

A SHADOWABLE CHAIN RECURRENT SET WITH AN ATTACHED HYPERBOLIC SINGULARITY

SOGO MURAKAMI
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO,
JAPAN

ABSTRACT. We construct a C^∞ -flow on the four-dimensional sphere whose nonwandering set contains an attached hyperbolic singularity yet possesses the standard shadowing property. This gives a counterexample to a conjecture given by Arbieto, López, Rego and Sánchez (Math. Annalen 390:417-437).

1. INTRODUCTION

The shadowing property is a fundamental concept in the theory of dynamical systems, providing a bridge between approximate trajectories and true ones. Informally speaking, for certain types of dynamical systems, any approximate trajectory (commonly referred to as a pseudotrajectory) can be closely followed, or shadowed, by a true orbit.

This property has profound applications across areas: for instance, in the numerical analysis, it ensures the reliability of simulations [7]; and in the ergodic theory, it has an application in iterated function systems [8]. These examples highlight its theoretical and practical versatility in analyzing complex systems.

The shadowing property is closely linked to the structural stability or hyperbolicity. Many results concerning the relationship between various shadowing and the stability has been obtained for flows. Notably, Palmer, Pilyugin and Tikhomirov proved that the Lipschitz shadowing property and the structural stability are equivalent for C^1 vector fields on a compact manifold [5].

On the other hand, beyond the context of uniformly hyperbolic systems, checking the shadowability is an important problem. For example, the geometric Lorenz attractor does not exhibit the shadowing property as proved by Komuro [3]. This suggests the limitations of the shadowing in the non-uniformly hyperbolic settings. Indeed, Wen and Wen [9] showed that every singular hyperbolic chain recurrent set with a singularity does not admit the shadowing property. These results showed that the shadowing property does not common in dynamical behavior with singularities beyond the uniform hyperbolicity.

One reason for the lack of the shadowing is thought to be the presence of singularities. In this context, Arbieto, López, Rego and Sánchez [1] demonstrated that chain recurrent sets with attached hyperbolic singularities satisfying a certain condition fail to exhibit the shadowing property. Moreover, they conjectured that any chain recurrent set with attached hyperbolic singularities cannot possess this

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37C10, 37C50.

Key words and phrases. Beyond uniform hyperbolicity; Shadowing; suspension flow; Smale Horseshoe.

property, suggesting a potential difficulty of possessing the shadowing property in the dynamical systems with singularities.

In this paper, we construct a C^∞ vector field on a four-dimensional sphere whose nonwandering set has an attached singularity and simultaneously satisfies the shadowing property. As a consequence, we disprove the conjecture mentioned above. The idea of the proof is to combine nonsingular hyperbolic structure with a hyperbolic singularity in the four dimensional setting, resulting in dynamics that exhibit properties distinct from those observed in previously studied systems beyond uniform hyperbolicity.

Let M be a C^∞ Riemannian closed manifold with the metric dist induced by the Riemannian metric. Let ϕ be a C^∞ flow on M .

We say that $\xi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ is a d -pseudotrajectory of ϕ if

$$\text{dist}(\xi(t+s), \phi(\xi(t), s)) < d$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in [0, 1]$. Let $\text{Ps}(d)$ be the set of all d -pseudotrajectories of ϕ . Denote by Rep the set of all homeomorphisms from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} which preserves the orientation. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$\text{Rep}(\varepsilon) = \left\{ f \in \text{Rep}; \left| \frac{f(a) - f(b)}{a - b} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon, \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a > b \right\}.$$

We say that a flow ϕ has the *standard shadowing property* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $d > 0$ such that if $\xi \in \text{Ps}(d)$ then

$$\text{dist}(\xi(t), \phi(h(t), x)) < \varepsilon, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

for some $x \in M$ and $h \in \text{Rep}(\varepsilon)$. As a weaker form of the shadowing properties, we say that a flow ϕ has the *oriented shadowing property* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $d > 0$ such that if $\xi \in \text{Ps}(d)$ then

$$\text{dist}(\xi(t), \phi(h(t), x)) < \varepsilon, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

for some $x \in M$ and $h \in \text{Rep}$.

A point $x \in M$ is called a *chain recurrent point* of a flow ϕ if for any $d, T > 0$ there exists a d -pseudotrajectory ξ such that $\xi(0) = \xi(T) = x$ for some $t \geq T$. Let $\text{CR}(\phi)$ be the set of all chain recurrent points of ϕ , which is called the *chain recurrent set* of ϕ . Denote by $\Omega(\phi)$ the nonwandering set of ϕ . Note that $\Omega(\phi) \subset \text{CR}(\phi)$. A singularity p (i.e., a fixed point for the flow ϕ) is *attached to* a ϕ -invariant set Λ if p is accumulated by regular points of Λ .

Theorem 1.1. *There is a C^∞ flow ϕ on S^4 such that a hyperbolic singularity is attached to $\text{CR}(\phi)$ and ϕ has the standard shadowing property on $\text{CR}(\phi)$. Moreover, the chain recurrent set $\text{CR}(\phi)$ coincides with the nonwandering set $\Omega(\phi)$ of ϕ .*

Remark 1.2. Theorem 1.1 gives a counterexample to this conjecture by Arbieto, López, Rego and Sánchez [1]. They conjectured that chain recurrent set with an attached hyperbolic singularity does not have the oriented shadowing property.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we describe the structure of desired flow on S^4 and reduce Theorem 1.1 to a problem on \mathbb{R}^4 . Let us denote by $\|\cdot\|_2$ the Euclidean metric of the Euclidean space. Now, we consider a 3-fold Smale horseshoe diffeomorphism $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, which will play an important role in the construction of X (see Figure 1). The shape P is a unit square centered at the origin with semicircles attached

to its top and bottom sides, and satisfies $f(P) \subset P$. The horizontal strips H_0, H_1, H_2 are mapped linearly onto vertical strips V_0, V_1, V_2 , respectively. We may also assume that:

- The chain recurrent set $\text{CR}(f)$ of f consists of two attracting fixed points p_f and q_f (see Figure 1) and a transitive non-trivial hyperbolic set Λ_f .
- $f(x, y) = (-x/2, -y/2)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with sufficiently large $\|(x, y)\|_2$.
- For all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have $f(-x, -y) = -f(x, y)$.
- For all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $f^n(x, y) \in P$.




