) = S(m(E), \omega(E), a(E))$ such that [N1A] holds, and $S(E) \rightarrow S(0)$ as $E \rightarrow 0$.

To do this, we choose $\omega(E)$ to be a unit vector orthogonal to $\bar{c}_{h_1}(E) - \bar{c}_h(E)$, and by continuity of the functions \bar{c} , $\omega(E) \rightarrow \omega(0)$ as $E \rightarrow 0$. Since $\alpha_{H^s}(\bar{c}_{h_1}(E)) = \alpha_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E)) = E$, [N1A] is satisfied. We then choose $m(E) = m(0)$ and $a(E) = a(0)$. Clearly $S(E) \rightarrow S(0)$ in Hausdorff metric. The proposition follows. \square

12.2 Variational problem for original coordinates

The original Hamiltonian H_ϵ is reduced via coordinate change, and time change, to

$$H_\epsilon^s(\varphi^s, I^s, \tau) = K(I^s) - U(\varphi^s) + \sqrt{\epsilon} P(\varphi^s, I^s, \tau),$$

with $\|P\|_{C^2} \leq C_1$, see Section B.2. The system H_ϵ^s is defined on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$, but is $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ periodic in τ , i.e. it is a periodic Tonelli Hamiltonian introduced in Section 6.1. Denote $\sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/(\sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{Z})$, then H_ϵ^s projects to $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T}$.

We now define a variational problem for the perturbed system. First, we will adjust the cohomologies so that they have the same alpha function.

Lemma 12.3. *Fix $e > 0$. There exists $C > 0$, and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depending only on $K(I)$, $\|U\|_{C^0}$ and e such that for any $\frac{e}{3} \leq E \leq \frac{2e}{3}$ and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, there exists $0 < E^\epsilon < e$ such that*

$$\alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}_h(E)) = \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}^\mu(\bar{c}_{h_1}(E^\epsilon)), \quad |E - E^\epsilon| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Proof. We note that $\alpha_{H^s}(c_h(E)) = E = \alpha_{H^s}(c_{h_1}^\mu(E))$. By Lemma 7.9,

$$\|\alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(c_h(E)) - E\|, \quad \|\alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(c_{h_1}^\mu(E)) - E\| \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

The Lemma easily follows if we choose ϵ_0 such that $e > 3C\sqrt{\epsilon_0}$. \square

We define a section $S^\epsilon(E) = S(m(E), a(E), \omega^\epsilon(E))$, by keeping $m(E)$, $a(E)$ the same as before, with $\omega^\epsilon(E)$ to be a unit vector orthogonal to $\bar{c}_h(E) - \bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E^\epsilon)$. It is natural to study the extended section $S^\epsilon \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T}$, and condition [N1] becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_1 - c_2 \\ -\alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(c_1) + \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(c_2) \end{bmatrix} \perp S^\epsilon \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T},$$

and the variational problem for [N2] is: For $(x, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}_h(E))$ and $(z, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E^\epsilon))$, consider the minimization

$$\min_{(y,t) \in S^\epsilon \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T}} \left\{ h_{H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}_h(E)}(x, 0; y, t) + h_{H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}_{h_1}^\mu(E^\epsilon)}(y, t; z, 0) \right\}. \quad (12.3)$$

We will not, however, study conditions [N1]-[N3] for H_ϵ^s directly. Instead, we transform the cohomology $\bar{c}_h(E)$ and $\bar{c}_{h_1}(E^\epsilon)$, the section $S^\epsilon \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T}$, and the variational problem (12.3) directly to the original system H_ϵ .

Recall that the original Hamiltonian H_ϵ can be brought into a normal form system N_ϵ . N_ϵ is related to H_ϵ^s via the coordinate Φ_L , and an energy reduction, see section B.2. Denote

$$\Phi_L^1(\varphi, \tau) = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi \\ \tau/\sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\Phi_L^1)^{-1}(\theta, t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} B \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix},$$

this is the angular component of the affine coordinate change Φ_L (see (B.16)). The 3×3 matrix B is defined in (B.9).

Given $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we define

$$c^\epsilon = p_0 + B_0^T \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon} \bar{c} \\ -\epsilon \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (12.4)$$

where B_0 is the first two rows of B , given precisely by k_1^T, k_2^T . According to Proposition B.7, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c^\epsilon - p_0 \\ -\alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c^\epsilon) + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} = B^T \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon} \bar{c} \\ -\epsilon \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) \end{bmatrix} = \Phi_L^*(\bar{c}, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})), \quad (12.5)$$

where Φ_L^* is from (5.8), and coincide with the action component of Φ_L . In particular, (12.4) is the first row of (12.5). Let us denote the cohomologies $c_h^\epsilon(E)$ and $c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E)$ the image of $\bar{c} = \bar{c}_h(E)$ and $\bar{c} = \bar{c}_{h_1}^\epsilon(E)$ under (12.4).

We define a section $\Sigma = \Sigma(\theta_0, a, \Omega, l) \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}$ (for the original Hamiltonian $H_\epsilon : \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) by

$$\Sigma(\theta_0, a, \Omega, l) = \{(\theta_0 + \lambda\Omega + lt, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T} : -a < \lambda < a, t \in \mathbb{T}\}, \quad (12.6)$$

where

$$\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad l \in \mathbb{Z}^3.$$

The section $S(m, a, \omega) \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{T}^2 \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T}$ is mapped under Φ_L^1 to $\Sigma(\theta_0, a, \Omega, l)$ with

$$\theta_0 = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} m \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{T}^3, \quad \Omega = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \omega \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad l = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}^3. \quad (12.7)$$

Note that for $(c_i^\epsilon, \alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c_i^\epsilon)) = \Phi_L^*(\bar{c}_i, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}_i))$, $i = 1, 2$, using (12.4) and $\Sigma = \Phi_L^1(S \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T})$, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{c}_1 - \bar{c}_2 \\ -\alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}_1) + \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}_2) \end{bmatrix} \perp S \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T} \iff \begin{bmatrix} c_1^\epsilon - c_2^\epsilon \\ -\alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c_1^\epsilon) + \alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c_2^\epsilon) \end{bmatrix} \perp \Sigma \quad (12.8)$$

We say that $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ has non-degenerate connection along a section $\Sigma(\theta, a, \Omega, l)$, if the following conditions hold.

[N1] We have

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_1 - c_2 \\ -\alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c_1) + \alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c_2) \end{bmatrix} \perp \Sigma.$$

[N2] There exists compact set $K \subset \Sigma$ such that: for each $(x, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon}(c_1)$ and $(z, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon}(c_2)$, the minimum in

$$\min_{(y,t) \in \bar{\Sigma}} \{h_{H_\epsilon, c_1}(x, 0; y, t) + h_{H_\epsilon, c_2}(y, t; z, 0)\}$$

is never achieved outside of K .

[N3] Assume that the minimum [N2] is reached at (y_0, t_0) , and let $p_1 - c_1$ and $-p_2 + c_2$ be any super-differentials of $h_{c_1}(x, 0; \cdot, t)$ and $h_{c_2}(\cdot, t_0; z, 0)$ respectively. Then

$$(\partial_p H(y_0, p_1, t_0), 1) \cdot \Sigma^\perp, \quad (\partial_p H(y_0, p_2, t_0), 1) \cdot \Sigma^\perp$$

have the same signs, where Σ^\perp is a normal vector to Σ .

Proposition 12.4. *Consider $c_h^\epsilon(E), c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E)$ be defined from $\bar{c}_h(E), \bar{c}_{h_1}(E)$ using (12.4). Let E^ϵ be as in Lemma 12.3, and let the section $S^\epsilon(E)$ be as in (12.3), and the section $\Sigma^\epsilon(E)$ be obtained from $S^\epsilon(E) \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T}$ via (12.7).*

Then for each $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, we have

$$c_h^\epsilon(E), c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E^\epsilon), \Sigma^\epsilon(E)$$

satisfies [N1]-[N3]. Moreover, the same holds with $c_h^\epsilon(E)$ and $c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E^\epsilon)$ switched.

The following statement is a direct application of Theorem 12.1 which holds for general Tonelli Hamiltonians.

Proposition 12.5. *Assume that the conclusions of Proposition 12.4 hold. In addition, assume that both $\mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon}(c_h^\epsilon(E))$ and $\mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon}(c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E^\epsilon))$ admits a unique static class. Then*

$$c_h(E) \dashv\vdash c_{h_1}^{\epsilon, \mu}(E^\epsilon).$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By Proposition 12.4, for the system H_ϵ , which is a perturbation of H_ϵ , all conditions of Proposition 12.5 are satisfied, except the condition of uniqueness of static classes. For this we consider again the residual condition that all rational minimal periodic orbits are hyperbolic, and has transversal homoclinic and heteroclinic intersections. Under this condition all cohomologies $c_h(E)$ and $c_{h_1}^{\epsilon, \mu}(E)$ has unique static class (using the fact that they are of Aubry-Mather type). \square

We prove Proposition 12.4 in section 12.3 and Proposition 12.5 in section 12.4.

12.3 Scaling limit of the barrier function

In this section we prove Proposition 12.4. Using the choice of the cohomology classes and the sections, together with (12.8), we get [N1] is satisfied for $c_h^\epsilon(E)$, $c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E^\epsilon)$, and $\Sigma^\epsilon(E)$. It suffices to prove [N2] and [N3]. We will show that the variational problem in [N2] is a scaling limit of the variational problem (12.3).

Proposition 12.6. *The family of functions $h_{H_\epsilon, c_h(E)}(\chi^{E,\epsilon}, 0; \cdot, t)/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ is uniformly semi-concave, and*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{(\theta, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}} \left| h_{H_\epsilon, c_h(E)}(\chi^{E,\epsilon}, 0; \theta, t)/\sqrt{\epsilon} - h_{H^s, \bar{c}_h(E)}(x^E, B_0 \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix}) \right| = 0.$$

uniformly over

$$(\chi^{E,\epsilon}, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon}(c_h(E)), \quad (x^E, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E)).$$

The same conclusions apply to the barrier function $h_{H_\epsilon, c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E)}(\cdot, \cdot; \xi^{E,\epsilon}, 0)/\sqrt{\epsilon}$.

Proof. The uniform semi-concavity of barrier functions follows from Proposition 7.6. Moreover, according to Proposition B.7, item 2, the families of functions

$$h_{H_\epsilon, c_h^\epsilon(E)}(\chi^{E,\epsilon}, 0; \theta, t)/\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad h_{H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}_h(E)}(\Phi_{LS}^1(\chi^{E,\epsilon}, 0); \Phi_{LS}^1(\theta, t))$$

share the same limit points as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, Proposition B.7, item 3 implies $\Phi_{LS}^1(\chi^{E,\epsilon}, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}_h(E))$.

The functions H_ϵ^s form a uniform family of periodic Hamiltonians, and $H_\epsilon^s \rightarrow H^s$ in $C^2(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R})$. By construction, $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E))$ has unique static class, therefore Proposition 7.4 applies, and for any $(x_E, 0) \in \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(\bar{c}_h(E))$,

$$h_{H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}_h(E)}(\Phi_{LS}^1(\chi^{E,\epsilon}, 0); \varphi, \tau) \rightarrow h_{H^s, \bar{c}_h(E)}(x^E, 0; \varphi, \tau)$$

uniformly. Finally, noticing

$$\Phi_L^1(\theta, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} B \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_0 \\ k_3^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} B_0 \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12.9)$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the desired limit. The case for $h_{H_\epsilon, c_{h_1}^\epsilon(E)}(\cdot, \cdot; \xi^{E,\epsilon}, 0)/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ is symmetric and we omit it. \square

Proof of Proposition 12.4. Condition [N1] is satisfied by the choice of section. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} B_0 \Sigma^\epsilon(E) &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} B \Sigma^\epsilon(E) = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} B B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} (S^\epsilon(E) \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T}) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} (S^\epsilon(E) \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T}) = S^\epsilon(E). \end{aligned}$$

Since $S^\epsilon(E) \rightarrow S(E)$ as $E \rightarrow 0$, combine with Proposition 12.2 we get [N2] still holds for $0 \leq \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, with ϵ_0 depending only on H^s . [N3] follows from the same limiting argument and we omit it. \square

12.4 The jump mechanism

In this section we show that [N1]-[N3] condition combined with uniqueness of static class imply $c_1 \vdash c_2$, which is Proposition 12.5. The discussions here apply to general Toneli Hamiltonians. Denote

$$\tilde{A}_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) = A_{H,c}(x, s, y, t) + \alpha_H(c)(t - s).$$

The subscript H may be omitted.

Theorem 12.1. *Assume that c_1, c_2 and Σ satisfies the conditions [N1]-[N3], and in addition,*

$$\mathcal{A}_H(c_1), \quad \mathcal{A}_H(c_2)$$

both have unique static class, then the following hold.

1. *(interior minimum) There exists $N < N', M < M' \in \mathbb{N}$ and a compact set $K' \subset \Sigma$, such that for any semi-concave function u on \mathbb{T}^2 , the minimum in*

$$v(z) := \min\{u(x) + \tilde{A}_{c_1}(x, 0; y, t + n) + \tilde{A}_{c_2}(y, t + n; z, n + m)\}, \quad (12.10)$$

where the minimum is taken in

$$x \in \mathbb{T}^2, (y, t) \in \Sigma, N \leq n \leq N', M \leq m \leq M',$$

is never achieved for $(y, t) \notin K'$.

2. *(no corner) Assume the minimum in (12.10) is achieved at $(y, t) = (y_0, t_0)$, $(n, m) = (n_0, m_0)$, and the minimizing curves are $\gamma_1 : [0, t_0 + n_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ and $\gamma_2 : [t_0 + n_0, t_0 + n_0 + m_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$. Then γ_1 and γ_2 connect to an orbit of the Euler-Lagrange equation, i.e.*

$$\dot{\gamma}_1(t_0 + n_0) = \dot{\gamma}_2(t_0 + n_0).$$

3. (connecting orbits) The function v is semi-concave, and its associated pseudo-graph satisfies

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}_{c_2, v}} \subset \bigcup_{0 \leq t \leq N' + M'} \phi^t \mathcal{G}_{c_1, u}.$$

As a consequence,

$$c_1 \vdash c_2.$$

Remark 12.2. We only need item 3 of the theorem for our purpose, the first two items are stated to illuminate the idea. Item 1 can be seen as a finite time version of the variational problem in [N2]. It holds for sufficiently large M, N , due to uniform convergence of the Lax-Oleinik semi-group. Item 2 implies the minimizers concatenate to a real orbit of the system, which is crucial in proving item 3.

Lemma 12.7. 1. Let u be a continuous function on \mathbb{T}^2 . The limit

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N' \rightarrow \infty} \min_{x \in \mathbb{T}^2, N \leq n \leq N'} \{u(x) + \tilde{A}_c(x, 0; y, t + n)\} = \\ = \min_{x \in D} \{u(x) + h_c(x, 0; y, t)\} \end{aligned}$$

is uniform in u and (y, t) .

2. The limit

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N' \rightarrow \infty} \min_{N \leq n \leq N'} \tilde{A}_c(y, t; z, n) = h_c(y, t; z, 0)$$

is uniform in y, t, z .

Proof. The proof of the first item is similar to the proof of Proposition 6.3 of [11] with some auxiliary facts proven in Appendix A there. The proof of the second item is similar to that of Proposition 6.1 from [11].

In both cases the action function, defined in (2.4) and (6.1) of [11], is restricted to have integer time increment. For non-integer time increments the same argument applies. \square

Using the representation formula (Proposition 6.11) and Lemma 7.5, we have the following characterization of the barrier functions.

Lemma 12.8. Assume that $\mathcal{A}(c)$ has only one static class. For each point $(y, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{T}$ and each $z \in \mathbb{T}^2$

1. there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}^2$ and $x_1 \in \mathcal{A}(c)$ such that

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{T}^2} \{u(x) + h_c(x, 0; y, t)\} = u(x_0) + h_c(x_0, 0; x_1, 0) + h_c(x_1, 0; y, t).$$

2. there exists $z_1 \in \mathcal{A}(c)$ such that

$$h_c(y, t; z, 0) = h_c(y, t; z_1, 0) + h_c(z_1, 0; z, 0).$$

Proof of Theorem 12.1. According to Lemma 12.7, (12.10) converges uniformly as $N, M \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$\min_{x, y, t} \{u(x) + h_{c_1}(x, 0; y, t) + h_{c_2}(y, t; z, 0)\},$$

which is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{(y, t)} \{u(x_0) + h_{c_1}(x_0, 0; x_1, 0) + h_{c_1}(x_1, 0; y, t) + h_{c_2}(y, t; z_1, 0) + h_{c_2}(z_1, 0; z, 0)\} \\ & = \min_{(y, t)} \{const + h_{c_1}(x_1, 0; y, t) + h_{c_2}(y, t; z_1, 0) + h_{c_2}(z_1, 0; z, 0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 12.8. Since the above variational problem has a interior minimum due to condition N2, by uniform convergence, the finite-time variational problem (12.10) also has an interior minimum for sufficiently large N, M .

We now prove the second conclusion. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be the minimizers for $\tilde{A}_{c_1}(x_0, 0; y_0, t_0 + n_0)$ and $\tilde{A}_{c_2}(y_0, t_0 + n_0; z, n_0 + m_0)$, and let p_1 and p_2 be the associated momentum, we will show that

$$p_1(t_0 + n_0) = p_2(t_0 + n_0),$$

which implies $\dot{\gamma}_1(t_0 + n_0) = \dot{\gamma}_2(t_0 + n_0)$. To abbreviate notations, we write $p_1^0 = p_1(t_0 + n_0)$ and $p_2^0 = p_2(t_0 + n_0)$ for the rest of the proof.

Note that

$$u_1(x_0) + \tilde{A}_{c_1}(x_0, 0; y_0, t_0 + n_0) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{T}^2} \{u_1(x) + \tilde{A}_{c_1}(x, 0; y_0, t_0 + n_0)\}.$$

By semi-concavity, the function $u_1(x) + \tilde{A}_{c_1}(x, 0; y_0, t_0 + n_0)$ is differentiable at x_0 and the derivative vanishes. By Proposition 6.2 part 3,

$$d_x u(x_0) = p_1(0) - c_1. \tag{12.11}$$

By a similar reasoning, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{A}_{c_1}(x_0, 0; y_0, t_0 + n_0) + \tilde{A}_{c_2}(y_0, t_0 + n_0; z, n_0 + m_0) \\ & = \min_{(y, t) \in \Sigma} \{\tilde{A}_{c_1}(x_0, 0; y, t + n_0) + \tilde{A}_{c_2}(y, t + n_0; z, n_0 + m_0)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{12.12}$$

By Proposition 6.2, we know

$$(p_1^0 - c_1, \alpha_H(c_1) - H(y_0, t_0, p_0^1)), \quad (-p_2^0 + c_1, -\alpha_H(c_2) + H(y_0, t_0, p_0^2)).$$

are super-differentials of $\tilde{A}_{c_1}(x_0, 0; y_0, t_0 + n_0)$ and $\tilde{A}_{c_2}(y_0, t_0 + n_0; z, n_0 + m_0)$ at $(y_0, t_0 + n_0)$, since the minimum in (12.12) is obtained inside of Σ , we have

$$(p_1^0 - p_2^0, -H(y_0, t_0, p_1^0) + H(y_0, t_0, p_2^0)) + (-c_1 + c_2, \alpha_H(c_1) - \alpha_H(c_2))$$

is orthogonal to Σ . Since the second term is orthogonal to Σ by [N1], we obtain

$$(p_1^0 - p_2^0, -H(y_0, t_0, p_1^0) + H(y_0, t_0, p_2^0)) \in \mathbb{R}\Sigma^\perp.$$

We proceed to prove $p_1^0 = p_2^0$.

Write $\Sigma^\perp = (v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$, then there exists λ_0 such that

$$p_1^0 - p_2^0 = \lambda_0 v, \quad -H(y_0, t_0, p_1^0) + H(y_0, t_0, p_2^0) = \lambda_0 w.$$

Define

$$f(\lambda) = H(y_0, t_0, p_1^0 + \lambda v) - H(y_0, t_0, p_1) + \lambda w,$$

then $f(\lambda_0) = 0$. Since $f(\lambda)$ is a strictly convex on \mathbb{R} , there are at most two solutions, one of them is $\lambda = 0$. Suppose there is a nonzero solution λ_0 , then $f'(0)$ and $f'(\lambda_0)$ must have different signs. Since

$$f'(0) = (\partial_p H(y_0, t_0, p_1^0), 1) \cdot (v, w), \quad f'(\lambda_0) = (\partial_p H(y_0, t_0, p_2^0), 1) \cdot (v, w),$$

have the same signs from [N3], we get a contradiction. As a result, 0 is the only solution to $f(\lambda) = 0$, indicating $p_1^0 = p_2^0$. Moreover, this implies $p_1^0 = p_2^0$ is uniquely defined and the functions $\tilde{A}_{c_1}(x_0, 0; \cdot, \cdot)$, $A_{c_2}(\cdot, \cdot; z_0, n_0 + m_0)$ are differentiable at $(y_0, t_0 + n_0)$.

