

AVOIDANCE OF NON-STRICT SADDLE POINTS BY BLOW-UP

EL MEHDI ACHOUR, UMBERTO L. HRYNIEWICZ, AND MICHAEL WESTDICKENBERG

ABSTRACT. It is an old idea to use gradient flows or time-discretized variants thereof as methods for solving minimization problems. In some applications, for example in machine learning contexts, it is important to know that for generic initial data, gradient flow trajectories do not get stuck at saddle points. There are classical results concerned with the nondegenerate situation. But if the Hessian of the objective function has a nontrivial kernel at the critical point, then these results are inconclusive. In this paper, we show how relevant information can be extracted by “blowing up” the objective function around the non-strict saddle point, i.e., by a suitable nonlinear rescaling that makes the higher order geometry visible. Then the center-stable manifold theorem of dynamical system theory can be applied.

1. INTRODUCTION

Gradient flows are well-known as important special cases of dynamical systems. Despite a long and rich history of mathematical research, new applications and mathematical questions & insights continue to emerge. Recently, the use of gradient flows and their time-discretized siblings as building blocks in optimization procedures, most notably in machine learning contexts, has reignited interest in the convergence behavior of these flows, especially in nonconvex regimes. Since in these applications, initial data is often chosen randomly, an important issue is to identify criteria that ensure that *generic* gradient flow trajectories do not “get stuck” at saddle points, but instead flow into (local) minima of the objective function. Here generic means that all initializations outside a set of measure zero have this desired property. (In infinite-dimensional contexts, different notions of genericity can be used, for example using Baire category arguments.) Understanding the global behavior of a dynamical system from local information about the property of the objective function at critical points, has long been a driving force in dynamical system theory.

To be more specific, let us introduce some notation. We consider an objective function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (also called an energy function) that is sufficiently smooth. We denote by ∇f its gradient with respect to the Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{R}^d , and by D^2f its Hessian. We say that $w_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *local minimizer* of f if there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of w_* such that $f(w_*) \leq f(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{O}$. If we can choose $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{R}^d$, then w_* is also a *global minimizer*. Any $w_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\nabla f(w_*) = 0$ is called a *critical point* of f . The *index* $\mu(w_*) \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ of a critical point w_* is defined as the number of negative eigenvalues of $D^2f(w_*)$, counted with multiplicity.

A critical point w_* is called *non-degenerate* when the kernel $\ker D^2f(w_*) = \{0\}$. Otherwise w_* is said to be *degenerate*. A critical point w_* is a **saddle point** if it is neither a local minimizer nor a local maximizer. A saddle point w_* is *strict* if




FIGURE 1. Left: Example of a strict saddle point at $(0,0)$.
Right: Example of nonstrict saddle point.

$\mu(w_*) > 0$, so that $\nabla^2 f(w_*)$ has at least one negative eigenvalue. A saddle point w_* is **nonstrict** if $\mu(w_*) = 0$. In that case, the Hessian $\nabla^2 f(w_*)$ is (symmetric and) positive semi-definite and $\ker \nabla^2 f(w_*) \neq \{0\}$; see also Figure 1.

Given a smooth objective function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we like to think of its graph as a landscape. What does existing theory tell us about the landscape of f near critical points? Let $w_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a critical point f and define $W^s(w_*)$ as the set

$$W^s(w_*) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d: w_x(t) \rightarrow w_* \text{ as } t \rightarrow +\infty\},$$

where the curve $w_x: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ solves the initial value problem

$$\dot{w}_x = -\nabla f(w_x), \quad w_x(t=0) = x.$$

For simplicity of exposition, we have assumed that the solution exists for all $t \geq 0$. Here the dot marks differentiation with respect to the time variable t . When w_* is a *nondegenerate* critical point, then $W^s(w_*)$ is known to be a smooth manifold, hence have Lebesgue measure zero, provided $D^2 f(w_*)$ has at least one strictly negative eigenvalue; see [6]. If the nondegeneracy assumption is dropped, then $W^s(w_*)$ can be a rather complicated set whose structure is not well-understood.

In the case of a *saddle point* w_* , the celebrated Gromoll-Meyer Splitting Lemma [1] reveals that if w_* is strict in the sense that $D^2 f(w_*)$ has at least one negative eigenvalue, then w_* is avoided by almost all gradient flow trajectories. We refer the reader to [3, 4, 5] for results on avoidance of saddle points in machine learning contexts. For **nonstrict saddle points** w_* (the Hessian $D^2 f(p)$ is positive semi-definite but has at least one eigenvalue equal to zero), standard results are inconclusive.

In this paper, we are going to show that the missing information needed to solve the avoidance problem for a nonstrict saddle point w_* can sometimes be obtained by “blowing up” the objective function f at w_* . A suitable nonlinear rescaling of the gradient vector field makes the local structure visible, thus revealing the qualitative features of the dynamics near the critical point. This makes it possible to devise a test for deciding whether the set $W^s(w_*)$ has zero Lebesgue measure.

To motivate the blow-up method, assume that $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real-analytic function and $w_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a saddle point of f . Since f is not the constant function, there exists a minimal $k \geq 2$ such that *some* partial derivative of f of order k is nonzero at w_* . By the Gromoll-Meyer Splitting Lemma, it suffices to consider $k \geq 3$.

Write $w - w_* =: ru$, with polar coordinates $r \in (0, +\infty)$ and $u \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. If p is the order- k homogeneous polynomial in the Taylor expansion of f at w_* , then

$$f(w) = f(w_*) + r^k p(u) + O(r^{k+1}) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

If one pulls the Euclidean metric from $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ back to $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ via the map $(r, u) \mapsto ru$ and computes ∇f in these coordinates, then the vector field

$$X(r, u) := r^{2-k} \nabla f(ru)$$

has a C^1 -extension up to the so-called “blown-up sphere” $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ satisfying

$$X|_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} = (0, \text{grad } P),$$

where $\text{grad } P$ denotes the Euclidean gradient of the restriction $P := p|_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . In other words, up to time-reparameterization, the dynamics extends up to the blown-up sphere $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ in a way that is tangent to it. This fact enables us to scrutinize the dynamics of $-\text{grad } P$ on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} in order to understand the dynamics of $-\nabla f$ near w_* . In Section 1.1 below, precise assumptions on P are used to devise tests that can decide whether almost all trajectories of $-\nabla f$ will avoid w_* .

One might ask whether these assumptions are artificial, but it turns out that they are C^∞ -generically necessary. When these assumptions are satisfied, the set of those points converging to the critical point w_* are contained in a Lipschitz graph, which has zero Lebesgue measure. The proof uses the center-stable manifold theorem. In a nongeneric situation where the test renders an inconclusive output, the blow-up can be iterated to provide finer tests. The Łojasiewicz inequality plays an important role because it ensures that gradient flow trajectories converge as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

Notation. The Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{R}^d is denoted by

$$g_0(v, w) := \sum_{i=1}^d v_i w_i \quad \text{with} \quad v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_d \end{pmatrix}, w = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We will interchangeably use the notation

$$\langle v, w \rangle := v \cdot w := g_0(v, w).$$

The induced norm $\|w\| = \sqrt{g_0(w, w)} = \sqrt{w_1^2 + \cdots + w_d^2}$ is referred to as Euclidean norm. We define the open ball centered at the origin and with radius $r > 0$ as

$$B_r(0) := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|z\| < r\}.$$

Let $j: \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the inclusion map. Then the restriction of g_0 to the tangent bundle of the unit sphere

$$\mathbb{S}^{d-1} := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|w\| = 1\}$$

defines a Riemannian metric $h = j^* g_0$, also referred to as Euclidean.

1.1. Main results. The following theorems provide sufficient criteria for a critical point of a smooth function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be avoided by *almost all* trajectories of its gradient flow, in the case that the jet of f at the corresponding critical point is generic. Gradients and Hessians of functions on \mathbb{R}^d or on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} are computed with respect to the Euclidean metric. The set of critical points of a real-valued function f is denoted by $\text{Crit}(f)$. We start by introducing the relevant notions.

Definition 1.1. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function and $w_* \in \text{Crit}(f)$. We call w_* a **weakly strict saddle point** provided the following holds:

- (1) For some integer $k \geq 2$ all partial derivatives of f of order $1 \leq l < k$ vanish at w_* , but some partial derivative of f of order k does not vanish at w_* . We call k the order of the weakly strict saddle point.
- (2) Let p be the non-vanishing homogeneous polynomial of smallest degree in the Taylor expansion of $f - f(w_*)$ at w_* . If $P := p|_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$, then every $z \in \text{Crit}(P)$ satisfies $P(z) < 0$ or $\text{Hess } P(z)$ has a negative eigenvalue.

We call the saddle point w_* **tamed** if $\text{Crit}(P)$ consists only of isolated points.

Our first result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.2. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function and denote by φ^t the flow of $-\nabla f$ (formed by gradient flow trajectories). Let $C \subset \text{Crit}(f)$ be such that every $w_* \in C$ is a tamed weakly strict saddle point. Consider the set E of points $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\varphi^t(w_0)$ is defined for all $t \geq 0$, and there exists a $w_* \in C$ such that $\varphi^t(w_0) \rightarrow w_*$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Then E has Lebesgue measure equal to zero.

