

HYPERBOLIC AND BI-HYPERBOLIC SOLUTIONS IN THE PLANAR RESTRICTED $(N + 1)$ -BODY PROBLEM

GUOWEI YU

ABSTRACT. Consider the planar restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem with trajectories of the $N (\geq 2)$ primaries forming a collision-free periodic solution of the N -body problem, for any positive energy h and directions $\theta_{\pm} \in [0, 2\pi)$, we prove that starting from any initial position x at any initial time t_x , there are hyperbolic solutions $\gamma^{\pm}|_{[t_x, \pm\infty)}$ satisfying $\gamma^{\pm}(t_x) = x$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \gamma^{\pm}(t)/|\gamma^{\pm}(t)| = e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\bmod 2\pi)}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{\gamma}^{\pm}(t) = \pm\sqrt{2h}e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\bmod 2\pi)}.$$

Moreover we also prove the existence of a bi-hyperbolic solution $\gamma|_{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \gamma(t)/|\gamma(t)| = e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\bmod 2\pi)}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{\gamma}(t) = \pm\sqrt{2h}e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\bmod 2\pi)}.$$

1. INTRODUCTION

The N -body problem studies motion of N point masses, $m_i > 0$, $i \in \mathbf{N} := \{1, \dots, N\}$, under Newton's universal gravitational law. The trajectories of the masses $q(t) = (q_i(t))_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ satisfy

$$(1) \quad \ddot{q}_i(t) = - \sum_{j \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{i\}} \frac{m_j(q_i(t) - q_j(t))}{|q_i(t) - q_j(t)|^3}, \quad \forall i \in \mathbf{N}.$$

One of the most important aspects of the problem is to understand final motions of the masses as time goes to infinity. When $N = 3$, a complete classification of the final behavior was given by Chazy [8] (also see [2], a similar classification can be obtained for $N > 3$). Although a solution of (1) may end at a finite time due to singularity, by results from [31], [32] and [17], such solutions should be rare in the measure sense.

By introducing an additional massless body into the system, we get the so-called *restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem*, where the motion of the massless body is governed by the gravitational forces of the N positive masses (will be referred as primaries), while the massless body does not produce any gravitational force, so the motion of the primaries are not affected by its presence. As a result, the trajectory $z(t)$ of the massless body satisfies

$$(2) \quad \ddot{z}(t) = \partial_z U(z(t), t) = - \sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{m_i(z(t) - q_i(t))}{|z(t) - q_i(t)|^3},$$

where $U(z, t)$ is a time-dependent potential function

$$(3) \quad U(z, t) = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{m_i}{|z - q_i(t)|}.$$

The restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem can be seen as certain limit of the $(N + 1)$ -body problem, when one of the masses is much smaller than the others. Hence it is a good model in describing the

This work is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (2020YFA0713303), NSFC (No. 12171253), Nankai Zhide Foundation and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

motion of comets and satellites in gravitational systems, and has been studied by many authors including Poincaré and Birkhoff.

Solutions of (2) may also experience singularities at finite time. However if we assume there is no collision between the primaries, then all these singularities must be binary collisions between the massless body and one of the primaries. As is well-known such singularities can be regularized (see [23], [29] and [35]), so solutions can be extended through these binary collisions as elastic bounce. Hence the maximum domain of any solution of (2) will be the whole time interval \mathbb{R} . Then following Chazy, a complete classification of all the solutions of (2) according to the final behaviors of the massless body can be given as below.

- **hyperbolic solution:** $|z(t)| \rightarrow \infty$ and $|\dot{z}(t)| \rightarrow c > 0$, as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$;
- **parabolic solution:** $|z(t)| \rightarrow \infty$ and $|\dot{z}(t)| \rightarrow 0$, as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$;
- **bounded solution:** $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} |z(t)| < \infty$;
- **oscillatory solution:** $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} |z(t)| < \infty$ and $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} |z(t)| < \infty$.

Remark 1.1. $z|_{\mathbb{R}}$ will be called **bi-hyperbolic**, if both $z|_{[0, \infty)}$ and $z|_{(-\infty, 0]}$ are hyperbolic solutions.

In this paper, we will study (bi)-hyperbolic solutions of the planar restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem, and we set $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$ for the rest of the paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $q(t) = (q_i(t))_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a planar collision-free periodic solution of (1), i.e.,*

$$(*) \quad \begin{cases} q(t) = q(t + T) \in \mathbb{C}^N, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ for some } T > 0; \\ \rho_0 = \inf\{|q_i(t) - q_j(t)| : t \in \mathbb{R}, i \neq j \in \mathbf{N}\} > 0. \end{cases}$$

Given arbitrarily an energy constant $h > 0$ and asymptotic directions $\theta_{\pm} \in [0, 2\pi)$, for any $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t_x \in \mathbb{R}$, there are hyperbolic solutions $\gamma^{\pm} : [t_x, \pm\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of (2) satisfies $\gamma^{\pm}(t_x) = x$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \gamma^{\pm}(t)/|\gamma^{\pm}(t)| = e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\text{mod } 2\pi)}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{\gamma}^{\pm}(t) = \pm\sqrt{2h}e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\text{mod } 2\pi)}.$$

Moreover $\gamma^{\pm}(t)$ must be collision-free, whenever $t \neq t_x$.

Remark 1.2. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we say $\gamma(t) \in \mathbb{C}$ is **collision-free**, if $\gamma(t) \neq q_i(t)$, for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$.

Next we will compare the above result with some previous results of the N -body problem.

Definition 1.1. Let $q|_{[t_0, \pm\infty)}$ be a solution of (1). We say it is a **hyperbolic solution**, if

$$|q_i(t) - q_j(t)| \simeq O(|t|), \text{ as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty, \forall \{i \neq j\} \subset \mathbf{N},$$

it is a **parabolic solution**, if

$$|q_i(t) - q_j(t)| \simeq O(|t|^{\frac{2}{3}}), \text{ as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty, \forall \{i \neq j\} \subset \mathbf{N},$$

and it is a **hyperbolic-elliptic solution**, if there is a $\mathbf{K} \subset \mathbf{N}$ with $2 \leq |\mathbf{K}| < N$, such that

$$|q_i(t) - q_j(t)| \leq C_1 < \infty, \forall |t| \geq t_0 \text{ and } \forall \{i \neq j\} \subset \mathbf{K};$$

$$|q_i(t) - q_j(t)| \simeq O(|t|), \text{ as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty, \forall (i, j) \in \mathbf{N} \times (\mathbf{N} \setminus \mathbf{K}) \text{ with } i \neq j.$$

Remark 1.3. Recall that the energy of a solution of the N -body is a constant. In particular the energy of a hyperbolic solution must be positive, and of a parabolic solution must be zero. In contrary, the energy of a hyperbolic-elliptic solution can be any real number.

In [26] Maderna and Venturelli showed that for any $h > 0$, starting from any initial configuration, there is a h -energy hyperbolic solution with any prescribed non-collision limiting shape at infinity (a different proof of this result was given in [24] recently). A similar result for parabolic solutions was obtained by Maderna and Venturelli in [25], when the energy is zero and the limiting shapes at infinity are minimal central configurations. While hyperbolic and parabolic solutions only affect dynamics on positive and zero energy surfaces, hyperbolic-elliptic solutions will affect dynamics at any energy surface as there is no restriction on energies of these solutions. However so far it is unclear whether similar results hold for hyperbolic-elliptic solutions.

Since hyperbolic solutions of the restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem could be seen as certain limit of hyperbolic-elliptic solutions of the $(N + 1)$ -body problem with a single escaping mass, Theorem 1.1 may also help us understand hyperbolic-elliptic solutions of the unrestricted problem.

Under different coordinates, solutions mentioned above form stable manifolds (when time goes to positive infinity) or unstable manifolds (when time goes to negative infinity) of different invariant subsets at infinity parameterized by the limiting energy and shape or direction (see [27], [30] and [15]). The geometric and topological properties of these manifolds have great influences on the global dynamics. A basic question is: *with given limiting energies and shapes or directions at infinity corresponding to negative and positive infinite time, does the corresponding stable and unstable manifolds intersect?* The intersection of these stable and unstable manifolds is equivalent to the existence of solutions with the given limiting energies and shapes as time goes to negative and positive infinity.

For the N -body problem, this is a difficult problem with very few results. Up to our knowledge there is only some partial result in [15] for hyperbolic solutions. Here we obtain the following result for the restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem.

Theorem 1.2. *Under the assumption (*), given arbitrarily an energy constant $h > 0$ and a pair of asymptotic directions $\theta_{\pm} \in [0, 2\pi)$. There is a bi-hyperbolic solution $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of (2) satisfying*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \gamma(t)/|\gamma(t)| = e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\text{mod } 2\pi)}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{\gamma}(t) = \pm\sqrt{2h}e^{i\theta_{\pm}(\text{mod } 2\pi)}.$$

Moreover $\gamma|_{\mathbb{R}}$ has at most one collision.

For the N -center problem, which is a simplified model of the restricted $(N + 1)$ -problem with the primaries fixed, there are much more results. In [21] and [22], (bi)-hyperbolic solutions of the planar and spatial N -center problem were studied correspondingly. More recently using variational methods, [6] and [3] studied bi-parabolic solutions and bi-hyperbolic solutions for the spatial N -center problem correspondingly, and [4] studied bi-parabolic solutions in the planar N -center problem.

Our proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are variational in nature. Since the work of Chenciner and Montgomery [14], variational methods have had a lot of success in the N -body problem, first in proving periodic solutions (see [16], [9], [39] and the references within), and recently in proving parabolic and hyperbolic solutions (see [25] and [26] given above). The success is similar in the N -center problem. Besides references mentioned above, periodic solutions were studied in [33], [38], [7] and [12], while homoclinic and heteroclinic solutions were studied in [13].

Compare to the N -body problem and the N -center problem, very few results were obtained using variational methods in the restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem. Up to our knowledge, so far there are only a few results for periodic solutions, see [1], [20] and [11], and no result seems to be available for parabolic or hyperbolic solutions.

The main difficulties in proving (bi)-hyperbolic solutions of the restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problems using variational methods are as below. First, energy is not conserved in this case as the

system is time periodic, and the energy conservation plays an important role in controlling the asymptotic behaviors at infinity. Second, to obtain a bi-hyperbolic solution as a minimizer, we need to find some proper topological constraint. Without it the minimizer is likely to be a trivial solution staying at infinity all the time. On the other hand, if the topological constraint was not chosen properly then the corresponding minimizer may be a collision-ejection solution that is not regularizable, as indicated by Gordon's result [19] for the Kepler problem.

Our paper is organized as following: Section 2 contains results that are essential for applying action minimization methods to the restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem; Section 3 and Section 4 are devoted to the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 correspondingly; Appendix A shows how to lower the action of a collision-ejection solution near an isolated collision by local deformation; Appendix B contains proofs of two propositions essential to control the asymptotic behavior of the massless body at infinity.

Notations. The following notations will be used throughout the paper.

- (1) for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{t\} \in [0, 1)$ represents the fractional part of t .
- (2) C_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$, are finite positive constants that vary in different properties and proofs.
- (3) For any $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\delta > 0$, $B_\delta(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{C} : |y - x| \leq \delta\}$ and $B_\delta = \{y \in \mathbb{C} : |y| \leq \delta\}$.
- (4) $H^1([t_1, t_2], \mathbb{C})$ denotes the set of all Sobolev paths defined on $[t_1, t_2]$.
- (5) For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t_1 < t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y) = \{\gamma \in H^1([t_1, t_2], \mathbb{C}) : \gamma(t_1) = x, \gamma(t_2) = y\}.$$

- (6) For any $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$, $\Delta(\gamma) = \{t \in [t_1, t_2] : \gamma(t) = q_i(t), \text{ for some } i \in \mathbf{N}\}$.
- (7) For any $\gamma \in H^1([t_1, t_2], \mathbb{C})$ and $\xi \in H^1([\tau_1, \tau_2], \mathbb{C})$ with $\gamma(t_2) = \xi(\tau_1)$ and $\{t_2\} = \{\tau_1\}$, $(\gamma * \xi)|_{[t_1, t_2 + \tau_2 - \tau_1]} = \gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]} * \xi|_{[\tau_1, \tau_2]}$ represents the concatenation of γ and ξ as

$$(\gamma * \xi)(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma(t), & \text{when } t \in [t_1, t_2]; \\ \xi(t - t_2 + \tau_1), & \text{when } t \in [t_2, t_2 + \tau_2 - \tau_1]. \end{cases}$$

2. PROPERTIES OF ACTION MINIMIZERS

In this section we prove some basic results that will be needed when applying action minimization methods to the restricted $(N + 1)$ -body problem. Some ideas are similarly to those used in the N -body problem.

For any constant h , a collision-free critical point of the action functional

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t), t) + h dt; \quad L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, t) = \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\gamma}(t)|^2 + U(\gamma(t), t),$$

is a solution of the restricted problem (2).

Definition 2.1. We say $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ is a *fixed-end local minimizer* of \mathcal{A}_h , if $\exists \varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_1, t_2), \quad \forall \xi \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y) \text{ satisfying } \|\xi - \gamma\|_{H^1} \leq \varepsilon.$$

We say $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ a *fixed-end minimizer* of \mathcal{A}_h , if

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) := \inf\{\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma) : \gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)\}.$$

For simplicity, a fixed-end (local) minimizer will be called a (local) minimizer in the following.

Proposition 2.1. *If $\gamma \in H^1([t_1, t_2], \mathbb{C})$ is a local minimizer of \mathcal{A}_h with finite action value, then its set of collision moments $\Delta(\gamma)$ is an isolated subset in $[t_1, t_2]$.*

Proof. As for any $t \in \Delta(\gamma)$, $U(\gamma(t), t) = \infty$, the Lebesgues measure of $\Delta(\gamma)$ must be zero. Therefore $[t_1, t_2] \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$ is the union of some (at most countable) open intervals.

Choose a $t_0 \in \Delta(\gamma) \cap (t_1, t_2)$ (if t_1 or $t_2 \in \Delta(\gamma)$, the proof is similar and will be omitted). Then $\gamma(t_0) = q_{i_0}(t_0)$, for some $i_0 \in \mathbf{N}$. By (*), we can find a $\delta > 0$ small enough, such that

$$(5) \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta], \begin{cases} |\gamma(t) - q_i(t)| \leq \rho_0/2, & \text{if } i = i_0; \\ |\gamma(t) - q_i(t)| \geq \rho_0/2, & \text{if } i \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{i_0\}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that for any $[\tau_1, \tau_2] \subset [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta] \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$, $\gamma|_{[\tau_1, \tau_2]}$ is a smooth solution of (2), as it is a collision-free local minimizer of \mathcal{A}_h . Then $E_{i_0} \in C^1([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta] \setminus \Delta(\gamma), \mathbb{R})$, where

$$(6) \quad E_{i_0}(t) = \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\gamma}(t) - \dot{q}_{i_0}(t)|^2 - \frac{m_{i_0}}{|\gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t)|}.$$

Moreover we have the following lemma, whose proof will be postponed.

Lemma 2.1. *$E_{i_0}(t)$ can be extended continuously to $[t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]$.*

By a contradiction argument, let's assume t_0 is not isolated in $\Delta(\gamma)$. Set $I(t) = |\gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t)|^2$, for any t , the we can find a sequence of times $\{\tau_n (\neq t_0)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n = t_0 \quad \text{and} \quad I(\tau_n) = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We may further assume $\{\tau_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotone and $(\tau_{2k-1}, \tau_{2k}) \cap \Delta(\gamma) = \emptyset, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $s_k \in (\tau_{2k-1}, \tau_{2k})$, such that

$$(7) \quad \dot{I}(s_k) = 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By (5) and Lemma 2.1, for any $t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta] \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$, there is a C_1 , such that

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \ddot{I}(t) &= 2 \frac{m_{i_0}}{|\gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t)|} + 4E_{i_0}(t) - 2(\gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t)), \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i(\gamma(t) - q_i(t))}{|\gamma(t) - q_i(t)|^3} + \ddot{q}_{i_0}(t) \\ &\geq 2m_{i_0} I^{-\frac{1}{2}}(t) - C_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $I(t_0) = 0$, we can find a $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta)$, such that

$$(9) \quad \ddot{I}(t) > 0, \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta_0, t_0 + \delta_0] \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$$

As $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_k = t_0$, we have $\dot{I}(s_k) > 0$, for k large enough, which is a contradiction to (7). \square

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Since $\max\{|\ddot{q}_{i_0}(t)|, |\dot{q}_{i_0}(t)| : t \in [t_1, t_2]\} < C_2$, for some constant C_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} |\dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0}|^2 dt &\leq \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} |\dot{\gamma}|^2 dt + 2C_2 \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} |\dot{\gamma}| dt + 2\delta C_2^2 \\ &\leq \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} |\dot{\gamma}|^2 dt + 2C_2 \left(2\delta \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} |\dot{\gamma}|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2\delta C_2^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{A}(\gamma; t_1, t_2) + 4C_2 \sqrt{\delta \mathcal{A}(\gamma; t_1, t_2)} + 2\delta C_2^2 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $E_{i_0}(t)$,

$$\int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} |E_{i_0}(t)| dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_0-\delta}^{t_0+\delta} |\dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0}|^2 dt + \mathcal{A}(\gamma; t_1, t_2) < \infty.$$

Meanwhile for any $t \in [t_1, t_2] \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$,

$$\dot{E}_{i_0} = \langle \dot{\gamma} - \ddot{q}_{i_0}, \dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0} \rangle + \left\langle \frac{m_{i_0}(\gamma - q_{i_0})}{|\gamma - q_{i_0}|^3}, \dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0} \right\rangle = -\langle \ddot{q}_{i_0} + \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i(\gamma - q_i)}{|\gamma - q_i|^3}, \dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0} \rangle.$$

By (5), $|\dot{E}_{i_0}| \leq C_3 |\dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0}|$, for some finite C_3 . Then the following implies $\dot{E}_{i_0} \in L^1([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta], \mathbb{R})$

$$\int_{t_0 - \delta}^{t_0 + \delta} |\dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0}| dt \leq \left(2\delta \int_{t_0 - \delta}^{t_0 + \delta} |\dot{\gamma} - \dot{q}_{i_0}|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

As a result, $E_{i_0} \in W^{1,1}([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta], \mathbb{R}) \subset C([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta], \mathbb{R})$. \square

By the above result, let's assume $\gamma \in H^1([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta], \mathbb{R})$ is a **collision-ejection solution** of (2), i.e., $\gamma(t)$ is collision-free and satisfies (2), $\forall t \neq t_0$, and $\gamma(t_0) = q_{i_0}(t_0)$, for some $i_0 \in \mathbf{N}$. Then we have the following two propositions, whose proofs can be found in Appendix A.

