

# Geometric shadowing in slow-fast Hamiltonian systems

Niklas Brännström<sup>1</sup> ‡ , Emiliano de Simone<sup>1</sup> § , Vassili Gelfreich<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, P.O. Box 68, FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

<sup>2</sup>Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, CV4 7AL Coventry, United Kingdom

**Abstract.** We study a class of slow-fast Hamiltonian systems with any finite number of degrees of freedom, but with at least one slow one and two fast ones. At  $\varepsilon = 0$  the slow dynamics is frozen. We assume that the frozen system (i.e. the unperturbed fast dynamics) has families of hyperbolic periodic orbits with transversal heteroclinics.

For each periodic orbit we define an action  $J$ . This action may be viewed as an action Hamiltonian (in the slow variables). It has been shown in [4] that there are orbits of the full dynamics which shadow any *finite* combination of forward orbits of  $J$  for a time  $t = O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ .

We introduce an assumption on the mutual relationship between the actions  $J$ . This assumption enables us to shadow any continuous curve (of arbitrary length) in the slow phase space for any time. The slow dynamics shadows the curve as a purely geometrical object, thus the time on the slow dynamics has to be reparameterised.

‡ The research of NB was funded by the Academy of Finland and the EU research training network CODY.

§ Funded by the Academy of Finland.

## 1. Introduction

Let us consider the Hamiltonian system defined by the Hamiltonian function

$$H = H(x, y, u, v; \varepsilon)$$

and the symplectic form

$$\Omega = dy \wedge dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} dv \wedge du$$

where  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$  and  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ . We assume that the parameter  $\varepsilon$  is small, hence the Hamiltonian system is "slow-fast" with  $(x, y)$  being fast variables and  $(u, v)$  being slow ones. This can readily be seen from the equations of motion

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}, & \dot{u} = \varepsilon \frac{\partial H}{\partial v}, \\ \dot{y} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}, & \dot{v} = -\varepsilon \frac{\partial H}{\partial u}. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We note that the form of (1) is not unusual, it appears in many applications.

If we set  $\varepsilon = 0$  the equations of motion are reduced to

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}, & \dot{u} = 0, \\ \dot{y} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}, & \dot{v} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We refer to (2) as the *frozen system*.

We are interested in describing the slow dynamics of system (1). In general it is a difficult task to exactly describe the slow dynamics and therefore often only approximations, or averaged solutions, are sought. The procedure to obtain the averaged solutions, i.e. an averaging method, is typically tailored for the particular class of systems it is applied to. The averaging method for the classical problem where there is only one fast degree of freedom is described in [3]. This method has been generalised to systems with several fast degrees of freedom where the fast system rotates with a constant vector of frequencies, see [10]. There are also averaging methods for slow-fast systems where the fast system is uniformly hyperbolic, see [1] (or [8] for a description in English). Contrary to [10] the class of problems studied in [1] contains systems which are fully coupled, i.e. the fast system depends on the slow variables as well as the fast ones. Or, more generally, if the fast system is ergodic and satisfies assumptions on how fast time averages converge to space averages then, see [7], the fast dynamics can be averaged out. Regardless of which averaging method is employed the aim is to derive effective equations for the slow dynamics which are independent of the fast variables  $(x, y)$ . We may write such averaged slow dynamics as

$$\dot{u} = \varepsilon \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial v} \right\rangle, \quad \dot{v} = -\varepsilon \left\langle \frac{\partial H}{\partial u} \right\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  denotes averaging with respect to  $(x, y)$ . A crucial point in the justification of all averaging methods is to verify that time averages can be approximated by space

averages. This property holds for most but not all trajectories. For example, if the fast dynamics spends most of its time close to a periodic orbit there is, in general, no reason to believe that the time average would converge to the space average.

In fact when the fast dynamics spend most of its time close to periodic orbits the slow dynamics of (1) may behave very differently from the averaged dynamics (3). In [4] it was shown that if the system satisfies assumptions **[A1]** and **[A2]** (defined later) then there exist trajectories of the full dynamics whose slow component deviates significantly from (3). In particular it was shown that there are orbits shadowing *accessible paths* of *finite* length composed of forward trajectories of the auxiliary systems

$$\dot{u} = \varepsilon \frac{\partial J_c}{\partial v}, \quad \dot{v} = -\varepsilon \frac{\partial J_c}{\partial u},$$

where  $J_c$  is an action defined on a periodic orbit (labelled by  $c$ ) in the fast phase space (see Definition 1). This shadowing result is valid on time-scales of order  $O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ . We note that this method yields trajectories which deviate at the rate  $O(\varepsilon)$  from (3).

This approach is a generalisation of the mechanism proposed in [5] for studying drift of the energy in a Hamiltonian system which depends on time explicitly and slowly. In this set-up it was shown that switching between fast periodic orbits does indeed provide the fastest possible rate of energy growth in several situations (see [5]). An interesting direct application of this theory is a rigorous proof of Fermi acceleration for a class of billiards with slowly moving boundary, [6].

The main result of this paper eliminates the upper bound on the time for which the shadowing result holds, that is we provide a description of the shadowing orbits for all times. Moreover, we show that for any continuous curve in the slow phase space there is a trajectory of the full dynamics whose slow component shadows it. We achieve this by refining the mechanism in [5] and [4] such that for any two  $O(\varepsilon)$  close points in the slow phase space there is a trajectory which starts in a neighbourhood of the first point and ends up in a neighbourhood of the second one. To prove this we have to introduce an assumption on the mutual relationship between the actions  $J_c$ . This assumption ensures that any vector in the tangent space of a point in the slow phase space can be written as a linear combination of gradients of the actions  $J_c$  where all coefficients are positive. We identify this linear combination with a path in the slow phase space and denote it *guiding path* (which is a generalisation of accessible path). We only consider guiding paths of length  $O(\varepsilon)$  and show that for any such guiding path there exists a trajectory of the full dynamics whose slow component shadows it. Thus by approximating any given curve by a set of points which are  $O(\varepsilon)$  apart we can find trajectories of the full dynamics whose slow component shadows a guiding path between these points. Then [5] implies that there exists a trajectory which lies close to the union of trajectories shadowing the guiding paths, hence there is a trajectory which shadows the entire curve. The idea of the proof is similar to that of [4], that is, using that the full dynamics takes place on normally hyperbolic manifolds where certain action Hamiltonians are preserved for long times.

