

Averaging and passage through resonances in two-frequency systems near separatrices*

Anatoly Neishtadt and Alexey Okunev

Abstract

The averaging method is a classical powerful tool in perturbation theory of dynamical systems. There are two major obstacles to applying the averaging method, resonances and separatrices. In this paper we obtain realistic asymptotic estimates that justify the use of averaging method in a generic situation where both these obstacles are present at the same time, passage through a separatrix for time-periodic perturbations of one-frequency Hamiltonian systems. As a general phenomenon, resonances accumulate at separatrices. The Hamiltonian depends on a parameter that slowly changes for the perturbed system (so slow-fast Hamiltonian systems with two and a half degrees of freedom are included in our class). Our results can also be applied to perturbations of generic two-frequency integrable systems near separatrices, as they can be reduced to periodic perturbations of one-frequency systems.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Averaging, resonances, separatrix crossings	4
2.1	Averaging method	4
2.2	Separatrix crossing in one-frequency systems	5
2.3	Two-frequency systems far from separatrices	6
2.4	Two-frequency systems near separatrices (our case)	6
3	Statement of results	7
3.1	Our setting	7
3.2	Averaged system	8
3.3	Condition B'	8
3.4	Main results	9
3.5	Two-frequency systems	10
4	Scheme of proof	11
4.1	Far from separatrices	11
4.2	Resonant zones near separatrices	11
4.3	Passage through resonant zones far from separatrices	12
4.4	Passage through resonant zones near separatrices	13
5	Plan of the rest of the paper	14
6	Approaching separatrices and passing through separatrices	14
7	Analysis of the perturbed system	17
7.1	Action-angle and energy-angle variables	17
7.2	Complex continuation	18
7.3	Estimates	19
8	Resonant and non-resonant zones	19
8.1	Fourier series	19
8.2	Non-resonant zones	20
8.3	Lemma on crossing non-resonant zones	21
8.4	Outer and middle resonant zones	21
8.5	Lemmas on crossing resonant zones	22

*The work was supported by the Leverhulme Trust (Grant No. RPG-2018-143).

9 Proof of the lemma on approaching separatrices	24
9.1 Picking constants and excluded set \mathcal{E}	24
9.2 Passing resonant and non-resonant zones	24
9.3 Estimating sums over resonant vectors s	25
9.4 End of the proof	26
10 Crossing non-resonant zone: proof	28
11 Auxiliary system describing resonance crossing	33
11.1 Transition to auxiliary system: statement of lemma	33
11.2 Rescaling the action	34
11.3 Transition to resonant phase	36
11.4 Averaging over time	36
11.5 After averaging	37
11.6 Main part of the Hamiltonian	39
12 Crossing resonant zones: proofs	42
12.1 High-numerator resonances: proof	42
12.2 Lemma on model system	42
12.3 Proof of the lemma on model system	43
12.4 Applying the lemma on model system	46
12.5 Low-numerator resonances: proof	48
13 Passing separatrices: proof	50
14 Probabilities	51
15 Systems without capture into resonances	53
16 Acknowledgment	54
A Analytic continuation: proofs	54
B Estimates on Fourier coefficients	56
C Proof of estimates on u	57
D Proof of auxiliary lemma	59
E Reduction of two-frequency systems to periodically perturbed one-frequency system	59

1 Introduction

Small perturbations of integrable Hamiltonian systems is an important class of dynamical systems encountered in various applications. Far from the separatrices of the unperturbed system one can use the action-angle variables of the unperturbed system. The values of action variables slowly change for the perturbed system and their evolution can be approximately described by the averaged system that is obtained by averaging the rate of change of the action variables over all values of the angle variables. For perturbations of one-frequency systems, the averaged system describes the evolution of the action variables for all initial data with accuracy $O(\varepsilon)$ over times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$ ([1], [2]). Here ε is the small parameter of perturbed system.

For two-frequency systems, the averaged system describes the evolution of most initial data (except a set with measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$) with accuracy $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$ over times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$ ([3], see also review [4] and references therein and earlier work [5], where two-frequency systems were studied under a condition that prohibits capture into resonances). Resonances between two frequencies of the problem are possible, and, as these frequencies change along solutions of the perturbed system, it is possible that the ratio between the frequencies remains near a resonant value for times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$. This phenomenon is called *capture into resonance*, and there are examples (e.g., in [4]) when this happens for a set of initial data with measure $\sim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Capture into resonances is the reason for the exceptional set with measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Most trajectories are not captured into resonances, but still passing through resonances leads to a jump of order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ (for most trajectories), this is called *scattering on resonance*. This is why accuracy of averaging method is only $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} \ln \varepsilon)$ (extra logarithm appears because for some trajectories outside the exceptional set scattering is larger than $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$).

Results that hold for multi-frequency systems are weaker. Very general results [6, 7] about averaging in slow-fast systems imply that for any $\rho > 0$ the measure of the set of initial data such that accuracy of averaging method is worse than ρ is $o(1)_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$. Restriction of the

generality allows to estimate how this measure depends on ρ and ε ([8, §6.1.9] and references therein).

The phase space of the unperturbed system is often divided into several domains by separatrices. Solutions of the perturbed system can cross separatrices of the unperturbed system and move between these domains. Effects of separatrix crossing are well studied for one-frequency systems ([9] and references therein). Importantly, separatrix crossing leads to probabilistic phenomena. For example, trajectory of a point moving in a double-well potential (unperturbed system) with small friction (perturbation) eventually exhibits separatrix crossing and remains bounded in one of the two wells. Trajectories caught in each well are finely mixed in the phase space when friction is small, thus capture in each well can be considered a "random event" with definite probability (see the discussion in [10], [9]). One can modify averaged system to cover trajectories crossing separatrices: when the solution of averaged system in some domain reaches the separatrices (and thus averaged system in this domain is no longer defined), one can write averaged system in another domain bounded by the same separatrices and continue this solution using averaged system in the other domain. When capture in several domains is possible after separatrix crossing, there are modified averaged systems describing capture into each such domain. The evolution of most initial data (with exceptional set having measure $O(\varepsilon^r)$ for any $r > 0$, this set corresponds to solutions that come too close to the saddle of perturbed system) is described by a solution of modified averaged system with accuracy $O(\varepsilon|\ln \varepsilon|)$ ([9]).

Separatrix crossing is much less studied for perturbations of Hamiltonian systems with two and more frequencies. Separatrix crossing for time-periodic perturbations of one-frequency systems of special form (periodically forced by a single harmonic and weakly damped motion in a double-well potential) is considered in [11] under an assumption that periodic forcing is sufficiently small so that captures into resonances close to separatrices do not occur. Authors use multiphase averaging between resonances and single-phase averaging near resonances to obtain formulas for the boundaries of the sets of initial data captured in each well (without rigorous justification). Stochastic perturbations of time-periodic perturbations of one-frequency systems were studied in [12].

The goal of this paper is to obtain realistic estimates for the accuracy of averaging method for time-periodic perturbations of one-frequency systems with separatrix crossing. The unperturbed Hamiltonian can depend on a parameter that slowly changes for perturbed system. This is a generic situation when there are both resonances and separatrix crossing. Perturbations of generic two-frequency systems can be reduced to this case, see Section 3.5 below. Phase angle on the closed phase trajectories of the unperturbed system and time are two angle variables, and resonances between their frequencies are possible. Far from separatrices results on two-frequency systems mentioned earlier are applicable. Resonances accumulate on separatrices and resonances near separatrices have to be studied separately. We prove that accuracy of averaging method $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$ holds for most initial conditions, the exceptional set has measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln^5 \varepsilon|)$. We also prove formulas for "probabilities" of proceeding into different domains after separatrix crossing similar to the formulas that hold in one-frequency case [9].

A natural and frequently encountered in applications subclass of systems we consider is the motion of a particle in a double-well or periodic potential with small friction and time-periodic forcing (there might also be a slow change of parameters). One example of such system is the system describing planar librational movement of an arbitrary shaped satellite in an elliptic orbit (cf., e.g., [13, Problem 1.2.19]; dissipation caused by tidal friction can be added to this problem). More examples can be found in [11].

Perturbations of two-frequency Hamiltonian systems can be reduced to our case, cf. Section 3.5. Examples of two-frequency integrable systems with separatrices include Euler top, geodesic flows on ellipsoid or a surface of revolution [14], Neumann problem [15] (i.e., movement on a sphere in a quadratic potential). One can also consider Kovalevskaya top (a 3-frequency integrable system), the coordinate corresponding to rotation around vertical axis is cyclic, so if the perturbation does not depend on this coordinate, the problem is reduced to a perturbation of a two-frequency system. Integrable systems with separatrices often appear as model problems arising after an asymptotic approximation in the study of non-integrable systems, e.g., a rigid body with vibrating suspension point ([16] and references therein), normal forms near equilibria and periodic trajectories ([8, §8.3, §8.4] and reference therein), Hamiltonian systems near resonances (e.g., [17] and references therein).

An important application of separatrix crossing is multiturn extraction in accelerator physics [18]. Consider a particle beam moving in a circular accelerator in horizontal direction (vertical direction is ignored in this problem). Accelerator tune measures the number of oscillations the beam makes on each pass around the accelerator. The idea of multiturn extraction is to vary the tune near a resonant value (e.g., $1 : 4$), this generates several well-separated beams of particles. The dynamics is represented by iterations of one-turn transfer map, some power of this map (4th power for $1 : 4$ resonance) is close to identity. This power of the transfer map can be written as unit-time flow of a vector field that slowly depends on time (as the map itself slowly depends on time) with small perturbation depending on time fastly and

periodically. Initially, phase portrait of the unperturbed vector field has no separatrices, but then, as the tune slowly changes, saddles connected by separatrices appear near the origin and domains bounded by these separatrices begin to grow, capturing the initial beam of particles into different domains bounded by separatrices and splitting it into several smaller beams. Thus the splitting of particle beam can be modeled by separatrix crossings for time-periodic perturbations of one-frequency systems. See also [19], where possibility of extending the results of adiabatic theory from differential equations to quasi-integrable area-preserving maps is discussed.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we discuss averaging method and two main obstacles to its use, resonances and separatrices. Then we discuss results of this paper in a less formal manner. In Section 4 we briefly discuss main ideas of the proofs and differences between resonance crossing far from separatrices and near separatrices. Then in Section 3 the results are stated. The rest of the paper contains proofs, plan of these parts can be found in Section 5.

2 Averaging, resonances, separatrix crossings

2.1 Averaging method

Consider a Hamiltonian system

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}, \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}, \quad \dot{z} = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Here $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and the Hamiltonian $H(p, q, z)$ depends on a scalar or vector parameter z . We will call (2.1) the *unperturbed system*. Suppose that this system is completely integrable (this always holds if $m = 1$) and in some domain of the phase space one can introduce action-angle variables $I \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\varphi \in \mathbb{T}^m = \mathbb{R}^m / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^m$. Then (2.1) rewrites as

$$\dot{I} = 0, \quad \dot{\varphi} = \omega(I, z), \quad \dot{z} = 0,$$

where $\omega = \frac{\partial H}{\partial I}$ is the vector of frequencies. We will call the system (2.1) m -frequency system. Let us add a small perturbation εf :

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} + \varepsilon f_q(p, q, z, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q} + \varepsilon f_p(p, q, z, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{z} = \varepsilon f_z(p, q, z, \varepsilon).$$

This rewrites in the action-angle variables as

$$\dot{I} = \varepsilon f_I(I, \varphi, z, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{\varphi} = \omega(I, z) + \varepsilon f_\varphi(I, \varphi, z, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{z} = \varepsilon f_z(I, \varphi, z, \varepsilon), \quad (2.2)$$

where f_I, f_φ, f_z are the components of f in the action-angle variables:

$$f_y = f_q \frac{\partial y}{\partial q} + f_p \frac{\partial y}{\partial p} + f_z \frac{\partial y}{\partial z}, \quad y = I, \varphi.$$

We see that I and z are *slow* variables of the perturbed system ($\dot{I}, \dot{z} = O(\varepsilon)$ far from separatrices), φ is *fast* variable. Evolution of slow variables can be approximately described using averaged system

$$\dot{I} = \varepsilon \langle f_I(I, \varphi, z, 0) \rangle_\varphi, \quad \dot{z} = \varepsilon \langle f_z(I, \varphi, z, 0) \rangle_\varphi.$$

Here $\langle \cdot \rangle_\varphi$ denotes averaging over the angle variables φ . For perturbations of one-frequency systems far from separatrices this works for all initial data with accuracy $O(\varepsilon)$ for times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$ ([1], [2]).

There are two major obstacles to the use of averaging. First, when the number of frequencies is at least two, *resonances* between frequencies of unperturbed system are possible, then the values of φ for solutions of unperturbed system do not span the whole \mathbb{T}^m . Second, solutions of perturbed system can *cross separatrices* of unperturbed system and move from one domain foliated by Liouville tori $I = \text{const}$ to another such domain. One action-angle chart cannot cover such trajectories; moreover, action-angle variables are singular on separatrices. In the following two subsections we discuss each of these obstacles in more detail.

2.2 Separatrix crossing in one-frequency systems




Figure 1: The unperturbed system.

Consider one-frequency systems, i.e., in (2.1) $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that for all z the unperturbed system has a saddle $C(z)$ with two separatrix loops l_1 and l_2 forming a figure eight (Figure 1). Solutions of perturbed system can cross separatrices of the unperturbed system. Set $h(p, q, z) = H(p, q, z) - H(p_C(z), q_C(z), z)$, where $(p_C, q_C) = C(z)$ is the saddle. Then $h = 0$ on separatrices, assume $h > 0$ in the domain \mathcal{B}_3 (outside separatrices) and $h < 0$ in the domain $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$ (inside). We can use energy h instead of action I , then h, z are new slow variables (let us call them *energy-angle variables*). We can write averaged system in this variables. Gluing




Figure 2: Phase space of averaged system.
Adapted from [9].

together averaged systems in \mathcal{B}_3 and \mathcal{B}_1 (or \mathcal{B}_2) by $h = 0$ (cf. Figure 2), we obtain averaged system describing transition from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_1 (or \mathcal{B}_2).

Averaging method works ([9]) for most initial data with measure of exceptional set $O(\varepsilon^r)$, where r can be as large as needed. Accuracy of averaging method $O(\varepsilon)$ before separatrix crossing and $O(\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|)$ after separatrix crossing holds for initial data outside the exceptional set (again for times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$). This means that after separatrix crossing evolution of slow variables is approximately described by averaging system describing either transition to \mathcal{B}_1 or to \mathcal{B}_2 . Let us note that the exceptional set is formed by points passing very close to the saddle of perturbed system and the number r above can be set as large as needed, but larger r gives worse constant in the estimate $O(\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|)$ for accuracy of averaging method.

Let us say that the outcome of separatrix crossing for some initial data in \mathcal{B}_3 is 1 if the corresponding solution of perturbed system moves to \mathcal{B}_1 and 2 if it moves to \mathcal{B}_2 . Initial data in \mathcal{B}_3 with different outcomes are finely mixed, $O(\varepsilon)$ change in initial data is enough to change the outcome. Thus outcome of separatrix crossing is often treated in literature as "random event" with some "probability". We state one precise definition of such probability in Section 3.4 below, see also [9] for another definition of such probability and more discussion of this topic.

Particular case when perturbed system is also Hamiltonian (e.g., slow-fast Hamiltonian systems can be written in form (2.1) if slow variables are treated as parameter z) is very important and frequently encountered in applications. For this case the action I (in one-frequency

case that we consider $2\pi I$ is the area bounded by closed trajectory of unperturbed system) remains constant along solutions of averaged system, so it is called *adiabatic invariant*. Separatrix crossings are still possible, as the area bounded by separatrices changes for perturbed system due to the change of z . Separatrix crossing leads to a jump of adiabatic invariant. This jump has magnitude $O(\varepsilon|\ln \varepsilon|)$, there are formulas [20, 21, 22, 23] for the value of this jump.

2.3 Two-frequency systems far from separatrices

Starting with two-frequency systems, resonances between the frequencies are possible. Recall that the evolution of fast variables (for two-frequency systems) is given by

$$\dot{\varphi}_1 = \omega_1(I, z), \quad \dot{\varphi}_2 = \omega_2(I, z),$$

where $I = (I_1, I_2)$. Resonances are given by

$$\omega_2/\omega_1 = s_2/s_1, \quad s_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, \quad s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

For each (s_1, s_2) such relation holds on a subset of the space of slow variables (I_1, I_2, z) that is called *resonant surface*. When slow variables are on a resonant surface, the evolution of fast variables for unperturbed system does not span the whole \mathbb{T}^2 , but a one-dimensional curve on \mathbb{T}^2 . This leads to deviations of the evolution of slow variables from trajectories of averaged system. Most solutions of perturbed system passing through a resonant surface




Figure 3: Capture into a resonance.




Figure 4: Scattering on a resonance.

Reproduced from [24].

exhibit *scattering on a resonance*: "random" jump of slow variables of magnitude $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Some solutions may be *captured into a resonance*: the solution stays near the resonant surface for time $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$. Such solution can deviate by 1 from trajectories of averaged system. However, measure of initial data that can be captured into resonance is small and evolution of most initial data is still approximately described by averaging method. Under some genericity condition

- Accuracy of averaging method $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$ holds for most initial data for times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$
- Exceptional set has measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$.

This is proved in [3], see also review [4] and references therein and an earlier work [5], where two-frequency systems were studied under a condition that prohibits capture into resonances.

2.4 Two-frequency systems near separatrices (our case)

We consider small time-periodic (with period 2π) perturbations of one-frequency systems with separatrices. Unperturbed system is as in Subsection 2.2 (cf. Figure 1), while the perturbation now depends on time:

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} + \varepsilon f_q(p, q, z, t, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q} + \varepsilon f_p(p, q, z, t, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{z} = \varepsilon f_z(p, q, z, t, \varepsilon),$$

where f_p, f_q, f_z are 2π -periodic in t . The time t together with the angle φ of the unperturbed one-frequency system form two angle variables of the perturbed system. This is the simplest case where both resonances and separatrix crossing are encountered. Perturbations of generic two-frequency systems can be reduced to this case, see Section 3.5 below.

As for one-frequency systems near separatrices, let us use h instead of I , then h and z are slow variables of perturbed system. Averaged system is given by

$$\dot{h} = \varepsilon \langle f_h(h, \varphi, z, 0) \rangle_{\varphi, t}, \quad \dot{z} = \varepsilon \langle f_z(h, \varphi, z, 0) \rangle_{\varphi, t},$$

where (f_h, f_φ, f_z) is the perturbation written in variables (h, φ, z) . As for one-frequency systems, we can glue averaged systems in different domains and obtain averaging systems describing transition from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 .

We assume that (full list of assumptions can be found in Section 3)

- H and f are analytic
- h decreases along solutions of averaged system (thus we have transitions from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2)
- some genericity condition similar to the one needed for two-frequency systems far from separatrices holds.

We show that (see Section 3 for precise statement of results)

- Evolution of most initial data in \mathcal{B}_3 is described by averaged system describing transition from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_1 or to \mathcal{B}_2 with accuracy $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$ over times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$.
- Exceptional set has measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln^5 \varepsilon|)$.
- Formulas for probabilities of capture in \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 similar to one-frequency case hold.
- Resonances near separatrices have smaller effect on the dynamics. Consider a part of a resonance surface with $h \sim h_0$, then it can capture measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon h_0})$ (up to some power of $\ln h_0$) and the size of scattering on such resonance for trajectories not captured is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon h_0}|\ln \varepsilon|)$ (up to some power of $\ln h_0$).

3 Statement of results

3.1 Our setting

Consider a Hamiltonian system with one degree of freedom

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}, \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$ and the Hamiltonian $H(p, q, z)$ depends on a vector parameter $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We will call this system the *unperturbed system*. Denote by $\mathcal{Z}_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ an open set of parameters, we will only consider $z \in \mathcal{Z}_0$. We assume that for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}_0$ the Hamiltonian H has a saddle $C(z)$ with two separatrix loops $l_1(z)$ and $l_2(z)$ forming a figure eight (Figure 1) and C is a non-degenerate critical point of H . Denote by $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}_{p,q}^2 \times \mathcal{Z}_0$ some open neighborhood of $\bigcup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_0} l_1(z) \cup l_2(z)$.

The separatrices $\bigcup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_0} l_1(z) \cup l_2(z)$ cut \mathcal{B} into three open domains: \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 inside each separatrix loops and \mathcal{B}_3 outside the union of the separatrices. Denote

$$h(p, q, z) = H(p, q, z) - H(C(z), z).$$

Then $h = 0$ on the separatrices for all z . We will assume

- $h > 0$ in \mathcal{B}_3 and $h < 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$ (if the sign is opposite, one can change the sign by exchanging p and q)
- \mathcal{B}_i are foliated by the level sets of H . This means that, with a slight abuse of notation, we may write $(h, z) \in \mathcal{B}_i$
- H is analytic on some *compact* set $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with $\bar{\mathcal{B}} \subset \text{int } \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is also foliated by the level sets of H .

Take a compact $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{Z}_0$. Then for small enough $c_h, c_z > 0$ for any $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}$ for any h, z with $|h| < c_h, \|z - z_*\| < c_z$ we have $(h, z) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Consider the perturbed system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} + \varepsilon f_q(p, q, z, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{p} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q} + \varepsilon f_p(p, q, z, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{z} &= \varepsilon f_z(p, q, z, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\lambda} &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Here

- The perturbation depends on the time λ . We used the notation t before, λ is introduced to distinguish the time λ the perturbation depends on from the time t of the unperturbed system that will be used below to parametrize trajectories of this system
- f_p, f_q, f_z are 2π -periodic in λ
- f_p, f_q, f_z are C^2 in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \times \mathbb{R}_\lambda \times [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$
- for $\varepsilon = 0$ the functions f_p, f_q, f_z are real-analytic in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \times \mathbb{R}_\lambda$.

3.2 Averaged system

The rate of change of h along the solutions of the perturbed system is εf_h , where

$$f_h = \frac{\partial h}{\partial p} f_p + \frac{\partial h}{\partial q} f_q + \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} f_z.$$

The variables h and z are slow variables of the perturbed system, their evolution can be approximately tracked using averaged system. In each domain \mathcal{B}_i denote by $T(h, z)$ and $\omega(h, z)$ the period and the frequency of the solution of the unperturbed system (3.1) with given h, z . The averaged system is given by the equations

$$\dot{\bar{h}} = \varepsilon f_{h,0}(\bar{h}, \bar{z}), \quad \dot{\bar{z}} = \varepsilon f_{z,0}(\bar{h}, \bar{z}), \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$f_{h,0} = \frac{1}{2\pi T} \int_0^{2\pi} \oint f_h|_{\varepsilon=0} dt d\lambda, \quad f_{z,0} = \frac{1}{2\pi T} \int_0^{2\pi} \oint f_z|_{\varepsilon=0} dt d\lambda$$

denote averages of f_h and f_z over the angle variables φ, λ . The inner integrals above are taken along the closed trajectory of the unperturbed system given by $h = \bar{h}, z = \bar{z}$ (inside \mathcal{B}_i) and this trajectory is parametrized by the time t of the unperturbed system. Recall that l_1 and l_2 denote the separatrices of the unperturbed system. Denote

$$\Theta_i(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \oint_{l_i} f_h|_{\varepsilon=0}(p(t), q(t), z, \lambda) dt d\lambda \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2; \quad \Theta_3 = \Theta_1 + \Theta_2. \quad (3.4)$$

(the separatrices are parametrized by the time t of unperturbed system). These integrals converge, see [9, Section 2.2]. We will assume $\Theta_i > 0, i = 1, 2, 3$. Note that near separatrices we have $T f_{h,0} \approx -\Theta_i$ in \mathcal{B}_i . Thus near separatrices h decreases in all \mathcal{B}_i along the solutions of averaged system. Moreover, for some $K_h > 0$ for small enough $|h| > 0$ we have

$$f_{h,0} < -K_h |\ln^{-1} h| < 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Once solution of the averaged system in \mathcal{B}_3 reaches $h = 0$, one can continue this solution using the averaged system in \mathcal{B}_1 or \mathcal{B}_2 (cf. Figure 2). We will say that such "glued" solutions correspond to capture into \mathcal{B}_1 or \mathcal{B}_2 , respectively. This is discussed in more detail in [9, Section 2.3].

3.3 Condition B'

Let φ be the angle variable (from the pair of action-angle variables) of the unperturbed system defined in \mathcal{B}_3 . Pick the transversal (to the solutions of unperturbed system) $\varphi = 0$ so that for all z it is a smooth curve that crosses l_1 at some point $a_1(z) \neq C(z)$. It is easy to check that the transversal $\varphi = \pi$ crosses l_2 at some point that we denote by $a_2(z)$. Let us define the coordinates t_1, t_2 on l_1 and l_2 as the time (for the unperturbed system) passed after the point a_1 and a_2 , respectively.

Denote

$$M_i(Q) = \int_{l_i} f_h(h=0, z, t_i=t, \lambda=t-Q, \varepsilon=0) dt \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

This is the famous Melnikov function [25] used to describe separatrix splitting, it is 2π -periodic. Given $s = (s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^2$, set

$$F_{s,i}^*(Q, z) = - (2\pi)^{-1} \left\langle M_i \left(Q - 2\pi \frac{j}{s_2} \right) \right\rangle_{j=0, \dots, s_2-1} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2;$$

$$F_{s,3}^*(Q, z) = F_{s,1}^*(Q, z) + F_{s,2}^* \left(Q + 2\pi \frac{\{s_1/2\}}{s_2}, z \right).$$

Here $\{\cdot\}$ denotes the fractional part and $\langle \psi(j) \rangle_{j=0, \dots, k-1}$ denotes the average $\frac{\psi(0) + \dots + \psi(k-1)}{k}$. The functions $F_{s,i}^*(Q)$ are periodic with period $2\pi/s_2$.

For a function $F(Q, z)$ set $V_F(Q, z) = \int_0^Q F(\tilde{Q}, z) d\tilde{Q}$. We will need the following

Condition $B'(V)$. All extrema of the function $V(Q)$ are non-degenerate (i.e. for all q such that $\frac{\partial V}{\partial Q} = 0$ we have $\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial Q^2} \neq 0$). Moreover, at different local maxima of V the values of V are different.

Condition $B'(s, z, i)$. The function $V(Q) = V_{F_{s,i}^*}(Q, z)$ satisfies the condition $B'(V)$ above.

For fixed s this is a codimension one genericity condition on (f_p, f_q, f_z) and z .

Condition $B'(z, i)$. For any $s = (s_1, s_2)$ condition $B'(s, z, i)$ holds.

The lemma below means that $B'(z, i)$ is also a codimension one genericity condition on (f_p, f_q, f_z) and z , as V_F has no extrema if $F > 0$ and thus satisfies condition $B'(V)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Given a uniform bound*

$$\|f_p\|_{C^2}, \|f_q\|_{C^2}, \|f_z\|_{C^2} \leq K, \quad \frac{\Theta_i}{2\pi} > K^{-1} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3$$

($K > 0$), there exists $S(K)$ such that $F_{s,i}^* > K^{-1}/2$ if $s_2 > S(K)$.

Proof. We have $f_h(C(z), z) = 0$ by [9, Lemma 2.1]. For definiteness, consider the separatrix l_1 ; let $(p(t_1), q(t_1))$ denote the point on l_1 with given value of t_1 . As $(p(t_1), q(t_1))$ exponentially converges to C for $t_1 \rightarrow +\infty$ and $t_1 \rightarrow -\infty$, there exists T_1 such that

$$\int_{t_1=-\infty}^{-T_1} \max_{\lambda} |f_h(h=0, t_1, \lambda)| + \int_{t_1=T_1}^{\infty} \max_{\lambda} |f_h(h=0, t_1, \lambda)| < K^{-1}/100. \quad (3.6)$$

For $|t_1| < T_1$ (i.e. far from C) the transition between coordinates h, t_1 and p, q is smooth, so $f_h(h=0, t_1, \lambda)$ is a smooth function of t_1, λ with bounded C^2 -norm. We have

$$\int_{-T_1}^{T_1} \left\langle f_h \left(h=0, z, t_1, \lambda=t_1 - Q + 2\pi \frac{j}{s_2} \right) \right\rangle_{j=0, \dots, s_2-1} dt_1 = \int_{-T_1}^{T_1} \langle f_h(h=0, z, t_1, \lambda) \rangle_{\lambda} + O(s_2^{-2}),$$

as averaging over j gives trapezoidal rule approximation for averaging over λ . The integral on the right-hand side is approximately $-\Theta_1$ with error at most $K^{-1}/100$ by (3.6). Take S such that the $O(s_2^{-2})$ term is less than $K^{-1}/100$, then for s with $s_2 > S$ we have $|2\pi F_{s,1}^* - \Theta_1| < 3K^{-1}/100$. We can obtain similar estimate for $|2\pi F_{s,2}^* - \Theta_2|$, together they yield the estimate on $|2\pi F_{s,3}^* - \Theta_3|$. \square

3.4 Main results

Denote $\bar{X} = (h, z)$, $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{B}_i \times [0, 2\pi]_{\lambda}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} \times [0, 2\pi]_{\lambda}$. Take a point

$$\hat{X}_0 = (\hat{h}_0, \hat{z}_0) \in \mathcal{B}_3$$

and $\Lambda > 0$.

For $i = 1, 2$ denote by $\hat{X}_i(\lambda)$ the solution of averaged system (3.3) describing capture from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_i with $\hat{X}_i(0) = \hat{X}_0$. Denote by $\mathcal{Z}_B \subset \mathcal{Z}$ the set of z that satisfy condition $B'(z, i)$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Suppose that, in addition to assumptions from Subsections 3.1 and 3.2,

1. ω decreases along solutions of the averaged system: $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial z} f_{z,0} + \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} f_{h,0} < 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2 \cup \mathcal{B}_3$;
2. solutions of averaged system stay in \mathcal{B} , i.e., there exists $c_B > 0$ such that for any $\lambda \in [0, \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ the points $\hat{X}_i(\lambda)$ are in \mathcal{B} and at least c_B -far from the border of \mathcal{B} ;
3. solutions of averaged system cross separatrices, i.e., $\hat{X}_1(\varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda) \in \mathcal{B}_1$, $\hat{X}_2(\varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda) \in \mathcal{B}_2$.
4. separatrix crossing happens when $z \in \mathcal{Z}_B$. To state this more precisely, denote by λ_* the time when \hat{X}_i cross separatrices (i.e. $\hat{h}_i(\lambda_*) = 0$) and set $z_* = \hat{z}_i(\lambda_*)$ (note that λ_* and z_* are the same for $i = 1, 2$). Then $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}_B$;
5. For some small enough¹ Λ_1 for $i = 1, 2$ the solutions \hat{X}_i satisfy condition B from [4, Section 2] for² $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_* - \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda_1]$ and $\lambda \in [\lambda_* + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda_1, \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$. This is a genericity condition, as explained in [4].

Let $B_r(\bar{X}) \subset \mathbb{R}_{h,z}^{n+1}$ denote the open ball with center \bar{X} and radius r . Denote

$$A_r(\bar{X}) = B_r(\bar{X}) \times [0, 2\pi]_{\lambda, \varphi}^2 \subset \mathcal{A}.$$

Denote by m the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_{p,q,z}^{n+2} \times [0, 2\pi]_{\lambda}$.

Theorem 3.2. *There exist $C, r > 0$ such that for any small enough ε there exists*

$$\mathcal{E} \subset A_r(\hat{X}_0) \subset \mathcal{A}_3 \quad \text{with} \quad m(\mathcal{E}) \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$$

such that the following holds for any $X_0 \in A_r(\hat{X}_0) \setminus \mathcal{E}$.

Set $\lambda_0 = \lambda(X_0)$. Denote by $X(\lambda)$ the solution of the perturbed system (3.2) with $X(\lambda_0) = X_0$. Then $X(\lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ for some $i = 1, 2$. Denote by $\bar{X}(\lambda)$ the solution of the averaged system (3.3) describing transition from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_i with $\bar{X}(\lambda_0) = (h(X_0), z(X_0))$. Then for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ we have

$$|h(X(\lambda)) - h(\bar{X}(\lambda))| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \|z(X(\lambda)) - z(\bar{X}(\lambda))\| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|. \quad (3.7)$$

This theorem is proved in Section 6, it is reduced to technical Theorem 6.1 below on crossing a small neighborhood of separatrices.

Let us now discuss "probabilities" of capture in \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 . Given $X_0 = (p_0, q_0, z_0, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{A}_3$ and small $\delta > 0$, denote $I_0 = I(p_0, q_0, z_0)$, $\varphi_0 = \varphi(p_0, q_0, z_0)$, $h_0 = h(p_0, q_0, z_0)$ (here I, φ are action-angle variables of unperturbed system in \mathcal{A}_3). Let us define the set $U^\delta \subset \mathcal{A}_3$ by

$$U^\delta = \{(I, z, \varphi, \lambda) : |I - I_0|, \|z - z_0\|, |\varphi - \varphi_0|, |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \delta\}.$$

¹It should be so small that if λ is $\varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda_1$ -close to λ_* , we have $|\bar{h}_i(\lambda)| < c_h/2$ and $\|\bar{z}_i(\lambda) - z_*\| < c_z/2$, where c_h, c_z should be so small that we can apply Theorem 6.1 below.

²In the notation of [4] these solutions should not cross the set θ .

Solutions of the perturbed system with initial data in $U^\delta \setminus \mathcal{E}$ are described by solutions of averaged system describing transition to \mathcal{B}_1 (we say that such initial data is captured in \mathcal{A}_1) or transition to \mathcal{B}_2 (we say that such initial data is captured in \mathcal{A}_2). Denote by $U_1^\delta, U_2^\delta \subset U^\delta \setminus \mathcal{E}$ the sets of initial data captured in \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 , respectively.

Definition 3.3 (V.I. Arnold, [10]). *The probability of capture in \mathcal{B}_i , $i = 1, 2$ is*

$$P_i(X_0) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(U_i^\delta)}{m(U^\delta)}.$$

Proposition 3.4.

$$P_i(X_0) = \Theta_i(z_*) / \Theta_3(z_*), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Here z_* is the value of z when the solution of averaged system with initial data (h_0, z_0) crosses separatrices.

This proposition is proved in Section 14.

Remark 3.5. *Resonances near separatrices have smaller effect on the dynamics. Consider a part of a resonance surface with $h \sim h_0$, then it can capture measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}h_0)$ (up to some power of $\ln h_0$) and the size of scattering on such resonance for trajectories not captured is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}h_0 |\ln \varepsilon|)$ (up to some power of $\ln h_0$).*

This informal statement is stated more precisely in Section 8.5 as Remark 8.10 and proved there.

Remark 3.6. *Our results are applicable for Hamiltonian systems with two and a half degrees of freedom, i.e., with the Hamiltonian*

$$H(p, q, y, x, t) = H_0(p, q, y, x) + \varepsilon H_1(p, q, y, x, t),$$

where H_1 is 2π -periodic in time t . Here pairs of conjugate variables are (q, p) and $(\varepsilon^{-1}x, y)$; (q, p) are fast variables and (x, y) are slow variables. Indeed, we can take $z = (x, y)$, then Hamilton's equations will be of form (3.2). Then the action $I(h, z)$ is the adiabatic invariant, it stays constant along the solutions of averaged system. Theorem 3.2 shows that for most initial data I is preserved after crossing separatrices with accuracy³ $\sim \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|$.

For this case the values Θ_i , $i = 1, 2$ can be computed as $\Theta_i(y, x) = \{S_i, H(C)\}$ ([8]), where S_i is the area of the domain \mathcal{B}_i (cf. Figure 1), $H(C) = H(p_C, q_C, y, x)$ denotes the value of the Hamiltonian H at the saddle $C(y, x) = (p_C(y, x), q_C(y, x))$, and $\{ , \}$ is the Poisson bracket in the variables y, x .

In [5] two-frequency systems (far from separatrices) were considered under the following condition prohibiting capture into resonances: $\dot{\omega} < C < 0$ along the solutions of *perturbed system*. This condition cannot hold near the separatrices, as ω is undefined on the separatrices, but a similar condition can be that $f_h < 0$ except in the saddle, where $f_h = 0$.

Remark 3.7. *Suppose $f_h(p, q, z, \lambda)|_{\varepsilon=0} < 0$ for all λ if $(p, q) \neq C(z)$. Then Theorem 3.2 holds with stronger estimates: for any $r > 0$ we can take exceptional set with measure $O(\varepsilon^r)$, then accuracy of averaging method (i.e., rhs in (3.7)) $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ holds for initial data outside exceptional set.*

A sketch of proof of this remark is given in Section 15. Note that the exceptional set in this remark is formed by initial data near separatrices of the saddle of *perturbed system* (these separatrices wind around the figure eight and are present even far from separatrices of unperturbed system). Estimate for accuracy of averaging method in Remark 3.7 cannot be improved, as scattering on resonance of amplitude $\sim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ is possible.

3.5 Two-frequency systems

Consider an integrable two-frequency system

$$\dot{q}_1 = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_1}, \quad \dot{q}_2 = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_2}, \quad \dot{p}_1 = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_1}, \quad \dot{p}_2 = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_2}, \quad \dot{z} = 0$$

with Hamiltonian H (depending on a parameter z) and another first integral F . Denote by v the Hamiltonian vector field given by H . Separatrices are singularities of the Liouville foliation. An isoenergy level $\{H = h\}$ is called *topologically stable* [26, §3.3] if for sufficiently small variations of energy level $\{H = h + \delta\}$ the Liouville foliations on these isoenergy levels are equivalent (i.e., there exists a diffeomorphism that maps one foliation into another). Consider perturbed and averaged systems. By separatrix crossing we mean that solution of averaged system crosses a singular leaf $H = h_0$, $F = f_0$, $z = z_0$ of the Liouville foliation. Suppose that separatrix crossing for averaged system happens on a topologically stable energy level $H = h_0$, $z = z_0$. We assume that the restrictions of F on isoenergy surfaces are Bott functions, such singularities are typical in real problems in physics and mechanics ([26, §1.8.1]).

³Far from separatrices this follows from the statement of Theorem 3.2, as $\frac{\partial I}{\partial h} = \omega^{-1}$ is bounded. But this also holds near separatrices, as in the proof of this theorem the difference in I is estimated, cf. Section 9.

Under these assumptions perturbation of two-frequency integrable system near separatrices can be reduced to a periodic perturbation of one-frequency integrable system depending on an additional parameter (it is denoted by h in (3.8) below). Thus Theorem 3.2 can be applied to perturbations of two-frequency systems.

