

# Parameterized viscosity solutions of convex Hamiltonian systems with time periodic damping

Ya-Nan Wang · Jun Yan · Jianlu Zhang\*

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** In this article we develop an analogue of Aubry Mather theory for time periodic dissipative equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = \partial_p H(x, p, t), \\ \dot{p} = -\partial_x H(x, p, t) - f(t)p \end{cases}$$

with  $(x, p, t) \in T^*M \times \mathbb{T}$  (compact manifold  $M$  without boundary). We discuss the asymptotic behaviors of viscosity solutions of associated Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\partial_t u + f(t)u + H(x, \partial_x u, t) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$$

w.r.t. certain parameters, and analyze the meanings in controlling the global dynamics. We also discuss the prospect of applying our conclusions to many physical models.

**Keywords** viscosity solution, weak KAM solution, convex Hamiltonian, Aubry Mather theory, global attractor, rotation number

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010)** 35B40, 37J50, 37J55, 49L25

---

Ya-Nan Wang

School of Mathematical Sciences, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, 210097, China  
E-mail: yananwang@njnu.edu.cn

Jun Yan

School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University & Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics, Shanghai 200433, China  
E-mail: yanjun@fudan.edu.cn

Jianlu Zhang

Hua Loo-Keng Key Laboratory of Mathematics & Mathematics Institute, Academy of Mathematics and systems science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China  
E-mail: jellychung1987@gmail.com

## 1 Introduction

For a smooth compact Riemannian manifold  $M$  without boundary, the Hamiltonian  $H$  is usually characterized as a  $C^{r \geq 2}$ -smooth function on the cotangent bundle  $T^*M$ , with the associated Hamilton equation defined by

$$\text{(Conservative)} \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = \partial_p H(x, p) \\ \dot{p} = -\partial_x H(x, p) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

for each initial point  $(x, p) \in T^*M$ . From the physical aspect, the Hamiltonian equation describes the movement of particles with conservative energy, since the Hamiltonian  $H(x, p)$  verifies to be a **First Integral** of (1). In particular, if the potential periodically depends on the time  $t$  (for systems with periodic propulsion or procession), we can introduce an augmented Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H}(x, p, t, I) = I + H(x, p, t), \quad (x, p, t, I) \in T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \quad (2)$$

such that the associated Hamiltonian equation

$$\text{(Conservative)} \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = \partial_p H(x, p, t) \\ \dot{p} = -\partial_x H(x, p, t) \\ \dot{t} = 1 \\ \dot{I} = -\partial_t H(x, p, t) \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

still preserves  $\tilde{H}$ .

However, the realistic motion of the masses inevitably sustains a dissipation of energy, due to the friction from the environment, e.g. the wind, the fluid, interface etc. That urges us to make rational modification of previous equations. In the current paper, the damping is assumed to be time-periodically proportional to the momentum. Precisely, for a  $C^2$ -function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $f(t+1) = f(t)$ , we modify (3) into

$$\text{(Dissipative)} \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = \partial_p H(x, p, t) \\ \dot{p} = -\partial_x H(x, p, t) - f(t)p \\ \dot{t} = 1 \\ \dot{I} = -\partial_t H(x, p, t) - f'(t)u - f(t)I \\ \dot{u} = \langle H_p, p \rangle - H + \alpha - f(t)u \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

with  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  being a constant of initial energy. Notice that the former three equations of (20) is decoupled with the latter two, so we can denote the flow of the former three equations of (4) by  $\varphi_H^t$  and by  $\hat{\varphi}_H^t$  the flow of the whole (4). Besides, we propose the following **standing assumptions** for the Hamiltonian:

- **(H1)** [Smoothness]  $H : TM \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $C^{r \geq 2}$  smooth;
- **(H2)** [Convexity] For any  $(x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ ,  $H(x, \cdot, t)$  is strictly convex on  $T_x^*M$ ;

- **(H3)** [Superlinearity] For any  $(x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ ,  $\lim_{|p|_x \rightarrow +\infty} H(x, p, t)/|p|_x = +\infty$  where  $|\cdot|_x$  is the norm deduced from the Riemannian metric.

As for the function  $f(t) \in C^2(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ , the following individual cases will be considered:

- **(H4<sup>-</sup>)**  $[f] := \int_0^1 f(t) dt > 0$
- **(H4<sup>+</sup>)**  $[f] < 0$
- **(H4<sup>0</sup>)**  $[f] = 0$

**Remark 11** **(H1-H3)** are usually called Tonelli conditions. Respectively, the three cases of **(H4)** leads to a dissipation, acceleration and periodic fluctuation of energy in the forward time since  $\frac{d}{dt} \hat{H} = -f(t) \hat{H}$  if we take

$$\hat{H}(x, p, t, I, u) = \tilde{H}(x, p, t, I) + f(t)u - \alpha. \quad (5)$$

Moreover,

$$(\phi_H^1)^* dp \wedge dx = e^{[f]} dp \wedge dx,$$

so the time-1 map  $\phi_H^1 : \{(x, p, t = 0)\} \rightarrow \{(x, p, t = 0)\}$  is conformally symplectic, which has wide applications in astronomy [8], optimal transport [30], biological physics [7] and economics [1] etc (see Sec. 2 for more details).

Recently, a variational approach was exploited in [3, 27, 28], for generalized 1<sup>st</sup> order PDEs. The current paper have a lot of similarities in the methodology with these works.

## 1.1 Variational Principle and Hamilton Jacobi equation

As the dual of the Hamiltonian, the **Lagrangian** can be defined via the **Legendre transformation**:

$$L(x, v, t) := \max_{p \in T_x^* M} \langle p, v \rangle - H(x, p, t), \quad (x, v, t) \in TM \times \mathbb{T}. \quad (6)$$

of which the maximum is achieved for  $v = H_p(x, p, t) \in T_x M$ , once **(H1-H3)** are assumed. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{L} : T^*M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow TM \times \mathbb{T}, \quad \text{via } (x, p, t) \rightarrow (x, H_p(x, p, t), t) \quad (7)$$

is a homeomorphism. With a slight abuse of notions, we can see the Lagrangian  $L : TM \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies **(H1-H3)** as well. Therefore, the following variational principle

$$h_\alpha^{s,t}(x, y) := \inf_{\substack{\gamma \in Lip([s,t], M) \\ \gamma(s)=x, \gamma(t)=y}} \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} \left( L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + \alpha \right) d\tau \quad (8)$$

with  $F(t) := \int_0^t f(\tau) d\tau$  is well defined for all  $s \leq t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , of which the minimizer  $\gamma_{\min} : [a, b] \rightarrow M$  is actually  $C^r$ -smooth (due to the Weierstrass Theorem, see Corollary 2.2.12 of [14]) and satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = v, \\ \frac{d}{dt} L_v(x, v, t) = L_x(x, v, t) - f(t) L_v(x, v, t). \end{cases} \quad (\text{E-L})$$

As a conjugation of  $\varphi_H^t$ , the Lagrangian flow  $\varphi_L^t$  of (E-L) is equivalently effective in exploring the dynamics of (4).

**Theorem 12 (main 1)** *For  $H(x, p, t)$  satisfying (H1-H3),  $f(t)$  satisfying (H4<sup>-</sup>) and any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , the following*

$$u_\alpha^-(x, t) := \inf_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}((-\infty, t], M) \\ \gamma(t) = x}} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s)-F(t)} (L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), s) + \alpha) ds$$

is well defined for  $(x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$  and satisfies

1. (Periodicity)  $u_\alpha^-(x, t+1) = u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  for any  $x \in M$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . By taking  $\bar{t} \in [0, 1)$  with  $t \equiv \bar{t} \pmod{1}$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we can interpret  $u_\alpha^-$  as a function on  $M \times \mathbb{T}$ .
2. (Lipschitzness)  $u_\alpha^- : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz, with the Lipschitz constant depending on  $L$  and  $f$ ;
3. (Domination<sup>1</sup>) For any Lipschitz continuous curve  $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow M$  connecting  $(x, \bar{s}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  and  $(y, \bar{t}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ , we have

$$e^{F(t)} u_\alpha^-(y, \bar{t}) - e^{F(s)} u_\alpha^-(x, \bar{s}) \leq \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \quad (9)$$

4. (Calibration) For any  $(x, \theta) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ , there exists a backward calibrated curve  $\gamma_{x, \theta}^- : (-\infty, \theta] \rightarrow M$ ,  $C^r$ -smooth and ending with  $\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(\theta) = x$ , such that for all  $s \leq t \leq \theta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(t)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(t), \bar{t}) - e^{F(s)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(s), \bar{s}) \\ &= \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{x, \theta}^-, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

5. (Viscosity)  $u_\alpha^- : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a viscosity solution of the following Stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (with time periodic damping):

$$\partial_t u + f(t)u + H(x, \partial_x u, t) = \alpha, \quad (x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{HJ}_+)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Any function  $\omega \in C(M \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$  satisfying (9) is called a (viscosity) subsolution of (HJ<sub>+</sub>) and denoted by  $\omega \prec_f L + \alpha$ .

**Theorem 13 (main 1')** For  $H(x, p, t)$  satisfying **(H1-H3)** and  $f(t)$  satisfying **(H4<sup>0</sup>)**, there exists a unique  $c(H) \in \mathbb{R}$  (Mañé Critical Value) such that

$$u_{z, \bar{s}}^-(x, \bar{t}) := \lim_{\substack{\bar{s} \equiv \bar{t} \pmod{1} \\ t - \bar{s} \rightarrow +\infty}} \left( \inf_{\substack{\gamma \in Lip([s, t], M) \\ \gamma(s) = z, \gamma(t) = x}} \int_s^t e^{F(\tau) - F(t)} (L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \right) \quad (11)$$

is well defined on  $M \times \mathbb{T}$  for any fixed  $(z, \bar{s}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  and satisfies

1. (Lipschitzness)  $u_{z, \bar{s}}^- : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz.
2. (Domination) For any Lipschitz continuous curve  $\gamma : [s, t] \rightarrow M$  connecting  $(x, \bar{s}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  and  $(y, \bar{t}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ , we have

$$e^{F(t)} u_{z, \bar{s}}^-(y, \bar{t}) - e^{F(s)} u_{z, \bar{s}}^-(x, \bar{s}) \leq \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau. \quad (12)$$

Namely,  $u_{z, \bar{s}}^- \prec_f L + c(H)$ .

3. (Calibration) For any  $(x, \theta) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ , there exists a  $C^r$  curve  $\gamma_{x, \theta}^- : (-\infty, \theta] \rightarrow M$  with  $\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(\theta) = x$ , such that for all  $s \leq t \leq \theta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(t)} u_{z, \bar{s}}^-(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(t), \bar{t}) - e^{F(s)} u_{z, \bar{s}}^-(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(s), \bar{s}) \\ &= \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{x, \theta}^-, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

4. (Viscosity)  $u_{z, \bar{s}}^-$  is a viscosity solution of

$$\partial_t u + f(t)u + H(x, \partial_x u, t) = c(H), \quad (x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}. \quad (\text{HJ}_0)$$

Following the terminologies in [14, 19], it's appropriate to call the function given in Theorem 12 (resp. Theorem 13) a **weak KAM solution**. Such a solution can be used to pick up different types of invariant sets with variational meanings of (4):

**Theorem 14 (main 2)** For  $H(x, p, t)$  satisfying **(H1-H3)**,  $f(t)$  satisfying **(H4<sup>-</sup>)** and any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we can get the following sets:

- (Aubry Set)  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  is called **globally calibrated**, if for any  $s < t \in \mathbb{R}$ , (10) holds on  $[s, t]$ . There exists a  $\varphi_L^t$ -invariant set defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} := \{(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t), \bar{t}) \in TM \times \mathbb{T} | \gamma \text{ is globally calibrated}\}$$

with the following properties:

- $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  is a Lipschitz graph over the projected Aubry set  $\mathcal{A} := \pi^2 \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset M \times \mathbb{T}$ .
- $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  is upper semicontinuous w.r.t.  $L : TM \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
- $u_\alpha^-$  is differentiable on  $\mathcal{A}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>  $\pi : TM \times \mathbb{T}$  (resp.  $T^*M \times \mathbb{T}$ )  $\rightarrow M \times \mathbb{T}$  is the standard projection

- (Mather Set) Suppose  $\mathfrak{M}_L$  is the set of all  $\varphi_L^t$ -invariant probability measure, then  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_L$  is called a **Mather measure** if it minimizes

$$\min_{\nu \in \mathfrak{M}_L} \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} L + \alpha - f(t)u_\alpha^- d\nu.$$

Let's denote by  $\mathfrak{M}_m$  the set of all Mather measures. Accordingly, the **Mather set** is defined by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} := \overline{\bigcup \{\text{supp } \mu \mid \mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m\}}$$

which satisfies

1.  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ .
2.  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is a Lipschitz graph over the projected Mather set  $\mathcal{M} := \pi \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset M \times \mathbb{T}$ .