Figure 1. 3-fold Smale horseshoe. $f(H_i) = V_i$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

In Section 3, we will construct a C^∞ vector field X on \mathbb{R}^4 using the diffeomorphism f , such that X satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $(0, 0, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ is the only singularity of X and is hyperbolic of index 2.
- (2) Let $R_0 = \{(x, 0, y, 0); x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and let $\phi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ be the flow generated by X . Then

$$\inf\{t > 0; \phi(t, p) \in R_0\} = 1, \quad p \in R_0 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0, 0)\}$$

and

$$\phi(1, (x, 0, y, 0)) = (-f_1(x, y), 0, -f_2(x, y), 0), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are functions such that $(f_1(x, y), f_2(x, y)) = f(x, y)$.

- (3) Let $K = \bigcup_{t \in [0, 1]} \phi(t, R_0)$. Then K is ϕ -invariant and attractive.
- (4) There is $N_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\phi(t, (x, y, z, w))\|_2^2 < -\|(x, y, z, w)\|_2^2$$

for all $(x, y, z, w) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $\|(x, y, z, w)\|_2 \geq N_0$.

The condition (2) above implies that ϕ has similar structure as the suspension flow of 3-fold Smale horseshoe. However, ϕ has a singularity at $(0, 0, 0, 0)$, and this is an essential difference between the suspension flow of Smale horseshoe and ϕ .

Using X , we can construct a vector field \tilde{X} on S^4 . Let $F : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow S^4$ be

$$F(p) = \left(\frac{4x}{\|p\|_2^2 + 4}, \frac{4y}{\|p\|_2^2 + 4}, \frac{4z}{\|p\|_2^2 + 4}, \frac{4w}{\|p\|_2^2 + 4}, \frac{\|p\|_2^2 - 4}{\|p\|_2^2 + 4} \right),$$

where $p = (x, y, z, w) \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Then F is a C^∞ diffeomorphism from \mathbb{R}^4 to $S^4 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0, 0, 1)\}$. Define a vector field \tilde{X} on S^4 by

$$\tilde{X}(p) = \begin{cases} F_*(X)(p), & p \in F(\mathbb{R}^4), \\ 0, & p = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1). \end{cases}$$

Then $(0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$ is a hyperbolic repeller of \tilde{X} . Thus, $\text{CR}(\tilde{X}) = F(\text{CR}(X)) \cup \{(0, 0, 0, 0, 1)\}$. Since it is obvious that ϕ has the standard shadowing property on a hyperbolic repeller, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is reduced to showing the following proposition:

Proposition 2.1. *ϕ has the standard shadowing property on $\text{CR}(X)$.*

Note that, if ϕ has the shadowing property on its chain recurrent set $\text{CR}(\phi)$, then $\text{CR}(\phi) = \Omega(\phi)$.

In Section 4, we prove that $\text{CR}(X)$ is a compact invariant set and in Section 5, ϕ has the shadowing property on $\text{CR}(X)$, which finishes the proof of Proposition 2.1 and then that of Theorem 1.1.

3. THE CONSTRUCTION OF X

Let us consider a family of diffeomorphisms $\{f_t : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2\}_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $\{f_t : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2\}_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is a smooth transformation from $\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ to f given in the beginning of Section 2. That is, $f_0 \equiv \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$, $f_1 \equiv f$ and

$$\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t}(p) \in T_{f_t(p)}\mathbb{R}^2$$

is smooth with respect to $(p, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1$.

- (2) $f_t(x, y) = -f_t(-x, -y)$.
- (3) There is $\nu_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t}(x, y) = (-\log 7)x, (\log 7)y$$

for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t \in [0, 1]$ with $\|f_t(x, y)\|_2 \leq \nu_0$.

- (4) There is $N_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t}(x, y) = (-x, -y)$$

for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t \in [0, 1]$ with $\|f_t(x, y)\|_2 \geq N_0/2$.

Using $\{f_t\}$, we may construct the suspension flow of f (see Figure 2). For $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, define

$$V(x, y, t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \Big|_{s=0} f_{t+s} \circ f_t^{-1}(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

This corresponds to the slope of the flow at the point $(t, f_t(x, y))$ in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Construction of suspension flow of f .

We can define $\tau : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$\tau(a) = \begin{cases} 0, & |a| \geq \nu_0/2, \\ 1, & |a| \leq \nu_0/4 \end{cases}$$

satisfying $\tau(a) = \tau(-a)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\theta \in [0, 2]$, define $e(\theta) = (\cos \pi\theta, \sin \pi\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In this paper, we regard a point in \mathbb{R}^4 as a point in $(\mathbb{R}^2)^2$ to express that point by a pair of polar coordinates. For $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta, \varphi \in [0, 2]$, let

$$R_{\theta, \varphi}(p, q) = (p \cdot e(\theta), q \cdot e(\varphi)) \in \mathbb{R}^4.$$

The vector field X on \mathbb{R}^4 is defined by the linear sum of three vector fields Y , Z , W . We define these vector fields separately as follows.

Let $Y(x, y, z, w) = (-\pi y, \pi x, -\pi w, \pi z)$. Notice that $Y(a \cdot e(\theta), b \cdot e(\varphi)) = (a \cdot e(\theta + 1/2), b \cdot e(\varphi + 1/2))$.

Letting

$$\begin{aligned} D_{Z_0} = & \{R_{\theta, \theta}(a, b); a, b \in \mathbb{R}, \theta \in [0, 2]\} \\ & \cup \{R_{\theta, \varphi}(a, b); a, b \in \mathbb{R}, \theta \in [0, 2], \|(a, b)\|_2 \leq \nu_0/2\} \\ & \cup \{R_{\theta, \varphi}(a, b); a, b \in \mathbb{R}, \theta \in [0, 2], \|(a, b)\|_2 \geq N_0\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

define a smooth vector field Z_0 on D_{Z_0} by

$$Z_0(R_{\theta, \varphi}(a, b)) = \begin{cases} R_{\theta, \varphi}(V_1(a, b, \theta), V_2(a, b, \theta)), & \theta = \varphi, \\ R_{\theta, \varphi}(-(\log 7)a, (\log 7)b), & \|(a, b)\|_2 \leq \nu_0/2, \\ R_{\theta, \varphi}(-a, -b), & \|(a, b)\|_2 \geq N_0 \end{cases}$$

where $V_1, V_2 : \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, 2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are functions such that $V(a, b, \theta) = (V_1(a, b, \theta), V_2(a, b, \theta))$. Then by applying [4, Lemma 2.26] to Z_0 , we obtain a smooth vector field Z on \mathbb{R}^4 satisfying $Z(p) = Z_0(p)$ for all $p \in D_{Z_0}$.

