

TYPICAL COEXISTENCE OF INFINITELY MANY STRANGE ATTRACTORS

PABLO G. BARRIENTOS AND JUAN DAVID ROJAS

ABSTRACT. We prove that the coexistence of infinitely many prevalent Hénon-like phenomena is Kolmogorov typical in sectional dissipative $C^{d,r}$ -Berger domains of parameter families of diffeomorphisms of dimension $m \geq 3$ for $d < r-1$. Namely, we answer an old question posed by Colli in [*Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré-Nonlinear Analysis*, 15, 539–580 (1998)] on typicality of the coexistence of infinitely many non-hyperbolic strange attractors for $3 \leq d < r-1$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Homoclinic bifurcations are one of the main mechanisms to create complicated dynamical behavior in the evolution of parametric families of discrete systems. A C^r -diffeomorphism has a *homoclinic tangency* if there is a pair of points P and Q in the same transitive hyperbolic set such that the unstable invariant manifold of P and the stable invariant manifold of Q have a non-transverse intersection at a point Y . A homoclinic tangency can be unfolded considering a C^d -family $(f_a)_a$ of C^r -diffeomorphisms parameterized by $a \in \mathbb{I}^k$ with $f_0 = f$, $\mathbb{I} = [-1, 1]$, $k \geq 1$ and $d \leq r$. From the pioneering work of Newhouse [New70], it is well known that the set of C^2 surface diffeomorphisms exhibiting homoclinic tangencies has a non-empty interior. See also [PV94, GST93b, Rom95, BD12, BR17] for higher dimensional dynamics. In a *Newhouse domain*, that is, in an open set of diffeomorphisms (or in the corresponding parameters space) where the dynamics with homoclinic tangencies associated with periodic points are dense, generic diffeomorphisms exhibit coexistence of infinitely many sinks [New79, Rob83, GST93a, GST08]. This result was coined under the name of *Newhouse phenomenon*. But also the unfolding of homoclinic tangencies in Newhouse domains brings the presence and coexistence of more complicated chaotic dynamics as (non-hyperbolic) strange attractors (see [MV93, Via93]). A *strange attractor* of a transformation g is an invariant compact set Λ whose stable set $W^s(\Lambda) = \{x : d(g^n(x), \Lambda) \rightarrow 0\}$ has a non-empty interior, and there is $z \in \Lambda$ with dense orbit (in Λ) displaying exponential growth of the derivative, that is, $\|Dg^n(z)\| \geq e^{cn}$ for all $n \geq 0$ and some $c > 0$.

Obviously, strange attractors are always non-trivial (i.e., they are not reduced to a periodic orbit). However, they could be still hyperbolic, as for instance the Plykin attractor or the Smale solenoid. One of the first examples of non-hyperbolic strange attractors was given (numerically) by Hénon [Hén76] for the two-parameter family given by

$$H_{a,b}(x, y) = (1 - ax^2 + y, bx).$$

The limit family ($b = 0$) is given by the quadratic maps $T_a(x) = 1 - ax^2$. Benedicks and Carleson proved in [BC85] that there exists a positive Lebesgue measure set of parameters

$a \in (1, 2]$ such that the compact interval $[1 - a, 1]$ is a strange attractor of T_a . These results, see also [Jak81], were key to prove the existence of strange attractors for the family of Hénon maps in [BC91]. It was quickly observed that an extension of conclusions in [BC91] could be possible for some other family $F_{a,b}$ whose family of limit maps was also the quadratic family T_a . Families of this type will be called *Hénon-like families*. Namely, Mora and Viana in [MV93] and [Via93] showed that any Hénon-like family of diffeomorphisms has a set of parameters with positive Lebesgue measure for which a strange attractor is exhibited. Such families appear in generic unfoldings of homoclinic tangencies associated with *sectional dissipative periodic points* [PT93, Via93, GST93a, GST08], that is, periodic points which have the product of any pair of multipliers less than one in absolute value.

