

INDEX THEORY FOR ZERO ENERGY SOLUTIONS OF THE PLANAR ANISOTROPIC KEPLER PROBLEM

XIJUN HU

Department of Mathematics, Shandong University, P.R. China

GUOWEI YU

Ceremade, University of Paris-Dauphine & IMCCE, Paris Observatory, France

ABSTRACT. In the variational study of singular Lagrange systems, the zero energy solutions play an important role. Here for the planar anisotropic Kepler problem, we give a complete classification of the zero energy solutions under some non-degenerate condition. A method is also developed to compute the Morse index of a zero energy solution. In particular an interesting connecting between the Morse index and the oscillating behavior of these solutions is established.

AMS Subject Classification: 70F16, 70F10, 37J45, 53D12

Key Words: anisotropic Kepler problem, parabolic solution, celestial mechanics, index theory

1. INTRODUCTION

The Lagrangian systems with singular potentials have been studied by many authors due to its connection with celestial mechanics and relevant problems in physics. It is impossible to give a complete bibliography. We refer the interested readers to [5], [6], [2], [3], [33], [34] and the references within.

In this paper, we study the 2-dimension singular Lagrangian system

$$(1) \quad \ddot{x}(t) = \nabla V(x(t)), \quad x(t) = (x_1(t), x_2(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

with V being a positive, $(-\alpha)$ -homogeneous potential for some $0 < \alpha < 2$, i.e.

$$(2) \quad V(x) = \frac{U(x/|x|)}{|x|^\alpha}, \quad \text{where } U \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{R}^+) \text{ and } \mathbb{S}^1 := [-\pi, \pi]/\{\pm\pi\}.$$

This can be seen as a generalization of the planar anisotropic Kepler problem, which was introduced by physicist Gutzwiller ([19], [20]) and further studied by Devaney ([15], [17]), where they considered the case with $\alpha = 1$ and

$$(3) \quad U(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu x_1^2 + x_2^2}}, \quad \text{for some } \mu > 1.$$

E-mail addresses: xjhu@sdu.edu.cn, yu@ceremade.dauphine.fr.

Both authors thank the support of NSFC(No.11425105). The second author also acknowledges the supported of FSMP and PSL.

For such a potential, it describes the motion of an electron in a semiconductor by an impurity of the donor type. This model also reveals the connection between chaotic behaviors in classic and quantum mechanics. In this paper, we do not restrict ourselves to the potential given by (3), so it may be applied to a broad range of problems. For example, in Section 5, we will show some applications of our results to celestial mechanics, in particular the Kepler problem and the isosceles three body problem. Notice that when $\alpha = 1$ and $\mu = 1$ in (3), it is the classic Kepler problem.

It is well known that if $x(t), t \in [t_1, t_2]$ is a solution of (1), then it is a critical point of the following action functional

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{F}(x; t_1, t_2) := \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L(x(t), \dot{x}(t)) dt$$

in the Hilbert space

$$E(t_1, t_2) := \{y(t) \in W^{1,2}([t_0, t_1], \mathbb{R}^2) \mid y(t_i) = x(t_i), i = 1, 2\}.$$

Here $L(x, \dot{x}) = K(\dot{x}) + V(x)$ is the corresponding Lagrangian with $K(\dot{x}) = \frac{1}{2}|\dot{x}|^2$ being the kinetic energy. Notice that $K(\dot{x}(t)) - V(x(t))$ is the total energy and is a constant along a solution $x(t)$.

Sometimes it will be more convenient to use the polar coordinates (r, θ) of \mathbb{R}^2 with $r \geq 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$, where $x = (x_1, x_2) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)$. In these coordinates, U only depends on θ and the Lagrangian has the following expression:

$$(5) \quad L(r, \theta, \dot{r}, \dot{\theta}) = K + V = \frac{1}{2}(\dot{r}^2 + r^2 \dot{\theta}^2) + \frac{U(\theta)}{r^\alpha}.$$

In this paper, we are mainly interested in the following three types of solutions.

Definition 1.1. Let $x(t) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)(t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}, t \in (T^-, T^+)$, be a solution of (1), where $T^\pm \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. $x(t)$ is a **parabolic solution**, if

- (i). $T^\pm = \pm\infty, \lim_{t \rightarrow T^\pm} |x(t)| = +\infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^\pm} |\dot{x}(t)| = 0$,

a **collision-parabolic solution**, if

- (ii). $T^- \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x(T^-) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} x(t) = 0$;
 (iii). $T^+ = +\infty, \lim_{t \rightarrow T^+} |x(t)| = +\infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^+} |\dot{x}(t)| = 0$,

and a **parabolic-collision solution**, if

- (iv). $T^+ \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x(T^+) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T^+} x(t) = 0$;
 (v). $T^- = -\infty, \lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} |x(t)| = +\infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} |\dot{x}(t)| = 0$.

In particular, if $\theta(t) \equiv \text{Constant}$, for all t in the domain, then $x(t)$ will be called a **homothetic solution**.

The names given above follows the tradition from celestial mechanics. Notice that a parabolic solution is always non-homothetic, as a homothetic solution must collide with the origin at a finite time in the future or past. In the following, we will also show that a collision-parabolic or parabolic-collision solution is homothetic if and only if

$$(6) \quad \theta(t) \equiv \theta_0, \text{ where } \theta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}(U) := \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1 : U_\theta(\theta) = 0\}.$$

One of the reasons that we are interested in these solutions is the following: under McGehee coordinates ([26], [17], [27], for details see Section 2), the singularity at origin becomes a two dimension collision manifold, and the vector field can be continuously extended to this manifold. The projections of the above solutions

to the collision manifold will still be solutions of the extended vector field. In particular the homothetic ones become the equilibria, while the non-homothetic ones are heteroclinic orbits between these equilibria. This indicates these solutions can be used as building block to construct complex trajectories, which usually can be coded through some symbolic dynamics, see [29] and [30].

It is not hard to see the solutions defined in Definition 1.1 must have zero energy. Meanwhile our next result shows the reverse statement is also true, when U satisfies some mild non-degenerate condition.

Theorem 1.1. *If $\mathfrak{C}(U)$ is isolated in \mathbb{S}^1 , then each zero energy solution $x(t)$, $t \in (T^-, T^+)$ of (1) must be one of the three types of solutions defined in Definition 1.1. Furthermore in polar coordinates $x(t) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)(t)$, both limits of $\theta(t)$ exist and belong to $\mathfrak{C}(U)$, as t goes to T^\pm .*

In the variational study of singular Lagrange systems, in particular the classic N -body problem, the biggest challenge is to show the corresponding critical point is collision-free. It turns out the zero energy solutions play a key role here, as an important technique in proving collision-free is some kind of *blow-up* argument ([33], [18]), after which one ends up with a zero solution similar to one of the three types defined above.

In recent years, many interesting periodic and quasi-periodic solutions have been found as collision-free critical points of the action functional in the N -body problem, see [12], [18], [11], [35] and the references within. However almost all these solutions are found as *action minimizers* under certain symmetric and (or) topological constraints. We believe in order to make more general variational approach, like *minimax method*, work in these problems, some kind of *Morse index theory* of the zero solutions seems to be necessary, and this is one of the main motivations of this paper.

Let $x(t)$, $t \in (T^-, T^+)$, be a zero energy solution of (1), choose a sequence of $T^- < t_n^- < t_n^+ < T^+$, such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} t_n^\pm = T^\pm$, we define the **Morse index** of x as

$$(7) \quad m^-(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^-(x; t_n^-, t_n^+).$$

For any finite $t_1 < t_2$, $m^-(x; t_1, t_2)$ is the dimension of the largest subspace in $W_0^{1,2}([t_1, t_2], \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$, where the second derivative $d^2\mathcal{F}(x; t_1, t_2)$ is negative. By the following monotone property (see [13]),

$$(8) \quad m^-(x; t_1, t_2) \leq m^-(x; t_1^*, t_2^*), \quad \text{if } t_1^* \leq t_1, t_2 \leq t_2^*,$$

the above $m^-(x)$ is well defined and independent of the choice of t_n^\pm .

The computation of the Morse index of a solution is usually quite difficult, especially along the directions that are not orthogonal to the solution. Our next theorem will give a simple way of computing the Morse index of the zero energy solutions. What's interesting is we also find a nice connection between the Morse index and the oscillating behavior of the solution. To better explain it, we draw the reader's attention to the following phenomena, which was discovered numerically by Gutzwiller and proven analytically by Devaney:

Given a potential $V(x) = \frac{U(x/|x|)}{|x|}$ with $U(x)$ defined as in (3), then $\mathfrak{C}(U) = \{-\pi/2, 0, \pi/2, \pi\}$. If $x(t) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)(t)$ is a collision solution of (1) with $x(0) = 0$, not necessarily with zero energy, then as $t \rightarrow 0$, $\theta(t)$ converges to $\theta_0 \in$




FIGURE 1

$\mathfrak{C}(U)$. If $\theta_0 \in \{\pm\pi/2\}$, then for a generic $\mu > 9/8$, the corresponding trajectory in \mathbb{R}^2 oscillates along the vertical axis $\{x_1 \equiv 0\}$, as it approaches to the origin. However if $\theta_0 \in \{0, \pi\}$, then such oscillating behavior does not exist along the horizontal axis $\{x_2 \equiv 0\}$. See Figure 1 for corresponding numerical simulations, where the corresponding graphs of the function $\theta(\tau)$ are given (τ is a new time parameter that will be given later). This may also be seen from the phase portrait given in Figure 4.

This inspires us to introduce the following definition.

Definition 1.2. Given a zero energy solution $x(t) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)(t)$, $t \in (T^-, T^+)$, $i(x)$ will be called its **oscillation index**,

$$(9) \quad i(x) := \begin{cases} \#\{t \in (T^-, T^+) \mid \dot{\theta}(t) = 0\}, & \text{if } x \text{ is non-homothetic,} \\ 0, & \text{if } x \text{ is homothetic.} \end{cases}$$

To justify the above definition, we remark that for a non-homothetic solution, $\{t \in (T^-, T^+) \mid \dot{\theta}(t) = 0\}$ is an isolated set in (T^-, T^+) , for a non-homothetic solution (see Remark 2.1). Meanwhile for a homothetic solution $\dot{\theta}(t) \equiv 0$, $\forall t$, but then there is no oscillation at all.

The following theorem is the main result of our paper.

Theorem 1.2. Let $x(t) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)(t)$, $t \in (T^-, T^+)$ be a non-homothetic zero energy solution of (1), if $\mathfrak{C}(U)$ only contains non-degenerate critical points, i.e., $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) \neq 0$, $\forall \theta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}(U)$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^\pm} \theta(t) = \theta_0^\pm \in \mathfrak{C}(U)$. Furthermore,

(a). if at least one of $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)$ is negative, then $m^-(x) = i(x) = +\infty$, where

$$(10) \quad \Delta(\theta_0) := \frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{2}U(\theta_0) + 4U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0), \quad \forall \theta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}(U),$$

(b). if both $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)$ are positive, then $m^-(x) - i(x) = 0$ or 1. In addition, if θ_0^- is a local minimizer of U , then $m^-(x) - i(x) = 0$.

Remark 1.1. Although $\mathfrak{C}(U)$ is required to be non-degenerate in the above theorem, we point out that in principle our approach still works even this is not satisfied. This is particularly important as the N -body problem is highly degenerate due to symmetries. As a example, in Section 5.2, we will show how our method can be applied to the Kepler-type problem, where $U(\theta) = \text{Constant}$, $\forall \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$.

Theorem 1.2 has the following corollary, a proof will be given in Section 4.

Corollary 1.1. *Let $x(t)$ be a parabolic solution, following the notations from Theorem 1.2, if both θ_0^\pm are non-degenerate global minimizers of U , then $m^-(x) = i(x) = 0$.*

It will be interesting to compare the above result with those in [9], where the authors studied the existence of parabolic solutions of (1), which connects two global minimizers of U . The parabolic solutions there are found as collision-free minimizers in the entire domain of time under certain topological constraints, which implies $m^-(x) = 0$. Corollary 1.1 can be seen as a complementation of their result, as it says any parabolic solution connecting two global minimizers of U must have zero Morse index.

Because of degeneracy, Theorem 1.2 does not hold for the homothetic zero energy solutions. Instead we have the following result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\bar{x}(t) = \bar{r}(t)(\cos \theta_0, \sin \theta_0)$, $\theta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}(U)$, be a homothetic zero energy solution of (1), then*

- (a). *if $\Delta(\theta_0) \geq 0$, $m^-(\bar{x}) = 0$,*
- (b). *if $\Delta(\theta_0) < 0$, $m^-(\bar{x}) = +\infty$.*

Our paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we introduce the McGehee coordinates and give a proof of Theorem 1.1; in Section 3, an asymptotic analysis of the linear system along a non-homothetic zero energy solution will be given as it approaches to the collision or infinity; in Section 4, we study the relations between various indices and given a proof of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.1; in Section 5, we give some application of our result in celestial mechanics.

2. MCGEHEE COORDINATES AND DYNAMICS ON THE COLLISION MANIFOLD

In [15], [17], using McGehee coordinates [26], Devaney blew up the singularity at the origin to a two dimensional collision manifold. He studied the dynamics on this manifold and gave a complete picture of it. We will recall some of these results that will be needed in our paper.

