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Abstract

Our object of study is the dynamics that arises in generic perturbations of an asymptotically stable heteroclinic cycle in $\mathbb{S}^3$. The cycle involves two saddle-foci of different type and is structurally stable within the class of $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$-symmetric vector fields. The cycle contains a two-dimensional connection that persists as a transverse intersection of invariant surfaces under symmetry-breaking perturbations.

Gradually breaking the symmetry in a two-parameter family we get a wide range of dynamical behaviour: an attracting periodic trajectory; other heteroclinic trajectories; homoclinic orbits; $\alpha$-pulses; suspended horseshoes and cascades of bifurcations of periodic trajectories near an unstable homoclinic cycle of Shilnikov type. We also show that, generically, the coexistence of linked homoclinic orbits at the two saddle-foci has codimension 2 and takes place arbitrarily close to the symmetric cycle.

1 Introduction

Symmetry, exact or approximate, plays an important role in the analysis of non-linear physical systems. Reflectional and rotational symmetries, for instance, are relevant to a wide range of experiments in physics, with the canonical example arising in the context of rotating Rayleigh–Bénard convection [8]; see also Melbourne et al [33]. Models are first constructed with perfect symmetry, leading to the existence of invariant subspaces and thus to the existence of heteroclinic cycles and their robustness with respect to symmetric perturbations. Equivariant bifurcation theory developed by several authors (see for instance Golubitsky et al [21]) has produced results that agree well with physical systems.

Nevertheless, reality usually has less perfect symmetry. Thus it would be desirable to understand the dynamics that persists under small symmetry-breaking perturbations. In the context of equivariant dynamics, it corresponds to the explicit addition of specific terms that break the symmetry of the system — forced symmetry-breaking. This is the subject of the present article.
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In the space of all smooth vector fields on $\mathbb{R}^n$ endowed with the $C^1$ Whitney topology and the topological equivalence, a vector field is structurally stable if it belongs to the interior of its equivalence class. The set of non-structurally stable systems is called the bifurcation set and the study of its structure is a big challenge; even for differential equations in three dimensions, the structure of the bifurcation set might be very complicated. Symmetric vector fields are not structurally stable and provide a good starting point for this study.

Particular effects of small symmetry-breaking have already been studied by several authors and aspects related to the question of how much of the dynamics persists under the inclusion of small noise have also been considered. However details vary greatly between the different examples. For instance, Kirk and Rucklidge [28] consider small symmetry-breaking for a system with an asymptotically stable heteroclinic network, Chossat [13] investigates the effect of symmetry-breaking near a symmetric homoclinic cycle and Melbourne [32] analyses small perturbations near a system whose dynamics contains a heteroclinic cycle between three symmetric periodic solutions (associated to non-trivial closed trajectories).

The construction of explicit examples of vector fields whose flow has asymptotically stable heteroclinic networks has been done by Aguiar et al [4] and Rodrigues et al [36]; adding terms that break the symmetry, the authors found examples with spontaneous bifurcation to chaos. This route to chaos corresponds to an interaction of symmetry-breaking, robust switching and chaotic cycling.

In this article, we study the dynamics observed in a $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$–symmetric system in $S^3$; we look at properties that persist under symmetry-breaking perturbations and we characterize the set of non-wandering points. Our results appeal to generic properties of the system and are valid for any $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$–equivariant system satisfying these properties. This analysis was partially motivated by a system constructed by Aguiar [2], whose flow contains a heteroclinic network connecting two saddle-foci of different types, where one heteroclinic connection is one-dimensional and the other is two-dimensional and both lie in different fixed point subspaces.

Our work also forms part of a program, started by Bykov [9] in the eighties, of systematic study of the dynamics near networks of equilibria whose linearization has a pair of non-real eigenvalues — rotating equilibria.

The main results of the article are stated in section 2. To make the paper self contained and readable, we recall some definitions and results about equivariance, heteroclinic switching and homo/heteroclinic bifurcations, adapted to our interests.

We consider a smooth two-parameter family of vector fields $f$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with flow given by the unique solution $x(t) = \varphi(t, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of

$$\dot{x} = f(x, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \quad x(0) = x_0,$$

where $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are real parameters.

Given two hyperbolic equilibria $A$ and $B$, an $m$-dimensional heteroclinic connection from $A$ to $B$, denoted $[A \rightarrow B]$, is an $m$-dimensional connected and flow-invariant manifold contained in $W^u(A) \cap W^s(B)$. There may be more than one connection from $A$ to $B$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{A_j : j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\}$ be a finite ordered set of hyperbolic equilibria. We say that there is a heteroclinic cycle associated to $\mathcal{S}$ if

$$\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}, W^u(A_j) \cap W^s(A_{j+1}) \neq \emptyset \quad (\text{mod } k).$$

If $k = 1$ we say that there is a homoclinic cycle associated to $A_1$. In other words, there is a connection whose trajectories tend to $A_1$ in both backward and forward time. A heteroclinic network is a connected set consisting of a finite union of heteroclinic cycles.
Heteroclinic networks appear frequently in the context of symmetry. Given a compact Lie group $\Gamma$ acting linearly on $\mathbb{R}^n$, a vector field $f$ is $\Gamma$-equivariant if for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $f(\gamma x) = \gamma f(x)$. In this case $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is said to be a symmetry of $f$ and all elements of the subgroup $\langle \gamma \rangle$ generated by $\gamma$ are also symmetries of $f$. We refer the reader to Golubitsky, Stewart and Schaeffer [21] for more information on differential equations with symmetry.

The $\Gamma$-orbit of $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the set $\Gamma(x_0) = \{ \gamma x_0, \gamma \in \Gamma \}$. If $x_0$ is an equilibrium of (1.1), so are the elements in its $\Gamma$-orbit.

The isotropy subgroup of $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is $\Sigma_{x_0} = \{ \gamma \in \Gamma, \ \gamma x_0 = x_0 \}$. For an isotropy subgroup $\Sigma$ of $\Gamma$, its fixed point subspace is

$$Fix(\Sigma) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \forall \gamma \in \Sigma, \ \gamma x = x \}.$$ 

If $f$ is $\Gamma$-equivariant and $\Sigma$ is an isotropy subgroup, then $Fix(\Sigma)$ is a flow-invariant vector space. This is the reason for the persistence of heteroclinic networks in symmetric flows: connections taking place inside a flow-invariant subspace may be robust to perturbations that preserve this subspace, even though they may be destroyed by more general perturbations.

## 2 Statement of Results

### 2.1 Description of the problem

The starting point of the analysis is a differential equation on the unit sphere $S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$

$$\dot{x} = f_0(x)$$

(2.2)

where $f_0 : S^3 \to TS^3$ is a smooth vector field with the following properties:

1. **(P1)** The organizing centre $f_0$ is equivariant under the action of $\Gamma = Z_2 \oplus Z_2$ on $S^3$ induced by the action on $\mathbb{R}^4$ of

$$\gamma_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (-x_1, -x_2, x_3, x_4)$$

and

$$\gamma_2(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (x_1, x_2, -x_3, x_4).$$

From now on, for a subgroup $\Delta$ of $\Gamma$, we denote by $Fix(\Delta)$ the sphere

$$\{ x \in S^3 : \delta x = x, \forall \delta \in \Delta \}.$$ 

In particular,

$$Fix(\Gamma) = \{(0, 0, 0, 1) \equiv v, (0, 0, 0, -1) \equiv w\}.$$ 

2. **(P2)** The equilibria $v$ and $w$ in $Fix(\Gamma)$ are hyperbolic saddle-foci where the eigenvalues of $df_0|_{x=v}$ are:

- $-C_v \pm \alpha_v i$ and $E_v$ with $\alpha_v \neq 0$, $C_v > E_v > 0$ for $X = v$

- $E_w \pm \alpha_w i$ and $-C_w$ with $\alpha_w \neq 0$, $C_w > E_w > 0$ for $X = w$.

3. **(P3)** Within $Fix(\langle \gamma_1 \rangle)$ the only equilibria are $v$ and $w$, a source and a sink, respectively. It follows that there are two heteroclinic trajectories ($\langle \gamma_2 \rangle$-symmetric) from $v$ to $w$ (see case (a) of figure 1) that we denote by $[v \to w]$.

4. **(P4)** Within $Fix(\langle \gamma_2 \rangle)$ the only equilibria are $v$ and $w$, a sink and a source, respectively. Thus, there is a two-dimensional heteroclinic connection from $w$ to $v$ (see case (b) of figure 1). This connection together with the equilibria is the two-sphere $Fix(\langle \gamma_2 \rangle)$.

---

1 By smooth we mean a map of class $C^k$, for a large enough $k$. In most places, $C^1$ suffices.
Our object of study is a germ at $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (0, 0)$ of a two-parameter family of vector fields of $f(\cdot, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ that unfolds the symmetry-breaking of the organizing center $f_0(x) = f(x, 0, 0)$. We denote by $f$ any of the vector fields

$$x \mapsto f(x, \lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

when the choice of $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ is clear from the context. The parameters $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ control the type of symmetry-breaking. Specifically, if $\lambda_1 \neq 0$, we are perturbing the $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$–equivariant vector field by breaking the symmetry $\gamma_2$ and preserving $\gamma_1$ (see Table 1). Analogously, if $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, we destroy the equivariance under $\gamma_1$ and preserve $\gamma_2$. Throughout this article, we are assuming that these parameters act independently.

Since $v$ and $w$ are hyperbolic equilibria, then for each $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ close to 0, the vector field $f$ still has two equilibria with eigenvalues satisfying (P2). When there is no loss of generality we ignore their dependence on $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$. In particular, the dimensions of the local stable and unstable manifolds of $v$ and $w$ do not change, but generically the heteroclinic connections may be destroyed, since the fixed point subsets are no longer flow-invariant. More precisely, we are assuming:

(P5) Depending on the values of $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$, the vector field $f$ has the symmetries indicated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symmetries preserved</th>
<th>Symmetries broken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$</td>
<td>$\langle \gamma_1 \rangle$</td>
<td>$\langle \gamma_2 \rangle$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$</td>
<td>$\langle \gamma_2 \rangle$</td>
<td>$\langle \gamma_1 \rangle$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The type of symmetry breaking depends on the parameters.
The following property states that the invariant manifolds $W^u(w)$ and $W^s(v)$ meet transversely. Generically, the intersection of the manifolds consists of a finite number of trajectories.

(P6) [Transversality] For $\lambda_1 \neq 0$, the two-dimensional manifolds $W^u(w)$ and $W^s(v)$ intersect transversely at a finite number of trajectories.

(P7) [Non-degeneracy] For $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, the heteroclinic connections $[v \to w]$ are broken.