Sometimes the non-hyperbolic strange attractors found in Hénon-like families are called *Hénon-like strange attractors*. The lack of hyperbolicity of Hénon-like strange attractors prevents stability under perturbations, and thus, the classical arguments (see [PT93]) to provide coexistence of infinitely many of such attractors do not work. This difficulty was overcome by Colli [Col98] and Leal [Lea08] who proved that, in Newhouse domains associated with homoclinic tangencies to sectional dissipative periodic points, there exists a dense set of diffeomorphisms (or corresponding parameters in the parameter space) exhibiting the coexistence of infinitely many non-hyperbolic strange attractors. These results say nothing about the persistence of the coexistence of infinitely many attractors. Recall that a parametric family $f = (f_a)_a$ of dynamics exhibits *persistently* a property \mathcal{P} if \mathcal{P} is observed for f_a in a set $E(f)$ of parameter values a with a positive Lebesgue measure. It was an old open question due to Colli (see [Col98, pg. 542]) whether for "most" or at least there exists a k -parameter family $(f_a)_a$ of diffeomorphisms which exhibits persistently the property of coexistence of infinitely many strange attractors. The abundance of such families must be understood in the sense of typicality introduced by Kolmogorov (see [HK10]). That is, a property \mathcal{P} is called *typical* (in the sense of Kolmogorov) if there is a Baire (local) generic set of parameter families of dynamics exhibiting the property \mathcal{P} persistently with full Lebesgue measure. See Definition 2.1 for a more precise statement of this important notion. On the other hand, Palis claimed that the measure of the set of parameters $E(f)$ where infinitely many attractors coexist is generically zero for families $f = (f_a)_a$ of one-dimensional dynamics and surface diffeomorphism [PT93, Pal00].

Pumariño and Rodríguez in [PR01, Thm. B] (see also [PR97]) provided a first example of a non-generic family of dynamical systems with persistent coexistence of infinitely many non-hyperbolic strange attractors. Although Palis' conjecture remains open, some advances in the opposite direction have been made by Berger in [Ber16, Ber17] for families of surface endomorphisms (in fact, local diffeomorphisms) and higher dimensional diffeomorphisms. Namely, Berger constructed open sets \mathcal{U} of k -parameter families of the above described dynamics in the $C^{d,r}$ -topology such that residually in these open sets any family exhibits simultaneously infinitely many hyperbolic periodic attractors (sinks) for *all* parameter value. See §2.1 to see the definition of the $C^{d,r}$ -topology. Mimicking previously introduced terminology, this result was coined in [BR22] under the name of *Berger phenomenon* and the open

sets \mathcal{U} as *Berger domains*. In fact, in [BR22], Raibekas and the first author of this work provide the following more specific definition of such domains:

Definition 1.1. *An open set \mathcal{U} of k -parameter C^d -families of C^r -diffeomorphisms is called $C^{d,r}$ -Berger domain if there exists a dense subset \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{U} such that for any $f = (f_a)_a \in \mathcal{D}$ there is a covering of \mathbb{I}^k by open balls J_i where f_a has a homoclinic tangency Y_a^i associated with a hyperbolic periodic point Q_a^i depending C^d -continuously on the parameter a in J_i .*

Roughly speaking, a Berger domain is the equivalent of a Newhouse domain for parametric families. As in a Newhouse domain (free parameter case), a Berger domain has a dense subset of families $f = (f_a)_a$ where each diffeomorphism f_a in the family exhibits a homoclinic tangency Y_a . But now, for every a_0 , the tangency Y_{a_0} of f_{a_0} is unfolding degenerately¹ inside the family $f = (f_a)_a$ in the sense that persists (as a homoclinic tangency) along an open set of parameters J containing a_0 , i.e., varies continuously with respect to a in J . For more details and a deeper description of the notion of Berger domain, see [BR22, Sec. 1.2].

