

# On birth of discrete Lorenz attractors under bifurcations of 3D maps with nontransversal heteroclinic cycles

Ivan I. Ovsyannikov<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*University of Bremen, MARUM, Department of Mathematics  
Bibliothekstrasse 5, 28359 Bremen, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Lobachevsky State University of Nizhny Novgorod, ITMM  
23 Gagarin av., 603022 Nizhny Novgorod, Russia*

Received August 17, 2017; in final form, Month XX, 20XX; accepted Month XX, 20XX

**Abstract**—Lorenz attractors are important objects in the modern theory of chaos. The reason from one side is that they are met in various natural applications (fluid dynamics, mechanics, laser dynamics, etc.). At the same time, Lorenz attractors are robust, in the sense that they are generally not destroyed by small perturbations (autonomous, non-autonomous, stochastic). This allows us to be sure that the observed in the experiment object is exactly the chaotic attractor, rather than a long-time periodic orbit.

Discrete-time analogs of the Lorenz attractor possess even more complicated structure – they allow homoclinic tangencies of invariant manifolds within the attractor. Thus, discrete Lorenz attractors belong to the class of wild chaotic attractors. These attractors can be born in codimension-three local and certain global (homoclinic and heteroclinic) bifurcations. While various homoclinic bifurcations leading to such attractors were studied, for heteroclinic cycles only cases when at least one of the fixed points is saddle-focus were considered to date.

In the present paper the case of a heteroclinic cycle consisting of saddle fixed points with a quadratic tangency of invariant manifolds, is considered. It is shown that in order to have a three-dimensional chaos such as the discrete Lorenz attractors, one needs to avoid the existence of lower-dimensional global invariant manifolds. Thus, it is assumed that either the quadratic tangency or the transversal heteroclinic orbit is non-simple. The main result of the paper is the proof that the original system is the limiting point in the space of dynamical systems of a sequence of domains in which the diffeomorphism possesses discrete Lorenz attractors.

MSC2010 numbers: 37C05, 37G25, 37G35

DOI: 10.0000/S1560354700000012

Keywords: Heteroclinic orbit, rescaling, 3D Henon map, bifurcation, Lorenz attractor

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since its discovery, the Lorenz attractor became an important object of the theory of dynamical systems. The reason is that it is a strange attractor that preserves its strangeness under small perturbations. It means that bifurcations may occur inside the attractor, but they do not lead to the appearance of simple attractors e.g. stable periodic orbits. Indeed, in the Lorenz attractor, while changing the parameters, numerous homoclinic bifurcations occur, but they lead only to the appearance and disappearance of saddle periodic orbits. Based on this, the Lorenz attractor is an object that can be observed in applications and experiments: even when the parameter values and initial conditions are given with tolerance, one can be sure that the trajectory still converges to a chaotic attractor rather than a periodic orbit with a large period.

This is not the case for many other known types of attractors, such as the Henon attractor, Rössler attractor, attractor in the Chua's circuit. These attractors exist for certain parameter values, but in any neighborhood of these values there exist systems with stable periodic orbits. Such attractors are called quasiattractors in the classification by Afraimovich and Shilnikov in [1]. The Lorenz attractor belongs to the class of genuine strange attractors according to this classification.

\*E-mail: [ivan.i.ovsyannikov@gmail.com](mailto:ivan.i.ovsyannikov@gmail.com); [iovsyann@uni-bremen.de](mailto:iovsyann@uni-bremen.de)

It is known that the Lorenz attractor contains infinitely many saddle periodic orbits, and their stable and unstable manifolds intersect transversely. In paper [2] an example of a *wild spiral attractor* was presented, in which stable and unstable sets in the chaotic attractor can have tangencies. In bifurcations breaking those tangencies, stable periodic orbits still do not appear, so that the attractor is also genuine. The wild spiral attractor belongs to the class of *wild hyperbolic attractors*, introduced and described in [2].

Another representative of this class is the discrete Lorenz attractor (see the definition in [3]). It can be regarded as a time-discretization of a classical Lorenz attractor under a periodic non-autonomous perturbation [4]. They can be met in applications, in particular, in the nonholonomic rattleback model [5] or a two-component convection [6]. Discrete Lorenz attractors are known to be born at local bifurcations of periodic orbits having three or more multipliers lying on the unit circle. The following 3D Hénon map

$$\bar{x} = y, \quad \bar{y} = z, \quad \bar{z} = M_1 + Bx + M_2y - z^2 \quad (1.1)$$

controlled by three independent parameters  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  and  $B$  is an example of a model that can undergo such codimension-three bifurcations. In papers [3, 7, 8] it was proved that map (1.1) possesses a discrete Lorenz-like attractor in some open parameter domain near point  $(M_1 = 1/4, B = 1, M_2 = 1)$ , where the map has a fixed point with the triplet  $(-1, -1, +1)$  of multipliers. The flow normal form of this bifurcation, after rescaling the coordinates and time, can be brought to the Shimizu-Morioka system:

$$\dot{X} = Y, \quad \dot{Y} = X(1 - Z) - \lambda Y, \quad \dot{Z} = -\alpha Z + X^2. \quad (1.2)$$

This system possesses the Lorenz attractor in some open domain of parameters as proved in [9]. Then, map (1.1) can be regarded as a time-shift map of periodically perturbed system (1.2). By [4], such a discretization has a chaotic attractor, that was called the discrete Lorenz attractor in [3].


This result immediately implies the existence of cascades discrete Lorenz attractors in global (homoclinic and heteroclinic) bifurcations in which map (1.1) appears as the first return map. The first such example was considered in [8] in case of a quadratic homoclinic tangency to a saddle-focus fixed point with a unit Jacobian. Later analogous results were obtained for non-simple homoclinic tangencies to saddle fixed points [10] and homoclinic tangencies to resonant saddle [11]. In heteroclinic cycles such bifurcations were studied only when it contains at least one saddle-focus [12–14]. Note that the presence of saddle-foci in these cases is a very important condition for the existence of Lorenz-like attractors as it prevents from the existence of lower-dimensional center manifolds and helps for the dynamics to be effectively three-dimensional (see [15]). Another important condition for this is the restriction on the Jacobians in the fixed points. It is based on the fact that the orbits under consideration may spend unboundedly large time in the neighbourhoods of the saddle fixed point. In the homoclinic case this means that if the Jacobian differs from one, the phase volumes near such orbits will be either unboundedly expanded or unboundedly contracted, and the dynamics will have effective dimension less than three. In the same way, for the heteroclinic cases it is necessary to demand for all the Jacobians not to be simultaneously contracting ( $< 1$ ) or expanding ( $> 1$ ). Thus, in order to get Lorenz attractors in heteroclinic cycles, one needs to consider “contracting-expanding” or “mixed” cases.

In the present paper the results of [12–14] are extended to the case of heteroclinic cycles that consist of saddles only, i.e. all the fixed points have only real multipliers. As it is known from [16, 17], in order to have the effective dimension of the corresponding problem to be equal to 3, an additional degeneracy assumptions should be imposed. Namely, one of the heteroclinic orbits is *non-simple* at the bifurcation moment. The case when the quadratic tangency is non-simple, was also called *generalized* tangency in [17]. However, in the heteroclinic cycle there is one more possibility — when the transversal heteroclinic orbit is non-simple (the required definitions are given below in section 2.). Such a case was not studied before.

