

QUALITATIVE ESTIMATES OF TOPOLOGICAL ENTROPY FOR NON-MONOTONE CONTACT LAX-OLEINIK SEMIFLOW

WEI CHENG, JIAHUI HONG, ZHI-XIANG ZHU*

ABSTRACT. For the non-monotone Hamilton-Jacobi equations of contact type, the associated Lax-Oleinik semiflow $(T_t, C(M))$ is expansive. In this paper, we provide qualitative estimates for both the lower and upper bounds of the topological entropy of the semiflow.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M be a compact and connected manifold without boundary. A function $H = H(x, p, u) : T^*M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a *Tonelli Hamiltonian of contact type* if it is of class C^2 and satisfies the following conditions:

- (H1) $H_{pp}(x, p, u) > 0$, $\forall (x, p, u) \in T^*M \times \mathbb{R}$;
- (H2) There exist a super-linear continuous function $\theta_1^* : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and a constant $c_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$H(x, p, 0) \geq \theta_1^*(|p|_x) - c_0, \quad \forall (x, p) \in T^*M;$$

- (H3) There exists $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$|H_u(x, p, u)| \leq \kappa, \quad \forall (x, p, u) \in T^*M \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Consider the Hamilton-Jacobi equation of contact type:

$$\begin{cases} D_t u + H(x, Du(x), u(x)) = 0, & t > 0, x \in M, \\ u(0, x) = \phi(x), & x \in M, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\phi \in C(M)$, the space of continuous functions on M . Using Herglotz' variational principle ([4, 3]) or the implicit variational principle ([13]), the (unique) solution of (1) has a representation formula. More precisely,

$$u(t, x) = T_t \phi(x), \quad (x \in M, t \geq 0).$$

The Lax-Oleinik operators $\{T_t\}$ are defined as follows:

$$(T_t \phi)(x) = \inf_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}_{t,x}} \left\{ \phi(\xi(0)) + \int_0^t L(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), u_\xi(s)) ds \right\},$$

where $L : TM \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the associated Tonelli Lagrangian of contact type defined by

$$L(x, v, u) := \sup_{p \in T_x^*M} \{p(v) - H(x, p, u)\}, \quad x \in M, v \in T_x M, u \in \mathbb{R},$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35F21, 37L05, 37B40, 49L25.

Key words and phrases. Hamilton-Jacobi equation, Lax-Oleinik semigroup, topological entropy.

* Corresponding author.

$\mathcal{A}_{t,x}$ is the family of absolutely continuous arcs $\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ with $\xi(t) = x$, and $u_\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ uniquely solves the Carathéodory equation:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_\xi(s) = L(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), u_\xi(s)), & s \in [0, t], \\ u_\xi(0) = \phi(\xi(0)). \end{cases}$$

For more details on the semigroup $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, see Section 2.2. A typical example of a contact-type Hamilton-Jacobi equation is the discounted equation with $H(x, p, u) = \lambda u + H(x, p)$, where $\lambda > 0$.

To understand the dynamics of the semiflow $(T_t, C(M))$ generated by (1), especially when $\lambda < 0$ in the discounted equation or $H_u < 0$ in general, many authors have studied the dynamics in a deterministic way, such as through Lyapunov stability and periodicity ([8, 14]). In the current paper, we will concentrate on certain statistical behaviors, specifically the topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$ (see Section 2.1 for the definition) of the semiflow $\{T_t\}$. Recall that one can easily deduce $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = 0$ for the classical Lax-Oleinik semigroup from the qualitative estimate of the Kolmogorov ε -entropy in the space $W^{1,1}(M)$, which was obtained in [2, 1].

When discussing the contact-type Lax-Oleinik semigroup, we contrast the case $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = 0$ when $H_u > \lambda > 0$, due to the contraction property of $\{T_t\}$, with the expansion case when $H_u < 0$. In the latter case, we will primarily focus on giving a qualitative estimate of $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$.

For the lower bound of $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$, we have the following result: under the assumptions (H1)-(H3), if there exists $0 < \lambda \leq \kappa$ such that $\lambda \leq L_u(x, v, u) \leq \kappa$ for all $(x, v, u) \in TM \times \mathbb{R}$, then $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) \geq \lambda$ (see Theorem 3.1). The estimate of the upper bound for $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$ is more difficult. We will focus on the discounted Hamiltonian in the form

$$H(x, p, u) = h(p) - \lambda u, \quad (x, p, u) \in T^*\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R},$$

where $h = h(p) : T^*\mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Hamiltonian and $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. We prove that for such a Hamiltonian, $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = \lambda$ (Theorem 3.2).