Let us define a vector field W_0 on \mathbb{R}^4 by

$$\begin{aligned} W_0(x, y, z, w) &= -(xw - yz) \operatorname{grad}(xw - yz) \\ &= (-(xw - yz)w, (xw - yz)z, (xw - yz)y, -(xw - yz)x). \end{aligned}$$

To localize this vector field, we introduce a smooth bump function $\tau_W : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$\tau_W(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & r \leq N_0/2, \\ 0, & r \geq N_0. \end{cases}$$

We then define a new vector field W by

$$W = \tau_W W_0.$$

4. THE CHAIN RECURRENT SET OF ϕ

Define $h : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $h(x, y, z, w) = xw - yz$. The following lemma asserts that every integral curve of Y is contained in a level set of h .

Lemma 4.1. *For all $p = (x, y, z, w) \in \mathbb{R}^4$,*

$$Dh(p)(Y(p)) = 0.$$

Proof. Denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ the inner product of elements of \mathbb{R}^4 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} Dh(p)(Y(p)) &= \left\langle \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(p), \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(p), \frac{\partial h}{\partial z}(p), \frac{\partial h}{\partial w}(p) \right), Y(p) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &= \langle (w, -z, -y, x), Y(p) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &= w(-\pi y) + (-z)\pi x + (-y)(-\pi w) + x\pi z \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

The following two lemmas gives an evaluation of the change of h through the integral curve of Z and W , respectively.

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$|Dh(p)(Z(p))| \leq C|h(p)|$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Moreover,

$$Dh(p)(Z(p)) = 0$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $\|p\|_2 \leq \nu_0/2$.

Proof. Notice that for all $p = (x, y, z, w) = (a \cdot e(\theta), b \cdot e(\varphi)) \in \mathbb{R}^4$, it follows that $Dh(p) = (w, -z, -y, x) = (b \cdot e(\varphi - 1/2), a \cdot e(\theta + 1/2))$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} Dh(p)(Z(p)) &= Dh(p)(Z_0(p)) \\ &= \langle (b \cdot e(\varphi - 1/2), a \cdot e(\theta + 1/2)), Z_0(p) \rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} 0, & \theta = \varphi, \\ 0, & \|(a, b)\|_2 \leq \nu_0/2, \\ -2h(p), & \|(a, b)\|_2 \geq N_0 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

for all $p \in D_{Z_0}$, where D_{Z_0} is the set given in (3.1). Thus, the proof of the lemma is reduced to proving the following claim.

Claim 1. *There is $C \geq 2$ such that*

$$|Dh(p)(Z(p))| \leq C|h(p)|$$

for all $p \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus D_{Z_0}}$.

Assume to the contrary that, there are $2 \leq C_1 < C_2 < \dots \rightarrow \infty$ and $p_n \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus D_{Z_0}}$ such that $|Dh(p_n)(Z(p_n))| > C_n|h(p_n)|$ for all $n \geq 1$. By the compactness, there is $p_0 \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus D_{Z_0}}$ satisfying $p_{n_k} \rightarrow p_0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For all k and l with $k > l$, we have

$$|Dh(p_{n_k})(Z(p_{n_k}))| > C_{n_k}|h(p_{n_k})| \geq C_{n_l}|h(p_{n_k})|.$$

Taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$|Dh(p_0)(Z(p_0))| \geq C_{n_l}|h(p_0)|.$$

Consequently, we have $|h(p_0)| = 0$. Since $p_0 \neq (0, 0, 0, 0)$, the point p_0 is a regular point of h . Apply implicit function theorem for h and p_0 to obtain a chart (U, φ_U) such that $p_0 \in U \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus D_{Z_0}}$ and $h(\varphi_U^{-1}(x, y, z, w)) = w$ for all $(x, y, z, w) \in \varphi_U^{-1}(U)$. If $p = (a \cdot e(\theta), b \cdot e(\varphi)) \in U$ satisfies $h(p) = 0$, then $\theta = \varphi$. This and (4.1) imply that for all $p \in U$, $h(p) = 0$ implies $Dh(p)(Z(p)) = 0$. Thus, by replacing U smaller if necessary, there is $C > 0$ such that $|Dh(p)(Z(p))| \leq C|h(p)|$ for all $p \in U$. This contradicts with the fact that $C_n > C$ for sufficiently large n . \square

Lemma 4.3. *For all $p \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $\|p\|_2 \leq N_0/2$,*

$$Dh(p)(W(p)) = -h(p) \cdot \|p\|_2^2.$$

Proof. Note that $W(p) = -h(p) \text{grad}h(p)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $\|p\|_2 \leq N_0/2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Dh(p)(W(p)) &= \langle (w, -z, -y, x), -h(p) \text{grad}h(p) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &= -h(p) \langle (w, -z, -y, x), \text{grad}h(p) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &= -h(p) \langle (w, -z, -y, x), (w, -z, -y, x) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &= -h(p)(x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + w^2) \\ &= -h(p)\|p\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Let C be the constant given in Lemma 4.2 and let $K = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^4; h(p) = 0\}$. Define the vector field X by $X = Y + Z + 2C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}W$. Let ϕ be the flow on \mathbb{R}^4 generated by X . The following proposition implies that every orbit of ϕ converges "monotonically" to K .

