

Second-species dynamics in the restricted planar circular three body problem: chaos, final motions and periodic orbits

Marcel Guardia ^{1,3}, José Lamas  ², Tere M-Seara  ^{2,3}

¹Departament de Matemàtiques i Informàtica, Universitat de Barcelona, Gran Via, 585, 08007
Barcelona, Spain

²Departament de Matemàtiques & IMTECH, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Diagonal
647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

³Centre de Recerca Matemàtica, Campus de Bellaterra, Edifici C, 08193, Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

Consider the Restricted Planar Circular Three Body Problem (RPC3BP), which models the motion of a massless particle (Asteroid) under the gravitational influence of two massive bodies (the primaries) moving on circular orbits. By considering the ratio between the masses of the primaries to be arbitrarily small, we construct orbits with close encounters with the smaller primary (Jupiter) that realize any combination of past and future final motions (in the sense of Chazy's), including oscillatory motions. We also obtain arbitrarily large ejection-collision orbits with Jupiter and ejection-collision orbits between the two primaries (Sun and Jupiter), as well as arbitrarily large periodic orbits that pass arbitrarily close to Jupiter. Our approach combines singular perturbation theory and Levi-Civita regularization near Jupiter, and McGehee regularization near infinity and near the Sun, together with a global analysis that leads to transverse intersections of invariant manifolds.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main results	3
1.2	Literature and previous results	6
1.3	Main ideas for the proofs of Theorems 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6	6
2	The Kepler problem	8
3	Local analysis close to \mathcal{J}	11
3.1	Levi-Civita regularization of the collision \mathcal{J}	12
3.2	Ejection and collision orbits from \mathcal{J}	13
3.3	The transition map close to collision	16
4	Local analysis close to \mathcal{S}	17
5	The invariant manifolds of infinity	20
5.1	Parameterization of the invariant manifolds of infinity	21
6	The distance between the invariant manifolds	24

E-mail addresses: guardia@ub.edu (M.Guardia), jose.lamas.rodriguez@upc.edu (J.Lamas), tere-m.seara@upc.edu (Tere M-Seara).

7 Proof of Theorem 1.3	25
7.1 Large ejection-collision orbits	25
7.2 Ballistic ejection-collision orbits	28
8 Proof of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6	29
8.1 Existence of the triple intersection	32
8.2 Transversality and ordering of the triple intersection	32
A Proof of Proposition 3.4	34
B Proof of Proposition 5.2	39
C Proof of Proposition 7.1	44
D Proof of Lemma 8.3	53

1 Introduction

In his *Méthodes nouvelles de la mécanique céleste* [44], Poincaré pointed out the fundamental role of collision and near-collision orbits in celestial mechanics. In particular, he introduced the concept of *second-species* solutions: periodic orbits that, while avoiding actual collision, pass arbitrarily close to it. Their construction typically involves singular perturbation methods and careful analysis of the flow near collision via regularization techniques. In contrast, *first-species* solutions correspond to periodic orbits that are continuation of those of the 2 body problem that arise through regular perturbations of integrable systems. In recent years, a variety of techniques (ranging from variational methods to geometric and perturbative approaches) have been developed to construct second-species solutions and to analyze their structure (see for instance [6, 7, 8, 33]).

A natural question concerning these near-collision behaviors is how they relate to the broader picture of long-term dynamics of the 3 body problem. These dynamics were studied extensively by Chazy, who classified all complete solutions (those defined for all positive or negative time) based on their asymptotic behavior. In the RPC3BP, this classification is reduced to 4 possible asymptotic behaviors. To provide the classification, let q denote the position of the Asteroid.

Theorem 1.1 (Chazy, 1922, see also [5]). *Every solution of the RPC3BP defined for all time belongs to one of the following four classes.*

- *Hyperbolic* (\mathcal{H}^\pm) : $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|q(t)\| = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|\dot{q}(t)\| = c > 0$.
- *Parabolic* (\mathcal{P}^\pm) : $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|q(t)\| = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|\dot{q}(t)\| = 0$.
- *Bounded* (\mathcal{B}^\pm) : $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|q(t)\| < \infty$.
- *Oscillatory* (\mathcal{OS}^\pm) : $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|q(t)\| = \infty$ and $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|q(t)\| < \infty$.

Note that this classification applies both when $t \rightarrow +\infty$ or $t \rightarrow -\infty$. To distinguish both cases we add a superindex + or - to each of the cases, e.g \mathcal{P}^+ and \mathcal{P}^- .

While this classification excludes collisions, it provides a natural framework in which to understand global dynamics, and it remains central to the description of the long-term motion in the 3 body problem.

Among these classes, oscillatory motions are particularly subtle: they exhibit infinitely many excursions far away from the primaries without tending to infinity. The first example of oscillatory motions was given by Sitnikov in [49]. Since then, more recent works have proven their existence in several models by showing their connection to chaotic behavior (see for instance [22, 24, 40]).

The existence of orbits exhibiting oscillatory behavior (and transitions between different types of final motions) has led to renewed interest in how near-collision dynamics fit into the Chazy framework. In our previous work [27], we analyzed the different types of final motions for the RPC3BP (including oscillatory motions) passing near the massive primary, referred to as the Sun. These orbits could be studied through classical perturbation theory because the system, also near collision, is a regular perturbation of the Sun-Asteroid 2 body problem. Using a slight abuse of terminology in line with Poincaré’s original classification, we refer to these orbits as *first-species* solutions to emphasize their distinction with the “more singular” behavior of the orbits considered in this article.

The present paper focuses on the behavior near the smaller primary, referred to as Jupiter. Here, the problem possesses a singular perturbation regime in which the dynamics can no longer be viewed as a small perturbation of a Kepler problem between the Sun and the Asteroid. As a result, the analytical framework used in [27] is no longer applicable, and a different class of geometric and regularization techniques is required. The orbits constructed here (including oscillatory motions, symbolic dynamics, and ejection-collision trajectories) although similar in nature to those in [27], arise through fundamentally different mechanisms and are referred to as *second-species* solutions in this broader sense.

1.1 Main results

We consider the RPC3BP and normalize the masses of the primaries to be $1 - \mu$ and μ , with $\mu \in (0, 1/2]$ denoting the mass ratio. Throughout this paper we consider $\mu > 0$ small, and accordingly we refer to the more massive primary as the Sun and the smaller one as Jupiter. Taking the appropriate units, the RPC3BP is a Hamiltonian system with respect to

$$H_\mu(Q, P, t) = \frac{|P|^2}{2} - \frac{1 - \mu}{|Q + \mu Q_0(t)|} - \frac{\mu}{|Q - (1 - \mu)Q_0(t)|}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $Q, P \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $-\mu Q_0(t)$ and $(1 - \mu)Q_0(t)$ with $Q_0(t) = (\cos t, \sin t)$ are the positions of the primaries.

The symplectic change to rotating coordinates (\hat{q}, \hat{p}) makes the Hamiltonian (1.1) autonomous and of the form

$$\hat{H}_\mu(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \frac{|\hat{p}|^2}{2} - (\hat{q}_1 \hat{p}_2 - \hat{q}_2 \hat{p}_1) - \frac{1 - \mu}{|\hat{q} + (\mu, 0)|} - \frac{\mu}{|\hat{q} - (1 - \mu, 0)|}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\hat{q}, \hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $(-\mu, 0)$ and $(1 - \mu, 0)$ are the new position of the primaries, which are now fixed.

For any $\mu \in (0, 1/2]$ it is known (see [22, 30]) that

$$X^+ \cap Y^- \neq \emptyset \quad \text{where } X, Y = \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{OS}.$$

Note that, when $\mu = 0$, the RPC3BP is reduced to a Kepler problem and therefore $\mathcal{OS}^\pm = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{H}^+ = \mathcal{H}^-, \mathcal{P}^+ = \mathcal{P}^-, \mathcal{B}^+ = \mathcal{B}^-$.

We define the Sun and Jupiter as the collision sets

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \hat{q} = (-\mu, 0)\}, \quad \mathcal{J} = \{(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \hat{q} = (1 - \mu, 0)\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Let us define also the ejection and collision orbits.

Definition 1.2. An ejection or collision orbit $\hat{\gamma}(t) = (\hat{q}(t), \hat{p}(t))$ associated to the Hamiltonian (1.2) belongs to one of the following families.

- Ejection orbits from the Sun (\mathcal{S}^-) : there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^+} \hat{q}(t) = (-\mu, 0)$.
- Ejection orbits from Jupiter (\mathcal{J}^-) : there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^+} \hat{q}(t) = (1 - \mu, 0)$.
- Collision orbits to the Sun (\mathcal{S}^+) : there exists $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_1^-} \hat{q}(t) = (-\mu, 0)$.
- Collision orbits to Jupiter (\mathcal{J}^+) : there exists $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_1^-} \hat{q}(t) = (1 - \mu, 0)$.

Moreover, we define

- Ejection-collision orbit with the Sun if it belongs to $\mathcal{S}^- \cap \mathcal{S}^+$.
- Ejection-collision orbit with Jupiter if it belongs to $\mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$.
- Ejection-collision orbit between the primaries if it belongs to $\mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{S}^+$ or $\mathcal{J}^+ \cap \mathcal{S}^-$.

The main results of the present paper are the following. The first one constructs two different “types” of ejection-collision orbits with Jupiter and between the primaries.

Theorem 1.3. For any open set $U \subset \left[\frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{3}, \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{3}\right]$ there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, the following statements hold:

1. For any $\hat{h} \in U$, there exists a sequence of trajectories $\{\hat{z}_k(t)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\hat{z}_k(t) = (\hat{q}_k(t), \hat{p}_k(t)) \in \mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$ in the energy level $\hat{H}_\mu(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \hat{h}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{t \in (t_0^k, t_1^k)} |\hat{q}_k(t)| \right) = +\infty, \quad (1.4)$$

where t_0^k, t_1^k are as in Definition 1.2.

2. There exists $\eta > 0$ (independent of μ) such that, for any $\hat{h} \in (-\eta\mu, \eta\mu) \subset U$, one can find

- a sequence of trajectories $\{\hat{z}_k^1(t)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\hat{z}_k^1(t) = (\hat{q}_k^1(t), \hat{p}_k^1(t)) \in \mathcal{S}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$,
- a sequence of trajectories $\{\hat{z}_k^2(t)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\hat{z}_k^2(t) = (\hat{q}_k^2(t), \hat{p}_k^2(t)) \in \mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{S}^+$,

in the energy level $\hat{H}_\mu(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \hat{h}$ which satisfy

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{t \in (t_{0,i}^k, t_{1,i}^k)} |\hat{q}_k^i(t)| \right) = +\infty, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $(t_{0,1}^k, t_{1,1}^k)$ and $(t_{0,2}^k, t_{1,2}^k)$ are as in Definition 1.2.

3. There exists $\eta > 0$ (independent of μ) such that, for any $\hat{h} \in (-\eta\mu, \eta\mu) \subset U$, one can find

- a trajectory $\hat{z}^3(t) = (\hat{q}^3(t), \hat{p}^3(t)) \in \mathcal{S}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$,

- a trajectory $\hat{z}^4(t) = (\hat{q}^4(t), \hat{p}^4(t)) \in \mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{S}^+$,

in the energy level $\hat{H}_\mu(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \hat{h}$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in (t_{0,i}, t_{1,i})} |\hat{q}^i(t)| = 1 - \mu, \quad i = 3, 4, \quad (1.5)$$

where $(t_{0,3}, t_{1,3})$ and $(t_{0,4}, t_{1,4})$ are as in Definition 1.2.

Remark 1.4. We say that an ejection-collision trajectory is large if it belongs to a sequence of trajectories for which (1.4) holds. An ejection-collision trajectory between the primaries is ballistic if it satisfies (1.5).

The second main theorem shows the existence of hyperbolic sets (whose dynamics is conjugated to the infinite symbols shift) which are unbounded and contain Jupiter at their closure.

Theorem 1.5. There exist $\eta > 0$ and $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, there exists $\hat{h} \in (-1 - \eta\mu^{\frac{1}{12}}, -1 + \eta\mu^{\frac{1}{12}})$ and a section $\Pi \subset \{\hat{H}_\mu(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \hat{h}\}$ transverse to the flow of (1.2) where the induced Poincaré map

$$\mathbb{P} : V \subset \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$$

has an invariant set \mathcal{X} which is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{N}^\mathbb{Z}$ and whose dynamics $\mathbb{P}|_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is topologically conjugated to the shift $\sigma : \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{Z}$, $(\sigma\omega)_k = \omega_{k+1}$. Moreover, this invariant set \mathcal{X} satisfies

$$\overline{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset, \quad \overline{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{J}^\pm \neq \emptyset, \quad \overline{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{P}^\pm \neq \emptyset.$$

A consequence of this result is the following theorem, which provides the existence of any combination of past and future asymptotic behaviors (in the sense of Chazy) accumulating to Jupiter.

Theorem 1.6. There exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$,

$$\overline{X^+ \cap Y^-} \cap \mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{where} \quad X, Y = \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{OS}.$$

Moreover,

- There exist trajectories $(\hat{q}(t), \hat{p}(t))$ of (1.2) which belong to $\mathcal{OS}^- \cap \mathcal{OS}^+$ and get arbitrarily close to collision with Jupiter. Namely, they satisfy

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} |\hat{q}(t)| = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} |\hat{q}(t) - (1 - \mu, 0)| = 0.$$

In particular, this also implies that they are oscillatory in their velocity:

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \hat{q}(t) \right| = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \hat{q}(t) \right| < \infty. \quad (1.6)$$

- For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a periodic trajectory $(\hat{q}(t), \hat{p}(t))$ of (1.2) satisfying

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\hat{q}(t)| \geq \varepsilon^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\hat{q}(t) - (1 - \mu, 0)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 7. Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 are proved together in Section 8.

1.2 Literature and previous results

The study of near-collision orbits has been the subject of several works, particularly in relation to second-species solutions. After Poincaré's initial classification [44], a geometric framework for studying these solutions was developed through regularization techniques and the analysis of invariant manifolds associated with the collision set. In the context of the planar 3 body problem, Levi-Civita and McGehee regularizations [28, 36] have been used to describe the flow near binary collisions. This approach has enabled the construction of near-collision orbits in both planar and spatial models [6, 7, 8, 9, 20, 33]. One can also rely on KAM Theory to build punctured tori (invariant tori containing collisions for the regularized flow), see [12, 16, 17, 50].

Ejection and collision orbits have also received considerable attention. Saari, and later Fleisher and Knauf, proved that the set of initial conditions leading to collision has zero Lebesgue measure [18, 19, 45, 46], though it may still be topologically large. The question of whether collision orbits form a dense set within an open set of the phase space was first posed by Siegel and later formulated as a conjecture by Alekseev [1]. Although it remains open, a partial answer was given in [21], where the authors prove that the set of orbits leading to collision in the RPC3BP is μ^α -dense (for some $\alpha > 0$) in some open set of phase space.

In the RPC3BP, ejection-collision orbits were first constructed by Lacomba and Llibre [25, 29]. Their results were later generalized in [32, 41, 42]. Using computer assisted proofs, ballistic ejection-collision orbits (see Remark 1.4) have been obtained in [10], and [11] provides oscillatory orbits in velocity (in the sense of (1.6)) accumulating to collision.

In the full 3 body problem, triple collisions are also possible and have been extensively study since the work of McGehee [36] (see also [14, 15, 26, 38, 48]). The analysis of these singularities has provided a framework for constructing various types of trajectories in the 3 body problem, including those with oscillatory behavior in both position and velocity (by Moeckel [37, 39]). These constructions rely on trajectories passing arbitrarily close to triple collision and therefore the total angular momentum has to be very close to zero. This is not the case of the present paper, where the primaries perform circular motion and therefore their angular momenta are not small.

Regarding the combination of past and future final motions, it can be traced back to the work done by Sitnikov for the now known as the Sitnikov problem [49], where he showed that all of them were possible (including oscillatory motions). A decade later, Moser [40] gave a new proof, relating these motions to chaotic behavior via the construction of Smale horseshoes. Moser's approach has since been adapted to other versions of the restricted 3 body problem [22, 30] (see [43] for similar results using other methods). In the non-restricted setting, similar results were given by Alekseev [2, 3, 4], and have been recently extended in [23].

1.3 Main ideas for the proofs of Theorems 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6

The orbits constructed in Theorems 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6 rely on a combination of invariant manifold theory and singular perturbation techniques applied to certain objects of the RPC3BP. These include both the analysis close to the primaries (the Sun and Jupiter) as well as the behavior of the system at infinity. After suitable regularizations and compactifications, these objects can be understood within the context of different regularized flows. To analyze the dynamics in these different regions of the phase space, we perform several changes of coordinates and time scalings. The McGehee regularizations near the Sun and at infinity (see [35, 36]) were deeply studied in [27]. In contrast, in the present paper the analysis near Jupiter is achieved through a Levi-Civita transformation [28], which is described in Section 3 below.

At a fixed energy level, the McGehee regularization transforms the Sun into an invariant torus con-

taining two normally hyperbolic invariant circles, each foliated by equilibrium points. As detailed in Section 4, the ejection and collision orbits correspond to unstable and stable manifolds associated to these circles, and their behavior can be analyzed as perturbations of the flow induced by the unperturbed Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 in (1.2).

After compactification, the “parabolic infinity” (described in Section 5) becomes a degenerate periodic orbit at each energy level. Though degenerate, it is known to possess well-defined stable and unstable manifolds for any value of $\mu \in [0, 1/2]$ (see [34]).

Near Jupiter we consider the Levi-Civita regularization (see Section 3 below). Then, at a given energy level, the collision set becomes a circle of regular points (located close to a saddle), and the associated ejection and collision orbits are generated by the forward and backward flow of this circle. Unlike the cases of the Sun and the parabolic infinity, the dynamics close to Jupiter does not arise as a small μ -perturbation of the Sun-Asteroid 2 body problem. Rather, after a scaling and a singular perturbation analysis, the dynamics is governed by the Jupiter-Asteroid 2 body problem and therefore a separate analysis is required.

We show that the invariant manifolds of infinity intersect transversally with the ejection and collision orbits associated to Jupiter. By combining these intersections with a local analysis near collisions and infinity, we construct the different types of motions provided by Theorems 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6.

Let us describe the strategy more precisely:

1. We prove that the stable manifold of infinity intersects transversally the ejection manifold \mathcal{J}^- and the unstable manifold of infinity intersects transversally the collision manifold \mathcal{J}^+ (see Section 6).
2. Relying on the local analysis close to infinity (at the C^1 level) done in [40], we prove that the ejection and collision manifolds \mathcal{J}^\mp intersect transversally and that these intersections can be arbitrarily far away from Jupiter. Building on our results in [27], where we prove an analogous result for the ejection and collision manifolds with \mathcal{S} , we prove the existence of transverse intersections of ejection and collision manifolds associated to \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{J} which can be arbitrarily far away from both primaries (see Section 7.1). This proves the first two items of Theorem 1.3.
3. Through the analysis of the invariant manifolds of collision with \mathcal{S} done in [27], we prove that the ejection and collision manifolds associated to \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{J} intersect transversally inside the region of the phase space enclosed by Jupiter’s orbit (see Section 7.2). This gives the third item of Theorem 1.3.
4. From the local analysis close to Jupiter (at the C^1 level) done in [33] (which we recall in Section 3 below), we prove that the stable and unstable manifolds of infinity intersect transversally close to the collision set \mathcal{J} . Then, we construct hyperbolic sets with symbolic dynamics which contain the homoclinic points to infinity in its closure (but not containing Jupiter in its closure). This leads to oscillatory motions passing close to \mathcal{J} (and combination of past and future different final motions), but not to oscillatory motions which have Jupiter at its closure, and it does not imply Theorems 1.5 and 1.6.
5. To prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 we have to further analyze the invariant manifolds of infinity and the ejection/collision manifolds \mathcal{J}^\mp . That is, we prove that there exists an energy level for which the transverse intersection of the invariant manifolds of infinity belongs to one of the ejection fibers of \mathcal{J}^- . Then, making use of the local analysis close to \mathcal{J} and the tools developed by Moser in [40], one can construct the behaviors provided by Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 (see Section 8).

2 The Kepler problem

We start by considering the Hamiltonian (1.2) with $\mu = 0$, which is the classical Kepler problem in rotating coordinates

$$\hat{H}_0(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \frac{|\hat{p}|^2}{2} - (\hat{q}_1 \hat{p}_2 - \hat{q}_2 \hat{p}_1) - \frac{1}{|\hat{q}|}. \quad (2.1)$$

This Hamiltonian has two first integrals: the angular momentum and the energy of the Asteroid in non-rotating coordinates centered at \mathcal{S} , defined respectively as

$$\hat{\Theta}(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \hat{q}_1 \hat{p}_2 - \hat{q}_2 \hat{p}_1, \quad H_0(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \frac{|\hat{p}|^2}{2} - \frac{1}{|\hat{q}|}. \quad (2.2)$$

In this model, we are interested in orbits hitting \mathcal{J} , defined in (1.3) (for $\mu = 0$ they are regular orbits). Relying on (2.1), for a fixed $\hat{h} \in \mathbb{R}$, the collision set \mathcal{J} at the energy level $\{\hat{H}_0 = \hat{h}\}$ becomes

$$\mathcal{J}_{\hat{h}} = \left\{ (\hat{q}, \hat{p}) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \quad \hat{q} = (1, 0), \quad \hat{p}_1^2 + (\hat{p}_2 - 1)^2 = 2\hat{h} + 3 \right\}.$$

The following lemma, whose proof is straightforward, gives a characterization of the ejection and collision orbits \mathcal{J}^- , \mathcal{J}^+ (see Definition 1.2) in terms of \hat{h} and $\hat{\Theta}$.

Lemma 2.1. *An orbit $\hat{\gamma}(t) \in \mathcal{J}^- \cup \mathcal{J}^+$ of the equations of motion associated to (2.1) in the hypersurface $\{\hat{H}_0(\hat{q}, \hat{p}) = \hat{h}\}$ belongs to one of the following three classes.*

- *Elliptic if one of the following conditions holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & - \hat{h} \in \left(-\frac{3}{2}, -\sqrt{2} \right) \text{ and } \hat{\Theta} \in \left[1 - \sqrt{2\hat{h} + 3}, 1 + \sqrt{2\hat{h} + 3} \right]. \\ & - \hat{h} \in \left[-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2} \right) \text{ and } \hat{\Theta} \in \left[1 - \sqrt{2\hat{h} + 3}, -\hat{h} \right). \end{aligned}$$

- *Parabolic if $\hat{h} \in [-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}]$ and $\hat{\Theta} = -\hat{h}$.*
- *Hyperbolic if $\hat{h} \in (-\sqrt{2}, +\infty)$ and $\hat{\Theta} > -\hat{h}$.*

We study the parabolic orbits in Lemma 2.1. It is convenient to work in the non-rotating polar coordinates defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= \check{r} \cos \check{\theta}, & P_1 &= \check{R} \cos \check{\theta} - \frac{\check{\Theta}}{\check{r}} \sin \check{\theta}, \\ Q_2 &= \check{r} \sin \check{\theta}, & P_2 &= \check{R} \sin \check{\theta} + \frac{\check{\Theta}}{\check{r}} \cos \check{\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

In these coordinates, the Hamiltonian $H_0(Q, P)$ in (1.1) becomes

$$\check{H}_0(\check{r}, \check{R}, \check{\Theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\check{R}^2 + \frac{\check{\Theta}^2}{\check{r}^2} \right) - \frac{1}{\check{r}}. \quad (2.4)$$

From (2.1), (2.2) and Lemma 2.1, the parabolic orbits crossing the orbit of Jupiter at a fixed angular momentum

$$\check{\Theta} = \check{\Theta}_0 = -\hat{h} \in \left[-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2} \right] \quad (2.5)$$

are given by

$$\mathcal{V}_{\check{\Theta}_0} = \left\{ (\check{r}, \check{\theta}, \check{R}, \check{\Theta}) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 : \check{\Theta} = \check{\Theta}_0 \right\} \cap \left\{ \check{H}_0 = 0 \right\}.$$

The rest of the section is devoted to compute explicitly the parabolic orbits in $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\Theta}_0}$ hitting Jupiter. We proceed as follows. First, we exploit the integrability of $\check{\mathcal{H}}_0$ in (2.4) to compute the parabolic orbits in $\mathcal{V}_{\check{\Theta}_0}$ and to analyze its asymptotic behavior as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Then we identify the orbits within this set that hit \mathcal{J} .

The equations of motion associated with the Hamiltonian $\check{\mathcal{H}}_0$ restricted to the plane $\{\check{\Theta} = \check{\Theta}_0, \check{\mathcal{H}}_0 = 0\}$ are reduced to

$$\frac{d}{dt}\check{r} = \check{R}, \quad \frac{d}{dt}\check{\theta} = \frac{\check{\Theta}_0}{\check{r}^2}, \quad \frac{d}{dt}\check{R} = \frac{\check{\Theta}_0^2}{\check{r}^3} - \frac{1}{\check{r}^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

Next lemma (see [30]) computes the trajectories of these equations.

Lemma 2.2. *Fix $\check{\Theta}_0 \in [-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}]$ and let $w(t)$ be the unique analytic function defined by*

$$t = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{3}w^3 + \check{\Theta}_0^2 w \right),$$

such that w is real for real values of t , that is,

$$w(t) = \begin{cases} \sqrt[3]{6t} & \text{if } \check{\Theta}_0 = 0, \\ \left(3t + \sqrt{9t^2 + \check{\Theta}_0^6} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - \check{\Theta}_0^2 \left(3t + \sqrt{9t^2 + \check{\Theta}_0^6} \right)^{-\frac{1}{3}} & \text{if } \check{\Theta}_0 \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Then:

(i) *If $\check{\Theta}_0 \neq 0$, the parabolic orbit solution of (2.6) with initial condition*

$$\check{r}_h(0, \check{\Theta}_0) = \frac{\check{\Theta}_0^2}{2}, \quad \check{\theta}_h(0, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) = \check{\theta}_0, \quad \check{R}_h(0, \check{\Theta}_0) = 0,$$

is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\gamma}_h(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) &= (\check{r}_h(t, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{R}_h(t, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{\Theta}_0) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} (w(t)^2 + \check{\Theta}_0^2), \check{\theta}_0 - i \log \left(\frac{i\check{\Theta}_0 - w(t)}{i\check{\Theta}_0 + w(t)} \right), \frac{2w(t)}{w(t)^2 + \check{\Theta}_0^2}, \check{\Theta}_0 \right), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

and satisfies $\check{\gamma}_h(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) \subset \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{P}^-$.

