GENERIC MAÑÉ SETS.

GONZALO CONTRERAS

ABSTRACT. We prove that $C^2$ generic hyperbolic Mañé sets contain a periodic orbit. In dimension 2, adding a result with A. Figalli and L. Rifford, which states that $C^2$ generic Mañé sets are hyperbolic we obtain Mañé’s Conjecture for surfaces in the $C^2$ topology: Given a Tonelli Lagrangian $L$ on a compact surface $M$ there is a $C^2$ open and dense set of functions $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the Mañé set of the Lagrangian $L + f$ is a hyperbolic periodic orbit.
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Let $M$ be a closed riemannian manifold. A Tonelli Lagrangian is a $C^2$ function $L : TM \to \mathbb{R}$ that is

(i) \textit{Convex}: $\exists a > 0 \ \forall (x,v), (x,w) \in TM, \ w \cdot \partial^2_{xx} L(x,v) \cdot w \geq a|w|^2_x$.

The uniform convexity assumption and the compactness of $M$ imply that $L$ is

(ii) \textit{Superlinear}: $\forall A > 0 \ \exists B > 0$ such that $\forall (x,v) \in TM$: $L(x,v) > A|v|_x - B$.

Given $k \in \mathbb{R}$, the Mañé action potential is defined as $\Phi_k : M \times M \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$,

$$(1) \quad \Phi_k(x,y) := \inf_{\gamma \in C(x,y)} \int k + L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}),$$

where

$$(2) \quad C(x,y) := \{\gamma : [0,T] \to M \text{ absolutely continuous} \mid T > 0, \ \gamma(0) = x, \ \gamma(T) = y \}.$$ 

The Mañé critical value is

$$(3) \quad c(L) := \sup\{ k \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists x, y \in M : \Phi_k(x,y) = -\infty \}.$$ 

See [19] for several characterizations of $c(L)$.

A curve $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is \textit{semi-static} if

$$\forall s < t \ \int_s^t c(L) + L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) = \Phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)).$$

Also $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is \textit{static} if

$$\forall s < t \ \int_s^t c(L) + L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) = -\Phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)).$$

The \textit{Mañé set} of $L$ is

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L) := \{(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \in TM \mid t \in \mathbb{R}, \ \gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M \text{ is semi-static}\},$$

and the \textit{Aubry set} is

$$\mathcal{A}(L) := \{(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \in TM \mid t \in \mathbb{R}, \ \gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M \text{ is static}\}.$$ 

The Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \partial_v L = \partial_x L$$

defines the Lagrangian flow $\varphi_t$ on $TM$. The \textit{energy function} $E : TM \to \mathbb{R},$

$$E(x,v) := \partial_v L(x,v) \cdot v - L(x,v),$$
is invariant under the Lagrangian flow. The Mañé set $\widetilde{N}(L)$ is invariant under the Lagrangian flow and it is contained in the energy level $E := [E = c(L)]$ (see e.g. Mañé [35, p. 146] or [19]).

Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)$ be the set of Borel probabilities in $TM$ which are invariant under the Lagrangian flow. Define the action functional $A_L : \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as

$$A_L(\mu) := \int L \, d\mu.$$ 

The set of minimizing measures is

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L) := \arg \min_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)} A_L,$$

and the Mather set $\mathcal{M}(L)$ is the union of the support of minimizing measures:

$$\mathcal{M}(L) := \bigcup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L)} \text{supp}(\mu).$$

Mañé proves (cf. Mañé [35, Thm. IV] also [16, p. 165]) that an invariant measure is minimizing if and only if it is supported in the Aubry set. Therefore we get the set of inclusions

$$\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \widetilde{N} \subseteq E. \tag{4}$$

0.1. Definition.

We say that $\widetilde{N}(L)$ is hyperbolic if there are sub-bundles $E^s$, $E^u$ of $T\widetilde{E} |_{\widetilde{N}(L)}$ and $T_0 > 0$ such that

(i) $T\widetilde{E} |_{\widetilde{N}(L)} = E^s \oplus (\frac{d}{dt} \varphi_t) \oplus E^u$.

(ii) $\|D\varphi_{T_0} |_{E^s}\| < 1$, $\|D\varphi_{-T_0} |_{E^u}\| < 1$.

(iii) $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ \quad $(D\varphi_t)^*(E^s) = E^s$, $(D\varphi_t)^*(E^u) = E^u$.

Hyperbolicity for autonomous lagrangian or hamiltonian flows is always understood as hyperbolicity for the flow restricted to the energy level.

Fix a Tonelli Lagrangian $L_0$. Let

$$\mathcal{H}^k(L_0) := \{ \phi \in C^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \mid \widetilde{N}(L_0 + \phi) \text{ is hyperbolic} \},$$

endowed with the $C^k$ topology. By [20, Lemma 5.2, p. 661] the map $\phi \mapsto \widetilde{N}(L_0 + \phi)$ is upper semi-continuous. Therefore $\mathcal{H}^k(L_0)$ is an open set for any $k \geq 2$.

Let

$$\mathcal{P}^2(L_0) := \{ \phi \in C^2(M, \mathbb{R}) \mid \widetilde{N}(L_0 + \phi) \text{ contains a periodic orbit or a singularity} \},$$

and let $\overline{\mathcal{P}^2(L_0)}$ be its closure in $C^2(M, \mathbb{R})$. We will prove
Theorem A. $\mathcal{H}^2(L_0) \subset \overline{\mathcal{P}^2(L_0)}$.

In [18] we proved that if $\Gamma \subset \tilde{N}(L)$ is a periodic orbit, adding a potential $\phi_0 \geq 0$ which is locally of the form $\phi_0(x) = \varepsilon d(x, \pi(\Gamma))^k$ makes $\Gamma$ a hyperbolic periodic orbit (or hyperbolic singularity) for the Lagrangian flow of $L + \phi_0$ and also $\tilde{N}(L_0 + \phi_0) = \Gamma$. Therefore defining

$\mathcal{H}^2(L_0) := \{ \phi \in C^2(M, \mathbb{R}) | \tilde{N}(L_0 + \phi) \text{ is a hyperbolic periodic orbit or singularity} \}$

and using the semicontinuity of $\tilde{N}$ and the expansivity of $\Gamma$, we get

Corollary B. The set $\mathcal{H}^2(L_0)$ contains an open and dense set in $\mathcal{H}^2(L_0)$.

With A. Figalli and L. Rifford in [13] we prove

Theorem C. If $\dim M = 2$ then $\mathcal{H}^2(L_0)$ is open and dense.

Thus for surfaces in the $C^2$ topology we obtain Mañé’s Conjecture [35, p. 143]:

Corollary D. If $\dim M = 2$ then $\mathcal{H}^2(L_0)$ contains an open and dense set in $C^2(M, \mathbb{R})$.

Observe that from the inclusions in (4), for potentials $\phi \in \mathcal{H}^2(L_0)$ the lagrangian $L + \phi$ has a unique minimizing measure and it is supported on a hyperbolic periodic orbit or a hyperbolic singularity. The set $\mathcal{H}^2(L_0)$ is open in the $C^2$ topology, so we can approximate the lagrangian $L_0$ with a $C^\infty$ potential $\phi$ to obtain a periodic minimizing measure, but the approximation is only proved to be $C^2$ small.

The proof of Theorem A follows the lines of our proof [15] of the corresponding conjecture in Ergodic Optimization. As such it is supported on the work by G. C. Yuan and B. R. Hunt [49], X. Bressaud and A. Quas [10], I. Morris [37] and A. Quas and J. Siefken [41].

For possible applications we want to remark that all the perturbing potentials in this paper are locally of the form

$$\phi(x) = \varepsilon d(x, \pi(\Gamma))^k, \quad k \geq 2,$$

where $\Gamma$ is a suitably chosen periodic orbit of the Lagrangian flow nearby the Mañé set.

The proof of Theorem A has two main steps corresponding to sections 1 and 2. In section 1 we prove that for $k \geq 2$, $C^k$ generic hyperbolic Mañé sets have zero topological entropy. Namely,

Theorem E. If $L_0$ is a Tonelli lagrangian and $k \geq 2$, the set

$$\mathcal{E}_0(L_0) = \{ \phi \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) | \tilde{N}(L_0 + \phi) \text{ has zero topological entropy} \}$$

contains a residual subset of $\mathcal{H}^k(L_0)$.
On surfaces Theorem E follows from

**Proposition F.** If \( L \) is a Tonelli Lagrangian, \( k \geq 2 \) and \( \dim M = 2 \), then \( \widetilde{N}(L) \) has zero topological entropy.

**Proof:** The topological entropy of \( \widetilde{N}(L) \) is the supremum of the metric entropies of the invariant measures supported on \( \widetilde{N}(L) \). By [35, Theorem V(c)] the \( \omega \)-limit of any orbit in \( \widetilde{N}(L) \) is in the Aubry set \( A(L) \). Thus, by the Poincaré Recurrence Theorem, any invariant measure on \( \widetilde{N}(L) \) is supported on \( A(L) \). Therefore it is enough to prove that the Aubry set has zero topological entropy. By the Graph Property [35, Theorem VI(b)], the flow on \( A(L) \) is the image under a Lipschitz (conjugacy) map \((\pi|_{A(L)})^{-1}\) of a flow on a (Lipschitz) continuous lamination on the surface \( M \). By Fathi [25, Lemma 3.3] and Young [48] the flow on the projected Aubry set \( \pi(A(L)) \) has zero entropy and then (Walters [47, Theorem 7.2]) \( A(L) \) has zero topological entropy. \( \square \)

The proof of Theorem E is done in two steps. The first step in subsection 1.3 is the study of how well hyperbolic minimizing measures can be approximated by closed orbits of a given period. For approximation with large periods on generic lagrangians see Mañé [34, Theorem F]. We found that the arguments of this proof follow elegantly using symbolic dynamics on the Mañé set.

Symbolic dynamics are usually constructed for locally maximal hyperbolic sets. In order to use Theorem C we only assume hyperbolicity of the Mañé set, not local maximality. See Crovisier [21] and Fisher [27] for examples of diffeomorphisms with hyperbolic sets which are not contained in nearby locally maximal hyperbolic sets. Fisher [27] constructs Markov partitions for general hyperbolic sets but this construction has not been done for hyperbolic flows. In Appendix D we define Markov partitions for hyperbolic flows. In Appendix E we construct Markov partitions for non locally maximal hyperbolic sets for flows. In Appendix F we recall from de la Llave, Marco, Moriyón [23] a useful version of the Structural Stability for flows and extend the symbolic dynamics to an invariant set containing the hyperbolic set. In Appendix G we apply all this to obtain a single symbolic dynamics for a neighbourhood of hyperbolic Mañé sets as used in subsection 1.3.

For the second part of the proof of Theorem E we show that for \( \gamma > 0 \) the set

\[
\mathcal{T}_\gamma := \{ \phi \in C^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \mid h_{top}(\widetilde{N}(L + \phi)) \leq \gamma \}
\]

contains an open and dense set in \( C^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \). For the open part we use the upper semicontinuity of the Mañé set and the uniform upper semicontinuity of the metric entropy for \( h \)-expansive maps, which we prove in Appendix A. The uniform \( h \)-expansivity needed is proved in Appendix B. For the density we use a short closed orbit with small action obtained in the first step, perturb the lagrangian with a canal as in (5) and show that the
new minimizing measures have to accumulate nearby the periodic orbit. Then we show that the entropy nearby a short periodic orbit must be small.

We also include a fundamental Appendix B on shadowing which is used for approximating lagrangian actions, to define approximating segments in section 2, for the construction of Markov partitions and for the uniform $h$-expansivity.

The second step of the proof of Theorem A is also split in two parts. The first part in subsection 2.2 is the observation that the existence of a special “solitary” returns and the shadowing lemma allow that a perturbation by a canal as in (5) with $k = 2$ includes a periodic orbit in the Aubry set. The second part shows that the support of a minimizing measure with zero entropy always contain those solitary returns.

Since we assume hyperbolicity of the Aubry set, which is chain recurrent (cf. Mañé [35, Theorem V]), the shadowing lemma implies the existence of many periodic orbits nearby. Along this paper we do not perturb recurrent orbits to close them. We just choose carefully an existing periodic orbit and perturb the lagrangian by a canal as in (5).

1. Generic hyperbolic Mañé sets have zero entropy.

We begin by proving the following analogous of a Theorem by I. Morris [37]:

Theorem E: If $L_0$ is a Tonelli lagrangian and $k \geq 2$, the set

$$\mathcal{E}_0(L_0) = \{ \phi \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \mid \tilde{N}(L_0 + \phi) \text{ has zero topological entropy} \}$$

contains a residual subset of $\mathcal{H}^k(L_0)$.

1.1. The Aubry set.

We say that a curve $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is static for a Tonelli Lagrangian $L$ if

$$s < t \implies \int_s^t L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) = -\Phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s));$$

equivalently (cf. Mañé [35, pp. 142–143]), if $\gamma$ is semi-static and

$$s < t \implies \Phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) + \Phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) = 0. \quad (6)$$

The Aubry set is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}(L) := \{ (\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma \text{ is static} \},$$

its elements are called static vectors.

1.1. Lemma (A priori bound).

For $C > 0$ there exists $A_0 = A_0(C) > 0$ such that if $\gamma : [0, T] \to M$ is a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation with $A_L(\gamma) < CT$, then

$$|\dot{\gamma}(t)| < A_0 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$
Proof: The Euler-Lagrange flow preserves the energy function

\[ E_L := v \cdot \partial_v L - L \]

We have that

\[ \frac{d}{ds} E_L(x, sv) \bigg|_{s} = sv \cdot \partial_{vv} L(x, v) \cdot v \geq sa |v|^2. \]

\[ E_L(x, v) = E_L(x, 0) + \int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds} E_L(x, sv) ds \geq \min_{x \in M} E_L(x, 0) + \frac{1}{2} a |v|^2. \]

Let

\[ g(r) := \sup \{ w \cdot \partial_{vv} L(x, v) : |v|^2 \leq r, |w|^2 = 1 \}. \]

Then \( g(r) \geq a \) and

\[ E_L(x, v) \leq \max_{x \in M} E_L(x, 0) + \frac{1}{2} g(|v|^2) |v|^2. \]

By the superlinearity there is \( B > 0 \) such that \( L(x, v) > |v|^2 - B \) for all \((x, v) \in TM\). Since \( A_L(\gamma) \leq CT \), the mean value theorem implies that there is \( t_0 \in [0, T] \) such that \( |\dot{\gamma}(t_0)| < B + C \). Then (9) gives an upper bound on the energy of \( \gamma \) and (8) bounds the speed of \( \gamma \).

\[ \square \]

For \( x, y \in M \) and \( T > 0 \) define

\[ C_T(x, y) := \{ \gamma : [0, T] \to M \mid \gamma(0) = x, \gamma(T) = y \}. \]

1.2. Corollary.

There exists \( A_1 > 0 \) such that if \( x, y \in M \) and \( \gamma \in C_T(x, y) \) is a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation with

\[ A_{L+c}(\gamma) \leq \Phi_c(x, y) + \max\{T, d(x, y)\}, \]

where \( c = c(L) \), then

(a) \( T \geq \frac{1}{A_1} d(x, y) \).

(b) \( |\dot{\gamma}(t)| \leq A_1 \) for all \( t \in [0, T] \).

Proof: First suppose that \( d(x, y) \leq T \). Then item (a) holds with \( A_1 = 1 \). Let

\[ \ell(r) := \sup \{ L(x, v) : (x, v) \in TM, |v| \leq r \}. \]

Since \( d(x, y) \leq T \), there exists a \( C^1 \) curve \( \eta : [0, T] \to M \) joining \( x \) to \( y \) with \( |\dot{\eta}| \leq 1 \). We have that

\[ A_{L+c}(\gamma) \leq \Phi_c(x, y) + T \leq A_{L+c}(\eta) + T \leq (\ell(1) + c) T + T. \]
Then item (b) holds for $A = A_0(\ell(1) + c + 1)$ where $A_0$ is from Lemma 1.1.

Now suppose that $d(x, y) \geq T$. Let $\eta : [0, d(x, y)] \to M$ be a minimal geodesic with $|\dot{\eta}| \equiv 1$ joining $x$ to $y$. Let $D := \ell(1) + c + 2$. From the superlinearity property there is $B > 1$ such that

$$L(x, v) + c > D |v| - B, \quad \forall (x, v) \in TM.$$

Then

$$[\ell(1) + c] d(x, y) \geq A_{L+c}(\eta) \geq \Phi_c(x, y) \geq A_{L+c}(\gamma) - d(x, y) \geq \int_0^T (D |\dot{\gamma}| - B) \, dt - d(x, y) \geq D d(x, y) - BT - d(x, y).$$

Hence

$$T \geq \frac{D - \ell(1) - c - 1}{B} d(x, y) = \frac{1}{B} d(x, y).$$

From (11) and (12), we get that

$$A_L(\gamma) \leq \left[ \ell(1) + c + 1 \right] d(x, y) - cT,$$

$$\leq \left\{ B \left[ \ell(1) + c + 1 \right] - c \right\} T.$$

Then Lemma 1.1 completes the proof.

We say that a curve $\gamma : [0, T] \to M$ is a Tonelli minimizer if it minimizes the action functional on $C_T(\gamma(0), \gamma(T))$, i.e. if it is a minimizer with fixed endpoints and fixed time interval.

1.3. **Corollary.** There is $A > 0$ such that if $x, y \in M$ and $\eta_n \in C_{T_n}(x, y)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ is a Tonelli minimizer with $A_{L+c}(\eta_n) \leq \Phi_c(x, y) + \frac{1}{n}$, then there is $N_0 > 0$ such that $\forall n > N_0, \forall t \in [0, T_n], |\dot{\eta}_n(t)| < A$.

**Proof:** If $d(x, y) > 0$ then for $n$ large enough $d(x, y) > \frac{1}{n}$. In this case Corollary 1.2 implies the result with a constant $A_1$. If $d(x, y) = 0$ let $\xi_n : [0, T_n] \to \{x\}$ be the constant curve. Then

$$A_L(\eta_n) \leq A_L(\xi_n) = \int_0^{T_n} L(x, 0) \, dt \leq |L(x, 0)| T_n.$$

Lemma 1.1 implies that $|\dot{\eta}_n| \leq A_0(C)$ with $C = \sup_{x \in M} |L(x, 0)|$. Now take $A = \max\{A_0(C), A_1\}$. □
1.4. Lemma.

If \((x,v)\) is a static vector then \(\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M, \gamma(t) = \pi \varphi_t(x,v)\) is a static curve, i.e. the Aubry set \(A(L)\) is invariant.

Proof:

Let \(\gamma(t) = \pi \varphi_t(x,v)\) and suppose that \(\gamma|_{[a,b]}\) is static. We have to prove that all \(\gamma|_{\mathbb{R}}\) is static. Let \(\eta_n \in C_{T_n}(\gamma(b),\gamma(a))\) be a Tonelli minimizer with

\[
A_{L+c}(\eta_n) < \Phi_c(\gamma(b),\gamma(a)) + \frac{1}{n}.
\]

By Corollary 1.3, for \(n\) large enough, \(|\dot{\eta}_n| < A\). We can assume that \(\dot{\eta}_n(0) \to w\). If \(w \neq \dot{\gamma}(b)\) then for some \(\varepsilon > 0\) the curve \(\gamma|_{[b-\varepsilon,b]} * \xi|_{[0,\varepsilon]}\) is not \(C^1\), and hence it can not be a (Tonelli) minimizer of \(A_{L+c}\) in \(C_{2\varepsilon}(\gamma(b-\varepsilon),\xi(\varepsilon))\). Thus

\[
\Phi_c(\gamma(b-\varepsilon),\xi(\varepsilon)) < A_{L+c}(\gamma|_{[b-\varepsilon,b]}*\xi|_{[0,\varepsilon]}).
\]

\[
\Phi_c(\gamma(a),\gamma(a)) \leq \Phi_c(\gamma(a),\gamma(b-\varepsilon)) + \Phi_c(\gamma(b-\varepsilon),\xi(\varepsilon)) + \Phi_c(\xi(\varepsilon),\gamma(a))
\]

\[
< A_{L+c}(\gamma|_{[a,b-\varepsilon]}) + A_{L+c}(\gamma|_{[b-\varepsilon,b]}) + A_{L+c}(\xi|_{[0,\varepsilon]}) + \lim_n \inf A_{L+c}(\eta_n|_{[\varepsilon,T_n]})
\]

\[
\leq A_{L+c}(\gamma|_{[a,b]}*\eta_n|_{[0,\varepsilon]}*\eta_n|_{[\varepsilon,T_n]})
\]

\[
= -\Phi_c(\gamma(b),\gamma(a)) + \Phi_c(\gamma(b),\gamma(a)) = 0.
\]

Thus there is a closed curve, from \(\gamma(a)\) to itself, with negative \(L+c\) action, and also negative \(L+k\) action for some \(k > c(L)\). Concatenating the curve with itself many times shows that \(\Phi_k(\gamma(a),\gamma(a)) = -\infty\). By (3) this implies that \(k < c(L)\), which is a contradiction. Thus \(w = \dot{\gamma}(b)\) and similarly \(\lim_n \dot{\eta}_n(T_n) = \dot{\gamma}(a)\).

If \(\limsup T_n < +\infty\), we can assume that \(\tau = \lim_n T_n > 0\) exists. In this case \(\gamma\) is a semi-static periodic orbit of period \(\tau + b - a\) and then \(\gamma|_{\mathbb{R}}\) is static.

Now suppose that \(\lim_n T_n = +\infty\). If \(s > 0\), we have that

\[
A_{L+c}(\gamma|_{[a-s,b+s]}) + \Phi_c(\gamma(b+s),\gamma(a-s)) \leq
\]

\[
\leq \lim_n \left\{ A_{L+c}(\eta_n|_{[T_n-s,T_n]}) + A_{L+c}(\gamma|_{[a,b]}) + A_{L+c}(\eta_n|_{[0,s]}) \right\}
\]

\[
+ \Phi_c(\gamma(b+s),\gamma(a-s))
\]

\[
\leq -\Phi_c(\gamma(b),\gamma(a))
\]

\[
+ \lim_n \left\{ A_{L+c}(\eta_n|_{[0,s]}) + A_{L+c}(\eta_n|_{[s,T_n-s]}) + A_{L+c}(\eta_n|_{[T_n-s,T_n]}) \right\}
\]

\[
\leq -\Phi_c(\gamma(b),\gamma(a)) + \Phi_c(\gamma(b),\gamma(a)) = 0.
\]

Thus \(\gamma|_{[a-s,b+s]}\) is static for all \(s > 0\).
Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)$ be the set of Borel probabilities in $TM$ invariant under the Lagrangian flow. Denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L)$ the set of minimizing measures for the Lagrangian $L$, i.e.

\begin{equation}
\mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L) \mid \int_{TM} L \, d\mu = -c(L) \right\}.
\end{equation}

Their name is justified (cf. Mañé [35, Theorem II]) by

\begin{equation}
-c(L) = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)} \int_{TM} L \, d\mu = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{C}(TM)} \int_{TM} L \, d\mu.
\end{equation}

Fathi and Siconolfi [26, Theorem 1.6] prove the second equality in (14) where the set of closed measures is defined by

\begin{equation}
\mathcal{C}(TM) := \left\{ \mu \text{ Borel probability on } TM \mid \forall \phi \in C^1(M, \mathbb{R}) \int_{TM} d\phi \, d\mu = 0 \right\}.
\end{equation}

Recall

1.5. **Theorem** (Theorem IV in [35] or [16]).

A probability $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)$ is minimizing if and only if $\text{supp} \mu \subset \mathcal{A}(L)$.

1.6. **Corollary**.

A probability $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)$ is minimizing if and only if $\text{supp} \mu \subset \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)$.

**Proof:** It is enough to prove that invariant probabilities supported in $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)$ are actually supported in $\mathcal{A}(L)$. Denote by $\varphi_t = \varphi_t^L$ the Lagrangian flow. We first prove that the non-wandering set of the restriction $\varphi_t|_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)}$ satisfies $\Omega(\varphi_t|_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)}) \subset \mathcal{A}(L)$. If $\vartheta \in \Omega(\varphi_t|_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)})$ then there is a sequence $\theta_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)$ and $t_n \geq 2$ such that $\lim_n \theta_n = \vartheta = \lim_n \varphi_{t_n}(\theta_n)$. The action potential $\phi_k$ in (1) is Lipschitz by Theorem I in Mañé [35] or [16]. Then

\[
A_L(\varphi_{[0,1]}(\vartheta)) + \phi_c(L)\left( \pi \varphi_1(\vartheta), \pi(\vartheta) \right) \leq \lim_n A_L(\varphi_{[0,1]}(\theta_n)) + \lim_n A_L(\varphi_{[1,t_n]}(\theta_n)),
\]

\[
\leq \lim_n A_L(\varphi_{[0,t_n]}(\theta_n)) = \lim_n \phi_c(L)(\theta_n, \varphi_{t_n}(\theta_n)) \leq \phi_c(L)(\pi \vartheta, \pi \vartheta) = 0.
\]

And hence $\vartheta \in \mathcal{A}(L)$. Now, if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)$ has $\text{supp} \mu \subset \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)$, by Poincaré recurrence theorem $\text{supp} \mu \subset \Omega(\varphi|_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L)}) \subset \mathcal{A}(L)$.

\[\square\]
1.2. Symbolic Dynamics for the Aubry set.

Throughout the rest of the section we will identify a periodic orbit with the invariant probability supported on the periodic orbit.

The first two results, Lemma 1.7 and Proposition 1.8 follow arguments by X. Bressaud and A. Quas [10].

Let $A \in \{0,1\}^{M \times M}$ be a $M \times M$ matrix with entries in $\{0,1\}$. The subshift of finite type $\Sigma_A$ associated to $A$ is the set

$$\Sigma_A = \left\{ \bar{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \{1, \ldots, M\}^\mathbb{Z} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad A(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1 \right\},$$

endowed with the metric

$$d_a(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = a^{-i}, \quad i = \max\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid x_i = y_i \ \forall |i| \leq k \}$$

for some $a > 1$ and the shift transformation

$$\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \sigma(\bar{x})_i = x_{i+1}.$$

1.7. Lemma. Let $\Sigma_A$ be a shift of finite type with $M$ symbols and topological entropy $h$. Then $\Sigma_A$ contains a periodic orbit of period at most $1 + Me^{1-h}$.

Proof: Let $k + 1$ be the period of the shortest periodic orbit in $\Sigma_A$. We claim that a word of length $k$ in $\Sigma_A$ is determined by the set of symbols that it contains. First note that since there are no periodic orbits of period $k$ or less, any allowed $k$-word must contain $k$ distinct symbols. Now suppose that $u$ and $v$ are two distinct words of length $k$ in $\Sigma_A$ containing the same symbols. Then, since the words are different, there is a consecutive pair of symbols, say $a$ and $b$, in $v$ which occur in the opposite order (not necessarily consecutively) in $u$. Then the infinite concatenation of the segment of $u$ starting at $b$ and ending at $a$ gives a word in $\Sigma_A$ of period at most $k$, which contradicts the choice of $k$.

It follows that there are at most $\binom{M}{k}$ words of length $k$. Using the basic properties of topological entropy

$$e^{hk} \leq \binom{M}{k} \leq \frac{M^k}{k!} \leq \left( \frac{Me^1}{k} \right)^k.$$

Taking $k$th roots, we see that $k \leq Me^{1-h}$. □

In Appendix E we prove that if $\mathcal{A}(L)$ is hyperbolic then there is a hyperbolic set $\Lambda$ in the energy level $c(L)$ which contains $\mathcal{A}(L), \mathcal{A}(L) \subset \Lambda \subset E^{-1}\{c(L)\}$, and which has a Markov partition, as defined in Appendix D. The Markov partition consists of a finite set
of rectangles $\mathfrak{T} = \{T_i\}_{i=1}^r$ included in mutually disjoint transversal disks $D_i \supset T_i$. There is a Lipschitz first return time $\tau : \cup \mathfrak{T} \to ]0, \alpha]$, $\cup \mathfrak{T} := \cup_{T \in \mathfrak{T}} T$,

$$\tau(\theta) := \min \{ t > 0 \mid \varphi_t(\theta) \in \cup \mathfrak{T} \},$$

and first return map (also called Poincaré map) $F : \cup \mathfrak{T} \to \cup \mathfrak{T}$,

$$F(\theta) := \varphi_{\tau(\theta)}(\theta).$$

By Lemma D.4 and Theorem D.6 there is a subshift of finite type $\Omega$ and a Lipschitz map $\Pi : \Omega \to \cup \mathfrak{T}$ which is a semiconjugacy between the shift map $\sigma$ and the Poincaré map $F$. Also $\Pi$ extends to a time preserving Lipschitz semiconjugacy $\Pi : S(\Omega, \tau) \to \Lambda$ from the suspension $S(\Omega, \tau) := \tau \circ \Pi : \Omega \to ]0, \alpha]$, as defined in (204) in Appendix C, with suspended flow $S_t$ defined in (205), to the lagrangian flow $\varphi_t|_{\Lambda}$ on $\Lambda$. In other words, the following diagram commutes for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Pi$ is Lipschitz.

$$\begin{array}{c}
S(\Omega, \tau) \xrightarrow{S_t} S(\Omega, \tau) \\
\Pi \downarrow \quad \Pi \\
\Lambda \xrightarrow{\varphi_t} \Lambda
\end{array}$$

A $\sigma$-invariant measure $\nu$ on $\Omega$ induces a $\varphi_t$-invariant measure $\mu_\nu$ on $\Lambda$ by

$$\int_\Lambda f d\mu_\nu := \int_\Omega \left[ \int_0^{\tau(\bar{w})} f(\varphi_t(\Pi(\bar{w}))) \, dt \right] d\nu(\bar{w}).$$

Define $B : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$B(\bar{w}) := \int_0^{\tau(\bar{w})} \left[ L(\varphi_t(\Pi(\bar{w}))) + c(L) \right] dt.$$

Then we have that

$$A_{L+c(L)}(\mu_\nu) = \int_\Lambda (L + c(L)) \, d\mu_\nu = \int_\Omega B \, d\nu.$$

To fix notation we use the metric $d_a$ from (203) on $\Omega$, namely

$$d_a(\bar{w}, \bar{w}) := a^{-n}, \quad n := \max \{ k \in \mathbb{N} : \forall |i| \leq k, \ u_i = w_i \},$$

and $a > 1$ is chosen as in Lemma D.4(i) such that $\Pi : \Omega \to \cup \mathfrak{T}$ is Lipschitz.

As constructed before Theorem D.6, the subshift $\Omega$ has symbols in $\mathfrak{T}$ and a transition matrix $A : \mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{T} \to \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$\Omega = \Sigma(A) = \{ \bar{w} \in \mathfrak{T}^\mathbb{Z} : \forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad A(w_i, w_{i+1}) = 1 \}.$$

We say that $(w_1, \ldots, w_n) \in \mathfrak{T}^n$ is a legal word in $\Omega$ iff $A(w_i, w_{i+1}) = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$. A cylinder in $\Omega$ is a set of the form

$$C(n, m, \bar{w}) := \{ \bar{z} \in \Omega : z_i = w_i \quad \forall i = n, \ldots, m \},$$
where \( w \in \Omega \) or \( w = (w_n, \ldots, w_m) \) is a legal word in \( \Omega \). A subshift of \( \Omega \) is a closed \( \sigma \)-invariant subset of \( \Omega \). If \( Y \subset \Omega \) is a subshift of \( \Omega \) we say that \( w = (w_n, \ldots, w_m) \) is a legal word in \( Y \) iff \( C(n, m, w) \cap Y \neq \emptyset \).

Since the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Omega & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \Omega \\
\Pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi \\
\cup \Sigma & \xrightarrow{F} & \cup \Sigma
\end{array}
\]

commutes and \( \Pi \) is continuous, the set

\begin{equation}
Y := \Pi^{-1}((\cup \Sigma) \cap A(L))
\end{equation}

is a subshift of \( \Omega \) and

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{ccc}
Y & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & Y \\
\Pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi \\
(\cup \Sigma) \cap A(L) & \xrightarrow{F} & (\cup \Sigma) \cap A(L)
\end{array}
\end{equation}

commutes.

1.3. **Approximation by periodic orbits.**

Let \( \mathcal{P}_L(T) \) be the set of Borel invariant probabilities for \( L \) which are supported on a periodic orbit with period \( \leq T \). For \( \mu \in \mathcal{P}_L(T) \) write

\[ c(\mu, A(L)) := \sup_{\theta \in \text{supp}(\mu)} d(\theta, A(L)). \]

1.8. **Proposition.** Suppose that the Aubry set \( A(L) \) is hyperbolic. Then for all \( \ell \in \mathbb{N}^+ \)

\[ \liminf_{T \to +\infty} T^\ell \left( \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_L(T)} c(\mu, A(L)) \right) = 0. \]

**Proof:**

For \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) let \( Z^{(n)} \) be the 1-step subshift of finite type whose symbols are the legal words of size \( n \) in \( Y := \Pi^{-1}(A(L)) \). A transition from the word

\begin{equation}
\text{u to v is allowed in } Z^{(n)} \text{ iff the word } uv \text{ of size } 2n \text{ is a legal word in } Y.
\end{equation}

(Observe that this is not the standard transition matrix for the \( n \)-word recoding of a subshift of finite type.) There is a natural semiconjugacy \( Z^{(n)} \to Y \) from the shift of finite
type $Z^{(n)}$ to $s^n$ on $Y$, and hence the topological entropy of $Z^{(n)}$ exceeds $n \, h_{\text{top}}(Y)$. Let $h = \frac{1}{n} h_{\text{top}}(Z^{(n)}) \geq h_{\text{top}}(Y)$. We have that

$$
\# \text{ symbols of } Z^{(n)} = \# \text{ n-words in } Y = \# \text{ n-cylinders in } Y = K_n \, e^{n \, h_{\text{top}}(Y)} \leq K_n \, e^n,
$$

where $K_n$ has subexponential growth. By Lemma 1.7 there is a periodic orbit $\Gamma_n$ in $Z^{(n)}$ with period at most $1 + K_n e^{nh} e^{1-nh} = 1 + e K_n$. Since each symbol in $Z^{(n)}$ corresponds to a word on length $n$ in the original shift space $\Omega = \Sigma(A)$, the periodic orbit $\Gamma_n$ corresponds to a periodic orbit in $\Sigma(A)$ of period at most

$$
P(n) := n (1 + e K_n),
$$

which has subexponential growth.

We claim that any $n$-word in the projection of $\Gamma_n$ is a legal $n$-word in $Y$. For this, observe that if the word is a symbol of $Z^{(n)}$ then it is a legal $n$-word in $Y$ by the definition of $Z^{(n)}$. If the $n$-word is inside a concatenation of two symbols of $Z^{(n)}$, the transition rule (18) defining $Z^{(n)}$ implies that it is a legal $n$-word in $Y$. It follows, using the metric (15), and identifying $\Gamma_n$ with its projection to $\Sigma(A)$, that

$$
c(\Gamma_n, Y) := \sup_{w \in \Gamma_n} d_a(w, Y) \leq a^{-n}.
$$

Recall that the return time $\tau$ to $\cup \Sigma$ and the ceiling function in $S(\Omega, \tau)$ are bounded above by $\alpha$. Let $B > 0$ be such that

$$
\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Lambda, \quad |t| \leq \alpha \quad \Longrightarrow \quad d(\varphi_t(\theta_1), \varphi_t(\theta_2)) < B d(\theta_1, \theta_2).
$$

Let $\Delta_n := \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\Pi(\Gamma_n)) = \varphi_{[0,\alpha]}(\Pi(\Gamma_n)) \subset \Lambda = \Pi(S(\Omega, \tau))$ be the periodic orbit in $\Lambda$ which corresponds to $\Gamma_n$. Recall that $\Pi$ is Lipschitz with the metric (15). Since $A(L) = \varphi_{[0,\alpha]}(\Pi(Y))$, from (19) and (20) we get that

$$
c(\Delta_n, A(L)) = \sup_{\theta \in \Delta_n} d(\theta, A(L)) \leq B \, \text{Lip}(\Pi) \, a^{-n}.
$$

The period $T(\Delta_n)$ of $\Delta_n$ is bounded by

$$
T(\Delta_n) \leq \alpha \, P(n).
$$

Since $P(n)$ has subexponential growth from (22) and (21) we have that

$$
\liminf_{T \to +\infty} T^\ell \left[ \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_L(T)} c(\mu, A(L)) \right] \leq \liminf_n T(\Delta_n)^\ell c(\Delta_n, A(L)) = 0.
$$

$\square$
1.9. **Corollary.** Suppose that the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}(L)$ is hyperbolic. There is a sequence of periodic orbits $\mu_n$ with periods $T_n$ and $m_n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $m_n > n$, such that for any $0 < \beta < 1$

$$\int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) \, d\mu_n(\theta) = o(\beta^k m_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n} \frac{\log T_n}{m_n} = 0.$$  

**Proof:** Observe that it is enough to prove the Lemma for $k = 1$. By Proposition 1.8 there is a sequence of periodic orbits $\mu_n$ with periods $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$

$$\lim_{n} T_{\ell} \left( \int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) \, d\mu_n(\theta) \right) = 0.$$  

Let

$$r_n := \log_{\beta} \left( \int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) \, d\mu_n(\theta) \right).$$  

Since

$$\beta^r_n \leq T_{\ell} \beta^r_n \leq 1 \quad \iff \quad -\frac{1}{\ell} \leq \frac{\log_{\beta} T_n}{r_n} \leq 0$$

we have that $r_n^{-1} \log T_n \rightarrow 0$. Define $m_n := \lfloor \frac{1}{2} r_n \rfloor$, then $m_n^{-1} \log T_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) \, d\mu_n(\theta) = \beta^r_n \leq \beta^{m_n + \frac{1}{2} r_n} = o(\beta^{m_n}).$$

1.10. **Lemma.** Let $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ be non-negative real numbers, and let $A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \geq 0$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} -a_i \log a_i \leq 1 + A \log n,$$

where we use the convention $0 \log 0 = 0$. Moreover,

if $A = 1$ then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} -a_i \log a_i \leq \log n.$$

**Proof:** Applying Jensen’s inequality to the concave function $x \mapsto -x \log x$ yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} -a_i \log a_i \leq - \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \right) \log \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \right) = - \frac{A}{n} \log A + A \frac{A}{n} \log n$$

from which the result follows. When $A = 1$ use that $1 \cdot \log 1 = 0$ in the previous inequality.

Recall that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)$ is the set of Borel probabilities in $TM$ invariant under the Lagrangian flow.
1.11. **Lemma.**

Let $L$ be a Tonelli Lagrangian and $e > c(L_0)$. There is $B = B(L, e) > 0$ such that for every $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L)$ with $\text{supp}(\nu) \subset \{\text{Energy}(L) < e\}$,

$$
\int L \, d\nu \leq -c(L) + B(L, e) \int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) \, d\nu(\theta).
$$

**Proof:** From Bernard [2] after Fathi and Siconolfi [26] we know that there is a critical subsolution $u$ of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the Hamiltonian $H$ of $L$, i.e.

(24) $$H(x, du) \leq c(L),$$

which is $C^1$ with Lipschitz derivatives. Let

$$
\mathbb{L}(x, v) := L(x, v) + c(L) - dx u(v).
$$

Inequality (24) implies that $\mathbb{L} \geq 0$. Also from (6), $\mathbb{L}|_{\mathcal{A}(L)} \equiv 0$. The Aubry set $\mathcal{A}(L)$ is included in the energy level $c(L)$ (e.g. Mañé [35, p. 146]), hence it is compact. There is a Lipschitz constant $B$ for the function $\mathbb{L}$ on the convex $[E(L) < e]$:

$$\forall \theta \in [E(L) < e] \quad \mathbb{L}(\theta) \leq 0 + B \, d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)).$$

By Birkhoff ergodic theorem every invariant probability is closed:

$$
\int du(x, v) \, d\nu = \int \left[ \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T du(\varphi_t(\theta)) \, dt \right] \, d\nu(\theta)
= \int \lim_{T \to \infty} \left[ \frac{u(\pi(\varphi_T(\theta))) - u(\pi(\theta))}{T} \right] \, d\nu(\theta) = 0.
$$

Therefore

$$
\int \left( L + c(L) \right) \, d\nu = \int \mathbb{L} \, d\nu \leq B \int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) \, d\nu.
$$

□

1.12. **Lemma.**

Let $N$ be a compact riemannian manifold and $\mu$ a Borel probability on $N$.

Given $h > 0$ there exists a finite Borel partition $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_r\}$ of $N$ with the following properties:

(1) $\text{diam} \ A < h$,
(2) $\forall A \in \mathcal{A} \quad \mu(\partial A) = 0$,
(3) $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad \forall A_i \in \mathcal{A} \quad \exists B_i \subset A_i$ such that $B_i$ is compact, $\mu(\partial B_i) = 0$, $\mu(A_i \setminus B_i) < \varepsilon$. 

Proof: We first show that for any \( x \in N \) there is a ball \( B(x, r), \ r < \frac{1}{2}h \) such that \( \mu(\partial B(x, r)) = 0 \). Indeed if \( h \) is small the sets \( F_r := \partial B(x, r), \ 0 < r < h \) are disjoint. Since \( \mu \) is finite, at most a countable number of the sets \( F_r \) can have positive measure. Let \( \mathcal{O} = \{U_i\}_{i=1}^m \) be a finite cover of \( N \) by open balls with \( \mu(\partial U_i) = 0, \ \text{diam} \ U_i < h \) and such that \( U_i \setminus \cup_{j \neq i} U_j \neq \emptyset \). Define inductively \( A_1 := U_1, \ A_{i+1} := U_{i+1} \setminus \cup_{j \leq i} U_j \). Then \( \bar{A}_i = \text{int} A_i \) and \( A := \{A_i\}_{i=1}^m \) is a Borel partition of \( N \) satisfying (1) and (2).

For \( r > 0 \) small let \( B_i(r) := \{x \in A_i : d(x, A_i^c) \geq r\} \). We have that \( B_i(r) \) is compact and \( B_i(r) \uparrow \text{int} A_i \). Thus \( \lim_{r \to 0} \mu(B_i(r)) = \mu(\text{int} A_i) = \mu(A_i) \). Also \( \partial B_i(r_1) \cap \partial B_i(r_2) = \emptyset \) if \( r_1 \neq r_2 \) because

\[
\partial B_i(r) = \{x \in A_i : d(x, A_i^c) = r\}.
\]

Therefore there is \( r_i > 0 \) such that \( B_i := B_i(r_i) \) satisfies \( \mu(A_i \setminus B_i) < \varepsilon \) and \( \mu(\partial B_i) = 0 \).