**Remark 1.** The notion of a simple quadratic homoclinic tangency (that is analogous to the notion of a quasitransversal homoclinic intersection [18]) was introduced in [16]. For three-dimensional maps with a homoclinic tangency to a saddle point  $O$  with multipliers  $\nu_i, i = 1, 2, 3$  such that  $|\nu_1| < |\nu_2| < |\nu_3|$ , it implies the existence of a global two-dimensional invariant manifold  $\mathfrak{M}$  for all

nearby maps. This manifold contains all orbits entirely lying in a small fixed neighbourhood of the homoclinic orbit. In general, it is  $C^1$  only and particularly hyperbolic. If point  $O$  has type  $(2, 1)$ , i.e.  $|\nu_{1,2}| < 1 < |\nu_3|$ , the manifold is center-stable; if point  $O$  has type  $(1, 2)$ , i.e.  $|\nu_1| < 1 < |\nu_{2,3}|$ , the manifold is center-unstable. It implies that neither periodic nor strange attractors can be born at homoclinic bifurcations if  $|\nu_2\nu_3| > 1$ . However, as it was shown in [17], periodic attractors can appear even in these cases if the homoclinic tangency is non-simple, see also paper [19] in which the case of the point of type  $(1, 2)$  was considered in more details. These results are very important for the theory of dynamical chaos since they show that the appearance of non-simple homoclinic tangencies can destroy the “strangeness” of attractors.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 contains the statement of the problem, main definitions, three principally different cases of non-simple heteroclinic orbits are identified, and the main theorem is formulated. In section 3 the first return map is constructed and the rescaling lemma for all three cases is formulated. Section 4 contains the proof of the rescaling lemma, from which the statement of the main theorem follows directly.



**Fig. 1.** A heteroclinic cycle consisting of two saddles, with a quadratic tangency of manifolds.

## 2. Statement of the problem and main definitions

Consider a three-dimensional orientable  $C^r$ -diffeomorphism  $f_0$ ,  $r \geq 3$ , satisfying the following conditions (see Fig. 1):

**A)**  $f_0$  has two fixed points of saddle type:  $O_1$  with multipliers  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \gamma_1)$  where  $0 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_1 < 1 < \gamma_1$ , and  $O_2$  with multipliers  $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \gamma_2)$  such that  $0 < \nu_2 < \nu_1 < 1 < \gamma_2$ ,

**B)**  $J_1 = J(O_1) \equiv \lambda_1\lambda_2\gamma_1 < 1$ ,  $J_2 = J(O_2) \equiv \nu_1\nu_2\gamma_2 > 1$ ,

**C)** Invariant manifolds  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$  intersect transversely at the points of a heteroclinic orbit  $\Gamma_{12}$ , the invariant manifolds  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  have a quadratic tangency at the points of a heteroclinic orbit  $\Gamma_{21}$ .

it is also assumed that the heteroclinic cycle has an additional degeneracy, namely  $f_0$  satisfies to one of the following conditions:

**D1)** The transversal intersection of  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$  is *simple*<sup>1)</sup> and the quadratic tangency of  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  is *non-simple*.

<sup>1)</sup>The detailed definition of simple and non-simple heteroclinic orbits will be given below in this section.

**D2)** The transversal intersection of  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$  is *non-simple* and the quadratic tangency of  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  is *simple*.

The goal of the paper is the study of bifurcations of single-round periodic orbits in generic unfoldings of  $f_0$ . For this purpose the necessary number of parameters to take, should be identified. Diffeomorphisms close to  $f_0$  and satisfying either conditions **A–D1** or **A–D2** compose locally connected bifurcation surfaces of codimension two in the space of  $C^r$ -diffeomorphisms, thus the number of parameters must be at least two. It is natural to choose the splitting parameter of invariant manifolds  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  with respect to some point of  $\Gamma_{21}$  as the first parameter  $\mu_1$ . The second parameter  $\mu_2$  is taken to control conditions **D1** or **D2** in such a way that for  $\mu_1 = 0$  and  $\mu_2 \neq 0$  the corresponding degeneracy disappears i.e. in the case **D1** the tangency of  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  becomes simple and in the case **D2** the intersection of  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$  becomes simple. Also note that due to condition **B** we have the contracting-expanding (or mixed) case, which requires one more parameter  $\mu_3$  that will control the values of the Jacobians  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ . It is well known [12–14] that the following value effectively plays this role:

$$\mu_3 = S(f_\mu) - S(f_0), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $S(f)$  is a functional defined as  $S(f) = -\frac{\ln J_1}{\ln J_2}$ .

In order to define simple and non-simple heteroclinic orbits, recall some facts from the normal hyperbolicity theory. Let  $O$  be a saddle fixed points of type  $(2, 1)$  and  $U_0$  be some small neighbourhood of it. It is known [20–23] that diffeomorphism  $f_\mu|_{U_0}$  for each small  $\mu$  can be represented in some  $C^r$ -smooth local coordinates  $(x_1, x_2, y)$  as follows (the so-called *main normal form*):


$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_1 &= \lambda_1(\mu)x_1 + \tilde{H}_2(y, \mu)x_2 + O(\|x\|^2|y|) \\ \bar{x}_2 &= \lambda_2(\mu)x_2 + \tilde{R}_2(x, \mu) + \tilde{H}_4(y, \mu)x_2 + O(\|x\|^2|y|) \\ \bar{y} &= \gamma(\mu)y + O(\|x\||y|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\tilde{H}_{2,4}(0, \mu) = 0$ ,  $\tilde{R}_2(x, \mu) = O(\|x\|^2)$ . In coordinates (2.2) the invariant manifolds of saddle fixed point  $O$  are locally straightened: stable  $W_{loc}^s(O) : \{y = 0\}$ , unstable  $W_{loc}^u(O) : \{x_1 = 0, x_2 = 0\}$  and strong stable  $W_{loc}^{ss}(O) : \{x_1 = 0, y = 0\}$ .

According to [23, 24], an important role in dynamics is played by an *extended unstable manifold*  $W^{ue}(O)$ , see Fig. 2. By definition, it is a two-dimensional invariant manifold, tangent to the leading stable direction (corresponding to  $\lambda_1$ ) at the saddle point and containing unstable manifold  $W^u(O)$ . Unlike the previous ones, the extended unstable manifold is not uniquely defined and its smoothness is, generally speaking, only  $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ . Locally,  $W_{loc}^{ue}(O) = W^{ue}(O) \cap U_0$ , and the equation of  $W_{loc}^{ue}(O)$  has the form  $x_2 = \varphi(x_1, y)$ , where  $\varphi(0, y) \equiv 0$  and  $\varphi'_{x_1}(0, 0) = 0$ . Note that despite the fact that  $W^{ue}(O)$  is non-unique, all of them have the same tangent plane at each point of  $W^u(O)$ .

Another essential fact is the existence of the *strong stable invariant foliation*, see Fig. 2. In  $W^s(O)$  there exists a one-dimensional strong stable invariant submanifold  $W^{ss}(O)$ , which is  $C^r$ -smooth and touches at  $O$  the eigenvector corresponding to the strong stable (nonleading) multiplier  $\lambda_2$ . Moreover, manifold  $W^s(O)$  is foliated near  $O$  by the leaves of invariant foliation  $F^{ss}$  which is  $C^r$ -smooth, unique and contains  $W^{ss}(O)$  as a leaf.

