

PARTIALLY HYPERBOLIC DYNAMICS IN THE 3-BODY PROBLEM

MARCEL GUARDIA AND JAIME PARADELA

ABSTRACT. We construct *symplectic blenders* for two classical Hamiltonian systems: the 3-body problem and its restricted version. We use these objects to show that both models exhibit a robust, strong form of topological instability. We do not assume any smallness conditions on the masses but require only that at least two of them are distinct.

Our construction is based on two abstract results which might be of independent interest. The first one gives an explicit condition under which a given pair of twist maps of the cylinder generates a locally transitive iterated function system. The second one extends this result to certain cylinder skew-products.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Chaotic dynamics in nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems	13
3. Symbolic blenders for IFS of the cylinder	14
4. Symplectic blenders for 4-dimensional symplectic maps	15
5. Local transitivity for cylinder IFS: proof of Theorem A	18
6. Almost transitivity of cylinder skew-products: proof of Theorem B	27
7. The 3-body problem: a (local) partially hyperbolic setting	31
8. A symplectic blender for the 3-body problem: proof of Theorem C	43
9. Existence of orbits accumulating \mathcal{E}_∞ : proof of Theorem D	53
10. A normally hyperbolic lamination in the restricted problem: proof of Theorem E	54
Appendix A. Technical lemmas from Section 5	60
Appendix B. Symplectic reduction for the three-body problem	66
Appendix C. Some technical results from [GMPS22]	68
Appendix D. The scattering maps of the restricted problem	68
References	71

1. INTRODUCTION

In plain words, a stable (unstable) blender is a robustly thick part of a hyperbolic set such that its stable (unstable) manifold meets every unstable manifold that comes near it and, moreover, it does so in a C^1 persistent fashion. Introduced by Bonatti and Díaz in [BD96] as a robust source of semi-local transitivity in partially hyperbolic settings, blenders have found numerous applications within smooth dynamics. Among others, these include the construction of C^1 robust, not uniformly hyperbolic, transitive diffeomorphisms [BD96], C^1 -robust homoclinic tangencies [BD12], a C^1 -dense set of stably ergodic partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms [ACW21], persistence of heterodimensional cycles [BD96, DP23, LT24] and persistence of saddle-center homoclinic loops [LT].

A symplectic version of blenders was developed by Nassiri and Pujals in [NP12] to produce arcs of smooth Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms which exhibit topologically transitive normally hyperbolic laminations (of codimension-two) in a robust fashion. These arcs are obtained by C^∞ perturbation techniques from *a priori* chaotic Hamiltonians, whose distinguishing property is that they admit a return map which behaves as a partially hyperbolic skew-product.

However, in all of the works cited above (except for [LT24, LT]), blenders are created via perturbation techniques only available in the C^k setting ($k = 1, \dots, \infty$). In particular, it is difficult to deduce, using these techniques, the existence of blenders (or their symplectic counterpart) for a given parametric family

of diffeomorphisms (or flows). Results identifying blenders in concrete models are rather scarce and, as far as the authors, up to this paper blenders had not been proven to exist in physical models. To the best of our knowledge, the only known examples include: a) parametric families exhibiting a particular kind of heterodimensional cycle at which the renormalized dynamics is governed by the center-unstable Hénon family (see [DKS14, DP19], or, for a computer-assisted proof see [CKOZ25]); b) parametric families of 4-dimensional symplectic diffeomorphisms exhibiting a saddle-center homoclinic loop [LT].

The motivation behind the present work is two sided. First, develop tools to identify blenders in parametric families of Hamiltonian systems, that is provide conditions that can be checked in given systems. Second, investigate how these objects influence the global dynamics of the system. We illustrate our approach by applying these tools to two concrete families : the classical 3-body problem and its restricted version, answering an open problem stated in [NP12], where the authors mention that “a major challenge would be to apply the present approach to the context of the restricted 3-body problem”. Even if the presented results deal with two Celestial Mechanics models, we believe that our techniques, based on abstract results for Iterated Function Systems and skew-products of the annulus, will have applications to a general class of nearly-integrable Hamiltonians (i.e. small perturbations of Arnold-Liouville integrable Hamiltonians (see [AKN06])). The rest of this section is organized as follows.

Abstract weak transversality-torsion mechanism: Section 1.1 contains two abstract results which might be of independent interest: Theorem A and Theorem B.

Theorem A introduces an explicit condition for a pair of twist maps of the annulus to generate a locally transitive Iterated Function System, and, in particular, exhibit a symbolic blender (see Section 3). Theorem A is the key ingredient needed to control some center directions for the flow of the 3-body problem and will find a direct application in the proof of Theorem D.

Theorem B can be seen as an extension of Theorem A to a more general setting: a non-locally-constant skew product over the full shift with fiber maps given by twist maps of the annulus. Theorem B is key to study the dynamics along weakly invariant normally hyperbolic laminations and will find a direct application in the proof of Theorem E.

We also outline in Section 1.1 the main mechanism behind these results: a variant of the transversality-torsion mechanism introduced by Cresson in [Cre03] in which the transversality is made arbitrarily small.

The 3-body problem: In Section 1.2 we introduce the 3-body problem and describe its phase space. In particular, we introduce a compactification (McGehee’s compactification [McG73]), which allows us to study (a particular kind of) unbounded motions in connection with homoclinic bifurcations. We will briefly recall known results on the existence of hyperbolic sets in the planar 3-body problem and their relation to a particularly exotic class of unbounded orbits: the so-called oscillatory motions.

Then, we outline how one can obtain a locally partially hyperbolic setting within this framework, and introduce our third main result: Theorem C, in which we show the existence of a symplectic blender for the (symplectically reduced) planar 3-body problem.

Finally, we study the implications of the existence of symplectic blenders on the dynamics of the 3-body problem. Our fourth main result: Theorem D, exploits the existence of a symplectic blender to construct an orbit of the 3-body problem whose projection to a suitable (center) subspace (of codimension two in the reduced five-dimensional phase space) is locally dense. We also present a geometric version of Theorem D, stating the existence of an orbit which accumulates (both forward and backwards) to an open set inside a three-dimensional normally-parabolic invariant manifold (of codimension two in the reduced phase space) with trivial dynamics (i.e. this invariant manifold is foliated by periodic orbits). Notice that accumulating this (degenerate) manifold requires bridging across two extra dimensions.

We believe that blenders will prove extremely useful to study other relevant aspects of the dynamics of the 3-body problem (see Section 2).

The restricted three-body problem: In Section 1.3 we consider the *restricted* 3-body problem, which can be seen as a limit of the 3-body problem along which the mass of one body becomes negligible. The very same ideas used for the 3-body problem can be adapted to this case in order to construct a symplectic blender.

Moreover, in this case we can use the blender to obtain a rather strong form of Arnold diffusion. Provided the eccentricity $\zeta \in [0, 1)$ of the massive bodies is small enough, one can construct a weakly

invariant, normally hyperbolic lamination \mathcal{A}_ζ whose three-dimensional leaves have codimension two inside the 5-dimensional phase space. In our last main result, Theorem E, we show the existence of an orbit inside this lamination which is almost dense¹ in \mathcal{A}_ζ . Moreover, as $\zeta \rightarrow 0$, the size of the leaves \mathcal{A}_ζ becomes unbounded.

1.1. Iterated function systems and skew-products. Our first set of results deal with the topological properties of certain iterated function systems and skew-products.

Iterated function systems. Let $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1]$ and consider a pair of real-analytic, exact symplectic maps $T_0 : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $T_1 : B \subset \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$. Given two constants $\rho, \sigma > 0$ we denote by

$$\mathbb{A}_{\rho, \sigma} = \{(\varphi, J) \in (\mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Im} \varphi| < \sigma, |\operatorname{Re} J| < 1, |\operatorname{Im} J| < \rho\}. \quad (1.1)$$

We denote by $|\cdot|_{\rho, \sigma}$ the sup-norm on $\mathbb{A}_{\rho, \sigma}$ and, for any open set $B \subset \mathbb{A}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $|\cdot|_{C^r(B)}$ the C^r norm on B . We say that the pair of maps T_0, T_1 satisfy the assumption:

(B0) For any $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}_{\rho, \sigma}$, T_0 is of the form

$$T_0 : \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \varphi + \beta + \tau J + R_\varphi(\varphi, J) \\ J + R_J(\varphi, J) \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.2)$$

with $\tau > 0$,

$$\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R} : |\beta - p/q| \geq \alpha |q|^{-2} : p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\} \quad (1.3)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$, and R_φ, R_J satisfying $\partial_J^n R_*(\varphi, 0) = 0$ for $n = 0, 1$ if $*$ = φ and $n = 0, 1, 2$ if $*$ = J .

(B1) Fix an open neighborhood B of $\{\varphi = J = 0\}$. Then, for $(\varphi, J) \in B$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, T_1 is of the form

$$T_1 : \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \varphi + \tilde{\beta}(J) + \varepsilon T_{1, \varphi}(\varphi, J) \\ J + \varepsilon T_{1, J}(\varphi, J) \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.4)$$

with

$$T_{1, J}(0, 0) = 0 \quad \partial_\varphi T_{1, J}(0, 0) = 1. \quad (1.5)$$

We denote by

$$K = \max\{|R_\varphi|_{\rho, \sigma}, |R_J|_{\rho, \sigma}, |\tilde{\beta}'|_{C^0(B)}, |T_{1, \varphi}|_{C^2(B)}, |T_{1, J}|_{C^2(B)}\}. \quad (1.6)$$

Theorem A. *Let T_0, T_1 verify (B0) and (B1) for some $\alpha, \rho, \sigma > 0$ and let $K > 0$ be as in (1.6). There exists $\varepsilon_0(K, \rho, \sigma) > 0$ such that for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0 \min\{\tau, \alpha\}$ the IFS generated by $\{T_0, T_1\}$ satisfies the following. For any pair of open balls*

$$B_1, B_2 \subset \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha := \mathbb{T} \times [-\alpha/|\log^3 \varepsilon|, \alpha/|\log^3 \varepsilon|] \quad (1.7)$$

there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^M$ such that, $T_{\omega_{M-1}} \circ \dots \circ T_{\omega_0}(B_1) \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$. In particular, there exists an orbit of the IFS generated by $\{T_0, T_1\}$ for which both its forward and backward closure contains the annulus $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$. Moreover, the very same conclusion holds true for any pair $(\tilde{T}_0, \tilde{T}_1)$ in a open C^1 -neighborhood of (T_0, T_1) .

An important observation is that we allow both the Diophantine constant α and the torsion τ to be arbitrarily small as long as ε (which measures the transversality between the maps) is much smaller. This will be crucial for applications to degenerate systems and, in particular, for the application to the 3-body problem. Note that Theorem A applies to constant type Diophantine numbers (see (1.3)). It can be generalized to all Diophantine numbers but the version above is enough for our purposes.

Another important remark is that we are able to control the dynamics on the annulus $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ whose size is only logarithmically small in ε , and not only on a $O(\varepsilon)$ -neighbourhood of the KAM curve $\{J = 0\}$ of the map T_0 .

Remark 1. We will also see from the proof of Theorem A that if the maps T_0, T_1 are only C^3 , then, there exists $\varepsilon_0(\tilde{K})$ where $\tilde{K} = \max\{|R_\varphi|_{C^2(\mathbb{A})}, |R_J|_{C^3(\mathbb{A})}, |\tilde{\beta}'|_{C^0(B)}, |T_{1, \varphi}|_{C^2(B)}, |T_{1, J}|_{C^2(B)}\}$ and $\kappa > 0$ (independent of ε and α) such that the same conclusion in Theorem A holds on the smaller annulus $\mathbb{T} \times [-\kappa\varepsilon, \kappa\varepsilon]$.

¹We will give a precise meaning to what we mean by “an orbit which is almost dense in the lamination” in Theorem E.

Applications. In the context of 4-dimensional symplectic maps the maps T_0 and T_1 above can be thought of as:

- T_0 : the inner map on a 2-dimensional normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder; T_1 : the scattering map to the same cylinder (see [DdLS06]) or,
- T_0, T_1 : two different scattering maps to the same normally hyperbolic invariant cylinder.

Indeed, we strongly believe that, for small perturbations of both *a priori stable* and *a priori unstable* Hamiltonians, it is in general possible to recover the scenario described in the first item with maps T_0, T_1 satisfying the assumptions in Theorem A.

For the 3-body problem (and its restricted version), we will study a strongly degenerate scenario in which the inner dynamics is given by the identity map. However, we will see that there exist two different scattering maps which, locally, satisfy the assumptions in Theorem A.

Skew-products over the shift. We now consider a particular class of skew-products and give an extension of Theorem A. To do so, we introduce the following notation. Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\omega = (\dots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0; \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

let

$$C_N(\omega) = \{\omega' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} : \omega'_k = \omega_k, \text{ for all } -N+1 \leq k \leq N\}. \quad (1.8)$$

We say that a set $U \subset \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}$, where $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1]$, is a N -cylinder if $U = C_N(\omega) \times B$ with $C_N(\omega)$ as in (1.8) and B an open set.

Definition 1.1. Fix any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that a countable covering $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}$ is a *countable covering by N -cylinders* if all the elements \mathcal{U}_k are N -cylinders.

The following is our second main result.

Theorem B. Let T_0, T_1 verify (B0) and (B1) for some $\rho, \sigma > 0$ and let $K > 0$ be as in (1.6). Let $\delta > 0$ be arbitrarily small and consider a skew-product map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A} &\rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times (\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}) \\ (\omega, z) &\mapsto (\sigma(\omega), F(\omega, z)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the full-shift and, for any $(\omega, z) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}$ the map $z \mapsto F(\omega, z)$ satisfies:

- (*C^1 approximation*): $F(\omega, z) = T_{\omega_0}(z) + O_{C^1}(\delta)$.
- (*Weak coupling*): For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if ω, ω' satisfy that $\omega' \in C_n(\omega)$, uniformly for all $z \in \mathbb{A}$

$$|F(\omega, z) - F(\omega', z)| \leq \delta^n. \quad (1.9)$$

Fix any $N > 0$. Under the above hypotheses, there exist $\varepsilon_0(K, \rho, \sigma, N) > 0$ and $\delta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any

$$0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0(K, \rho, \sigma, N) \min\{\tau, \alpha\} \quad 0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0(\varepsilon),$$

given any pair of sequences $\omega, \omega' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and any pair of open balls $B, B' \subset \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ (see (1.7)) there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}^M(C_N(\omega), B) \cap (C_N(\omega'), B') \neq \emptyset.$$

In particular, given any countable covering $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ by N -cylinders, there exists an orbit of \mathcal{F} which visits all the \mathcal{U}_k .

Before proceeding, this result calls for a few comments. First, we notice that the lamination $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}$ is only weakly invariant for the map \mathcal{F} (there might exist (ω, z) such that $F(\omega, z) \notin \mathbb{A}$). In this situation, one actually expects that “most of the orbits” escape from $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}$. What we prove in Theorem B is that, still, given any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, provided ε is small enough, there exists an orbit which visits any element from any countable covering of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ by N -cylinders. Second, it is also worth pointing out that, for T_0, T_1 with finite regularity we also get a similar conclusion but on a smaller annulus (see Remark 1). This will be clear from the proof.




FIGURE 1.1. Let $F_n = T_0^n \circ T_1$. In the left we show the image of a small rectangle D under the map F_n for $n \gg 1/\varepsilon$. In the right we show the image of D under F_{n_i} , $i = 1, 2, 3$ for $n_i \sim 1/\varepsilon$. In this regime the expansion/contraction is arbitrarily close to one. Moreover, if β is sufficiently irrational it is possible to chose n_i such that the union $\bigcup_i F_{n_i}(D)$ contains D .

Applications. The map \mathcal{F} in Theorem B can be thought of as the restriction of a 4-dimensional map to a weakly invariant normally hyperbolic lamination which accumulates on two different homoclinic channels. Weakly invariant laminations appear naturally, close to resonances, in perturbations of non-degenerate integrable Hamiltonians. A particularly interesting feature in Theorem B is that the map \mathcal{F} is not locally constant. This is important for applications to laminations arising from real-analytic Hamiltonians. In particular, Theorem B is the main ingredient in the proof of Theorem E below.

The weak transversality-torsion mechanism. Originally, the transversality-torsion mechanism was introduced to create isolating blocks for (compositions of) maps as T_0, T_1 above. Roughly speaking the idea can be understood as follows. Let

$$L_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \tau \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad L_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The former is a parabolic (shear) matrix while the second one is a rotation. In particular, none of them are hyperbolic. However, an straightforward computation shows that

$$L_0^n L_1 = \begin{pmatrix} n\tau & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

so $L_0^n L_1$ is hyperbolic for $n\tau > 2$. In the setting of maps of the annulus T_0, T_1 described above, one can think of L_0 as the matrix $DT_0|_{\{\varphi=0\}}$. On the other hand, if one assumes that $\partial_\varphi T_1|_{\{\varphi=J=0\}} \neq 0$ the map T_1 acts, close to $\{\varphi = J = 0\}$, as a rotation. Indeed, after a affine change of variables (which becomes singular as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) one may conjugate $DT_1|_{\{\varphi=J=0\}}$ to the matrix L_1 . Thus, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ an isolating block D is obtained for the map $T_0^n \circ T_1$ provided n is taken large enough with respect to $1/\varepsilon$ (see Figure 1.1). This argument was used by Cresson in the context of Arnold diffusion [Cre03] (see also [GdlL06]) and later appeared in [GMPS22] in order to construct non-trivial hyperbolic sets in the 3-body problem (see Section 1.2).

1.1.1. Weak transversality. For fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, the rate of expansion/contraction for the map $T_0^n \circ T_1$ becomes infinite. In particular, the intersection of the isolating block D with itself corresponds to a very thin rectangle within D .

The key idea behind the proof of Theorem A is to look at a range $n \in \mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ of iterates for which the rate of expansion/contraction for the maps $T_0^n \circ T_1$ is uniformly (for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$) close to one. In this setting, the overlapping between the isolating block and its image is large. Moreover, as the dynamics of T_0 is driven by a strongly irrational rotation, we will be able to show that there exists a subset $\mathcal{N}_* \subset \mathcal{N}$ for which the image of the isolating block under the corresponding maps come very close to the isolating block itself. In particular, we will see that the union of the images of the isolating block under the different maps in \mathcal{N}_* covers the isolating block (see Figure 1.1).

The idea of working in a framework with weak transversality was first considered by Li and Turaev in [LT], in which the authors analyze the dynamics in a neighborhood of a cubic tangency between the invariant curve of the map T_0 and its image by the map T_1 .

1.2. The 3-body problem. We now abandon the abstract setting and introduce a dynamical system which has played a mayor role in the evolution of the modern theory of dynamics, the so-called 3-body problem. For $i = 0, 1, 2$, let $(q_i, p_i) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be Cartesian coordinates and let $m_i > 0$. The planar *3-body problem* is the Hamiltonian system defined by

$$H(q, p) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2} \frac{|p_i|^2}{2m_i} - \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq 2} \frac{m_i m_j}{|q_i - q_j|} \quad (1.10)$$

on the symplectic manifold $(q, p) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^6 \setminus \Delta)$ equipped with the canonical symplectic form $dp \wedge dq$. Here $|\cdot| : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Euclidean norm and we have defined the collision locus $\Delta = \{q = (q_0, q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}^6 : q_i = q_j \text{ for some } i \neq j\}$. The flow of (1.10) preserves:

- (time translation symmetry): the total energy $H(q, p)$,
- (space translation symmetry): the total linear momentum $\mathbf{p}(p) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2} p_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and,
- (rotational symmetry): the total angular momentum $\Theta(q, p) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2} \Theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ where $\Theta_i = q_{i,x} p_{i,y} - p_{i,x} q_{i,y}$.

Hence, for any $H_0, \Theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the Hamiltonian (1.10) induces a complete flow²

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_H : \mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta_0) \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta_0) \\ z &\mapsto \phi_H^t(z) \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

on the 5-dimensional submanifold

$$\mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta_0) = \{(q, p) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^6 \setminus \Delta) : H(q, p) = H_0, \mathbf{p}(p) = 0, \Theta(q, p) = \Theta_0\} / SE(2). \quad (1.12)$$

Here $SE(2)$ is the special Euclidean group on the plane, which acts on $(q, p) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^6 \setminus \Delta)$ by

$$(v, g) \mapsto (v + gq_0, v + gq_1, v + gq_2, gp_0, gp_1, gp_2)$$

for $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and g a rotation on \mathbb{R}^2 .

Homoclinic bifurcations and oscillatory motions. For centuries, researchers have put considerable effort in understanding the global dynamics of the 3-body problem. A remarkable result in this direction was obtained by Chazy [Cha22], who classified, from a qualitative point of view, all the possible asymptotic behaviors of its complete (i.e. defined for all time) orbits. Among the seven possible behaviors, perhaps the most exotic³ case corresponds to the so-called *oscillatory orbits*. These are orbits along which at least one of the mutual distances is unbounded while all the bodies come together infinitely many times. We refer to *forward* (resp. *backward*) oscillatory orbits if this qualitative behavior happens as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (resp. $t \rightarrow -\infty$) and we reserve the term oscillatory orbit for those which exhibit this qualitative behavior for both $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$.

The first existence result for this type of oscillatory orbits was obtained by Sitnikov in a simplified (restricted) model [Sit60]. Years later, Alekseev [Ale68a, Ale68b] and Moser [Mos73] put the study of oscillatory orbits on a more geometric framework. Using McGehee's compactification of phase space [McG73], they noticed that, again for the simplified model studied by Sitnikov⁴, oscillatory motions are indeed a subset of the *homoclinic class* asociated to a topological saddle at "infinity". More precisely, Sitnikov's model, which describes the motion of a massless particle in a certain gravitational field, corresponds to a time-periodic perturbation of a one degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian (i.e. a three-dimensional flow). McGehee's compactification glues a manifold of periodic orbits at infinity (the massless particle is infinitely far from the sources of the gravitational field). Although degenerate from the dynamical point of view, one

²To be precise, the flow is only complete for initial conditions which do not lead to collision. This is a full measure subset of $\mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta_0)$ as a consequence of the fact that binary collisions are regularizable and triple collision cannot happen for $\Theta \neq 0$ (see also [Saa71, FK19]). Moreover, our analysis will take place on regions very far from the collision locus.

³Indeed, all the other 6 cases can already be found in the limit $m_1, m_2 \rightarrow 0$ for which the system decouples as the (uncoupled) sum of two 2-body problems. On the contrary oscillatory motions are an inherent feature of the 3-body problem.

⁴Alekseev actually studied Sitnikov's configuration but in the non-restricted case, i.e. with all masses positive. Still the symmetry of the configuration allows one to reduce the system to a three-dimensional flow.

of these orbits possesses stable and unstable invariant manifolds: these correspond to the set of initial conditions for which the particle escapes to infinity with zero asymptotic velocity. By showing that these manifolds intersect transversally, they were able to embed the full-shift acting on the space of bi-infinite sequences as a factor for this system. From the construction of the coding, oscillatory orbits could be identified with sequences $\{a_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ for which $\limsup a_n \rightarrow \infty$ both as $n \rightarrow \pm\infty$.

Extending these results to the full 3-body problem is a non-trivial task due to the increase in dimension (unless one considers symmetric configurations, which lower the dimension of the model, as Alekseev did [Ale68a, Ale68b]): as we have seen above, the symplectically reduced flow (1.11) takes place on a five-dimensional manifold. The first results on existence of oscillatory motions for the planar 3-body problem (1.10) were obtained by Moeckel in [Moe07] (a partial proof for one-sided orbits, using a different idea, was given before by Xia in [Xia94]). These results applied only to non-generic choices of the masses $\{m_i\}_{i=0,1,2} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$. Recently, the existence of oscillatory motions on the 3-body problem for any value of the masses (except all of them equal) has been established in [GMPS22].

The approach taken in [GMPS22] can be seen as a generalization to higher dimensions of the ideas of Alekseev and Moser. To describe the main ideas we need to first introduce McGehee's partial compactification in the context of the 3-body problem.

McGehee's partial compactification for the 3-body problem. To reduce the translation invariance we introduce the (symplectic) change of coordinates⁵

$$\Psi : (r, y) \in \mathbb{R}^8 \mapsto (q, p) \in (T^*(\mathbb{R}^6) \cap \{p = 0\})/\mathbb{R}^2$$

given by $r_1 = q_1 - q_0$, $r_2 = q_2 - q_0$ and $y_i = p_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then, we can define McGehee's map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : B &\mapsto T^*(\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \Delta) \\ (x, y) &\mapsto (r, y) \end{aligned}$$

given by $r_1 = x_1$, $r_2 = \frac{2}{|x_2|^3}x_2$, and consider the boundary submanifold

$$B_\infty = \{(x, y) \in B : |x_2| = 0\} \subset \partial B$$

corresponding to configurations for which the mutual distance between the third and inner bodies (i.e. r_2) becomes infinite. On the partially compactified configuration space

$$\mathcal{B} = B \sqcup B_\infty.$$

the Hamiltonian flow defined by $\mathcal{H} = H \circ \Psi \circ \Phi$ and the (singular) non-degenerate symplectic form $\omega = \Phi^*(dy \wedge dr)$:

- extends continuously up to B_∞ (on which it defines a non-trivial flow!),
- leaves B_∞ invariant.

Finally, in order to reduce the invariance by rotations, we observe that on \mathcal{B} one may define the action of $SO(2)$ by $g \mapsto (gx_1, gx_2, gy_1, gy_2)$ with $g \in SO(2)$ (notice that the action extends continuously up to B_∞ and $g(B_\infty) = B_\infty$). Thus, we can fix any $H_0 < 0$ and any $|\Theta_0| > 0$ and define the reduced McGehee flow

$$\bar{\phi}_{\mathcal{H}} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0) \quad (1.13)$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0)$ is the five dimensional manifold

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0) = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{H}(x, y) = H_0, \Theta \circ \Psi \circ \Phi(x, y) = \Theta_0\}/SO(2). \quad (1.14)$$

A normally-parabolic manifold for McGehee's flow: For the flow (1.13), which extends (1.11) continuously (and in a non-trivial way) it is a classical result [Rob84] (see also [BFM20a, BFM20b]) that the 3-dimensional submanifold

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0) = \{(x, y) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0) : |x_2| = 0, \langle y_2, x_2/|x_2| \rangle = 0\} \quad (1.15)$$

possesses four-dimensional stable and unstable invariant manifolds (for the flow (1.13)): these correspond to orbits along which q_2 escapes to infinity with zero asymptotic velocity in the future (stable) or in the past

⁵The action of \mathbb{R}^2 here is understood as a diagonal translation in $q = (q_0, q_1, q_2)$.

(unstable). The submanifold \mathcal{E}_∞ is diffeomorphic⁶ to \mathbb{S}^3 (see [Rob84]) and corresponds to configurations of the bodies for which

- the two inner bodies q_0, q_1 revolve around each other on a Keplerian ellipse of fixed semimajor axis (determined entirely by H_0) and which can be parametrized by its eccentricity $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$ and angle of the pericenter $g \in \mathbb{T}$.
- q_2 is located infinitely far from the two inner bodies.

The submanifold \mathcal{E}_∞ is *degenerate* in two senses:

- it is foliated by periodic orbits of (1.13) (the two inner bodies revolve around each other following the Kepler laws),
- all the eigenvalues of the linearization of (1.13) at \mathcal{E}_∞ are zero except along the flow direction.

Embedding the full shift in the 3-body problem. A natural strategy to embed the full shift on the flow (1.11) is to show that the four-dimensional manifolds $W^{u,s}(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ intersect transversally and study the return map $\Psi : U \rightarrow U$ to a suitable four-dimensional section U accumulating on $W^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \cap W^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$. However, in order to follow this route, the authors in [GMPS22] faced a significant challenge. Namely, as a consequence of the degeneracy of the flow on \mathcal{E}_∞ , the dynamics of the return map Ψ in the center directions (those tangent to the manifold \mathcal{E}_∞) is given by a close to identity (symplectic) map. Hence, spotting any sign of hyperbolicity along these directions is a rather complicated task. To overcome this issue and gain hyperbolicity along the center directions, the authors considered a suitable composition of return maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j} : U_i \rightarrow U_j$ between different sections $U_i \subset U$, $i, j = 0, 1$ accumulating on different homoclinic channels and which reproduce the so-called *transversality-torsion* mechanism described in Section 1.1.

In this way, the authors in [GMPS22] constructed a non-compact *uniformly hyperbolic* set (for the return map Ψ) accumulating on \mathcal{E}_∞ and on which the dynamics is conjugated to the full shift acting on the space of bi-infinite sequences of countable symbols. From this conjugacy, oscillatory orbits of the 3-body problem can be extracted from the symbolic coding as explained above.

A partially hyperbolic setting and symplectic blenders. In the present work we will push the ideas above further and show that a *symplectic blender* (see Definition 4.3 below) exists close to a homoclinic manifold associated to \mathcal{E}_∞ . Roughly speaking, the blender construction relies on the *weak transversality-torsion* mechanism described in Section 1.1. First, we observe that for a judiciously chosen range of compositions of maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j} : U_i \rightarrow U_j$ as above, one can reproduce the weak transversality-torsion mechanism described in Section 1.1. In particular, one can obtain a family of partially hyperbolic maps $\{\Psi^{(N)}\}$ with arbitrarily weak hyperbolicity in the center directions. Second, by centering the sections U_i on a region where the center dynamics is driven by a strongly irrational rotation, one can guarantee that the images of these sections by the family of maps $\{\Psi^{(N)}\}$ is well-distributed and covers the center directions.

This leads to the third main theorem of the paper.

Theorem C. *Fix any value of the masses $m_0, m_1, m_2 > 0$ (except $m_0 = m_1$). Let $H_0 < 0$ and fix any $|\Theta_0| \gg 1$. Then, there exists a 4-dimensional section $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta_0)$ such that the return map $\Psi : U \subset \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ induced on \mathcal{X} by the flow (1.13) exhibits a symplectic blender.*

Blenders and the dynamics of the 3-body problem. Although already interesting on their own, symplectic blenders can have a global influence on the dynamics of the system. In particular, they allow us to construct an oscillatory orbit whose projection on the center directions (i.e. those tangent to \mathcal{E}_∞) is “large”. Before giving a precise statement let us first motivate the study of these orbits.

The shape space of planar oriented ellipses. Consider the planar 2-body problem Hamiltonian

$$h_{\text{Kep}}(q, p) = \sum_{i=0,1} \frac{|p_i|^2}{2m_i} - \frac{m_0 m_1}{|q_0 - q_1|}. \quad (1.16)$$

It is well known that this system is integrable (see [AKN06]). If we fix any $h \in \mathbb{R}$ the Hamiltonian (1.16) induces a flow

$$\phi_{h_{\text{Kep}}} : \mathcal{S}(h) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(h)$$

⁶To be precise, (1.15) is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{S}^3 after regularizing the binary collision between q_0, q_1 .




FIGURE 1.2. An ellipse with unit semimajor axis, eccentricity $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$ and argument of the pericenter $g \in \mathbb{T}$. The position of the red point inside the ellipse is measured by the angle $\ell \in \mathbb{T}$.

on the 3-dimensional manifold

$$\mathcal{S}(h) = \{(q, p) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta) : h_{\text{Kep}}(q, p) = h, p_0 + p_1 = 0\} / \mathbb{R}^2$$

where \mathbb{R}^2 acts on (q, p) by diagonal translation on $q = (q_0, q_1)$. Moreover, for $h < 0$ (after regularizing collisions)

$$\mathcal{S}(h) \simeq \mathbb{S}^3$$

and $\mathcal{S}(h)$ is foliated by periodic orbits for the flow $\phi_{h_{\text{Kep}}}$. One may introduce a (local) coordinate system $(\ell, g, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1)$ on $\mathcal{S}(h)$ such that, in the full phase space, the vector $q_1(t) - q_0(t)$ traces a *fixed ellipse* $\mathcal{E}(g, \epsilon; h)$ which can be parametrized by its semimajor axis (completely determined by h), the argument of its pericenter $g \in \mathbb{T}$, (with respect to a fixed direction) and its eccentricity $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$, while the position inside $\mathcal{E}(g, \epsilon; h)$ is specified by an angle $\ell \in \mathbb{T}$ (see Figure 1.2). In the coordinates (ℓ, g, ϵ) the flow $\phi_{h_{\text{Kep}}}$ is given by a linear (resonant) translation

$$\phi_{h_{\text{Kep}}}^t : (\ell, g, \epsilon) \in \mathcal{S}(h) \mapsto (\ell + \omega(h)t, g, \epsilon) \in \mathcal{S}(h). \quad (1.17)$$

for some $\omega(h) \in \mathbb{R}$.

For the Hamiltonian H in (1.10) the relative motion between q_0 and q_1 is much more erratic as these bodies now interact with q_2 . A popular practice to make the problem more tractable is to study the motion in the *hierarchical region* of the phase space where $|q_2| \gg |q_0|, |q_1|$. The reason is that, in view of the fast decay of Newtonian interaction, in this region one still expects that (at least for short time scales) the motion of q_0, q_1 is governed by the Hamiltonian h_{Kep} . Hence, in this region of the phase space, we expect that the bodies q_0, q_1 still move on ellipses whose shape *evolve slowly* in time. As we will see below, for fixed total energy H_0 and angular momentum Θ_0 , one may introduce local coordinate patches on the 5-dimensional manifold (1.14)

$$\psi : U \times \mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0) \cap \{|q_2| \gg |q_0|, |q_1|\}$$

and describe the evolution of $q_1 - q_0$ in terms of elliptic elements⁷ $(\ell, g, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1)$ ⁸. In view of the above discussion, we expect that the projection of the flow (1.13) onto the coordinates (ℓ, g, ϵ) is given by a small perturbation of the linear flow (1.17).

A natural question is:

Describe the set of elliptical elements $\{(\ell(t), g(t), \epsilon(t)) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ which can be seen along orbits of (1.10).

In view of the above connection between oscillatory motions and chaotic dynamics, these of orbits seem good candidates for displaying a rich set of elliptical elements. Our main result shows that, at least locally, this is indeed the case. The following is an informal version of our second main result.

⁷Note that the argument of the pericenter becomes undefined at circular motion. In the paper we use Poincaré coordinates which extend to circular motion (see Section 7.1).

⁸The reader is probably wondering why we do not include the semimajor axis in our coordinate system. The reason is that, as we will see below, this quantity is approximately constant on a neighborhood of $\mathcal{E}_\infty \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0)$, which is where our analysis will take place. Hence, on this region the semimajor axis can be recovered from the value of H_0, Θ_0 and the other coordinates.

It is an open problem to construct orbits of the 3-body problem (far from \mathcal{E}_∞) along which the semimajor axis presents significant variations.

Theorem D (Informal version). *Fix any value of the masses m_0, m_1 and m_2 (except $m_0 = m_1$). There exists an oscillatory orbit of (1.10) whose projection to the shape space of planar oriented ellipses $\mathcal{S} = \{(\ell, g, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1)\}$ contains a locally dense subset. Moreover, the same is true if we just consider the projection of its future or backwards semi-orbit.*

A more precise and geometric version of this result is given in below.

Orbits accumulating a normally-parabolic invariant manifold. In this section we present a more geometric version of our main result. We fix any $H_0 < 0$ any $|\Theta| > 0$ and let $\mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0)$ be the 3-dimensional submanifold in (1.15), which, we recall is invariant for the extended flow (1.13).

Theorem D (Geometric version). *Fix any value of the masses m_0, m_1 and m_2 (except $m_0 = m_1$). Let $H_0 < 0$ and fix any $|\Theta_0| \gg 1$. There exists an orbit of the five-dimensional extended flow (1.13) such that both its forward and backward closure contain an open subset $\mathcal{A}_\infty \subset \mathcal{E}_\infty$ of the three-dimensional normally-parabolic invariant manifold $\mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0)$.*

This result can be recognized as a strong form of (micro) Arnold diffusion. The classical Arnold diffusion construction (in the context of topological instability of nearly-integrable Hamiltonian systems) considers orbits which shadow a (in general finite) pseudo-orbit connecting a long sequence of partially hyperbolic tori inside a normally-hyperbolic manifold (see [Arn64]). The main features of our result compared to classical results on Arnold diffusion are:

- The orbit in Theorem D not only visits a finite (or countable) sequence of periodic orbits on \mathcal{E}_∞ , but actually visits a locally dense subset of \mathcal{E}_∞ . Notice that, due to the degeneracy of the flow on \mathcal{E}_∞ (it is foliated by periodic orbits!), this construction requires bridging across two extra dimensions.
- The closure of the orbit in Theorem D is large in both time directions: i.e. the forward closure contains a locally dense subset of \mathcal{E}_∞ and the backward closure contains a locally dense subset of \mathcal{E}_∞ . Typical results in Arnold diffusion are only one-sided (and no two-sided conclusions can be extracted from the usual arguments).

The geometric object behind our construction is the symplectic blender in Theorem C. This object provides local “transitivity of the flow (1.13) along the center directions” (i.e. those tangent to \mathcal{E}_∞). Moreover, using this blender we are able to implement a two-sided shadowing argument which allows us to control both the future and past of the orbit.

Finally, before moving on, let us comment on why, at the moment, we are not able to accumulate the whole \mathcal{E}_∞ . The main reason is that, understanding the splitting between the manifolds $W^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ and $W^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ is a remarkably complicated task. In particular, in the present paper we rely on a result from [GMPS22] which shows that these manifolds intersect transversally along at least two (small) homoclinic channels $\Gamma_\pm \subset W^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \cap W^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$. Hence, with only this information available on the geometry of the intersection between these manifolds, we can only construct orbits shadowing these small channels.

We do indeed expect that $W^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ and $W^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ intersect transversally along two homoclinic channels which are diffeomorphic to $\mathcal{E}_\infty \setminus \mathcal{B}$ where \mathcal{B} is a (finite) set of curves along which tangencies between the manifolds $W^{u,s}(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ take place. However, proving this result seems formidably technical and out of the scope of the present work.

1.3. The restricted 3-body problem. Let $\mu \in (0, 1/2]$, $\zeta \in [0, 1)$ and let

$$q_0(t) = \mu \varrho(t)(\cos f(t), \sin f(t)) \quad q_1(t) = -(1 - \mu) \varrho(t)(\cos f(t), \sin f(t))$$

where $m_0 = 1 - \mu$ and $m_1 = \mu$ are the masses of the bodies q_0 and q_1 , ζ is the eccentricity of the ellipses described by these bodies, $\varrho : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the distance between them, defined by

$$\varrho(t) = \frac{1 - \zeta^2}{1 + \zeta \cos f(t)}$$

and $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ is the so-called true-anomaly (see [Win41]), which satisfies $f(0) = 0$ and

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \frac{(1 + \zeta \cos f(t))^2}{(1 - \zeta^2)^{3/2}}.$$




FIGURE 1.3. The primaries (i.e. the massive bodies) q_0, q_1 orbit around themselves, each of them describing an ellipse around the center of mass. The massless body q moves influenced by their gravitational field.

The *restricted* 3-body problem is the time-periodic Hamiltonian system

$$H_\zeta(q, p) = \frac{|p|^2}{2} - U(q, t), \quad U_\zeta(q, t) = \frac{1 - \mu}{|q - q_0(t)|} - \frac{\mu}{|q - q_1(t)|}. \quad (1.18)$$

on the symplectic manifold $(q, p) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^2)$ equipped with the canonical symplectic form $dp \wedge dq$. In the *hierarchical region* of the phase space, i.e. for $|q| \gg 1$,

$$U_\zeta(q, t) = \frac{1}{|q|} + V_\zeta(q, t) \quad V(q, t) = O(|q|^{-3})$$

so H_ζ in (1.18) recasts as a (singular) perturbation of the two-body problem

$$H_\zeta(q, p) = h_{\text{Kep}}(q, p) + V_\zeta(q, t) \quad h_{\text{Kep}}(q, p) = \frac{|p|^2}{2} - \frac{1}{|q|}.$$

In Section 1.2 we have already mentioned that h_{Kep} possesses periodic dynamics in each (three-dimensional) negative energy hypersurface admits a foliation by periodic orbits. Positive or zero energy levels are not compact but still the invariance by rotation guarantees that, for any $h_* \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $G_* \in \mathbb{R}$, the two-dimensional submanifolds

$$M_{r3bp}(h_*, G_*) = \{(q, p) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^2) : h(q, p) = h_*, G(q, p) = G_*\} \quad G(q, p) = q_x p_y - q_y p_x \quad (1.19)$$

are left invariant under the flow of h_{Kep} . It is then natural to ask if there exists orbits of (1.18) along which either h or G exhibit significant variations. We showed in [GPS23] that this is the case for any $\mu \in (0, 1/2)$ by constructing orbits along which the angular momentum G exhibits arbitrarily large variations provided the eccentricity $\zeta > 0$ is sufficiently small. Our last main result is a strengthened version of the main result in [GPS23]. To state this result, let us denote by $\phi_{H_\zeta}(t, t_0, q, p)$ the general solution associated to (1.18) and introduce the (four-dimensional) time-one map

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\zeta : \{t = 0\} &\rightarrow \{t = 0\} \\ (q, p) &\mapsto \phi_{H_\zeta}(2\pi, 0, q, p) \end{aligned}$$

Recall that, in the context of skew-products over the shift, N -cylinders were introduced in (1.8).