Proposition 2.2. *There exist $\sigma_{\pm} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f^{\pm} \in C^0([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta], \mathbb{C}) \cap C^1([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta] \setminus \{t_0\}, \mathbb{C})$ with $f^{\pm}(t) \simeq o(|t - t_0|^{2/3})$ and $\dot{f}^{\pm}(t) \simeq o(|t - t_0|^{-1/3})$, when $t \rightarrow t_0$, such that the following hold.*

- (a). $\sigma_{\pm} = \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^{\pm}} \frac{\gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t)}{|\gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t)|}$.
- (b). When $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \delta]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t) &= \left(\frac{9}{2}m_{i_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}(t - t_0)^{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_+ + f^+(t); \\ \dot{\gamma}(t) - \dot{q}_{i_0}(t) &= \frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{9}{2}m_{i_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}(t - t_0)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_+ + \dot{f}^+(t). \end{aligned}$$

- (c). When $t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t) &= \left(\frac{9}{2}m_{i_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}(t - t_0)^{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_- + f^-(t); \\ \dot{\gamma}(t) - \dot{q}_{i_0}(t) &= \frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{9}{2}m_{i_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}(t - t_0)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_- + \dot{f}^-(t). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.3. *When $\sigma_- \neq \sigma_+$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there are two collision-free paths $\eta^{\pm} \in H_{t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta}^1(\gamma(t_0 - \delta), \gamma(t_0 + \delta))$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}(\eta^{\pm}; t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta) < \mathcal{A}(\gamma; t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta)$ and*

$$(10) \quad |\eta^{\pm}(t) - \gamma(t)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta].$$

Moreover for δ small enough, we have

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Arg}(\eta^+(t_0 + \delta) - q_{i_0}(t_0 + \delta)) - \text{Arg}(\eta^+(t_0 - \delta) - q_{i_0}(t_0 - \delta)) &\in (0, 2\pi); \\ \text{Arg}(\eta^-(t_0 + \delta) - q_{i_0}(t_0 + \delta)) - \text{Arg}(\eta^-(t_0 - \delta) - q_{i_0}(t_0 - \delta)) &\in (-2\pi, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1. A similar result as the above proposition was obtained in [5] for the perturbed Kepler problem. However it does not imply our result, as the trajectories of the primaries were given a priori, so can not be deformed.

Proposition 2.4. *If $\gamma \in H^1([t_1, t_2], \mathbb{C})$ is a local minimizer of \mathcal{A}_h , then $\gamma|_{(t_1, t_2)}$ is a collision-free solution of (2).*

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 2.1 and 2.3. \square

Proposition 2.5. *For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t_1 < t_2$, there is a $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ satisfying*

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2).$$

Proof. As \mathcal{A}_h is weakly lower semi-continuous in $H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$, by a standard argument from the direct method of calculus of variation, the existence of such a γ follows once we can show \mathcal{A}_h is coercive in $H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$, i.e., if a sequence $\{\gamma_n \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)\}$ satisfies $\|\gamma_n\|_{H^1} \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n) \rightarrow \infty$ as well.

By a contradiction argument, let's assume $\|\gamma_n\|_{H^1} \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and there is a finite C_1 , such that $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n) \leq C_1, \forall n$. Then the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality implies

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_n| dt \leq (t_2 - t_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_n(t)|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2(t_2 - t_1)C_1}.$$

As a result,

$$|\gamma_n(t)| \leq |x| + \int_{t_1}^t |\dot{\gamma}_n(\tau)| d\tau \leq |x| + \sqrt{2(t_2 - t_1)C_1}, \forall t \in [t_1, t_2].$$

Then the following inequality holds for all n , which is a contradiction.

$$\|\gamma_n\|_{H^1}^2 = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\gamma(t)|^2 + |\dot{\gamma}(t)|^2 dt \leq (|x| + \sqrt{2(t_2 - t_1)C_1})^2(t_2 - t_1) + 2C_1.$$

□

By (*) or the periodicity of $q(t)$, we can find an $R_0 > 0$, such that

$$(12) \quad \sup\{|q_i(t)| : t \in \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathbf{N}\} = R_0 - 1.$$

Lemma 2.2. *Given any $(x, y) \in \mathbb{C} \times (\mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o)$ and $t_1 < t_2$, there is a C_1 with*

$$\sup\{\psi_h(x, z; t_1, t_2) : z \in B_{1/2}(y)\} \leq C_1.$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.5, there is a $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ with $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2)$. Then

$$\tau_0 = \min\{t \in [t_1, t_2] : \gamma(t) \in B_{1/2}(y)\} < t_2.$$

Notice that for any $z \in B_{1/2}(y)$, $|z| \geq |y| - |y - z| \geq R_0 - 1/2$, then there is a $C_2 > 0$, such that

$$(13) \quad U(z, t) \leq C_2, \forall z \in B_{1/2}(y) \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Now for any $z \in B_{1/2}(y)$, we define a new path

$$\xi(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma(t), & \text{if } t \in [t_1, \tau_0], \\ \gamma(\tau_0) + \frac{t - \tau_0}{t_2 - \tau_0}(z - \gamma(\tau_0)), & \text{if } t \in [\tau_0, t_2]. \end{cases}$$

Since $\xi(t) \in B_{1/2}(y), \forall t \in [\tau_0, t_2]$, by (13),

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_h(x, z; t_1, t_2) - \psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) &\leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) - L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}, t) dt \leq \int_{\tau_0}^{t_2} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) dt \\ &= \int_{\tau_0}^{t_2} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\xi}(t)|^2 + U(\xi(t), t) dt \leq \frac{|z - \gamma(\tau_0)|^2}{2(t_2 - \tau_0)} + C_2(t_2 - \tau_0) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(t_2 - \tau_0)} + C_2(t_2 - \tau_0). \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $C_1 = \psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) + C_2(t_2 - \tau_0) + 2^{-1}(t_2 - \tau_0)^{-1}$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Fix arbitrarily an $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and a $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $(y, t_2) \mapsto \psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in $(\mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o) \times \{t_2 \in \mathbb{R} : t_2 > t_1\}$.*

Proof. Since h is a constant, it is enough to prove the result for $h = 0$.

Let's fix an arbitrary $t_2 > t_1$, and prove the local Lipschitz continuity of ϕ_0 with respect to y first. Choose a $y_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$ and a $\delta \in (0, 1/4]$ small enough. For any $y \in B_\delta(y_0)$, by Proposition 2.5, there is a $\gamma_y \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}_0(\gamma_y; t_1, t_2) = \psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2)$. Let

$$\tau_y = \min\{t_0 \in [t_1, t_2] : \gamma_y(t) \in B_{1/2}(y_0), \forall t \in [t_0, t_2]\}.$$

We claim

$$(14) \quad \tau = \sup\{\tau_y : y \in B_\delta(y_0) \text{ with } \tau_y > t_1\} < t_2.$$

Notice that we only need to consider the cases, when $\tau_y > t_1$, and in these case, we must have $|\gamma_y(\tau_y) - y_0| = 1/2$. Then by Lemma 2.2, there is a $C_1 > 0$, such that

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} C_1 \geq \mathcal{A}_0(\gamma_y; t_1, t_2) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tau_y}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_{y_n}|^2 dt \geq \frac{1}{2(t_2 - \tau_y)} \left(\int_{\tau_y}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_y| dt \right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{|y - \gamma_y(\tau_y)|^2}{2(t_2 - \tau_y)} \geq \frac{(|\gamma_y(\tau_y) - y_0| - |y_0 - y|)^2}{2(t_2 - \tau_y)} \geq \frac{(\frac{1}{2} - \delta)^2}{2(t_2 - \tau_y)}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result $t_2 - \tau_y \geq (1 - 2\delta)^2 / (8C_1) > 0$, and this implies (14).

Next we show that there must be an $s_y \in [\tau, t_2]$ with

$$|\dot{\gamma}_y(s_y)| \leq \sqrt{2C_1(t_2 - t_1)} / (t_2 - \tau).$$

Otherwise $\int_{\tau}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_y| dt > \sqrt{2C_1(t_2 - t_1)}$, which is a contradiction to

$$\int_{\tau}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_y| dt \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_y| dt \leq \sqrt{2(t_2 - t_1)\mathcal{A}_0(\gamma_y; t_1, t_2)} \leq \sqrt{2C_1(t_2 - t_1)}.$$

Meanwhile since $\forall t \in [\tau, t_2]$, $\gamma_y(t)$ satisfies (2), and $\gamma_y(t) \in B_{1/2}(y_0) \subset (\mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0-1/2}^o)$, there is a $C_2 > 0$, such that

$$|\ddot{\gamma}_y(t)| \leq |\nabla U(\gamma_y(t), t)| \leq C_2.$$

Therefore for any $t \in [\tau, t_2]$ and $y \in B_\delta(y_0)$,

$$(16) \quad |\dot{\gamma}_y(t)| \leq |\dot{\gamma}_y(s_y)| + \int_{\tau}^{t_2} |\ddot{\gamma}_y(s)| ds \leq \frac{\sqrt{2C_1(t_2 - t_1)}}{t_2 - \tau} + C_2(t_2 - \tau) = C_3.$$

Let $\delta_0 = \min\{\delta, t_2 - \tau\}$. For any $y \in B_{\delta_0}(y_0)$, define a new path $\xi \in H_{t_2 - \Delta y, t_2}^1(\gamma_{y_0}(t_2 - \Delta y), y_0)$ as below, where $\Delta y = |y - y_0|$,

$$\xi_y(t) = \gamma_{y_0}(t_2 - \Delta y) + \frac{t + \Delta y - t_2}{\Delta y} (y - \gamma_{y_0}(t_2 - \Delta y)), \quad t \in [t_2 - \Delta y, t_2].$$

By the triangle inequality and (16),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_2 - \Delta y}^{t_2} |\dot{\xi}_y|^2 dt &\leq \frac{1}{\Delta y} \left(\int_{t_2 - \Delta y}^{t_2} |\dot{\xi}_y| dt \right)^2 = \frac{|y - \gamma_{y_0}(t_2 - \Delta y)|^2}{\Delta y} \\ &\leq \frac{(|y - y_0| + |y_0 - \gamma_{y_0}(t_2 - \Delta y)|)^2}{\Delta y} \leq \frac{\left(\Delta y + \int_{t_2 - \Delta y}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_{y_0}| dt \right)^2}{\Delta y} \leq (C_3 + 1)^2 \Delta y. \end{aligned}$$

As there is a $C_4 > 0$, such that $U(z, t) \leq C_4$, for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0-1/2}^0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2) - \psi_0(x, y_0; t_1, t_2) \leq \int_{t_2-\Delta y}^{t_2} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\xi}_y|^2 + U(\xi_y(t), t) dt \leq \frac{1}{2}(C_3 + 1)^2 \Delta y + C_4 \Delta y.$$

Meanwhile we can also define a path $\eta_y \in H_{t_2-\Delta y, t_2}^1(\gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta y), y)$ as

$$\eta_y(t) = \gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta y) + \frac{t + \Delta y - t_2}{\Delta y} (y - \gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta y)), \quad t \in [t_2 - \Delta y, t_2].$$

Then a similar argument as above shows

$$\psi_0(x, y_0; t_1, t_2) - \psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2) \leq \int_{t_2-\Delta y}^{t_2} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\eta}_y|^2 + U(\eta_y(t), t) dt \leq \frac{1}{2}(C_3 + 1)^2 \Delta y + C_4 \Delta y.$$

These results imply that for any $y \in B_\delta(y_0)$,

$$|\psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2) - \psi_0(x, y_0; t_1, t_2)| \leq \frac{(C_3 + 1)^2 + 2C_4}{2} |y - y_0| = C_5 |y - y_0|.$$

This finishes our proof of the local Lipschitz continuity of ϕ_0 with respect to y .

To show the local Lipschitz continuity of ϕ_0 with respect to t_2 . Let $\gamma_y \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ be a minimizer of \mathcal{A}_0 . Now choose a $\Delta t > 0$ small enough, then similar arguments as above show

$$(17) \quad |\dot{\gamma}_y(t)| \leq C_3 \text{ and } U(\gamma_y(t), \tau) \leq C_4, \quad \forall t \in [t_2 - \Delta t, t_2] \text{ and } \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This implies

$$|y - \gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t)| \leq \int_{t_2-\Delta t}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}_y(t)| dt \leq C_3 \Delta t;$$

$$\mathcal{A}_0(\gamma_y; t_2 - \Delta t, t_2) = \int_{t_2-\Delta t}^{t_2} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\gamma}_y(t)|^2 + U(\gamma_y(t), t) dt \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} C_3^2 + C_4\right) \Delta t.$$

Combining these inequalities with the Lipschitz continuity with respect to y , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |\psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2) - \psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2 - \Delta t)| \\ & \leq \mathcal{A}_0(\gamma_y; t_2 - \Delta t, t_2) + |\psi_0(x, \gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t); t_1, t_2 - \Delta t) - \psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2 - \Delta t)| \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} C_3^2 + C_4\right) \Delta t + C_5 |y - \gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t)| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} C_3^2 + C_4 + C_3 C_5\right) \Delta t. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2 + \Delta t) - \psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2)| \\ & \leq |\psi_0(\gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t), y; t_2, t_2 + \Delta t)| + |\psi_0(x, \gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t); t_1, t_2) - \psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2)| \\ & \leq |\psi_0(\gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t), y; t_2, t_2 + \Delta t)| + C_6 |y - \gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t)| \\ & \leq |\psi_0(\gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t), y; t_2, t_2 + \Delta t)| + C_3 C_6 \Delta t. \end{aligned}$$

Now define a new path $\tilde{\gamma}_y \in H_{t_2, t_2+\Delta t}^1(\gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t), y)$ as $\tilde{\gamma}_y(s) = \gamma_y(s - \Delta t)$, $\forall s \in [t_2, t_2 + \Delta t]$. With (17), we get

$$|\psi_0(\gamma_y(t_2 - \Delta t), y; t_2, t_2 + \Delta t)| \leq \mathcal{A}_0(\tilde{\gamma}_y; t_2, t_2 + \Delta t) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} C_3^2 + C_4\right) \Delta t.$$

As a result,

$$|\psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2 + \Delta t) - \psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2)| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} C_3^2 + C_4 + C_3 C_6\right) \Delta t.$$

This proves the local Lipschitz continuity of ϕ_0 with respect to t_2 . \square

To control the asymptotic energy of the massless body as it goes to infinity, instead of minimizer with the same starting and ending time, we need to consider minimizers with varying starting and ending time. However as the system is T -periodic the time difference must belong to $T\mathbb{Z}$. For simplicity, we will only state and prove these results for $T = 1$ (it is easy to generalize the following results to arbitrary $T > 0$). Notice that

In the rest of the section, we assume $q(t)$ is 1-periodic, i.e., $T = 1$ in (*).

Definition 2.2. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ and $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1)$, we say $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ is a free-time minimizer of \mathcal{A}_h , if $\{t_i\} = s_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2)$, where

$$\phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) := \inf\{\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma) : \gamma \in H_{\tau_1, \tau_2}^1(x, y) \text{ with } \tau_1 < \tau_2, \{\tau_i\} = s_i, i = 1, 2\};$$

Remark 2.2. Since the Lagrangian L is 1-periodic, if $\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a free-time minimizer of \mathcal{A}_h , then so is $\gamma|_{[\tau_1, \tau_2]}$, for any $t_1 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 \leq t_2$.

Proposition 2.7. When $h > 0$, for any $x \neq y \in \mathbb{C}$ and $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1)$, there exist $t_1 < t_2$ with $\{t_i\} = s_i$, $i = 1, 2$ and a $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2)$. Moreover $\gamma|_{(t_1, t_2)}$ is a collision-free solution of (2).

Proof. First let's assume $s_1 < s_2$, then

$$\phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}} \psi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2 + n).$$

Since $h > 0$, $\psi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2 + n) \geq h(s_2 - s_1 + n) \rightarrow \infty$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. As a result,

$$\phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) = \psi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2 + n_0), \text{ for some } n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}.$$

By Proposition 2.5, there is a $\gamma \in H_{s_1, s_2 + n_0}^1(x, y)$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; s_1, s_2 + n) = \psi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2 + n) = \phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2),$$

and $\gamma|_{(s_1, s_2 + n_0)}$ is a collision-free solution of (2).