As a consequence, (γ_1, p_1) and (γ_2, p_2) connect as a solution of the Hamiltonian flow. Using (12.11), we have

$$\phi^{n_0+m_0}(x_0, du_x(x_0) + c_1) = (z, p_2(n_0 + m_0)).$$

Note that $p_2(n_0 + m_0) - c_2$ is a super-differential to v at z . If v is differentiable at z , then $p_2 = dv(z) + c_2$. This implies

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}_{c_2, v}} \subset \bigcup_{0 \leq t \leq N' + M'} \phi^t \mathcal{G}_{c_1, u}$$

and the forcing relation. □

A Generic properties of mechanical systems on the two-torus

Most of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 4.2. At the end of the section we prove Proposition 4.5. This states that the minimal shortest curves in a fixed homology class h is generically hyperbolic, with finitely many bifurcations. To achieve this, we study generic properties of *non-degenerate* orbits. It is well known that minimal non-degenerate orbits must be hyperbolic.

The proof of Theorem 4.2 consists of three parts.

1. In section A.1, we prove a Kupka-Smale-like theorem about non-degeneracy of periodic orbits. For a fixed energy surface, generically, all periodic orbits are non-degenerate. This fails for an interval of energies. We show that while degenerate periodic orbits exists, there are only finitely many of them. Moreover, there could be only a particular type of bifurcation for any family of periodic orbits crossing a degeneracy.
2. In section A.2, we show that a non-degenerate locally minimal orbit is always *hyperbolic*. Using part I, we show that for each energy, the globally minimal orbits is chosen from a finite family of *hyperbolic* locally minimal orbits.
3. In section A.3, we finish the proof by proving the finite local families obtained from part II are “in general position”, and therefore there are at most two global minimizers for each energy.

A.1 Generic properties of periodic orbits

We simplify notations and drop the superscript “s” from the notation of the slow mechanical system. Moreover, we treat U as a parameter, and write

$$H^U(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi), \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{T}^2, \quad I \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad U \in C^r(\mathbb{T}^2). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We shall use U as *an infinite-dimensional parameter*. As before K is a kinetic energy and it is fixed. Denote by $\mathcal{G}^r = C^r(\mathbb{T}^2)$ the space of potentials, x denotes (φ, I) , W denotes $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, and either ϕ_t^U or $\Phi(\cdot, t, U)$ denotes the flow of (A.1). We will use $\chi^U(x) = (\partial K, \partial U)(x)$ to denote the Hamiltonian vector field of H^U and use S_E to denote the energy surface $\{H^U = E\}$. We may drop the superscript U when there is no confusion.

By the invariance of the energy surface, the differential map $D_x \phi_t^U$ defines a map

$$D_x \phi_t^U(x) : T_x S_{H(x)} \longrightarrow T_{\phi_t^U(x)} S_{H(x)}.$$

Since the vector field $\chi(x)$ is invariant under the flow, $D_x\phi$ induces a factor map

$$\bar{D}_x\phi_t^U(x) : T_x S_{H(x)}/\mathbb{R}\chi(x) \longrightarrow T_{\phi_t^U(x)} S_{H(x)}/\mathbb{R}\chi(\phi_t(x)).$$

Given $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}^r$, $x_0 \in W$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$\mathcal{V} = V(x_0) \times (t_0 - a, t_0 + a) \times V(U_0)$$

be a neighborhood of (x_0, t_0, U_0) , $V(x_0, t_0)$ of (x_0, t_0) , and $V(\phi_{t_0}^{U_0}(x_0))$ a neighborhood of $\phi_{t_0}^{U_0}(x_0)$, such that

$$\phi_t^U(x) \in V(\phi_{t_0}^{U_0}(x_0)), \quad (x, t, U) \in \mathcal{V}.$$

By fixing the local coordinates on $V(x_0)$ and $V(\phi_{t_0}^{U_0}(x_0))$, we define

$$\tilde{D}_x\Phi : \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow Sp(2),$$

where $\tilde{D}_x\Phi(x, t, U)$ is the 2×2 symplectic matrix associated to $\bar{D}_x\phi_t^U(x)$ under the local coordinates. The definition depends on the choice of coordinates.

Let $\{\phi_t^{U_0}(x_0)\}$ be a periodic orbit with minimal period t_0 . The periodic orbit is *non-degenerate* if and only if 1 is *not* an eigenvalue of $\tilde{D}_x\Phi(x_0, t_0, U_0)$ ⁶. Furthermore, we identify two types of degeneracies:

1. A degenerate periodic orbit (x_0, t_0, U_0) is of *type I* if $\tilde{D}_x\Phi(x_0, t_0, U_0) = Id$, the identity matrix;
2. It is of *type II* if $\tilde{D}_x\Phi(x_0, t_0, U_0)$ is conjugate to the matrix $[1, \mu; 0, 1]$ for $\mu \neq 0$.

Denote

$$N = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mu \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : \mu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{O}(N) = \{BAB^{-1} : A \in N, B \in Sp(2)\}.$$

Then (x_0, t_0, U_0) is of type II if and only if $\tilde{D}_x\Phi(x_0, t_0, U_0) \in \mathcal{O}(N)$.

Lemma A.1. *The set $\mathcal{O}(N)$ is a 2-dimensional submanifold of $Sp(2)$.*

Proof. Any matrix in $\mathcal{O}(N)$ can be expressed by

$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mu \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - ac\mu & a^2\mu \\ -c^2\mu & 1 - ac\mu \end{bmatrix},$$

⁶Note that we are interested in non-degeneracy for minimal period of periodic orbits only. As the result eigenvalues given by $\exp(2\pi i p/q)$ with integer $p, q \neq 0$ are allowed

where $ad - bc = 1$ and $\mu \neq 0$. Write $\alpha = a^2\mu$ and $\beta = ac\mu$, we can express any matrix in $\mathcal{O}(N)$ by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 - \beta & \alpha \\ 1 - \beta^2/\alpha & 1 - \beta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

□

The standard Kupka-Smale theorem (see [67], [69]) *no longer holds for an interval of energies*. Generically, periodic orbits appear in one-parameter families and may contain degenerate ones. However, while degenerate periodic orbits may appear, generically, a family of periodic orbits crosses the degeneracy “transversally”. This is made precise in the following theorem.

Theorem A.1. *There exists residual subset of potentials \mathcal{G}' of \mathcal{G}^r , such that for all $U \in \mathcal{G}'$, the following hold:*

1. *The set of periodic orbits for ϕ_t^U form a submanifold of dimension 2. Since a periodic orbit itself is a 1-dimensional manifold, distinct periodic orbits form one-parameter families.*
2. *There is no degenerate periodic orbits of type I.*
3. *The set of periodic orbits of type II form a 1-dimensional manifold. Factoring out the flow direction, the set of type II degenerate orbits are isolated.*
4. *For $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}^r$, let $\Lambda^{U_0} \subset W \times \mathbb{R}^+$ denote the set of periodic orbits for $\phi_t^{U_0}$, and $\Lambda_N^{U_0} \subset \Lambda^{U_0}$ denote the set of type II degenerate ones. Then for any $(x_0, t_0) \in \Lambda_N^{U_0}$, let $V(x_0, t_0)$ be a neighborhood of (x_0, t_0) . Then*

$$\tilde{D}_x \Phi|_{U=U_0} : \Lambda^{U_0} \cap V(x_0, t_0) \longrightarrow Sp(2)$$

is transversal to $\mathcal{O}(N) \subset Sp(2)$.

Remark A.1. Statement 4 of the theorem can be interpreted in the following way. Let $A(\lambda)$ be the differential of the Poincare return map on associated with a family of periodic orbits. Then if $A(\lambda_0) \in \mathcal{O}(N)$, then the tangent vector $A'(\lambda_0)$ is transversal to $\mathcal{O}(N)$.

We can improve the set \mathcal{G}' to an open and dense set, if there is a lower and upper bound on the minimal period.

Corollary A.2. *1. Given $0 < T_0 < T_1$, there exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}^r$, such that the set of periodic orbits with minimal period in $[T_0, T_1]$ satisfies the conclusions of Theorem A.1.*

2. For any $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}'$, there are at most finitely many type II degenerate periodic orbits. Moreover, there exists a neighbourhood $V(U_0)$ of U_0 , such that the set of type II degenerate periodic orbits depends smoothly on U . (This means the number of such periodic orbits is constant on $V(U_0)$, and each periodic orbit depends smoothly on U .)

We define

$$F : W \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{G}^r \longrightarrow W \times W, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$F(x, t, U) = (x, \Phi(x, t, U)).$$

F is a C^{r-1} -map of Banach manifolds. Define the diagonal set by $\Delta = \{(x, x)\} \subset W \times W$. Then $\{\phi_t^{U_0}(x_0)\}$ is an period orbit of period t_0 if and only if $(x_0, t_0, U_0) \in F^{-1}\Delta$.

Proposition A.3. *Assume that $(x_0, t_0, U_0) \in F^{-1}\Delta$ or, equivalently, x_0 is periodic orbit of period t_0 for H^U and that t_0 is the minimal period, then there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{V} of (x_0, t_0, U_0) such that the map*

$$d\pi_{\Delta}^{\perp} D_{(x,t,U)} F : T_{(x,t,U)}(W \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{G}^r) \longrightarrow T_{F(x,t,U)}(W \times W)/T\Delta$$

has co-rank 1 for each $(x, t, U) \in \mathcal{V}$, where $d\pi_{\Delta}^{\perp} T(W \times W) \longrightarrow T(W \times W)/T\Delta$ is the standard projection along $T\Delta$.

Remark A.2. If the aforementioned map has full rank, then the map is called transversal to Δ at (x_0, t_0, U_0) . However, the transversality condition fails for our map.

Given $\delta U \in \mathcal{G}^r$, the directional derivative $D_U \Phi \cdot \delta U$ is defined as follows $\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon}|_{\epsilon=0} \Phi(x, t, U + \epsilon \delta U)$. The differential $D_U \Phi$ then defines a map from $T\mathcal{G}^r$ to $T_{\Phi(x,t,U)}W$. The following hold for this differential map:

Lemma A.4. [67] *Assume that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that the orbit of x has no self-intersection for the time interval $(\epsilon, \tau - \epsilon)$, then the map*

$$D_U \Phi(x, \tau, U) : \mathcal{G}^r \longrightarrow T_{\Phi(x,\tau,U)}W$$

generates a subspace orthogonal to the gradient $\nabla H^U(\Phi(x, \tau, U))$ and the Hamiltonian vector field $\chi^U(\Phi(x, \tau, U))$ of H^U .

Proof. We refer to [67], Lemma 16 and 17. We note that while the proof was written for a periodic orbit of minimal period τ , the proof holds for non-self-intersecting orbit. \square

Proof of Proposition A.3. We note that if $\{\phi_t^U(x)\}$ is a periodic orbit of minimal period τ , then the orbit $\{\phi_t^{U'}(x')\}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma A.4. It follows that the matrix

$$d\pi_{\Delta}^{\perp} \circ D_U F = \begin{bmatrix} D_x \Phi - I & D_t \Phi & D_U \Phi \end{bmatrix}$$

has co-rank 1, since the last two component generates the subspace

$$\text{Image } (D_U\Phi) + \mathbb{R}\chi^U,$$

which is a subspace complementary to ∇H^U . \square

Proposition A.3 allows us to apply the constant rank theorem in Banach spaces.

Proposition A.5. *The set $F^{-1}\Delta$ as a subset of a Banach space is a submanifold of codimension $2n - 1$. If $r \geq 4$, then for generic $U \in \mathcal{G}^r$, $F^{-1}\Delta \cap \pi_U^{-1}\{U\}$ is a 2-dimensional manifold.*

Proof. We note that the kernel and cokernel of the map $d\pi \circ D_U F$ has finite codimension, hence the constant rank theorem (see [1], Theorem 2.5.15) applies. As a consequence, we may assume that locally, $\Delta = \Delta_1 \times (-a, a)$ and that the map $\pi_1 \circ F$ has full rank. Since the dimension of Δ_1 is $2n - 1$, $F^{-1}\Delta$ is a submanifold of codimension $2n - 1$. The second claim follows from Sard's theorem. \square

Denote $\Lambda = F^{-1}\Delta$. On a neighbourhood \mathcal{V} of each $(x_0, t_0, U_0) \in \Lambda$, we define the map

$$\tilde{D}_x\Phi : \Lambda \cap \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow Sp(2), \quad \tilde{D}_x\Phi(x, t, U) = \tilde{D}\phi_t^U(x). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

First we refer to the following lemma of Oliveira:

Lemma A.6 ([67], Theorem 18). *For each $(x_0, t_0, U_0) \in \Lambda$ such that t_0 is the minimal period, let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ be the set of tangent vectors in $T_{(x_0, t_0, U_0)}\Lambda$ of the form $(0, 0, V)$. Then the map*

$$D_U \tilde{D}_x\Phi : \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \longrightarrow T_{\tilde{D}_x\Phi(x_0, t_0, U_0)}Sp(2)$$

has full rank.

Corollary A.7. *The map (A.4) is transversal to the submanifold $\{Id\}$ and $\mathcal{O}(N)$ of $Sp(2)$.*

Denote

$$\Lambda_{Id} = \Lambda \cap \tilde{D}_x\Phi^{-1}(\{Id\}) \text{ and } \Lambda_N = \Lambda \cap \tilde{D}_x\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}(N)).$$

Note that the expression is well defined because both preimages are defined independent of local coordinate changes.

Proof of Theorem A.1. The first statement of the theorem follows from Proposition A.5.

As the subset $\{Id\}$ has codimension 3 in $Sp(2)$, Λ_{Id} has codimension 3 in Λ , and hence has codimension $2n+2$ in $W \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{G}^r$. By Sard's lemma, for a generic $U \in \mathcal{G}^r$, the set $\Lambda_{Id} \cap \pi_U^{-1}$ is empty. This proves the second statement of the theorem.

Since the set $\mathcal{O}(N)$ has codimension 1, Λ_N has codimension 1 in Λ , and hence has codimension $2n$ in $W \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{G}^r$. As a consequence, generically, the set $\Lambda_N^U = \Lambda_N \cap \pi_U^{-1}$ has dimension 1. This proves the third statement.

Fix $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}'$, the set $\Lambda^{U_0} = \Lambda \cap \pi_U^{-1}(U_0)$ has dimension 2, while $\Lambda_N^{U_0} \subset \Lambda^{U_0}$ has dimension 1. It follows that at any $(x_0, t_0) \in \Lambda_N^{U_0}$, there exists a tangent vector

$$(\delta x, \delta t) \in T_{(x_0, t_0)} \Lambda^{U_0} \setminus T_{(x_0, t_0)} \Lambda_N^{U_0}$$

such that

$$(\delta x, \delta t, 0) \in T_{(x_0, t_0, U_0)} \Lambda \setminus T_{(x_0, t_0, U_0)} \Lambda_N.$$

It follows that

$$D_{(x,t)} \tilde{D}_x \Phi|_{U=U_0}(x_0, t_0) = D_{(x,t,U)} \tilde{D}_x \Phi(x_0, t_0, U_0) \cdot (\delta x, \delta t, 0)$$

is not tangent to $\mathcal{O}(N)$. Since $\mathcal{O}(N)$ has codimension 1, this implies that the map $\tilde{D}_x \Phi|_{U=U_0}$ is transversal to $\mathcal{O}(N)$. This proves the fourth statement. \square

Proof of Corollary A.2. If a potential $U \in \mathcal{G}'$, then by Theorem A.1 conditions 1–4 are satisfied. In particular, all periodic orbits are either non-degenerate or degenerate satisfying conditions 3 and 4. Non-degenerate periodic orbits of period bounded both from zero and infinity form a compact set. Therefore, they stay non-degenerate for all potential C^r -close to U . By condition 3 degenerate periodic orbits are isolated. This implies that there are finitely many of them. Condition 4 is a transversality condition, which is C^r open for each degenerate orbit. \square

Fix $U \in \mathcal{G}'$ as in Corollary A.2. It follows that periodic orbits of ϕ_t^U for one-parameter families. We now discuss the generic bifurcation of such a family at a degenerate periodic or

Proposition A.8. *Let (x_λ, t_λ) be a family of periodic orbits such that (x_0, λ_0) is degenerate. The one side of $\lambda = \lambda_0$, the matrix $\tilde{D}_x \phi_{t_\lambda}^U(x_\lambda)$ has a pair of distinct real eigenvalues; on the other side of $\lambda = \lambda_0$, it has a pair of complex eigenvalues.*

Proof. Write $A(\lambda) = \tilde{D}_x \phi_{t_\lambda}^U(x_\lambda)$ for short. By choosing a proper local coordin we may assume that $A(\lambda_0) = [1, \mu; 0, 1]$. The tangent space to $Sp(2)$ at $[1, \mu; 0, 1]$ is given by the set of traceless matrices $[a, b; c, -a]$. Using (A.2), we have a basis of the tang space to $\mathcal{O}(N)$ to $[1, \mu; 0, 1]$ is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\beta^2/\alpha^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -2\beta/\alpha & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

An orthogonal matrix to this space, using the inner product $\text{tr}(A^T B)$, is given by $[0, 0; 1, 0]$. As a consequence, a matrix $[a, b; c, -a]$ is transversal to $\mathcal{O}(N)$ if and only if $c \neq 0$.

The eigenvalues of the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 + ah & \mu + bh \\ ch & 1 - ah \end{bmatrix}$$

are given by $\lambda = 1 \pm \sqrt{a^2 h^2 - bch^2 - \mu ch}$. Using $\mu \neq 0$ and $c \neq 0$ we obtain that $a^2 h^2 - bch^2 - \mu ch$ changes sign at $h = 0$. This proves our proposition. \square

A.2 Generic properties of minimal orbits

In this section, we analyze properties of families of minimal orbits. It is well known that a non-degenerate minimizing geodesic is hyperbolic. However, we have shown in the previous section that degenerate ones do exist. The main idea is when one extend a family of hyperbolic minimal orbits, the family must terminate at a degenerate orbit of type II. We then can “slide” different families against each other so that the degenerate orbit is never the shortest.

Let d_E denote the metric derived from the Riemannian metric $g_E(\varphi, v) = 2(E + U(\varphi))K^{-1}(v)$. We define the arclength of any continuous curve $\gamma : [t, s] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ by

$$l_E(\gamma) = \sup \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} d_E(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})),$$

where the supremum is taken over all partitions $\{[t_i, t_{i+1}]\}_{i=0}^{N-1}$ of $[t, s]$. A curve γ is called rectifiable if $l_E(\gamma)$ is finite.

A curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ is called piecewise regular, if it is piecewise C^1 and $\dot{\gamma}(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \in [a, b]$. A piecewise regular curve is always rectifiable.

A closed curve γ is called a (g_E, h) minimizer. We write

$$l_E(h) = \inf_{\xi \in \mathcal{C}_h^E} l_E(\xi),$$

where \mathcal{C}_h^E denote the set of all piecewise regular closed curves with homology $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$. A curve realizing the infimum is the shortest geodesic curve in the homology h , which we will also refer to as a global (g_E, h) -minimizer.

It is well known that for any $E > -\min_{\varphi} U(\varphi)$, a global g_E -minimizer is a closed g_E -geodesic. Hence, it corresponds to a periodic orbit of the Hamiltonian flow.

It will also be convenient to consider the local minimizers. Let $V \subset \mathbb{T}^2$ be an open set, a closed continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow V$ is a local minimizer if

$$l_E(\gamma) = \inf_{\xi \in \mathcal{C}_h^E, \xi \subset V} l_E(\xi). \tag{A.5}$$

Since $\gamma \in V$, there is an open set V_1 such that $\gamma \in V_1 \Subset V_2$. Then by modifying the metric outside of V_1 , we can ensure that γ is a global minimizer of the new metric.

Proposition A.9. *Assume that γ is a (g_E, h) (local) minimizer, and assume that the associated Hamiltonian periodic orbit η is nondegenerate. Then η is hyperbolic.*

An orbit $(\theta, p)(t), t \in \mathbb{R}$ of the Hamiltonian flow is called dis-conjugate if

$$D\phi_s \mathbb{V}(x(t), p(t)) \cap \mathbb{V}(x(t+s), p(t+s)), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathbb{V}(x, p) = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Let $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ be a (g_E, h) minimizer, let $\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ be the associated periodic Hamiltonian orbit. Then:

Lemma A.10 ([21, 3]). *η is minimizing and disconjugate. Its differential map $D\phi_s(\eta(t))$ admits a 2-dimensional invariant bundle (and the associated Poincaré map preserves a 1-dimensional bundle).*

Proof of Proposition A.9. A non-degenerate periodic orbit $\eta : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ either is hyperbolic or the associated Poincaré map has eigenvalues on the unit circle. In this case the Poincaré map does not preserve any one-dimensional subspace, which contradicts with Lemma A.10. \square

Theorem A.2. *Given $0 < e < \bar{E}$, there exists an open and dense subset \mathcal{G}' of \mathcal{G}^r , such that for each $U \in \mathcal{G}'$, the Hamiltonian $H(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi)$ satisfies the following statements. There exists finitely many smooth families of local minimizers*

$$\xi_j^E, \quad a_j - \sigma \leq E \leq b_j + \sigma, \quad j = 1, \dots, N,$$

and $\sigma > 0$, with the following properties.

1. All ξ_j^E for $a_j - \sigma \leq E \leq b_j + \sigma$ are hyperbolic.
2. $\bigcup_j [a_j, b_j] \supset [E_0, \bar{E}]$.
3. For each $E_0 \leq E \leq \bar{E}$, any global minimizer is contained in the set of all ξ_j^E 's such that $E \in [a_j, b_j]$.

Proof of Theorem A.2, occupies the rest of this section.