The paper is structured as follows. In the next section we present the assumptions on the frozen system (2) and state our main result. Before proving this result we present an example where the assumptions on the frozen system are verified to hold. In Section 3 we provide a short summary of the results from [4] and [5] on normal hyperbolicity which we will require to prove our main theorem. In Section 4 we state two lemmas which we then combine to prove Theorem 1. The proofs of the two lemmas are of more technical nature and have been postponed to Section 5 to increase the readability of the previous section.

## 2. Set-up and Statement of the Result

We impose a number of assumptions on the frozen system (2). Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  be an open and bounded subset.

- [A1] We assume that the frozen system (2) has  $n$  families of hyperbolic periodic orbits  $L_c(u, v)$ ,  $c \in \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ , defined for all  $(u, v) \in D$ .
- [A2] We assume that each of the periodic orbits has a family of heteroclinic orbits to every other periodic orbit, i.e. for all  $c_i, c_j \in \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  and  $(u, v) \in D$  there are a pair of transversal heteroclinic orbits

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{c_i c_j}(u, v) &\subset W^u(L_{c_i}(u, v)) \cap W^s(L_{c_j}(u, v)), \\ \Gamma_{c_j c_i}(u, v) &\subset W^u(L_{c_j}(u, v)) \cap W^s(L_{c_i}(u, v)).\end{aligned}$$

We note that under assumptions [A1] and [A2] the frozen system has a family of uniformly hyperbolic invariant transitive sets  $\Lambda_{(u,v)}$ , also known as Smale horseshoes (see for instance [9]). The dynamics on the Smale horseshoe can be described by symbolic dynamics. Let  $\Lambda := \cup_{(u,v) \in D} \Lambda_{(u,v)}$ . For each family of periodic orbits we define a family of actions.

**Definition 1** *The action  $J_c$  of a periodic orbit  $L_c$  is defined by the integral*

$$J_c(u, v) := \oint_{L_c(u,v)} y dx.$$

The function  $J_c(u, v)$  is independent of the fast variables and can be considered as a Hamiltonian function which generates some dynamics in the slow variables

$$\dot{u} = \frac{1}{T_c(u, v)} \frac{\partial J_c}{\partial v}, \quad \dot{v} = -\frac{1}{T_c(u, v)} \frac{\partial J_c}{\partial u}, \quad (4)$$

where  $T_c$  is the period of the periodic orbit  $L_c$ . Following the notation of [11] we refer to (4) as the *guiding system* and its equations of motion can be written in the concise form

$$\dot{z} = (\dot{u}, \dot{v}) =: X_c(z), \quad (5)$$

where  $X_c$  is the *guiding vector field*.

**[A3]** We assume that there is a closed subset  $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \subset D \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  such that for all  $(u, v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ ,  $\mathbf{0}$  is inside the convex envelope (or convex hull) of  $\{\nabla_{(u,v)} J_{c_i}\}$  where  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Remark 1** Although  $n = 2d + 1$  actions are sufficient to satisfy **[A3]** we allow for a larger set of actions to be considered since it may increase the size of the domain  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ . Nevertheless, at any point in  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$  we will use only  $2d + 1$  vectors (but not necessarily the same  $2d + 1$  vectors for every point in  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ ).

We can now state the main result. Let  $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{2m+2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  be the projection on the slow variables.

**Theorem 1** Let  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{D}}$  be any continuous curve. Assume that the frozen system (2) satisfies assumptions **[A1]**, **[A2]** and **[A3]**. Then there exist positive constants  $C$  and  $\varepsilon_0$  such that for any  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  there exists a trajectory  $\psi(t)$  of the full system (1) and a continuous monotone reparameterisation of time  $\mathcal{T}(t)$  such that the slow component  $z(t) := \pi\psi(t)$  of  $\psi(t)$  satisfies  $z(0) = \gamma(0)$  and

$$\|z(\mathcal{T}(t)) - \gamma(t)\| \leq C\varepsilon,$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ .

Before proving the theorem we construct an example where assumptions **[A1]**, **[A2]** and **[A3]** are shown to be satisfied.

### 2.1. Example

Let  $\varepsilon = 0$  and let  $\mu$  be a small parameter. Consider a Hamiltonian function of the form

$$H(x, y) = H_0(x, y) - \mu H_1(x, y)$$

where  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ . Assume that the dynamics of the "unperturbed" Hamiltonian  $H_0$  has three hyperbolic periodic orbits  $L_c$ ,  $c \in \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$  with transversal heteroclinic connections (hence assumption **[A1]** and **[A2]** are satisfied). The implicit function theorem implies that the hyperbolic periodic orbits persists for  $\mu$  sufficiently small, and furthermore the periodic orbits depend smoothly on  $\mu$ . Therefore we can expand the periodic orbit  $L_c$  as well as the action  $J_c$  in a power series in  $\mu$ . For the action we write

$$J_c = J_0^c + \mu J_1^c + O(\mu^2),$$

where  $J_0$  is the action of the periodic orbits of the "unperturbed" Hamiltonian  $H_0$ .  $J_0$  and  $J_1$  are constants as the Hamiltonian is independent of  $(u, v)$ . The action  $J_0$  and its first order correction  $J_1$  are generically non-zero. Now, by abusing the notation slightly we let  $\mu$  depend on  $(u, v)$  in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \mu = \mu(x, y, u, v) &= \mu \sum_{i=1}^3 \chi_{L_{c_i+\delta}}(x, y) \varphi^{c_i}(u, v) \\ &\quad + \mu \sum_{i=1}^3 \chi_{(L_{c_i+\delta})^C}(x, y) f(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu$  is a small parameter,  $\chi$  is the indicator function,  $L_{c_i} + \delta$  is a  $\delta$  neighbourhood of  $L_{c_i}$ , i.e.

