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#### Abstract

We consider discrete time systems $x_{k+1}=U\left(x_{k} ; \lambda\right), x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, with a complex parameter $\lambda$, and study their trajectories of large amplitudes. The expansion of the map $U(\cdot ; \lambda)$ at infinity contains a principal linear term, a bounded positively homogeneous nonlinearity, and a smaller vanishing part. We study Arnold tongues: the sets of parameter values for which the largeamplitude periodic trajectories exist. The Arnold tongues in problems at infinity generically are thick triangles [4]; here we obtain asymptotic estimates for the length of the Arnold tongues and for the length of their triangular part. These estimates allow us to study subfurcation at infinity. In the related problems on small-amplitude periodic orbits near an equilibrium, similarly defined Arnold tongues have the form of narrow beaks. For standard pictures associated with the Neimark-Sacker bifurcation of smooth discrete time systems at an equilibrium, the Arnold tongues have asymptotically zero width except for the strong resonance points. The different shape of the tongues in the problem at infinity is due to the non-polynomial form of the principal homogeneous nonlinear term of the map $U(\cdot ; \lambda)$ : this form implies non-degeneracy of the nonlinear terms in the expansion of the map iterations and non-degeneracy of the corresponding resonance functions.


1. Introduction. We study bifurcations of periodic trajectories from infinity for the discrete time system

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k+1}=U\left(x_{k} ; \lambda\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, N \geq 2, \quad \lambda \in D \subset \mathbb{C} . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We suppose that for $x$ with sufficiently large norm $|x|$ the map $U$ is continuous with respect to the set of its arguments and has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(x ; \lambda)=A(\lambda) x+\Phi(x ; \lambda)+\xi(x ; \lambda) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Figure 1. Typical shapes of the Arnold tongues at zero (left) and at infinity (right).
here $A(\lambda) x$ is the linear part, $\Phi$ is a bounded positively homogeneous nonlinearity, and $\xi$ is a small term (exact assumptions are in Section 2.1).

For any $\lambda \in D$ consider the set $\mathfrak{P}_{\lambda} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N}$ of all periodic points of system (1.1). If the matrices $A=A(\lambda)$ have no eigenvalues in a fixed vicinity of the unit circle $S \in \mathbb{C}$, then the union $\mathfrak{P}=\bigcup_{\lambda \in D} \mathfrak{P}_{\lambda}$ is bounded: this follows from representation (1.2). If the matrix $A=A(\lambda)$ has a pair of simple complex conjugate eigenvalues $\mu(\lambda), \bar{\mu}(\lambda)$ and the range of $\mu(\lambda)$ has a limit point in $S$, then the set $\mathfrak{P}$ may be unbounded. The two cases are possible:
(i) For some fixed $n$ the subset $\mathfrak{P}^{n}$ of $\mathfrak{P}$ that contains all periodic points of the period $n$ is unbounded.
(ii) For any $n$ the set $\mathfrak{P}^{n}$ is bounded, while $\mathfrak{P}$ is unbounded, i.e., there exist sequences $n_{k}$ and $x_{k} \in \mathfrak{P}^{n_{k}}$ such that $n_{k},\left|x_{k}\right| \rightarrow \infty$.
Cases (i) and (ii) are referred to as subharmonic bifurcation and subfurcation [3]. As we will see below, both of them can take place in a vicinity of the same limit point $\mu_{q}=e^{2 \pi q i}$ of the range of $\mu(\lambda)$ if $q$ is a rational number. We shall present sufficient conditions for these bifurcations.

To stress the difference between bifurcations at infinity and at zero, let us recall some relevant facts about bifurcation of periodic trajectories from the zero equilibrium of a smooth system (1.1) (see, e.g., [3]). Let for small $|x|$

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(x ; \lambda)=A(\lambda) x+A_{2}(x ; \lambda)+A_{3}(x ; \lambda)+\ldots \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where all $N$ components of each term $A_{s}: \mathbb{R}^{N} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N}$ are polynomials of the degree $s$ with respect to all $x$-variables. Then, for any rational $q=m / n(n>4)$ with co-prime positive integer $m$ and $n$ there exists an open set $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ called the Arnold tongue such that (see, e.g., [1]): $\mu_{q}$ belongs to the closure $\overline{\mathfrak{A}}_{q}$ of $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$; system (1.1) has a periodic point $x_{\lambda}^{n}$ of the period $n$ whenever $A(\lambda)$ has an eigenvalue $\mu(\lambda)$ in $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$; and $\left|x_{\lambda}^{n}\right| \rightarrow 0$ as $\mu(\lambda) \rightarrow \mu_{q}$ along the set $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$. Six points on the unit circle that correspond to the values $q=m / n$ with the denominators $n=1,2,3,4\left(q \in\left\{1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\right\}\right.$ modulo 1) are called strong resonances. For any $q$ except for these special values, the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ has the shape shown on the left picture of Fig. 1. Locally, $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ is a cusp between two curves that meet at the point $\mu_{q}$ and have the same tangent straight line $\ell$ at this point. Moreover, the width $w$ of the cusp at a distance $d$ from the vertex $\mu_{q}$ is of order $d^{n / 2-1}$ as $d \rightarrow 0$ (see [8]), i.e., the order of tangency of the cusp borders at the vertex $\mu_{q}$ grows as $n$ increases. For the strong resonances the set $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ has the shape shown on the right picture of Fig. 1 (at least $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ contains such a triangular part).

In [4], it is proved that in the problem on bifurcation of periodic orbits from infinity the Arnold tongues are thick sectors, shown on the right picture of Fig. 1. The angle between the tangent lines to the borders of any tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ at its vertex $\mu_{q}$ is positive except for non-generic degenerate situations. This angle tends to zero as the denominator $n$ of $q$ increases.


Figure 2. Subharmonic bifurcation and subfurcation.
Now, assume that the parameter $\lambda$ varies so that the eigenvalue $\mu(\lambda)$ of $A(\lambda)$ moves along a smooth curve $\Gamma$ through the point $\mu_{q} \in S$ with a rational $q$, and $\ell$ is a tangent line of $\Gamma$ at this point. According to the approach of [1], one observes the subharmonic bifurcation if some arc of the curve $\Gamma$ with one end at $\mu_{q}$ is contained in the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ (as on the left picture of Fig. 2), and the subfurcation if the curve $\Gamma$ crosses infinitely many Arnold tongues in any neighborhood of the point $\mu_{q}$ (as on the right picture of Fig. 2). Figs. 1 and 2 show that the subharmonic bifurcation can occur for a unique direction of $\ell$ in the local problem at zero of a smooth system (1.1) (and thus the subharmonic bifurcation is a specific nongeneric case for this problem, except for points of strong resonances), while there is a bunch of such directions in the problem at infinity. The crucial fact underlying the subfurcation scenario on the right picture of Fig. 2 is that infinitely many Arnold tongues are long enough to intersect the curve $\Gamma$. The focus of this paper is estimation of the length of the Arnold tongues from below, justifying this fact.

A simple change of variables of the type $x \rightarrow B x /|x|^{2}$ transforms the bifurcation problem at infinity to that near the origin. Consequently all our results can be formulated equivalently in terms of the local behavior of the transformed system near its zero equilibrium. However, the evolution operator of the latter system generically does not have the form (1.2). To be more specific, consider two-dimensional systems which provide understanding also of the $N$-dimensional case in a simpler setting. With complex number notations, the evolution operator of system (1.1) in proper polar coordinates at infinity reads as

$$
U(r, \varphi ; \lambda)=r \mu(\lambda) e^{i \varphi}+\Phi(\varphi ; \lambda)+\xi(r, \varphi ; \lambda)
$$

where $\xi$ vanishes as $r \rightarrow \infty$. In the problem on bifurcation from infinity, we consider positively homogeneous nonlinearities represented by generic complex valued $2 \pi$ periodic functions $\Phi(\cdot ; \lambda)$ with infinitely many harmonics in their Fourier series. Then the thick Arnold tongues are easily described in terms of some closed curves defined by the Fourier series of $\Phi$. Now, the inversion $r e^{i \varphi} \rightarrow r^{-1} e^{-i \varphi}$ in $\mathbb{C}$ sends infinity to the origin and transforms the evolution operator to the form

$$
\tilde{U}(r, \varphi ; \lambda)=\mu(\lambda)^{-1} r e^{i \varphi}+r^{2} \tilde{\Phi}(\varphi ; \lambda)+o\left(r^{2}\right), \quad r \rightarrow 0
$$

An important point is that the function $\tilde{\Phi}$ here has infinite Fourier series whenever $\Phi$ does, and consequently in this case the map $\tilde{U}$ does not have the form (1.3) at the zero equilibrium whatever smoothness is possessed by the original function $\Phi$. Sufficiently smooth maps admitting the Taylor expansion (1.3) near its zero equilibrium have the form

$$
U(r, \varphi ; \lambda)=\mu(\lambda) r e^{i \varphi}+r^{2} \Phi_{2}(\varphi ; \lambda)+r^{3} \Phi_{3}(\varphi ; \lambda)+\ldots,
$$

where $\Phi_{s}(\cdot ; \lambda)$ is a complex-valued trigonometric polynomial of order at most $s$. This particular form of the map $U$ defines the shape of the classical thin Arnold tongues. Most results of this paper are inapplicable to such maps, which are a degenerate case in our setting, because the closed curve that determines the shape of a thick Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ shrinks to a point if $\tilde{\Phi}=\Phi_{s}$ and $n>s+1$. Finally note that we consider the set of all $2 \pi$-periodic functions $\Phi$ (equivalently, $\tilde{\Phi}$ ) satisfying some smoothness requirements as a natural class of nonlinearities in a problem at infinity, while all trigonometric polynomials $\Phi_{s}$ form only a narrow special subclass in this generic class.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2.1 contains notation and main assumptions. In Section 2.2, we present Theorem 2.1 (it is a simpler version of the main result from [4]) on the existence of a thick Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ with the vertex at the point $\mu_{q}$ for a given rational $q$ and discuss its geometric interpretation for two-dimensional systems. Section 3 contains main results: asymptotic estimates of the lengths of the Arnold tongue and its thick part as $n$ increases to infinity. In Section 4, these results are used to analyze subfurcation of discrete time systems with one scalar parameter. In Section 5, a nonlinear change of variables is suggested to reduce the system to the simplest possible form. This form is then used to derive sufficient conditions for the existence of a large invariant annulus. In the rest of the paper we present the proofs. The basis of all the proofs is Theorem 6.1 of Section 6.2, which provides an approximation to system (1.1). Periodic trajectories of system (1.1) (as well as other information about its dynamics) can be recovered from that of the approximation whenever the latter is non-degenerate and thus is the principal part of (1.1).

The shapes of the Arnold tongues at the points of strong resonances in the bifurcation problem at the origin are similar to that of the Arnold tongues $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ at infinity. Moreover, there are indications that this analogy can be extended to other aspects of dynamics at infinity (at least for finite ranges of the denominator $n$ of $q=m / n$, where a particular range is defined by the nonlinearity $\Phi$ in representation (1.2) and can be arbitrarily large). Our numerical experiments with systems (1.1) near the points $\mu_{q}=e^{2 \pi q i}$ reveal a rich variety of dynamical scenarios at infinity, which are typical for strong resonances of smooth systems at the origin. We briefly discuss them in Section 5. The focus of this paper is periodic trajectories, the shape of the Arnold tongues, and estimates of their length.

