

# PROVING THE CHOW-RASHEVSKIĬ THEOREM À LA RASHEVSKIĬ

CRISTINA GIANNOTTI   ANDREA SPIRO   MARTA ZOPPELLO

ABSTRACT. We give a new independent proof of a generalised version of the theorem by Rashevskiĭ, which appeared in [Uch. Zapiski Ped. Inst. K. **2** (1938), 83 – 94] and from which the classical Chow-Rashevskiĭ Theorem follows as a corollary. The proof is structured to allow generalisations to the case of orbits of compositions of flows in absence of group structures, thus appropriate for applications in Control Theory. In fact, the same structure of the proof has been successfully exploited in [C. Giannotti, A. Spiro and M. Zoppello, arXiv 2401.07555 & 2401.07560 (2024)] to determine new controllability criteria for real analytic non-linear control systems. It also yields a corollary, which can be used to derive results under lower regularity assumptions, as it is illustrated by a simple explicit example.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most frequent way to state the Chow-Rashevskiĭ Theorem is the following: *If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a connected  $n$ -dimensional manifold equipped with a bracket generating distribution  $\mathcal{D} \subset T\mathcal{M}$ , then any two points of  $\mathcal{M}$  can be connected by a piecewise smooth  $\mathcal{D}$ -path, i.e. by a path whose tangent vectors are all in  $\mathcal{D}$ .* However, in the original papers [9, 2], Rashevskiĭ and Chow proved two different theorems on the set  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  of the points of a manifold with distribution  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ , that can be joined to a given  $x_o \in \mathcal{M}$  by means of  $\mathcal{D}$ -paths and the above statement of Chow-Rashevskiĭ Theorem is a corollary of such two different results. Curiously enough, the two theorems have different hypotheses and are equivalent one to the other only if a certain additional condition holds.

On the one hand, Rashevskiĭ's Theorem has the hypothesis that the enlarged distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$ , generated by all vector fields in  $\mathcal{D}$  and all possible iterated Lie brackets between them, has constant rank <sup>(1)</sup>. In this case, he proves that, for any  $x_o \in \mathcal{M}$ , the corresponding set  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  is the maximal integral submanifold of  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$  (which is easily seen to be involutive) that passes through  $x_o$ . On the other hand, the hypothesis in Chow's Theorem is that a different enlarged distribution has constant rank, i.e. the distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$  spanned by all vector fields in  $\mathcal{D}$  together with the vector fields of the form  $\Phi_{t*}^X(Y)$ , where  $X, Y$  are in  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\Phi_{t*}^X(Y)$  is the pushed forward of  $Y$  by the flow of  $X$  for all sufficiently small  $t$ 's. Under this assumption, Chow proves that  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$  is involutive and that, if  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$  has constant rank, for any  $x_o \in \mathcal{M}$ , the corresponding set  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  coincides with the maximal integral submanifold of  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$  passing through  $x_o$ . On

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58A30, 34H05, 58J60.

*Key words and phrases.* Non-integrable distributions; Chow-Rashevskiĭ-Sussmann Theorem; Iterated Lie brackets.

<sup>1</sup>Strictly speaking, in [9] the author assumes that  $\text{rank } \mathcal{D}_x^{(\text{Lie})} = \dim \mathcal{M}$  at all points, but its proof works perfectly well under the weaker assumption that  $\text{rank } \mathcal{D}_x^{(\text{Lie})}$  is constant.

this regard, it should be observed that the celebrated Orbit Theorem by Sussmann [10] (proved several years later than Rashevskii and Chow's papers) shows that the constant rank condition on  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$  can be removed and that  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  is *always* a maximal integral submanifold for the (possibly non-regular) distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$ .

Since the distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$  is always a subdistribution of  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$ , by Rashevskii's and Chow and Sussmann's results, whenever  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$  has a constant rank, say  $p$  – so that  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  is a  $p$ -dimensional maximal integral submanifold for both  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$  – then also  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flows})}$  has constant rank and its rank is  $p$  as well. Thus, in these cases, Rashevskii's and Chow's theorems are equivalent. Differences occur only when  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$  has non-constant rank. In these situations only Chow's (or Sussmann's) theorem applies, meaning that, in a sense, the result by Chow is more powerful than the one by Rashevskii. On the other hand, the dimensions of the spaces  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}|_x$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , (and hence the dimension of the integral submanifold  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  when  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$  is regular) is undoubtedly much easier to be determined than the dimension of  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Flow})}|_x$ : For the first one needs just to compute Lie brackets, while for the second it is necessary to integrate the vector fields in  $\mathcal{D}$ , determine their flows and, finally, compute the pushed-forward vector fields  $\Phi_{t*}^X(Y)$ . Due to this, wherever Rashevskii's condition holds (note that, by semicontinuity of the rank function, for any point of an open and dense subset of  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D})$ , there is a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{U}$  of that point where the restricted distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}|_{\mathcal{U}}$  has constant rank), Rashevskii's theorem is much handier than Chow's.

In this paper, we present a proof of (a minor generalisation of) Rashevskii's theorem, which we constructed independently, before we were able to read [9] <sup>(2)</sup>. In fact, our proof is different from Rashevskii's one and is crucially rooted on a lemma on iterated Lie brackets, which was also proved by Feleqi and Rampazzo in [3] and has an independent interest on its own <sup>(3)</sup>. The circle of ideas we follow is designed to allow several kinds of modifications and generalisations, more appropriate for studies of orbits of points under families of compositions of flows which do not have a natural group structure, as it often occurs in Control Theory. Modifications and generalisation of this kind have been successfully exploited in [4, 5] (see also [1]). As a corollary of our proof, we also get an estimate for the radius of a ball, made of points joinable to its centre through  $\mathcal{D}$ -paths. The estimate is designed to be applicable in discussions of deformations of distributions and of Hausdorff limits of orbits. At the end of the last section, we give a simple explicit example which illustrates one of the ways this estimate might be exploited.

The structure of the paper is as follows. After a preliminary section §2, where we review the notion of piecewise smooth curves tangent to a distribution and we fix once and for all the definition of smooth non-regular distribution, in §3 we introduce the notion of distribution of uniform  $\mu$ -type and state Rashevskii's Theorem. In §4 and §5, the announced proof and its corollary (Corollary 5.1) on the radii of the balls, made of points that are joinable to the centre via  $\mathcal{D}$ -paths, are given.

---

<sup>2</sup>It was quite hard to get a copy of [9]. We succeeded in getting a copy from the Russian State Library with the help of a long chain of friends.

<sup>3</sup>Also Rashevskii built his proof on a lemma on iterated Lie brackets. His lemma is surely different from ours, but it is very close to it in the spirit.

## 2. CURVES TANGENT TO DISTRIBUTIONS

**2.1. Piecewise regular curves.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a connected  $N$ -dimensional manifold of class  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ . In this paper by (*regular*) *curve* we always mean a subset of  $\mathcal{M}$ , which is homeomorphic to a closed bounded interval of  $\mathbb{R}$  and equal to the image  $\gamma([a, b])$  of a smooth and regular map  $\gamma : [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  (i.e. a  $\mathcal{C}^1$  map with  $\dot{\gamma}(t) \neq 0$  at all points). In other words, with the term “curve” we mean the trace of a parameterised curve  $\gamma(t)$  of class  $\mathcal{C}^1$ , which has nowhere vanishing velocity  $\dot{\gamma}(t)$  (this is what is called “regular parameterisation” throughout the paper) and which is a homeomorphism between its domain  $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$  and its image  $\gamma([a, b])$ . Let  $\gamma_1(t)$ ,  $\gamma_2(s)$ ,  $t \in [a, b]$ ,  $s \in [c, d]$ , be two regular parameterisations of two curves (which, for simplicity, we just denote by  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ ), such that the endpoint  $\gamma_1(b)$  of the first curve is equal to the endpoint  $\gamma_2(c)$  of the second curve. The *composition*  $\gamma_1 * \gamma_2$  is the union of these two curves. The curves  $\gamma_1$ ,  $\gamma_2$  are the *regular arcs* of  $\gamma_1 * \gamma_2$ . In a similar way we define the *composition* of a finite number of regular parameterisations  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_r$ , each of them sharing one of its endpoints with an endpoint of the succeeding one. A connected subset of  $\mathcal{M}$ , which is obtained as composition of a finite collection of curves, is called *piecewise regular curve*.

**2.2. Regular and singular distributions and their tangent curves.** A *regular distribution of rank  $p$*  on a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  is a smooth family  $\mathcal{D}$  of subspaces  $\mathcal{D}_x \subset T_x\mathcal{M}$  of the tangent spaces of  $\mathcal{M}$  of constant dimension  $p$ . Here, by “smooth family of subspaces” we mean a set of subspaces with the following property: for any point  $x_o \in \mathcal{M}$  there exists a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{U}$  and a set of  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  pointwise linearly independent vector fields  $X_1, \dots, X_p$  on  $\mathcal{U}$ , such that

$$\mathcal{D}_x = \langle X_1|_x, \dots, X_p|_x \rangle \quad \text{for any } x \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Given a regular distribution  $\mathcal{D} \subset T\mathcal{M}$ , we will use the short notation “ $X \in \mathcal{D}$ ” to indicate that the (local) vector field  $X$  takes values in the vector spaces  $\mathcal{D}_x$  of the distribution.

Generalisations of the notion of “regular distribution”, in which the condition  $\dim \mathcal{D}_x = \text{constant}$  is not assumed, are possible, but demand some care. In this paper we adopt the following definition, which is a variant of those considered in [7, 11, 10].

