

Delayed Rabinowitz Floer Homology

Urs Frauenfelder

February 8, 2023

Abstract

In this article we study Rabinowitz Floer Homology for several interaction particles. In general Rabinowitz action functional is invariant under simultaneous time translation for all particles but not invariant if the times of each particle are translated individually. The delayed Rabinowitz action functional is invariant under individual time translation for each particle. Although its critical point equation looks like a Hamiltonian delay equation it is actually an ODE in disguise and nothing else than the critical point equation of the undelayed Rabinowitz action functional. We show that we can even interpolate between the two action functionals without changing the critical points and their actions. Moreover, for each of these interpolating action functionals we have compactness for gradient flow lines under a suitable restricted contact type assumption.

1 Introduction

Rabinowitz Floer homology is the semi-infinite dimensional Morse homology in the sense of Floer associated to Rabinowitz action functional [3]. Rabinowitz action functional is the Lagrange multiplier functional for minus the area functional to the constraint given by the mean value of a Hamiltonian. It detects periodic orbits of this Hamiltonian for fixed energy but arbitrary period. The periodic orbits are parametrized. To get unparametrized periodic orbits one has to mod out the circle action given by reparametrisation of the free loop space.

In this article we are interested in several interacting particles. The phase space of each particle is modelled by a symplectic manifold M_i so that the total phase space is the product

$$M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m M_i,$$

when m denotes the number of particles. The Hamiltonian is of the form

$$H = f(H_1, \dots, H_m)$$

where the H_i are Hamiltonians on M_i and $f: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function. A motivating example to consider for this kind of set-up are toric domains. There

$M_i = \mathbb{C}$ and $H_i(z) = \pi|z|^2$ is the moment map for the standard circle action on \mathbb{C} for $1 \leq i \leq m$. It is worth mentioning in this context that in recent times quite some Hamiltonian systems of important physical origin were interpreted in terms of toric geometry as concave toric domains. The pioneering work in this context is the interpretation of the billiard system on a round table as a concave toric domain by Ramos [11]. Mohebbi interpreted the rotating Kepler problem below the first critical value as a concave toric domain [9]. In [7] the same was proved for the Stark problem and in view of the proof of the Dullin-Montgomery conjecture by Pinzari [10] this holds true as well for the Euler problem.

The free loop space of a product of m symplectic manifolds is invariant under the action of the m -dimensional torus T^m which acts by reparametrizing the loop in each component individually. The periodic orbits of a Hamiltonian as above are invariant under the T^m -action as well. However, Rabinowitz action functional \mathcal{A} is in general *not* invariant under the torus action, but just under its diagonal circle action, unless the function f is linear.

To remedy this unpleasant situation we consider in this note a deformation of Rabinowitz action functional \mathcal{A}_r for $r \in [0, 1]$, where $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}$ is the original Rabinowitz action functional while the action functional \mathcal{A}_1 is invariant under the full T^m -action. The action functional is a Lagrange multiplier version of action functionals considered in [2] to study Hamiltonian delay equations. We therefore refer to the action functional \mathcal{A}_1 as the *delayed Rabinowitz action functional*. Its critical point equation looks like a delay equation. But in this paper we analyse this equation further and the analysis reveals that it is actually an ODE and nothing else than the periodic orbit equation. In fact the critical points of \mathcal{A}_0 and \mathcal{A}_1 coincide. Even more is true. We prove the following *non-bifurcation theorem*.