We remark that it is still an interesting problem whether the developed theory in infinite-dimensional dynamical systems (see, for instance, [9, 11, 10, 7]) can be applied to study the expansive Lax-Oleinik semiflow $(T_t, C(M))$ for (1), with positive topological entropy, and its potential consequences on the complicated dynamical behavior.

Acknowledgements. Wei Cheng was partly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12231010). Wei Cheng and Jiahui Hong are grateful to Kaizhi Wang for helpful discussions.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Topological entropy. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, and let $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a continuous semigroup action on X . That is, $T(t, x) = T_t(x) : [0, +\infty) \times X \rightarrow X$ is continuous, $T_0 = \text{id}$, and $T_s \circ T_t = T_{s+t}$ for any $t, s \geq 0$. For any $x \in X$, $t \geq 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, we define the *dynamical ball* of center x with length t and radius $\varepsilon > 0$ as

$$B(x, t, \varepsilon) = \{y \in X \mid d(T_s(y), T_s(x)) < \varepsilon \text{ for all } s \in [0, t]\}.$$

It is immediate that $B(x, 0, \varepsilon) = B(x, \varepsilon)$. Let $K \subset X$ be a compact subset. A set $E \subset X$ is called a (t, ε) -generating set for K if

$$K \subset \bigcup_{x \in E} B(x, t, \varepsilon),$$

and $E \subset K$ is a (t, ε) -separated set if the dynamical ball $B(x, t, \varepsilon)$ for each $x \in E$ contains no other element of E . For any compact subset K and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $g_t(\varepsilon, K)$ be the smallest cardinality of a (t, ε) -generating set of K , and $s_t(\varepsilon, K)$ the largest cardinality of a (t, ε) -separated set $E \subset K$. Then, we define

$$g(K) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} g(K, \varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log g_t(\varepsilon, K),$$

$$s(K) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} s(K, \varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log s_t(\varepsilon, K).$$

It is known that $g(K) = s(K)$ for any compact set $K \subset X$. We now define the topological entropy of the semigroup $\{T_t\}$ as

$$h(T_t) = h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = \sup_{K \subset X} g(K) = \sup_{K \subset X} s(K),$$

where the supremum is taken over all compact subsets K of X .

Recall a semigroup $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is called *uniformly continuous* if for any $t > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d(x, y) < \delta \implies d(T_s(x), T_s(y)) < \varepsilon \text{ for every } s \in [0, t].$$

Proposition 2.1 ([12]). *If the semi-flow $\{T_t\}$ is uniformly continuous then its topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$ coincides with the topological entropy of its time- τ map for any $\tau > 0$.*

Lemma 2.1 ([12]). *If the semigroup $\{T_t\}$ is non-expansive, i.e.,*

$$d(T_t(x), T_t(y)) \leq d(x, y), \quad \forall t \geq 0, x, y \in X,$$

then for any compact subset K of X , $g(K) = 0$. In particular, $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = 0$.

In fact, the topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$ is independent of the action of the semigroup T_t in finite time. More precisely, for any $x \in X$, $t \geq t_0 > 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, we define the dynamical ball over time $[t_0, t]$ as

$$B_{t_0}(x, t, \varepsilon) = \{y \in X \mid d(T_s(x), T_s(y)) < \varepsilon \text{ for all } s \in [t_0, t]\}.$$

For any compact subset $K \subset X$, $t \geq t_0 > 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K) = \min \left\{ \#(E) \mid E \subset X, \bigcup_{x \in E} B_{t_0}(x, t, \varepsilon) \supset K \right\}.$$

Proposition 2.2.