$$L_{c_i} + \delta := \{(x, y) \text{ s.t. } \text{dist}((x, y), L_{c_i}) \leq \delta\}$$

and  $f$  is chosen as to interpolate  $H_1$  into a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  function. Then the action of the periodic orbit  $L_c$  becomes

$$J_c(u, v) = J_0^c + \mu \varphi^{c_i}(u, v) J_1^{c_i} + O(\mu^2).$$

For example, by choosing

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{c_1} &= \text{sgn}(J_1^{c_1})v, \\ \varphi^{c_2} &= -\text{sgn}(J_1^{c_2})u, \\ \varphi^{c_3} &= \text{sgn}(J_1^{c_3})u - \text{sgn}(J_1^{c_3})v, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{sgn}(A) := 1$  if  $A > 0$  and  $\text{sgn}(A) := -1$  if  $A < 0$ , will generate

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{(u,v)} J^{c_1} &= \mu \vec{e}_u, \\ \nabla_{(u,v)} J^{c_2} &= \mu \vec{e}_v, \\ \nabla_{(u,v)} J^{c_3} &= -\mu \vec{e}_u - \mu \vec{e}_v, \end{aligned}$$

This choice ensures that assumption **[A3]** is satisfied.

### 3. Normal Hyperbolicity and symbolic dynamics

It was shown in [4] and [5] that the dynamics of the full system (1) can be studied using symbolic dynamics. Here we provide a short summary of the results therein which we will need to prove Theorem 1. For each periodic orbit  $L_c$  we denote by  $\Sigma_c$  a Poincaré section, and by  $x_i, y_i, z_i$  (where  $z_i = (u_i, v_i)$ ) we denote an intersection of a solution of (1) with one of these Poincaré sections. Let  $\xi = \{\xi_i\}_{i=-\infty}^{i=\infty}$  be a bi-infinite sequence of letters  $\xi_i \in \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  where  $c_i$  is the index of the  $n$  actions. The sequence  $\xi$  is called the code of the dynamics. It has been shown that by specifying an initial condition for the dynamics the code  $\xi$  generates a trajectory of (1) whose dynamics on the Poincaré sections are given by

$$z_{i+1} = z_i + \varepsilon \phi_{\xi_i \xi_{i+1}}(x_i(z_i, \xi, \varepsilon), y_{i+1}(z_i, \xi, \varepsilon), z_i, \varepsilon), \quad (6)$$

where  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^1$ , and the index  $i$  counts intersections with the Poincaré sections. The iterate  $z_i \in \Sigma_{\xi_i}$ . Note that the functions  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  depends on entire code  $\xi$ .

Lemma 2 in [4] implies that for  $\varepsilon = 0$  and any two codes  $\xi^{(1)}$  and  $\xi^{(2)}$  that satisfy  $\xi_i^{(1)} = \xi_i^{(2)}$  for  $|i| \leq n$  for any  $n$  the following estimate holds

$$\max \left\{ \|x_i(z, \xi^{(1)}) - x_i(z, \xi^{(2)})\|, \|y_i(z, \xi^{(1)}) - y_i(z, \xi^{(2)})\| \right\} \leq 2r\lambda^{n-|i|}, \quad (7)$$

where the constants  $r > 0$  and  $0 < \lambda < 1$  do not depend on the sequences  $\xi^{(1),(2)}$ . For  $\varepsilon$  small Lemma 3 in [4] implies the functions  $(x_i, y_i)$  are defined for all small  $\varepsilon$  and all  $z \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ , they are uniformly bounded along with their first derivatives with respect to  $z$

and satisfy (7). Moreover, by the lemma, there is a constant  $C_0 > 0$ , independent of the code  $\xi$ , such that

$$\|x_i(z, \xi, \varepsilon) - x_i(z, \xi, 0), y_i(z, \xi, \varepsilon) - y_i(z, \xi, 0)\| < C_0\varepsilon, \quad (8)$$

for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

#### 4. Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we construct a code  $\xi^{(*)}$  that generates a trajectory  $z^{(*)}$  of the full dynamics (6) which satisfies Theorem 1. The proof relies on two lemmas. The first one states that two trajectories of (6) which have a slow iterate in common stay uniformly close to each other as long as their respective codes coincide (Lemma 1). The second one states that given any two points in the slow phase space which are  $O(\varepsilon)$  close we can find a trajectory which goes from the neighbourhood of the first point to the neighbourhood of the second point. This trajectory is essentially obtained by updating the code of another trajectory. We then combine these two lemmas to give an inductive proof of Theorem 1.

##### 4.1. Uniform closeness of trajectories

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, finding a trajectory that satisfies Theorem 1 is an iterative process which involves updating the code. The crucial point here is that when we update the code we do not only alter the future of the trajectory but we switch to another trajectory. Differently put, as we update the code the *entire* slow dynamics changes (not only the "future" iterates of the trajectory); in fact if one considers the description of the slow component of the full dynamics given in equation (6) one sees that the first two arguments of the function  $\phi_{\xi_i \xi_{i+1}}$  depend on the *entire* code  $\xi$  (not just the current and next to current code elements). The following lemma gives us a uniform estimate on how much the "past" of the trajectory changes when the code is updated and the initial condition is kept fixed, i.e.  $z_0^{(a)} = z_0^{(b)}$ . The estimate appears in [5] (see the paragraph between equation (56) and (57) therein) but since the proof was only sketched and the result is crucial to our theory we state it together with a full proof.

**Lemma 1** *There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  the following holds: If  $\xi^{(a)}$  and  $\xi^{(b)}$  are two codes such that for some  $N > 0$*

$$\xi_i^{(a)} = \xi_i^{(b)} \quad \text{for all } |i| \leq N$$

*and  $z^{(a)}$  and  $z^{(b)}$  are two slow trajectories of (6) which correspond to the codes  $\xi^{(a)}$  and  $\xi^{(b)}$  respectively and  $z_0^{(a)} = z_0^{(b)}$  then*

$$\|z_i^{(a)} - z_i^{(b)}\| \leq K\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq i \leq N \quad (9)$$

where

$$K := \frac{8 \|\phi\|_{C^1} r \lambda}{1 - \lambda}. \quad (10)$$

Note that the constant  $K$  is independent of  $N$ . We postpone the proof of this Lemma to Section 5.1.