(ii) *If $\check{\Theta}_0 = 0$, $\check{\gamma}_h(t, \check{\theta}_0, 0)$ above is no longer defined at $t = 0$. Instead, there exist two trajectories of (2.6) given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\gamma}_h^+(t, \check{\theta}_0) &= (\check{r}_h^+(t), \check{\theta}_h^+(t, \check{\theta}_0), \check{R}_h^+(t), \check{\Theta}_h^+(t)) = \left(\lambda t^{\frac{2}{3}}, \check{\theta}_0, \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda}} t^{-\frac{1}{3}}, 0 \right), \quad \forall t > 0, \\ \check{\gamma}_h^-(t, \check{\theta}_0) &= (\check{r}_h^-(t), \check{\theta}_h^-(t, \check{\theta}_0), \check{R}_h^-(t), \check{\Theta}_h^-(t)) = \left(\lambda t^{\frac{2}{3}}, \check{\theta}_0, -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda}} |t|^{-\frac{1}{3}}, 0 \right), \quad \forall t < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda = \left(\frac{9}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. They satisfy $\check{\gamma}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0) \subset \mathcal{S}^\mp \cap \mathcal{P}^\pm$ (see Definition 1.2).

Note that the singularities in (2.8), located at $w = \pm i\check{\Theta}_0$ (or equivalently at $t = \pm i\frac{\check{\Theta}_0^3}{3}$), are in fact zeroes of the function \check{r}_h and therefore correspond to collisions of the parabolic orbit with the primary \mathcal{S} , which occur at purely complex values of time if $\check{\Theta}_0 \neq 0$.

To deal at the same time with the cases $\check{\Theta}_0 \neq 0$ and $\check{\Theta}_0 = 0$, we introduce

$$\check{\gamma}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) = (\check{r}_h^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{R}_h^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{\Theta}_0) = \begin{cases} \check{\gamma}_h(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) \text{ for } \pm t \geq 0 \text{ if } \check{\Theta}_0 \neq 0, \\ \check{\gamma}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0) \text{ for } \pm t > 0 \text{ if } \check{\Theta}_0 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

The following corollary provides the asymptotic behavior of the parabolic trajectories $\check{\gamma}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0)$ as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$.

Corollary 2.3. *The trajectories $\check{\gamma}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) = (\check{r}_h^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{R}_h^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0), \check{\Theta}_0)$ in (2.9) satisfy*

$$\check{r}_h^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0) \sim |t|^{\frac{2}{3}}, \quad \check{R}_h^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0) \sim \pm|t|^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \quad \check{\theta}_h^\pm(t, \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) - \check{\theta}_0 \sim \check{\Theta}_0|t|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty.$$

Recall that for $\mu = 0$, the Hamiltonian (1.2) reduces to a Kepler problem involving only the Sun and the Asteroid. Hence, it is an abuse of language to say that the orbits $\check{\gamma}_h^\pm$ in (2.9) collide with \mathcal{J} . To address this ambiguity, we say that these orbits “hit Jupiter” if there exist $(t_c, \check{\theta}_0) \in (0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\check{r}_h^\pm(\pm t_c, \check{\Theta}_0) = 1, \quad \check{\theta}_h^\pm(\pm t_c, \pm \check{\theta}_0, \check{\Theta}_0) = \pm t_c.$$

Imposing both conditions on (2.9) yields

$$t_c = t_c(\check{\Theta}_0) = \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{2 - \check{\Theta}_0^2} (1 + \check{\Theta}_0^2), \quad \check{\theta}_c := \check{\theta}_0(\check{\Theta}_0) = t_c(\check{\Theta}_0) + i \log \left(\frac{i\check{\Theta}_0 - w(t_c(\check{\Theta}_0))}{i\check{\Theta}_0 + w(t_c(\check{\Theta}_0))} \right). \quad (2.10)$$

Then, the two trajectories

$$\check{\gamma}_c^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0) := \check{\gamma}_h^\pm(t, \pm \check{\theta}_c, \check{\Theta}_0) \quad (2.11)$$

correspond to the parabolic orbits colliding with \mathcal{J} at time $t = \pm t_c(\check{\Theta}_0)$, respectively.




Figure 2.1: Examples of the orbits analyzed in Remark 2.4. In the left and right pictures we consider $\check{\Theta}_0^* = \sqrt{2}$ and $\check{\Theta}_0^* = 1$ respectively.

Remark 2.4. *We make the following remark regarding the orbits $\check{\gamma}_c^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0)$ (see Figure 2.1).*

- For $\check{\Theta}_0^* = \pm\sqrt{2}$ we have $t_c(\pm\sqrt{2}) = 0$ in (2.10) so the orbits $\check{\gamma}_c^\pm(t, \check{\Theta}_0^*)$ correspond to parabolic ejection and collision orbits with \mathcal{J} , respectively. Namely

$$\check{\gamma}_c^+(t, \check{\Theta}_0^*) \subset \mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{P}^+, \quad \check{\gamma}_c^-(t, \check{\Theta}_0^*) \subset \mathcal{J}^+ \cap \mathcal{P}^-.$$

- For $\check{\Theta}_0^* \in (-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}) \setminus \{0\}$ we have
 - For $t \in [0, t_c]$, $\check{\gamma}_c^+(t, \check{\Theta}_0^*) \subset \mathcal{J}^+$ and for $t \geq t_c$, $\check{\gamma}_c^+(t, \check{\Theta}_0^*) \subset \mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{P}^+$.
 - For $t \in [-t_c, 0]$, $\check{\gamma}_c^-(t, \check{\Theta}_0^*) \subset \mathcal{J}^-$ and for $t \leq -t_c$, $\check{\gamma}_c^-(t, \check{\Theta}_0^*) \subset \mathcal{J}^+ \cap \mathcal{P}^-$.
- For $\check{\Theta}_0^* = 0$ we have
 - For $t \in (0, t_c]$, $\check{\gamma}_c^+(t, 0) \subset \mathcal{S}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$ (and ballistic, see Remark 1.4) and for $t \geq t_c$, $\check{\gamma}_c^+(t, 0) \subset \mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{P}^+$.
 - For $t \in [-t_c, 0)$, $\check{\gamma}_c^-(t, 0) \subset \mathcal{S}^+ \cap \mathcal{J}^-$ (also ballistic) and for $t \leq -t_c$, $\check{\gamma}_c^-(t, 0) \subset \mathcal{J}^+ \cap \mathcal{P}^-$.

3 Local analysis close to \mathcal{J}

To carry out a local analysis around the collision set \mathcal{J} in (1.3), we first consider the translation to put \mathcal{J} at the origin

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 &= \hat{q}_1 - (1 - \mu), & q_2 &= \hat{q}_2, \\ p_1 &= \hat{p}_1, & p_2 &= \hat{p}_2 - (1 - \mu). \end{aligned}$$

In these coordinates, the Hamiltonian (1.2) reads

$$H_\mu(q, p) = \frac{|p|^2}{2} - (q_1 p_2 - q_2 p_1) - q_1(1 - \mu) - \frac{1 - \mu}{|q + (1, 0)|} - \frac{\mu}{|q|} - \frac{(1 - \mu)^2}{2}, \quad (3.1)$$

and \mathcal{J} in (1.3) becomes $\{q = 0\}$. For q close to 0, it has the expansion

$$H_\mu(q, p) = \frac{|p|^2}{2} - (q_1 p_2 - q_2 p_1) - (1 - \mu) \left(q_1^2 - \frac{q_2^2}{2} \right) - \frac{\mu}{|q|} - (1 - \mu) \left(1 + \frac{(1 - \mu)}{2} \right) + \mathcal{O}_3(q).$$

We consider the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} G_\mu(q, p) &= H_\mu(q, p) + (1 - \mu) \left(1 + \frac{1 - \mu}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{|p|^2}{2} - (q_1 p_2 - q_2 p_1) - (1 - \mu) \left(q_1^2 - \frac{q_2^2}{2} \right) - \frac{\mu}{|q|} + \mathcal{O}_3(q). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Both Lemma 2.1 and Hamiltonian (3.2) prompt us to consider energy levels $G_\mu = g$, where $h \in (-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2})$ and therefore g satisfies

$$g = h + (1 - \mu) \left(1 + \frac{1 - \mu}{2} \right) > 0. \quad (3.3)$$

The analysis performed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 below will be restricted to a neighborhood of $q = 0$ in the energy level $G_\mu^{-1}(g)$,

$$B_\gamma = \{(q, p) \in G_\mu^{-1}(g): |q| \leq \mu^\gamma\}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is independent of μ .

Notation 3.1. *Throughout the paper we use several coordinate systems. For a coordinate x and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we write $f(x) = \mathcal{O}_k(x)$ if there exist $C > 0$ independent of μ , such that there is $d > 0$ and a function $j \in C^k((-d, d))$ with $\|j\|_{C^k((-d, d))} \leq C$, such that $f(x) = x^k j(x)$.*

3.1 Levi-Civita regularization of the collision \mathcal{J}

Following [21], we perform the Levi-Civita transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \psi: \mathbb{R}^4 &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4 \\ (z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2) &\mapsto \left(2(z_1^2 - z_2^2), 4z_1 z_2, \frac{w_1 z_1 - w_2 z_2}{\xi |z|^2}, \frac{w_1 z_2 + w_2 z_1}{\xi |z|^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where ξ is related to g in (3.3) as

$$\xi = (2g)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (2h + 3)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}(\mu) > 0, \quad (3.6)$$

to the system of equations associated to Hamiltonian (3.2). Applying this change of coordinates and also the time scaling

$$d\tau = \frac{dt}{\xi^2 |z|^2}$$

to the Hamiltonian G_μ in (3.2), we obtain a new system which is Hamiltonian with respect to

$$\begin{aligned} L_\mu(z, w) &= \xi^2 |z|^2 \left(\left(G_\mu - \frac{1}{2\xi^2} \right) \circ \psi \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (|w|^2 - |z|^2) - \frac{\xi^2 \mu}{2} - 2\xi |z|^2 (z_1 w_2 - z_2 w_1) - \xi^2 |z|^2 f(z), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$f(z) = 4(1 - \mu) ((z_1^2 - z_2^2)^2 - 2z_1^2 z_2^2) + \mathcal{O}_6(z). \quad (3.8)$$

The orbits belonging to the hypersurface $\{G_\mu = 1/(2\xi^2)\}$, including the ejection and collision ones, now lie in $\{L_\mu(z, w) = 0\}$. In particular, in coordinates (z, w) , the collision manifold $\{|q| = 0\}$ restricted to the level set $\{L_\mu(z, w) = 0\}$ becomes the circle

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_h &= \{(z, w) \in L_\mu^{-1}(0) : z = 0\} = \{(0, 0, w_1, w_2) : w_1^2 + w_2^2 = \xi^2 \mu\} \\ &= \{(0, 0, \xi \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \cos \beta, \xi \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sin \beta), \beta \in \mathbb{T}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

and B_γ defined in (3.4) now becomes a neighborhood of $z = 0$ in $L_\mu^{-1}(0)$ given by

$$B_\gamma = \left\{ (z, w) \in L_\mu^{-1}(0) : |z| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mu^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \right\}. \quad (3.10)$$

Note that $f(z)$ in (3.8) is analytic in B_γ . The equations of motion associated to (3.7) have a saddle at the origin with eigenvalues ± 1 with multiplicity 2. We denote by $W_\mu^s(0)$ and $W_\mu^u(0)$ its stable and unstable invariant manifolds respectively. The following proposition (see [33], § 3.3.1, p. 231) establishes a change of coordinates that straightens both invariant manifolds.

Proposition 3.2. *Fix $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and denote by B a ϵ -neighborhood of the origin. Then, there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, there exists an analytic change of variables*

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi: B &\subset \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \Xi(B) \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \\ (z, w) &\mapsto (s, u) \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

satisfying

$$s = s(z, w) = \frac{z - w}{\sqrt{2}} + \mathcal{O}_5(z, w), \quad u = u(z, w) = \frac{z + w}{\sqrt{2}} + \mathcal{O}_5(z, w),$$

which transforms the equations of motion associated to Hamiltonian (3.7) into equations of the form

$$\begin{aligned} s' &= -s(1 + F^s(s, u)) \\ u' &= u(1 + F^u(s, u)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where F^s and F^u are analytic functions such that $F^*(s, u) = \mathcal{O}_2(s, u)$, for $* = s, u$. In these coordinates the saddle point remains as $(s, u) = (0, 0)$ and its local invariant manifolds become

$$W_\mu^s(0) = \{u = 0\}, \quad W_\mu^u(0) = \{s = 0\}.$$

Moreover the Hamiltonian (3.7) becomes the first integral

$$\begin{aligned} l_\mu(s, u) = L_\mu \circ \Xi^{-1}(s, u) &= -(s_1 u_1 + s_2 u_2) - \frac{\xi^2 \mu}{2} \\ &\quad - \xi ((s_1 + u_1)^2 + (s_2 + u_2)^2) (s_1 u_2 - s_2 u_1) + \mathcal{O}_6(s, u). \end{aligned}$$

In coordinates (s, u) , the collision circle defined in (3.9) becomes

$$\mathcal{J}_h = \{(s, u) \in l_\mu^{-1}(0) : (s, u) = \Gamma(\beta), \beta \in \mathbb{T}\}, \quad (3.13)$$

where $\Gamma(\beta)$ satisfies

$$\Gamma(\beta) = \left(-\frac{\xi \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \beta, \sin \beta), \frac{\xi \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \beta, \sin \beta) \right) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1} \left(\mu^{\frac{5}{2}} \right).$$

Note that $B_\gamma \subset B$ (where B_γ is defined in (3.10)). Hence, there exists a function W satisfying

$$W(s, u) = (s_1 + u_1)^2 + (s_2 + u_2)^2 + \mathcal{O}_6(s, u)$$

such that the boundary of the domain $\mathbf{B}_\gamma = \Xi(B_\gamma)$ in (3.11) is given by

$$\partial B_\gamma = \{(s, u) \in l_\mu^{-1}(0) : W(s, u) = \mu^\gamma\}. \quad (3.14)$$

3.2 Ejection and collision orbits from \mathcal{J}

As stated in Section 1.3, we compare the ejection and collision orbits from Jupiter with the invariant manifolds of infinity (see Section 5) in a common set of coordinates. We do the comparison in rotating polar coordinates centered at Jupiter, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon: [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4 \\ (r, \theta, R, \Theta) &\mapsto (q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

In these coordinates, the Hamiltonian $H_\mu(q, p)$ in (3.1) reads

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu(r, \theta, R, \Theta) = \frac{1}{2} \left(R^2 + \frac{\Theta^2}{r^2} \right) - \Theta - r \cos \theta (1 - \mu) - \frac{1 - \mu}{\sqrt{r^2 + 2r \cos \theta + 1}} - \frac{\mu}{r} - \frac{(1 - \mu)^2}{2}, \quad (3.16)$$

which is reversible with respect to the symmetry

$$(r, \theta, R, \Theta; t) \rightarrow (r, -\theta, -R, \Theta; -t), \quad (3.17)$$

and ∂B_γ in (3.10) (see also ∂B_γ in (3.4)) becomes, for a fixed level set $\{\mathcal{H}_\mu = h\}$, the section

$$\Sigma_\gamma = \{(r, \theta, R, \Theta) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 : r = \mu^\gamma, \mathcal{H}_\mu(\mu^\gamma, \theta, R, \Theta) = h\}. \quad (3.18)$$

This section analyzes the ejection and collision orbits from Jupiter and their intersections with Σ_γ . We proceed as follows. First, in coordinates (s, u) , we compute the ejection and collision orbits from the collision circle \mathcal{J}_h in (3.13) and, in particular, their intersections with $\partial\mathbf{B}_\gamma$, defined in (3.14). Then, we translate the result to coordinates (r, θ, R, Θ) .

Next lemma analyzes the dynamics of the collision circle \mathcal{J}_h through the linearized part of the vector field in (3.12) until it reaches the section $\partial\mathbf{B}_\gamma$. To control the non-linear terms for the full system, we complexify β in the parameterization of \mathcal{J}_h in (3.13) on the complex strip

$$\mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0} = \{\beta \in \mathbb{C}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z}): |\text{Im}\beta| \leq \sigma_0\}, \quad \sigma_0 \in (0, 1). \quad (3.19)$$

Lemma 3.3. *Fix a closed interval $I \subset (-\sqrt{2} + \frac{3}{2}, \sqrt{2} + \frac{3}{2})$, $\xi > 0$ with $1/(2\xi^2) \in I$, $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Denote by $(s_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta), u_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta))$ the ejection (defined for $\text{Re}(\tau) > 0$) and collision (defined for $\text{Re}(\tau) < 0$) trajectories of the linearization of (3.12) such that $(s_{\text{lin}}(0, \beta), u_{\text{lin}}(0, \beta)) = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\beta) \in \mathcal{J}_h$ (see (3.13)) with $\beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0}$ in (3.19). Then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, there exists a time $\tau_{\text{lin}}(\beta)$ of the form*

$$\tau_{\text{lin}}(\beta) = \text{arcsinh} \left(\frac{\mu^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}\xi} \right) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1} \left(\mu^{\frac{3+\gamma}{2}} \right) = \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}\mu^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}}{\xi} \right) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1} \left(\mu^{1-\gamma} \right), \quad (3.20)$$

such that the orbits $(s_{\text{lin}}, u_{\text{lin}})$ satisfy $(s_{\text{lin}}(\pm\tau_{\text{lin}}(\beta), \beta), u_{\text{lin}}(\pm\tau_{\text{lin}}(\beta), \beta)) \in \partial\mathbf{B}_\gamma$ defined in (3.14), forming two complex-analytic curves $\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu) \subset \partial\mathbf{B}_\gamma$ of the form

$$\mathbf{D}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu) = \{(s_{\text{lin}}^\mp(\beta), u_{\text{lin}}^\mp(\beta)) : \beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0}\} \subset \partial\mathbf{B}_\gamma$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\text{lin}}^\mp(\beta) &= -\frac{1}{2}\mu^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\mp 1 + 1)(\cos \beta, \sin \beta) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1} \left(\mu^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \right), \\ u_{\text{lin}}^\mp(\beta) &= \frac{1}{2}\mu^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}(\pm 1 + 1)(\cos \beta, \sin \beta) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1} \left(\mu^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is a direct consequence of the integration of the linear part of system (3.12), whose trajectory (with initial condition at a point in (3.13)) is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta) &= \left(-\frac{\xi\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}(\cos \beta, \sin \beta) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1} \left(\mu^{\frac{5}{2}} \right) \right) e^{-\tau}, \\ u_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta) &= \left(\frac{\xi\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}(\cos \beta, \sin \beta) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1} \left(\mu^{\frac{5}{2}} \right) \right) e^\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

□

The next proposition shows that if one considers the full system (3.12), the same is true up to a small error.

Proposition 3.4. *Fix a closed interval $I \subset (-\sqrt{2} + \frac{3}{2}, \sqrt{2} + \frac{3}{2})$, $\xi > 0$ with $1/(2\xi^2) \in I$, $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, 1)$. Denote by $(s_\mu(\tau, \beta), u_\mu(\tau, \beta))$ the ejection (defined for $\text{Re}(\tau) > 0$) and collision (defined for*

$\text{Re}(\tau) < 0$) trajectories of (3.12) such that $(s_\mu(0, \beta), u_\mu(0, \beta)) = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\beta) \in \mathcal{J}_h$ (see (3.13)) with $\beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0/2}$ in (3.19). Then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, there exists a time $T(\beta)$ satisfying

$$T(\beta) = \tau_{\text{lin}}(\beta) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}\right), \quad (3.22)$$

such that $(s_\mu(\pm T(\beta), \beta), u_\mu(\pm T(\beta), \beta)) \in \partial \mathbf{B}_\gamma$ in (3.14), forming two complex-analytic curves $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu) \subset \partial \mathbf{B}_\gamma$ of the form

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu) = \{(s^\mp(\beta), u^\mp(\beta)) : \beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0/2}\} \subset \partial \mathbf{B}_\gamma, \quad (3.23)$$

where

$$(s^\mp(\beta), u^\mp(\beta)) = (s_{\text{lin}}^\mp(\beta), u_{\text{lin}}^\mp(\beta)) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\gamma-1)}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}}\right). \quad (3.24)$$

The proof of this proposition is done in Appendix A. The following proposition translates the curves $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu)$ to polar coordinates (r, θ, R, Θ) .

Proposition 3.5. Fix a closed interval $I \subset (-\sqrt{2} + \frac{3}{2}, \sqrt{2} + \frac{3}{2})$, $\xi > 0$ with $1/(2\xi^2) \in I$ and $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, 1)$. Then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, the curves $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu)$ defined in (3.23) for $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ are written, in coordinates (r, θ, R, Θ) , as graphs of the form

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu) = \{(r, \theta, R_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\theta), \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\theta)) : r = \mu^\gamma, \theta \in \mathbb{T}\} \subset \Sigma_\gamma, \quad (3.25)$$

where Σ_γ is defined in (3.18) and both $R_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp$, $\Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp$ are real-analytic functions of the form

$$R_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\theta) = \pm \xi^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}}\right), \quad \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\theta) = \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{19\gamma-3}{8}}, \mu\right). \quad (3.26)$$

Proof. We apply the transformations Ξ^{-1} and ψ in (3.11) and (3.5) respectively to translate the curves $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu)$ in (3.23) into coordinates (q, p) yielding

$$\begin{aligned} q^\mp(\beta) &= \mu^\gamma (\cos(2\beta), \sin(2\beta)) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{19\gamma-3}{8}}, \mu\right), \\ p^\mp(\beta) &= \pm \xi^{-1} (\cos(2\beta), \sin(2\beta)) + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$. Note that the points $q^\mp(\beta)$ satisfy $|q^\mp(\beta)| = \mu^\gamma$ since $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu) \subset \partial \mathbf{B}_\gamma$ (see (3.14)).

Then, we apply the transformation Υ^{-1} in (3.15) to obtain the components (r, θ) as $r = \mu^\gamma$ and

$$\theta^\mp(\beta) = \arctan\left(\frac{q_2^\mp(\beta)}{q_1^\mp(\beta)}\right) = 2\beta + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-\gamma}\right), \quad (3.27)$$

which can be inverted as

$$\beta(\theta^\mp) = \frac{\theta^\mp}{2} + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-\gamma}\right).$$

Relying on the change Υ^{-1} in (3.15) we write the momenta (R, Θ) in terms of $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, leading to (3.26) and completing the proof. \square

Remark 3.6. We make the following remarks regarding this coordinate transformation and notation.

1. The sign of the radial velocity R of the curve $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ is positive, and negative for $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu)$ (see (3.25)). This prompts us to define the following sections

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{\gamma}^> &= \{(r, \theta, R, \Theta) : r = \mu^{\gamma}, \mathcal{H}_{\mu}(\mu^{\gamma}, \theta, R, \Theta) = h, R > 0\} \subset \Sigma_{\gamma}, \\ \Sigma_{\gamma}^< &= \{(r, \theta, R, \Theta) : r = \mu^{\gamma}, \mathcal{H}_{\mu}(\mu^{\gamma}, \theta, R, \Theta) = h, R < 0\} \subset \Sigma_{\gamma},\end{aligned}\quad (3.28)$$

where \mathcal{H}_{μ} is defined in (3.16). Then $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \subset \Sigma_{\gamma}^>$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu) \subset \Sigma_{\gamma}^<$.

2. Equation (3.27) relates the angles from the collision curve $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu)$ with the ones from the ejection curve $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ as follows

$$\theta^+ = \theta^- + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-\gamma}\right). \quad (3.29)$$

3.3 The transition map close to collision

Let us decompose the boundary $\partial \mathbf{B}_{\gamma} = \Sigma^- \cup \Sigma^+$ (see (3.14)) where

$$\Sigma^- = \{(s, u) \in \partial \mathbf{B}_{\gamma} : |s| \leq |u|\}, \quad \Sigma^+ = \{(s, u) \in \partial \mathbf{B}_{\gamma} : |s| \geq |u|\}, \quad (3.30)$$

so that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \subset \Sigma^-$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu) \subset \Sigma^+$ (see (3.23)). The following proposition defines a transition map from Σ^+ to Σ^- . It sends transverse curves to $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+$ to transverse curves to $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-$.

Proposition 3.7. Fix $\beta_* \in \mathbb{T}$, $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, 1)$ and $\iota > 0$ small enough. There exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, consider a curve $\gamma_{\text{in}} \subset \Sigma^+$ of the form

$$\gamma_{\text{in}}(\beta) = (s_{\text{in}}(\beta), u_{\text{in}}(\beta)), \quad \beta \in (\beta_* - \iota, \beta_* + \iota)$$

where $s_{\text{in}}(\beta), u_{\text{in}}(\beta)$ are C^1 -functions, which is transverse to $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu) \subset \Sigma^+$ at

$$\mathbf{p}_+ = \gamma_{\text{in}}(\beta_*) = (s^+(\beta_*), u^+(\beta_*)) \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu).$$

Then, the flow associated to (3.12) induces a C^1 Poincaré map $\mathbf{f} : \Sigma^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^-$ that maps the curve γ_{in} to a curve $\gamma_{\text{out}} \subset \Sigma^-$, parameterized as

$$\gamma_{\text{out}}(\beta) = \mathbf{f}(\gamma_{\text{in}}(\beta)) = \left(\frac{|u_{\text{in}}(\beta)|}{|s_{\text{in}}(\beta)|} \cdot s_{\text{in}}(\beta), \frac{|s_{\text{in}}(\beta)|}{|u_{\text{in}}(\beta)|} \cdot u_{\text{in}}(\beta) \right) + \mathcal{O}_2(|s_{\text{in}}(\beta)|). \quad (3.31)$$

Moreover, it is transverse to $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \subset \Sigma^-$ at

$$\mathbf{p}_- = \gamma_{\text{out}}(\beta_*) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}_+) = (s^-(\beta_*), u^-(\beta_*)) \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu).$$

The proof of this proposition relies on the analysis carried out in [33], which is performed within the following neighborhood

$$\mathbf{V}_{\varepsilon} = \{(s, u) \in l_{\mu}^{-1}(0) : |s| \leq \varepsilon, |u| \leq \varepsilon\},$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is considered small enough. The boundary $\partial \mathbf{V}_{\varepsilon}$ is the union of the submanifolds $C_s(\varepsilon)$ and $C_u(\varepsilon)$ defined as

$$C_s(\varepsilon) = \{(s, u) \in l_{\mu}^{-1}(0) : |s| = \varepsilon, |u| \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad C_u(\varepsilon) = \{(s, u) \in l_{\mu}^{-1}(0) : |s| \leq \varepsilon, |u| = \varepsilon\}. \quad (3.32)$$

Using the results in [33] (§ 3.3.2, § 3.3.4, p. 232), the following lemma provides the transition map from C_s to C_u . This transition map is a perturbation of the one given by the linearized part of the vector field in (3.12).

