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Abstract

There is a long standing conjecture that there are at least $n$ closed characteristics for any compact convex hypersurface $\Sigma$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, and the symmetric case, i.e. $\Sigma = -\Sigma$, has already been proved by C. Liu, Y. Long and C. Zhu in [Math. Ann., 323(2002), pp. 201-215]. In this paper, we extend the result in that paper to the $P$-symmetric case $\Sigma = P\Sigma$ for a certain class of symplectic matrix $P$, and prove that there are at least $[\frac{3n}{4}]$ closed characteristics on $\Sigma$ for any positive integer $n$, where $[a] := \sup\{l \in \mathbb{Z}, l \leq a\}$. To obtain our result, the key problem is to estimate (3.13) in which the method is based on the theorem called Common Index Jump Theorem. By using the Bott-type iteration formulas of Maslov index and Maslov-type index for a certain kind of iteration symplectic path, we provide the some new estimations (4.9-4.11), which are not considered in other papers.
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1. Introduction

This paper deal with the multiplicity of closed characteristics on $P$-symmetric compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. For each $C^2$-compact convex hypersurface $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ surrounding 0, we will consider the following problem:

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{y}(t) &= JN_{\Sigma}(y(t)), \quad y(t) \in \Sigma, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \\
y(\tau) &= y(0), \quad \tau > 0,
\end{align*}
$$

(1.1)

with the standard symplectic matrix $J$, i.e. $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and the outward normal unit vector $N_{\Sigma}(x)$ of $x \in \Sigma$. A solution $(\tau, y)$ of (1.1) is called a closed characteristic on $\Sigma$, and we call it a prime closed characteristic if $\tau$ is the minimal period. If two closed characteristics $(\tau, y)$ and $(\sigma, z)$ are not completely overlapping, then they are called geometrically distinct. For the set of closed characteristics and geometrically distinct ones

$$
[(\tau, y)] = \{(\sigma, z) \in J(\Sigma) | y(\mathbb{R}) = z(\mathbb{R})\},
$$

we denote them by $J(\Sigma)$ and $\hat{J}(\Sigma)$, respectively.

In the last century, this problem attracted the attentions of many mathematicians. The milestone of this problem was made by P.H. Rabinowitz and A. Weinstein in 1978 [20, 27], who...
proved that
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq 1, \forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{H}(2n).
\]
The notation \(\mathcal{H}(2n)\) denotes the collection of all hypersurfaces as considered in (1.1). After this, I. Ekeland, H. Hofer, L. Lassoued and A. Szulkin [6, 7, 23] provide a stronger result that
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq 2, \forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{H}(2n), \ n \geq 2.
\]
This result was improved greatly by Y. Long and C. Zhu [18]. They showed that
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + 1, \forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{H}(2n).
\]
Later, the case \(n = 3, 4\) for this conjecture were proved in [28] and [25], respectively.

Besides, there are also plenty of results for special compact convex hypersurfaces. In [10], C. Liu, Y. Long and C. Zhu gave the first surprising result that
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq n, \forall \Sigma = -\Sigma. \quad (1.2)
\]
This is the only result that proves the conjecture in high dimension. After that, Y. Dong and Y. Long [3] studied the \(P\)-symmetric case for
\[
P = \text{diag}(-I_{n-\kappa}, I_\kappa, -I_{n-\kappa}, I_\kappa), \ \kappa \in \{1, \cdots, n\}.
\]
Under certain assumptions about \(\Sigma\), it holds that
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq n - 2\kappa, \ \Sigma = \mathcal{P}\Sigma.
\]
The \(P\)-symmetric case was studied by D. Zhang in [29]. He considered the symplectic and orthogonal matrix \(P\) with satisfying \(P^r = I_{2n}\) for some integer \(r > 1\), and proved there are at least two geometrically distinct closed characteristics \((\tau_j, x_j)\) satisfying that
\[
x_j(t + \frac{\tau_j}{r}) = P x_j(t), \ t \in \mathbb{R}, \ j = 1, 2.
\]
For other kinds of special hypersurfaces such as brake symmetric, pinched or star-shaped hypersurfaces, we refer to [1, 4, 14, 15, 13, 16, 21, 24, 26] and it’s references.

However there are still no other results about the total number of closed characteristics on \(P\)-symmetric ones yet. Therefore, in this paper, we will focus on the \(P\)-symmetric case. We define the symplectic group as
\[
\text{Sp}(2n) = \{ M \in GL(2n, \mathbb{R}) | M^T J M = J \}.
\]
For \(\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_P(2n) := \{ \Sigma \in \mathcal{H}(2n) | P x = \Sigma, \forall x \in \Sigma, P \in \text{Sp}(2n) \}\), we call \(\Sigma\) \(P\)-symmetric, and we also call a closed characteristic \((\tau, x)\) \(P\)-symmetric if \((\tau, x)\) belongs to the set
\[
\mathcal{J}_P(\Sigma) := \{ (\tau, x) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) | x(\mathbb{R}) = P x(\mathbb{R}) \}.
\]
Then we prove the following main results.

**Theorem 1.1.** Assume that \(P \in \text{Sp}(2n)\) and \(\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_P(2n)\). If \(P\) is similar to the matrix
\[
R(-\theta)^{\frac{n}{2}} - 3\mathbb{1}, R(\theta)^{\frac{n}{2}} \quad (1.3)
\]
with \(\circ\) defined as (4.3), then
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{3n}{4}, \quad (1.4)
\]
where $R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}$, $e^{im\theta} = 1$ for some integer $m > 1$ and $\frac{\theta}{\pi} \notin \mathbb{Z}$.

Actually, this estimation is followed directly by Theorem 4.7 and we can also obtained $\# J(\Sigma) \geq n$ when $m$ is even, i.e. the result in [10]. Besides, according to Proposition 3.1(3) below, we find out for any $P$-symmetric closed characteristic $(\tau, x)$, there exist $l(x) \in \{1, \cdots, m - 1\}$ such that $x(t) = Px(t + \frac{l(x)}{m})$. However $l$ is indeterminate for each $(\tau, x)$. If we fix $l(x) \equiv 1$ for all prime closed characteristics, the following result will hold.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $P \in \text{Sp}(2n)$ and integer $m > 1$. Assume that the following conditions hold:

(i) $P$ is similar to the matrix $R(-\theta)^m$ with $\theta \in (0, \pi]$ and $e^{im\theta} = 1$,

(ii) $x(t) = Px(t + \frac{l}{m})$ for any prime closed characteristic $(\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\# J(\Sigma) \geq n.$$ 

**Remark 1.3.** If $P$ is orthogonal, we can also replace Theorem 1.1 in [11], i.e. the Bott-type formula for Maslov index, with Theorem 1.1 in [2] to prove these results.

An outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, the Maslov-type index and Maslov index are briefly introduced, and then we list some properties of splitting numbers and Krein type numbers. In Section 3, firstly, we provide the properties of symmetric closed characteristics, which have been considered by X. Hu and S. Sun in [9] for orthogonal symplectic matrix $P$. Then we transfer the multiplicity problem into the estimation (5.13) by using the Common Index Jump Theorem, i.e. Lemma 3.4. In Section 4, by using the Bott-type iteration formulas, especially, Theorem 1.1 in [11], we provide some new estimations (4.9-4.11) and prove the main results.

2. Known properties

In this section, we first introduce the Maslov-type index and Maslov index briefly. Then we will list some useful properties of Splitting numbers and Krein type numbers which will play important roles in this paper.