First by setting $p_1 = \dot{r}$, $p_2 = r^2\dot{\theta}$, we find the corresponding Hamiltonian of $L(r, \theta, \dot{r}, \dot{\theta})$ given in (5),

$$(11) \quad H(p_1, p_2, r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}p_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}r^{-2}p_2^2 - r^{-\alpha}U(\theta).$$

Let $z = (p_1, p_2, r, \theta)^T$, then the corresponding Hamiltonian system of (1) is

$$(12) \quad \dot{z} = J\nabla H(z), \quad \text{where } J = \begin{pmatrix} 0_2 & -I_2 \\ I_2 & 0_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\nabla H(z)$ is the gradient,

$$\nabla H(z) = (p_1, r^{-2}p_2, \alpha r^{-1-\alpha}U(\theta) - r^{-3}p_2^2, -r^{-\alpha}U_\theta(\theta))^T.$$

Now we introduce the McGehee coordinates (v, u, r, θ) , by setting

$$(13) \quad v = r^{\alpha/2}p_1 = r^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\dot{r}, \quad u = r^{-1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}p_2 = r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\dot{\theta}.$$

Then equation (12) becomes

$$(14) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{v} &= r^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}-1} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} v^2 + u^2 - \alpha U(\theta) \right), \\ \dot{u} &= r^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}-1} \left(\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1 \right) uv + U_\theta(\theta) \right), \\ \dot{r} &= r^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} v, \\ \dot{\theta} &= r^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}-1} u. \end{cases}$$

After changing the time parameter from t to τ by $dt = r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} d\tau$, we get

$$(15) \quad \begin{cases} v' &= \frac{\alpha}{2} v^2 + u^2 - \alpha U(\theta), \\ u' &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1 \right) uv + U_\theta(\theta), \\ r' &= rv, \\ \theta' &= u, \end{cases}$$

where $'$ means $\frac{d}{d\tau}$ throughout the paper.

The most important feature of the above transformation is that it extends the vector field to the singular set $\{(v, u, r, \theta) : r = 0\}$. This set now becomes an invariant sub-manifold of (15), which will be denoted by \mathfrak{M} and called the *collision manifold*.

Recall that the Hamiltonian H also represents the energy of solutions of (12), which is a first integral. As a result, we have the following identity along a solution in the McGehee coordinates

$$(16) \quad \frac{1}{2}(u^2 + v^2) - U(\theta) = r^\alpha H.$$

By continuity, (16) holds on the collision manifold \mathfrak{M} as well, and as $r = 0$ in \mathfrak{M} , it reads

$$(17) \quad \frac{1}{2}(u^2 + v^2) = U(\theta).$$

Plug this into the first equation of (15), we get

$$(18) \quad v' = \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) u^2.$$

This means v is a Lyapunov function of the vector field (15), whenever (17) holds, i.e., $v(\tau)$ is non-decreasing along any orbit.

By (17), \mathfrak{M} is a 2-dim torus homeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$. We introduce a global coordinates (ψ, θ) with θ defined as before and ψ as

$$(19) \quad \cos \psi = \frac{u}{\sqrt{2U(\theta)}}, \quad \sin \psi = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2U(\theta)}}.$$

Then on \mathfrak{M} , the vector field (15) has the following expression:

$$(20) \quad \begin{cases} \psi' &= \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \sqrt{2U(\theta)} \cos \psi - \frac{U_\theta(\theta) \sin \psi}{\sqrt{2U(\theta)}}, \\ \theta' &= \sqrt{2U(\theta)} \cos \psi. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.1. (a). $(\psi_0, \theta_0) \in \mathfrak{M}$ is an equilibrium of (20), if and only if $\psi_0 \in \{\pm\pi/2\}$ and $\theta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}(U)$;

(b). If $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, is a none equilibrium solution of (20), then $\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} : \theta'(\tau) = 0\}$ is an isolated set in \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Since $U(\theta) > 0$ for any θ , $\theta' = 0$ if and only if $\cos \psi = 0$ or $\psi \in \{\pm\pi/2\}$. When $\cos \psi = 0$, $\psi' = \pm \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{\sqrt{2U(\theta)}}$ and it is zero if and only if $U_\theta(\theta) = 0$. This proves property (a).

For property (b), it will be enough to show $\theta''(\tau_0) \neq 0$, for any τ_0 with $\theta'(\tau_0) = 0$. Notice that $\theta'(\tau_0) = 0$ implies $\cos \psi(\tau_0) = 0$ and $\sin \psi(\tau_0) \neq 0$. As a result,

$$(21) \quad \theta''(\tau_0) = -\sqrt{2U(\theta(\tau_0))}(\sin \psi(\tau_0))\psi'(\tau_0) \neq 0.$$

Otherwise $\psi'(\tau_0) = 0$, and $(\psi, \theta)(\tau_0)$ is a equilibrium, which is absurd. \square

Let (ψ_0, θ_0) be an arbitrary equilibrium of (20). To understand the dynamics near it, we will study the linearization of (20) at (ψ_0, θ_0) :

$$(22) \quad M(\psi_0, \theta_0) = \begin{pmatrix} (\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1)\sqrt{2U(\theta_0)} \sin \psi_0 & -\frac{U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) \sin \psi_0}{\sqrt{2U(\theta_0)}} \\ -\sqrt{2U(\theta_0)} \sin \psi_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Notice that $U_\theta(\theta_0) = 0$ was used to obtain the above matrix.

Definition 2.1. We set $\lambda_s(\psi_0, \theta_0), \lambda_l(\psi_0, \theta_0)$ as the two eigenvalues of $M(\psi_0, \theta_0)$, and $e_s(\psi_0, \theta_0), e_l(\psi_0, \theta_0)$ the corresponding eigenvectors. When both $\lambda_s(\psi_0, \theta_0)$ and $\lambda_l(\psi_0, \theta_0)$ are real numbers, we always assume $\lambda_s(\psi_0, \theta_0) \leq \lambda_l(\psi_0, \theta_0)$. When there is no confusion, we may omit (ψ_0, θ_0) in these notations.

For $\Delta(\theta_0)$ defined in (10), in the following, whenever it is negative, $\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0)}$ should be understood as the imaginary number $i\sqrt{|\Delta(\theta_0)|}$. By a direct computation, we get

Lemma 2.2. Let (ψ_0, θ_0) be an equilibrium of (20) in \mathfrak{M} . Following the notations given in Definition 2.1, we have

$$\lambda_s = -\frac{(2-\alpha)}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0)} \sin \psi_0 - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0)}, \quad e_s = \left(\frac{2-\alpha}{4} + \frac{\sin \psi_0}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(\theta_0)}{2U(\theta_0)}}, 1 \right)^T;$$

$$\lambda_l = -\frac{(2-\alpha)}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0)} \sin \psi_0 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0)}, \quad e_l = \left(\frac{2-\alpha}{4} - \frac{\sin \psi_0}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(\theta_0)}{2U(\theta_0)}}, 1 \right)^T.$$

Furthermore,

- (a). when $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) > 0$, $\Delta(\theta_0) > 0$ and $\lambda_s < 0 < \lambda_l$;
- (b). when $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) = 0$, $\Delta(\theta_0) > 0$ and


$$\lambda_s < \lambda_l = 0, \text{ if } \psi_0 = \pi/2; \quad 0 = \lambda_s < \lambda_l, \text{ if } \psi_0 = -\pi/2;$$
- (c). when $0 > U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) > -\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8}U(\theta_0)$, $\Delta(\theta_0) > 0$ and

$$\lambda_s < \lambda_l < 0, \text{ if } \psi_0 = \pi/2; \quad 0 < \lambda_s < \lambda_l, \text{ if } \psi_0 = -\pi/2;$$
- (d). when $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) = -\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8}U(\theta_0)$, $\Delta(\theta_0) = 0$ and

$$\lambda_s = \lambda_l < 0, \text{ if } \psi_0 = \pi/2; \quad \lambda_s = \lambda_l > 0, \text{ if } \psi_0 = -\pi/2;$$
- (e). when $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) < -\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8}U(\theta_0)$, $\Delta(\theta_0) < 0$ and

$$\Re(\lambda_{s,l}) < 0, \text{ if } \psi_0 = \pi/2; \quad \Re(\lambda_{s,l}) > 0, \text{ if } \psi_0 = -\pi/2.$$

When the corresponding θ_0 is a *non-degenerate* critical point of U , i.e., $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) \neq 0$, we have the following well-known result (see [36]).

FIGURE 2. $(\psi_0, \theta_0) = (\pi/2, 0)$

Lemma 2.3. *Following the notations from the previous lemma,*

- (a). *if $\lambda_s < 0 < \lambda_l$, then (ψ_0, θ_0) is a **saddle**, with a 1-dim stable manifold and a 1-dim unstable manifold, which are tangent of linear subspace $\langle e_s \rangle$ and $\langle e_l \rangle$ at (ψ_0, θ_0) respectively. See Figure 2.*
- (b). *if $\lambda_s < \lambda_l < 0$, then (ψ_0, θ_0) is a **stable node**. It is asymptotically stable with all the orbits asymptotically converge to (ψ_0, θ_0) , when t goes to positive infinity, along the linear subspace $\langle e_l \rangle$, except two orbits which asymptotically converge to (ψ_0, θ_0) along the linear subspace $\langle e_s \rangle$. See Figure 3a.*
- (c). *if $0 < \lambda_s < \lambda_l$, then (ψ_0, θ_0) is a **unstable node**. It is asymptotically unstable with all the orbits asymptotically converge to (ψ_0, θ_0) , when t goes to negative infinity, along the linear subspace $\langle e_l \rangle$, except two orbits which asymptotically converge to (ψ_0, θ_0) along the linear subspace $\langle e_s \rangle$. See Figure 3b.*
- (d). *if $\lambda_{s,l} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, with $\Re(\lambda_{s,l}) < 0$, then (ψ_0, θ_0) is a **stable focus**. It is asymptotically stable with all the orbits spiral into (ψ_0, θ_0) . See Figure 3c.*
- (e). *if $\lambda_{s,l} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, with $\Re(\lambda_{s,l}) > 0$, then (ψ_0, θ_0) is a **unstable focus**. It is asymptotically unstable with all the orbits spiral away from (ψ_0, θ_0) . See Figure 3d.*

Since v is a Lyapunov function of the vector field on the collision manifold, we know that besides the equilibria, there are no closed or recurrent orbits on the collision manifold. As a corollary, we have

Corollary 2.1. *If $\mathfrak{C}(U)$ is isolated in \mathbb{S}^1 , then any orbit in the collision manifold \mathfrak{M} is either an equilibrium or a heteroclinic orbit connecting two different equilibria.*

Combining this with Lemma 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, we can get a complete picture of the phase portraits of the vector field on \mathfrak{M} (numerical pictures with $U(\theta)$ defined as in (3) can be found in Figure 4).

Let's assume $(\psi, \theta)(\tau), \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ is a heteroclinic orbit in \mathfrak{M} satisfying

$$(23) \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} (\psi, \theta)(\tau) = (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm),$$




FIGURE 3

where $(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ are two equilibria in \mathfrak{M} . Then correspondingly

$$(24) \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} (v, u, \theta)(\tau) = (\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)} \sin \psi_0^\pm, \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)} \cos \psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm).$$

Because v serves as a Lyapunov function, the following must hold

$$(25) \quad \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)} \sin \psi_0^- < \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} \sin \psi_0^+.$$

As a result, there are possibly three different types of heteroclinic orbits in \mathfrak{M} :

- I. $\psi_0^- = -\pi/2, \psi_0^+ = \pi/2$;
- II. $\psi_0^- = \psi_0^+ = \pi/2$ and $U(\theta_0^-) < U(\theta_0^+)$;
- III. $\psi_0^- = \psi_0^+ = -\pi/2$ and $U(\theta_0^-) > U(\theta_0^+)$.




FIGURE 4

Lemma 2.4. *Given a heteroclinic orbit $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ in \mathfrak{M} , if $(r, t) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R})$ is a solution of*

$$(26) \quad \begin{cases} r' &= r \sqrt{2U(\theta)} \sin \psi, \\ t' &= r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \end{cases}$$

then

- (a). when $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ is type-I, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} r(\tau) = \pm\infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} t(\tau) = \pm\infty$;
- (b). when $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ is type-II, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} r(\tau) = +\infty$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} t(\tau) = +\infty$, and $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} r(\tau) = 0$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} t(\tau) = T_0^- > -\infty$;
- (c). when $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ is type-III, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} r(\tau) = 0$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} t(\tau) = T_0^+ < +\infty$ and $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} r(\tau) = +\infty$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} t(\tau) = -\infty$.

Proof. First let's assume $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ is type-I. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there exists $T_1 > 0$ large enough, such that

$$\forall \tau \geq T_1, \quad \begin{cases} |\sqrt{2U(\theta(\tau))} - \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)}| \leq \varepsilon, \\ |\sin \psi(\tau) - \sin \psi_0^+| = |\sin \psi(\tau) - 1| \leq \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Then for any $T_2 > T_1$,

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \ln(r(T_2)) - \ln(r(T_1)) &= \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sqrt{2U(\theta)} \sin \psi \, d\tau \\ &= (\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)(T_2 - T_1) \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ as } T_2 \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\ln(r(T_2))$, as well as $r(T_2)$, goes to $+\infty$, when $T_2 \rightarrow +\infty$.