Now consider diffeomorphism  $f_0$ . It has fixed points  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  and heteroclinic orbit  $\Gamma_{21}$  in the points of which manifolds  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  have a quadratic tangency. Everything mentioned above on the existence of extended unstable manifolds and strong stable foliations can be applied to each of the saddles. Let  $U_{01} \ni O_1$  and  $U_{02} \ni O_2$  be some small neighbourhoods of the fixed points,  $M_1^+ \in W_{loc}^s(O_1) \subset U_{01}$  and  $M_2^- \in W_{loc}^u(O_2) \subset U_{02}$  be two points of  $\Gamma_{21}$  and  $\Pi_1^+ \subset U_{01}$  and  $\Pi_2^- \subset U_{02}$  their respective neighborhoods. Note that there exists some integer  $q_1$  such that  $M_1^+ = f_0^{q_1}(M_2^-)$ . Define the global map along  $\Gamma_{21}$  for all small  $\mu$  as  $T_{21, \mu} : \Pi_2^- \rightarrow \Pi_1^+ = f_\mu^{q_1}|_{\Pi_2^-}$  (for simpler notation, further we will omit the subscript  $\mu$  for global and local maps, implicitly always assuming them to be the corresponding parametric families). The heteroclinic tangency of  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  is




**Fig. 2.** Invariant structures near a saddle fixed point. A part of the strong stable foliation  $F^{ss}$  containing the strong stable manifold  $W^{ss}$  and a piece of one of the extended unstable manifolds  $W^{ue}$  containing  $W^u$  and being transversal to  $W^{ss}$  at  $O$ .

called *simple* if image  $T_{21}(P^{ue}(M_2^-))$  of tangent plane  $P^{ue}(M_2^-)$  to  $W^{ue}(O_2)$  at point  $M_2^-$ , intersects transversely the leaf  $F_1^{ss}(M_1^+)$  of invariant foliation  $F_1^{ss}$ , containing point  $M_1^+$ . If this condition is not fulfilled we call such a quadratic tangency *non-simple*. Following [17], there may be only two generic cases of non-simple heteroclinic tangencies defined by condition **D1**:

Case I. *The surface  $T_{21}(P^{ue}(M_2^-))$  is transversal to the plane  $W_{loc}^s(O_1)$  but is tangent to the line  $F_1^{ss}(M_1^+)$  at point  $M_1^+$ , Fig.3 (a).*

Case II. *The surfaces  $T_{21}(P^{ue}(M_2^-))$  and  $W_{loc}^s(O_1)$  have a quadratic tangency at  $M_1^+$  and the curves  $T_{21}(W_{loc}^u(O_2) \cap \Pi_2^-)$  and  $F_1^{ss}(M_1^+)$  have a general intersection, Fig.3 (b).*

Thus, in Case I tangent vectors  $l_u$  to  $T_{21}(W_{loc}^u(O_2))$  and  $l_{ss}$  to  $F_1^{ss}(M_1^+)$  are collinear, while in Case II these vectors have different directions, the latter guarantees the absence of additional degeneracies.



**Fig. 3.** Two types of the non-simple quadratic (heteroclinic) tangency: (a)  $W^{ue}(O_2)$  is transversal to  $W_{loc}^s(O_1)$  and touches the leaf  $F^{ss}(M_1^+)$ ; (b)  $W^{ue}(O_2)$  is tangent to  $W_{loc}^s(O_1)$  and the curves  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $F^{ss}(M_1^+)$  have a general intersection at  $M_1^+$ .

Note that if saddle points  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  coincide, we formally obtain the known definition of a non-simple *homoclinic* tangency [10, 17, 19]. However, in distinct from the homoclinic case, the heteroclinic cycle under consideration allows one more degeneracy, related to the second heteroclinic orbit  $\Gamma_{12}$ . This is the case when the transversal heteroclinic intersection of manifolds  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$  is non-simple. Consider two heteroclinic points  $M_1^- \in U_{01}$  and  $M_2^+ \in U_{02}$  and their small respective neighbourhoods  $\Pi_1^- \subset U_{01}$  and  $\Pi_2^+ \subset U_{02}$ . Again, there exists some integer  $q_2$  such that  $M_2^+ = f_0^{q_2}(M_1^-)$  so that we define the global map from  $U_{01}$  to  $U_{02}$  as  $T_{12} : \Pi_1^- \rightarrow \Pi_2^+ = f_\mu^{q_2}|_{\Pi_1^-}$ . Let  $P^{ue}(M_1^-)$  be the tangent plane to  $W^{ue}(O_1)$  at  $M_1^-$  and  $F_2^{ss}(M_2^+)$  be the leaf of invariant foliation  $F_2^{ss}$  on  $W^s(O_2)$  passing through  $M_2^+$ . The heteroclinic intersection of  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$  is called *simple* if image  $T_{12}(P^{ue}(M_1^-))$  and leaf  $F_2^{ss}(M_2^+)$  intersect transversely. If this condition is not fulfilled the heteroclinic intersection is *non-simple*, see Fig. 4. Thus, under condition **D2**, we have




Fig. 4. A non-simple heteroclinic intersection of  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$ .

Case III. The surface  $T_{12}(P^{ue}(M_1^-))$  is transversal to the plane  $W_{loc}^s(O_2)$  but is tangent to the line  $F_2^{ss}(M_2^+)$  at  $M_2^+$ .

In the present paper the birth of discrete Lorenz attractors in cases I – III is studied. The main result is given by the following

**Theorem 1.** Let  $f_\mu$  be the three-parametric family under consideration ( $f_0$  satisfies **A–D** and  $f_\mu$  is a general unfolding of conditions **B**, **C** and **D**, where **D** is either **D1** or **D2**). Then, in any neighbourhood of the origin  $\mu = 0$  in the parameter space there exist infinitely many domains  $\delta_{ij}$ , where  $\delta_{ij} \rightarrow (0, 0, 0)$  as  $i, j \rightarrow \infty$ , such that the diffeomorphism  $f_\mu$  has at  $\mu \in \delta_{ij}$  a discrete Lorenz attractor.

### 3. The first return map and the rescaling lemma

Let  $U$  be a sufficiently small and fixed neighborhood of heteroclinic cycle  $\{O_1, O_2, \Gamma_{12}, \Gamma_{21}\}$ . It is composed as a union of small neighborhoods  $U_{01}$  and  $U_{02}$  of points  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  respectively, with a finite number of small neighborhoods  $U_i$  of those points of heteroclinic orbits  $\Gamma_{12}$  and  $\Gamma_{21}$  which do not belong to  $U_{01} \cup U_{02}$ . Each single-round periodic orbit lying entirely in a small neighborhood of the heteroclinic cycle should have exactly one intersection point with each of  $U_i$  and the rest points lying in  $U_{01} \cup U_{02}$ .

Consider heteroclinic points  $M_{1,2}^\pm$  and their respective small neighborhoods  $\Pi_{1,2}^\pm$  described in the previous section. Define the first return map as a composition of two local and two global maps. Local maps  $T_{01}$  and  $T_{02}$  are the restrictions of  $f_\mu$  onto  $U_{01}$  and  $U_{02}$  respectively and the global maps were defined in the following way:  $T_{12} = f_\mu^{q_1} : \Pi_1^- \rightarrow \Pi_2^+$ ,  $T_{21} = f_\mu^{q_2} : \Pi_2^- \rightarrow \Pi_1^+$ .

Begin iterating  $\Pi_1^+$  under the action of  $T_{O_1}$ . Starting from some number  $i_0$  images  $T_{O_1}^i \Pi_1^+$  will have a nonempty intersection with  $\Pi_1^-$ . The same applies for iterations of  $\Pi_2^+$ , there exists some  $j_0$  such that for any  $j \geq j_0$  image  $T_{O_2}^j \Pi_2^+$  has a nonempty intersection with  $\Pi_2^-$ . The first return map  $T_{ij} \equiv T_{21} T_{O_2}^j T_{12} T_{O_1}^i$  is thus defined on an infinite set of regions  $V_{ij}$  that lie in  $\Pi_1^+$  and shrink to  $M_1^+$  as  $i, j \rightarrow \infty$ . Their images  $f_\mu^i V_{ij}$  lie in  $\Pi_1^-$ , regions  $f_\mu^{i+q_1} V_{ij}$  lie in  $\Pi_2^+$ , and regions  $f_\mu^{i+q_1+j} V_{ij}$  lie in  $\Pi_2^-$ , so  $f_\mu^{i+q_1+j+q_2} V_{ij}$  lie in  $\Pi_1^+$  again.