Let $\mathcal{P}_r(2n)$ be the collection of symplectic paths in $C([0, \tau], \text{Sp}(2n))$ starting from $I_{2n}$ and $\text{Sp}(2n)_{\omega}^0 = \{M \in \text{Sp}(2n) | \det(M - \omega I_{2n}) = 0\}$, $\text{Sp}(2n)^*_{\omega} = \text{Sp}(2n) \setminus \text{Sp}(2n)_{\omega}^0$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \mathcal{U} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| = 1\}$ and $\tau > 0$. The vector space $V$ is called symplectic if $V$ endows with a nondegenerate and closed two form $\omega_V$. Let $\tilde{J} : V \rightarrow V$ be a complex structure, i.e. $\tilde{J}^2 = -\text{id}$. $\tilde{J}$ is said to be compatible with $\omega_V$ if

$$\omega_V(\tilde{J}u, \tilde{J}v) = \omega_V(u, v), \quad \omega_V(v, \tilde{J}v) > 0, \forall u, v \in V.$$ 

A subspace $\Lambda \subset V$ is called Lagrangian if $\omega_V|\Lambda = 0$ and dim $\Lambda = n$. Let $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{st})$ be the standard symplectic space, where the standard symplectic form

$$\omega_{st}((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) := (x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1), \forall (x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}, i = 1, 2.$$ 

Each Lagrangian $\Lambda$ in $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{st})$ will possess a Lagrangian frame $Z(\Lambda) = (X, Y)^T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ whose image is $\Lambda$, where $X, Y$ are $n \times n$ matrices satisfying $Y^TX = X^TY$. Let Lag(n) be the Lagrangian Grassmannian which is the collection of all Lagrangian in $(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{st})$.

We introduce the maslov-type index and Maslov index as follows.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_r(2n)$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{U}$, the Maslov-type index ($\omega$ index) is an integer-pair value map

$$(i_\omega, \nu_\omega) : \mathcal{P}_r(2n) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \times \{0, 1, \cdots, 2n\},$$
in which
\[ \nu_\omega(\gamma) := \dim \ker \omega(\gamma) - \omega I_{2n} \]
and \( i_\omega \) is uniquely characterized by five properties of Theorem 6.2.7 in \[10\].

Let \( \mathcal{P}([a, b], V) \) be the collection of pairs of Lagrangian paths in \( V \). For any pair of Lagrangian paths \((\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)\), the Maslov index \((\text{CLM index})\) is an integer value map
\[ \mu : \mathcal{P}([a, b], V) \to \mathbb{Z} \]
uniquely characterized by properties I-VI in \[3\].

**Remark 2.2.** From the Theorem 2.6.6 in \[10\], we known that for each symplectic matrix \( M \), the symplectic path \( M e^{Jt} \in \text{Sp}(2n), t \in \mathbb{R} \), will transverse the singular cycle \( \text{Sp}(2n)^0 \) for any \( \omega \in U \). Here we call the directions of path \( M e^{Jt} \) and \( M e^{-Jt} \) are the positive and negative direction of \( M \), respectively. For any symplectic path \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(2n) \), the Maslov-type index \( i_\omega(\gamma) \in \mathbb{Z} \) in \[10\] is actually defined by counting how many half-turns \( \gamma \) winds after perturbing the end point \( \gamma(\tau) \) along the negative direction a little.

For any symplectic path \( \gamma \) which may not start from \( I_{2n} \), the Maslov index is originally defined in Theorem 1.1 in \[1\]. However, if \( \Lambda_1 \equiv V \) is contant, we can also explain \( \mu(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \) as \([e^{-J} \Lambda : \Sigma(V)]\), which is the number of points (counting the multiplicity) that the path \( e^{-J} \Lambda \), i.e. perturbing the whole curve along the negative direction a little, intersects on the Maslov cycle
\[ \Sigma(V) := \{ \Lambda \in \text{Lag}(2n), \Lambda \cap V \neq \{0\} \} \subset \text{Sp}(2n). \]

Where \( \epsilon > 0 \) is small enough and the matrix \( \tilde{J} \) is compatible with the symplectic form \( \omega_V \). All the details of this two definitions can be found in \[10, 14, 12, 3\] and \[1\]. Especially, when \((V, \omega_V) = (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{st} \oplus (-\omega_{st}))\), the graph of any symplectic path \( \gamma \in C([a, b], \text{Sp}(2n)) \) will become a Lagrangian path in \((\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_{st} \oplus (-\omega_{st}))\), i.e.
\[ \text{Gr}(\gamma(t)) := \{(x, \gamma(t)x), x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \} \subset \text{Lag}(2n), \forall t \in [a, b]. \]

Then we can define the Maslov index of \( \gamma \) respect to \( P \in \text{Sp}(2n) \) as
\[ \mu(\text{Gr}(P^T), \text{Gr}(\gamma)) = [e^{-J} \text{Gr}(\gamma) : \Sigma(\text{Gr}(P^T))] = [\text{Gr}(e^{-2\tau J} \gamma) : \Sigma(\text{Gr}(P^T))], \]
in which \( \tilde{J} \) will be \( J \oplus (-J) \) and is compatible with the symplectic form \( \omega_{st} \oplus (-\omega_{st}) \).

By these definitions above, the relations between this two indices given by Lemma 4.6 in \[3\] still hold when \( P \) is not just orthogonal but symplectic.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( P \in \text{Sp}(2n) \), \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(2n) \), we have
\[ \mu(\text{Gr}(\omega P^T), \text{Gr}(\gamma(t))) = \begin{cases} i_\omega(\gamma) + n, & \omega = 1 \\ i_\omega(\gamma), & \omega \in U \setminus \{1\}, \end{cases} \]
and
\[ \mu(\text{Gr}(\omega P^{-1}), \text{Gr}(\gamma(t))) = \mu(\text{Gr}(\omega), \text{Gr}(P \gamma(t))) = i_\omega(\tilde{\gamma} \ast \xi) - i_\omega(\xi) \]
for any path \( \xi \in \mathcal{P}(2n) \) connecting \( I_{2n} \) to \( P \), where \( \tilde{\gamma} = P \gamma \) and
\[ \tilde{\gamma} \ast \xi := \begin{cases} \xi(2t), & t \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}] \\ \tilde{\gamma}(2t - \tau), & t \in [\frac{\tau}{2}, \tau]. \end{cases} \]

Note that the identity \[2.2\] is exactly same as the Maslov index \( i_\omega P^{-1}(\gamma) \) defined in \[11\].

---
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Denote $M$ as the end point $\gamma(\tau)$ of $\gamma$, the Krein type numbers $(P_\omega(M), Q_\omega(M))$ are defined by the total multiplicities of positive and negative eigenvalues of $\sqrt{-1}J$ restricted on $E_\omega = \ker(M - \omega I_{2n})^{2n}$, respectively. Since $\sqrt{-1}J$ is nondegenerate, then we have

$$P_\omega(M) + Q_\omega(M) = \dim(E_\omega) \geq \nu_\omega(M), \ \forall \omega \in U.$$  \hfill (2.4)

The $m$-iteration path of $\gamma$ is defined by

$$\gamma^m(t) = \gamma(t - j\tau)\gamma(\tau)^j, \ \forall j\tau \leq t \leq (j + 1)\tau, \ j = 0, \cdots, m - 1.$$  \hfill (2.5)

In addition, the splitting numbers of $\gamma$ were introduced in Section 9.1 of [16] as

$$S_{M}^+(\omega) = \lim_{\epsilon \to \pm 0} (i_{\exp(\sqrt{-1}t)\omega}(\gamma) - i_{\omega}(\gamma)),$$  \hfill (2.6)

which only depend on the end point $M$, actually. For splitting numbers, we have

**Proposition 2.4.** Let $M \in \text{Sp}(2n)$, $\omega \in U$ and $0 \leq \bar{\theta} \leq \hat{\theta} \leq 2\pi$. $\sigma(M)$ donates the spectral set of $M$. Then there hold

$$S_{M}^+(\omega) \geq 0, \forall \omega \in U, \ S_{M}^+(\omega) = 0, \omega \notin \sigma(M),$$  \hfill (2.7)

$$S_{M}^{-}(\omega) = S_{M}^+(\omega), \ \nu_\omega(M) = \nu_\omega(M),$$  \hfill (2.8)

$$P_\omega(M) - S_{M}^+(\omega) = Q_\omega(M) - S_{M}^-(\omega) \geq 0,$$  \hfill (2.9)

$$S_{M}^+(\omega) + S_{M}^-(\omega) \leq \dim \ker(M - \omega I_{2n})^{2n}, \ \omega \in \sigma(M),$$  \hfill (2.10)