When $s_1 \geq s_2$, $\phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \psi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2 + n)$, and the rest of the proof is the exactly the same as above. \square

Proposition 2.8. When $h > 0$, for any $x \neq y$ and $s \in [0, 1)$, there is a $s^* \in [0, 1)$, such that

$$\phi_h(x, y; s, s^*) = \inf\{\phi_h(x, y; s, t) : t \in [0, 1)\}.$$

Proof. As the infimum in the above equation is finite, there is a sequence $\{s_n \in [0, 1)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ with

$$(18) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_h(x, y; s, s_n) = \inf\{\phi_h(x, y; s, t) : t \in [0, 1)\} \leq C_1.$$

By Proposition 2.7, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there is a $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$ and a $\gamma_n \in H_{s, s_n + k_n}^1(x, y)$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; s, s_n + k_n) = \phi_h(x, y; s, s_n).$$

We claim $\{k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ must have a finite upper bound. Otherwise

$$\phi_h(x, y; s, s_n) = \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; s, s_n + k_n) \geq hk_n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is a contradiction to (18).

This implies the existence of a finite $t^* \in \mathbb{R}$ with (after passing to a subsequence) $s_n + k_n \rightarrow t^*$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\gamma_n(s) = x$, $\forall n$ and

$$\int_s^{s_n + k_n} |\dot{\gamma}_n|^2 dt \leq 2\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; s, s_n + k_n) = 2\phi_h(x, y; s, s_n) \leq 2C_1.$$

By a similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 2.5, we can show $\{\gamma_n|_{[s, s_n+k_n]}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a bounded sequence under the H^1 -norm. Then there is a $\gamma \in H^1_{s, t^*}(x, y)$, such that (after passing to a proper subsequence) γ_n will converge weakly to γ with respect to the H^1 -norm, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The weakly lower semi-continuity of \mathcal{A}_h then implies

$$\phi_h(x, y; s, s^*) \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; s, t^*) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; s, s_n + k_n) = \inf\{\phi_h(x, y; s, t) : t \in [0, 1)\},$$

where $s^* = \{t^*\}$. The desired result then follows from the fact that

$$\inf\{\phi_h(x, y; s, t) : t \in [0, 1)\} \leq \phi_h(x, y; s, s^*).$$

□

3. EXISTENCE OF HYPERBOLIC SOLUTIONS

In this section, we assume $q(t)$ is a 1-periodic solution of (1), and give a detailed proof of Theorem 1.1, until the last proof, where the cases with $T \neq 1$ will be treated by a blow-up argument. Moreover only the proof of $\gamma^+|_{[t_x, \infty)}$ will be given, as it is the same for $\gamma^-|_{(-\infty, t_x]}$.

In the following it is more convenient to rewrite the potential function U given in (3) as

$$(19) \quad U(z, t) = \frac{m}{|z|} + W(z, t), \quad \text{where } m = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i.$$

A direct computation shows

$$(20) \quad W(z, t) \simeq O(m|z|^{-2}), \quad \text{as } |z| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore we can find a constant $R_1 \geq R_0$, and positive constants α_1, α_2 , such that

$$(21) \quad |W(z, t)| \leq \frac{\alpha_1}{|z|^2} \leq \frac{m}{|z|}, \quad |\partial_z W(z, t)| \leq \frac{\alpha_2}{|z|^3} \leq \frac{m}{|z|^2}, \quad \forall |z| \geq R_1.$$

Let $\gamma(t) = r(t)e^{i\theta(t)} \in C^2([t_1, t_2], \mathbb{C})$ be a collision-free solution of (2), we have the following results, which are useful in controlling the asymptotic behavior of the massless body near infinity.

Proposition 3.1. *If $r(t_1) \geq R_1$ and $\dot{r}(t_1) \geq \sqrt{6m/r(t_1)}$, then $\dot{r}(t) > \frac{1}{2}\dot{r}(t_1)$, $\forall t \in [t_1, t_2]$.*

Proposition 3.2. *If $r(t_1) \geq R_1$ and $\dot{r}(t) \geq v_0$, $\forall t \geq t_1$, for some constant $v_0 > 0$, then*

- (a). $\sup\{|\omega(t)| : t \in [t_1, t_2]\} \leq |\omega(t_1)| + \frac{\alpha_2}{v_0 r(t_1)}$, where $\omega(t) = \gamma(t) \wedge \dot{\gamma}(t)$;
- (b). when $t_2 = \infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta(t) = \theta_0$, for some $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proofs of the above two propositions will be given in Appendix B.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $\sqrt{2}R_1 \leq |x|, |y| \leq R$, the following results hold.*

- (a). $\psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2) \leq 16\frac{R^2}{t_2-t_1} + 12m\frac{t_2-t_1}{R}$, $\forall t_1 < t_2$.
- (b). For any $h > 0$, there exist positive constants β_1, β_2 independent of R , such that

$$\sup\{\phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) : s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1)\} \leq \beta_1 R + \beta_2.$$

Proof. (a). Choose a point $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| = R$. Let $\vec{o\hat{x}}, \vec{o\hat{y}}$ and $\vec{o\hat{z}}$ denote the three rays starting from the origin and passing the points x, y and z correspondingly. Moreover we assume $\vec{o\hat{z}}$ divide the angle between $\vec{o\hat{x}}$ and $\vec{o\hat{y}}$ into two equal angles with each angle less than or equal to $\pi/2$.

Define a straight line segment $\xi(t) = (1 - \lambda(t))x + \lambda(t)z$, $t \in [t_1, \frac{t_1+t_2}{2}]$ with

$$\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} \mu \left[1 - \left(\frac{\tau-t}{\tau-t_1} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \right], & \text{if } t \in [t_1, \tau]; \\ \mu + (1 - \mu) \left(\frac{t-\tau}{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}-\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}, & \text{if } t \in [\tau, \frac{t_1+t_2}{2}], \end{cases}$$

satisfying $\lambda(t_1) = 0$ and $\lambda(\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}) = 1$. For this, we need to let

$$\mu = \frac{|x|}{|x| + |z|} \in (0, 1), \quad \tau = t_1 + \frac{\mu^{3/2}}{\mu^{3/2} + (1 - \mu)^{3/2}} \frac{t_2 - t_1}{2} \in (t_1, \frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_2)).$$

By the triangle inequality, for any $t \in [t_1, \frac{t_1+t_2}{2}]$,

$$|\xi(t)| = |(1 - \lambda(t))x + \lambda(t)z| \geq |(1 - \lambda(t))x| - \lambda(t)|z| = |\mu - \lambda(t)|(|x| + |z|).$$

Since $|x|, |z| \geq \sqrt{2}R_1$, $|\xi(t)| \geq R_1$, $\forall t \in [t_1, \frac{t_1+t_2}{2}]$. Then (21) and the above inequality imply

$$U(\xi(t), t) \leq \frac{2m}{|\xi(t)|} \leq \frac{2m}{(|x| + |z|)|\mu - \lambda(t)|} \leq \frac{2m}{|z| \cdot |\mu - \lambda(t)|}.$$

Using this, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_1}^{\tau} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) dt &= \int_{t_1}^{\tau} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\xi}|^2 + U(\xi, t) dt \leq \frac{|z-x|^2}{2} \int_{t_1}^{\tau} |\dot{\lambda}(t)|^2 dt + \frac{2m}{|z|} \int_{t_1}^{\tau} \frac{1}{|\mu - \lambda(t)|} dt \\ &= \frac{2|z-x|^2}{9} \frac{\mu^2}{(\tau-t_1)^2} \int_{t_1}^{\tau} \left(\frac{\tau-t}{\tau-t_1} \right)^{-\frac{2}{3}} dt + \frac{2m}{|z|} \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{t_1}^{\tau} \left(\frac{\tau-t}{\tau-t_1} \right)^{-\frac{2}{3}} dt \\ &= \frac{2}{3} |z-x|^2 \frac{\mu^2}{\tau-t_1} + \frac{6m}{|z|} \frac{\tau-t_1}{\mu} \\ &= \frac{4}{3} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} + (1-\mu)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \frac{|z-x|^2}{t_2-t_1} + 3m \frac{\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} + (1-\mu)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{t_2-t_1}{|z|}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tau}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) dt &= \int_{\tau}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\xi}(t)|^2 + U(\xi(t), t) dt \\ &\leq \frac{|z-x|^2}{2} \int_{\tau}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} |\dot{\lambda}(t)|^2 dt + \frac{2m}{|z|} \int_{\tau}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} \frac{1}{|\mu - \lambda(t)|} dt \\ &= \left(\frac{2|z-x|^2}{9} \frac{(1-\mu)^2}{(\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}-\tau)^2} + \frac{2m}{|z|} \frac{1}{1-\mu} \right) \int_{\tau}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} \left(\frac{t-\tau}{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}-\tau} \right)^{-\frac{2}{3}} dt \\ &= \frac{2}{3} |z-x|^2 \frac{(1-\mu)^2}{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}-\tau} + \frac{6m}{|z|} \frac{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}-\tau}{1-\mu} \\ &= \frac{4}{3} (1-\mu)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} + (1-\mu)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \frac{|z-x|^2}{t_2-t_1} + 3m \frac{(1-\mu)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} + (1-\mu)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{t_2-t_1}{|z|}. \end{aligned}$$

These two estimates imply

$$(22) \quad \int_{t_1}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) dt \leq \frac{4}{3} f_1(\mu) f_2(\mu) \frac{|z-x|^2}{t_2-t_1} + 3m \frac{f_1(\mu)}{f_2(\mu)} \frac{t_2-t_1}{|z|},$$

where

$$f_1(\mu) = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + (1 - \mu)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad f_2(\mu) = \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} + (1 - \mu)^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Since $\mu \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\mu) &= 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \mu)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \mu + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \mu) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{2}; \\ 1 &\geq f_2(\mu) = 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \mu^{\frac{3}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \mu)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \geq 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \mu + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \mu) \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Plug these into (22), we have

$$\int_{t_1}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}) dt \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{3} \frac{|z-x|^2}{t_2-t_1} + 6m \frac{t_2-t_1}{|z|} \leq \frac{16\sqrt{2}}{3} \frac{R^2}{t_2-t_1} + 6m \frac{t_2-t_1}{R}.$$

A similarly straight line segment $\zeta|_{[\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}, t_2]}$ going from z to y can be found, which satisfies

$$\int_{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}}^{t_2} L(\zeta, \dot{\zeta}, t) dt \leq \frac{16\sqrt{2}}{3} \frac{R^2}{t_2-t_1} + 6m \frac{t_2-t_1}{R}.$$

As a result,

$$\psi_0(x, y; t_1, t_2) \leq \int_{t_1}^{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) dt + \int_{\frac{t_1+t_2}{2}}^{t_2} L(\zeta, \dot{\zeta}, t) dt \leq 16 \frac{R^2}{t_2-t_1} + 12m \frac{t_2-t_1}{R}.$$

(b). Let $t_1 = s_1$, we can always find a $t_2 \in [s_1 + R, s_1 + R + 1]$ satisfying $\{t_2\} = s_2$. Then $R \leq t_2 - t_1 = t_2 - s_1 \leq R + 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) &\leq \psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) \leq 16 \frac{R^2}{t_2-t_1} + 6m \frac{t_2-t_1}{R} + h(t_2-t_1) \\ &\leq 16R + 6m(1 + R^{-1}) + hR + h \\ &\leq (16 + h)R + 6m + \frac{3\sqrt{2}m}{R_1} + h. \end{aligned}$$

□

For the rest of the section, we fix arbitrarily a positive constant h , a position $x \in \mathbb{C}$, a moment t_x (without loss of generality we further assume $t_x \in [0, 1)$) and an angle $\theta_+ \in [0, 2\pi)$. Set

$$(23) \quad \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R) := \{re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{C} : r \geq R \text{ and } \theta = \theta_+ \pmod{2\pi}\}, \quad \text{for } R > 0.$$

By Proposition 2.7 and 2.8, for any $y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(|x| + 1)$, there is a $\gamma_y \in H_{t_x, t_y}^1(x, y)$ satisfying

$$(24) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; t_x, t_y) = \phi_h(x, y; t_x, \{t_y\}) = \inf_{s \in [0, 1)} \phi_h(x, y; t_x, s).$$

Lemma 3.2. *For any $R_2 \geq \max\{2\sqrt{2}R_1, |x| + 1\}$ and $y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)$, let*

$$(25) \quad \tau_y := \min\{t \in [t_x, t_y] : |\gamma_y(t)| = R_2\}.$$

The following results hold.

- (a). $t_x < \inf\{\tau_y : y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)\} \leq \sup\{\tau_y : y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)\} < \infty$.
- (b). *When R_2 is large enough, $\dot{r}_y(t) \geq \sqrt{3m/2R_2}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \forall t \in [\tau_y, t_y]$, where $r_y(t) = |\gamma_y(t)|$.*

Proof. (a). The second inequality in the statement is trivial. Let's give a proof of the third inequality first. Fix an $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, by Proposition 2.6,

$$\sup\{\psi_h(x, z; t_x, t) : z \in \partial B_{R_2} \text{ and } t \in [n_0, n_0 + 1]\} \leq C_1.$$

Since $\gamma_y|_{[t_x, t_y]}$ is a free-time minimizer, so is $\gamma_y|_{[t_x, \tau_y]}$. Then

$$(26) \quad h(\tau_y - t_x) \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; t_x, \tau_y) = \phi_h(x, \gamma_y(\tau_y); t_x, \{\tau_y\}) \leq \psi_h(x, \gamma_y(\tau_y); t_x, n_0 + \{\tau_y\}) \leq C_1.$$

This implies

$$\sup\{\tau_y : y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)\} \leq t_x + C_1/h < \infty.$$

Meanwhile by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$(\tau_y - t_x) \int_{t_x}^{\tau_y} |\dot{\gamma}_y|^2 dt \geq \left(\int_{t_x}^{\tau_y} |\dot{\gamma}_y| dt \right)^2 \geq |\gamma(\tau_y) - x|^2 \geq (R_2 - |x|)^2.$$

Combining this with (26), we get

$$C_1 \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; t_x, \tau_y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_x}^{\tau_y} |\dot{\gamma}_y|^2 dt \geq \frac{(R_2 - |x|)^2}{2(\tau_y - t_x)}.$$

Assuming the first inequality in the statement does not hold, then we can find a sequence $\{y_n \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ with the corresponding $\{\tau_{y_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{y_n} = t_x$. Then

$$C_1 \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{y_n}; t_x, \tau_{y_n}) \geq \frac{(R_2 - |x|)^2}{2(\tau_{y_n} - t_x)} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is absurd.

(b). For each $y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)$, let $a_y = \max\{t \in [t_x, \tau_y] : r_y(t) = R_2/2\}$. Then

$$r_y(t) \geq R_2/2 \geq R_1, \quad \forall t \in [a_y, \tau_y].$$

Now it is enough to show $\dot{r}_y(t_0) \geq \sqrt{6m/r_y(t_0)}$, for some $t_0 \in [a_y, \tau_y]$, as Proposition 3.1 implies

$$\dot{r}_y(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} \dot{r}(t_0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{6m/r_y(t_0)} \geq \sqrt{3m/2R_2}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_y],$$

where the last inequality follows from $r_y(t_0) \leq r_y(\tau_y) = R_2$.

By a contradiction argument, let's assume $\dot{r}_y(t) < \sqrt{6m/r_y(t)}$, $\forall t \in [a_y, \tau_y]$. Then

$$\frac{R_2}{2} = r_y(\tau_y) - r_y(a_y) = \int_{a_y}^{\tau_y} \dot{r}_y(t) dt < \int_{a_y}^{\tau_y} \sqrt{6m/r_y(t)} dt \leq \sqrt{\frac{12m}{R_2}} (\tau_y - a_y).$$

Notice that $r_y(t) \geq R_2/2$, $\forall t \in [a_y, \tau_y]$. As a result,

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; a_y, \tau_y) \geq h(\tau_y - a_y) > \frac{h}{4\sqrt{3m}} R_2^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

However with Lemma 3.1, they imply

$$\frac{h}{4\sqrt{3m}} R_2^{\frac{3}{2}} < \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; a_y, \tau_y) = \phi_h(\gamma_y(a_y), \gamma_y(\tau_y); \{a_y\}, \{\tau_y\}) \leq \beta_1 R_2 + \beta_2,$$

which is absurd, when R_2 is large enough. \square

In the rest of the section, we fix an $R_2 \geq \max\{2\sqrt{2}R_1, |x| + 1\}$ large enough, such that the above lemma always holds.