Proposition 4.4. *There exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} h(\phi_t(p)) + Ch(p) \cdot \|p\|_2^2 \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} h(\phi_t(p)) + 3Ch(p) \cdot \|p\|_2^2 \right) \leq 0$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and the value $|h(\phi_t(p))|$ converges monotonically to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} h(\phi_t(p)) &= Dh(p)(X(p)) \\
 &= Dh(p)(Y + Z + 2CW)(p) \\
 &= Dh(p)Y(p) + Dh(p)Z(p) + 2C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}Dh(p)W(p) \\
 &= 0 + Dh(p)Z(p) - 2C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}h(p) \cdot \|p\|_2^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Lemma 4.2 implies that

$$|Dh(p)Z(p)| \leq C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}|h(p)| \cdot \|p\|_2^2$$

regardless of whether $\|p\|_2 \leq \nu_0/2$ holds or not. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} h(\phi_t(p)) = 0 &\iff C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}h(p) \cdot \|p\|_2^2 = 0 \\
 &\iff h(p) = 0 \text{ or } \|p\|_2^2 = 0 \\
 &\iff h(p) = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} h(\phi_t(p)) > 0 &\iff C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}h(p) \cdot \|p\|_2^2 < 0 \\
 &\iff h(p) < 0 \text{ and } \|p\|_2^2 \neq 0 \\
 &\iff h(p) < 0
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} h(\phi_t(p)) < 0 \iff h(p) > 0.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

Proposition 4.5. For all $p \in \mathbb{R}^4$, if $\|p\|_2 \geq N_0$, then

$$\left\langle X(p), \frac{p}{\|p\|_2} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} = -\|p\|_2.$$

Proof. For all $p = (a \cdot e(\theta), b \cdot e(\varphi)) = R_{\theta, \varphi}(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ with $\|p\|_2 \geq N_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 X(p) &= Y(p) + Z(p) + 2C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}W(p) \\
 &= R_{\theta+1/2, \varphi+1/2}(a, b) + R_{\theta, \varphi}(-a, -b) + 0 \\
 &= R_{\theta+1/2, \varphi+1/2}(a, b) + R_{\theta, \varphi}(-a, -b).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle X(p), p \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} &= \langle R_{\theta+1/2, \varphi+1/2}(a, b), R_{\theta, \varphi}(a, b) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} + \langle R_{\theta, \varphi}(-a, -b), R_{\theta, \varphi}(a, b) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\
 &= \langle a \cdot e(\theta + 1/2), a \cdot e(\theta) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} + \langle b \cdot e(\varphi + 1/2), b \cdot e(\varphi) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\
 &\quad + \langle -a \cdot e(\theta), a \cdot e(\theta) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} + \langle -b \cdot e(\varphi), b \cdot e(\varphi) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\
 &= 0 + 0 - a^2 - b^2 \\
 &= -\|p\|_2^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof. \square

Let $\text{CR}(\phi)$ be the chain recurrent set of ϕ .

Proposition 4.6. $\text{CR}(\phi)$ is bounded and $\text{CR}(\phi) \subset K$.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in \text{CR}(\phi)$ and let $\{g_n\}_n$ be $(1/n)$ -cycle from x_0 (i.e., $g_n(0) = x_0$ and $g_n(t_n) = x_0$ for some t_n with $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$). Proposition 4.5 implies that

$$\phi(1, \{p \in \mathbb{R}^4; \|p\|_2 \leq N_0 + 1\}) \subset \{p \in \mathbb{R}^4; \|p\|_2 \leq N_0\},$$

that is, $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^4; \|p\|_2 \leq N_0 + 1\}$ is an attracting neighborhood. Consequently, we can assume that $g_n(\mathbb{R}) \subset \{p \in \mathbb{R}^4; \|p\|_2 \leq N_0 + 1\}$. This implies that $x_0 = g_n(0)$ satisfies $\|x_0\|_2 \leq N_0 + 1$ and thus $\text{CR}(\phi)$ is bounded.

Assume to the contrary that there is $x_0 \in \text{CR}(\phi) \setminus K$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $h(x_0) > 0$, because the other case can be proven analogously. For $t \geq 0$, let

$$K(t) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^4; |h(p)| \leq t, \|p\|_2 \leq N_0 + 1\}.$$

Let us fix $\lambda \in (h(\phi(1, x_0)), h(x_0))$. Then Proposition 4.4 implies that there exists N_1 such that $g_n(1) \in K(\lambda)$ for all $n \geq N_1$. Again, using Proposition 4.4, we see that there exists $d > 0$ such that if $p \in K(\lambda)$ and $\text{dist}(\phi(1, p), q) < d$, then $q \in K(\lambda)$. Thus, for $n \geq N_1$ with $1/n < d$ and $k \geq 1$, we have $g_n(k) \in K(\lambda)$, which is a contraction. \square

We have an explicit formula for the flow ϕ on K . Notice that $K = \{R_{\theta, \theta}(a, b); \theta \in [0, 1], a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and by Proposition 4.4, K is ϕ -invariant.

Claim 2. For all $\theta, t \in [0, 1]$ with $\theta + t \leq 1$,

$$\phi(t, R_{\theta, \theta}(f_\theta(a, b))) = R_{\theta+t, \theta+t}(f_{\theta+t}(a, b)).$$

Proof. It is enough to prove the case where $\theta = 0$. $f_t(a, b) = (0, 0)$ if and only if $(a, b) = (0, 0)$. Thus, the desired formula holds when $(a, b) = (0, 0)$ and we can assume that $(a, b) \neq (0, 0)$. Then

$$\left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=t} R_{s, s}(f_s(a, b)) = R_{t, t}(V(a, b, t)) + R_{t+1/2, t+1/2}(f_t(a, b)).$$

For $p = R_{\theta, \theta}(a, b) \in K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=t} \phi(s, R_{0, 0}(f_0(a, b))) &= X(p) \\ &= Y(p) + Z(p) + 2C(\nu_0/2)^{-2}W(p) \\ &= R_{\theta+1/2, \theta+1/2}(a, b) + R_{\theta, \theta}(V_1(a, b, \theta), V_2(a, b, \theta)) + 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the desired equation. \square

Let $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be such that $\tilde{f}(a, b) = -f(a, b)$. By Claim 2,

$$\phi(1, R_{0, 0}(f_0(a, b))) = R_{1, 1}(f_1(a, b)) = R_{0, 0}(-f_1(a, b)) = R_{0, 0}(\tilde{f}(a, b)).$$

It is easy to see that $\text{CR}(\tilde{f}) = \text{CR}(f)$ and they have the same hyperbolic splitting.