$$(S_{I_{2}(1)}^+(1), S_{I_{2}(1)}^-(1)) = (1, 1), \ (S_{I_{2}(-1)}^+, S_{I_{2}(-1)}^-) = (1, 1),$$  \hfill (2.11)

$$(S_{R(\theta)}(e^{\sqrt{-1}t}), S_{R(\theta)}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}t})) = (0, 1) \text{ and }$$

$$(S_{R(-\theta)}(e^{\sqrt{-1}t}), S_{R(-\theta)}(e^{-\sqrt{-1}t})) = (1, 0), \forall \theta \neq \pm 1,$$  \hfill (2.12)

$$(S_{M_{1}\circ M_{2}}^+(\omega)) = S_{M_{1}}^+(\omega) + S_{M_{2}}^+(\omega), \ M_{j} \in \text{Sp}(2n_{j}), j = 1, 2 \text{ and } n = n_{1} + n_{2},$$  \hfill (2.13)

$$S_{M}^+(\omega) = S_{M}^+(\omega), \text{ for any } N \in \text{Sp}(2n) \text{ similar to } M,$$  \hfill (2.14)

$$0 \leq \nu_\omega(M) - S_{M}^+(\omega) \leq P_\omega(M), \ 0 \leq \nu_\omega(M) - S_{M}^-(\omega) \leq Q_\omega(M),$$  \hfill (2.15)

$$P_\omega(M), Q_\omega(M) = (Q_\omega(M), P_\omega(M)),$$  \hfill (2.16)

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in U} \nu_\omega(M) - \sum_{\omega \in U} P_\omega(M) = \sum_{\omega \in U} Q_\omega(M) \leq n,$$  \hfill (2.17)

$$i_{\nu_\omega(M)}(\gamma) = i_1(\gamma) + \sum_{0 < \theta < \hat{\theta}} S_{M}^+(e^{\sqrt{-1}t}) - \sum_{0 < \theta < \hat{\theta}} S_{M}^-(e^{\sqrt{-1}t}).$$  \hfill (2.18)

\begin{equation}
= \sum_{\theta < \hat{\theta}} S_{PM}^+(e^{\theta}) - \sum_{\theta < \hat{\theta}} S_{PM}^-(e^{\theta}) - \sum_{\theta < \hat{\theta}} \sum_{\theta < \hat{\theta}} S_{P}(e^{\theta}). \hfill (2.19)
\end{equation}

*Proof.* (2.6, 2.7, 2.13) follow from Lemma 9.1.6 and Lemma 9.1.9 in [16]. (2.8, 2.9) follow from Lemma 1.8.14, Theorem 9.1.7 in [16] and the definition of Krein type numbers. (2.10-2.12) follow from List 9.1.12 in [16]. (2.14) is a spacial case of Theorem 9.1.10(1). (2.15) follows from Proposition 9.1.11 in [16]. (2.16) follows from Lemma 1.3.8 in [16]. (2.17) follows from the second identity of (2.14), (2.14) and (2.16). (2.18) follows from Proposition 9.1.11 in [16]. (2.19) follows from (2.18) and (2.18). \hfill \Box

**Remark 2.5.** For any diagonalizable matrix $P \in \text{Sp}(2n)$, we also have

$$S_{P}^+(\omega) = P_\omega(P), S_{P}^- (\omega) = Q_\omega(P), S_{P}^+(\omega) + S_{P}^- (\omega) = \nu_\omega(P), \forall \omega \in U.$$
Indeed, let $\omega \in U$. According to the diagonalizable condition, (2.4), (2.9), (2.8) and (2.13).  
\[
\nu_\omega(P) \leq P_\omega(P) + S_P(\omega) \leq P_\omega(P) + Q_\omega(P) = \dim \ker (P - \omega I_{2n})^{2n} = \nu_\omega(P).
\]
Then we have $S_P(\omega) = Q_\omega(P)$. Similarly, $S_P^*(\omega) = P_\omega(P)$ and the last identity follows directly.

3. Special properties of $P$-symmetric hypersurfaces

In this section, we first provide some useful properties of closed characteristics. Then based on the method in [10], we conclude that the multiplicity problem, i.e. estimating the total number of geometrically distinct closed characteristics on $\Sigma$, is equivalent to the estimation (3.13).

Let $j_\Sigma : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a gauge function of $\Sigma$ defined by
\[
j_\Sigma(0) = 0, \quad j_\Sigma(x) = \inf \{ \lambda > 0, \frac{x}{\lambda} \in C \}, \quad x \neq 0.
\]
Fix a constant $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ and define the Hamiltonian function $H_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to [0, \infty)$ by
\[
H_\alpha(x) = j_\Sigma(x)^\alpha, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}. \tag{3.1}
\]
Note that $H_\alpha \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{R})$ is convex and $\Sigma = H_\alpha^{-1}(0)$. Since the gradient of $H_\alpha$ on $\Sigma$ is normal and nonzero, then the problem (1.1) is equivalent to the following fixed-energy problem
\[
\begin{cases}
H_\alpha(x) = 1, \\
x = JH_\alpha'(x), \\
x(0) = x(\tau).
\end{cases} \tag{3.2}
\]
It’s well know that the solutions of (3.2) and (1.1) are in one to one correspondence with each other. It does not depend on the particular choice of $\alpha$.

For any $(\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)$, we denote by $\gamma_x \in \mathcal{P}_r(2n)$ the fundamental solution of the linear system
\[
\dot{y}(t) = JH_\alpha''(x(t))y(t), \tag{3.3}
\]
which is the linearization of system (3.2) respect to $x$. We also call $\gamma_x$ the associated symplectic path of $(\tau, x)$. Consider $P \in \text{Sp}(2n)$ and $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_P(2n)$, it implies that $H_\alpha(x) = H_\alpha(Px), \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Then we have
\[
H_\alpha'(x) = P^T H_\alpha'(Px), \quad H_\alpha''(x) = P^T H_\alpha''(Px)P. \tag{3.4}
\]

Denote by $(l, k)$ the greatest common divisor of $l, k \in N$. $l$ and $k$ are relatively prime integers if $(l, k) = 1$. Then we have following properties, which have been considered by X. Hu and S. Sun in [9] for orthogonal case.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $(\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)$ be a closed characteristic, and let $\gamma_x$ be the associated symplectic path of $(\tau, x)$, then we have
(1) $(\tau, Px) \in J(\Sigma)$ is also a closed characteristic.
(2) $\gamma_{Px}(t) = P_{\gamma_x}(t)P^{-1}$, where $\gamma_{Px}$ is the associated symplectic path of $(\tau, Px)$.
(3) If there exist $a, b \in [0, \tau)$ ($a < b$) and a smallest integer $k > 0$ such that $x(a) = Px(b)$ and $x(t) = P^k x(t), \forall t \in [0, \tau)$, then $(\tau, x)$ is $P$-symmetric and
\[
x(t) = Px(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}),
\]
where $(l, k) = 1.
(4) If \((\tau, x)\) is \(P\)-symmetric as in (3), then \(\gamma_x(t + \frac{\gamma_x}{k}) = P^{-1}\gamma_x(t)P\gamma_x(t + \frac{\gamma_x}{k})\). Especially, \[\gamma_x(\frac{\gamma_x}{k}) = P^{-k}(P\gamma_x(t + \frac{\gamma_x}{k}))^k.\]