(1) *For any compact subset $K \subset X$, $t \geq t_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K) \leq g_t(\varepsilon, K), \quad g_{t_0}(\varepsilon, K) \cdot g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K) \geq g_t(2\varepsilon, K).$$

(2) For any compact subset $K \subset X$, $t_0 > 0$, we have

$$g(K) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K).$$

Proof. By definition, we know that

$$B(x, t, \varepsilon) \subset B_{t_0}(x, t, \varepsilon), \quad \forall x \in X,$$

which implies directly

$$g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K) \leq g_t(\varepsilon, K).$$

For the second inequality, we consider two finite covers of the compact set K :

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{g_{t_0}(\varepsilon, K)} B(x_i, t_0, \varepsilon) \supset K, \quad \bigcup_{j=1}^{g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K)} B_{t_0}(y_j, t, \varepsilon) \supset K.$$

If $B(x_i, t_0, \varepsilon) \cap B_{t_0}(y_j, t, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$, we choose $z_{ij} \in B(x_i, t_0, \varepsilon) \cap B_{t_0}(y_j, t, \varepsilon)$. It follows from the definition of the dynamical ball that

$$B(z_{ij}, t, 2\varepsilon) \supset B(x_i, t_0, \varepsilon) \cap B_{t_0}(y_j, t, \varepsilon).$$

Thus, we have

$$g_t(2\varepsilon, K) \leq \#\{z_{ij}\} \leq g_{t_0}(\varepsilon, K) \cdot g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K).$$

Now we turn to prove statement (2). Using the result in (1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g(K) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log g_t(2\varepsilon, K) \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log (g_{t_0}(\varepsilon, K) \cdot g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K)) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log g_{t_0, t}(\varepsilon, K) \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log g_t(\varepsilon, K) = g(K). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

2.2. Herglotz' variational principle. Let M be a compact and connected manifold without boundary and $H : T^*M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a Tonelli Hamiltonian of contact type. Its associated Tonelli Lagrangian of contact type $L = L(x, v, u) : TM \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of class C^2 and satisfies the following conditions:

(L1) $L_{vv}(x, v, u) > 0$, $\forall (x, v, u) \in TM \times \mathbb{R}$;

(L2) There exist a super-linear continuous function $\theta_0 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and a constant $c_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$L(x, v, 0) \geq \theta_0(|v|_x) - c_0, \quad \forall (x, v) \in TM;$$

(L3) There exists $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$|L_u(x, v, u)| \leq \kappa, \quad \forall (x, v, u) \in TM \times \mathbb{R}.$$

To introduce the Lax-Oleinik evolution of contact type, let us recall the relevant Herglotz' variational principle. For any $x, y \in M$ and $t > 0$, let $\Gamma_{x,y}^t$ be the set of absolutely continuous arcs $\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ connecting x to y , and $\mathcal{A}_{t,x}$ the set of absolutely continuous arcs $\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ such that $\xi(t) = x$. We define the Lax-Oleinik evolution of contact type as a operator T_t , $t > 0$, acting on a function $\phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as

$$(T_t\phi)(x) = \inf_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}_{t,x}} \left\{ \phi(\xi(0)) + \int_0^t L(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), u_\xi(s)) ds \right\},$$

where $u_\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ uniquely solves the Carathéodory equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_\xi(s) = L(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), u_\xi(s)), & s \in [0, t], \\ u_\xi(0) = \phi(\xi(0)). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Let $C(M)$ the space of continuous real-valued functions on M endowed with the norm

$$\|f\| = \max_{x \in M} |f(x)|.$$

The space $(C(M), \|\cdot\|)$ is a complete metric space. We can conclude from the following Lemma 2.2 that

$$T_t : C(M) \rightarrow C(M), \quad \phi \mapsto T_t\phi$$

is a continuous semigroup with $T_0 = \text{id}$. For the proof, one can refer to [4, 3].

Lemma 2.2.

(1) For any $\phi \in C(M)$, $t > 0$ and $x \in M$ there exists $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_{t,x}$ such that

$$T_t\phi(x) = \phi(\xi(0)) + \int_0^t L(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), u_\xi(s)) ds = u_\xi(t),$$

where u_ξ is uniquely determined by (2).

(2) For any $\phi \in C(M)$, $(t, x) \mapsto T_t\phi(x)$ is a continuous real-valued function on $[0, +\infty) \times M$, and it is locally semiconcave on $(0, +\infty) \times M$.

(3) $T_s \circ T_t\phi = T_{s+t}\phi$ for all $s, t \geq 0$ and $\phi \in C(M)$.