With  $K$  given by (10) we let

$$A_1 = \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} 3\varepsilon(K + \|\phi_{cc}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + 1 + |T_c(u,v)| |X_c(u,v)|)$$

and define recursively

$$A_i := \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} 3\varepsilon(A_{i-1} + \|\phi_{cc}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + 1 + |T_c(u,v)| |X_c(u,v)|).$$

Let

$$A := A_{2d} \tag{11}$$

where  $d$  is the number of slow degrees of freedom.

**Lemma 2** *Let  $L > 0$  be any fixed constant and  $A$  given by (11). There exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  and any  $z \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$  and any code  $\xi^{(a)}$  with a corresponding trajectory  $z_i^{(a)}$  satisfying*

$$\|z_0^{(a)} - z\| \leq \varepsilon(L + A)$$

*the following holds: There exists another code  $\xi^{(b)}$  with*

$$\xi_i^{(b)} = \xi_i^{(a)} \quad i < 0$$

*such that for any  $p \leq 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and a corresponding trajectory  $z^{(b)}$  which satisfies*

$$z_p^{(a)} = z_p^{(b)},$$

$$\|z_N^{(b)} - z\| \leq \varepsilon A.$$

*Moreover there exists a uniformly bounded constant  $C_1 > 0$  such that*

$$\|z_i^{(b)} - z\| \leq \varepsilon(C_1 + A) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq N. \tag{12}$$

Next we combine these two lemmas to show that we can shadow any curve  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ .

#### 4.2. Combining the results

**Proof. (of Theorem 1)** Let  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{D}}$  be any curve. Pick a constant  $L > 0$  arbitrarily. Take the smallest  $\varepsilon_0$  of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. The following analysis is valid for any  $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ . Using  $L$  we define a sequence  $t_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$ , as follows

$$\begin{cases} t_0 = 0 \\ t_{i+1} = \min_{t > t_i} \{t : \|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t_i)\| = \varepsilon L\} \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

and if for some  $k$

$$\|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t_k)\| \leq \varepsilon L \quad \text{for all } t > t_k$$

then

$$t_{i+1} = t_i + 1 \quad \text{for all } i \geq k.$$

The sequence  $t_i$  divide the curve  $\gamma$  into points  $\gamma(t_i)$  which are at most  $\varepsilon L$  apart. Next we take any code  $\xi^{(0)}$  and a corresponding trajectory  $z^{(0)}$  such that  $z_0^{(0)} = \gamma(t_0) = \gamma(0)$ . We also define  $P(0) = 0$ .

**Inductive assumption:** There exists a code  $\xi^{(l)}$  and a monotone sequence  $P(l)$  such that for all  $1 \leq l \leq k$

$$\xi_j^{(l)} = \xi_j^{(l-1)} \quad \text{for } j < P(l-1).$$

Moreover, there is a trajectory  $z^{(l)}$  corresponding to  $\xi^{(l)}$  such that

$$z_0^{(l)} = z_0^{(0)}$$

and

$$\left\| z_{P(l)}^{(l)} - \gamma(t_l) \right\| \leq \varepsilon A. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore

$$\left\| z_j^{(l)} - \gamma(t_l) \right\| \leq \varepsilon(C_1 + A) \quad \text{for } P(l-1) \leq j \leq P(l), \quad (15)$$

where  $C_1$  is given by Lemma 2.

**Inductive step.** We will use Lemma 2 to verify the inductive assumption. Set  $p = -P(k)$ ,  $z = \gamma(t_{k+1})$  and  $z_i^{(a)} = z_{P(k)+i}^{(k)}$  then using (14) and (13) we get

$$\left\| z_0^{(a)} - z \right\| \leq \varepsilon(A + L).$$

Then applying Lemma 2 implies that there exists a code  $\xi_{P(k)+i}^{(k+1)} := \xi_i^{(b)}$  which satisfies

$$\xi_i^{(k+1)} = \xi_i^{(k)} \quad \text{for } i < P(k)$$

and generates a trajectory  $z_j^{(k+1)}$  which satisfies

$$z_0^{(k+1)} = z_0^{(k)} = \gamma(0).$$

Furthermore there exists  $N_{k+1}$  such that

$$\left\| z_{P(k)+N_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} - z \right\| \leq \varepsilon A$$

and

$$\left\| z_j^{(k+1)} - \gamma(t_{k+1}) \right\| \leq \varepsilon(C + A) \quad \text{for } P(k) \leq j \leq P(k+1).$$

The monotone sequence  $P(k)$  is defined inductively by

$$\begin{aligned} P(0) &= 0, \\ P(k) &= P(k-1) + N_k. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the inductive step.

By induction there exists a unique code  $\xi^{(*)}$  which for all  $k > 0$  satisfies

$$\xi_i^{(*)} = \xi_i^{(k)} \quad \text{for } i \leq P(k).$$

Denote by  $z^{(*)}$  the trajectory of (6) which corresponds to the code  $\xi^{(*)}$  and satisfies  $z_0^{(*)} = \gamma(0)$ . Next we want to apply Lemma 1 to show that for all  $k$  the trajectory  $z^{(*)}$  lies close to the points  $\gamma(t_k)$ . Set  $\xi^{(a)} = \xi^{(*)}$ ,  $\xi^{(b)} = \xi^{(k)}$  and  $N = P(k)$ . Then Lemma 1 implies

$$\left\| z_i^{(*)} - z_i^{(k)} \right\| \leq \varepsilon K \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq P(k).$$

Combining this estimate with (15) gives

$$\forall k > 0 \quad \left\| z_i^{(*)} - \gamma(t_k) \right\| \leq \varepsilon(K + C_1 + A) \quad \text{for } P(k-1) \leq i \leq P(k). \quad (16)$$

To conclude the proof we have to define the time reparameterisation  $\mathcal{T}(t)$  of Theorem 1 and pass from the discrete solution  $z_i^{(*)}$  to the time continuous  $z^{(*)}(t)$ . Let us begin with the time reparameterisation. For  $t_k \leq t \leq t_{k+1}$  we define

$$\mathcal{T}_k(t) = \tau_{P(k)} + \frac{\tau_{P(k+1)} - \tau_{P(k)}}{t_{k+1} - t_k}(t - t_k),$$

where  $\tau_i$  is the time  $z^{(*)}(t)$  intersects the Poincaré surface  $\Sigma_{\xi_i^{(*)}}$ , i.e.  $z^{(*)}(\tau_i) = z_i^{(*)}$ . The complete  $\mathcal{T}(t)$  is obtained by gluing together all  $\mathcal{T}_k(t)$ .