**Proof.** (1) Since \((\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)\), then \((\tau, x)\) solves the system (3.2), i.e.
\[
\dot{x} = JH_0'(x), x(0) = x(\tau)\quad \text{(3.5)}
\]
\(\Sigma \in H_P(2n)\) implies that \(P_x \in \Sigma\) and \(P_x(0) = P_x(\tau)\). By (3.4), we obtain
\[P\dot{x} = PJH_0'(x) = PJH_0'(x) = JH_0'(P_x).
\]
Then (1) follows.
(2) Combining with (3.4) and identity \(PJPT = J\), it follows that
\[\gamma_x(t) = JH_0'(x(t))\gamma_x(t)\quad \text{(3.6)}
\]
implies that
\[P\gamma_x(t) = JH_0''(P_x(t))\gamma_x(t).\]
Since the fundamental solution starts from \(I_{2n}\), we get (2).
(3) By condition \(x(a) = P_x(b)\) and the uniqueness of solution of (3.5), we have
\[x(t) = P_x(t + b - a) = P^2x(t + 2(b - a)) = \cdots = P^kx(t + k(b - a)).\]
Since \(x(t) = P^kx(t)\) with the smallest integer \(k > 0\), there exist \(l < k\) such that \(k(b - a) = l\tau\), i.e. \(x(t) = P_x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k})\), and \(l, k\) are relatively prime integers. Otherwise, let \(l = rl_1, k = rk_1, r > 1\), we obtain \(k_1 < k\) such that
\[x(t) = P_x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k_1}) = \cdots = P^{k_1}x(t),\]
which is a contradiction.
(4) Replacing \(t\) of (3.6) by \(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}\), by (3.4) and (3) above, we get that
\[P\gamma_x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}) = PJH_0''(x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}))\gamma_x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}) = PJH_0''(P^{-1}x(t))\gamma_x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}) = PJPT H_0''(x(t)) \gamma_x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}) = JH_0''(x(t)) \gamma_x(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}).\]
Since the fundamental solution starts from \(I_{2n}\) again, we have
\[P\gamma(t + \frac{l\tau}{k}) \gamma(t) = \gamma(t),\]
then (4) follows.

Note that (3) of Proposition 3.1 actually implies that there are only two possibilities for each closed characteristic \((\tau, x), x(\mathbb{R}) = P_x(\mathbb{R})\) or \(x(\mathbb{R}) \cap P_x(\mathbb{R}) = \emptyset\).

Now, we will introduce the Common Jump Index Theorem since this theorem is so important in this paper. First we define the mean index of \(\gamma \in P_+(2n)\) by
\[
\hat{i}_1(\gamma) = \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{i_1(\gamma^m)}{m} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \mathcal{C} i_\omega(\gamma) d\omega,
\]
which is always a finite real number.

Consider the linear Hamiltonian system \(3.3\) where \((\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)\). Since \(H_0\) is autonomous and also convex, i.e. \(H_0''(x) > 0\) on \(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}\), then by Proposition 15.1.3 in [16], the associated symplectic path \(\gamma_x\) satisfies

\[
\nu_1(\gamma_x) \geq 1, \quad i_1(\gamma_x) = \sum_{0 < s < 1} \nu_1(\gamma_x(s\tau)) + n \geq n. \tag{3.7}
\]

Then we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let \(\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}(2n)\), \((\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)\) and \(m \in \mathbb{N}\), denote by \(M = \gamma(\tau), i^m_x = i_1(\gamma^m_x)\), and \(\nu^m_x = \nu_1(\gamma^m_x)\). Then

\[
i^{m+1}_x - i^m_x \geq 2, \quad i^{m+1}_x + \nu^{m+1}_x - 1 \geq i^m_x + \nu^m_x - 1,
\]

\[
i^2_x + 2s^+_M(1) - \nu^2_x \geq n. \tag{3.8}
\]

**Proof.** \(3.8\) is followed by Theorem 10.2.4 in [16] and \(3.7\). \(3.9\) is followed by Corollary 8.3.2(2) in [16]. \(3.10\) is followed by Lemma 15.6.3 in [16]. \(\square\)

Apart from the Maslov-type index above, Ekeland also provided a very important result by using Fadell-Rabinowitz \(S^1\) index theory. Let \(E_\alpha := \{u \in L^2([0,1],\mathbb{R}^{2m})\mid \int_0^1 u dt = 0\}\), \(\alpha^{-1} + \beta^{-1} = 1\) and \(\alpha \in (1,2)\). In Chapter V of [3], the Clarke-Ekeland dual action functional on \(E_\alpha\) is defined by

\[
f_\alpha(u) = \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1}{2}Ju \cdot \Pi u + H^*_\alpha(-Ju)\right) dt,
\]

where \(H_\alpha\) is defined as \(3.11\) and the operator \(\Pi : E^\beta \to E^\alpha\) is defined by \(\frac{d}{dt}\Pi u = u\) and \(\int_0^1 \Pi u dt = 0\) which is compact. Note that for any \((\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)\) and \(m \in \mathbb{N}\), the action functional \(f_\alpha\) has the corresponding critical point

\[
u^m_x(t) = (m\tau)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \dot{x}(m\tau t), t \in [0,1], \tag{3.11}
\]

which is also a 1-periodic orbit of Hamiltonian system of \(H_\alpha\).

Since there is a nature \(S^1\) action on \(E_\alpha\) by shifting, then the Fadell-Rabinowitz \(S^1\)-cohomology index, i.e. “ind”, for \(S^1\)-invariant subset \([f_\alpha]_c := \{u \in E_\alpha, f(u) < c\} \subset E_\alpha\) is defined by

\[
\text{ind}([f_\alpha]_c) := \text{sup}\{k|c_1(E_\alpha)^{k-1} = c_1(E_\alpha) \cup \cdots \cup c_1(E_\alpha) \neq 0\},
\]

where \(E_\alpha\) is a principle \(S^1\) bundle, \(c_1(E_\alpha)\) denote the first Chern class and \(\cup\) is the cup product. For further details of Fadell-Rabinowitz index theory, we refer to their original paper [8]. Define a sequence of critical values \(c_k\) as

\[
c_k = \inf\{c < 0, \text{ind}([f_\alpha]_c) \geq k\}, k \in \mathbb{N},
\]

which satisfy

\[-\infty < \min_{u \in E_\alpha} f_\alpha(u) = c_1 \leq \cdots \leq c_k \leq \cdots < 0,
\]

and \(c_k \to 0\) as \(k \to +\infty\). By Theorem V.3.4 in Ekeland’s book [3], it holds that for any \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), there exist \((\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)\) and \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) such that the critical point \(u^m_x\) of \(f_\alpha\) defined by \(3.11\) satisfy

\[
f'_\alpha(u^m_x) = 0, \quad f_\alpha(u^m_x) = c_k, \quad i^m_x \leq 2k - 2 + n \leq i^m_x + \nu^m_x - 1. \tag{3.12}
\]

Under this result, Long and Zhu proved the following lemma.
Lemma 3.3. Suppose $\# \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) < +\infty$. There exists an injection map $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \times \mathbb{N}$ such that (3.12) happens for $(\tau, x)$.

Proof. This Lemma is followed by Lemma 15.3.5(i) in [16]. \hfill \Box

Now we show the famous Common Index Jump Theorem proved by Long and Zhu in [18] also in Chapter 11 of Long’s book [16].

Lemma 3.4. For $k = 1, \cdots, q$, let $\gamma_k \in P_{\tau_k}(2n)$ be a finite family of symplectic paths, denote by $M_k = \gamma(\tau_k), \nu_k^m = \nu_1(\gamma_k^m)$, and $\nu_k = \nu_1(\gamma_k^n)$. Suppose \( \hat{i}(\gamma) > 0, \forall k = 1, \cdots, q. \)

Then there exist infinitely many $(N, n_1, \cdots, n_q) \in \mathbb{N}^{q+1}$ with $N \geq n$ such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu_k^{2m_k-1} &= \nu_k^1, \\
\nu_k^{2m_k} &= \nu_k^1, \\
i_k^{2m_k-1} &= 2N - (i_k^1 + 2S_{M_k}^+(1) - \nu_k^1), \\
i_k^{2m_k} &= 2N + \nu_k^1, \\
i_k^{2m_k} &= 2N - n, \\
i_k^{2m_k} + \nu_k^{2m_k} &\leq 2N + n,
\end{align*}
\]

for $k = 1, \cdots, q$.

By using this Common Index Jump Theorem, we have the following Proposition. Note that this proof is basically using the approach in [15] with a small modification. However, we would like to show the details of this proof because the following Proposition is the key in this paper.