Theorem E. *Fix any $\mu \in (0, 1/2)$ any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, any $R > 0$ and any $G_1 \gg 1$. Then, for any $\zeta > 0$ sufficiently small there exists a subset $\mathcal{A}_\zeta \subset T^*(\mathbb{R}^2)$, a homeomorphism $\Phi_\zeta : \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\zeta$ and a natural number $M \in \mathbb{N}$ for which the following holds:*

- \mathcal{A}_ζ is a weakly invariant normally hyperbolic lamination for the map Ψ_ζ^M , where the leaves of the lamination are C^1 and are a graph with respect to $(\alpha, G) \in \mathbb{T} \times [G_1, G_1 + R]$ with α being the angle of the massless body with respect to the argument of the perihelion (see Figure 1.3) of the primaries and G being its angular momentum (see (1.19)).
- Given any countable covering of \mathcal{A}_ζ by N -cylinders there exists an orbit of Ψ_ζ^M which visits all the elements in the covering,

In particular, there exist an orbit in the lamination whose projection onto $(\alpha, G) \in \mathbb{T} \times [G_1, G_1 + R]$ is dense.

The orbits realizing the construction in Theorem E not only exhibit large drifts on the G -component but are “dense modulo N -cylinders” on \mathcal{A}_ζ . In particular, the projection of any of these orbits to the center coordinates contains a dense subset of $\mathbb{T} \times [G_1, G_1 + R]$ and therefore provide a rather strong form of Arnold diffusion. The main ingredient in the proof of Theorem C is the abstract result in Theorem B.

1.4. Organization of the article. The rest of the article is organized as follows:

Literature.

- In Section 2 we review and compare our main results to those previously obtained in the existing literature.

Blenders in symbolic and symplectic context.

- In Section 3 we will introduce symbolic blenders for IFS on surfaces, describe how these appear in the context of maps satisfying assumptions B0, B1 and relate symplectic blenders to the proof of Theorem A. We will also collect certain intermediate results which are key to the proof of Theorem D (and will be used in Section 7).
- In Section 4 we introduce symplectic blenders in the context of 4-dimensional symplectic maps and explain some of the challenges that we face in our construction of these objects for the 3-body problem.

Abstract results for IFS of the annulus.

- In Section 5 we present the proof of Theorem A. As discussed in Section 1.1, it relies on a variant of the transversality-torsion mechanism introduced by Cresson [Cre03].

Abstract results for cylinder skew-products.

- In Section 6 we extend the results from Section 5 to cylinder skew-products. The fact that we do not assume the skew-product to be locally constant introduces some technicalities, but the main ideas are those discussed in Section 5 in the context of IFSs.

The 3-body problem.

- In Section 7 we recall results from [GMPS22] which show how to obtain a (locally) partially hyperbolic framework for the 3-body problem. We obtain a four dimensional return map Ψ to a suitable transverse section accumulating on two different homoclinic manifolds. Special emphasis is put in controlling the center dynamics close to each homoclinic manifold and show that, up to first order, are governed by twist maps satisfying the assumptions in Theorem A.
- In Section 8 we construct a cs -blender for the map Ψ . To that end, we look at a judiciously chosen range of iterates of the map Ψ which, in the center directions reproduces the weak transversality-torsion mechanism behind the proof of Theorem A. We then verify that this family of maps satisfy the so-called covering property and exhibit well-distributed hyperbolic periodic orbits (see Section 4). In this way we complete the proof of Theorem C.
- In Section 9 we complete the proof of Theorem D. The main idea is that using a symplectic blender, one can implement a two-sided shadowing argument.

The restricted 3-body problem.

- In Section 10 we introduce a (locally) partially hyperbolic setting for the restricted 3-body problem dynamics. The framework is very similar to that in Section 7 and builds on previous results obtained in [GPS23]. We then construct a weakly invariant normally hyperbolic lamination for a suitable return map and complete the proof of Theorem E by combining the tools in Section 6 with those in [GPS23].

Acknowledgements. The authors want to thank D. Li and D. Turaev for many enlightening discussions about the creation of blenders in Hamiltonian dynamics and for sharing with us a draft of their forthcoming paper [LT].

This work is part of the grant PID-2021-122954NB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and “ERDF A way of making Europe”. M.G. is supported by the Catalan Institution for Research and Advanced Studies via an ICREA Academia Prizes 2018 and 2023. This work is also supported by the Spanish State Research Agency, through the Severo Ochoa and María de Maeztu Program for Centers and Units of Excellence in R&D (CEX2020-001084-M).

2. CHAOTIC DYNAMICS IN NEARLY INTEGRABLE HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS

The present work intersects a number of topics relevant to the dynamics of nearly-integrable Hamiltonians. Before delving into the details of the proofs of our main results, we find it convenient to compare our results to those previously obtained in the literature.

Chaotic dynamics in celestial mechanics: From a historical point of view, Poincaré’s finding of a homoclinic tangle in the restricted 3-body problem marks celestial mechanics as the starting point of the theory of chaotic dynamics. After the introduction of Smale’s horseshoe, the work of Alekseev [Ale68a, Ale68b] and Moser [Mos73] paved the way for the construction of chaotic (i.e non-trivial) *uniformly hyperbolic sets* in models coming from celestial mechanics.

However, in the modern theory of dynamics, it was soon realized that chaos it is often not uniformly hyperbolic. A classical scenario for the robust lack of uniformity corresponds to the existence of *homoclinic tangencies*. A number of works have explored the rich dynamics that are associated to this phenomenon and it was natural to ask if these dynamics are also observed in celestial mechanics models. For celestial mechanics models, Newhouse domains (i.e. open parameter sets for which the dynamics exhibits homoclinic tangencies) were first constructed in the unpublished manuscript [GK12]). Some other works exploring the dynamics in Newhouse domains associated to the restricted 3-body problem are [BGG23, GMP25].

Switching now to chaotic dynamics associated to *partially hyperbolic* scenarios, Nassiri and Pujals introduced in [NP12] an abstract construction to produce C^∞ arcs of *a priori chaotic* Hamiltonians exhibiting robustly transitive invariant laminations. By *a priori chaotic* we mean that the authors perturb systems which already exhibit a normally hyperbolic invariant lamination with regular leaves on which the dynamics is conjugated to a skew-product over the shift.

In the list of open problems included in Section 6 of [NP12] the authors mention that “a major challenge would be to apply the present approach to the context of the restricted 3-body problem”. Theorems C, D and E can be seen as the natural extension of the abstract construction in [NP12] to the 3-body problem and its restricted version.

There are two main obstacles to adapt their construction to our setting. The first one is that we study the restricted 3-body problem (a similar discussion also applies to the non-restricted problem) as a perturbation of the 2-body problem. The latter is integrable and, in particular, does not exhibit any non-trivial normally hyperbolic lamination. To construct such a lamination we show that the invariant manifolds of a certain (topological) normally hyperbolic invariant manifold intersect transversally along a homoclinic manifold and then look at the return map to a neighbourhood of this homoclinic manifold. However, the homoclinic manifold contains *holes* associated to curves of non-transverse intersection (tangencies). We thus have to restrict our study to the region away from these holes. Hence, the corresponding lamination on a neighbourhood of the homoclinic manifold is only *weakly invariant*.

The second difficulty is that in [NP12] blenders are constructed via perturbation techniques only available in the smooth setting (as they involve the use of compactly supported functions). More concretely, the authors introduce localized perturbations on different elements of the corresponding Markov partition so that the corresponding skew-product dynamics on the lamination is transitive. Realizing this construction on a real-analytic setting would certainly be rather challenging as the laminations are themselves very localized and the different elements of the Markov partition get extremely close. Our approach to obtain rich dynamics in the center directions is different and does not require any perturbation argument if the system already satisfies a rather explicit condition (encoded in Theorem A).

Laminations in real-analytic Hamiltonians: Weakly invariant normally hyperbolic laminations arise (under suitable conditions) close to *single resonances* in nearly-integrable Hamiltonians. One of the first works in which (a simplified version of) this situation was considered is [Moe02]. With a view towards the implementation of the Arnold diffusion mechanism, in this work Moeckel provides a criterion under which the dynamics on the lamination exhibits drifting orbits. This idea was later exploited by Gelfreich and Turaev in [GT17] to prove that a generic real-analytic perturbation of an a priori chaotic Hamiltonian exhibits drifting orbits. Among many other things, in [MS04] Marco and Sauzin construct an explicit Gevrey perturbation of an integrable convex Hamiltonian for which there exists a normally hyperbolic lamination admitting an orbit whose projection to the center subspace (i.e. tangent to the leaves) is dense. In some sense, these results are concerned with *topological aspects* of the dynamics on these laminations. This is also the case of our Theorems B and E. We believe that the ideas in Theorem B will be of good use to establish similar conclusions to those in Theorem E in given parametric families of real-analytic Hamiltonians. Finally, let us also mention that one could also investigate the *statistical properties* of dynamics on these laminations. For instance, in [MS04] the authors are able to embed a random walk in the nearly integrable dynamics.

Both weakly invariant normally hyperbolic laminations and the statistical properties of its dynamics has been also analyzed in Celestial Mechanics models by by Capinski and Gidea for the restricted 3-body problem [CG23] and also in the forthcoming papers [GKMR25b, GKMR25a], where M. Guardia, together with P. Martín, P. Roldán and V. Kaloshin obtain a similar result for a lamination arising at the so-called *mean motion* resonances in the restricted 3 body problem. Weakly invariant normally hyperbolic laminations are expected to exist in other Celestial Mechanics contexts such as secular resonances [CFG25] or along the center manifolds of the Lagrange points. However, for some models the leaves of the laminations have dimension higher to those considered in the present paper.

Blenders as a tool in Celestial mechanics: We believe that blenders might prove extremely useful to tackle (or at least make some partial progress) on several longstanding conjectures in celestial mechanics. For instance, one may think of using these objects to address Alekseev's conjecture on the existence of a locally dense subset of initial conditions leading to collision orbits.

Blenders in real-analytic Hamiltonians: Another question posed in Section 6 of [NP12] is if one can introduce real-analytic perturbation techniques to create blenders in nearly-integrable Hamiltonians. This question has recently been considered by Li and Turaev in [LT]. They show that for Hamiltonians (not necessarily close to integrable) exhibiting a two-dimensional partially hyperbolic KAM-torus with a homoclinic orbit, a symplectic blender can be created by an arbitrarily small real-analytic perturbation.

Related to this setting, we believe that our abstract result in Theorem A will prove useful to find blenders in given real-analytic parametric families of Hamiltonians. If we think of the maps T_0, T_1 in Theorem A as the inner dynamics and scattering map to a normally hyperbolic cylinder, this theorem gives explicit conditions (which do not require any further perturbation) for the existence of a symbolic blender for this IFS. It seems quite reasonable that, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem C in the context of the 3-body problem, this explicit condition guarantees the existence of a symplectic blender.

3. SYMBOLIC BLENDERS FOR IFS OF THE CYLINDER

In this section we introduce symbolic blenders for IFS on surfaces. Then, we consider an IFS of twist maps of the cylinder and show that it exhibits a symbolic blender provided the maps satisfy assumptions B0, B1.

- On one hand the existence of a symbolic blender is the main ingredient in the proof of Theorem A, which will be completed in Section 5.
- On the other hand, the techniques used to construct this symbolic blender will be of high relevance for the construction of symplectic blenders in the context of 4-dimensional symplectic maps (in particular, for a suitable return map in the 3-body problem).

3.1. Definition of symbolic blenders. Consider an IFS $\{T_i\}_{i=1,\dots,k}$ of smooth maps acting on a smooth surface M . Let $Q \subset M$ be a rectangle and denote by $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}_{i=1,\dots,k}$ the corresponding induced return maps on Q . We now suppose that:

- for at least one $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the map T_j has a hyperbolic fixed point $P_j \in Q$ and denote by $W^u(P_j; T_j)$ and $W^s(P_j; T_j)$ their local unstable and stable manifold respectively (for the map T_j),
- there exist families of cone fields $\mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^s$ which are common for all the maps T_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$.

In this setting we say that a C^1 curve $\gamma \subset Q$ is a s -curve (resp. u -curve) if its tangent bundle is contained in the cone \mathcal{C}^s (resp. \mathcal{C}^u).

Definition 3.1 (Symbolic cs -blender). We say that the pair (P_j, Q) is a *symbolic cs -blender* for the IFS $\{T_i\}_{i=1, \dots, k}$ if for any s -curve $\gamma \subset Q$ there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in \{1, \dots, k\}^M$ such that

$$T_\sigma^{-1}(\gamma) \pitchfork W^u(P_j; T_j) \neq \emptyset.$$

Analogously, the pair (P_j, Q) is a *symbolic cu -blender* if for any u -curve $\gamma \subset Q$ there exist M and σ as above such that $T_\sigma(\gamma) \pitchfork W^s(P_j; T_j) \neq \emptyset$. As we will see below (see Section 3.2), under the conditions **B0** and **B1**, the maps T_0, T_1 display a symbolic cs -blender (provided their transversality, measured by ε , is small enough). Appealing to the almost reversibility (i.e. reversibility up to small errors) of the maps T_0, T_1 under the involution $\psi_R : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (-\varphi, J)$, we will also deduce the existence of a cu -blender (see Section 5).

Definition 3.2 (Symbolic double blender). Let (P_j, Q) be a symbolic cu -blender and (P_i, Q') be a symbolic cs -blender for the IFS $\{T_i\}_{i=1, \dots, k}$. Together they form a *symbolic double blender* if

$$W^s(P_j; T_j) \pitchfork W^u(P_i; T_i) \neq \emptyset.$$

The proof of Theorem A is based on the existence of a symbolic double blender for the pair of maps T_0, T_1 . Indeed, given a u -curve $\gamma \subset Q$ and a s -curve $\gamma' \subset Q'$ the transversality condition $W^s(P_j; T_j) \pitchfork W^u(P_i; T_i) \neq \emptyset$ and the classical Lambda lemma (see [PdM82]) implies that an iterate of γ will intersect transversally γ' . Hence, local transitivity for the pair of maps T_0, T_1 follows (after some minor extra work) from the fact that we can intersect any u -curve with any s -curve. This is explained in Section 5.

3.2. Symbolic blenders for IFS of the cylinder. In Section 5 we will show that, provided that assumptions **B0**, **B1** are met, the IFS generated by the pair T_0, T_1 exhibits a symbolic double blender and then complete the proof of Theorem A.

In this section we collect some of the intermediate statements that lead to the proof of Theorem A and which will prove useful for establishing Theorem D.

Proposition 3.3. *Consider two maps T_0, T_1 satisfying **B0** and **B1** for some $\alpha, \rho, \sigma > 0$ and let $K > 0$ be as in (1.6). There exists $\varepsilon_0(K, \rho, \sigma) > 0$ such that for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0 \min\{\tau, \alpha\}$ the IFS generated by the pair $\{T_0, T_1\}$ exhibits a symbolic cs -blender.*

The main ingredient needed to establish Proposition 3.3 is the following normal-form like result for a suitable range of iterates of the maps T_0 and T_1 .

Proposition 3.4. *Fix any value $0 < \chi \ll 1$ and consider the setting of Proposition 3.3 (possibly with a smaller ε_0). Then, there exists an affine local coordinate system $\phi_\chi : [-2, 2]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ and a subset $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ and all $(\xi, \eta) \in [-2, 2]^2$*

$$\mathcal{F}_n := \phi_\chi^{-1} \circ T_0^n \circ T_1 \circ \phi_\chi = \begin{pmatrix} b_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \chi & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \chi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} + O(\chi^2).$$

for some constant $b_n \in [-1, 1]$. Moreover, the family $\{b_n\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi}$ is $\frac{1}{10}\chi$ -dense on $[-10\chi, 10\chi]$.

Proposition 3.4 will be proved in Section 5. After doing so, we will check that the set of maps $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi}$ satisfy the so-called covering and equidistribution properties (see [NP12]) in order to establish Proposition 3.3.

4. SYMPLECTIC BLENDERS FOR 4-DIMENSIONAL SYMPLECTIC MAPS

The purpose of this section is to introduce symplectic blenders for 4-dimensional symplectomorphisms. The presentation that we propose here is tailored for the application to the problem at hand and we refer the reader to [NP12], [BDV05] (and the references therein) for other (more general) constructions.

4.1. Partially hyperbolic return maps. We start by introducing the scenario in which we will construct symplectic blenders. This setting corresponds to maps which display (at least locally) partially hyperbolic behavior. Let ψ be a diffeomorphism on a 4-dimensional manifold M . Let $Q \subset M$ be a (4-dimensional) rectangle and denote by Ψ the induced return map on Q . We suppose that:

H1 There exists $a > b > 1$, $\lambda > \chi > 0$ and a (smooth) local coordinate chart on Q

$$\phi : (p, \tau, \xi, \eta) \in [-1, 1]^4 \rightarrow Q$$

such that at any $Z = (p, \tau, \xi, \eta)$, the cones

$$C_Z^{ss} = \{v \in T_Z Q : |v_p| \geq a \max\{|v_\tau|, |v_\xi|, |v_\eta|\}\} \quad C_Z^s = \{v \in T_Z Q : \max\{|v_p|, |v_\xi|\} \geq b \max\{|v_\tau|, |v_\eta|\}\}$$

and

$$C_Z^{uu} = \{v \in T_Z Q : |v_\tau| \geq a \max\{|v_p|, |v_\xi|, |v_\eta|\}\} \quad C_Z^u = \{v \in T_Z Q : \max\{|v_\tau|, |v_\eta|\} \geq b \max\{|v_p|, |v_\xi|\}\}$$

satisfy that (wherever the return map or its inverse are well defined)

$$D\Psi_Z^{-1} C_Z^{*s} \subset C_{\Psi^{-1}(Z)}^{*s} \quad D\Psi_Z C_Z^{*u} \subset C_{\Psi(Z)}^{*u} \quad *s = s, ss \quad *u = u, uu$$

and, moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} |(D\Psi^{-1}(Z)v)_p| &\geq (1 + \lambda)|v_p| \quad \text{if } v \in C_Z^{ss}, & \max_{*=p, \xi} |(D\Psi^{-1}(Z)v)_*| &\geq (1 + \chi) \max_{*=p, \xi} |v_*| \quad \text{if } v \in C_Z^s \\ |(D\Psi(Z)v)_\tau| &\geq (1 + \lambda)|v_\tau| \quad \text{if } v \in C_Z^{uu}, & \max_{*=\tau, \eta} |(D\Psi(Z)v)_*| &\geq (1 + \chi) \max_{*=\tau, \eta} |v_*| \quad \text{if } v \in C_Z^u. \end{aligned}$$

Consider now the larger rectangle

$$Q^{\text{ext}} = \phi([-1, 1]^2 \times [-2, 2]^2). \quad (4.1)$$

We say that a $\Delta \subset Q^{\text{ext}}$ is a *horizontal submanifold* if it admits a parametrization of the form

$$\Delta = \{(p, h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi)) : \gamma_l(p) \leq \xi \leq \gamma_r(p), p \in [-1, 1]\} \quad (4.2)$$

for any C^1 functions $\gamma_l < \gamma_r$ and h_1, h_2 such that

$$\partial_p Z_l(p), \partial_p Z_r(p) \in \mathcal{C}^{ss} \quad \text{where} \quad Z_\star(p) = \phi(p, h_1(p, \gamma_\star(p)), \gamma_\star(p), h_2(p, \gamma_\star(p))). \quad \star = l, r,$$

and at any $Z \in \phi(\Delta)$ we have $T_Z \phi(\Delta) \subset \mathcal{C}_Z^s$. We say that a $\Delta \subset Q^{\text{ext}}$ is a *vertical submanifold* if it admits a parametrization of the form

$$\Delta = \{(v_1(\tau, \eta), \tau, v_2(\tau, \eta), \eta) : \gamma_d(\tau) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_u(\tau), \tau \in [-1, 1]\}$$

for any differentiable functions $\gamma_d < \gamma_u$ and v_1, v_2 such that

$$\partial_\tau Z_d(\tau), \partial_\tau Z_u(\tau) \in \mathcal{C}^{uu} \quad \text{where} \quad Z_\star(\tau) = \phi(v_1(\tau, \gamma_\star(\tau)), \tau, v_2(\tau, \gamma_\star(\tau)), \gamma_\star(\tau))$$

and at any $Z \in \phi(\Delta)$ we have $T_Z \phi(\Delta) \subset \mathcal{C}_Z^u$. We say that on Q the map Ψ satisfies:

H2 if for any vertical submanifold $\Delta \subset Q$ the image $\Psi(\Delta) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$ contains at least $k \geq 2$ disjoint vertical submanifolds and for any horizontal submanifold $\Delta \subset Q$ the preimage $\Psi^{-1}(\Delta) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$ contains at least $k \geq 2$ distinct horizontal submanifolds.

If we define vertical (resp. horizontal) *rectangles* as 4-dimensional compact subsets which are C^1 foliated by two-dimensional vertical (resp. horizontal) submanifolds, **H2** implies, in particular, that $\Psi(Q) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$ contains at least $k \geq 2$ vertical rectangles and $\Psi^{-1}(Q) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$ contains at least $k \geq 2$ horizontal rectangles.

Remark 2. Observe however that the vertical (resp. horizontal) rectangles contained in $\Psi(Q) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$ (resp. $\Psi^{-1}(Q) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$) might not be entirely contained in Q .

4.2. *cu-blenders, the covering property and well distributed periodic orbits.* It is in the framework above (Assumptions **H1** and **H2**) that we will introduce blenders and derive sufficient conditions for their existence. We say that a horizontal submanifold Δ is a *cs-strip* if $\Delta \subset Q$.

Definition 4.1. Let $P \in Q$ be a hyperbolic periodic point of the map Ψ . We say that the pair (P, Q) is a *cs-blender* for the map Ψ if any *cs-strip* $\Delta \subset Q$ intersects $W^u(P)$ in a robust fashion.

Following [BDV05], [NP12] (but adapted to the present context) we now provide a condition on the map Ψ which guarantees the existence of a *cs-blender*. We define the width $\text{width}(\Delta)$ of a *cs-strip* Δ as

$$\text{width}(\Delta) = \inf_{p \in [-1, 1]} |\gamma_r(p) - \gamma_l(p)|.$$

The proof of the following result is a straightforward application of the lambda-lemma (see [PdM82]).

Lemma 4.2 (Intersection/expansion dichotomy). *Suppose that there exist $k \geq 2$, pairwise disjoint subsets $\{V_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \subset Q$, a real number $\chi > 0$ and hyperbolic periodic points $P_i \in V_i$ of the map Ψ . Assume that P_i and P_j are homoclinically related for $i \neq j$ and that the following dichotomy holds: for any *cs-strip* $\Delta \subset Q$ either*

- (Intersection): *there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\Delta \cap W^u(P_i) \neq \emptyset$ or*
- (Expansion): *there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\bar{\Delta} = \Psi^{-1}(\Delta \cap V_i) \cap Q$ is a *cs-strip* and*

$$\text{width}(\bar{\Delta}) > (1 + \chi)\text{width}(\Delta).$$

*Then, the pair (P_1, Q) is a *cs-blender* for the map Ψ .*

Inspired by [NP12], we now present an strategy to materialize the above dichotomy in a concrete example. Let $\Delta \subset Q$ be a *cs-strip*. By the Assumption **H2** the image $\Psi^{-1}(\Delta) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$ contains at least two horizontal submanifolds. Notice however that these submanifolds do not necessarily fit into the definition of *cs-strips* above as they might not be contained in Q .

In order to gain control over the center directions we will proceed as follows. By the assumption **H.2** there exists $k \geq 2$ non-empty vertical subrectangles $\{\tilde{V}_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \subset Q$ of the form

$$\tilde{V}_i = \{v_{1,l}^i(\tau, \eta) \leq p \leq v_{1,r}^i(\tau, \eta), v_{2,l}^i(\tau, \eta) \leq \xi \leq v_{2,r}^i(\tau, \eta)\} \quad (4.3)$$

for some differentiable functions $v_{1,l}^i < v_{1,r}^i$, $v_{2,l}^i < v_{2,r}^i$ and such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \tilde{V}_i = \Psi^{-1}(Q) \cap Q^{\text{ext}}$. Define now the (possibly empty) vertical subrectangles

$$V_i = \tilde{V}_i \cap Q.$$

In this setting we now say that Ψ satisfies the:

- (Covering property): if for any *cs-strip* $\Delta \subset Q$ as in (4.2) there exists at least one element $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and differentiable functions $\tilde{\gamma}_l, \tilde{\gamma}_r$ with $\gamma_l \leq \tilde{\gamma}_l < \tilde{\gamma}_r \leq \gamma_r$ such that the piece $\tilde{\Delta}_i \subset \Delta$ defined implicitly by⁹

$$\tilde{\Delta}_i = \{(p, h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi)) : \tilde{\gamma}_l(p) \leq \xi \leq \tilde{\gamma}_r(p), v_{1,l}^i(h_1(p, \xi), h_2(p, \xi)) \leq p \leq v_{1,r}^i(h_1(p, \xi), h_2(p, \xi))\}$$

is entirely contained in V_i (see Figure 4.1).

Roughly speaking, the covering property asks that the projections of the V_i onto the center directions (ξ, η) are such that their union covers (robustly) the entire square $[-1, 1]^2$ (as in the right part of Figure 1.1). This property implies that $\Psi^{-1}(\Delta)$ contains at least one *cs-strip* (in particular $\Psi^{-1}(\Delta_i)$ is a *cu-strip*) and hence allows us to produce new *cs-strips* by considering the backward images of *cs-strips*.

The covering property is our first ingredient towards establishing the dichotomy in Lemma 4.2. The second ingredient is the following. We say that Ψ satisfies the:

- (Well-distributed periodic orbits property): if there exists hyperbolic periodic orbits $P_i \in V_i$, which are pairwise homoclinically related, such that, for any *cs-strip* $\Delta \subset Q$ either:

⁹A sufficient condition for the inequalities

$$\tilde{\gamma}_l(p) \leq \xi \leq \tilde{\gamma}_r(p) \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,l}^i(h_1(p, \xi), h_2(p, \xi)) \leq p \leq v_{1,r}^i(h_1(p, \xi), h_2(p, \xi))$$

to define a non-empty region of the (p, ξ) -plane is that $|\partial_\tau v_{1,\star}^i \partial_p h_1|, |\partial_\tau v_{1,\star}^i \partial_p h_2| \ll 1$ with $\star = l, r$. We assume these conditions are met.




FIGURE 4.1. The strip Δ intersects only the vertical rectangles V_1, V_2 . It intersects V_2 cleanly, i.e. $\hat{\Delta}_2 \subset V_2$ but the intersection with V_1 is not clean, i.e. $\hat{\Delta}_1 \not\subset V_1$. However, the smaller subset $\tilde{\Delta}_1$ is contained in V_1 .

- there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\Delta \cap W^u(P_i) \neq \emptyset$ or,
- there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that the piece $\hat{\Delta}_i \subset \Delta$ defined implicitly by

$$\hat{\Delta}_i = \{(p, h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi)) : \gamma_l(p) \leq \xi \leq \gamma_r(p), v_l^i(h_1(p, \xi), h_2(p, \xi)) \leq p \leq v_r^i(h_1(p, \xi), h_2(p, \xi))\}$$

is entirely contained in V_i .

Finally, we observe that if the piece $\hat{\Delta}_i \subset V_i$ then $\bar{\Delta} = \Psi^{-1}(\hat{\Delta}_i)$ is a *cs*-strip and, moreover, since, by definition, it is tangent to the stable cone \mathcal{C}^s , we will have

$$\text{width}(\bar{\Delta}) \geq (1 + \chi) \text{width}(\hat{\Delta}_i) \geq (1 + \chi) \text{width}(\Delta)$$

for some $\chi > 0$.

4.3. Symplectic blenders. When a *cu*-blender and a *cs*-blender are homoclinically related, these local objects might have a global influence on the dynamics of the system.

Definition 4.3 (Symplectic blender). Let (P, Q) be a *cu*-blender and (P', Q') be a *cs*-blender for the map Ψ . Together, they form a symplectic blender if P and P' are homoclinically related.

A straightforward application of the lambda-lemma (see [PdM82]) implies that some forward iterate of any *cu*-strip in Q intersects any *cs*-strip in Q' . Roughly speaking, the presence of a symplectic blender guarantees that the dynamics is locally transitive “modulo strongly hyperbolic directions”.

5. LOCAL TRANSITIVITY FOR CYLINDER IFS: PROOF OF THEOREM A

In this section we give the proof of Theorem A. We do so in several steps.

- (1) We recall an elementary result about the arithmetic properties of circle rotations with $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ (Section 5.1).
- (2) We construct finite sequences $\omega^{(n)} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$F_n = T_{\omega_n^{(n)}} \circ \dots \circ T_{\omega_0^{(n)}}$$

admits a local affine approximation in terms of weakly hyperbolic affine maps $A_n(\varphi) + ([n\beta], 0)^\top$ (Section 5.2).

- (3) We construct a uniform coordinate system in which we analyze the maps F_n corresponding to a suitable family of finite sequences $\omega^{(n)}$ and obtain the normal form in Proposition 3.4 (Section 5.3).
- (4) We verify that for the chosen family of sequences $\omega^{(n)}$, thanks to the arithmetic properties of β , the maps F_n verify the so-called covering and equidistribution properties considered in [NP12] (Section 5.4).

- (5) Then, we study the dynamics of s -curves under the family of maps F_n and show the existence of a symbolic cs -blender (Section 5.5). In particular, we prove Proposition 3.3.
- (6) Finally, we exploit the almost reversibility of the system to show the existence of a cu -blender which is homoclinically related to the cs -blender and complete the proof of Theorem A (Section 5.7).

Remark 3. For the sake of clarity, and to avoid introducing extra notation, we will suppose in the following that $|\tilde{\beta}'|_{C^0(B)}, |T_{1,\varphi}|_{C^2(B)}, |T_{1,J}|_{C^2(B)} \leq 1$ and $\tau < 1$ where B is introduced in Hypothesis B1. The reader can easily adapt the proof to the general case.

Notation. We include a list of some relevant symbols used in this notation.

- Coordinate systems:
 - $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}$ are the original variables in which the mapst T_0, T_1 are defined.
 - $(\xi, \eta) \in D$ are local coordinates localized on a square $D = [-1, 1]^2$ where certain iterates exhibit weakly hyperbolic behavior.
- Parameters:
 - $\beta, \alpha, \tau, \varepsilon$ correspond respectively, to the rotation number on the KAM curve of T_0 , the Diophantine constant of β , the torsion of T_0 at its KAM curve, the transversality of the map T_1 .
 - $\chi, \kappa > 0$ are auxiliary quantities. The first one fixes the hyperbolicity of the maps \mathcal{F}_n below. The second one measures size of the domain D in the original coordinate system.
 - We will always work within following parameter hierarchy: We first fix $0 < \chi \ll 1$, then we choose $0 < \kappa \ll \chi$ and, a posteriori, we take ε sufficiently small (depending also on α, τ).
- Maps:
 - $F_n = T_0^n \circ T_1$
 - $\mathcal{F}_n = \phi_{\chi, \varepsilon}^{-1} \circ F_n \circ \phi_{\chi, \varepsilon}$ where $\phi_{\chi, \varepsilon}$ is the affine change of variables in Lemma 5.4. These maps are approximately affine and the inhomogeneous part is given by a translation vector $\mathbf{b}_n = (b_n, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.
- Range of iterates:
 - $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a range of iterates for which we study the maps \mathcal{F}_n . For two special indices $n = N_l, N_r \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ the maps F_n exhibit hyperbolic fixed points $z_{l,r}$ which are well distributed.
- Construction of blenders:
 - s -curves are curves in D which in (ξ, η) coordinates can be parametrized as a graph over ξ .
 - $Q^{cs} = \phi_{\chi, \varepsilon}(D)$ and $P_{l,r}^{cs} = \phi_{\chi, \varepsilon}(z_{l,r})$.

5.1. Arithmetic properties of β . The following inhomogeneous version of Dirichlet approximation theorem will prove useful in the proof of Theorem A.

Theorem 5.1 (Theorem VI in Chapter 5 of [Cas72]). *Let $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$. Then, for N large enough the sequence $\{[n\beta]\}_{n=1, \dots, N} \subset \mathbb{T}$ is $N^{-1}\alpha^{-1}$ -dense in \mathbb{T} .*

5.2. Linear approximation of $T_0^n \circ T_1$. In the following lemma, given a range of values for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct a sufficiently small rectangle on which the map $T_0^n \circ T_1$ (see (1.2) and (1.4)) is approximately affine.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying*

$$N \leq \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} \tag{5.1}$$

and define

$$l = \frac{1}{N}.$$

Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \leq 2N$, the map

$$F_n := T_0^n \circ T_1 : B \cap \{|J| \leq l/2\} \subset \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times [-l, l] \subset \mathbb{A}$$

is given by

$$F_n : \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} \mapsto A_n \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{b}_n + \mathcal{E}(\varphi, J) \quad A_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + n\tau\varepsilon & n\tau \\ \varepsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{b}_n = \begin{pmatrix} b + [n\beta] \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{E}_\varphi, \mathcal{E}_J)$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}_\varphi(\varphi, J) = O(n\varepsilon\varphi^2, l, \varepsilon\varphi) \quad \mathcal{E}_J(\varphi, J) = O(\varepsilon\varphi^2, l^2).$$

Moreover,

$$D(T_0^n \circ T_1)(\varphi, J) = A_n + \begin{pmatrix} O(n\varepsilon\varphi, l) & O(1) \\ O(\varepsilon\varphi, l^2) & O(l) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The proof of this result is given in Appendix A. We now study the linear approximation of the map F_n . The proof of the following result is a straightforward computation.

Lemma 5.3. *The symplectic matrix A_n is hyperbolic with eigenvalues $0 < \lambda_n < 1 < 1/\lambda_n$*

$$\lambda_n = 1 - \sqrt{n\tau\varepsilon} + O(n\tau\varepsilon) \quad (5.2)$$

and contracting/expanding eigenspaces spanned, respectively, by the vectors

$$\mathbf{v}_n = (1, v_n)^\top \quad \mathbf{w}_n = (1, w_n)^\top,$$

where

$$v_n = -\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n\tau}} (1 + O(\sqrt{n\tau\varepsilon})) \quad w_n = \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n\tau}} (1 + O(\sqrt{n\tau\varepsilon})). \quad (5.3)$$

5.3. Weakly hyperbolic regime: range of iterates and geometry of the domain. We are interested in the regime

$$(\text{Weakly hyperbolic regime}) \quad 0 < n\tau\varepsilon \ll 1.$$

In the following we will introduce several quantifiers which specify: the *range of iterates*, i.e., for which $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we want to study the maps F_n , and the *geometry* of the domain in which we want to study the maps F_n . This is done as follows:

- We fix any $0 < \kappa \ll \chi \ll 1$.
- We let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be given by

$$N = \left\lceil \frac{\chi^2}{\varepsilon\tau} \right\rceil. \quad (5.4)$$

- We let $N_* \in \mathbb{N}$ be given by

$$N_* = \left\lceil \frac{1}{5\alpha\chi\tau\kappa} \right\rceil, \quad (5.5)$$

where α is the constant introduced in (1.3).

We will consider iterations $T_0^n \circ T_1$ with $n \in \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}$ and describe the dynamics of points in a domain which depends on the quantities κ and χ . We obtain results for $0 < \kappa \ll \chi$ small, but fixed, in the regime where

$$0 < \varepsilon \ll \alpha, \quad \varepsilon \leq \tau.$$

Observe that in this weakly hyperbolic regime, the eigenvalues of A_n are approximately given by $\lambda_n = 1 \pm \chi + O(\chi^2)$ and that, by Theorem 5.1 the sequence¹⁰

$$\{[n\beta]\}_{n \in \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}} \quad \text{is } \frac{1}{5}\chi\tau\kappa\text{-dense in } \mathbb{T}.$$

In the following section we exploit the fact that in this regime the ratio

$$\frac{N_*}{N} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha\kappa\chi^3}$$

can be made arbitrarily small to construct a uniform (for $n \in \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}$) coordinate system and study the geometry of the images of a suitable rectangle under the map F_n .

¹⁰The important observation here is that the domain in which we will work is of size $\kappa\tau$, so the sequence $\{[n\beta]\}$ is $\frac{1}{5}\chi$ -dense at that scale, while the hyperbolicity is just slightly stronger: of strength χ .




FIGURE 5.1. The expanding (red) and contracting (blue) directions associated to the hyperbolic matrix A_N . These directions are approximately symmetric with respect to the x -axis and the angle between them is of order $\angle \sim \varepsilon/\chi^2$. The gray rectangle corresponds to the image of D under ϕ_χ .

5.3.1. *Uniform coordinate system.* We fix any $\chi \ll 1$ and, for $\kappa, \varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we introduce the (local) linear change of coordinates given by (here v_N and w_N are as in Lemma 5.3)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\xi} \\ \tilde{\eta} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} = \psi_P(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ v_N & w_N \end{pmatrix}}_P \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\xi} \\ \tilde{\eta} \end{pmatrix},$$

we define the scaling

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\xi} \\ \tilde{\eta} \end{pmatrix} = \psi_S(\xi, \eta) = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \kappa\tau & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa\tau/\chi \end{pmatrix}}_S \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix},$$

and we denote by

$$\phi_{\chi, \varepsilon} := \psi_P \circ \psi_S : D \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad D = [-1, 1]^2. \quad (5.6)$$

We notice that, in view of the asymptotics in (5.3), for the choice of N in (5.4) and for $0 < \kappa \ll \chi \ll 1$ sufficiently small (see Figure 5.1)

$$\phi_{\chi, \varepsilon}(D) \subset \left[-\frac{2\kappa\tau}{\chi}, \frac{2\kappa\tau}{\chi} \right] \times \left[-\frac{2\varepsilon\kappa\tau}{\chi^2}, \frac{2\varepsilon\kappa\tau}{\chi^2} \right] \subset \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right] \times \left[-\frac{l}{2}, \frac{l}{2} \right], \quad l = \frac{1}{N} \leq \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{\chi^2},$$

so we can make use of Lemma 5.2 to analyze the dynamics of the family of maps

$$\mathcal{F}_n := \phi_{\chi, \varepsilon}^{-1} \circ F_n \circ \phi_{\chi, \varepsilon} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (5.7)$$

with $n \in \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}$ and F_n as in Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.4. *Fix any $\chi \ll 1$. Then, there exists $\kappa_0(\chi) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0(\kappa, \chi) > 0$ such that for any*

$$0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_0(\chi) \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0(\kappa, \chi) \min\{\tau, \alpha\} \quad (5.8)$$

the following holds. There exists a subset $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \{N, \dots, N + N_\}$ for which the maps $\mathcal{F}_n : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ defined in (5.7) with $n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ are of the form*

$$\mathcal{F}_n : \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} b_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 - \chi & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \chi \end{pmatrix}}_A \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{E}_n(\xi, \eta), \quad (5.9)$$

the sequence $\{b_n\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi}$ is $\frac{1}{10}\chi$ -dense in $[-10\chi, 10\chi]$, and $|\mathbf{E}_n|_{C^1} = O(\chi^2)$.

The proof of Lemma 5.4 is given in Appendix A. From now on, having fixed $0 \ll \chi \ll 1$ and any $0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_0(\chi)$ we consider values of τ, α and ε such that (5.8) holds and drop these quantities from the notation.

