

HYPERBOLIC MOTIONS IN THE N -BODY PROBLEM WITH HOMOGENEOUS POTENTIALS

GUOWEI YU

ABSTRACT. In the N -body problem, a motion is called hyperbolic, when the mutual distances between the bodies go to infinity with non-zero limiting velocities as time goes to infinity. For Newtonian potential, in [9] Maderna and Venturelli proved that starting from any initial position there is a hyperbolic motion with any prescribed limiting velocities at infinity.

Recently based on a different approach, Liu, Yan and Zhou [7] generalized this result to a larger class of N -body problem. As the proof in [7] is quite long and technical, we give a simplified proof for homogeneous potentials following the approach given in the latter paper.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider the N -body problem in \mathbb{R}^d ($d \geq 2$) with α -homogeneous potential as below

$$(1) \quad U(q) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \frac{m_i m_j}{|q_i - q_j|^\alpha}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 2).$$

With m_i and q_i representing the mass and position of the i -th body, motion of the bodies can be described by the following equation

$$(2) \quad m_i \ddot{q}_i = -\alpha \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \frac{m_i m_j (q_i - q_j)}{|q_i - q_j|^{\alpha+2}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

When $\alpha = 1$, it is the Newtonian N -body problem.

Define the mass weighted inner product and norm on the configuration space $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{R}^{dN}$ as

$$\ll x, y \gg = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \langle x_i, y_i \rangle, \quad \|x\| = \sqrt{\ll x, x \gg}.$$

$\mathbb{S} = \{x \in \mathbb{E} : \|x\| = 1\}$ represents the set of normalized configurations.

Since the potential function U is not well-define on the collision set

$$(3) \quad \Delta = \{q \in \mathbb{E} : q_i = q_j \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq N\}.$$

Given an initial condition, the corresponding solution of (2) may not exist after a finite time. However it is believed (see [10] and [6]), these initial conditions should form a set with measure zero in the phase space. Now a fundamental question is what are the possible final motions of the bodies as time goes to infinity. This was first studied by Chazy in [1]. Among all possible final motions, one is called *hyperbolic*, which can be defined as below according to Chazy.

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

Definition 1.1. A solution $q(t)$, $t \in [t_0, \infty)$, of (2) is a hyperbolic motion, if there is a limiting velocity $\xi \in \hat{\mathbb{E}} = \mathbb{E} \setminus \Delta$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, i.e.,

$$(4) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{q}(t) = \xi \text{ or } q(t) = \xi t + o(t), \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Recall that energy $E(q(t))$ is conserved along a solution

$$(5) \quad E(q(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{q}(t)\|^2 - U(q(t)).$$

If h is the energy of a hyperbolic motion $q(t)$, then it must be positive, as

$$h = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E(q(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\dot{q}(t)\|^2 - U(q(t)) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \|\xi\|^2 > 0.$$

Then we can rewrite the asymptotic expression in (4) as below, if $v = \xi/\sqrt{2h} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}} = \mathbb{S} \setminus \Delta$,

$$(6) \quad q(t) = \sqrt{2h}vt + o(t), \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

This means v is also the limiting shape of the normalized configuration of $q(t)$, as

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} q(t)/\|q(t)\| = v.$$

For the Newtonian N -body problem, in [9] Maderna and Venturilli showed that starting from any initial configuration, there are hyperbolic motions with any asymptotic limiting velocities from $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ at infinity, as stated in Theorem 1.1. The motions were found as free-time minimizers based on the weak KAM theory. A crucial part of the proof is to establish the asymptotic expression (6). In [9], this was done indirectly using the continuous property of the limiting shape of hyperbolic motions at infinity, which were given by Chazy.

Recently in [7], Liu, Yan and Zhou gave a different proof of this result. In particular, they found a way to show the asymptotic expression directly. Moreover their approach works for a much larger class of N -body problem, as long as $U(q)$ satisfies certain conditions (including the α -homogeneous potential), for the details see [7, Theorem 1.4]. To obtain such a general result, the details in [7] are quite long and technical.

Since the α -homogeneous potential is most interesting to us and using the Lagrange-Jacobi identity (Lemma 2.5), one can significantly simplify the proof in Section 5 of [7] (see Lemma 2.8). We feel it is worth to write down this short note. However it must be emphasized that the main idea of our proof is from [7].