Proposition 3.5. Let $P \in \text{Sp}(2n), \Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_P(2n)$ and assume $\# \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) < +\infty$. If there exists an integer $n_1 > 0$ such that for any prime symmetric closed characteristic $[(\tau, x)] \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,

\[
i(\gamma_x) + 2S_{\gamma(\tau)}^+(1) - \nu(\gamma_x) \geq n_1,
\]

(3.13) then

\[
\# \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \geq \frac{n_1 + n}{2}.
\]

Proof. According to the assumption that the set $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ is finite and the fact that $x$ and $Px$ are overlapped or completely separated, we can denote $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ by

\[
\{[(\tau_1, x_1)], \cdots, [(\tau_p, x_p)]\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^q \{[(\tau_{p+i}, x_{p+i})], [(\tau_{p+i}, Px_{p+i})], \cdots, [(\tau_{p+i}, P^k x_{p+i})]\}. 
\]

(3.14)

Where $\{[(\tau_j, x_j)]\}_{i=1}^q$ are geometrically distinct $P$-symmetric closed characteristics and

\[
\{[(\tau_{p+i}, x_{p+i})], [(\tau_{p+i}, Px_{p+i})], \cdots, [(\tau_{p+i}, P^k x_{p+i})]\}_{i=1}^q
\]

are distinct sets of $P$-asymmetric ones. Let $K$ be the total number of $P$-asymmetric closed characteristics. Since $k_i \geq 2$ for any $i = 1, \cdots, q$, then we have $\# \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) = p + K < +\infty, K = k_1 + \cdots + k_q \geq 2q$.

Let \( i_j^m = i_1(\gamma_j^m), \nu_j^m = \nu_1(\gamma_j^m), M_j = \gamma_j(\tau_j), j \in \{1, \cdots, p + q\}. \) By (3.9), every closed characteristic on $\Sigma$ corresponds to a symplectic path with positive mean index. Applying the Common Index Jump Theorem, i.e. Lemma 3.3 to the associated symplectic paths of

\[
\{[(\tau_1, x_1)], \cdots, (\tau_{p+q}, x_{p+q}), (2\tau_{p+1}, x_{p+1}^2), \cdots, (2\tau_{p+q}, x_{p+q}^2)\},
\]

(3.15)
we obtain infinite many \((N, m_1, \ldots, m_{p+2q}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2q+1}, N \geq n\) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
i_j^{2m_j+1} &= 2N + i_j^{1}, \quad i_j^{2m_j-1} + \nu_j^{2m_j-1} = 2N - (i_j^{1} + 2S_{M_j}^{+}(1) - \nu_j^{1}), \\
i_j^{2m_j} &\geq 2N - n, \quad i_j^{2m_j} + \nu_j^{2m_j} \leq 2N + n,
\end{align*}
\]

(3.15)

(3.16)

\(\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, p + q\},\) and

\[
i_j^{2m_j+1} = 2N + i_j^{1}, \quad i_j^{2m_j-1} + \nu_j^{2m_j-1} = 2N - (i_j^{1} + 2S_{M_j}^{+}(1) - \nu_j^{1}),
\]

(3.17)

(3.18)

\[
i_j^{2m_j} \geq 2N - n, \quad i_j^{2m_j} + \nu_j^{2m_j} \leq 2N + n,
\]

(3.19)

\(\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}.

**Claim 1:** \(m_{p+j} = 2m_{p+q+j}\) for any \(j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}.

In fact, by using \((3.16), (3.10), (3.18)\) and \((3.7)\), we have

\[
i_{p+j}^{2m_{p+j}} \geq 2N - n \geq 2N - (i_{p+j}^{1} + 2S_{M_{p+j}}^{+}(1) - \nu_{p+j}^{1})
\]

\[
= i_{p+j}^{2m_{p+j}-2} + \nu_{p+j}^{2m_{p+j}-2} > i_{p+j}^{2m_{p+q+j}-2}.
\]

Then, by \((3.7), (3.16)\) and \((3.17)\),

\[
i_{p+j}^{2m_{p+j}} < i_{p+j}^{2m_{p+j}} + \nu_{p+j}^{2m_{p+j}} \leq 2N + n \leq 2N + i_{p+j}^{2m_{p+q+j}+2}.
\]

Finally, by \((3.8)\), we get

\[
4m_{p+q+j} - 2 < 2m_{p+j} < 4m_{p+q+j} + 2 \Rightarrow m_{p+j} = 2m_{p+q+j}.
\]

The claim follows.

According to Lemma 3.3, we get an injection map \(\Psi : \mathbb{N} \to \tilde{J}(\Sigma) \times \mathbb{N}\). Let

\[
\Psi(N - s + 1) := ([\{j(s), x_j(s)\}, m(s)], s \in \{1, \ldots, n\},
\]

such that

\[
i_{j(s)}^{m(s)} \leq 2N - 2s + n \leq i_{j(s)}^{m(s)} + \nu_{j(s)}^{m(s)} - 1.
\]

(3.20)

where \(j(s) \in \{1, \ldots, p + q\}, m(s) \in \mathbb{N}\). Then from \((3.20), (3.7)\) and \((3.15)\), we deduce that

\[
i_{j(s)}^{m(s)} \leq 2N - 2s + n < 2N + n \leq 2N + i_{j(s)}^{1} = i_{j(s)}^{2m_{j(s)}+1}.
\]

(3.21)

Let

\[
S_1 = \{k \in \{1, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n+1+n/2} \rfloor\}, 1 \leq j(k) \leq p\}, S_2 = \{k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, p + 1 \leq j(k) \leq p + q\}.
\]

(3.22)

**Claim 2:** \(#S_1 \leq p.\)

In fact, let \(k \in S_1\), then \(1 \leq j(k) \leq p\). By \((3.20), (3.15)\) and the assumption \((3.13)\), it follows that

\[
i_{j(k)}^{m(k)} + \nu_{j(k)}^{m(k)} - 1 \geq 2N - 2k + n \geq 2N + n - 2(\frac{n_1 + n}{2}) = 2N - n_1
\]

\[
\geq 2N - (i_{j(k)}^{1} + 2S_{M_{j(k)}}^{+}(1) - \nu_{j(k)}^{1}) = i_{j(k)}^{2m_{j(k)}+1} + \nu_{j(k)}^{2m_{j(k)}+1}.
\]
According to (3.21) and (3.8), we conclude that
\[ 2m_{j(k)} - 1 < m(k) < 2m_{j(k)} + 1 \Rightarrow m(k) = 2m_{j(k)}. \]
Then \( \Psi(N - k + 1) = ([(\tau_{j(k)}, x_{j(k)})], 2m_{j(k)}). \) Since \( \Psi \) is injective, by (3.22), we have \( \#S_1 \leq p. \)

**Claim 3:** \( \# S_2 \leq 2q. \)

In fact, let \( k \in S_2, \) then \( p + 1 \leq j(k) \leq p + q. \) From (3.20), (3.10), (3.18) and Claim 1, we obtain

\[
2m_{j(k)} + 2m_{j(k)} - 1 \geq 2N - 2s + n \geq 2N - n \geq 2n - (i_{j(k)}^2 + 2S_{M_j^2}^+(1) - \nu_j^2) = j_{j(k)}^2 + \nu_j^2 - 2m_{j(k)} - 2m_{j(k)} - 2.
\]

By (3.21) and (3.8) again, we have
\[ 2m_{j(k)} - 2 < m(k) < 2m_{j(k)} + 1 \Rightarrow m(k) \in \{2m_{j(k)} - 1, 2m_{j(k)}\}. \]

Since \( \Psi \) is injective again, this claim follows.

Finally, combining with Claim 2, Claim 3 and (3.22), we have
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\Sigma) = p + K \geq p + 2q \geq \#S_1 + \#S_2 \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n_1 + n}{2} \right\rfloor.
\]

\[ \square \]

4. Iteration theory of Maslov index and the proof of the main theorem

In this section, the symplectic matrix \( P, \) which \( \Sigma \) is symmetric with, will be selected as a special class of symplectic matrix satisfies \( P^m = I \) for some \( m. \) Under this case, we will use Bott-type iteration formulas for \((P, m)\)-iteration paths in [11] to estimate the number \( n_1 \) in Proposition 3.5. We provide this estimation in Theorem 4.6 below. In the end of this section, we will prove the main results. Note that, this special \((P, m)\)-iteration was found by Dong and Long in [3].