We shall prove Theorem 1.2 as a consequence of the following result.

Theorem 1.3. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function and let φ^t be the flow induced by the vector field $-\nabla f$. Suppose that $w_* \in \text{Crit}(f)$ is a tamed weakly strict saddle point. Then there exists a set $W(w_*)$ with the following properties:

- (1) For some open neighborhood B of w_* , if w_0 is such that $\varphi^t(w_0)$ is defined and satisfies $\varphi^t(w_0) \in B$ for all $t \geq 0$, then $w_0 \in W(w_*)$.
- (2) $W(w_*)$ has Lebesgue measure equal to zero.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof consists of an elementary covering argument combined with Theorem 1.3. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed, the map φ^t is defined on an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d , which we denote by \mathcal{D}_t . Let $\Phi := \varphi^1$ and $U := \mathcal{D}_1$. The n -fold iterate Φ^n of the map Φ is well-defined on an open set U_n defined recursively as

$$U_1 := U, \quad U_n := \Phi^{-1}(U_{n-1}) = \{w \in U : \Phi(w) \in U_{n-1}\}.$$

Then Φ^n defines a diffeomorphism of U_n onto the open set $\Phi^n(U_n)$. The pre-image of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ by Φ^n is denoted by $\Phi^{-n}(A) = \{w \in U_n : \Phi^n(w) \in A\}$. Since Φ^n is a diffeomorphism, if A has Lebesgue measure zero, then so does $\Phi^{-n}(A)$.

For each $w_* \in C$ let $W(w_*)$ be the set associated to w_* , as given by Theorem 1.3. According to item (1) in Theorem 1.3, each w_* has an open neighborhood $B(w_*)$ with the following property: If $w_0 \in B(w_*)$ is such that $\varphi^t(w_0)$ is defined and belongs to $B(w_*)$ for all $t \geq 0$, then $w_0 \in W(w_*)$. Let $\{B(w_*^i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable open cover of C by such balls and define

$$E_0 := \bigcup_i \bigcup_n \Phi^{-n}(W(w_*^i)).$$

Each $\Phi^{-n}(W(w_*^i))$ has Lebesgue measure equal to zero because each $W(w_*^i)$ does. It follows that E_0 has Lebesgue measure equal to zero. Let $w_0 \in E$ be arbitrary and $w_* := \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \varphi^t(w_0) \in C$, which exists by construction. There exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $w_* \in B(w_*^i)$. We can find $T > 0$ such that if $t \geq T$, then $\varphi^t(w_0) \in B(w_*^i)$. Then $\Phi^n(w_0) \in W(w_*^i)$ for all $n \geq T$, in view of item (1) in Theorem 1.3. We have shown that $E_0 \supset E$. Therefore the Lebesgue measure of E is equal to zero. \square

Our main result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-constant real-analytic function, and denote by φ^t the flow induced by the vector field $-\nabla f$. Let C be a bounded connected component of $\text{Crit}(f)$ consisting only of tamed weakly strict saddle points. Consider the set E' of all points $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\inf\{\text{dist}(\varphi^t(w_0), C) : t \geq 0\} = 0$. Then E' has Lebesgue measure equal to zero.*

Proof. We present a proof based on Theorem 1.2 and on the well-known Lemma 2.5 below. Let E be the set obtained from Theorem 1.2. Since E has Lebesgue measure equal to zero, it suffices to show that $E' \subset E$.

Let $w_0 \in E'$ and denote by $T_+ \in (0, +\infty]$ the maximal existence time of $\varphi^t(w_0)$. We claim that $T_+ = +\infty$. Indeed if $T_+ < +\infty$, then standard ODE theory implies that $\|\varphi^t(w_0)\| \longrightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow T_+$. Since C is bounded, $\text{dist}(\varphi^t(w_0), C) \longrightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow T_+$, in contradiction to the definition of E' . Notice that $\text{dist}(\varphi^t(w_0), C)$ is bounded away from zero on any compact set of times. This proves the claim.

Denote by $\omega(w_0)$ the ω -limit set of $t \mapsto \varphi^t(w_0)$; see Definition 2.2 below for details. Then $\omega(w_0)$ is a closed set contained in $\text{Crit}(f)$. By definition of E' , we must have $\omega(w_0) \cap C \neq \emptyset$, in particular $\omega(w_0) \neq \emptyset$. We claim that $\omega(w_0)$ is bounded. Let ω_* be a connected component of $\omega(w_0)$ containing some point in $\omega(w_0) \cap C$. Then $\omega_* \cup C$ is a connected subset of $\text{Crit}(f)$ that contains the connected component C . It follows that $\omega_* \cup C = C$, hence $\omega_* \subset C$. If $\omega(w_0)$ were disconnected, then ω_* would be unbounded (see Remark 2.3), in contradiction to the boundedness of C . Hence $\omega(w_0) = \omega_*$ is connected and $\omega(w_0) \subset C$, thus proving the claim.

We have that $\omega(w_0)$ is bounded, connected, and non-empty. Hence $\varphi^{[0, +\infty)}(w_0)$ is bounded. Then Lemma 2.5 applies and we find $w_* \in C$ such that $\omega(w_0) = \{w_*\}$, i.e., $\varphi^t(w_0) \longrightarrow w_*$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. It follows that $w_0 \in E$; see Theorem 1.2. \square

1.2. Example. To demonstrate how the method works, we consider the map

$$f(x, y, z) := \frac{1}{2}(xyz - 1)^2 - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}x^2y^2z^2 - xyz \quad \text{for } (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

One can check that at the origin $(x, y, z) = (0, 0, 0)$ the function value, the gradient, and the Hessian of f all vanish. The origin is not a local minimizer/maximizer, as can be checked by considering the diagonal $(x, y, z) = (r, r, r)$ for $r \in \mathbb{R}$, but it is a critical point. In fact, it is a non-strict saddle point. Since f is a polynomial, it is analytic and coincides with its Taylor expansion. The homogeneous polynomial in this expansion of minimal order is of order $k = 3$ and equal to

$$p(x, y, z) := -xyz \quad \text{for } (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

We restrict the polynomial p to the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^2 and call this restriction P . Recall that the projection operator $\text{Proj}_w : \mathbb{R}^3 \longrightarrow T_w\mathbb{S}^2$ with $w \in \mathbb{S}^2$ is given by

$$\text{Proj}_w(u) := u - \langle w, u \rangle w \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

The gradient of P in \mathbb{S}^2 is the projection of the gradient ∇p in \mathbb{R}^3 :

$$\text{grad } P(w) = \text{Proj}_w(\nabla p(w)) = - \begin{pmatrix} yz(1 - 3x^2) \\ xz(1 - 3y^2) \\ xy(1 - 3z^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore the critical points of P on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 are

$$\begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \pm 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 \\ \pm 1 \\ \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.1)$$

To conduct the test for the blow-up method, we must check whether $\text{Hess } P$ at these critical points has a negative eigenvalue or P is negative. In order to compute the Riemannian Hessian, we use that for $w \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $u \in T_w \mathbb{S}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess } P(w)[u] &= \text{Proj}_w (D^2 p(w)[u]) - \langle w, \nabla p(w) \rangle u \\ &= D^2 p(w)[u] - \langle w, D^2 p(w)[u] \rangle w - \langle w, \nabla p(w) \rangle u. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u \cdot w = 0$, it follows that

$$\langle u, \text{Hess } P(w)[u] \rangle = \langle u, D^2 p(w)[u] \rangle - \langle w, \nabla p(w) \rangle \|u\|^2. \quad (1.2)$$

Therefore, if we can prove that *for each* w as in (1.1) we have

$$P(w) < 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \langle u, \text{Hess } P(w)[u] \rangle < 0 \quad \text{for some } u \in T_w \mathbb{S}^2, \quad (1.3)$$

then a generic trajectory of the gradient flow of f will avoid the origin.

For our particular choice of f , we find that

$$D^2 p(w) = - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & z & y \\ z & 0 & x \\ y & x & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle w, \nabla p(w) \rangle = -3xyz, \quad (1.4)$$

for $w = (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{S}^2$. For the point $w = (0, 0, 1)$, we have $P(w) = 0$. Therefore we must check the second condition in (1.3). We have

$$D^2 p(w) = - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad \text{Choosing } u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in T_w \mathbb{S}^2,$$

we conclude with (1.2), (1.4) that

$$\langle u, \text{Hess } P(w)[u] \rangle = -2 + 0 < 0.$$

This argument works analogously for the first six cases in (1.1).