Lemma 3.8. *There exist (z -dependent) new canonical coordinates (p, q, h, s) , $s \in [0, 2\pi]$ and a cover (a bijection or a double cover) $C: p, q, h, s, z \mapsto p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, z$ defined in a neighborhood of the singular leaf $\{H = h_0, F = f_0, z = z_0\}$ such that the dynamics of (p, q, h, s, z) given by the unperturbed system with s as new time is*

$$s' = 1, \quad h' = 0, \quad p' = -\frac{\partial S}{\partial q}, \quad q' = \frac{\partial S}{\partial p}, \quad z' = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

with some Hamiltonian $S(p, q, h, z)$ depending on parameters h and z , here \cdot' denotes the derivative with respect to s .

This lemma is based on the description of two-frequency integrable systems in [26], its proof (by A.V. Bolsinov) is presented in Appendix E. In this appendix we also write perturbed system in the new coordinates, it has the form (3.2).

4 Scheme of proof

4.1 Far from separatrices

Let us recall the scheme of proof of the result on averaging in two-frequency systems far from separatrices from [4]. More details can be found in [4, Section 5]. General two-frequency case is reduced to time-periodic perturbations of one-frequency systems. Denote by ω the frequency of unperturbed system. Effect of a resonance $\omega = s_2/s_1$ is determined by Fourier coefficients of unperturbed system. Effect of a resonance $\omega = s_2/s_1$ is determined by Fourier coefficients f_{ks} , $s = (s_1, s_2)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ of the perturbation $f(\varphi, t) = (f_h, f_\varphi, f_z)$. As Fourier coefficients of analytic functions decay exponentially, effect of resonances also exponentially decays when s grows. It is enough to consider $\sim \ln^2 \varepsilon$ resonances with $|s_1|, |s_2| \lesssim |\ln \varepsilon|$, as total effect of other resonances is negligibly small. Let us represent each of these resonances by a point s_2/s_1 on the line of possible values of ω (cf. Figure 5) and surround it by a *resonance zone* with width of order

$$\delta_s = \sqrt{\varepsilon a_s / s_1} + \varepsilon s_1, \quad a_s = e^{-K|s|}.$$

Here $K > 0$ is some constant; $|s| = |s_1| + |s_2|$; the numbers a_s are bounds on Fourier coefficients f_s . Two neighboring resonant zones Δ_r and Δ_{r+1} given by $\omega \approx \xi_r$ and $\omega \approx \xi_{r+1}$ ($\xi_r, \xi_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Q}$) are shown in Figure 5 together with a *non-resonant zone* $\Delta_{r,r+1}$ between them. Total width of all resonant zones is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$.




Figure 5: Resonant and non-resonant zones.
Adapted from [4].

It is assumed that ω decreases along solutions of averaged system. Dynamics between resonant zones is described by standard coordinate change used to justify averaging method. We will discuss methods used to study dynamics inside resonant zones in Subsection 4.3 below. It turns out that there are only finitely many resonances such that capture into resonance is possible (as for capture we should have $a_s \sim 1$) and each such resonant can capture measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ with scattering of order $\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|$ for the remaining trajectories. The size of scattering on other resonances is of the same order as the width of corresponding resonance zone. Thus total scattering on all resonances is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|)$.

4.2 Resonant zones near separatrices

Near the separatrices the angle variable φ behaves badly, as solutions of unperturbed system spend most time near the saddle C . Many functions used in the averaging method are unbounded (e.g., f_φ in (2.2)). Also, for a smooth function $\psi(p, q, z)$ after transition to the energy-angle variables the partial derivative $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial h}$ can be unbounded, as it is taken for fixed φ . Estimates on these functions are required to use the averaging method.

Estimates on Fourier coefficients of the perturbation f are needed to determine resonant zones. Denote $Y = (p, q, z)$. For fixed h, z we prove that the function $Y(\varphi)$ can be continued to the complex domain

$$|\operatorname{Im} \varphi| \lesssim \omega \sim |\ln^{-1} h|. \quad (4.1)$$

This gives estimates on Fourier coefficients of f (cf. Lemma 8.1 below). Then we define resonant zones and non-resonant zones between them. The definition is same as far from separatrices, but the width of resonant zones is different:

$$\delta_s \approx \sqrt{\varepsilon b_s h^{-1}} + \varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^2 \varepsilon,$$

where \approx means that this formula holds up to multiplying both summands by some powers of $\ln h$, and $b_s = e^{-C_F s^2}$ with some constant C_F is a bound on norm $\|f_s\|$ of the Fourier coefficient. Full formula for δ_s is given below, cf. (8.4). The formula above is for the width of resonant zones in ω , the width in h can be computed using $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} \sim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h$, it is (up to some powers of $\ln h$)

$$\delta_{s,h} \approx \sqrt{\varepsilon b_s h} + \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon.$$

We see that the width of resonant zones in the phase space decreases near separatrices. Further differences in the structure of resonant zones compared with what happens far from separatrices are as follows.

- We consider resonances with $|s_1|, |s_2| \lesssim \ln^2 \varepsilon$, their number is $\sim \ln^4 \varepsilon$.
- There are infinitely many resonant zones $\omega = s_2/s_1$ such that capture into resonance is possible (i.e, number of such zones grows when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$). Capture is only possible when $|s_2|$ is small, but $|s_1|$ can be large.
- Total width (in h) of all resonant zones is still $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, as far from separatrices.
- Methods describing passage through resonant zones work when $|h| \gtrsim \varepsilon |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$, passage through the zone $|h| \lesssim \varepsilon |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$ is thus considered separately (we call it *immediate neighborhood of separatrices*). We only consider resonant and non-resonant zones with $|h| \gtrsim \varepsilon |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$.

Dynamics in non-resonant zones is studied with help of the standard coordinate change used to justify averaging method, as in [4]. This coordinate change is written using decomposition of the perturbation f in Fourier series, estimates on Fourier coefficients follow from analytic continuation in the domain (4.1). We use estimates on components of the perturbation in energy-angle and their partial derivatives obtained in [27].

Dynamics in the immediate neighborhood of separatrices might be complicated, as different resonant zones begin to overlap when $h \lesssim \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon$. Resonance overlap is the celebrated Chirikov criterion for chaotic dynamics [28]. However, this zone is small, and a volume argument based on the fact that the flow of perturbed system changes volume slowly (as perturbation has divergence $O(\varepsilon)$) can be used to show that most solutions leave the zone $|h| < \varepsilon |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$ after time $O(\varepsilon^{-1/2} |\ln \varepsilon|)$ passes, thus leading to $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|)$ deviation from the solution of averaged system. This argument is where exceptional set of measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^5 \varepsilon|)$ appears, the power of logarithm comes from technical details of the proof and might potentially be improved (but still exceptional set should have measure at least $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|)$, as estimates far from separatrices cannot be improved [4]).

The hardest part of this paper is the study of dynamics in resonant zones near separatrices. Let us first recall how resonant zones far from separatrices are studied and then comment on the differences arising near separatrices.

4.3 Passage through resonant zones far from separatrices

Dynamics near resonances can be reduced to an auxiliary system. This approach is widely used (cf. references in introduction of [4]), our exposition loosely follows [4] with some parts modified to be closer to the way we treat resonance zones near separatrices in the current paper. Consider the following simplified case, where parameter z and dependence of the perturbation on ε are removed.

$$\dot{I} = \varepsilon f_I(I, \varphi, t), \quad \dot{\varphi} = \omega(I) + \varepsilon f_\varphi(I, \varphi, t).$$

Fix rational $\hat{\omega}$, consider resonance $\omega \approx \hat{\omega}$. Define \hat{I} by $\omega(\hat{I}) = \hat{\omega}$. Let us introduce new variables

$$\gamma = \varphi - \hat{\omega} t, \quad J = I - \hat{I}.$$

Near the resonance $J, \gamma \approx 0$. Denote $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I} = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I} \Big|_{\hat{I}}$. We have

$$\dot{\gamma} = \omega - \hat{\omega} + O(\varepsilon) = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I} J + O(\varepsilon) + O(J^2), \quad \dot{J} = \varepsilon f_I(I, \gamma + \hat{\omega} t, t) = \varepsilon f_I(\hat{I}, \gamma + \hat{\omega} t, t) + O(\varepsilon J).$$

Set $\alpha = \sqrt{\varepsilon / \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I}}$, $\beta = \sqrt{\varepsilon \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I}} \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, $P = J/\alpha$, $Q = \gamma$. Assume $P \lesssim 1$ (as we consider only what happens near resonance, this shows why width of resonant zones is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$). We get

$$\dot{Q} = \beta P + O(\varepsilon), \quad \dot{P} = \beta f_I(\hat{I}, Q + \hat{\omega} t, t) + O(\varepsilon).$$

We see that t is fast variable compared with P, Q . Let us apply averaging over t , we omit justification of the use of averaging method here (it goes close to the standard justification of

averaging using coordinate change) and simply replace the true system by averaged system. Denote $F(Q) = \langle f_I(\hat{I}, Q + \hat{\omega}t, t) \rangle_{t \in [0, 2\pi]}$. We get the system

$$\dot{Q} = \beta P + O(\varepsilon), \quad \dot{P} = \beta F(Q) + O(\varepsilon).$$

Taking new time $\tau = \beta t$ and denoting $a' = \frac{da}{d\tau}$, we get an auxiliary system describing dynamics near the resonance:

$$Q' = P + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \quad P' = F(Q) + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}). \quad (4.2)$$

Here

- $F(Q)$ is 2π -periodic
- $P = (I - \hat{I}) / \sqrt{\varepsilon / \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I}}$ measures how far we are from the resonance.

We will call the system (4.2) *auxiliary system* describing passage through resonances. This system can be considered as a simple Hamiltonian system

$$Q' = P, \quad P' = F(Q)$$

describing a movement of a unit mass particle with coordinate Q and velocity P under the force $F(Q)$ with extra perturbation of order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. There are two possibilities. First, $F(Q)$




Figure 6: Possible phase portraits of unperturbed auxiliary system. Adapted from [4].

can have the same sign for all Q , the case $F > 0$ is depicted in Figure 6, left. Then capture into resonance is impossible and trajectory leaves resonant zone $|P| \lesssim 1$ after time $O(1)$ for auxiliary system, corresponding to time $O(1/\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ for initial system and evolution of slow variables of order $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. We will say that such resonances are *weak*⁴. The second possibility is that F changes sign. Points with $F = 0$ correspond to equilibria of unperturbed auxiliary system. An example is depicted in Figure 6, right. Some of these equilibria are saddles, and crossing separatrices of these saddles due to perturbation can lead to capture into resonance. For example, in Figure 6 (right) a trajectory going near separatrix of the right saddle can cross this separatrix and enter the dashed domain, staying in the dashed domain. This trajectory of auxiliary system corresponds to a trajectory of the initial system staying $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ -close to resonance.

4.4 Passage through resonant zones near separatrices

As in the previous subsection, we discuss simplified case without the parameter z to make main ideas more transparent. The perturbation f grows near separatrices in variables I, φ , but the divergence of f remains $O(1)$, as the coordinate change $p, q \mapsto I, \varphi$ is volume-preserving. This allows us to separate the perturbation (in action-angle variables) into a Hamiltonian part that grows near separatrices and a non-Hamiltonian part that is bounded even close to separatrices. The Hamiltonian part of perturbation has amplitude $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon/h})$ (up to multiplying by some power of $\ln \varepsilon$) and the non-Hamiltonian part has amplitude $O_*(\sqrt{\varepsilon h})$ (here and thereafter the notation O_* denotes that the estimate holds up to multiplying by some power of $\ln h$).

Then rescaling near resonance together with averaging over the remaining fast variable is applied. As the Hamiltonian part of the perturbation is fairly large, estimates on accuracy of single step of averaging method are not enough, for example, to get good estimates of measure captured into resonances: the small parameter for averaging method is $\approx \sqrt{\varepsilon/h}$, while we want estimates with accuracy $\approx \sqrt{\varepsilon h}$. However, it is possible to use many steps of averaging method instead of just one to get better accuracy. We use the result [29] on many-step averaging. This result needs estimates for complex continuation of the perturbation in action-angle variables, we obtain such estimates. This allows to get auxiliary system describing dynamics near resonances.

⁴We adapt the terminology from [4] so that it can be used near separatrices. In [4] resonances were divided into high-order, weak, and strong, and capture was possible only into strong resonances. We drop high-order resonances and divide resonances simply into strong (capture is possible) and weak (capture is impossible).

The resulting auxiliary system is similar to auxiliary system far from separatrices. The unperturbed system is the same, but the perturbation is now divided into $O_*(\sqrt{\varepsilon/h})$ Hamiltonian part and $O_*(\sqrt{\varepsilon h})$ non-Hamiltonian part. Hamiltonian perturbation alone does not lead to capture into resonances, as separatrix loops (cf. Figure 6) survive. So amplitude of non-Hamiltonian perturbation determines the measure of captured trajectories, this measure is $O_*(\sqrt{\varepsilon h})$. The magnitude of scattering on resonances is $O_*(\sqrt{\varepsilon h}|\ln \varepsilon|)$, as width of resonance zones near separatrices is $O_*(\sqrt{\varepsilon h})$.

Finally, let us mention one of the technical details. Certain condition on non-degeneracy of unperturbed auxiliary system should hold for all strong resonances, it is needed for estimates on passage through resonance zones. Far from separatrices there are only finitely many strong resonances, so for generic systems this condition is satisfied for all strong resonances. But strong resonances accumulate on separatrices and their number grows when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. To deal with this problem, we show that there are only finitely many limit auxiliary systems near separatrices.

5 Plan of the rest of the paper

In the rest of paper we prove Theorem 3.2. In Section 6 a technical theorem on crossing a small neighborhood of separatrices is stated (Theorem 3.2 follows from it, as dynamics far from separatrices is covered by [4]) and this technical theorem is splitted into three lemmas on approaching separatrices, crossing separatrices, and moving away from separatrices. In Section 7 estimates on functions describing the perturbed system in action-angle variables and their complex continuation are gathered. In Section 8 estimates on Fourier coefficients of the perturbation are obtained, resonant and non-resonant zones are defined, and lemmas on passage through resonant and non-resonant zones are stated. Then these lemmas are used to prove Lemma on approaching separatrices in Section 9. Lemma on moving away from separatrices can be proved in the same way. In Section 10 Lemma on crossing non-resonant zones is proved. In Section 11 auxiliary system describing movement in resonant zones is obtained and in Section 12 lemmas on crossing resonant zones are proved. Lemma on passing separatrices is proved in Section 13, thus completing the proof of the technical theorem. In Section 14 formula for probabilities of capture into different regions (Proposition 3.4) is proved. Finally, in Section 15 we sketch a proof of Remark 3.7, where our main results is strengthened for a special class of perturbations such that capture into resonance is impossible.

6 Approaching separatrices and passing through separatrices

In this section we state a technical theorem on crossing a small neighborhood of separatrices and reduce Theorem 3.2 to this technical theorem. Then we split the technical theorem into three lemmas on approaching separatrices, crossing separatrices, and moving away from separatrices.

- For given $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3$, denote $\lambda_{init} = \lambda(X_{init})$ and let $X(\lambda)$ be the solution of the perturbed system (3.2) with initial data $X(\lambda_{init}) = X_{init}$.
- Given $\bar{X}_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{h,z}^{n+1}$ and λ_0 , denote by $\bar{X}(\lambda)$ the solution of the averaged system (one needs to specify in which domain \mathcal{B}_i or in which union of these domains) with initial data $\bar{X}(\lambda_0) = \bar{X}_0$.

Theorem 6.1. *Given any $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}_B$, for any small enough $c_z, c_h > 0$ for any $C_0, \Lambda > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any small enough ε there exists $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{A}_3$ with*

$$m(\mathcal{E}) \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln^5 \varepsilon|$$

such that the following holds for any $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}$.

Suppose at some time

$$\lambda_0 \in [\lambda_{init}, \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$$

the point $X_0 = X(\lambda_0)$ satisfies

$$X_0 \in \mathcal{A}_3, \quad \|z(X_0) - z_*\| \leq c_z, \quad h(X_0) = c_h.$$

Then there exists $i = 1, 2$ and $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ such that

$$X(\lambda_1) \in \mathcal{A}_i, \quad h(X(\lambda_1)) = -c_h.$$

Take any $\bar{X}_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{h,z}^{n+1}$ with

$$\|\bar{X}_0 - (h(X_0), z(X_0))\| < C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|$$

and consider the solution $\bar{X}(\lambda)$ of averaged system corresponding to capture from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_i with initial data $\bar{X}(\lambda_0) = \bar{X}_0$. Then for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$ we have

$$|h(X(\lambda)) - h(\bar{X}(\lambda))| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \|z(X(\lambda)) - z(\bar{X}(\lambda))\| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|. \quad (6.1)$$

Let us now prove the main theorem using the technical theorem to cover passage near separatrices and [4, Theorem 1 and Corollary 3.1] far from separatrices. Let us now state this result from [4] using our notation.

Theorem 6.2 ([4]). *Pick \widehat{X}_0 and $\Lambda > 0$. Suppose that solution of the averaged system \widehat{X} with initial data $\overline{X}(0) = \widehat{X}_0$ stays far from the separatrices for $\lambda \in [0, \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ and satisfies certain conditions (discussed right after the statement of theorem).*

Then for small enough $r > 0$ for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\mathcal{E} \subset A_r(\widehat{X}_0)$ with $m(\mathcal{E}) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ such that for any $X_0 \in A_r(\widehat{X}_0) \setminus \mathcal{E}$ we have

$$|h(X(\lambda)) - h(\overline{X}(\lambda))| = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|), \quad \|z(X(\lambda)) - z(\overline{X}(\lambda))\| = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$$

for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$, where $\lambda_0 = \lambda(X_0)$, $X(\lambda)$ is the solution of perturbed system with initial data $X(\lambda_0) = X_0$ and $\overline{X}(\lambda)$ is the solution of averaged system with initial data $\overline{X}(\lambda_0) = (h(X_0), z(X_0))$.

For a full statement of the conditions, we refer the reader to [4, Section 2]. When we apply this theorem below, these conditions are satisfied, the conditions in Section 3.4 are written for this purpose.

We will also need the lemma below, it is proved in Appendix D.

Lemma 6.3. *For any $\Lambda > 0$ there exists $C > 1$ such that the flow g^λ of (3.2) satisfies the following. Take open $A \subset \mathbb{R}_{p,q,z}^{2+n} \times [0, 2\pi]_\lambda$ with $m(A) < \infty$. Then for any $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda, \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ we have*

$$m(g^\lambda(A)) \leq Cm(A).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Take $c_h, c_z > 0$ such that we can apply Theorem 6.1 with these constants. Recall that $\widehat{X}_i(\lambda) = (\widehat{h}_i(\lambda), \widehat{z}_i(\lambda))$ denotes the solution of averaged system describing capture in \mathcal{B}_i with $\widehat{X}_i(0) = \widehat{X}_0$. Define λ_+ by $\widehat{h}_1(\lambda_+) = \widehat{h}_2(\lambda_+) = 2c_h/3$ and $\lambda_{-,i}$ by $\widehat{h}_i(\lambda_{-,i}) = -2c_h/3$, $i = 1, 2$. The number Λ_1 from the conditions for the main theorem is such that if λ is $\varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda_1$ -close to λ_* , we have $|\widehat{h}_i(\lambda)| < c_h/2$ and $\|\widehat{z}_i(\lambda) - z_*\| < c_z/2$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus

$$\lambda_+ < \lambda_* - \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda_1 < \lambda_* + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda_1 < \lambda_{-,i}.$$

This means condition B from [4, Section 2] is satisfied for

$$\widehat{X}_i(\lambda), \lambda \in [0, \lambda_+] \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{X}_i(\lambda), \lambda \in [\lambda_{-,i}, \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda].$$

For small enough r solutions $\overline{X}'(\lambda) = (\overline{h}'(\lambda), \overline{z}'(\lambda))$ of averaged system with any initial condition $\overline{X}'(0) \in B_r(\widehat{X}_0)$ satisfy

$$\overline{h}'(\lambda_+) \in [c_h/2, 3c_h/4], \quad \overline{h}'_i(\lambda_{-,i}) \in [-3c_h/4, -c_h/2]. \quad (6.2)$$

By [4, Corollary 3.1] we have (3.7) for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_+]$, given that X_0 is not in some set \mathcal{E}_1 of measure $\lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Together with (6.2) for small ε this implies $h(X(\lambda_0 + \lambda_+)) < 4c_h/5$. By continuity we have $h(X(\lambda_0 + \lambda'_+)) = c_h$ for some $\lambda'_+ \in [0, \lambda_+]$. Thus we can apply Theorem 6.1 (with λ_0 in this theorem equal to $\lambda_0 + \lambda'_+$). This theorem gives (possibly after reducing r) a set \mathcal{E}_2 of measure $\lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln^5 \varepsilon|$ such that if $X_0 \notin \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2$, there is $i = 1, 2$ and $\lambda'_{-,i}$ such that $X(\lambda_0 + \lambda'_{-,i}) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, with $h(X(\lambda_0 + \lambda'_{-,i})) = -c_h$ and (3.7) holds for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0 + \lambda_+, \lambda_0 + \lambda'_{-,i}]$. We have $\widehat{h}_i(\lambda_0 + \lambda'_{-,i}) < -4c_h/5$, by (6.2) this implies $\lambda'_{-,i} > \lambda_{-,i}$ and so (3.7) holds for $\lambda = \lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i}$.

Denote

$$\widehat{X}_{-,1} = \widehat{X}_1(\lambda_{-,1}), \quad \widehat{X}_{-,2} = \widehat{X}_2(\lambda_{-,2}).$$

By [4, Corollary 3.1] there exist r_- and $\mathcal{E}'_{-,i}$, $i = 1, 2$ with $m(\mathcal{E}'_{-,i}) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ such that for $i = 1, 2$ solutions starting in $A_{r_-}(\widehat{X}_{-,i}) \setminus \mathcal{E}'_{-,i}$ are approximated by solutions of the averaged system (with the same initial h, z) with error $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{-,i}$ be the preimage of $\mathcal{E}'_{-,i}$ under the flow of perturbed system over time $\lambda_{-,i}$, we have $m(\mathcal{E}_{-,i}) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ by Lemma 6.3. We can now write the exceptional set in the current theorem: $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2 \cup \mathcal{E}_{-,1} \cup \mathcal{E}_{-,2}$. Reducing r if needed, we may assume that solutions of averaged system describing capture in \mathcal{B}_i starting in $A_r(\widehat{X}_0)$ at $\lambda = \lambda_0$ are in $A_{r_-/2}(\widehat{X}_{-,i})$ at $\lambda = \lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus $X(\lambda)$ is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$ -close to the solution of averaged system with initial data

$$\overline{X}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i}) = (h(X(\lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i})), z(X(\lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i})))$$

for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i}, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$. The difference between this solution of averaged system and $\overline{X}_i(\lambda)$ at the moment $\lambda = \lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i}$ is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}|\ln \varepsilon|)$, it stays of the same order, as the dynamics in slow time takes time $O(1)$ and the averaged system is smooth far from separatrices. Thus we have (3.7) for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0 + \lambda_{-,i}, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$. Now we have proved (3.7) for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$, as required. \square

Let us now split Theorem 6.1 into a lemma on approaching the separatrices, lemma on crossing immediate neighborhood of separatrices, and lemma on moving away from the separatrices.

- Take $\rho = 5$, suppose we are given $C_\rho > 0$. Denote $h_* = C_\rho \varepsilon |\ln^\rho \varepsilon|$.

The immediate neighborhood of separatrices is given by $|h| < h_*(\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 6.4 (On approaching separatrices). *Take any $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}_B$, any small enough $c_h, c_z > 0$, any large enough $C_\rho > 0$. Then for any $C_0, \Lambda > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any small enough ε there exists $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{A}_3$ with*

$$m(\mathcal{E}) < C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

such that for any $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}$ the following holds.

Suppose that at some time

$$\lambda_0 \in [\lambda_{init}, \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$$

the point $X_0 = X(\lambda_0)$ satisfies

$$X_0 \in \mathcal{A}_3, \quad h(X_0) = c_h, \quad \|z(X_0) - z_*\| \leq c_z.$$

Then at some time $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ we have

$$X(\lambda_1) \in \mathcal{A}_3, \quad h(X(\lambda_1)) = h_*(\varepsilon).$$

Take any $\bar{X}_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{h,z}^{n+1}$ with

$$\|\bar{X}_0 - (h(X_0), z(X_0))\| < C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

and consider the solution $\bar{X}(\lambda)$ of averaged system in \mathcal{B}_3 with initial data $\bar{X}(\lambda_0) = \bar{X}_0$. Then for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$ we have

$$|h(X(\lambda)) - h(\bar{X}(\lambda))| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \|z(X(\lambda)) - z(\bar{X}(\lambda))\| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

Moreover,

$$|h(X(\lambda_1)) - h(\bar{X}(\lambda_1))| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

This lemma will be proved in Section 9.

Lemma 6.5 (On moving away from separatrices). *Take any $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}_B$, any small enough $c_h, c_z > 0$, any large enough $C_\rho > 0$. Then for any $C_0, \Lambda > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any small enough ε there exists $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{A}_3$ with*

$$m(\mathcal{E}) < C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

such that for any $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}$ the following holds.

Suppose that for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$ at some time

$$\lambda_0 \in [\lambda_{init}, \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$$

the point $X_0 = X(\lambda_0)$ satisfies

$$X_0 \in \mathcal{A}_i, \quad h(X_0) = -h_*(\varepsilon), \quad \|z(X_0) - z_*\| \leq c_z.$$

Take any $\bar{X}_0 = (\bar{h}_0, \bar{z}_0) \in \mathbb{R}_{h,z}^{n+1}$ with

$$|\bar{h}_0 - h(X_0)| < C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad \|\bar{z}_0 - z(X_0)\| < C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|$$

and consider the solution $\bar{X}(\lambda)$ of averaged system in \mathcal{B}_i with initial data $\bar{X}(\lambda_0) = \bar{X}_0$. Then for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ we have

$$|h(X(\lambda)) - h(\bar{X}(\lambda))| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \|z(X(\lambda)) - z(\bar{X}(\lambda))\| < C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

This lemma is proved similarly to the previous one, thus we omit the proof. In the proofs of these two lemmas we estimate the difference between solutions of perturbed and averaged system in the chart $w = (I, z)$, and this distance is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|)$. This and the estimate $\|\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}\| = O(\ln^{-1} h)$ in Lemma 7.1 below explains why near separatrices (when $\ln h \sim \ln \varepsilon$) the distance in h is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, while far from separatrices this distance is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|)$.

Lemma 6.6 (On passing separatrices). *Take any $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}$, any small enough $c_z > 0$, any large enough $C_\rho > 0$. Then for any $\Lambda > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{A}_3$ with*

$$m(\mathcal{E}) \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^{\rho-\gamma+1} \varepsilon|$$

such that for any $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}$ the following holds.

Suppose that at some time

$$\lambda_0 \in [\lambda_{init}, \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$$

the point $X_0 = X(\lambda_0)$ satisfies

$$X_0 \in \mathcal{A}_3, \quad \|z(X_0) - z_*\| \leq c_z, \quad h(X_0) = h_*(\varepsilon).$$

Then at some time $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ with

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|.$$

we have

$$X(\lambda_1) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2, \quad h(X(\lambda_1)) = -h_1.$$

This lemma will be proved in Section 13.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Suppose that $c_z^{(0)}$ is small enough for all three lemmas, take in the theorem $c_z = c_z^{(0)}/3$. Take c_h in the theorem such that

- it is small enough for all three lemmas;
- while any solution of averaged system describing passage from \mathcal{B}_3 to \mathcal{B}_1 or \mathcal{B}_2 passes from $h = c_h$ to $h = -2c_h$ the total variation of z is at most $c_z/3$. This can be done, as $\frac{dz}{dh} = O(\ln h)$ for solutions of averaged system.

Take C_ρ large enough for all three lemmas. Take $\Lambda^{(0)}$ such that solutions of averaged systems describing capture in \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 starting with $h = c_h$ reach $h = -2c_h$ after time less than $\varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda^{(0)}$ passes. We will apply the three lemmas with Λ greater than given in the theorem by $\Lambda^{(0)}$.

Given C_0 and Λ , Lemma 6.4 gives us C, \mathcal{E} that we denote by $C^{(1)}, \mathcal{E}^{(1)}$. For $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}^{(1)}$ the solution $X(\lambda)$ reaches $h = h_*(\varepsilon)$ at some moment that we denote $\lambda^{(1)}$. For $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda^{(1)}]$ we have (6.1) with $C = C^{(1)}$. Note that $\|z(X(\lambda^{(1)})) - z_*\| < c_z^{(0)}$ for small enough ε due to (6.1) and $\|z(\bar{X}(\lambda^{(1)})) - z_*\| < c_z/3$ (this holds by our choice of c_h).

Apply Lemma 6.6 with $\gamma = 1$, $c_z = c_z^{(0)}$, $C_0 = C^{(1)}$, it gives us C, \mathcal{E} that we denote by $C^{(2)}, \mathcal{E}^{(2)}$. For $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus (\mathcal{E}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{E}^{(2)})$ the solution $X(\lambda)$ reaches $h = -h_*(\varepsilon)$ at some moment that we denote $\lambda^{(2)}$. We have $\varepsilon(\lambda^{(2)} - \lambda^{(1)}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|$. The change of h, z, \bar{h}, \bar{z} during this time is bounded by $C^{(2)}\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|$ for some $C^{(2)} > 0$. Then for $\lambda \in [\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}]$ we have (6.1) with $C = C^{(1)} + 2C^{(2)}$. As above, we get $\|z(X(\lambda^{(2)})) - z_*\| < c_z^{(0)}$.

Finally, apply Lemma 6.5 with $c_z = c_z^{(0)}$ and $C_0 = C^{(1)} + 2C^{(2)}$, it gives us C, \mathcal{E} that we denote by $C^{(3)}, \mathcal{E}^{(3)}$. Set \mathcal{E} in the theorem equal to $\mathcal{E}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{E}^{(2)} \cup \mathcal{E}^{(3)}$. For $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}$ the solution $X(\lambda)$ reaches $h = -c_h$ at some moment that we denote $\lambda^{(3)}$. For $\lambda \in [\lambda^{(2)}, \lambda^{(3)}]$ we have (6.1) with $C = C^{(3)}$. Take in the theorem $C = C^{(3)} + 2C^{(1)} + 2C^{(2)}$. \square

7 Analysis of the perturbed system

We now focus on the proof of the lemma on approaching separatrices. Let us consider the perturbed system in \mathcal{A}_3 .

7.1 Action-angle and energy-angle variables

In the domain \mathcal{B}_3 let us consider the action-angle variables $I(p, q, z), \varphi(p, q, z)$ of the unperturbed system. We choose the angle variable in such a way that $\varphi = 0$ is given by an analytic transversal to one of the separatrices that is far away from the saddle. In the energy-angle variables h, φ the perturbed system rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{h} &= \varepsilon f_h(h, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{z} &= \varepsilon f_z(h, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\varphi} &= \omega(h, z) + \varepsilon f_\varphi(h, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\lambda} &= 1. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

We will denote by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ the partial derivative for fixed h, φ and by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{p,q}}$ the partial derivative for fixed p, q . We will often use the action I instead of h , then the perturbed system rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{I} &= \varepsilon f_I(I, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{z} &= \varepsilon f_z(I, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\varphi} &= \omega(I, z) + \varepsilon f_\varphi(I, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\lambda} &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_I = \frac{\partial I}{\partial h} f_h + \frac{\partial I}{\partial z} f_z$. We will denote $w = (I, z)$ and $f = (f_I, f_z)$. Then the system above rewrites as

$$\dot{w} = \varepsilon f(w, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{\varphi} = \omega(w) + \varepsilon f_\varphi(w, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \quad \dot{\lambda} = 1. \quad (7.2)$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= \langle f(w, \varphi, \lambda, 0) \rangle_{\varphi, \lambda}, & f_{z,0} &= \langle f_z(w, \varphi, \lambda, 0) \rangle_{\varphi, \lambda}, \\ f_{h,0} &= \langle f_h(w, \varphi, \lambda, 0) \rangle_{\varphi, \lambda}, & f_{I,0} &= \langle f_I(w, \varphi, \lambda, 0) \rangle_{\varphi, \lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\langle \psi(\varphi, \lambda) \rangle$ denotes the average $\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(\varphi, \lambda) d\varphi d\lambda$. Note that this gives the same $f_{h,0}$ and $f_{z,0}$ as the formulas in Section 3.2. The averaged system can be rewritten using I instead of h as follows

$$\dot{\bar{w}} = \varepsilon f_0(\bar{w}). \quad (7.3)$$

As $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} \sim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h > 0$ (see (7.8) below), (3.5) implies that close enough to separatrices for some $K_\omega > 0$

$$\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial w} f_0 = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} f_{h,0} + \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial z} f_{z,0} < -K_\omega h^{-1} |\ln^{-3} h| < 0. \quad (7.4)$$

This means that near separatrices ω decreases along the solutions of averaged system.

The following estimates on the connection between I and h will be proved in Appendix C. Denote $v = (h, z)$.

Lemma 7.1. *We have*

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial I} = \omega, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial w}{\partial v} \right\| = O(\ln h), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial h}{\partial w} \right\| = O(\ln^{-1} h), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial f_{I,0}}{\partial w} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\partial f_{z,0}}{\partial w} \right\| = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h).$$

7.2 Complex continuation

Taking a finite subcover, it is easy to prove that there is $K_1 > 0$ such that the function H and the unperturbed system (3.1) can be continued to the set

$$U_{K_1}(\mathcal{B}) = \{v + v', v = (p, q, z) \in \mathcal{B}, v' \in \mathbb{C}_{p,q,z}^{n+2}, \|v'\| < K_1\},$$

while the functions $f_p|_{\varepsilon=0}, f_q|_{\varepsilon=0}, f_z|_{\varepsilon=0}$ can be continued to

$$U_{K_1}(\mathcal{A}) = \{X + X', X = (p, q, z, \lambda) \in \mathcal{A}, X' \in \mathbb{C}_{p,q,z,\lambda}^{n+3}, \|X'\| < K_1\}.$$

Let us now discuss analytic continuation of the angle variable near the separatrices. The proofs of the statements below can be found in Appendix A.

For given $\hat{\omega}$ define $\hat{h}(z)$ by the equality $\omega(\hat{h}, z) = \hat{\omega}$.

Lemma 7.2. *For any $c_1 > 0$ there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for any $(h_0, z_0) \in \mathcal{B}_3$ with $0 < h_0 < c_2$ the following holds. Set $\hat{\omega} = \omega(h_0, z_0)$ and $\hat{T} = T(h_0, z_0)$. Then \hat{h} is uniquely defined for all z with $\|z - z_0\| < c_2$ and the period $T(h, z)$ can be continued to*

$$\{(h, z) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1}, \|z - z_0\| < c_2, |h - \hat{h}(z)| < c_2 |\hat{h}(z)|\}$$

with $|T(h, z) - \hat{T}| < c_1 \hat{T}$. Moreover, in the neighborhood above we have $T = A(h, z) \ln h + B(h, z)$, where A and B are bounded analytic functions with $A \neq 0$ and \ln is the branch of the complex logarithm obtained by analytic continuation of the real logarithm.

Lemma 7.3. *Denote $r(h, z, \varphi) = (p, q)$. Then there is $c \in (0, c_2)$ (here c_2 is the constant from Lemma 7.2) such that for any z_0 and any $\hat{\omega} \in (0, c)$ with $(\hat{h}(z_0), z_0) \in \mathcal{B}_3$ the function $r(h, z, \varphi)$ can be continued to*

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(h, z, \varphi) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+2}, \|z - z_0\| < c, |h - \hat{h}(z)| < c |\hat{h}(z)|, |\operatorname{Im} \varphi| < c \hat{\omega}\}$$

with $(r, z) \in U_{K_1}(\mathcal{B})$ and $r(h, z, \varphi) = r(h, z, \varphi + 2\pi)$.

Let us now consider a resonance given by $\omega = s_2/s_1$ for coprime positive integers s_1, s_2 . Set $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1$. Given a function $\psi(h, z)$, we denote $\hat{\psi}(z) = \psi(\hat{h}(z), z)$. Take z_0 with $(\hat{h}(z_0), z_0) \in \mathcal{B}_3$. By Lemma 7.3 the system (7.1) can be continued to the complex domain

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \left\{ z, h, \varphi, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{n+3} : \|z - z_0\| < c_{cont}, |h - \hat{h}(z)| < c_{cont} |\hat{h}(z)|, |\operatorname{Im} \varphi| < c_{cont} \hat{\omega}, |\operatorname{Im} \lambda| < c_{cont} \right\} \quad (7.5)$$

for some $c_{cont} > 0$. The function $T(h, z)$ also continues in this domain with $|T(h, z) - \hat{T}| < d_{cont} \hat{T}$, where $\hat{T} = 2\pi/\hat{\omega}$ and $d_{cont} > 0$ can be made as small as needed by reducing c_{cont} , by Lemma 7.2. The constants c_{cont} and d_{cont} are uniform, they do not depend on s_2, s_1, h_0, z_0 . Finally, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 7.4. *Consider an analytic function $\psi(p, q, z, \lambda)$ (such that ψ can be continued to $U_{K_1}(\mathcal{A})$) such that $\psi = 0$ at $C(z)$ for all z and λ . Rewrite this function in the chart h, z, φ, λ . Then for any $(h, z, \varphi_0, \lambda) \in \mathcal{D}_0$ with $\operatorname{Re} \varphi_0 \in [0, 2\pi]$ we have*

$$\omega^{-1} \int_{\varphi=0}^{\varphi_0} \psi(h, z, \varphi, \lambda) d\varphi = O(1).$$

Here the integral is taken along any path homotopic to the segment $[0, \varphi_0]$.

7.3 Estimates

Lemma 7.5. *We have the following estimates and equalities valid in \mathcal{D}_0 , the constants in O -estimates below do not depend on s_1, s_2, h_0, z_0 .*

$$\begin{aligned} T &\sim \ln h, \quad \frac{\partial T}{\partial h} \sim h^{-1}, \quad \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = O(\ln h), \\ \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} &\sim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial h \partial z} = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h), \quad \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial h^2} = O(h^{-2} \ln^{-2} h), \\ \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I} &\sim h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial I^2} = O(h^{-2} \ln^{-4} h), \\ \frac{\partial h}{\partial I} &= \omega, \quad \frac{\partial I}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{t=0}^T \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \Big|_{p,q} (h, z, \omega t) dt = O(1), \\ \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z} &= O(h \ln h). \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Here and below in this paper we use the expressions $y = O(x)$ and $y \sim x$ for negative or complex x and y as a shorthand for $|y| = O(|x|)$ and $|y| \sim |x|$.