For any $\tau > T_1$, by (27)

$$\ln(r(\tau)) \geq (\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)(\tau - T_1) + \ln(r(T_1)).$$

Then $r(\tau) \geq C_1(\varepsilon, T_1)e^{C_2(\varepsilon, T_1)\tau}$, and

$$t(T_2) - t(T_1) = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\tau) d\tau \geq \int_{T_1}^{T_2} C_1^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} e^{C_2(1+\frac{\alpha}{2})\tau} d\tau.$$

As a result, $t(T_2) \rightarrow +\infty$, when $T_2 \rightarrow +\infty$.

Meanwhile we may also find a $T_1 < 0$ small enough, such that

$$\forall \tau \leq T_1, \begin{cases} |\sqrt{2U(\theta(\tau))} - \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)}| \leq \varepsilon, \\ |\sin \psi(\tau) - \sin \psi_0^-| = |\sin \psi(\tau) + 1| \leq \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Then for any $T_2 < T_1$,

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} \ln(r(T_2)) - \ln(r(T_1)) &\geq - \int_{T_2}^{T_1} \sqrt{2U(\theta)} \sin \psi d\tau \\ &\geq (\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)} - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)(T_1 - T_2) \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ as } T_2 \rightarrow -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\ln(r(T_2))$, as well as $r(T_2)$, goes to $+\infty$, when $T_2 \rightarrow -\infty$.

For any $\tau < T_1$, by (28),

$$\ln(r(\tau)) \geq (\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)} - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)(T_1 - \tau) + \ln(r(T_1)).$$

Then $r(\tau) \geq C_3(\varepsilon, T_1)e^{-C_4(\varepsilon, T_1)\tau}$, and

$$t(T_1) - t(T_2) = \int_{T_2}^{T_1} r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} d\tau \geq \int_{T_2}^{T_1} C_3^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} e^{-C_4(1+\frac{\alpha}{2})\tau} d\tau.$$

As a result, $t(T_2) \rightarrow -\infty$, when $T_2 \rightarrow -\infty$.

This finishes our proof of property (a). Now let's assume the heteroclinic orbit is type-II. The proof for $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} r(\tau) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} t(\tau) = +\infty$ are exactly the same as above.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there exists $T_1 < 0$ small enough, such that

$$\forall \tau \leq T_1, \begin{cases} |\sqrt{2U(\theta(\tau))} - \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)}| \leq \varepsilon, \\ |\sin \psi(\tau) - \sin(\psi_0^-)| = |\sin \psi(\tau) - 1| \leq \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Then for any $T_2 < T_1$,

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \ln(r(T_2)) - \ln(r(T_1)) &= - \int_{T_2}^{T_1} \sqrt{2U(\theta)} \sin \psi d\tau \\ &\leq (\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)} - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)(T_2 - T_1) \rightarrow -\infty, \text{ as } T_2 \rightarrow -\infty \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\ln(r(T_2)) \rightarrow -\infty$, as $T_2 \rightarrow -\infty$, which means $r(-T_2) \rightarrow 0$ at the same time.

For any $\tau < T_1$, by (29)

$$\ln(r(\tau)) \leq (\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)} - \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)(\tau - T_1) + \ln(r(T_1)).$$

Then $r(\tau) \leq C_5(\varepsilon, T_1)e^{C_6(\varepsilon, T_2)\tau}$, and

$$t(T_1) - t(T_2) = \int_{T_2}^{T_1} r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\tau) d\tau \leq \int_{-\infty}^{T_1} C_5^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} e^{C_6(1+\frac{\alpha}{2})\tau} d\tau.$$

As a result, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} t(\tau) = T_0^- > -\infty$.

This finishes our proof of property (b). Property (c) can be proven similarly as above, we omit the details. \square

Given a zero energy solution $x(t)$, let $\pi(x)(\tau) := (\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ be the corresponding orbit in the collision manifold defined as above, then we have the following result, which clearly implies Theorem 1.1

Proposition 2.1. *If $\mathfrak{C}(U)$ is isolated in \mathbb{S}^1 , then*

- (a). $\pi(x)(\tau)$ is an equilibrium in \mathfrak{M} , if and only if $x(t)$ is homothetic;
- (b). $\pi(x)(\tau)$ is a type-I heteroclinic orbit, if and only if $x(t)$ is a non-homothetic parabolic solution;
- (c). $\pi(x)(\tau)$ is a type-II heteroclinic orbit, if and only if $x(t)$ is a non-homothetic collision-parabolic solution;
- (d). $\pi(x)(\tau)$ is a type-III heteroclinic orbit, if and only if $x(t)$ is a non-homothetic parabolic-collision solution.

Proof. Notice that if a solution $x(t)$'s energy is zero, then the corresponding orbit $z(t)$ of (12) satisfies $H(z(t)) \equiv 0$. As a result, (17) holds. This means in McGehee coordinates with time parameter τ , $z(\tau)$ should satisfies (15) with the first equation replaced by (18).

Let $\pi(z(\tau))$ be the projection of $z(\tau)$ to the collision manifold \mathfrak{M} , then it must satisfies (20). By Corollary 2.1, it is either an equilibrium or a heteroclinic orbit between two different equilibria. The former holds, if and only if $\theta(t) \equiv \theta_0 \in \mathfrak{C}(U)$, $\forall \tau$. This proves property (a). The rest followings from Lemma 2.4. \square

Remark 2.1. *If $x(t), t \in (T^-, T^+)$ is a non-homothetic zero energy solution, by Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.1, $\{t \in (T^-, T^+) : \dot{\theta}(t) = 0\}$ is an isolated subset of (T^-, T^+) , as $dt = r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}d\tau$ and $r(\tau) > 0$, for any τ .*

3. ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LINEAR HAMILTONIAN SYSTEM

In this section, let $x(t), t \in (T^-, T^+)$, be a zero energy solution of (1) and $z(t) = (p_1, p_2, r, \theta)^T(t)$ the corresponding zero energy orbit of (12). We will study the corresponding linear Hamiltonian system along $z(t)$. Particularly its asymptotic behavior, as $x(t)$ approaches to the collision or infinity.

By results from Section 2, the projection of $z(\tau)$ on the collision manifold, $(\psi, \theta)(\tau) = \pi(z(\tau)), \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, is either a equilibrium or a heteroclinic orbit. In the rest of this section, we always assume the latter holds with $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} (\psi, \theta)(\tau) = (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ for some $\theta_0^\pm \in \mathfrak{C}(U)$ and $\psi_0^\pm \in \{\pm\pi/2\}$.

Consider the linearized equation of (12) along $z(t)$

$$(30) \quad \dot{\xi}(t) = J\nabla^2 H(z(t))\xi(t).$$

Like before we change the time parameter to τ ,

$$(31) \quad \xi'(\tau) = B(\tau)\xi(\tau) := r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\tau)J\nabla^2 H(z(\tau))\xi(\tau).$$

By a direct computation

$$(32) \quad B(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & r^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1} & -2r^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-2}p_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{2p_2}{r^{2-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} & \frac{3p_2^2}{r^{3-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} - \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)U(\theta)}{r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}} & \alpha r^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}U_\theta(\theta) \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha r^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}U_\theta(\theta) & -r^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}U_{\theta\theta}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}(\tau).$$

To separate the variable r , we define the following symplectic matrix

$$(33) \quad R(\tau) = \text{diag}(r^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{4}}, r^{\frac{\alpha}{4} - \frac{1}{2}}, r^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{4}}, r^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{4}})(\tau).$$

Then if $\xi(\tau)$ is a solution of (31), $\eta(\tau) = R(\tau)\xi(\tau)$ satisfies

$$(34) \quad \eta'(\tau) = J\hat{B}(\tau)\eta(\tau),$$

where $\hat{B}(\tau) = -JR'(\tau)R^{-1}(\tau) + R(\tau)B(\tau)R^{-1}(\tau)$.

In order to use the results from Section 2, we write $\hat{B}(\tau)$ in McGehee coordinates. Recall that $v = r'r^{-1} = r^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}p_1$, $u = r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\dot{\theta} = r^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}p_2$. Then a straightforward computation shows

$$(35) \quad \hat{B}(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -\frac{2+\alpha}{4}v & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2u & \frac{2-\alpha}{4}v \\ -\frac{2+\alpha}{4}v & -2u & 3u^2 - \alpha(\alpha+1)U(\theta) & \alpha U_{\theta}(\theta) \\ 0 & \frac{2-\alpha}{4}v & \alpha U_{\theta}(\theta) & -U_{\theta\theta}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}(\tau).$$

We need to study the limiting system of (34) as τ goes to infinity. Recall that

$$(36) \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} (v, u, \theta)(\tau) = (\pm\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})}, 0, \theta_0^{\pm}).$$

Set $\hat{B}_{\pm} := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} \hat{B}(\tau)$, then we can write $\hat{B}_{\pm} = \hat{B}_{\pm}^{(1)} \diamond \hat{B}_{\pm}^{(2)}$ with

$$\hat{B}_{\pm}^{(1)} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{2+\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})}\sin\psi_0^{\pm} \\ -\frac{2+\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})}\sin\psi_0^{\pm} & -\alpha(\alpha+1)U(\theta_0^{\pm}) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\hat{B}_{\pm}^{(2)} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{2-\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})}\sin\psi_0^{\pm} \\ \frac{2-\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})}\sin\psi_0^{\pm} & -U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0^{\pm}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the above the *symplectic sum* \diamond is defined as ([24]): for any two $2m_k \times 2m_k$

square block matrices, $M_k = \begin{pmatrix} A_k & B_k \\ C_k & D_k \end{pmatrix}$, $k = 1, 2$,

$$M_1 \diamond M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & 0 & B_2 \\ C_1 & 0 & D_1 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & 0 & D_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

For $i = 1$ or 2 , let $\hat{\lambda}_{\pm,s}^i, \hat{\lambda}_{\pm,l}^i$ be the two eigenvalues of the corresponding $J\hat{B}_{\pm}^{(i)}$, and $\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^i, \hat{e}_{\pm,l}^i$ the corresponding eigenvectors. Like before, we always assume $\hat{\lambda}_{\pm,s}^i \leq \hat{\lambda}_{\pm,l}^i$, when both of them are real numbers. Then we have the following results.

Lemma 3.1. $J\hat{B}_{\pm}^{(1)}$ always are hyperbolic matrices, with

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\pm,s}^1 = -\frac{2+3\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})} < 0 < \hat{\lambda}_{\pm,l}^1 = \frac{2+3\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})},$$

and

$$\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1 = \left(\frac{(2+\alpha)\sin\psi_0^{\pm} - (2+3\alpha)\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})}}{4}, 1 \right)^T,$$

$$\hat{e}_{\pm,l}^1 = \left(\frac{(2+\alpha)\sin\psi_0^{\pm} + (2+3\alpha)\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^{\pm})}}{4}, 1 \right)^T,$$

Lemma 3.2. *When the following condition holds:*

$$(37) \quad \Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0 \text{ or equivalently } U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0^\pm) > -\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8}U(\theta_0^\pm),$$

$J\hat{B}_\pm^{(2)}$ are hyperbolic matrices with

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\pm,s}^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)} < 0 < \hat{\lambda}_{\pm,l}^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2 &= \left(-\frac{2-\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)}\sin\psi_0^\pm - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)}, 1 \right)^T; \\ \hat{e}_{\pm,l}^2 &= \left(-\frac{2-\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)}\sin\psi_0^\pm + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)}, 1 \right)^T. \end{aligned}$$

The proofs of the above two lemmas are straight forward computations. Notice that unlike $J\hat{B}_\pm^{(1)}$, the hyperbolicity of $J\hat{B}_\pm^{(2)}$ depends on $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)$ given by (10).

By the $(-\alpha)$ -homogeneous property of the potential V , if $x(t) = (r(t), \theta(t))$ is solution of (1), then so is $x_h(t) = (r_h(t), \theta_h(t))$, for any $h > 0$, where $r_h(t) = h^{-\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}r(ht)$, $\theta_h(t) = \theta(ht)$. For the corresponding Hamiltonian system, this means

$$(38) \quad \dot{z}_h(t) = J\nabla H_h(z_h(t)),$$

where $z_h(t) = (p_{1,h}, p_{2,h}, r_h, \theta_h)^T(t)$ with

$$p_{1,h}(t) = \dot{r}_h(t) = h^{\frac{\alpha}{2+\alpha}}\dot{r}(ht); \quad p_{2,h}(t) = r_h^2(t)\dot{\theta}_h(t) = h^{\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha+2}}r^2(ht)\dot{\theta}(ht),$$

and

$$H_h(z_h(t)) = \frac{1}{2}(p_{1,h}^2(t) + r_h^{-2}(t)p_{2,h}^2(t)) - r_h^{-\alpha}(t)U(\theta_h(t)).$$

First let's set $h = 1$, then (38) is just (12), and by differentiating both sides of it with respect to t , we get that a solution of (30) as below:

$$\zeta_1(t) := \dot{z}_1(t) = (\ddot{r}, 2r\dot{r}\dot{\theta} + r^2\ddot{\theta}, \dot{r}, \dot{\theta})^T(t).$$

To obtain another solution of (30), we differentiate both sides of (38) with respect to h . Then

$$(39) \quad \frac{dz_h}{dh}|_{h=1}(t) = J\nabla^2 H(z_1(t)) \left(\frac{dz_h}{dh}|_{h=1}(t) \right).$$

Hence $\zeta_3(t) := \frac{dz_h}{dh}|_{h=1}(t)$ is a solution of (30) as well. Set $\zeta_3(t) = \zeta_2(t) + t\zeta_1(t)$ with $\zeta_1(t)$ defined as above, then

$$\zeta_2(t) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\alpha}\dot{r}, \frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha+2}r^2\ddot{\theta}, -\frac{\alpha}{2+\alpha}r, 0 \right)^T(t).$$

In McGehee coordinates, $\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)$ can be written as following:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(t) &= \left(\frac{u^2 - \alpha U(\theta)}{r^{1+\alpha}}, \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{r^\alpha}, \frac{v}{r^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \frac{u}{r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}} \right)^T(t); \\ \zeta_2(t) &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{2+\alpha} \frac{v}{r^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}, \frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha+2} r^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} u, -\frac{2}{2+\alpha} r, 0 \right)^T(t). \end{aligned}$$

Now change the time parameter of ζ_i , $i = 1, 2$, from t to τ , and define $\eta_i(\tau) := R(\tau)\zeta_i(\tau)$, $i = 1, 2$, where $R(\tau)$ is given in (33), then $\eta_i(\tau)$'s are solutions of the linear system (34). By this, we can separate the variable r :

$$(40) \quad \eta_1(\tau) = r^{-\frac{2+3\alpha}{4}}(\tau)(u^2 - \alpha U(\theta), U_\theta(\theta), v, u)^T(\tau),$$

$$(41) \quad \eta_2(\tau) = r^{\frac{2-\alpha}{4}}(\tau) \left(\frac{\alpha v}{2+\alpha}, \frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha+2}u, -\frac{2}{2+\alpha}, 0 \right)^T(\tau).$$

Please note $\eta_1(\tau), \eta_2(\tau)$ are linear independent if and only if $x(t)$ is a non-homothetic solution.