\( \square \)

1.4. Small entropy nearby closed orbits.

Recall that \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L) \) is the set of Borel probabilities in \( TM \) which are invariant under the Lagrangian flow and \( \mathcal{M}_{\min}(L) \) is the set of minimizing measures (13). For \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{inv}}(L) \) denote by \( h(L, \mu) \) the entropy of \( \mu \) under the Lagrangian flow \( \varphi_t \).

Proof of Theorem E:

For \( \gamma > 0 \) write

\[
\mathcal{H}^k(L_0) := \{\phi \in C^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \mid \bar{N}(L_0 + \phi) \text{ is hyperbolic}\},
\]

\[
\mathcal{E}_\gamma := \{\phi \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \mid \forall \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\min}(L_0 + \phi) \ h(L_0 + \phi, \mu) < \gamma\}.
\]

The upper semicontinuity of the Mañé set (cf. [20, Lemma 5.2]) and properties of hyperbolic sets (see e.g. Theorem G.3 in Appendix G) imply that the set \( \mathcal{H}^k(M) \) is open. As an open subset \( \mathcal{H}^k(L) \subset C^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \) of a complete metric space we have that \( \mathcal{H}^k(L) \) is a Baire space.

It is enough to prove that for every \( \gamma > 0 \) the set \( \mathcal{E}_\gamma \) is open and dense in \( \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \) because in that case using Corollary 1.6 and the variational principle (Theorem A.1), we have that

\[
\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{n}} = \{\phi \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \mid \forall \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\min}(L_0 + \phi) \ h(L_0 + \phi, \mu) = 0\}
\]

\[
= \{\phi \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \mid \bar{N}(L_0 + \phi) \text{ has zero topological entropy}\}
\]

is a residual set.
Step 1. $E_\gamma$ is $C^k$ open.

The map $C^k(M,\mathbb{R}) \ni \phi \mapsto \mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi)$ is upper semicontinuous (cf. [20, Lemma 5.2]). Therefore, given $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0)$, there are neighbourhoods $U$ of $\mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi_0)$ in $TM$ and $U$ of $\phi_0$ in $C^k(M,\mathbb{R})$ such that for any $\phi \in U$, $\mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi) \subset U$ and $\mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi)$ is a hyperbolic set for $\varphi_t^{L_0+\phi}$ restricted to $E_\phi := E^{-1}_{L_0+\phi}\{c(L+\phi)\}$. Moreover, by Theorem G.3 and Remark B.9 we can choose $U$ and $U$ such that for every $\phi \in U$ the lagrangian flow $\varphi_t^{L_0+\phi}$ of $L_0 + \phi$ is hyperbolic in the maximal invariant subset of $\mathcal{U}$ and $\{ \varphi_1^{L_0+\phi} |_{E_\phi \cap \mathcal{U}} : \phi \in U \}$ is a uniformly $h$-expansive family on $\mathcal{U}$. In particular $\mathcal{H}^k(L_0)$ is open in $C^k(M,\mathbb{R})$.

Consider the subset $S \subset C^k(M,\mathbb{R})$ of potentials $\phi$ for which $\mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi)$ contains a singular point for the Lagrangian flow. By [20, Theorem C] there is an open and dense subset $O_1 \subset S$ such that if $\phi \in O_1$ then $\mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi)$ is a single singularity of $\varphi_t^{L_0+\phi}$. Then by [18, Theorem D] generically this singularity is hyperbolic, i.e. $O_1 \cap \mathcal{H}^k(L_0)$ is open and dense in $O_1$.

So we can restrict our arguments to Mañé sets without singularities. In this case by Corollary G.2 we can identify the energy level $E_\phi \supset \mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi)$ with the unit tangent bundle $SM$ by the radial projection.

Suppose that $\phi_n \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \setminus E_\gamma$, $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}^k(L_0)$ and $\lim_n \phi_n = \phi_0$ in $C^k(M,\mathbb{R})$. Then there are $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}_{\min}(L_0 + \phi_n)$ with $h(L_0 + \phi_n, \nu_n) \geq \gamma$. The map $\phi \mapsto c(L_0 + \phi)$ is continuous (cf. [20, Lemma 5.1]) and $\sup \nu_n$ is in the energy level $E_{\phi_0} = E^{−1}_{L_0+\phi_0}\{c(L_0 + \phi_0)\}$ (cf. Carneiro [12]). Thus we can assume that all the probabilities $\nu_n$ are supported on a fixed compact subset $K$ of $TM$. Taking a subsequence if necessary we can assume that $\nu_n \rightarrow \nu \in \mathcal{N}(L_0 + \phi_0)$ in the weak* topology.

The map $(\mu, \phi) \mapsto \int (L_0 + \phi) \, d\mu$ is continuous with respect to $\|\phi\|_{\sup}$ and to the weak* topology on the set of Borel probabilities on $K$. Also the map $\phi \mapsto c(L_0 + \phi)$ is continuous with respect to $\|\phi\|_{\sup}$ (cf. [20, Lemma 5.1]). Using that [see eq. (14)]

$$c(L_0 + \phi) = -\min_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(L_0+\phi)} \int (L_0 + \phi) \, d\mu,$$

we obtain that the limit $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\min}(L_0 + \phi_0)$.

We can identify the energy levels $E_{\phi_n}$ with the unit tangent bundle $SM$ under the radial projection $R(\phi_n) : E_{\phi_n} \rightarrow SM$. Since $\phi \mapsto c(L_0 + \phi)$ is continuous, we have that the projected lagrangian vector fields $R(\phi_n)_* X(L_0 + \phi_n)|_{E_{\phi_n}} \rightarrow R(\phi_0)_* X(L_0 + \phi_0)|_{E_{\phi_0}}$ converge in the $C^{k−1}$ topology on $SM$ (see Remark G.4).
By Corollary 1.6 we have that \( \text{supp} \nu_n \subset U \). By Remark B.9 the family of conjugated lagrangian flows \( \psi^n_t := R(\phi_n) \circ \varphi^{L + \phi_n}_{L + \phi} \circ R(\phi_n)^{-1}, \ n \geq 0 \) in \( SM \) is uniformly \( h \)-expansive on their maximal invariant sets of \( R(U) \). Applying Theorem A.6 we get that

\[
\gamma \leq \limsup_n h(L_0 + \phi_n, \nu_n) \leq h(L_0 + \phi_0, \nu).
\]

Therefore \( \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \setminus \mathcal{E}_\gamma \) is relatively closed in (the open set) \( \mathcal{H}^k(L_0) \) and hence \( \mathcal{E}_\gamma \) is open in \( C^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \).

**Step 2. Density.**

We have to prove that \( \mathcal{E}_\gamma \) intersects every non-empty open subset of \( \mathcal{H}^k(L) \). Let \( U_1 \subset \mathcal{H}^k(L) \) be open and non-empty. By Mañé [34, Thm. C.(a)] there is \( \phi_0 \in U_1 \) such that \( \# \mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L_0 + \phi_0) = 1 \). Write

\[
L := L_0 + \phi_0.
\]

Let \( m_n, T_n, \mu_n \) be given by Corollary 1.9 for \( L \). Let \( \Gamma_n := \text{supp} \mu_n \) and let \( \Gamma_n(t) \) be the associated periodic orbit with its parametrization. Corollary 1.9 and Lemma 1.11 are proven for a single lagrangian. The reader can check that in the following proof they are only applied to the lagrangian \( L \) in (25).

For \( \phi \in C^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \) near 0 write \( \mathcal{E}_\phi := E_{L + \phi}^{-1}\{c(L + \phi)\} \).

**Claim 1.13.1:**

There are \( 0 < \beta < 1, N^1_\gamma > 0, C(U_1, \beta) > 0 \) and a neighbourhood \( 0 \in U_2 \subset U_1 - \phi_0 \) such that if \( n > N^1_\gamma, \phi \in U_2, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L + \phi), \Gamma_n(t) \) is also a periodic orbit for \( L + \phi \) and \( h(\mu) > 3\gamma C(U_1, \beta) \) then

\[
\mu(\{ \theta \in \mathcal{E}_\phi \mid d(\theta, \Gamma_n) \geq \beta^{m_n} \}) > \gamma.
\]

**Proof Claim 1.13.1:**

The hyperbolicity of \( \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L) \) and the upper semicontinuity of the Mañé set implies that there is \( h > 0 \) and an open subset \( 0 \in U_{12} \subset U_1 - \phi_0 \) such that \( h \) is a uniform \( h \)-expansivity constant (cf. Definition A.5, Remark B.9) for all \( \varphi^{L + \phi}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L + \phi)} \), with \( \phi \in U_{12} \).

Using Corollary G.2 identify the energy levels \( \mathcal{E}_\phi := E_{L + \phi}^{-1}\{c(L + \phi)\} \) with the unit tangent bundle \( SM \) using the radial projection \( R(v) = \frac{v}{|v|} \). Let \( \mu_0 \) be the minimizing measure for \( L \):

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L) = \{ \mu_0 \}.
\]

Let \( \mathcal{A} = \{ A_1, \ldots, A_r \} \) be a finite Borel partition of the energy level \( \mathcal{E}_\phi \) with

\[
\text{diam} \ A < h
\]
and $\mu_0(\partial A) = 0$ for all $A \in A$. Let

$$0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}(r \log r)^{-1},$$

where $r = \# A$. Using Lemma 1.12, for each $A_i \in A$ let $B_i \subset A_i$ be a compact set such that $\mu_0(A_i \setminus B_i) < \varepsilon$ and $\mu_0(\partial B_i) = 0$. Define the partition $\mathcal{B} := \{B_0, B_1, \ldots, B_r\}$, where $B_0 := E_{\phi} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} B_i$.

By the continuity of the critical value map $\phi \mapsto c(L + \phi)$ and the ergodic characterization (14) we have that any weak* limit of minimizing measures is a minimizing measure. By the uniqueness (26) and the compactness of $E_{\phi}$, if $\lim_k \phi_k = 0$ and $\nu_k \in M_{\text{min}}(L + \phi_k)$ then $\lim_k \nu_k = \mu_0$. Since $\mu_0(\partial A_i) = 0 = \mu_0(\partial B_i)$ and $\partial(A_i \setminus B_i) \subset \partial A_i \cup \partial B_i$ we have that $\lim_k \phi_k = 0$, $\nu_k \in M_{\text{min}}(L + \phi_k) \Rightarrow \forall i \lim_k \nu_k(A_i \setminus B_i) = \mu_0(A_i \setminus B_i)$.

Then there is an open set $0 \in U_{13} \subset U_{12}$ such that

$$\forall \phi \in U_{13} \forall \mu \in M_{\text{min}}(L + \phi) \forall i \leq r \mu(A_i \setminus B_i) < \varepsilon.$$ 

Let $\mathcal{O} := \{B_0 \cup B_1, \ldots, B_0 \cup B_r\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{O}$ is an open cover because $B_0 \cup B_i = (\cup_{j \neq i} B_j)^c$.

Then there is an open set $0 \in U_{13} \subset U_{12}$ such that

$$\forall \phi \in U_{13} \forall \mu \in M_{\text{min}}(L + \phi) \forall i \leq r \mu(A_i \setminus B_i) < \varepsilon.$$ 

Let $\delta > 0$ be a Lebesgue number for $\mathcal{O}$.

Let $\beta > 0$ be such that

$$0 < \beta < \min\left\{ \frac{\delta}{2}, \inf_{\phi \in U_1} \text{Lip}(\varphi_1^{L+\phi}|_{E_{\phi}})^{-1} \right\}$$

and such that

$$\sup_{\phi \in U_1} \sup_{|\tau| \leq \beta} \sup_{\theta \in E_{\phi}} d(\varphi_{\tau}^{L+\phi}(\theta), \theta) < \frac{\delta}{2}.$$ 

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha > 0$ let $G(n, \alpha)$ be a cover of $E_{\phi}$ of minimal cardinality by balls of radius $\alpha^n$. Let

$$C(U_1, \alpha) := \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log \# G(n, \alpha).$$

Then (cf. Falconer [24, Prop. 3.2])

$$1 \leq \lim_{\alpha \to 0} C(U_1, \alpha) = \dim E_{\phi} < \infty.$$ 

Shrink $\beta$ if necessary so that $\beta$ satisfies (31), (32) and

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq C(U_1, \beta) < \infty.$$ 

Let $Q \in \mathbb{N}^+$ be such that

$$\frac{3 + 2 \log 2}{Q} < \frac{1}{4} \gamma C(U_1, \beta).$$
Let
\begin{equation}
N^1_\gamma > 3Q > 0
\end{equation}
be such that
\begin{equation}
\forall n > N^1_\gamma \quad \frac{1}{n} \log \# G(n, \beta) \leq 2C(U, \beta)
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
\forall n > N^1_\gamma \quad \frac{1}{m_n} \log T_n - \frac{1}{m_n} \log \beta < \frac{1}{4} \gamma C(U, \beta).
\end{equation}
Suppose that \( \phi \in U_{13}, \mu \in M_{\min}(L + \phi), \gamma > 0 \) and \( n > N^1_\gamma \) satisfy
\begin{equation}
\mu(\{ \theta \in E_\phi | d(\theta, \Gamma_n) \geq \beta^{m_n} \}) \leq \gamma,
\end{equation}
and that \( \Gamma_n \) is also a periodic orbit for \( \phi^{L+\phi} \), we shall prove that then
\begin{equation}
h_\mu(\varphi^{L+\phi}) \leq 3\gamma C(U, \beta).
\end{equation}
This implies Claim 1.13.1.

Observe that
\[
A_i \cap B_j = \begin{cases} 
\emptyset & \text{if } i \neq j \neq 0, \\
B_j & \text{if } i = j \neq 0, \\
A_i \setminus B_i & \text{if } j = 0.
\end{cases}
\]
Let \( \rho(x) := -x \log x, x \in [0,1], \) with \( \rho(0) := 0. \) Then
\[
\rho\left( \frac{\mu(A_i \cap B_j)}{\mu(B_j)} \right) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } j \neq 0, \\
\rho\left( \frac{\mu(A_i \setminus B_i)}{\mu(B_0)} \right) & \text{if } j = 0.
\end{cases}
\]
Observe that \( B_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^r (A_i \setminus B_i), \) then from (29),
\begin{equation}
\mu(B_0) < r \varepsilon.
\end{equation}
We have that the relative entropy satisfies
\[
H_\mu(A|B) := - \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \mu(A_i \cap B_j) \log \frac{\mu(A_i \cap B_j)}{\mu(B_j)}
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \mu(B_j) \rho\left( \frac{\mu(A_i \cap B_j)}{\mu(B_j)} \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^r \mu(B_0) \rho\left( \frac{\mu(A_i \cap B_0)}{\mu(B_0)} \right)
\]
\[
\leq \mu(B_0) \log r \quad \text{by Lemma 1.10 with } A=1,
\]
\[
\leq \varepsilon r \log r < 1 \quad \text{using (40) and (28)}.
\]
Therefore

\[ h_\mu(f^Q, A) \leq h_\mu(f^Q, B) + H_\mu(A|B) \leq h_\mu(f^Q, B) + 1. \]

Define

\[ B(\Gamma_n, \beta^{mn}) := \{ \theta \in \mathbb{E}_\phi \mid d(\theta, \Gamma_n) < \beta^{mn} \}. \]

Let \( f \) be the time 1 map \( f := \varphi_1^{L+\phi} \). Fix \( \theta_0 \in \Gamma_n \) and let

\[ R_n := \{ \varphi_{i\beta}(\theta_0) \mid i = 0, 1, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{T_n}{\beta} \rfloor \}. \]

We claim that \( R_n \) is an \((m_n, \delta, f)\)-generating set for \( B(\Gamma_n, \beta^{mn}) \), i.e.

\[ B(\Gamma_n, \beta^{mn}) \subset \bigcup_{p \in R_n} V(p, m_n, \delta, f), \]

where

\[ V(p, m_n, \delta, f) := \{ \theta \in \mathbb{E}_\phi \mid d(f^i(\theta), f^i(p)) < \delta, \ \forall i = 0, \ldots, m_n - 1 \}. \]

Indeed if \( q \in B(\Gamma_n, \beta^{mn}) \) there is \( \theta \in \Gamma_n \) such that \( d(q, \theta) < \beta^{mn} \). Recall that by hypothesis \( \Gamma_n(t) \) is a periodic orbit of \( \varphi^{L+\phi} \). There is \( p \in R_n \) such that \( p = \varphi_{\tau}^{L+\phi}(\theta) \) with \( |\tau| \leq \beta \). In particular

\[ f^j(p) = \varphi_1^{L+\phi}(\varphi_{\tau}^{L+\phi}(\theta)) = \varphi_{\tau}^{L+\phi}(f^j(\theta)). \]

If \( 0 \leq j \leq m_n - 1 \), by (31) and (32) we have that

\[
\begin{align*}
    d(f^j(q), f^j(\theta)) &\leq \text{Lip}(f)^j d(q, \theta) \leq \text{Lip}(f)^j \beta^{mn} \leq \beta < \delta/2, \\
    d(f^j(\theta), f^j(p)) &\leq d(f^j(\theta), \varphi_{\tau}^{L+\phi}(f^j(\theta))) \leq d_{C^0}(\varphi_{\tau}^{L+\phi}, \text{id}) < \delta/2, \\
    d(f^j(q), f^j(p)) &\leq d(f^j(q), f^j(\theta)) + d(f^j(\theta), f^j(p)) < \delta/2 + \delta/2 = \delta.
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore \( q \in V(p, m_n, \delta, f) \) and \( p \in R_n \).

Recall that \( Q \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) is from (34). Write

\[
\begin{align*}
    \mathbb{B}^{(k)}_{f^Q} &:= \bigvee_{i=0}^{k-1} f^{-iQ}(B), \\
    \bigcap_{f^Q}^{(k)} &:= \{ \bigcap_{i=0}^{k-1} f^{-iQ}(U_i) \mid U_i \in \bigcap \ \forall i = 0, \ldots, k-1 \}.
\end{align*}
\]

Let

\[ W(n, k, Q) := \{ \mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{B}^{(k)}_{f^Q} \mid \mathcal{B} \cap B(\Gamma_n, \beta^{mn}) \neq \emptyset \}. \]

Let \( k_n = k(n, Q) \in \mathbb{N} \) be such that

\[ (k_n - 1)Q < m_n \leq k_n Q. \]
Since in (23) \( m_n > n \), by (35) we have that \( k_n \geq 2 \) whenever \( n > N_\gamma^1 \). We want to estimate \( \#W(n,k_n,Q) \). Given \( B \in W(n,k_n,Q) \), choose \( q(B) \in B \cap B(\Gamma_n,\beta^{m_n}) \). By the inclusion (42) there is \( p(B) \in R_n \) such that

\[
q(B) \in V(p(B),m_n,\delta,f) \subset V(p(B),k_n,\delta,f^Q).
\]

In particular \( d(f^{Q_i}(q(B)), f^{Q_i}(p(B))) < \delta \) for \( 0 \leq i < k_n \). The choice of \( \delta \) in (30) implies that there is \( j_i = j_i(p) \in \{1, \ldots, r\} \), depending only on \( (i,p) \), such that

\[
f^{Q_i}(q(B)) \in B(f^{Q_i}(p(B)),\delta) \subset B_0 \cup B_{j_i}, \quad i = 0, \ldots, k_n - 1.
\]

Therefore

\[
q(B) \in \bigcap_{i=0}^{k_n-1} f^{-Q_i}B(f^{Q_i}(p(B)),\delta) \subset \bigcap_{i=0}^{k_n-1} f^{-Q_i}(B_0 \cup B_{j_i}) = \bigcap_{i=0}^{k_n-1} \left( f^{-Q_i}(B_0) \cup f^{-Q_i}(B_{j_i}) \right).
\]

Since \( B \) is a partition, \( B \in \mathcal{B}_f^{(k_n)} \) and \( q(B) \in B \) we have that

\[
(45) \quad B = \bigcap_{i=0}^{k_n-1} f^{-Q_i}(B_{\ell_i}), \quad \text{where} \quad \ell_i \in \{0, j_i(p)\}.
\]

Observe that \( j_i(p) \) depends only on \( i \) and \( p \). Thus for \( p \in R_n \) we have that

\[
\#\{ B \in W(n,k_n,Q) \subset \mathcal{B}_f^{(k_n)} \mid p(B) = p \} \leq 2^{k_n}.
\]

Therefore

\[
(46) \quad \#W(n,k_n,Q) \leq 2^{k_n} \cdot \#R_n \leq 2^{k_n} \frac{T_n}{\beta}.
\]

By (31) we have that \( B(\theta,\beta^m) \subset V(\theta,n,\delta,f) \). Therefore

\[
(47) \quad \forall \theta \in \mathcal{E}_\phi \quad B(\theta,\beta^{m_n}) \subset V(\theta,m_n,\delta,f) \subset V(\theta,k_n,\delta,f^Q).
\]

Identify the covering \( G(m_n,\beta) \) from (33) by balls of radius \( \beta^{m_n} \) with the set of their centers. Then by (47), the set \( G(m_n,\beta) \) is a \((k_n,\delta,f^Q)\)-generating set, i.e.

\[
\mathcal{E}_\phi \subset \bigcup_{\theta \in G(m_n,\beta)} V(\theta,k_n,\delta,f^Q).
\]

We show that the same argument as in (46) gives for \( n > N_\gamma^1 \) that

\[
(48) \quad \#\mathcal{B}_f^{(k_n)} \leq 2^{k_n} \#G(m_n,\beta).
\]
Namely, we construct a map \( p : \# \mathcal{B}^{(k_n)} \rightarrow G(m_n, \beta) \) which is at most \( 2^{k_n} \) to 1 as follows. Given \( \mathcal{B} \in \# \mathcal{B}^{(k_n)} \) choose \( q(\mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{B} \). Now choose \( p(\mathcal{B}) \in G(m_n, \beta) \) such that

\[
q(\mathcal{B}) \in V(p(\mathcal{B}), k_n, \delta, f^Q).
\]

From (30) for all \( i = 0, \ldots, k_n - 1 \) there is \( j_i(p) \) such that \( B(f^{iQ}(p(\mathcal{B})), \delta) \subset B_0 \cup B_{j_i(p)} \) and therefore

\[
q(\mathcal{B}) \in \bigcap_{i=0}^{k_n-1} f^{-iQ} \left( B(f^{iQ}(p(\mathcal{B})), \delta) \right) \subset \bigcap_{i=0}^{k_n-1} f^{-iQ} (B_0 \cup B_{j_i(p)}).
\]

This implies that

\[
\mathcal{B} = \bigcap_{i=0}^{k_n-1} f^{-iQ} (B_{\ell_i}) \quad \text{with} \quad \ell_i \in \{0, j_i(p(\mathcal{B}))\},
\]

which in turn implies (48).

By the hypothesis (38) and (43) we have that

\[
\tilde{\gamma}_n := \sum_{\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}^{(k_n)} \setminus W(n, k_n, Q)} \mu(\mathcal{B}) \leq \gamma.
\]

Using Lemma 1.10 and inequalities (46) and (48) we have that

\[
h_\mu(f^Q, \mathcal{B}) \leq \frac{1}{k_n} H_\mu(\mathcal{B}^{k_n}) \quad \text{by (164) (cf. Walters [47, Theorem 4.10])},
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{\mathcal{B} \in W(n, k_n, Q)} -\mu(\mathcal{B}) \log \mu(\mathcal{B}) + \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{B}^{(k_n)} \setminus W(n, k_n, Q)} -\mu(\mathcal{B}) \log \mu(\mathcal{B})
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{k_n} \left(1 + (1 - \tilde{\gamma}_n) \log \# W(n, k_n, Q)\right) + \frac{1}{k_n} \left(1 + \gamma \log \# \mathcal{B}^{(k_n)}\right)
\]

\[
\leq (1 + \gamma) \log 2 + \frac{1}{k_n} (2 + \log T_n - \log \beta) + \frac{1}{k_n} \gamma \log \# G(m_n, \beta).
\]

Thus, using (41), and then (36) and that \( m_n > n \) we have that for \( n > N^1_\gamma \),

\[
h_\mu(f^Q, \mathcal{B}) \leq 1 + h_\mu(f^Q, \mathcal{B})
\]

\[
\leq 1 + 2 \log 2 + \frac{1}{k_n} (2 + \log T_n - \log \beta) + \frac{m_n}{k_n} 2 \gamma C(U_1, \beta).
\]

The hyperbolicity of \( \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L + \phi) \) implies that \( f^Q \) has also h-expansivity constant \( h \) on \( \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L + \phi) \) because for \( \theta \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(L + \phi) \) there is \( \tau = \tau(\theta) > 0 \) such that

\[
\Gamma_h(\theta, f) = \Gamma_h(\theta, f^Q) = \varphi_{[-\tau, \tau]}(\theta),
\]

where

\[
\Gamma_h(\theta, f^Q) := \{ \varphi \in E_\phi \mid \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad d(f^{nQ}(\varphi), f^{nQ}(\theta)) < h\}.
\]
In particular \( h_{\text{top}}(\Gamma_h(\theta, f^Q)) = h_{\text{top}}(\Gamma_h(\theta, f)) = 0 \). By Corollary 1.6, \( \text{supp}(\mu) \subset \mathcal{N}(L + \phi) \).

Therefore \( h \) is an \( h \)-expansivity constant on \( \text{supp}(\mu) \). Since by (27) \( \text{diam} A < h \), by Theorem A.3 (cf. Bowen [5, Theorem 3.5]) we have that
\[
h_{\mu}(f^Q) = h_{\mu}(f^Q, A).
\]

By (44), \( k_n \geq \frac{m_n}{Q} \),
\[
h_{\mu}(f) = \frac{1}{Q} h_{\mu}(f^Q) = \frac{1}{Q} h_{\mu}(f^Q, A)
\leq \frac{1}{Q} (3 + 2 \log 2) + \frac{1}{m_n} \log T_n - \frac{1}{m_n} \log \beta + 2 \gamma C(U_1, \beta).
\]

Using (34) and (37) we obtain
\[
h_{\mu}(f) \leq 3 \gamma C(U_1, \beta).
\]

This proves inequality (39), and also Claim 1.13.1.

\[\triangle\]

**Claim 1.13.2:**

There are \( C > 0 \), \( N_2 > 0 \) such that if \( n > N_2 \), \( \phi \in U_2 \) are such that
\[
\phi \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \phi|_{\pi \Gamma_n} \equiv 0,
\]
and \( \nu \in M_{\text{min}}(L + \phi) \), \( \theta \in \Gamma_n \), \( \vartheta \in \text{supp}(\nu) \), \( d(\theta, \vartheta) \geq \beta^{m_n} \), then
\[
d(\pi(\theta), \pi(\vartheta)) \geq \frac{1}{C} \beta^{m_n}.
\]

Denote the action of a \( C^1 \) curve \( \alpha : [S, T] \to \mathbb{R} \) by
\[
A_L(\alpha) := \int_S^T L(\alpha(t), \dot{\alpha}(t)) \, dt.
\]

The following Crossing Lemma is extracted for Mather [36] with the observation that the estimates can be taken uniformly on \( U_2 \).

**Lemma** (Mather [36, p. 186]).

If \( K > 0 \), then there exist \( \varepsilon, \delta, \eta > 0 \) and
\[
C > 1,
\]

such that if \( \phi \in U_2 \), and \( \alpha, \gamma : [t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon] \to M \) are solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equation with \( \|d\alpha(t_0)\|, \|d\gamma(t_0)\| \leq K \), \( d(\alpha(t_0), \gamma(t_0)) \leq \delta \), and
\[
d(d\alpha(t_0), d\gamma(t_0)) \geq C d(\alpha(t_0), \gamma(t_0)),
\]
then there exist $C^1$ curves $a, c : [t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon] \to M$ such that $a(t_0 - \varepsilon) = \alpha(t_0 - \varepsilon)$, $a(t_0 + \varepsilon) = \gamma(t_0 + \varepsilon)$, $c(t_0 - \varepsilon) = \gamma(t_0 - \varepsilon)$, $c(t_0 + \varepsilon) = \alpha(t_0 + \varepsilon)$, and

$$A_{L+\phi}(\alpha) + A_{L+\phi}(\gamma) - A_{L+\phi}(a) - A_{L+\phi}(c) \geq \eta \cdot d(a(t_0), d(\gamma(t_0))^2).$$

\textbf{Proof of Claim 1.13.2:} Let $K > 0$ be such that

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{U}_2 \quad E_{L+\phi}^{-1}\{c(L + \phi)\} \subset \{\xi \in TM \mid ||\xi|| < K\}.$$

Let $\varepsilon, \delta, \eta, C > 0$ be from Lemma 1.14. Choose $M_\gamma > N^1_\gamma$ such that if $n > M_\gamma$ then

$$\frac{1}{n} \beta^m < \delta.$$

Suppose by contradiction that there are $\phi \in \mathcal{U}_2, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{min}}(L + \phi), \theta \in \Gamma_n, \vartheta \in \text{supp}(\nu)$ such that $\phi \geq 0$, $\phi|_{\Gamma_n} \equiv 0$,

$$d(\theta, \vartheta) \geq \beta^m_n \quad \text{and} \quad d(\pi(\theta), \pi(\vartheta)) < \frac{1}{n} \beta^m_n.$$

Since $\phi$ is $C^2$, $\phi \geq 0$ and $\phi|_{\Gamma_n} \equiv 0$ we have that $d\phi|_{\pi\Gamma_n} \equiv 0$ and then $\Gamma_n(t)$ is also a periodic orbit for $L + \phi$, with the same parametrization. Write $\alpha(t) = \pi \varphi^{L+\phi}_t(\vartheta)$, $\gamma(t) = \pi \varphi^{L+\phi}_t(\theta)$, $t \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$. By (52) we can apply Lemma 1.14 and obtain $a, c : [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \to M$ satisfying (51). Since $\vartheta \in \text{supp}(\nu) \subset A(L + \phi)$ the segment $\alpha$ is semi-static for $L + \phi$:

$$A_{L+\phi+c(L+\phi)}(\alpha) = \Phi^{L+\phi}_{c(L+\phi)}(\alpha(-\varepsilon), \alpha(\varepsilon))$$

$$= \inf \{ A_{L+\phi+c(L+\phi)}(x) \mid x \in C^1([0, T], M), T > 0, x(0) = \alpha(-\varepsilon), x(T) = \alpha(\varepsilon) \}.$$

Consider the curve $x = a \ast \pi \varphi^{L+\phi}_{[\varepsilon, T_n]_{-\varepsilon}}(\theta) \ast c$ joining $\alpha(-\varepsilon)$ to $\alpha(\varepsilon)$. Writing

$$L_\phi := L + \phi,$$

we have that

$$A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(x) = A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(a) + A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(\Gamma_n) - A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(\gamma) + A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(c)$$

$$\leq A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(\alpha) - \eta \cdot d(\theta, \vartheta)^2 + A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(\Gamma_n)$$

$$\leq A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(\alpha) - \eta \beta^{2m_n} + A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(\Gamma_n).$$

Now we estimate $A_{L_\phi+c(L_\phi)}(\Gamma_n)$. Observe that since $L_\phi = L + \phi \geq L$ we have that

$$c(L + \phi) \leq c(L).$$
Since $\phi|_{\Gamma_n} \equiv 0$, we have that $\phi|_{\Gamma_n} + c(L + \phi)|_{\Gamma_n} \leq c(L)$. Observe that $\mu_n$ is an invariant measure for the flows of both $L$ and $L + \phi$ with $\supp \mu_n = \Gamma_n$, thus

$$A_{L+\phi+c(L+\phi)}(\Gamma_n) = T_n \int \left[ L + \phi + c(L + \phi) \right] \, d\mu_n$$

$$\leq T_n \int \left[ L + c(L) \right] \, d\mu_n = A_{L+c(L)}(\Gamma_n).$$

By the choice of $m_n$, $T_n$, $\mu_n$ from Corollary 1.9 for $L$ and using Lemma 1.11 applied to $L$, we have that for any $\rho > 0$, setting $e := c(L) + 1$,

$$A_{L+c(L)}(\Gamma_n) = T_n \int \left[ L + c(L) \right] \, d\mu_n \leq B(L, e) \cdot T_n \int d(\xi, A(L)) \, d\mu_n(\xi)$$

$$\leq T_n \cdot o(\beta^{kn}) = o(\beta^{(k-\rho)m_n}).$$

In Corollary 1.9 the estimate holds with the same sequence $\mu_n$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Thus, choosing $k, \rho$ such that $k - \rho \geq 2$, if $n$ is large enough, from (54), (55) and (56), we get

$$A_{L+\phi+c(L+\phi)}(x) \leq A_{L+\phi+c(L+\phi)}(\alpha) - \eta \beta^{2m_n} + o(\beta^{2m_n})$$

$$< A_{L+\phi+c(L+\phi)}(\alpha).$$

This contradicts (53) and proves Claim 1.13.2.

\[ \triangle \]

We use $L$ from (25) and $m_n$, $T_n$, $\mu_n$, $\Gamma_n$, $\beta$ and $\mathcal{U}_2$ from Claim 1.13.1 and $C$, $N^2_\gamma$ from Claim 1.13.2. By Whitney Extension Theorem [45, p. 176 ch. VI §2.3] there is $A > 0$ and $C^k$ functions $f_n \in C^k(M, [0, 1])$ such that

$$0 \leq f_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in a small neighbourhood of } \pi(\Gamma_n), \\ \beta^{(k+1)m_n} & \text{if } d(x, \pi(\Gamma_n)) \geq \frac{1}{C} \beta^{m_n}, \end{cases}$$

and $\|f_n\|_{C^k} \leq A$. Take $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\forall n > N^2_\gamma$, $\phi_n := \varepsilon f_n \in \mathcal{U}_2$.

Write $L_n := L + \phi_n$. Observe that $\Gamma_n$ is also a periodic orbit for $L_n$. In particular Claim 1.13.1 and Claim 1.13.2 hold for measures in $\mathcal{M}_{\min}(L_n)$. Suppose by contradiction that there is a sequence $n = n_i \to +\infty$ such that $\phi_n \notin \mathcal{E}_\tau$ with $\tau = 4\gamma C(\mathcal{U}_1, \beta)$. Then there is a minimizing measure $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}_{\min}(L_n)$ with $h(\nu_n) \geq 4\gamma C(\mathcal{U}_1, \beta) > 3\gamma C(\mathcal{U}_1, \beta)$. By Claim 1.13.1 and Claim 1.13.2 we have that

$$\nu_n\left( \left\{ \vartheta \in TM \mid d(\pi(\vartheta), \pi(\Gamma_n)) \geq \frac{1}{C} \beta^{m_n} \right\} \right) > \gamma.$$
Since \( \nu_n \in \mathcal{M}(L_n) \subset \mathcal{C}(TM) \) is a closed measure, by (14), \( \int [L + c(L)] d\nu_n \geq 0 \). Then
\[
\int (L + \phi_n) d\nu_n \geq -c(L) + \int \phi_n d\nu_n
\geq -c(L) + \varepsilon \gamma \beta^{(k+1)m_n}.
\]

Observe that \( \mu_n \) is also an invariant probability for \( L_n = L + \phi_n \). From Lemma 1.11 and Corollary 1.9 applied to \( L \) and \( e = c(L) + 1 \), we have that
\[
\int (L + \phi_n) d\mu_n = \int L d\mu_n \leq -c(L) + B(L, e) \int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) d\mu_n(\theta)
\leq -c(L) + o(\beta^{(k+1)m_n}).
\]

Inequalities (58) and (57) imply that for \( n = n_i \) large enough \( \nu_{n_i} \) is not minimizing, contradicting the choice of \( \nu_{n_i} \). Therefore \( \phi_n \in \mathcal{E}_{\gamma} \cap \mathcal{U}_1 \) for \( n \) large enough.

\[\square\]

2. Hyperbolic Aubry sets can be closed.

In this section we prove Theorem A. Throughout the section we assume that \( L \) is a Tonelli lagrangian with Aubry set \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) hyperbolic.

2.1. The action of a periodic specification.

A dominated function for \( L \) is a function \( u : M \to \mathbb{R} \) such that for any \( \gamma : [0, T] \to M \) absolutely continuous and \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \) we have
\[
u_n \in \mathcal{M}(L_n) \subset \mathcal{C}(TM) \] is a closed measure, by (14), \( \int [L + c(L)] d\nu_n \geq 0 \). Then
\[
\int (L + \phi_n) d\nu_n \geq -c(L) + \int \phi_n d\nu_n
\geq -c(L) + \varepsilon \gamma \beta^{(k+1)m_n}.
\]

Observe that \( \mu_n \) is also an invariant probability for \( L_n = L + \phi_n \). From Lemma 1.11 and Corollary 1.9 applied to \( L \) and \( e = c(L) + 1 \), we have that
\[
\int (L + \phi_n) d\mu_n = \int L d\mu_n \leq -c(L) + B(L, e) \int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) d\mu_n(\theta)
\leq -c(L) + o(\beta^{(k+1)m_n}).
\]

Inequalities (58) and (57) imply that for \( n = n_i \) large enough \( \nu_{n_i} \) is not minimizing, contradicting the choice of \( \nu_{n_i} \). Therefore \( \phi_n \in \mathcal{E}_{\gamma} \cap \mathcal{U}_1 \) for \( n \) large enough.

\[\square\]

2. Hyperbolic Aubry sets can be closed.

In this section we prove Theorem A. Throughout the section we assume that \( L \) is a Tonelli lagrangian with Aubry set \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) hyperbolic.

2.1. The action of a periodic specification.

A dominated function for \( L \) is a function \( u : M \to \mathbb{R} \) such that for any \( \gamma : [0, T] \to M \) absolutely continuous and \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \) we have
\[
\int (L + \phi_n) d\mu_n = \int L d\mu_n \leq -c(L) + B(L, e) \int d(\theta, \mathcal{A}(L)) d\mu_n(\theta)
\leq -c(L) + o(\beta^{(k+1)m_n}).
\]

We say that the curve \( \gamma \) calibrates \( u \) if the equality holds in (59) for every \( 0 \leq s < t \leq T \). Dominated functions always exist, for example, by the triangle inequality for Mañé’s potential \( \Phi_c \), the functions \( u_p(x) := \Phi_c(p, x) \) are dominated for every \( p \in M \). The definition of the Hamiltonian \( H \) associated to \( L \) implies that any \( C^1 \) function \( u : M \to \mathbb{R} \) which satisfies
\[
\forall x \in M, \quad H(x, d_x u) \leq c(L)
\]
is dominated.

2.1. Lemma. If \( u \) is a dominated function and \( \gamma \) is a static curve then \( \gamma \) calibrates \( u \).

Proof: Recall that \( \gamma \) is static iff for all \( s < t \) we have
\[
\int_s^t \left[ c(L) + L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \right] = -\phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) = \phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)).
\]
If $u$ is dominated, $\gamma$ is static and $s < t$ we have that
\[
u(t) \leq \nu(s) + \phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = \nu(s) - \phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)).
\]
Using again the domination of $u$ and then the previous inequality we get
\[
u(s) \leq \nu(t) + \phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) \leq \nu(s).
\]
Therefore, using (60),
\[
u(t) = \nu(s) - \phi_{c(L)}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) = \nu(s) + \int_s^t [c(L) + L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma})].
\]
\[\square\]

2.2. Lemma.

There are $K > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $(z, \dot{z}) \in \mathcal{A}(L)$ is a static vector, $u$ is a dominated function and $d(z, y) < \delta_0$, then
\[
u(y) - \nu(z) - \partial_c L(z, \dot{z})(y - z) \leq K|y - z|^2,
\]
where $y - z := (\exp_z)^{-1}(y)$.

Proof: Let $E \subset TM$ be a compact subset such that $E^{-1}_E{c(L)} \subset \text{int}E$. Cover $M$ by a finite set $\mathcal{O}$ of charts. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that if $\gamma : [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \to M$ has velocity $(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \in E$ then $\gamma([-\varepsilon, \varepsilon])$ lies inside the domain of a chart in $\mathcal{O}$. There are $\delta_1 > 0$ smaller than the Lebesgue number of the covering $\mathcal{O}$ and $A > 0$ such that if $(x, v) \in E$ and $\max\{|h|, |k|\} \leq \delta_1$ then in the charts
\[L(x + h, v + k) - L(x, v) - DL(x, v)(h, k) \leq A|\nu| + |k|^2).
\]
Let $u : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be dominated and $(z, \dot{z}) \in \mathcal{A}(L)$. Recall that $\mathcal{A}(L) \subset E^{-1}_E{c(L)} \subset E$. Write $\gamma(t) := \pi_{\mathcal{L}}(z, \dot{z})$. By Lemma 1.4 the complete curve $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is static. By Lemma 2.1, $\gamma$ calibrates $u$. Let $\delta_0 := \varepsilon \delta_1$. Let $y \in M$ with $|y - z| < \delta_0$ in a local chart. Define $\beta : [-\varepsilon, 0] \to M$ by
\[
\beta(t) := \gamma(t) + \left(\frac{t + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\right)(y - z).
\]
Then $\beta(-\varepsilon) = \gamma(-\varepsilon), \beta(0) = y, \dot{\beta} = \dot{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(y - z)$. In particular $|\dot{\beta} - \dot{\gamma}| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}|y - z| \leq \delta_1$ and we can apply (62).
\[
\int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} L(\beta, \dot{\beta}) \leq \int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) + \int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} \left\{L_x(\gamma, \dot{\gamma})(\beta - \gamma) + L_v(\gamma, \dot{\gamma})(\dot{\beta} - \dot{\gamma})\right\} + A\varepsilon(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2})|y - z|^2.
\]
Using that \( \gamma \) is a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation \( \frac{d}{dt} L_v = L_x \) and integrating by parts, we get that
\[
\int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} L(\beta, \dot{\beta}) \leq \int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \, dt + L_v(\gamma, \dot{\gamma})(\beta - \gamma)\big|_{-\varepsilon}^{0} + \frac{2A}{\varepsilon} |y - z|^2,
\]
\[
(63)
\leq \int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \, dt + L_v(z, \dot{z})(y - z) + \frac{2A}{\varepsilon} |y - z|^2.
\]
Since \( u \) is dominated and calibrated by \( \gamma|_{[-\varepsilon, 0]} \) we obtain one of the inequalities in (61):
\[
u(y) \leq u(\gamma(-\varepsilon)) + \int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} c(L) + L(\beta, \dot{\beta})
\leq u(\gamma(-\varepsilon)) + \int_{-\varepsilon}^{0} \{ L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) + c(L) \} \, dt + L_v(z, \dot{z})(y - z) + \frac{2A}{\varepsilon} |y - z|^2
\leq u(z) + L_v(z, \dot{z})(y - z) + \frac{2A}{\varepsilon} |y - z|^2.
\]
Now define \( \alpha : [0, \varepsilon] \rightarrow M \) by
\[
\alpha(t) \equiv \gamma(t) + \left( \frac{\varepsilon - t}{\varepsilon} \right) (y - z).
\]
A similar argument to (63) gives
\[
\int_{0}^{\varepsilon} L(\alpha, \dot{\alpha}) \, dt \leq \int_{0}^{\varepsilon} L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \, dt - L_v(z, \dot{z})(y - z) + \frac{2A}{\varepsilon} |y - z|^2.
\]
Since \( u \) is dominated we have that
\[
u(\gamma(\varepsilon)) \leq u(y) + \int_{0}^{\varepsilon} \{ L(\alpha, \dot{\alpha}) + c(L) \}
\leq u(y) + \int_{0}^{\varepsilon} \{ L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) + c(L) \} \, dt - L_v(z, \dot{z})(y - z) + \frac{2A}{\varepsilon} |y - z|^2.
\]
Since \( u \) is calibrated by \( \gamma|_{[0, \varepsilon]} \) we have that
\[
u(\gamma(z)) - \int_{0}^{\varepsilon} \{ L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) + c(L) \} = u(z).
\]
Thus we get the remaining inequality
\[
u(z) \leq u(y) - L_v(z, \dot{z})(y - z) + \frac{2A}{\varepsilon} |y - z|^2.
\]
\[\Box\]

Recall that the Aubry set \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) is inside the energy level \( c(L) \), \( \mathcal{A}(L) \subset E_{L}^{-1}\{c(L)\} \). Recall also that we are assuming that \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) is a hyperbolic set for the lagrangian flow restricted to \( E_{L}^{-1}\{c(L)\} \). In Corollary B.15 in Appendix B we state the version of the Shadowing Lemma used in the following proposition. From Definition B.11, a \( \delta \)-possible \( \ell \)-specification is a collection of orbit segments \( \{ \varphi_{[i_{n},i_{n+1}]}(\theta_{i_{n}}) \}_{i_{n} \in \mathbb{Z}} \) such that for all \( i_{n} \in \mathbb{Z} \),
Corollary B.15 states that there are $\delta > 0$ such that $\varepsilon$-shadowing by $\xi \in E^{-1}_L(c(L))$ if there is an increasing homeomorphism $s : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $s(t_0) = t_0$ and

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}] \quad |s(t) - t| \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad d(\varphi_{s(t)}(\xi), \varphi_t(\theta_i)) < \varepsilon.$$

Corollary B.15 states that there are $\delta_0(\ell) > 0$ and $Q(\ell) > 0$ such that every $\delta$-possible $\ell$-specification in $\mathcal{A}(L)$ with $0 < \delta < \delta(\ell)$ is $\varepsilon$-shadowed by a point in the energy level $E^{-1}_L(c(L))$ with $\varepsilon = Q(\ell) \delta$.