## 2. Preliminary definitions and results.

2.1. Assumptions on the map and basic notation. Consider system (1.1) with the map $U$ of the form (1.2). Assume that the function $\Phi=\Phi(x ; \lambda)$ is positively homogeneous of order zero in $x$ for each $\lambda \in D$, and the term $\xi=\xi(x ; \lambda)$ vanishes at infinity as $O\left(|x|^{s}\right)$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(\theta x ; \lambda)=\Phi(x ; \lambda) \quad \text { for all } \quad|x|=1, \theta>0, \lambda \in D \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\limsup _{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \sup _{\lambda \in D}|x|^{-s}|\xi(x ; \lambda)|<\infty \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $s>0$. Assume additionally that $\Phi$ satisfies the Hölder condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Phi\left(x_{1} ; \lambda\right)-\Phi\left(x_{2} ; \lambda\right)\right| \leq K\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right|^{\tau}, \quad\left|x_{1}\right|=\left|x_{2}\right|=1, \quad 0<\tau \leq 1 \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the sake of simplicity it is assumed that $\lambda$ and $\bar{\lambda}$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix $A(\lambda)$, i.e., a simple ${ }^{1}$ complex eigenvalue $\lambda$ of $A=A(\lambda)$ is used as a parameter of the system. Throughout the paper it is supposed that $\lambda$ ranges over some neighborhood $D$ of a closed subset $\Lambda$ of the unit circle $S=\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}:|\lambda|=1\}$ and that all the eigenvalues $\sigma_{j}=\sigma_{j}(\lambda)$ of $A(\lambda)$ different from $\lambda$ and $\bar{\lambda}$ satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left|\sigma_{j}(\lambda)\right|-1\right| \geq \delta>0 \quad \text { for all } \quad \lambda \in D, j=1, \ldots, N-2 \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

All three terms in the right-hand side of (1.2) are supposed to be continuous with respect to the set of their arguments $x, \lambda$. Non-constant homogeneous functions $\Phi$ satisfying (2.4) have discontinuities at the origin; we consider our systems for $x \neq 0$.

Denote by $E_{\lambda}$ the proper plane of the matrix $A(\lambda)$ corresponding to the pair of its eigenvalues $\lambda, \bar{\lambda}$ and by $E_{\lambda}^{\prime}$ the proper $(N-2)$-dimensional subspace of $A(\lambda)$, complementary to $E_{\lambda}$. Denote by $P_{\lambda}$ the linear projector onto the plane $E_{\lambda}$ along the subspace $E_{\lambda}^{\prime} ; P_{\lambda}$ commutes with $A(\lambda)$. Choose a basis $\left\{e_{1}^{\lambda}, e_{2}^{\lambda}\right\}$ in $E_{\lambda}$ such that the restriction of $A(\lambda)$ to $E_{\lambda}$ reads

$$
\left(\begin{array}{rr}
\Re e \lambda & -\Im m \lambda \\
\Im m \lambda & \Re e \lambda
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Let $Q_{\lambda}$ be the linear invertible map of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ onto $E_{\lambda}$ defined by $Q_{\lambda} 1=e_{1}^{\lambda}, Q_{\lambda} i=e_{2}^{\lambda}$. Hence, $Q_{\lambda}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{\lambda}^{-1} A(\lambda) Q_{\lambda} z=\lambda z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $Q_{\lambda}$ depends continuously on $\lambda \in D$. Formulations of all the further theorems are independent of the particular choice of the map $Q_{\lambda}$ satisfying (2.8) (i.e., of the basis $\left.\left\{e_{1}^{\lambda}, e_{2}^{\lambda}\right\}\right)$ and of the norm $|\cdot|$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$; once chosen, they are fixed up to the end of the paper ${ }^{2}$. The map $Q_{\lambda}$ defines a complex structure in $E_{\lambda}$, which simplifies further notation.

Consider the complex-valued $2 \pi$-periodic function

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)=Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda} e^{i \varphi} ; \lambda\right), \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and its Fourier series

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)=\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{k}^{\lambda} e^{i k \varphi}, \quad \psi_{k}^{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

For any positive $q$ denote $\lambda_{q}=e^{2 \pi q i}$; if $q=m / n$ is rational ( $m$ and $n$ are coprime) then define the continuous $2 \pi$-periodic function $\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(\varphi)=-\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{k n+1}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{i k \varphi} \equiv-\frac{e^{-i \varphi / n}}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Psi_{\lambda_{q}}\left(\frac{\varphi+2 j \pi}{n}\right) e^{-2 j \pi i / n} \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]2.2. Local theorem. Suppose that function (2.11) has no zeros. Then one can fix some continuous branch of the function $\arg \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(\varphi)$. Denote by $\mathfrak{B}_{q}$ the range of this branch of $\arg \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}$ : the set $\mathfrak{B}_{q}$ is a closed interval.

Our main assumption is that the interval $\mathfrak{B}_{q}$ has a non-empty interior Int $\mathfrak{B}_{q}$ and its length is less than $2 \pi$. This is a generic case if $\psi_{1}^{\lambda_{q}} \neq 0$, the function $\Psi_{\lambda_{q}}$ is not a trigonometric polynomial (it has infinitely many non-zero Fourier coefficients), and $n$ is sufficiently large.

Theorem 2.1. Let $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathfrak{B}_{q}$ be a closed non-empty interval. Then there are numbers $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(q, \mathfrak{B}), r_{j}=r_{j}(q, \mathfrak{B})>0, j=1,2$ such that for every $\lambda$ from the sector

$$
S_{q}=S_{q}(\mathfrak{B})=\left\{\lambda \in D \subset \mathbb{C}: 0<\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \leq \varepsilon, \arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \in \mathfrak{B}\right\}
$$

system (1.1) has at least one periodic point $x_{\lambda}$ with the minimal period $n$ and $a$ norm $\left|x_{\lambda}\right|$ in the interval $r_{1}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}<\left|x_{\lambda}\right|<r_{2}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}$.

A more general version of Theorem 2.1 was proved in [4].
Assume that we let $\lambda$ vary along the ray $\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)=\nu$ for some fixed $\nu \in \mathfrak{B}_{q}$. Consider the points $\varphi_{\nu}$ satisfying $\arg \Psi_{q}^{r e s}\left(\varphi_{\nu}\right)=\nu$. Let us call $\varphi_{\lambda}$ robust if the function $\arg \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}$ is strictly monotone in a vicinity of $\varphi_{\lambda}$. Generically, all $\varphi_{\lambda}$ are robust and there exists a finite number (typically, exactly 2 ) of such points. Each robust point $\varphi_{\nu}$ defines an $n$-periodic orbit $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, which satisfies asymptotically (as $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \rightarrow 0$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{k}=\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}\left|\Psi_{q}^{r e s}\left(\varphi_{\nu}\right)\right| Q_{\lambda_{q}}\left(e^{i\left(\varphi_{\nu}^{j}+2 \pi k\right) / n}\right)+o\left(\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}\right) . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

If an open set $\mathfrak{B}^{\prime}$ contains the closure $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}_{q}$ of the set $\mathfrak{B}_{q}$, then system (1.1) does not have $n$-periodic points with a sufficiently large norm for $\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \notin \mathfrak{B}^{\prime}$ for sufficiently small $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$. In this sense, Theorem 2.1 describes the Arnold tongue near its vertex $\lambda_{q}$ pretty accurately. In the two-dimensional case, system (1.1) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{k+1}=U\left(z_{k} ; \lambda\right), \quad z=r e^{i \varphi} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad U(z ; \lambda)=\lambda z+\Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)+o(1) \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the last term vanishes as $z \rightarrow \infty$, the phase plane is complexified, and $\Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)=\Phi\left(e^{i \varphi} ; \lambda\right)$. Neglecting the small terms in the equation $z=U^{n}(z ; \lambda)$, we arrive at its natural approximation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r=\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi) \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Solutions of the equations $z=U^{n}(z, \lambda)$ and (2.14) are close for small $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$. The solutions $z=r e^{i \varphi}$ of equation (2.14) and the set of parameter values $\lambda-\lambda_{q}$ for which these solutions exist are described straightforwardly in terms of the curve $\Gamma_{q}=\left\{\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow C\right\}$ (see details in [4]).

A discrete time system (1.1) naturally arises as the Poincare map of a differential equation. Let us consider the simplest two-dimensional example where the Poincare map has the form (2.13). It reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime}=\nu z+a(t) f(z)+b(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

in the complex notation. Here $a=a(t), b=b(t)$ are complex valued $2 \pi$-periodic functions and $\nu$ is a complex parameter. Assume that the function $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ has a radial limit $F: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ at infinity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\theta \rightarrow \infty} \sup _{|z|=1}|f(\theta z)-F(z)|=0, \quad F(z)=F(z /|z|) \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the Poincare map of (2.15) is $U(z ; \nu)=\lambda z+\Phi(z ; \nu)+o(1)$ in a vicinity of infinity, where $\lambda=e^{2 \pi \nu}$ is our standard parameter, which lies on the complex unit circle if $\nu$ is on the imaginary axis, and $\Phi$ is the bounded homogeneous part of $U$. In terms of the Fourier series of the functions

$$
a(t)=\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_{k} e^{i k t}, \quad F\left(e^{i \varphi}\right)=\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_{k} e^{i k \varphi}
$$

one obtains

$$
\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(\varphi)=-2 \pi e^{2 \pi q i} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_{-m k} \phi_{n k+1} e^{i k \varphi}
$$

If $a=$ const, then Theorem 2.1 is inapplicable, because $\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }} \equiv$ const too.
3. Estimates of the length of tongues. In this section we estimate the length of the Arnold tongues $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ for system (1.1) and the length of their thick part asymptotically as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\Lambda \subset\{\lambda \in D \subset \mathbb{C}:|\lambda|=1\}$ be a closed set. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi(\lambda):=-\frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} e^{-i \varphi} \Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi) d \varphi \neq 0, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Psi_{\lambda}$ is function (2.9) (note that $-\psi(\lambda)$ equals the coefficient $\psi_{1}^{\lambda}$ of the first harmonic in (2.10) and $\psi(\lambda)$ is the average value of function (2.11)). Given a rational $q$ and a $\nu>0$, consider the angle

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{A}=\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}:\left|\Im m\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)\right| \leq \nu \Re e\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right\}\right. \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\bar{\psi}(\lambda)$ is the complex conjugate of $\psi(\lambda)$. The constant $\nu$ defines the spread of this angle with the vertex $\lambda_{q}$ and the bisector $\left\{\lambda: \lambda-\lambda_{q}=r \psi(\lambda), r>0\right\}$. We say that the length of the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ in the angle (3.18) is not less then $\delta$, if on any continuous curve

$$
\begin{equation*}
L=\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}: \lambda=\lambda^{*}(\rho), \rho \in[0,1]\right\} \subset \mathcal{A} \cap\left\{\lambda: 0<\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|<\delta\right\} \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

that has its ends on the different sides of the angle (3.18) there is at least one $\lambda=\lambda^{*}\left(\rho_{0}\right) \in L$ such that system (1.1) with this $\lambda$ has an $n$-periodic point $x_{L}$, and $\left|x_{L}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ as $\max \left\{\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|: \lambda \in L\right\} \rightarrow 0$ (i.e., as $L$ shrinks to $\lambda_{q}$ ).


Figure 3. The length of the Arnold tongue and of its triangular part.

Theorem 3.1. Let (3.17) be valid. Then given any $\nu>0$, there is an $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\nu, \Lambda)>$ 0 such that for every rational positive $q=m / n$ with a sufficiently large $n$ and with $\lambda_{q} \in \Lambda$, the length of the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ in the angle (3.18) is not less then $\varepsilon / n$.