Lemma 3.3. *For any $\tau > \sup\{\tau_y : y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)\}$, the following results hold.*

- (a). *There is a constant $R = R(\tau, R_2) > 0$ (independent of y), such that for any $y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)$ with $t_y \geq \tau$, we have $|\gamma_y(t)| \leq R$, $\forall t \in [t_x, \tau]$.*
- (b). *$\{\gamma_y|_{[t_x, \tau]} : y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2) \text{ with } t_y \geq \tau\}$ is a bound subset in $H^1([t_x, \tau], \mathbb{C})$.*

Proof. (a). By (25), $|\gamma_y(t)| \leq R_2$, when $t \in [t_x, \tau_y]$. Meanwhile Lemma 3.2 implies $|\gamma_y(t)|$ is strictly increasing, when $t \in [\tau_y, \tau]$. Hence it is enough to show $|\gamma_y(\tau)| \leq R$, for some finite constant R independent of y . By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$|\gamma_y(\tau)| \leq |\gamma_y(\tau_y)| + |\gamma_y(\tau) - \gamma_y(\tau_y)| \leq R_2 + \int_{\tau_y}^{\tau} |\dot{\gamma}_y| dt \leq R_2 + \left((\tau - \tau_y) \int_{\tau_y}^{\tau} |\dot{\gamma}_y|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

At the same time, Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\int_{\tau_y}^{\tau} |\dot{\gamma}_y|^2 dt \leq 2\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; \tau_y, \tau) = 2\phi_h(\gamma_y(\tau_y), \gamma_y(\tau); \{\tau_y\}, \{\tau\}) \leq 2\beta_1|\gamma_y(\tau)| + 2\beta_2.$$

These two estimates implies $|\gamma_y(\tau)| \leq R_2 + \sqrt{2\tau}(\beta_1|\gamma_y(\tau)| + \beta_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which is equivalent to

$$|\gamma_y(\tau)|^2 - 2(R_2 + \beta_1\tau)|\gamma_y(\tau)| + R_2^2 - 2\beta_2\tau \leq 0.$$

Solving this inequality, we get

$$|\gamma_y(\tau)| \leq R_2 + \beta_1\tau + (\beta_1^2\tau^2 + 2\beta_1\tau R_2 + 2\beta_2\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} := R.$$

(b). Let $a = \inf\{\tau_y : y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2) \text{ and } \tau_y \geq \tau\}$, $b = \sup\{\tau_y : y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2) \text{ and } \tau_y \geq \tau\}$. By Lemma 3.2, $t_x < a < b < \infty$. As $|\gamma_y(\tau_y)| = R_2$, $\forall y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)$ with $t_y \geq \tau$. By Proposition 2.6

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; t_x, \tau_y) = \psi_h(x, \gamma_y(\tau_y); t_x, \tau_y) \leq \sup_{t \in [a, b], z \in \partial B_{R_2}} \psi_h(x, z; t_x, t) \leq C_2.$$

Meanwhile as $\sqrt{2}R_1 \leq R_2 = |\gamma_y(\tau_y)| \leq |\gamma_y(\tau)| \leq R$, Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; \tau_y, \tau) = \phi_h(\gamma_y(\tau_y), \gamma_y(\tau); \{\tau_y\}, \{\tau\}) \leq \beta_1 R + \beta_2.$$

Combining these two estimates, we get

$$\int_{t_x}^{\tau} |\dot{\gamma}_y|^2 dt \leq 2\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_y; t_x, \tau) \leq 2(\beta_1 R + \beta_2 + C_2).$$

On the other hand, property (a) implies

$$\int_{t_x}^{\tau} |\gamma_y(t)|^2 dt \leq (\tau - t_x)R^2.$$

As a result, for any $y \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)$ with $t_y \geq \tau$,

$$\|\gamma_y|_{[t_x, \tau]}\|_{H^1} \leq \int_{t_x}^{\tau} |\gamma_y|^2 + |\dot{\gamma}_y|^2 dt \leq (\tau - t_x)R^2 + 2(\beta_1 R + \beta_2 + C_2).$$

□

The next result is a simple exercise from real analysis, which will be needed.

Proposition 3.3. *Given a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C^2([T_1, T_2], \mathbb{C})$, whose C^2 -norm is bounded. If there is a $f \in C^2([T_1, T_2], \mathbb{C})$ with $\|f_n - f\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\|f_n - f\|_{C^1} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Now let's choose a sequence of points $\{y_n \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $|y_n| \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each n , let $\gamma_{y_n} \in H_{t_x, t_{y_n}}^1(x, y_n)$ be a free-time minimizer satisfying

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{y_n}; t_x, t_{y_n}) = \phi_h(x, y_n; t_x, \{t_{y_n}\}) = \inf_{s \in [0, 1]} \phi_h(x, y_n; t_x, s).$$

Proposition 3.4. *Under the above notations, the following results hold.*

- (a). $t_{y_n} \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (b). *There exists a $\gamma \in H^1([t_x, \infty), \mathbb{C})$, such that (after passing to a proper subsequence) $\gamma_{y_n} \rightarrow \gamma$ strongly in L_{loc}^∞ -norm and weakly in H_{loc}^1 -norm, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*
- (c). $\forall t > t_x$, $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_x, t) = \phi_h(x, \gamma(\tau); t_x, \{t\})$, and $\gamma|_{(t_x, \infty)}$ is a collision-free solution of (2).
- (d). $\gamma_{y_n} \rightarrow \gamma$ in C_{loc}^1 -norm, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., for any compact subset $I \subset (t_x, \infty)$, $\|\gamma_{y_n}|_I - \gamma|_I\|_{C^1}$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 3.1. For the rest of the section, we set $\gamma_n = \gamma_{y_n}$, $t_n = t_{y_n}$ and $\tau_n = \tau_{y_n}$ (given as in (25)).

Proof. (a). Since for n large enough, $|\gamma_n(\tau_n)|$ and $|\gamma_n(t_n)| = |y_n| \geq \sqrt{R_1}$, by Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 |y_n| + \beta_2 &\geq \phi_h(\gamma_n(\tau_n), \gamma_n(t_n); \{\tau_n\}, \{t_n\}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tau_n}^{t_n} |\dot{\gamma}_n|^2 dt \geq \frac{1}{2(t_n - \tau_n)} \left(\int_{\tau_n}^{t_n} |\dot{\gamma}_n| dt \right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{|y_n - \gamma_n(\tau_n)|^2}{2(t_n - \tau_n)} \geq \frac{(|y_n| - |\gamma_n(\tau_n)|)^2}{2t_n} \geq \frac{|y_n|^2 - 2R_2|y_n| + R_2^2}{2t_n}. \end{aligned}$$

This then implies

$$t_n \geq \frac{|y_n|^2 - 2R_2|y_n| + R_2^2}{2(\beta_1|y_n| + \beta_2)} \geq \frac{|y_n| - 2R_2 + R_2^2|y_n|^{-1}}{2\beta_1 + 2\beta_2|y_n|^{-1}} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } |y_n| \rightarrow \infty.$$

(b). For any $\tau > t_x$ large enough, by Lemma 3.3, $\{\gamma_n|_{[t_x, \tau]}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded under the H^1 -norm, so (after passing to a proper subsequence) it converges to a $\xi \in H^1([t_x, \tau], \mathbb{C})$ weakly in H^1 -norm and strongly in L^∞ -norm.

Since $t_n \rightarrow \infty$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$, by a diagonal argument, we can find a $\gamma \in H^1([t_x, \infty), \mathbb{C})$, such that (after passing to a proper subsequence) $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma$ strongly in L_{loc}^∞ -norm and weak in H_{loc}^1 -norm. Moreover the weakly lower semi-continuity of \mathcal{A}_h implies

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_x, \tau) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; t_x, \tau), \quad \forall \tau > t_x.$$

(c). Notice that is enough to prove the result for all t large enough. By a contradiction argument, let's assume there is a $t > t_x$ large, such that

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_x, t) > \phi_h(x, \gamma(\tau); t_x, \{t\}).$$

Then by Proposition 2.7, there is a $\xi \in H_{t_x, \tau}^1(x, \gamma(t))$ with $\{\tau\} = \{t\}$ (see Figure 1), such that

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_x, \tau) = \phi_h(x, \gamma(t); t_x, \{t\}) \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_x, t) - 3\varepsilon,$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Then by (27), when n is large enough,

$$(28) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; t_x, t) \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_x, t) - \varepsilon \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_x, \tau) + 2\varepsilon.$$

Since $\xi(\tau) = \gamma(t)$ must be collision-free, for τ large enough, so is $\xi|_{[\tau', \tau]}$ for τ' close enough to τ . Then \mathcal{A}_h is continuous in a small neighborhood of $\xi|_{[\tau', \tau]}$ in $H^1([\tau', \tau], \mathbb{C})$. As $\gamma_n(t) \rightarrow \gamma(t) = \xi(t)$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each n large enough, we can find a $\eta_n \in H_{\tau', \tau}^1(\xi(\tau), \gamma_n(t))$ with

$$|\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; \tau', \tau) - \mathcal{A}_h(\eta_n; \tau', \tau)| \leq \varepsilon.$$




FIGURE 1.

Then $\zeta_n|_{[t_x, \tau]} = \xi|_{[t_x, \tau']} * \eta_n|_{[\tau', \tau]} \in H_{t_x, \tau}^1(x, \gamma_n(t))$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_x, \tau) - \mathcal{A}_h(\zeta_n; t_x, \tau) = \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; \tau', \tau) - \mathcal{A}_h(\eta_n; \tau', \tau) \geq -\varepsilon.$$

Combining this with (28), we get the following inequality, which is absurd.

$$\phi_h(x, \gamma_n(t); t_x, \{t\}) = \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; t_x, t) \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_x, \tau) + 2\varepsilon \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\zeta_n; t_x, \tau) + \varepsilon.$$

(d). Given an arbitrary compact subset $I \subset (t_x, \infty)$, by property (c), $\gamma|_I$ is a collision-free solution of (2). As a result,

$$|\ddot{\gamma}(t)| = \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{m_i(\gamma(t) - q_i(t))}{|\gamma(t) - q_i(t)|^3} \right| \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{m_i}{|\gamma(t) - q_i(t)|} \leq C_1, \quad \forall t \in I.$$

Since each $\gamma_n|_I$ is also a free-time minimizer, $\gamma_n|_I$ is a collision-free solution of (2) as well. By property (a), $\|\gamma_n|_I - \gamma|_I\|_{L^\infty} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for n large enough,

$$|\ddot{\gamma}_n(t)| = \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{m_i(\gamma_n(t) - q_i(t))}{|\gamma_n(t) - q_i(t)|^3} \right| \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{m_i}{|\gamma_n(t) - q_i(t)|} \leq 2C_1, \quad \forall t \in I.$$

The desired result now follows directly from Proposition 3.3. \square

For γ and γ_n from above, in polar coordinate, we let $\gamma(t) = r(t)e^{i\theta(t)}$ and $\gamma_n(t) = r_n(t)e^{i\theta_n(t)}$.

Proposition 3.5. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta(t) = \theta_+ \pmod{2\pi}$.

Proof. Notice that Proposition 3.4 implies

$$(29) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma_n(t) - \gamma(t)| = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\dot{\gamma}_n(t) - \dot{\gamma}(t)| = 0, \quad \forall t > t_x.$$

Meanwhile by a direct computation,

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{r}_n - \dot{r}| &= \left| \frac{\langle \gamma_n, \dot{\gamma}_n \rangle}{|\gamma_n|} - \frac{\langle \gamma, \dot{\gamma} \rangle}{|\gamma|} \right| = \left| \frac{\langle |\gamma| \gamma_n, \dot{\gamma}_n \rangle - \langle |\gamma_n| \gamma, \dot{\gamma} \rangle}{|\gamma_n| |\gamma|} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{\langle |\gamma| \gamma_n, \dot{\gamma}_n \rangle - \langle |\gamma| \gamma_n, \dot{\gamma} \rangle + \langle |\gamma| \gamma_n, \dot{\gamma} \rangle - \langle |\gamma_n| \gamma, \dot{\gamma} \rangle + \langle |\gamma| \gamma, \dot{\gamma} \rangle - \langle |\gamma_n| \gamma, \dot{\gamma} \rangle}{|\gamma_n| |\gamma|} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|\langle |\gamma| \gamma_n, \dot{\gamma}_n - \dot{\gamma} \rangle| + |\langle |\gamma| (\gamma_n - \gamma), \dot{\gamma} \rangle| + |\langle (|\gamma| - |\gamma_n|) \gamma, \dot{\gamma} \rangle|}{|\gamma_n| |\gamma|} \\ &\leq \frac{|\gamma| \cdot |\gamma_n| \cdot |\dot{\gamma}_n - \dot{\gamma}| + |\gamma| \cdot |\gamma_n - \gamma| \cdot |\dot{\gamma}| + |\gamma - \gamma_n| \cdot |\gamma| \cdot |\dot{\gamma}|}{|\gamma| \cdot |\gamma_n|} \end{aligned}$$

Then by (29),

$$(30) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\dot{r}_n(t) - \dot{r}(t)| = 0, \quad \forall t > t_x.$$

Recall $\tau_n = \tau_{y_n} = \min\{t \in [t_x, t_{y_n}] : |\gamma_{y_n}(t)| = R_2\}$. By Lemma 3.2, $\tau = \sup\{\tau_n : n \geq 1\} < \infty$. From now on we always assume $t_n = t_{y_n} > \tau$. Then again by Lemma 3.2,

$$(31) \quad \dot{r}_n(t) \geq v_0 = (3m/2)^{\frac{1}{2}} R_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall t \geq \tau \text{ and } \forall n.$$

Then (30) implies

$$(32) \quad \dot{r}(t) \geq v_0, \quad \forall t \geq \tau.$$

As $|\gamma(\tau)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma_n(\tau)| \geq R_2$, Proposition 3.2 implies,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta(t) = \theta_0, \quad \text{for some } \theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

What's left now is to show $\theta_0 = \theta_+ \pmod{2\pi}$. For this, we need an uniform upper bound of the angular momenta $\omega(t)$ and $\omega_n(t)$. First by Proposition 3.2, for all $t \geq \tau$,

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} |\omega(t)| &\leq |\omega(\tau)| + \frac{\alpha_2}{v_0 r(\tau)} \leq |\omega(\tau)| + \frac{\alpha_2}{v_0 R_2}; \\ |\omega_n(t)| &\leq |\omega_n(\tau)| + \frac{\alpha_2}{v_0 r_n(\tau)} \leq |\omega_n(\tau)| + \frac{\alpha_2}{v_0 R_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile notice that

$$|\omega - \omega_n| = |\gamma \wedge \dot{\gamma} - \gamma \wedge \dot{\gamma}_n + \gamma \wedge \dot{\gamma}_n - \gamma_n \wedge \dot{\gamma}_n| \leq |\gamma| \cdot |\dot{\gamma} - \dot{\gamma}_n| + |\dot{\gamma}_n| \cdot |\gamma - \gamma_n|.$$

Then (29) implies, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\omega(\tau) - \omega_n(\tau)| = 0$. Combining this with (33), we get

$$(34) \quad |\omega(t)|, |\omega_n(t)| \leq C_1, \quad \forall t \geq \tau \text{ and } \forall n.$$

For any $s_2 > s_1 \geq \tau$, using (32) and (34), we get

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} |\theta(s_2) - \theta(s_1)| &\leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} |\dot{\theta}(t)| dt \leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \frac{|\omega(t)|}{r^2(t)} dt \leq \frac{C_1}{v_0^2} \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \left(t - s_1 + \frac{r(s_1)}{v_0}\right)^{-2} dt. \\ &\leq \frac{C_1}{v_0^2} \left(\frac{v_0}{r(s_1)} - \frac{v_0}{v_0(s_2 - s_1) + r(\tau)}\right) \leq \frac{v_0^{-1} C_1}{r(s_1)}, \end{aligned}$$

By (31) and (34), a similar computation as above shows that for any n ,

$$(36) \quad |\theta_n(s_2) - \theta_n(s_1)| \leq \frac{v_0^{-1} C_1}{r_n(s_1)}.$$

By a contradiction argument, let's assume $\theta_0 \neq \theta_+ \pmod{2\pi}$, then there is a $\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$(37) \quad |\theta_0 - \theta_+ - 2k\pi| \geq 6\varepsilon, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

As $r(t) \rightarrow \infty$, when $t \rightarrow \infty$, there must be a $s_0 \geq \tau$ with $r(s_0) \geq C_1/(v_0\varepsilon)$. Then (35) implies

$$(38) \quad |\theta(t) - \theta(s_0)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq s_0.$$

Since $\gamma_n(s_0) \rightarrow \gamma(s_0)$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each n large enough, there is a $j_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$(39) \quad |\theta(s_0) - \theta_n(s_0) - 2j_n\pi| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Notice that $r_n(s_0) \geq \frac{r(s_0)}{2} \geq \frac{C_1}{2v_0\varepsilon}$, for n large enough. Then (36) implies

$$(40) \quad |\theta_n(t) - \theta_n(s_0)| \leq 2\varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq s_0.$$

Since $y_n = \gamma_n(t_n) \in \Lambda_{\theta_+}(R_2)$, for each n , there is a $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$(41) \quad \theta_n(t_n) - \theta_+ = 2k_n\pi.$$

Meanwhile as $t_n \rightarrow \infty$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$(42) \quad |\theta_0 - \theta(t_n)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for } n \text{ large enough.}$$

Then by (38), (39), (40), (41) and (42), for n large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_0 - \theta_+ - 2k_n\pi - 2j_n\pi| &= |\theta_0 - \theta_n(t_n) - 2j_n\pi| \\ &= |\theta_0 - \theta(t_n) + \theta(t_n) - \theta(s_0) + \theta(s_0) - \theta_n(s_0) - 2j_n\pi + \theta_n(s_0) - \theta_n(t_n)| \leq 5\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to (37). \square

Proposition 3.6. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\gamma}(t) = \sqrt{2h}e^{i\theta_+}$.

Proof. First we claim $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{r}(t) = v_1$, for some $v_1 > 0$.

Since $r(t) \geq R_2 \geq R_1$, $\forall t \geq \tau$, (34) and the first equation in (93) imply

$$|\ddot{r}(t)| \leq \frac{2m}{r^2(t)} + \frac{|\omega^2(t)|}{r^3(t)} \leq \frac{2m}{r^2(t)} + \frac{C_1^2}{r^3(t)}.$$

Meanwhile by (32), $r(t) \geq v_0(t - \tau) + r(\tau)$, $\forall t \geq \tau$. As a result, $\int_{\tau}^{\infty} |\ddot{r}(t)| dt < \infty$. This implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{r}(t)$ exists and is finite. Moreover (32) shows it is also positive. This proves the claim.