5.4. Covering and equidistribution. We now study the geometry of the images of D under the maps \mathcal{F}_n , $n \in \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}$.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}$ be as in Lemma 5.4. Then,*

$$D \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi} \mathcal{F}_n(D).$$

Moreover, denote by $B_{r,\xi}(z)$ the horizontal segment centered at $z \in D$ of radius r . Then, the number

$$a := \min\{r \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \text{there exists } z \in D \text{ such that } B_{r,\xi}(z) \subset D \text{ and } B_{r,\xi}(z) \not\subset \mathcal{F}_n(D) \text{ for any } n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi\} \quad (5.10)$$

satisfies

$$a \geq 1 - 10\chi.$$

Proof. The first observation is that, in view of the estimates in Lemma 5.4, in order to prove the first item it is enough to show that

$$\{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \text{dist}(z, D) \leq \chi/2\} \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi} \mathbf{F}_n(D) \quad (5.11)$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}_n : (\xi, \eta) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} b_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{A} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \chi & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \chi \end{pmatrix}.$$

Indeed, (5.11) guarantees that a $\chi/2$ -neighborhood of D is contained in the union of its images under \mathbf{F}_n while the error committed in approximating \mathcal{F}_n by \mathbf{F}_n is of order $O(\chi^2)$, which can be made much smaller than $\chi/2$ by decreasing, if necessary, the value of χ .

Recall that $\{b_n\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi}$ forms a $\frac{1}{10}\chi$ -dense grid of $[-10\chi, 10\chi]$, i.e., for every ξ in this interval there exists $n \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ such that $|b_n - \xi| \leq \frac{1}{10}\chi$. In particular, there exist $N_\pm \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ such that

$$b_{N_+} \in (2\chi, 3\chi) \quad b_{N_-} \in (-3\chi, -2\chi).$$

On the other hand

$$\mathbf{F}_n(D) \cap \{-1 \leq \eta \leq 1\} = [b_n - 1 + \chi, b_n + 1 - \chi] \times [-1, 1].$$

so $\{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \text{dist}(z, D) \leq \chi/2\} \subset \mathbf{F}_{N_+}(D) \cup \mathbf{F}_{N_-}(D)$.

We now establish the second item. Again it is enough to show that $\tilde{a} \geq 1 - 5\chi$ where \tilde{a} is defined as in (5.10) but with \mathbf{F}_n replacing \mathcal{F}_n . Let $\xi \in (-1, 0]$ (the case $\xi \in [0, 1]$ can be dealt with analogously replacing N_- below with N_+) and let

$$r \in (0, \min\{1 - |\xi|, 1 - 5\chi\})$$

(notice that for $r > 1 - |\xi|$ the ball $B_r((\xi, \eta))$ is not contained in D). Then,

$$\xi + r \leq 1 - 5\chi \leq b_{N_-} + 1 - \chi$$

and

$$\xi - r \geq -1 \geq b_{N_-} - 1 + \chi$$

so

$$[\xi - r, \xi + r] \subset [b_{N_-} - 1 + \chi, b_{N_-} + 1 - \chi]. \quad \square$$

In the following proposition we prove the existence of two well-distributed hyperbolic fixed points.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \mathbb{N}$ and b_n be as in Lemma 5.4. There exist $N_l, N_r \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ for which*

$$b_{N_l} \in \left(-\frac{3}{4}\chi, -\frac{1}{4}\chi\right) \quad b_{N_r} \in \left(\frac{1}{4}\chi, \frac{3}{4}\chi\right). \quad (5.12)$$

Each of the maps \mathcal{F}_{N_l} and \mathcal{F}_{N_r} has a unique (hyperbolic) fixed point

$$z_n = \left(\frac{b_n}{\chi} + o(\chi), b_n + o(\chi)\right) \quad n = N_l, N_r$$

contained in D . Moreover,




FIGURE 5.2. The hyperbolic fixed points z_{N_l}, z_{N_r} together with their stable (red) and unstable (blue) manifolds.

- its unstable manifold is a fully crossing vertical curve, that is, a curve which admits a graph parametrization of the form

$$W^u(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n) = \{(f_n(\eta), \eta) : \eta \in [-1, 1]\}$$

for some differentiable function f_n . Moreover, the function f_n satisfies

$$f_n(\eta) = \frac{b_n}{\chi} + o_{C^1}(\chi),$$

- its stable manifold is a fully crossing horizontal curve, that is admits a parametrization of the form

$$W^s(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n) = \{(\xi, \tilde{f}_n(\xi)) : \xi \in [-1, 1]\}$$

with $\tilde{f}_n(\xi) = o_{C^1}(\chi)$.

The proof of this proposition is deferred to Appendix A.

5.5. Existence of a symbolic cs -blender. We call s -curve any curve $\gamma \subset D$ of the form

$$\gamma = \{(\xi, h(\xi)) : \xi \in I\} \tag{5.13}$$

for some open interval $I \subset [-1, 1]$ and a C^1 function h satisfying $|h|_{C^1} \leq 1$.

Remark 4. Notice that the definition of s -curve above is just the coordinate formulation of the definition presented in Section 3 in the context of symbolic blenders.

We now complete the proof of Proposition 3.3, i.e we prove the existence of a symbolic cs -blender, by showing the following.

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \mathbb{N}$ be the subset in Lemma 5.4. Let γ be a s -curve and for $n \in \{N_l, N_r\} \subset \mathcal{N}_\chi$ and let $W^{u,s}(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n)$ be the invariant manifolds of the hyperbolic fixed points constructed in Proposition 5.6. There exists $n \in \{N_l, N_r\}$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{N}_\chi^M$ such that*

$$(\mathcal{F}_\omega)^{-1}(\gamma) \cap W^u(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n) \neq \emptyset$$

where we have used the notation $\mathcal{F}_\omega = \mathcal{F}_{\omega_M-1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_{\omega_0}$

Proof. Let a be the number defined in (5.10) and introduce

$$b = \min_{n \in \{N_l, N_r\}} \max_{(\xi, \eta) \in D} \{|\xi - f_n(\eta)|\},$$

where f_n is the function in the parametrization of γ_n^u . From Proposition 5.6 we observe that $b \leq 3/4$. Hence, it follows from Proposition 5.5 that

$$b \leq \frac{3}{4} < \frac{9}{10} < 1 - 10\chi \leq a.$$

Given any s -curve γ , if $|I| \geq 9/5 > 2b$ then $\gamma \cap W^u(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n) \neq \emptyset$ for some $n \in \{N_l, N_r\}$ and the desired conclusion follows. If $|I| < 9/5 < 2a$ there exists $n' \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\gamma \subset \mathcal{F}_{n'}(D)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_{n'}^{-1}(\gamma) \subset D$ and it is easy to check (proceeding similarly as in the proof of Proposition 5.6) that

$$\mathcal{F}_{n'}^{-1}(\gamma) = \{(\xi, \bar{h}(\xi)) : \xi \in \bar{I}\}$$

for some open interval $\bar{I} \subset [-1, 1]$ with $|\bar{I}| \geq (1 + \frac{1}{2}\chi)|I|$ and some \bar{h} with

$$|\bar{h}'| \leq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2}\chi} |h'|.$$

Since $1 + \frac{1}{2}\chi > 1$, by repeating this process at most a finite number of steps we arrive to the first scenario and we are done. \square

We also present the following stronger version of Proposition 5.7 which will prove useful in Section 8.

Proposition 5.8. *Let γ, γ' be s -curves whose projection onto the horizontal axes overlap and let $W^u(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n)$ with $n \in \{N_l, N_r\}$ be as in Proposition 5.7. Then, there exists $n \in \{N_l, N_r\}$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{N}_\chi^M$ such that*

$$(\mathcal{F}_\omega)^{-1}(\gamma) \cap W^u(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{F}_\omega)^{-1}(\gamma') \cap W^u(z_n; \mathcal{F}_n) \neq \emptyset.$$

The proof of this result can be obtained by simple inspection of the proof of Proposition 5.7 and it is left to the reader.

5.6. Existence of a symbolic double blender. We fix any $0 < \chi \ll 1$ and let $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ be sufficiently small (depending on α, τ) so that all the results in the preceding sections hold.

The results obtained so far can be summarized as follows. Let

$$Q^{cs} = \phi(D) \quad P^{cs} = \phi(z_{N_l})$$

where $D = [-1, 1]^2$, ϕ is the linear map defined in (5.6) and z_{N_l} is the hyperbolic fixed point for the map F_{N_l} constructed in Proposition 5.6 (there is nothing special about choosing z_l instead of z_r and the argument below works in the exact same way with that choice). Then, for any s -curve $\gamma^{cs} \subset Q^{cs}$ there exists $M^{cs} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega^{cs} \in \{0, 1\}^{M^{cs}}$ such that $(T_{\omega^{cs}})^{-1}(\gamma^{cs})$ intersects $W^u(P^{cs}; F_{N_l})$. Namely, the pair (Q^{cs}, P^{cs}) is a symbolic cs -blender.

We now appeal to the almost reversibility, that is reversibility up to higher order terms, of the system under the involution

$$\psi_R : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (-\varphi, J)$$

to construct a cu -blender which is homoclinically related to the cs -blender above. Indeed, if we denote by

$$L_i : (\varphi, J) \mapsto T_i(0, 0) + DT_i(0, 0) \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} \quad i = 0, 1$$

the linear approximations of the maps T_0, T_1 at the origin we have

$$\psi_R \circ L_i \circ \psi_R = L_i^{-1}$$

Hence, the very same computation in Lemma 5.2 shows that locally (for $\{|J| \leq \varepsilon/8\}$ and $n \leq 1/4\varepsilon$)

$$\tilde{F}_n := T_1 \circ T_0^n = \psi_R \circ (T_0^n \circ T_1)^{-1} \circ \psi_R + \mathcal{E}(\varphi, J)$$

with $\mathcal{E}(\varphi, J)$ as in Lemma 5.2. Therefore, verbatim repetition of the discussion in Sections 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 shows that there exists a point

$$P^{cu} = \psi_R(P^{cs}) + O(\chi^2)$$

which is a hyperbolic fixed point for the map \tilde{F}_{N_l} and such that the pair (P^{cu}, Q^{cu}) where $Q^{cu} = \psi_R(Q^{cs})$ is a cu -blender for the IFS generated by $\{T_0, T_1\}$ (see Figure 5.3). We now show that P^{cu} and P^{cs} are homoclinically related to conclude the existence of a symbolic double blender. To alleviate the notation we denote by $W^u(P^{cs}) = W^u(P^{cs}; F_{N_l})$ and by $W^s(P^{cu}) = W^s(P^{cu}; \tilde{F}_{N_l})$.




FIGURE 5.3. The cs -blender formed by the pair (P^{cs}, Q^{cs}) is homoclinically related to the cu -blender (P^{cu}, Q^{cu}) .

Lemma 5.9. *Let P^{cu} and P^{cs} be as above. Then, we have that $W^u(P^{cs}) \pitchfork W^s(P^{cu}) \neq \emptyset$*

Proof. On the coordinate system $(\xi, \eta) \in [-1, 1]^2$ on Q^{cs} given by the linear map ϕ in (5.6), we have shown on Proposition 5.6 that the local unstable manifold $W^u(P^{cs})$ is given by a C^1 curve which is almost vertical and fully crosses the rectangle $[-1, 1]^2$. On the other hand, on the coordinate system $(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) \in [-1, 1]^2$ on Q^{cu} given by the linear map $\phi \circ \psi_R$, it follows by construction that $W^s(P^{cu})$ is given by a C^1 curve which is almost vertical and fully crosses the rectangle $[-1, 1]^2$. A straightforward computation shows that on $Q^{cu} \cap Q^{cs}$ the transition map between the two coordinate charts is given by a rotation by 90 degrees so the proof follows (see also Figure 5.3). \square

In particular, we have proven the existence of a symbolic double blender.

Proposition 5.10. *The pairs (P^{cu}, Q^{cu}) and (P^{cs}, Q^{cs}) constructed above form a symbolic double blender for the IFS generated by the maps $\{T_0, T_1\}$.*

5.7. Proof of Theorem A. In this section we complete the proof of Theorem A. Given $\kappa > 0$ (independent of ε, α) we denote by

$$\mathbb{A}_\varepsilon = \mathbb{T} \times [-\kappa\varepsilon, \kappa\varepsilon] \quad \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha = \mathbb{T} \times [-\alpha/|\log^3 \varepsilon|, \alpha/|\log^3 \varepsilon|] \quad (5.14)$$

We divide the proof in three steps:

- We first notice that if $B \subset Q^{cu}$ and $B' \subset Q^{cs}$ then, the conclusion follows from the double blender dynamics.
- Second, we show that if $B, B' \in \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon$ with $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small (independent of α, ε), there exists $n_f, n_b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T^{n_f}(B) \cap Q^{cu} \neq \emptyset$ and $T^{-n_b}(B') \cap Q^{cs} \neq \emptyset$.
- Finally, we complete the proof by showing that for any $B, B' \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ there exist $n'_f, n'_b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T^{n'_f}(B) \cap \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$ and $T^{-n'_b}(B') \cap \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$.

Step 1: B is open so it contains a u -curve γ_B . Hence since (P^{cu}, Q^{cu}) is a symbolic cu -blender we must have that $W^s(P^{cu})$ intersects γ_B transversally. On the other hand, B' is open so it contains a s -curve $\gamma_{B'}$ and the fact that (P^{cs}, Q^{cs}) is a symbolic cs -blender implies that $W^u(P^{cs})$ intersects $\gamma_{B'}$ transversally. The conclusion now follows from a direct application of the lambda-lemma (see [PdM82]) and the fact that $P^{cs} \sim P^{cu}$.

Step 2: We only deal with the existence of n_f , the existence of n_b being deduced from the same argument. Let $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon$ and recall that

$$Q^{cu} = \psi_R \circ \phi([-1, 1]^2),$$

with $\phi : [-1, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ as in Lemma 5.4 and $\psi_R : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (-\varphi, J)$. We show that, provided $\kappa > 0$ is small enough, there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_0^M(\varphi, J) \in Q^{cu}$. This is done in two steps:

- First, we notice that there exists $\ell > 0$ independent of ε such that, for any $\kappa > 0$ small and for any $J_* \in [-\kappa\varepsilon, \kappa\varepsilon]$ there exists an interval $I_{J_*} \subset \mathbb{T}$ of length $|I_{J_*}| \geq \ell$ such that

$$I_{J_*} \times [J_* - \varepsilon^2, J_* + \varepsilon^2] \subset \psi_R \circ \phi([-1/2, 1/2]^2) \subset Q^{cu}.$$

Indeed, if we denote by ℓ_u, ℓ_d the upper and lower sides of Q^{cu} , these correspond to segments of the lines $\ell_{u,d} = \{J = a\varphi + b_{u,d}\}$ with $|a| \sim \varepsilon$ and $|b_u - b_d| \sim \varepsilon$. It follows that $\ell \gtrsim |b_u - b_d|/|a| \sim 1$.

- Second, for any $C > 0$, any $n \leq C/\alpha$, and any $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon$, we have

$$T_0^n(\varphi, J) = (\varphi + [n\beta] + O(C\kappa\alpha^{-1}\varepsilon), J + O(C\kappa^3\alpha^{-1}\varepsilon^3)). \quad (5.15)$$

By Theorem 5.1 the sequence $\{[n\beta]\}_{n=1, \dots, [C/\alpha]}$ is $\frac{1}{C}$ -dense in \mathbb{T} so, for $C \geq 10\ell^{-1}$, in view of (5.15) and the fact that $|I_{J_0}| \geq \ell$ we deduce that that, any $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}_\varepsilon$,

$$\{T_0^n(\varphi, J)\}_{n=1, \dots, [C/\alpha]} \cap (I_J \times [J - \varepsilon^2, J + \varepsilon^2]) \neq \emptyset.$$

Remark 5. Up to now we have not used at all that the maps T_0, T_1 are real-analytic but just C^2 estimates. Notice that we have already obtained a proof of the Remark 1.

Step 3: We only deal with the existence of n'_f , the existence of n'_b being deduced from the same argument. We rely on the following Birkhoff normal form type result. Although this result is rather standard, we present a proof in Appendix A to keep track of some quantitative estimates. Given $\rho > 0$ we let $\mathbb{B}_\rho \subset \mathbb{C}$ the complex ball around the origin of radius ρ .

Lemma 5.11. *Let $\rho, \sigma > 0$ be as in Theorem A. Fix any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let*

$$\rho_0(\alpha, k, \rho, \sigma) = \alpha \frac{\sigma^3 \rho^2}{8k^4}.$$

Then, there exists a real-analytic, exact-symplectic change of variables $\Phi : \mathbb{T}_{\sigma/2} \times \mathbb{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\rho_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\rho, \sigma}$ of the form

$$\Phi : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + \phi_\varphi(\varphi, J), J + \phi_J(\varphi, J))$$

with $\partial_J^n \phi_(\varphi, 0) = 0$ for $0 \leq n \leq 1$ if $*$ = φ , $0 \leq n \leq 2$ if $*$ = J and such that*

$$\mathbf{T}_0 := \Phi^{-1} \circ T_0 \circ \Phi : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + h(J) + \tilde{R}_\varphi(\varphi, J), J + \tilde{R}_J(\varphi, J))$$

with $h(J) = \beta + \tau J + O_2(J)$ and $\partial_J^n R_(\varphi, 0) = 0$ for $0 \leq n \leq k-1$ if $*$ = φ and $0 \leq n \leq k$ if $*$ = J . Moreover, uniformly for $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma/2} \times \mathbb{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\rho_0}$,*

$$|\phi_\varphi(\varphi, J)| \lesssim \alpha \frac{\sigma^4 \rho}{k^6} \left(\frac{|J|}{\rho_0} \right)^2 \quad |\phi_J(\varphi, J)| \lesssim \alpha^2 \frac{\sigma^6 \rho^3}{k^{10}} \left(\frac{|J|}{\rho_0} \right)^3$$

and

$$|R_\varphi(\varphi, J)| \lesssim 2^{-k} \left(\frac{|J|}{\rho_0} \right)^{k-1} \quad |R_J(\varphi, J)| \lesssim 2^{-k} \left(\frac{|J|}{\rho_0} \right)^k.$$

We now express the map T_1 in the new coordinate system.

Lemma 5.12. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\Phi : \mathbb{T}_{\sigma/2} \times \mathbb{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\rho_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\rho, \sigma}$ be as in Lemma 5.11. Then,*

$$\mathbf{T}_1 := \Phi^{-1} \circ T_1 \circ \Phi : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + \varepsilon \mathbf{T}_{1, \varphi}(\varphi, J; \varepsilon), J + \varepsilon \mathbf{T}_{1, J}(\varphi, J; \varepsilon))$$

and $\mathbf{T}_{1, J}(\varphi, J; \varepsilon) = T_{1, J}(\varphi, J; \varepsilon) + \tilde{T}_{1, J}(\varphi, J; \varepsilon)$ with

$$\partial_J^n \tilde{T}_{1, J}(\varphi, 0; \varepsilon) = 0 \quad \text{for } n = 0, 1$$

and, uniformly, for all $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma/2} \times \mathbb{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\rho_0}$

$$|\tilde{T}_{1, J}(\varphi, J; \varepsilon)| \lesssim \alpha \frac{\sigma^4 \rho}{k^6} \left(\frac{|J|}{\rho_0} \right)^2$$

In particular, for any sufficiently large k (depending only on ρ, σ), there exists a smooth curve

$$\varphi_* : [-\rho_0, \rho_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$$

such that

$$\mathbf{T}_{1, J}(\varphi_*(J), J; 0) = 0 \quad a(J) := \partial_\varphi \mathbf{T}_{1, J}(\varphi_*(J), J; 0) \neq 0. \quad (5.16)$$

The proof of this result follows from elementary computations and is left to the reader. We now choose

$$k = k_* = \frac{3|\log \varepsilon|}{\log 2}$$

so, uniformly for $(\varphi, J) \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ (recall the definition of this (real) subset in (5.14))

$$\mathbf{T}_0 : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + \beta + O(\alpha/|\log^3 \varepsilon|), J + O(\varepsilon^3)).$$

Since $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$, there exists $C > 0$ (independent of α and ε) such that, if we let $\tilde{C}(\alpha, \varepsilon) = C \frac{\log \varepsilon}{\alpha}$ the set $\{[n\beta]\}_{n \leq \tilde{C}(\alpha, \varepsilon)}$ is $1/|\log \varepsilon|$ -dense in \mathbb{T} . On the other hand, for any $(\varphi, J) \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ and $n \leq \tilde{C}(\alpha, \varepsilon)$

$$T_0^n : \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \varphi + [n\beta] + O(n\alpha/\log^2 \varepsilon) \\ J + O(n\varepsilon^3) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi + [n\beta] + O(1/\log^2 \varepsilon) \\ J + O(\varepsilon^2 \log \varepsilon) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.17)$$

where we have used that $\varepsilon \lesssim \alpha$. Suppose now that $a(J) > 0$ (the other case being analogous). We choose $n_\pm(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\varphi + [n_+\beta] - \varphi_*(J) \in (1/\log \varepsilon, 4/\log \varepsilon) \quad \varphi + [n_-\beta] - \varphi_*(J) \in (-4/\log \varepsilon, -1/\log \varepsilon).$$

Then, after writing

$$\pi_J T_1(\varphi, J) = \varepsilon a(J)(\varphi - \varphi_*(J)) + O(\varepsilon |\varphi - \varphi_*(J)|^2, \varepsilon^2),$$

it follows from (5.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_+ J &:= \pi_J(T_1 \circ T_0^{n_+})(\varphi, J) - J \in \left(2a(J) \frac{\varepsilon}{\log \varepsilon}, 3a(J) \frac{\varepsilon}{\log \varepsilon} \right) \\ \Delta_- J &:= \pi_J(T_1 \circ T_0^{n_-})(\varphi, J) - J \in \left(-3a(J) \frac{\varepsilon}{\log \varepsilon}, -2a(J) \frac{\varepsilon}{\log \varepsilon} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If $J + \Delta_\pm J \in [-\kappa\varepsilon, \kappa\varepsilon]$ (for κ , independent of ε, α , as in Step 2) we are done. If not, we repeat the argument a finite number of times. The proof of Theorem A is completed.

Remark 6. For the applications of these ideas to the skew-product setting in Section 6 it will be important to bear in mind that, the construction in Steps 2 and 3 actually shows that, for a fixed value of α, ε , there exists a uniform M such that for any $B, B' \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\alpha$ there exist $n'_f, n'_b \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ such that $T^{n'_f}(B) \cap Q^{cu} \neq \emptyset$ and $T^{-n'_b}(B') \cap Q^{cs} \neq \emptyset$.

6. ALMOST TRANSITIVITY OF CYLINDER SKEW-PRODUCTS: PROOF OF THEOREM B

In this section we present the proof of Theorem B. The proof shares many ideas with the proof of Theorem A and it is divided in several steps:

- Section 6.1 contains two technical lemmas: Lemma 6.2 (normal form lemma) and Lemma 6.1 (comparison of center dynamics along different base sequences).
- In Sections 6.2 we exploit that for each $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ the skew-product fiber dynamics $F(\omega, z)$ is a small perturbation of the map T_{ω_0} to translate the results in Sections 5.1-5.5 (blender-like dynamics) to the skew-product setting.
- Finally, in Section 6.3 we complete the proof of Theorem B.

Notation.

- $(\omega, z) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{A}$ are coordinates in the lamination.
- $\sigma : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ stands for the full shift and, for a given $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $F_\omega : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ is the corresponding map on the fiber.
- We borrow the notation from Sections 3 and 5, for instance the definition of s -curves. We also recall the notation \mathcal{F}_N for the maps constructed in (5.4) and $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ for the subset in Proposition 5.5.
- We denote by

$$F_\omega^n(z) = \underbrace{F_{\sigma^{n-1}(\omega)} \circ \dots \circ F_\omega}_{n}(z)$$

where $F_\omega(z)$ is shorthand notation for $F(\omega, z)$ as in Theorem B. It will be important to keep in mind the expression

$$(F_{\sigma^{-n}(\omega)}^n)^{-1}(z) = \underbrace{F_{\sigma^{-n}(\omega)}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ F_{\sigma^{-1}(\omega)}^{-1}}_n(z)$$

- A number of quantifiers appear in this section:
 - Having fixed any $0 < \chi \ll 1$ we let $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ be sufficiently small (depending on α, τ) so that all the results from Section 5 hold.

– Then, we let the coupling constant δ in Theorem B be arbitrarily small.

6.1. Technical lemmas. We would like to be able to compare maps associated to different sequences $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. To do so, we have the following technical lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\delta > 0$ be small enough. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega, \omega' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\omega_k = \omega'_k$ for all $-n \leq k \leq n$. Then,*

$$|F_\omega^n - F_{\omega'}^n|_{C^0} \lesssim \delta \quad |DF_\omega^n - DF_{\omega'}^n|_{C^0} \lesssim \max\{|DT_0|, |DT_1|\}\delta$$

and

$$|(F_{\sigma^{-n}(\omega)}^n)^{-1} - (F_{\sigma^{-n}(\omega')}^n)^{-1}|_{C^0} \lesssim \delta \quad |(DF_{\sigma^{-n}(\omega)}^n)^{-1} - (DF_{\sigma^{-n}(\omega')}^n)^{-1}|_{C^0} \lesssim \max\{|DT_0|^{-1}, |DT_1|^{-1}\}\delta$$

Proof. The proof follows by induction. We only prove the case $n = 2$ from which the reader can easily extrapolate the argument for the general case. We write

$$F_\omega^2(z) - F_{\omega'}^2(z) = \underbrace{F_{\sigma(\omega)}(F_\omega(z)) - F_{\sigma(\omega')}(F_\omega(z))}_{\mathcal{E}_1} + \underbrace{F_{\sigma(\omega')}(F_\omega(z)) - F_{\sigma(\omega')}(F_{\omega'}(z))}_{\mathcal{E}_2}$$

On one hand,

$$(\sigma(\omega))_k = (\sigma(\omega'))_k \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1$$

so it follows from the assumption (1.9) that $|\mathcal{E}_1|_{C^0} \leq \delta$. On the other hand, (1.9) implies as well that $|F_\omega - F_{\omega'}|_{C^0} \leq \delta^2$. Hence, by the mean value theorem $|\mathcal{E}_2|_{C^0} \leq \max\{|DT_0|, |DT_1|\}\delta^2$. We conclude that

$$|F_\omega^2(z) - F_{\omega'}^2(z)|_{C^0} \leq \delta(1 + \max\{|DT_0|, |DT_1|\})\delta \lesssim \delta.$$

The estimates for the differential, the inverse, and the differential of the inverse, are obtained in a similar fashion. \square

We now obtain normal forms for compositions $F_\omega^n(z)$ associated to sequences $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ which reproduce the weak transversality-torsion mechanism. Since for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, $F_\omega(z) = T_{\omega_0} + O_{C^1}(\delta)$, verbatim repetition of the arguments in Section 5 shows the following.

Lemma 6.2. *Fix any $0 < \chi \ll 1$. Then, there exists $\varepsilon_0(\chi, \tau, \alpha)$ such that if $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ there exists a local coordinate system (the one given in Lemma 5.4)*

$$\phi : [-2, 2]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$$

and a subset $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \mathbb{N}$ for which the following holds. For any $N \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ and any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with

$$\omega_0 = 0, \quad \omega_1 = \dots = \omega_{N-1} = 1$$

the map

$$\mathcal{F}_{\omega, N} := \phi^{-1} \circ F_\omega^N \circ \phi$$

satisfies that, uniformly for $(\xi, \eta) \in [-2, 2]^2$, provided δ is small enough,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\omega, N} : \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} b_N \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \chi & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \chi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} + O_{C^1}(\chi^2) \quad (6.1)$$

for some constant $b_N \in [-1, 1]$. Moreover, the sequence $\{b_N\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ is $\frac{1}{10}\chi$ -dense in $[-10\chi, 10\chi]$.

6.2. Local blender dynamics. Recall the definition of the maps $\{\mathcal{F}_N\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ in Lemma 5.4.

cs-blender dynamics: In Section 5 we have shown that the iterated function system generated by $\{\mathcal{F}_N\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ (these maps were defined in Section 5.4) exhibits a symbolic cs-blender (recall the Definition 3.1). To do so,

- We have proved that (recall that $B_{r, \xi}(z)$ is the horizontal segment of radius r and centered at z)

$$a = \min\{r \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \text{there exists } B_{r, \xi}(z) \subset D \text{ such that } B_{r, \xi}(z) \not\subset \mathcal{F}_n(D) \text{ for any } n \in \mathcal{N}\}$$

satisfies

$$a \geq 1 - 10\chi > 9/10.$$

- We have established the existence of $\{N_l, N_r\} \in \mathcal{N}$ and, for $\star = l, r$, a hyperbolic fixed point z_{N_\star} of the map \mathcal{F}_{N_\star} with parametrizations of their local unstable manifolds of the form $W_{loc}^u(z_{N_\star}; \mathcal{F}_{N_\star}) = \{(f_{N_\star}(\eta), \eta), \eta \in [-1, 1]\}$. Moreover, we have proved that

$$b := \min_{n \in \{N_l, N_r\}} \max_{(\xi, \eta) \in [-1, 1]^2} |\xi - f_n(\eta)| < 3/4.$$

Exploiting the fact that (uniformly in χ, ε)

$$a > 9/10 > 3/4 > b,$$

we have proved that the backwards orbit (with respect to the iterated function system generated by $\{\mathcal{F}_N\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$) of any s -curve $\gamma \in [-1, 1]^2$ intersects $W_{loc}^u(z_{N_\star}; \mathcal{F}_{N_\star})$ for some $\star = l, r$. We now show how to adapt this construction to show the following.

Proposition 6.3. *Fix any $0 < \chi \ll 1$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small. There exists $\delta_0(\chi, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ the following holds. Let $\gamma \subset [-1, 1]^2$ be a s -curve (see (5.13)). Then, there exist $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{N_1, \dots, N_M\} \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ and $\omega' \in \{0, 1\}^{\sum_{i=1}^M N_i}$ such that, for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z}$ with*

$$\omega_k = \omega'_k \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq k \leq \sum_{i=1}^M N_i$$

the curve

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-\sum_{i=1}^M N_i}(\omega), N_M}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N_1 - N_2}(\omega), N_2}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N_1}(\omega), N_1}^{-1}(\gamma)$$

is a fully-crossing s -curve, i.e its projection onto the first component ξ covers the interval $[-1, 1]$.

Remark 7. It is worth pointing out that, given a s -curve γ , the sequence $\{N_1, \dots, N_M\} \in \mathcal{N}_\chi$ obtained as an output of Proposition 6.3 is, in general, different from the sequence obtained as an output of Proposition 5.7.

Proof. The proof of this result can be obtained using the very same inductive construction in the proof of Proposition 5.7. It will be important to keep in mind that, having fixed χ, ε , the subset $\mathcal{N}_\chi \subset \mathbb{N}$ in Proposition 5.5 is bounded (it is comprised by finitely many elements). Given a sequence $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z}$ and a s -curve γ :

Scenario 1: if $|I| \geq 9/5 > 2b$, we have that $\gamma \cap W_{loc}^u(z_{N_\star}; \mathcal{F}_{N_\star}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\star = l, r$. Moreover, since $9/5 > 3/2 > 2b$, we can suppose that there is a finite piece (of length bounded below) of γ to both sides of $W_{loc}^u(z_{N_\star}; \mathcal{F}_{N_\star})$. Suppose $\star = l$ (the other case being analogous). We can then choose $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\omega = (\dots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0; \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N_l}, 1, \omega_{N_l+1}, \dots).$$

Notice that the choice of N_l depends exclusively on γ . For any ω as above, it follows from the assumptions in Theorem B and the definition of \mathcal{F}_N in Lemma 5.4 that, for $\delta \geq 0$ small enough (since $N_l \in \mathcal{N}$ and \mathcal{N} is bounded)

$$|\mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N_l}(\omega), N_l}^{-1} - \mathcal{F}_{N_l}^{-1}|_{C^1} \lesssim \delta.$$

In particular, it is easy to observe that $\tilde{\gamma} = \mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N_l}(\omega), N_l}^{-1}(\gamma)$ is again a s -curve, $\tilde{\gamma} \cap W_{loc}^u(z_{N_\star}; \mathcal{F}_{N_\star}) \neq \emptyset$, and the associated $\tilde{I} \subset [-1, 1]$ in its parametrization satisfies $|\tilde{I}| \geq (1 + \chi - O(\chi^2, \delta))|I|$. We can then repeat the above construction with $\sigma^{-N_l}(\omega)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}$. After a finite number of iterations the corresponding s -curve must be fully crossing.

Scenario 2: If $|I| < 9/5 < 2a$ then there exists $N_\star \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\gamma \subset \mathcal{F}_{N_\star}([-1, 1]^2)$. We can then choose $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\omega = (\dots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0; \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N_\star}, 1, \omega_{N_\star+1}, \dots) \quad (6.2)$$

Again, the choice of N_\star depends exclusively on γ . For any ω as above we have that

$$|\mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N_\star}(\omega), N_\star}^{-1} - \mathcal{F}_{N_\star}^{-1}|_{C^1} \lesssim \delta.$$

In particular, $\tilde{\gamma} = \mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N_\star}(\omega), N_\star}^{-1}(\gamma)$ is again a s -curve and the corresponding $\tilde{I} \subset [-1, 1]$ in its parametrization satisfies that $|\tilde{I}| \geq (1 + \chi - O(\chi^2, \delta))|I|$. If $|\tilde{I}| \geq 9/5$ then we arrive to the first scenario with $\sigma^{-N_\star-1}(\omega)$

and $\tilde{\gamma}$. If $|\tilde{I}| < 9/5$ then we repeat the construction of the second scenario with $\sigma^{-N*}(\omega)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}$. The key observation is that, even if $\tilde{\gamma}$ depends on ω , for any ω as in (6.2) we have that the corresponding $\tilde{\gamma}$ is contained in a $O(\delta)$ -neighborhood of $\mathcal{F}_{N*}^{-1}(\gamma)$. Hence there exists $N_{**} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that for all ω as in (6.2) $\tilde{\gamma} \subset \mathcal{F}_{N_{**}}([-1, 1]^2)$. After a finite number of iterations we must arrive to the first scenario. \square

Double blender dynamics: Let

$$Q^{cs} := \phi([-2, 2]^2) \subset \mathbb{A},$$

where ϕ is as in Lemma 6.2. Proposition 6.3 can be restated as follows: Given any s -curve $\gamma \subset Q^{cs}$ there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega' = (\omega'_1, \dots, \omega'_N) \in \mathbb{N}^M$ such that for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\omega_k = \omega'_k$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ the curve

$$\tilde{\gamma} = F_{\sigma^{-M}(\omega)}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ F_{\sigma^{-1}(\omega)}^{-1}(\gamma_s)$$

is a fully crossing s -curve (i.e. in local coordinates $(\xi, \eta) \in [-1, 1]^2$ the projection of $\tilde{\gamma}$ onto the first component covers the interval $[-1, 1]$). Let now

$$Q^{cu} := \psi_R \circ \phi([-2, 2]^2) \subset \mathbb{A}$$

with $\psi_R : (\varphi, J) = (-\varphi, J)$ and ϕ as in Lemma 6.2. Exploiting the almost reversibility of the maps T_0, T_1 under ψ_R , the argument in Section 5.6 plus direct repetition of the proof of Proposition 6.3 shows the following. Given any u -curve $\gamma \subset Q^{cu}$ there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega' = (\omega'_{-M+1}, \dots, \omega'_0) \in \{0, 1\}^M$ such that for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\omega_k = \omega'_k$ for all $k \in \{-M+1, 0\}$ the curve

$$\tilde{\gamma} = F_{\sigma^{M-2}(\omega)} \circ \dots \circ F_{\sigma(\omega)} \circ F_{\omega}(\gamma_u)$$

is a fully crossing u -curve. It is then straightforward to prove the following.

Proposition 6.4. *Fix any $0 < \chi \ll 1$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small. There exists $\delta_0(\chi, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ the following holds. Let $\gamma_s \subset Q^{cs}$ be a s -curve and let $\gamma_u \subset Q^{cu}$ be a u -curve. Then, there exists $M_f, M_b \in \mathbb{N}$ and*

$$\omega^f = (\omega_{-M_f+1}^f, \dots, \omega_0^f) \in \{0, 1\}^{M_f} \quad \omega^b = (\omega_{-M_f-M_b+1}^b, \dots, \omega_{-M_f}^b) \in \{0, 1\}^{M_b}$$

such that for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with

$$\omega_k = \omega_k^f \quad \text{for all } k \in \{-M_f+1, \dots, 0\} \quad \omega_k = \omega_k^b \quad \text{for all } k \in \{-M_f-M_b+1, \dots, -M_f\}$$

we have

$$F_{\sigma^{M_f-1}(\omega)} \circ \dots \circ F_{\omega}(\gamma_u) \pitchfork F_{\sigma^{M_f}(\omega)}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ F_{\sigma^{M_f+M_b-1}(\omega)}^{-1}(\gamma_s) \neq \emptyset.$$

In particular,

$$F_{\sigma^{M_f+M_b-1}(\omega)} \circ \dots \circ F_{\omega}(\gamma_s) \pitchfork \gamma_u \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. Arguing as above, given $\gamma_s \subset Q^{cs}$ there exists $M_b \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega^b \in \{0, 1\}^{M_b}$ such that, for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\omega_k = \omega_k^b$ for all $k \in \{1, M_b\}$ the curve

$$\tilde{\gamma}_s = F_{\sigma^{-M_b}(\omega)}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ F_{\sigma^{-1}(\omega)}^{-1}(\gamma_s)$$

is a fully crossing s -curve. Analogously, for any u -curve $\gamma_u \subset Q^{cu}$ there exists $M_f \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega^f \in \{0, 1\}^{M_f}$ such that for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\omega_k = \omega_k^f$ for all $k \in \{-M_f+1, \dots, 0\}$ the curve

$$\tilde{\gamma}_u = F_{\sigma^{M_f-1}(\omega)} \circ \dots \circ F_{\sigma(\omega)} \circ F_{\omega}(\gamma_u)$$

is a fully crossing u -curve. Hence, we let $M = M_f + M_b$ and let $\omega' \in \{0, 1\}^M$ be given by

$$\omega' = (\underbrace{\omega'_{-M_f-M_b+1}, \dots, \omega'_{-M_f}}_{\omega_f}, \underbrace{\omega'_{-M_f+1}, \dots, \omega'_0}_{\omega_b}).$$

By construction, for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\omega_k = \omega'_k$ for $k \in \{-M+1, \dots, 0\}$ we have

$$F_{\sigma^{M_f-1}(\omega)} \circ \dots \circ F_{\omega}(\gamma_u) \pitchfork F_{\sigma^{M_f}(\omega)}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ F_{\sigma^{M_f+M_b-1}(\omega)}^{-1}(\gamma_s) \neq \emptyset.$$

\square

6.3. Proof of Theorem B. We finally complete the proof of Theorem B. Fix any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ be sufficiently small so that, for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we have that

$$F_{\omega}^N(\mathbb{T} \times [-\alpha/|2 \log^3 \varepsilon|, \alpha/|2 \log^3 \varepsilon|]) \subset \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\alpha} \quad (F_{\sigma^{-N}(\omega)}^N)^{-1}(\mathbb{T} \times [-\alpha/|2 \log^3 \varepsilon|, \alpha/|2 \log^3 \varepsilon|]) \subset \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\alpha}$$

with \mathbb{A}_{α} as in (5.14). Given $\omega, \omega' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $B, B' \in \mathbb{T} \times [-\alpha/|2 \log^3 \varepsilon|, \alpha/|2 \log^3 \varepsilon|]$ we let

$$\tilde{B}' = F_{\omega'}^N(B') \quad \tilde{B} = (F_{\sigma^{-N}(\omega)}^N)^{-1}(B).$$

Observe that, by direct application of Lemma 6.1, for any $\tilde{\omega}$ with $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and for any $\tilde{\omega}'$ with $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega'_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ we have that

$$\text{dist}(F_{\tilde{\omega}'}^N(B'), \tilde{B}') \lesssim \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}((F_{\sigma^{-N}(\tilde{\omega})}^N)^{-1}(B), \tilde{B}) \lesssim \delta.$$

In Section 5.7 we have shown that there exist M_{f_1} and $\omega^{f_1} \in \{0, 1\}^{M_{f_1}}$ such that $T_{\omega^{f_1}}(B') \cap Q^{cu} \neq \emptyset$ and also M_{b_1} and $\omega^{b_1} \in \{0, 1\}^{M_{b_1}}$ such that $T_{\omega^{b_1}}^{-1}(B) \cap Q^{cs} \neq \emptyset$. Since M_{b_1} and M_{f_1} are uniformly bounded for any pair $B, B' \in \mathbb{A}_{\alpha}$ (see Remark 6), provided δ is chosen sufficiently small, for any $\tilde{\omega}' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega'_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^{f_1}$ for $k \in \{-M_{f_1} - N, \dots, -N - 1\}$ satisfies that

$$F_{\tilde{\omega}'}^{N+M_{f_1}}(B') \cap Q^{cu} \neq \emptyset.$$

In particular, $F_{\tilde{\omega}'}^{N+M_{f_1}}(B')$ contains a u-curve $\gamma_u(\tilde{\omega}')$. Analogously, for any $\tilde{\omega}$ with $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k^{b_1}$ for $k \in \{N + 1, \dots, N + M_{b_1}\}$ satisfies that

$$(F_{\sigma^{-N-M_{b_1}}(\tilde{\omega})}^{N+M_{b_1}})^{-1}(B) \cap Q^{cu} \neq \emptyset$$

so, in particular, $(F_{\sigma^{-N-M_{b_1}}(\tilde{\omega})}^{N+M_{b_1}})^{-1}(B)$ contains a s-curve $\gamma_s(\tilde{\omega})$. Moreover, for any $\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\omega}'$ as above all $\gamma_u(\tilde{\omega}')$ fit into a ball of radius $O(\delta)$ and all $\gamma_s(\tilde{\omega})$ fit into a ball of radius $O(\delta)$. Verbatim repetition of the iterative construction in Proposition 6.3 shows that we can find $M_{f_2} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega^{f_2} \in \{0, 1\}^{M_{f_2}}$ such that for any $\tilde{\omega}' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega'_k$ for $|k| \leq N$, $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^{f_1}$ for $k \in \{-M_{f_1} - N, \dots, -N - 1\}$ and $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^{f_2}$ for $k \in \{-M_{f_2} - M_{f_1} - N, \dots, -M_{f_2} - N - 1\}$ satisfies that

$$\hat{\gamma}_u(\tilde{\omega}') := F_{\sigma^{N+M_{f_1}}(\tilde{\omega}')}^{M_{f_2}}(\gamma_u(\tilde{\omega}'))$$

is a fully-crossing u-curve. Analogously, we find $M_{b_2} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega^{b_2} \in \{0, 1\}^{M_{b_2}}$ such that for any $\tilde{\omega}' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega'_k$ for $|k| \leq N$, $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^{b_1}$ for $k \in \{-N + 1, \dots, N + M_{b_1}\}$ and $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^{b_2}$ for $k \in \{M_{b_1} + 1, \dots, M_{b_1} + M_{b_2}\}$ satisfies that

$$\hat{\gamma}_s(\tilde{\omega}) := (F_{\sigma^{-N-M_{b_1}-M_{b_2}}(\tilde{\omega}')}^{M_{b_2}})^{-1}(\gamma_s(\tilde{\omega}'))$$

is a fully-crossing s-curve. The proof of Theorem B is completed by choosing any $\bar{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of the form

$$\bar{\omega} = (\dots, \underbrace{\tilde{\omega}'_{-N}, \dots, \tilde{\omega}'_N}_{2N+1}, \omega^{b_1}, \omega^{b_2}, \omega^{f_2}, \omega^{f_1}, \underbrace{\tilde{\omega}_{-N}, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_N}_{2N+1}, \dots).$$

7. THE 3-BODY PROBLEM: A (LOCAL) PARTIALLY HYPERBOLIC SETTING

In this section we recall the (local) framework introduced in [GMPS22]. We do not claim to be original in the results presented in this section as these are just convenient reformulations of those obtained in [GMPS22]. The section is organized as follows:

- In Section 7.1 we perform the symplectic reductions which recast the Hamiltonian (1.10) as a 3 degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian.
- In Section 7.2 we introduce McGehee's partial compactification of the phase space which allows us to study (a particular kind of) unbounded motions. The key point of this compactification is that the extended flow “at infinity” is non-trivial.
- In Section 7.3 we introduce parameterizations of the invariant manifold \mathcal{E}_{∞} in (1.15) as well as its invariant manifolds. Moreover, we recall a result from [GMPS22] which describes two homoclinic manifolds $\Gamma_{0,1}$ contained in the transverse intersection of $W^{u,s}(\mathcal{E}_{\infty})$.