Next for  $t_k \leq t \leq t_{k+1}$ , and consequently  $P(k) \leq i \leq P(k+1)$ , we estimate the distance between  $z^{(*)}(t)$  and  $\gamma(t)$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t)) - \gamma(t) \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t)) - z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t_{k+1})) \right\| + \left\| z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t_{k+1})) - z_{P(k+1)}^{(*)} \right\| \\ & \quad + \left\| z_{P(k+1)}^{(*)} - \gamma(t_{k+1}) \right\| + \left\| \gamma(t_{k+1}) - \gamma(t) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the right hand side. The second term is 0 by definition, the third term is bounded by (16) and the fourth one by (13). The first term in the right hand side we estimate as

$$\left\| z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t)) - z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t_{k+1})) \right\| \leq \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \dot{z} \sup_k (\tau_{P(k+1)} - \tau_{P(k)}).$$

We note that the set of periodic orbits and transversal heteroclinics is compact. The full trajectory, whose projection on the slow phase space is  $z^{(*)}$ , lies in a compact neighbourhood of this set, therefore  $\dot{z}$  given by (1) is uniformly bounded on this set: there exists a constant  $C_2 > 0$ , independent of  $k$ , such that

$$\left\| z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t)) - z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t_{k+1})) \right\| \leq \varepsilon C_2.$$

By choosing  $C := C_2 + L + K + C_1 + A$  we have

$$\left\| z^{(*)}(\mathcal{T}(t)) - \gamma(t) \right\| \leq \varepsilon C \quad \text{for } t > 0.$$

■

## 5. Technical Results

In this section we include the proofs of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 that we used to prove Theorem 1

### 5.1. Proof of Lemma 1

Let  $\varepsilon_0$  be sufficiently small for the normal hyperbolicity estimates to be valid and smaller than  $\frac{1-\lambda}{2C\lambda}$ , where

$$C = \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \|\phi\|_{C^1} \left( 1 + \max \left( \left\| \frac{\partial x}{\partial z} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\partial y}{\partial z} \right\| \right) \right). \quad (17)$$

Consider the two codes  $\xi^{(a)}$  and  $\xi^{(b)}$ . By assumption we have

$$\xi_i^{(a)} = \xi_i^{(b)} \quad |i| \leq N,$$

and as a consequence of normal hyperbolicity that

$$\|x_i(z, \xi^{(a)}) - x_i(z, \xi^{(b)}), y_i(z, \xi^{(a)}) - y_i(z, \xi^{(b)})\| \leq 2r\lambda^{N-|i|}, \quad (18)$$

for all  $|i| \leq N$ , see (7). For convenience we repeat equation (6) which gives the slow component of the full dynamics generated by the code  $\xi$

$$z_{i+1} = z_i + \varepsilon \phi_{\xi_i \xi_{i+1}}(x_i(z_i, \varepsilon; \xi), y_{i+1}(z_i, \varepsilon; \xi), z_i, \varepsilon).$$

We note that the functions  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  depend on the full code  $\xi$  (not only the current element in the code). Taking the difference of the  $z$  components of the two trajectories coded by  $\xi^{(a)}$  and  $\xi^{(b)}$  and using that they have the same initial condition  $z_0^{(a)} = z_0^{(b)}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_k^{(a)} - z_k^{(b)}\| &= \varepsilon \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \phi_{\xi_i^{(a)} \xi_{i+1}^{(a)}}(x_i(z_i^{(a)}, \varepsilon; \xi^{(a)}), y_{i+1}(z_i^{(a)}, \varepsilon; \xi^{(a)}), z_i^{(a)}, \varepsilon) - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \phi_{\xi_i^{(b)} \xi_{i+1}^{(b)}}(x_i(z_i^{(b)}, \varepsilon; \xi^{(b)}), y_{i+1}(z_i^{(b)}, \varepsilon; \xi^{(b)}), z_i^{(b)}, \varepsilon) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now,  $\xi_i^{(a)} = \xi_i^{(b)}$  for all  $|i| < N$ , therefore  $\phi_{\xi_i^{(a)} \xi_{i+1}^{(a)}}$  and  $\phi_{\xi_i^{(b)} \xi_{i+1}^{(b)}}$  are the same functions in the interval we are studying. Using the mean value inequality and suppressing the dependence of  $\varepsilon$  in the notation we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_k^{(a)} - z_k^{(b)}\| &\leq \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left( x_i(z_i^{(a)}, \xi^{(a)}) - x_i(z_i^{(b)}, \xi^{(b)}), \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. y_{i+1}(z_i^{(a)}, \xi^{(a)}) - y_{i+1}(z_i^{(b)}, \xi^{(b)}) \right) \right\| + \\ &\quad \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (z_i^{(a)} - z_i^{(b)}) \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

By adding and subtracting terms and using the triangle inequality we rewrite this expression to a form where inequality (18) can be used

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| z_k^{(a)} - z_k^{(b)} \right\| &\leq \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\| \left( x_i(z_i^{(a)}, \xi^{(a)}) - x_i(z_i^{(b)}, \xi^{(b)}), \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. y_{i+1}(z_i^{(a)}, \xi^{(a)}) - y_{i+1}(z_i^{(a)}, \xi^{(b)}) \right) \right\| + \\
 &\varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\| \left( x_i(z_i^{(a)}, \xi^{(b)}) - x_i(z_i^{(b)}, \xi^{(b)}), \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. y_{i+1}(z_i^{(a)}, \xi^{(b)}) - y_{i+1}(z_i^{(b)}, \xi^{(b)}) \right) \right\| + \\
 &\varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\| z_i^{(a)} - z_i^{(b)} \right\|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using inequality (18) to estimate the first term and the mean value inequality to estimate the second term gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| z_k^{(a)} - z_k^{(b)} \right\| &\leq \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 2r\lambda^{N-i} + \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\| z_i^{(a)} - z_i^{(b)} \right\| \\
 &\quad + \varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} \max \left( \left\| \frac{\partial x}{\partial z} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\partial y}{\partial z} \right\| \right) \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\| z_i^{(a)} - z_i^{(b)} \right\|,
 \end{aligned}$$