**Definition 2.1.** A *quasi-regular set of  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  vector fields of rank  $p$*  on  $\mathcal{M}$  is a set  $V$  of local vector fields of the following kind. There exist an open cover  $\{\mathcal{U}_A\}_{A \in J}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  and a family  $\{(X_1^{(A)}, \dots, X_{p_A}^{(A)})\}_{A \in J}$  of tuples of cardinalities  $p_A \geq p$ , of  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  vector fields – one tuple for each open set  $\mathcal{U}_A$  – each of them containing a  $p$ -tuple, made of vector fields that are pointwise linearly independent on some open and dense subset of  $\mathcal{U}_A$ , and satisfying the following conditions:

- if  $\mathcal{U}_A \cap \mathcal{U}_B \neq \emptyset$ , then for any  $x \in \mathcal{U}_A \cap \mathcal{U}_B$  one has  $X_i^{(A)}|_x = \mathcal{A}^{(AB)}_i{}^j|_x X_j^{(B)}|_x$  for a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  matrix valued map  $\mathcal{A}^{(AB)} : \mathcal{U}_A \cap \mathcal{U}_B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{p_A \times p_B}$
- the vector fields  $Y \in V$  are exactly the local vector fields, for which any restriction  $Y|_{\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}_A}$  to the intersection between the domain  $\mathcal{U}$  and a set in  $\{\mathcal{U}_A\}_{A \in J}$ , has the form

$$Y|_{\mathcal{U}_A \cap \mathcal{U}} = Y^{(A)i} X_i^{(A)} \tag{2.1}$$

for some  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  functions  $Y^{(A)i}$ .

The tuples  $(X_1^{(A)}, \dots, X_{p_A}^{(A)})$  are called *sets of local generators for  $V$* .

A *generalised distribution of rank  $p$*  is a pair  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  given by (i) a quasi-regular set of vector fields  $V$  of rank  $p$  and (ii) the uniquely associated family  $\mathcal{D}^V$  of subspaces of tangent spaces of  $\mathcal{M}$ , given by

$$\mathcal{D}_x^V = \{X_x, X \in V\}, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}.$$

If  $\dim \mathcal{D}_x^V$  is constant, the generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D})$  is called *regular*, otherwise it is called *singular*.

Notice that if  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  is regular, then  $V$  coincides with the set of local vector fields with values in the regular distribution  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V$  and  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  is fully determined by  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V$ . On the other hand, if  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  is singular, there might be several different generalised distributions, all of them determining the same family of tangent subspaces  $\mathcal{D}^V$ . For instance the quasi-regular sets of local vector fields on  $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \left\{ X = f^1(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + f^2(x) x^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2}, f^i \text{ smooth} \right\}, \\ \tilde{V} &= \left\{ X = g^1(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1} + g^2(x) (x^1)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2}, g^i \text{ smooth} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

determine the same families of subspaces  $\mathcal{D}^V = \mathcal{D}^{\tilde{V}}$ , but  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V) \neq (\tilde{V}, \mathcal{D}^{\tilde{V}})$  because  $\tilde{V}$  is a proper subset of  $V$ .

A generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  is called *non-integrable* if there exists at least one pair of vector fields  $X, Y \in V$ , whose Lie bracket  $[X, Y]$  is not in  $V$ . It is called *integrable* or *involutive*, otherwise. In case  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  is regular and thus identifiable with the regular distribution  $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}^V$ , the non-integrability is equivalent to the existence of  $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $[X, Y]_x \notin \mathcal{D}|_x$  at some  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ .

**Remark 2.2.** The notion of generalised distributions can be equivalently defined using the language of sheaves as follows. First of all, note that if  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  is a generalised distribution on a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ , then the collection of the sets of vector fields in  $V$  that are defined on open sets and the maps between pairs of such collections, determined by the usual restriction map, give the ordered pair

$$\left( \{V|_{\mathcal{U}}\}_{\mathcal{U} \text{ open}}, \{\rho_{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}} : V|_{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow V|_{\mathcal{V}}\}_{\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U} \text{ open}} \right),$$

which is a pre-sheaf and corresponds to a subsheaf  $\pi : \mathbb{V}^{(V, \mathcal{D})} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  of the sheaf  $\pi : \mathcal{T}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  of the germs of the local  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ -vector fields of  $\mathcal{M}$ . This subsheaf satisfies the following two conditions: (a) there exists an open dense subset  $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset \mathcal{M}$ , on which each fiber  $\mathbb{V}|_x$ ,  $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ , span a subspace  $\mathcal{D}_x \subset T_x \mathcal{M}$  of dimension  $p$ ; (b) for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  there is a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{U}$  and a tuple  $(X_1, \dots, X_{\bar{p}})$ ,  $\bar{p} \geq p$ , of sections of  $\mathbb{V}|_{\mathcal{U}}$  generating all other sections of  $\mathbb{V}|_{\mathcal{U}}$  over the ring of  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  functions, i.e. the sheaf is *locally finite generated*. Conversely, one can directly check that for any subsheaf  $\mathbb{V} \subset \mathcal{T}\mathcal{M}$  satisfying (a) and (b), the set  $V$  of all local sections of  $\mathbb{V}$  together with the family of the vector spaces  $\mathcal{D}_x^V = \text{Span}(\mathbb{V}_x) \subset T_x \mathcal{M}$  gives a generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D}^V)$  in the above sense.

A curve  $\gamma$  is said to be *tangent to the generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$*  if for one (hence, for all) regular parameterisation  $\gamma(t)$  of the curve, the velocities  $\dot{\gamma}(t)$  are such

that  $\dot{\gamma}(t) \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma(t)}$  for any  $t$ . A piecewise regular curve  $\gamma = \gamma_1 * \gamma_2 * \dots * \gamma_r$  is *tangent to*  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  if each of its regular arcs has this property. We call any such  $\gamma$  a  $\mathcal{D}$ -*path*.

The following relation between points of  $\mathcal{M}$

$$x \sim x' \text{ if and only if there is a } \mathcal{D}\text{-path with endpoints } x \text{ and } x' \quad (2.2)$$

is an equivalence relation. Indeed, in order to check that (2.2) is reflexive, symmetric and transitive, it suffices to recall that each (regular) curve, which is tangent to  $\mathcal{D}$  at all points, is simultaneously the image of a regular parameterisation  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  and of its “inverse” regular parameterisation  $\bar{\gamma} : [-b, -a] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\bar{\gamma}(t) := \gamma(-t)$ . The equivalence classes of such relation are called  $\mathcal{D}$ -*path components* of  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $\mathcal{M}$  consists of just one  $\mathcal{D}$ -path component, we say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -*path connected*.

### 3. DISTRIBUTIONS OF UNIFORM $\mu$ -TYPE AND RASHEVSKIĬ'S THEOREM

**3.1. Distributions of uniform  $\mu$ -type.** Let  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  be a generalised distribution on a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ . We denote by  $V^{\text{Lie}}$  the smallest family of smooth local vector fields on  $\mathcal{M}$ , which contains all local vector fields  $X \in V$  and is closed under Lie brackets and under the standard operations of sum and multiplication by smooth real functions. An equivalent *constructive* (and more formal) definition of  $V^{\text{Lie}}$  is given in the language of “germs” and “sheaves” as follows.

First of all, let us fix some notational convention. We denote sheaves of germs of smooth vector fields on  $\mathcal{M}$  by underlined calligraphic symbols, as e.g.  $\underline{\mathcal{A}}, \underline{\mathcal{B}}$ , etc. Moreover, given a generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$ , we denote by  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}$  the sheaf of the germs of the (local) smooth vector fields that are in  $V$ . We recall that the standard operations  $+$  and  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  of sum and Lie brackets between vector fields induce natural corresponding operations between germs of vector fields. Given two sheaves  $\underline{\mathcal{A}}, \underline{\mathcal{B}}$  of germs of vector fields, we denote by

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}} + \underline{\mathcal{B}} \quad \text{and} \quad [\underline{\mathcal{A}}, \underline{\mathcal{B}}]$$

the sheaves given by sums and Lie brackets, respectively, of the germs in  $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{B}}$ . In this way, for any generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  we may consider the following increasing sequence of sheaves:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-1)} &:= \underline{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-2)} &:= \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-1)} + [\underline{\mathcal{D}}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-1)}], \\ \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-3)} &:= \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-2)} + [\underline{\mathcal{D}}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-2)}], \\ &\text{etc.} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

A simple inductive argument based on the Jacobi identity shows that if  $X, Y$  are two local smooth vector fields defined on a common open set  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$  and with germs in  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-m)}$ , respectively, then their Lie bracket  $[X, Y]$  is a vector field with germs in  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell-m)}$ . This means that *the above described class  $V^{\text{Lie}}$  of local vector fields on  $\mathcal{M}$  coincide with the class of all possible local vector fields, whose germs belong to one of the sheaves  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)}$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$* . In particular,  $V^{\text{Lie}}$  is closed under sum and Lie brackets of pairs of vector fields defined on common open sets.

We now observe that, for any fixed point  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , the values at  $x$  of the germs of  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)}$  give a linear subspace  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)}|_x$  of  $T_x\mathcal{M}$ , and determine a nested sequence of linear subspaces

$$\underline{\mathcal{D}}_x = \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-1)}|_x \subset \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-2)}|_x \subset \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-3)}|_x \subset \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-4)}|_x \subset \dots \quad (3.2)$$

We remark that if  $\ell$  is such that  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)}|_x = \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell-1)}|_x$  at all points  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , then  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)} = \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell-1)}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)} = \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell-s)}$  for any  $s \geq 1$ .