To construct the first return map one needs first to write both local and global maps in the most suitable form. For both local maps  $T_{O_1}$  and  $T_{O_2}$  it is the main normal form (2.2). One its important property is that the iterations  $T_{O_m}^k : U_{0m} \rightarrow U_{0m}$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ , for any  $k$  can be calculated in a simple way, namely, in a form close to linear (see, for example, [22, 23]). Namely, for small  $\mu$  iterations  $T_{O_1}^k(\mu) : (x_0, y_0) \rightarrow (x_k, y_k)$  can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{1k} &= \lambda_1^k x_{10} + \hat{\lambda}^k \xi_{1k}(x_0, y_k, \mu), \\ x_{2k} &= \hat{\lambda}^k \xi_{2k}(x_0, y_k, \mu), \\ y_0 &= \gamma_1^{-k} y_k + \hat{\gamma}_1^{-k} \xi_{3k}(x_0, y_k, \mu), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

and iterations  $T_{O_2}^k(\mu) : (u_0, v_0) \rightarrow (u_k, v_k)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} u_{1k} &= \nu_1^k u_{10} + \hat{\nu}^k \xi_{4k}(u_0, v_k, \mu), \\ u_{2k} &= \hat{\nu}^k \xi_{5k}(u_0, v_k, \mu), \\ v_0 &= \gamma_2^{-k} v_k + \hat{\gamma}_2^{-k} \xi_{6k}(u_0, v_k, \mu). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Here  $0 < \hat{\lambda} < \lambda_1$ ,  $0 < \hat{\nu} < \nu_1$ ,  $\hat{\gamma}_{1,2} > \gamma_{1,2}$ , functions  $\xi_{mk}$  and their derivatives up to the order  $(r-2)$  are uniformly bounded and their higher order derivatives tend to zero, .

In normal coordinates (2.2) local stable and unstable manifolds of  $O_1$  in  $U_1$  are  $W_{loc}^s = \{y = 0\}$  and  $W_{loc}^u = \{x = 0\}$ , the local stable and unstable manifolds of  $O_2$  in  $U_2$  are  $W_{loc}^s = \{v = 0\}$  and  $W_{loc}^u = \{u = 0\}$ . Assume that for  $\mu = 0$ , we have  $M_1^- = (0, 0, y^-) \in W_{loc}^u(O_1)$ ,  $M_2^+ = (u_1^+, u_2^+, 0) \in W_{loc}^s(O_2)$ , and  $M_2^- = (0, 0, v^-) \in W_{loc}^u(O_2)$ ,  $M_1^+ = (x_1^+, x_2^+, 0) \in W_{loc}^s(O_1)$ . Then global maps for all small  $\mu$  are written as Taylor expansions near points  $M_1^-$  and  $M_2^-$ :

$$T_{12} : \begin{aligned} u - u^+ &= A^{(1)}x + b^{(1)}(y - y^-) + O(\|x\|^2 + \|x\| \cdot |y - y^-| + (y - y^-)^2), \\ v &= (c^{(1)})^\top x + d^{(1)}(y - y^-) + O(\|x\|^2 + \|x\| \cdot |y - y^-| + |y - y^-|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

$$T_{21} : \begin{aligned} \bar{x} - x^+ &= A^{(2)}u + b^{(2)}(v - v^-) + O(\|u\|^2 + \|u\| \cdot |v - v^-| + (v - v^-)^2), \\ \bar{y} = y^+ &+ (c^{(2)})^\top u + d^{(2)}(v - v^-)^2 + O(\|u\|^2 + \|u\| \cdot |v - v^-| + (v - v^-)^3), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where  $d^{(1)} \neq 0$  and  $d^{(2)} \neq 0$ , since  $W^u(O_1)$  and  $W^s(O_2)$  intersect transversely and the tangency between  $W^u(O_2)$  and  $W^s(O_1)$  is quadratic for  $\mu = 0$ . Moreover, both maps  $T_{12}$  and  $T_{21}$  are diffeomorphisms, so that we have

$$J_{12} = \det \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^{(1)} & a_{12}^{(1)} & b_1^{(1)} \\ a_{21}^{(1)} & a_{22}^{(1)} & b_2^{(1)} \\ c_1^{(1)} & c_2^{(1)} & d^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} \neq 0, \quad J_{21} = \det \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^{(2)} & a_{12}^{(2)} & b_1^{(2)} \\ a_{21}^{(2)} & a_{22}^{(2)} & b_2^{(2)} \\ c_1^{(2)} & c_2^{(2)} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0. \quad (3.5)$$

In particular, this means that  $\sqrt{b_1^{(2)2} + b_2^{(2)2}} \neq 0$  and  $\sqrt{c_1^{(2)2} + c_2^{(2)2}} \neq 0$  for  $\mu = 0$ .

Now consider conditions **D1** and **D2** separately.

Case I. Tangent plane  $P^{ue}(M_2^-)$  to  $W_{loc}^{ue}(O_2)$  at  $M_2^-$  has equation  $u_2 = 0$ . The equation of  $T_{21}(P_{ue}(M_2^-))$  at  $\mu = 0$  is obtained by putting  $u_2 = 0$  into (3.4). Then the transversality of  $T_{21}(P_{ue}(M_2^-))$  and  $W_{loc}^s(O_1)$  which has the equation  $\bar{y} = 0$ , yields  $c_1^{(2)}(0) \neq 0$ . The tangent vector to the line  $T_{21}(P_{ue}(M_2^-)) \cap W_{loc}^s(O_1)$  at point  $M_1^+$  is  $(b_1^{(2)}(0), b_2^{(2)}(0), 0)$ . The equation of leaf  $F^{ss}(M_1^+)$  is  $\{x_1 = x_1^+, y = 0\}$ . Therefore, the tangency of  $T_{21}(P_{ue}(M_2^-))$  and  $F^{ss}(M_1^+)$  implies  $b_1^{(2)}(0) = 0$ . In this case  $b_2^{(2)}(0) \neq 0$  and  $a_{11}^{(2)2} + a_{12}^{(2)2} \neq 0$  because of (3.5).

Case II. The equation of  $T_1(P^{ue}(M_2^-))$  at  $\mu = 0$  is the same as in Case I. Then the tangency of surfaces  $T_{21}(P^{ue}(M_2^-))$  and  $W_{loc}^s(O_1)$  at  $\mu = 0$  implies  $c_1^{(2)}(0) = 0$ . Also, the tangent vectors to the lines  $T_{21}(W_{loc}^u(O_2) \cap \Pi_2^-)$  and  $F^{ss}(M_1^+)$  at point  $M_1^+$  are non-parallel if  $b_1^{(2)}(0) \neq 0$ .

Case III. The equation of tangent plane  $P^{ue}(M_1^-)$  to  $W_{loc}^{ue}(O_1)$  at  $M_1^-$  is  $x_2 = 0$ . Putting this to (3.3) gives the equation of its image under  $T_{12}$ . The equation of leaf  $F^{ss}(M_2^+)$  is  $\{u_1 = u_1^+, v = 0\}$ . Thus this leaf will be tangent to  $T_{12}(P^{ue}(M_1^-))$  at  $\mu = 0$  if:

$$A_{11}^{(1)}(0) = a_{11}^{(1)}(0) - b_1^{(1)}(0)c_1^{(1)}(0)/d_1(0) = 0.$$

We are now able to write the non-simple heteroclinic orbit conditions in the explicit form for all three cases:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Case I : } & b_1^{(2)}(0) = 0, b_2^{(2)}(0) \neq 0, c_1^{(2)}(0) \neq 0, A_{11}^{(1)}(0) \neq 0. \\ \text{Case II : } & b_1^{(2)}(0) \neq 0, c_1^{(2)}(0) = 0, c_2^{(2)}(0) \neq 0, A_{11}^{(1)}(0) \neq 0. \\ \text{Case III : } & b_1^{(2)}(0) \neq 0, c_1^{(2)}(0) \neq 0, A_{11}^{(1)}(0) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

We will construct a three-parameters family  $f_\mu$ , where  $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$ , As the first governing parameter we take the splitting parameter  $\mu_1$  for the quadratic heteroclinic tangency so that

$$\mu_1 \equiv y^+(\mu). \quad (3.7)$$

The second parameter  $\mu_2$  is responsible for the degeneracy related to, respectively, conditions **(D1)**:

$$\mu_2 = b_1^{(2)} \quad \text{in Case I,} \quad (3.8)$$

$$\mu_2 = c_1^{(2)} \quad \text{in Case II} \quad (3.9)$$

or **(D2)**:

$$\mu_2 = A_{11}^{(1)} = a_{11}^{(1)} - \frac{b_1^{(1)}c_1^{(1)}}{d_1} \quad \text{in Case III.} \quad (3.10)$$

The third parameter has been already given by formula (2.1).