Proposition 4.7. Let \tilde{f} be $\tilde{f}(a, b) = -f(a, b)$.

$$\text{CR}(\phi|_K) = \bigcup_{\theta \in [0, 1]} \{\phi(\theta, R_{0, 0}(a, b)); (a, b) \in \text{CR}(\tilde{f})\}.$$

Proof. Let $p = R_{0, 0}(a, b)$ with $(a, b) \in \text{CR}(\tilde{f})$. Then for all $d > 0$, there is a periodic d -pseudotrajectory of f from (a, b) to (a, b) . Then we can easily construct a periodic d -pseudotrajectory of $\phi|_K$ from (a, b) to (a, b) . Thus,

$$\bigcup_{\theta \in [0, 1]} \{\phi(\theta, R_{0, 0}(a, b)); (a, b) \in \text{CR}(f)\} \subset \text{CR}(\phi|_K).$$

Note that, $\text{CR}(\tilde{f})$ consists of an attracting periodic orbit $\{p_f, q_f\}$, and a transitive nontrivial set Λ_f of \tilde{f} (see Figure 1). Thus, for every $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \text{CR}(\tilde{f})$,

$$\tilde{f}^n(a, b) \rightarrow \{p_f, q_f\}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.2)$$

or

$$\|\tilde{f}^n(a, b)\|_2 \rightarrow \infty, \quad n \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (4.3)$$

Now, let

$$p = \phi(\theta, R_{0,0}(a, b)) \in K \setminus \bigcup_{\theta \in [0,1]} \{\phi(\theta, R_{0,0}(a, b)); (a, b) \in \text{CR}(\tilde{f})\}.$$

Then $(a, b) \notin \text{CR}(\tilde{f})$, and (a, b) satisfies (4.2) or (4.3). If (a, b) satisfies (4.2), then $R_{0,0}(a, b)$ is in an attracting neighborhood in K of the closed orbit generated by p_f and q_f , which means that $R_{0,0}(a, b) \notin \text{CR}(\phi|_K)$. Similarly, if (a, b) satisfies (4.3), then $R_{0,0}(a, b) \notin \text{CR}(\phi)$ by Proposition 4.6. Combining these, we obtain

$$\text{CR}(\phi|_K) \subset \bigcup_{\theta \in [0,1]} \{\phi(\theta, R_{0,0}(a, b)); (a, b) \in \text{CR}(\tilde{f})\}.$$

□

Proposition 4.8. *$\text{CR}(\phi)$ is a chain recurrent set with an attached singularity written as*

$$\text{CR}(\phi) = \bigcup_{\theta \in [0,1]} \{\phi(\theta, R_{0,0}(a, b)); (a, b) \in \text{CR}(f)\}.$$

Proof. Applying [2, Theorem 1.5.36] for ϕ , we have

$$\text{CR}(\phi|_K) \subset \text{CR}(\phi) = \text{CR}(\phi|_{\text{CR}(\phi)}) \subset \text{CR}(\phi|_K).$$

This and Proposition 4.7 yield the equation. Since $(0, 0) \in \text{CR}(f)$ is not isolated, $\text{CR}(\phi)$ is a chain recurrent set with an attached singularity.

□

5. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we prove that ϕ has the standard shadowing property on $\text{CR}(\phi)$. This is equivalent to the fact that ϕ has the standard shadowing property on each chain component. Recall that $\text{CR}(\phi)$ consists of two chain components: a hyperbolic attracting closed orbit generated by p_f and q_f of f , and a chain component Λ generated by non-trivial transitive set Λ_f (see Figure 1). Since it is obvious that ϕ has the standard shadowing property on the hyperbolic attracting closed orbit, the proof of Proposition 2.1 can be reduced to that of the following proposition:

Proposition 5.1. *ϕ has the standard shadowing property on Λ .*

Let us fix $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$. There is $\varepsilon'_0 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ such that if $p, q \in \Lambda$ satisfy $\text{dist}(p, q) < \varepsilon'_0$, then $\text{dist}(\phi(t, p), \phi(t, q)) < \varepsilon_0/2$ for all $t \in [-2, 5]$. Let $\Delta_0 > 0$ be such that $\text{dist}(\phi(t, x), x) < \varepsilon_0/4$ for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|t| \leq 2\Delta_0$.

Since \tilde{f} has the shadowing property on Λ_f , there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that every δ_0 -pseudotrajectory of \tilde{f} on Λ_f is $\varepsilon'_0/2$ -shadowed. For $\theta \in [0, 1]$, denote by R_θ the set $R_{\theta, \theta} = \{(a \cdot e(\theta), b \cdot e(\theta)) \in \mathbb{R}^4; a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$. There exists $r_0 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $d_0 > 0$ such that if d_0 -pseudotrajectory ξ of ϕ on Λ satisfies $\text{dist}(\xi(0), (0, 0, 0, 0)) < r_0$, then $\text{dist}(\xi(t), (0, 0, 0, 0)) < \varepsilon_0/2$ and

$$\xi(t) \in \{R_\theta(x); (\theta, x) \in [0, 1) \times \Lambda_f, \text{dist}(x, (0, 0)) < \delta_0/2\} \quad (5.1)$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|t| \leq 1/\min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}$ (this is possible since the set in this formula is a neighborhood of $(0, 0, 0, 0)$).

The following lemma is an analog of [6, Lemma 2.4]:

Lemma 5.2. *For all $v, w \in \Lambda_f$ and $s, t \in [0, 1]$ with $R_s(f_s(v)) \neq (0, 0, 0, 0)$,*

$$\min\{|s-t|, |1+s-t|, |1+t-s|\} \leq \frac{\text{dist}(R_s(f_s(v)), R_t(f_t(w)))}{\|R_t(f_t(w))\|_2}.$$

Proof. Let $\Delta = \langle e(s), e(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} = \cos \pi(s-t)$. and let $R_t(f_t(w)) = (a \cdot e(t), b \cdot e(t))$. Then for all $(c \cdot e(s), d \cdot e(s)) \in R_s$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle R_t(f_t(w)) - (a\Delta \cdot e(s), b\Delta \cdot e(s)), (c \cdot e(s), d \cdot e(s)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &= \langle R_t(f_t(w)), (c \cdot e(s), d \cdot e(s)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ & - \langle (a\Delta \cdot e(s), b\Delta \cdot e(s)), (c \cdot e(s), d \cdot e(s)) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^4} \\ &= \langle a \cdot e(t), c \cdot e(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} + \langle b \cdot e(t), d \cdot e(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \\ & - (\langle a\Delta \cdot e(s), c \cdot e(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} + \langle b\Delta \cdot e(s), d \cdot e(s) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2}) \\ &= ac\Delta + bd\Delta - (ac\Delta + bd\Delta) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $R_t(f_t(w)) - (a\Delta \cdot e(s), b\Delta \cdot e(s))$ is orthogonal to R_t . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(R_t(f_t(w)), R_s(f_s(v))) &\geq \text{dist}(R_t(f_t(w)), R_s) \\ &= \text{dist}(R_t(f_t(w)), (a\Delta \cdot e(s), b\Delta \cdot e(s))) \\ &= \sqrt{\text{dist}(a \cdot e(t), a\Delta \cdot e(s))^2 + \text{dist}(b \cdot e(t), b\Delta \cdot e(s))^2} \\ &= \sqrt{a^2 \sin^2 \pi(s-t) + b^2 \sin^2 \pi(s-t)} \\ &= |\sin \pi(s-t)| \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$|\sin \pi(s-t)| \leq \frac{\text{dist}(R_s(f_s(v)), R_t(f_t(w)))}{\|R_t(f_t(w))\|_2}. \quad (5.2)$$