Assumption (3.17) implies that the angular width of the tongues $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ goes to zero as the denominator $n$ of $q$ increases. More precisely, for any $\nu>0$ the intersection of the tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ with the circle $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \leq \varepsilon(\nu, \Lambda) / n$ lies in the angle (3.18) for any $\lambda_{q} \in \Lambda$ such that the denominator $n$ of $q$ is sufficiently large (i.e., there are no $n$ periodic points with a sufficiently large norm if $\lambda$ lies in the circle $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \leq \varepsilon(\nu, \Lambda) / n$ outside this angle).

On Fig. 3 we show schematically two parts of the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$, the existence of which is ensured by Theorems 2.1 and 3.1: the shadowed solid triangular part and the rest, drawn conditionally as a dashed curve. If the curve (3.19) crosses the triangular part of $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$, then the intersection is an arc with a non-empty interior on this curve $L$. However, the triangular part is shorter than the length $\delta=\varepsilon(\nu, \Lambda) / n$ of $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$, ensured by Theorem 3.1. For curves (3.19) lying within the distance $\delta$ from $\lambda_{q}$ but outside the circle where Theorem 2.1 ensures the triangular shape of $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$, we can guarantee only one intersection point of $L$ with $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ (i.e., with the dashed tail on Fig. 3).

Theorem 2.1 states the existence of a triangular part of the tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$. In the next Theorem 3.2 we suggest a lower asymptotic estimate for the length of this part as $n \rightarrow \infty$ under some additional assumptions: this estimate is uniform for $\lambda$. Denote by $\Lambda_{\triangle}$ the set of all $\lambda_{q} \in \Lambda$ with rational $q$ such that Int $\mathfrak{B}_{q} \neq \emptyset$. Suppose that $\Lambda_{\triangle}$ is infinite, hence the function $\Psi_{\lambda}$ has infinitely many non-zero Fourier coefficients. From (2.11) and (3.17) it follows that if the denominator $n$ of $q$ is sufficiently large, then the function $\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}$ does not have zeros and $\mathfrak{B}_{q}$ is a segment, i.e., $\mathfrak{B}_{q}=\left[M_{q}^{-}, M_{q}^{+}\right]$with $M_{q}^{+}>M_{q}^{-}$for $\lambda_{q} \in \Lambda_{\triangle}$. Denote the positive length of this segment by

$$
\Delta_{q}=M_{q}^{+}-M_{q}^{-} .
$$

Theorem 2.1 implies that for any $\theta \in(0,1)$ there is a $\delta_{q}(\theta)>0$ such that for each $\lambda$ from the set

$$
\left\{\lambda:\left|\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)-\left(M_{q}^{+}+M_{q}^{-}\right) / 2\right| \leq \theta \Delta_{q} / 2, \quad 0<\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \leq \delta_{q}(\theta)\right\}
$$

system (1.1) has at least one periodic point $x_{\lambda}$ with the minimal period $n$ and a norm $\left|x_{\lambda}\right|$ in the interval $r_{1}^{q}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}<\left|x_{\lambda}\right|<r_{2}^{q}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}$, where $r_{j}^{q}>0$ do not depend on $\lambda$. We say that $\delta_{q}(\theta)$ is a lower estimate for the length of the triangular part of the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ for a given $\theta$.

Let $0<s_{1}<s, 0<\tau_{1}<\tau$, where $s$ and $\tau$ are the exponents in (2.5) and (2.6). Let a sequence $\rho_{n}>0$ satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{q=m / n, \lambda_{q} \in \Lambda_{\Delta}} \frac{n^{\tau_{1}} \rho_{n}^{\tau_{1}}+\rho_{n}^{s_{1}}}{\Delta_{q}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty \tag{3.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we take supremum over $m$ for a fixed $n$. Assume that the

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Psi_{\lambda_{1}}(\varphi)-\Psi_{\lambda_{2}}(\varphi)\right| \leq K^{\prime}\left|\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}\right|^{\tau}, \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2} \in D \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

for function (2.9). For example, this holds if $A(\lambda), \Phi(x ; \lambda)$ are Lipschitz continuous in $\lambda$ and $Q_{\lambda}$ is chosen to be Lipschitz continuous as well.

Theorem 3.2. Let relations (3.17), (3.20), and (3.21) hold. Then, given a $\theta \in$ $(0,1)$ the value $\delta_{q}(\theta)=\rho_{n}$ is a lower estimate for the length of the thick part of
the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ for any rational $q=m / n$ with sufficiently large $n$ such that $\lambda_{q} \in \Lambda_{\triangle}$ (how large $n$ is depends on $\theta$ ).

Condition (3.20) can be specified in terms of the rate at which $\Delta_{q}$ decreases to zero. This rate depends on the smoothness of the function $\Psi_{\lambda}$, which defines how quickly the Fourier coefficients $\psi_{k}^{\lambda}$ of $\Psi_{\lambda}$ converge to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For example, let $\psi_{k}^{\lambda} \sim k^{-2}$ (this corresponds to Lipschitzian but non-differentiable functions $\Psi_{\lambda}$ ). Generically, in this case $\Delta_{q} \sim n^{-2}$. If $\tau=1$ in (2.6), (3.21), i.e., functions $\Phi, \Psi_{\lambda}$ are Lipschitz in both arguments, and $s \geq 2 / 3$ in (2.5), then Theorem 3.2 ensures that $n^{-3-\varepsilon}$ is a lower estimate for the length of the triangular part of the tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ for any $\varepsilon>0$.
4. Systems with a scalar parameter. Suppose that the complex parameter $\lambda$ is a function of some real parameter $\mu: \lambda=\lambda(\mu), \mu \in(0,1)$, hence the range of $\lambda$ is a curve on the complex plane. Assume that this curve is smooth and intersects transversally the unit circle at the point $\lambda\left(\mu_{0}\right)=\lambda_{q}$ with a real (either rational or irrational) $q$. Then subfurcation can occur for values of $\mu$ close to $\mu_{0}$, like in the case of local dynamics near the origin considered in [3].

Consider system (1.1) with $\lambda=\lambda(\mu):(0,1) \rightarrow D \subset \mathbb{C}$. Let us say that this system undergoes subfurcation at infinity near the point $\mu_{0}$ if for any $\varepsilon>0$ there is at least one $\mu_{\varepsilon} \in\left(\mu_{0}-\varepsilon, \mu_{0}+\varepsilon\right)$ such that system (1.1) with $\lambda=\lambda\left(\mu_{\varepsilon}\right)$ has a periodic point $x_{\varepsilon}$ with the norm $\left|x_{\varepsilon}\right|>1 / \varepsilon$ and a minimal period $n_{\varepsilon}>1 / \varepsilon$ (i.e., there exist periodic points of arbitrarily large minimal period and norm for parameter values $\mu$ from any vicinity of $\mu_{0}$ ).
Theorem 4.1. Suppose that function (3.17) is non-zero on a closed set $\Lambda \subset\{\lambda \in$ $\mathbb{C}:|\lambda|=1\}$. Suppose that for some non-zero $b \in \mathbb{C}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\arg \lambda-\arg b \neq \pi / 2+\pi k, \quad \arg \psi(\lambda)-\arg b \neq \pi k \tag{4.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and all integer $k$. Given such a number $b$, if, additionally, $\lambda_{\mu}^{\prime}\left(\mu_{0}\right)=b$ and $\lambda\left(\mu_{0}\right)=\lambda_{q}$ for either an irrational $q$ or a rational $q=m / n$ with a sufficiently large $n$, then system (1.1) with $\lambda=\lambda(\mu)$ undergoes subfurcation at infinity near the point $\mu_{0}$.

This theorem follows from Theorem 3.1, because under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 the curve $\lambda(\mu)$ intersects infinitely many Arnold tongues $\mathfrak{A}_{q_{k}}$, where $q_{k}=m_{k} / n_{k}$ are good enough one-sided rational approximations of $q$. If $q$ is irrational, then this is true for the sequence of convergents $q_{k}$ of $q$ with either even or odd $k$. Indeed, the convergents satisfy $\left|q-q_{k}\right| \leq n_{k}^{-2}$ (see, e.g., [2]) and hence $\left|\lambda_{q}-\lambda_{q_{k}}\right|=O\left(n_{k}^{-2}\right)$, while the length of the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q_{k}}$ is not less than $\varepsilon n_{k}^{-1}$ according to Theorem 3.1. Consequently, condition (4.22) implies that the curve $\lambda(\mu)$ intersects the tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q_{k}}$ (by ensuring that the curve and the tongue are not 'parallel') whenever $n_{k}$ is sufficiently large and the tongue vertex $\lambda_{q_{k}}$ lies on the proper side from the point $\lambda_{q}=\lambda\left(\mu_{0}\right)$ on an arc of the unit circle. The latter condition means equivalently that $q_{k}$ is either always a lower or always an upper approximation to $q$, i.e., the index $k$ has the same proper parity for all $q_{k}$.

If $q=m / n$ is rational, then a similar argument works for the sequence of rational $q_{k}=m_{k} / n_{k}$ such that $\left|m n_{k}-n m_{k}\right|=1$ and the difference $m n_{k}-n m_{k}$ has the same proper sign for all $k$ (both infinite sequences $q_{k}=m_{k} / n_{k}$ with $m n_{k}-n m_{k}=1$ and $m n_{k}-n m_{k}=-1$ exist, because $m$ and $n$ are coprime). Again, the curve $\lambda(\mu)$ intersects the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q_{k}}$ for large enough $n_{k}$ whenever $\lambda_{q_{k}}$ lies on the proper
side from $\lambda_{q}$ and the tongue's length is sufficiently large compared to the difference $\left|q-q_{k}\right|$, which now equals $\left|m / n-m_{k} / n_{k}\right|=\left(n n_{k}\right)^{-1}$. Consequently, the lower estimate $\varepsilon / n_{k}$ of the tongue's length ensures that the curve $\lambda(\mu)$ passing through the point $\lambda_{q}$ intersects infinitely many Arnold tongues if the denominator $n$ of $q$ is sufficiently large. This construction sketches the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.1 does not answer the questions of whether subfurcation at infinity occurs for some finite range of the denominator $n$ of $q$ and how large this range is. Note that smooth systems undergo subfurcation at the origin for all irrational $q$ and all rational $q=m / n$ with $n>4$.