If there is a finite number  $1 \leq \nu$  for which the dimensions of the spaces  $\underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\ell)}|_x$  stabilise for all  $x \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\ell \geq \nu$ , we call *minimal depth* of  $\mathcal{D}$  the smallest integer  $\mu$  with this property. In the other cases, we say that the *minimal depth is infinite*.

**Definition 3.1.** A generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  is called *of uniform  $\mu$ -type* if

- it is of finite minimal depth  $\mu$ ;
- the family of vector spaces  $(\mathcal{D}_{-\mu})_x := \underline{\mathcal{D}}^{(-\mu)}|_x$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , is a regular distribution.

If  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  is of uniform  $\mu$ -type and  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}|_x = T_x\mathcal{M}$  for any  $x$ , the generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  is called *bracket generating*.

Notice that a generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  is of uniform  $\mu$ -type of depth  $\mu = 1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}$  is regular and involutive. In the other cases (regardless of being of uniform  $\mu$ -type or not) it is non-integrable.

The following simple lemma can be directly checked.

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  is a generalised distribution of uniform  $\mu$ -type, for any  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , there exists a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$  and a set of local generators  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_p)$  for  $V|_{\mathcal{U}}$ , such that the set of all vector fields of the form*

$$Y_{i_1}, \quad [Y_{i_1}, Y_{i_2}], \quad \dots \quad [Y_{i_1}, [Y_{i_2}, [\dots [Y_{i_{\mu-1}}, Y_{i_\mu}] \dots]]], \quad 1 \leq i_\ell \leq p,$$

*constitute a set of local generators (not necessarily pointwise linearly independent) for the regular distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ .*

**3.2. Rashevskii's Theorem for generalised distributions of uniform  $\mu$ -type.** Let  $(V, \mathcal{D})$  be a generalised distribution on  $\mathcal{M}$  of uniform  $\mu$ -type. In this case, the distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$  coincides with the distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\text{Lie})}$ , described in the Introduction and the class of the local vector fields in  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$  is the above considered set  $V^{\text{Lie}}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$  is *involutive*. Being also regular, by the classical Frobenius Theorem, for any  $y_o \in \mathcal{M}$  there exists a unique maximal integral leaf  $\mathcal{S}^{(y_o)}$  of  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$  passing through  $y_o$  and such a leaf coincides with the  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ -path component of  $y_o$  (see e.g. [12]).

Moreover, if we denote by  $M$  the rank of  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ ,  $M \leq \dim \mathcal{M}$ , any such integral leaf  $\mathcal{S}^{(y_o)}$  has the form  $\mathcal{S}^{(y_o)} = \iota(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})$  for an injective immersion  $\iota : \tilde{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  of an  $M$ -dimensional manifold  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ . In particular, for any  $y \in \mathcal{S}^{(y_o)}$ , there is a neighbourhood  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  of the point  $\tilde{y} = \iota^{-1}(y)$  such that  $\iota(\tilde{\mathcal{V}})$  is an  $M$ -dimensional embedded submanifold passing through  $y$ . In what follows, any set  $\iota(\tilde{\mathcal{V}})$  determined in this way will be called *neighbourhood of  $y$  of the intrinsic topology of  $\mathcal{S}^{(y_o)}$* .

We are now ready to state our generalisation of Rashevskii's result, originally established just for regular distributions.

**Theorem 3.3.** *If  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  is a generalised distribution of uniform  $\mu$ -type, the  $\mathcal{D}$ -path components of  $\mathcal{M}$  are equal to the  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ -path components, that is to the maximal integral leaves of the involutive distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -path connected if and only if  $\mathcal{D}$  is bracket generating.*

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.3

In this section we give a proof of Theorem 3.3, which can be taken as a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  version and for arbitrary codimension of the proof in [3], which holds under much weaker regularity assumptions. As we mentioned above, the details of this proof lead to Corollary 5.1 (see also [3, Thm. 4.4]) which give very useful information.

In the next subsection §4.1, two preliminary lemmas on iterated Lie brackets are given. The proof of Theorem 3.3 is in §4.2.

**4.1. Two lemmas on iterated Lie brackets.** Given two smooth (local) vector fields  $X, Y$  on a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ , it is well known that the commutator of their flows satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (\Phi_{-t}^X \circ \Phi_t^Y \circ \Phi_t^X \circ \Phi_{-t}^Y(y))|_{t=0} = -[Y, X]_y = [X, Y]_y \quad \text{for any } y. \quad (4.1)$$

This identity admits a generalisation for iterated flow commutators which we now discuss (see also [3]).

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_p$  be a  $p$ -tuple of smooth (locally defined) vector fields on an open subset  $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{M}$  and, for any ordered  $r$ -tuple of integers  $(i_1, \dots, i_r)$  with  $1 \leq i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r \leq p$ , let us denote by  $X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)}$  the vector field defined by

$$\begin{aligned} X_{(i_1)} &:= X_{i_1} && \text{if } r = 1, \\ X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)} &:= [X_{i_1}, [X_{i_2}, [X_{i_3}, \dots, [X_{i_{r-1}}, X_{i_r}] \dots]]] && \text{if } r > 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

For any iterated Lie bracket  $X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)}$ , we introduce the following one-parameter family of local diffeomorphisms  $G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t} : \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  which we define inductively on the integer  $r$  as follows:

- For  $r = 1$ , we set

$$G_{(k)t} := \Phi_t^{X_k}, \quad (4.3)$$

- Assuming that  $G_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m)t}$  is defined for any  $1 \leq m \leq r - 1$ , we set

$$G_{(k, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_{r-1})t} := \Phi_{-t}^{X_k} \circ G_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{r-1})t} \circ \Phi_t^{X_k} \circ (G_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{r-1})t})^{-1}. \quad (4.4)$$

By construction, the local diffeomorphism  $G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}$  smoothly depends on  $t$ . As it can be checked by an inductive argument, the map  $G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}$  is obtained by composing an appropriate set of flows, whose cardinality depends on  $r$  and is equal to

$$n_r = 2^{r-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} 2^j = 2^r + 2^{r-1} - 2. \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover

**Lemma 4.1.** *For any  $y \in \mathcal{V}$*

$$\begin{aligned} G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y) \Big|_{t=0} &= y, \\ \frac{dG_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} &= \frac{d^2 G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} = \dots = \frac{d^{r-1} G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt^{r-1}} \Big|_{t=0} = 0, \\ \frac{d^r G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt^r} \Big|_{t=0} &= r! X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)} \Big|_y. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

*Proof.* For  $r = 1$ , the equalities follow immediately from the definitions. Assume now that the claim is true for  $r = r_o - 1$  and let us prove it for  $r = r_o$ . Since the result is of local nature, with no loss of generality we may identify  $\mathcal{V}$  with an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and, for any integer  $v \geq 1$ , we may consider the map  $(t, y) \mapsto G_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_v)t}(y)$  as a smooth map from an open subset of  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N$  into  $\mathbb{R}^N$ :

$$G_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_v)} : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \times \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N.$$

According to this identification, a vector field  $X = X^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$  can be identified with the  $t$ -independent map

$$X : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \times \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N, \quad X := (X(t, y) = (X^1(y), \dots, X^N(y))).$$

By inductive hypothesis,

$$\frac{\partial^\ell G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})t}(y)}{\partial t^\ell} \Big|_{t=0} = 0, \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq r_o - 2, \quad \frac{\partial^{r_o-1} G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})t}(y)}{\partial t^{r_o-1}} \Big|_{t=0} = (r_o - 1)! X_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})}(y), \quad (4.7)$$

or, equivalently, considering the Taylor expansion with respect to  $t$  up to order  $r_o - 1$

$$G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})t}(y) = y + X_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})}(y)t^{r_o-1} + \mathbf{r}_{r_o-1}(y, t), \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}_{r_o-1}(y, t) = o(t^{r_o-1})$  for any  $y$ . Note also that, for any given  $t$ , a local inverse map  $(G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})t})^{-1}$  from an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  into  $\mathbb{R}^N$  has the form

$$(G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})t})^{-1}(y) = y - X_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})}(y)t^{r_o-1} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}_{r_o-1}(y, t), \quad (4.9)$$

where, again,  $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_{r_o-1}(y, t) = o(t^{r_o-1})$  for any  $y$ . We now introduce the two-parameter family of local diffeomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})} : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \times \mathcal{V} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t,s)}(y) &:= \left( \Phi_{-t}^{X_{i_1}} \circ G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})s} \circ \Phi_t^{X_{i_1}} \circ (G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})s})^{-1} \right)(y). \end{aligned}$$

and notice that

$$G_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})t}(y) = \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t,t)}(y) \quad \text{for any } y.$$

From (4.7) the derivatives in  $t$  and  $s$  at  $(0, 0)$  of the maps  $\tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t,s)}$  are such that:

(i) For  $1 \leq j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^j \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t,s)}(y)}{\partial s^j} \Big|_{(0,0)} &= \frac{\partial^j}{\partial s^j} \left( \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(0,s)}(y) \right) \Big|_{s=0} = \\ &= \frac{\partial^j}{\partial s^j} \left( \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N} \circ G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})s} \circ \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N} \circ (G_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})s})^{-1} \right)(y) \Big|_{s=0} = \frac{\partial^j}{\partial s^j} (\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N}(y)) \Big|_{s=0} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$



$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^j \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t, s)}(y)}{\partial t^j} \Big|_{(t=0, s=0)} &= \frac{\partial^j}{\partial t^j} \left( \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t, 0)}(y) \right) \Big|_{t=0} = \\ &= \frac{\partial^j}{\partial t^j} \left( \Phi_{-t}^{X_{i_1}} \circ \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N} \circ \Phi_t^{X_{i_1}} \circ \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N} \right) (y) \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{\partial^j}{\partial t^j} (\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N}(y)) \Big|_{t=0} = 0 ; \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