On the other hand, if w is of the last form in (1.1) and either *all three components* or *only one component* is positive, then $P(w) < 0$, hence the first condition in (1.3) is satisfied. If all three components are negative, then we have

$$D^2 p(w) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad \text{Choosing } u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in T_w \mathbb{S}^2,$$

we conclude with (1.2), (1.4) that

$$\langle u, \text{Hess } P(w)[u] \rangle = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} < 0. \quad (1.5)$$

Finally, for $w = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1, 1, -1)$ we obtain

$$D^2 p(w) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad \text{Choosing } u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \in T_w \mathbb{S}^2,$$

we conclude that (1.5) holds again. The remaining two cases follow analogously.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

Let ϕ be the “polar coordinates” map

$$\phi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \phi(r, u) := ru.$$

Note that $\phi|_{(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ defines a C^∞ -diffeomorphism $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \simeq \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$. According to the identification

$$T_{(r,u)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = T_r \mathbb{R} \times T_u \mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \mathbb{R} \times T_u \mathbb{S}^{d-1},$$

the differential $d\phi(r, u) : \mathbb{R} \times T_u \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \longrightarrow T_{ru} \mathbb{R}^d = \mathbb{R}^d$ is the linear map

$$(\delta r, \delta u) \mapsto \delta r u + r \delta u.$$

One computes explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^* g_0(r, u)((\delta r, \delta u), (\delta r', \delta u')) &= g_0(\delta r u + r \delta u, \delta r' u + r \delta u') \\ &= \delta r \delta r' + r^2 g_0(\delta u, \delta u') \\ &= \delta r \delta r' + r^2 h(u)(\delta u, \delta u'), \end{aligned}$$

where the identity $T_u \mathbb{S}^{d-1} = (\mathbb{R}u)^\perp$ was used. This proves that

$$\phi^* g_0 = dr \otimes dr + r^2 h,$$

where we still write h to denote the pull-back of h by the projection $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ onto the second factor.

Let F be a C^1 function defined on an open subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Its gradient ∇F with respect to the metric $\phi^* g_0$ is computed as follows. Denote by $D_1 F$ the partial derivative with respect to r , i.e., for $(r, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ let

$$D_1 F(r, u) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F(r+t, u) - F(r, u)}{t}.$$

Given $r \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $F^r : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the map $u \mapsto F(r, u)$. According to the identification $T_{(r,u)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \mathbb{R} \times T_u \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, the gradient ∇F has components

$$\nabla F(r, u) =: (a(r, u), b(r, u)),$$

which can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a(r, u)\delta r + r^2 h(u)(b(r, u), \delta u) &= \phi^* g_0(r, u)(\nabla F(r, u), (\delta r, \delta u)) \\ &= dF(r, u)(\delta r, \delta u) \\ &= D_1 F(r, u)\delta r + dF^r(u)\delta u \\ &= D_1 F(r, u)\delta r + h(u)(\text{grad } F^r(u), \delta u), \end{aligned}$$

where grad denotes the gradient with respect to h . It follows that

$$a(r, u) = D_1 F(r, u), \quad b(r, u) = r^{-2} \text{grad } F^r(u). \quad (2.1)$$

2.1. The blow-up construction. Consider a smooth function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a critical point at 0. Assume that $f(0) = 0$ and that *some* partial derivative of f does not vanish at 0. Let now $k \geq 2$ be the smallest integer such that some partial derivative of f of order k does not vanish at 0. Then there exist a non-zero polynomial $p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ homogeneous of degree k such that

$$f(w) = p(w) + e(w),$$

where the remainder term $e : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth and satisfies

$$\|D^\alpha e(w)\| = O(\|w\|^{k+1-|\alpha|}) \text{ as } r \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.2)$$

for all multi-indices α such that $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k+1$. Define for $(r, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$

$$F(r, u) := f(ru) = r^k P(u) + E(r, u), \quad E(r, u) = e(ru),$$

where $P : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $P := p|_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$, and $E : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth. It follows from (2.1) that the gradient with respect to $\phi^* g_0$ is

$$\nabla F(r, u) = (kr^{k-1}P(u), r^{k-2} \text{grad } P(u)) + \nabla E(r, u). \quad (2.3)$$

Consider now the vector field $X : (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ defined by

$$X(r, u) := r^{2-k} \nabla F(r, u). \quad (2.4)$$

Because of (2.3), it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} X(r, u) &= (krP(u), \text{grad } P(u)) + r^{2-k} \nabla E(r, u) \\ &=: X_0(r, u) + r^{2-k} \nabla E(r, u). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly X_0 defines a smooth vector field on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Lemma 2.1. *The vector field $(r, u) \mapsto r^{2-k} \nabla E(r, u)$ has a C^1 -extension to $r = 0$. This extension vanishes on $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. As a consequence, the vector field X has a C^1 -extension to $r = 0$, which agrees with X_0 on $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Moreover, if $u_0 \in \text{Crit}(P)$ and if $\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}$ denotes the spectrum of the Hessian of P at u_0 , then X vanishes at $(0, u_0)$ and the linearization of X at $(0, u_0)$ has spectrum equal to $\{kP(u_0)\} \cup \sigma$.*

In particular, the local behavior of the flow induced by the vector field $-X$ near the “blown-up sphere” $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is determined by the spectrum of the linearization around a point $(0, u_0)$, which depends on the sign of the value $kP(u_0)$ (with $k \geq 2$) and the spectrum of $\text{Hess } P(u_0)$. This motivates item (2) in Definition 1.1.

Proof. Every point of \mathbb{S}^{d-1} belongs to an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ where a smooth map $\Phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is defined in such a way that $(U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \Phi|_{U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}})$ is a chart of \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . This means that $\Phi(U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ is open in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} and $\Phi|_{U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ defines a diffeomorphism $U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \Phi(U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. The inverse of such a diffeomorphism will be denoted here by $\psi : \Phi(U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}) \rightarrow U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the map $\pi(w) := \text{id} - \langle w, \cdot \rangle w$, where we use the canonical basis to identify real $(d \times d)$ -matrices with linear endomorphisms of \mathbb{R}^d . If $u \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, then $\pi(u)$ is the orthogonal projection $\text{Proj}_u : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow T_u \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

The chart $\Phi|_{U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ induces a chart $\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}} \times \Phi|_{U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with domain $\mathbb{R} \times (U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. Recall from (2.1) that

$$\nabla E(r, u) = (D_1 E(r, u), r^{-2} \text{grad } E^r(u)) = (\langle \nabla e(ru), u \rangle, r^{-1} \pi(u) \nabla e(ru)),$$

where $E^r : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the function $u \mapsto E(r, u) = e(ru)$. The local representation of ∇E in the chart $\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}} \times \Phi|_{U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ is given by

$$(r, z) \mapsto \left(\langle \nabla e(r\psi(z)), \psi(z) \rangle, r^{-1} D\Phi(\psi(z)) \pi(\psi(z)) \nabla e(r\psi(z)) \right)$$

where $(r, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Phi(U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. Hence the local expression of $r^{2-k} \nabla E$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(r^{2-k} \langle \nabla e(r\psi(z)), \psi(z) \rangle, r^{1-k} D\Phi(\psi(z)) \pi(\psi(z)) \nabla e(r\psi(z)) \right) \\ & =: (A(r, z), B(r, z)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Because of (2.2), we have that

$$\|A(r, z)\| = O(r^2), \quad \|B(r, z)\| = O(r) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.6)$$

uniformly on compact subsets of $\Phi(U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. Similarly, there holds

$$\|\partial_{z_i} A(r, z)\| = O(r^2), \quad \|\partial_r A(r, z)\| = O(r), \quad \|\partial_{z_i} B(r, z)\| = O(r) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0,$$

again uniformly on compact subsets of $\Phi(U \cap \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$. The only first order derivative that does not converge to 0 as $r \rightarrow 0$ is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r B(r, z) &= (1-k)r^{-k} D\Phi(\psi(z)) \pi(\psi(z)) \nabla e(r\psi(z)) \\ &\quad + r^{1-k} D\Phi(\psi(z)) \pi(\psi(z)) \left(D\nabla e(r\psi(z)) \right) \psi(z). \end{aligned}$$

In order to complete the proof that $r^{2-k} \nabla E(r, u)$ has the desired C^1 -extension, it therefore suffices to show that $r^{-k} \nabla e(ru)$ and $r^{1-k} D\nabla e(ru)$ converge to continuous limits as $r \rightarrow 0$, uniformly on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Note that $e(w)$ can be written as

$$e(w) = \sum_{\{\alpha: |\alpha|=k+1\}} e_\alpha(w) w^\alpha,$$

where $e_\alpha : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions satisfying

$$e_\alpha(0) = \frac{D^\alpha f(0)}{\alpha!}, \quad \alpha! = \alpha_1! \dots \alpha_d!.$$

From this it follows that there exist homogeneous polynomials $\zeta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ of degree k and $M : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ of degree $k-1$ such that

$$r^{-k} \nabla e(ru) \rightarrow \zeta(u), \quad r^{1-k} D\nabla e(ru) \rightarrow M(u) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0,$$

uniformly in $u \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. This shows that $\partial_r B(r, u)$ has a limit as $r \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in $u \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Hence $(r, u) \mapsto r^{2-k} \nabla E(r, u)$ has a C^1 -extension up to $r = 0$, taking zero values on $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ because of (2.5), (2.6).