In [Ber16, Ber17], Berger constructed $C^{d,r}$ -Berger domains of persistent homoclinic tangencies associated with sectional dissipative periodic points Q_a^i with $d \leq r$ for endomorphisms in dimension two and diffeomorphisms in higher dimension. New and different examples of $C^{d,r}$ -Berger domains of k -parametric families of diffeomorphisms in dimension $m \geq 3$ for $d < r-1$ were obtained also in [BR22] as a consequence of [BR21]. The coexistence of infinitely many smooth attracting invariant circles was shown also $C^{d,r}$ -Kolmogorov typical in these new examples of Berger domains. In this paper, we will answer the previously mentioned question posed by Colli by showing that the coexistence of infinitely many non-hyperbolic strange attractors is typical for k -parametric families in the sense of Kolmogorov in sectional dissipative Berger domains:

Theorem A. *Let \mathcal{U} be a $C^{d,r}$ -Berger domain of k -parameter families of diffeomorphisms of dimension $m \geq 3$ with $3 \leq d < r-1$ and $k \geq 1$ associated with sectional dissipative periodic points. Then there exists a residual set \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{U} such that for every family $(f_a)_a \in \mathcal{R}$ the diffeomorphism f_a exhibits infinitely many non-hyperbolic strange attractors for Lebesgue almost every $a \in \mathbb{I}^k$.*

The proof of the above theorem is strongly based on the fact that the coexistence of non-hyperbolic strange attractors is a prevalent phenomenon for Hénon-like families. To be more precise, we need some definitions.

Let us denote by $\Phi = (\Phi_M)_M$ the parabola family given by

$$\Phi_M(x, y) = (0, M - y^2) \quad \text{where } (x, y) \in [-3, 3]^{m-1} \times [-3, 3] \quad \text{and } M \in [1, 2]. \quad (1)$$

A phenomenon \mathcal{P} is a fact or property that is observed to exist or to occur in a dynamics. Examples of phenomena for the quadratic map are the existence of sinks, saddle-nodes, flip bifurcation, homoclinic tangencies, and strange attractors among others.

¹The notion of *degenerate unfolding* is introduced in [Ber16, Def. 3.8] under the name of *paratangency*. For a more precise definition and contextualization see [BR21, Sec. 1.4].

Definition 1.2. A phenomenon \mathcal{P} of a dynamics is said to be C^s -prevalent for Hénon-like families if there exists $0 < c \leq 1$ such that any $C^{d,r}$ -family $\varphi = (\varphi_M)_M$ of diffeomorphisms with $s \leq d \leq r$ which is sufficiently C^s -close to the parabola family $\Phi = (\Phi_M)_M$ satisfies \mathcal{P} for any M in a subset of parameters of $(1, 2)$ with Lebesgue measure at least c .

An example of C^s -prevalent phenomenon for Hénon-like families is the existence of hyperbolic attractors [PT93, GST08] (with $s = 2$). As explained in [Col98, Sec. 5], [Lea08, Sec. 3.2] and notify in [DRV96, p. 52], it follows from the proof of the results in [MV93, Via93]² that the existence of non-hyperbolic strange attractors is also a C^s -prevalent phenomenon for Hénon-like families (with $s = 3$). However, in this case, we need to be careful with the meaning of sufficiently close to the parabola family (see conditions (QL) and (SD) in [Via93]²). The family φ in the above definition needs to belong to an open set of C^3 -perturbations of the family of parabolas, which occur in the renormalization scheme of the unfolding of some homoclinic tangencies.

Many of the ideas in this paper come from the Ph.D. thesis of the second author [Roj17] where similar results were obtained in the case of endomorphisms on surfaces. Note that the main techniques used here to prove Theorem A are essentially different from those introduced by Berger in [Ber16, Ber17]. To describe the differences, let us first explain briefly the strategy developed by Berger to get his results.

As we mentioned earlier, a family of diffeomorphisms $f = (f_a)_a$ that unfolds a homoclinic tangency of f_0 exhibits many different phenomena. Some of these phenomena are robust in the sense that they appear for open sets of parameters arbitrarily close to $a = 0$. For instance, we have the existence of (hyperbolic) sinks. But they are quickly destroyed by a small perturbation of the dynamics. In other words, the lifetime of these sinks (the size of the open set of parameters where there exists a well-defined continuation) is very small. The persistent homoclinic tangency Y_a^i associated with the saddle Q_a^i that appears in Definition 1.1 allows Berger, by means of an arbitrarily small perturbation of the family f , to create a sink with a large timelife. Indeed, the created sink has a well-defined continuation for all parameters $a \in J_i$. Since a sink is robust (i.e., it has a continuation for nearby systems), it is obtained that any family sufficiently close has a sink for all parameters $a \in J_i$. Now, Berger's phenomenon is proved by well-known arguments used to prove Newhouse's phenomenon.