Proof. We have $\frac{\partial h}{\partial I} = \omega$ from the Hamiltonian equations in the coordinates I, φ . The estimates for T and ω and their derivatives follow from the last part of Lemma 7.2 and the formula for $\frac{\partial h}{\partial I}$. The formula for $\frac{\partial I}{\partial z}$ is well known. It can be found, e.g., in [9, Corollary 3.2], where the estimate $\frac{\partial I}{\partial z} = O(1)$ is proved in the real case. In the complex case this estimate follows from the formula for $\frac{\partial I}{\partial z}$ by Lemma 7.4.

Let us prove the estimate for $\frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z}$. We have $0 = \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial h} \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial z}$, thus $\frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z} = -\frac{\frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial z}}{\frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial h}} = O(h \ln h)$. Here we use the notation $\hat{\psi}(z) = \psi(z, \hat{h}(z))$. \square

Let us move on from estimates on the complex continuation of the perturbed system to estimates on the real perturbed system. We will use the notation O_* . A precise definition can be found in [27, Table 1]. Roughly speaking, $g = O_*(h^a \ln^b h)$ means that $gh^{-a} \ln^{-b} h = O(1)$ and fastly decreases near the saddle C . We will need the following fact ([27, Lemma 11.1])

$$\int_0^{2\pi} O_*(h^a \ln^b h) d\varphi = O(h^a \ln^{b-1} h). \tag{7.7}$$

Lemma 7.6. *Let $\psi(p, q, z)$ denote any smooth function such as⁵ f_h or f_z . Then we have in the real domain \mathcal{B}_3*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial h} \right\| &= O_*(h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} \right\| = O(1), \\ f_\varphi &= O_*(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h), \quad f_I = O(\ln h), \quad f_{h,0} \sim \ln^{-1} h, \quad f_{I,0} = O(1), \quad f_{z,0} = O(1), \\ \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial w} \right\| &= O_*(h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h), \quad \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} \sim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial z} \right\| = O(\ln^{-1} h). \end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

These estimates hold with O -estimates bounded from above by uniform constants that depend only on the system and the domain \mathcal{B}_3 and \sim -estimates bounded from above and from below by uniform constants.

Proof. For the proofs of these estimates (except the estimate for $\frac{\partial f}{\partial w}$) see [27, Table 1] and the references within. We have $\frac{\partial f_z}{\partial I} = \omega \frac{\partial f_z}{\partial h} = O_*(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h)$ and

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f_I}{\partial I} \right\| = \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial I} (\omega^{-1} f_h) \right\| = \left\| \omega^{-1} \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial I} + \frac{\partial}{\partial I} (\omega^{-1}) f_h \right\| = O_*(h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h).$$

In the same way we get $\left\| \frac{\partial f_z}{\partial z} \right\| = O(1)$ and $\left\| \frac{\partial f_I}{\partial z} \right\| = O(\omega^{-1})$. This implies the estimate for $\frac{\partial f}{\partial w}$. \square

8 Resonant and non-resonant zones

8.1 Fourier series

Denote by f_m , $m = (m_1, m_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ the Fourier coefficients of the vector-valued function $f|_{\varepsilon=0}$:

$$f(w, \varphi, \lambda, 0) = f_0(w) + \sum_{|m| \neq 0} f_m(w) e^{i(m_1 \varphi + m_2 \lambda)}.$$

The following lemma will be proved in Appendix B, using the results on complex continuation stated in Subsection 7.2.

⁵We can ignore that f_h and f_z also depends on λ , as we can just use the estimates on ψ for each fixed value of λ .

Lemma 8.1. *There is C_F such that for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have in \mathcal{B}_3*

$$\|f_m\| \lesssim \exp\left(-C_F|m_2| - C_F\frac{|m_1|}{T}\right). \quad (8.1)$$

Moreover,

$$\left\|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial h}\right\| \lesssim |h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h| \exp(-C_F|m_2|), \quad \left\|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial z}\right\| \lesssim \exp(-C_F|m_2|),$$

For given N that will be chosen in the lemma below let us denote

$$R_N f(w, \varphi, \lambda) = \sum_{|m| > N} f_m(w) e^{i(m_1 \varphi + m_2 \lambda)}.$$

Lemma 8.2. *There is $N \sim \ln^2 \varepsilon$ such that for $h > \varepsilon$ we have $\|R_N f\| < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. As $h > \varepsilon$, we have $T \lesssim |\ln \varepsilon|$. Hence, we can take $N \sim \ln^2 \varepsilon$ such that $C_F N/T \geq 2|\ln \varepsilon|$, then $\exp\left(-C_F|m_2| - C_F\frac{|m_1|}{T}\right) \leq \varepsilon^2$ for any m with $|m| > N$. From this it is easy to obtain $\|R_N f\| < \varepsilon$. \square

8.2 Non-resonant zones

A resonance is given by $\omega(h, z) = \xi > 0$, where $\xi = s_2/s_1$ with $s = (s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^2$; $|s| = |s_1| + |s_2| \leq N$ and the numbers s_1 and s_2 are coprime. Assume that the resonances are enumerated in such a way that $\xi_1 > \xi_2 > \xi_3 > \dots$. Let s_r denote the vector (s_1, s_2) corresponding to ξ_r . Take small $k > 0$ and denote by $\mathcal{B}_{3,*} \subset \mathcal{B}_3$ the set of points (h, z) that satisfy $\|w(h, z) - w(h=0, z_*)\| < k$. The value of k is picked so that $\mathcal{B}_{3,*}$ is far from $\partial\mathcal{B}$. The constants c_h, c_z in Theorem 6.1 are small enough; we will assume that $\mathcal{B}_{3,*}$ contains the set given by $h \in (0, 2c_h)$, $\|z - z_*\| < 2c_z$. Let us fix $\gamma = 5$ and consider the sets

$$\Pi = \{(h, z) \in \mathcal{B}_{3,*} : h \geq 2\varepsilon |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|\}, \quad \partial\Pi = \{(h, z) \in \mathcal{B}_{3,*} : h = 2\varepsilon |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|\}. \quad (8.2)$$

Inside Π (and also inside the zone $\tilde{\Pi}$ defined below in Section 10) we have (for any $\alpha > 0$)

$$\varepsilon/h \leq |\ln^{-\gamma} \varepsilon| < 1, \quad |\ln h| < |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \varepsilon h^{-1} |\ln^{-\alpha} h| \leq |\ln^{-(\gamma+\alpha)} \varepsilon|. \quad (8.3)$$

For a resonance s denote $b_s = e^{-C_F s_2} < 1$, where C_F is defined in (8.1). Recall that when s is fixed, $\hat{h}(z)$ denotes the resonant value of h given by $\omega(\hat{h}(z), z) = s_2/s_1$. Set

$$\delta_s(z) = \sqrt{\varepsilon b_s \hat{h}^{-1} \ln^{-4} \hat{h} + \varepsilon \hat{h}^{-1} |\ln^{-3} \hat{h}| \ln^2 \varepsilon}. \quad (8.4)$$

Take any large enough C_Z (it should be greater than some constant K_Z which will be determined in the proof of Lemma 8.6). For each resonance given by $s = (s_1, s_2)$, define its *inner resonant zone*

$$Z(s) = \left\{ (h, z) \in \Pi : |\omega(h, z) - s_2/s_1| \leq C_Z \delta_s(z) \right\}.$$

Set $Z_r = Z(s_r)$. Such resonant zone has width $\sim \sqrt{\varepsilon h}$ in h if $s_2 \sim 1$ and $h \gtrsim \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon$.

The following lemma shows that the value of h stays roughly the same between two neighboring resonances for fixed z .

Lemma 8.3. *Let $\xi_r > \xi_{r+1}$ be neighboring resonances. Fix z and let $\hat{h}_r > \hat{h}_{r+1}$ be the corresponding values of h . Then if $\hat{h}_{r+1} \geq \varepsilon |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|$, we have*

$$\hat{h}_r < \left(1 + O(|\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|)\right) \hat{h}_{r+1}. \quad (8.5)$$

Proof. As $\omega \sim \ln^{-1} h$, $\hat{h}_{r+1} \geq \varepsilon |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|$ implies $\xi_{r+1} \gtrsim |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|$. As ξ_r^{-1} and ξ_{r+1}^{-1} are two neighboring rational numbers that can be written as s_1/s_2 with $|s_1| + |s_2| \leq N$, $N \sim \ln^2 \varepsilon$, taking fixed $s_2 \approx N \xi_r/3$ and changing $s_1 \approx N/3$ with unit step gives the estimate

$$|\xi_r^{-1} - \xi_{r+1}^{-1}| \lesssim s_2^{-1} \sim (\xi_r N)^{-1} \lesssim |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|.$$

Integrating the equality $\frac{\partial}{\partial h}(\omega^{-1}) \sim h^{-1}$, we get

$$|\ln \hat{h}_r - \ln \hat{h}_{r+1}| \sim |\xi_r^{-1} - \xi_{r+1}^{-1}| \lesssim |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|.$$

Taking exponent gives (8.5). \square

Lemma 8.4. *For any $C_Z > 0$ for all sufficiently small ε each point $w \in \Pi$ lies inside at most one zone Z_r .*

Proof. Take two resonances s and s' . We have

$$|s_2/s_1 - s'_2/s'_1| \geq s_1^{-1}(s'_1)^{-1} = s_2^{-1}(s_2/s_1)(s'_1)^{-1} \gtrsim s_2^{-1} \ln^{-3} \varepsilon$$

and (as $b_s s_2^2 = O(1)$)

$$(\delta_s/|s_2/s_1 - s'_2/s'_1|)^2 \lesssim \varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h \ln^6 \varepsilon \lesssim \ln^{2-\gamma} \varepsilon$$

with the last inequality following from (8.3). Similarly, we have $(\delta_{s'}/|s_2/s_1 - s'_2/s'_1|)^2 \lesssim \ln^{2-\gamma} \varepsilon$. Thus for $\gamma_2 > 2$ and small enough ε these resonant zones are disjoint. \square

Remark 8.5. Take an integer $k \sim \ln \varepsilon$, $\frac{s'_2}{s'_1} = \frac{k-1}{k^2}$, $\frac{s_2}{s_1} = \frac{1}{k+1}$. We have

$$\left| \frac{s'_2}{s'_1} - \frac{s_2}{s_1} \right| = \frac{1}{k^2(k+1)} \sim \ln^{-3} \varepsilon.$$

As $b_s \sim 1$ (and even $a_s \sim 1$ for a_s defined later in Subsection 10) and $\ln h \sim \omega^{-1} \sim \ln \varepsilon$, we have

$$\delta_s \gtrsim \sqrt{\varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^{-4} \varepsilon}.$$

To avoid s'_2/s'_1 being inside the resonant zone of s_2/s_1 , we need $h \gtrsim \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon$.

Denote by $Z_{r,r+1} \subset \Pi$ the zone between two neighboring resonance zones Z_r and Z_{r+1} , $\xi_r > \xi_{r+1}$. For a more formal definition we need to denote by $S_z \subset \Pi$ the set of all $w \in \Pi$ with given z . The intersection $Z_{r,r+1} \cap S_z$ is defined as the segment between $Z_r \cap S_z$ and $Z_{r+1} \cap S_z$ if both are non-empty. If one of these sets is empty, we take the segment between the other set and an endpoint of the segment S_z . If both these sets are empty, $Z_{r,r+1} \cap S_z$ is also empty.

8.3 Lemma on crossing non-resonant zones

It is convenient to use action-angle variables to describe crossing non-resonant zones. We will denote $W = (w, \varphi, \lambda)$. Take some initial data $W_{init} = (w_{init}, \varphi_{init}, \lambda_{init}) \in \mathcal{A}_3$. Let $W(\lambda) = (w(\lambda), \varphi(\lambda), \lambda)$ be the solution of the perturbed system (7.2) with this initial data. Let us also denote by $\bar{w}(\lambda)$ some solution of the averaged system (7.3) with $\bar{w}(\lambda_{init})$ close to $w(\lambda_{init})$. We will use the notation $h(\lambda) = h(w(\lambda))$, $\bar{h}(\lambda) = h(\bar{w}(\lambda))$.

Along the solution of the averaged system ω decreases due to (7.4). Until this solution reaches $\partial\Pi$, it passes the zones in the following order: $Z_1, Z_{1,2}, Z_2, Z_{2,3}, \dots$. The evolution of slow variables given by the perturbed system $w(\lambda)$ passes the zones more or less in the same order, but as it oscillates, it can leave and reenter the zones. The lemma below covers the times from the first entry to $Z_{r,r+1}$ until the first entry to Z_{r+1} (or reaching $\partial\Pi$).

Lemma 8.6. Fix $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}$, then there exist $\gamma_1, K_Z > 0$ such that the following holds for any $C_Z > K_Z$ for some $C_6, C_7, C_t > 0$ and any small enough $c_z, \omega_0, \varepsilon > 0$. Suppose at some time $\lambda_0 > \lambda_{init}$ we have

$$w(\lambda_0) \in Z_{r,r+1}, \quad \omega(w(\lambda_0)) < \omega_0.$$

a) Then there exists $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ such that $w(\lambda_1)$ lies in $\partial\Pi$ or on the border between $Z_{r,r+1}$ and Z_{r+1} .
b)

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \leq C_t(\xi_r - \xi_{r+1})h(\lambda_1)|\ln^3 h(\lambda_1)|.$$

c) $h(\lambda) \leq \frac{5}{3}h(\lambda_0)$ for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$.

d) Assume that for some $\lambda_{01} \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$ we also have

$$\bar{h}(\lambda_{01}) > 0.5h(\lambda_{01}), \quad \bar{h}(\lambda_0) < 2h(\lambda_0). \quad (8.6)$$

Denote $b_{s_r} = e^{-C_F s_2^2}$, where $\xi_r = s_2/s_1$. Denote $b_{s_{r+1}}$ by the same formula with ξ_r replaced by ξ_{r+1} . Then for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_{01}]$ we have (in the error term below we denote $h = h(\lambda_1)$)

$$\|w(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\| < e^{C_6(\xi_r - \xi_{r+1})} \|w(\lambda_0) - \bar{w}(\lambda_0)\| + C_7(\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}})\sqrt{\varepsilon h} |\ln h| + C_7 \varepsilon |\ln^{\gamma_1} \varepsilon|. \quad (8.7)$$

8.4 Outer and middle resonant zones

Suppose we are given C_Z, C'_Z with $C'_Z > C_Z > 0$ and numbers $D'(s)$ for each resonance $s = (s_1, s_2)$. Define the *outer resonant zone*

$$Z'(s) = \left\{ (h, z) \in \Pi : |\omega(h, z) - s_2/s_1| \leq C'_Z \delta_s(z) \right\}.$$

Fix some resonant $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1$. Given a function $\psi(h, z)$, denote $\hat{\psi}(z) = \psi(\hat{h}(z), z)$. Denote

$$\alpha(z) = \alpha_s(z) = \sqrt{\varepsilon / \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial I}} \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon \hat{h} \ln^3 \hat{h}}.$$

Let $D(h, z) = D_s(h, z)$ be defined by

$$I(h, z) = \hat{I}(z) + D\alpha(z)\sqrt{\hat{\omega}}.$$

The *middle resonant zone* is defined in terms of D as

$$Z^m(s) = \left\{ (h, z) \in \Pi : |D(h, z)| \leq D'(s) \right\}.$$

Set $Z_r^m = Z^m(s_r)$ and $Z_r' = Z'(s_r)$.

Lemma 8.7. *Given $K, S_2 > 0$, there exists $K_1 > K$ such that for any $D_{p,0} > K_1$ we can pick $C_Z' > C_Z > K$ and functions $D_p'(s, z)$ such that for small enough ε for any s we have*

- $Z(s) \subset Z^m(s) \subset Z'(s)$,
- $D_p'(s, z) \leq D_{p,0}$ and $D_p'(s, z) = D_{p,0}$ if $s_2 > S_2$,
- $D_p'(s, z) = c_1 D_{p,0} \left(\sqrt{b_s} + \sqrt{\varepsilon \hat{h}(z)^{-1} \ln^{-1} \hat{h}(z) \ln^2 \varepsilon} \right)$ for some $c_1 > 0$.

Proof. Denote

$$Z(s, C) = \left\{ (h, z) \in \Pi : |\omega(h, z) - s_2/s_1| \leq C\delta_s(z) \right\}.$$

This gives inner resonant zones for $C = C_Z$ and outer resonant zones for $C = C_Z'$. Let $D_s(z, C)$ be the width of this zone in D . It is easy to check that $\delta_s(z) = O(\ln^{-1} \varepsilon)$ if $(\hat{h}_s(z), z) \in \Pi$, so for fixed z the values of h in $Z(s, C)$ differ by $o(h)$. This implies $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I} \sim \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial I}$ in this zone (for any C this holds for small enough ε).

As $\gamma \geq 2$, we have $\varepsilon \hat{h}^{-1} \ln^{-3} h \ln^2 \varepsilon \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon \hat{h}^{-1} \ln^{-4} h}$. Denote $\tilde{\delta}_s = \sqrt{\varepsilon \hat{h}^{-1} \ln^{-4} h}$. We have $\delta_s \leq C_1 \tilde{\delta}_s$ for some $C_1 > 0$. We have

$$D_s(z, C) \sim C\delta_s / \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial I} \alpha \sqrt{\hat{\omega}} \right) \sim C\delta_s / \sqrt{\varepsilon \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial I} \hat{\omega}} \sim C \frac{\delta_s}{\tilde{\delta}_s}.$$

Take $d'(s) = C_1^{-1} \delta_s / \tilde{\delta}_s \leq 1$ if $s_2 > S_2$ and $d'(s) = 1$ otherwise. Note that $\delta_s \sim \tilde{\delta}_s$ if $s_2 \leq S_2$ as $b_s \sim 1$ for such s . Then for some $C_2 > 1$ we have

$$D_s(z, C) \in [CC_2^{-1}d'(s), CC_2d'(s)] \quad \text{for all } s.$$

Note that the value of C_2 does not depend on K and $D_{p,0}$, it only depends on S_2 . Take

$$C_Z = D_{p,0}C_2^{-1}, \quad C_Z' = D_{p,0}C_2, \quad D_p'(s) = D_{p,0}d'(s)$$

and K_1 so large that $D_{p,0} > K_1$ implies $C_Z > K$. We have

$$D_s(z, C_Z) \leq C_Z C_2 d'(s) = D_{p,0}d'(s) = D_p'(s), \quad D_s(z, C_Z') \geq C_Z' C_1^{-1} d'(s) = D_{p,0}d'(s) = D_p'(s).$$

This implies $Z_r(s) \subset Z_r^m(s) \subset Z_r'(s)$. \square

8.5 Lemmas on crossing resonant zones

We will call a resonance high-numerator if $s_2 < S_2$ and low-numerator otherwise. The constant S_2 is picked in the proof of Lemma 8.8 below. Denote by $B_r(O)$ the open ball with center O and radius r . The lemma below covers crossing middle resonant zones of high-numerator resonances.

Lemma 8.8. *Given $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}$, for any $C_{s_1} > 0$ and $D_p > 1$ for any large enough S_2 there exist $C_\rho, C > 1$ such that for any small enough $c_z, \omega_0, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ for any $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1 \in (0, \omega_0)$ with $s_2 > S_2$ and $s_1 < C_{s_1} \ln^2 \varepsilon$ we have the following for any $D_p' \in (0, D_p]$. Take some initial condition $X_0 = (p_0, q_0, z_0, \lambda_0)$ with*

$$|I(X_0) - \hat{I}(z_0)| \leq D_p' \alpha(z_0) \hat{\omega}^{0.5}, \quad z_0 \in B_{c_z}(z_*), \quad h(X_0) > C_\rho \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon^5|.$$

Denote by $X(\lambda)$ the solution of the perturbed system with this initial data. Then this solution crosses the hypersurface

$$I = \hat{I}(z) - D_p' \alpha(z) \hat{\omega}^{0.5}$$

at some time $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ with

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \leq CD_p' \alpha(z_0) \hat{\omega}^{0.5} + 2\pi s_1 \varepsilon.$$

This lemma is proved in Section 12.1.

The next lemma covers crossing middle resonant zones of low-numerator resonances.

Lemma 8.9. *Given $z_* \in Z_B$, for any $C_{s_1}, D_{p,0}, \Lambda > 1$ there exist*

$$D_p > D_{p,0}, C_\rho, C > 1$$

such that for any small enough $c_z, \omega_0, \varepsilon > 0$ for any $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1 \in (0, \omega_0)$ with $s_1 < C_{s_1} \ln^2 \varepsilon$ we have the following. Set

$$\alpha_* = \max_{B_{c_z}(z_*)} \alpha(z).$$

Then there exists a set $\mathcal{E}_s \subset \mathcal{A}_3$ with

$$m(\mathcal{E}_s) \leq C_{s_1} \hat{\omega}^{-1} \alpha_*$$

such that the following holds.

Take some initial condition $X_{init} = (p_{init}, q_{init}, z_{init}, \lambda_{init}) \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}_s$. Let $X(\lambda)$ be the solution of the perturbed system with this initial data. Suppose that this solution crosses the hypersurface

$$I = \hat{I}(z) + D_p \alpha(z) \hat{\omega}^{0.5}$$

at some time $\lambda_0 > \lambda_{init}$ with $\varepsilon(\lambda_0 - \lambda_{init}) \leq \Lambda$, $z(\lambda_0) \in B_{c_z}(z_)$ and $h(\lambda_0) > C_\rho \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon^5|$. Then this solution crosses the hypersurface*

$$I = \hat{I}(z) - D_p \alpha(z) \hat{\omega}^{0.5}$$

at some time $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ with

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \leq C \alpha(z_0) |\ln \varepsilon| \hat{\omega}^{0.5} \leq C \alpha_* |\ln \varepsilon| \hat{\omega}^{0.5}.$$

This lemma is proved in Section 12.5.

Remark 8.10. *Resonances near separatrices have smaller effect on the dynamics. Namely, exceptional set in Lemma 8.9 has measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon h_*})$ (up to some power of $\ln h_*$), where $h_* = \min_{B_{c_z}(z_*)} \hat{h}(z)$. Time spent in resonant zone (i.e. between two hypersurfaces with given I) in Lemma 8.9 and Lemma 8.8 is $O(\sqrt{h_*/\varepsilon})$ (up to some power of $\ln h_*$). The change of slow variables h and z while inside resonant zone is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon h_*})$ (up to some power of $\ln h_*$).*

Proof. The first two estimates (on measure of exceptional set and time spent in resonant zones) follow from $\alpha \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon h \ln^3 h}$ and Lemmas 8.8 and 8.9. The estimate on the change of slow variables follows from the estimate on time spent in resonant zones, as the rate of change of slow variables is $O(\varepsilon)$. \square

9 Proof of the lemma on approaching separatrices

9.1 Picking constants and excluded set \mathcal{E}

Considerations for non-resonant zones give us C_{s_1} and some bound from below K_Z on C_Z . Lemma 8.9 gives us the value of S_2 . Lemma 8.7 (with $K = K_Z$ and S_2 fixed above) gives us $D_{p,0}$. Apply Lemma 8.9 (with this $D_{p,0}$) to get D_p . Plug $K_1 = D_p$ in Lemma 8.7 to get $C'_Z > C_Z > K_Z$ and $D'_p(s, z) \leq D_p$ (and $D'_p(s, z) = D_p$ if s is a low-numerator resonance). Now resonant (inner, outer, middle) zones and non-resonant zones (zones between inner resonant zones) are defined. Pick c_z, ω_0 so that lemmas 8.6, 8.8 and 8.9 hold with this ω_0 and with c_z in these lemmas equal to $2c_z$. Pick $\Lambda > 0$ so that any solution of the averaged system under consideration starting with $\lambda = \lambda_0$ crosses $h = -c_h$ after time less than $\varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda$. Let \mathcal{E}_1 be the union of excluded sets \mathcal{E}_s for all low-numerator resonances provided by Lemma 8.9 and \mathcal{E}_2 be the union of all middle resonant zones of all low-numerator resonances. Define the excluded set \mathcal{E} by $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2$.

9.2 Passing resonant and non-resonant zones

Consider solutions $X(\lambda)$ of (3.2) and $\bar{X}(\lambda)$ of (3.3) as in the statement of Lemma 6.4 (then $X(\lambda_{init}) \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}$). Denote

$$w(\lambda) = (I(h(\lambda), z(\lambda)), z(\lambda)) = w(X(\lambda)), \quad \bar{w}(\lambda) = (I(\bar{h}(\lambda), \bar{z}(\lambda)), \bar{z}(\lambda)) = w(\bar{X}(\lambda)).$$

In this subsection we introduce the quantities d_r and $d_{r,r+1}$ that measure how much w and \bar{w} can deviate from each other when $w(\lambda)$ passes through Z_r^m and $Z_{r,r+1}$, respectively. Denote

$$h_*(s) = \max_{z \in B_{2c_z}(z_*)} h_s(z), \quad \alpha_*(s) = \max_{z \in B_{2c_z}(z_*)} \alpha_s(z).$$

For resonant zones, Lemma 8.9 and Lemma 8.8 provide estimates for the time of resonant crossing, let us now estimate how much w can deviate from \bar{w} using that \dot{w} and $\dot{\bar{w}}$ are bounded.

Lemma 9.1. *For some $C_{res} > 1$ the following holds. Suppose that $X_{init} \in \mathcal{A}_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}$ and at some time λ_0 with*

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_0 - \lambda_{init}) \leq \Lambda, \quad z(\lambda_0) \in B_{2c_z}(z_*), \quad \omega(\lambda_0) \leq \omega_0$$

$w(\lambda)$ reaches the border of $Z^m(s)$ given by $I = \hat{I}(z) + D'_p(s, z)\alpha(z)$. We assume $s_1 < C_{s_1} \ln^2 \varepsilon$.

Then $w(\lambda)$ exits $Z^m(s)$ at some time $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ via the other border $I = \hat{I}(z) - D'_p(s, z)\alpha(z)$ and we have the estimate

$$\|w(\lambda_1) - \bar{w}(\lambda_1)\| \leq \|w(\lambda_0) - \bar{w}(\lambda_0)\| + d(s),$$

where

$$d(s) = C_{res}\alpha_*(s)|\ln \varepsilon|\sqrt{s_1/s_2} \quad \text{for low-numerator resonances} \quad (9.1)$$

and

$$d(s) = C_{res}\sqrt{b_s}\alpha_*(s)\sqrt{s_1/s_2} + C_{res}\varepsilon|\ln^5 \varepsilon| \quad \text{for high-numerator resonances.}$$

Proof. Low-numerator resonances. By Lemma 8.9 such λ_1 exists and

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \lesssim \alpha_*(s)|\ln \varepsilon|\sqrt{s_2/s_1}.$$

As \dot{w} and $\dot{\bar{w}}$ are bounded by $O(\varepsilon\hat{\omega}^{-1}) = O(\varepsilon s_1/s_2)$ (we use Lemma 7.1 to estimate the rate of change of w), this gives the estimate (9.1).

High-numerator resonances. We argue in the same way as for low-numerator resonances, but apply Lemma 8.8 instead. We have (we use the formula for $D'_p(s, z)$ from Lemma 8.7 and the estimates $\alpha(z_0) \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon\hat{h}(z_0)\ln^3 \hat{h}(z_0)}$ and $s_1 \lesssim \ln^2 \varepsilon$)

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \lesssim D'_p(s, z_0)\alpha(z(\lambda_0))\hat{\omega}^{0.5} + \varepsilon s_1 \lesssim \sqrt{b\hat{\omega}}\alpha_* + \varepsilon|\ln^5 \varepsilon|.$$

□

We will use the notation $d_r = d(s_r)$ for shorthand.

Passing non-resonant zones is described by Lemma 8.6. Denote by

$$d_{r,r+1} = C_{nonres}\sqrt{\varepsilon h_*(s_r)}|\ln h_*(s_r)|(\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}}) + C_{nonres}\varepsilon|\ln^{\gamma_1} \varepsilon|.$$

Here we pick large enough C_{nonres} so that the last term in (8.7) is bounded by $d_{r,r+1}$ (as long as $z(w(\lambda))$ stays in $B_{2c_z}(z_*)$). This is possible, as for fixed z by Lemma 8.3 the values of h in $Z_{r,r+1}$ are close to each other, so we have in the last term of (8.7) $h \sim \hat{h}_{s_r}(z) \lesssim h_*(s_r)$.

9.3 Estimating sums over resonant vectors s

Lemma 9.2. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c, d > 0$ we have (sums are taken for all $s = (s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s: s_2 \leq S_2} h_*(s)^c s_1^a &\lesssim 1, & \sum_s h_*(s)^c b_s^d s_1^a s_2^b &\lesssim 1, \\ \sum_{s: s_2 \leq S_2} \alpha_*(s) s_1^a &\lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}, & \sum_s b_s^d \alpha_*(s) s_1^a s_2^b &\lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The period T depends on h and z : $T = -a(h, z) \ln h + b(h, z)$ by Lemma 7.2. From this we have

$$\ln h = -a^{-1}(T - b), \quad \ln \hat{h}_s(z) = -a^{-1}(2\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1} - b).$$

Thus for some $c_1 > 0$ we have

$$h_*(s) \lesssim e^{-c_1\hat{\omega}^{-1}}. \quad (9.2)$$

If $s_2 \leq S_2$, we also have

$$h_*(s) \lesssim e^{-c_2 s_1},$$

where $c_2 = c_1/S_2$. This implies the upper left estimate.

As for any f we have

$$h_*(s)^{c/2} (s_1/s_2)^f \sim h_*(s)^{c/2} |\ln^f h_*(s)| \lesssim 1, \quad b_s^{d/2} s_2^f = e^{-dC_F s_2/2} s_2^f \lesssim 1,$$

the upper right estimate follows from

$$\sum_s h_*(s)^{c/2} b_s^{d/2} = O(1). \quad (9.3)$$

Let us now prove this estimate. Recall the notation $|s| = s_1 + s_2$. Either $\hat{\omega}^{-1} = s_1/s_2 \gtrsim \sqrt{|s|}$ or $s_2 \gtrsim \sqrt{|s|}$. But h decreases exponentially with the growth of $\hat{\omega}^{-1}$ by (9.2) and b_s decreases exponentially with the growth of s_2 . Therefore, we have $h_*(s)^{c/2} b_s^{d/2} = O(e^{-c_3\sqrt{|s|}})$ for some c_3 , which implies the required estimate (9.3).

Finally, the lower estimates follow from the upper estimates if we take into account

$$\alpha \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon h_*(s) \ln^3 h_*(s)} \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon h_*(s) s_1^3 s_2^{-3}}.$$

□

By Lemma 9.2 we have $m(\mathcal{E}_1) \leq \sum m(\mathcal{E}_s) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. As the width of low-numerator resonant zones in h is $\sim \sqrt{\varepsilon h_s}$, the width in I is $\sim \sqrt{\varepsilon h_s s_1/s_2}$ and thus $m(Z^m(s)) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon h_s s_1})$. By Lemma 9.2 we have $m(\mathcal{E}_2) \leq \sum m(Z^m(s)) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. This implies

$$m(\mathcal{E}) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}).$$

Lemma 9.3.

$$\sum_r d_r \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

Proof. The sum over low-numerator resonances is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|)$ by the bottom left estimate of Lemma 9.2. The sum of the terms $C_{res} \sqrt{b_s} \alpha_*(s) \sqrt{s_1/s_2}$ over high-numerator resonances is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ by the bottom right estimate of Lemma 9.2. Finally, as the number of resonances is bounded by some power of $\ln \varepsilon$, the sum of the terms $C_{res} \varepsilon |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$ is also $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. □

Lemma 9.4.

$$\sum_r d_{r,r+1} = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. Firstly, the sum of the terms $\varepsilon |\ln^{\gamma_1} \varepsilon|$ is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, as the total number of resonances is bounded by some power of $\ln \varepsilon$. Secondly, we have $h_*(r+1) \sim h_*(r)$ by Lemma 8.3, thus it is enough to prove

$$\sum_r \sqrt{h_*(r)} |\ln h_*(r)| \sqrt{b_{s_r}} = O(1).$$

This estimate follows from Lemma 9.2, as $|\ln h_*(r)| \sim (s_1/s_2)|_{s=s_r}$. □

9.4 End of the proof

Lemma 9.5. *For any large enough $C > 0$ there is λ_f such that $h(\lambda_f) = C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. For all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_f]$ we have $h(\lambda) \geq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and*

$$\|w(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\| < O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|).$$

Proof. Set λ_f equal to the first moment such that $h(\lambda_f) = C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ or $|h(\lambda_f) - \bar{h}(\lambda_f)| > 0.5C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ or $\|z - z_*\| = 2c_z$ or $\|w(\lambda_f) - w(h=0, z_*)\| = k$ or $\lambda_f = \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda$. For $\lambda < \lambda_f$ we can apply the last part of Lemma 8.6 and we have $\bar{h} \sim h$.

Consider the trajectory $w(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \leq \lambda_f$. We will apply Lemma 9.1 to cover the moments from the time $w(\lambda)$ first enters Z_r^m until $w(\lambda)$ reaches the border of Z_r^m (with $\omega < \hat{\omega}(s_r)$). We will apply Lemma 8.6 from this moment until $w(\lambda)$ first reaches Z_r^{m+1} . Let us renumerate the resonances in such a way that the point $w(\lambda_0)$ is either in non-resonant zone Z_{12} or in high-numerator middle resonant zone Z_1^m (it is not in low-numerator resonant zone, as low-numerator resonant zones lie in \mathcal{E}). In the latter case, by Lemma 9.1 this solution enters the non-resonant zone Z_{12} and the difference between $w(\lambda)$ and $\bar{w}(\lambda)$ accumulated is $\leq d_1$. Thus we can assume that $w(\lambda)$ starts in Z_{12} at $t = 0$ with

$$\delta_1 = \|w - \bar{w}\| \leq d_1 + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|).$$

Then $w(\lambda)$ passes Z_{12} and approaches the second resonance zone Z_2^m , on entering this zone by Lemma 8.6 we have

$$\|w - \bar{w}\| \leq \delta_1 e^{C_6(\xi_1 - \xi_2)} + d_{1,2}.$$

On leaving Z_2^m into $Z_{2,3}$ we have

$$\delta_2 = \|w - \bar{w}\| \leq \delta_1 e^{C_6(\xi_1 - \xi_2)} + d_{1,2} + d_2.$$

After passing $Z_{2,3}$ and Z_3^m , on exit from Z_3^m we have

$$\delta_3 = \|w - \bar{w}\| \leq \delta_1 e^{C_6(\xi_1 - \xi_3)} + (d_{1,2} + d_2) e^{C_6(\xi_2 - \xi_3)} + d_{2,3} + d_3.$$

Continuing like this, we get the estimate

$$\delta_k \leq (O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|) + d_1 + d_{1,2} + d_2 + \dots + d_{k-1, d_k} + d_k) \times e^{C_6(\xi_1 - \xi_k)}. \quad (9.4)$$

As we have $\xi_i = O(1)$, by Lemma 9.3 and Lemma 9.4 this gives us

$$\delta_k \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

This implies that we cannot have $\|z(\lambda_f) - z_*\| = 2c_z$, as $\|z(\lambda_0) - z_*\| \leq c_z$. Similarly, we see that $\|w(\lambda_f) - w(h=0, z_*)\| \neq k$, as near separatrices the solution of averaged system is close to $w(h=0, z_*)$. From (9.4) and $\|\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}\| = O(\ln^{-1} h)$ (this is proved in Lemma 7.1) we have

$$|h(\lambda) - \bar{h}(\lambda)| \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon| |\ln^{-1} h(\lambda)|.$$

This means that for large enough C we cannot have $|h(\lambda_f) - \bar{h}(\lambda_f)| = 0.5C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. This also means $\bar{h}(\lambda_f) > 0$, thus we cannot have $\lambda_f = \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda$. This leaves just one possibility: $h(\lambda_f) = C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. \square

Remark 9.6. *By Lemma 7.1 we have $\|\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}\| = O(\ln^{-1} h)$. Taking this into account, in Lemma 9.5 we have*

$$|h(\lambda_f) - \bar{h}(\lambda_f)| = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \quad \|z(\lambda_f) - \bar{z}(\lambda_f)\| = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|).$$

Lemma 9.7. *Assume that for some λ_f we have*

$$h(\lambda_f) = C\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad \|h(\lambda) - \bar{h}(\lambda)\| = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \quad \|z(\lambda) - \bar{z}(\lambda)\| = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|).$$

Then there is $\lambda_\Pi > \lambda_f$ with $h(w(\lambda_\Pi)) = 2\varepsilon \ln^\gamma \varepsilon$ such that for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_f, \lambda_\Pi]$

$$|h(\lambda) - \bar{h}(\lambda)| < O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}), \quad \|z(\lambda) - \bar{z}(\lambda)\| < O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|).$$

Proof. Denote $v = (h, z)$, $v(\lambda) = v(w(\lambda))$ and $\bar{v}(\lambda) = v(\bar{w}(\lambda))$. Set $\lambda_\Pi > \lambda_f$ be the first moment such that $v(\lambda_\Pi) \in \partial\Pi$ or $\|z(\lambda_\Pi) - z_*\| = 2c_z$ or $\|w(\lambda_\Pi) - w(h=0, z_*)\| = k$ or $\lambda_\Pi = \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda$. Consider $v(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in [\lambda_f, \lambda_\Pi]$.

The solution $v(\lambda)$ subsequently passes non-resonant and resonant zones, and the behaviour in these zones is described by Lemma 8.6 and Lemma 9.1, respectively. The total time λ_{tot} between λ_f and λ_Π is split into the time λ_{res} spent in resonant zones and the time λ_{nonres} spent in non-resonant zones. By Lemma 9.3 we have $\varepsilon \lambda_{res} \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|$. By Lemma 8.6 we have $\varepsilon \lambda_{nonres} \lesssim h_{max} \ln^2 \varepsilon$, where h_{max} is the maximum value of $h(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in [\lambda_f, \lambda_\Pi]$. Indeed, in our domain we have $\ln h \sim \ln \varepsilon$ and the sum of all terms $\xi_r - \xi_{r+1}$ is $O(\ln^{-1} \varepsilon)$. As $h_{max} \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\varepsilon \lambda_{tot} \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} \ln^2 \varepsilon.$$

As $\|\dot{v}\|, \|\ddot{v}\| \lesssim \varepsilon$, for $t \in [\lambda_f, \lambda_\Pi]$ all the values of $v(\lambda)$ and $\bar{v}(\lambda)$ differ from each other for different λ by at most $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} \ln^2 \varepsilon)$. Thus we cannot have

$$\|z(\lambda_\Pi) - z_*\| = 2c_z \text{ or } \|w(\lambda_\Pi) - w(h=0, z_*)\| = k \text{ or } \lambda_\Pi = \lambda_{init} + \varepsilon^{-1} \Lambda$$

(in the last case we would have $\bar{h}(\lambda_\Pi) = -c_h$ and this is impossible). The remaining possibility is $h(\lambda_\Pi) = 2\varepsilon \ln^\gamma \varepsilon$.