- In Section 7.4 we describe the scattering maps associated to the aforementioned homoclinic manifolds. In particular, we show that on a suitably chosen annular region, they satisfy assumptions **B0** and **B1** in Theorem A and, moreover, the transversality can be assumed to be arbitrarily small.
- Finally, in Section 7.5 we describe the return map to a transverse section which accumulates on both channels $\Gamma_{0,1}$. We observe that this map displays a strongly contracting and a strongly expanding direction while the dynamics in the center coordinates (the directions tangent to \mathcal{E}_∞) are governed by the corresponding scattering map.

Notation. In this section the following notation will be used:

- General subsets:
 - $\mathbb{D} = \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \bar{\xi} = \eta\}$ (notice that \mathbb{D} is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{C}).
 - $\mathbb{D}(a) = \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |\xi| < a, \bar{\xi} = \eta\}$ (notice that for any $a > 0$, $\mathbb{D}(a)$ is diffeomorphic to the unit disk in \mathbb{C})
 - $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}$,
 - $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T} \times \{|J| \leq 1\}$.
- Coordinate systems:
 - $(\lambda, \xi, \eta, x, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D} \times (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R}$ are local coordinates on a negative energy level set of the partially compactified phase space.
 - Σ^{out} and Σ^{in} are two sections transverse to $W_{loc}^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ and $W_{loc}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ respectively.
 - $\Gamma_i \subset W^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \pitchfork W^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ for $i = 0, 1$ are two homoclinic channels.
 - Associated to Γ_i we define two scattering maps $S_i : \mathcal{E}_\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_\infty$, $i = 0, 1$. On a certain annulus shaped subset of \mathcal{E}_∞ there exists a local coordinate system $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}$ such that the corresponding expressions of the scattering maps, denoted by \mathbf{S}_i , are as the maps in Theorem A.
 - $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset \Sigma^{out}$ is a $O(\delta)$ -neighbourhood of $\Gamma_i \cap \Sigma^{out}$ and (p, τ, φ, J) are local coordinates on U^i for which $W_{loc}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \cap \Sigma^{out}$ (resp. $W_{loc}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \cap \Sigma^{out}$) corresponds to $\{\tau = 0\}$ (resp. $\{p = 0\}$).
- Dynamics:
 - Λ_v and Λ_h are respectively partially vertical and partially horizontal subsets of \mathcal{Q}_δ^i .
 - $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$ is a map from $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta^j$.

7.1. A good coordinate system. The first step is to introduce a coordinate system which realizes the symplectic reduction outlined in Section 1.2. We do so by introducing a local coordinate system on a suitable subset $M_{PE}(\Theta_0) \subset M(\Theta_0)$ on which the third body is located very far from the two inner bodies. The notation PE refers to parabolic-elliptic and is explained below.

Lemma 7.1. *Fix any $m_0, m_1, m_2 > 0$, any $|\Theta_0| > 0$ and consider the six-dimensional manifold*

$$M(\Theta_0) = \{(q, p) \in T^*(\mathbb{R}^6 \setminus \Delta) : \mathbf{p}(p) = 0, \Theta(q, p) = \Theta_0\} / SE(2), \quad (7.1)$$

where \mathbf{p} and Θ are the total linear and angular momentum introduced in Section 1.2. Choose any pair $0 < L_0 < L_1$ and let R_0 be large enough. Denote by $I_L = (L_0, L_1)$ and $I_R = (R_0, \infty)$. There exists a holomorphic, local coordinate system

$$\Phi_{\Theta_0} : \{(\lambda, L, \xi, \eta, r, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times I_L \times \mathbb{D} \times I_R \times \mathbb{R} : (\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{D}(\sqrt{L})\} \rightarrow M_{PE}(\Theta_0) \subset M(\Theta_0) \quad (7.2)$$

on which the projection of the flow of (1.10) to $M(\Theta_0)$ is given by the Hamiltonian vector field generated by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\Theta_0} = H_{\text{ell}}(L) + H_{\text{par}}(r, y, \Theta_0 - \Gamma(L, \xi, \eta)) + V(\lambda, L, \xi, \eta, r) \quad \omega = dL \wedge d\lambda + id\xi \wedge d\eta + dy \wedge dr$$

with

- $H_{\text{ell}}(L) = -\frac{\nu}{2L^2}$ for some $\nu > 0$ which only depends on m_0, m_1, m_2 .
- $H_{\text{par}}(r, y, G) = \frac{y^2}{2} + \frac{G^2}{2r^2} - \frac{1}{r}$ and $\Gamma(L, \xi, \eta) = L - \xi\eta$
- For $r \gg L^{4/3}$ we have $V = O(L^4/r^3)$.

The proof of this lemma is achieved by a number of symplectic transformations and is deferred to the Appendix B.

Remark 8. From now on we fix any $m_0, m_1, m_2 > 0$ and drop these symbols from the notation.

The Parabolic-Elliptic scenario. Observe that for $r \gg L^{4/3}$ the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_{Θ_0} in Lemma 7.1 is given by the sum of two-uncoupled integrable Hamiltonians H_{ell} and H_{par} plus a small perturbation. To explain the origin of the notation H_{ell} and H_{par} it is convenient to recall that the geometric objects involved in Theorem D (namely, the manifold \mathcal{E}_∞ which was defined in (1.15)) are associated to trajectories along which:

- The distance between the two inner bodies remains bounded, i.e. $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |q_1(t) - q_0(t)| < \infty$,
- The third body escapes (resp. comes from the past) with asymptotic zero velocity, i.e. if we denote by Q_2 the relative vector going from the center of mass of the inner system to q_2

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |Q_2(t)| = \infty \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |\dot{Q}_2(t)| = 0 \text{ (resp. } \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} |\dot{Q}_2(t)| = 0).$$

For the two-body problem: a) bounded motions happen exclusively for negative energy levels in which the bodies revolve around each other in Keplerian ellipses; b) unbounded solutions with zero asymptotic velocities happen only on the zero-energy level, for which the relative position between the bodies describes a parabola. Roughly speaking,

- (*Inner elliptic motion*): H_{ell} is the expression of the 2-body problem Hamiltonian in the so-called Poincaré coordinates (see [Fej13]). The coordinates (λ, L, ξ, η) describe the evolution of the relative vector $q_1 - q_0$ by specifying an instantaneous ellipse (parametrized by its semimajor axis (determined by L) and the pair (ξ, η) , which can be related to the eccentricity and angle of the pericenter, see Appendix (B)) and the position of this vector inside the ellipse, which is measured by the angle λ . The flow generated by the (integrable) Hamiltonian H_{ell} reduces to a linear (resonant) translation

$$\phi_{H_{\text{ell}}}^t : (\lambda, L, \xi, \eta) \mapsto (\lambda + (\nu/L^3)t, L, \xi, \eta). \quad (7.3)$$

In particular, the elliptic elements (L, ξ, η) remain constant for this flow.

- (*Outer parabolic motion*): $H_{\text{par}}(r, y)$ is the expression of the Hamiltonian for the two-body problem in polar coordinates (after reduction by rotations). The coordinates (r, y) describe the evolution of the distance r from q_2 to the center of mass of the inner system. We will be interested in motions which happen close to the level set $H_{\text{par}} = 0$ for which the outer body describes (approximately) a parabola around the inner system.

In our constructions below we will show that the coupling term V although very weak, can alter slightly the trajectory of the parabolic body and make it come back from the parabolic infinity, obtaining motions in which the third body repeatedly approaches the inner bodies and makes far away excursions.

7.2. McGehee's partial compactification. Let $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and let Φ_Θ be as in (7.2). We now introduce McGehee's partial compactification of the six-dimensional reduced phase space $M(\Theta)$ in (7.1). The tuple $(\lambda, L, \xi, \eta, r, y)$ introduced in Lemma 7.1 forms a global coordinate system on $M(\Theta)$. Given any $H_0 < 0$ we also define the 5-dimensional energy level

$$\mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta) = M(\Theta) \cap \{H = H_0\}.$$

Aimed at studying motions for which the trajectory of the third body is unbounded (i.e. r is unbounded) we introduce the change of variables

$$r = \frac{2}{x^2}$$

and denote it by ϕ_{MG} (after [McG73]). In the new coordinate system we obtain a Hamiltonian

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta := \mathcal{H}_\Theta \circ \phi_{\text{MG}}$$

which extends continuously the flow of (1.10) to the partially compactified manifold

$$\overline{M}(\Theta) = M(\Theta) \sqcup M_\infty(\Theta), \quad M_\infty(\Theta) = \Phi_\Theta \circ \phi_{\text{MG}}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{D} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}) \quad (7.4)$$

equipped with global coordinates $(\lambda, L, \xi, \eta, x, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{D} \times (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R}$ and with the (singular) symplectic form

$$\omega = dL \wedge d\lambda + id\xi \wedge d\eta + \frac{4}{x^3} dy \wedge dx \quad (7.5)$$

Remark 9. From now on we will work directly in McGehee's coordinates. Moreover, we identify any object defined in terms of these coordinates with its embedding on the partially compactified space $M(\Theta_0)$ under the coordinate chart

$$\Phi_\Theta \circ \phi_{\text{MG}} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{D} \times (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{M}(\Theta)$$

constructed above.

We observe that in McGehee's coordinates the Hamiltonian $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta$ reads

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta = H_{\text{ell}}(L) + \frac{y^2}{2} - \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{x^4}{8}(\Theta - \Gamma(L, \xi, \eta))^2 + V(\lambda, L, \xi, \eta, 2/x^2) \quad (7.6)$$

with H_{ell} , Γ and V as in Lemma 7.1. Finally, we fix any value $H_0 < 0$ and define the partially compactified energy level

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta) = \overline{M}(\Theta) \cap \{H = H_0\}. \quad (7.7)$$

Since, for fixed $L < \infty$ the function $r \mapsto V(\cdot, r)$ decays as $O(r^{-3})$ when $r \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce that $V(\cdot, 2/x^2) = O(x^6)$ as $x \rightarrow 0$. In particular, on $\mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta)$ it is possible to recover L from H_0, Θ and the remaining coordinates. Hence, for $(x, y) \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ a small neighborhood of the origin, we may use $(\lambda, \xi, \eta, x, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D} \times U$ as local coordinate system on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0)$. In fact, one can make a Poincaré-Cartan reduction so that λ becomes time (and one gets rid of the conjugate variable). To this end, we define the Hamiltonian, defined implicitly by

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta(\lambda, \mathcal{K}_{\Theta, H_0}(\xi, \eta, x, y, \lambda), \xi, \eta, x, y) = H_0.$$

Then, the non-autonomous Hamiltonian¹¹ $\mathcal{K}_{\Theta, H_0}$ and the symplectic form

$$\tilde{\omega} = i d\xi \wedge d\eta + \frac{4}{x^3} dy \wedge dx$$

generate the flow defined by the system of differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= -\frac{x^3}{4} \partial_y \mathcal{K}_{\Theta, H_0} = -\left(\frac{\nu}{2|H_0|}\right)^{-1/3} \frac{x^3}{4} y(1 + O_2(x)) & \dot{\xi} &= i \partial_\eta \mathcal{K}_{\Theta, H_0} = O_4(x) & \dot{\lambda} &= 1 \\ \dot{y} &= \frac{x^3}{4} \partial_x \mathcal{K}_{\Theta, H_0} = \left(\frac{\nu}{2|H_0|}\right)^{-1/3} \frac{x^3}{4} (x + O_2(x)) & \dot{\eta} &= -i \partial_\xi \mathcal{K}_{\Theta, H_0} = O_4(x) \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

7.3. A normally-parabolic manifold at infinity. It follows easily from (7.8) that the 3-dimensional manifold

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0) = \left\{ (\xi, \eta, 0, 0, \lambda) : \lambda \in \mathbb{T}, (\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{D}(\sqrt{L}), L_0 = \sqrt{\nu/2H_0} \right\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}(H_0, \Theta_0) \quad (7.9)$$

is invariant for the flow defined by $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta$. Moreover, the flow on \mathcal{E}_∞ is given by (c.f. (7.3))

$$\phi_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\Theta}^t|_{\mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0)} : (\xi, \eta, \lambda) \mapsto (\xi, \eta, \lambda + t). \quad (7.10)$$

Remark 10. The manifold \mathcal{E}_∞ consists of configurations in which the third body is “at infinity” while the inner bodies revolve around each other on a Keplerian ellipse which is described by its semimajor axis (entirely determined by L_0) and the value of the pair $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{D}(\sqrt{L_0})$ which define, implicitly, the corresponding eccentricity $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$ and angle of the pericenter g (see Appendix B).

In defining the coordinate system in Lemma 7.1 we have implicitly chosen an orientation for the dynamics inside the ellipses. By considering the opposite choice, proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 7.1, one obtains a local coordinate system on a different subset of $M(\Theta)$ on which the inner bodies rotate with opposite orientation. Analogously, in this region there also exist an invariant manifold $\mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{opp}}$ which corresponds to the same set of configurations as those in \mathcal{E}_∞ but with the inner bodies rotating with opposite orientation. Both manifolds \mathcal{E}_∞ and $\mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{opp}}$ share a common boundary: the two-torus $\partial \mathcal{E}_\infty = \{|\xi| = \sqrt{L}\}$ corresponding to motions on degenerate ellipses with eccentricity one. After regularizing collisions one may glue these manifolds and observe that $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_\infty = \mathcal{E}_\infty \sqcup \mathcal{E}_\infty^{\text{opp}} \sqcup \partial \mathcal{E}_\infty \simeq \mathbb{S}^3$. Moreover, it is a classical fact that the flow (7.10) extends to the Hopf flow on $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_\infty$ (see [Rob84] for instance).

For our purposes though, it will be enough to restrict our attention to the solid torus $\mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta)$ and a neighborhood of this manifold inside $M_{PE}(\Theta) \subset M(\Theta)$.

¹¹Note that from now on we change the order of the variables and we place last λ to emphasize that it is now time.

Denote by X_Θ the vector field induced by \overline{H}_Θ . A straightforward computation shows that the linearization of X_Θ at $\mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0)$ only has one non-zero eigenvalue which corresponds to the flow direction. To get an insight on the dynamics of (7.8) around \mathcal{E}_∞ we first focus on the behavior of the (x, y) variables alone and neglect higher order terms. We see that the reduced system

$$\dot{x} = - \left(\frac{\nu}{2|H_0|} \right)^{-1/3} \frac{x^3}{4} y \quad \dot{y} = - \left(\frac{\nu}{2|H_0|} \right)^{-1/3} \frac{x^3}{4} x \quad (7.11)$$

exhibits a parabolic fixed point at $\{x = y = 0\}$ with stable and unstable manifolds corresponding, respectively, to the curves $\{x + y = 0\}$ and $\{x - y = 0\}$. Moreover, after a (singular) time reparametrization we can conjugate (7.11) to $\dot{x} = y$, $\dot{y} = x$, for which the origin becomes a hyperbolic fixed point. Hence, one may expect that, at least at a topological level, the flow of (7.8) on a neighborhood of \mathcal{E}_∞ bears some resemblance with the flow around a normally-hyperbolic invariant manifold.

A classical result by Robinson shows that indeed, and in spite of the strong degeneracy of the flow, the invariant manifold \mathcal{E}_∞ possesses smooth stable and unstable invariant manifolds.

Remark 11. From now on we fix any value of $H_0 < 0$ and drop this symbol from the notation.

Theorem 7.2 ([Rob84, BFM20a, BFM20b]). *Let $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and let \mathcal{U}_∞ be a sufficiently small open neighborhood of $\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)$. The stable and unstable invariant sets*

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{loc}}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) &= \{z \in \mathcal{U}_\infty : \phi_{\overline{H}_\Theta}^t(z) \in \mathcal{U}_\infty \text{ for all } t > 0\} \\ W_{\text{loc}}^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) &= \{z \in \mathcal{U}_\infty : \phi_{\overline{H}_\Theta}^t(z) \in \mathcal{U}_\infty \text{ for all } t < 0\} \end{aligned} \quad (7.12)$$

are 4-dimensional immersed submanifolds, which are C^∞ everywhere and real-analytic on the complement of $\{x = 0\}$. Moreover, for any $z_\infty \in \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)$ the leaves

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\text{loc}}^s(z_\infty) &= \{z \in \mathcal{U}_\infty : |\phi_{\overline{H}_\Theta}^t(z) - \phi_{\overline{H}_\Theta}^t(z_\infty)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty\} \subset W_{\text{loc}}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) \\ W_{\text{loc}}^u(z_\infty) &= \{z \in \mathcal{U}_\infty : |\phi_{\overline{H}_\Theta}^t(z) - \phi_{\overline{H}_\Theta}^t(z_\infty)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow -\infty\} \subset W_{\text{loc}}^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

depend on z_∞ in a real-analytic fashion.

Remark 12. To be precise, Robinson not only studies the invariant manifolds of \mathcal{E}_∞ but of the whole three-sphere $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_\infty$ introduced in Remark 10.

Having established the existence of these local manifolds it is natural to wonder whether their globalizations display transverse intersections. This fact was established in [GMPS22].

Theorem 7.3 (Theorem 4.5 in [GMPS22]). *Let $\Theta \gg 1$. Then, there exists (at least) two different, non-empty, transverse homoclinic manifolds*

$$\Gamma_i \subset W_{\text{loc}}^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) \pitchfork W_{\text{loc}}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) \quad i = 0, 1.$$

Recall that, as we discussed in Section 1.2, our strategy to find a local partially hyperbolic framework, consists on analyzing the return maps to suitable neighborhoods of the homoclinic channels Γ_i , $i = 0, 1$. To that end, in the next section we describe the “outer dynamics” along the homoclinic channels making use of the scattering map formalism (see [DdlS06, GMPS22]).

7.4. The scattering maps to \mathcal{E}_∞ . We now want to describe the dynamics of orbits along the homoclinic manifolds Γ_i . This can be achieved via the construction of the so-called scattering maps first introduced in [DdlS06]. To construct these maps we first observe that, given a transverse homoclinic manifold $\Gamma \subset W_{\text{loc}}^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) \pitchfork W_{\text{loc}}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta))$, since the leaves (7.13) depend regularly on the base point, the holonomy maps

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{u,s} : \Gamma &\rightarrow \mathcal{E}_\infty \\ z &\mapsto z_{u,s} \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

defined by the rule

$$z_{u,s} = \Omega^{u,s}(z) \iff z \in W^{u,s}(z^{u,s})$$

are local diffeomorphisms (see [DdLS06, DdLS08]). In particular, since for $i = 0, 1$, the manifolds $W_{\text{loc}}^{u,s}(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta))$ intersect transversally along Γ_i in Theorem 7.3, one can define the composition map

$$\begin{aligned} S_i : \Omega^u(\Gamma_i) \subset \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta) &\mapsto \Omega^s(\Gamma_i) \subset \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta) \\ z &\mapsto \Omega^s \circ (\Omega^u)^{-1}(z). \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

The map (7.15) is the so-called scattering map along the homoclinic channel Γ_i . It is a classical result (see for instance [DdLS08, GMPS22] and the references therein) that these are real-analytic, symplectic maps. Note that these maps are a priori only defined locally. The next proposition describes the dynamics of the scattering maps (which we recall, encode the dynamics along the manifolds Γ_i) in suitable domains.

Proposition 7.4 (After Proposition 4.6. in [GMPS22]). *Let $r = \Theta^{-3}$, let $\mathbb{D}_r \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the disk around the origin of radius r and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for $\Theta \gg 1$ there exists an embedding*

$$\phi : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}_r \rightarrow \Omega^u(\Gamma_1) \cap \Omega^u(\Gamma_2) \subset \mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)$$

such that, when expressed in local coordinates¹² $(\lambda, z) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}_r \subset \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{C}$, the scattering maps S_i act trivially on the first component and their expression for the dynamics of the z coordinate read

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 : z &\mapsto e^{i\beta_0} z + \sum_{k=2}^N P_k z^k + O(z^{N+1}) \\ S_1 : z &\mapsto \Delta(z) + S_0(z) + O(|z + \Delta_0|^{N+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (7.16)$$

with $P_k = O(\Theta^{-3})$, $\Delta(z) = \Delta_0(1 + O(\Theta^{-3/2}))$ and

$$\beta_0(\Theta) \sim \Theta^{-3} \quad P_3(\Theta) \sim \Theta^{-3} \quad \Delta_0(\Theta) \sim \Theta^{9/2} \exp(-C\Theta^3)$$

for some constant C independent of Θ .

Proof. In Proposition 4.6 in [GMPS22] the authors establish the asymptotic formula for S_0 above and show that

$$S_1(z) = \Delta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^N P_k^{(1)}(z + \Delta_0)^k + O(|z + \Delta_0|^{N+1})$$

for some coefficients $P_k^{(1)}$. From the proof of Proposition 4.6 it can be easily deduced that

$$|P_k^{(1)} - P_k| = O(\Delta_0 \Theta^{3k/2}) \quad 1 \leq k \leq N, \quad (7.17)$$

where $P_1 = e^{i\beta_0}$. We then write

$$S_1(z) = \Delta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^N P_k^{(1)}(z + \Delta_0)^k + O(z^{N+1}) = \Delta_0 + \sum_{n=0}^N \tilde{P}_n^{(1)} z^n + O(z^{N+1})$$

for $\tilde{P}_n^{(1)} = \sum_{k=\max\{1,n\}}^N P_k^{(1)} \binom{n}{k} \Delta_0^{k-n}$. In particular, for $n = 0$

$$\tilde{P}_0^{(1)} = \sum_{k=1}^N P_k^{(1)} \Delta_0^k = O(\Theta^{-3} \Delta_0)$$

and for $n \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_n^{(1)} &= P_k^{(1)} + \Delta_0 \sum_{k=n+1}^N P_k^{(1)} \binom{n}{k} \Delta_0^{k-(n+1)} \\ &= P_k + (P_k^{(1)} - P_k) + \Delta_0 \sum_{k=n+1}^N P_k^{(1)} \binom{n}{k} \Delta_0^{k-(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$S_1(z) = \Delta_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N P_n z^n + O(\Theta^{-3} \Delta_0) + \sup_{k \leq N} O(|P_k^{(1)} - P_k| z^k) + O(\Delta_0 z) + O(|z + \Delta_0|^{N+1})$$

so we are done. \square

¹²Recall that on \mathcal{E}_∞ , $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{D}(\sqrt{L(H_0)})$ and that $\mathbb{D}(\sqrt{L(H_0)})$ is diffeomorphic to the unit disk in \mathbb{C} .

We observe from the expressions (7.16) that, up to $O_{N+1}(z)$ corrections, the scattering maps S_0, S_1 are exponentially close (in $1/\Theta$). The fact that we have an asymptotic expression for the function $\Delta(z)$ (and not just an upper bound) will be crucial to check that (on a suitable region) the invariant curves of the map S_0 are not invariant for the map S_1 but instead intersect their images (under S_1) transversally. This is the basis for the transversality-torsion mechanism.

This idea was already exploited in [GMPS22] to construct hyperbolic basic sets for the 3-body problem. For the purposes of the present paper we will need a much more delicate control on the relation between the following quantities which can be associated to an invariant curve γ of the map S_0 :

- the arithmetic properties of its rotation number,
- the torsion of the map S_0 at the curve γ ,
- the angle at which $S_1(\gamma)$ intersects γ .

In Theorem 7.5 below we show that, provided Θ is large enough, it is possible to find a KAM curve of the map S_0 for which the angle between this curve and its image under S_1 can be made arbitrarily small compared to both its Diophantine constant and the torsion coefficient. This is crucial to construct a symbolic blender for the IFS generated by the pair of maps $\{S_0, S_1\}$.

Theorem 7.5 (After Theorem 4.7. in [GMPS22]). *Let $\Theta \gg 1$, $r = \Theta^{-2}$ and let $S_i : \mathbb{D}_r \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{2r}$ $i = 0, 1$, be the coordinate expression (7.16) for the scattering maps constructed in (7.15). Let $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T} \times \{|J| \leq 1\}$. Then, there exists constants $\rho, \sigma > 0$ independent of Θ and a real-analytic, conformally symplectic, coordinate transformation $\phi_{\text{KAM}} : (\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}_{\rho, \sigma} \rightarrow (\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{D}_r$ such that the maps*

$$S_i = \phi_{\text{KAM}}^{-1} \circ S_i \circ \phi_{\text{KAM}} \quad (7.18)$$

are real-analytic, exact symplectic, and of the form (compare the expressions for T_0, T_1 in Theorem A)

- $S_0 : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + \beta + \tau J + R_\varphi(\varphi, J), J + R_J(\varphi, J))$ for some $\alpha > 0$, and R_φ, R_J satisfying $\partial_J^n R_*|(\varphi, 0) = 0$ for $n = 0, 1$ if $*$ = φ and $n = 0, 1, 2$ if $*$ = J . Moreover, $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ with

$$\beta(\Theta) \sim \Theta^{-3} \quad \alpha \gtrsim \Theta^{-3} \exp(-C_1 \Theta^{-3}) \quad \tau(\Theta) \sim \Theta^{-3} \exp(-C_1 \Theta^3)$$

for certain $C_1 > 0$ independent of Θ .

- $S_1 : (\varphi, J) \mapsto S_0(\varphi, J) + (O_{C^2}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon \sin \varphi + O_{C^2}(\varepsilon^2))$ with

$$\varepsilon(\Theta) \sim \Theta^{3/2} \exp(-C_2 \Theta^3)$$

for some $C_2 > 0$ which does not depend on Θ and satisfies $C_2 > 4C_1$.

Proof. The proof follows from an argument similar to that in the proof of Theorem 4.7. of [GMPS22] but with some minor modifications. Indeed, the only difference is that we look for a KAM curve of S_0 located at a largest distance from the origin (compared to the one in [GMPS22]). This allows us to obtain smaller angles between this curve and its image by S_1 .

The proof is divided in four steps. The first three are devoted to putting the map S_0 in normal form around a KAM curve with frequency vector of constant type. Then, in the last step we express the map S_1 in the new local coordinate system (around the KAM curve for the map S_0).

Step 1: (Birkhoff normal form) Observe that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, provided we take Θ we can guarantee that

$$|e^{ik\beta_0} - 1| \gtrsim \Theta^{-3}.$$

Then, proceeding as in [GMPS22] one finds a symplectic, real-analytic, coordinate transformation $\Psi_1 : \mathbb{D}_{\rho_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_{2\rho_1} \subset \mathbb{D}_r$, where

$$\rho_1(\Theta) = \Theta^{-4}$$

which satisfies $\Psi_1(z) = z + O(z^2)$ such that

$$S_0^{(1)} := \Psi_1^{-1} \circ S_0 \circ \Psi_1 : z \mapsto z \lambda_1(|z|) + O(z^7)$$

for $\lambda_1(|z|) = \exp(i(\beta_0 + \mathcal{T}|z|^2 + O(|z|^4)))$ and $\mathcal{T} \sim \Theta^{-3}$.

Step 2: (Scaled action-angle coordinates) We now let C be the constant in Proposition 7.4 and define

$$\rho_2(\Theta) = \exp(-C\Theta^3/10).$$

Fix now any two sufficiently small constants $\rho, \sigma > 0$ independent of Θ . Then, we introduce the real-analytic map

$$\Psi_2 : (\varphi, I) \in \mathbb{T}_\sigma \times [1, 3]_\rho \rightarrow \rho_2(\Theta) \sqrt{I} e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D}_{2\rho_2}$$

(by $[1, 3]_\rho$ we mean a ρ -complex neighbourhood of the real interval $[1, 3]$) so, for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ (provided we take Θ large enough)

$$S_0^{(2)} := \Psi_2^{-1} \circ S_0^{(1)} \circ \Psi_2 : (\theta, I) \mapsto (\theta + b(I) + O_{C^l}(\rho_2^6), I + O_{C^l}(\rho_2^6))$$

with

$$b(I) = K_1 \Theta^{-3} + K_2 \rho_2^2(\Theta) \Theta^{-3} I + O(\rho_2^4(\Theta))$$

for some $K_1, K_2 \neq 0$ independent of Θ .

Step 3: (*KAM normal form*) It now follows from a standard application of the KAM theorem for twist maps (see for example Theorem 9.3. in [GMPS22] which is a simplified version of a theorem of Herman) that there exists a constant

$$\alpha \geq \rho_2^2(\Theta) \Theta^{-4}$$

a frequency $\beta \sim \Theta^{-3}$ satisfying $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$, a torsion coefficient $\tau \sim \rho_2^2(\Theta) \Theta^{-3}$, a real number $I_* \in [3/2, 5/2]$ and a symplectic transformation $\Psi_2 : \mathbb{A}_{\rho/2, \sigma/2} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_\sigma \times [1, 3]_\rho$ of the form

$$\Psi_2 : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + O_{C^1}(\rho_2^2), J + I_* + O_{C^1}(\rho_2^2))$$

such that

$$\mathbf{S}_0 := \Psi_3^{-1} \circ S_0^{(2)} \circ \Psi_3 : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + \beta + \tau J + O(J^2), J + O(J^3))$$

Step 4: (*Transforming the map S_1*) Recall the expression for the map S_1 given in Proposition 7.4 and denote by $\Psi = \Psi_1 \circ \Psi_2 \circ \Psi_3$. Then, using that $\Psi_1(z) = z + O(z^2)$, the explicit expression for the map Ψ_2 and the fact that $\Psi_3 = \text{id} + O_{C^1}(\rho^2)$ we arrive to

$$\mathbf{S}_1 := \Psi^{-1} \circ S_1 \circ \Psi = \mathbf{S}_0 + \frac{1}{\rho} \Delta(e^{i\beta} z - 1)(1 + O(\rho)) + O_{N-1}(\rho).$$

Hence, it is a straightforward exercise to check that, for all $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}_{\rho/4, \sigma/4}$,

$$\mathbf{S}_1 : (\varphi, J) \mapsto \mathbf{S}_0(\varphi, J) + (O(\Delta/\rho), \varepsilon \sin \varphi + O(\Delta, \rho^{N-1}))$$

with (recall that C is the constant in Proposition 7.4)

$$\varepsilon(\Theta) \sim \frac{\Delta(\Theta)}{\Theta^3 \rho(\Theta)} \sim \Theta^{3/2} \exp(-9C\Theta^3/10). \quad \square$$

Finally, since ρ, σ are constants independent of Θ , the corresponding C^2 estimates follow from straightforward Cauchy estimates (after slightly reducing ρ, σ).

The main observation now is that in the local coordinate system given by ϕ_{KAM} , and in the parameter range $\Theta \gg 1$, the scattering maps satisfy the assumptions **B0** and **B1** introduced in Section 1 and, moreover,

$$\frac{\varepsilon(\Theta)}{\alpha(\Theta)}, \frac{\varepsilon(\Theta)}{\tau(\Theta)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \Theta \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, we can apply Proposition 3.4 to obtain the following.

Proposition 7.6. *Fix any $0 < \chi \ll 1$. For any Θ large enough there exists an affine local coordinate system*

$$\phi_{\chi, \Theta} : [-2, 2]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$$

and a subset $\mathcal{N}_{\chi, \Theta} \subset \mathbb{N}$ for which the following holds. Let \mathbf{S}_i with $i = 0, 1$, be the maps in (7.18). Then, for any $N \in \mathcal{N}_{\chi, \Theta}$ the map

$$\mathcal{F}_N := \phi_{\chi, \Theta}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{S}_0^N \circ \mathbf{S}_1 \circ \phi_{\chi, \Theta},$$

satisfies that, uniformly for $(\xi, \eta) \in [-2, 2]^2$,

$$\mathcal{F}_N : \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} b_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \chi & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + \chi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} + O_{C^1}(\chi^2) \quad (7.19)$$

for some $b_n \in [-1, 1]$. Moreover, the sequence $\{b_N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is $\frac{1}{10}\chi$ -dense in $[-10\chi, 10\chi]$.

Consequences of Proposition 7.6. The following straightforward corollary of Proposition 7.6 will prove useful for the construction, in Section 8, of a cs -blender for the return map to a suitable subset located close to $W^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \pitchfork W^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$.

Lemma 7.7 (Robust covering property for scattering maps). *Let χ, Θ and \mathcal{F}_N be as in Proposition 7.6. Then, there exists $\delta_0(\chi) > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0(\chi)$*

$$[-1, 1]^2 \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_N^{-1}([-1 + \delta, 1 - \delta]^2).$$

We also highlight the following fact, which is again a corollary of Proposition 7.6 and will be useful to construct well-distributed periodic orbits.

Lemma 7.8. *Let $D_N \subset [-1, 1]^2$ be a square centered around the point $(c_N, 0)$, where $c_N = b_N/\chi$, and with sides parallel to the coordinates axes and of size $\ell > 0$ with $\chi^2 \ll \ell \ll 1$. Then D_N is an isolating block for \mathcal{F}_N . In particular, there exists a hyperbolic periodic orbit of \mathcal{F}_N in D_N .*

7.5. The return maps. Having understood the outer dynamics along the homoclinic channels Γ_i , in this section we construct return maps to suitable sections accumulating in these channels. These are defined as a composition of:

- a local map which describes the local dynamics near the normally-parabolic manifold \mathcal{E}_∞ in (7.9),
- a global map which describes the outer dynamics of orbits which shadow closely the homoclinic channels associated to the manifolds $\Gamma_i \subset W_{\text{loc}}^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta)) \pitchfork W_{\text{loc}}^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty(\Theta))$ described in Theorem 7.3.

Notation. The following notation will be used throughout this section. We denote by

$$\mathcal{A}_\infty(H_0, \Theta) = \phi \circ \phi_{\text{KAM}}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{A}) \subset \Omega^u(\Gamma_1) \cap \Omega^u(\Gamma_2) \subset \mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta) \quad (7.20)$$

with ϕ as in Proposition 7.4 and ϕ_{KAM} as in Theorem 7.5. This is the annulus in which the scattering map dynamics fit into the framework of Theorem A. We use coordinates $(\lambda, \varphi, J) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{A}$ on this domain.

The local map. In the next lemma we describe the local structure of the flow on a neighborhood of \mathcal{A}_∞ .

Lemma 7.9 (Theorem 5.2 in [GMPS22]). *Fix any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{U}_\infty \subset \mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta_0)$ be a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\mathcal{A}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0) \subset \mathcal{E}_\infty(H_0, \Theta_0)$ with \mathcal{A}_∞ as in (7.20). On \mathcal{U}_∞ there exists a C^k change of variables $\Phi : (\lambda, \tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{J}, q, p) \mapsto (\lambda, \varphi, J, x, y)$ of the form*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \\ x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{id} & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\varphi} \\ \tilde{J} \\ q \\ p \end{pmatrix} + O_2(x, y)$$

for some matrix A , and such that, after a regular time parametrization, conjugates the flow induced by (7.8) on $\mathcal{M}(H_0, \Theta_0)$ to the flow induced by a vector field of the form (we write $\tilde{z} = (\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{J})$)


$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= q((q+p)^3 + O_4(q, p)) & \dot{\tilde{z}} &= (qp)^k O_4(q, p) \\ \dot{p} &= -p((q+p)^3 + O_4(q, p)) & \dot{\lambda} &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (7.21)$$

Remark 13. Below, we drop the tilde from the variables $(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{J})$ in order to alleviate the notation and, occasionally, we write $z = (\varphi, J)$.

Before proceeding, a few remarks are in order. First, we note that, in the new coordinate system, the local manifolds $W_{\text{loc}}^{s,u}(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ have been straightened, i.e. they are respectively given by $\{q = 0\}$ (stable) and $\{p = 0\}$ (unstable). Second, by taking k large enough, the dynamics of the z variable are arbitrarily close to the trivial dynamics ($\dot{z} = 0$) as we approach the manifolds $W_{\text{loc}}^{s,u}(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$. This can be interpreted as a manifestation of the strongly degenerate dynamics on \mathcal{E}_∞ .

In the coordinate system constructed in Lemma 7.9, we define, for $a > 0$ small enough, the 4-dimensional transverse sections

$$\Sigma_a^{\text{out}} = \{q = a, p > 0\} \quad \Sigma_a^{\text{in}} = \{p = a, q > 0\}$$

FIGURE 7.1. The domains $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^0, \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1 \subset \Sigma^{\text{out}}$

Then, it is not difficult to check that (see for instance Chapter VI in [Mos73]) if $U \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{in}}$ is a small neighborhood of $\Sigma \cap \{q = 0\}$ the local map

$$\Phi_{\text{loc}} : U \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{in}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \quad (7.22)$$

which to any point in U , associates the first point at which the solution of (10.6) hits Σ_a^{out} , is well defined.