Note that (P1)–(P4) are satisfied on a $C^1$–open subset of smooth $\Gamma$–equivariant vector fields on $S^3$ and that (P5)–(P7) hold for a $C^1$–open subset of two parameter families of vector fields unfolding a $\Gamma$–equivariant differential equation on the sphere. Our results are still valid on any manifold $C^1$–diffeomorphic to $S^3$ if instead of (P1) we assume that $f_0$ commutes with two involutions $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ that fix, respectively, a circle and a two-sphere, that only meet at $\{v, w\}$.

2.2 Organizing centre

When $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$, there is a heteroclinic network (that we denote by $\Sigma$), in $S^3$, associated to the two saddle-foci $v$ and $w$. The network $\Sigma$ is the union of two heteroclinic cycles related by the $\gamma_2$–symmetry.

In order to describe the dynamics near $\Sigma$ when the symmetry is broken, we start breaking part of the symmetry, as outlined in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$</th>
<th>dim($[v \to w]$)</th>
<th>dim($[w \to v]$)</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 and 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 and 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 and 2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Dependence of heteroclinic connections on the symmetry and on the parameters.

The heteroclinic connections in the network are contained in fixed point subspaces such that the hypothesis (H1) of Krupa & Melbourne [30] is satisfied. Since the inequality $C_vC_w > E_vE_w$ holds, the Krupa and Melbourne stability criterion ([30]) may be applied to $\Sigma$ and we have:

Proposition 1 Under conditions (P1)–(P4) the heteroclinic network $\Sigma$ associated to $v$ and $w$ is asymptotically stable.

The previous result means that there exists an open neighbourhood $V_\Sigma$ of the network $\Sigma$ such that every trajectory starting in $V_\Sigma$ is forward asymptotic to the network. Due to the $\langle \gamma_2 \rangle$–equivariance, trajectories whose initial condition starts outside the invariant subspaces will approach in positive time one of the cycles. The time spent near each equilibrium increases geometrically. The ratio of this geometrical series is related to the eigenvalues of $df_0(x, 0, 0)$ at the equilibria. The fixed point hyperplanes prevent jumps between the two cycles; in particular, random visits to both cycles require breaking the symmetry (and thus the breaking of the invariant subspaces).

2.3 Breaking the two-dimensional connection

When (P6) holds with $\lambda_2 = 0$ and $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ the network $\Sigma^*$ consists of two copies of the simplest heteroclinic cycle between two saddle-foci, where one heteroclinic connection is structurally...
stable and the other is not. This cycle, called a Bykov cycle, has been first studied in the eighties by Bykov [9] and by Glendinning and Sparrow [20].

A Bykov cycle is a cycle with two saddle-foci of different types, in which the one-dimensional invariant manifolds coincide and the two-dimensional invariant manifolds have a transversal intersection (see figure 2). It arises as a bifurcation of codimension 2. In the $\mathbb{Z}_2$–symmetric context, Bykov cycles are generic. The study of bifurcations arising in the unfolding Bykov cycles, called also T–points in the literature is done in [14]. We also refer Knobloch et al [29] who study heteroclinic cycles similar to $\Sigma^*$ in the context of hamiltonian systems with one transverse intersection.

Recently, there has been a renewal of interest in this type of heteroclinic bifurcation in different contexts – see Sánchez et al [15], Homburg and Natiello [24], Ibáñez and Rodriguez [25]. Heteroclinic bifurcations of this type have also been reported to arise on models of Josephson junctions [11] and Michelson system [12]. Our approach is similar to that of Lamb et al [31], although they study $\mathbb{Z}_2$–reversible systems and we study the $\langle \gamma_1 \rangle$-equivariant case and then break the symmetry.

There are two different possibilities for the geometry of the flow around $\Sigma^*$, depending on the direction trajectories turn around the connection $[v \to w]$. Throughout this article, we only consider the case where each trajectory when close to $v$ turns in the same direction as when close to $w$. A simpler formulation of this will be given in Section 3.1 below, after we have established some notation, but for the moment we are assuming:

(P8) There are open neighbourhoods $V$ and $W$ of $v$ and $w$, respectively, such that, for any trajectory going from $V$ to $W$, the direction of its turning around the connection $[v \to w]$ is the same in $V$ and in $W$ (see figure 3).

This is the situation in the reversible case studied by Lamb et al [31], where the anti-symmetry is a rotation by $\pi$. The condition would not hold if the anti-symmetry were a reflection.

In a more general setting the dynamics around heteroclinic cycles has been studied by Aguiar et al [5]. The main result of [5] is that, close to what remains of the network $\Sigma$ after perturbation, there are trajectories that visit neighbourhoods of the saddles following all the heteroclinic connections in any given order. This is the concept of heteroclinic switching; the next paragraph gives a set-up of switching near a heteroclinic network. Recently, Homburg and Knobloch [23] gave an equivalent definition of switching for a heteroclinic network, using the notion of connectivity matrix (which characterizes the admissible sequences) and symbolic dynamics.
Figure 3: There are two different possibilities for the geometry of the flow around \( \Sigma^* \) depending on the direction trajectories turn around the heteroclinic connection \([v \rightarrow w]\). Throughout this paper, we restrict our study to the case where the direction of turning around \([v \rightarrow w]\) is the same in \(V\) and \(W\).

For a heteroclinic network \(\Sigma\) with node set \(\mathcal{A}\), a path of order \(k\) on \(\Sigma\) is a finite sequence 
\(s^k = (c_j)_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}}\) of connections \(c_j = [A_j \rightarrow B_j]\) in \(\Sigma\) such that \(A_j, B_j \in \mathcal{A}\) and \(B_j = A_{j+1}\) i.e. \(c_j = [A_j \rightarrow A_{j+1}]\). For an infinite path, take any \(j \in \mathbb{N}\).

Let \(N_\Sigma\) be a neighbourhood of the network \(\Sigma\) and let \(U_A\) be a neighbourhood of each node \(A\) in \(\Sigma\). For each heteroclinic connection in \(\Sigma\), consider a point \(p\) on it and a small neighbourhood \(V\) of \(p\). The neighbourhoods of the nodes should be pairwise disjoint, as well as those of points in connections. Given neighbourhoods as above, the point \(q\), or its trajectory \(\varphi(t)\), follows the finite path \(s^k = (c_j)_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}}\) of order \(k\), if there exist two monotonically increasing sequences of times \((t_i)_{i \in \{1, \ldots, k+1\}}\) and \((z_i)_{i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}}\) such that for all \(i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\), we have \(t_i < z_i < t_{i+1}\) and:

- \(\varphi(t) \subset N_\Sigma\) for all \(t \in (t_i, t_{i+1})\);
- \(\varphi(t_i) \in U_{A_i}\) and \(\varphi(z_i) \in V_i\) and
- for all \(t \in (z_i, z_{i+1})\), \(\varphi(t)\) does not visit the neighbourhood of any other node except that of \(A_{i+1}\).

There is finite switching near \(\Sigma\) if for each finite path there is a trajectory that follows it. Analogously, we define infinite switching near \(\Sigma\) by requiring that each infinite path is followed by a trajectory. In other words, for any given forward infinite sequence of heteroclinic connections \((c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\) such that the \(\omega\)-limit of any point in \(c_j\) coincide with the \(\alpha\)-limit of any points in \(c_{j+1}\), there exists at least one trajectory that remains very close to the network and follows the sequence (see figure 4).

**Proposition 2** If a vector field \(f_0\) satisfies (P1)–(P4) and (P8), then the following properties are satisfied by all vector fields in an open neighbourhood of \(f_0\) in the space of \(\langle \gamma_1 \rangle\)-equivariant vector fields of class \(C^1\) on \(S^3\):

1. the only heteroclinic connections from \(v\) to \(w\) are the original ones;
2. there are no homoclinic connections;
3. there is infinite switching;
4. the finite switching may be realized by an \(n\)-pulse heteroclinic connection \([w \rightarrow v]\);
5. there exists an increasing nested chain of suspended uniformly hyperbolic compact sets $(G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ topologically conjugate to a full shift over a finite number of symbols, which accumulates on the cycle (see figure 5).

In the restriction to a uniformly hyperbolic invariant compact set whose existence is assured by item 5 of proposition 2, the dynamics is conjugated to a full shift over a finite alphabet. In particular, since the ceiling function associated to the suspension of any horseshoe is bounded above and below (in a compact set), it follows that the topological entropy of the corresponding flow is positive. This means that there is a positive exponential growth rate for the number of orbits, for the first return map, distinguishable with fine but finite precision – see Abramov [1] and Katok [26].

The nested chain of horseshoes is illustrated in figure 5: a vertical rectangle in the wall of $V$, later called $H^n_v$, first returns to the wall as several rectangles transverse to the original one. If the height of the rectangle is increased by moving its lower boundary closer to $W^s(v)$, then the number of returning rectangles (legs of the horseshoe) increases; continuing the rectangle all the way down to $W^s(v)$ creates infinitely many legs.

A challenge in topological dynamics is to decide whether periodic solutions can be separated by homotopies, or not. Roughly speaking, a link is a collection of disjoint one-spheres in $S^3$. A knot is a link with one connected component. Two links $L_1 \subset S^3$ and $L_2 \subset S^3$ are equivalent if there exists an isotopy $\{H_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ of $S^3$ such that $H_0 = Id_{S^3}$ and $H_1(L_1) = L_2$. We may use the following result:

**Theorem 3** (Franks and Williams [16], 1985) *If $\Phi_t$ is a $C^r$ flow on $\mathbb{R}^3$ or $S^3$ such that either:

- $r > 1$ and $\Phi_t$ has a hyperbolic periodic orbit with a transverse homoclinic point, or
- $r > 2$ and $\Phi_t$ has a compact invariant set with positive topological entropy,

then among the closed orbits there are infinitely many distinct knot types.*

It follows that among all the closed orbits which appear in the nested chain of horseshoes, there are many distinct inequivalent knot types. In particular, we may conclude that:

**Corollary 4** *If a vector field $f_0$ satisfies $(P1)$–$(P4)$ and $(P8)$ then, for the flow associated to all vector fields in an open neighbourhood of $f_0$ in the space of $\langle \gamma_1 \rangle$–equivariant vector fields of*
class $C^1$ on $S^3$, there are closed orbits linked to each of the cycles in $\Sigma^*$ exhibiting infinitely many knot types.

The previous result shows that among all the periodic solutions, there are many distinct inequivalent knot types. Nevertheless, we do not know if these horseshoes induce all link types. For example, neither the standard horseshoe (with two strips) nor its second iterate induces all types of links. The third iterate of the Smale horseshoe induces all link types - see Kin [27]. Based on the paper of Hirasawa and Kin [22], we solved affirmatively the problem using the concepts of generalized horseshoes and twist signature.

**Corollary 5** If a vector field $f_0$ satisfies (P1)–(P4) and (P8) then, for the flow associated to all vector fields in an open neighbourhood of $f_0$ in the space of $\langle \gamma_1 \rangle$–equivariant vector fields of class $C^1$ on $S^3$, there are closed orbits linked to each of the cycles in $\Sigma^*$ inducing all link types.

We address the proof of corollary 5 in section 4. Observe that for each $n$–pulse heteroclinic connection from $w$ to $v$, we may define a new $n$–heteroclinic cycle and thus a subsidiary Bykov cycle. Hence, these new cycles have the same structure in their unfolding as the original cycles.

In the context of a heteroclinic cycle associated to non-trivial periodic solutions, Rodrigues et al [36] describe the phenomenon of chaotic cycling: there are trajectories that follow the cycle making any prescribed number of turns near the periodic solutions, for any given bi-infinite sequence of turns. The rigorous definition of this concept requires an open neighbourhood $V_{\Sigma^*}$ of $\Sigma^*$, a set of neighbourhoods of the saddles (isolating blocks) and a set of Poincaré sections near each limit cycle (counting sections). Given these sets, it is possible to code with an infinite word over a finite alphabet each trajectory that remains inside $V_{\Sigma^*}$ for all time. Each repetition of a letter corresponds to a new turn inside the neighbourhood of the limit cycle; an infinite repetition (resp. periodic word) corresponds to a trajectory lying in an invariant manifold (resp. periodic solution). Coding trajectories that remain for all time in the neighbourhood of $\Sigma^*$ is
beyond the scope of this paper, but we point out that this technique may be naturally applied to a heteroclinic cycle of saddle-foci.

2.4 Breaking the one-dimensional connection

For $C^1$–vector fields on the plane, let $\Theta$ be an attracting heteroclinic network associated to two equilibria with two cycles sharing one connection. Assuming that $\xi$ is the splitting parameter governing the common connection, it follows by Andronov-Leontovich theorem [6] that for sufficiently small $\xi > 0$ there exists a unique stable hyperbolic limit cycle such that when $\xi \to 0$, the limit cycle approaches the locus of one of the cycles of $\Theta$ and its period tends to $+\infty$.

The classical Shilnikov problem [38] in smooth three-dimensional systems states that small $C^1$–perturbations of an attracting homoclinic cycle associated to a saddle-focus could yield a stable hyperbolic periodic solution with the same properties of that of Andronov-Leontovich on the plane. The main goal of this section is to extend the classical Shilnikov problem for Bykov cycles. The technique to tackle our problem is similar to that of Shilnikov: the reduction to the Poincaré map.

When (P7) holds, with $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, the heteroclinic cycles that existed in the fully symmetric case disappear. The invariance of $Fix(\langle \gamma_2 \rangle)$ is not preserved and the asymptotically stable heteroclinic network $\Sigma$ is broken; nevertheless near the ghost of the original attractor there will still exist some attracting structure.

We will prove that each cycle is replaced by an asymptotically stable closed trajectory that lies near the original (attracting) heteroclinic cycle. One possibility would be to generate a multi-pulse heteroclinic connection from $v$ to $w$, that goes several times around close to where the original heteroclinic connection was, in a sense that will be made precise in Section 5. This is ruled out by the next result, proved in Section 5.

**Theorem 6** If a vector field $f_0$ satisfies (P1)–(P4), then the following properties are satisfied by all vector fields in an open neighbourhood of $f_0$ in the space of $\langle \gamma_2 \rangle$–equivariant vector fields of class $C^1$ on $S^3$:

1. there are no multi-pulse heteroclinic connections from $v$ to $w$;
2. near each of the two cycles present in the $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$–symmetric equation, the perturbed equations have a non-trivial asymptotically stable periodic solution.

In our context, Theorem 6 may be rephrased as follows: consider a generic $\langle \gamma_2 \rangle$-equivariant one-parameter perturbation $f(x, \lambda_2)$ of the $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$–symmetric organizing centre $f_0$ that satisfies (P7). Then, for each small $\lambda_2 \neq 0$ there is a pair of symmetry-related non-trivial asymptotically stable periodic solutions to $\dot{x} = f(x, 0, \lambda_2)$. As $\lambda_2$ tends to 0 the closed trajectories approach the two cycles in $\Sigma$ and their period tends to $+\infty$. In local coordinates (such as will be assured by Samovol’s Theorem, see Section 3 below), the limit cycle of the stable periodic trajectory winds increasingly around the local stable manifold of $w$ and the time of flight inside fixed neighbourhoods of $v$ and of $w$ tends to $+\infty$.

2.5 Breaking the two heteroclinic connections

In this section we conclude that the Bykov cycle involving $v$ and $w$ may give rise to homoclinic orbits involving saddle-focus. These homoclinic cycles are usually called Shilnikov homoclinic orbits because the systematic study of the dynamics near them began with L. P. Shilnikov [38] in 1965. The homoclinic orbits associated to a saddle-focus is one of the main sources of
chaotic dynamics in three-dimensional flows. In several applications these homoclinicities play an important role – see for example [10] in the setting of neuron model.

First of all, note that under perturbation the generalized horseshoes \( (G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) which occur near the Bykov cycle in proposition 2 survive for finitely many \( N \). For each \( N \), \( G_N \) is uniformly hyperbolic but \( \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i \) is not.

### 2.5.1 Dynamics near Shilnikov Homoclinic Orbits

In autonomous planar systems, a codimension 1 homoclinic bifurcation creates or destroys a single closed orbit. However, when the dimension of the system is greater than 2, it is well known that the appearance of a homoclinic orbit associated to a hyperbolic equilibrium may give rise to a richness of periodic and aperiodic motions. A review of results on the dynamical consequences of some homoclinic and heteroclinic motions in two, three and four dimensions is described by Wiggins [41].

This subsection summarizes some well-known results about the dynamics near homoclinic orbits associated to a hyperbolic equilibrium \( p_0 \) in a three-dimensional manifold. All results will be applied in the present work. We are assuming that \( \dim W^s(p_0) = 2 = \dim W^u(p_0) + 1 \). For more details, see the books Shilnikov et al [39, 40].

In three-dimensional flows, if \( p_0 \) is a saddle-focus of (2.2) such that:

- the eigenvalues of \( df \), at \( p_0 \), are \( \lambda^s + i\omega \) and \( \lambda^u \), where \( -\lambda^s \neq \lambda^u \) are positive numbers and \( \omega \neq 0 \);
- (non-linear condition) there is a homoclinic trajectory \( \Gamma \) connecting \( p_0 \) to itself,

then \( \Gamma \) is said a Shilnikov homoclinic connection of \( p_0 \). It is easy to see that \( p_0 \) possesses a local two-dimensional stable manifold and a local one-dimensional unstable manifold which intersect non-transversely. If \( -\lambda^s < \lambda^u \), we say that the homoclinic orbit \( \Gamma \) satisfies the Shilnikov condition (see Gaspard [17]). Let \( \Gamma \) be a Shilnikov homoclinic connection to an equilibrium \( p_0 \) of the flow of (2.2).

1. If \( \Gamma \) satisfies the Shilnikov condition, then there exists a countable infinity of suspended Smale horseshoes (accumulating on the homoclinic cycle) in any small cylindrical neighbourhood of \( \Gamma \). When the vector field is perturbed to break the homoclinic connection, finitely many of these horseshoes remain and there appear persistent strange attractors [34]. For each \( N \in \mathbb{N} \), \( N \)–homoclinic orbits exist for infinitely many parameter values.

2. If \( \Gamma \) does not satisfy the Shilnikov condition, then the homoclinic orbit is an attractor.

In both cases, we assume that \( -\lambda^s \neq \lambda^u \). Reverting the time, dual results may be obtained for homoclinic orbits involving a saddle-focus \( p_0 \) such that \( \dim W^u(p_0) = 2 = \dim W^s(p_0) + 1 \).

### 2.5.2 Homoclinic orbits near the ghost of the network

In general, the existence of a homoclinic orbit is not a robust property. Here, we prove that the homoclinic orbits of \( v \) and \( w \) occur along lines in the two parameter space \( (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \). There are two main theorems in this section: the first one characterizes the dynamics near the homoclinic orbits associated to \( v \) and the other states the similar results for \( w \). Both follow from the analysis of the bifurcation diagram depicted in figure 6.
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Theorem 7 Consider a vector field $f_0$ satisfying (P1)--(P4) and (P8). A generic symmetry-breaking family $f(x, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ unfolding $f_0$ satisfies (P5)--(P7) and its dynamics, for $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and for $\lambda_2 \neq 0$ sufficiently small satisfies:

1. for each $\lambda_1 > 0$, there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\lambda_2^k(\nu)$ such that if $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^k(\nu)$ there exists an attracting homoclinic orbit associated to $v$;

2. the homoclinic orbits which exist for $\lambda_2^k(\nu)$ and for $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^{k+2}(\nu)$ are distinguished by the number of revolutions inside $W$ around $W_{loc}(w)$;

3. for each $\lambda_1 > 0$, either for $\lambda_2^k(\nu) < \lambda_2 < \lambda_2^{k+1}(\nu)$ or for $\lambda_2^{k+1}(\nu) < \lambda_2 < \lambda_2^{k+2}(\nu)$, there exists an attracting periodic solution near the locus of the homoclinic orbit;

4. in the bifurcation diagram, the tongues for which there are no attracting limit cycles (associated to bifurcations of homoclinic orbits of $v$) are alternated;

5. when $\lambda_2 \to 0$, the homoclinic orbits of $v$ accumulate on the heteroclinic connection $[v \to w]$.

Note that $\lambda_2^k(\nu)$ depends on $\lambda_1$. We omit this dependence to simplify the notation. From a simple analysis of the bifurcation diagram, it follows that along a vertical line ($\lambda_1 = \lambda_1^0$), a stable limit cycle is born from a simple homoclinic loop for $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^k(\lambda_1^0)$; along the path, the limit cycle decreases its period and increases once again until it reaches $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^{k+1}(\lambda_1^0)$ where the stable periodic solution becomes once again a homoclinic orbit of $v$.

We have the following result concerning homoclinicities of $w$: 
Theorem 8 Consider a vector field $f_0$ satisfying (P1)–(P4) and (P8). A generic symmetry-breaking family $f(x, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ unfolding $f_0$ satisfies (P5)–(P7) and its dynamics, for $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and for $\lambda_2 \neq 0$ sufficiently small satisfies:

1. for each $\lambda_1 > 0$, there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\lambda_2^k(w)$ such that if $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^k(w)$ there exists a homoclinic orbit associated to $w$;
2. the homoclinic orbits which exist for $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^k(w)$ and for $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^{k+2}(w)$ are distinguished by the number of revolutions inside $V$ around $W^{lu}_{loc}(v)$;
3. if $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^k(w)$ there exists a horseshoe with an infinite number of periodic orbits;
4. when $\lambda_2 \to 0$, the sequence of homoclinic orbits of $w$ accumulates on the cycle.

