

# 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 [8] 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 [6] generalized this result to a larger class of  $N$ -body problem. As the proof in [6] 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  $\alpha$ -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 [9] and [5]), 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 [8] 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 [8], this was done indirectly using the continuous property of the limiting shape of hyperbolic motions at infinity, which were given by Chazy.

Recently in [6], 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  $\alpha$ -homogeneous potential), for the details see [6, Theorem 1.4]. To obtain such a general result, the details in [6] are quite long and technical.

Since the  $\alpha$ -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 [6] (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 [6].

**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*

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

## 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

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

**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 [4] 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  $\gamma$  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  $\gamma_x$  and  $\gamma_y$  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  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$ , 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 [7, Theorem 1], there two positive constants  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$  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  $\beta_2 = 4\eta_1 \eta_2$ .  $\square$

This lemma further implies continuity of  $\phi_h$ .

**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

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

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

**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

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

$\square$

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

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

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  $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ ,  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2h}}\phi_h(r_1u, r_2u) \leq r_2 - r_1 + W_{\alpha,v}(r_1, r_2)$  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  $\xi(t) = r_1u + \sqrt{2h}tu$ ,  $t \in [0, \frac{r_2-r_1}{\sqrt{2h}}]$ . Then  $\rho(t) = \|\xi(t)\| = r_1 + \sqrt{2h}t$  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  $\gamma$ , 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  $f_\alpha$  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

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

Fix an arbitrary  $t \in [T', T)$  (the result is trivial, when  $t = T$ ), set  $r = \|\gamma(t)\|$  and  $z = ru$ , then  $\Sigma = \{q \in \mathbb{E} : \ll q - z, u \gg = 0\}$  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  $\Sigma$ , 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,

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




FIGURE 1.

Combining these with (11), we get

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(\gamma|_{[0,t]}) & \geq \|\gamma(t) - x\| \geq r - \|x\|; \\
\ell(\gamma|_{[t',T]}) & \geq \|y - \gamma(t')\| \geq \|y - z\| \geq \|y\| - r.
\end{aligned}$$

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

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

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  $\gamma$  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  $\mathcal{A}_h(\gamma_n; 0, T_n) = \phi_h(x, y_n)$ .

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

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

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

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

*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,

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

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  $t \in [t_{n,k}, t_{n,k+1})$ ,

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

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

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

The desired result then follows from induction. □

By the above lemma,  $\frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta \underline{v}}(v)$ , 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  $\frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta \underline{v}}(v)$ . 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  $\gamma_n$  converges to  $\gamma$  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  $\phi_h$  (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  $t \geq \tilde{t}_{n_0}$ ,

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

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\|\gamma(t)\|} - v \right\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\|\gamma_n(t)\|} - v \right\| \leq \delta \underline{v};$$

$$\left| \frac{\gamma(t)}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\gamma_n(t)}{\sqrt{2ht}} - 1 \right| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_{\alpha}(\|\gamma_n(t)\|) \leq g_{\alpha}(\|\gamma(t)\|).$$

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] 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.
- [5] S. Fleischer and A. Knauf. Improbability of collisions in  $n$ -body systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 234(3):1007–1039, 2019.
- [6] 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.
- [7] E. Maderna. On weak KAM theory for  $N$ -body problems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 32(3):1019–1041, 2012.
- [8] 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.
- [9] 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