Let ω be the standard symplectic form on \mathbb{R}^4 for the rest of the paper.

Lemma 3.3. $V(\tau) := \text{span}\{\eta_1(\tau), \eta_2(\tau)\}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, is a path of Lagrangian subspaces of (\mathbb{R}^4, ω) .

Proof. By a direct computation,

$$\omega(\eta_1, \eta_2) = \frac{2\alpha}{2+\alpha}r^{-\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{2}(u^2 + v^2) - U(\theta) \right).$$

Then the result follows from (16) and the energy of the corresponding solution being zero. \square

We finish this section with a property regarding the limits of $V(\tau)$ as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$. To define such a limit, let $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ be the Grassmannian of \mathbb{R}^4 , i.e. the set of all closed linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^4 . For any $W \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^4)$, let P_W be the orthogonal projection of \mathbb{R}^4 to W , then

$$\text{dist}(W, W^*) := \|P_W - P_{W^*}\|, \text{ for any } W, W^* \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^4),$$

gives a complete metric on $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^4)$. Here $\|\cdot\|$ represents the metric on the space of bounded linear operators from \mathbb{R}^4 to itself.

For the limits of $V(\tau)$ to exist, we need $J\hat{B}_\pm^{(1)}$ and $J\hat{B}_\pm^{(2)}$ to be hyperbolic. Meanwhile the precise limits also depend on how the corresponding heteroclinic orbit $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ on the collision manifold approaches to the two equilibria $(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$. Following the notations defined in Definition 2.1, we set

$$e_s^\pm = e_s(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm), \quad e_l^\pm = e_l(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm).$$

When $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$, by Lemma 2.2 and 2.3, as $(\psi, \theta)(t)$ converges to $(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$, it is either along the subspace $\langle e_s^\pm \rangle$ or the subspace $\langle e_l^\pm \rangle$.

Proposition 3.1. Assume $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$ and $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0^\pm) \neq 0$,

- when $\psi_0^\pm = \pi/2$ and $(\psi, \theta)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ along $\langle e_s^\pm \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$, then $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2\}$;
- when $\psi_0^\pm = \pi/2$ and $(\psi, \theta)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ along $\langle e_l^\pm \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$, then $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,l}^2\}$;
- when $\psi_0^\pm = -\pi/2$ and $(\psi, \theta)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ along $\langle e_s^\pm \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$, then $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,l}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2\}$;
- when $\psi_0^\pm = -\pi/2$ and $(\psi, \theta)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ along $\langle e_l^\pm \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$, then $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,l}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,l}^2\}$.

The following lemma will be needed in the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.4. Assume $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$ and $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0^\pm) \neq 0$,

(a). if $(\psi, \theta)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ along $\langle e_s^\pm \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$, then

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} = -\lambda_l(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm) = \frac{2-\alpha}{4} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)} \sin \psi_0^\pm - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)};$$

(b). if $(\psi, \theta)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ along $\langle e_l^\pm \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$, then

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} = -\lambda_s(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm) = \frac{2-\alpha}{4} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)} \sin \psi_0^\pm + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)}.$$

First we give a proof of Proposition 3.1 based on the above lemma.

Proof. Only the details of property (a) will be given, while the others are similarly. For each $i \in 1, 2, 3, 4$, we define a vector $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with the i -th component equal to 1 and the others all being zero. Then the \mathbf{e}_i 's form a basis of \mathbb{R}^4 .

Recall that $V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\eta_1(\tau), \eta_2(\tau)\}$, where η_1 and η_2 are defined by (40) and (41) correspondingly, then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1 \wedge \eta_2 &= \frac{u}{(2+\alpha)r^\alpha} \left\{ \left((2-\alpha)(\alpha U(\theta) - u^2) - \alpha v \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} \right) \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_2 \right. \\ &\quad - (2-\alpha)u \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_3 - \alpha v \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_4 + \left((2-\alpha)v - 2 \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} \right) \mathbf{e}_2 \wedge \mathbf{e}_3 \\ &\quad \left. + (2-\alpha)u \mathbf{e}_2 \wedge \mathbf{e}_4 + 2\mathbf{e}_3 \wedge \mathbf{e}_4 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\psi_0^\pm = \pi/2$ and $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ converges to $(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$ along $\langle e_s^\pm \rangle$, by (36) and property (a) in Lemma 3.4, a direct computation shows

$$(42) \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{(2+\alpha)r^\alpha}{u} \eta_1 \wedge \eta_2 = \left(\frac{\alpha(2-\alpha)}{2} U(\theta_0^\pm) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)} \right) \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_2 \\ - \alpha \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)} \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_4 + \left(\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)} + \sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)} \right) \mathbf{e}_2 \wedge \mathbf{e}_3 + 2\mathbf{e}_3 \wedge \mathbf{e}_4.$$

Meanwhile for $\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2$ given in Lemma 3.1 and 3.2, a straight forward computation shows $2\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1 \wedge \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2$ is exactly the same as what we got in (42). This finishes our proof. \square

Now we give a proof of Lemma 3.4.

Proof. We will only give the details for τ goes to $+\infty$. Notice that $\psi_0^+ = \pi/2$ or $-\pi/2$, so $\sin \psi_0^+ = 1$ or -1 . As both $U_\theta(\theta)$ and u goes to 0, when $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, by L'Hospital's rule,

$$(43) \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{U_{\theta\theta}(\theta)\theta'}{(\sqrt{2U(\theta)} \cos \psi)'} = -\frac{U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0^+)}{\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+) \sin \psi_0^+}} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\theta'}{\psi'}$$

If $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ converges to (ψ_0^+, θ_0^+) along $\langle e_s^+ \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, by Lemma 2.2,

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\psi'}{\theta'} = \frac{2-\alpha}{4} + \frac{\sin \psi_0^+}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(\theta_0^+)}{2U(\theta_0^+)}}.$$

Plug this into (43), we get

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} = \frac{2-\alpha}{4} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} \sin \psi_0^+ - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^+)} = -\lambda_l(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm).$$

The second equality follows from Lemma 2.2. Similarly if $(\psi, \theta)(\tau)$ converges to (ψ_0^+, θ_0^+) along $\langle e_i^+ \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, then

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\psi'}{\theta'} = \frac{2 - \alpha}{4} - \frac{\sin \psi_0^+}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\Delta(\theta_0^+)}{2U(\theta_0^+)}}.$$

Plug this into (43), together with Lemma 2.2, we get

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} = \frac{2 - \alpha}{4} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} \sin \psi_0^+ + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^+)} = -\lambda_s(\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm).$$

□

4. RELATION WITH THE MORSE AND MASLOV INDICES

This section will be devoted to the proofs of our main results, which establishes the connection between the Morse and oscillation indices of a zero energy solution. Except the last proof, which deals with the homothetic solution, we always assume $x(t)$, $t \in (T^-, T^+)$, is a non-homothetic zero energy solution of (1) with $z(t)$ being the corresponding zero energy orbit of (12) and $\pi(z)(\tau)$ the heteroclinic orbit on \mathfrak{M} satisfying $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \pi(z)(\tau) = (\psi_0^\pm, \theta_0^\pm)$.

The tool that will connect the two indices is the *Maslov index*. Let $\gamma(t, t_1)$ be the fundamental solution of the linear Hamiltonian equation (30):

$$(44) \quad \dot{\gamma}(t, t_1) = J\nabla^2 H(z(t))\gamma(t, t_1), \quad \gamma(t_1, t_1) = I_4.$$

For any $t_1 < t_2$, we define the Maslov index of $x(t)$, $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ as

$$(45) \quad \mu(V_d, \gamma(t, t_1)V_d; [t_1, t_2]).$$

We define $V_d = \mathbb{R}^2 \oplus 0$ and $V_n = 0 \oplus \mathbb{R}^2$. The details of Maslov index can be found in the Appendix.

Recall that $m(x; t_1, t_2)$ is the Morse index of $x(t)$, $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ under Dirichlet boundary condition. By the Morse index Theorem (see [23])

$$(46) \quad m^-(x; t_1, t_2) + 2 = \mu(V_d, \gamma(t, t_1)V_d; [t_1, t_2]),$$

Let τ be the new time parameter defined in Section 2 with $\tau_i = \tau(t_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, then $\gamma(\tau, \tau_1)$ is the fundamental solution of equation (31). This means $\hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_1) = R(\tau)\gamma(\tau, \tau_1)R^{-1}(\tau_1)$ ($R(\tau)$ is the matrix defined in (33)) is the fundamental solution of equation (34), i.e.,

$$(47) \quad \hat{\gamma}'(\tau, \tau_1) = J\hat{B}(\tau)\hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_1), \quad \hat{\gamma}(\tau_1, \tau_1) = I_4.$$

In the following, let $\hat{\gamma}(\tau, \sigma)$ represent the linear flow of (47) with $\hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \sigma) = I_4$, for any two $\tau, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 4.1. $\mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_1)V_d; [\tau_1, \tau_2]) = \mu(V_d, \gamma(t, t_1)V_d; [t_1, t_2])$.

Proof. First as the Maslov index is invariant under the change of time parameter,

$$(48) \quad \mu(V_d, \gamma(t, t_1)V_d; [t_1, t_2]) = \mu(V_d, \gamma(\tau, \tau_1)V_d; [\tau_1, \tau_2]),$$

Meanwhile

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_1)V_d; [\tau_1, \tau_2]) &= \mu(V_d, R(\tau)\gamma(\tau, \tau_1)R^{-1}(\tau_1)V_d; [\tau_1, \tau_2]) \\ &= \mu(R^{-1}(\tau)V_d, \gamma(\tau, \tau_1)R^{-1}(\tau_1)V_d; [\tau_1, \tau_2]) = \mu(V_d, \gamma(\tau, \tau_1)V_d; [\tau_1, \tau_2]). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $R^{-1}(\tau)V_d = V_d$, for any τ , as $R(\tau)$ is a diagonal matrix. □

By the above lemma, we have

$$(50) \quad m^-(x; t_1, t_2) + 2 = \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_1)V_d; [\tau_1, \tau_2]).$$

Recall the Morse index $m^-(x)$ defined in (7), we have

$$(51) \quad m^-(x) + 2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_1)V_d; [\tau_n^-, \tau_n^+]),$$

where $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \tau_n^\pm = \pm\infty$.

To compute the limit in the above identity, a slightly different Maslov index will be needed. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the stable and unstable subspace $V^s(\tau)$ and $V^u(\tau)$ of the linear system (47) as

$$V^s(\tau) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)v = 0\},$$

$$V^u(\tau) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow -\infty} \hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)v = 0\}.$$

Notice that $V^{s/u}(\tau) = \hat{\gamma}(\tau, \sigma)V^{s/u}(\sigma)$, for any two $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 4.1. We define the **Maslov index** $\mu(x)$ of x as

$$(52) \quad \mu(x) := \mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); \mathbb{R}) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); [-T, T]).$$

The Maslov index $\mu(x)$ defined above is introduced for the study of heteroclinic orbits (see [21], [22]). Further details can be found in the Appendix.

At this moment it is not clear, whether $\mu(x)$ is well defined. We will show this shortly. Recall $J\hat{B}_\pm = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} J\hat{B}(\tau)$ are hyperbolic matrices, when $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$. Let $V^+(J\hat{B}_\pm)$ and $V^-(J\hat{B}_\pm)$ be the $J\hat{B}_\pm$ invariant subspace of \mathbb{R}^4 corresponding to eigenvalues with positive and negative real part respectively. By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2,

$$V^+(J\hat{B}_\pm) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,l}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,l}^2\}, \quad V^-(J\hat{B}_\pm) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2\}.$$

The following lemma will be needed (for a proof see [1, Theorem 2.1]).