First we will show some notations. Let
\[
\omega_k := e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1} \theta_k} = e^{\frac{2\pi \sqrt{-1} k \theta_k}{m}}, \quad k = 0, \ldots, m - 1. \tag{4.1}
\]

\( \sigma(M) \) denotes the spectrum set of matrix \( M. \) Then we define
\[
\Omega_m(2n) := \{ P \in \text{Sp}(2n) | P^m = I_{2n} \text{ and } \sigma(P) = \{ \omega_k, \bar{\omega}_k \}, k \in \{1, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor \}, \}
\]
\[
\Omega_{m,k}(2n) := \{ P \in \Omega_m(2n) | \omega_k \in \sigma(P) \}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor,
\]
\[
\tilde{\Omega}_m^a(2n) := \{ P \in \Omega_m(2n) | S_P^+(\omega) = S_P^-(\omega) + a, \forall \omega \in U^+ \}
\]
and
\[
\tilde{\Omega}_{m,k}^a(2n) := \{ P \in \Omega_{m,k}(2n) | S_P^+(\omega_k) = S_P^-(\omega_k) + a \}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor,
\]
where \( a = -1, 0, 1 \) and \( U^+ := \{ e^{\sqrt{-1} \theta}, \theta \in (0, \pi) \}. \) For convenience, we denote by
\[
\hat{\Omega}_m(2n) = \tilde{\Omega}_m^0(2n), \quad \hat{\Omega}_{m,k}(2n) = \tilde{\Omega}_{m,k}^0(2n).
\]

**Remark 4.1.** Note that \( P \in \Omega_m(2n), \) \( m \geq 2 \) if and only if \( P \) is similar to the following matrix
\[
R(-\theta)^{2m} S_P^-(\omega) \circ R(\theta)^{2m} S_P^+(\omega), \tag{4.2}
\]
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where \( R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \), \( e^{i\alpha} = 1 \) and \( \frac{\theta}{2\pi} \not\in \mathbb{Z} \).

Indeed, \( \Leftarrow \) follows directly. We only consider \( \Rightarrow \). Denote the minimal polynomial of \( P \) by
\[
f(P) = (P - \omega_k)^p(P - \omega_{m-k})^p,
\]
for some positive integers \( k \in \{1, \cdots, \left[ \frac{m}{2} \right] \}, p > 0 \). Since \( P^m = I_{2n} \), this polynomial \( f(y) \) should exactly divide polynomial \( y^m - 1 \), which means \( p \) must be 1. Then we have \( P \) is diagonalizable and then (4.2) is followed by (2.10)–(2.14).

According to Remark 4.1 above, we know that \( a = 0 \) (resp., \( \pm 1 \)) implies that \( n \) is even (resp., odd).

For any two matrices \( M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_3 & A_4 \end{pmatrix}_{2i \times 2i} \) and \( M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ B_3 & B_4 \end{pmatrix}_{2j \times 2j} \), we define the diamond product of them by the \( 2(i + j) \times 2(i + j) \) matrix
\[
M_1 \circ M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & A_2 & 0 \\ 0 & B_1 & 0 & B_2 \\ A_3 & 0 & A_4 & 0 \\ 0 & B_3 & 0 & B_4 \end{pmatrix},
\]
and denote by \( M^{\circ k} \) the \( k \)-fold diamond product \( M \circ \cdots \circ M \).

According to the properties of \( P \)-symmetric closed characteristics given by Proposition 3.14, we define the following \((P, m)\)-iteration for symplectic pathes as [3] did. Note that this is the definition in [11] if we replace \( P \) by \( P^{-1} \).

**Definition 4.2.** Let \( \gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{r}(2n), P \in \text{Sp}(2n) \). Define the \((P, m)\)-iteration of \( \gamma \) by
\[
\gamma^{m \cdot P} := P^{-(j-1)}(t - (j - 1)\tau)(P\gamma(t))^j, t \in [(j - 1)\tau, j\tau], \forall j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}.
\]

Then following Bott-type iteration formulas hold.

**Proposition 4.3.** For any \( P \in \text{Sp}(2n), \gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{r}(2n), \omega_0 \in U \), and \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), we have
\[
\mu(\text{Gr}(\omega_0 I_{2n}), \text{Gr}(P^{m \cdot \gamma \cdot P})) = \sum_{\omega = \omega_0} \mu(\text{Gr}(\omega_0 I_{2n}), \text{Gr}(P\gamma)),
\]
(4.4)
\[
\nu_{\omega_0}(P^{m \cdot \gamma \cdot P}) = \sum_{\omega = \omega_0} \nu_{\omega}(P\gamma),
\]
(4.5)
\[
S_{p, \gamma \cdot P, \omega_0}^{\pm}(\omega) = \sum_{\omega = \omega_0} S_{p, \gamma, \omega_0}^{\pm}(\omega),
\]
(4.6)
where \( \gamma_1 * \xi \) for any symplectic path \( \gamma_1 \in C([0, \tau], \text{Sp}(2n)) \) not starting from \( I_{2n} \), \( \xi \) is arbitrary in \( \{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_{r}(2n)|\xi(\tau) = \gamma_1(0)\} \) and * is defined as \( \underline{\cdot} \).

**Proof.** In view of Proposition 3.14, we have \( \gamma^{m \cdot P} \cdot (m\tau) = P^{-m}(P\gamma(t))^m \). According to the relation (2.22) and Definition 2.7 of Maslov \((P, \omega)\)-index \( i^P_\omega(\gamma) \) in [11], we have
\[
\mu(\text{Gr}(\omega_0 I_{2n}), \text{Gr}(P\gamma)) = i_\omega(P\gamma) - i_\omega(\xi) = i_\omega^{P^{-1}}(\gamma), \quad \overline{P\gamma} = P\gamma * \xi.
\]
The iteration path \( \gamma^{m \cdot P} \) defined in (5.5) of [11] is exactly the iteration path \( \gamma^{m \cdot P^{-1}} \) defined above. It follows from Theorem 4.12 in [11] that
\[
\mu(\text{Gr}(\omega_0 I_{2n}), \text{Gr}(P^{-m \cdot \gamma \cdot P^{-1} })) = \mu(\text{Gr}(\omega_0 I_{2n}), \text{Gr}(P^{-m \cdot \gamma})) = i^{P^{-1}}_{\omega_0}(\gamma^m) = \sum_{\omega = \omega_0} i^P_\omega(\gamma)
\]
I does not start from Theorem 1.1 in [9]. Next, in order to calculate the Maslov index of symplectic paths which Gr Proposition 4.4. Let

\[
\Lambda(\omega) := \sum_{\omega^m = \omega_0} \mu(\omega I_{2n}, Gr(P^{-1}\gamma)),
\]

after replacing \( P^{-1} \) by \( P \), (4.4) holds. By the definition of \( \nu_\omega(\gamma) \) and Theorem 9.2.1(2) in [16],

\[
\nu_{\omega_0}(P_{m\gamma,m,P}) = \nu_{\omega_0}(P_{m\gamma,m,P}(m\tau)) = \nu_{\omega_0}((P\gamma(\tau))^m) = \sum_{\omega^m = \omega_0} \nu_\omega(P\gamma(\tau)) = \sum_{\omega^m = \omega_0} \nu_\omega(P\gamma(\tau)),
\]

then (4.5) follows. For the last one, by using Theorem 9.2.4 in [16], we have

\[
S_{\pm}^+(m\gamma_P(\tau))(\omega_0) = S_{\pm}^+(P\gamma(\tau))^m(\omega_0) = \sum_{\omega^m = \omega_0} S_{\pm}^+(\omega_0),
\]

thus (4.6) follows directly.

Note that, if \( \omega_0 = 1 \), \( P \) is orthogonal and satisfies \( P^m = I_{2n} \), then (4.4) will reduce to the Theorem 1.1 in [9]. Next, in order to calculate the Maslov index of symplectic paths which does not start from \( I_{2n} \), we need to prove the following Lemma. Before this, we introduce the definition of the crossing form in [22].