Theorem 1.1. *Given arbitrarily a positive energy h and asymptotic configuration $v \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{E}$, there is a hyperbolic motion $\gamma : [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$, which is collision-free of (2) for all $t \neq 0$ and satisfies*

$$\gamma(t_0) = x, \quad \gamma(t) = \sqrt{2h}tv + o(t), \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

In a recently preprint by Polimeni and Terracini [4], another approach to prove the above theorem when $\alpha = 1$ was given. Their idea is to look for minimizer of a normalized Lagrangian action with the desired asymptotic behavior. The advantage of such an approach is it can also be used to prove a similar result for hyperbolic-parabolic motion.

2. PRELIMINARY

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{E}$ and $T > 0$, let $\mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$ denote the set of absolute continuous paths defined on $[0, T]$, which go from x to y , and $\mathcal{C}(x, y) = \cup_{T>0} \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$. For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$, we define its length and h -modified Lagrangian action value as

$$(7) \quad \ell(\gamma|_{[0,T]}) = \int_0^T \|\dot{\gamma}\| dt \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) = \int_0^T \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\gamma}\|^2 + U(\gamma) + h \right) dt.$$

Lemma 2.1. *For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$, $\|y - x\| \leq \ell(\gamma|_{[0,T]}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}} \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T)$.*

Proof. While the first inequality is obvious, the second one follows from

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) \geq \int_0^T \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\gamma}\|^2 + h \right) dt \geq \sqrt{2h} \int_0^T \|\dot{\gamma}\| dt.$$

□

Definition 2.1. We say $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$ is a minimizer, if $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) = \phi_h(x, y; T)$, and an h -free-time minimizer, if $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) = \phi_h(x, y)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_h(x, y; T) &= \inf \{ \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) : \gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T) \}; \\ \phi_h(x, y) &= \inf \{ \phi_h(x, y; T) : T > 0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.1. *If $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$ is a minimizer, $\gamma|_{(0,T)}$ is a collision-free solution of (2).*

Remark 2.1. This is the well-known *Machal's Lemma*. A proof can be found in [2] for $\alpha = 1$ and in [5] for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. Notice that $\gamma(0)$ or $\gamma(T)$ may contain collision, if we choose x or $y \in \Delta$.

Lemma 2.2. *When $h > 0$ and $x \neq y \in \mathbb{E}$, the following properties hold.*

- (a). *There exists a $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) = \phi_h(x, y)$.*
- (b). *$\gamma|_{(0,T)}$ is collision-free solution of (2) with energy $E(\gamma(t)) \equiv h$.*
- (c). *For any $z \in \mathbb{E}$, $\phi_h(x, y) \leq \phi_h(x, z) + \phi_h(z, y)$.*

Proof. (a). By a standard argument in the direct method of calculus of variation, there exists a $\gamma_\tau \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; \tau)$ for some $\tau > 0$, such that $\mathcal{A}(\gamma_\tau; 0, \tau) = \phi_h(x, y; \tau)$. The Cauchy-Schwartz inequality then implies

$$\ell(\gamma_\tau|_{[0,\tau]}) = \int_0^\tau \|\dot{\gamma}_\tau\| dt \leq \sqrt{\tau} \left(\int_0^\tau \|\dot{\gamma}_\tau\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

As $x \neq y$, if $\tau \rightarrow 0$,

$$\phi_h(x, y; \tau) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau \|\dot{\gamma}_\tau\|^2 dt \geq \frac{1}{2\tau} (\ell(\gamma_\tau|_{[0,\tau]}))^2 \geq \frac{\|x - y\|^2}{2\tau} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Meanwhile $\phi_h(x, y; \tau) \geq h\tau \rightarrow \infty$, when $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

As a result, there must exist a $T > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) = \phi_h(x, y; T) = \inf_{\tau>0} \phi_h(x, y; \tau) = \phi_h(x, y).$$

(b). By Proposition 2.1, $\gamma|_{(0,T)}$ is a collision-free solution. Since γ is an h -free-time minimizer, it is well-known its energy must be h . For a detailed proof see [3, 3.3].

(c). The result is trivial, when $z = x$, $\phi_h(x, x) = 0$. The same argument holds for $z = y$.

When $z \neq x$ and $z \neq y$, there exist $\gamma_x \in \mathcal{C}(x, z)$ and $\gamma_y \in \mathcal{C}(z, y)$ satisfying

$$\int L(\gamma_x, \dot{\gamma}_x) + h dt = \phi_h(x, z), \quad \int L(\gamma_y, \dot{\gamma}_y) + h dt = \phi_h(z, y).$$

As the concatenation of γ_x and γ_y belongs to $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$, we have

$$\phi_h(x, y) \leq \phi_h(x, z) + \phi_h(z, y).$$

□

Lemma 2.3. *There are two positive constants β_1 and β_2 , such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{E}$ and $h > 0$,*

$$\phi_h(x, y) \leq (\beta_1 \|x - y\|^2 + \beta_2 \|x - y\|^{2-\alpha})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. When $x = y$, $\phi_h(x, y) = 0$ and the result holds. Let's assume $x \neq y$ from now on.