Lemma 3.8. *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, the following C^1 -transition map*

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varepsilon: C_s(\varepsilon) &\rightarrow C_u(\varepsilon) \\ (s, u) &\mapsto (f_\varepsilon^s(s, u), f_\varepsilon^u(s, u)) \end{aligned}$$

maps points $(s, u) \in C_s(\varepsilon)$ to points $(f_\varepsilon^s(s, u), f_\varepsilon^u(s, u)) \in C_u(\varepsilon)$ (see (3.32)) as follows

$$f_\varepsilon^s(s, u) = \frac{|u|}{\varepsilon} s + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}(\varepsilon^2), \quad f_\varepsilon^u(s, u) = \varepsilon \frac{u}{|u|} + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}(\varepsilon^2).$$

The rest of the proof consists on translating this result to the sections Σ^+ and Σ^- . Note that $\gamma_{\text{in}} \subset \Sigma^+ \subset \partial B_\gamma$ (see (3.14) and (3.30)), so $|s_{\text{in}}(\beta)| \geq |u_{\text{in}}(\beta)|$ with $|s_{\text{in}}(\beta)| = \mathcal{O}(\mu^{\frac{\gamma}{2}})$. Hence, if we consider $\varepsilon(\beta) = |s_{\text{in}}(\beta)|$, then $\gamma_{\text{in}}(\beta) \in C_s(\varepsilon(\beta))$ for $\beta \in B_\varepsilon(\beta_*)$. Namely, the curve γ_{in} satisfies

$$\gamma_{\text{in}} \subset \bigcup_{\beta \in B_\varepsilon(\beta_*)} C_s(\varepsilon(\beta)).$$

Then, we apply the transition map f_ε from Lemma 3.8 to the curve γ_{in} , which leads to the curve

$$\gamma_{\text{out}} = \bigcup_{\beta \in B_\varepsilon(\beta_*)} f_\varepsilon(\gamma_{\text{in}}(\beta)) \subset \Sigma^-,$$

yielding (3.31) and completing the proof.

4 Local analysis close to \mathcal{S}

To analyze the dynamics close to the collision set \mathcal{S} in (1.3), we follow the study performed in [27]. Consider the change to rotating polar coordinates centered at \mathcal{S}

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{q}_1 &= -\mu + \bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta}, & \hat{p}_1 &= \bar{R} \cos \bar{\theta} - \frac{\bar{\Theta}}{\bar{r}} \sin \bar{\theta}, \\ \hat{q}_2 &= \bar{r} \sin \bar{\theta}, & \hat{p}_2 &= \bar{R} \sin \bar{\theta} + \frac{\bar{\Theta}}{\bar{r}} \cos \bar{\theta}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where (\hat{q}, \hat{p}) are the cartesian coordinates centered at the center of mass. In these coordinates, the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_μ in (1.2) becomes

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\bar{R}^2 + \frac{\bar{\Theta}^2}{\bar{r}^2} \right) - \frac{1}{\bar{r}} - \bar{\Theta} - \bar{V}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}; \mu), \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\bar{V}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}; \mu) = -\mu \left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}} + \bar{R} \sin \bar{\theta} + \frac{\bar{\Theta}}{\bar{r}} \cos \bar{\theta} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \bar{r}^2 - 2\bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta}}} \right).$$

Moreover, this system is reversible with respect to the involution

$$(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) \rightarrow (\bar{r}, -\bar{\theta}, -\bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) \tag{4.3}$$

and the collision set \mathcal{S} in (1.3) becomes $\{\bar{r} = 0\}$.

To regularize (4.2) at $\bar{r} = 0$ we perform the McGehee transformation [36]

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\zeta}: \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \\ (\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, v, u) &\mapsto (\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = \left(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, v\bar{r}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mu \sin \bar{\theta}, u\bar{r}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \bar{r}^2 - \mu \bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

and the change of time

$$dt = \bar{r}^{\frac{3}{2}} d\tau,$$

so that the equations of motion associated to the Hamiltonian $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ in (4.2) become

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r}' &= \bar{r}v \\ \bar{\theta}' &= u \\ v' &= \frac{v^2}{2} + u^2 + 2u\bar{r}^{\frac{3}{2}} + \bar{r}^3 - 1 + \mu \left[1 - \bar{r}^2 \left(\cos \bar{\theta} + \frac{\bar{r} - \cos \bar{\theta}}{(1 + \bar{r}^2 - 2\bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \right] \\ u' &= -\frac{uv}{2} - 2v\bar{r}^{\frac{3}{2}} + \mu \bar{r}^2 \sin \bar{\theta} \left[1 - \frac{1}{(1 + \bar{r}^2 - 2\bar{r} \cos \theta)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $'$ denotes $\frac{d}{d\tau}$. Observe that (4.5) is now regular at $\bar{r} = 0$.

The change of variables in (4.4) is not symplectic but the Hamiltonian $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ in (4.2) is still a first integral of (4.5). Moreover, the level set $\{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu = h\}$ is now given by $(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu - h) \circ \bar{\zeta} = 0$, where

$$(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu - h) \circ \bar{\zeta}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, v, u) = -h + \frac{v^2 + u^2}{2\bar{r}} - \frac{\bar{r}^2}{2} - \frac{1 - \mu}{\bar{r}} + \mu \left[-\frac{\mu}{2} + \bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \bar{r}^2 - 2\bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta}}} \right].$$

We now multiply by \bar{r} to remove the singularity, obtaining

$$\bar{M}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, v, u; \mu, h) = -\bar{r}h + \frac{v^2 + u^2}{2} - \frac{\bar{r}^3}{2} - 1 + \mu + \mu \bar{r} \left[-\frac{\mu}{2} + \bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \bar{r}^2 - 2\bar{r} \cos \bar{\theta}}} \right].$$

We study (4.5) restricted to the manifold $\bar{M}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, v, u; \mu, h) = 0$ since the orbits belonging to the hyper-surface $\{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = h\}$, including the ejection and collision ones, now lie in $\bar{M}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, v, u; \mu, h) = 0$. It is convenient to introduce a last change of coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta: \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^+ &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \\ (s, \bar{\theta}, \alpha, \rho) &\mapsto (\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, v, u) = \left(s^2, \bar{\theta}, \sqrt{2(1 - \mu) + \rho} \sin \alpha, \sqrt{2(1 - \mu) + \rho} \cos \alpha \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

such that $\{\bar{M} = 0\}$ becomes

$$0 = M(s, \bar{\theta}, \alpha, \rho; \mu, h) = -\rho + 2s^2h + s^6 - 2\mu s^2 \left[-\frac{\mu}{2} + s^2 \cos \bar{\theta} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + s^4 - 2s^2 \cos \bar{\theta}}} \right]. \quad (4.7)$$

Note that we have taken $\bar{r} = s^2$ so the vector field (4.5) in coordinates $(s, \bar{\theta}, \alpha, \rho)$ is now of class C^∞ .

To study the motion in coordinates $(s, \bar{\theta}, \alpha, \rho)$, we define the 3-dimensional submanifold

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(s, \bar{\theta}, \rho, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}: M(s, \bar{\theta}, \rho, \alpha; \mu, h) = 0\}.$$

Using $(s, \bar{\theta}, \alpha)$ as coordinates in \mathcal{M} (ρ can be obtained from (4.7)) the collision manifold $\{\bar{r} = 0\}$ becomes the invariant torus

$$\Omega = \{(0, \bar{\theta}, \alpha): \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}, \alpha \in \mathbb{T}\} \subset \mathcal{M}$$

whose dynamics is given by

$$\bar{\theta}' = \sqrt{2(1 - \mu)} \cos \alpha, \quad \alpha' = \frac{\sqrt{2(1 - \mu)}}{2} \cos \alpha.$$

This system has two circles of critical points

$$S^+ = \left\{ S_{\bar{\theta}}^+ = \left(0, \bar{\theta}, \frac{\pi}{2} \right) : \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{T} \right\}, \quad S^- = \left\{ S_{\bar{\theta}}^- = \left(0, \bar{\theta}, -\frac{\pi}{2} \right) : \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{T} \right\}. \quad (4.8)$$

Next lemma, whose proof is done in [27], analyzes the stable and unstable invariant manifolds associated to these circles.

Lemma 4.1. *The invariant circles S^\pm in (4.8) are normally hyperbolic and they have 2-dimensional stable and unstable manifolds $W_\mu^{u,s}(S^\pm) = \bigcup_{\bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}} W_\mu^{u,s}(S_{\bar{\theta}}^\pm)$ such that*

- $W_\mu^s(S^+)$ and $W_\mu^u(S^-)$ are contained in Ω . Moreover, they coincide along a homoclinic manifold

$$M := W_\mu^s(S^+) = W_\mu^u(S^-) \subset \Omega.$$

Therefore

$$\Omega = S^+ \cup S^- \cup M,$$

and M is foliated by a family of heteroclinic orbits between $S_{\bar{\theta}}^-$ and $S_{\bar{\theta}}^+$, for $\bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$.

- $W_\mu^s(S^-)$ and $W_\mu^u(S^+)$ belong to $\mathcal{M} \setminus \Omega$.

Remark 4.2. *The definitions of $W_\mu^s(S^-)$ and $W_\mu^u(S^+)$ can be translated to coordinates $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta})$ by means of the changes (4.4) and (4.6). Abusing the notation, we denote the collision and ejection manifolds as*

$$W_\mu^s(S^-) = \left\{ (\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 : \exists t_* = t_*(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) > 0 \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*^-} \bar{\Phi}_t^{\bar{r}}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = 0, \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*^-} \bar{\Phi}_t^{\bar{R}}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = -\infty \right\}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$W_\mu^u(S^+) = \left\{ (\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 : \exists t_* = t_*(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) < 0 \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*^+} \bar{\Phi}_t^{\bar{r}}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = 0, \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*^+} \bar{\Phi}_t^{\bar{R}}(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = +\infty \right\},$$

where $\bar{\Phi}_t$ refers to the flow of the equations of motion associated to the Hamiltonian $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ in (4.2).

We stress that, although invariant (until hitting collision), they are not stable and unstable manifolds of any invariant objects since S^+ and S^- collapse to the singular set $\{\bar{r} = 0\}$.

To compute the ejection and collision orbits \mathcal{S}^- and \mathcal{S}^+ (see Definition 1.2) we recall the results obtained in [27] (§ 2.5, pp. 17-18), contained in the following proposition, which provides a parameterization in polar coordinates centered at \mathcal{S} in (4.1) of the invariant manifolds of collision $W_\mu^u(S^+)$ and $W_\mu^s(S^-)$ (see Remark 4.2).

Proposition 4.3. *Fix $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varrho \in [a, b]$. Then, there exist $\delta_0, \mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, $0 < \mu < \mu_0$ and $h = -\hat{\Theta}_0 = -\mu\varrho$, the invariant manifolds $W_\mu^u(S^+)$, $W_\mu^s(S^-)$ in (4.9), written in polar coordinates centered at \mathcal{S} (see (4.1)), intersect the section*

$$\bar{\Sigma} = \{\bar{r} = \delta^2, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\delta^2, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = h\}, \quad (4.10)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ is the Hamiltonian (4.2), at two curves $\bar{\Delta}_{S+}^u(\mu)$ and $\bar{\Delta}_{S-}^s(\mu)$ that can be written as graphs with respect to $\bar{\theta}$ as

$$\bar{\Delta}_{S+}^u(\mu) = \{(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\Theta}_{S+}^u(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu)), \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}\}, \quad \bar{\Delta}_{S-}^s(\mu) = \{(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\Theta}_{S-}^s(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu)), \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}\}, \quad (4.11)$$

which depend smoothly on μ . The expression for $\bar{\Theta}_{S+}^u(\bar{\theta})$ is given by

$$\bar{\Theta}_{S+}^u(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \mu I_{S+}^u(\bar{\theta}) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^2)$$

with

$$I_{S+}^u(\bar{\theta}) = \mathcal{I}_{S+}^u \left(\bar{\theta} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \delta^3 \right)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_{S+}^u(\alpha) = \lambda \int_{\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \delta^3}^0 \frac{s^{\frac{2}{3}} \sin(\alpha - s)}{\left(1 + \lambda^2 s^{\frac{4}{3}} - 2\lambda s^{\frac{2}{3}} \cos(\alpha - s)\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} ds + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda}} \int_{\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \delta^3}^0 \frac{\cos(\alpha - s)}{s^{\frac{1}{3}}} ds$$

with $\lambda = (\frac{9}{2})^{\frac{1}{3}}$.

The expression for $\bar{\Theta}_{S-}^s(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu)$ comes from the symmetry (4.3) as

$$\bar{\Theta}_{S-}^s(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \bar{\Theta}_{S+}^u(-\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu). \quad (4.12)$$

Remark 4.4. The sign of the radial velocity \bar{R} for the curve $\bar{\Delta}_{S+}^u(\mu)$ is positive, and negative for $\bar{\Delta}_{S-}^s(\mu)$. This prompts us to define domains in the section $\bar{\Sigma}$ in (4.10)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Sigma}^> &= \{(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) : \bar{r} = \delta^2, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\delta^2, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = h, \bar{R} > 0\} \subset \bar{\Sigma}, \\ \bar{\Sigma}^< &= \{(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) : \bar{r} = \delta^2, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\delta^2, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = h, \bar{R} < 0\} \subset \bar{\Sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ corresponds to the Hamiltonian (4.2), so that $\bar{\Delta}_{S+}^u(\mu) \subset \bar{\Sigma}^>$ and $\bar{\Delta}_{S-}^s(\mu) \subset \bar{\Sigma}^<$.

5 The invariant manifolds of infinity

To study the behavior of the infinity “invariant set” and the dynamics close to them, we introduce the so-called *McGehee coordinates at infinity* (see for instance [35]). This will lead to the existence of the corresponding stable and unstable invariant manifolds. In Section 5.1, we provide a parameterization of these manifolds.

We express the Hamiltonian (1.2) in (synodical) polar coordinates centered at the center of mass $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$, yielding

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{R}^2 + \frac{\hat{\Theta}^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right) - \frac{1}{\hat{r}} - \hat{\Theta} - \hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu), \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$\hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) = \frac{1 - \mu}{\left(\hat{r}^2 + 2\hat{r}\mu \cos \hat{\theta} + \mu^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{\mu}{\left(\hat{r}^2 - 2\hat{r}(1 - \mu) \cos \hat{\theta} + (1 - \mu)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{1}{\hat{r}}. \quad (5.2)$$

We consider the change of coordinates $\hat{r} = 2x^{-2}$, in which the parabolic infinity $\{\hat{r} = \infty, \hat{R} = 0\}$ becomes

$$A = \left\{ (x, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}^2 : x = 0, \hat{R} = 0 \right\}, \quad (5.3)$$

and the equations of motion associated to the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ in (5.1) now read

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = -\frac{\hat{R}x^3}{4}, \quad \frac{d\hat{\theta}}{dt} = \frac{\hat{\Theta}}{4}x^4 - 1, \quad \frac{d\hat{R}}{dt} = -\frac{x^4}{4} + \frac{\hat{\Theta}^2}{8}x^6 + \frac{x^3}{4}\partial_x\hat{V}(x, \hat{\theta}; \mu), \quad \frac{d\hat{\Theta}}{dt} = \partial_{\hat{\theta}}\hat{V}(x, \hat{\theta}; \mu), \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$\hat{V}(x, \hat{\theta}; \mu) = \frac{x^2}{2} \left(\frac{1-\mu}{\left(1+x^2\mu\cos\hat{\theta}+\frac{x^4}{4}\mu^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{\mu}{\left(1-x^2(1-\mu)\cos\hat{\theta}+\frac{x^4}{4}(1-\mu)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - 1 \right).$$

From (5.4), one obtains that the manifold A in (5.3) is foliated by periodic orbits as $A = \bigcup_{\hat{\Theta}_0 \in \mathbb{R}} A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}$ with

$$A_{\hat{\Theta}_0} = \left\{ (x, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) : x = 0, \hat{R} = 0, \hat{\Theta} = \hat{\Theta}_0, \hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{T} \right\}.$$

In [34] it was proven that these periodic orbits have stable and unstable manifolds, which we denote by $W_{\mu}^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and $W_{\mu}^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ respectively. Moreover, these manifolds depend analytically on $\hat{\Theta}_0$. Note that the rates of convergence of the invariant manifolds $W_{\mu}^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ are polynomial in t and not exponential as in the case of hyperbolic objects. For this reason, in [13] and [22], the set A in (5.3) is referred to as a “normally parabolic” invariant manifold.

5.1 Parameterization of the invariant manifolds of infinity

For $\mu = 0$, Lemma 2.1 shows that the parabolic ejection and collision orbits with \mathcal{J} lie in the plane $\{\hat{H}_0 = \hat{h}, \hat{\Theta}_0 = -\hat{h}\}$ for $\hat{h} \in [-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}]$ and $\hat{\Theta}_0 = \check{\Theta}_0$ (see (2.5)), where \hat{H}_0 corresponds to the Hamiltonian (2.1). Lemma 2.2 (and Remark 2.4) analyzes these orbits and thus, the parabolic ejection trajectories $\check{\gamma}_c^+(t, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ in (2.11) (defined for $t \geq t_c$ with t_c as in (2.10)) provide a parametrization in the non-rotating polar coordinates $(\check{r}, \check{\theta}, \check{R}, \check{\Theta})$ (see (2.3)) of the stable manifold $W_0^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$. Analogously, the parabolic collision trajectories $\check{\gamma}_c^-(t, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ (defined for $t \leq -t_c$) parameterize the unstable manifold $W_0^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$.

The following lemma (whose proof is straightforward) gives a graph parameterization of the invariant manifolds $W_0^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ in coordinates $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$.

Lemma 5.1. *For $\mu = 0$ and for any $\hat{\Theta}_0 \in [-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}]$, the invariant manifolds of infinity $W_0^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ can be written as graphs of the form*

$$W_0^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) = \left\{ \left(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}_0^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \hat{\Theta}_0^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0) \right) : (\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) \in \left(\hat{\Theta}_0^2/2, +\infty \right) \times \mathbb{T} \right\},$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_0^s(\hat{r}; \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \frac{1}{\hat{r}} \sqrt{2\hat{r} - \hat{\Theta}_0^2}, & \hat{\Theta}_0^s(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \hat{\Theta}_0, \\ \hat{R}_0^u(\hat{r}; \hat{\Theta}_0) &= -\frac{1}{\hat{r}} \sqrt{2\hat{r} - \hat{\Theta}_0^2}, & \hat{\Theta}_0^u(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \hat{\Theta}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

The following proposition shows that, for $\mu > 0$ small enough, the invariant manifolds $W_{\mu}^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ can be extended to reach a neighborhood of \mathcal{J} , and provides a graph parameterization for them in coordinates $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$.

Proposition 5.2. Fix $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$, $m > 0$, $\hat{\Theta}_0 \in [-\sqrt{2} + m, \sqrt{2} - m]$ and $\kappa > 0$. There exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, the invariant manifolds $W_\mu^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ associated to the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ in (5.1) can be written as graphs of the form

$$W_\mu^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) = \left\{ \left(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}_\infty^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \hat{\Theta}_\infty^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}_0) \right) : (\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) \in [1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu, +\infty) \times \mathbb{T} \right\} \quad (5.6)$$

such that

$$\hat{R}_\infty^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{R}_0^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\nu}), \quad \hat{\Theta}_\infty^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{\Theta}_0 + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\nu}),$$

where $\hat{R}_0^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ are defined in (5.5). Moreover

$$\partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{R}_\infty^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-3\nu}), \quad \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{\Theta}_\infty^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-3\nu}).$$

The proof of this proposition is done in Appendix B.

To compare the invariant manifolds of infinity with the ejection and collision curves $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu)$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ in (3.25), we express the invariant manifolds $W_\mu^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ in (5.6) into rotating polar coordinates centered at Jupiter (see (3.15)) and we prove that they intersect the section Σ_ν in (3.18).

Proposition 5.3. Fix $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$, $\hat{\Theta}_0 \in \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{2}, \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ and $h = -\hat{\Theta}_0$. Then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, the invariant manifold $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ intersects the section $\Sigma_\nu^<$ in (3.28) in a curve that can be written in coordinates (r, θ, R, Θ) as a graph of the form

$$\Lambda_\infty^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \left\{ \left(r, \theta, R_\infty^u(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0), \Theta_\infty^u(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) \right) : r = \mu^\nu, \theta \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}\right) \right\} = W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \Sigma_\nu^<, \quad (5.7)$$

where R_∞^u and Θ_∞^u are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} R_\infty^u(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= f(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^\nu), & \partial_\theta R_\infty^u(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \partial_\theta f(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-3\nu}), \\ \Theta_\infty^u(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \mu^\nu \partial_\theta f(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{2\nu}), & \partial_\theta \Theta_\infty^u(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \mu^\nu \partial_\theta^2 f(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\nu}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

and $f(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) = -\cos \theta \sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2} + \sin \theta (\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1) < 0$.

Moreover, due to the symmetry (3.17), the curve $\Lambda_\infty^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \Sigma_\nu^>$ can be written as

$$\Lambda_\infty^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \left\{ \left(r, \theta, R_\infty^s(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0), \Theta_\infty^s(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) \right) : r = \mu^\nu, \theta \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}\right) \right\}, \quad (5.9)$$

where

$$R_\infty^s(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) = -R_\infty^u(-\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0), \quad \Theta_\infty^s(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \Theta_\infty^u(-\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0). \quad (5.10)$$

Proof. The first step is to identify, for a $\kappa > 0$ on an interval to be determined, the points in $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \{\hat{r} = 1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu\}$ that also lie on the section Σ_ν defined in (3.18). We do it in cartesian coordinates (q, p) , introduced in (3.15), so we obtain two points (which depend on κ and μ) satisfying $\hat{r} = 1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu$ and $r = \mu^\nu$. Namely

$$q_1^2 + q_2^2 = r^2 = \mu^{2\nu}, \quad (q_1 + (1 - \mu))^2 + q_2^2 = \hat{r}^2 = (1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu)^2.$$

Solving for (q_1, q_2) gives two points

$$q_1(\kappa, \mu) = \mu^\nu \left(\kappa - \mu^\nu \frac{1 - \kappa^2}{2(1 - \mu)} \right), \quad q_2^\pm(\kappa, \mu) = \pm \mu^\nu \sqrt{1 - \kappa^2} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu}{1 - \mu} - \mu^{2\nu} \frac{1 - \kappa^2}{4(1 - \mu)^2}},$$

whose arguments are respectively given by

$$\theta^\pm(\kappa, \mu) = \pm \arctan \left(\frac{\sqrt{1-\kappa^2}}{\kappa - \mu^\nu \frac{1-\kappa^2}{2(1-\mu)}} \sqrt{\frac{1-\mu+\kappa\mu^\nu}{1-\mu} - \mu^{2\nu} \frac{1-\kappa^2}{4(1-\mu)^2}} \right)$$

These arguments are well defined for any $\kappa \in (\kappa_0(\mu), 1) \subset (0, 1)$ with

$$\kappa_0(\mu) := \frac{\sqrt{(1-\mu)^2 + \mu^{2\nu}} - (1-\mu)}{\mu^\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\mu^\nu + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{3\nu}).$$

The derivative satisfies

$$\partial_\kappa \theta^\pm(\kappa, \mu) = \mp \frac{1-\mu+\kappa\mu^\nu}{\sqrt{1-\kappa^2} \sqrt{(1-\mu)^2 + \kappa\mu^\nu - \kappa\mu^{1+\nu} - \frac{\mu^{2\nu}}{4}(1-\kappa^2)}},$$

so that $\partial_\kappa \theta^+(\kappa, \mu) < 0$ and $\partial_\kappa \theta^-(\kappa, \mu) > 0$ for $\kappa \in (\kappa_0(\mu), 1)$. Hence $\theta^+(\cdot, \mu)$ is a diffeomorphism from $(\kappa_0(\mu), 1)$ onto $(0, \frac{\pi}{2})$, and $\theta^-(\cdot, \mu)$ is a diffeomorphism from $(\kappa_0(\mu), 1)$ onto $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$.

Therefore, the Inverse Function Theorem yield C^1 inverse functions for $\theta^+(\kappa, \mu)$ and $\theta^-(\kappa, \mu)$, which we denote by $\kappa^+(\theta, \mu)$ and $\kappa^-(\theta, \mu)$, defined on $(0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ and $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$, respectively. These functions satisfy $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^\pm} \kappa^\pm(\theta, \mu) = 1$ and $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^\pm} \partial_\theta \kappa^\pm(\theta, \mu) = 0$ and, therefore, one can define the smooth function

$$\kappa(\theta, \mu) := \begin{cases} \kappa^-(\theta, \mu), & \theta \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0], \\ \kappa^+(\theta, \mu), & \theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}). \end{cases}$$

From now on, since it is enough for our purposes, we restrict to $\theta \in (-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4})$.