Theorem A: *The critical set $\text{crit}(\mathcal{A}_r)$ is constant, i.e., independent of r , and the restriction of \mathcal{A}_r to it as well.*

The second result is a compactness result for gradient flow lines of the functionals \mathcal{A}_r . Even for the nondelayed Rabinowitz action functional \mathcal{A}_0 this requires some assumption on the hypersurface in the symplectic manifold. In [3] compactness was established under a restricted contact assumption. In Section 3 we introduce a restricted contact type assumption for the case of several particles modelled on a product symplectic manifold. Under this assumption compactness of gradient flow lines holds true, namely

Theorem B: *Under the restricted contact type assumption, suppose that w_ν is a sequence of gradient flow lines for \mathcal{A}_{r_ν} where $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r_\nu \in [0, 1]$ such that there exists an interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ with the property that*

$$\mathcal{A}_{r_\nu}(w_\nu(s)) \in [a, b], \quad \nu \in \mathbb{N}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then w_ν has a subsequence which converges to a gradient flow line in the C_{loc}^∞ -topology.

From Theorem A and Theorem B it follows that the Rabinowitz Floer homology of the delayed Rabinowitz action functional is well defined and canonically isomorphic to the usual Rabinowitz Floer homology. Moreover, since the action according to Theorem A stays constant along the critical set the two spectral numbers of the delayed Rabinowitz Floer homology coincide with the ones of the usual Rabinowitz Floer homology.

The main interest of the author on this result is that the delayed Rabinowitz action functional is invariant under the torus action obtained by changing time for each particle individually, which is in general not the case for the undelayed Rabinowitz action functional. This in particular gives us the possibility to define as well *Tate Rabinowitz Floer homology* for this torus action by using the delayed Rabinowitz action functional. Spectral numbers for Tate Rabinowitz Floer homology the author is currently studying with Cieliebak [4] for several harmonic oscillators. The case of several harmonic oscillators corresponds to the case where the function f is linear so that the delayed Rabinowitz action functional coincides with the undelayed one. Spectral numbers in Tate Rabinowitz Floer homology show fascinating connections to the quantum spectrum and therefore play an important role in the question if there is a homological approach to Gutzwiller's intriguing trace formula [8]. In particular, it would be interesting to address this question for toric domains in view of the close connection referred to above of important Hamiltonian systems arising in atomic physics with toric geometry. On the other hand the delayed Rabinowitz action functional studied in this note can be delayed further to get actual Hamiltonian delay equations as critical points. Such Hamiltonian delay equation for example show up in the study of Helium for mean interactions of the electrons [5, 6].

Acknowledgements: The author acknowledges partial support by DFG grant FR 2637/2-2.

2 The delayed Rabinowitz action functional

In this section we define the delayed Rabinowitz action functional after having recalled the undelayed one, show that it is invariant under a torus action and proof Theorem A from the introduction.

Suppose that $(M_i, \omega_i = d\lambda_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ is a finite collection of exact symplectic manifolds and $H_i: M_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as well as $f: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions. On the product manifold

$$M := \bigoplus_{i=1}^m M_i$$

we consider the smooth function

$$H_f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \mapsto f\left(H_1(z_1), \dots, H_m(z_m)\right).$$

The product manifold M is itself an exact symplectic manifold with symplectic form

$$\omega = \oplus_{i=1}^m \omega_i \in \Omega^2(M)$$

and primitive

$$\lambda = \oplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \in \Omega^1(M).$$

Abbreviate the free loop space of M by

$$\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_M := C^\infty(S^1, M),$$

where $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is the circle. Rabinowitz action functional

$$\mathcal{A}_0: \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

at $(v, \tau) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_0(v, \tau) = - \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda + \tau \int_0^1 H_f(v(t)) dt.$$

We denote by X_{H_f} the Hamiltonian vector field of H_f implicitly defined by

$$dH_f = \omega(\cdot, X_{H_f}).$$

With this notation the critical points of \mathcal{A}_0 are solutions of the problem

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \partial_t v(t) = \tau X_{H_f}(v(t)), \quad t \in S^1 \\ \int_0^1 H_f(v(t)) dt = 0. \end{array} \right\}$$

By preservation of energy this is equivalent to the problem

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \partial_t v(t) = \tau X_{H_f}(v(t)), \quad t \in S^1 \\ H_f(v(t)) = 0 \quad t \in S^1. \end{array} \right\}, \quad (1)$$

i.e., the critical points of \mathcal{A}_0 are periodic orbits of the Hamiltonian vector field X_{H_f} of period τ of energy zero. The period τ is allowed to be zero, which means that the orbit is constant, or negative, which means that the orbit is traversed backwards.