In the bifurcation diagram of figure 6, when we follow along a vertical line ($\lambda_1 = \lambda_1^0$), we observe period-doubling cascade bifurcations that destabilize and restabilize the periodic orbits leading to the full horseshoe which exists near the homoclinic orbit of $w$ – see Glendinning and Sparrow [19], Yorke and Alligood [43]. In [19], it has been demonstrated the existence of a sequence of real numbers $s_i$, such that for $\lambda_2 = s_i$ one observe a double pulse homoclinic orbit exhibiting the same behaviour as the main homoclinic orbit. This double pulse follows the primary homoclinic cycle twice. The existence of $n$–pulse homoclinic orbits ($n > 2$) has been also showed.

For dissipative systems, the process of creation and destruction of horseshoes can be accompanied by unfoldings of homoclinic tangencies to hyperbolic periodic solutions. The co-existence of different types of behaviour in the flow has been investigated by many authors – see Bykov [9], Xiao-Feng and Rui-hai [42], Glendinning, Abshagen and Mullin [18]. In the present paper, from the analysis of the bifurcation diagrams, we may conclude that:

Corollary 9 For any family of differential equations satisfying (P1)–(P5) and (P8) the co-existence of the homoclinic trajectories of $v$ and $w$ is a codimension 2 phenomenon. \footnote{They occur at isolated points in parameter space, accumulating at the origin.}

Note that the coexistence of homoclinic trajectories is not a true bifurcation since these trajectories occur in different regions of the phase space. Due to the property (P8), the homoclinic trajectories associated to $v$ and $w$, when both coexist, must be linked; each one winds around the other infinitely many times, inside the linearized neighbourhood defined in section 3.

3 Local Dynamics near the saddles

In this section, we establish local coordinates near the saddle-foci $v$ and $w$ and define some notation that will be used in the rest of the paper. The starting point is an application of Samovol’s Theorem [37] to linearize the flow around the equilibria and to introduce cylindrical coordinates around each saddle-focus. These are used to define neighbourhoods with boundary transverse to the linearized flow. For each saddle, we obtain the expression of the local map that sends points in the boundary where the flow goes in, into points in the boundary where the flows goes out. Finally, we establish a convention for the transition maps from one neighbourhood to the other.

Note that when we refer to the stable/unstable manifold of an equilibrium point, we mean the local stable/unstable manifold of that equilibrium.
3.1 Linearization near the equilibria

By Samovol’s Theorem [37] (see also section 6.4 Part I of Anosov et al [7] and Ren & Yang [35]), around the saddle-foci, the vector field $f$ is $C^1$-conjugated to its linear part, since there are no resonances of order 1. In cylindrical coordinates $(\rho, \theta, z)$ the linearizations at $v$ and $w$ take the form, respectively:

$$
\begin{cases}
\dot{\rho} = -C_v \rho \\
\dot{\theta} = \alpha_v \\
\dot{z} = E_v z
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\begin{cases}
\dot{\rho} = E_w \rho \\
\dot{\theta} = \alpha_w \\
\dot{z} = -C_w z.
\end{cases}
$$

We consider cylindrical neighbourhoods of $v$ and $w$ in $S^3$ of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ and height $2\varepsilon$ that we denote by $V$ and $W$, respectively. Their boundaries consist of three components (see figure 1):

- The cylinder wall parametrized by $x \in \mathbb{R} \ (\text{mod } 2\pi)$ and $|y| \leq \varepsilon$ with the usual cover $(x, y) \mapsto (\varepsilon, x, y) = (\rho, \theta, z)$. Here $x$ represents the angular coordinate and $y$ is the height of the cylinder.

- Two disks, the top and the bottom of the cylinder. We take polar coverings of these disks: $(r, \varphi) \mapsto (r, \varphi, j\varepsilon) = (\rho, \theta, z)$ where $j \in \{-, +\}, 0 \leq r \leq \varepsilon$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R} \ (\text{mod } 2\pi)$.

On these cross sections, we define the return maps to study the dynamics near the cycle.

**Remark 1** Property (P8) concerning the direction of turning around the connection $[v \to w]$, may be interpreted in terms of the sign of $\alpha_v$ and $\alpha_w$: property (P8) holds when they have the same signs.

3.2 Coordinates near $v$

The cylinder wall is denoted by $H_{v}^{in}$. Trajectories starting at interior points of $H_{v}^{in}$ go into $V$ in positive time and $H_{v}^{in} \cap W^s(v)$ is parametrized by $y = 0$. The set of points in $H_{v}^{in}$ with positive (resp. negative) second coordinate is denoted by $H_{v}^{in,+}$ (resp. $H_{v}^{in,-}$).

The top and the bottom of the cylinder are denoted, respectively, $H_{v}^{out,+}$ and $H_{v}^{out,-}$. Trajectories starting at interior points of $H_{v}^{out,+}$ and $H_{v}^{out,-}$ go inside the cylinder in negative time.

After linearization $W^u(v)$ is the $z$-axis, intersecting $H_{v}^{out,+}$ at the origin of coordinates of $H_{v}^{out,+}$. Trajectories starting at $H_{v}^{in,j}, j \in \{+, -\}$ leave $V$ at $H_{v}^{out,j}$.

3.3 Coordinates near $w$

After linearization, $W^s(w)$ is the $z$-axis, intersecting the top and bottom of the cylinder at the origin of its coordinates. We denote by $H_{w}^{in,j}, j \in \{-, +\}$, its two components. Trajectories starting at interior points of $H_{w}^{in,x}$ go into $W$ in positive time.

Trajectories starting at interior points of the cylinder wall $H_{w}^{out}$ go into $W$ in negative time. The set of points in $H_{w}^{out}$ whose second coordinate is positive (resp. negative) is denoted $H_{w}^{out,+}$ (resp. $H_{w}^{out,-}$) and $H_{w}^{out} \cap W^u(w)$ is parametrized by $y = 0$. Trajectories that start at $H_{w}^{in,j} \setminus W^s(w)$, $j \in \{+, -\}$ leave the cylindrical neighbourhood at $H_{w}^{out,j}$.  
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3.4 Local map near \( v \)

The local map \( \Phi_v : H^{in,+}_v \rightarrow H^{out,+}_v \) near \( v \) is given by

\[
\Phi_v(x, y) = (c_1 y^{\delta_v}, -g_v \ln y + x + c_2) = (r, \phi)
\]

where \( \delta_v \) is the saddle index of \( v \),

\[
\delta_v = \frac{C_v}{E_v} > 1, \quad c_1 = \varepsilon^{1-\delta_v} > 0, \quad g_v = \frac{\alpha_v}{E_v} \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 = g_v \ln(\varepsilon).
\]

The expression for the local map from \( H^{in,-}_v \) to \( H^{out,-}_v \) we obtain for \( y < 0 \), \( \phi_v(x, y) = \phi_v(x, -y) \).

3.5 Local map near \( w \)

The local map \( \Phi_w : H^{in,+}_w \setminus W^s(w) \rightarrow H^{out,+}_w \) near \( w \) is given by:

\[
\Phi_w(r, \varphi) = (c_3 - g_w \ln r + \varphi, c_4 r^{\delta_w}) = (x, y),
\]

where \( \delta_w \) is the saddle index of \( w \),

\[
\delta_w = \frac{C_w}{E_w} > 1, \quad g_w = \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w}, \quad c_3 = g_w \ln \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad c_4 = \varepsilon^{1-\delta_w} > 0.
\]

The same expression holds for the local map from \( H^{in,-}_w \setminus W^s(w) \) to \( H^{out,-}_w \).

3.6 Geometry near the saddle-foci \( v \) and \( w \)

The notation and constructions of previous subsections are now used to study the geometry associated to the local dynamics around each saddle-focus.
Definition 1 1. A segment $\beta$ on $H^i_{v}$ or $H^o_{w}$ is a smooth regular parametrized curve of the type $\beta : [0,1] \to H^i_{v}$ or $\beta : [0,1] \to H^o_{w}$ that meets $W^s_{loc}(v)$ or $W^u_{loc}(w)$ transversely at the point $\beta(1)$ only and such that, writing $\beta(s) = (x(s),y(s))$, both $x$ and $y$ are monotonic functions of $s$.

2. A spiral on $H^o_{w}$ or $H^i_{v}$ around a point $p$ is a curve $\alpha : [0,1) \to H^o_{w}$ or $\alpha : [0,1) \to H^i_{v}$ satisfying $\lim_{s \to 1^-} \alpha(s) = p$ and such that, if $\alpha(s) = (\alpha_1(s),\alpha_2(s))$ are its expressions in polar coordinates $(\rho,\theta)$ around $p$, then $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ are monotonic, with $\lim_{s \to 1^-} |\alpha_2(s)| = +\infty$.

3. Let $a,b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a < b$ and let $H^o_{w}$ be a surface parametrized by a covering $(\theta,h) \in \mathbb{R} \times [a,b]$ where $\theta$ is periodic. A helix on $H^o_{w}$ accumulating on the circle $h = h_0$ is a curve $\gamma : [0,1) \to H$ such that its coordinates $(\theta(s),h(s))$ are monotonic functions of $s$ with $\lim_{s \to 1^-} h(s) = h_0$ and $\lim_{s \to 1^-} |\theta(s)| = +\infty$.

At the item 2 of the previous definition, $p$ will be seen as the intersection of the one-dimensional local stable/unstable manifold of $v$ or $w$ with the considered cross section. At the item 3, the curve is the intersection of the two-dimensional local unstable manifold of $w$ with the cross section $H^o_{w}$. Observing figure 8, the definitions become clear. The next lemma summarizes some basic technical results about the geometry near the saddle-foci. The proof may be found in section 6 of Aguiar et al [5] - this is why it will be omitted here.

Lemma 10 1. For $j \in \{+,-\}$, a segment $\beta$ on $H^i_{v} \cap W^u(v)$ is mapped by $\phi_{v}$ into a spiral on $H^o_{w} \cap W^s(w)$;

2. For $j \in \{+,-\}$, a segment $\beta$ on $H^o_{w}$ is mapped by $\phi_{w}^{-1}$ into a spiral on $H^i_{v}$ around $W^s(w)$;

3. For $j \in \{+,-\}$, a spiral on $H^o_{w}$ around $W^s(w)$ is mapped by $\phi_{w}$ into a helix on $H^o_{v}$ accumulating on the circle $H^o_{w} \cap W^u(w)$.

On the proof of item 3 of lemma 10, the authors of [5] used implicitly that the orientations in which trajectories turn around in $V$ and $W$ are the same (i.e., they used implicitly property (P8)).