(ii) For  $1 \leq \ell \leq r_o - 2$  and  $j \geq 1$

$$\frac{\partial^{j+\ell} \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t, s)}(y)}{\partial t^j \partial s^\ell} \Big|_{(t=0, s=0)} = \frac{\partial^j}{\partial t^j} \left( \frac{\partial^\ell \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t, s)}(y)}{\partial s^\ell} \Big|_{(s=0)} \right) \Big|_{t=0} = 0 ; \quad (4.12)$$

(iii) For  $j = 1$  and  $\ell = r_o - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^{r_o} \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t, s)}(y)}{\partial t \partial s^{r_o-1}} \Big|_{(t=0, s=0)} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})(t, s)}(y)}{\partial s^{r_o-1}} \Big|_{(t, 0)} \right) \Big|_{t=0} = \\ &= (r_o - 1)! \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( (\Phi_{-t}^{X_{i_1}})_* \left( X_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})} \Big|_{\Phi_t^{X_{i_1}}(y)} \right) \right) \Big|_{t=0} + \\ &- (r_o - 1)! \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( (\Phi_{-t}^{X_{i_1}} \circ \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N} \circ \Phi_t^{X_{i_1}})_* \left( X_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})} \Big|_y \right) \right) \Big|_{t=0} = \\ &= (r_o - 1)! \mathcal{L}_{X_{i_1}} X_{(i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})} \Big|_y = (r_o - 1)! X_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})} \Big|_y , \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where we used the notation  $\mathcal{L}_Y(Z) = [Y, Z]$  for the classical Lie derivative of a vector field  $Z$  along a vector field  $Y$ . From (i) – (iii), it follows that  $\tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})}(t, s, y)$  has the form

$$\tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})}(t, s, y) = y + X_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})}(y) t s^{r_o-1} + \mathfrak{A}(y, t, s) , \quad (4.14)$$

where  $\mathfrak{A}(y, t, s)$  is a smooth function of  $(y, t, s)$  which is infinitesimal of order higher than  $r_o$  with respect to  $|t, s|$  for any given  $y$ . This implies that

$$G_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})t}(y) = \tilde{G}_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r_o})}(t, t, y) = y + X_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{r_o})}(y) t^{r_o} + \mathfrak{r}_{r_o}(y, t) , \quad (4.15)$$

and hence that (4.6) is true for  $r = r_o$  as well.  $\square$

Now, for any vector field  $X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)}$ , we consider the following associated one-parameter family of local diffeomorphisms (defined only for  $t \geq 0$ )

$$g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t} := G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^{\frac{1}{r}} . \quad (4.16)$$

From (4.6) it follows that:

- (i)  $g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t=0}(y) = y$ ;
- (ii) On  $t > 0$ , the family is smoothly depending on  $t$  and at  $t = 0$  the first derivative  $\frac{dg_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{dg_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt}$  is well defined and equal to

$$\frac{dg_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} = X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)} \Big|_y ; \quad (4.17)$$

- (iii) For  $t > 0$ , the point  $g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)$  and the Jacobian  $J(g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}) \Big|_y$  of the local diffeomorphism  $g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}$  are continuous and such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y) = y , \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} J(g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}) \Big|_y = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^N} . \quad (4.18)$$

With these properties, we are now ready to prove the next lemma. In the statement, the norms  $\|\cdot\|$  of vectors are determined by some choice of a Riemannian metric (it does not matter which) on  $\mathcal{V}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *For any vector field  $X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)}$ , a relatively compact subset  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$  and a prescribed real number  $\eta > 0$ , there is a  $0 < \delta_o = \delta_o(\eta, \mathcal{V}')$  and a 1-parameter family of local diffeomorphisms  $f_t^{(\delta)} : \mathcal{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ ,  $t \in (-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2})$  associated with any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_o)$ , smoothly depending on  $t$ , which satisfies the following conditions:*

(1) *Each local diffeomorphism  $f_t^{(\delta)} : \mathcal{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ ,  $t \in (-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2})$ , has the structure*

$$f_t^{(\delta)} = \Phi_{\sigma_{2A}(t)}^{X_{\ell_A}} \circ \Phi_{\sigma_{2A-1}(t)}^{X_{\ell_{A-1}}} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{\sigma_{A+1}(t)}^{X_{\ell_1}} \circ \Phi_{\sigma_A(t)}^{X_{\ell_1}} \circ \Phi_{\sigma_{A-1}(t)}^{X_{\ell_2}} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{\sigma_1(t)}^{X_{\ell_A}}, \quad (4.19)$$

*for appropriate integers  $A, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_A \geq 1$  and real  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  functions  $\sigma_j(t)$ ;*

(2)  $f_{t=0}^{(\delta)} = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{V}'}$ ;

(3) *For all  $y \in \mathcal{V}'$  the derivative  $\left. \frac{df_t^{(\delta)}(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0}$  is such that*

$$\left\| \left. \frac{df_t^{(\delta)}(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} - X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)}|_y \right\| < \eta.$$

*Proof.* For any sufficiently small  $\delta$  we define

$$h_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta := g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)\delta}^{-1} \circ g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t+\delta}, \quad t \in \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right). \quad (4.20)$$

Note that each  $h_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta$  satisfies the following three conditions:

- (A)  $h_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t=0}^\delta(y) = y$ ;
- (B) The one-parameter family of local diffeomorphisms  $t \mapsto h_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta$  is smoothly depending on  $t$ ;
- (C) The first derivative with respect to  $t$  at  $t = 0$  and at the point  $y$  is the vector

$$\left. \frac{dh_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \left( g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)\delta}^{-1} \right)_* \left( \left. \frac{dg_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=\delta} \right) \quad (4.21)$$

and depends continuously on  $\delta > 0$ . Moreover, by the properties (ii) and (iii) of the maps  $g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}$  and estimating the difference

$$\left. \frac{dh_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} - X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)}|_y \quad (4.22)$$

by means of the integral form for the remainder  $\mathfrak{r}_r(y, t)$  in (4.15), one can check the existence of a constant  $C_{\mathcal{V}'}$  for any relatively compact subset  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$  such that

$$\left\| \left. \frac{dh_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} - X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)}|_y \right\| < C_{\mathcal{V}'} \delta^{\frac{1}{r}} \quad \text{for any } y \in \mathcal{V}'. \quad (4.23)$$

Furthermore, writing explicitly the local diffeomorphisms  $G_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}$  in terms of the flows  $\Phi_t^{X_{j\ell}}$  and substituting such explicit expressions in the definition of  $g_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}$ , one can check that each local diffeomorphisms  $h_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta$  has the form (4.19) with the  $\sigma_j(t)$  that are either smooth functions of the form  $\sigma_j(t) = \pm(t+\delta)^{\frac{1}{r}}$  or constant functions of the form

$\sigma_j(t) \equiv \pm \delta^{\frac{1}{r}}$ . From this it follows that the one-parameter family of local diffeomorphisms  $f_t^{(\delta)} := h_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)t}^\delta$  satisfies (1) and (2). Moreover, from (4.23), there exists  $\delta = \delta(\eta, \mathcal{V}') > 0$  such that  $f_t^{(\delta)}$  satisfies (3) as well.  $\square$

**4.2. Proof of Theorem 3.3.** For any fixed point  $x_o \in \mathcal{M}$ , let us denote by  $\mathcal{T}^{(x_o)}$  the  $\mathcal{D}$ -path connected component of  $x_o$  and by  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  the maximal integral leaf through  $x_o$  of the involutive distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ , that is the  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ -path component of  $\mathcal{M}$  containing  $x_o$ . Since  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ , the  $\mathcal{D}$ -path component  $\mathcal{T}^{(x_o)}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$ . Being  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  (pathwise) connected, the theorem is proved if we can show that  $\mathcal{T}^{(x_o)}$  is an open and closed subset of  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  in its intrinsic topology. As a matter of fact, it suffices to show that, for any  $y \in \mathcal{S}^{(x_o)} = \iota(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})$ , the  $\mathcal{D}$ -path connected component  $\mathcal{T}^{(y)}$  of  $y$  is an open subset of  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$ . This would directly imply that the sets  $\mathcal{T}^{(x_o)}$  and  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)} \setminus \mathcal{T}^{(x_o)} = \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{S}^{(x_o)} \setminus \mathcal{T}^{(x_o)}} \mathcal{T}^{(y)}$  are both open in  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$ .

Let  $M := \text{rank } \mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ . Given  $y \in \mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$ , let us consider local generators for the quasi-regular set  $V$  of the generalised distribution  $(V, \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^V)$  nearby  $y$ , i.e. a  $p$ -tuple of vector fields  $(X_1, \dots, X_p)$  on a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $y$  such that any vector field  $Y \in V|_{\mathcal{V}}$  has the form

$$Y = f^i X_i \quad \text{for some smooth } f^i : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

As in §4.1, for any  $1 \leq r \leq \mu$  and any ordered  $r$ -tuple of integers  $(i_1, \dots, i_r)$  with  $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_{r-1} < i_r \leq p$ , we denote

$$X_{(i_1, \dots, i_r)} := [X_{i_1}, [X_{i_2}, [X_{i_3}, \dots, [X_{i_{r-1}}, X_{i_r}] \dots]]] \quad \text{if } r > 1. \quad (4.24)$$

By Lemma 3.2 and the hypothesis of uniform  $\mu$ -type, we may consider  $M$  vector fields  $Y_1, \dots, Y_M$ , each of them of the form  $Y_\ell = X_{(i_1(\ell), \dots, i_{r_\ell}(\ell))}$  for some choice of the indices  $i_j(\ell)$ , that are pointwise linearly independent and generate the involutive *regular* distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$  on the neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $y$ .