Before writing down the delayed Rabinowitz action functional we first rewrite the usual Rabinowitz action functional a bit. If we write a loop $v \in \mathcal{L}$ into components

$$v = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$$

where

$$v_i \in \mathcal{L}_{M_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m$$

the Rabinowitz action functional can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}_0(v, \tau) = - \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda + \tau \int_0^1 f(H_1(v_1), \dots, H_m(v_m)) dt.$$

The *delayed Rabinowitz action functional*

$$\mathcal{A}_1: \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is obtained from the usual Rabinowitz action functional by interchanging the order of the integral and the function f , namely

$$\mathcal{A}_1(v, \tau) = - \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda + \tau f \left(\int_0^1 H_1(v_1) dt, \dots, \int_0^1 H_m(v_m) dt \right).$$

In order to write this a bit more compactly we introduce the following notation. We define

$$H: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m, \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \mapsto (H_1(z_1), \dots, H_m(z_m)),$$

so that

$$H_f = f \circ H.$$

For any smooth function $G: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the averaged function

$$\overline{G}: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k, \quad v \mapsto \int_0^1 G(v(t)) dt.$$

Using these abbreviations we have

$$\mathcal{A}_0(v, \tau) = - \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda + \tau \overline{f \circ H}(v), \quad \mathcal{A}_1(v, \tau) = - \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda + \tau f \circ \overline{H}(v),$$

i.e., for the usual Rabinowitz action function the function f is applied before averaging while for the delayed one after averaging.

The delayed Rabinowitz action functional is invariant under a torus action which in general is not true for the undelayed one. On each loop space \mathcal{L}_{M_i} we have a circle action

$$S^1 \times \mathcal{L}_{M_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{M_i}$$

given by reparametrisation. Namely if $v_i \in \mathcal{L}_{M_i}$ and $r \in S^1$ we set

$$r_* v(t) = v(t+r), \quad r \in S^1.$$

This circle action gives rise to a product action of the m -dimensional torus

$$T^m := \underbrace{S^1 \times \dots \times S^1}_{m \text{ times}}$$

on \mathcal{L}_M given for $r = (r_1, \dots, r_m) \in T^m$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_m) \in \mathcal{L}_M$ by

$$r_*v = \left((r_1)_*v_1, \dots, (r_m)_*v_m \right).$$

We extend this action trivially to $\mathcal{L}_M \times \mathbb{R}$ by

$$r_*(v, \tau) = (r_*v, \tau), \quad (v, \tau) \in \mathcal{L}_M \times \mathbb{R}, \quad r \in T^m.$$

Lemma 2.1 *The delayed Rabinowitz action functional \mathcal{A}_1 is invariant under the action of the torus T^m on $\mathcal{L}_M \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof: The area functional

$$\mathcal{L}_M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad v = (v_1, \dots, v_m) \rightarrow \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{S^1} v_i^* \lambda_i$$

is invariant under the action of T^m , since each functional

$$\mathcal{L}_{M_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad v_i \mapsto \int_{S^1} v_i^* \lambda_i$$

is invariant under the circle action on \mathcal{L}_{M_i} . Moreover, each averaged function

$$\overline{H}_i: \mathcal{L}_{M_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is invariant under the circle action as well, so that $f \circ \overline{H}$ is again invariant under the action of T^m . This proves the lemma. \square

In contrast to the delayed Rabinowitz action functional the undelayed one is in general only invariant under the standard circle action of $\mathcal{L}_M \times \mathbb{R}$ given by reparametrising the loop which we obtain from the torus action by embedding the circle diagonally into the torus

$$S^1 \rightarrow T^m, \quad r \mapsto (r, r, \dots, r).$$

An exception is the case where the function f is linear. Since the integral is linear one has in this case $f \circ \overline{H} = \overline{f \circ H}$, so that the delayed and the undelayed Rabinowitz action functionals coincide and are therefore both invariant under the torus action.