We say that a specification $\{\varphi_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(\theta_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is periodic with $J \in \mathbb{N}^+$ jumps if

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (t_{i+j}, \theta_{i+j}) = (t_i, \theta_i).$$

2.3. Lemma.

Let $Q = Q(1) > 0$, $\delta_0 = \delta_0(1) > 0$ be from Corollary B.15 applied to the hyperbolic set $\mathcal{A}(L)$ in $E^{-1}_L(c(L))$.

There is $E > 0$ such that if $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, $\{(x_k, \dot{x}_k)|[T_k, T_{k+1}]\}$ is a periodic $\delta$-possible $1$-specification in $\mathcal{A}(L)$ with $J \in \mathbb{N}^+$ jumps and $(y, \dot{y})$ is the periodic orbit with energy $c(L)$ which $\varepsilon$-shadows $\{(x_k, \dot{x}_k)\}$ with $\varepsilon = Q \delta$ then

$$A_{L+c(L)}(y) \leq JE^2.$$

Proof: The set $\mathcal{A}(L)$ is hyperbolic for the Euler-Lagrange flow restricted to the energy level $[E = c(L)]$. By the Shadowing Corollary B.15, there is an Euler-Lagrange solution $(y, \dot{y})$ with energy $c(L)$ and a continuous reparametrization $\sigma(t)$, with $|\sigma(t) - t| \leq \varepsilon$ such that

$$\forall t \quad d\left(\left[x(t), \dot{x}(t)\right], \left[y(\sigma(t)), \dot{y}(\sigma(t))\right]\right) < \varepsilon.$$

Then $Y(s) := (y(s), \dot{y}(s))$ is a periodic orbit with a period near $\sigma(T_J - T_0)$. We want a sequence of times $S_k$ near $\sigma(T_k)$ such that $S_J - S_0$ is a period for $Y(s)$. Write $X(t) := (x(t), \dot{x}(t))$. Using canonical coordinates B.3 define $w_k \in \mathbb{R}$ small by

$$\begin{align*}
(Y(\sigma(T_k)), X(T_k)) &= W^s_\gamma(Y(\sigma(T_k))) \cap W^{uu}_\gamma(X(T_k)) \\
&= W^{ss}_\gamma(\varphi_{w_k}(Y(\sigma(T_k)))) \cap W^{uu}(X(T_k)) \neq \emptyset.
\end{align*}$$

Now let $S_k := w_k + \sigma(T_k)$. Observe that the time shift $w_k$ is determined by the sequence $X(T_k)$ which is periodic. Then the sequence $S_k$ is periodic modulo the period $S_J - S_0$ of $Y$.

By Proposition B.7 there are $D > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that if $\varepsilon$ is small enough there is $|v_k| < D \varepsilon$, such that

$$\forall s \in [S_k, S_{k+1}] \quad d\left([x_k(s + v_k), \dot{x}_k(s + v_k)], [y(s), \dot{y}(s)]\right) \leq D \varepsilon \lambda^{\min\{s-S_k, S_{k+1}-s\}}.$$
Let \( z_k(s) := x_k(s + v_k) \). Since \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) is invariant we also have that \( (z_k, \dot{z}_k) \in \mathcal{A}(L) \).

By adding a constant we can assume that \( \kappa(L) = 0 \). On local charts we have that

\[
L(y, \dot{y}) \leq L(z_k, \dot{z}_k)(y - z_k) + \partial_y L(z_k, \dot{z}_k)(y - \dot{z}_k) + K_1 \varepsilon^2 \lambda^{2 \min\{s-S_k, S_{k+1}-s\}}.
\]

Using that \( z_k \) is an Euler-Lagrange solution we obtain

\[
\int_{S_k}^{S_{k+1}} L(y, \dot{y}) \leq \int_{S_k}^{S_{k+1}} L(z_k, \dot{z}_k) + \partial_y L(z_k, \dot{z}_k)(y - z_k) + K_2 \varepsilon^2.
\]

Let \( u \) be a dominated function. By Lemma 2.2 if \( (z, \dot{z}) \in \mathcal{A}(L) \) is a static vector, then

\[
\left| u(y) - u(z) - \partial_y L(z, \dot{z})(y - z) \right| \leq K_3 |y - z|^2.
\]

By Lemma 2.1, \( u \) is necessarily calibrated on static curves. Therefore

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{J} A_L(z_k) = \sum_{k} u(z_k(S_{k+1})) - u(z_k(S_k)) = \sum_{k} u(z_k(S_{k+1})) - u(z_{k+1}(S_{k+1}))) = \sum_{k} \left\{ u(z_k) - u(y) + u(y) - u(z_{k+1}) \right\} \bigg|_{S_{k+1}} \\
\leq \sum_{k} \left\{ \partial_y L(z_k, \dot{z}_k)(z_k - y) + \partial_y L(z_{k+1}, \dot{z}_{k+1})(y - z_{k+1}) + 2K_3D^2 \varepsilon^2 \right\} \bigg|_{S_{k+1}}.
\]

Replacing estimate (65) for \( \sum_k A_L(z_k) \) in inequality (64) we obtain

\[
A_L(y) \leq 2JK_3D^2 \varepsilon^2 + JK_2 \varepsilon^2 =: JK_4 \varepsilon^2.
\]

Since \( \varepsilon = Q \delta \), we obtain Lemma 2.3 with \( E = K_4Q^2 \). \( \square \)
2.4. **Lemma.** Given a Tonelli lagrangian $L_0$ a compact subset $\Delta \subset TM$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $K > 0$ and $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for any Tonelli lagrangian $L$ with $\|(L - L_0)|_E\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon$, and any $T > 0$:

(a) If $x \in C^1([0, T], M)$ is a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation for $L$ with $(x, \dot{x}) \in \Delta$ and $z \in C^1([0, T], M)$ satisfies

$$d([z(t), \dot{z}(t)], [x(t), \dot{x}(t)]) \leq 2\rho \leq \delta_1 \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

then

$$\left| \int_0^T L(z, \dot{z}) \, dt - \int_0^T L(x, \dot{x}) \, dt - \partial_v L(x, \dot{x}) \cdot (z - x) \right| \leq K (1 + T) \rho^2,$$

where $z - x := (\exp_x)^{-1}(z)$.

(b) If $x \in C^1([0, T], M)$ is a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation for $L$ with $(x, \dot{x}) \in \Delta$ and the curves $w_1, w_2, z \in C^1([0, T], M)$ satisfy $w_1(0) = x(0), w_1(T) = z(T), w_2(0) = z(0), w_2(T) = x(T)$, and for $\xi = z, w_1, w_2$ we have

$$d([\xi(t), \dot{\xi}(t)], [x(t), \dot{x}(t)]) \leq 2\rho \leq \delta_1 \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

then

$$|A_L(x) + A_L(z) - A_L(w_1) - A_L(w_2)| \leq 3K\rho^2(1 + T).$$

**Proof:**

(a) We use a coordinate system on a tubular neighbourhood of $x([0, T])$ with a bound in the $C^2$ norm independent of $T$ and of $\dot{x}(0)$. In case $x$ has self-intersections or short returns the coordinate system is an immersion.

We have that

$$L(z, \dot{z}) - L(x, \dot{x}) = \partial_z L(x, \dot{x})(z - x) + \partial_v L(x, \dot{x})(\dot{z} - \dot{x}) + O(\rho^2),$$

here $O(\rho^2) \leq K\rho^2$ where $K$ depends on the second derivatives of $L$ on a small neighbourhood of the compact $\Delta$ and hence it can be taken uniform on a $C^2$ neighbourhood of $L$. Since $x$ satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation for $L$,

$$L(z, \dot{z}) - L(x, \dot{x}) = \frac{d}{dt}[\partial_v L(x, \dot{x})(z - x)] + O(\rho^2).$$

This implies (66).
(b) By item (a)

\[
A_L(w_1) - A_L(x) \leq \partial_v L(x, \dot{x})(w_1 - x) \left\| T \right\|_0 + K\rho^2(1 + T) \\
\leq \partial_v L(x(T), \dot{x}(T))(z(T) - x(T)) + K\rho^2(1 + T).
\]

\[
A_L(w_2) - A_L(x) \leq -\partial_L(x(0), \dot{x}(0))(z(0) - x(0)) + K\rho^2(1 + T).
\]

\[
A_L(x) - A_L(z) \leq -\partial_L(x(T), \dot{x}(T))(z(T) - x(T)) \\
+ \partial_L(x(0), \dot{x}(0))(z(0) - x(0)) + K\rho^2(1 + T).
\]

Adding these inequalities we get

\[
A_L(w_1) + A_L(w_2) - A_L(x) - A_L(z) \leq 3K\rho^2(1 + T).
\]

The remaining inequality is obtained similarly.

2.2. Closing solitary returns.

The following proposition has its origin in Yuan and Hunt [49], the present proof uses some arguments by Quas and Siefken [41].

2.5. Proposition.

Let \( J \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Suppose that for any \( \delta > 0 \) there is a periodic \( \delta \)-possible 1-specification \( \{ \varphi_{\bar{T}k,\bar{T}k+1}(\theta_k) \}_{k=1}^\ell \) in \( A(L) \) with at most \( J \) jumps (\( \ell \leq J \)) such that the smallest approach

\[
\gamma_\delta := \min \left\{ d(\varphi_{s_i}(\theta_i), \varphi_{t_j}(\theta_j)) \mid s_i \in [T_i, T_{i+1}], t_j \in [T_j, T_{j+1}]; |s_i - t_j|_{\text{mod}(T_{k+1} - T_1)} \geq 1 \right\}
\]

satisfies

\[
\liminf_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\delta}{\gamma_\delta} = 0.
\]

Then for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is \( \phi \in C^2(M, \mathbb{R}) \) with \( \|\phi\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon \) such that \( A(L + \phi) \) contains a periodic orbit.

2.6. Remark. The function \( \phi \) used in proposition 2.5 does not require a special technique to perturb the flow, we describe it here explicitly. For \( \delta \) and \( \frac{\delta}{\gamma_\delta} \) sufficiently small let \( \Gamma \) be the periodic orbit with energy \( c(L) \) which shadows the pseudo-orbit. The function \( \phi \) is a canal about \( \pi(\Gamma) \) defined in (84). In particular \( \Gamma \) is a common periodic orbit for the flows of \( L \) and \( L + \phi \). Proposition 2.5 proves that \( \Gamma \) is a periodic orbit in the Aubry set \( A(L + \phi) \).
2.7. Lemma. If $\mathcal{A}(L)$ has no periodic orbits and $\{\varphi^\alpha_{[T_k^\alpha,T_{k+1}^\alpha]}(\theta_k^\alpha)\}_{k=1}^\ell$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ is a sequence of $\delta_\alpha$-possible 1-specifications with $\ell \leq J$ jumps with $\lim_\alpha \delta_\alpha = 0$, then $\lim_\alpha \gamma_\delta_\alpha = 0$.

Proof: We first prove that $\lim_\alpha (T_\ell^\alpha - T_1^\alpha) = +\infty$. If not, we can extract a subsequence $\alpha_n$ such that all $\{\theta_{\alpha_n}^{\ell+1}\}_{k=1}^\ell$ converge in $n$. Let $\theta_k := \lim_n \theta_k^{\alpha_n} \in \mathcal{A}(L)$ and $T_k := \lim_n T_k^{\alpha_n}$. Since $\lim_n \delta_{\alpha_n} = 0$, we have that $\forall k \varphi_{T_k^\alpha + 1}(\theta_k) = \varphi_{T_k^\alpha + 1}(\theta_k^\alpha + 1)$ and hence $\theta_1$ is a periodic point in $\mathcal{A}(L)$ with period $T_\ell^\alpha - T_1^\alpha$. This contradicts the hypothesis.

We can assume that $T_1^\alpha = 0$ for all $\alpha$. Consider the points $\xi^\alpha_{4m} := \varphi_{4m}(\theta_i^\alpha)$, where $i$ is such that $T_i \leq 4m < T_{i+1}$ and $1 \leq m < M_\alpha := \lfloor \frac{1}{4}T_\ell^\alpha \rfloor$. Since $T_\ell^\alpha \to \infty$, when $\alpha \to \infty$ the quantity $M_\alpha$ of these points tends to infinity. Therefore

$$\gamma_\delta_\alpha \leq \min_{m_1 \neq m_2} d(\xi^\alpha_{4m_1}, \xi^\alpha_{4m_2}) \to 0$$

□

Idea of the Proof:

We first close the specification using the Shadowing Corollary B.15 and obtain a periodic orbit $\Gamma$. Then perturb the Lagrangian by a potential $\phi$ which is a non-negative channel centred at $\pi(\Gamma)$ defined in (84). The curve $\Gamma$ is a periodic orbit for the flows of $L$ and of $L + \phi$. We show that $\Gamma$ is contained in the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}(L + \phi)$ by proving that any semi-static curve $x : [-\infty, 0] \to M$ for $L + \phi$ has

$\alpha$-limit of $(x, \dot{x}) = \Gamma$;

because by Mañé [35, Theorem V.(c)], $\alpha$-limits of semi-static orbits are static. This is done by calculating the action of each segment of the semi-static which is spent outside of a small neighbourhood of $\pi(\Gamma)$, and proving that it has a uniform positive lower bound. Since the total action of a semi-static is finite, the quantity of those segments is finite. Thus the semi-static eventually stays forever in a small neighbourhood of $\Gamma$. The expansivity of $\mathcal{A}(L + \phi)$ implies that the $\alpha$-limit of the semi-static is $\Gamma$.

Proof of Proposition 2.5:

By adding a constant we can assume that

$$(67) \quad c(L) = 0.$$ 

Let $u$ be a $C^1$ critical subsolution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for $L$, $H(x, d_x u) \leq c(L)$. Thus

$$(68) \quad L - du \geq 0.$$ 

By Gronwall’s inequality and the continuity of Mañé’s critical value $c(L)$ (see [20, Lemma 5.1]) there is $\alpha > 0$ and $\gamma_0$ such that if $\|\phi\|_{C^2} \leq 1$, $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ and $\Gamma$ is a
periodic orbit for $L + \phi$ with energy smaller than $c(L + \phi) + 1$ then
\begin{equation}
(69) \quad d(\varphi^L_{s+\phi}(\vartheta), \Gamma) \leq \frac{\gamma}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad d(\varphi^L_{t+\phi}(\vartheta), \Gamma) \geq \frac{\gamma}{3} \implies |t - s| > \alpha.
\end{equation}

The graph property states that the projection $\pi: A(L) \to M$ has a Lipschitz inverse (see Mañé [35]). The Lipschitz constant is the same as $C$ in Mather’s Crossing Lemma 1.14. The Aubry set has energy $c(L)$ and $c(L + \phi)$ is continuous on $\phi$. Then one can choose $\varepsilon_1$ and $K, C > 1$ in Lemma 1.14 such that if $\|\phi\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon_1$ then $A(L + \phi)$ is a graph with Lipschitz constant $C$.

By the upper semicontinuity of the Mañé set we can choose a neighbourhood $U$ of $\tilde{N}(L)$ and $0 < \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1$ such that if $\|\phi\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon_2$ then the set
\begin{equation}
\Lambda(\phi) := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \varphi^L_{t+\phi}(U)
\end{equation}
is hyperbolic and contains $\tilde{N}(L + \phi)$. We can assume that in the statement of Proposition 2.5, $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_3$ from (72). Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be a flow expansivity constant for $\tilde{N}(L + \phi)$ as in Definition B.8 and Remark B.9.

Fix $K_1 > 0$ such that
\begin{equation}
(70) \quad [E_L \leq c(L) + 1] \subset [|v| \leq K_1].
\end{equation}

We can assume that $A(L)$ has no periodic points. By Lemma 2.7, $\gamma_\delta$ is small when $\delta$ is small. Choose $\delta$ and a $\delta$-possible 1-specification with $\gamma_\delta$ and $\frac{\delta}{\gamma_\delta}$ so small that
\begin{equation}
(71) \quad \delta < \delta_0(1) \quad \text{from Corollary B.15},
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(72) \quad \gamma_\delta < \epsilon_0 \quad \text{a flow expansivity constant for } \tilde{N}(L + \phi),
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(73) \quad 2\gamma_\delta < \delta_1 \quad \text{where } \delta_0 \text{ and } \delta_1 \text{ are from Propositions B.7 and B.4 for } \tilde{N}(L + \phi), \text{ for all } \|\phi\|_{C^2} < \varepsilon_3 < \varepsilon_2.
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(74) \quad \gamma_\delta < \eta \quad \text{where } \eta \text{ is from the canonical coordinates B.3 for } \tilde{N}(L) \text{ as in (95)},
\end{equation}
and such that writing
\begin{equation}
(75) \quad \overline{\gamma}_\delta := \frac{\gamma_\delta}{C(B + 1)} < \frac{1}{2} \gamma_\delta
\end{equation}
we have that
\begin{equation}
(76) \quad \overline{\gamma}_\delta < \gamma_0 \quad \text{where } \gamma_0 \text{ is from (69)},
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(77) \quad \overline{\gamma}_\delta - 2Q \delta > \frac{3}{4} \overline{\gamma}_\delta \quad Q := Q(1) \text{ from Corollary B.15 with}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(78) \quad Q > 1,
\end{equation}

(89) \[ d(\varphi^L_{s+\phi}(\vartheta), \Gamma) \leq \frac{\gamma}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad d(\varphi^L_{t+\phi}(\vartheta), \Gamma) \geq \frac{\gamma}{3} \implies |t - s| > \alpha. \]
and there is

\[(79) \quad \delta < \rho < \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{\delta}\]

such that

\[(80) \quad \frac{1}{4}\epsilon \rho^2 > J E \delta^2,\]

\[(81) \quad C \rho > \delta \sqrt{\frac{JE}{\eta}},\]

\[(82) \quad \left(\frac{1}{32} \epsilon (\tau_{\delta})^2 - J E \delta^2\right) \alpha - 96 K D^2 C^2 (B + 1)^2 \rho^2 - 3 J E \delta^2 > 0.\]

where \(\alpha\) is from (69), \(E\) is from Lemma 2.3, \(B\) is from Lemma B.5, \(C\) and \(\eta\) are from Lemma 1.14 and (50), with

\[(83) \quad C > 1,\]

\(D\) is from Proposition B.7 and \(K\) is from Lemma 2.4 applied to the compact \(\Delta = [E_L \leq c(L) + 5].\)

Let \(Q = Q(1) > 1\) be from the Shadowing Corollary B.15 applied to the hyperbolic set \(A(L)\) in \(E^{-1}\{c(L)\}\). Let \(\Gamma\) be the periodic orbit with energy \(c(L)\) which \(Q\delta\)-shadows the 1-specification \(\{\varphi_{[T_k,T_{k+1}]}(\theta_k)\}\) and let \(\mu_{\Gamma}\) be the \(L\)-invariant probability measure supported on \(\Gamma\). Let \(T\) be the period of \(\Gamma\).

Let \(\phi : M \to [0, 1]\) be a \(C^\infty\) function such that \(\|\phi\|_{C^2} < 10 \epsilon\) and

\[(84) \quad 0 \leq \phi(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } x \in \pi(\Gamma), \\
\geq \frac{1}{4} \epsilon \rho^2 & \text{if } d(x, \pi \Gamma) \geq \rho, \\
\frac{1}{32} \epsilon (\tau_{\delta})^2 & \text{if } d(x, \pi \Gamma) \geq \frac{1}{4} \gamma_{\delta}.
\end{cases}\]

Write

\[\mathbb{L} := L + \phi + c(L + \phi) - du.\]

**Claim 2.7.1:** If \(\frac{\delta}{\gamma_{\delta}}\) is small enough then

1. We have that

\[\inf_{d(s,t) \mod T \geq 2} d\left(\pi \Gamma(t), \pi \Gamma(s)\right) > \frac{3}{4} \gamma_{\delta}.\]

In particular the neighbourhood \(B(\pi \Gamma, \frac{3}{8} \gamma_{\delta})\) of \(\pi \Gamma\) of radius \(\frac{3}{8} \gamma_{\delta}\) has no self intersections, i.e. it is homeomorphic to \(S^1 \times [0, 1]^{\dim M - 1}\).

2. If \(x : [-\infty, 0] \to M\) is a semi-static orbit for \(\mathbb{L}\) then for all \(t \leq -1\)

\[(85) \quad \text{either } d([x(t), \dot{x}(t)], \Gamma) \leq \delta \sqrt{\frac{JE}{\eta}} \quad \text{or} \quad d([x(t), \dot{x}(t)], \Gamma) \leq C d(x(t), \pi \Gamma),\]

\[(86) \quad \text{or } d(x(t), \pi \Gamma) \geq \delta_1,\]

where \(E\) is from Lemma 2.3; \(\eta_1 = \eta_1(K_1), C = C(K_1)\) and \(\delta_1 = \delta_1(K_1)\) is from Lemma 1.14 for \(K = K_1\) from (70).
Proof:

(1). If $d(s,t) \mod T \geq 2$, by Corollary B.15 for $L$, there are points $\theta_i, \theta_j$ and $s_i, t_j \in \mathbb{R}$ in the specification, with $\max\{|s-s_i|, |t-t_j|\} \leq Q\delta$ such that

$$d(\pi\Gamma(s), \pi\varphi_s(\theta_i)) \leq d(\Gamma(s), \varphi_{s_i}(\theta_i)) \leq Q\delta,$$
$$d(\pi\Gamma(t), \pi\varphi_t(\theta_j)) \leq d(\Gamma(t), \varphi_{t_j}(\theta_j)) \leq Q\delta.$$

If $\delta$ is small we have that $|s_i-t_i| \geq 1$ and then $d(\varphi_{s_i}(\theta_i), \varphi_{t_j}(\theta_j)) \geq \gamma\delta$. Since $\theta_i, \theta_j \in \mathcal{A}(L)$, by the graph property for $\mathcal{A}(L)$ we have that

$$d(\pi\varphi_s(\theta_i), \pi\varphi_t(\theta_j)) \geq \frac{1}{C} d(\varphi_{s_i}(\theta_i), \varphi_{t_j}(\theta_j)) \geq \frac{1}{C}\gamma\delta \geq \overline{\gamma}\delta.$$

Then

$$d(\pi\Gamma(s), \pi\Gamma(t)) \geq d(\pi\varphi_s(\theta_i), \pi\varphi_t(\theta_j)) - d(\pi\Gamma(s), \pi\varphi_s(\theta_i)) - d(\pi\Gamma(t), \pi\varphi_t(\theta_j)).$$

Therefore by (77)

$$\inf_{d(s,t) \mod T \geq 2} d(\pi\Gamma(s), \pi\Gamma(t)) \geq \overline{\gamma}\delta - 2Q\delta > \frac{3}{4}\overline{\gamma}\delta.$$

(2). Suppose by contradiction that there exists $t \leq -1$ such that

$$d(x(t), \pi\Gamma) < \delta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad d([x(t), \dot{x}(t)], \Gamma)^2 > \delta^2 \frac{JE}{\eta} \quad \text{and} \quad d([x(t), \dot{x}(t)], \Gamma) > C d(x(t), \pi\Gamma).$$

First we check that we can apply Lemma 1.14 to $L$. For $\gamma : [0, T] \to M$ we have that

$$\oint_{\gamma} c(L + \phi) - du = T c(L + \phi) - u(\gamma(T)) + u(\gamma(0))$$

depends only on the time interval $T$ and the endpoints of $\gamma$. Thus instead of $L$ it is enough to apply Lemma 1.14 to $L + \phi$, for whom it holds if $\phi \in \mathcal{U}_2$ is small enough.

Now we check the speed hypothesis in Lemma 1.14. Observe that

$$E_{L} = vL - L = E_{L+\phi} - c(L + \phi) = E_{L} - \phi - c(L + \phi)$$

and that by (14)

$$c(L) = c(L + \phi + c(L + \phi)) = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{N}(L) \subset [E_L = c(L)] \subset [E_L = \phi + c(L + \phi)].$$

If $\phi$ is small enough

$$\phi + c(L + \phi) < c(L) + 1,$$
and then \( \dot{x}(t) \in \mathcal{N}(L) \subset [E_L \leq c(L) + 1] \). The Shadowing Corollary B.15 is applied to the hyperbolic set \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) of the lagrangian flow \( \varphi^L \) restricted to the energy level \([E_L = c(L)]\). So the shadowing periodic orbit \( \Gamma \) is in the same manifold \( \Gamma(t) \in [E_L = c(L)] \). Therefore

\[
\forall t \quad \dot{x}(t), \quad \Gamma(t) \in [E_L \leq c(L) + 1].
\]

Finally we check the distance hypothesis in Lemma 1.14. Let \( t_0 \) be such that \( d(x(t), \pi \Gamma) = d(x(t), \pi(\Gamma(t_0))) \). By (87) and the definition of \( \delta_1 \) in (73) we can apply Lemma 1.14 for \( L \) and \( K = K_1 \) from (70), to \( x \) and \( \pi \Gamma \) at \( x(t) \) and \( \pi(\Gamma(t_0)) \). Using \( 0 < \varepsilon \leq 1 \) from Lemma 1.14 we obtain \( C^1 \) curves \( w_1, w_2 : [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \to M \) with \( w_1(-\varepsilon) = x(t - \varepsilon), \ w_1(\varepsilon) = \pi \Gamma(t_0 + \varepsilon), \ w_2(-\varepsilon) = \pi \Gamma(t_0 - \varepsilon), \ w_2(\varepsilon) = x(t + \varepsilon) \) such that

\[
A_L(w_1) + A_L(w_2) < A_L(\pi \Gamma_{[t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon]}) + A_L(x_{[t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon]}) - \eta_1 d([x(t), \dot{x}(t)], \Gamma(t_0))^2.
\]

Since \( \phi \geq 0 \) we have that

\[
(88) \quad c(L + \phi) \leq c(L) = 0.
\]

Using Lemma 2.3, \( \phi|_{\pi \Gamma} \equiv 0 \) and that \( \Gamma \) is a closed curve we have that

\[
A_L(\pi \Gamma) = A_{L + c(L + \phi)}(\pi \Gamma) \leq A_{L + c(L)}(\pi \Gamma) \leq J E \delta^2.
\]

We compute the action of the curve \( w_1 \ast \pi \Gamma_{[t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + T - \varepsilon]} \ast w_2 \) which joins \( x(t - \varepsilon) \) to \( x(t + \varepsilon) \).

\[
A_L(w_1) + A_L(\pi \Gamma_{[t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + T - \varepsilon]}) + A_L(w_2) <
\]

\[
< A_L(x_{[t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon]}) + A_L(\pi \Gamma_{[t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon]}) + A_L(\pi \Gamma_{[t_0 + \varepsilon, t_0 + T - \varepsilon]}) - \eta_1 d([x(t), \dot{x}(t)], \Gamma(t_0))^2
\]

\[
\leq A_L(x_{[t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon]}) + J E \delta^2 - \eta_1 d([x(t), \dot{x}(t)], \Gamma)^2
\]

\[
< A_L(x_{[t - \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon]}).
\]

This contradicts the assumption that \( x \) is semi-static for \( L \).

\( \triangle \)

Observe that \( \Gamma \) is also a periodic orbit for \( L + \phi \). By Lemma 2.3 and (67) we have that

\[
(89) \quad c(L + \phi) \geq - \int (L + \phi) \, d\mu_L = - \int L \, d\mu_L \geq - \frac{J E}{T} \delta^2,
\]

where \( T \) is the period of \( \Gamma \). Since we can assume that \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) has no periodic orbits, if \( \delta \) is small enough

\[
(90) \quad T \geq 1.
\]

We will prove that any semi-static curve \( x : [-\infty, 0] \to M \) for \( L + \phi \) has \( \alpha \)-limit \( \{ (x, \dot{x}) \} = \Gamma \). Since \( \alpha \)-limits of semi-static orbits are static (Mañé [35, Theorem V.(c)]), this implies that \( \Gamma \subset \mathcal{A}(L + \phi) \). Thus finishing the proof of Proposition 2.5.
Since by (71) the number $\tau_\delta$ is smaller than the flow expansivity constant of $\hat{N}(L + \phi)$, it is enough to prove that the tangent $(x, \dot{x})$ of any semi-static curve $x : [-\infty, 0] \rightarrow M$ spends only a bounded time outside the $\frac{3}{4}\gamma_\delta$-neighbourhood of $\Gamma$.

Let $x : [-\infty, 0] \rightarrow M$ be a semi-static curve for $L + \phi$. Let $\theta := (x(0), \dot{x}(0))$.

By (73) and (75) we have that

$$d(x(t), \pi\Gamma) > \frac{1}{4}\tau_\delta.$$  

By (85)-(86) and (81) we have that

$$d(\varphi_\theta, \Gamma) > C_\rho \quad \& \quad d(x(t), \pi\Gamma) < \delta_1 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad d(x(t), \pi\Gamma) > \frac{1}{4} d(\varphi_\theta, \Gamma).$$

By (79) we have that $\frac{1}{4}\gamma_\delta > C_\rho$. And then from (91) and (92) we get

$$d(\varphi_\theta, \Gamma) > \frac{1}{4}\gamma_\delta \left( > \frac{1}{4}C\tau_\delta \right) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad d(x(t), \pi\Gamma) > \frac{1}{4}\tau_\delta.$$  

Then by (50), (84), (89), (90) and (80), we have that

$$d(\varphi_\theta, \Gamma) > C_\rho \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \phi(x(t)) + c(L + \phi) \geq \frac{1}{4}\epsilon\rho^2 - J\epsilon\delta^2 =: a_0 > 0.$$  

For $\xi \in \hat{N}(L + \phi)$ consider the local invariant manifolds

$$W_\eta^s(\xi) := \{ \zeta \in E^{-1}_L\{c(L)\} : \forall t \geq 0 \quad d(\varphi_t(\xi), \varphi_t(\xi)) \leq \eta \},$$

$$W_\eta^{ss}(\xi) := \{ \zeta \in W_\eta^s(\xi) : \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} d(\varphi_t(\xi), \varphi_t(\xi)) = 0 \},$$

$$W_\eta^u(\xi) := \{ \zeta \in E^{-1}_L\{c(L)\} : \forall t \leq 0 \quad d(\varphi_t(\xi), \varphi_t(\xi)) \leq \eta \},$$

$$W_\eta^{uu}(\xi) := \{ \zeta \in W_\eta^u(\xi) : \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} d(\varphi_t(\xi), \varphi_t(\xi)) = 0 \}.$$  

Also consider the canonical coordinates (cf. B.3) on $\hat{N}(L)$, i.e. there are $\alpha_1, \eta > 0$ such that if $\xi, \zeta \in \hat{N}(L)$ and $d(\xi, \zeta) < \alpha_1$ then there is $v = v(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R}$, $|v| \leq \eta$ such that

$$(\xi, \zeta) := W_\eta^{ss}(\varphi_v(\xi)) \cap W_\eta^{uu}(\zeta) \neq \emptyset.$$  

We use the canonical coordinates to parametrize the approaches of $\varphi_\theta(\xi)$ to $\Gamma$ in the following way. We can assume that $\gamma_\delta < \alpha_1$. The local weak stable manifold of $\Gamma$

$$W_\eta^{ss}(\Gamma) := \bigcup_{\xi \in \Gamma} W_\eta^s(\xi) = \bigcup_{\xi \in \Gamma} W_\eta^{ss}(\xi)$$

forms a cylinder homeomorphic to $\Gamma(\mathbb{R}) \times [0, 1]^{\dim M - 1}$. When $d(\varphi_\theta(\xi), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) > \gamma_\delta$ the strong local unstable manifold $W_\eta^{uu}(\varphi_\theta(\xi))$ intersects this cylinder transversely and defines a unique time parameter $v(t)$ (mod $T$) such that

$$W_\eta^{ss}(\Gamma(v(t))) \cap W_\eta^{uu}(\varphi_\theta(\xi)) \neq 0.$$  

Since the family of strong invariant manifolds is invariant under each iterate \( \varphi_t \) we have that if \( d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) < \gamma \delta \) for all \( t \in [a, b] \) then
\[
\forall s \in [0, b-a] \quad v(a + s) = v(a) + s.
\]

Let \( B \) be from Lemma B.5. Write \( \theta = (x(0), \dot{x}(0)) \) and define \( S_k(\theta) \), \( T_k(\theta) \) recursively by
\[
S_0(\theta) := 0, \\
T_k(\theta) := \sup \left\{ t < S_{k-1}(\theta) \mid d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(v(t))) \leq C(B + 1)\rho \right\}, \\
C_k(\theta) := \sup \left\{ t < T_k(\theta) \mid d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) = \frac{\gamma}{3} \right\}, \\
S_k(\theta) := \inf \left\{ t > C_k(\theta) \mid d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(v(t))) \leq C(B + 1)\rho \right\}.
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\int_{S_{k-1}(\theta)}^{S_k(\theta)} L(x, \dot{x}) = \int_{S_{k-1}(\theta)}^{S_k(\theta)} \left\{ c(L) + L(x, \dot{x}) \right\} \geq \Phi^L_{\varphi_{\theta}}(x(-t), x(S_{k-1}(\theta))) \\
\geq \inf_{y, z \in M} \Phi^L_{\varphi_{\theta}}(y, z) =: b_0 > -\infty.
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Figure 1. This figure illustrates the distance of the orbit of } \theta \text{ to the periodic orbit } \Gamma \text{ and the choice of } S_k \text{ and } T_k.\]
Recall that $\eta$ is from the canonical coordinates B.3 for $\mathcal{N}(L)$ as in (95) and satisfies (74). Since $T_k(\theta) = -\infty$ we have that for all $t < S_{k-1}(\theta)$ either
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) &> \eta > \gamma_\delta 
& \text{ or }
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
In the case (99) let $s$ be such that $d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(s(t))) = d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) \leq \eta$. We have that
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\langle \Gamma(s(t)), \varphi_t(\theta) \rangle &= W^\text{loc}(\Gamma(s(t))) \cap W^\text{uu}(\varphi_t(\theta)) \\
&= W^\text{loc}(\Gamma(v(t))) \cap W^\text{uu}(\varphi_t(\theta)) = \langle \Gamma(v(t)), \varphi_t(\theta) \rangle \\
&= W^\text{ss}(\Gamma(v(t))) \cap W^\text{uu}(\varphi_t(\theta)).
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
We apply Lemma B.5 with $x := \Gamma(s(t))$ and $y := \varphi_t(\theta)$. Using (177) we have that
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
d(y, \varphi_v(x)) &\leq d(y, x) + d(x, \varphi_v(x)) \leq (1 + B) d(y, x).
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
Observe that (100) implies that $\varphi_v(x) = \Gamma(v(t))$. Replacing $x$ and $y$ in (101) and using (99) we have that
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) &= d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(s(t))) \geq \frac{1}{1+B} d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(v(t))) \\
&\geq C \rho.
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
Observe that by (79) and (75), in case (98) inequality (102) also holds. Therefore
\begin{equation}
\forall t < S_{k-1}(\theta) \quad d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) \geq C \rho.
\end{equation}
Since $x$ is semi-static for $L + \phi$ we have that
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\infty > \sup_{y, z} \Phi_{L+\phi}^{L+\phi}(y, z) &\geq \Phi_{c(L+\phi)}^{L+\phi}(x(-t), x(S_{k-1}(\theta))) \\
&= \int_{-t}^{S_{k-1}(\theta)} \left[ L(x, \dot{x}) + \phi(x) + c(L + \phi) \right] \\
&= \int_{-t}^{S_{k-1}(\theta)} L(x, \dot{x}) + \int_{-t}^{S_{k-1}(\theta)} \left[ \phi(x) + c(L + \phi) \right] \\
&\geq b_0 + a_0(t + S_{k-1}(\theta)) \quad \text{by (97) and (103), (94)}.
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
By (94) we have that $a_0 > 0$. Letting $t \to +\infty$, inequality (104) gives a contradiction.

(2). Let
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
f(t) := d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(\mathbb{R})) \quad \text{and} \quad g(t) := d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(v(t))),
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
when $g$ is defined (in particular by (74) when $f(t) < \gamma_\delta$). Then $f(t) \leq g(t)$.
Suppose first that $C_k(\theta) = -\infty$. Then $f(t) \neq \frac{1}{3} \gamma_\delta$ for all $t < T_k(\theta)$. By hypothesis $T_k(\theta) > -\infty$, then $f(T_k(\theta)) \leq g(T_k(\theta)) \leq C(B + 1) \rho$. Therefore, by (79), $f(t) < \frac{1}{3} \gamma_\delta$ for
all $t < T_k(\theta)$. By (72) and Proposition B.6, $\varphi_t(\theta) \in W_y^{\text{wu}}(\Gamma(v(t)))$ and by Proposition B.2

$$\lim_{t \to -\infty} g(t) = 0.$$ Then $S_k(\theta) = -\infty$ and also $T_{k+1}(\theta) = -\infty$.

Now suppose that $C_k(\theta) > -\infty$. By the definition of $S_k(\theta)$ for all $t \in [C_k(\theta), S_k(\theta)]$ we have that $g(t) > C(B + 1)\rho$. This implies that $T_{k+1}(\theta) \leq C_k(\theta)$.

(3). Let $f, g$ be as in (105). By the hypothesis $C_{k-1}(\theta) > -\infty$ and by the definition of $C_{k-1}(\theta)$, $C_{k-1}(\theta) \leq T_{k-1}(\theta)$. Then $f(C_{k-1}(\theta)) = \frac{1}{3}\gamma \delta$. By (79), $C(B + 1)\rho < \frac{1}{3}\gamma \delta$ and then

$$C(B + 1)\rho < \frac{1}{3}\gamma \delta = f(C_{k-1}(\theta)) \leq g(C_{k-1}(\theta)).$$

By the definition of $S_{k-1}(\theta)$ we have that $C_{k-1}(\theta) \leq S_{k-1}(\theta)$. But by (106), $g(C_{k-1}(\theta)) \geq \frac{1}{3}\gamma \delta$ and by the definition of $S_{k-1}(\theta)$, if $S_{k-1}(\theta) < +\infty$ then $g(S_{k-1}(\theta)) \leq C(B + 1)\rho < \frac{1}{3}\gamma \delta$. Therefore $C_{k-1}(\theta) \neq S_{k-1}(\theta)$ and then

$$C_{k-1}(\theta) < S_{k-1}(\theta) \leq +\infty.$$

By (106) and the definition of $S_{k-1}(\theta)$ we have that

$$\forall t \in [C_{k-1}(\theta), S_{k-1}(\theta)] \quad g(t) > C(B + 1)\rho.$$ This implies that $T_k(\theta) < C_{k-1}(\theta)$, with strict inequality by (106). By (107) and item (1) we have that $C_{k-1}(\theta) > -\infty$ implies that $T_k(\theta) > -\infty$. Therefore

$$-\infty < T_k(\theta) < C_{k-1}(\theta) < S_{k-1}(\theta).$$

The definition of $T_k(\theta)$ and the continuity of $g(t)$ on its domain imply that

$$g(T_k(\theta)) \leq C(B + 1)\rho.$$ The domain of definition and continuity of $g$ contains $f^{-1}([0, \gamma \delta]) \supset g^{-1}([0, \gamma \delta])$. By the intermediate value theorem for $g$ on connected components of $[g \leq \gamma \delta]$ and (108), (109), (106), the image $g([T_k(\theta), C_{k-1}(\theta)])$, and hence also $g([-\infty, S_{k-1}(\theta)])$, contain the closed interval $[C(B + 1)\rho, \frac{1}{3}\gamma \delta]$. Therefore, by the definition of $T_k(\theta)$, we have that $g(T_k(\theta)) = C(B + 1)\rho$.