Let \( V, \Lambda(t) \in \text{Lagr}(n), t \in [a, b] \) be a Lagrangian and a Lagrangian path, respectively. For each pair \( (V, \Lambda) \), we define the crossing form as

\[
\Gamma(\Lambda(t), V, t) := Q(\Lambda(t), \dot{\Lambda}(t))|_{\Lambda(t) \cap V}, \quad \forall t \in [a, b],
\]

where, for some Lagrangian \( W \),

\[
(Q(\Lambda(t_0), \dot{\Lambda}(t_0))u, v) := \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=t_0}\omega_{st}(v, w(t)), \quad \forall v \in \Lambda(t_0), \ w(t) \in W, \ u + w(t) \in \Lambda(t),
\]

which does not depend on the choice of \( W \). Like Maslov index, the crossing form is also invariant under the action of \( \text{Sp}(2n) \), i.e. \( \Gamma(\Phi \Lambda, \Phi V, t) = \Gamma(\Lambda, V, t), \ \forall \Phi \in \text{Sp}(2n) \). If the Lagrangian path \( \Lambda \) has only regular crossings which means the crossing form \( \Gamma(\Lambda(t), V, t) \) is nondegenerate when \( \Lambda(t) \cap V \neq \{0\} \), then [17] provides the following relation

\[
\mu(V, \Lambda) = m^+(\Gamma(\Lambda(a)), V, a) + \sum_{0 < t < 1} \text{Sign}(\Gamma(\Lambda(t), V, t)) - m^-(\Gamma(\Lambda(b), V, b)),
\]

where \( m^+(M) \) denote the dimensions of positive and negative definite subspace of matrix \( M \), respectively. \( \text{Sign}(M) = m^+(M) - m^-(M) \) denotes the signature of \( M \). Note that any Lagrangian path can be regularized by a small perturbation.

Now we show the crossing form in a special case.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let \( \gamma \in C([0, \tau], \text{Sp}(2n)) \). If \( \gamma(t_0) \in \text{Sp}_0^0(2n) \) and \( -J\gamma(t_0)\gamma(t_0) \) is positive definite for some \( t_0 \in [0, \tau] \), then \( \Gamma(\text{Gr}(\gamma(t_0)), \text{Gr}(\omega I_{2n}), t_0) \) is positive definite and

\[
\text{Sign} \Gamma(\text{Gr}(\gamma(t_0)), \text{Gr}(\omega I_{2n}), t_0) = \nu_\omega(\gamma(t_0)).
\]

**Proof.** First we know \( \text{Gr}(\omega I_{2n}), \text{Gr}(\gamma(t_0)) \) are Lagrangian in \( (\mathbb{R}^{4n}, \omega_\text{str} \oplus (-\omega_\text{str})) \). Let \( E_\omega(\gamma(t_0)) \neq \{0\} \) be the eigenvector space of \( \omega \). Since \( \gamma(t_0) \in \text{Sp}_0^0(2n) \), then \( E_\omega(\gamma(t_0)) \cong \text{Gr}(\omega I_{2n}) \cap \text{Gr}(\gamma(t_0)) \neq \{0\} \). Let \( Z(M) = \left(M \setminus I_{2n}\right) : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^{4n} \) be the Lagrangian frame of \( M \in \text{Sp}(2n) \) in
\((\mathbb{R}^{4n}, \omega_{st} \oplus (-\omega_{st}))\) whose image is \(Gr(M)\). Then for any \(u \in E_\omega(\gamma(t_0))\) we have

\[
(\Gamma(\Gamma(\gamma(t_0)))u, Gr(\omega I_{2n}), t_0) = \left. \frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t_0}(\omega_{st} \oplus (-\omega_{st}))(Z(\omega I_{2n})u, Z(\gamma(t_0))u) = \left. \frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t_0}(J_0 0 -J) \begin{pmatrix} \omega I_{2n} \\ I_{2n} \end{pmatrix}u, \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(t) \\ I_{2n} \end{pmatrix}u = \left. \frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t_0}(J(\omega I_{2n})u, \gamma(t)u) = (J\gamma(t_0)u, \gamma(t_0)u) = (-J\gamma(t_0)\gamma(t_0)^{-1}u, u) > 0.
\]

Then \(\Gamma(\gamma(t_0)), Gr(\omega I_{2n}), t_0)\) is positive definite and the signature is exactly \(\dim(E_\omega(\gamma(t_0)))\).

Therefore this proposition follows. \(\square\)

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \(P \in Sp(2n)\) and let symmetric matrix path \(B_{[0, \tau]}\) be positive definite. \(\gamma \in P_\gamma(2n)\) denotes the fundamental solution of \(\dot{y}(t) = JB(t)y(t)\), then

\[
\mu(Gr(\omega I_{2n}), Gr(P\gamma)) = \nu_\omega(P) + \sum_{0 < t < \tau} \nu_\omega(P\gamma(t)).
\]

**Proof.** First we get

\[
B_p(t) = -JP\gamma(t)(P\gamma(t))^{-1} = (P^{-1})^T B(t) P^{-1}, \ t \in [0, \tau],
\]

which is positive definite. By Proposition [4.4] it further implies that the crossing form is always nondegenerate, i.e. \(P\gamma\) is regular. Then, by Lemma [4.3] and [4.8], we have

\[
\mu(Gr(\omega I_{2n}), Gr(P\gamma)) = m^+ \Gamma(Gr(P), Gr(\omega I_{2n}), 0) + \sum_{0 < t < \tau} \text{Sign} \Gamma(Gr(P\gamma(t)), Gr(\omega I_{2n}), t) - m^- \Gamma(Gr(P\gamma(\tau)), Gr(\omega I_{2n}), \tau) = \nu_\omega(P) + \sum_{0 < t < \tau} \nu_\omega(P\gamma(t)).
\]

This lemma follows. \(\square\)

Then we have following estimation results.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let \(P \in \Omega_m(2n)\) with prime number \(m \geq 2\). \((\tau, x) \in J(\Sigma)\) is a prime closed characteristic and \(\gamma_x\) is the associated symplectic path of \((\tau, x)\). Assume that

\[
x(t) = P \left. x(t + \frac{r}{m}) \right|, \forall t \in [0, \tau],
\]

then

\[
\mu(Gr(I_{2n}), Gr(\gamma_x)) + 2S^+_{\tau_{\gamma_x}(\tau)}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x) \geq 2n - S^-_\tau(\omega), \ \omega \in \sigma(P) \cap U^+.
\]

 Especially, if \(P \in \hat{\Omega}_m(2n)\), then

\[
\mu(Gr(I_{2n}), Gr(\gamma_x)) + 2S^+_{\tau_{\gamma_x}(\tau)}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x) \geq \frac{3n}{2}.
\]

E especially, if \(P \in \hat{\Omega}_m^1(2n)\) (resp., \(\hat{\Omega}_m^{-1}(2n)\)), then

\[
\mu(Gr(I_{2n}), Gr(\gamma_x)) + 2S^+_{\tau_{\gamma_x}(\tau)}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x) \geq \left[\frac{3n}{2}\right] + 1 \text{ (resp., } \left[\frac{3n}{2}\right]).
\]
Proof. Denote by $\omega := e^{\sqrt{-1} \theta}$ and $\omega_k$ as (4.1). Without loss of generality, we assume $P \in \Omega_{m,k}(2n)$, i.e. $\{\omega_k, \omega_{m-k}\} = \sigma(P)$ where $k \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$. Let $M = \gamma(t) \tau(t) = \gamma(t) \tau(t) \forall t \in [0, \frac{\pi}{m}]$. According to Proposition 3.1 and Definition 4.2 we have $\gamma_x = \gamma_x^m, \tau$ with end point \(\gamma_x(\tau) = (PM)^m\).