Critical points of \mathcal{A}_1 are solution of the Hamiltonian delay equation

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t v(t) &= \tau X_{df(\overline{H}(v))H}(v(t)), \quad t \in S^1 \\ f \circ \overline{H}(v) &= 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2)$$

This equation looks like a delay equation but it is actually an ODE in disguise and we will see that solutions of (2) are actually precisely the solution of (1).

Even more is true as Theorem A from the introduction says. We interpolate between the two functional as follows. Namely for $r \in [0, 1]$ we set

$$\mathcal{A}_r : \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (v, \tau) \mapsto - \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda + \tau \left(r f \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r) \overline{f \circ H}(v) \right).$$

We are now in position to prove Theorem A from the introduction.

Proof of Theorem A: Suppose that $(v, \tau) \in \text{crit}(\mathcal{A}_r)$. Then (v, τ) is a solution of the problem

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \partial_t v(t) &= \tau X_{r df(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v(t)), \quad t \in S^1 \\ r f \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r) \overline{f \circ H}(v) &= 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3)$$

Abbreviate by

$$f_i := \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m$$

the partial derivatives of f . We rewrite the first equation in (3) componentwise as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v_i(t) &= \tau r f_i(\overline{H}_1(v_1), \dots, \overline{H}_m(v_m)) X_{H_i}(v_i(t)) \\ &\quad + \tau(1-r) f_i(H_1(v_1(t)), \dots, H_m(v_m(t))) X_{H_i}(v_i(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

By preservation of energy it follows from (4) that $H_i(v_i)$ is constant so that we have

$$H_i(v_i)(t) = \overline{H}_i(v_i), \quad t \in S^1. \quad (5)$$

Plugging this into (4) we obtain

$$\partial_t v_i(t) = \tau f_i(H_1(v_1(t)), \dots, H_m(v_m(t))) X_{H_i}(v_i(t))$$

which is independent of r . This implies that the first equation of (3) does not depend on the homotopy parameter.

From (5) we infer further that

$$f \circ \overline{H}(v) = \overline{f \circ H}(v)$$

so that the second equation in (3) becomes

$$\overline{f \circ H}(v) = 0$$

which is independent of r as well. This shows that the critical set does not depend on the homotopy parameter.

It remains to explain why \mathcal{A}_r is constant on the critical set. If $(v, \tau) \in \text{crit}(\mathcal{A}_r)$ it holds that

$$\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau) = - \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda.$$

This expression does not depend on r and the proof of the lemma is complete.

□

3 The delayed fundamental lemma

In this section we explain the restricted contact type condition for several particles needed in Theorem B from the introduction. We then show that under the restricted contact type condition the fundamental lemma in Rabinowitz Floer homology continues to hold for the delayed case. Having the fundamental lemma established the compactness proof for gradient flow lines is standard and is briefly recalled at the end of the section.

Note that the primitive λ of the symplectic form ω on M , uniquely determines a Liouville vector field $Y = Y_\lambda$ which is implicitly defined by the condition

$$\lambda = \omega(Y, \cdot).$$

The first hypothesis we want to assume throughout this section is

(H1) The function H_f has 0 as a regular value and the energy hypersurface

$$\Sigma := H_f^{-1}(0)$$

is compact and positively transverse to the Liouville vector field Y , in the sense that

$$\lambda(X_{H_f})|_{\Sigma} > 0.$$

It follows from Hypothesis (H1) that the restriction of λ to Σ is a contact form on Σ and at every point in Σ the Hamiltonian vector field X_{H_f} is proportional to the Reeb vector field by a positive proportionality constant. Our second hypothesis is

(H2) The functions H_i are constant outside of a compact set for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

It follows from Hypothesis (H2) that the Hamiltonian vector fields X_{H_i} have compact support. Our third hypothesis is