(4). Let $f, g$ be from (105). If $C_k(\theta) > -\infty$ then by the definition of $C_k(\theta)$,

$$C_k(\theta) \leq T_k(\theta).$$

Therefore $T_k(\theta) > -\infty$. Then the definition of $T_k(\theta)$ implies that

$$g(T_k(\theta)) \leq C(B + 1)\rho.$$ Since $f(t)$ is continuous,

$$f(C_k(\theta)) = \frac{1}{3}\gamma \delta.$$
By (111), (79) and (112) we have that
\[ g(T_k(\theta)) \leq C(B + 1)\rho < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0 < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0 = f(C_k(\theta)) \leq g(C_k(\theta)). \]
This implies that \( C_k(\theta) \neq T_k(\theta). \) This together with (110) imply that
\[ C_k(\theta) < T_k(\theta). \]
By (111) and (114) the value \( S_k(\theta) \) is an infimum of a set which contains \( T_k(\theta), \) therefore
\[ S_k(\theta) \leq T_k(\theta). \]
This proves the second inequality in item (4).

The first of the following inequalities follows from the definition of \( S_k(\theta). \) The second inequality is (115). The third inequality follows from the definition of \( T_k(\theta). \)
\[ C_k(\theta) \leq S_k(\theta) \leq T_k(\theta) \leq S_{k-1}(\theta). \]
We get that
\[ -\infty < C_k(\theta) \leq S_k(\theta) \leq S_{k-1}(\theta) \leq \cdots \leq S_0(\theta) := 0 < +\infty. \]
From the definition of \( S_k(\theta) \) and \( S_k(\theta) < +\infty, \) and then (112), we have that
\[ g(S_k(\theta)) \leq C(B + 1)\rho < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0 = f(C_k(\theta)) \leq g(C_k(\theta)). \]
In particular \( C_k(\theta) \neq S_k(\theta). \) Thus from (116), \( C_k(\theta) < S_k(\theta). \)

(5). If the sequence \( \{T_k\} \) is finite, there is \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( T_\ell > -\infty \) and \( T_{\ell + 1} = -\infty. \) Let \( f, g \) be as in (105). By item (2) we have that \( -\infty < T_\ell(\theta) \leq C_{\ell - 1}(\theta). \) Then we can apply item (3) and use (79) to obtain
\[ f(T_\ell(\theta)) \leq g(T_\ell(\theta)) = C(B + 1)\rho < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0. \]
Since \( T_{\ell + 1}(\theta) = -\infty, \) by item (1), \( S_\ell(\theta) = -\infty \) and by item (4), \( C_\ell(\theta) = -\infty. \) Since \( C_\ell(\theta) = -\infty \) we have that \( f(t) \neq \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0 \) for all \( t < T_\ell(\theta). \) But by (117), \( f(T_\ell(\theta)) < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0. \)
Since \( f(t) \) is continuous, using (72) we get that
\[ f(t) < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0 < \beta_0 \quad \text{for all} \quad t < T_\ell(\theta). \]
This implies that there is a continuous function \( s : ]-\infty, T_\ell(\theta)] \to \mathbb{R} \) such that
\[ \forall t \leq T_\ell(\theta) \quad d\left(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(s(t))\right) \leq \beta_0. \]
By Proposition B.7 and Proposition B.2 there is \( v \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \lambda > 0 \) such that
\[ \forall t \leq T_\ell(\theta) \quad d\left(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(t + v)\right) \leq D \beta_0 e^{-\lambda(T_\ell(\theta) - t)}. \]
This implies that \( \lim_{t \to +\infty} d(\varphi_{-t}(\theta), \Gamma) = 0 \) and that \( \alpha\text{-limit}(\theta) = \Gamma(\mathbb{R}). \)

(6). By item (3) we have that \( f(T_k(\theta)) \leq g(T_k(\theta)) = C(B + 1)\rho < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0. \) By the definition of \( C_k(\theta) \) we have that \( \forall t \in ]C_k(\theta), T_k(\theta)] \quad f(t) \neq \frac{1}{3}\gamma_0. \) Then by the continuity of \( f(t), \)
\( \forall t \in [C_k(\theta), T_k(\theta)] \) \( f(t) < \frac{1}{3}\gamma_\delta \). Now it is enough to see that by item (4), \([S_k(\theta), T_k(\theta)] \subset [C_k(\theta), T_k(\theta)]\).

\[ \triangle \]

Let

\[ B_k(\theta) := \sup \left\{ t < C_k(\theta) \mid d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma) \leq \frac{2\gamma}{4} \right\}. \]

**Claim 2.7.3:**

\[ [B_k(\theta), C_k(\theta)] \subset [T_{k+1}(\theta), S_k(\theta)]. \]

**Proof:**

Let \( f, g \) be as in (105). By the definition of \( S_k(\theta) \) we have that \( S_k(\theta) \geq C_k(\theta) \). By the definition of \( B_k(\theta) \) and (79), we have that

\[ g|_{[B_k, C_k]} \geq f|_{[B_k, C_k]} > \frac{1}{4}\gamma_\delta > C(B + 1)\rho. \]  

By the definition of \( S_k(\theta) \) we have that

\[ g|_{[C_k, S_k]} > C(B + 1)\rho. \]  

By the definition of \( C_k(\theta) \) and the continuity of \( f(t) \) we have that

\[ g(C_k(\theta)) \geq f(C_k(\theta)) = \frac{1}{3}\gamma_\delta > C(B + 1)\rho. \]  

Joining (118), (119) and (120) we get that

\[ g|_{[B_k, S_k]} > C(B + 1)\rho. \]

By the definition of \( T_{k+1}(\theta) \) this implies that \( T_{k+1}(\theta) \leq B_k(\theta) \).

\[ \triangle \]

If \( t \in [B_k(\theta), C_k(\theta)] \), by the definition of \( B_k(\theta) \) we have that

\[ d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma) \geq \frac{1}{4}\gamma_\delta. \]

Then by (93),

\[ t \in [B_k(\theta), C_k(\theta)] \implies d(x(t), \pi\Gamma) > \frac{1}{4}\gamma_\delta. \]

By the definition of \( T_{k+1}(\theta) \) we have that

\[ \forall t \in [T_{k+1}(\theta), S_k(\theta)] \quad d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(v(t))) > C(B + 1)\rho. \]

The arguments in (101)-(102) apply in the case (122) to obtain

\[ t \in [T_{k+1}(\theta), S_k(\theta)] \implies d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma) > C\rho. \]
From \{(121), (84), (89), \{(76), (69)\} and \{(123), (94)\}, we have that
\[
\int_{T_{k+1}(\theta)}^{T_k(\theta)} \left( \phi + c(L + \phi) \right) \geq \int_{B_k(\theta)}^{C_k(\theta)} \left( \frac{1}{2\delta} \varepsilon (\gamma_\delta)^2 - \frac{JE}{\delta} \delta^2 \right) + \int_{[T_{k+1}, S_k)\setminus[B_k, C_k]} \left( \phi + c(L + \phi) \right)
\]
\[
\geq \left( \frac{1}{2\delta} \varepsilon (\gamma_\delta)^2 - \frac{JE}{\delta} \delta^2 \right) \alpha + 0.
\]

Recall that
\[
\mathbb{L} := L + \phi + c(L + \phi) - du,
\]
where \(u\) is from (68). Observe that the lagrangian flow for \(\mathbb{L}\) is the same as the lagrangian flow \(\varphi_t\) for \(L + \phi\). Also \(\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{L}) = \mathcal{N}(L + \phi)\) and \(\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{L}) = \mathcal{A}(L + \phi)\). Using (68) and (124),
\[
\int_{T_{k+1}(\theta)}^{S_k(\theta)} \mathbb{L}(\varphi_t(\theta)) dt = \int_{T_{k+1}(\theta)}^{S_k(\theta)} (L - du) + \int_{T_{k+1}(\theta)}^{S_k(\theta)} \left( \phi + c(L + \phi) \right)
\]
\[
\geq 0 + \left( \frac{1}{2\delta} \varepsilon (\gamma_\delta)^2 - \frac{JE}{\delta} \delta^2 \right) \alpha.
\]

**Case 1:** Suppose that \(T_k(\theta) - S_k(\theta) > T + 2\).

Let \(m_k \in \mathbb{N}\) be such that
\[
S_k(\theta) + m_k T \leq T_k(\theta) - 1 < S_k(\theta) + (m_k + 1) T.
\]
Then \(m_k \geq 1\). Let \(R_k(\theta) := S_k(\theta) + m_k T\). Then \(1 \leq T_k(\theta) - R_k(\theta) < T + 1\). By Claim 2.7.2.(6) \(\Gamma\) is \(\frac{2\pi}{3}\)-shadowed by \(\varphi_{[S_k, T_k]}(\theta)\). Therefore by inequality (198) in Proposition B.7 there is \(v \in \mathbb{R}\) such that \(\forall t \in [S_k, T_k]\)
\[
d(\varphi_t(\theta), \Gamma(t+v)) \leq D e^{-\lambda_{\min(t-S_k, \Gamma(t))}} [d(\varphi_{S_k}(\theta), \Gamma(S_k+v)) + d(\varphi_{T_k}(\theta), \Gamma(T_k+v))].
\]
Also the choice of \(v\) in Proposition B.7 is the same as in (96) so that
\[
t + v = v(t) \quad \forall t \in [S_k(\theta), T_k(\theta)].
\]
By the definition of \(S_k\) and \(T_k\) and the continuity of \(g(t)\) on its domain we have that
\[
g(S_k) \leq C(B + 1)\rho, \quad g(T_k) \leq C(B + 1)\rho.
\]
By (126), (127) and (128) we have for \(s \in [0, 1]\) that
\[
d(\varphi_{s+R_k}\theta, \Gamma(v(s + R_k))) \leq D e^{-\lambda_{\min(s+R_k, S_k, T_k - s-R_k)}} [d(\varphi_{S_k}\theta, \Gamma(v(S_k))) + d(\varphi_{T_k}\theta, \Gamma(v(T_k)))]
\]
\[
\leq D e^0 [g(S_k) + g(T_k)] \leq 2DC(B + 1)\rho.
\]
\[
d(\Gamma(v(s+S_k)), \varphi_{s+S_k}\theta) \leq 2DC(B + 1)\rho.
\]
From (127) we have that
\[
v(s + R_k) = s + R_k + v = s + S_k + v + m_k T = v(s + S_k) + m_k T.
\]
Figure 2. The auxiliary segments $w_1$ and $w_2$.

So that $\Gamma(v(s + R_k)) = \Gamma(v(s + S_k))$. Adding the inequalities above we get

\[(129) \quad \forall s \in [0, 1] \quad d(\varphi_{s + R_k} \theta, \varphi_{s + S_k} \theta) \leq 4DC(B + 1)\rho.\]

In local coordinates about $\pi(\Gamma)$ define

\[w_1(s + R_k) = (1-s) x(s + R_k) + s x(s + S_k), \quad s \in [0, 1];\]

\[w_2(s + S_k) = s x(s + R_k) + (1-s) x(s + S_k), \quad s \in [0, 1].\]

By Lemma 2.4(b) and (129) we have that

\[A_{L+\phi}(x|_{S_k, 1+S_k}) + A_{L+\phi}(x|_{R_k, 1+R_k}) \geq A_{L+\phi}(w_1) + A_{L+\phi}(w_2) - 96KD^2C^2(B + 1)^2\rho^2.\]

Since the pairs of segments \{ $x|_{S_k, 1+S_k}$, $x|_{R_k, 1+R_k}$ \} and \{ $w_1$, $w_2$ \} have the same collections of endpoints

\[\int_{S_k}^{1+S_k} du(\dot{x}) + \int_{R_k}^{1+R_k} du(\dot{x}) = \oint_{w_1} du + \oint_{w_2} du.\]

Therefore, since $c(L + \phi)$ is constant,

\[(130) \quad A_L(x|_{S_k, 1+S_k}) + A_L(x|_{R_k, 1+R_k}) \geq A_L(w_1) + A_L(w_2) - 96KD^2C^2(B + 1)^2\rho^2.\]

The integral of $d_xu$ on closed curves is zero. Therefore

\[(131) \quad c(\mathbb{L}) = c(L + \phi + c(L + \phi)) = 0.\]

Since $w_1 * x|_{1+S_k,R_k}$ is a closed curve and $c(\mathbb{L}) = 0$,

\[(132) \quad A_L(w_1) + A_L(x|_{1+S_k,R_k}) \geq 0.\]
Using (68) and (89),

\[(133)\]

\[
L = (L - du) + \phi + c(L + \phi) \geq 0 + 0 - \frac{JE}{T} \delta^2.
\]

Since \(T_k(\theta) - R_k(\theta) \leq T + 2\), on the curve \(w_2 \cdot x|_{[1 + R_k, T_k]}\), using (90) we have that

\[(134)\]

\[
A_L(w_2) + A_L(x|_{[1 + R_k, T_k]}) \geq -\frac{JE}{T} \delta^2 (T + 2) \geq -3JE \delta^2.
\]

From (130), (132) and (134) we get that

\[
A_L(x|_{[S_k, T_k]}) \geq -\frac{JE}{T} \delta^2 (T + 2) \geq -3JE \delta^2.
\]

**Case 2:** If \(T_k - S_k \leq T + 2\), from (133) we also have

\[
A_L(x|_{[S_k, T_k]}) \geq -\frac{JE}{T} \delta^2 (T + 2) \geq -3JE \delta^2
\]

Adding inequality (125) and using (82) we obtain a positive lower bound for the action independent of \(k\):

\[
A_L(x|_{[T_{k+1}, T_k]}) \geq \left(\frac{1}{32} \varepsilon (\tau_\delta)^2 - \frac{JE}{T} \delta^2\right) \alpha - 96KD^2C^2(B + 1)^2 \rho^2 - 3JE \delta^2 > 0.
\]

Since \(x\) is also semi-static for \(L\) and by (131) \(c(L) = 0\), the total action is finite:

\[
A_L(x|_{-\infty, 0}) = \max_{p, q \in M} \Phi_{c(L)}^L(p, q) < +\infty
\]

is finite. Therefore there must be at most finitely many \(T_k\)’s.

By item (5) in Claim 2.7.2, we have that \(\alpha\)-limit\((x, \dot{x}) = \Gamma\). Since \(\alpha\)-limits of semi-static orbits are static (Mañé [35, Theorem V.(c)]), we obtain that \(\Gamma \subset A(L + \phi)\). This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.5.

**Proof of Theorem A:**

By Theorem C(a) in [20] the set

\[
\mathcal{G}_2^k := \{ \phi \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}) \mid \mathcal{M}_{\min} (L_0 + \phi) = \{\mu\} \text{ and } A(L_0 + \phi) = \text{supp}(\mu) \}
\]

is residual\(^1\) in \(C^k(M, \mathbb{R})\), \(2 \leq k \leq \infty\). Since any invariant probability in the Aubry set is minimizing (c.f. Theorem IV in Mañé [35], and in [16]), for \(\phi \in \mathcal{G}_2^k\) the set \(A(L_0 + \phi) = \text{supp}(\mu)\) is uniquely ergodic.

\(^1\)The proof is the same for all \(2 \leq k \leq \infty\).
Let $\mathcal{E}_0$ be from Theorem E. We will prove that any $\phi \in \mathcal{E}_0 \cap G^2_2$ can be $C^2$ approximated by a potential $\phi_1$ for which $\mathcal{A}(L_0 + \phi_1)$ contains a periodic orbit.

Fix $\phi \in \mathcal{E}_0 \cap G^2_2$. Suppose that $\phi$ can not be $C^2$ approximated by a potential $\phi_1$ for which $\mathcal{A}(L_0 + \phi_1)$ contains a periodic orbit. Write $L = L_0 + \phi$ and let $\varphi_t = \varphi_t^L$ be the lagrangian flow of $L$.

Let $$A := 1 + \sup_{|t| \leq 1} \text{Lip} \left( \varphi_t \big|_{E^{L,\leq c(L) + 1}} \right).$$ By Proposition 2.5 with $J = 2$ we have that

2.8. Statement.

There are $\delta_0 > 0$ and $Q > 0$ such that for any periodic $\delta$-possible 1-specification in $\mathcal{A}(L)$ with at most 2 jumps $\{ \varphi_{T_i, T_{i+1}}(\theta_i) \}_{i=1,2}$ with $\delta < \delta_0$ there is an approach

$$d(\varphi_s(\theta_i), \varphi_t(\theta_j)) < \frac{1}{2\pi} Q \delta,$$

with $\{i, j\} \subset \{1, 2\}$, $|s - t|(\text{mod } (T_3 - T_1)) \geq 1$ and $s \in [T_i, T_{i+1}]$, $t \in [T_j, T_{j+1}]$, (if there is only one jump, $J = 1$, we set $T_3 = T_2$).

Let $\mu$ be the minimizing measure of $L$. Fix a point $\vartheta \in \mathcal{A}(L)$ which is generic for $\mu$, i.e. for every continuous function $F : TM \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{T \to +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T F(\varphi_t(\vartheta)) \, dt = \int F \, d\mu.$$

Let $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

(135) \quad $Q^{-N_0} < \delta_0$.

Given $\theta \in \mathcal{A}(L)$ let $\Sigma(\theta)$ be a small codimension 1 submanifold of $TM$ transversal to $\varphi$ containing $\theta$. Since $\mathcal{A}(L)$ has no periodic orbits we can choose $\Sigma(\theta)$ small enough such that its return time is larger than one, i.e.

(136) \quad $\Sigma(\theta) \cap \varphi_{[0,1]}(\Sigma(\theta)) = \emptyset.$

Given $N > N_0$ let $t_1^N(\theta) < t_2^N(\theta) < \cdots$ be all the $\frac{1}{2}Q^{-N}$ returns near $\theta$ in $\Sigma$ of the orbit of $\vartheta$, i.e.

(137) \quad $\{ t_1^N(\theta), t_2^N(\theta), \ldots \} = \{ t > 0 \mid \varphi_t(\vartheta) \in \Sigma(\theta), \, d(\varphi_t(\vartheta), \theta) < \frac{1}{2}Q^{-N} \}.$

We need the following result which will be proved in subsection 2.3.

2.9. Proposition. For any $\theta \in \mathcal{A}(L)$ and $\ell \geq 1$, \quad $t_{\ell+1}^N(\theta) - t_{\ell}^N(\theta) \geq \sqrt{2}^{N-N_0-3}.$
We continue the proof using Proposition 2.9. Write
\[ B(\theta, r) := \{ \omega \in TM \mid d(\omega, \theta) < r \}. \]

In the definition of the return times \( t_i^N(\theta) \) in (137) we shall use the following family of transversal sections.

**Claim 2.9.1:**

If \( \tilde{N}(L) \) has no periodic points then there is a family of local transversal sections \( \{ \Sigma(\theta) \}_{\theta \in \tilde{N}(L)} \) and there are \( N_3 > N_2 > N_0 \) such that if \( N > N_3 \) then
\[ \forall \theta \in A(L), \quad B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2}) \subset \varphi([-\varepsilon, -\varepsilon])(\Sigma(\theta) \cap B(\theta, \frac{1}{2N}Q^{-N})) \]

and
\[ \forall \theta \in \tilde{N}(L), \quad \Sigma(\theta) \cap \bigcup_{0<|t|<1} \varphi_t(\Sigma(\theta)) = \emptyset. \]

**Proof:**

Since \( \tilde{N}(L) \) has no periodic points, there is \( r_0 > 0 \) such that condition (138) is satisfied if \( \text{diam} \Sigma(\theta) < r_0 \) for all \( \theta \in \tilde{N}(L) \). Let \( X(\theta) \) be the lagrangian vector field. There is \( 0 < r_1 < r_0 \) such that for all \( \theta \in A(L) \), setting
\[ \Sigma(\theta) := \exp_\theta \left( \{ v \in T_\theta(E_L^{-1}\{c(L)\}) : \langle v, X(\theta) \rangle = 0, |v| < r_1 \} \right), \]
we have that \( \text{diam} \Sigma(\theta) < r_0 \), that \( \Sigma(\theta) \) is a transversal section to \( \varphi_t \) in the energy level \( E_L^{-1}\{c(L)\} \) and that
\[ W(\theta) := \varphi([-\varepsilon, \varepsilon])(B(\theta, r_1) \cap \Sigma(\theta)) \]

is a tubular neighbourhood of \( \varphi([-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]) \). There is \( r_2 > 0 \) such that for all \( \theta \in A(L) \), \( B(\theta, r_2) \subset W(\theta) \). Choose \( N_4 > N_0 \) such that \( Q^{-N_4} < r_2 \) and hence
\[ \forall \theta \in A(L) \quad B(\theta, Q^{-N_4}) \subset W(\theta). \]

The projection map \( P_\theta : W(\theta) \to \Sigma(\theta) \cap B(\theta, r_1) \), \( P_\theta(\varphi_\tau(\xi)) = \xi \) is smooth. We show that it has a uniform Lipschitz constant. Consider the map
\[ F_\theta : [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \times (\Sigma(\theta) \cap B(\theta, r_1)) \to W(\theta), \quad F(t, \xi) := \varphi_t(\xi). \]

Then \( \partial_t F_\theta(t, \xi) = X(\varphi_t(\xi)) \) and \( \partial_\xi F_\theta(t, \xi) = D\varphi_t(\xi) \) is near the identity. The angle \( \angle(\Sigma(\theta), X(\xi)), \xi \in \Sigma(\theta), \theta \in A(L) \) is uniformly bounded away from zero. This implies that there is a uniform bound \( a > 0 \) such that \( |DF_\theta(t, \xi) \cdot \zeta| \geq a|\zeta| \) for all \( \xi \in \Sigma(\theta), t \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon], \theta \in A(L) \) and \( \zeta \in T_{(t, \xi)}([-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \times \Sigma(\theta)). \] By the inverse function theorem \( \|DF_\theta^{-1}(\varphi_\tau(\xi))\| \leq a^{-1} \). Since \( F_\theta^{-1}(\varphi_\tau(\xi)) = (\star, P_\theta(\varphi_\tau(\xi))) \) we have that \( a^{-1} \) is a uniform Lipschitz constant for all \( P_\theta, \theta \in A(L) \).
Choose \( N_2 > N_4 \) such that \( \frac{1}{2A}Q^{N_2} > a^{-1} \) so that \( \frac{1}{2A}Q^{N_2} \) is a Lipschitz constant for \( P_0 \) on \( W(\theta) \), for all \( \theta \in A(L) \). Choose \( N_3 > N_2 \). Then for \( N > N_3 \) we have that \( N + N_2 > N_4 \) and hence \( B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2}) \subset W(\theta) \). Since \( \text{Lip}(P_0) \leq \frac{1}{2A}Q^{N_2} \) we have that \( P_0(B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2})) \subset \Sigma(\theta) \cap B(\theta, \frac{1}{2A}Q^{-N}) \). Therefore

\[
B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2}) \subset (P_0|_{W(\theta)})^{-1}(\Sigma(\theta) \cap B(\theta, \frac{1}{2A}Q^{-N})) = \varphi_{[-3..3]}(\Sigma(\theta) \cap B(\theta, \frac{1}{2A}Q^{-N})).
\]

\( \triangle \)

Thus if \( \xi \in B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2}) \cap \varphi_{[3,T-3]}(\theta) \) then there are \( \tau \in [-3,3] \) and \( s \in [0,T] \) such that \( \varphi_s(\tau) \in \Sigma(\theta) \cap B(\theta, \frac{1}{2A}Q^{-N}) \) and \( \xi = \varphi_\tau(\varphi_s(\theta)) \). Observe that then \( s = t_\ell^N(\theta) \) for some \( t_\ell^N(\theta) \leq T \). Therefore, denoting by \( m \) the Lebesgue measure on \( \mathbb{R} \),

\[
m \left\{ t \in [3, T - 3] : \varphi_\ell(\theta) \in B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2}) \right\} \leq 0.6 \# \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : t_\ell^N(\theta) \leq T \}.
\]

Similarly, using (138),

\[
m \left\{ t \in [1.1, T - 1.1] : \varphi_\ell(\theta) \in \varphi_{[-11,11]}(B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2})) \right\} \leq 0.82 \# \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : t_\ell^N(\theta) \leq T \}
\]

\[
\leq \# \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : t_\ell^N(\theta) \leq T \}.
\]

Given \( N \gg N_3 \) and \( \theta \in A(L) \), let \( f_\theta : TM \to [0,1] \) be a continuous function such that \( f_\theta|_{\varphi_{[-1,1]}(B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2-1}))} \equiv 1 \) and \( \text{supp} f_\theta \subseteq \varphi_{[-11,11]}(B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2})) \). Then

\[
\int_{0.41}^{T-0.41} f_\theta(\varphi_\ell(\theta)) \, dt \leq m \left\{ t \in [1.1, T - 1.1] : \varphi_\ell(\theta) \in \varphi_{[-11,11]}(B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2})) \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \# \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : t_\ell^N(\theta) \leq T \}.
\]

Using that \( \theta \) is a generic point for \( \mu \) and Proposition 2.9 we have that

\[
\mu(\varphi_{[-1,1]}(B(\theta, Q^{-N-N_2-1}))) \leq \int f_\theta \, d\mu = \lim_{T \to +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f_\theta(\varphi_\ell(\theta)) \, dt
\]

\[
= \lim_{T \to +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{0.41}^{T-0.41} f_\theta(\varphi_\ell(\theta)) \, dt
\]

\[
\leq \limsup_{T \to +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \# \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : t_\ell^N(\theta) \leq T \}
\]

\[
\leq \sqrt{2}^{N+N_0+3} \quad \forall \theta \in A(L).
\]

(139)

Fix a point \( \omega \in \text{supp}(\mu) = A(L) \) for which Brin-Katok Theorem (see Theorem A.7 in Appendix A or [11]) holds:

\[
0 = h_\mu(\varphi^L) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{T \to +\infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \left( \mu(V(\omega, T, \epsilon)) \right),
\]

(140)
where $V(\omega, T, \varepsilon)$ is the **dynamic ball**:

$$V(\omega, T, \varepsilon) := \{ \xi \in TM \mid d(\varphi_t(\xi), \varphi_t(\omega)) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \}.$$ 

Since $h_\mu(\varphi^L) = 0$, equation (140) is equivalent to

$$0 = h_\mu(\varphi^L) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{T \to +\infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \left( \mu(V(\omega, T, \varepsilon)) \right).$$

Since the inner limit increases as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, the inequality holds without taking $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}$:

(141) \hspace{1em} 0 = h_\mu(\varphi^L) = \lim_{T \to +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \log \left( \mu(V(\omega, T, \varepsilon)) \right).

Fix $\varepsilon_0$ for which (141) holds for every $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$.

By Proposition B.7 there are constants $D > 0$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ such that if $\varepsilon$ is small enough, $\theta \in A(L)$ and $d(\varphi_s(\xi), \varphi_s(\theta)) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $s \in [-T, T]$ then there is $|v| < D \varepsilon$ such that

(142) \hspace{1em} \forall |s| \leq T, \quad d(\psi_s(\xi), \varphi_{s+v}(\theta)) \leq D \varepsilon \lambda^{(T-|s|)}.

We can choose $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ such that (142) holds and $D \varepsilon < 0.1$.

Since $\omega \in A(L)$, from (142) we get that

(143) \hspace{1em} \varphi_T(V(\omega, 2T, \varepsilon)) \subset \varphi_{[-D \varepsilon, D \varepsilon]}(B(\varphi_T(\omega), D \varepsilon \lambda^T)).

Take $N = N(T)$ such that

(144) \hspace{1em} Q^{-N-N_2-2} < D \varepsilon \lambda^T \leq Q^{-N-N_2-1}.

Then $B(\varphi_T(w), D \varepsilon \lambda^T) \subset B(\varphi_T(w), Q^{-N-N_2-1})$ and from (143),

$$\varphi_T(V(w, 2T, \varepsilon)) \subset \varphi_{[-1, 1]}(B(\varphi_T(w), Q^{-N-N_2-1})).$$

Using (139) we have that

$$\frac{-1}{2T} \log \mu(V(w, 2T, \varepsilon)) = \frac{-1}{2T} \log \mu(\varphi_T(V(w, 2T, \varepsilon)))$$

$$\geq \frac{-1}{2T} \log \mu(\varphi_{[-1, 1]}(B(\varphi_T(w), Q^{-N-N_2-1})))$$

$$\geq \frac{-1}{2T} \log \sqrt{2}^{-N+N_0+3}.$$

Taking the limit when $T \to +\infty$ and using (141) and (144), we get

$$h_\mu(\varphi^L) \geq \frac{-\log \lambda \cdot \log \sqrt{2}}{2 \log Q} > 0.$$ 

This contradicts the choice of $\phi \in \mathcal{E}_0$. □
2.3. Counting approximations.

Now we prove

2.9. Proposition. For any \( \theta \in \mathcal{A}(L) \) and \( \ell \geq 1 \), \( t_{\ell+1}^N(\theta) - t_{\ell}^N(\theta) \geq \sqrt{2}^{N-N_0-3} \).

Proof:

For \( N \in \mathbb{N} \), let

\[
\mathcal{A}_N := \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{A}(L) \times \mathcal{A}(L) \mid d(x, y) \leq Q^{-N}\}.
\]

Recall that

\[
A := 1 + \sup_{|t| \leq 1} \| \varphi_t \|_{E \leq c(L) + 1}.
\]

From (135) and Statement 2.8, setting \( \delta = Q^{-N} \), we get

2.10. Statement.

If \( N > N_0 \) and \( \{ \varphi_{[T_i, T_{i+1}]}(\theta_i) \}_{i=1}^2 \) is a periodic \( Q^{-N} \)-possible 1-specification in \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) with at most two jumps then there is a \( Q^{-N-1} \) approach

\[
d(\varphi_{\sigma}(\xi), \varphi_{\tau}(\zeta)) < \frac{1}{2A} Q^{-N+1}
\]

with \( \{i, j\} \subset \{1, 2\} \), \( |s - t|(\text{mod}(T_3 - T_1)) \geq 1 \) and \( s \in [T_i, T_{i+1}], t \in [T_j, T_{j+1}] \). And with \( T_3 = T_2, i = j = 1 \) if there is only one jump.

2.11. Lemma. If \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) has no periodic orbits and \( N_0 \) is large enough then

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \xi, \zeta \in \mathcal{A}(L), \quad d(\xi, \zeta) < Q^{-N_0}, \\ \sigma, \tau \in [0, 1], \quad 2 \geq \sigma + \tau \geq 1 \end{array} \right\} \implies d(\varphi_{-\sigma}(\xi), \varphi_{\tau}(\zeta)) \geq Q^{-N_0},
\]

and

if \( \{ \varphi_{[a,b]}(\theta_1), \varphi_{[c,d]}(\theta_2) \} \) is a periodic \( Q^{-N_0} \)-specification

with \( \theta_i \in \mathcal{A}(L), i = 1, 2 \), and \( |c - a| \geq 1 \),

\[
\text{then } \max\{ |b - a|, |c - b| \} > 500.
\]

Proof: If (147) does not hold there is a sequence \( n \to +\infty \), points \( \xi_n, \zeta_n \in \mathcal{A}(L) \) and \( \sigma_n, \tau_n \in [0, 1] \) such that \( d(\xi_n, \zeta_n) < Q^{-n}, 2 \geq \sigma_n + \tau_n \geq 1 \) but \( d(\varphi_{-\sigma_n}(\xi_n), \varphi_{\tau_n}(\zeta_n)) < Q^{-n} \).

Since \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) is compact, extracting a subsequence we can assume that the limits \( \xi := \lim_{n} \xi_n, \zeta := \lim_{n} \zeta_n, \sigma := \lim_{n} \sigma_n, \tau := \lim_{n} \tau_n \) exist. Then we have that \( \xi = \zeta \in \mathcal{A}(L), 1 \leq \sigma + \tau \leq 2, \varphi_{\sigma + \tau}(\zeta) = \xi = \zeta \). Therefore \( \zeta \) is a periodic point in \( \mathcal{A}(L) \), which contradicts the hypothesis.
Now we prove (148). If (148) does not hold then there is a sequence \( n \to +\infty \) and periodic \( Q^{-n} \)-possible specifications \( \{ \varphi_{[a_n,b_n]}(\theta_1^n), \varphi_{[c_n,b_n]}(\theta_2^n) \} \subset \mathcal{A}(L) \) such that \( |c_n - a_n| \geq 1, |b_n - a_n| \leq 500 \) and \( |c_n - b_n| \leq 500 \). Translating the time intervals we can assume that \( a_n = 0 \) for all \( n \), then \( \forall n \ \{ a_n, b_n, c_n \} \subset [0,500] \). Since \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) is compact, extracting a subsequence we can assume that the limits \( \theta_1 := \lim_n \theta_1^n, \theta_2 := \lim_n \theta_2^n \), \( a := \lim_n a_n, b := \lim_n b_n, c := \lim_n c_n \) exist with \( |c - a| \geq 1 \) and \( \theta_1 \in \mathcal{A}(L) \). Since \( d(\varphi_{b_n}(\theta_1^n), \varphi_{b_n}(\theta_2^n)) < Q^{-n} \) and \( d(\varphi_{c_n}(\theta_2^n), \varphi_{a_n}(\theta_1^n)) < Q^{-n} \), we have that \( \varphi_{b}(\theta_1) = \varphi_{b}(\theta_2) \), hence \( \theta_1 = \theta_2 \), also \( \varphi_c(\theta_1) = \varphi_c(\theta_2) = \varphi_a(\theta_1) \) and \( |c - a| \geq 1 \). Therefore \( \theta_1 \) is a periodic point in \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) which contradicts the hypothesis.

\[ \square \]

Since \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) has no periodic orbits we can assume that \( N_0 \) is so large that (147) and (148) hold.

By (137) and (136) we have that \( \varphi_{[t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta),t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)]}(\theta) \) is a periodic \( Q^{-N} \)-possible specification in \( \mathcal{A}(L) \). Therefore there is a \( Q^{-N+1} \)-interval \( \frac{1}{2\pi}Q^{-N+1} \leq Q^{-N+1} \) with \( 1 < (t - s) \mod (t^N_{\ell+1} - t^N_{\ell}) \), i.e.

\[ t^N_{\ell}(\theta) \leq s < s + 1 < t < \min \{ t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta), (t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta) - 1) + (s - t^N_{\ell}(\theta)) \}. \]

This implies that the length \( t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta) - t^N_{\ell}(\theta) \geq 2 \). It also gives rise to two periodic \( \frac{1}{2\pi}Q^{-N+1} \)-possible specifications in \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) with at most 2 jumps. Namely \( \varphi_{[s,t]}(\theta) \) and \( \{ \varphi_{[t,t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)]}(\theta), \varphi_{[t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta),s]}(\theta) \} \). At most one of \( \varphi_{s,N}(\theta), \varphi_{t,N}(\theta) \) is possibly at distance \( \leq 1 \) to the endpoints \( \varphi_{t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)}, \varphi_{t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)} \). Say \( |t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta) - t| \geq |s - t^N_{\ell}(\theta)| \). Suppose for example that also \( |s - t^N_{\ell}(\theta)| > 1 \). In this case both periodic \( Q^{-N+1} \)-specifications, \( \varphi_{[s,t]}(\theta) \) and \( \{ \varphi_{[t,t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)]}(\theta), \varphi_{[t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta),s]}(\theta) \} \), are 1-specifications. By Statement 2.10, each of these specifications imply the existence of a new \( \frac{1}{2\pi}Q^{-N+2} \) approach and we expect that each approach adds a length of one to a lower bound for \( t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta) - t^N_{\ell}(\theta) \). This process will continue as long as the exponent \( -N + k \leq -N_0 \). In this way we expect that the number of distinct \( Q^{-N+k} \) approaches in the segment \( \varphi_{[t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta),t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)]}(\theta) \) grows exponentially with \( k \) and then implying that the length of the segment \( t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta) - t^N_{\ell}(\theta) \) grows exponentially with \( k \), giving the result in Proposition 2.9.

There are two possible problems we have to consider. The first one is when some of the new approaches in this process is near to the endpoints of the mother specification. In this case the process will imply only one or no new segment or length one in \( [t^N_{\ell}(\theta),t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)] \). When there is no new segment we will obtain one return giving rise to a specification with only one jump. The other problem is when one of the child specifications obtained
in the process has more than two jumps. For such specification with three jumps we stop
the process. When this happens, we will see that the sister 1-specification has only one
jump. In both cases we get a 1-specification with only one jump, this gives rise in the
next generation to two specifications with at most two jumps, re-activating the duplication
process. In this way we can assure that in three generations this process gives a duplication
of implied segments of length one in the interval \([t^N_{\ell}(\theta), t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)]\), obtaining an exponential
growth with rate \(\sqrt[3]{2}\) as Proposition 2.9 claims.

It is simpler to show the inductive process in a picture. On a plane draw a circle \(S\)
representing the specification \(\varphi_{[t^N_{\ell}(\theta), t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)]}(\vartheta)\). On \(S\) both points \(\varphi_{t^N_{\ell}(\theta)}(\vartheta)\) and \(t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)\) are
represented by a single black dot with level \(N\). Inside the disk \(D\) with boundary \(S\) draw a
line from \(\varphi_{s}(\vartheta)\) to \(\varphi_{t}(\vartheta)\). It may be that the distance \(d(s, \{t^N_{\ell}(\theta), t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)\}) \leq 1\) but in that
case \(d(t, \{t^N_{\ell}(\theta), t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)\}) > 1\) because by Proposition 2.5, \(|s-t| \mod (t^N_{\ell+1} - t^N_{\ell}) \geq 1\) and
then by (148)

\[
\max \bigg\{ \, d(s, \{ t^N_s(\theta), t^N_{s+1}(\theta) \}), \, d(t, \{ t^N_t(\theta), t^N_{t+1}(\theta) \} ) \bigg\} > 5.
\]

The line \( \overline{\varphi_2(\theta)\varphi_2(\theta)} \) separates the disk in two components. If for example the minimum is larger than 1, then each component in the disk \( \mathbb{D} \) is a \( Q^{-N+1} \)-possible 1-specification in \( \mathcal{A}(L) \) with at most 2 jumps (one jump of size \( \leq Q^{-N+1} \) and possibly another with size \( \leq Q^{-N} < Q^{-N+1} \)). By Statement 2.10 each component has at least one \( \frac{1}{2A} Q^{-N+2} \) approach. The construction is iterated in this way. The interior of the lines in this construction do not intersect.

**Figure 5.** This is a possible next step from the example in Figure 4. At level \( N - 3 \), we had a node 0 2 which only issues one branch with label 0. At level \( N - 4 \), the node 0 \( \otimes \) corresponds to the shadowed region on the left of the disc. This node comes from a branch with label 1, i.e. a periodic specification with 2 jumps. In this case the implied return in \( \mathcal{A}_{N-4} \) has both of its points at time distance \( \leq 1 \) from the jumps of the specification. We put a white (or empty) node \( \otimes \) in the tree, signifying that this node (approach) does not count as another interval of length one in \( [t^N_t(\theta), t^N_{t+1}(\theta)] \). We write a label 0 in the node 0 \( \otimes \) meaning that the implied specification has only one jump. The node 0 \( \otimes \) will issue only one branch (with label 0). We shadow the pentagonal region at the left of the disc so that it is not considered in the process any more. After drawing the shadow it remains a white region with periodic specification with only one jump that will restore the duplication process.

We will also draw a tree with the approaches, in order to see that their number grows exponentially. We put a black node \( \bullet \) when we find a new approach which has at least one of its points is at distance at least 1 from all the points in the approaches considered earlier. In this way we shall obtain

\[
t^N_{t+1} - t^N_t \geq \# \{ \text{black nodes} \}.
\]

It may be that the newly obtained approach has its two points at distance \( \leq 1 \) from the previously obtained approaches. In this case we put a white (or empty) node \( \otimes \) in the

\[2\]The other case is treated in Case 0 \( \bullet \) 0 in subsection 2.4.2, but here we continue with this example to illustrate the construction of the figures in the circle and the construction of the tree.
2.12. **Remark** (by Andrea Davini).

Black and white nodes are used because in a black node we count a new end-interval of length one in a new specification obtained in the process. White nodes appear when the points in a new implied approach are at small distance \((\leq 1)\) to the endpoints of a previous approach.

But we can observe that the specifications corresponding to the bottom level \(N_0\) of the tree have disjoint interiors. And then use Lemma 2.11, which says that any new specification in the inductive process must have length at least 500, to obtain

\[
t^{N}_{\ell+1} - t^{N}_{\ell} \geq 498 \cdot \#\{\text{bottom level nodes}\};
\]

without caring about the end segments of the bottom specifications and neither if the nodes in the tree were black or white.

An example of the inductive process appears in Figure 4. The nodes of the tree are the approaches implied by Statement 2.10. The height of the node bounds the size of the approach, namely \(Q^{-N+k}\). The numbers near a node are the quantity of approaches in upper levels of the tree which are adjacent to the approach of the node, either at its left or at its right. These numbers are also equal to -1 + the quantity of jumps of the two new periodic specifications determined by the node. Thus the numbers are associated to the branches issued from the node. The branches in the tree are the new periodic specifications of the next level \(Q^{-N+k+1}\) obtained by cutting through the approach of the issuing node. Most of the nodes issue two branches but some of them issue only one branch. These are the nodes \(0\) which issue only one branch corresponding to the number 0, i.e. a periodic specification with only one branch; and the node \(0 \bullet 2\) which issues one branch corresponding to the number 0 and no branch for the number 2, because it is a periodic specification with 3 jumps and we are stopping the process at at most two jumps.

We now describe the possible nodes that end a branch with number 0 in subsection 2.4 and a branch with number 1 in subsection 2.5.

### 2.4. Childs of a 1 jump periodic 1-specification.

Let \(\varphi_{[T_1, T_2]}(\vartheta)\) be a \(Q^{-B}\)-possible 1-specification with only one jump. Statement 2.10 implies the existence of an approach \((\varphi_a(\vartheta), \varphi_b(\vartheta)) \in \mathbb{A}_{B-1}\) where \(T_1 \leq a < a+1 < b \leq T_2\) and

\[
d(\varphi_a(\vartheta), \varphi_b(\vartheta)) < \frac{1}{2^4} Q^{-B+1}.
\]
2.4.1. Case 0 • 1. When both points in the approach are at time interval > 1 from the endpoints of the specification, i.e. when \( a - T_1 > 1, T_2 - b > 1 \) (and \( b - a > 1 \)).

In this case we obtain two child periodic \( Q^{-B+1} \)-possible 1-specifications: \( \varphi_{[a,b]}(\vartheta) \) with 1-jump and \( \{ \varphi_{[T_1,a]}(\vartheta), \varphi_{[b,T_2]}(\vartheta) \} \) with 2-jumps. We write a node 0 • 1 in the tree, representing a specification with 1 jump and another with 2 jumps. The node is black • because at least one (in this case two) of the points of the approach is at distance \( \geq 1 \) from the endpoints of the mother specification.

2.4.2. Case 0 • 0. When one of the points in the \( A_B \) approach\(^3\) is at time interval \( \leq 1 \) from one of the endpoints of the mother specification.