Since

$$\min\{|s-t|, |1+s-t|, |1+t-s|\} = \min\{|s-t-n|; n \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

we see that

$$|\sin \pi(s-t)| \geq \min\{|s-t|, |1+s-t|, |1+t-s|\}. \quad (5.3)$$

Combining (5.2) and (5.3), we get the conclusion. \square

Lemma 5.3. *There exists $d_1 \in (0, d_0)$ such that if $v, w \in \Lambda_f$ and $s, t \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $\text{dist}(R_s(f_s(v)), R_t(f_t(w))) < d_1$ and $\|R_t(f_t(w)), (0, 0, 0, 0)\|_2 \geq r_0$, then one of the followings holds:*

- (1) $|s-t| \leq \min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}$ and $\text{dist}(v, w) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}$.
- (2) $|1+s-t| \leq \min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}$ and $\text{dist}(\hat{f}^{-1}(v), w) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}$.
- (3) $|1+t-s| \leq \min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}$ and $\text{dist}(\hat{f}(v), w) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}$.

Proof. Choose $d_2 \in (0, d_0)$ so that

$$\text{dist}(\phi(t, x), \phi(t, y)) < \frac{\delta_0}{4} \quad (5.4)$$

for all $t \in [-1, 0]$ and $x, y \in \Lambda$ with $\text{dist}(x, y) < d_2$. Then, let $\Delta_1 > 0$ be such that $\text{dist}(\phi(t, x), x) < \min\{\delta_0/8, d_2/3\}$ for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $|t| \leq \Delta_1$. Take $d_1 \in (0, d_0)$ satisfying

$$d_1 < \min\{\Delta_0 r_0, \varepsilon_0 r_0, \delta_0 r_0/4, \Delta_1 r_0, d_2/3\}.$$

Assume that $v, w \in \Lambda_f$ and $s, t \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $\text{dist}(R_s(f_s(v)), R_t(f_t(w))) < d_1$ and $\|R_t(f_t(w)), (0, 0, 0, 0)\|_2 \geq r_0$. From Lemma 5.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{|s-t|, |1+s-t|, |1+t-s|\} &\leq \frac{\text{dist}(R_s(f_s(v)), R_t(f_t(w)))}{\|R_t(f_t(w))\|_2} \\ &\leq \frac{\min\{\Delta_0 r_0, \varepsilon_0 r_0, \delta_0 r_0/4, \Delta_1 r_0, d_2 r_0\}}{r_0} \\ &\leq \min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0, \delta_0/4, \Delta_1, d_2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Let us prove this lemma by considering the following three cases separately:

Case 1: The left-hand side of (5.5) is $|s-t|$.

In this case, by (5.4) and Claim 2, we have

$$\text{dist}(\phi(-t, R_s(f_s(v))), R_0(w)) = \text{dist}(\phi(-t, R_s(f_s(v))), \phi(-t, R_t(f_t(w)))) < \delta_0/4.$$

By the definition of Δ_1 ,

$$\text{dist}(\phi(-t, R_s(f_s(v))), R_0(v)) = \text{dist}(\phi(s-t, R_0(v)), R_0(v)) < \delta_0/8.$$

Combining these inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(R_0(v), R_0(w)) &\leq \text{dist}(R_0(v), \phi(-t, R_s(f_s(v)))) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}(\phi(-t, R_s(f_s(v))), R_0(w)) \\ &< \delta_0/4 + \delta_0/8 \\ &< \delta_0/2. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: The left-hand side of (5.5) is $|1+s-t|$.

Since $|1+s-t| \leq \Delta_1$, we have $|s|, |1-t| \leq \Delta_1$. Thus,

$$\text{dist}(R_0(v), R_s(f_s(v))) \leq d_2/3$$

and

$$\text{dist}(R_t(f_t(w)), \tilde{f}(w)) = \text{dist}(R_t(f_t(w)), R_1(f_1(w))) \leq d_2/3,$$

which imply

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(v, f(w)) &= \text{dist}(R_0(v), f(w)) \\ &\leq \text{dist}(R_0(v), R_s(f_s(v))) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}(R_s(f_s(v)), R_t(f_t(w))) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}(R_t(f_t(w)), f(w)) \\ &\leq \frac{d_2}{3} + \frac{d_2}{3} + \frac{d_2}{3} = d_2. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of d_2 , we obtain $\text{dist}(f^{-1}(v), w) < \delta_0/2$.

Case 3: The left-hand side of (5.5) is $|1+t-s|$.

The proof of this case is similar to that of **Case 2**. □

Assume that $d_1 < \min\{\Delta_0 r_0, \varepsilon_0 r_0\}$ and

$$\text{dist}(\xi(t+s), \phi(\xi(t), s)) < \min\{d_0, \varepsilon_0/4\}, \quad s \in [0, 2], \quad (5.6)$$

for all d_1 -pseudotrajectory ξ . Let ξ be a d_1 -pseudotrajectory of ϕ on Λ . For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $p_k = \xi(2k)$ and take $\{(\theta_k, q_k) \in [0, 1) \times \Lambda_f; k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ so that $p_k = R_{\theta_k}(f_{\theta_k}(q_k))$. Define

$$S = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}; \text{dist}(p_k, (0, 0, 0, 0)) < r_0\}$$

and

$$\tilde{S} = \{j \in \mathbb{Z}; |j - i| \leq 1/\varepsilon_0 \text{ for some } i \in S\}.$$

For $i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$, let

$$[i, j] = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}; i \leq k \leq j\}.$$


Then \tilde{S} can be divided into a collection of consecutive integers $\{[i_n, j_n]; a_S < n < b_S, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Note that:

- (1) $j_n + 2 \leq i_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $a_S < n < n+1 < b_S$;
- (2) The case that $a_S = -\infty$ and $b_S = \infty$ is admitted;
- (3) If $a_S > -\infty$ (resp. $b_S < \infty$), then $i_{a_S+1} = -\infty$ (resp. $j_{b_S-1} = \infty$) is permissible;
- (4) By the definition of \tilde{S} , we have $j_n - i_n \geq 2/\varepsilon_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $a_S < n < b_S$.