(H3) The exact symplectic manifolds (M_i, λ_i) are completions of Liouville domains for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

In view of Hypothesis (H3) we choose an ω -compatible almost complex structure on M which has the property that outside of a compact set

$$J = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m J_i$$

where J_i is an ω_i compatible almost complex structure on M_i which is SFT-like outside a compact subset of M_i . On $\mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ we consider the L^2 -metric $g = g_J$ which at a point $(v, \tau) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ is given for tangent vectors

$$(\hat{v}_1, \hat{\tau}_1), (\hat{v}_2, \hat{\tau}_2) \in T_v \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$$

is given by

$$g((\hat{v}_1, \hat{\tau}_1), (\hat{v}_2, \hat{\tau}_2)) = \int_0^1 \omega(\hat{v}_1(t), J(v(t))\hat{v}_2(t)) + \hat{\tau}_1 \cdot \hat{\tau}_2.$$

With respect to this metric the gradient $\nabla \mathcal{A}_r = \nabla_J \mathcal{A}_r$ at a point $(v, \tau) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ becomes

$$\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau) = \left(\begin{array}{c} J(v)(\partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v)) \\ rf \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r)f \circ H(v) \end{array} \right) \in T_v \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence gradient flow lines of $\nabla \mathcal{A}_r$ are solutions $(v, \tau) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times S^1, M) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ of the problem

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \partial_s v + J(v)(\partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v)) = 0 \\ \partial_s \tau + rf \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r)f \circ H(v) = 0. \end{array} \right\} \quad (6)$$

In the following we denote by $\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r\|$ the norm of the gradient with respect to the metric g_J . The next lemma tells us that if the norm of the gradient is small we can bound the Lagrange multiplier τ in terms of the action. With the help of this lemma the compactness proof is standard and follows along the same lines as in [3]. Therefore in [1] this lemma is referred to as the *fundamental lemma in Rabinowitz Floer homology*. In the delayed case it requires quite some additional work to establish it compared to the nondelayed one in [3].

Lemma 3.1 *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following implication holds for $(v, \tau) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $r \in [0, 1]$*

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| \leq \frac{1}{c} \implies |\tau| \leq c(|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + 1). \quad (7)$$

Proof: In view of Hypotheses (H1) and (H2) there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ and a constant

$$0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{\kappa}{4} \quad (8)$$

such that the following implication holds true

$$|H_f(z)| \leq \epsilon \implies \lambda(X_{H_f}(z)) \geq \kappa. \quad (9)$$

Since outside of a compact set the ω_i -compatible almost complex structures J_i are SFT-like the norm of λ is uniformly bounded and hence there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that

$$\|\lambda_z\| \leq L, \quad z \in M. \quad (10)$$

The functions $H_i: M_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we freely interpret as well as functions on M in the obvious way by pulling them back to M under the canonical projection $\pi_i: M \rightarrow M_i$, namely for $z = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \in M$ we have

$$H_i(z) := H_i(z_i).$$

Since outside of a compact set the metric induced from the ω -compatible almost complex structure J is of product type the norm $\|dH_i(z)\|$ there only depends on z_i and since H_i on M_i is constant outside of a compact set, there exists a further constant C such that

$$\|dH_i(z)\| \leq C, \quad z \in M, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m. \quad (11)$$

In view of Hypothesis (H1) the image of H in \mathbb{R}^m is compact and therefore $f|_{\text{im}(H)}$ is uniformly continuous. Therefore there exists $\delta > 0$ with the property that for $h_1, h_2 \in \text{im}(H)$ one has the following implication

$$\|h_1 - h_2\| \leq \delta \implies |f(h_1) - f(h_2)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \quad (12)$$

Maybe after shrinking δ we can in view of (9) assume that the following implication holds

$$\|H_f(z)\| \leq \epsilon, \quad |h - H(z)| \leq \delta \implies \lambda(X_{df(h)H}(z)) \geq \frac{\kappa}{2}. \quad (13)$$

If $v \in \mathcal{L}$ we define its H -oscillation

$$\mathfrak{o}(v) := \max \left\{ \|H(v(t_1)) - H(v(t_2))\| : t_1, t_2 \in S^1 \right\}.$$

We prove now the lemma in three steps.