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $f_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3}$  be the family under consideration. Then, in the space  $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$  there exist infinitely many regions  $\Delta_{ij}$  accumulating to the origin as  $i, j \rightarrow \infty$ , such that the first return map  $T_{ij}$  in appropriate rescaled coordinates and parameters is asymptotically  $C^{r-1}$ -close to one of the following limit maps.*

1) *In Case I, the limit map is*

$$\bar{X}_1 = -J_{ij}X_2 + M_2Y, \quad \bar{X}_2 = Y, \quad \bar{Y} = M_1 - X_1 - Y^2, \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= -d^{(1)2}d^{(2)}\gamma_1^{2i}\gamma_2^{2j}(\mu_1 + \nu_1^j c_1^{(2)}u_1^+ - \gamma_1^{-i}y^- + \nu_{ij}^1), \\ M_2 &= (\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^1)c_1^{(2)}A_{11}^{(1)}\lambda_1^i\gamma_1^i\nu_1^j\gamma_2^j, \\ J_{ij} &= J_{12}J_{21}(\lambda_1\lambda_2\gamma_1)^i(\nu_1\nu_2\gamma_2)^j, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$



and  $\nu_{ij}^1 = O(\hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} + \hat{\nu}^j + \gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j})$ ,  $\rho_{ij}^1 = O(\nu_1^j)$ .

2) In Case II, the limit map is

$$\bar{X}_1 = Y, \quad \bar{X}_2 = X_1, \quad \bar{Y} = M_1 + M_2X_1 + BX_2 - Y^2, \quad (3.13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= -d^{(1)2}d^{(2)}\gamma_1^{2i}\gamma_2^{2j}(\mu_1 + \nu_1^j\mu_2u_1^+ - \gamma_1^{-i}y^- + \nu_{ij}^2), \\ M_2 &= (\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^2)b_1^{(2)}A_{11}^{(1)}\lambda_1^i\nu_1^j\gamma_1^i\gamma_2^j, \\ B &= J_{12}J_{21}(\lambda_1\lambda_2\gamma_1)^i(\nu_1\nu_2\gamma_2)^j \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

and  $\nu_{ij}^2 = O(\hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} + \hat{\nu}^j + \gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j} + \nu_1^j \left( \hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1 \right)^i)$ ,  $\rho_{ij}^2 = O\left(\left(\hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1\right)^i + (\hat{\nu}/\nu_1)^j\right)$ .

3) In Case III, the limit map is

$$\bar{X}_1 = Y, \quad \bar{X}_2 = X_1, \quad \bar{Y} = M_1 + M_2X_1 + BX_2 - Y^2, \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= -d^{(1)2}d^{(2)}\gamma_1^{2i}\gamma_2^{2j}(\mu_1 + \nu_1^j c_1^{(2)}u_1^+ - \gamma_1^{-i}y^- + \nu_{ij}^3), \\ M_2 &= (\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^3)b_1^{(2)}c_1^{(2)}\lambda_1^i\nu_1^j\gamma_1^i\gamma_2^j, \\ B &= J_{12}J_{21}(\lambda_1\lambda_2\gamma_1)^i(\nu_1\nu_2\gamma_2)^j \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

and  $\nu_{ij}^3 = O(\hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} + \hat{\nu}^j + \gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j})$ ,  $\rho_{ij}^3 = O\left(\left(\hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1\right)^i + (\hat{\nu}/\nu_1)^j\right)$ .

It is easy to see that the rescaled first return map in Cases II and III is asymptotically close to the 3D Henon map (1.1). In Case I for system (3.11) we make an additional change of coordinates  $X_{1new} = X_1 - M_2X_2$  and scale  $X_1$  by  $(-J_{ij})$ , bringing it again to the form (1.1). Next, the statement of Theorem 1 follows immediately – as shown in [7, 8], this three-dimensional Henon map possesses the discrete Lorenz attractor for an open set of parameters  $(M_1, M_2, B)$ . Hence for each sufficiently large  $i$  and  $j$ , for which the Jacobian  $J_{ij}$  stays finite, the corresponding domain  $\delta_{ij}$  in the original parameters  $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3)$  is determined from formulas (3.12), (3.14) or (3.16) respectively in Cases I–III. These domains accumulate to the origin when  $i$  and  $j$  unboundedly grow. This proves Theorem 1.

#### 4. Proof of the rescaling Lemma 1.

Note that the first return map  $T_{ij}$  is rescaled differently in cases I–III, however, there is a preparation part of the proof that is conducted in the same way for all the cases.

Using formulas (3.1), (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4), we obtain the following expression for the first return map  $T_{ij} \equiv T_{21}T_{02}^jT_{12}T_{01}^i : \Pi_1^+ \rightarrow \Pi_1^+$