Consider the "complement of the interior of \tilde{S} ", that is, define a set $T \subset \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$T = \{l \in \mathbb{Z}; \{l-1, l, l+1\} \not\subset \tilde{S}\}$$

(see Figure 3). Now, let us construct a pseudotrajectory $\{\tilde{q}_i\}$ of f from $\{p_k\}$.



(a) T with bounded \tilde{S} .



(b) T with unbounded \tilde{S} .

Figure 3. T .

Firstly, let $k \in T$. By (5.6), we have $\text{dist}(\phi(2, p_k), p_{k+1}) < d_0$. Apply Lemma 5.3 for $\phi(2, p_k) = \phi(2 + \theta_k, q_k) = R_{\theta_k}(f_{\theta_k} \circ \tilde{f}^2(q_k))$ and p_{k+1} to obtain

$$\min \left\{ \text{dist}(\tilde{f}^2(q_k), q_{k+1}), \text{dist}(\tilde{f}^3(q_k), q_{k+1}), \text{dist}(\tilde{f}^1(q_k), q_{k+1}) \right\} \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}.$$

Then, there is $m_k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{f}^{m_k}(q_k), q_{k+1}) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2} \quad (5.7)$$

and

$$|\theta_k + 2 - m_k - \theta_{k+1}| \leq \frac{\text{dist}(\phi(2, p_k), p_{k+1})}{\|p_{k+1}\|_2} < \min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}. \quad (5.8)$$

Define $\tilde{q}(k, i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$\tilde{q}(k, i) = \tilde{f}^i(q_k) \quad (5.9)$$

for all $0 \leq i < m_k$.

Secondly, when $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus T$, that is, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is contained in the set

$$\{l \in \mathbb{Z}; \{l-1, l, l+1\} \subset \tilde{S}\},$$

let $m_k = 2$ and define $\tilde{q}(k, i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$\tilde{q}(k, i) = (0, 0) \quad (5.10)$$

for all $0 \leq i < m_k = 2$. Combining (5.9) and (5.10), we get a sequence $\{\tilde{q}_i\}$ by the arrangement of $\{\tilde{q}(k, i); k \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq i < m_k\}$ in lexicographic order, that is, define $\{\tilde{q}_i\}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \vdots \\ \tilde{q}_i &= \tilde{q}(-k, i + M_{-k}), & -M_{-k} \leq i < -M_{-k+1}, \\ & \vdots \\ \tilde{q}_i &= \tilde{q}(-1, i + m_{-1}), & -m_{-1} \leq i < 0, \\ \tilde{q}_i &= \tilde{q}(0, i), & 0 \leq i < m_0, \\ \tilde{q}_i &= \tilde{q}(1, i - m_0), & m_0 \leq i < m_0 + m_1, \\ & \vdots \\ \tilde{q}_i &= \tilde{q}(k, i - M_k), & M_k \leq i < M_{k+1}, \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$$

where $M_k = m_0 + m_1 + \cdots + m_{k-1}$ and $M_{-k} = m_{-1} + m_{-2} + \cdots + m_{-k}$ for $k \geq 0$.

Claim 3. $\{\tilde{q}_i\}$ is a δ_0 -pseudotrajectory of \tilde{f} .

Note that $\{\tilde{q}(k, 0), \tilde{q}(k, 1), \dots, \tilde{q}(k, m_k - 1)\}$ is a segment of a \tilde{f} -orbit for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. In fact, (5.7) (resp. (5.10)) implies that if k and $k+1$ are both contained in T (resp. $\mathbb{Z} \setminus T$), then

$$\text{dist}(f(\tilde{q}(k, m_k - 1)), \tilde{q}(k+1, 0)) < \delta_0. \quad (5.11)$$

It is enough to prove (5.11) when exactly one of k and $k+1$ is contained in T and the other is contained in $\mathbb{Z} \setminus T$. Now we prove the case where $k \in T$ and $k+1 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus T$ (the other case can be proved similarly). Since $k+1 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus T$, we have $k+1 \in \tilde{S}$.

By the choice of \tilde{S} , it follows from (5.1) that $\text{dist}(q_{k+1}, (0, 0)) < \delta_0/2$. Combining this and (5.7), we obtain (5.11), finishing the proof of Claim 3.

Therefore, there exists $q \in \Lambda_f$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{q}_i, \tilde{f}^i(q)) < \frac{\varepsilon'_0}{2}, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (5.12)$$

Let us construct a homeomorphism $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as a reparametrization. For $k \in T$, define

$$h(2k) = \begin{cases} M_k + \theta_k, & k \geq 0, \\ -M_k + \theta_k, & k \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

and extend this to an affine function. If the set T is (upper or lower) bounded, then extend h so that h has slope 1.

Claim 4. $h \in \text{Rep}(\min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\})$.

Proof. Assume that $k, k+1 \in T$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h(2(k+1)) - h(2k) &= \begin{cases} (M_{k+1} + \theta_{k+1}) - (M_k + \theta_k), & k \geq 1, \\ (-M_{k+1} + \theta_{k+1}) - (-M_k + \theta_k), & k \leq -1, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} m_k + \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k, & k \geq 0, \\ m_k + \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k, & k \leq -1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (5.8), we have

$$|h(2(k+1)) - h(2k) - 2| \leq \min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}.$$