The estimate on the change of $z(\lambda)$ allows us to show that $h(\lambda)$ decreases exponentially with the growth of $T(v(\lambda))$. The period T depends on h and z : $T = -a(h, z) \ln h + b(h, z)$ by Lemma 7.2. From this we have

$$\ln h = -a^{-1}(T - b).$$

As h and z change by at most $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^2 \varepsilon|)$, for some constants a_0, b_0 we have

$$a(h, z) = a_0 + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^2 \varepsilon|), \quad b(h, z) = b_0 + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^2 \varepsilon|),$$

so

$$h = (1 + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^3 \varepsilon|)) e^{-a_0^{-1}(T - b_0)}.$$

Now we can get a better estimate for λ_{nonres} . Denote $\omega_r = \hat{\omega}(s_r)$, $T_r = 2\pi/\omega_r$, let h_r be the value of h when entering $Z_{r, r+1}$. By Lemma 8.6 we have

$$\varepsilon \lambda_{nonres} \lesssim \sum_{r > r_0} (\omega_r - \omega_{r+1}) h_r \ln^3 h_r = (2\pi^{-1}) \sum_{r > r_0} \omega_r \omega_{r+1} (T_{r+1} - T_r) h_r \ln^3 h_r \sim \sum_{r > r_0} h_r \ln h_r (T_{r+1} - T_r).$$

It is easy to see that $T_{r+1} - T_r$ are bounded, e.g. we can take resonances $\omega = 1/n$, then $T = 2\pi n$ (up to $T = 2\pi N \sim \ln^2 \varepsilon$). As $h(T)$ decreases exponentially, we have $\varepsilon \lambda_{nonres} \lesssim h_{r_0+1} |\ln h_{r_0+1}| \lesssim h_{max} |\ln \varepsilon| \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|$. So we have

$$\varepsilon \lambda_{tot} \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

We have $\dot{\bar{h}} \lesssim \varepsilon |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|$. Similarly, for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [\lambda_f, \lambda_\Pi]$ we have

$$\int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \dot{h} d\lambda \lesssim (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \varepsilon |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon| + O(\varepsilon),$$

as the integral of \dot{h} during one period is $O(\varepsilon)$ and $T \sim |\ln \varepsilon|$. Hence,

$$|\bar{h}(\lambda) - h(\lambda)| < |\bar{h}(\lambda_f) - h(\lambda_f)| + O(\varepsilon |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|) \lambda_{tot} + O(\varepsilon) \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}).$$

As $\dot{z}, \ddot{z} = O(\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\|\bar{z}(\lambda) - z(\lambda)\| < \|\bar{z}(\lambda_f) - z(\lambda_f)\| + O(\varepsilon) \lambda_{tot} \leq O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|).$$

□

Together Lemma 9.5 and Lemma 9.7 imply Lemma 6.4.

10 Crossing non-resonant zone: proof

This section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 8.6. Let us define the function

$$u(w, \varphi, \lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq N, m \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \frac{f_m e^{i(m_1 \varphi + m_2 \lambda)}}{i(m_1 \omega(w) + m_2)}.$$

Given w , let $\xi_r = \frac{s_2}{s_1}$ be the nearest resonance to $\omega(w)$. Let us also denote $\Delta = |\omega(w) - \xi_r|$.

Lemma 10.1. *Denote*

$$a_s(w) = \exp\left(-C_F s_2 - C_F \frac{s_1}{T(w)}\right), \quad b_s = \exp(-C_F s_2), \quad 0 < a_s < b_s < 1.$$

Then inside Π we have (provided that s_2/s_1 is the nearest resonance to $\omega(w)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\| &\lesssim a_s s_1^{-1} \Delta^{-1} + \ln^2 \varepsilon, \\ \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \lambda} \right\| &\lesssim a_s s_2 s_1^{-1} \Delta^{-1} + \ln^2 \varepsilon, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} \right\| \lesssim a_s \Delta^{-1} + |\ln^3 \varepsilon|, \\ \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial h} \right\| &\lesssim b_s s_1^{-1} h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h \Delta^{-1} (\Delta^{-1} + |\ln h|) + h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h \ln^4 \varepsilon, \\ \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \right\| &\lesssim b_s s_1^{-1} |\ln^{-1} h| \Delta^{-1} (\Delta^{-1} + |\ln h|) + \ln^4 \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This lemma is proved in Appendix C.

Take small $\tilde{k} > k$ (here k is from Section 8.2) and denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{3,*} \subset \mathcal{B}_3$ the set of points (h, z) that satisfy $\|w(h, z) - w(h=0, z_*)\| < \tilde{k}$. The value of \tilde{k} is picked so that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{3,*}$ is far from $\partial \mathcal{B}$. Let us consider the sets

$$\tilde{\Pi} = \{(h, z) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{3,*} : h \geq \varepsilon |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|\}, \quad \partial \tilde{\Pi} = \{(h, z) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{3,*} : h = \varepsilon |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|\}.$$

where $\gamma > 2$ is the same as in (8.2). We have $\Pi \subset \tilde{\Pi}$. The (large enough) constant $C_{\tilde{Z}} \in (0, C_Z)$ will be chosen later in Lemma 10.5. For each resonance $\xi_r = s_2/s_1$ define the zone \tilde{Z}_r by the condition

$$\tilde{Z}_r = \left\{ (\tilde{h}, \tilde{z}) \in \tilde{\Pi} : |\omega(\tilde{h}, \tilde{z}) - \xi_r| \leq C_{\tilde{Z}} \delta_s(\tilde{z}) \right\}.$$

Denote by $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ the zone between two neighboring zones \tilde{Z}_r and \tilde{Z}_{r+1} , $\xi_r > \xi_{r+1}$. We have $Z_{r,r+1} \subset \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$. As the zones \tilde{Z} differ from Z only in the values of constants, the properties of the zones Z discussed in Section 8.2 also hold for the zones \tilde{Z} for large enough $C_{\tilde{Z}}$. Let us also note that in $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ for s corresponding to the nearest resonance (ξ_r or ξ_{r+1}) we have (recall that by Lemma 8.3 we have $\hat{h}_{\xi_r}, \hat{h}_{\xi_{r+1}} \in [0.9h, 1.1h]$)

$$\Delta^{-1} \leq 2C_{\tilde{Z}}^{-1} \sqrt{h \ln^4 h / (\varepsilon b_s)}, \quad \Delta^{-1} \leq 2C_{\tilde{Z}}^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} h \ln^{-3} h \ln^{-2} \varepsilon. \quad (10.1)$$

Lemma 10.2. *There is $C_u > 0$ such that for large enough $C_{\tilde{Z}}$ the following estimates hold in $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ for all r (with s corresponding to the nearest to $\omega(w)$ resonance)*

- $\|\varepsilon u\| < C_u C_{\tilde{Z}}^{-1} \sqrt{b_s \varepsilon h \ln^2 h} + C_u \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon < \min(0.1h, |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|)$,
- $\left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial w} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \lambda} \right\| \leq 0.1 \varepsilon^{-1}$.

Moreover, the coordinate change

$$U : \tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda \mapsto \tilde{w} + \varepsilon u(\tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda), \varphi, \lambda \quad (10.2)$$

is invertible in $(\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}) \times [0, 2\pi]^2$.

Proof. First, let us prove that inside $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ we have (for s corresponding to ξ_r or ξ_{r+1})

$$s_1^{-1} = O(\ln^{-1} h). \quad (10.3)$$

By (8.5) we have $\xi_r, \xi_{r+1} \sim -\ln^{-1} h$, so $s_1^{-1} = s_2^{-1} \xi_{r_1} = O(\ln^{-1} h)$, where $r_1 = r$ or $r_1 = r+1$.

The estimates on u and its derivatives follow from Lemma 10.1 and from (10.1), (10.3) and (8.3). To estimate the I -derivative, we use $\frac{\partial u}{\partial I} = \omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial h}$.

Denote $Y = (\tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda)$. From the estimates on the derivatives of u we have $\varepsilon \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial Y} \right\| < 0.5$, so the coordinate change U is invertible. \square

Lemma 10.3. *Take some $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$, φ, λ . Set $w = \tilde{w} + \varepsilon u(\tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda)$. Let $h = h(w)$, $\tilde{h} = h(\tilde{w})$. Then we have $\|h - \tilde{h}\| < \min(0.25\tilde{h}, |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|)$.*

Proof. For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ let us denote $w_\alpha = \tilde{w} + \alpha \varepsilon u(\tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda)$, $h_\alpha = h(w_\alpha)$. Take largest possible α' such that we have $|h_\alpha - \tilde{h}| \leq 0.25\tilde{h}$ for all $\alpha \leq \alpha'$. We have $h_{\alpha'} - \tilde{h} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial w} \Big|_\xi \alpha' u$ with some $\xi \in [\tilde{w}, \tilde{w} + \alpha' u]$. As we have $h \in [0.75\tilde{h}, 1.25\tilde{h}]$ in $[\tilde{w}, \tilde{w} + \alpha' u]$, Lemma 7.1 gives $|h_{\alpha'} - \tilde{h}| = O(\ln^{-1} h) u < O(\ln^{-1} \tilde{h}) \min(0.1\tilde{h}, |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|)$ close enough to the separatrices by Lemma 10.2. Thus we actually have $\alpha' = 1$ and the estimate for $h_{\alpha'}$ gives $|h(w) - \tilde{h}| < \min(0.25\tilde{h}, |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|)$. \square

Recall that the zones Z_r depend on the constant C_Z .

Lemma 10.4. *Given $C_{\tilde{Z}}$, there is $C_{Z,0} > 0$ such that for any $C_Z > C_{Z,0}$ for all sufficiently small ε and we have the following. Take the map U defined by (10.2). Then for all r*

$$Z_{r,r+1} \times [0, 2\pi]^2 \subset U(\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1} \times [0, 2\pi]^2).$$

Proof. For $w_0 \in \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ denote $h_0 = h(w_0)$. Set

$$R(w_0) = \varepsilon \max_{\varphi, \lambda} \|u(w_0, \varphi, \lambda)\|, \quad B(w_0) = \{w \in \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1} : \|w - w_0\| \leq R(w_0)\}.$$

Let us note that by Lemma 10.2 we have

$$\sup_{w_0 \in \cup_r \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}} R(w_0) \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

By Lemma 10.3 we also have

$$|h(w) - h_0| \leq 0.25h_0 \quad \text{for } w \in B(w_0). \quad (10.4)$$

As we have $Z_{r,r+1} \subset \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ (due to $C_Z > C_{\tilde{Z}}$), it is enough to prove that for any $w_0 \in \partial \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ the ball $B(w_0)$ does not intersect $Z_{r,r+1}$.

First, we may have $w_0 \in \partial \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{3,*}$ with $\|w_0 - w(h=0, z_*)\| = \tilde{k}$. Then for $w \in B(w_0)$ we have $\|w - w(h=0, z_*)\| = \tilde{k} + o(1) > k$ for small ε , thus the ball $B(w_0)$ does not intersect $\mathcal{B}_{3,*} \supset Z_{r,r+1}$.

Second, we may have $w_0 \in \partial \tilde{\Pi}$ with $h_0 = \varepsilon |\ln^7 \varepsilon|$. By (10.4), for any $(h, z) \in B(w_0)$ we have $h \leq 1.5\varepsilon |\ln^7 \varepsilon|$, so $B(w_0)$ does not intersect $\Pi \supset Z_{r,r+1}$.

Finally, we may have $|\omega(w_0) - \xi_r| = C_{\tilde{Z}} \hat{\delta}_{\xi_r}(z_0)$ (or the same for $r+1$ instead of r , this case is treated in the same way). We will write δ instead of δ_{ξ_r} for brevity. By (10.4) we have $h \in [0.25h_0, 1.25h_0]$ in $B(w_0)$. By Lemma 8.3 this implies $h(z(w)) \in [0.5h_0, 1.5h_0]$ in $B(w_0)$. So in \lesssim -estimates below we will write h for both $h(w)$ and $h(z(w))$ for $w \in B(w_0)$. This also means $\delta(z) \in [0.5\delta(z_0), 2\delta(z_0)]$ in $B(w_0)$.

Denote $\Delta\omega = |\omega(w) - \omega(w_0)|$. It is enough to prove that there is a constant $c_1 > 0$ (that does not depend on r or w_0) such that $\Delta\omega < c_1\delta(z_0)$, then we can take $C_{Z,0} = 2(c_1 + C_{\tilde{Z}})$ and have

$$|\omega - \xi_r| < (c_1 + C_{\tilde{Z}})\delta(z_0) < 2(c_1 + C_{\tilde{Z}})\delta(z) < C_Z\delta(z)$$

in $B(w_0)$. Hence, $B(w_0)$ does not intersect $Z_{r,r+1}$.

We have $\Delta\omega \leq \left\| \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial w}(w_{int}) \right\| R(w_0)$ for some $w_{int} \in [w_0, w]$. We have $\left\| \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial w} \right\| \lesssim h_0^{-1} \ln^{-3} h_0$. We will use that

$$R(w_0) \lesssim \varepsilon b_s s_1^{-1} \delta^{-1}(w_0) + \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon$$

by Lemma 10.1. Hence we obtain using (10.3)

$$\|\Delta\omega\| \lesssim \varepsilon b_s h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h \delta^{-1}(w_0) + \varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h \ln^2 \varepsilon.$$

We have $\varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h \ln^2 \varepsilon \lesssim \delta(w_0)$. We also have

$$\varepsilon b_s h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h \delta^{-1}(w_0) \lesssim \delta(w_0),$$

as $\delta(w_0) \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon b_s h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h}$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 10.5. *For some $C_\beta > 0$ and for large enough value of the constant $C_{\tilde{Z}}$ defined above the following holds. Inside $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ the change of variables $w = \tilde{w} + \varepsilon u(w, \varphi, \lambda)$ takes the perturbed system (7.2) to the form*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{w}} &= \varepsilon f_0(\tilde{w}) + \varepsilon^2 \beta, \\ \dot{\varphi} &= \omega(\tilde{w} + \varepsilon u) + \varepsilon g(\tilde{w} + \varepsilon u, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\lambda} &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (10.5)$$

where β is a smooth function of $\tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda$ that depends on ε and

$$\|\beta\| = O(b_s \Delta^{-2} h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h) + O(b_s \Delta^{-1} h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h \ln^3 \varepsilon) + O(h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h \ln^5 \varepsilon) \quad (10.6)$$

(here s corresponds to the nearest to $\omega(\tilde{w})$ resonance). Moreover, for small enough ε we have

$$\varepsilon^2 \|\beta\| \leq C_\beta C_{\tilde{Z}}^{-2} \varepsilon \quad (10.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
-1.5\varepsilon K_h |\ln^{-1} h| &< \frac{dh(\tilde{w})}{d\lambda} < -0.5\varepsilon K_h |\ln^{-1} h|, \\
-1.5\varepsilon K_\omega h^{-1} |\ln^{-3} h| &< \frac{d\omega(\tilde{w})}{d\lambda} < -0.5\varepsilon K_\omega h^{-1} |\ln^{-3} h|, \\
0.5 \left| \frac{d\omega(\tilde{w})}{d\lambda} \right| &> C_{\tilde{z}} \frac{d\delta_{s_r}(z(\tilde{w}))}{d\lambda},
\end{aligned} \tag{10.8}$$

where $\frac{d\tilde{w}}{d\lambda}$ is given by (10.5).

Proof. From [4, Proof of Lemma 7.3] we have

$$\varepsilon\beta = \left((E + \varepsilon \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tilde{w}})^{-1} - E \right) (f_0(\tilde{z}) + \varepsilon\beta_1) + \varepsilon\beta_1$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon\beta_1 &= [f(w, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon) - f(w, \varphi, \lambda, 0)] + [f(\tilde{w} + \varepsilon u, \varphi, \lambda, 0) - f(\tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda, 0)] \\
&\quad + R_N f - \varepsilon \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} f_\varphi - \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} [\omega(\tilde{w} + \varepsilon u) - \omega(\tilde{w})].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that as $w \in \Pi$ we have $|\ln h| < |\ln \varepsilon|$. As ω is bounded, $1 \lesssim \Delta^{-1} \lesssim \Delta^{-2}$. For a vector function $g(w) = (g_1(w), \dots, g_n(w))$ denote $(\frac{\partial g}{\partial w})_{int} = (\frac{\partial g_1}{\partial w}(\eta_1), \dots, \frac{\partial g_n}{\partial w}(\eta_n))$, where $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in [w, w + \varepsilon u]$ are some intermediate points. By Lemma 10.3 the values of h for the points η_i are in $[0.5h(w), 2h(w)]$. We have the following estimates (using the estimates from Lemma 10.1, Lemma 8.2, (7.8) and (10.3)).

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{-1} \|f(w, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon) - f(w, \varphi, \lambda, 0)\| &= O(\ln h), \\
\varepsilon^{-1} \|f(\tilde{w} + \varepsilon u, \varphi, \lambda, 0) - f(\tilde{w}, \varphi, \lambda, 0)\| &= \left\| \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial w} \right)_{int} u \right\| = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h) b_s \Delta^{-1} + O(h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h \ln^2 \varepsilon), \\
\varepsilon^{-1} \|R_N f\| &< 1, \\
\left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} f_\varphi \right\| &= O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h) b_s \Delta^{-1} + O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h \ln^3 \varepsilon), \\
\varepsilon^{-1} \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} [\omega(\tilde{w} + \varepsilon u) - \omega(\tilde{w})] \right\| &= \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} \left(\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial w} \right)_{int} u \right\| = \\
&= O(h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h) (b_s^2 \Delta^{-2} + b_s \Delta^{-1} |\ln^3 \varepsilon|) + O(h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h \ln^5 \varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives (we use $|\ln \varepsilon| \gtrsim |\ln h|$ to simplify the expression below)

$$\|\beta_1\| \leq O(h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h) b_s^2 \Delta^{-2} + O(h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h \ln^3 \varepsilon) b_s \Delta^{-1} + O(h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h \ln^5 \varepsilon).$$

As $\|\varepsilon \frac{\partial u}{\partial w}\| \leq 0.5$ and $\|f_{w,0}\| = O(1)$, we have the estimate

$$\|\beta\| \lesssim \|\beta_1\| + \|f_0\| \left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tilde{w}} \right\|$$

As we have the estimate

$$\left\| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tilde{w}} \right\| \lesssim b_s h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h (\Delta^{-2} + |\ln h| \Delta^{-1}) + h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h \ln^4 \varepsilon,$$

by Lemma 10.1 and (10.3) (we use $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tilde{w}} = \omega \frac{\partial u}{\partial h}$), this implies (10.6).

From (10.6) and (10.1) we have (10.7), the estimate for the second and third terms of (10.6) uses (8.3). Here we use that $\gamma > 2$ and so $|\ln \varepsilon|^{2-\gamma} < C_{\tilde{z}}^{-2}$ for small ε .

As $\frac{\partial h}{\partial w} = O(\ln^{-1} h)$ by Lemma 7.1, for large $C_{\tilde{z}}$ we have $\left\| \frac{\partial h}{\partial w} \right\| C_\beta C_{\tilde{z}}^{-2} < 0.5K_h |\ln^{-1} h|$. Then (10.7) and (3.5) imply the first part of (10.8). For some $c_1 > 0$ we have $\left\| \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial w} \right\| < c_1 h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{3,*}$. For large $C_{\tilde{z}}$ we have $C_\beta C_{\tilde{z}}^{-2} c_1 < 0.5K_\omega$. This (together with (10.7) and (7.4)) means that the second part of (10.8) also holds.

We have $\frac{\partial \hat{h}_{\varepsilon_r}}{\partial z} = O(h \ln h)$ by (7.6). This implies $\frac{\partial \delta_{s_r}}{\partial z} = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon/h} \ln^3 \varepsilon)$. As $\frac{dz}{d\lambda} = O(\varepsilon)$, this means $\frac{d\delta_{s_r}}{d\lambda} = O(\varepsilon^{3/2} h^{-1/2} \ln^3 \varepsilon)$. By the estimate on $\frac{d\omega}{d\lambda}$ this implies the last part of (10.8). \square

Lemma 10.6. *There is a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that the following holds. Assume that a solution $(\tilde{w}(\lambda), \varphi(\lambda), \lambda(\lambda))$ of (10.5) stays inside $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ for $\lambda \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$. Denote $\tilde{h}(\lambda) = h(\tilde{w}(\lambda))$. Then we have $\tilde{h}(\lambda_2) > c_1 \tilde{h}(\lambda_1)$.*

Proof. By (10.8) both h and ω decrease along our solution and $\frac{d\omega}{dh} \sim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h$. This gives $\frac{d}{dh}(\omega^{-1}) \sim h^{-1}$. Afterwards this lemma is proved like Lemma 8.3, but we integrate the derivative $\frac{d}{dh}(\omega^{-1})$ along our solution instead of the partial derivative for fixed z . \square

Let us say that a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is L -approximately convex ($L \geq 1$), if any two points $w_1, w_2 \in D$ can be connected by a piecewise linear path with length at most $L \|w_1 - w_2\|$ that lies in D . In such domain any vector-function $\psi(w)$ satisfies the estimate

$$\|\psi(w_1) - \psi(w_2)\| \leq L \max_D \left\| \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial w} \right\| \|w_1 - w_2\|.$$

We will need the following lemma. It is well-known for convex domains (with $L = 1$) and generalises straightforwardly for L -approximately convex domains, using the estimate above.

Lemma 10.7. *Consider two ODEs*

$$\dot{w}_1 = a(w_1), \quad \dot{w}_2 = a(w_2) + b(\lambda)$$

defined in some L -convex domain D . Consider two solutions $w_1(\lambda), w_2(\lambda)$ with

$$\|w_1(\lambda_0) - w_2(\lambda_0)\| < \delta$$

that exist and stay in D up to the moment T . Assume that in D we have the estimate $L \left\| \frac{\partial a}{\partial w} \right\| \leq A$. Then for any $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, T)$ we have the estimate

$$\|w_2(\lambda) - w_1(\lambda)\| \leq e^{A(\lambda - \lambda_0)} \left(\delta + \int_{\tau=\lambda_0}^{\lambda} \|b(\tau)\| d\tau \right).$$

Lemma 10.8. *There exists $L \geq 1$ such that for all $h_0 > 0$ the domain $\{w \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{3,*} : h(w) > h_0\}$ is L -approximately convex.*

Proof. Let us build a path connecting w_1 with w_2 . We assume $I(w_1) \leq I(w_2)$. Let I_{max} and I_{min} be the maximum and minimum of $I(h_0, z)$, where z lies in the segment connecting $z(w_1)$ and $z(w_2)$. If $I(w_1), I(w_2) > I_{max}$, we can connect w_1 and w_2 by a segment. Otherwise, we have $I(w_1) \leq I_{max}$. Then we connect by a segment w_1 with $(I_{max}, z(w_1))$, then $(I_{max}, z(w_1))$ with $(I_{max}, z(w_2))$ and, finally, $(I_{max}, z(w_2))$ with w_2 . The length of this path is bounded by $(I_{max} - I_{min}) + \|z_1 - z_2\| + (I(w_2) - I(w_1))$ if $I(w_2) > I_{max}$ and by $2(I_{max} - I_{min}) + \|z_1 - z_2\|$ otherwise.

Let us prove that for some L_0 we have

$$I_{max} - I_{min} \leq L_0 \|z_1 - z_2\|. \quad (10.9)$$

As $\frac{\partial I}{\partial h} = \omega^{-1}$, for any $z', z'' \in [z(w_1), z(w_2)]$ we have

$$|I(h_0, z') - I(h_0, z'')| \leq |I(0, z') - I(0, z'')| + \epsilon \lambda_0^{h_0} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \omega^{-1} \right\| \|z' - z''\| dh_1 \lesssim \|z' - z''\|.$$

This gives (10.9). So our domain is approximately convex with $L = 2L_0 + 2$. \square

Lemma 10.9. *There exist $C_6, \tilde{C}_t > 0$ and $\gamma_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the following statement holds. Assume that for some $\lambda_0 > 0$ and \tilde{w}_0 we have*

$$\tilde{w}_0 \in \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}.$$

a) *Then for any $\varphi_0 \in [0, 2\pi]$ there exists $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ such that the solution $\tilde{X}(\lambda)$ of (10.5) with $\tilde{X}(\lambda_0) = (\tilde{w}_0, \varphi_0, \lambda_0)$ is defined for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$. This solution satisfies $\tilde{w}(\lambda) \in \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$ and $\tilde{w}(\lambda_1)$ lies on the boundary of $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$: in $\partial \tilde{\Pi}$ or on the border with \tilde{Z}_{r+1} .*

b) *Denote $\tilde{h}(\lambda) = h(\tilde{w}(\lambda))$. Then*

$$\epsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \leq \tilde{C}_t (\xi_r - \xi_{r+1}) \tilde{h}(\lambda_1) |\ln^3 \tilde{h}(\lambda_1)|. \quad (10.10)$$

c) *Denote $\bar{h}(\lambda) = h(\bar{w}(\lambda))$. Assume that for some $\lambda_{01} \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$ we have*

$$\bar{h}(\lambda_{01}) > 0.25 \tilde{h}(\lambda_{01}), \quad \bar{h}(\lambda_0) < 3 \tilde{h}(\lambda_0). \quad (10.11)$$

Then for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_{01}]$ we have (we use the notation $h = h(\lambda_1)$ in the formula below)

$$\|\tilde{w}(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\| < e^{C_6(\xi_r - \xi_{r+1})} \|\tilde{w}(\lambda_0) - \bar{w}(\lambda_0)\| + O(\sqrt{\epsilon h} |\ln h|) (\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}}) + O(\epsilon |\ln^{\gamma_1} \epsilon|). \quad (10.12)$$

Proof. By (10.8) the value of $|\omega - \xi_r| - C_{\tilde{Z}_r} \delta_{s_r}$ increases with the time, so the solution $\tilde{w}(\lambda)$ does not cross the border of \tilde{Z}_r and $\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1}$. This proves the first statement of the lemma.

As ω decreases with the time, we can take ω as an independent variable. From (10.8) we have

$$\frac{d\lambda}{d\omega} \sim \epsilon^{-1} h \ln^3 h, \quad (10.13)$$

so

$$\lambda_1 - \lambda_0 = O(\epsilon^{-1} h \ln^3 h) (\omega(\lambda_0) - \omega(\lambda_1)).$$

As $\omega \in [\xi_{r+1}, \xi_r]$, this gives (10.10).

Let us now prove the estimate for $\|\tilde{w}(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\|$. Note that by Lemma 10.6 and (10.11) the values of $h(\lambda)$ for different $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_{01}]$ differ at most by a constant factor between themselves and also with $h(\bar{w}(\lambda))$. Thus we will simply write h in O -estimates (for definiteness, set $h = h(\lambda_1)$). Let us use Lemma 10.7 with $D = \{w \in G : h(w) > c_1 h\}$ for $c_1 > 0$ chosen to cover all the values of h discussed above. This domain is L -convex for L chosen in Lemma 10.8. We have $a = (\varepsilon f_{I,0}, \varepsilon f_{z,0})$. By Lemma 7.1 we have $L \left\| \frac{\partial a}{\partial w} \right\| \leq A \sim \varepsilon h^{-1} |\ln^{-3} h|$. By (10.10) for some $C_6 > 0$ we have

$$A(\lambda - \lambda_0) \leq C_6(\xi_r - \xi_{r+1}).$$

We have $b(\lambda) = \varepsilon^2 \beta$. For some γ_1 we get from (10.6) the following estimate for β

$$\|\beta\| = O(b_s \Delta^{-2} h^{-1} \ln^{-4} h) + O(h^{-1} |\ln^{\gamma_1 - 4} \varepsilon|)(b_s \Delta^{-1} + 1).$$

Denote $\omega_0 = \omega(\lambda_0)$, $\omega_1 = \omega(\lambda_1)$, we have $\omega_0 > \omega_1$. By (10.13) we have

$$\int_{\tau=\lambda_0}^{\lambda} \|b(\tau)\| d\tau \leq \int_{\tau=\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1} \|b(\tau)\| d\tau \lesssim \varepsilon h |\ln^3 h| \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_0} \|\beta\| d\omega.$$

We will use (10.1) in the estimates for the integrals below. Clearly,

$$\int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_0} b_s \Delta^{-2} d\omega \leq b_{s_r} \Delta^{-1}(\omega_0) + b_{s_{r+1}} \Delta^{-1}(\omega_1) = O(\sqrt{h |\ln^4 h| / \varepsilon})(\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}})$$

and

$$\int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_0} (b_s \Delta^{-1} + 1) d\omega \leq (|\ln \Delta(\omega_0)| + |\ln \Delta(\omega_1)|) + (\omega_0 - \omega_1) = O(\ln \varepsilon).$$

By the estimate on $\|\beta\|$ this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_0} \|\beta\| d\omega &= O(\varepsilon^{-1/2} h^{-1/2} |\ln^{-2} h|)(\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}}) + O(h^{-1} |\ln^{\gamma_1 - 3} \varepsilon|), \\ \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_0} |b(\tau)| d\tau &= O(\varepsilon^{1/2} h^{1/2} |\ln h|)(\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}}) + O(\varepsilon |\ln^{\gamma_1} \varepsilon|). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, in Lemma 10.7 we take $\delta = \|w(\lambda_0) - \bar{w}(\lambda_0)\|$. Then this lemma gives the estimate (10.12). \square

Proof of Lemma 8.6. Let us start with fixing the values of the constants $C_{\tilde{Z}}, K_Z$. Take $C_{\tilde{Z}}$ as needed by Lemma 10.5. Then pick K_Z so that Lemma 10.4 holds for all $C_{\tilde{Z}} > K_Z$.

Consider the coordinate change U given by (10.2). By Lemma 10.4 we have

$$Z_{r,r+1} \times [0, 2\pi]^2 \subset U(\tilde{Z}_{r,r+1} \times [0, 2\pi]^2).$$

Define $\tilde{w}(\lambda)$ by the formula

$$(\tilde{w}(\lambda), \varphi(\lambda), \lambda(\lambda)) = U^{-1}(w(\lambda), \varphi(\lambda), \lambda(\lambda)) \in \tilde{Z}_{r,r+1} \times [0, 2\pi]^2.$$

Set

$$h(\lambda) = h(w(\lambda)), \quad \tilde{h}(\lambda) = h(\tilde{w}(\lambda)), \quad \bar{h}(\lambda) = h(\bar{w}(\lambda)).$$

By Lemma 10.3 we have

$$h(\lambda) \in [0.5\tilde{h}(\lambda), 1.5\tilde{h}(\lambda)], \quad \tilde{h}(\lambda) \in [(2/3)h(\lambda), 2h(\lambda)]. \quad (10.14)$$

Let us apply Lemma 10.9, this lemma gives some moment λ_1 that we denote by $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ to avoid the conflict with λ_1 from the current lemma. From Lemma 10.4 and the continuity of $w(\lambda)$ if $\tilde{w}(\tilde{\lambda}_1)$ is in $\partial\tilde{\Pi}$ or on the border between \tilde{Z}_r and \tilde{Z}_{r+1} , for some $\lambda_1 < \tilde{\lambda}_1$ the point $w(\lambda_1)$ is in $\partial\Pi$ or on the border between Z_r and Z_{r+1} . We have proved that λ_1 exists.

The estimate on $\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$ follows from the estimate on $\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \lambda_0$ provided by (10.10) and from (10.14).

The estimate $h(\lambda) \leq \frac{5}{3}h(\lambda_0)$ follows from Lemma 10.3, as $\tilde{h}(\lambda)$ decreases: we have

$$h(\lambda) \leq \frac{5}{4}\tilde{h}(\lambda) \leq \frac{5}{4}\tilde{h}(\lambda_0) \leq \frac{5}{4} \times \frac{4}{3}h(\lambda_0).$$

By (8.6) and (10.14) we have

$$\bar{h}(\lambda_{01}) \geq 0.5h(\lambda_{01}) \geq 0.25\tilde{h}(\lambda_{01}), \quad \bar{h}(\lambda_0) \leq 2h(\lambda_0) \leq 3\tilde{h}(\lambda_0).$$

Hence, we may apply the last part of Lemma 10.9 and obtain an estimate for $\|\tilde{w}(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\|$ for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_{01}]$. By the estimate on εu in Lemma 10.2 we have

$$\|\tilde{w}(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\| - \|w(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\| \lesssim (\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}}) \sqrt{\varepsilon \tilde{h}(\lambda) \ln^2 \tilde{h}(\lambda)} + \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon.$$

Hence, the estimate from Lemma 10.9 means that for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_{01}]$

$$\|w(\lambda) - \bar{w}(\lambda)\| < e^{C_6(\xi_r - \xi_{r+1})} \|w(\lambda_0) - \bar{w}(\lambda_0)\| + O(\sqrt{b_{s_r}} + \sqrt{b_{s_{r+1}}}) \sqrt{\varepsilon h} |\ln h| + O(\varepsilon |\ln^{\gamma_1} \varepsilon|).$$

We have proved the estimate (8.7). \square

11 Auxiliary system describing resonance crossing

11.1 Transition to auxiliary system: statement of lemma

In this subsection we state lemmas on the auxiliary system describing passage through resonances. These lemmas will be proved in the rest of the current section. Denote

$$\alpha(z) = \sqrt{\varepsilon/\frac{\partial\hat{\omega}}{\partial I}} \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon\hat{h}\ln^3\hat{h}}, \quad \beta(z) = \sqrt{\varepsilon\frac{\partial\hat{\omega}}{\partial I}} \sim \sqrt{\varepsilon\hat{h}^{-1}\ln^{-3}\hat{h}}. \quad (11.1)$$

We have $\varepsilon = \alpha\beta$. For given resonance $s = (s_1, s_2)$ denote $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1$ and let $\hat{h}(z)$ be given by $\omega(\hat{h}, z) = \hat{\omega}$.

Lemma 11.1. *There exists $d_Z > 0$ such that for any $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1$ and z_0 such that $(\hat{h}(z_0), z_0) \in \mathcal{B}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\|z - z_0\| \leq \hat{\omega}d_Z$ we have*

$$|\hat{h}(z) - \hat{h}(z_0)| < \hat{h}(z_0)/10, \quad |\alpha(z) - \alpha(z_0)| < \alpha(z_0)/10, \quad |\beta(z) - \beta(z_0)| < \beta(z_0)/10. \quad (11.2)$$

Lemma 11.2. *For any $C_{s_1} > 0$ for any large enough $C_\gamma > 0$ there exist $C, C_\rho, c_Z > 0$ such that for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, any z_0 , and any resonance $s = (s_1, s_2)$ with*

$$|s_1| < C_{s_1} \ln^2 \varepsilon, \quad (\hat{h}(z_0), z_0) \in \mathcal{B}, \quad \hat{h}(z_0) > C_\rho \varepsilon |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$$

after a coordinate change $(p, q) \rightarrow (P, Q)$ depending on λ (with period $2\pi s_1$) and z , and the time and coordinate change given by

$$\frac{d\tau}{d\lambda} = \hat{\omega}^{-0.5}\beta(z), \quad Z = \hat{\omega}^{-1}(z - z_0) \quad (11.3)$$

the perturbed system (7.1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} P' &= -F_s(Q, z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z) - \hat{\omega}^{-2}s_1\beta\frac{\partial H_7}{\partial Q}(P, Q, Z) + \alpha u_P(P, Q, Z, \tau, \varepsilon), \\ Q' &= P + \hat{\omega}^{-2}s_1\beta\frac{\partial H_7}{\partial P}(P, Q, Z) + \alpha\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}u_Q(P, Q, Z, \tau, \varepsilon), \\ Z' &= \alpha\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}u_z(P, Q, Z, \tau, \varepsilon), \\ \tau' &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (11.4)$$

in the domain

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ Z, P, Q, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{n+3} : \|Z\| < c_Z, |P| < \frac{\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}}{4}, |Q| < \frac{\hat{\omega}^{-1}C_\gamma}{4} \right\}.$$

The values of α and β in (11.4) are taken at $z = z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z$. The function $F_s(Q, z)$ is described by Lemma 11.4 below. We have the estimates

$$\|H_7\|_{C^2}, |u_Q|, |u_z| < C, \quad |u_P| < C\hat{\omega}^{-1}$$

and

$$\left| \alpha^{-1}(I - \hat{I}) - \sqrt{\hat{\omega}}P(J, \gamma, z, t) \right| < C|s_1\hat{\omega}^{-1}\beta|, \quad |\gamma - \hat{\omega}Q(J, \gamma, z, t)| < C|s_1\beta|, \quad (11.5)$$

where $\gamma = \varphi - (s_2/s_1)\lambda$.

Lemma 11.3. *Denote $D(P, Q, z, \lambda) = \alpha^{-1}\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}(I - \hat{I})$, then this function is $2\pi s_1$ -periodic in λ and we have*

$$|D - P|, \left| \frac{\partial D}{\partial Q} \right| < C|s_1\hat{\omega}^{-1.5}\beta|, \quad \left| \frac{\partial D}{\partial P} - 1 \right| < C|s_1\hat{\omega}^{-1}\beta|, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial D}{\partial z} \right\| < C|s_1\hat{\omega}^{-2.5}\beta|. \quad (11.6)$$

Lemma 11.4.

- $F_s(Q, z)$ is 2π -periodic in Q .
- F_s can be continued to

$$\mathcal{D}_F = \{Q, z \in [0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{C}^n : |z - z_0| < 0.5c\},$$

where c is the constant from Lemma 7.3, it does not depend on s . The function F_s is uniquely determined by s and the perturbed system in the action-angle variables (7.1).

- For any $\delta_1 > 0$ there exist $S, \delta_2 > 0$ such that for any s_2, s_1 with $s_2 > S$ and $s_2/s_1 < \delta_2$ we have

$$\|F_s - \Theta_3(z)\|_{C^1} < \delta_1, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial \Theta_3}{\partial z} \right\|_{C^1} < \delta_1 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_F$$

(recall that Θ_3 is given by (3.4)).