Lemma A.11. *Assume that γ_{E_0} is a hyperbolic local (ρ_{E_0}, h) -minimizer. The following hold.*

1. There exists a neighbourhood V of γ_{E_0} , such that γ_{E_0} is the unique local (g_E, h) -minimizer on V .

2. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $U' \in C^r(\mathbb{T}^2)$ with $\|U - U'\|_{C^2} \leq \delta$ and $|E' - E_0| \leq \delta$, the Hamiltonian $H'(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U'(\varphi)$ admits a hyperbolic local minimizer in V .
3. There exists $\delta > 0$ and a smooth family $\gamma_E \subset V$, $E_0 - \delta \leq E \leq E_0 + \delta$, such that each of them is a hyperbolic local minimizer.

Proof. Let η_{E_0} denote the Hamiltonian orbit of γ_{E_0} . Inverse function theorem implies that if η_{E_0} is hyperbolic, then it is locally unique, and it uniquely extends to hyperbolic periodic orbit $\eta_{E,U'}$ if E is close to E_0 and U' is close to U . Let γ_E be the projection of η_E , then they must be the unique local minimizers. \square

We now use the information obtained to classify the set of global minimizers.

- Consider the Hamiltonian $H(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi) + \min_{\varphi} U(\varphi)$. For $0 < E_0 < \bar{E}$, it is easy to see that any periodic orbit in the energy $E_0 \leq E \leq \bar{E}$ has a lower bound and upper bound on the minimal period, which depends only on E_0 and \bar{E} . Hence, Corollary A.2 applies. In particular, there are only finitely many degenerate periodic orbits and the number of them is constant under small perturbation of U .
- By the previous item, all but finitely many global minimizers are nondegenerate, hence hyperbolic by Proposition A.9.
- Since a global minimizer is always a local minimizer, using Lemma A.11, it extends to a smooth one parameter family of local minimizers. The extension can be continued until either the orbit is no-longer locally minimizing, or if the orbit becomes degenerate. Once a local minimizer becomes degenerate, this family can no longer be extended as local minimizers as by Proposition A.8, it must bifurcate to a periodic orbit of complex eigenvalues.
- It is well known that for a fixed energy, any two global minimizers do not cross (see for example, [64]). We can locally extend the global minimizers for a small interval of energy without them crossing.
- There are at most finitely many families of local minimizers, because they are isolated and do not accumulate (Lemma A.11).
- There are at most finitely many energies on which the global minimizer may be a degenerate periodic orbit.

We have proved the following statement.

Proposition A.12. *Given $0 < e < \bar{E}$, there exists an open and dense subset \mathcal{G}' of \mathcal{G}^r , such that for each $U \in \mathcal{G}'$, for the Hamiltonian $H(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi) + \min_{\varphi} U(\varphi)$, such that the following hold.*

1. *There are at most finitely many (maybe none) isolated global minimizers $\gamma_j^{E_j, d}$, $j = 1, \dots, M$.*
2. *There are finitely many smooth families of local minimizers*

$$\gamma_j^E, \quad \bar{a}_j \leq E \leq \bar{b}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, N,$$

with $[e, \bar{E}] \supset \bigcup [\bar{a}_j, \bar{b}_j]$, such that γ_j^E are hyperbolic for $\bar{a}_j < E < \bar{b}_j$. The set $\bar{\gamma}_j^E$ for $E = \bar{a}_j, \bar{b}_j$ may be hyperbolic or degenerate.

3. *For a fixed energy surface E , the sets $\{\gamma_j^{E, d}\}$ and $\bigcup_{\bar{a}_j \leq E \leq \bar{b}_j} \gamma_j^E$ are pairwise disjoint.*
4. *For each $e \leq E \leq \bar{E}$, the global minimizer is chosen among the set of all $\gamma_j^{c_j, d}$ with $E = c_j$, or one of the local minimizers γ_j^E with $E \in [\bar{a}_j, \bar{b}_j]$.*

Proof of Theorem A.2. We first show that the set of potentials U satisfying the conclusion of Theorem A.2 is open. By Lemma A.11, the family of local minimizers persists under small perturbation of the potential U . It suffices to show that for sufficiently small perturbation of U satisfying the conclusion, the global minimizer is still taken at one of the local families. Assume, by contradiction, that there is a sequence U_n approaching U , and for each $H_n = K - U_n$, there is some global minimizer $\gamma_n^{E_n}$ not from these families. By picking a subsequence, we can assume that it converges to a closed curve γ_* , which belong one of the local families γ_j^E . Using local uniqueness from Lemma A.11, $\gamma_n^{E_n}$ must belong to one of the local families as well. This is a contradiction.

To prove density, it suffices to prove that for a potential U satisfying the conclusion of Proposition A.12, we can make an arbitrarily small perturbation, such that there are no degenerate global minimizers.

Our strategy is to eliminate the degenerate global minimizers one by one using a sequence of perturbations. Suppose γ_E^d is an isolated degenerate minimizer. Then by ([26], proof of Theorem D, page 40-42), there is a perturbation δU with the property that: $\delta U \geq 0$, $U|_{\gamma_E^d} = 0$, such that γ_E^d is still a global minimizer, but the associated Hamiltonian orbit η_E^d becomes hyperbolic (i.e. the perturbation keeps the orbit η_E^d intact but changes it's linearization). This perturbation strictly decreases the number of isolated degenerate minimizers by 1.

Suppose γ_E^d is the terminal point of one of the local families $\gamma_j^E : E \in [\bar{a}_j, \bar{b}_j]$, let's say $\gamma_E^d = \gamma_j^E(\bar{b}_j)$. Then since claim γ_j^E can not be extended to $E > \bar{b}_j$, the

global minimizer for $E \in (\bar{b}_j, \bar{b}_j + \delta)$ must be contained in a different local branch, say $\gamma_i^E : E \in [\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_i]$. In particular, $\gamma_i^E(\bar{b}_j)$ is another global minimizer.

Let V be a neighborhood of $\gamma_j^{E_j}$, such that \bar{V} is disjoint from the set of other global minimizers with the same energy. For $\delta > 0$ we define $U_\delta : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $U_\delta|_{\gamma_j^{E_j}} = \delta$ and $\text{supp } U_\delta \subset V$. Let $H_\delta = K - U - U_\delta$, and let $l_{E,\delta}$ be the perturbed length function. We have

$$l_{E_j,\delta}(\gamma_j^{E_j}) = \int_{\gamma_j^{E_j}} \sqrt{2(E_j + U + \delta)K} > l_{E_j}(\gamma_j^{E_j}) = l_{E_j}(h) = l_{E_j,\delta}(h).$$

As a consequence, $\gamma_j^{E_j}$ is no longer a global minimizer for the perturbed system. Moreover, for sufficiently small δ , no new degenerate global minimizer can be created. Hence the perturbation has decreased the number of degenerate global minimizers strictly. By repeating this process finitely many times, we can eliminate all degenerate global minimizers. \square

A.3 Non-degeneracy at high energy

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem 4.2. This amounts to proving that finite local families of local minimizers, obtained from the previous section, are “in general position”.

We assume that the potential $U_0 \in \mathcal{G}^r$ satisfies the conclusions of Theorem A.2. Let $\gamma_j^{E,U}$ denote the branches of local minimizers from Theorem A.2, where we have made the dependence on U explicit. There exists a neighbourhood $V(U_0)$ of U_0 , such that the local branches $\gamma_j^{E,U}$ are defined for $E \in [a_j - \sigma/2, b_j + \sigma/2]$ and $U \in V(U_0)$.

Define a set of functions

$$f_j : [a_j - \sigma/2, b_j + \sigma/2] \times V(U_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f_j(E, U) = l_E(\gamma_j^{E,U}).$$

Then $\gamma_i^{E,U}$ is a global minimizer if and only if

$$f_i(E, U) = f_{\min}(E, U) := \min_j f_j(E, U),$$

where the minimum is taken over all j 's such that $E \in [a_j, b_j]$.

The following proposition implies Theorem 4.2.

Proposition A.13. *There exists an open and dense subset V' of $V(U_0)$ such that for every $U \in V'$, the following hold:*

1. *For each $E \in [E_0, \bar{E}]$, there are at most two j 's such that $f_j(E, U) = f_{\min}(E, U)$;*

2. There are at most finitely many $E \in [E_0, \bar{E}]$ such that there are two j 's with $f_j(E, U) = f_{\min}(E, U)$;
3. For any $E \in [E_0, \bar{E}]$ and j_1, j_2 be such that $f_{j_1}(E, U) = f_{j_2}(E, U) = f_{\min}(E, U)$; we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial E} f_{j_1}(E, U) \neq \frac{\partial}{\partial E} f_{j_2}(E, U).$$

Proof. We first note that it suffices to prove the theorem under the additional assumption that all functions f_j 's are defined on the same interval (a, b) with $f_{\min}(E, U) = \min_j f_j(E, U)$. Indeed, we may partition $[E_0, \bar{E}]$ into finitely many intervals, on which the number of local branches is constant, and prove proposition on each interval.

We define a map

$$f = (f_1, \dots, f_N) : (a, b) \times V(U_0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and subsets

$$\Delta_{i_1, i_2, i_3} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n); x_{i_1} = x_{i_2} = x_{i_3}\}, \quad 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 \leq N,$$

$$\Delta_{i_1, i_2} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n); x_{i_1} = x_{i_2}\}, \quad 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq N$$

of $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$. We also write $f^U(E) = f(E, U)$. The following two claims imply our proposition:

1. For an open and dense set of $U \in V(U_0)$, for all $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 \leq N$, the set $(f^U)^{-1} \Delta_{i_1, i_2, i_3}$ is empty.
2. For an open and dense set of $U \in V(U_0)$, and all $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq N$, the map $f^U : (a, b) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ is transversal to the submanifold Δ_{i_1, i_2} .

Indeed, the first claim imply the first statement of our proposition. It follows from our second claim that there are at most finitely many points in $(f^U)^{-1} \Delta_{i_1, i_2}$, which implies the second statement. Furthermore, using the second claim, we have for any $E \in (f^U)^{-1} \Delta_{i_1, i_2}$, the subspace $(Df^U(E))\mathbb{R}$ is transversal to $T\Delta_{i_1, i_2}$. This implies the third statement of our proposition.

For a fixed energy E and $(v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let $\delta U : \mathbb{T}^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\delta U(\varphi) = v_j$ on an open neighbourhood of γ_j^E for each $j = 1, \dots, N$. Let $l_{E, \epsilon}$ and $\gamma_j^{E, \epsilon}$ denote the arclength and local minimizer corresponding to the potential $U + \epsilon \delta U$. For any φ in a neighbourhood of γ_j^E , we have

$$E + U(\varphi) + \delta U(\varphi) = E + U(\varphi) + \epsilon v_j,$$

hence for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $\xi_j^{E, \epsilon} = \xi_j^{E + \epsilon v_j}$.

The directional derivative

$$D_U f(E, U) \cdot \delta U = \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} l_{E,\epsilon}(\xi_j^{E,\epsilon}) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} l_{E+\epsilon v_j}(\xi_j^{E+\epsilon v_j}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial E} f_j(E, U) v_j.$$

It follows from a direct computation that each f_j is strictly increasing in E and the derivative in E never vanishes. As a consequence, we can choose (v_1, \dots, v_N) in such a way, that $D_U f(E, U) \cdot \delta U$ takes any given vector in \mathbb{R}^N . This implies the map

$$D_U f : (a, b) \times TV(U_0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$$

has full rank at any (E, U) . As a consequence, f is transversal to any Δ_{i_1, i_2, i_3} and Δ_{i_1, i_2} . Using Sard's lemma, we obtain that for a generic U , the image of f^U is disjoint from Δ_{i_1, i_2, i_3} and that f^U is transversal to Δ_{i_1, i_2} . \square

A.4 Unique hyperbolic minimizer at very high energy

In this section we prove Proposition 4.4, namely for the mechanical system

$$H^s(\varphi, I) = K(I) + U(\varphi),$$

the shortest loop in the homology $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ for Jacobi metric $g_E(\varphi, v) = 2(E + U(\varphi))K^{-1}(v)$, where $K^{-1}(v)$ is the Legendre dual of K . Since the metrics

$$g_E(\varphi, v) = 2(1 + E^{-1}U(\varphi))K^{-1}(\sqrt{E}v), \quad \bar{g}_E(\varphi, v) = 2(1 + E^{-1}U(\varphi))K^{-1}(v)$$

differ by a constant multiple, it suffices to study the shortest loops for the metric \bar{g}_E . Denote $\delta = E^{-1}$, this is then equivalent to study the mechanical system

$$H_\delta(\varphi, I) = K(I) + \delta U(\varphi)$$

with energy $E = 1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $h = (1, 0)$. Let us write

$$U(\varphi) = U_1(\varphi_1) + U_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2),$$

where $\int_0^1 U_2(\varphi_1, s) ds = 0$. We will show an averaging effect that eliminates U_2 . Let us denote by ρ_0 the unique positive number such that $K^{-1}(\rho_0 h) = 1$, and let $c_0 = \partial K^{-1}(\rho_0 h)$.

Lemma A.14. *There is $C > 1$ depending only on $\|\partial^2 K\|, \|\partial^2 K^{-1}\|$ such that then the associated Hamiltonian orbit $\eta_h^1 = \{(\varphi, I)(t)\}$ satisfies*

$$\|\dot{\varphi} - \rho_0 h\|, \|I - c_0\| \leq C\delta.$$

Proof. Let us note the shortest curve γ_h^1 corresponds to the orbit $\eta_h^1 = (\varphi_h, I_h)$ of the Hamiltonian H_δ , satisfying $\varphi_h(T) = \varphi_h(0) + h$. Note:

1. $\ddot{\varphi}_h(t) = \delta \nabla U(\varphi_h(t)) = O(\delta)$,
2. Since the energy is 1, $K(I_h(t)) = 1 + O(\delta)$, $K^{-1}(\dot{\varphi}_h(t)) = K^{-1}(\partial_I K(I_h(t))) = K(I_h(t)) = 1 + O(\delta)$;

The first item implies $\dot{\varphi}_h(t) = \frac{1}{T}h + O(\delta)$, when combined with the second item, implies $\dot{\varphi}_h(t) = \rho_0 h + O(\delta)$. apply ∂K^{-1} , we get $I_h(t) = c_0 + O(\delta)$. \square

Note that the condition $\partial K(I) = \rho h$ corresponds precisely to the resonance segment $\Gamma = I \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\partial K(I) \cdot (1, 0) = 0$, in other words, we are in precisely the same situation as in single resonance. In fact, since there are fewer degree of freedom, the normal form is much stronger.

Proposition A.15. *For any $M > 0$, there is $\delta_0 = \delta_0(K, M)$ and $C = C(K, M) > 0$ such that for every H_δ with $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, there is a C^∞ coordinate change Φ homotopic to identity such that*

$$H_\delta \circ \Phi = K(I) + \delta U_1(\varphi_1) + \delta R(\varphi),$$

with $\|R\|_{C_I^2} \leq \sqrt{\delta}$, and $\|\pi_\theta(\Phi - Id)\|_{C^2} \leq C\delta$ and $\|\pi_p(\Phi - Id)\|_{C^2} \leq C\delta$, where the norms are measured on the set $I \in B_{M\sqrt{\delta}}(c_0)$.

If $U_1(\varphi_1)$ has a unique non-degenerate minimum at $\varphi_1 = \varphi_1^*$, and satisfies

$$U(\varphi_1) - U(\varphi_1^*) \geq \lambda \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_1^*\|^2.$$

Then by choosing $\delta_0 = \delta_0(K, M, \lambda) > 0$ smaller, the system $H_\delta \circ \Phi$ has a normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder \mathcal{C} given by

$$(\varphi_1, I_1) = (F(\varphi_2, I_2) + \varphi_1^*, G(\varphi_2, I_2)), \quad \varphi_2 \in \mathbb{T}, I_2 \in \Gamma \cap B_{M\sqrt{\delta}}(c_0),$$

satisfying $\|F\|_{C^0} \leq C\kappa$, $\|G\|_{C^0} \leq C\kappa\sqrt{\delta}$. \mathcal{C} contains all the invariant sets in

$$\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_1^*\| < C^{-1}, \quad \text{dist}(I, \Gamma \cap B_{M\sqrt{\delta}}) < C^{-1}.$$

The minimal periodic orbit η_h^1 is contained in \mathcal{C} and is a graph over φ_2 . It is therefore unique and hyperbolic.

Proof. The first part is very similar to Theorem 3.2, but in the much simpler case of two-degrees of freedom. In this case, we can give out the coordinate change explicitly. Define

$$W(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \rho_0^{-1} \int_0^1 s U_2(\varphi_1, \varphi_2 + s) ds,$$

note that W is well defined on \mathbb{T}^2 due to $\int_0^1 U_2(\varphi_1, s) ds = 0$. Note that $\partial_{\varphi_2} W = \rho_0^{-1} U_2$. Consider the coordinate change $I \mapsto I + \delta \nabla W$. Then the new Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} & K(I + \delta \nabla W) - \delta U_1 - \delta U_2 \\ &= K(I) + \delta \partial K(I) \cdot \nabla W - \delta U_1 - \delta U_2 + \delta^2 K(\nabla W) \\ &= K(I) - \delta U_1 + \delta(\rho_0 h \cdot \nabla W - U_2) + \delta^2 K(\nabla W) + \delta(\partial K(I) - \rho_0 h) \cdot \nabla W. \end{aligned}$$

The main observation is that the second term in the last equality vanishes, the third term is $O(\delta^2)$ in C^2 norm, and the last term is $O(\delta^{\frac{3}{2}})$ in C_I^2 norm.

The other parts of the proposition is identical to Theorem 9.1 and Theorem 9.2, and are omitted. \square

Proposition 4.4 follows immediately from the above proposition.

A.5 Proof of Proposition 4.5

We prove Proposition 4.5, namely non-degenerate conditions $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$. This consists of two steps consisting of two localized perturbations of the potential U .

First, we perturb U near the origin to achieve properties $[DR1^c] - [DR2^c]$. Let W' be a ρ -neighborhood of the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 for small enough $\rho > 0$ so that it does not intersect sections Σ_{\pm}^s and Σ_{\pm}^u . Consider $\xi(\varphi)$ a C^∞ -bump function so that $\xi(\varphi) \equiv 1$ for $|\varphi| < \rho/2$ and $\xi(\varphi) \equiv 0$ for $|\varphi| > \rho$. Let $Q_\zeta(\varphi) = \sum \zeta_{ij} \varphi_i \varphi_j$ be a symmetric quadratic form. Consider $U_\zeta(\varphi) = U(\varphi) + \xi(\varphi)(Q_\zeta(\theta) + \zeta_0)$. In $W' \times \mathbb{R}^2$ we can diagonalize both: the quadratic form $K(p) = \langle Ap, p \rangle$ and the Hessian $\partial^2 U(0)$. Explicit calculation shows that choosing properly ζ one can make the minimum of U at 0 being unique and eigenvalues to be distinct.

Suppose now that conditions $[DR1^c] - [DR2^c]$ hold. Fix a point $\theta^* \in \gamma^+$ at a distance of order of one from the origin. In particular, it is away from sections Σ_{\pm}^s . Let W'' be its small neighborhood so that intersects only one homoclinic γ^+ . Denote $w^u = W'' \cap \Sigma_+^u$ an unstable curve on the exit section Σ_+^u and $w^s = W'' \cap \Sigma_+^s$ a stable curve on the enter section Σ_+^s . Denote on w^u (resp. w^s) the point of intersection Σ_+^u (resp. Σ_+^s) with strong stable direction q^{ss} (resp. q^{uu}). Recall that q^+ (resp. p^+) denotes the point of intersection of γ^+ with Σ_+^u (resp. Σ_+^s). We also denote by $T^{uu}(q^+)$ (resp. $T^{ss}(p^+)$) subspaces the tangent to w^u (resp. w^s) at the corresponding points. The critical energy surface $\{H = K - U = 0\}$ is denoted by S_0 . In order to satisfy conditions $[DR3^c] - [DR4^c]$ the global map Φ_{glob}^+ has to satisfy

- $\Phi_{glob}^+ w^u \cap w^s \neq q^{ss}$ and $(\Phi_{glob}^+)^{-1}(w^s) \cap w^u \neq q^{uu}$.
- $D\Phi_{glob}^+(q^+)|_{TS_0} T^{uu}(q^+) \pitchfork T^{ss}(p^+)$, $D\Phi_{glob}^-(q^-)|_{TS_0} T^{uu}(q^-) \pitchfork T^{ss}(p^-)$.

The first condition can also be viewed as a property of the restriction of $\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+|_{S_0}$. Notice that Φ_{glob}^+ , restricted to S_0 , is a 2-dimensional map.

Consider perturbations $\delta U \in \mathcal{G}^r$ of the potential U localized in W'' . By Lemma A.4 the differential map $D_U\Phi$ generates a subspace orthogonal to the gradient ∇H^U and the Hamiltonian vector field $\chi^U(\cdot)$ of H^U . Notice that when we restrict Φ_{glob}^+ onto $\Sigma_+^u \cap S_0$ we factor out ∇H^U and $\chi^U(\cdot)$. Both conditions on Φ_{glob}^+ (resp. $D\Phi_{\text{glob}}^+|_{S_0}$) are non-equality conditions on images and preimages for a 2-dimensional map. Thus, these conditions can be satisfied by Lemma A.4.