Let $u_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ be a critical point of P . The above calculations show that

$$DX(r, u_0) = \begin{pmatrix} kP(u_0) + O(r) & O(r^2) \\ O(1) & \text{Hess } P(u_0) + O(r) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\text{Hess } P(u_0) : T_{u_0} \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow T_{u_0} \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is the Hessian of P at u_0 with respect to the Euclidean inner product. Since it was proved above that $DX(r, u_0)$ does admit a limit as $r \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the expression

$$DX(0, u_0) = \begin{pmatrix} kP(u_0) & 0 \\ * & \text{Hess } P(u_0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The claim made in the statement about the spectrum of $DX(0, u_0)$ follows. \square

2.2. Controlling trajectories.

Definition 2.2. For $c : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ continuous, its ω -**limit set** is defined as

$$\omega(c) := \{w_* \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{there exists } t_n \rightarrow +\infty \text{ with } c(t_n) \rightarrow w_*\}.$$

Remark 2.3. We recall the following standard facts whose proofs are omitted:

- ω -limit sets are closed. The image of the curve c is bounded if and only if $\omega(c)$ is bounded and non-empty. If c has bounded image, then $\omega(c)$ is connected. If $\omega(c)$ is disconnected, then all its connected components are unbounded.
- If $w : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is an integral curve of $-\nabla f$ (gradient flow trajectory), then $\omega(w)$ consists of critical points of f .

- If $\omega(c)$ contains two distinct points, then c has infinite length.

Lemma 2.4. *For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that, if*

$$\gamma : [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow (0, R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \quad \gamma(t) =: (r(t), u(t))$$

is an integral curve of $-X$ (recall (2.4)), then

$$\sup \{ \text{dist}(x, \text{Crit}(P)) : x \in \omega(u) \} \leq \delta, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\text{diam } P(\omega(u)) = \sup \{ |P(x) - P(y)| : x, y \in \omega(u) \} \leq \delta. \quad (2.8)$$

Proof. In the following, we will write ∇P instead of $\text{grad } P$ and use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to denote the Riemannian metric h on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} for simplicity. We first address claim (2.8). To this end, consider regular values $a < b$ of p . We claim that there exists $L = L(a, b) > 0$ such that, if $u : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is C^1 and satisfies

$$\|\dot{u} + \nabla P(u)\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} < L, \quad P(\omega(u)) \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset,$$

then there holds

$$\omega(u) \subset P^{-1}((a, b)),$$

hence $\text{diam } P(\omega(u)) < b - a$. To prove the claim, notice first that $K = P^{-1}([a, b])$ is a smooth compact manifold with boundary $\partial K = P^{-1}(a) \cup P^{-1}(b)$. On $P^{-1}(b)$ the vector field $-\nabla P$ points *into* K transversely to the boundary, on $P^{-1}(a)$ the vector field $-\nabla P$ points *out of* K transversely to the boundary. By compactness of K , there exists $L(a, b) > 0$ such that, if $\|\dot{u} + \nabla P(u)\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} < L(a, b)$, then $\dot{u}(t)$ points into K transversely to the boundary for all t such that $P(u(t)) = b$, and $\dot{u}(t)$ points out of K transversely to the boundary for all t such that $P(u(t)) = a$. It follows that $u^{-1}(K)$ is an *interval* if $\|\dot{u} + \nabla P(u)\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} < L(a, b)$.

In this case, if $\omega(u) \cap K \neq \emptyset$, then the interval $u^{-1}(K)$ is not bounded from above and $u(t)$ stays at a positive distance from ∂K for all t large enough. Hence $\omega(u) \subset K \setminus \partial K$. Note that if $P(\omega(u)) \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset$, then $\omega(u) \cap K \neq \emptyset$ and the above conclusions hold, i.e., $P(\omega(u)) \subset (a, b)$ and $\omega(u) \subset K \setminus \partial K$.

Now let $\delta > 0$ be given arbitrarily. Consider regular values

$$a_0 < \min p < a_1 < \cdots < a_{N-1} < \max p < a_N$$

of P , such that $a_{i+1} - a_i < \delta$ for all $0 \leq i \leq N-1$. Choose L such that

$$0 < L < \min_i L(a_i, a_{i+1}),$$

and suppose that $u : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ satisfies $\|\dot{u} + \nabla P(u)\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} < L$. Notice that $P(\omega(u))$ is a closed interval because $\omega(u)$ is a connected and compact subset of \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . We find i such that $P(\omega(u)) \cap [a_i, a_{i+1}] \neq \emptyset$. Above it was shown that $P(\omega(u)) \subset (a_i, a_{i+1})$. Hence $\text{diam } P(\omega(u)) \leq \delta$ as desired.

By Lemma 2.1, there exist $R_0 > 0$, $C > 0$ such that if $0 < r \leq R_0$, then

$$|X_1(r, u)| + \|X_2(r, u) - \nabla P(u)\| \leq Cr, \quad (2.9)$$

where we write $X = (X_1, X_2)$ according to $T_{(r, u)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}) = \mathbb{R} \times T_u \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Hence a trajectory $\gamma(t) = (r(t), u(t))$ of $-X$ contained in $(0, R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ satisfies

$$\|\dot{u} + \nabla P(u)\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} \leq CR$$

provided $R < R_0$. Combining this with what the above, we obtain that $\text{diam } P(\omega(u))$ becomes arbitrarily small provided R is small enough. This proves (2.8).

In order to prove the claim (2.7), we argue by contradiction and assume that for some $\delta > 0$ there exists a sequence

$$\gamma_n(t) = (r_n(t), u_n(t)) : [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$$

of integral curves of $-X$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|r_n\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} = 0,$$

for all n there exists $x_n \in \omega(u_n)$ with $\text{dist}(x_n, \text{Crit}(P)) \geq \delta$.

Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\|r_n\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} \leq R_0$ for all $n \geq n_0$. By (2.9), then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\dot{r}_n| + \|\dot{u}_n + \nabla P(u_n)\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} \\ &= |X_1(r_n, u_n)| + \|X_2(\gamma_n) - \nabla P(u_n)\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))} \leq C\|r_n\|_{L^\infty([0, +\infty))}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

From our arguments above and (2.8), it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{diam } P(\omega(u_n)) = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Since $x_n \in \omega(u_n)$ for all n , up to a subsequence (not relabeled for simplicity) we may assume that $x_n \rightarrow x_*$. Then $\text{dist}(x_*, \text{Crit}(P)) \geq \delta$, by continuity. Let

$$\eta := \|\nabla P(x_*)\| > 0, \quad M := \sup \{|P(u)| + \|\nabla P(u)\| : u \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}\}.$$

With respect to the Riemannian metric $g_1 = dr \otimes dr + h$ on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have the identity $\|X(0, x_*)\|_{g_1} = \|\nabla P(x_*)\| = \eta$. Let now $R > 0$ and $U \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ be an open neighborhood of x_* such that for all $(r, u) \in [0, R) \times U$

$$\|X(r, u)\|_{g_1} \geq \eta/2. \quad (2.12)$$

Let d_1 be the distance on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ induced by g_1 and consider a neighborhood $W \subset U$ of x_* in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} such that the d_1 -distance from $[0, R/2] \times W$ to the complement of $[0, R) \times U$ in $[0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is a positive number ρ . Choose

$$M' > \sup\{\|X(r, u)\|_{g_1} : (r, u) \in [0, 2R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}\}.$$

If $\alpha : [a, b] \rightarrow [0, 2R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is a C^1 curve satisfying

$$\alpha(a) \in [0, R/2] \times W, \quad \alpha(b) \notin [0, R) \times U, \quad \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \|\dot{\alpha}(t)\|_{g_1} \leq v,$$

then we can estimate

$$\rho \leq \int_a^b \|\dot{\alpha}(t)\|_{g_1} dt \leq (b-a)v,$$

which implies that $b-a \geq \rho/v$. Hence, if $\tau = \rho/2M'$, then we observe that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t^* \geq \tau$ such that $\gamma_n(t_*) \in [0, R/2] \times W$ it follows that

$$\gamma_n([t_* - \tau, t_* + \tau]) \subset [0, R) \times U,$$

hence $\|X(\gamma_n(t))\|_{g_1} \geq \eta/2$ for all $t \in [t_* - \tau, t_* + \tau]$. Now choose n_1 such that

$$C\|r_n\|_{L^\infty} \leq \eta/4 \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_1.$$