Say \( |a - T_1| \leq 1 \) and \( |b - a| > 1 \).

We have that \( \{ \varphi_{[T_1,a]}(\vartheta), \varphi_{[b,T_2]}(\vartheta) \} \) is a periodic \( Q^{-B+1} \)-specification with \( |T_2 - b| + |a - T_1| \geq 1 \),

then by (148),

\[ |T_2 - b| > 5. \]

We will change the approach to \( \pi = T_1, \bar{b} = b - (a - T_1) = b + (T_1 - a) \). Then

(151) \[ |\bar{b} - T_1| = |\bar{b} - \pi| = |b - a| > 1. \]

(152) \[ |T_2 - \bar{b}| \geq |T_2 - b| - 1 > 1. \]

\(^3\)The set \( A_B \) is defined in (145).
Using (146) and (150) we have that
\begin{align}
(153) \quad d(\varphi_T(\vartheta), \varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta)) & \leq \text{Lip}(\varphi_{T_1-a}) d(\varphi_b(\vartheta), \varphi_a(\vartheta)) < A \cdot \frac{1}{T} Q^{-B+1} \leq \frac{1}{2} Q^{-B+1}.
\end{align}

\begin{align}
(154) \quad d(\varphi_T(\vartheta), \varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta)) & \leq d(\varphi_T(\vartheta), \varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta)) + d(\varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta), \varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta)) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} Q^{-B+1} + Q^{-B} < Q^{-B+1}.
\end{align}

By (151) and (153) we have that \( \varphi_{[T_1, b]}(\vartheta) \) is a periodic \( Q^{-B+1} \)-possible 1-specification with only 1 jump. From (152) and (154) we get that \( \varphi_{[b, T_2]}(\vartheta) \) is another \( Q^{-B+1} \)-possible 1-specification with only 1 jump. In the disc \( \mathbb{D} \) we draw lines \( \overline{T_1 b}, \overline{b T_2} \) representing approaches in \( \mathbb{A}_{B-1} \). Before we had drawn the line \( \overline{T_1 T_2} \) corresponding to a \( Q^{-B} \) approach. These three lines bound a triangular region that we shadow as in Figure 6. In the tree we add a node with numbers \( 0 \bullet 0 \) which represents two specifications with only 1 jump. This node will issue two branches in the next step corresponding to these two child periodic specifications with only one jump. The node is black \( \bullet \) because there is a new point \( \overline{b} \) in the approach which is at time interval at least 1 from the endpoints \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) of the mother specification.

### 2.5. Childs of a 2 jump periodic 1-specification.

Let \( \{ \varphi_{[0,T_1]}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{[T_1,T_2]}(\vartheta_2) \} \) be a \( Q^{-B} \)-possible 1-specification with 2 jumps. In particular
\begin{align}
(155) \quad d(\vartheta_1, \varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta_2)) < Q^{-N} \quad \text{and} \quad d(\varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta_2)) < Q^{-N}.
\end{align}

Statement 2.10 implies the existence of an approach \( (\varphi_a(\vartheta_i), \varphi_b(\vartheta_j)) \in \mathbb{A}_{B-1} \) such that \( |b - a|_{\text{mod } T_2} > 1 \) and
\begin{align}
(156) \quad d(\varphi_a(\vartheta_i), \varphi_b(\vartheta_j)) < \frac{1}{T} Q^{-B+1}.
\end{align}

We can assume that \( \vartheta_i = \vartheta_1 \) and \( a \in [0,T_1] \). The following cases appear in Figure 8.

The first two cases are when the distance \( d(\{a, b\}, \{0, T_1, T_2\}) > 1 \). Interchanging \( \varphi_a(\vartheta_1) \) and \( \varphi_b(\vartheta_2) \) if necessary we can assume that \( 0 < a < a + 1 < b < T_2 \).

#### 2.5.1. Case 1 \( a \bullet 1 \). When \( 0 < a < T_1 < b < T_2 \) and \( d(\{a, b\}, \{0, T_1, T_2\}) \geq 1 \).

Since \( |b - a|_{\text{mod } T_2} \geq 1 \), in this case we have two child \( Q^{-B+1} \)-possible 1-specifications with 2 jumps, namely \( \{ \varphi_{[0,a]}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{[b,T_2]}(\vartheta_2) \} \) and \( \{ \varphi_{[a,T_1]}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{[T_1,b]}(\vartheta_2) \} \). In the disc we draw a line \( \overline{ab} \) and on the tree we add a node with numbers \( 1 \bullet 1 \) and a black node \( \bullet \).

#### 2.5.2. Case 0 \( a \bullet 2 \). When \( 0 < a < a + 1 < b < T_1 < T_2 \) and \( d(\{a, b\}, \{0, T_1, T_2\}) \geq 1 \).

In this case \( \varphi_{[a,b]}(\vartheta_1) \) is a \( Q^{-B+1} \)-possible periodic 1-specification with only 1 jump. Also \( \{ \varphi_{[b,T_1]}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{[T_1,T_2]}(\vartheta_2), \varphi_{[0,a]}(\vartheta_1) \} \) is a \( Q^{-B+1} \)-possible 1-specification with 3 jumps. In
Figure 7. Case $0 \bullet 1$. Here we study the case in which the approach in $A_{B-1}$ implied by Statement 2.10 contains a point $P_0$ at a time interval $0 \leq a < 1$ of one of the endpoints $R_1$ of the mother periodic specification and the other point $P_1$ at a time interval $> 1 + a$ from all the jumping points of the mother specification. Let $R_2$ be the other point in the approach to $R_1$ in the mother specification, i.e., $d(R_1, R_2) < Q^{-B}$. If $P_0 = \varphi_a(R_1)$, we flow the two endpoints to $P_0 := \varphi_{-a}(P_0) = R_1$ and $P_1 := \varphi_{-a}(P_1)$ and calculate that both $(P_0, P_1)$ and $(P_1, R_2)$ are approaches in $A_{B-1}$. They imply two child periodic $Q^{-B+1}$-possible 1-specifications. The approach $(P_0, P_1)$ implies a specification with only one jump and hence we write the number 0 in the next node. The approach $(P_1, R_2)$ implies a specification with two jumps, and hence we write the number 1 in the next node. Since the point $P_1$ is at distance $> 1$ from all the previous endpoints (nodes) in the tree it counts as a new interval of length one in $[t^B_N(\theta), t^{B+1}_N(\theta)]$. So the next node in the tree is coded $1 \bullet 0$. The number 0 issues a new branch corresponding to a periodic specification with only $0 + 1$ jump and the number 1 issues another new branch corresponding to a periodic specification with $1 + 1$ jumps.

Now we study the cases with $d(\{a, b\}, \{0, T_1, T_2\}) < 1$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $a \in [0, T_1)$, $d(a, \{0, T_1\}) < 1 < d(b, \{0, T_1, T_2\})$. Now $a \in [0, T_1]$ and $|a - b|_{\text{mod } T_2} \geq 1$ but $b \in [0, T_2]$. In this case the approach point $\varphi_a(\vartheta_1)$ will not count as
Figure 8. Possible nodes ending a branch with a label 1, i.e. child specifications of a periodic 1-specification with two jumps.

a new interval of length one in $[t_N^\ell(\theta), t_{\ell+1}^N(\theta)]$. Define

$$\overline{a} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a < 1 \leq T_1 - a, \\ T_1 & \text{if } a \geq 1 > T_1 - a. \end{cases}$$

$$\overline{b} := \begin{cases} b - a & \text{if } a < 1 \leq T_1 - a, \\ (b + T_1 - a) \mod T_2 & \text{if } a \geq 1 > T_1 - a. \end{cases}$$

We have that

$$|\overline{a} - \overline{b}| \mod T_2 = |a - b| \mod T_2 \geq 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (157)

Since $d(a, \{0, T_1\}) < d(b, \{0, T_1, T_2\})$ we have that $\{b, \overline{b}\} \subset [0, T_1]$ or $\{b, \overline{b}\} \subset [T_1, T_2]$ and, using that $|\overline{a} - a| < 1$,

$$d(\varphi_{\overline{a}}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{\overline{b}+\overline{a}}(\vartheta_j)) = d(\varphi_{\overline{a}}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{b+\overline{a}}(\vartheta_j))$$

$$\leq \operatorname{Lip}(\varphi_{\overline{a}-a}) d(\varphi_a(\vartheta_1), \varphi_b(\vartheta_j)) < A \cdot \frac{1}{2^A} Q^{-B+1} \leq \frac{1}{2} Q^{-B+1}. \hspace{1cm} (158)$$

Define a new approach $\varphi_c(\overline{v}_1)$ (see Fig. 9) by $\overline{v}_1 := \vartheta_j$ and $c \in \{0, T_1, T_2\}$ is such that

$$\varphi_c(\overline{v}_1) := \begin{cases} \vartheta_1 & \text{if } \overline{a} = 0 \text{ and } \vartheta_j = \vartheta_1, \\ \varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta_1) & \text{if } \overline{a} = T_1 \text{ and } \vartheta_j = \vartheta_1, \\ \varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta_2) & \text{if } \overline{a} = T_1 \text{ and } \vartheta_j = \vartheta_2, \\ \varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta_2) & \text{if } \overline{a} = 0 \text{ and } \vartheta_j = \vartheta_2, \end{cases}$$

where $\{\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2\}$ are the branch labels.
Using (158) have that
\[
d(\varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1), \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)) \leq d(\varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1), \varphi^\pi_1) + d(\varphi^\pi_1, \varphi^\pi_2(\vartheta_j)) \\
\leq \max \left\{ d(\varphi_{\mathcal{T}_2}(\vartheta_2), \vartheta_1), d(\varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_2)) \right\} + d(\varphi^\pi_1, \varphi^\pi_2(\vartheta_j)) \\
\leq Q^{-B} + \frac{1}{2}Q^{-B+1} < Q^{-B+1}.
\] (159)

So that \((\varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1), \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j))\) is an approach in \(\mathbb{M}_{B-1}\). Moreover, we have chosen the approach \(\varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1)\) so that it is in the same orbit segment as \(\varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)\) because \(\bar{\vartheta}_1 = \vartheta_j\). Also
\[
|\bar{\vartheta} - c| = \begin{cases} 
|\bar{\vartheta} - \bar{\vartheta}| = |\bar{\vartheta} - \bar{\vartheta}| \mod T_2 \geq 1 & \text{when } c = \bar{\vartheta}, \\
|\bar{\vartheta} - T_2| = |\bar{\vartheta} - \bar{\vartheta}| \mod T_2 \geq 1 & \text{when } \bar{\vartheta} = 0 \text{ and } c = T_2.
\end{cases}
\]

Then we have proved

2.13. Statement.

The segment \(\varphi_{[c,\bar{\vartheta}]}(\vartheta_j)\) if \(c < \bar{\vartheta}\), (or \(\varphi_{[\bar{\vartheta},c]}(\vartheta_j)\) if \(\bar{\vartheta} < c\)), is a periodic \(Q^{-B+1}\)-possible 1-specification with only one jump.

Define
\[
\vartheta^*_1 := \begin{cases} 
\varphi_{\mathcal{T}_2}(\vartheta_2) & \text{if } \varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1) = \vartheta_1, \\
\varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_2) & \text{if } \varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1) = \varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_1), \\
\varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_1) & \text{if } \varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1) = \varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_2), \\
\vartheta_1 & \text{if } \varphi_c(\bar{\vartheta}_1) = \varphi_{\mathcal{T}_2}(\vartheta_2).
\end{cases}
\]

If \(\vartheta^*_1 = \varphi^\pi_1(\vartheta_1)\), then using (158),
\[
d(\vartheta^*_1, \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)) = d(\varphi^\pi_1(\vartheta_1), \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)) \leq \frac{1}{2}Q^{-B+1}.
\] (160)

If \(\vartheta^*_1 \neq \varphi^\pi_1(\vartheta_1)\) then
\[
d(\vartheta^*_1, \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)) \leq d(\vartheta^*_1, \varphi^\pi_1(\vartheta_1)) + d(\varphi^\pi_1(\vartheta_1), \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)) \\
\leq \max \left\{ d(\varphi_{\mathcal{T}_2}(\vartheta_2), \vartheta_1), d(\varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\vartheta_2)) \right\} + d(\varphi^\pi_1(\vartheta_1), \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)) \\
\leq Q^{-B} + \frac{1}{2}Q^{-B+1} < Q^{-B+1}.
\] (161)

From (160) and (161) we get that
\[
(\vartheta^*_1, \varphi^\pi_\bar{\vartheta}(\vartheta_j)) \in \mathbb{M}_{B-1}.
\] (162)
2.5.3. Case 0 • 1. When $d(\overline{b}, \{0, T_1, T_2\}) \geq 1$.

Say that $\varphi_\pi(\vartheta_1) = \vartheta_1$, the other case ($\varphi_\pi(\vartheta_1) = \varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta_1)$) is similar. This case $\varphi_\pi(\vartheta_1) = \vartheta_1$ is described in the two upper pictures in Figure 9. In this case we count $\varphi_b(\vartheta_1)$ as a new interval of length 1 in $[t^N(\theta), t^N_{\ell+1}(\theta)]$ and we write a black dot • in the tree. If $0 < \overline{b} < T_1$ (and $\vartheta_j = \vartheta_1, \overline{a} = 0$) then by (158), $\varphi_{[0, \overline{b}]}(\vartheta_1)$ is a periodic $Q^{-B+1}$-possible 1-specification with only 1 jump, and we write 0• in the node in the tree. In this case $0 < \overline{b} < T_1$ we also have that $\{\varphi_{[\overline{b}, T_1]}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{[T_1, T_2]}(\vartheta_2)\}$ is a $Q^{-B+1}$-possible 1-specification with 2 jumps. We complete the information writing 0• 1 in the node in the tree. In the disc we draw a line $\vartheta_1 \varphi_b(\vartheta_1)$ and another line $\varphi_{[\overline{b}, T_1]}(\vartheta_1) \varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta_2)$, which is also $\varphi_\pi(\vartheta_1) \vartheta_1$. By (158) and (162) respectively, both lines are approaches in $A_{B-1}$. These lines together with the previously drawn line $\varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta_2) \vartheta_1$ bound a triangle that we shadow. The shadow means that we will
not consider new approaches whose lines enter in the shadow and also that the three pairs corresponding to the edges of the triangles are approaches in $A_{B-1}$. The shadow gives a node in the tree with two sides, left and right, chosen at the readers will, with numbers which are the amount of jumps seen in the region of the disc separated by the shadow, in this case $0 \cdot 1$. Each number which is less than 2 in turn issues a new branch in the tree.

Figure 10. Case $0 \otimes$. In this case the white dot $\bar{b}$ is at time distance $d(\bar{b}, \{0, T_2 \}) \leq 1$ from the endpoints of its orbit segment. It could even be that $\{a, b\} \subset \{0, T_1, T_2\}$. By Statement 2.13 the approach $(\varphi_c(\vartheta), \varphi_d(\vartheta)) \in A_{B-1}$ always determines a new periodic $Q^{-B+1}$-possible 1-specification with only one jump which was not considered before. For simplicity we forget about the rest of the mother specification and shadow the region delimited by it. In the tree we label the node with $0 \otimes$. This node will issue a branch with label 0. From subsection 2.4 and Figure 6 such branch with label 0 (i.e. a 1-specification with only one jump) will restart the duplication process because it always have two childs because its node is either $0 \cdot 0$ or $0 \cdot 1$.

If $T_1 < \bar{b} < T_2$ we have that $\{\varphi_{[0,T_1]}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{[T_1,T_2]}(\vartheta_2)\}$ is a $Q^{-B+1}$-possible 1-specification with 2 jumps and $\varphi_{[\bar{b},T_2]}(\vartheta_2)$ is a periodic $Q^{-B+1}$-possible 1-specification with only 1 jump. In this case we also write a node with $1 \cdot 0$ in the tree. The black node $\bullet$ will have two branches in the tree corresponding to numbers 0 and 1. We similarly also shadow the triangle bounded by the lines $\varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta_1), \varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta_2), \varphi_{T_1}(\vartheta_2)$, $\varphi_{T_2}(\vartheta_2)$. And we notice that by (158), (159) and (155) respectively, the three lines are approaches in $A_{B-1}$.
2.5.4. Case $0\otimes$. When $d(b, \{0, T_1, T_2\}) \leq 1$.

Say that $\varphi_a(\vartheta_1) = \vartheta_1$, the other case is similar. Since by (157) $|\bar{b} - \bar{a}| \mod T_2 \geq 1$, in this case $|\bar{b} - T_1| < 1$ and then neither of the two points in the approach is implying a new interval of length one. We write a white (or empty) node $\otimes$ in the tree. By Statement 2.13 this situation implies at least one child specification with only one jump corresponding to the approach $(\varphi_c(\vartheta_j), \varphi_{\bar{T}}(\vartheta_j)) \in A_{B-1}$. For simplicity we will forget about the other parts of the mother specification. This case is shown in Figure 10. We draw a line $\varphi_c(\vartheta_j) \varphi_{\bar{T}}(\vartheta_j)$ and shadow the complement in the mother specification of the region bounded by the segment $\varphi_{[c, \bar{T}]}(\vartheta_j)$ or $\varphi_{[\bar{T}, c]}(\vartheta_j)$ and the line $\varphi_c(\vartheta_j) \varphi_{\bar{T}}(\vartheta_j)$, as shown in Figure 10. On the tree we write a label $0\otimes$ on the node. This node will issue only one branch corresponding to the label 0: i.e. a child periodic $Q^{-N+1}$-possible 1-specification with only one jump. Indeed, Statement 2.13 says it is a $Q^{-N+1}$-possible 1-specification.

**Figure 11.** From the childhood possibilities given in Figures 6 and 8 we construct the possible sub-trees of two and three levels to show that they satisfy Claim 2.14. Claim 2.14 asks for at least two black nodes in the sub-tree with three levels and at least two ending nodes in the subtree with three levels. The dotted lines denote that from this node we have at least one branch that continues to levels 2 and 3. White dots $\circ$ denote that we don’t know if the ending node is black $\bullet$ or empty $\otimes$. Since by Figures 6 and 8 each node issues at least one branch, we have that if the sub-tree at level 2 satisfies Claim 2.14, then the sub-tree at level 3 also satisfies Claim 2.14. In Figure 12 we develop the 2 level sub-tree for the case $1 \bullet 1 \rightarrow 0\otimes$ and show that in fact we don’t need the three level sub-tree because all the sub-trees with two levels already satisfy Claim 2.14.
Our tree has black nodes and white nodes. Each black node is at time interval at least one from the other nodes. So we have that

\[(163) \quad t_{t+1}^N - t_t^N \geq \# \{\text{black nodes}\}.\]

In order to have the estimate in Proposition 2.9 it is enough to prove that

2.14. Claim. Given a node \(P\) at level \(B \geq 3\) the next three levels in the tree, \(B - 1\), \(B - 2\) and \(B - 3\), contain at least two black nodes below the node \(P\) (not counting the node \(P\)); and also the level \(B - 3\) below the node \(P\) has at least two nodes, black or white.

This is because each node, black or white, has at least one successor in the next level. So at any two levels the number of black dots is duplicated and the number of successor branches is duplicated. This gives an exponential rate of growth of \(3\sqrt{2}\) new black dots per level.

In subsection \(\S\) 2.4 and Figure 6 we showed all the possible nodes ending a branch with label 0, namely 0 • 0 and 0 • 1. Also subsection \(\S\) 2.5 and Figure 8 show the possible nodes ending a branch with label 1. We get that all the possible labels of a node are 0\(\otimes\), 0 • 0, 0 • 1, 0 • 2, 1 • 1 and their symmetric labels 1 • 0, 2 • 0. All these nodes issue at least one branch. In Figure 11 we show the possibilities of two or three labels issued by any node. The dotted branches and white dots \(\circ\) denote that there is at least one branch issued and we don’t know if it ends in a black dot • or empty node \(\otimes\). Figure 11 shows that Claim 2.14 is satisfied. In most cases in Figure 11 we develop the tree only two levels because with two levels we already have at least two ending nodes and two black dots in the sub-tree. Since each ending node will issue at least one branch the sub-tree with three labels will have at least the same amount of ending nodes as the sub-tree with two labels. Therefore if a sub-tree with two labels already satisfies Claim 2.14 its continuation to three labels also satisfies Claim 2.14. The only sub-tree with three labels on Figure 11
is a node $1 \cdot 1$ followed with a node $0 \otimes$. In this case the node $0 \otimes$ issues at least two descendant black nodes in two labels. This implies that the three level sub-tree satisfies Claim 2.14. In fact this case already satisfies Claim 2.14 in two labels as seen in Figure 12 where the right branch has been developed. So in fact we have a better exponential rate $\sqrt{2}$ in Proposition 2.9.

The diagrams in Figure 11 exploit the fact that as in Figure 6, a branch with label 0 ends in a node with label $0 \cdot 0$ or $0 \cdot 1$. In both cases this node has two branches and at least one new branch with label 0. The diagrams are ordered first by the label of the upper node, then by the existence in the next level of a given label. Then in the last diagram we have an upper node $1 \cdot 1$ issuing a node with label $1 \cdot 1$, for the other node at level 1 the other possibilities $0 \otimes, 0 \cdot 1, 0 \cdot 2$, given from Figure 8 have already been studied in the previous diagrams, it only remains to study a second node with label $1 \cdot 1$.

This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.9.

□

APPENDIX A. ENTROPY.

Let $\phi_t$ be a continuous flow without fixed points on a compact metric space $X$.

For $T > 0$ define the distance $d_T$ on $X$ by

$$d_T(x, y) := \max_{s \in [0, T]} d(\phi_s(x), \phi_s(y)).$$

For $\delta, T > 0, x \in X$ the dynamic ball $V(x, T, \delta)$ is defined as the closed ball of radius $\delta$ for the distance $d_T$ centered at $x$, equivalently

$$V(x, T, \delta) := \{ y \in X \mid \forall s \in [0, T] \quad d(\phi_s(x), \phi_s(y)) \leq \delta \}.$$

Given $E, F \subset X$ we say that $E$ is a $(T, \delta)$-spanning set for $F$ (or that it $(T, \delta)$-spans $F$) iff

$$F \subset \bigcup_{e \in E} V(e, T, \delta).$$

Let

$$r(F, T, \delta) := \min\{\#E \mid E \quad (T, \delta)\text{-spans } F\}.$$

If $F$ is compact, the continuity of $\phi_t$ implies that $r(F, T, \delta) < \infty$. Let

$$\tau_\phi(F, \delta) := \limsup_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \log r(F, T, \delta).$$

We say that $E \subset X$ is $(T, \delta)$-separated if

$$x, y \in E, \quad x \neq y \quad \Rightarrow \quad V(x, T, \delta) \cap V(y, T, \delta) = \emptyset.$$
Given $F \subset X$ let

$$s(F, T, \delta) := \max \{ \# E \mid E \subset F, \ E \text{ is } (T, \delta)\text{-separated} \}.$$  

If $F$ is compact, Theorem 6.4 in [46] shows that $s(F, T, \delta) < \infty$. Let

$$\overline{s}_\phi(F, \delta) := \limsup_{T \to +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \log s(F, T, \delta).$$

Define the topological entropy by

$$h_{top}(F, \phi) := \lim_{\delta \to 0} \overline{s}_\phi(F, \delta) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \overline{s}_\phi(F, \delta).$$

By Lemma 1 in [4] these limits exist and are equal.

In fact the topological entropy of a flow $\phi$ equals the topological entropy of the homeomorphism $\phi_1$, and more generally $h(\phi_t) = |t| h(\phi)$, see Proposition 21 in [4].

Denote by $\mathcal{B}(X)$ the Borel $\sigma$-algebra of $X$. Let $f : X \to X$ be a measurable map. Denote by $\mathcal{M}(f)$ the set of $f$-invariant Borel probabilities on $X$. Given a finite Borel partition $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(X)$ of $X$ and an $f$-invariant Borel probability $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(f)$ define its entropy by

$$H_\mu(\mathcal{A}) := -\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \mu(A) \log \mu(A).$$

Given two finite Borel partitions $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ of $X$ define $\mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B}$ as

$$\mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B} := \{ A \cap B \mid A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B} \}.$$  

From Walters [47, Theorem 4.10], the map

$$N^+ \ni N \mapsto \frac{1}{N} H_\mu\left( \bigvee_{n=0}^{N-1} f^{-n}(\mathcal{A}) \right)$$

is decreasing.

Let

$$h_\mu(f, \mathcal{A}) := \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} H_\mu\left( \bigvee_{n=0}^{N-1} f^{-n}(\mathcal{A}) \right).$$

The (metric) entropy of $\mu$ under $f$ is defined as

$$h_\mu(f) := \sup \{ h_\mu(f, \mathcal{A}) \mid \mathcal{A} \text{ is a Borel partition of } X \}.$$  

### A.1. Theorem (Variational Principle) (cf. Walters [47, Theorem 8.6])

Let $f : X \to X$ be a continuous map of a compact metric space $X$. Then

$$h_{top}(X, f) = \sup \{ h_\mu(f) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{M}(f) \}.$$  

---

4 More generally $\mathcal{A} \vee \mathcal{B} = \sigma(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B})$ is the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. This is the definition used for an infinite refinement $\bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_i$. 

---
A.2. Definition.

Let $f : X \to X$ be a homeomorphism. For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in X$ define

$$\Gamma_{\varepsilon}(x, f) := \{ y \in X \mid \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad d(f^n(y), f^n(x)) \leq \varepsilon \}.$$ 

We say that $f$ is entropy expansive or $h$-expansive if there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in X \quad h_{\text{top}}(\Gamma_{\varepsilon}(x, f), f) = 0.$$ 

Such an $\varepsilon$ is called an $h$-expansive constant for $f$.

The following theorems use the definition from Hurewicz and Wallman [31] of a finite dimensional metric space. They mainly use the property from the Corollary to Theorem V.1, page 55 in [31], that if the metric space $X$ has dimension $\leq m$, then for any $\gamma > 0$, $X$ has a covering $\mathcal{B}(\gamma)$ of diameter $< \gamma$, such that no point in $X$ is in more than $m + 1$ elements of $\mathcal{B}(\gamma)$.

A.3. Theorem (Bowen [5, Theorem 3.5]).

Let $X$ be a finite dimensional metric space and $f : X \to X$ a uniformly continuous homeomorphism. Suppose that $\varepsilon > 0$ is an $h$-expansive constant for $f$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite Borel partition of $X$ with $\text{diam} \mathcal{A} < \varepsilon$ then $h_{\mu}(f) = h_{\mu}(f, \mathcal{A})$.

A.4. Definition.

A continuous flow $\phi : \mathbb{R} \times X \to X$ is said flow expansive (cf. [9]) if for every $\eta > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $x, y \in X$ and $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous with $\alpha(0) = 0$ such that $\forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad d(\phi_t(x), \phi_{\alpha(t)}(y)) \leq \delta$, then $y = \phi_v(x)$ for some $|v| \leq \eta$. Observe that if a flow $\phi$ is flow expansive then its time 1 map $\phi_1$ is entropy expansive.

For a continuous flow $\phi : \mathbb{R} \times X \to X$, the metric entropy $h_{\mu}(\phi)$ of a $\phi$-invariant Borel probability measure $\mu$ is defined as the metric entropy of its time one map $h_{\mu}(\phi) := h_{\mu}(\phi_1)$.

A.5. Definition.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a topological subspace of $C^0(X, X) \supset \mathcal{U}$ and $Y \subseteq X$ compact. We say that $\mathcal{U}$ is uniformly $h$-expansive on $Y$ if there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{U} \quad \forall y \in Y \quad h_{\text{top}}(\Gamma_{\varepsilon}(y, f), f) = 0.$$ 

In our applications $\mathcal{U}$ will be a $C^1$ neighbourhood of a diffeomorphism endowed with the $C^0$ topology. An $h$-expansive homeomorphism corresponds to $\mathcal{U} = \{ f \}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}(X)$ be the set of Borel probability measures on $X$ endowed with the weak* topology. Let $\mathcal{M}(f) \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$ the subspace of $f$-invariant probabilities.
A.6. Theorem.

Let $X$ be a finite dimensional compact metric space, $Y \subseteq X$ compact and let $U \subseteq C^0(X, X)$ be a uniformly $h$-expansive set on $Y$. Then the entropy map $(\mu, f) \mapsto h_\mu(f)$ is upper semicontinuous on $U$, i.e.

if $f \in U$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(f)$ and $\text{supp} \mu \subseteq Y$ then given $\varepsilon > 0$ there are open sets $V, U, f \in V \subseteq C^0(X, X)$ and $\mu \in U \subseteq \mathcal{P}(Y)$ such that

$$\forall g \in U \cap V, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{M}(g) \cap U \cap \mathcal{P}(Y) \quad h_\nu(g) \leq h_\mu(f) + \varepsilon.$$ 

In particular, this applies to time-one maps of uniformly expansive flows as in Remark B.9, giving

$$\limsup_{(\psi^n, \nu_n) \to (\phi, \mu)} h_{\nu_n}(\psi^n) \leq h_{\mu}(\phi).$$

Proof:

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a uniform entropy $h$-expansivity constant on $Y$ for all $f \in U$. Fix $f \in U$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(f)$ and let $\delta > 0$.

Let $C = \{C_1, \ldots, C_n\}$ be a finite partition of $Y$ by Borel sets with $\text{diam} C_i < \varepsilon$. By Theorem A.3, $h_\nu(g) = h_\nu(g, C)$ for all $g \in U$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(g)$. Let $N$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{N} H_\mu\left(\bigvee_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k} C\right) < h_\mu(f) + \frac{1}{2} \delta.$$ 

Since $\mu$ is regular, there are compact sets

$$K_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}} \subseteq \bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k} C_{i_k}$$

such that

$$\mu\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k} C_{i_k} \setminus K_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}}\right) < \varepsilon_1.$$ 

Then

$$L_j := \bigcup_{k=0}^{N-1} \bigcup_{i_k = j} f^k K_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}} \subseteq C_j.$$ 

The sets $L_1, \ldots, L_n$ are compact and disjoint so there is a partition $\mathcal{D} := \{D_1, \ldots, D_n\}$ with $\text{diam}(D_j) < \varepsilon$ and $L_j \subseteq \text{int}(D_j)$. We have that

$$K_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}} \subseteq \text{int}\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k} D_{i_k}\right).$$

Choose open subsets $W_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}}$ such that

$$K_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}} \subseteq W_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}} \subseteq \overline{W_{i_0 \cdots i_{N-1}}} \subseteq \text{int}\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k} D_{i_k}\right).$$
We have that

\[ f^k\left(W_{i_0...i_{N-1}}\right) \subset \text{int} D_{i_k}. \]

Choose a relatively open subset \( f \in U_1 \subset U \) such that

\[ \forall g \in U_1 \quad \forall (i_0, \ldots, i_{N-1}) \quad \forall k \in \{0, \ldots, N-1\} \quad g^k\left(W_{i_0...i_{N-1}}\right) \subset \text{int} D_{i_k}. \]

So that

\[ \forall g \in U_1 \quad K_{i_0...i_{N-1}} \subset W_{i_0...i_{N-1}} \subset \text{int} \left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{-k}D_{i_k}\right). \]

By Urysohn's Lemma there exist \( \psi_{i_N} \in C^0(X, \mathbb{R}) \) such that

- \( 0 \leq \psi_{i_0...i_N} \leq 1. \)
- equals 1 on \( K_{i_0...i_{N-1}}. \)
- vanishes on \( X \setminus W_{i_0...i_{N-1}}. \)

Define

\[ U_{i_0...i_{N-1}} := \left\{ m \in \mathcal{P}(Y) : \left| \int \psi_{i_0...i_{N-1}} dm - \int \psi_{i_0...i_{N-1}} d\mu \right| < \varepsilon_1 \right\}. \]

The set \( U_{i_0...i_{N-1}} \) is open in \( \mathcal{P}(Y) \) and if \( m \in U_{i_0...i_{N-1}} \) and \( g \in U_1 \) then

\[ m\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{-k}D_{i_k}\right) \geq \int \psi_{i_0...i_{N-1}} dm > \int \psi_{i_0...i_{N-1}} d\mu - \varepsilon_1 \geq \mu(K_{i_0...i_{N-1}}) - \varepsilon_1. \]

From (166) and (167) we get that

\[ \mu\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k}C_{i_k}\right) - m\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{-k}D_{i_k}\right) < 2\varepsilon_1. \]

If \( U := \bigcap_{i_0...i_{N-1}} U_{i_0...i_{N-1}} \) and \( m \in U \) and \( g \in U_1 \) then:

\[ \left| \mu\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k}C_{i_k}\right) - m\left(\bigcap_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{-k}D_{i_k}\right) \right| < 2\varepsilon_1n^N, \]

because if \( \sum_{i=1}^q a_i = 1 = \sum_{i=1}^q b_i \) and there exists \( c > 0 \) such that \( a_i - b_i < c \) for all \( i \), then

\[ \forall i \quad |a_i - b_i| < c q, \]

because \( b_i - a_i = \sum_{j \neq i} (a_j - b_j) < c q. \)

So if \( m \in U, g \in U_1 \) and \( \varepsilon_1 \) is small enough, for \( N \) fixed in (165), the continuity of \( x \log x \) gives:

\[ \frac{1}{N} H_m\left(\bigcup_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{-k}D\right) < \frac{1}{N} H_\mu\left(\bigcup_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k}C\right) + \frac{\delta}{2}. \]
Hence, for \( g \in U_1 \), \( m \in U \cap M(g) \) and \( \varepsilon_1 \) small enough, using Theorem A.3 and (164) we have that
\[
\begin{align*}
    h_m(g) &= h_m(g, \mathbb{D}) \\
    &\leq \frac{1}{N} H_m\left( \bigvee_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{-k} \mathbb{D} \right) \\
    &\leq \frac{1}{N} H_\mu\left( \bigvee_{k=0}^{N-1} f^{-k} \mathcal{C} \right) + \frac{\delta}{2} < h_\mu(f) + \delta.
\end{align*}
\]
\( \square \)

Let \( W(x, N, \varepsilon) \) be the dynamic ball for the time 1 map \( \phi_1 \):
\[
W(x, N, \varepsilon) := \{ y \in X \mid d(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)) \leq \varepsilon \quad \forall n = 0, \ldots, N - 1 \}.
\]
Given \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is \( \delta > 0 \) such that
\[
(168) \quad x, y \in X, \quad d(x, y) < \delta \implies \forall t \in [0, 1] \quad d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) < \varepsilon.
\]
If \( \varepsilon, \delta \) are as in (168), \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( N \leq T \leq N + 1 \), we have that
\[
(169) \quad W(x, N + 1, \delta) \subset V(x, N, \delta) \subset W(x, N, \varepsilon).
\]
Using (169) we can use the Brin-Katok theorem for maps (cf. Brin-Katok [11]) to obtain

A.7. **Theorem** (Brin-Katok [11]).

*If \( \mu \) is an ergodic \( \phi \)-invariant Borel probability, then for \( \mu \)-almost every \( x \in X \) we have*
\[
\begin{align*}
    h_\mu(\phi) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{T \to +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \log \mu(V(x, T, \varepsilon)) \\
    &= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \liminf_{N \to +\infty} -\frac{1}{N} \log \mu(W(x, N, \varepsilon)).
\end{align*}
\]

**APPENDIX B. SHADOWING.**

Let \( \phi \) be the flow of a \( C^1 \) vector field on a compact manifold \( M \). A compact \( \phi \)-invariant subset \( \Lambda \subset M \) is *hyperbolic* for \( \phi \) if the tangent bundle restricted to \( \Lambda \) is decomposed as the Whitney sum \( T_\Lambda M = E^s \oplus E \oplus E^u \), where \( E \) is the 1-dimensional vector bundle tangent to the flow and there are constants \( C, \lambda > 0 \) such that
\[
\begin{align*}
    (a) & \quad D\phi_t(E^s) = E^s, \quad D\phi_t(E^u) = E^u \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \\
    (b) & \quad |D\phi_t(v)| \leq C e^{-\lambda t} |v| \quad \text{for all } v \in E^s, \quad t \geq 0. \\
    (c) & \quad |D\phi_{-t}(u)| \leq C e^{-\lambda t} |u| \quad \text{for all } u \in E^u, \quad t \geq 0.
\end{align*}
\]
It follows from the definition that the hyperbolic splitting $E^s \oplus E \oplus E^u$ over $\Lambda$ is continuous.

From now on we shall assume that $\Lambda$ does not contain fixed points for $\phi$. For $x \in \Lambda$ define the following stable and unstable sets:

\[
W^{ss}(x) := \{ y \in M \mid d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \to 0 \text{ as } t \to +\infty \},
\]

\[
W^{ss}_\varepsilon(x) := \{ y \in W^{ss}(x) \mid d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \varepsilon \ \forall t \geq 0 \},
\]

\[
W^{uu}(x) := \{ y \in M \mid d(\phi^{-t}(x), \phi^{-t}(y)) \to 0 \text{ as } t \to +\infty \},
\]

\[
W^{uu}_\varepsilon(x) := \{ y \in W^{uu}(x) \mid d(\phi^{-t}(x), \phi^{-t}(y)) \leq \varepsilon \ \forall t \geq 0 \},
\]

\[
W^s_\varepsilon(x) := \{ y \in M \mid d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \varepsilon \ \forall t \geq 0 \},
\]

\[
W^u_\varepsilon(x) := \{ y \in M \mid d(\phi^{-t}(x), \phi^{-t}(y)) \leq \varepsilon \ \forall t \geq 0 \}.
\]

Conditions (b) and (c) are equivalent to

(d) There exists $T > 0$ such that $\|D\phi_T|_{E^s}\| < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|D\phi^{-T}|_{E^u}\| < \frac{1}{2}$.

Let $X^k(M)$ be the Banach manifold of the $C^k$ vector fields on $M$, $k \geq 1$. Let $X = \partial_t \phi_t$ the vector field of $\phi_t$.

### B.1. Proposition.

There are open sets $X \in \mathcal{U} \subset X^1(M)$ and $\Lambda \subset U \subset M$ such that for every $Y \in \mathcal{U}$ the set $\Lambda_Y := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi^Y_t(U)$ is hyperbolic for the flow $\psi^Y_t$ of $Y$, with uniform constants $C$, $\lambda$, $T$ on (b), (c) and (d).

Proposition B.1 can be proven by a characterization of hyperbolicity using cones (cf. Hasselblatt-Katok [29, Proposition 17.4.4]) and obtaining uniform contraction (expansion) for a fixed iterate in $\Lambda_Y$. 
B.2. **Proposition** (Hirsch, Pugh, Shub [30, Corollary 5.6, p. 63], Bowen [6, Prop. 1.3]).

There are constants \( C, \lambda > 0 \) such that, for small \( \varepsilon, \)

(a) \( d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq C e^{-\lambda t} d(x, y) \) when \( x \in \Lambda, y \in W^s_\varepsilon(x), t \geq 0. \)

(b) \( d(\phi_{-t}(x), \phi_{-t}(y)) \leq C e^{-\lambda t} d(x, y) \) when \( x \in \Lambda, y \in W^u_\varepsilon(x), t \geq 0. \)

B.3. **Canonical Coordinates** [40, (3.1)], [30, (4.1)], [44, (7.4)], [6, (1.4)], [7, (1.2)]:

There are \( \delta, \gamma > 0 \) for which the following is true: If \( x, y \in \Lambda \) and \( d(x, y) \leq \delta \) then there is a unique \( v = v(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( |v| \leq \gamma \) such that

\[
\langle x, y \rangle := W^s_\gamma(\phi_v(x)) \cap W^u_\gamma(y) \neq \emptyset.
\]

This set consists of a single point, which we denote \( \langle x, y \rangle \in M \). The maps \( v \) and \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) are continuous on the set \( \{ (x, y) \mid d(x, y) \leq \delta \} \subset \Lambda \times \Lambda. \)

We will take a small neighborhoods \( \Lambda \subset U \subset M \) and \( U \subset \mathcal{X}^1(M) \) and take uniform constants from B.2 and B.3 which hold for every \( Y \in U \) and all points in the maximal invariant set \( \Lambda^Y_U := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{U} \). The following proposition is a modification of Bowen [6, Prop. 1.6, p. 4] which we prove below.

B.4. **Proposition.**

There are open sets \( X \in U \subset \mathcal{X}^1(M) \) and \( \Lambda \subset U \subset M \) and \( \eta_0 > 0, B > 1 \) such that

\[
\forall \eta > 0 \quad \exists \beta = \beta(\eta) = \frac{1}{B} \min\{\eta, \eta_0\} \quad \forall Y \in U
\]

if \( \psi_t = \psi^Y_t \) is the flow of \( Y, x, y \in \Omega^Y_U := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi_t(U) \) and \( s : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) continuous with \( s(0) = 0 \) satisfy

\[
d(\psi_{t+s(t)}(y), \psi_t(x)) \leq \beta \quad \text{for } |t| \leq L,
\]

then

\[
|s(t)| \leq 3\eta \quad \text{for all } |t| \leq L, \quad |v(x, y)| \leq \eta \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\forall |s| \leq L, \quad d(\psi_s(y), \psi_{s+v}(x)) \leq C e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)} \left[ d(\psi_L(y), \psi_L(x)) + d(\psi_{-L}(w), \psi_{-L+v}(x)) \right],
\]

where \( w := \langle x, y \rangle = W^s_\gamma(\psi_v(x)) \cap W^u_\gamma(y). \)

also

\[
\forall |s| \leq L, \quad d(\psi_s(y), \psi_{s}\psi_v(x)) \leq C \gamma e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)}.
\]

In particular

\[
d(y, \psi_v(x)) \leq C \gamma e^{-\lambda L}.
\]

For the proof of Proposition B.4 we need the following
B.5. **Lemma.** There is $\eta_0 > 0$ and $B > 1$ such that
if $d(x, y) \leq \eta_0$, $Y \in \mathcal{U}$, $x, y \in \Lambda^Y$ and $\eta = B d(x, y)$ then
\begin{align}
\langle x, y \rangle \in W_{\eta}^{ss}(\psi^Y_v(x)) \cap W_{\eta}^{uu}(y) \quad \text{with} \quad |v(x, y)| \leq \eta \\
\text{and} \quad d(x, \psi^Y_v(x)) \leq \eta.
\end{align}

**Proof:**

We have that $\langle x, x \rangle = x$ and $v(x, x) = 0$. By uniform continuity, given $\delta > 0$, for $d(x, y)$ small enough
\begin{align}
d(\langle x, y \rangle, x) \leq \delta, \quad d(\langle x, y \rangle, y) \leq \delta,
\end{align}
and $v = v(x, y)$ is so small that
\begin{align}
d(\psi_v(x), x) \leq \delta.
\end{align}

The continuity of the hyperbolic splitting implies that the angles $\angle(E^s, E^u)$, $\angle(Y, E^s)$ and $\angle(E^s \oplus \mathbb{R}Y, E^u)$ are bounded away from zero, uniformly on $\Lambda^Y$, for some $V \supset U$ and all $Y$ in an open set $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{X}(M)$ with $X \in \mathcal{U}_0$. There is $\beta_1 > 0$ such that if $x, y \in \Lambda^Y$, and $d(x, y) < \beta_1$ then
\[\langle x, y \rangle = W^s_\gamma(x) \cap W^{uu}_\gamma(y) \in V.\]

The strong local invariant manifolds $W^s_\gamma$, $W^{uu}_\gamma$ are tangent to $E^s$, $E^u$ at $\Lambda^Y$, and for a fixed $\gamma$ as $C^1$ submanifolds they vary continuously on the base point $x \in M$ and on the vector field in $C^1$ topology (cf. [22, Thm. 4.3][30, Thm. 4.1]). There is a family of small cones $E^u_X(x) \subset C^u(x) \subset T_x M$, $E^s_X(x) \subset C^s(x) \subset T_x M$ defined on a neighbourhood $W$ of $\Lambda$ such that $\exp_x(C^u(x) \cap B_8(0))$, $\exp_x(C^s(x) \cap B_8(0))$ are invariant under $\psi^Y_1$ and $\psi^Y_1$, respectively, for $Y$ in a $C^1$ neighborhood $W$ of $X$. These cones contain $W^{uu}_\gamma(x)$ and $W^s_\gamma(x)$ for $x \in \Lambda^Y$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}$. The angles between these cones are uniformly bounded away from zero, so for example if $z^u \in W^{uu}(x)$, $z^s \in W^{ss}(x)$ and $d(z^u, x)$, $d(z^s, x)$ are small, then $d(z^u, x) + d(z^s, x) < A_0 d(z^u, z^s)$ for some $A_0 > 0$. We can construct similar cones separating $E^u$ from $E^s \oplus \mathbb{R}X$.