which we rewrite as

$$\left\| z_k^{(a)} - z_k^{(b)} \right\| \leq 2\varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} r \frac{\lambda^{N-k+1}}{1-\lambda} + \varepsilon C \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\| z_i^{(a)} - z_i^{(b)} \right\|, \quad (19)$$

where  $C$  is given by (17). Now, in order to prove Lemma 1 we will show that

$$\left\| z_k^{(a)} - z_k^{(b)} \right\| \leq \varepsilon K \lambda^{N-k}, \quad (20)$$

for all  $0 \leq k < N$  where  $K$  is given by (9). The Gronwall type of estimate follows from inequality (19) by finite induction. Since  $z_0^{(a)} = z_0^{(b)}$  the statement is valid for  $k = 0$ . Let us assume that (20) is true for all  $k \leq m$ . Consider the case  $k = m + 1$ . By (19) we get

$$\left\| z_{m+1}^{(a)} - z_{m+1}^{(b)} \right\| \leq 2\varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} r \frac{\lambda^{N-m}}{1-\lambda} + \varepsilon C \sum_{i=0}^m \left\| z_i^{(a)} - z_i^{(b)} \right\|.$$

The induction assumption implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| z_{m+1}^{(a)} - z_{m+1}^{(b)} \right\| &\leq 2\varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} r \frac{\lambda^{N-m}}{1-\lambda} + \varepsilon C \sum_{i=0}^m \varepsilon K \lambda^{N-i} \\
 &\leq 2\varepsilon \|\phi\|_{C^1} r \frac{\lambda^{N-m}}{1-\lambda} + \varepsilon^2 C K \frac{\lambda^{N-m}}{1-\lambda}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For

$$K := \frac{8 \|\phi\|_{C^1} r \lambda}{1-\lambda}$$

and  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1-\lambda}{2C\lambda}$  we have

$$K > \frac{2 \|\phi\|_{C^1} r \lambda}{1 - \lambda - \varepsilon C \lambda}.$$

Thus it follows that

$$\left\| z_{m+1}^{(a)} - z_{m+1}^{(b)} \right\| \leq \varepsilon K \lambda^{N-(m+1)}. \quad (21)$$

Since  $0 < \lambda < 1$  and  $0 < m + 1 \leq N$  the lemma follows from (21). We note that  $K$  is independent of  $N$  and  $\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

## 5.2. Proof of Lemma 2

Fix  $L > 0$  arbitrarily and let  $A$  be given by (11). Then we choose  $\varepsilon_0$  as the smallest of that required by Lemma 1 and

$$\frac{1}{C \max_c \left( \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \frac{L+A}{T_c(u,v) |\nabla J_c|} \right)},$$

where  $C$  is given by (17). Then for any  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$  let  $\xi^{(a)}$  be a code generating a trajectory of (6) such that

$$\left\| z_0^{(a)} - z \right\| \leq \varepsilon(L + A).$$

To show that there exists a code  $\xi^{(b)}$  that satisfies the lemma we introduce the notion of guiding path. Denoting by  $T_{z_0^{(a)}}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$  the tangent space of  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$  at the point  $z_0^{(a)}$ , consider the vector  $\vec{v} \in T_{z_0^{(a)}}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$  pointing towards  $z$  with length  $\varepsilon(L + A)$ . Condition **[A3]** implies that there exists (a possibly non-unique) injective map  $\sigma : \{1, \dots, 2d\} \rightarrow \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  (where  $c_i$  is the index of the periodic orbits), with  $\sigma = \sigma(\vec{v})$  and non-negative coefficients  $a_1, \dots, a_{2d}$  such that

$$\vec{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \varepsilon a_i \vec{X}_{\sigma(i)}(z_0^{(a)}). \quad (22)$$

We refer to the coefficients  $a_i$  as *guiding times*. We denote  $\| \cdot \|$  the *guiding path* between  $z_0^{(a)}$  and  $z$  as

$$G(t, z_0^{(a)}, z) = z_0^{(a)} + \sum_{j=1}^i \varepsilon a_j \vec{X}_{\sigma(j)}(z_0^{(a)}) + \varepsilon(t - \sum_{j=1}^i a_j) \vec{X}_{\sigma(i)}(z_0^{(a)}) \quad (23)$$

for  $\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^i a_j < t < \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} a_j$ . Let us denote by  $W_{\vec{v}} := \left\{ \vec{X}_{\sigma(1)}(z_0^{(a)}), \dots, \vec{X}_{\sigma(2d)}(z_0^{(a)}) \right\}$  the  $2d \times 2d$  matrix whose columns are the  $2d$  Hamiltonian vectors needed to represent  $\vec{v}$  as a linear combination of the type (22). Now, condition **[A3]** implies that  $\left\{ \vec{X}_{\sigma(1)}(z_0^{(a)}), \dots, \vec{X}_{\sigma(2d)}(z_0^{(a)}) \right\}$  is a basis in  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ , thus  $W_{\vec{v}}$  is invertible and from (22), denoting  $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{2d})$ , we get

$$\|\vec{a}\| \leq \left\| W_{\vec{v}}^{-1} \right\| \frac{\|\vec{v}\|}{\varepsilon} \leq D \quad (24)$$

$\|$  At this point we abuse the notation by identifying vector fields and points in  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ .

where  $D = \sup_{z \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \sup_{\zeta \in T_{z_0^{(a)}}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})} \left\| W_{\zeta}^{-1} \right\| (L + A) < \infty$  depends only on  $L + A$ . Hence the guiding times  $a_i$  are uniformly bounded.