To address a similar result but involving non-hyperbolic phenomena (as Hénon-like attractors) we have to tackle the fact that these phenomena are not robust. In this direction, we replace the notion of topological robustness by the notion of prevalent for Hénon-like families. By introducing a new parameter μ , we consider a family $g = (g_{a,\mu})_{a,\mu}$ which unfolds the homoclinic tangency Y_a^i of f_a generically with respect to μ and such that $g_{a,0} = f_a$. With the help of the rescaling lemmas in [GST08], we can get a curve $C_n = \{(a, \mu_n(a))\}$ in the (a, μ) -parameter space arbitrarily close to $\{(a, 0)\}$ such that $g|_{C_n} = (g_{a,\mu_n(a)})_a$ is a family close to

²The referee pointed out that similarly to Mora-Viana's proof, Viana's proof needed one extra assumption on distortion bound of the determinant of the family. This property seems nonetheless not necessary in view of the alternative proof of [Ber19]

f and it is also a Hénon-like family (after renormalization in J_i). Now, the prevalence allows us to conclude Theorem A similarly as Berger did to obtain his result.

In the next section, we introduce formally the set of families of diffeomorphisms that we are considering and the $C^{d,r}$ -topology. After that, we will prove Theorem A.

2. TYPICAL COEXISTENCE OF INFINITELY MANY PREVALENT PHENOMENA

2.1. Topology of families of diffeomorphisms. We introduce the topology of the set of families. To do this, set $\mathbb{I} = [-1, 1]$. Given $0 < d \leq r \leq \infty$, $k \geq 1$ and a compact manifolds \mathcal{M} , we denote by $C^{d,r}(\mathbb{I}^k, \mathcal{M})$ the space of k -parameter C^d -families $f = (f_a)_a$ of C^r -diffeomorphisms f_a of \mathcal{M} parameterized by a in an open neighborhood of \mathbb{I}^k such that

$$\partial_a^i \partial_x^j f_a(x) \text{ exists continuously for all } 0 \leq i \leq d, \quad 0 \leq i + j \leq r \quad \text{and} \quad (a, x) \in \mathbb{I}^k \times \mathcal{M}.$$

We endow this space with the topology given by the $C^{d,r}$ -norm given by

$$\|f\|_{C^{d,r}} = \max\{\sup \|\partial_a^i \partial_x^j f_a(x)\| : 0 \leq i \leq d, \quad 0 \leq i + j \leq r\} \quad \text{where } f = (f_a)_a \in C^{d,r}(\mathbb{I}^k, \mathcal{M}).$$

If $d = r$, we will say that the family is of class C^r . Note that a family $f = (f_a)_a$ is of class C^r , if and only if the map $(a, x) \mapsto f_a(x)$ is of class C^r .

Definition 2.1. Fix $0 < d \leq r \leq \infty$, $k \geq 1$ and an open set \mathcal{U} of $C^{d,r}(\mathbb{I}^k, \mathcal{M})$. A property \mathcal{P} is said to be $C^{d,r}$ -Kolmogorov typical in \mathcal{U} if there is a residual set \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{U} such that for every $f = (f_a)_a \in \mathcal{R}$ there is a set E of full Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{I}^k such that f_a exhibits the property \mathcal{P} for all $a \in E$.

Sometimes, to emphasize the notion of locally genericity without mentioning the open set \mathcal{U} , \mathcal{P} is simply said to be *locally Kolmogorov typical* in parametric families.