B Derivation of the slow mechanical system

In this section we derive the slow mechanical system. The discussions here applies to arbitrary degrees of freedom, and indeed we will consider

$$H_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) = H_0(p) + \epsilon H_1(\theta, p, t), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{T}^n, p \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{T},$$

and let $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an n -resonance, namely, there are linearly independent $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ such that

$$k_i \cdot (\partial H_0(p_0), 1), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since the resonance depends only on the hyperplane containing k_1, \dots, k_n , we may choose k_1, \dots, k_n to be *irreducible*, namely

$$\text{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\{k_1, \dots, k_n\} = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{k_1, \dots, k_n\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}.$$

Results in this section applies to the rest of the paper by restricting $n = 2$.

First, we will reduce the system near an n -resonance to a normal form. After that, we perform a coordinate change on the extended phase space, and an energy reduction to reveal the slow system.

In section B.1, we describe a resonant normal form.

In section B.2, we describe the affine coordinate change and the rescaling, revealing the slow system.

In section B.3 we discuss variational properties of these coordinate changes.

B.1 Normal forms near double resonances

Write $\omega_0 := \partial_p H_0(p_0)$, then the orbit $(\omega_0, 1)t$ is periodic. Let

$$T = \inf_{t>0} \{t(\omega_0, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^3\}$$

be the minimal period, then there exists a constant $T_* = T_*(k_1, \dots, k_n) > 0$, such that $T \leq T_*(k_1, \dots, k_n)$.

Given a function $f : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$[f]_{\omega_0}(\theta, p, t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(\theta + \omega_0 s, p, t + s) ds.$$

$[f]_{\omega_0}$ corresponds to the resonant component related to the double resonance.

Writing $H_1(\theta, p, t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} h_k(p) e^{2\pi i k \cdot (\theta, t)}$, and let $\Lambda = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\{k_1, \dots, k_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$, then

$$[H_1]_{\omega_0}(\theta, p, t) = \sum_{k \in \Lambda} h_k(p) e^{2\pi i k \cdot (\theta, t)}.$$

We define a rescaled differential in the action variable by

$$\partial_I f(\theta, p, t) = \sqrt{\epsilon} \partial_p f(\theta, p, t), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and use the notation C_I^r to denote the C^r norm with ∂_p replaced by ∂_I . For a vector or a matrix valued function, we take the C^r (or C_I^r) norm to be the sum of the norm of all elements. Let $B_r^n(p)$ denote the r -neighborhood of p_0 in \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem B.1. *Assume that $r \geq 5$. Then for any $M_1 > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0 > 0$, $C_1 > 1$ depending only on $\|H_0\|_{C^r}, T_*(k_1, \dots, k_n), n, M_1$ such that for any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, there exists a C^∞ symplectic coordinate change*

$$\Phi_\epsilon : \mathbb{T}^n \times B_{M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}}^n(p_0) \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times B_{2M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}}^n(p_0) \times \mathbb{T},$$

which is the identity in the t component, such that

$$N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) := H_\epsilon \circ \Phi_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) = H_0(p) + \epsilon Z(\theta, p, t) + \epsilon Z_1(\theta, p, t, \epsilon)^7 + \epsilon R(\theta, p, t, \epsilon),$$

where $Z = [H_1]_{\omega_0}$, $[Z_1]_{\omega_0} = Z_1$, and

$$\|Z_1\|_{C_I^2} \leq C_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad \|R\|_{C_I^2} \leq C_1 \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and

$$\|\Phi_\epsilon - Id\|_{C_I^2} \leq C_1 \epsilon.$$

Moreover, Φ_ϵ admits the following extensions:

1. Φ_ϵ can be extended to $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$ such that Φ_ϵ is identity outside of $\mathbb{T}^n \times U_{4M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}}(p_0) \times \mathbb{T}$.
2. The extension in item 1 can be further extended to $\tilde{\Phi}_\epsilon(\theta, p, t, E)$ on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\tilde{\Phi}_\epsilon(\theta, p, t, E) = (\Phi_\epsilon(\theta, p, t), E + \tilde{E}(\theta, p, t)),$$

and $\tilde{\Phi}_\epsilon$ is exact symplectic.

⁷formally speaking this term contains two terms of the averaging expansion

3. $\|\tilde{\Phi}_\epsilon - Id\|_{C_I^2} \leq C_1\epsilon$ holds.

Remark B.1. • Our normal form is related to the classical “partial averaging”, see, for example expansion (6.5) in [2, Section 6.1.2]. Our goal here is to obtain precise control of the norms with minimal regularity assumptions. In particular, the norm estimate of $\Phi_\epsilon - Id$ is stronger than the usual results, and is needed in the proof of Proposition B.8.

- It is possible to lower the regularity assumption to $r \geq 4$, and use the weaker estimate $\|R\|_{C_I^2} \leq C_1\epsilon$. This, however, requires more technical discussions in the next few sections, and we choose to avoid it.
- Due to existence of the extension, we consider $N_\epsilon = H_\epsilon \circ \Phi_\epsilon$ as defined on all of $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$, however, the normal form only holds on the local neighborhood.

The rest of this section is dedicated to proving Theorem B.1. Denote $\Pi_\theta(\theta, p, t) = \theta$, $\Pi_p(\theta, p, t) = p$ the natural projections. For a map $\Phi : \mathbb{T}^n \times U \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$, which is the identity in the last component, denote $\Phi = (\Phi_\theta, \Phi_p, Id)$, where $\Phi_\theta = \Pi_\theta \circ \Phi$ and $\Phi_p = \Pi_p \circ \Phi$.

Lemma B.1. *We have the following properties of the rescaled norm.*

1. $\|f\|_{C_I^r} \leq \|f\|_{C^r}$, $\|f\|_{C^r} \leq \epsilon^{-r/2}\|f\|_{C_I^r}$.
2. $\|\partial_\theta f\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq \|f\|_{C_I^r}$, $\|\partial_p f\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\|f\|_{C_I^r}$.
3. There exists $c_{r,n} > 1$ such that $\|fg\|_{C_I^r} \leq c_{r,n}\|f\|_{C_I^r}\|g\|_{C_I^r}$.
4. Let Φ be as before, and Id denote the identity map. There exists $c_{r,n} > 1$ such that if

$$\max\{\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_I^r}, \|\Pi_p(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_I^r}/\sqrt{\epsilon}\} < 1$$

we have

$$\|f \circ \Phi\|_{C_I^r} \leq c_{r,n}\|f\|_{C_I^r}.$$

Proof. The first two conclusions follow directly from definition. For the third conclusion, we have $\|\tilde{f}\|_{C^r} = \|f\|_{C_I^r}$, where

$$\tilde{f}(\theta, I) = f(\theta, \sqrt{\epsilon}I).$$

The conclusion then follows from properties of the C^r -norm.

For the fourth conclusion, we note

$$f \circ \Phi = \tilde{f} \circ \tilde{\Phi},$$

where \tilde{f} is as before, and $\tilde{\Phi}(\theta, I) = (\Phi_\theta(\theta, \sqrt{\epsilon}I), \Phi_p(\theta, \sqrt{\epsilon}I)/\sqrt{\epsilon})$. Moreover, let us denote $\Psi = \Phi - Id$, and note that $\tilde{\Psi} = \tilde{\Phi} - Id$. Then there exists $c > 0$ depending only on dimension that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D\tilde{\Phi}\|_{C^{r-1}} &\leq c + \|D(\tilde{\Phi} - Id)\|_{C^{r-1}} \leq c + \max\{\|\Pi_\theta\tilde{\Psi}\|_{C^r}, \|\Pi_p\tilde{\Psi}\|_{C^r}\} \\ &\leq c + \max\{\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_I^r}, \|\Pi_p(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_I^r}/\sqrt{\epsilon}\} \leq c + 1, \end{aligned}$$

By the Faa-di Bruno formula, there exists $d_r > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f \circ \Phi\|_{C_I^r} &= \|\tilde{f} \circ \tilde{\Phi}\|_{C^r} \leq d_r \|\tilde{f}\|_{C^r} \left(1 + \|D\tilde{\Phi}\|_{C^{r-1}}^r\right) \\ &\leq d_r \|f\|_{C_I^r} (1 + (c + 1)^r) \leq c_{r,n} \|f\|_{C_I^r} \end{aligned}$$

where $c_{r,n} = d_r(1 + (c + 1)^r)$. □

For $\rho > 0$, denote

$$D_\rho = \mathbb{T}^n \times U_\rho(p_0) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We require another lemma for estimating the norm of a Hamiltonian coordinate change. This is an adaptation of Lemma 3.15 from [31].

Lemma B.2. *For $0 < \rho' < \rho < \rho_0$, $r \geq 4$, $2 \leq \ell \leq r - 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, and a C^r Hamiltonian $G : D_{\rho_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let Φ_t^G denote the Hamiltonian flow defined by G .*

Let $c_{r,n} > 1$ be the constant from item 4, Lemma B.1. Assume that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|G\|_{C_I^{\ell+1}} < \frac{1}{c_{r,n}\sqrt{\epsilon}} \min\{\sqrt{\epsilon}, \rho - \rho'\},$$

then for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, the flow Φ_t^G is well defined from $D_{\rho'}$ to D_ρ . Moreover,

$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_t^G - Id)\|_{C_I^\ell} \leq c_{r,n} \|\partial_p G\|_{C_I^\ell}, \quad \|\Pi_p(\Phi_t^G - Id)\|_{C_I^\ell} \leq c_{r,n} \|\partial_\theta G\|_{C_I^\ell}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Proof. Define

$$A_t = \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \left\{ \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_\tau^G - Id)\|_{C_I^\ell}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|\Pi_p(\Phi_\tau^G - Id)\|_{C_I^\ell} \right\}.$$

Let t_0 be the largest $t \in [0, 1]$ such that the following conditions hold.

- (a) $A_t \leq 1$.
- (b) $\Phi_{-t}^G(D_\rho) \supset D_{\rho'}$, in other words, $\Phi_t^G : D_{\rho'} \rightarrow D_\rho$ is well defined.

We first show (B.3) holds on $0 \leq t \leq t_0$, then we show $t_0 = 1$.

By Lemma B.1, item 4, we have

$$\|\Pi_\theta (\Phi_t^G - Id)\|_{C_I^l} \leq \int_0^t \|\partial_p G \circ \Phi_\tau^G\|_{C_I^l} d\tau \leq c_{r,n} \|\partial_p G\|_{C_I^l}$$

and

$$\|\Pi_p (\Phi_t^G - Id)\|_{C_I^l} \leq \int_0^t \|\partial_\theta G \circ \Phi_\tau^G\|_{C_I^l} d\tau \leq c_{r,n} \|\partial_\theta G\|_{C_I^l}.$$

We now show $t_0 = 1$. By the estimates obtained,

$$A_{t_0} \leq c_{r,n} \max\{\|\partial_p G\|_{C_I^l}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|\partial_\theta G\|_{C_I^l}\} \leq \frac{c_{r,n}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|G\|_{C_I^{l+1}} < 1.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|\Pi_p (\Phi_{t_0}^G - Id)\|_{C_I^l} \leq c_{r,n} \|\partial_\theta G\|_{C_I^l} < \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{c_{r,n}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|G\|_{C_I^{l+1}} < \rho - \rho',$$

implying $\Phi_{-t_0} D_\rho \supsetneq D_{\rho'}$. If $t_0 \neq 1$, we can extend conditions (a) and (b) to $t > t_0$, contradicting the maximality of t_0 . \square

We now state our main technical lemma, which is an adaptation of an inductive lemma due to Bounemoura.

Lemma B.3. *There exists a constant $K > 2$ depending only on r such that the following hold. Assume the parameters $r \geq 4$, $\rho > 0$, $\mu > 0$ satisfy*

$$0 < \epsilon \leq \mu^2, \quad KT\mu < \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\rho}{2(r-2)\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right\}.$$

Assume that

$$H : \mathbb{T}^n \times U_\rho(p_0) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad H(\theta, p, t, E) = l + g_0 + f_0,$$

where $l(p, E) = (\omega_0, 1) \cdot (p, E)$ is linear, g_0, f_0 are C^r and depend only on (θ, p, t) , and

$$\|g_0\|_{C_I^r} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}\mu, \quad \|f_0\|_{C_I^r(p_0)} \leq \epsilon, \quad \|\partial_p f_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq \epsilon. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Then for $j \in \{1, \dots, r-2\}$ and $\rho_j = \rho - j \frac{\rho}{2(r-2)} > \rho/2$, there exists a collection of C^{r-j} -symplectic maps $\Phi_j : D_{\rho_j} \longrightarrow D_\rho$, of the special form

$$\Phi_j(\theta, p, t, E) = (\Theta(\theta, p, t), P(\theta, p, t), t, E + \tilde{E}(\theta, p, t)).$$

The maps Φ_j have the properties

$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_j - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}(D_{\rho_j})} \leq jK^{j+1}(T\mu)^2, \quad \|\Pi_p(\Phi_j - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}(D_{\rho_j})} \leq jK^j(T\mu)\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and

$$H \circ \Phi_j = l + g_j + f_j,$$

for each $j \in \{1, \dots, r-2\}$ satisfying $g_j = g_{j-1} + [f_{j-1}]_{\omega_0}$ and

$$\|g_j\|_{C^{r-j}(D_{\rho_j})} \leq (2 - 2^{-j})\sqrt{\epsilon}\mu, \quad \|f_j\|_{C^{r-j}(D_{\rho_j})} \leq (KT\mu)^j \epsilon. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Proof. The proof is an adaptation of the proof of Proposition 3.2, [19], page 9.

Following [19], we define

$$\chi_j = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T s(f_j - [f_j]_{\omega_0})(\theta + \omega_0 s, p, t + s) ds, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$\Phi_0 = Id$, and

$$\Phi_{j+1} = \Phi_j \circ \Phi_1^{\chi_j},$$

where $\Phi_s^{\chi_j}$ is the time- s map of the Hamiltonian flow of χ_j .

Using the fact that χ_j is independent of E , we have the map $\Phi^{\chi_j} := \Phi_1^{\chi_j}$ is independent of E in the (θ, p, t) components. Furthermore, Φ^{χ_j} is the identity in the t component, and $\Pi_E \Phi^{\chi_j} - E$ is independent of E . Hence Φ_j takes the special format described in the lemma. The special form of Φ_j implies that g_j and f_j are also independent of E , allowing the induction to continue.

First of all, assuming the step j of the induction is complete, we prove the norm estimate (B.5). Using (B.6),

$$\|[f_j]_{\omega_0}\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq \|f_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq (KT\mu)^j \epsilon, \quad \|\chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq 2T\|f_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} < 2T(KT\mu)^j \epsilon.$$

We will choose K such that $K \geq 2c_{r,n}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|\chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq \frac{1}{c_{r,n}} (2Tc_{r,n}\sqrt{\epsilon})(KT\mu)^j \leq \frac{1}{c_{r,n}} (KT\mu)^{j+1} < \frac{1}{c_{r,n}} \max\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\rho}{2\sqrt{\epsilon}(r-2)}\right\}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

therefore Lemma B.2 applies with $\rho = \rho_j$, $\rho' = \rho_{j+1}$, $G = \chi_j$.

For $j \geq 1$, using the inductive assumption and $c_{r,n} > 1$,

$$\|\partial_p \chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|\chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq (KT\mu)^{j+1},$$

while for $j = 0$, the initial assumption on f_0 implies

$$\|\partial_p \chi_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq 2T\|\partial_p f_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq 2T\epsilon \leq 2T\mu^2 < \frac{1}{c_{r,n}} (KT\mu)^2,$$

since $T \geq 1$ and $K \geq 2c_{r,n}$. Apply Lemma B.2, we get Φ^{χ_j} are well defined maps from $D_{\rho_{j+1}}$ to D_{ρ_j} , and

$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi^{\chi_j} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq c_{r,n} \|\partial_p \chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq (KT\mu)^2,$$

$$\|\Pi_p(\Phi^{\chi_j} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq c_{r,n} \|\partial_\theta \chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq c_{r,n} \|\chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} < (KT\mu)^{j+1} \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

using (B.8). Since $\Phi_1 = \Phi_1^{\chi_0}$, we obtain (B.5) for $j = 1$.

For each $j \geq 2$, using the bound on $\Phi^{\chi_j} - Id$ above, Lemma B.1, item 4 applies for $\Phi = \Phi^{\chi_j}$. Then

$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_{j-1} - Id) \circ \Phi^{\chi_{j-1}}\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq c_{r,n} \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_{j-1} - Id)\|.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_j - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \\ &= \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_{j-1} \circ \Phi^{\chi_{j-1}} - \Phi^{\chi_{j-1}} + \Phi^{\chi_{j-1}} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \\ &\leq \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_{j-1} - Id) \circ \Phi^{\chi_{j-1}}\|_{C_I^{r-j}} + \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi^{\chi_{j-1}} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \\ &\leq c_{r,n} \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi_{j-1} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}} + \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi^{\chi_{j-1}} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_{r,n}^{j-i-1} \|\Pi_\theta(\Phi^{\chi_i} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-i-1}} < jK^{j-1}(KT\mu)^2, \end{aligned}$$

noting $c_{r,n} < K$ and $\|\Pi(\Phi^{\chi_j} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq (KT\mu)^2$.

By the same reasoning, we get

$$\|\Pi_p(\Phi_j - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} c_{r,n}^{j-i-1} \|\Pi_p(\Phi^{\chi_i} - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-i-1}} \leq jK^{j-1}(KT\mu)\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

We now proceed with the induction in j . The inductive assumption (B.6) holds for $j = 0$ due to (B.4), which is in fact stronger. For the inductive step, define

$$g_{j+1} = g_j + [f_j]_{\omega_0}.$$

Since $\|f_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq (KT\mu)^j \epsilon < 4^{-j} \sqrt{\epsilon} \mu$, we get

$$\|g_{j+1}\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq \|g_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} + \|f_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq (2 - 2^{-j} + 4^{-j}) \sqrt{\epsilon} \mu < (2 - 2^{j+1}) \sqrt{\epsilon} \mu.$$

By a standard computation,

$$f_{j+1} = \int_0^1 \{f_j^s, \chi_j\} \circ \Phi_s^{\chi_j} ds,$$

where $f_j^s = g_j + sf_j + (1-s)[f_j]_{\omega_0}$. Estimate (B.6) implies $\|f_j^s\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq 3\|g_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq 6\sqrt{\epsilon}\mu$. Using Lemma B.1, items 2 and 3, there exists an absolute constant $d > 1$ such that for any $f, g \in C^l(D_\rho)$, we have

$$\|\{f, g\}\|_{C_I^l} = \|\partial_\theta f \cdot \partial_p g + \partial_p f \cdot \partial_\theta g\|_{C_I^l} \leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|f\|_{C_I^{l+1}} \|g\|_{C_I^{l+1}}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{f_j^s, \chi_j\}\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} &\leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \|f_j^s\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \|\chi_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \\ &\leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \cdot 3\sqrt{\epsilon}\mu \cdot 2T \|f_j\|_{C_I^{r-j}} \leq (6dT\mu)(KT\mu)^j \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma B.1, items 4,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{j+1}\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} &\leq \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \|\{f_j^s, \chi_j\} \circ \Phi_s^{\chi_j}\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \leq c_{r,n} \max_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \|\{f_j^s, \chi_j\}\|_{C_I^{r-j-1}} \\ &\leq (6c_{r,n}d)T\mu(KT\mu)^j \epsilon \leq (KT\mu)^{j+1} \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

if we choose $K \geq 6c_{r,n}d$. The induction is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem B.1. First, we show that We write

$$H(\theta, p, t, E) = H_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) - H_0(p_0) + E = l + g_0 + f_0,$$

where $l(p, E) = (\omega_0, 1) \cdot (p, E)$,

$$g_0(\theta, p, t) = H_0(p) - H_0(p_0) - \omega_0 \cdot p$$

and $f_0 = \epsilon H_1$.