Shrinking $U$ and $\mathcal{U}$ if necessary there are $0 < \beta_2 < \beta_1$ and $A_1, A_2, A_3 > 0$ such that if $Y \in \mathcal{U}$, $x, y \in \Lambda^Y$, and $d(x, y) < \beta_2$, taking $w := \langle x, y \rangle \in W^s_\gamma(x) \cap W^{uu}_\gamma(y)$ and $v$ such that $w \in W^{ss}_\gamma(\psi^Y_v(x))$, i.e. $\psi_v(x) \in \psi^Y_[-1,1](x) \cap W^{ss}_\gamma(w)$, then
\begin{align}
d(x, w) + d(w, y) \leq A_1 d(x, y), \\
d(x, \psi^Y_v(x)) + d(\psi^Y_v(x), w) \leq A_2 d(x, w) \leq A_2 A_1 d(x, y), \\
|v| \leq A_3 d(x, \psi^Y_v(x)) \leq A_3 A_2 A_1 d(x, y).
\end{align}
We can assume that \( U_0 \) and \( U \) are so small that the constants \( C, \lambda, \varepsilon \) in Proposition B.2 can be taken uniform for all \( Y \in U_0 \) and in \( \Lambda_Y \). By Proposition B.2, since \( \langle x, y \rangle \in W^{ss}_\gamma(\psi_v(x)) \), we have that
\[
\forall t \geq 0 \quad d(\psi_t(\langle x, y \rangle), \psi_t(\psi_v(x))) \leq C e^{-\lambda t} d(w, \psi_v(x)) \\
\leq A_2 A_1 C e^{-\lambda t} d(x, y) \quad \text{using (181)}.
\]
Take \( B_1 := (1 + A_2)A_1C \). Then if \( d(x, y) < \beta_2 \) and \( \eta = B_1 d(x, y) \) we obtain that \( \langle x, y \rangle \in W^{ss}_\eta(\psi_v(x)) \).

Since \( \langle x, y \rangle \in W^{uu}_\gamma(y) \) we have that
\[
\forall t \geq 0 \quad d(\psi_{-t}(\langle x, y \rangle), \psi_{-t}(\psi_v(x))) \leq C e^{-\lambda t} d(w, y) \\
\leq A_1 C e^{-\lambda t} d(x, y) \quad \text{using (180)}.
\]
Thus if \( \eta = B_1 d(x, y) \) then \( \langle x, y \rangle \in W^{uu}_\eta(y) \).

By (178) and (179) there is \( 0 < \beta_0 < \beta_2 \) such that if \( d(x, y) < \beta_0 \) then \( d(w, x), d(w, y) \) and \( d(\psi_v(x), x) \) are small enough to satisfy the above inequalities. Now let
\[
B := \max\{1, B_1, A_3A_2A_1, A_2A_1\}.
\]

Proof of Proposition B.4:

Let \( \gamma \) be from B.3. We may assume that \( \eta \) is so small that
\begin{align*}
\eta &< \frac{\gamma}{8}, \\
\sup\{d(\psi_u(x), x) : x \in M, |u| \leq 4\eta\} &\leq \frac{\gamma}{8}.
\end{align*}
Let
\[
\beta = \beta(\eta) := \frac{1}{B} \min\{\eta, \eta_0\},
\]
where \( B > 1 \) and \( \eta_0 \) are from Lemma B.5. Consider \( x, y \) and \( s(t) \) as in the hypothesis. Since \( s(0) = 0 \) we have that \( d(x, y) \leq \beta \). Using Lemma B.5 we can define
\[
w := \langle x, y \rangle = W^{ss}_\eta(\psi_v(x)) \cap W^{uu}_\eta(y) \neq \emptyset,
\]
we also have
\[
|v| = |v(x, y)| \leq \eta.
\]
Define the sets
\[
A := \{ t \in [0, L] : |s(t)| \geq 3\eta \quad \text{or} \quad d(\psi_t(y), \psi_t(w)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma \},
\]
\[
B := \{ t \in [0, L] : |s(-t)| \geq 3\eta \quad \text{or} \quad d(\psi_{-t+v}(x), \psi_{-t}(w)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma \}.
\]
Suppose that $A \neq \emptyset$. Let $t_1 := \inf A$. Then $d(\psi_t(y), \psi_t(w)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma, \forall t \in [0, t_1]$. Since $w \in W^u_\eta(y)$ and by (182), $\eta < \frac{1}{\gamma}$; from (170) we have that $d(\psi_t(y), \psi_t(w)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma, \forall t \leq 0$. Therefore
\begin{equation}
(187) \quad d(\psi_{t-r}(y), \psi_{t-r}(w)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma, \quad \forall r \geq 0.
\end{equation}

Since $s$ is continuous, $s(0) = 0$ and $t_1 \in \partial A$, we have that $|s(t_1)| \leq 3\eta$. Using (183) twice with $u = |s(t_1)|$ and the triangle inequality we obtain
\begin{equation}
(188) \quad d(\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)-r}(y), \psi_{t_1+s(t_1)-r}(w)) \leq \frac{3}{2} \gamma, \quad \forall r \geq 0.
\end{equation}

Hence $\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(w) \in W^u_\gamma(\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(y))$. From (185), $w \in W^s(\psi_v(x))$, and then
\begin{equation}
(189) \quad d(\psi_r(w), \psi_{r+v}(x)) \leq \eta < \frac{\gamma}{8}, \quad \forall r \geq 0.
\end{equation}

Since $|s(t_1)| \leq 3\eta$, using (183) twice with $u = s(t_1)$, and (188) with $r = t_1 + p \geq 0$, and the triangle inequality, we get
\begin{equation}
(190) \quad d(\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)+p}(w), \psi_{t_1+s(t_1)+v+p}(x)) \leq \frac{3\gamma}{8}, \quad \forall p \geq 0.
\end{equation}

Hence $\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(w) \in W^s(\psi_{s(t_1)+v}(\psi_v(t_1)(x)))$. We have shown that
\begin{equation}
(191) \quad \psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(w) \in W^s(\psi_{s(t_1)+v}(\psi_v(t_1)(x))) \cap W^u_\gamma(\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(y)).
\end{equation}

Since $|s(t_1)+v| \leq |s(t_1)| + |v| \leq 4\eta < \gamma$ and by (172),
\begin{equation}
(192) \quad d(\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(y), \psi_{t_1}(x)) \leq \beta,
\end{equation}
equation (191) implies that
\begin{align*}
&v(\psi_{t_1}(x), \psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(y)) = s(t_1) + v(x, y), \\
&\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(w) = \langle \psi_{t_1}(x), \psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(y) \rangle.
\end{align*}

By Lemma B.5, (190) and (184),
\begin{equation}
(193) \quad |s(t_1)+v| \leq \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(w) \in W^u_\eta(\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(y)), \text{ in particular}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(194) \quad d(\psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(w), \psi_{t_1+s(t_1)}(y)) \leq \eta.
\end{equation}

Since $|s(t_1)| \leq 3\eta$, from (183), (192) and (182), we get that
\begin{equation}
(195) \quad d(\psi_{t_1}(w), \psi_{t_1}(y)) \leq \eta + 2 \left(\frac{\gamma}{8}\right) \leq \frac{3\gamma}{8}.
\end{equation}

From (191) and (186) we have that
\begin{equation}
|s(t_1)| \leq |s(t_1)+v| + |v| \leq 2\eta.
\end{equation}

These statements contradict $t_1 \in A$. Hence $A = \emptyset$.  
Similarly one shows that \( B = \emptyset \). Since \( A = \emptyset \), inequality (193) holds for all \( t \in [0, L] \). From (185), \( w \in W_{\eta}^{\nu}(y) \) and by (182), \( \eta < \frac{7}{8} \); thus inequality (193) also holds for \( t \leq 0 \).

\[
\forall t \leq L \quad d(\psi_t(y), \psi_t(w)) < \frac{1}{7}\gamma. \tag{193}
\]

Therefore

\[
\psi_L(w) \in W_{\frac{7}{\gamma}}^{\nu}(\psi_L(y)). \tag{194}
\]

From Proposition B.2 we get

\[
\forall |s| \leq L \quad d(\psi_s(w), \psi_s(y)) \leq C e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)} d(\psi_L(w), \psi_L(y)).
\]

Similarly, \( B = \emptyset \) imples that

\[
\psi_L(w) \in W_{\frac{7}{\gamma}}^{\nu}(\psi_{L+v}(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall |s| \leq L \quad d(\psi_s(w), \psi_{s+v}(x)) \leq C e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)} d(\psi_L(w), \psi_{L+v}(x)). \tag{195}
\]

Adding these inequalities we obtain

\[
\forall |s| \leq L \quad d(\psi_s(y), \psi_{s+v}(x)) \leq C e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)} \left[ d(\psi_L(w), \psi_L(y)) + d(\psi_L(w), \psi_{L+v}(x)) \right], \tag{196}
\]

where \( w := \langle x, y \rangle = W_{\eta}^{\nu}(\psi_v(x)) \cup W_{\eta}^{\nu}(y) \).

This proves inequality (174).

From (186), \( |v(x, y)| \leq \eta \). The fact \( A \cup B = \emptyset \) also gives \( |s(t)| \leq 3\eta \) for \( t \in [-L, L] \). This proves (173). From (194), (195) and (196) we get inequality (175).

\[\square\]

**B.6. Proposition.**

Let \( \beta(\eta) \) be from Proposition B.4.

(a) If \( x, y \in \Lambda \) and \( s : [0, +\infty[ \to \mathbb{R} \) continuous with \( s(0) = 0 \) satisfy

\[
d(\phi_{t+s(t)}(y), \phi_t(x)) \leq \beta \quad \forall t \geq 0,
\]

then \( |s(t)| \leq 3\eta \) for all \( t \geq 0 \) and there is \( |v(x, y)| \leq \eta \) such that \( y \in W_{\eta}^{ss}(\phi_v(x)) \).

(b) Similarly, if \( x, y \in \Lambda \), \( s : [-\infty, 0] \to \mathbb{R} \) is continuous with \( s(0) = 0 \) and

\[
d(\phi_{t+s(t)}(y), \phi_t(x)) \leq \beta \quad \forall t \leq 0,
\]

then \( |s(t)| \leq 3\eta \) for all \( t \leq 0 \) and there is \( |v(x, y)| \leq \eta \) such that \( y \in W_{\eta}^{\nu}(\phi_v(x)) \).

**Proof:**

We only prove item (a). The same proof as in Proposition B.4 shows that taking

\[
w := \langle x, y \rangle = W_{\eta}^{ss}(\phi_v(x)) \cap W_{\eta}^{\nu}(y) \neq \emptyset,
\]

and there is
we have that $|v| = |v(x, y)| \leq \eta$ and
\[
0 = A := \{ t \in [0, +\infty[ : |s(t)| \geq 3\eta \text{ or } d(\phi_t(y), \phi_t(w)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma \}.
\]
Therefore $|s(t)| \leq 3\eta$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $w \in W^{ts}_{\frac{1}{2}\gamma}(y) \cap W^{ss}_\eta(\phi_v(x))$. Since $\frac{1}{2}\gamma + \eta < \gamma$ we get that $y \in W^{ss}_\gamma(\phi_v(x))$.

\[\square\]

**B.7. Proposition.**

There are $D > 0$, $\beta_0 > 0$ and open sets $X \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}^1(M)$, $\Lambda \subset U \subset M$, such that
\[
\forall \beta \in [0, \beta_0] \quad \forall Y \in \mathcal{U},
\]
if $Y \in \mathcal{U}$, $\psi_t = \psi^Y_t$ is the flow of $Y$, $x, y \in \Lambda^Y_U := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi_t(U)$ and $s : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ continuous with $s(0) = 0$ satisfy
\[
d(\psi_{t+s(t)}(y), \psi_t(x)) \leq \beta \quad \text{for } |t| \leq L,
\]
then $|s(t)| \leq D\beta$ for all $|t| \leq L$ and there is $|v| = |v(x, y)| \leq D\beta$ such that
\[
\forall |s| \leq L, \quad d(\psi_s(y), \psi_{s+v}(x)) \leq D\beta e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)}.
\]
Moreover for all $|s| \leq L$,
\[
d(\psi_s(y), \psi_{s+v}(x)) \leq D e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)} \left[ d(\psi_L(y), \psi_{L+v}(x)) + d(\psi_{-L}(y), \psi_{-L+v}(x)) \right],
\]
and $v$ is determined by
\[
(x, y) = W^{ss}_\gamma(\psi_v(x)) \cap W^{uu}_\gamma(y) \neq \emptyset.
\]

**Proof:**

Let $C, \mathcal{U}, U, \eta_0 > 0$ and $B$ be from Proposition B.4. The continuity of the hyperbolic splitting implies that the angle $\angle(E^s, E^u)$ is bounded away from zero. As in the argument after (179), there are invariant families of cones separating $E^s$ from $E^u$ whose image under the exponential map contains the local invariant manifolds $W^{ss}_\gamma$, $W^{uu}_\gamma$. And hence as in (180) there are $A, \beta_1 > 0$ such that if $x, y \in \Lambda^Y_U$, $d(x, y) < \beta_1$ and
\[
w = \langle x, y \rangle = W^{ss}_\gamma(\psi_v(x)) \cap W^{uu}_\gamma(y),
\]
then
\[
d(w, \psi_v(x)) + d(w, y) \leq A d(\psi_v(x), y).
\]
Suppose that $0 < \beta < \min\{\frac{1}{2}\eta_0, \beta_1\}$ and $x, y, s(t), \psi^Y_t, L$ satisfy (197). Apply Proposition B.4 with $\eta := B\beta$.
Then $|s(L)| \leq 3\eta$, and

$$d(\psi_L(y), \psi_L(x)) \leq d(\psi_{L+s(L)}(y), \psi_L(x)) + |s(L)| \cdot \|Y\|_{\sup} \leq \beta + 3\eta \|Y\|_{\sup} < \delta,$$

if $\beta$ is small enough. So that $\langle \psi_L(x), \psi_L(y) \rangle$ is well defined. Similarly $|s(-L)| \leq 3\eta$ and $d(\psi_{-L}(y), \psi_{-L}(x)) < \delta$. Since the time $t$ map $\psi_t$ preserves the family of strong invariant manifolds, in equation (174) we have that

$$\psi_L(w) = \langle \psi_L(x), \psi_L(y) \rangle = W^s_{\gamma}(\psi_{L+v}(x)) \cap W^u_{\gamma}(\psi_L(y)),$$

$$\psi_{-L}(w) = \langle \psi_{-L}(x), \psi_{-L}(y) \rangle = W^s_{\gamma}(\psi_{-L+v}(x)) \cap W^u_{\gamma}(\psi_{-L}(y)).$$

Therefore, using (199),

$$d(\psi_L(w), \psi_L(y)) + d(\psi_{-L}(w), \psi_{-L+v}(x)) \leq A \left[ d(\psi_{L+v}(x), \psi_L(y)) + d(\psi_{-L+v}(x), \psi_{-L}(y)) \right],$$

$$d(\psi_{L+v}(x), \psi_L(y)) \leq d(\psi_L(x), \psi_{L+s(L)}(y)) + d(\psi_{L+s(L)}(y), \psi_L(y)) \leq |v| \|Y\|_{\sup} + \beta + |s(L)| \|Y\|_{\sup} \leq B_1 \beta,$$

for some $B_1 = B_1(U) > 0$, because by Proposition B.4, $|v| \leq \eta$, $|s(t)| \leq 3\eta$ and $\eta = B\beta$, so that

$$|v| \leq B\beta, \quad |s(t)| \leq 3B\beta.$$ 

A similar estimate holds for $d(\psi_{-L+v}(x), \psi_{-L}(y))$ and hence from (200),

$$d(\psi_L(w), \psi_L(y)) + d(\psi_{-L}(w), \psi_{-L+v}(x)) \leq 2AB_1 \beta.$$ 

Replacing this in (174) we have that

$$\forall |s| \leq L, \quad d(\psi_s(y), \psi_{s+v}(x)) \leq D_1 \beta e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)},$$

where $D_1 = 2AB_1 C$.

By (200) and (174) we also have that

$$d(\psi_s(y), \psi_{s+v}(x)) \leq AC e^{-\lambda(L-|s|)} \left[ d(\psi_L(y), \psi_{L+v}(x)) + d(\psi_{-L}(y), \psi_{-L+v}(x)) \right].$$

Now take $D := \max\{D_1, B, 3B, AC\}$.

\[ \Box \]

**B.8. Definition.**

We say that $\psi|_{\Lambda}$ is flow expansive if for every $\eta > 0$ there is $\overline{\eta} = \overline{\eta}(\eta) > 0$ such that if $x \in \Lambda$, $y \in M$ and there is $s : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ continuous with $s(0) = 0$ and $d(\psi_{s(\cdot)}(y), \psi_{t}(x)) \leq \overline{\eta}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $y = \psi_v(x)$ for some $|v| \leq \eta$. 


Observe that Proposition B.4 implies uniform expansivity in a neighbourhood of \((X, \Lambda)\), namely there are neighbourhoods \(X \in U \subset X^1(M)\) and \(\Lambda \subset U \subset M\) such that for every \(\eta > 0\) there is \(\alpha = \alpha(\eta, U, \Lambda) > 0\) such that if \(x \in \Lambda^Y_U := \cap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi^Y_t(U), y \in M, s : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0)\) continuous and \(\forall t \in \mathbb{R}, d(\psi^Y_s(t)(y), \psi^Y_t(x)) < \alpha\); then \(y = \psi^Y_v(x)\) for some \(|v| < \eta\).

This also implies uniform h-expansivity as in Definition A.5.


There are open sets \(X \in U \subset X^1(M), \Lambda \subset U \subset M\) such that for all \(Y \in U\) the set \(\cap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi^Y_t(U)\) is hyperbolic for \(\psi^Y_t\) with uniform hyperbolic constants \(C, \lambda\) on \(U\) and

\[
\forall \eta > 0 \quad \exists \alpha = \alpha(\eta) > 0 \quad \forall Y \in U
\]

if \(\psi^Y_t\) is the flow of \(Y, x, y \in \cap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi^Y_t(U), s : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) is continuous, \(s(0) = 0\) and

\[
\forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad d(\psi^Y_{s(t)}(y), \psi^Y_t(x)) \leq \alpha,
\]

then \(y = \psi^Y_v(x)\) for some \(|v| \leq \eta\).

B.11. Definition.

Let \(L > 0\), we say that \((T, \Gamma)\) is an \(L\)-specification if

(a) \(\Gamma = \{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \Lambda\).

(b) \(T = \{t_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbb{R}\) and \(t_{i+1} - t_i \geq L \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\).

We say that the specification \((T, \Gamma)\) is \(\delta\)-possible if

\[
\forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad d(\psi_{t_i}(x_i), x_{i+1}) \leq \delta.
\]

If \(s : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) we denote

\[
U^s_{\varepsilon}(s, T, \Gamma) := \{ y \in M \mid d(\psi_{t+s(t)}(y), \psi_t(x_i)) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } t \in ]t_i, t_{i+1}[\};
\]

\[
STEP^s_{\varepsilon}(T) := \{ s \mid s|_{t_i, t_{i+1}} \text{ is constant, } s(t_i) \in \{s(t_i-), s(t_i+)\}, |s(t_0)| \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } |s(t_i+) - s(t_i-)| \leq \varepsilon \};
\]

\[
U^s_{\varepsilon}(T, \Gamma) := \bigcup \{ U^s_{\varepsilon}(s, T, \Gamma) \mid s \in STEP^s_{\varepsilon}(T) \}.
\]

If \(y \in U^s_{\varepsilon}(T, \Gamma)\) we say that the point \(y\) \(\varepsilon\)-shadows the specification \((T, \Gamma)\).
B.12. Remark.

(a) Observe that a function \( s \in \text{STEP}_\varepsilon(T) \) is possibly discontinuous. But from the conditions in \( \text{STEP}_\varepsilon(T) \) and \( U_\varepsilon(s,T,\Gamma) \) it is easy to replace \( s \) by a continuous function satisfying (172) with \( \beta = K \varepsilon \). Indeed, replace \( s \) by

\[
\sigma(t) = s(t_i - \varepsilon) + \frac{s(t_i + \varepsilon) - s(t_i - \varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} (t - (t_i - \varepsilon)) \quad \text{if} \quad t \in [t_i - \varepsilon, t_i + \varepsilon],
\]

and \( \sigma(t) = s(t) \) otherwise. Then

\[
d(\psi_{t+\sigma(t)}(y), \psi_{t+s(t)}(y)) \leq \|\partial_t \psi\|_{\sup} |\sigma(t) - s(t)| \leq \|\partial_t \psi\|_{\sup} \varepsilon,
\]

(201) \( \sigma(t) = s(t) \) otherwise. Then

\[
d(\psi_{t+\sigma(t)}(y), \psi_{t+s(t)}(y)) \leq \varepsilon + \|\partial_t \psi\|_{\sup} \varepsilon = K \varepsilon \quad \text{when} \quad |t - t_i| \leq \varepsilon.
\]

(b) In (201) the continuous function \( t + \sigma(t) \) is strictly increasing. Indeed, \( s(t) \) is constant on each interval \([t_i, t_{i+1}]\) and \(|s(t_0^+) - s(t_0^-)| \leq \varepsilon\), therefore

\[
|\sigma'(t)| = \left| \frac{s(t_0^+) - s(t_0^-)}{2\varepsilon} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{on} \quad t \in [t_i - \varepsilon, t_i + \varepsilon], \quad \sigma'(t) = 0 \quad \text{otherwise}.
\]

And thus

\[
\frac{d}{dt}(t + \sigma(t)) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} > 0, \quad t \neq t_i.
\]

(c) Similarly we can modify the function \( s \) by a function \( \sigma \) which is continuous, strictly increasing, satisfying (202) for some \( K \) independent of \( \varepsilon \) and also \( \sigma(0) = 0 \). Indeed, define

\[
\sigma_2(t) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{3\varepsilon}(t - t_0) s(t_0 + 3\varepsilon) & \text{if} \quad t - t_0 \in [0, 3\varepsilon], \\
\frac{1}{3\varepsilon}(t - t_0) s(t_0 - 3\varepsilon) & \text{if} \quad t - t_0 \in [-3\varepsilon, 0], \\
\sigma(t) & \text{if} \quad t - t_0 \notin [-3\varepsilon, 3\varepsilon].
\end{cases}
\]

Then \( \sigma_2(t_0) = 0 \). Since \(|s(t_0)| \leq \varepsilon\) and \(|s(t_0^+) - s(t_0^-)| \leq \varepsilon\), if \( \varepsilon < L/3 \) we have that \(|s(t_0 + 3\varepsilon)| = |s(t_0^-)| \leq 2\varepsilon\) and \(|s(t_0 - 3\varepsilon)| = |s(t_0^-)| \leq 2\varepsilon\). Therefore \(|\sigma'_2(t)| \leq \frac{2}{3}\) and then

\[
\frac{d}{dt}(t + \sigma_2(t)) \geq 1 - \frac{2}{3} > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad 0 < |t - t_0| \leq 3\varepsilon.
\]

Also \(|\sigma_2(t) - s(t)| \leq \max\{|s(t_0^+)|, |s(t_0^-)|\} \leq 2\varepsilon\) and the argument in (202) gives

\[
d(\psi_{t+\sigma(t)}(y), \psi_{t+s(t)}(x_i)) \leq \varepsilon + \|\partial_t \psi\|_{\sup} 2\varepsilon =: K_2 \varepsilon \quad \text{when} \quad |t - t_0| \leq 3\varepsilon.
\]


Given \( L > 0 \) there are \( \delta_0, Q > 0 \) such that if \( 0 < \delta < \delta_0 \) and \((T, \Gamma)\) is a \( \delta \)-possible \( L \)-specification on \( \Lambda \) then \( U^*_\varepsilon(T, \Gamma) \neq \emptyset \) with \( \varepsilon = Q\delta \).

This Theorem is proven in Bowen [6] with a similarly presented statement without the estimate on \( \varepsilon \). In the context of Bowen [6] the set \( \Lambda \) is locally maximal but this is not needed for Theorem B.13. A proof of this theorem for flows without the local maximality
hypothesis and with the explicit estimate on $\varepsilon$ appears in Palmer [38] Theorem 9.3, p. 188. In [38], [39] the theorem requires an upper bound on the lengths of the intervals in $T$. This is because there the theorem is proven also for perturbations of the flow. Indeed by Proposition B.4 longer intervals in $T$ improve the estimate on $\varepsilon$.

**B.14. Remark.**

(a) Theorem B.13 does not require the local maximality of $\Lambda$.

(b) Without the local maximality the shadowing orbit may not be in $\Lambda$.

(c) In Palmer [38] Theorem 9.3, p. 188 there is a proof for this Theorem where a specification for $\phi$ in $\Lambda$ is shadowed by a perturbation $\psi$ of the flow. It requires an upper bound in the lengths of the intervals in $T$ and the estimate is $\varepsilon = M(\delta + \sigma)$, where $\sigma$ is the $C^1$ distance of their vector fields.

(d) It is possible to shadow specifications which are in a neighbourhood of $\Lambda$. Namely, given $\varepsilon > 0$, $L > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ and a neighbourhood $U(\Lambda)$ of $\Lambda$ such that if $(T, \Gamma)$ is a $\delta$-possible $L$-specification on $U(\Lambda)$ then $U_\varepsilon\ast(T, \Gamma) \neq \emptyset$.

(e) If $y \in U_\varepsilon(s, T, \Gamma)$, by Remark B.12, $s(t)$ can be replaced by a continuous function satisfying (197) with $\beta = \varepsilon K_2$ and such that $t \mapsto t + s(t)$ is strictly increasing and $s(t_0) = 0$. By Corollary B.7, $|s(t)| \leq \varepsilon K_3$ for some $K_3 > 0$.

(f) If the specification is periodic with period $T$ and $y \in U_\varepsilon(s, T, \Gamma)$, with $\sigma(t) := t + s(t)$ a homeomorphism we have that $d(\psi_{\sigma(t)}(y), \psi_{\sigma(t+T)}(y)) \leq 2\varepsilon$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. By the flow expansivity of $\psi$ in $\Lambda$ (Remark B.9), if $\varepsilon$ is small enough then there is $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\psi_\tau(y) = y$. Then $y$ is a periodic point.

Therefore we get

**B.15. Corollary.**

Given $\ell > 0$ there are $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\ell) > 0$ and $Q = Q(\ell) > 0$ such that if $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and $(T, \Gamma) = (\{t_i\}, \{x_i\})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a $\delta$-possible $\ell$-specification on $\Lambda$ then there exist $y \in M$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ continuous, piecewise linear, strictly increasing with $\sigma(t_0) = t_0$ and $|\sigma(t) - t| < Q \delta$ such that

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \forall t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}] \quad d(\psi_{\sigma(t)}(y), \psi_t(x_i)) < Q \delta.$$  

Moreover, if the specification is periodic then $y$ is a periodic point for $\phi$. 
Appendix C. Symbolic Dynamics.

Let $\mathcal{A} := \{T_1, \ldots, T_M\}$ be a finite set, called the set of symbols, and let

$$\mathcal{A}^\mathbb{Z} = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{A} = \{(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \ x_i \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$  

We denote $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $x_i = x_i$. Endow $\mathcal{A}$ with the discrete topology and $\mathcal{A}^\mathbb{Z}$ with the product topology. By Tychonoff Theorem $\mathcal{A}^\mathbb{Z}$ is compact. Given $a > 1$ the metric

$$d_a(x, y) = a^{-n}, \quad n = \max \{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \forall |i| \leq k, \ x_i = y_i \}$$  

induces the same topology.

The shift homeomorphism $\sigma : \mathcal{A}^\mathbb{Z} \to \mathcal{A}^\mathbb{Z}$ is defined by $\sigma(x)_i = x_{i+1}$. A subset $\Omega \subset \mathcal{A}^\mathbb{Z}$ is called a subshift if $\Omega$ is closed and $\sigma(\Omega) = \Omega$. We call $\Omega$ a subshift of finite type iff there is a function $A : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \to \{0, 1\}$ (or equivalently a matrix $A \in \{0, 1\}^{M \times M}$) such that

$$\Omega = \Sigma(A) := \{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^\mathbb{Z} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{Z} \ A(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1 \}.$$  

Suppose that $\Omega$ is a subshift and $\tau : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a positive continuous function. The suspension $S(\Omega, \sigma, \tau)$ is defined as the topological quotient space $S(\Omega, \sigma, \tau) = \Omega \times \mathbb{R} / \equiv$, where

$$\forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \quad (x, s + \tau(x)) \equiv (\sigma(x), s).$$

Equivalently,

$$\forall (x, s) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (x, s + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \tau(\sigma^i(x))) \equiv (\sigma^n(x), s).$$

Then $S(\Omega, \sigma, \tau)$ is a compact metrizable space. A metric appears in [9].

We obtain the suspension flow $S_t = sus_t(\Omega, \sigma, \tau)$ by “flowing vertically” and remembering identifications, i.e.

$$S_t(P(x, s)) = P(x, s + t),$$

where $P : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to S(\Omega, \sigma, \tau)$ is the canonical projection.

C.1. Definition.

A hyperbolic symbolic flow is a suspension flow $sus_t(\Sigma_A, \sigma, \tau)$ on $S(\Sigma_A, \sigma, \tau)$, where $\Sigma_A$ is a subshift of finite type and $\tau : \Sigma_A \to \mathbb{R}$ is positive and Lipschitz with respect to the metric $d_a$ for some $a > 1$.

Given a $\sigma$-invariant Borel probability $\nu$ on $\Sigma_A$, construct the $S_t$-invariant Borel probability $\mu$ on $S(\Sigma_A, \sigma, \tau)$ as

$$\int_{S(\Sigma_A, \sigma, \tau)} f \, d\mu := \left(\int_{\Sigma_A} \tau \, d\nu\right)^{-1} \int_{\Sigma_A} \int_0^{\tau(x)} f(x, t) \, dt \, d\nu(x).$$
C.2. **Theorem (Abramov Formula [1]).**

If \( \nu \) is a \( \sigma \)-invariant probability on \( \Sigma_A \) and \( \mu \) is from (206) then their entropies satisfy

\[
h(S_1, \mu) = \frac{h(\sigma, \nu)}{\int \tau \, d\nu}.
\]

**Appendix D. Markov Partitions.**

Markov partitions were constructed by Ratner [42] for Anosov flows and then by Bowen [7] for locally maximal hyperbolic sets. In this paper we need to consider hyperbolic sets which may be non locally maximal. This appendix covers the definition and application of Markov partitions and Appendix E covers their construction.

There are flows without a global cross section [28]. For example geodesic flows never have a global cross section because a closed geodesic in opposite directions give a counterexample to Fried’s criterion [28, Theorem D]. In negative curvature geodesic flows are hyperbolic (Anosov). Similarly, any energy level of an autonomous Tonelli Hamiltonian has no global cross section because the Liouville measure has zero asymptotic cycle (see Section 3 in [17]). Thus Markov partitions must be constructed from **local** transversal sections.

In this section we follow Bowen [7] so that we can quote Theorem D.6 refering its proof to [7]. Let \( \phi_t : M \leftarrow \) be the flow of a \( C^1 \) vector field on a compact manifold \( M \) and let \( \Lambda \) be a hyperbolic compact \( \phi \)-invariant set. This appendix deals mainly with the definition of a Markov partition and its symbolic dynamics. It will be applied to a larger hyperbolic set \( X \supset \Lambda \) which we construct on Appendix E that will have a Markov partition.

Suppose that \( D \subset M \) is a differentiable closed disk containing \( x \in X \) of \( \dim D = \dim M - 1 \) and transverse to the flow \( \phi_t \). Then \( D \) is a local transverse section to \( \phi_t \), i.e. there is \( \xi > 0 \) such that \( (x, t) \to \phi_t(x) \) is a diffeomorphism of \( D \times [-\xi, \xi] \) onto a neighbourhood \( U_\xi(D) \) of \( x \). The projection map \( \text{pr}_D : U_\xi(D) \to D \) defined by \( \text{pr}_D(\phi_t(y)) = y \) for \( |t| \leq \xi \) is differentiable.

We use the canonical coordinates \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) from B.3. They are defined in \( X \times X \) with values on \( M \). For a closed set \( T \subset X \cap D \), disjoint from \( \partial D \) of small diameter (depending on \( d(T, \partial D) \)) we have that

\[
\langle x, y \rangle_D : T \times T \to D, \quad \langle x, y \rangle_D := \text{pr}_D(\langle x, y \rangle) = D \cap W^s_\gamma(x) \cap W^u_\gamma(y).
\]

is well defined and continuous.
D.1. Definition.

We say that $T$ is a rectangle if $T$ is closed and $\langle x, y \rangle_D \in T$ for all $x, y \in T$; in this case we write $\langle x, y \rangle_T$ for $(x, y)_D$ and notice that it does not actually depend on $D$.

We say that a rectangle $T \subset D$ is proper if $T = T^*$, where $T^*$ is the interior of $T$ as subset of $D \cap X$.

Observe that even if $X \cap D$ were a union of rectangles, it does not mean that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_D$ was closed on $X \cap D$. It may happen that $x$ and $y$ are close but in different rectangles in $X \cap D$ and $\langle x, y \rangle_D \notin X$.

For $x \in T$ with $T$ a small rectangle set
\[ W^s(x, T) := \{ \langle x, y \rangle_T \mid y \in T \} = T \cap \text{pr}_D \left( U_\xi(D) \cap W^s_\xi(x) \right), \]
\[ W^u(x, T) := \{ \langle z, x \rangle_T \mid z \in T \} = T \cap \text{pr}_D \left( U_\xi(D) \cap W^u_\xi(x) \right), \]
where $\xi$ is large compared to diam $T$. The map $(u, v) \mapsto \langle u, v \rangle_T$ defines a homeomorphism $G_x : W^u(x, T) \times W^s(x, T) \to T$.

D.2. Lemma.

The boundary $\partial T$ (as subset of $D \cap X$) consists of two parts $\partial T = \partial^s T \cup \partial^u T$, where
\[ \partial^s T = G_x \left( \partial W^u(x, T) \times W^s(x, T) \right), \]
\[ \partial^u T = G_x \left( W^u(x, T) \times \partial W^s(x, T) \right). \]

Here $\partial W^u(x, T)$ and $\partial W^s(x, T)$ denote the boundaries of these sets as subsets of $W^u_\xi(x) \cap (D \cap X)$ and $W^s_\xi(x) \cap (D \cap X)$ respectively.

Proof: We have to prove that
\[ x \in \text{int } T \iff x \in \text{int } W^s(x, T) \cap \text{int } W^u(x, T). \]
Suppose that $x \in \text{int } T$, then $W^u(x, T) = T \cap (W^u_\gamma(x) \cap D \cap X)$ is a neighbourhood of $x$ in $W^u_\gamma(x) \cap D \cap X$ because $T$ is a neighbourhood of $x$ in $D \cap X$. Therefore $x \in \text{int } W^u(x, T)$. Similarly $x \in \text{int } W^s(x, T)$.

Now suppose that $x \in \text{int } W^s(x, T) \cap \text{int } W^u(x, T)$. Let $B_1$ be a small neighbourhood of $x$ in $X$. Since $x \in \text{int } W^s(x, T)$, if $B_1$ is small enough, $B_1 \cap W^s_\xi(x) \cap (D \cap X) \subset W^s(x, T)$.

By the continuity of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_D$, there is an open set $x \in B_2 \subset B_1$ such that if $y \in B_2$ then $\langle x, y \rangle_D \in B_1$ and therefore $\langle x, y \rangle_D \in W^s(x, T)$. Similarly there is an open set $x \in B_3 \subset B_2$ such that if $y \in B_3$ then $\langle y, x \rangle_D \in W^u(x, T)$. By the rectangle property we have that if $y \in B_3 \cap D$ then
\[ z = \langle y, x \rangle_D, \langle x, y \rangle_D \in T. \]
Since \( z \in W^s_\gamma(y) \cap D \) and \( z \in W^u_\gamma(y) \cap D \), by the expansivity property B.8, \( y = z \in T \).

We have proved that \( T \supset B_3 \cap D \ni x \). Therefore \( x \in \text{int} \, T \).

\[ \square \]

For \( x \in T \) one can check that for small \( \varepsilon > 0 \) one has

(a) \( x \in \partial^s T \) iff \( x = \operatorname{lim}_n x_n \) for some sequence of \( x_n \in W^s_\varepsilon(x) \cap X \) with \( x_n \notin \phi_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]} T \).

(b) \( x \in \partial^u T \) iff \( x = \operatorname{lim}_n x_n \) for some sequence of \( x_n \in W^u_\varepsilon(x) \cap X \) with \( x_n \notin \phi_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]} T \).

D.3. Definition.

A proper family of size \( \alpha \) is a set \( \mathcal{I} = \{ T_1, \ldots, T_n \} \) such that

(i) each \( T_i \) is a closed subset of \( X \),

(ii) \( X = \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(\cup \mathcal{I}) \), where \( \cup \mathcal{I} = T_1 \cup \cdots \cup T_n \),

and there are differentiable closed disks \( D_1, \ldots, D_n \) in \( M \) transverse to the flow \( \phi_t \) so that

(iii) \( \dim D_i = \dim M - 1 \),

(iv) \( \operatorname{diam} D_i < \alpha \),

(v) \( T_i \subset \text{int} D_i \) and \( T_i = T_i^* \), where \( T_i^* \) is the interior of \( T_i \) as a subset of the metric space \( D_i \cap X \),

(vi) for \( i \neq j \), at least one of the sets \( D_i \cap \phi_{[0,\alpha]} D_j \) and \( D_j \cap \phi_{[0,\alpha]} D_i \) is empty; in particular \( D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset \) and also \( T_i \cap T_j = \emptyset \).

Suppose that \( \mathcal{I} \) is as above and \( \alpha \) is small. From (ii) it follows that for any \( x \in \cup \mathcal{I} \) there is a first positive time \( 0 < \tau(x) \leq \alpha \) such that \( \phi_{\tau(x)}(x) \in \cup \mathcal{I} \). Since the \( D_i \) are compact and pairwise disjoint and each \( D_i \) is a local cross-section to the flow, there is \( \beta > 0 \) such that \( \tau(x) \geq \beta \) for all \( x \in \cup \mathcal{I} \). The first return map \( F = F_\mathcal{I} : \cup \mathcal{I} \to \cup \mathcal{I} \) defined by \( F_\mathcal{I}(x) = \phi_{\tau(x)}(x) \) is a bijection: it is onto because by (ii), \( \cup \mathcal{I} \subset X \subset \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(\cup \mathcal{I}) \).

The functions \( \tau(x) \) and \( F_\mathcal{I} \) are not continuous on \( \cup \mathcal{I} \). However they are continuous on \( \cup' \mathcal{I} \).

Since the rectangles are proper, the complement of \( \cup' \mathcal{I} \) is a countable union of local invariant manifolds \( T_i \cap F^{-k}(\partial T_j) \) which are nowhere dense in \( \cup \mathcal{I} \). By the Baire category theorem \( \cup' \mathcal{I} \) is dense in \( \cup \mathcal{I} \) and

\[ \phi_{\mathbb{R}}(\cup' \mathcal{I}) = \left\{ x \in X \mid \phi_{\mathbb{R}}(x) \cap \cup \mathcal{I} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n T_i^* \right\} \]

is dense in \( X \).

For \( x \in \cup' \mathcal{I} \) let \( q(x) \) be the unique \( T_i \) containing \( x \). Since \( q : \cup' \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{I} \) is continuous, the itinerary map \( Q : \cup' \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{I}^\mathbb{Z} = \prod \mathcal{I} \) given by

\[ Q(x) = (q(F_\mathcal{I}^i(x)))_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \]
is continuous. Since \( \phi_t : X \to X \) is flow expansive (cf. Corollary B.10) it follows that \( Q \) is injective (remember that \( \alpha \) is small and use Theorem 3(iv) in [9]). Thus the map
\[
Q^{-1} : Q(\cup' \mathcal{T}) \to \cup' \mathcal{T}
\]
is well-defined. The following lemma says that \( Q^{-1} \) extends to a continuous function \( \pi : \Omega \to \cup' \mathcal{T} \), where
\[
\Omega = \Omega(\mathcal{T}) = \{ Q(x) \mid x \in \cup' \mathcal{T} \} \subset \prod_z \mathcal{T}.
\]
Observe that for the shift map \( \sigma \), we have that \( \sigma(\Omega) = \Omega \) because \( \sigma(Q(x)) = Q(F_T(x)) \).

D.4. Lemma (Bowen [7, Lemma 2.2]).