2.2. Proof of Theorem A. From now on, fix a manifold \mathcal{M} of dimension $m \geq 3$, $k \geq 1$ and $0 < 3 \leq s \leq d < r - 1$. Consider a Berger domain $\mathcal{U} \subset C^{d,r}(\mathbb{I}^k, \mathcal{M})$ associated with sectional dissipative hyperbolic periodic points. Let \mathcal{P} be the property "existence of a non-hyperbolic strange attractor"³. We will prove that the coexistence of infinitely many phenomena \mathcal{P} is Kolmogorov typical in \mathcal{U} . First, we need to introduce an important definition:

Definition 2.2. Let $f = (f_a)_a$ be a family in $C^{d,r}(\mathbb{I}^k, \mathcal{M})$ and fix $\alpha < \beta$, $n \geq 1$ and $\rho > 0$. The family f is said to be a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n in $I = (\alpha, \beta)^k$ if, for each $\bar{a} \in [\alpha, \beta]^{k-1}$, there is a one-parameter family $R_{\bar{a}} = (R_{\bar{a},b})_b$ of smooth transformations $R_{\bar{a},b} : [-3, 3]^m \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with $b \in [\alpha, \beta]$ such that the family $F = (F_M)_M$ given by

$$F_M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_{a(M)}^{-1} \circ f_{a(M)}^n \circ R_{a(M)}$$

where

$$a(M) = (\bar{a}, b(M)) \in I \quad \text{with} \quad b(M) = (\beta - \alpha)M + 2\alpha - \beta \quad \text{for } M \in [1, 2]$$

is ρ - C^s -close to the parabola family $\Phi = (\Phi_M)_M$ given in (1).

³The proof also works for other prevalent phenomenon, such as the existence of a hyperbolic attractor.

We observe that to be a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n in I is an open property in the $C^{d,r}$ -topology of parametric families.

Remark 2.3. Here we will explain in more detail the prevalence of \mathcal{P} that is required. We will say that $f = (f_a)_a \in C^{d,r}(\mathbb{I}^k, \mathcal{M})$ is a C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization in $I \subset \mathbb{I}^k$ if there are $\rho_\ell \rightarrow 0^+$ and $n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ such that f is a ρ_ℓ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n_ℓ in I for all $\ell \geq 1$. Such a family is obtained by a renormalization scheme in the unfolding of some homoclinic tangencies. In particular, the renormalized families $F_\ell = (F_{\ell,M})_M$ converge to Φ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ in the C^s -topology. Therefore, for ℓ large enough, they are quadratic-like families as defined in [Via93, see (QL) and p. 21] and thus F_ℓ has a strange attractor for a positive Lebesgue measure set $J_\ell \subset (1, 2)$ of parameters M .⁴ Moreover, paraphrasing [DRV96, pp. 52 and 54], actually the proof in [Via93] provides a uniform lower bound for the measure of these sets J_ℓ on a neighborhood of the family Φ . We conclude that there are $c_0 > 0$ and $\ell_0 \geq 1$ such that for every $\ell \geq \ell_0$, the set J_ℓ has Lebesgue measure $|J_\ell| \geq c_0$. Then $f_a^{n_\ell}$ has a strange attractor for any a in a subset $J_\ell^* \subset I$ of parameters with Lebesgue measure at least $c \cdot |I|$ for some $c > 0$ independent of ℓ . Compare with [Col98, Sec. 5] and [Lea08, Sec. 3.2]. Therefore, following Definition 1.2 and in order to emphasize the parameters $c > 0$, we will say that \mathcal{P} is a c -prevalent phenomenon for C^s -Hénon-like families after renormalization.

Recall that \mathcal{D} denotes the dense set in \mathcal{U} provided by Definition 1.1. We also assume that the period of the periodic points Q_a^i that appears in this definition is equal to one. This does not affect the argument of the proof, and it will suppose a considerable simplification in the notation and the statement of the next results. Also, to simplify notation, we will refer to the Cartesian product of k open intervals with the same length as an *open ball* (in the supremum norm in \mathbb{R}^k).

Proposition 2.4. For any $f = (f_a)_a \in \mathcal{D}$ one finds $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(f) > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\rho > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$, there are $n_0 = n_0(\epsilon, \rho, f, \alpha) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite collection $\{I_j\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint open balls $I_j = I_j(f, \alpha)$ of \mathbb{I}^k with

$$|I_j| \leq \alpha |\mathbb{I}^k|, \quad |\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_j| \leq \alpha |\mathbb{I}^k|$$

and the following property:

for every $n \geq n_0$ there is an ϵ -close family $g = (g_a)_a$ to $f = (f_a)_a$ in the $C^{d,r}$ -topology such that g is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n in any I_j .