By Lemma 4.2, for any choice of  $\eta > 0$  we may consider a relatively compact neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$  of  $y$ , a real number  $\delta = \delta(\eta, \mathcal{V}') > 0$  and a collection of  $M$  one-parameter families of local diffeomorphisms  $f_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}$ , with  $t$  varying in  $(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2})$ , each of them defined on  $\mathcal{V}'$  and satisfying (1) – (3) for the vector fields  $Y_\ell = X_{(i_1(\ell), \dots, i_{r_\ell}(\ell))}$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq M$ . In particular

$$f_{t=0}^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y) = y, \quad \left\| \frac{df_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} - Y_\ell|_y \right\| = \left\| \frac{df_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} - X_{(i_1(\ell), \dots, i_{r_\ell}(\ell))}|_y \right\| < \eta. \quad (4.25)$$

We stress the fact that (4.19) implies that, for any  $1 \leq \ell \leq M$ ,  $t \in (-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2})$  and  $z \in \mathcal{V}'$ , the image  $z' := f_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(z)$  is the endpoint of a  $\mathcal{D}$ -path of the form

$$\gamma = \gamma_1 * \dots * \gamma_A * \gamma'_A * \dots * \gamma'_1$$

where the regular arcs  $\gamma_j$  and  $\gamma'_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq A$ , are integral curves of vector fields  $X_{k_j}$  which belong to the set of generators  $\{X_1, \dots, X_p\}$  for the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . In particular *any point  $z' := f_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(z)$  is in the same  $\mathcal{D}$ -path connected component of  $z$ .*

Now, let  $\delta > 0$  be a sufficiently small number such that the composed map

$$F^{(\delta,y)} : \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^M \subset \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}, \quad F^{(\delta,y)}(s^1, \dots, s^M) := f_{s^1}^{(\delta)(1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{s^M}^{(\delta)(M)}(y) \quad (4.26)$$

is well defined and of class  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ . By construction and the above remark, we have:

- Any point  $z = F^{(\delta,y)}(s^1, \dots, s^M)$  is the image of the prescribed point  $y$  under a diffeomorphism which is obtained composing maps of the form (4.19) and hence it is connected to  $y$  by a  $\mathcal{D}$ -path;
- In any set of coordinates, the columns of the Jacobian  $J(F^{(\delta,y)})|_{(0,\dots,0)}$  are given by the coordinate components of the vectors

$$\left. \frac{df_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = Y_\ell|_y + \left( \left. \frac{df_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} - Y_\ell|_y \right) \quad \text{with} \quad \left\| \left. \frac{df_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} - Y_\ell|_y \right\| < \eta. \quad (4.27)$$

Since the  $Y_\ell|_y$  are linearly independent (thus with components forming a matrix of rank  $M$ ), by the semicontinuity of the rank, for any sufficiently small  $\eta$  and a corresponding choice for the parameter  $\delta = \delta(\eta, \mathcal{V})$ , the vectors  $\left. \frac{df_t^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{dt} \right|_{t=0}$  are linearly independent and the Jacobian  $J(F^{(\delta,y)})|_{(0,\dots,0)}$  has rank  $M = \text{rank } \mathcal{D}_{-\mu}$ . By the Inverse Function Theorem, this implies that, for a sufficiently small neighbourhood  $\mathcal{U} \subset \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^M \subset \mathbb{R}^M$  of  $0_{\mathbb{R}^M}$ , the image  $F^{(\delta,y)}(\mathcal{U})$  is an  $M$ -dimensional submanifold of  $\mathcal{M}$ , which contains  $y = F^{(\delta,y)}(0)$  and is entirely included in  $\mathcal{T}^{(y)} \subset \mathcal{S}^{(y)} = \mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$ . If  $\mathcal{U}$  is sufficiently small,  $F^{(\delta,y)}(\mathcal{U})$  is open in one of the sets  $\mathcal{W} = \iota(\tilde{\mathcal{W}}) \subset \mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  of the intrinsic topology of  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)} = \iota(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})$  which are embedded submanifolds of  $\mathcal{M}$ . By the arbitrariness of  $y$  and the remarks at the beginning of the proof, it follows that  $\mathcal{T}^{(x_o)}$  is open and closed in the intrinsic topology of  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$ .  $\square$

## 5. A COROLLARY OF THE PROOF

In the next corollary, we give the information, which can be derived from the above proof of Theorem 3.3 and which we advertised at the beginning of §4. But before stating it, a preliminary clarification is in need. As we pointed out in the previous section, for any fixed point  $y \in \mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$  and any choice of a sufficiently small  $\delta$  (i.e. of a sufficiently small domain), the map  $F^{(\delta,y)}$  takes values in a relatively compact subset  $\mathcal{W} = \iota(\tilde{\mathcal{W}})$  of  $\mathcal{S}^{(x_o)}$ , which contains  $y$  and is an  $M$ -dimensional embedded submanifold of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Such  $\mathcal{W}$  can be assumed to be contained in a prescribed relatively compact neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{M}$  of  $y$ . With no loss of generality, we may assume that the neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}$  admits a set of coordinates for the  $N$ -dimensional manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  with the properties that: (a)  $y$  corresponds to the origin  $y = 0_{\mathbb{R}^N}$ ; (b)  $\mathcal{W}$  is the  $M$ -dimensional submanifold of  $\mathcal{V}$  obtained by imposing each of the last  $N - M$  coordinates equal to 0. As a consequence, the first  $M$  coordinates of this chart represent also a set of coordinates for the submanifold  $\mathcal{W}$ . From now on, *we use such coordinates to identify  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  as open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^M$  and  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , respectively*. In this way the map  $F^{(\delta,y)}$  can be taken as a smooth map between two open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^M$ , which maps 0 into itself, and we may use the standard Euclidean metric of  $\mathbb{R}^M$  to determine distances between points and norms of vectors.

We now claim that, after fixing a point  $y_o \in \mathcal{V}$ , there exists a sufficiently small compact neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}_o \subset \mathcal{V}$  of  $y_o$  and a positive real number  $\delta_{\max} = \delta_{\max}(y_o, \mathcal{V}) > 0$ , depending on  $y_o$  and  $\mathcal{V}$ , such that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_{\max})$ , each corresponding map  $F^{(\delta, y)}$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{V}_o$ , is well defined on the hypercube  $[-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}]^M$ . This can be checked as follows. We recall that each map  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  is obtained by applying to  $y$  a composition of the local diffeomorphisms  $f_s^{(\delta)(i)}$  with an appropriate sequence of flow parameters. The latter are in turn appropriate finite compositions of the flows of the vector fields  $X_i$ , so that  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  itself is determined by applying to  $y$  a finite composition of flows. We now observe that there exists at least one interval of definition  $I_{\max} = [-\varepsilon_{\max}, \varepsilon_{\max}] \subset \mathbb{R}$  which is common to all integral curves  $t \mapsto \gamma(t)$  of the vector fields  $X_i$  that start from points of the relatively compact open set  $\mathcal{V}$ . There is also a possibly smaller relatively compact neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}'$  of  $y_o$  and a smaller interval  $I'_{\max} = [-\varepsilon'_{\max}, \varepsilon'_{\max}] \subset I_{\max}$  with the property that all of the above integral curves starting from points in  $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$  have their final points in  $\mathcal{V}$ . By construction, the composition  $\Phi_s^{X_i} \circ \Phi_{\tilde{s}}^{X_j}(y)$  is well defined for any  $y \in \mathcal{V}'$  and  $s, \tilde{s} \in [-\varepsilon'_{\max}, \varepsilon'_{\max}]$ . Iterating this argument, after a finite number of reductions  $\mathcal{V} \supset \mathcal{V}' \supset \mathcal{V}'' \supset \dots$  and  $I_{\max} \supset I'_{\max} \supset I''_{\max} \supset \dots$  of the open set  $\mathcal{V}$  and of the interval  $I_{\max}$ , one ends up with a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}_o$  of  $y_o$  and a real number  $\check{\varepsilon}_{\max}$  such the composition of the flows which appears in the definitions of the maps  $F^{(\delta, y)}$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{V}_o$ , is well defined for the flow parameters running in the interval  $[-\check{\varepsilon}_{\max}, \check{\varepsilon}_{\max}]$ . We finally recall that, in the definition of  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  the flow parameters are either equal to a constant (which depend continuously on  $\delta$ ) or are given by continuous functions of the arguments  $(s^i) = (s^1, \dots, s^M)$  of  $F^{(\delta, y)}$ . This implies the existence of a real number  $\delta_{\max} = \delta_{\max}(\mathcal{V}, y_o) > 0$  such that if  $\delta \in (0, \delta_{\max})$ , all flow parameters occurring in the construction of  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  take values in  $[-\check{\varepsilon}_{\max}, \check{\varepsilon}_{\max}]$  whenever the arguments  $(s^i)$  of  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  are in the hypercube  $[-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}]^M$ . This implies that  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\mathcal{V}_o$  have the required property. With no loss of generality, we may also assume  $\delta_{\max} < 1$ .