(4) We have

$$\|T_t\phi - T_t\psi\| \leq e^{\kappa t} \|\phi - \psi\|, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \phi, \psi \in C(M).$$

In particular, if $L_u(x, v, u) \leq 0$ for all $(x, v, u) \in TM \times \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\|T_t\phi - T_t\psi\| \leq \|\phi - \psi\|, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \phi, \psi \in C(M).$$

3. QUALITATIVE ESTIMATE OF TOPOLOGICAL ENTROPY

3.1. Lower bound. Now we can estimate the topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$. By the non-expansivity property of the semigroup $\{T_t\}$ in the case $L_u \leq 0$, the following consequence can be easily obtained from Lemma 2.2 (4) and Lemma 2.1.

Proposition 3.1. Under the assumption (L1)-(L3), if

$$L_u(x, v, u) \leq 0, \quad \forall (x, v, u) \in TM \times \mathbb{R},$$

then $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = 0$.

The following result provides a lower bound of $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Under the assumptions (L1)-(L3) and that there exists $0 < \lambda \leq \kappa$ such that*

$$\lambda \leq L_u(x, v, u) \leq \kappa, \quad \forall (x, v, u) \in TM \times \mathbb{R}.$$

- (1) *For any compact subset of the form $K = \{\phi = \phi_0 + \delta \mid \delta \in [0, a]\} \subset C(M)$, where $\phi_0 \in C(M)$ and $a > 0$, it holds that $g(K) \geq \lambda$.*
(2) $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) \geq \lambda$.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$. Let $\phi_m = \phi_0 + 2me^{-\lambda t}\varepsilon$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim

$$\|T_t\phi_m - T_t\phi_{m-1}\| \geq 2\varepsilon, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3)$$

Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in M$, let $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_{t,x}$ be a minimizer for $T_t\phi_m(x)$. That is

$$T_t\phi_m(x) = \phi_m(\xi(0)) + \int_0^t L(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), u_\xi(s)) ds = u_\xi(t),$$

where $u_\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is determined by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_\xi = L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, u_\xi), \\ u_\xi(0) = \phi_m(\xi(0)) = \phi_0(\xi(0)) + 2me^{-\lambda t}\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand,

$$T_t\phi_{m-1}(x) \leq \phi_{m-1}(\xi(0)) + \int_0^t L(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), v_\xi(s)) ds = v_\xi(t),$$

with $v_\xi : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ solving the equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v}_\xi = L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, v_\xi), \\ v_\xi(0) = \phi_{m-1}(\xi(0)) = \phi_0(\xi(0)) + 2(m-1)e^{-\lambda t}\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Set $w_\xi = u_\xi - v_\xi$, then we have

$$\begin{cases} \dot{w}_\xi = L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, u_\xi) - L(\xi, \dot{\xi}, v_\xi) = \widehat{L}_u \cdot w_\xi, \\ w_\xi(0) = u_\xi(0) - v_\xi(0) = 2e^{-\lambda t}\varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\widehat{L}_u(s) = \int_0^1 L_u(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s), u_\xi(s) + \theta(u_\xi(s) - v_\xi(s))) d\theta, \quad s \in [0, t].$$

It follows

$$w_\xi(t) = e^{\int_0^t \widehat{L}_u ds} \cdot 2e^{-\lambda t}\varepsilon \geq e^{\lambda t} \cdot 2e^{-\lambda t}\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon,$$

and

$$T_t\phi_{m-1}(x) \leq v_\xi(t) = u_\xi(t) - w_\xi(t) \leq T_t\phi_m(x) - 2\varepsilon,$$

which implies our claim (3).

Thus, for any $\phi \in C(M)$ the dynamical ball $B(\phi, t, \varepsilon)$ contains only a unique ϕ_m with $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Then,

$$g_t(\varepsilon, K) \geq \#\{\phi_m \in K\} \geq \left\lfloor \frac{a}{2e^{\lambda t \varepsilon}} \right\rfloor + 1 \geq \frac{a}{2e^{\lambda t \varepsilon}}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$g(K) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log g_t(\varepsilon, K) \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \frac{a}{2e^{\lambda t \varepsilon}} = \lambda,$$

and this completes the proof of (1).

Item (2) is immediate from the definition of $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$ together with (1). \square

3.2. Upper bound. Let M be a compact and connected manifold without boundary. A function $l = l(x, v) : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a Tonelli Lagrangian if it is of class C^2 and satisfies the following conditions:

- (11) $l_{vv}(x, v) > 0$, $\forall (x, v) \in TM$;
- (12) There exist a super-linear continuous function $\theta_0 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and a constant $c_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$l(x, v) \geq \theta_0(|v|_x) - c_0, \quad \forall (x, v) \in TM.$$

In this section, we will estimate the topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(T_t)$ in the case

$$L(x, v, u) = l(x, v) + \lambda u, \quad (x, v, u) \in TM \times \mathbb{R},$$

where $l = l(x, v) : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Lagrangian and $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. It is well known that this type of contact system is equivalent to a classical non-autonomous system, which has some properties in the following Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose M is a compact manifold, $l(x, v) : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Lagrangian, and $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. For any $t > 0$, $y, x \in M$, let*

$$A(t, y, x) = \inf_{\xi \in \Gamma_{y,x}^t} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} l(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) ds.$$

- (1) *For any $t > 0$, $y, x \in M$, there exists a minimizer ξ for $A(t, y, x)$. Moreover, there exists $K_1 > 0$ such that if $t \geq 1$, we have*

$$|\dot{\xi}(s)| \leq K_1, \quad \forall s \in [0, t].$$

- (2) *There exists $K_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 1$, $y \in M$, the function $A(t, y, \cdot)$ is $e^{-\lambda t} K_0$ -Lipschitz.*
- (3) *If $M = \mathbb{T}^d$ and $l(x, v) = l(v)$ is independent of x , then for all $t \geq 1$, $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, the function $A(t, \cdot, x)$ is $e^{-\lambda t} K_0$ -Lipschitz.*

Proof. The result in (1) is well known. One can refer to [6] for the proof.

For any $x \in M$ and minimizer ξ for $A(t, y, x)$, the result (1) implies

$$|p(t)| = |e^{-\lambda t} l_v(\xi(t), \dot{\xi}(t))| \leq e^{-\lambda t} K_0.$$

Combining this with the relation (see [5])

$$D_x^+ A(t, y, x) = \text{co} \left\{ p(t) = e^{-\lambda t} l_v(\xi(t), \dot{\xi}(t)) \mid \xi \text{ is a minimizer} \right\},$$

where “co” stands for the convex hull, we conclude that $A(t, y, \cdot)$ is $e^{-\lambda t}K_0$ -Lipschitz continuous.

Now, we turn to prove statement (3). Under this condition, for any $y \in M$ and minimizer ξ for $A(t, y, x)$, the Euler-Lagrange equation implies

$$\dot{p}(s) = e^{-\lambda t}l_x(\dot{\xi}(s)) = 0, \quad \forall s \in [0, t].$$

This leads to $|p(0)| = |p(t)| \leq e^{-\lambda t}K_0$. Additionally, we have

$$D_y^+ A(t, y, x) = -\text{co} \left\{ p(0) = e^{-\lambda t}l_v(\xi(0), \dot{\xi}(0)) \mid \xi \text{ is a minimizer} \right\}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that $A(t, \cdot, x)$ is $e^{-\lambda t}K_0$ -Lipschitz continuous. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose M is a compact manifold, $l(x, v) : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Lagrangian, $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. Let*

$$L(x, v, u) : TM \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad L(x, v, u) = l(x, v) + \lambda u.$$

(1) *For any $\varphi \in C^0(M)$, $t > 0$, $x \in M$, we have*

$$T_t \varphi(x) = \inf_{y \in M} \{ e^{\lambda t} \varphi(y) + D(t, y, x) \},$$

where

$$D(t, y, x) = \inf_{\xi \in \Gamma_{y,x}^t} \int_0^t e^{\lambda(t-s)} l(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) ds.$$

(2) *If $M = \mathbb{T}^d$ and $l(x, v) = l(v)$ is independent of x , then there exists $K_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 1$, $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, the function $D(t, \cdot, x)$ is K_0 -Lipschitz continuous.*

Proof. By definition, we have

$$T_t \phi(x) = \inf_{y \in M} \inf_{\xi \in \Gamma_{y,x}^t} \left(\phi(y) + \int_0^t \{ l(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) + \lambda u_\xi(s) \} ds \right)$$

where $u_\xi(s)$ satisfies the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_\xi(s) = l(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) + \lambda u_\xi(s), & s \in [0, t], \\ u_\xi(0) = \phi(y). \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Solving (4), we obtain

$$u_\xi(t) = e^{\lambda t} \phi(y) + \int_0^t e^{\lambda(t-s)} l(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) ds.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_t \phi(x) &= \inf_{y \in M} \inf_{\xi \in \Gamma_{y,x}^t} \left(e^{\lambda t} \phi(y) + \int_0^t e^{\lambda(t-s)} l(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) ds \right) \\ &= \inf_{y \in M} \left(e^{\lambda t} \phi(y) + D(t, y, x) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $D(t, y, x)$ is the integral term. This completes the proof of (1).

To prove (2), for any $t \geq 1$, $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d$, we have

$$D(t, y, x) = \inf_{\xi \in \Gamma_{y,x}^t} e^{\lambda t} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} l(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) ds = e^{\lambda t} A(t, y, x).$$

Combining this with Lemma 3.1 (3), we know that $D(t, y, x)$ is K_0 -Lipschitz with respect to y . \square

For any compact subset $V \subset C^0(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we try to get a finite estimate of $g_t(\varepsilon, V)$. That is, we need to construct finite functions $\psi \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^d)$ such that

$$\bigcup_{\psi} B(\psi, t, \varepsilon) \supset V.$$

So we hope $T_t \psi$ is determined by the values of ψ at finite points z_i 's, see the following Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.2. *Under the assumption of Proposition 3.2 (2), suppose $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a set of finite points on \mathbb{T}^d . For any function $\psi : \{z_i\}_{i=1}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let*

$$\begin{aligned} K_\psi &= \max\{K_0, \text{Lip}[\psi]\}, \\ \tilde{\psi} : \mathbb{T}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \tilde{\psi}(x) = \min_{i=1, \dots, m} \psi(z_i) + K_\psi d(z_i, x). \end{aligned}$$

(1) $\tilde{\psi}$ is K_ψ -Lipschitz, and

$$\tilde{\psi}(z_i) = \psi(z_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

(2) We have

$$T_t^- \tilde{\psi}(x) = \min_{i=1, \dots, m} e^{\lambda t} \psi(z_i) + D(t, z_i, x), \quad \forall t \geq 1, x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Proof. Given $x, y \in M$, there exists z_i such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}(x) &= \psi(z_i) + K_\psi d(z_i, x), \\ \tilde{\psi}(y) &\leq \psi(z_i) + K_\psi d(z_i, y). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\tilde{\psi}(y) - \tilde{\psi}(x) \leq K_\psi d(z_i, y) - K_\psi d(z_i, x) \leq K_\psi d(x, y).$$

Similarly, we have $\tilde{\psi}(x) - \tilde{\psi}(y) \leq K_\psi d(x, y)$, which shows that $\tilde{\psi}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant K_ψ . Recalling that $K_\psi \geq \text{Lip}[\psi]$, for any $i, j = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(z_i) &\leq \psi(z_j) + \text{Lip}(\psi) \cdot d(z_j, z_i) \\ &\leq \psi(z_j) + K_\psi \cdot d(z_j, z_i). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\psi(z_i) = \tilde{\psi}(z_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Now, we turn to the proof of (2). For any $y \in \mathbb{T}^d$, there exists z_i such that $\tilde{\psi}(y) = \psi(z_i) + K_\psi d(z_i, y)$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\lambda t} \psi(z_i) + D(t, z_i, x) \\ & \leq e^{\lambda t} (\tilde{\psi}(y) - K_\psi d(z_i, y)) + D(t, y, x) + K_0 d(z_i, y) \\ & \leq e^{\lambda t} \tilde{\psi}(y) + D(t, y, x), \quad \forall t \geq 1, x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (1) implies

$$\begin{aligned} T_t \tilde{\psi}(x) &= \inf_{y \in \mathbb{T}^n} e^{\lambda t} \psi(y) + D(t, y, x) \\ &= \min_{i=1, \dots, m} e^{\lambda t} \psi(z_i) + D(t, z_i, x), \quad \forall t \geq 1, x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.2. *Under the assumption of Proposition 3.2 (2), for any compact subset $V \subset C^0(\mathbb{T}^d)$, there holds $g(V) \leq \lambda$. Moreover, we have $h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = \lambda$.*

Proof. By compactness of V , there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$\|\phi\|_{C^0} \leq R, \quad \forall \phi \in V.$$

Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist finite points $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^m$ such that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^m B(z_i, \varepsilon) = \mathbb{T}^d.$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{2Re^{\lambda n}}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$, let

$$U_{n,k} = \left\{ -R + ke^{-\lambda n} \varepsilon + l \cdot e^{-\lambda j} \varepsilon \mid j = 1, \dots, n, l = 0, 1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{K_0}{\varepsilon} \right\rfloor + 1 \right\}.$$

Consider the set of functions

$$\begin{aligned} F_n &= \left\{ \psi : \{z_i\}_{i=1}^m \rightarrow U_{n,k} \mid k = 0, 1, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{2Re^{\lambda n}}{\varepsilon} \right\rfloor \right\}, \\ \tilde{F}_n &= \left\{ \tilde{\psi} \mid \psi \in F_n \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}$ is defined by Lemma 3.2. We claim that

$$\bigcup_{\tilde{\psi} \in \tilde{F}_n} \tilde{B}(\tilde{\psi}, n, (1 + K_0)\varepsilon) \supset V, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\tilde{B}(\tilde{\psi}, n, (1 + K_0)\varepsilon) = \left\{ \phi \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^d) \mid \|T_k \phi - T_k \tilde{\psi}\|_{C^0} < (1 + K_0)\varepsilon, \forall k = 1, \dots, n \right\}.$$

The relation (5) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_n(V, (1 + K_0)\varepsilon) &\leq \#(\tilde{F}_n) = \#(F_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{2Re^{\lambda n}}{\varepsilon} \rfloor} \#^m(U_{n,k}) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2Re^{\lambda n}}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right) n^m \left(\frac{K_0}{\varepsilon} + 3 \right)^m, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{g}_n(V, (1 + K_0)\varepsilon) = \min \left\{ \#(E) \mid E \subset C^0(\mathbb{T}^d), \bigcup_{\psi \in E} \tilde{B}(\psi, n, (1 + K_0)\varepsilon) \supset V \right\}.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.2 (4), Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} g(V) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{g}_n(V, \varepsilon) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{g}_n(V, (1 + K_0)\varepsilon) \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\frac{2Re^{\lambda n}}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right) n^m \left(\frac{K_0}{\varepsilon} + 3 \right)^m \\ &= \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of V , we have

$$h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = \sup_{V \subset C^0(\mathbb{T}^n)} g(V) \leq \lambda.$$

Combining this with Theorem 3.1, we conclude that

$$h_{\text{top}}(T_t) = \lambda.$$

Finally, we only need to prove the claim (5). In fact, for any $\phi \in V$, there exists a unique $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{2Re^{\lambda n}}{\varepsilon} \rfloor\}$ such that

$$-R + ke^{-\lambda n}\varepsilon \leq \min_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x) < -R + (k+1)e^{-\lambda n}\varepsilon.$$

Let $\psi : \{z_i\}_{i=1}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\psi(z_i) = \max \{c \in U_{n,k} \mid c \leq \phi(x), \forall x \in B(z_i, \varepsilon)\}.$$

Then $\psi \in F_n$ and $\tilde{\psi} \in \tilde{F}_n$. Now we only need to prove

$$\phi \in \tilde{B}(\tilde{\psi}, n, (1 + K_0)\varepsilon),$$

that is,

$$\|T_j \tilde{\psi} - T_j \phi\|_{C^0} < (1 + K_0)\varepsilon, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (6)$$

For any $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$, there exists $y_x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ such that

$$T_j \phi(x) = e^{\lambda j} \phi(y_x) + D(j, y_x, x).$$

Choose z_i such that $y_x \in B(z_i, \varepsilon)$. By the choice of ψ , we have $\psi(z_i) \leq \phi(y_x)$. Using Proposition 3.2, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} T_j \tilde{\psi}(x) &\leq e^{\lambda j} \psi(z_i) + D(j, z_i, x) \\ &\leq e^{\lambda j} \phi(y_x) + D(j, y_x, x) + (D(j, z_i, x) - D(j, y_x, x)) \\ &\leq T_j \phi(x) + K_0\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, the choice of k and ψ implies that there exists z_{i_0} such that

$$\psi(z_{i_0}) = \min_{1=1, \dots, m} \psi(z_i) = -R + ke^{-\lambda n}\varepsilon.$$

Lemma 3.2 implies that there exists z_{i_x} such that

$$T_j \tilde{\psi}(x) = e^{\lambda j} \psi(z_{i_x}) + D(j, z_{i_x}, x) \leq e^{\lambda j} \psi(z_{i_0}) + D(j, z_{i_0}, x),$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(z_{i_x}) &\leq \psi(z_{i_0}) + e^{-\lambda j} (D(j, z_{i_0}, x) - D(j, z_{i_x}, x)) \\ &\leq -R + ke^{-\lambda n} \varepsilon + K_0 e^{-\lambda j}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Now, by the definition of $U_{n,k}$ and the choice of ψ , we know that there exists $y \in B(z_{i_x}, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\psi(z_{i_x}) \leq \phi(y) < \psi(z_{i_x}) + e^{-\lambda j} \varepsilon.$$

If it were not the case, Pigeonhole principle yields

$$\psi(z_{i_x}) \geq -R + ke^{-\lambda n} \varepsilon + \left(\left\lceil \frac{K_0}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil + 1 \right) \cdot e^{-\lambda j} \varepsilon > -R + ke^{-\lambda n} \varepsilon + K_0 e^{-\lambda j},$$

which contradicts (8). Thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned} T_j \tilde{\psi}(x) &= e^{\lambda j} \psi(z_{i_x}) + D(j, z_{i_x}, x) \\ &\geq e^{\lambda j} (\phi(y) - e^{-\lambda j} \varepsilon) + D(j, y, x) + (D(j, z_{i_x}, x) - D(j, y, x)) \\ &\geq e^{\lambda j} \phi(y) - \varepsilon + D(j, y, x) - K_0 d(z_{i_x}, y) \\ &\geq T_j \phi(x) - (1 + K_0) \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It is easy to see that (6) follows directly from (7) and (9). This completes the proof of our claim (5). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Fabio Ancona, Piermarco Cannarsa, and Khai T. Nguyen. Compactness estimates for Hamilton-Jacobi equations depending on space. *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.)*, 11(1):63–113, 2016.
- [2] Fabio Ancona, Piermarco Cannarsa, and Khai T. Nguyen. Quantitative compactness estimates for Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 219(2):793–828, 2016.
- [3] Piermarco Cannarsa, Wei Cheng, Liang Jin, Kaizhi Wang, and Jun Yan. Herglotz’ variational principle and Lax-Oleinik evolution. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 141:99–136, 2020.
- [4] Piermarco Cannarsa, Wei Cheng, Kaizhi Wang, and Jun Yan. Herglotz’ generalized variational principle and contact type Hamilton-Jacobi equations. In *Trends in control theory and partial differential equations*, volume 32 of *Springer INdAM Ser.*, pages 39–67. Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [5] Piermarco Cannarsa and Carlo Sinestrari. *Semiconcave functions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, and optimal control*, volume 58 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2004.
- [6] Albert Fathi. Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian dynamics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (to appear).
- [7] Wen Huang and Kening Lu. Entropy, chaos, and weak horseshoe for infinite-dimensional random dynamical systems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 70(10):1987–2036, 2017.
- [8] Liang Jin and Jun Yan. On the dynamics of contact Hamiltonian systems: I. Monotone systems. *Nonlinearity*, 34(5):3314–3336, 2021.
- [9] Zeng Lian, Peidong Liu, and Kening Lu. SRB measures for a class of partially hyperbolic attractors in Hilbert spaces. *J. Differential Equations*, 261(2):1532–1603, 2016.
- [10] Zeng Lian and Kening Lu. Lyapunov exponents and invariant manifolds for random dynamical systems in a Banach space. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 206(967):vi+106, 2010.

- [11] Kening Lu, Qiudong Wang, and Lai-Sang Young. Strange attractors for periodically forced parabolic equations. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 224(1054):vi+85, 2013.
- [12] Marcelo Viana and Krerley Oliveira. *Foundations of ergodic theory*, volume 151 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [13] Kaizhi Wang, Lin Wang, and Jun Yan. Implicit variational principle for contact Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinearity*, 30(2):492–515, 2017.
- [14] Kaizhi Wang, Jun Yan, and Kai Zhao. Time periodic solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with autonomous Hamiltonian on the circle. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 171:122–141, 2023.

(Wei Cheng) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY, NANJING 210093, CHINA
Email address: chengwei@nju.edu.cn

(Jiahui Hong) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS, NANJING 211106, CHINA
Email address: hongjiahui@nuaa.edu.cn

(Zhi-Xiang Zhu) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY, NANJING 210093, CHINA
Email address: zhuzhixiang0928@gmail.com