Remark 2.5. By construction, the renormalization after period n is done on the first return map $T_n = f_a^n$ associated with a homoclinic tangency of f_a in Definition 1.1. Actually, T_n is defined on a box $\sigma_n = \sigma_n(a)$ as the first return to a tower of boxes $\cup_{n'} \sigma_{n'}$ with $\sigma_n \cap \sigma_{n'} = \emptyset$ if $n \neq n'$. Thus, the phenomena \mathcal{P} after renormalization of periods n and n' with $n \neq n'$ are geometrically independent. That is, if g_a has a phenomenon \mathcal{P} after renormalization of

⁴Smooth linearization near the saddle is not necessary for this conclusion. See [Rom95] and [GST08] where the linearizability conditions were removed in the development of the renormalization scheme in the unfolding of generic homoclinic tangencies.

period n and n' with $n \neq n'$ where $g = (g_a)_a$ is provided in Proposition 2.4, then we have a pair of periodic attractors Λ_a and Λ'_a of g_a of minimal period, i.e., fixed attractors of T_n and $T_{n'}$. In particular, their orbits are pairwise disjoint, and the attractors are distinct.

Before proving the above proposition, we will conclude Theorem A:

Theorem 2.6. *For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho > 0$, there exists an open and dense set $\mathcal{O}_m = \mathcal{O}_m(\rho)$ in \mathcal{U} such that it holds the following:*

For any family $g = (g_a)_a$ in \mathcal{O}_m and each $\ell = 1, \dots, m$, there exist $\alpha_\ell = 2^{-\ell}\alpha_0 > 0$ (with $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(g)$), a positive integer n_ℓ (with $n_1 < \dots < n_m$) and a finite collection $\{I_{\ell,j}\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint open balls $I_{\ell,j}$ of \mathbb{I}^k with $|I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell|\mathbb{I}^k|$ and $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell|\mathbb{I}^k|$ such that g is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n_ℓ in any $I_{\ell,j}$.

Moreover, there is a residual subset \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{U} such that any family $g = (g_a)_a \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfies that g_a has the coexistence of infinitely many phenomenon \mathcal{P} for Lebesgue almost every $a \in \mathbb{I}^k$.

Proof. First of all consider the sequence $\epsilon_i = 1/i$ for $i \geq 1$. We will prove the result by induction. To do this, we are going to construct \mathcal{O}_m for $m = 1$.

By Proposition 2.4, for each $f = (f_a)_a$ in \mathcal{D} one finds $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(f) > 0$ such that for $\alpha_1 = 2^{-1}\alpha_0$ and every $\rho > 0$, there are $n_0(i) = n_0(\epsilon_i, \rho, f, \alpha_1) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite collection $\{I_{1,j}\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint open balls $I_{1,j} = I_{1,j}(f, \alpha_1)$ of \mathbb{I}^k with $|I_{1,j}| \leq \alpha_1|\mathbb{I}^k|$, $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{1,j}| \leq \alpha_1|\mathbb{I}^k|$ and the following property: For any $n \geq n_0(i)$, we get an ϵ_i -close family $g_i = (g_{i,a})_a$ to f such that g_i is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n in any $I_{1,j}$ for all $i \geq 1$. Since this property persists under perturbations, we have a sequence $\{\mathcal{O}_1(f, \epsilon_i, \rho)\}_i$ of open sets $\mathcal{O}_1(f, \epsilon_i, \rho)$ converging to f where the same conclusion holds for any family in these open sets. By taking the union of all these open sets for any f in \mathcal{D} and $\epsilon_i > 0$ for $i \geq 1$, we get an open and dense set $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}_1(\rho)$ in \mathcal{U} where for any $g = (g_a)_a \in \mathcal{O}_1$ there exist $\alpha_0 > 0$, $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite collection $\{I_{1,j}\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint open balls $I_{1,j}$ of \mathbb{I}^k with $|I_{1,j}| \leq \alpha_1|\mathbb{I}^k|$ and $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{1,j}| \leq \alpha_1|\mathbb{I}^k|$ where $\alpha_1 = 2^{-1}\alpha_0$ such that g is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n_1 in any $I_{1,j}$.