- (Maximal Global Attractor) Define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Sigma}_H^- := \{ (x, p, \bar{s}, \alpha - f(s)u - H(x, p, s), u) \in T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \mid \\ u > u_\alpha^-(x, s) \} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0 := \{ (x, p, \bar{s}, \alpha - f(s)u - H(x, p, s), u) \in T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \mid \\ u = u_\alpha^-(x, s) \}, \end{aligned}$$

then  $\Omega := \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(\widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0)$  is the maximal  $\widehat{\varphi}_H^t$ -invariant set, which satisfies:

1. If the  $p$ -component of  $\Omega$  is bounded, then the  $u$ - and  $I$ -component of  $\Omega$  are also bounded.
2. If  $\Omega$  is compact, it has to be a **global attractor** in the sense that for any point  $(x, p, \bar{s}, I, u) \in T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$  and any open neighborhood  $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \Omega$ , there exists a  $T_\Omega(\mathcal{U})$  such that for all  $t \geq T_\Omega(\mathcal{U})$ ,  $\widehat{\varphi}_H^t(x, p, \bar{s}) \in \mathcal{U}$ . Besides, the followings hold:
  - $\Omega$  is a maximal attractor set, i.e. it isn't strictly contained in any other global attractor;
  - $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  is the maximal invariant set contained in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{A}} := \left\{ \left( \mathcal{L}(x, \partial_x u_\alpha^-(x, s), \bar{s}), \partial_t u_\alpha^-(x, s), u_\alpha^-(x, s) \right) \in TM \times \right. \\ \left. T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \mid (x, \bar{s}) \in \mathcal{A} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 15 (main 2')** For  $H(x, p, t)$  satisfying **(H1-H3)** and  $f(t)$  satisfying **(H4<sup>0</sup>)**, the Mañé Critical Value  $c(H)$  has an alternative expression

$$-c(H) = \frac{\inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_L} \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F(t)} L(x, v, t) d\mu}{\int_0^1 e^{F(t)} dt}. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, the minimizer achieving the right side of (14) has to be a **Mather measure**. Similarly we can define the **Mather set**  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  as the union of the support sets of all the Mather measures, which is Lipschitz-graphic over the projected Mather set  $\mathcal{M} := \pi \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ .

## 1.2 Parametrized viscosity solutions and asymptotic dynamics

In this section we deal with two kinds of parametrized viscosity solutions with practical meanings. The first case corresponds to a Hamiltonian

$$\widehat{H}_\delta(x, p, t, I, u) := I + H(x, p, t) + f_\delta(t)u, \quad (15)$$

with  $(x, p, \bar{t}, I, u) \in T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $f_\delta \in C^r(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$  continuous of  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ . For suitable  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we can seek the weak KAM solution of

$$\partial_t u_\delta(x, t) + H(x, \partial_x u_\delta, t) + f_\delta(t)u_\delta = \alpha \quad (16)$$

as we did in previous theorems. Consequently, it's natural to explore the convergence of viscosity solutions w.r.t. the parameter  $\delta$ :

**Theorem 16 (main 3)** *Suppose  $H(x, p, t)$  satisfies **(H1-H3)** and  $f_\delta$  converges to  $f_0$  w.r.t. the uniform norm as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$ . If  $[f_0] = 0$  and the right derivative of  $f_\delta$  w.r.t.  $\delta$  exists at 0, i.e.*

$$f_1(t) := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \frac{f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)}{\delta} > 0, \quad (17)$$

*there exists a unique  $c(H) \in \mathbb{R}$  given by (14) and a  $\delta_0 > 0$ , such that the weak KAM solution  $u_\delta^-(x, t)$  of (16) associated with  $f_\delta$  and  $\alpha_\delta \equiv c(H)$  for all  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$  converges to a uniquely identified viscosity solution of*

$$\partial_t u(x, t) + H(x, \partial_x u, t) + f_0(t)u = c(H). \quad (18)$$

*which is actually the largest viscosity subsolutions of (16) such that*

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F_0(t)} f_1(t) \cdot u(x, t) d\mu \leq 0, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m(\delta = 0)$$

*where  $F_0(t) = \int_0^t f_0(\tau) d\tau$  and  $\mathfrak{M}_m(0)$  being the set of Mather measures of system  $\widehat{H}_0(x, p, t, I, u)$  in (15).*

**Remark 17** *It's remarkable that in Theorem 16 we didn't assume  $f_\delta$  to be nonnegative, which is usually necessary in proving the convergence of the viscosity solutions, see [12, 31]. That invalidates the Comparison Principle to (16) and brings new difficulties to prove the equi-boundedness and equi-Lipschitzness of  $\{u_\delta^-\}_{\delta > 0}$ . However, we can overcome these difficulties by a dynamic analysis of the Lax-Oleinik semigroups, see Sec. 5 for more details.*

The second parametrized problem we concern takes  $M = \mathbb{T}$  and a mechanical  $H(x, p, t)$ . We can involve a cohomology parameter  $c \in H^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$  to

$$\widehat{H}(x, p, t, I, u) = I + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}(p + c)^2 + V(x, t)}_{H(x, p, t)} + f(t)u \quad (19)$$

of which  $H(x, p, t)$  surely satisfies **(H1-H3)**, then (4) becomes

$$\text{(Dissipative)} \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = p + c \\ \dot{p} = -V_x - f(t)p \\ \dot{t} = 1 \\ \dot{I} = -V_t - f'(t)u - f(t)I \\ \dot{u} = \frac{1}{2}(p^2 - c^2) - V(x, t) - f(t)u. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

In physical models, the former three equations of (20) is usually condensed into a single equation

$$\ddot{x} + V_x(x, t) + f(t)(\dot{x} - c) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}. \quad (21)$$

**Theorem 18 (main 4)** *For  $f(t) \in C^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$  satisfying **(H4<sup>-</sup>)**, the following conclusions hold for equation (21):*

- For any  $c \in H^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ , there exists a unified rotation number of  $\tilde{A}(c)$ , which is defined by

$$\rho(c) := \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T d\gamma, \quad \forall \text{ globally calibrated curve } \gamma.$$

- $\rho(c)$  is continuous of  $c \in H^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ ; Moreover, we have

$$|\rho(c) - c| \leq \varsigma([f]) \cdot \|V(x, t)\|_{C^1} \quad (22)$$

for some constant  $\varsigma$  depending only on  $[f]$ . Consequently, for any  $p/q \in \mathbb{Q}$  irreducible, there always exists a  $c_{p/q}$  such that  $\rho(c_{p/q}) = p/q$ .

- There exists an compact maximal global attractor  $\Omega \subset T^*\mathbb{T} \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$  of the flow  $\widehat{\varphi}_H^t$ .

**Organization of the article:** The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. 2, we exhibit a list of physical models with time-periodic damping. For these models, we state some notable dynamic phenomena and show how these phenomena can be linked to our main conclusions. In Sec. 3, we prove Theorem 12 and Theorem 13. In Sec. 4, we get an analogue Aubry Mather theory for systems satisfying **(H4<sup>-</sup>)** condition, and prove Theorem 14. Besides, we also prove Theorem 15 for systems satisfying **(H4<sup>0</sup>)** condition. In Sec. 5, we discuss the parametrized viscosity solutions of (16), and prove the convergence of them. In Sec. 6, for 1-D mechanical systems with time periodic damping, we prove Theorem 18, which is related to the dynamic phenomena of the models in Sec 2. For the consistency of the proof, parts of preliminary conclusions are postponed to the Appendix.



**Acknowledgements:** The first author is supported by Natural Scientific Foundation of China (Grant No.11501437). The second author is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11631006, 11790272) and Shanghai Science and Technology Commission (Grant No. 17XD1400500). The third author is supported by the Natural Scientific Foundation of China (Grant No. 11901560). All the authors are grateful to Prof. Wei Cheng for helpful discussion about the details.

## 2 Zoo of practical models

In this section we display a bunch of physical models with time-periodic damping, and introduce some practical problems (related with our main conclusions) around them.

### 2.1 Conformally symplectic systems

For  $f(t) \equiv \lambda > 0$  being constant, we get a so called **conformally symplectic system (or discount system)**. The associated ODE becomes

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = \partial_p H(x, p, t), \\ \dot{p} = -\partial_x H(x, p, t) - \lambda p. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

This kind of systems has been considered in [2, 12, 19], although earlier results on Aubry-Mather sets have been discussed by Le Calvez [16] and Casdagli [6] for  $M = \mathbb{T}$ . Besides, we need to specify that the Duffing equation with **viscous damping** also conforms to this case, which concerns all kinds of oscillations widely found in electromagnetics [20] and elastomechanics [22].


A significant property this kind of systems possess is that

$$(\varphi_H^1)^* dp \wedge dx = e^\lambda dp \wedge dx.$$

When  $H(x, p, t)$  is mechanical, the equation usually describes the low velocity oscillation of a solid in a fluid medium (see Fig. 1), which can be formally expressed as

$$\ddot{x} + \lambda \dot{x} + \partial_x V(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}, \lambda > 0. \quad (24)$$

Chaos and bifurcations topics of this setting has ever been rather popular in 1970s [15].



**Fig. 1** A dissipative pendulum with  $\lambda = 1/5$  and  $V(t, x) = 1 - \cos x$ .

## 2.2 Tidal torque model

The tidal torque model was firstly introduced by [24], describing the motion of a rigid satellite  $S$  under the gravitational influence of a point-mass planet  $P$ . Due to the internal non-rigidity of the body, a tidal torque will causes a time-periodic dissipative to the motion of  $S$ , which can be formalized by

$$\ddot{x} + \varepsilon V_x(x, e, t) + \kappa \eta(e, t)(\dot{x} - c(e)) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2, \quad (25)$$

with the parameter  $e$  is the eccentricity of the elliptic motion  $S$  around  $P$ . Due to the astronomical observation,  $\varepsilon$  is the equatorial ellipticity of the satellite and

$$\kappa \propto \frac{1}{a^3} \cdot \frac{m_P}{m_S},$$

with  $a$  being the semi-major and  $m_P$  (resp.  $m_S$ ) being the mass respectively.

Although this model might seem very special, there are several examples in the solar system for which such a model yields a good description of the motion, at least in a first approximation, and anyhow represents a first step toward the understanding of the problem. For instance, in the pairs Moon-Earth, Enceladus-Saturn, Dione-Saturn, Rhea-Saturn even Mercury-Sun this model is available. Besides, we need to specify that usually  $\kappa \ll \varepsilon$  in all these occasions.

A few interesting phenomena has been explained by numerical approaches, e.g. the 1 : 1 resonance for Moon-Earth system which make the people can




Fig. 2 A tidal torque model for Moon-Earth and Mercury-Sun.


only see one side of the Moon from the Earth. However, the Mercury-Sun model shows a different 3 : 2 resonance because of the large eccentricity, see Fig. 2.

Due to Theorem 14 and Theorem 16, such a resonance seems to be explained by the following aspect: **any trajectory within the global attractor  $\Omega$  of (25) has a longtime stability of velocity, namely, the average velocity is close to certain rotation number, or even asymptotic to it.** In Sec. 6 we will show that variational minimal trajectories indeed match this description.

**Remark 21** *As a further simplification, a spin-orbit model with  $\eta(e)$  being a constant is also widely concerned, which is actually a conformally symplectic system. In [2] they further discussed the existence of KAM torus for this model and proved the local attraction of the KAM torus.*

### 2.3 Pumping of the swing

The pumping of a swing is usually modeled as a rigid object forced to rotate back and forth at the lower ends of supporting ropes. After a series of approximations and reasonable simplifications, the pumping of the swing can be characterized as a harmonic oscillator with driving and parametric terms [7]. Therefore, this model has a typical meaning in understanding the dynamics of motors.



**Fig. 3** A simulation of the pumping of the swing

As shown in Fig. 3, the length of the ropes supporting the swinger is  $l$ , and  $s$  is the distance between the center of mass of the swinger to the lower ends of the rope. The angle of the supporting rope to the vertical position is denoted by  $\phi$ , and the angle between the symmetric axis of the swinger and the rope is  $\theta$ , which varies as  $\theta = \theta_0 \cos \omega t$ . So we get the equation of the motion by

$$(l^2 - 2ls \cos \theta + s^2 + R^2)\ddot{\phi} = -gl \sin \phi + gs \sin(\phi + \theta) - ls \sin \theta \dot{\theta}^2 \quad (26)$$

$$+ (ls \cos \theta - s^2 - R^2)\ddot{\theta} - 2ls \sin \theta \dot{\theta} \dot{\phi}, \quad \phi \in \mathbb{T}$$

where  $g$  is the gravity index and  $mR^2$  is the moment of inertia of the center ( $m$  is the mass of swinger). **We can see that by reasonable adjustment of  $l, s, \omega$  parameters, this system can be dissipative, accelerative or critical.**

Notice that numerical research of this equation for  $|\phi| \ll 1$  has been done by numerical experts in a bunch of papers, see [25] for a survey of that. Those results successfully simulate the swinging at small to modest amplitudes. As the amplitude grows these results become less and less accurate, and that's why we resort to a theoretical analysis in this paper.

### 3 Weak KAM solution of $(\text{HJ}_+)$

Due to the superlinearity of  $L(x, v, t)$ , for each  $k \geq 0$ , there exists  $C(k) \geq 0$ , such that

$$L(x, v, t) \geq k|v| - C(k), k > 0, x \in M.$$

Moreover, the compactness of  $M$  implies that for each  $k > 0$ , there exists  $C_k > 0$  such that

$$\max_{\substack{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T} \\ |v| \leq k}} L(x, v, t) \leq C_k.$$

### 3.1 Weak KAM solution of (HJ<sub>+</sub>) in the condition (H4<sup>-</sup>)

Note that  $[f] > 0$ . The following conclusion can be easily checked.