3.7 Transition Maps

In the rest of this paper, we study the Poincaré first return map on the boundaries defined in this section. Consider the transition maps

$$\Psi_{v,w} : H^o_{v} \to H^i_{v} \quad j = +,- \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_{w,v} : H^o_{w} \to H^i_{v}.$$ 

For $\lambda_1 = 0$, the map $\Psi_{w,v}$ may be taken to be the identity. For $\lambda_1 \neq 0$, the map can be seen as a rotation by an angle $\alpha(\lambda_1)$ with $\alpha(0) = 0$. Without loss of generality, we use $\alpha \equiv \frac{\pi}{2}$, that simplifies the expressions used.

For $\lambda_2 = 0$ one of the connections $[v \to w]$ goes from $H^o_{v} \to H^i_{v}$. For $\lambda_2 = 0$, the linear part of the map $\Psi_{v,w}$ may be represented (in rectangular coordinates) as the composition of a rotation of the coordinate axes and a change of scales. As in Bykov [9], after a rotation and a uniform rescaling of the coordinates, we may assume without loss of generality that for $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, $\Psi_{v,w}$ is given by the map $T(x,y) + L(x,y)$, where:

$$T(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad L(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\}.$$
Figure 8: Smooth structures referred in lemma 10. (a) A segment $\beta$ on $H^{in,j}_v$ is mapped by $\phi_v$ into a spiral on $H^{out,j}_v$ around $W^s(v)$. (b) A segment $\beta$ on $H^{out,j}_w$ is mapped by $\phi_w^{-1}$ into a spiral on $H^{in,j}_w$ around $W^s(w)$. (c) A spiral on $H^{in,j}_w$ around $W^s(w)$ is mapped by $\phi_w$ into a helix on $H^{out,j}_w$ accumulating on the circle $H^{out} \cap W^u(w)$. The double arrows on the segments, spiral and helix indicate correspondence of orientation and not the flow.

Figure 9: The transition map from $v$ to $w$. We set that the transition map from $v$ to $w$ may be approximated by a diagonal map.

Note that the map $\Psi_{v,w}$ is given in rectangular coordinates. To compose this map with $\Phi_w$, it is required to change the coordinates. We address this issue later in section 5. We summarize the above information in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symmetries preserved</th>
<th>$\Psi_{v,w}$</th>
<th>$\Psi_{w,v}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$</td>
<td>$\gamma_1, \gamma_2$</td>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$</td>
<td>$\gamma_1$</td>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$</td>
<td>$\gamma_2$</td>
<td>$T \circ L$</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>$T \circ L$</td>
<td>Rotation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The transition maps $\Psi_{v,w}$ and $\Psi_{w,v}$ depend on the type of symmetry breaking.

With this choice of local coordinates the maps $\Psi_v$ and $\Psi_w$ do not depend on $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$. The transition map $\Psi_{w,v}$ may be taken to depend on $\lambda_1$ but not on $\lambda_2$ and is written as $\Psi_{w,v}(x, y, \lambda_1)$. The other transition map $\Psi_{v,w}$ may be taken to depend on $\lambda_2$ but not on $\lambda_1$ and is written as $\Psi_{v,w}(r, \varphi, \lambda_2)$ (see figure 9).
4 Transverse Intersection of 2-dimensional manifolds

In this section, when we break the $\mathbb{Z}_2(\gamma_2)$ equivariance, using property (P6), we are assuming that the heteroclinic connection between $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ becomes transverse and one-dimensional. We still have a heteroclinic network of a different nature, which will be denoted by $\Sigma^*$. 

4.1 Proof of Proposition 2

Items 1 and 2 of proposition 2 follow from the three facts:

- the equilibria are hyperbolic;
- the fixed point subspace that contains the two connections $[v \to w]$ remains invariant;
- $\dim W^u(v) \cap W^s(w) = 1$ and $W^u(v) \cap W^s(w) \subset \text{Fix}(\gamma_1)$.

Item 3 is a direct consequence of the main result about finite and infinite switching of Aguiar et al [5]. Item 4 follows straightforwardly from the referred paper picking the segment $\beta$ as $W^u(w) \cap H^\text{in}$. 

In order to prove item 5, we start with some terminology about horizontal and vertical strips. Given a rectangular region $\mathcal{R}$ in $H^\text{in}$ or in $H^\text{out}$ parametrized by a rectangle $R = [w_1, w_2] \times [z_1, z_2]$, a horizontal strip in $\mathcal{R}$ will be parametrized by:

$$ H = \{(x, y) : x \in [w_1, w_2], y \in [u_1(x), u_2(x)]\}, $$

where

$$ u_1, u_2 : [w_1, w_2] \to [z_1, z_2] $$

are Lipschitz functions such that $u_1(x) < u_2(x)$. The horizontal boundaries of the strip are the lines parametrized by the graphs of the $u_i$, the vertical boundaries are the lines $\{w_i\} \times [u_1(w_i), u_2(w_i)]$ and its height is

$$ h = \max_{x \in [w_1, w_2]} (u_2(x) - u_1(x)). $$

When both $u_1(x)$ and $u_2(x)$ are constant functions we call $H$ a horizontal rectangle across $\mathcal{R}$. A vertical strip across $\mathcal{R}$, its width and a vertical rectangle have similar definitions, with the roles of $x$ and $y$ reversed.

Item 5 follows from the construction of the Cantor sets presented in Aguiar et al [3] – if $R_v \subset H^\text{in}_v$ is a rectangle containing $[w \to v] \cap H^\text{in}_v$ on its border, the initial conditions that returns to $H^\text{in}_v$ are contained in a sequence of horizontal strips accumulating on the stable manifold of $v$, whose heights tend to zero. Each one of these horizontal strips lying on the rectangle $R_v \subset H^\text{in}_v$, is mapped by $\Phi_w \circ \Psi_{v,w} \circ \Phi_v$ into a horizontal strip across $H^\text{out}_w$. By (P6), they are mapped by $\Psi_{v,w}$ into vertical strips across $R_w$ crossing transversely the original. This gives rise to a nested chain of uniformly hyperbolic horseshoes, accumulating on the heteroclinic connection, each one with positive topological entropy [16]. The hyperbolicity guarantees that these invariant sets persist under symmetry breaking perturbations. An illustration of the way these horseshoes are appearing is given in figure 5. However, note that among the infinitely many nested horseshoes that occur when there is a heteroclinic network, only finitely many persist under generic $C^1$-perturbations.
4.2 Proof of Corollary 5

The proof of Corollary 5 is connected with the geometry of the horseshoe $G_n$ (with $n$ strips) which arises near the cycle (see item 5 of proposition 2). Each horizontal strip in $H^u_v$ is mapped by the first return map into a vertical strip. This vertical strip intersects transversely $n$ times the original horizontal strip. As in Hirasawa et al [22], denoting the consecutive intersection points by $p_1, \ldots, p_n$, we are able to construct the twist signature of the horseshoe associated to $G_n$: it is a finite sequence of integers $(a_i)_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $a_1 = 0$;
- $a_i = a_{i-1} + 1$ if the oriented segment $[p_{i-1}, p_i]$ goes around the counterclockwise direction;
- $a_i = a_{i-1} - 1$ if the oriented segment $[p_{i-1}, p_i]$ goes around the clockwise direction.

We will use the following result of Hirasawa and Kin [22] [adapted]:

**Theorem 11** Let $G$ a generalized horseshoe map with twist signature $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$. Then $G$ induces all link types if and only if one of the following is satisfied:

1. each $a_i \geq 0$ and $\max\{a_i\} \geq 3$.
2. each $a_i \leq 0$ and $\max\{a_i\} \geq -3$.

For $n > 2$, the generalized horseshoe $G_n$ induces all links because the admissible signatures are of the type $(0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n)$ or $(0, -1, -2, -3, \ldots, -n)$ – the intersection of the horseshoes is clear in the arrows in figure 10.

5 Proof of Theorem 6: existence of periodic trajectories

In this section, we treat the case $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, when the two-dimensional manifolds $W^u(w)$ and $W^s(v)$ coincide. We prove theorem 6 – the existence of a non-trivial closed trajectory – by finding a fixed point of the Poincaré first return map $R$ in $H^u_w$.

5.1 Poincaré Map

Since $\lambda_3 = 0$, then $\Psi_{w,v}$ is the identity. The symmetry $\gamma_2$ is preserved and thus the two half-spheres in $S^3 \setminus \text{Fix}(\langle \gamma_2 \rangle)$ are flow-invariant with symmetric dynamics. We look at one of them,
where for \( \lambda_2 = 0 \) the connection goes from \( H_v^{\text{out,+}} \) to \( H_w^{\text{in,+}} \), omitting the redundant + signs to lighten the notation. Consider the map:

\[
R_* = \Phi_v \circ \Psi_{w,v} \circ \Phi_w : H_w^{\text{in}} \setminus W_{\text{loc}}^u(w) \rightarrow H_v^{\text{out}}
\]

that in polar coordinates is given by

\[
R_*(r, \varphi) = \left( c_5 r^\delta, c_6 + \varphi - c_7 \ln(r) \right) = (\rho, \theta)
\]

where

\[
c_5 = c_1 c_4^\delta = \varepsilon^{1-\delta}, \quad \delta = \delta_v \delta_w, \quad c_6 = -g_v \ln(c_4) + c_2 + c_3 \quad c_7 = g_v \delta_w + g_w
\]

and, due to (P2), we have:

\[
\delta = \delta_v \delta_w = \frac{C_v C_w}{E_v E_w} > 1.
\]

It is worth noting that:

\[
c_7 = g_v \delta_w + g_w > 0.
\]

In Cartesian coordinates, we have \( R_*(r, \varphi) = (\rho \cos \theta, \rho \sin \theta) = (x, y) \). The Poincaré first return map is \( \lambda_2 \)-dependent and given by \( R(r, \varphi) = \Psi_{w,v}(R_*(r, \varphi), \lambda_2) \), where \( \Psi_{w,v} : H_v^{\text{out}} \rightarrow H_w^{\text{in}} \) is given by \( \Psi_{w,v}(x, y) = (x + \lambda_2, y) \).

### 5.2 There are no multi-pulse heteroclinic connections \([v \rightarrow w]\)

In this section, we will prove the first assertion of theorem 6. Reminding that \( V \) and \( W \) are neighbourhoods of \( v \) and \( w \) in which the vector field can be \( C^1 \)-linearized, we start by making the statement of theorem 6 more precise:

**Definition 2** Let \( A \subset V \) be a cross-section to the flow meeting \( W^u(v) \). A one-dimensional connection \([v \rightarrow w]\) that meets \( A \) at precisely \( k \) points is called a \( k \)-pulse heteroclinic connection with respect to \( A \). If \( k > 1 \) we call it a multi-pulse heteroclinic connection. A similar definition holds for a cross-section \( B \subset W \) and for pairs of cross-sections \( A \), \( B \).