Step 1: Assume that $\mathfrak{o}(v) \leq \delta$, then the following implication holds

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{3} \implies |\tau| \leq \frac{6}{\kappa} \left(|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + \frac{2\epsilon L}{3} \right). \quad (14)$$

For $t \in S^1$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| H(v(t)) - \overline{H}(v) \right\| &= \left\| H(v(t)) - \int_0^1 H(v(s)) ds \right\| \\ &= \left\| \int_0^1 (H(v(t)) - H(v(s))) ds \right\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|H(v(t)) - H(v(s))\| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \mathfrak{o}(v) ds \\ &= \mathfrak{o}(v) \\ &\leq \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In view of (12) this implies

$$|f(H(v(t))) - f(\overline{H}(v))| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \quad (16)$$

Since $t \in S^1$ is arbitrary we deduce from that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \overline{f \circ H}(v) - f \circ \overline{H}(v) \right| &= \left| \int_0^1 f(H(v(t))) dt - f(\overline{H}(v)) \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 |f(H(v(t))) - f(\overline{H}(v))| dt \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We now subdivide the proof of Step 1 into three substeps.

Step 1a: Assume that $|H_f(v(t))| \leq \epsilon$ for every $t \in S^1$, then

$$|\tau| \leq \frac{6}{\kappa} \left(|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + L \|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| \right). \quad (18)$$

Suppose that $t \in S^1$. In view of the assumption of Step 1a it follows from (9) that

$$\lambda(X_{H_f}(v(t))) \geq \kappa.$$

Using additionally (15) we infer with (13) that

$$\lambda(X_{df(\overline{H}(v))_H}(v(t))) \geq \frac{\kappa}{2}.$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda(X_{r df(\overline{H}(v))_H + (1-r) f_H}(v(t))) \\ &= r \lambda(X_{df(\overline{H}(v))_H}(v(t))) + (1-r) \lambda(X_{H_f}(v(t))) \\ &\geq \frac{r\kappa}{2} + (1-r)\kappa \\ &\geq \frac{\kappa}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In view of the assumption of Step 1a we infer that

$$|\overline{f \circ H}(v)| \leq \epsilon.$$

Combining this estimate with (17) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |f \circ \overline{H}(v)| &\leq |f \circ \overline{H}(v) - \overline{f \circ H}(v)| + |\overline{f \circ H}(v)| \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \epsilon \\ &= \frac{4\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above two estimates we infer

$$\begin{aligned} |rf \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r)\overline{f \circ H}(v)| &\leq r|f \circ \overline{H}(v)| + (1-r)|\overline{f \circ H}(v)| \\ &\leq \frac{4\epsilon r}{3} + (1-r)\epsilon \\ &\leq \frac{4\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Using the inequalities (19) and (20), the uniform bound L on the one-form λ from (10) and remembering that in (8) we have chosen $\epsilon \leq \frac{\kappa}{4}$ we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| &\geq \left| \int_{S^1} v^* \lambda \right| - |\tau| \cdot |rf \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r)\overline{f \circ H}(v)| \\
&\geq \left| \int_0^1 \lambda \left(\tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right) dt \right| \\
&\quad - \left| \int_0^1 \lambda \left(\partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right) dt \right| - \frac{4\epsilon|\tau|}{3} \\
&\geq \frac{\kappa|\tau|}{2} - L \left\| \partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right\|_{L^1(S^1)} - \frac{\kappa|\tau|}{3} \\
&\geq \frac{\kappa|\tau|}{6} - L \left\| \partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right\|_{L^2(S^1)} \\
&\geq \frac{\kappa|\tau|}{6} - L \|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\|
\end{aligned}$$

from which (18) follows. This proves Step 1a.