Now we will assume $\mathcal{O}_m = \mathcal{O}_m(\rho)$ constructed and we will show how to obtain \mathcal{O}_{m+1} . Since \mathcal{O}_m is an open and dense set in \mathcal{U} , we can start by taking $f = (f_a)_a \in \mathcal{O}_m \cap \mathcal{D}$. Hence, there is $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(f) > 0$ such that for each $\ell = 1, \dots, m$, there is a positive integer n_ℓ (with $n_1 < \dots < n_m$) and a finite collection $\{I_{\ell,j}\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint open balls $I_{\ell,j}$ of \mathbb{I}^k with $|I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell|\mathbb{I}^k|$ and $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell|\mathbb{I}^k|$ where $\alpha_\ell = 2^{-\ell}\alpha_0 > 0$, satisfying that f is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n_ℓ in any $I_{\ell,j}$. As before, from the robustness of this property, there exists $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(f) > 0$ such that any ϵ' -close family $g = (g_a)_a$ to f still is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization with respect to the same periods and in the same open balls. Then, for $\alpha_{m+1} = 2^{-(m+1)}\alpha_0$ and any $\epsilon_i < \epsilon'/2$, we can apply Proposition 2.4 finding $n_0(i) = n_0(\epsilon_i, \rho, f, \alpha_{m+1}) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite collection $\{I_{m+1,j}\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint open balls $I_{m+1,j} = I_{m+1,j}(f, \alpha_{m+1})$ of \mathbb{I}^k with $|I_{m+1,j}| \leq \alpha_{m+1}|\mathbb{I}^k|$ and $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{m+1,j}| \leq \alpha_{m+1}|\mathbb{I}^k|$. Moreover, by taking an integer $n_{m+1} > \max\{n_0(i), n_m\}$, we get an ϵ_i -perturbation $g_i = (g_{i,a})_a$ of f such that g_i is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n_{m+1} in any $I_{m+1,j}$ and

$i \geq 1$. Hence, by the robustness as before, we have a sequence $\{\mathcal{O}_{m+1}(f, \epsilon_i, \rho)\}_i$ of open sets $\mathcal{O}_{m+1}(f, \epsilon_i, \rho) \subset \mathcal{O}_m$ converging to f where the same conclusion holds for any family in these open sets. Taking the union of all these open sets for any $f \in \mathcal{O}_m \cap \mathcal{D}$ and $\epsilon_i < \epsilon'(f)$, we get an open and dense set $\mathcal{O}_{m+1} = \mathcal{O}_{m+1}(\rho)$ in \mathcal{U} . In addition, for any $g = (g_a)_a \in \mathcal{O}_{m+1}$ there exist $\alpha_0 > 0$, positive integers $n_1 < \dots < n_{m+1}$ and, for each $\ell = 1, \dots, m+1$, a finite collection $\{I_{\ell,j}\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint open balls $I_{\ell,j}$ of \mathbb{I}^k with $|I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell |\mathbb{I}^k|$ and $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell |\mathbb{I}^k|$ where $\alpha_\ell = 2^{-\ell} \alpha_0$ such that g is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n_ℓ in any $I_{\ell,j}$.

To conclude the proof of the theorem, we need to prove that the coexistence of infinitely many phenomena \mathcal{P} is Kolmogorov typical in \mathcal{U} . To do this, let $0 < c \leq 1$ be the constant that appears in Remark 2.3. Consider now the residual set of \mathcal{R} of \mathcal{U} given by the intersection of $\mathcal{O}_{m,\ell} = \mathcal{O}_m(\rho_\ell)$ for all $m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ where $\rho_\ell \rightarrow 0^+$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, any $g = (g_a)_a \in \mathcal{R}$ belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{m,\ell}$ for all $m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, we find $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(g) > 0$, and by a diagonal argument, a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers $(n_\ell)_\ell$ and collections $\{I_{\ell,j}\}_j$ of finitely many pairwise disjoint open balls $I_{\ell,j}$ in \mathbb{I}^k with $|I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell |\mathbb{I}^k|$ and $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell |\mathbb{I}^k|$ where $\alpha_\ell = 2^{-\ell} \alpha_0$ such that g is ρ_ℓ - C^s -Hénon-like renormalizable after period n_ℓ in any $I_{\ell,j}$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Let $J_{\ell,j}^* \subset I_{\ell,j}$ be the set of parameters where a phenomenon \mathcal{P} holds after renormalization of period n_ℓ . Notice that since \mathcal{P} is c -prevalent phenomenon for C^s -Hénon-like families after renormalization, we obtain that $J_{\ell,j}^*$ has at least Lebesgue measure