Now we consider the transformation from the coordinates (r, θ, R, Θ) in (3.15) to the ones centered at the center of mass $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}(r, \theta) &= \arctan \left(\frac{r \sin \theta}{r \cos \theta + (1-\mu)} \right), \\ R(r, \theta, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) &= \hat{R} \cdot \frac{r + (1-\mu) \cos \theta}{\sqrt{r^2 + 2r(1-\mu) \cos \theta + (1-\mu)^2}} \\ &\quad + (1-\mu) \sin \theta \left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}}{r^2 + 2r(1-\mu) \cos \theta + (1-\mu)^2} - 1 \right), \\ \Theta(r, \theta, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) &= \hat{\Theta} \cdot \frac{r(r + (1-\mu) \cos \theta)}{r^2 + 2r(1-\mu) \cos \theta + (1-\mu)^2} \\ &\quad - r(1-\mu) \left(\hat{R} \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{r^2 + 2r(1-\mu) \cos \theta + (1-\mu)^2}} + \cos \theta \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Relying on (5.11) and Proposition 5.2 we have, for some fixed $m > 0$ (independent of μ) and

$$\hat{\Theta}_0 \in [-\sqrt{2} + m, \sqrt{2} - m], \quad \hat{r} = 1 - \mu + \kappa(\theta, \mu) \mu^\nu, \quad r = \mu^\nu,$$

the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R} &= \hat{R}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{R}_\infty^u(1 - \mu + \kappa(\theta, \mu) \mu^\nu, \hat{\theta}(\mu^\nu, \theta), \hat{\Theta}_0) \\ &= -\frac{\sqrt{2(1-\mu + \kappa(\theta, \mu) \mu^\nu) - \hat{\Theta}_0^2}}{1 - \mu + \kappa(\theta, \mu) \mu^\nu} + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}(\mu^{1-2\nu}) = -\sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2} + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}(\mu^\nu), \\ \hat{\Theta} &= \hat{\Theta}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{\Theta}_\infty^u(1 - \mu + \kappa(\theta, \mu) \mu^\nu, \hat{\theta}(\mu^\nu, \theta), \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{\Theta}_0 + \mathcal{O}_{C^1}(\mu^{1-2\nu}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

where we have used that $\mu^\nu \gg \mu^{1-2\nu}$ since $\nu \in (0, 1/3)$. Computing both $\partial_\theta R(\mu^\nu, \theta, \hat{R}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0), \hat{\Theta}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0))$ and $\partial_\theta \Theta(\mu^\nu, \theta, \hat{R}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0), \hat{\Theta}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0))$ from (5.11) (relying on the estimates in (5.12)) yields (5.8). Finally, we restrict the domain of $\hat{\Theta}_0$ to

$$\hat{\Theta}_0 \in \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{2}, \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) \subset [-\sqrt{2}+m, \sqrt{2}-m],$$

for $m = \frac{1}{200}$ so that $\cos \theta > \sin \theta$ and $\sqrt{2-\hat{\Theta}_0^2} > |\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1|$. Therefore the leading term for R_∞^u in (5.8) given by $f(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) = -\cos \theta \sqrt{2-\hat{\Theta}_0^2} + \sin \theta (\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1) < 0$, completing the proof. \square

6 The distance between the invariant manifolds

Once we have characterized the invariant manifolds of infinity and the ejection/collision orbits with \mathcal{J} , we analyze their intersections at a common section. To this end, we recall:

- The curves $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu)$, provided by Proposition 3.5, are the intersection of the ejection and collision orbits \mathcal{J}^\mp (see Definition 1.2) with the section Σ_γ in (3.18) with $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, 1)$. They admit a graph parameterization in polar coordinates (θ, Θ) , as shown in (3.25).
- The curves $\Lambda_\infty^{u,s}(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$, provided by Proposition 5.3, are the intersection of the invariant manifolds of infinity with the section Σ_ν with $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$. They admit a graph parameterization in polar coordinates (θ, Θ) , as shown in (5.7) and (5.9).
- Taking $\gamma = \nu \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$, both curves $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^\mp(\mu)$ and $\Lambda_\infty^{u,s}(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ belong to the same section Σ_ν .

The following theorem provides the transverse intersection between the curves $\Lambda_\infty^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \subset W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \subset \mathcal{J}^-$ in $\Sigma_\nu^>$ (see Remark 3.6 and Proposition 5.2) for adequate values of $\hat{\Theta}_0$. By the symmetry (3.17), there will be also a transverse intersection between the curves $\Lambda_\infty^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \subset W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu) \subset \mathcal{J}^+$ in $\Sigma_\nu^<$.

Theorem 6.1. *Fix $\hat{\Theta}_0 \in \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{3}, \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{3}\right)$, $\nu \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$ and consider the section $\Sigma_\nu \subset \{\mathcal{H}_\mu = h\}$ in (3.18). There exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ we have*

- $\Lambda_\infty^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ intersect transversally at a point

$$p_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \left(\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \Theta_\infty^s \left(\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \hat{\Theta}_0 \right) \right) = \left(\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^- \left(\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \right) \right), \quad (6.1)$$

where $\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \arctan \left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1}{\sqrt{2-\hat{\Theta}_0^2}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4} \right)$.

- $\Lambda_\infty^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu)$ intersect transversally at a point

$$p_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \left(\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \Theta_\infty^u \left(\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \hat{\Theta}_0 \right) \right) = \left(\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^+ \left(\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \right) \right), \quad (6.2)$$

where $\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = -\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = -\arctan \left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1}{\sqrt{2-\hat{\Theta}_0^2}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4} \right)$.

Proof. We compute the distance between these curves using the Θ -component in the transverse section Σ_ν in (3.18) for $h = -\hat{\Theta}_0$. Relying on (3.26), (5.8) and (5.10), the asymptotic formulas for the distances between $\Lambda_\infty^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \Lambda_\mathcal{J}^-(\mu) \subset \Sigma_\nu^>$ (which we denote by d_-), and between $\Lambda_\infty^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \Lambda_\mathcal{J}^+(\mu) \subset \Sigma_\nu^<$ (which we denote by d_+) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} d_\mp(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \mu^\nu \left(\cos \theta (\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1) \mp \sin \theta \sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{19\nu-3}{8}} \right), \\ d_\mp'(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \mu^\nu \left(-\sin \theta (\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1) \mp \cos \theta \sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{19\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-2\nu} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

for $\theta \in (-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4})$. Therefore, finding a transverse intersection between $\Lambda_\infty^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ and $\Lambda_\mathcal{J}^-(\mu)$ is equivalent to find a non-degenerate zero of $d_-(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0)$. We write

$$\mathcal{F}_-(\theta, \mu^\nu) = \mu^{-\nu} \cdot d_-(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \cos \theta (\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1) - \sin \theta \sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2} + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right).$$

For $\hat{\Theta}_0 \in \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{3}, \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{3} \right)$, the angle $\theta_* := \arctan \left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1}{\sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2}} \right) \in (-\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4})$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}_-(\theta_*, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_\theta \mathcal{F}_-(\theta_*, 0) = -\sqrt{(\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1)^2 + (2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2)} \neq 0,$$

and the Implicit Function Theorem gives the result. \square

7 Proof of Theorem 1.3

We divide the proof of Theorem 1.3 as follows. In Section 7.1 we prove the existence of an unbounded sequence of orbits in $\mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$ (see Definition 1.2) and we obtain the existence of large ejection-collision orbits $\mathcal{J}^\mp \cap \mathcal{S}^\pm$. Then, in Section 7.2 we prove the existence of ballistic ejection-collision orbits between the primaries (see Remark 1.4 for the definition of large and ballistic ejection-collision orbits).

7.1 Large ejection-collision orbits

This section proves the first two statements of Theorem 1.3. The proof requires a global analysis of the dynamics (including close passages to infinity), for which the polar coordinates (r, θ, R, Θ) , used for the local analysis close to Jupiter, are no longer adequate. Instead, we consider (rotating) polar coordinates centered at the center of mass $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$, in which Proposition 5.2 provides an explicit description of the invariant manifolds of infinity on the following “outer” sections. For fixed $\hat{r}_0 > 1$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^> &= \left\{ (\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) : \hat{r} = \hat{r}_0, \hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\hat{r}_0, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) = h, \hat{R} > 0 \right\}, \\ \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^< &= \left\{ (\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) : \hat{r} = \hat{r}_0, \hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\hat{r}_0, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) = h, \hat{R} < 0 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ is the Hamiltonian defined in (5.1). Then, the intersections $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ and $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$ are curves parameterized as graphs in terms of $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$.

We fix $h = -\hat{\Theta}_0 \in \left(-\frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{3}-1}{3} \right)$, $\nu \in \left(\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3} \right)$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ so that Theorem 6.1 holds. Denote by $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$ the flow of the equations of motion associated to the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ in (5.1). Since $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and the ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- are invariant (and analogously $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and the collision orbits \mathcal{J}^+), the transverse intersections $p_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \in \Sigma_\nu^>$ and $p_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \in \Sigma_\nu^<$ (defined in (6.1) and (6.2)) are sent by $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$ to two transverse intersections at $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$ respectively. We denote by

$$\hat{p}_\mathcal{J}^- = (\hat{\theta}_\mathcal{J}^-, \hat{\Theta}_\mathcal{J}^-) \in \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>, \quad \hat{p}_\mathcal{J}^+ = (\hat{\theta}_\mathcal{J}^+, \hat{\Theta}_\mathcal{J}^+) \in \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<, \quad (7.2)$$

the corresponding transverse intersections of $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and \mathcal{J}^- at $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ and $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and \mathcal{J}^+ at $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$.

We consider the following annulus

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}} = \left\{ (\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}) \in \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^> : \hat{\Theta}_\infty^s(\hat{\theta}) - \varepsilon < \hat{\Theta} < \hat{\Theta}_\infty^s(\hat{\theta}) \right\},$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, where $\hat{\Theta}_\infty^s(\hat{\theta}) := \hat{\Theta}_\infty^s(\hat{r}_0, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ is defined in (5.6). Then, we define the Poincaré map

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{P}} : \hat{\mathcal{R}} &\subset \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^> \rightarrow \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^< \\ \hat{p} = (\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}) &\mapsto \hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{p}) = \hat{\Phi}_\mu \left(t_\mu(\hat{p}), \left(\hat{r}_0, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}; h, \mu), \hat{\Theta} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

where $\hat{R}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}; h, \mu)$ is the radial velocity, which can also be computed from (5.1), and $t_\mu(\hat{p})$ is the time needed for the orbit with initial condition at $\hat{p} \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}$ to reach $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$. By construction, $t_\mu(\hat{p})$ is well defined and finite for $\hat{p} \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}$ (but becomes unbounded as \hat{p} gets closer to the invariant manifold $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$).

Step 1. Proof of first statement of Theorem 1.3: For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough (independent of μ), denote by

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{J}} = \left\{ (\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}} : |\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-| < \varepsilon \right\} \subset \hat{\mathcal{R}}$$

and consider the C^1 -curve

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^- := \mathcal{J}^- \cap \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{J}}$$

which intersects transversally $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ at $\hat{p}_{\mathcal{J}}^-$, defined in (7.2) (see Figure 7.1). Since the points of the curve $\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-$ are close to the point $\hat{p}_{\mathcal{J}}^-$, they are close to $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$. Hence, the study of the image $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-)$, where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is the Poincaré map defined in (7.3), is given by the analysis of the dynamics “close” to $A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}$. Thus, one can easily adapt the approach done by Moser for the Sitnikov problem in [40] (see also [22]) to this case, and prove that the image $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-)$ “spirals” towards $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$ (see Figure 7.1). In particular, we have

$$W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^< \subset \text{Cl} \left(\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-) \right). \quad (7.4)$$

Consider the C^1 -curve

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^+ := \hat{\mathcal{V}}_{\mathcal{J}} \cap \mathcal{J}^+,$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\hat{p}_{\mathcal{J}}^+$ in (7.2). Then, there exists a sequence $\hat{q}_k \in \hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^+ \cap \hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{q}_k = \hat{p}_{\mathcal{J}}^+$. In particular, the closer is \hat{q}_k to $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$, the larger is the time $t_\mu(\hat{p}_k)$, where \hat{p}_k is such that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{p}_k) = \hat{q}_k$. Since $\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^+ \subset \mathcal{J}^+$ and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-) \subset \mathcal{J}^-$, the points $\hat{q}_k \in \mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$, completing the first statement of Theorem 1.3.

Step 2. Proof of second statement of Theorem 1.3: To prove the second statement, we use Theorem 1.7 of [27] where is shown that, for sufficiently small values of $h = -\hat{\Theta}_0$ of order μ (and therefore satisfying the conditions of Theorem 6.1), there exist transverse intersections $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap W_\mu^u(S^+)$ and $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap W_\mu^s(S^-)$ (where $W_\mu^{s,u}(S^\pm)$ are defined in (4.9)) at the sections $\bar{\Sigma}^>$ and $\bar{\Sigma}^<$ in (4.13) respectively. By the invariance of $W_\mu^{s,u}(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and $W_\mu^{s,u}(S^\pm)$, these transverse intersections are sent by $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$ to two transverse intersections at the sections $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$ in (7.1) respectively.

Denote by $\hat{p}_{\mathcal{S}}^- = (\hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{S}}^-, \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{S}}^-) \in \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ the point of (transverse) intersection between $W_\mu^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and $W_\mu^u(S^+)$ with the section $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ (see Figure 7.1). For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough (independent of μ), denote by

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{S}} = \left\{ (\hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta}) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}} : |\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{S}}^-| < \varepsilon \right\} \subset \hat{\mathcal{R}}$$

and consider the C^1 -curve

$$\hat{\gamma}_S^- := W_\mu^u(S^+) \cap \hat{\mathcal{R}}_S \subset \mathcal{S}^-,$$

where \mathcal{S}^- are the ejection orbits from the Sun (see Definition 1.2). Following the same argument as in (7.4) we have

$$W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^< \subset \text{Cl}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_S^-)),$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is the Poincaré map (7.3).




Figure 7.1: Representation of the “spiraling effect” of the transition map $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ on the curves $\hat{\gamma}_{S,J}^- \subset \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^>$ and their transverse intersections with the curves $\hat{\gamma}_{S,J}^+ \subset \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$.

Denote by $\hat{p}_S^+ \in \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$ the point of (transverse) intersection of $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\theta}_0})$ and $W_\mu^s(S^-)$ with the section $\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$ defined in (7.1) and consider the C^1 -curve

$$\hat{\gamma}_S^+ := W_\mu^s(S^-) \cap \hat{\mathcal{V}}_S \subset \mathcal{S}^+,$$

where \mathcal{S}^+ are the collision orbits to the Sun (see Definition 1.2) and $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_S$ is a sufficiently small neighborhood of \hat{p}_S^+ . Therefore, there exists

- A sequence $\hat{x}_k \in \hat{\gamma}_J^+ \cap \hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_S^-)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{x}_k = \hat{p}_J^+$ in (7.2). In particular, the closer is \hat{x}_k to $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$, the larger is the time $t_\mu(\hat{p}_k)$, where \hat{p}_k is such that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{p}_k) = \hat{x}_k$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_S^-) \subset W_\mu^u(S^+)$, the points $\hat{x}_k \in W_\mu^u(S^+) \cap \mathcal{J}^+$ and, therefore, they belong to $\mathcal{S}^- \cap \mathcal{J}^+$.
- A sequence $\hat{y}_k \in \hat{\gamma}_S^+ \cap \hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_J^-)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \hat{y}_k = \hat{p}_S^+$. In particular, the closer is \hat{y}_k to $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\theta}_0}) \cap \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{r}_0}^<$, the larger is the time $t_\mu(\hat{p}_k)$, where \hat{p}_k is such that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{p}_k) = \hat{y}_k$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(\hat{\gamma}_J^-) \subset \mathcal{J}^-$, the points $\hat{y}_k \in \mathcal{J}^- \cap W_\mu^u(S^-)$ and, therefore, they belong to $\mathcal{J}^- \cap \mathcal{S}^+$.

7.2 Ballistic ejection-collision orbits

This section is devoted to prove the last item of Theorem 1.3, that is, the existence of a ballistic orbit (see Remark 1.4) in $\mathcal{S}^+ \cap \mathcal{J}^-$ (by the symmetry (4.3), also a ballistic orbit in $\mathcal{J}^+ \cap \mathcal{S}^-$) satisfying (1.5). To this end, we compare the ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- with the curve $\overline{\Delta}_{S-}^s \subset \mathcal{S}^+ \subset \overline{\Sigma}^<$ in (4.11) (and between the collision orbits \mathcal{J}^+ and the curve $\overline{\Delta}_{S+}^u \subset \mathcal{S}^- \subset \overline{\Sigma}^>$). For a fixed $h = \mathcal{O}(\mu)$, the following proposition provides a parameterization of the intersection between the ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- with the section $\overline{\Sigma}^<$ in (4.13) (and between the collision orbits \mathcal{J}^+ with the section $\overline{\Sigma}^>$).

Proposition 7.1. *Consider the rotating polar coordinates centered at the Sun $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta})$ defined in (4.1) and the parameter $\delta_0 > 0$ given in Proposition 4.3. Fix a, b with $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h_0 \in [a, b]$. Then, for $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \mu < \mu_0$ and $h = \mu h_0$, the set of ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- intersects the section $\overline{\Sigma}^<$ in (4.13) in a curve written as a graph with respect to $\bar{\theta}$ as*

$$\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) = \left\{ \left(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu), \bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) \right) : \bar{r} = \delta^2, \bar{\theta} \in (\bar{\theta}_0 - \delta^4, \bar{\theta}_0 + \delta^4) \right\} \quad (7.5)$$

where $\bar{\theta}_0 = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3)$ and $\bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-$ is a C^1 -function satisfying

$$\bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^5), \quad \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)). \quad (7.6)$$

Due to symmetry (4.3), the collision set of orbits \mathcal{J}^+ intersect the section $\overline{\Sigma}^>$ in (4.13) in a curve written as a graph with respect to $\bar{\theta}$ as

$$\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu) = \left\{ \left(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\bar{\theta}, \mu), \bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\bar{\theta}, \mu) \right) : \bar{r} = \delta^2, \bar{\theta} \in (-\bar{\theta}_0 - \delta^4, -\bar{\theta}_0 + \delta^4) \right\} \quad (7.7)$$

such that $\bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\bar{\theta}, \mu) = \bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\bar{\theta}, \mu)$.

The proof of this proposition is done in Appendix C.

Relying on this result and the Implicit Function Theorem, the following theorem provides the transverse intersection between the curves $\overline{\Delta}_{S-}^s(\mu)$ and $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ and the curves $\overline{\Delta}_{S+}^u(\mu)$ and $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu)$ (see (4.11), (7.5) and (7.7) respectively). This proves the last statement of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 7.2. *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 7.1, we have*

- $\overline{\Delta}_{S-}^s(\mu)$ and $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ intersect transversally at a point

$$\bar{p}_- = (\bar{\theta}_-(\delta, \mu), \bar{\Theta}_{S-}^s(\bar{\theta}_-(\delta, \mu))) = (\bar{\theta}_-(\delta, \mu), \bar{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\bar{\theta}_-(\delta, \mu))),$$

where $\bar{\theta}_-(\delta, \mu) = \bar{\theta}_0 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4)$.

- $\overline{\Delta}_{S+}^u(\mu)$ and $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu)$ intersect transversally at a point \bar{p}_+ given by the symmetry (4.3).
- Both points \bar{p}_- and \bar{p}_+ belong to the surface $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\delta^2, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta}) = h$, where $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ is the Hamiltonian (4.2).

Proof. Relying on (4.12) and (7.6), we compute an asymptotic formula for the distance between the curves $\overline{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ and $\overline{\Delta}_{S-}^s(\mu)$ at the section $\overline{\Sigma}^<$ (defined in (4.13)) using the $\bar{\Theta}$ -component, obtaining

$$\bar{d}_-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^5), \quad \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \bar{d}_-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta))$$

for $\bar{\theta} \in (\bar{\theta}_0 - \delta^4, \bar{\theta}_0 + \delta^4)$, where $\bar{\theta}_0$ is given in Proposition 7.1.

Finding a transverse intersection between $\bar{\Delta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ and $\bar{\Delta}_{S^-}^s(\mu)$ in $\bar{\Sigma}^<$ is reduced to find a non-degenerate zero of $\bar{d}_-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu)$. Namely, we look for a non-degenerate zero of the function

$$\mathcal{F}(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \sqrt{2}\delta^{-1}\bar{d}_-(\bar{\theta}, \delta, \mu) = \bar{\theta} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4).$$

Since $\mathcal{F}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}, 0, 0\right) = 0$ and $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}\mathcal{F}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}, 0, 0\right) = 1 \neq 0$, the Implicit Function Theorem gives the result. \square

8 Proof of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6

We fix $\nu = \gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$ so that the curves $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^{\mp}(\mu)$ and $\Lambda_{\infty}^{u,s}(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$, defined in (3.25), (5.7) and (5.9) respectively, belong to the same section Σ_{ν} in (3.18).

The key step in the proof of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 is Proposition 8.2 below. To state it, we define the *triple intersection* of $W_{\mu}^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$, $W_{\mu}^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and \mathcal{J}^- .

Definition 8.1. *We say that the invariant manifolds $W_{\mu}^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$, $W_{\mu}^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and the ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- have a triple intersection at $p_-^* = (\theta_-^*, \Theta_-^*) \in \Sigma_{\nu}^>$ in (3.28) if*

- $\Lambda_{\infty}^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ intersect at $p_-^* = (\theta_-^*, \Theta_-^*) \in \Sigma_{\nu}^>$.
- $\Lambda_{\infty}^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu)$ intersect at $p_+^* = (\theta_+^*, \Theta_+^*) \in \Sigma_{\nu}^<$.
- The composition

$$f := \Upsilon^{-1} \circ \psi \circ \Xi^{-1} \circ \mathbf{f} \circ \Xi \circ \psi^{-1} \circ \Upsilon: \Sigma_{\nu}^< \rightarrow \Sigma_{\nu}^> \quad (8.1)$$

maps the point p_+^* to p_-^* . Here ψ , Ξ and Υ are the diffeomorphisms defined in (3.5), (3.11) and (3.15) respectively, and the transition map \mathbf{f} is given in Proposition 3.7.

Moreover, if f maps a C^1 -curve in $\Lambda_{\infty}^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ to a C^1 -curve $\Gamma_{\infty}^{u,>} \subset \Sigma_{\nu}^>$ containing p_-^* , then we say that the triple intersection is transverse if the curves $\Gamma_{\infty}^{u,>}$, $\Lambda_{\infty}^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ intersect pairwise transversally at p_-^* .

Next proposition proves the existence of a transverse triple intersection between the invariant manifolds $W_{\mu}^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and $W_{\mu}^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and the ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- at a suitable energy level.

Proposition 8.2. *For any $\nu \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$, there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, there exists $\hat{\Theta}_0^* = \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu) = 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right)$ such that, for $h = h^*(\mu) = -\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)$, the following statements hold.*

- The invariant manifolds $W_{\mu}^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$, $W_{\mu}^s(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ and the ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- have a transverse triple intersection at $p_-^* = (\theta_-^*, \Theta_-^*) \in \Sigma_{\nu}^>$ (in the sense of Definition 8.1) where

$$\theta_-^* = \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right), \quad \Theta_-^* = \Theta_{\infty}^s(\theta_-^*, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)) = \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-^*),$$

where $\Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta)$ and $\Theta_{\infty}^s(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ are defined in (3.26) and (5.10) respectively.

- For fixed $\iota > 0$ small enough independent of μ , denote by $B_{\iota}(p_-^*) \subset \Sigma_{\nu}^>$ a ι -neighborhood of p_-^* . Let

$$\Gamma_{\infty}^{s,>} := \Lambda_{\infty}^s(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu) \cap B_{\iota}(p_-^*), \quad \Gamma_{\mathcal{J}}^- := \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \cap B_{\iota}(p_-^*),$$

be the C^1 -curves intersecting pairwise transversally at p_-^* with $\Gamma_\infty^{u,>}$ (see Definition 8.1). Denote by

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\infty^{s,>} &:= \left\{ \left(\theta, \Theta_\infty^s(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)) \right) : \theta \in (\theta_-^* - \iota, \theta_-^* + \iota) \right\} \subset \Sigma_\nu^>, \\ \gamma_{\mathcal{J}}^- &:= \left\{ \left(\theta, \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)) \right) : \theta \in (\theta_-^* - \iota, \theta_-^* + \iota) \right\} \subset \Sigma_\nu^>, \\ \gamma_\infty^{u,>} &:= \left\{ \left(\theta, \Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)) \right) : \theta \in (\theta_-^* - \iota, \theta_-^* + \iota) \right\} \subset \Sigma_\nu^>,\end{aligned}\quad (8.2)$$

their corresponding C^1 graph parameterizations in coordinates (θ, Θ) . Then, the angles

$$A = \angle((\gamma_\infty^{u,>})'(\theta_-^*), (\gamma_\infty^{s,>})'(\theta_-^*)), \quad B = \angle((\gamma_\infty^{u,>})'(\theta_-^*), (\gamma_{\mathcal{J}}^-)'(\theta_-^*)) \quad (8.3)$$

(taken in $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$) satisfy

$$-\frac{\pi}{2} < A < B < 0, \quad (8.4)$$

leading to the configuration depicted in Figure 8.1.

The proof of this proposition is divided into two parts. In Section 8.1 we prove that the triple intersection p_-^* exists and in Section 8.2 we establish its transversality as well as the ordering given by (8.4). Now we prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 relying on Proposition 8.2.

Proof of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6. At $h = h^*$, Proposition 8.2 ensures that there exists a triple transverse intersection (in the sense of Definition 8.1) between the invariant manifolds of infinity and with the family of ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- . In particular, this also means that there exist transverse intersections between the stable manifold of infinity and the family of ejection orbits \mathcal{J}^- at $p_-^* \in \Sigma_\nu^>$, and between the unstable manifold of infinity and the family of collision orbits \mathcal{J}^+ at $p_+^* \in \Sigma_\nu^<$, that guarantees the existence of a parabolic ejection/collision orbit.




Figure 8.1: Representation of the “ordering of the intersection” given by the angles A and B in (8.3). The region shaded in green represents the set \mathcal{D} where the forward and backward return maps to the section $\Sigma_\nu^>$ are well defined. That is, the region where the construction made by Moser in [40] is performed.

Then, one can adapt the construction done by Moser in [40] to our setting (see also [22, 30]) to prove the existence of a hyperbolic set (at a suitable Poincaré section transverse to the flow) whose dynamics is conjugated to the shift of infinite symbols and which accumulates to the invariant manifolds of infinity. This leads to the existence of any combination of hyperbolic, parabolic and oscillatory orbits in forward and backward time, and the existence of periodic orbits arbitrarily close to infinity (at the energy level h^*). The classical Moser approach relies on the existence of a transverse homoclinic point of the invariant manifolds at infinity, which is only present for the regularized flow associated to the equations of motion in (3.12) but not in original coordinates, since the homoclinic orbit goes through collision. Nevertheless, the Moser approach can be easily adapted to this setting. We follow the approach in [27], adapted to Levi-Civita coordinates. That is, we fix $\iota > 0$ small and consider the points of intersection p_-^* , p_+^* . Then, we define

- $D^>$ as the points in $\Sigma_\nu^>$, ι -close to p_-^* , whose forward orbit hits $\Sigma_\nu^<$.
- $D^<$ as the points in $\Sigma_\nu^<$, ι -close to p_+^* , whose backward orbit hits $\Sigma_\nu^>$.

To characterize the domains $D^>$ and $D^<$, consider first two ι -neighborhoods of the intersection points p_-^* and p_+^* in Σ_ν , which we denote by $B_\iota(p_-^*) \subset \Sigma_\nu^>$ and $B_\iota(p_+^*) \subset \Sigma_\nu^<$ respectively. We denote by

$$\Lambda_\infty^{s,u}(\mu) := \Lambda_\infty^{s,u}(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu), \quad R_\infty^{s,u}(\theta) := R_\infty^{s,u}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)), \quad \Theta_\infty^{s,u}(\theta) := \Theta_\infty^{s,u}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu))$$

The curve $\Lambda_\infty^s(\mu)$ intersects $B_\iota(p_-^*)$, dividing it into two connected open regions. By definition, $\Lambda_\infty^s(\mu)$ corresponds to points whose forward orbits are parabolic. As a result, one of these regions contains points whose forward orbits escape to infinity with positive speed, that is hyperbolic orbits, while the other region contains points whose forward orbits return and intersect the section $\Sigma_\nu^<$. The latter region, corresponding to the domain $D^>$, is defined as points with radial momentum below the curve $\Lambda_\infty^s(\mu)$. Namely

$$D^> = \{(\theta, \Theta) \in B_\iota(p_-^*): R(\mu^\gamma, \theta, \Theta; h^*) < R_\infty^s(\theta)\} \subset \Sigma_\nu^>,$$

where $R(\mu^\gamma, \theta, \Theta; h^*)$ is obtained from the Hamiltonian (3.16) and $R_\infty^s(\theta) > 0$ is defined in (5.10).

Similarly, the curve $\Lambda_\infty^u(\mu)$ separates $B_\iota(p_+^*)$ into two connected components within $B_\iota(p_+^*)$. In this case, the domain $D^<$ corresponds to the points with radial momentum smaller (in absolute value) than those on $\Lambda_\infty^u(\mu)$. That is,

$$D^< = \{(\theta, \Theta) \in B_\iota(p_+^*): R(\mu^\gamma, \theta, \Theta; h^*) > R_\infty^u(\theta)\} \subset \Sigma_\nu^<,$$

where $R_\infty^u(\theta) < 0$ is defined in (5.8).

As the points in $D^<$ are close to p_+^* , one can map this domain to $\Sigma_\nu^>$ by means of the map f in (8.1). This result gives the domain $\tilde{D}^<$, defined as

$$\tilde{D}^< = \{(\theta, R) \in B_\iota(p_-^*): R < R_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)\},$$

where $R_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)$ corresponds to the image of $R_\infty^u(\theta)$ under f .

Alternatively, by the conservation of the Hamiltonian (3.16), the domains $D^>$ and $\tilde{D}^<$ can be also defined as

$$D^> = \{(\theta, \Theta) \in B_\iota(p_-^*): \Theta < \Theta_\infty^s(\theta)\} \subset \Sigma_\nu^>, \quad \tilde{D}^< = \{(\theta, \Theta) \in B_\iota(p_-^*): \Theta < \Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)\} \subset \Sigma_\nu^>,$$

where $\Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) := \Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu))$ is introduced in (8.2).

Recall that Proposition 8.2 gives the “ordering” of the invariant manifolds at the triple intersection (see (8.3) and (8.4)). Hence the transition of the points from $D^<$ to $\tilde{D}^<$ has not gone through collision with Jupiter. Therefore, the domain $\mathcal{D} = D^> \cap \tilde{D}^<$ contains points in $\Sigma_\nu^>$, ι -close to p_-^* , whose backward and forward orbit hit $\Sigma_\nu^>$. Hence, proceeding as in [27] (§ 6, pp. 39–40), one can complete the proof. \square

8.1 Existence of the triple intersection

Fix $h = -\hat{\Theta}_0 \in \left(-\frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{3}-1}{3}\right)$, $\nu \in \left(\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3}\right)$ and $\mu > 0$ small enough so that Theorem 6.1 holds and consider the point

$$p_+ = p_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \left(\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \Theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)\right) \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\mu) \setminus \Lambda_{\infty}^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \in \Sigma_{\nu}^<, \quad (8.5)$$

with $\Theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \Theta_{\infty}^u(\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu), \hat{\Theta}_0) = \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu))$, where $\Theta_{\infty}^u(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ and $\Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^+(\theta)$ are defined in (5.8) and (3.26) respectively.

Since the changes of coordinates ψ , Ξ and Υ (defined in (3.5), (3.11) and (3.15), respectively) are diffeomorphisms, we can apply Proposition 3.7 so the map f in (8.1) is well defined and

$$p_-^u = (\theta_-^u, \Theta_-^u) = f \circ p_+ \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \subset \Sigma_{\nu}^>.$$

Therefore $\Theta_-^u = \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-^u)$ (see (3.26)) and $p_-^u \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \setminus W_{\mu}^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$. The θ -component of both points can be related from (3.29) as

$$\theta_-^u = \theta_-^u(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \theta_+(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right)$$

since $\nu < \frac{1}{3}$. To guarantee the triple intersection we need that $p_-^u = p_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \setminus \Lambda_{\infty}^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu)$ defined in (6.1). Namely, we look for $\hat{\Theta}_0$ such that

$$\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) = \theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \quad (8.6)$$

which is equivalent to solve

$$2 \arctan\left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}_0 - 1}{\sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^2}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right) = 0. \quad (8.7)$$

The Implicit Function Theorem ensures that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, there exists a unique $\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)$ with $\hat{\Theta}_0^*(0) = 1$ satisfying (8.7) (and therefore (8.6)). Since $\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu) \in \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{3}, \frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{3}\right)$, the point

$$p_-^* = \left(\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu), \Theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu)\right), \quad \Theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu) = \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu)) \quad (8.8)$$

belongs to $W_{\mu}^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) \cap \Lambda_{\infty}^s(\hat{\Theta}_0, \mu) \cap \Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ at

$$h^* = h(\mu) = -\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu) = -1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right). \quad (8.9)$$

8.2 Transversality and ordering of the triple intersection

From now on we consider h^* as in (8.9) and use the expressions for θ_- and θ_+ given in Theorem 6.1. We denote by

$$\theta_{\mp} = \theta_{\mp}(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu) = \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right), \quad d_{\mp}(\theta) = d_{\mp}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)), \quad \Theta_{\infty}^{u,s}(\theta) = \Theta_{\infty}^{u,s}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)), \quad (8.10)$$

where $\theta_{\mp}(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu)$ are defined in (8.5) and (8.8), the distances are introduced in (6.3) and $\Theta_{\infty}^{u,s}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu))$ are defined in (5.8) and (5.10). The following lemma (whose proof is done in Appendix D) proves the existence of a C^1 -curve $\Gamma_{\infty}^{u,>} \subset \Sigma_{\nu}^>$ related to $\Lambda_{\infty}^u(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu) \subset \Sigma_{\nu}^<$ via the map f in (8.1) and provides C^1 estimates for its graph parameterization in coordinates (θ, Θ) .

Lemma 8.3. Fix $\iota > 0$ small and denote by $B_\iota(p_+)$ a ι -neighborhood of the point p_+ in (8.5). Consider the C^1 -curve given by

$$\Gamma_\infty^{u,<} := \Lambda_\infty^u(\hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu), \mu) \cap B_\iota(p_+) \subset \Sigma_\nu^{<}. \quad (8.11)$$

Then the map f in (8.1) maps the curve $\Gamma_\infty^{u,<}$ into a C^1 -curve of the form

$$\Gamma_\infty^{u,>} := f \circ \Gamma_\infty^{u,<} \subset \Sigma_\nu^{>}$$

which admits the graph parameterization $\gamma_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) = (\theta, \Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)))$ defined in (8.2). For $\theta \in (\theta_- - \iota, \theta_- + \iota)$, the following estimates hold:

$$\Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)) = \mu^\nu \left(\sin \theta + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \right), \quad \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu)) = \mu^\nu \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right). \quad (8.12)$$

Denote by $\Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-) := \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-, \hat{\Theta}_0^*(\mu))$. Relying on (8.2), the transversality condition of the triple intersection (see Definition 8.1) is guaranteed once we prove that

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^s(\theta_-) \neq 0, \quad \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-) \neq 0, \quad \Theta_\infty^s(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-) \neq 0. \quad (8.13)$$

Since $\nu \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$, by (3.26), (5.10), (8.9), (8.10) and (8.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-) &= \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{19\nu-3}{8}} \right), \\ \Theta_\infty^s(\theta_-) &= -\Theta_\infty^u(-\theta_-) = -\mu^\nu \left(\sin \theta_- (\hat{\Theta}_0^* - 1) + \cos \theta_- \sqrt{2 - \hat{\Theta}_0^{*2}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\nu}) \\ &= -\mu^\nu \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we rewrite (8.13) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^s(\theta_-) &= \mu^\nu \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right) \neq 0, \\ \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-) &= -\mu^\nu \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right) \neq 0, \\ \Theta_\infty^s(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-) &= -2\mu^\nu \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right) \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8.14)$$

Following (8.2) and (8.14), we compute the angles in (8.3) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sin A &= \frac{\Theta_\infty^s(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-)}{\sqrt{(1 + (\Theta_\infty^s(\theta_-))^2)(1 + (\Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-))^2)}} = -2\mu^\nu \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right), \\ \sin B &= \frac{\Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-) - \Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-)}{\sqrt{(1 + (\Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_-))^2)(1 + (\Theta_\infty^{u,>'}(\theta_-))^2)}} = -\mu^\nu \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

leading to (8.4). See Figure 8.1 to see the relative position of the curves.

Declarations

- **Funding:** This work was partially supported by the grant PID-2021-122954NB-100 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and “ERDF A way of making Europe”.

M.Guardia has been supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 757802). M.Guardia

was also supported by the Catalan Institution for Research and Advanced Studies via an ICREA Academia Prize 2018 and 2023.

J.Lamas has been supported by grant 2021 FI_B 00117 under the European Social Fund.

Tere M.Seara has been supported by the Catalan Institution for Research and Advanced Studies via an ICREA Academia Prize 2018.

This work was 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).

- **Competing interests:** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article. All authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript. The authors have no financial or proprietary interests in any material discussed in this article. Indirectly, the authors hope to gain reputation in the scientific community via the publication of this article.
- **Data availability :** The authors declare that all the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the paper.

A Proof of Proposition 3.4

We write the equations of motion (3.12) as

$$s' = -s + Q^s(s, u), \quad u' = u + Q^u(s, u).$$

where $Q^s(s, u)$ and $Q^u(s, u)$ are analytic in $\Xi(B)$, defined in (3.11). They satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} Q^s(s, u) &= s\mathcal{O}_2(s, u), & Q^u(s, u) &= u\mathcal{O}_2(s, u), \\ \partial_s Q^s(s, u) &= \mathcal{O}_2(s, u), & \partial_s Q^u(s, u) &= u\mathcal{O}_2(s, u), \\ \partial_u Q^s(s, u) &= s\mathcal{O}_2(s, u), & \partial_u Q^u(s, u) &= \mathcal{O}_2(s, u). \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

We provide the proof for the ejection orbit $(s_\mu(\tau, \beta), u_\mu(\tau, \beta))$ (with $\text{Re}(\tau) > 0$) since the proof for the collision orbit is analogous. To simplify notation, throughout the proof we denote by $C > 0$ any constant independent of μ and by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &:= \tau(\beta), & (s(\tau), u(\tau)) &:= (s_\mu(\tau, \beta), u_\mu(\tau, \beta)), \\ \tau_{\text{lin}} &:= \tau_{\text{lin}}(\beta), & (s_{\text{lin}}(\tau), u_{\text{lin}}(\tau)) &:= (s_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta), u_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta)), \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where $\tau_{\text{lin}}(\beta)$ and $(s_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta), u_{\text{lin}}(\tau, \beta))$ are defined in (3.20) and (3.21) respectively for $\beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0}$ in (3.19).

The initial condition $(s_0, u_0) := (s_\mu(0, \beta), u_\mu(0, \beta))$ in (3.13) is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} s_{01} &= -\frac{\xi\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \cos \beta + \mathcal{O}_{\frac{5}{2}}(\mu), & s_{02} &= -\frac{\xi\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \beta + \mathcal{O}_{\frac{5}{2}}(\mu), \\ u_{01} &= \frac{\xi\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \cos \beta + \mathcal{O}_{\frac{5}{2}}(\mu), & u_{02} &= \frac{\xi\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \beta + \mathcal{O}_{\frac{5}{2}}(\mu), \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

with $\beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0}$ and therefore satisfies the uniform estimate

$$|s_{0i}| \leq C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |u_{0i}| \leq C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{A.4}$$

Fix $\eta \in (0, 3/2]$ and $a_0 \in (0, 1)$. Since $|\operatorname{Im}(\tau_{\operatorname{lin}})| = \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-\gamma})$ for $\mu > 0$ small enough (see (3.20)), we can always assume that $|\operatorname{Im}(\tau_{\operatorname{lin}})| < \frac{a_0}{2}$. Let B be the ball from Proposition 3.2 (where the estimates in (A.1) are still valid). Denote by

$$T^* = \sup \{T \in (0, +\infty) : (s(\tau), u(\tau)) \in B \text{ for all } \tau \in \mathbf{S}_T\},$$

where \mathbf{S}_T is the complex strip

$$\mathbf{S}_T = \{\tau \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\tau) \in [0, T], |\operatorname{Im}(\tau)| \leq a_0\}.$$

We study the evolution of the orbit $(s(\tau), u(\tau))$ for $\tau \in \mathbf{D}$ with

$$\mathbf{D} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\tau) \in [0, \eta \min\{\operatorname{Re}(\tau_{\operatorname{lin}}), T^*\}], |\operatorname{Im}(\tau)| \leq a_0\}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Applying the variation of constants formula we have for $\tau \in \mathbf{D}$

$$s(\tau) = e^{-\tau}(s_0 + \tilde{s}(\tau)), \quad u(\tau) = e^{\tau}(u_0 + \tilde{u}(\tau)), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

with $(\tilde{s}(\tau), \tilde{u}(\tau))$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s}(\tau) &= (\tilde{s}_1(\tau), \tilde{s}_2(\tau))^{\top} = \int_0^{\tau} e^z Q^s (e^{-z}(s_0 + \tilde{s}(z)), e^z(u_0 + \tilde{u}(z))) dz, \\ \tilde{u}(\tau) &= (\tilde{u}_1(\tau), \tilde{u}_2(\tau))^{\top} = \int_0^{\tau} e^{-z} Q^u (e^{-z}(s_0 + \tilde{s}(z)), e^z(u_0 + \tilde{u}(z))) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We analyze the evolution of $\tilde{s}(\tau), \tilde{u}(\tau)$ for $\tau \in \mathbf{D}$ by a fixed point argument. For fixed (s_0, u_0) in (A.3), we denote by χ the Banach space of analytic functions in $\mathring{\mathbf{D}}$ which extends continuously to $\partial\mathbf{D}$. Hence, the space χ^4 is a Banach space under the norm

$$\|f\|_{\chi^4} = \|(f_1^s, f_2^s, f_1^u, f_2^u)\|_{\chi^4} = \max (\|f_1^s\|, \|f_2^s\|, \|f_1^u\|, \|f_2^u\|),$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the supremum norm in \mathbf{D} . We define the following operator acting on χ^4

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : \chi^4 &\rightarrow \chi^4 \\ f = (f^s, f^u) &\mapsto \mathcal{F}(f) = (\mathcal{F}^s(f), \mathcal{F}^u(f)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^s(f)(z) &= \int_0^{\tau} e^z Q^s (e^{-z}(s_0 + f^s(z)), e^z(u_0 + f^u(z))) dz, \\ \mathcal{F}^u(f)(z) &= \int_0^{\tau} e^{-z} Q^u (e^{-z}(s_0 + f^s(z)), e^z(u_0 + f^u(z))) dz. \end{aligned}$$

The solutions $(\tilde{s}(\tau), \tilde{u}(\tau))$ defined in (A.7) are fixed points of \mathcal{F} .

A fixed point theorem argument allows us to provide estimates for $\tilde{s}(\tau)$ and $\tilde{u}(\tau)$. Relying on (A.1) and (A.4) we obtain the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^s(0)\| &= \sup_{\tau \in \mathbf{D}} \left(\left| \int_0^{\tau} e^z Q^s (e^{-z}s_0, e^z u_0) dz \right| \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathbf{D}} \left(\int_0^{\tau} \left(C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} |e^{-z} + e^z|^2 \right) dz \right) \leq C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{2\eta \operatorname{Re}(\tau_{\operatorname{lin}})} \leq C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}-\eta+\eta\gamma}, \\ \|\mathcal{F}^u(0)\| &= \sup_{\tau \in \mathbf{D}} \left(\left| \int_0^{\tau} e^{-z} Q^u (e^{-z}s_0, e^z u_0) dz \right| \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathbf{D}} \left(\int_0^{\tau} \left(C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} |e^{-z} + e^z|^2 \right) dz \right) \leq C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{2\eta \operatorname{Re}(\tau_{\operatorname{lin}})} \leq C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}-\eta+\eta\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\|\mathcal{F}(0)\|_{\chi^4} \leq C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}-\eta+\eta\gamma} = \varepsilon(\eta). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We impose $\eta \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$ and $\varepsilon(\eta) \ll |s_0| = |u_0| = \mathcal{O}(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}})$ satisfying (A.4). That is, we look for η, γ such that

$$1 - \eta + \eta\gamma > 0.$$

This is achieved for $\gamma \in \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}, 1\right)$.

We define the ball $B_{2\varepsilon} = \{f \in \chi^4 : \|f\|_{\chi^4} < 2\varepsilon(\eta)\}$ and we prove that the operator \mathcal{F} is Lipschitz in $B_{2\varepsilon}$. Consider $f, g \in B_{2\varepsilon}$. For $t \in [0, 1]$ the function

$$h^t(\tau) = (h_s^t(\tau), h_u^t(\tau)) = t \cdot (f_s^t(\tau), f_u^t(\tau)) + (1-t) \cdot (g_s^t(\tau), g_u^t(\tau))$$

satisfies, for $\tau \in \mathbf{D}$,

$$|s_0 + h_s^t| \leq C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |u_0 + h_u^t| \leq C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore, relying on (A.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |Q^s(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + f^s), e^{\tau}(u_0 + f^u)) - Q^s(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + g^s), e^{\tau}(u_0 + g^u))| \\ & \leq \int_0^1 (|\partial_s Q^s(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + h_s^t), e^{\tau}(u_0 + h_u^t))| \cdot e^{-\tau}|f^s - g^s| \\ & \quad + |\partial_u Q^s(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + h_s^t), e^{\tau}(u_0 + h_u^t))| \cdot e^{\tau}|f^u - g^u|) dt \leq C e^{\tau} \mu \|f - g\|_{\chi^4}, \\ \\ & |Q^u(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + f^s), e^{\tau}(u_0 + f^u)) - Q^u(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + g^s), e^{\tau}(u_0 + g^u))| \\ & \leq \int_0^1 (|\partial_s Q^u(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + h_s^t), e^{\tau}(u_0 + h_u^t))| \cdot e^{-\tau}|f^s - g^s| \\ & \quad + |\partial_u Q^u(e^{-\tau}(s_0 + h_s^t), e^{\tau}(u_0 + h_u^t))| \cdot e^{\tau}|f^u - g^u|) dt \leq C e^{3\tau} \mu \|f - g\|_{\chi^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain the following estimate for the norms $\|\mathcal{F}^s(f) - \mathcal{F}^s(g)\|$ and $\|\mathcal{F}^u(f) - \mathcal{F}^u(g)\|$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{s,u}(f) - \mathcal{F}^{s,u}(g)\| & \leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathbf{D}} \left(\int_0^\tau e^{\pm z} |Q^{s,u}(f) - Q^{s,u}(g)| dz \right) \leq C\mu e^{2\eta \operatorname{Re}(\tau_{\text{lin}})} \|f - g\|_{\chi^4} \\ & \leq C\mu^{1-\eta+\eta\gamma} \|f - g\|_{\chi^4}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\|\mathcal{F}(f) - \mathcal{F}(g)\|_{\chi^4} \leq C\mu^{1-\eta+\eta\gamma} \|f - g\|_{\chi^4}$$

corresponds to the Lipschitz constant. Hence, for $\eta \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$, $\gamma \in \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}, 1\right)$ and $\mu > 0$ small enough, the operator \mathcal{F} is contractive and satisfies $\mathcal{F}(B_{2\varepsilon}) \subset B_{2\varepsilon}$. Then the Banach fixed point theorem ensures that there exists a unique fixed point in $B_{2\varepsilon}$ for the operator \mathcal{F} in (A.8), which we denote by $(\tilde{s}(\tau), \tilde{u}(\tau))$. It satisfies, for $\tau \in \mathbf{D}$ in (A.5), the following estimates

$$|\tilde{s}(\tau)| \leq \|(\tilde{s}, \tilde{u})\|_{\chi^4} < 2\varepsilon(\eta), \quad |\tilde{u}(\tau)| \leq \|(\tilde{s}, \tilde{u})\|_{\chi^4} < 2\varepsilon(\eta). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Hence, for $\eta \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$, $\gamma \in \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}, 1\right)$ and $\tau \in \mathbf{D}$,

$$s(\tau) = e^{-\tau} (s_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon(\eta))), \quad u(\tau) = e^{\tau} (u_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon(\eta))). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Fix $\eta = \frac{11}{8} \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$ and $\gamma \in \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}, 1\right) = (\frac{3}{11}, 1)$. Then $\varepsilon(\eta)$ in (A.9) becomes

$$\varepsilon := \varepsilon \left(\frac{11}{8} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{1+11\gamma}{8}} \right). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Recall that we have simplified the notation and dropped the dependencies on β (see (A.2)). The next step is to look for $\tau \in \mathbf{D}$ satisfying $(s(\tau), u(\tau)) \in \partial \mathbf{B}_\gamma$ defined in (3.14). Namely, we look for a zero of a function of the form

$$F(\tau) = (s_1(\tau) + u_1(\tau))^2 + (s_2(\tau) + u_2(\tau))^2 + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\tau), u(\tau)) - \mu^\gamma. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

We use a fixed point argument. We write $s(\tau)$ and $u(\tau)$ in (A.6) as

$$s(\tau) = s_{\text{lin}}(\tau) + e^{-\tau} \tilde{s}(\tau), \quad u(\tau) = u_{\text{lin}}(\tau) + e^\tau \tilde{u}(\tau),$$

where $s_{\text{lin}}(\tau)$ and $u_{\text{lin}}(\tau)$ are defined in (3.21). Let $\tau(z) := \tau_{\text{lin}} + z$, where τ_{lin} is defined in (3.20) and set

$$\mathfrak{L}(z) := s_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)) + u_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)), \quad \mathfrak{R}(z) := e^{-\tau(z)} \tilde{s}(\tau(z)) + e^{\tau(z)} \tilde{u}(\tau(z)).$$

We denote by $(\cdot | \cdot)$ the complex bilinear form on \mathbb{C}^2 defined for $u = (u_1, u_2)$ and $v = (v_1, v_2)$ by $(u | v) := u_1 v_1 + u_2 v_2$. Then by the triangle inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz we have

$$|(u | v)| = |u_1 v_1 + u_2 v_2| \leq |u_1| |v_1| + |u_2| |v_2| \leq |u| |v|. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

We write $F(\tau(z)) = F(\tau_{\text{lin}} + z) = h_0(z) + h_1(z)$ in (A.13) with

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(z) &= (\mathfrak{L}(z) | \mathfrak{L}(z)) - \mu^\gamma, \\ h_1(z) &= 2(\mathfrak{L}(z) | \mathfrak{R}(z)) + (\mathfrak{R}(z) | \mathfrak{R}(z)) + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\tau(z)), u(\tau(z))). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Relying on (3.21) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h'_0(z) &= 2(\mathfrak{L}'(z) | \mathfrak{L}(z)) = 2[(u_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)) | u_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z))) - (s_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)) | s_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)))] , \\ h'_1(z) &= 2(\mathfrak{L}'(z) | \mathfrak{R}(z)) + 2(\mathfrak{L}(z) | \mathfrak{R}'(z)) + 2(\mathfrak{R}(z) | \mathfrak{R}'(z)) + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\tau(z)), u(\tau(z))). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

We define the operator

$$\mathcal{W}(z) = z - \frac{h_0(z) + h_1(z)}{h'_0(0)},$$

where $h'_0(0)$ can be computed from Lemma 3.3 as

$$h'_0(0) = 2[(u_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}}) | u_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}})) - (s_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}}) | s_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}}))] = 2\mu^\gamma + \mathcal{O}(\mu) \neq 0 \quad (\text{A.17})$$

for $\beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0}$ in (3.19). Fixed points of this operator correspond to zeroes of F in (A.13).

Relying on Lemma 3.3 and equations (A.10) and (A.14) we obtain the following estimates for the terms of $h_1(0)$ in (A.15)

$$\begin{aligned} |2(\mathfrak{L}(0) | \mathfrak{R}(0))| &\leq 2|\mathfrak{L}(0)| \cdot |\mathfrak{R}(0)| \leq C\mu^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \cdot \mu^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \varepsilon = C\mu^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon, \\ |(\mathfrak{R}(0) | \mathfrak{R}(0))| + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\tau_{\text{lin}}), u(\tau_{\text{lin}})) &\leq C\mu^{\gamma-1} \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned}$$

where ε is defined in (A.12). Therefore we have

$$|\mathcal{W}(0)| = \frac{|h_1(0)|}{|h'_0(0)|} \leq C\mu^{-\gamma} \left(\mu^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon + \mu^{\gamma-1} \varepsilon^2 \right) \leq C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon \leq C\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}} = D_\mu, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

which is small since $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, 1)$.

We define the ball $B_{2D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 2D_\mu\}$ (and therefore $\tau(z) = \tau_{\text{lin}} + z \in \mathbf{D}$ in (A.5)). We prove that the operator \mathcal{W} is Lipschitz in B_{2D} . We consider $z_1, z_2 \in B_{2D}$ so that

$$|\mathcal{W}(z_2) - \mathcal{W}(z_1)| \leq \sup_{z \in B_{2D}} |\mathcal{W}'(z)| \cdot |z_2 - z_1|$$

with

$$\mathcal{W}'(z) = 1 - \frac{h'_0(z) + h'_1(z)}{h'_0(0)},$$

where $h'_0(z)$ and $h'_1(z)$ are defined in (A.16). Relying on (3.21), for $z \in B_{2D}$ we can expand $h'_0(z)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} h'_0(z) &= 2((u_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)) \mid u_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z))) - (s_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)) \mid s_{\text{lin}}(\tau(z)))) \\ &= 2((u_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}} \mid u_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}})) \cdot e^{2z} - (s_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}}) \mid s_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}})) \cdot e^{-2z}) \\ &= h'_0(0) + 4z((u_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}} \mid u_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}})) + (s_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}}) \mid s_{\text{lin}}(\tau_{\text{lin}}))) + \mathcal{O}_2(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence from Lemma 3.3 we obtain

$$|h'_0(z) - h'_0(0)| \leq C\mu^\gamma D_\mu, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where D_μ is defined in (A.18).