Since $|\omega(t)| \leq C_1$, $\forall t \geq \tau$ and $r(t) \rightarrow \infty$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r(t)\dot{\theta}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\omega(t)/r(t)) = 0.$$

Then Proposition 3.5 and the above claim imply

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\gamma}(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\dot{r}(t) + ir(t)\dot{\theta}(t))e^{i\theta(t)} = v_1 e^{i\theta_+ (\text{mod } 2\pi)}.$$

Now we only need to show $v_1 = \sqrt{2h}$. By a contradiction argument, assume $v_1 \neq \sqrt{2h}$. Notice that $\sqrt{2h}$ is the unique global minimum of the following continuous function

$$f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; \quad v \mapsto v/2 + h/v.$$

Then $\delta = (f(v_1) - \sqrt{2h})/5 > 0$, and for $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ small enough, $f(v_1 + \varepsilon) - \sqrt{2h} \geq 4\delta$.

As $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| = v_1$, we can find an $s_1 > \tau$ large enough, such that

$$v_1 - \varepsilon \leq |\dot{\gamma}(t)| \leq v_1 + \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq s_1.$$

Then for any $s_2 > s_1$, $|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| \leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| dt \leq (v_1 + \varepsilon)(s_2 - s_1)$, which implies

$$s_2 - s_1 \geq |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| / (v_1 + \varepsilon).$$

Using the above estimates, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; s_1, s_2) &\geq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\gamma}|^2 + h dt \geq \left(\frac{1}{2}(v_1 - \varepsilon)^2 + h \right) \frac{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|}{v_1 + \varepsilon} \\ (43) \quad &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2}(v_1 + \varepsilon) + \frac{h}{v_1 + \varepsilon} - 2\varepsilon \right) |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| \\ &= (f(v_1 + \varepsilon) - 2\varepsilon) |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| \geq (\sqrt{2h} + 4\delta - 2\varepsilon) |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| \\ &\geq (\sqrt{2h} + 2\delta) |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|. \end{aligned}$$

For any $s_2 > s_1$ as above, we can always find an $s \in [0, 1)$, such that

$$s_2^* = s_1 + (2h)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| + s \quad \text{satisfying} \quad \{s_2^*\} = \{s_2\}.$$




FIGURE 2. the two triangles.

We will show $\xi \in H_{s_1, s_2^*}^1(\gamma(s_1), \gamma(s_2))$ given as below satisfying $\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; s_1, s_2^*) < \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; s_1, s_2)$.

$$\xi(t) = \gamma(s_1) + \frac{t - s_1}{s_2^* - s_1}(\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)), \quad \forall t \in [s_1, s_2^*].$$

However this is a contradiction to $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; s_1, s_2) = \phi_h(\gamma(s_1), \gamma(s_2); \{s_1\}, \{s_2\})$.

To estimate $\int |\dot{\xi}|^2 dt$, consider the following strictly increasing continuous function,

$$g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; \quad v \mapsto (1 + v) + (1 + v)^{-1}.$$

As $|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| \rightarrow \infty$, when $s_2 \rightarrow \infty$,

$$g\left(\frac{\sqrt{2hs}}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|}\right) \leq 2 + \sqrt{2/h\delta}, \quad \text{for } s_2 \text{ large enough.}$$

As a result, for s_2 large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s_1}^{s_2^*} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\xi}|^2 + h dt &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|^2}{(s_2^* - s_1)^2} + h\right) \left(\frac{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|}{\sqrt{2h}} + s\right) \\ (44) \quad &= \left[\left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2hs}}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2hs}}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|}\right)^{-1} \right] \sqrt{\frac{h}{2}} |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| \\ &\leq (\sqrt{2h} + \delta) |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $\int U(\xi(t), t) dt$, we set $\theta_+ = 0$ for simplicity. For any $s_2 > s_1$ with s_1 large enough,

$$(45) \quad |\theta(s_2)|, |\theta(s_1)| \leq \pi/12.$$

By further assuming $s_2 - s_1$ is large enough, we can get

$$(46) \quad |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| > |\gamma(s_1)|.$$

Consider the triangle with $\gamma(s_1), \gamma(s_2)$ and the origin as the three vertices, and $\sigma_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, as the three angles (see Figure 2). By (45), $0 \leq \sigma_1 \leq \pi/6$. Then (46) implies $0 \leq \sigma_3 \leq \sigma_1 \leq \pi/6$. As a result, $2\pi/3 \leq \sigma_2 \leq \pi$.

Meanwhile for any $t \in [s_1, s_2^*]$, there is a triangle with $\gamma(s_1), \xi(t)$ and the origin as the three vertices, and $\sigma_i, i = 2, 4, 5$ as the three angles (see Figure 2). Then $2\pi/3 \leq \sigma_2 \leq \pi$ implies $0 \leq \sigma_4, \sigma_5 \leq \pi/3$ and as a result, for any $t \in [s_1, s_2^*]$,

$$|\xi(t)| = |\xi(t) - \gamma(s_1)| \cos \sigma_4 + |\gamma(s_1)| \cos \sigma_5 \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{t - s_1}{s_2^* - s_1} |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| + |\gamma(s_1)| \right) \geq R_1.$$

Using this, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{s_1}^{s_2^*} |U(\xi(t), t)| dt &\leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2^*} \frac{2m}{|\xi(t)|} dt \leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2^*} \frac{4m(s_2^* - s_1)}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|} \left(t - s_1 + \frac{(s_2^* - s_1)|\gamma(s_1)|}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|} \right)^{-1} dt \\
 (47) \qquad &= \int_{s_1}^{s_2^*} \frac{\frac{4m}{\sqrt{2h}} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2hs}}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|} \right)}{t - s_1 + \frac{|\gamma(s_1)|}{\sqrt{2h}} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2hs}}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|} \right)} dt \\
 &= \frac{4m}{\sqrt{2h}} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2hs}}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|} \right) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|}{|\gamma(s_1)|} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequality with (43) and (44), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; s_1, s_2) - \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; s_1, s_2^*) \\
 &\geq \delta |\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)| - \frac{4m}{\sqrt{2h}} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2hs}}{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|} \right) \log \left(1 + \frac{|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)|}{|\gamma(s_1)|} \right) > 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

for s_2 large enough, which is absurd. \square

Up to now, we have proved the existence of the desired hyperbolic solution $\gamma^+|_{[t_x, \infty)}$, when $T = 1$. By a similar argument, we can obtain the corresponding $\gamma^-|_{(-\infty, t_x]}$, when $T = 1$. To generalize the result to $T \neq 1$, we use a blow-up argument similar to the one that have been used quite a lot in the variational study of the N -body problem (see [37] and [16]).

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Recall that $q(t) = (q_i(t))_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a collision-free T -periodic solution of the N -body problem (1). Define $q^\lambda(t) = (q_i^\lambda(t))_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ as

$$q_i^\lambda(s) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}} q_i(t) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}} q_i(s/\lambda), \quad i \in \mathbf{N}, \quad \text{where } \lambda = T^{-1}.$$

Then $q^\lambda(t)$ is a collision-free 1-periodic solution of (1), as a direct computation shows

$$\ddot{q}_i^\lambda(s) = - \sum_{j \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{i\}} \frac{m_j (q_i^\lambda(s) - q_j^\lambda(s))}{|q_i^\lambda(s) - q_j^\lambda(s)|^3}, \quad \forall i \in \mathbf{N}.$$

By previous results of this section, for $h^\lambda = \lambda^{-\frac{2}{3}} h$ and $\theta_+ \in [0, 2\pi)$, there is a $\gamma^\lambda(s)$, $s \in [\lambda t_x, \infty)$, with $\gamma^\lambda(\lambda t_x) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}} x$, which is a solution of

$$\ddot{\gamma}^\lambda(s) = - \sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{m_i (\gamma(s) - q_i^\lambda(s))}{|\gamma(s) - q_i^\lambda(s)|^3},$$

and satisfies

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^\lambda(s)/|\gamma^\lambda(s)| = e^{i\theta_+ \pmod{2\pi}}, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\gamma}^\lambda(s) = \sqrt{2h^\lambda} e^{i\theta_+ \pmod{2\pi}}.$$

Then $\gamma^+(t) = \lambda^{-\frac{2}{3}} \gamma^\lambda(\lambda t) = \lambda^{-\frac{2}{3}} \gamma^\lambda(s)$, $t \in [t_x, \infty)$, is a solution of (2) satisfying $\gamma^+(t_x) = x$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^+(t)/|\gamma^+(t)| = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^\lambda(s)/|\gamma^\lambda(s)| = e^{i\theta_+ \pmod{2\pi}}$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\gamma}^+(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^{\frac{1}{3}} \dot{\gamma}^\lambda(s) = \lambda^{\frac{1}{3}} \sqrt{2h^\lambda} e^{i\theta_\pm \pmod{2\pi}} = \sqrt{2h} e^{i\theta_\pm \pmod{2\pi}}.$$

The proof of $\gamma^-|_{(-\infty, t_x]}$ is exactly the same and will be omitted. \square

4. EXISTENCE OF BI-HYPERBOLIC SOLUTIONS

Like in the previous section we assume $T = 1$ throughout this section except the last proof.

Definition 4.1. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$ and $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$ with $\gamma([t_1, t_2]) \cap B_{R_0} \neq \emptyset$, let

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} s_y &= s_y(\gamma) = \max\{t \in [t_1, t_2] : |\gamma(t)| = R_0\}; \\ s_x &= s_x(\gamma) = \min\{t \in [t_1, t_2] : |\gamma(t)| = R_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We say such a γ is *tied with m_{i_0} and m_{i_1}* ($\{i_0 \neq i_1\} \subset \mathbf{N}$), if for any $\xi \in H_{s_x, s_y}^1(\gamma(s_x), \gamma(s_y))$ with $\xi([s_x, s_y]) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$, there is no fixed-end homotopy between $\gamma|_{[s_x, s_y]}$ and $\xi|_{[s_x, s_y]}$ avoiding the trajectories of m_{i_0} and m_{i_1} , i.e., there is no continuous paths $P(t, \tau)$, $(t, \tau) \in [s_x, s_y] \times [0, 1]$, in $H^1([s_x, s_y], \mathbb{C})$ satisfying $P(t, 0) = \gamma(t)$, $P(t, 1) = \xi(t)$, $\forall t \in [s_x, s_y]$, and

$$P(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{q_{i_0}(t), q_{i_1}(t)\}, \forall (t, \tau) \in [s_x, s_y] \times [0, 1].$$

Remark 4.1. The named *tied* was used as in the 3-dim space $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}$, the trajectories $q_{i_0}|_{[s_x, s_y]}$, $q_{i_1}|_{[s_x, s_y]}$ and $\gamma|_{[s_x, s_y]}$ can be seen as three braids. It has been used by Gordon [19] and Montgomery [28].

For the rest of the section, we shall always assume $x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$ unless otherwise stated.

Definition 4.2. For any $t_1 < t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Gamma}_{t_1, t_2}^{i_0, i_1}(x, y) &= \{\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y) : \gamma \text{ is tied with } m_{i_0} \text{ and } m_{i_1}\}; \\ \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}^{i_0, i_1}(x, y) &= \text{the weak closure of } \hat{\Gamma}_{t_1, t_2}^{i_0, i_1}(x, y) \text{ in } H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y); \\ \hat{\Xi}_{s_1, s_2}^{i_0, i_1}(x, y) &= \cup_{\{t_i\}=s_i, i=1,2} \hat{\Gamma}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}^{i_0, i_1}(x, y); \quad \Xi_{s_1, s_2}^{i_0, i_1}(x, y) = \cup_{\{t_i\}=s_i, i=1,2} \Gamma_{\tau_1, \tau_2}^{i_0, i_1}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.2. An arbitrary pair of indices $\{i_0 \neq i_1\} \subset \mathbf{N}$ will be fixed for the rest of the section, and for simplicity, they will be omitted from the notations introduced in the above definition.

The next result is a simple corollary of the above definition, but will be useful in our proof.

Lemma 4.1. For any $\gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$, if there is a $t_0 \in (t_1, t_2)$, such that $\gamma(t_0) = q_{i_0}(t_0)$ or $q_{i_1}(t_0)$, then $\gamma \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$.

We further introduce the following two functions:

$$(49) \quad \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) = \inf\{\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) : \gamma \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)\},$$

$$(50) \quad \Phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) = \inf\{\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma) : \gamma \in \Xi_{s_1, s_2}(x, y)\}.$$

In the previous section, we assume $x \neq y$ in several lemmas and propositions to give a positive lower bound of $\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}| dt$, $\forall \gamma \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y)$. Here it is not needed, because of the following result.

Lemma 4.2. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$, $\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| dt \geq 2$.

Proof. By the definition $\Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$, there must be a $t_0 \in (t_1, t_2)$ with $|\gamma(t_0)| \leq R_0 - 1$, then

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\dot{\gamma}(t)| dt \geq |\gamma(t_1) - \gamma(t_0)| + |\gamma(t_0) - \gamma(t_2)| \geq 2.$$

□

Proposition 4.1. There is a $\gamma \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2)$. Moreover

- (a). for any $\tau_0 \in (t_1, t_2) \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$, there is a $\delta > 0$ small enough, such that $\gamma|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]}$ is a collision-free local minimizer and a solution of (2);

(b). $\Delta(\gamma) = \emptyset$ or $\{t_0\} \subset (t_1, t_2)$ and in the latter case, $\gamma(t_0) = q_{j_0}(t_0)$ with $j_0 \in \{i_0, i_1\}$ and the following limits exist

$$(51) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\gamma}(t) - \dot{q}_{j_0}(t)|^2 - \frac{m_i}{|\gamma(t) - q_{j_0}(t)|}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} \frac{\gamma(t) - q_{j_0}(t)}{|\gamma(t) - q_{j_0}(t)|}.$$

(c). $\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a solution of (2) with at most one collision, and if there is a collision, it is regularizable.

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, the existence of such a $\gamma \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$ follows from the same argument given in the proof of property (a) in Proposition 2.5. In particular $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2)$ must be finite.

(a). Since $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2)$ is finite, the Lebesgue measure of $\Delta(\gamma)$ must be zero with $(t_1, t_2) \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$ being the union of at most countably many open intervals. Then $\forall \tau_0 \in (t_1, t_2) \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$, there is a $\delta > 0$ small enough, such that $[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta] \subset (t_1, t_2) \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$ with $\gamma|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]}$ being collision-free.

As a result, we can find a $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, such that $\forall \xi \in H_{\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta}^1(\gamma(\tau_0 - \delta), \gamma(\tau_0 + \delta))$ satisfying $\|\xi - \gamma\|_{H^1} \leq \varepsilon$, the following new path still belongs to $\Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$,

$$(52) \quad \tilde{\gamma}|_{[t_1, t_2]} = \gamma|_{[t_1, \tau_0 - \delta]} * \xi|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]} * \gamma|_{[\tau_0 + \delta, t_2]} \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y).$$

This means $\gamma|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]}$ is a collision-free local minimizer and a solution of (2), as otherwise

$$(53) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\tilde{\gamma}; t_1, t_2) < \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2),$$

which is absurd.

(b). By the above property (a), $\gamma(t)$, $t \in [t_1, t_2] \setminus \Delta(\gamma)$, satisfies (2). Then similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 2.1 show that $\Delta(\gamma)$ must be isolated in $[t_1, t_2]$.

Choose an arbitrary $\tau_0 \in \Delta(\gamma)$. Then $\gamma(\tau_0) = q_{j_0}(\tau_0)$ for some $j_0 \in \mathbf{N}$. First we will show $j_0 \in \{i_0, i_1\}$. Otherwise we can find $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ small enough, such that $\forall \xi \in H_{\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta}^1(\gamma(\tau_0 - \delta), \gamma(\tau_0 + \delta))$ satisfying $\|\gamma|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]} - \xi|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]}\|_{H^1} \leq \varepsilon$, the new path $\tilde{\gamma}$ given as in (52) is still contained in $\Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$. Meanwhile by Proposition 2.3, one of such a ξ satisfies

$$(54) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; \tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta) < \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; \tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta).$$

This then leads to (53), which is absurd.

Next we will show $|\Delta(\gamma)| \leq 1$. By a contradiction argument, assume there are two different collision moments τ_0 and τ_1 . Then $\gamma(\tau_k) = q_{j_k}(\tau_k)$ with $j_k \in \{i_0, i_1\}$, for $k = 1, 2$. By Proposition 2.3, there is a $\xi \in H_{\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta}^1(\gamma(\tau_0 - \delta), \gamma(\tau_0 + \delta))$ satisfying $\|\gamma|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]} - \xi|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]}\|_{H^1} \leq \varepsilon$ and (54), for $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be a path given as in (52), then (53) holds. However by Lemma 4.1, $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$, which is absurd.

What's left now is to prove (51). Without loss of generality, let's assume $\gamma(\tau_0) = q_{i_0}(\tau_0)$. Then the first limit in (51) follows directly from Lemma 2.1. For the second limit, by Proposition 2.2, the following two one-sided limits exist

$$\sigma_{\pm} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_0^{\pm}} \frac{\gamma(t) - q_i(t)}{|\gamma(t) - q_i(t)|}.$$

Then it is enough show $\sigma_- = \sigma_+$. Assume this is not true. By Proposition 2.3, for $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there are two paths $\eta^{\pm} \in H_{\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta}^1(\gamma(\tau_0 - \delta), \gamma(\tau_0 + \delta))$ satisfying (10), (11) and

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\eta^{\pm}; \tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta) < \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; \tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta).$$

Let $\gamma^{\pm}|_{[t_1, t_2]} = \gamma|_{[t_1, \tau_0 - \delta]} * \xi^{\pm}|_{[\tau_0 - \delta, \tau_0 + \delta]} * \gamma|_{[\tau_0 + \delta, t_2]}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma^{\pm}; t_1, t_2) < \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2)$. Since one of γ^{\pm} must belong to $\Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$, we get a contradiction.