Assume that k and k' with $k < k'$ are in T and every l with $k < l < k'$ is in \tilde{S} . From the definition of \tilde{S} , it follows that $k' - k \geq 2/\min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h(2k') - h(2k) &= \begin{cases} (M_{k'} + \theta_{k'}) - (M_k + \theta_k), & k \geq 0, \\ (M_{k'} + \theta_{k'}) - (-M_k + \theta_k), & k' \geq 0 > k, \\ (-M_{k'} + \theta_{k'}) - (-M_k + \theta_k), & k' < 0, \end{cases} \\ &= m_{k'-1} + m_{k'-2} + \cdots + m_k + \theta_{k'} - \theta_k \\ &= 2 \cdot (k' - k - 1) + m_k + \theta_{k'} - \theta_k \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (5.8) implies

$$\begin{aligned} |h(2k') - h(2k) - (2k' - 2k)| &= |m_k - 2 + \theta_{k'} - \theta_k| \\ &= |m_k - 2 - \theta_k + \theta_{k+1} + \theta_{k'} - \theta_{k+1}| \\ &\leq |m_k - 2 - \theta_k + \theta_{k+1}| + |\theta_{k'} - \theta_{k+1}| \\ &\leq \varepsilon_0 + 1 \\ &\leq 2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$\frac{|h(2k') - h(2k) - (2k' - 2k)|}{(2k' - 2k)} \leq \frac{2}{2/\min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}} = \min\{\Delta_0, \varepsilon_0\}.$$

□

Finally, we prove

$$\text{dist}(\xi(t), \phi(h(t), R_0(q))) < \varepsilon_0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.14)$$

Let $k \in T$. Then, using

$$\phi(h(2k), R_0(q)) = \phi(M_k + \theta_k, R_0(q)) = R_{\theta_k}(f_{\theta_k}(\tilde{f}^{M_k}(q)))$$

and

$$\xi(2k) = p_k = R_{\theta_k}(f_{\theta_k}(q_k)) = R_{\theta_k}(f_{\theta_k}(\tilde{q}_{M_k})),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(\phi(h(2k) + (t - 2k), R_0(q)), \phi(t - 2k, \xi(2k))) \\ &= \text{dist}(\phi(t - 2k, R_{\theta_k}(f_{\theta_k}(\tilde{f}^{M_k}(q))))), \phi(t - 2k, R_{\theta_k}(f_{\theta_k}(\tilde{q}_{M_k})))) \\ &= \text{dist}(\phi(t - 2k + \theta_k, R_0(\tilde{f}^{M_k}(q))), \phi(t - 2k + \theta_k, R_0(\tilde{q}_{M_k}))) \end{aligned}$$

for all t with $2k \leq t \leq 2(k + 1)$. By the choice of ε'_0 and (5.12),

$$\text{dist}(\phi(h(2k) + (t - 2k), R_0(q)), \phi(t - 2k, \xi(2k))) < \varepsilon_0/2$$

for all t with $2k \leq t \leq 2(k + 1)$. By (5.6) and the choice of Δ_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\phi(h(t), R_0(q)), \xi(t)) &\leq \text{dist}(\phi(h(t), R_0(q)), \phi(h(2k) + (t - 2k), R_0(q))) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}(\phi(h(2k) + (t - 2k), R_0(q)), \phi(t - 2k, \xi(2k))) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}(\phi(t - 2k, \xi(2k)), \xi(t)) \\ &\leq \text{dist}(R_{\theta_k}(\tilde{f}^{M_k}(q)), R_{\theta_k}(\tilde{q}_{M_k})) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_0/4 + \varepsilon_0/2 + \varepsilon_0/4 \\ &= \varepsilon_0 \end{aligned}$$

for all t with $2k \leq t \leq 2(k + 1)$.

Let $k, k' \in T$ with $k < k'$ satisfy $l \in \tilde{S}$ for every $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $l \in [2k, 2k']$, and let $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $k < l < k'$. Now, what is remaining to be proved is (5.14) for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $2l \leq t \leq 2(l + 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &= (h(t) - h(2k)) + h(2k) \\ &= (h(t) - h(2k)) + \theta_k + M_k \\ &= (h(t) - h(2k) - 2(l - k)) + \theta_k + M_k + 2(l - k) \\ &= (h(t) - h(2k) - 2(l - k)) + \theta_k + M_l \end{aligned}$$

and by the choice of h and (5.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |h(t) - h(2k) - 2(l - k) + \theta_k| &\leq |h(t) - h(2k) - (t - 2k)| + |t - 2l| + \theta_k \\ &\leq 2 + 2 + 1 \\ &= 5, \end{aligned}$$

implying that, $|h(t) - M_l| \leq 5$. Since $l \in Z \setminus T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(R_0(\tilde{f}^{M_l}(q)), (0, 0, 0, 0)) &= \text{dist}(R_0(\tilde{f}^{M_l}(q)), R_0(\tilde{q}(l))) \\ &= \text{dist}(\tilde{f}^{M_l}(q), \tilde{q}(l)) \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon'_0}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of ε'_0 and r_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\phi(h(t), R_0(q)), (0, 0, 0, 0)) &\leq \text{dist}(\phi(h(t) - M_l, R_0(\tilde{f}^{M_l}(q))), (0, 0, 0, 0)) \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{dist}(\xi(t), (0, 0, 0, 0)) < \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}.$$

Combining these inequalities, we get the conclusion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to my advisor S. Hayashi for his constructive suggestions and continuous support. This work was supported by the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, an International Joint Usage/Research Center located in Kyoto University.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexander Arbieto, Andrés M. López, Elias Rego, and Yeison Sánchez, *On the shadowableness of flows with hyperbolic singularities*, *Mathematische Annalen* **390** (2024), no. 1, 417–437.
- [2] T. Fisher and B. Hasselblatt, *Hyperbolic flows*, 2019.
- [3] Motomasa KOMURO, *Lorenz attractors do not have the pseudo-orbit tracing property*, *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan* **37** (1985), no. 3, 489–514.
- [4] John M. Lee, *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, Springer, 2012.
- [5] S.Y. Pilyugin and S. Tikhomirov, *Lipschitz shadowing implies structural stability*, *Nonlinearity* **23** (2010), no. 10, 2509.
- [6] Romeo F. Thomas, *Stability properties of one-parameter flows*, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* **s3-45** (1982), no. 3, 479–505.
- [7] Qiqi Wang, Rui Hu, and Patrick Blonigan, *Least squares shadowing sensitivity analysis of chaotic limit cycle oscillations*, *Journal of Computational Physics* **267** (2014), 210–224.
- [8] Xinxing Wu, Lidong Wang, and Jianhua Liang, *The chain properties and average shadowing property of iterated function systems*, *Qualitative Theory of Dynamical Systems* **17** (2018), no. 1, 219–227.
- [9] Lan Wen Xiao Wen, *No-shadowing for singular hyperbolic sets with a singularity.*, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems* **40(10):** (2020), 6043–6059.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, JAPAN
Email address: murakami-sogo880@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp