arXiv:2406.00910v2 [math.DS] 4 Jun 2024

STABILITY OF PHASE DIAGRAM FOR A GRADIENT ODE WITH MEMORY

PIOTR KALITA, PIOTR ZGLICZYŃSKI

Abstract. We consider the problem governed by the gradient ODE $x' = \nabla F(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ on which we assume that it has a finite number of hyperbolic equilibria whose stable and unstable manifolds intersect transversally. This problem is perturbed by the memory term $x'(t) = \nabla F(x(t)) + \varepsilon \int_{-\infty}^{t} M(t-s)x(s)ds$ where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small constant. The key result is that the structure of connections between the equlibria of the unperturbed problem is exactly preserved for a small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Contents

1. Introduction. 2
2. The weighted history space and its norm. 4
3. Problem setup 5
4. Further properties of the weighted history norm. 11
5. Continuation of Lyapunov functions and isolating blocks with cone conditions. 12
5.1. Lyapunov function for the problem with delay. 12
5.2. The continuation of the isolating block 14
5.3. Cone condition 17
6. Equilibria and their nonexpansion in the limit 22
7. Continuation of the intersection of manifolds. 24
8. Appendix 1: Asymptotic compactness 33
9. Appendix 2: Graph transform for existence of local stable and unstable manifolds. 35
10. Appendix 3: C^0 dependence of local unstable and stable manifolds on parameter. 39
10.1. Cone condition with parameter 39
10.2. Lipshitz continuous dependence of local unstable manifolds on parameter 40
10.3. Lipshitz continuous dependence of local stable manifolds on parameter 41
11. Appendix 4: C^1 smoothness of local stable and unstable manifolds 42
11.1. Fibre contraction theorem 42
11.2. Cone condition 43
11.3. Fixed point procedure for unstable manifold and its derivative 44
11.4. Fixed point argument for construction of the stable manifold and its derivative 50
12. Appendix 5: Verification of conditions from Appendix 4. 56
13. Appendix 6. Continuity of derivatives of stable and unstable manifolds on parameter. 59
13.1. Graph transform for the unstable manifold. 59
13.2. Graph transform for the stable manifold. 61
References 61

This work was supported by National Science Center (NCN) of Poland under project No. UMO2016/22/A/ST1/00077. Work of PK was also partially supported by Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación of Kingdom of Spain under project No. PID2021-122991NB-C21.

1. Introduction.

This paper deals with the gradient ordinary differential equation in $\mathbb{R}^d$

$$x'(t) = \nabla F(x(t)) \text{ for } F \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{1}$$

and its perturbation by the linear memory term though which the derivative of the unknown solution depends not only on the instantaneous value of this solution but also on its past values

$$x'(t) = \nabla F(x(t)) + \varepsilon \int_{-\infty}^{t} M(t-s)x(s)\,ds. \tag{2}$$

Because of the presence of the distributed delay term, if we study the flow governed by (2), we need to consider it in an infinite dimensional space, containing functions defined in the time interval from minus infinity to the current time instance.

We make the following assumptions on the functions $F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $M : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$:

(1) There exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(x) \le -\gamma|x|^2 + \delta$, cf. (6).
(2) The unperturbed equation (1) has finite number of equilibria, all of them being hyperbolic, and their stable and unstable manifolds intersect transversally.
(3) There exists a function $A \in C^1([0,\infty); \mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$ with $A(s)$ being symmetric and positive definite matrix for every $s \ge 0$ such that
   (A) For almost every $s > 0$ and for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have
   $$\left(\frac{dA(s)}{ds}x, x\right) \le -C(A(s)x, x),$$
   with a constant $C > 0$ cf. Assumption 2.1.
   (B) For every $s \ge 0$ we have
   $$\frac{\lambda_{max}(A(s))}{\lambda_{min}(A(s))} \le D,$$
   with a constant $D > 0$, cf. Assumption 2.3,

and

$$\|M(s)\| \le E\lambda_{min}(A(s)),$$

with $\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds$ symmetric.

The function A, which by (3)(A) must decay exponentially to zero as $t \to \infty$, defines the phase for the memory term, it is the space

$$L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d = \left\{\eta : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, \int_0^\infty (A(s)\eta(s), \eta(s))\,ds < \infty\right\}.$$

Now, the equation (1) defines the gradient dynamical system $S^0(t) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ for $t \ge 0$. This dynamical system has a global attractor which consists of the finite number of equilibria and their connections. It structure is represented as a graph of partial order, the vertexes of this graph correspond to the equilibria of the system. An edge from e_i to e_j exists in this graph it there exists a bounded solution of (1) which converges to e_i as time tends to minus infinity and to e_j as time tends to plus infinity.

Now, the problem governed by (2) defines a dynamical system for $\varepsilon > 0$ denoted as $S^\varepsilon(t) : L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where the space $\mathbb{R}^d$ contains the current state of the system, and $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ its past. This system for $\varepsilon > 0$ is infinite dimensional. The main result of the paper is the following theorem

Theorem 1.1. *Assume (1)–(3) above. There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ the dynamical system governed by* (2) *has a global attractor consisting of a finite number of equilibria and their connections. The graph that represents this system coincides with the graph for the unperturbed finite dimensional system $\{S^0(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$.*

The result is perturbative in its nature, i.e., it assumes that $\varepsilon > 0$ is small. It states that for such small ε we can fully determine the structure of the global attractor consisting of the equilibria and their connections which coincide with that of the unperturbed problem.

The question is motivated by the results of [2]. There, the authors consider the infinite dimensional autonomous gradient dynamical system and they prove that upon small non-autonomous perturbation the structure of its attractor is preserved, that is the phase diagram of the non-autonomous dynamics coincides with the autonomous one. Thus, the authors in [2] are able to fully characterize the non-autonomous dynamics for the problem which is small perturbation of the autonomous one (see also [1] for a similar result where the small perturbation is autonomous, but not C^1 - only Lipschitz). Our result is of similar nature as [1, 2], but our main contribution stands in the fact that the unperturbed system is finite-dimensional and the perturbed one - infinite dimensional.

The proof that the structure of connections is exactly preserved upon perturbation consists of three ingredients:

(A) the equilibria of the perturbed problem exist in the vicinity of the equilibria of the original one, and that these are all equilibria,
(B) no new connections arise when $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e. the connections structure behaves upper-semi-continuously,
(C) the existing connections are preserved upon perturbation, i.e. the connections structure behaves lower-semicontinuously.

Fundamental ingredient in the proofs of these items is the fact, obtained in Section 5, that certain dynamical properties of the unperturbed problem can be continued for $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular it is possible to construct the common Lyapunov function for $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$. Moreover, we construct sets which isolate the equilibria of (1), which after taking the Cartesian product with a certain ball in the memory space $L^2_A(R^+)^d$ also isolate the equilibria of (2) with entry and exit behavior on the boundary being uniform with respect to $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$. We prove that the new, infinite dimensional variable $\eta \in L^2_A(R^+)^d$ can be bundled together with the stable variables in the finite dimensional state $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Finally, we prove that the cone condition holds in these sets with the same system of coordinates and the same quadratic form in the range of small $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$. This opens the possibility of using the Hadamard's graph transform procedure to construct the local stable and unstable manifolds of the equilibria as the Lipschitz graphs over the same systems of coordinates in the considered range of ε. The above assertion (A) follows from the construction of common isolating sets with the cone condition, and (B) follows from the compactness argument (similar as in [2]), these results are contained in Section 6. To get the most involved result (C), we need to prove that the local stable and unstable manifolds are actually C^1 close to each other in dependence on ε. We prove this by differentiation of the graph transform. Moreover, we transport the smallness of C^1 distance between the local unstable manifolds along the flow in order to prove that the transversality of the intersection implies that this intersection is preserved upon the perturbation. This result is contained in Section 7.

The fact that the norm of the memory term is weighted by the expression that decays exponentially to zero is a fundamental fact which allows us to treat the memory variable as the stable variable in the neighbourhood of the equilibrium. The key result here is the dissipative estimate (18) on the time evolution of the norm of memory variable which is obtained in Section 4. This estimate is derived using the concept from the seminal paper of Dafermos [6], who proved that in the linear problem of viscoelasticity the memory term is dissipative and has damping effect on the solution, which decays to zero due to this term's presence. Discoveries of Dafermos were later used in the context of global attractors for the nonlinear problem of viscoelasticity by Conti and Pata [4], who explored the dissipative nature of the memory term to obtain the existence of the global attractor. Dissipativity of the memory term in the context of global attractors has also been explored for the first order, reaction-diffusion type, problems in [5, 9, 10]. All these results,

however are of global nature. The novel contribution of this paper, is the exploitation of the dissipative nature of the memory term in the local argument realized in the neighbourhood of the equilibria and its application to recover the full intrinsic structure of the global attractor.

2. The weighted history space and its norm.

Let $A : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ be a time dependent matrix function. This function will define the norm. Assumptions 2.1, 2.3 on the function A and assumption 2.5 on related matrix function M will be standing assumptions throughout the whole article.

Assumption 2.1. *Assume that $A(s)$ is a symmetric and positive definite matrix for $s \geq 0$, $[0,\infty) \ni s \mapsto A(s)$ belongs to $C^1([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$ and that for almost every $s > 0$ and every $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\left(\frac{dA(s)}{ds}u, u\right) \leq -C(A(s)u, u).$$

Lemma 2.2. *Under Assumption 2.1 we have*

$$\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\, ds < \infty$$

Proof. We have

$$e^{Cs}\frac{d}{ds}(A(s)u, u) + Ce^{Cs}(A(s)u, u) \leq 0,$$

for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence

$$\frac{d}{ds}(e^{Cs}(A(s)u, u)) \leq 0,$$

and

$$e^{Cs}(A(s)u, u) \leq (A(0)u, u).$$

Finally

$$(A(s)u, u) \leq e^{-Cs}(A(0)u, u),$$

for every $s \geq 0$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$. As $A(s)$ is symmetric and positively definite then for every s we can find a vector $u(s)$ with norm one such that

$$\|A(s)\| = (A(s)u(s), u(s)) \leq e^{-Cs}(A(0)u(s), u(s)) \leq \|A(0)\|e^{-Cs},$$

and the assertion follows. □

We define the space $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ with the norm $\|\eta\|^2 = \int_0^\infty (A(s)\eta(s), \eta(s))\, ds$.

Assumption 2.3. *Assume that for some constant $\overline{D} > 0$ and every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$*

$$\|A(s)\|\, |x|^2 \leq \overline{D}^2(A(s)x, x). \tag{3}$$

In other words

$$\frac{\lambda_{max}(A(s))}{\lambda_{min}(A(s))} \leq \overline{D}^2 \quad \textit{for every} \quad s \geq 0.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 for every $\eta \in L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$*

$$\left|\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta(s)\, ds\right| \leq \left(\overline{D}\sqrt{\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\, ds}\right)\|\eta\| := D\|\eta\|.$$

Proof.

$$\left|\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta(s)\,ds\right|^2 \le \left(\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\,|\eta(s)|\,ds\right)^2.$$

By the Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta(s)\,ds\right|^2 &\le \left(\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\|A(s)\|}\sqrt{\|A(s)\|}|\eta(s)|\,ds\right)^2\\ &\le \int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\,ds\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\||\eta(s)|^2\,ds \le \overline{D}^2\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\,ds\int_0^\infty (A(s)\eta(s),\eta(s))\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. □

Now consider the function $M:[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$. Make the following assumption

Assumption 2.5. *Assume that for every $s\ge 0$*

$$\|M(s)\| \le \overline{C_1}^2\lambda_{min}(A(s)),$$

with a constant $\overline{C_1}>0$ and

$$\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds \text{ is symmetric.}$$

The next result holds analogously to Lemma 2.4

Lemma 2.6. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.5 we have*

$$\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds<\infty$$

and

$$\left|\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta(s)\,ds\right| \le C_1\|\eta\| \quad \text{for every} \quad \eta\in L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d,$$

for every $\eta\in L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$, where $C_1=\overline{C_1}\sqrt{\int_0^\infty\|M(s)\|\,ds}$.

An example of $A(s)$ which satisfies the above assumptions is $A(s)=e^{-\kappa s}I$. Then $C=\kappa$, $\overline{D}=1$, and we need, in addition to the symmetry of the integral of M that

$$\|M(s)\|\le \overline{C_1}^2 e^{-\kappa s}.$$

3. Problem setup

We consider the following ODE

$$x'(t)=f(x(t)) \quad \text{where} \quad f\in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{4}$$

We assume that the ODE has a gradient form, i.e.

$$f(x)=\nabla F(x) \text{ where } F\in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{5}$$

Moreover we assume that there exist constants $\gamma>0$ and $\delta\in\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$F(x)\le -\gamma|x|^2+\delta, \tag{6}$$

We perturb the above ODE with the additive linear distributed delay term with a multiplicative parameter $\varepsilon>0$. This yields the equation

$$x'(t)=f(x(t))+\varepsilon\int_{-\infty}^t M(t-s)x(s)\,ds, \tag{7}$$

where $M(s)=\{M_{ij}(s)\}_{i,j=1}^d$ is a time dependent matrix.

Rearranging, we obtain

$$x'(t) = f(x(t)) + \varepsilon \int_{-\infty}^{t} M(t-s)(x(s) - x(t) + x(t))\,ds$$
$$= f(x(t)) + \varepsilon \left(\int_{-\infty}^{t} M(t-s)\,ds \right) x(t) + \varepsilon \int_{-\infty}^{t} M(t-s)(x(s) - x(t))\,ds.$$

This motivates the system

$$x'(t) = f(x(t)) + \varepsilon \left(\int_{0}^{\infty} M(s)\,ds \right) x(t) + \varepsilon \int_{-\infty}^{t} M(t-s)(x(s) - x(t))\,ds,$$

or

$$x'(t) = f^{\varepsilon}(x(t)) + \varepsilon \int_{0}^{\infty} M(s)(x(t-s) - x(t))\,ds = f^{\varepsilon}(x(t)) + \varepsilon \int_{0}^{\infty} M(s)\eta^{t}(s)\,ds, \tag{8}$$

where $\eta^t : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as $\eta^t(s) = x(t-s) - x(t)$, or, more specifically

$$\eta^{t}(s) = \begin{cases} x(t-s) - x(t) \ \text{ for } \ s \le t \\ x(t-s) - x(t) = x_0 + \eta^0(s-t) - x(t) \ \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

and $f^{\varepsilon}(x) = f(x) + \varepsilon \left(\int_0^{\infty} M(s)\,ds \right) x$.

While we skip the standard argument on the existence of global solution for every initial data $(\eta^0, x_0) \in L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times R^d$, which follows from the fact that f is locally Lipschitz, and from the Lyapunov function (24), we prove the Lipschitz continuous dependence on the initial data. Before we pass to this result we prove the boundedness of the solution.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume* (5) *and* (6). *Then if only*

$$\varepsilon \int_{0}^{\infty} \|M(s)\|\,ds < 2\gamma, \tag{10}$$

then every solution is bounded uniformly on bounded sets of initial data.

Proof. From the Lyapunov function (23) we obtain that

$$E\|\eta^t\|^2 - 2F(x(t)) - \varepsilon \left(\int_0^{\infty} M(s)\,ds x(t), x(t) \right) \le E\|\eta^0\|^2 - 2F(x_0) - \varepsilon \left(\int_0^{\infty} M(s)\,ds x_0, x_0 \right) \le C(|x_0|, \|\eta^0\|),$$

where $C(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a continuous function independent of ε, that may change from line to line. This means that

$$E\|\eta^t\|^2 + 2\gamma|x(t)|^2 \le C(|x_0|, \|\eta^0\|) + \varepsilon \int_0^{\infty} \|M(s)\|\,ds |x(s)|^2,$$

which immediately yields the assertion of the lemma. □

Lemma 3.2. *Assume* (5) *and* (6). *There exists* ε_0 *such that for every* $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ *if* $(\eta^t, x(t))$ *and* $(\xi^t, x(t))$ *are two solutions with the initial data* (η^0, x_0) *and* (ξ^0, y_0), *respectively, then for every* $T > 0$ *there exists a constant* $L(T)$ *such that for every* $t \in [0, T]$ *we have*

$$|x(t) - y(t)| + \|\eta^t - \xi^t\| \le L(T)(|x_0 - y_0| + \|\eta^0 - \xi^0\|).$$

Proof. In the proof by D we will denote constants (which can vary from line to line) dependent on the initial data for both problems and by C_i constants independent on these data. Subtracting (8) for the two solutions we obtain

$$(x(t) - y(t))' = f(x(t)) - f(y(t)) + \varepsilon \int_0^{\infty} M(s)\,ds (x(t) - y(t)) + \varepsilon \int_0^{\infty} M(s)(\eta^t(s) - \xi^t(s))\,ds.$$

From Lemma 3.1 we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt}|x(t) - y(t)| \le D|x(t) - y(t)| + C_1\|\eta^t - \xi^t\|. \tag{11}$$

From Lemma 4.2 we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|^2+C_2\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|^2\le C_3\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|\ \|(x(t)-y(t))'\|.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|+C_1\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|\le D\ \|x(t)-y(t)\|+C_3\varepsilon\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|,$$

and choosing $\varepsilon>0$ small enough (this choice in independent on the initial data), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|\le D\ \|x(t)-y(t)\|.$$

This inequality, together with (11) yield the assertion of the Lemma. □

The question which we address in the remaining part of the article is the following. Assume that $x'=f(x)$ is a Morse–Smale system. The Morse–Smale property in our case means that the vector field f has a finite number of hyperbolic equilibria such that the intersections of stable and unstable manifolds are transversal. If $\varepsilon>0$ is small, can we say that the problem with distributed memory has the same structure of the global attractor as the ODE?

The families of maps $\{S_\varepsilon(t)\}_{t\ge0}: L^2_A(R^+)^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\to L^2_A(R^+)^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ denote the semiflows the govern the solutions of the problem (8).

We prove that assumptions (5) and (6) imply that for $\varepsilon\in[0,\varepsilon_0]$ problems have global attractors $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon\subset L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\bigcup_{\varepsilon\in[0,\varepsilon_0)}\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon\quad\text{is bounded in } L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d\times\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{12}$$

We will restrict the analysis of the dynamics to these sets.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume* (5) *and* (6). *Then there exists* ε_0 *such that for every* $\varepsilon\in[0,\varepsilon_0]$ *the problems governed by* (8)-(9) *have global attractors* $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$, *that satisfy* (12).

Proof. We are in position to use Lemma 8.1 to deduce that for every bounded set $\mathcal{B}\subset L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ its ω-limit set $\omega(\mathcal{B})$ is nonempty, compact and attracts $\mathcal{B}$ in the sense of Hausdorff semidistance in $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

The argument now follows the lines of the proof of Theorem A.3 in [4]. Now the set of equilibria is denoted as $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ and for every equilibrium $\eta=0$, while x belongs to the isolating set around the equilibrium for $\varepsilon=0$. Lemma 8.1 as well as the existence of the Lyapunov function imply that for every initial data (η^0,x_0) we can find an equilibrium $(0,x^*)$ such that $S_\varepsilon(t)(\eta^0,x_0)\to(0,x^*)$ as $t\to\infty$. Denote the Lyapunov function as

$$L_\varepsilon(x,\eta)=E\|\eta\|^2-F(x)-\varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds x,x\right), \tag{13}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon=\left\{(x,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d\ :\ L_\varepsilon(x,\eta)<\max_{(y,\xi)\in\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon}L_\varepsilon(y,\xi)+1\right\}.$$

The set $\bigcup_{\varepsilon\in[0,\varepsilon_0]}\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ is bounded.

If we fix $\mathcal{B}$, then there exists time $t^*(\mathcal{B})$ such that $S_\varepsilon(t)\omega(\mathcal{B})\subset\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ for $t\ge t^*$. Indeed, by continuity of $S_\varepsilon(t)$ for every $p\in\omega(\mathcal{B})$ there exists a neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}_p$ and t_p such that for $S_\varepsilon(t_p)\mathcal{U}_p\subset\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$. As $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ is positively invariant the inclusion $S_\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{U}_p\subset\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ holds for every $t\ge t_p$. Sets $\{\mathcal{U}_p\}_{p\in\omega(\mathcal{B})}$ are open cover of $\omega(\mathcal{B})$. We extract finite subcover, $\{\mathcal{U}_{p_n}\}_{n=1}^N$ whereas $t^*=\max\{t_{p_1},\dots,t_{p_n}\}$. Since there exists a function $\psi(t)>0$ such that $\lim_{t\to\infty}\operatorname{dist}_{\mathbb{R}^d\times L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}(S_\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{B},\omega(\mathcal{B}))\le\lim_{t\to\infty}\psi(t)=0$, for every t and $(x,\eta)\in\mathcal{B}$ there exists $k(t)\in\omega(\mathcal{B})$ and $q(t)$ such that $S_\varepsilon(t)(x,\eta)=k(t)+q(t)$ and $\|q(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d\times L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}\le 2\psi(t)$. Now $S_\varepsilon(t+t^*)(x,\eta)=S_\varepsilon(t^*)k(t)+S_\varepsilon(t^*)(k(t)+q(t))-S_\varepsilon(t^*)k(t)$ and $S_\varepsilon(t^*)k(t)\in\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$. Moreover

$S_\varepsilon(t^*)$ is continuous and hence it is uniformly continuous in a neighbourhood of a compact set, and hence for t large enough

$$\|S_\varepsilon(t^*)(k(t)+q(t)) - S_\varepsilon(t^*)k(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d\times L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d} \le 1.$$

This means that, for t large enough $S_\varepsilon(t+t^*)(x,\eta)$ belongs to the ball centered at zero and with radius $\sup_{(x,\eta)\in\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon}\|(x,\eta)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d\times L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}+1$. Together with Lemma 8.1 it is enough to guarantee the existence of the global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ and the bound (12). □

In the next lemma we compare two solutions for original and variational equations. We always assume that $\varepsilon\in[0,\varepsilon_0]$ with ε_0 being sufficiently small.

Lemma 3.4. *Consider two solutions: one (η,x) of problem with ε_1 with the initial data (η^0,x_0) and another one (ξ,y) of the problem with ε_2 with the initial data (ξ^0,y_0). Then*

$$|x(t)-y(t)| + \|\eta^t-\xi^t\| \le Ce^{Ct}(\|\eta^0-\xi^0\|+|x_0-y_0|+|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|), \tag{14}$$

for every $t\ge 0$ where the constants C dependin on the initial data (η^0,x_0) and (ξ^0,y_0) and are bounded on bounded sets of initial data.

Proof. Then

$$(x(t)-y(t))' = f(x(t))-f(y(t)) + \varepsilon_1\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)(x(t)-y(t)) + (\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2)\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)y(t)$$
$$+\varepsilon_1\int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta^t(s)-\xi^t(s))\,ds + (\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2)\int_0^\infty M(s)\xi^t(s)\,ds.$$

Liapunov function (13) implies that sets $\{\mathrm{conv}\{x(t),y(t)\} \ : \ t\ge 0\}$ and $\{\mathrm{conv}\{\eta^t,\xi^t\} \ : \ t\ge 0\}$ are bounded by constants depending on the initial data of the problem. We denote the generic constant depending on the initial data by C. Applying the norm on the both sides of the above equatiom we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}|x(t)-y(t)| \le C\,|x(t)-y(t)| + C|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2| + C\varepsilon_1\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|.$$

Using (20) it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|^2 + C\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|^2 \le C\|\xi^t-\eta^t\||x'(t)-y'(t)| \le C\|\xi^t-\eta^t\||x(t)-y(t)| + C|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|\|\xi^t-\eta^t\| + C\varepsilon_1\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|^2.$$

After straightforward calculations, and for sufficiently small ε_0,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t-\xi^t\| \le C|x(t)-y(t)| + C|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|,$$

whence

$$\frac{d}{dt}(|x(t)-y(t)| + \|\eta^t-\xi^t\|) \le C\,(|x(t)-y(t)| + \|\eta^t-\xi^t\|) + C|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|,$$

which yields the assertion of the lemma. □

In the next lemma we characterize the derivative of the flow with respect to the initial data

Lemma 3.5. *Consider the mapping $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d\times\mathbb{R}^d \ni (\eta^0,x_0)\mapsto(\eta(t),x_t) = S^\varepsilon(t)(\eta^0,x_0)$ defining the solutions of (8)–(9). The mapping $S^\varepsilon(t)$ is Fréchet differentiable and its derivative at (η^0,x_0) is defined as the linear mapping that assigns to (ξ^0,w_0) the solution of the variational problem*

$$w'(t) = Df(x(t))w(t) + \varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)w(t) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)\theta^t(s)\,ds. \tag{15}$$

$$\theta^t(s) = \begin{cases} w(t-s)-w(t) & \text{for } s\le t \\ w_0+\xi^0(s-t)-w(t) & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{16}$$

$w(0)=w_0$, $\theta^0=\xi^0$.

Proof. We take two initial conditions $x_0, \overline{x}_0$ and $\eta^0, \overline{\eta}^0$ and call the corresponding solutions $(\eta^t, x(t))$ and $(\overline{\eta}^t, \overline{x}(t))$. Their difference will be called $z(t) = \overline{x}(t) - x(t)$ and $\xi^t = \overline{\eta}^t - \eta^t$. They satisfy the equations

$$z'(t) = f(x(t)+z(t)) - f(x(t)) + \varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)z(t) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)\xi^t(s)\,ds.$$

and

$$\xi^t(s) = \begin{cases} z(t-s) - z(t) & \text{for } s \le t \\ z_0 + \xi^0(s-t) - z(t) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This motivates the definition (15)–(16) of a variational equation with unknowns θ^t and $w(t)$. Denote the difference $z - w = p$ and $\xi^t - \theta^t = \omega^t$. Then

$$p'(t) = f(x(t)+z(t)) - f(x(t)) - Df(x(t))w(t) + \varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)p(t) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)\omega^t(s)\,ds.$$

$$\omega^t(s) = \begin{cases} p(t-s) - p(t) & \text{for } s \le t \\ -p(t) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Rearranging the first equation and using the Taylor formula we obtain

$$p'(t) = Df(x(t))p(t) + \frac{1}{2}D^2 f(x(t)+\lambda(t)z(t))(z(t),z(t)) + \varepsilon\int_0^t M(t-s)p(s)\,ds.$$

Integrating and using the fact that $p(0) = 0$ we obtain

$$|p(t)| \le C\int_0^t |p(s)|ds + C\int_0^t |z(s)|^2\,ds + \varepsilon C\int_0^t\int_0^s |p(r)|\,dr\,ds \le C\int_0^t |z(s)|^2\,ds + C(1+\varepsilon t)\int_0^t |p(s)|\,ds.$$

We need an estimate for $|z(s)|$. We have

$$z'(t) = Df(x(t)+\lambda(t)z(t))z(t) + \varepsilon\int_0^t M(s)z(t-s)\,ds + \varepsilon\int_t^\infty M(s)\,ds z_0 + \varepsilon\int_t^\infty M(s)\xi^0(s-t)\,ds.$$

Rewriting, we obtain

$$z'(t) = Df(x(t)+\lambda(t)z(t))z(t) + \varepsilon\int_0^t M(t-s)z(s)\,ds + \varepsilon\int_t^\infty M(s)\,ds z_0 + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s+t)\xi^0(s)\,ds.$$

Now $x(t)$ is bounded and as is $z(t)$ because $\overline{x}(t)$ is attracted to the attractor and hence also bounded. We obtain

$$|z(t)| \le (1+\varepsilon Ct)|z_0| + \varepsilon Ct\|\xi^0\| + C(1+\varepsilon t)\int_0^t |z(s)|\,ds.$$

By the Gronwall lemma

$$|z(t)| \le ((1+\varepsilon Ct)|z_0| + \varepsilon Ct\|\xi^0\|)e^{Ct(1+\varepsilon t)}.$$

This means that

$$|z(t)|^2 \le g(t)(|z_0|^2 + \|\xi^0\|^2),$$

where by $g(t)$ we denote a generic increasing and continuous function of t. We deduce that

$$|p(t)| \le g(t)(|z_0|^2 + \|\xi^0\|^2) + C(1+\varepsilon t)\int_0^t |p(s)|\,ds.$$

By the Gronwall lemma

$$|p(t)| \le g(t)(|z_0|^2 + \|\xi^0\|^2).$$

Moreover,

$$\|\omega^t\|^2 = \int_0^t (A(s)p(t-s), p(t-s))\,ds - \int_0^\infty (A(s)p(t), p(t))\,ds,$$

this means that

$$\|\omega^t\|^2 \le g(t)\left(|p(t)|^2 + \int_0^t |p(s)|^2\,ds\right).$$

We deduce that

$$\|\omega^t\| \le g(t)(|z_0|^2 + \|\xi^0\|^2).$$

We conclude that

$$\lim_{|z_0|\to 0,\|\xi^0\|\to 0} \frac{|p(t)| + \|\omega^t\|}{|z_0| + \|\xi^0\|} \le \lim_{|z_0|\to 0,\|\xi^0\|\to 0} \frac{g(t)(|z_0|^2 + \|\xi^0\|^2)}{|z_0| + \|\xi^0\|} = 0.$$

This implies the Fréchet differentiability of the flow and the fact that the derivative with respect to the initial data is a solution of the variational equation. □

The following lemma implies the continuous dependence of the derivative with respect to the initial data on the parameter ε on attractors.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $(\eta^{0,\varepsilon_1}, x_0^{\varepsilon_1})$ and $(\eta^{0,\varepsilon_2}, x_0^{\varepsilon_2})$ be the initial data for problems with ε_1 and ε_2, respectively. Moreover, let $(\Theta^{0,\varepsilon_1}, w_0^{\varepsilon_1})$ and $(\Theta^{0,\varepsilon_2}, w_0^{\varepsilon_2})$ be the initial data for the variational problem. Then*

$$\left\| \frac{DS^{\varepsilon_2}(t)(\eta^{0,\varepsilon_2}, x_0^{\varepsilon_2})}{D(\eta, x)}(\Theta^{0,\varepsilon_2}, w_0^{\varepsilon_2}) - \frac{DS^{\varepsilon_1}(t)(\eta^{0,\varepsilon_1}, x_0^{\varepsilon_1})}{D(\eta, x)}(\Theta^{0,\varepsilon_1}, w_0^{\varepsilon_1}) \right\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d}$$
$$\le Ce^{Ct}(|\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1| + |w_0^{\varepsilon_2} - w_0^{\varepsilon_1}| + \|\Theta^{0,\varepsilon_2} - \Theta^{0,\varepsilon_1}\| + |x_0^{\varepsilon_2} - x_0^{\varepsilon_1}| + \|\eta^{0,\varepsilon_2} - \eta^{0,\varepsilon_1}\|),$$

for every $t \ge 0$, where C is non-decreasing in all arguments and bounded on bounded sets.

Proof. Denote

$$\frac{DS^{\varepsilon_i}(t)(\eta^{0,\varepsilon_i}, x_0^{\varepsilon_i})}{D(\eta, x)}(\Theta^{0,\varepsilon_i}, w_0^{\varepsilon_i}) = (\Theta^{\varepsilon_i,t}, w^{\varepsilon_i}(t)).$$

We have

$$\frac{d}{dt}|w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)| \le C|w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)| + \varepsilon_2\|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\|.$$

Moreover, from (18),

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\|^2 + C\|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\|^2 \le C\|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\||(w^{\varepsilon_2})'(t)|.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\| \le C|w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)|,$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}(|w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)| + \|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\|) \le C(|w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)| + \|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\|),$$

whereas

$$|w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)| + \|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\| \le e^{Ct}(|w_0^{\varepsilon_2}| + \|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,0}\|). \tag{17}$$

Now, we have the following equation for the difference between two solutions of variational equations along the equations on attractors

$$(w^{\varepsilon_2}(t) - w^{\varepsilon_1}(t))' = (Df(x^{\varepsilon_2}(t)) - Df(x^{\varepsilon_1}(t)))w^{\varepsilon_2}(t) + Df(x^{\varepsilon_1}(t))(w^{\varepsilon_2}(t) - w^{\varepsilon_1}(t))$$
$$+ (\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1)\int_0^\infty M(s)(s)\,ds w^{\varepsilon_2}(t) + \varepsilon_1\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds(w^{\varepsilon_2}(t) - w^{\varepsilon_1}(t))$$
$$+ (\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1)\int_0^\infty M(s)\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}(s)\,ds + \varepsilon_1\int_0^\infty M(s)(\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t} - \Theta^{\varepsilon_1,t})\,ds.$$

Denote $w^{\varepsilon_2}(t) - w^{\varepsilon_1}(t) = z(t)$ and $\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t} - \Theta^{\varepsilon_1,t} = \zeta^t$. We obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}|z(t)| \le C|x^{\varepsilon_2}(t) - x^{\varepsilon_1}(t)||w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)| + C|z(t)| + C|\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1|(|w^{\varepsilon_2}(t)| + \|\Theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\|) + \varepsilon_1\|\zeta^t\|.$$

Using (17) and Lemma 3.4 we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}|z(t)| \le Ce^{Ct}|x_0^{\varepsilon_2} - x_0^{\varepsilon_1}| + Ce^{Ct}\|\eta^{0,\varepsilon_2} - \eta^{0,\varepsilon_1}\| + C|z(t)| + Ce^{Ct}|\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1| + \varepsilon_1\|\zeta^t\|,$$

where the constants C depend on the initial data for original problems and variational problems. We need to derive the estimate on the difference of the norms $\|\theta^{\varepsilon_1,t} - \theta^{\varepsilon_2,t}\| = \|\zeta^t\|$. To this end, we use let (20), whence

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\zeta^t\|^2 + C\|\zeta^t\|^2 \le C\|\zeta^t\||z'(t)|.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\zeta^t\| \le Ce^{Ct}|x_0^{\varepsilon_2} - x_0^{\varepsilon_1}| + Ce^{Ct}\|\eta^{0,\varepsilon_2} - \eta^{0,\varepsilon_1}\| + C|z(t)| + Ce^{Ct}|\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1|.$$

We deduce the estimate

$$\frac{d}{dt}(|z(t)| + \|\zeta^t\|) \le C(|z(t)| + \|\zeta^t\|) + Ce^{Ct}(|x_0^{\varepsilon_2} - x_0^{\varepsilon_1}| + \|\eta^{0,\varepsilon_2} - \eta^{0,\varepsilon_1}\| + |\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1|),$$

and the Gronwall lemma yields the desired assertion. □

4. Further properties of the weighted history norm.

The following lemma plays a crucial role in passing from ODE (4) to (7) as it shows that the tail η can be treated as a "contracting" direction from the point of view of geometric methods in dynamics.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold and let (η, x) solve (7), (9) with $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\eta_0 \in L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$. Then*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t\|^2 + C\|\eta^t\|^2 \le -2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds, x'(t)\right) \tag{18}$$

and

$$\|\eta^{t_2}\|^2 \le e^{-C(t_2-t_1)}\|\eta^{t_1}\|^2 - 2e^{-Ct_2}\int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{Ct}\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds, x'(t)\right)dt \ \text{ for } \ t_1 < t_2. \tag{19}$$

Proof. Let $\eta^0 \in L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define $x(-s) = x_0 + \eta^0(s)$ for $s \le 0$ and let $x \in C^1([0,\infty))$ be a solution of (7). Moreover, for $t > 0$

$$\eta^t(s) = \begin{cases} x(t-s) - x(t) \ \text{ for } \ s \le t \\ x(t-s) - x(t) = x_0 + \eta^0(s-t) - x(t) \ \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The squared norm of η^t is given by

$$\|\eta^t\|^2 = \int_0^\infty (A(s)(x(t-s) - x(t)), (x(t-s) - x(t)))\,ds = \int_{-\infty}^t (A(t-s)(x(s) - x(t)), (x(s) - x(t)))\,ds.$$

Let $t \ge 0$ and $h > 0$. We calculate the right derivative of the above squared norm with respect to t.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|\eta^{t+h}\|^2 - \|\eta^t\|^2}{h} &= \frac{1}{h}\int_t^{t+h} (A(t+h-s)(x(s) - x(t+h)), (x(s) - x(t+h)))\,ds \\
&+ \int_{-\infty}^t \left(\frac{A(t+h-s) - A(t-s)}{h}(x(s) - x(t)), (x(s) - x(t))\right)ds \\
&+ h\left(\int_{-\infty}^t A(t+h-s)\,ds\frac{x(t) - x(t+h)}{h}, \frac{x(t) - x(t+h)}{h}\right) \\
&+ 2\left(\int_{-\infty}^t A(t+h-s)(x(s) - x(t))\,ds, \frac{x(t) - x(t+h)}{h}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit with $h \to 0^+$, using the mean value theorem for integrals, the first term in the above sum tends to zero. Moreover, the limit of the third term is zero. In the second and fourth term we use the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem to pass to the limit, whence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{h\to 0^+} \frac{\|\eta^{t+h}\|^2 - \|\eta^t\|^2}{h} \\
&= \lim_{h\to 0^+} \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{A(s+h)-A(s)}{h}(x(t-s)-x(t)), (x(t-s)-x(t)) \right) ds \\
&\quad - 2\left(\lim_{h\to 0^+} \int_0^\infty A(s+h)(x(t-s)-x(t))\, ds, x'(t) \right) \\
&= \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{dA(s)}{ds}\eta^t(s), \eta^t(s) \right) ds - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\, ds, x'(t) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar calculation for $t > 0$ and $h < 0$ leads to the left derivative for $t > 0$. Hence

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t\|^2 = \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{dA(s)}{ds}\eta^t(s), \eta^t(s) \right) ds - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\, ds, x'(t) \right),$$

and the assertion (18) follows by Assumption 2.1. After multiplication by the integrating factor e^{Ct} we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} e^{Ct}\|\eta^t\|^2\, dt \le -2e^{Ct}\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\, ds, x'(t) \right)$$

Integrating from t_1 to t_2 we obtain (19). □

Similar argument leads to the following result

Lemma 4.2. *Let (x,η) and (y,ξ) be two solutions, not necessarily with same ε. Then*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t - \xi^t\|^2 + C\|\eta^t - \xi^t\|^2 \le -2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta^t(s) - \xi^t(s))\, ds, (x(t) - y(t))' \right) \tag{20}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\eta^{t_2} - \xi^{t_2}\|^2 &\le e^{-C(t_2-t_1)}\|\eta^{t_1} - \xi^{t_1}\|^2 \\
&\quad - 2e^{-Ct_2}\int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{Ct}\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta^t(s) - \xi^t(s))\, ds, x'(t) - y'(t) \right) dt \quad \text{for} \quad t_1 < t_2.
\end{aligned}$$

5. Continuation of Lyapunov functions and isolating blocks with cone conditions.

The goal of this section is to show that several dynamical properties of (4) "survive" as we pass to (7). The dynamical objects discussed here are

- Lyapunov function. For ODE which is a gradient system (i.e. $f = \nabla F$) for sufficiently small ε for (7) we construct the Lyapunov function. This is contained in Lemma 5.1 and, see inequality (23).
- Isolating blocks satisfying cone conditions from (4) "survive" for sufficiently small ε in (7). The continuation of isolating block is established in Section 5.2. The cone conditions are discussed in Section 5.3.

5.1. **Lyapunov function for the problem with delay.**

Lemma 5.1. *For every $E > 0$ there holds the bound*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}E\|\eta^t\|^2 + 2|x'(t)|^2 + EC\|\eta^t\|^2 \le 2(f(x(t)), x'(t)) \\
&\quad + 2\varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\, ds x(t), x'(t) \right) + 2\left(\int_0^\infty (EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s))\eta^t(s)\, ds, x'(t) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

In particular if $f = \nabla F$ and $\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds$ is symmetric then

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(E\|\eta^t\|^2 - 2F(x(t)) - \varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\,x(t), x(t)\right)\right) + 2|x'(t)|^2 + EC\|\eta^t\|^2 \leq 2\left(\int_0^\infty (EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s))\,\eta^t(s)\,ds, x'(t)\right). \tag{22}$$

Moreover, there exists $E_0 > 0$ such that for every $E \in (0, E_0)$ there exists $\varepsilon_0(E) > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0)$ there holds

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(E\|\eta^t\|^2 - 2F(x(t)) - \varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\,x(t), x(t)\right)\right) + |x'(t)|^2 + E\frac{C}{4}\|\eta^t\|^2 \leq 0 \tag{23}$$

Proof. Multiply (8) by $2x'(t)$. Then

$$2|x'(t)|^2 = 2(f^\varepsilon(x(t)), x'(t)) + 2\varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds, x'(t)\right).$$

Adding this equation to the inequality (18) multiplied by $E > 0$ we obtain (21). If $f = \nabla F$, we obtain (22). Choosing $\delta > 0$ we estimate the term on the right-hand side as

$$2\left(\int_0^\infty (EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s))\,\eta^t(s)\,ds, x'(t)\right) \leq \delta|x'(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{\delta}\left|\int_0^\infty (EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s))\,\eta^t(s)\,ds\right|^2$$

. The last term can be estimated as

$$\frac{1}{\delta}\left|\int_0^\infty (EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s))\,\eta^t(s)\,ds\right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\delta}\left(\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\|EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s)\|}\sqrt{\|EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s)\|}|\eta^t(s)|\,ds\right)^2$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{\delta}\int_0^\infty \|EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s)\|\,ds \int_0^\infty \|EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s)\||\eta^t(s)|^2\,ds.$$

Moreover,

$$\int_0^\infty \|EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s)\|\,ds \leq E\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\,ds + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds,$$

and, using Assumption 2.3 and 2.5

$$\int_0^\infty \|EA(s) - \varepsilon M(s)\||\eta^t(s)|^2\,ds \leq E\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\||\eta^t(s)|^2\,ds + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\||\eta^t(s)|^2\,ds$$
$$\leq \left(E\overline{D}^2 + \varepsilon\overline{C_1}^2\right)\|\eta^t\|^2$$

Choosing $\delta = 1$ we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(E\|\eta^t\|^2 - 2F(x(t)) - \varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\,x(t), x(t)\right)\right) + |x'(t)|^2 + EC\|\eta^t\|^2$$
$$\leq \left(E\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\,ds + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds\right)\left(E\overline{D}^2 + \varepsilon\overline{C_1}^2\right)\|\eta^t\|^2.$$

Moving all terms to the left, the constant in front of $\|\eta^t\|^2$ is equal to

$$-E^2\overline{D}^2\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\,ds + E\left(C - \varepsilon\overline{C_1}^2\int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\,ds - \varepsilon\overline{D}^2\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds\right) - \varepsilon^2\overline{C_1}^2\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds.$$

This expression can be rewritten as

$$-E^2G_1 + E(G_2 - \varepsilon G_3) - \varepsilon^2 G_4,$$

where G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4 are positive constants. Take $E_0 = \frac{G_2}{2G_1}$. If $E \in (0, E_0)$, then

$$-E^2 G_1 + E(G_2 - \varepsilon G_3) - \varepsilon^2 G_4 \geq EG_2 - E\frac{G_2}{2} - \varepsilon\frac{G_3 G_2}{2G_1} - \varepsilon^2 G_4 = E\frac{G_2}{2} - \varepsilon\frac{G_3 G_2}{2G_1} - \varepsilon^2 G_4.$$

Now take $\varepsilon_0(E)$ such that

$$\varepsilon\frac{G_3 G_2}{2G_1} + \varepsilon^2 G_4 \leq E\frac{G_2}{4},$$

if only $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. This means that

$$-E^2 G_1 + E(G_2 - \varepsilon G_3) - \varepsilon^2 G_4 \geq E\frac{G_2}{4} = E\frac{C}{4}.$$

The proof is complete. □

As a consequence of the above Lemma we obtained to following Lyapunov function $L : L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ valid for every $E \in (0, E_0)$ and for every $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0(E))$

$$L(\eta^t, x(t)) = E\|\eta^t\|^2 - 2F(x(t)) - \varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\, ds\, x(t), x(t)\right) \tag{24}$$

5.2. **The continuation of the isolating block.** The next result follows from [11, Theorem 26]. We give a short proof for the completeness of exposition. In this section we use the notation

$$B_u(\delta) = \prod_{k=1}^{u_1}[-\delta, \delta] \times \prod_{k=u_1+1}^{u_1+u_2} \{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 \leq \delta^2\},$$

and

$$B_s(\delta) = \prod_{k=u_1+u_2+1}^{u_1+u_2+s_1} [-\delta, \delta] \times \prod_{k=u_1+u_2+s_1+1}^{u_1+u_2+s_1+s_2} \{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 \leq \delta^2\}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let x_0 be such that $f(x_0) = 0$. Assume that this equilibrium is hyperbolic, that it, that the matrix $Df(x_0)$ is nonsingular, with s equal to the dimension of its stable space, and $u = d - s$ the dimension of its unstable space. Let $s = s_1 + 2s_2$, where s_1 is the dimension of the generalized eigenspace related with real stable eigenvalues, and $2s_2$ is the dimension of the generalized eigenspace related with complex stable eigenvalues. Analogously, $u = u_1 + 2u_2$. There exists the nonsingular matrix T_κ and a number $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for every $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ the set*

$$N_\kappa(\delta) = T_\kappa(B_u(\delta) \times B_s(\delta)) + x_0.$$

is an isolating block with cones for $\varepsilon = 0$, i.e. for equation (4).

Proof. Let T_κ be an invertible matrix such that $T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa$ is the Jordan form, that on the diagonal has either real eigenvalues λ of $Df(x_0)$, or blocks $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ -\beta & \alpha \end{pmatrix}$ in case of complex eigenvalues, and all off-diagonal terms belong to $(0, \kappa)$. Assume that the eigenvalues in T_κ are sorted such that: first there are real positive eigenvalues, then complex eigenvalues with positive real part, then negative real eigenvalues, and finally complex eigenvalues with negative real part. Moreover assume that $T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$, where $A + A^T \in M^{u\times u}$ is negative definite and $B + B^T \in M^{s\times s}$ is positive definite. For every $\kappa > 0$ such change of coordinates T_κ exists. We first prove that the set $N_\kappa(\delta)$ is isolating.

If we denote $x = x_0 + T_\kappa y$, we obtain the system

$$y' = T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa y + T_\kappa^{-1} f(x_0 + T_\kappa y) - T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa y = h(y).$$

Now for $y \in B_u(2\delta) \times B_s(2\delta)$, we deduce, by the Taylor theorem, as $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ that

$$|T_\kappa^{-1} f(x_0 + T_\kappa y) - T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa y| \le C_\kappa \delta^2$$

where C_κ depends on κ but not on $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$. We need to prove that:

- if $y \in B_u(2\delta) \times \partial B_s(\delta)$, then

$$h_i(y) y_i < 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in \{u_1 + 2u_2 + 1, \dots, u_1 + 2u_2 + s_1\} \tag{25}$$

and

$$h_i(y) y_i + h_{i+1}(y) y_{i+1} < 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in \{u_1 + 2u_2 + s_1 + 1, \dots, u_1 + 2u_2 + s_1 + j, \dots u_1 + 2u_2 + s_1 + (2s_2 - 1)\}, \tag{26}$$

where j are odd numbers,

- if $y \in (B_u(2\delta) \setminus (\text{int} B_u(\delta))) \times B_s(\delta)$, then

$$h_i(y) y_i > 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in \{1, \dots, u_1\} \tag{27}$$

and

$$h_i(y) y_i + h_{i+1}(y) y_{i+1} > 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in \{u_1 + 1, \dots, u_1 + j, \dots u_1 + 2u_2 - 1\}, \tag{28}$$

where j are odd numbers,

By the Lipschitz continuous dependence on the initial condition, on bounded sets of initial data and compact time intervals these conditions imply the isolation in Definition 9.6.

To prove the first assertion observe that for $i \in u_1 + u_2 + 1, \dots, u_1 + u_2 + s_1$.

$$h_i(y) y_i = \lambda_i y_i^2 + G(y),$$

where

$$|G(y)| \le (d-1)\kappa 4 |\delta|^2 + 2C_\kappa |\delta|^3,$$

the first term coming from off diagonal values (at most $d-1$) in $T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa$, and the second one from the remainder which is a product of number which is dominated by the euclidean norm of a vector bounded by $C_\kappa |\delta|^2$ and a number bounded by 2δ. This means that we can choose κ small enough (related to the lowest eigenvalue λ_i) and δ_0 (that is chosen according to C_κ) and to get t(25).

For the complex pairs of eigenvalues the off diagonal term in blocks $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ -\beta & \alpha \end{pmatrix}$ cancels and we obtain

$$h_i(y) y_i + h_{i+1}(y) y_{i+1} = \text{Re}\, \lambda_i (y_i^2 + y_{i+1}^2) + G(y),$$

with

$$|G(y)| \le 8(d-2)\kappa |\delta|^2 + 2C_k |\delta|^3,$$

and (26) holds analogously as (25). Verification of (27) and (28) follows analogously.

To see that the cone condition holds it is enough to take the matrix Q such that $q_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$, $q_{ii} = -1$ for $i = 1, \dots, u$ and $q_{ii} = 1$ for $i = u+1, \dots, d$ and see that $Q T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa + T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa Q$ is positive definite, which must be preserved on a small neighborhood of $y = 0$. □

In the subsequent part of this section we will show that it is possible to choose δ and as well as $R > 0$ such that if $N_\kappa(\delta)$ is an isolating block with cones for (4) then the set $N_\kappa(\delta) \times B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}(0, R)$ is an isolating block with cones for (7). We start from an estimate. Substitute (8) in (18). Then we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t\|^2 + C\|\eta^t\|^2 \le -2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds, f(x(t))\right) - 2\varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds, \left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)x\right)$$
$$- 2\varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds, \int_0^\infty M(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds\right).$$

After computations which use Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6 it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t\|^2 + C\|\eta^t\|^2 \leq 2D\|\eta^t\|\|f(x(t))| + 2\varepsilon D\|\eta^t\| \int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds|x(t)| + 2\varepsilon DC_1\|\eta^t\|^2.$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t\|^2 \leq \|\eta^t\|\left(2D|f(x(t))| + 2\varepsilon D \int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds|x(t)| + 2\varepsilon DC_1\|\eta^t\| - C\|\eta^t\|\right).$$

The above computation leads is a straightforward way to the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $f(x_0) = 0$ and that $N \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a compact set containing x_0. Moreover let $\varepsilon < \frac{C}{2DC_1}$ and*

$$R > \frac{2D\left(\sup_{z\in N}|f(z)| + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds \cdot \sup_{z\in N}|z|\right)}{C - 2\varepsilon DC_1} = \frac{2D\left(\sup_{z\in N}|f(z)| + \varepsilon D \cdot \sup_{z\in N}|z|\right)}{C - 2\varepsilon DC_1}.$$

Then for $\eta \in \partial B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}(0,R)$, and $y \in N$ there holds

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t\|^2_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d} < 0.$$

Let us rewrite the equation (7) in the changed variables y.

$$y'(t) = h(y(t)) + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t)) + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds.$$

Now choose κ and δ_0 such that Lemma 5.2 holds and assume that $\delta < \frac{\delta_0}{2}$. For such δ let $r(\delta)$ be a smallest possible number such that $N_\kappa(2\delta) \subset B(x_0, r)$. Note that $r \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$. Take $\eta^t \in B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^n}(0,R)$ and $x = T_\kappa y + x_0 \in N_\kappa(2\delta)$. We rewrite the i-th equation of the above system as

$$y_i'(t) = h_i(y(t)) + g_i(y(t), \eta^t),$$

where

$$g_i(y(t),\eta^t) = \varepsilon\left(T_\kappa^{-1}\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t))\right)_i + \varepsilon\left(T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds\right)_i$$

hence

$$|g_i(y,\eta)| \leq |g(y,\eta)| \leq \varepsilon\|T_\kappa^{-1}\|D\|\eta^t\| + \varepsilon\|T_\kappa^{-1}\|\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds(|x_0| + r) \leq \varepsilon\|T_\kappa^{-1}\|D(R + |x_0| + r). \tag{29}$$

Theorem 5.4. *There exists $\kappa > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $\delta > 0$, and $R > 0$ such that for every fixed point x_0, every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ the set $N_\kappa(\delta) \times B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R)$ is an isolating block for (7), i.e.*

(I) *if $(y,\eta) \in B_u(2\delta) \times \partial B_s(\delta) \times B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R)$, then*

$$(h_i(y) + g_i(y,\eta))y_i < 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in u_1 + 2u_2 + 1, \ldots, u_1 + 2u_2 + s_1 \tag{30}$$

and

$$(h_i(y)+g_i(y,\eta))y_i+(h_{i+1}(y)+g_{i+1}(y,\eta))y_{i+1} < 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in u_1+2u_2+s_1+1, \ldots, u_1+2u_2+s_1+j, \ldots u_1+2u_2+s_1+(2s_2-1), \tag{31}$$

where j are odd numbers,

(II) *if $(y,\eta) \in (B_u(2\delta) \setminus (intB_u(\delta))) \times B_s(\delta) \times B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R)$, then*

$$(h_i(y) + g_i(y,\eta))y_i > 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in 1, \ldots, u_1 \tag{32}$$

and

$$(h_i(y) + g_i(y,\eta))y_i + (h_{i+1}(y) + g_{i+1}(y,\eta))y_{i+1} > 0 \ \text{ for } \ i \in u_1 + 1, \ldots, u_1 + j, \ldots u_1 + 2u_2 - 1, \tag{33}$$

where j are odd numbers,

(III) *if* $(y,\eta) \in B_u(2\delta) \times B_s(\delta) \times \partial B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R)$, *then*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta_t\|^2_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d} \leq 0 \ \ at \ \ t = 0.$$

Proof. We first provide the condition needed for (III) to hold: this is the entry condition for the variable δ. Following Lemma 5.3 we need that $R > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ should satisfy

$$R > \frac{2D\left(\sup_{z\in N_\kappa(2\delta)}|\nabla f(z)|r(\delta) + \varepsilon D r(\delta)\right)}{C - 2\varepsilon D C_1}. \tag{34}$$

We switch to the conditions needed for (I) and (II), that is, for (30)–(33).

We first note that there exists δ_0 and a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that if only $\delta \in (0,\delta_0)$ and $y \in B_u(2\delta) \times \partial B_s(\delta) \cup (B_u(2\delta) \setminus \text{int}B_u(\delta)) \times B_s(\delta)$ then

$$C_1\delta \leq |h_i(y)| \ \text{ for indexes corresponding to real eigenvalues,} \tag{35}$$

and

$$C_1\delta^2 \leq |h_i(y)y_i + h_{i+1}(y)y_{i+1}| \ \text{ for indexes corresponding to complex eigenvalues.} \tag{36}$$

In order for (30) and (32) we need $h_i(y)$ to have the same sign as and $h_i(y)+g_i(y,\eta)$ for $y \in B_u(2\delta)\times \partial B_s(\delta) \cup (B_u(2\delta) \setminus \text{int}B_u(\delta)) \times B_s(\delta)$ and $\eta \in B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R)$. For the complex eigenvalues we need, on the other hand, that $(h_i(y) + g_i(y,\eta))y_i + (h_{i+1}(y) + g_{i+1}(y,\eta))y_{i+1}$ and $h_i(y)y_i + h_{i+1}(y)y_{i+1}$ have the same signs. Therefore, in view of (35) it is sufficient to prove that $|g_i(y,\eta)| < C_1\delta$ and $|g_i(y,\eta)y_i + g_{i+1}(y,\eta)y_{i+1}| < C_1\delta^2$. Using (29) it is enough that the following inequality holds

$$\varepsilon\|T_\kappa^{-1}\|D(R + |x_0| + r(\delta)) < C_1\delta. \tag{37}$$

First choose ε_0 such that $C - 2\varepsilon_0 D C_1 < \frac{C}{2}$. The same inequality holds for $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$ in the denominator of (34). Now pick $R > 0$. We need to choose δ small enough such that

$$\frac{4D\sup_{z\in N_\kappa(2\delta)}|Df(z)|r(\delta)}{C} < \frac{R}{2}.$$

This is possible, because by decreasing δ we can make $r(\delta)$ arbitrarily small. Now it is possible to choose sufficiently small ε_0 such that $\varepsilon_0\|T_\kappa^{-1}\|D(R + |x_0| + r(\delta)) < C_1\delta$ and $\frac{\varepsilon_0 4D^2 r}{C} < \frac{R}{2}$. Thus both inequalities are satisfied and the proof is complete. □

5.3. **Cone condition.** The goal of this section is to show that cone conditions from (4) "survive" for sufficiently small ϵ for (7). To this end assume that for the equation

$$x'(t) = f^\varepsilon(x(t)) = f(x(t)) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds x(t)$$

we have a quadratic form Q (a symmetric matrix) and a set N (h-set) such that on N we have for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $|\varepsilon| \leq \Delta$ for some $G > 0$

$$x^t(Df^\varepsilon(N)^T Q + QDf^\varepsilon(N))x \geq G|x|^2. \tag{38}$$

Note that, as

$$Df^\varepsilon(x) = Df(x) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds.$$

Hence, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, then the same form Q is valid both for f and for f^ε (with possibly smaller constant G). Let (η,x) and (ξ,y) be two solutions of (8)–(9) such $x,y \in N$ and $\|\eta\|,\|\xi\| \leq R$. Let $E > 0$ be any positive constant. We hope that for the quadratic form

$$\widetilde{Q}(\eta,x) = Q(x) - E\|\eta\|^2 \tag{39}$$

we will have cone-conditions on the set (isolated block)

$$\widetilde{N} = \{\|\eta\| \leq R\} \times N. \tag{40}$$

We have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(Q(x(t)-y(t),x(t)-y(t))\right) = (x'-y')^\top Q(x-y) + (x-y)^\top Q(x'-y').$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} x'-y' &= \left(f^\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta(s)ds\right) - \left(f^\varepsilon(y) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)\xi(s)ds\right) \\ &= (f^\varepsilon(x) - f^\varepsilon(y)) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds \\ &= \overline{Df^\varepsilon[x,y]}(x-y) + \varepsilon\int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain using Lemma 2.6

$$\begin{aligned} &(x'-y')^\top Q(x-y) + (x-y)^\top Q(x'-y') = (x-y)^\top\left(\overline{Df^\varepsilon[x,y]}^\top Q + Q\overline{Df^\varepsilon[x,y]}\right)(x-y) \\ &+\varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds\right)^\top Q(x-y) + \varepsilon(x-y)^T Q\int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds \\ &\geq G|x-y|^2 - 2\varepsilon C_1\|Q\|\cdot|x-y|\cdot\|\eta-\xi\|. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|^2 &\leq -C\|\eta-\xi\|^2 - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds, (x(t)-y(t))'\right) \\ &\leq -C\|\eta-\xi\|^2 - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds, \overline{Df^\varepsilon[x,y]}(x-y)\right) + \\ &\quad - 2\varepsilon\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds, \int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta(s)-\xi(s))ds\right) \\ &\leq -C\|\eta-\xi\|^2 + 2D\|\eta-\xi\|\cdot\|Df^\varepsilon(N)\|\cdot|x-y| + \varepsilon 2C_1D\|\eta-\xi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready to demonstrate that the cone condition holds. From previous derivations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\left(Q(x(t)-y(t),x(t)-y(t)) - E\|\eta^t-\xi^t\|^2\right) \\ &\quad\geq G|x-y|^2 - 2\varepsilon C_1\|Q\|\cdot|x-y|\cdot\|\eta-\xi\| \\ &\qquad - E\left(-C\|\eta-\xi\|^2 + 2D\|\eta-\xi\|\cdot\|Df^\varepsilon(N)\|\cdot|x-y| + \varepsilon 2C_1D\|\eta-\xi\|^2\right) \\ &\quad= G|x-y|^2 + 2\left(-\varepsilon C_1\|Q\| - ED\|Df^\varepsilon(N)\|\right)|x-y|\cdot\|\eta-\xi\| + \\ &\qquad + (CE - 2\varepsilon C_1D)\|\eta-\xi\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

The expression on the right-hand side is a quadratic form in terms of $(|x-y|, \|\eta-\xi\|)$ with the matrix

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} G & \left(-\varepsilon C_1\|Q\| - ED\|Df^\varepsilon(N)\|\right) \\ \left(-\varepsilon C_1\|Q\| - ED\|Df^\varepsilon(N)\|\right) & (CE - 2\varepsilon C_1D) \end{bmatrix} \tag{41}$$

Consider first the case with $\varepsilon = 0$. Matrix B becomes

$$B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} G & -ED\|Df(N)\| \\ -ED\|Df(N)\| & CE \end{bmatrix} \tag{42}$$

It is positive definite provided the following condition holds

$$0 < \det(B_0) = CEG - E^2D^2\|Df(N)\|^2, \tag{43}$$

which is satisfied if

$$E < \frac{CG}{D^2\|Df(N)\|^2}. \tag{44}$$

Since $\det B$ depends continuously on ε we obtain the following theorem.

Lemma 5.5. *For any $E > 0$ satisfying*

$$E < \frac{CG}{D^2\|Df(N)\|^2}. \tag{45}$$

there exists $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(E)$, such cone condition holds for quadratic form (39) for any $\varepsilon \le \varepsilon_1$.

Consider the problem governed by (8)–(9) and denote the solution with $\varepsilon \in [0, \Delta]$ and initial data $(\eta^0, x_0) \in \widetilde{N}$ by $S^\varepsilon(t)(\eta^0, x_0) = (\eta^t_{\varepsilon,x_0,\eta_0}, x_{\varepsilon,x_0,\eta_0})$. Define

$$\widehat{Q}(x,\eta,\varepsilon) = \widetilde{Q}(x,\eta) + L|\varepsilon|^2 = Q(x) - E\|\eta\|^2 + L|\varepsilon|^2,$$

where L can be either positive or negative. In the next lemma we prove that $\widehat{Q}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 10.1 for the sufficient choice of L.

Lemma 5.6. *There exists $L_0 > 0$ and $E_{max} > 0$ such that for every $|L| \ge L_0$ and $E \in (0, E_{max})$ there exists $\Delta(E) > 0$ such that the cone conditions with parameter given in (i) and (ii) of Definition 10.1 are satisfied on the h-set $\widetilde{N}$ with $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in [0, \Delta(E)]$*

Proof. Assume that $(\eta_1^0, x_1^0, \varepsilon_1)$ and $(\eta_2^0, x_2^0, \varepsilon_2)$ are such that

$$\widehat{Q}(x_1^0 - x_2^0, \eta_1^0 - \eta_2^0, \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2) = 0.$$

We must prove that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\widehat{Q}(x_{\varepsilon_1,x_1^0\eta_1^0}(t) - x_{\varepsilon_2,x_2^0\eta_2^0}(t), \eta_{\varepsilon_1,x_1^0,\eta_1^0}(t) - \eta_{\varepsilon_2,x_2^0\eta_2^0}(t), \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2) \ge 0 \ \text{ for } \ t = 0.$$

Denoting, for simplicity, $(\eta_1(t), x_1(t)) = (\eta_{\varepsilon_1,x_1^0,\eta_1^0}(t), x_{\varepsilon_1,x_1^0\eta_1^0}(t))$ and $(\eta_2(t), x_2(t)) = (\eta_{\varepsilon_2,x_2^0,\eta_2^0}(t), x_{\varepsilon_2,x_2^0\eta_2^0}(t))$ we should prove that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big((x_1(t) - x_2(t))^\top Q(x_1(t) - x_2(t)) - E\|\eta_1(t) - \eta_2(t)\|^2\Big) \ge 0 \ \text{ for } \ t = 0. \tag{46}$$

We estimate both terms from below separately

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}((x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t)) = (x_1'(t)-x_2'(t))^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t)) + (x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q(x_1'(t)-x_2'(t))\\
&\quad = (f(x_1(t))-f(x_2(t)))^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t)) + (\varepsilon_1 x_1(t)-\varepsilon_2 x_2(t))^\top \int_0^\infty M^\top(s)\,ds Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t))\\
&\qquad + \left(\varepsilon_1\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_1^t(s)\,ds - \varepsilon_2\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_2^t(s)\,ds\right)^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t))\\
&\qquad + (x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q(f(x_1(t))-f(x_2(t))) + (x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds(\varepsilon_1 x_1(t)-\varepsilon_2 x_2(t))\\
&\qquad + (x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q\left(\varepsilon_1\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_1^t(s)\,ds - \varepsilon_2\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_2^t(s)\,ds\right)\\
&\quad = (x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top (Df(N)^\top Q + QDf(N))(x_1(t)-x_2(t))\\
&\qquad + \varepsilon_2(x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top\left(\int_0^\infty M^\top(s)\,ds Q + Q\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)(x_1(t)-x_2(t))\\
&\qquad + 2\varepsilon_2(x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))\,ds\right)\\
&\qquad + 2(\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2)(x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds x_1(t) + 2(\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2)(x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_1^t(s)\,ds\right)\\
&\quad = I_1+I_2+I_3+I_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$I_1 + I_2 \geq G|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|^2,$$

where G can be chosen uniformly for $\varepsilon \in [0,\Delta]$. Moreover

$$I_3 \geq -2\Delta|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|\,\|Q\|C_1\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|,$$

and

$$I_4 \geq -2|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|\,|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|\,\|Q\|\left(\int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds \sup_{x\in N}|x| + C_1 R\right).$$

For simplicity we use the following notation for the constant which will appear several times in the subsequent computations $\overline{R} = \int_0^\infty \|M(s)\|\,ds \sup_{x\in N}|x| + C_1 R$. Summarizing, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}((x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t)) \geq G|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|^2 - 2\Delta|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|\,\|Q\|C_1\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|\\
&\quad - 2|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|\,|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|\,\|Q\|\overline{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the second term in (46) from Lemma 4.2

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2 &\le -C\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2 - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))ds, (x_1(t)-x_2(t))'\right)\\
&= -C\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2 - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))ds, f(x(t))-f(y(t))\right)\\
&\quad - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))ds, \varepsilon_1\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds x_1(t) - \varepsilon_2\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds x_2(t)\right)\\
&\quad - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))ds, \varepsilon_1\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_1^t(s)\,ds - \varepsilon_2\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_2^t(s)ds\right)\\
&= -C\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2 - 2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))ds, f(x(t))-f(y(t))\right)\\
&\quad - 2(\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2)\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))ds, \int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds x_1(t) + \int_0^\infty M(s)\eta_1^t(s)\,ds\right)\\
&\quad - 2\varepsilon_2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))ds, \int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds(x_1(t)-x_2(t)) + \int_0^\infty M(s)(\eta_1^t(s)-\eta_2^t(s))\,ds\right).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2 &\le -C\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2 + 2D\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|\cdot\|Df(N)\|\cdot|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|\\
&\quad + 2|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|D\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|\overline{R} + 2\Delta C_1 D\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2 + 2\Delta D\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|\,|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting together the two estimates we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\Big((x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t)) - E\|\eta_1(t)-\eta_2(t)\|^2\Big) &\ge G|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|^2 + E(C-2\Delta C_1 D)\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2\\
&\quad - 2|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|(\Delta\|Q\|C_1 + ED\|Df(N)\| + E\Delta D)\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|\\
&\quad - 2|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|\,|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|\,\|Q\|\overline{R} - 2E|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|D\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|\overline{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

We need the right-hand side of the last estimate to be bounded from below by 0 at $t=0$, on the boundary of the cone, i.e. for $Q(x_1^0-x_2^0) - E\|\eta_1^0-\eta_2^0\|^2 + L|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2|^2 = 0$, whereas we can estimate from above as follows

$$|\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon_2| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{|L|}}\left(\sqrt{\|Q\|}\cdot|x_1^0-x_2^0| + \sqrt{E}\|\eta_1^0-\eta_2^0\|\right)$$

We deduce that, at $t=0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\Big((x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t)) - E\|\eta_1(t)-\eta_2(t)\|^2\Big)\Big|_{t=0} &\ge \left(G - \frac{2\|Q\|^{\frac{3}{2}}\overline{R}}{\sqrt{|L|}}\right)|x_1^0-x_2^0|^2\\
&\quad + E\left(C - 2\Delta C_1 D - \frac{2\sqrt{E}D\overline{R}}{\sqrt{|L|}}\right)\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2\\
&\quad - 2|x_1^0-x_2^0|\left(\Delta\|Q\|C_1 + ED\|Df(N)\| + E\Delta D + \frac{E\sqrt{\|Q\|}D\overline{R}}{\sqrt{|L|}} + \frac{\|Q\|\overline{R}\sqrt{E}}{\sqrt{|L|}}\right)\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|.
\end{aligned}$$

We are free to choose sufficiently large (positive or negative) L, sufficiently small Δ and sufficiently small E. We already have the upper bound on E in Lemma 5.5 given by $E \le E_{max}$.

Now suppose that $|L|$ is large enough and Δ is small enough such that

$$\sqrt{|L|} \ge \max\left\{\frac{4\|Q\|^{\frac{3}{2}}R}{G}, \frac{8\sqrt{E_{max}}D\overline{R}}{C}\right\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta \le \frac{C}{8C_1 D}.$$

With these assumption the above estimate takes the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big((x_1(t)-x_2(t))^\top Q(x_1(t)-x_2(t))-E\|\eta_1(t)-\eta_2(t)\|^2\Big)|_{t=0}\geq\frac{G}{2}|x_1^0-x_2^0|^2$$
$$+\frac{EC}{2}\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|^2-2|x_1^0-x_2^0|\left(\Delta\|Q\|C_1+ED\|Df(N)\|+E\Delta D+\frac{E\sqrt{\|Q\|}D\overline{R}}{\sqrt{|L|}}+\frac{\|Q\|\overline{R}\sqrt{E}}{\sqrt{|L|}}\right)\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|.$$

The above quadratic form on $|x_1^0-x_2^0|$ and $\|\eta_1^t-\eta_2^t\|$ is nonnegatively defined provided

$$\frac{ECG}{4}\geq\left(\Delta\|Q\|C_1+ED\|Df(N)\|+E\Delta D+\frac{E\sqrt{\|Q\|}D\overline{R}}{\sqrt{|L|}}+\frac{\|Q\|\overline{R}\sqrt{E}}{\sqrt{|L|}}\right)^2.$$

But we know that

$$\left(\Delta\|Q\|C_1+ED\|Df(N)\|+E\Delta D+\frac{E\sqrt{\|Q\|}D\overline{R}}{\sqrt{|L|}}+\frac{\|Q\|\overline{R}\sqrt{E}}{\sqrt{|L|}}\right)^2$$
$$\leq 5\Delta^2\|Q\|^2C_1^2+5E^2D^2\|Df(N)\|^2+5E^2\Delta^2D^2+\frac{5E^2\|Q\|D^2\overline{R}^2}{|L|}+\frac{5\|Q\|^2\overline{R}^2E}{|L|}.$$

Hence we need the following five inequalities

$$5\Delta^2\|Q\|^2C_1^2\leq\frac{ECG}{20},\ \ 5E^2D^2\|Df(N)\|^2\leq\frac{ECG}{20},\ \ 5E^2\Delta^2D^2\leq\frac{ECG}{20},$$
$$\frac{5E^2\|Q\|D^2\overline{R}^2}{|L|}\leq\frac{ECG}{20},\ \ \frac{5\|Q\|^2\overline{R}^2E}{|L|}\leq\frac{ECG}{20},$$

or, after the simplification,

$$100\Delta^2\|Q\|^2C_1^2\leq ECG,\ \ 100ED^2\|Df(N)\|^2\leq CG,\ \ 100E\Delta^2D^2\leq CG,$$
$$100E\|Q\|D^2\overline{R}^2\leq CG|L|,\ \ 100\|Q\|^2\overline{R}^2\leq CG|L|.$$

We see that it is enough to choose

$$|L|\geq\max\left\{\frac{100E_{max}\|Q\|D^2\overline{R}^2}{CG},\frac{100\|Q\|^2\overline{R}^2}{CG}\right\}$$

and the last two inequalities hold. We are now free to pick E which satisfies

$$0<E\leq\frac{CG}{100D^2\|Df(N)\|^2}\ \text{ and }\ E<E_{max},$$

and we finally need to pick Δ such that

$$\Delta^2\leq\min\left\{\frac{ECG}{100\|Q\|^2C_1^2},\frac{CG}{100ED^2}\right\}.$$

The proof is complete. □

6. Equilibria and their nonexpansion in the limit

In this section we relate the equilibria of the unperturbed system (4) with the equilibria of the problem (8)–(9). We show that if ε is small, then for every equilibrium e of (4) there exists an equilibrium $(0,e^\varepsilon)$ of (8)–(9) in its vicinity and the perturbed system has no other equilibria. Moreover, we show the upper semi-continuity result on the connections between the equilibria, that is, if the two equilibria of (8)–(9) are connected for a sequence of parameters $\varepsilon\to 0$, then the connection also exists for $\varepsilon=0$. We remind that the limit equation (4) has only a finite number of isolated and hyperbolic equilibria and the system is Morse–Smale, i.e. the intersections of their stable and unstable manifolds are always transversal.

Lemma 6.1. *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0)$ if $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an equilibrium for (4) with an isolating block with cones N^x then the problem governed by (8)–(9) has an equilibrium $(0, e^\varepsilon)$ which is unique in the set $\widetilde{N}^x = \{\|\eta\| \leq R\} \times N^x$. Moreover $(0, e^\varepsilon)$ are the only equilibria for (8)–(9).*

Proof. Denote by $\mathcal{E}$ the set of equilibria of (4) and let $e \in \mathcal{E}$. Take R and N^x from Theorem 5.4 (isolating set) and take E satisfying the constraints from Lemma 5.5 (the cone condition), Lemma 5.6 (the cone condition with parameters) and Lemma 5.1 (the Lyapunov function). Now take $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$, where ε_0 satisfies all the constraints of the previous results: the constraint of Lemma 5.5 (the cone condition), Lemma 5.6 (the cone condition with parameters), Lemma 5.1 (the Lyapunov function) and Theorem 5.4 (isolating set) and the constraints of Section 3. From Lemma 5.1 we deduce that the equilibria of (8) must have the η component equal to zero. Theorem 9.9 together with Lemma 5.5 imply that the problem governed by (8)–(9) has a unique equilibrium in the set $\widetilde{N}^x$. We denote this equilibrium by $(0, e^\varepsilon)$. It must be $f^\varepsilon(e^\varepsilon) = 0$. We must show that problem (8) does not have other equilibria than the ones which lie in $\widetilde{N}^x$.

From (12) we deduce that if $f^\varepsilon(e^\varepsilon) = 0$ then $|x^\varepsilon| \leq \overline{R}$. Assume that $e^\varepsilon \notin \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{E}} \operatorname{int} N^y$. Now let

$$\beta = \min \left\{ |f(x)| : \ |x| \leq \overline{R}, x \notin \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{E}} \operatorname{int} N^y \right\}.$$

This is a positive constant. We have

$$|f^\varepsilon(e^\varepsilon)| \geq |f(e^\varepsilon)| - \varepsilon |e^\varepsilon| \int_0^\infty \|M(s)\| \, ds \geq \beta - \varepsilon \overline{R} \int_0^\infty \|M(s)\| \, ds.$$

Decreasing ε is necessary we note that we must have $|f^\varepsilon(e^\varepsilon)| > 0$, a contradiction. □

In the sequel we always assume that E, ε_0, R satisfy the constraints which follow from the above Lemma.

Definition 6.2. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$. The function $(\eta, x) : \mathbb{R} \to L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded complete (eternal) solution for (8)–(9) if for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the function $(\eta^{t+\cdot}, x(t+\cdot)) : \mathbb{R} \to L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is a solution for (8)–(9) and moreover $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left(|x(t)| + \|\eta^t\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d} \right)$ is bounded.

The existence of the Liapunov function in Lemma 5.1 directly implies the following result

Lemma 6.3. *The pair $t \mapsto (\eta^t, x(t))$ is a bounded complete solution for (8)–(9) if and only if there exists two points $e_1^\varepsilon, e_2^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $f^\varepsilon(e_1^\varepsilon) = f^\varepsilon(e_2^\varepsilon) = 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{t \to -\infty} (\eta^t, x(t)) = (0, e_1^\varepsilon), \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} (\eta^t, x(t)) = (0, e_2^\varepsilon)$$

In such case we say that the exists a connection between the equilibria e_1^ε and e_2^ε.

In the next lemma we prove that the existing connections are preserved in the limit, see [2, Proposition 4].

Lemma 6.4. *If for a sequence $\varepsilon^n \to 0^+$ there exist connections between equilibria $e_1^{\varepsilon^n}$ and $e_2^{\varepsilon^n}$ through the system (8)-(9) where $\lim_{n \to \infty} e_1^{\varepsilon^n} = e_1$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} e_2^{\varepsilon^n} = e_2$ then e_1 and e_2 are equilibria of (4) and there exists a sequence of equilibria $e_1 = g_1, \ldots, g_N = e_2$ such that there exist complete trajectories of (4) which connect $e_i \to e_{i+1}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, N-1\}$.*

Proof. The fact that e_1 and e_2 are equilibria of (4) follows from the definition of f^ε. Denote by $(\eta_n^{(\cdot)}, x_n(\cdot)) : \mathbb{R} \to L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ the bounded complete solutions for ϵ_n such that for each n

$$\lim_{t \to -\infty} (\eta_n^t, x_n(t)) = (0, e_1^{\epsilon^n}), \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} (\eta_n^t, x_n(t)) = (0, e_2^{\epsilon^n}).$$

Now x_n and η_n are bounded uniformly with respect to t. The Lyapunov function in Lemma 21 implies that they are also bounded uniformly with respect to n. Hence $x_n'(t)$ is also uniformly

bounded with respect to both n and t. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists t_n^1 such that if only $t \le t_n^1$ then $|x_n(t) - e_1^{\varepsilon_n}| \le \delta$. From the Arzela–Ascoli lemma, using the diagonal argument we can construct a function $x^1 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x_n(t + t_n^1) \to u^1(t)$ uniformly for t on every bounded time interval. Since

$$x_n(t_n^1 + t) = x_n(t_n^1) + \int_{t_n^1}^{t_n^1+t} \left(f(x_n(s)) + \varepsilon_n \int_0^\infty M(r)\, dr x_n(s) + \varepsilon_n \int_0^\infty M(r)\eta_n^s(r)\, dr \right) ds,$$

we can pass to the limit with n to infinity whence

$$u_1(t) = u_1(0) + \int_0^t f(u_1(s))\, ds,$$

i.e. x_1 solves (4). Now let $t \le 0$ be fixed. We have

$$|u_1(t) - e_1| \le |u_1(t) - x_n(t + t_n^1)| + |x_n(t + t_n^1) - e_1^{\varepsilon_n}| + |e_1^{\varepsilon_n} - e_1| \le |u_1(t) - x_n(t + t_n^1)| + \delta + |e_1^{\varepsilon_n} - e_1|.$$

Passing with n to infinity we deduce that

$$|u_1(t) - e_1| \le \delta.$$

Since $\lim_{t\to-\infty} u_1(t) = e$, an equilibrium of (4), we deduce by taking δ small enough related to minimal distance between the equilibria of the system, that it must be $e = e_1$. Now $\lim_{t\to\infty} u_1(t) = g_2$, an equilibrium of (4). If $g_2 = e_2$ the proof is complete. Otherwise for every n there exists $k(n) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$ and τ_n^2 such that $|x_{k(n)}(\tau_n^2) - g_2| \le \frac{1}{n}$. Hence $x_{k(n)}(\tau_n^2 + t)$ converges to e_2 uniformly on bounded time intervals. This means that for every sufficiently small δ and every n there exists a maximal $t_n^2 > \tau_n^2$ such that for $t \in [\tau_n^2, t_n^2]$ we have $|x_n(t) - g_2| \le \delta$ and it must be $t_n^2 - \tau_n^2 \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Solutions $x_n(t_n^2 + t)$, again from the Arzela–Ascoli lemma converge to $u_2(t)$, the solution of (4), uniformly on bounded time intervals. Moreover for every $t \le 0$ we are able to find n_0 such that for every $n \ge n_0$ we have $\tau_n^2 < t + t_n^2$. Then

$$|u_2(t) - g_2| \le |u_2(t) - x_n(t + t_n^2)| + |x_n(t + t_n^2) - g_2| \le |u_2(t) - x_n(t + t_n^2)| + \delta.$$

Passing with $n \to \infty$ we deduce that $|u^2(t) - g_2| \le \delta$ for every $t \le 0$ and it is enough to choose δ sufficiently small so that $\lim_{t\to-\infty} u_2(t) = g_2$. Now, $\lim_{t\to\infty} u_2(t) = g_3$. If $g_3 = e_2$ the proof is complete. If not, we continue the procedure, which is always possible if the equilibrium is not e_2. Since the number of equilibria of (4) is finite and the system is gradient, the procedure must end after finite number of steps, which concludes the proof. □

As the limit system (4) is Morse–Smale, the existence of the sequence of connections $e_1 = g_1 \to g_2 \to \ldots \to g_N = e_2$ implies the existence of connection $e_1 \to e_2$, whence we can formulate the following lemma

Lemma 6.5. *If for a sequence $\varepsilon^n \to 0^+$ there exist connections between equilibria $(0, e_1^{\varepsilon^n})$ and $(0, e_2^{\varepsilon^n})$ through the system (8)–(9) where $\lim_{n\to\infty} e_1^{\varepsilon^n} = e_1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} e_2^{\varepsilon^n} = e_2$ then e_1 and e_2 are equilibria of (4) and there exists a connection $e_1 \to e_2$ through the system (4).*

7. Continuation of the intersection of manifolds.

We recall that for the system (4) there exists a finite number of equilibria $\{e_1, \ldots, e_N\}$ which are all hyperbolic, that is $Df(e_i) = D^2F(e_i)$ is a nonsingular matrix for every e_i.

Using the Hadamard–Perron theorem, cf. for example [7, Theorem 3.2.1], and the fact that $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^2)$ we deduce that each equilibrium has the stable and unstable manifold $W^u(e_i)$ and $W^s(e_i)$ which is of class C^2. If, for the two equilibria e_i and e_j, there exists the solution γ that connects e_i to e_j then this solution belong to both the unstable manifold of e_i and the stable manifold of e_j.

In the previous sections we have constructed the local stable and unstable manifolds of all equilibria in such their neighbourhoods, that are isolating h-sets with cones, which are moreover

preserved when the problem is perturbed by the delay term ε. So, if the equilibrium e_i is connected to e_j if $W^u(e_i) \cap W^s(e_j) \neq \emptyset$, we can take as an intersection point, a point $z \in W^s_{loc,N(e_j)}$ where $N(e_j)$ is an h-set with cones for the equlibrium e_j. Then $z \in W^u(e_i)$.

We assume that the intersection of $W^u(e_i)$ and $W^s_{loc,A(e_j)}(e_j)$ is transversal that is

$$T_z W^u(e_i) \oplus T_z W^s_{loc,A(e_j)}(e_j) = \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let $\dim W^u(e_i) = u_i$ and $\dim W^s_{loc,A(e_j)}(e_j) = s_j$. Then $u_i + s_j \geq d+1$. Tangent space $T_z W^u(e_i)$ is the u_i dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $T_z W^s_{loc,A(e_j)}(e_j)$ is its s_j dimensional subspace. The intersection of both spaces is c dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ where $c = u_i + s_j - d$. Denote $u_i = k_1 + c$ and $s_j = k_2 + c$. There exists an invertible $d \times d$ matrix M such that $M \cdot (\mathbb{R}^c \otimes \mathbb{R}^{k_1} \otimes (0)_{k_2}) = T_z W^u(e_i)$ and $M \cdot (\mathbb{R}^c \otimes (0)_{k_1} \otimes \mathbb{R}^{k_2}) = T_z W^s_{loc,A(e_j)}(e_j)$. This matrix defines the linear change of coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We will denote the new coordinates by $(\overline{a}, \overline{x}, \overline{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^c \otimes \mathbb{R}^{k_1} \otimes \mathbb{R}^{k_2}$. The next lemma states that in that local systems of coordinates the local stable and unstable manifolds constitute the horizontal and vertical disks with the arbitrarily small Lipschitz constants.

Lemma 7.1. *There exist constants $\delta_{k_1}, \delta_{k_2}, \delta_c > 0$ and Lipschitz functions $\overline{x}^0 : B(0,c) \times B(0,\delta_{k_2}) \to B(0,\delta_{k_1})$ and $\overline{y}^0 : B(0,c) \times B(0,\delta_{k_1}) \to B(0,\delta_{k_2})$ such that*

$$M \cdot \{(\overline{a}, \overline{x}^0(\overline{a},\overline{y}), \overline{y}) : (\overline{a},\overline{y}) \in B(0,\delta_c) \times B(0,\delta_{k_2})\} = (W^s(e_j) - z) \cap M \cdot (B(0,\delta_c) \times B(0,\delta_{k_1}) \times B(0,\delta_{k_2})).$$

and

$$M \cdot \{(\overline{a}, \overline{x}, \overline{y}^0(\overline{a},\overline{x})) : (\overline{a},\overline{x}) \in B(0,\delta_c) \times B(0,\delta_{k_1})\} = (W^u(e_i) - z) \cap M \cdot (B(0,\delta_c) \times B(0,\delta_{k_1}) \times B(0,\delta_{k_2})).$$

Moreover, with decreasing $\delta_{k_1}, \delta_{k_2}, \delta_c$, the Lipschitz constants of both disks can be made arbitrarily small.

Proof. We will denote by $S^0(t)$ the flow for $\varepsilon = 0$. We first study the local stable manifold of e_j. This manifold is a graph of the Lipschitz function in the coordinates that we denote by (x,y), where x is in the unstable space of e_j, and y is in the stable one. In these coordinates the point of intersection, z, can be represented as $x_z + y_z$. Then, this manifold translated by z is a graph of a function $x = x^0(y)$. Since it is of class C^1, the points on it have the form

$$x_z + x^0(y) + y_z + y = z + \frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy} y + y + \Delta(y),$$

where, $\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy} y + y \in T_z W^s(e_j)$, and $\Delta(y) \in o(|y|)$. Denoting $\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}$ the projection on the tangent space $T_z W^s(e_j)$ and by $\Pi_{M\cdot(0,\overline{x},0)}$ the complementary projection, we can represent the considered point on $W^s(e_j)$ as

$$z + \frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy} y + y + \Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\Delta(y) + \Pi_{M\cdot(0,\overline{x},0)}\Delta(y).$$

We need to prove that there exists $\delta_0, \delta_1 > 0$ such that for every $(\overline{a},\overline{y}) \in B(0,\delta_1)$ there exists $y \in B(0,\delta_0)$ such that

$$(\overline{a}, 0, \overline{y}) = M^{-1}\left(\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy} y + y + \Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\Delta(y)\right).$$

The mapping

$$y \mapsto M^{-1}\left(\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy} y + y\right)$$

is a linear invertible mapping from s_j dimensional space into s_j dimensional space. Therefore for every δ_0 we can find a ball $B(0,\overline{\delta}(\delta_0))$ such that

$$\{(\overline{a}, 0, \overline{y}) : (\overline{a},\overline{y}) \in B(0,\overline{\delta})\} \subset \left\{M^{-1}\left(\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy} y + y\right) : y \in B(0,\delta_0)\right\}.$$

Consider the homotopy

$$B(0,\delta_0)\times[0,1]\ni(y,\theta)\mapsto f(y,\theta)=M^{-1}\left(\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy}y+y+\theta\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\Delta(y)\right).$$

Now for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ we have

$$|f(y,\theta)|\geq C_1|y|-C_2|\Delta_1(y)| \text{ for } (y,\theta)\in B(0,\delta_0)\times[0,1].$$

Therefore if $|y|=\delta_0$, by taking the constant δ_0 small enough, we obtain $|f(y,\theta)|>\frac{C_1}{2}\delta_0$. Hence, by the homotopy invariance of the Brouwer degree if only $\delta_1<\min\left\{\frac{C_1}{2}\delta_0,\overline{\delta}(\delta_0)\right\}$ we obtain the existence of the pair $(\overline{a},\overline{y})$ such that there exists $\overline{x}$ for which the point $M(\overline{a},\overline{x},\overline{y})$ belongs to the local stable manifold.

In the next step we show that for this pair the point $\overline{x}$ is unique and that the dependence $\overline{x}=\overline{x}^0(\overline{a},\overline{y})$ is Lipschitz with a constant that can be made arbitrarily small by decreasing, if necessary the radius δ_1. We will use the notation $\overline{F([a,b])}=\mathrm{conv}\{F(x)\,x=\lambda a+(1-\lambda b),\lambda\in[0,1]\}$. Consider two points on the local stable manifold, denote them by $x_1+y_1=M\cdot(\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_1,\overline{y}_1)$ and $x_2+y_2=M\cdot(\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_2)$. Now

$$M(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)=(x_1^0(y_1)-x_2^0(y_2)+y_1-y_2).$$

Now

$$M\cdot(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)\in\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\left(\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy}(y_1-y_2)+y_1-y_2\right)$$
$$+\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\left(\overline{\frac{Dx^0([y_1,y_2])}{Dy}}-\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy}\right)(y_1-y_2),$$

and, as $\left(\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy}(y_1-y_2)+y_1-y_2\right)$ belongs to the tangent space,

$$M\cdot(0,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)\in\Pi_{M\cdot(0,\overline{x},0)}\left(\overline{\frac{Dx^0([y_1,y_2])}{Dy}}-\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy}\right)(y_1-y_2).$$

We use the fact that x^0 is of class C^1. The first of the above two inclusions implies that there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$

$$|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)|\geq C_1|y_1-y_2|-C_2|y_1-y_2|,$$

where C_2 can be made as small as we need by taking sufficiently small δ_0. Moreover

$$|(0,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|\leq C_3|y_1-y_2|,$$

where C_3 again can be made as small as necessary by taking sufficiently small δ_0. Both above inequalities imply that $|(0,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|\leq C_s|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)|$ with the Lipschitz constant C_s being as small as we need, which can be obtained by taking small δ_0. Observe that this gives the restriction on the radii $c,\delta_{k_1},\delta_{k_2}$ in order to guarantee that the constructed disk remains in the box, namely that $\delta_{k_1}^2\geq C_s^2(\delta_c^2+\delta_{k_2}^2)$.

We pass to the analysis of the unstable manifold $W^u(e_i)$. There exists a point p in the local unstable manifold of e_i and time t such that $z=S^0(t)p$. Denote $p=x_p+y_p$ with x being the u_i-dimensional coordinates in the unstable space of e_i and y being the $d-u_i$ dimensional coordinates in its stable space. The local unstable manifold is a graph of a C^1 function $y=y^0(x)$ (translated such that $y_p=x^0(0)$). Take a ball $B(0,\delta_0)$ such that the graph of the unstable manifold over that ball is inside the h-set. For x in this ball we have

$$S(t)(x_p+x+y^0(x))=S(t)\left(x_p+x+y^0(0)+\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x+\Delta(x)\right)=S(t)\left(p+x+\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x+\Delta(x)\right),$$

where $\Delta(x) \in o(|x|)$. Denote

$$\Delta_1(x) = x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x + \Delta(x).$$

From now on we will denote by $\frac{\partial}{\partial u_0}$ the derivative with respect to the initial data. Then

$$\begin{aligned} S^0(t)(x_p + x + y^0(x)) &= S^0(t)p + \frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\Delta_1(x) + \Delta_2(\Delta_1(x)) \\ &= S^0(t)p + \frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\left(x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right) + \frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\Delta(x) + \Delta_2(\Delta_1(x)), \end{aligned}$$

with $\Delta_2(\Delta_1(x)) \in o(|\Delta_1(x)|)$. Denote $\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\Delta(x) + \Delta_2(\Delta_1(x)) = \Delta_3(x)$. This quantity belongs to $o(|x|)$. Then we have

$$S^0(t)(x_p + x + y^0(x)) = z + \frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\left(x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right) + \Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},\overline{x},0)}\Delta_3(x) + \Pi_{M\cdot(0,0,\overline{y})}\Delta_3(x),$$

and the expression $\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\left(x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right) + \Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},\overline{x},0)}\Delta_3(x)$ belongs to the tangent space $T_z W^u(e_i)$. We need to show that there exists δ_1 such that for every $(\overline{a},\overline{x}) \in B(0,\delta_1)$ there exists $x \in B(0,\delta)$ such that

$$M\cdot(\overline{a},\overline{x},0) = \frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\left(x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right) + \Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},\overline{x},0)}\Delta_3(x),$$

the argument follows by homotopy, analogously as for the stable manifold. Indeed, the invertibility of the linear mapping $x \mapsto \frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\left(x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right)$ implies that there exists $\overline{\delta}(\delta_0)$ such that

$$\{(\overline{a},\overline{x},0) :\ (\overline{a},\overline{x}) \in B(0,\overline{\delta})\} \subset \left\{M^{-1}\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\left(x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right) :\ y \in B(0,\delta_0)\right\},$$

and, decreasing $\overline{\delta}(\delta_0)$ if necessary, as in the case of the stable manifold, the result follows by considering the homotopy

$$B(0,\delta_0)\times[0,1] \ni (x,\theta) \mapsto M^{-1}\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial u_0}\left(x + \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right) + \theta\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},\overline{x},0)}\Delta_3(x).$$

To demonstrate that the point $\overline{y}$ is uniquely determined for a given pair $(\overline{a},\overline{x})$ and the Lipschitz condition holds, consider the two points on the local unstable manifold of e_i, denote them by $p_1 = x_1 + y_1$ and $p_2 = x_2 + y_2$. We consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} S^0(t)(p_2) - S^0(t)(p_1) &\in \overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial x}}(x_2 - x_1) + \overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial y}}(y_2 - y_1) \\ &\subset \left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial x}} + \overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial y}}\ \overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}\right)(x_2 - x_1) \\ &\subset \frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial x}(x_2 - x_1) + \frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}(x_2 - x_1) + \frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\left(\overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}} - \frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}\right)(x_2 - x_1) \\ &\quad + \left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial x}} - \frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial x} + \left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial y}} - \frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\right)\overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}\right)(x_2 - x_1). \end{aligned}$$

Now denote $S^0(t)p_1 = M\cdot(\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_1,\overline{y}_1)$ and $S^0(t)p_2 = M\cdot(\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_2)$. Because the sum of the first two terms in the above expression belongs to the tangent space $T_zW^u(e_i)$, we have

$$M\cdot(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)\in\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial x}(x_2-x_1)+\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}(x_2-x_1)$$
$$+\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},\overline{x},0)}\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\left(\overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}-\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}\right)(x_2-x_1)$$
$$+\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},\overline{x},0)}\left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial x}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial x}+\left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\right)\overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}\right)(x_2-x_1),$$

and

$$M\cdot(0,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)\in\Pi_{M\cdot(0,0\overline{y})}\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\left(\overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}-\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}\right)(x_2-x_1)$$
$$+\Pi_{M\cdot(0,0,\overline{y})}\left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial x}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial x}+\left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)([p_1,p_2])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}\right)\overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}\right)(x_2-x_1),$$

Now, as $\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial x}(x_2-x_1)+\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial y}$ is a nonsingular matrix, by the C^1 continuity of the flow S^0 and of the unstable manifold y^0 we deduce as in the stable case that

$$|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|\geq C_1|x_1-x_2|-C_2|x_1-x_2|,$$

and

$$|(0,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2,0)|\leq C_3|x_1-x_2|,$$

where C_1 is fixed and C_2, C_3 can be made as small as we need by taking sufficiently small δ_0. This implies the required Lipschitz condition $|(0,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2,0)|\leq C_u|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|$ with the arbitrarily small constant C_u. We also have the restriction $\delta_{k_2}^2\geq C_u^2(\delta_c^2+\delta_{k_1}^2)$ that needs to be satisfied together with $\delta_{k_1}^2\geq C_s^2(\delta_c^2+\delta_{k_2}^2)$ so that the graphs are vertical and horizontal disks in the box. But these restrictions can be made to hold together as $C_u\to 0$ as $(\delta_c,\delta_{k_1})\to 0$ and $C_s\to 0$ as $(\delta_c,\delta_{k_2})\to 0$, so we can rescale the three radii if necessary. □

Now we consider the problem with $\varepsilon>0$. Then, the local stable manifold of the corresponding equilibrium $(0,e_j^\varepsilon)$ is a disk over variables (η,x) where $\eta\in B_{L_A^2(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R_1)$ with values denoted by y and (x,y) are the local variables in the h-set containing e_j. Likewise, the local unstable manifold is the disk over the variable y with values being variables (x,η) with $\eta\in B_{L_A^2(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R_2)$ and (x,y) are the local coordinates in the h-set containing e_i. In the next lemma we prove that for every $\eta\in B_{L_A^2(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R_1)$ the section of stable manifold of e_j is a vertical disk in the box constructed in Lemma 7.1 and the image by $S^0(t)$ of the local unstable manifold of e_i is the horizontal disk in the same box. We also calculate the Lipschitz constants of these disks.

Lemma 7.2. *Consider the box $(\overline{a},\overline{x},\overline{y})\in B(0,\delta_c)\times B(0,\delta_{k_1})\times B(0,\delta_{k_2})$ from Lemma 7.1. There exists $\varepsilon_0>0$ such that for every $\varepsilon\in[0,\varepsilon_0]$, if $(0,e_j^\varepsilon)$ is an equilibrium for ε that corresponds to e^j, then, decreasing the size of the box, if necessary, the intersection of the local stable manifold of $(0,e_j^\varepsilon)$ with this box is a vertical disk $\overline{x}^\varepsilon(\cdot,\eta)$ for every $\eta\in B_{L_A^2(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R_1)$ with some $R_1>0$ and the following Lipschitz condition holds*

$$|\overline{x}^\varepsilon(\overline{a}_2,\overline{y}_2,\eta_2)-\overline{x}^\varepsilon(\overline{a}_1,\overline{y}_1,\eta_1)|\leq D_1|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)|+D_2E\|\eta_1-\eta_2\|_{L_A^2(\mathbb{R}_+)^d},$$

for every $\eta_1,\eta_2\in B_{L_A^2(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R_1)$ and with the constant D_1 that can be made arbitrarily small be scaling down the size of the box and decreasing ε, and E being the Lipschitz constant of the η variable in the local unstable manifolds of $(0,e_j^\varepsilon)$.

Moreover, the intersection of the unstable manifold of $(0, e_i^\varepsilon)$ *with the box is the horizontal disk* $\overline{y}^\varepsilon$ *satisfying*

$$|\overline{y}^\varepsilon(\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_2)-\overline{y}^\varepsilon(\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_1)|\le D_3|(\overline{a}_2-\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_2-\overline{x}_1,0)|,$$

where the constant D_3 *can be made arbitrarily small by decreasing* ε *and the size of the box. The corresponding variables* $\overline{\eta}$ *satisfy the Lipschitz condition*

$$\|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_2)-\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_1)\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}\le D_4|(\overline{a}_2-\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_2-\overline{x}_1,0)|,$$

for some constant $D_4>0$.

Proof. Consider first the local stable manifold of $(e_j^\varepsilon,0)$, denote its graph translated by z by $x^\varepsilon(y,\eta)$. Note that $\lim_{\varepsilon_t o 0} x^\varepsilon(0,\eta)=0$. Now fix $\eta\in B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}_+)^d}(0,R_1)$ and consider the point $z+x+y$ on the local stable manifold of e_j with this η. We have

$$x=x^\varepsilon(y,\eta)\in x^\varepsilon(0,\eta)+\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([0,y],\eta)}{\partial y}}y,$$

and hence the point can be written as

$$z+y+\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}y+x^\varepsilon(0,\eta)+\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([0,y],\eta)}{\partial y}}-\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([0,y])}{\partial y}}y+\left(\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([0,y])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}\right)y.$$

The proof now follows the same scheme using the Brouwer degree and the homotopy argument as for the case $\varepsilon=0$ noting that $y+\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}y$ belongs to the tangent space of the stable manifold at z for $\varepsilon=0$, the term $x^\varepsilon(0,\eta)+\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([0,y],\eta)}{\partial y}}-\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([0,y])}{\partial y}}y$ can be made arbitrarily small by decreasing ε, uniformly with respect to η, and the term $\left(\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([0,y])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}\right)y$ can be decreased by scaling down the size of the box, if necessary. Note that the projection on the above point on $M\cdot(0,\overline{x},0)$ can be made to lie in $B(0,\delta_{k_1})$ again by scaling down the size of the box, and decreasing ε.

Now consider the two points in the stable manifold for ε, and denote them by (η_1,x_1+y_1) with $x_1+y_1=M(\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_1,\overline{y}_1)$ and (η_2,x_2+y_2) with $x_2+y_2=M(\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_2)$. The argument again follows the one for $\varepsilon=0$ with some extra terms that become small for small ε. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
M(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)&=(x_1^\varepsilon(y_1,\eta_1)-x_2^\varepsilon(y_2,\eta_2)+y_1-y_2)\\
&=\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial y}}(y_1-y_2)+\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial \eta}}(\eta_1-\eta_2)+y_1-y_2\\
&=\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial y}}-\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([y_2,y_1])}{\partial y}}(y_1-y_2)+\left(\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([y_2,y_1])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}\right)(y_1-y_2)\\
&\quad+\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial \eta}}(\eta_1-\eta_2)+y_1-y_2+\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}(y_1-y_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Like for $\varepsilon=0$ we project this formula on the tangent space $T_zW^s(e_j)$ and its complement. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
M\cdot(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)&\in\left(\frac{Dx^0(0)}{Dy}(y_1-y_2)+y_1-y_2\right)\\
&\quad+\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial y}}-\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([y_2,y_1])}{\partial y}}(y_1-y_2)\\
&\quad+\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\left(\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([y_2,y_1])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}\right)(y_1-y_2)+\Pi_{M\cdot(\overline{a},0,\overline{y})}\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial \eta}}(\eta_1-\eta_2).
\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)|\geq C_1|y_1-y_2|-(C_2(\varepsilon)+C_3)|y_1-y_2|-C_4E|\eta_1-\eta_2|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d},$$

where $C_2(\varepsilon)$ can be made arbitrarily small by taking small ε, C_3 can be decreased by decreasing the size of the box, and E is the Lipschitz constant for η in the graph of x^ε. Now

$$\begin{aligned}M\cdot(0,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)\in{}&\Pi_{M\cdot(0,\overline{x},0)}\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial x^0([y_2,y_1])}{\partial y}(y_1-y_2)\\&+\Pi_{M\cdot(0,\overline{x},0)}\left(\overline{\frac{\partial x^0([y_2,y_1])}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial x^0(0)}{\partial y}\right)(y_1-y_2)+\Pi_{M\cdot(0,\overline{x},0)}\overline{\frac{\partial x^\varepsilon([(y_2,\eta_2)-(y_1,\eta_1)])}{\partial \eta}}(\eta_1-\eta_2).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|(0,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|\leq(C_5(\varepsilon)+C_6)|y_1-y_2|+C_7E\|\eta_1-\eta_2\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}.$$

Summarizing, we obtain

$$|(0,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|\leq\frac{C_5(\varepsilon)+C_6}{C_1-C_2(\varepsilon)-C_3}|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)|+\left(C_7E+\frac{C_5(\varepsilon)+C_6}{C_1-C_2(\varepsilon)-C_3}C_4E\right)\|\eta_1-\eta_2\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}.$$

Note that decreasing ε and the size of the box can make the constant $\frac{C_5(\varepsilon)+C_6}{C_1-C_2(\varepsilon)-C_3}$ arbitrarily small, which ends the proof of the assertion for the stable manifold.

We pass to the argument for the unstable manifold of $(0,e_i^\varepsilon)$. We denote the coordinates that follow from the stable and unstable directions in the local unstable manifold of $(0,e_i^\varepsilon)$ by $(\eta,x+y,\eta)$. The point in this manifold is denoted by

$$\begin{aligned}&(\eta^\varepsilon(x),x_p+x+y^\varepsilon(x))\in\left(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p)+\frac{D\eta^\varepsilon(0)}{Dx}x+\Delta_\eta(x),x_p+x+y^0(0)+(y^\varepsilon(0)-y^0(0))+\frac{Dy^\varepsilon(0)}{Dx}x+\Delta_y(x)\right)\\&=(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)+\left(\frac{D\eta^\varepsilon(0)}{Dx}x,x+\frac{Dy^\varepsilon(0)}{Dx}x\right)+(0,y^\varepsilon(0)-y^0(0))+\left(\Delta_\eta(x),\Delta_y(x)\right)\\&=(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)+\left(\frac{D\eta^\varepsilon(0)}{Dx}x,x+\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right)+\left(0,\frac{Dy^\varepsilon(0)}{Dx}-\left(\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}\right)x\right)+(0,y^\varepsilon(0)-y^0(0))+\left(\Delta_\eta(x),\Delta_y(x)\right)\\&=I+II+III+IV+V.\end{aligned}$$

Now denote the flow by $S^\varepsilon(t)=\left(S^\varepsilon_\eta(t),S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)\right)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x),x_p+x+y^\varepsilon(x))\\&=z+(S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)-S^0(t)p)+\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)}{\partial u_0}II\\&\qquad+\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)}{\partial u_0}(III+IV+V)+o(|II+III+IV+V|)\\&=z+\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial u_0}\left(x+\frac{Dy^0(0)}{Dx}x\right)+(S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)-S^0(t)p)+\left(\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_u(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)}{\partial u_0}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial u_0}\right)II+\\&\qquad+\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)}{\partial u_0}(III+IV+V)+o(|II+III+IV+V|).\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the fact that for every $(\overline{a},\overline{x})$ there exists $\overline{y}$ in the box in the image by $S^\varepsilon(t)$ of the graph of the local unstable manifold follows again by the Brouwer degree and the homotopy argument as in previous cases. Indeed, terms III,IV can be made as small as we need by taking small ε. Same thing can be done with the terms $S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)-S^0(t)p$ and $\left(\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta^\varepsilon(x_p),p)}{\partial u_0}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)(p)}{\partial u_0}\right)II$. The term V satisfies the estimate $|V|\leq c(|x|)|x|$ with $c(|x|)\to 0$ as $|x|\to 0$. This term can be decreased

by decreasing the size of the ball in the variable x. Finally in the term $o(|II+III+IV+V|)$ the dominating contribution comes from II but this, same as in case of V has the form of $c(|x|)|x|$ with $c(|x|)\to 0$ as $|x|\to 0$. We observe that the projection of the above point on $M\cdot(0,0,\overline{y})$ can be made to belong to $B(0,\delta_{k_2})$ by scaling down the box and decreasing ε if necessary.

Now let us consider two points in the local unstable manifold of $(0,e_i^\varepsilon)$. Denote them by $(\eta_1,p_1)=(\eta_1,x_1+y_1)$ and $(\eta_2,p_2)=(\eta_2,x_2+y_2)$. Now $S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta_1,p_1)=M\cdot(\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_1,\overline{y}_1)$ and $S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta_2,p_2)=M\cdot(\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_2,\overline{y}_2)$. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&M\cdot(\overline{a}_2-\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_2-\overline{x}_1,\overline{y}_2-\overline{y}_1)=S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta_2,x_2+y_2)-S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)(\eta_1,x_1+y_1)\\
&\in\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial x}}(x_2-x_1)\\
&\qquad+\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial y}}(y_2-y_1)+\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial \eta}}(\eta_2-\eta_1)\\
&\in\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial x}}(x_2-x_1)+\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial y}}\,\overline{\frac{Dy^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}(x_2-x_1)\\
&\qquad+\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial \eta}}\,\overline{\frac{D\eta^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}(x_2-x_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}
&M\cdot(\overline{a}_2-\overline{a}_1,\overline{x}_2-\overline{x}_1,\overline{y}_2-\overline{y}_1)\in\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial x}\left(\frac{Dy^0(x_p)}{Dx}(x_2-x_1)+x_2-x_1\right)\\
&+\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial x}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)[p_1,p_2]}{\partial x}(x_2-x_1)+\left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)[p_1,p_2]}{\partial x}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial x}\right)(x_2-x_1)\\
&+\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)[p_1,p_2]}{\partial y}\,\overline{\frac{Dy^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}(x_2-x_1)\\
&+\left(\overline{\frac{\partial S^0(t)[p_1,p_2]}{\partial y}}-\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial y}\right)\overline{\frac{Dy^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}(x_2-x_1)\\
&+\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial y}\overline{\frac{Dy^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}-\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}(x_2-x_1)+\frac{\partial S^0(t)p}{\partial y}\left(\overline{\frac{Dy^0([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}-\frac{Dy^0(x_p)}{Dx}\right)(x_2-x_1)\\
&\qquad+\overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_{(x,y)}(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial \eta}}\,\overline{\frac{D\eta^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}(x_2-x_1)=I+II+III+IV+V+VI+VII+VIII.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the last sum belong to the tangent space $T_zW^u(e_i)$ for $\varepsilon=0$. Terms II,IV,VI satisfy the estimate $|II+IV+VI|\le C_2(\varepsilon)|x_1-x_2|$ with $C_2(\varepsilon)\to 0$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$. Terms III,V,VII satisfy the bound $|III+V+VII|\le C_3|x_2-x_1|$, where C_2 may be made arbitrarily small by decreasing the size of the box. As for term $VIII$ we have the bound $|VIII|\le C_4E|x_2-x_1|$, where E is the Lipshitz constant in variable η of the local unstable manifold at ε of the point $(0,e_i^\varepsilon)$. It follows that

$$|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|\ge C_1|x_1-x_2|-(C_2(\varepsilon)+C_3+C_4E)|x_1-x_2|,$$

and

$$|(0,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)|\le(C_2(\varepsilon)+C_3+C_4E)|x_1-x_2|.$$

Now note that E can be decreased to arbitrarily low value by decreasing ε (cf. Lemma 5.6). Hence

$$|(0,0,\overline{y}_1-\overline{y}_2)|\le\frac{C_2(\varepsilon)+C_3+C_4E}{C_1-C_2(\varepsilon)-C_3-C_4E}|(\overline{a}_1-\overline{a}_2,\overline{x}_1-\overline{x}_2,0)|,$$

and we have the required Lipschitz condition with the arbitrarily small constant obtained by decreasing ε and the size of the box, if necessary.

Finally, let us estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\eta}_2 - \overline{\eta}_1 &= S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)(\eta_2, x_2 + y_2) - S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)(\eta_1, x_1 + y_1) \\
&\in \overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial x}}(x_2 - x_1) \\
&\quad + \overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial y}}(y_2 - y_1) + \overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial \eta}}(\eta_2 - \eta_1) \\
&\in \overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial x}}(x_2 - x_1) + \overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial y}}\ \overline{\frac{Dy^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}(x_2 - x_1) \\
&\quad + \overline{\frac{\partial S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)[(\eta_1,p_1),(\eta_2,p_2)]}{\partial \eta}}\ \overline{\frac{D\eta^\varepsilon([x_1,x_2])}{Dx}}(x_2 - x_1).
\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\|\overline{\eta}_2 - \overline{\eta}_1\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d} \le L_1|x_1 - x_2| \le L_2|(\overline{a}_1 - \overline{a}_2, \overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2, 0)|,$$

which completes the proof. □

Now we prove that the manifolds for $\varepsilon > 0$ intersect. We find the intersection, in the constructed box, of the unstable manifold of $(0, e^\varepsilon_i)$ with the stable manifold of $(0, e^\varepsilon_j)$. To this end we consider first the mapping

$$B(0,\delta_{k_1}) \ni \overline{x} \mapsto (\overline{y}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{x}), \overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{x})) \in B(0,\delta_{k_2}) \times B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}(0,R_1).$$

We will compose it with the mapping

$$B(0,\delta_{k_1}) \times B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}(0,R_1) \ni (\overline{y},\overline{\eta}) \mapsto \overline{x}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{y},\overline{\eta}) \in B(0,\delta_{k_1}).$$

If we are able to prove that the composition of the above mappings has a fixed point then this fixed point corresponds to the intersection point of the manifolds for $\varepsilon > 0$.

Lemma 7.3. *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ the unstable manifold of $(0, e^\varepsilon_i)$ intersects with the stable manifold of $(0, e^\varepsilon_j)$.*

Proof. Take $\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2 \in B(0,\delta_{k_1})$. We have

$$|\overline{y}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{x}_2) - \overline{y}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{x}_1)| \le D_3|\overline{x}_2 - \overline{x}_1|,$$

and

$$\|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{x}_2) - \overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{x}_1)\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d} \le D_4|\overline{x}_2 - \overline{x}_1|.$$

We already know that the $\overline{y}$ variable belongs to the ball $B(0,\delta_{k_2})$. But we still need to show that $\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0,\overline{x}) \in B_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d}(0,R_1)$ for $\overline{x} \in B(0,\delta_{k_1})$. To this end observe that $S^0(t)p \to e_j$ as $t \to \infty$. Let us estimate the norm of the delay at $\varepsilon = 0$ corresponding to this solution as $t \to \infty$. We have

$$\eta^t(r) = S^0(t-r)p - S^0(t)p.$$

The norm of this delay is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\eta^t\|^2 &= \int_0^\infty (A(r)(S^0(t-r)p - S^0(t)p), (S^0(t-r)p - S^0(t)p))\,dr \\
&= \int_0^{r_0} (A(r)(S^0(t-r)p - S^0(t)p), (S^0(t-r)p - S^0(t)p))\,dr \\
&\quad + \int_{r_0}^\infty (A(r)(S^0(t-r)p - S^0(t)p), (S^0(t-r)p - S^0(t)p))\,dr.
\end{aligned}$$

In the following calculation by C we will denote a generic constant. Fix $\gamma > 0$ and r_0. For these values we can find t such that for $r \in [0, r_0]$ we have $t - r \geq t - r_0 \geq t_0$ with t_0 sufficiently large to guarantee that $S(s)p \in B(e_j, \gamma)$ for $s \geq t_0$. We have

$$\|\eta^t\|^2 \leq 4\gamma^2 \int_0^{r_0} \|A(r)\| dr + C \int_{r_0}^{\infty} \|A(r)\| dr \leq C\gamma^2 + Ce^{-Cr_0}.$$

whence

$$\|\eta^t\| \leq C\gamma + Ce^{-Cr_0}.$$

Now $\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x})$ is an image by $S^\varepsilon_\eta(t)$ of a certain point $(\xi, x + y)$ in a local unstable manifold of $(0, e^\varepsilon_i)$ such that the distance $|x - x_p|$ does not exceed δ. From (14) we deduce that

$$\|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}) - \eta^t\| \leq Ce^{Ct}(\|\xi - \eta_0\| + |x - x_p| + |y - y_p| + \varepsilon),$$

where η^0 is the delay term corresponding to the total solution passing through p with $\varepsilon = 0$. By Theorem 10.2 the last quantity can be estimated from above as follows

$$\|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}) - \eta^t\| \leq Ce^{Ct}(|x - x_p| + \varepsilon) \leq Ce^{Ct}(\delta + \varepsilon).$$

Now we estimate $\|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x})\|$. We have

$$\|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x})\| \leq \|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}) - \eta^t\| + \|\eta^t\| \leq Ce^{Ct}\delta + Ce^{Ct}\varepsilon + C\gamma + Ce^{-Cr_0}.$$

We need the last quantity to be less than R_1. We fix r_0 and γ so that each of two two last terms is no larger than $\frac{R_1}{4}$. This forces us to choose t. Now choose ε such that the second term is no larger than $\frac{R_1}{4}$. Finally, if necessary, decrease δ so that the first term does not exceed $\frac{R_1}{4}$. We come back to the calculation of the Lipschitz constant for the fixed point mapping. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\overline{x}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{y}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_2), \overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_2)) - \overline{x}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{y}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_1), \overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_1))| \\
&\quad \leq D_1|\overline{y}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_2) - \overline{y}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_1)| + D_2 E\|\overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_2) - \overline{\eta}^\varepsilon(0, \overline{x}_1)\|_{L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d} \\
&\quad \leq (D_1 D_3 + D_2 E D_4)|\overline{x}_2 - \overline{x}_1|.
\end{aligned}$$

The constants D_1, D_3 can be made arbitrarily small by decreasing ε and scaling down the size of the box. Moreover E can be made arbitrarily small by decreasing ε (cf. Lemma 5.6). We decrease these constants such that $D_1 D_3 + D_2 E D_4 < 1$. Then the constructed mapping is a contraction and hence it has a fixed point which is the sought intersection of the manifolds. □

8. Appendix 1: Asymptotic compactness

We consider the semigroup

$$S^\varepsilon(t) : L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \to L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d,$$

given by the solutions of (8)–(9), namely as $S^\varepsilon(t)(\eta^0, x_0) = (\eta^t, x(t))$. We do not expect the compactness of $S^\varepsilon(t)$ for a finite t. Instead we prove the following lemma

Lemma 8.1. *Assume that we have the estimate $|x(t)| \leq C(|x_0|, \|\eta_0\|)$ for the function C nondecreasing with respect to both arguments (this a priori estimate follows from the Lyapunov function in Lemma 5.1). Assume that $\{\eta^{0,n}, x^n_0\}$ is a sequence of initial data bounded in $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t_n \to \infty$. Then $S^\varepsilon(t_n)(\eta^{0,n}, x^n_0)$ is relatively compact.*

Proof. Denote $(\eta^{t,n}, x^n(t)) = S^\varepsilon(t)(\eta^{0,n}, x^n_0)$. Then $|x^n(t_n)|$ is bounded, so it has a convergent subsequence. We denote this subsequence by the same index n, without renumbering. Then $x^n(t_n) \to \xi$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We need to show the relative compactness of $\eta^{t_n,n}$, that is of $x^n(t_n - s) - x^n(t_n)$. in $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$. Observe that

$$0 \leq \int_0^\infty (A(s)(x^n(t_n) - \xi), x^n(t_n) - \xi)\, ds \leq \int_0^\infty \|A(s)\|\, ds |x^n(t_n) - \xi|^2 \to 0.$$

It is enough to prove the relative compactness of $[0,\infty) \ni s \to x^n(t_n - s) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the space $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$. We first demonstrate the relative compactness on $L^2_A(0,T)^d$ for every T. Note that the continuity and positive definiteness of $[0,T] \ni s \mapsto A(s)$ implies that the norms $L^2_A(0,T)^d$ and $L^2(0,T)^d$ are equivalent. We are in position to use the Kolmogorov-Riesz-Frechet theorem which states that the set $B \subset L^2(0,T)^d$ is relatively compact if and only if it is bounded in that space and

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \sup_{u\in B} \int_0^{T-h} |u(s+h) - u(s)|^2 \, ds = 0.$$

In our case we need to show that

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \sup_{n} \int_0^{T-h} |x^n(t_n - s - h) - x^n(t_n - s)|^2 \, ds = 0,$$

or

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \sup_{n} \int_0^{T-h} \int_{t_n - s - h}^{t_n - s} |(x^n)'(r)|^2 \, dr \, ds = 0.$$

It is enough that the result is obtained for $n \geq n_0$ where n_0 may depend on T. We chose n_0 sufficiently large such that $t_n \geq T$. Then

$$\int_0^{T-h} \int_{t_n - s - h}^{t_n - s} |(x^n)'(r)|^2 \, dr \, ds \leq h \int_{t_n - T}^{t_n} |(x^n)'(r)|^2 \, dr.$$

But, cf. (8) and Lemma 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{t_n - T}^{t_n} |(x^n)'(r)|^2 \, dr &\leq 3 \int_{t_n - T}^{t_n} |f(x^n(s))|^2 \, ds + \varepsilon C \int_{t_n - T}^{t_n} |x^n(s)|^2 \, ds + \varepsilon C \int_{t_n - T}^{T_n} \|\eta^{s,n}\|^2 \, ds \\ &\leq TC(\|\eta^{0,n}\|, |x_0|),\end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. By the diagonal argument we can construct a subsequence, still denoted by n, which converges in $L^2_A(0,T)^d$ for every T. We denote the limit by η. We also have that $\eta^{t_n,n}(r) \to \eta(r)$ for almost every $r \geq 0$. As $\eta^{t_n,n}(r) = x^n(t_n - r) - x^n(r)$, it follows that $|\eta^{t_n,n}(r)| \leq E$ for a constant $E > 0$ and $r \in [0, t_n]$, whence $|\eta(r)| \leq E$ for a.e. $r \geq 0$. We claim that this subsequence actually converges in $L^2_A(\mathbb{R}^+)^d$. To get this assertion we need to show that for every $\delta > 0$ there exists n_δ such that for every $n \geq n_\delta$ there holds

$$\|\eta^{t_n,n} - \eta\| = \int_0^\infty (A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)), (\eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r))) \, dr \leq \delta$$

We choose T_δ such that

$$\int_{T_\delta}^\infty \|A(r)\| \, dr \leq \frac{\delta}{12E^2}.$$

For large T_δ we split the integral into three parts

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^\infty (A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)), \eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)) \, dr \\ &= \int_0^{T_\delta} (A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)), \eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)) \, dr \\ &+ \int_{T_\delta}^{t_n} (A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)), \eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)) \, dr + \int_{t_n}^\infty (A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)), \eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)) \, dr.\end{aligned}$$

From convergence in $L^2_A(0,T)^d$ for every T it follows that we can find n_δ such that the first integral in no greater than $\delta/3$. Norm of the second integral is majorized as follows

$$\left| \int_{T_\delta}^{t_n} (A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)), \eta^{t_n,n}(r) - \eta(r)) \, dr \right| \leq 4E^2 \int_{T_\delta}^{t_n} \|A(r)\| \, dr \leq 4E^2 \int_{T_\delta}^\infty \|A(r)\| \, dr \leq \frac{\delta}{3}.$$

To deal with the last integral let us compute

$$\int_{t_n}^{\infty}(A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r)-\eta(r)),\eta^{t_n,n}(r)-\eta(r))\,dr$$
$$\leq 2\int_{t_n}^{\infty}(A(r)\eta^{t_n,n}(r),\eta^{t_n,n}(r))\,dr+2\int_{t_n}^{\infty}(A(r)\eta(r),\eta(r))\,dr$$
$$\leq 2\int_{0}^{\infty}(A(r+t_n)\eta^{0,n}(r),\eta^{0,n}(r))\,dr+2E^2\int_{t_n}^{\infty}\|A(r)\|\,dr.$$

From 2.1 we deduce

$$\int_{t_n}^{\infty}(A(r)(\eta^{t_n,n}(r)-\eta(r)),\eta^{t_n,n}(r)-\eta(r))\,dr$$
$$\leq 2e^{-Ct_n}\int_{0}^{\infty}(A(r)\eta^{0,n}(r),\eta^{0,n}(r))\,dr+\frac{\delta}{6}=2e^{-Ct_n}\|\eta^{0,n}\|^2+\frac{\delta}{6}.$$

We can find n_δ large enough, that the right-hand side of the last bound is no greater than $\delta/3$ and the proof is complete. □

9. Appendix 2: Graph transform for existence of local stable and unstable manifolds.

We begin with the definitions and properties of hyperbolic sets, isolation, and cone conditions adapted for the problems with the distributed delay.

Definition 9.1. A family of mappings $\{S(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ will be called a C^0 semiflow on X if

- $[0,\infty)\times X\ni(t,x)\to S(t)x$ is continuous,
- $S(0)=I_X$, the identity,
- $S(t+s)x=S(t)(S(s)x)$ for every $s,t\geq 0$ and $x\in X$

Definition 9.2. A C^0 semiflow on X $\{S(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ is asymptotically compact if for a bounded sequence $\{x_n\}\subset X$ and a sequence $t_n\to\infty$ the sequence $S(t_n)x_n$ is relatively compact.

Definition 9.3. For a bounded set B we define its ω-limit set as

$$\omega(B)=\{x\in X:\ x=\lim_{n\to\infty}S(t_n)x_n\ \text{ for sequences }\ t_n\to\infty\ \text{ and }\ \{x_n\}\subset B\}.$$

The following result is well known.

Lemma 9.4. *If a a C^0 semiflow is assymptotically compact, then for every nonempty bounded set $B\subset X$, the set $\omega(B)$ is nonempty, compact, connected, invariant, and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\operatorname{dist}(S(t)B,\omega(B))=0.$$

Definition 9.5. Let X be a Banach space. The set $A\subset X$ is called an h-set (hyperbolic set) if there exist the linear closed subspaces X_1,X_2 of X with $X=X_1\oplus X_2$ and $\dim X_1<\infty$, $\dim X_1=s+u$, with $s,u\in\mathbb{N}$, $u=u_1+2u_2$ and $s=s_1+2s_2$, the numbers $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^{s_1+s_2+u_1+u_2}$ with $a_k>0$ and an affine bijective mapping $L:\mathbb{R}^{\dim X_1}\to X_1$ such that

$$A=L(N_u\times N_s)\oplus\overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r),$$

where

$$N_u=\prod_{k=1}^{u_1}[-a_k,a_k]\times\prod_{k=u_1+1}^{u_1+u_2}\{(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2:\ x^2+y^2\leq a_k^2\},$$

and

$$N_s=\prod_{k=u_1+u_2+1}^{u_1+u_2+s_1}[-a_k,a_k]\times\prod_{k=u_1+u_2+s_1+1}^{u_1+u_2+s_1+s_2}\{(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2:\ x^2+y^2\leq a_k^2\},$$

We also define

$$N_{u,\varepsilon} = \prod_{k=1}^{u_1}[-a_k-\varepsilon, a_k+\varepsilon] \times \prod_{k=u_1+1}^{u_1+u_2}\{(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^2 : x^2+y^2 \le (a_k+\varepsilon)^2\}.$$

If an element x belongs to an h-set A we can represent it uniquely as

$$x = L((x_u, x_s)) + y,$$

where $y \in \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r)$, $x_u \in N_u \subset \mathbb{R}^u$ and $x_s \in N_s \subset \mathbb{R}^s$. We will use the notation $P_u x = x_u$, $P_s x = x_s$ and $P_{X_2} x = y$. For and h-set we define its exit set as

$$A_{exit} = L(\partial N_u \times N_s) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r).$$

and its ε exit extension as

$$A^\varepsilon = L(N_{u,\varepsilon} \times N_s) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r).$$

Note that P_u, P_s and P_{X_2} make sense for elements of A^ε. An equivalent norm on X will be denoted by $\|x\|_X = |P_u x| + |P_s x| + \|P_{X_2} x\|_{X_2}$, where by $|\cdot|$ we denote an euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^s$ or $\mathbb{R}^u$.

Definition 9.6. Let X be a Banach space and let $\{S(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ be a C^0 semiflow of mappings $S(t) : X \to X$. An h-set A is isolating with respect to this semiflow if there exixts $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for every $s \in (0, t(\varepsilon)]$

(A1) $S(s)A \subset A^\varepsilon$,
(A2) $[S(s)(A_{exit})] \cap A = \emptyset$.

Condition (A1) imples that if via the evolution $S(t)$ we leave an isolating h-set, we have to stay in A^ε within the short time interval, while condition (A2) implies that if we are on the exit set of A, then, although we stay in A^ε, we cannot reenter A is a short time.

Definition 9.7. The h-set $A \subset X$ is called an h-set with cones if there exist three continuous quadratic forms $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^u \to \mathbb{R}$, $\beta : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma : X_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$m_\alpha |x|^2 \le \alpha(x) \le M_\alpha |x|^2 \quad \text{for every} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^u,$$
$$m_\beta |x|^2 \le \beta(x) \le M_\beta |x|^2 \quad \text{for every} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^s,$$
$$m_\gamma \|y\|_{X_2}^2 \le \gamma(y) \le M_\gamma \|y\|_{X_2}^2 \quad \text{for every} \quad y \in X_2,$$

such that for every $x_1, x_2 \in A$ satisfying $x_1 \ne x_2$ the function

$$t \mapsto \alpha(P_u(S(t)x_1 - S(t)x_2)) - \beta(P_s(S(t)x_1 - S(t)x_2)) - \gamma(P_{X_2}(S(t)x_1 - S(t)x_2))$$

is strictly increasing as long as both $S(t)x_1$ and $S(t)x_2$ stay in A. For short we will write, for $x \in X$

$$Q(x) = \alpha(P_u(x)) - \beta(P_s(x)) - \gamma(P_{X_2}(x)).$$

Consider two points $x_1, x_2 \in A$. If $Q(x_1 - x_2) > 0$, then we will say that x_1 is in the positive cone of x_2 (and, equivalently, x_2 is in the positive cone of x_1), and if $Q(x_1 - x_2) < 0$ then we will say that x_1 is in the negative cone of x_2 (and, equivalently, x_2 is in the negative cone of x_1).

Definition 9.8. Let $\{S(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ be a C^0 semiflow on X. A point $x_0 \in X$ is an equilibrium if $S(t)x_0 = x_0$ for every $t \ge 0$. Let A be and h-set such that $x_0 \in A$ is an equilibrium. We define its local stable and unstable sets

$$W^s_{loc,A}(x_0) = \{x \in A : S(t)x \in A \ \text{ for every } \ t \ge 0 \ \text{ and } \ \lim_{t\to\infty} S(t)x = x_0\},$$

$$W^u_{loc,A}(x_0) = \{x \in A : \text{ there exists the function } \ u : (-\infty, 0] \to A \ \text{ such that}$$
$$u(0) = x, \lim_{s\to-\infty} u(s) = x_0 \ \text{ and for every } \ s \in (-\infty, 0] \ \text{ and } \ t \in [0, -s] \ \text{ we have } \ S(t)u(s) = u(s+t)\},$$

We provide the theorem of the existence of a unique fixed points and local stable and unstable manifolds inside the isolating h-set with cones. Its proof is a version of Hadamard's proof of the existence of local stable and unstable manifolds and is based on a concept of the graph transform method.

Theorem 9.9. *Let A be an isolating h-set with cones for an asymptotically compact C^0 semiflow $\{S(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$. Then there exist:*

- *a unique equilibrium x_0 in A,*
- *a Lipschitz continuous mapping*

$$F_s : L\left(\prod_{k=1}^{u}\{0\} \times N_s\right) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r) \to A,$$

with $P_s F_s(L(x_u,x_s)+y) = x_s$ and $P_{X_2} F_s(L(x_u,x_s)+y) = y$ such that $\operatorname{im} F_s = W^s_{loc,A}(x_0)$,

- *a Lipschitz continuous mapping*

$$F_u : N_u \to A,$$

with $P_u F_u(L(x_u,x_s)+y) = x_u$ such that $\operatorname{im} F_u = W^u_{loc,A}(x_0)$.

Proof. **Step 1. Graph transform.** Consider a function $h : N_u \to A$ with $P_u(h(x)) = x$ for every $x \in N_u$ such that for every $x_1, x_2 \in N_u$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$ the point $h(x_1)$ is in the positive cone of $h(x_2)$. We will call such function the horizontal disk. For every $x \in N_u$ consider $s \in (0, t(\varepsilon)]$ and observe that

$$P_u S(s)(h(x)) \in N_{u,\varepsilon}.$$

Choose $s \in (0, t(\varepsilon))$. We should show that for every $x \in N_u$ there exists a unique $z \in N_u$ such that $S(r)h(z) \in A$ for every $r \in (0,s]$ and $P_u S(s)(h(z)) = x$. We start from the proof of uniqueness. For the sake of contradiction assume that $P_u S(s)(h(z_1)) = P_u S(s)(h(z_2))$. By (A1) and (A2) we can use the cone condition whence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq -\beta(P_s(S(s)h(z_1) - S(s)h(z_2))) - \gamma(P_{X_2}(S(s)h(z_1) - S(s)h(z_2))) \\ &= Q(S(s)h(z_1) - S(s)h(z_2)) > Q(h(z_1) - h(z_2)), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction with the fact that h is a horizontal disk.

To prove the existence consider the map

$$\Phi_s : N_u \to N_{u,\varepsilon}$$

defined by

$$N_u \ni x \mapsto P_u S(s)(h(x)) \in N_{u,\varepsilon}$$

and the map $\Psi_s : \mathbb{R}^u \to \mathbb{R}^u$

$$\mathbb{R}^u \ni x \to e^s x \in \mathbb{R}^u.$$

Define the homotopy

$$f_r(x) = \Psi_{(1-r)s}(\Phi_{rs}(x)) \quad \text{for} \quad r \in [0,1].$$

From (A1), (A2) and the fact the Ψ_s is expanding and Ψ_0 is the identity we obtain that $N_u \cap \Psi_{(1-r)s}(\Phi_{rs}(\partial N_u))) = \emptyset$. This implies that

$$\deg(\Phi_1, \operatorname{int} N_u, x) = \deg(\Psi_1, \operatorname{int} N_u, x) \neq 0,$$

for every $x \in N_u$. In consequence we get the needed existence. Define the set

$$N_u \supset N_u(t) = \{x \in N_u : S(s)(h(x)) \in A \text{ for } s \in [0,t]\}$$

and a mapping

$$N_u \ni P_u S(t)h(y) \mapsto S(t)h(y) \in A \ \text{ for some } \ y \in N_u(t).$$

We have to prove that this mapping is a horizontal disk. This fact holds from the observation that the cone condition and the fact that h is a horizontal disk imply

$$Q(S(t)h(x_1) - S(t)h(x_2)) > Q(h(x_1) - h(x_2)) > 0.$$

Our aim is to prove that

$$\bigcap_{t\geq 0} N_u(t) \neq \emptyset.$$

This is a deceasing family of sets which are nonempty, bounded and closed and hence compact. Their intersection is nonempty and there exists $x \in N_u$ such that $S(t)(h(x)) \in A$ for every $t \geq 0$.

Step 2. Existence of unique equilibrium. In this step we will prove that there exists a unique $z_0 \in A$ such that if $S(t)z \in A$ for every $t \in [0,\infty)$ then $\lim_{t\to\infty} S(t)z = z_0$. Take $z \in A$ such that $S(t)z \in A$ for every $t \geq 0$ and let $\overline{z} \in \omega(z)$. We will show that a cone condition allows us to construct a Lyapunov function, and we will use the invariance principle. Let $S(t_n)z \to \overline{z}$. Note that $S(t)S(t_n)z \to S(t)\overline{z}$. The function $[0,\infty) \ni s \to Q(S(s)z - S(s)S(t)z)$ is nondecreasing and bounded from above. Hence $\lim_{s\to\infty} Q(S(s)z - S(t)S(s)z) = Q_0$. There holds $Q(\overline{z} - S(t)\overline{z}) = Q_0$. Assume that $\overline{z} \neq S(t)\overline{z}$. Then $Q(S(r)\overline{z} - S(r)S(t)\overline{z}) > Q_0$ for $r > 0$. But

$$Q(S(r)S(t_n)z - S(r)S(t_n)S(t)z) = Q(S(t_n + r)z - S(t)S(t_n + r)z) \to Q_0$$

and, simultaneously

$$Q(S(r)S(t_n)z - S(r)S(t_n)S(t)z) \to Q(S(r)\overline{z} - S(r)S(t)\overline{z}) > Q_0,$$

a contradiction. Hence $\overline{z} = S(t)\overline{z}$. Hence every $\overline{z} \in \omega(z)$ is an equilibrium. An immediate observation that uses the cone condition implies that the equilibrium in A must be unique. Hence $\omega(z) = \{z_0\}$ and $S(t)z \to z_0$ as $t \to \infty$.

Step 3. Local stable manifold. We prove that for any horizontal disk $h : N_u \to A$ the point $h(x)$ such that its trajectory stays in A is unique. We will denote such point $x_h \in N_u$. Indeed assume that there are two such points $h(x_1)$ and $h(x_2)$. Then both $S(t)(h(x_1)) \to z_0$ and $S(t)(h(x_2)) \to z_0$ as $t \to \infty$. Hence

$$Q(h(x_1) - h(x_2)) < Q(S(t)(h(x_1)) - S(t)(h(x_2))) \to 0.$$

On the other hand $Q(h(x_1) - h(x_2)) > 0$, a contradiction. For $z \in L\left(\prod_{k=1}^{u}\{0\} \times N_s\right) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r)$ given by $z = L((0,P_s z)) + P_{x_2} z$ define the horizontal disk $h_z(x) = L((x,P_s z)) + P_{X_2} z$. There exists a unique point in this disk x_{h_z} such that its trajectory stays in A for all t. We denote $F_s(z) = x_{h_z}$. Graph of F_s is a local stable manifold of the unique eqilibrium z_0. We prove that F_s is Lipschitz. If $z_1 \neq z_2$ then $F_s(z_1)$ and $F_s(z_2)$ cannot stay mutually in their positive cones, otherwise their trajectories could not converge to the same point (hence the map F_s is a vertical disk). This means that

$$\alpha(P_u(F_s(z_1) - F_s(z_2))) \leq \beta(P_s(z_1 - z_2)) + \gamma(P_{X_2}(z_1 - z_2)),$$

which is enough to assert that F_s is Lipschitz.

Step 4. Local unstable manifold. Consider a horizontal disk $h : N_u \to A$ and the map $N_u(t) \ni x \to S(t)(h(x)) \in A$. As it was established in Step 1, for every $t \geq 0$ there exists a horizontal disk with the image equal to the image of this map. Fix $t > 0, x \in N_u$ and consider the sequence

$$a_k := [S(kt)(h(N_u(kt)))] \cap \left[L(\{x\} \times N_s) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r)\right].$$

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the intersection has exactly one point, so this sequence is well defined. By applying the diagonal argument to this sequence, we can find

$$w_x \in L(\{x\} \times N_u) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r)$$

with infinite backward orbit in A. Indeed: since each a_k has the backward orbit in A with the length at least t, we can consider the sequence $\{b_k\} \subset A$ such that $S(t)b_k = a_k$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By the asymptotic compactness we can pick a convergent subsequence of b_k and, abusing the notation, we consider the corresponding subsequence of a_k without renumbering it. By the continuity of $S(t)$ we have $S(t)\lim b_k = \lim a_k$, so the subsequence a_k has limit with backward orbit in A of length at least t. We set $w_1 = a_1$. We take the subsequence of a_k consisting of points which have the backward orbits in A of time length at least $2t$ and we do not renumber it. We repeat the procedure to obtain the subsequence with the limit having the backward orbit in A with

time length $2t$ and take as w_2 the first element of this new subsequence. Then we continue the argument for time intervals of length lt for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and each time we set $w_l = a_1$, the first element of the new subsequence. By construction, the limit of this diagonal sequence w_x has infinite backward orbit $\{o_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}}, o_{k+1} = S(t)o_k$ in A for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_-, o_0 = w_x$. Since $V(z) := Q(z - z_0)$ is a Lyapunov function, it holds that $\lim_{k\to-\infty} o_k = z_0$. Thus $w_x \in W^u_{loc,A}(z_0)$. Assume that for some $z \in L(\{x\} \times N_s) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0, r)$ such that $z \neq w_x$ for some x there exists an infinite backward orbit o'_k in A. Then $0 > Q(z - w_x) > \lim_{k\to-\infty} Q(o_k - o'_k) = Q(z_0 - z_0) = 0$, a contradiction. We define $F_u : N_u \ni x \mapsto w_x \in A$. This is the local unstable manifold, and by the argument analogous to the one in the step 3, it is a Lipschitz function. □

10. Appendix 3: C^0 dependence of local unstable and stable manifolds on parameter.

10.1. **Cone condition with parameter.** Consider the family $\{S_\delta\}_{\delta\in[0,\Delta]}$ of semiflows on the space X and a set $A \subset X$ which is an isolating h-set for every $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$.

Definition 10.1. Let $\{S_\delta(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ given for $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$ be C^0 semiflows and let $A \subset X$ be an h-set with cones for every $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$. We say that this set is a parameterized h-set with cones if there exist three continuous quadratic forms $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^u \to \mathbb{R}$, $\beta : \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma : X_2 \to \mathbb{R}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&m_\alpha|x|^2 \leq \alpha(x) \leq M_\alpha|x|^2 \ \text{ for every } \ x \in \mathbb{R}^u,\\
&m_\beta|x|^2 \leq \beta(x) \leq M_\beta|x|^2 \ \text{ for every } \ x \in \mathbb{R}^s,\\
&m_\gamma\|x\|^2_{X_2} \leq \gamma(x) \leq M_\gamma\|x\|^2_{X_2} \ \text{ for every } \ x \in X_2,
\end{aligned}
$$

and a positive constant $L \in \mathbb{R}$ such that:

(i) for every $x_1, x_2 \in A$ and every $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0, \Delta]$ if the function

$$
\begin{aligned}
[0,\infty) \ni t \mapsto\ & L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2 + \alpha(P_u(S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1 - S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2))\\
&- \beta(P_s(S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1 - S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2)) - \gamma(P_{X_2}(S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1 - S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2)) = \widehat{Q}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

satisfies $\widehat{Q}(0) \geq 0$ then $\widehat{Q}(t) \geq 0$ as long as both $S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1$ and $S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2$ stay in A,

(ii) for every $x_1, x_2 \in A$ and every $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0, \Delta]$ if the function

$$
\begin{aligned}
[0,\infty) \ni t \mapsto\ & \alpha(P_u(S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1 - S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2))\\
&- \beta(P_s(S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1 - S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2)) - \gamma(P_{X_2}(S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1 - S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2)) - L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2 = \overline{Q}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

satisfies $\overline{Q}(0) \geq 0$ then $\overline{Q}(t) \geq 0$ as long as both $S_{\delta_1}(t)x_1$ and $S_{\delta_2}(t)x_2$ stay in A,

(iii) for every given $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$ the function

$$
[0,\infty) \ni t \mapsto \alpha(P_u(S_\delta(t)x_1 - S_\delta(t)x_2)) - \beta(P_s(S_\delta(t)x_1 - S_\delta(t)x_2)) - \gamma(P_{X_2}(S_\delta(t)x_1 - S_\delta(t)x_2))
$$

is strictly increasing for every $x_1 \neq x_2$ as long as both trajectories $S_\delta(t)x_1$ and $S_\delta(t)x_2$ stay in A.

If there exists a parameterized h-set with cones then the same α, β, γ can be used in the definition of an h-set with cones for every $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$, so every S_δ must have a unique equilibrium $x^\delta_0 \in A$ and a local stable and unstable manifolds $W^s_{loc,A}(x^\delta_0), W^u_{loc,A}(x^\delta_0)$ given by the images of the Lipshitz functions

$$
F^\delta_u : N_u \to A, \qquad F^\delta_s : L\left(\prod_{k=1}^{u}\{0\} \times N_s\right) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0, r) \to A,
$$

10.2. **Lipshitz continuous dependence of local unstable manifolds on parameter.** In the proof of the Lipshitz continuous dependence of local unstable manifolds on parameter we will say that the pairs (δ_1, x_1) and (δ_2, x_2) belong mutually to their positive cones if

$$L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2 + \alpha(P_u(x_1 - x_2)) > \beta(P_s(x_1 - x_2)) + \gamma(P_{s_2}(x_1 - x_2)),$$

so we link the variable δ with the unstable variable x_u. We prove the following result.

Theorem 10.2. *Let A be an isolating parameterized h-set with cones with a constant $L > 0$ for asymptotically compact C^0 semiflows $\{S_\delta(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ for $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$ and let F_u^δ be the Lipschitz functions such that $imF_u^\delta = W^u_{loc,A}(x_0^\delta)$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0, \delta]$ and every $x_1, x_2 \in N_u$ we have*

$$\|F_u^{\delta_1}(x_1) - F_u^{\delta_2}(x_2)\|_X \leq C(|\delta_1 - \delta_2| + |x_1 - x_2|).$$

Proof. The proof follows the lines of Steps 1 and 4 in the proof of Theorem 9.9, where we additionally treat the extra variable δ (which is constant in time) as one of unstable variables. We provide the details of the proof for the completeness of the exposition.

Step 1. Graph transform in extended variables. Define

$$N_{cu} = [0, \Delta] \times N_u,$$

and consider the function $h : N_{cu} \to A$ with $P_u(h(\delta, x)) = x$ such that for every $(\delta_1, x_1), (\delta_2, x_2) \in N_{cu}$ with $(\delta_1, x_1) \neq (\delta_2, x_2)$ the point $(\delta_1, h(\delta_1, x_1))$ is in the positive cone of $(\delta_2, h(\delta_2, x_2))$. Proceeding exactly as in the proof of Theorem 9.9, for every $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$ and $t > 0$ there exists the nonempty and compact set $N_{cu}(t, \delta) \subset N_u$ such that

$$N_{cu} \supset \bigcup_{\delta \in [0,\Delta]} \{\delta\} \times N_{cu}(t, \delta) = \{(\delta, x) \in N_{cu} : S_\delta(s)(h(\delta, x)) \in A \text{ for } s \in [0, t]\}$$

and the mapping

$$N_{cu} \ni (\delta, P_u S_\delta(t)h(z)) \mapsto S_\delta(t)h(z) \in A \text{ for some } z \in N_{cu}(t, \delta)$$

is a horizontal disk, i.e. any two points in its graph belong mutually to their positive cones.

Step 2. Local unstable manifold in extended variables. We proceed as in step 4 of the proof of Theorem 9.9. From the previous step, by evolving the horizontal disk $h : N_{cu} \to A$ by the family of semigroups $\{S_\delta\}_{\delta \in [0,\Delta]}$ we obtain horizontal disks for every $t > 0$. Fix $t > 0, (\delta, x) \in N_{cu}$ and consider the sequence obtained by intersecting the horizontal disk with the vertical segment

$$a_k(\delta, x) := [S_\delta(kt)(h(N_{cu}(kt, \delta)))] \cap \left[L(\{x\} \times N_s) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0, r)\right].$$

As we have shown in step 4 in the proof of Theorem 9.9 this sequence has a convergent subsequence and the limit $w_{x,\delta}$ has an infinite backward trajectory via S_δ convergent backward in time to the unique equilibrium z_0^δ of S_δ in A. Moreover, for every $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$ the limit $w_{x,\delta}$ is the unique point among the points z with $P_u z = x$ with the infinite backward trajectory in A. This uniqueness implies that the whole sequence $a_k(\delta, x)$ converges to $w_{x,\delta}$. We can define the mapping $F_{cu} : N_{cu} \ni (\delta, x) \to w_{x,\delta} \in A$. For every $\delta \in [0, \Delta]$ we have $\operatorname{im} F_{cu}(\delta, \cdot) = W^u_{loc,A}(z_0^\delta)$. To show that F_{cu} is Lipschitz observe that for every $(\delta_1, x_1), (\delta_2, x_2) \in N_{cu}$ the points $a_k(\delta_1, x_1)$ and $a_k(\delta_2, x_2)$ belong to the same horizontal disk so they also belong to each other's positive cones. Hence, for every k we have

$$0 < L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2 + \alpha(x_1 - x_2) - \beta(P_s(a_k(\delta_1, x_1) - a_k(\delta_2, x_2)))) - \gamma(P_{X_2}(a_k(\delta_1, x_1) - a_k(\delta_2, x_2)))),$$

and passing to the limit with $k \to \infty$ we obtain

$$\beta(P_s(w_{x_1,\delta_1} - w_{x_2,\delta_2})) + \gamma(P_{X_2}(w_{x_1,\delta_1} - w_{x_2,\delta_2})) \leq L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2 + \alpha(x_1 - x_2),$$

which leads to the required Lipschitz condition.

□

10.3. **Lipshitz continuous dependence of local stable manifolds on parameter.** In the proof of the Lipshitz continuous dependence of local stable manifolds on parameter the key role will be played by the cone condition given in item (ii) of Definition 10.1. We will now say that the pairs (δ_1, x_1) and (δ_2, x_2) belong mutually to their positive cones if

$$\alpha(P_u(x_1 - x_2)) > \beta(P_s(x_1 - x_2)) + \gamma(P_{X_2}(x_1 - x_2)) + L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2.$$

We prove the following result.

Theorem 10.3. *Let A be an isolating parameterized h-set with cones with a constant $L > 0$ for asymptotically compact C^0 semiflows $\{S_\delta(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ for $\delta \in [0,\Delta]$ and let F_s^δ be the Lipschitz functions such that $imF_s^\delta = W^s_{loc,A}(x_0^\delta)$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0,\delta]$ and every $z_1, z_2 \in L\left(\prod_{k=1}^u \{0\} \times N_s\right) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r)$ we have*

$$\alpha(P_u(F_s^{\delta_1}(z_2) - F_s^{\delta_2}(z_1))) \leq \beta(P_s(z_1 - z_2)) + \gamma(P_{X_2}(z_1 - z_2)) + L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2.$$

Proof. Again the proof follows the lines of Steps 1 and 3 in the proof of Theorem 9.9.

Step 1. Graph transform in extended variables. As in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 10.2 we define

$$N_{cu} = [0,\Delta] \times N_u,$$

and consider the function $h : N_{cu} \to A$ with $P_u(h(\delta, x)) = x$ such that for every $(\delta_1, x_1), (\delta_2, x_2) \in N_{cu}$ with $(\delta_1, x_1) \neq (\delta_2, x_2)$ the point $(\delta_1, h(\delta_1, x_1))$ is in the positive cone of $(\delta_2, h(\delta_2, x_2))$, now with respect to $\overline{Q}$. Again, evolving the graph of this function we obtain a family of horizontal disks in extended variables parameterized by time.

Step 2. Local stable manifold in extended variables. Exactly as in step 3 of the proof of Theorem 9.9, for $z \in L\left(\prod_{k=1}^u \{0\} \times N_s\right) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r)$ given by $z = L((0, P_s z)) + P_{X_2} z$ define the horizontal disk $h_z(\delta, x) = L((x, P_s z)) + P_{X_2} z$. This disk, after time t transforms to the horizontal disk $h_{z,t}(\delta, x)$. Let us define the mapping

$$[0,\Delta] \times L\left(\prod_{k=1}^u \{0\} \times N_s\right) \oplus \overline{B}_{X_2}(0,r) \ni (\delta, z) \mapsto f_t(\delta, z) = L(x(t,\delta,z), P_s z) + P_{X_2} z \in A,$$

where $x(t,\delta,z) \in N_u$ is such a point that $P_u(h_{z,t}(\delta, x(t,\delta,z))) = 0$. We prove that this mapping is a vertical disk, that is, that

$$\alpha(x(t,\delta_1,z_1) - x(t,\delta_2,z_2)) \leq \beta(P_s(z_1 - z_2)) + \gamma(P_{X_2}(z_1 - z_2)) + L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2.$$

Indeed, if the opposite inequality holds

$$\alpha(x(t,\delta_1,z_1) - x(t,\delta_2,z_2)) > \beta(P_s(z_1 - z_2)) + \gamma(P_{X_2}(z_1 - z_2)) + L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2,$$

then points $(\delta_1, f_t(\delta_1, z_1))$ and $(\delta_2, f_t(\delta_2, z_2))$ belong mutually to their positive cones, whence, after time t, we should have, that

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(0-0) \geq{}& \beta(P_s(h_{z_1,t}(\delta_1, x(t,\delta_1,z_1)) - h_{z_2,t}(\delta_2, x(t,\delta_2,z_2))))\\ &+ \gamma(P_{X_2}(h_{z_1,t}(\delta_1, x(t,\delta_1,z_1)) - h_{z_2,t}(\delta_2, x(t,\delta_2,z_2)))) + L|\delta_1 - \delta_2|^2,\end{aligned}$$

which would mean that $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = \delta$ and $h_{z_1,t}(\delta, x(t,\delta,z_1)) = h_{z_2,t}(\delta, x(t,\delta,z_2))$. But this means that

$$\alpha(x(t,\delta,z_1) - x(t,\delta,z_2)) > \beta(P_s(z_1 - z_2)) + \gamma(P_{X_2}(z_1 - z_2)),$$

i.e. $Q(f_t(\delta, z_1) - f_t(\delta, z_2)) > 0$, whence, after time t

$$\begin{aligned}0 = \alpha(0-0) >{}& \beta(P_s(h_{z_1,t}(\delta, x(t,\delta,z_1)) - h_{z_2,t}(\delta, x(t,\delta,z_2))))\\ &+ \gamma(P_{X_2}(h_{z_1,t}(\delta, x(t,\delta,z_1)) - h_{z_2,t}(\delta, x(t,\delta,z_2)))) = 0,\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. We prove that for every (δ, z) there holds

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} f_t(\delta, z) = F_s^\delta(z).$$

Indeed, for a given fixed z and δ the stable part of $f_t(\delta,z)$ is constant in time and equal to z and the unstable part given by $x(t,\delta,z)$ belongs to the sets $N_u(t)$ (depending also on δ and z) given in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 9.9, i.e. those points in the horizontal disk $h_z(\delta,\cdot)$ whose trajectory stays in A for time at least t. The sets $N_u(t)$ are a decreasing family of nonempty and compact sets, whose intersection is a singleton given by $P_s(F_s^\delta(z))$. We can pass to the limit with t to infinity in the vertical disk condition

$$\alpha(P_u(f_t(\delta_1,z_1)-f_t(\delta_2,z_2)))\le\beta(P_s(z_1-z_2))+\gamma(P_{X_1}(z_1-z_2))+L|\delta_1-\delta_2|^2,$$

which yields

$$\alpha(P_u(F_s^{\delta_1}(z_2)-F_s^{\delta_2}(z_1)))\le\beta(P_s(z_1-z_2))+\gamma(P_{X_2}(z_1-z_2))+L|\delta_1-\delta_2|^2,$$

the assertion of the theorem. □

11. Appendix 4: C^1 smoothness of local stable and unstable manifolds

11.1. **Fibre contraction theorem.** The following result is known as the fiber contraction theorem [8, Theorem 1.2]

Theorem 11.1. *Let $(X,\rho_X),(Y,\rho_Y)$ be complete metric spaces and let $f:X\to X$ and $g:X\times Y\to Y$ be continuous maps such that*

$$\rho_X(f(x_1),f(x_2))\le\lambda_1\rho_Y(x_1,x_2)\ \text{ for every }\ x_1,x_1\in X,$$
$$\rho_Y(g(x,y_1),g(x,y_2))\le\lambda_2\rho_Y(y_1,y_2)\ \text{ for every }\ x\in X,y_1,y_2\in Y,$$

where $\lambda_1,\lambda_2\in(0,1)$. Then there exists a unique pair $(x_\infty,y_\infty)\in X\times Y$ such that $f(x_\infty)=x_\infty$, $g(x_\infty,y_\infty)=y_\infty$. Moreover (x_∞,y_∞) is attracting.

The mapping $X\times Y\in(x,y)\mapsto\Lambda(x,y)=(f(x),g(x,y))\in X\times Y$ in the above theorem is called a fibre contraction.

Theorem 11.2. *Suppose we have a family of fibre contractions Λ^ε depending on the parameter $\varepsilon\in[0,\varepsilon_0]$ with constants λ_1,λ_2 such that $\Lambda^\varepsilon(x,y)=\Lambda(\varepsilon,x,y)$ is continuous. Then, for their fixed points, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\rho_X(x_\infty^\varepsilon,x_\infty^0)=0,$$
$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\rho_Y(y_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0)=0.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_X(x_\infty^\varepsilon,x_\infty^0)&=\rho_X(f^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon),f^0(x_\infty^0))\le\rho_X(f^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon),f^\varepsilon(x_\infty^0))+\rho_X(f^\varepsilon(x_\infty^0),f^0(x_\infty^0))\\&\le\lambda_1\rho_X(x_\infty^\varepsilon,x_\infty^0)+\rho_X(f^\varepsilon(x_\infty^0),f^0(x_\infty^0)).\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\rho_X(x_\infty^\varepsilon,x_\infty^0)\le\frac{1}{1-\lambda_1}\rho_X(f^\varepsilon(x_\infty^0),f^0(x_\infty^0)),$$

and the first desired convergence follows. Next,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_Y(y_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0)&=\rho_Y(g^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^\varepsilon),g^0(x_\infty^0,y_\infty^0))\\&\le\rho_Y(g^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^\varepsilon),g^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0))+\rho_Y(g^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0),g^0(x_\infty^0,y_\infty^0))\\&\le\lambda_2\rho_Y(y_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0)+\rho_Y(g^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0),g^0(x_\infty^0,y_\infty^0)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\rho_Y(y_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0)\le\frac{1}{1-\lambda_2}\rho_Y(g^\varepsilon(x_\infty^\varepsilon,y_\infty^0),g^0(x_\infty^0,y_\infty^0)),$$

and the proof is complete by continuity. □

11.2. **Cone condition.** Assume that z_0 is a hyperbolic fixed point for $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, which of class C^1 and that $z = (x, y)$, where x is unstable direction and y is the stable direction. Consider the following set which we call a cone

$$C_u = \{(x, y) \ : \ \|y\| \leq L\|x\|\} \tag{47}$$

for some $L > 0$. We define some constants

$$\xi = m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) - L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|, \tag{48}$$

$$\mu = \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|, \tag{49}$$

$$\beta = \frac{\mu}{\xi}L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|, \tag{50}$$

$$\xi_1 = m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) - \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|, \tag{51}$$

$$\mu_1 = \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| + L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|. \tag{52}$$

Note that for $z_1 = (x_1, y_1)$, $z_2 = (x_2, y_2)$, such that $z_1 - z_2 \in C_u$ we have

$$\|f_x(z_1) - f_x(z_2)\| \geq \left(m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}[z_1, z_2]\right) - L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}[z_1, z_2]\right\|\right)\|x_1 - x_2\|, \tag{53}$$

$$\|f_y(z_1) - f_y(z_2)\| \leq \left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}[z_1, z_2]\right\| + L\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}[z_1, z_2]\right\|\right)\|x_1 - x_2\| \tag{54}$$

For $z_1 - z_2 \notin C_u$ we obtain

$$\|f_y(z_1) - f_y(z_2)\| \leq \mu\|y_1 - y_2\|. \tag{55}$$

If $\mu \leq \xi$ then the graph transform for unstable manifold is well defined. If $\beta < 1$, then the graph transform for unstable manifold is a contraction (Thm. 11.8) and the same holds also for C^1 the graph transform if $\beta < \min\{1, \xi, \xi^2\}$ (Thm. 11.16).

If $\mu_1 \leq \xi_1$ then the graph transform for the stable manifold is well definded. If $\xi_1 > 1$, then the graph transform for stable manifold is a contraction (Thm. 11.20). The same holds for the C^1-graph transform (Thm. 11.29) if $\xi_1 > \max\{1, \mu, \mu^2\}$.

It is enough to show the following inequalities

$$\xi > 1, \mu < 1, \beta < 1, \xi_1 > 1, \mu_1 < 1. \tag{56}$$

In order to get them it suffices to show that

(1) $m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) > 1, \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| < 1,$

(2) $\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|$ can be made arbitrarily small by decreasing, if necessary, the set N and parameter ε.

Note that the value $\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|$ does not have to be small. Indeed, it appears in the constants μ and ξ_1 and is always multiplied by $\frac{1}{L}$. So, if only $m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) > 1$, we can always choose L large enough so that $\xi > 1$. Likewise, if only $\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| < 1$, we can always choose L large enough n order to gyuarantee that

$\mu < 1$. So, once (1) is satisfied, and $\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|$ is found, we choose large L to guarantee that $\mu < 1$ and $\xi_1 > 1$, and then, for this L we decrease $\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|$ to guarantee that $\xi > 1$, $\beta < 1$, and $\mu_1 < 1$.

11.3. **Fixed point procedure for unstable manifold and its derivative.**

11.3.1. *Graph transform for the unstable manifold.* Assume that we have an equilibrium $z_0 \in N = \overline{B}_u(0, r_u) \times \overline{B}_s(0, r_s) \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ are Banach spaces, and

$$N \overset{f}{\Longrightarrow} N \tag{57}$$

In infinite dimensional setting, this requires that $u = \dim \mathcal{X} < \infty$.

Definition 11.3. For a continuous map $y : \overline{B}_u(0, r_u) \to \overline{B}_s(0, r_s)$ we will say that $(x, y(x))$ is *horizontal disk satisfying cone condition* if

$$\|y(x_1) - y(x_2)\| \le L\|x_1 - x_2\|. \tag{58}$$

Definition 11.4. Let $H \subset C^0(\overline{B}_u(0, r_u), \mathbb{R}^s)$ by given defined as follows: $h \in H$ iff h is a horizontal disk satisfying cone condition.

Observe that H is closed. Assume that $(x, y(x))$ is an unstable manifold of z_0. Then we have

$$f_y(x, y(x)) = y(f_x(x, y(x))). \tag{59}$$

We are in position to define the graph transform $\mathcal{T} : H \to H$ by the formula

$$f_y(x, h(x)) = \mathcal{T}(h)(f_x(x, h(x))). \tag{60}$$

Define, implicitly, the mapping $G(h)$ as $G(h)(x) = \overline{x}$ such that $x = f_x(\overline{x}, h(\overline{x}))$. In other words, $G(h)(x)$ satisfies the following implicit equation

$$f_x(G(h)(x), h(G(h)(x))) = x. \tag{61}$$

Observe that using the map G we can write the graph transform as follows

$$\mathcal{T}(h)(x) = f_y(G(h)(x), h(G(h)(x))). \tag{62}$$

Remark 11.5. The following lemma, which implies the uniform convergence of the graph transform, is proved in [3, 11].

Lemma 11.6. *There exists K, such that for any m holds for any h_1, h_2*

$$\|\mathcal{T}^m(h_1) - \mathcal{T}^m(h_2)\| \le K\mu^m \tag{63}$$

Lemma 11.7. *Let $\xi > 0$. Then the mapping G is well defined, and, assuming that $h_1, h_2 \in H$, we have*

$$\|G(h_1)(x_1) - G(h_2)(x_2)\| \le \frac{1}{\xi}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|h_1 - h_2\| + \frac{1}{\xi}\|x_1 - x_2\|. \tag{64}$$

Proof. Let us fix $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u)$ and let us denote $\overline{x}_i = G(h_i)(x_i)$. By definition of G we have $f_x(\overline{x}_i, h_i(\overline{x}_i)) = x_i$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\|x_1 - x_2\| &= \|f_x(\overline{x}_1, h_1(\overline{x}_1)) - f_x(\overline{x}_2, h_2(\overline{x}_2))\| \\ &\ge m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right)\|\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2\| - \left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\| \cdot \|h_1(\overline{x}_1) - h_2(\overline{x}_2)\|\end{aligned}$$

But

$$\|h_1(\overline{x}_1) - h_2(\overline{x}_2)\| \le \|h_1(\overline{x}_1) - h_1(\overline{x}_2)\| + \|h_1(\overline{x}_2) - h_2(\overline{x}_2)\| \le L\|\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2\| + \|h_1 - h_2\|,$$

and hence

$$\|x_1 - x_2\| \ge \left(m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) - L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\right)\|\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2\| - \left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\| \cdot \|h_1 - h_2\|,$$

which immediately implies the assertion. □

The following estimate is crucial for proving that the graph transform is a contraction.

Theorem 11.8. *Let $\xi > 0$. For any $h_1, h_2 \in H$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u)$ the following estimate holds*

$$\|\mathcal{T}(h_1)(x_1) - \mathcal{T}(h_2)(x_2)\| \leq \beta\|h_1 - h_2\| + L\frac{\mu}{\xi}\|x_1 - x_2\|. \tag{65}$$

Proof. Assume that $h_1, h_2 \in H$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathcal{T}(h_1)(x_1) - \mathcal{T}(h_2)(x_2)\| = \|f_y(G(h_1)(x_1), h_1(G(h_1)(x_1))) - f_y(G(h_2)(x_2), h_2(G(h_2)(x_2)))\| \\
&\leq \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\| \cdot \|G(h_1)(x_1) - G(h_2)(x_2)\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| \cdot \|h_1(G(h_1)(x_1)) - h_2(G(h_2)(x_2))\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|h_1(G(h_1)(x_1)) - h_2(G(h_2)(x_2))\| \\
&\qquad \leq \|h_1(G(h_1)(x_1)) - h_1(G(h_2)(x_2))\| + \|h_1(G(h_2)(x_2)) - h_2(G(h_2)(x_2))\| \\
&\qquad \leq L\|G(h_1)(x_1) - G(h_2)(x_2)\| + \|h_1 - h_2\|,
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{T}(h_1)(x_1) - \mathcal{T}(h_2)(x_2)\| \leq \left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\| + L\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|\right)\|G(h_1)(x_1) - G(h_2)(x_1)\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|\|h_1 - h_2\|.$$

We are in position to use Lemma 11.7, whence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathcal{T}(h_1)(x_1) - \mathcal{T}(h_2)(x_2)\| \leq L\mu\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|h_1 - h_2\| + \frac{1}{\xi}\|x_1 - x_2\|\right) + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| \cdot \|h_1 - h_2\| \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\mu}{\xi}L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|\right) \cdot \|h_1 - h_2\| + L\frac{\mu}{\xi}\|x_1 - x_2\|,
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. □

We easily deduce the following two results

Theorem 11.9. *If $\mu \leq \xi$ then $\mathcal{T}(H) \subset H$.*

Theorem 11.10. *If $\beta < 1$ then $\mathcal{T}$ is a contraction.*

11.3.2. *Graph transform for the derivative of unstable manifold.* Let us fix $h \in H \cap C^1$. We first differentiate G with respect to x, we will denote the differentiation symbol by D. By applying such differentiation with respect to x of (61) we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(G(h)(x), h(G(h)(x))) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(G(h)(x), h(G(h)(x)))Dh(G(h)(x))\right)D(G(h))(x) = I. \tag{67}$$

Setting $z(h)(x) = (G(h)(x), h(G(h)(x)))$ the above equality can be rewritten in a simpler way as

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\right)D(G(h))(x) = I. \tag{68}$$

Observe that if $\|Dh(G(h)(x))\| \leq L$, then the condition $\xi > 0$ implies that the matrix in the parethesis is invertible and we have

$$D(G(h))(x) = \left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\right)^{-1}. \tag{69}$$

Let us differentiate the graph transform $\mathcal{T}$ with respect to x, we use formula (62)

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{T}(h))(x) &= \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(h)(x))D(G(h))(x) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\cdot D(G(h))(x) \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\right)\cdot D(G(h))(x) \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

We deduce that

$$D(\mathcal{T}(h))(x) = \left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\right)\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\right)^{-1}.$$

In other words

$$D(\mathcal{T}(h))(x)\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\right) = \left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h)(x))\right).$$

This motivates the implicit definition of extended graph transform $\mathcal{U}$ acting on (h,M), where $h\in H$ and $M:\overline{B}_u(0,r_u)\to \mathrm{Lin}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})$ with the C^0-norm

$$\mathcal{U}(h,M)(x)\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))M(G(h)(x))\right) = \left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))M(G(h)(x))\right). \tag{71}$$

We have the following lemma that is a consequence of the implicit function theorem

Lemma 11.11. *Let $h\in C^1(\overline{B}_u(0,r_u),\overline{B}_s(0,r_s))$ with $\|Dh\|\le L$ and let $\mu\le\xi$ and $\beta<1$. Then the graph transform $\mathcal{T}(h)$ is continuously differentiable and $D(\mathcal{T}(h))=\mathcal{U}(h,Dh)$.*

Proof. The fact that $\mu\le\xi$ imples that the matrix $\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))Dh(G(h))(x)$ is invertible. Then by the implicit function theorem $G(h)$ is differentiable with a derivative given by (69), and the assertion follows from differentiation of (62). □

We will consider the mapping

$$(h,M)\mapsto(\mathcal{T}(h),\mathcal{U}(h,M)),$$

and we will prove that it is the fiber contraction.

11.3.3. *A priori bound for $\mathcal{U}(h,M)$.*

Lemma 11.12. *Assume that $\mu\le\xi$. If $h\in H$ and $\|M\|\le L$, then $\|\mathcal{U}(h,M)\|\le L$.*

Proof. Note that

$$m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))M(G(h)(x))\right) \ge m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) - L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\| = \xi. \tag{72}$$

This means that

$$\left\|\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))M(G(h)(x))\right)^{-1}\right\| \le \frac{1}{\xi}. \tag{73}$$

Therefore

$$\|\mathcal{U}(h,M)\| \le \left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|\cdot\|M\|\right)\frac{1}{\xi} \le L\left(\frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|\right)\cdot\frac{1}{\xi} \le L\frac{\mu}{\xi} \le L.$$

The proof is complete. □

11.3.4. *A priori bound for the difference $\mathcal{U}(h_1,M_1)-\mathcal{U}(h_2,M_2)$.* Denote

$$F(h,M)(x)=\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(h)(x))+\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(h)(x))M(G(h)(x))\right)^{-1}$$

In the first step we will estimate the difference between F at two distinct points.

Lemma 11.13. *Let $\mu\le\xi$. Assume that, for $i\in\{1,2\}$ we have $h_i\in H$ and $\|M_i\|\le L$ and*

$$\|M_i(x_1)-M_i(x_2)\|\le L_M\|x_1-x_2\| \text{ for every } x_1,x_2\in\overline{B}_u(0,r_u). \tag{74}$$

Then

$$\|F(h_1,M_1)(x_1)-F(h_2,M_2)(x_2)\|\le\left(C_1+\frac{L_M\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|}{\xi^3}\right)\|x_1-x_2\|+C_2\|h_1-h_2\|+\frac{1}{\xi^2}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|M_1-M_2\|. \tag{75}$$

where $C_1=C_1(N,f,Df,D^2f,L)$ does not depend on L_M, and $C_2=C_2(N,f,Df,D^2f,L,L_M)$.

Proof. To shorten the notation we will write $z_i=z(h_i(x_i))$ and $G_i=G(h_i)(x_i)$. We first observe that using Lemma 11.7

$$\begin{aligned}\|M_1(G_1)-M_2(G_2)\|&\le L_M\|G_1-G_2\|+\|M_1-M_2\|\le L_M\|G_1-G_2\|+\|M_1-M_2\|\\&\le L_M\frac{1}{\xi}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|h_1-h_2\|+L_M\frac{1}{\xi}\|x_1-x_2\|+\|M_1-M_2\|\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

From the definition of F it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1)+\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_1(G_1)\right)F(h_1,M_1)(x_1)\\&=\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2)+\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2)M_2(G_2)\right)F(h_2,M_2)(x_2).\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1)+\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_1(G_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2)+\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2)M_2(G_2)\right)F(h_2,M_2)(x_2)\\&=\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1)+\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_1(G_1)\right)\cdot(F(h_1,M_1)(x_1)-F(h_2,M_2)(x_2))\end{aligned}$$

From (72) and assumption $\|M\|\le L$ we have

$$\|F(h_1,M_1)(x_1)-F(h_2,M_2)(x_2)\|\le\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2)\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_1(G_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2)M_2(G_2)\right\| \tag{77}$$

We estimate both terms separately, using (66) and Lemma 11.7

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2)\right\|&=\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(G_1,h_1(G_1))-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(G_2,h_2(G_2))\right\|\\&\le\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x^2}\right\|\cdot\|G_1-G_2\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x\partial y}\right\|\cdot\|h_1(G_1)-h_2(G_2)\|\\&\le\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x^2}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x\partial y}\right\|L\right)\cdot\|G_1-G_2\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x\partial y}\right\|\|h_1-h_2\|\\&\le\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x^2}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x\partial y}\right\|L\right)\frac{1}{\xi}\|x_1-x_2\|+\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x\partial y}\right\|+\frac{1}{\xi}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x^2}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x\partial y}\right\|L\right)\right)\|h_1-h_2\|.\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

Before we estimate the second term observe that analogous computations give

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2)\right\|\\&\leq\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y\partial x}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y^2}\right\|L\right)\frac{1}{\xi}\|x_1-x_2\|+\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y^2}\right\|+\frac{1}{\xi}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y\partial x}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y^2}\right\|L\right)\right)\|h_1-h_2\|.\end{aligned}$$

We use this last bound to estimate the second term in (77).

$$\begin{aligned}(79)\quad&\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_1(G_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2)M_2(G_2)\right\|\\&\leq\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_1(G_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_2(G_2)\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)M_2(G_2)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2)M_2(G_2)\right\|\\&\leq\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\cdot\|M_1(G_1)-M_2(G_2)\|+L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)-\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2)\right\|\\&\leq\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|L_M\frac{1}{\xi}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|h_1-h_2\|+L_M\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\frac{1}{\xi}\|x_1-x_2\|+\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|M_1-M_2\|\\&+L\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y\partial x}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y^2}\right\|L\right)\frac{1}{\xi}\|x_1-x_2\|+L\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y^2}\right\|+\frac{1}{\xi}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\left(\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y\partial x}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y^2}\right\|L\right)\right)\|h_1-h_2\|.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates we obtain the assertion of the lemma. □

Lemma 11.14. *Let $\mu\leq\xi$. Assume that, for $i\in\{1,2\}$ we have $h_i\in H$ and $\|M_i\|\leq L$ and*

$$\|M_i(x_1)-M_i(x_2)\|\leq L_M\|x_1-x_2\|\ \text{for every}\ \ x_1,x_2\in\overline{B}_u(0,r_u). \tag{80}$$

Then

$$\|\mathcal{U}(h_1,M_1)(x_1)-\mathcal{U}(h_2,M_2)(x_2)\|\leq\left(C_1+\frac{\beta}{\xi^2}L_M\right)\cdot\|x_1-x_2\|+C_2\|h_1-h_2\|+\frac{\beta}{\xi}\|M_1-M_2\|. \tag{81}$$

where $C^1=C(N,f,Df,D^2f,L)$ does not depend on L_M.

Proof. To shorten some formulas we will use the following notation $F_i=F(h_i,M_i)(x_i)$, $z_i=z(h_i)(x_i)$ and $G_i=G(h_i)(x_i)$ for $i\in\{1,2\}$. We will also denote by C_1 a generic constant dependent on N,f,Df,D^2f,L and by C_2 a generic constant dependent on N,f,Df,D^2f,L,L_M. From the definition (71) of $\mathcal{U}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}(h_1,M_1)(x_1)-\mathcal{U}(h_2,M_2)(x_2)&=\left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1)+\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1)M(G_1)\right)\cdot(F_1-F_2)\\&+\left(\left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1)-\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2)\right)+\left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1)M(G_1)-\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2)M(G_2)\right)\right)F_2\end{aligned}$$

For the first term from Lemma 11.13 we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1)+\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1)M(G_1)\right)\cdot(F_1-F_2)\right\|\\&\leq\left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|+\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\|\cdot L\right)\cdot\left(\left(C_1+\frac{L_M\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|}{\xi^3}\right)\|x_1-x_2\|+C_2\|h_1-h_2\|+\frac{1}{\xi^2}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|M_1-M_2\|\right)\\&\leq\left(C_1+L_M\frac{\mu L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|}{\xi^3}\right)\cdot\|x_1-x_2\|+C_2\|h_1-h_2\|+\frac{\mu L}{\xi^2}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|M_1-M_2\|.\end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(N, f, Df, D^2 f, L)$ does not depend on L_M. We deal with the second term. Note that by (73) we have $\|F_2\| \le \frac{1}{\xi}$. Moreover, analogously to (78)

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2) \right\| \le C_1 \|x_1 - x_2\| + C_1 \|h_1 - h_2\|.$$

and

$$\left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) \right\| \le C_1 \|x_1 - x_2\| + C_1 \|h_1 - h_2\|.$$

We deal with the second term analogously as in (79), namely

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) M_1(G_1) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) M_2(G_2) \right\| \\
&\le \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) M_1(G_1) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) M_2(G_2) \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) M_2(G_2) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) M_2(G_2) \right\| \\
&\le \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \cdot \|M_1(G_1) - M_2(G_2)\| + L \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) \right\| \\
&\le C_2 \|h_1 - h_2\| + \left(C_1 + L_M \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \frac{1}{\xi} \right) \|x_1 - x_2\| + \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \|M_1 - M_2\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining all estimates leads us to the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{U}(h_1, M_1)(x_1) - \mathcal{U}(h_2, M_2)(x_2)\| &\le \left(C_1 + L_M \frac{\mu L \left\| \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y} \right\|}{\xi^3} \right) \cdot \|x_1 - x_2\| + C_2 \|h_1 - h_2\| \\
&+ \frac{\mu L}{\xi^2} \left\| \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y} \right\| \|M_1 - M_2\| + \left(C_1 + L_M \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \frac{1}{\xi^2} \right) \|x_1 - x_2\| + \frac{1}{\xi} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \|M_1 - M_2\|,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the assertion of the lemma. □

11.3.5. *A priori bound for the Lipschitz constant for $\mathcal{U}(h, M)$.*

Theorem 11.15. *Let $\mu \le \xi$ and assume that $\beta < \min\{1, \xi^2\}$. There exists a constant L_M (depending on N, f, Df, $D^2 f$ and L), such that if $h \in H$ and $\|M\| \le L$ and*

$$\|M(x_1) - M(x_2)\| \le L_M \|x_1 - x_2\| \text{ for every } x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u), \tag{82}$$

then

$$\|\mathcal{U}(h, M)(x_1) - \mathcal{U}(h, M)(x_2)\| \le L_M \|x_1 - x_2\| \text{ for every } x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u), \tag{83}$$

Proof. From Lemma 11.14 it follows that it is enough to have

$$\left(C + \frac{\beta}{\xi^2} L_M \right) \le L_M.$$

Observe that $\frac{\beta}{\xi^2} < 1$. Therefore it is enough to take

$$L_M \ge \frac{C}{1 - \frac{\beta}{\xi^2}}.$$

□

11.3.6. *Graph transform $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{U})$ for the unstable manifold and its derivative has an absorbing fixed point.*

Theorem 11.16. *Let $\xi \geq \mu$ and let $\beta < 1$. Assume that for $i \in \{1,2\}$ we have $h_i \in H$, $\|M_i\| \leq L$, and*

$$\|M_i(x_1) - M_i(x_2)\| \leq L_M \|x_1 - x_2\| \text{ for } x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u). \tag{84}$$

Then there exists constant C depending on $N, f, Df, D^2 f, L, L_M$, such that

$$\|\mathcal{T}_2(h_1, M_1) - \mathcal{T}_2(h_2, M_2)\| \leq C\|h_1 - h_2\| + \frac{\beta}{\xi}\|M_1 - M_2\|.$$

Proof. The result follows from Lemma 11.14 by taking $x_1 = x_2$. □

Theorem 11.17. *Let L_M be as in Theorem 11.15. Assume that $\beta < \min\{1, \xi, \xi^2\}$ and $\xi \geq \mu$. The mapping $(h, M) \mapsto (\mathcal{T}(h), \mathcal{U}(h, M))$ leads from the set*

$$H \times \left\{ M \in C^0(\overline{B}_u(0, r_u); Lin(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})) : \|M\| \leq L, \ \ Mis\ L_M - Lipschitz \right\},$$

into itself and has the unique fixed point which is moreover attracting.

Proof. The fact that the mapping $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{U})$ leads from the above set into itself is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 11.9 and Lemma 11.12, as well as Theorem 11.15. The result follows from Theorem 11.1 by Theorem 11.10 and Theorem 11.16. □

11.4. **Fixed point argument for construction of the stable manifold and its derivative.**

11.4.1. *Graph transform for the stable manifold.* Now we will consider vertical cones satisfying cone condition.

Definition 11.18. For a continuous map $x : \overline{B}_s(0, r_s) \to \overline{B}_u(0, r_u)$ we will say that $(x(y), y)$ is a *vertical disk satisfying cone condition* if

$$\|x(y_1) - x(y_2)\| \leq \frac{1}{L}\|y_1 - y_2\| \text{ for every } y_1, y_2 \in \overline{B}_s(0, r_s) \tag{85}$$

Definition 11.19. Let $V \subset C^0(\overline{B}_s(0, r_2), \overline{B}_u(0, r_u))$ be defined as follows: $v \in V$ iff h is a vertical disk satisfying cone condition.

Observe that V is closed. Assume that $(x(y), y)$ is an stable manifold of z_0. Then for any y there exists y_0 such that

$$f(x(y), y) = (x(y_0), y_0). \tag{86}$$

This is equivalent to

$$f_x(x(y), y) = x(f_y(x(y), y)), \quad y_0 = f_y(x(y), y). \tag{87}$$

This suggest the following definition of the graph transform, given $v \in V$ we want $f^{-1}(v)$ parameterized as a vertical disk to be its graph transform. Therefore for given $y \in \overline{B}_s(0, r_s)$ we look for $x = \mathcal{S}(v)(y)$ such that point $f(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y)$ belongs to image of v, i.e. there exists y_0 such that

$$f(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y) = (v(y_0), y_0), \tag{88}$$

which is equivalent to

$$f_x(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y) = v(f_y(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y)). \tag{89}$$

This is an implicit definition of $\mathcal{S}(v)$.

Theorem 11.20. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ satisfy* (89)*. If $\xi_1 > 0$, then for $v_1, v_2 \in V$ holds*

$$\|\mathcal{S}(v_1)(y_1) - \mathcal{S}(v_2)(y_2)\| \leq \frac{\|v_1 - v_2\|}{\xi_1} + \frac{1}{L}\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1}\|y_1 - y_2\|. \tag{90}$$

Proof. Let us fix $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and $y_1, y_2 \in \overline{B}_s(0, r_s)$. Let us denote $x_i = \mathcal{S}(v_i)(y_i)$. Then

$$f_x(x_i, y_i) = v_i(f_y(x_i, y_i)) \text{ for } \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{91}$$

Hence, subtracting, we obtain

$$f_x(x_1, y_1) - f_x(x_2, y_2) = v_1(f_y(x_1, y_1)) - v_2(f_y(x_2, y_2)).$$

We have

$$\|f_x(x_1, y_1) - f_x(x_2, y_2)\| \geq m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right)\|x_1 - x_2\| - \left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\|y_1 - y_2\|,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|v_1(f_y(x_1, y_1)) - v_2(f_y(x_2, y_2))\| \leq \|v_1(f_y(x_1, y_1)) - v_1(f_y(x_2, y_2))\| + \|v_1(f_y(x_2, y_1)) - v_2(f_y(x_2, y_2))\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{L}\|f_y(x_1, y_1) - f_y(x_2, y_2)\| + \|v_1 - v_2\| \leq \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\| \cdot \|x_1 - x_2\| + \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| \cdot \|y_1 - y_2\| + \|v_1 - v_2\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequalities we obtain

$$\left(m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) - \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|\right)\|x_1 - x_2\| \leq \frac{1}{L}\left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| + L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\right)\|y_1 - y_2\| + \|v_1 - v_2\|,$$

which yields the assertion of the theorem. □

Theorem 11.21. *Assume the covering relation* (57) *and that* $\mu_1 \leq \xi_1$. *Then*

$$\mathcal{S}(V) \subset V. \tag{92}$$

Proof. Take $v \in V$. The topological argument implies that at least one $x = \mathcal{S}(v)(y)$ exists. Its uniqueness and the fact that $\mathcal{S}(v)$ is $\frac{1}{L}$-Lipschitz follows from Theorem 11.20 by taking $v_1 = v_2 = v$. □

Theorem 11.22. *If* $\xi_1 > 1$, *then* $\mathcal{S}$ *is a contraction on* V.

Proof. The result follows by taking $y_1 = y_2 = y$ in Theorem 11.20. □

11.4.2. *Graph transform for the derivative of stable manifold.* Now we derive the equation for $D\mathcal{S}(v)(y) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}(v)}{\partial y}(y)$. We assume that $v \in C^1$ and differentiate (89). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y)D\mathcal{S}(y) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y) \\
&= Dv(f_y(\mathcal{S}(v)(y)), y)\left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y)D\mathcal{S}(y) + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$z(v)(y) = (\mathcal{S}(v)(y), y). \tag{93}$$

Observe that $z(v)(y) \in N$ for $y \in \overline{B}_s(0, r_s)$. Let $M = Dv$. We can rewrite the above implicit equation as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(v)(y))D(\mathcal{S}(v))(y) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(v)(y)) \\
&= M(f_y(z(v)(y)))\left(\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(v)(y))D(\mathcal{S}(v))(y) + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(v)(y))\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which becomes

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(v)(y)) - M(f_y(z(v)(y)))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(v)(y))\right) D(\mathcal{S}(v))(y)$$
$$= M(f_y(z(v)(y)))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(v)(y)) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(v)(y)).$$

Now we define the extended graph transform acting on (v, M), where $v \in V$ and $M \in C^0(\overline{B}_s(0, r_s), Lin(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}))$ by

$$\mathcal{R}(v, M)(y) = \left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(v)(y)) - M(f_y(z(v)(y)))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(v)(y))\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(M(f_y(z(v)(y)))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z(v)(y)) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z(v)(y))\right). \tag{94}$$

Lemma 11.23. *Assume that $v \in C^1(\overline{B}_s(0, r_s); \overline{B}_u(0, r_u))$ is such that $\xi_1 > 1$. Then $\mathcal{S}(v)$ is continuously differentiable and $D(\mathcal{S}(v)) = \mathcal{R}(v, Dv)$.*

Proof. The fact that $\xi_1 > 1$ implies that the jacobian matrix $\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z(v)(y)) - M(f_y(z(v)(y)))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z(v)(y))$ is invertible for every $y \in \overline{B}_s(0, r_s)$. The assertion follows from the implicit function theorem. □

11.4.3. *A priori bounds for $\mathcal{R}$.*

Lemma 11.24. *Assume that $\xi_1 \geq \mu_1$ and $\xi_1 > 1$. If $v \in V$ and $\|M\| \leq \frac{1}{L}$, then $\mathcal{R}(v, M) \leq \frac{1}{L}$.*

Proof. Denote for simplicity $z = z(v)(y)$. We have

$$\left\|\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z) - M(f_y(z))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z)\right)\mathcal{R}(v, M)(y)\right\| = \left\|M(f_y(z))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z)\right\|.$$

It follows that

$$m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z) - M(f_y(z))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z)\right)\left\|\mathcal{R}(v, M)(y)\right\| \leq \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|.$$

We deduce

$$\left(m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) - \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|\right)\left\|\mathcal{R}(v, M)(y)\right\| \leq \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| + \left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|.$$

It means that

$$\xi_1\|\mathcal{R}(v, M)\| \leq \frac{1}{L}\left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| + L\left\|\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}\right\|\right) = \frac{\mu_1}{L},$$

whence the assertion follows. □

11.4.4. *A priori bounds for the difference of two $\mathcal{R}$'s.*

Theorem 11.25. *Assume that, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $v_i \in V$,*

$$\|M_i\| \leq \frac{1}{L}, \tag{95}$$

and

$$\|M_i(y_1) - M_i(y_2)\| \leq L_M\|y_1 - y_2\| \text{ for every } y_1, y_2 \in \overline{B}_s(0, r_s). \tag{96}$$

Then

$$\|\mathcal{R}(v_2, M_2)(y_2) - \mathcal{R}(v_1, M_1)(y_1)\| \leq \left(C_1 + L_M\frac{\mu}{\xi_1}\left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| + \frac{1}{L}\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|\right)\right)\|y_1 - y_2\|$$
$$+ C_2\|v_1 - v_2\| + \frac{1}{\xi_1}\left(\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}\right\| + \frac{1}{L}\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|\right)\|M_1 - M_2\|.$$

If, additionally, $\mu_1 \le \xi_1$*, then*

$$\|\mathcal{R}(v_2,M_2)(y_2)-\mathcal{R}(v_1,M_1)(y_1)\| \le \left(C_1 + L_M\frac{\mu^2}{\xi_1}\right)\|y_1-y_2\| + C_2\|v_1-v_2\| + \frac{\mu}{\xi_1}\|M_1-M_2\|, \tag{97}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(N,f,Df,D^2f,L)$ *does not depend on* L_M *and* $C_2 = C_2(N,f,Df,D^2f,L,L_M)$.

Proof. To shorten some formulas let us denote $R_i = \mathcal{R}(v_i,M_i)(y_i)$ and $z_i = z(v_i)(y_i)$ for $i = 1,2$. Our point of departure is equation (94) rewritten below for $i = 1,2$ as an implicit equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_i) - M_i(f_y(z_i))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_i)\right)R_i = M_i(f_y(z_i))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_i) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_i).$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2) - M_2(f_y(z_2))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2)\right)R_2 - \left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1) - M_1(f_y(z_1))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1)\right)R_1\\ &= M_2(f_y(z_2))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2) - M_1(f_y(z_1))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1)\end{aligned}$$

Our aim is to derive the upper bound for $\|R_1 - R_2\|$. From the above equation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2) - M_2(f_y(z_2))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2)\right)(R_2-R_1)\\ &= \left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2)\right)R_1 + \left(M_2(f_y(z_2))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2) - M_1(f_y(z_1))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1)\right)R_1\\ &+ M_2(f_y(z_2))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) - M_1(f_y(z_1))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) + \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2) = I + II + III + IV\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

For the lhs of (98) we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2) - M_2(f_y(z_2))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2)\right)(R_2-R_1)\right\|\\ &\ge m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2) - M_2(f_y(z_2))\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2)\right)\|R_2-R_1\|\\ &\ge \left(m\left(\frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}\right) - \frac{1}{L}\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|\right)\|R_2-R_1\| = \xi_1\|R_2-R_1\|.\end{aligned}$$

In the estimates for the rhs of (98) we will have several expressions proportional either to $\|z_1-z_2\|$, or to $\|M_i(f_y(z_2)) - M_i(f_y(z_1))\|$, or to $\|M_1 - M_2\|$. It is important to us to get the explicit constants multiplying the last two terms. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|z_1-z_2\| = \|z(v_1)(y_1) - z(v_2)(y_2)\| = \|(\mathcal{S}(v_1)(y_1) - \mathcal{S}(v_2)(y_2), y_1-y_2)\|\\ &\le \|\mathcal{S}(v_1)(y_1) - \mathcal{S}(v_1)(y_2)\| + \|\mathcal{S}(v_1)(y_2) - \mathcal{S}(v_2)(y_2)\| + \|y_1-y_2\| \le \frac{1}{\xi_1}\|v_1-v_2\| + \left(\frac{1}{L}+1\right)\|y_1-y_2\|,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
(99)\qquad &\|M_2(f_y(z_2)) - M_1(f_y(z_1))\| \le \|M_2(f_y(z_2)) - M_1(f_y(z_2))\| + \|M_1(f_y(z_2)) - M_1(f_y(z_1))\| \\
&\le \|M_2 - M_1\| + L_M \|f_y(\mathcal{S}(v_1)(y_1), y_1) - f_y(\mathcal{S}(v_2)(y_2), y_2)\| \\
&\le \|M_1 - M_2\| + L_M \left(\left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| \cdot \|\mathcal{S}(v_1)(y_1) - \mathcal{S}(v_2)(y_2)\| + \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \cdot \|y_1 - y_2\| \right) \\
&\le \|M_1 - M_2\| + L_M \left(\left(\frac{1}{L} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \right) \|y_1 - y_2\| + \frac{1}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| \|v_1 - v_2\| \right) \\
&= L_M \mu \|y_1 - y_2\| + \|M_1 - M_2\| + \frac{L_M}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| \|v_1 - v_2\|.
\end{aligned}
$$

We are in position to estimate all terms on rhs of (98). We first estimate the term I, whence we obtain

$$
\|I\| \le \left\| \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_1) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial x}(z_2) \right\| \|R_1\| \le \left(\left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x^2} \right\| \left(\frac{1}{\xi_1} \|v_1 - v_2\| + \frac{1}{L} \|y_1 - y_2\| \right) + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial x \partial y} \right\| \|y_1 - y_2\| \right) \frac{1}{L} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1}.
$$

Now we estimate the term IV. We get

$$
\|IV\| \le \left\| \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_1) - \frac{\partial f_x}{\partial y}(z_2) \right\| \le \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y \partial x} \right\| \left(\frac{1}{\xi_1} \|v_1 - v_2\| + \frac{1}{L} \|y_1 - y_2\| \right) + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_x}{\partial y^2} \right\| \|y_1 - y_2\|.
$$

Next, we deal with the term III. We obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|III\| &\le \left\| M_2(f_y(z_2)) - M_1(f_y(z_1)) \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) \right\| + \left\| M_1(f_y(z_1)) \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_2) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y}(z_1) \right\| \\
&\le L_M \mu \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \|y_1 - y_2\| + \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \|M_1 - M_2\| + \frac{L_M}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| \|v_1 - v_2\| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{L} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_y}{\partial y \partial x} \right\| \left(\frac{1}{\xi_1} \|v_1 - v_2\| + \frac{1}{L} \|y_1 - y_2\| \right) + \frac{1}{L} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_y}{\partial y^2} \right\| \|y_1 - y_2\|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, we estimate the last term II, whence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|II\| &\le \left\| M_2(f_y(z_2)) \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2) - M_1(f_y(z_1)) \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1) \right\| \|R_1\| \\
&\le \frac{1}{L} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \left(\left\| M_2(f_y(z_2)) - M_1(f_y(z_1)) \right\| \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2) \right\| + \|M_1(f_y(z_1))\| \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_2) - \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}(z_1) \right\| \right) \\
&\le \frac{1}{L} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| L_M \mu \|y_1 - y_2\| + \frac{1}{L} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| \|M_1 - M_2\| + \frac{L_M}{\xi_1} \frac{1}{L} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\|^2 \|v_1 - v_2\| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{L^2} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_y}{\partial x^2} \right\| \left(\frac{1}{\xi_1} \|v_1 - v_2\| + \frac{1}{L} \|y_1 - y_2\| \right) + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_y}{\partial x \partial y} \right\| \|y_1 - y_2\| \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Adding all four estimates we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\xi_1 \|R_1 - R_2\| \le &\left(D_1(N, f, Df, D^2 f, L) + L_M \mu \left(\left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| + \frac{1}{L} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| \right) \right) \|y_1 - y_2\| \\
&+ D_2(N, f, Df, D^2 f, L, L_M) \|v_1 - v_2\| + \left(\left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial y} \right\| + \frac{1}{L} \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \left\| \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x} \right\| \right) \|M_1 - M_2\|,
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies the assertion. □

11.4.5. *A priori bounds for Lipschitz constant for $\mathcal{R}(v,M)$.*

Lemma 11.26. *Assume that $\mu_1 \le \xi_1$. If $v \in V$, $\|M\| \le \frac{1}{L}$ and*

$$\|M(y_1) - M(y_2)\| \le L_M \|y_1 - y_2\|, \tag{100}$$

then

$$\|\mathcal{R}(v,M)(y_1) - \mathcal{R}(v,M)(y_2)\| \le \left(C + L_M \frac{\mu^2}{\xi_1}\right)\|y_1 - y_2\|, \tag{101}$$

where $C = C(N, f, Df, D^2 f, L)$ does not depend on L_M.