Without loss of generality  $\blacktriangleright$  we will prove the lemma for  $d = 1$ , and we write  $v = \varepsilon a_1 X_1 + \varepsilon a_2 X_2$ . Then the guiding path consists of two segments. We will show that these two segments can be shadowed one at a time, hence the code  $\xi^{(b)}$  will be obtained by updating the code  $\xi^{(a)}$  twice. The rules for updating the code are

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\xi}_k^{(b)} = \xi_k^{(a)} & \text{for } k \leq 0, \\ \tilde{\xi}_k^{(b)} = c_1 & \text{for all } k > 0, \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \xi_k^{(b)} = \tilde{\xi}_k^{(b)} & \text{for } k \leq \left\lceil \frac{a_1}{T_{c_1}} \right\rceil, \\ \xi_k^{(b)} = c_2 & \text{for all } k > \left\lceil \frac{a_1}{T_{c_1}} \right\rceil, \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

where  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  denotes rounding up to the next integer and  $T_{c_1}$  denotes the period of the periodic orbit  $L_{c_1}$  (also note that by (24)  $a_i$  are of order  $O(\varepsilon)$ ). We define  $\tilde{N} = \left\lceil \frac{a_1}{T_{c_1}} \right\rceil$  and  $N^b = \left\lceil \frac{a_2}{T_{c_2}} \right\rceil$  and let  $N = \tilde{N} + N^b$ .

We begin by updating the code according to (25) which gives us the code  $\tilde{\xi}^{(b)}$ . For any  $p \leq 0$  we pick the trajectory of (6) corresponding to  $\tilde{\xi}^{(b)}$  such that  $\tilde{z}_p^{(b)} = z_p^{(a)}$ . Let us also consider two auxiliary sequences,  $\hat{z}_k^{(b)}$  which corresponds to the code  $\tilde{\xi}^{(b)}$  and  $z_k^{c_1}$  which corresponds to the constant code  $(c_1)^\infty$ . Both sequences satisfy the initial condition

$$\hat{z}_0^{(b)} = z_0^{c_1} = z_0^{(a)}.$$

By the definition (25) we have  $\tilde{\xi}_k^{(b)} = c_1$  for all  $k \geq 0$ . Then

**Lemma 3** (Lemma 5, [4]) *For any  $K_0 > 0, t_0 > 0$ , there is  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that for any  $|\varepsilon| < \varepsilon_0$  and any two codes  $\xi^1$  and  $\xi^2$  such that for some index  $j$*

$$\xi_{j+i}^1 = \xi_{j+i}^2 = c \quad 0 \leq i \leq N_0(\varepsilon) \equiv \left\lfloor \frac{t_0}{\varepsilon} \right\rfloor$$

*the inequality  $\|z_j^1 - z_j^2\| \leq \varepsilon K_0$  implies*

$$\|z_{j+N}^1 - z_{j+N}^2\| \leq \varepsilon C_1 e^{\varepsilon N C_2} \quad 0 \leq N \leq N_0(\varepsilon),$$

*where*

$$C_1 = \left\| \frac{\partial \phi_{cc}}{\partial(x, y)} \right\| \frac{4r}{1 - \lambda} + K_0$$

*and*

$$C_2 = \left\| \frac{\partial \phi_{cc}}{\partial z} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial \phi_{cc}}{\partial(x, y)} \right\| \max \left\{ \left\| \frac{\partial x_c}{\partial z} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\partial y_c}{\partial z} \right\| \right\}.$$

$\blacktriangleright$  The proof for  $d > 1$  is analogous to the case  $d = 1$ . The only difference is that the guiding path will consist of more segments. Consequently the constant  $A$  depends on  $d$ .

In the compact set  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$  we have

$$\|z_{j+N}^1 - z_{j+N}^2\| \leq 3\varepsilon C_1 \quad 0 \leq N \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon C_2}.$$

implies that

$$\|\hat{z}_k^{(b)} - z_k^{c_1}\| \leq 3\varepsilon \left( \|\phi_{c_1 c_1}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} \right) \quad (27)$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq N$ . By Lemma 1 we have the following bound

$$\|\tilde{z}_0^{(b)} - \hat{z}_0^{(b)}\| = \|\tilde{z}_0^{(b)} - z_0^{(a)}\| \leq \varepsilon K, \quad (28)$$

since  $\tilde{z}_k^{(b)}$  and  $z_k^{(a)}$  share the same code for  $k \leq 0$  and  $\tilde{z}_p^{(b)} = z_p^{(a)}$ . Now, since  $\tilde{z}^{(b)}$  and  $\hat{z}^{(b)}$  are generated from the identically same code, Lemma 3 implies that

$$\|\tilde{z}_k^{(b)} - \hat{z}_k^{(b)}\| \leq 3\varepsilon \left( \|\phi_{c_1 c_1}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + K \right) \quad (29)$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq N$ . Combining the estimates (27) and (29) we obtain

$$\|\tilde{z}_k^{(b)} - z_k^{c_1}\| \leq \|\tilde{z}_k^{(b)} - \hat{z}_k^{(b)}\| + \|\hat{z}_k^{(b)} - z_k^{c_1}\| \quad (30)$$

$$\leq 3\varepsilon \left( 2 \|\phi_{c_1 c_1}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + K \right). \quad (31)$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq \tilde{N}$ . Now it remains to prove that  $z^{c_1}$  stays close to the guiding path  $G$ . By definition we have

$$G(t, z_0^{(a)}, z) = z_0^{(a)} - t\Omega^{-1}\nabla J_{c_1}(z_0^{(a)}) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon a_1,$$

where  $\Omega^{-1}$  is the inverse of the symplectic matrix. The map (6) takes a simple form for the constant code  $(c_1)^\infty$ , see [4] and the proof of Lemma 1 therein,

$$z_k^{c_1} = z_0^{(a)} - \varepsilon k T_{c_1} \Omega^{-1} \nabla J_{c_1}(z_0^{(a)}) + O(\varepsilon^2).$$

Therefore

$$\left\| z_{\tilde{N}}^{c_1} - G(\varepsilon a_1, z_0^{(a)}, z) \right\| \leq O(\varepsilon^2) + \varepsilon \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} |T_c(u,v)| |X_c(u,v)| \quad (32)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon (1 + \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} |T_c(u,v)| |X_c(u,v)|), \quad (33)$$

where the  $O(\varepsilon^2)$  term is the difference of the two maps and the second term compensates for the fact that  $a_1$  in general is not a multiple of  $T_{c_1}$ , this round off error is bounded by the strength of the vector field times the largest period. Collecting the estimates we obtain

$$\left\| \tilde{z}_{\tilde{N}}^{(b)} - G(\varepsilon a_1, z_0^{(a)}, z) \right\| \leq 3\varepsilon \left( 2 \|\phi_{c_1 c_1}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + K \right) + \varepsilon \quad (34)$$

$$+ \varepsilon \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} |T_c(u,v)| |X_c(u,v)|, \quad (35)$$

which is the accuracy with which we have shadowed the first segment of the guiding path.