- For each s_2 there exist finite set \mathcal{F}_{s_2} such that we have

$$\min_{\tilde{F} \in \mathcal{F}_{s_2}} \left(\|F_s - \tilde{F}\|_{C^1} + \left\| \frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial z} \right\|_{C^1} \right) \xrightarrow{s_1 \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_F.$$

11.2 Rescaling the action

In this subsection we start the proof of Lemma 11.2, this proof continues till Subsection 11.5. Lemma 11.1 is obtained as a byproduct in this subsection.

First, we use Lemma 7.3 to continue the perturbed system in the complex domain \mathcal{D}_0 given by (7.5), we will use the notation c_{cont} from (7.5). As ω is bounded in \mathcal{B} , for small enough d_Z we have $\hat{\omega}d_Z < c_{cont}$ for all s . By (7.6)

$$\frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z} = O(h \ln h) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_0.$$

For any $K > 10$, reducing d_Z if needed, we get

$$|\hat{h}(z) - \hat{h}(z_0)| < \hat{h}(z_0)/K. \quad \text{if } |z - z_0| < \hat{\omega}d_Z$$

This clearly implies the first estimate in (11.2), other two estimates also follow by (11.1). This proves Lemma 11.1.

Let us continue the proof of Lemma 11.2, we will assume below that c_Z in this lemma satisfies $8c_w \leq d_Z$. We will use the notation $\hat{\psi}(z) = \psi(z, \hat{h}(z))$. Let us replace the energy variable h by the rescaled action J that will be defined shortly. First, note that the action $I(h, z)$ can be continued to \mathcal{D}_0 by the formula $I = \int_{\varphi=0}^{2\pi} p \frac{\partial q}{\partial \varphi} d\varphi$, where $p(h, z, \varphi)$ and $q(h, z, \varphi)$ are defined in \mathcal{D}_0 by Lemma 7.3. As by (7.6) we have $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I} \neq 0$ in \mathcal{D}_0 , $\sqrt{\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I}}$ is uniquely continued from the real square root). Hence, α and β are correctly defined by (11.1) even for complex z . Let us define (in \mathcal{D}_0) the rescaled action J by the formula

$$J = \alpha^{-1}(I - \hat{I}),$$

then

$$I = \hat{I} + \alpha J, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial I} = \alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial J}.$$

Denote by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}_J$ the z -derivative for fixed J, φ, λ . Denote by $f_J = \frac{\partial J}{\partial h} f_h + \frac{\partial J}{\partial z} f_z$ the J -component of the vector field f , here $\frac{\partial J}{\partial h} = \alpha^{-1} \omega^{-1}$. Denote

$$\text{div}_J f = \frac{\partial f_z}{\partial z}_J + \frac{\partial f_\varphi}{\partial \varphi} + \frac{\partial f_J}{\partial J}.$$

Lemma 11.5. $\text{div}_J f = O(1) + a(z)f_z$ with $a(z) = O(\hat{\omega}^{-1})$ in \mathcal{D}_0 . Thus, $\text{div}_J f = O(\hat{\omega}^{-1})$.

Proof. We need the following formula [see page 15 of <http://owl.net.rice.edu/fjones/chap15.pdf>] for the divergence in curvilinear coordinates. Let \tilde{x}_i be curvilinear coordinates and x_i be cartesian coordinates, let \tilde{F}_i and F_i be components of a vector field F in these coordinates. Let D be the Jacobian of the map T given by $x = T(\tilde{x})$. Then

$$\sum \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_i} = \sum \frac{\partial \tilde{F}_i}{\partial \tilde{x}_i} + D^{-1} \sum \tilde{F}_i \frac{\partial D}{\partial \tilde{x}_i}.$$

Let us apply this formula to coordinate systems $\tilde{x} = (J, \varphi, z)$ and $x = (p, q, z)$ (for fixed λ). The map $(I, \varphi) \mapsto (p, q)$ is volume-preserving for any fixed value of z , so for fixed z the map $(J, \varphi) \mapsto (p, q)$ has Jacobian equal to $\alpha(z)$. Thus, we have $D = \alpha(z)$.

$$\frac{\partial f_p}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial f_q}{\partial q} + \frac{\partial f_z}{\partial z}_{p,q} = \text{div}_J f + \alpha(z)^{-1} f_z \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial z}.$$

Using that $\frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z} = O(h \ln h)$ by (7.6), we get $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} = \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial h \partial z} + \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial h^2} \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z} = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h)$ by (7.6). As we can write $\alpha = \varepsilon^{1/2} \hat{\omega}^{-1/2} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h}^{-1/2}$, where only the last multiplier depends on z , we have

$$\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial z} \sim \varepsilon^{1/2} \hat{\omega}^{-1/2} \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}^{-3/2}}{\partial h} \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \hat{\omega}}{\partial h} = \alpha O(\ln h).$$

Thus $\text{div}_J f = O(1) + a(z)f_z$ with $a(z) = \alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial z} = O(\ln h) = O(\hat{\omega}^{-1})$. \square

Let us prove some estimates that will be used later. We have $\frac{\partial \hat{I}}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial \hat{I}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial \hat{I}}{\partial h} \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial \hat{I}}{\partial z} + O(h \ln^2 h)$. As $\frac{\partial^2 I}{\partial z \partial h} \sim \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = O(\ln h)$, we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}(I - \hat{I}) = O(h - \hat{h}) \ln h + O(h \ln^2 h) = O(h \ln^2 h)$ in \mathcal{D}_0 . Thus we have in \mathcal{D}_0 (as $I - \hat{I} = O(h \ln h)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial J}{\partial z} &= \alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(I - \hat{I}) - \alpha^{-2} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial z}(I - \hat{I}) = O(h \ln^2 h) \alpha^{-1} + O(\ln h) \alpha^{-1}(I - \hat{I}) = \\ &= O(h \ln^2 h) \alpha^{-1} = O(\ln^{-1} h) \beta^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.7)$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{1,0} &= \left\{ z, J, \varphi, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{n+3} : |z - z_0| < 4c_w \hat{\omega}, |J| < c_{cont,J} \beta^{-1} \ln^{-2} \hat{h}, |\operatorname{Im} \varphi| < c_{cont} \hat{\omega}, |\operatorname{Im} \lambda| < c_{cont} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_1 &= \left\{ z, J, \varphi, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{n+3} : |z - z_0| < 2c_w \hat{\omega}, |J| < \frac{c_{cont,J}}{2} \beta^{-1} \ln^{-2} \hat{h}, |\operatorname{Im} \varphi| < \frac{c_{cont}}{2} \hat{\omega}, |\operatorname{Im} \lambda| < \frac{c_{cont}}{2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the constant $c_{cont,J} > 0$ is chosen so that the image of $\mathcal{D}_{1,0}$ under the map $J, z, \varphi, \lambda \mapsto h, z, \varphi, \lambda$ lies in \mathcal{D}_0 . We will use the domain \mathcal{D}_1 below, the domain $\mathcal{D}_{1,0}$ is needed to obtain Cauchy estimates in \mathcal{D}_1 . The width of these domains in J is $O(\alpha^{-1} \hat{h} \ln \hat{h}) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon^{-1} \hat{h} \ln^{-1} \hat{h}}) = O(\beta^{-1} \ln^{-2} \hat{h})$.

We have $\frac{\partial f_z}{\partial z} J = O(\ln h)$ in \mathcal{D}_1 by Cauchy formula. However, we have weaker estimates $O_*(h^{-1})$ for $\frac{\partial f_\varphi}{\partial \varphi}$ and $\frac{\partial f_J}{\partial J}$ (this is not used later, so we skip the proof). Let us set

$$H_1(J, z, \varphi, \lambda) = - \int_{\psi=0}^{\varphi} (f_J(J, z, \psi, \lambda, \varepsilon=0) - \langle f_J(J, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon=0) \rangle_\varphi) d\psi. \quad (11.8)$$

We have $f_J = \frac{\partial J}{\partial h} f_h|_{\varepsilon=0} + \frac{\partial J}{\partial z} f_z|_{\varepsilon=0} = O(\ln h) \alpha^{-1} + O(\ln^{-1} h) \beta^{-1} = O(\ln h) \alpha^{-1}$. By the estimates above we have $\int_{\psi=0}^{\varphi} \frac{\partial J}{\partial z} f_z d\psi = O(\beta^{-1} \ln^{-1} h) = O(\alpha^{-1})$. As $\frac{\partial J}{\partial h} = \omega^{-1} \alpha^{-1}$, we have $\int_0^{\varphi} \frac{\partial J}{\partial h} f_h d\psi = \alpha^{-1} \int_0^{\omega^{-1} \varphi} f_h dt = O(\alpha^{-1})$ by Lemma 7.4. Thus we have $\int_0^{\varphi} f_J d\psi = O(\alpha^{-1})$ for any φ . This implies

$$\langle f_J \rangle_\varphi = O(\alpha^{-1}), \quad H_1 = O(\alpha^{-1}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1. \quad (11.9)$$

We can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial J} &= - \int_{\psi=0}^{\varphi} \left(\frac{\partial f_J}{\partial J} - \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \langle f_J \rangle_\varphi \right) d\psi = \\ &= f_\varphi - f_\varphi|_{\varphi=0} + \int_{\psi=0}^{\varphi} \left(\frac{\partial f_z}{\partial z} J - \operatorname{div}_J f + \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \langle f_J \rangle_\varphi \right) d\psi. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$f_J = - \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial J} + \tilde{f}_J(J, z, \lambda) + \check{f}_J(J, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \quad f_\varphi = \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial J} + \tilde{f}_\varphi(J, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_J &= \langle f_J|_{\varepsilon=0} \rangle_\varphi, \\ \tilde{f}_\varphi &= \left(f_\varphi|_{\varphi=0} - \int_{\psi=0}^{\varphi} \left(\frac{\partial f_z}{\partial z} J - \operatorname{div}_J f + \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \langle f_J \rangle_\varphi \right) d\psi \right) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} + (f_\varphi - f_\varphi|_{\varepsilon=0}), \quad (11.10) \\ \check{f}_J &= f_J - f_J|_{\varepsilon=0}. \end{aligned}$$

By (11.9) we have $\tilde{f}_J = O(\alpha^{-1})$. We also have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial J} \langle f_J \rangle_\varphi = \langle \operatorname{div}_J f - \frac{\partial f_z}{\partial z} J \rangle_\varphi = O(\ln h). \quad (11.11)$$

Note that \tilde{f}_φ is clearly 2π -periodic. Let us also set $\tilde{f}_z = f_z$.

Lemma 11.6.

$$f_\varphi|_{\varepsilon=0} - f_J = O(\ln h) \beta, \quad f_\varphi|_{\varepsilon=0} - f_\varphi = O(\varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h).$$

Proof. Denote $\vec{f} = (f_p, f_q, f_z)$. The maps $\vec{f} \mapsto f_J$ and $\vec{f} \mapsto f_\varphi$ are linear. As $\vec{f}|_{\varepsilon=0} - \vec{f} = O(\varepsilon)$, the lemma follows from the estimates $f_J = O(\ln h) \alpha$ and $f_\varphi = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h)$ that hold for any \vec{f} . \square

As $\varphi = 0$ is given by a transversal to one of the separatrices that is separated from the saddle, the time $t = \omega^{-1} \varphi$ is a smooth function of the coordinates p, q, z near $\varphi = 0$ (we treat values of φ near 2π as negative values near 0). Therefore, from $\varphi = \omega t$ we get

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial q} \Big|_{\varphi=0} = \omega \frac{\partial t}{\partial q} \Big|_{t=0} = O(\ln^{-1} h), \quad \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial p} \Big|_{\varphi=0} = \omega \frac{\partial t}{\partial p} \Big|_{t=0} = O(\ln^{-1} h), \quad \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial z} \Big|_{\varphi=0} = \omega \frac{\partial t}{\partial z} \Big|_{t=0} = O(\ln^{-1} h).$$

Hence, $f_\varphi|_{\varphi=0} = O(\ln^{-1} h)$. We have by Lemma 11.5 (we use the notation $a(z)$ from this lemma, with $a(z) = O(\ln h)$)

$$\int_{\psi=0}^{\varphi} \operatorname{div}_J f - \langle \operatorname{div}_J f \rangle_\varphi d\psi = O(1) + a(z) \int_{\psi=0}^{\varphi} (f_z - f_z(C)) - \langle f_z - f_z(C) \rangle_\varphi d\psi.$$

This is $O(1)$, as the integral above can be estimated by Lemma 7.4. By (11.10) this implies $\tilde{f}_\varphi = O(1)$ (note that $f_\varphi|_{\varepsilon=0} - f_\varphi = O(1)$ by Lemma 11.6, as $h \gtrsim \varepsilon \ln^5 \varepsilon$).

The system (7.1) rewrites in \mathcal{D}_1 (we use the notation $\omega(J, z) = \omega(h(J, z), z)$) as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{J} &= -\varepsilon \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \varphi} + \varepsilon \tilde{f}_J(J, z, \lambda) + \varepsilon \tilde{f}_J(J, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{z} &= \varepsilon \tilde{f}_z(J, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\varphi} &= \omega(J, z) + \varepsilon \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial J} + \varepsilon \tilde{f}_\varphi(J, z, \varphi, \lambda, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{\lambda} &= 1. \end{aligned} \tag{11.12}$$

11.3 Transition to resonant phase

It will be convenient to use new angle variables γ, μ given by

$$\gamma = \varphi - (s_2/s_1)\lambda, \quad \mu = \lambda/s_1; \quad \varphi = \gamma + s_2\mu, \quad \lambda = s_1\mu. \tag{11.13}$$

Note that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma}$, as both these derivatives are taken for fixed λ and μ . After the coordinate change $(J, z, \varphi, \lambda) \mapsto (J, z, \gamma, \mu)$ and the time change $\psi' = \frac{d\psi}{d\mu} = s_1\dot{\psi}$ the system (11.12) rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} J' &= -s_1\varepsilon \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \gamma} + s_1\varepsilon \tilde{f}_J + s_1\varepsilon \tilde{f}_J, \\ z' &= s_1\varepsilon \tilde{f}_z, \\ \gamma' &= s_1\omega - s_2 + s_1\varepsilon \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial J} + s_1\varepsilon \tilde{f}_\varphi, \\ \mu' &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The coefficients of this system are 2π -periodic in γ and μ and also are invariant under the translation $(\gamma, \mu) \mapsto (\gamma - 2\pi \frac{s_2}{s_1}, \mu + \frac{2\pi}{s_1})$. Set

$$H_2(J, z, \gamma, \mu) = \alpha \left(H_1(J, z, \gamma + s_2\mu, s_1\mu) - \gamma \tilde{f}_J(0, z, s_1\mu) \right) + \beta^{-1} \int_0^J (\omega(\tilde{J}, z) - s_2/s_1) d\tilde{J}.$$

Note that H_2 is 2π -periodic in μ . Set

$$g_J(J, z, \gamma, \mu, \varepsilon) = \tilde{f}_J(J, z, s_1\mu) - \tilde{f}_J(0, z, s_1\mu) + \tilde{f}_J, \quad g_z(J, z, \gamma, \mu, \varepsilon) = \tilde{f}_z, \quad g_\varphi(J, z, \gamma, \mu, \varepsilon) = \tilde{f}_\varphi.$$

Then our system rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} J' &= -s_1\beta \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \gamma} + s_1\varepsilon g_J, \\ z' &= s_1\varepsilon g_z, \\ \gamma' &= s_1\beta \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial J} + s_1\varepsilon g_\varphi, \\ \mu' &= 1. \end{aligned} \tag{11.14}$$

We will consider the Hamiltonian part of this system (i.e. without the g_* terms) in the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_2 = \left\{ z, J, \gamma, \mu \in \mathbb{C}^{n+3} : |z - z_0| < 2c_w\hat{\omega}, |J| < 1, |\operatorname{Im} \gamma| < \frac{c_{cont}}{4}\hat{\omega}, |\operatorname{Re} \gamma| < C_\gamma, |\operatorname{Im} \mu| < \frac{c_{cont}}{4s_1} \right\},$$

where $C_\gamma > 0$ should satisfy $C_\gamma \gg \hat{\omega}c_{cont}$. Note that we have $\beta^{-1} \ln^{-3} h > 1$ for small enough ε given $h > \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|^\rho$ for $\rho > 1$. Thus, the image of this domain under the map $J, z, \gamma, \mu \mapsto J, z, \varphi, \lambda$ lies inside \mathcal{D}_1 . Using the estimates (7.6) on $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial I}, \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial I^2}$, we can compute $\beta^{-1}(\omega(I = \hat{I} + \alpha J) - s_2/s_1) = J + O(\beta \ln^2 h)$. As $H_1, \tilde{f}_J = O(\alpha^{-1})$ by (11.9), we have $H_2 = O(1)$ in \mathcal{D}_2 (also for $\rho > 1$). We also have $g_J = O(\ln h)$; $g_\varphi, g_z = O(1)$ in the real part of \mathcal{D}_2 . Indeed, the estimates on \tilde{f}_φ and \tilde{f}_z were obtained above and the estimate on g_J follows from (11.11) and Lemma 11.6.

As we have $\alpha H_1 = O(1)$ in \mathcal{D}_1 by (11.9), we get Cauchy estimate $\frac{\partial \alpha H_1}{\partial J} = O(\beta \ln^2 h)$ in \mathcal{D}_2 . This allows us to separate the main part of H_2 : in \mathcal{D}_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_2 &= J^2/2 + H_{2,0}(z, \gamma, \mu) + \beta \ln^2 h H_{2,1}(J, z, \gamma, \mu), \quad \text{where} \\ H_{2,0} &= \alpha \hat{H}_1(z, \gamma + s_2\mu, s_1\mu) - \gamma \alpha \hat{f}_J(z, s_1\mu), \quad H_{2,1} = O(1). \end{aligned} \tag{11.15}$$

11.4 Averaging over time

Let us state the following lemma that follows from [29].

Lemma 11.7. Consider a Hamiltonian system with the Hamiltonian $\varepsilon H(p, q, t)$ periodically depending on time t (with the period 2π) and slow variables p, q :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= \varepsilon \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(p, q, t), \\ \dot{p} &= -\varepsilon \frac{\partial H}{\partial q}(p, q, t), \\ \dot{t} &= 1. \end{aligned} \tag{11.16}$$

Assume that the Hamiltonian $\varepsilon H(p, q, t)$ is defined for (p, q) in a complex neighborhood U_δ of some real domain $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of width $\delta > 0$: $U_\delta = U + \{p, q \in \mathbb{C}^2; |p|, |q| \leq \delta\}$ and $t \in S_t^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and we have $|H| < C_H$ in $U_\delta \times S_t^1$. We assume H to be analytic in p, q and continuous in t .

Then there is $C > 0$ depending only on C_H and δ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, C)$ there are new canonical variables $\tilde{p}(p, q, t)$, $\tilde{q}(p, q, t)$ with

$$|\tilde{p}(p, q, t) - p| \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon, \quad |\tilde{q}(p, q, t) - q| \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon$$

such that in these coordinates our system is defined in $V = U_{0.5\delta} \times S_t^1$ and is given by the Hamiltonian

$$\varepsilon \bar{H}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) + \varepsilon \Delta H(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, t)$$

with

$$\|\bar{H}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) - \langle H(p, q, t) \rangle_t|_{p=\tilde{p}, q=\tilde{q}}\|_V \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon, \quad \|\Delta H\|_V \leq \exp(-C\varepsilon^{-1}).$$

Let us obtain explicit dependence of the estimates in this lemma on the width of the complex domain where the system is defined.

Corollary 11.8. Consider the system (11.16) with the Hamiltonian εH periodically depending on time t (with the period 2π) and slow variables p, q . Assume that the Hamiltonian $\varepsilon H(p, q, t)$ is defined for (p, q) in a complex neighborhood U_{δ_p, δ_q} of some real domain $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of width $\delta_p, \delta_q \in (0, 1)$ in p and q , respectively:

$$U_{\delta_p, \delta_q} = U + \{p, q \in \mathbb{C}^2; |p| < \delta_p, |q| < \delta_q\}$$

and $t \in S_t^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ and we have $|H| < C_H$ in $U_{\delta_p, \delta_q} \times S_t^1$. We assume H to be analytic in p, q and continuous in t ,

Then there is $C > 0$ depending only on C_H such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, C\delta_p\delta_q)$ there are new canonical variables $\tilde{p}(p, q, t)$, $\tilde{q}(p, q, t)$ with

$$|\tilde{p}(p, q, t) - p| \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon\delta_q^{-1}, \quad |\tilde{q}(p, q, t) - q| \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon\delta_p^{-1}$$

such that in these coordinates our system is defined in $V = U_{0.5\delta_p, 0.5\delta_q} \times S_t^1$ and is given by the Hamiltonian

$$\varepsilon \bar{H}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) + \varepsilon \Delta H(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, t)$$

with

$$\|\bar{H}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) - \langle H(p, q, t) \rangle_t|_{p=\tilde{p}, q=\tilde{q}}\|_V \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon\delta_p^{-1}\delta_q^{-1}, \quad \|\Delta H\|_V \leq \exp(-C\delta_p\delta_q\varepsilon^{-1}).$$

Proof. Let us make a coordinate change $p = \delta_p p'$, $q = \delta_q q'$. The Hamiltonian in the new coordinates is $\varepsilon(\delta_p\delta_q)^{-1}H$. Denote $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon(\delta_p\delta_q)^{-1}$, then the new system is given by the Hamiltonian $\varepsilon'H$. This system is analytic for (p', q') in a complex neighborhood U'_1 of some real domain U' with width 1 in both p' and q' . The domain U' is large, but the constant C in Lemma 11.7 does not depend on U' and U'_δ , it only depends on the width δ . Lemma 11.7 gives us new coordinates \tilde{p}', \tilde{q}' with $|\tilde{p}' - p'|, |\tilde{q}' - q'| \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon'$. In the coordinates \tilde{p}', \tilde{q}' the system is given by the Hamiltonian $\varepsilon'\bar{H}'(\tilde{p}', \tilde{q}') + \varepsilon'\Delta H'(\tilde{p}', \tilde{q}', t)$ with

$$\|\bar{H}'(\tilde{p}', \tilde{q}') - \langle H(p, q, t) \rangle_t|_{p=\delta_p\tilde{p}', q=\delta_q\tilde{q}'}\|_{U'_{0.5} \times S_t^1} \leq C^{-1}\varepsilon\delta_p^{-1}\delta_q^{-1}; \quad \|\Delta H'\|_{U'_{0.5} \times S_t^1} \leq \exp(-C\delta_p\delta_q\varepsilon^{-1}).$$

Set $\tilde{p} = \delta_p\tilde{p}'$, $\tilde{q} = \delta_q\tilde{q}'$ and let $\bar{H}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q})$, $\Delta H(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q})$ be \bar{H}' and $\Delta H'$ written in these coordinates. It is easy to check that the estimates above imply the estimates in the statement of this corollary. \square

11.5 After averaging

Let us recall the system (11.14)

$$\begin{aligned} J' &= -s_1\beta \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial \gamma} + s_1\varepsilon g_J, \\ z' &= s_1\varepsilon g_z, \\ \gamma' &= s_1\beta \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial J} + s_1\varepsilon g_\varphi, \\ \mu' &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian part of this system is defined in

$$\mathcal{D}_2 = \left\{ z, J, \gamma, \mu \in \mathbb{C}^{n+3} : |z - z_0| < 2c_Z \hat{\omega}, |J| < 1, |\operatorname{Im} \gamma| < \frac{c_{cont}}{4} \hat{\omega}, |\operatorname{Re} \gamma| < C_\gamma, |\operatorname{Im} \mu| < \frac{c_{cont}}{4s_1} \right\},$$

and the whole system is defined in the real part of this complex domain. Let us apply Lemma 11.8 to the Hamiltonian part of (11.14), with $t = \mu$, $U = (-0.5, 0.5)_J \times (-C_\gamma + \frac{c_{cont}\hat{\omega}}{4}, C_\gamma - \frac{c_{cont}\hat{\omega}}{4})_\gamma$, $\delta_J = 0.5$, $\delta_\gamma = \frac{c_{cont}\hat{\omega}}{4}$ and $\varepsilon_1 = s_1\beta$. Here we denote by ε_1 the ε variable used in Corollary 11.8 to distinguish it from ε in (7.1). This corollary gives new coordinates that we denote \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q} . Corollary 11.8 is applied separately for different values of z , but it is easy to check that the construction in [29] gives $\tilde{P}(J, \gamma, z, \mu)$ and $\tilde{Q}(J, \gamma, z, \mu)$ that are analytic in z . Let us make a scale transformation

$$Q = \tilde{Q}/\hat{\omega}, P = \tilde{P}/\sqrt{\hat{\omega}}; \quad \tilde{Q} = \hat{\omega}Q, \tilde{P} = \sqrt{\hat{\omega}}P,$$

this will simplify the main part of our system that will be written later. By Corollary 11.8 we have

$$\left| J - \sqrt{\hat{\omega}}P(J, \gamma, z, t) \right| = O(s_1\hat{\omega}^{-1}\beta), \quad |\gamma - \hat{\omega}Q(J, \gamma, z, t)| = O(s_1\beta). \quad (11.17)$$

In \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q} coordinates the system (11.14) without g is given by the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, z, \mu) &= s_1\beta\tilde{H}_3(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, z) + s_1^2\hat{\omega}^{-1}\beta^2\tilde{H}_4(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, z) + s_1\beta \exp(-C\hat{\omega}s_1^{-1}\beta^{-1})\tilde{H}_5(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, z, \mu), \\ \tilde{H}_3(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, z) &= \langle H_2(J, \gamma, z, \mu) \rangle_\mu|_{J=\tilde{P}, \gamma=\tilde{Q}}, \\ \tilde{H}_3, \tilde{H}_4, \tilde{H}_5 &= O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $H(P, Q, z, \mu)$ the new Hamiltonian after scaling, we have $H = \hat{\omega}^{-1.5}\tilde{H}$. Hence, in the P, Q coordinates this rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \hat{\omega}^{-1.5}s_1\beta H_3(P, Q, z) + s_1^2\hat{\omega}^{-2.5}\beta^2 H_4(P, Q, z) + \hat{\omega}^{-1.5}s_1\beta \exp(-C\hat{\omega}s_1^{-1}\beta^{-1})H_5(P, Q, z, \mu), \\ H_3(P, Q) &= \langle H_2(J, \gamma, \mu) \rangle_\mu|_{J=\sqrt{\hat{\omega}}P, \gamma=\hat{\omega}Q}, \\ H_3, H_4, H_5 &= O(1). \end{aligned}$$

This system is defined in the domain (we reduce this domain a bit to have a shorter formula, taking into account that $C_\gamma \gg c_{cont}\hat{\omega}$)

$$\mathcal{D}_3 = \left\{ z, P, Q, \mu \in \mathbb{C}^{n+2} \times \mathbb{R} : |z - z_0| < 2c_Z \hat{\omega}, |P| < \frac{\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}}{2}, |\operatorname{Re} Q| < \frac{C_\gamma \hat{\omega}^{-1}}{2}, |\operatorname{Im} Q| < \frac{c_{cont}}{8} \right\}.$$

Let us also consider real domain

$$\mathcal{D}_4 = \left\{ z, P, Q, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^{n+3} : |z - z_0| < c_Z \hat{\omega}, |P| < \frac{\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}}{4}, |Q| < \frac{C_\gamma \hat{\omega}^{-1}}{4} \right\}$$

and the same domain rewritten using $Z = \hat{\omega}^{-1}(z - z_0)$ instead of z :

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ Z, P, Q, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^{n+3} : |Z| < c_Z, |P| < \frac{\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}}{4}, |Q| < \frac{C_\gamma \hat{\omega}^{-1}}{4} \right\}.$$

We have Cauchy estimates valid in \mathcal{D}

$$\|H_i\|_{C^2} = O(1) \quad \text{for } i = 3, 4, 5. \quad (11.18)$$

Denote $C_{H_5} = \hat{\omega}^{-1.5}s_1\beta \exp(-C\hat{\omega}s_1^{-1}\beta^{-1})$. For large enough C_ρ we have

$$Cs_1\hat{\omega}^{-1}\beta < |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|/4 \quad (11.19)$$

and thus $C_{H_5} = O(\varepsilon^3)$. By (11.18) this means that the corresponding terms in Hamiltonian equations are also $O(\varepsilon^3)$.

Let us now include the terms appearing after we reintroduce the terms $s_1\varepsilon g$ in (11.14) rewritten in the new coordinates. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} u_P &= \frac{\partial \tilde{P}}{\partial J} g_J + \frac{\partial \tilde{P}}{\partial \gamma} g_\gamma + \frac{\partial \tilde{P}}{\partial z} g_z - C_{H_5} s_1^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \hat{\omega}^{0.5} \frac{\partial H_5}{\partial Q}, \\ u_Q &= \frac{\partial \tilde{Q}}{\partial J} g_J + \frac{\partial \tilde{Q}}{\partial \gamma} g_\gamma + \frac{\partial \tilde{Q}}{\partial z} g_z + C_{H_5} s_1^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} \hat{\omega} \frac{\partial H_5}{\partial P}, \\ u_z &= g_z. \end{aligned}$$

From the estimates $g_J = O(\ln h)$, $g_\varphi, g_z = O(1)$ we get $u_P = O(\ln h)$, $u_Q, u_z = O(1)$ (we use that $\frac{\partial(\hat{P}-J)}{\partial x} = O(1)$, $\frac{\partial(\hat{Q}-\gamma)}{\partial x} = O(\ln^{-1} \varepsilon)$ for $x = J, \gamma, z$ in \mathcal{D}_4 by the Cauchy formula and (11.17) and (11.19)). Now the system (11.14) rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} P' &= -\hat{\omega}^{-1.5} s_1 \beta \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial Q}(P, Q, z) - \omega^{-2.5} s_1^2 \beta^2 \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial Q}(P, Q, z) + s_1 \varepsilon \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} u_P(P, Q, z, \mu), \\ Q' &= \hat{\omega}^{-1.5} s_1 \beta \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial P}(P, Q, z) + \hat{\omega}^{-2.5} s_1^2 \beta^2 \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial P}(P, Q, z) + s_1 \varepsilon \hat{\omega}^{-1} u_Q(P, Q, z, \mu), \\ z' &= s_1 \varepsilon u_z(P, Q, z, \mu), \\ \mu' &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

After the time change $\frac{d\tau}{d\mu} = s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} \beta(z)$, $\frac{d\tau}{d\lambda} = \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} \beta(z)$ we obtain the system (we recycle ' to denote also the derivative with respect to the new time τ)

$$\begin{aligned} P' &= -\hat{\omega}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial Q}(P, Q, z) - \hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial Q}(P, Q, z) + \alpha u_P(P, Q, z, \tau), \\ Q' &= \hat{\omega}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_3}{\partial P}(P, Q, z) + \hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta \frac{\partial H_4}{\partial P}(P, Q, z) + \alpha \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} u_Q(P, Q, z, \tau), \\ z' &= \alpha \hat{\omega}^{0.5} u_z(P, Q, z, \tau), \\ \tau' &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now use (11.15) to separate the main part of this system. We replace

$$H_3 = \langle H_2(J, \gamma, z, \mu) \rangle_\mu |_{J=\sqrt{\hat{\omega}P}, \gamma=\hat{\omega}Q}$$

with its main part (corresponding to $J^2/2 + H_{2,0}(z, \gamma, \mu)$ from (11.15)) that we denote H_6 and add the remainder to H_4 (this sum is denoted H_7). We have in \mathcal{D}_3

$$H_6(P, Q) = \hat{\omega} \frac{P^2}{2} + \langle H_{2,0} \rangle_\mu |_{\gamma=\hat{\omega}Q}, \quad H_7(P, Q) = H_4(P, Q) + O(s_2^{-1}) \langle H_{2,1} \rangle_\mu |_{J=\sqrt{\hat{\omega}P}, \gamma=\hat{\omega}Q} = O(1). \quad (11.20)$$

Denote

$$F_s = \hat{\omega}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_6}{\partial Q}. \quad (11.21)$$

Then the system above rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} P' &= -F_s(Q, z) - \hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial Q}(P, Q, z) + \alpha u_P(P, Q, z, \tau), \\ Q' &= P + \hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta \frac{\partial H_7}{\partial P}(P, Q, z) + \alpha \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} u_Q(P, Q, z, \tau), \\ z' &= \alpha \hat{\omega}^{0.5} u_z(P, Q, z, \tau), \\ \tau' &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

This system is defined in the domain \mathcal{D}_4 ; using Z instead of z gives the system (11.4) defined in \mathcal{D} . As $H_7 = O(1)$ in \mathcal{D}_3 , in \mathcal{D} we also have $\|H_7\|_{C_2} = O(1)$ by Cauchy formula (moreover, $\frac{\partial H_7}{\partial P} = O(\sqrt{\hat{\omega}})$). Thus we have in \mathcal{D} :

$$\|H_7\|_{C_2}, \|u_Q\|_C, \|u_z\|_C = O(1), \quad \|u_P\|_C = O(\ln h).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 11.2. \square

Proof of Lemma 11.3. As D depends 2π -periodically on μ , it depends $2\pi s_1$ -periodically on λ . As $D = J/\sqrt{\hat{\omega}}$, by (11.17) we have

$$|D - P| = O(s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1.5} \beta) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_3.$$

The estimates of Lemma 11.3 in $\mathcal{D}_4 \subset \mathcal{D}_3$ follow by Cauchy formula. \square

11.6 Main part of the Hamiltonian

In this section we prove Lemma 11.4. By (11.21), (11.20), (11.15) and (11.13) we have

$$-F_s = -\hat{\omega}^{-1} \frac{\partial H_6}{\partial Q} = -\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \langle \hat{H}_1(z, \gamma + s_2 \mu, s_1 \mu) - \gamma \hat{f}_J(z, s_1 \mu) \rangle_\mu |_{\gamma=\hat{\omega}Q}.$$

As $\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_\mu$ commute, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} |_{\mu=\text{const}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} |_{\lambda=\text{const}}$ and $\tilde{f}_J = \langle f_J \rangle_\varphi$ by (11.10), this rewrites as

$$-F_s = \alpha \left\langle \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} \hat{H}_1(z, \varphi, \lambda) + \langle \hat{f}_J(z, \varphi, \lambda) \rangle_\varphi \right) \Big|_{\varphi=s_2 \mu + \hat{\omega}Q, \lambda=s_1 \mu} \right\rangle_\mu.$$

From (11.8) we obtain

$$-F_s = \alpha \langle \hat{f}_J(z, \varphi=s_2 \mu + \hat{\omega}Q, \lambda=s_1 \mu, \varepsilon=0) \rangle_\mu = \alpha \langle \hat{f}_J(z, \varphi, \lambda=\hat{\omega}^{-1} \varphi - Q, \varepsilon=0) \rangle_{\varphi \in [0, 2s_2 \pi]}.$$

Let us again use the notation $t = \hat{\omega}^{-1}\varphi = (s_1/s_2)\varphi$ for the time for the unperturbed system. We have $\alpha\hat{f}_J = \hat{\omega}^{-1}\hat{f}_h + \alpha\frac{\partial J}{\partial z}\hat{f}_z$. Denote (we reuse the notation g already used in Section 11.3, as g from Section 11.3 is not mentioned in the current section) $g = (\hat{f}_h + \hat{\omega}\alpha\frac{\partial J}{\partial z}\hat{f}_z)|_{\varepsilon=0}$. We have $\alpha\hat{f}_J = \hat{\omega}^{-1}g$. We have the estimate (11.7) $\frac{\partial J}{\partial z} = O(h \ln^2 h \alpha^{-1})$, thus

$$g = \hat{f}_h + O(\hat{h} \ln \hat{h})\hat{f}_z \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}_0. \quad (11.22)$$

We will write $g(z, t, \lambda) = g(z, \varphi=\omega t, \lambda)$. Let us rewrite

$$-F_s = \hat{\omega}^{-1} \langle g(z, \varphi, \lambda=\hat{\omega}^{-1}\varphi-Q) \rangle_{\varphi \in [0, 2s_2\pi]} = (2\pi s_2)^{-1} \int_{t=0}^{s_2 T} g(z, t, \lambda=t-Q) dt. \quad (11.23)$$

Let us denote by l_0 and l_1 the separatrices, let l_0 correspond to $\varphi \approx 0$ and l_1 to $\varphi \approx \pi$. Let us split the phase curve of the unperturbed system for given h, z into 2 pieces \hat{l}_0, \hat{l}_1 close to the separatrices. We cut the phase curve by the line $y = x$ (cf. fig. 8). Let us define the coordinates $t_0 = t, t_1 = t - 0.5T$ on \hat{l}_0 and \hat{l}_1 , respectively. These coordinates are defined up to adding $iT, i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and are given by the time passed after crossing the transversals $\varphi = 0$ and $\varphi = \pi$, respectively. One may check that for $h \rightarrow 0$ these transversals approach some limit points on the separatrices, so the coordinates t_0, t_1 can be continued to the separatrices themselves. Note that $iT = 2\pi \frac{is_1}{s_2}$. We can split the integral above as

$$\begin{aligned} -F_s &= (2\pi s_2)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_0} \sum_{i=0}^{s_2-1} g\left(z, t_0=t_0, \lambda=t_0+2\pi \frac{is_1}{s_2}-Q\right) dt_0 + \\ &+ (2\pi s_2)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_1} \sum_{i=0}^{s_2-1} g\left(z, t_1=t_1, \lambda=t_1+\pi \frac{(2i+1)s_1}{s_2}-Q\right) dt_1. \end{aligned}$$

As s_1 and s_2 are coprime, we have $\{is_1/s_2 \bmod 1\}_{i=0}^{s_2-1} = \{i/s_2 \bmod 1\}_{i=0}^{s_2-1}$ and this rewrites as

$$\begin{aligned} F_s &= -(2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_0} \left\langle g\left(z, t_0=t_0, \lambda=t_0+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2}-Q\right) \right\rangle_{i=0, \dots, s_2-1} dt_0 \\ &- (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_1} \left\langle g\left(z, t_1=t_1, \lambda=t_1+\frac{\pi s_1}{s_2}+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2}-Q\right) \right\rangle_{i=0, \dots, s_2-1} dt_1. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the derivative of the expression above yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_s}{\partial Q} &= (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_0} \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial \lambda}\left(z, t_0=t_0, \lambda=t_0+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2}-Q\right) \right\rangle_{i=0, \dots, s_2-1} dt_0 \\ &+ (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_1} \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial \lambda}\left(z, t_1=t_1, \lambda=t_1+\frac{\pi s_1}{s_2}+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2}-Q\right) \right\rangle_{i=0, \dots, s_2-1} dt_1. \end{aligned} \quad (11.24)$$

Note that as $\omega(\hat{h}, z) = s_2/s_1$, we have $\hat{h} \rightarrow 0$ for $s_2/s_1 \rightarrow 0$. For fixed value t of t_0 or t_1 by (11.22) and using that the coordinates h, t do not have singularities on the separatrices (i.e. $p(h, t)$ and $q(h, t)$ are smooth) we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(z, t_0=t, \lambda) &= f_h(h=0, z, t_0=t, \lambda) + O(\hat{h} \ln \hat{h}), \\ g(z, t_1=t, \lambda) &= f_h(h=0, z, t_1=t, \lambda) + O(\hat{h} \ln \hat{h}). \end{aligned}$$

As $f_h(C) = 0$, the values of $\max_\lambda |f_h(h=0, z, t_0=t, \lambda)|$ and $\max_\lambda |f_h(h=0, z, t_1=t, \lambda)|$ exponentially decrease when $|t| \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, the formulas above imply C^0 -convergence in

$$\begin{aligned} F_s \xrightarrow{s_2/s_1 \rightarrow 0} &- (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_0} \left\langle f_h\left(h=0, z, t_0=t_0, \lambda=t_0-Q+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2}, \varepsilon=0\right) \right\rangle_{i=0, \dots, s_2-1} dt_0 \\ &- (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\hat{l}_1} \left\langle f_h\left(h=0, z, t_1=t_1, \lambda=t_1-Q+2\pi \frac{s_1 \bmod 2s_2}{2s_2}+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2}, \varepsilon=0\right) \right\rangle_{i=0, \dots, s_2-1} dt_1 \end{aligned} \quad (11.25)$$

in the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_{F,0} = \{Q, z \in [0, 2\pi] \times \mathbb{C}^n : \|z - z_0\| < c\}.$$

We can check that $-\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial Q}$ converges to the Q -derivative of the right-hand side in the same way, using (11.24). Note that $\frac{\partial f_h}{\partial \lambda}(C) = 0$ and, similarly to (11.22), we have $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial \lambda} + O(h \ln h) \frac{\partial \hat{f}_z}{\partial \lambda}$. Finally, by Cauchy formula $\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 F_s}{\partial z^2}$ converge to $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}$, respectively, of the right-hand side of (11.25) in \mathcal{D}_F . Similarly, $\frac{\partial^2 F_s}{\partial z \partial Q}$ converges to the $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z \partial Q}$ of the right-hand side of (11.25). This shows that $\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z}$ converges in C^1 to the z -derivative of the right-hand side of (11.25).

Proof of Lemma 11.4. The first and the second parts of Lemma 11.4 follows from (11.23). Periodicity follows from the fact that $g(\lambda)$ is 2π -periodic. As the right-hand side of (11.23) is defined in \mathcal{D}_0 , we can continue F_s in the domain $\mathcal{D}_{F,0}$.

By the estimate for the error of the trapezoidal integration rule we have

$$\left\langle f_h \left(h=0, z, t_0=t_0, \lambda=t_0+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2} - Q \right) \right\rangle_{i=0}^{s_2-1} = \langle f_h(h=0, z, t_0=t_0, \lambda) \rangle_\lambda + O(s_2^{-2}).$$

Together with (11.25) this implies $\|F_s - \Theta_3\|_{C^0} \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{D}_{F,0}$ for $s_2 \rightarrow \infty, s_2/s_1 \rightarrow 0$. By Cauchy formula this also means $\|\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial \Theta_3}{\partial z}\|_{C^0} \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\frac{\partial^2 F_s}{\partial z^2} - \frac{\partial^2 \Theta_3}{\partial z^2}\|_{C^0} \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{D}_F . We have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial Q} \left\langle f_h \left(h=0, z, t_0=t_0, \lambda=t_0+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2} - Q \right) \right\rangle_{i=0}^{s_2-1} = - \left\langle \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial \lambda} \left(h=0, z, t_0=t_0, \lambda=t_0+2\pi \frac{i}{s_2} - Q \right) \right\rangle_{i=0}^{s_2-1}.$$

Applying trapezoidal rule argument again yields $\|\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial Q}\|_{C^0} \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{D}_{F,0}$ for $s_2 \rightarrow \infty, s_2/s_1 \rightarrow 0$.

Cauchy formula implies $\|\frac{\partial^2 F_s}{\partial Q \partial z}\|_{C^0} \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{D}_F , this proves the third part of the lemma.

The last part of the lemma follows from (11.25) and C^1 -convergence of z -derivatives in this formula established above. As the right-hand sides of (11.25) depend on $s_1 \bmod 2s_2$ and not on s_1 , there is a finite set of possible right-hand sides and we take this set as \mathcal{F}_{s_2} . \square

12 Crossing resonant zones: proofs

12.1 High-numerator resonances: proof

Proof of Lemma 8.8. Let us apply Lemma 11.2 with z_0 as in the statement of lemma and $C_\gamma \geq 8\pi$. By (11.1) and the bound on s_1 from the statement of lemma we have

$$\hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta(z_0) \lesssim C_\rho^{-0.5}. \quad (12.1)$$

This means that for large enough C_ρ the terms containing H_7 in (11.4) are small. The terms containing u are also small for small enough ε . For large enough S_2 there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $F_s > \delta$ if $s_2 > S_2$ (by Lemma 11.4). This means $P' < -0.5\delta$ in (11.4).

Lemma 11.2 gives the domain \mathcal{D} . We need (11.2) to hold in this domain. This holds if $c_Z < d_Z$, where c_Z is from Lemma 11.2 and d_Z is from Lemma 11.1. We reduce c_Z if needed so that $c_Z < d_Z$. Denote $D(I, z)$ by the equation $I = \hat{I}(z) + D\alpha(z)\hat{\omega}^{0.5}$. This also gives the function $D(P, Q, Z, \tau)$ defined in \mathcal{D} . By (11.5) we have

$$|D - P| = O(s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1.5} \beta) \lesssim \sqrt{\hat{\omega}} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}. \quad (12.2)$$

Denote by $\mathcal{D}' \subset \mathcal{D}$ the subdomain given by the additional restriction $|P| < D_p + 1$. Denote $Y = (P, Q, Z, \tau)$ and consider a solution $Y(\tau)$ of (11.4) with the initial condition $Y_0, Y_0 = (P_0, Q_0, Z_0, \tau_0)$, obtained from X_0 after the coordinate change of Lemma 11.2. We can add $2\pi k$ to $\varphi(X_0)$ so that $\gamma = \varphi - (s_2/s_1)\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi]$, then by (11.5) and (12.1) we have $Q_0 \in [-1.1\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}, 1.1\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1}]$. By this estimate on Q_0 and (12.2) $Y_0 \in \mathcal{D}'$ for small enough ω_0 .

As $P' < 0$, the solution $Y(\tau)$ cannot leave \mathcal{D}' through $P = D_p + 1$. Time τ required to leave \mathcal{D}' without reaching the hypersurface $D = -D_p - 1$ (i.e., via $\|Z\| = c_Z$ or $|Q| = \hat{\omega}^{-1}C_\gamma/4$) is $\gtrsim \hat{\omega}^{-1}$ by (11.4). On the other hand, after time $\tau \lesssim D_p$ we will have $P < -D_p - 1$, thus (for small enough ω_0) the solution $Y(\tau)$ leaves \mathcal{D}' through $P = -D_p - 1$. Denote the time λ when this happens by λ_{out} . At the moment λ_{out} we have $P = -D_p - 1$ and thus $D < -D_p \leq -D'_p$. Hence, $\lambda_1 < \lambda_{out}$.

Let us now obtain estimate for the time passed before crossing $D = -D'_p$, i.e. for $\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$. Such estimate can be obtained from (12.2), but we need better estimate. Given $\lambda_2 \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_{out} - 2\pi s_1]$, set $\lambda_3 = \lambda_2 + 2\pi s_1$. Denote by $\Delta\tau$ the time τ between λ_2 and λ_3 . We have $\Delta\tau \sim s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} \beta(z_0)$. Let us compare $D(\lambda_3)$ with $D(\lambda_2)$. We have from (11.4)

$$P(\lambda_3) \leq P(\lambda_2) - 0.5\delta\Delta\tau, \quad |P(\lambda_3) - P(\lambda_2)| + |Q(\lambda_3) - Q(\lambda_2)| \lesssim \Delta\tau, \quad \|z(\lambda_3) - z(\lambda_2)\| \lesssim \alpha(z_0)\hat{\omega}^{-1.5}\Delta\tau.$$

By (12.1) and (11.6) we have $\frac{\partial D}{\partial P} > 0.9$ for small enough ω_0 . Together with the estimates above and (11.6), this implies

$$D(X(\lambda_3)) \leq D(X(\lambda_2)) - \Delta\tau \left(0.5\delta + O(s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1.5} \beta(z_0)) + O(s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-4} \varepsilon) \right) \leq D(X(\lambda_2)) - 0.25\delta\Delta\tau.$$

As $\delta \sim 1$, this gives the estimate for $\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$ from the statement of the current lemma:

$$\lambda_1 - \lambda_0 - 2\pi s_1 \lesssim s_1 D'_p / \Delta\tau \sim D'_p \hat{\omega}^{0.5} \beta(z_0)^{-1} \sim D'_p \hat{\omega}^{0.5} \varepsilon^{-1} \alpha(z_0).$$

□

12.2 Lemma on model system

In this subsection we state a general lemma that will be later applied to study resonance crossing described by (11.4). Consider a system

$$\begin{aligned} p' &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}(p, q, w) + v_p(p, q, w, \tau), \\ q' &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(p, q, w) + v_q(p, q, w, \tau), \\ w' &= v_w(p, q, w, \tau), \\ \tau' &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (12.3)$$

where

$$H = H_0 + \Delta H(p, q, w), \quad H_0 = p^2/2 + V(q),$$

and

$$\|\Delta H\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon_1, \quad \|v_p\|_{C^0}, \|v_q\|_{C^0}, \|v_w\|_{C^0} < \varepsilon_2 \quad (12.4)$$

and

$$V(q) = V_c q + V_{per}(q), \quad (12.5)$$

where $V_c > 0$ is a constant and $V_{per}(q)$ is 2π -periodic. We will call the system (12.3) the *perturbed system*. We will call this system without the v terms the *intermediate system*. It is an autonomous Hamiltonian system with the Hamiltonian $H(p, q, w)$. We will call the Hamiltonian system given by H_0 the *unperturbed system*. One can find analysis of the unperturbed system in [4, Section 9.2]. We will assume that the function V satisfies Condition B' introduced in Subsection 3.3. Note that the saddles of the unperturbed system correspond to the local maxima of V . This also holds for the intermediate system if ε_1 is small enough.

Lemma 12.1. Fix $V(q)$ as above. Then for any small enough $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and any large enough $D_{p,1}, D_{p,2} > 0$ with $D_{p,1} < D_{p,2}$ for any large enough (compared with $D_{p,2}$) C_p for any large enough (compared with C_p) C_q there exists $C > 1$ such that for any $c_Z > 0$ and any $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ with

$$\varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1, \quad \varepsilon_2(1 + |\ln \varepsilon_2|) < 0.5c_Z C^{-1}$$

the following holds.

Consider the unperturbed system in the domain

$$\mathcal{D} = \{w, p, q, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{n+3} : \|w\| \leq c_Z, p \in [-C_p, C_p], q \in [-C_q, C_q]\}.$$

For any $\Delta H, v_p, v_q, v_w$ that satisfy (12.4) in this domain with $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ fixed above, also consider the intermediate and the perturbed systems in this domain. Let

$$X_0 = (p_0, q_0, w_0, \tau_0)$$

denote some initial data with

$$p_0 \in [D_{p,1}, D_{p,2}], \quad q_0 \in [-\pi, \pi], \quad \|w_0\| < 0.5c_Z.$$

If V has no local maxima, set $\Delta h_0 = 1$. Otherwise, let $C_i(w)$ be a saddle of the intermediate system such that $H(C_i(w_0), w_0)$ is as close as possible to $H(p_0, q_0, w_0)$ and set

$$\Delta h_0 = |H(p_0, q_0, w_0) - H(C_i(w_0), w_0)|.$$

We will assume

$$\Delta h_0 > 2C\varepsilon_2.$$

Let $X(\tau) = (p(\tau), q(\tau), w(\tau), \tau)$ denote the solution of the perturbed system with initial data X_0 . Then there exists $\tau_1 > \tau_0$ such that

$$p(\tau_1) = -C_p, \quad \tau_1 - \tau_0 < C(1 + |\ln \Delta h_0|)$$

and for any $\tau \in [\tau_0, \tau_1]$ we have

$$X(\tau) \in \mathcal{D}, \quad |H(X(\tau)) - H(X(\tau_0))| < C\varepsilon_2, \quad \|w(\tau) - w(\tau_0)\| < C\varepsilon_2(1 + |\ln \Delta h_0|).$$

12.3 Proof of the lemma on model system

Let us state a lemma that will be used to prove Lemma 12.1. Denote by U some neighborhood of $(0, 0, 0)$ with $\text{diam } U < 1$. Consider the Hamiltonian system given in U by the Hamiltonian $H = p^2/2 - aq^2 + \Delta H(p, q, w)$, $a > 0$ and its perturbation given by a vector field u :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p} &= 2aq - \frac{\partial \Delta H}{\partial q}(p, q, w) + u_p(p, q, w, t), \\ \dot{q} &= p + \frac{\partial \Delta H}{\partial p}(p, q, w) + u_q(p, q, w, t), \\ \dot{w} &= u_w(p, q, w, t). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that in U we have

$$\|\Delta H\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon_1, \quad \|u_p\|_{C^0}, \|u_q\|_{C^0}, \|u_w\|_{C^0} < \varepsilon_2. \quad (12.6)$$

The constants ε_1 and ε_2 are assumed to be small enough compared to $\min(a, a^{-1})$. The Hamiltonian system has a saddle $C(w) = (p_C(w), q_C(w))$ with $p_C, q_C = O(\varepsilon_1)$. Assume $C(w) \in U$ for all values of w encountered in U . Denote $h(p, q, w) = H(p, q, w) - H(C(w), w)$.

Lemma 12.2. There exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for any $\Delta H, u_p, u_q, u_w$ as above the following holds. Given any initial data (p_0, q_0, w_0, t_0) in U such that

$$|h(p_0, q_0, w_0)| \geq C_1\varepsilon_2,$$

consider the solution $p(t), q(t), w(t), t$ of the perturbed system starting at p_0, q_0, w_0, t_0 . Then this solution exits U at some time $t_1 > t_0$ and for any $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ we have the estimates

$$|h(p(t), q(t), w(t)) - h(p_0, q_0, w_0)| < 0.5C_1\varepsilon_2, \quad t_1 - t_0 < C_1(1 + |\ln |h(p_0, q_0, w_0)||).$$

Proof. We will assume $H(p_0, q_0, w_0) > H(p_C(w_0), q_C(w_0), w_0)$, the proof is similar when the opposite inequality holds. All O -estimates in this proof will be uniform in $p_0, q_0, w_0, \Delta H, u_p, u_q, u_w$. Denote $\tilde{p} = p - p_C(w)$, $\tilde{q} = q - q_C(w)$. Let us denote by \tilde{H} the Hamiltonian $H - H(p_C(w), q_C(w), w)$ rewritten in the shifted coordinates. We can write $\tilde{H} = \tilde{p}^2/2 - a\tilde{q}^2 + \psi(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, w)$, where $\psi = O(\varepsilon_1)$. As at the points $(0, 0, w)$ we have $\tilde{H} = \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{p}} = \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{q}} = 0$, ψ does not contain constant or linear terms with respect to \tilde{p}, \tilde{q} . Hence, we have

$$\tilde{H} = \tilde{p}^2/2 - a\tilde{q}^2 + \psi(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, w), \quad \psi, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial w} = \varepsilon_1 O(\tilde{p}^2 + \tilde{q}^2), \quad \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tilde{p}}, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tilde{q}} = \varepsilon_1 O(|\tilde{p}| + |\tilde{q}|). \quad (12.7)$$

Denote $\tilde{p}(t) = p(t) - p_C(w(t))$, $\tilde{q}(t) = q(t) - q_C(w(t))$ and $h(t) = \tilde{H}(\tilde{p}(t), \tilde{q}(t), w(t))$. Let us take the largest $t_2 > t_0$ such that for any $t \in [t_0, t_2]$ we have

$$(p(t), q(t), w(t)) \in U, \quad h(t) > \varepsilon_2.$$

Then for any $t \in [t_0, t_2]$ at the point $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, w) = (\tilde{p}(t), \tilde{q}(t), w(t))$ we have

$$h = h(t) = (1 + O(\varepsilon_1))\tilde{p}^2/2 - (a + O(\varepsilon_1))\tilde{q}^2.$$

Hence,

$$|\tilde{p}| \geq \sqrt{a\tilde{q}^2 + h} \geq c_1 \max(|\tilde{q}|, \sqrt{\varepsilon_2})$$

for some $c_1 \in (0, 1)$. Hence, $\tilde{p}(t)$ has the same sign for all $t \in [t_0, t_2]$. Without loss of generality we will assume it to be positive. We have $\dot{\tilde{q}} = \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{p}} + \varepsilon_2(u_q - \frac{dC_q}{dw}u_w) = \tilde{p} + \varepsilon_1 O(|\tilde{p}| + |\tilde{q}|) + O(\varepsilon_2)$. Therefore,

$$\dot{\tilde{q}} \geq 0.25c_1(|\tilde{p}| + |\tilde{q}|), \quad \dot{\tilde{q}} \geq 0.5\sqrt{a\tilde{q}^2 + h}. \quad (12.8)$$

By (12.7) we have $\left| \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{p}} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{q}} \right| \leq O(1)(|\tilde{p}| + |\tilde{q}|)$ and thus $\dot{\tilde{q}}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{p}}, \dot{\tilde{q}}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{q}} = O(1)$. As $\dot{\tilde{q}} > 0$, we can use \tilde{q} as an independent variable instead of t . Denote by $'$ the derivative with respect to \tilde{q} . We have

$$h' = \dot{\tilde{q}}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{q}} \left(u_q - \frac{dC_q}{dw} u_w \right) + \dot{\tilde{q}}^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{p}} \left(u_p - \frac{dC_p}{dw} u_w \right) + \frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial w} u_w = O(\varepsilon_2).$$

Thus for $t \in [t_0, t_2]$ we have the estimate $|h(t) - h(t_0)| = O(\varepsilon_2)$ and this estimate does not depend on t_2 . Denote $h_0 = h(t_0)$. We have

$$h_0 = \tilde{H}(\tilde{p}_0, \tilde{q}_0, w_0) = H(p_0, q_0, w_0) - H(C_p(w_0), C_q(w_0), w_0) \geq C_1 \varepsilon_2.$$

Hence, for large enough C_1 we have $h(t_2) > 0.5h_0 > 0$ and thus the solution exists U at the time t_2 . This means that t_1 exists and $t_1 = t_2$. This also proves the estimate for the change of H .

Using (12.8), we can estimate (the details are given below)

$$t_1 - t_0 = \int_{q(t_0)}^{q(t_1)} \frac{d\tilde{q}}{\dot{\tilde{q}}} \leq 2 \int (a\tilde{q}^2 + 0.5h_0)^{-0.5} d\tilde{q} = O(|\ln h_0| + 1).$$

The estimate for the integral above can be obtained by splitting it into two parts, with $|\tilde{q}| \leq \sqrt{h_0}$ and with $|\tilde{q}| > \sqrt{h_0}$. When $|\tilde{q}| \leq \sqrt{h_0}$, we use $(a\tilde{q}^2 + 0.5h_0)^{-0.5} = O(h_0^{-0.5})$, so this part is $O(1)$. When $|\tilde{q}| > \sqrt{h_0}$, we use $(a\tilde{q}^2 + 0.5h_0)^{-0.5} = O(\tilde{q}^{-1})$, so this part is $O(|\ln h_0| + 1)$. This gives the estimate for $t_1 - t_0$ and thus completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 12.1. We will consider the case where the unperturbed system has saddles, the other case is much simpler. Let us first consider the unperturbed system in

$$\{w, p, q, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{n+3} : \|w\| \leq c_Z\}.$$

Note that for $p > 0$ the value of the function $L = p^2/2 + V_{per}(q) = H_0 - V_c q$ decreases along the solutions of the unperturbed system, $\dot{L} = -pV_c < 0$. For small enough ε_1 (this implies that ΔH and v are small) and $p > 1$ we also have $\dot{L} < 0$ along the solutions of intermediate and perturbed systems. The function L is 2π -periodic in q and its contour lines such that $p > 1$ on the whole contour line provide transversals to solutions of all three systems.

Let us take a contour line \mathcal{D}_p of L such that $p > 1$ on this line, let $D_{p,0}$ be the maximum of p on this line. We assume $D_{p,1} > D_{p,0}$. Given $D_{p,1}$ and $D_{p,2}$, take $C_p > D_{p,2}$ such that there is a contour line of L with $p \in (D_{p,2}, C_p)$ on the whole contour line. This guarantees that a solution (of any of the three systems) starting with $p \leq D_{p,2}$ does not cross the line $p = C_p$. Let us now restrict to the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_+ = \{w, p, q, \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{n+3} : \|w\| \leq c_Z, |p| \leq C_p\}.$$

By (12.4) the set

$$\mathcal{H}(w, \Delta H) = \{H(p, q, w) : (p, q, w, \tau) \in \mathcal{D}_+, q \in [-\pi, \pi]\}$$

is bounded (uniformly in w and ΔH). We will assume $\varepsilon_1 < 0.25V_c$. Then we have

$$H(p, q + 2\pi) \geq H(p, q) + \pi V_c.$$

As \mathcal{H} is bounded, this means that the values of $|q|$ on the contour lines given by $H(p, q, w) = h_0 + h_1$, $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $h_1 \in [-1, 1]$ is bounded by some constant (uniformly in w and ΔH), take C_q equal to this constant. This choice of C_q gives the following property that will be used later: if we start in \mathcal{D}_+ with $q \in [-\pi, \pi]$, and the value of H changes by at most 1 (while still being in \mathcal{D}_+), the value of q stays in $(-C_q, C_q)$.

Fixed points of the unperturbed system correspond to extrema of V , with maxima of V corresponding to saddles and minima of V corresponding to centers. For each saddle $C_{V,i} = (0, q_{C,i})$ of the unperturbed system let us fix a small neighborhood U_i in the space with coordinates p, q, w (these neighborhoods will respect 2π -periodicity of the unperturbed system, i.e. neighborhoods of saddles that differ by $2\pi k$ will be shifts of each other; this means that we only need to construct such neighborhoods for saddles with $q_{C,i} \in [0, 2\pi)$) in the following way. First, let us fix preliminary neighborhoods $U_{i,0} = U_{i,0}^{p,q} \times \{w : \|w\| < c_Z\}$ such that there is $c_{sep} > 0$ such that the values of H_0 inside different $U_{i,0}$ are separated by at least c_{sep} . Now for fixed i let us define U_i . Let $q_i = q - q_{C,i}$, we can write $V = V(q_{C,i}) - a_i q_i^2 + O(q_i^3)$. We will now use Lemma 12.2 together with the notation defined there, we add tilde to expressions from this lemma to distinguish them. Let us apply this lemma to $\tilde{q} = q_i, \tilde{p} = p, \tilde{w} = w, \tilde{a} = a_i$ and $\tilde{U} = U_{i,0}$, it gives us $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1$ such that the lemma can be applied if in $U_{i,0}$ we have $\|\widetilde{\Delta H}\|_{C_2} < \tilde{\varepsilon}_1$. Now take $U_i \subset U_{i,0}$ such that inside U_i we have $\|V - V(q_{C,i}) + a_i q_i^2\|_{C_2} < 0.5\tilde{\varepsilon}_1$ and assume $\varepsilon_1 < 0.5\tilde{\varepsilon}_1$ (note that this restriction on ε_1 depends only on V , this will also hold for further restrictions on ε_1). Denote by $C_i(w)$ the saddle of the intermediate system near $C_{V,i}$. If needed, let us further increase ε_1 so that we have $C_i \in 0.5U_i$ for any ΔH that satisfies (12.4), here $0.5U_i$ is the image of U_i under w -dependent homothety with center $C_i(w)$ and ratio 0.5. Take

$$\widetilde{\Delta H} = \Delta H + V - V(q_{C,i}) + a_i q_i^2$$

and $\tilde{u} = v$, we have $H_0 + \Delta H = p^2/2 - a_i q_i^2 + \widetilde{\Delta H} + const$ in U_i . As $\widetilde{\Delta H}$ satisfies (12.6) in U_i (with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1$ instead of ε_1), we can apply Lemma 12.2 to describe the movement inside U_i for small enough ε_2 . The words "small enough" here give another upper bound on ε_1 .

By the choice of U_i the values of H_0 in different sets U_i are separated by at least c_{sep} . For small enough ε_1 the values of H in different sets U_i are separated by at least $c_{sep}/2$. Take small enough $h_b \in (0, c_{sep}/8)$ such that for any $i, \Delta H, w$ the set $|H - H(C_i(w), w)| \leq 2h_b$ intersects ∂U_i by four disjoint sets near intersections of separatrices of C_i with ∂U_i .

Let us suppose we are given some initial data. Denote

$$h(p, q, w) = H(p, q, w) - H(C_i(w), w).$$

We will assume $h_0 < h_b$, the case $h_0 \geq h_b$ (meaning the initial condition is far from separatrices of the intermediate system) is easier and we omit it. We consider the case $h_0 > 0$, the proof is similar when $h_0 < 0$. Let Z be the stripe given by

$$Z = \{(p, q, w, \tau) \in \mathcal{D} : h \in [0.5h_0, 2h_b]\}$$

(cf. Figure 7). For small enough h_b we have $q \in (-C_q, C_q)$ in Z . Also, as $2h_b < c_{sep}/4$, the




Figure 7: The zones Z_i .

zone Z does not intersect U_j for $j \neq i$.

We can split Z into a union of three zones Z_1^-, Z_1^+, Z_3 far from C_i and two zones Z_2^-, Z_2^+ inside U_i . Solutions of the intermediate system visit these zones in the following order: $Z_1^-, Z_2^-, Z_3, Z_2^+, Z_1^+$. Thus, for small ε_2 solutions of the perturbed system starting in each zone can only leave this zone into the next zone or through the boundary of Z , but not into the previous zone.

Take one of the zones Z_1^-, Z_3, Z_1^+ . It is easy to show that solutions of the perturbed system starting at any point inside this zone exit it after time $O(1)$ passes. As $h' = O(\varepsilon_2)$ and $w' = O(\varepsilon_2)$, both h and w change by at most $O(\varepsilon_2)$ while passing this zone.

Now take one of the zones Z_2^-, Z_2^+ inside U_i . When selecting U_i above, we have checked that Lemma 12.2 can be applied to describe the solutions of the perturbed system inside U_i . By this lemma any orbit starting in our zone leaves this zone after time $O(|\ln h_0| + 1)$ passes and h changes by $O(\varepsilon_2)$. From the estimate on the time spent in this zone we conclude that w changes by at most $O(|\ln h_0| + 1)\varepsilon_2$.

Thus the total time spent in Z and changes in h and w before leaving Z are bounded by $O(|\ln h_0| + 1)$, $O(\varepsilon_2)$ and $O(|\ln h_0| + 1)\varepsilon_2$, respectively. Take τ_1 to be the moment when the solution leaves Z . Taking C much greater than the (uniform) constants in these O -estimates, we obtain the estimates for $\tau_1 - \tau_0$ and the change in h and w from the statement of the lemma. For large enough C we also have $h(\tau) \in [h_0 - C\varepsilon_2, h_0 + C\varepsilon_2] \subset (0.5h_0, 2h_0)$ and $\|w(\tau) - w_0\| \leq C(|\ln \varepsilon_2| + 1)\varepsilon_2 < 0.5c_Z$ (due to the inequalities on ε_2 from the statement of the lemma) for large enough C . Recall that we have $q(\tau) \in (-C_q, C_q)$ in Z . This implies that our solution can only leave Z by crossing one of the lines $p = C_p$, $p = -C_p$. However, the choice of C_p above prohibits crossing $p = C_p$, thus the solution crosses $p = -C_p$. This completes the proof. \square

12.4 Applying the lemma on model system

In this section we apply Lemma 12.1 to system (11.4) (with P, Q, Z in (11.4) corresponding to p, q, w in (12.3) in the same order) in such a way that the estimates of this lemma will be uniform for all resonances close enough to separatrices. We also take care of the fact that the main part of the Hamiltonian in (11.4) depends on Z by taking its value at $Z = 0$ as the main part and considering the difference as part of the Hamiltonian perturbation.

We will use the notation V_F introduced in Subsection 3.3. Without the u terms the system (11.4) is Hamiltonian with the Hamiltonian

$$H_r(P, Q, Z) = P^2/2 + V(Q, z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z) + \hat{\omega}^{-2}s_1\beta H_7, \quad (12.9)$$

where $V = V_{F_s}$.

Lemma 12.3. *Given $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}_B$, for any C_{s_1} for any large enough $D_{p,2} > D_{p,1} > 0$ there exist*

$$C_p > D_{p,2}, \quad C_p, C, C_q > 1, \quad c_z, c_Z, \omega_0, \varepsilon_0 > 0$$

such that for any z_0 with $\|z_0 - z_\| < c_z$ for any $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1 \in (0, \omega_0)$, and $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ with*

$$|s_1| < C_{s_1} \ln^2 \varepsilon, \quad \hat{h}(z_0) > C_\rho \varepsilon |\ln^5 \varepsilon|$$

we have the following.

1. *We can apply Lemma 11.2 and the system (11.4) given by this lemma is defined in the domain*

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(Z, P, Q, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+3} : \|Z\| < c_Z, |P| < C_p, |Q| < \pi\hat{\omega}^{-1} + C_q\},$$

where $Z = \hat{\omega}^{-1}(z - z_0)$.

2. *Set $\varepsilon_2 = C\alpha(z_0)\hat{\omega}^{-1}$. Let*

$$X_0 = (P_0, Q_0, Z_0, \tau_0)$$

denote some initial data with

$$P_0 \in [D_{p,1}, D_{p,2}], \quad Q_0 \in [-\hat{\omega}^{-1}\pi - 1, \hat{\omega}^{-1}\pi + 1], \quad \|Z_0\| < c_Z/2.$$

If $V_{F_s}(Q, z_)$ (here F_s is from (11.4)) has no local maxima, set $\Delta h_{r,0} = 1$. Otherwise, let $C_i(Z)$ be a saddle of the intermediate system such that $H(C_i(Z_0), Z_0)$ is as close as possible to $H(p_0, q_0, Z_0)$ and set*

$$\Delta h_{r,0} = |H_r(p_0, q_0, Z_0) - H_r(C_i(Z_0), Z_0)|.$$

We assume

$$\Delta h_{r,0} > 2C\varepsilon_2.$$

Let $X(\tau) = (P(\tau), Q(\tau), Z(\tau), \tau)$ denote the solution of (11.4) with initial data X_0 . Denote $h_r(\tau) = H_r(P(\tau), Q(\tau), Z(\tau))$. Then there exists $\tau_1 > \tau_0$ such

$$P(\tau_1) = -C_p, \quad \tau_1 - \tau_0 < C(1 + |\ln \Delta h_{r,0}|)$$

and for $\tau \in [\tau_0, \tau_1]$ we have

$$X(\tau) \in \mathcal{D}, \quad |H_r(X(\tau)) - H_r(X(\tau_0))| < C\varepsilon_2, \quad \|Z(\tau) - Z_0\| < C\varepsilon_2(1 + |\ln \Delta h_{r,0}|).$$

Proof. We apply Lemma 11.2 with $C_\gamma \geq 8\pi$. This lemma gives us the values of the constants (we add $\tilde{\cdot}$ to the names of this constants)

$$\tilde{c}_Z, \tilde{C}, \tilde{C}_\rho.$$

Fix $c_Z = \tilde{c}_Z$ and assume $C_\rho \geq \tilde{C}_\rho$. We apply Lemma 11.2 with z_0 as in the current lemma. For small enough ω_0 the conditions on s_1 and z_0 in Lemma 11.2 are satisfied and the domain \mathcal{D} lies in the domain provided by Lemma 11.2.

Let us now build a finite set \mathcal{F} such that elements of this set approximate the functions F_s for any s as in the statement of lemma. Denote $V_\Theta = V_F$, where $F = \Theta_3(z)$. Let us apply Lemma 12.1 to $V_\Theta(Q, z_*)$, denote by $\varepsilon_{1,0}$ the largest value of ε_1 allowed by this lemma. Apply Lemma 11.4 with z_0 in that lemma equal to z_* and with $\delta_1 = 0.5 \min(\varepsilon_{1,0}, \min_{z_B} \Theta_3(z))$. This lemma gives S, c and a set \mathcal{F}_{s_2} for each $s_2 \leq S$, take

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\Theta_3\} \cup (\cup_{s_2 \leq S} \mathcal{F}_{s_2}), \quad \mathcal{F}_* = \{F(Q, z_*) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Let us now determine the constants used to define the domain \mathcal{D} . We will assume $c_z < 0.5c$ and $\omega_0 c_Z < 0.5c$, then estimates of Lemma 11.4 are valid for $z = z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z$ with $\|Z\| < c_Z$. Let $\varepsilon_{1,1}$ be so small that Lemma 12.1 can be applied to all functions $V_{F_i}, F_i \in \mathcal{F}_*$ with $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_{1,1}$. Clearly, $\varepsilon_{1,1} \leq \varepsilon_{1,0}$. Let us apply Lemma 12.1 to the functions $V_{F_i}, F_i \in \mathcal{F}_*$ with $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_{1,0}$ for V_Θ and $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_{1,1}$ for other V_{F_i} . We can take the same values of C_p, C_q for all V , fix these constants.

Let us now prove that for small enough c_z and ω_0 for any z_0 and s we have

$$\|V_{F_s}(Q, z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z) - V_{F_s}(Q, z_*)\|_{C^2(Q,Z), Q \in [-C_q, C_q]} < 0.25\varepsilon_{1,1}, \quad (12.10)$$

(here and thereafter we consider all Z with $\|Z\| < c_Z$ when taking the norm). We use that $\|F_s\|_{C^1(Q,z)}$ and $\|\frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z}\|_{C^1(Q,z)}$ are bounded by Lemma 11.4. Denote

$$z = z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z, \quad U(Q, Z) = V_{F_s}(Q, z) - V_{F_s}(Q, z_*).$$

We have (in the formula below $z_{int} \in [z, z_*]$ denotes some intermediate z)

$$U = \int_0^Q F_s(\tilde{Q}, z) - F_s(\tilde{Q}, z_*) d\tilde{Q} = \int_0^Q \frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z}(\tilde{Q}, z_{int}(\tilde{Q})) d\tilde{Q} = O(z - z_*) = O(c_z + \hat{\omega}c_Z).$$

We check in the same way that $\frac{\partial U}{\partial Q}, \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial Q^2} = O(c_z + \hat{\omega}c_Z)$. We have

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial Z} = \hat{\omega} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} V_{F_s}(Q, z) = \hat{\omega} \int_0^Q \frac{\partial F_s}{\partial z}(\tilde{Q}, z) d\tilde{Q} = O(\hat{\omega}).$$

We check in the same way that $\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial Q \partial Z}, \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial Z^2} = O(\hat{\omega})$, this proves (12.10).

Decompose $Q_0 = Q_{0,1} + \Delta Q$ with $\Delta Q = 2\pi k, Q_{0,1} \in [-\pi, \pi]$. To apply Lemma 12.1, we use shifted variable \tilde{Q} defined by $Q = \tilde{Q} + \Delta Q$. Set $\tilde{V}_F(\tilde{Q}) = V_F(Q)|_{Q=\tilde{Q}}$. Given F_s from (11.4), we take $\tilde{V}_{F_i}(\tilde{Q}, z_*)$ as $V(\tilde{Q})$ in Lemma 12.1, where F_i is the closest to F_s element of \mathcal{F} and set in Lemma 12.1

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta H(P, \tilde{Q}, Z) &= \tilde{V}_{F_s}(\tilde{Q}, z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z) - \tilde{V}_{F_i}(\tilde{Q}, z_*) + \hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta H_7(P, \tilde{Q} + \Delta Q, Z), \\ (v_p, v_q, v_z) &= (\alpha u_P, \alpha \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} u_Q, \alpha \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} u_z)|_{Q=\tilde{Q}+\Delta Q}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta H\|_{C^2(\tilde{Q}, Z), \tilde{Q} \in [-C_q, C_q]} &\leq \|V_{F_s}(Q, z) - V_{F_s}(Q, z_*)\|_{C^2(Q, Z), Q \in [-C_q, C_q]} \\ &\quad + \|V_{F_i}(Q, z_*) - V_{F_s}(Q, z_*)\|_{C^2(Q), Q \in [-C_q, C_q]} \\ &\quad + \|\hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta H_7\|_{C^2(P, Q, Z), Q \in [\Delta Q - C_q, \Delta Q + C_q]}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by $0.25\varepsilon_{1,1}$ due to (12.10). The second term is bounded by $0.5\varepsilon_{1,0}$ for $V_{F_i} = V_\Theta$ due to item 3 of Lemma 11.4, and by $0.5\varepsilon_{1,1}$ for other V_{F_i} when ω_0 is small enough due to item 4 of the same lemma. Let us now show that for large enough C_ρ the third term is bounded by $0.25\varepsilon_{1,1}$. Indeed, by (11.2) we have $|\beta(z_0 + \hat{\omega}Z)| \sim \beta(z_0)$ for complex Z with $\|Z\| < 8c_Z$, by Cauchy formula this means $\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial Z}, \frac{\partial^2 \beta}{\partial Z^2} = O(\beta(z_0))$. Together with the bound on $\|H_7\|$ from Lemma 11.2 this implies

$$\|\hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta H_7\|_{C^2} = O(\hat{\omega}^{-2} s_1 \beta(z_0)) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon \hat{h}^{-1} \hat{\omega}^{-1} s_1^2}) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon \hat{h}^{-1} C_{s_1}^2 |\ln^5 \varepsilon|}) = O(\sqrt{C_{s_1}^2 / C_\rho}).$$

Thus, $\|\Delta H\|_{C^2(Q, Z)}$ is bounded by $\varepsilon_{1,0}$ if $V_{F_i} = V_\Theta$ and by $\varepsilon_{1,1}$ otherwise. This means that we can apply Lemma 12.1 with these ΔH and v . Recall that we took $\varepsilon_2 = C\alpha(z_0)\hat{\omega}^{-1}$. Clearly, for large enough C we have $\|v\|_{C^0} < \varepsilon_2$. We have

$$\varepsilon_2 = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon \hat{h}(z_0) |\ln^5 \hat{h}|}).$$

It is easy to see that ε_2 satisfies the conditions in Lemma 12.1 for small enough ε_0 and large enough C_ρ . We can finally apply Lemma 12.1, we assume that C from the current lemma is greater than the constant C from Lemma 12.1. Then Lemma 12.1 gives us the estimates stated in the current lemma. \square

12.5 Low-numerator resonances: proof

In this subsection we prove Lemma 8.9, thus estimating the measure of initial conditions captured into resonances and time spent in resonance zones for initial conditions that are not captured. To prove this lemma we first prove auxiliary Lemma 12.4. Recall that m denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{A} and $B_r(O)$ denotes the ball with center O and radius r . Denote by m_z the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^n .