The global map. Let now $U_i^* \subset \Sigma_a^*$ be small neighborhoods of the two-dimensional sets $\Gamma_i \cap \Sigma_a^*$ for $i = 0, 1$ and $\star = \text{in}, \text{out}$. We want to describe the dynamics of the maps

$$\Phi_{i,\text{glob}} : U_i^{\text{out}} \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \mapsto \Sigma_a^{\text{in}} \quad i = 0, 1 \quad (7.23)$$

defined by following the flow of the Hamiltonian (7.6). To describe these maps, for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, on each of the subsets U_i^{out} we define a local coordinate system

$$\phi_i : (p, \tau, \varphi, J) \in ([0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset U_i^{\text{out}} \quad (7.24)$$

such that (\mathcal{Q}_δ^i is simply the image of $([0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A})$ under ϕ_i and we use the same labeling both for the coordinate system on U_1 and U_2 as this will cause no confusion in the future)

$$W^s(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \cap U_i^{\text{out}} = \{\tau = 0\}$$

See Figure 7.1 for a schematic picture of the new coordinate system (see also Section 6.1. of [GMPS22] for a more detailed construction). Analogously, we define a local coordinate system $\tilde{\phi}_i : (q, \sigma, \varphi, J) \in ([0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A}) \rightarrow U_i^{\text{in}}$ such that $W^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty) \cap U_i^{\text{in}} = \{\sigma = 0\}$.

Lemma 7.10. *Let (p, τ, z) be the local coordinate system on $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset U^i$ defined in (7.24) and (σ, q, z) be local coordinates on U_i^{in} . For $i = 0, 1$ the global maps (7.23) are well defined on $(p, \tau, z) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A}$ and of the form*

$$\Phi_{i,\text{glob}} : \begin{pmatrix} p \\ \tau \\ z \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \tau \nu_1(z)(1 + O(p, \tau)) \\ p \nu_2(z)(1 + O(p, \tau)) \\ \mathbf{S}_i(z) + O(p, \tau) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\nu_1(z)\nu_2(z) \neq 0$ and \mathbf{S}_i are the coordinate expression of the scattering maps given in Theorem 7.5.

The proof of this result follows from a standard argument which simply uses the fact that the manifolds $W^{s,u}(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$ intersect transversally at Γ_i (more details can be found in Section 6.1. of [GMPS22]). The main observation is that the center dynamics is given by a C^0 -small perturbation of the scattering map dynamics. This asymptotic formula will be key to control and describe the dynamics of the return maps that we construct below.

Construction of the return map. Finally, we introduce (whenever it is defined) the return map

$$\Psi : \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}. \quad (7.25)$$

For convenience, it will also be convenient to define (whenever they are defined) the maps

$$\Psi_{i \rightarrow j} = \Psi_{\text{loc}} \circ \Psi_{i,\text{glob}} : \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta^j \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \quad i, j = 0, 1. \quad (7.26)$$

The rest of the section is devoted to the analysis of the maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$.

Dynamics of partially horizontal and partially vertical strips. In the following result we study how the global maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$ act on a certain class of two-dimensional submanifolds whose tangent space is close to the strong expanding/contracting directions of the maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$. To this end, we define *partially horizontal and partially vertical strips*.

Definition 7.11. Let $(p, \tau, \varphi, J) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A}$ be the local coordinate system in \mathcal{Q}_δ^i , $i = 0, 1$, introduced in (7.24). We say that a two-dimensional subset Λ_v (respectively Λ_h) is a partially vertical (resp. horizontal) strip provided there exist

- $0 < \rho < \delta$
- C^1 functions $\gamma_l, \gamma_r : [0, \rho] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\gamma_l(\tau) < \gamma_r(\tau)$ and $\partial_\tau \gamma_l, \partial_\tau \gamma_r = O(1)$
- C^1 functions F_v (resp. F_h) of the form

$$F_v(\tau, s) = (v_1(\tau, s), \tau, v_2^\varphi(\tau, s), v_2^J(\tau, s))$$

$$(\text{resp. } F_h(\tau, s) = (p, h_1(p, s), h_2^\varphi(p, s), h_2^J(p, s))),$$

satisfying

$$\partial_s(v_2^\varphi(\tau, s), v_2^J(\tau, s)) \neq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } (\partial_s h_2^\varphi(\tau, s), \partial_s h_2^J(\tau, s)) \neq 0)$$

and $(\star = \varphi, J)$

$$\partial_\tau v_1 = O(1), \quad \partial_s v_1 = O(\delta), \quad \partial_\tau v_2^\star = \partial_s v_2^\star = O(1)$$

$$(\text{resp. } \partial_p h_1 = O(1), \quad \partial_s h_1 = O(\delta), \quad \partial_p h_2^\star = \partial_s h_2^\star = O(1))$$

such that Λ_v (resp. Λ_h) can be parameterized as

$$\Lambda_v = \{(p, \tau, \varphi, J) = F_v(\tau, s) : \gamma_l(\tau) \leq s \leq \gamma_r(\tau), \tau \in [0, \rho]\} \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i$$

$$(\text{resp. } \Lambda_h = \{(p, \tau, \varphi, J) = F_h(\tau, s) : \gamma_l(p) \leq s \leq \gamma_r(p), p \in [0, \rho]\} \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i).$$

Next theorem analyzes how partially horizontal and vertical strips get mapped under $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$.

Theorem 7.12 (After Lemma 12.2 in [GMPS22]). *Let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small and, for $i = 0, 1$ let $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset U^i$ be the subset defined in (7.24). Let $(p, \tau, \varphi, J) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A}$ be the local coordinate system in \mathcal{Q}_δ^i introduced in (7.24) and consider a partially vertical (resp. horizontal) strip Λ_v (respectively Λ_h) as in Definition 7.11.*

Then, $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}(\Lambda_v) \cap \mathcal{Q}_\delta^j$ contains a countable family of partially vertical strips $\Lambda_v^{(n)}$, $n \geq n_v$ for some sufficiently large n_v . Analogously $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}(\Lambda_h) \cap \mathcal{Q}_\delta^j$ contains a countable family of partially horizontal strips $\Lambda_h^{(n)}$, $n \geq n_h$ for some sufficiently large n_h .

Moreover, these strips can be parameterized as follows. For any $n \geq n_v$ (resp. $n \geq n_h$) sufficiently large there exist two differentiable functions $\gamma_l^{(n)}, \gamma_r^{(n)} : [n, n+\delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\tilde{\gamma}_l^{(n)}, \tilde{\gamma}_r^{(n)} : [n, n+\delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) such that for any $T \in [n, n+\delta]$ and $\gamma_l^{(n)}(T) < s < \gamma_r^{(n)}(T)$ (resp. any $P \in [n, n+\delta]$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_l^{(n)}(P) < s < \tilde{\gamma}_r^{(n)}(P)$) the equation

$$T = \pi_{\tilde{\tau}}(\Psi_{i \rightarrow j} \circ F_h)(\tau, s) \quad (\text{resp. } P = \pi_{\tilde{p}}(\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}^{-1} \circ F_v)(p, s)) \quad (7.27)$$

define functions $\hat{\tau}^n(T, s)$ (resp. $\hat{p}^n(P, s)$) such that the strips $\Lambda_v^{(n)}$ (resp. $\Lambda_h^{(n)}$) can be written as

$$\Lambda_v^{(n)} = \{(p, \tau, \varphi, J) = F_v^{(n)}(T, s) : \gamma_l^n(T) \leq s \leq \gamma_r^n(T), T \in [n, n+\delta]\}$$

$$(\text{resp. } \Lambda_h^{(n)} = \{(p, \tau, \varphi, J) = F_h^{(n)}(P, s) : \tilde{\gamma}_l^n(P) \leq s \leq \tilde{\gamma}_r^n(P), P \in [n, n+\delta]\})$$

where

$$F_v^{(n)}(T, s) = \Psi_{i \rightarrow j} \circ F_v(\hat{\tau}^n(T, s), s) \quad (\text{resp. } F_h^{(n)}(P, s) = \Psi_{i \rightarrow j}^{-1} \circ F_h(\hat{p}^n(P, s), s))$$

and satisfy the following:

- (Accumulation to $W_{\text{loc}}^{u,s}(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$): $\pi_p F_v^{(n)}(T, s) \rightarrow 0$ (resp. $\pi_\tau F_h^{(n)}(P, s) \rightarrow 0$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the C^1 topology
- (Asymptotics for central dynamics): uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\pi_z F_v^{(n)}(T, s) = \mathbf{S}_i(v_2^\varphi(\hat{\tau}^n(T, s), s), v_2^J(\hat{\tau}^n(T, s), s)) + O(\delta)$$

$$(\text{resp. } \pi_z F_h^{(n)}(P, s) = \mathbf{S}_j^{-1}(h_2^\varphi(\hat{p}^n(P, s), s), h_2^J(\hat{p}^n(P, s), s)) + O(\delta)) \quad (7.28)$$

- (Action of the differential): uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\partial_T F_v^{(n)}(T, s) = \begin{pmatrix} O(\delta) \\ 1 \\ O(\delta) \\ O(\delta) \end{pmatrix} \quad \partial_s F_v^{(n)}(T, s) = \begin{pmatrix} O(\delta) \\ 0 \\ DS_i(v_2^\varphi(\hat{\tau}^n, s), v_2^J(\hat{\tau}^n, s)) \left(\frac{\partial_s v_2^\varphi}{\partial_s v_2^J} \right) + O(\delta) \end{pmatrix} \quad (7.29)$$

and

$$\partial_P F_h^{(n)}(P, s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ O(\delta) \\ O(1) \\ O(1) \end{pmatrix} \quad \partial_s F_h^{(n)}(P, s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ O(\delta) \\ DS_j^{-1}(h_2^\varphi(\hat{p}^n, s), h_2^J(\hat{p}^n, s)) \left(\frac{\partial_s h_2^\varphi}{\partial_s h_2^J} \right) + O(\delta) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7.30)$$

Proof. The proof of this result is entirely contained in the proof of Lemma 12.2 of [GMPS22]¹³. Roughly speaking, the proof boils down to an application of the graph transform to the manifold Λ_v (resp. Λ_h). Here we just recall briefly the argument and refer the interested reader for the details. We only consider the case of vertical submanifolds (the horizontal case being similar). The proof relies on a rather technical lemma which, for the convenience of the reader, we have copied in Appendix C.

Let Λ_v be the graph of a function $F_v(\tau, s)$ with $(\tau, s) \in \{\gamma_l(\tau) \leq s \leq \gamma_r(\tau), \tau \in [0, \rho]\}$ as in Definition 7.11. Let

$$\tilde{F}_v(\tau, s) = \Psi_{i \rightarrow j} \circ F_v(\tau, s) = (\tilde{h}_1(\tau, s), T(\tau, s), Z(\tau, s)).$$

The authors in [GMPS22] show in equations (243)-(245) of that paper that (this is a consequence of Lemmas 7.10 and C.1)

$$\tilde{T}(\tau, s) \gtrsim \tau^{-3/2+Ca} \quad \partial_\tau T(\tau, s) \gtrsim \tau^{-3/5+Ca} \quad (7.31)$$

with $C > 0$ being some fixed constant (recall that we may take a to be arbitrarily small). In particular, the equation

$$T = \pi_{\tilde{\tau}}(\Psi_{i \rightarrow j} \circ F_h)$$

defines (for all n large enough) functions $\hat{\tau}^n(T, s)$ and $\gamma_r^{(n)} > \gamma_l^{(n)}$ such that the the strips $\Lambda_v^{(n)}$ can be written as

$$\Lambda_v^{(n)} = \{(p, \tau, \varphi, J) = F_v^{(n)}(T, s) : \gamma_l^n(T) \leq s \leq \gamma_r^n(T), T \in [n, n + \delta]\}$$

where

$$F_v^{(n)}(T, s) = \Psi_{i \rightarrow j} \circ F_v(\hat{\tau}^n(T, s), s)$$

and satisfy that $\pi_p F_v^{(n)}(T, s) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the C^1 topology (this is a consequence of the first inequality in Lemma C.1). Moreover, using (7.31) and Lemma C.1 one obtains that $\partial_T F_v^{(n)}(T, s)$ is as in (7.29). Moreover, by Lemma 7.10 and the first item in Lemma C.1 one deduces (7.28) (see also expression (185) in [GMPS22]).

The proof of the statement for $\partial_s F_v^{(n)}$ is somehow more technical and relies on a careful study of the action of the differential $D\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$ on partially vertical (and horizontal) submanifolds (see Lemma 12.1 in [GMPS22]). We refer the reader to that paper for this part of the argument. The estimates (7.29) correspond to expression (189) in [GMPS22]. \square

The following complement to Theorem 7.12 will prove key for the construction of blenders in Section 8.

Lemma 7.13. *Consider the setting of Theorem 7.12. Then, for any $n \geq n_v$ $\gamma_r^{(n)}$ (resp. $n \geq n_h$)*

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{T \in [n, n + \delta]} |\gamma_r^{(n)}(T) - \gamma_l^{(n)}(T)| &> (1 - O(\delta)) \inf_{\tau \in [0, \delta]} |\gamma_r(\tau) - \gamma_l(\tau)|, & \partial_T \gamma_l^{(n)}, \partial_T \gamma_r^{(n)} &= O(1) \\ (\text{resp. } \inf_{P \in [n, n + \delta]} |\tilde{\gamma}_r^{(n)}(P) - \tilde{\gamma}_l^{(n)}(P)| &> (1 - O(\delta)) \inf_{p \in [0, \delta]} |\tilde{\gamma}_r(p) - \tilde{\gamma}_l(p)|, & \partial_P \tilde{\gamma}_l^{(n)}, \partial_P \tilde{\gamma}_r^{(n)} &= O(1)) \end{aligned} \quad (7.32)$$

¹³To be precise, Lemma 12.2 in [GMPS22] gives a similar statement to that above but instead of studying one iterate of the map $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$ considers a concatenation of iterates of these. Of course, the proof in that paper proceeds by induction so, in particular, the first step is to produce an statement like the one in Theorem 7.12.

Proof. We already know that $\gamma_r^{(n)} > \gamma_l^{(n)}$. To obtain a quantitative estimate we proceed as follows. Note first that the condition $s - \gamma_l(\tau) > 0$ expressed in the new coordinates is

$$s - \gamma_l(\hat{\tau}^n(T, s)) > 0. \quad (7.33)$$

Observe that from the estimates (7.31) the solution $\hat{\tau}(T, s)$ to the implicit equation (7.27) satisfies (recall that $|\tau| \leq \delta$)

$$\partial_s \hat{\tau}(T, s) = O(\delta). \quad (7.34)$$

Now, by the fact that $\gamma_l = O_{c^1}(1)$ and the estimate (7.34), the implicit function theorem ensures that there exists a function $\gamma_l^{(n)}$ satisfying $\gamma_l(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))) = \gamma_l^{(n)}(T)$. Moreover, by construction, (7.33) is equivalent to $s > \gamma_l^{(n)}(T)$. Analogously one can obtain $\gamma_r^{(n)}$. Now we use its implicit definition, as

$$\gamma_r^{(n)}(T) - \gamma_l^{(n)}(T) = \left(\gamma_l(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))) - \gamma_r(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))) \right) + \left(\gamma_r(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))) - \gamma_r(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_r^{(n)}(T))) \right)$$

Now, on the one hand, since $T \rightarrow \hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))$ is a diffeomorphism,

$$\inf_{T \in [n, n+\delta]} \left(\gamma_l(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))) - \gamma_r(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))) \right) = \inf_{\tau \in [0, \delta]} (\gamma_l(\tau) - \gamma_r(\tau))$$

and on the other, by (7.34) and $\gamma_l = O_{c^1}(1)$

$$\inf_{T \in [n, n+\delta]} \left(\gamma_r(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_l^{(n)}(T))) - \gamma_r(\hat{\tau}^n(T, \gamma_r^{(n)}(T))) \right) \geq -C\delta \inf_{T \in [n, n+\delta]} \left(\gamma_l^{(n)}(T) - \gamma_r^{(n)}(T) \right),$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of $\delta > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

8. A SYMPLECTIC BLENDER FOR THE 3-BODY PROBLEM: PROOF OF THEOREM C

Here we show how to construct a symplectic blender for the return map Ψ defined in (7.25). The proof is divided in three steps:

- First, in Section 8.1 we show how hyperbolicity in the center variables emerges from the transversality-torsion mechanism described in Section 1.4. This will allow us to recover the partially-hyperbolic framework described in Section 4.
- Then, in Section 8.2 we will prove that the map Ψ satisfies the covering property and, moreover exhibits well-distributed periodic orbits (see Section 4). From these properties we will conclude that there exists a *cs*-blender.
- Finally, owing to the reversibility of the system, we will see in Section 8.3 that the *cs*-blender is homoclinically related to a *cu*-blender. Together they form a symplectic blender.

Notation.

- Coordinate systems:
 - $(\xi, \eta) \in [-1, 1]^2$ are local coordinates on a rectangular shaped region of \mathbb{A} on which certain combinations of the scattering maps \mathbf{S}_i , $i = 0, 1$ is close to an affine hyperbolic map. These symbols were before used in Section 7 with a different meaning but that use will never appear again.
 - Recall the sets $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset \Sigma^{out}$ defined in Section 7.
 - We introduce a smaller subset $Q_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1$ and local coordinates (p, τ, ξ, η) on this subset. On Q_δ certain combination $\Psi_{0 \rightarrow 1} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 0}^{n-1} \circ \Psi_{1 \rightarrow 0}$ exhibits hyperbolic behavior in all directions.
 - $Q_\delta^{ext} \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1$ is a neighbourhood of Q_δ .
- Dynamics:
 - $\Lambda_h, \Lambda_v \subset Q_\delta^{ext}$ are horizontal and vertical two-dimensional manifolds.
 - Construction of *cs*-blenders: $\Delta \subset Q_\delta$ is used to denote *cs*-strips. These are just horizontal submanifolds entirely contained in Q_δ . P is a hyperbolic periodic orbits which passes through Q_δ .
 - Construction of symplectic blenders: We introduce two subsets $\tilde{Q}_\delta, \hat{Q}_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$ and construct a *cs*-blender on \hat{Q}_δ and a *cu*-blender on \tilde{Q}_δ . These regions have a non-empty intersection which contains a four-dimensional cube $O_\delta = \hat{Q}_\delta \cap \tilde{Q}_\delta$.

8.1. Transversality-torsion hyperbolicity for the global return map. In Theorem 7.12 we have identified strongly hyperbolic behavior along the (p, τ) -directions for any of the global maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$ with $i, j = 0, 1$. However, the dynamics in the center variables, is given by a $O_{C^0}(\delta)$ perturbation of the scattering maps S_i . The latter being two-dimensional Θ^{-3} -close to identity twist maps (see Theorem 7.5), makes it very difficult to detect any sign of hyperbolicity along these directions. Indeed, any of the maps S_i is conjugated to an integrable twist map up to an exponentially small reminder (in Θ^{-3}).

In order to spot hyperbolic behavior along the center directions we reproduce the transversality-torsion mechanism described in Section 1.4. A similar construction was carried out in [GMPS22], where the authors established the existence of basic sets for a (single) map of the form $\Psi^{(N)} = \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 1} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 0}^{N-1} \circ \Psi_{1 \rightarrow 0}$ with a value of $N \gg 1$ such that the expansion/contraction rates are far away from 1.

Our construction differs from the one in [GMPS22] in that we will look at a family of return maps $\{\Psi^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ for a suitable subset $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ (to be specified below) in which:

- (*Weak-hyperbolicity*): The rate of expansion of $\Psi^{(N)}$ along the (expanding) center direction is of order $1 + \chi > 1$ with $0 < \chi \ll 1$.
- (*Well-distributed iterates*): For a suitable subset $Q_{\chi, \delta} \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1$ the set of images $\bigcup_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \Psi^{(N)}(Q_{\chi, \delta})$ is well-distributed in a sense similar to that described in Section 4.

The purpose of this section is to define properly (in terms of quantifiers) the aforementioned regime and observe how in this regime hyperbolic behavior emerges in the center directions. We do so by:

- studying the action of the maps $\Psi^{(N)}$ along what we call horizontal and vertical strips (see the parametrizations (8.4) and (8.3) below)
- establishing the existence of cone fields for the differentials $D\Psi^{(N)}$.

The statements and proofs below are convenient reformulations of those in [GMPS22], which indeed follow plainly from Theorem 7.12.

Remark 14. An important point to notice in the following is that both the definition of the aforementioned horizontal and vertical strips as well as the directions of the cone fields are uniform in N for $N \in \mathcal{N}$. This will be crucial for the construction, in Section 8, of a *cs*-blender for the map Ψ in (7.25).

Local coordinate system and quantifiers. We begin by defining a local coordinate system on a suitable subset of \mathcal{Q}_δ^2 . Given any value $0 < \chi \ll 1$, we let $\Theta > 0$ large enough and let $\phi_{\chi, \Theta} : [-1, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be the coordinate transformation introduced in Proposition 7.6. Then, we define the subsets (recall that ϕ_i is defined in (7.24))

$$Q_{\delta, \chi, \Theta} = \phi_1([0, \delta]^2 \times \phi_{\chi, \Theta}([-1, 1]^2)) \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1, \quad Q_{\delta, \chi, \Theta}^{\text{ext}} = \phi_1([0, \delta]^2 \times \phi_{\chi, \Theta}([-2, 2]^2)) \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1 \quad (8.1)$$

and introduce the local coordinate system (p, τ, ξ, η) on $Q_{\delta, \chi, \Theta}^{\text{ext}}$ given by

$$(\varphi, J) = \phi_{\chi, \Theta}(\xi, \eta) \quad \text{for } (\xi, \eta) \in [-2, 2]^2.$$

We let $\mathcal{N}_{\Theta, \chi}$ be the subset defined in Proposition 7.6.

For the rest of the paper we fix any value of χ, Θ as above and then consider $\delta > 0$ small enough. The quantities χ, Θ being fixed we also suppress them from the notation and simply write

$$Q_{\delta, \chi, \Theta} = Q_\delta \quad Q_{\delta, \chi, \Theta}^{\text{ext}} = Q_\delta^{\text{ext}} \quad \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{\Theta, \chi}. \quad (8.2)$$

Given a positive real number a we will write

$$a = O(\delta) \quad \implies \quad \text{there exists } C(\Theta, \chi) \text{ such that } a \leq C\delta.$$

Notation for parametrizations of differentiable submanifolds. Throughout the rest of the paper we will describe submanifolds of \mathcal{Q}_δ^i ($i = 0, 1$) using local parametrizations. When we say that a certain function $h : U \subset \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (involved in some parametrization) is C^1 we will implicitly assume that its partial derivatives are $O(1)$, i.e. there exists $C > 0$ independent of δ (but which might depend on χ, Θ) such that for all $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ we have

$$\sup_{z \in U} |\partial_{z_\alpha} h(z)| \leq C.$$

Dynamics of horizontal and vertical strips and isolating blocks. We now study the dynamics of a class of submanifolds under the family of maps $\{\Psi^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$. We say that a two-dimensional submanifold Λ_V is a *vertical strip* if it admits a parametrization of the form

$$\Lambda_v = \{(p, \tau, \varphi, J) = F_v(\tau, \eta) : \gamma_d(\tau) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_u(\tau), \tau \in [0, \delta]\} \subset Q_\delta^{\text{ext}} \quad (8.3)$$

for some C^1 functions $\gamma_d < \gamma_u$ and

$$F_v(\tau, \eta) = (v_1(\tau, \eta), \tau, v_2(\tau, \eta), \eta)$$

with

$$\partial_\eta v_1 = O(\delta).$$

We say that a two-dimensional submanifold Λ is a *horizontal strip* if it admits a parametrization of the form

$$\Lambda_h = \{(p, \tau, \varphi, J) = F_h(p, \xi) : \gamma_l(p) \leq \xi \leq \gamma_r(p), p \in [0, \delta]\} \subset Q_\delta^{\text{ext}} \quad (8.4)$$

for some C^1 functions $\gamma_d < \gamma_u$ and

$$F_h(p, \xi) = (p, h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi))$$

with

$$\partial_\xi h_1 = O(\delta).$$

The following result is a convenient reformulation of Lemma 12.2 in [GMPS22] for $N \in \mathcal{N}$. A subtle but crucial difference with Lemma 12.2 in [GMPS22] is that our definition of horizontal (resp. vertical) strips allows the strips to be arbitrarily short in the η -direction (resp. ξ -direction). The proof boils down to an iteration of Theorem 7.12 together with Proposition 7.6.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small, let $Q_\delta \subset U^1$ be the subset defined in (8.1) and let $\Lambda \subset Q_\delta$ be a vertical strip (resp. horizontal strip) as in (8.4). Let $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be the subset defined in (8.2) and denote by*

$$\Psi^{(N)} = \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 1} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 0}^{N-1} \circ \Psi_{1 \rightarrow 0} : Q_\delta \rightarrow Q_\delta^1.$$

Then, there exists $n_v \in \mathbb{N}$ (resp. $n_h \in \mathbb{N}$) such that, for any $N \in \mathcal{N}$, $\Psi^N(\Lambda_v) \cap Q_\delta^1$ contains a countable family of vertical strips $\Lambda_{v,N}^{(n)}$, $n \geq n_v$. Analogously $(\Psi^N)^{-1}(\Lambda_h) \cap Q_\delta$ contains a countable family of horizontal strips $\Lambda_{h,N}^{(n)}$, $n \geq n_h$ for some sufficiently large n_h .

Moreover, these strips can be parameterized as follows. Let also (p, τ, φ, J) be the local coordinate system on Q_δ introduced in (7.24).

Then, there exists $\tilde{\chi} > 0$ such that for any $N \in \mathcal{N}$ for any $T > 0$ (resp. $P > 0$) sufficiently large there exist differentiable functions $\gamma_d^{n,N}$ and $\gamma_u^{n,N}$ (resp. $\gamma_l^{n,N}$ and $\gamma_r^{n,N}$) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{T \in [n, n+\delta]} |\gamma_d^{n,N}(T) - \gamma_u^{n,N}(T)| &> (1 + \tilde{\chi}) \inf_{\tau \in [0, \delta]} |\gamma_d(\tau) - \gamma_u(\tau)| & \partial_T \gamma_d^{n,N}, \partial_T \gamma_u^{n,N} &= O(1) \\ (\text{resp. } \inf_{P \in [n, n+\delta]} |\gamma_r^{n,N}(P) - \gamma_l^{n,N}(P)| &> (1 + \tilde{\chi}) \inf_{p \in [0, \delta]} |\gamma_r(p) - \gamma_l(p)| & \partial_P \gamma_d^{n,N}, \partial_P \gamma_u^{n,N} &= O(1)) \end{aligned} \quad (8.5)$$

such that, for any $v \in (\gamma_d^{n,N}(T), \gamma_u^{n,N}(T))$ (resp. any $\varrho \in (\gamma_l^{n,N}(P), \gamma_r^{n,N}(P))$) the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \pi_\tau(\Psi^{(N)} \circ F_v)(\tau, \eta) & v &= \pi_\eta(\Psi^{(N)} \circ \Lambda)(\tau, \eta) \\ (\text{resp. } P &= \pi_p((\Psi^{(N)})^{-1} \circ F_h)(p, \xi) & \varrho &= \pi_\xi((\Psi^{(N)})^{-1} \circ \Lambda)(p, \xi)) \end{aligned}$$

defines two functions $\hat{\tau}_N(T, v)$ and $\hat{\eta}_N(T, v)$ (resp. $\hat{p}_N(P, \varrho)$ and $\hat{\xi}_N(P, \varrho)$) such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the submanifold

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{v,N}^{(n)} &= \{\Psi^{(N)} \circ F_v(\hat{\tau}(T, v), \hat{\eta}(T, v)) : \gamma_d^{n,N}(T) \leq v \leq \gamma_u^{n,N}(T), T \in [n, n + \delta]\} \\ (\text{resp. } \Lambda_{h,N}^{(n)} &= \{(\Psi^{(N)})^{-1} \circ F_h(\hat{p}(P, \varrho), \hat{\xi}(P, \varrho)) : \gamma_l^{n,N}(P) \leq \varrho \leq \gamma_r^{n,N}(P), P \in [n, n + \delta]\}) \end{aligned}$$

admits a parametrization

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{v,N}^{(n)} &= \{(v_1^{(n),N}(T, v), T, v_2^{(n),N}(T, v), v) : \gamma_d^{n,N}(T) \leq v \leq \gamma_u^{n,N}(T), T \in [n, n + \delta]\} \\ (\text{resp. } \Lambda_{h,N}^{(n)} &= \{(P, h_1^{(n),N}(P, \varrho), \varrho, h_2^{(n),N}(P, \varrho), v) : \gamma_l^{n,N}(P) \leq \varrho \leq \gamma_r^{n,N}(P), P \in [n, n + \delta]\}) \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

in terms of two differentiable functions $v_1^{(n),N}, v_2^{(n),N}$ (resp. $h_1^{(n),N}, h_2^{(n),N}$) which satisfy the following:

- (Accumulation to $W_{loc}^{u,s}(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$): $v_1^{(n),N}(T, v) \rightarrow 0$ (resp. $h_1^{(n),N}(P, \varrho) \rightarrow 0$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the C^1 topology.
- (Asymptotics for central dynamics): uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{(\xi, \eta)} \Lambda_{v, N}^{(n)}(T, v) &= \mathcal{F}_N(v_2(\hat{\tau}(T, v), \hat{\eta}(T, v)), \hat{\eta}(T, v)) + O(\delta) \\ (\text{resp. } \pi_{(\xi, \eta)} \Lambda_{h, N}^{(n)}(T, v) &= \mathcal{F}_N^{-1}\left(\hat{\xi}(P, \varrho), h_2\left(\hat{p}(P, \varrho), \hat{\xi}(P, \varrho)\right)\right) + O(\delta)) \end{aligned} \quad (8.7)$$

where \mathcal{F}_N is the map in (7.19).

- (Action of the differential): uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\partial_T v_1^{(n),N}, \partial_v v_1^{(n),N} = O(\delta) \quad (\text{resp. } \partial_P h_1^{(n),N}, \partial_\varrho h_1^{(n),N} = O(\delta))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_T v_2^{(n),N} &= O(\delta) & |\partial_v v_2^{(n),N}| &\leq (1 + \tilde{\chi})^{-2} |\partial_\eta v_2| + O(\delta) \\ (\text{resp. } \partial_P h_2^{(n),N} &= O(1) & |\partial_\varrho h_2^{(n),N}| &\leq (1 + \tilde{\chi})^{-2} |\partial_\xi h_2| + O(\delta)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the image of Λ_v (resp. Λ_h) under $\Psi^{(N)}$ (resp. $(\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}$) contains a countable collection of wider vertical (resp. horizontal) strips.

Remark 15. Notice that, since in Theorem 7.12 we allow for arbitrarily short Λ_v (resp. Λ_h) manifolds (as one may take $\rho > 0$ arbitrarily small), the statement in Proposition 8.1 holds unchanged also for arbitrarily short Λ_v (resp. Λ_h). This will be of importance in the proof of Proposition 9.2.

Proof. We only give the proof for vertical strips since the same argument can be applied to horizontal strips. Let $\phi : [-1, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be the change of coordinates introduced in Lemma 7.6 and write

$$(v_2^\varphi(\tau, \eta), v_2^J(\tau, \eta)) = \phi(v_2(\tau, \eta), \eta).$$

Then, the submanifold (described now in the coordinate system (p, τ, φ, J))

$$\Lambda_v = \{F_v(\tau, \eta) = (v_1(\tau, \eta), \tau, v_2^\varphi(\tau, \eta), v_2^J(\tau, \eta)) : \gamma_d^n(\tau) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_u^n(\tau), \tau \in [0, \delta]\} \subset Q_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1$$

satisfies the assumptions in Theorem 7.12. Hence, we can choose any $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large and let

$$\Lambda_1 = \Lambda^{(n_*)} = \{\Psi_{1 \rightarrow 0} \circ F_v(\hat{\tau}(T, \eta), \eta) : \gamma_d^{n_*}(T) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_u^{n_*}(T), T \in [n_*, n_* + \delta]\}$$

where, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Lambda^{(n)}$ and $\gamma_d^{n*}, \gamma_u^{n*}$ are as in Theorem 7.12. We now check that $\Lambda_1 \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$ and that $v_1^1 = \pi_p \Lambda_1$ satisfies

$$\partial_T v_1^1 = O(\delta), \quad \partial_\eta v_1^1 = O(\delta),$$

so we can apply again Theorem 7.12 to Λ_1 . On one hand, for $n_* \gg 1$ we can guarantee that $0 < v_1^1 < \delta$. Moreover, it follows from the asymptotic expansion (7.28) that $\pi_z \Lambda_1 \subset \mathbb{A}$ so we conclude that $\Lambda_1 \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$. On the other hand, the estimates for the partial derivatives of v_1^1 follow plainly from (7.29). By iterating this construction we deduce that for any $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and any integer $n \gg 1$ there exist differentiable functions $\gamma_l^{n,N}$ and $\gamma_r^{n,N}$ such that, for any $T \in [n, n + \delta]$ and $v \in (\gamma_l^{n,N}(T), \gamma_r^{n,N}(T))$ the system of equations

$$T = \pi_\tau(\Psi^{(N)} \circ F_v)(\tau, \eta) \quad v = \pi_\eta(\Psi^{(N)} \circ F_v)(\tau, \eta)$$

defines two functions $\hat{\tau}_N(T, v)$ and $\hat{\eta}_N(T, v)$. We thus end up with a countable collection of vertical submanifolds

$$\Lambda_N^{(n)} = \{F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) = \Psi^{(N)} \circ F_v(\hat{\tau}_N(T, \eta), \eta) : \gamma_d^{n,N}(T) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_u^{n,N}(T), T \in [n, n + \delta]\}$$

which satisfy:

- (Accumulation to $W_{loc}^u(\mathcal{E}_\infty)$): $\pi_p F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$
- (Asymptotics for central dynamics): uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\pi_z F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) = \mathbf{S}_0^N \circ \mathbf{S}_1(v_2^\varphi(\hat{\tau}_N(T, \eta), \eta), v_2^J(\hat{\eta}_N(T, \eta), \eta)) + O(\delta) \quad (8.8)$$

- (Action of the differential): uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\partial_T F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) = \begin{pmatrix} O(\delta) \\ 1 \\ O(\delta) \\ O(\delta) \end{pmatrix} \quad \partial_\xi F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) = \begin{pmatrix} O(\delta) \\ O(\delta) \\ D(\mathbf{S}_0^N \circ \mathbf{S}_1)(v_2^\varphi(\hat{\tau}_N, \eta), v_2^J(\hat{\tau}_N, \eta)) \left(\frac{\partial_\eta v_2^\varphi}{\partial_\eta v_2^J} \right) + O(\delta) \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.9)$$

- (Control on the center width): uniformly in n

$$\inf_{T \in [n, n+\delta]} |\gamma_u^{n,N}(T) - \gamma_d^{n,N}(T)| \geq (1 - O(\delta)) \inf_{\tau \in [0, \delta]} |\gamma_u(\tau) - \gamma_d(\tau)|. \quad (8.10)$$

It now only remains to describe the submanifolds $\Lambda_N^{(n)}$ in the (p, τ, ξ, η) -local coordinate system given by the linear map ϕ in Proposition 7.6

$$(\varphi, J) = \phi(\xi, \eta) \quad \text{for } (\xi, \eta) \in [-1, 1]^2.$$

On one hand, for $\mathcal{F}_N = \phi^{-1} \circ \mathbf{S}_0^N \circ \mathbf{S}_1 \circ \phi$, the asymptotic expansion (8.8) readily implies that

$$\pi_{(\xi, \eta)} F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) = \mathcal{F}_N(v_2^\varphi(v_2(\hat{\tau}_N(T, \eta), \eta)), \eta) + O(\delta).$$

On the other hand, it follows from (7.19) that

$$\pi_\xi D\mathcal{F}_N(v_2^\varphi(v_2(\hat{\tau}_N(T, \eta), \eta)), \eta) \begin{pmatrix} \partial_\eta v_2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1 + \chi + O(\chi^2). \quad (8.11)$$

Recall moreover that we can assume that $0 < \chi \ll 1$ is arbitrarily small. Then, in view of the above expression the equation

$$v = \pi_\eta F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta)$$

admits a unique solution $\hat{\eta}_N(T, v)$ for all

$$v \in \{\pi_\eta F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) : \gamma_d^{n,N}(T) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_u^{n,N}(T)\}$$

Notice that (8.11) implies that for fixed T

$$\{\pi_\eta F_N^{(n)}(T, \eta) : \gamma_d^{n,N}(T) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_u^{n,N}(T)\} = \{\tilde{\gamma}_d^{n,N}(T) \leq v \leq \tilde{\gamma}_u^{n,N}(T)\}$$

with

$$|\tilde{\gamma}_d^{n,N}(T) - \tilde{\gamma}_u^{n,N}(T)| \geq (1 + \chi - O(\chi^2)) |\gamma_d^{n,N}(T) - \gamma_u^{n,N}(T)|. \quad (8.12)$$

We have then shown that for any $T > 0$ sufficiently large and any $v \in \{\tilde{\gamma}_d^{n,N}(T) \leq v \leq \tilde{\gamma}_u^{n,N}(T)\}$ the system of equations

$$T = \pi_\tau(\Psi^{(N)} \circ F_v)(\tau, \eta) \quad v = \pi_\eta(\Psi^{(N)} \circ F_v)(\tau, \eta)$$

defines two functions $\hat{\tau}(T, v)$ and $\hat{\eta}(T, v)$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the submanifold $\Lambda_N^{(n)}$ admits a parametrization

$$\Lambda_N^{(n)} = \{(v_1^{(n)}(T, v), T, v_2^{(n)}(T, v), v) : \tilde{\gamma}_d^{n,N}(T) \leq v \leq \tilde{\gamma}_u^{n,N}(T), T \in [n, n + \delta]\}$$

in terms of two differentiable functions $v_1^{(n)}, v_2^{(n)}$. The corresponding estimates for $v_1^{(n)}, v_2^{(n)}$ follow from straightforward computations. Finally, the estimate (8.5) is a trivial consequence of (8.10) and (8.12). \square

We now state a corollary of Proposition 8.1 which will prove useful later. To this end we need the following definition.