For any $r > \|x - y\| > 0$, by [8, Theorem 1], there two positive constants η_1 and η_2 independent of x and y , such that for any $T > 0$,

$$\phi_h(x, y; T) \leq \eta_1 \frac{r^2}{T} + \eta_2 \frac{T}{r^\alpha} + hT.$$

The right hand side of the above inequality as a function of T has a global minimum in $(0, \infty)$ at $T = (\eta_1 r^2 / (h + \eta_2 / r^\alpha))^{\frac{1}{2}}$, so

$$\phi_h(x, y) \leq (4h\eta_1 r^2 + 4\eta_1 \eta_2 r^{2-\alpha})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Letting r go to $\|x - y\|$, the desired result follows from continuity with $\beta_1 = 2h\eta_1$ and $\beta_2 = 4\eta_1 \eta_2$. □

This lemma further implies continuity of ϕ_h .

Lemma 2.4. *$\phi_h(x, y)$ is continuous with respect to both x and y .*

Proof. Choose an arbitrary y' close to y , by Lemma 2.3, there is a $C > 0$, such that

$$\phi_h(x, y) - \phi_h(x, y') \leq \phi_h(y', y) \leq C \|y - y'\|^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2}};$$

$$\phi_h(x, y') - \phi_h(x, y) \leq \phi_h(y, y') \leq C \|y - y'\|^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2}}.$$

This shows $\phi_h(x, y)$ is continuous with respect to y . The proof for x is similar. □

Lemma 2.5. *If $\gamma(t)$ is collision-free solution of (2) with energy $h > 0$, then $d^2 \|\gamma(t)\| / dt^2 > 0$.*

Proof. Since $\gamma(t)$ is collision-free, $\|\gamma(t)\|$ is always positive. Let $I(t) = \|\gamma(t)\|^2$. It is enough to prove $\ddot{I}(t) > 0$, which follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \ddot{I} &= \ll \dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma} \gg^2 + \ll \gamma, \ddot{\gamma} \gg = \|\dot{\gamma}\|^2 - \alpha U(\gamma) \\ &= \frac{2-\alpha}{2} \|\dot{\gamma}\|^2 + \alpha \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\gamma}\|^2 - U(\gamma) \right) = \frac{2-\alpha}{2} \|\dot{\gamma}\|^2 + \alpha h > 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

For any $v \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}$, define $\underline{v} := \min\{|v_{ij}| = |v_i - v_j| : 1 \leq i \neq j \leq N\}$ and

$$\mathbb{B}_{\delta \underline{v}}(v) := \{u \in \mathbb{S} : \|u - v\| \leq \delta \underline{v}\},$$

where $\delta := \frac{\sqrt{m_0}}{4}$ and $m_0 := \min\{m_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$.

Lemma 2.6. *If $u \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta \underline{v}}(v)$, then $|u_{ij}| \geq \frac{1}{2} |v_{ij}|$, $\forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$, and $U(u) \leq 2^\alpha U(v)$.*

Proof. Notice that $m_0|u - v|^2 \leq \|u - v\|^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{ij}| &= |u_i - v_i + v_i - v_j + v_j - u_j| \geq |v_{ij}| - |u_i - v_i| - |u_j - v_j| \\ &\geq |v_{ij}| - 2\|u - v\| \geq |v_{ij}| - \frac{2}{\sqrt{m_0}}\|u - v\| \geq |v_{ij}| - \frac{1}{2}v \\ &\geq |v_{ij}| - \frac{1}{2}|v_{ij}| = \frac{1}{2}|v_{ij}|. \end{aligned}$$

By the above inequality,

$$U(u) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \frac{m_i m_j}{|u_{ij}|^\alpha} \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2^\alpha \frac{m_i m_j}{|v_{ij}|^\alpha} \leq 2^\alpha U(v).$$