Lemma 12.4. *Given $z_* \in \mathcal{Z}_B$, for any $C_{s_1}, D_{p,0} > 0$ there exist*

$$c_z, \omega_0, \varepsilon_0 > 0, D_p > D_{p,0}, C, C_\rho, C_B > 1$$

such that for any $\hat{\omega} = s_2/s_1 \in (0, \omega_0)$, and $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ with $|s_1| < C_{s_1} \ln^2 \varepsilon$ there exist a finite collection of balls B_i with centers $z_i \in B_{c_z}(z_)$ and equal radii $\hat{\omega} c_Z$ such that*

$$\cup_i B_{\hat{\omega} c_Z/2}(z_i) \supset B_{c_z}(z_*), \quad \sum_i m_z(B_i) \leq C_B$$

and a collection of sets

$$\mathcal{V}_i \subset \mathbb{R}_{p,q}^2 \times B_i \times [0, 2\pi]_\lambda,$$

such that for any i we have

$$m(\mathcal{V}_i) \leq C \alpha_i^2 s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-0.5} m_z(B_i)$$

(we denote $\alpha_i = \alpha(z_i)$).

These collections satisfy the following: for any i for any initial data p_0, q_0, z_0, λ_0 with

$$I(p_0, q_0, z_0) = \hat{I}(z_0) + D_p \alpha(z_0) \hat{\omega}^{0.5}, \quad z_0 \in B_{\hat{\omega} c_Z/2}(z_i), \quad h(p_0, q_0, z_0) > C_\rho \varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon^5| \quad (12.11)$$

at least one of the following holds.

- *The solution of the perturbed system (3.2) with this initial data crosses the hypersurface $I = \hat{I}(z) - D_p \alpha(z) \hat{\omega}^{0.5}$ at some time $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ with*

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \leq C |\ln \varepsilon| \hat{\omega}^{0.5} \alpha_i.$$

- *There exists $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ with*

$$\varepsilon(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0) \geq C^{-1} \hat{\omega}^{0.5} \alpha_i$$

such that this solution remains in \mathcal{V}_i for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_1]$.

Proof. Recall that we define $D(I, z)$ by the equality

$$I = \hat{I}(z) + D \alpha(z) \hat{\omega}^{0.5}.$$

The values of $D_{p,1}$ in Lemma 12.3 should be large enough, we denote by $D'_{p,0}$ a constant such that this lemma can be applied for $D_{p,1} > D'_{p,0}$. The coordinate change of Lemma 11.2 (we do not specify the details yet, this will be done later) gives the variables P, Q . By (11.5) we have $D = P + O(s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1.5} \beta)$. We have

$$s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1.5} \beta \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^4 \varepsilon} \lesssim |\ln \varepsilon|^{-0.5} \ll 1.$$

Thus we can take $D_p > D_{p,0}$ and $D_{p,2}, D_{p,1} > D'_{p,0}$ with $D_{p,2} > D_{p,1} + 3$ such that

- $P(I, z, \varphi, \lambda) \in [D_{p,1} + 1, D_{p,2} - 1]$ for any I, z, φ, λ with $D(I, z) = D_p$
- $P(I, z, \varphi, \lambda) = -D_{p,2}$ implies $D(I, z) < -D_p$.

Let us now apply Lemma 12.3 with $D_{p,1}$ and $D_{p,2}$ chosen above, it provides us with constants (we add $\tilde{\cdot}$ to constants provided by this lemma)

$$\tilde{C}_p, \tilde{C}_\rho, \tilde{C}, \tilde{C}_q, \tilde{c}_z, \tilde{c}_Z, \tilde{\omega}_0, \tilde{\varepsilon}_0.$$

Set $c_z = \tilde{c}_z$, $c_Z = \tilde{c}_Z$, $C_\rho = 2\tilde{C}_\rho$.

The existence of C_B and $\{B_i\}$ is obvious, we can place the centers z_i in the nodes of a hyper-cubic lattice (with step $\sim \hat{\omega} c_Z$). Let us now fix some i . Assume that condition (12.11) is satisfied for some initial condition, else we have nothing to prove. Let us apply Lemma 12.3 with z_0 (from that lemma) equal to z_i . The bound on $\hat{h}(z_i)$ required by Lemma 12.3 is satisfied by (11.2), (12.11) and our choice of C_ρ .

We will use the coordinates P, Q provided by Lemma 11.2 applied as a part of statement of Lemma 12.3. Set

$$\varepsilon_{2,i} = 2\tilde{C} \alpha_i \hat{\omega}^{-1},$$

it is greater that the value of ε_2 in Lemma 12.3 ($\tilde{C} \alpha(z_0) \hat{\omega}^{-1}$). We have $\ln \varepsilon_{2,i} \sim \ln \varepsilon$. Set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{0,i} = \left\{ (Z, P, Q, \tau) \in \mathcal{D}_i : \|Z\| < c_Z, P \in [D_{p,1}, D_{p,2}], Q \in [-\pi \hat{\omega}^{-1} - \tilde{C}_q, \pi \hat{\omega}^{-1} + \tilde{C}_q] \right\},$$

where \mathcal{D}_i denotes the domain \mathcal{D} from Lemma 12.3. Define $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_i \subset \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{0,i}$ by additional condition that the value of the Hamiltonian $H_{r,i}$ defined by (12.9) is at least $2\tilde{C} \varepsilon_{2,i}$ -far from its values

at the saddles of the Hamiltonian system given by $H_{r,i}$. Let \mathcal{V}_i be the preimage of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_i$ under the coordinate change of Lemma 11.2.

Take an initial condition satisfying (12.11). Rewriting our initial condition in the new chart gives P_0, Q_0, Z_0, τ_0 (there is some freedom, as we can add $2\pi k$ to $\varphi_0 = \varphi(p_0, q_0)$, this will be resolved later). By the choice of D_p we have $P_0 \in [D_{p,1} + 1, D_{p,2} - 1]$. We can also achieve $Q_0 \in [-\pi\hat{\omega}^{-1} - 1, \pi\hat{\omega}^{-1} + 1]$. Indeed, by (11.5) it is sufficient to have $\gamma(\varphi_0, \lambda_0) \in [-\pi, \pi]$ and this can be accomplished by adding $2\pi k$ to φ_0 .

We study the evolution of this initial condition using the system (11.4). As $P', Q', Z' = O(1)$ in (11.4), solutions starting in $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{0,i}$ with $\|Z_0\| < 0.5c_Z$ and $P \in [D_{p,1} + 1, D_{p,2} - 1]$ spend in $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{0,i}$ time $\tau \gtrsim 1$, thus time $\lambda \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-1}\alpha\hat{\omega}^{0.5}$. Indeed, by (11.3) we have

$$\Delta\lambda = \varepsilon^{-1}\alpha\hat{\omega}^{0.5}\Delta\tau.$$

If during the crossing of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{0,i}$ the solution is not in $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_i$ (at just one time), by Lemma 12.3 this solution reaches $P = -\tilde{C}_p < -D_{p,2}$ at some point. By the choice of D_p this implies $D \leq -D_p$, by continuity at some point before this solution crosses $D = -D_p$, i.e. $I = \hat{I}(z) - D_p\alpha(z)\hat{\omega}^{0.5}$. The estimate on the time λ before this moment follows from the estimate $\tau \lesssim |\ln \varepsilon_2| \lesssim |\ln \varepsilon|$ on the time τ before this moment provided by Lemma 12.3.

Let us consider sections $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_i$ and sections $\mathcal{V}_{i,z}$ of \mathcal{V}_i with fixed z . We will also consider sections $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z,\tau}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_i$ with fixed z and τ . In $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_0$ we have $\frac{\partial H_r}{\partial P} \approx P > D_{p,1}$ and thus $\frac{\partial H_r}{\partial P} > 0.5D_{p,1}$. This means that the measures of intersections of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z,\tau}$ with each segment where only P varies are $O(\varepsilon_{2,i})n_{sadd}$, where n_{sadd} is the number of saddles we need to consider. When Q is fixed, $n_{sadd} = O(1)$. Indeed, for fixed Q the range of values of H_r is bounded and so, as (we use notation V_c from (12.5)) $V_c > 0$, the number of saddles where the value of H_r is close to that range is also bounded. Thus, as the range of values of Q is $\sim \hat{\omega}^{-1}$, the measures of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z,\tau} \subset \mathbb{R}_{P,Q}^2$ are $O(\varepsilon_{2,i}\hat{\omega}^{-1}) = O(\alpha_i\hat{\omega}^{-2})$.

To estimate the measure of the set $\mathcal{V}_{i,z}$, we follow the construction of the coordinate change of Lemma 11.2 (see the proof of this lemma) in the reverse order. The z -dependent time change $\mu \rightarrow \tau$ does not change the measures of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z,\tau}$ (for the preimages of these sets μ is fixed instead of τ). As our system is 2π -periodic in μ , integrating by μ shows that measures of the preimages of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{P,Q}^2 \times [0, 2\pi]_\mu$ are $O(\alpha_i\hat{\omega}^{-2})$. Before the scaling $\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q} \rightarrow P, Q$ the measures of the preimages of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}}^2 \times [0, 2\pi]_\mu$ are $O(\alpha_i\hat{\omega}^{-0.5})$. The coordinate change of Corollary 11.8 is volume-preserving, so the measure of the preimages of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{J,\gamma}^2 \times [0, 2\pi]_\mu$ is again $O(\alpha_i\hat{\omega}^{-0.5})$. We project γ from \mathbb{R} to $[0, 2\pi]$, this does not increase the measures. Before the change of angular variables the measures in $\mathbb{R}_J \times [0, 2\pi]_{\varphi,\lambda}^2$ are $O(\alpha_i s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-0.5})$. Before the scaling of I the measures in $\mathbb{R}_I \times [0, 2\pi]_{\varphi,\lambda}^2$ are $O(\alpha_i^2 s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-0.5})$.

Finally, moving from I, φ -variables back to p, q (this preserves the volume), we get that the measure of the preimages of $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{i,z}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{p,q}^2 \times [0, 2\pi]_\lambda$ (i.e. $\mathcal{V}_{i,z}$) is $O(\alpha_i^2 s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-0.5})$. Taking union of these preimages for $z \in B_i$ gives the estimate on the measure of \mathcal{V}_i . This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 8.9. Let us apply Lemma 12.4 to our z_* , C_{s_1} , $D_{p,0}$, it gives us

$$c_z, \omega_0, \varepsilon_0, D_p > D_{p,0}.$$

Denote by M_i the set of all initial conditions X_{init} such that the second alternative of Lemma 12.4 holds with this i for some $X(\lambda_0)$ with λ_0 as above, let m_i be the measure of M_i . Set $\mathcal{E}_s = \cup_i M_i$. Then the statement of the lemma holds if $X_{init} \notin \mathcal{E}_s$, it only remains to estimate the measure of \mathcal{E}_s .

Denote by g^λ the flow given by the perturbed system. Let $\lambda_i \sim \varepsilon^{-1}\alpha_i\hat{\omega}^{0.5}$ denote the estimate from below on the time spent in \mathcal{V}_i claimed in the second alternative. Set

$$K_1 = \lceil \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda/\lambda_i \rceil \sim \alpha_i^{-1}\hat{\omega}^{-0.5}.$$

Then we have

$$M_i \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{K_1} g^{-j\lambda_i}(\mathcal{V}_i).$$

By Lemma 6.3 there is $K_2 > 1$ such that for any $\lambda \in [0, \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ the map $g^{-\lambda}$ expands the volume m by factor at most K_2 . Thus we have the estimate

$$m_i \leq K_2 K_1 m(\mathcal{V}_i) \lesssim \alpha_i s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1} m_z(B_i).$$

As $\sum_i m_z(B_i) = O(1)$, this gives

$$m(\mathcal{E}_s) \leq \sum_i m_i \lesssim s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1} \max_i \alpha_i \lesssim s_1 \hat{\omega}^{-1} \alpha_*.$$

\square

13 Passing separatrices: proof

Proof of Lemma 6.6. Pick $R_Z \sim |\ln^{-1} h_*| \sim |\ln^{-1} \varepsilon|$ such that we have $R_Z < d_Z \omega(h, z)$ for all $z \in B_{c_z}(z_*)$ and $h \in [h_*, 4h_*]$, where the constant d_Z is provided by Lemma 11.1. Build a finite collection of balls B_i with centers $z_i \in B_{c_z}(z_*)$ and equal radii R_Z such that for some $C_B > 0$ we have

$$\cup_i B_{R_Z/2}(z_i) \supset B_{c_z}(z_*), \quad \sum_i m_z(B_i) \leq C_B$$

(recall that m_z denotes Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^n). Fix some i and set

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \{X \in B_{R_Z}(z_i) \times \mathbb{R}_{p,q}^2 \times [0, 2\pi]_\lambda : h(X) \in [-h_*, 4h_*]\}.$$

Let us prove the following alternative: for any X_0 with $z_0 \in B_{R_Z/2}(z_i)$ and $h(X_0) = h_*$ (then $X_0 \in \mathcal{L}_i$) the corresponding solution of (3.2) either reaches $h = -h_*$ after time at most $\Delta\lambda$ or stays in \mathcal{L}_i for time $\Delta\lambda$, where

$$\Delta\lambda = \varepsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^\gamma \varepsilon|.$$

To prove this alternative, we need to show that this solution cannot leave \mathcal{L}_i through $|z - z_i| = R_Z$ or through $h = 4h_*$. The first part follows from $\dot{z} = O(\varepsilon)$, thus changing z by $0.5R_Z$ requires time at least $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}/R_Z \gg \Delta\lambda$.

To prove the second part, we find a non-resonant zone $Z_{r,r+1}$ such that we have $(h, z_i) \in Z_{r,r+1}$ for some $h \in [1.4h_*, 1.6h_*]$. We can find such non-resonant zone, as different resonant zones with $h \sim h_*$ do not intersect and have width $\sim \sqrt{\varepsilon h_*} \ll h_*$ in h . By Lemma 11.1 (applied to s_r and s_{r+1}) for all $z \in B_{R_Z}(z_i)$ there exists some $h \in [1.2h_*, 1.8h_*]$ with $(h, z) \in Z_{r,r+1}$.

By Lemma 8.6 if at some time we have $X(\lambda) \in Z_{r,r+1}$ (this must happen before reaching $h = 4h_*$), we then reach either $\partial\Pi$ (then $h \ll h_*$) or the border of $Z_{r,r+1}$ with Z_{r+1} (then h is again less than in $Z_{r,r+1}$ and the solution must again enter $Z_{r,r+1}$ before reaching $h = 4h_*$). The third part of Lemma 8.6 gives the estimate $h \leq \frac{5}{3} \times 1.8h_* = 3h_*$, so it is impossible to have $h > 3h_*$ while z stays in $B_{c_z}(z_*)$. The alternative is proved.

Denote by g^λ the flow given by the perturbed system. Set

$$K_1 = [\varepsilon^{-1} \Lambda / \Delta\lambda] \sim \varepsilon^{-0.5} \ln^{-\gamma} \varepsilon$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_i = \bigcup_{j=0}^{K_1} g^{-j\Delta\lambda}(\mathcal{L}_i).$$

This set covers all X_{init} such that second part of the alternative can be satisfied for some λ_0 with $z(X(\lambda_0)) \in B_{R_Z/2}(z_i)$. Indeed, if the second part of the alternative is satisfied, we have $X(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}_i$ for all $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \Delta\lambda]$, thus for some natural $k \geq 0$ we have $X(\lambda_{init} + k\Delta\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}_i$ and $X_{init} \in g^{-k\Delta\lambda}(\mathcal{L}_i)$.

By Lemma 6.3 there is $K_2 > 1$ such that for any $\lambda \in [0, \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ the map $g^{-\lambda}$ expands the volume m by factor at most K_2 . As $\Delta h = h_*$ corresponds to $\Delta I \sim h_* \ln \varepsilon$, we have $m(\mathcal{L}_i) \sim h_* \ln \varepsilon m_z(B_i)$. Thus we have the estimate

$$m(\mathcal{C}_i) \leq K_2 K_1 m(\mathcal{L}_i) \lesssim m_z(B_i) h_* \ln \varepsilon \varepsilon^{-0.5} \ln^{-\gamma} \varepsilon \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} \ln^{\rho-\gamma+1} \varepsilon m_z(B_i).$$

Set $\mathcal{E} = \cup_i \mathcal{C}_i$. As $\sum_i m_z(B_i) = O(1)$, this gives

$$m(\mathcal{E}) \leq \sum_i m(\mathcal{C}_i) \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon} \ln^{\rho-\gamma+1} \varepsilon.$$

Clearly, if $X_0 \notin \mathcal{E}$, we have $z_0 \in B_{R_Z/2}(z_i)$, $X_0 \notin \mathcal{E}_i$ for some i . But then the corresponding solution cannot stay in \mathcal{L}_i for time $\Delta\lambda$, thus it crosses $h = -h_*$. \square

14 Probabilities

Denote

$$\mathcal{F}(h, z, i) = \frac{1}{2\pi T} \int_0^{2\pi} \oint \operatorname{div} f dt d\lambda.$$

The inner integral above is taken along the closed trajectory of the unperturbed system given by $h = h, z = z$ that lies inside \mathcal{B}_i , this trajectory is parametrized by the time t .

Lemma 14.1. *In the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, there exists a set \mathcal{E}_1 with*

$$m(\mathcal{E}_1) = O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^5 \varepsilon|)$$

such that if the initial condition is not in \mathcal{E}_1 , for $\lambda \in [\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^{-1}\Lambda]$ we have

$$\varepsilon \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} \operatorname{div} f(X(\lambda)) d\lambda = \varepsilon \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} \mathcal{F}(\bar{X}(\lambda)) d\lambda + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|).$$

Proof. Set $\tilde{z} = (z, z_\rho)$, $f_{\tilde{z}} = (f_z, \operatorname{div} f)$. Consider extended perturbed system, where we replace z and f_z by \tilde{z} and $f_{\tilde{z}}$. Then along solutions of extended perturbed system we have $\dot{z}_\rho = \varepsilon \operatorname{div} f$ and along solutions of extended averaged system we have $\dot{\tilde{z}}_\rho = \mathcal{F}$. Note that the right-hand side of the extended systems (perturbed and averaged) does not depend on z_ρ , the evolution of all variables except z_ρ is given by the initial systems. Apply Theorem 3.2 to the extended system and denote by \mathcal{E}_1 the excluded set for extended system. Solutions of perturbed and averaged system are $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|)$ -close to each other. Taking z_ρ -coordinates yields

$$\varepsilon \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} \operatorname{div} f(X(\lambda)) d\lambda = z_\rho(\lambda) - z_\rho(\lambda_0) = \bar{z}_\rho(\lambda) - \bar{z}_\rho(\lambda_0) + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|) = \varepsilon \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} \mathcal{F}(\bar{X}(\lambda)) d\lambda + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln \varepsilon|). \quad \square$$

Given a vector $v_0 = (v_0^1, \dots, v_0^s)$, denote by $C_\delta(v_0)$ the cube with side 2δ and center v_0 . Set

$$W^\delta(I_0, z_0) = C_\delta(I_0, z_0) \times [0, 2\pi]_{\varphi, \lambda}^2 \subset \mathcal{A}_3.$$

Let $W_i^\delta \subset W^\delta \cap \mathcal{E}$ be the subset of initial conditions such that the solution is captured in \mathcal{A}_i , $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma 14.2.

$$m(W_i^\delta) = \int_{W^\delta} \frac{\Theta_i(z_*)}{\Theta_3(z_*)} dp_0 dq_0 dz_0 + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\ln^5 \varepsilon|), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Here $z_*(p_0, q_0, z_0)$ denotes the value of z when the solution of the averaged system with initial data $(h(p_0, q_0, z_0), z_0)$ crosses the separatrices.

Proof. This lemma is similar to [9, Proposition 2.4] and can be proved in the same way. In [9] the proof of Proposition 2.4 is based on Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2. Lemma 5.1 in [9] is an analogue of Lemma 14.1 above, and we replace the use of Lemma 5.1 in [9] by our Lemma 14.1. Lemma 5.2 in [9] is a statement about the averaged system (in one-frequency case). One can obtain averaged system in two-frequency case as follows: first, average the perturbation over the time λ and obtain a system with one frequency (corresponding to the angle φ) and then take average over φ . Thus, averaged system in two-frequency case is the same as averaged system in one-frequency system obtained after averaging over λ , and the statement of Lemma 5.2 holds for our case. The rest of the proof of Proposition 2.4 can be straightforwardly applied to our case, we just need to change the error terms to adjust for the difference of precision of averaged method and the measure of exceptional set in one-frequency and two-frequency cases. \square

Recall the notation

$$U^\delta(I_0, z_0, \varphi_0, \lambda_0) = C_\delta(I_0, z_0, \varphi_0, \lambda_0).$$

Lemma 14.3. *We have the following for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose that for (I_0, z_0) in some open set \mathcal{U} we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(W_i^\delta)}{m(W^\delta)} = \psi(I_0, z_0), \quad (14.1)$$

where the function ψ is continuous in \mathcal{U} and the limit is uniform for all $(I_0, z_0) \in \mathcal{U}$. Then for any $(I_0, z_0) \in \mathcal{U}$ and any $\varphi_0, \lambda_0 \in [0, 2\pi]$ we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(U_i^\delta)}{m(U^\delta)} = \psi(I_0, z_0). \quad (14.2)$$

Proof. Assume w.l.o.g. that $i = 1$. Suppose we are given some tolerance κ and we want to show that for each small enough δ for small enough ε we have $|m(U_1^\delta)/m(U^\delta) - \psi| \leq \kappa$ for fixed I_0, z_0 and all φ_0, λ_0 . The value of δ should be so small that in the set $\mathcal{U}_0 = C_\delta(I_0, z_0)$ the values of ψ differ from $\psi(I_0, z_0)$ by at most $\kappa/9$.

Denote $\phi = (\varphi, \lambda)$. Let m_ϕ, m_ω and $m_{I,z}$ denote the Lebesgue measure on the space where the corresponding variable(s) is defined: \mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , respectively. Set $\Omega_0 = \{\omega(I, z), (I, z) \in \mathcal{U}_0\}$. Denote by $\Omega(\nu, \delta_\phi, N) \subset \Omega_0$ the set of all ω such that the flow $R_\omega^t(\varphi, \lambda) = (\varphi + \omega t, \lambda + t)$ on $[0, 2\pi^2]$ satisfies the following: for any ϕ_1, ϕ_2 there exists $t \in [0, N]$ such that

$$m_\phi(C_{\delta_\phi}(\phi_1) \Delta R_\omega^t(C_{\delta_\phi}(\phi_2))) \leq \nu \delta_\phi^2. \quad (14.3)$$

We have the following

- $\Omega(\nu, \delta_\phi, N)$ is compact.
- $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m_\omega(\Omega(\nu, \delta_\phi, k)) = m_\omega(\Omega_0)$ for each $\nu > 0$.

The first property is straightforward (we can write $\Omega(\nu, \delta_\phi, N)$ as intersection of sets such that the property above is satisfied for each pair (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) , each such set is compact as we can pick convergent subsequence of the values of t). To prove the second property, note that if ω is irrational, we have $\omega \in \Omega(\nu, \delta_\phi, k)$ for large enough k , as orbits of the flow R_ω^t are dense. This gives $m_\omega(\cup_k \Omega(\nu, \delta_\phi, k)) = m_\omega(\Omega_0)$, our statement follows from the continuity of Lebesgue measure.

Now set $\delta_\phi = \delta, \nu = \kappa/100$ and $\Omega_k = \Omega(\nu, \delta, k)$. Take large enough k so that

$$m(\{X : \omega(X) \in \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_k\}) \leq \kappa/9 m(W^\delta) \quad (14.4)$$

(this can be done, as $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial X}$ is non-degenerate). Each point of Ω_k has a neighborhood (a segment with center at this point) such that (14.3) holds for all ω in this segment with the same t but 2ν instead of ν :

$$m_\phi(C_\delta(\phi_1) \Delta R_\omega^t(C_\delta(\phi_2))) \leq 2\nu \delta_\phi^2. \quad (14.5)$$

Pick a finite cover α of Ω_k by such segments. Let $\{I_j\}$ denote all segments between endpoints of the segments from α that intersect Ω_k , the segments I_j are disjoint from each other and their union covers Ω_k . Denote $K_j = \{(I, z) \in \mathcal{U}_0 : \omega(I, z) \in I_j\}$. We can decompose this set (except a subset of small measure) as disjoint union of cubes $K_{j,l}$ with small side δ_w . We pick δ_w so small that most of volume of K_j is covered (except the proportion at most $\kappa/9$) and $|m(W_1^\delta)/m(W^\delta) - \psi| \leq \kappa/9$ when $\delta \leq \delta_w$ for small enough ε . Let us now apply (14.1) to the set $W^\delta = W^{j,l} = K_{j,l} \times [0, 2\pi]_\phi^2$. We obtain for small enough ε (in the formula below and thereafter the lower index 1 denotes that we consider initial data from some set that is captured in \mathcal{A}_1)

$$\frac{m(W_1^{j,l})}{m(W^{j,l})} \in [\psi(I, z) - \kappa/9, \psi(I, z) + \kappa/9] \subset [\psi(I_0, z_0) - 2\kappa/9, \psi(I_0, z_0) + 2\kappa/9].$$

Denote by W^{j,l,ϕ_0} the subset of $W^{j,l}$ defined by the condition $|\varphi - \varphi_0|, |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \delta_\phi$, where $(\varphi_0, \lambda_0) = \phi_0$. We have (14.5). Thus for small enough ε we have

$$m(W^{j,l,\phi_1} \Delta g_\varepsilon^t(W^{j,l,\phi_2})) \leq 3\nu \delta_\phi^2 m_{I,z}(W^{j,l})$$

for any ϕ_1, ϕ_2 . Here g_ε^t denotes the flow of the perturbed system. The set of points captured in \mathcal{A}_1 is invariant under g_ε^t , so the estimate above means that $m(W_1^{j,l,\phi})$ is almost the same for all ϕ , with difference $\leq 3\nu \delta_\phi^2 m_{I,z}(W^{j,l})$. As the average of $m(W_1^{j,l,\phi})/m(W^{j,l,\phi})$ over ϕ is $m(W_1^{j,l})/m(W^{j,l})$, this means (given $\nu = \kappa/100$) for all ϕ

$$\frac{m(W_1^{j,l,\phi})}{m(W^{j,l,\phi})} \in [\psi(I_0, z_0) - 3\kappa/9, \psi(I_0, z_0) + 3\kappa/9].$$

Denote $K^{j,\phi} = K_j \times C_\delta(\phi)$. Taking sum over l gives

$$\frac{m(K_1^{j,\phi})}{m(K^{j,\phi})} \in [\psi(I_0, z_0) - 4\kappa/9, \psi(I_0, z_0) + 4\kappa/9].$$

Finally, taking union over j and using (14.4), we get

$$\frac{m(U_1^\delta)}{m(U^\delta)} \in [\psi(I_0, z_0) - 5\kappa/9, \psi(I_0, z_0) + 5\kappa/9].$$

This estimates holds for any κ when δ and ε are small enough (and ε is small compared with δ). This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Fix any open set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{A}_3$ that is separated from the separatrices. By Lemma 14.2 we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m(W_i^\delta)}{m(W^\delta)} = \Theta_i(z_*)/\Theta_3(z_*),$$

where z_* is taken at (I_0, z_0) . This holds uniformly in \mathcal{U} . By Lemma 14.3 for any $(I_0, z_0) \in \mathcal{U}$ and any $\varphi_0, \lambda_0 \in [0, 2\pi]$ we have (14.2). Proposition 3.4 follows from this statement. \square

15 Systems without capture into resonances

In this section we sketch a proof of Remark 3.7. The lemma below is used to estimate the measure of trajectories that come too close to the saddle of perturbed system.

Lemma 15.1. *Take small enough $R > 0$ and define a neighborhood U of the saddle of unperturbed system as*

$$\{(p, q, z) : |p - p_C(z)|, |q - q_C(z)| \leq R, z \in \mathcal{Z}_0\}.$$

Then for any $r > 1$ there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that the measure of the set of initial data $(p, q, z, \lambda) \in U \times [0, 2\pi]$ such that the corresponding solution of perturbed system (3.2) does not leave U is at most ε^r .

Sketch of proof. Let us use Moser's normal form near the saddle, it provides us coordinates x, y such that unperturbed system rewrites as in these coordinates

$$\dot{x} = a(h, z)x, \quad \dot{y} = -a(h, z)y, \quad \dot{z} = 0, \quad \dot{\lambda} = 1$$

and perturbed system rewrites as

$$\dot{x} = a(h, z)x + \varepsilon f_x, \quad \dot{y} = -a(h, z)y + \varepsilon f_y, \quad \dot{z} = \varepsilon f_z, \quad \dot{\lambda} = 1,$$

where f_x, f_y, f_z are smooth functions depending on x, y, z, t . We assume that U is covered by this chart.

The x direction is expanding for the unperturbed system. The cone field

$$|dx| \geq \sqrt{dy^2 + dz^2 + d\lambda^2}$$

is invariant by the flow of the perturbed system for small enough ε and curves tangent to this cone field are expanded. Take $\Delta t \sim 1$ such that flow over time Δt expands such curves by a factor at least $e = 2.718\dots$

Take $C > 3r\Delta t$. Cut the phase space into curves $y, z, t = \text{const}$ parametrized by x . Over time $C|\ln \varepsilon|$ (at least $2r \lceil |\ln \varepsilon| \rceil$ times Δt) such curves are expanded by a factor at least $e^{2r|\ln \varepsilon|} = \varepsilon^{-2r}$. This means (we use that curve length is equivalent to the measure of projection on x axis, as the curve is tangent to cone field) that the length of the part of the curve that stays in U after such time passes is $\lesssim \varepsilon^{2r}$. Integrating over all such curves and taking into account $\varepsilon^{2r} \ll \varepsilon^r$ gives the statement of the lemma. \square

Let us say that a trajectory is *captured in U* , if (over times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$) at some point it enters U and then does not leave U for time at least $2C_1|\ln \varepsilon|$, or leaves U through $z \in \partial\mathcal{Z}_0$. Let us show that total measure of initial data captured in U is $O(\varepsilon^r)$. We will say that such points form exceptional set of initial data and exclude them from consideration.

Let us deduce this from the lemma above. First, it is possible to show that solutions cannot leave U after time $O(|\ln \varepsilon|)$ via $z \in \partial\mathcal{Z}_0$, as we assume that along considered solutions of averaged system z stays in \mathcal{Z} that is $O(1)$ -far from $\partial\mathcal{Z}_0$. Thus it is enough to prove simply that most solutions of perturbed system leave U in due time.

Take C_1 determined by Lemma 15.1 so that during one passage through U the measure of initial data in U that stays there for time at least $C_1|\ln \varepsilon|$ is at most ε^{r+1} . Denote by $V \subset U$ this set. If trajectory starting at some point X (possibly outside U) spends time at least $2C_1|\ln \varepsilon|$ in U , then it spends time at least $C_1|\ln \varepsilon|$ in V and thus lies in a preimage of V under some iterate of the time $C_1|\ln \varepsilon|$ flow of perturbed system. We consider times $\sim \varepsilon$, thus all initial data such that the corresponding solution stays in U for (continuous) time at least $C_1|\ln \varepsilon|$ (during times $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}$) are covered by $\sim \varepsilon^{-1} \ln^{-1} \varepsilon$ such preimages. By Lemma 6.3 measure of each preimage is $\sim \varepsilon^{r+1}$. This proves the estimate on measure of trajectories captured in U .

Consider immediate neighborhood of separatrices with width $\sim \varepsilon \ln^5 \varepsilon$. The condition $f_h < 0$ allows to make a stronger estimate for time of passage through this zone than for general case. We assume that for all z the neighborhood U of the saddle C does not contain a whole separatrix l_1 or l_2 of saddle C . This means that a trajectory of perturbed system can be split as follows: passage near l_1 (outside U), passage through U , passage near l_2 , passage through U , and so on. Each passage through U takes time at most $2C_1|\ln \varepsilon|$ by our definition of exceptional set. This process can only terminate when the solution leaves the immediate neighborhood of separatrices. Outside U we have $f_h < -c_1 < 0$ for some $c_1 < 0$ (by compactness). Thus during each passage near l_1 or l_2 the value of h decreases by $\gtrsim \varepsilon$ and the number of such passages is $\lesssim \ln^5 \varepsilon$. Passages near separatrices take time $O(1)$ and passage through U takes time $O(\ln \varepsilon)$, thus the whole passage through immediate neighborhood of separatrices takes time $O(\ln^6 \varepsilon)$. As time derivatives of slow variables are $O(\varepsilon)$ for both perturbed and averaged systems, passage through immediate neighborhood of separatrices leads to $O(\varepsilon \ln^6 \varepsilon) \ll \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ deviation between solutions of perturbed and averaged system.

It is also possible to improve the estimate on passage through resonance zones. Recall that width of resonant zones has order δ_s , where δ_s is given by (8.4). Outside the immediate neighborhood (in \mathcal{B}_3) of separatrices h solution of perturbed system winds around the separatrices,

during each wind h decreases by $\sim \varepsilon$ and this wind takes time $\sim \ln h$. Thus on average h decreases with speed $O(\ln^{-1} h)$. As $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} \sim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h$, this gives $\dot{\omega} \sim \varepsilon h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h$ (on average). Thus crossing resonant zone with width $\sim \delta_r$ takes time $\sim \varepsilon^{-1}(\sqrt{\varepsilon b_s h \ln^2 h} + \varepsilon \ln^2 \varepsilon)$. Taking sum over all resonances as in Section 9.3 gives that total time of crossing all resonant zones is $O(\varepsilon^{-1/2})$, which gives total change of slow variables in resonant zones $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$.

Combining improved estimates for accuracy of averaging method in immediate neighborhood of separatrices and in resonant zones with estimates for nonresonant zones as for general case (as done in Section 9 for general case) gives the estimate in Remark 3.7.

16 Acknowledgment

We are grateful to A.V. Bolsinov for advices on integrable systems and to A.V. Artemyev and V.V. Sidorenko for useful discussion.

Appendix A Analytic continuation: proofs




Figure 8: The transversals.

Proof of Lemma 7.2. We will use Moser's normal form [30] in a neighborhood of C . There are coordinates x and y such that our system can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= a(h, z)x, \\ \dot{y} &= -a(h, z)y, \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where $a > 0$ for real h, z . Rescaling p, q, x, y if necessary, we may assume that new coordinates are defined for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ with $|x|, |y| \leq 1$. Let us consider four transversals $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_4$ given by $x = \pm 1$ and $y = \pm 1$ as shown in Figure 8. We can split $T = T_{12} + T_{23} + T_{34} + T_{41}$, where T_{ij} is the time from Γ_i to Γ_j . Note that as all paths connecting (h, z) and (h_0, z_0) are homotopic to each other (we assume $c_2 < 0.5$, then $h > 0$), the functions T and T_{ij} are continued as single-valued functions.

The functions T_{23} and T_{41} are holomorphic even for $h = 0$. Let us denote $\tilde{h} = xy$. As it is a first integral of (A.1), we have $\tilde{h} = \tilde{h}(h, z)$. Using (A.1), we can compute $T_{12} = T_{34} = -a^{-1} \ln \tilde{h}$; the branch of the logarithm here is obtained by analytic continuation of the real logarithm. As $\tilde{h} = 0$ for $h = 0$, we can write $\tilde{h}(h, z) = h\tilde{h}_0(h, z)$ with analytic h_0 and thus $T_{12} = T_{34} = -a^{-1} \ln h - a^{-1} \ln \tilde{h}_0$. Thus for z close to z_0 we have $T = A(h, z) \ln h + B(h, z)$, where $A = -2a^{-1}$ and B are holomorphic, $A \neq 0$.

Let us now prove that $\hat{h}(z)$ is uniquely defined for any z close to z_0 . Fix such z and denote $F(h) = T(h) - T_0$ and $F_1(h) = A(h_0, z) \ln h + B(h_0, z) - T_0$. Let \hat{h}_1 be determined by $F_1(\hat{h}_1) = 0$. Consider the curve $h_\beta = \hat{h}_1(1 + \alpha e^{i\beta})$, where $\beta \in [0, 2\pi]$ is a parameter and $\alpha > 0$ is a small fixed number. We have $|F(h_\beta) - F_1(h_\beta)| = O(\alpha |\hat{h}_1|)(|\ln \hat{h}_1| + 1)$ and $|F_1(h_\beta)| = |A(h_0, z) \ln(1 + \alpha e^{i\beta})| \gtrsim \alpha$. As $|\hat{h}_1|$ is small (we have $\hat{h}_1 = e^{A^{-1}(T_0 - B)}$, here T_0 is large positive number for small h_0 , B is bounded, and A is close to $A(z_0)$ which is a real negative number), we have $|F_1(h_\beta)| > 2|F(h_\beta) - F_1(h_\beta)|$. Thus, by Rouché's theorem the equation $F(h) = 0$ has a unique solution $\hat{h}(z)$ in the region bounded by h_β .

From $|h - \hat{h}| < c_2 |\hat{h}|$ we have

$$\ln h - \ln \hat{h} = \ln\left(1 + \frac{h - \hat{h}}{\hat{h}}\right) = O(c_2)$$

and

$$T(h, z) = O(c_2) + A(h, z) \ln \hat{h} + B(h, z) = A(\hat{h}, z) \ln \hat{h} + B(\hat{h}, z) + O(c_2)(1 + |\ln \hat{h}|) = T_0(1 + O(c_2)),$$

as claimed above.