For $n \geq \max\{n_0, n_1\}$, $t_* \geq \tau$ with $\gamma_n(t_*) \in [0, R/2] \times W$, and $t \in [t_* - \tau, t_* + \tau]$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P(u_n(t))\| &\geq \|\dot{u}_n(t)\| - \|\nabla P(u_n(t)) + \dot{u}_n(t)\| \\ &= \left(|\dot{r}_n(t)| + \|\dot{u}_n(t)\|\right) - \left(|\dot{r}_n(t)| + \|\nabla P(u_n(t)) + \dot{u}_n(t)\|\right) \\ &\geq \|X(\gamma_n(t))\|_{g_1} - C\|r_n\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\geq \eta/4; \end{aligned}$$

see (2.10), (2.12). Note that for $n \geq n_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}P(u_n(t)) &= dP(u_n(t)) \dot{u}_n(t) \\ &= -\|\nabla P(u_n(t))\|^2 + \langle \nabla P(u_n(t)), \dot{u}_n(t) + \nabla P(u_n(t)) \rangle \\ &\leq -\|\nabla P(u_n(t))\|^2 + MC\|r_n\|_{L^\infty([0,+\infty))}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Let n_2 be such that for all $n \geq n_2$

$$MC\|r_n\|_{L^\infty([0,+\infty))} \leq \eta^2/32.$$

Then by (2.13), for $n \geq \max\{n_0, n_1, n_2\}$ and $t_* \geq \tau$ with $\gamma_n(t_*) \in [0, R/2] \times W$

$$\begin{aligned} P(u_n(t_* + \tau)) &\leq P(u_n(t_*)) + \tau(-\eta^2/16) + MC\|r_n\|_{L^\infty([0,+\infty))} \\ &\leq P(u_n(t_*)) - \tau\eta^2/32. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $P(u_n)$ has diameter larger than $\tau\eta^2/32 > 0$ provided n is large enough. This is in contradiction to (2.11), which proves the lemma. \square

The following lemma provides a condition for convergence of gradient flow trajectories in the limit $t \rightarrow +\infty$. The argument is based on the Łojasiewicz inequality and well-known. We include the short proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $w : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-constant solution of $\dot{w} = -\nabla f(w)$, with f is real-analytic. Suppose that $\omega(w)$ is bounded and non-empty. Then there exists a critical point w_* of f such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} w(t) = w_*$.*

Proof. By Remark 2.3 and the assumptions, $\omega(w)$ is a connected compact non-empty set consisting of critical points of f . Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\{c\} = f(\omega(w))$, i.e. c is the critical value attained along $\omega(w)$. Note that $f(w(t)) > c$ for all $t \geq 0$ because $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(w(t)) = c$ and $f(w(t))$ is strictly decreasing.

Recall Łojasiewicz's inequality: for every $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist constants $0 < \theta < 1$, $C > 0$ such that $|f(w) - f(w_0)|^\theta \leq C\|\nabla f(w)\|$ for all w in some neighborhood of w_0 . By compactness of $\omega(w)$ and a simple covering argument, one finds an open neighborhood U_0 of $\omega(w)$ and constants $0 < \theta < 1$, $C > 0$ such that

$$|f(w) - c|^\theta \leq C\|\nabla f(w)\| \quad \text{for all } w \in U_0. \quad (2.14)$$

Let U_1 be an open neighborhood of $\omega(w)$ such that $|f(w) - c| \leq 1$ for all $w \in U_1$. Let $t_0 > 0$ be such that $t \geq t_0 \Rightarrow w(t) \in U := U_0 \cap U_1$. On U we can then replace θ in inequality (2.14) by larger exponents smaller than 1. Set $h(t) := f(w(t)) - c$ so that $h(t) > 0$ and $h'(t) = -\|\nabla f(w(t))\|^2$. One finds $\frac{1}{2} < \beta < 1$ such that

$$h(t)^\beta \leq C\sqrt{-h'(t)} \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0. \quad (2.15)$$

We now define

$$\epsilon_* := \frac{2(1-\beta)}{2\beta-1} > 0.$$

Then we claim that for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_*$ there holds

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} t^{1+\epsilon} h(t) = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Indeed, since $-1 < 1 - 2\beta < 0$, we obtain from (2.15) that for all $t \geq t_0$

$$(h(t)^{1-2\beta})' = (2\beta-1)h(t)^{-2\beta}(-h'(t)) \geq \frac{2\beta-1}{C^2} > 0.$$

It follows that there exist constants $\alpha \in (0, +\infty)$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$h(t)^{1-2\beta} \geq \alpha t + \kappa \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0.$$

The map $g : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $g(y) := y^{\frac{1}{1-2\beta}}$ is strictly decreasing. Hence

$$h(t) = g(h(t)^{1-2\beta}) \leq g(\alpha t + \kappa) = (\alpha t + \kappa)^{\frac{1}{1-2\beta}},$$

and we finally arrive at $h(t)t^{1+\epsilon} \leq (\alpha t + \kappa)^{\frac{1}{1-2\beta}} t^{1+\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\epsilon < \epsilon_*$ implies $\frac{1}{1-2\beta} + 1 + \epsilon < 0$. This concludes the proof of (2.16).

Choose $\epsilon < \epsilon' < \epsilon_*$. Since $\|\dot{w}(t)\| = \|\nabla f(w(t))\| = \sqrt{-h'(t)}$, the square of the length of the curve w is estimated using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \|\dot{w}(t)\| dt \right)^2 &= \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \sqrt{-h'(t)} dt \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \sqrt{-h'(t)} t^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}} t^{-\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}} dt \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^{+\infty} -h'(t) t^{1+\epsilon} dt \right) \left(\int_0^{+\infty} t^{-(1+\epsilon)} dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

To prove that w has finite length we integrate by parts. With (2.16) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} -h'(t) t^{1+\epsilon} dt &= - \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} h(t) t^{1+\epsilon} + \int_0^{+\infty} h(t) (1+\epsilon) t^\epsilon dt \\ &= (1+\epsilon) \int_0^{+\infty} h(t) t^{1+\epsilon'} t^{-1-\epsilon'+\epsilon} dt \\ &\leq (1+\epsilon) \|h(t) t^{1+\epsilon'}\|_{L^\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} t^{-1-\epsilon'+\epsilon} dt < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof that w has finite length. If $\omega(w)$ contained at least two different points, then w would have infinite length, which would be a contradiction. Therefore $\omega(w)$ consists of precisely one point, as we wanted to show. \square

2.3. Completing the proof. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be smooth and $w_* \in \text{Crit}(f)$ a *tamed weakly strict* saddle point; see Definition 1.1. There is no loss of generality to assume that $w_* = 0$ and $f(0) = 0$. We find an integer $k \geq 2$ such that

$$f(w) = p(w) + O(\|w\|^{k+1})$$

for some non-zero homogeneous polynomial $p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of degree k . Let φ^t be the flow induced by the vector field $-\nabla f$. We denote by $P : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the restriction $P = p|_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$. Recall the “polar coordinates” map

$$\phi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (r, u) \mapsto ru,$$

and note that $\phi|_{(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$ defines a diffeomorphism $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \simeq \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$. According to the analysis in subsection 2.1, the vector field $\|w\|^{2-k} \nabla f$ gets pulled back by this diffeomorphism to a vector field X defined on $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ that has a C^1 -extension to $[0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. It has then a non-unique C^1 -extension to $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, which we continue to denote by X in the following. The restrictions of X and its derivatives to $[0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ are uniquely determined. We denote by ψ^t the flow of the vector field $-X$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

The maximal domain of definition of $\Psi := \psi^1$ is an open set denoted here by $U \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Hence $\Psi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is a C^1 -embedding onto the open set $\Psi(U)$.

The n -fold iteration Ψ^n of Ψ is defined on an open set U_n , specified recursively as $U_1 := U$, $U_n := \{q \in U : \Psi(q) \in U_{n-1}\} = \Psi^{-1}(U_{n-1})$. Then $\Psi^n(U_n)$ is open and Ψ^n defines a C^1 diffeomorphism of U_n onto $\Psi^n(U_n)$.

By Lemma 2.1, the set of zeros of X on $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is precisely $\{0\} \times \text{Crit}(P)$. By item (2) in Definition 1.1 and Lemma 2.1, for every $u_* \in \text{Crit}(P)$ the linearization $-DX(0, u_*)$ of $-X$ at $(0, u_*)$ has an eigenvalue with strictly positive real part. By Lemma A.6, for each $u_* \in \text{Crit}(P)$ the point $(0, u_*)$ has an open neighborhood $B(u_*) \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with the following property: If $E(u_*)$ is the set of points (r_0, u_0) such that $\psi^t(r_0, u_0)$ is defined and satisfies $\psi^t(r_0, u_0) \in B(u_*)$ for all $t \geq 0$, then $E(u_*)$ has measure zero. Since $\#\text{Crit}(P) < \infty$ by assumption, the set

$$E_* = \bigcup_{u_* \in \text{Crit}(P)} E(u_*)$$

then has measure zero too. Consider

$$Z := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \Psi^{-n}(E_*) = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \{w \in U_n : \Psi^n(w) \in E_*\}.$$

Then Z has measure zero because it is a countable union of sets of measure zero.

Choose $R_0 > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\text{dist}(u, \text{Crit}(P)) \geq 2\delta$ for

$$(r, u) \in [0, R_0] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \setminus \bigcup_{u_* \in \text{Crit}(P)} B(u_*).$$

By Lemma 2.4, for some $0 < R < R_0$ the following holds: If (r_0, u_0) is such that $\psi^t(r_0, u_0) = (r(t), u(t))$ is well-defined and belongs to $(0, R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ for all $t \geq 0$, then $\omega(u)$ is contained in the δ -neighborhood of $\text{Crit}(P)$. Thus for such (r_0, u_0) one finds $T > 0$ such that for all $t \geq T$ there holds

$$\text{dist}(u(t), \text{Crit}(P)) \leq \frac{3\delta}{2},$$

which further implies that

$$\psi^t(r_0, u_0) \in \bigcup_{u_* \in \text{Crit}(P)} B(u_*).$$

As a consequence, if $(r_0, u_0) \in (0, R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is such that $\psi^t(r_0, u_0)$ is well-defined and belongs to $(0, R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ for all $t \geq 0$, then for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\Psi^n(r_0, u_0) \in E_*$, and hence in particular $(r_0, u_0) \in Z$.