□

Lemma 2.7. *If $u \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta v}(v)$ and $r_2 > r_1 > 0$, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}}\phi_h(r_1 u, r_2 u) \leq r_2 - r_1 + W_{\alpha, v}(r_1, r_2)$ with*

$$(8) \quad W_{\alpha, v}(r_1, r_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{2^\alpha U(v)}{2h(\alpha-1)} \left(\frac{1}{r_1^{\alpha-1}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{\alpha-1}} \right), & \text{if } \alpha > 1; \\ \frac{2^\alpha U(v)}{2h} (\log r_2 - \log r_1), & \text{if } \alpha = 1; \\ \frac{2^\alpha U(v)}{2h(1-\alpha)} (r_2^{1-\alpha} - r_1^{1-\alpha}), & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $\xi(t) = r_1 u + \sqrt{2ht}u$, $t \in [0, \frac{r_2 - r_1}{\sqrt{2h}}]$. Then $\rho(t) = \|\xi(t)\| = r_1 + \sqrt{2ht}$ and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}} \mathcal{A}_h(\xi; 0, \frac{r_2 - r_1}{\sqrt{2h}}) \leq r_2 - r_1 + \frac{2^\alpha U(v)}{2h} \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \rho^{-\alpha} d\rho = r_2 - r_1 + W_{\alpha, v}(r_1, r_2).$$

□

Lemma 2.8. *Given an arbitrary x and $v \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}$. There is an $R > 2\|x\|$ large enough, such that for any y with $\|y\| \geq R$ and $u = y/\|y\| \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta v}(v)$, if $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y; T)$ is an h -free-time minimizer, there is a constant $C_{\alpha, v}$ independent of γ , such that*

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\|\gamma(t)\|} - u \right\| \leq C_{\alpha, v} f_\alpha(\|\gamma(t)\|), \quad \forall t \in [T', T],$$

where $T' = \inf\{t \in [0, T]; \|\gamma(t)\| = \frac{1}{2}\|y\|\}$ and f_α is decreasing function as below

$$(9) \quad f_\alpha(r) = \begin{cases} (2r)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } \alpha > 1; \\ \left(\frac{\log 2r}{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } \alpha = 1; \\ (2r)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $\frac{1}{2}\|y\| > \|x\|$, T' is well-defined with $\frac{d\|\gamma(t)\|}{dt}|_{t=T'} > 0$. By Lemma 2.5, $\|\gamma(t)\|$ is strictly increasing, when $t \in [T', T]$.

By Lemma 2.3, there is a constant C_1 depending on x and v , such that

$$\sup\{\phi_h(x, \|x\|u); u \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta v}(v)\} \leq \sqrt{2h}C_1.$$

Then Lemma 2.2 and 2.7 imply

$$(10) \quad \phi_h(x, y) \leq \phi_h(x, \|x\|u) + \phi_h(\|x\|u, y) \leq \sqrt{2h}(C_1 + \|y\| - \|x\| + W_{\alpha, v}(\|x\|, \|y\|)).$$

With this, Lemma 2.1 implies

$$(11) \quad \ell(\gamma|_{[0, T]}) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}}\phi_h(x, y) \leq \|y\| + W_{\alpha, v}(\|x\|, \|y\|) + C_1 - \|x\|.$$




FIGURE 1.

Fix an arbitrary $t \in [T', T)$ (the result is trivial, when $t = T$), set $r = \|\gamma(t)\|$ and $z = ru$, then $\Sigma = \{q \in \mathbb{E} : \langle q - z, u \rangle = 0\}$ is the hyperplane perpendicular to the line $\overrightarrow{0z}$ at z . If $\gamma(t) = z$, set $t' = t$. If not, $\gamma(t)$ and y must be separated by Σ , as $\|\gamma(t)\| < \|y\|$. Then we can always find a $t' \in (t, T)$ with $\gamma(t') \in \Sigma$ (see Figure 1). As a result,

$$(12) \quad \begin{cases} \|\gamma(t') - z\|^2 = \|\gamma(t')\|^2 - \|z\|^2, & \|\gamma(t')\| \geq \|z\| \\ \|\gamma(t') - z\|^2 = \|y - \gamma(t')\|^2 - \|y - z\|^2, & \|y - \gamma(t')\| \geq \|y - z\| \end{cases}$$

Combining these with (11), we get

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\|\gamma(t') - z\|^2 &= \|\gamma(t')\|^2 + \|\gamma(t') - y\|^2 - (\|z\|^2 + \|y - z\|^2) \\ &= (\|\gamma(t')\| + \|\gamma(t') - y\|)^2 - 2\|\gamma(t')\| \cdot \|\gamma(t') - y\| - (\|y - z\| + \|z\|)^2 + 2\|z\| \cdot \|y - z\| \\ &\leq (\|\gamma(t')\| + \|\gamma(t') - y\|)^2 - \|y\|^2 \\ &\leq (\|x\| + \|x - \gamma(t')\| + \|\gamma(t') - y\|)^2 - \|y\|^2 \\ &\leq (\|x\| + \ell(\gamma|_{[0, T]})^2 - \|y\|^2 \\ &\leq (\|y\| + W_{\alpha, v}(\|x\|, \|y\|) + C_1)^2 - \|y\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity let's write $W_{\alpha, v}(\|x\|, \|y\|)$ as $W_{\alpha, v}$. Then