An interesting problem is to estimate from below the length of the intervals of intersection of the curve $\lambda(\mu)$ with the Arnold tongues. At zero these intervals are very short: if $q$ is irrational, $q_{k}=m_{k} / n_{k}$ is an approximation of $q$, and $\varepsilon_{n_{k}}=\left|q-q_{k}\right|$, then the length of the corresponding interval is at most of order $\varepsilon_{n_{k}}^{n_{k} / 2-1}$, where generically $\varepsilon_{n_{k}} \sim n_{k}^{-2}$ : on Fig. 2 one of such intervals (in a tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q_{1}}$ ) is shown as a bold segment. For the problem at infinity these intervals may be wider, at least for some values of $q$. If $q$ is the so-called well approximable irrational number (this means that $\varepsilon_{n_{k}}$ tends to zero quicker than $\left.n_{k}^{-2}\right)$, than the curve $\lambda(\mu)$ may intersect triangular parts of the tongues $\mathfrak{A}_{q_{k}}$. For this case it is possible to obtain polynomial estimates $n_{k}^{-K}$ from below for the width of the intervals of intersection, where $K$ is independent from $n_{k}$ and depends on the well approximable irrational $q$ and the smoothness of $\Psi_{\lambda}$. The set of well approximable numbers is dense but has measure zero on the real axis.
5. Invariant annulus. Here we consider sufficient conditions for the existence of invariant sets for (1.1) that are situated far from the origin. Let us start with the simple example of a two-dimensional map (2.13) with the term $o(1)$ identically equal to zero. In complex notation, the corresponding system (1.1) has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{k+1}=\lambda z_{k}+\Psi_{\lambda}\left(\varphi_{k}\right), \quad z_{k}=r_{k} e^{\varphi_{k} i} \tag{5.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that for every $\lambda$ from some set $\tilde{\Lambda} \subset\{z \in \mathbb{C},|z|<1\}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Re e\left(\lambda^{-1} e^{-i \varphi} \Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)\right) \geq \varepsilon_{0}>0, \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R} \tag{5.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

and consequently the numbers

$$
M_{\lambda}^{\min }=\min _{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}} \Re e\left(\lambda^{-1} e^{-i \varphi} \Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)\right), \quad M_{\lambda}^{\max }=\max _{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}} \Re e\left(\lambda^{-1} e^{-i \varphi} \Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)\right)
$$

satisfy $M_{\lambda}^{\max } \geq M_{\lambda}^{\min }>\varepsilon_{0}$. It is straightforward to check that under the assumption (5.24) for any $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{0}\right)$ the annulus

$$
K_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}=\left\{z \in \mathbb{C}: M_{\lambda}^{\min }-\varepsilon \leq|z|(1-|\lambda|) \leq M_{\lambda}^{\max }+\varepsilon\right\}
$$

is invariant for system (5.23) whenever $1-|\lambda|>0$ is sufficiently small. Moreover, every annulus $K_{r_{1}, r_{2}}=\left\{z \in \mathbb{C}: r_{1} \leq|z| \leq r_{2}\right\}$ that contains $K_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ and has sufficiently large internal radius $r_{1}$ is invariant for system (5.23) and $K_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ is attractive: if an initial point $z_{0}$ lies outside $K_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ far enough from the origin, then after a number of iterations $z_{k} \in K_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$. Similar facts are true for small perturbations (2.13) of system (5.23) and for $N$-dimensional system (1.1).

Consider the iterated system $z_{k+1}=U^{n}\left(z_{k} ; \lambda\right)$ with the $n$-th iteration of the $\operatorname{map} U(z ; \lambda)=\lambda z+\Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)$ for $\lambda$ close enough to the point $\lambda_{q}$ with $q=m / n$. The analogue of condition (5.24) for this system is $\Re e\left(\lambda_{q}^{-1} \Psi_{q}^{r e s}(\varphi)\right)<-\varepsilon_{0}$, which is less restrictive than (5.24). Below we show that under this condition system (2.13) itself also has an invariant annulus after a proper change of variable of the form
$y=x+$ 'homogeneous term'. We formulate this type of result for more general system (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$.

Assume that all the eigenvalues of the matrix $A(\lambda)$ different from $\lambda$ and $\bar{\lambda}$ lie in the open unit circle of the complex plane, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\sigma_{j}(\lambda)\right|<1-\delta_{*}, \quad \lambda \in D, \delta_{*}>0, j=1, \ldots, N-2 . \tag{5.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, assume that the function $\Phi=\Phi(x ; \lambda)$ is Lipschitz continuous in $x$. For $\lambda$ sufficiently close to some $\lambda_{q}$ ( $q$ may be either rational or irrational), define a new variable $y \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$ by the formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
y=B_{q}(x):=x+Q_{\lambda_{q}} \Theta_{q}\left(Q_{\lambda_{q}}^{-1} P_{\lambda_{q}} x\right) \tag{5.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

with a positively homogeneous function $\Theta_{q}: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. As we show in the proofs below, such change of variables in the phase space $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ is continuously invertible in some vicinity of infinity for any positively homogeneous Lipschitz $\Theta_{q}$. We choose $\Theta_{q}$ in different ways for rational and irrational $q$.

Let the number $q$ be rational. Set

$$
\rho^{\min }=\min _{\varphi}\left|\Re e\left(\lambda_{q}^{-1} \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(\varphi)\right)\right|, \quad \rho^{\max }=\max _{\varphi}\left|\Re e\left(\lambda_{q}^{-1} \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(\varphi)\right)\right|
$$

Theorem 5.1. Let (5.25) hold and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Re e\left(\lambda_{q}^{-1} \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(\varphi)\right)<0 \quad \text { for all } \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R} \tag{5.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some rational $q=m / n$. Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Theta_{q}\left(r e^{\varphi i}\right)=\sum_{k \not \equiv 1(\bmod n)} \psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{-2 \pi q i}\left(1-e^{2 \pi(k-1) q i}\right)^{-1} e^{k \varphi i} \tag{5.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}}$ are the Fourier coefficients of (2.10), and define the change of variable $y=B_{q}(x)$ by (5.26). Then there is $R>0$ such that for any $\delta>0$

$$
\Pi_{q}=\left\{x=B_{q}^{-1}(y): \rho^{\min }-\delta \leq\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \cdot\left|P_{\lambda_{q}} y\right| \leq \rho^{\max }+\delta,\left|y-P_{\lambda_{q}} y\right| \leq R\right\}
$$

is an invariant set of system (1.1) for any $\lambda$ from the set $\Lambda_{q}^{\varepsilon}=\left\{|\lambda|<1,\left|\lambda_{q}-\lambda\right|<\varepsilon\right\}$ with some $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\delta)>0$.

The constant $R$ in the definition of the set $\Pi_{q}$ may be chosen independently from $\delta, \varepsilon$. It depends on the value of $1-\delta_{*}$, geometric properties of the matrices $A(\lambda)$, and estimates of the bounded terms $\Phi$ and $\xi$ of (1.2).

Let us note that the series in (5.28) converges uniformly to the Lipschitzian function $\Theta_{q}$ if $\Psi_{\lambda_{q}}$ is Lipschitzian. This follows from

$$
\Theta_{q}\left(e^{\varphi i}\right)=\sum_{\ell=0,2,3, \ldots, n-1} e^{-2 \pi q i}\left(1-e^{2 \pi(\ell-1) q i}\right)^{-1} \sum_{k \equiv \ell(\bmod n)} \psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{k \varphi i}
$$

since any function

$$
\sum_{k \equiv \ell(\bmod n)} \psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{k \varphi i}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{-2 j \ell \pi i / n} \Psi_{\lambda_{q}}(\varphi+2 j \pi / n)
$$

is Lipschitzian together with function (2.9). Also, note that the change of variable (5.26) is the same for all $\lambda \in \Lambda_{q}^{\varepsilon}$.

Geometrically, condition (5.27) means that the Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ points inside the unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$.

Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 are satisfied for two-dimensional system (2.13), and hence $\Pi_{q}$ is an invariant set for this system. Numerical experiments show that if $\lambda \notin \mathfrak{A}_{q}$, then, generically, the set $\Pi_{q}$ contains an attractive
invariant curve of the system. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{A}_{q}$, we observed different phase portraits: with and without the invariant curve. If it exists, periodic trajectories sometimes belong to this curve and sometimes do not. When $\lambda$ follows some continuous curve close enough to the point $\lambda_{q}$, the system undergoes various bifurcations. For example, a saddle-node bifurcations takes place on the boundaries of each Arnold tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$. One scenario is that a saddle-node is born on the invariant curve like in the case of weak resonances for smooth systems near the equilibrium. In another scenario, the saddle-node is born away from the invariant curve: in this case the saddle point can collide with the invariant curve and destroy it as parameter varies inside the Arnold tongue. The study of such bifurcations will be an object of another paper.

The next theorem is an analogue of Theorem 5.1 for an irrational $q$.
Theorem 5.2. Let (5.25) hold and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho:=\Re e\left(\lambda_{q}^{-1} \psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)<0 \tag{5.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

for an irrational $q$. Then for any $\delta>0$ there are an $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\delta)>0$ and an integer $K=K(\delta)$ such that

$$
\Pi_{q}=\left\{x=B_{q}^{-1}(y):|\rho|-\delta \leq\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \cdot\left|P_{\lambda_{q}} y\right| \leq|\rho|+\delta,\left|y-P_{\lambda_{q}} y\right| \leq R\right\}
$$

is an invariant set of system (1.1) for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{q}^{\varepsilon}$ if $\Theta_{q}=\Theta_{q, K}$ in the change of variable $y=B_{q}(x)$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Theta_{q, K}\left(r e^{\varphi i}\right)=\sum_{|k| \leq K, k \neq 1} \psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{-2 \pi q i}\left(1-e^{2 \pi(k-1) q i}\right)^{-1} e^{k \varphi i} \tag{5.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Condition (5.29) means that the Arnold tongues $\mathfrak{A}_{p}$ point inside the unit disc for all rational $p$ close enough to $q$. The constant $R$ in the definition of $\Pi_{q}$ is independent of $\delta$, like in Theorem 5.1.

Now we combine Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 to formulate a non-local result with respect to $\lambda$. Let $\mathfrak{L}$ be an arbitrary closed subset of the set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}:|\lambda|=1$, $\Re e(\bar{\lambda} \psi(\lambda))<0\}$. Then there exists an integer $n_{0}>0$ (depending on $\mathfrak{L}$ ) such that if $q=m / n$ is rational with $n>n_{0}$ and $\lambda_{q} \in \mathfrak{L}$, then (5.27) holds, i.e., the tongue $\mathfrak{A}_{q}$ points inside the unit disc. For $\delta, \varepsilon>0$ denote

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{O}(\delta) & =\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}: \min _{q=m / n, n \leq n_{0}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|<\delta\right\}, \\
\mathfrak{L}_{\delta, \varepsilon} & =\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}:|\lambda|<1, \inf _{\nu \in \mathfrak{L}}|\lambda-\nu|<\varepsilon\right\} \backslash \tilde{O}(\delta) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 5.3. Given any $\delta>0$, there are $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\delta)>0, R>0$ and a finite number of the maps $y=B_{q_{k}}(x)$ of the form (5.26) such that for any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{L}_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ at least one of the sets

$$
\Pi_{k}(\lambda)=\left\{x=B_{q_{k}}^{-1}(y): \rho(\lambda)-\delta \leq(1-|\lambda|)\left|P_{\lambda} y\right| \leq \rho(\lambda)+\delta,\left|y-P_{\lambda} y\right| \leq R\right\}
$$

with $\rho(\lambda)=|\Re e(\bar{\lambda} \psi(\lambda))|$ is invariant for system (1.1).

## 6. Proofs.

6.1. Main theorem. We denote by $E_{\lambda}^{+}$the proper subspace of the matrix $A(\lambda)$ corresponding to all its eigenvalues $\sigma_{j}(\lambda)$ satisfying $\left|\sigma_{j}(\lambda)\right|>1$, and by $E_{\lambda}^{-}$the proper subspace of $A(\lambda)$ corresponding to its eigenvalues $\sigma_{j}(\lambda)$ satisfying $\left|\sigma_{j}(\lambda)\right|<1$. Consequently, $E_{\lambda}^{+} \oplus E_{\lambda}^{-}=E_{\lambda}^{\prime}$ and $E_{\lambda}^{+} \oplus E_{\lambda}^{-} \oplus E_{\lambda}=\mathbb{R}^{N}$. Let $P_{\lambda}^{+}$be the linear projector onto the subspace $E_{\lambda}^{+}$along the complementary proper subspace $E_{\lambda}^{-} \oplus E_{\lambda}$ of $A(\lambda)$, and let $P_{\lambda}^{-}$be the linear projector onto $E_{\lambda}^{-}$along the complementary proper
subspace $E_{\lambda}^{+} \oplus E_{\lambda}$ of $A(\lambda)$ so that $P_{\lambda}^{+}+P_{\lambda}^{-}+P_{\lambda}=I$. By these definitions, there is a norm $|\cdot|_{\lambda}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ depending continuously on $\lambda$ and a $\kappa<1$ such that for all $\lambda \in D$

$$
\begin{equation*}
|A(\lambda) x|_{\lambda} \leq \kappa|x|_{\lambda}, \quad x \in E_{\lambda}^{-} ; \quad|A(\lambda) x|_{\lambda} \geq \kappa^{-1}|x|_{\lambda}, \quad x \in E_{\lambda}^{+} \tag{6.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

From relations (6.31) and from the boundedness of the nonlinear terms $\Phi$ and $\xi$ of representation (1.2), it follows the existence of a $\beta>0$ such that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} U(x ; \lambda)\right|_{\lambda}<\beta \quad \text { if } \quad\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} x\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta,  \tag{6.32}\\
\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} U(x ; \lambda)\right|_{\lambda}<\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} x\right|_{\lambda} \quad \text { if } \quad\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} x\right|_{\lambda} \geq \beta  \tag{6.33}\\
\left|\eta P_{\lambda}^{+} U(x ; \lambda)+(1-\eta) P_{\lambda}^{+} A(\lambda) x\right|_{\lambda}>\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda} \quad \text { if } \quad\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda} \geq \beta \tag{6.34}
\end{gather*}
$$

for every $\lambda \in D$ and every $\eta \in[0,1]$. Such a $\beta$ is fixed up to the end of the proofs. Estimates (6.32), (6.33), and (6.34) (the latter with $\eta=1$ ) imply that all the periodic points of the map $U(\cdot ; \lambda)$ lie in the interior of the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{\lambda}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}:\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} x\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta,\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta\right\} \tag{6.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider the nonlinear projector onto the set $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}:\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta\right\}$ defined by

$$
W_{\lambda}(x)=x+\left(\frac{\min \left\{\beta,\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda}\right\}}{\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda}}-1\right) P_{\lambda}^{+} x
$$

and define the map

$$
V_{\lambda}(x)=U\left(W_{\lambda}(x) ; \lambda\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, \lambda \in D
$$

If (5.25) holds, then $V_{\lambda}(x)=U(x ; \lambda)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$; if not, then $V_{\lambda}(x)=U(x ; \lambda)$ on the set $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N}:\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta\right\} \supset \Omega_{\lambda}$. Therefore in any case each periodic point of the $\operatorname{map} U(\cdot ; \lambda)$ is a periodic point of the map $V_{\lambda}$ too. On the other hand, relations (6.32) and $P_{\lambda}^{-} W_{\lambda}(x)=P_{\lambda}^{-} x$ imply

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} V_{\lambda}(x)\right|_{\lambda}<\beta \quad \text { if } \quad\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} x\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta \tag{6.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

while relations (6.34) (with $\eta=1$ ) and

$$
\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} W_{\lambda}(x)\right|_{\lambda}=\beta \quad \text { if } \quad\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda} \geq \beta
$$

imply

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}(x)\right|_{\lambda}>\beta \quad \text { if } \quad\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} x\right|_{\lambda} \geq \beta \tag{6.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining estimates (6.36) and (6.37), one concludes that for any periodic point $x$ of $V_{\lambda}$ lying in $\Omega_{\lambda}$ all the iterations $V_{\lambda}^{k}(x), k \in \mathbb{N}$, also belong to the set $\Omega_{\lambda}$, where $V_{\lambda}$ coincides with $U(\cdot ; \lambda)$. Consequently, the periodic points of $U(\cdot ; \lambda)$ coincide with the periodic points of $V_{\lambda}$ lying in $\Omega_{\lambda}$. The map $V_{\lambda}$ is defined in such a way that the images of the set $\Omega_{\lambda}$ under the iterated maps $V_{\lambda}^{k}$ have uniformly bounded projections onto the subspace $E_{\lambda}^{\prime}$ along the subspace $E_{\lambda}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{N}$ for all $k$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V_{\lambda}^{k}(x)\right|_{\lambda} \leq c_{0}, \quad x \in \Omega_{\lambda}, k \in \mathbb{N} . \tag{6.38}
\end{equation*}
$$

Set

$$
\Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}(\varphi)=-\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{k n+1}^{\lambda} e^{i k \varphi} \equiv-\frac{e^{-i \varphi / n}}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Psi_{\lambda}\left(\frac{\varphi+2 j \pi}{n}\right) e^{-2 j \pi i / n}
$$

By definition, this function equals (2.11) for $\lambda=\lambda_{q}$ with $q=m / n$. The following statement plays the main role for the further proofs.

Theorem 6.1. For any $\tau_{1}<\tau, s_{1}<s$, and $0<\kappa_{1}<\kappa_{2}$ there is a $\delta=$ $\delta\left(\tau_{1}, s_{1}, \kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}\right)$ such that if $0<n\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|<\delta$ for a positive rational $q=m / n$ then the $n$-th iteration of the operator $V_{\lambda}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left|Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)-z-n \lambda_{q}^{-1}\left(\left(\lambda \lambda_{q}\right) z-e^{i \varphi} \Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right)\right| \\
& \leq 2 n\left(n^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right) \tag{6.39}
\end{align*}
$$

with $z=Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} x, \varphi=\arg z$ for all $x$ from the set

$$
\Omega_{\lambda}^{q, \kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}}=\left\{x \in \Omega_{\lambda}: \kappa_{1} \leq\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|\left|Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} x\right| \leq \kappa_{2}\right\} .
$$

6.2. Proof of Theorem 6.1. All the constants $c, \bar{c}, c_{1}$ etc. are absolute in this proof, i.e., they do not depend on $\lambda$ and $q$. First note that estimates

$$
\left|\frac{x_{1}}{\left|x_{1}\right|}-\frac{x_{2}}{\left|x_{2}\right|}\right| \leq \frac{2\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right|}{\left|x_{1}\right|}, \quad x_{1}, x_{2} \neq 0
$$

and (2.6) imply

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Phi\left(x_{1} ; \lambda\right)-\Phi\left(x_{2} ; \lambda\right)\right| \leq \frac{2^{\tau} K\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right|^{\tau}}{\left|x_{1}\right|^{\tau}} \tag{6.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $x \in \Omega_{\lambda}^{q, \kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}}$. Define $x_{k}=V_{\lambda}^{k}(x), z_{k}=Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} x_{k}$, and $z=Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} x$. Assume that for some $1 \leq k \leq n$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|z_{k}-\lambda^{k} z-\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \lambda^{k-j-1} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right)\right| \leq k\left(k^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right) \tag{6.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, this is true for $k=1$ if $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ is sufficiently small. Indeed, relations

$$
z_{1}=Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} V_{\lambda}(x)=\lambda z+Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi(x ; \lambda)+Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \xi(x ; \lambda)
$$

imply

$$
\left|z_{1}-\lambda z-Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda} z ; \lambda\right)\right| \leq\left|Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda}\left(\Phi(x ; \lambda)-\Phi\left(Q_{\lambda} z ; \lambda\right)+\xi(x ; \lambda)\right)\right|
$$

where due to (6.40) and (2.5)

$$
\Phi(x ; \lambda)-\Phi\left(Q_{\lambda} z ; \lambda\right)=O\left(|z|^{-\tau}\right), \quad \xi(x ; \lambda)=O\left(|z|^{-s}\right)
$$

(when applying (6.40) we take into account that the value $x-Q_{\lambda} z=x-P_{\lambda} x$ is bounded for all $x \in \Omega_{\lambda}$ ). Since $|z| \geq \kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$, we arrive at

$$
\left|z_{1}-\lambda z-Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda} z ; \lambda\right)\right| \leq\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}
$$

for small $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$, which is (6.41) for $k=1$.
From the equality

$$
z_{k+1}=\lambda z_{k}+Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right) ; \lambda\right)+Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \xi\left(W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right) ; \lambda\right)
$$

and relations $\xi\left(W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right) ; \lambda\right)=O\left(\left|z_{k}\right|^{-s}\right)$ and (6.41), it follows that

$$
\begin{align*}
\mid z_{k+1}-\lambda^{k+1} z- & \sum_{j=0}^{k} \lambda^{k-j} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right) \mid \\
\leq & |\lambda| k\left(k^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right)+\bar{c}\left|z_{k}\right|^{-s}  \tag{6.42}\\
& +\left|Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda}\left(\Phi\left(W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right) ; \lambda\right)-\Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{k} z\right) ; \lambda\right)\right)\right|
\end{align*}
$$

We assume that the product $n\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ is sufficiently small, which implies $1 / 2 \leq$ $|\lambda|^{k} \leq 2$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Therefore (6.41) implies $\left|z_{k}-\lambda^{k} z\right| \leq k c$. Combining the estimate $\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} x_{k}\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta$ (which follows from (6.36) for all $k$ ) with the relations
$\left(I-P_{\lambda}^{+}\right) W_{\lambda}(\tilde{x})=\left(I-P_{\lambda}^{+}\right) \tilde{x},\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} W_{\lambda}(\tilde{x})\right|_{\lambda} \leq \beta$, valid for all $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, we obtain $\left|W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right)-P_{\lambda} x_{k}\right|_{\lambda} \leq 2 \beta$ and consequently

$$
\left|W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right)-Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{k} z\right)\right| \leq\left|W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right)-P_{\lambda} x_{k}\right|+\left|Q_{\lambda}\left(z_{k}-\lambda^{k} z\right)\right| \leq \bar{c}+k \tilde{c}
$$

This relation and (6.40) imply the estimates

$$
\left|\Phi\left(W_{\lambda}\left(x_{k}\right) ; \lambda\right)-\Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{k} z\right) ; \lambda\right)\right| \leq \tilde{c}_{1} k^{\tau}|z|^{-\tau} \leq \tilde{c}_{2} k^{\tau}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau}
$$

for the last term of (6.42). Taking into account that

$$
\left|z_{k}\right| \geq\left|\lambda^{k} z\right|-\left|z_{k}-\lambda^{k} z\right| \geq|z| / 2-k c \geq \kappa_{1} /\left(2\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|\right)-n c
$$

and therefore $\left|z_{k}\right| \geq \tilde{c}_{3}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}$ whenever $n\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ is sufficiently small, we obtain from (6.42) the estimate

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|z_{k+1}-\lambda^{k+1} z-\sum_{j=0}^{k} \lambda^{k-j} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right)\right| \\
& \quad \leq|\lambda| k\left(k^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right)+c_{1}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s}+c_{1} k^{\tau}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau} \tag{6.43}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that one obtains the left-hand side of (6.43) from the left-hand side of (6.41) by replacing $k$ with $k+1$. For sufficiently small $n\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ the relations

$$
|\lambda| k \leq\left(1+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|\right) k \leq k+1 / 2
$$

and

$$
c_{1}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s}+c_{1} k^{\tau}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau}<\left(\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}+k^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}\right) / 2
$$

are valid, and consequently the right-hand side of (6.43) is less than

$$
(k+1)\left(k^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right),
$$

which implies that if (6.41) holds for some $k \leq n$ then it also holds for $k+1$ in place of $k$. By induction we conclude that (6.41) is valid for all $1 \leq k \leq n$.