Definition 8.2. We say that a subset $\mathcal{H} \subset Q_\delta^{\text{ext}}$ is a *h-set* if it can be foliated by horizontal strips: in the local coordinate system given by $(p, \tau, \xi, \eta) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times [-2, 2]^2$ can be described implicitly as

$$\mathcal{H} = \{h_{1,d}(p, \xi, \eta) \leq \tau \leq h_{1,u}(p, \xi, \eta), \gamma_l(p, \tau) \leq \xi \leq \gamma_r(p, \tau), h_{2,d}(p, \tau, \xi) \leq \eta \leq h_{2,u}(p, \tau, \xi), p \in [0, \delta]\} \quad (8.13)$$

for some differentiable functions which satisfy

$$\partial_p h_{1,\star} = O(\delta), \quad \partial_\xi h_{1,\star}, \partial_\eta h_{1,\star} = O(\delta) \quad \star = d, u. \quad (8.14)$$

Analogously, $\mathcal{V} \subset Q_\delta^{\text{ext}}$ is a *v-set* if it can be foliated by vertical strips: it admits a parametrization of the form

$$\mathcal{V} = \{v_{1,l}(\tau, \xi, \eta) \leq p \leq v_{1,r}(\tau, \xi, \eta), \gamma_u(p, \tau) \leq \eta \leq \gamma_d(p, \tau), v_{2,l}(p, \tau, \eta) \leq \xi \leq v_{2,r}(p, \tau, \eta), \tau \in [0, \delta]\} \quad (8.15)$$

in terms of differentiable functions satisfying

$$\partial_\tau v_{1,\star} = O(\delta), \quad \partial_\xi v_{1,\star}, \partial_\eta h_{1,\star} = O(\delta) \quad \star = l, r.$$

Proposition 8.3. *Let $\mathcal{V} \subset Q_\delta$ (resp. \mathcal{H}) be a *v-set* (resp. *h-set*). Then, for any $N \in \mathcal{N}$ the image $\Psi^{(N)}(\mathcal{V}) \cap Q_\delta^{\text{ext}}$ (resp. $(\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}(\mathcal{H}) \cap Q_\delta^{\text{ext}}$) contains a countable collection of *v-sets* (resp. *h-sets*). In particular $\Psi^{(N)}(Q_\delta) \cap Q_\delta^{\text{ext}}$ (resp. $(\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}(Q_\delta) \cap Q_\delta^{\text{ext}}$) contains a countable collection of *v-sets* (resp. *h-sets*).*

Proof. We only provide the proof for *h-sets* the one for *v-sets* being similar. Notice that \mathcal{H} admits a foliation of the form $\mathcal{H} = \bigcup_{(r,s) \in [0,1]^2} \Delta_{r,s}$ for

$$\Delta_{r,s} = \{\tau = \tau(s, p, \xi, \eta), \eta = \eta(r, p, \tau, \xi), \gamma_l(p, \tau(s, p, \xi, \eta)) \leq \xi \leq \gamma_r(p, \tau(s, p, \xi, \eta)), p \in [0, \delta]\}$$

where

$$\tau(s, p, \xi, \eta) = s h_{1,u}(p, \xi, \eta) + (1-s) h_{1,d}(p, \xi, \eta) \quad \eta(r, p, \tau, \xi) = r h_{2,u}(p, \tau, \xi) + (1-r) h_{2,d}(p, \tau, \xi).$$

Making use of the estimates (8.14) it is not difficult to check that the system of equations $\tau = \tau(s, p, \xi, \eta)$ and $\eta = \eta(r, p, \tau, \xi)$ defines two functions $h_1(p, \xi; r, s)$ and $h_2(p, \xi; r, s)$ such that

$$\Delta_{r,s} = \{(p, h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi)) : \gamma_l(p, h_1(p, \xi)) \leq \xi \leq \gamma_r(p, h_2(p, \xi)), p \in [0, \delta]\}.$$

Moreover, one may check that $\partial_p h_1 = O(1)$, $\partial_\xi h_1 = O(\delta)$ and $\partial_p h_2, \partial_\xi h_2 = O(1)$. Hence, $\Delta_{r,s}$ is a horizontal submanifold and the conclusion follows by direct application of Proposition 8.1. \square

Finally, we conclude this section by constructing an *isolating block* for each of the maps $\Psi^{(N)}$. If \mathcal{H} is a *h-set* and \mathcal{V} is a *v-set* (with parametrizations as in (8.13) and (8.15)) we say that \mathcal{V} fully-crosses \mathcal{H} if the subset defined implicitly by

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{H}} = \{(p, \tau, \xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{V} : h_{1,d}(p, \xi, \eta) \leq \tau \leq h_{1,u}(p, \xi, \eta), h_{2,d}(p, \tau, \xi) \leq \eta \leq h_{2,u}(p, \tau, \xi)\}$$

is entirely contained in \mathcal{H} . Analogously, we say that \mathcal{H} fully-crosses \mathcal{V} if the subset defined implicitly by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}} = \{(p, \tau, \xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{H} : v_{1,l}(\tau, \xi, \eta) \leq p \leq v_{1,r}(\tau, \xi, \eta), v_{2,l}(p, \tau, \eta) \leq \xi \leq v_{2,r}(p, \tau, \eta)\}$$

is entirely contained in \mathcal{V} .

Proposition 8.4. *For each $n \in \mathcal{N}$ let $Q_{\delta,N} \subset Q_\delta$ be the rectangle given by*

$$Q_{\delta,N} = [0, \delta]^2 \times D_N$$

with D_N as in Lemma 7.7. Then, $\Psi^{(N)}(Q_{\delta,N}) \cap Q_\delta$ fully crosses $Q_{\delta,N}$ and $(\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}(Q_{\delta,N}) \cap Q_\delta$ fully crosses $Q_{\delta,N}$.

Proof. The proof is a trivial consequence of Proposition 8.1 and Lemma 7.7. In particular, we notice that by (8.7), the center dynamics is given by a $O(\delta)$ perturbation of the maps \mathcal{F}_N in Proposition 7.6. Therefore, the conclusion follows from Lemma 7.8. \square

Existence of cone fields. Having analyzed the dynamics of horizontal and vertical strips we now establish the existence of two families of cone fields $\mathcal{C}^u, \mathcal{C}^s$ for the family of maps $\{\Psi^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$. We do so in Proposition 8.5 which, again, is a suitable reformulation of the results in [GMPS22]. As pointed out above (see Remark 14) an important observation is that the families are uniform in N for $N \in \mathcal{N}$.

Proposition 8.5 (After Proposition 6.5 in [GMPS22]). *At any $Z \in Q_\delta$ there exists a matrix of the form*

$$C(Z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ O(1) & 0 & \text{id}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8.16)$$

and real numbers $0 < \alpha' < \alpha < 1$ such that the following holds for any $\delta > 0$ small enough. For any $N \in \mathcal{N}$ let

$$\mathcal{M}_N(Z) = C(\Psi^{(N)}(Z))^{-1} D\Psi^{(N)}(Z) C(Z)$$

and, in coordinates $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ define the cones

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha^s = \{\alpha \max\{|y_1|, |y_3|\} \geq \max\{|y_2|, |y_4|\}\} \quad \mathcal{C}_\alpha^u = \{\alpha \max\{|y_2|, |y_4|\} \geq \max\{|y_1|, |y_3|\}\}.$$

Then, at any $Z \in Q_\delta$ we have:

- (Invariance):

$$\mathcal{M}_N \mathcal{C}_\alpha^u \subset \mathcal{C}_{\alpha'}^u \quad \mathcal{M}_N^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\alpha^s \subset \mathcal{C}_{\alpha'}^s$$

- (Expansion): There exists $\tilde{\chi} > 1$ such that: if $y \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha^u$ (resp. $y \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha^s$) then

$$\max\{|\mathcal{M}_N y|_2, |\mathcal{M}_N y|_4\} \geq \tilde{\chi} \max\{|y|_2, |y|_4\} \quad (\text{resp. } \max\{|\mathcal{M}_N^{-1} y|_1, |\mathcal{M}_N^{-1} y|_3\} \geq \tilde{\chi} \max\{|y|_1, |y|_3\})$$

Proof. Proposition 12.4 in [GMPS22] shows that there exist $0 < \tilde{\alpha}' < \tilde{\alpha} < 1$ independent of δ such that (in the notation of that paper) for each N there exists a matrix $C_N(Z) = C_{2,1}(Z) \tilde{C}_N(Z)$, with $C_{2,1}$ independent of N and of the form (8.16), and $\tilde{C}_N(Z)$ being a $O(\delta^{1/5})$ -perturbation of the identity matrix, for which

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N(Z) = C_N(\Psi^{(N)}(Z))^{-1} D\Psi^{(N)}(Z) C_N(Z)$$

satisfies

$$\mathcal{M}_N \mathcal{C}_\alpha^u \subset \mathcal{C}_{\alpha'}^u \quad \mathcal{M}_N^{-1} \mathcal{C}_\alpha^s \subset \mathcal{C}_{\alpha'}^s$$

and

$$\max\{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N y|_2, |\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N y|_4\} \geq \tilde{\chi} \max\{|y|_2, |y|_4\} \quad \max\{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N^{-1} y|_1, |\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_N^{-1} y|_3\} \geq \tilde{\chi} \max\{|y|_1, |y|_3\}.$$

The result then follows trivially since $\tilde{C}_N(Z), \tilde{C}_N(Z)^{-1}$ only move the cones by $O(\delta^{1/5})$ so we can take

$$\alpha = \tilde{\alpha} - O(\delta^{1/5}) \quad \alpha' = \tilde{\alpha}' + O(\delta^{1/5}). \quad \square$$

8.2. Existence of a cs -blender. In this section we establish the existence of a cs -blender for the return map Ψ . In this particular setting we define cs -strips as follows.

Definition 8.6 (cs -strips). We say that a horizontal submanifold Δ is a cs -strip if $\Delta \subset Q_\delta$.

Theorem 8.7. *There exists a hyperbolic periodic point $P \in Q_\delta$ (of the map Ψ) such that the pair (P, Q_δ) is a cs -blender for Ψ in (7.25). More concretely, any cs -strip $\Delta \subset Q_\delta$ intersects $W^u(P)$ robustly.*

Inspired by the discussion in Section 4 the proof of Theorem 8.7 is split into two parts.

Covering property. We first recall that, by Proposition 8.3 for each $N \in \mathcal{N}$ there exist a countable collection of v -sets $\mathcal{V}_N^{(n)}$

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{V}_N^{(n)} = \Psi^{(N)}(Q_\delta) \cap Q_\delta^{\text{ext}} \quad (8.17)$$

We choose any n_* large enough and let $\mathcal{V}_N = \mathcal{V}_N^{(n_*)}$.

Proposition 8.8. *For any cs -strip Δ , the image $(\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}(\Delta) \cap Q_\delta$ contains at least one cs -strip. More concretely, if $\{\mathcal{V}_N\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \subset Q_\delta$ is the family of vertical rectangles in (8.17), for any cs -strip Δ there exists a (possibly equal) cs -strip $\tilde{\Delta} \subset \Delta$ and $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\tilde{\Delta} = (\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta} \cap \mathcal{V}_N)$ is a cs -strip. Moreover, if $\text{width}(\tilde{\Delta}) \leq 7/4$, the conclusion holds with $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta$.*

Proof. The proof is a rather straightforward consequence of Lemma 7.7 and the argument given in Proposition 5.5 for the symbolic case. The increased length of the argument is a just a consequence of small technicalities inherent to the non-linear setting.

We consider a cs -strip Δ and let γ_l, γ_r and h_1, h_2 be the functions associated to the parametrization of Δ as in (8.4). The rectangles \mathcal{V}_N have a slightly distorted geometry and, before continuing, it will be convenient to first construct suitable subsets of $\mathcal{V}_N^{(n)}$ which can be written as graphs over (ξ, η) . Denote by $v_{i,\star}^N$ $i = 0, 1, \star = l, r$ and γ_\star^N , $\star = l, r$ the functions involved in the parametrization (8.15) of the v -set \mathcal{V}_N . Since

$$\partial_\tau v_{2,\star}^N = O(1) \quad \partial_\tau \gamma_\star^N = O(1)$$

it is not difficult to see that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_N := \{(p, \tau, \xi, \eta) : v_{1,l}^N(\tau, \xi, \eta) \leq p \leq v_{1,r}^N(\tau, \xi, \eta), (\xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{F}_N([-1 + C\delta, 1 - C\delta]^2), \tau \in [0, \delta]\} \subset \mathcal{V}_N$$

where \mathcal{F}_N are the maps in Proposition 7.6. Let b_N be as in Proposition 7.6 and define

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{l,N} = (1 - \chi)(-1 + C\delta + b_N), \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{r,N} = (1 - \chi)(1 - C\delta + b_N)$$

so

$$\mathcal{F}_N([-1 + C\delta, 1 - C\delta]^2) \cap [-1, 1] = [\tilde{\gamma}_{l,N}, \tilde{\gamma}_{r,N}] \times [-1, 1].$$

The result then follows if we show that at least for one $N \in \mathcal{N}$ we can find

$$-1 \leq \gamma_l \leq \tilde{\gamma}_l < \tilde{\gamma}_r \leq \gamma_r \leq 1$$

such that the piece $\tilde{\Delta}_N$ defined implicitly by

$$\tilde{\Delta}_N = \{(p, h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi)) : \tilde{\gamma}_l \leq \xi \leq \tilde{\gamma}_r, v_{1,l}^N(h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi)) \leq p \leq v_{1,r}^N(h_1(p, \xi), \xi, h_2(p, \xi))\} \quad (8.18)$$

is contained entirely in $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_N$. Indeed, Lemma 7.7 implies that for δ small enough there exist $N_{\pm} \subset \mathcal{N}$ such that (enough to consider N_+ for which $b_{N_+} \in (2\chi, 3\chi)$ and N_- for which $b_{N_-} \in (-3\chi, -2\chi)$)

$$[-1, 1] \subset \bigcup_{N \in \{N_+, N_-\}} [\tilde{\gamma}_{l,N}, \tilde{\gamma}_{r,N}].$$

Moreover a straightforward computation shows that

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{r,N_+} - \tilde{\gamma}_{l,N_-} \geq 2 - O(\chi).$$

so if the *cu*-strip Δ is such that the slices

$$\Delta_{p*} = \Delta \cap \{p = p_*\}$$

satisfy $\pi_{(\xi,\eta)}\Delta_p = \pi_{(\xi,\eta)}\Delta_{p*}$ for any pair of values $p, p_* \in [0, \delta]$ then the result would follow provided we choose $\tilde{\gamma}_r - \tilde{\gamma}_l \leq 7/4$ (any number strictly smaller than two would suffice) in the definition (8.18) of the pieces $\tilde{\Delta}_{N_{\pm}}$.

Our definition of *cs*-strips only allows these slices to move slightly as we move p . In particular, it follows from the mean value theorem and the fact that $\partial_p h_2(p, \xi) = O(1)$ and $\partial_p \gamma_l, \partial_p \gamma_r = O(1)$ that for any pair $p, p_* \in [0, \delta]$

$$\max\{ |(\xi, \eta) - (\xi_*, \eta_*)| : (\xi, \eta) \in \pi_{(\xi,\eta)}(\Delta_p), (\xi_*, \eta_*) \in \pi_{(\xi,\eta)}(\Delta_{p_*}) \} = O(\delta).$$

Hence, if $\tilde{\Delta}_{N_+} \not\subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{N_+}$ we must have $\tilde{\Delta}_{N_-} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{N_-}$. \square

Well-distributed hyperbolic periodic orbits in Q_δ . Together, Propositions 8.4 and 8.5 imply that, for each $N \in \mathcal{N}$ there exists a hyperbolic set $\mathcal{X}_N \subset Q_{\delta,N} \subset Q_\delta$ on which $\Psi^{(N)}|_{\mathcal{X}_N}$ is conjugated to the full-shift acting on the space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of bi-infinite sequences. In particular, for each $N \in \mathcal{N}$ we can extract a hyperbolic fixed point $P_N \in Q_{\delta,N}$ for the map $\Psi^{(N)}$.

Proposition 8.9. *Let $P_N \in \mathcal{V}_N$ be a hyperbolic periodic point corresponding to a fixed point of the map $\Psi^{(N)}$. Then,*

$$W_{\text{loc}}^u(P_N) = \{(g_{1,N}(\tau, \eta), \tau, g_{2,N}(\tau, \eta), \eta) : \tau \in [0, \delta], \eta \in [-1, 1]\} \quad (8.19)$$

for some differentiable functions satisfying

$$\partial_\tau g_{1,N}, \partial_\eta g_{1,N} = O(\delta), \quad g_{2,N} = \frac{b_N}{\chi} + O_{C^1}(\chi).$$

where b_N is as in Proposition 7.6.

Proof. The proof of this result follows easily from a graph transform argument and the estimates given in Proposition 8.1. Although establishing the asymptotic expansion for $g_{2,N}$ requires a somewhat delicate analysis, the corresponding estimates can be obtained as in the proof of Proposition 5.6 for the symbolic case. The details are left to the reader. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.7. . We now use Propositions 8.8 and 8.9 to show that, there exists $\tilde{\chi} > 1$ such that for any cs -strip $\Delta \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta$ either:

- there exists $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\Delta \cap W^u(P_N) \neq \emptyset$ or
- there exists $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\bar{\Delta} = (\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}(\Delta \cap \mathcal{V}_N) \cap \mathcal{Q}_\delta$ is a cs -strip and $\text{width}(\bar{\Delta}) > \tilde{\chi} \text{width}(\Delta)$.

On one hand we notice that (see Proposition 7.6) there exist $\{N_l, N_r\} \subset \mathcal{N}$ is such that

$$b_{N_l} \in \left(-\frac{3}{4}\chi, -\frac{1}{4}\chi\right) \quad b_{N_r} \in \left(\frac{1}{4}\chi, \frac{3}{4}\chi\right)$$

Hence, for any cs -strip Δ with $\text{width}(\Delta) \geq 7/4$ there exists at least one $N_* \in \{N_l, N_r\}$ such that $\Delta \cap W^u(P_{N_*}) \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, if $\text{width}(\Delta) \leq 7/4$ we have shown in Proposition 8.8 that there exists $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\Psi^{-1}(\Delta \cap \mathcal{V}_N)$ is a cs -strip. Thus, by Proposition 8.1 there exists $\tilde{\chi} > 1$ (independent of Δ) such that

$$\text{width}(\Psi^{-1}(\Delta \cap \mathcal{V}_N)) \geq \tilde{\chi} \text{width}(\Delta).$$

The proof of Theorem 8.7 is complete.

8.3. Existence of a symplectic blender. As we did for the symbolic case (see Section 5) we now exploit the almost reversibility of the maps S_i constructed in Theorem 7.5 under the involution $\psi_R(\varphi, J) \mapsto (-\varphi, J)$ to construct a cu -blender for the map Ψ in (7.25).

Let us recall that the argument in Section 5 was based in the fact that the affine approximations L_0, L_1 of the maps T_0, T_1 in Section 5 (recall that these maps constitute an abstract model in which the scattering maps S_0, S_1 fall) are indeed reversible with respect to ψ_R . Therefore, we concluded that, up to small errors $T_1 \circ T_0^n$ was conjugated by ψ_R to the map $(T_0^n \circ T_1)^{-1}$. Hence, our previous construction of a cs -blender using maps of the form $\{T_0^n \circ T_1\}_n$ automatically implied the existence of a cu -blender associated to the family of maps $\{T_1 \circ T_0^n\}_n$.

The very same argument would be valid in the present context. However, in order to reproduce the sequence $T_1 \circ T_0^n$ one needs to consider the map

$$\Psi_{1 \rightarrow 0} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 1} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 0}^{N-1}$$

which is only defined on a subset of \mathcal{Q}_δ^0 . As a consequence the cu -blender obtained by this construction would be associated to a subset of the section \mathcal{Q}_δ^0 , while the cs -blender constructed in Theorem 8.7 is associated to a subset $Q_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1$. Although one could get around this technical annoyance by later transporting the cu -blender to the section \mathcal{Q}_δ^1 it is slightly more convenient to take a slightly different approach which we detail below.

Different coordinate systems. Throughout this section we will make use of several coordinate systems:

- We recall that the transverse sections \mathcal{Q}_δ^i were introduced in (7.24) and that we defined local coordinate charts $\phi_i : (p, \tau, \varphi, J) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i$.
- In Section 8 we considered a smaller region (here $\phi : [-2, 2]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ is the affine map in Proposition 7.6.)

$$Q_\delta = \phi_1([0, \delta]^2 \times \phi([-1, 1])^2) \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1.$$

and introduced a local coordinate system $(p, \tau, \xi, \eta) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times [-1, 1]^2$.

- We now define the region

$$\tilde{Q}_\delta = \phi_0([0, \delta]^2 \times \psi_R \circ \phi([-1, 1])^2) \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0. \quad (8.20)$$

and let $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times [-1, 1]^2$ be local coordinates on \tilde{Q}_δ .

- Finally we define the region

$$\hat{Q}_\delta = \phi_0([0, \delta]^2 \times \phi([-1, 1])^2) \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0. \quad (8.21)$$

We notice that there exist $-1 < a < 0 < b < 1$ such that

$$\hat{Q}_\delta \cap \tilde{Q}_\delta = \phi_0([0, \delta]^2 \times \phi([-1, 1] \times [a, b])) = \phi_0([0, \delta]^2 \times \psi_R \circ \phi([a, b] \times [-1, 1])) \quad (8.22)$$

and that the transition map between the two local coordinate patches is given by a rotation by an angle $\pi/2$:

$$(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta}) \mapsto (\hat{p}, \hat{\tau}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{\eta}) = (\tilde{p}, \tilde{\tau}, -\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\xi}). \quad (8.23)$$

A cs -blender in \mathcal{Q}_δ^0 . Our solution to the technical issue highlighted above passes through the construction of a cs -blender in \mathcal{Q}_δ^0 . To that end, the main observation is that, for large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, at the affine level, the maps $T_0^n \circ T_1$ and $T_0^n \circ T_1 \circ T_0$ (recall that T_0, T_1 are abstract models for the scattering maps S_0, S_1) only differ by a constant horizontal shift. Indeed, the same computation performed in Lemma 5.2 shows that for $n \leq 1/2\varepsilon$ and $\{|J| \leq \varepsilon/8\}$

$$\hat{F}_n = T_1^n \circ T_2 \circ T_1 : (\varphi, J) \mapsto A_n \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} + \hat{b}_n + \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\varphi, J)$$

with A_n as in Lemma 5.2, $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfying the same estimates as \mathcal{E} in Lemma 5.2 and $\hat{b}_n = (\hat{b} + [n\omega], 0)^\top$ for some $\hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, the very same change of variables ϕ in Lemma 5.4 also puts \hat{F}_n in normal form (5.9) (modulo a horizontal, constant in n , shift).

In the context of the scattering maps S_0, S_1 , the above discussion implies that the same transformation ϕ in Proposition 7.6 also puts $S_0^N \circ S_1 \circ S_0$ in normal form (7.19) and that for a suitable $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ the associated sequence $\{\hat{b}_N\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ is $\frac{1}{10}\chi$ -dense in $[-10\chi, 10\chi]$. We can therefore consider the family of maps

$$\hat{\Psi}^{(N)} = \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 0}^N \circ \Psi_{1 \rightarrow 0} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 1} : \hat{Q}_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$$

and repeat all the discussion in Sections 8.1, 8.2 to deduce the following.

Proposition 8.10. *There exists a hyperbolic periodic point $\hat{P} \in \hat{Q}_\delta$ (of the map Ψ) such that the pair $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q}_\delta)$ is a cs -blender for the map Ψ in (7.25): any cs -strip $\Delta \subset \hat{Q}_\delta$ intersects $W^u(P)$ robustly. Moreover, in local coordinates $(\hat{p}, \hat{\tau}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{\eta})$ in \hat{Q}_δ the local manifold $W_{\text{loc}}^u(P)$ admits a parametrization of the form (8.19).*

A cu -blender in \mathcal{Q}_δ^0 . For $N \in \mathcal{N}$ we define on \tilde{Q}_δ the map

$$\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)} = \Psi_{1 \rightarrow 0} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 1} \circ \Psi_{0 \rightarrow 0}^{N-1} \quad (8.24)$$

Then, the very same argument deployed in the proof of Proposition 8.1 shows that a similar statement also holds for the family of maps $\{\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ but with the following modifications. Instead of considering vertical and horizontal submanifolds as the ones in (8.3) (resp. (8.4)) we now consider submanifolds

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}_v &= \{\tilde{F}_v(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}) = (v_1(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}), \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}, v_2(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi})) : \gamma_d(\tilde{\tau}) \leq \tilde{\xi} \leq \gamma_u(\tilde{\tau}), \tilde{\tau} \in [0, \delta]\} \subset \tilde{Q}_\delta \\ (\text{resp. } \tilde{\Lambda}_h &= \{\tilde{F}_h(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}) = (\tilde{p}, h_1(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}), h_2(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}), \tilde{\eta}) : \gamma_l(\tilde{p}) \leq \tilde{\eta} \leq \gamma_r(\tilde{p}), \tilde{p} \in [0, \delta]\} \subset \tilde{Q}_\delta) \end{aligned} \quad (8.25)$$

and refer to them as $\tilde{\Psi}$ -vertical (resp. $\tilde{\Psi}$ -horizontal). Each of the images $\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)}(\Lambda_v)$ (resp. $(\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)})^{-1}(\Lambda_h)$) contain a countable collection of $\tilde{\Psi}$ -vertical (resp. $\tilde{\Psi}$ -horizontal) submanifolds $\tilde{\Lambda}_{v,N}^{(n)}$ with parametrizations of the form (8.25) satisfying¹⁴:

- (Asymptotics for central dynamics): uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (instead of the expressions (8.7))

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})} \tilde{F}_{v,N}^{(n)}(T, v) &= \psi_R \circ \mathcal{F}_N^{-1} \circ \psi_R(\check{\xi}(T, v), v_2(\check{\tau}(T, v), \check{\xi}(T, v))) + O(\chi^2, \delta) \\ (\text{resp. } \pi_{(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})} \tilde{F}_{h,N}^{(n)}(P, \varrho) &= \psi_R \circ \mathcal{F}_N \circ \psi_R(h_2(\check{p}(P, \varrho), \check{\eta}(P, \varrho)), \check{\eta}(P, \varrho)) + O(\chi^2, \delta)). \end{aligned} \quad (8.26)$$

To see this it is enough to note that (here $S_i : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ are the maps in Theorem 7.5)

$$S_1 \circ S_0^N = \psi_R \circ (S_0^N \circ S_1)^{-1} \circ \psi_R + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\varphi, J)$$

with $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ containing only non-linear errors (in particular, satisfying estimates similar to those satisfied by \mathcal{E} in Lemma 5.2). Roughly speaking, the behavior of the center for the map $\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)}$ is conjugated by ψ_R to the inverse of the map which gives the center dynamics of the map $\Psi^{(N)}$. The existence of cone fields for the maps $\{\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$ can be deduced in the very same way as for the family of maps $\{\Psi^{(N)}\}_{N \in \mathcal{N}}$. The proof of the following result now follows after verbatim repetition of the argument in Section 8.2.

Remark 16. Below, a cu -strip $\Delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$ is a $\tilde{\Psi}$ -vertical submanifold which is entirely contained in $\tilde{Q}_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$.

¹⁴Here $\check{\tau}, \check{\xi}$ are the corresponding solutions to the system of equations $T = \pi_{\tilde{\tau}}(\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)} \circ F_v)(\tau, \xi)$ and $v = \pi_{\tilde{\xi}}(\tilde{\Psi}^{(N)} \circ F_v)(\tau, \xi)$.

Proposition 8.11. *There exists a hyperbolic periodic point $\tilde{P} \in \tilde{Q}_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$ such that the pair $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}_\delta)$ is a cu-blender for the map Ψ in (7.25): any cu-strip $\Delta \subset \tilde{Q}_\delta$ intersects $W^s(\tilde{P})$ robustly. Moreover, in the local coordinate system $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})$ defined on \tilde{Q}_δ*

$$W_{\text{loc}}^s(\tilde{P}) = \{(\tilde{p}, f_1(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}), f_2(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\eta}), \tilde{\eta}) : \tilde{p} \in [0, \delta], \tilde{\eta} \in [-1, 1]\}$$

for some C^1 functions satisfying

$$\partial_{\tilde{p}} f_1, \partial_{\tilde{\eta}} f_1 = O(\delta) \quad f_2 = c + O_{C^1}(\chi)$$

for some $c \in (-3/4, 3/4)$.

Homoclinically related blenders yield a symplectic blender. It is a straightforward consequence of the parametrizations of $W_{\text{loc}}^u(\hat{P})$ (see Proposition 8.10) $W_{\text{loc}}^s(\tilde{P})$ (see Proposition 8.11) and the expression (8.23) for the transition map between coordinate charts that the points \hat{P} in Proposition 8.10 and \tilde{P} in Proposition 8.11 are homoclinically related. Thus, the pairs $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q}_\delta)$ and $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}_\delta)$ form a symplectic blender for the map Ψ .

Theorem 8.12. *Let $\hat{P} \in \hat{Q}_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$ be the hyperbolic periodic point in Proposition 8.10 and let $\tilde{P} \in \tilde{Q}_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$ be the hyperbolic periodic point in Proposition 8.11. Then, the pairs $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q}_\delta)$ and $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}_\delta)$ form a symplectic blender for the map Ψ in (7.25).*

9. EXISTENCE OF ORBITS ACCUMULATING \mathcal{E}_∞ : PROOF OF THEOREM D

Let

$$O_\delta = \hat{Q}_\delta \cap \tilde{Q}_\delta \subset \mathcal{Q}_\delta^0$$

We define h -sets $\mathcal{H} \subset O_\delta$ and v -sets $\mathcal{V} \subset O_\delta$ according to Definition 8.2 (but adapted to the local coordinate system $(\hat{p}, \hat{\tau}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{\eta})$).

Remark 17. Recall that the coordinate systems on $\tilde{Q}_\delta, \hat{Q}_\delta$ are related by a rotation of 90 degrees. Hence, in the local coordinate system $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta})$, our definition of h -sets and v -sets above, corresponds, respectively to v -sets and h -sets.

Proposition 9.1. *Let $\mathcal{H} \subset O_\delta$ be a h -set and $\mathcal{V} \subset O_\delta$ be a v -set. Then, there exists $n_f \in \mathbb{N}$ (resp. $n_b \in \mathbb{N}$) and a v -set \mathcal{V}_{n_f} (resp. a h -set \mathcal{H}_{n_b}) which is a connected component of $\Psi^{n_f}(\mathcal{V}) \cap O_\delta$ (resp. $\Psi^{-n_b}(\mathcal{H}) \cap O_\delta$) such that \mathcal{V}_{n_f} (resp. \mathcal{H}_{n_b}) fully crosses \mathcal{H} (resp. \mathcal{V}).*

Proof. Think of $W_{\text{loc}}^u(\hat{P})$ (resp. $W_{\text{loc}}^s(\tilde{P})$) as a (zero-volume) v -set (resp. h -set). Then, since $(\hat{P}, \hat{Q}_\delta)$ is a cs -blender (resp. $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}_\delta)$ is a cu -blender) we claim that for any h -set (resp. v -set) the local manifold $W_{\text{loc}}^u(\hat{P})$ (resp. $W_{\text{loc}}^s(\tilde{P})$) fully crosses \mathcal{H} (resp. \mathcal{V}). Since \hat{P} and \tilde{P} are homoclinically related we reach the desired conclusion by a direct application of the lambda lemma.

In order to verify the claim one needs to proceed as follows (we only analyze the case of h -sets the result for v -sets following from the same analysis). Recall that a h -set is a union of horizontal submanifolds $\bigcup_{(r,s) \in [0,1]} \Delta_{r,s}$ (see the proof of Proposition 8.3). The claim follows if it is possible to find a single $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and a single sequence $\omega \in \hat{\mathcal{N}}^M$ such that the following holds: if we denote by \mathcal{V}_ω any of the countable family of vertical v -sets contained in $\Psi_\omega(\hat{Q}_\delta)$ then for any pair $(r, s) \in [0, 1]$

$$W_{\text{loc}}^u(\hat{P}) \cap \Psi_\omega^{-1}(\Delta_{r,s} \cap \mathcal{V}_\omega) \neq \emptyset.$$

However, the existence of such sequence ω is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.8. \square

9.1. Two-sided shadowing. Define the countable family of closed rectangles which, in local coordinates (p, τ, ξ, η) are given by

$$\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \{[0, r]^2 \times [x - r, x + r] \times [y - r, y + r] : (x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}^2 \cap [-1, 1]^2, r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]\} \subset O_\delta,$$

We now show the following.

Proposition 9.2. *There exists $z \in O_\delta$ such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\mathcal{U}_k \cap \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi^n(z) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_k \cap \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi^{-n}(z) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. Observe first that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the image $\Psi^{(N)}(\mathcal{U}_k)$ (resp. the preimage $(\Psi^{(N)})^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_k)$) contains a countable collection of v -sets (resp. h -sets). Indeed, this is a consequence of Remark 15 after Proposition 8.1. Pick any of them and denote it by \mathcal{V}_k (resp. \mathcal{H}_k). Then, by Proposition 9.1 we know that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

- there exists $n_f \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Psi^{n_f}(\mathcal{V}_{k+1})$ fully-crosses \mathcal{H}_k and,
- there exists $n_b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Psi^{-n_b}(\mathcal{H}_{k+1})$ fully-crosses \mathcal{V}_k .

Hence, given $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the compact sets

$$\mathbf{H}_m := \bigcap_{k \leq m} \left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi^n(\mathcal{U}_k) \cap O_\delta \right) \quad \mathbf{V}_m := \bigcap_{k \leq m} \left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi^{-n}(\mathcal{U}_k) \cap O_\delta \right)$$

are non-empty and contain, respectively, a h -set and a v -set. By direct application of Proposition 9.1 the compact set

$$\mathbf{R}_m = \bigcap_{k \leq m} \left(\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi^n(\mathcal{U}_k) \cap O_\delta \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi^{-n}(\mathcal{U}_k) \cap O_\delta \right) \right)$$

is non-empty as well. Moreover, by construction $\mathbf{R}_{m+1} \subset \mathbf{R}_m$ so (recall that the countable intersection of compact non-empty nested sets is non-empty)

$$\mathbf{R}_\infty := \bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{R}_m \neq \emptyset.$$

Finally, we notice that for $z \in \mathbf{R}_\infty$ and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Psi^{n_1}(z) \in \mathcal{U}_k \neq \emptyset$ and $\Psi^{-n_2}(z) \in \mathcal{U}_k \neq \emptyset$. \square

The proof of Theorem D is complete.

10. A NORMALLY HYPERBOLIC LAMINATION IN THE RESTRICTED PROBLEM: PROOF OF THEOREM E

In this section we construct a weakly invariant normally hyperbolic lamination for the return map to a suitable 4-dimensional section transverse to the flow of (1.18).

McGehee's partial compactification. Consider polar coordinates

$$\phi_{\text{pol}} : (r, \alpha, y, G) \mapsto (q, p)$$

on $T^*(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Delta)$ where Δ is the collision set. Then, one introduces McGehee's partial compactification by the change of coordinates $\phi_{MG} : (x, \alpha, y, G) \mapsto (\frac{2}{x^2}, \alpha, y, G)$. On the compactified manifold

$$\overline{M} = M \sqcup M_\infty \quad M_\infty = \phi_{\text{pol}} \circ \phi_{MG}(\{0\} \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2)$$

equipped with local coordinates $(x, \alpha, y, G) \in (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and the singular symplectic form

$$\Omega = \frac{4}{x^3} dy \wedge dx + dG \wedge d\alpha, \quad (10.1)$$

the Hamiltonian (1.18) recasts as

$$\mathcal{H}(x, \alpha, y, G, t) = \frac{y^2}{2} - \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{G^2 x^4}{8} - V(x, \alpha, t) \quad V = U \circ \phi_{\text{pol}} \circ \phi_{MG} - \frac{x^2}{2}. \quad (10.2)$$

The vector field generated by the pair (Ω, \mathcal{H}) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= -\frac{x^3}{4} \partial_y \mathcal{H} = -\frac{x^3}{4} y & \dot{\alpha} &= \partial_G \mathcal{H} = \frac{G x^4}{4} & \dot{t} &= 1 \\ \dot{y} &= \frac{x^3}{4} \partial_x \mathcal{H} = -\frac{x^3}{4} \left(x - \frac{G^2 x^3}{8} - \partial_x V \right) & \dot{G} &= -\partial_\alpha \mathcal{H} = \partial_\alpha V. \end{aligned} \quad (10.3)$$

The following lemma, whose proof boils down to an straightforward computation and the application of Schwarz's lemma, will prove useful.

Lemma 10.1. *Let $V(x, \alpha, t)$ be as in (10.2) and define $\phi = \alpha - t$. Then,*

$$V(x, \alpha, t; \zeta) = V_0(x, \phi) + \zeta V_1(x, \phi, t; \zeta)$$

with $V_0, V_1 = O(x^6)$.

A normally-parabolic cylinder at infinity. It follows from the equations (10.3) that the cylinder

$$\mathcal{P}_\infty = \{x = y = 0, (\alpha, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2, G \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

is invariant for the flow of (10.2). The flow restricted to \mathcal{P}_∞ is given by the linear resonant translation

$$\phi_{\mathcal{H}}^s : (\alpha, t, G) \mapsto (\alpha, t + s, G).$$

The linearized dynamics at \mathcal{P}_∞ is degenerate (normally-parabolic) but the manifold \mathcal{P}_∞ admits four-dimensional local stable and unstable manifolds which we denote by $W_{\text{loc}}^{u,s}(\mathcal{P}_\infty)$. Moreover, the dependence of the strong stable/unstable leaves on the base point is real-analytic (see for instance [McG73, BFM20a, BFM20b]). The globalization of these manifolds intersect transversally along “large homoclinic channels”.

Theorem 10.2 (Theorem 2.2 in [GPS23]). *Let $\mu \in (0, 1/2)$ and let $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ be sufficiently small. Fix any pair*

$$|\log \zeta| \ll G_1 < G_2 \ll \zeta^{-1/3}.$$

Then, there exists (at least) two different, non-empty, real-analytic, transverse homoclinic manifolds

$$\Gamma_i \subset W_{\text{loc}}^u(\mathcal{P}_\infty) \pitchfork W_{\text{loc}}^s(\mathcal{P}_\infty) \quad i = 0, 1,$$

which satisfy (here the wave map Ω^u is defined exactly as in (7.14) but for the flow of (10.2))

$$\mathcal{P}_\infty(G_1, G_2) := \mathcal{P}_\infty \cap \{G_1 \leq G \leq G_2\} \subset \Omega^u(\Gamma_0) \cap \Omega^u(\Gamma_1) \quad (10.4)$$

The homoclinic channel allows us to construct scattering maps. Let us first define them. Let us consider a normally hyperbolic (or parabolic) invariant manifold Λ (as is \mathcal{P}_∞) and let us denote by $W^s(\Lambda)$ and $W^u(\Lambda)$ its stable and unstable invariant manifolds, and by $W_x^{s,u}(\Lambda)$, $x \in \Lambda$, the associated stable/unstable leaves. One these invariant manifolds one can define the classical holonomy maps (called often also wave maps) $\Omega^{u,s} : W^{u,s}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \Lambda$, which assign to each point the unique point in Λ such that both orbits get synchronized forward/backward in time. That is $y^{u,s} = \Omega^{u,s}(x)$ if $x \in W_{y^{s,u}}^{s,u}(\Lambda)$. These maps are as regular as Λ .

If we consider a a transverse homoclinic channel Γ as the ones obtained in Theorem 10.2 for \mathcal{P}_∞ , one has that the restriction of $\Omega^{u,s}$ to Γ are diffeomorphisms onto their images. Then, one can define the scattering map associated to Γ as $S = \Omega^s \circ (\Omega^u)^{-1}$, which is as regular as Λ and symplectic [DdILS08]. Note that the domain of definition of this map may be small since it depends on the “size” of Γ .

The following result describes the dynamics of the scattering maps along these homoclinic channels.

Theorem 10.3 ([GPS23]). *Let $\mu \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\zeta \in (0, 1)$. Let Γ_i , $i = 0, 1$ be the transverse homoclinic channels given by Theorem 10.2 and let S_i , $i = 0, 1$ be the corresponding scattering maps. Then:*

- *There exists an annulus \mathcal{A}_∞ and a local coordinate system $(t, \phi(\varphi, J)) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathcal{A}_\infty$ in which the maps S_i act trivially on the t -component and their action on the (φ, J) variables, given by*

$$S_i = \phi^{-1} \circ S_i \circ \phi,$$

satisfy the assumptions B0, B1 for certain $\gamma, \tau, \rho, \sigma \neq 0$ independent of ζ and $\varepsilon > 0$ which satisfies $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\zeta \rightarrow 0$.

- *There exists $M_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}$ there exists a natural number $M \leq M_*$ and a finite sequence $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^M$ such that*

$$S_{\omega_{M-1}} \circ \cdots \circ S_{\omega_0}(\varphi, J) \in \mathcal{A}_\infty.$$

Although this result is not stated explicitly as a theorem in [GPS23] it follows plainly from the construction in Section 2.2 of that work. The details are shown in Appendix D.

The return maps. We now reproduce the argument in Section 7.5 to construct a return map to certain transverse sections which accumulate on the homoclinic manifolds Γ_i , $i = 0, 1$ obtained in Theorem 10.2. The first step is to show that the normal form Lemma 7.9 also holds for the vector field (10.3). As for Lemma 7.9, this is a consequence of the more general result which was obtained in [GMPS22].