**Lemma 31** *Assume  $t > s$ , then*

1.  $F(s) - F(t) \leq 2k_0 - (t - s - 1)[f]$ ;
2.  $\int_s^t e^{F(\tau) - F(t)} d\tau \leq \frac{e^{2k_0 + [f]}}{[f]} (1 - e^{-(t-s)[f]})$ ;
3.  $\int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(\tau) - F(t)} d\tau \leq \frac{e^{2k_0 + [f]}}{[f]}$ ,

where  $k_0 = \max_{s \in [0, 2]} \left| \int_0^s f(\tau) d\tau \right|$ .

Now we define a function  $u_\alpha^- : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$u_\alpha^-(x, t) := \inf \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s) - F(t)} (L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), s) + \alpha) ds \mid \gamma \in Lip((-\infty, t], M), \gamma(t) = x \right\}. \quad (27)$$

We can easily prove this function is bounded, since

$$-|C(k=0) - \alpha| \cdot \frac{e^{2k_0 + [f]}}{[f]} \leq u_\alpha^-(x, t) \leq |C_{k=0} + \alpha| \frac{e^{2k_0 + [f]}}{[f]},$$

where  $C(0)$  and  $C_0$  have been defined in the beginning of Sec. 3. Later we will see,  $u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  is actually Lipschitz continuous.

**Lemma 32 [(1) of Theorem 12]**  $u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  is 1-periodic with respect to  $t$ , i.e.,

$$u_\alpha^-(x, t + 1) = u_\alpha^-(x, t).$$

*Proof* By the definition of  $u_\alpha^-$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & u_\alpha^-(x, t + 1) \\ &= \inf_{\gamma(t+1)=x} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{t+1} e^{F(s) - F(t+1)} (L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), s) + \alpha) ds \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\gamma(t+1)=x} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s+1) - F(t+1)} (L(\gamma(s+1), \dot{\gamma}(s+1), s+1) + \alpha) ds \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\eta(t)=x} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s) - F(t)} (L(\eta(s), \dot{\eta}(s), s) + \alpha) ds \right\} \\ &= u_\alpha^-(x, t) \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 33 [(3) of Theorem 12]** Let  $\gamma : [s_1, s_2] \rightarrow M$  be a Lipschitz continuous curve. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(s_2)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma(s_2), s_2) - e^{F(s_1)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma(s_1), s_1) \\ & \leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

*Proof* Let  $\{\gamma_n\}$  be a sequence of Lipschitz continuous curve from  $(-\infty, s_1]$  to  $M$  with  $\gamma_n(s_1) = \gamma(s_1)$ , such that

$$e^{F(s_1)}u_\alpha^-(\gamma(s_1), s_1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\infty}^{s_1} e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma_n(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_n(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau.$$

Let  $\hat{\gamma}_n = \gamma_n * \gamma$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{F(s_2)}u_\alpha^-(\gamma(s_2), s_2) &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)}(L(\hat{\gamma}_n(\tau), \dot{\hat{\gamma}}_n(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{s_1} e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma_n(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_n(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we derive (28) is true.  $\square$

**Lemma 34** *For each  $(x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $s < t$ , it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{F(t)}u_\alpha^-(x, t) \\ &= \inf_{\substack{\gamma(t)=x \\ \gamma \in Lip([s, t], M)}} \left\{ e^{F(s)}u_\alpha^-(\gamma(s), s) + \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Moreover, the infimum in (29) can be achieved and each minimizer is  $C^r$  smooth.

*Proof* Due to Lemma 33,

$$e^{F(t)}u_\alpha^-(x, t) \leq \inf_{\substack{\gamma(t)=x \\ \gamma \in Lip([s, t], M)}} \left\{ e^{F(s)}u_\alpha^-(\gamma(s), s) + \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \right\}.$$

For each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a Lipschitz continuous curve  $\gamma : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow M$  with  $\gamma(t) = x$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{F(t)}u_\alpha^-(x, t) + \epsilon &\geq \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &= \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^s e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\geq e^{F(s)}u_\alpha^-(\gamma(s), s) + \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (29) proves to be an equality. Therefore, we can find a sequence of Lipschitz continuous curve  $\{\gamma_n\}$  with  $\gamma_n(t) = x$  such that

$$e^{F(t)}u_\alpha^-(x, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ e^{F(s)}u_\alpha^-(\gamma_n(s), s) + \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)}(L(\gamma_n, \dot{\gamma}_n, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \right\}.$$

Hence, there exists a constant  $c$  independent of  $n$ , such that

$$\int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_n(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_n(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \leq c. \quad (30)$$

Due to Theorem 6.4 in [12], there exists a subsequence  $\{\gamma_{n_k}\}$  converging to a curve  $\gamma_*$  such that

$$\int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_*, \dot{\gamma}_*, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_s^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{n_k}, \dot{\gamma}_{n_k}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \quad (31)$$

Hence, (29) can be achieved at  $\gamma_* : [s, t] \rightarrow M$ , which definitely solves the Euler-Lagrange equation (E-L). Due to Corollary 2.2.12 of [14],  $\gamma_*$  is  $C^r$  smooth.  $\square$

**Lemma 35 [(4) of Theorem 12]** *For each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $(x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$ , there exists  $C^r$  curve  $\gamma_{x,t}^- : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow M$  with  $\gamma_{x,t}^-(t) = x$  such that for each  $t_1 < t_2 \leq t$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(t_2)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(t_2), t_2) - e^{F(t_1)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(t_1), t_1) \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

*Proof* By Lemma 34, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a sequence of  $C^r$  curve  $\gamma_n : [t-n, t] \rightarrow M$  with  $\gamma_n(t) = x$  such that

$$e^{F(t)} u_\alpha^-(x, t) = e^{F(t-n)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_n(t-n), t-n) + \int_{t-n}^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_n(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_n(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau.$$

It is easy to see for each interval  $[a, b] \subset [t-n, t]$

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(b)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_n(b), b) - e^{F(a)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_n(a), a) \\ &= \int_a^b e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_n(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_n(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Due to diagonal approach, we derive there exists a subsequence of  $\{\gamma_n\}$ , denoted by  $\{\gamma_{n_k}\}$  and a curve  $\gamma_{x,t}^- : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow M$  such that  $\gamma_{n_k}$  converges uniformly to  $\gamma_{x,t}^-$  on each finite subinterval of  $(-\infty, t]$ . Taking  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (33), due to Theorem 6.4 in [12],

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(b)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(b), b) - e^{F(a)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(a), a) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{n_k}, \dot{\gamma}_{n_k}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \geq \int_a^b e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (28), we get (32). Since  $\gamma_{x,t}^-|_{[s,t]}$  is a minimizer of (29) for each  $s < t$ , due to Lemma 34,  $\gamma_{x,t}^-$  is  $C^r$  and solves (E-L).  $\square$

**Remark 36** Due to Lemma 37, if we take  $t_2 = t$  and make  $t_1 \rightarrow -\infty$  in (32) we instantly get

$$u_\alpha^-(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(\tau)-F(t)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau,$$

i.e. the infimum in (27) is achieved at  $\gamma_{x,t}^- : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow M$ .

**Lemma 37** Suppose  $\gamma_{x,\theta}^- : (-\infty, \theta] \rightarrow M$  is a backward calibrated curve ending with  $x$  of  $u_\alpha^-(x, \theta)$ , then

$$|\dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-(\tau)| \leq \kappa_0, \quad \forall (x, \theta) \in M \times \mathbb{T}, \tau < \theta.$$

for a constant  $\kappa_0$  depending on  $L$  and  $\alpha$ .

*Proof* Let  $s_1, s_2 \leq \theta$  and  $s_2 - s_1 = 1$ . Due to Lemma 35,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(s_2)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,\theta}^-(s_2), s_2) - e^{F(s_1)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,\theta}^-(s_1), s_1) \\ &= \int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,\theta}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\geq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)} (|\dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-(\tau)| - C(1) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let  $\beta : [s_1, s_2] \rightarrow M$  be a geodesic satisfying  $\beta(s_1) = \gamma_{x,\theta}^-(s_1)$ ,  $\beta(s_2) = \gamma_{x,\theta}^-(s_2)$ , and  $|\dot{\beta}(\tau)| \leq \text{diam}(M) =: k_1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(s_2)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,\theta}^-(s_2), s_2) - e^{F(s_1)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,\theta}^-(s_1), s_1) \\ &\leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\beta(\tau), \dot{\beta}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)} (C_{k_1} + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)} |\dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-(\tau)| d\tau \leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} e^{F(\tau)} (C_{k_1} + C(1)) d\tau.$$

Due to the continuity of  $\dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-(\tau)$ , there exists  $s_0 \in (s_1, s_2)$  such that

$$|\dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-(s_0)| \leq C_{k_1} + C(1). \quad (34)$$

Note that  $\gamma_{x,\theta}^-$  solves (E-L), so  $|\dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-(\tau)|$  is uniformly bounded for  $(x, \theta) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  and  $\tau \in (-\infty, \theta]$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 38** [(2) of Theorem 12] For each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u_\alpha^-$  is Lipschitz on  $M \times \mathbb{T}$ .



*Proof* First of all, we prove  $u_\alpha^-(\cdot, \theta) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is uniformly Lipschitz w.r.t.  $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ . Let  $x, y \in M$ ,  $\Delta t = d(x, y)$ , and  $\gamma_{x, \theta}^- : (-\infty, \theta] \rightarrow M$  be a minimizer of  $u_\alpha^-(x, \theta)$ . Define  $\tilde{\gamma} : (-\infty, \theta] \rightarrow M$  by

$$\tilde{\gamma}(s) = \begin{cases} \gamma_{x, \theta}^-(s), & s \in (-\infty, \theta - \Delta t), \\ \beta(s), & s \in [\theta - \Delta t, \theta], \end{cases}$$

where  $\beta : [\theta - \Delta t, \theta] \rightarrow M$  is a geodesic satisfying  $\beta(\theta - \Delta t) = \gamma_{x, \theta}^-(\theta - \Delta t)$ ,  $\beta(\theta) = y$ , and

$$|\dot{\beta}(s)| \equiv \frac{d(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(\theta - \Delta t), y)}{\Delta t} \leq \frac{d(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(\theta - \Delta t), x)}{\Delta t} + 1 \leq \kappa_0 + 1.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} u_\alpha^-(x, \theta) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\theta} e^{F(\tau) - F(\theta)} (L(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x, \theta}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau, \\ u_\alpha^-(y, \theta) &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\theta} e^{F(\tau) - F(\theta)} (L(\tilde{\gamma}(\tau), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} u_\alpha^-(y, \theta) - u_\alpha^-(x, \theta) &\leq \int_{\theta - \Delta t}^{\theta} e^{F(\tau) - F(\theta)} (L(\beta, \dot{\beta}, \tau) - L(\gamma_{x, \theta}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{x, \theta}^-, \tau)) d\tau \\ &\leq (C_{\kappa_0+1} + C(0)) \int_{\theta - \Delta t}^{\theta} e^{F(\tau) - F(\theta)} d\tau \\ &\leq (C_{\kappa_0+1} + C(0)) e^{2k_0 + [f]} \cdot d(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

By a similar approach, we derive the opposite inequality holds. Hence,

$$|u_\alpha^-(y, \theta) - u_\alpha^-(x, \theta)| \leq \rho_* \cdot d(x, y), \quad (35)$$

where  $\rho_* = (C_{\kappa_0+1} + C(0)) e^{2k_0 + [f]}$ .