(c). By property (c), $\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ contains at most one collision moment. If t_0 is such a collision moment, then $t_0 \in (t_1, t_2)$ and the two limits in (51) hold. This implies $\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is regularizable, where the details can be found in [40]. \square

Lemma 4.3. *For any $t_1 < t_2$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$, there is a $C_1 = C_1(x, y, t_1, t_2, h)$, such that*

$$\sup\{\Psi_h(x', y'; t_1, t_2) : (x', y') \in B_{1/2}(x) \times B_{1/2}(y) \text{ with } |x'|, |y'| \geq R_0\} \leq C_1.$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, there is a $\gamma \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$ with $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2)$. Then

$$\tau_1 = \max\{\tau \in [t_1, t_2] : \gamma(t) \in B_{1/2}(x), \forall t \in [t_1, \tau]\};$$

$$\tau_2 = \min\{\tau \in [t_1, t_2] : \gamma(t) \in B_{1/2}(y), \forall t \in [\tau, t_2]\},$$

are well-defined. Moreover $t_1 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < t_2$ and $|\gamma(\tau_1) - x| = |\gamma(\tau_2) - y| = 1/2$.

For any $x' \in B_{1/2}(x) \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o)$ and $y' \in B_{1/2}(y) \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o)$, we can define a new path

$$\xi(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma(\tau_2) + \frac{t-\tau_2}{t_2-\tau_2}(y' - \gamma(\tau_2)), & \text{if } t \in [\tau_2, t_2], \\ \gamma(t), & \text{if } t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2], \\ x' + \frac{t-t_1}{\tau_1-t_1}(\gamma(\tau_1) - x'), & \text{if } t \in [t_1, \tau_1]. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\xi \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x', y')$. Moreover $\xi(t) \in B_{1/2}(x), \forall t \in [t_1, \tau_1]$ and $\xi(t) \in B_{1/2}(y), \forall t \in [\tau_2, t_2]$. By (12), there is a $C_2 = C_2(x, y)$ with $U(\xi(t), t) \leq C_2$, for all $t \in [t_1, \tau_1] \cup [\tau_2, t_2]$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_h(x', y'; t_1, t_2) &\leq \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_1, t_2) - \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) + \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) \\ &\leq \int_{t_1}^{\tau_1} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) dt + \int_{\tau_2}^{t_2} L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, t) dt + \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) \\ &\leq \frac{|\gamma(\tau_1) - x'|^2}{2(\tau_1 - t_1)} + \frac{|\gamma(\tau_2) - y'|^2}{2(t_2 - \tau_2)} + C_2(t_2 - t_1) + \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(\tau_1 - t_1)} + \frac{1}{2(t_2 - \tau_2)} + C_2(t_2 - t_1) + \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) := C_1. \end{aligned}$$

\square

The next three propositions are similarly to Proposition 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8, so are their proofs.

Proposition 4.2. *Ψ_h is locally Lipschitz continuous in $\{(x, y, t_1, t_2) : x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o, t_2 > t_1\} \subset \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$.*

Proof. With Lemma 4.3, this can be proven by a similar argument as Proposition 2.6. \square

Proposition 4.3. *When $h > 0$, for any $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1)$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$. There exist $t_1 < t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\{t_i\} = s_i, i = 1, 2$, and a $\gamma \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)$, such that*

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_1, t_2) = \Psi_h(x, y; t_1, t_2) = \Phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2).$$

Proof. With Proposition 4.1, this can be proven by the same arguments as Proposition 2.7. \square

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$ and $t_1 < t_2$, we set

$$(55) \quad \Omega_{t_1, t_2}(x, y) = \{\xi \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(x, y) : |\xi(t)| \geq R_0, \forall t \in [t_1, t_2]\}.$$

Proposition 4.4. *For any $h > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_{R_0}^o$, there is a $\gamma_{xy} \in \Gamma_{t_x, t_y}(x, y)$ satisfying:*

- (a). $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; t_x, t_y) = \Phi_h(x, y; \{t_x\}, \{t_y\}) = \inf\{\Phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2) : s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1)\};$

(b). for any $\tau_1 \in [t_x, s_x]$ and $\tau_2 \in [s_y, t_y]$ (with s_x and s_y given as in (48)),

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_1, \tau_2) = \Phi_h(\gamma_{xy}(\tau_1), \gamma_{xy}(\tau_2); \{\tau_1\}, \{\tau_2\}).$$

(c). for any $[\tau_1, \tau_2] \subset [t_x, s_x]$ or $[s_y, t_y]$,

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_1, \tau_2) = \inf\{\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; \tau_1, \tau_2) : \xi \in \Omega_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(\gamma_{xy}(\tau_1), \gamma_{xy}(\tau_2))\}.$$

Proof. (a). By Proposition 4.3, we can find a sequence of paths $\{\gamma_n \in \Gamma_{t_n, \tau_n}(x, y)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; t_n, \tau_n) = \Phi_h(x, y; \{t_n\}, \{\tau_n\}) = \inf\{\Phi_h(x, y; s_1, s_2); s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Since the above infimum must be finite, $\{\tau_n - t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Otherwise the following holds, which is absurd.

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; t_n, \tau_n) \geq h(\tau_n - t_n) \rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

As we may assume $t_n \in [0, 1]$, $\forall n$, the rest of property (a) can be proven just like Proposition 2.8.

(b). For simplicity, set $\gamma = \gamma_{xy}$. By a contradiction argument, let's assume the desired result does not hold. Then there exist $t_1 < t_2$ with $\{t_i\} = \{\tau_i\}$, $i = 1, 2$, and a $\xi \in \Gamma_{t_1, t_2}(\gamma(\tau_1), \gamma(\tau_2))$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_1, t_2) < \Phi_h(\gamma(\tau_1), \gamma(\tau_2); \{\tau_1\}, \{\tau_2\})$. Then

$$\tilde{\gamma}|_{[t_x, \tau_1 + t_2 - t_1 + t_y - \tau_2]} = \gamma|_{[t_x, \tau_1]} * \xi|_{[t_1, t_2]} * \gamma|_{[\tau_2, t_y]} \in \Xi_{\{t_x\}, \{t_y\}}(\gamma(t_x), \gamma(t_y))$$

and $\mathcal{A}_h(\tilde{\gamma}; t_1, \tau_1 + t_2 - t_1 + t_y - \tau_2) < \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; t_x, t_y) = \Phi_h(x, y; \{t_n\}, \{\tau_n\})$, which is absurd.

(c). This follows directly from Definition 4.1 and (55). \square

A lemma similar to Lemma 3.1 will be needed. However because of the topological constraint imposed in Definition 4.1, we only consider paths from Ω as defined in (55).

Lemma 4.4. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $\sqrt{2}R_1 \leq |x|, |y| \leq R$, the following results hold.

(a). For any $t_1 < t_2$, $\inf\{\mathcal{A}(\gamma; t_1, t_2) : \gamma \in \Omega_{t_1, t_2}(x, y)\} \leq 16 \frac{R^2}{t_2 - t_1} + 12m \frac{t_2 - t_1}{R}$.

(b). For any $h > 0$, there exist positive constant β_1, β_2 independent of R , such that

$$\inf\{\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; \tau_1, \tau_2) : \gamma \in \cup_{\tau_1 < \tau_2} \Omega_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(x, y)\} \leq \beta_1 R + \beta_2.$$

Proof. This can be proven exactly the same as Lemma 3.1. \square

For the rest of the section, let's fix arbitrarily an $h > 0$, a pair of angles $\theta_{\pm} \in [0, 2\pi)$ and set

$$\Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R) = \{(r_1 e^{i\theta_1}, r_2 e^{i\theta_2}) : r_1, r_2 \geq R, \theta_1 = \theta_{-} \pmod{2\pi} \text{ and } \theta_2 = \theta_{+} \pmod{2\pi}\}.$$

For any $(x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_0)$, let $\gamma_{xy} \in \Gamma_{t_x, t_y}(x, y)$ be the minimizer given by Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 4.5. For any $(x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_2)$ with $R_2 \geq 2\sqrt{2}R_1$, let

$$(56) \quad \tau_y = \min\{t \in [s_y, t_y] : |\gamma_{xy}(t)| = R_2\}, \quad \tau_x = \max\{t \in [t_x, s_x] : |\gamma_{xy}(t)| = R_2\},$$

with s_x, s_y defined as in (48). The following results hold.

(a). $0 < \inf\{s_y - s_x : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_2)\} \leq \sup\{s_y - s_x : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_2)\} < \infty$.

(b). $0 < \inf\{\tau_y - s_y : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_2)\} \leq \sup\{\tau_y - s_y : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_2)\} < \infty$.

(c). $0 < \inf\{s_x - \tau_x : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_2)\} \leq \sup\{s_x - \tau_x : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_{\pm}}^{\theta_{\pm}}(R_2)\} < \infty$.

(d). Set $r_{xy}(t) = |\gamma_{xy}(t)|$, when R_2 is large enough,

$$(57) \quad \dot{r}_{xy}(t) \geq \sqrt{3m/2} R_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall t \in [\tau_y, t_y]; \quad \dot{r}_{xy}(t) \leq -\sqrt{3m/2} R_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall t \in [t_x, \tau_x].$$




FIGURE 3.

Proof. (a). Fixed an $n_0 \geq 2$, by Proposition 4.2,

$$\sup\{\Psi_h(x_0, y_0; s_1, s_2 + n_0) : x_0 \in \partial B_{R_2}, y_0 \in \partial B_{R_2}, s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1]\} \leq C_1.$$

Then By Proposition 4.4, for any $[\tau_1, \tau_2] \subset [\tau_x, \tau_y]$ (notice that $[s_x, s_y] \subset [\tau_x, \tau_y]$, see Figure 3),

$$(58) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_1, \tau_2) &\leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_x, \tau_y) = \Phi_h(\gamma_{xy}(\tau_x), \gamma_{xy}(\tau_y); \{\tau_x\}, \{\tau_y\}) \\ &\leq \Psi_h(x, y; \{\tau_x\}, \{\tau_y\} + n_0) \leq C_1. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us the following estimates, which imply the third inequality in (a),

$$s_y - s_x \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; s_x, s_y)/h \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_x, \tau_y)/h \leq C_1/h.$$

Meanwhile by Lemma 4.2 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$(s_y - s_x) \int_{s_x}^{s_y} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}|^2 dt \geq \left(\int_{s_x}^{s_y} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}| dt \right)^2 \geq 4.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{2}{s_y - s_x} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{s_x}^{s_y} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}|^2 dt \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; s_x, s_y) \leq C_1.$$

This implies the first inequality in (a), while the second inequality in (a) is trivial.

(b) & (c). Since $[\tau_x, s_x], [s_y, \tau_y] \subset [\tau_x, \tau_y]$ and

$$\int_{s_y}^{\tau_y} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}| dt, \int_{\tau_x}^{s_x} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}| dt \geq R_2 - R_0 > 0,$$

the proofs are similar to those given in part (a) and will be omitted.

(d). With Lemma 4.4, this can be proven by a similar argument as the proof of property (b) in Lemma 3.2. \square

Like in the previous section, we fix an $R_2 \geq 2\sqrt{2}R_1$ for the rest of the section, such that the above lemma always holds. Moreover since the system is 1-periodic, we may further assume

$$(59) \quad s_x \in [0, 1), \forall (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2).$$

Under the above assumption, Lemma 4.5 implies

$$(60) \quad \sup\{|\tau_x|, |\tau_y| : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)\} < \infty.$$

Lemma 4.6. *Given an arbitrary $\tau \geq \sup\{|\tau_x|, |\tau_y| : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)\}$, the following results hold.*

- (a). *For any $(x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)$ with $[-\tau, \tau] \subset [t_x, t_y]$, there is a finite $R = R(\tau, R_2)$ independent of (x, y) , such that $|\gamma_{xy}(t)| \leq R$, $\forall t \in [-\tau, \tau]$.*
- (b). *$\{\gamma_{xy}|_{[-\tau, \tau]} : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2) \text{ with } [-\tau, \tau] \subset [t_x, t_y]\}$ is a bound subset of $H^1([-\tau, \tau], \mathbb{C})$.*

Proof. Throughout this proof, we only consider $(x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)$ with $[-\tau, \tau] \subset [t_x, t_y]$.

(a). Since $|\gamma_{xy}(t)| \leq R_2$, $\forall t \in [\tau_x, \tau_y]$. By property (d) in Lemma 4.5, it is enough to show $|\gamma_{xy}(\pm\tau)| \leq R$, for some R independent of (x, y) . Meanwhile by property (c) in Proposition 4.4 and property (b) in Lemma 4.4,

$$(61) \quad \int_{\tau_y}^{\tau} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}|^2 dt \leq 2\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_y, \tau) \leq 2\beta_1 R + 2\beta_2;$$

$$(62) \quad \int_{-\tau}^{\tau_x} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}|^2 dt \leq 2\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; -\tau, \tau_x) \leq 2\beta_1 R + 2\beta_2.$$

The desired result then follows from the same argument as in property (a) of Lemma 3.3.

(b). It is enough to show $\int_{-\tau}^{\tau} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}|^2 dt \leq C_1$ for some C_1 independent of γ_{xy} . By Lemma 4.5,

$$0 < a^- = \inf\{\tau_x : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)\} < a^+ = \sup\{\tau_x : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)\} < \infty;$$

$$0 < b^- = \inf\{\tau_y : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)\} < b^+ = \sup\{\tau_y : (x, y) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)\} < \infty.$$

Then Proposition 4.2 implies

$$\sup\{\Psi_h(z_1, z_2; t_1, t_2) : z_1, z_2 \in \partial B_{R_2}, t_1 \in [a^-, a^+], t_2 \in [b^-, b^+]\} \leq C_2.$$

By Proposition 4.4,

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_x, \tau_y) = \Phi_h(\gamma_{xy}(\tau_x), \gamma_{xy}(\tau_y); \{\tau_x\}, \{\tau_y\}) \leq \Psi_h(\gamma_{xy}(\tau_x), \gamma_{xy}(\tau_y); \{\tau_x\}, \{\tau_y\}).$$

Since $|\gamma_{xy}(\tau_x)| = |\gamma_{xy}(\tau_y)| = R_2$, the above two estimates imply

$$\int_{\tau_x}^{\tau_y} |\dot{\gamma}_{xy}|^2 dt \leq 2\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_{xy}; \tau_x, \tau_y) \leq 2\Psi_h(\gamma_{xy}(\tau_x), \gamma_{xy}(\tau_y); \{\tau_x\}, \{\tau_y\}) \leq 2C_2.$$

Combining this with (61) and (62), we get the desired result. \square

For the rest of the section, let's choose a sequence $\{(x_n, y_n) \in \Lambda_{\theta_-}^{\theta_+}(R_2)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |y_n| = \infty.$$

For each n , by Proposition 4.4, there is a $\gamma_n \in \Gamma_{t_{x_n}, t_{y_n}}(x_n, y_n)$, such that

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; t_{x_n}, t_{y_n}) = \Phi_h(x_n, y_n; \{t_{x_n}\}, \{t_{y_n}\}) = \inf\{\Phi_h(x_n, y_n; s_1, s_2) : s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *Under the above notations.*

- (a). $t_{x_n} \rightarrow -\infty$ and $t_{y_n} \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (b). *There is a $\gamma \in H^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$, such that (after passing to a proper subsequence) $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma$ strongly in L_{loc}^∞ -norm and weakly in H_{loc}^1 -norm, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

(c). For any $t_0 > 0$ large enough, $\gamma|_{[-t_0, t_0]} \in \Gamma_{-t_0, t_0}(\gamma(-t_0), \gamma(t_0))$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; -t_0, t_0) = \Phi_h(\gamma(-t_0), \gamma(t_0); \{-t_0\}, \{t_0\}).$$

(d). $\gamma(t)$ is a solution of (2) with at most one regularizable collision, and there is a $\tau_0 > 0$ large enough, such that for any compact interval $I \subset (-\infty, \tau_0)$ or (τ_0, ∞) , $\|\gamma_n|_I - \gamma|_I\|_{C^1} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. (a). We give the details for $t_{y_n} \rightarrow \infty$, while $t_{x_n} \rightarrow \infty$ can be proven similarly.

By Proposition 4.4, Lemma 4.4 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 |y_n| + \beta_2 &\geq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; \tau_{y_n}, t_{y_n}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tau_{y_n}}^{t_{y_n}} |\dot{\gamma}_n|^2 dt \geq \frac{1}{2(t_{y_n} - \tau_{y_n})} \left(\int_{\tau_{y_n}}^{t_{y_n}} |\dot{\gamma}_n| dt \right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{|y_n - \gamma_n(\tau_{y_n})|^2}{2(t_{y_n} - \tau_{y_n})} \geq \frac{|y_n|^2 - 2R_2|y_n| + R_2^2}{2t_{y_n}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$t_{y_n} \geq \frac{|y_n|^2 - 2R_2|y_n| + R_2^2}{2(\beta_1|y_n| + \beta_2)} \geq \frac{|y_n| - 2R_2 + R_2^2|y_n|^{-1}}{2\beta_1 + 2\beta_2|y_n|^{-1}} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ and } |y_n| \rightarrow \infty.$$

(b). With property (a), it follows from a similarly argument as in the proof of property (b) in Lemma 3.4.