In the next statement and throughout its proof, for any relatively compact set  $\mathcal{V}_o \subset \mathcal{M}$  and any function  $f : \mathcal{V}_o \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is  $\mathcal{C}^k$  up to the boundary, we denote

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^k(\mathcal{V}_o)} := \max\{1, \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^k(\mathcal{V}_o)}\}.$$

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_M\}$  be a fixed choice of generators for the distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{-\mu}|_{\mathcal{V}}$  of the form  $Y_\ell = X_{(i_1(\ell), \dots, i_{r_\ell}(\ell))}$ , with  $(X_i)$  generators for  $\mathcal{D}$ , and denote by  $\mathcal{V}_o$  and  $0 < \delta_{\max} = \delta_{\max}(\mathcal{V}) < 1$  a relatively compact neighbourhood of a point  $y_o \in \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{M}$  and a corresponding real number such that the property described above holds.*

Assume that  $\left| \det \left( Y_i^j(y) \right)_{1 \leq i, \ell \leq M} \right|$  is bounded away from 0 in  $\mathcal{V}_o$ , Then there are constants  $K, K' > 0$ , depending just on  $M = \dim \mathcal{W}$ ,  $N = \dim \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mu$ , such that for any  $y \in \mathcal{V}_o$  and any  $C_0, C_1 > 0$  satisfying

$$C_0 \leq \inf_{y \in \mathcal{V}_o} \left| \det \left( Y_i^j(y) \right)_{1 \leq i, \ell \leq M} \right|, \quad \sum_{j, \ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \leq C_1, \quad (5.1)$$

the image of the map  $F^{(\delta_o, y)} : (-\frac{\delta_o}{2}, \frac{\delta_o}{2})^M \subset \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  contains the ball  $B_{\mathbf{r}_o}(y)$ , centred at  $y \equiv 0_{\mathbb{R}^m}$  and of radius

$$\mathbf{r}_o := K' \delta_o \frac{\min\{C_0, C_0^2\}}{C_1^{N(\mu, M)}}, \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$\delta_o := \min \left\{ K \frac{C_0^\mu}{C_1^{\mu \mathbf{N}(\mu, M)}}, \delta_{\max} \right\}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{N}(\mu, M) := 6(2^\mu + 2^{\mu-1} - 2)(\mu + 3)M(2M + 1). \quad (5.3)$$

**Remark 5.2.** Corollary 5.1 shows that, if there are upper and lower bounds as in (5.1) for any  $y_o \in \mathcal{M}$ , then for any point  $y_o$  of the manifold there exist a neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}_o$  and a real number  $\delta_o > 0$  such that all maps  $F^{(\delta_o, y)}$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{V}_o$ , are surjective onto balls, each of them with a radius  $\mathbf{r}_o$  that is independent of  $y$ . This is the property that motivates our interest. In fact, under these hypotheses, if  $y_k$  is a sequence converging to a point  $y_o$ , then for any sufficiently large  $k$  the image of the corresponding map  $F^{(\delta_o, y_k)}$  contains a whole neighbourhood of  $y_o$ . Similarly, given a sequence of uniform  $\mu$ -type distributions  $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ , admitting a set of generators  $\{Y_1^{(k)}, \dots, Y_M^{(k)}\}$  that converge (in an appropriate norm) to a set of generators  $\{Y_1^{(\infty)}, \dots, Y_M^{(\infty)}\}$  for a limit distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\infty)}$ , a pair of uniform bounds as in (5.1) for the distributions  $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$  imply the existence of balls of appropriate radii in the images of the maps  $F^{(\delta_o, y)}$  of the limit distribution  $\mathcal{D}^{(\infty)}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\eta$  be the real number  $\eta = \frac{1}{2} \det \left( Y_i^j |_{y=0} \right)_{1 \leq i, \ell \leq M}$ . Via a reordering of the generators, we may assume that  $\eta > 0$ . Let us use such a value in the construction of the map  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  given in §4.2. We recall that for any  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{\max}$  and any  $y \in \mathcal{V}_o$ , the corresponding map  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  is well defined on  $[-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}]^M \subset \mathbb{R}^M$  and is determined as an appropriate composition of maps

$$f_s^{(\delta)(\ell)}(z) := g_{I_\ell \delta}^{-1} \circ g_{I_\ell s + \delta}(z), \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq M, \quad (5.4)$$

where:

- $I_\ell := (i_1(\ell), \dots, i_{r_\ell}(\ell))$  denotes the tuple of integers such that  $Y_\ell = X_{I_\ell} = X_{(i_1(\ell), \dots, i_{r_\ell}(\ell))}$ ,
- $g_{I_\ell t} = G_{I_\ell t}^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}$  where  $G_{I_\ell t}$  is the composition of flows of the vector fields  $X_j$ , given by (4.3) and (4.4).

Moreover, we may take  $\delta = \delta(\eta)$  sufficiently small (with no loss of generality, we may also assume  $\delta \leq \eta$ ) such that

$$\left\| \frac{df_s^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{ds} \Big|_y - Y_\ell \Big|_y \right\| = \left\| \frac{dg_{I_\ell \delta}^{-1} \circ g_{I_\ell s + \delta}(y)}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} - Y_\ell \Big|_y \right\| < \eta = \frac{1}{2} \det \left( Y_i^j |_{y=0} \right)_{1 \leq i, \ell \leq M}. \quad (5.5)$$

We want to determine an estimate for such a  $\delta = \delta(\eta)$ . This can be derived from a common upper bound for the second derivatives with respect to  $s$  of the maps (5.4) at the points  $z \in \mathcal{V}_o$ . This is what we are now going to compute. By (4.8) the map  $g_{I_\ell s + \delta}(z) = G_{I_\ell(s+\delta)}^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}(z)$  admits the expansion

$$g_{I_\ell s + \delta}(z) = z + X_{I_\ell}(z)(s + \delta) + \mathbf{r}_{r_\ell}(z, (s + \delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}), \quad (5.6)$$

where the map  $(z, s) \mapsto \mathbf{r}_{r_\ell}(z, (s + \delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}})$  can be explicitly determined from the remainder  $\mathbf{r}_{r_\ell}(z, t)$  in (4.15), written in integral form.

We now observe that, for any  $z \in \mathcal{V}_o$ , being each map  $t \mapsto \Phi_t^{X_\ell}(z)$  an integral curve of the vector field  $X_\ell$ , each of its partial derivatives at  $z$  with respect to  $t$  and/or the coordinates  $z^i$  is equal either to a polynomial function (of order less than or equal to the order of the considered derivative) of the coordinate components of the vector field  $X_\ell$  and their partial derivatives, or to the value of a solution of an ordinary differential equation with independent variable  $t$  and coefficient given by the same partial derivatives of the components of  $X_\ell$ . In all cases, upper bounds for such partial derivatives of order  $k$  can be determined by powers of upper bounds for the partial derivatives of the components of the  $X_\ell$  up to the same order  $k$ . Assuming that the latter upper bounds are greater than 1, up to a multiplicative constant the power  $k$  of these upper bounds give a bound for all partial derivatives up to  $k$ . On the other hand, each map  $(t, z) \mapsto G_{I_\ell t}(z)$  is a composition of flows  $(t', z') \mapsto \Phi_{t'}^{X_\ell}(z')$ , whose number is less than or equal to  $n_\mu := 2^\mu + 2^{\mu-1} - 2$  (see (4.5)). Combining these two observations it follows that all derivatives of  $k$ -th order,  $k \geq 1$ , of the maps  $(t, z) \mapsto G_{I_\ell t}(z)$  with respect to  $t$  and with respect to the coordinates  $z^i$ , are completely determined by the coordinate components of the vector fields  $X_\ell$  and of their partial derivatives up to order  $k$ . More precisely, upper bounds for such  $k$ -th order derivatives are determined (up to constants) by powers of order less than or equal to  $kn_\mu + 1 - k \leq n_\mu k$  of upper bounds greater than 1 for the derivatives up to order  $k$  of the coordinate components of the vector fields  $X_i$ .

Writing the rest  $\mathfrak{r}_{r_\ell}$  in (4.15) in its integral form, one gets

$$\mathfrak{r}_{r_\ell}(z, (s + \delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}) := \frac{1}{r_\ell!} \int_0^{(s+\delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}} ((s + \delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}} - \sigma)^{r_\ell} \frac{\partial^{r_\ell+1} G_{I_\ell \sigma}(z)}{\partial \sigma^{r_\ell+1}} d\sigma. \quad (5.7)$$

It follows that for any  $z \in \mathcal{V}_o$  and  $s \in (-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 g_{I_\ell s+\delta}(z)}{ds^2} &= \frac{1}{r_\ell!} \int_0^{(s+\delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}} \frac{d^2 ((s + \delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}} - \sigma)^{r_\ell} \partial^{r_\ell+1} G_{I_\ell \sigma}(z)}{ds^2 \partial \sigma^{r_\ell+1}} d\sigma = \\ &= \frac{1}{r_\ell!} \frac{r_\ell - 1}{r_\ell} \int_0^{(s+\delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}} \sigma \left( (s + \delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}} - \sigma \right)^{r_\ell-2} (s + \delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}-2} \frac{\partial^{r_\ell+1} G_{I_\ell \sigma}(z)}{\partial \sigma^{r_\ell+1}} d\sigma \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{r_\ell!} \frac{r_\ell - 1}{r_\ell} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{V}_o} \left| \frac{\partial^{r_\ell+1} G_{I_\ell \sigma}(z)}{\partial \sigma^{r_\ell+1}} \right| \left( \frac{3\delta}{2} \right)^{\frac{r_\ell-2}{r_\ell}} \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}-2} \int_0^{(s+\delta)^{\frac{1}{r_\ell}}} \sigma d\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Since  $r_\ell \leq \mu$ , this implies that there exists a constant  $K_1 > 0$  (depending only on  $M$ ,  $\mu$  and  $N$ ) such that

$$\left\| \frac{d^2 g_{I_\ell s+\delta}(z)}{ds^2} \right\| < K_1 \left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\mu+1}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{n_\mu(\mu+1)} \frac{1}{\delta^{1-\frac{1}{\mu}}}. \quad (5.9)$$

We observe that, being each map  $g_{I_\ell t}$  a composition of flows, also their inverse maps,  $g_{I_\ell t}^{-1}$  are composition of flows (one is obtained from the other by reversing the order of the considered flows and changing all parameters of the flows into their opposites). Then, using once again the expansion (5.6), the components  $J \left( g_{I_\ell \delta}^{-1}(z) \right)_j^i$  and  $J \left( g_{I_\ell \delta}(z) \right)_j^i$  of the Jacobian matrices of the maps  $z \rightarrow g_{I_\ell \delta}^{-1}(z)$  and  $z \rightarrow g_{I_\ell \delta}(z)$ , respectively, admit a

common upper bound of the form

$$J\left(g_{I_\ell}^{-1}(z)\right)_j^i, J\left(g_{I_\ell \delta}(z)\right)_j^i \leq \delta_j^i + K_2 \left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\mu+2}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{n_\mu(\mu+2)} \quad (5.10)$$

for some constant  $K_2 > 0$  (which, as before, depends just on  $M$ ,  $\mu$  and  $N$ ).