Lemma 4.2. When $J\hat{B}_\pm$ are hyperbolic matrices.

- $V^s(\tau)$ is the only linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^4 satisfying $\hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)V^s(\tau) \rightarrow V^-(J\hat{B}_+)$, as $\sigma \rightarrow +\infty$, and $V^u(\tau)$ is the only linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^4 satisfying $\hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)V^u(\tau) \rightarrow V^+(J\hat{B}_-)$, as $\sigma \rightarrow -\infty$;
- if a linear subspace W of \mathbb{R}^4 is topologically complement of $V^s(\tau)$, then for any $v \in W \setminus \{0\}$, $|\hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)v| \rightarrow +\infty$ exponentially fast, as $\sigma \rightarrow +\infty$, and $\hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)W \rightarrow V^+(J\hat{B}_+)$ at the same time;
- if a linear subspace W of \mathbb{R}^4 is topologically complement of $V^u(\tau)$, then for any $v \in W \setminus \{0\}$, $|\hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)v| \rightarrow +\infty$ exponentially fast, as $\sigma \rightarrow -\infty$, and $\hat{\gamma}(\sigma, \tau)W \rightarrow V^-(J\hat{B}_-)$ at the same time.

In the following let $V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\eta_1(\tau), \eta_2(\tau)\}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, be the path of Lagrangian subspaces defined in Lemma 3.3, where $\eta_i(\tau)$, $i = 1, 2$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ are two solutions of the linear system (34) defined in (40) and (41).

Lemma 4.3. When $J\hat{B}_\pm$ are hyperbolic, let $W(\tau)$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, be a path of Lagrangian subspaces of (\mathbb{R}^4, ω) invariant under the flow of (47), if $\eta_1(\tau) \in W(\tau)$, $\forall \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, then

- when $\psi_0^\pm = \frac{\pi}{2}$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} W(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2\}$ or $\text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,s}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,l}^2\}$;
- when $\psi_0^\pm = -\frac{\pi}{2}$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} W(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,l}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,s}^2\}$ or $\text{span}\{\hat{e}_{\pm,l}^1, \hat{e}_{\pm,l}^2\}$.

Proof. We will only give the details for τ goes to $+\infty$. The other is exactly the same.

First let's assume $\psi_0^+ = \pi/2$, recall $\eta_1 = r^{-\frac{2+3\alpha}{2}}(u^2 - \alpha U(\theta), U_\theta(\theta), v, u)^T$. Then

$$(53) \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\eta_1(\tau)}{|\eta_1(\tau)|} = \frac{(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)}, 0, 1, 0)^T}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 U(\theta_0^+)/2 + 1}} = \frac{\hat{e}_{+,s}^1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 U(\theta_0^+)/2 + 1}}.$$

Meanwhile by Lemma 2.4, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau) = 0$.

Notice that we can find a path $\eta(\tau) \in W(\tau)$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, invariant under the flow of (47) and independent of $\eta_1(\tau)$. Since $W(\tau)$ is a Lagrangian subspace, $\eta(\tau) \in V^\omega(\eta_1(\tau))$, the ω orthogonal space of η_1 in \mathbb{R}^4 .

If $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau) = 0$, since the dimension of $W(\tau)$ is two, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(\sigma, \tau)v = 0$, for any $v \in W(\tau)$. By Lemma 4.2, $W(\tau) = V^s(\tau)$ and $W(\tau) \rightarrow V^-(J\hat{B}_+) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{+,s}^1, \hat{e}_{+,s}^2\}$, when $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$.

If $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau) \neq 0$, then we can find a two dimensional linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^4 , which is topological complement of $V^s(\tau)$ and contains $\eta(\tau)$. By Lemma 4.2, for τ large enough, $\eta(\tau) \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(V^+(J\hat{B}_+))$, which is the ε neighborhood of $V^+(J\hat{B}_+)$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. As a result, $\eta(\tau) \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(V^+(J\hat{B}_+)) \cap V^\omega(\eta_1)$. Since ε can be arbitrarily small, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau)/|\eta(\tau)| \in V^+(J\hat{B}_+) \cap V^\omega(\hat{e}_{+,s}^1)$.

Recall that $V^+(J\hat{B}_+) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{+,l}^1, \hat{e}_{+,l}^2\}$, by a direct computation,

$$\omega(\hat{e}_{+,s}^1, \hat{e}_{+,l}^2) = 0, \quad \omega(\hat{e}_{+,s}^1, \hat{e}_{+,l}^1) = -\frac{2+3\alpha}{2}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} \neq 0.$$

Hence $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau)/|\eta(\tau)| = \hat{e}_{+,l}^2/|\hat{e}_{+,l}^2|$, and together with (53), it shows $W(\tau) \rightarrow \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{+,s}^1, \hat{e}_{+,l}^2\}$ as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$. This finishes our proof of property (a).

Now let's assume $\psi_0^+ = -\pi/2$. In this case,

$$(54) \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\eta_1(\tau)}{|\eta_1(\tau)|} = \frac{(\frac{\alpha}{2}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)}, 0, 1, 0)^T}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 U(\theta_0^+)/2 + 1}} = \frac{\hat{e}_{+,l}^1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 U(\theta_0^+)/2 + 1}}$$

and by Lemma 2.4, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} r(\tau) = 0$. Then $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} |\eta_1(\tau)| = +\infty$. Let $\eta(\tau)$ be the path define as above. If $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau) \neq 0$, then $W(\tau)$ is topological complement of $V^s(\tau)$ in \mathbb{R}^4 and by Lemma 4.2, $W(\tau) \rightarrow \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{+,l}^1, \hat{e}_{+,l}^2\}$, as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$.

If $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau) = 0$, then by Lemma 4.2, for $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small, $\eta(\tau) \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(V^-(J\hat{B}_+))$, for τ large enough. As a result, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau)/|\eta(\tau)| = V^-(J\hat{B}_+) \cap V^\omega(\hat{e}_{+,l}^1)$. As $V^-(J\hat{B}_+) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{+,s}^1, \hat{e}_{+,s}^2\}$, a similar computation as before shows, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \eta(\tau)/|\eta(\tau)| = \hat{e}_{+,s}^2/|\hat{e}_{+,s}^2|$, and combine it with (54), we get $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} W(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{+,l}^1, \hat{e}_{+,s}^2\}$. This finish our proof of property (b). \square

Corollary 4.1. Let $V^u(\pm\infty) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} V^u(\tau)$, $V^s(\pm\infty) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} V^s(\tau)$,

- (a). if $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-I, then $V^u(\pm\infty), V^s(\pm\infty)$ exist and are transversal to V_d ;
- (b). if $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-II, then $V^s(\pm\infty)$ exist and are transversal to V_d ;
- (c). if $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-III, then $V^u(\pm\infty)$ exist and are transversal to V_d .

Proof. Notice that regardless of the type of $\pi(z)(\tau)$, by Lemma 4.2, $V^u(-\infty) = V^+(J\hat{B}_-)$ and $V^s(+\infty) = V^-(J\hat{B}_+)$, and both are transversal to V_d .

First assume $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-I. By Lemma 2.4, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} r(\tau) = +\infty$. Hence $\eta_1(\tau) \rightarrow 0$, as $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$. As a result, $\eta_1(\tau) \in V^u(\tau)$ and $V^s(\tau)$. Then property (a) following from Lemma 4.3.

Second assume $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-II. By Lemma 2.4, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} r(\tau) = +\infty$, so $\eta_1(\tau) \in V^s(\tau)$. Then property (b) follows from Lemma 4.3.

Third assume $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-III. Now $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} r(\tau) = +\infty$, so $\eta_1(\tau) \in V^u(\tau)$. Then the rest follows again from Lemma 4.3. \square

By the above corollary, when $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-I or III, $\mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); [-T, T])$ is a constant for $T > 0$ large enough, so $\mu(x)$ given in Definition 4.1 is well defined.

Theorem 4.1. *If $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-I or III and $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$, then $m^-(x) = \mu(x)$.*

Proof. Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, for any $T > 0$ large enough,

$$\mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; [-T, T]) = \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)V_d; [-T, T]) - 2.$$

Together with (50), it shows

$$(55) \quad m^-(x; -T, T) = \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; -T, T).$$

Now we will try to estimate $\mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; -T, T) - \mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); -T, T)$.

For this, let Λ_s , $s \in [0, 1]$ be a path of Lagrangian subspaces of \mathbb{R}^4 with $\Lambda_0 = V^u(-T)$ and $\Lambda(1) = e^{\varepsilon J}V_d$, then by the homotopy invariant property of Maslov index,

$$(56) \quad \mu(V_d, \Lambda_s; [0, 1]) + \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; [-T, T]) = \mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); [-T, T]) + \mu(V_d, \gamma(T, -T)\Lambda_s; [0, 1]).$$

Then we have,

$$(57) \quad \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; [-T, T]) - \mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); [-T, T]) = \mu(V_d, \gamma(T, -T)\Lambda_s; [0, 1]) - \mu(V_d, \Lambda_s; [0, 1]) = s(\gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d, V_d; V^u(-T), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d),$$

where $s(\cdot, \cdot; \cdot, \cdot)$ is the Hörmander index (see (88) in Appendix). As $V_d \pitchfork V^u(T)$,

$$(58) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d = V^-(J\hat{B}_-).$$

Since the above hold for any T large enough, we get

$$(59) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} s(\gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d, V_d; V^u(-T), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d) = s(V^-(J\hat{B}_-), V_d; V^u(-\infty), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d).$$

Recall that $V^-(J\hat{B}_-) = \hat{e}_{-,s}^1 \wedge \hat{e}_{-,s}^2$ and $V^u(-\infty) = \hat{e}_{-,l}^1 \wedge \hat{e}_{-,l}^2$. Then we have the following decomposition of the Hörmander index,

$$(60) \quad s(V^-(J\hat{B}_-), V_d; V^u(-\infty), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d) = s(\langle \hat{e}_{-,s}^1, V_d^1; \langle \hat{e}_{-,l}^1, e^{\varepsilon J}V_d^1 \rangle + s(\langle \hat{e}_{-,s}^2, V_d^2; \langle \hat{e}_{-,l}^2, e^{\varepsilon J}V_d^2 \rangle),$$

A simple computation shows

$$s(\langle \hat{e}_{-,s}^1, V_d^1; \langle \hat{e}_{-,l}^1, e^{\varepsilon J}V_d^1 \rangle) = s(\langle \hat{e}_{-,s}^2, V_d^2; \langle \hat{e}_{-,l}^2, e^{\varepsilon J}V_d^2 \rangle) = 0.$$

This means $m^-(x) = \mu(x)$. \square

While the above theorem connects $m^-(x)$ with $\mu(x)$, the next one will does the same for $i(x)$ and $\mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R})$. Here

$$\mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R}) = \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \mu(V_d, V(\tau); [-T, T]),$$

which is well defined when $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$, as under this condition $V(\pm\infty) \cap V_d$, by Proposition 3.1.

Theorem 4.2. *When $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$, $i(x) = \mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. From (86), we have

$$(61) \quad \mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R}) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \dim(V_d \cap V(\tau)),$$

Recall that $V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\eta_1(\tau), \eta_2(\tau)\}$, where $\eta_1(\tau), \eta_2(\tau)$ are defined in (40) and (41). Obviously $\eta_2(\tau) \notin V_d, \forall \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, which implies $\dim(V(\tau) \cap V_d) \leq 1$.

We claim $\dim(V(\tau) \cap V_d) = 1$, if and only if $u(\tau) = 0$. Assume there is a non-zero $\eta(\tau) = \beta_1 \eta_1(\tau) + \beta_2 \eta_2(\tau)$, which is also contained in V_d . Then it must satisfies the following two equations

$$(62) \quad \beta_1 v - \frac{2\beta_2}{2+\alpha} = 0; \quad \beta_1 u = 0.$$

However the above equations has a solution if and only if $u = 0$.

Meanwhile by the third equation in (15),

$$u(\tau) = \theta'(\tau) = \dot{\theta}(t(\tau))r^{-(1+\frac{\alpha}{2})}(t).$$

Since $r(\tau) > 0$, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\frac{dt}{d\tau} = r^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} > 0$ and

$$(63) \quad i(x) = \#\{t \in (T^-, T^+) | \dot{\theta}(t) = 0\} = \#\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} | u(\tau) = 0\}.$$

This finishes our proof. □

With the above result, all we need to do now is to estimate the difference between $\mu(x)$ and $\mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R})$, which is exactly the purpose of next lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-I or III and $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$, when $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$,*

- (a). *if $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-)$ along $\langle e_l(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-) \rangle$, then $\mu(x) - \mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R}) = 0$;*
- (b). *if $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-)$ along $\langle e_s(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-) \rangle$, then $\mu(x) - \mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R}) = 0$ or 1.*

Proof. Notice that when $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is type-I or III, $\psi_0^- = -\pi/2$, if $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-)$ along $\langle e_l^- \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$, by Proposition 3.1,

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{-,l}^1, \hat{e}_{-,l}^2\} = V^+(J\hat{B}_-).$$

By Lemma 4.2, $V(\tau) = V^u(\tau)$, for any τ . Then $\mu(x) = \mu(V_d, V(\tau); \mathbb{R})$. This proves property (a).