The estimate of the derivative $h'_1(z)$ in (A.16) requires some estimates for the derivatives $\tilde{s}'_i(z)$ and $\tilde{u}'_i(z)$, which can be computed from (A.7) as

$$\tilde{s}'(z) = e^{\tau_{\text{lin}}+z} Q^s(\tilde{s}(z), \tilde{u}(z)), \quad \tilde{u}'(z) = e^{-(\tau_{\text{lin}}+z)} Q^u(\tilde{s}(z), \tilde{u}(z)),$$

where Q^s, Q^u are defined in (A.1). Relying on (3.20) and (A.4) we obtain for $z \in B_{2D}$

$$|e^{-(\tau_{\text{lin}}+z)} \tilde{s}'(z)| \leq |s(z) + u(z)|^2 \leq C\mu^\gamma, \quad |e^{\tau_{\text{lin}}+z} \tilde{u}'(z)| \leq |s(z) + u(z)|^2 \leq C\mu^\gamma. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

From (3.20), (A.10), (A.14) and (A.20) we obtain, for $z \in B_{2D}$, the following estimates for the terms of $h'_1(z)$ in (A.16)

$$\begin{aligned} \left| 2[(\mathfrak{L}'(z) \mid \mathfrak{R}(z)) + (\mathfrak{L}(z) \mid \mathfrak{R}'(z))] \right| &\leq 2(|\mathfrak{L}'(z)| \cdot |\mathfrak{R}(z)| + |\mathfrak{L}(z)| \cdot |\mathfrak{R}'(z)|) \\ &\leq C\mu^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \cdot \mu^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \varepsilon + C\mu^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \cdot \left(\mu^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \varepsilon + 2K\mu^\gamma \right) \\ &\leq C\mu^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \\ \left| 2(\mathfrak{R}(z) \mid \mathfrak{R}'(z)) + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\tau_{\text{lin}}+z), u(\tau_{\text{lin}}+z)) \right| &\leq C \left(\mu^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \varepsilon + 2K\mu^\gamma \right) \cdot \mu^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} \varepsilon \\ &\leq C\mu^{\gamma-1} \varepsilon^2 \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \end{aligned}$$

where ε is defined in (A.12). Therefore we have

$$|h'_1(z)| \leq C\mu^\gamma \mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}},$$

which is small since $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, 1)$. Combining this estimate with the ones in (A.17) and (A.19) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{W}'(z)| &= \left| 1 - \frac{h'_0(0) + h'_0(z) - h'_0(0) + h'_1(z)}{h'_0(0)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{h'_0(0)} (|h'_0(z) - h'_0(0)| + |h'_1(z)|) \\ &\leq C\mu^{-\gamma} \left(C\mu^\gamma D_\mu + C\mu^\gamma \mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}} \right) \leq C\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \end{aligned}$$

where D_μ is defined in (A.18). Hence, the operator \mathcal{W} is contractive and satisfies $\mathcal{W}(B_{2D}) \subset B_{2D}$. Then, the Banach fixed point theorem ensures that there exists a unique fixed point in B_{2D} for the operator \mathcal{W} , which we denote by z_* , so the time $\tau_* = \tau_{\text{lin}} + z_*$ corresponds to a zero of F in (A.13). Using Cauchy's estimates we have for $\beta \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_0/2}$

$$|z'_*(\beta)| \leq 2 \frac{|z_*(\beta)|}{\sigma_0} \leq \frac{4}{\sigma_0} D_\mu \leq C\mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}},$$

which leads to (3.22). Evaluating (A.11) at $\tau = \tau_*$ leads to (3.23) and (3.24), completing the proof.

B Proof of Proposition 5.2

The proof of Proposition 5.2 is based on the approach proposed in [31, 47]. That is, we take advantage of the fact that the invariant manifolds of infinity are Lagrangian and therefore they can be locally parameterized as graphs of generating functions, which are solutions of the so-called Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

Hence, we consider the Hamilton-Jacobi equation associated to Hamiltonian (5.1) and we look for functions $\hat{S}^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ such that

$$(\hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) = \left(\partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{S}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0), \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{S}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0) \right)$$

parameterize the invariant manifolds as a graph. Then, the Hamilton-Jacobi equation reads

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{S}, \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{S}) = -\hat{\Theta}_0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Recall that we put $-\hat{\Theta}_0$ in the right hand side since it corresponds to the the level of energy of the periodic orbit $A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}$.

For the unperturbed Hamiltonian, that is, considering $\mu = 0$ (see (5.2)), this equation simply reads

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{S}^2 + \frac{\partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{S}^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right) - \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{S} - \frac{1}{\hat{r}} = -\hat{\Theta}_0.$$

It has two solutions of the form

$$\hat{S}_0^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{f}^{s,u}(\hat{r}; \hat{\Theta}_0) + \hat{\Theta}_0 \hat{\theta} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $\hat{f}^{s,u}(\hat{r}; \hat{\Theta}_0)$ satisfy $\partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{f}^{s,u}(\hat{r}; \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{R}_0^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ and $\hat{R}_0^{s,u}(\hat{r}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ are defined in (5.5).

We look for solutions of (B.1) close to (B.2). We write $\hat{S}^{s,u} = \hat{S}_0^{s,u} + \hat{S}_1^{s,u}$. Then the equation for $\hat{S}_1^{s,u}$ becomes

$$\partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{f} \partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{S}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{S}_1^2 + \left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}_0}{\hat{r}^2} - 1 \right) \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{S}_1 + \frac{1}{2\hat{r}^2} \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{S}_1^2 - \hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) = 0.$$

To look for solutions of this equation we reparameterize the variables $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta})$ through the unperturbed separatrix in (2.9). Namely, we consider the changes

$$(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) = \left(\check{r}_h^\pm(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h^\pm(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) \right). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

We omit the symbols \pm to simplify notation. We define the generating functions

$$\hat{T}^{s,u}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}; \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \hat{S}^{s,u}(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0),$$

which can be written as $\hat{T}^{s,u} = \hat{T}_0^{s,u} + \hat{T}_1^{s,u}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}_0(\hat{u}, \hat{v}; \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \hat{S}_0(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \hat{\Theta}_0), \\ \hat{T}_1(\hat{u}, \hat{v}; \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \hat{S}_1(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Equation (B.1) now reads

$$\partial_{\hat{u}} \hat{T}_1 - \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1 + \frac{1}{\check{R}_h} \left(\partial_{\hat{u}} \hat{T}_1 - \frac{\hat{\Theta}_0}{\check{r}_h^2} \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2\check{r}_h^2} \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1^2 - \hat{V}(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \mu) = 0, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $\check{r}_h, \check{\theta}_h, \check{R}_h$ are defined in (2.9) and \hat{V} is defined in (5.2).

The change of variables (B.3) implies that we are looking for parameterizations of the stable and unstable invariant manifolds of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r} &= \check{r}_h^\pm(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \\ \hat{\theta} &= \check{\theta}_h^\pm(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \\ \hat{R} &= \check{R}_h^\pm(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0) + \frac{1}{\check{R}_h^\pm(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0)} \left(\partial_{\hat{u}} \hat{T}_1^{s,u} - \frac{\hat{\Theta}_0}{\check{r}_h^\pm(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0)^2} \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1^{s,u} \right), \\ \hat{\Theta} &= \hat{\Theta}_0 + \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1^{s,u},\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{T}_1^{s,u}$ are solutions of equation (B.4) with asymptotic boundary conditions for the unstable manifold

$$\lim_{\hat{u} \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\partial_{\hat{u}} \hat{T}_1^u(\hat{u}, \hat{v}; \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0)}{\check{R}_h^-(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0)} = 0, \quad \lim_{\hat{u} \rightarrow -\infty} \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1^u(\hat{u}, \hat{v}; \mu, \hat{\Theta}_0) = 0, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and analogous ones for the stable manifolds taking $\hat{u} \rightarrow +\infty$. The symmetry

$$\hat{V}(\hat{r}, -\hat{\theta}) = \hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta})$$

of \hat{V} in (5.2) implies that if $\hat{T}_1(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$ solves (B.4), then $-\hat{T}_1(-\hat{u}, -\hat{v})$ also solves it. Imposing the asymptotic condition (B.5) for \hat{T}_1^u (and the reverse for \hat{T}_1^s) yields

$$\hat{T}_1^s(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) = -\hat{T}_1^u(-\hat{u}, -\hat{v}).$$

Therefore, proving the existence of the unstable manifold implies existence of the stable one.

Proposition B.1. *Fix $m > 0$, $\hat{\Theta}_0 \in [-\sqrt{2} + m, \sqrt{2} - m]$ and $\kappa > 0$. Then, for $\nu \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$, there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, the unstable manifold $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$ of the system associated to Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ in (5.1) can be written as*

$$W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0}) = \left\{ (\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) = \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^u(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) : (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_\sigma \right\}$$

where \hat{D} and \mathbb{T}_σ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{D} &= \left\{ \hat{u} \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(\hat{u}) \leq -\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{2(1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu) - \hat{\Theta}_0^2} \cdot (1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu + \hat{\Theta}_0^2) \right\}, \\ \mathbb{T}_\sigma &= \left\{ \hat{v} \in \mathbb{C}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z}) : |\operatorname{Im}(\hat{v})| < \sigma - \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 - \frac{2\hat{\Theta}_0}{\hat{\Theta}_0 + \sqrt{2(1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu)}} \right) \right\},\end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

with

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{4} \log \left(\frac{1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu}{1 - \mu} \right). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Here $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}^u$ is a real-analytic function of the form

$$\hat{\mathcal{Y}}^u(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) = (\hat{r}(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \hat{\theta}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \hat{R}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \hat{\Theta}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0))$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r}(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \check{r}_h^-(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \\ \hat{\theta}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \check{\theta}_h^-(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \\ \hat{R}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \check{R}_h^-(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\nu}), \\ \hat{\Theta}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) &= \hat{\Theta}_0 + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\nu}),\end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where $\check{r}_h^-(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$, $\check{\theta}_h^-(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ and $\check{R}_h^-(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ are defined in (2.9). Moreover

$$\partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{R}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{\Theta}(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0) = \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-3\nu}). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

To prove this proposition, we rewrite (B.4) as

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{T}_1) = \mathcal{F}(\hat{T}_1) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(f) &= \partial_{\hat{u}} f - \partial_{\hat{v}} f, \\ \mathcal{F}(\hat{T}_1) &= -\frac{1}{\check{R}_h} \left(\partial_{\hat{u}} \hat{T}_1 - \frac{\hat{\Theta}_0}{\check{r}_h^2} \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1 \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2\check{r}_h^2} \partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1^2 + \hat{V}(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \mu). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to finding a solution of (B.10) with asymptotic conditions (B.5). To this end, we consider the domain $\hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_1}$ in (B.6) for $\sigma_1 = 3\sigma = \frac{3}{4} \log \left(\frac{1-\mu+\kappa\mu^\nu}{1-\mu} \right)$.

Remark B.2. From (2.7), (2.9) and for $\hat{\Theta}_0 \in [-\sqrt{2} + m, \sqrt{2} - m]$ we have that

$$0 \notin \hat{D} \quad \text{and} \quad |\check{r}_h^{-1}(\hat{u})| \leq C$$

for $\hat{u} \in \hat{D}$ in (B.6), where $C > 0$ is an adequate constant (that depends on m).

The next lemma gives the estimates for the potential \hat{V} in (5.2) in the domain $\hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_1}$.

Lemma B.3. There is $C > 0$ such that for any $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_1}$, the following bound is satisfied

$$|\hat{V}(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \mu)| \leq C\mu^{1-\nu}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

In particular, for $|\hat{u}| \rightarrow \infty$,

$$|\hat{V}(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \mu)| \leq C \frac{\mu}{|\hat{u}|^{\frac{4}{3}}}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Proof of Lemma B.3. We denote by $\hat{r} := \check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ and $\hat{\theta} := \hat{v} + \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0)$. The estimate of the potential \hat{V} in (5.2) can be split as follows

$$|\hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu)| \leq |\hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) - \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r})| + |\hat{V}_{\mathcal{J}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu)|$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) &= \frac{1-\mu}{\left(\hat{r}^2 + 2\hat{r}\mu \cos \hat{\theta} + \mu^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r}) = \frac{1}{\hat{r}}, \\ \hat{V}_{\mathcal{J}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) &= \frac{\mu}{\left(\hat{r}^2 - 2\hat{r}(1-\mu) \cos \hat{\theta} + (1-\mu)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The domain \hat{D} in (B.6) is considered so that $|\hat{r}| \geq 1 - \mu + \kappa\mu^\nu$, meaning that we are far from both the primary \mathcal{S} and the center of mass. Moreover, for $\mu = 0$ we have that $\hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; 0) - \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r}) = 0$. Therefore we have

$$|\hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) - \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r})| \lesssim \mu.$$

We estimate $|\hat{V}_{\mathcal{J}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu)|$ by looking for a lower bound for $|\hat{r}^2 - 2\hat{r}(1 - \mu) \cos \hat{\theta} + (1 - \mu)^2|$ on $\hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_1}$. We denote by $\tilde{r} := (1 - \mu)^{-1}\hat{r}$ so that

$$|\hat{r}^2 - 2\hat{r}(1 - \mu) \cos \hat{\theta} + (1 - \mu)^2| = (1 - \mu) |\tilde{r} - e^{i\hat{\theta}}| \cdot |\tilde{r} - e^{-i\hat{\theta}}|.$$

Since

$$|\tilde{r}| \geq 1 + \frac{\kappa\mu^\nu}{1 - \mu}, \quad |e^{\pm i\hat{\theta}}| \leq \exp\left(\frac{3}{4} \log\left(1 + \frac{\kappa\mu^\nu}{1 - \mu}\right)\right) = 1 + \frac{3}{4} \frac{\kappa\mu^\nu}{1 - \mu} + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{2\nu}), \quad \forall (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_1},$$

we obtain

$$|\tilde{r} - e^{\pm i\hat{\theta}}| \geq |\tilde{r}| - |e^{\pm i\hat{\theta}}| \geq 1 + \frac{\kappa\mu^\nu}{1 - \mu} - \left(1 + \frac{3}{4} \frac{\kappa\mu^\nu}{1 - \mu} + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{2\nu})\right) \geq \frac{\kappa\mu^\nu}{4(1 - \mu)} + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{2\nu}),$$

which leads to (B.12).

Finally, the estimate (B.13) is a direct consequence of Corollary 2.3 and the expansion of \hat{V} in \hat{r}^{-1} for large \hat{r} . \square

As a consequence of this Lemma, the operator \mathcal{F} in (B.11) is well-defined. The next step is to set up a fixed point argument to solve equation (B.10) in a suitable Banach space for functions defined on $\hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_1}$. For a big enough constant $K > 0$, we define the following norm for $f: \hat{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$\|f\|_a = \sup_{\substack{\hat{u} \in \hat{D} \\ |\hat{u}| > K}} |\hat{u}^a f(\hat{u})| + \sup_{\substack{\hat{u} \in \hat{D} \\ |\hat{u}| \leq K}} |f(\hat{u})|.$$

Then, for $\sigma > 0$ and functions $f: \hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we define

$$\|f\|_{a,\sigma} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f^{[k]}\|_a e^{|k|\sigma},$$

and the function space

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma} = \left\{ f: \hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \text{ real-analytic, } \|f\|_{a,\sigma} < \infty \right\}.$$

It can be checked that it is a Banach space for any fixed $a \geq 0$. Moreover, since equation (B.10) involves the derivatives $\partial_{\hat{u}} \hat{T}_1$ and $\partial_{\hat{v}} \hat{T}_1$, we need a Banach space that controls at the same time the norms of a function and its derivatives. To this end we define the norm

$$\|f\|_{a,\sigma} = \|f\|_{a,\sigma} + \|\partial_{\hat{u}} f\|_{a+1,\sigma} + \|\partial_{\hat{v}} f\|_{a+1,\sigma}$$

and the corresponding Banach space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a,\sigma} = \left\{ f: \hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \text{ real-analytic, } \|f\|_{a,\sigma} < \infty \right\}.$$

Next lemma, whose proof is analogous to the one of Lemma 5.6 of [22], gives properties about the following inverse of \mathcal{L}

$$\mathcal{G}(f)(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) = \int_{-\infty}^0 f(\hat{u} + s, \hat{v} - s) ds \tag{B.14}$$

acting on the Banach space $\mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma}$.

Lemma B.4. *The operator \mathcal{G} defined in (B.14), when considered acting on the space $\mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma}$, satisfies the following properties.*

- For any $a > 1$, $\mathcal{G}: \mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{a-1,\sigma}$ is well-defined and linear continuous. Moreover, $\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{G} = \text{Id}$.
- If $f \in \mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma}$ for some $a > 1$, then

$$\|\mathcal{G}(f)\|_{a-1,\sigma} \lesssim K \|f\|_{a,\sigma}.$$

- If $f \in \mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma}$ for some $a \geq 1$, then $\partial_{\hat{u}}\mathcal{G}(f), \partial_{\hat{v}}\mathcal{G}(f) \in \mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma}$ and

$$\|\partial_{\hat{u}}\mathcal{G}(f)\|_{a,\sigma} \lesssim \|f\|_{a,\sigma}, \quad \|\partial_{\hat{v}}\mathcal{G}(f)\|_{a,\sigma} \lesssim \|f\|_{a,\sigma}.$$

- From the previous statements, one can conclude that if $f \in \mathcal{Z}_{a,\sigma}$ for some $a > 1$, then $\mathcal{G}(f) \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{a-1,\sigma}$ and

$$\|\mathcal{G}(f)\|_{a-1,\sigma} \lesssim \|f\|_{a,\sigma}.$$

We look for a fixed point in the space $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{1/3,\sigma}$ of the operator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{F} \tag{B.15}$$

where \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are the operators defined in (B.11) and (B.14), respectively. Proposition B.1 is a straightforward consequence of the following proposition.

Proposition B.5. *Fix $\kappa > 0$ and $\sigma_0 = \frac{2}{3}\sigma_1 = 2\sigma = \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1-\mu+\kappa\mu^\nu}{1-\mu}\right)$ in (B.7). There exists a constant $b_0 > 0$ such that, for $\mu > 0$ small enough, the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ in (B.15) has a fixed point $\hat{T}_1 \in B(b_0\mu^{1-2\nu}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{1/3,\sigma_0}$.*

Proof of Proposition B.5. We bound $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(0) = \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{F}(0)$. By the definition of \mathcal{F} in (B.11) we have that

$$\mathcal{F}(0) = \hat{V}(\check{r}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{\Theta}_0), \check{\theta}_h(\hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{\Theta}_0); \mu),$$

with \hat{V} is defined in (5.2). It satisfies

$$\|\hat{V}\|_{4/3,\sigma_0} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\hat{V}^{[k]}\|_{4/3} \cdot e^{|k|\sigma_0} \leq \|\hat{V}\|_{4/3,\sigma_1} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-|k|(\sigma_1 - \sigma_0)} \lesssim \mu^{1-2\nu},$$

where we have used that \hat{V} is an analytic function on $\hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_1}$ in (B.6) so that $\|\hat{V}^{[k]}\|_{4/3} \leq \|\hat{V}\|_{4/3,\sigma_1} \cdot e^{-|k|\sigma_1}$. Therefore $\mathcal{F}(0) \in \mathcal{Z}_{4/3,\sigma_0}$ and $\|\mathcal{F}(0)\|_{4/3,\sigma_0} \leq K\mu^{1-2\nu}$ for some adequate constant $K > 0$. Then, applying the last statement of Lemma B.4, there exists a constant $b_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{F}(0)\|_{1/3,\sigma_0} \leq \frac{b_0}{2} \mu^{1-2\nu}.$$

We show that the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is contractive in the ball $B(b_0\mu^{1-2\nu}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{1/3,\sigma_0}$. Let $f_1, f_2 \in B(b_0\mu^{1-2\nu})$. Using the last statement of Lemma B.4 we have that

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(f_2) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(f_1)\|_{1/3,\sigma_0} \lesssim \|\mathcal{F}(f_2) - \mathcal{F}(f_1)\|_{4/3,\sigma_0}.$$

We bound the right hand side of this formula. We write it as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(f_2) - \mathcal{F}(f_1) &= -\frac{1}{\check{R}_h} \left(\partial_{\hat{u}} f_2 + \partial_{\hat{u}} f_1 - \frac{2\hat{\Theta}_0}{\check{r}_h^2} \partial_{\hat{v}} f_2 \right) (\partial_{\hat{u}} f_2 - \partial_{\hat{u}} f_1) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{2\hat{\Theta}_0}{\check{R}_h \check{r}_h^2} \partial_{\hat{u}} f_1 - \left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}_0^2}{\check{R}_h \check{r}_h^4} + \frac{1}{2\check{r}_h^2} \right) (\partial_{\hat{v}} f_2 + \partial_{\hat{v}} f_1) \right) (\partial_{\hat{v}} f_2 - \partial_{\hat{v}} f_1). \end{aligned}$$

Using Remark B.2, the behavior of \check{r}_h from Corollary 2.3 and the fact that $f_1, f_2 \in B(b_0\mu^{1-2\nu})$ we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{F}(f_2) - \mathcal{F}(f_1)\|_{4/3, \sigma_0} \lesssim \mu^{1-2\nu} \|f_2 - f_1\|_{1/3, \sigma_0}.$$

Therefore

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(f_2) - \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(f_1)\|_{1/3, \sigma_0} \lesssim \|\mathcal{F}(f_2) - \mathcal{F}(f_1)\|_{4/3, \sigma_0} \lesssim \mu^{1-2\nu} \|f_2 - f_1\|_{1/3, \sigma_0},$$

and thus, the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is well-defined and it is contractive. Hence, it has a unique fixed point $\hat{T}_1 \in B(b_0\mu^{1-2\nu}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}_{1/3, \sigma_0}$. This leads to the parameterization (B.8) of $W_\mu^u(A_{\hat{\Theta}_0})$. The estimates (B.9) are obtained from the Cauchy's estimates on \mathbb{T}_σ defined in (B.6), whose minimum distance to $\partial\mathbb{T}_\sigma$ is $\frac{1}{4} \log\left(\frac{1-\mu+\kappa\mu^\nu}{1-\mu}\right) > \frac{1}{8\kappa}\mu^\nu$. \square

C Proof of Proposition 7.1

We provide the proof for the ejection orbits. One can deduce an analogous result for the collision ones using that the system is reversible.

Fix $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$. The proof relies on extending of the ejection curve $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ in (3.25) (which belongs to the section Σ_γ in (3.18)) to the section $\bar{\Sigma}$ in (4.10). The argument is carried out using the polar coordinates centered at the center of mass $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$, and is structured as follows:

1. We express the curve $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) \subset \Sigma_\gamma$ in coordinates $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$. We denote this curve as $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$.
2. We express the target section $\bar{\Sigma}$ in coordinates $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$, and denote it as $\hat{\Sigma}$.
3. We extend the curve $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ by the flow associated to the Hamiltonian (5.1) to reach a curve in the section $\hat{\Sigma}$. This is done in two stages: first we consider the flow for the unperturbed Hamiltonian ($\mu = 0$) and then we study the perturbed flow for $\mu > 0$ small enough.
4. We express the image curve in polar coordinates $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta})$ (see (4.1)) and we parameterize it as graph in terms of $\bar{\theta}$, yielding (7.5) and completing the proof.

Step 1. Coordinate transformation of the curve $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$: In coordinates $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$, the ejection curve $\Lambda_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ becomes

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu) = \left\{ \left(\hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu), \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu), \hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu), \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu) \right) : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \right\}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu) &= \sqrt{\mu^{2\gamma} + 2\mu^\gamma \cos\theta(1-\mu) + (1-\mu)^2}, \\ \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu) &= \arctan\left(\frac{\mu^\gamma \sin\theta}{\mu^\gamma \cos\theta + (1-\mu)}\right), \\ \hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu) &= R_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \xi, \mu) \cos(\theta - \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu)) - \frac{\Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \xi, \mu)}{\mu^\gamma} \sin(\theta - \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu)) + \sin\hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu)(1-\mu), \\ \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu) &= \hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu) R_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \xi, \mu) \sin(\theta - \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu)) + \frac{\hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu)}{\mu^\gamma} \Theta_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \xi, \mu) \cos(\theta - \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu)) \\ &\quad + \hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu) \cos\hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; \mu)(1-\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Since $h = \mathcal{O}(\mu)$, we obtain the following estimate for the value of ξ in (3.6)

$$\xi = (2h+3)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}(\mu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} + \mathcal{O}(\mu).$$

We substitute this estimate in both $(R_{\mathcal{J}}, \Theta_{\mathcal{J}})$ defined in (3.26) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}(\theta, v) &= 1 + v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v), & \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}(\theta, v) &= v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v), \\ \hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma), & \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= 1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma),\end{aligned}\tag{C.3}$$

where

$$\sigma := \sigma(\mu) = \mu^{\frac{11\gamma-3}{8}}, \quad v := v(\mu) = \mu^\gamma \tag{C.4}$$

are defined to simplify notation. Note that $\sigma \gg v$ since $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3}) < 1$.