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 - u_1^+ &= a_{11}^{(1)}(\lambda_1^i x_1 + \hat{\lambda}^i \xi_{1i}(x, y, \mu)) + a_{12}^{(1)}\hat{\lambda}^i \xi_{2i}(x, y, \mu) + b_1^{(1)}(y - y^-) + \\ &\quad + O(\lambda_1^{2i}\|x\|^2 + \lambda_1^i\|x\| \cdot |y - y^-| + (y - y^-)^2), \\ u_2 - u_2^+ &= a_{21}^{(1)}(\lambda_1^i x_1 + \hat{\lambda}^i \xi_{1i}(x, y, \mu)) + a_{22}^{(1)}\hat{\lambda}^i \xi_{2i}(x, y, \mu) + b_2^{(1)}(y - y^-) + \\ &\quad + O(\lambda_1^{2i}\|x\|^2 + \lambda_1^i\|x\| \cdot |y - y^-| + (y - y^-)^2), \\ \gamma_2^{-j}(v + (\hat{\gamma}_2/\gamma_2)^{-j} \xi_{6j}(u, v, \mu)) &= c_1^{(1)}(\lambda_1^i x_1 + \hat{\lambda}^i \xi_{1i}(x, y, \mu)) + c_2^{(1)}\hat{\lambda}^i \xi_{2i}(x, y, \mu) + \\ &\quad + d^{(1)}(y - y^-) + O(\lambda_1^{2i}\|x\|^2 + \lambda_1^i\|x\| \cdot |y - y^-| + (y - y^-)^2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{x}_1 - x_1^+ &= a_{11}^{(2)}(\nu_1^j u_1 + \hat{\nu}^j \xi_{4j}(u, v, \mu)) + a_{12}^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j \xi_{5j}(u, v, \mu) + b_1^{(2)}(v - v^-) + \\
&\quad + O(\nu_1^{2j} \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j |u| \cdot |v - v^-| + (v - v^-)^2), \\
\bar{x}_2 - x_2^+ &= a_{21}^{(2)}(\nu_1^j u_1 + \hat{\nu}^j \xi_{4j}(u, v, \mu)) + a_{22}^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j \xi_{5j}(u, v, \mu) + b_2^{(2)}(v - v^-) + \\
&\quad + O(\nu_1^{2j} \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j |u| \cdot |v - v^-| + (v - v^-)^2), \\
\gamma_1^{-i}(\bar{y} + (\hat{\gamma}_1/\gamma_1)^{-i} \xi_{3i}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \mu)) &= \mu_1 + c_1^{(2)}(\nu_1^j u_1 + \hat{\nu}^j \xi_{4j}(u, v, \mu)) + \\
&\quad + c_2^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j \xi_{5j}(u, v, \mu) + d^{(2)}(v - v^-)^2 + O(\nu_1^{2j} \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j \|u\| \cdot |v - v^-| + \\
&\quad + (v - v^-)^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Make a coordinate shift  $u_{new} = u - u^+ + \varphi_{ij}^1$ ,  $v_{new} = v - v^- + \varphi_{ij}^2$ ,  $x_{new} = x - x^+ + \psi_{ij}^1$ ,  $y_{new} = y - y^- + \psi_{ij}^2$ , where  $\varphi_{ij}^1$ ,  $\psi_{ij}^1 = O(\gamma_2^{-j} + \lambda_1^i)$  and  $\varphi_{ij}^2$ ,  $\psi_{ij}^2 = O(\nu_1^j)$ . With that, the nonlinearity functions in the left parts of the third equations of (4.1) and (4.2) can be expressed as Taylor expansions  $\xi_{6j}(u + u^+ + \varphi_{ij}^1, v + v^- + \varphi_{ij}^2, \mu) = \xi_{6j}^0 + \xi_{6j}^1 v + \xi_{6j}^2(u, v) + \xi_{6j}^3(v)$ ,  $\xi_{3i}(\bar{x} + x^+ + \psi_{ij}^1, \bar{y} + y^- + \psi_{ij}^2, \mu) = \xi_{3i}^0 + \xi_{3i}^1 \bar{y} + \xi_{3i}^2(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) + \xi_{3i}^3(\bar{y})$  respectively, where coefficients  $\xi_{6j}^0$ ,  $\xi_{6j}^1$ ,  $\xi_{3i}^0$ ,  $\xi_{3i}^1$  are uniformly bounded in  $i$  and  $j$  for all small  $\mu$  and  $\xi_{6j}^2(u, v) = O(u)$ ,  $\xi_{3i}^2(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = O(\bar{x})$ ,  $\xi_{6j}^3(v) = O(v^2)$ ,  $\xi_{3i}^3(\bar{y}) = O(\bar{y}^2)$ . We select constants  $\varphi_{ij}^1$ ,  $\varphi_{ij}^2$ ,  $\psi_{ij}^1$ ,  $\psi_{ij}^2$  in such a way that all constant terms in equations (4.1), the constant terms in the first two equations and the linear in  $v_{new}$  term in the last equation of (4.2) vanish. In addition, we plug the expressions for  $u$  coordinates from the first two equations of (4.1) into the third one, this will cause additions of order  $\hat{\gamma}_2^{-j}$  to all the coefficients. The system is rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_1 &= a_{11}^{(1)} \lambda_1^i x_1 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i + \lambda_1^i \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|) + b_1^{(1)} y + \lambda_1^i O(\|x\| \cdot |y|) + O(y^2), \\
u_2 &= a_{21}^{(1)} \lambda_1^i x_1 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i + \lambda_1^i \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|) + b_2^{(1)} y + \lambda_1^i O(\|x\| \cdot |y|) + O(y^2), \\
\gamma_2^{-j} (1 + q_{ij}^{(2)}) v + \hat{\gamma}_2^{-j} O(v^2) &= c_1^{(1)} \lambda_1^i x_1 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i + \lambda_1^i \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|) + d^{(1)} y + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i O(\|x\| \cdot |y|) + O(y^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{x}_1 &= a_{11}^{(2)} \nu_1^j u_1 + \tilde{a}_{12}^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j u_2 + b_1^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\nu}^j \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j \|u\| \cdot |v| + v^2), \\
\bar{x}_2 &= a_{21}^{(2)} \nu_1^j u_1 + \tilde{a}_{22}^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j u_2 + b_2^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\nu}^j \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j \|u\| \cdot |v| + v^2), \\
\gamma_1^{-i} (1 + q_{ij}^{(1)}) \bar{y} + \hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} O(\bar{x}) + \hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} O(\bar{y}^2) &= M^1 + c_1^{(2)} \nu_1^j u_1 + \tilde{c}_2^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j u_2 + d^{(2)} v^2 + \\
&\quad + O(\hat{\nu}^j \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j \|u\| \cdot |v| + |v|^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where  $q_{ij}^{(1)} = O((\hat{\gamma}_1/\gamma_1)^{-i})$ ,  $q_{ij}^{(2)} = O((\hat{\gamma}_2/\gamma_2)^{-j})$ , coefficients marked with “tilde” are uniformly bounded for small  $\mu$  and the following expression is valid for  $M^1$ :

$$M^1 = \mu_1 + \nu_1^j c_1^{(2)} u_1^+ - \gamma_1^{-i} y^- + O(\hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} + \hat{\nu}^j + \gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}). \tag{4.5}$$

Next, we take the right-hand side of the third equation of (4.3) divided by factor  $\gamma_2^{-j} (1 + q_{ij}^{(2)})$  from the left-hand side as the new variable  $y$  – the equation becomes the following  $v + ((\hat{\gamma}_2/\gamma_2)^{-j}) O(v^2) = y$ . We substitute this formula instead of the  $y$  variable to all equations. Defining  $u_{new} = u - (b^{(1)}/d^{(1)}) \gamma_2^{-j} v + O(\hat{\gamma}_2^{-j} v^2)$  we eliminate all terms in the equation for  $u$  which depend on  $v$  alone. In addition, we substitute the expressions for  $\bar{x}$  to the last equation of (4.4).

These actions cause the linear in  $v$  term of order  $O(\hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} + \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j})$  to appear in the equation for  $\bar{v}$ . We will make it zero again later. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
u_1 &= A_{11}^{(1)} \lambda_1^i x_1 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i + \lambda_1^i \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|) + \lambda_1^i \gamma_2^{-j} O(\|x\| \cdot |v|), \\
u_2 &= A_{21}^{(1)} \lambda_1^i x_1 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i + \lambda_1^i \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|) + \lambda_1^i \gamma_2^{-j} O(\|x\| \cdot |v|), \\
\bar{x}_1 &= a_{11}^{(2)} \nu_1^j u_1 + \tilde{a}_{12}^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j u_2 + b_1^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\nu}^j \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j \|u\| \cdot |v| + v^2), \\
\bar{x}_2 &= a_{21}^{(2)} \nu_1^j u_1 + \tilde{a}_{22}^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j u_2 + b_2^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\nu}^j \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j \|u\| \cdot |v| + v^2), \\
\frac{\gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}} \bar{v} (1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) + \gamma_1^{-i} \hat{\gamma}_2^{-j} O(\bar{v}^2) &= M^1 + c_1^{(2)} \nu_1^j u_1 + \tilde{c}_2^{(2)} \hat{\nu}^j u_2 + \\
&\quad + O(\hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} + \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) v + d^{(2)} v^2 + O(\hat{\nu}^j \|u\|^2 + \nu_1^j \|u\| \cdot |v| + |v|^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where  $q_{ij}^{(3)} = O\left((\hat{\gamma}_1/\gamma_1)^{-i} + (\hat{\gamma}_2/\gamma_2)^{-j}\right)$  and

$$A_{11}^{(1)} = a_{11} - b_1^{(1)} c_1^{(1)}/d^{(1)}, \quad A_{21}^{(1)} = a_{21} - b_2^{(1)} c_1^{(1)}/d^{(1)}. \tag{4.7}$$

Next, we substitute  $u$  as a function of  $x$  and  $v$  from the first two equations to the last three ones. After this, in addition, we make a shift of  $(x, v)$  coordinates by a constant of order  $O(\hat{\gamma}_1^{-i} + \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j})$  to nullify the linear in  $v$  term in the last equation. This gives us the following formula for the map  $T_{ij} : (x, v) \mapsto (\bar{x}, \bar{v})$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{x}_1 &= A_{11}^{(1)} a_{11}^{(2)} \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{a}_{12} s_{ij}^{(1)} x_2 + b_1^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\
\bar{x}_2 &= A_{11}^{(1)} a_{21}^{(2)} \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{a}_{22} s_{ij}^{(2)} x_2 + b_2^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\
\frac{\gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}} \bar{v} (1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) + \gamma_1^{-i} \hat{\gamma}_2^{-j} O(\bar{v}^2) &= M^1 + A_{11}^{(1)} c_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{c}_2 s_{ij}^{(3)} x_2 + d^{(2)} v^2 + \\
&\quad + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where  $s_{ij}^{(k)} = O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j})$ .