Now assume $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-)$ along $\langle e_s^- \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$. Fix an arbitrary $T > 0$ large enough in the following. It will be enough for us to prove

$$(64) \quad \mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); [-T, T]) - \mu(V_d, V(\tau); [-T, T]) = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

By the proof of Theorem 4.1, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\mu(V_d, V^u(\tau); [-T, T]) = \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; [-T, T]).$$

Hence instead of (64), we will show the following

$$(65) \quad \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; [-T, T]) - \mu(V_d, V(\tau); [-T, T]) = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

Let Λ_s , $s \in [0, 1]$ be a path of Lagrangian subspaces of \mathbb{R}^4 with $\Lambda_0 = V(-T)$ and $\Lambda_1 = e^{\varepsilon J}V_d$. Similar to the way (57) is obtained, we get

$$(66) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, -T)e^{\varepsilon J}V_d; -T, T) - \mu(V_d, V(\tau); -T, T) \\ = s(\gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d, V_d; V(-T), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d = V^-(J\hat{B}_-) = \hat{e}_{-,s}^1 \wedge \hat{e}_{-,s}^2$, and under the condition of property (b), $\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} V(-T) = V(-\infty) = \hat{e}_{-,l}^1 \wedge \hat{e}_{-,s}^2$. Therefore

$$s(\gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d, V_d; V(-T), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d) = s(\gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d, e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}J}V_d; V(-T), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d).$$

Recall that by Lemma 3.1 and 3.2, when $\psi_0^- = -\pi/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{-,s}^1 &= \left(-(\alpha+1)\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)}, 1 \right)^T, \quad \hat{e}_{-,l}^1 = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)}, 1 \right)^T, \\ \hat{e}_{-,s}^2 &= \left(\frac{2-\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^-)}, 1 \right)^T. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, set $b = \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^-)}$, $c = \frac{2-\alpha}{4}\sqrt{2U(\theta_0^\pm)} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)}$.

If we write the Lagrangian subspaces as graphs of linear maps: $V_n \rightarrow V_d$, then

$$V^-(J\hat{B}_-) = \text{Gr}(A_0), e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}J}V_d = \text{Gr}(A_1); \quad V(-\infty) = \text{Gr}(B_0), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d = \text{Gr}(B_1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} -(\alpha+1)b & 0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \cot(\varepsilon/2) & 0 \\ 0 & \cot(\varepsilon/2) \end{pmatrix}; \\ B_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha}{2}b & 0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \cot(\varepsilon) & 0 \\ 0 & \cot(\varepsilon) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $A_{0,T}, B_{0,T}$ be the matrices, such that $\gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d = \text{Gr}(A_{0,T})$ and $V(-T) = \text{Gr}(B_{0,T})$. Then for T large enough, $A_{0,T}, B_{0,T}$ are in the $\varepsilon/2$ -neighborhood of A_0, B_0 correspondingly. By the property of Hörmander index (see (90)),

$$\begin{aligned} s(\gamma(T, -T)^{-1}V_d, e^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}J}V_d; V(-T), e^{\varepsilon J}V_d) &= \frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_{0,T} - A_1) + \\ &\frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_1 - A_{0,T}) - \frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_1 - A_1) - \frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_{0,T} - A_{0,T}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $B_{0,T} - A_1, B_1 - A_1$ are negative definite, and $B_1 - A_{0,T}$ is positive definite. Hence

$$-\frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_{0,T} - A_1) = \frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_1 - A_{0,T}) = -\frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_1 - A_1) = 1.$$

Since $B_{0,T} - A_{0,T}$ is in the ε -neighborhood of $B_0 - A_0$, which has a positive eigenvalue $(1 + \frac{3}{2}\alpha)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(B_{0,T} - A_{0,T}) = 0, \quad \text{or } 1.$$

This completes our proof. \square

Corollary 4.2. *Assume $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$. When $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is a type-I or III heteroclinic orbit,*

- (a). if $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-)$ along $\langle e_l(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-) \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$, then $m^-(x) = i(x)$;
- (b). if $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-)$ along $\langle e_s(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-) \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$, then $m^-(x) - i(x) = 0$ or 1 .

When $\pi(z)(\tau)$ is a type-II heteroclinic orbit,

- (c). if $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^+, \theta_0^+)$ along $\langle e_s(\psi_0^+, \theta_0^+) \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, then $m^-(x) = i(x)$;
- (d). if $\pi(z)(\tau) \rightarrow (\psi_0^+, \theta_0^+)$ along $\langle e_l(\psi_0^+, \theta_0^+) \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, then $m^-(x) - i(x) = 0$ or 1 .

Proof. Property (a) and (b) follows directly from Theorem 4.1, 4.2 and Lemma 4.4.

For property (c) and (d), as the corresponding $x(t)$ is a collision-parabolic solution, $\tilde{x}(t) = x(-t)$ will be a parabolic-collision solution. By their definitions, it is not hard to see $m^-(\tilde{x}) = m^-(x)$ and $i(\tilde{x}) = i(x)$.

Let \tilde{z} be the zero energy orbit of (12) corresponding to \tilde{x} , and $(\tilde{v}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{\theta})(\tau)$ the corresponding orbit in McGehee coordinates, then by the computation given at the beginning of Section 2, we have

$$(\tilde{v}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{\theta})(\tau) = (-v, -u, r, \theta)(-\tau).$$

As a result, on the collision manifold \mathfrak{M} with coordinates defined in (19), we have

$$(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\theta})(\tau) = (\psi + \pi, \theta)(-\tau).$$

Then

$$(\tilde{\psi}_0^-, \tilde{\theta}_0^-) := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} (\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\theta})(\tau) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} (\psi + \pi, \theta)(-\tau) = (\psi_0^+ + \pi, \theta_0^+).$$

By (22),

$$M(\tilde{\psi}_0^-, \tilde{\theta}_0^-) = M(\psi_0^+ + \pi, \theta_0^+) = -M(\psi_0^+, \theta_0^+).$$

As a result,

$$e_l(\tilde{\psi}_0^-, \tilde{\theta}_0^-) = e_s(\psi_0^+, \theta_0^+), \quad e_s(\tilde{\psi}_0^-, \tilde{\theta}_0^-) = e_l(\psi_0^+, \theta_0^+).$$

Then the rest follows from property (a) and (b), which we have already proven. \square

In the above we always assume $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) > 0$, to deal the non-hyperbolic case, i.e., $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm) < 0$, we have the next proposition

Proposition 4.1. *If at least one of $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)$ is negative, then $m^-(x) = i(x) = +\infty$.*

Proof. We only give the details for the case $\Delta(\theta_0^+) < 0$, while the proof for the other case is exactly the same.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we can find a $\tau_0 > 0$, such that $\|\hat{B}(\tau) - \hat{B}_+\| < \varepsilon$, for any $\tau \in [\tau_0, +\infty)$. By (50), if $\lim_{\tau_1 \rightarrow +\infty} \mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_0))V_d; [\tau_0, \tau_1] = +\infty$, then $m^-(x) = +\infty$. Since $\hat{B}(\tau) > \hat{B}_+ - \varepsilon I_4$, from the monotonic property of Maslov index,

$$\mu(V_d, \hat{\gamma}(\tau, \tau_0))V_d; [\tau_0, \tau_1] \geq \mu(V_d, e^{(\tau-\tau_0)(\hat{B}_+ - \varepsilon I_4)}V_d; [\tau_0, \tau_1]), \quad \forall \tau_1 > \tau_0.$$

By the symplectic additivity property,

$$(67) \quad \mu(V_d, e^{(\tau-\tau_0)(\hat{B}_+ - \varepsilon I_4)}V_d) = \mu(V_d, e^{(\tau-\tau_0)(\hat{B}_+^{(1)} - \varepsilon I_2)}V_d) + \mu(V_d, e^{(\tau-\tau_0)(\hat{B}_+^{(2)} - \varepsilon I_2)}V_d).$$

Since in this case the crossing form is always positive, $\mu(V_d, \exp((\tau - \tau_0)(\hat{B}_+^{(i)} - \varepsilon I_2))V_d)$ is the summation of $\dim(\exp((\tau - \tau_0)(\hat{B}_+^{(i)} - \varepsilon I_2))V_d \cap V_d)$ over $\tau \in [\tau_0, \tau_1]$, for $i = 1, 2$. As a result,

$$\mu(V_d, e^{(\tau - \tau_0)(\hat{B}_+ - \varepsilon I_4)}V_d) \geq \sum_{\tau \in [\tau_0, \tau_1]} \dim e^{(\tau - \tau_0)(\hat{B}_+^{(2)} - \varepsilon I_2)}V_d \cap V_d.$$

Notice that

$$\hat{B}_+^{(2)} - \varepsilon I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon & \frac{2-\alpha}{4} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} \\ \frac{2-\alpha}{4} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0^+)} & -U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0^+) - \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}.$$

For ε small enough, $\hat{B}_+^{(2)} - \varepsilon I_2 > 0$, a direct computation shows the summation of crossing time is unbounded as $\tau_1 \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence $m^-(x) = +\infty$.

For $i(x)$, when $\Delta(\theta_0^+) < 0$, by Lemma 2.2 and 2.3, (ψ_0^+, θ_0^+) is a stable focus. As a heteroclinic orbit on \mathfrak{M} , $\pi(z)(\tau)$ spiral into (ψ_0^+, θ_0^+) as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore $i(x) = \#\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} : \dot{\theta}(\tau) = 0\} = +\infty$.

This complete the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.1

Proof. [**Theorem 1.2**] First notice if $x(t)$ a collision-parabolic solution, then $\tilde{x}(t) = x(-t)$ is a parabolic-collision solution. Since $m^-(\tilde{x}) = m^-(x)$ and $i(\tilde{x}) = i(x)$, it will be enough to prove our result, when $x(t)$ is a parabolic or parabolic-collision solutions. Since $x(t)$ is not homothetic, the corresponding orbit $\pi(z)(\tau)$ on the collision manifold \mathfrak{M} with time parameter τ , must be a type-I or III heteroclinic orbit.

Now if one of $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)$ is negative, then $m^-(x) = i(x) = +\infty$, by Proposition 4.1. This proves property (a). If both $\Delta(\theta_0^\pm)$ are positive, then property (b) follows from Lemma 2.4. In particular, when θ_0^- is a local minimizer, $U(\theta_0^-) > 0$, by Lemma 2.2, $\lambda_s(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-) < 0 < \lambda_l(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-)$, and by Lemma 2.3, the unstable manifold of (ψ_0^-, θ_0^-) in the collision manifold is tangent to $\langle e_l(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-) \rangle$. Hence $\pi(z)(\tau)$ approaches to (ψ_0^-, θ_0^-) along $\langle e_l(\psi_0^-, \theta_0^-) \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$. Then by property (a) in Corollary 4.2, $m^-(x) = i(x)$. \square

Proof. [**Corollary 1.1**] By Theorem 1.2, $m^-(x) = i(x)$, so it is enough to show $i(x) = 0$. By (63), this is equivalent to $u(\tau) \neq 0, \forall \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, which by (19) is the same as $\psi(\tau) \neq \pm\pi/2$, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$.

Recall that $v(\tau) = \sin(\psi(\tau))\sqrt{U(\theta(\tau))}$ is non-decreasing function of τ , and $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} \psi(\tau) = \pm\pi/2$, we have

$$v(\pm\infty) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} \sin(v(\tau))\sqrt{U(\theta(\tau))} = \pm\sqrt{U(\theta_0^\pm)}$$

where

$$(68) \quad U(\theta_0^\pm) = \min\{U(\theta) : \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1\}.$$

Let's assume, there is a $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $\psi(\tau_0) = \frac{\pi}{2}$ (the proof for $\psi(\tau_0) = -\frac{\pi}{2}$ is similar), then $v(\tau_0) = \sqrt{U(\theta(\tau_0))}$. By the monotonicity of $v(\tau)$, $\sqrt{U(\theta(\tau_0))} \leq v(+\infty) = \sqrt{U(\theta_0^\pm)}$. Combine this with (68), they implies $\sqrt{U(\theta(\tau_0))} = \sqrt{U(\theta_0^\pm)}$. This means $\theta(\tau_0)$ is a critical point of U . Then by Lemma 2.1, $(\psi(\tau_0), \theta(\tau_0))$ is a equilibrium in the collision manifold, which is absurd.

□

We finish this section with a proof of Theorem 1.3. The idea of the proof is similar to the one used in [8] and [7], where similar results were obtained for homothetic solutions of the N -body problem.

Proof. Without loss of generality let's assume $\bar{x}(t)$ is a collision-parabolic solution defined on $\mathbb{R}^+ = (0, +\infty)$. With the energy being zero, we have

$$\bar{r}(t) = (\kappa t)^{\frac{2}{2+\alpha}}, \text{ where } \kappa = \frac{2+\alpha}{2} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0)}.$$

Recall that in polar coordinates, the action functional is

$$\mathcal{F}(r, \theta) = \int \frac{1}{2} \dot{r}^2 + \frac{1}{2} r^2 \dot{\theta}^2 + r^{-\alpha} U(\theta) dt.$$

First it is not hard to see for any $0 < t_0 < t_1 < +\infty$, $\bar{x}(t)$ is a minimizer of \mathcal{F} among the following set of paths

$$\{(r, \theta) \in W^{1,2}([t_0, t_1], \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{S}^1) : r(t_0) = \bar{r}(t_0), r(t_1) = \bar{r}(t_1), \theta(t) \equiv \theta_0\}.$$

For a proof see [14].