Step 1b: Assume that there exists $t_0 \in S^1$ such that $|H_f(v(t_0))| > \epsilon$, then

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| > \frac{2\epsilon}{3}. \quad (21)$$

Suppose that $t \in S^1$. Since the H -oscillation is bounded by δ we have

$$\|H(v(t)) - H(v(t_0))\| \leq \delta$$

and therefore we estimate with the help of (12)

$$\begin{aligned}
|H_f(v(t))| &= |f(H(v(t)))| \\
&\geq |f(H(v(t_0)))| - |f(H(v(t))) - f(H(v(t_0)))| \\
&> \epsilon - \frac{\epsilon}{3} \\
&= \frac{2\epsilon}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the circle is connected we either have

$$H_f(v(t)) > \frac{2\epsilon}{3}, \quad \forall t \in S^1 \quad (22)$$

or

$$H_f(v(t)) < -\frac{2\epsilon}{3}, \quad \forall t \in S^1. \quad (23)$$

We first discuss (22). In this case we have

$$\overline{f \circ H}(v) > \frac{2\epsilon}{3}. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$H_f(v(t_0)) > \epsilon$$

and hence applying (16) for $t = t_0$ we infer that

$$f \circ \overline{H}(v) > \frac{2\epsilon}{3}. \quad (25)$$

From (24) and (25) we infer that

$$rf \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r)\overline{f \circ H} > \frac{2\epsilon}{3}$$

from which (21) follows. This proves Step 1b in case (22) holds. The case (23) is similar. There we infer

$$\overline{f \circ H}(v) < -\frac{2\epsilon}{3}, \quad f \circ \overline{H}(v) < -\frac{2\epsilon}{3}$$

from which follows

$$rf \circ \overline{H}(v) + (1-r)\overline{f \circ H} < -\frac{2\epsilon}{3}$$

which again implies (21). This finishes the proof of Step 1b.

Step 1c: *We prove Step 1.*

We assume that

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{3}.$$

In view of Step 1b this implies that $|H_f(v(t))| \leq \epsilon$ for every $t \in S^1$. Therefore we can apply Step 1a and infer that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau| &\leq \frac{6}{\kappa} \left(|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + L \|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{6}{\kappa} \left(|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + \frac{2\epsilon L}{3} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Step 1.

In the second step we treat the case of large H -oscillation. For that recall the constant C which appeared in (11).

Step 2: *Assume that $\mathfrak{o}(v) > \delta$, then*

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| > \frac{\delta}{C\sqrt{m}}. \quad (26)$$

By definition of the oscillation there exist times $t_0, t_1 \in S^1$ such that

$$\|H(v(t_1)) - H(v(t_0))\| > \delta.$$

In particular, there exists $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that

$$|H_i(v_i(t_1)) - H_i(v_i(t_0))| > \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Maybe after interchanging the roles of t_1 and t_0 we can even assume that

$$H_i(v_i(t_1)) - H_i(v_i(t_0)) > \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

By going to the universal cover \mathbb{R} of the circle $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ we interpret t_0 and t_1 as real numbers satisfying

$$t_0 < t_1 < t_0 + 1.$$

Abbreviate

$$P := \{t \in [t_0, t_1] : dH_i(v_i(t))\partial_t v_i(t) \geq 0\}.$$

We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{m}} \\ & < H_i(v_i(t_1)) - H_i(v_i(t_0)) \\ & = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dH_i(v_i(t))\partial_t v_i(t) dt \\ & \leq \int_P dH_i(v_i(t))\partial_t v_i(t) dt \\ & = \int_P dH_i(v_i(t)) \left(\partial_t v_i(t) - \tau \left(r f_i(\overline{H}(v)) + (1-r) f_i(H(v(t))) \right) X_{H_i}(v_i(t)) \right) dt \\ & = \int_P dH_i(v) \left(\partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right) dt \\ & \leq C \int_P \left\| \partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right\| dt \\ & \leq C \left\| \partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right\|_{L^1(S^1)} \\ & \leq C \left\| \partial_t v - \tau X_{rdf(\overline{H}(v))H+(1-r)fH}(v) \right\|_{L^2(S^1)} \\ & \leq C \left\| \nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (26) and finishes the proof of Step 2.