**Case I.** The second parameter in the first case is introduced as  $\mu_2 \equiv b_1^{(2)}(\mu)$  and we also recall that  $c_1^{(2)}$ ,  $b_2^{(2)}$  and  $A_{11}^{(1)}$  are bounded from zero due to (3.6). We make the following change of coordinates:

$$x_{1new} = x_1 + O\left(\left(\hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1\right)^i + \gamma_2^{-j}\right) O(\|x\|), \quad x_{2new} = x_2, \quad v_{new} = v$$

such that all the terms which depend only on  $x$ -coordinates are now put into  $x_{1new}$  in the third equation. Then (4.8) is rewritten in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{x}_1 &= A_{11}^{(1)} a_{11}^{(2)} \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{a}_{12} s_{ij}^{(1)} x_2 + (\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^1) v + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\
\bar{x}_2 &= A_{11}^{(1)} a_{21}^{(2)} \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{a}_{22} s_{ij}^{(2)} x_2 + b_2^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\
\frac{\gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}} \bar{v} (1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) + \gamma_1^{-i} \hat{\gamma}_2^{-j} O(\bar{v}^2) &= M^1 + A_{11}^{(1)} c_1^{(2)} \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + d^{(2)} v^2 + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where  $\rho_k^1 = O(\nu_1^j)$ . Now we rescale the coordinates as follows

$$v = -\frac{\gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}d^{(2)}}(1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) Y, \quad x_1 = \frac{\lambda_1^{-i}\gamma_1^{-2i}\nu_1^{-j}\gamma_2^{-2j}}{c_1^{(2)}A_{11}^{(1)}(d^{(1)})^2d^{(2)}} X_1, \quad x_2 = -\frac{b_2^{(2)}\gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}d^{(2)}} X_2.$$

Then system (4.9) is rewritten in the new coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &= -J_{ij}X_2 + M_2Y + O(\lambda_1^i\nu_1^j), \\ \bar{X}_2 &= Y + O(\hat{\lambda}^i\nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i\nu_1^j\gamma_2^{-j} + \gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}), \\ \bar{Y} &= M_1 - X_1 - Y^2 + O(\gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where formulas (3.12) are valid for  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . Note, that the coefficient  $J_{ij}$  is the Jacobian of map (4.10) up to asymptotically small in  $i, j$  terms, and, hence,  $J_{ij}$  coincides in the main order with the Jacobian of map  $T_{21}T_{02}^jT_{12}T_{01}^i$ , i.e. it is given by formula (3.12).

**Case II.** Now we have  $\mu_2 \equiv c_1^{(2)}(\mu)$  and coefficients  $b_1^{(2)}$ ,  $c_2^{(2)}$  and  $A_{11}^{(1)}$  are not zeros. Introduce the new coordinates as  $x_{1new} = x_1$ ,  $x_{2new} = x_2 - (b_2^{(2)}/b_1^{(2)})x_1$ ,  $v_{new} = v$ . Then (4.8) recasts as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_1 &= A_{11}^{(1)}a_{11}^{(2)}\lambda_1^i\nu_1^jx_1 + \tilde{a}_{12}s_{ij}^{(1)}x_2 + b_1^{(2)}v + O(\hat{\lambda}^i\nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i\nu_1^j\gamma_2^{-j})O(\|x\|^2) + \\ &\quad + \lambda_1^i\nu_1^jO(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\ \bar{x}_2 &= A_{11}^{(1)}A_{21}^{(2)}\lambda_1^i\nu_1^jx_1 + \tilde{a}_{22}s_{ij}^{(2)}x_2 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i\nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i\nu_1^j\gamma_2^{-j})O(\|x\|^2) + \\ &\quad + \lambda_1^i\nu_1^jO(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\ \frac{\gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}}\bar{v}(1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) + \gamma_1^{-i}\hat{\gamma}_2^{-j}O(\bar{v}^2) &= M^1 + (\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^2)A_{11}^{(1)}\lambda_1^i\nu_1^jx_1 + \tilde{c}_2s_{ij}^{(3)}x_2 + \\ &\quad + d^{(2)}v^2 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i\nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i\nu_1^j\gamma_2^{-j})O(\|x\|^2) + \lambda_1^i\nu_1^jO(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^3), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where  $\rho_{ij}^2 = O\left(\left(\hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1\right)^i + (\hat{\nu}/\nu_1)^j\right)$ ,  $A_{21}^{(2)} = a_{21}^{(2)} - (b_2^{(2)}/b_1^{(2)})a_{11}^{(2)} \neq 0$  due to (3.5) and (3.6). Now we rescale the coordinates as follows

$$v = -\frac{\gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}d^{(2)}}(1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) Y, \quad x_1 = -\frac{b_1^{(2)}\gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}d^{(2)}} X_1, \quad x_2 = -\frac{b_1^{(2)}A_{11}^{(1)}A_{21}^{(2)}\lambda_1^i\gamma_1^{-i}\lambda_2^j\gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}d^{(2)}} X_2.$$

After this, we can rewrite (4.11) in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &= Y + O(\lambda_1^i\nu_1^j + \gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}), \\ \bar{X}_2 &= X_1 + O(\lambda_1^i\nu_1^j + \gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}), \\ \bar{Y} &= M_1 + M_2X_1 + J_{ij}X_2 - Y^2 + O(\lambda_1^i\nu_1^j + \gamma_1^{-i}\gamma_2^{-j}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

and formulas (3.14) are valid for  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  and  $J_{ij}$ .

**Case III.** Here we have  $\mu_2 \equiv A_{11}^{(1)} = a_{11} - b_1^{(1)}c_1^{(1)}/d^{(1)}$ , and coefficients  $b_1^{(2)}$ ,  $c_1^{(2)}$  are not zeros. Introduce the new coordinates as in the previous case:  $x_{1new} = x_1$ ,  $x_{2new} = x_2 - (b_2^{(2)}/b_1^{(2)})x_1$ ,  $v_{new} =$

v. The system (4.8) is then rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{x}_1 &= a_{11}^{(2)}(\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^4)\lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{a}_{12} s_{ij}^{(1)} x_2 + b_1^{(2)} v + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\
\bar{x}_2 &= A_{21}^{(2)}(\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^5)\lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{a}_{22} s_{ij}^{(2)} x_2 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \\
&\quad + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^2), \\
\frac{\gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)}} \bar{v} (1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) + \gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j} O(\bar{v}^2) &= M^1 + c_1^{(2)}(\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^3)\lambda_1^i \nu_1^j x_1 + \tilde{c}_2 s_{ij}^{(3)} x_2 + \\
&\quad + d^{(2)} v^2 + O(\hat{\lambda}^i \nu_1^j + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j \gamma_2^{-j}) O(\|x\|^2) + \lambda_1^i \nu_1^j O(\|x\| \cdot |v|) + O(v^3),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where  $A_{21}^{(2)} = a_{21}^{(2)} - (b_2^{(2)}/b_1^{(2)})a_{11}^{(2)}$  and  $\rho_{ij}^{3,4,5} = O\left(\left(\hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1\right)^i + (\hat{\nu}/\nu_1)^j\right)$ . Now we will select  $\mu_2 = O\left(\left(\hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1\right)^i + (\hat{\nu}/\nu_1)^j\right)$  in the way to make the value of  $\delta_{ij} = \mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^3$  asymptotically small as  $i, j \rightarrow \infty$ . Then we have  $A_{21}^{(2)}(\mu_2 + \rho_{ij}^5) = A_{21}^{(2)} \rho_{ij}^6 = O\left(\left(\hat{\lambda}/\lambda_1\right)^i + (\hat{\nu}/\nu_1)^j\right) \neq 0$  as otherwise the Jacobian of map  $T_{21} T_{02}^j T_{12} T_{01}^i$  would be vanishing when  $\delta_{ij}$  goes to zero.