(c). Choose an arbitrary $t_0 > \sup\{|\tau_{x_n}|, |\tau_{y_n}| : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. By (60), the supremum must be finite. Then for n large enough, $\gamma_n|_{[-t_0, t_0]} \in \Gamma_{-t_0, t_0}(\gamma_n(-t_0), \gamma_n(t_0))$. Then property (b) implies $\gamma|_{[-t_0, t_0]} \in \Gamma_{-t_0, t_0}(\gamma(-t_0), \gamma(t_0))$. To obtain the rest of the property, by a contradiction argument, let's assume there is a t_0 large enough, such that

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; -t_0, t_0) < \Phi_h(\gamma(-t_0), \gamma(t_0); \{t_0\}, \{t_0\}).$$

By Proposition 4.4, there is a $\xi \in H_{t_1, t_2}^1(\gamma(-t_0), \gamma(t_0))$ with $\{t_1\} = \{-t_0\}$ and $\{t_2\} = \{t_0\}$ (see Figure 4), and an $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, such that

$$(63) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_1, t_2) = \Phi_h(\gamma(-t_0), \gamma(t_0); \{-t_0\}, \{t_0\}) \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; -t_0, t_0) - 4\varepsilon.$$

By property (b) above and the lower semi-continuity of \mathcal{A}_h , for n large enough,

$$(64) \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; -t_0, t_0) \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; -t_0, t_0) - \varepsilon \geq \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_1, t_2) + 3\varepsilon.$$

Notice that $\xi(t_1) = \gamma(-t_0)$ and $\xi(t_2) = \gamma(t_0)$ are collision-free, for t_0 large enough. Then so is $\gamma|_{[t_1, \tau_1]}$ and $\gamma|_{[\tau_2, t_2]}$, for τ_i close enough to t_i , $i = 1, 2$. As a result, \mathcal{A}_h is continuous in a small neighborhood of $\xi|_{[t_1, \tau_1]}$ in $H_{t_1, \tau_1}^1(\xi(t_1), \xi(\tau_1))$, and of $\xi|_{[\tau_2, t_2]}$ in $H_{\tau_2, t_2}^1(\xi(\tau_2), \xi(t_2))$. Since

$$\gamma_n(-t_0) \rightarrow \gamma(-t_0) = \xi(t_1), \quad \gamma_n(t_0) \rightarrow \gamma(t_0) = \xi(t_2), \quad \text{when } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For each n large enough, there is a $\eta_n \in H_{t_1, \tau_1}^1(\gamma_n(-t_0), \xi(\tau_1))$ and $\tilde{\eta}_n \in H_{\tau_2, t_2}^1(\xi(\tau_2), \gamma_n(t_0))$ with

$$|\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_1, \tau_1) - \mathcal{A}_h(\eta_n; t_1, \tau_1)|, |\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; \tau_2, t_2) - \mathcal{A}_h(\tilde{\eta}_n; \tau_2, t_2)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let $\zeta_n|_{[t_1, t_2]} = \eta_n|_{[-t_0, \tau_1]} * \xi|_{[\tau_1, \tau_2]} * \tilde{\eta}_n|_{[\tau_2, t_2]}$. Then

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\xi; t_1, t_2) - \mathcal{A}_h(\zeta_n; t_1, t_2) \geq -2\varepsilon.$$

Combining this with (64), we get

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; -t_0, t_0) - \mathcal{A}_h(\zeta_n; t_1, t_2) \geq \varepsilon.$$




FIGURE 4.

This is absurd, as $\zeta_n|_{[t_1, t_2]} \in \Xi_{\{-t_0\}, \{t_0\}}(\gamma_n(-t_0), \gamma_n(t_0))$ and Proposition 4.4 implies

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; -t_0, t_0) = \Phi_h(\gamma_n(-t_0), \gamma_n(t_0); \{-t_0\}, \{t_0\}).$$

(d). With property (c), Proposition 4.1 shows $\gamma|_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a solution of (2) with at most one regularizable collision. Then we can find a $\tau > 0$ large enough, such that $\gamma(t)$ is collision-free, for all $t \in (-\infty, \tau_0] \cup [\tau_0, \infty)$. The result then follows from similar arguments as in the proof of property (d) in Proposition 3.4. \square

With the above results, similar arguments as in the proofs of Proposition 3.5 and 3.6 can show

Proposition 4.6. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{\gamma(t)}{|\gamma(t)|} = e^{i\theta \pm (\text{mod } 2\pi)}$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{\gamma}(t) = \pm\sqrt{2h}e^{i\theta \pm (\text{mod } 2\pi)}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. When $T = 1$, the desired result follows from previous results obtained in this section. When $T \neq 1$, it follows from a blow-up argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 given in the end of Section 3. \square

5. APPENDIX A: ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS NEAR AN ISOLATED COLLISION

We give proofs of Proposition 2.2 and 2.3 in this appendix. For this it is more convenient to consider the relative position between the massless body and the primary m_{i_0} , which is

$$(65) \quad \zeta(t) = \gamma(t) - q_{i_0}(t), \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta].$$

Then the Lagrangian L becomes

$$(66) \quad L(\zeta, \dot{\zeta}, t) = \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\zeta}(t) + \dot{q}_{i_0}(t)|^2 + \frac{m_{i_0}}{|\zeta(t)|} + \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i}{|\zeta(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t)|} dt.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Since $\gamma(t)$ is a collision-ejection solution of (2), $\zeta(t)$ satisfies

$$(67) \quad \ddot{\zeta}(t) = -\frac{m_{i_0}\zeta(t)}{|\zeta(t)|^3} - \ddot{q}_{i_0}(t) - \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i(\zeta(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t))}{|\zeta(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t)|^3}, \quad \forall t \neq t_0.$$

Notice that there is a $C_1 > 0$, such that for any $t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]$,

$$\left| \ddot{q}_{i_0}(t) + \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i(\zeta(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t))}{|\zeta(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t)|^3} \right| \leq C_1.$$

This means $\zeta(t)$ is a collision-ejection solution of the Kepler problem with bounded perturbation. Then the desired results follow from Sperling [34]. \square

For the proof of Proposition 2.3, we need some results of the Kepler problem

$$(68) \quad \ddot{\xi}(s) = -m_{i_0} \frac{\xi(s)}{|\xi(s)|^3},$$

which is the Euler-Lagrangian equation of the following Lagrangian action functional

$$(69) \quad \bar{A}(\xi; s_1, s_2) = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \bar{L}(\xi, \dot{\xi}) ds, \quad \text{where } \bar{L}(\xi, \dot{\xi}) = \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\xi}|^2 + \frac{m_{i_0}}{|\xi|}.$$

Recall that for $\sigma_{\pm} \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\sigma_{\pm}| = 1$, the following $\bar{\zeta}(s)$ is a *parabolic homothetic collision-ejection solution* of the Kepler problem (68) with an isolated collision at the moment t_0 ,

$$(70) \quad \bar{\zeta}(s) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{9}{2}m_{i_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}|s|^{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_-, & \text{if } s \leq t_0; \\ \left(\frac{9}{2}m_{i_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}|s|^{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_+, & \text{if } s \geq t_0. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 5.1. *When $\sigma_- \neq \sigma_+$, for any $T > 0$, there are two collision-free solutions of (68), $\xi^{\pm} \in C^{\infty}([-T, T], \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ satisfying $\bar{A}(\xi^{\pm}; -T, T) < \bar{A}(\bar{\zeta}; -T, T)$ and*

- (a). $\xi^+(\pm T) = \bar{\zeta}(\pm T)$ and $\text{Arg}(\xi^+(T)) - \text{Arg}(\xi^+(-T)) \in (0, 2\pi)$;
- (b). $\xi^-(\pm T) = \bar{\zeta}(\pm T)$ and $\text{Arg}(\xi^-(T)) - \text{Arg}(\xi^-(-T)) \in (-2\pi, 0)$.

Remark 5.1. As the angular momentum of a collision-free solution of the Kepler problem is a non-zero constant, $\text{Arg}(\xi^+(t))$ is strictly increasing and $\text{Arg}(\xi^-(t))$ is strictly decreasing, as t goes from $-T$ to T .

Proof. This is a well-known result with several different proofs, see [36], [18], [38] or [10]. \square

A blow-up argument will be used in order to apply this result.

Definition 5.1. For any $\lambda > 0$, define the λ -**blow-up** of $\zeta|_{[t_0-\delta, t_0+\delta]}$ and $q_i|_{[t_0-\delta, t_0+\delta]}$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$, as

$$(71) \quad \zeta^{\lambda}(s) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}}\zeta(t_0 + \lambda^{-1}s), \quad q_i^{\lambda}(s) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}}q_i(t_0 + \lambda^{-1}s), \quad \forall s \in [-\lambda\delta, \lambda\delta].$$

The time is shifted only to simplify notations. As a result, $\zeta^{\lambda}(s)$, $s \in [-\lambda\delta, \lambda\delta] \setminus \{0\}$, satisfies

$$(72) \quad \ddot{\zeta}^{\lambda}(s) + \ddot{q}_i^{\lambda}(s) = -m_{i_0} \frac{\zeta^{\lambda}(s)}{|\zeta^{\lambda}(s)|^3} - \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i(\zeta^{\lambda}(s) + q_{i_0}^{\lambda}(s) - q_i^{\lambda}(s))}{|\zeta^{\lambda}(s) + q_{i_0}^{\lambda}(s) - q_i^{\lambda}(s)|^3},$$

which is the Euler-Lagrangian equation of the action functional

$$(73) \quad \mathcal{A}^{\lambda}(\zeta^{\lambda}; s_1, s_2) = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} L^{\lambda}(\zeta^{\lambda}(s), \dot{\zeta}^{\lambda}(s), s) ds,$$

where

$$(74) \quad L^{\lambda}(\zeta^{\lambda}(s), \dot{\zeta}^{\lambda}(s), s) = \frac{1}{2}|\dot{\zeta}^{\lambda}(s) + \dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda}(s)|^2 + \frac{m_{i_0}}{|\zeta^{\lambda}(s)|} + \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i}{|\zeta^{\lambda}(s) + q_{i_0}^{\lambda}(s) - q_i^{\lambda}(s)|}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *For any $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta]$, $\mathcal{A}^{\lambda}(\zeta^{\lambda}; -\lambda\delta_1, \lambda\delta_1) = \lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}\mathcal{A}(\zeta; t_0 - \delta_1, t_0 + \delta_1)$.*

Proof. By a direct computation,

$$L^{\lambda}(\zeta^{\lambda}(s), \dot{\zeta}^{\lambda}(s), s) = \lambda^{-\frac{2}{3}}L(\zeta(t), \dot{\zeta}(t), t).$$

The result then follows from the fact that $t = \lambda^{-1}s + t_0$, as it implies $ds = \lambda dt$. \square

Lemma 5.2. *For any $T > 0$, as λ goes to infinity,*

- (a). $\zeta^\lambda(s)$ converges uniformly to $\bar{\zeta}(s)$ on $[-T, T]$;
- (b). $\dot{\zeta}^\lambda(s)$ converges uniformly to $\dot{\bar{\zeta}}(s)$ on any compact subset of $[-T, T] \setminus \{0\}$;

Proof. It follows from Proposition 2.2 and direct computations. \square

Now we are ready to give a proof of Proposition 2.3.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Fix a $T > 0$ for the rest of the proof. Let ξ be either ξ^+ or ξ^- obtained in Proposition 5.1. Then there is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that

$$(75) \quad \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{\zeta}; -T, T) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi; -T, T) = 6\varepsilon_0.$$

As $\sigma_\pm = \frac{\bar{\zeta}(\pm T)}{|\bar{\zeta}(\pm T)|} = \frac{\xi(\pm T)}{|\xi(\pm T)|}$, we may further assume $\text{Arg}(\sigma_\pm) = \text{Arg}(\xi(\pm T))$. By Proposition 5.1,

$$(76) \quad \text{Arg}(\sigma_+) - \text{Arg}(\sigma_-) \in \begin{cases} (0, 2\pi), & \text{if } \xi = \xi^-; \\ (-2\pi, 0), & \text{if } \xi = \xi^+. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.2, $\{\zeta^\lambda|_{[-2T, 2T]} : \lambda > 2T/\delta\}$ is bound in $H^1([-2T, 2T], \mathbb{C})$, so we can find a sequence of positive numbers $\{\lambda_n \nearrow \infty\}_{n=1}^\infty$ with $\zeta^{\lambda_n}|_{[-2T, 2T]}$ converging weakly to $\bar{\zeta}|_{[-2T, 2T]}$, as n goes to infinity. The weakly lower semi-continuity of $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ then implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) \geq \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{\zeta}; -2T, 2T).$$

As a result, for n large enough,

$$(77) \quad \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) \geq \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{\zeta}; -2T, 2T) - \varepsilon_0.$$

By Lemma 5.2, we can also find a sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_n \searrow 0\}_{n=1}^\infty$, such that

$$(78) \quad |\zeta^{\lambda_n}(s) - \bar{\zeta}(s)| \leq \delta_n, \quad |\dot{\zeta}^{\lambda_n}(s) - \dot{\bar{\zeta}}(s)| \leq \delta_n, \quad \forall s \in [-2T, 2T] \setminus [-T, T].$$

For each n , we define a path $\xi^{\lambda_n} \in H^1([-\delta/\lambda_n, \delta/\lambda_n], \mathbb{C})$ as

$$(79) \quad \xi^{\lambda_n}(s) = \begin{cases} \zeta^{\lambda_n}(s), & \text{when } s \in [2T, \lambda_n\delta], \\ \frac{2T-s}{\delta_n}(\bar{\zeta}(s) - \zeta^{\lambda_n}(s)) + \zeta^{\lambda_n}(s), & \text{when } s \in [2T - \delta_n, 2T], \\ \bar{\zeta}(s), & \text{when } s \in [T, 2T - \delta_n], \\ \xi(s), & \text{when } s \in [-T, T], \\ \bar{\zeta}(s), & \text{when } s \in [-2T + \delta_n, -T], \\ \frac{s+2T-\delta_n}{\delta_n}(\bar{\zeta}(s) - \zeta^{\lambda_n}(s)) + \bar{\zeta}(s), & \text{when } s \in [-2T, -2T + \delta_n], \\ \zeta^{\lambda_n}(s), & \text{when } s \in [-\lambda_n\delta, -2T], \end{cases}$$

and a corresponding path $\eta^n \in H^1([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta], \mathbb{C})$ as

$$\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) = \lambda_n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \xi^{\lambda_n}(\lambda_n(t - t_0)), \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta].$$

We will show that for large n , $(\eta^{\lambda_n} + q_{i_0})|_{[t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]}$ are the desired paths we are looking for.

Notice that $\xi^{\lambda_n}(s)$ and $\zeta^{\lambda_n}(s)$ are correspondingly the λ_n -blow-up of $\eta^{\lambda_n}(t)$ and $\zeta(t)$. By (79), for any n large enough, we have the following inequality, which verifies (10).

$$(80) \quad |\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) - \zeta(t)| = |\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - \gamma(t)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta].$$

In particular this implies that, for ε small enough,

$$\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) + q_{i_0}(t) \neq q_i(t), \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta].$$

At the same time Proposition 5.1 and (79) also implies $|\xi^{\lambda_n}(s)| \neq 0, \forall s \in [-\lambda_n\delta, \lambda_n\delta]$. Then

$$\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) \neq 0, \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta].$$

As a result, for n large enough, $(\eta^{\lambda_n} + q_{i_0})|_{[t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]}$ must be collision-free.

Meanwhile by Proposition 2.2, $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \zeta(t_0 \pm \delta)/|\zeta(t_0 \pm \delta)| = \sigma_{\pm}$. Therefore we may assume

$$(81) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \text{Arg}(\zeta(t_0 \pm \delta)) = \text{Arg}(\sigma_{\pm}).$$

Then by (76), for δ small enough,

$$(82) \quad \text{Arg}(\zeta(t_0 + \delta)) - \text{Arg}(\zeta(t_0 - \delta)) \in \begin{cases} (0, 2\pi), & \text{if } \xi = \xi^+; \\ (-2\pi, 0), & \text{if } \xi = \xi^-. \end{cases}$$

Since $\xi^{\lambda_n}(\pm\lambda_n\delta) = \zeta^{\lambda_n}(\pm\lambda_n\delta)$, we may assume

$$\text{Arg}(\xi^{\lambda_n})(\pm\lambda_n\delta) = \text{Arg}(\zeta^{\lambda_n})(\pm\lambda_n\delta).$$

This then implies

$$\text{Arg}(\eta^{\lambda_n})(t_0 \pm \delta) = \text{Arg}(\zeta)(t_0 \pm \delta).$$

Combining this with (82), we get

$$\text{Arg}(\eta^{\lambda_n}(t_0 + \delta)) - \text{Arg}(\eta^{\lambda_n}(t_0 - \delta)) \in \begin{cases} (0, 2\pi), & \text{if } \xi = \xi^+; \\ (-2\pi, 0), & \text{if } \xi = \xi^-. \end{cases}$$

This implies $\eta^{\lambda_n}|_{[t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]} + q_{i_0}|_{[t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]}$ satisfies (11), for n large enough.