Finally, the action $I(h, z)$ is defined by $I = \int pdq$. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.3. Let us first state some helper statements. The local uniqueness and existence theorem (see e.g. [31, Theorem 1.1]) claims that in a small neighborhood of any initial condition y_0, t_0 the solution of a complex ODE $\dot{y} = g(y, t)$ exists and depends holomorphically on the initial condition. From this we have the following corollary.

Corollary A.1. *For any complex ODE $\dot{y} = g(y, t)$ for any point y_0 there are $\Delta t > 0, \Delta y > 0$ such that for any y_1 with $|y_1 - y_0| < \Delta y$ the solution $y(t)$ with $y(0) = y_1$ exists for all complex t with $|t| < \Delta t$.*

By a compactness argument we get

Corollary A.2. *Consider a complex ODE $\dot{y} = g(y, t)$ in some open domain U . Consider a compact set $V \subset U$. Then there is $\Delta t > 0$ such that for any $y_0 \in V$ the solution of our ODE with the initial condition $y(0) = y_0$ exists and stays in U for all t with $|t| < \Delta t$.*

We are now ready to prove Lemma 7.3. We will use the notation of the proof of Lemma 7.2 such as Γ_i, a and T_{ij} . Given $(h, z) \in \pi\mathcal{D}$ (here π is the projection along the φ axis), let us consider a continuous piecewise-linear path $t_s : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ with

$$t_0 = 0, t_{1/4} = T_{12}(h, z), t_{1/2} = T_{12} + T_{23}, t_{3/4} = T_{12} + T_{23} + T_{34}, t_1 = T$$

that is linearly interpolated between the points $0, 1/4, 1/2, 3/4, 1$. Then if we consider the cycle $r(t_s)$ lying in the complex solution of the unperturbed system with given h, z starting with $r(t_0) \in \Gamma_1$, the path $r(t_s)$ then crosses $\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3, \Gamma_4$ for $s = 1/4, 1/2, 3/4$ and returns to the same point on Γ_1 for $s = 1$.

Let us check that the segment $[0, T]$ lies in c_2 -neighborhood of the path t_s with the constant $c_2 > 0$ that can be made as small as needed by reducing c . Pick $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}, |\alpha| = 1$ such that $\alpha T_{12} = \alpha T_{34} \in \mathbb{R}$. As T_{23} and T_{41} are analytic functions of h, z , we have $\text{Im } \alpha T_{ij} < O(c)$. This means that $\text{Im } \alpha T = O(c)$ and $\text{Im } \alpha t_s = O(c)$ for all s , so $[0, T]$ lies in $O(c)$ -neighborhood of the path t_s .

Let us choose a neighborhood V (in the space with coordinates p, q, z) of the union of the real separatrices of the system for $z = z_0$ such that $r(t_s) \in V$ for all considered h, z . We take any V that contains the set given by $x, y \in [-1, 1]$ for all z with $|z - z_0| < c_2$. This implies that $r(t_s)$ stays in V for $s \in [0, 1/4]$ and $s \in [1/2, 3/4]$. For other values of s the point $r(t_s)$ also stays $O(c)$ -close to the union of the real separatrices of the system for $z = z_0$, so for small enough c it lies in V .

Now we apply Corollary A.2 (with $y = (p, q, z), \dot{z} = 0$) to the closure of V , it gives us some Δt . Denote by $t = \frac{\varphi T}{2\pi}$ the time for the unperturbed system. Let us continue $r(h, z, \varphi(t))$ as a function of t . Clearly, it is defined for $t \in \{t_s\}$. By Corollary A.2 it can be continued to Δt -neighborhood of $\{t_s\}$. We have proved above that for small enough c we have that $\Delta t/2$ -neighborhood of $\{t_s\}$ covers $[0, T]$. This means that Δt -neighborhood of $\{t_s\}$ covers $\Delta t/2$ -neighborhood of $[0, T]$, so r can be continued to the latter neighborhood. Returning to φ , we get that r can be continued to $\pi\Delta t/|T|$ -neighborhood of $[0, 2\pi]$. As from Lemma 7.2 we have $|T| \sim T(h_0, z_0)$, this estimate proves the lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.4. We can rewrite

$$\omega^{-1} \int_{\varphi=0}^{\varphi_0} \psi(h, z, \varphi, \lambda) d\varphi = \int_{t=0}^{t_0} \psi(h, z, \omega t, \lambda) dt,$$

where $t_0 = \omega\varphi_0$. Let us again consider the contour $\{t_s\}$ introduced in the proof of Lemma 7.3. As shown in this lemma, δ -neighborhood of $\{t_s\}$ covers $[0, T]$ for some $\delta = O(1)$. As we have $|\omega^{-1}| \text{Im}(\varphi_0) = O(1)$, we can connect the point t_0 with the point $\omega^{-1} \text{Re } \varphi_0 \in [0, T]$ and then with some point t_{s_0} on $\{t_s\}$ by a path of length $O(1)$ on the complex plane of the values of t . As ψ is bounded, we have $\int_{t_{s_0}}^{t_0} \psi dt = O(1)$. Thus, it is enough to show that

$$\int_{t=0}^{t_{s_0}} \psi dt = O(1)$$

along the contour $\{t_s, 0 \leq s \leq s_0\}$. This contour is split into up to four parts by the transversals Γ_i (cf. Figure 8). For the parts when the solution is far from the saddle, the integral along these parts is $O(1)$. Let us prove that the integral along the parts near the saddle is also $O(1)$. For definiteness, let us consider the part between Γ_1 and Γ_2 (or some fragment of this part if it is included in our contour only partially). During this part the solution is near the saddle, and we can use the x, y chart (A.1). As $\psi(C) = 0$ (C corresponds to $x = y = 0$), we can write

$\psi(x, y, z, \lambda) = x\psi_x + y\psi_y$, where ψ_x, ψ_y are analytic. As $\dot{x} = ax$, we can write (we omit the limits of integration, as they are not important for the $O(1)$ estimate)

$$\int x\psi_x dt = a^{-1} \int \psi_x dx = O(1).$$

Similarly, we have $\int y\psi_y dt = O(1)$. Thus, $\int_{t=0}^{t=t_0} \psi dt = O(1)$, as required. \square

Appendix B Estimates on Fourier coefficients

Lemma 7.3 can be used to estimate Fourier coefficients near the separatrices. Let $\psi(p, q, z, \lambda)$ and $\psi_0(p, q, z, \lambda)$ be analytic functions in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with $\psi_0 = 0$ at the saddle $C(z)$ for all λ, z .

Corollary B.1. *There is $K > 0$ such that for any real $(h, z) \in \mathcal{B}$, $\lambda \in [0, 2\pi]$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(h, \varphi, z, \lambda) e^{ik\varphi} d\varphi \right| &\leq K \exp(-c|k|/T(h, z)), \\ \left| \int_0^{2\pi} \psi_0(h, \varphi, z, \lambda) e^{ik\varphi} d\varphi \right| &\leq KT^{-1}(h, z) \exp(-c|k|/T(h, z)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first inequality is proved exactly like the exponential decay of Fourier coefficients of an analytic function. We can move the contour of integration up (assuming $k > 0$, otherwise down) by adding $ic/T(h, z)$ to φ . By the periodicity it will not change the integral. But for the new integral $|e^{ik\varphi}| = \exp(-ck/T(h, z))$ while $|\psi(h, \varphi, z, \lambda)|$ is bounded, as ψ is bounded in the compact set \tilde{B} .

The second inequality is proved by the same shift of the contour of integration, but we now take into account that ψ_0 is small near C . Denote $\tilde{\varphi}(t) = 2\pi(t + \frac{ic}{2\pi})/T$, $\varphi(t) = 2\pi t/T$. Rewriting our integral as integral dt , we get

$$\omega \int_0^T e^{2\pi ikt/T} e^{-kc/T} \psi_0(h, \tilde{\varphi}, z, \lambda) dt. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In a neighborhood \mathcal{S} of C given by $|x|, |y| < 1$ we can use (A.1). Solving this system, we get

$$x(t) = e^{a(t-t_0)} x(t_0), \quad y(t) = e^{-a(t-t_0)} y(t_0).$$

Here $a > 0$, as h and z are real. Taking $t - t_0 = ic/(2\pi)$, we get $|x(\varphi)| = |x(\tilde{\varphi})|$ and $|y(\varphi)| = |y(\tilde{\varphi})|$. Let us now show that the integral of $|\psi_0|$ inside \mathcal{S} is $O(1)$. Indeed, as $\psi_0(C) = 0$ (C corresponds to $x = y = 0$), we can write $\psi_0(x, y, z, \lambda) = x\psi_x + y\psi_y$, where ψ_x, ψ_y are analytic. Let $[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T]$ be a segment such that the solution $(x(\varphi(t)), y(\varphi(t)))$ is in \mathcal{S} for all $t \in [t_1, t_2]$. Then $(x(\tilde{\varphi}(t)), y(\tilde{\varphi}(t)))$ is also in \mathcal{S} . We may use $x = x(\varphi(t))$ as an independent variable, from $\dot{x} = ax$ we have $dt = dx/(ax)$. Thus we have

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |x(\tilde{\varphi})\psi_x(\tilde{\varphi})| dt = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\psi_x(\tilde{\varphi})| |x(\varphi)| dt = a^{-1} \int_{x(t_1)}^{x(t_2)} |\psi_x(\tilde{\varphi})| dx = O(1).$$

Similarly, we have $\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |y\psi_y| dt = O(1)$. Thus, $\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\psi_0| dt = O(1)$, as required.

It is clear that the integral of $|\psi_0|$ outside \mathcal{S} is also $O(1)$, as the solution only spends time $O(1)$ there. Thus, $\int |\psi_0(\tilde{\varphi})| dt = O(1)$ and $\int |\psi_0(\tilde{\varphi})| d\varphi = O(T^{-1})$. Together with (B.1) this yields the second inequality. \square

Corollary B.2. *There are $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any $(h, z) \in \mathcal{B}$, $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(h, \varphi, z, \lambda) e^{ik\varphi} e^{il\lambda} d\varphi d\lambda \right| &\leq C_1 \exp\left(-C_2|l| - C_2 \frac{|k|}{T}\right), \\ \left| \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \psi_0(h, \varphi, z, \lambda) e^{ik\varphi} e^{il\lambda} d\varphi d\lambda \right| &\leq C_1 T^{-1} \exp\left(-C_2|l| - C_2 \frac{|k|}{T}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Proof. Let us prove the second part, the first one can be obtained similarly. Denote by L the left hand side of the second line of (B.2). It is enough to obtain two separate estimates

$$L \leq C_1 T^{-1} \exp(-2C_2|l|), \quad L \leq C_1 T^{-1} \exp\left(-2C_2 \frac{|k|}{T}\right).$$

Shifting the contour of integration in λ by ci (as in the usual argument for the exponential decay of Fourier coefficients of an analytic function that we have already used in Corollary B.1), we get

$$L \lesssim \exp(-cl) \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |\psi_0(h, \varphi, z, \lambda + ci)| d\varphi d\lambda.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Corollary B.1, we can show that for all λ we have $\int_0^{2\pi} |\psi_0(h, \varphi, z, \lambda + ci)| d\varphi = O(T^{-1})$. This means $L \lesssim T^{-1} \exp(-cl)$ and thus the first required estimate holds.

Multiplying the estimate from Lemma B.1 by $e^{il\lambda}$ and integrating by λ , we obtain the second required estimate. \square

Proof of Lemma 8.1. As $\frac{\partial I}{\partial h} = \omega^{-1}$, the Fourier coefficients of f_I can be expressed via the Fourier coefficients of f_h : $f_{I,m} = \omega^{-1} f_{h,m}$. Thus the first part follows from Corollary B.2.

Let us prove the second part. Let us first estimate $\frac{\partial f_{h,m}}{\partial h}$. We have

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f_{h,m}}{\partial h} \right\| \sim \left\| \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial h} e^{-i(m_1\varphi+m_2\lambda)} d\lambda d\varphi \right\| \lesssim \int_0^{2\pi} \left\| \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial h} e^{-im_2\lambda} d\lambda \right\| d\varphi$$

By (7.8) we have $\frac{\partial p}{\partial h}, \frac{\partial q}{\partial h} = O_*(h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h)$. Note that these expressions do not depend on λ and $\int_0^{2\pi} O_*(h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h) d\varphi = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h)$ by (7.7). As $\frac{\partial f_h}{\partial h} = \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial p} \frac{\partial p}{\partial h} + \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial q} \frac{\partial q}{\partial h}$, we may continue the estimate above as follows.

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f_{h,m}}{\partial h} \right\| \lesssim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h \max_{\varphi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left\| \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial p} e^{-im_2\lambda} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial f_h}{\partial q} e^{-im_2\lambda} \right\| d\lambda \lesssim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h \exp(-C_F |m_2|),$$

as the Fourier coefficients of smooth functions $\frac{\partial f_h}{\partial p}$ and $\frac{\partial f_h}{\partial q}$ decrease exponentially. As $f_{I,m} = \omega^{-1} f_{h,m}$, this gives

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f_{I,m}}{\partial h} \right\| \lesssim \omega^{-1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_{h,m}}{\partial h} \right\| + \|f_{h,m}\| \frac{\partial}{\partial h}(\omega^{-1}) \lesssim |h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h| \exp(-C_F |m_2|).$$

The estimate $\left\| \frac{\partial f_{h,m}}{\partial z} \right\| \lesssim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h \exp(-C_F |m_2|)$ is obtained in the same way as the estimate for $\left\| \frac{\partial f_{h,m}}{\partial h} \right\|$. \square

Appendix C Proof of estimates on u

The following three lemmas will be used to prove Lemma 10.1. Fix a resonance s_2/s_1 . In all three lemmas we will assume that s_2/s_1 is the nearest to ω resonance. We will use the notation $m = (m_1, m_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. In summation over m we will often need to skip the vectors m that are equal to $(\nu s_1, -\nu s_2)$ for some $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. This will be denoted by an upper index s in the summation symbol.

Lemma C.1.

$$\sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq N}^{(s)} \|f_m\| |m_1\omega + m_2|^{-1} (|m_2| + 1) \lesssim |s_1| + |\ln h| \ln |\ln \varepsilon|. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Moreover, this holds not only for the Fourier coefficients f_m , but for any non-negative numbers $\|f_m\|$ with $\|f_m\| \lesssim e^{-C_F |m_2|}$.

Proof. Denote by S_{m_2} the part of the left-hand side of (C.1) with this m_2 . Note that we have $m_1\omega + m_2 \neq 0$. For fixed m_2 let m_1^+ (m_1^-) be the values of m_1 corresponding to the smallest in absolute value positive (negative) value of $m_1\omega + m_2$. Here we consider *all* integer values of m_1 , including the ones with $|m_1| > N$, so we may have $|m_1^\pm| > N$. Let $A_{m_2}^+$ ($A_{m_2}^-$) denote the corresponding term in S_{m_2} if it exists (i.e. $1 \leq |m| \leq N$), or 0 otherwise. Denote by B_{m_2} the sum of all other terms, $S_{m_2} = A_{m_2}^+ + A_{m_2}^- + B_{m_2}$.

As in [4, Proof of Lemma 7.1], for all $1 \leq |m| \leq N$ we have $|m_1\omega + m_2| \geq (4s_1)^{-1}$. This means $A_{m_2}^+ \lesssim s_1 (|m_2| + 1) e^{-C_F |m_2|}$ and $\sum_{m_2} A_{m_2}^+ \lesssim s_1$. Similarly, $\sum_{m_2} A_{m_2}^- \lesssim s_1$.

For fixed m_2 set $k(m_1) = m_1 - m_1^+$ for $m_1 > m_1^+$ and $k(m_1) = m_1^- - m_1$ for $m_1 < m_1^-$. We have $|m_1\omega + m_2| \geq \omega k$, so

$$B_{m_2} \lesssim 2\omega^{-1} (|m_2| + 1) e^{-C_F |m_2|} \sum_{k=1}^{2N} k^{-1} \lesssim \omega^{-1} \ln |\ln \varepsilon| (|m_2| + 1) e^{-C_F |m_2|}$$

and $\sum_{m_2} B_{m_2} \lesssim \omega^{-1} \ln |\ln \varepsilon|$. \square

Lemma C.2. For the Fourier coefficients f_m of f we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq N}^{(s)} \|f_m\| |m_1\omega + m_2|^{-1} |m_1| \lesssim |s_1 \ln h| + \ln^2 h \ln |\ln \varepsilon|. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Proof. Let us argue as above, adapting the notation $A_{m_2}^\pm$ and B_{m_2} to the corresponding terms in (C.2). We now have (we use $|m_1^+\omega + m_2| \leq \omega$, so $|m_1^+ + \omega^{-1}m_2| \leq 1$)

$$A_{m_2}^+ \lesssim s_1 |m_1^+| e^{-C_F |m_2|} \lesssim s_1 (\omega^{-1} |m_2| + 1) e^{-C_F |m_2|}$$

and $\sum_{m_2} A_{m_2}^+ \lesssim |s_1 \ln h|$. Similarly, $\sum_{m_2} A_{m_2}^- \lesssim |s_1 \ln h|$.

We also have

$$\left| \frac{m_1}{m_1\omega + m_2} \right| = \left| \omega^{-1} - \frac{m_2\omega^{-1}}{m_1\omega + m_2} \right| \lesssim |\omega^{-1}| + |\omega^{-1}| |m_2| |m_1\omega + m_2|^{-1}.$$

Thus we can split $B_{m_2} \lesssim B_{1,m_2} + B_{2,m_2}$, where the two summands correspond to the summands ω^{-1} and $\omega^{-1}|m_2||m_1\omega + m_2|^{-1}$ above (in this order). By the estimate (8.1) for f_m we have $\sum_{|m_1| \leq N} \|f_{(m_1, m_2)}\| \lesssim e^{-C_F|m_2|}\omega^{-1}$, thus $\sum_{m_2} B_{1,m_2} \lesssim \omega^{-2}$. Denote by \tilde{B} the terms B in (C.1). The estimate $\sum_{m_2} \tilde{B}_{m_2} \lesssim \omega^{-1} \ln |\ln \varepsilon|$ from the proof of (C.1) gives $\sum_{m_2} B_{2,m_2} \lesssim \omega^{-2} \ln |\ln \varepsilon|$. \square

Lemma C.3. *For the Fourier coefficients f_m of f we have*

$$\sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq N}^{(s)} \|f_m\| |m_1\omega + m_2|^{-2} |m_1| \lesssim |\ln h| \ln^4 \varepsilon. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Proof. Let us once again argue as in the proof of Lemma C.1, adapting the notation $A_{m_2}^\pm$ and B_{m_2} to the corresponding terms in (C.3). As in the proof of Lemma C.2, we have

$$A_{m_2}^+ \lesssim s_1^2 |m_1| e^{-C_F|m_2|} \lesssim s_1^2 \omega^{-1} |m_2| e^{-C_F|m_2|}.$$

Thus, $\sum_{m_2} A_{m_2}^+ \lesssim |\ln h| \ln^4 \varepsilon$ and, similarly, $\sum_{m_2} A_{m_2}^- \lesssim |\ln h| \ln^4 \varepsilon$.

To estimate B , let us reuse the notation k from the proof of Lemma C.1. Recall that $|m_1\omega + m_2| \geq \omega k$. We have

$$B_{m_2} \lesssim N e^{-C_F|m_2|} \sum_{m_1} |m_1\omega + m_2|^{-2} \lesssim e^{-C_F|m_2|} N \omega^{-2} \sum_k k^{-2} \lesssim e^{-C_F|m_2|} N \omega^{-2}.$$

This implies $\sum_{m_2} B_{m_2} \lesssim \ln^2 h \ln^2 \varepsilon$. \square

Proof of Lemma 10.1. We have $u = A + B$ with

$$A = \sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq N, m \in \mathbb{Z}^2}^{(s)} \frac{f_m e^{i(m_1\varphi + m_2\lambda)}}{i(m_1\omega + m_2)}, \quad B = \sum_{1 \leq |\nu s| \leq N, \nu \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{f_{\nu s} e^{i\nu(s_1\varphi - s_2\lambda)}}{i\nu(s_1\omega - s_2)}.$$

We have $s_1 \leq N \lesssim \ln^2 \varepsilon$ and $\omega \sim \ln h \lesssim \ln \varepsilon$. By (C.1) we get $\|A\| \lesssim \ln^2 \varepsilon$. As $\Delta = |\omega - \xi_s|$, we have $|s_1\omega - s_2| = s_1\Delta$. We also have from (8.1) that $\|f_{\nu s}\| \lesssim a_s^{|\nu|}$, $a_s \leq e^{-C_F} < 1$. Hence, $\|B\| \lesssim a_s s_1^{-1} \Delta^{-1}$. This gives the estimate on $\|u\|$.

Taking $\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda}$ or $\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi}$ of the terms in A multiplies them by m_2 or m_1 , respectively. The estimates on $\frac{\partial A}{\partial \lambda}$ and $\frac{\partial A}{\partial \varphi}$ follow from (C.1) and (C.2), respectively. We also have $\|\frac{\partial B}{\partial \lambda}\| \lesssim a_s s_2 s_1^{-1} \Delta^{-1}$ and $\|\frac{\partial B}{\partial \varphi}\| \lesssim a_s \Delta^{-1}$.

Taking $\frac{\partial}{\partial h}$ of A or B creates two terms. In one of them f_m are replaced by $\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial h}$, denote this term by $A_{h,1}$ or $B_{h,1}$. By Lemma 8.1 and Lemma C.1 we have $A_{h,1} \lesssim h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h \ln^2 \varepsilon$. By Lemma 8.1 we also have $B_{h,1} \lesssim b_s s_1^{-1} h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h \Delta^{-1}$.

For the second term we have

$$A_{h,2} = -\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} \sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq N}^{(s)} \frac{f_m m_1 e^{i(m_1\varphi + m_2\lambda)}}{i(m_1\omega + m_2)^2}, \quad B_{h,2} = -\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} \sum_{1 \leq |\nu s| \leq N} \frac{f_{\nu s} s_1 e^{i\nu(s_1\varphi - s_2\lambda)}}{i\nu(s_1\omega - s_2)^2}.$$

We have $\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} \sim h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h$. By (C.3) we have $\|A_{h,2}\| \lesssim |\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h}| \ln h \ln^4 \varepsilon \lesssim h^{-1} \ln^{-1} h \ln^4 \varepsilon$. As $\|f_{\nu s}\| \lesssim b_s^{|\nu|}$, we have $\|B_{h,2}\| \lesssim b_s \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial h} s_1^{-1} \Delta^{-2}$.

The estimate on $\frac{\partial u}{\partial z}$ is obtained in the same way. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.1. From the Hamiltonian equations we have $\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = \omega$. By [9, Corollary 3.2] we have

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial z} = O(1), \quad \frac{\partial I}{\partial z h} = O(\ln h), \quad \frac{\partial^2 I}{\partial z^2} = O(1).$$

As $\frac{\partial I}{\partial h} = \omega^{-1}$, the first estimate implies $\|\frac{\partial w}{\partial v}\| = O(\ln h)$. We have $\frac{\partial I}{\partial h} \Big|_{I=\text{const}} + (\frac{\partial I}{\partial z})_{h=\text{const}} = 0$, this gives $(\frac{\partial h}{\partial z})_{I=\text{const}} = O(\ln^{-1} h)$ and $\|\frac{\partial h}{\partial w}\| = O(\ln^{-1} h)$.

We have

$$f_{I,0} = \frac{\partial I}{\partial h} f_{h,0} + \frac{\partial I}{\partial z} f_{z,0}.$$

This rewrites as

$$f_{I,0} = (2\pi)^{-1} \oint f_h dt + \frac{\partial I}{\partial z} f_{z,0}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

The contour integral is taken along the closed trajectory of the unperturbed system given by the values of h, z and this trajectory is parametrized by the time t . By [9, Lemma 3.2] we have

$$\oint f_h dt = O(1), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \oint f_h dt = O(\ln h), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \oint f_h dt = O(1).$$

Plugging the first estimate in (C.4) gives $f_{I,0} = O(1)$. From [9, Lemma 3.2] we also have

$$\frac{\partial f_{h,0}}{\partial h}, \frac{\partial f_{z,0}}{\partial h} = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial f_{h,0}}{\partial z} \right\| = O(\ln^{-1} h), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial f_{z,0}}{\partial z} \right\| = O(1).$$

Plugging this in the derivatives of (C.4) gives

$$\frac{\partial f_{I,0}}{\partial h} = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-2} h), \quad \left\| \frac{\partial f_{I,0}}{\partial z} \right\| = O(1).$$

As $\frac{\partial h}{\partial w} = O(\ln^{-1} h)$, we have $\left\| \frac{\partial f_{I,0}}{\partial w} \right\| = \left\| \frac{\partial f_{I,0}}{\partial h} \frac{\partial h}{\partial w} + \frac{\partial f_{I,0}}{\partial z} \frac{\partial z}{\partial w} \right\| = O(h^{-1} \ln^{-3} h)$. The estimate for $\left\| \frac{\partial f_{z,0}}{\partial w} \right\|$ is obtained in the same way. \square

Appendix D Proof of auxiliary lemma

Proof of Lemma 6.3. Recall that the divergence of a vector field v with respect to a volume form α is a function $\operatorname{div}_\alpha(v)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_v(\alpha) = \operatorname{div}_\alpha(v) \cdot \alpha$ (here \mathcal{L} denotes the Lie derivative). Let $\alpha = dp \wedge dq \wedge dz \wedge d\lambda$ be the volume form. Set

$$b(X, \lambda) = ((g^\lambda)^* \alpha)_X / \alpha_X,$$

i.e. we take pullback of α by the flow and divide it by α at the point X . This gives a number, as the space of $n+3$ -forms on $n+3$ -manifold in the given point is one-dimensional. By definition of Lie derivative the number $b(X, \lambda)$ satisfies

$$\frac{db(X, \lambda)}{d\lambda} = \operatorname{div} v(g^\lambda(X)) b(X, \lambda),$$

where v is the right-hand side of (3.2). As the Hamiltonian terms have zero divergence and $\dot{\lambda} = 1$, we have $\operatorname{div} v = \varepsilon \operatorname{div} f = O(\varepsilon)$. This shows that for λ with $|\lambda| < \varepsilon^{-1} \Lambda$ we have $b(X, \lambda) \in (0, C]$ with $C = \exp(\Lambda \max |\operatorname{div} f|)$. Integrating over all $X \in A$ gives the required estimate. \square

Appendix E Reduction of two-frequency systems to periodically perturbed one-frequency system

In this appendix we present the proof of Lemma 3.8. This proof was kindly communicated to us by A.V. Bolsinov. Then we show how this lemma can be used to reduce perturbations of two-frequency integrable systems to time-periodic perturbations of one-frequency systems.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. We will consider the case without the parameter z , as with z one can simply construct the new coordinates separately for each z as described below. The proof is based on results presented in the book [26].

Let L denote the singular leaf of the Liouville foliation (i.e., the foliation of the phase space into *Liouville tori* given by $H = H_0, F = F_0$; each Liouville torus is parametrized by the values H_0, F_0 of the two first integrals) and let Q^3 denote the isoenergy level that contains L . By [26, Theorem 3.2] there exists a *periodic integral* s_1 defined in a four-dimensional neighborhood $V(L)$, i.e. a function s_1 that is smooth even on separatrices and is such that the flow of the vector field $\operatorname{sgrad} s_1$ is 2π -periodic (we use the notation $\operatorname{sgrad} U$ for the *Hamiltonian vector field* of the function U , it is determined by $\omega(v, \operatorname{sgrad} U) = dU(v)$, where ω is the symplectic structure, v is arbitrary tangent vector and $dU(v)$ denotes the derivative of U in the direction v). The periodic integral s_1 allows to define the structure of a Seifert fibration in a neighborhood $U(L) \subset Q^3$ of the singular leaf L , the fibration of $U(L)$ by the orbits of the flow of $\operatorname{sgrad} s_1$ ([26, Theorem 3.3]).

As shown in [26, Chapter 3], there are two cases:

1. one can take a two-dimensional surface $P \subset U(L)$ that intersects each leaf of the Seifert fibration once;
2. one can take a two-dimensional surface $\hat{P} \subset U(L)$ that intersects each regular leaf of the Seifert fibration twice and each singular leaf once.

By [26, Proposition 5.4] topological stability of the isoenergy level Q^3 implies that P and \hat{P} can be taken transversal to $\operatorname{sgrad} H$. On Q^3 the vector fields $\operatorname{sgrad} s_1$ and $\operatorname{sgrad} H$ are tangent to Q^3 . Thus we can continue P and \hat{P} to 3-dimensional transversals $P^3, \hat{P}^3 \subset V(L)$.

Let us consider the first case and construct a phase variable φ_1 conjugate to s_1 . To do so, we set $\varphi_1 = 0$ on P^3 and propagate it along the leaves of Seifert fibration. Indeed, we want $\{\varphi_1, s_1\} = 1$ (here $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ denotes the Poisson bracket), this condition can be rewritten in the following way: the derivative of φ_1 along $\operatorname{sgrad} s_1$ is 1 and used to define φ_1 . As trajectories of $\operatorname{sgrad} s_1$ are 2π -periodic, this correctly defines the angle variable φ_1 .

In the second case we can construct φ_1 in the same way, the difference will be that φ_1 will be defined on a double cover. We will consider the lift of the unperturbed system to the covering space instead of the original unperturbed system in the rest of the proof.

Let us now define variables p, q so that s_1, p, φ_1, q are canonical variables. Fix variables p, q on some two-dimensional section $\{\varphi_1 = 0, s_1 = \bar{s}_1\}$ so that these variables are canonical with

respect to the restriction of the symplectic structure to this section. Spread these coordinates on the whole $V(L)$ by the flows of $\text{sgrad } s_1$ and $\text{sgrad } \varphi_1$ (these flows commute, as $\{\varphi_1, s_1\} = 1$). As these flows are symplectic, we have $\{q, p\} = 1$ on $V(L)$. By construction we have $\{a, b\} = 0$, where $a = \varphi_1, s_1$ and $b = p, q$. Thus s_1, p, φ_1, q are canonical variables.

In these new variables the dynamics of the unperturbed system rewrites as

$$\dot{\varphi}_1 = \frac{\partial H}{\partial s_1}, \quad \dot{s}_1 = 0, \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q}, \quad \dot{q} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}.$$

Take φ_1 as a new independent variable (new time). Denote $\psi' = \frac{d\psi}{d\varphi_1}$. Denote $h = H$ and take h as a new variable that replaces s_1 .

According to general formulas of isoenergetic reduction [32, §9.45.B], the dynamics of p and q with respect to the time φ_1 is given by the Hamiltonian $S(p, q, h) = -s_1(p, q, h)$. Finally, denote $s = \varphi_1$. We have transformed the unperturbed system to the form

$$s' = 1, \quad h' = 0, \quad p' = -\frac{\partial S}{\partial q}, \quad q' = \frac{\partial S}{\partial p}.$$

□

In the coordinates of Lemma 3.8 the perturbed system rewrites as

$$s' = 1 + \varepsilon f_s, \quad h' = \varepsilon f_h, \quad p' = -\frac{\partial S}{\partial q} + \varepsilon f_p, \quad q' = \frac{\partial S}{\partial p} + \varepsilon f_q, \quad z' = \varepsilon f_z$$

where (f_s, f_h, f_p, f_q, z) is the lift of the perturbation f under the cover

$$(s, h, p, q, z) \mapsto (p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, z).$$

This vector field is smooth. Taking s as new time gives (denoting $\dot{a} = \frac{da}{ds}$).

$$\dot{s} = 1, \quad \dot{h} = \varepsilon g_h, \quad \dot{p} = -\frac{\partial S}{\partial q} + \varepsilon g_p, \quad \dot{q} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial p} + \varepsilon g_q, \quad \dot{z} = \varepsilon g_z$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_h &= f_h / (1 + \varepsilon f_s), \\ g_p &= (1 + \varepsilon f_s)^{-1} \left(f_p + \frac{\partial S}{\partial q} f_s \right), \\ g_q &= (1 + \varepsilon f_s)^{-1} \left(f_q - \frac{\partial S}{\partial p} f_s \right), \\ g_z &= f_z / (1 + \varepsilon f_s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus perturbed two-frequency system is reduced to time-periodic perturbation of one-frequency system with Hamiltonian depending on additional parameter h (that can be included in the vector z).

References

- [1] P. Fatou. “Sur le mouvement d’un système soumis à des forces à courte période”. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* 56 (1928), pp. 98–139.
- [2] N. N. Bogolyubov and Yu. A. Mitropol’skij. *Asymptotic Methods in the Theory of Non-Linear Oscillations*. Hindustan Publishing Corp., Delhi; Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1961.
- [3] A.I. Neishtadt. “Passage through resonances in a two-frequency problem”. *Akademiia Nauk SSSR Doklady*. Vol. 221. 1975, pp. 301–304.
- [4] A.I. Neishtadt. “Averaging, passage through resonances, and capture into resonance in two-frequency systems”. *Russian Mathematical Surveys* 69.5 (2014), p. 771.
- [5] V.I. Arnold. “Applicability conditions and an error bound for the averaging method for systems in the process of evolution through a resonance”. *Doklady Akademii Nauk*. Vol. 161. 1. Russian Academy of Sciences. 1965, pp. 9–12.
- [6] D.V. Anosov. “Averaging in systems of ordinary differential equations with rapidly oscillating solutions”. *Izvestiya Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk. Seriya Matematicheskaya* 24.5 (1960), pp. 721–742.
- [7] T. Kasuga. “On the adiabatic theorem for the Hamiltonian system of differential equations in the classical mechanics. I, II, III”. *Proceedings of the Japan Academy* 37.7 (1961), pp. 366–371, 372–376, 377–382.

- [8] V.I. Arnold, V.V. Kozlov, and A.I. Neishtadt. *Mathematical aspects of classical and celestial mechanics*. Vol. 3. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [9] A.I. Neishtadt. “Averaging method for systems with separatrix crossing”. *Nonlinearity* 30.7 (2017), p. 2871.
- [10] V.I. Arnold. “Small denominators and problems of stability of motion in classical and celestial mechanics”. *Russ. Math. Surv* 18.6 (1963), pp. 85–191.
- [11] J.D. Brothens and R. Haberman. “Slow passage through a homoclinic orbit with subharmonic resonances”. *Studies in Applied Mathematics* 101.2 (1998), pp. 211–232.
- [12] G. Wolansky. “Limit theorem for a dynamical system in the presence of resonances and homoclinic orbits”. *Journal of Differential Equations* 83.2 (1990), pp. 300–335.
- [13] S. Wiggins. *Introduction to applied nonlinear dynamical systems and chaos*. Springer, 1990.
- [14] A.V. Bolsinov and A.T. Fomenko. *Integrable geodesic flows on two-dimensional surfaces*. Springer, 2000.
- [15] C. Neumann. “De problemate quodam mechanico, quod ad primam integralium ultraellipticorum classem revocatur.” (1859).
- [16] A.P. Markeev. “The equations of the approximate theory of the motion of a rigid body with a vibrating suspension point”. *Journal of applied mathematics and mechanics* 75.2 (2011), pp. 132–139.
- [17] V.V. Sidorenko, A.I. Neishtadt, A.V. Artemyev, and L.M. Zelenyi. “Quasi-satellite orbits in the general context of dynamics in the 1:1 mean motion resonance: perturbative treatment”. *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy* 120.2 (2014), pp. 131–162.
- [18] R. Cappi and M. Giovannozzi. “Novel method for multiturn extraction: trapping charged particles in islands of phase space”. *Physical review letters* 88.10 (2002), p. 104801.
- [19] Armando Bazzani, Christopher Frye, Massimo Giovannozzi, and Cédric Hernalsteens. “Analysis of adiabatic trapping for quasi-integrable area-preserving maps”. *Physical Review E* 89.4 (2014), p. 042915.
- [20] A.V. Timofeev. “On the constancy of an adiabatic invariant when the nature of the motion changes”. *Sov. Phys. — JETP* 48 (1978), p. 656.
- [21] J.R. Cary, D.F. Escande, and J.L. Tennyson. “Adiabatic-invariant change due to separatrix crossing”. *Physical Review A* 34.5 (1986), p. 4256.
- [22] A.I. Neishtadt. “Change of an adiabatic invariant at a separatrix”. *Fizika plazmy* 12.8 (1986), p. 992. [Engl. transl.: *Sov. J. Plasma Phys.* 12, 568-573 (1986)].
- [23] A.I. Neishtadt. “On the change in the adiabatic invariant on crossing a separatrix in systems with two degrees of freedom”. *Prikl. Mat. Mekh.* 51.5 (1987), pp. 750–757. [Engl. transl.: *J. Appl. Math. Mech.* 51, No. 5, 586-592 (1987)].
- [24] A.I. Neishtadt. “On mechanisms of destruction of adiabatic invariance in slow-fast Hamiltonian systems”. *Nonlinearity* 32.11 (2019), R53.
- [25] V.K. Melnikov. “On the stability of a center for time-periodic perturbations”. *Trudy moskovskogo matematicheskogo obshchestva* 12 (1963), pp. 3–52.
- [26] A.V. Bolsinov and A.T. Fomenko. *Integrable Hamiltonian systems: geometry, topology, classification*. CRC press, 2004.
- [27] A.I. Neishtadt and A. Okunev. “On the phase change for perturbations of Hamiltonian systems with separatrix crossing”. *arXiv:2003.05828* (2020).
- [28] B.V. Chirikov. “Resonance processes in magnetic traps”. *The Soviet Journal of Atomic Energy* 6.6 (1960), pp. 464–470.
- [29] A.I. Neishtadt. “The separation of motions in systems with rapidly rotating phase”. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics* 48.2 (1984), pp. 133–139.
- [30] J. Moser. “The analytic invariants of an area-preserving mapping near a hyperbolic fixed point”. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 9.4 (1956), pp. 673–692.

- [31] Y. Ilyashenko and S. Yakovenko. *Lectures on Analytic Differential Equations*. Vol. 86. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [32] V.I. Arnold. “Mathematical methods of classical mechanics”. *Graduate texts in mathematics* 60 (1989).

Anatoly Neishtadt,
Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, United Kingdom;
Space Research Institute, Moscow 117997, Russia
E-mail : a.neishtadt@lboro.ac.uk

Alexey Okunev,
Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, United Kingdom
E-mail : a.okunev@lboro.ac.uk