

# ON $C^r$ -CLOSING FOR FLOWS ON ORIENTABLE AND NON-ORIENTABLE 2-MANIFOLDS

CARLOS GUTIERREZ AND BENITO PIRES

ABSTRACT. We provide an affirmative answer to the  $C^r$ -Closing Lemma,  $r \geq 2$ , for a large class of flows defined on every closed surface.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses the open problem  $C^r$  Closing Lemma, which can be stated as follows:

**Problem 1.1** ( $C^r$  Closing Lemma). *Let  $M$  be a compact smooth manifold,  $r \geq 2$  be an integer,  $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  be a  $C^r$  vector field on  $M$ , and  $p \in M$  be a non-wandering point of  $X$ . Does there exist  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to  $X$  having a periodic trajectory passing through  $p$ ?*

C. Pugh [21] proved the  $C^1$  Closing Lemma for flows and diffeomorphisms on manifolds. As for greater smoothness  $r \geq 2$ , the  $C^r$  Closing Lemma is an open problem even for flows on the 2-torus. Concerning flows on closed surfaces, only a few, partial results are known in the orientable case (see [4, 6, 10]). No affirmative  $C^r$ -closing results are known for flows on non-orientable surfaces. In this paper, we present a class of flows defined on every closed surface supporting non-trivial recurrence for which Problem 1.1 has an affirmative answer – see Theorem A. Notice that every closed surface distinct from the sphere, from the projective plane and from the Klein bottle (see [15]) admits flows with non-trivial recurrent trajectories (see [12]).

To achieve our results we provide a partial, positive answer to the following local version of the  $C^r$  Closing Lemma for flows on surfaces:

**Problem 1.2** (Localized  $C^r$  Closing Lemma). *Let  $M$  be a closed surface,  $r \geq 2$  be an integer,  $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  be a  $C^r$  vector field on  $M$ , and  $p \in M$  be a non-wandering point of  $X$ . For each neighborhood  $V$  of  $p$  in  $M$  and for each neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}^r(M)$ , does there exist  $Y \in \mathcal{V}$ , with  $Y - X$  supported in  $V$ , having a periodic trajectory meeting  $V$ ?*

It is obvious that if Problem 1.2 has a positive answer for some class of vector fields  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  then so does Problem 1.1, considering the same class  $\mathcal{N}$ . The approach we use to show that a flow has local  $C^r$ -closing properties is to make arbitrarily small  $C^r$ -twist-perturbations of the original flow along a transversal segment. This requires a tight control of the perturbation: it may happen that a twist-perturbation leaves the non-wandering set unchanged [11] or else collapses it into the set of singularities [4], [7]. More precisely: C. Gutierrez [7] proved that local  $C^2$ -closing is not always possible even for flows on the 2-torus; C. Carroll [4] presented a flow on the 2-torus with poor  $C^r$ -closing properties: no arbitrarily small  $C^2$ -twist-perturbation yields closing; C. Gutierrez and B. Pires [11] provided a flow on a non-orientable surface of genus four whose

non-trivial recurrent behaviour persists under a class of arbitrarily small  $C^r$ -twist-perturbations of the original flow.

Deeply related to Problem 1.1 is the Peixoto-Wallwork Conjecture that the Morse-Smale vector fields are  $C^r$ -dense on non-orientable closed surfaces, which is implied by the following open problem:

**Problem 1.3** (Weak  $C^r$  Connecting Lemma). *Let  $M$  be a non-orientable closed surface,  $r \geq 2$  be an integer, and  $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  have singularities, all of which hyperbolic. Assume that  $X$  has a non-trivial recurrent trajectory. Does there exist  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to  $X$  having one more saddle-connection than  $X$ ?*

M. Peixoto [20] gave an affirmative answer to the Weak  $C^r$  Connecting Lemma,  $r \geq 1$ , for flows on orientable closed surfaces whereas C. Pugh [22] solved the Peixoto-Wallwork Conjecture in class  $C^1$ .

To give a positive answer to the Peixoto-Wallwork Conjecture, it would be enough to prove either the  $C^r$ -Closing Lemma or the Weak  $C^r$  Connecting Lemma for the class  $\mathcal{G}^\infty(M)$  of smooth vector fields having nontrivial recurrent trajectories and finitely many singularities, all hyperbolic. However there is not a useful classification of vector fields of  $\mathcal{G}^\infty(M)$ . Surprisingly, this is not contradictory with the fact that the class  $\mathcal{F}^\infty(M)$  of smooth vector fields having nontrivial recurrent trajectories and finitely many singularities, all locally topologically equivalent to hyperbolic ones, is essentially classified. The vector fields that are constructed to classify  $\mathcal{F}^\infty(M)$  have flat singularities [5]. The answer to either of the following questions is unknown (see [16] for related results):

- (1) Given  $X \in \mathcal{F}^\infty(M)$ , is there a vector field  $Y \in \mathcal{G}^\infty(M)$  topologically equivalent to  $X$ ?
- (2) Given  $X \in \mathcal{G}^\infty(M)$  which is dissipative at its saddles, is there  $Y \in \mathcal{G}^\infty(M)$  topologically equivalent to  $X$  but which has positive divergence at some of its saddles?

Considering vector fields of  $\mathcal{G}^\infty(M)$  which are dissipative at their saddles, their existence in a broad context was considered by C. Gutierrez [8]. The motivation of this work was to find a  $C^r$ -Closing Lemma for all vector fields of  $\mathcal{G}^\infty(M)$  whose existence is ensured by the work done in [8]. In this paper we have accomplished this aim. We do not know any other existence result improving that of [8].

## 2. STATEMENT OF THE RESULTS

Throughout this paper, we shall denote by  $M$  a closed Riemannian surface, that is, a compact, connected, boundaryless,  $C^\infty$ , Riemannian 2-manifold and by  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  the open subspace of  $\mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  formed by the  $C^r$  vector fields on  $M$  having singularities (at least one), all of which hyperbolic. When  $M$  is neither the torus nor the Klein bottle,  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  is also dense in  $\mathfrak{X}^r(M)$ . To each  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  we shall associate its flow  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ . Given a transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and an arc length parametrization  $\theta : I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Sigma$  of  $\Sigma$ , we shall perform the identification  $\Sigma = \theta(I) = I$ , where  $I$  is a subinterval of  $\mathbb{R}$ . In this way, subintervals of  $I$  will denote subsegments of  $\Sigma$ . If  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$  on  $\Sigma$  and  $x$  belongs to the domain

$\text{dom}(P)$  of  $P$ , we shall denote:

$$DP(x) = D(\theta^{-1} \circ P \circ \theta)(\theta^{-1}(x)).$$

Notice that  $DP(x)$  does not depend on the particular arc length parametrization  $\theta$  of  $\Sigma$  and may take positive and negative values. Given  $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , we let

$$\mathcal{O}_n^-(\partial\Sigma) = \{P^{-i}(\partial\Sigma) : 0 \leq i \leq n-1\},$$

where  $\partial\Sigma$  denotes the set of endpoints of  $\Sigma$  and  $P^0$  is the identity map. In this way, the  $n$ -th iterate  $P^n$  is differentiable on  $\text{dom}(P^n) \setminus \mathcal{O}_n^-(\partial\Sigma)$ .

**Definition 2.1** (Infinitesimal contraction). *Let  $\Sigma$  be a transversal segment to a vector field  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and let  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  be the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$ . Given  $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $0 < \kappa < 1$ , we say that  $P^n$  is an infinitesimal  $\kappa$ -contraction if  $|DP^n(x)| < \kappa$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(P^n) \setminus \mathcal{O}_n^-(\partial\Sigma)$ .*

We say that  $N \subset M$  is a *quasiminimal set* if  $N$  is the topological closure of a non-trivial recurrent trajectory of  $X$ .