Combining (5.9) with (5.10) and with the definition of the map  $f_s^{(\delta)(\ell)}(z)$ , we infer the existence of a constant  $K_3 > 0$  (depending just on  $M$ ,  $\mu$  and  $N$ ), which allows to bound the second derivatives of the  $f_s^{(\delta)(\ell)}(z)$  with respect to  $s$  or with respect to  $\delta$  and  $s$  at any  $s_o \in \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$  and  $z \in \mathcal{V}_o$  by

$$\left\| \frac{d^2 f_s^{(\delta)(\ell)}(z)}{d\delta ds} \Big|_{s=s_o} \right\|, \left\| \frac{d^2 f_s^{(\delta)(\ell)}(z)}{ds^2} \Big|_{s=s_o} \right\| < K_3 \frac{\left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{3n_\mu(\mu+3)}}{\delta^{1-\frac{1}{\mu}}}. \quad (5.11)$$

From this we get the following. For any  $\delta \leq \delta_{\max}$ :

- There exists a constant  $K_4 > 0$ , depending only on  $M$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $N$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{df_s^{(\delta)(\ell)}(y)}{ds} \Big|_y - Y_\ell \Big|_y \right\| &\leq K_4 \frac{\left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{3n_\mu(\mu+3)}}{\delta^{1-\frac{1}{\mu}}} \delta < \\ &< K_4 \left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{3n_\mu(\mu+3)} \delta^{\frac{1}{\mu}}; \end{aligned}$$

This in turn implies that the inequality (5.5) holds for any  $\delta$  satisfying

$$\delta \leq \left( \frac{1}{2K_4} \right)^\mu \left( \frac{\det \left( Y_i^j \Big|_{y=0} \right)_{1 \leq i, \ell \leq M}}{\left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{3n_\mu(\mu+3)}} \right)^\mu. \quad (5.12)$$

- There exists a constant  $K_5 > 0$  such that for any two points  $\check{s} = (s^1, \dots, s^M)$ ,  $\check{s}' = (s'^1, \dots, s'^M)$  on which the map  $F^{(\delta, y)}$  is defined, the following estimate holds (we stress that the exponent  $6n_\mu(\mu+3)M$  appearing in the estimate might not be optimal; we also remind that, since  $\delta \leq \delta_{\max} < 1$ , then  $\delta < \delta^{1-\frac{1}{\mu}}$ , a property which is used to derive the second inequality)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| JF^{(\delta, y)} \Big|_{\check{s}} - JF^{(\delta, y)} \Big|_{\check{s}'} \right\| &\leq K_5 \frac{\left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{6n_\mu(\mu+3)M}}{\delta^{1-\frac{1}{\mu}}} |\check{s} - \check{s}'| < \\ &< K_5 \left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{6n_\mu(\mu+3)M} \sqrt{M}. \quad (5.13) \end{aligned}$$

Let us use this estimate to determine an (independent of  $\delta$  and  $y$ ) upper bound for the component of the matrix valued map  $\delta \rightarrow (JF^{(\delta, y)} \Big|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1}$ ,  $\delta > 0$ . For this, we recall that the components of  $\delta \rightarrow (JF^{(\delta, y)} \Big|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1}$  are rational functions of the components of  $\delta \rightarrow$



$(JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})$ , whose denominator is  $\det(JF^{(\delta,y)}|_0)$  and the numerator is a polynomial of degree  $M - 1$ . Hence, if we denote by  $D > 1$  an upper bound for the components of  $\delta \rightarrow (JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})$ , then, *up to a multiplicative constant*, the components of the map  $\delta \rightarrow (JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1}$  are bounded above by  $\frac{D^{M-1}}{C_0}$ . Using the same circle of ideas, which led to the estimates (5.11) and (5.13), it is possible to check that one can assume

$$D = \tilde{K} \left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{E}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{6n_\mu(\mu+3)M} \quad (5.14)$$

for some constant  $\tilde{K}$  depending only on  $N, M$  and  $\mu$ . Thus, setting  $K_6 := \tilde{K}^{M-1}$ , we get that the components of the map  $\delta \rightarrow (JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1}$  are bounded above by

$$\| (JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1} \| < \frac{K_6}{C_0} \left( \sum_{i,\ell} \left\| X_\ell^j \right\|_{\mathcal{E}^{\mu+3}(\mathcal{V}_o)} \right)^{6n_\mu(\mu+3)M^2} < K_6 \frac{C_1^{6n_\mu(\mu+3)M^2}}{C_0} . \quad (5.15)$$

We now recall that, from standard facts on the Inverse Function Theorem (see e.g. [6, Thm. 2.9.4]), if  $\mathbf{r} > 0$  is a real number such that

- (1) the ball of radius  $2\mathbf{r}\|(JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1}\|$  and centre  $\check{s} = 0$  is contained in the domain of  $F^{(\delta,y)}$  (i.e. if  $2\mathbf{r}\|(JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ );
- (2) the Lipschitz ratio  $\frac{\|JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}} - JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}'}\|}{|\check{s} - \check{s}'|}$  is less than or equal to  $\frac{1}{2\mathbf{r}\|(JF^{(\delta,y)}|_{\check{s}=0})^{-1}\|^2}$

then the image of  $F^{(\delta,y)}$  contains a ball of radius  $\mathbf{r}$  centred at  $y$ . From the estimate (5.13) and denoting  $\mathbf{N}(\mu, M) := 6n_\mu(\mu + 3)M(2M + 1)$ , we see that (1) and (2) are necessarily satisfied if  $\mathbf{r}$  is such that

$$\mathbf{r} \leq \frac{1}{4K_6} \frac{\delta C_0}{C_1^{\mathbf{N}(\mu, M)}} \left( < \frac{1}{4K_6} \frac{\delta C_0}{C_1^{6n_\mu(\mu+3)M^2}} \right), \quad \mathbf{r} \leq \frac{1}{2K_5 K_6^2} \frac{\delta^{\frac{\mu-1}{\mu}} C_0^2}{C_1^{\mathbf{N}(\mu, M)}} . \quad (5.16)$$

If we set (we recall that  $\delta_{\max} < 1$ )

$$\delta_o = \min \left\{ \delta_{\max}, \frac{1}{(2K_4)^\mu} \frac{C_0^\mu}{C_1^{\mu\mathbf{N}(\mu, M)}} \right\}, \quad \mathbf{r}_o = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4K_6}, \frac{1}{2K_5 K_6^2} \right\} \delta_o \frac{\min\{C_0, C_0^2\}}{C_1^{\mathbf{N}(\mu, M)}}, \quad (5.17)$$

then  $\delta_o$  is less than or equal to  $\delta_{\max}$  and verifies (5.12), both (1) and (2) are satisfied by  $(\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_o, \delta = \delta_o)$  and the ball  $B_{\mathbf{r}_o}(0)$  is contained in  $F^{(\delta_o, y)}((-\frac{\delta_o}{2}, \frac{\delta_o}{2})^M)$ . Denoting  $K := \frac{1}{(2K_4)^\mu}$ ,  $K' := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4K_6}, \frac{1}{2K_5 K_6^2} \right\}$ , the claim follows.  $\square$

**Example 5.3.** A hint of the possible applications of Corollary 5.1 might be obtained from the following simple example. Consider the 1-parameter family of pairs of vector fields  $(X_1^{(\lambda)}, X_2^{(\lambda)})$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , defined on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by

$$X_1^{(\lambda)} := \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}, \quad X_2^{(\lambda)} := \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + \left( x^1 + \lambda(x^1)^5 \sqrt{|x^1|} \rho(x^1, x^2, x^3) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3} \quad (5.18)$$

where we denote by  $\rho : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$  a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  bump function which is identically equal to 1 on the unit closed ball  $\overline{B_1(0)}$  and with support in the ball  $B_2(0)$  of radius 2. For any  $\lambda$  let us denote by  $(V^{(\lambda)}, \mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)})$  the pair given by the family  $V^{(\lambda)}$  of the local vector fields

of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  of the form  $Y := f_1 X_1^{(\lambda)} + f_2 X_2^{(\lambda)}$ , determined by  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  functions  $f_1, f_2$ , and the corresponding family of tangent subspaces, defined at each point by

$$\mathcal{D}_x^{(\lambda)} = \langle X_1^{(\lambda)}|_x, X_2^{(\lambda)}|_x \rangle.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{D}_o := \mathcal{D}^{(\lambda=0)}$  is the standard *contact structure* of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . It is a regular  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  distribution of uniform  $\mu$ -type with  $\mu = 2$ , and its associated distribution  $\mathcal{D}_o^{(\text{Lie})}$  coincides with  $T\mathbb{R}^3$ , being generated by the vector fields

$$Y_1 := X_1^{(\lambda=0)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}, \quad Y_2 := X_2^{(\lambda=0)} := \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} + x^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3}, \quad Y_3 = [X_1^{(\lambda=0)}, X_2^{(\lambda=0)}] = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3}.$$

As immediate consequence of Theorem 3.3, any two points  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^3$  can be joined by a  $\mathcal{D}_o$ -path, as is well known.