As a result, we will only consider variations of \mathcal{F} along $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{S}^1)$, which has a compact support. For an arbitrary ϕ like this, the second derivative of \mathcal{F} along ϕ is

$$(69) \quad d^2 \mathcal{F}(r, \theta)[\phi, \phi] = \int r^2 \dot{\phi}^2 + r^{-\alpha} U_{\theta\theta}(\theta) \phi^2 dt.$$

Like before with the time parameter τ given by $d\tau = \bar{r}^{-\frac{2+\alpha}{2}} dt$, we have

$$(70) \quad d^2 \mathcal{F}(\bar{r}, \theta_0)[\phi, \phi] = \int \bar{r}^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2}} ((\phi')^2 + U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) \phi^2) d\tau,$$

Let $\xi(t) = \bar{r}(t)^{\frac{2-\alpha}{4}} \phi(t)$, for any $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{S}^1)$, then $\xi' = \bar{r}^{\frac{2-\alpha}{4}} \phi' + \frac{2-\alpha}{4} \bar{r}^{-\frac{2+\alpha}{4}} r' \phi$, and

$$(71) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{r}^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2}} (\phi')^2 &= (\xi')^2 + \frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{16} \left(\frac{\bar{r}'}{\bar{r}}\right)^2 \xi^2 - \frac{2-\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{\bar{r}'}{\bar{r}}\right) \xi \xi' \\ &= (\xi')^2 + \frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8} U(\theta_0) \xi^2 - \frac{2-\alpha}{2} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0)} \xi \xi', \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality following from

$$\frac{\bar{r}'}{\bar{r}} = \dot{\bar{r}} \bar{r}^{-1} \frac{dt}{d\tau} = \dot{\bar{r}} \bar{r}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} = \frac{2}{2+\alpha} \kappa = \sqrt{2U(\theta_0)}.$$

Plug (71) into (70), we get

$$d^2 \mathcal{F}(\bar{r}, \theta_0)[\phi, \phi] = \int (\xi')^2 + \left(\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8} U(\theta_0) + U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) \right) \xi^2 - \frac{2-\alpha}{2} \sqrt{2U(\theta_0)} \xi \xi' d\tau.$$

As ξ has a compact support in \mathbb{R}^+ , using integration by parts, we get $\int \xi \xi' d\tau = 0$. Therefore

$$d^2 \mathcal{F}(\bar{r}, \theta_0)[\phi, \phi] = \int (\xi')^2 + \left(\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8} U(\theta_0) + U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) \right) \xi^2 d\tau.$$

Notice that when $\Delta(\theta_0) \geq 0$, $\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8} U(\theta_0) + U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) \geq 0$ and $d^2 \mathcal{F}(\bar{r}, \theta_0)[\phi, \phi] \geq 0$, for any ϕ , so $m^-(x) = 0$. When $\Delta(\theta_0) < 0$, $\frac{(2-\alpha)^2}{8} U(\theta_0) + U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0) < 0$. It is not hard to see that there is a countable set of linear independent functions $\{\phi_n \in$

$C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{S}^1) : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ satisfying $d^2\mathcal{F}(\bar{r}, \theta_0)[\phi_n, \phi_n] < 0$, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, for the details see [8, Theorem 4.3]. This means $m^-(x) = +\infty$. \square

5. APPLICATION IN CELESTIAL MECHANICS

In this section, some applications of our results to celestial mechanics will be given.

5.1. The planar isosceles three body problem. Following [16] and [27], in this subsection we show the planar isosceles three body problem can be reduced to a singular Lagrangian system with two degree of freedom, so that the results we established in the previous sections can be applied.

The planar three body problem describes the motion of three points, m_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, under Newtonian gravity force of each other. Let $q = (q_1, q_2, q_3)$, where q_i represents the position of m_i , and $p = M\dot{q}$, where $M = \text{diag}(m_1, m_1, m_2, m_2, m_3, m_3)$, then

$$(72) \quad \dot{p} = \nabla_q \tilde{V}(q); \quad \dot{q} = M^{-1}p,$$

where $\tilde{V}(q) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} \frac{m_i m_j}{|q_i - q_j|}$, is the (negative) potential. This is equivalent to the Lagrangian equation $\frac{d}{dt}L_{\dot{q}}(q, \dot{q}) = L_q(q, \dot{q})$ with

$$(73) \quad L(q, \dot{q}) = K(\dot{q}) + \tilde{V}(q) = \frac{1}{2}|\dot{q}|_M^2 + \tilde{V}(q),$$

where $|q|_M := (\sum_{i=1}^3 m_i |q_i|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a *mass scaled norm* for any $q \in \mathbb{R}^6$.

Equation (72) has six degree of freedom. Since the solutions of it are invariant under linear translation, we can fixed the center of mass at the origin, $\sum_{i=1}^3 m_i q_i = 0$. This reduces the degree of freedom to four.

Furthermore when two of the masses are equal ($m_1 = m_2$), let \mathfrak{R} be the reflection in \mathbb{R}^2 with respect to the vertical axis, then

$$(74) \quad \{q = (q_1, q_2, q_3) \mid q_2 = \mathfrak{R}(q_1), q_3 = \mathfrak{R}(q_3)\},$$

forms an invariant sub-system of (72), which has only two degree of freedom.

For simplicity, we assume $m_1 = m_2 = m$ and $m_3 = 1$. In order to find the suitable coordinates that the results from the previous sections can be applied directly, we set

$$r = |q|_M; \quad s_i = q_i/r, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Then $|s|_M = 1$, where $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$. Set $s_1 = (\xi, \eta)$, then by (74),

$$s_2 = (-\xi, \eta), \quad s_3 = (0, -2m\eta)$$

By $|s|_M = 1$, we have

$$2m\xi^2 + 2m(2m+1)\eta^2 = 1.$$

This allows us to introduce the angular variable $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ by

$$\xi = \frac{\cos \theta}{\sqrt{2m}}, \quad \eta = \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2m(2m+1)}}.$$

Following the above process, direct computations tell us under the coordinates (r, θ) , the isosceles sub-system can be described by the singular Lagrangian system with the corresponding Lagrange $L(r, \theta, \dot{r}, \dot{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2}\dot{r}^2 + \frac{1}{2}r^2\dot{\theta}^2 + \frac{U(\theta)}{r}$, and

$$(75) \quad U(\theta) = \frac{m^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}|\cos \theta|} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}m^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(1+2m \sin^2 \theta)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

With such a singular system, the index theory developed in this paper can be applied directly now. However we should point out besides the singularity at the origin, $r = 0$, corresponding a triple collision. There are other singularities due to double collisions, which correspond to $\theta = \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$. Although as is well-known, a double collision can be regularized (see [32, Section 7] or [28]), it is not so clear how to define the corresponding Morse index for in such cases, so when applying our results, we have to restrict ourselves to a domain of the zero energy solution, where there is no collision.

Let's give some further explanations for the problem introduced above. First $U(\theta)$ has four different non-degenerate global minima:

$$-\pi + \theta^* < -\theta^* < \theta < \pi - \theta^*, \quad \text{for some } \theta^* \in (0, \pi/2).$$

They represent the Lagrangian configurations, where the three masses form an equilateral triangle. The second derivatives of $U(\theta)$ at these four critical points all are positive. As a result the hyperbolicity condition (37) always holds at these points.

Beside the above four, there are additional two non-degenerate critical points at $\theta = 0$ or π , which are local maxima of U . They are the Euler-configurations with m_3 at the origin, m_1 and m_2 both on the horizontal axis and symmetric with respect to m_3 . By a direct computation,

$$U(0) = U(\pi) = \frac{m^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} + 2\sqrt{2}m^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad U_{\theta\theta}(0) = U_{\theta\theta}(\pi) = -\frac{7}{\sqrt{2}}m^{\frac{5}{2}}.$$

Recall that for $\alpha = 1$, $\Delta(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{2}U(\theta_0) + 4U_{\theta\theta}(\theta_0)$. Then $\Delta(0) = \Delta(\pi)$ are positive, when $m < 4/55$, and negative, when $m > 4/55$.

As proven by Moeckel in [27], if a zero energy solution (non-homothetic) approaches to the origin or the infinity along the horizontal axis (or equivalently the configuration formed by the three masses converges to a Euler configuration), then for a generic $m > 4/55$, during the process, the three masses oscillate frequently along the horizontal axis. This corresponds to the change of the sign of $\dot{\theta}(t)$, which by our results gives an estimate of the Morse index of the solution.

5.2. The Kepler-type problem. During the proofs of our main results, we required the critical points of U to be non-degenerate. However problems related to celestial mechanics are usually highly degenerate due to symmetries. In this subsection, we will demonstrate in general our approach should still work even when the non-degenerate condition is not satisfied. In some sense, what we need is the knowledge of the asymptotic behavior of $V(\tau)$ defined in Lemma 3.3, as τ goes to infinity.

As an example, we will consider the *Kepler-type* problem, for which

$$U(\theta) \equiv m, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1, \quad \text{for some constant } m > 0.$$

When $\alpha = 1$, it is the classic Kepler problem. Now every θ is a degenerate critical point of U .

The vector field (20) on \mathfrak{M} becomes

$$(76) \quad \begin{cases} \psi' &= (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})\sqrt{2m} \cos \psi, \\ \theta' &= \sqrt{2m} \cos \psi. \end{cases}$$

Then very (ψ_0, θ_0) with $\psi_0 \in \{\pm\frac{\pi}{2}\}$ and $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$, is an equilibrium of (76).

Let $M(\psi_0, \theta_0)$ be defined as in (22), following the notations given in Definition 2.1, by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{cases} -(2 - \alpha) = \lambda_s(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) < \lambda_l(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) = 0; \\ e_s(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) = (\frac{2-\alpha}{2}, 1)^T, \quad e_l(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) = (0, 1)^T, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \lambda_s(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) < \lambda_l(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) = (2 - \alpha); \\ e_s(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) = (0, 1)^T, \quad e_l(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0) = (\frac{2-\alpha}{2}, 1)^T \end{cases}$$

Let $x(t)$ be a parabolic solution of the Kepler-type problem, then its projection to the collision manifold is a heteroclinic orbit going from $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^-)$ to $(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^+)$. Since θ_0^\pm are degenerate, Lemma 2.3 does not apply. However by (76), we can see

$$(77) \quad \frac{\psi'}{\theta'}(\tau) = \frac{2 - \alpha}{2}, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence the heteroclinic orbit converges to $(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^+)$ along the subspace $\langle e_s(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^+) \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, and converges to $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^-)$ along the subspace $\langle e_l(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^-) \rangle$, as $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$. Following the notations from Section 3, this is a type-I heteroclinic orbit.

Let $V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\eta_1(\tau), \eta_2(\tau)\}$ be the same path of Lagrangian subspaces defined in Lemma 3.3. Since $U_{\theta\theta}(\theta) \equiv 0$, Lemma 3.4, can not be applied. However by (77), the same computation used in the proof of this lemma shows

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{U_\theta(\theta)}{u} = 0.$$

Recall that $\lambda_l(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^+) = \lambda_s(\frac{\pi}{2}, \theta_0^-) = 0$, so results of Lemma 3.4 still hold. Then by Proposition 3.1,

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{+,s}^1, \hat{e}_{+,s}^2\}, \quad \lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} V(\tau) = \text{span}\{\hat{e}_{-,l}^1, \hat{e}_{-,l}^2\}.$$

Notice that for the Kepler-type potential, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{+,s}^1 &= (-\alpha\sqrt{m/2}, 1)^T, \quad \hat{e}_{+,s}^2 = (-(2 - \alpha)\sqrt{m/2}, 1)^T; \\ \hat{e}_{-,l}^1 &= (\alpha\sqrt{m/2}, 1)^T, \quad \hat{e}_{-,l}^2 = ((2 - \alpha)\sqrt{m/2}, 1)^T. \end{aligned}$$

With the above properties, the corresponding results given in Section 4 will still hold. In particular, by Corollary 4.2, $i(x) = \mu(x) = m^-(x)$.

Meanwhile as the angular momentum is a first integral of the Kepler-type problem, for a parabolic solution (so non-homothetic), $\dot{\theta}(t)$ is always positive or negative. This means the oscillation index $i(x) = 0$, which implies the following result.

Corollary 5.1. *For a Kepler-type problem, the Morse index of a parabolic solution is always zero.*

6. APPENDIX: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE MASLOV INDEX FOR HETEROCLINIC ORBITS

We start with a brief review of the Maslov index theory from [4, 10, 31]. Let $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)$ be the standard symplectic space, and $Lag(2n)$ the Lagrangian Grassmannian, i.e. the set of Lagrangian subspaces of $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)$. Given two continuous paths $L_1(t), L_2(t)$, $t \in [a, b]$, in $Lag(2n)$, the Maslov index $\mu(L_1(t), L_2(t))$ is an integer invariant. There several different ways to define such an invariant. Here we use the one given in [10]. Following are some properties of the Maslov index (for the details see [10]).