Finally we rescale the coordinates as follows

$$v = -\frac{\gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)} d^{(2)}} (1 + q_{ij}^{(3)}) Y, \quad x_1 = -\frac{b_1^{(2)} \gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)} d^{(2)}} X_1, \quad x_2 = -\frac{b_1^{(2)} A_{21}^{(2)} \rho_{ij}^6 \lambda_1^i \gamma_1^{-i} \lambda_2^j \gamma_2^{-j}}{d^{(1)} d^{(2)}} X_2.$$

After this, we can rewrite (4.11) in the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{X}_1 &= Y + O(\lambda_1^i \nu_1^j + \gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}), \\
\bar{X}_2 &= X_1 + O(\lambda_1^i \nu_1^j + \gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}), \\
\bar{Y} &= M_1 + M_2 X_1 + J_{ij} X_2 - Y^2 + O(\lambda_1^i \nu_1^j + \gamma_1^{-i} \gamma_2^{-j}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

the author thanks J. C. Tatjer for useful discussions that led to the idea of condition **D2** and **Case III**.

## FUNDING

This paper is a contribution to the project M7 (Dynamics of Geophysical Problems in Turbulent Regimes) of the Collaborative Research Centre TRR 181 ‘‘Energy Transfer in Atmosphere and Ocean’’ funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Projektnummer 274762653. The paper is also supported by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation 19-11-00280.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The data that support the findings of this study (proofs, pictures) are placed in the body of the text. If some extra requirements appear, they should be addressed to the corresponding author.

## REFERENCES

1. Aframovich, V. S. and Shilnikov, L. P., Strange attractors and quasiattractors, in *Nonlinear Dynamics and Turbulence*, eds. G. I. Barenblatt, G. Iooss, D. D. Joseph (Eds.), Boston: Pitman, 1983, pp. 1–34.
2. Turaev, D. V. and Shilnikov, L. P., An example of a wild strange attractor, *Sb. Math.*, 1998, vol. 189, no. 2, pp. 137–160; see also: *Mat. Sb.*, 1998, vol. 189, no. 2, pp. 137–160.
3. Gonchenko, S. V., Gonchenko, A. S., Ovsyannikov, I. I. and Turaev, D. V., Examples of Lorenz-like attractors in Hénon-like maps, *Mat. Model. of Nat. Phenom.*, 2013, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 48–70.
4. Turaev, D. V. and Shilnikov, L. P., Pseudo-hyperbolicity and the problem on periodic perturbations of Lorenz-like attractors. *Dokl. Math.*, 2008, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 17–21; see also: *Dokl. Akad. Nauk*, 2008, vol. 418, no. 1, pp. 23–27.
5. Gonchenko, A. S., Gonchenko, S. V. and Kazakov, A. O., Richness of chaotic dynamics in nonholonomic models of a Celtic stone, *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 2013, vol. 18, pp. 521–538.
6. Eilertsen, J. S. and Magnan, J. F., Asymptotically exact codimension-four dynamics and bifurcations in two-dimensional thermosolutal convection at high thermal Rayleigh number: Chaos from a quasi-periodic homoclinic explosion and quasi-periodic intermittency, *Physica D: Non-linear Phenomena*, 2018, vol. 382–383, pp. 1–21.
7. Gonchenko, S. V., Ovsyannikov, I. I., Simó, C. and Turaev, D., Three-dimensional Hénon-like maps and wild Lorenz-like attractors, *Int. J. Bifurc. Chaos*, 2005, vol. 15, pp. 3493–3508.
8. Gonchenko, S. V., Meiss, J. D. and Ovsyannikov, I. I., Chaotic dynamics of three-dimensional Hénon maps that originate from a homoclinic bifurcation, *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 2006, vol. 11, pp. 191–212.
9. Capiński, M., Turaev, D. and Zgliczyński, P., Computer assisted proof of the existence of the Lorenz attractor in the Shimizu-Morioka system, *Nonlinearity*, 2018, vol. 31, pp. 5410–5440.
10. Gonchenko, S. V., Ovsyannikov, I. I. and Tatjer, J. C., Birth of discrete Lorenz attractors at the bifurcations of 3D maps with homoclinic tangencies to saddle points, *Reg. and Chaotic Dyn.*, 2014, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 495–505.
11. Gonchenko, S. V. and Ovsyannikov, I. I., Homoclinic tangencies to resonant saddles and discrete Lorenz attractors, *Discrete and continuous dynamical systems, series S*, 2017, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 273–288.
12. Gonchenko, S. V. and Ovsyannikov, I. I., On bifurcations of three-dimensional diffeomorphisms with a non-transversal heteroclinic cycle containing saddle-foci, *Nelin. Dyn.*, 2010, vol. 6, pp. 61–77 (Russian).
13. Gonchenko, S. V. and Ovsyannikov, I. I., On Global Bifurcations of Three-dimensional Diffeomorphisms Leading to Lorenz-like Attractors. *Mat. Model. of Nat. Phenom*, 2013, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 71–83.
14. Gonchenko, S. V., Shilnikov, L. P. and Turaev, D. V., On global bifurcations in three-dimensional diffeomorphisms leading to wild Lorenz-like attractor. *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 2009, vol. 14, pp. 137–147.
15. Turaev, D. V., On dimension of nonlocal bifurcational problems. *Int. J. of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 1996, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 919–948.
16. Gonchenko, S. V., Shilnikov, L. P. and Turaev, D. V., Dynamical phenomena in multidimensional systems with a structurally unstable homoclinic Poincaré curve. *Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.*, 1993, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 410–415; see also: *Ross. Akad. Nauk Dokl.*, 1993, vol. 330, no. 2.
17. Tatjer, J. C., Three-dimensional dissipative diffeomorphisms with homoclinic tangencies. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 2001, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 249–302.
18. Newhouse, S. E., Palis, J. and Takens, F., Bifurcations and stability of families of diffeomorphisms, *Publ. Math. Inst. Haute Etudes Sci.*, 1983, vol. 57, pp. 5–72.
19. Gonchenko, S. V., Gonchenko, V. S. and Tatjer, J. C., Bifurcations of three-dimensional diffeomorphisms with non-simple quadratic homoclinic tangencies and generalized Hénon maps. *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics*, 2007, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 233–266.
20. Gonchenko, S. V., Shilnikov, L. P. and Turaev, D. V., On dynamical properties of multidimensional diffeomorphisms from Newhouse regions, *Nonlinearity*, 2008, vol. 21, pp. 923–972.
21. Gonchenko, S. V. and Shilnikov, L. P., Invariants of  $\Omega$ -conjugacy of diffeomorphisms with a nontransversal homoclinic orbit, *Ukr. Math. J.*, 1990, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 134–140 (Russian).
22. Gonchenko, S. V. and Shilnikov, L. P., On moduli of systems with a nontransversal Poincaré homoclinic orbit, *Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math.*, 1993, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 417–445.
23. Shilnikov, L. P., Shilnikov, A. L., Turaev, D. V. and Chua, L. O., *Methods of Qualitative Theory in Nonlinear Dynamics, Part I*, Sci. Ser. Nonlinear Sci. Ser. A Monogr. Treatises, vol. 4, River Edge, N. J.: World Sci., 1998.
24. M. W. Hirsch, C. C. Pugh and M. Shub. *Invariant manifolds*. Lecture Notes in Math., 1977, vol. 583, New York: Springer, 1977.