**Definition 2.2.** *We say that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at a subset  $V$  of  $M$  if for every non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in V$ , for every  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$  and for every transversal segment  $\Sigma_1$  to  $X$  passing through  $p$ , there exists a subsegment  $\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  induced by  $X$  is an infinitesimal  $\kappa$ -contraction.*

Given a transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  passing through a non-trivial recurrent point of  $X$ , we let  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  denote the set of Borel probability measures on  $\Sigma$  invariant by the forward Poincaré Map  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  induced by  $X$ . We say that a Borel subset  $B \subset \Sigma$  is of *total measure* if  $\nu(B) = 1$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Lyapunov exponents). *We say that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  has negative Lyapunov exponents at a subset  $V$  of  $M$  if for each non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in V$  and for each transversal segment  $\Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$ , there exist a subsegment  $\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma_1$  containing  $p$  and a total measure set  $W \subset \Omega_+$  such that for all  $x \in W$ ,*

$$\chi(x) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |DP^n(x)| < 0,$$

where  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$  and  $\Omega_+ = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{dom}(P^n)$ .

Now we state our results.

**Theorem A.** *Suppose that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , has the contraction property at a quasiminimal set  $N$ . For each  $p \in N$ , there exists  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to  $X$  having a periodic trajectory passing through  $p$ .*

**Theorem B.** *Suppose that  $X$  has divergence less or equal to zero at its saddle-points and that  $X$  has negative Lyapunov exponents at a quasiminimal set  $N$ . Then  $X$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $N$ .*

**Theorem C.** *Suppose that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , has the contraction property at a quasiminimal set  $N$ . There exists  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to  $X$  having one more saddle-connection than  $X$ .*

### 3. PRELIMINARES

A transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  passes through  $p \in M$  if  $p \in \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$ . Given  $p \in M$ , we shall denote by  $\gamma_p$  the trajectory of  $X$  that contains  $p$ . We may write  $\gamma_p = \gamma_p^- \cup \gamma_p^+$  as the union of its negative and positive semitrajectories, respectively. We shall denote by  $\alpha(p)$  or  $\alpha(\gamma_p)$  (resp.  $\omega(p)$  or  $\omega(\gamma_p)$ ) the  $\alpha$ -limit set (resp.  $\omega$ -limit set) of  $\gamma_p$ . The trajectory  $\gamma_p$  is *recurrent* if it is either  $\alpha$ -*recurrent* (i.e.  $\gamma_p \subset \alpha(\gamma_p)$ ) or  $\omega$ -*recurrent* (i.e.  $\gamma_p \subset \omega(\gamma_p)$ ). A recurrent trajectory is either *trivial* (a singularity or a periodic trajectory) or *non-trivial*. A point  $p \in M$  is *recurrent* (resp. *non-trivial recurrent*,  *$\omega$ -recurrent*,...) according to whether  $\gamma_p$  is recurrent (resp. non-trivial recurrent,  $\omega$ -recurrent...). We say that  $N \subset M$  is a *quasiminimal set* if  $N$  is the topological closure of a non-trivial recurrent trajectory of  $X$ . There are only finitely many quasiminimal sets  $\{N_j\}_{j=1}^m$ , all of which are invariant. Furthermore, every non-trivial recurrent trajectory is a dense subset of exactly one quasiminimal set.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $N$  be a quasiminimal set of  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ . Suppose that for some non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in N$ , there exist a transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X$  passing through  $p$ ,  $(\kappa, n) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{N}$ , and  $L > 0$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  induced by  $X$  has the following properties:*

- (a) *The  $n$ -th iterate  $P^n$  is an infinitesimal  $\kappa$ -contraction;*
- (b)  $\sup \{|DP(x)| : x \in \text{dom}(P)\} \leq L$ .

*Then  $X$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $N$ .*

*Proof.* We claim that

- (a) for every  $K \in (0, 1)$  there exists a subsegment  $\Sigma_K$  of  $\Sigma$  passing through  $p$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $P_K : \Sigma_K \rightarrow \Sigma_K$  induced by  $X$  is an infinitesimal  $K$ -contraction.

In fact, let  $L_0 = \max\{1, L^{n-1}\}$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $L_0 \kappa^d < K$ . We shall proceed considering only the case in which  $p$  is nontrivial  $\alpha$ -recurrent. We can take a subsegment  $\Sigma_K$  of  $\Sigma$  passing through  $p$  such that  $\Sigma_K \subset \text{dom}(P^{-dn})$  and  $\Sigma_K, P^{-1}(\Sigma_K), \dots, P^{-dn}(\Sigma_K)$  are pairwise disjoint. Hence, if  $P_K : \Sigma_K \rightarrow \Sigma_K$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$ , then, for all  $q \in \text{dom}(P_K)$ , there exists  $m(q) > dn$  such that  $P_K(q) = P^{m(q)}(q)$ . In this way, since the function  $m : q \mapsto m(q)$  is locally constant,  $|DP_K(q)| = |DP^{m(q)}(q)| \leq L_0 \kappa^d < K$  for all  $q \in \text{dom}(P_K) \setminus P_K^{-1}(\partial\Sigma_K)$ . This proves (a).

Let  $q \in N$  be a nontrivial recurrent point. Now we shall shift the property obtained in (a) to any segment  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  transversal to  $X$  passing through  $q$ . We shall only consider the case in which  $q$  is non-trivial  $\alpha$ -recurrent and so  $\gamma_q^-$  is dense in  $N$ .

Let  $K \in (0, 1)$  and take  $p_1 \in (\gamma_q^- \cap \Sigma_{K/2}) \setminus \{p\}$ . Select a subsegment  $\Sigma_1$  of  $\Sigma_{K/2}$  passing through  $p_1$  and a subsegment  $\tilde{\Sigma}_K$  of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  passing through  $q$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $T : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_K$  is a diffeomorphism and, for all  $x \in \Sigma_1$ ,  $y \in \tilde{\Sigma}_K$ ,  $|DT(x)DT^{-1}(y)| < 2$ . This implies that the forward Poincaré Map  $\tilde{P}_K : \tilde{\Sigma}_K \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_K$  will be an infinitesimal  $K$ -contraction because

$$|D\tilde{P}_K(y)| = |D(T \circ P_1 \circ T^{-1})(y)| \leq 2|DP_1(z)| < K,$$

where  $P_1 : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$  and  $T(z) = y$ . □

**Definition 3.2** (flow box). *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and let  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$  be disjoint, compact transversal segments to  $X$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $T : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_2$  induced by  $X$  is a diffeomorphism. For each  $p \in \Sigma_1$ , let  $\tau(p) = \min \{t > 0 : X_t(p) \in \Sigma_2\}$ . The compact region  $\{X_t(p) : p \in \Sigma_1, 0 \leq t \leq \tau(p)\}$  is called a flow box of  $X$ .*

**Theorem 3.3** (flow box theorem). *Let  $U \subset M$  be an open set,  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(U)$ ,  $\Sigma \subset U$  be a compact transversal segment to  $X$  and  $p \in \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$ . There exist  $\epsilon > 0$  arbitrarily small such that  $B = B(\Sigma, \epsilon) = \{X_t(p) : t \in [-\epsilon, 0], p \in \Sigma\}$  is a flow box of  $X$ , and a  $C^r$ -diffeomorphism  $h : B \rightarrow [-\epsilon, 0] \times [a, b]$  such that  $h(p) = (0, 0)$ ,  $h(\Sigma) = \{0\} \times [a, b]$ ,  $h|_\Sigma$  is an isometry and  $h_*(X|_B) = (1, 0)|_{[-\epsilon, 0] \times [a, b]}$ , where  $a < 0 < b$ ,  $(1, 0)$  is the unit horizontal vector field in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and  $h_*(X|_B)$  is the pushforward of the vector field  $X|_B$  by  $h$ . The map  $h$  is denominated a  $C^r$ -rectifying diffeomorphism for  $B$ .*

*Proof.* See Palis and de Melo [18, Tubular Flow Theorem, p. 40]. □

**Definition 3.4.** *Given a compact transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $p \in \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  small, we say that  $B(\Sigma, \epsilon) = \{X_t(p) : t \in [-\epsilon, 0], p \in \Sigma\}$  is a flow box of  $X$  ending at  $\Sigma$  or at  $p$ . We say that  $B(\Sigma, \epsilon)$  is arbitrarily thin if  $\epsilon$  can be taken arbitrarily small and we say that  $B(\Sigma, \epsilon)$  is arbitrarily small if  $B(\Sigma, \epsilon)$  can be taken contained in any neighborhood of  $p$ .*

Next lemma will be used in the proofs of Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 6.4.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Suppose that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at a non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in M$  of  $X$ . There exist an arbitrarily small flow box  $B_0$  of  $X$  ending at  $p$  and an arbitrarily small neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}_0$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  such that every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$ , with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$ , has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $B_0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Sigma_1 = (a_1, b_1)$  be a transversal segment to  $X$  passing through  $p$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $P_1 : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$  induced by  $X$  is an infinitesimal  $\kappa$ -contraction for some  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $[a, b] \subset (a_1, b_1)$  be a compact subsegment passing through  $p$  and let  $B_0 = B([a, b], \epsilon)$  be a flow box. There exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}_1$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  such that for every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_1$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  we have that  $B_0$  is still a flow box of  $Z$ . In particular, for every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_1$  such that  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$ ,  $\text{dom}(P_Z) = \text{dom}(P_1)$ , where  $P_Z$  denotes the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $Z$  on  $(a_1, b_1)$ . Given  $\delta > 0$  satisfying  $0 < \kappa + \delta < 1$ , by the continuity of the map  $Z \mapsto DP_Z$ , there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{V}_1$  of  $X$  such that for every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  we have that  $|DP_Z(w)| < |DP_1(w)| + \delta < \kappa + \delta < 1$  for all  $w \in \text{dom}(P_1)$ . Hence  $P_Z$  is an infinitesimal  $(\kappa + \delta)$ -contraction. The rest of the proof follows as in the proof of Proposition 3.1 by recalling that the trajectory of every non-trivial recurrent point of  $Z$  in  $B_0$  meets  $(a_1, b_1)$ . □

#### 4. TOPOLOGICAL DYNAMICS

Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ . We say that  $N \subset M$  is an *invariant set* of  $X$  if  $X_t(N) \subset N$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . We say that  $K \subset N$  is a *minimal set* of  $X$  if  $K$  is compact, non-empty and invariant, and there does

not exist any proper subset of  $K$  with these properties. We shall need the following lemmas from topological dynamics.

As every vector field of  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  has singularities, the Denjoy–Schwartz Theorem (see [23] or [24, pp. 39–40]) implies that

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ . Then any minimal set of  $X$  is either a singularity or a periodic trajectory.*

The proof of the following lemma can be found in [17, Theorem 2.6.1].

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and let  $p \in M$ . Then  $\omega(p)$  (resp.  $\alpha(p)$ ) is exactly one of the following sets: a singularity, a periodic trajectory, an attracting graph, or a quasiminimal set.*

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $N$  be a quasiminimal set of  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ . Then every trajectory of  $N$  is either a saddle–point or a saddle–connection or else a non–trivial recurrent trajectory dense in  $N$  (which may possibly be a saddle–separatrix.)*

*Proof.* See [17, Theorem 2.4.2, pp. 31–32]. □

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , and let  $N$  be a quasiminimal set of  $X$ . Then there exist saddle–separatrices  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \subset N$  such that  $\alpha(\sigma_1) = N = \omega(\sigma_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Firstly let us prove that  $X$  has singularities in  $N$  and that all of them are hyperbolic saddle–points. If this was not the case, then  $N$  would contain no singularities and, by Lemma 4.3,  $N$  would be a minimal set of  $X$  contradicting Lemma 4.1.

We shall only prove that  $N$  contains dense unstable separatrices. Suppose by contradiction that

- (a) every unstable separatrix  $\sigma \subset N$  is a saddle–connection.

Take a non-trivial  $\omega$ -recurrent semitrajectory  $\gamma^+$  in  $N$  (there is a continuum of such trajectories in  $N$ , see [1, Theorem 2.1, p. 57]). We say that a region  $R \subset M$  is a  $\gamma^+$ -flow-box if there exists a homeomorphism  $h : [-1, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow R$  such that

- (b1) for all  $y \in (0, 1]$ ,  $h([-1, 1] \times \{y\})$  is an arc of trajectory of  $X$  starting at the point  $h((-1, y))$  and ending at the point  $h((1, y))$ . Also,  $h((0, 0))$  is a saddle–point and  $h([-1, 0] \times \{0\})$  (resp.  $h((0, 1] \times \{0\})$ ) is a stable (resp. an unstable) half–separatrix of  $h((0, 0))$ ;
- (b2)  $h(\{-1\} \times [0, 1])$  (resp.  $h(\{1\} \times [0, 1])$ ) is a transversal segment to  $X$  called the entering edge (resp. exiting edge) of  $R$ . Moreover,  $\gamma^+ \cap h(\{-1\} \times [0, 1])$  accumulates at the point  $h((-1, 0))$ .

As  $X$  has only finitely many unstable separatrices, by using (a) we shall be able to find a sequence  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n$  of  $\gamma^+$ -flow-boxes, whose interiors are pairwise disjoint, such that, for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ , the exiting edge of  $R_i$  is the equal to the entering edge of  $R_{i+1}$  and the exiting edge of  $R_n$  is contained in the entering edge of  $R_1$ . In this way, the interior of  $\cup_{i=1}^n R_i$  is an open annulus eventually trapping the semitrajectory  $\gamma^+$  which so cannot be dense. This contradiction proves the lemma. □

**Definition 4.5.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and let  $\sigma$  be a non–trivial recurrent unstable separatrix of a saddle–point  $s$ . We say that a transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -adapted if  $\sigma$  (oriented as starting at  $s$ ) intersects  $\Sigma$  infinitely many times and the first two of such intersections are precisely the endpoints of  $\Sigma$ .*

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $\sigma$  be a non-trivial recurrent unstable saddle-separatrix of  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ . Then every transversal segment  $\Sigma_1 = (a_1, b_1)$  to  $X$  intersecting  $\sigma$  contains a compact subsegment  $[a, b] \subset (a_1, b_1)$  which is  $\sigma$ -adapted.*

*Proof.* Orient  $\sigma$  so that it starts at the saddle-point  $\alpha(\sigma)$ . Let  $p_1, p_2, p_3$  be the first three points at which  $\sigma$  intersects  $(a_1, b_1)$  and denoted in such a way that  $a_1 < p_1 < p_2 < p_3 < b_1$ . If  $\sigma$  accumulates at  $p_2$  from above (resp. from below) then  $[p_2, p_3]$  (resp.  $[p_1, p_2]$ ) will be  $\sigma$ -adapted.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $\Sigma = [a, b]$  be a transversal segment to  $X$  passing through a non-trivial recurrent point of  $X$  and  $P : [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b]$  be the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$ . Then  $\text{dom}(P) \setminus \{a, b\}$  is properly contained in  $(a, b)$  and consists of finitely many open intervals such that if  $s \notin \{a, b\}$  is an endpoint of one of these intervals then the positive semitrajectory  $\gamma_s^+$  starting at  $s$  goes directly to a saddle-point without returning to  $[a, b]$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of this lemma can be found in Palis and de Melo [18, pp. 144–146] or in Peixoto [20].  $\square$

### 5. $C^r$ -CONNECTING RESULTS

**Definition 5.1.** *Given  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and a flow box  $B$  of  $X$ , we shall denote by  $\mathcal{A}(B, X)$  the set of the vector fields  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  supported in  $B$  such that for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $B$  is still a flow box of  $X + \lambda Y$ .*

In next lemma we assume that the domain of the forward Poincaré Map  $P$  is non-empty. In the applications of Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 5.3,  $p$  will be a non-trivial recurrent point.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  be smooth in a neighborhood  $V_0$  of a point  $p \in M$  and let  $\Sigma = [a, b] \subset V_0$ , with  $a < 0 < b$ , be a transversal segment to  $X$  passing through  $p = 0$ . There exist an arbitrarily thin flow box  $B = B([a, b], \epsilon)$  contained in  $V_0$ , and  $Y \in \mathcal{A}(B, X) \subset \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to the zero-vector-field such that for each  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  the forward Poincaré Map  $P_\lambda : [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b]$  induced by  $X + \lambda Y$  is of the form  $P_\lambda = E_\lambda \circ P$ , where  $P = P_0$ ,  $E_0$  is the identity map,  $c = \min\{-a, b\}$ ,  $\delta \in (0, c/8)$ , and  $E_\lambda : [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b]$  is a  $C^r$  diffeomorphism satisfying the following conditions:*

$$(1) \quad E_\lambda(x) - x = \lambda\delta, \quad x \in [-4\delta, 4\delta],$$

$$(2) \quad E_\lambda(x) - x \leq \lambda\delta, \quad x \in [a, b].$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.3, there exist  $\epsilon > 0$  arbitrarily small, a flow box  $B = B([a, b], \epsilon) \subset V_0$ , and a  $C^{r+1}$ -rectifying diffeomorphism  $h : B \rightarrow [-\epsilon, 0] \times [a, b]$ . Let  $\phi_1 : [-\epsilon, 0] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $\phi_2 : [a, b] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be smooth functions such that  $(\phi_1)^{-1}(1) = [-8\epsilon/10, -2\epsilon/10]$ ,  $(\phi_1)^{-1}(0) = [-\epsilon, 0] \setminus [-9\epsilon/10, -\epsilon/10]$ ,  $(\phi_2)^{-1}(1) = [-6\delta, 6\delta]$ ,  $(\phi_2)^{-1}(0) = [a, b] \setminus [-7\delta, 7\delta]$ . Let  $Y_0 : [-\epsilon, 0] \times [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be the smooth vector field which at each  $(x, y) \in [-\epsilon, 0] \times [a, b]$  takes the value:

$$Y_0(x, y) = (1, 0) + \eta\phi_1(x)\phi_2(y)(0, \delta),$$

where  $\eta > 0$  is a positive constant such that the positive semitrajectory  $\gamma_{(-\epsilon, -4\delta)}^+$  of  $Y_0$  starting at  $(-\epsilon, -4\delta)$  intersects  $\{0\} \times [a, b]$  at the point  $(0, -3\delta)$ . By construction, for each  $y \in [-4\delta, 4\delta]$ , the positive semitrajectory  $\gamma_{(-\epsilon, y)}^+$  of  $Y_0$  starting at  $(-\epsilon, y)$  is an upward shift of  $\gamma_{(-\epsilon, -4\delta)}^+$  and so

intersects  $\{0\} \times [a, b]$  at  $(0, y + \delta)$ . Define  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  to be a vector field supported in  $B$  such that  $Y|_B = (h^{-1})_*(Y_0)$ . Accordingly,

$$(X + \lambda Y)|_B = (h^{-1})_*((1, 0) + \lambda Y_0).$$

Recall that by Theorem 3.3, the map  $h$  takes isometrically  $[a, b]$  onto  $\{0\} \times [a, b]$ . By construction, the one-parameter family of vector fields  $X + \lambda Y$  has all the required properties.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $\sigma$  be a non-trivial recurrent unstable saddle-separatrix,  $\Sigma = [a, b]$  be a  $\sigma$ -adapted transversal segment to  $X$ ,  $B = B([a, b], \epsilon)$  be a flow box of  $X$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{A}(B, X)$ . If  $q \in [a, b]$  is the first intersection of  $\sigma$  with  $[a, b]$  then either of the following alternatives happens:*

(a) *for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $[a, b]$  intersects a saddle-connection of  $X + \lambda Y$  or,*

(b) *for every  $(\lambda, n) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{N}$ , the point  $q$  belongs to  $\text{dom}(P_\lambda^n)$  and  $P_\lambda^n(q)$  depends continuously on  $\lambda$ . In this case, for each  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , the sequence  $\{P_\lambda^n(q)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  accumulates in a point of  $[a, b]$  belonging, with respect to  $X + \lambda Y$ , to either a closed trajectory or to a non-trivial recurrent trajectory, where  $P_\lambda : [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b]$  denotes the forward Poincaré map induced by  $X + \lambda Y$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that (a) does not happen. Let us prove that then (b) occurs. Firstly we have to show that for every  $(\lambda, n) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{N}$ , the point  $q$  belongs to  $\text{dom}(P_\lambda^n)$ . Suppose that this does not happen. So for some  $(\lambda_1, n_1) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$ , we have that  $q \in \text{dom}(P_{\lambda_1}^{n_1-1})$  for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , and  $q \notin \text{dom}(P_{\lambda_1}^{n_1})$ . Hence, we have that  $P_{\lambda_1}^{n_1-1}(q)$  does not belong to  $\text{dom}(P_{\lambda_1}) = \text{dom}(P_0)$  whereas  $P_0^{n_1-1}(q) \in \text{dom}(P_0)$ . By construction,  $P_{\lambda_1}^{n_1-1}(q)$  depends continuously on  $\lambda$ , and so for some  $\lambda_2 \in [0, \lambda_1]$ ,  $P_{\lambda_2}^{n_1-1}(q)$  intersects the boundary of  $\text{dom}(P_0)$ . By Lemma 4.7,  $X + \lambda_2 Y$  has a saddle-connection intersecting  $[a, b]$ , which contradicts the initial assumption. Therefore, the first part of (b) is proved. The second part of (b) follows from Lemma 4.2 since the existence of an attracting graph intersecting  $[a, b]$  would imply (a).  $\square$

In the proof of next lemma we shall use the fact that a transversal segment  $\Sigma = [a, b]$  to  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  may also be represented by  $[a + s, b + s]$ , for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Henceforth, if  $A$  is a subset of  $M$  then  $\overline{A}$  will denote its topological closure.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , be smooth in a neighborhood  $V_0$  of a non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in M$ . Assume that  $X$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $p$ . Given a neighborhood  $V$  of  $p$ , there exist a flow box  $B \subset V$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{A}(B, X)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to the zero-vector-field such that for some  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $X + \lambda Y$  has a saddle-connection meeting  $B$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.4, there exist non-trivial recurrent saddle-separatrices  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  such that  $\omega(\sigma_2) \cap \alpha(\sigma_1) = \overline{\gamma_p}$ . Let  $\Sigma_1 = [a_1, b_1] \subset V_0 \cap V$  be a transversal segment to  $X$  passing through  $p$  such that  $P_{\Sigma_1}$  is an infinitesimal  $\kappa$ -contraction for some  $0 < \kappa < 0.1$ . By Lemma 4.6, there exists a  $\sigma_2$ -adapted subsegment  $\Sigma = [a, b] \subset [a_1, b_1]$ . Let  $\overline{p} \in (a, b)$  be the first intersection of  $\sigma_1$  with  $(a, b)$ . Accordingly,  $\overline{p}$  is a non-trivial recurrent point. Modulo shifting the interval  $[a_1, b_1]$ , we may assume that  $a < 0 < b$  and  $\overline{p} = 0$ . Let  $B = B([a, b], \epsilon) \subset V_0 \cap V$  be a flow box for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . By Lemma 5.2, there exists  $Y \in \mathcal{A}(B, X)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to the zero-vector-field such that the forward Poincaré Map  $P_\lambda = E_\lambda \circ P$  induced by  $X + \lambda Y$  on  $[a, b]$  has the properties (1) and (2). We shall consider only the



case in which 0 is an accumulation point of  $\sigma_2 \cap [a, 0)$ . Let  $q \in \sigma_2 \cap [a, b]$  be the first intersection of  $\sigma_2$  with  $[a, b]$ .