From (6.40) it follows

$$
\left|\Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{k} z\right) ; \lambda\right)-\Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda_{q}^{k} z\right) ; \lambda\right)\right| \leq \hat{c}\left|\lambda^{k}-\lambda_{q}^{k}\right|^{\tau}
$$

Since $\left|\lambda^{k}-\lambda_{q}^{k}\right| \leq 2 k\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n$, this implies

$$
\begin{align*}
\mid \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda^{n-j-1} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} & \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right) \\
& -\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{q}^{n-j-1} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda_{q}^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right)\left|\leq \hat{c}_{1} n^{1+\tau}\right| \lambda-\left.\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau} \tag{6.44}
\end{align*}
$$

The relation $\lambda_{q}^{n}=1$ implies

$$
\lambda^{n}=\left(1+\frac{\lambda-\lambda_{q}}{\lambda_{q}}\right)^{n}=1+n \lambda_{q}^{-1}\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)+O\left(n^{2}\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)^{2}\right), \quad n\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \rightarrow 0
$$

and consequently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\lambda^{n} z-z-n \lambda_{q}^{-1}\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) z\right| \leq \hat{c}_{2} n^{2}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \tag{6.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the estimate $|z| \leq \kappa_{2}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ is used. Combining estimates (6.44), (6.45) and (6.41) with $k=n$ and taking into account that $\tau_{1}<\tau \leq 1$, we arrive at

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left|z_{n}-z-n \lambda_{q}^{-1}\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) z-\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{q}^{n-j-1} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda_{q}^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right)\right| \\
& \leq 2 n\left(n^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right) \tag{6.46}
\end{align*}
$$

for all sufficiently small $n\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$. Here

$$
\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{q}^{n-j-1} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda_{q}^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right)=-n \lambda_{q}^{-1} e^{i \varphi} \Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}(n \varphi)
$$

with $\varphi=\arg z$, which follows from the relations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{q}^{n-j-1} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} \Phi\left(Q_{\lambda}\left(\lambda_{q}^{j} z\right) ; \lambda\right)=\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{q}^{n-j-1} \Psi_{\lambda}\left(\arg \left(\lambda_{q}^{j} z\right)\right) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2 \pi q(n-j-1) i} \Psi_{\lambda}(2 \pi q j+\varphi)= \\
&=\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{-2 \pi q(j+1) i} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{k}^{\lambda} e^{i k(2 \pi q j+\varphi)} \\
&= e^{-2 \pi q i} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{k}^{\lambda} e^{i k \varphi} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2 \pi q j(k-1) i}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2 \pi q j(k-1) i}= \begin{cases}n & \text { if } k-1 \text { is a multiple of } \mathrm{n} \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Hence (6.46) coincides with (6.39). This completes the proof of Theorem 6.1.

### 6.3. Proof of Theorem 3.2.

6.3.1. We start with sketching the idea of the proof. Fix a $\theta \in(0,1)$ and a $q=m / n$ such that $\lambda_{q} \in \Lambda_{\Delta}$. Denote $z=r e^{\varphi i} \in \mathbb{C}, h \in E_{\lambda}^{\prime}, x=Q_{\lambda} z+h \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, and put

$$
\mathbb{H}_{\lambda}(x)=h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V_{\lambda}^{n}(x) \in E_{\lambda}^{\prime} .
$$

Consider for any $\lambda$ close to $\lambda_{q}$ the space $\mathbb{E}_{\lambda}=\mathbb{C} \times E_{\lambda}^{\prime}$ of pairs $(z, h)$. Two continuous vector fields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}(z, h) & =\left(n^{-1} \lambda_{q} e^{-i \varphi} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda}\left(V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)-x\right), \mathbb{H}_{\lambda}(x)\right), \\
\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}(z, h) & =\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi), \mathbb{H}_{\lambda}(x)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

are analyzed on the boundary $\partial G_{\lambda}$ of a set $G_{\lambda} \subset \mathbb{E}_{\lambda}$ defined below.
The equation $x=V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}(z, h)=0$ for any $\lambda$. Hence, to prove the existence of a fixed point $x_{*}$ of $V_{\lambda}^{n}$ we shall show that for proper values of $\lambda$ the vector field $\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}$ is non-degenerate on $\partial G_{\lambda}$ and its rotation $\gamma\left(\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}, \partial G_{\lambda}\right)$ is not equal to 0 . For this purpose, using Theorem 6.1, we prove that the vector field $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ is non-degenerate and is the principal part of the field $\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}$. Due to Rouche's Theorem, this implies that $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ and $\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}$ are homotopic on $\partial G_{\lambda}$ and have the same rotation. Finally, we show that the rotation of the field $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ equals $\pm 1$, hence $\gamma\left(\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}, \partial G_{\lambda}\right)=$ $\gamma\left(\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}, \partial G_{\lambda}\right) \neq 0$, which ensures that $\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}$ has a zero $\left(z_{*}, h_{*}\right) \in G_{\lambda}$.
6.3.2. The first step of the proof is to construct the set $G_{\lambda}$. Fix $\kappa_{1,2}$ independent of $q$ and $\lambda$ to satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{1}=\min _{\lambda \in \Lambda}|\psi(\lambda)| / 2, \quad \kappa_{2}=2 \max _{\lambda \in \Lambda}|\psi(\lambda)| \tag{6.47}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\varphi_{q}^{-}, \varphi_{q}^{+} \in[0,2 \pi]$ be any numbers such that

$$
\arg \Psi_{q}^{r e s}\left(n \varphi_{q}^{ \pm}\right)=M_{q}^{ \pm}, \quad \arg \Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi) \in\left(M_{q}^{-}, M_{q}^{+}\right), \quad \varphi \in\left(\varphi_{q}^{-}, \varphi_{q}^{+}\right)
$$

Now for any $\lambda$ from the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| \leq \rho_{n}, \quad\left|\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)-\left(M_{q}^{+}+M_{q}^{-}\right) / 2\right| \leq \theta \Delta_{q} / 2 \tag{6.48}
\end{equation*}
$$

define the intervals

$$
\begin{equation*}
J^{r}=\left[\kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|, \kappa_{2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|\right], \quad J^{\varphi}=\left[\varphi_{q}^{-}, \varphi_{q}^{+}\right] . \tag{6.49}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, consider the set

$$
G=G_{\lambda}=\left\{(z, h): r \in J^{r}, \varphi \in J^{\varphi}, h \in \Omega_{\lambda} \cap E_{\lambda}^{\prime}\right\} \subset \mathbb{E}_{\lambda}
$$

with $\Omega_{\lambda}$ defined by (6.35). The boundary of this set is

$$
\partial G_{\lambda}=\left(G_{\lambda}^{z} \times G_{\lambda}^{h}\right) \cup\left(G_{\lambda}^{z} \times \partial G_{\lambda}^{h}\right)
$$

where

$$
G_{\lambda}^{z}=\left\{z \in \mathbb{C}:|z| \in J^{r}, \arg z \in J^{\varphi}\right\}, \quad G_{\lambda}^{h}=\left\{h \in E_{\lambda}^{\prime}: \Omega_{\lambda} \cap E_{\lambda}^{\prime}\right\}
$$

6.3.3. The next step is to prove that the vector field $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ is non-degenerate on $\partial G_{\lambda}$. More precisely, the first component $\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)$ of this field (it is independent from $h$ ) is non-degenerate on the set $\partial G_{\lambda}^{z}$ and the second component $\mathbb{H}_{\lambda}$ is non-degenerate on the set $\partial G_{\lambda}^{h}$ for any $z \in G_{\lambda}^{z}$. To show this, let us note that the Fourier series of a Hölder function converges uniformly, therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(n \varphi)-\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right| \rightarrow 0 \tag{6.50}
\end{equation*}
$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, (6.47) implies that there exists $n_{0}$ such that for $n>n_{0}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
3 \kappa_{1} / 2<\min _{\lambda \in \Lambda}\left|\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(n \varphi)\right|, \quad 2 \kappa_{2} / 3>\max _{\lambda \in \Lambda}\left|\Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(n \varphi)\right| \tag{6.51}
\end{equation*}
$$

The set $\partial G_{\lambda}^{z}$ consists of the points $z=r e^{\varphi}$, where either $r=\kappa_{j} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ or $\varphi=\varphi^{ \pm}$. If $r=\kappa_{j} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$, then $\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| r=\left|\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right|$, which contradicts (6.51). If $\varphi=\varphi^{ \pm}$, then $\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)=\arg \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}(n \varphi)$, which contradicts the second inequality in (6.48). On the boundary $\partial G_{\lambda}^{h}$ the equality $h=\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)$ contradicts the definition of the set $\Omega_{\lambda}$. This proves non-degeneracy of $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ on $\partial G_{\lambda}$.
6.3.4. To calculate the rotation $\gamma\left(\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}, \partial G_{\lambda}\right)$ of the vector field $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ on the boundary of the set $G_{\lambda}=G_{\lambda}^{z} \times G_{\lambda}^{h}$, we use the Rotation Product Formula $\gamma\left(\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}, \partial G_{\lambda}\right)=$ $\gamma_{z} \gamma_{h}$, where $\gamma_{z}=\gamma\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi), \partial G_{\lambda}^{z}\right)$ is the rotation of the first component of the field $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ on $\partial G_{\lambda}^{z}$ and $\gamma_{h}=\gamma\left(\mathbb{H}_{\lambda}, \partial G_{\lambda}^{h}\right)$ is the rotation of the second component of $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ on $\partial G_{\lambda}^{h}$ (see, e.g., [5]).

Let us show that $\gamma_{z}=-1$. First note that $\gamma_{z}$ is equal to the rotation of the complex vector field $r-Z(z)=r-\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)^{-1} \Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi), z=r e^{\varphi i}$, on $\partial G_{\lambda}^{z}$. Relations (6.48) and (6.50) imply $\Re e Z>0$ and $|\Im m Z| / \Re e Z \rightarrow 0$ for sufficiently large $n$, hence $|Z|<3 \Re e Z / 2$.

If $\varphi=\varphi_{q}^{+}$, then $\Im m(r-Z(z))=-\Im m Z(z)=-\Im m\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)^{-1} \Psi_{q}^{\text {res }}\left(n \varphi_{q}^{+}\right)\right)<0$, since (6.48) implies $\arg \Psi_{q}^{r e s}\left(n \varphi_{q}^{+}\right)-\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)=M_{q}^{+}-\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)>0$. Similarly, $\Im m(r-Z(z))>0$ for $\varphi=\varphi_{q}^{-}$.

If $r=\kappa_{2}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}$, then the second estimate of (6.51) implies $\Re e(r-Z(z))>0$. If $r=\kappa_{1}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}$, then $\Re e(r-Z(z))<0$ according to the first estimate of (6.51) and $|Z(z)|<3 \Re e Z(z) / 2$.

Now, the relation $\gamma_{z}=-1$ follows from the definition of the winding number.
Lemma 6.2. The fields $h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)$ and $\quad h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) A^{n}(\lambda) x=h-A^{n}(\lambda) h$ are linearly homotopic on $\partial G_{\lambda}^{h}$.

This lemma implies $\left|\gamma_{h}\right|=1$ and therefore $\left|\gamma\left(\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}, \partial G_{\lambda}\right)\right|=\left|\gamma_{z}\right|\left|\gamma_{h}\right|=1$, which finalizes this step of the proof. Lemma 6.2 is proved in the next section.
6.3.5. Finally, let us show that the field $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda}$ is the principal part of the field $\mathbb{W}_{\lambda}$. Since the second components of these fields coincide, it is sufficient to prove the relation
$\left|\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right|>\left|\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)-n^{-1} \lambda_{q} e^{-i \varphi} Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda}\left(V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)-x\right)\right|=: w$ for all $h \in G_{\lambda}^{h}$ and $z \in \partial G_{\lambda}^{z}$. From Theorem 6.1, it follows that

$$
w \leq 2\left(n^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right)+\left|\Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}(n \varphi)-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right|
$$

From assumption (3.21) and from the definition of the function $\Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}$ it follows that it is Hölder in $\lambda$ with the same constants $K^{\prime}$ and $\tau$ :

$$
\left|\Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}(n \varphi)-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right| \leq K^{\prime}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau}=o\left(\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}\right)
$$

If $\varphi=\varphi^{ \pm}$, then $\arg \Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)=M_{q}^{ \pm}$and therefore

$$
\left|\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right| \geq \kappa_{1}\left|\sin \left(\arg \left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right)-M_{q}^{ \pm}\right)\right| \geq \kappa_{1} \sin \left((1-\theta) \Delta_{q} / 2\right)
$$

If $r=\kappa_{j}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{-1}$, then (6.51) implies $\left|\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right| \geq \kappa_{1} / 2$. Now, for sufficiently large $n$, the inequality $\left|\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r-\Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)\right|>w$ follows from assumption (3.20). Theorem 3.2 is completely proved.
6.4. Proof of Lemma 6.2. The inclusion $h \in \partial G_{\lambda}^{h}$ means either $\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} h\right|_{\lambda}=\beta$ or $\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} h\right|_{\lambda}=\beta$. Consider these two cases separately.