We intend to show that generically in a one-parameter unfolding satisfying (P1)–(P5) and (P7), with \( \lambda_1 = 0 \), there are no multi-pulse heteroclinic connections with respect to \( A = H_v^{\text{out}} \). Then a 2–pulse heteroclinic connection occurs for \( \lambda_2 = \lambda_* \) whenever \( R \) maps \( \Psi_{v,w}(0, 0, \lambda_*) \in H_v^{\text{out}} \) into the origin of \( H_w^{\text{in}} \). A \( k \)-pulse connection arises when \( R^k(\Psi_{v,w}(0, 0, \lambda_*)) = (0, 0) \) and \( R^j(\Psi_{v,w}(0, 0, \lambda_*)) \neq (0, 0) \) for \( 0 < j < k \). Thus, in order to find a value \( \lambda_* \) where there is a multi-pulse connection one has to solve the two equations \( R^k(\Psi_{v,w}(0, 0, \lambda_*)) = (0, 0) \) for \( \lambda_* \). Generically the two equations do not have a common solution.

**Remark 2** Note that for two-parameter families, i.e. \( \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), generically there would be isolated values \( \lambda_k \) for which there would be \( k \)-pulse connections. In order to get branches of multi-pulses arbitrarily close to \( \lambda_2 = 0 \), one would need three parameters. This codimension 3 behaviour is beyond the scope of this paper.
5.3 Existence of a fixed point of the Poincaré map

We start by finding the radial coordinate of the fixed point. For this we consider the maps $g^\pm : (0, \varepsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ (see figure 11)

$$g^+(r) = r + \varepsilon \left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)^\delta \quad g^-(r) = r - \varepsilon \left(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)^\delta.$$ 

Since $\delta > 1$ both maps are of class $C^1$ and

$$\frac{dg^+}{dr}(0) = \frac{dg^-}{dr}(0) = 1. \quad (5.7)$$

**Lemma 12** If $C$ is a circle of centre $(0, 0)$ and radius $r_0$ in $H^m_w$, with $0 < r_0 < \varepsilon$, then $R(C, \lambda_2)$ is a circle of centre $(\lambda_2, 0)$ and radius $c_5 r_0^\delta < r_0$. Moreover:

- if $\lambda_2 \in (g^-(r_0), g^+(r_0))$, then $R(C, \lambda_2) \cap C$ contains exactly two points;
- if either $\lambda_2 = g^+(r_0)$ or $\lambda_2 = g^-(r_0)$, then $R(C, \lambda_2)$ is tangent to $C$ and thus $R(C, \lambda_2) \cap C$ contains a single point;
- if $\lambda_2$ lies outside the interval $[g^-(r_0), g^+(r_0)]$, then $R(C, \lambda_2) \cap C$ is empty.

**Proof:** Write $C$ in polar coordinates as $(r_0, \varphi)$, where $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi)$, $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ is fixed, and let $R_*(r_0, \varphi) = (\rho, \theta)$. Then $\rho = c_5 r_0^\delta$ is constant and $\theta = \varphi + c_6 - c_7 \ln(r_0)$ varies in an interval of length $2\pi$. Hence, $R_*(C)$ is a circle with centre $(0, 0)$ and therefore, $R(C, \lambda_2) = \Psi_{w,v} \circ R_*(C)$ is a circle with centre $(\lambda_2, 0)$ and radius $\varepsilon \left(\frac{r_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^\delta$. Since $r_0 < \varepsilon$ and $\delta > 1$, then this radius is less that $r_0$.

For $\lambda_2 = 0$, the two circles $C$ and $R(C, \lambda_2)$ are concentric. For a fixed $r_0 > 0$, as $\lambda_2$ increases from zero, $R(C, \lambda_2)$ moves to the right and is contained in $H^m_w$ as long as $\lambda_2 \leq \varepsilon \left(1 - \left(\frac{r_0}{\varepsilon}\right)^\delta\right)$. As $R(C, \lambda_2)$ moves to the right it has first an internal tangency to $C$ at $\lambda_2 = g^+(r_0)$, then the two circles meet at exactly two points and at $\lambda_2 = g^-(r_0)$ they two points come together as $C$ and $R(C, \lambda_2)$ have an external tangency (figure 11).

Let $a(\lambda_2)$, $b(\lambda_2)$ be the inverses of the maps $\lambda_2 = g^+(r)$ and $\lambda_2 = g^-(r)$, respectively. Since $g^-$ has a maximum at some point $r^* \in (0, \varepsilon)$ with $g^-(r^*) = \lambda_2^*$, then $b(\lambda_2)$ is defined only for $0 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_2^*$ (see figure 11). For each $r \in (a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2))$, in the circle $C$ with centre at the origin and radius $r$ there are two points whose images by $R$ lie in the same circle. These points $P^+(r)$ and $P^-(r)$ are symmetrically placed with respect to the line that contains the centres of $C$ and of $R(C, \lambda_2)$. In proposition 13 we show that for at least one of these points the angular coordinate is also fixed by $R$ and that this happens for each $\lambda_2 < \lambda_2^*$.

**Proposition 13** For any $\lambda_2$ with $0 < \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_2^*$ there is a point $P \in H^m_w$ such that $R(P, \lambda_2) = P$.

**Proof:** Consider a fixed $\lambda_2 \in [0, \lambda_2^*]$. For this proof, we need two systems of polar coordinates in $H^m_w$: one centered at $W^s(w) \cap H^m_w$ (that we call $S_1$, coordinates $(r, \theta)$) and the other centered at $W^u(v) \cap H^m_w$ (that we call $S_2$, coordinates $(\rho, \varphi)$). The angular component of both systems of coordinates starts at the line through the two centres; for $S_1$ at the half-line that contains the centre of $S_2$, for $S_2$ at the half-line that does not contain the centre of $S_1$ (see figure 12). Both angular coordinates $\varphi$ and $\theta$ are taken in $[-\pi, \pi]$ ( $\mathbb{R}$ (mod $2\pi$)).
Figure 11: Thin line: graph of \( g^+ (r) = r + \varepsilon \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \right) ^\delta \) where the circle \( C \) of radius \( r \) and the circle \( R(C, \lambda_2) \) have an external tangency; thick line: graph of \( g^- (r) = r - \varepsilon \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \right) ^\delta \) where \( C \) and \( R(C, \lambda_2) \) have an internal tangency. Inside the wedge-shaped region between the two curves, \( C \) meets \( R(C, \lambda_2) \) at two points, outside it \( C \cap R(C, \lambda_2) = \emptyset \).

Figure 12: The two coordinate systems \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \).
We begin by measuring the angular component of the two intersection points $P^+$ and $P^-$ of the circles $C$ and $R(C, \lambda_2)$. Let $\varphi^+(r)$ and $\varphi^-(r)$ stand for the angular coordinates $\varphi^+(P^+(r))$ and $\varphi^-(P^-(r))$, in the reference frame $S_2$ (see Figure 13). Then the functions

$$\varphi^+ : [a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2)] \to [0, \pi] \quad \varphi^- : [a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2)] \to [-\pi, 0]$$

are both monotonic and satisfy

$$\varphi^+(a(\lambda_2)) = \pi \quad \varphi^+(b(\lambda_2)) = 0 \quad \varphi^-(a(\lambda_2)) = -\pi \quad \varphi^-(b(\lambda_2)) = 0 \quad (5.8)$$

Similarly, $\theta^+(r) = \theta^+(P^+(r))$ and $\theta^-(r) = \theta^-(P^-(r))$ are measured in the reference frame $S_1$ and define monotonic functions

$$\theta^+ : [a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2)] \to [0, \pi] \quad \theta^- : [a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2)] \to [-\pi, 0]$$

such that

$$\theta^+(a(\lambda_2)) = \theta^+(b(\lambda_2)) = 0 \quad (5.9)$$

Finally, denoting by $\Psi(r, \theta) = c_0 + \theta - c_1 \ln r$ the angular coordinate of $R(r, \theta)$ measured in $S_2$, with $\theta$ measured in $S_1$, let $\Psi^+$, $\Psi^- : [a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2)] \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\Psi^+(r) = \Psi(r, \theta^+(r)) \quad \Psi^-(r) = \Psi(r, \theta^-(r)) \quad .$$

Again, these are monotonic functions and they satisfy:

$$\Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) = \Psi^-(a(\lambda_2)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) = \Psi^-(b(\lambda_2)) \quad (5.10)$$

With this notation, if for some $r_0 \in [a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2)]$ we have $\varphi^+(r_0) = \Psi^+(r_0) \pmod{2\pi}$ then the point with $S_2$ coordinates $(r_0, \varphi^+(r_0))$ is a fixed point for $R$. Similarly, $\varphi^-(r_0) = \Psi^-(r_0) \pmod{2\pi}$ implies that $(r_0, \varphi^-(r_0))$ is a fixed point for $R$ (see figure 13).

Note that by (5.8) the union of the graphs of $\varphi^+$ and $\varphi^-$ is a connected curve and this curve divides the strip $[a(\lambda_2), b(\lambda_2)] \times \mathbb{R}$ in three connected components. The limited component contains the segment $(a(\lambda_2)) \times (-\pi, \pi)$; each one of the unlimited components contains one of the half-lines $\{b(\lambda_2)\} \times (0, +\infty)$ and $\{b(\lambda_2)\} \times (-\infty, 0)$. If either $\Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) = (2k + 1)\pi$ or...
Figure 14: When either $\varphi^+(r) = \Psi^+(r)$ (mod $2\pi$) or $\varphi^-(r) = \Psi^-(r)$ (mod $2\pi$) there is a fixed point for the first return map $R$. Graphs are: thick lines for $\varphi^\pm$, thin for $\Psi^\pm$, solid lines for $+$, dashed for $-$, with $\Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) \in (-\pi, \pi)$. Left: when $\Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) > 0$ the graphs of $\varphi^+$ and $\Psi^+$ must cross. At the centre, crossing of the graphs of $\varphi^-$ and $\Psi^-$ when $\Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) < 0$. Right: for large $\lambda_2$ new fixed points appear in pairs as the graphs of $\Psi^\pm$ cross the graphs of $\varphi^\pm$ several times (mod $2\pi$).

$\Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) = 2k\pi$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ then either $(a(\lambda_2), \varphi^+(a(\lambda_2)))$ or $(b(\lambda_2), \varphi^+(b(\lambda_2)))$, respectively, is fixed by $R$. When this is not the case, let $N$ be an integer such that $\Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) + 2N\pi \in (-\pi, \pi)$, so $(a(\lambda_2), \Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) + 2N\pi)$ lies in the limited component of the strip. Since

$$(b(\lambda_2), \Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) + 2N\pi) = (b(\lambda_2), \Psi^-(b(\lambda_2)) + 2N\pi)$$

lies in one of the unlimited components, then the graphs of $\Psi^+$ and of $\Psi^-$ must cross the union of the graphs of $\varphi^+$ and $\varphi^-$ (see figure 14). If $(b(\lambda_2), \Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) + 2N\pi)$ lies in $\{(b(\lambda_2)) \times (0, +\infty)$, then the graph of $\Psi^+(r) + 2N\pi$ crosses the graph of $\varphi^+(r)$, otherwise the graphs of $\Psi^+(r) + 2N\pi$ and of $\varphi^-(r)$ must cross.