(1) When $m > 2$, we know that $k - 1, k, m - k$ are all different. In view of Proposition 4.3 Remark 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.14, 2.17, 2.19, Lemma 1.3 and the convexity of $\Sigma$, we have the following facts

\[
(2.6) \text{, } (2.8) \text{, } (2.15) \Rightarrow \ 0 \leq S^N_{PM}(\omega) \leq \nu(\omega) \leq Q(\omega) + S^N_M(\omega), \\
S^N_{PM}(\omega) \leq P(\omega), \quad S^N_M(\omega) \leq Q(\omega), \forall M \in \text{Sp}(2n).
\]

$P \in \Omega_{m,k}(2n)$, Remark 2.5 Remark 4.1 $\Rightarrow P$ is diagonalizable and $S^+_P(\omega_k) = P(\omega_k)$,

\[
S^P_{PM}(\omega_k) = Q(\omega_k), S^P_{PM}(\omega_k) + S^P_{PM}(\omega_k) = \nu(\omega_k) = n.
\]

$P \in \Omega_{m,k}(2n)$, $H^P_M(x) > 0$, Lemma 4.10 $\Rightarrow \mu(Gr(\omega_k I_{2n}), Gr(\omega_k)) \geq \nu(\omega_k) = n$.

$P \in \Omega_{m,k}(2n)$, (2.19) $\Rightarrow \mu(Gr(\omega_k I_{2n}), Gr(\omega_k)) \geq \nu(\omega_k) = n$.

We have the following:

\[
\nu(1) - S^+_P(\omega_k)(1) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} Q(\omega_i)(PM) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} P(\omega_i)(PM) \leq n.
\]

With these facts, we can deduce that

\[
\mu(Gr(I_{2n}), Gr(\gamma_x)) + 2S^+_{\gamma_x}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mu(Gr(\omega_i I_{2n}), Gr(\gamma_x)) + 2S^+_{\gamma_x}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x)
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mu(Gr(\omega_{i-1} I_{2n}), Gr(P(\gamma_x)) + \mu(Gr(\omega_i I_{2n}), Gr(P(\gamma_x)) + \mu(Gr(\omega_{m-k} I_{2n}), Gr(P(\gamma_x))
\]

\[
+ 2S^+_{\gamma_x}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x)
\]

\[
= 2\nu(\omega_k) + \nu(\omega_{m-k}) + \mu(Gr(\omega_{m-k} I_{2n}), Gr(P(\gamma_x)) + \mu(Gr(\omega_{m-k} I_{2n}), Gr(P(\gamma_x)))
\]

\[
+ 2S^+_{\gamma_x}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x)
\]

\[
= 3n - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} S^+_{PM}(\omega_i) + 2S^+_{PM}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x)
\]

\[
\geq 3n - S^P(\omega_k) - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} S^+_{PM}(\omega_i) - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} P(\omega_i)(PM)
\]

\[
\geq 3n - S^P(\omega_k) - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} P(\omega_i)(PM) \geq 2n - S^P(\omega_k).
\]

When $m = 2$, $P$ must be $-I_{2n}$. Similarly, we can deduce that

\[
\mu(Gr(I_{2n}), Gr(\gamma_x)) + 2S^+_{\gamma_x}(1) - \nu(\gamma_x) \geq 2n.
\]

(4.12)

By Remark 2.5, 2.7, $P \in \tilde{\Omega}_{m,k}(2n)$ implies that $n$ is even and

\[
S^P_{PM}(\omega_k) = S^P_{PM}(\omega_{m-k}) = \frac{n}{2}.
\]
Thus we get \(4.10\). Similarly, \(P \in \hat{\Omega}_{m,k}^1(2n)\) (resp., \(P \in \hat{\Omega}_{m,k}^{-1}(2n)\)) implies that \(n\) is odd and
\[
S_P^- (\omega_k) = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \text{ (resp., } \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1\).
\]
Then \(4.11\) follows.

Here we note that, when \(m = 2\), the calculation in the above proof essentially coincides with the proof of C. Liu, Y. Long and C. Zhu in \cite{10}. Therefore, we omit the calculation.

Then we conclude the following Theorem.

**Theorem 4.7.** Let \(P \in \Omega_m(2n)\) with an integer \(m \geq 2\) and \(\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_P(2n)\). It holds that
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n_1 + n}{2} \right\rfloor = n + \left\lfloor -\max\{S_P^-(\omega), S_P^- (\bar{\omega})\} \right\rfloor.
\]  
\[\text{(4.13)}\]

Especially, if \(m\) is even, then
\[
\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) \geq n.
\]  
\[\text{(4.14)}\]

**Proof.** We prove this result by following steps.

**Step 1:** Assume that \(m\) is not prime. Denote by \(m = m_1p\) and \(P_1 = P^{m_1}\), where \(p\) is a prime factor. Then we have \(\Sigma = P_1^\theta \Sigma\), and it is sufficient to consider \(m\) as a prime number.

**Step 2:** Let \(m\) be a prime. Assume that \(P \in \Omega_{m,k}(2n)\) and \((\tau, x) \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma)\) is a prime closed characteristic. By Proposition 3.1(3), there exist an integer \(l \in \{1, \cdots, m - 1\}\) such that
\[
x(t) = P x(t + \frac{l\tau}{m}), \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
Then we can choose \(r \in \{1, \cdots, m - 1\}\) such that
\[
x(t) = P^r x(t + \frac{r}{m}), \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
By Remark 4.1 \(P^r\) will be similar to \(R(-r\theta)^\circ S_P^+ (\omega) \circ R(r\theta)^\circ S_P^- (\omega)\), where \(\omega = e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}\). It implies
\[
S_P^+ (\omega) = S_P^+ (\omega^r).
\]  
\[\text{(4.15)}\]
If \(\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) = +\infty\), we are done. Then we assume that \(\# \hat{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma) < +\infty\) and \(m > 2\). If \(\omega^r_k \in \{\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor}\}\), then by \(3.9\), \(2.1\) and \(4.15\), we obtain that
\[
i_1(\gamma_k) + 2S_{\gamma_k}^+ (1) - \nu_1(\gamma_k) \geq n - S_P^-(\omega_k^r) \geq n - \max\{S_P^-(\omega_k), S_P^-(\omega_{m-k})\},
\]  
\[\text{(4.16)}\]
else if \(\omega^r_{m-k} \in \{\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor}\}\), \(4.16\) follows as well. Since \(4.16\) does not depend on the choice of \((\tau, x)\), we have
\[
n_1 = n - \max\{S_P^-(\omega_k), S_P^-(\omega_{m-k})\}.
\]
Then by Proposition 3.5 \(4.13\) follows. However, if \(m = 2\), it follows from \(4.12\) that \(n_1 = n\). Then combining with Step 1 and Proposition 3.5 this theorem holds.

Then we prove Theorem 1.1 as follows.

**Proof.** When \(m\) is even, by Remark 4.1 and \(4.13\), \(1.4\) follows. We only focus on \(m > 2\) is odd. If \(n\) is even, it follows from the assumption \(1.3\) and Remark 4.1 that \(P \in \hat{\Omega}_{m,k}^1(2n)\) for some \(k \in \{1, \cdots, \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor\}\). By Remark 4.1 and Theorem 4.7 we have \(S_P^+(\omega) = S_P^+(\omega_{m-k}) = n_1 = \frac{1}{2}\) and \(1.4\) holds. Similarly, If \(n\) is odd, \(P \in \hat{\Omega}_{m,k}^{-1}(2n)\) for some \(k \in \{1, \cdots, \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor\}\). By Remark 4.1 and 16
Theorem 4.7 again, we get \( \max(S^+_P(\omega_k), S^-_P(\omega_k)) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 \) and \( n_1 = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \), then \( \# \tilde{J}(\Sigma) = \left\lfloor \frac{3n-1}{4} \right\rfloor \). Since \( n \) is odd, it holds that \( \left\lfloor \frac{3n}{4} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{3n-1}{4} \right\rfloor \) and this result follows.

Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof. If \( m = 2 \), \( P \) is similar to \( -I_{2n} \), then this theorem follows from Theorem 1.1. Let \( m > 2 \) and \( e^{i\theta} = \omega \). From assumption (i) and Remark 4.1, we know that \( S^-_P(\omega) = 0 \) and \( S^+_P(\omega) = n \). According to (ii), (2.1), and (4.9), we have \( n_1 = n \). Then by Proposition 3.5, this result follows.
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