$$(14) \quad \|\gamma(t') - z\| \leq \left(\|y\| W_{\alpha, v} + \frac{1}{2} W_{\alpha, v}^2 + C_1(\|y\| + W_{\alpha, v} + \frac{1}{2} C_1) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Meanwhile notice that

$$\ell(\gamma|_{[0, t]}) \geq \|\gamma(t) - x\| \geq r - \|x\|;$$

$$\ell(\gamma|_{[t', T]}) \geq \|y - \gamma(t')\| \geq \|y - z\| \geq \|y\| - r.$$

Then together with (11), they imply

$$\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t')\| \leq \ell(\gamma|_{[t, t']}) = \ell(\gamma|_{[0, T]}) - \ell(\gamma|_{[0, t]}) - \ell(\gamma|_{[t', T]}) \leq W_{\alpha, v} + C_1.$$

Combining this with (14), we get

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\gamma(t) - z\| &\leq \|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t')\| + \|\gamma(t') - z\| \\ &\leq \left(\|y\|W_{\alpha,v} + \frac{1}{2}W_{\alpha,v}^2 + C_1 \left(\|y\| + W_{\alpha,v} + \frac{1}{2}C_1 \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + W_{\alpha,v} + C_1. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing the above inequality by $r = \|\gamma(t)\|$, and using the fact that $\|y\| \leq 2r$, we get

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\|\gamma(t)\|} - u \right\| \leq \left(\frac{2W_{\alpha,v}}{r} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{r} \right)^2 + \frac{C_1(2r + W_{\alpha,v} + \frac{1}{2}C_1)}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{r} + \frac{C_1}{r}$$

From now on we use $W_{\alpha,v}$ to represent $W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, 2r)$. As $\|y\| \leq 2r$ implies $W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, \|y\|) \leq W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, 2r)$, the above inequality still holds. Hence we may rewrite it as,

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\|\gamma(t)\|} - u \right\| \leq \left(4 \frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r} + 2 \left(\frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r} \right)^2 + \frac{C_1(2r + W_{\alpha,v} + \frac{1}{2}C_1)}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 \frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r} + \frac{C_1}{r}.$$

When $r \rightarrow \infty$, by (8), $\frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r} \rightarrow \infty$. While

$$2 \frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r} + \frac{C_1}{r} \simeq o \left(\sqrt{\frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r}} \right),$$

and

$$\frac{C_1(2r + W_{\alpha,v} + \frac{1}{2}C_1)}{r^2} \simeq \begin{cases} o\left(\frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r}\right), & \text{when } \alpha \in (0, 1]; \\ O\left(\frac{W_{\alpha,v}}{2r}\right), & \text{when } \alpha \in (1, 2). \end{cases}$$

As a result, when R is large enough, there is a constant C_2 independent of γ with

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\|\gamma(t)\|} - u \right\| \leq C_2 \left(\frac{W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, 2r)}{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The rest then follows from Lemma 2.7 and direct computations.

For the case $x = 0$, again by Lemma 2.3, there is a constant C_2 , such that

$$\sup\{\phi_h(0, u); u \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta v}(v)\} \leq \sqrt{2h}C_2.$$

Using Lemma 2.2 and 2.7 again, we get

$$(16) \quad \phi_h(0, y) \leq \phi_h(0, u) + \phi_h(u, y) \leq \sqrt{2h}(C_2 + \|y\| - 1 + W_{\alpha,v}(1, \|y\|)).$$

With this, we get the desired result by repeating the exact same argument as above. \square

Lemma 2.9. $\lim_{n_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=n_0}^{\infty} f_{\alpha}(2^k) = 0$.