Assume $\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} h\right|_{\lambda}=\beta$. Then relation (6.37) implies $\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right|_{\lambda} \geq \beta$ for all $k=1, \ldots, n$ (here $\left.V_{\lambda}^{0}=I\right)$. Therefore

$$
W_{\lambda}\left(V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right)=V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)+\left(\frac{\beta}{\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right|_{\lambda}}-1\right) P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\lambda}^{+} W_{\lambda}\left(V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right)=\beta P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x) /\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right|_{\lambda} \tag{6.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} W_{\lambda}\left(V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right)\right|_{\lambda}=\beta$, relation (6.34) implies

$$
\left|\eta P_{\lambda}^{+} U\left(W_{\lambda}\left(V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right) ; \lambda\right)+(1-\eta) P_{\lambda}^{+} A(\lambda) W_{\lambda}\left(V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right)\right|_{\lambda}>\beta
$$

which, due to $U\left(W_{\lambda}(x) ; \lambda\right)=V_{\lambda}(x), P_{\lambda}^{+} A(\lambda)=A(\lambda) P_{\lambda}^{+}$and (6.52), is equivalent to

$$
\left|\eta P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k}(x)+(1-\eta) \alpha P_{\lambda}^{+} A(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right|_{\lambda}>\beta,
$$

with $\alpha=\beta /\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right|_{\lambda}$. Furthermore, because $\alpha \leq 1$ and this estimate holds for all $\eta \in[0,1]$, it implies

$$
\left|\eta P_{\lambda}^{+} V_{\lambda}^{k}(x)+(1-\eta) P_{\lambda}^{+} A(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right|_{\lambda}>\beta
$$

for all $\eta \in[0,1]$. Applying to this the second of relations (6.31), we obtain

$$
\left|\eta P_{\lambda}^{+} A^{n-k}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k}(x)+(1-\eta) P_{\lambda}^{+} A^{n-k+1}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right|_{\lambda}>\beta, \quad \eta \in[0,1] .
$$

Consequently, the equality $\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} h\right|_{\lambda}=\beta$ ensures that

$$
\eta P_{\lambda}^{+} A^{n-k}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k}(x)+(1-\eta) P_{\lambda}^{+} A^{n-k+1}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x) \neq P_{\lambda}^{+} h
$$

and hence

$$
\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right)\left(\eta A^{n-k}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k}(x)+(1-\eta) A^{n-k+1}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)\right) \neq h
$$

Therefore the vector fields

$$
h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) A^{n-k}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k}(x) \quad \text { and } \quad h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) A^{n-k+1}(\lambda) V_{\lambda}^{k-1}(x)
$$

are linearly homotopic for each $k=1, \ldots, n$ on the part of $\partial G_{\lambda}^{h}$ where $\left|P_{\lambda}^{+} h\right|_{\lambda}=\beta$, and thus the vector fields

$$
\begin{equation*}
h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V_{\lambda}^{n}(x) \quad \text { and } \quad h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) A^{n}(\lambda) x=h-A^{n}(\lambda) h \tag{6.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

are also homotopic.
The case $\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} h\right|_{\lambda}=\beta$ is simpler. Relation (6.36) implies $\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)\right|_{\lambda}<\beta$ and the first of relations (6.31) implies $\left|P_{\lambda}^{-} A^{n}(\lambda) h\right|_{\lambda}<\beta$, therefore

$$
\eta P_{\lambda}^{-} V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)+(1-\eta) P_{\lambda}^{-} A^{n}(\lambda) h \neq P_{\lambda}^{-} h, \quad \eta \in[0,1]
$$

and the vector fields (6.53) are again linearly homotopic.

### 6.5. Proof of Theorem 3.1.

6.5.1. Sketch of the proof. We use the notation of the previous subsection. We introduce additionally an ( $N-2$ )-dimensional space $Y$ and the family of linear invertible maps $T_{\lambda}: Y \rightarrow E_{\lambda}^{\prime}$ such that $Y$ with some fixed norm $|\cdot|$ is independent of $\lambda$, while the maps $T_{\lambda}$ depend on $\lambda$ continuously; the norm in $E_{\lambda}^{\prime}$ is $|\cdot|_{\lambda}$. The idea of the proof is to exchange the roles of the parameter $\lambda$ and the unknown $\varphi$. We take an arbitrary $\varphi=\varphi_{0}$, which is now fixed until the end of the proof, and given a curve $L=\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}: \lambda=\lambda^{*}(\rho), 0 \leq \rho \leq 1\right\}$ show that the equation $x=V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)$ has a solution $x=Q_{\lambda}\left(r e^{i \varphi_{0}}\right)+T_{\lambda} y(y \in Y)$ for some $\lambda=\lambda^{*}(\rho) \in L$. In other words, we need to find a triple $(r, \rho, y) \in \mathbb{R}_{+} \times[0,1] \times Y$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
r e^{i \varphi_{0}}=Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} V_{\lambda}^{n}(x), \quad y=T_{\lambda}^{-1}\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V_{\lambda}^{n}(x) \tag{6.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

here and henceforth $\lambda=\lambda^{*}(\rho)$ and $x=Q_{\lambda}\left(r e^{i \varphi_{0}}\right)+T_{\lambda} y$. For this purpose, let us rewrite the first equation of (6.54) as

$$
\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right) r+\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|^{2}-S=0
$$

where $\bar{\psi}$ is the complex conjugate of $\psi$ and $S=S(r, \rho, y, q)$ is defined by

$$
S=\left(\left(r e^{i \varphi_{0}}-Q_{\lambda}^{-1} P_{\lambda} V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)\right) n^{-1} \lambda_{q} e^{-i \varphi_{0}}+\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) r+\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)
$$

In this notation, solutions of system (6.54) are zeros of the vector field

$$
\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}(r, \rho, y)=\left(\begin{array}{l}
r \Re e\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)-\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|^{2}-\Re e S \\
r \Im m\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)-\Im m S \\
y-T_{\lambda}^{-1}\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V_{\lambda}^{n}(x)
\end{array}\right)
$$

in the $N$-dimensional space of triples $(r, \rho, y)$. We shall prove that this vector field has at least one zero in the set

$$
G_{q}=\left\{(r, \rho, y): r\left|\lambda^{*}(\rho)-\lambda_{q}\right| \in\left[\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}\right] ; \rho \in[0,1] ; T_{\lambda^{*}(\rho)} y \in \Omega_{\lambda^{*}(\rho)}\right\}
$$

where $\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}$ is a fixed pair of positive numbers such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{1}<\min _{\lambda \in \Lambda}|\psi(\lambda)|, \quad \kappa_{2}>\sqrt{1+\nu^{2}} \max _{\lambda \in \Lambda}|\psi(\lambda)| \tag{6.55}
\end{equation*}
$$

The proof will follow the same line as that of the previous subsection. Thus, we first of all show that for $(r, \rho, y) \in G_{q}$ the first component $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{r}$ of the vector field $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}$ is negative if $r=\kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ and positive if $r=\kappa_{2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$; the second component $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{\rho}$ has different signs for $\rho=0$ and $\rho=1$; and the third component $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{y}$ is nonzero and is homotopic to the vector field $y-T_{\lambda}^{-1} A^{n}(\lambda) T_{\lambda} y$ on the boundary of the domain $T_{\lambda}^{-1}\left(E_{\lambda}^{\prime} \cap \Omega_{\lambda}\right)$. Therefore the rotation $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}, G_{q}\right)$ is defined. However, because the set $G_{q}$ here is not a direct product of domains in the three subspaces corresponding to the components of $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}$, the Rotation Product Formula can not be applied directly for calculation of the rotation $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}, G_{q}\right)$, at least in the same simple form as we used above. Therefore, we shall complete the proof by some additional standard argument enabling the use of this formula.
6.5.2. Case $\rho=0,1$. For these values of $\rho$,

$$
\left|r \Im m\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)\right|=r \nu \Re e\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)=r \nu\left(1+\nu^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|
$$

(with $\left.\lambda=\lambda^{*}(\rho)\right)$ and because $r \geq \kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ in $G_{q}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|r \Im m\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)\right| \geq \kappa_{1} \nu\left(1+\nu^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2} \min _{\lambda \in \Lambda}|\psi(\lambda)|>0 \tag{6.56}
\end{equation*}
$$

To estimate $S$, consider that $(r, \rho, y) \in G_{q}$ implies $x=Q_{\lambda}\left(r e^{i \varphi_{0}}\right)+T_{\lambda} y \in \Omega_{\lambda}^{q, \kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}}$, which by Theorem 6.1 ensures estimate (6.39). From (6.39) it follows

$$
|S| /\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right| \leq\left|\Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}\left(n \varphi_{0}\right)-\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|+2\left(n^{\tau_{1}}\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{\tau_{1}}+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|^{s_{1}}\right)
$$

provided that $n\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|<\delta$ for some fixed $\delta>0$. Hence, for any $\varepsilon<\delta$

$$
|S| /\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right| \leq\left|\Psi_{\lambda, n}^{r e s}\left(n \varphi_{0}\right)-\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|+2\left(\varepsilon^{\tau_{1}}+\varepsilon^{s_{1}}\right) \quad \text { for } \quad n\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|<\varepsilon
$$

Combining this with (6.50), we see that for some fixed function $\tilde{\chi}=\tilde{\chi}(n, \varepsilon)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
|S| \leq \tilde{\chi}(n, \varepsilon) \quad \text { if } \quad\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|<\varepsilon / n \tag{6.57}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{\chi}(n, \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This estimate and (6.56) imply that the sign of the second component $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{\rho}$ of the vector field $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}$ is the same as that of the function $r \Im m\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)$ for $\rho=0,1$ provided that $\varepsilon$ and $n^{-1}$ are sufficiently small. Consequently this component has different signs for $\rho=0$ and $\rho=1$.
6.5.3. Case $r\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|=\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}$. For $r\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|=\kappa_{1}$,

$$
r \Re e\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)-\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|^{2} \leq\left(\kappa_{1}-\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|\right)\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|,
$$

while for $r\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|=\kappa_{2}$

$$
r \Re e\left(\left(\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right) \bar{\psi}\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right)-\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|^{2} \geq\left(\kappa_{2}\left(1+\nu^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2}-\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right|\right)\left|\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)\right| .
$$

These estimates and relations (6.55) and (6.57) imply that the first component $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{r}$ of the vector field $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}$ is negative whenever $r\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|=\kappa_{1}$ and positive whenever $r\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|=\kappa_{2}$ in $G_{q}$ if $\varepsilon$ and $n^{-1}$ are sufficiently small.
6.5.4. Case $T_{\lambda} y \in \partial\left(E_{\lambda}^{\prime} \cap \Omega_{\lambda}\right)$. According to Lemma 6.2, the vector fields $h-\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V^{n}(x)$ and $h-A^{n}(\lambda) h$ are linearly homotopic on the boundary of the domain $E_{\lambda}^{\prime} \cap \Omega_{\lambda}$ for any fixed $q, \lambda, r, \varphi$. This implies that the third component $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{y}(r, \rho, y)=y-T_{\lambda}^{-1}\left(I-P_{\lambda}\right) V^{n}(x)$ of $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}$ is homotopic to the vector field $y-$ $T_{\lambda}^{-1} A^{n}(\lambda) T_{\lambda} y$ on the boundary of the domain $T_{\lambda}^{-1}\left(E_{\lambda}^{\prime} \cap \Omega_{\lambda}\right)$ for $\varphi=\varphi_{0}$ and any fixed $r$ and $\rho$.
6.5.5. Completion of the proof. Consider the vector field

$$
\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}=\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{r}, \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{\rho}, y-T_{\lambda}^{-1} A^{n}(\lambda) T_{\lambda} y\right) .
$$