Several periodic trajectories may occur in two ways: first, there may be trajectories that make more than one loop around the place where the original cycle was, appearing as fixed points of some higher iterate $R^N$ of the Poincaré map $R$; second, the graphs of $\Psi^\pm$ may cross the graphs of $\varphi^\pm$ several times (mod $2\pi$), giving rise to several fixed points of the Poincaré map $R$. We show next that the second possibility does not take place for small $\lambda_2$.

**Proposition 14** For small $\lambda_2 > 0$ the Poincaré map has only one fixed point in $H_{\omega}^{\mu}$.

**Proof:** For the map $\Psi^+$ defined in the proof of proposition 13, using (5.9), we have

$$\Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) - \Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) = c_6 + \theta^j(b(\lambda_2)) - c_7 \ln b(\lambda_2) - c_6 - \theta^j(a(\lambda_2)) + c_7 \ln a(\lambda_2) = c_7 \ln \frac{a(\lambda_2)}{b(\lambda_2)}.$$
Then, since by (5.7),
\[
\lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} a(\lambda_2) = \lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} b(\lambda_2) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} \frac{da}{d\lambda_2}(\lambda_2) = \lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} \frac{db}{d\lambda_2} = 1
\]
we get
\[
\lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} \left( \Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) - \Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) \right) = 0
\]
even though, since \(c_7 > 0\)
\[
\lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} \Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) = \lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} \Psi^+(a(\lambda_2)) = \infty. 
\]
It follows that \(|\Psi^+(b(\lambda_2)) - \Psi^+(a(\lambda_2))| \ll \pi\) for small \(\lambda_2 > 0\) and thus, since \(\Psi^+\) and \(\varphi^+\) are monotonic, there is only one crossing (mod \(2\pi\)) of either the graphs of \(\Psi^+\) and \(\varphi^+\) or of the graphs of \(\Psi^-\) and \(\varphi^-\). Therefore the fixed point of the Poincaré map is unique. \(\square\)

5.4 Stability of the fixed point

**Proposition 15** For small \(\lambda_2 > 0\) the periodic solution corresponding to the unique fixed point of Poincaré map in \(H^n_w\) of Proposition 14 is asymptotically stable.

**Proof:** We want to estimate the eigenvalues of the derivative \(DR(X)\) of the Poincaré map \(R : H^n_w \rightarrow H^n_w\). To do this we write \(R\) as a composition of maps
\[
R(X) = P \circ R_s \circ h^{-1}(X)
\]
where \(R_s = (\rho(r, \varphi), \theta(r, \varphi))\) is the expression (5.5) in polar coordinates, \(h(r, \varphi) = (r \cos \varphi, r \sin \varphi)\) and \(P(\rho, \theta) = (\rho \cos \theta + \lambda_2, \rho \sin \theta)\). For \(X \in H^n_w, X \neq (0, 0)\) we write \(h^{-1}(X) = (r(X), \varphi(X))\).

From the derivatives
\[
DP(\rho, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\rho \sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \rho \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad DR_s(r, \varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} c_5 \delta r^{\delta-1} & 0 \\ \frac{c_7}{r} & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]
\[
Dh^{-1}(X) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \varphi(X) & \sin \varphi(X) \\ -\sin \varphi(X) & \cos \varphi(X) \end{pmatrix}
\]
\[
\begin{pmatrix} r(X) \\ r(X) \end{pmatrix}
\]
it follows that \(DR(X)\) does not depend explicitly on \(\lambda_2\). Then, at \(X = h^{-1}(r, \varphi)\) we have
\[
\det DR(X) = c_5^2 \delta r^{2\delta-2}(X) .
\]
The trace \(\text{tr} \, DR(X)\), omitting the dependence on \(X\), is given by
\[
\text{tr} \, DR(X) = \left(c_5 \delta r^{\delta-1} + \frac{\varphi}{r}\right) \left(\cos \theta \cos \varphi + \sin \theta \sin \varphi\right) + \frac{c_7 \varphi}{r} \left(\sin \theta \cos \varphi - \cos \theta \sin \varphi\right) .
\]
We want to estimate \(\det DR\) and \(\text{tr} \, DR\) at points \(X(\lambda_2)\) where \(R(X(\lambda_2)) = X(\lambda_2)\) for small \(\lambda_2 > 0\). In polar coordinates we get \(h^{-1}(X(\lambda_2)) = (r(\lambda_2), \varphi(\lambda_2))\) and we know that \(\lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} r(\lambda_2) = 0\). Then from the expression above, and since by (5.6) we have \(\delta > 1\),
\[
\lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} \det DR(X)(\lambda_2) = 0 .
\]
For the trace, substituting the value of \( \rho(r, \varphi) = c_5r^\delta \) obtained in (5.5) we get
\[
\lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\rho(r, \varphi)}{r} = \lim_{r \to 0} c_5 r^{\delta - 1} = 0
\]
since \( \delta > 1 \). Then at the limit cycle \( \lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} \text{tr} \, DR(X(\lambda_2)) = 0 \). It follows that the eigenvalues of \( DR(X(\lambda_2)) \) also tend to zero and thus for small \( \lambda_2 \) they lie within the disk of radius 1. \hfill \Box

6 Proof of theorem 7: existence of homoclinic dynamics of Shilnikov type

In general, vector fields with homoclinic cycles are structurally unstable and present fast transitions between different (and complex) dynamics. In this section, we are assuming that both symmetries \( Z_2(\gamma_1) \) and \( Z_2(\gamma_2) \) are broken (i.e. \( \lambda_1 \neq 0 \) and \( \lambda_2 \neq 0 \)) and that property (P8) is satisfied. Without loss of generality, we assume that the transition map from \( v \) to \( w \) is just a translation along the horizontal axis. Recall that the parameter \( \lambda_2 \) controls the splitting of the heteroclinic orbit \( [v \to w] \) and \( \lambda_1 \) is the parameter controlling the angle in \( H_v^u \) of the transverse intersection \( W^u(w) \) and \( W^s(v) \).

Near the heteroclinic network \( \Sigma^* \) which exists for \( \lambda_1 \neq 0 \) and \( \lambda_2 = 0 \), there exists an invariant Cantor set topologically equivalent to a full shift with an infinite countable set of periodic solutions. It corresponds to infinitely many intersections of a vertical rectangle \( R_v \) in \( H_v^u \) with its image, under the first return map to \( H_v^u \). Only a finite number of them will survive, under a small perturbation (i.e., the horseshoes which exist for \( \lambda_2 = 0 \) lose infinitely many legs).

If \( \lambda_1 \neq 0 \neq \lambda_2 \), the tips of the spirals \( \Phi_w^{-1}(W^s(v)) \cap H_w^u \) and \( \Psi_{v,w} \circ \Phi_v(W^u(w)) \cap H_w^u \) are separated and generically the center of the first curve does not intersect the second spiral. Thus, the spirals have only a finite number of intersections and consequently the number of heteroclinic connections from \( v \) to \( w \) is finite.

For \( \lambda_1 \neq 0 \neq \lambda_2 \), besides the existence of uniformly hyperbolic horseshoes, there are homoclinic orbits of \( v \) and \( w \), whose coexistence we address in the present section. The existence of these homoclinic loops is a phenomenon which depends on the right combination of the parameters \((\lambda_1, \lambda_2)\).

We start by a global description of \( \Phi_w^{-1}(W^s(v)) \cap H_w^u \). The homoclinic connections are then discussed separately: those in \( v \) in section 6.1 and those in \( w \) in section 6.2. For \( \lambda_1 \) close to zero, we are assuming that \( W^s(v) \) intersects the wall \( H_w^{out} \) of the cylinder \( W \) in an ellipse. This is the expected unfolding from the coincidence of the invariant manifolds of the equilibria (see figure 15).

We are assuming that \( W^u(w) \cap W^s(v) \cap H_w^{out} \) consists of two points \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) (see figure 15). Each of these points \( W^s(v) \cap H_w^{out} \) defines a segment and each segment may be approximated by a line of slope \( \pm \lambda_1 \) parametrized by \( s \) (see figure 16) with either \( s \in (0, \varepsilon^*) \) or \( s \in (\pi - \varepsilon^*, \pi) \), respectively, where \( \varepsilon^* \in (0, \varepsilon) \). The points are \( Z_2 \)-related; this is an artifact of the broken symmetry.

Near \( P_1 \), the slope is \( \lambda_1 \); near \( P_2 \), the slope is \(-\lambda_1 \). When \( \lambda_1 = 0 \), the invariant manifolds coincide; when \( \lambda_1 \neq 0 \), these two segments appear automatically. For assumption, we have:
\[
\lim_{s \to 0^+} s_1(s) = P_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \to \pi^-} s_2(s) = P_2.
\]
Figure 15: Both $W^s(v) \cap H^{out}_w$ and $W^u(w) \cap H^{in}_v$ are closed curves, approximated by ellipses for small $\lambda_1$.

Figure 16: The cylinder $H^{out}_w$ is shown here opened into a rectangle to emphasize the fact that locally $W^s(v)$ defines two lines on this wall.
Figure 17: The backwards iterate $\Phi^{-1}_w(W^s(v))$ consists of two joined-up spirals in $H^{\text{in}}_w$ shown in red, that divide $H^{\text{in}}_w$ into two components, mapped into the upper and lower parts of $H^{\text{in}}_w$. As $\lambda_2$ increases from zero, $W^u(v) \cap H^{\text{in}}_w$ moves along the thick blue line (grey in print), whose image by $\Phi_w$ describes a helix in $H^{\text{out}}_w$. Arrows on $W^u(v)$ and on the blue line are just indications of orientation, not of flow.

By lemma 10, locally the curves $\Phi^{-1}_w(s_1(s))$ and $\Phi^{-1}_w(s_2(s))$ are disjoint spirals in $H^{\text{in}}_w$ accumulating on the point $W^u_{lo}(w) \cap H^{\text{in}}_w$.

Globally, $W^s(v) \cap H^{\text{out}}_w$ is a closed curve $(x(s), y(s)), s \in [0, 2\pi]$, with two arcs where $y(s)$ is monotonic. Each arc is mapped diffeomorphically by $\Phi_w^{-1}$ into a spiral and the two spirals meet at the image of the maximum of $y(s)$ (see figure 17).

6.1 Homoclinic connections of $v$ - Tongues of Attracting Periodic Trajectories

Although the existence of homoclinic orbits is not easy to prove, here we have been able to characterize the curves for which we observe homoclinic cycles (of Shilnikov type) arising in the unfolding of the heteroclinic network $\Sigma^*$. Our study is consistent with the exhaustive study of bifurcations arising in the unfolding of Bykov cycles done in [20] and [31].