Proof. The result follows by taking $v_1 = v_2 = v$ and $M_1 = M_2 = M$ in Lemma 11.25. □

Theorem 11.27. *Assume that $\xi_1 > \max\{1, \mu^2\}$ and $\xi_1 \ge \mu_1$. There exists a constant L_M(depending on N, f, Df, $D^2 f$ and L), such that if $v \in V$ and $\|M\| \le \frac{1}{L}$ and*

$$\|M(y_1) - M(y_2)\| \le L_M \|y_1 - y_2\|, \tag{102}$$

then

$$\|\mathcal{R}(h,M)(y_1) - \mathcal{R}(h,M)(y_2)\| \le L_M \|y_1 - y_2\|, \tag{103}$$

Proof. We use Lemma 11.26. It is easy to see that we can take any L_M satisfying

$$L_M \ge \frac{C}{1 - \frac{\mu^2}{\xi_1}}.$$

□

11.4.6. *Graph transform $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{R})$ for the stable manifold and its derivative has an absorbing fixed point.*

Theorem 11.28. *Let $\xi_1 \ge \mu_1$. Assume that $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and $\|M_1\| \le \frac{1}{L}$, $\|M_2\| \le \frac{1}{L}$ and L_M be as in Theorem 11.27 and*

$$\|M_i(y_1) - M_i(y_2)\| \le L_M \|y_1 - y_2\| \ \text{ for } \ i \in \{1,2\}. \tag{104}$$

Then there exists a constant C depending on f, Df, $D^2 f$ (restricted to N) and L and L_M, such that

$$\|\mathcal{R}(v_1,M_1) - \mathcal{R}(v_2,M_2)\| \le C\|v_1 - v_2\| + \frac{\mu}{\xi_1}\|M_1 - M_2\|. \tag{105}$$

Proof. The result follows from Lemma 11.25 by taking $y_1 = y_2$. □

Theorem 11.29. *Let L_M be as in Theorem 11.27. Assume that $\xi_1 \ge \mu_1$ and $\xi_1 > \max\{1, \mu, \mu^2\}$. The mapping $(v,M) \mapsto (\mathcal{S}(v), \mathcal{R}(v,M))$ leads from the set*

$$V \times \left\{ M \in C^0(\overline{B}_s(0,r_s); Lin(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{X})) : \ \|M\| \le \frac{1}{L}, \ \ M \text{ is } L_M - Lipschitz \right\},$$

into itself and has the unique fixed point which is moreover attracting.

Proof. The fact that the mapping $(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{R})$ leads from the above set into itself is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 11.24 and Theorem 11.27, as well as Theorem 11.21. The result follows from Theorem 11.1 by Theorem 11.28 and Theorem 11.22. □

12. Appendix 5: Verification of conditions from Appendix 4.

In this section we work in local coordinates in the isolating set with cones, we denote these coordinates as (y_s, y_u), where the unstable variable is y_u and the stable one is y_s. We need to verify the conditions of Appendix 4, namely that

(1) $m\left(\frac{\partial f_u}{\partial y_u}\right) > 1, \left\|\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial(y_s,\eta)}\right\| < 1,$

(2) $\left\|\frac{\partial f_u}{\partial(y_s,\eta)}\right\|$ can be made arbitrarily small by decreasing, if necessary, the set N and ε,

where f is the mapping that assigns to the initial data the solution after a given time and the derivatives are understood with respect to the initial data.

The equation which we are solving has the following form in the local coordinates

$$y'(t) = h(y(t)) + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right)(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t)) + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^\infty M(s)\eta^t(s)\,ds.$$

with

$$h(y) = T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa y + T_\kappa^{-1} f(x_0 + T_\kappa y) - T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa y$$

The variable η^t is evolving according to the rule

$$\eta^t(s) = \begin{cases} T_k(y(t-s) - y(t)) \text{ for } s \le t \\ T_k(y(t-s) - y(t)) = T_k y_0 + \eta^0(s-t) - T_\kappa y(t) \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We use Lemma 3.5 by which the derivative of the solution with respect to the initial data is given by the solution of the variational problem, which, after the change of variables to the local variables in the isolating set N has the form

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t) &= T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa w(t) + T_\kappa^{-1}(Df(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t)) - Df(x_0)) T_\kappa w(t) \\ &+ \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\left(\int_0^\infty M(s)\,ds\right) T_\kappa w(t) + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^\infty M(s)\theta^t(s)\,ds. \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

$$\theta^t(s) = \begin{cases} T_k(w(t-s) - w(t)) \text{ for } s \le t \\ T_\kappa w_0 + \xi^0(s-t) - T_\kappa w(t) \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where (ξ^0, w_0) are the initial data. We rewrite (106) as

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t) &= T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa w(t) + T_\kappa^{-1}(Df(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t)) - Df(x_0)) T_\kappa w(t) \\ &+ \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^t M(s) T_\kappa w(t-s)\,ds + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_t^\infty M(s)\,ds T^\kappa w_0 + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_t^\infty M(s)\xi^0(s-t)\,ds. \end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

We can further rewrite the above equation as

$$\begin{aligned} w'(t) &= T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t)) T_\kappa w(t) \\ &+ \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^t M(t-s) T_\kappa w(s)\,ds + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_t^\infty M(s)\,ds T^\kappa w_0 + \varepsilon T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^\infty M(s+t)\xi^0(s)\,ds. \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

Assume that $t \in [0,1]$. It follows that

$$|w(t)| \le C|w(0)| + \varepsilon C\|\xi^0\| + C\int_0^t |w(s)|\,ds.$$

So, the Gronwall lemma implies that

$$|w(t)| \le Ce^{Ct}(|w(0)| + \varepsilon\|\xi^0\|). \tag{109}$$

This also implies that

$$\int_0^t |w(s)|\,ds \le Ce^{Ct}(|w(0)| + \varepsilon\|\xi^0\|). \tag{110}$$

We project (107) on the stable and unstable direction of w, whence we get the following two equations

$$\begin{aligned} w_s'(t) &= (T_\kappa^{-1}Df(x_0)T_\kappa)_s w_s(t) + \Pi_s T_\kappa^{-1}(Df(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t)) - Df(x_0))T_\kappa w(t) \\ &+ \varepsilon\Pi_s T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^t M(s)T_\kappa w(t-s)\,ds + \varepsilon\Pi_s T_\kappa^{-1}\int_t^\infty M(s)\,ds T^\kappa w(0) + \varepsilon\Pi_s T_\kappa^{-1}\int_t^\infty M(s)\xi^0(s-t)\,ds. \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

$$\begin{aligned} w_u'(t) &= (T_\kappa^{-1}Df(x_0)T_\kappa)_u w_u(t) + \Pi_u T_\kappa^{-1}(Df(x_0 + T_\kappa y(t)) - Df(x_0))T_\kappa w(t) \\ &+ \varepsilon\Pi_u T_\kappa^{-1}\int_0^t M(s)T_\kappa w(t-s)\,ds + \varepsilon\Pi_u T_\kappa^{-1}\int_t^\infty M(s)\,ds T_\kappa w(0) + \varepsilon\Pi_u T_\kappa^{-1}\int_t^\infty M(s)\xi^0(s-t)\,ds. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

From (112) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}|w_u(t)| \ge m\Big((T_\kappa^{-1}Df(x_0)T_\kappa)_u\Big)|w_u(t)| - C\delta^2|w(t)| - \varepsilon C\int_0^t |w(s)|\,ds - \varepsilon C|w(0)| - \varepsilon C\|\xi^0\|. \tag{113}$$

Furthermore,

$$\frac{d}{dt}|w_u(t)| \ge m\Big((T_\kappa^{-1}Df(x_0)T_\kappa)_u\Big)|w_u(t)| - C(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)e^{Ct}(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|). \tag{114}$$

We denote $m\Big((T_\kappa^{-1}Df(x_0)T_\kappa)_u\Big) = \lambda_1 > 0$, hence

$$\frac{d}{dt}|w_u(t)| - \lambda_1|w_u(t)| \ge -C(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)e^{Ct}(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|)$$

We estimate t in e^{Ct} by T and we multiply by $e^{-\lambda_1 t}$

$$e^{-\lambda_1 t}\frac{d}{dt}|w_u(t)| - e^{-\lambda_1 t}\lambda_1|w_u(t)| \ge -e^{-\lambda_1 t}Ce^{CT}(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}e^{-\lambda_1 t}|w_u(t)| \ge -e^{-\lambda_1 t}Ce^{CT}(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|)$$

We integrate from 0 to T, whence

$$e^{-\lambda_1 T}|w_u(T)| - |w_u(0)| \ge -\frac{1}{\lambda_1}(1 - e^{-\lambda_1 T})Ce^{CT}(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|)$$

It follows that

$$|w_u(T)| \ge e^{\lambda_1 T}|w_u(0)| - \frac{e^{(\lambda_1 + C)T}C}{\lambda_1}(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|)$$

Now, if $w(0) = w_u(0)$ and $\xi^0 = 0$, then

$$|w_u(T)| \ge \left(e^{\lambda_1 T} - \frac{e^{(\lambda_1 + C)T}C}{\lambda_1}(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)\right)|w_u(0)|, \tag{115}$$

and it is possible to choose δ and ε small enough to get the constant in front of $|w_u(0)|$ greater then one. This verifies the first assertion of (1).

On the other hand, coming back to (112), for a constant $\lambda_2 = \left\|(T_\kappa^{-1}Df(x_0)T_\kappa)_u\right\|$ we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}|w_u(t)| \le \lambda_2|w_u(t)| + C(\delta^2 + \varepsilon)e^{CT}(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|).$$

The Gronwall lemma implies that

$$|w_u(T)| \le e^{\lambda_2 T}|w_u(0)| + \frac{e^{(\lambda_2+C)T}}{\lambda_2} C(\delta^2+\varepsilon)(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|).$$

Now, if $w_u(0) = 0$, we obtain

$$|w_u(T)| \le \frac{e^{(\lambda_2+C)T}}{\lambda_2} C(\delta^2+\varepsilon)(|w_s(0)| + \|\xi^0\|). \tag{116}$$

Equations 115 and 116 which verify the first assertion of (1) and the condition (2). Indeed, no matter how large T we take we can always find small δ and ε such that these assertions hold.

For the stable part of (106) we denote $\mu\Big((T_\kappa^{-1} Df(x_0) T_\kappa)_s\Big) = -\lambda_3 < 0$. Hence, (111) implies

$$\frac{d}{dt}|w_s(t)| \le -\lambda_3 |w_s(t)| + Ce^{CT}(\delta^2+\varepsilon)(|w(0)| + \|\xi^0\|). \tag{117}$$

In order to deal with the history variable θ note that, as in Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta^t\|^2 + C\|\theta^t\|^2 \le -2\left(\int_0^\infty A(s)\theta^t(s)\,ds, T_k w'(s)\right).$$

Using (108) this implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta^t\|^2 + C\|\theta^t\|^2 \le C_1\|\theta^t\||w'(t)| \le C_1\|\theta^t\|\left(|w(t)| + \varepsilon\int_0^t |w(s)|ds + \varepsilon|w_0| + \varepsilon\|\xi^0\|\right),$$

or

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta^t\| \le -C\|\theta^t\| + C_1\left(|w_s(t)| + |w_u(t)| + \varepsilon\int_0^t |w(s)|dsds + \varepsilon|w_0| + \varepsilon\|\xi^0\|\right).$$

Using (110) this means that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\theta^t\| \le -C\|\theta^t\| + C_1\left(|w_s(t)| + |w_u(t)| + \varepsilon e^{CT}(|w_0| + \|\xi^0\|)\right).$$

Taking a linear combination of this equation with (117) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)|) \le -C\|\theta^t\| + (C_1 - K\lambda_3)|w_s(t)| + C_1|w_u(t)| + (\varepsilon+\delta^2)Ce^{CT}(|w_0| + \|\xi^0\|).$$

We take K such that $C_1 - K\lambda_3 < 0$. Then for some constant $D > 0$ we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)|) \le -D(\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)|) + C_1|w_u(t)| + (\varepsilon+\delta^2)Ce^{CT}(|w_0| + \|\xi^0\|).$$

First we take $w_u(0) = 0$. Then

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)|) \le -D(\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)|) + (\varepsilon+\delta^2)Ce^{CT}(|w_s(0)| + \|\xi^0\|).$$

After application of the Gronwall lemma we obtain

$$\|\theta^T\| + K|w_s(T)| \le e^{-DT}(\|\xi^0\| + K|w_s(0)|) + (\varepsilon+\delta^2)Ce^{CT}(|w_s(0)| + \|\xi^0\|).$$

This means that for a given T we can find ε and δ small enough such that the second assertion of (1) is satisfied.

Now let us take $\xi^0 = 0$ and $w_s(0) = 0$. This leads to the estimate of the value of $\left\|\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial y_u}\right\|$ which corresponds to $\left\|\frac{\partial f_y}{\partial x}\right\|$ present in the constants μ in (49) and ξ_1 in (51). Note that this quantity does not have to be small, conditions that $\mu < 1$ and $\xi_1 > 1$ are guaranteed by the selection of appropriately large L. We obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)|) \le -D(\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)|) + e^{\lambda_2 T}|w_u(0)| + (\varepsilon+\delta^2)Ce^{CT}|w_u(0)|.$$

This means that

$$\|\theta^t\| + K|w_s(t)| \le e^{\lambda_2 T} C|w_u(0)| + (\varepsilon + \delta^2) C e^{CT} |w_u(0)|.$$

13. Appendix 6. Continuity of derivatives of stable and unstable manifolds on parameter.

We verify the conditions of Theorem 11.2, namely that the graph transform mappings for stable and unstable manifolds are continuous functions with respect to parameter ε. This will yield the assertion that their fixed points, stable and unstable manifolds, are C^1 continuous functions of ε. Specifically we need to show that the mappings

$$(\varepsilon, h, M) \mapsto (\mathcal{T}(\varepsilon, h), \mathcal{U}(\varepsilon, h, M)),$$

and

$$(\varepsilon, v, M) \mapsto (\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon, v), \mathcal{R}(\varepsilon, v, M)),$$

are continuous. The arguments is analogous to the arguments of Appendix 4, we need consider mappings with additional dependence on ε, namely $(f_x^\varepsilon)(x,y), f_y^\varepsilon(x,y))$, hence in all estimates we obtain extra terms depending of the difference $f^{\varepsilon_1} - f^{\varepsilon_2}$ or its derivatives. As the derivations of the estimates closely follow the lines of the ones from Appendix 4, we skip the proofs, presenting only the results. We make the standing assumptions that for every $(x,y) \in N$ and every $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ we have

$$\|f_x^{\varepsilon_1}(x,y) - f_x^{\varepsilon_2}(x,y)\| \le K|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|,$$

and

$$\|f_y^{\varepsilon_1}(x,y) - f_y^{\varepsilon_2}(x,y)\| \le K|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|,$$

moreover

$$\left\|\frac{\partial f_y^{\varepsilon_1}(x,y)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial f_y^{\varepsilon_2}(x,y)}{\partial y}\right\| \le K|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2| \text{ and } \left\|\frac{\partial f_y^{\varepsilon_1}(x,y)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial f_y^{\varepsilon_2}(x,y)}{\partial y}\right\| \le K|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|,$$

and

$$\left\|\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}(x,y)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_2}(x,y)}{\partial y}\right\| \le K|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2| \text{ and } \left\|\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}(x,y)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_2}(x,y)}{\partial y}\right\| \le K|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|,$$

with a constant $K > 0$. The estimates for the difference of functions follow from Lemma 3.2 and for the difference of derivatives follow from Lemma 3.4.

Constants $\xi, \mu, \beta, \xi_1, \mu_1$ now depend on ε. We will denote the new constants as $\xi^\varepsilon, \mu^\varepsilon, \beta^\varepsilon, \xi_1^\varepsilon, \mu_1^\varepsilon$. Arguments of Appendix 5 demonstrate that the bounds (56) hold independently on ε, and moreover $\xi^\varepsilon > 0$ and $\xi_1^\varepsilon > 0$ for every $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$. These bounds are used in the proofs of the results in the following parts of this section.

13.1. **Graph transform for the unstable manifold.** The arguments of this section are obtained analogously to the proofs of Section 11.3. The mapping $\mathcal{T}$, the graph transform with parameter, is now given by

$$\mathcal{T}(\varepsilon, h)(x) = f_y^\varepsilon(G(\varepsilon, h)(x), h(G(\varepsilon, h)(x))), \tag{118}$$

with G given as $G(\varepsilon, h)(x) = \overline{x}$ such that $x = f_x^\varepsilon(\overline{x}, h(\overline{x}))$. Proceeding analogously as in the proof of Lemma 11.7 we obtain the next result

Lemma 13.1. *Let $\xi^{\varepsilon_1} > 0$. Then, assuming that $h_1, h_2 \in H$, we have*

$$\|G(\varepsilon_1, h_1)(x) - G(\varepsilon_2, h_2)(x)\| \le \frac{K}{\xi^{\varepsilon_1}}|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2| + \frac{1}{\xi^{\varepsilon_1}}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}}{\partial y}\right\| \|h_1 - h_2\|. \tag{119}$$

Proof. Let us fix $x \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u)$ and let us denote $\overline{x}_i = G(\varepsilon_i, h_i)(x)$. By definition of G we have $f_x^{\varepsilon_i}(\overline{x}_i, h_i(\overline{x}_i)) = x$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \|f_x^{\varepsilon_1}(\overline{x}_1, h_1(\overline{x}_1)) - f_x^{\varepsilon_2}(\overline{x}_2, h_2(\overline{x}_2))\| \\
&\geq \left(\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}}{\partial x}\right)\|\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2\| - \left\|\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}}{\partial y}\right\| \cdot \|h_1(\overline{x}_1) - h_2(\overline{x}_2)\| - \|f_x^{\varepsilon_1}(\overline{x}_2, h_1(\overline{x}_2)) - f_x^{\varepsilon_2}(\overline{x}_2, h_2(\overline{x}_2))\| \\
&\geq \left(\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}}{\partial x}\right)\|\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2\| - \left\|\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}}{\partial y}\right\| \cdot (\|h_1 - h_2\| + L\|\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2\|) - K|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|,
\end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows exactly as in Lemma 11.7. □

The proof of the next result follows the lined of the proof of Theorem 11.8.

Theorem 13.2. *For any $h_1, h_2 \in H$ and $x \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u)$ the following estimate holds*

$$\|\mathcal{T}(\varepsilon_1, h_1)(x) - \mathcal{T}(\varepsilon_2, h_2)(x)\| \leq \beta^{\varepsilon_1}\|h_1 - h_2\| + K\left(1 + L\frac{\mu^{\varepsilon_1}}{\xi^{\varepsilon_1}}\right)|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|. \tag{120}$$

In order to get the estimate for the derivative of the graph transform first define analogously to the notation of Section 11.3.2, $z(\varepsilon, h)(x) = (G(\varepsilon, h)(x), h(G(\varepsilon, h)(x)))$ and

$$F(\varepsilon, h, M)(x) = \left(\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon}}{\partial x}(z(\varepsilon, h)(x)) + \frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon}}{\partial y}(z(\varepsilon, h)(x))M(G(\varepsilon, h)(x))\right)^{-1}.$$

The argument that follows the lines of the proof of Lemma 11.13 allows us to deduce the following result.

Lemma 13.3. *Assume that, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $h_i \in H$ and $\|M_i\| \leq L$ and*

$$\|M_i(x_1) - M_i(x_2)\| \leq L_M\|x_1 - x_2\| \text{ for every } x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u). \tag{121}$$

Then

$$\|F(\varepsilon_1, h_1, M_1)(x) - F(\varepsilon_2, h_2, M_2)(x)\| \leq C_1^{\varepsilon_1}\|h_1 - h_2\| + \frac{1}{\xi^{\varepsilon_1}\xi^{\varepsilon_2}}\left\|\frac{\partial f_x^{\varepsilon_1}}{\partial y}\right\|\|M_1 - M_2\| + C_2^{\varepsilon_1}|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|. \tag{122}$$

where $C_1^{\varepsilon_1} = C(\varepsilon_1, N, f^{\varepsilon_1}, Df^{\varepsilon_1}, D^2 f^{\varepsilon_1}, L, L_M)$ and $C_2^{\varepsilon_1} = C(\varepsilon_1, N, f^{\varepsilon_1}, Df^{\varepsilon_1}, L, L_M, K)$.

The proof of the next result uses Lemma 13.3 and follows the lines of the proof of Lemma 11.14.

Theorem 13.4. *Assume that, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $h_i \in H$ and $\|M_i\| \leq L$ and*

$$\|M_i(x_1) - M_i(x_2)\| \leq L_M\|x_1 - x_2\| \text{ for every } x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B}_u(0, r_u). \tag{123}$$

Then

$$\|\mathcal{U}(\varepsilon_1, h_1, M_1)(x) - \mathcal{U}(\varepsilon_2, h_2, M_2)(x)\| \leq C_1^{\varepsilon_1}\|h_1 - h_2\| + \frac{\beta^{\varepsilon_1}}{\xi^{\varepsilon_2}}\|M_1 - M_2\| + C_2|\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|. \tag{124}$$

where $C_1^{\varepsilon_1} = C(\varepsilon_1, N, f^{\varepsilon_1}, Df^{\varepsilon_1}, D^2 f^{\varepsilon_1}, L, L_M)$ and $C_2^{\varepsilon_1} = C(\varepsilon_1, N, f^{\varepsilon_1}, Df^{\varepsilon_1}, L, L_M, K)$.

Theorems 13.2 and 13.4 imply the desired C^1 continuity of the graph transform map $(\varepsilon, h, M) \mapsto (\mathcal{T}(\varepsilon, h), \mathcal{U}(\varepsilon, h, M))$ for the unstable manifold.

13.2. **Graph transform for the stable manifold.** The graph transform with parameter for the stable manifold is defined in the following way: given $y \in \overline{B}_s(0,r_s)$ we look for $x = \mathcal{S}(\varepsilon,v)(y)$ such that point $f^\varepsilon(\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon,v)(y),y)$ belongs to image of v, i.e. there exists y_0 such that

$$f^\varepsilon(\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon,v)(y),y) = (v(y_0),y_0). \tag{125}$$

The next result is proved anaogously to Theorem 11.20.

Theorem 13.5. *Let $y \in \overline{B}_s(0,r_s)$. For $v_1, v_2 \in V$ we have*

$$\|\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon_1,v_1)(y) - \mathcal{S}(\varepsilon_2,v_2)(y_2)\| \leq \frac{\|v_1 - v_2\|}{\xi_1^{\varepsilon_1}} + \frac{1}{\xi_1^{\varepsilon_1}} K \left(1 + \frac{1}{L}\right) |\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|. \tag{126}$$

Now, the graph transform for the derivative of the stable manifold is given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\varepsilon,v,M)(y) = &\left(\frac{\partial f_x^\varepsilon}{\partial x}(z(\varepsilon,v)(y)) - M(f_y^\varepsilon(z(\varepsilon,v)(y))) \frac{\partial f_y^\varepsilon}{\partial x}(z(\varepsilon,v)(y)) \right)^{-1} \cdot \\ &\left(M(f_y^\varepsilon(z(\varepsilon,v)(y))) \frac{\partial f_y^\varepsilon}{\partial y}(z(\varepsilon,v)(y)) - \frac{\partial f_x^\varepsilon}{\partial y}(z(\varepsilon,v)(y)) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

with $z(\varepsilon,v)(y) = (\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon,v)(y),y)$. The following result is proved analogously to Theorem 11.25, taking into account the additional terms that come from the difference between f^{ε_1} and f^{ε_2} and their derivatives.

Theorem 13.6. *Assume that, for $i \in \{1,2\}$ we have $v_i \in V$,*

$$\|M_i\| \leq \frac{1}{L}, \tag{128}$$

and

$$\|M_i(y_1) - M_i(y_2)\| \leq L_M \|y_1 - y_2\| \ \text{ for every } \ y_1, y_2 \in \overline{B}_s(0,r_s). \tag{129}$$

Then

$$\|\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon_2,v_2,M_2)(y) - \mathcal{R}(\varepsilon_1,v_1,M_1)(y)\| \leq C_1^{\varepsilon_1} \|v_1 - v_2\| + \frac{\mu^{\varepsilon_1}}{\xi_1^{\varepsilon_2}} \|M_1 - M_2\| + C_2^{\varepsilon_1} |\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2|, \tag{130}$$

where $C_1^{\varepsilon_1} = C(\varepsilon_1, N, f^{\varepsilon_1}, Df^{\varepsilon_1}, D^2 f^{\varepsilon_1}, L, L_M)$ and $C_2^{\varepsilon_1} = C(\varepsilon_1, N, f^{\varepsilon_1}, Df^{\varepsilon_1}, L, L_M, K)$.

Theorems 13.5 and 13.6 imply the desired C^1 continuity of the graph transform map $(\varepsilon,h,M) \mapsto (\mathcal{S}(\varepsilon,h), \mathcal{R}(\varepsilon,h,M))$, for the stable manifold.

References

[1] M.C. Bortolan, C.A.E.N. Cardoso, A.N. Carvalho, L. Pires, Lipschitz perturbations of Morse–Smale semigroups, Journal of Differential Equations 269 1904–1943 (2020).

[2] M.C. Bortolan, A.N. Carvalho, J.A. Langa, G. Raugel, Nonautonomous perturbations of Morse–Smale semigroups: stability of the phase diagram, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations 34 (2022) 2681–2747.

[3] M.J. Capiński, P. Zgliczyński, *Geometric proof for normally hyperbolic invariant manifolds*, J. Diff. Eq., 259(2015) 6215–6286.

[4] M. Conti, V. Pata, Weakly dissipative semilinear equations of viscoelasticity, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 4 (2005), 705–720.

[5] M. Conti, V. Pata, M. Squassina, Singular limit of differential systems with memory, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 1 (2006) 169–215.

[6] C.M. Dafermos, Asymptotic stability in viscoelasticity, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 37 (1970), 297–308.

[7] J. Guckenheimer and P. Holmes, Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems, and bifurcations of vector fields, Springer, Applied Mathematical Sciences 42, 2013.

[8] M.W. Hirsch, C.C. Pugh, Stable manifolds and hyperbolic sets, Proc. Symp. in Pure Math., 14(1970), 133–163.

[9] J. Xu, T. Caraballo, J. Valero, Asymptotic behavior of a semilinear problem in heat conduction with long time memory and non-local diffusion, Journal of Differential Equations 327 (2022), 418–447.

[10] J. Xu, T. Caraballo, J. Valero, Asymptotic behavior of nonlocal partial differential equations with long time memory, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series S 15 (2022), 3059–3078.
[11] P. Zgliczyński, Covering relations, cone conditions and stable manifold theorem, Journal of Differential Equations, 246 (2009) 1774–1819.

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, ul. Łojasiewicza 6, 30-348 Kraków, Poland
Email address: piotr.kalita@ii.uj.edu.pl, umzglicz@cyf-kr.edu.pl