Proof. First let's assume $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\frac{f_{\alpha}(2^{k+1})}{f_{\alpha}(2^k)} = \frac{(2^{k+1})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{(2^{k+2})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}} < 1.$$

By the summation formula of geometric series,

$$\sum_{k=n_0}^{\infty} f_{\alpha}(2^k) = \frac{f_{\alpha}(2^{n_0})}{1 - 2^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}} = \frac{1}{(2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - 1)} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}n_0}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n_0 \rightarrow \infty,$$

The proof is the same for $\alpha > 1$, as in this case

$$\frac{f_\alpha(2^{k+1})}{f_\alpha(2^k)} = \frac{(2^{k+1})^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2^{k+2})^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{1}{2}}} < 1,$$

and

$$\sum_{k=n_0}^{\infty} f_\alpha(2^k) = \frac{f_\alpha(2^{n_0})}{1 - 2^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} - 1} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n_0}{2}}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now assume $\alpha = 1$. Since there is an n_0 large enough, such that $\log 2^{k+1} \leq 2^{\frac{k+1}{2}}, \forall k \geq n_0$,

$$\sum_{k=n_0}^{\infty} f_\alpha(2^k) \leq \sum_{k=n_0}^{\infty} 2^{-\frac{k+1}{4}} = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{1}{4}} - 1} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n_0}{4}}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

□

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

By Lemma 2.9, we can find an n_0 large enough, such that

$$(17) \quad C_{\alpha,v} \sum_{k=n_0}^{\infty} f_\alpha(2^k) \leq \delta \underline{v}.$$

For each $n \geq n_0$, set $y_n = 2^n v$, there is a $\gamma_n \in \mathcal{C}(x, y_n; T_n)$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; 0, T_n) = \phi_n(x, y_n)$.

Let R be the constant given in Lemma 2.8, we will further assume $2^{n_0} \geq R$. By the strictly increasing property of $\|\gamma_n(t)\|$ obtained in the proof of the same lemma, for each $n \geq n_0$, there is a unique sequence of moments $\{t_{n,k}\}_{k=n_0}^n$, such that

$$\|\gamma_n(t_{n,k})\| = 2^k \text{ for each } k = n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots, n.$$

Lemma 3.1. *For each $n \geq n_0$ and $t \in [t_{n,n_0}, t_{n,n}]$, let $[\|\gamma_n(t)\|]$ be the integer part of $\|\gamma_n(t)\|$,*

$$(18) \quad \left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - v \right\| \leq C_{\alpha,v} \sum_{i=[\log \|\gamma_n(t)\|]}^{\infty} f_\alpha(2^i) \leq \delta \underline{v},$$

Proof. As $\|\gamma_n(t)\| \geq 2^{n_0}, \forall t \in [t_{n,n_0}, t_{n,n}]$, the second inequality in (18) follows directly from (17).

Notice that $2^{n-1} \leq \|\gamma_n(t)\| < 2^n$, when $t \in [t_{n,n-1}, t_{n,n}]$. By Lemma 2.8,

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - \frac{\gamma_n(t_{n,n})}{\|\gamma_n(t_{n,n})\|} \right\| \leq C_{\alpha,v} f_\alpha(\|\gamma_n(t)\|) \leq C_{\alpha,v} f_\alpha(2^{n-1}) \leq C_{\alpha,v} \sum_{i=[\log \|\gamma(t)\|]}^{\infty} f_\alpha(2^i).$$

This proves (18), when $t \in [t_{n,n-1}, t_{n,n}]$.

Now let's assume there is an integer $k \in (n_0, n)$, such that (18) holds for all $t \in [t_{n,k+1}, t_{n,n}]$. With this we can apply Lemma 2.8 to $\gamma|_{[0, t_{n,k+1}]}$, and as a result, for any $t \in [t_{n,k}, t_{n,k+1})$,

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - \frac{\gamma_n(t_{n,k+1})}{\|\gamma_n(t_{n,k+1})\|} \right\| \leq C_{\alpha,v} f_\alpha(\|\gamma(t)\|) \leq C_{\alpha,v} f_\alpha([\log \|\gamma(t)\|]) = C_{\alpha,v} f_\alpha(2^k).$$

As a result, for any $t \in [t_{n,k}, t_{n,k+1})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - v \right\| &\leq \left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - \frac{\gamma_n(t_{n,k+1})}{\|\gamma_n(t_{n,k+1})\|} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t_{n,k+1})}{\|\gamma_n(t_{n,k+1})\|} - v \right\| \\ &\leq C_{\alpha,v} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} f_{\alpha}(2^i) \leq C_{\alpha,v} \sum_{i=\lfloor \log \|\gamma_n(t)\| \rfloor}^{\infty} f_{\alpha}(2^i). \end{aligned}$$

The desired result then follows from induction. \square

By the above lemma, $\frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta v}(v)$, for any $t \in [t_{n,n_0}, t_{n,n}]$. From the proof of Lemma 2.8, in particular (10) and (16), we know there is a constant $C_0 > 0$, such that

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_h(x, \gamma_n(t)) &\leq \phi_h \left(x, \|x\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} \right) + \phi_h \left(\|x\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}, \gamma_n(t) \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{2h} (C_0 + \|\gamma_n(t)\| + W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, \|\gamma_n(t)\|)). \end{aligned}$$

Here and in the below, when $x = 0$, $W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, \cdot)$ should be seen as $W_{\alpha,v}(1, \cdot)$.