Suppose now that W is the image of Z under the polar coordinates diffeomorphism $\phi|_{(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}}$. Then $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ has measure zero. The image of $(0, R] \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ under ϕ is the punctured Euclidean ball $B_R(0) \setminus \{0\}$. It follows that if $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is such that $\varphi^t(w_0)$ is well-defined and belongs to $B_R(0)$ for all $t \geq 0$, then $w_0 \in W \cup \{0\}$. The latter set has measure zero because W does.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete.

APPENDIX A. CENTER-STABLE MANIFOLD THEOREM

In this appendix we give a prove of the variant of the center-stable manifold theorem that we need for our method. Consider a linear isomorphism $T : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and its spectrum $\sigma(T) \subset \mathbb{C}$. Choose a number $\mu > 1$ such that

$$\lambda \in \sigma(T) \implies |\lambda| \notin (1, \mu]. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then pick θ and ρ such that $1 < \theta < \rho < \mu$. By suitably modifying the real Jordan form of T , or alternatively by a direct application of [2, Chapter III, §6.4], we find a decomposition of \mathbb{R}^m into T -invariant linear subspaces

$$\mathbb{R}^m = E_1 \oplus E_2, \quad T(E_j) \subset E_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with the property that (with $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$ the closed unit disc)

$$\sigma(T|_{E_1}) = \sigma(T) \cap \mathbb{D} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(T|_{E_2}) = \sigma(T) \setminus \sigma(T|_{E_1}).$$

This and (A.1) imply that there exist norms on E_1 and E_2 , both denoted as $\|\cdot\|$ with no fear of ambiguity, such that

$$\|Tx\| < \theta\|x\| \quad \forall x \in E_1, \quad \|Ty\| > \mu\|y\| \quad \forall y \in E_2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We identify $\mathbb{R}^m = E_1 \oplus E_2 \simeq E_1 \times E_2$ and equip it with the so-called adapted norm

$$\|z = (x, y)\| = \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Remark A.1. For any pair (X, d) , (X', d') of metric spaces, the Lipschitz constant $\text{Lip}(h) \in [0, +\infty]$ of a map $h : X \rightarrow X'$ is defined by

$$\text{Lip}(h) := \sup \left\{ \frac{d'(h(x_1), h(x_2))}{d(x_1, x_2)} : x_1, x_2 \in X, x_1 \neq x_2 \right\}.$$

Note that h is Lipschitz continuous precisely when $\text{Lip}(h) < +\infty$.

In Lemma A.2 below E_1 , E_2 , and \mathbb{R}^m are considered as metric spaces with the distance induced by the norm (A.4).

Lemma A.2 (Theorem III.2 in [6]). *There exists $\eta > 0$ depending only on T with the following property: If $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfies $f(0) = 0$ and $\text{Lip}(f - T) < \eta$, then there exists $g : E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ with $\text{Lip}(g) \leq 1$, $g(0) = 0$, such that the set*

$$W_1 := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(S_1),$$

where $S_1 := \{z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|x\| \geq \|y\|\}$, satisfies

$$W_1 = \text{Graph}(g) = \{z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m : y = g(x)\}.$$

Alternatively, the set W_1 can be characterized as

$$W_1 = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sup_{n \geq 0} \rho^{-n} \|f^n(z)\| < +\infty \right\}.$$

The proof is postponed until the end of this appendix.

Remark A.3. It can be shown that if f is C^r then also g is C^r ; see [6, Chapter III]. It can also be shown that the intersection of the set W_1 with a small neighborhood of 0 depends only on the germ of f at the point 0. These facts are not necessary for the purposes of this paper.

We now prove some useful corollaries of Lemma A.2.

Lemma A.4. *Consider a C^1 map $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ defined on an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $0 \in U$, $f(0) = 0$, $f(U)$ is open, and $f : U \rightarrow f(U)$ is a diffeomorphism. If $Df(0)$ has an eigenvalue of absolute value strictly larger than 1, then there exists an open neighborhood $B \subset U$ of 0 such that set*

$$\{z \in U : f^n(z) \in B \text{ for all } n \geq 0\}$$

has Lebesgue measure zero.

Proof. Let $T := Df(0)$ and consider a decomposition $\mathbb{R}^m = E_1 \oplus E_2$ as in (A.2) into T -invariant subspaces, and an adapted norm $\|\cdot\|$ as in (A.4) that satisfies (A.3), where $1 < \theta < \mu$ and μ satisfies (A.1). Choose any $\rho \in (\theta, \mu)$. Fix a smooth function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that ϕ takes values on $[0, 1]$, ϕ is identically 1 on $B_1(0)$, and $\text{supp}(\phi)$ is a compact subset of $B_2(0)$. For each $n \geq 1$ the domain of the n -fold composition f^n of f is the open subset $U_n \subset U$ defined inductively as $U_1 := U$,

$$U_n := f^{-1}(U_{n-1}) = \{z \in U : f(z) \in U_{n-1}\}.$$

Write $f(z) =: Tz + h(z)$ where h satisfies

$$\|h(z)\| = o(\|z\|), \quad \|Dh(z)\| = o(1) \quad \text{as } \|z\| \rightarrow 0.$$

For all $s > 0$ small enough so that $B_{2s}(0) \subset U$ define $f_s : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by

$$\begin{aligned} f_s(z) &= Tz + \phi(s^{-1}z)h(z) & \text{if } z \in B_{2s}(0), \\ f_s(z) &= Tz & \text{if } z \notin B_{2s}(0). \end{aligned}$$

Then f_s is C^1 and a direct computation shows that for all $z \in B_{2s}(0)$

$$Df_s(z) = T + s^{-1} \langle \nabla \phi(s^{-1}z), \cdot \rangle h(z) + \phi(s^{-1}z)Dh(z).$$

In $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus B_{2s}(0)$ the map f_s coincides with T . In $B_{2s}(0)$ we have $\|z\| \leq 2s$ and

$$\|Df_s(z) - T\| = s^{-1} o(s) + o(1) = o(1) \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow 0.$$

It follows that for s small enough, f_s satisfies the assumptions of Lemma A.2. Fix such $s > 0$ and let W_1 be the set obtained by applying Lemma A.2 to f_s . Note that the Lebesgue measure of W_1 is zero because it is the graph of a Lipschitz function. Suppose now that $z \in U$ satisfies $f^n(z) \in B_s(0)$ for all $n \geq 0$. Then $f^n(z) = f_s^n(z)$ is bounded. But then Lemma A.2 implies that $z \in W_1$. \square

The version of the above lemma for smooth manifolds is an immediate consequence. Manifolds are here always assumed to be Hausdorff and second countable. Recall that a subset A of a smooth manifold is said to have measure zero if for every chart (U, φ) the set $\varphi(A \cap U)$ has Lebesgue measure zero. It follows that countable unions of sets of measure zero have measure zero, subsets of sets of measure zero have measure zero, and sets of measure zero have dense complement. To check that A has measure zero it suffices to check that for every $p \in A$ there exists a chart (U, φ) such that $p \in U$ and $\varphi(A \cap U)$ has Lebesgue measure zero. Moreover, if $\phi : U \rightarrow V$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism between open sets $U, V \subset M$ and $A \subset M$ has measure zero then $f^{-1}(A) = \{p \in U : f(p) \in A\}$ has measure zero.

Lemma A.5. *Let M be a smooth manifold, $p_0 \in M$, and $f : U \rightarrow M$ be a C^1 map defined on an open set $U \subset M$ with the property that $p_0 \in U$, $f(p_0) = p_0$, $f(U)$ is open, and $f : U \rightarrow f(U)$ is a diffeomorphism. If $Df(p_0)$ has an eigenvalue of absolute value strictly larger than 1, then there exists an open neighborhood B of p_0 such that the set $\{p \in U : f^n(p) \in B \text{ for all } n \geq 0\}$ has measure zero.*

For flows we have the following statement.