Define $\rho = 2M_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$. we have the following estimates: $\partial_\theta g_0 = 0$,

$$\|\partial_p g_0\|_{C^0} = \|\partial_p H_0(p) - \partial_p H_0(p_0)\|_{C^0} \leq \|H_0\|_{C^2} \cdot \rho = 2\|H_0\|_{C^2} M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

and $\|\partial_{p^j}^j g_0\|_{C^0} \leq \|H_0\|_{C^{1+j}}$ for all $j \geq 2$. Then for some $\tilde{C}_1 > 1$ depending on H_0, H_1 ,

$$\|\partial_p g_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}(D_\rho)} \leq \max_{j \geq 1} (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{j-1} \|\partial_{p^j}^j g_0\|_{C^0} \leq \tilde{C}_1 M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

On the other hand, using $\|f\|_{C_I^r} \leq \|f\|_{C^r}$, we have

$$\|f_0\|_{C_I^r(D_\rho)} \leq \tilde{C}_1 \epsilon, \quad \|\partial_p f_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}(D_\rho)} \leq \tilde{C}_2 \epsilon.$$

Choose $\mu = \tilde{C}_1 M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}$, we have

$$\|g_0\|_{C_I^r} \leq \max\{\|\partial_\theta g_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}(D_\rho)}, \sqrt{\epsilon}\|\partial_p g_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}(D_\rho)}\} \leq \tilde{C}_1 M_1 \epsilon = \sqrt{\epsilon}\mu,$$

and $\|f_0\|_{C_I^r(D_\rho)}, \|\partial_p f_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}(D_\rho)} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}\mu$. By choosing ϵ sufficiently small, we ensure

$$KT\mu = KT\tilde{C}_1 M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon} < \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\rho}{2(r-2)\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right\} = \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{2\bar{E}}{2(r-2)}\right\}.$$

The conditions of Lemma B.3 are satisfied with these parameters and we apply the lemma with $j = 3$. There exists a map $\Phi_3 : D_{\rho/2} \rightarrow D_\rho$,

$$\|\Phi_3 - Id\|_{C_I^2(D_{\rho/2})} \leq \max\{2K^3(T\mu)^2, 2K^2(T\mu)\sqrt{\epsilon}\} \leq \tilde{C}_2 \epsilon$$

for some $\tilde{C}_2 > 1$ depending on T, \tilde{C}_1, M_1 . Moreover,

$$H \circ \Phi_3 = l + g_0 + [f_0]_{\omega_0} + [f_1]_{\omega_0} + [f_2]_{\omega_0} + f_3,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \|[f_1]_{\omega_0}\|_{C_I^2(D_{\rho/2})} &\leq (KT\mu)\sqrt{\epsilon}\mu \leq \tilde{C}_3 \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}, \\ \|[f_2]_{\omega_0}\|_{C_I^2(D_{\rho/2})} &\leq (KT\mu)^2 \sqrt{\epsilon}\mu \leq \tilde{C}_3 \epsilon^2, \\ \|[f_3]_{\omega_0}\|_{C_I^2(D_{\rho/2})} &\leq (KT\mu)^3 \sqrt{\epsilon}\mu \leq \tilde{C}_3 \epsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for some \tilde{C}_3 depending on T, \tilde{C}_1, M_1 . Using $l + g_0 = H_0(p) + E - H_0(p_0)$, define $\epsilon Z = [f_0]_{\omega_0}$, $\epsilon Z_1 = [f_1 + f_2]_{\omega_0}$, and $\epsilon R = f_3$, we obtain

$$(H_\epsilon + E) \circ \Phi_2 = H_0 + \epsilon Z + \epsilon Z_1 + \epsilon R + E$$

with the desired estimates and constant $C_1 = \max\{\tilde{C}_2, \tilde{C}_3\}$. Finally, we define $\Phi_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) = \Phi_3(\theta, p, t, E)$. This is well defined since Φ_3 is independent of E .

We now use a smooth approximation technique to show the normal form Φ can be taken to be C^∞ . Using standard techniques, for every $\sigma > 0$, there is $C = C(r) > 0$ such that there is C^∞ functions $H'_0(p)$ and $H'_1(\theta, p, t)$ satisfying:

$$\|H_0 - H'_0\|_{C^2} \leq \sigma, \quad \|H_1 - H'_1\|_{C^2} \leq \sigma, \quad \|H_0\|_{C^r}, \|H_1\|_{C^r} \leq C.$$

Note that the estimates of the normal form depends on the C^r norm of the smooth approximation. We apply the above procedure to $H'_0 + \epsilon H'_1$, and obtain a C^∞ coordinate change Φ' such that

$$(H'_0 + \epsilon H'_1 + E) \circ \Phi' = H_0 + \epsilon Z' + \epsilon Z'_1 + \epsilon R'.$$

We have $\|\epsilon Z' - \epsilon Z\|_{C^2} \leq \epsilon \|H_1 - H'_1\|_{C^2} < \epsilon \sigma$ and $\|Z'_1\|_{C_I^2} \leq \tilde{C}\epsilon$, $\|R\|_{C_I^2} \leq \tilde{C}\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}$. We now compute

$$\begin{aligned} & (H_0 + \epsilon H_1 + E) \circ \Phi' \\ &= H_0 + \epsilon Z + \epsilon Z'_1 + \epsilon R' + (H_0 - H'_0) \circ \Phi' + \epsilon(H_1 - H'_1) \circ \Phi' + \epsilon(Z' - Z). \end{aligned}$$

The last three terms are bounded in C_I^2 norms by $\tilde{C}\sqrt{\epsilon}^{-2}\sigma$. To ensure the remainder is small we can take $\sigma = \epsilon^4$. \square

The normal form lemma stated here also applies to double resonances with long period, which then combined with the idea of Lochak, can be used to study single resonance. This is Proposition 3.3, which we prove here.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. As in the proof of Theorem B.1, we apply the Lemma B.3 to $l + g_0 + f_0$ where $l + g_0 = H_0 + E$ and $f_0 = \epsilon H_1$. Choose $\rho = K_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$, then

$$\|g_0\|_{C_I^r} \leq CK_1\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad \|f_0\|_{C_I^r} \leq \epsilon, \quad \|\partial_p f_0\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq \epsilon$$

where C depends on r, n , $\|H_0\|_{C^r}$. Choose

$$\mu = CK_1\sqrt{\epsilon},$$

by assumption $T \leq C_1/(K_1^2\sqrt{\epsilon})$, then $KT\mu \leq (KCC_1)K_1^{-1}$. The condition of Lemma B.3 is satisfied if K_1 is sufficiently large. We apply Lemma B.3 with $j = 1$, the conclusion is

$$\|\Pi_\theta(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq K^2(KCC_1)^2K_1^{-2}, \quad \|\Pi_p(\Phi - Id)\|_{C_I^{r-1}} \leq K(KCC_1)K_1^{-1}\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

and

$$\|f_1\|_{C^{r-j}} \leq (KCC_1)K_1^{-1}\epsilon.$$

We can also apply the same smooth approximation to upgrade the coordinate change to C^∞ . \square

B.2 Affine coordinate change, rescaling and energy reduction

Definition of the slow system. Recall that an n -tuple of vectors $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ defines an irreducible lattice, if the lattice $\Lambda = \langle k_1, \dots, k_n \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is not contained in any lattice of the same rank or, equivalently, $\langle k_1, \dots, k_n \rangle_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} = \Lambda$. Let B_0 be the $n \times (n+1)$ matrix whose rows are vectors k_1^T, \dots, k_n^T from \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} , and let $k_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ be such that

$$B := \begin{bmatrix} k_1^T \\ \vdots \\ k_{n+1}^T \end{bmatrix} \in SL(n+1, \mathbb{Z}). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Such a k_{n+1} exists if and only if k_1, \dots, k_n is irreducible. By possibly changing the signs of the rows of B , we ensure

$$\beta := k_{n+1} \cdot (\omega_0, 1) > 0 \quad (\text{B.10})$$

In particular, we have

$$B \begin{bmatrix} \omega_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \beta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Let $A_0 = \partial_{pp}^2 H_0(p_0)$, we define

$$K(I) = \frac{1}{2} (B_0 A_0 B_0^T) I \cdot I, \quad I \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (\text{B.12})$$

and $U(\varphi)$, $\varphi \in \mathbb{T}^n$ by the relation

$$U(k_1 \cdot (\theta, t), \dots, k_n \cdot (\theta, t)) = -Z(\theta, p_0, t). \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Consider the corresponding autonomous system

$$G_\epsilon(\theta, p, t, E) = N_\epsilon + E,$$

We show that G_ϵ can be reduced to

$$H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) = \frac{1}{\beta} (K(I) - U(\varphi) + \sqrt{\epsilon} P(\varphi, I, \tau, \epsilon)), \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{T}^n, I \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tau \in \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T}, \quad (\text{B.14})$$

with a coordinate change and an energy reduction. See Proposition B.6.

Linear and rescaling coordinate change. Our coordinate change is a combination of a linear and a rescaling coordinate change. Namely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta, p, t, E) &= \Phi_1(\varphi, p^s, s, p^f) : \quad \begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix} = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi \\ s \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} p - p_0 \\ E + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} = B^T \begin{bmatrix} p^s \\ p^f \end{bmatrix}, \\ (\varphi, p^s, s, p^f) &= \Phi_2(\varphi, I, \tau, F) = (\varphi, \sqrt{\epsilon} I, \tau/\sqrt{\epsilon}, \epsilon F). \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$\Phi_L = \Phi_1 \circ \Phi_2 : \quad (\varphi, I, \tau, F) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\theta, p, t, E) \quad (\text{B.15})$$

by the formula

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ t \end{bmatrix} = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi \\ \tau/\sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} p - p_0 \\ E + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} = \sqrt{\epsilon} B^T \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \sqrt{\epsilon} F \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Given any $M_1 > 0$, there exists $C_B > 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \{ \|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| < C_B^{-1}M_1 \} &\subset \Phi_L \left(\{ \|(p - p_0, E + H_0(p_0))\| < \sqrt{\epsilon}M_1 \} \right) \\ &\subset \{ \|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| < C_B M_1 \}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Define

$$G_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau, F) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} G_\epsilon \circ \Phi_L,$$

then the Hamiltonian flows of G_ϵ^s and G_ϵ are conjugate via Φ_L . This can be seen from the equivalence of the following Hamiltonian systems:

$$\begin{aligned} (G_\epsilon, \quad d\theta \wedge dp + dt \wedge dE) &\sim (G_\epsilon \circ \Phi_L, \quad \sqrt{\epsilon}(d\varphi \wedge dI + d\tau \wedge dF)) \\ &\sim \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} G_\epsilon \circ \Phi_L, \quad d\varphi \wedge dI + d\tau \wedge dF \right) \end{aligned}$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma B.4. *Assume that N_ϵ satisfies (B.2) on $D_{M_1\sqrt{\epsilon}}$. Then there exists $C_B > 1$ and $C_1 = C_1(H_0, \tilde{C}, M)$ such that*

$$G_\epsilon^s = \sqrt{\epsilon} \left(K(I) - U(\varphi) + (\beta + \sqrt{\epsilon}l(I, F)) \cdot F + \sqrt{\epsilon}P_1(\varphi, I, \tau, F, \epsilon) \right), \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where $\beta = k_{n+1} \cdot (\omega(p_0), 1)$, and

$$\|l\|_{C^2}, \|P_1\|_{C^2} \leq C_1,$$

with the norm taken on the set

$$\{ \|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| < C_B^{-1}M_1 \}. \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Proof of Lemma B.4. Due to (B.17), $G_\epsilon \circ \Phi_L$ is defined on the $\{ \|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| < C_B^{-1}M_1 \}$.

Consider the expansion of N_ϵ from Theorem B.1

$$N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) := H_\epsilon \circ \Phi_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) = H_0(p) + \epsilon Z(\theta, p, t) + \epsilon Z_1 + \epsilon R.$$

Denote

$$A = \partial^2(H_0(p) + E)(p_0, -H_0(p_0)) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{pp}^2 H_0(p_0) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $H_0(p) + E$ is a function of p and E . Expanding $H_0(p) + E$ to the third order at $(p_0, -H_0(p_0))$, and $Z(\cdot, p)$ to the first order at p_0 , we have

$$G_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} p - p_0 \\ E + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2} A \begin{bmatrix} p \\ E \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} p \\ E \end{bmatrix} + \epsilon Z(\theta, p_0, t) + \check{H}_0 + \epsilon \check{Z}_1 + \epsilon R,$$

with

$$\check{H}_0 = H_0(p) - H_0(p_0) - \omega(p_0) \cdot (p - p_0) - \frac{1}{2}A \begin{bmatrix} p \\ E \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} p \\ E \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{Z}_1 = Z(\theta, p, t) - Z(\theta, p_0, t) + Z_1.$$

On the set $\|p - p_0\| \leq M_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$ and $|E + H_0(p)| \leq M_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$, for some $C = C(H_0, \check{C}, M_1)$, we have

$$\|\check{H}_0\|_{C_I^2} \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \|\check{Z}_1\|_{C_I^2} \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon}, \quad \|R\|_{C_I^2} \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

From (B.16) we have $U(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) = -Z(\theta, p_0, t)$, and from (B.11),

$$(\omega_0, 1) \cdot (p - p_0, E + H_0(p_0)) = (0, \beta) \cdot (\sqrt{\epsilon}I, \epsilon F) = \epsilon\beta F,$$

we get

$$G_\epsilon \circ \Phi_L = \epsilon \left(\frac{1}{2}BAB^T \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}F \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}F \end{bmatrix} + \beta F - U(\varphi) + (\check{H}_0/\epsilon + \check{Z}_1 + R) \circ \Phi_L \right). \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Finally, note $K(I) = \frac{1}{2}BAB^T \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and define

$$l(I, F) \cdot F = BAB^T \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}F \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2}BAB^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}F \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}F \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\sqrt{\epsilon}P = (\check{H}_0 + \epsilon\check{Z}_1 + R) \circ \Phi_L,$$

then (B.18) follows directly from (B.20) and definition of Φ_L . It is also clear from the definition that $l(I, F)/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ has bounded C^2 norm on the set $\{\|I\|, \|\sqrt{\epsilon}F\| \leq C_B^{-1}M\}$.

For the norm estimates, we note the coordinate change Φ_1 increase C^2 norm by a factor C_B depending only on B . Note that \check{Z}_1 depends only on $k_1 \cdot (\theta, t), \dots, k_n \cdot (\theta, t), p$, \check{Z}_1 depends only on φ, I, F (and not in τ). As a result, using the definition of the rescaled norm (B.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\check{H}_0/\epsilon + \check{Z}_1) \circ \Phi_L\|_{C^2} &\leq \|(\check{H}_0/\epsilon + \check{Z}_1) \circ \Phi_1(\varphi, \sqrt{\epsilon}I, \epsilon F)\|_{C_I^2} \\ &\leq \|(\check{H}_0/\epsilon + \check{Z}_1) \circ \Phi_1\|_{C^2} \leq C_B C \sqrt{\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

For terms depending on τ , we have

$$\|R \circ \Phi_L\|_{C^2} = \|R \circ \Phi_1(\varphi, \tau/\sqrt{\epsilon}, \sqrt{\epsilon}I, \epsilon F)\|_{C^2} \leq C_B(\sqrt{\epsilon})^{-2} \|R\|_{C_I^2} \leq C_B C \sqrt{\epsilon},$$

where we used (B.2). The C^2 -norm estimate of P follows from estimates on C_I^2 norms of $\check{H}_0, \check{Z}_1, R$. \square

Reduction on energy surface We perform a standard reduction on the energy surface $G_\epsilon^s = 0$, with τ as the new time, obtaining a time-periodic system.

Lemma B.5. *Assume that conclusions of Lemma B.4 hold on the set $\{\|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| < M_2\}$. Then there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(H_0, C_1, M_2)$, $C_3 = C_2(H_0, C_1, M_2, U) > 0$, such that for any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, there is a function*

$$H_\epsilon^s : \mathbb{T}^n \times B_{M_2}^n(0) \times \sqrt{\epsilon}\mathbb{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

uniquely solving the equation

$$G_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau, -H_\epsilon^s) = 0$$

on the set $\{\|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| \leq M_2\}$. Moreover, H_ϵ^s has the form (B.14), i.e.

$$H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) = \frac{1}{\beta} (K(I) - U(\varphi) + \sqrt{\epsilon}P(\varphi, I, \tau, \epsilon))$$

where $\|P\|_{C^2} \leq C_3$.

In particular, $H_\epsilon^s \longrightarrow H^s/\beta$ uniformly in $C^2(\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R})$.

Proof of Lemma B.5. We can choose ϵ_0 such that for any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial F}(G_\epsilon^s) > \frac{\beta}{2} > 0$$

on $\{\|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| \leq M_2\}$. Therefore, H_ϵ^s exists by the implicit function theorem. Moreover, there exists a constant C' , depending on H_0 and U , but independent of ϵ , such that $\|H_\epsilon^s\|_{C^2} \leq C'$.

Let $Q = H_\epsilon^s - \frac{1}{\beta}(K(I) - U(\varphi)) = H_\epsilon^s - H^s$, then $\|Q\|_{C^2} \leq \|H^s\|_{C^2} + C'$. We know

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= G_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau, -Q - H^s) \\ &= \sqrt{\epsilon}(-\beta Q + \sqrt{\epsilon}l(I, Q + H^s)(Q + H^s) + \sqrt{\epsilon}P_1(\varphi, I, \tau, Q + H^s, \epsilon)) \\ &=: \sqrt{\epsilon}(-\beta Q + \sqrt{\epsilon}P_2(\varphi, I, \tau, Q + H^s, \epsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$Q = \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\beta} P_2(\varphi, I, \tau, Q + H^s, \epsilon).$$

To solve this implicit equation notice that there exists $C''' > 0$ depending only on C_1, H^s such that $\|P_2\|_{C^2} \leq C'''$. Application of the Faa-di Bruno formula show that for some $C > 0$ depending only on n we have

$$\|Q\|_{C^2} = \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\beta} \|P_2(\varphi, I, \tau, Q + H^s, \epsilon)\|_{C^2} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} C C''' \|Q\|_{C^2}^2 \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} C C''' (\|H^s\|_{C^2} + C'),$$

and the lemma follows. \square

We have

$$G_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau, F) = 0, \quad \iff \quad H_\epsilon^s + F = 0. \quad (\text{B.21})$$

The following Proposition follows from the standard energy reduction (see for example [8]).

Proposition B.6. *Assume the conclusions of Theorem B.1 hold on the set*

$$D_{M_1} := \{\|(p - p_0, H + H_0(p_0))\| < M_1\sqrt{\epsilon}\}$$

for sufficiently large M_1 depending only on H_0 . Then for $M_3 = C_B^{-2}M_1$, $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0(H_0, C_1, M_1)$, the following are equivalent:

1. The curve $(\theta, t, p, E)(t)$ is an orbit of $N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) + E$ inside D_{M_1} .
2. The curve $(\varphi, \tau, I, F)(t) = \Phi_L(\theta, t, p, E)(t)$ is the time change of an orbit of $N_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) + F$, with τ as the new time.

B.3 Variational properties of the coordinate changes

We have made two reductions: The normal form

$$H_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) \longrightarrow N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) = H_\epsilon \circ \Phi_\epsilon,$$

and the coordinate change with time change

$$N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) + E \longrightarrow H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) + F.$$

In this section, we discuss the effect of these reductions on the Lagrangian, barrier function, and the Mather, Aubry, Mañe sets. The main conclusion of this section is the following proposition, which follows directly from Propositions B.8 and B.9 below.

Proposition B.7. *For M_1 large enough depending only on H_0, k_1, \dots, k_n, n , there exist $C_2 > 1$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on $H_0, k_1, \dots, k_n, n, M_1$, such that the following hold for any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$.*

1. For $M' = C_B^{-2}M_1/2$ (see (B.19)), and $\|c - p_0\| \leq M'\sqrt{\epsilon}$ and $\alpha = \alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c)$, let \bar{c} and $\bar{\alpha}$ satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} c - p_0 \\ -\alpha + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} = B^T \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon}\bar{c} \\ -\epsilon\bar{\alpha} \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) = \bar{\alpha}$.

2. Let $c, \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c), \bar{c}, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})$ satisfy the relation in item 1, and suppose $(\varphi_i, t_i) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}$, $(\varphi_i, \tau_i) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T}$, $i = 1, 2$ satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_i \\ t_i \end{bmatrix} = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_i \\ \tau_i / \sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}},$$

then

$$|h_{H_\epsilon, c}(\theta_1, t_1; \theta_2, t_2) - \sqrt{\epsilon} h_{H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}}(\varphi_1, \tau_1; \varphi_2, \tau_2)| \leq C\epsilon.$$

3. Let $c, \alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c), \bar{c}, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})$ be as before, then

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) = \Phi_L \circ \Phi_\epsilon(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{H_\epsilon}(c)), \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) = \Phi_L \circ \Phi_\epsilon(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c)), \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) = \Phi_L \circ \Phi_\epsilon(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}(c)).$$

Recall that Φ_ϵ can be extended to the whole phase space, and $N_\epsilon = H_\epsilon \circ \Phi_\epsilon$ is considered as a function on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}$.

Proposition B.8. *In the setup of Proposition B.7 there exists $C_3 > 1$ depending on $H_0, k_1, \dots, k_n, n, M_1$ such that we have the following relation.*

1. $\alpha_{H_\epsilon}(c) = \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c)$, $\Phi_\epsilon \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{H_\epsilon}(c) = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{N_\epsilon}(c)$, $\Phi_\epsilon \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon}(c) = \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{N_\epsilon}(c)$, $\Phi_\epsilon \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon}(c) = \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{N_\epsilon}(c)$.
2. $|A_{H_\epsilon, c}(\theta_1, \tilde{t}_1; \theta_2, \tilde{t}_2) - A_{N_\epsilon, c}(\theta_1, \tilde{t}_1; \theta_2, \tilde{t}_2)| \leq C_3\epsilon$.
3. $|h_{H_\epsilon, c}(\theta_1, t_1; \theta_2, t_2) - h_{N_\epsilon, c}(\theta_1, t_1; \theta_2, t_2)| \leq C_3\epsilon$.

Proof of Proposition B.8. The symplectic invariance of the alpha function and the Mather, Aubry and Mañe sets follows from exactness $\widetilde{\Phi}_\epsilon$ (see [10]). In order to get the quantitative estimate of action, we need more detailed estimates.