Let us continue by shadowing the second segment of the guiding path. We begin by updating the code to  $\xi^{(b)}$ , using the rule given by equation (26). We pick the trajectory  $z^{(b)}$  which corresponds to  $\xi^{(b)}$  and satisfies  $z_p^{(b)} = z_p^{(a)}$ . We repeat the arguments above to shadow the second segment of the guiding path. Indeed, we consider two auxiliary sequences  $\tilde{z}_k^{(b)}$  which corresponds to the code  $\xi^{(b)}$  and  $z_k^{c_2}$  which corresponds to the constant code  $(c_2)^\infty$ . Both sequences satisfy the initial condition

$$\tilde{z}_{\tilde{N}}^{(b)} = z_{\tilde{N}}^{c_2} = G(\varepsilon a_1, z_0^{(a)}, z).$$

By the definition (25) we have  $\xi_k^{(b)} = c_2$  for all  $k > \tilde{N}$ . Then by Lemma 3

$$\left\| \tilde{z}_{\tilde{N}+k}^{(b)} - z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{c_2} \right\| \leq 3\varepsilon \left( \|\phi_{c_2 c_2}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} \right) \quad (36)$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq N^b$ . Lemma 1 together with (34) yields the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| z_{\tilde{N}}^{(b)} - \tilde{z}_{\tilde{N}}^{(b)} \right\| &= \left\| z_{\tilde{N}}^{(b)} - G(\varepsilon a_1, z_0^{(a)}, z) \right\| \\ &\leq \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \left( 6\varepsilon \|\phi_{cc}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + 4\varepsilon K \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon + \varepsilon |T_c(u, v)| |X_c(u, v)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then Lemma 3 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{(b)} - \tilde{z}_{\tilde{N}+k}^{(b)} \right\| \quad (37) \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \left( 7 \|\phi_{cc}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + 4K + 1 + |T_c(u, v)| |X_c(u, v)| \right) \quad (38) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq N^b$ . Combining the estimates (36) and (37) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{(b)} - z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{c_2} \right\| \leq \left\| z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{(b)} - \tilde{z}_{\tilde{N}+k}^{(b)} \right\| + \left\| \tilde{z}_{\tilde{N}+k}^{(b)} - z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{c_2} \right\| \quad (39) \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \left( 8 \|\phi_{cc}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + 4K + 1 + |T_c(u, v)| |X_c(u, v)| \right). \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq N^b$ . Using that  $z_{\tilde{N}}^{c_2} = G(t^1, z_0^{(a)}, z)$  the guiding path is shadowed by  $z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{c_2}$  exactly analogously to the first segment. The result is

$$\left\| z_{\tilde{N}+k}^{c_2} - G(\varepsilon a_2, z_0^{(a)}, z) \right\| \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} |T_c(u, v)| |X_c(u, v)| \quad (41)$$

Using that  $z_{\tilde{N}+N^b}^{(b)} = z_N^{(b)}$  by definition and combining (39) and (41) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| z_N^{(b)} - G(\varepsilon a_2, z_0^{(a)}, z) \right\| = \quad (42) \\ &\leq 4\varepsilon \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \left( 6 \|\phi_{cc}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + 3K + 1 + |T_c(u, v)| |X_c(u, v)| \right) \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the definition (11) of  $A$

$$A = 4 \max_c \sup_{(u,v) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}} \left( 6 \|\phi_{cc}\|_{C^1} \frac{4r}{1-\lambda} + 3K + 1 + |T_c(u, v)| |X_c(u, v)| \right),$$

and the definition of guiding path gives

$$\left\| z_N^{(b)} - z \right\| \leq \varepsilon A.$$

The constant  $A$  is uniformly bounded on the compact space  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ . Lastly, from the fact that the guiding times  $a_i$  are uniformly bounded it follows that the length of the guiding path is bounded by  $\varepsilon C_1$  where  $C_1$  is a uniform constant. This and the estimates above implies that

$$\left\| z_k^{(b)} - z \right\| \leq \varepsilon(C_1 + A) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq N.$$

## References

- [1] Anosov D 1960, Averaging in systems of ODEs with rapidly oscillating solutions, *Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR* **24**, pp721-742,
- [2] Arnold V I 1964, Instability of dynamical systems with several degrees of freedom, *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **5**pp.581-585,
- [3] Bogoliubov N N and Mitropolskii Yu A 1961 *Asymptotic Methods in the Theory of Nonlinear Oscillations*, Gordon and Breach
- [4] Brännström N and Gelfreich V 2008 Drift of slow variables in slow-fast Hamiltonian systems, *Physica D* **237**, pp. 2913-2921
- [5] Gelfreich V and Turaev D Unbounded energy growth in Hamiltonian systems with a slowly varying parameter, *Comm. Math. Phys.* (in press)
- [6] Gelfreich V, Turaev D, Fermi acceleration in non-autonomous billiards, *J. Phys. A* (in press)
- [7] Kifer Y 2004 Averaging principle for fully coupled dynamical systems and large deviations, *Ergod. Th & Dynam. Sys.* **24**, pp.847-871
- [8] Lochak P and Meunier C 1988 *Multiphase averaging for classical systems*, Springer Verlag (New York)
- [9] Moser J 1973 *Stable and Random Motions in Dynamical Systems*, Annals of mathematical studies 77. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- [10] Neishtadt A 1976 Averaging in multi-frequency systems. II., *Sov. Phys. Dokl* **21**, pp.80-82
- [11] Sanders J, Verhulst F and Murdock J *Averaging methods in Nonlinear Dynamical Systems*, Springer Verlag (New York), 2 Rev Ed., 2007