Next, we prove  $u_\alpha^-(x, \cdot)$  is uniformly Lipschitz continuous for  $x \in M$ . Let  $\bar{t}, \bar{t}' \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $d(\bar{t}, \bar{t}') = t' - t$ , and  $t \in [0, 1)$ . Then,  $t' \in [0, 2]$ . A curve  $\eta : (-\infty, t'] \rightarrow M$  is defined by

$$\eta(s) = \begin{cases} \gamma_{x, t}^-(s), & s \in (-\infty, t], \\ x, & s \in (t, t']. \end{cases}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{F(t')} u_\alpha^-(x, t') - e^{F(t)} u_\alpha^-(x, t) \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{t'} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\eta, \dot{\eta}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau - \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x, t}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{x, t}^-, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq \int_t^{t'} e^{F(\tau)} (C_0 + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq (C_0 + \alpha) \max_{\tau \in [0, 2]} e^{F(\tau)} \cdot |t' - t|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we write  $\Delta t = d(\bar{t}', \bar{t})$  and define  $\eta_1 \in Lip((-\infty, t], M)$  by

$$\eta_1(s) = \begin{cases} \gamma_{x,t'}^-(s), & s \in (-\infty, t - \Delta t], \\ \gamma_{x,t'}^-(2(s - t) + t'), & s \in (t - \Delta t, t]. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check  $\eta_1(t) = x$ , and  $|\dot{\eta}_1(\tau)| \leq 2\kappa_0$ , where  $\kappa_0$  is a Lipschitz constant of  $\gamma_{x,t'}^-$ .

$$\begin{aligned} e^{F(t)} u_\alpha^-(x, t) &\leq \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\eta_1(\tau), \dot{\eta}_1(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq \int_{t-\Delta t}^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\eta_1(\tau), \dot{\eta}_1(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{t-\Delta t} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t'}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t'}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\gamma_{x,t'}^-$  is a minimizer of  $u_\alpha^-(x, t')$ . We derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{F(t)} u_\alpha^-(x, t) - e^{F(t')} u_\alpha^-(x, t') \\ &\leq \int_{t-\Delta t}^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\eta_1(\tau), \dot{\eta}_1(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_{t-\Delta t}^{t'} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t'}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t'}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq (C_{2\kappa_0} + 2C(0) + |\alpha|) \max_{\tau \in [0, 2]} e^{F(\tau)} \cdot d(\bar{t}', \bar{t}). \end{aligned}$$

We have proved the map  $t \mapsto e^{F(t)} u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  is uniformly Lipschitz for  $x \in M$ , with Lipschitz constant depends only on  $L, f$  and  $\alpha$ . Note that  $F(t)$  is  $C^{r+1}$  and  $F'(t) = f(t)$  is 1-periodic. We derive  $u_\alpha^-(x, \cdot)$  is uniformly Lipschitz for  $x \in M$  with Lipschitz constant  $\rho_0^*$  depending on  $L, f$ , and  $\alpha$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_\alpha^-(x', \theta') - u_\alpha^-(x, \theta)| &\leq |u_\alpha^-(x', \theta') - u_\alpha^-(x, \theta')| + |u_\alpha^-(x, \theta') - u_\alpha^-(x, \theta)| \\ &\leq \rho_* d(x', x) + \rho_0^* d(\theta', \theta) \end{aligned}$$

so we finish the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 39 [(5) of Theorem 12]** *The function  $u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  defined by (27) is a viscosity solution of  $(HJ_+)$ .*

*Proof* Let  $\phi^*(x, t)$  be a  $C^1$  function such that  $u_\alpha^-(x, t) - \phi^*(x, t)$  attains maximum at  $(x_0, t_0)$  and  $u(x_0, t_0) = \phi^*(x_0, t_0)$ . For each  $v \in T_{x_0}M$ , there exists a  $C^1$  curve  $\gamma$  defined on a neighborhood of  $t_0$  with  $\dot{\gamma}(t_0) = v$  and  $\gamma(t_0) = x_0$ . Let  $\Delta t < 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{F(t_0)} \phi^*(\gamma(t_0), t_0) - e^{F(t_0)} \phi^*(\gamma(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) \\ &\leq e^{F(t_0)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma(t_0), t_0) - e^{F(t_0)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) \\ &= e^{F(t_0)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma(t_0), t_0) - e^{F(t_0 + \Delta t)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) \\ &\quad + (e^{F(t_0 + \Delta t)} - e^{F(t_0)}) u_\alpha^-(\gamma(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t). \end{aligned}$$

By (28), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(t_0)} \left( \frac{\phi^*(\gamma(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) - \phi^*(\gamma(t_0), t_0)}{\Delta t} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \Delta t} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ & \quad - \left( \frac{e^{F(t_0 + \Delta t)} - e^{F(t_0)}}{\Delta t} \right) u_\alpha^-(\gamma(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t). \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0^-$ , we derive that

$$\partial_t \phi^*(x_0, t_0) + \partial_x \phi^*(x_0, t_0) \cdot v - L(x_0, v, t_0) + f(t_0) u_\alpha^-(x_0, t_0) \leq \alpha.$$

By the arbitrariness of  $v$ ,

$$\partial_t \phi^*(x_0, t_0) + H(x_0, \partial_x \phi^*(x_0, t_0), t_0) + f(t_0) u_\alpha^-(x_0, t_0) \leq \alpha,$$

which implies  $u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  is a viscosity subsolution of (HJ<sub>+</sub>).

Let  $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^- : (-\infty, t_0] \rightarrow M$  be a minimizer of  $u_\alpha^-(x_0, t_0)$  and let  $\phi_*(x, t) \in C^1(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $u_\alpha^-(x, t) - \phi_*(x, t)$  attains minimum at  $(x_0, t_0)$ . Then, for  $\Delta t < 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(t_0)} (\phi_*(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0), t_0) - \phi_*(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t)) \\ & \geq e^{F(t_0)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0), t_0) - e^{F(t_0 + \Delta t)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) \\ & \quad + e^{F(t_0 + \Delta t)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) - e^{F(t_0)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) \\ & = \int_{t_0 + \Delta t}^{t_0} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x_0, t_0}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ & \quad + (e^{F(t_0 + \Delta t)} - e^{F(t_0)}) u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(t_0)} \frac{\phi_*(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t) - \phi_*(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0), t_0)}{\Delta t} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + \Delta t} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x_0, t_0}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ & \quad - \left( \frac{e^{F(t_0 + \Delta t)} - e^{F(t_0)}}{\Delta t} \right) u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x_0, t_0}^-(t_0 + \Delta t), t_0 + \Delta t). \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0^-$ , we derive that

$$\partial_t \phi_*(x_0, t_0) + H(x_0, \partial_x \phi_*(x_0, t_0), t_0) + f(t_0) u(x_0, t_0) \geq \alpha$$

which implies the assertion.  $\square$

As an important complement, the following result is analogue to Proposition 6 of [19] will be useful in the following sections:

**Proposition 310** *The weak KAM solution  $u_\alpha^-$  of  $(HJ_+)$  is differentiable at  $(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), \bar{s})$  for any  $\mathbb{R} \ni s < t$ , where  $\gamma_{x,t}^- : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow M$  is a backward calibrated curve ending with  $x$ . In other words, we have*

$$\partial_t u^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s) + H(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), \partial_x u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s), s) + f(s)u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s) = \alpha$$

and

$$(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(s), \bar{s}) = \mathcal{L}\left(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), \partial_x u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s), \bar{s}\right) \quad (36)$$

for all  $\mathbb{R} \ni s < t$ .

*Proof* By Theorem B4, we derive  $u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  is semiconcave. Let  $s \in (-\infty, t)$  and  $\tilde{p} = (p_x, p_t) \in D^+ u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s)$ . For  $\Delta s > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{e^{F(s+\Delta s)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s+\Delta s), s+\Delta s) - e^{F(s)} u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s)}{\Delta s} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Delta s} \int_s^{s+\Delta s} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + \alpha) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\Delta s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s+\Delta s), s+\Delta s) - u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s)}{\Delta s} \\ &= L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(s), s) + \alpha - f(s)u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition B3,

$$\lim_{\Delta s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s+\Delta s), s+\Delta s) - u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s)}{\Delta s} \leq p_x \cdot \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(s) + p_t,$$

which implies

$$p_t + H(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), p_x, s) + f(s)u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s) \geq \alpha.$$

On the other hand,  $u_\alpha^-$  is a viscosity solution of  $(HJ_+)$ . Hence, for each  $(p_x, p_t) \in D^+ u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s)$ ,

$$p_t + H(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), p_x, s) + f(s)u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s) = \alpha. \quad (37)$$

Note that  $H(x, p, t)$  is strictly convex with respect to  $p$ . By (37), We derive  $D^+ u_\alpha^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s)$  is a singleton. By Proposition B3,  $u_\alpha^-(x, t)$  is differentiable at  $(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s), s)$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Weak KAM solution of (HJ<sub>0</sub>) in the condition (H4<sup>0</sup>)

Now  $[f] = 0$ , so  $F(t) := \int_0^t f(\tau) d\tau$  is 1-periodic. Let  $\ell = \int_0^1 e^{F(\tau)} d\tau$ , then we define a new Lagrangian  $\mathbf{L} : TM \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\mathbf{L}(x, v, t) = e^{F(t)} L(x, v, t).$$

For such a  $\mathbf{L}$ , the Peierls Barrier  $\mathbf{h}_\alpha^\infty : M \times \mathbb{T} \times M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbf{h}_\alpha^\infty(x, \bar{s}, y, \bar{t}) = \liminf_{\substack{t \equiv \bar{t}, s \equiv \bar{s} \pmod{1} \\ t-s \rightarrow +\infty}} \inf_{\substack{\gamma \in Lip([s, t], M) \\ \gamma(s)=x, \gamma(t)=y}} \int_s^t \mathbf{L}(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + \alpha \cdot \ell d\tau,$$

is well-defined, once  $\alpha$  is uniquely established by

$$c(H) = \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \mid \int_s^t \mathbf{L}(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + \alpha \cdot \ell d\tau \geq 0, \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{C}\} \quad (38)$$

with  $\mathcal{C} = \{\gamma \in Lip([s, t], M) \mid \gamma(s) = \gamma(t) \text{ and } t - s \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ , due to Proposition 2 of [10]. Moreover, the following properties were also proved in [10]:

**Proposition 311** (i) If  $\alpha < c(H)$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_\alpha^\infty \equiv -\infty$ .

(ii) If  $\alpha > c(H)$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_\alpha^\infty \equiv +\infty$ .

(iii)  $\mathbf{h}_{c(H)}^\infty$  is finite.

(iv)  $\mathbf{h}_{c(H)}^\infty$  is Lipschitz.

(v) For each  $\gamma \in Lip([s, t], M)$  with  $\gamma(s) = x, \gamma(t) = y$ ,

$$\mathbf{h}_{c(H)}^\infty(z, \bar{s}, y, \bar{t}) - \mathbf{h}_{c(H)}^\infty(z, \bar{s}, x, \bar{s}) \leq \int_s^t \mathbf{L}(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + c(H) \cdot \ell d\tau.$$

Consequently, for any  $(z, \bar{s}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  fixed, we construct a function  $u_{z, \bar{s}}^- : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$u_{z, \bar{s}}^-(x, \bar{t}) = e^{-F(\bar{t})} \left( \mathbf{h}_{c(H)}^\infty(z, \bar{s}, x, \bar{t}) + c(H) \cdot \int_{\bar{s}}^{\bar{t}} e^{F(\tau)} - \ell d\tau \right). \quad (39)$$

**Proof of Theorem 13:** (1) Due to (iv) of Proposition 311,  $u_{z, \bar{s}}^-$  is also Lipschitz.

(2) The domination property of  $u_{z, \bar{s}}^-$  can be achieved immediately by (v) of Proposition 311.

(3) By Tonelli Theorem and the definition of  $u_{z, \bar{s}}^-$ , there exists a sequence  $\varsigma_k$  tending to  $-\infty$  and a sequence  $\gamma_k \in Lip([\varsigma_k, \theta], M)$  with  $\gamma_k(\varsigma_k) = z, \gamma_k(\theta) = x$ , such that  $\gamma_k$  minimizes the action function

$$\mathcal{F}(\beta) = \inf_{\substack{\beta \in Lip([\varsigma_k, \theta]) \\ \beta(\varsigma_k)=z, \beta(\theta)=x}} \int_{\varsigma_k}^{\theta} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\beta, \dot{\beta}, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau$$

and

$$e^{F(\theta)} u_{z, \bar{s}}^-(x, \theta) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\varsigma_k}^{\theta} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_k, \dot{\gamma}_k, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau.$$

Since each  $\gamma_k$  solves E-L(E-L), which implies  $\gamma_k$  is  $C^r$ . By a standard way, there exists  $\kappa_0$  independent of the choice of  $k$ , such that  $|\dot{\gamma}_k| \leq \kappa_0$ , when  $\theta - \varsigma_k \geq 1$ . By Ascoli Theorem, there exists a subsequence of  $\{\gamma_k\}$  (denoted still by  $\gamma_k$ ) and a Lipschitz continuous curve  $\gamma_{x,\theta}^- : (-\infty, \theta] \rightarrow M$  such that  $\gamma_k$  converges uniformly to  $\gamma_{x,\theta}^-$  on each compact subset of  $(-\infty, \theta]$  and  $\gamma_{x,\theta}^-(\theta) = x$ . Then, for each  $s < \theta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{F(\theta)} u_{z,\bar{\varsigma}}^-(x, \theta) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \left( \int_{\varsigma_k}^s e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_k, \dot{\gamma}_k, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_s^\theta e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_k, \dot{\gamma}_k, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\varsigma_k}^s e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_k, \dot{\gamma}_k, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \\ &\quad + \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_s^\theta e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_k, \dot{\gamma}_k, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \\ &\geq e^{F(s)} u_{z,\bar{\varsigma}}^-(\gamma_{x,\theta}^-(s), s) + \int_s^\theta e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,\theta}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{x,\theta}^-, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\gamma_{x,\theta}^-$  is a calibrated curve by  $u_{z,\bar{\varsigma}}^-$ .

(4) By a similar approach of the proof of Lemma 39, we derive  $u_{z,\bar{\varsigma}}^-$  is also a viscosity solution of (HJ<sub>0</sub>).  $\square$

## 4 Various properties of variational invariant sets

### 4.1 Aubry set in the condition (H4<sup>-</sup>)

Due to Theorem 12 and Proposition 310, for any  $(x, \bar{s}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  we can find a backward calibrated curve

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{x,s}^- := \left( \gamma_{x,s}^-(t) \right) : t \in (-\infty, s] \rightarrow M \times \mathbb{T} \quad (40)$$

ending with it, such that the associated backward orbit  $\varphi_L^{t-s}(\gamma_{x,s}^-(s), \dot{\gamma}_{x,s}^-(s), s)$  has an  $\alpha$ -limit set  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{x,s} \subset TM \times \mathbb{T}$ , which is invariant and graphic over  $\mathcal{A}_{x,s} := \pi \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{x,s}$ . Therefore, any critical curve  $\tilde{\gamma}_{x,s}^\infty$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{x,s}$  has to be a globally calibrated curve, namely

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{x,s} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \quad (\text{resp. } \mathcal{A}_{x,s} \subset \mathcal{A}).$$

So  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$ .

Recall that any critical curve in  $\mathcal{A}$  is globally calibrated, then due to Proposition 310, that implies for any  $(x, \bar{s}) \in \mathcal{A}$ , the critical curve  $\tilde{\gamma}_{x,s}$  passing it is unique. In other words,  $\pi^{-1} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  is a graph, and

$$\dot{\gamma}_{x,s}(t) = \partial_p H(\text{du}^-(\gamma_{x,s}(t), t), t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

That indicates that  $du^- : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow TM$  coincides with  $\partial_v L \circ (\pi|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}})^{-1}$ . On the other side,  $\|\dot{\gamma}_{x,s}(t)\| \leq A < +\infty$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  due to Lemma 37, so  $\partial_v L \circ (\pi|_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}})^{-1}$  has to be Lipschitz. So  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  is Lipschitz over  $\mathcal{A}$ . This is an analogue of Theorem 4.11.5 of [14] and a.4) of [19], which is known as **Mather's graph theorem** in more earlier works [21] for conservative Hamiltonian systems.

**Lemma 41**  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  has an equivalent expression

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} := \{(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t), \bar{t}) \in TM \times \mathbb{T} \mid \forall a < b \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma \text{ achieves } h_{\alpha}^{a,b}(\gamma(a), \gamma(b))\}. \quad (41)$$

*Proof* Let  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  be a globally calibrated curve by  $u_{\alpha}^-$ . Due to (3) and (4) of Theorem 12, for  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau &= e^{F(b)} u_{\alpha}^-(\gamma(b), b) - e^{F(a)} u_{\alpha}^-(\gamma(a), a) \\ &\leq h_{\alpha}^{a,b}(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the definition of  $h_{\alpha}^{a,b}(\gamma(a), \gamma(b))$ , we derive  $\gamma$  achieves  $h_{\alpha}^{a,b}(\gamma(a), \gamma(b))$  for all  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

To prove the lemma, it suffices to show any curve  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  achieving  $h_{\alpha}^{a,b}(\gamma(a), \gamma(b))$  for all  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$  is a calibrated curve by  $u_{\alpha}^-$ . We claim

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} h_{\alpha}^{s,t}(z, x) = e^{F(t)} u_{\alpha}^-(x, t), \quad \forall x, z \in M, t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (42)$$

Due to (3) of Theorem 12, for  $s < t$ ,

$$e^{F(t)} u_{\alpha}^-(x, t) - h_{\alpha}^{s,t}(z, x) \leq e^{F(s)} u_{\alpha}^-(z, s) \rightarrow 0, s \rightarrow -\infty.$$

On the other hand, we assume  $\gamma_{x,t}$  is a globally calibrated curve by  $u_{\alpha}^-$  with  $\gamma_{x,t}(t) = x$  and  $s+1 < t$ . Let  $\beta : [s, s+1] \rightarrow M$  be a geodesic with  $\beta(s) = z, \beta(s+1) = \gamma_{x,t}(s+1)$  satisfying  $|\dot{\beta}| \leq k_1 := \text{diam}(M)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\alpha}^{s,t}(z, x) &\leq \int_s^{s+1} e^{F(\tau)} (L(\beta, \dot{\beta}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau + \int_{s+1}^t e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}, \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq (C_{k_1} + \alpha) e^{\max f + [f][s]} + e^{F(t)} u_{\alpha}^-(x, t) - e^{F(s+1)} u_{\alpha}^-(\gamma_{x,t}(s+1), s+1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$h_{\alpha}^{s,t}(z, x) - e^{F(t)} u_{\alpha}^-(x, t) \leq (C_{k_1} + \alpha) e^{\max f + [f][s]} - e^{F(s+1)} u_{\alpha}^-(\gamma_{x,t}(s+1), s+1).$$

From  $[f] > 0$ , it follows that the right side of the inequality above tending to 0, as  $s \rightarrow -\infty$ . Hence, (42) holds. Actually, the limit in (42) is uniform for  $x, z \in M$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

If  $\gamma$  achieves  $h_{\alpha}^{a,b}(\gamma(a), \gamma(b))$  for  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$h_{\alpha}^{s,b}(\gamma(s), \gamma(b)) - h_{\alpha}^{s,a}(\gamma(s), \gamma(a)) = \int_a^b e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau, \forall s < a.$$

Taking  $s \rightarrow -\infty$ , we derive  $\gamma$  is also a calibrated curve by  $u_{\alpha}^-$ .  $\square$

With the help of (41), the following Lemma can be proved:

**Lemma 42 (Upper Semi-continuity)** *The set valued function*

$$L \in \underbrace{C^{r \geq 2}(TM \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})}_{\|\cdot\|_{C^r}} \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \underbrace{TM \times \mathbb{T}}_{d_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot, \cdot)}$$

is upper semi-continuous. Here  $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$  is the  $C^r$ -norm and  $d_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the Hausdorff distance.

*Proof* It suffices to prove that for any  $L_n \rightarrow L$  w.r.t.  $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$ -norm, the accumulating curve of any sequence of curves  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$  in  $\mathcal{A}(L_n)$  should lie in  $\mathcal{A}(L)$ . Due to Lemma 37, for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $\|L_n - L\|_{C^r} \leq 1$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(L_n)$  is uniformly compact in the phase space. Therefore, for any sequence  $\{\tilde{\gamma}_n\}$  each of which is globally minimal, the accumulating curve  $\tilde{\gamma}_*$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^s e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_*, \dot{\gamma}_*, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^s e^{F(\tau)} (L_n(\gamma_n, \dot{\gamma}_n, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_t^s e^{F(\tau)} (L_n(\eta_n, \dot{\eta}_n, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for any Lipschitz continuous  $\eta_n : [t, s] \rightarrow M$  ending with  $\gamma_n(t)$  and  $\gamma_n(s)$ . Since for any Lipschitz continuous  $\eta : [t, s] \rightarrow M$  ending with  $\gamma_*(t)$  and  $\gamma_*(s)$ , we can find such a sequence  $\eta_n : [t, s] \rightarrow M$  converging to  $\eta$  uniformly, then we get

$$\int_t^s e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_*, \dot{\gamma}_*, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau \leq \inf_{\substack{\eta \in Lip([t, s], M) \\ \eta(t) = \gamma_*(t) \\ \eta(s) = \gamma_*(s)}} \int_t^s e^{F(\tau)} (L(\eta, \dot{\eta}, \tau) + \alpha) d\tau$$

for any  $t < s \in \mathbb{R}$ , which implies  $\gamma_*$  satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation. Due to Theorem 12, the weak KAM solution  $u_*^-$  associated with  $L$  is unique, so  $\gamma_*$  is globally minimal, then globally calibrated by  $u_*^-$ , i.e.  $\tilde{\gamma}_* \in \mathcal{A}(L)$ .  $\square$

#### 4.2 Mather set in the condition (H4<sup>-</sup>)

For any globally calibrated curve  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , we can always find a sequence  $T_n > 0$ , such that a  $\varphi_L^t$ -invariant measure  $\tilde{\mu}$  can be found by

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} f(x, v, t) d\tilde{\mu} = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T_n} \int_0^{T_n} f(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, t) dt, \quad \forall f \in C_c(TM \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}).$$

So the set of  $\varphi_L^t$ -invariant measures  $\mathfrak{M}_L$  is not empty.

**Proposition 43** *For all  $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathfrak{M}_L$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have*

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} L + \alpha - f(t) u_{\alpha}^- d\tilde{\nu} \geq 0.$$

Besides,

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} L + \alpha - f(t) u_{\alpha}^- d\tilde{\nu} = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$$



*Proof* For any Euler-Lagrange curve  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  contained in  $\pi_x^3 \text{supp}(\tilde{\nu})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} f(t) u_{\alpha}^{-}(x, t) d\tilde{\nu} \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(t) u_{\alpha}^{-}(\gamma(t), t) dt \\
&\leq \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(t) \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s)-F(t)} [L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), s) + \alpha] ds dt \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(t) e^{-F(t)} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s)} [L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), s) + \alpha] ds dt \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left( \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s)} [L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), s) + \alpha] ds \right) de^{-F(t)} \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{T} \left( e^{-F(t)} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{F(s)} [L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s), s) + \alpha] ds \Big|_0^T \right) \\
&\quad + \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t), t) + \alpha dt \\
&= \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} L(x, v, t) + \alpha d\tilde{\nu},
\end{aligned}$$

which is an equality only when  $\gamma$  is a backward calibrated curve of  $(-\infty, t]$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , which implies  $\gamma$  is globally calibrated.  $\square$

Due to this Proposition we can easily show that  $\emptyset \neq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ . Moreover, as we did for the Aubry set, we can similarly get that  $\pi^{-1} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is a Lipschitz function.

#### 4.3 Maximal global attractor in the condition (H4<sup>-</sup>)

Since now  $[f] > 0$  and  $\frac{d}{dt} \widehat{H}(x, p, \bar{s}, I, u) = -f(t) \widehat{H}(x, p, \bar{s}, I, u)$  due to Remark 11, so for any initial point  $(x, p, s, I, u)$ , the  $\omega$ -limit of trajectory  $\widehat{\varphi}_H^t(x, p, \bar{s}, I, u)$  lies in

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_H := \{ \widehat{H}(x, p, \bar{s}, I, u) = 0 \} \subset T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (43)$$

**Lemma 44** *For any point  $Z := (x, p, \bar{s}, \alpha - f(s)u - H(x, p, s), u) \in \widehat{\Sigma}_H$  with  $u \leq u_{\alpha}^{-}(x, s)$ , if*

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow -\infty} e^{F(t)} |\pi_u \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z)| = 0,$$

*then  $\pi_x \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z)$  is a backward calibrated curve for  $t \leq 0$ .*

---

<sup>3</sup> Here  $\pi_x, \pi_t, \pi_u$  is the standard projection to the space  $M, \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}$  respectively.

*Proof* From the equation  $\dot{u} = \langle H_p, p \rangle - H + \alpha - f(t)u$ , we derive

$$\begin{aligned} e^{F(s)}\pi_u Z &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{d}{dt} e^{F(t+s)}\pi_u \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z) dt \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^s e^{F(t)} \left( L(\mathcal{L}(\varphi_H^{t-s}(x, p, \bar{s}))) + \alpha \right) dt \leq u_\alpha^-(x, s), \end{aligned}$$

then due to the expression of  $u_\alpha^-$  in (27),  $\pi_x \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z)$  is a backward calibrated curve for  $t \leq 0$ .  $\square$

This Lemma inspires us to decompose  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H$  further:

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\Sigma}_H^- := \{(x, p, \bar{s}, \alpha - f(s)u - H(x, p, s), u) \mid u > u_\alpha^-(x, s)\}, \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0 := \{(x, p, \bar{s}, \alpha - f(s)u - H(x, p, s), u) \mid u = u_\alpha^-(x, s)\}, \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_H^+ := \{(x, p, \bar{s}, \alpha - f(s)u - H(x, p, s), u) \mid u < u_\alpha^-(x, s)\}. \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 45** For any  $Z = (x, p, \bar{s}, \alpha - f(s)u - H(x, p, s), u) \in \widehat{\Sigma}_H$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t^+ \left( u_\alpha^-(\pi_{x,t} \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z)) - \pi_u \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z) \right) \\ &\leq -f(t+s) \left( u_\alpha^-(\pi_{x,t} \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z)) - \pi_u \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Consequently,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z) \in \widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ .

*Proof* As  $\widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z) = (x(t), p(t), \overline{t+s}, -f(s+t)u(t) - H(x(t), p(t), s+t), u(t))$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t^+ [u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t) - u(t)] \\ &\leq \max \langle \partial_x^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t), \dot{x}(t) \rangle + \partial_t^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t) - \dot{u}(t) \\ &\leq \max H(x(t), \partial_x^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t), s+t) + L(x(t), \dot{x}(t), s+t) \\ &\quad + \partial_t^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t) - \langle H_p(x(t), p(t), t+s), p(t) \rangle \\ &\quad + f(t+s)u(t) + H(x(t), p(t), s+t) - \alpha \\ &= \max H(x(t), \partial_x^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t), s+t) + \partial_t^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t) \\ &\quad + f(t+s)u(t) - \alpha \\ &\leq f(t+s)[u(t) - u_\alpha^-(x(t), t+s)] \end{aligned}$$

where the ‘max’ is about all the element  $(\partial_x^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t), \partial_t^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t))$  in  $D^* u_\alpha^-(x(t), s+t)$  (see Theorem B5 for the definition). So  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(Z) \in \widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 46**  $\Omega := \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \widehat{\varphi}_H^t(\widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0)$  is the maximal invariant set contained in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ .

*Proof* Due to (44),  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$  is forward invariant. Besides, any invariant set in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H$  has to lie in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ . So  $\Omega$  is the maximal invariant set in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H^- \cup \widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 47** *If the  $p$ -component of  $\Omega$  is bounded, then the  $u, I$ -components of  $\Omega$  are also bounded.*

*Proof* It suffices to prove that for any  $(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0) \in T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a time  $T(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0) > 0$  such that for any  $t \geq T$ ,

$$\|\pi_{u,I}\widehat{\varphi}_H^t(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0)\| \leq C \quad (*)$$

for a uniform constant  $C = C(\pi_p\Omega)$ . Since  $\pi_p\Omega$  is bounded, due to the definition of  $\Omega$ , for any  $(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0) \in T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ , there always exists a time  $T'(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0) > 0$  such that for any  $t \geq T'$ ,

$$\|\pi_p\widehat{\varphi}_H^t(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0)\| \leq C' = \frac{3}{2}\text{diam}(\pi_p\Omega).$$

On the other side, the  $u$ -equation of (4) implies that for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\pi_u\widehat{\varphi}_H^{t+T'}(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0)\| \\ & \leq e^{F(t_0+T')-F(t+T'+t_0)}|\pi_u\widehat{\varphi}_H^{T'}(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0)| \\ & \quad + \int_0^t e^{F(s+t_0+T')-F(t+t_0+T')} \left| \langle H_p, p \rangle - H \right|_{\widehat{\varphi}_H^{s+T'}(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0)} ds \end{aligned}$$

where the first term of the right hand side will tend to zero as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , and the second term has a uniform bound depending only on  $[f], C'$ . Therefore, there exists a time  $T''(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0)$  such that for any  $t \geq T' + T''$ , there exists a constant  $C'' = C''(C', [f])$  such that

$$\|\pi_u\widehat{\varphi}_H^t(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0, I_0, u_0)\| \leq C''.$$

Benefiting from the boundedness of  $u$ -component, we can repeat aforementioned scheme to the  $I$ -equation of (4), then prove (\*).  $\square$

Once  $\Omega$  is compact, it has to be the maximal global attractor of  $\widehat{\varphi}_H^t$  in the whole phase space  $T^*M \times T^*\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ . Then due to Proposition 310, any backward calibrated curve  $\gamma_{x,s}^- : (-\infty, s] \rightarrow M$  decides a unique trajectory

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{\varphi}_H^t \left( \mathcal{L}^{-1}(x, \lim_{\varsigma \rightarrow s-} \dot{\gamma}_{x,s}^-(\varsigma), s), \alpha - f(s)u_\alpha^-(x, s) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - H(\mathcal{L}^{-1}(x, \lim_{\varsigma \rightarrow s-} \dot{\gamma}_{x,s}^-(\varsigma), s)), u_\alpha^-(x, s) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , which lies in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H$ . Furthermore,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A}} := \left\{ \left( \mathcal{L}^{-1}(x, \partial_x u_\alpha^-(x, t), t), \partial_t u_\alpha^-(x, t), u_\alpha^-(x, t) \right) \middle| (x, t) \in \mathcal{A} \right\} \subset \Omega$$

because  $\Omega$  is the maximal invariant set in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H$ .

**Lemma 48**  *$\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  is the maximal invariant set contained in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ .*

*Proof* If  $\mathcal{I}$  is an invariant set contained in  $\widehat{\Sigma}_H^0$ , then  $\pi_u(\widehat{\varphi}_H^t(\mathcal{I}))$  is always bounded. Due to Lemma 44, any trajectory in  $\mathcal{I}$  has to be backward calibrated. As  $\mathcal{I}$  is invariant, any trajectory in it has to be contained in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 15:* Let  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_L$  be ergodic, then we can find  $(x_0, v_0, t_0) \in TM \times \mathbb{T}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F(t)} (L(x, v, t) + c(H)) d\mu \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^0 e^{F(\tau)} (L(\varphi_L^\tau(x_0, v_0, t_0)) + c(H)) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any weak KAM solution  $u_c^- : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of (HJ<sub>0</sub>), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(0)} u_c^-(x_0, t_0) - e^{F(-T)} u_c^-(\pi_{x,t} \varphi_L^{-T}(x_0, v_0, t_0)) \\ & \leq \int_{-T}^0 e^{F(\tau)} (L(\varphi_L^\tau(x_0, v_0, t_0)) + c(H)) d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^0 e^{F(\tau)} (L(\varphi_L^\tau(x_0, v_0, t_0)) + c(H)) d\tau \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} (e^{F(0)} u_c^-(x_0, t_0) - e^{F(-T)} u_c^-(\pi_{x,t} \varphi_L^{-T}(x_0, v_0, t_0))) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F(t)} (L(x, v, t) + c(H)) d\mu \geq 0.$$

That further implies

$$\frac{\inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_L} \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F(t)} L(x, v, t) d\mu}{\int_0^1 e^{F(\tau)} d\tau} \geq -c(H).$$

On the other side, for any  $(x, 0) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  fixed, the backward calibrated curve  $\gamma_{x,0}^- : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow M$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F(0)} u_c(\gamma_{x,0}^-(0), 0) - e^{F(-n)} u_c(\gamma_{x,0}^-(-n), -n) \\ &= \int_{-n}^0 e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,0}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,0}^-(\tau), \tau) + c) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . By the **Resize Representation Theorem**, the time average w.r.t.  $\gamma_{x,0}^-|_{[-n,0]} : [-n, 0] \rightarrow M$  decides a sequence of Borel probability measures  $\mu_n$ .

Due to Lemma 37, we can always find a subsequence  $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$  converging to a unique Borel probability measure  $\mu^*$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} g(x, v, t) d\mu^* &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} g(x, v, t) d\mu_{n_k} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \int_{-n_k}^0 g(\gamma_{x,0}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,0}^-(\tau), \bar{\tau}) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for any  $g \in C_c(TM \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ . Besides, we can easily prove that  $\mu^* \in \mathfrak{M}_L$  and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F(t)} (L(x, v, t) + c(H)) d\mu^* \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \int_{-n_k}^0 e^{F(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,0}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,0}^-(\tau), \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \left( u_c^-(\gamma_{x,0}^-(0), 0) - u_c^-(\gamma_{x,0}^-(-n_k), -n_k) \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$-c(H) = \frac{\inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_L} \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F(t)} L(x, v, t) d\mu}{\int_0^1 e^{F(\tau)} d\tau}.$$

Gathering all the infimum of the right side of previous equality, we get a set of Mather measures  $\mathfrak{M}_m$ . Due to the Cross Lemma in [21], the Mather set

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} := \overline{\bigcup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m} \text{supp}(\mu)}$$

is a Lipschitz graph over  $\mathcal{M} := \pi \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ . □

## 5 Convergence of parameterized viscosity solutions

In this section we deal with the convergence of weak KAM solution  $u_\delta^-$  for system (15) as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$ . Recall that  $[f_0] = 0$  and

$$f_1(t) := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \frac{f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)}{\delta} > 0,$$

there must exist a  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that

$$f_\delta(t) > f_0(t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{T}$$

for all  $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$ . Due to Theorem 13 there exists a unique  $c(H)$ , such that the weak KAM solutions  $u_0^-$  of (18) with  $\alpha = c(H)$  exist. For each  $(x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $s < t$ , the Lax-Oleinik operator

$$T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) = \inf_{\substack{\gamma \in Lip([s, t], M) \\ \gamma(t) = x}} \int_s^t e^{F_\delta(\tau) - F_\delta(t)} (L(\gamma(\tau), \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \tau) + c(H)) d\tau$$

is well defined, of which the following Lemma holds:

**Lemma 51** For each  $\delta \geq 0$  and  $T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t)$  converges uniformly to  $u_\delta^-(x, t)$  on each compact subset of  $M \times \mathbb{R}$  as  $s \rightarrow -\infty$ .

*Proof* Let  $\gamma_{\delta,x,t}^- : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow M$  be a calibrated curve of  $u_\delta^-(x, t)$ . Then,

$$e^{F_\delta(t)} u_\delta^-(x, t) = e^{F_\delta(s)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_{\delta,x,t}^-(s), s) + \int_s^t e^{F_\delta(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{\delta,x,t}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{\delta,x,t}^-, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau$$

and

$$e^{F_\delta(t)} T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) \leq \int_s^t e^{F_\delta(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{\delta,x,t}^-, \dot{\gamma}_{\delta,x,t}^-, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau.$$

Then,

$$T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) - u_\delta^-(x, t) \leq -e^{F_\delta(s)-F_\delta(t)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_{\delta,x,t}^-(s), s). \quad (45)$$

On the other hand, let  $\gamma_0 : [s, t] \rightarrow M$  be a minimizer of  $T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t)$ . Then,

$$e^{F_\delta(t)} T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) = \int_s^t e^{F_\delta(\tau)} (L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H)) d\tau$$

and

$$e^{F_\delta(t)} u_\delta^-(x, t) - e^{F_\delta(s)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_0(s), s) \leq \int_s^t e^{F_\delta(\tau)} (L(\gamma_0, \dot{\gamma}_0, \tau) + c(H)) d\tau.$$

Hence,

$$u_\delta^-(x, t) - T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) \leq e^{F_\delta(s)-F_\delta(t)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_0(s), s). \quad (46)$$

From (45) and (46), it follows

$$|u_\delta^-(x, t) - T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t)| \leq e^{F_\delta(s)-F_\delta(t)} \max u_\delta^-,$$

which means  $T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t)$  converges uniformly to  $u_\delta^-(x, t)$  on each compact subset of  $M \times \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 52**  $u_\delta^- : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are equi-bounded and equi-Lipschitz w.r.t.  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ .

*Proof* To show  $u_\delta^-$  are equi-bounded from below, it suffices to show

$$\{T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) | (x, t) \in M \times [0, 1], s \leq 0, \delta \in (0, \delta_0]\}$$

is bounded from below. Let  $\gamma_0 : [s, t] \rightarrow M$  be a minimizer of  $T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t)$ ,  $u_\delta(\tau) := T_s^{\delta,-}(\gamma_0(\tau), \tau)$ , and  $\tilde{u}_\delta(\tau) := e^{F_\delta(\tau)} u_\delta(\tau)$ ,  $\tau \in [s, t]$ . Then,

$$\frac{d\tilde{u}_\delta(\tau)}{d\tau} = e^{F_\delta(\tau)} (L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H)).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{du_\delta(\tau)}{d\tau} = L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H) - f_\delta(\tau) u_\delta(\tau).$$

We could assume  $T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) < 0$  for some  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ ,  $(x, t) \in M \times [0, 1]$ ,  $s \leq 0$ , otherwise 0 is a uniform lower bound of  $\{T_s^{\delta,-}(x, t) | (x, t) \in M \times [0, 1], s \leq 0, \delta \in$

$(0, \delta_0]\}$ . Note that  $u_\delta(\cdot)$  is continuous and  $u_\delta(s) = 0$ . There exists  $s_0 \in [s, t]$  such that  $u_\delta(s_0) = 0$  and  $u_\delta(\tau) < 0, \tau \in (s_0, t]$ . From  $f_\delta > f_0$ , it follows that

$$\frac{du_\delta(\tau)}{d\tau} \geq L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H) - f_0(\tau)u_\delta(\tau), \tau \in [s_0, t].$$

Hence,

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}(e^{F_0(\tau)}u_\delta(\tau)) \geq e^{F_0(\tau)}(L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H)),$$

where  $F_0(\tau) = \int_0^\tau f_0(\sigma)d\sigma$ . Integrating on  $[s_0, t]$ , it holds that

$$e^{F_0(t)} \cdot u_\delta(t) \geq \int_{s_0}^t e^{F_0(\tau)}(L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H))d\tau. \quad (47)$$

Let  $\beta : [t, t+2-\overline{t-s_0}] \rightarrow M$  be a geodesic with  $\beta(t) = \gamma_0(t), \beta(t+2-\overline{t-s_0}) = \gamma_0(s_0)$ , and

$$|\dot{\beta}(\tau)| = \frac{d(\gamma_0(s_0), \gamma_0(t))}{2-\overline{t-s_0}} \leq \text{diam}(M) =: k_1.$$

Due to the definition of  $c(H)$  in (38), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{s_0}^t e^{F_0(\tau)}(L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H))d\tau \\ & + \int_t^{t+2-\overline{t-s_0}} e^{F_0(\tau)}(L(\beta(\tau), \dot{\beta}(\tau), \tau) + c(H))d\tau \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_t^{t+2-\overline{t-s_0}} e^{F_0(\tau)}(L(\beta(\tau), \dot{\beta}(\tau), \tau) + c(H))d\tau \\ & \leq \int_t^{t+2-\overline{t-s_0}} e^{F_0(\tau)}(C_{k_1} + c(H))d\tau \leq 2(C_{k_1} + c(H))e^{\max_{t \in \mathbb{T}} F_0(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{s_0}^t e^{F_0(\tau)}(L(\gamma_0(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_0(\tau), \tau) + c(H))d\tau \geq -2(C_{k_1} + c(H))e^{\max F_0}.$$

Combining (47), we derive

$$u_\delta(t) \geq -2|C_{k_1} + c(H)|e^{\max F_0 - \min F_0}.$$

Next, we prove  $u_\delta^-(x, t)$  are equi-bounded from above. It suffices to show  $\{T_s^{\delta, -}(x, t) | (x, t) \in M \times [0, 1], s \leq 0, \delta \in (0, \delta_0]\}$  is bounded from above. We could assume  $T_s^{\delta, -}(x, t) > 0$  for some  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0], (x, t) \in M \times [0, 1], s \leq 0$ , otherwise 0 is a uniform upper bound of  $\{T_s^{\delta, -}(x, t) | (x, t) \in M \times [0, 1], s \leq 0, \delta \in (0, \delta_0]\}$ .

Let  $u_0^-(x, t)$  be a weak KAM solution of

$$\partial_t u + H(x, \partial_x u, t) + f_0(t)u = c(H),$$

and  $\gamma_{x,t}^- : (-\infty, t] \rightarrow M$  be a calibrated curve of  $u_0^-(x, t)$ . Let

$$v_\delta(\tau) := T_s^{\delta,-}(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau), \tau \in [s, t].$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{e^{F_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau)}v_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau) - e^{F_\delta(\tau)}v_\delta(\tau)}{\Delta\tau} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\Delta\tau} \int_\tau^{\tau+\Delta\tau} e^{F_\delta(\sigma)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\sigma), \sigma) + c(H)) d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^{F_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau)}v_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau) - e^{F_\delta(\tau)}v_\delta(\tau)}{\Delta\tau} \\ & = \overline{\lim}_{\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^{F_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau)}v_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau) - e^{F_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau)}v_\delta(\tau) + e^{F_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau)}v_\delta(\tau) - e^{F_\delta(\tau)}v_\delta(\tau)}{\Delta\tau} \\ & = e^{F_\delta(\tau)} \overline{\lim}_{\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{v_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau) - v_\delta(\tau)}{\Delta\tau} \right) + e^{F_\delta(\tau)} f_\delta(\tau) v_\delta(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\overline{\lim}_{\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{v_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau) - v_\delta(\tau)}{\Delta\tau} \right) \leq L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + c(H) - f_\delta(\tau) v_\delta(\tau).$$

Since  $v_\delta(s) = 0$  and  $v_\delta(\tau)$  is continuous, there exists  $s_1 \in [s, t]$  such that  $v_\delta(s_1) = 0$  and  $v_\delta(\tau) > 0, \tau \in (s_1, t]$ .

For  $\tau \in (s_1, t]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{v_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau) - v_\delta(\tau)}{\Delta\tau} \right) & \leq L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + c(H) - f_\delta(\tau) v_\delta(\tau) \\ & \leq L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + c(H) - f_0(\tau) v_\delta(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{e^{F_0(\tau+\Delta\tau)}v_\delta(\tau+\Delta\tau) - e^{F_0(\tau)}v_\delta(\tau)}{\Delta\tau} \right) \\ & \leq e^{F_0(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + c(H)). \end{aligned}$$

From  $v_\delta(s_1) = 0$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{F_0(t)}v_\delta(t) & \leq \int_{s_1}^t e^{F_0(\tau)} (L(\gamma_{x,t}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{x,t}^-(\tau), \tau) + c(H)) d\tau \\ & = e^{F_0(t)}u_0^-(x, t) - e^{F_0(s_1)}u_0^-(\gamma_{x,t}^-(s_1), s_1). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$v_\delta(t) \leq 2 \max |u_0^-| \cdot e^{\max F_0 - \min F_0}.$$

Note that  $u_\delta^-(x, t)$  is equi-bounded. By a similar approach of the proof of Lemma 38, we derive that  $u_\delta^-$  is equi-Lipschitz.  $\square$



**Lemma 53** *For any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$  and any  $(x, \bar{s}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ , the backward calibrated curve  $\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^- : (-\infty, s] \rightarrow M$  associated with  $u_\delta^-$  has a uniformly bounded velocity, i.e. there exists a constant  $K > 0$ , such that*

$$|\dot{\gamma}_{\delta, x, s}^-(t)| \leq K, \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 1] \text{ and } t \in (-\infty, s).$$

*Proof* By a similar way in the proof of Lemma 37, there exists  $s_0$  in each interval with length 1, such that

$$|\dot{\gamma}_{\delta, x, s}^-(s_0)| \leq C_{k_1} + C(1),$$

where  $k_1 = \text{diam}(M)$ . Note that  $f_\delta$  depends continuously on  $\delta$  and is 1-periodic. We derive the Lagrangian flow  $(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(\tau), \dot{\gamma}_{\delta, x, s}^-(\tau), \tau)$  is 1-periodic and depends continuously on the parameter  $\delta$ . Hence, there exists  $K > 0$  depends only on  $L, k_1$ , and  $\delta_0$ , such that  $|\dot{\gamma}_{\delta, x, s}^-| < K$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 54** *For any ergodic measure  $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m(0)$  and any  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ , we have*

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} e^{F_0(t)} \frac{f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)}{\delta} u_\delta^-(x, t) d\mu(x, v, t) \leq 0. \quad (48)$$

*Proof* Since  $\{u_\delta^-\}_{\delta \in (0, \delta_0]}$  is uniformly bounded and  $[f_0] = 0$ , then

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T u_\delta^-(\gamma(t), t) de^{F_0(t)} = \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} u_\delta^-(x, t) f_0(t) e^{F_0(t)} d\mu(x, v, t)$$

for any regular curve  $\tilde{\gamma}(t) = (\gamma(t), t) : t \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M \times \mathbb{T}$  contained in  $\mathcal{M}(\delta)$ . Due to Proposition 310,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T u_\delta^-(\gamma(t), t) de^{F_0(t)} \\ &= \frac{1}{T} u_\delta^-(\gamma(t), t) e^{F_0(t)} \Big|_0^T - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T e^{F_0(t)} [\partial_t u_\delta^-(\gamma(t), t) + \langle \dot{\gamma}(t), \partial_x u_\delta^-(\gamma(t), t) \rangle] dt \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T e^{F_0(t)} [\partial_t u_\delta^-(\gamma(t), t) + \langle \dot{\gamma}(t), \partial_x u_\delta^-(\gamma(t), t) \rangle] dt \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T e^{F_0(s)} [L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, s) + H(\gamma(s), \partial_x u_\delta^-(\gamma(s), s), s) + \partial_t u_\delta^-(\gamma(s), s)] ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T e^{F_0(s)} [L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, s) + c(H) - f_\delta(s) u_\delta^-(\gamma(s), s)] ds, \end{aligned}$$

by taking  $T \rightarrow +\infty$  and dividing both sides by  $\delta$  we get the conclusion.  $\square$

**Definition 55** *Let's denote by  $\mathcal{F}_-$  the set of all viscosity subsolutions  $\omega : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of (16) with  $\delta = 0$  such that*

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} f_1(t) \omega(x, t) e^{F_0(t)} d\mu \leq 0, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathfrak{M}_m(0). \quad (49)$$

**Lemma 56** *The set  $\mathcal{F}_-$  is uniformly bounded from above, i.e.*

$$\sup\{u(x) \mid \forall x \in M, u \in \mathcal{F}_-\} < +\infty.$$

*Proof* By an analogy of Lemma 10 of [10], all the functions in the set

$$\left\{ e^{F_0(t)} \omega : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \omega \prec_{f_0} L + c(H) \right\}$$

are uniformly Lipschitz with a Lipschitz constant  $\kappa > 0$ . Then for any  $u \in \mathcal{F}_-$

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)} &= \frac{\int_{M \times \mathbb{T}} f_1(t) \min_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)} d\mu}{\int_{M \times \mathbb{T}} f_1(t) d\mu} \\ &= \frac{\int_{M \times \mathbb{T}} f_1(t) \min_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)} d\mu}{\int_0^1 f_1(t) dt} \\ &\leq \frac{\int_{M \times \mathbb{T}} f_1(t) u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)} d\mu}{\int_0^1 f_1(t) dt} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)} &\leq \max_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)} - \min_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)} \\ &\leq \kappa \operatorname{diam}(M \times \mathbb{T}) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\max_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) \leq \frac{\max_{(x,t) \in M \times \mathbb{T}} u(x,t) e^{F_0(t)}}{\min_{t \in \mathbb{T}} e^{F_0(t)}} < +\infty$$

so we finish the proof.  $\square$

As  $\mathcal{F}_-$  is now upper bounded, we can define a supreme subsolution by

$$u_0^* := \sup_{u \in \mathcal{F}_-} u. \quad (50)$$

Later we will see that this is indeed a viscosity solution of (16) for  $\delta = 0, \alpha = c(H)$  and is the unique accumulating function of  $u_\delta^-$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$ .

**Proposition 57** *For any  $\delta > 0$ , any viscosity subsolution  $\omega : M \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of (16) with  $\delta = 0, \alpha = c(H)$  and any point  $(x, s) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$ , there exists a  $\varphi_L^t$ -backward invariant finite measure  $\mu_{x,s}^\delta : TM \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$u_\delta^-(x, s) \geq \omega(x, s) - \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} \omega(y, t) e^{F_0(t)} f_1(t) d\mu_{x,s}^\delta(y, v_y, t) \quad (51)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} g(y, t) d\mu_{x,s}^\delta(y, v_y, t) \\ &:= \int_{-\infty}^s \frac{g(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \cdot \frac{d}{dt}(e^{F_\delta(t)} - e^{F_0(t)})}{f_1(t)} dt, \quad \forall g \in C(M \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof* For any  $(x, \bar{s}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$  and any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ , there exists a backward calibrated curve  $\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^- : (-\infty, s] \rightarrow M$  ending with  $x$ , such that the viscosity solution  $u_\delta^-$  is differentiable along  $(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), \bar{t})$  for all  $t \in (-\infty, s)$  due to Proposition 310. Precisely, for all  $t \in (-\infty, s)$

$$\frac{d}{dt} (e^{F_\delta(t)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t)) = e^{F_\delta(t)} (L(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) + c(H)).$$

Integrating on  $[s, -T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F_\delta(s)} u_\delta^-(x, s) - e^{F_\delta(-T)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(-T), -T) \\ &= \int_{-T}^s e^{F_\delta(t)} \left[ L(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) + c(H) \right] dt \end{aligned}$$

for any  $T > 0$ , where  $F_\delta(t) := \int_0^t f_\delta(\tau) d\tau$ . On the other side,

$$\partial_t \omega(x, t) + H(x, \partial_x \omega(x), t) + f_0(t) \omega(x, t) \leq c(H), \quad a.e. (x, \bar{t}) \in M \times \mathbb{T}$$

since  $\omega$  is also a subsolution of (16) (with  $\delta = 0$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{F_\delta(s)} u_\delta^-(x, s) - e^{F_\delta(-T)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(-T), -T) \\ & \geq \int_{-T}^s e^{F_\delta(t)} \left[ L(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) + H(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), \partial_x \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t), t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \partial_t \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) + f_0(t) \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) \right] dt \\ & \geq \int_{-T}^s e^{F_\delta(t)} \left[ \frac{d}{dt} \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) + f_0(t) \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) \right] dt \\ & \geq e^{F_\delta(s)} \omega(x, s) - e^{F_\delta(-T)} \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(-T), -T) \\ & \quad - \int_{-T}^s \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) e^{F_\delta(t)} (f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $T \rightarrow +\infty$  we finally get

$$e^{F_\delta(s)} u_\delta^-(x, s) - e^{F_\delta(s)} \omega(x, s) \geq - \int_{-\infty}^s \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) e^{F_\delta(t)} (f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)) dt.$$

By a suitable transformation,

$$\begin{aligned} & u_\delta^-(x, s) \\ & \geq \omega(x, s) - \int_{-\infty}^s \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) e^{F_0(t)} e^{F_\delta(t) - F_0(t)} (f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)) dt \\ & = \omega(x, s) - \int_{-\infty}^s \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) e^{F_0(t)} d e^{F_\delta(t) - F_0(t)} \\ & = \omega(x, s) - \int_{-\infty}^s \omega(\gamma_{\delta, x, s}^-(t), t) e^{F_0(t)} f_1(t) \frac{d e^{F_\delta(t) - F_0(t)}}{f_1(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any  $g \in C(M \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ , the measure  $\mu_{x,s}^\delta$  defined by

$$\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} g(y, \tau) d\mu_{x,s}^\delta(y, \tau) := \int_{-\infty}^s g(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \frac{de^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)}}{f_1(t)}$$

is just the desired one.  $\square$

**Lemma 58** *Any weak limit of the normalized measure*

$$\widehat{\mu}_{x,s}^\delta := \frac{\mu_{x,s}^\delta}{\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} d\mu_{x,s}^\delta} \quad (52)$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$  is contained in  $\mathfrak{M}_m(0)$ , i.e. a Mather measure.

*Proof* As is proved in Proposition 57,  $\mu_{x,s}^\delta$  are uniformly bounded w.r.t.  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ . Therefore, it suffices to prove that any weak limit  $\mu_{x,s}$  of  $\mu_{x,s}^\delta$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$  satisfies the following two conclusions:

First, we show  $\mu_{x,s}$  is a closed measure. It is equivalent to show that for any  $\phi(\cdot) \in C^1(M \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \int_{-\infty}^s \frac{d}{dt} \phi(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \frac{de^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)}}{f_1(t)} = 0.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \int_{-\infty}^s \frac{d}{dt} \phi(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \frac{de^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)}}{f_1(t)} \\ &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)} \frac{f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)}{f_1(t)} d\phi(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \\ &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \frac{f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)}{f_1(t)} e^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)} \phi(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \Big|_{-\infty}^s \\ & \quad - \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \int_{-\infty}^s \phi(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \cdot d\left(\frac{f_\delta(t) - f_0(t)}{f_1(t)} e^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)}\right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

because  $f_\delta \rightarrow f_0$  uniformly as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$ .

Next, we can show that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{F_\delta(t)} \left[ L(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) + c(H) \right] \frac{de^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)}}{f_1(t)} = 0.$$

Note that

$$\frac{d}{dt} (e^{F_\delta(t)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t)) = e^{F_\delta(t)} (L(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) + c(H)).$$

We derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \int_{-\infty}^s e^{F_\delta(t)} \left[ L\left(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), \dot{\gamma}_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t\right) + c(H) \right] \frac{de^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)}}{f_1(t)} \\ &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} \int_{-\infty}^s \frac{d}{dt} \left( e^{F_\delta(t)} u_\delta^-(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), t) \right) \frac{de^{F_\delta(t)-F_0(t)}}{f_1(t)} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since  $u_\delta^-$  is differentiable along  $(\gamma_{\delta,x,s}^-(t), \bar{t})$  for all  $t \in (-\infty, s)$  and  $\mu_{x,s}$  is closed. So we finish the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 16:* Due to the stability of viscosity solution (see Theorem 1.4 in [11]), any accumulating function  $u_0^-$  of  $u_\delta^-$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$  is a viscosity solution of (16) with  $\delta = 0$ . Therefore, Proposition 54 indicates  $u_0^- \in \mathcal{F}_-$ , so  $u_0^- \leq u_0^*$ . On the other side, Proposition 57 implies  $u_0^- \geq \omega$  for any  $\omega \in \mathcal{F}_-$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$ , since any weak limit of  $\hat{\mu}_{x,s}^\delta$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0_+$  proves to be a Mather measure in Lemma 58. So we have  $u_0^- \geq u_0^*$ .  $\square$

## 6 Asymptotic behaviors of trajectories of 1-D mechanical systems

**Lemma 61** *For system (21),  $\rho(c)$  is continuous of  $c \in H^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ .*

*Proof* Firstly, all the orbits in  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c)$  should have the unified rotation number. This is because  $\pi^{-1} : \mathcal{A}(c) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c)$  is a Lipschitz graph and  $\dim(M) = 1$ . Secondly,  $\overline{\lim_{c' \rightarrow c} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c')} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c)$  due to Lemma 42. That further indicates  $\lim_{c' \rightarrow c} \rho(c') = \rho(c)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 62** *For system (21), the rotation number  $\rho(c)$  can be dominated by*

$$-\|V\|_{C^1} \cdot \varsigma - c \leq \rho(c) \leq \|V\|_{C^1} \cdot \varsigma - c \quad (53)$$

where  $\varsigma = \varsigma([f]) > 0$  tends to infinity as  $[f] \rightarrow 0_+$ .

*Proof* Recall that

$$\dot{p} = -V_x(x, t) - f(t)p,$$

then starting from any point  $(x_0, p_0, \bar{t}_0) \in T^*M \times \mathbb{T}$ , we get

$$p(t) = e^{-F(t)} p_0 - e^{-F(t)} \int_0^t e^{F(s)} V_x(x(s), s) ds, \quad t > 0.$$

As  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} |p(t)| &\leq \|V\|_{C^1} \cdot \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-F(t)} \int_0^t e^{F(s)} ds \\ &\leq \varsigma(\|f\|) \cdot \|V\|_{C^1} \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

for a constant  $\varsigma(\|f\|) > 0$  depending only on  $f$ . As a consequence,

$$-\|V\|_{C^1} \cdot \varsigma \leq \pi_p \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c) \leq \|V\|_{C^1} \cdot \varsigma \quad (55)$$

dominates the  $p$ -component of  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(c)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 18:* The first two items have been proved in previous Lemma 61 and Lemma 62. As for the third item, Lemma 62 has shown the boundedness of  $p$ -component of  $\Omega$ , then due to Theorem 14, we get the compactness of  $\Omega$ .  $\square$

### A Mather measure of convex Lagrangians with $[f] = 0$

For a Tonelli Hamiltonian  $H(x, p, t)$ , the conjugated Lagrangian  $L(x, v, t)$  can be established by (6), which is also Tonelli. On the other side, for  $[f] = 0$ , the following Lagrangian

$$\tilde{L}(x, v, t) := e^{F(t)} L(x, v, t), \quad (x, v, t) \in TM \times \mathbb{T}$$

with

$$F(t) := \int_0^t f(s) ds$$

is still time-periodic as the case considered in [21]. Besides, the Euler-Lagrange equation associated with  $\tilde{L}$  is the same with (E-L). So Mañé's approach to get a Mather measure in [18] is still available for us. As his approach doesn't rely on the E-L flow, that supplies us with great convenience.

Let  $X$  be a metric separable space. A probability measure on  $X$  is a nonnegative, countably additive set function  $\mu$  defined on the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  of Borel subsets of  $X$  such that  $\mu(X) = 1$ . In this paper,  $X = TM \times \mathbb{T}$ . We say that a sequence of probability measures  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  (weakly) converges to a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $TM \times \mathbb{T}$  if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} h(x, v, t) d\mu_n(x, v, t) = \int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} h(x, v, t) d\mu(x, v, t)$$

for any  $h \in C_c(TM \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ .

**Definition A1** A probability measure  $\mu$  on  $TM \times \mathbb{T}$  is called **closed** if it satisfies:

- $\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} |v| d\mu(x, v, t) < +\infty$ ;
- $\int_{TM \times \mathbb{T}} \langle \partial_x \phi(x, t), v \rangle + \partial_t \phi(x, t) d\mu(x, v, t) = 0$  for every  $\phi \in C^1(M \times \mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ .

Let's denote by  $\mathbb{P}_c(TM \times \mathbb{T})$  the set of all closed measures on  $TM$ , then the following conclusion is proved in [18]:

#### Theorem A2

$$\min_{\mu \in \mathbb{P}_c(TM \times \mathbb{T})} \int_{TM} \tilde{L}(x, v, t) d\mu(x, v, t) = -c(H).$$

Moreover, the minimizer  $\mu_{\min}$  must be a Mather measure, i.e.  $\mu_{\min}$  is invariant w.r.t. the Euler-Lagrange flow (E-L).

*Proof* This conclusion is a direct adaption of Proposition 1.3 of [18] to our system  $\tilde{L}(x, v, t)$ , with the  $c(H)$  already given in (14).

## B Semiconcave functions

Here we attach a series of conclusions about the semiconcave functions which can be found in [4], for the use of Proposition 310.

**Definition B1** Assume  $S$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A function  $u : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *semiconcave*, if there exists a nondecreasing upper semicontinuous function  $\omega : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \omega(\rho) = 0$  and

$$\lambda u(x) - (1 - \lambda)u(y) - u(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \lambda(1 - \lambda)|x - y|\omega(|x - y|), \forall \lambda \in [0, 1]. \quad (56)$$

We call  $\omega$  a modulus of semiconcavity for  $u$  in  $S$ .

**Definition B2 (Definition 3.1.1 in [4])** For any  $x \in S$ , the set

$$D^+u(x) = \left\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{u(y) - u(x) - \langle p, y - x \rangle}{|y - x|} \leq 0 \right\}$$

is called the *Fréchet superdifferential* of  $u$  at  $x$ .

We shall give some properties of  $D^+u(x)$ , which can be found in Chapter 3 of [4].

**Proposition B3** Assume  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is open. Let  $u : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a semiconcave function with modulus  $\omega$  and  $x \in A$ . Then,

- $D^+u(x) \neq \emptyset$ .
- $D^+u(x)$  is a closed, convex set of  $T_x^*A \cong \mathbb{R}^n$
- If  $D^+u(x)$  is a singleton, then  $u$  is differentiable at  $x$ .
- If  $A$  is also convex,  $p \in D^+u(x)$  if and only if

$$u(y) - u(x) - \langle p, y - x \rangle \leq |y - x|\omega(|y - x|)$$

for each  $y \in A$ .

**Theorem B4 (Theorem 3.2 in [5])** Let  $u \in Lip_{loc}(\Omega \times (0, T))$  be a viscosity solution of

$$\partial_t u + G(x, \partial_x u, t, u) = 0 \quad (57)$$

where  $G \in Lip_{loc}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  is strictly convex in the second group of variables. Then  $u$  is locally semiconcave in  $\Omega \times (0, T)$ .

**Theorem B5 (Proposition 3.3.4, Theorem 3.3.6 in [4])** For any  $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T)$ , we define the reachable derivative set of any viscosity solution  $u$  of (57) by

$$D^*u(x, t) := \left\{ (p_x, p_t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\partial_x u(x_n, t_n), \partial_t u(x_n, t_n)) \in T_x^*\Omega \times T_t^*(0, T) \mid \right.$$

$$\left. \exists (x_n, t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \Omega \times (0, T) \text{ converging to } (x, t), \text{ at which } u \text{ is differentiable} \right\}.$$

Consequently,  $D^+u(x, t) = co(D^*u(x, t))$  i.e. any superdifferential of  $u$  at  $(x, t)$  is a convex combination of elements in  $D^*u(x, t)$ .

## References

1. Bensoussan A., *Perturbation methods in optimal control*, Wiley/Gauthier-Villars Ser. Modern Appl. Math., John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1988, translated from the French by C. Tomson.
2. Calleja R., Celletti A. & de la Llave R., *A KAM theory for conformally symplectic systems: efficient algorithms and their validation*. J. Differential Equations, 255 (5): 978-1049, 2013.

3. Cannarsa P., Cheng W., Jin L., Wang K. & Yan J. *Herglotz??? variational principle and Lax-Oleinik evolution*. J. Math. Pures Appl. 141: 99-136, 2020.
4. Cannarsa P. & Sinestrari C., *Semiconcave functions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, and optimal control*. Vol. 58. Springer, 2004.
5. Cannarsa P. & Soner H. M., *Generalized one-side estimates for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and applications*. Nonlinear Anal., 13: 305-323, 1989.
6. Casdagli M., *Periodic orbits for dissipative twist maps*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 7 (2): 165-173, 1987.
7. Case W. B., *The pumping of a swing from the standing position*. American Journal of Physics, March 1996.
8. Celletti A. & Chierchia L., *Quasi-periodic attractors in celestial mechanics*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 191 (2): 311-345, 2009.
9. Chen Q., Cheng W., Ishii H. & Zhao K., *Vanishing contact structure problem and convergence of the viscosity solutions*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 44(9): 801-836, 2019.
10. Contreras G., Iturriaga R. & Morgado H. S., *Weak KAM solutions of the Hamiltonian-Jacobi equation for time-periodic Lagrangians*, arXiv:1307.0287.
11. Crandall, M. G., Evans, L. C. & Lions P.-L., *Some properties of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 282(2): 487-502, 1984.
12. Davini A., Fathi A., Iturriaga R. & Zavidovique M. *Convergence of the solutions of the discounted Hamilton-Jacobi equation: convergence of the discounted solutions*. Invent. Math., 206(1): 29-55, 2016.
13. Duffing G., *Erzwungene schwingungen bei veränderlicher eigenfrequenz und ihre technische bedeutung*, Series: Sammlung Vieweg, No 41/42. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1918.
14. Fathi A., *Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian dynamics*. preliminary version 10, Lyon. unpublished. 2008.
15. Holmes P., *Ninety plus thirty years of nonlinear dynamics: less is more and more is different*. International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos, 15: 2703-2716, 2005.
16. Le Calvez P., *Existence d'orbites quasi-périodiques dans les attracteurs de Birkhoff*. Comm. Math. Phys., 106 (30): 383-394, 1986.
17. Lions P.-L., *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*. Pitman, Boston, 1982.
18. Mañé R., *Generic properties and problems of minimizing measures of Lagrangian systems*. Nonlinearity, 9: 273-310, 1996.
19. Maro S. & Sorrentino A., *Aubry-Mather theory for conformally symplectic systems*. Commun. Math. Phys., 354(2): 775-808, 2017.
20. Martienssen V.O., *Über neue, resonanzerscheinungen in wechselstromkreisen*. Physik Zeitschrift-Leipz, 11: 448-460, 1910.
21. Mather J., *Action minimizing invariant measures for positive definite Lagrangian systems*. Math. Z., 207: 169-207, 1991.
22. Moon F. C. & Holmes P., *A magnetoelastic strange attractor*. Journal of Sound and Vibration, 65: 275-296, 1979.
23. Peale S. J., *The free precession and libration of Mercury*. Icarus, 178: 4-18, 2005.
24. Poincaré H., *Les méthodes nouvelles de la mécanique céleste*, vol. 2, Paris, esp. Sec. 148 and 149: 99-105, 1893.
25. Post A, de Groot G, Daffertshofer A. & Beek P. J., *Pumping a Playground Swing*. Motor Control, 11: 136-150, 2007.
26. Ueda Y., *Random phenomena resulting from nonlinearity in the system described by Duffing's equation*. International Journal of Non-linear Mechanics, 20: 481-491, 1985.
27. Wang K., Wang L., and Yan J., *Aubry-Mather theory for contact Hamiltonian systems*, Comm. Math. Phys., 366: 981-1023, 2019.
28. Wang K., Wang L., and Yan J., *Variational principle for contact Hamiltonian systems and its applications*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 123(9): 167-200, 2019.
29. Wang Y.-N., Yan J., & Zhang J., *Convergence of viscosity solutions of generalized contact Hamilton-Jacobi equations*. Arxiv:2004.12269, 2020.
30. Wojtkowski M. P. & Liverani C., *Conformally symplectic dynamics and symmetry of the Lyapunov spectrum*. Comm. Math. Phys., 194 (1): 47-60, 1998.
31. Zavidovique M., *Convergence of solutions for some degenerate discounted Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, arXiv:2006.00779, 2020.