Property I. (Reparametrization invariance) Let $\varrho : [c, d] \rightarrow [a, b]$ be a continuous and piecewise smooth function satisfying $\varrho(c) = a$, $\varrho(d) = b$, then

$$(78) \quad \mu(L_1(t), L_2(t)) = \mu(L_1(\varrho(\tau)), L_2(\varrho(\tau))).$$

Property II. (Homotopy invariant with end points) If two continuous families of Lagrangian paths $L_1(s, t)$, $L_2(s, t)$, $0 \leq s \leq 1$, $a \leq t \leq b$ satisfies $\dim(L_1(s, a) \cap L_2(s, a)) = C_1$, $\dim(L_1(s, b) \cap L_2(s, b)) = C_2$, for any $0 \leq s \leq 1$, where C_1, C_2 are two constant integers, then

$$(79) \quad \mu(L_1(0, t), L_2(0, t)) = \mu(L_1(1, t), L_2(1, t)).$$

Property III. (Path additivity) If $a < c < b$, then

$$(80) \quad \mu(L_1(t), L_2(t)) = \mu(L_1(t), L_2(t); [a, c]) + \mu(L_1(t), L_2(t); [c, b]).$$

Property IV. (Symplectic invariance) Let $\gamma(t)$, $t \in [a, b]$ be a continuous path of symplectic matrices in $\text{Sp}(2n)$, then

$$(81) \quad \mu(L_1(t), L_2(t)) = \mu(\gamma(t)L_1(t), \gamma(t)L_2(t)).$$

Property V. (Symplectic additivity) Let W_i , $i = 1, 2$, be two symplectic spaces, if $L_i \in C([a, b], \text{Lag}(W_1))$ and $\hat{L}_i \in C([a, b], \text{Lag}(W_2))$, $i = 1, 2$, then

$$(82) \quad \mu(L_1(t) \oplus \hat{L}_1(t), L_2(t) \oplus \hat{L}_2(t)) = \mu(L_1(t), L_2(t)) + \mu(\hat{L}_1(t), \hat{L}_2(t)).$$

Property VI. (Symmetry) If $L_i \in C([a, b], \text{Lag}(2n))$, $i = 1, 2$, then

$$(83) \quad \mu(L_1(t), L_2(t)) = \dim L_1(a) \cap L_2(a) - \dim L_1(b) \cap L_2(b) - \mu(L_2(t), L_1(t)).$$

One efficient way to study the Maslov index is via crossing form introduced in [31]. For simplicity and since it is enough for our purpose, we only review the case of the Maslov index for a path of Lagrangian subspaces with respect to a fixed Lagrangian subspace.

Let $\Lambda(t)$ be a C^1 -path of Lagrangian subspaces with $\Lambda(0) = \Lambda$, and V a fixed Lagrangian subspace which is transversal to Λ . Given a $v \in \Lambda$, for t close enough to 0, define $w(t) \in V$ by $v + w(t) \in \Lambda(t)$. Then the form

$$(84) \quad Q(v) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \omega(v, w(t))$$

is independent of the choice of V (see [31]).

A *crossing* of $\Lambda(t)$ is a moment t , where $\Lambda(t)$ intersects W nontrivially, i.e. $\Lambda(t) \in \overline{O_1(W)}$. The set of all crossings form a compact subset. At each crossing, the corresponding crossing form is defined as

$$(85) \quad \Gamma(\Lambda(t), W, t) = Q|_{\Lambda(t) \cap W}.$$

A crossing is called *regular*, if its crossing form is non-degenerate.

When the path $\Lambda(t)$ also satisfies $\Lambda(t) = \gamma(t)\Lambda$ with $\gamma(t) \in \text{Sp}(2n)$ and $\Lambda \in \text{Lag}(2n)$, then the crossing form is equal to $(-\gamma(t)^T J \dot{\gamma}(t)v, v)$, for $v \in \gamma(t)^{-1}(\Lambda(t) \cap W)$, where (\cdot, \cdot) is the standard inner product on \mathbb{R}^{2n} . Furthermore if $\Lambda(t)$ only has regular crossings, then by [25], the following holds for the Maslov index

$$\mu(W, \Lambda(t)) = m^+(\Gamma(\Lambda(a), W, a)) + \sum_{a < t < b} \text{sign}(\Gamma(\Lambda(t), W, t)) - m^-(\Gamma(\Lambda(b), W, b)),$$

where the sum runs over all the crossings $t \in (a, b)$, m^+, m^- are the dimensions of positive and negative definite subspaces, and $\text{sign} = m^+ - m^-$ is the *signature*.

Notice that for a C^1 -path $\Lambda(t)$ with fixed end points, we can make all the crossings regular through a small perturbation.

When the Hamiltonian system is given by the Legendre transformation of a Sturm-Liouville system and all the crossing forms are positive, the previous identity shows

$$(86) \quad \mu(W, \Lambda(t)) = \dim(\Lambda(a) \cap W) + \sum_{a < t < b} \dim(\Lambda(t) \cap W),$$

for $W = V_d$, which is the Lagrangian subspace corresponding to the Dirichlet boundary condition (for the detail see [21]).

Given a Lagrangian path $t \mapsto \Lambda(t)$, the difference of the Maslov indices of it with respect to two Lagrangian subspaces $V_0, V_1 \in \text{Lag}(2n)$, is given in terms of the *Hörmander index* (see [31, Theorem 3.5])

$$(87) \quad s(V_0, V_1; \Lambda(0), \Lambda(1)) = \mu(V_0, \Lambda(t)) - \mu(V_1, \Lambda(t)).$$

Obviously for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$(88) \quad s(V_0, V_1; \Lambda(0), \Lambda(1)) = s(V_0, V_1; e^{-\varepsilon J} \Lambda(0), e^{-\varepsilon J} \Lambda(1)),$$

The Hörmander index is independent of the choice of the path connecting $\Lambda(0)$ and $\Lambda(1)$. Under the non-degenerate condition, i.e., V_0, V_1 are transversal to $\Lambda(0), \Lambda(1)$ correspondingly, it has the following two basic properties

$$(89) \quad \begin{aligned} s(V_0, V_1; \Lambda(0), \Lambda(1)) &= -s(V_1, V_0; \Lambda(0), \Lambda(1)), \\ s(\Lambda(0), \Lambda(1); V_0, V_1) &= -s(V_0, V_1; \Lambda(0), \Lambda(1)). \end{aligned}$$

If $V_i = \text{Gr}(A_i)$, $\Lambda(i) = \text{Gr}(B_i)$ for symmetry matrices A_i and B_i , $i = 0, 1$, then

$$(90) \quad \begin{aligned} s(V_0, V_1; \Lambda(0), \Lambda(1)) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(B_0 - A_1) + \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(B_1 - A_0) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(B_1 - A_1) - \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(B_0 - A_0), \end{aligned}$$

where for a symmetric matrix A , $\text{sign}(A)$ is the signature of the symmetric form $\langle A \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. A direct corollary shows that

$$(91) \quad |s(V_0, V_1; \Lambda(0), \Lambda(1))| \leq 2n.$$

Now we will recall the Maslov index theory for heteroclinic orbits, the details can be found in [22],[21]. Considering a linear Hamiltonian system

$$(92) \quad \dot{x}(t) = JB(t)x(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}$$

with symmetric $B(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $JB(\pm\infty) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} JB(t)$ being hyperbolic. Let $\gamma(t, s)$ be the fundamental solution of (92), that is

$$\dot{\gamma}(t, s) = JB(t)\gamma(t, s), \quad \gamma(s, s) = I_{2n}$$

We associate the *stable* and *unstable* subspaces defined by

$$(93) \quad V^s(\tau) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma(t, \tau)v = 0\}, \quad V^u(\tau) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \gamma(t, \tau)v = 0\}.$$

By invoking [1, Proposition 1.2], the hyperbolic limit implies the following convergence result on the invariant manifolds

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} V^s(\tau) &= V^s(+\infty) = V^-(JB(+\infty)); \\ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow -\infty} V^u(\tau) &= V^u(-\infty) = V^+(JB(-\infty)), \end{aligned}$$

where $V^\pm(JB(\pm\infty))$ be the corresponding $JB(\pm\infty)$ invariant splitting of \mathbb{R}^{2n} into closed subspaces, given by the spectral decomposition of the right and left part of the imaginary line.

For a fixed $V_0 \in Lag(2n)$, assume $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty} V^u(\tau) \pitchfork V_0$, then the Maslov index of the heteroclinic orbits with respect to V_0 is defined by

$$(94) \quad \mu(V_0, V_u, \mathbb{R}),$$

which is well defined since there are no crossing for $|\tau|$ large enough.

Acknowledgments. The second author wishes to thank School of Mathematics, Shandong University for its hospitality, where part of the work was done when he was a visitor there.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Abbondandolo and P. Majer. Ordinary differential operators in Hilbert spaces and Fredholm pairs. *Math. Z.*, 243(3):525–562, 2003.
- [2] A. Ambrosetti and V. Coti Zelati. *Periodic solutions of singular Lagrangian systems*, volume 10 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993.
- [3] A. Ambrosetti and V. Coti Zelati. Non-collision periodic solutions for a class of symmetric 3-body type problems. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, 3(2):197–207, 1994.
- [4] V. I. Arnold. On a characteristic class entering into conditions of quantization. *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen.*, 1:1–14, 1967.
- [5] A. Bahri and P. H. Rabinowitz. A minimax method for a class of Hamiltonian systems with singular potentials. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 82(2):412–428, 1989.
- [6] A. Bahri and P. H. Rabinowitz. Periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems of 3-body type. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 8(6):561–649, 1991.
- [7] V. Barutello, X. Hu, A. Portaluri, and S. Terracini. An index theory for asymptotic motions under singular potentials. Preprint, 2017, arxiv 1705.01291.
- [8] V. Barutello and S. Secchi. Morse index properties of colliding solutions to the N -body problem. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 25(3):539–565, 2008.
- [9] V. Barutello, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini. Entire minimal parabolic trajectories: the planar anisotropic Kepler problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 207(2):583–609, 2013.
- [10] S. E. Cappell, R. Lee, and E. Y. Miller. On the Maslov index. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 47(2):121–186, 1994.
- [11] K.-C. Chen. Existence and minimizing properties of retrograde orbits to the three-body problem with various choices of masses. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(2):325–348, 2008.
- [12] A. Chenciner and R. Montgomery. A remarkable periodic solution of the three-body problem in the case of equal masses. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 152(3):881–901, 2000.
- [13] R. Courant and D. Hilbert. *Methods of mathematical physics. Vol. I*. Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1953.
- [14] A. da Luz and E. Maderna. On the free time minimizers of the Newtonian N -body problem. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 156(2):209–227, 2014.
- [15] R. L. Devaney. Collision orbits in the anisotropic Kepler problem. *Invent. Math.*, 45(3):221–251, 1978.
- [16] R. L. Devaney. Triple collision in the planar isosceles three-body problem. *Invent. Math.*, 60(3):249–267, 1980.
- [17] R. L. Devaney. Blowing up singularities in classical mechanical systems. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 89(8):535–552, 1982.
- [18] D. L. Ferrario and S. Terracini. On the existence of collisionless equivariant minimizers for the classical n -body problem. *Invent. Math.*, 155(2):305–362, 2004.
- [19] M. C. Gutzwiller. The anisotropic Kepler problem in two dimensions. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 14:139–152, 1973.
- [20] M. C. Gutzwiller. Bernoulli sequences and trajectories in the anisotropic Kepler problem. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 18(4):806–823, 1977.

- [21] X. Hu and Y. Ou. Collision index and stability of elliptic relative equilibria in planar n -body problem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 348(3):803–845, 2016.
- [22] X. Hu and A. Portaluri. An index theory for unbounded motions of hamiltonian systems. preprint, 2017, arXiv:1703.03908v1.
- [23] X. Hu and S. Sun. Index and stability of symmetric periodic orbits in Hamiltonian systems with application to figure-eight orbit. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 290(2):737–777, 2009.
- [24] Y. Long. *Index theory for symplectic paths with applications*, volume 207 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2002.
- [25] Y. Long and C. Zhu. Maslov-type index theory for symplectic paths and spectral flow. II. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B*, 21(1):89–108, 2000.
- [26] R. McGehee. Triple collision in the collinear three-body problem. *Invent. Math.*, 27:191–227, 1974.
- [27] R. Moeckel. Orbits of the three-body problem which pass infinitely close to triple collision. *Amer. J. Math.*, 103(6):1323–1341, 1981.
- [28] R. Moeckel. Heteroclinic phenomena in the isosceles three-body problem. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 15(5):857–876, 1984.
- [29] R. Moeckel. Chaotic dynamics near triple collision. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 107(1):37–69, 1989.
- [30] R. Moeckel and R. Montgomery. Realizing all reduced syzygy sequences in the planar three-body problem. *Nonlinearity*, 28(6):1919–1935, 2015.
- [31] J. Robbin and D. Salamon. The Maslov index for paths. *Topology*, 32(4):827–844, 1993.
- [32] C. L. Siegel and J. K. Moser. *Lectures on celestial mechanics*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Translated from the German by C. I. Kalme, Reprint of the 1971 translation.
- [33] K. Tanaka. Noncollision solutions for a second order singular Hamiltonian system with weak force. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 10(2):215–238, 1993.
- [34] K. Tanaka. A prescribed energy problem for a singular Hamiltonian system with a weak force. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 113(2):351–390, 1993.
- [35] G. Yu. Simple choreographies of the planar newtonian n -body problem. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* to appear.
- [36] Z. F. Zhang, T. R. Ding, W. Z. Huang, and Z. X. Dong. *Qualitative theory of differential equations*, volume 101 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992. Translated from the Chinese by Anthony Wing Kwok Leung.