Writing $\widetilde{\Phi}_\epsilon(\theta, p, t, E) = (\Theta, P, t, \Phi_E)$, from Theorem B.1 and using the rescaled norm (B.1), we have

$$\|\widetilde{\Phi}_\epsilon - Id\|_{C^0} \leq C_1\epsilon, \quad \|\Phi_\epsilon - Id\|_{C^1} \leq C_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$$

Denote $\widetilde{E} = \Phi_E - E$. By exactness of $\widetilde{\Phi}_\epsilon$, we have there exists a function $S : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$Pd\Theta + \Phi_E dt - (pd\theta + E dt) = Pd\Theta - pd\theta + \widetilde{E} dt = dS(\theta, p, t, E) = dS(\theta, p, t) \quad (\text{B.22})$$

In particular, given a curve $(\theta, p, t, E)(t)$, $t \in [\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2]$ with $N_\epsilon + E = 0$, we have for $(\Theta, P, t, \Phi_E)(t) = \widetilde{\Phi}_\epsilon(\theta, p, t, E)$ (and hence $H_\epsilon(\Theta, P, t) + \Phi_E = 0$), we apply (B.22) to

the tangent vector of the curve to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}S(\theta, p, t, E) &= P \cdot \dot{\Theta} + \Phi_E - (p \cdot \dot{\theta} + E) \\
&= P \cdot \dot{\Theta} - H_\epsilon(\Theta, P, t) - (p \cdot \dot{\theta} - N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t)) \\
&= L_{H_\epsilon}(\Theta, \dot{\Theta}, t) - L_{N_\epsilon}(\theta, \dot{\theta}, t)
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\tilde{t}_1}^{\tilde{t}_2} \left(L_{H_\epsilon}(\Theta, \dot{\Theta}, t) - c \cdot \dot{\Theta} \right) dt - \int_{\tilde{t}_1}^{\tilde{t}_2} \left(L_{N_\epsilon}(\theta, \dot{\theta}, t) - c \cdot \dot{\theta} \right) dt \\
&= \left(S(\theta, p, t, E) - c \cdot (\tilde{\Theta} - \tilde{\theta}) \right) \Big|_{\tilde{t}_1}^{\tilde{t}_2},
\end{aligned} \tag{B.23}$$

where $\tilde{\Theta}, \tilde{\theta}$ are lifts of $\Theta(t), \theta(t)$ to the universal cover. Moreover, from

$$\|\Phi_\epsilon - id\|_{C^0} \leq C_1 \epsilon,$$

we get $\Theta - \theta$ is a well defined vector function on $\mathbb{T}^n \times B_{M_1}(p_0)^n \times \mathbb{T}$. In particular, we have $\tilde{\Theta} - \tilde{\theta} = \Theta - \theta$.

We now estimate the C^0 -norm of S . Write $S_0 = p \cdot (\Theta - \theta)$, using (B.22) we have

$$dS = (P - p)d\Theta + pd(\Theta - \theta) + \tilde{E}dt = (P - p)d\Theta + dS_0 - (\Theta - \theta)dp + \tilde{E}dt.$$

Since $\|\Theta - \theta\|_{C^0}, \|P - p\|_{C^0}, \|\tilde{E}\|_{C^0} = \|\Phi_E - E\|_{C^0} \leq C_1 \epsilon$, we have $\|dS\|_{C^0} \leq C_1 \epsilon$, and $\|S - S(0)\|_{C^0} \leq C' \epsilon$ for some C' depending on C_1 .

We now conclude that the integral in (B.23) is bounded by $C' \epsilon$. Apply this estimate to a minimizer, we have

$$|A_{N_\epsilon, c}(\theta(\tilde{t}_1), \tilde{t}_1; \theta(\tilde{t}_2), \tilde{t}_2) - A_{H_\epsilon, c}(\Theta(\tilde{t}_1), \tilde{t}_1; \Theta(\tilde{t}_2), \tilde{t}_2))| \leq C' \epsilon.$$

Since $\|\Phi_\epsilon - Id\|_{C^0} \leq C_1 \epsilon$, we have $\|\theta(\tilde{t}_i) - \Theta(\tilde{t}_i)\| \leq C_1 \epsilon, i = 1, 2$. The estimate follows from the Lipschitz property of $A_{H, c}$.

Taking limit, we obtain the estimate for the barrier $h_{H, c}$. \square

We now study the relation between N_ϵ and H_ϵ^s . We extend the definition of H_ϵ^s to $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ such that the $\sqrt{\epsilon}P$ term is supported on the set $\{\|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F)\| < 2M_2\}$.

Proposition B.9. *Assume the conclusions of Theorem B.1 hold on the set*

$$\{\|(p - p_0, H + H_0(p_0))\| < M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}\}$$

for sufficiently large M_1 depending only on H_0 . Then for $M_3 = C_B^{-2} M_1$, we have:

1. Let (θ, p, t, E) satisfies $\|(p - p_0, E + H_0(p_0))\| < M_3$, $N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) + E = 0$, and
- $$(\varphi, I, \tau, F) = \Phi_L(\theta, p, t, E).$$

Let L_{N_ϵ} and $L_{H_\epsilon^s}$ be the Lagrangians for N_ϵ and H_ϵ^s . Then for

$$v = \partial_p N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t), \quad \begin{bmatrix} v^s \\ v^f \end{bmatrix} = B \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

we have

$$L_{N_\epsilon}(\theta, v, t) - p_0 \cdot v + H_0(p_0) = \epsilon v^f L_{H_\epsilon^s} \left(\varphi, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \frac{v^s}{v^f}, s\sqrt{\epsilon} \right).$$

2. Suppose $(c, \alpha), (\bar{c}, \bar{\alpha}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\|c - p_0\| \leq \frac{M_3}{2} \sqrt{\epsilon}$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} c - p_0 \\ -\alpha + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} = B^T \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon} \bar{c} \\ \epsilon \bar{\alpha} \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\alpha = \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c)$ if and only if $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})$.

3. Let $c, \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c), \bar{c}, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})$ satisfies the relation in item 2, and suppose $(\varphi_i, t_i) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{T}$, $(\varphi_i, \tau_i) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{T}$, $i = 1, 2$ satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_i \\ t_i \end{bmatrix} = B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_i \\ \tau_i / \sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}},$$

then

$$h_{N_\epsilon, c}(\theta_1, t_1; \theta_2, t_2) = \sqrt{\epsilon} h_{H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}}(\varphi_1, \tau_1; \varphi_2, \tau_2).$$

4. Let $c, \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c), \bar{c}, \alpha_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c})$ be as before, then

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) = \Phi_L(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{N_\epsilon}(c)), \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) = \Phi_L(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{N_\epsilon}(c)), \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{H_\epsilon^s}(\bar{c}) = \Phi_L(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_{N_\epsilon}(c))$$

Proof of Proposition B.9. The choice of M_3 is to ensure that for $M_2 = C_B^{-1} M_1$ as in Lemma B.4,

$$\Phi_L(\{\|(p - p_0, E + H_0(p_0))\| < M_3\}) \subset \{\|(I, \sqrt{\epsilon} F)\| < M_2\}.$$

Item 1. Recall that $G_\epsilon = H_\epsilon + E$, and

$$\begin{aligned} L_{N_\epsilon} - p_0 \cdot v + H_0(p_0) &= \sup_p \{(p - p_0) \cdot v - N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) + H_0(p_0)\} \\ &= \sup_{p, E} \{(p - p_0, E + H_0(p_0)) \cdot (v, 1) : N_\epsilon(\theta, p, t) + E = 0\}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.24}$$

where the supremum is achieved at a unique point since $H_\epsilon + E \leq 0$ is a strictly convex set. Let us denote $L_{N_\epsilon}^{p_0} = L_{N_\epsilon} - p_0 \cdot v + H_0(p_0)$.

Continuing from (B.24) and using (B.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{N_\epsilon}^{p_0}(\theta, v, t) &= \sup \left\{ (B^T)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} p - p_0 \\ E + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} \cdot B \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} : G_\epsilon(\theta, p, t, E) = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sup \left\{ \sqrt{\epsilon}(I, \sqrt{\epsilon}F) \cdot (v^s, v^f) : G_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau, F) = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{\epsilon} \sup \left\{ (I, F) \cdot (v^s, v^f \sqrt{\epsilon}) : H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) + F = 0 \right\}, \\
&= \epsilon v^f \sup \left\{ (I, F) \cdot (v^s/(v^f \sqrt{\epsilon}), 1) : H_\epsilon^s(\varphi, I, \tau) + F = 0 \right\} \\
&= \epsilon v^f L_{H_\epsilon^s}(\varphi, v^s/(v^f \sqrt{\epsilon}), \tau).
\end{aligned}$$

Item 2. We first derive a relation between the integrals of the Lagrangians. Let $(\theta, p, t, E)(t)$, $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ be a solution to $N_\epsilon + E$ with

$$N_\epsilon + E = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|(p - p_0, E + H_0(p_0))\| < M_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Let $(\varphi, I, \tau, F)(t) = \Phi_L^{-1}(\theta, p, t, E)(t)$. Then from (B.16),

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\varphi} \\ \dot{\tau}/\sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} = B \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\theta} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} v^s \\ v^f \end{bmatrix} (t), \quad \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} = \frac{v^s}{\sqrt{\epsilon} v^f}.$$

From item 1 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{t_1}^{t_2} L_{N_\epsilon}^{p_0}(\theta, \dot{\theta}, t) dt &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \epsilon v^f(t) L_{H_\epsilon^s}(\varphi, v^s/(v^f \sqrt{\epsilon}), \tau) dt \\
&= \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \epsilon v^f(\tau) L_{H_\epsilon^s}(\varphi(\tau), \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau}(\tau), \tau) \frac{dt}{d\tau}(\tau) d\tau = \sqrt{\epsilon} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} L_{H_\epsilon^s}(\varphi, \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau}, \tau) d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\theta}(t)$ be a lift of $\theta(t)$ to the universal cover and $\tilde{\varphi}(t), \tilde{\tau}(t)$ be a lift of $(\varphi(t), \tau(t))$. Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\varphi}(t) \\ \tilde{\tau}(t)/\sqrt{\epsilon} \end{bmatrix} = B \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}(t) \\ t \end{bmatrix} + \text{const.}$$

Given any $(c, -\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left(L_{N_\epsilon}(\theta, \dot{\theta}, t) - c \cdot \dot{\theta} + \alpha \right) dt \\
&= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L_{N_\epsilon}^{p_0}(\theta, \dot{\theta}, t) dt - (c - p_0, -\alpha + H_0(p_0)) \cdot \left((\tilde{\theta}(t_2) - \tilde{\theta}(t_1), t_2 - t_1) \right) \\
&= \sqrt{\epsilon} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} L_{H_\epsilon^s} d\tau - (B^T)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} c - p_0 \\ -\alpha + H_0(p_0) \end{bmatrix} \cdot B \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\theta}(t_2) - \tilde{\theta}(t_1) \\ t_2 - t_1 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \sqrt{\epsilon} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} L_{H_\epsilon^s} d\tau - (\sqrt{\epsilon} \bar{c}, -\epsilon \bar{\alpha}) \cdot (\tilde{\varphi}(\tau_2) - \tilde{\varphi}(\tau_1), (\tau_2 - \tau_1)/\sqrt{\epsilon}) \\
&= \sqrt{\epsilon} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \left(L_{H_\epsilon^s} - \bar{c} \cdot \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau} + \bar{\alpha} \right) \left(\varphi, \frac{d\varphi}{d\tau}, \tau \right) d\tau.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.25}$$

We now prove Item 2. Suppose $\alpha = \alpha_{N_\epsilon}(c)$, let $(\theta, p, t, E)(t)$, $t \in [-\infty, \infty)$ be an orbit in the Mane set $\mathcal{N}_{N_\epsilon}(c)$. Then there exists $C_* > 0$ such that we have $\|p(t) - c\| \leq C_* \sqrt{\epsilon}$, by Proposition 7.6. Since $\|c - p_0\| \leq M_3 \sqrt{\epsilon}/2$, with M_3 large enough, we have $\|p(t) - p_0\| \leq M_3 \sqrt{\epsilon}$ for all t .

Moreover, using the fact that the orbit is semi-static, we have

$$-C \leq \int_0^T (L_{N_\epsilon} - c \cdot v + \alpha)(\theta(t), \dot{\theta}(t), t) dt \leq C.$$

From (B.25), we get

$$-C \leq \int_{\tau(0)}^{\tau(T)} (L_{H_\epsilon^s} - \bar{c} \cdot v + \bar{\alpha}) d\tau \leq C$$

for all $T > 0$. This implies $\bar{\alpha}$ is Mañe critical for \bar{c} .

As a result, we obtain that α is Mane critical for $L_{N_\epsilon} - c \cdot v$ implies $\bar{\alpha}$ is Mane critical for $L_{H_\epsilon^s} - \bar{c} \cdot v$. Moreover the converse is true by reversing the above computations.

Item 3. We apply (B.25) to any one-sided minimizer of $h_{N_\epsilon, c}(\theta_1, t_1; \theta_2, t_2)$, and use the localization of calibrated orbits.

Item 4. (B.25) implies that an orbit $(\theta, p, t, E)(t)$ is semi-static for $L_{N_\epsilon, c}$ implies $(\varphi, I, \tau, F) = \Phi_L^{-1}(\theta, p, t, E)$ is a reparametrization of a semi-static orbit of $L_{H_\epsilon^s, \bar{c}}$. The converse also holds. This implies the relation between Mane sets. The same applies to Aubry sets. We note that the Mather set is precisely the support of all invariant measures contained in the Aubry set, and therefore is also invariant. \square

C Variational aspects of the slow mechanical system

In this section we study the variational properties of the slow mechanical system

$$H^s(\varphi, I) = K(I) - U(\varphi),$$

with $\min U = U(0) = 0$.

The main goal of this section is to derive some properties of the “channel” $\bigcup_{E>0} \mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$, and information about the Aubry sets for $c \in \mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$. More precisely, we prove Proposition 5.1 and justify the picture Figure 5.1.

- In section C.1, we show that each $\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$ is an segment parallel to h^\perp .
- In section C.2, we provide a characterization of the segment, and provide information about the Aubry sets.
- In section C.3, we provide a condition for the “width” of the channel to be non-zero.
- In section C.4, we discuss the limit of the set $\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$ as $E \rightarrow 0$ which corresponds to the “bottom” of the channel.

We drop all superscripts “s” to simplify the notations. The results proved in this section are mostly contained in [62] in some form. Here we reformulate some of them for our purpose and also provide some different proofs.

C.1 Relation between the minimal geodesics and the Aubry sets

Assume that $H(\varphi, I)$ satisfies the conditions $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$ and $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$. Then for $E \neq E_j$, $1 \leq j \leq N - 1$, there exists a unique shortest geodesic γ_h^E for the metric g_E in the homology h . For the bifurcation values $E = E_j$, there are two shortest geodesics γ_h^E and $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$.

The function $l_E(h)$ denotes the length of the shortest g_E -geodesic in homology h . By Lemma C.2 the length function $l_E(h)$ is continuous and strictly increasing in $E \geq 0$. It is easy to see that it is positive homogeneous ($l_E(nh) = nl_E(h)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$) and sub-additive ($l_E(h_1 + h_2) \leq l_E(h_1) + l_E(h_2)$) in h .

Assume that the curves γ_h^E are parametrized using the Maupertuis principle, namely, it is the projection of the associated Hamiltonian orbit. Let $T(\gamma_h^E)$ be the period under this parametrization, and write $\lambda(\gamma_h^E) = 1/(T(\gamma_h^E))$.

We pick another vector $\bar{h} \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ such that h, \bar{h} form a basis of $H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ and for the dual basis h^*, \bar{h}^* in $H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ we have $\langle h, \bar{h}^* \rangle = 0$. We denote \bar{h}^* by h^\perp to emphasise the latter fact.

The main result of this section is:

Theorem C.1. 1. For $E = E_j$,

$$\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda(\gamma_h^E) \cdot h) = \mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda(\bar{\gamma}_h^E) \cdot h).$$

As a consequence, write $\lambda_h^E = \lambda(\gamma_h^E)$, then the set $\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$ is well defined (the definition is independent of the choice of γ_h^E).

2. For each $E > 0$, there exists $-\infty \leq a_E^-(h) \leq a_E^+(h) \leq \infty$ such that

$$\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h) = l_E(h)h^* + [a_E^-(h), a_E^+(h)] h^\perp.$$

Moreover, the set function $[a_E^-, a_E^+]$ is upper semi-continuous in E .

3. For each $c \in \mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$, $E \neq E_j$, there is a unique c -minimal measure supported on γ_h^E .

4. For each $c \in \mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^{E_j} h)$, there are two c -minimal measures supported on $\gamma_h^{E_j}$ and c .

5. For $E > 0$, assume that the torus \mathbb{T}^2 is not completely foliated by shortest closed g_E -geodesics in the homology h , then $a_E^+(h) - a_E^-(h) > 0$ and the channel has non-zero width.

Assume that γ is a geodesic parametrized according to the Maupertuis principle. First, we note the following useful relation.

$$L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) + E = 2(E + U(\gamma)) = \sqrt{g_E(\gamma, \dot{\gamma})}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where L denote the associated Lagrangian.

According to [21], the minimal measures for L is in one-to-one correspondence with the minimal measures of $\frac{1}{2}g_E(\varphi, v)$. On the other hand, any minimal measure $\frac{1}{2}g_E$ with a rational rotation number is supported on closed geodesic. The following lemma characterizes minimal measures supported on a closed geodesic.

Lemma C.1. 1. Assume that $c \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ is such that $\alpha_H(c) = E > 0$. Then for any $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$,

$$l_E(h) - \langle c, h \rangle \geq 0.$$

2. Let γ be a closed geodesic of g_E , $E > 0$, with $[\gamma] = h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$. Let μ be the invariant measure supported on the periodic orbit associated to γ . Then given $c \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ with $\alpha_{H^s}(c) = E$,

$$\mu \text{ is } c\text{-minimal if and only if } l_E(h) - \langle c, h \rangle = 0. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

3. Let γ be a closed geodesic g_E , $E \geq 0$, with $[\gamma] = h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ and $\alpha_{H^s}(c) = E$. Then $\gamma \subset \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$ if and only if (C.2) holds.

Proof. Let γ be a closed geodesic of g_E , $E > 0$, with $[\gamma] = h$. Assume that with the Maupertuis parametrization, the period of γ is T . Let μ be the associated invariant measure, then $\rho(\mu) = h/T$. Assume that $\alpha(c) = E$, by definition, we have

$$\int Ld\mu + E \geq \beta(h/T) + \alpha(c) \geq \langle c, h/T \rangle.$$

By (C.1), we have

$$\int Ld\mu + E = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (L + E)(d\gamma) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \sqrt{g_E(d\gamma)} = l_E(\gamma)/T.$$

Combine the two expressions, we have $l_E(\gamma) - \langle c, h \rangle \geq 0$. By choosing γ such that $l_E(\gamma) = l_E(h)$, statement 1 follows.

To prove statement 2, notice that if μ is c -minimal, then $\alpha(c) = E$ and the equality

$$\int Ld\mu + E = \langle c, h/T \rangle$$

holds. Equality (C.2) follows from the same calculation as statement 1.

For $E > 0$, $\gamma \subset \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$ if and only if γ is a minimal measure. Hence we only need to prove statement 3 for $E = 0$. In this case, γ can be parametrized as a homoclinic orbit. $\gamma \subset \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$ if and only if

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (L - c \cdot v + \alpha(c))(d\gamma) = 0.$$

Since

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (L - c \cdot v + \alpha(c))(d\gamma) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (L + E)(d\gamma) - \langle c, h \rangle = l_E(h) - \langle c, h \rangle,$$

the statement follows. □

Proof of Theorem C.1, item 1-4. By Lemma C.1, if there are two shortest geodesics γ_h^E and $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$ for g_E , for any c , the invariant measure supported on γ_h^E is c -minimal if and only if the measure on $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$ is c -minimal. This implies statement 1.

Statement 2 follows from the fact that $\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$ is a closed convex set, and (C.2).

Statement 3 and 4 follows directly from Lemma C.1. Item 5 is proved in Proposition C.7. \square

We also record the following consequence of Theorem 4.1.

Lemma C.2. *The period $T_E := T(\gamma_h^E)$ and action l_h^E as functions of E are strictly monotone for $E > 0$.*

Proof. Let γ_h^E be a minimal geodesic of g_E , then for any $E' < E$ we have

$$l_{E'}(h) \leq \int \sqrt{g_{E'}(\dot{\gamma}_h^E)} < \int \sqrt{g_E(\dot{\gamma}_h^E)} = l_E(h),$$

therefore $l_E(h)$ is strictly monotone.

To prove strict monotonicity of T_E application of Theorem C.1 part 2 gives

$$\mathcal{LF}_\beta(h/T_E) \cdot h = l_h^E h^* \cdot h,$$

where $h^* \cdot h > 0$. Since $\mathcal{LF}_\beta(h/T_E)$ are distinct for different E , $T_E \neq T_{E'}$ for $E \neq E'$, proving strict monotonicity. \square

C.2 Characterization of the channel and the Aubry sets

In this section we provide a precise characterization of the set

$$\mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h) = l_E(h) h^* + [a_E^-(h), a_E^+(h)] h^\perp.$$

For each $E > 0$, define

$$d_E^\pm(h) = \pm \inf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (l_E(nh \pm \bar{h}) - l_E(nh)),$$

where h, \bar{h} is a basis in $H_1(T^2, \mathbb{R})$ and the dual of \bar{h} satisfies $\langle \bar{h}^*, h \rangle = 0$ so we denote it h^\perp . Note that the sequence $l_E(nh \pm \bar{h}) - l_E(nh)$ is decreasing, so the infimum coincides with the limit. We will omit dependence on h when it is not important.