There is a continuous surjective map \( \pi : \Omega \to \cup \mathcal{T} \) such that
(i) \( \pi \) is Lipschitz with respect to the metric \( d_a \) on \( X \) for some \( a > 1 \).
(ii) \( \pi(\mathcal{S}) \in S_0 \) for \( \mathcal{S} \in \Omega \).
(iii) \( \pi^{-1}\{x\} = \{Q(x)\} \) for \( x \in \cup' \mathcal{T} \).

For \( \mathcal{S} \in Q(\cup' \mathcal{T}) \) consider \( \tau(\pi(\mathcal{S})) \). On the set
\[
\{ \mathcal{S} = Q(x) \mid x \in T_i, F_T(x) \in T_j \}
\]
the function \( \tau(\pi(\mathcal{S})) \) is just the time it takes for the point \( \pi(\mathcal{S}) \) to go from \( D_i \) to \( D_j \). As \( D_i, D_j \) are differentiable local cross-sections, this time depends differentiably upon \( x \), hence Lipschitz. On the metric \( d_a \) the (cylindrical) sets (207) are open, closed and disjoint. Thus \( \tau(\pi(\mathcal{S})) \) is Lipschitz on \( \mathcal{S} \) and extends to a function \( f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) Lipschitz with respect to the metric \( d_a \). For \( \mathcal{S} = Q(x) \) we have that
\[
\phi_{f(\mathcal{S})}\pi(\mathcal{S}) = \pi(\sigma(\mathcal{S})),
\]
(both sides are \( F_T(x) \)); so by continuity this formula holds for all \( \mathcal{S} \in \Omega \).

Construct the suspension \( S_t = \text{sus}_t(\Omega, \sigma, f) \) as in appendix C. Define the map \( \rho : S(\Omega, \sigma, f) \to X \) by
\[
\rho(S_t(\mathcal{S})) = \phi_t(\pi(\mathcal{S})).
\]
This map is well defined, and continuous, because \( \phi_{f(\mathcal{S})}\pi(\mathcal{S}) = \pi(\sigma(\mathcal{S})) \). We want \( \Omega \) to be a subshift of finite type, as in definition C.1. For this we need the following Markov property:

D.5. Definition.

Let \( \mathcal{T} \) be a proper family for \( \phi_t : X \to X \) of small size \( \alpha \). We say that \( \mathcal{T} \) is Markov if
(1) each \( T_i \) is a rectangle,
(2) \( x \in U(T_i, T_j) := \{ w \in \cup' \mathcal{T} \mid w \in T_i, F_T(w) \in T_j \} \) implies \( W^s(x, T_i) \subset U(T_i, T_j) \).
(3) \( y \in V(T_k, T_i) := \{ w \in \cup' \mathcal{T} \mid F_T^{-1}(w) \in T_k, w \in T_i \} \) implies \( W^u(y, T_i) \subset V(T_k, T_i) \).
Define $A_T : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \to \{0, 1\}$ by $A(T_i, T_j) = 1$ iff $\exists x \in \cup' \mathcal{T}$ such that $x \in T_i$ and $F_T(x) \in T_j$. Then $\Omega \subset \Sigma(A_T)$ with the notation of appendix C.

D.6. Theorem (Bowen [7] Theorem 2.4, p. 437). $\Omega = \Sigma(A_T)$ iff $\mathcal{T}$ is Markov.

APPENDIX E. LOCAL MAXIMALITY.

A (compact) hyperbolic set $\Lambda$ for the flow $\phi_t$ on $M$ is locally maximal (or isolated) if there is an open set $\Lambda \subset U \subset M$ such that

$$\Lambda = \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(U).$$

We say that a hyperbolic set has local product structure if there are $\delta, \gamma > 0$ as in the canonical coordinates B.3 such that $x, y \in \Lambda$, $d(x, y) < \delta$ $\implies$ $(x, y) \in \Lambda,$ where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is from (171).

We show that this definition is invariant under time reversal of the flow. Indeed, it is symmetric on $x$ and $y$, but the definition of

$$(x, y) = W^s_\gamma(x) \cap W^{uu}_\gamma(y)$$

is not invariant under time reversal. Nevertheless the symmetric definitions

$$W^s_\gamma(x) \cap W^{uu}_\gamma(y) \quad \text{and} \quad W^u_\gamma(x) \cap W^{ss}_\gamma(y)$$

are in the same orbit because

$$W^s_\gamma(x) = \phi_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(W^{ss}_\gamma(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad W^u_\gamma(x) = \phi_{[-\gamma, \gamma]}(W^{uu}_\gamma(x)).$$

Since $\Lambda$ is $\phi_t$-invariant we get that the property of having local product structure is invariant under time reversal.

E.1. Remark.

Given a hyperbolic set $\Lambda$ there is a neighbourhood $V$ of $\Lambda$ such that for any open set $\Lambda \subset U \subset V$ the set

$$\hat{\Lambda} := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(U)$$

is also a hyperbolic set. Indeed, it is enough to consider the time 1 map $\phi_1$ as a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism and obtain the extension to a neighbourhood of the dominated splitting for $\phi_1$ as in [3] appendix B, p. 289 and pp. 292-293.

E.2. Proposition.

A hyperbolic set is locally maximal if and only if it has local product structure.
Here we adapt the proof for diffeomorphisms given in Theorem 18.4.1 in Hasselblatt-Katok [29].

**Proof:**

Suppose that Λ is locally maximal with $U$ as in (208). Take $δ, γ$ as in the canonical coordinates B.3 with

$$B_γ(Λ) := \{ x \in M \mid d(x, Λ) ≤ γ \} ⊂ U.$$  

Then if $x, y ∈ Λ$ and $d(x, y) < δ$ we have that

$$⟨x, y⟩ = W^{ss}_γ(φ_ν(x)) ∩ W^{uu}_γ(y)$$  

$$= W^s_γ(x) ∩ W^{uu}_γ(y) ⊂ \left[ \bigcap_{t ≤ 0} φ_t(U) \right] ∩ \left[ \bigcap_{t ≥ 0} φ_t(U) \right] = Λ.$$ 

Therefore Λ has local product structure.

For the converse we need the following

**E.3. Lemma.** Let Λ be a hyperbolic set with local product structure. There exist $δ_1, δ_2 > 0$ such that if $x ∈ Λ$, $y ∈ W^{uu}_δ(x)$ and $d(φ_t(y), Λ) < δ_2$ for all $t ≥ 0$, then $y ∈ Λ$.

**Proof:**

Using Proposition B.2 choose $T > 0$ such that for some $µ < 1$

$$d(φ_{-T}(x), φ_{-T}(y)) ≤ µ d(x, y) \quad \text{when } x ∈ Λ, y ∈ W^{uu}_ε(x).$$  

Let $K := \sup \| Dφ_T \|$ taken over a neighbourhood of Λ. Let $δ, γ > 0$ be from the definition of local product structure for Λ. Observe that if $δ_3 := \max\{δ_1, δ_2\}$ is small enough, we have that both $x$ and $y$ are in the larger hyperbolic set

$$\hat{Λ} = \bigcap_{t ∈ \mathbb{R}} φ_t(B_{δ_3}(Λ)).$$  

Let $d^u$ be the distance along the strong unstable leaves $W^{uu}$. The continuity of the hyperbolic splitting implies that the angles among its subspaces are bounded below. Then there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$d^u(p, ⟨q, p⟩) = d^u(p, W^s_γ(q) ∩ W^{uu}_γ(p)) ≤ M d(p, q),$$  

whenever $d(p, q)$ is small enough. For any $δ_1 < \min\{\frac{1}{MK}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{δ}{2}, \frac{γ}{2}\}$ take $δ_2 ≤ \min\{δ_1/MK, δ_1\}$ such that

$$p, q ∈ \hat{Λ}, \quad d(p, q) < δ_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad W^s_δ(p) ∩ W^{uu}_{δ_1}(q) \neq ∅.$$  

**Claim E.3.1:** If $x ∈ Λ$, $y ∈ W^{uu}_{δ_1}(x)$ and $d(φ_t(y), Λ) < δ_2$ for all $t ≥ 0$, then

$$a_n := \min_{z ∈ Λ ∩ W^{uu}(φ_nT(y))} d^u(φ_nT(y), z) = 0 \quad \text{for some } n ∈ \mathbb{N}.$$
Then by (210) for $z$ attaining the minimum we would have
\[ d(y, \Lambda) \leq d(y, \phi_{-nT}(z)) \leq \mu^n a_n = 0. \]

Since $\Lambda$ is closed and $\phi_t$ invariant, for Lemma E.3 it is enough to prove Claim E.3.1.

To prove Claim E.3.1 we first show inductively that
\[ a_n < \delta_1 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \]  

Since $y \in W_{\delta_1}^{uu}(x)$, we have that
\[ a_0 \leq d^{uu}(y,x) < \delta_1. \]

Suppose that $a_n < \delta_1$ then there is $w_n \in \Lambda \cap W^{uu}(\phi_{nT}(y))$ such that $d^{uu}(\phi_{nT}(y), w_n) < \delta_1$. Take $z_n \in \Lambda$ such that
\[ d(\phi_{nT}(y), z_n) < \delta_2. \]

Using (213) observe that
\[ p_n := (z_n, \phi_{nT}(y)) = W_{\delta_1}^s(z_n) \cap W_{\delta_1}^{uu}(\phi_{nT}(y)) \]
\[ = W_{\delta_1}^s(z_n) \cap W_{2\delta_1}^{uu}(w_n) = \langle z_n, w_n \rangle \in \Lambda \]
by the local product structure. Therefore, using (212),
\[ a_n \leq d^{uu}(\phi_{nT}(y), p_n) \leq M d(\phi_{nT}(y), z_n) < M \delta_2 \leq \frac{\delta_1}{K}. \]

By the choice of $K$ we have that $a_{n+1} \leq K a_n < \delta_1$. This proves (214).

The definition of $a_n$ implies that
\[ a_n \leq \mu^n a_{n+1} \]
when $a_{n+1} < \varepsilon$ and $\mu < 1$ is from (210). Therefore, if $\delta_1$ is small enough we have that $a_n < \delta_1 \Rightarrow a_{n+1} \geq \mu^{-1} a_n$. Combining this with (214) we get that $a_n = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This proves Claim E.3.1.

Using Lemma E.3 we finish the proof of Proposition E.2. Let $\rho > 0$ be such that
\[ z, w \in \hat{\Lambda}, \quad d(z,w) < \rho \implies W_{\delta_2/2}^s(z) \cap W_{\delta_2/2}^{uu}(w) \neq \emptyset. \]

Take $\delta_4 := \min\{\rho, \delta_2/2\}$. Suppose now that $d(\phi_t(y), \Lambda) < \delta_4$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. From (211) we have that $y \in \hat{\Lambda}$. Let $x \in \Lambda \subset \hat{\Lambda}$ be such that $d(y,x) < \delta_2/2$ and let
\[ p = \langle y, x \rangle = W_{\delta_2/2}^s(y) \cap W_{\delta_2/2}^{uu}(x). \]

We have that
\[ \forall t \geq 0 \quad d(\phi_t(p), \Lambda) \leq d(\phi_t(p), \phi_t(y)) + d(\phi_t(y), \Lambda) \leq \frac{\delta_2}{2} + \frac{\delta_2}{2} \leq \delta_2, \]
and $p \in W_{\delta_1}^{\text{uu}}(x)$, $x \in \Lambda$. By Lemma E.3, $p \in \Lambda$. Applying the same arguments to the reverse flow $\phi_{-t}$ (recall the discussion in (209)) we get

$$q = W_{\delta_2/2}^s(y) \cap W_{\delta_2/2}^{\text{us}}(x) \in \Lambda.$$  

Thus $p, q \in \Lambda$ and

$$y \in W_{\delta_2/2}^s(p) \cap W_{\delta_2/2}^{\text{uu}}(q) \subset \phi_{[-\gamma,\gamma]}\left(W_{\gamma}^s(p) \cap W_{\gamma}^{\text{us}}(q)\right) = \phi_{[-\gamma,\gamma]}\langle p, q \rangle.$$  

By the local product structure $\langle p, q \rangle \in \Lambda$. Therefore by the invariance of $\Lambda$, $y \in \Lambda$. This finishes the proof of Proposition E.2.

□

Crovisier [21] has shown an example of a hyperbolic set $\Lambda$ for a diffeomorphism which is not contained in a locally maximal hyperbolic set. Nevertheless Fisher [27] shows that for diffeomorphisms every hyperbolic set has an extension with a Markov partition. Here we extend Fisher theorem to flows. See also Bowen [8].

E.4. Theorem.

Let $\phi_t$ be a flow on a compact manifold $\mathcal{M}$. If $\Lambda$ is a hyperbolic set without fixed points for $\phi_t$ and $U \supset \Lambda$ is an open neighbourhood of $\Lambda$. Then there is a hyperbolic set $\Lambda \subset \tilde{\Lambda} \subset U$ which has a Markov partition.

The remaining of the section is dedicated to the

Proof of Theorem E.4:

Let $V \subset U_0$ be a neighbourhood of $\Lambda$ such that the Shadowing Theorem B.13 holds for specifications in $V$ with jumps of size at most $\delta_0$. Using Remark E.1 obtain an open set $U$ such that $\Lambda \subset U \subset \overline{U} \subset V$ and that

(215) $\Lambda_U := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(\overline{U})$

is hyperbolic.

Let $0 < \alpha_0 \ll 1$ be such that

(216) $\alpha_0 \left\| \partial_t \phi \right\|_{\text{sup}} + 2 \left( \sup_{|t| \leq 1} \text{Lip}(\phi_t) \right) \alpha_0 < \frac{1}{2}$ (flow expansivity constant on $\Lambda_U$),

(217) $\forall x \in \overline{U}, \text{diam } \phi_{[-\alpha_0,\alpha_0]}(B_{\alpha_0}(x)) < \frac{1}{4} \gamma$,

where $\gamma$ is from the definition of canonical coordinates B.3.

Given $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$ we first construct a proper family of size $\alpha$ made with rectangles as in definitions D.3 and D.5. Choose a finite family of smooth disjoint open discs $D_1, \cdots, D_m$ transversal to the flow such that
(218.a) $\dim D_i = \dim M - 1$.
(218.b) $D_i$ is open.
(218.c) $\text{diam } D_i < \alpha$.
(218.d) For $i \neq j$ at least one of the sets $D_i \cap \phi_{[-\alpha,\alpha]}(D_j)$ or $\phi_{[-\alpha,\alpha]}(D_i) \cap D_j$ is empty.
(218.e) $\Lambda \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_i} \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(\tilde{D}_i)$, where
\[
\tilde{D}_i = \{ x \in D_i \mid d(x, \partial D_i) > \frac{\alpha}{10} \}.
\]
(218.f) The sets $D_i \cap \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_j) \cap \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_k)$ and $D_i \cap \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_j)$ when non-empty are connected.

Let $\mathbb{D} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_i} D_i$ and
\[
2\beta := \inf \{ t > 0 \mid x \in \mathbb{D}, \phi_t(x) \in \mathbb{D} \} > 0.
\]
By (218.e) $0 < 2\beta < \alpha$.

Let $A > 1$ be such that
\[
\exists i, y, z \in \phi_{[-2\alpha,2\alpha]}(D_i) \implies d(P_{D_i}(y), P_{D_i}(z)) \leq A d(y, z),
\]
where $P_{D_i} : \phi_{[-2\alpha,2\alpha]}(D_i) \to D_i$ is the projection
\[
P_{D_i}(\phi_t(y)) = y, \quad \text{when } y \in D_i.
\]
Denote the projection time by $\tau_{D_i} : \phi_{[-2\alpha,2\alpha]}(D_i) \to [2\beta, 2\alpha]$ where
\[
\tau_{D_i}(x) := \min \{ t > 0 \mid \phi_t(x) \in D_i \}.
\]

Let
\[
0 < \varepsilon_0 < \frac{\alpha}{20} \cdot \frac{1}{A+1},
\]
be a Lebesgue number for the open cover $\{ \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_i) \}_{i=1}^{m}$ of $\Lambda$. From (216) and (223) we have that
\[
\alpha_0 \| \partial_t \phi \|_{\text{sup}} + 2 \sup_{|t| \leq \alpha_0} \text{Lip}(\phi_t) \varepsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2} (\text{flow expansivity constant on } \Lambda_U).
\]

Let $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ be such that
\[
(225.i) \quad 0 < 4\varepsilon_1 < \min_{i \neq j} d(D_i, D_j),
(225.ii) \quad \exists j \quad w \in \tilde{D}_j \implies B_{\varepsilon_1}(w) \subset \phi_{[-\alpha,\alpha]}(D_j), \quad \text{where } \tilde{D}_j \text{ is from (219)},
(225.iii) \quad B_{4\varepsilon_1}(\Lambda) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_i),
(225.iv) \quad \Lambda_1 := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(B_{3\varepsilon_1}(\Lambda)) \text{ is hyperbolic}.
\]

Using $A$ from (221), let $0 < \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1$ be such that
\[
(226.i) \quad 0 < \varepsilon_2 < \frac{\varepsilon_1}{4} < \varepsilon_1
\]
\[(226.\text{ii})\] \(\frac{(1+A)\varepsilon_2}{\|\partial_t \phi\|_{\text{sup}}} < \frac{1}{4} \alpha.\)

\[(226.\text{iii})\] \(5\varepsilon_2 < \pi(\frac{1}{4} \beta)\) is a flow expansivity constant for the hyperbolic set \(\Lambda_1\) for \(\eta = \frac{1}{4} \beta\) in Definition B.8.

\[(226.\text{iv})\] \(\varepsilon_2 < \frac{1}{2} \beta(\frac{1}{4} \alpha),\) where \(\beta(\eta)\) is from Proposition B.4 for \(\Lambda_1.\)

Using \(A > 1\) from (221) and Corollary B.15, let
\[(227)\] \(0 < \varepsilon_3 < \varepsilon_2\)
be such that any \(2\varepsilon_3\)-possible \(\beta\)-specification on \(\Lambda_1\) is \(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_2\)-shadowed (by an orbit which is possibly not in \(\Lambda_1)).\) Let
\[(228)\] \(0 < \varepsilon_4 < \frac{\varepsilon_3}{A + 1}.\)

**E.5. Lemma.** If \(z \in D_i, \ d(z, \hat{D}_i) < 4\varepsilon_1, \ w = \phi_a(z) \in D_j, \) \(0 < a < \alpha, \ d(w, \hat{D}_j) < 4\varepsilon_1, \) then \(B_{4\varepsilon_1}(z) \cap D_i \subset \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_j).\)

**Proof:** Since \(\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0,\) from (223) we have that
\[(229)\] \(4\varepsilon_1 A < \frac{\alpha}{m} - 4\varepsilon_1.\)

By (221) the projection \(P_{D_j} : \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_j) \rightarrow D_j\) has Lipschitz constant \(A.\) Since \(w = P_{D_j}(z)\) and \(d(w, \hat{D}_j) < 4\varepsilon_1,\) we have that
\[d(P_{D_j}(z), \partial D_j) = d(w, \partial D_j) \geq d(\hat{D}_j, \partial D_j) - d(w, \hat{D}_j) \]
\[\geq \frac{\alpha}{m} - 4\varepsilon_1.\]

If \(x \in B_{4\varepsilon_1}(z) \cap D_i \cap \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_j) =: E,\) then
\[d(P_{D_j}(x), \partial D_j) \geq d(P_{D_j}(z), \partial D_j) - d(P_{D_j}(x), P_{D_j}(z)) \]
\[> \frac{\alpha}{m} - 4\varepsilon_1 - 4\varepsilon_1 A > 0.\]

This implies that the set \(E\) contains \(B_{4\varepsilon_1}(z) \cap D_i\) and hence \(B_{4\varepsilon_1}(z) \cap D_i \subset \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_j).\) \(\square\)

Let
\[\mathcal{D} := \cup_{i=1}^m D_i.\]

For \(x \in \mathcal{D}\) let \(D(x) := D_i\) where \(x \in D_i.\)

Let \(W\) be a finite \(\varepsilon_4\)-dense set in \(\Lambda \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^m \hat{D}_i.\) For \(w \in W,\) by (225.(iii)) and the definition of \(\varepsilon_0\) after (223), there is \(j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\) such that
\[(230)\] \(B_{3\varepsilon_1}(w) \subset \phi_{[-\alpha,0]}(D_j).\)

For \(w \in W\) let \(E(w) := B_{3\varepsilon_1}(w) \cap D(w).\) From Lemma E.5 we get

If \( w_1, w_2 \in W \) and \( P_{D(w_2)}(E(w_1)) \cap E(w_2) \neq \emptyset \) then \( E(w_1) \subset \phi_{[-\alpha,\alpha]}(D(w_2)) \). In particular \( P_{D(w_2)} : E(w_1) \to D(w_2) \) is well defined and smooth.

Let \( \Omega \subset W^\mathbb{Z} \) be the set of sequences \( \pi = (w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \) such that \( \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, w_k \in \phi_{[-\alpha,\alpha]}(D(w_{k+1})) \) and

\[
\forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \quad d(P_{D(w_{k+1})}(w_k), w_{k+1}) < \varepsilon_3. 
\]

Then \( \Omega \) is closed and invariant under the shift map \( \sigma : W^\mathbb{Z} \to W^\mathbb{Z}, \sigma(\pi)_i = w_{i+1} \). In fact it is a subshift of finite type.

Observe that Corollary E.6 and (220) imply that if \( \pi = (w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega \) then

\[
\beta < \tau_{D(w_{k+1})}(E(w_k)) \leq \alpha.
\]

If \( \pi \in \Omega \), write

\[
S_n \tau(\pi) := \begin{cases} 
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \tau_{D(w_{k+1})}(w_k) & \text{if } n \geq 1, \\
0 & \text{if } n = 0, \\
-\sum_{k=-n}^{-1} \tau_{D(w_{k+1})}(w_k) & \text{if } n \leq -1.
\end{cases}
\]

Let \( f_\pi \) be the \( \varepsilon_3 \)-possible \( \beta \)-specification

\[
f_\pi(S_n \tau(\pi) + t) = \phi_t(w_n), \quad t \in [0, \tau_{D(w_{k+1})}(w_n)], \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]

By (227) and the Shadowing Corollary B.15 there is \( y \in M \) and \( s : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0) \) strictly increasing piecewise linear with \( s(0) = 0 \) such that

\[
d(\phi_{s(t)}(y), f_\pi(t)) < \varepsilon_2, \quad |s(t) - t| < \varepsilon_2.
\]

Since \( f_\pi(0) = w_0 \) and \( s(0) = 0 \), we have that \( d(y, w_0) < \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1 \). Also by (225.ii), \( B_{\varepsilon_1}(w_0) \subset \phi_{[-\alpha,\alpha]}(D(w_0)) \) and by (221) and (226.i)

\[
d(w_0, P_{D(w_0)}(y)) \leq A d(w_0, y) \leq A \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1.
\]

Thus \( P_{D(w_0)}(y) \in E(w_0) = B_{3\varepsilon_1}(w_0) \cap D(w_0) \).

Define \( \pi : \Omega \to D \) by

\[
\pi(\pi) := P_{D(w_0)}(y) \in E(w_0),
\]

where \( y \) is from (235). Since \( W \subset \Lambda \) and in (235) \( s : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is a homeomorphism, we have that \( d(\phi_s(y), \Lambda) < \varepsilon_2 \) for all \( s \in \mathbb{R} \). From the definition in (225.iv) we have that

\[
\pi(\pi) \in \Lambda_1.
\]
From (235) and (236) we have that
\[ d(y, P_{D(w_0)}(y)) \leq d(y, w_0) + d(w_0, P_{D(w_0)}(y)) < (1 + A) \varepsilon_2. \]

Using (226.ii) we have that \( \pi(\overline{w}) = P_{D(w_0)}(y) = \phi_0(y) \) with
\[ |b| < \frac{(1 + A) \varepsilon_2}{\| \partial \phi \|} < \frac{1}{4} \alpha. \]

For the record, using (235), (239) and \( y = \phi_{-b}(\pi(\overline{w})) \), we have that
\[ \exists |b| \leq \frac{\alpha}{4} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad d(\phi_{(s(t) + b)}(\pi(\overline{w})), f_{\overline{w}}(t)) < \varepsilon_2, \]
where \( s : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0) \) is continuous, strictly increasing and \( s(0) = 0 \).

On \( \Omega \) we use the restriction of the metric \( d_a \) in \( W^Z \) defined in (203).

E.7. Lemma.

There is an \( a \in ]0, 1[ \) such that the map \( \pi \) is Lipschitz for \( d_a \).

If \( w \in W \) and \( T_w := \pi(\{ \overline{w} \mid w_0 = w \}) \) then
\[ \text{diam } T_w < \varepsilon_2. \]

In particular, from \( \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_3 \) and (232),
\[ \beta < \tau_{D(w_{k+1})}|T_{w_k}| \leq \alpha. \]

**Proof:** Observe that from (235), if \( \overline{w}, \overline{z} \in \Omega \) and \( d(\overline{w}, \overline{z}) < a^N \), then there are strictly increasing piecewise linear functions \( s_1, s_2 : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0) \) such that
\[ \forall t \in [S_{-N\tau}(\overline{w}), S_{N\tau}(\overline{w})] \]
\[ d(\phi_{s_1(t)}(\pi(\overline{w})), f_{\overline{w}}(t)) < \varepsilon_2 \quad \text{and} \quad d(\phi_{s_2(t)}(\pi(\overline{z})), f_{\overline{z}}(t)) < \varepsilon_2, \]
because \( f_{\overline{w}}(t) = f_\tau(t) \) for all \( S_{-N\tau}(\overline{w}) \leq t \leq S_{N\tau}(\overline{w}) \). Thus
\[ d(\phi_{s_1(t)}(\pi(\overline{w})), \phi_{s_2(t)}(\pi(\overline{z}))) < 2\varepsilon_2 \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in [S_{-N\tau}(\overline{w}), S_{N\tau}(\overline{w})]. \]

By (220) we have that \( S_{-N\tau} < -N\beta \) and \( S_{N\tau} > N\beta \). Since \( s_2 \) is a homeomorphism, we have that \( s_1 \circ s_2^{-1} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is continuous, \( s_1 \circ s_2^{-1}(0) = 0 \) and
\[ d(\phi_{s_1(\circ s_2^{-1}(t))}(\pi(\overline{w})), \phi_t(\pi(\overline{z}))) < 2\varepsilon_2 \quad \text{for all} \quad |t| \leq N\beta. \]

From Proposition B.4 and (226.iv) there is \( |v| \leq \alpha \) such that \( d(\pi(\overline{w}, \phi_v(\pi(\overline{w}))) < C \gamma e^{-\lambda N\beta} \).

Since \( w_0 = z_0 \), by (237) we have that \( \pi(\overline{z}), \pi(\overline{w}) \in D(w_0) \). By Property (221),
\[ d(\pi(\overline{w}), \pi(\overline{z})) = d(P_{D(w_0)}(\pi(\overline{w})), P_{D(w_0)}(\phi_v(\pi(\overline{w})))) \leq A d(\pi(\overline{w}), \phi_v(\pi(\overline{z}))) \]
\[ \leq AC \gamma e^{-\lambda N\beta} \leq AC \gamma d_a(\overline{w}, \overline{z}) \]
if \( a = e^{-\lambda \beta} \). Therefore \( \pi \) is Lipschitz.
We now prove (241). If \( w, z \in \pi^{-1}(T_w) \), applying (243) to \( N = 0, t = 0, s_2(0) = 0 \) we get
\[
d(\pi z, \pi w) = d(\phi_{s_2(0)}(\pi z), f(0)) < \varepsilon_2.
\]
□

Since \( \Omega \) is a subshift of finite type, on \( \Omega \) we have the local product structure
\[
\cdot : \{ (w, z) \in \Omega \times \Omega \mid w_0 = z_0 \} \mapsto \Omega
\]
given by
\[
[w, z]_n := \begin{cases} w_n & \text{if } n \geq 0, \\ z_n & \text{if } n \leq 0. \end{cases}
\]

E.8. Lemma. If \( w_0 = z_0 \),
\begin{equation}
\pi(\Omega) \ni \pi([w, z]) = (\pi w, \pi z)_{D(w_0)} = P_{D(w_0)}(W^s_\gamma(\pi w) \cap W^u_\gamma(\pi z)).
\end{equation}

Proof: Let \( \pi := [w, z] \). By (235) there are \( s_1, s_2 : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0) \) such that
\[
\forall t \geq 0 \quad d(\phi_{s_1(t)}(\pi w), f(t)) < \varepsilon_2, \quad d(\phi_{s_2(t)}(\pi z), f(t)) < \varepsilon_2.
\]
Since \( u_n = w_n \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( f(t) = f(t) \) for all \( t \geq 0 \). Therefore
\[
d(\phi_{s_2 \circ s_1^{-1}}(t)(\pi w), \phi(t)) \leq 2\varepsilon_2 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.
\]
Using (226.iv) and Proposition B.6 we have that \( \pi w \in W^s_{\gamma}(\phi_v(\pi w)) \) with \( |v| < \frac{1}{2}\alpha \), then \( \pi w \in W^s_{\gamma}(\phi_v(\pi w)) \). Similarly \( \pi z \in W^u_{\gamma}(\phi_{v_2}(\pi z)) \). Therefore
\[
\pi w \in P_{D(w_0)}(W^s_\gamma(\pi w) \cap W^u_\gamma(\pi z)) = P_{D(w_0)}(W^s_\gamma(\pi w) \cap W^u_\gamma(\pi z)) = (\pi w, \pi z)_{D(w_0)}.
\]
□

For each \( w \in W \) define
\[
T_w := \pi\{ z \in \Omega \mid z_0 = w \}.
\]
Observe that by Lemma E.7, \( T_w \) is the continuous image of a closed cylinder in \( \Omega \), thus it is closed. Equation (244) implies that \( T_w \) is a rectangle in \( D(w) \).

Define
\[
\Lambda := \phi_\mathbb{R}(\pi(\Omega)) = \phi_{[0,\alpha]}(\pi(\Omega)),
\]
where the second equality follows from (237) and (242). We have that \( \Lambda \) is closed because \( \pi \) is continuous. The set \( \Lambda \) is invariant by construction. By (238) we have that \( \Lambda \subset \Lambda_1 \) and hence by the choice of \( \varepsilon_1 \) in (225.iv), \( \Lambda \) is a hyperbolic set.

E.9. Lemma. \( \Lambda \subset \Lambda \).
Proof: Let $x \in \Lambda$. By (218.e) there is $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $x \in \phi_{[-\alpha, 0]}(\bar{D}_i)$. Then $\exists P_{D_i}(x) = y \in \bar{D}_i$. Since $\Lambda$ is invariant it is enough to prove $y \in \Lambda$.

By (218.e) $\Lambda \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m \phi_{[-\alpha, 0]}(\bar{D}_i)$. Define inductively the sequence of returns $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $y$ to $\bar{D} := \bigcup_i \bar{D}_i$ by $y_0 := y$,

$$
\tau_{n+1} = \min\{t > \tau_n \mid \phi_t(y) \in \bigcup_i \bar{D}_i\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z};
$$

$y_n = \phi_{\tau_n}(y) \in \bar{D}_{i_n}, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the definition of $W$ before (230) there are $w_n \in W$ such that

$$
d(y_n, w_n) < \varepsilon_4.
$$

Let $E(w_n) := B_{\varepsilon_4}(w_n) \cap D(w_n)$. Since $y_n \in E(w_n)$ and $y_{n+1} \in E(w_{n+1})$ we have that $y_{n+1} \in P_{D(w_{n+1})}(E(w_n)) \cap E(w_{n+1}) \neq \emptyset$. Then by Corollary E.6, $E(w_n) \subset \phi_{[-\alpha, 0]}(D(w_{n+1}))$. In particular $\{y_n, w_n\} \subset \phi_{[-\alpha, 0]}(D(w_{n+1})) \subset \text{Domain of } P_{D(w_{n+1})}$. Using (221) and (228) we have that

$$
d(P_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n), w_{n+1}) \leq d(P_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n), P_{D(w_{n+1})}(y_n)) + d(P_{D(w_{n+1})}(y_n), w_{n+1})
\leq A d(w_n, y_n) + d(y_{n+1}, w_{n+1})
\leq A \varepsilon_4 + \varepsilon_4 < \varepsilon_3.
$$

Therefore by (231), $\overline{w} := (w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega$.

Define $S_n \tau(\overline{w})$ by (233) and $f_{\overline{w}}(t)$ by (234). Let $\sigma : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0)$ be the continuous function which is affine on the intervals $[S_n \tau(\overline{w}), S_{n+1} \tau(\overline{w})], n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and such that

$$
\sigma(S_n \tau(\overline{w})) = \begin{cases} 
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T_{D(w_{k+1})}(y_k) & n \geq 1, \\
0 & n = 0, \\
-\sum_{k=n}^{-1} T_{D(w_{k+1})}(y_k) & n \leq -1.
\end{cases}
$$

If $s_n := S_n \tau(\overline{w})$ and $0 \leq t \leq T_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n)$ we have that

$$
d(\phi_{\sigma(s_n+t)}(y), f_{\overline{w}}(s_n + t)) = d(\phi_{\sigma(s_n+t) - \sigma(s_n)}(y_n), \phi_t(w_n)),
\quad d(\phi_{b\delta}(y_n), \phi_t(w_n)),
\quad b = \frac{T_{D(w_{n+1})}(y_n)}{T_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n)},
\quad \leq d(\phi_{b\delta}(y_n), \phi_t(y_n)) + d(\phi_t(y_n), \phi_t(w_n)),
\quad \leq \left| T_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n) - T_{D(w_{n+1})}(y_n) \right| \|\partial_t \phi\|_{\text{sup}} + \sup_{|t| \leq \alpha} \text{Lip}(\phi_t) \cdot d(y_n, w_n)
\leq \alpha \|\partial_t \phi\|_{\text{sup}} + \sup_{|t| \leq \alpha} \text{Lip}(\phi_t) \cdot \varepsilon_4.
$$
Thus, by (224),
\[ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad d(\phi_{b(t)}(y), f\pi(t)) < \frac{1}{2} \text{(flow expansivity constant for } \Lambda_U). \]

From (240) and (226.iii) we have that
\[ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad d(fw(t), \phi_{b+s(t)}(\pi\overline{w})) < \frac{1}{5} \text{(flow expansivity constant for } \Lambda_U). \]

Since \( t \mapsto b + s(t) \) is a homeomorphism of \( \mathbb{R} \) the last two inequalities and the definition B.8 of flow expansivity imply that \( y \) and \( \pi\overline{w} \) are in the same orbit. Since \( y = PD_1(x) \) we have that \( y \) and \( x \) are in the same orbit of \( \pi\overline{w} \). Therefore
\[ x \in \phi\pi(\pi(\Omega)) = \Lambda. \]

\[ \square \]

Observe that \( \Lambda \) may fail to be locally maximal. We have covered \( \Lambda \) with \( \text{‘flowed rectangles’ } \phi_{[0,\alpha]}(T_w) \). Each rectangle \( T_w \) is closed under the bracket \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{D_i}, w \in D_i \). But it does not imply that \( \Lambda \) has a local product structure. There could be points \( x, y \in \Lambda \) with \( d(x, y) \) small which lie in different flowed rectangles for which \( \langle x, y \rangle \notin \Lambda \). In the symbolic dynamics \( \Omega \) the pre-images of these points lie in different cylinders, and thus they are far in \( \Omega \). In \( \Omega \) the return time is continuous.

**E.10. Lemma.** Write \( T^* := \text{int } T \).

Let \( W_1 := \{ w \in W \mid T^*_w \neq \emptyset \} \), then \( \pi(\Omega) = \bigcup_{w \in W_1} T^*_w \).

**Proof:** The rectangles \( T_w \) are images of symbolic cylinders under a continuous map, hence they are closed. If \( w \in W \) then \( \text{int}(T_w \setminus T^*_w) = \emptyset \) and hence its complement \( T^c_w \cup T^*_w \) is open and dense in \( \pi(\Omega) \). By Baire Theorem \( Y := \bigcap_{w \in W}(T^c_w \cup T^*_w) \) is dense in \( \pi(\Omega) \). Since \( W \) is finite, \( Y \) is also open in \( \pi(\Omega) \). If \( x \in Y \) and \( x \in T_u \) then \( x \in T^*_u \). Therefore \( Y \subset O := \bigcup_{w \in W} T^*_w = \bigcup_{w \in W_1} T^*_w \). Since \( W \) is finite we have that \( O \) is closed and dense in \( \pi(\Omega) \). Therefore \( O = \pi(\Omega) \). \[ \square \]

From now on we replace \( W \) by \( W_1 \) and the rectangles \( T_w \) by \( T^*_w \), so that they are proper. And replace correspondingly \( \Omega \) by \( \Omega \cap (W_1)^\mathbb{Z} \). Then
\[ \mathcal{F} := \{ T_w \mid w \in W_1 \} \]
satisfies almost all the requirements for a proper family of rectangles for \( \Lambda \) as in definitions D.3. and D.5. It may only not satisfy condition (vi) in Definition D.3 for \( \phi_{t=0} \), namely, the rectangles in \( \mathcal{F} \) may intersect and also any discs which contain them may intersect. For simplicity we will only solve this problem at the end of the construction. We now refine the family \( \mathcal{F} \) to obtain a family with the Markov Property.
For $\overline{w} \in \Omega$ write
\[
W_{\text{loc}}^s(\overline{w}) := \{ z \in \Omega \mid \forall k \geq 0 \ z_k = \overline{w}_k \},
\]
\[
W_{\text{loc}}^u(\overline{w}) := \{ z \in \Omega \mid \forall k \leq 0 \ z_k = \overline{w}_k \}.
\]

E.11. Lemma.

For $\overline{w} = (w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega$ we have that
\[
\pi(W_{\text{loc}}^s(\overline{w})) \subset W^s(\pi(\overline{w}), T_{w_0}),
\]
\[
\pi(W_{\text{loc}}^u(\overline{w})) \subset W^u(\pi(\overline{w}), T_{w_0}).
\]

Proof: We only prove the inclusion for the stable manifolds.

Let $z = (z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \in W_{\text{loc}}^s(\overline{w})$ then from (234) $f_T(z) = f(\overline{w})$ for all $t \geq 0$. Also $\pi z \in T_{w_0}$.

From (240) we have that there are $s_1, s_2 : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0)$ continuous and strictly increasing and $|a_1|, |a_2| < \frac{\alpha}{2}$ such that
\[
d(\phi_{s_1(t)+a_1}(\pi z), f\overline{w}(t)) < \varepsilon_2, \quad \forall t \geq 0,
\]
\[
d(\phi_{s_2(t)+a_2}(\pi \overline{w}), f\overline{w}(t)) < \varepsilon_2, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\]

Then $\sigma := s_1 \circ s_2^{-1}$ is also continuous, strictly increasing, $\sigma(0) = 0$ and
\[
\forall t \geq a_2, \quad d(\phi_{s_1 + \sigma(t-a_2)}(\pi z), f_{t\overline{w}}(\pi \overline{w})) < 2\varepsilon_2.
\]

Equivalently, setting $s = t - a_2$,
\[
\forall s \geq 0, \quad d(\phi_{\sigma(s)}(\phi_{a_1}(\pi z)), \phi_{a_2}(\pi \overline{w})) < 2\varepsilon_2.
\]

By Proposition B.6 and (226.iv) we have that $\phi_{a_1}(\pi z) \in W^{ss}_{\gamma}(\phi_{\alpha_2}(\pi \overline{w}))$ with $|v| < \frac{\alpha}{2}$. Since $|v + a_2 - a_1| < \alpha$ and $z_0 = w_0$, we get that $\pi z \in P_{D(w_0)}(W^{s}_{\gamma}(\pi \overline{w})) \cap T_{w_0} = W^{s}(\pi \overline{w}, T_{w_0})$.

\[\square\]

By Lemma E.10, $\cup z = \pi(\Omega)$. For $w_0 \in W_1$ define $w : T_{w_0} \to |\beta, \alpha]$ and $G_{w_0} : T_{w_0} \to \pi(\Omega)$ as
\[
\tau_{w_0}(x) = \min \{ \tau_{D(w_1)}(x) \mid \exists \overline{w} \in \Omega \ x = \pi(\overline{w}), \overline{w}_0 = w_0, \overline{w}_1 = w_1 \in W_1 \};
\]
\[
G_{w_0}(x) = \phi_{\tau_{w_0}(x)}(x).
\]

The function $G_{w}$ may not be the first return map of $T_{w}$ to $\pi(\Omega)$. On Lemma E.15 we will prove that $G_{w}$ is the first return map to $\pi(\Omega)$ on rectangles which intersect $\Lambda$.

E.12. Lemma. For $x \in \pi(\Omega)$, if $w_0, w_1 \in W_1$, $x \in T_{w_0}$ and $G_{w_0}(x) \in T_{w_1}$, then
\[
G_{w_0}(W^s(x, T_{w_0})) \subset W^s(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1}),
\]
\[
G_{w_0}(W^u(x, T_{w_0})) \supset W^u(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1}),
\]
Proof: Let \( x \in T_{wu} \) and let \( w_1 \in W_1 \) be such that \( G_{wu}(x) \in T_{w_1} \). Let \( \varpi \in \Omega \), be such that \( \pi(\varpi) = x \), \( \varpi_0 = w_0 \) and \( \varpi_1 = w_1 \). Let \( y \in W^s(x,T_{wu}) \), then \( y = \pi(\varpi) \) for some \( \varpi \in \Omega \) with \( \varpi_0 = w_0 \) and \( G_{wu}(y) \in T_{\varpi_1} \). Let \( \varpi^* := [\varpi,\varpi] \in W^s_{\text{loc}}(\varpi) \), then \( \varpi^*_1 = w_1 \). By (244) we have that \( \pi(\varpi^*) = (\pi(\varpi),\pi(\varpi))_{D(wu)} = (x,y)_{D(wu)} = y \). Since \( \varpi^*_1 = w_1 \), we have that

\[
y = \pi(\varpi^*) \in \phi_{1-\alpha,0}(T_{w_1}) \subset \phi_{1-\alpha,0}(D(w_1)).
\]

Now let \( \varpi^* := [\varpi,\varpi] \). Similarly \( \pi(\varpi^*) = x \), \( \varpi^*_1 = \varpi_1 \) and \( x \in \phi_{1-\alpha,0}(D(\varpi_1)) \). Since \( G_{wu}(x) \in T_{wu} \subseteq D(w_1) \), we have that \( \tau_{D(w_1)}(x) \leq \tau_{D(\varpi_1)}(x) \). Since the discs \( D_i \) are disjoint and by (218.f), either \( \varpi_1 = w_1 \) or \( \tau_{D(\varpi_1)}(z) < \tau_{D(\varpi_1)}(z) \) for all \( z \in D(w_0) \cap \phi_{1-\alpha,0}(D(w_1)) \cap \phi_{1-\alpha,0}(D(\varpi_1)) \). But since for \( y \) we have that \( G_{wu}(y) \in T_{\varpi_1} \), then \( \tau_{D(w_1)}(y) \geq \tau_{D(\varpi_1)}(y) \). By (248) we have that \( y \in D(w_0) \cap \phi_{1-0,0}(D(w_1)) \cap \phi_{1-\alpha,0}(D(\varpi_1)) \), therefore \( \varpi_1 = w_1 \).