Lemma A.6. *Let X be a C^1 vector field defined on a smooth manifold M . Suppose that $p_0 \in M$ satisfies $X(p_0) = 0$. If $DX(p_0)$ has an eigenvalue λ satisfying $\text{Re}(\lambda) > 0$ then there exists an open neighborhood $B \subset M$ of p_0 with the following property: the set E of points $p \in M$ such that the solution $\gamma(t)$ of $\dot{\gamma} = X \circ \gamma$, $\gamma(0) = p$ is defined and satisfies $\gamma(t) \in B$ for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$, has measure zero.*

Proof. Standard ODE theory gives an open set $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$ and a C^1 map $\varphi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow M$ satisfying the following: For each $p \in M$ the maximal interval of definition J_p of the solution $\gamma(t)$ of the initial value problem $\dot{\gamma} = X \circ \gamma$, $\gamma(0) = p$ satisfies

$$J_p = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : (t, p) \in \mathcal{D}\},$$

and $\gamma(t) = \varphi(t, p)$ holds for all $t \in J_p$. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ define the open set

$$\mathcal{D}_t := \{p \in M : (t, p) \in \mathcal{D}\},$$

and denote by $\varphi^t : \mathcal{D}_t \rightarrow M$ the map $p \mapsto \varphi(t, p)$. Set $U = \mathcal{D}_1$, $f = \varphi^1 : U \rightarrow V$. Let λ be an eigenvalue of $DX(p_0)$ such that $\operatorname{Re} \lambda > 0$. Then e^λ is an eigenvalue of $Df(p_0)$ satisfying $|e^\lambda| > 1$. By Lemma A.5 there exists an open neighborhood B of p_0 such that the set E_0 consisting of points $p \in M$ such that $f^n(p)$ is defined and satisfies $f^n(p) \in B$ for all $n \geq 0$, has measure zero. Use B to define a set E as in the statement. Then $E \subset E_0$. The desired conclusion follows. \square

We close this appendix with a proof of Lemma A.2 adapted from [6].

Proof of Lemma A.2. The proof presented here is based on [6, Chapter III]. Note first that f is Lipschitz because so are $f - T$ and T . We claim that if $2\eta < \|T^{-1}\|^{-1}$, then f is a homeomorphism, f^{-1} is a Lipschitz map, and

$$\operatorname{Lip}(f^{-1}) < 2\|T^{-1}\|, \quad \operatorname{Lip}(f^{-1} - T^{-1}) < 2\|T^{-1}\|^2 \operatorname{Lip}(f - T). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(z_2) - f(z_1)\| &= \|T(z_2 - z_1) + (f - T)(z_2) - (f - T)(z_1)\| \\ &\geq \|T(z_2 - z_1)\| - \|(f - T)(z_2) - (f - T)(z_1)\| \\ &\geq (\|T^{-1}\|^{-1} - \eta)\|z_2 - z_1\| \\ &> (2\|T^{-1}\|)^{-1}\|z_2 - z_1\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

shows that f is injective. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and consider $\Phi := \operatorname{id} - T^{-1} \circ f + T^{-1}z_0$. Then $\operatorname{Lip}(\Phi) = \operatorname{Lip}(T^{-1} \circ (T - f)) \leq \|T^{-1}\|\eta < \frac{1}{2}$, and so Φ is a contraction. The unique fixed point z of Φ satisfies $z - T^{-1}f(z) + T^{-1}z_0 = z$, therefore $f(z) = z_0$. This shows that f is a bijection. Estimate (A.6) gives $\operatorname{Lip}(f^{-1}) < 2\|T^{-1}\|$ which is the first inequality in (A.5). From $T^{-1} - f^{-1} = T^{-1} \circ (f - T) \circ f^{-1}$ one gets the second inequality in (A.5) since Lipschitz constants get multiplied under composition.

Consider the set $S_2 := \{(x, y) \in E_1 \times E_2 : \|y\| \geq \|x\|\}$. From now on denote $\hat{\eta} = \operatorname{Lip}(f^{-1} - T^{-1})$. We write in components

$$f(x, y) = (f_1(x, y), f_2(x, y)), \quad f^{-1}(x, y) = (\alpha_1(x, y), \alpha_2(x, y)),$$

according to the identification $\mathbb{R}^m \simeq E_1 \times E_2$. The set of functions

$$X = \{g : E_1 \rightarrow E_2 : g(0) = 0, \operatorname{Lip}(g) \leq 1\}$$

can be equipped with the distance

$$d(g_1, g_2) := \sup_{x \in E_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|g_2(x) - g_1(x)\|}{\|x\|}.$$

It is simple to check that (X, d) is a complete metric space.

The remainder of the proof is split into several steps.

Step 0. For every $g \in X$ the function $\alpha_1 \circ \text{id} \times g : E_1 \longrightarrow E_1$ is a Lipschitz homeomorphism satisfying

$$\text{Lip}((\alpha_1 \circ \text{id} \times g)^{-1}) \leq (\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta})^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Denote $h := \alpha_1 \circ \text{id} \times g$. Then $\text{Lip}(h) \leq \text{Lip}(\alpha_1)\text{Lip}(\text{id} \times g) \leq \text{Lip}(f^{-1}) < +\infty$, thus h is Lipschitz. If $(x, y) \in S_1$ then

$$\|T^{-1}y\| < \mu^{-1}\|y\| \leq \mu^{-1}\|x\| < \theta^{-1}\|x\| < \|T^{-1}x\|.$$

It follows that for $(x, y) \in S_1$ we have

$$\|T^{-1}(x, y)\| = \max\{\|T^{-1}x\|, \|T^{-1}y\|\} = \|T^{-1}x\| > \theta^{-1}\|x\|.$$

Moreover, since $\text{Lip}(g) \leq 1$ we get for all $x_1, x_2 \in E_1$

$$(x_2, g(x_2)) - (x_1, g(x_1)) \in S_1, \quad \|(x_2, g(x_2)) - (x_1, g(x_1))\| = \|x_2 - x_1\|.$$

Using these facts we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|h(x_2) - h(x_1)\| &= \left\| \left(h(x_2) - h(x_1), g(h(x_2)) - g(h(x_1)) \right) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \left(h(x_2), g(h(x_2)) \right) - \left(h(x_1), g(h(x_1)) \right) \right\| \\ &= \|f^{-1}(x_2, g(x_2)) - f^{-1}(x_1, g(x_1))\| \\ &\geq \|T^{-1}(x_2, g(x_2)) - T^{-1}(x_1, g(x_1))\| \\ &\quad - \|(f^{-1} - T^{-1})(x_2, g(x_2)) - (f^{-1} - T^{-1})(x_1, g(x_1))\| \\ &> (\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta})\|x_2 - x_1\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

It follows that the map h is injective. To prove surjectivity of h let $x_0 \in E_1$ be fixed arbitrarily, and consider $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $\Phi := \text{id} - T \circ f^{-1} + (Tx_0, 0)$. From $\text{id} - T \circ f^{-1} = T \circ (T^{-1} - f^{-1})$ we obtain $\text{Lip}(\Phi) \leq \|T\|\hat{\eta}$. Let $\Lambda : E_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $\Lambda(x) = \Phi \circ \text{id} \times g$, written in components as $\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$. Then

$$\text{Lip}(\Lambda_1) \leq \text{Lip}(\Lambda) \leq \text{Lip}(\Phi)\text{Lip}(\text{id} \times g) \leq \|T\|\hat{\eta}.$$

If $\hat{\eta}$ is small enough so that $\|T\|\hat{\eta} < 1$, then Λ_1 is a contraction and has a unique fixed point x . From

$$x = \Lambda_1(x) = x - T\alpha_1(x, g(x)) + Tx_0$$

it follows that $h(x) = x_0$ as desired. This concludes that proof that h is a Lipschitz map and a homeomorphism. Estimate (A.7) follows from (A.8)

Step 1. We now show that there exists a unique $g \in X$ with the property that

$$f^{-1}(x, g(x)) = \left(h(x), g(h(x)) \right) \quad \text{for all } x \in E_1,$$

where $h : E_1 \longrightarrow E_1$ is the function defined by $h(x) := \alpha_1(x, g(x))$.

The proof is based the so-called graph transform: for any $g \in X$ define

$$\Gamma(g) : E_1 \longrightarrow E_2, \quad \Gamma(g) := (\alpha_2 \circ \text{id} \times g) \circ (\alpha_1 \circ \text{id} \times g)^{-1},$$

where $\text{id} \times g$ denotes the map $x \mapsto (x, g(x))$. By Step 0 the map $\alpha_1 \circ \text{id} \times g$ is a homeomorphism, hence $\Gamma(g)$ is well-defined. From the identity

$$\alpha_2(x, g(x)) = T^{-1}g(x) + (f^{-1} - T^{-1})_2(x, g(x))$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\alpha_2(x_2, g(x_2)) - \alpha_2(x_1, g(x_1))\| \\
& \leq \|T^{-1}(g(x_2) - g(x_1))\| + \hat{\eta} \|(x_2 - x_1, g(x_2) - g(x_1))\| \\
& < \mu^{-1} \|g(x_2) - g(x_1)\| + \hat{\eta} \max\{\|x_2 - x_1\|, \|g(x_2) - g(x_1)\|\} \\
& \leq (\mu^{-1} + \hat{\eta}) \|x_2 - x_1\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if η is small enough, then

$$\text{Lip}(\Gamma(g)) \leq \text{Lip}(\alpha_2 \circ \text{id} \times g) \text{Lip}((\alpha_1 \circ \text{id}) \times g)^{-1} \leq \frac{\mu^{-1} + \hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} < 1.$$