Suppose by contradiction that, for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $X + \lambda Y$  has no saddle-connections. Then by Theorem 5.3, for all  $(\lambda, n) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{N}$ , the point  $q$  belongs to  $\text{dom}(P_\lambda^n)$  and  $P_\lambda^n(q)$  depends continuously on  $\lambda$ . By (2) of Lemma 5.2 and by proceeding inductively, we may see that, for all integer  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$|P \circ (E_\lambda \circ P)^{n-1}(q) - P^n(q)| \leq \kappa\delta(1 + \kappa + \dots + \kappa^{n-2}) \leq \frac{\kappa\delta}{1 - \kappa}.$$

As 0 is an accumulation point of  $\sigma_2 \cap [a, 0)$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $P^N(q) \in [-\kappa\delta, 0]$ . Therefore,

$$P \circ (E_1 \circ P)^{N-1}(q) \geq P^N(q) - \frac{\kappa\delta}{1 - \kappa} \geq -\kappa\delta - \frac{\kappa\delta}{1 - \kappa} \geq -3\kappa\delta.$$

Hence, by (1) of Lemma 5.2 and by the fact that  $0 < \kappa < 0.1$ ,

$$(E_1 \circ P)^N(q) = E_1 \circ (P \circ (E_1 \circ P)^{N-1})(q) = P \circ (E_1 \circ P)^{N-1}(q) + \delta \geq -3\kappa\delta + \delta > 0.$$

This implies that there exists  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  such that  $P_\lambda^N(q) = (E_\lambda \circ P)^N(q) = 0$  (see (b) of Theorem 5.3). That is,  $X + \lambda Y$  has a saddle-connection passing through 0. This contradiction proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** *Suppose that  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , has the infinitesimal contraction property at a non-trivial recurrent point  $p$ . Then, given neighborhoods  $V$  of  $p$  in  $M$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}^r(M)$ , there exist  $Z \in \mathcal{V}$ , with  $Z - X$  supported in  $V$ , having either a periodic trajectory meeting  $V$  or a saddle-connection meeting  $V$ .*

*Proof.* Let be given neighborhoods  $V$  of  $p$  in  $M$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ . By Lemma 3.5, there exist a flow box  $B_0 \subset V$  and a neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{V}$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  such that every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$ , with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$ , has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $B_0$ . By the proof of Lemma 3.5 and by Lemma 4.6, we may assume that  $B_0 = B(\Sigma, \epsilon)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a  $\sigma$ -adapted transversal segment to  $X$  for some non-trivial recurrent unstable saddle-separatrix  $\sigma$ . By shrinking  $\mathcal{V}_0$  if necessary, we may assume that for every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  we have that  $Z - X \in \mathcal{A}(B, X)$ . Suppose, by contradiction, that every vector field in  $\mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  has neither periodic trajectories meeting  $B_0$  nor saddle-connections meeting  $B_0$ . We claim that, under these assumptions, every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  has a non-trivial recurrent point in the interior of  $B_0$ . Indeed, by taking  $\lambda = 1$  in (b) of Theorem 5.3, we get that every  $Z = X + (Z - X) \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  has a non-trivial recurrent point intersecting the boundary of  $B_0$ . Since  $B_0$  is still a flow box of  $Z$ , we have that the interior of  $B_0$  has non-trivial recurrent points of  $Z$ . This proves the claim. Now let  $Z_1 \in \mathcal{V}_0$  be a  $C^r$  vector field which is smooth in  $B_0$  and is such that  $Z_1 - X$  supported in  $B_0$ . By the claim,  $Z_1$  has a non-trivial recurrent point  $p_1$  in the interior of  $B_0$ , and  $Z_1$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $B_0$ . By Lemma 5.4, there exist a flow box  $B \subset V$  and  $Z_2 \in \mathcal{V}_0$ , with  $Z_2 - X$  supported in  $B$ , having a saddle-connection meeting  $B$ . This contradiction finishes the proof.  $\square$

6.  $C^r$ -CLOSING RESULTS

An *interval exchange transformation* or simply an *iet* is an injective map  $E : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  of the unit circle, differentiable everywhere except possibly at finitely many points and such that for all  $x \in \text{dom}(E)$  (its domain of definition),  $|DE(x)| = 1$ . The trajectory of  $E$  passing through  $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  is the set  $O(x) = \{E^n(x) : n \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } x \in \text{dom}(E^n)\}$ . We say that  $E$  is *minimal* if  $O(x)$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ . Given a transversal circle  $C$  to  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ , we say that the forward Poincaré Map  $P : C \rightarrow C$  is *topologically semiconjugate* to an iet  $E : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  if there is a monotone continuous map  $h : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  of degree one such that  $E \circ h(x) = h \circ P(x)$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(P)$ .

We shall need the following structure theorem due to Gutierrez [5]. We should remark that in this theorem below, the item (d) although not explicitly stated in [5] follows from the proof given therein and from the fact that  $X$  has finitely many singularities.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ . The topological closure of the non-trivial recurrent trajectories of  $X$  determines finitely many quasiminimal sets  $N_1, N_2, \dots, N_m$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , there exists a transversal circle  $C_i$  to  $X$  intersecting every non-trivial recurrent trajectory of  $X|_{N_i}$  such that if  $P_i : C_i \rightarrow C_i$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$  on  $C_i$  then:*

- (a) *Either  $N_i \cap C_i = C_i$  or  $N_i \cap C_i$  is a Cantor set;*
- (b)  *$N_j \cap C_i = \emptyset$ , for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, m\}$ ;*
- (c)  *$P_i$  is topologically semiconjugate to a minimal interval exchange transformation  $E_i : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ ;*
- (d) *For each  $q \in C_i$ ,  $\gamma_q \cap C_i$  is an infinite set.*

We call the circle  $C_i$  a *special transverse circle* for  $N_i$ .

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and let  $N$  be a quasiminimal set. Given a transversal segment  $\Sigma_1$  passing through a non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in N$ , there exists a subsegment  $\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$  such that if  $z \in \Sigma$  then either  $\alpha(z) = N$  or  $\omega(z) = N$ . In particular, either  $z \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{dom}(P^n)$  or  $z \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{dom}(P^{-n})$ , where  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be a special transversal circle for  $N$ . There exist a subsegment  $\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$  and a subsegment  $\Gamma$  of  $C$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $T : \Sigma \rightarrow \Gamma$  induced by  $X$  is a diffeomorphism. Since  $C$  is free of finite trajectories (by (d) of Theorem 6.1), so is  $\Sigma$ . Hence, by Lemma 4.2, either  $\alpha(z)$  or  $\omega(z)$  is a quasiminimal set, which by (b) of Theorem 6.1, has to be  $N$ . □

**Proposition 6.3.** *Suppose that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at a non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in M$ . There exists an arbitrarily small flow box  $B_0$  ending at  $p$  and an arbitrarily small neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}_0$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  such that either:*

- (i) *some  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  has a periodic trajectory meeting  $B_0$  or,*
- (ii) *every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  has a non-trivial recurrent point in the interior of  $B_0$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 6.2, given a transversal segment  $\Sigma_1$  to  $X$  passing through  $p$ , there exists a subsegment  $\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$  such that for every  $z \in \Sigma$ , either  $\alpha(z) = N$  or  $\omega(z) = N$ , where  $N = \overline{\gamma}_p$ . By taking a subsegment of  $\Sigma$  if necessary, we may assume that the forward Poincaré Map  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  induced by  $X$  is an infinitesimal  $\kappa$ -contraction for some  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ .

We claim that  $z \in \Sigma \setminus \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{dom}(P^n)$  if and only if  $\omega(z)$  is a saddle-point. Indeed, if  $z \in \Sigma \setminus \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{dom}(P^n)$  then there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $z \in \text{dom}(P^m)$  but  $z \notin \text{dom}(P^{m+1})$ . Hence,  $P^m(z) \notin \text{dom}(P)$  and by Lemma 4.7, either  $\omega(z)$  is a saddle-point or  $P^m(z)$  belongs to the open set  $\Sigma \setminus \text{dom}(P)$ . In this last case, there exists a subsegment  $I \subset \Sigma$  containing  $z$  such that  $P^m(I) \subset \Sigma \setminus \text{dom}(P)$  and  $I \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{dom}(P^{-n})$  (by the first part of this proof). Of course, this is impossible since  $P^{-1}$  has a uniformly expanding behaviour and  $\Sigma$  has finite length. This proves the claim.

In particular, we have that  $\text{dom}(P)$  is the whole transversal segment  $\Sigma$  but finitely many points. Let  $B_0 = B(\Sigma, \epsilon)$  be a flow box and let  $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  be a neighborhood of  $X$  such that if  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  and  $Z - X$  is supported in  $B_0$  then  $B_0$  is still a flow box of  $Z$  and so  $\text{dom}(P_Z) = \text{dom}(P)$ , where  $P_Z$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $Z$  on  $\Sigma$ . Hence, for every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  such that  $Z - X$  is supported in  $B_0$ ,  $\text{dom}(P_Z)$  is the whole transversal segment but finitely many points whose positive trajectories go directly to saddle-points. Since there are only finitely many saddle-points, we have that for each  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  such that  $Z - X$  is supported in  $B_0$ , there exists a countable subset  $D$  of  $\Sigma$  such that for every  $z \in \Sigma \setminus D$  the positive semitrajectory of  $Z$  starting at  $z$  intersects  $\Sigma$  infinitely many times. By Lemma 4.2,  $\omega(z)$  is either a recurrent trajectory intersecting  $B_0$  or an attracting graph intersecting  $B_0$ . In the second case, an arbitrarily small  $C^r$ -perturbation of  $Z$  supported in  $B_0$  yields a vector field  $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{V}_0$  having a periodic trajectory meeting  $B_0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 6.4** (Localized  $C^r$ -Closing Lemma). *Suppose that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , has the contraction property at a non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in M$  of  $X$ . Given neighborhoods  $V$  of  $p$  in  $M$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $X$  in  $\mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ , there exists  $Y \in \mathcal{V}$ , with  $Y - X$  supported in  $V$ , such that  $Y$  has a periodic trajectory meeting  $V$ .*

*Proof.* Assume by contradiction that no vector field  $Y \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $V$  has a periodic trajectory meeting  $V$ . By Proposition 6.3 and by Lemma 3.5, there exist a flow box  $B_0 \subset V$  and a neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{V}$  of  $X$  such that every  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $B_0$  and a non-trivial recurrent point in  $\text{int}(B_0)$ , the interior of  $B_0$ . Note that every vector field  $Z \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z - X$  supported in  $B_0$  has at most  $4N_s$  saddle-connections, where  $N_s$  is the number of saddle-points of  $X$ . Therefore, the proof will be finished if we construct a sequence  $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^{4N_s+1}$  of vector fields in  $\mathcal{V}_0$  such that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $Z_n - X$  is supported in  $B_0$  and  $Z_{n+1}$  has one more saddle-connection than  $Z_n$ . Let us proceed with such a construction. Let  $p_0 \in \text{int}(B_0)$  be a non-trivial recurrent point of  $Z_0 = X$ . By Theorem 5.5, there exist an open set  $V_1 \subset B_0$  and  $Z_1 \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z_1 - X$  supported in  $V_1$  having a saddle-connection  $\sigma_1$  meeting  $V_1$ . By the above,  $Z_1$  has also a non-trivial recurrent point  $p_1 \in \text{int}(B_0)$ . Now we may repeat the reasoning. By Theorem 5.5, there exist an open set  $V_2 \subset B_0 \setminus \sigma_1$  and  $Z_2 \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z_2 - X$  supported in  $V_2$  having a saddle-connection  $\sigma_2$  meeting  $V_2$  (and a saddle-connection  $\sigma_1$  meeting  $V_1$ ). Moreover,  $Z_2$  has a non-trivial recurrent point  $p_2 \in \text{int}(B_0)$ . By proceeding by induction, we shall obtain a vector field  $Z_{4N_s+1} \in \mathcal{V}_0$  with  $Z_{4N_s+1} - X$  supported in  $B_0$  having at least  $4N_s + 1$  saddle-connections, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem A.** *Suppose that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , has the contraction property at a quasiminimal set  $N$ . For each  $p \in N$ , there exists  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to  $X$  having a periodic trajectory passing through  $p$ .*

*Proof.* That localized  $C^r$ -closing (Theorem 6.4) implies  $C^r$ -closing (Theorem A) is an elementary fact.  $\square$

## 7. TRANSVERSE MEASURES

Let  $N$  be a quasiminimal set of  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $\Sigma$  be a transversal segment to  $X$  such that  $\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$  intersects  $N$  and  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  be the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$ . We may consider  $\Sigma$  as a Borel measurable space  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{B})$ , where  $\mathcal{B}$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Sigma$ . We say that a Borel probability measure is *non-atomic* if it assigns measure zero to every one-point-set. A *transverse measure on  $\Sigma$*  is a non-atomic  $P$ -invariant Borel probability measure which is supported in  $N \cap \Sigma$ . A transverse measure  $\nu$  is called *ergodic* if whenever  $P^{-1}(B) = B$  for some Borel set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  then either  $\nu(B) = 0$  or  $\nu(B) = 1$ . We let  $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$  denote the set of Borel probability measures on  $\Sigma$  and we let  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  denote the subset of  $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$  formed by the  $P$ -invariant Borel probability measures. We say that  $P$  is *uniquely ergodic* if  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  is a unitary set. A set  $W \subset \Sigma$  is called a *total measure set* if  $\nu(W) = 1$  for every  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . Concerning the existence of transverse measures, we have the following result.

**Theorem 7.1.** *Let  $N$  be a quasiminimal set of  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$  and let  $\Sigma_1$  be a compact transversal segment to  $X$  passing through a non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in N$ . There exist a subsegment  $\Sigma \subset \Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$  and finitely many ergodic transverse measures  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_s \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  such that every  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  can be written in the form  $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i \nu_i$ , where  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i = 1$ .*

*Proof.* The proof may be split into two parts. The first part of the proof – that every small subsegment of  $\Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$  can be endowed with a transverse measure – can be found in Katok [13] and Gutierrez [9]. To prove the second part, let  $C$  be a special transversal circle to  $X$  passing through  $\gamma_p$  as in the Theorem 6.1. There exist subsegments  $\Sigma \subset \Sigma_1$  containing  $p$  and  $\Gamma \subset C$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $T : \Sigma \rightarrow \Gamma$  induced by  $X$  is a diffeomorphism. We claim that  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  is made up of transverse measures, where  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$ . Indeed, by (d) of Theorem 6.1,  $\Sigma$  is free of periodic points. By Poincaré Recurrence Theorem, the set of non-trivial recurrent points in  $\Sigma$  is a total measure set. By (b) of Theorem 6.1, all these non-trivial recurrent points belong to the same quasiminimal set. This proves the claim. Now, every (ergodic) transverse measure on  $\Sigma$  corresponds, via the diffeomorphism  $T$ , to a (ergodic) transverse measure  $\nu$  on  $C$ . By (c) of Theorem 6.1, every (ergodic) transverse measure on  $C$  corresponds to a (ergodic) Borel probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  invariant by a minimal interval exchange transformation  $E : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ . By a result of Keane [14], which also holds for interval exchange transformations with flips [3], there exist only finitely many ergodic Borel probability measures invariant by  $E$ . Each of such  $E$ -invariant Borel probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  is associated to exactly one ergodic transverse measure in  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . Now the rest of the proof follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  is the convex hull of its ergodic measures.  $\square$

Let  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  be the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$  on a transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ . By Lemma 4.7, the domain of  $P$  is the union of finitely many open, pairwise disjoint subintervals of  $\Sigma$ :  $\text{dom}(P) = \cup_{i=1}^m J_i$ . We say that the *lateral limits of  $|DP|$  exist* if for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and for every  $p \in \partial J_i$ , the lateral limit  $\ell = \lim_{\substack{x \rightarrow p \\ x \in J_i}} |DP(x)|$  exists as a point of  $[0, +\infty]$ .