Theorem 10.4 (Theorem 5.2 in [GMPS22]). *Fix any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $K \subset \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ be a compact set. Let $B, C \in \mathbb{R}$. Let X be any C^∞ vector field of the form*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= -x^3 y(1 + B(x^2 - y^2) + R_1(x, y, z, t)) & \dot{t} &= 1 \\ \dot{y} &= -x^4(1 + (B - C)x^2 - By^2 + R_2(x, y, z, t)) & \dot{z} &= R_3(x, y, z, t) \end{aligned} \quad (10.5)$$

with $x \mapsto R_i(x, \cdot)$ even for $i = 1, 2, 3$, $R_3 = O(x^6)$ and $R_1, R_2 = O_2(x^2, y^2)$ and which is defined on $\mathcal{U}_\infty = \{(x, y \in U, z = (\varphi, G) \in K, t \in \mathbb{T}\}$ with $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ an sufficiently small open neighborhood of the origin. On \mathcal{U}_∞ there exists a C^k change of variables $\Phi : (t, \tilde{z}, q, p) \rightarrow (t, z, x, y)$ given by a $O_2(x, y)$ perturbation of a constant linear map $(x, y) = A \binom{q}{p}$ and such that, after a regular time parametrization, conjugates the vector field X to the vector field (we write $\tilde{z} = (\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{J})$)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q} &= q((q + p)^3 + O_4(q, p)) & \dot{\tilde{z}} &= (qp)^k O_4(q, p) \\ \dot{p} &= -p((q + p)^3 + O_4(q, p)) & \dot{t} &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (10.6)$$

A trivial computation shows that the vector field (10.3) is of the form (10.5) with $B = 0$, $C = \frac{G^2}{8}$, $R_1 = 0$, $R_2 = \frac{1}{x} \partial_x V = O_4(x)$ and $R_3 = (\frac{Gx^4}{4}, -\partial_\alpha V)^\top = O(x^4, x^6)^\top$. Notice that $R_3 = O(x^4)$ so we cannot apply Theorem 10.4 directly. This technical annoyance is bypassed by considering the new variable $\beta = \alpha + yG$. Indeed, an easy computation shows that the component of the vector field in the direction of $\hat{z} = (\beta, G)$ is of order $O(x^6)$ (see also [GSMS17]).

Hence, fixed any pair $G_1 < G_2 < \infty$, we can apply Theorem 10.4 to the vector field (10.3) to reduce it to the normal form (10.6) on a neighborhood of $\mathcal{P}_\infty(G_1, G_2)$. Let now $1 \ll G_1 < G_2 < \infty$ and let $\zeta \in (0, G_2^{-3})$ (see Theorem 10.2). Denote by

$$\mathbb{A}(G_1, G_2) = \{\varphi \in \mathbb{T}, G_1 \leq G \leq G_2\}.$$

Proceeding in the very same way as we did in Section 7.5 we consider:

- Transverse sections $\Sigma_a^{\text{out}} = \{q = a, p > 0\}$, $\Sigma_a^{\text{in}} = \{p = a, q > 0\}$. We let $U_i^{\text{out}}, U_i^{\text{in}}$ be small sets (in $\Sigma_a^{\text{out}}, \Sigma_a^{\text{in}}$) having the intersections $\Gamma_i \cap \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}, \Gamma_i \cap \Sigma_a^{\text{in}}$ in their boundaries respectively.
- For δ small enough and $i = 0, 1$, a local coordinate system on U_i^{out} given by

$$\phi_i : (p, \tau, \alpha, G) \in [0, \delta]^2 \times \mathbb{A}(G_1, G_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset U_i^{\text{out}}$$

and such that $\Gamma_i = \{\tau = 0\}$.

- A local map $\Phi_{\text{loc}} : U \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{in}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}$,
- Global maps: $\Phi_{i, \text{glob}} : U_i^{\text{out}} \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{in}}$.
- Return maps: (wherever they are defined)

$$\Psi : \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}. \quad (10.7)$$

Note that restricting the domain this map gives the family of maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j} = \Psi_{\text{loc}} \circ \Phi_{i, \text{glob}} : \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}$, $i, j = 0, 1$.

Existence of a normally hyperbolic lamination. By construction, the maps $\Psi_{i \rightarrow j}$ also satisfy the very same conclusion in Theorem 7.12. Hence, making use of the second item in Theorem 10.3, we could, for instance, reproduce the argument in Section 8 to deduce the analogue statements to Theorems C and D.

Instead, we prefer to follow a distinct road and obtain results of slightly different flavor. To that end we notice that, compared to the return maps (7.26) for the 3-body problem, the return maps constructed above for the restricted version are defined on subsets $\mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}$ whose projection onto the center directions (φ, G) cover a (arbitrarily large) cylinder. Indeed, given any pair $1 \ll G_1 < G_2 < \infty$, provided ζ is small enough we can take $(\varphi, G) \in \mathbb{A}(G_1, G_2)$.

In our following result we construct a weakly invariant, normally-hyperbolic lamination for the first return map $\Psi : \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}$. The leaves of these lamination are compact cylinders which become unbounded as $\zeta \rightarrow 0$. More precisely, we let $G_1 \gg 1$ be as in Theorem 10.2, for $\zeta > 0$ small enough let $G_2(\zeta) = \zeta^{-1/3}$, and define

$$\mathbb{A}_\zeta = \{(\varphi, G) : 2G_1 \leq G \leq \frac{1}{2}G_2(\zeta), \varphi \in \mathbb{T}\}. \quad (10.8)$$

We prove the following.

Proposition 10.5. *Let $\mu \in (0, 1/2)$. Let Σ_a^{out} be the transverse section constructed above and let $\Psi : \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}$ be the first return map in (10.7). Then, for any $\zeta > 0$ sufficiently small, provided δ is sufficiently small, there exists a subset $\mathcal{X} \subset (\mathcal{Q}_\delta^0 \cup \mathcal{Q}_\delta^1) \subset \Sigma_a^{\text{out}}$ such that:*

- *it is homeomorphic to the product $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta$. More precisely, $\mathcal{X} = \Phi(\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta)$ for a homeomorphism of the form $\Phi : (\omega, z) \mapsto (p_\omega(z), \tau_\omega(z), z)$ with p_ω, τ_ω differentiable functions which satisfy*

$$\partial_z p_\omega, \partial_z \tau_\omega = O(\delta).$$

For $\omega \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we refer to $\mathcal{L}_\zeta(\omega) = \{(p, \tau) = (p_\omega(z), \tau_\omega(z), z), z \in \mathbb{A}_\zeta\}$ as the leaves of the lamination.

- *it is weakly invariant for the map Ψ and the restriction $\Psi|_{\mathcal{X}}$ (whenever it is defined) is topologically conjugated to the skew-product map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta &\rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta \\ (\omega, z) &\mapsto (\sigma(\omega), \mathcal{F}_\omega(z)) \end{aligned} \quad (10.9)$$

where $\sigma : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the full shift and, for any $(\omega, z) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta$,

$$\mathcal{F}_\omega(z) = S_{\text{par}(\omega_0)}(z) + O_{C^1}(\delta). \quad (10.10)$$

where $\text{par}(\omega_0) = 0$ if $\omega_0 \in 2\mathbb{N}$ and $\text{par}(\omega_0) = 1$ otherwise, and $S_i : \mathbb{A}_\zeta \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_\zeta$, $i = 0, 1$ are the scattering maps in Theorem 10.3.

- *There exists some $r \in (0, 1)$ such that if ω, ω' satisfy that $\omega' \in C_n(\omega)$, uniformly for all $z \in \mathbb{A}$*

$$|\mathcal{F}(\omega, z) - \mathcal{F}(\omega', z)| \leq \delta^{rn}. \quad (10.11)$$

Remark 18. For the case $\zeta = 0$ the same result is true with \mathbb{A}_ζ substituted by $\mathbb{A}_0 = \{(\varphi, G) : 2G_1 \leq G, \varphi \in \mathbb{T}\}$.

Remark 19. Notice that the lamination constructed above is homomorphic to the product. This is way more than what we need to establish Theorem E, which only concerns a lamination in two symbols. However, the construction below does not require any extra effort to handle the infinite symbols case so we present the statement and proof of that result.

Trivially, from Proposition 10.5 one can get a lamination on two symbols by restricting to the (weakly) invariant subset $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta \subset \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta$.

Proof. The proof is divided in a number of steps.

Step 1: We first modify the flow as follows. Let $G_1 \gg 1$ be as in Theorem 10.3 and, for $\zeta > 0$ small enough let $G_2(\zeta) = \zeta^{-3}$. In view of the result in Lemma 10.1 we introduce the change of variables Φ given by $\beta = \alpha - t$. In the new set of variables, the dynamics is governed by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} \circ \Phi(x, y, \beta, G, t) - G = \underbrace{\frac{y^2}{2} - \frac{x^2}{2} - G + \frac{G^2 x^4}{8}}_{\mathcal{H}_0(x, y, \beta, G)} + V_0(x, \beta) + \zeta V_1(x, \beta, t), \quad (10.12)$$

that is, a time-periodic perturbation of a system with two degrees of freedom. We let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any C^∞ compactly supported function such that

$$\psi(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u \in (2G_1, \frac{1}{2}G_2(\zeta)), \\ 0 & \text{if } u \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (G_1, G_2(\zeta)). \end{cases}$$

Then, we consider the modified Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(x, y, \beta, G, t) = \mathcal{H}_0(x, y, \beta, G) + \zeta \psi(|\mathcal{H}_0|) V_1(x, \beta, t). \quad (10.13)$$

By construction, the Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ leaves invariant the submanifolds $\{\mathcal{H}_0 = -G_2(\zeta)\}$ and $\{\mathcal{H}_0 = -G_1\}$. In particular, the region

$$\mathcal{A}(\zeta) = \{(x, y, \beta, G) \in (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}, -G_2(\zeta) \leq \mathcal{H}_0 \leq -G_1\}$$

is invariant for the flow of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Moreover, the vector field associated to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ (with respect to the symplectic form (10.1)) verifies the hypotheses in Theorem 10.4.

Step 2: We then define the subsets

$$\Sigma_{a,\zeta}^{\text{out}} = \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \cap A(\zeta).$$

Proceeding in the exact same way as above, we define the modified return maps (wherever they are defined)

$$\tilde{\Psi} : \Sigma_{a,\zeta}^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_{a,\zeta}^{\text{out}}$$

and $\tilde{\Psi}_{i \rightarrow j} : \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^i \subset \Sigma_{a,\zeta}^{\text{out}} \rightarrow \Sigma_{a,\zeta}^{\text{out}}$ where

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^i = \mathcal{Q}_\delta^i \cap A(\zeta).$$

In local coordinates (p, τ, β, G) we let $\mathcal{G}_i(p, \tau, \beta)$, $i = 1, 2$ be the solutions to the implicit equations

$$\mathcal{H}_0 \circ \phi_i(p, \tau, \beta, G) = G_1 \quad \mathcal{H}_0 \circ \phi_i(p, \tau, \beta, G) = G_2(\zeta).$$

with respect to G .

By construction, the boundaries

$$\Sigma_{a,\zeta}^{\text{out},+} = \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \cap \{G = \mathcal{G}_2(p, \tau, \beta)\} \quad \Sigma_{a,\zeta}^{\text{out},-} = \Sigma_a^{\text{out}} \cap \{G = \mathcal{G}_1(p, \tau, \beta)\}$$

are invariant under the map $\tilde{\Psi}$ (and hence, under the maps $\tilde{\Psi}_{i \rightarrow j}$).

Step 3: The set \mathcal{X} is constructed as a locally maximal invariant set for $\tilde{\Psi}$. The details are as follows. We start by noticing that Theorem 7.12 holds for the maps $\tilde{\Psi}_{i \rightarrow j}$, $i, j = 0, 1$. During the remaining part of the proof we will exploit this fact in several occasions. We will abuse notation and refer to Theorem 7.12 as if it refers to the maps $\tilde{\Psi}_{i \rightarrow j}$.

We say that a subset $V \subset \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^i$ is a *vertical* subset if, in local coordinates (p, τ, β, G) , it admits a parametrization of the form

$$V = \{(p, \tau, \beta, G) : v_1(\tau, \beta, G) \leq p \leq v_2(\tau, \beta, G), \mathcal{G}_1(p, \tau, \beta) \leq G \leq \mathcal{G}_2(p, \tau, \beta), \beta \in \mathbb{T}, \tau \in [0, \delta]\}$$

for some C^1 regular functions v_1, v_2 satisfying (write $z = (\beta, G)$)

$$\partial_z v_i = O(\delta), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Analogously $H \subset \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^i$ is a *horizontal* subset if it admits a parametrization of the form

$$H = \{(p, \tau, \beta, G) : h_1(p, \beta, G) \leq \tau \leq h_2(p, \beta, G), \mathcal{G}_1(p, \tau, \beta) \leq G \leq \mathcal{G}_2(p, \tau, \beta), \beta \in \mathbb{T}, p \in [0, \delta]\}$$

for some C^1 regular functions h_1, h_2 satisfying (write $z = (\beta, G)$)

$$\partial_z h_i = O(\delta), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Notice in particular that $\mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^i$ are, at the same time, vertical and horizontal subsets.

It follows from application of Theorem 7.12 that, for any pair $i, j = 0, 1$, and any vertical (resp. horizontal) subset V (resp. H) the set $\tilde{\Psi}_{i \rightarrow j}^{-1}(V) \cap \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^i$ (resp. $\tilde{\Psi}_{i \rightarrow j}(H) \cap \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^j$) contains infinitely many vertical subsets $V^{(n)}$ (resp. infinitely many horizontal subsets $H^{(n)}$). We let

$$\mathcal{X} = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\Psi}^k(\mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^0 \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^1) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta} = \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^0 \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^1.$$

Step 4: We now introduce a symbolic coding on \mathcal{X} as follows. We denote by $\{V_{i,j}^{(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ the collection of vertical subsets contained in $\tilde{\Psi}_{i \rightarrow j}^{-1}(\mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^j)$ and let $V_i^{(n)} = V_{i,1}^{(n)} \cup V_{i,2}^{(n)}$. By construction $V_i^{(n)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{\delta,\zeta}^i$. Then, to any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we can associate a doubly infinite sequence $\omega \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ by the rule

$$\omega_k = 2n - 1 \iff \tilde{\Psi}^{-k}(x) \in V_1^{(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_k = 2n \iff \tilde{\Psi}^{-k}(x) \in V_0^{(n)}$$

Notice that, by construction, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\tilde{\Psi}^{-k}(\tilde{\Psi}^{-1}(x)) \in V_{\text{par}(\omega_k)}^{([\omega_k/2])}$$

Given any $\omega \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we let

$$V(\omega) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\Psi}^k(V_{\text{par}(\omega_k)}^{([\omega_k/2])})$$

and observe that, by construction, there exist differentiable functions $\tau_\omega(z), p_\omega(z)$ which satisfy

$$\partial_z p_\omega, \partial_z \tau_\omega = O(\delta) \quad (10.14)$$

such that

$$V(\omega) = \{p = p_\omega(\beta, G), \tau = \tau_\omega(\beta, G) : \mathcal{G}_1(p_\omega(\beta, G), \tau_\omega(\beta, G), \beta) \leq G \leq \mathcal{G}_2(p_\omega(\beta, G), \tau_\omega(\beta, G), \beta), \beta \in \mathbb{T}\}.$$

Step 5: We let

$$\mathcal{F}_z(\omega, z) = \pi_z \tilde{\Psi}(p_\omega(\beta, G), \tau_\omega(\beta, G), \beta, G).$$

Clearly, the map $\tilde{\Psi}|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is topologically conjugated to the skew-product

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta &\rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta \\ (w, z) &\mapsto (\sigma(w), \mathcal{F}_z(w, z)) \end{aligned}$$

We now show that $\mathcal{F}_z(\omega, z) = S_{\text{par}(\omega)}(z) + O_{C^1}(\delta)$. At the C^0 level this is a plain consequence of the asymptotic expansions (7.28) in Theorem 7.12 (notice that one should substitute the maps S_i in the original statement by the scattering maps \tilde{S}_i associated to the modified Hamiltonian (10.13)). At the C^1 level this follows from the chain rule, the estimates (10.14) and the estimates (7.29), (7.30) in Theorem 7.12.

Step 6: Normal hyperbolicity follows also from the estimates (7.29), (7.30) in Theorem 7.12.

Step 7: Finally, (10.11) follows from the construction of the symbolic coding above.

The proof of Proposition 10.5 is complete. \square

Before completing the proof of Theorem E we need to address a few technical points. First, the lamination \mathcal{X} is only weakly invariant for the map Ψ in (10.7). There are two ways in which the orbit of a point $(\omega, z) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{A}_\zeta$ can leave \mathcal{X} :

- For some points, there may exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{F}^N(\omega, z) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times (\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{A}_\zeta)$, i.e. the orbit leaves along the center directions.
- If no such N exists, it might still be the case that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \pm\infty} \omega_k = \infty$. These are orbits which escape asymptotically along the base directions.

The lamination \mathcal{X} accumulates on the homoclinic channels Γ_i in Theorem 10.2, i.e. for $\omega \in Z$

$$\text{dist}(\mathcal{L}_\zeta(\omega), \Gamma_i) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \omega_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

This is the main reason why we had to give a proof of Proposition 10.5 instead of appealing to classical persistence results for normally hyperbolic laminations and why, a priori, we can only guarantee that the leaves are C^1 . We indeed believe that the leaves enjoy much better regularity (C^∞ in particular) but proving such a result would require a refined version of Lemma 7.9. For our purposes C^1 regularity is enough.

Remark 20. If we restrict our attention to a subset of \mathcal{X} which stays at finite distance from the homoclinic channels Γ_i we can easily construct C^r laminations (provided ζ is small enough). The construction goes as follows. Recall that (trivially) \mathcal{H}_0 in (10.12) is a conserved quantity when $\zeta = 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}(p, \tau, \beta; E)$ the solution to the equation $\{\mathcal{H}_0 = -E\}$ for any $E \in [G_1, \infty)$, $(p, \tau) \in [0, \delta]^2$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$. The main observation is that for $\zeta = 0$ the corresponding map $\Psi_0 : \Sigma_{\text{out}}^a \rightarrow \Sigma_{\text{out}}^a$ admits a real-analytic normally hyperbolic lamination \mathcal{X}_0 on which the induced dynamics is given by an integrable twist map (by integrable we mean that the sections $\{\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{const}\}$ are invariant). Since for $(p, \tau) \in [0, \delta]$ we have that $\mathcal{G} = G + O(\delta)$ we conclude that, for any $\omega \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ the map $z \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{0,z}(\omega, z)$ is real-analytic and

$$\mathcal{F}_{0,z}(\omega, z) = S_{0,\text{par}(\omega_0)}(z) + O_{C^1}(\delta)$$

where $S_{0,i}$, $i = 0, 1$ are the scattering maps in Theorem 10.2 for the case $\zeta = 0$.

If we now fix any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the subset $\mathcal{X}_{0,M} = \Phi(\{1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times (\mathbb{T} \times [G_1, \infty)))$ and let $K \subset \Sigma_{\text{out}}^a$ be a sufficiently small compact neighborhood of this set, the map $\Psi : K \subset \Sigma_{\text{out}}^a \rightarrow \Sigma_{\text{out}}^a$ for $\zeta > 0$ but small enough, is given by a real-analytic $O(\zeta)$ -perturbation of the map Ψ_0 . The persistence of the lamination $\mathcal{X}_{0,M}$ for $\zeta > 0$ is now a consequence of standard results (see, for instance, [HPS77]). Moreover, having fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$, for $\zeta > 0$ small enough (depending on r), the leaves of the lamination are C^r (this is a consequence of the fact that when $\zeta = 0$ the asymptotic rate of contraction/expansion along directions tangent to the lamination is at most polynomial while the normal behavior is hyperbolic). Hence, at any $\omega \in \{1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ the map $z \mapsto \mathcal{F}_z(\omega, z)$ is a $O_{C^r}(\zeta)$ perturbation of the real-analytic integrable twist map $z \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{0,z}(\omega, z)$.

10.1. Proof of Theorem E. We now give the proof of Theorem E, which follows from a minor modification of the proof of Theorem B given in Section 6 (see, in particular, Section 6.3). Consider the subset $\hat{\mathcal{X}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ defined as $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = \Phi : (\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \hat{\mathbb{A}}_{\zeta})$ where

$$\hat{\mathbb{A}}_{\zeta} = \{(\varphi, G) : 4G_1 \leq G \leq \frac{1}{4}G_2(\zeta), \varphi \in \mathbb{T}\}.$$

Given $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ let $\mathcal{F}_{\omega} : \mathbb{A}_{\zeta} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{A}}_{\zeta}$ be as in (10.10). We will prove that, given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, provided $\zeta, \delta > 0$ are small enough, for any $B, B' \in \hat{\mathbb{A}}$ and any $\omega, \omega' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (here $C_N(\omega)$ is the N -cylinder around ω , see (1.8))

$$\mathcal{F}^M(C_N(\omega), B) \cap (C_N(\omega'), B') \neq \emptyset.$$

The existence of orbits visiting any element of a given countable covering follows by a standard Baire category argument.

We proceed as follows. Fix any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\zeta, \delta > 0$ be sufficiently small so that, for any $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we have that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^N(\hat{\mathbb{A}}_{\zeta}) \subset \mathbb{A}_{\zeta} \quad (\mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N}(\omega)}^N)^{-1}(\hat{\mathbb{A}}_{\zeta}) \subset \mathbb{A}_{\zeta}$$

with \mathbb{A}_{ζ} as in (10.8). Given $\omega, \omega' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $B, B' \in \hat{\mathbb{A}}_{\zeta}$ we let

$$\tilde{B}' = \mathcal{F}_{\omega'}^N(B') \quad \tilde{B} = (\mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N}(\omega)}^N)^{-1}(B).$$

Observe that, by direct application of Lemma 6.1 (which we can apply in virtue of the estimate (10.11)), for any $\tilde{\omega}$ with $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and for any $\tilde{\omega}'$ with $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega'_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ we have that

$$\text{dist}(\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\omega}'}^N(B'), \tilde{B}') \lesssim \delta \quad \text{dist}((\mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N}(\tilde{\omega})}^N)^{-1}(B), \tilde{B}) \lesssim \delta.$$

Let $\mathcal{A}_{\infty} \subset \mathbb{A}_{\zeta}$ be the annulus in Theorem 10.3. By the second part of Theorem 10.3 there exists $M_* < \infty$ (uniform in B, B'), a natural number $M_{f_0} < M_*$ and $\omega^{f_0} \in \{0, 1\}^{M_{f_0}}$ such that $S_{\omega^{f_0}}(B') \cap \mathcal{A}_{\infty} \neq \emptyset$ and also $M_{b_0} < M_*$ and $\omega^{b_0} \in \{0, 1\}^{M_{b_0}}$ such that $S_{\omega^{b_0}}^{-1}(B) \cap \mathcal{A}_{\infty} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, provided δ is chosen sufficiently small (but uniformly in B, B'), for any $\tilde{\omega}' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega'_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^{f_0}$ for $k \in \{-M_{f_0} - N, \dots, -N - 1\}$ satisfies that

$$\tilde{B}'(\tilde{\omega}') = \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\omega}'}^{N+M_{f_0}}(B') \cap \mathcal{A}_{\infty} \neq \emptyset.$$

Analogously, for any $\tilde{\omega}$ with $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k^{b_0}$ for $k \in \{N + 1, \dots, N + M_{b_0}\}$ satisfies that

$$\tilde{B}(\tilde{\omega}) = (\mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N-M_{b_0}}(\tilde{\omega})}^{N+M_{b_0}})^{-1}(B) \cap \mathcal{A}_{\infty} \neq \emptyset.$$

Since on \mathcal{A}_{∞} the scattering maps satisfy the assumptions of Theorem B, proceeding as in Section 6.3 we can find $M_f, M_b \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega^f \in \{0, 1\}^{M_f}$, $\omega^b \in \{0, 1\}^{M_b}$ such that for any:

- $\tilde{\omega}' \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega'_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^{f_0}$ for $k \in \{-M_{f_0} - N, \dots, -N - 1\}$ and $\tilde{\omega}'_k = \omega_k^f$ for $k \in \{-M_f - M_{f_0} - N, \dots, -M_f - N - 1\}$
- $\tilde{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k$ for $|k| \leq N$ and $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k^{b_1}$ for $k \in \{-N + 1, \dots, N + M_{b_0}\}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_k = \omega_k^{b_0}$ for $k \in \{M_{b_0} + 1, \dots, M_{b_0} + M_b\}$

the open sets

$$\hat{B}'(\tilde{\omega}') := \mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{N+M_{f_0}}(\tilde{\omega}')}^{M_f}(\tilde{B}'(\tilde{\omega}')) \quad \hat{B}(\tilde{\omega}) := (\mathcal{F}_{\sigma^{-N-M_{b_0}-M_b}(\tilde{\omega})}^{M_b})^{-1}(\tilde{B}(\tilde{\omega}))$$

satisfy

$$\hat{B}'(\tilde{\omega}') \cap \hat{B}(\tilde{\omega}) \neq \emptyset.$$

The proof of Theorem E is completed by choosing any $\tilde{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of the form

$$\tilde{\omega} = (\dots, \underbrace{\tilde{\omega}'_{-N}, \dots, \tilde{\omega}'_N}_{2N+1}, \omega^{b_0}, \omega^b, \omega^f, \omega^{f_0}, \underbrace{\tilde{\omega}_{-N}, \dots, \tilde{\omega}_N}_{2N+1}, \dots).$$

APPENDIX A. TECHNICAL LEMMAS FROM SECTION 5

In this appendix we give the missing proofs from Section 5.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. The proof follows by induction. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \leq N = l^{-1}$ and suppose that

$$(\varphi_n, J_n) := T_0^n \circ T_1(\varphi, J)$$

is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_n &= \varphi + \tilde{\beta}(J) + \varepsilon T_{1,\varphi}(\varphi, J) + n(\beta + \tau J + \tau \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J)) + O(2nl^2) \\ J_n &= J + \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O(nl^3).\end{aligned}$$

We notice that, for $J \in [-l/2, l/2]$ and $n \leq N$, this implies that $|J_n| \leq l/2 + \varepsilon + Nl^3 \leq 3l/4 + l^2 \leq l$. Therefore,

$$J_{n+1} = J_n + O(J_n^3) = J + \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O(nl^3) + O(J_n^3) = J + \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O((n+1)l^3).$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{n+1} &= \varphi_n + \beta + \tau J_n + O(J_n^2) \\ &= \varphi + \tilde{\beta}(J) + \varepsilon T_{1,\varphi}(\varphi, J) + n(\beta + \tau J + \tau \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J)) + O(2nl^2) \\ &\quad + \beta + \tau(J + \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O(nl^3)) + O(l^2) \\ &= \varphi + \tilde{\beta}(J) + \varepsilon T_{1,\varphi}(\varphi, J) + (n+1)(\beta + \tau J + \tau \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J)) + O(2nl^2) + O(l^2) + O(l^2) \\ &= \varphi + \tilde{\beta}(J) + \varepsilon T_{1,\varphi}(\varphi, J) + (n+1)(\beta + \tau J + \tau \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J)) + O(2(n+1)l^2).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $n \leq N$ we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}T_0^n \circ T_1(\varphi, J) &= (\varphi + \tilde{\beta}(0) + n(\beta + \tau J + \tau \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J)) + O(\varepsilon \varphi, l), J + \varepsilon T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O(l^2)) \\ &= (\varphi + \tilde{\beta}(0) + n(\beta + \tau J + \tau \varepsilon \varphi) + O(\varepsilon \varphi, l, n\varepsilon \varphi^2), J + \varepsilon \varphi + O(l^2, \varepsilon \varphi^2)).\end{aligned}$$

We now show how to obtain C^1 estimates. Again we prove this by induction. Suppose that

$$D(T_0^n \circ T_1)(\varphi, J) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + n\tau\varepsilon\partial_\varphi T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O(7nl^2) & \tau n + O(7nl) \\ \varepsilon\partial_\varphi T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + (3nl^3) & 1 + O(3nl^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, a straightforward computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}D(T_0^{n+1} \circ T_1)(\varphi, J) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 + O(l^2) & \tau + O(l) \\ O(l^3) & 1 + O(l^2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + n\tau\varepsilon\partial_\varphi T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O(7nl^2) & \tau n + O(7nl) \\ \varepsilon\partial_\varphi T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + (3nl^3) & 1 + O(3nl^2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 + (n+1)\tau\varepsilon\partial_\varphi T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + O((n+1)7l^2) & \tau(n+1) + O((n+1)7l) \\ \varepsilon\partial_\varphi T_{1,J}(\varphi, J) + (3(n+1)l^3) & 1 + O(3(n+1)l^2) \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Throughout the proof we write v, w instead of v_N, w_N . Let P, S be the matrices associated to the linear maps ψ_P, ψ_S and observe that

$$P^{-1} = \frac{1}{w-v} \begin{pmatrix} w & -1 \\ -v & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We let $C = PS$

$$\mathcal{A}_n = C^{-1}A_nC, \quad \mathbf{b}_n = C^{-1}\mathbf{b}_n, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n = \phi^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E}_n \circ \phi.$$

After some algebraic manipulations it is not difficult to show that

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \frac{1}{w-v} \begin{pmatrix} w-v-\varepsilon+n\tau w(\varepsilon+v) & \frac{1}{\chi}(-\varepsilon+n\tau w(\varepsilon+w)) \\ \chi(\varepsilon-n\tau v(\varepsilon+v)) & w-v+\varepsilon-n\tau v(\varepsilon+w) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now give an asymptotic expression for the diagonal terms and estimate the off-diagonal terms. To that end we notice that, from the definition of v, w (since \mathcal{A}_N must be diagonal)

$$\varepsilon - N\tau v(\varepsilon+v) = 0 \quad \varepsilon - N\tau w(\varepsilon+w) = 0.$$

Therefore, if we introduce

$$\delta = \frac{N_*}{N},$$

for any $n \in \{N, \dots, N+N_*\}$,

$$|\varepsilon - n\tau v(\varepsilon+v)| = |(N-n)\tau v(\varepsilon+v)| \leq \delta N\tau|v||\varepsilon+v| \quad |\varepsilon - nw(\varepsilon+w)| \leq \delta N\tau|w||\varepsilon+w|.$$

Also, from the asymptotics in (5.2) and the definition of v, w

$$|w - v| \geq \frac{1}{2}v, \quad v = O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\chi}\right), \quad |w| = O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\chi}\right).$$

Thus, we conclude that, for the off-diagonal terms

$$\left| \frac{\varepsilon - n\tau v(\varepsilon + v)}{w - v} \right|, \left| \frac{\varepsilon - n\tau w(\varepsilon + w)}{w - v} \right| \leq 2\delta N\tau \left(\varepsilon + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\chi}\right) \right) \leq 4\delta N\tau \frac{\varepsilon}{\chi} = 4\delta\chi.$$

Proceeding analogously, for the diagonal terms

$$1 - \frac{1}{w - v}(\varepsilon - n\tau w(\varepsilon + v)) = 1 - \sqrt{N\tau\varepsilon} + O(\delta\chi, \chi^2)$$

$$1 + \frac{1}{w - v}(\varepsilon - n\tau v(\varepsilon + w)) = 1 + \sqrt{N\tau\varepsilon} + O(\delta\chi, \chi^2),$$

where we have used that

$$w - v = 2w(1 + O(\chi)) = -2v(2 + O(\chi)) = -2\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{N\tau}}(1 + O(\chi)).$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \sqrt{N\tau\varepsilon} + O(\delta\chi, \chi^2) & O(\delta) \\ O(\delta\chi^2) & 1 + \sqrt{N\tau\varepsilon} + O(\delta\chi, \chi^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The expression for \mathbf{b}_n follows from a simple computation. Indeed,

$$\mathbf{b}_n = C^{-1}\mathbf{b}_n = \frac{1}{\kappa\tau} \frac{[n\beta]}{w - v} (w, -v\chi)$$

so, writing $v = -w(1 + O(\chi))$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{b}_n = \frac{[n\beta]}{2\kappa\tau} (1 + O(\chi)) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ O(\chi) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that, by Theorem 5.1, since $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ and $N_* = \frac{1}{5\alpha\kappa\chi\tau}$, the set

$$\{[n\beta]\}_{n \in \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}}$$

is $\frac{1}{5}\kappa\tau\chi$ -dense on \mathbb{T} . The set $\mathcal{N} \subset \{N, \dots, N + N_*\}$ is defined as the subset for which

$$[n\beta] \in [-20\kappa\tau\chi, 20\kappa\tau\chi].$$

Finally, we check the estimate for $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n$. We recall from Lemma 5.2 that

$$\mathcal{E}_n(\varphi, J) = \begin{pmatrix} O(n\varepsilon\varphi^2, N^{-1}) \\ O(\varepsilon\varphi^2, N^{-2}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} O(\chi^2\varphi^2, \varepsilon\tau/\chi^2) \\ O(\varepsilon\varphi^2, \varepsilon^2\tau^2/\chi^4) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now observe that, for any $(\xi, \eta) \in D$,

$$|\varphi(\xi, \eta)| = O(\kappa\tau/\chi)$$

so (since we assume that $\varepsilon \leq \tau$)

$$\mathcal{E}_n \circ \phi = \begin{pmatrix} O(\tau\kappa^2, \varepsilon/\chi^2) \\ O(\tau^2\varepsilon(\kappa/\chi)^2, \varepsilon^2\tau^2/\chi^4) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} O(\tau\kappa^2) \\ O(\tau^2\varepsilon\kappa^2/\chi^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the expression for C^{-1} above it is then easy to check that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n = \phi^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E}_n \circ \phi = \begin{pmatrix} O(\kappa/\chi) \\ O(\kappa/\chi) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then obtain C^0 estimates for the error.

$$\mathbf{E}_n(\xi, \eta) = (\mathcal{A}_n - \mathbf{A}) \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n(\xi, \eta) = \begin{pmatrix} O(\chi^2, \kappa/\chi) \\ O(\chi^2, \kappa/\chi) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} O(\chi^2) \\ O(\chi^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, we obtain C^1 estimates. To that end we notice that,

$$D\mathbf{E}_n = (\mathcal{A}_n - \mathbf{A}) + D\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n = (\mathcal{A}_n - \mathbf{A}) + C^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} O(\chi\kappa) & O(1) \\ O(\varepsilon\kappa\tau/\chi) & O(\varepsilon\tau/\chi^2) \end{pmatrix} C.$$

where, in the second equality, we have used the estimates for $D\mathcal{E}_n$ in 6.5.2. Then, a tedious but easy computation yields

$$D\mathcal{E}_n = \begin{pmatrix} O(\chi^2) & O(\delta) \\ O(\delta\chi^2) & O(\chi^2) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} O(\kappa) & O(\kappa/\chi) \\ O(\chi\kappa) & O(\kappa) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.6. In Lemma 5.4 we have seen that $\mathcal{F}_n - \mathbb{F}_n = O_{C^1}(\chi^2)$. However, a slightly better affine approximation, can be obtained from that proof in the regime where

$$0 < \kappa \leq \kappa_0(\chi) \quad 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0(\kappa) \min\{\tau, \alpha\}.$$

Indeed, it is easy to check that the proof implies the existence of

$$\lambda_n = 1 - \sqrt{n\varepsilon\tau\kappa} + O(\chi^2) \quad \nu_n = 1 + \sqrt{n\varepsilon\tau\kappa} + O(\chi^2) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

such that, if we define the affine map

$$\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_n(\xi, \eta) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_n & 0 \\ 0 & \nu_n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{b}_n,$$

where

$$\mathbf{b}_n = c_n \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \chi \end{pmatrix} \quad c_n = \frac{[n\beta]}{2\kappa\tau}(1 + O(\chi))$$

and denote by g_ξ, g_η the ξ and η components of the difference $\mathcal{F}_n - \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_n$, then

$$(g_\xi(\xi, \eta), g_\eta(\xi, \eta)) = \mathcal{F}_n(\xi, \eta) - \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_n(\xi, \eta) = O_{C^1}(\epsilon),$$

for a quantifier

$$\epsilon(\kappa, \varepsilon, \alpha, \tau) > 0$$

which, can be made arbitrarily small as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ and, a posteriori,

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_0(\kappa) \min\{\tau, \alpha\}} \rightarrow 0.$$

The proof of Proposition 5.6 is now divided in several steps:

(I) *Result for the map $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_n$:* For the map $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_n$ the ξ and η variables are uncoupled. An easy computation shows that the fixed point $z_0^{(n)} = (\xi_0^{(n)}, \eta_0^{(n)})$ of this map is given by

$$\xi_0^{(n)} = \frac{c_n}{1 - \lambda_n} \quad \eta_0^{(n)} = \frac{c_n\chi}{\nu_n - 1}(1 + O(\chi))$$

Note that for $n \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $|c_n| \lesssim \chi$ we have $\xi_0^{(n)} = O(1)$ and $\eta_0^{(n)} = O(\chi)$. By the implicit function theorem, the map \mathcal{F}_n has a fixed point $O(\epsilon/\chi)$ -close to $z_0^{(n)}$. The rest of the proof is a standard application of the usual graph transform to describe its stable/unstable manifolds. Although this construction is entirely classical very precise quantitative estimates are of importance here so we provide the details of the construction of the unstable manifold. The construction of the stable manifold follow analogously.

(II) *A space of vertical curves:* We deal with vertical curves of the form $\gamma = \{(f(\eta), \eta) : \eta \in [-1, 1]\}$. We denote by C^0 be the Banach space of continuous functions $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and we let $C_\sigma \subset C^0$ be the set of Lipschitz functions with Lipschitz constant $\sigma > 0$.

(III) *Graph transform operator:* Let $\sigma > 0$. Given a curve $\gamma = \{(f(\eta), \eta) : \eta \in [-1, 1]\}$ with $f \in C_\sigma$ we define a new curve

$$\mathcal{F}(\gamma) = \{(\mathcal{G}(f)(\eta), \eta) : \eta \in [-1, 1]\}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}(f)(\eta) = -c_n + \lambda_n f(u(\eta)) + g_\xi(f(u(\eta)), u(\eta))$$

and $u(\eta)$ is such that

$$\nu_n u(\eta) + g_\eta(f(u(\eta)), u(\eta)) = \eta. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Lemma A.1. *Let \mathcal{G} be the operator (formally) defined above and let $\sigma > 0$. Then, provided $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, $\mathcal{G} : C_\sigma \rightarrow C_\sigma$ is well defined.*

Proof. We first show that there exists $u : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (A.2). To that end we rewrite (A.2) as

$$u(\eta) = G(u(\eta)) := \frac{1}{\nu_n}(\eta - g_\eta(f(u(\eta)), u(\eta)))$$

and notice that, for any fixed $y \in [-1, 1]$ and any $u, u_* \in [-1, 1]$

$$|G(u_*) - G(u)| = \frac{1}{\nu_n}|g_\eta(f(u_*), u_*) - g_\eta(f(u), u)| \leq \frac{1}{\nu_n}|g_\eta|_{C^1}(1 + \sigma)|u - u_*| \leq \frac{1}{\nu_n}\epsilon(1 + \sigma)|u - u_*|.$$

Then, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, the existence of a unique continuous $u(\eta)$ follows from the contraction mapping principle. Moreover, it is Lipchitz. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta - \eta_*| &= |\nu_n(u(\eta) - u(\eta_*)) - (g_\eta(f(u(\eta)), u(\eta)) - g_\eta(f(u(\eta_*)), u(\eta_*)))| \\ &\geq \nu_n|u(\eta) - u(\eta_*)| - \epsilon(1 + \sigma)|u(\eta) - u(\eta_*)| = (\nu_n - \epsilon(1 + \sigma))|u(\eta) - u(\eta_*)|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We now show that $\mathcal{G}(f) : C_\sigma \rightarrow C_\sigma$. For $\eta, \eta_* \in [-1, 1]$ write

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{G}(f)(\eta_*) - \mathcal{G}(f)(\eta)| &= |\lambda_n(f(u(\eta)) - f(u(\eta_*))) + (g_\xi(f(u(\eta)), u(\eta)) - g_\xi(f(u(\eta_*)), u(\eta_*)))| \\ &\leq \lambda_n\sigma|u(\eta) - u(\eta_*)| + \epsilon(1 + \sigma)|u(\eta) - u(\eta_*)|. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows now from (A.3), which implies

$$|\mathcal{G}(f)(\eta_*) - \mathcal{G}(f)(\eta)| \leq \frac{\lambda_n\sigma + \epsilon(1 + \sigma)}{\nu_n - \epsilon(1 + \sigma)}|\eta_* - \eta|,$$

and

$$\frac{\lambda_n\sigma + \epsilon(1 + \sigma)}{\nu_n - \epsilon(1 + \sigma)} < \sigma$$

provided ϵ is small enough.