Step 2. Coordinate transformation of the section $\bar{\Sigma}$: We consider the transformation from coordinates $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta})$ to coordinates $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu) &= \sqrt{\hat{r}^2 + 2\hat{r}\mu \cos \hat{\theta} + \mu^2}, & \bar{\theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu) &= \arctan \left(\frac{\hat{r} \sin \hat{\theta}}{\hat{r} \cos \hat{\theta} + \mu} \right), \\ \bar{R}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}, \mu) &= \hat{R} \frac{\bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) - \mu \cos \bar{\theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta})}{\hat{r}} - \mu \hat{\Theta} \frac{\bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) \sin \bar{\theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta})}{\hat{r}}, \\ \bar{\Theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}, \mu) &= \mu \hat{R} \frac{\bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) \sin \bar{\theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta})}{\hat{r}} + \hat{\Theta} \frac{\bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) (\bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) - \mu \cos \bar{\theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}))}{\hat{r}^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{C.5}$$

This transformation satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu) &= \hat{r} + \mu \cos \hat{\theta} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\hat{r}}\right), & \bar{\theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu) &= \hat{\theta} - \mu \frac{\sin \hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}} + \mathcal{O}_2\left(\frac{\mu}{\hat{r}}\right), \\ \bar{R}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}, \mu) &= \hat{R} - \mu \hat{\Theta} \sin \hat{\theta} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\hat{r}^2}\right), \\ \bar{\Theta}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}, \mu) &= \hat{\Theta} \left(1 + \frac{\mu \cos \hat{\theta}}{\hat{r}}\right) + \mu \hat{R} \sin \hat{\theta} + \mathcal{O}_2(\mu).\end{aligned}\tag{C.6}$$

We define the function $\mathcal{F}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu) = \bar{r}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu) - \delta^2$ and look for its zeroes. It satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}(\delta^2, \hat{\theta}, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_{\hat{r}} \mathcal{F}(\delta^2, \hat{\theta}, 0) = 1 \neq 0.$$

Then, the Implicit Function Theorem ensures that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \mu < \mu_0$ and $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$, there is $\hat{r} = \hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu)$ with $\hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, 0) = \delta^2$ such that $\bar{r}(\hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu), \hat{\theta}; \mu) = \delta^2$. Moreover, we have

$$\hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu) = \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\mu).\tag{C.7}$$

Hence, in coordinates $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta})$, the section $\bar{\Sigma}$ in (4.10) becomes

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \left\{ (\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) : \hat{r} = \hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu), \hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu(\hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu), \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) = h \right\}.\tag{C.8}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\mu$ is the Hamiltonian (5.1).

Step 3. Extension by the flow: We extend the ejection curve $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$ in (C.2) by the flow associated to the Hamiltonian (5.1) to the section $\hat{\Sigma}$ defined in (C.8). To carry out this extension, denote by \hat{F} the vector field associated to the Hamiltonian (5.1), which can be written as

$$\hat{F}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}; \mu) = \hat{F}_0(\hat{r}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) + \hat{F}_1(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu)$$

where

$$\hat{F}_0(\hat{r}, \hat{R}, \hat{\Theta}) = \left(\hat{R}, \frac{\hat{\Theta}}{\hat{r}^2} - 1, \frac{\hat{\Theta}^2}{\hat{r}^3} - \frac{1}{\hat{r}^2}, 0 \right)^T, \quad \hat{F}_1(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) = \left(0, 0, \partial_{\hat{r}} \hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu), \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu) \right)^T, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

and $\hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \mu)$ is the potential (5.2), which satisfies $\hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, 0) = 0$.

The vector field \hat{F} has multiple singularities located at $\hat{r} = 0$, $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) = (\mu, \pi)$ and $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) = (1-\mu, 0)$ which correspond to the positions of the center of mass and the primaries \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{J} respectively. However, the extension we consider avoids these singularities, and thus the vector field \hat{F} remains regular throughout the associated flow.

We first perform the extension for \hat{F}_0 . To this end we recall Remark 2.4 (the case $\hat{\Theta}_0 = 0$) and consider, in non-rotating coordinates $(\check{r}, \check{\theta}, \check{R}, \check{\Theta})$, the ballistic trajectory $\check{\gamma}_c^-(t, 0) \in \mathcal{S}^+ \cap \mathcal{J}^-$ in (2.11), defined for $t \in [-t_c, 0]$ where $t_c = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}$ is given in (2.10) (see Remark 1.4 for the definition of ballistic trajectory). Since for $\mu = 0$ the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$ in (2.4) is autonomous, without loss of generality we consider the initial condition $\check{\gamma}_c^-(0, 0) \in \mathcal{J}$ so that $\check{\gamma}_c^-(t, 0) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow t_c^-]{} \mathcal{S}$.

We denote by $\hat{\Phi}_0(t, x_0) := (\hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}, \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\theta}}, \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{R}}, \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\Theta}})$ the flow associated to the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$ with initial condition $x_0 = (\hat{r}_0, \hat{\theta}_0, \hat{R}_0, 0)$ (where $\hat{R}_0 = \hat{R}_0(\hat{r}_0, \hat{\Theta}_0)$ is obtained through the conservation of the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$). Then we have

$$\hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t, x_0) = \left(\hat{r}_0^{\frac{3}{2}} - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}, \quad \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\theta}}(t, x_0) = \hat{\theta}_0 - t, \quad \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{R}}(t, x_0) = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t, x_0)}}, \quad \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\Theta}}(t, x_0) = 0. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

We compute the time t_0 such that $\hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t_0, x_0) \in \hat{\Sigma}$ in (C.8), yielding

$$t_0 = t_0(\hat{r}_0) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \left(\hat{r}_0^{\frac{3}{2}} - \delta^3 \right). \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Building on these results, the following lemma provides estimates for both the flow $\hat{\Phi}_0$ and the time required for initial conditions in $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu)$, defined in (C.1), to reach the section $\hat{\Sigma}$ in (C.8).

Lemma C.1 (Extension by the flow $\hat{\Phi}_0$). *Let $\delta_0 > 0$ be the parameter given in Proposition 4.3 and fix $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$. For $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, consider the time interval*

$$\mathcal{T} = \left[0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \left(1 - \frac{\delta^3}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Then, there exist $\mu_0, \omega_0 > 0$ such that, for $(\mu, \omega) \in (0, \mu_0) \times (0, \omega_0)$ and any initial condition $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(v, \sigma)$ (with v, σ given in (C.4)) defined as

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(v, \sigma) = \left\{ \left(\hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; v, \sigma), \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; v, \sigma), \hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; v, \sigma), \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta; v, \sigma) \right) : \theta \in (\theta_* - \omega, \theta_* + \omega) \right\} \subset \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\mu), \quad (\text{C.13})$$

where $\theta_ = \arcsin\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right) + \pi$, the flow $\hat{\Phi}_0$ satisfies the following estimates*

$$\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}) = \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega), \quad \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}) = \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega), \quad (\text{C.14})$$

for $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Moreover, the time needed for the flow $\hat{\Phi}_0$ starting at $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(v, \sigma)$ to reach the section $\hat{\Sigma}$ in (C.8) satisfies

$$t(\theta, v, \sigma) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (1 - \delta^3) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega) \in \mathcal{T}, \quad \partial_{\theta} t(\theta, v, \sigma) = \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega). \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. We compute the time needed for an arbitrary point $\hat{x}_0 \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(0)$ defined in (C.1) to reach the section $\hat{\Sigma}$ in (C.8) under the flow $\hat{\Phi}_0$ in (C.10). Relying on (C.3), such point \hat{x}_0 has the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_0(\theta_0) &= \left(\hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_0, 0), \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_0, 0), \hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_0, 0, 0), \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_0, 0, 0) \right) \\ &= \left(1, 0, \sqrt{3} \cos \theta_0, 1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta_0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

To apply the expression in (C.10), the $\hat{\Theta}$ -component of $\hat{x}_0(\theta_0)$ must be zero. That is, we look for $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfying $\hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_0, 0, 0) < 0$ and $\hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta_0, 0, 0) = 0$ in (C.3), or equivalently

$$\cos \theta_0 < 0, \quad 1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta_0 = 0,$$

which yields

$$\theta_* = \arcsin \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) + \pi \quad (\text{C.16})$$

so that

$$\hat{x}_0(\theta_*) = \left(1, 0, \sqrt{3} \cos \theta_*, 0 \right) = (1, 0, -\sqrt{2}, 0) \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

In this case, the time needed to reach the section $\hat{\Sigma}$ in (C.8) is computed from (C.11) as

$$t_0^* = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (1 - \delta^3). \quad (\text{C.18})$$

We extend the previous analysis to points in $\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(v, \sigma)$, defined in (C.13). Recall that $\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(0, 0)$ corresponds to the point $x_0(\theta_*)$ defined in (C.17). For any initial condition

$$\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) = \left(\hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v), \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v), \hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v, \sigma), \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v, \sigma) \right) \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(v, \sigma)$$

we consider the flow $\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma))$ for $t \in \mathcal{T}$ (defined in (C.12)) and we expand it with respect to the initial condition $\hat{x}(\theta_*, 0, 0) = \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)$ in (C.17), yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) &= \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) + \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) \cdot (\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) - \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_2(\|\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) - \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)\|) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

where, relying on (C.3) and (C.17), the difference $\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) - \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)$ is given by

$$\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) - \hat{x}_0(\theta_*) = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v) \\ \hat{\theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v) \\ \hat{R}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v, \sigma) \\ \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ -\sqrt{2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \\ 1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega) \quad (\text{C.20})$$

for $\theta \in (\theta_* - \omega, \theta_* + \omega)$, and $\partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*))$ is the solution of the variational equations whose motion is expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*))' = D\hat{F}_0 \left(\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*, 0, 0)) \right) \cdot \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) \\ \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(0, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) = \text{Id}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

where \hat{F}_0 is defined in (C.9) so that

$$D\hat{F}_0(\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*))) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{(\hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)))^2} \\ \frac{2}{(\hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)))^3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{4}{3}}} \\ \frac{2}{(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}})^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Equation (C.21) is integrable, and the solutions are bounded for $t \in \mathcal{T}$ defined in (C.12). They are given by

$$\partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{5(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{1}{3}}} + \frac{1}{5} \left(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} & 0 & \frac{3}{5(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{1}{3}}} - \frac{3}{5} \left(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{1}{3}}} \\ \frac{4}{15(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{1}{3}}} - \frac{4}{15} \left(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} & 0 & \frac{1}{5(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{4}{3}}} + \frac{12}{15} \left(1 - \frac{3t}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.22})$$

yielding (C.14).

We compute the time t satisfying $\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) \in \hat{\Sigma}$, defined in (C.8). Namely, we find a zero of a function of the form

$$\mathcal{G}(t, \theta, v, \sigma) = \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) - \delta^2.$$

Note that we have taken \mathcal{G} as a function of v and σ , which depend on the parameter $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ as described in (C.4).

Recall that $\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma))$ no longer corresponds to the expression provided in (C.10) since $\hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v, \sigma) \neq 0$ for $v, \sigma \neq 0$. Nevertheless, the function \mathcal{G} satisfies

$$\mathcal{G}(t_0^*, \theta_*, 0, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_t \mathcal{G}(t_0^*, \theta_*, 0, 0) = \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{R}}(t_0^*, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\delta^2}} \neq 0,$$

where $\hat{x}_0(\theta_*)$ and t_0^* are defined in (C.17) and (C.18) respectively, and where we use the expression for the unperturbed vector field \hat{F}_0 in (C.9). As a result, the Implicit Function Theorem ensures that there exist

$$\sigma_0, v_0, \omega_0 = \sigma_0(\delta), v(\delta), \omega_0(\delta) > 0 \quad (\text{C.23})$$

such that there exists $t = t(\theta, v, \sigma)$ smooth, defined for $\theta \in (\theta_* - \omega, \theta_* + \omega)$ (where θ_* is defined in (C.16)) and $(v, \sigma) \in (0, v_0) \times (0, \sigma_0)$ with $t(\theta_*, 0, 0) = t_0^*$ and

$$\hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t(\theta, v, \sigma), \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) = \delta^2.$$

Since $t(\theta_*, 0, 0) = t_0^* \in \mathcal{T}$ in (C.12), the expressions in (C.22) are well-defined and

$$\partial_{\theta} t(\theta_*, 0, 0) = -\frac{\partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t_0^*, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) \cdot \partial_{\theta} \hat{x}(\theta_*, 0, 0)}{\partial_t \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t_0^*, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*))}.$$

Relying on (C.20) and (C.22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\theta} \hat{x}(\theta_*, 0, 0) &= (0 \ 0 \ -\sqrt{3} \sin \theta_* \ \sqrt{3} \cos \theta_*)^T = (0 \ 0 \ 1 \ -\sqrt{2})^T, \\ \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t_0^*, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{5(1 - \frac{3t_0^*}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{1}{3}}} + \frac{1}{5} \left(1 - \frac{3t_0^*}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} & 0 & \frac{3}{5(1 - \frac{3t_0^*}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{1}{3}}} - \frac{3}{5} \left(1 - \frac{3t_0^*}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{(1 - \frac{3t_0^*}{\sqrt{2}})^{\frac{1}{3}}} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \left(\frac{4}{5\delta} + \frac{\delta^4}{5} \ 0 \ \frac{3}{5\delta} - \frac{3\delta^4}{5} \ 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\partial_\theta t(\theta_*, 0, 0) = \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} (1 + \delta^5)$, leading to (C.15) and completing the proof. \square

Now we perform the extension under the flow induced by the vector field \hat{F} defined in (C.9), which we denote as $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$, result of the following lemma.

Lemma C.2 (Extension by the flow $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$). *Let $\delta_0 > 0$ be the parameter given in Proposition 4.3 and fix $\gamma \in (\frac{3}{11}, \frac{1}{3})$. Then, for $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, there exist $v_0, \sigma_0, \omega_0 > 0$ such that, for $(v, \sigma, \omega) \in (0, v_0) \times (0, \sigma_0) \times (0, \omega_0)$, the time needed for the flow $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$, starting at an initial condition $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(v, \sigma)$ in (C.13) (where v, σ are defined in (C.4)), to reach the section $\hat{\Sigma}$ defined in (C.8) satisfies the following estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} t_\mu(\theta, v, \sigma) &= t(\theta, v, \sigma) + \mathcal{O}(\mu) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu) \in \mathcal{T}, \\ \partial_\theta t_\mu(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \partial_\theta t(\theta, v, \sigma) + \mathcal{O}(\mu) = \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.24})$$

where \mathcal{T} is defined in (C.12) and $t(\theta, v, \sigma), \partial_\theta t(\theta, v, \sigma)$ are given in (C.15).

Moreover, for $t \in [0, t_\mu(\theta, v, \sigma)]$, the flow $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_\mu(t, \hat{x}) &= \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\gamma}) = \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-2\gamma}), \\ \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_\mu(t, \hat{x}) &= \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-3\gamma}) = \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-3\gamma}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.25})$$

where $\hat{x}_0(\theta_*)$ is defined in (C.17).

Proof of Lemma C.2. First, we compute the time needed for an arbitrary point $\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\sigma, v)$ defined in (C.13) to reach the section $\hat{\Sigma}$ in (C.8) under the flow $\hat{\Phi}_\mu$. Namely, we look for a zero of a function of the form

$$\mathcal{F}(t, \theta, v, \sigma, \mu) = \hat{\Phi}_\mu^{\hat{r}}(t, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) - \hat{P}\left(\Phi_\mu^{\hat{\theta}}(t, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)), \mu\right),$$

where $\hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu)$ is defined in (C.7) for $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$. This function satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}(t(\theta, v, \sigma), \theta, v, \sigma, 0) = \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{r}}(t(\theta, v, \sigma), x(\theta, v, \sigma)) - \delta^2 = 0,$$

where $t(\theta, v, \sigma)$ is defined in (C.15). Relying on (C.10) and (C.14) we also obtain

$$\partial_t \mathcal{F}(t(\theta, v, \sigma), \theta, v, \sigma, 0) = \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{R}}(t(\theta, v, \sigma), x(\theta, v, \sigma)) = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\delta^2}} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega) \neq 0.$$

Hence, the Implicit Function Theorem ensures that there exists $\mu_0, \omega_0 > 0$ and a smooth function $t_\mu(\theta, v, \sigma)$ defined for $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, $\omega \in (0, \omega_0)$ and $\theta \in (\theta_* - \omega, \theta_* + \omega)$ (where $v \in (0, v_0)$, $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0)$ are defined in (C.4) and (C.23) respectively) with $t_0(\theta, v, \sigma) = t(\theta, v, \sigma)$ such that

$$\hat{\Phi}_\mu(t_\mu(\theta, v, \sigma), x(\theta, v, \sigma)) \in \hat{\Sigma},$$

and satisfying (C.24).

Denote by

$$\hat{r}_{\min} := \min_{\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}} \hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu), \quad \hat{r}_{\max} := \max_{\theta \in (\theta_* - \omega_0, \theta_* + \omega_0)} \hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v). \quad (\text{C.26})$$

where $\hat{P}(\hat{\theta}, \mu)$ and $\hat{r}_{\mathcal{J}}(\theta, v)$ are given in (C.7) and (C.3) respectively. Then, for any point $\hat{x} = \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(v, \sigma)$ in (C.13), we consider $T \in [0, t_{\mu}(\theta, v, \sigma)]$ to be the first time that $\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}^{\hat{r}}(T, \hat{x}) \notin [\hat{r}_{\min}, \hat{r}_{\max}]$ and we study the evolution of such orbit for $t \in [0, T]$. If it does not exist we consider $t \in [0, t_{\mu}(\theta, v, \sigma)]$.

Using the mean value theorem we have the following estimate for the flow $\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}$ and its derivative $\partial_{\hat{x}}\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}(t, \hat{x}) - \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x})| &\leq |D\hat{F}_0| \int_0^t |\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}(s, x) - \hat{\Phi}_0(s, x)| ds + \int_0^t |\hat{F}_1| ds, \\ |\partial_{\hat{x}}\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}(t, \hat{x}) - \partial_{\hat{x}}\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x})| &\leq |D^2\hat{F}_0| \int_0^t |\partial_{\hat{x}}\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}(s, x) - \partial_{\hat{x}}\hat{\Phi}_0(s, x)| ds + \int_0^t |D\hat{F}_1| ds, \end{aligned}$$

where \hat{F}_0, \hat{F}_1 are defined in (C.9). Then, by Gronwall's lemma

$$|\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}(t, \hat{x}) - \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x})| \leq t|\hat{F}_1|e^{|D\hat{F}_0|t}, \quad |\partial_{\hat{x}}\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}(t, \hat{x}) - \partial_{\hat{x}}\hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x})| \leq t|D\hat{F}_1|e^{|D^2\hat{F}_0|t}. \quad (\text{C.27})$$

We bound both \hat{F}_1 and $D\hat{F}_1$ (which are related to the potential \hat{V} in (5.2)) for $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) \in [\hat{r}_{\min}, \hat{r}_{\max}] \times \mathbb{T}$, where $\hat{r}_{\min}, \hat{r}_{\max}$ are defined in (C.26). To this end, we consider instead the complex domain $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) \in \hat{D} \times \mathbb{T}_{\sigma}$ defined as

$$\hat{D} = \{\hat{r} \in \mathbb{C}: \operatorname{Re}(\hat{r}) \in [\hat{r}_{\min}, \hat{r}_{\max}], |\operatorname{Im}(\hat{r})| \leq \sigma\}, \quad \mathbb{T}_{\sigma} = \left\{ \hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (2\pi\mathbb{Z}): |\operatorname{Im}(\hat{\theta})| < \sigma \right\}, \quad (\text{C.28})$$

where $\sigma = \frac{3}{4} \log \left(\frac{1-\mu-\mu^{\gamma}}{1-\mu} \right)$. The potential \hat{V} in (5.2) is analytic in this domain and its estimate can be split as follows

$$|\hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu)| \leq |\hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) - \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r})| + |\hat{V}_{\mathcal{J}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu)|$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) &= \frac{1-\mu}{\left(\hat{r}^2 + 2\hat{r}\mu \cos \hat{\theta} + \mu^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r}) = \frac{1}{\hat{r}}, \\ \hat{V}_{\mathcal{J}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) &= \frac{\mu}{\left(\hat{r}^2 - 2\hat{r}(1-\mu) \cos \hat{\theta} + (1-\mu)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Relying on (C.3), (C.6) and (C.26), the domain \hat{D} in (C.28) is considered so that $|\operatorname{Re}(\hat{r})| \in (\delta^2 - M\mu, 1 - M\mu^{\gamma})$ for some adequate constant M independent of μ and δ , meaning we are “far” from both the primary \mathcal{S} and the center of mass. Moreover for $\mu = 0$ we have that $\hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; 0) - \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r}) = 0$, and therefore

$$|\hat{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}; \mu) - \hat{V}_{\text{CM}}(\hat{r})| \lesssim \mu.$$

Finally, the estimate of $\hat{V}_{\mathcal{J}}$ follows the same argument as the one in the proof of Lemma B.3, yielding

$$|\hat{V}(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta})| \lesssim \mu^{1-\gamma}.$$

Hence, from the Cauchy's estimates we obtain, for $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}) \in [\hat{r}_{\min}, \hat{r}_{\max}] \times \mathbb{T}$

$$|\hat{F}_1| \lesssim \mu^{1-2\gamma}, \quad |D\hat{F}_1| \lesssim \mu^{1-3\gamma}. \quad (\text{C.29})$$

To compute the estimates for (C.27) we also bound both $|D\hat{F}_0|$ and $|D^2\hat{F}_0|$, where \hat{F}_0 is defined in (C.9). Both functions depend on $(\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Theta})$, where $\hat{r} \in [\hat{r}_{\min}, \hat{r}_{\max}], \hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\hat{\Theta}$ satisfies

$$\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}^{\hat{\Theta}}(t, \hat{x}) = \hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v, \sigma) + \int_0^t \hat{F}_1^{\hat{\Theta}}(\hat{\Phi}_{\mu}(s, \hat{x})) ds,$$

where $\hat{\Theta}_{\mathcal{J}}^-(\theta, v, \sigma)$ is defined in (C.3) for $\theta \in (\theta_* - \omega, \theta_* + \omega)$ (with θ_* defined in (C.16)), $t \in [0, t_{\mu}(\theta, v, \sigma)] \subset \mathcal{T}$ defined in (C.12) and \hat{F}_1 satisfies (C.29). Hence, we can bound both $|D\hat{F}_0|$ and $|D^2\hat{F}_0|$ by an uniform constant C_0 , leading to (C.25) and completing the proof. \square

Step 4. Parameterization of the image curve as a graph: We express the image curve in coordinates $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta})$ (defined in (C.5)) and parameterize it as a graph in terms of $\bar{\theta}$. We consider $t = t_\mu = t_\mu(\theta, v, \sigma)$. Then, we denote by

$$\hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) := \hat{\Phi}_\mu^{\hat{\theta}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)), \quad \hat{R}(\theta, v, \sigma) := \hat{\Phi}_\mu^{\hat{R}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)), \quad \hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) := \Phi_\mu^{\hat{\Theta}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)).$$

We compute $\hat{R}(\theta, v, \sigma)$ using the estimate in (C.25), obtaining

$$\hat{R}(\theta, v, \sigma) = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\delta^2}} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-2\gamma}).$$

The expressions for $\hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$, $\hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$ and its derivatives $\partial_\theta \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$, $\partial_\theta \hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$ are obtained from both (C.25) and the expansion in (C.19). Both functions satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} z(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \hat{\Phi}_0^z(t_\mu, x_0(\theta_*)) + \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0^z(t_\mu, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) \cdot (\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) - \hat{x}(\theta_*, 0, 0)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_2(\|\hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) - \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)\|) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\gamma}) \\ \partial_\theta z(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \partial_t \hat{\Phi}_\mu^{\hat{\theta}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) \cdot \partial_\theta t_\mu + \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_\mu^z(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) \cdot \partial_\theta \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) \\ &= \partial_t \hat{\Phi}_\mu^z(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) \cdot \partial_\theta t_\mu \\ &\quad + \left(\partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0(t, \hat{x}(\theta_*, 0, 0)) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \theta - \theta_*, \mu^{1-3\gamma}) \right) \cdot \partial_\theta \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.30})$$

where z denotes either the function $\hat{\theta}$ or $\hat{\Theta}$. To obtain estimates of (C.30), first we recall the estimates in (C.20), (C.22), (C.24) and (C.25).

$$\begin{aligned} t_\mu &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu), & \partial_\theta t_\mu &= \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu), \\ \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\theta}}(t_\mu, x_0(\theta_*)) &= -t_\mu, & \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\Theta}}(t_\mu, x_0(\theta_*)) &= \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-2\gamma}), \\ \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\theta}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \left(1 - \frac{3t_\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \end{pmatrix}, & \partial_{\hat{x}} \hat{\Phi}_0^{\hat{\Theta}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}_0(\theta_*)) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \partial_t \hat{\Phi}_\mu^{\hat{\theta}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) &= \frac{\hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)}{\delta^4} - 1, & \partial_t \hat{\Phi}_\mu^{\hat{\Theta}}(t_\mu, \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma)) &= \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{V}(\delta^2, \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma), \mu), \\ \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) - \hat{x}(\theta_*, 0, 0) &= \begin{pmatrix} v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \\ 1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix}, & \partial_\theta \hat{x}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \begin{pmatrix} -v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ -\sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \\ \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.31})$$

Since $\theta \in (\theta_* - \omega, \theta_* + \omega)$ for θ_* defined in (C.16) we have that

$$1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta = -\sqrt{2}(\theta - \theta_*) + \mathcal{O}_2(\theta - \theta_*). \quad (\text{C.32})$$

Substituting both (C.31) and (C.32) in (C.30) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= -t_\mu + \left(0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad \sqrt{2} \left(1 - \frac{3t_\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\right) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_1(v, \sigma) \\ 1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_2(v, \sigma, \omega) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\gamma}) \\ &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-2\gamma}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\delta} (1 + \delta^{-3} \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu)) \left(-\sqrt{2}(\theta - \theta_*) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega^2)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.33})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= (0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_1(v, \sigma) \\ 1 + \sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}_2(v, \sigma, \omega) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{1-2\gamma}) \\ &= -\sqrt{2}(\theta - \theta_*) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega^2, \mu^{1-2\gamma}).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C.34})$$

The derivative $\partial_\theta \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\theta \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \left(\frac{\hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)}{\delta^4} - 1 \right) \cdot \left(\frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \left(1 - \frac{3t_\mu}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-3\gamma}) \right) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ -\sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_1(v, \sigma) \\ \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\frac{2}{\delta} - \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} + \delta^{-4} \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu) \neq 0,\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C.35})$$

where we have considered $\mu_0 \ll \delta^4$, and therefore from (C.23) both $v_0, \sigma_0 \ll \delta^4$ and $\omega_0 \ll \delta^4$.