We have shown that Γ defines a map $\Gamma : X \rightarrow X$, and now we prove this map is a contraction in (X, d) provided η is small enough so that $\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta} < \theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}$. This is a consequence of the fact that for all $(x, y) \in S_1$

$$\frac{\|\alpha_2(x, y) - \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, y))\|}{\|\alpha_1(x, y)\|} \leq \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} \right) \frac{\|y - g(x)\|}{\|x\|}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

for all $g \in X$. Indeed, substitute $y = \hat{g}(x)$ in (A.9) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\Gamma(\hat{g}), \Gamma(g)) &= \sup_{x \in E_1} \frac{\|\Gamma(\hat{g})(x) - \Gamma(g)(x)\|}{\|x\|} \\
&= \sup_{x \in E_1} \frac{\left\| \Gamma(\hat{g})(\alpha_1(x, \hat{g}(x))) - \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, \hat{g}(x))) \right\|}{\|\alpha_1(x, \hat{g}(x))\|} \\
&= \sup_{x \in E_1} \frac{\left\| \alpha_2(x, \hat{g}(x)) - \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, \hat{g}(x))) \right\|}{\|\alpha_1(x, \hat{g}(x))\|} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} \right) \sup_{x \in E_1} \frac{\|\hat{g}(x) - g(x)\|}{\|x\|} = \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} \right) d(\hat{g}, g).
\end{aligned}$$

We now prove (A.9). Fix $(x, y) \in S_1$ arbitrarily. From

$$\begin{aligned}
& f^{-1}(x, y) - f^{-1}(x, g(x)) \\
&= (0, T^{-1}y - T^{-1}g(x)) + (f^{-1} - T^{-1})(x, y) - (f^{-1} - T^{-1})(x, g(x))
\end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\|\alpha_1(x, y) - \alpha_1(x, g(x))\| \leq \hat{\eta} \|y - g(x)\| \quad (\text{A.10})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\alpha_2(x, y) - \alpha_2(x, g(x))\| \\
& \leq \|T^{-1}(y - g(x))\| + \|(f^{-1} - T^{-1})(x, y) - (f^{-1} - T^{-1})(x, g(x))\| \\
& < (\mu^{-1} + \hat{\eta}) \|y - g(x)\|.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We also estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\alpha_1(x, y)\| &= \|T^{-1}x + \alpha_1(x, y) - T^{-1}x\| \\
&\geq \|T^{-1}x\| - \|\alpha_1(x, y) - T^{-1}x\| \\
&> \theta^{-1}\|x\| - \hat{\eta}\|(x, y)\| \\
&= (\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta})\|x\|.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Putting (A.10) and (A.11) together gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\alpha_2(x, y) - \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, y))\| \\
&= \|\alpha_2(x, y) - \alpha_2(x, g(x)) + \alpha_2(x, g(x)) - \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, y))\| \\
&= \|\alpha_2(x, y) - \alpha_2(x, g(x)) + \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, g(x))) - \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, y))\| \\
&\leq \|\alpha_2(x, y) - \alpha_2(x, g(x))\| + \text{Lip}(\Gamma(g))\|\alpha_1(x, g(x)) - \alpha_1(x, y)\| \\
&< (\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta})\|y - g(x)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining with (A.12), we obtain

$$\frac{\|\alpha_2(x, y) - \Gamma(g)(\alpha_1(x, y))\|}{\|\alpha_1(x, y)\|} \leq \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} \right) \frac{\|y - g(x)\|}{\|x\|},$$

which is (A.9). Before moving to the next step, note that (A.9) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\|y - \Gamma(g)(x)\|}{\|x\|} \leq \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} \right) \frac{\|f_2(x, y) - g(f_1(x, y))\|}{\|f_1(x, y)\|} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

with $(x, y) \in f^{-1}(S_1)$, where $g \in X$ is arbitrary.

Step 2. Let g be given by Step 1. Then $\text{Graph}(g) = W_1 := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(S_1)$. Indeed from $\text{Lip}(f - T) < \eta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_1(x, y)\| &= \|Tx + f_1(x, y) - Tx\| < \theta\|x\| + \eta\|(x, y)\|, \\
\|f_2(x, y)\| &= \|Ty + f_2(x, y) - Ty\| > \mu\|y\| - \eta\|(x, y)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $(x, y) \in S_2$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_1(x, y)\| &< (\theta + \eta)\|y\|, \\
\|f_2(x, y)\| &> (\mu - \eta)\|y\|.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

It follows that, if η is small enough so that $\theta + \eta < \rho < \mu - \eta$, then

$$f(S_2) \subset S_2. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Assume η is small enough so that

$$\frac{\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} < 1.$$

Let g be given by Step 1. It satisfies $\Gamma(g) = g$. Using (A.13) we will prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{if } z = (x, y) \in S_1 \setminus \text{Graph}(g), \\
& \text{then there exists } n_0 \geq 0 \text{ with } f^{n_0}(z) \in S_2.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Arguing by contradiction, assume that $(x, y) \in S_1 \setminus \text{Graph}(g)$ satisfies

$$f^n(x, y) = (f_1^n(x, y), f_2^n(x, y)) \in S_1 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By (A.13), there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\mu^{-1} + 2\hat{\eta}}{\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}} \right)^{-n} \frac{\|y - g(x)\|}{\|x\|} &< \frac{\|f_2^n(x, y) - g(f_1^n(x, y))\|}{\|f_1^n(x, y)\|} \\
&\leq \frac{\|f_2^n(x, y)\|}{\|f_1^n(x, y)\|} + \frac{\|g(f_1^n(x, y))\|}{\|f_1^n(x, y)\|} \leq \frac{\|f_2^n(x, y)\|}{\|f_1^n(x, y)\|} + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\|f_2^n(x, y)\| > \|f_1^n(x, y)\|$ if n is large enough. This contradiction proves (A.16). Together (A.15) and (A.16) imply that $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(S_1) \subset \text{Graph}(g)$.

The converse inclusion follows from the f -invariance of $\text{Graph}(g) \subset S_1$, which is a consequence of the fact that for all $x \in E_1$ we have

$$f^{-1}(x, g(x)) = (h(x), g(h(x))), \quad f(x, g(x)) = (h^{-1}(x), g(h^{-1}(x))),$$

where $h = \alpha_1 \circ \text{id} \times g$.

Step 3. Finally, we prove that $z \in W_1$ if and only if $\sup_{n \geq 0} \rho^{-n} \|f^n(z)\| < +\infty$. Indeed by (A.7) and $h(0) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{-n} \|f^n(x, g(x))\| &= \rho^{-n} \|(h^{-n}(x), g(h^{-n}(x)))\| \\ &= \rho^{-n} \|h^{-n}(x)\| \\ &\leq (\rho(\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta}))^{-n} \|x\| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty \end{aligned}$$

for arbitrary $x \in E_1$, provided η is small enough so that $\theta^{-1} - \hat{\eta} > \rho^{-1}$.

We now show that

$$(x, y) \notin \text{Graph}(g) \implies \rho^{-n} \|f^n(x, y)\| \longrightarrow +\infty. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

From $f(S_2) \subset S_2$ and (A.14), we have that if $(x, y) \in S_2$, then

$$\|f^k(x, y)\| \geq (\mu - \eta)^k \|(x, y)\| \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

By Step 2, if $(x, y) \notin \text{Graph}(g)$, then there exists n_0 such that $f^{n_0}(x, y) \in S_2$, hence $f^{n_0+k}(x, y) \in S_2$ for all $k \geq 0$ and therefore

$$\rho^{-k} \|f^{n_0+k}(x, y)\| \geq (\rho^{-1}(\mu - \eta))^k \|f^{n_0}(x, y)\| \longrightarrow +\infty$$

as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, and so (A.17) follows. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project number 442047500 through the Collaborative Research Center “Sparsity and Singular Structures” (CRC 1481).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Gromoll and W. Meyer. “On differentiable functions with isolated critical points”. In: *Topology* 8 (1969), pp. 361–369. DOI: 10.1016/0040-9383(69)90022-6.
- [2] Tosio Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [3] Jason D Lee et al. “First-order methods almost always avoid strict saddle points”. In: *Mathematical programming* 176 (2019), pp. 311–337. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-019-01374-3.
- [4] Jason D. Lee et al. “Gradient Descent Only Converges to Minimizers”. In: *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*. Vol. 49. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. Columbia University, New York: PMLR, 2016, pp. 1246–1257. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v49/lee16.html>.
- [5] Ioannis Panageas and Georgios Piliouras. *Gradient Descent Only Converges to Minimizers: Non-Isolated Critical Points and Invariant Regions*. 2016. arXiv: 1605.00405 [math.DS].
- [6] Michael Shub. *Global stability of dynamical systems*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4757-1947-5.

EL MEHDI ACHOUR, UNIVERSITY MOHAMMED VI POLYTECHNIC, COLLEGE OF COMPUTING,
ROCADE RABAT, TECHNOLIS, 11103 RABAT, MOROCCO

Email address: `elmehdi.achour@um6p.ma`

UMBERTO L. HRYNIEWICZ, GEOMETRY AND ANALYSIS, RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, PONTDRI-
ESCH 10-12, 52062 AACHEN, GERMANY

Email address: `hryniewicz@mathga.rwth-aachen.de`

MICHAEL WESTDICKENBERG, INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, IM
SÜSTERFELD 2, 52072 AACHEN, GERMANY

Email address: `mwest@instmath.rwth-aachen.de`