It has the same two first components as the vector field $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}=\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{r}, \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{\rho}, \tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}^{y}\right)$. The vector fields $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}$ are homotopic on the boundary $\partial G_{q}$ of the domain $G_{q}$, because their first two components are non-zero on the parts of $\partial G_{q}$ where $r=$ $\kappa_{1,2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ and $\rho=0,1$, and their third components are homotopic on the part of $\partial G_{q}$ where $T_{\lambda} y \in \partial\left(E_{\lambda}^{\prime} \cap \Omega_{\lambda}\right)$ ( $\partial G_{q}$ is the union of all these parts). Therefore $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}, G_{q}\right)=\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}, G_{q}\right)$. To calculate this rotation, consider the domain

$$
\tilde{G}=\left\{(r, \rho, y): r\left|\lambda^{*}(\rho)-\lambda_{q}\right| \in\left[\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}\right] ; \rho \in[0,1] ;|y| \leq \eta\right\}
$$

where $\eta>0$ is sufficiently small such that $\tilde{G} \subset G_{q}$. Since $y=0$ for each zero $(r, \rho, y)$ of the vector field $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}$, this field does not have zeros in the set $G_{q} \backslash \tilde{G}$ and consequently $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}, G_{q}\right)=\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}, \tilde{G}\right)$. Now, fix a sufficiently large $R>0$ such that

$$
\left[\kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda^{*}(\rho)-\lambda_{q}\right|, \kappa_{2} /\left|\lambda^{*}(\rho)-\lambda_{q}\right|\right] \subset[-R, R] \quad \text { for all } \quad \rho \in[0,1]
$$

and define a continuous extension $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}$of the vector field $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}$ from the domain $\tilde{G}$ to the cylinder

$$
\tilde{G}^{+}=\{r: r \in[-R, R]\} \times\{\rho: \rho \in[0,1]\} \times\{y \in Y:|y| \leq \eta\} \supset \tilde{G}
$$

by the formula $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}(r, \rho, y)=\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}(\Pi(r), \rho, y)$ with the continuous projector

$$
\Pi(r)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| & \text { if } \quad r \in\left[-R, \kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|\right] \\
r & \text { if } \quad r \in\left[\kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|, \kappa_{2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|\right] \\
\kappa_{2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right| & \text { if } \quad r \in\left[\kappa_{2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|, R\right]
\end{array}\right.
$$

Because $\Pi(r)=\kappa_{1,2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ for $(r, \rho, y) \in \tilde{G}^{+} \backslash \tilde{G}$ and the first component of the vector field $\tilde{U}_{q}(r, \rho, y)$ is non-zero whenever $r=\kappa_{1,2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$, the extension $\tilde{U}_{q}^{+}$does not have zeros in the set $G^{+} \backslash \tilde{G}$, hence $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}, \tilde{G}\right)=\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}, \tilde{G}^{+}\right)$and we conclude that $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}, G_{q}\right)=\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}, \tilde{G}^{+}\right)$. The latter rotation can now be calculated by the Rotation Product Formula as the domain $\tilde{G}^{+}$has the appropriate structure. From the fact that the first component of the vector fields $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}, \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}$ is negative if $r=\kappa_{1} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$ and positive if $r=\kappa_{2} /\left|\lambda-\lambda_{q}\right|$, it follows that the first component of the vector field $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}$is negative if $r=-R$ and positive if $r=R$ for every fixed $\rho \in[0,1],|y| \leq \eta$, and therefore the rotation $\gamma^{r}$ of the first component of $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}$on the boundary of the segment $[-R, R] \ni r$ equals 1 . Similarly, since the second component of $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}, \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}$ has different signs at the ends of the segment $[0,1] \ni \rho$, the same is true for the second component of $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}$for every fixed $r \in[-R, R],|y| \leq \eta$, hence the rotation $\gamma^{\rho}$ of the second component of $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}$on the boundary of the segment $[0,1] \ni \rho$ equals either 1 or -1. Finally, the rotation $\gamma^{y}$ of the third component $y-T_{\lambda}^{-1} A^{n}(\lambda) T_{\lambda} y$ of $\tilde{U}_{q}^{+}$on the sphere $|y|=\eta$ is either 1 or -1 , because the matrix $I-T_{\lambda}^{-1} A^{n}(\lambda) T_{\lambda}$ is invertible. The Rotation Product Formula implies $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}, \tilde{G}^{+}\right)=\gamma^{r} \gamma^{\rho} \gamma^{y}$, consequently the rotations $\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{V}}_{q}, G_{q}\right)=\gamma\left(\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_{q}^{+}, \tilde{G}^{+}\right)$equal either 1 or -1 . This completes the proof.
6.6. Sketch of the proof of Theorems $5.1 \mathbf{- 5 . 3}$. To be simple, we sketch the proof for two-dimensional system (2.13) on the complex plane $z \in \mathbb{C}$. We use the notation $\Psi_{\lambda}(z)=\Psi_{\lambda}\left(e^{\varphi i}\right)=\Psi_{\lambda}(\varphi)$. Consider the change of variable $\zeta=B(z)=$ $z+\Theta(z)$ in (2.13), where $\Theta(\alpha z)=\Theta(z), \alpha>0$, is a homogeneous Lipschitz function, unknown a priori.

Lemma 6.3. The map $B$ is one-to-one for sufficiently large $|z|$. The inverse operator has the form $B^{-1}(\zeta)=\zeta-\Theta(\zeta)+o(1),|\zeta| \rightarrow \infty$.

The lemma follows from the Banach Contraction Mapping Principle: the equation $\zeta=z+\Theta(z)$ has a unique solution $z$ for any $\zeta$ with a sufficiently large $|\zeta|$, since the function $\zeta-\Theta(z)$ has small Lipschitz constant for large $|z|$ and relations $|z| \rightarrow \infty$ and $|\zeta| \rightarrow \infty$ are equivalent, because $\Theta$ is bounded. The form of the inverse operator follows from direct computations.

After the change of the variable, the evolution map becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
B U B^{-1}(\zeta) & =U B^{-1}(\zeta)+\Theta\left(U B^{-1}(\zeta)\right) \\
& =\lambda B^{-1}(\zeta)+\Psi_{\lambda}\left(B^{-1}(\zeta)\right)+\Theta\left(\lambda B^{-1}(\zeta)+\Psi_{\lambda}\left(B^{-1}(\zeta)\right)\right)+o(1) \\
& =\lambda \zeta-\lambda \Theta(\zeta)+\Psi_{\lambda}(\zeta)+\Theta(\lambda \zeta)+o(1)=\lambda \zeta+\Delta_{\lambda}(\zeta)+o(1)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\Delta_{\lambda}(\zeta)=-\lambda \Theta(\zeta)+\Psi_{\lambda}(\zeta)+\Theta(\lambda \zeta)$ and the terms $o(1)$ vanish as $|z|,|\zeta| \rightarrow \infty$. Now we choose the function $\Theta$ in such a way that the positively homogeneous function $\Delta_{\lambda_{q}}$ has the smallest possible number of non-zero terms in its Fourier series

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\lambda_{q}}\left(e^{\varphi i}\right) & =\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}\left(-e^{2 \pi q i} \theta_{k} e^{k \varphi i}+\psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{k \varphi i}+\theta_{k} e^{k \varphi i} e^{2 \pi k q i}\right) \\
& =\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}\left(\psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}}-\theta_{k} e^{2 \pi q i}\left(1-e^{2 \pi(k-1) q i}\right)\right) e^{k \varphi i}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\varphi=\arg \zeta$ and $\theta_{k}$ are Fourier coefficients of the function $\Theta\left(e^{\varphi i}\right)$. If $q=m / n$ is a rational number, then $1=e^{2 \pi(k-1) q i}$ for $k=1(\bmod n)$. Hence, for such $k$, the $k$-th Fourier coefficient of $\Delta_{\lambda_{q}}$ is independent of $\theta_{k}$ and we set $\theta_{k}=0$. For all the other $k$ we put $\theta_{k}=\psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{-2 \pi q i}\left(1-e^{2 \pi(k-1) q i}\right)^{-1}$, which implies

$$
\Delta_{\lambda_{q}}\left(e^{\varphi i}\right)=\sum_{k=1(\bmod n)} \psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{k \varphi i}=e^{\varphi i} \sum_{s=-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_{n s+1}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{n s \varphi i}=-e^{\varphi i} \Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)
$$

Thus, for $\lambda=\lambda_{q}$, the change of the variable $\zeta=B_{q}(z)=z+\Theta_{q}(z)$, with $\Theta_{q}$ defined by (5.28), transforms the evolution map of system (2.13) to $B U B^{-1}(\zeta)=$ $\lambda_{q} \zeta-e^{\varphi i} \Psi_{q}^{r e s}(n \varphi)+o(1)$.

If $q$ is irrational, then $e^{2 \pi q i}\left(1-e^{2 \pi(k-1) q i}\right) \neq 0$ for any $k \neq 1$. In this case, we choose a large $K$ and set $\theta_{k}=\psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}}\left(e^{2 \pi q i}-e^{2 \pi k q i}\right)^{-1}$ for $|k| \leq K, k \neq 1$ and $\theta_{k}=0$ for $|k|>K$, i.e., we define $\Theta=\Theta_{q, K}$ by (5.30). Then

$$
\Delta_{\lambda_{q}}\left(e^{\varphi i}\right)=\psi_{1}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{\varphi i}+\sigma_{K}=-\psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right) e^{\varphi i}+\sigma_{K}, \quad \sigma_{K}=\sum_{|k|>K} \psi_{k}^{\lambda_{q}} e^{k \varphi i}
$$

where the term $\sigma_{K}$ can be made arbitrarily small by choosing $K$ large enough. This implies $B U B^{-1}(\zeta)=\lambda_{q} \zeta-e^{\varphi i} \psi\left(\lambda_{q}\right)+o(1)$ for $\lambda=\lambda_{q}$.

Using the above formulas for $B U B^{-1}$, one can finalize the proof of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 by the type of argument outlined in the beginning of Section 5.

Theorem 5.3 follows from Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 , which imply that any $\lambda_{q} \in \mathfrak{L}$, except for those with rational $q=m / n$ with $n \leq n_{0}$, has a neighborhood $O_{q}$ such that for all $\lambda \in O_{q}$ with $|\lambda|<1$ the set $\Pi_{q}$ is invariant for system (1.1). These neighborhoods $O_{q}$ plus the neighborhood $\tilde{O}(\delta)$ of the finite set of points $\lambda_{q}$ with $q=m / n, n \leq n_{0}$, constitute a cover of the closed subset $\mathfrak{L}$ of the unit circle. If we choose a finite subcover $O$ from this cover, then $O \backslash \tilde{O}(\delta)$ contains the set $\mathfrak{L}_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ for a sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$ and the conclusion of the theorem holds for this set $\mathfrak{L}_{\delta, \varepsilon}$.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ If either $\lambda=1$ or $\lambda=-1$, then $\lambda$ has multiplicity 2 : these values are not considered.
    ${ }^{2}$ It is natural to suppose that $\left|Q_{\lambda} z\right|=|z|$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