As the energy identity can be written as $\|\dot{\gamma}_n\|^2 = L(\gamma_n, \dot{\gamma}_n) + h$, we get

$$(20) \quad \int_0^t \|\dot{\gamma}_n(s)\|^2 ds = \phi_h(x, \gamma_n(t)) \leq \sqrt{2h} (C_0 + \|\gamma_n(t)\| + W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, \|\gamma_n(t)\|));$$

Meanwhile the energy identity also implies $\|\dot{\gamma}_n\| \geq \sqrt{2h}$. Therefore

$$(21) \quad \sqrt{2ht} \leq \int_0^t \|\dot{\gamma}_n\| ds \leq \sqrt{t} \left(\int_0^t \|\dot{\gamma}_n\|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (\sqrt{2ht})^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\gamma_n(t)\| + W_{\alpha,v} + C_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

As a result,

$$(22) \quad \frac{\sqrt{2ht}}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} \leq 1 + \frac{W_{\alpha,v} + \beta_{x,v}}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} \Rightarrow \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \geq -\frac{W_{\alpha,v} + C_0}{\|\gamma_n(t)\| + W_{\alpha,v} + C_0}.$$

On the other hand, (20) also implies

$$\frac{1}{t} \|\gamma_n(t) - x\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{t} \left(\int_0^t \|\dot{\gamma}_n\| ds \right)^2 \leq \int_0^t \|\dot{\gamma}_n\|^2 ds \leq \sqrt{2h} (\|\gamma_n(t)\| + W_{\alpha,v} + C_0).$$

Multiplying the above inequality by $\|\gamma_n(t)\|/(\sqrt{2h}\|\gamma_n(t) - x\|^2)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} &\leq \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|(\|\gamma_n(t)\| + W_{\alpha,v} + C_0)}{\|\gamma_n(t) - x\|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{(\|\gamma_n(t) - x\| + \|x\|)(\|\gamma_n(t) - x\| + \|x\| + W_{\alpha,v} + C_0)}{\|\gamma_n(t) - x\|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$(23) \quad \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \leq \frac{W_{\alpha,v} + C_0 + 2\|x\|}{\|\gamma_n(t) - x\|} + \frac{\|x\|(W_{\alpha,v} + C_0 + \|x\|)}{\|\gamma_n(t) - x\|^2}.$$

By (22) and (23), when n_0 is large enough, we can find a continuous function $g_{\alpha} : [2^{n_0}, \infty)$,

$$(24) \quad g_{\alpha}(r) = \begin{cases} O(\frac{1}{r}), & \text{if } \alpha > 1; \\ O(\frac{\log r}{r}), & \text{if } \alpha = 1; \\ O(\frac{1}{r^{\alpha}}), & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1), \end{cases} \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty$$

such that, for any $t \in [t_{n,n_0}, t_{n,n}]$,

$$(25) \quad \left| \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \right| \leq g_\alpha(\|\gamma_n(t)\|).$$

By (24) and (26), we can assume the following holds

$$(26) \quad \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} \leq 2, \quad \forall t \in [t_{n,n_0}, t_{n,n}] \text{ and } n \geq n_0.$$

The second inequality in (26) then implies

$$T_n = t_{n,n} \geq \frac{\|\gamma_n(t_{n,n})\|}{2\sqrt{2h}} = \frac{2^n}{2\sqrt{2h}} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, the first inequality in (26) implies

$$t_{n,n_0} \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2h}} \|\gamma_n(t_{n,n_0})\| = \frac{2^{n_0+1}}{\sqrt{2h}}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

Hence $\tilde{t}_{n_0} = \sup\{t_{n,n_0} : n \geq n_0\}$ is a finite number.