Note that we are assuming that $\alpha_v, \alpha_w > 0$ since hypothesis (P8) is satisfied. The primary homoclinicity of $v$ occurs when the unstable manifold of $v$ has a successful encounter with the stable manifold of the same equilibrium on $H^{\text{in}}_w$. Here, we will find the values $\lambda_2(v)$ of the parameter $\lambda_2$ for which system (2.2) has a homoclinic connection of $v$. This happens when $\lambda_1 > 0$ and either:

$$\lambda_2(v) = \left(\frac{\lambda_1 s}{c_4}\right)^{\frac{1}{s_w}} \quad \text{and} \quad s - c_3 + \left(\frac{\alpha_w}{c_w}\right) \ln \left(\frac{\lambda_1 s}{c_4}\right) = 2k\pi, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (6.11)$$

or
\[ \lambda_2(v) = \left( -\frac{\lambda_1(s - \pi)}{c_4} \right)^{\frac{1}{2w}} \text{ and } s - c_3 + \left( \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \right) \ln \left( -\frac{\lambda_1(s - \pi)}{c_4} \right) = 2k\pi, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (6.12) \]

Using the above equations, we may write the parameter \( \lambda^k_1 \) as function of \( \lambda_2 \):

\[ \lambda^k_1(\lambda_2) = \frac{c_4\lambda_2^{\delta_w}}{2k\pi + c_3 - \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \ln(\lambda_2)} \text{ and } s \in (0, \varepsilon^*) \quad (6.13) \]

or

\[ \lambda^k_1(\lambda_2) = \frac{c_4\lambda_2^{\delta_w}}{\pi + 2k\pi + c_3 - \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \ln(\lambda_2)} \text{ and } s \in (\pi - \varepsilon^*, \pi) \quad (6.14) \]

Both equations (6.13) and (6.14) may be simplified as:

\[ \lambda^k_1(\lambda_2) = \frac{c_4\lambda_2^{\delta_w}}{k\pi + c_3 - \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \ln(\lambda_2)} \]

where the denominator is either for the value of \( s \) or of \( \pi - s \) and only has meaning when it lies in the interval \((0, \varepsilon^*)\). For \( \lambda_2 > 0 \), define:

\[ k_0(\lambda_2) = \min \left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z} : 2k\pi + c_3 - \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \ln(\lambda_2) > 0 \right\}. \]

Further, we will use the information of the next lemma to depict the bifurcation diagram of figure 18.

**Lemma 16**

1. \( \lim_{\lambda_2 \to 0} k_0(\lambda_2) = -\infty \)

2. \( \forall k > k_0, \quad \frac{d\lambda^k_1}{d\lambda_2}(0) = 0; \)

**Proof:**

1. It is immediate from the fact that when \( \lambda_2 \to 0 \), \( \ln(\lambda_2) \to -\infty \).

2. Since \( \delta_w > 1 \), observe that:

\[ \frac{d\lambda^k_1}{d\lambda_2}(\lambda_2) = \frac{c_4\lambda_2^{\delta_w - 1}}{k\pi + c_3 - \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \ln(\lambda_2)} + \left( \frac{c_4\lambda_2^{\delta_w - 1} \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w}}{(k\pi + c_3 - \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \ln(\lambda_2))^2} \right) \]

When \( \lambda_2 \to 0 \), the above expression tends to zero.

In a neighbourhood of the singular point \((\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (0, 0)\), the graph of \( \lambda_1 \) as function of \( \lambda_2 \) is depicted in figure 18, for different values of \( k > k_0 \). Recall that \( s \in [0, \varepsilon^*] \); in particular, the end points of the graphs coincide with the intersection of the graphs of \( \lambda^k_1(\lambda_2) \) with that of \( \lambda_1(\lambda_2) = c_4\lambda_2^{\delta_w} \) (which represents the evolution of the end point of \( s_i \) of the linear approximation of \( W^*(v) \cap H_w^{out,+} \)). When \( \lambda_2 \to 0^+ \), the equation

\[ k\pi + c_3 - \frac{\alpha_w}{E_w} \ln(\lambda_2) = 0 \]

has infinitely many solutions (one for each \( k \)). In particular:
Figure 18: Top: solid lines are the curves $(\lambda_1^k(\lambda_2), \lambda_2)$ where there is a homoclinic connection to $v$, dashed line is the limit $s = \epsilon^*$ for the linear approximation of $W^s(v) \cap H^\text{out}_w$. Bottom: Pairs of these lines delimitate a tongue where there is a periodic trajectory.

Lemma 17  For all $k$ sufficiently large, there exists $\lambda_2^*(k)$ such that

$$\lim_{\lambda_2 \to \lambda_2^*(k)} \lambda_1^k(\lambda_2) = +\infty$$

and moreover $\lim_{k \to +\infty} \lambda_2^*(k) = 0$. In other words, the graph of $\lambda_1^k(\lambda_2)$ has a vertical asymptote for $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^*(k)$.

Observing closer the bifurcation diagram of figure 18, it follows that for a fixed $\lambda_2$, there are finitely many $\lambda_1$ for which we observe homoclinic connections of $v$. We also conclude that for a fixed $\lambda_2$, there exists a $\lambda_1^*$, such that for $\lambda_1 < \lambda_1^*$, there are no more homoclinic connections.

Remark 3 Note that the eigenvalues of $v$ verify $C_v > E_v$ and consequently the spectral assumption of the attracting Shilnikov problem holds. For small variations of the parameters, the equilibria are persistent and the same conditions on the eigenvalues are satisfied.

Assertions 1. and 2. of theorem 7 follow from lemmas 16 and 17. The other assertions of theorem 7 follow from the results of Shilnikov [38], Glendinning and Sparrow [19] and Shilnikov et al [39, 40].

Corollary 18 In the bifurcation diagram $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, there are infinitely many tongues of attracting periodic trajectories accumulating on the line $\lambda_2 = 0$. These periodic trajectories bifurcate from the attracting homoclinic orbit of $v$.

It is straightforward that when $\lambda_2 \to 0$, the homoclinic orbits of $v$ accumulate on the heteroclinic connection $[v \to w]$. 
6.2 Homoclinic orbits of $w$ - A cascade of horseshoes is only a participating part!

In three-dimensions, the simplest homoclinic cycle that yield infinitely many transitions between complicated dynamics is the classical Shilnikov problem (unstable version). In this section, we prove the existence of homoclinic orbits in a neighbourhood of the ghost of the heteroclinic network $\Sigma^*$. Near these trajectories, there are infinitely many suspended horseshoes. When the vector field is perturbed, generically the homoclinic orbits are destroyed and we conjecture that persistent strange attractors might coexist. Among these sets, we are able to prove that along specific curves in the bifurcation diagram, homoclinic trajectories of $w$ exist.

Using the same argument as before, we assume the existence of two segments $r_1$ and $r_2$ (parametrized by $s$) which correspond to a linear approximation of $W^u(w) \cap H_w^\text{in}$, in a neighbourhood of the points $W^s(v) \cap W^u(w) \cap H_v^\text{out}$ ($Q_1$ and $Q_2$). The parameter $\lambda_1 > 0$ is the absolute value of the slope of $r_1$ and $r_2$; near $Q_1$, the slope is $\lambda_1$; near $Q_2$, the slope is $-\lambda_1$.

Their parametrizations are given by:

$$r_1 : \quad r_1(s) = (s, \lambda_1 s), \quad \text{for} \quad s \in [0, \varepsilon^*]$$

and

$$r_2 : \quad r_2(s) = (s, -\lambda_1 (s - \pi)), \quad \text{for} \quad s \in [\pi - \varepsilon^*, \pi].$$

As before, we have:

**Lemma 19** If $\lambda_1 \neq 0$, then $\phi_v(r_1(s))$ and $\phi_v(r_2(s))$ are disjoint logarithmic spirals in $H_v^\text{out}$ accumulating on the point $W_{loc}^u(v) \cap H_v^\text{out}$.

Observing that:

$$\phi_v(r_1(s)) = \phi_v(s, \lambda_1 s) = (c_1(\lambda_1 s)^{\lambda_v}; -g_v \ln(\lambda_1 s) + s + c_2) = (\sigma, \phi)$$

and

$$\phi_v(r_2(s)) = \phi_v(s, -\lambda_1 (s - \pi)) = (c_1(\lambda_1 (s - \pi))^{\lambda_v}; -g_v \ln(-\lambda_1 (s - \pi)) + s + c_2) = (\sigma, \phi),$$

the homoclinic orbit associated to $w$ (investigated on $H_w^\text{in}$) exists if and only if either

$$\lambda_2(w) = c_1(\lambda_1 s)^{\lambda_v} \quad \text{and} \quad s + c_2 - \left(\frac{\alpha_v}{E_v}\right) \ln(\lambda_1 s) = 2k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (6.15)$$

or

$$\lambda_2(v) = c_1(-\lambda_1 (s - \pi))^{\lambda_v} \quad \text{and} \quad s + c_2 - \left(\frac{\alpha_v}{E_v}\right) \ln(-\lambda_1 (s - \pi)) = 2k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (6.16)$$

Using the above equations, we may write the parameter $\lambda_1^k$ as function of $\lambda_2$ as either:

$$\lambda_1^k(\lambda_2) = \frac{c_1^k \lambda_2^{\frac{1}{\lambda_v}}}{2k\pi + c_2 - \frac{\alpha_v}{E_v} \ln(\lambda_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad s \in (0, \varepsilon^*)$$

or

$$\lambda_1^k(\lambda_2) = \frac{c_1^k \lambda_2^{\frac{1}{\lambda_v}}}{\pi + 2k\pi + c_2 - \frac{\alpha_v}{E_v} \ln(\lambda_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad s \in (0, \varepsilon^*).$$
The proof of theorem 8 proceeds as that of Theorem 7, except that the curves $(\lambda_1^k(\lambda_2), \lambda_2)$ are tangent to the $\lambda_1$–axis (see figure 19). It follows from results of Shilnikov [38] and Glendinning and Sparrow [19], that a horseshoe bifurcates from each homoclinic connection. In the neighbourhood of these homoclinic orbits, infinitely many periodic solutions of saddle type occur. These solutions are contained in suspended horseshoes that accumulate on the homoclinic cycle, whose dynamics is conjugated to a subshift of finite type on an infinite number of symbols. Multipulse homoclinic orbits and attracting 2-periodic solutions may unfold from the homoclinic cycles, under additional hypothesis ($E_w - 2C'_w < 0$).

**Remark 4** Besides the interest of the study of the dynamics arising in generic unfoldings of an attracting heteroclinic network, its analysis is important because in the fully non-equivariant case (at first glance) the return map seems intractable. Here we are able to predict qualitative features of the dynamics of the perturbed vector field by assuming that the perturbation is very close to the organizing center. This is an important advantage of studying systems close to symmetry.
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