On the other hand, none of the pairs  $(V^{(\lambda)}, \mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)})$ ,  $\lambda \neq 0$ , fits into the class considered in Definition 2.1, because one of the two generators is not even  $\mathcal{C}^6$ . Nonetheless, it still makes sense to consider  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$ -paths (= piecewise regular curves that are tangent to the spaces of  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$  at all points) and to ask which pairs of points can be joined by  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$ -paths. Despite of the fact that Theorem 3.3 cannot be immediately used for the pairs  $(V^{(\lambda)}, \mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)})$ , using Corollary 5.1 one can prove that *any pair  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^3$  can be joined by a  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$ -path for any  $\lambda$  in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of 0.*

To see this, consider the triples  $(Y_i^{(\lambda)})_{i=1,2,3}$  of vector fields (depending on  $\lambda$ )

$$Y_1^{(\lambda)} := X_1^{(\lambda)}, \quad Y_2^{(\lambda)} := X_2^{(\lambda)}, \quad Y_3^{(\lambda)} := [X_1^{(\lambda)}, X_2^{(\lambda)}]. \quad (5.19)$$

Using just the definition, one can directly see that, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that the coordinate components  $X_i^{(\lambda)j}, Y_\ell^{(\lambda)j}$ , of the vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda)}, Y_\ell^{(\lambda)}$  satisfy

$$\max_{\substack{i=1,2 \\ j=1,2,3}} \|X_i^{(\lambda)j} - X_i^{(\lambda=0)j}\|_{\mathcal{C}^5(\overline{B_3(0)})}, \quad \max_{\substack{\ell=1,2,3 \\ j=1,2,3}} \|Y_\ell^{(\lambda)j} - Y_\ell^{(\lambda=0)j}\|_{\mathcal{C}^0(\overline{B_3(0)})} < \varepsilon \quad (5.20)$$

for any  $\lambda \in (-\delta, \delta)$ . Then, using the smoothness of the components of the vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda=0)}, Y_\ell^{(\lambda=0)}$ , we have that if  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small there are constants  $C_0, C_1$  such that the estimates (5.1) are satisfied over the ball  $\mathcal{V}_o = \overline{B_3(0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  by the coordinate components of the vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda)}, Y_\lambda^{(\ell)}$  for any  $\lambda \in (-\delta, \delta)$ .

Now, take a sequence of  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  functions  $f_k : [-2, 2] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , converging in  $\mathcal{C}^5$ -norm of  $[-2, 2]$  to the function  $f(s) = s^5 \sqrt{|s|}$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$  (a sequence of this kind can be determined using Bernstein polynomials – see e.g. [8]). Then, for each  $\lambda \in (-\delta, \delta)$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , consider the vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda/k)}, Y_\ell^{(\lambda/k)}$  which can be obtained from the vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda)}, Y_\ell^{(\lambda)}$  by simply replacing each occurrence of the expression  $f(x^1) = (x^1)^5 \sqrt{|x^1|}$  by  $f_k(x^1)$ . The new vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda/k)}$  (resp.  $Y_\ell^{(\lambda/k)}$ ) are  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  and their coordinate components converge to the components of the vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda)}$  (resp.  $Y_\ell^{(\lambda)}$ ) in the  $\mathcal{C}^5$ - (resp.  $\mathcal{C}^4$ -) norm on the compact set  $\overline{B_3(0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ . Thus, after possibly slightly adjusting the constants  $C_0$  and  $C_1$ , for a fixed  $\lambda \in (-\delta, \delta)$ , the estimates (5.1) hold on  $\mathcal{V}_o = \overline{B_3(0)}$  for  $X_i^{(\lambda/k)}, Y_\ell^{(\lambda/k)}$ ,  $k \geq k_o$ , with  $k_o$  sufficiently large.

By Corollary 5.1, for any  $y \in \overline{B_2(0)}$  and for a possibly larger  $k_o$ , for each  $k \geq k_o$  there is a map  $F^{(k)(\delta_o, y)} : (-\frac{\delta_o}{2}, \frac{\delta_o}{2})^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  with the following three properties:

- (i) Its domain is an hypercube  $(-\frac{\delta_o}{2}, \frac{\delta_o}{2})^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , which is independent of  $k$  and  $y$ ;

- (ii) Its image contains a ball  $B_{\mathbf{r}_o}(y)$ , whose radius  $\mathbf{r}_o$  is independent of  $k$  and  $y$ ;
- (iii) The points  $F^{(k)(\delta_o, y)}(s)$  are the images of  $y$  under an appropriate composition (defined in (4.26) and (4.19)) of flows of the vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda|k)}$ , which can be assumed to be determined by a construction that is independent of  $k$  and  $y$ .

This implies that, for each  $y \in \overline{B_2(0)}$  and for  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the smooth maps  $F^{(k)(\delta_o, y)}$  converge in  $\mathcal{C}^5$ -norm to a map  $F^{(\delta_o, y)} : \left(-\frac{\delta_o}{2}, \frac{\delta_o}{2}\right)^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ , such that (a) each point of  $\text{Im}(F^{(\delta_o, y)})$  is joined to  $y$  through a  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$ -path and (b)  $\text{Im}(F^{(\delta_o, y)})$  contains the ball  $B_{\mathbf{r}_o}(y)$ . Since  $\mathbf{r}_o$  is independent on  $y$ , a standard open and closed argument yields that any pair  $x, x' \in \overline{B_2(0)}$  is joined by a  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$ -path. Combining this with the fact that the  $X_i^{(\lambda)}$  are equal to the  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  vector fields  $X_i^{(\lambda=0)}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_2(0)$  (that is, on a region on which  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$  is a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  regular distribution to which Theorem 3.3 applies), we conclude that *any* pair of points  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is joined by a  $\mathcal{D}^{(\lambda)}$ -path if  $\lambda \in (-\delta, \delta)$ , as claimed.

This example illustrates how Corollary 5.1 can be exploited to derive sufficient conditions for the existence of piecewise regular curves, joining prescribed pairs of points and tangent to families  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_x\}$  of subspaces  $\mathcal{D}_x \subset T_x \mathcal{D}$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{M}$ , which do not satisfy the classical hypothesis of being generated by  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  vector fields. Results of this kind are useful tools for investigations in Control Theory. We also remark that the structure of the proof of Theorem 3.3 yielded the results in [4, 5], where a very similar line of argument has been used to get new local controllability criteria for non-linear real analytic control systems. This suggests further uses of Corollary 5.1 (or, more precisely, of appropriate modifications), as for instance to obtain improvements of the new criteria holding under regularities assumptions weaker than real analyticity.

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bagagiolo, C. Giannotti, A. Spiro and M. Zoppello, *Proving the Kalman criterion with flows and orbits*, in preparation.
- [2] W.-L. Chow, *Über Systeme von linearen partiellen Differentialgleichungen erster Ordnung*, Math. Ann. **117** (1939), 98–105.
- [3] E. Feleqi and F. Rampazzo, *Iterated Lie brackets for nonsmooth vector fields*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **24**, (2017), Paper No. 61, pp. 43.
- [4] C. Giannotti, A. Spiro and M. Zoppello, *Distributions and controllability problems (I)*, preprint posted in arxiv 2401.07555 (2024).
- [5] C. Giannotti, A. Spiro and M. Zoppello, *Distributions and controllability problems (II)*, preprint posted in arxiv 2401.07560 (2024).
- [6] J. H. Hubbard and B. B. Hubbard, *Vector calculus, linear algebra, and differential forms*. Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1999.
- [7] T. Nagano, *Linear differential systems with singularities and an application to transitive Lie algebras*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **18**, (1966), 398–404.
- [8] G. M. Phillips, *Interpolation and approximation by polynomials*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [9] P.K. Rashevskii, *About connecting two points of complete non-holonomic space by admissible curve* (in Russian), Uch. Zapiski Ped. Inst. K. **2** (1938), 83–94.
- [10] H. J. Sussmann, *Orbits of families of vector fields and integrability of distributions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **180** (1973), 171–188.
- [11] H. J. Sussmann and V. Jurdjevic, *Controllability of nonlinear systems*, J. Differential Equations **12**, (1972), 95–116.
- [12] F. W. Warner, *Foundations of Differentiable Manifolds and Lie groups*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.

MARTA ZOPPELLO  
DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE MATEMATICHE  
"G. L. LAGRANGE" (DISMA)  
POLITECNICO DI TORINO  
CORSO DUCA DEGLI ABRUZZI, 24,  
10129 TORINO  
ITALY

*E-mail:* [marta.zoppello@polito.it](mailto:marta.zoppello@polito.it)

CRISTINA GIANNOTTI & ANDREA SPIRO  
SCUOLA DI SCIENZE E TECNOLOGIE  
UNIVERSITÀ DI CAMERINO  
VIA MADONNA DELLE CARCERI  
I-62032 CAMERINO (MACERATA)  
ITALY

*E-mail:* [cristina.giannotti@unicam.it](mailto:cristina.giannotti@unicam.it)

*E-mail:* [andrea.spiro@unicam.it](mailto:andrea.spiro@unicam.it)