Step 3: *We prove the lemma.*

We define

$$c := \max \left\{ \frac{C\sqrt{m}}{\delta}, \frac{3}{2\epsilon}, \frac{6}{\kappa}, \frac{4\epsilon L}{\kappa} \right\}$$

and show that with this choice of the constant c the implication (7) holds true. For this purpose suppose that

$$\left\| \nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{c}. \quad (27)$$

This implies that

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| \leq \frac{\delta}{C\sqrt{m}}.$$

From Step 2 we infer that

$$\sigma(v) \leq \delta.$$

Therefore we deduce from Step 1 that the implication (14) holds true. From (27) we further deduce that

$$\|\nabla \mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{3}.$$

Hence we obtain from (14) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau| &\leq \frac{6}{\kappa} \left(|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + \frac{2\epsilon L}{3} \right) \\ &= \frac{6}{\kappa} |\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + \frac{4\epsilon L}{\kappa} \\ &\leq c |\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + c \\ &= c (|\mathcal{A}_r(v, \tau)| + 1). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the implication (7) and the lemma follows. \square

Having Lemma 3.1 at our disposal the compactness proof for the gradient flow lines now follows precisely the same scheme as the compactness proof in [3], which then proves Theorem B from the introduction. We sketch the main steps.

Sketch of proof of Theorem B: The fundamental lemma allows to bound the Lagrange multiplier in terms of action. Since the action stays in the bounded interval $[a, b]$ these leads to a uniform bound on the Lagrange multiplier. Because outside of a compact set the almost complex structures J_i are SFT-like and the Hamiltonian vector fields X_{H_i} vanish, the maximum principle tells us that gradient flow lines have to stay in a compact subset of M . Moreover, there derivatives cannot explode since the symplectic form ω is exact and therefore there is no bubbling. With these uniform bounds the compactness theorem follows from elliptic regularity of the Cauchy-Riemann operator. \square

References

- [1] P. Albers, U. Frauenfelder, *Rabinowitz Floer homology: a survey*. Global differential geometry, 437–461, Springer Proc. Math., **17**, Springer, Heidelberg (2012).
- [2] P. Albers, U. Frauenfelder, F. Schlenk, *Hamiltonian delay equations – examples and lower bound for the number of periodic solutions*, Adv. Math. **373**, 107319 (2020).

- [3] K. Cieliebak, U. Frauenfelder, *A Floer homology for exact contact embeddings*, Pacific J. Math. **239** (2009), no. 2, 251–316.
- [4] K. Cieliebak, U. Frauenfelder, *Spectral numbers in Tate Rabinowitz Floer homology*, preprint.
- [5] K. Cieliebak, U. Frauenfelder, E. Volkov, *A variational approach to frozen planet orbits in Helium*, to appear in Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré.
- [6] U. Frauenfelder, *Helium and Hamiltonian delay equations*, Israel J. Math. **246**, no. 1, 239–260 (2021).
- [7] U. Frauenfelder, *The Stark problem as a concave toric domain*, Geom. Dedicata **217**, no. 1, Paper No. 10 (2023).
- [8] M. Gutzwiller, *Chaos in classical and quantum mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1990).
- [9] A. Mohebbi, *The special concave toric domain for the rotating Kepler problem*, arXiv:2108.04581
- [10] G. Pinzari, *Proof of a conjecture by H. Dullin and R. Montgomery*, arXiv:2209.07097
- [11] V. Ramos, *Symplectic embeddings and the Lagrangian bidisk*, Duke Math. J. **166**, no. 9, 1703–1738 (2017).