Henceforth, till the end of this paper, we shall assume that  $N$  is a quasiminimal set,  $\Sigma$  is a transversal segment to  $X$  such that  $\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$  intersects  $N$  and  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  is the forward Poincaré Map induced by  $X$  on  $\Sigma$ . We shall assume that  $\Sigma$  is so small that the forward Poincaré Map  $T : \Sigma \rightarrow T(\Sigma) \subset C$  induced by  $X$  is a diffeomorphism, where  $C$  is a special transversal circle for  $N$ , and that  $P$  has the following properties:

- (P1)  $|DP|$  is bounded from above;
- (P2) The lateral limits of  $|DP|$  exist.

**Definition 7.2** (Almost-integrable function). *We say that  $\log |DP|$  is  $\nu$ -almost-integrable if*

$$\min \left\{ \int \log^+ |DP| d\nu, \int \log^- |DP| d\nu \right\} < \infty,$$

where

$$\log^+ |DP(x)| = \max \{ \log |DP(x)|, 0 \}, \quad \log^- |DP(x)| = \max \{ -\log |DP(x)|, 0 \},$$

and  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ . In this case we define

$$\int \log |DP| d\nu = \int \log^+ |DP| d\nu - \int \log^- |DP| d\nu,$$

which is a well defined value of the subinterval  $[-\infty, \infty)$  of the extended real line  $[-\infty, \infty]$ .

**Lemma 7.3.** *Suppose that there exists  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int \log |DP| d\nu < K$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . Then there exists a continuous function  $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  everywhere defined, with  $\log |DP(x)| < \phi(x)$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(P) \setminus P^{-1}(\partial\Sigma)$ , such that  $\int \phi d\nu < K$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* By reasoning as in Theorem 7.1, since  $\Sigma$  is disjoint of periodic trajectories, we may show that  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  is the convex hull of finitely many ergodic (non-atomic) transverse measures  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_s$ . It follows from (P1) and (P2) that there exists a continuous function  $\bar{\phi} : \overline{\text{dom}(P)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int \bar{\phi} d\nu_i < K$ , for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , and  $\log |DP(x)| < \bar{\phi}(x)$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(P) \setminus P^{-1}(\partial\Sigma)$ . Hence,  $\int \bar{\phi} d\nu < K$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . Now we may take  $\phi$  to be any continuous extension of  $\bar{\phi}$  to  $\Sigma$ . Since every  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$  is supported in  $N \cap \Sigma \subset \overline{\text{dom}(P)}$ , we have that  $\int \phi d\nu = \int \bar{\phi} d\nu < K$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.4.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |DP(x)| < 0$  for all  $x$  in a total measure set;
- (b)  $\int \log |DP| d\nu < -c$  for some  $c > 0$  and for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ ;
- (c)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |DP(x)| < -c$  for some  $c > 0$  and for all  $x$  in a total measure set;

*Proof.* Let us show that (a) implies (b). By (P1),  $\log |DP|$  is  $\nu$ -almost integrable with respect to each  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ . Hence, there exists  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int \log |DP| d\nu_i < K$ , for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , where  $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^s$  are the ergodic transverse measures in  $\mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . So either  $\int \log |DP| d\nu_i = -\infty$  for

all  $i = 1, \dots, s$  (and we are done) or there exists a non-empty subset  $\Lambda$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\log |DP|$  is  $\nu_i$ -integrable for all  $i \in \Lambda$ . In this case, (a) and Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem yields that

$$\int \log |DP| d\nu_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |DP(x)| = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |DP(x)| = -c_i < 0$$

for some  $x$  in a  $\nu_i$ -full measure set. Now take  $c = \min \{c_i : i \in \Lambda\}$ . A similar reasoning shows that (b) implies (c). This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.5.** *Let  $\{\mu_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of Borel probability measures in  $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$  weakly\* converging to  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ . The following hold:*

- (a)  $\mu(B) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(B)$  for every Borel set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$ , where  $\partial B$  denote the topological boundary of  $B$ ;
- (b)  $\mu(J) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(J)$  for every open subinterval  $J$  of  $\Sigma$  such that  $\mu(\partial J \setminus \partial \Sigma) = 0$ .

*Proof.* The item (a) is a standard theorem from measure theory (see [19, Theorem 6.1]). Let us prove (b). Let  $J$  be an open subinterval of  $\Sigma$ . If  $\partial J \cap \partial \Sigma = \emptyset$  then  $\mu(\partial J) = \mu(\partial J \setminus \partial \Sigma) = 0$  and the result follows from (a). If  $J = \Sigma$  then the indicator function  $\chi_J$  is continuous and so the result follows immediately from the weak\* convergence of  $\{\mu_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  to  $\mu$ . Hence we may assume that  $\partial J \cap \partial \Sigma$  is a one-point set such that  $\mu(\partial J \setminus \partial \Sigma) = 0$ . Under these assumptions, there exist monotone sequences of continuous functions  $\{\varphi_K\}_{K \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{\psi_K\}_{K \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\varphi_K < \chi_J < \psi_K$  and  $\int \psi_K - \varphi_K d\mu < \frac{1}{K}$  for each  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\mu_j \xrightarrow{*} \mu$  (in the weak\* topology) as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\psi_K - \varphi_K$  is a continuous function, we have that for each  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $L_K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\int \psi_K - \varphi_K d\mu_j < \frac{2}{K}$  for all  $j > L_K$ . It is easy to see that for each  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  and for all  $j > L_K$ ,

$$\left| \int \chi_J d\mu - \int \chi_J d\mu_j \right| < \frac{3}{K} + \left| \int \varphi_K d\mu - \int \varphi_K d\mu_j \right|.$$

This shows that  $\mu(J) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(J)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.6.** *Let  $\{x_{n_j}\}_{j=0}^\infty$  be a sequence in  $\Sigma$  such that  $n_j \geq 1$  and  $x_{n_j} \in \text{dom}(P^{n_j-1})$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Any accumulation point of the sequence of Borel probability measures*

$$(3) \quad \mu_j = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j-1} \delta_{P^k(x_{n_j})},$$

where  $\delta_x$  is the Dirac probability measure on  $\Sigma$  concentrated at  $x$ , is a non-atomic measure.

*Proof.* Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$  be an accumulation point of  $\{\mu_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . By taking a subsequence if necessary and by renaming variables, we may assume that  $\mu_j \xrightarrow{*} \mu$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . Since the set  $D = \{z \in \Sigma \mid \mu(\{z\}) > 0\}$  is at most countable, for each  $p \in \Sigma$ , there exists an open subinterval  $I_p$  of  $\Sigma$  containing  $p$  of length  $\ell(I_p)$  arbitrarily small such that  $\mu(\partial I_p \setminus \partial \Sigma) = 0$ . By (c) of Theorem 6.1 and by Lemma 3.1 of Camelier–Gutierrez [2], for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist  $\delta > 0$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that if  $\ell(I_p) < \delta$  then for each  $n \geq N$  and  $x \in \text{dom}(P^{n-1})$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \chi_{I_p}(P^k(x)) < \epsilon.$$

Hence, for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist  $\delta > 0$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $\ell(I_p) < \delta$  then for all  $j \geq N$ ,

$$\mu_j(I_p) = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j-1} \chi_{I_p}(P^k(x_{n_j})) < \epsilon.$$

By Lemma 7.5, for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $\ell(I_p) < \delta$  then

$$\mu(I_p) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(I_p) \leq \epsilon.$$