Lemma C.3. *The function $d_E^\pm(h)$ is continuous in $E > 0$.*

Proof. From the sub-linearity of $l_E(h)$, we get,

$$-l_E(\bar{h}) \leq l_E(nh \pm \bar{h}) - l_E(nh) \leq l_E(\bar{h}),$$

as a result, the family $l_E(nh \pm \bar{h}) - l_E(nh)$ as a function of $E \in [E_1, E_2] \subset (0, \infty)$ is equi-continuous and equi-bounded. Then there exists a subsequence such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} l_E(nh \pm \bar{h}) - l_E(nh) = d_E^\pm(h)$$

uniformly. This implies $d_E^\pm(h)$ is continuous. The same argument works for $d_E^-(h)$. \square

Proposition C.4. *For each $E > 0$, we have*

$$d_E^\pm(h) = a_E^\pm(h).$$

Proof. We first show

$$d_E^-(h) \leq a_E^-(h) \leq a_E^+(h) \leq d_E^+(h).$$

Omit dependence on h . Denote $c^+ = l_E(h)h^* + a_E^+h^\perp$, by definition, $l_E(h) - \langle c^+, h \rangle = 0$. By Lemma C.1, statement 1, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - \langle c^+, nh + \bar{h} \rangle &= l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - nl_E(h) - \langle c^+, \bar{h} \rangle \\ &= l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - nl_E(h) - a_E^+. \end{aligned}$$

Take infimum in n , we have $d_E^+ - a_E^+ \geq 0$. Perform the same calculation with $nh + \bar{h}$ replaced by $nh - \bar{h}$, we obtain $0 \leq l_E(nh - \bar{h}) - nl_E(h) + a_E^-$, hence $a_E^- - d_E^- \geq 0$.

We now prove the opposite direction. Take any $c \in l_E(h)h^* + [d_E^-, d_E^+]h^\perp$, we first show that $\alpha(c) = E$.

Take $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}h + \mathbb{Q}\bar{h}$, then any invariant measure μ with rotation number ρ is supported on some $[\gamma] = m_1h + m_2\bar{h}$ with $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let T denote the period, by Lemma C.5 below,

$$\beta(\rho) + E = l_E(m_1h + m_2\bar{h})/T \geq \langle c, m_1h + m_2\bar{h} \rangle / T = \langle c, \rho \rangle.$$

Since β is continuous, we have $\alpha(c) = \sup \langle c, \rho \rangle - \beta(\rho) \leq E$, where the supremum is taken over all rational ρ 's. Since the equality is achieved at $\rho = h$, we conclude that $\alpha(c) = E$.

By Lemma C.1, statement 2, the measure supported on γ_h^E is c -minimal, and hence $c \in \mathcal{LF}_\beta(\lambda_h^E h)$. \square

Recall h, \bar{h} form a basis in $H_1(T^2, \mathbb{Z})$ and the dual of \bar{h} is perpendicular to h and denoted by h^\perp .

Lemma C.5. For any $c \in l_E(h)h^* + [d_E^-, d_E^+]h^\perp$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$l_E(m_1h + m_2\bar{h}) - \langle c, m_1h + m_2\bar{h} \rangle \geq 0.$$

Moreover, if $c \in l_E(h)h^* + (d_E^-, d_E^+)h^\perp$ and $m_1, m_2 \neq 0$, there exists $a > 0$ such that

$$l_E(m_1h + m_2\bar{h}) - \langle c, m_1h + m_2\bar{h} \rangle > a > 0.$$

Proof. The inequality for $m_1 = 0$ or $m_2 = 0$ follows from positive homogeneity of l_E . We now assume $m_1, m_2 \neq 0$.

If $m_2 > 0$, for a sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, have

$$\begin{aligned} & l_E(m_1h + m_2\bar{h}) - \langle c, m_1h + m_2\bar{h} \rangle \\ &= l_E(m_1h + m_2\bar{h}) + l_E((nm_2 - m_1)h) - \langle c, nm_2h + m_2\bar{h} \rangle \\ &\geq l_E(m_2(nh + \bar{h})) - \langle c, m_2(nh + \bar{h}) \rangle = m_2(l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - \langle c, nh + \bar{h} \rangle) \\ &\geq l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - \langle c, nh + \bar{h} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - \langle c, nh + \bar{h} \rangle = l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - nl_E(h) - \langle c, \bar{h} \rangle,$$

for $c \in l_E(h)h^* + (d_E^-, d_E^+)h^\perp$, then there exists $a > 0$ such that for sufficiently large n ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - nl_E(h) - \langle c, \bar{h} \rangle > a.$$

For $m_2 < 0$, we replace the term $(nm_2 - m_1)h$ with $(-nm_2 - m_1)h$ in the above calculation. \square

We have the following characterization of the Aubry sets for the cohomologies contained in the channel.

Proposition C.6. For any $E > 0$ and $c \in l_E(h)h^* + (d_E^-, d_E^+)h^\perp$, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c) = \gamma_h^E$$

if E is not a bifurcation value and

$$\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c) = \gamma_h^E \cup \bar{\gamma}_h^E$$

if E is a bifurcation value.

Proof. We first consider the case when E is not a bifurcation value. Since γ_h^E is the unique closed shortest geodesic, if $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c) \supseteq \gamma_h^E$, it must contain an infinite orbit γ^+ . Moreover, as γ_h^E supports the unique minimal measure, the orbit γ^+ must

be biasymptotic to γ_h^E . As a consequence, there exists $T_n, T'_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\gamma^+(-T_n) - \gamma^+(T'_n) \rightarrow 0$. By closing this orbit using a geodesic, we obtain a closed piece-wise geodesic curve γ_n . Moreover, since γ^+ has no self-intersection, we can arrange it such that γ_n also have no self-intersection. We have

$$\int (L - c \cdot v + \alpha(c))(d\gamma_n) = \int (L + E)(d\gamma_n) - \langle c, [\gamma_n] \rangle = l_E(\gamma_n) - \langle c, [\gamma_n] \rangle.$$

By the definition of the Aubry set, and take limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} l_E(\gamma_n) - \langle c, [\gamma_n] \rangle = 0.$$

Since γ_n has no self intersection, we have $[\gamma_n]$ is irreducible. However, this contradicts to the strict inequality obtained in Lemma C.5.

We now consider the case when E is a bifurcation value, and there are two shortest geodesics γ_h^E and $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$. Assume by contradiction that $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c) \supseteq \gamma_h^E \cup \bar{\gamma}_h^E$. For mechanical systems on \mathbb{T}^2 , the Aubry set satisfies an ordering property. As a consequence, there must exist two infinite orbits γ_1^+ and γ_2^+ contained in the Aubry set, where γ_1^+ is forward asymptotic to γ_h^E and backward asymptotic to $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$, and γ_2^+ is forward asymptotic to $\bar{\gamma}_h^E$ and backward asymptotic to γ_h^E . Then there exists $T_n, T'_n, S_n, S'_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\gamma_1^+(T'_n) - \gamma_2^+(-S_n), \gamma_2^+(S'_n) - \gamma_1^+(-T_n) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The curves $\gamma_{1,2}^+, \gamma_h^E, \bar{\gamma}_h^E$ are all disjoint on \mathbb{T}^2 . Similar to the previous case, we can construct a piecewise geodesic, non-self-intersecting closed curve γ_n with

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int (L - c \cdot v + \alpha(c))(d\gamma_n) = 0.$$

This, however, lead to a contradiction for the same reason as the first case. □

C.3 The width of the channel

We show that under our assumptions, the “width” of the channel

$$d_E^+(h) - d_E^-(h) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - l_E(nh)) + \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (l_E(nh - \bar{h}) - l_E(nh)),$$

is non-zero.

The following statement is a small modification of a theorem of Mather (see [62]), we provide a proof using our language.

Proposition C.7. *For $E > 0$, assume that the torus \mathbb{T}^2 is not completely foliated by shortest closed g_E -geodesics in the homology h . Then*

$$d_E^+(h) - d_E^-(h) > 0.$$

Remark C.1. This is the last item of Theorem C.1.

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} denote the union of all shortest closed g_E -geodesics in the homology h . We will show that $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathbb{T}^2$ implies $d_E^+(h) - d_E^-(h) > 0$. Omit h dependence. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote

$$d_n = (l_E(nh + \bar{h}) - l_E(nh)) + (l_E(nh - \bar{h}) - l_E(nh)).$$

Assume by contradiction that $\inf d_n = \lim d_n > 0$.

Let γ_0 be a shortest geodesic in homology h . We denote $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ its lift to the universal cover, and use " $\leq_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ " to denote the order on $\tilde{\gamma}$ defined by the flow. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be shortest curves in the homology $nh + \bar{h}$ and $nh - \bar{h}$ respectively, and let T_1 and T_2 be their periods. γ_i depends on n but we will not write it down explicitly.

Let $\tilde{\gamma}_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2$ denote a lift of γ_i to the universal cover. Using the standard curve shortening lemma in Riemannian geometry, it's easy to see that $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ may intersect at most once. Let $a \in \gamma_0 \cap \gamma_1$ and lift it to the universal cover without changing its name. Let $b \in \gamma_0 \cap \gamma_2$, and we choose a lift in $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ by the largest element such that $b \leq a$. We now choose the lifts $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ of γ_i , $i = 1, 2$, by the relations $\tilde{\gamma}_1(0) = a$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_2(T_2) = b$.

We have for $1 \leq k \leq 2n$, $\tilde{\gamma}_2(T_2) + kh > \tilde{\gamma}_1(0)$ and

$$\tilde{\gamma}_2(0) + kh = b - (nh - \bar{h}) + kh \leq_{\tilde{\gamma}_0} a + nh + \bar{h} = \tilde{\gamma}_1(T_1).$$

As a consequence, $\tilde{\gamma}_2 + kh$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ has a unique intersection. Let

$$x_k = (\tilde{\gamma}_2 + kh) \cap \tilde{\gamma}_1, \quad \bar{x}_k = (\tilde{\gamma}_2 + kh) \cap (\tilde{\gamma}_1 - h).$$

We have x_k is in increasing order on $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ and \bar{x}_k is in decreasing order after projection to γ_2 (see Figure C.1). Define

$$\tilde{\gamma}_k^* = (\tilde{\gamma}_2 + kh)|[\bar{x}_k, x_k] * \tilde{\gamma}_1|[x_k, x_{k+1}],$$

and let γ_k^* be its projection to \mathbb{T}^2 . We have $[\gamma_k^*] = h$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2n} l_E(\gamma_k^*) = l_E(\gamma_1) + l_E(\gamma_2).$$

Using $l_E(\gamma_k) \geq l_E(h)$ and $l_E(\gamma_1) + l_E(\gamma_2) \leq 2nl_E(h) + d_n$, we obtain

$$l_E(h) \leq l_E(\gamma_k) \leq l_E(h) + d_n.$$

Any connected component in the complement of \mathcal{M} is diffeomorphic to an annulus. Pick one such annulus, and let $b > 0$ denote the distance between its




Figure C.1: Proof of Proposition C.7, green curves are $\tilde{\gamma}_k^*$'s.

boundaries. Since γ_1 intersects each boundary once, there exists a point $y_n \in \gamma_1$ such that $d(y_n, \mathcal{M}) = b/2$. Since $\gamma_1 \subset \bigcup_k \gamma_k^*$ there exists some γ_k^* containing y_n . By taking a subsequence if necessary, we may assume $y_n \rightarrow y_* \notin \mathcal{M}$. Using the above discussion, we have

$$l_E(h) \leq \inf_{y_* \in \gamma, [\gamma]=h} l_E(\gamma) \leq \inf_n l_E(h) + d_n = l_E(h).$$

Taking limits, we conclude that there exists a rectifiable curve γ_* containing y_* with $l_E(\gamma_*) = l_E(h)$, hence γ_* is a shortest curve. But $y_* \notin \mathcal{M}$, leading to a contradiction. \square

Proposition C.7 clearly applies to the slow system as there are either one or two shortest geodesics.

C.4 The case $E = 0$

We now extend the earlier discussions to the case $E = 0$. While the functions a_E^\pm is not defined at $E = 0$, the functions d_E^\pm is well defined at $E = 0$. Recall h, \bar{h} form a basis in $H_1(T^2, \mathbb{Z})$ and the dual of \bar{h} is perpendicular to h and denoted by h^\perp .

Proposition C.8. *The properties of the channel and the Aubry sets depends on the type of homology h .*

1. *Assume h is simple and critical.*

- (a) $d_0^+(h) - d_0^-(h) > 0$.
- (b) $l_0(h)h^* + [d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h)]h^\perp \subset \mathcal{LF}_\beta(0)$.
- (c) For $c \in l_0(h)h^* + [d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h)]h^\perp$, we have $\gamma_h^0 \subset \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$;
For $c \in l_0(h)h^* + (d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h))h^\perp$, we have $\gamma_h^0 = \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$.

2. Assume h is simple and non-critical.

- (a) $d_0^+(h) - d_0^-(h) > 0$.
- (b) $l_0(h)h^* + [d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h)]h^\perp \subset \mathcal{LF}_\beta(0)$.
- (c) For $c \in l_0(h)h^* + [d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h)]h^\perp$, we have $\gamma_h^0 \cup \{0\} \subset \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$;
For $c \in l_0(h)h^* + (d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h))h^\perp$, we have $\gamma_h^0 \cup \{0\} = \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$.
- (d) The functions $d_E^\pm(h)$ is right-continuous at $E = 0$.

3. Assume h is non-simple and $h = n_1h_1 + n_2h_2$, with h_1, h_2 simple.

- (a) $d_0^+(h) = d_0^-(h)$. Moreover, let $c^*(h) = l_E(h_1)h_1^* + l_E(h_2)h_2^*$, where (h_1^*, h_2^*) is the dual basis to (h_1, h_2) , then

$$c^* = l_E(h)h^* + d_0^\pm(h)h^\perp,$$

where h^\perp is a unit vector perpendicular to h .

- (b) $\gamma_{h_1}^0 \cup \gamma_{h_2}^0 = \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c^*)$.
- (c) $d_0^+(h_1) - d_0^-(h_1) > 0$ with

$$l_E(h_1)h_1^* + d_0^+(h_1)h_2^* = c^*.$$

Before proving Proposition C.8, we first explain how the proof of Proposition C.7 can be adapted to work even for $E = 0$.

Lemma C.9. *Assume that there is a unique g_0 -shortest geodesic in the homology h . Then*

$$d_0^+(h) - d_0^-(h) > 0.$$

Proof. We will try to adapt the proof of Proposition C.7. Let γ_0, γ_1 and γ_2 be shortest geodesics in homologies $h, nh + \bar{h}$ and $nh - \bar{h}$, respectively. We choose an arbitrary parametrization for γ_i on $[0, T]$. Note that the parametrization is only continuous in general.

The proof of Proposition C.7 relies only on the property that lifted shortest geodesics intersects at most once. For $E = 0$, we will rely on a weaker property.

Let $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ be the lifts to the universal cover \mathbb{R}^2 . The degenerate point $\{0\}$ lifts to the integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 . Since g_0 is a Riemannian metric away from the integers, using the shortening argument, we have: if γ_i intersect γ_j at more than one point, then either the intersections occur only at integer points, or the two curve coincide on a segment with integer end points.

Let $a_0 \in \gamma_0 \cap \gamma_1$ and let $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ be lifts with $\tilde{\gamma}_0(0) = \tilde{\gamma}_1(0) = a_0$. If $a_0 \notin \mathbb{Z}^2$, then it is the only intersection between the two curves. If $a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we define a'_0

to be the largest intersection between $\tilde{\gamma}_0|[0, T)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ according to the order on $\tilde{\gamma}_0$. a'_0 is necessarily an integer point, and since $a'_0 \in \tilde{\gamma}_0$, there exists $n_1 < n$ such that $a'_0 - a_0 = n_0 h$. Moreover, using the fact that $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ is minimizing, we have

$$l_0(\tilde{\gamma}_0|[a_0, a'_0]) = l_0(\tilde{\gamma}_1|[a_0, a'_0]).$$

We now apply a similar argument to $\tilde{\gamma}_0 + \bar{h}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_1$. Let $a_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_0(T) + \bar{h} = \tilde{\gamma}_1(T)$ and let a'_1 be the smallest intersection between $\tilde{\gamma}_0|(0, T]$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_1$. Then there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_0 + n_1 < n$, such that $a_1 - a'_1 = n_1 h$. Moreover,

$$l_0((\tilde{\gamma}_0 + \bar{h})|[a'_1, a_1]) = l_0(\tilde{\gamma}_1|[a'_1, a_1]).$$

Let $\tilde{\eta}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_1|[a'_0, a'_1]$ and η_1 be its projection. We have $[\eta] = (n - n_0 - n_1)h + \bar{h} =: m_1 h + \bar{h}$, and

$$l_0(\eta_1) - m_1 l_0(h) = l_0(\gamma_1) - n l_0(h).$$

The curve η_1 has the property that it intersects γ_0 only once. Apply the same argument to γ_2 , we obtain a curve η_2 with $[\eta_2] = m_2 h - \bar{h}$, and

$$l_0(\eta_2) - m_2 l_0(h) = l_0(\gamma_2) - n l_0(h).$$

To proceed as in the proof of Proposition C.7, we show that if $\tilde{\eta}_1$ and $\tilde{\eta}_2$ are lifts of η_1 and η_2 with the property that

$$\tilde{\eta}_1(0), \tilde{\eta}_2(T) \in \{\tilde{\gamma}_0(t)\}, \quad \tilde{\eta}_1(T), \tilde{\eta}_2(0) \in \{\tilde{\gamma}_0(t) + \bar{h}\},$$

then $\tilde{\eta}_1$ and $\tilde{\eta}_2$ intersects only once. Indeed, there are no integer points between $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_0 + \bar{h}$.

We have

$$l_0(\eta_1) - m_1 l_0(h) + l_0(\eta_2) - m_2 l_0(h) = d_n,$$

where d_n is as defined in Proposition C.7. Assume $\inf d_n = 0$, proceed as in the proof of Proposition C.7, we obtain curves $[\gamma_k] = h$, positive distance away from γ_0 , such that

$$l_0(h) \leq l_0(\gamma_k) \leq l_0(h) + d_n.$$

This leads to a contradiction. □

Proof of Proposition C.8. Case 1, h is simple and critical.

(a) This follows from Lemma C.9.

(b) We note that Lemma C.5 depends only on positive homogeneity and sub-additivity of $l_E(h)$, and hence applies even when $E = 0$. We obtain for $c \in l_0(h)h^* + [d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h)]\bar{h}^*$

$$l_0(h') - \langle c, h' \rangle \geq 0, \forall h' \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z}^2).$$

Since $l_E(h)$ is strictly increasing, we obtain $l_E(h') - \langle c, h' \rangle > 0$ for $E > 0$. By Lemma C.1, there are no c -minimal measures with energy $E > 0$. As a consequence, $\alpha(c) = 0$. Since $\{0\}$ is a c -minimal measure with rotation number 0, we conclude $l_0(h)h^* + [d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h)]\bar{h}^* \subset \mathcal{LF}_\beta(0)$.

(c) Since we proved $\alpha(c) = 0$, the first conclusion follows from Lemma C.1. For the second conclusion, we verify that the proof of Proposition C.6 for non-bifurcation val applies to this case.

(d) The set function $[d_E^-(h), d_E^+(h)]$ is upper semi-continuous at $E = 0$ from the right, by definition. We will show that it is continuous. Assume by contradiction that

$$[\liminf_{E \rightarrow 0^+} d_E^-(h), \limsup_{E \rightarrow 0^+} d_E^+(h)] \subsetneq [d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h)].$$

Then there exists $c \in l_0(h)h^* + (d_0^-(h), d_0^+(h))\bar{h}^*$ and

$$c(E) \notin l_E(h)h^* + [d_E^-(h), d_E^+(h)]h^\perp$$

such that $c(E) \rightarrow c$. By part (c), the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$ supports a unique minimal measure. By Proposition 7.3, the Aubry set is upper semi-continuous in c . Hence any limit point of $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c(E))$ as $E \rightarrow 0$ is in $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$. This implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(c(E))$ approaches γ_h^E as $E \rightarrow 0$. Since γ_h^E is the unique closed geodesic in a neighbourhood of itself, we conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{H^s}(c(E)) = \gamma_h^E$ for sufficiently small E . But this contradicts with $c(E) \notin l_E(h)h^* + [d_E^-(h), d_E^+(h)]h^\perp$.

Case 2, h is simple and non-critical.

(a) This follows from Lemma C.9.

(b) The proof is identical to case 1.

(c) For the first conclusion, we can directly verify that $\gamma_h^0 \subset \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$ and $\{0\} \subset \mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$. For the second conclusion, we note that proof of Proposition C.6 for bifurcation values applies to this case.

Case 3, h is non-simple with $h = n_1h_1 + n_2h_2$.

(a) Assume that $\bar{h} = m_1h_1 + m_2h_2$ for some $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. For sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $nh \pm \bar{h} \in \mathbb{N}h_1 + \mathbb{N}h_2$. As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} l_0(nh \pm \bar{h}) - l_0(nh) &= (nn_1 \pm m_1)l_0(h_1) + (nn_2 \pm m_2)l_0(h_2) - (nn_1l_0(h_1) + nn_2l_0(h_2)) \\ &= \pm m_1l_0(h_1) \pm m_2l_0(h_2). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain $d_0^+(h) - d_0^-(h) = 0$ by definition.