(IV) *Fixed point of the graph transform operator:* We now define inductively a sequence of differentiable curves and check that this sequence has a limit. Let

$$f_0(\eta) = \frac{c_n}{1 - \lambda_n}.$$

We show that

$$|\mathcal{G}(f_0) - f_0|_{C^0} \leq \epsilon \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and that, for any pair $f, f_* \in C_\sigma$ with

$$|f_* - f_0|_{C^0}, |f - f_0|_{C^0} \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\chi\sqrt{\tau}}$$

we have

$$|\mathcal{G}(f) - \mathcal{G}(f_*)|_{C^0} \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_n)|f - f_*|_{C^0}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

We claim that (A.4) and (A.5) hold, show how to complete the proof and verify the claim afterwards. To that end we define inductively $f_{i+1} = \mathcal{G}(f_i)$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}_n = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_n) \in (0, 1)$. Using (A.4) and (A.5) one may check by induction that for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|f_i - f_0|_{C^0} \leq \sum_{k=1}^i |f_k - f_{k-1}|_{C^0} \leq |f_1 - f_0|_{C^0} \sum_{k=1}^i \tilde{\lambda}_n^k \leq \frac{|f_1 - f_0|_{C^0}}{1 - \tilde{\lambda}_n} \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\chi\sqrt{\tau}}.$$

Thus, using (A.5) we deduce that $\{f_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in C_σ which converges to $f \in C_\sigma$ satisfying

$$|f - f_0|_{C^0} \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\chi\sqrt{\tau}}.$$

(V) *Claims (A.4) and (A.5):* We now verify the claims. (A.4) is straightforward from the definition of the operator \mathcal{G} and the fact that $|g|_{C^1} \leq \epsilon$. We now check (A.5). To that end we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(f) - \mathcal{G}(f_*) &= \lambda_n(f \circ u_f - f_* \circ u_{f_*}) + g_\xi(f \circ u_f, u_f) - g_\xi(f_* \circ u_{f_*}, u_{f_*}) \\ &= \lambda_n(f \circ u_f - f_* \circ u_f) + \lambda_n(f_* \circ u_f - f_* \circ u_{f_*}) + (g_\xi(f \circ u_f, u_f) - g_\xi(f_* \circ u_f, u_f)) \\ &\quad + g_\xi(f_* \circ u_f, u_f) - g_\xi(f_* \circ u_{f_*}, u_{f_*}) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3 + \mathcal{E}_4, \end{aligned}$$

and analyze term by term. For the first term one readily checks that

$$|\mathcal{E}_1|_{C^0} \leq \lambda_n |f - f_*|_{C^0}.$$

To estimate the second term we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_f - u_{f_*}| &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_n} |g|_{C^1} (|f \circ u_f - f_* \circ u_f| + |f_* \circ u_f - f_* \circ u_{f_*}| + |u_f - u_{f_*}|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\nu_n} \epsilon (|f - f_*|_{C^0} + (1 + \sigma) |u_f - u_{f_*}|), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$|u_f - u_{f_*}|_{C^0} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\nu_n - (1 + \sigma)\epsilon} |f - f_*|_{C^0} \leq 2\epsilon |f - f_*|_{C^0}.$$

Hence

$$|\mathcal{E}_2|_{C^0} \leq \lambda_n \sigma |u_f - u_{f_*}|_{C^0} \leq 2\lambda_n \sigma \epsilon |f - f_*|_{C^0}.$$

Analogous computations show that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}_3|_{C^0} &\leq \epsilon |f - f_*|_{C^0} \\ |\mathcal{E}_4|_{C^0} &\leq \epsilon(1 + \sigma) |u_f - u_{f_*}|_{C^0} \leq 2\epsilon^2(1 + \sigma) |f - f_*|_{C^0}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$|\mathcal{G}(f) - \mathcal{G}(f_*)|_{C^0} \leq (\lambda_n(1 + 2\sigma\epsilon) + 3\epsilon) |f - f_*|_{C^0} \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_n) |f - f_*|_{C^0}.$$

□

A.1. Proof of Lemma 5.11. The proof follows from a standard iteration argument so we only give a sketch of the underlying idea. Let $\rho_0(\alpha, k, \rho, \sigma)$ be as in the statement of Lemma 5.11. Given a real-analytic function $h : \mathbb{T}_\sigma \times \mathbb{B}_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we consider its Fourier-Taylor series

$$h(\varphi, J) = \sum_{(j,l) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} h_j^{[l]} J^j e^{il\varphi},$$

and the associated Fourier-Taylor norm.

$$\|h\|_{\rho, \sigma} = \sum_{(j,l) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}} |h_j^{[l]}| \rho^j e^{|l|\sigma}.$$

For $n \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define

$$\rho^{(n)} = \rho_0 \left(1 - \frac{n}{2k}\right) \quad \sigma^{(n)} = \sigma \left(1 - \frac{n}{2k}\right).$$

Suppose we are given a map $\mathbf{T}^{(n)} : \mathbb{T}_{\sigma^{(n)}} \times \mathbb{B}_{\rho^{(n)}} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\rho, \sigma}$ of the form

$$\mathbf{T}^{(n)} : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + \beta + h^{(n)}(J) + R_\varphi^{(n)}(\varphi, J), J + R_J^{(n)}(\varphi, J))$$

with

$$\partial_{J^l}^l R_\varphi^{(n)}(\varphi, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l < 2 + n, \quad \partial_{J^l}^l R_J^{(n)}(\varphi, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l < 3 + n$$

and satisfying

$$\|R_\varphi^{(n)}\|_{\rho^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n)}} \lesssim \frac{k}{\rho_0} \left(\frac{k^4}{\alpha \sigma^3 \rho}\right)^n \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\rho}\right)^{3+n} \quad \|R_J^{(n)}\|_{\rho^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n)}} \leq \frac{k}{\sigma} \left(\frac{k^4}{\alpha \sigma^3 \rho}\right)^n \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\rho}\right)^{3+n}.$$

We now look for a function

$$\mathcal{S}^{(n)}(\varphi, I) = \varphi I + S^{(n)}(\varphi, I)$$

such that the associated change of coordinates $\Phi : (\theta, I) \mapsto (\varphi, J)$ eliminates the term of order $2 + n$ in $R_\varphi^{(n)}$ (by symplectic symmetry this transformation will also eliminate the term of order $3 + n$ in $R_J^{(n)}$). Let

$$Q^{(n)}(\varphi, J) = \partial_J^{n+2} R_\varphi^{(n)}(\varphi, 0)$$

and define

$$S^{(n)}(\varphi, J) = s^{(n)}(\varphi) J^{2+n}$$

with

$$s^{(n)}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2+n} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{(Q^{(n)})^{[l]}}{1 - e^{il\beta}} e^{il\varphi}$$

Since $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ a standard computation shows that

$$(2+n)(S^{(n)}(\varphi + \beta, J) - S^{(n)}(\varphi, J)) = Q^{(n)}(\varphi, J)$$

and

$$\|S^{(n)}\|_{\rho^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n)} - \frac{\sigma}{4k}} \lesssim \frac{k^2}{\alpha \sigma^2} \|R_\varphi^{(n)}\|_{\rho^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n)}}.$$

In particular,

$$\Phi^{-1} \circ \mathbf{T}^{(n)} \circ \Phi : (\varphi, J) \mapsto (\varphi + \beta + h^{(n+1)}(J) + R_\varphi^{(n+1)}(\varphi, J), J + R_J^{(n+1)}(\varphi, J))$$

with

$$\partial_{J^l}^l R_\varphi^{(n+1)}(\varphi, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l < 2+n, \quad \partial_{J^l}^l R_J^{(n+1)}(\varphi, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq l < 3+n$$

and satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_\varphi^{(n+1)}\|_{\rho^{(n+1)}, \sigma^{(n+1)}} &\lesssim \frac{k}{\rho_0} \left(\frac{k^4}{\alpha \sigma^3 \rho} \right)^{n+1} \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\rho} \right)^{3+(n+1)} \\ \|R_J^{(n+1)}\|_{\rho^{(n+1)}, \sigma^{(n+1)}} &\lesssim \frac{k}{\sigma} \left(\frac{k^4}{\alpha \sigma^3 \rho} \right)^{n+1} \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\rho} \right)^{3+(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

From here the conclusion follows after noticing that for our choice of ρ_0 we have

$$\frac{k^4 \rho_0}{\alpha \sigma^3 \rho} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

APPENDIX B. SYMPLECTIC REDUCTION FOR THE THREE-BODY PROBLEM

The reader is referred to [GMPS22] for explicit expressions of the constants which we do not specify below.

Jacobi reduction. In order to reduce the invariance by translation (i.e. the invariance of (1.10) by parallel translation of all the bodies) we define the change of coordinates:

$$\Phi_{\text{Jac}} : (Q, P) \mapsto (q, p)$$

given by the symplectic completion of the change

$$Q_0 = q_0 \quad Q_1 = q_1 - q_0 \quad Q_2 = q_2 - \frac{m_0 q_0 + m_1 q_1}{m_0 + m_1}.$$

In the new coordinate system, the Hamiltonian (1.10) reads

$$H_{\text{Jac}}(Q_1, Q_2, P_1, P_2) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{|P_i|^2}{2\mu_i} - \tilde{U}(Q_1, Q_2)$$

for some $\mu_i > 0$ and

$$\tilde{U}(Q_1, Q_2) = \frac{m_0 m_1}{|Q_1|} + \frac{m_0 m_2}{|Q_2 + \sigma_0 Q_1|} + \frac{m_1 m_2}{|Q_2 - \sigma_1 Q_1|} - \frac{(m_0 + m_1) m_2}{|Q_2|} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

for certain $\sigma_0, \sigma_1 \neq 0$ satisfying $m_0 \sigma_0 + m_1 \sigma_1 = 0$. We are interested in the hierarchical region of the phase space where $|Q_2| \gg |Q_1|$ and $|Q_1|$ is contained in a bounded region of the plane. Hence, we decompose H_{Jac} as

$$H_{\text{Jac}}(Q, P) = \hat{H}_{\text{ell}}(Q_1, P_1) + \hat{H}_{\text{par}}(Q_2, P_2) + \hat{V}(Q_1, Q_2), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where

$$\hat{H}_{\text{ell}}(Q_1, P_1) = \frac{|P_1|^2}{2\mu_1} - \frac{m_0 m_1}{|Q_1|} \quad \hat{H}_{\text{par}}(Q_2, P_2) = \frac{|P_2|^2}{2\mu_2} - \frac{m_2(m_0 + m_1)}{|Q_2|}$$

and

$$\hat{V}(Q_1, Q_2) = \tilde{U}(Q_1, Q_2) - \frac{m_0 m_1}{|Q_1|} - \frac{m_2(m_0 + m_1)}{|Q_2|} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Notice that, in the region $|Q_2| \gg |Q_1|$ and $|Q_1| \sim 1$ the term \tilde{V} becomes perturbative since $\tilde{V}(Q_1, Q_2) = O_3(|Q_2|/|Q_1|)$ so we can study (B.2) as a perturbation of two uncoupled two-body problems: \tilde{H}_{ell} describing the dynamics of the inner system and \tilde{H}_{par} describing the dynamics of the outer body with respect to the inner system. After a conformally symplectic rescaling $\Phi_{\mathbf{m}} : (\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}) \mapsto (Q, P)$ (involving only the masses m_0, m_1, m_2) it is possible to recast the system (B.2) as

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{Jac}} := H_{\text{Jac}} \circ \Phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}) = \tilde{H}_{\text{ell}}(\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{P}_1) + \tilde{H}_{\text{par}}(\tilde{Q}_2, \tilde{P}_2) + \tilde{V}(\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2),$$

with

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{ell}}(\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{P}_1) = \nu \left(\frac{|\tilde{P}_1|^2}{2} - \frac{1}{|\tilde{Q}_1|} \right) \quad \tilde{H}_{\text{par}}(\tilde{Q}_2, \tilde{P}_2) = \frac{|\tilde{P}_2|^2}{2} - \frac{1}{|\tilde{Q}_2|}$$

where $\nu \neq 0$ and \tilde{V} is as in (B.3) for certain $\tilde{\sigma}_0, \tilde{\sigma}_1 \neq 0$ which also satisfy $m_0\tilde{\sigma}_0 + m_1\tilde{\sigma}_1 \neq 0$.

Delaunay-polar variables. We now introduce a change of variables tailored for the description of elliptic motions, the so called Delaunay map (see [AKN06])

$$\phi_{\text{Del}} : (\ell, L, g, \Gamma) \mapsto (\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{P}_1)$$

In this coordinate system the instantaneous state of \tilde{Q}_1 is described in terms of an “instantaneous” ellipse, parametrized in terms of (L, g, Γ) and an angle ℓ , the mean anomaly, giving the position of \tilde{Q}_1 inside this ellipse. The angle $g \in \mathbb{T}$ measures the angle of the pericenter with respect to some fixed line, $L \in \mathbb{R}$ is the square root of the semimajor axis and Γ is the angular momentum. Then, the eccentricity of the ellipse is given by

$$\epsilon(L, \Gamma) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\Gamma^2}{L^2}}$$

The Delaunay map is real-analytic and symplectic on the region (see [AKN06, Fej13])

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\tilde{H}_{\text{ell}}(\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{P}_1) < 0, 0 < \Gamma(\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{P}_1) < L(\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{P}_1)\}$$

which corresponds to the set of planar oriented ellipses with strictly positive eccentricity¹⁵. In Delaunay coordinates, the elliptic Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{\text{ell}} := \tilde{H}_{\text{ell}} \circ \phi_{\text{Del}}(L) = -\frac{\nu}{2L^2}$$

so the flow induced by H_{ell} reduces to a linear (resonant) translation

$$\phi_{H_{\text{ell}}}^t : (\ell, L, g, \Gamma) \mapsto (\ell + (\nu/L^3)t, L, g, \Gamma).$$

On the other hand, to describe the parabolic motion of \tilde{Q}_2 , it is convenient to introduce polar coordinates

$$\phi_{\text{pol}}(r, \alpha, y, G) \mapsto (\tilde{Q}_2, \tilde{P}_2) = \left(r \cos \alpha, r \sin \alpha, y \cos \alpha - \frac{G}{r} \sin \alpha, y \sin \alpha + \frac{G}{r} \cos \alpha \right).$$

In the new coordinate system

$$H_{\text{par}} := \tilde{H}_{\text{par}} \circ \phi_{\text{pol}}(r, y, G) = \frac{y^2}{2} + \frac{G^2}{2r^2} - \frac{1}{r}.$$

For later use we denote by

$$\hat{\Phi} = (\phi_{\text{Del}}, \phi_{\text{pol}}) : (\ell, L, g, \Gamma, r, \alpha, y, G) \mapsto (\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}).$$

and observe that

$$\hat{H} := H_{\text{Jac}} \circ \hat{\Phi} = H_{\text{ell}}(L) + H_{\text{par}}(r, y, G) + \hat{V}(\ell, L, g - \alpha, \Gamma, r) \quad \hat{V} = \tilde{V} \circ \hat{\Phi}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

¹⁵Notice, for instance, that g is not well defined for circular motions

The reduction by rotations. The Hamiltonian (B.4) only depends on the difference $g - \alpha$ (a manifestation of the invariance by rotation of the system). To take advantage of this fact and reduce (B.4) to a system with 3 degrees-of-freedom we let

$$\Phi_{\text{rot}} : (\ell, L, \phi, \Gamma, r, \alpha, y, \Theta) \mapsto (\ell, L, g, \Gamma, r, \alpha, y, G),$$

with $\phi = g - \alpha$ and $\Theta = G + \Gamma$. We thus arrive to the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{rot}} = \hat{H} \circ \Phi_{\text{rot}} = H_{\text{ell}}(L) + H_{\text{par}}(r, y, \Theta - \Gamma) + \hat{V}(\ell, L, \phi, \Gamma, r)$$

for which α is a cyclic variable. Hence, the total angular momentum Θ is conserved along the flow of H_{rot} .

Poincaré coordinates. Finally, we introduce an additional transformation which gives a local chart which also includes circular motions of the inner bodies (recall that Delaunay variables are only well-defined for ellipses with positive eccentricity). This change of coordinates, which we denote by Φ_{Poin} , is given by

$$\lambda = \ell + \phi \quad \xi = \sqrt{L - \Gamma} e^{i\phi} \quad \eta = \sqrt{L - \Gamma} e^{-i\phi}.$$

The resulting composition

$$\Phi_{\Theta} := \hat{\Phi} \circ \Phi_{\text{rot}} \circ \Phi_{\text{Poin}} : (\lambda, L, \xi, \eta, r, y; \alpha, \Theta) \mapsto (Q_1, P_1, Q_2, P_2) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

is real-analytic in (a complex extension of) $(\lambda, L) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ and $(r, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\Phi_{\Theta}^*(dP \wedge dQ) = dL \wedge d\lambda + i d\xi \wedge d\eta + dy \wedge dr + d\Theta \wedge d\alpha$$

(see [Fej13]). For any fixed $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}$ we thus end up with the real-analytic Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{\Theta} := H \circ \Phi_{\Theta} = H_{\text{ell}}(L) + H_{\text{par}}(r, y, \Theta - \Gamma) + V(\lambda, L, \eta, \xi, r) \quad V = \hat{V} \circ \Phi_{\text{Poin}}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

APPENDIX C. SOME TECHNICAL RESULTS FROM [GMPS22]

Here we copy a technical Lemma which is used in the proof of Theorem 7.12.

Lemma C.1 (Theorem 5.4. in [GMPS22]). *Fix any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let Φ_{loc} be the map in 7.22. Then, if $(q, a, \varphi, J) \in \Sigma_a^{\text{in}}$ the image point*

$$(a, p_1, \underbrace{\varphi_1, J_1}_{z_1}, \lambda_1) = \Psi_{\text{loc}}(q, a, \underbrace{\varphi, J}_z, \lambda_0)$$

satisfies that

$$q^{1+Ca} \leq p_1 \leq q^{1-Ca}, \quad |z_1 - z| \lesssim a^{N(1+Ca)} q^{N(1-Ca)} \quad q^{-3/2-Ca} \leq \lambda_1 - \lambda_0 \lesssim q^{-3/2+Ca}.$$

Moreover, for any C^1 curve $\gamma(q) = (q, a, z(q), \lambda_0(q))$

$$|p'_1(q)|, |z'_1(q)| \lesssim 1 \quad \left| \frac{p'_1(q)}{\lambda'_1(q)} \right| \lesssim q^{1-Ca} \quad \lambda'_1(q) \gtrsim q^{-3/5+Ca}.$$

APPENDIX D. THE SCATTERING MAPS OF THE RESTRICTED PROBLEM

In this section we show how Theorem 10.3 can be extracted from the results in [GPS23]. We divide the proof in several steps.

Asymptotic formulas for the scattering maps: We use the following result.

Theorem D.1 (Theorem 2.10 in [GPS23]). *Let $1 \ll G_1 < G_2$ be fixed and let $\mathcal{P}_{\infty}(G_1, G_2)$ be as in (10.4). There exists $\rho > 0$ (independent of G_1, G_2 and ζ) such that the scattering maps admit a holomorphic extension to a ρ -complex neighbourhood of $\mathcal{P}_{\infty}(G_1, G_2)$ and are of the form*

$$S_i : \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ G \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi + \omega(G) + O(\zeta|G|^{-7}) \\ G + \zeta r(\varphi, G) + O(\zeta|G|^{-7}) \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\omega(G) = -\mu(1-\mu) \frac{3\pi}{2G^4} + O(|G|^{-7}) \quad \text{and} \quad r(\varphi, G) = \mu(1-\mu)(1-2\mu) \frac{15\pi}{8G^5} \sin \varphi. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Let now $G_0 \in (G_1, G_2)$ and let $J = G - G_0$. We abuse notation, write

$$\omega(J) = \omega(G_0 + J) \quad r(\varphi, J) = r(\varphi, G_0 + J)$$

and still denote by

$$S_i : \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ J \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \varphi + \omega(J) + O(\zeta G_0^{-7}) \\ J + \zeta r(\varphi, J) + O(\zeta G_0^{-7}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

the expression of the scattering maps in (φ, J) coordinates for $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A} = \mathbb{T} \times [-1, 1]$. In particular, these maps are of the form in Theorem 2.4 of [GPS23].

Remark 21. Throughout the rest of the section ρ, c are constants which do not depend on G, ζ .

Hamiltonian approximation for the map S_0 : Using the fact that, $G_0 \gg 1$ so for $J \in [-1, 1]$ $\omega(J) \sim G_0^{-4} \ll 1$ it is shown the following (in the notation of that paper one should take $\varepsilon = G_0^{-4}$ and $\delta = \zeta G_0^{-5}$)

Lemma D.2 (Lemma 6.2 in [GPS23]). *There exists*

- a real-analytic, one degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian \mathcal{K} , defined on a ρ -complex neighbourhood of \mathbb{A} and of the form

$$\mathcal{K}(\varphi, J) = h(J) + O(\zeta G_0^{-5}) \quad h'(J) = \omega(J), \quad (\text{D.3})$$

- a real-analytic change of variables ψ of the form $\psi = \text{id} + O(\zeta G_0^{-9})$

such that the map $\tilde{S}_0 = \psi^{-1} \circ S_0 \circ \psi$ satisfies that

$$\tilde{S}_0 = \phi_{\mathcal{K}} + O(\zeta G_0^{-5} \exp(-cG_0^4)). \quad (\text{D.4})$$

In plain words, \tilde{S}_0 is integrable up to exponentially small terms.

KAM invariant curves for the map S_0 : We introduce action-angle variables for the Hamiltonian \mathcal{K} as follows. We let

$$L(E) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\{\mathcal{K}(\varphi, J) = E + h(0)\}} J d\varphi$$

and define the generating function

$$W(\varphi, L) = \int_0^\varphi J(\tau, E(L)) d\tau$$

where $J(\varphi, E)$ is the (unique) solution to $\mathcal{K}(\varphi, J) = E + h(0)$. Making use of (D.1) and (D.3) it is easy to check that

$$L(E) = \frac{1}{\omega(G_0)} (E + O(G_0^{-1} E^2, \zeta G_0^{-5}))$$

Then, we define the change of variables $\phi : (\ell, L) \mapsto (\varphi, J)$ via the implicit relation

$$\ell = \partial_L W(\varphi, L) \quad J = \partial_\varphi W(\varphi, L).$$

It is not difficult to check that ϕ is $O(\zeta)$ -close to the identity on a complex ρ -neighbourhood of \mathbb{A} . In the new variables, the map $\hat{S}_0 = \phi^{-1} \circ \tilde{S}_0 \circ \phi$ is a real-analytic perturbation of size $O(\zeta G_0^{-5} \exp(-cG_0^4))$ of the integrable twist map of the annulus given by

$$F_0 : (\ell, L) \mapsto (\ell + \tilde{\omega}(L), L) \quad \tilde{\omega}(L) = \frac{d}{dL} (\mathcal{K} \circ \phi)(L).$$

Let

$$\omega_- := \tilde{\omega}(1) < \tilde{\omega}(-1) := \omega_+$$

Since $|\partial_L \tilde{\omega}(L)| \sim |\partial_J \omega(J)| \gtrsim G_0^{-5}$, standard application of the KAM theorem for real-analytic twist maps shows that for any $\alpha > 0$ satisfying

$$\alpha \gg \sup_{\text{dist}(z, \mathbb{A}) \leq \rho''} \|\hat{S}_0(z) - F_0(z)\|^{1/2} = O(\sqrt{\zeta} \exp(-cG_0^4))$$

any $\tau \geq 2$ and any $\omega_0 \in DC(\alpha, \tau) \cap [\omega_-, \omega_+]$ there exists an invariant curve $\gamma(\omega_0)$ on which the motion is conjugated to a rotation by ω_0 and which is given by the graph of a function whose C^1 norm is $O(\sqrt{\zeta} \exp(-cG_0^4))$. We now write the map \tilde{S}_0 in Birkhoff normal form (up to order 3) around the curve $\gamma(\omega_0)$ with suitable ω_0 . We restrict ourselves to the case $\omega_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha_*} := DC(\alpha_*, 2) \cap [\omega_-, \omega_+]$ with $\alpha_* \geq G_0^{-6}$

(clearly this set is non-empty for G_0 large enough as $DC(\alpha_*, 2)$ is α_* -dense on \mathbb{R} and $|\omega_+ - \omega_-| \gtrsim G_0^{-5}$). By standard averaging techniques, for any $\omega_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha_*}$ one can find a change of variables of the form

$$\phi_{\omega_0} : \begin{pmatrix} \theta \\ I \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \ell \\ L \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta + \phi_\theta(\theta, I) \\ I_* + I + \phi_I(\theta, I) \end{pmatrix} \quad |\phi_\theta|, |\phi_I| = O(\sqrt{\zeta} \exp(-cG_0^4))$$

for some $I_*(\omega_0) \in \mathbb{A}$ such that

$$\mathbf{S}_0 := \phi_{\omega_0}^{-1} \circ \hat{S}_0 \circ \phi_{\omega_0}$$

is of the form (1.2) with frequency $\omega_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha_*}$ and torsion $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $|\tau| \sim \partial_G \omega(G_0) \sim G_0^{-5}$. Before completing the proof of Theorem 10.3 we introduce some more notation. We let

$$\kappa = \sqrt{\zeta} \exp(-cG_0^4)$$

and define the annulus

$$\mathcal{A}_\infty = \{(\theta, I) \in \mathbb{T} \times [-\alpha_*/|\log^3 \kappa|, \alpha_*/|\log^3 \kappa|]\} \subset \mathbb{A}.$$

Proof of the first claim in Theorem 10.3. We start by showing that the invariant curves for the map S_0 can be traversed making use of the map S_1 . Let \mathcal{K} be the one-degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian \mathcal{K} constructed above, \tilde{S}_0 be as in (D.4) and let $\tilde{S}_1 = \psi^{-1} \circ S_1 \circ \Psi$.

Proposition D.3 (Proposition 6.3 in [GPS23]). *For any γ in the set*

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{ess}} = \{\gamma \subset \mathbb{A} : \gamma \text{ is an essential invariant curve for } \tilde{S}_0\}$$

we have

$$\max\{|\mathcal{K}(z_2) - \mathcal{K}(z_1)|, z_2, z_1 \in \gamma\} \lesssim \sqrt{\zeta} \exp(-cG_0^4) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

This result is indeed a consequence of the fact that any essential invariant curve is trapped between two KAM curves and the gaps between the latter are of size $O(\sqrt{\zeta} \exp(-cG_0^4))$. Combining Theorem 2.14, Lemma 2.15 and Proposition 6.8 in [GPS23] (see also Theorem 2.5. in that paper) it is shown that for any $(\varphi, J) \in \mathbb{A}$

$$\mathcal{K} \circ \tilde{S}_1(\varphi, J) - \mathcal{K}(\varphi, J) = \frac{C\zeta}{(G_0 + J)^{5/2}} \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J))(\sin \varphi + O(G_0)^{-1}) \quad (\text{D.6})$$

for $C = -\mu^2(1 - \mu)^2 9(2\pi)^{3/2}$ and

$$\sigma(G_0, J) = \frac{1}{3}(G_0 + J)^3. \quad (\text{D.7})$$

We then claim that, provided

$$G_0 \gg |\log \zeta|$$

there exists $C > 0$, $M_\pm < \infty$ and $\sigma^\pm \in \mathbb{N}^{M_\pm}$ for which

$$\mathcal{K} \circ \tilde{S}_{\sigma_{M-1}^+} \circ \cdots \circ \tilde{S}_{\sigma_0^+}(\varphi, J) - \mathcal{K}(\varphi, J) \in (C\zeta \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J)), 2C\zeta \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J))) \quad (\text{D.8})$$

and

$$\mathcal{K} \circ \tilde{S}_{\sigma_{M-1}^-} \circ \cdots \circ \tilde{S}_{\sigma_0^-}(\varphi, J) - \mathcal{K}(\varphi, J) \in (-2C\zeta \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J)), -C\zeta \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J))) \quad (\text{D.9})$$

This claim is verified by noticing the following. First, in view of (D.5) and (D.6) there are 2 intervals of \mathbb{T}_\pm of size of order one on which, making use of the map \tilde{S}_1 , one can either increase or decrease the value of \mathcal{K} by a quantity bounded below by $C\zeta \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J))$. Second, since $\omega(J) \sim G_0^{-4}$, we can reach these intervals by iterating the map \tilde{S}_0 no more than $N \sim G_0^4$ times. In view of the expression (D.4) along this iteration the value of \mathcal{K} remains almost constant.

To conclude the proof of the first item in Theorem 10.3 it is enough to notice that the width of \mathcal{A}_∞ is much larger than the increments in (D.8), (D.9). \square

Proof of the second claim in Theorem 10.3. We need to obtain an asymptotic expression for the map S_1 in the coordinate system given by the transformation $\Phi := \psi \circ \phi \circ \phi_{\omega_0}$ with $\psi, \phi, \phi_{\omega_0}$ as above. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_1 &:= \Phi^{-1} \circ S_1 \circ \Phi = \Phi^{-1}(S_0 + (S_1 - S_0)) \circ \Phi \\ &= \mathbf{S}_0 + D\Phi^{-1}(S_0 \circ \Phi)(S_1 - S_0) \circ \Phi + O(\|\Phi - \text{id}\|^2, \|S_1 - S_0\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.10})$$

The desired conclusion then plainly follows from i) the fact that Φ is $O(\zeta)$ -close to identity ii) as shown in Theorem 2.14 of [GPS23]

$$(S_1 - S_0) : (\varphi, J) \mapsto \Delta(\varphi, J) + (O(G_0^{-1/2} \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J))), O(\zeta G_0^{-5/2} \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J))))$$

with

$$\Delta(\varphi, J) = (\partial_J(\mathcal{L}_+ - \mathcal{L}_-)(\varphi, J), -\partial_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_+ - \mathcal{L}_-)(\varphi, J))$$

where \mathcal{L}_\pm being the so-called reduced Melnikov potentials iii) The asymptotic expressions (see Appendix B in [GPS23] and expression (44) in [DKdlRS19])

$$\mathcal{L}_\pm(\varphi, J) = \pm\mu(1 - \mu)(2L_{1,1}(J) \cos(s(\varphi) - \varphi) + 2L_{1,2}(J) \cos(s(\varphi) - 2\varphi) + O(\zeta G_0^{-3/2}, \zeta^2 G_0^4))$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} L_{1,1}(J) &= O(G_0^{-1/2}) \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J)) \\ L_{1,2}(J) &= - (3\zeta \sqrt{\frac{\pi(G_0 + J)^3}{2}} + O(\zeta, \zeta^2 G_0^{3/2})) \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J)) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\partial_J \mathcal{L}_\pm(J) = O(G_0^{5/2} \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J)), \zeta G_0^{9/2} \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J)))$$

and σ as in (D.7) and $s(\varphi)$ being of the form $s(\varphi) = \varphi + f(\varphi, J)$ with $|f|, |\partial_\varphi f| = O(\zeta G_0^{3/2})$. We thus find that (recall that we assume $\zeta \ll G_0^{-4}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_J(\mathcal{L}_+ - \mathcal{L}_-)(\varphi, J) &= O(G_0^{5/2} \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J))) \\ \partial_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_+ - \mathcal{L}_-)(\varphi, J) &= (2L_{1,2}(J) \sin \varphi + O(\zeta G_0)) \exp(-\sigma(G_0, J)). \end{aligned} \tag{D.11}$$

Combining the expressions (D.10) and (D.11) we deduce that the map S_1 is of the form (1.4). By (D.11), for G_0 large enough, there exists a unique solution $\varphi_*(J)$ to $\varphi \mapsto \partial_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_+ - \mathcal{L}_-)$ which is close to zero. Moreover,

$$\varepsilon := \sup_{J \in [-1, 1]} |\partial_\varphi(\mathcal{L}_+ - \mathcal{L}_-)(\varphi_*(J), J)| \ll \min\{\alpha_*, \tau\} = O(G_0^{-6}).$$

Hence, for G_0 large enough, the maps S_0, S_1 satisfy the assumptions of Theorem A and the proof follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [ACW21] A. Avila, S. Crovisier, and A. Wilkinson. C^1 density of stable ergodicity. *Adv. Math.*, 379:Paper No. 107496, 68, 2021.
- [AKN06] V. I. Arnold, V. V. Kozlov, and A. I. Neishtadt. *Mathematical aspects of classical and celestial mechanics*, volume 3 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 2006. [Dynamical systems. III], Translated from the Russian original by E. Khukhro.
- [Ale68a] V. M. Alekseev. Invariant Markov subsets of diffeomorphisms. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 23(2(140)):209–210, 1968.
- [Ale68b] V. M. Alekseev. Quasirandom dynamical systems. II. One-dimensional nonlinear vibrations in a periodically perturbed field. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 77(119):545–601, 1968.
- [Arn64] V. I. Arnold. Instability of dynamical systems with many degrees of freedom. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 156:9–12, 1964.
- [BD96] C. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz. Persistent nonhyperbolic transitive diffeomorphisms. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 143(2):357–396, 1996.
- [BD12] C. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz. Abundance of C^1 -robust homoclinic tangencies. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 364(10):5111–5148, 2012.
- [BDV05] C. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz, and M. Viana. *Dynamics beyond uniform hyperbolicity*, volume 102 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. A global geometric and probabilistic perspective, Mathematical Physics, III.
- [BFM20a] I. Baldomá, E. Fontich, and P. Martín. Invariant manifolds of parabolic fixed points (I). Existence and dependence on parameters. *J. Differential Equations*, 268(9):5516–5573, 2020.
- [BFM20b] I. Baldomá, E. Fontich, and P. Martín. Invariant manifolds of parabolic fixed points (II). Approximations by sums of homogeneous functions. *J. Differential Equations*, 268(9):5574–5627, 2020.
- [BGG23] I. Baldomá, M. Giralt, and M. Guardia. Coorbital homoclinic and chaotic dynamics in the restricted 3-body problem, 2023.
- [Cas72] J. W. S. Cassels. *An introduction to Diophantine approximation*, volume No. 45 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*. Hafner Publishing Co., New York, 1972. Facsimile reprint of the 1957 edition.
- [CFG25] Andrew Clarke, Jacques Fejoz, and Marcel Guardia. Why are inner planets not inclined? *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 141:1–98, 2025.

- [CG23] M. J. Capiński and M. Gidea. Arnold diffusion, quantitative estimates, and stochastic behavior in the three-body problem. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 76(3):616–681, 2023.
- [Cha22] J. Chazy. Sur l’allure du mouvement dans le problème des trois corps quand le temps croît indéfiniment. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)*, 39:29–130, 1922.
- [CKOZ25] M. J. Capiński, B. Krauskopf, H. M. Osinga, and P. Zgliczyński. Characterising blenders via covering relations and cone conditions. *J. Differential Equations*, 416:768–805, 2025.
- [Cre03] J. Cresson. Symbolic dynamics and Arnold diffusion. *J. Differential Equations*, 187(2):269–292, 2003.
- [DdlS06] A. Delshams, R. de la Llave, and T. M. Seara. A geometric mechanism for diffusion in Hamiltonian systems overcoming the large gap problem: heuristics and rigorous verification on a model. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 179(844), 2006.
- [DdlS08] A. Delshams, R. de la Llave, and T. M. Seara. Geometric properties of the scattering map of a normally hyperbolic invariant manifold. *Adv. Math.*, 217(3):1096–1153, 2008.
- [DKdlRS19] A. Delshams, V. Kaloshin, A. de la Rosa, and T. M. Seara. Global instability in the restricted planar elliptic three body problem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 366(3):1173–1228, 2019.
- [DKS14] L. J. Díaz, S. Kiriki, and K. Shinohara. Blenders in centre unstable Hénon-like families: with an application to heterodimensional bifurcations. *Nonlinearity*, 27(3):353–378, 2014.
- [DP19] L. J. Díaz and S. A. Pérez. Blender-horseshoes in center-unstable Hénon-like families. In *New trends in one-dimensional dynamics*, volume 285 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 137–163. Springer, Cham, [2019] ©2019.
- [DP23] L. J. Díaz and S. A. Pérez. Nontransverse heterodimensional cycles: stabilisation and robust tangencies. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 376(2):891–944, 2023.
- [Fej13] J. Fejoz. On action-angle coordinates and the Poincaré coordinates. *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 18(6):703–718, 2013.
- [FK19] S. Fleischer and A. Knauf. Improbability of collisions in n -body systems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 234(3):1007–1039, 2019.
- [GdlL06] M. Gidea and R. de la Llave. Topological methods in the instability problem of Hamiltonian systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 14(2):295–328, 2006.
- [GK12] A. Gorodetski and V. Kaloshin. Hausdorff dimension of oscillatory motions for restricted three body problems. Preprint, available at <http://www.terpconnect.umd.edu/~vkaloshi>, 2012.
- [GKMR25a] M. Guardia, V. Kaloshin, P. Martín, and P. Roldan. A normally hyperbolic invariant lamination along mean motion resonances in the restricted planar three body problem, 2025. In preparation.
- [GKMR25b] M. Guardia, V. Kaloshin, P. Martín, and P. Roldan. Stochastic behavior along mean motion resonances in the restricted planar 3-body problem, 2025. In preparation.
- [GMP25] M. Garrido, P. Martín, and J. Paradelá. Parabolic saddles and Newhouse domains in celestial mechanics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 406(7):Paper No. 173, 67, 2025.
- [GMPS22] M. Guardia, P. Martín, J. Paradelá, and T. M. Seara. Hyperbolic dynamics and oscillatory motions in the 3 body problem, 2022.
- [GPS23] M. Guardia, J. Paradelá, and T. M. Seara. A degenerate arnold diffusion mechanism in the restricted 3 body problem, 2023.
- [GSMS17] M. Guardia, T.M. Seara, P. Martín, and L. Sabbagh. Oscillatory orbits in the restricted elliptic planar three body problem. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 37(1):229–256, 2017.
- [GT17] V. Gelfreich and D. Turaev. Arnold diffusion in a priori chaotic symplectic maps. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 353(2):507–547, 2017.
- [HPS77] M. W. Hirsch, C. C. Pugh, and M. Shub. *Invariant manifolds*, volume Vol. 583 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.
- [LT] Dongchen Li and Dmitry Turaev. Symplectic blenders near whiskered tori and the persistence of saddle-center homoclinics. In preparation.
- [LT24] D. Li and D. Turaev. Persistence of heterodimensional cycles. *Invent. Math.*, 236(3):1413–1504, 2024.
- [McG73] R. McGehee. A stable manifold theorem for degenerate fixed points with applications to celestial mechanics. *J. Differential Equations*, 14:70–88, 1973.
- [Moe02] R. Moeckel. Generic drift on Cantor sets of annuli. In *Celestial mechanics (Evanston, IL, 1999)*, volume 292 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 163–171. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [Moe07] R. Moeckel. Symbolic dynamics in the planar three-body problem. *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 12(5):449–475, 2007.
- [Mos73] J. Moser. *Stable and random motions in dynamical systems*, volume No. 77 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1973. With special emphasis on celestial mechanics, Hermann Weyl Lectures, the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.
- [MS04] J. P. Marco and D. Sauzin. Wandering domains and random walks in Gevrey near-integrable systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 24(5):1619–1666, 2004.
- [NP12] M. Nassiri and E. R. Pujals. Robust transitivity in Hamiltonian dynamics. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 45(2):191–239, 2012.
- [PdM82] J. Palis, Jr. and W. de Melo. *Geometric theory of dynamical systems*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982. An introduction, Translated from the Portuguese by A. K. Manning.
- [Rob84] C. Robinson. Homoclinic orbits and oscillation for the planar three-body problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 52(3):356–377, 1984.
- [Saa71] D. G. Saari. Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 162:267–271; erratum, *ibid.* 168 (1972), 521, 1971.

- [Sit60] K. Sitnikov. The existence of oscillatory motions in the three-body problems. *Soviet Physics. Dokl.*, 5:647–650, 1960.
- [Win41] A. Wintner. *The Analytical Foundations of Celestial Mechanics*, volume vol. 5 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1941.
- [Xia94] Z. Xia. Arnold diffusion and oscillatory solutions in the planar three-body problem. *J. Differential Equations*, 110(2):289–321, 1994.

(MG) DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, GRAN VIA, 585, 08007 BARCELONA, SPAIN & CENTRE DE RECERCA MATEMÀTICA, EDIFICI C, CAMPUS BELLATERRA, 08193 BELLATERRA, SPAIN
Email address: `guardia@ub.edu`

(JP) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, 4176 CAMPUS DRIVE, 20782, MD, US
Email address: `paradela@umd.edu`