Hence,  $\mu(\{p\}) = 0$  and so  $\mu$  is non-atomic, which finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.7.** *Suppose that there exist a constant  $c > 0$  and a continuous function  $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int \phi d\nu < -c$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . Then there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for each  $n > N$  and for all  $x \in \text{dom}(P^{n-1})$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi(P^k(x)) < -c.$$

*Proof.* Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence  $\{x_{n_j}\}_{j=0}^\infty \subset \Sigma$  such that for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x_{n_j} \in \text{dom}(P^{n_j-1})$  and

$$\frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j-1} \phi(P^k(x_{n_j})) \geq -c.$$

The set  $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ , endowed with the weak\* topology, is a compact metric space. Consequently, the sequence of Borel probability measures

$$\mu_j = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j-1} \delta_{P^k(x_{n_j})},$$

has a subsequence that weakly\* converges to a Borel probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ . By renaming variables, we may assume that  $\mu_j \xrightarrow{*} \mu$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . By Lemma 7.5 and by Lemma 7.6, we have that  $\mu(B) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(B)$  for all Borel set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . This combined with the fact that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(P^{-1}(B)) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(B)$  for all Borel set  $B$  yields that  $\mu$  is  $P$ -invariant and so  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . Since the function  $\phi$  is continuous, we have

$$\int \phi d\mu = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int \phi d\mu_j = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j-1} \phi(P^k(x_{n_j})) \geq -c,$$

by the definition of  $\mu$  and by the way we have chosen the sequence  $\{n_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ , which contradicts the initial assumption that  $\int \phi d\nu < -c$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem B.** *Suppose that  $X$  has divergence less or equal to zero at its saddle-points and that  $X$  has negative Lyapunov exponents at a quasiminimal set  $N$ . Then  $X$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Sigma_1$  be a transversal segment to  $X$  passing through a non-trivial recurrent point  $p \in N$  so small that the forward Poincaré Map  $T : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow T(\Sigma_1) \subset C$  is a diffeomorphism, where  $C$  is a special transversal circle for  $N$ . By the hypothesis on the divergence of  $X$  at its saddle-points every forward Poincaré Map  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  induced by  $X$  on a transversal segment  $\Sigma$  to  $X$  has properties (P1) and (P2) (see [16]). By the hypothesis of negative Lyapunov exponents and by Lemma 7.4,

there exist a subsegment  $\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma_1$  passing through  $p$  and a constant  $c > 0$  such that the forward Poincaré Map  $P : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  induced by  $X$  satisfies  $\int \log |DP| d\nu < -c$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . By Lemma 7.3, there exists a continuous function  $\phi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  everywhere defined, with  $\log |DP(x)| < \phi(x)$  for all  $x \in \text{dom}(P) \setminus P^{-1}(\partial\Sigma)$ , such that  $\int \phi d\nu < -c$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_P(\Sigma)$ . By Proposition 7.7, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq N$  and for all  $x \in \text{dom}(P^n) \setminus \mathcal{O}_n^-(x)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |DP^n(x)| = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log |DP(P^k(x))| < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi(P^k(x)) < -c.$$

Thus  $P^n$  is an infinitesimal contraction. By Proposition 3.1,  $X$  has the infinitesimal contraction property at  $N$ . ■

To finish the paper, we now provide a sketch of the proof of Theorem C.

**Theorem C.** *Suppose that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_H^r(M)$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , has the contraction property at a quasiminimal set  $N$ . There exists  $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  arbitrarily  $C^r$ -close to  $X$  having one more saddle-connection than  $X$ .*

*Sketch of the proof.* In the smooth case, we may use the same proof of Theorem 5.5 without any changes. In the case in which  $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r(M)$  we cannot use that proof because in taking a  $C^r$ -flow box to make the perturbation, the vector field so obtained is of class  $C^{r-1}$ . Thus we have to make the perturbation directly on the surface (using bump functions defined on the surface and using also the orthogonal vector field to  $X$ ) and to use the flow box coordinates only for estimation purposes. ■

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are grateful to the professors A. López, B. Scárdua, D. Smania, and M. A. Teixeira, who have made many useful remarks to a previous version of this paper. We also would like to thank the professor Simon Lloyd for checking the English. The first author was supported in part by FAPESP Grant Temático # 03/03107-9, and by CNPq Grant # 306992/2003-5. The second author was fully supported by FAPESP Grants # 03/03622-0 and # 06/52650-5.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Kh. Aranson, G. Belitsky and E. Zhuzhoma. *Introduction to the qualitative theory of dynamical systems on surfaces*, volume 153 of Translation of Mathematical Monographs, American Mathematical Society, 1996.
- [2] R. Camelier and C. Gutierrez. Affine interval exchange transformations with wandering intervals, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **17**(6), 1315–1338, 1996.
- [3] I.P. Cornfeld, S.V. Fomin, and Ya. G. Sinai. *Ergodic Theory*, Springer Verlag, 1982.
- [4] C. Carroll. Rokhlin towers and  $C^r$ -closing for flows on  $\mathbb{T}^2$ , *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **12**(1), 683–706, 1992.
- [5] C. Gutierrez. Smoothing continuous flows on two-manifolds and recurrences, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **6**(1), 17–44, 1986.
- [6] C. Gutierrez. On  $C^r$ -closing for flows on 2-manifolds. *Nonlinearity*, **13**(6), 1883–1888, 2000.
- [7] C. Gutierrez. A counterexample to a  $C^2$ -closing lemma *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **7**(4), 509–530, 1987.
- [8] C. Gutierrez. On two-dimensional recurrence. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat.*, **10**(1), 1–16, 1979.
- [9] C. Gutierrez. Smoothability of Cherry flows on two-manifolds vol. 1007 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, 1981.
- [10] C. Gutierrez. On the  $C^r$ -closing lemma for flows on the torus  $\mathbb{T}^2$ , *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **6**(1), 45–46, 1986.



- [11] C. Gutierrez and B. Pires. On Peixoto's conjecture for flows on non-orientable 2-manifolds, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **133**(4), 1063–1074, 2005.
- [12] M. Hirsch. Dense recurrence in area-preserving flows on surfaces, *Nonlinearity*, **12**(6), 1545–1553, 1994.
- [13] A. Katok. Invariant measures of flows on orientable surfaces, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **211**, 775–778, 1973.
- [14] M. Keane. Interval exchange transformations, *Math. Z.*, **141**, 25–31, 1975.
- [15] N. Markley. The Poincaré-Bendixson theorem for the Klein bottle, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **135**, 159–165, 1969.
- [16] M. Martens, S. van Strien, W. de Melo and P. Mendes. On Cherry Flows, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **10**, 531–554, 1990.
- [17] I. Nikolaev and E. Zhuzhoma. *Flows on 2-dimensional manifolds: an overview*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1705, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [18] J. Palis and W. de Melo. *Geometric theory of dynamical systems: an introduction*, Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [19] K. Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces*, American Mathematical Society, 2005.
- [20] M. Peixoto. Structural Stability on two-dimensional manifolds, *Topology*, **1**, 101–120, 1962.
- [21] C. Pugh. An improved closing lemma and a general density theorem, *Amer. J. Math.* **89**, 1010–1021, 1967.
- [22] C. Pugh. Structural stability on  $M$ , *An. Acad. Brasil. Ci.*, **39**, 45–48, 1967.
- [23] A. Schwartz. A generalization of a Poincaré Bendixson theorem to closed two-dimensional manifolds, *Americ. J. Math* **85**, 453–458, 1963.
- [24] J. de Vries. *Elements of topological dynamics*, vol 257 of *Mathematics and its Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, 1993.

INSTITUTO DE CIÊNCIAS MATEMÁTICAS E DE COMPUTAÇÃO, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO, CAIXA POSTAL 668,  
13560-970, SÃO CARLOS-SP, BRAZIL.

*E-mail address:* gutp@icmc.usp.br,    bfpires@hotmail.com