Then we have that \( G_{wu}(y) = P_{D(w_1)}(y) = \pi(\sigma(\varpi)) \in T_{w_1} \cap W^s(G_{wu}(x)) \). Since \( d(y,x) < \text{diam} T_{wu} < \alpha < \alpha_0 \), by (217) we have that \( d(G_{wu}(x),G_{wu}(y)) = d(P_{D(w_1)}(x),P_{D(w_1)}(y)) < \gamma \), and thus \( G_{wu}(y) \in W^u(G_{wu}(x)) \cap T_{w_1} = W^s(G_{wu}(x),T_{w_1}) \). The inclusion for the unstable manifolds is proved similarly.

□

For \( u, v \in W_1 \) define

\[
T^1_{uw} := T_u \cap T_v,
T^2_{uw} := \{ x \in T_u \mid W^s(x,T_u) \cap T_v = \emptyset, W^u(x,T_u) \cap T_v \neq \emptyset \},
T^3_{uw} := \{ x \in T_u \mid W^s(x,T_u) \cap T_v \neq \emptyset, W^u(x,T_u) \cap T_v = \emptyset \},
T^4_{uw} := \{ x \in T_u \mid W^s(x,T_u) \cap T_v = \emptyset, W^u(x,T_u) \cap T_v \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

By Lemma D.2 the boundary of each rectangle \( T_w \) is \( \partial T_w = \partial^s T_w \cup \partial^u T_w \), where

\[
\partial^s T_w := \{ x \in T_w \mid x \notin \text{int} W^u(x,T_w) \},
\partial^u T_w := \{ x \in T_w \mid x \notin \text{int} W^s(x,T_w) \}.
\]

Define

\[
Y := \{ x \in \pi(\Omega) \mid W^s_\gamma(x) \cap \partial^s T_w = \emptyset, W^u_\gamma(x) \cap \partial^u T_w = \emptyset, \forall w \in W_1 \},
R(x) := \{ x \in T_{uw} \mid \text{int} T^a_{uw}, T_u \cap T_v \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

Comparing with condition (217) we see that the invariant manifolds \( W^s_\gamma(x), W^u_\gamma(x) \) cross entirely rectangles in \( D(x) \). It follows that if \( x, y \in Y \) then either \( R(x) = R(y) \) or \( R(x) \cap R(y) = \emptyset \). By construction the sets \( \overline{R(x)} \) for \( x \in Y \) are proper and rectangles.

E.13. Lemma. If \( w, u \in W_1 \) then

\[
T^1_{wu} = T_w \cap T_u = \{ x \in T_w \mid W^s(x,T_w) \cap T_u \neq \emptyset, W^u(x,T_w) \cap T_u \neq \emptyset \}.
\]
**Proof:** We only prove \[
\{ x \in T_w \mid W^s(x, T_w) \cap T_u \neq \emptyset, W^u(x, T_w) \cap T_u \neq \emptyset \} \subseteq T_u,
\]
the other inclusions are easy. Suppose that \[
\exists y \in W^s(x, T_u) \cap T_u \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \exists z \in W^u(x, T_u) \cap T_u \neq \emptyset.
\]
Since \( T_u \) is a rectangle we have that \( x = \langle y, z \rangle_{T_u} \in T_u \).

\[\square\]

**E.14. Lemma.**

If \( w_0, w_1 \in W_1 \), \( x, y \in T_{w_0} \), \( G_{w_0}(x), G_{w_0}(y) \in T_{w_1} \) then

\[G_{w_0}(\langle x, y \rangle_{T_{w_0}}) = (G_{w_0}(x), G_{w_0}(y))_{T_{w_1}}.\]

**Proof:**

Since \( \text{diam } T_{w_0} < \alpha_0 \) we have that

\[\langle x, y \rangle_{T_{w_0}} = T_{w_0} \cap W^s_{\alpha_0}(x) \cap W^u_{\alpha_0}(y).\]

By (217)

\[G_{w_0}(\langle x, y \rangle_{T_{w_0}}) \in W^s(G_{w_0}(x)) \cap W^u(G_{w_0}(y)).\]

By Lemma E.12 we have that

\[G_{w_0}(\langle x, y \rangle_{T_{w_0}}) \in G_{w_0}(W^s(x, T_{w_0})) \subset W^s(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1}) \subset T_{w_1}.\]

Therefore

\[G_{w_0}(\langle x, y \rangle_{T_{w_0}}) \in T_{w_1} \cap W^s_{\gamma}(G_{w_0}(x)) \cap W^u_{\gamma}(G_{w_0}(y)) = (G_{w_0}(x), G_{w_0}(y))_{T_{w_1}}.\]

\[\square\]

Let \( F : \pi(\Omega) \to \pi(\Omega) \) be the first return map to \( \pi(\Omega) \). For the Markov property we will prove that for \( x \in \Lambda \),

\[F(W^s(x, R(x))) \subset W^s(F(x), R(F(x))) \quad \text{and} \quad W^u(F(x), R(F(x))) \subset F(W^u(x, R(x))).\]

\[\text{(250)}\]

We only show the proof for the stable manifolds.

**E.15. Lemma.** If \( x \in \Lambda \) there is \( \overline{w} \in \Omega \) such that \( \pi(\overline{w}) = x \) and \( G_{\overline{w}_0}(x) = F(x) \in T_{\overline{w}_1}. \)
Proof: For \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \) let \( w_n \in W_1 \) be such that \( d(w_n, F^n(x)) < \varepsilon_4 \) and \( F^n(x) \in D(w_n) \). We have that
\[
d(P_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n), w_{n+1}) \leq d(P_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n), F^{n+1}(x)) + d(F^{n+1}(x), w_{n+1}) \\
\leq d(P_{D(w_{n+1})}(w_n), P_{D(w_{n+1})}(F^n(x))) + \varepsilon_4 \\
\leq A d(w_n, F^n(x)) + \varepsilon_4 \leq (A + 1) \varepsilon_4 < \varepsilon_3 \quad \text{using (228)}.
\]
Then by (231), \( \bar{w} = (w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \Omega \cap (W_1)^\mathbb{Z} \). Also \( x = \pi(\bar{w}) \) by the same argument as in the end of Lemma E.9: Lemma E.9 concludes that \( x \) and \( \pi(\bar{w}) \) are in the same orbit, but in this case \( x = P_{D(w_0)}(x) = P_{D(w_0)}(\pi \bar{w}) = \pi \bar{w} \). Since \( F(x) \in D(w_1) \) we have that the minimum in (247) is attained in \( D(w_1) \): \( \tau_{w_0}(x) = \tau_{D(w_1)}(x) \). Therefore \( F(x) = P_{D(w_1)}(x) = G_{w_0}(x) \).

\[\square\]

E.16. Lemma.

If \( x, y \in \Lambda \cap Y \), \( R(x) = R(y) \) and \( y \in W^s(x, R(x)) \), then \( R(F(x)) = R(F(y)) \).

Proof:

Let \( w_1 \in W_1 \) be such that \( F(x) \in T_{w_1} \). Since \( x \in \Lambda \) and \( F(x) \in T_{w_1} \), by Lemma E.15 there is \( \bar{w} \in \Omega \) such that \( \pi(\bar{w}) = x \) and \( \bar{w}_1 = w_1 \). Let \( w_0 := \bar{w}_0 \), then \( F(x) = G_{w_0}(x) \).

We have that \( y \in W^s(x, R(x)) \subset W^s(x, T_{w_0}) \). Since \( G_{w_0}(x) = F(x) \in T_{w_1} \), by Lemma E.12,
\[
G_{w_0}(y) \in G_{w_0}(W^s(x, T_{w_0})) \subset W^s(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1}).
\]
Therefore \( W^s(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1}) = W^s(G_{w_0}(y), T_{w_1}) \). Thus
\[
G_{w_0}(x) \in T_{w_1} \implies \forall z \in W_1 \quad W^s(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1} \cap T_z = W^s(G_{w_0}(y), T_{w_1} \cap T_z).
\]

Since \( G_{w_0}(y) \in T_{w_1} \) we also get that \( G_{w_0}(y) = F(y) \). Therefore
\[
F(x) \in T_{w_1} \implies \forall z \in W_1 \quad W^s(F(x), T_{w_1} \cap T_z = W^s(F(y), T_{w_1} \cap T_z).
\]

Now suppose that \( z \in W_1 \) and \( \exists q_1 \in W^u(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1} \cap T_z \neq \emptyset \). By Lemma E.12,
\[
q_1 \in W^u(G_{w_0}(x), T_{w_1}) \subset G_{w_0}(W^u(x, T_{w_0})).
\]
Therefore there exists \( q_0 \in W^u(x, T_{w_0}) \) such that
\[
G_{w_0}(q_0) = q_1 \in T_{w_1} \cap T_z.
\]
Since \( G_{w_0}(q_0) = q_1 \in T_z \), using Lemma E.12 we have that
\[
G_{w_0}((q_0, y)_{T_{w_0}}) \subset G_{w_0}(W^s(q_0, T_{w_0})) \subset W^s(G_{w_0}(q_0), T_z) \subset T_z.
\]
By construction \( G_{w_0}(q_0) = q_1 \in T_{w_1} \). From (251), also \( G_{w_0}(y) \in T_{w_1} \) and using Lemma E.14
\[
G_{w_0}((q_0, y)_{T_{w_0}}) = (G_{w_0}(q_0), G_{w_0}(y))_{T_{w_1}} \in W^u(G_{w_0}(y), T_{w_1}).
\]
We have proven that
\[ W^u(G_{w_0}(x), T_{u_1}) \cap T_z \neq \emptyset \implies W^u(G_{w_0}(y), T_{u_1}) \cap T_z \neq \emptyset. \]
Since the hypothesis on \( x \) and \( y \) are symmetric we obtain
\[ W^u(G_{w_0}(x), T_{u_1}) \cap T_z \neq \emptyset \iff W^u(G_{w_0}(y), T_{u_1}) \cap T_z \neq \emptyset. \]
Since \( G_{w_0}(x) = F(x) \) and \( G_{w_0}(y) = F(y) \), we have that
\[ W^u(F(x), T_{u_1}) \cap T_z \neq \emptyset \iff W^u(F(y), T_{u_1}) \cap T_z \neq \emptyset. \]

The statements (252) and (255) and Lemma E.13 imply Lemma E.16.

\[ \square \]

E.17. Lemma. If \( x \in \Lambda \) then
\[ F(W^s(x, R(x))) \subset W^s(F(F(x))). \]

\textbf{Proof:} Given \( y \in W^s(x, R(x)) \) by Lemma E.16 we have that \( F(y) \in R(F(y)) = R(F(x)) \).
Since \( \text{diam } R(x) < \alpha_0 \), by (217) we have that \( d(F(y), F(x)) < \gamma \) and hence
\[ F(y) \in W^s_\gamma(F(x)) \cap R(F(x)) = W^s(F(x), R(F(x))). \]

\[ \square \]

The inclusion (250) is proven similarly, it can also be proved applying Lemma E.17 to the reverse flow \( \phi_{-t} \).

Then the set of rectangles \( \{ R(x) \mid x \in \Lambda \} \) satisfies the Markov property. Let
\[ \mathcal{R} := \cup \{ R(x) \mid x \in \Lambda \}, \quad \Sigma_1 := \{ y \in \mathcal{R} \mid \forall k \in \mathbb{Z} \quad F^k(y) \in \mathcal{R} \}. \]
Then \( \Sigma_1 \) is closed and \( F \)-invariant.

E.18. Lemma. If \( p \in \Lambda \cap Y \) then \( R(p) \cap \Sigma_1 \) is a rectangle in \( \Sigma_1 \).

\textbf{Proof:} Let \( x, y \in R(p) \cap \Sigma_1 \) and \( z := (x, y)_{R(p)} \). Since \( x, y \in \Sigma_1 \) we have that \( \forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \) \( R(F^n(x)), R(F^n(y)) \in \{ R(q) \mid q \in \Lambda \} \). Since \( z \in W^s(x, R(p)) \) by the Markov property (256), for \( n \geq 0, F^n(z) \in W^s(F^n(x), R(F^n(x))) \subset R(F^n(x)) \subset \mathcal{R} \). Since \( z \in W^u(y, R(p)) \), by (250) \( F^{-n}(z) \in W^u(F^{-n}(y), R(F^{-n}(y))) \subset \mathcal{R} \). Therefore \( z \in \Sigma_1 \).

\[ \square \]

The rectangles in \( \{ R(p) \mid p \in \Lambda \} \) will give a Markov partition in the hyperbolic set \( \Lambda_1 := \phi_{\mathcal{R}}(\Sigma_1) \), with \( \Lambda \subset \Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda \).

Finally, in order to fulfill the requirement \( D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset \) in Definition D.3.(vi) for \( t = 0 \) we slightly modify the disks \( D(w), w \in W_1 \) in the following way. Take \( u_1, \ldots, u_L, L = \#W_1 \).
very small and distinct. Enumerate \( W_1 = \{ w_1, \ldots, w_L \} \). Then redefine the disks \( D(w_i) \) and the rectangles \( R(w_i) \) by
\[
D_1(w_i) := \phi_{u_i}(D(w_i)), \quad R_1(w_i) := \phi_{u_i}(R(w_i)).
\]
This finishes the proof of Theorem E.4.

\[\square\]

Appendix F. Structural Stability.

As we shall see the structural stability result presented here does not need the local maximality of the hyperbolic set.

Let \( M \) be a \( C^\infty \) compact manifold and \( \phi \) a \( C^k \) flow on \( M \). Let \( \Lambda \) be a hyperbolic set for \( \phi \). Define
\[ C^{\alpha}(\Lambda, M) := \left\{ u : \Lambda \to M \mid u \text{ is } \alpha\text{-Hölder continuous} \right\}. \]
This space has the structure of a Banach manifold modelled by the Banach space \( C^{\alpha}(\Lambda, \mathbb{R}^n) \) with the norm \( \| f \| := \| f \|_0 + \| f \|_\alpha \), where for \( f \in C^{\alpha}(\Lambda, \mathbb{R}^n) \),
\[
\| f \|_0 := \sup_{x \in \Lambda} |f(x)|, \quad \| f \|_\alpha := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{d(x, y)^\alpha}.
\]

Let
\[ C^0_\phi(\Lambda, M) := \left\{ u \in C^0(\Lambda, M) \mid D_\phi u(x) := \frac{d}{dt} u(\phi_t(x)) \bigg|_{t=0} \text{ exists} \right\}, \]
\[ C^{\alpha}_\phi(\Lambda, M) := \left\{ u \in C^{\alpha}(\Lambda, M) \mid D_\phi u(x) := \frac{d}{dt} u(\phi_t(x)) \bigg|_{t=0} \text{ exists and is } \alpha\text{-Hölder} \right\}. \]

Let \( X \) be the vector field of \( \phi \). The structural stability of the hyperbolic set \( \Lambda \) can be written as a solution \((u, \gamma) \in C^0_\phi(\Lambda, M) \times C^0(\Lambda, \mathbb{R}^+) \) to the equation
\[ Y \circ u = \gamma \, D_\phi u \]
for a vector field \( Y \) nearby \( X \). Here \( u \) is the topological equivalence and \( \gamma \) encodes the reparametrization of the flow. The following theorem says that such solutions can be obtained as implicit functions of \( Y \).

F.1. Theorem.

Let \( M \) be a \( C^{k+1} \) compact manifold and \( \phi \) a flow of a \( C^k \) vector field \( X \) on \( M \). Let \( X^k \) be the Banach manifold of \( C^k \) vector fields on \( M \). Suppose that \( \Lambda \) is a hyperbolic set for \( \phi_t \). Then
(a) There exist \(0 < \beta < 1\), a neighbourhood \(U \subset X^k(M)\) of \(X\) and \(C^{k-1}\) maps \(U \to C^\beta(\Lambda, M) : Y \mapsto u_Y\) and \(U \to C^\beta(\Lambda, \mathbb{R}^+) : Y \mapsto \gamma_Y\) such that

\[
Y \circ u_Y = \gamma_Y D_Y u_Y.
\]

(b) The maps \(U \to C^0(\Lambda, M) : Y \mapsto u_Y\) and \(U \to C^0(\Lambda, \mathbb{R}^+) : Y \mapsto \gamma_Y\) are \(C^k\).

The version for Hölder maps in item (a) is useful for proving smooth dependence of equilibrium states, entropies and SBR measures, see [14]. For \(Y\) near \(X\) the topological equivalence \(u_Y\) is uniquely determined if we require that \(u_Y(x) \in \exp_x(X(x)^\perp)\) and \(u_Y\) near the identity. One can change \(\Gamma(x) = \exp_x(X(x)^\perp \cap B(0, \delta))\) by any other smooth family of local transversal sections to the flow.

The first version of Theorem F.1 appears in de la Llave, Marco, Moriyón [23]. Item (a) is proven in [32, p. 591] and item (b) is proven in [33, p. 23ff.] in the case \(k = 1\), but the proof can be immediately generalized to and arbitrary positive integer \(k\).

F.2. Corollary.

There is a neighbourhood \(U \subset X^k(M)\) of \(X\) such that for every \(Y \in U\) the map \(u_Y\) is a homeomorphism \(u_Y : \Lambda \to u_Y(\Lambda)\).

Proof:

Since \(\Lambda\) is compact and \(u_Y\) is continuous, it is enough (cf. Rudin [43] Theorem 4.17) to prove that \(u_Y\) is injective for \(Y\) near \(X\).

Let \(\eta > 0\) be such that every periodic orbit in \(\Lambda\) has period larger than \(4\eta\). Let \(\alpha = \pi(\eta) < \eta\) be a flow expansivity constant for \((\Lambda, \phi_t)\) as in Definition B.8. There is a neighbourhood \(U_0\) of \(X\) such that for all \(Y \in U_0\) every periodic orbit in \(B(\Lambda, \alpha) := \{ y \in M \mid d(y, \Lambda) < \alpha \}\) has period larger than \(2\eta\).

Since \(u_X = \text{id}_\Lambda\) there is a neighbourhood \(U_1 \subset U_0\) of \(X\) such that

\[
\forall Y \in U_1 \quad \forall x \in \Lambda \quad d(u_Y(x), x) < \frac{1}{2}\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} < \gamma_Y(x) < 2.
\]

Denote by \(\psi_x^Y\) the flow of \(Y \in U_1\). From equation (257) we get that for \(Y \in U_1, x \in \Lambda\) and \(t \in \mathbb{R}\) we have that

\[
Y(\phi_t(x)) = \gamma_Y(\phi_t(x)) \frac{d}{ds} u_Y(\phi_s(x)) \bigg|_{s=t}.
\]

This implies that the equation

\[
u_Y(\phi_t(x)) = \psi_x^Y(\phi_t(x))
\]
has a solution \( s(t) \) with \( s(0) = 0 \) satisfying
\[
\frac{ds}{dt}(t) = \gamma_Y (\phi_t(x))^{-1}.
\]
Since \( \frac{ds}{dt} > 0 \) we have that \( s(t) \) has a continuous inverse \( t(s) : \mathbb{R} \leftarrow \) satisfying \( t(0) = 0 \).
Also
\[
\forall s \in \mathbb{R} \quad u_Y (\phi_t(s)(x)) = \psi^Y_s (u_Y(x)),
\]
and by (259),
\[
\forall s \in \mathbb{R} \quad d((\psi^Y_s (u_Y(x)), \phi_t(s)(x))) < \frac{1}{2} \alpha.
\]
Suppose that \( Y \in U_1 \) and \( x, y \in \Lambda \) are such that \( u_Y(x) = u_Y(y) \). There are increasing homeomorphisms \( t_1, t_2 : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \leftarrow \) such that
\[
d((\psi^Y_s (u_Y(x)), \phi_{t_1(s)}(x))) < \frac{1}{2} \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad d((\psi^Y_s (u_Y(y)), \phi_{t_2(s)}(y))) < \frac{1}{2} \alpha.
\]
Since \( u_Y(x) = u_Y(y) \) we get that
\[
\forall \tau \in \mathbb{R} \quad d(\phi_\tau(x), \phi_{t_2 \circ t_1^{-1}(\tau)}(y)) < \alpha.
\]
Since \( t_2 \circ t_1^{-1} \) is continuous and \( t_2 \circ t_1^{-1}(0) = 0 \), by the flow expansivity of \( \phi_\tau \) we have that \( y = \phi_\nu(x) \) with \( |\nu| < \eta \). Suppose that \( v \neq 0 \). Since by (259), \( \gamma_Y^{-1} < 2 \), the orbit segment from \( x \) to \( \phi_\nu(x) \) is sent by \( u_Y \) to a closed orbit \( \psi^Y_s(y) \) with a period smaller than \( 2\eta \). This contradicts the choice of \( U_1 \) in (258) and (259). Therefore \( v = 0 \) and hence \( y = x \).

\[\square\]

F.3. Proposition.

If \( k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), \( \Lambda \subset M \) is a hyperbolic set for the flow \( \phi \) on \( M \) with vector field \( X \) and \( V \) is an open neighbourhood of \( \Lambda \), then there is an open set \( U \) such that \( \Lambda \subset U \subset \overline{U} \subset V \), an open set \( X \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}^k(M) \), a subshift of finite type \( \sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega \), \( 0 < \beta < 1 \) and \( C^k \) maps \( \tau : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow C^\beta(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^+) \), \( Y \rightarrow \tau_Y \) and \( \pi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow C^\beta(\Omega, M) \), \( Y \rightarrow \pi_Y \) such that the natural extension of \( \pi_Y \) to \( \pi_Y : S(\Omega, \tau_Y) \rightarrow M \) is a well defined time preserving semiconjugacy
\[
S(\Omega, \tau_Y) \xrightarrow{\pi_Y} S(\Omega, \tau_Y)
\]
\[
\Lambda_Y \xrightarrow{\psi^Y_t} \Lambda_Y
\]
between the suspended flow \( S_t \) of \( \sigma \) in \( S(\Omega, \tau_Y) \) and a hyperbolic set \( \Lambda_Y \) for the flow \( \psi^Y_t \) of \( Y \) which satisfies
\[
\forall Y \in \mathcal{U} \quad \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi^Y_t(\overline{U}) \subset \Lambda_Y \subset V.
\]
In particular \( \Lambda \subset \Lambda_X \).
Proof:

Let \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) be such that\( B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_0) := \{ y \in M \mid d(y, x) < \varepsilon_0 \} \subset V. \)

Let \( U_0 \subset X^k(M) \) be the neighbourhood of \( X \) given by Theorem F.1 and Corollary F.2.

Using Corollary B.10 with \( \eta = 1 \) there exist an open set \( U_1 \subset X^k(M) \) with \( X \subset U_1 \subset U_0 \) and \( \varepsilon_1, \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \) such that
\[
\tag{264} 0 < \alpha < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0
\]
\[
\Lambda_1^Y := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi_{\varepsilon_1}^Y \left( \overline{B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_1)} \right)
\]
is hyperbolic and if \( Y \in U_1, z, w \in \Lambda_1^Y, \beta \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), \beta(0) = 0 \) satisfy
\[
\tag{265} \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad d(\psi_{\beta(t)}^Y(w), \phi_t^Y(z)) < \alpha,
\]
then \( w = \psi_{\xi}^Y(z) \) for some \( |\xi| < 1. \)

Let
\[
\tag{266} 0 < \delta_0 < \alpha
\]
be such that any \( \delta_0 \) possible 1-specification for \( (\Lambda, \phi_t) \) is \( \frac{1}{3} \alpha \)-shadowed as in the Shadowing Corollary B.15. For a metric space \((B, d)\) and \( f, g : A \to B \) write
\[
d_0(f, g) := \sup_{a \in A} d(f(a), f(b)).
\]

Let \( \varepsilon_2 \) be such that
\[
\tag{267} 0 < \alpha < \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1.
\]

Let \( 0 < \varepsilon_3 < \varepsilon_2 \) and \( X \in U_2 \subset U_1 \) be such that
\[
\tag{268} \left( \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \text{Lip}(\phi_t) \right) \varepsilon_3 + \sup_{Y \in U_2} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} d_0(\phi_t, \psi_t^Y) < \frac{\delta_0}{3} < \frac{\alpha}{3}
\]
and
\[
\tag{269} \frac{1}{3} \delta_0 + \varepsilon_3 < \frac{2}{3} \delta_0.
\]

Observe that by the choice of \( \varepsilon_1 \) in (264) and Corollary B.10 the set
\[
\Lambda_1 := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(\overline{B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_1)})
\]
is hyperbolic. Let \( X \in U_3 \subset U_2 \) be a neighbourhood of \( X \) from Theorem F.1 applied to \( \Lambda_1 \) so that \( u_Y \) and \( \gamma_Y \) are defined on \( \Lambda_1 \) for all \( Y \in U_3 \) and that \( U_3 \) is small enough so that
\[
\tag{270} \forall Y \in U_3 \quad d_0(u_Y|_{\Lambda_1}, id|_{\Lambda_1}) < \frac{1}{3} \alpha.
\]

Define
\[
\tag{271} \Lambda_2 := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(\overline{B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_2)}).
\]
By Theorem E.4 there is a hyperbolic set $\Lambda$ for $\phi_t$ such that $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_2 \subset \Lambda \subset B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_1) \subset V$ and with a Markov partition which is the image by a time preserving Lipschitz semiconjugacy $\pi$ of a suspension of a subshift of finite type $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ with Hölder ceiling function $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. $\pi \in \mathcal{U}$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\pi \\
\Lambda \\
\downarrow \\
\Lambda \\
\phi_t \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\downarrow \\
\uparrow \\
\downarrow \\
\downarrow \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
S(\Omega, \tau) \\
\pi \\
S(\Omega, \tau) \\
\end{array}$$

Since $\Lambda$ is invariant by $\phi_t$ and $\Lambda \subset B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_1)$ we have that $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_1$. In particular for all $Y \in \mathcal{U}_3$ the functions $u_Y$ and $\gamma_Y$ are defined on $\Lambda_1 \supset \Lambda$. For $Y \in \mathcal{U}_3$ let $\Lambda_Y := u_Y(\Lambda)$ and $\pi_Y := u_Y \circ \pi|_{\Omega \times \{0\}} \in C^\beta(\Omega \times \{0\}, \Lambda_Y)$. Since $u_Y : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_Y$ is a (non time preserving) topological equivalence among the flows $(\Lambda, \phi_t)$ and $(\Lambda_Y, \psi^Y_\phi)$ we have that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Omega \times \{0\} \\
\pi \\
\Lambda \\
\downarrow \\
\Lambda_Y \\
\downarrow \\
\Lambda_Y \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\sigma \\
\downarrow \\
\Omega \times \{0\} \\
\downarrow \\
\Lambda_Y \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\Lambda \\
\downarrow \\
F \\
\downarrow \\
\Lambda \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
F_Y \\
\downarrow \\
\Lambda_Y \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\downarrow \\
\uparrow \\
\downarrow \\
\downarrow \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\pi \\
\Lambda \\
\downarrow \\
\Lambda_Y \\
\end{array}$$

where $F_Y := u_Y \circ F \circ u_Y^{-1}$ and $F$ is the first return map to the Markov partition for $\Lambda$, $F(\pi \overline{w}) = \phi_{\tau(\overline{w})}(\pi \overline{w})$.

Since $u_Y$ satisfies the equalities (260) and (261) we have that

$$F_Y(\pi_Y \overline{w}) = \psi^Y_{\pi_Y(\overline{w})}(\pi_Y(\overline{w})),$$

where

$$\tau_Y(\overline{w}) := \int_0^{\tau(\overline{w})} \gamma_Y(\phi_t(\pi \overline{w}))^{-1} dt.$$

Then the diagram (262) commutes.

It remains to prove the inclusions in (263). Since $Y \mapsto u_Y \in C^0(\Lambda, M)$ is continuous, and $u_X(\Lambda) = \Lambda \subset V$, there is a neighbourhood $X \in \mathcal{U}_4 \subset \mathcal{U}_3$ such that

$$\forall Y \in \mathcal{U}_4 \quad \Lambda_Y = u_Y(\Lambda) \subset V.$$

Let $U := B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_3)$. Given $z \in \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \psi^Y_s(U)$ let $z_n := \psi^Y_n(z) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $z_n \in U = \overline{B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_3)}$ there is $y_n \in \Lambda$ such that $d(y_n, z_n) \leq \varepsilon_3$. Define a 1-specification $f(t)$ (cf. definition B.11) for $(\Lambda, \phi_t)$ by

$$f(n + t) := \phi_t(y_n), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad t \in [0, 1[.$$
Using (268) we have that
\[ \begin{align*}
    d(f(n + t), \psi^Y_t(z_n)) &= d(\phi_t(y_n), \psi^Y_t(z_n)) \\
    &\leq d(\phi_t(y_n), \phi_t(z_n)) + d(\phi_t(z_n), \psi^Y_t(z_n)) \\
    &\leq \left( \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \text{Lip}(\phi_t) \right) d(z_n, y_n) + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} d_0(\phi_t, \psi^Y_t) \\
    &\leq \frac{1}{3} \delta_0.
\end{align*} \]

(272)

Observe that \( f \) is \( \delta_0 \)-possible because, using that \( \psi^Y_1(z_n) = z_{n+1} \) and (269), we have that
\[ d(f(n + 1^{-}), y_{n+1}) \leq d(f(n + 1^{-}), \psi^Y_1(z_n)) + d(z_{n+1}, y_{n+1}) \leq \frac{1}{3} \delta_0 + \varepsilon_3 < \frac{2}{3} \delta_0. \]

By the Shadowing Corollary B.15 and the choice of \( \delta_0 \) in (266), there is \( x \in M \) and an increasing homeomorphism \( \beta : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0) \) such that
\[ \begin{align*}
    \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad d(\phi_{\beta(t)}(x), f(t^L)) &\leq \frac{1}{3} \alpha.
\end{align*} \]

(273)

Since by definition \( f(t) \in \Lambda \) and \( \beta(t) \) is a homeomorphism, and using (267) and (271) we obtain that
\[ x \in \bigcap_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_{\beta}(B(\Lambda, \frac{1}{3} \alpha)) \subset \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_t(B(\Lambda, \varepsilon_2)) = \Lambda_2 \subset \Lambda. \]

(274)

Then by (273), (272) and (266),
\[ \begin{align*}
    d(\phi_{\beta(n+t)}(x), \psi^Y_{n+t}(z)) &= d(\phi_{\beta(n+t)}(x), \psi^Y_t(z_n)) \\
    &\leq d(\phi_{\beta(n+t)}(x), f(n + t)) + d(f(n + t), \psi^Y_t(z_n)) \\
    &\leq \frac{1}{3} \alpha + \frac{1}{3} \delta_0 \leq \frac{2}{3} \alpha.
\end{align*} \]

(275)

There is a homeomorphism \( \sigma : (\mathbb{R}, 0) \to (\mathbb{R}, 0) \) such that
\[ \psi^Y_{\sigma(t)}(u_Y(x)) = u_Y(\phi_{\beta(t)}(x)). \]

(276)

Indeed, comparing (276) and (257) we get that
\[ \sigma(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\sigma}(t) = \dot{\beta}(t) \gamma_Y(\phi_{\beta(t)}(x))^{-1}. \]

Therefore, using (270) and (275),
\[ \begin{align*}
    d(\psi^Y_{\sigma(t)}(u_Y(x)), \psi^Y_t(z)) &= d(u_Y(\phi_{\beta(t)}(x)), \psi^Y_t(z)) \\
    &\leq d(u_Y(\phi_{\beta(t)}(x)), \phi_{\beta(t)}(x)) + d(\phi_{\beta(t)}(x), \psi^Y_t(z)) \\
    &\leq d_0(u_Y, id) + \frac{3}{3} \alpha < \alpha.
\end{align*} \]
By the choice of \( \alpha \) in (265) we have that there is \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( z = \psi^Y_\xi(u_Y(x)) \). Since \( \Lambda_Y = u_Y(\Lambda) \) is \( \psi^Y_t \)-invariant and by (274), \( x \in \Lambda \), we obtain that \( z \in \Lambda_Y \). Therefore
\[
\bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \psi^Y_s(\mathcal{U}) \subset \Lambda_Y.
\]

\[\square\]

F.4. Proposition.

Let \( \phi \in \mathcal{U} \) and \( \Lambda \subset U \subset V \) be from Proposition F.3. If \( Y \in \mathcal{U} \) and \( \mu \) is a \( \psi^Y_t \)-invariant Borel probability with \( \text{supp} \mu \subset U \) then there is and \( S_t \)-invariant Borel probability on \( \mathcal{S}(\Omega, \tau_Y) \) such that \( (\pi_Y)_* \nu = \mu \).

Proof: By Proposition F.3 \( \text{supp}(\mu) \subset \Lambda_Y \). For \( f \in C^0(\Lambda_Y, \mathbb{R}) \) let \( G(f \circ \pi_Y) = \int f \, d\mu \).
Then \( G \) defines a positive linear functional on a subspace \( W \) of \( C^0(\mathcal{S}(\Omega, \tau_Y), \mathbb{R}) \).
By the Riesz extension theorem, \( G \) extends to a positive linear functional on \( C^0(\mathcal{S}(\Omega, \tau_Y), \mathbb{R}) \).
Since \( G(1) = G(1 \circ \pi) = 1 \), the extension \( G \) corresponds to a Borel probability \( \beta \) on \( \mathcal{S}(\Omega, \tau_Y) \).
By the construction \( (\pi_Y)_* \beta = \mu \).
By compactness we can choose a sequence \( T_k \to \infty \) such that \( \nu = \lim_{k} \frac{1}{T_k} \int_{0}^{T_k} (S_t)_* \beta \, dt \) exists.
We have that \( \nu \) is \( S_t \)-invariant and using that
\[
(\pi_Y)_*(S_t)_* \beta = (\psi^Y_t)_*(\pi_Y)_* \beta = (\psi^Y_t)_* \mu = \mu,
\]
we get that \( (\pi_Y)_* \nu = \mu \).

\[\square\]

Appendix G. Stability of hyperbolic Mañé sets.

Observe that the definition 0.1 of a hyperbolic set for an autonomous lagrangian corresponds to hyperbolicity for the flow restricted to an energy level. Nearby energy levels can be considered as perturbations of the flow.

Given Tonelli lagrangian \( L : TM \to \mathbb{R} \) let \( E_L := v \cdot L_v - L \) be its energy function and define
\[
e_0(L) := \inf\{ \, k \in \mathbb{R} \mid \pi(E_{L}^{-1}\{k\}) = M \, \}.
\]
Observe that
\[
\frac{d}{dt} E_L(x, tv) = v \cdot L_v(x, tv) \cdot v > 0 \quad \text{if} \ v \neq 0.
\]
Then \( f(t) := E_L(x, tv) \) is increasing on \( t > 0 \). This implies that for \( k > e_0(L) \) the radial projection is a diffeomorphism between the unit tangent bundle and the energy level \( E_L^{-1}\{k\} \).

Denote by \( O_M \) the zero section of \( TM \).

G.1. Lemma.

If \( E^{-1}\{c(L)\} \cap O_M \neq \emptyset \) then \( c(L) = e_0(L) \) and \( E_L^{-1}(e_0) \cap O_M \subset \mathcal{A}(L) \subset \mathcal{N}(L) \).
Proof:

Let

\[ \Sigma^+(L) := \{ v \in TM \mid \pi \circ \phi_t(v)|_{[0, +\infty[} \text{ is semi-static} \} . \]

We have that \( E(\Sigma^+(L)) = \{ c(L) \} \) (Mañé [35, p. 146]). By the Covering Property (Mañé [35, Theorem VII] also [16, Th. VII]), \( \pi(\Sigma^+(L)) = M \). Therefore \( c(L) \geq c_0(L) \) and

\[ E^{-1}\{ c(L) \} \cap O_M \neq \emptyset \implies c(L) = c_0(L). \]

Let

\[ F(x, v) := L(x, v) + E_L(x, v) = v \cdot L_\nu(x, v). \]

If \( \gamma : [0, T] \to M \) is a closed curve with energy \( c(L) \) we have that

\[ \int_0^T F(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \, dt = \int_0^T (L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) + c(L)) \, dt \geq A_{L+c}(\gamma|_{[0, t]}) + \Phi_c(\gamma(t), \gamma(0)) \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, T[. \]

Suppose that \((x_0, 0) \in E^{-1}_L\{ c(L) \} \cap O_M \neq \emptyset \). Let \( \gamma(t) \equiv x_0 \) for \( t \in [0, 2] \). Then \( E_L(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) = E_L(x_0, 0) = c(L) \), \( F(x_0, 0) = 0 \) and \( \int_0^2 F(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) \, dt = 0 \). From (277) we obtain that \( \gamma \) is static and hence \( (\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) = (x_0, 0) \in \mathcal{A}(L) \).

\[ \square \]

G.2. Corollary.

If \( \tilde{N}(L) \) does not contain fixed points of the lagrangian flow then \( c(L) > c_0(L) \) and the energy level \( E^{-1}_L\{ c(L) \} \) is diffeomorphic to the unit tangent bundle \( SM \) under the radial projection.

G.3. Theorem.

Suppose that \( L : TM \to \mathbb{R} \) is a Tonelli lagrangian and that its Mañé set \( \tilde{N}(L) \) is hyperbolic without fixed points. Let \( V \) be an open set with \( \tilde{N}(L) \subset V \). Then there is a subshift of finite type \( \sigma : \Omega \to \Omega \) and there are open sets \( \tilde{N}(L) \subset U \subset V \) and \( 0 \in \mathcal{U} \subset C^2(M, \mathbb{R}) \) and continuous maps \( C^2(M, \mathbb{R}) \supset \mathcal{U} \ni \phi \mapsto \tau_\phi \in C^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^+) \) and \( C^2(M, \mathbb{R}) \supset \mathcal{U} \ni \phi \mapsto \pi_\phi \in C^0(S(\Omega, \tau_\phi), TM) \), where \( (S(\Omega, \tau_\phi), S_t) \) is the suspension flow of \( \sigma \) with ceiling function \( \tau_\phi \), and there are hyperbolic sets \( \Lambda_\phi = \pi_\phi(S(\Omega, \tau_\phi)) \) for the flow \( \varphi^L_{L+\phi} \) of \( L + \phi \) restricted to the energy level \( E^{-1}_L\{ c(L + \phi) \} \) such that

\[ \forall \phi \in \mathcal{U} \quad \tilde{N}(L + \phi) \subset \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \varphi^L_{L+\phi}(U) \subset \Lambda_\phi \subset V \]
and the following diagram commutes for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
S(\Omega, \tau) & \xrightarrow{S_t} & S(\Omega, \tau) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Lambda_\phi & \xrightarrow{\varphi^{L+\phi}_t} & \Lambda_\phi
\end{array}
$$

Moreover any invariant measure $\mu$ for $L + \phi$ with $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset U$ lifts to an invariant measure $\nu$ on $S(\Omega, \tau)$ with $(\pi_\phi)_* \nu = \mu$. In particular $\mu$ is a minimizing measure for $L + \phi$ iff it is the projection of an invariant probability $\nu$ on $S(\Omega, \tau)$ which minimizes the integral of the function $A_\phi := (L + \phi) \circ \pi_\phi$.

**Proof:**

By Lemma 5.1 in [20] for all $\ell \geq 2$ the map $C^\ell(M, \mathbb{R}) \ni \phi \mapsto c(L + \phi) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. And by Lemma 5.2 in [20] the map $C^\ell(M, \mathbb{R}) \ni \phi \mapsto \tilde{N}(L + \phi)$ is upper semicontinuous. By Corollary G.2 for $\phi \in \mathcal{U}$ small enough we can identify the energy levels $E^{-1}_{L+\phi}(c(L + \phi)) \approx E^{-1}_L(c(L)) \approx SM$ with the unit tangent bundle $SM$ and consider their lagrangian flows as perturbations of the flow of $L$ on the same manifold $SM$.

Let $\mathcal{I} := ]c(L) - \varepsilon, c(L) + \varepsilon[ \text{ with } \varepsilon > 0$ small. Let $P_{\phi,k} : SM \to E^{-1}_{L+\phi}(k)$ be the radial projection and let $X_\phi$ be the Lagrangian vector field for $L + \phi$. Let $\mathfrak{X}^1(SM)$ be the vector space of $C^1$ vector fields on $SM$. The map $\mathfrak{X} : C^\ell(M, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{I} \to \mathfrak{X}^1(SM)$, $(\phi, k) \mapsto (dP_{\phi,k})^{-1} \circ X_\phi \circ P_{\phi,k}$ is $C^{\ell-2}$ in a neighbourhood of $(\phi, k) = (0, c(L))$. If we compose this map with the continuous function $\phi \mapsto k = c(L + \phi)$ we obtain a continuous map $C^\ell(M, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathfrak{X}^1(SM)$, $\phi \mapsto \mathfrak{X}(\phi, c(L + \phi))$. The flow of this vector field is $\psi^\phi_t := P_{\phi}^{-1} \circ \varphi^{L+\phi}_t \circ P_{\phi}$, which is smoothly conjugate to the lagrangian flow of $L + \phi$ on $E^{-1}_{L+\phi}(c(L + \phi))$, and $\phi \mapsto \psi^\phi_t$ is a continuous family of $C^1$ flows on $SM$. Then there are neighbourhoods $\mathcal{U}$ of $0$ and $U \subset V$ of $\tilde{N}(L)$ in $SM$ such that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{U}$ the set $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is hyperbolic and $P_{\phi}^{-1}(\tilde{N}(L + \phi)) \subset U$, using the upper semicontinuity of $\phi \mapsto \tilde{N}(L + \phi)$.

Applying Proposition F.3 and Proposition F.4, shrinking $\mathcal{U}$ and $U$ if necessary, we obtain Proposition G.3.

$\square$

**G.4. Remark.**

In the proof of Theorem G.3 the map $\mathfrak{X} : C^\ell(M, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{I} \to \mathfrak{X}^{\ell-1}(SM)$ is continuous and then the map $C^\ell(M, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathfrak{X}^{\ell-1}(SM)$, $\phi \mapsto \mathfrak{X}(\phi, c(L + \phi))$ is continuous in the $C^{\ell-1}$ topology for $\mathfrak{X}^{\ell-1}(SM)$. 
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