Relying on (C.29), the derivative $\partial_\theta \hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\theta \hat{\Theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \partial_{\hat{\theta}} \hat{V}(\delta^2, \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma), \mu) \cdot \left(\frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu) \right) \\ &\quad + \left((0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-3\gamma}) \right) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -v \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ v \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}_2(v) \\ -\sqrt{3} \sin \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \\ \sqrt{3} \cos \theta + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \sqrt{3} \cos \theta (1 + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-3\gamma})) = -\sqrt{2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-3\gamma})) \neq 0.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C.36})$$

To have a parameterization as in (7.5), we translate the result in (C.33) into coordinates $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{R}, \bar{\Theta})$ in (C.5). Using both estimates in (C.6) and (C.35) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) + \mathcal{O}(\mu) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3) - \frac{2}{\delta}(\theta - \theta_*) + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega^2, \mu), \\ \partial_\theta \bar{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) &= \partial_\theta \hat{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma) + \mathcal{O}(\mu) = -\frac{2}{\delta} - \frac{3}{5\sqrt{2}} + \delta^{-4} \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu) \neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\omega_0 \ll \delta^4$, the image of $\bar{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$ belongs to a δ^4 -neighborhood of $-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3)$, leading to the domain $B(\bar{\theta}_0)$ provided in (7.5). Moreover, the Inverse Function Theorem defines an inverse for $\bar{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)$, which we denote $\theta(\bar{\theta}, v, \sigma)$, in $B(\bar{\theta}_0)$. The estimates for $\theta(\bar{\theta}, v, \sigma)$ and its derivative are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(\bar{\theta}, v, \sigma) &= \bar{\theta}_* - \frac{\delta}{2} \left(\bar{\theta} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(1 - \delta^3) \right) + \delta \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega^2, \mu), \\ \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \theta(\bar{\theta}, v, \sigma) &= \frac{1}{\partial_\theta \bar{\theta}(\theta, v, \sigma)} = -\frac{\delta}{2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting these expressions in both (C.34) and (C.36) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Theta}(\bar{\theta}, v, \sigma) &= \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\bar{\theta} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (1 - \delta^3) \right) + \delta \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega^2, \mu^{1-2\gamma}), \\ \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \hat{\Theta}(\bar{\theta}, v, \sigma) &= \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \hat{\Theta} \cdot \partial_{\bar{\theta}} \theta(\bar{\theta}, v, \sigma) = \left(-\sqrt{2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(v, \sigma, \omega, \mu^{1-3\gamma})) \right) \cdot \left(-\frac{\delta}{2} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)) \right) \\ &= \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta, \mu^{1-3\gamma})).\end{aligned}$$

Translating the result using the estimates in (C.6) completes the proof.

D Proof of Lemma 8.3

Consider the value of the energy for which we prove the existence of a triple intersection in Section 8.1:

$$h^* = -\hat{\Theta}_0^* = -1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right) \quad (\text{D.1})$$

so $\xi^* = (2h^* + 3)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}(\mu) = 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right) > 0$ (see (3.6)). Denote by

$$\gamma_{\infty}^{u,<} := \{(\theta, \Theta_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta)) : \theta \in (\theta_- - \iota, \theta_- + \iota)\} \subset \Sigma_{\nu}^{<}$$

the C^1 graph parameterization of the curve $\Gamma_{\infty}^{u,<}$ in (8.11), where θ_- and $\Theta_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta)$ are defined in (8.10) and $\Sigma_{\nu}^{<}$ is defined in (3.28). We apply the change of coordinates Υ in (3.15) to translate the curve $\gamma_{\infty}^{u,<}$ into coordinates (q, p) . This leads to a curve parameterized in terms of θ of the form

$$\gamma_{\infty}^{u,<} = (q_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta), p_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta)) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned}q_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta) &= (q_1^{u,<}(\theta), q_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \mu^{\nu}(\cos \theta, \sin \theta), \\ p_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta) &= (p_1^{u,<}(\theta), p_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = R_{\infty}^u(\theta)(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) + \frac{\Theta_{\infty}^u(\theta)}{\mu^{\nu}}(-\sin \theta, \cos \theta).\end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Relying on (D.1), (D.3) and the estimates for both the angular and radial momenta $\Theta_{\infty}^u(\theta)$ and $R_{\infty}^u(\theta)$ (and their derivatives) given in (5.8), we obtain the following estimates for $p_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta)$ and its derivative

$$p_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta) = (-1, 0) + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}\right), \quad \partial_{\theta} p_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta) = \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu}\right). \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Once in coordinates (q, p) , we apply the diffeomorphism ψ^{-1} in (3.5) to express the curve $\gamma_{\infty}^{u,<}$ in (D.2) in Levi-Civita coordinates (z, w) , yielding the following parameterization

$$\gamma_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta) = (z_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta), w_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta)) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

which, from (D.1), (D.3) and (D.4), satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}z_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta) &= (z_1^{u,<}(\theta), z_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \pm \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{q_2^{u,<}(\theta)}{\sqrt{\mu^{\nu} - q_1^{u,<}(\theta)}}, \sqrt{\mu^{\nu} - q_1^{u,<}(\theta)} \right) \\ &= \pm \frac{1}{2} \mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}} (\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta}, \sqrt{1 - \cos \theta}), \\ w_{\infty}^{u,<}(\theta) &= (w_1^{u,<}(\theta), w_2^{u,<}(\theta)) \\ &= \xi (p_1^{u,<}(\theta) z_1^{u,<}(\theta) + p_2^{u,<}(\theta) z_2^{u,<}(\theta), p_2^{u,<}(\theta) z_1^{u,<}(\theta) - p_1^{u,<}(\theta) z_2^{u,<}(\theta)) \\ &= \mp \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2} (\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta}, -\sqrt{1 - \cos \theta}) + \mathcal{O}\left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}}\right).\end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Relying on (D.3), (D.4) and (D.6), its tangent vector $\partial_\theta \gamma_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) = (\partial_\theta z_\infty^{u,<}(\theta), \partial_\theta w_\infty^{u,<}(\theta))$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\theta z_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) &= (\partial_\theta z_1^{u,<}(\theta), \partial_\theta z_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{4} \left(\mp \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta}}, \pm \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{1 - \cos \theta}} \right), \\ \partial_\theta w_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) &= (\partial_\theta w_1^{u,<}(\theta), \partial_\theta w_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{4} \left(\frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta}}, \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{1 - \cos \theta}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{5}{2}\nu} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D.7})$$

We apply the diffeomorphism Γ defined in (3.11) to express the curve $\gamma_\infty^{u,<}$ in (D.5) in coordinates (s, u) , yielding a parameterization of the form

$$\gamma_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) = (s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta), u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)).$$

Relying on (D.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned}s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) &= (s_1^{u,<}(\theta), s_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta}, 0 \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right), \\ u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) &= (u_1^{u,<}(\theta), u_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(0, \sqrt{1 - \cos \theta} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D.8})$$

From (D.7) its tangent vector $\gamma_\infty^{u,<'}(\theta) = (s_\infty^{u,<'}(\theta), u_\infty^{u,<'}(\theta))$ admits the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\theta s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) &= (\partial_\theta s_1^{u,<}(\theta), \partial_\theta s_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \mp \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta}}, 0 \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{5}{2}\nu} \right), \\ \partial_\theta u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) &= (\partial_\theta u_1^{u,<}(\theta), \partial_\theta u_2^{u,<}(\theta)) = \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(0, \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{1 - \cos \theta}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{5}{2}\nu} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D.9})$$

To apply the transition map \mathbf{f} in Proposition 3.7 we have to compute the norm of both components $s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)$ and $u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)$ in (D.8),

$$\begin{aligned}|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}} \sqrt{1 + \cos \theta} \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \right) = \mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}} (1 + \mathcal{O}_2(\iota)), \\ |u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}} \sqrt{1 - \cos \theta} \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \right) = \mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}} \mathcal{O}(\iota),\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D.10})$$

where we have used that $\theta \in (\theta_- - \iota, \theta_- + \iota)$ for θ_- defined in (8.10). Since $|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)| > |u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|$, we obtain $\gamma_\infty^{u,<} \subset \Sigma^+$ in (3.30). Moreover, from (D.8) and (D.9) we estimate their derivatives as

$$\begin{aligned}|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|' &= \frac{s_1^{u,<}(\theta) \partial_\theta s_1^{u,<}(\theta) + s_2^{u,<}(\theta) \partial_\theta s_2^{u,<}(\theta)}{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} = \mp \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(\sqrt{1 - \cos \theta} + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right), \\ |u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|' &= \frac{u_1^{u,<}(\theta) \partial_\theta u_1^{u,<}(\theta) + u_2^{u,<}(\theta) \partial_\theta u_2^{u,<}(\theta)}{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} = \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta} + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D.11})$$

We apply the transition map \mathbf{f} from Proposition 3.7 to the curve $\gamma_\infty^{u,<} \subset \Sigma^+$, which yields the following curve

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) &= \mathbf{f}(\gamma_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)) = (s_\infty^{u,>}(\theta), u_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)) = \left(\frac{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|}{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} \cdot s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta), \frac{u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)}{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} \cdot |s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)| \right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}_2(|s_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)|).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D.12})$$

Relying on (D.8) and (D.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}s_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) &= (s_1(\theta), s_2(\theta)) = \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\sqrt{1 - \cos \theta}, 0 \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right), \\ u_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) &= (u_1(\theta), u_2(\theta)) = \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(0, \sqrt{1 + \cos \theta} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D.13})$$

We compute the tangent vector $\partial_\theta \gamma_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) = (\partial_\theta s_\infty^{u,>}(\theta), \partial_\theta u_\infty^{u,>}(\theta))$ from (D.8), (D.9), (D.10) and (D.11) yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\theta s_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) &= (s'_1(\theta), s'_2(\theta)) \\
&= \partial_\theta s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) \frac{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|}{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} + s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) \left(\frac{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|'}{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} - \frac{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)| \cdot |s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|'}{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^\nu) \\
&= \pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(\sqrt{1 + \cos \theta}, 0 \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{5}{2}\nu} \right), \\
\partial_\theta u_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) &= (u'_1(\theta), u'_2(\theta)) \\
&= \partial_\theta u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) \frac{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|}{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} + u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta) \left(\frac{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|'}{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|} - \frac{|s_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)| \cdot |u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|'}{|u_\infty^{u,<}(\theta)|^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^\nu) \\
&= \mp \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(0, \sqrt{1 - \cos \theta} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}}, \mu^{1-\frac{5}{2}\nu} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.14}$$

We apply the changes Γ^{-1} , ψ in (3.11) and (3.5) on the curve $\gamma_\infty^{u,>} \subset \Sigma^-$ in (D.12) (see (3.30) for the definition of the section Σ^-) to obtain the curve $\gamma_\infty^{u,>} \subset \Sigma_\nu^>$ (see (3.28)) in coordinates (q, p) parameterized in terms of θ as

$$\gamma_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) = (q_\infty^{u,>}(\theta), p_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)) = (q_1(\theta), q_2(\theta), p_1(\theta), p_2(\theta)) \tag{D.15}$$

where, from the estimates in (D.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_1(\theta) &= (s_1(\theta) + u_1(\theta))^2 - (s_2(\theta) + u_2(\theta))^2 + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\theta), u(\theta)) \\
&= \left(\pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{1 - \cos \theta} + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right) \right)^2 - \left(\pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{1 + \cos \theta} + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right) \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{3\nu}) \\
&= -\mu^\nu \left(\cos \theta + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \right), \\
q_2(\theta) &= 2(s_1(\theta) + u_1(\theta)) \cdot (s_2(\theta) + u_2(\theta)) + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\theta), u(\theta)) \\
&= 2 \left(\pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{1 - \cos \theta} + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right) \right) \left(\pm \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{1 + \cos \theta} + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\mu^{3\nu}) \\
&= \mu^\nu \left(\sin \theta + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \right), \\
p_1(\theta) &= -\frac{(s_1^2(\theta) - u_1^2(\theta)) - (s_2^2(\theta) - u_2^2(\theta)) + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\theta), u(\theta))}{(s_1(\theta) + u_1(\theta))^2 + (s_2(\theta) + u_2(\theta))^2 + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\theta), u(\theta))} = -\frac{\mu^\nu + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{19\nu-3}{8}} \right)}{\mu^\nu + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{19\nu-3}{8}} \right)} \\
&= -1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right), \\
p_2(\theta) &= \frac{(s_1(\theta) + u_1(\theta))(u_2(\theta) - s_2(\theta)) + (s_2(\theta) + u_2(\theta))(u_1(\theta) - s_1(\theta)) + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\theta), u(\theta))}{(s_1(\theta) + u_1(\theta))^2 + (s_2(\theta) + u_2(\theta))^2 + \mathcal{O}_6(s(\theta), u(\theta))} \\
&= \frac{\mu^{\frac{\nu}{2}} \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{3(5\nu-1)}{8}} \right)}{\mu^\nu + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{19\nu-3}{8}} \right)} = \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the tangent vector

$$\partial_\theta \gamma_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) = (\partial_\theta q_\infty^{u,>}(\theta), \partial_\theta p_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)) = (q'_1(\theta), q'_2(\theta), p'_1(\theta), p'_2(\theta))$$

is obtained from (D.13) and (D.14) as

$$\begin{aligned} q'_1(\theta) &= \mu^\nu \left(\sin \theta + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right), & q'_2(\theta) &= \mu^\nu \left(\cos \theta + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right), \\ p'_1(\theta) &= \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right), & p'_2(\theta) &= \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We apply the change Υ^{-1} in (3.15) on the curve $\gamma_\infty^{u,>}$ in (D.15) to express it in coordinates (θ, Θ) as a graph of the form

$$\gamma_\infty^{u,>} = \left\{ (\theta, \Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)) : \theta \in (\theta_- - \iota, \theta_- + \iota) \right\},$$

where $\Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) &= q_1(\theta)p_2(\theta) - q_2(\theta)p_1(\theta) = \mu^\nu \left(\sin \theta + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}} \right) \right), \\ \partial_\theta \Theta_\infty^{u,>}(\theta) &= q'_1(\theta)p_2(\theta) + q_1(\theta)p'_2(\theta) - q'_2(\theta)p_1(\theta) - q_2(\theta)p'_1(\theta) = \mu^\nu \left(\cos \theta + \mathcal{O} \left(\mu^{\frac{11\nu-3}{8}}, \mu^{1-3\nu} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof.

References

- [1] V.M. Alekseev. “Final motions in the three-body problem and symbolic dynamics”. In: *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 36.4(220) (1981), pp. 161–176, 248. ISSN: 0042-1316.
- [2] V.M. Alekseev. “Quasirandom dynamical systems”. In: *Mat. Zametki* 6 (1969), pp. 489–498. ISSN: 0025-567X.
- [3] V.M. Alekseev. “Quasirandom dynamical systems. II. One-dimensional nonlinear vibrations in a periodically perturbed field”. In: *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* 77(119) (1968), pp. 545–601. ISSN: 0368-8666.
- [4] V.M. Alekseev. “Quasirandom dynamical systems. III. Quasirandom vibrations of one-dimensional oscillators”. In: *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* 78(120) (1969), pp. 3–50. ISSN: 0368-8666.
- [5] V.I. Arnold, V.V. Kozlov, and A.I. Neishtadt. *Mathematical aspects of classical and celestial mechanics*. Third. Vol. 3. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences. [Dynamical systems. III], Translated from the Russian original by E. Khukhro. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, pp. xiv+518. ISBN: 978-3-540-28246-4; 3-540-28246-7.
- [6] S.V. Bolotin. “Shadowing chains of collision orbits for the elliptic 3-body problem”. In: *SPT 2004—Symmetry and perturbation theory*. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2005, pp. 51–58. ISBN: 981-256-136-6. DOI: [10.1142/9789812702142_0007](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812702142_0007). URL: https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812702142_0007.
- [7] S.V. Bolotin and R.S. MacKay. “Nonplanar second species periodic and chaotic trajectories for the circular restricted three-body problem”. In: *Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom.* 94.4 (2006), pp. 433–449. ISSN: 0923-2958, 1572-9478. DOI: [10.1007/s10569-006-9006-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10569-006-9006-0). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10569-006-9006-0>.
- [8] S.V. Bolotin and R.S. Mackay. “Periodic and chaotic trajectories of the second species for the n -centre problem”. In: *Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom.* 77.1 (2000), pp. 49–75. ISSN: 0923-2958, 1572-9478. DOI: [10.1023/A:1008393706818](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008393706818). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008393706818>.
- [9] Sergey V. Bolotin and Piero Negrini. “Variational approach to second species periodic solutions of Poincaré of the 3 body problem”. In: *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems* 33.3 (2013), pp. 1009–1032. ISSN: 1078-0947. DOI: [10.3934/dcds.2013.33.1009](https://doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2013.33.1009). URL: <https://www.aimscolleges.org/article/id/f5fae5cd-4a05-477c-8a62-559001fd734a>.
- [10] M.J. Capiński, S. Kepley, and J.D. Mireles. “Computer assisted proofs for transverse collision and near collision orbits in the restricted three body problem”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 366 (2023), pp. 132–191. ISSN: 0022-0396, 1090-2732. DOI: [10.1016/j.jde.2023.03.053](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2023.03.053). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2023.03.053>.

[11] M.J. Capiński and A. Pasiut. *Oscillatory collision approach in the Earth-Moon restricted three body problem*. 2024. DOI: doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.12386. arXiv: 2401.12386. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.12386>.

[12] A. Chenciner and J. Llibre. “A note on the existence of invariant punctured tori in the planar circular restricted three-body problem”. In: *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 8* (1988), pp. 63–72. ISSN: 0143-3857,1469-4417. DOI: [10.1017/S0143385700009330](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385700009330). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385700009330>.

[13] A. Delshams et al. “Global instability in the restricted planar elliptic three body problem”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 366.3 (2019), pp. 1173–1228. ISSN: 0010-3616,1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-018-3248-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-018-3248-z). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-018-3248-z>.

[14] R.L. Devaney. “Triple collision in the planar isosceles three-body problem”. In: *Invent. Math.* 60.3 (1980), pp. 249–267. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: [10.1007/BF01390017](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01390017). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01390017>.

[15] M.S. ElBialy. “Triple collisions in the isosceles three body problem with small mass ratio”. In: *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* 40.5 (1989), pp. 645–664. ISSN: 0044-2275,1420-9039. DOI: [10.1007/BF00945869](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00945869). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00945869>.

[16] J. Féjoz. “Averaging the planar three-body problem in the neighborhood of double inner collisions”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 175.1 (2001), pp. 175–187. ISSN: 0022-0396,1090-2732. DOI: [10.1006/jdeq.2000.3972](https://doi.org/10.1006/jdeq.2000.3972). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jdeq.2000.3972>.

[17] J. Féjoz. “Quasiperiodic motions in the planar three-body problem”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 183.2 (2002), pp. 303–341. ISSN: 0022-0396,1090-2732. DOI: [10.1006/jdeq.2001.4117](https://doi.org/10.1006/jdeq.2001.4117). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jdeq.2001.4117>.

[18] S. Fleischer and A. Knauf. “Improbability of collisions in n-body systems”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 234 (2019), pp. 1007–1039.

[19] S. Fleischer and A. Knauf. “Improbability of wandering orbits passing through a sequence of Poincaré surfaces of decreasing size”. In: *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 231 (2019), pp. 1781–1800.

[20] Joaquim Font, Ana Nunes, and Carles Simó. “Consecutive quasi-collisions in the planar circular RTBP”. In: *Nonlinearity* 15.1 (2001), p. 115.

[21] M. Guardia, V. Kaloshin, and J. Zhang. “Asymptotic density of collision orbits in the restricted circular planar 3 body problem”. In: *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 233.2 (2019), pp. 799–836. ISSN: 0003-9527,1432-0673. DOI: [10.1007/s00205-019-01368-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-019-01368-7). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-019-01368-7>.

[22] M. Guardia, P. Martín, and T. M-Seara. “Oscillatory motions for the restricted planar circular three body problem”. In: *Invent. Math.* 203.2 (2016), pp. 417–492. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: [10.1007/s00222-015-0591-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-015-0591-y). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-015-0591-y>.

[23] M. Guardia et al. “Hyperbolic dynamics and oscillatory motions in the 3 Body Problem”. In: (July 2022). DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2207.14351](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2207.14351).

[24] Marcel Guardia et al. “Oscillatory orbits in the restricted elliptic planar three body problem”. In: *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 37.1 (2017), pp. 229–256. ISSN: 1078-0947,1553-5231. DOI: [10.3934/dcds.2017009](https://doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2017009). URL: <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2017009>.

[25] E.A. Lacomba and J. Llibre. “Transversal ejection-collision orbits for the restricted problem and the Hill’s problem with applications”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 74.1 (1988), pp. 69–85. ISSN: 0022-0396,1090-2732. DOI: [10.1016/0022-0396\(88\)90019-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(88)90019-8). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396\(88\)90019-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(88)90019-8).

[26] E.A. Lacomba and L. Losco. “Triple collisions in the isosceles 3-body problem”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 3.1 (1980), pp. 710–714. ISSN: 0273-0979,1088-9485. DOI: [10.1090/S0273-0979-1980-14802-8](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0273-0979-1980-14802-8). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0273-0979-1980-14802-8>.

[27] José Lamas, Marcel Guardia, and Tere M. Seara. “Oscillatory Motions, Parabolic Orbits and Collision Orbits in the Planar Circular Restricted Three-Body Problem”. In: *Communications in Math-*

ematical Physics 406.5 (Apr. 2025), p. 106. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-025-05283-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-025-05283-9). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-025-05283-9>.

[28] T. Levi-Civita. “Sur la régularisation du problème des trois corps”. In: *Acta Math.* 42.1 (1920), pp. 99–144. ISSN: 0001-5962,1871-2509. DOI: [10.1007/BF02404404](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02404404). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02404404>.

[29] J. Llibre. “On the restricted three-body problem when the mass parameter is small”. In: *Celestial Mech.* 28.1-2 (1982), pp. 83–105. ISSN: 0008-8714. DOI: [10.1007/BF01230662](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01230662). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01230662>.

[30] J. Llibre and C. Simó. “Oscillatory solutions in the planar restricted three-body problem”. In: *Math. Ann.* 248.2 (1980), pp. 153–184. ISSN: 0025-5831,1432-1807. DOI: [10.1007/BF01421955](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01421955). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01421955>.

[31] P. Lochak, J.P. Marco, and D. Sauzin. *On the splitting of invariant manifolds in multidimensional near-integrable Hamiltonian systems*. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.

[32] T. M-Seara et al. “Generalized analytical results on n -ejection-collision orbits in the RTBP. Analysis of bifurcations”. In: *J. Nonlinear Sci.* 33.1 (2023), Paper No. 17, 53. ISSN: 0938-8974,1432-1467. DOI: [10.1007/s00332-022-09873-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00332-022-09873-y). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00332-022-09873-y>.

[33] J.P. Marco and L. Niederman. “Sur la construction des solutions de seconde espèce dans le problème plan restreint des trois corps”. In: *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.* 62.3 (1995), pp. 211–249. ISSN: 0246-0211. URL: http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPA_1995__62_3_211_0.

[34] R. McGehee. “A stable manifold theorem for degenerate fixed points with applications to celestial mechanics”. In: *J. Differential Equations* 14 (1973), pp. 70–88. ISSN: 0022-0396,1090-2732. DOI: [10.1016/0022-0396\(73\)90077-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(73)90077-6). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396\(73\)90077-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(73)90077-6).

[35] R. McGehee. “Parabolic orbits in the three-body problem”. In: *Dynamical Systems*. Ed. by M.M. Peixoto. Academic Press, New York, 1973, pp. 249–254.

[36] R. McGehee. “Triple collision in the collinear three-body problem”. In: *Invent. Math.* 27 (1974), pp. 191–227. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: [10.1007/BF01390175](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01390175). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01390175>.

[37] R. Moeckel. “Chaotic dynamics near triple collision”. In: *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 107.1 (1989), pp. 37–69. ISSN: 0003-9527. DOI: [10.1007/BF00251426](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00251426). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00251426>.

[38] R. Moeckel. “Orbits of the three-body problem which pass infinitely close to triple collision”. In: *Amer. J. Math.* 103.6 (1981), pp. 1323–1341. ISSN: 0002-9327,1080-6377. DOI: [10.2307/2374233](https://doi.org/10.2307/2374233). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2374233>.

[39] R. Moeckel. “Symbolic dynamics in the planar three-body problem”. In: *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.* 12.5 (2007), pp. 449–475. ISSN: 1560-3547,1468-4845. DOI: [10.1134/S1560354707050012](https://doi.org/10.1134/S1560354707050012). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1560354707050012>.

[40] J. Moser. *Stable and random motions in dynamical systems: With special emphasis on celestial mechanics*. Vol. 1. Princeton university press, 2001.

[41] M. Ollé, O. Rodríguez, and J. Soler. “Analytical and numerical results on families of n -ejection-collision orbits in the RTBP”. In: *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.* 90 (2020), pp. 105294, 27. ISSN: 1007-5704,1878-7274. DOI: [10.1016/j.cnsns.2020.105294](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnsns.2020.105294). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnsns.2020.105294>.

[42] Mercè Ollé, Óscar Rodríguez, and Jaume Soler. “Ejection-collision orbits in the RTBP”. In: *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation* 55 (2018), pp. 298–315.

[43] J. Paradela and S. Terracini. *Oscillatory Motions in the Restricted 3-body Problem: A functional analytic approach*. 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2212.05684](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.05684).

[44] Henri Poincaré. *Les méthodes nouvelles de la mécanique céleste: tome III Invariants intégraux. Solutions périodiques du deuxième genre. Solutions doublement asymptotiques*. Librairie Albert Blanchard, 1987.

- [45] D.G. Saari. “Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 162 (1971), 267–271, erratum, ibid. **168 (1972)**, 521. ISSN: 0002-9947,1088-6850. DOI: [10.2307/1995752](https://doi.org/10.2307/1995752). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1995752>.
- [46] D.G. Saari. “Improbability of collisions in Newtonian gravitational systems. II”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 181 (1973), pp. 351–368. ISSN: 0002-9947,1088-6850. DOI: [10.2307/1996638](https://doi.org/10.2307/1996638). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1996638>.
- [47] D. Sauzin. “A new method for measuring the splitting of invariant manifolds”. In: *Annales scientifiques de l'Ecole normale supérieure*. Vol. 34. 2. 2001, pp. 159–221.
- [48] C. Simó. “Analysis of triple collision in the isosceles problem”. In: *Classical mechanics and dynamical systems (Medford, Mass., 1979)*. Vol. 70. Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math. Dekker, New York, 1981, pp. 203–224. ISBN: 0-8247-1529-2.
- [49] K. Sitnikov. “The existence of oscillatory motions in the three-body problems”. In: *Soviet Physics Dokl., Soviet Physics. Doklady. A translation of the physics sections of Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR* 5 (1960), pp. 647–650.
- [50] L. Zhao. “Quasi-periodic almost-collision orbits in the spatial three-body problem”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 68.12 (2015), pp. 2144–2176. ISSN: 0010-3640,1097-0312. DOI: [10.1002/cpa.21539](https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.21539). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.21539>.