We check directly that

$$l_0(h) - \langle c^*, h \rangle = 0.$$

Since $l_0(h)h^* + d_0^-(h)h^\perp = l_0(h)h^* + d_0^+(h)h^\perp$ is the unique c with this property. The second claim follows.

(b) We note that any connected component of the complement to $\gamma_{h_1}^0 \cup \gamma_{h_2}^0$ is contractible. If $\mathcal{A}_{H^s}(c)$ has other components, the only possibility is a contractible orbit bi-asymptotic to $\{0\}$. However, such an orbit can never be minimal, as the fixed point $\{0\}$ has smaller action.

(c) The statement $d_0^+(h_1) - d_0^-(h_1) > 0$ follows from part 1(a). For the second claim, we compute

$$d_0^+(h_1) = \inf_n l_0(nh_1 + h_2) - l_0(nh_2) = l_0(h_2)$$

and the claim follows. □

Acknowledgment

V.K. has been partially supported of the NSF grant DMS-1402164 and enjoyed the hospitality of the ETH Institute for Theoretical Studies. He has been partially supported by the Dr. Max Ressler, the Walter Haefner Foundation and the ETH Zurich Foundation. K.Z. is supported by the NSERC Discovery grant, reference number 436169-2013, and thank the hospitality of the Institute for Theoretical Studies for visiting in 2017. During the spring semester of 2012 the authors visited the Institute for Advanced Study. They acknowledge hospitality and a highly stimulating research atmosphere. The authors are grateful to John Mather for numerous inspiring discussions. The course of lectures Mather gave in the spring of 2009 was very helpful for the authors. The authors thank Abed Bounemoura and Chong-Qing Cheng for helpful comments on preliminary versions of this paper. Bounemoura pointed out some errors related to normal forms and Cheng on error related to total disconnectedness of Mañé sets. The authors are thankful to Giovanni Forni for helpful remarks on exposition.

D Notations

We provide a list of notations for the reader's convenience.

D.1 Formulation of the main result

(θ, p, t)	A point in the phase space $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}$.
$\phi_H^{s,t}$	The Hamiltonian flow for a non-autonomous Hamiltonian.
Φ_H^t	The Hamiltonian flow for an autonomous Hamiltonian.

$H_\epsilon = H_0 + \epsilon H_1$	Nearly integrable system.
D	A fixed constant controlling the norm and convexity of H_0 .
$\mathbb{Z}_*^3 = \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, 1)\}$	Set of integer vectors defining a resonance relation.
$k = (k^1, k^2, k^0)$	Resonance vectors, contained in \mathbb{Z}_*^3 .
S_k	Single resonance surface in the action space given by $k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3$.
Γ_k	Single resonance segment, a closed segment contained in S_k .
S_{k_1, k_2}	Double resonance point in the action space given by $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_*^3$.
\mathcal{S}^r	The unit sphere of the C^r functions.
\mathcal{P}	Diffusion path consisting of segments of single resonance segments.
$\mathcal{K} = \{(k, \Gamma_k)\}$	Collection of resonances and resonance segments making up a diffusion path.
$\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P})$	An open and dense set in \mathcal{S}^r defining the “non-degenerate perturbations” relative to a diffusion path.
$\mathcal{U}_{SR}^\lambda(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1})$	Set of $H_1 \in \mathcal{S}^r$ satisfying the quantitative non-resonance conditions $[SR1_\lambda] - [SR3_\lambda]$ relative to the resonant segment (k_1, Γ_{k_1}) .
$\mathcal{U}_{DR}(k_1, k_2)$	Set of $H_1 \in \mathcal{S}^r$ satisfying the non-degeneracy conditions $[DR1^h] - [DR3^h]$ and $[DR1^c] - [DR4^c]$.
$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{U}, \epsilon_0)$	A “cusp” set of perturbations, equal to $\{\epsilon H_1 : H_1 \in \mathcal{U}, 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0(H_1)\}$.
$\mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, \lambda)$	Set of strong additional resonances relative to the resonance segment Γ_{k_1} , for an perturbation $H_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{SR}^\lambda(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1})$.
B_σ	Ball in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n .
$\mathcal{V}_\sigma^r, \mathcal{V}_\sigma$	Ball in the functional space C^r . When supscript is not indicated, then stands for C^r where r is from the main theorem.

D.2 Weak KAM and Mather theory

$\varpi = \varpi(H)$	The period of a time periodic Hamiltonian, i.e. $H(\theta, p, t + \varpi) = H(\theta, p, t)$.
$\mathbb{T}_\varpi = \mathbb{R}/(\varpi\mathbb{Z})$	Torus with period ϖ .
$\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H}(D)$	A family of Hamiltonians satisfying uniform conditions depending on the parameter $D > 1$.
$L = L_H$	The Lagrangian of H .
$L_{H,c}$	The “penalized” Lagrangian $L_H(\theta, v, t) - c \cdot v$.
$A_{H,c}(x, s, y, t)$	The minimal action for the Lagrangian $L_{H,c}$.
$\alpha_H(c), \alpha_L(c)$	Mather’s alpha function.

$\beta_H(\rho), \beta_L(\rho)$	Mather's beta function.
$h_{H,c}(x, s, y, t)$	The time dependent Peierl's barrier function.
$h_{H,c}(x, y)$	The discrete Peierl's barrier function, equal to $h_{H,c}(x, 0, y, 0)$.
$d_{H,c}(x, s, y, t)$	Mather's semi-distance
$T_c^{s,t}u(x)$	Lax-Oleinik semi-group defined on \mathbb{T}^n .
$\partial^+u(x)$	The supergradient of a semi-concave function at x .
$\mathcal{G}_{c,w}, w = w(\theta, t)$	The time-dependent pseudograph as a subset of $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, or $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}_\varpi$.
$\tilde{I}(c, w)$	The maximum invariant set contained in the pseudograph $\mathcal{G}_{c,w}$.
$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_H(c), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c), \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H(c)$	The continuous (Hamiltonian) Mather, Aubry and Mañe set, defined on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{T}_{\varpi(H)}$.
$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_H^0(c), \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H^0(c), \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_H^0(c)$	The discrete (Hamiltonian) Mather, Aubry and Mañe set, defined on $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, invariant under the map $\phi_H = \phi_H^{\varpi(H)}$.
$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(H, c)$	A static class of the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_H(c)$.
$c \vdash c'$	The forcing relation.
$c \dashv\vdash c'$	The forcing equivalence relation.

D.3 Single resonance

$[H_1]_{k_1}$	The average of H_1 relative to the resonance k_1 .
$[H_1]_{k_1, k_2}$	The average of H_1 relative to the double resonance k_1, k_2 .
Φ_ϵ	The averaging coordinate change at single resonance.
N_ϵ	Normal form under the coordinate change. Same notation is used at double resonance.
$Z_{k_1}(\theta^s, p, t)$	The resonant component of H_1 relative to the resonance k_1 .
$R(\theta, p, t)$	The remainder in the single resonance normal form.
$\mathcal{K}^{\text{st}}(k_1, \Gamma_{k_1}, K)$	Set of strong additional resonance k_2 intersecting Γ_{k_1} with norm at most K , plus any resonances in the diffusion path that intersect Γ_{k_1} .
$\Gamma_{k_1}^{SR}$	The punctured resonance segment after removing $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ neighborhoods of strong double resonances.
$\ \cdot\ _{C_I^r}$	The rescaled C^r norm where the derivatives in the action variable are rescaled by $\sqrt{\epsilon}$.
T_ω	The period of the rational vector $(\omega, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^3$.
$B \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$	An integer matrix defining the linear coordinate change relative to a double resonance k_1, k_2 .

$(\theta^s, \theta^f, p^s, p^f, t)$	The coordinate at single resonance after taking a linear coordinate change. The resonance becomes $(1, 0, 0) \cdot (\omega, 1) = 0$ in this coordinate.
$(\Theta^s, P^s)(\theta^f, p^f, t)$	Normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder for the single resonant normal form, parametrized using the (θ^f, p^f, t) variables.

D.4 Double resonance

Φ_ϵ	The averaging coordinate change at double resonance.
N_ϵ	The normal form at double resonance.
Φ_L	The linear coordinate change corresponding to the double resonance k_1, k_2 .
$K(I)$	The kinetic energy of the slow mechanical system.
$U(\varphi)$	The potential function of the slow mechanical system.
g_E	The Jacobi metric at energy E of the slow mechanical system.
h	A homology class in $H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{Z})$.
γ_h^E	Shortest curves of the Jacobi metric in homology class h .
η_h^E	The Hamiltonian periodic orbit corresponding to the geodesic γ_h^E .
$\Phi_{\text{loc}}^{ij}, i, j \in \{+, -\}$	Local maps near the saddle fixed point of H^s .
Φ_{glob}	Global map along a homoclinic orbit η of H^s .
$\bar{c}_h(E)$	Curve of cohomologies chosen in the channel of h .
$\bar{\Gamma}_h$	Choice of cohomologies along the homology h .
$\bar{\Gamma}_h^e$	In the non-simple case, choice of cohomology curve above energy e .
$\bar{\Gamma}_{h_1}^{e, \mu}$	In the non-simple case, choice of cohomology along the adjacent simple homology h_1 .
Φ_L^*	The relation between cohomology class and alpha function after the coordinate change Φ_L .
$\Phi_{L, H_\epsilon^s}^*$	The relation between the cohomology classes for the coordinate change Φ_L . Depends on the alpha function of the system H_ϵ^s .
Γ_{k_1, k_2}^{DR}	The choice of cohomology classes at a double resonance k_1, k_2 .

References

- [1] Ralph Abraham, Jerrold E. Marsden, and Tudor S. Ratiu. *Manifolds, tensor analysis, and applications*, volume 2 of *Global Analysis Pure and Applied: Series B*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1983.
- [2] VI Amol'd, VV Kozlov, and AI Neishtadt. Mathematical aspects of classical and celestial mechanics. *Accomplishments in Science and Engineering*, 3:117–122, 1988.
- [3] Marie-Claude Arnaud. Green bundles and related topics. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians. Volume III*, pages 1653–1679. Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 2010.
- [4] V. I. Arnold. Small denominators and problems of stability of motion in classical and celestial mechanics. *Akademiya Nauk SSSR i Moskovskoe Matematicheskoe Obshchestvo. Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 18(6 (114)):91–192, 1963.
- [5] V. I. Arnold. Instability of dynamical systems with many degrees of freedom. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 156:9–12, 1964.
- [6] Vladimir I Arnold. The stability problem and ergodic properties for classical dynamical systems. In *Vladimir I. Arnold-Collected Works*, pages 107–113. Springer, 1968.
- [7] Vladimir I Arnold. Mathematical problems in classical physics. In *Trends and perspectives in applied mathematics*, pages 1–20. Springer, 1994.
- [8] Vladimir Igorevich Arnol'd. *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics*, volume 60. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [9] Patrick Bernard. Perturbation d'un hamiltonien partiellement hyperbolique. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences. Série I. Mathématique*, 323(2):189–194, 1996.
- [10] Patrick Bernard. Symplectic aspects of mather theory. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 136(3):401–420, 2007.
- [11] Patrick Bernard. The dynamics of pseudographs in convex Hamiltonian systems. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 21(3):615–669, 2008.
- [12] Patrick Bernard. On the conley decomposition of mather sets. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 26(1):115–132, 2010.

- [13] Patrick Bernard, Vadim Kaloshin, and Ke Zhang. Arnold diffusion in arbitrary degrees of freedom and normally hyperbolic invariant cylinders. *Acta Mathematica*, 217(1):1–79, 2016.
- [14] Massimiliano Berti and Philippe Bolle. A functional analysis approach to arnold diffusion. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis*, volume 19, pages 395–450. Elsevier, 2002.
- [15] Ugo Bessi. Arnold’s diffusion with two resonances. *Journal of differential equations*, 137(2):211–239, 1997.
- [16] Luca Biasco, Luigi Chierchia, and Dimitri Treschev. Stability of nearly integrable, degenerate hamiltonian systems with two degrees of freedom. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 16(1):79–107, 2006.
- [17] GD Birkhoff. Collected math papers. vol. 2, 1968.
- [18] SV Bolotin and PH Rabinowitz. A variational construction of chaotic trajectories for a hamiltonian system on a torus. *Bollettino dell’Unione Matematica Italiana*, 1(3):541–570, 1998.
- [19] Abed Bounemoura. Nekhoroshev estimates for finitely differentiable quasi-convex hamiltonians. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 249(11):2905–2920, 2010.
- [20] Jean Bourgain and Vadim Kaloshin. On diffusion in high-dimensional hamiltonian systems. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 229(1):1–61, 2005.
- [21] MJ Dias Carneiro. On minimizing measures of the action of autonomous lagrangians. *Nonlinearity*, 8(6):1077, 1995.
- [22] O Castejón and V Kaloshin. Random iteration of maps on a cylinder and diffusive behavior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.03319*, 2015.
- [23] Chong-Qing Cheng. Dynamics around the double resonance. *Cambridge Journal of Mathematics*, 5(2):153–228, 2017.
- [24] Chong-Qing Cheng and Jun Yan. Existence of diffusion orbits in a priori unstable hamiltonian systems. *J. Differential Geom.*, 67(3):457–517, 2004.
- [25] Chong-Qing Cheng and Jun Yan. Arnold diffusion in hamiltonian systems: a priori unstable case. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 82(2):229–277, 2009.
- [26] Gonzalo Contreras and Renato Iturriaga. Convex hamiltonians without conjugate points. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 19(4):901–952, 1999.

- [27] Gonzalo Contreras, Renato Iturriaga, and Hector Sanchez-Morgado. Weak solutions of the hamilton-jacobi equation for time periodic lagrangians. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.0287*, 2013.
- [28] M. N. Davletshin and D. V. Treshchev. Arnold diffusion in a neighborhood of low-order resonances. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 295(Sovremennye Problemy Mekhaniki):72–106, 2016.
- [29] Amadeu Delshams, Rafael De la Llave, and Tere M Seara. *A Geometric Mechanism for Diffusion in Hamiltonian Systems Overcoming the Large Gap Problem: Heuristics and Rigorous Verification on a Model: Heuristics and Rigorous Verification on a Model*, volume 179. American Mathematical Soc., 2006.
- [30] Amadeu Delshams, Marian Gidea, Rafael de la Llave, and Tere M Seara. Geometric approaches to the problem of instability in hamiltonian systems. an informal presentation. In *Hamiltonian dynamical systems and applications*, pages 285–336. Springer, 2008.
- [31] Amadeu Delshams and Gemma Huguet. Geography of resonances and arnold diffusion in a priori unstable hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 22(8):1997, 2009.
- [32] Amadeu Delshams and Rodrigo G. Schaefer. Arnold diffusion for a complete family of perturbations with two independent harmonics. *Preprint*.
- [33] Amadeu Delshams and Rodrigo G. Schaefer. Arnold diffusion for a complete family of perturbations. *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics*, 22(1):78–108, Jan 2017.
- [34] Paul Ehrenfest and Tatiana Ehrenfest. *The conceptual foundations of the statistical approach in mechanics*. Courier Corporation, 2002.
- [35] Albert Fathi. Weak kam theorem in lagrangian dynamics preliminary version number 10. *by CUP*, 2008.
- [36] Jacques Féjoz, Marcel Guàrdia, Vadim Kaloshin, and Pablo Roldán. Kirkwood gaps and diffusion along mean motion resonances in the restricted planar three-body problem. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 18(10):2315–2403, 2016.
- [37] Enrico Fermi. Dimostrazione che in generale un sistema meccanico normale è quasiergodico. *Il Nuovo Cimento (1911-1923)*, 25(1):267–269, 1923.
- [38] Giovanni Gallavotti. Fermi and ergodic problem. *preprint*, 2001.

- [39] Vassili Gelfreich and Dmitry Turaev. Unbounded energy growth in hamiltonian systems with a slowly varying parameter. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 283(3):769–794, 2008.
- [40] Vassili Gelfreich and Dmitry Turaev. Arnold diffusion in a priori chaotic symplectic maps. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 353(2):507–547, Jul 2017.
- [41] Marian Gidea and Rafael De La Llave. Topological methods in the instability problem of hamiltonian systems. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 14(2):295, 2006.
- [42] Marian Gidea and Jean-Pierre Marco. Diffusion along chains of normally hyperbolic cylinders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.08314*, 2017.
- [43] M Guardia, Vadim Kaloshin, and Jianlu Zhang. A second order expansion of the separatrix map for trigonometric perturbations of a priori unstable systems. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 348(1):321–361, 2016.
- [44] Morris W Hirsch, Charles Chapman Pugh, and Michael Shub. *Invariant manifolds*, volume 583. Springer, 2006.
- [45] V Kaloshin and K Zhang. Arnold diffusion for three and half degrees of freedom. *preprint*.
- [46] V Kaloshin and Ke Zhang. Dynamics of the dominant hamiltonian, with applications to arnold diffusion. *Bulletin de la Socit Mathmatique de France*, to appear, 2017.
- [47] Vadim Kaloshin, John N Mather, Enrico Valdinoci, et al. Instability of resonant totally elliptic points of symplectic maps in dimension 4. *Astérisque*, 297:79–116, 2004.
- [48] Vadim Kaloshin, Jianlu Zhang, and Ke Zhang. Normally hyperbolic invariant laminations and diffusive behaviour for the generalized arnold example away from resonances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.04835*, 2015.
- [49] Vadim Kaloshin and Ke Zhang. A strong form of arnold diffusion for two and a half degrees of freedom. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.1150v2*, 2012.
- [50] Y Katznelson and DS Ornstein. Twist maps and aubry-mather sets. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 211:343–358, 1997.
- [51] P. Lochak. Hamiltonian perturbation theory: periodic orbits, resonances and intermittency. *Nonlinearity*, 6(6):885–904, 1993.

- [52] Jean-Pierre Marco. Chains of compact cylinders for cusp-generic nearly integrable convex systems on \mathbb{A}^3 . *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.02399*, 2016.
- [53] JP Marco. Arnold diffusion for cusp-generic nearly integrable convex systems on \mathbb{A}^3 . *Preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.02403>*, 2016.
- [54] Daniel Massart. On Aubry sets and Mather's action functional. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 134(1):157–171, 2003.
- [55] John Mather. Personal communication.
- [56] John Mather. Variational construction of trajectories for time periodic Lagrangian systems on the two torus. *preprint*, 1996.
- [57] John N Mather. Action minimizing invariant measures for positive definite Lagrangian systems. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 207(1):169–207, 1991.
- [58] John N Mather. Variational construction of orbits of twist diffeomorphisms. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 4(2):207–263, 1991.
- [59] John N Mather. Total disconnectedness of the quotient Aubry set in low dimensions. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 56(8):1178–1183, 2003.
- [60] John N Mather. Arnold diffusion. i: Announcement of results. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 124(5):5275–5289, 2004.
- [61] John N Mather. Arnold diffusion. ii. *preprint*, pages 1–185, 2008.
- [62] John N Mather. Order structure on action minimizing orbits. *Symplectic topology and measure preserving dynamical systems*, 512:41, 2010.
- [63] John N Mather. Shortest curves associated to a degenerate Jacobi metric on T^2 . *Progress in variational methods, Nankai Ser. Pure Appl. Math. Theoret. Phys.*, 7, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2011., 7:126–168, 2010.
- [64] John N Mather and Giovanni Forni. Action minimizing orbits in Hamiltonian systems. In *Transition to chaos in classical and quantum mechanics*, pages 92–186. Springer, 1994.
- [65] Marco Mazzucchelli and Alfonso Sorrentino. Remarks on the symplectic invariance of Aubry-Mather sets. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique. Académie des Sciences. Paris*, 354(4):419–423, 2016.
- [66] Richard McGehee. The stable manifold theorem via an isolating block. In *Symposium on Ordinary Differential Equations*, pages 135–144. Springer, 1973.

- [67] Elismar R Oliveira. On generic properties of lagrangians on surfaces: the kupka-smale theorem. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 21(2):551–569, 2008.
- [68] Charles Pugh, Michael Shub, and Amie Wilkinson. Hölder foliations. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 86(3):517–546, 1997.
- [69] Ludovic Rifford and Rafael O Ruggiero. Generic properties of closed orbits of hamiltonian flows from mañé’s viewpoint. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2012(22):5246–5265, 2011.
- [70] Leonid Pavlovich Shilnikov. On a Poincaré–Birkhoff problem. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 116(3):378–397, 1967.
- [71] Alfonso Sorrentino. *Action-minimizing Methods in Hamiltonian Dynamics (MN-50): An Introduction to Aubry-Mather Theory*. Princeton University Press, 2015.
- [72] D Treschev. Multidimensional symplectic separatrix maps. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 12(1):27–58, 2002.
- [73] D Treschev. Evolution of slow variables in a priori unstable hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 17(5):1803, 2004.
- [74] D Treschev. Arnold diffusion far from strong resonances in multidimensional a priori unstable hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 25(9):2717, 2012.
- [75] D Turaev and L Shilnikov. On the hamiltonian-systems with homoclinic curves for a saddle. *Doklady Akademii Nauk USSR*, 304(4):811–814, 1989.
- [76] Ke Zhang. Speed of arnold diffusion for analytic hamiltonian systems. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 186(2):255–290, 2011.
- [77] Ke Zhang. On the tangent cones of Aubry sets. *Annales de la Facult des Sciences de Toulouse, to appear*, 2017.