Now fix an arbitrary $t \geq \tilde{t}_{n_0}$, by Lemma 3.1 $\frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta v}(v)$. Then (26) implies

$$(27) \quad 2^{n_0} \leq \|\gamma_n(t)\| \leq 2\sqrt{2ht}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

Combining the second inequality above with (19) gives us

$$\phi_h(x, \gamma_n(t)) \leq 4ht + \sqrt{2h}(W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, \sqrt{2ht}) + C_0).$$

We may further assume n_0 large enough, such that

$$W_{\alpha,v}(\|x\|, \sqrt{2ht}) + C_0 \leq 2\sqrt{2ht}, \quad \text{when } \sqrt{2ht} \geq 2^{n_0}.$$

Hence $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; 0, t) = \phi_h(x, \gamma_n(t)) \leq 8ht, \forall n \geq n_0$. Then for any $0 \leq \tau < \tau' \leq t$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\gamma_n(\tau') - \gamma_n(\tau)\| &\leq \int_\tau^{\tau'} \|\dot{\gamma}_n\| ds \leq (\tau' - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_\tau^{\tau'} \|\dot{\gamma}_n\|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq (\tau' - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, t))^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2\sqrt{2h}(\tau' - \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows $\{\gamma_n|_{[0,t]} : n \geq n_0\}$ is equicontinuous. Since $\gamma_n(0) = x, \forall n \geq n_0$, it is also equibounded. By the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem (after passing to a proper subsequence) $\{\gamma_n|_{[0,t]}; n \geq n_0\}$ will converge uniformly to an absolute continuous path $\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$.

Since the above argument can be repeated for any $\tau_k \geq \tilde{t}_{n_0}$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau_k = \infty$, by a diagonal argument there exists an absolute continuous path $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$, such that γ_n converges to γ uniformly on any compact sub-interval of $[0, \infty)$.

For any $T > 0$, by the lower semi-continuity of \mathcal{A}_h and the continuity of ϕ_h (Lemma 2.4),

$$\phi_h(x, \gamma(T)) \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma; 0, T) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; 0, T) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_h(x, \gamma_n(T)) = \phi_h(x, \gamma(T)).$$

Hence $\gamma|_{[0,T]}$ is an h -free-time minimizer, and then a collision-free h -energy solution of (2).

The above results show that for any $t \geq \tilde{t}_{n_0}$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\|\gamma(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} \leq 2;$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\|\gamma(t)\|} - v \right\| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - v \right\| \leq \delta v; \\ \left| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \right| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \right| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_\alpha(\|\gamma_n(t)\|) \leq g_\alpha(\|\gamma(t)\|). \end{aligned}$$

With these estimates, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\gamma(t) - \sqrt{2ht}v\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\gamma_n(t) - \sqrt{2ht}v\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} \\ &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\|\gamma_n(t) - \|\gamma_n(t)\|v\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} + \frac{\|\|\gamma_n(t)\|v - \sqrt{2ht}v\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} \left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - v \right\| + \left| \frac{\|\gamma_n(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \right| \right) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\|\gamma(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} \left\| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\|\gamma(t)\|} - v \right\| + \left| \frac{\|\gamma(t)\|}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \right| \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(2C_{\alpha,v} \sum_{i=\lceil \log \|\gamma(t)\| \rceil}^{\infty} f_\alpha(2^i) + g_\alpha(\|\gamma(t)\|) \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This means $\gamma(t) = \sqrt{2ht}v + o(t)$, when $t \rightarrow \infty$, which finishes our proof of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgement. The author thanks Duokui Yan and Yuan Zhou for their encouragement and helpful comments, and the anonymous referees for their value comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Chazy. Sur l'allure du mouvement dans le problème des trois corps quand le temps croît indéfiniment. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)*, 39:29–130, 1922.
- [2] A. Chenciner. Action minimizing solutions of the Newtonian n -body problem: from homology to symmetry. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III (Beijing, 2002)*, pages 279–294. Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.
- [3] G. Contreras and R. Iturriaga. Global minimizers of autonomous lagrangians. <https://www.cimat.mx/~gonzalo/libro/lagrangians.pdf>, 2000.
- [4] P. Davide and S. Terracini. On the existence of minimal expansive solutions to the n -body problem. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06360>, 2023.
- [5] D. L. Ferrario and S. Terracini. On the existence of collisionless equivariant minimizers for the classical n -body problem. *Invent. Math.*, 155(2):305–362, 2004.
- [6] S. Fleischer and A. Knauf. Improbability of collisions in n -body systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 234(3):1007–1039, 2019.
- [7] J. Liu, D. Yan, and Y. Zhou. Existence of hyperbolic motions to a class of Hamiltonians and generalized N -body system via a geometric approach. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 247(4):Paper No. 64, 54, 2023.
- [8] E. Maderna. On weak KAM theory for N -body problems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 32(3):1019–1041, 2012.
- [9] E. Maderna and A. Venturelli. Viscosity solutions and hyperbolic motions: a new PDE method for the N -body problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 192(2):499–550, 2020.
- [10] D. G. Saari. Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 162:267–271; erratum, *ibid.* 168 (1972), 521, 1971.

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