We claim that for n large enough,

$$(83) \quad \mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -\lambda_n\delta, \lambda_n\delta) < \mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -\lambda_n\delta, \lambda_n\delta).$$

Then (83) and Lemma 5.1 imply

$$\mathcal{A}(\eta^{\lambda_n}; t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta) < \mathcal{A}(\zeta; t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta).$$

As a result, our proof is finished once (83) is established. To show this, notice that

$$(84) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -\lambda_n\delta, \lambda_n\delta) - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -\lambda_n\delta, \lambda_n\delta) \\ &= \mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) \\ &\geq \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) + \int_{-2T}^{2T} \langle \dot{\zeta}^{\lambda_n} - \dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}, \dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda_n} \rangle ds \\ &\quad - \int_{-2T}^{2T} \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i}{|\xi^{\lambda_n} + q_{i_0}^{\lambda_n} - q_i^{\lambda_n}|} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile by (75) and (79),

$$(85) \quad \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{\zeta}; -2T, 2T) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) \geq 6\varepsilon_0 - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -2T, -2T + \delta_n) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; 2T - \delta_n, 2T).$$

As (78) and (79) imply

$$|\dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}(s)| \leq \begin{cases} 1 + |\dot{\zeta}^{\lambda_n}(s)|, & \text{if } s \in [2T - \delta_n, 2T]; \\ 1 + |\dot{\zeta}(s)|, & \text{if } s \in [-2T, -2T + \delta_n], \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.2, for n large enough, there exist positive C_1 and C_2 , such that

$$(86) \quad \begin{aligned} |\dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}(s)| &\leq C_1, \quad \forall s \in [-2T, -2T + \delta_n] \cup [2T - \delta_n, 2T]; \\ |\xi^{\lambda_n}(s)| &\leq C_2^{-1}, \quad \forall s \in [-2T, -2T + \delta_n] \cup [2T - \delta_n, 2T]. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -2T, -2T + \delta_n) + \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; 2T - \delta_n, 2T) \\ &\leq \int_{-2T}^{-2T + \delta_n} + \int_{2T - \delta_n}^{2T} \frac{1}{2} |\dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}(s)|^2 + \frac{m_{i_0}}{|\xi^{\lambda_n}(s)|} ds \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} C_1^2 + m_{i_0} C_2 \right) \delta_n \leq \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

Plug the above inequality into (85), we get

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{\zeta}; -2T, 2T) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) \geq 5\varepsilon_0.$$

Then (77) implies

$$(87) \quad \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -2T, 2T) \geq 4\varepsilon_0.$$

Since $\rho_1 = \min\{|\gamma(t) - q_i(t)| : \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta] \text{ and } i \neq i_0\} > 0$, $\forall i \neq i_0$, (80) implies,

$$|\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t)| \geq |\zeta(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t)| - |\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) - \zeta(t)| \geq \rho_1 - \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta].$$

As a result, when $0 < \varepsilon \leq \rho_1/2$, for n large enough, we have

$$(88) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{-2T}^{2T} \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i}{|\xi^{\lambda_n}(s) + q_{i_0}^{\lambda_n}(s) - q_i^{\lambda_n}(s)|} ds = \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{3}} \int_{t_0 - \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}}^{t_0 + \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}} \sum_{i \neq i_0} \frac{m_i}{|\eta^{\lambda_n}(t) + q_{i_0}(t) - q_i(t)|} dt \\ &\leq \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{3}} \int_{t_0 - \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}}^{t_0 + \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}} \frac{\sum_{i \neq i_0} m_i}{\rho_1 - \varepsilon} dt \leq \frac{8T(\sum_{i \neq i_0} m_i)}{\rho_1} \lambda_n^{-\frac{2}{3}} \leq \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

Plug (87) and (88) into (84), we get that when n is large enough,

$$\mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\zeta^{\lambda_n}; -\delta/\lambda_n, \delta/\lambda_n) - \mathcal{A}^{\lambda_n}(\xi^{\lambda_n}; -\delta/\lambda_n, \delta/\lambda_n) \geq 3\varepsilon_0 + \int_{-2T}^{2T} \langle \dot{\zeta}^{\lambda_n}(s) - \dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}(s), \dot{q}_i^{\lambda_n}(s) \rangle ds.$$

As a result, it is enough to show that when n is large enough,

$$\int_{-2T}^{2T} |\dot{\zeta}^{\lambda_n}(s)| \cdot |\dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda_n}(s)| ds + \int_{-2T}^{2T} |\dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}(s)| \cdot |\dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda_n}(s)| ds \leq 2\varepsilon_0.$$

By the definition of λ_n -blow up,

$$(89) \quad \int_{-2T}^{2T} |\dot{\zeta}^{\lambda_n}(s)| \cdot |\dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda_n}(s)| ds = \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{3}} \int_{t_0 - \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}}^{t_0 + \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}} |\dot{\zeta}(t)| \cdot |\dot{q}_{i_0}(t)| dt$$

Since $q|_{[t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]}$, is a collision-free solution of (2),

$$(90) \quad C_3 = \sup\{|\dot{q}_{i_0}(t)| : t \in [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]\} < \infty.$$

Meanwhile by Proposition 2.2, there exist two positive constants C_4, C_5 ,

$$(91) \quad |\dot{\zeta}(t)| \leq C_4 |t - t_0|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + C_5, \quad \forall t \neq t_0 \text{ small enough.}$$

As a result, for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-2T}^{2T} |\dot{\zeta}^{\lambda_n}(s)| \cdot |\dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda_n}(s)| ds &\leq \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{3}} C_3 \int_{t_0 - \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}}^{t_0 + \frac{2T}{\lambda_n}} C_4 |t - t_0|^{-\frac{1}{3}} + C_5 dt \\ &= C_3 (3C_4(2T)^{\frac{2}{3}} \lambda_n^{-\frac{1}{3}} + 4C_5 T \lambda_n^{-\frac{2}{3}}) \leq \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

By (79) and the first inequality in (86), we can find a C_6 , such that for n large enough,

$$\int_{-2T}^{2T} |\dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}(s)| ds \leq C_6.$$

Since $|\dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda_n}(s)| = \lambda_n^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\dot{q}_{i_0}(t_0 + \lambda_n^{-1}s)| \leq \lambda_n^{-\frac{1}{3}} C_3$, $\forall s \in [-2T, 2T]$, for n large enough, we have

$$\int_{-2T}^{2T} |\dot{\xi}^{\lambda_n}(s)| \cdot |\dot{q}_{i_0}^{\lambda_n}(s)| ds \leq \lambda_n^{-\frac{1}{3}} C_3 C_6 \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

This finishes our proof. □

6. APPENDIX B: THE PERTURBED KEPLER PROBLEM

In this appendix, instead of the restricted $(N+1)$ -body problem, we will prove two propositions of the perturbed Kepler problem (92), that imply Proposition 3.1 and 3.2, as we believe these results will be useful in more general setting.

$$(92) \quad \ddot{z} = -\frac{mz}{|z|^3} + F(z, t), \quad F \in C^0(\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}).$$

Let $z|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a solution of (92) for the rest of the appendix. Rewrite it in polar coordinates with $z(t) = r(t)e^{i\theta(t)}$, we get

$$(93) \quad \begin{cases} \ddot{r} - r\dot{\theta}^2 = -m/r^2 + F_1(r, \theta, t); \\ r\ddot{\theta} + 2\dot{r}\dot{\theta} = F_2(r, \theta, t), \end{cases}$$

where $F_1(r, \theta, t) = \operatorname{Re}(F(re^\theta, t)e^{-i\theta})$, and $F_2(r, \theta, t) = \operatorname{Im}(F(re^\theta, t)e^{-i\theta})$.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume there are two positive constants R and C , such that*

$$(94) \quad |F(x, t)| \leq C/|x|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_R^o.$$

If $r(t_1) \geq R$ and $\dot{r}(t_1) \geq \sqrt{\frac{3(m+C)}{r(t_1)}} > 0$, then $\dot{r}(t) > \frac{1}{2}\dot{r}(t_1)$, $\forall t \in [t_1, t_2]$.

Proof. Assume the desired result does not hold, then there is a $\tau_1 \in (t_1, t_2]$, such that

$$\dot{r}(\tau_1) = \dot{r}(t_1)/2 \text{ and } \dot{r}(t) > \dot{r}(t_1)/2, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, \tau_1).$$

By (94), for $i = 1, 2$,

$$(95) \quad |F_i(r, \theta, t)| < C/r^2, \quad \forall r \geq R.$$

Let $g(t) = \frac{1}{2}\dot{r}(t)^2 - \frac{m+C}{r(t)}$. Then

$$\dot{g} = \dot{r}(\ddot{r} + \frac{m+C}{r^2}).$$

Combining this with (93) and (95), we get

$$\ddot{r} = r\dot{\theta}^2 - \frac{m}{r^2} + F_1 \geq -\frac{m+C}{r^2}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, \tau_1].$$

As a result, $\dot{g}(t) \geq 0$, $\forall t \in [t_1, \tau_1]$. This implies $g(\tau_1) \geq g(t_1)$ and

$$\frac{\dot{r}^2(t_1)}{4} = \dot{r}^2(\tau_1) > 2g(\tau_1) \geq 2g(t_1) \geq \dot{r}^2(t_1) - \frac{2(m+C)}{r(t_1)},$$

which is a contradiction to the condition that $\dot{r}(t_1) \geq \sqrt{3(m+C)/r(t_1)}$. □

Proposition 6.2. *Assume there are two positive constants R and C , such that*

$$(96) \quad |F(x, t)| \leq C/|x|^3, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus B_R^o.$$

If $r(t_1) \geq R$ and $\dot{r}(t) \geq v_0$, $\forall t \geq t_1$, for some constant $v_0 > 0$, then

- (a). $\sup\{|\omega(t)| : t \in [t_1, t_2]\} \leq |\omega(t_1)| + \frac{C}{v_0 r(t_1)}$, where $\omega(t) = z(t) \wedge \dot{z}(t)$;
- (b). when $t_2 = \infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta(t) = \theta_0$, for some $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. (a). By (92) and (96),

$$|\dot{\omega}(t)| = |z(t) \wedge \ddot{z}(t)| = |z(t) \wedge F(z, t)| \leq \frac{C}{r^2(t)}.$$

For any $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, since $r(t) \geq v_0(t - t_1) + r(t_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega(t)| &\leq |\omega(t_1)| + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{C}{r^2(\tau)} d\tau \leq |\omega(t_1)| + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{C/v_0^2}{(\tau - t_1 + \frac{r(t_1)}{v_0})^2} d\tau \\ &= |\omega(t_1)| + \frac{C}{v_0^2} \left(\frac{v_0}{r(t_1)} - \frac{v_0}{v_0(t - t_1) + r(t_1)} \right) \\ &\leq |\omega(t_1)| + \frac{C}{v_0 r(t_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

(b). Notice that in polar coordinates $\omega(t) = r^2(t)\dot{\theta}(t)$. Hence

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = \frac{\omega(t)}{r^2(t)} \leq \frac{v_0 r(t_1) |\omega(t_1)| + C}{v_0^3 r(t_1)} \frac{1}{(t - t_1 + r(t_1)/v_0)^2}.$$

Therefore for any $t > t_1$,

$$(97) \quad |\theta(t) - \theta(t_1)| \leq \int_{t_1}^t |\dot{\theta}(\tau)| d\tau \leq \frac{|\omega(t_1)|}{v_0 r(t_1)} + \frac{C}{v_0^2 r^2(t_1)}.$$

Since $\dot{r}(t) \geq v_0 > 0$, $\forall t \geq t_0$, $r(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. As a result, the upper bound given in the above inequality goes to zero, as t_1 goes to infinity. By Cauchy's criterion for convergence, $\theta(t)$ converges to a finite θ_0 , as t goes to infinity. □

By (20), Proposition 3.1 and 3.2 follows directly from the above two results correspondingly.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Arioli, F. Gazzola, and S. Terracini. Minimization properties of Hill's orbits and applications to some N -body problems. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 17(5):617–650, 2000.
- [2] V. I. Arnold, V. V. Kozlov, and A. I. Neishtadt. *Mathematical aspects of classical and celestial mechanics*, volume 3 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 2006. [Dynamical systems. III], Translated from the Russian original by E. Khukhro.
- [3] A. Boscaggin, A. Bottois, and W. Dambrosio. The spatial N -centre problem: scattering at positive energies. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 57(5):Paper No. 118, 23, 2018.
- [4] A. Boscaggin, W. Dambrosio, and D. Papini. Parabolic solutions for the planar N -centre problem: multiplicity and scattering. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 197(3):869–882, 2018.
- [5] A. Boscaggin, W. Dambrosio, and D. Papini. Periodic solutions to a forced Kepler problem in the plane. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148(1):301–314, 2020.
- [6] A. Boscaggin, W. Dambrosio, and S. Terracini. Scattering parabolic solutions for the spatial N -centre problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 223(3):1269–1306, 2017.
- [7] R. Castelli. Topologically distinct collision-free periodic solutions for the N -center problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 223(2):941–975, 2017.
- [8] J. Chazy. Sur l'allure du mouvement dans le problème des trois corps quand le temps croît indéfiniment. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)*, 39:29–130, 1922.
- [9] K.-C. Chen. Existence and minimizing properties of retrograde orbits to the three-body problem with various choices of masses. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(2):325–348, 2008.
- [10] K.-C. Chen. A minimizing property of hyperbolic Keplerian orbits. *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 19(1):281–287, 2017.
- [11] K.-C. Chen and K.-J. Hus. Variational construction of periodic solutions for planar restricted $(n + 1)$ -body problems with collinear primaries. *preprint*, 2020.
- [12] K.-C. Chen and G. Yu. Syzygy sequences of the N -center problem. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 38(2):566–582, 2018.
- [13] K.-C. Chen and G. Yu. Variational construction for heteroclinic orbits of the N -center problem. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 59(1):Paper No. 4, 21, 2020.
- [14] A. Chenciner and R. Montgomery. A remarkable periodic solution of the three-body problem in the case of equal masses. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 152(3):881–901, 2000.
- [15] N. Duignan, R. Moeckel, R. Montgomery, and G. Yu. Chazy-type asymptotics and hyperbolic scattering for the n -body problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 238(1):255–297, 2020.
- [16] D. L. Ferrario and S. Terracini. On the existence of collisionless equivariant minimizers for the classical n -body problem. *Invent. Math.*, 155(2):305–362, 2004.
- [17] S. Fleischer and A. Knauf. Improbability of collisions in n -body systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 234(3):1007–1039, 2019.
- [18] G. Fusco, G. F. Gronchi, and P. Negrini. Platonic polyhedra, topological constraints and periodic solutions of the classical N -body problem. *Invent. Math.*, 185(2):283–332, 2011.
- [19] W. B. Gordon. A minimizing property of Keplerian orbits. *Amer. J. Math.*, 99(5):961–971, 1977.
- [20] Y. Kajihara and M. Shibayama. Variational existence proof for multiple periodic orbits in the planar circular restricted three-body problem. *Nonlinearity*, 35(3):1431–1446, 2022.
- [21] M. Klein and A. Knauf. *Classical Planar Scattering by Coulombic Potentials*, volume 13 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [22] A. Knauf. The n -centre problem of celestial mechanics for large energies. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 4(1):1–114, 2002.
- [23] T. Levi-Civita. Sur la régularisation du problème des trois corps. *Acta Math.*, 42(1):99–144, 1920.
- [24] J. Liu, D. Yan, and Y. Zhou. Existence of hyperbolic motions to a class of hamiltonians and generalized n -body system via a geometric approach. *preprint*, *arXiv:2112.07450*, 2021.
- [25] E. Maderna and A. Venturelli. Globally minimizing parabolic motions in the Newtonian N -body problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 194(1):283–313, 2009.
- [26] E. Maderna and A. Venturelli. Viscosity solutions and hyperbolic motions: a new PDE method for the N -body problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 192(2):499–550, 2020.
- [27] R. McGehee. A stable manifold theorem for degenerate fixed points with applications to celestial mechanics. *J. Differential Equations*, 14:70–88, 1973.

- [28] R. Montgomery. The N -body problem, the braid group, and action-minimizing periodic solutions. *Nonlinearity*, 11(2):363–376, 1998.
- [29] J. Moser. Regularization of Kepler’s problem and the averaging method on a manifold. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 23:609–636, 1970.
- [30] C. Robinson. Homoclinic orbits and oscillation for the planar three-body problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 52(3):356–377, 1984.
- [31] D. G. Saari. Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 162:267–271; erratum, *ibid.* 168 (1972), 521, 1971.
- [32] D. G. Saari. Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 181:351–368, 1973.
- [33] N. Soave and S. Terracini. Symbolic dynamics for the N -centre problem at negative energies. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 32(9):3245–3301, 2012.
- [34] H. J. Sperling. The collision singularity in a perturbed two-body problem. *Celestial Mech.*, 1:213–221, 1969/70.
- [35] E. L. Stiefel and G. Scheifele. *Linear and regular celestial mechanics. Perturbed two-body motion, numerical methods, canonical theory.* Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 174. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1971.
- [36] S. Terracini and A. Venturelli. Symmetric trajectories for the $2N$ -body problem with equal masses. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 184(3):465–493, 2007.
- [37] A. Venturelli. "Application de la Minimisation de L’action au Problème des N Corps dans le plan et dans L’espace,". PhD thesis, Université Denis Diderot in Paris, 2002.
- [38] G. Yu. Periodic Solutions of the Planar N -Center Problem with topological constraints. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 36(9):5131 – 5162, 2016.
- [39] G. Yu. Connecting planar linear chains in the spatial N -body problem. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire*, 38(4):1115–1144, 2021.
- [40] L. Zhao. Generalized periodic orbits of the time-periodically forced kepler problem accumulating at the center and of circular and elliptic restricted three-body problems. *Math. Ann.*, to appear.

CHERN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND LPMC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN, CHINA
Email address: yugw@nankai.edu.cn