$$|J_{\ell,j}^*| \geq c \cdot |I_{\ell,j}| \quad \text{for all } \ell \text{ large enough.} \quad (2)$$

Let A be a measurable set in \mathbb{I}^k with $|A| > 0$. By Lebesgue's density theorem, we have a density point $a_0 \in A$. That is,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|A \cap B_\varepsilon(a_0)|}{|B_\varepsilon(a_0)|} = 1$$

where $B_\varepsilon(a_0)$ denotes the open ball in \mathbb{I}^k centered at a_0 with radius ε (in the usual norm in \mathbb{R}^k). Hence, for a given $\delta > 0$, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$|A \cap B_\varepsilon(a_0)| \geq (1 - \delta) |B_\varepsilon(a_0)|. \quad (3)$$

Since $|I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell |\mathbb{I}^k| \rightarrow 0$ and $|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_{\ell,j}| \leq \alpha_\ell |\mathbb{I}^k| \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, for any ℓ large enough, we can extract a subcollection $\{I_{\ell,j_i}\}_i$ of $\{I_{\ell,j}\}_j$ with $I_{\ell,j_i} \subset B_\varepsilon(a_0)$ (pairwise disjoint) and $|\cup_i I_{\ell,j_i}| \geq |B_\varepsilon(a_0)|/3$. Thus, by (2)

$$|\cup_i J_{\ell,j_i}^*| \geq c |\cup_i I_{\ell,j_i}| \geq \frac{c}{3} |B_\varepsilon(a_0)|. \quad (4)$$

Hence, (3) and (4) imply⁵ that

$$|\cup_i J_{\ell,j_i}^* \cap A| \geq (1 - \delta + c/3 - 1) |B_\varepsilon(a_0)| \geq \frac{c}{6} |B_\varepsilon(a_0)| \quad \text{for all } \ell \text{ large enough}$$

⁵If $|A \cap B| \geq \Delta |B|$ and $|J| \geq C |B|$ with $J \subset B$, then

$$|A \cap J| = |(A \cap B) \cap (J \cap B)| = |A \cap B| + |J \cap B| - |(A \cap B) \cup (J \cap B)| \geq \Delta |B| + C |B| - |B| = (\Delta + C - 1) |B|.$$

if $\delta > 0$ is taken close enough to 0. In particular, denoting by

$$J_\ell^* = \{a \in \mathbb{I}^k : g_a \text{ has a phenomenon } \mathcal{P} \text{ after renormalization of period } n_\ell\}$$

and having into account that $J_{\ell,j}^* \subset J_\ell^*$ we get $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|J_\ell^* \cap A| \geq c|B_\varepsilon(a_0)|/6$ for every ℓ large enough. This implies that

$$\sum_{\ell \geq 1} |A \cap J_\ell^*| = \infty \quad \text{for all measurable set } A \text{ with } |A| > 0.$$

By the generalization of the second Borel-Cantelli lemma in [Shu70, Thm. 1(a)], the set of event that occurs for infinitely many ℓ , that is,

$$J^* = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{\ell \geq n} J_\ell^*$$

has full Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{I}^k . In particular, and since the sequence of period n_ℓ is strictly increasing, by Remark 2.5, for any $a \in J^*$ the map g_a has coexistence of infinitely many different phenomena \mathcal{P} . This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

Now we will prove Proposition 2.4. To do this, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Given $\alpha > 0$ let $g = (g_a)_a$ be a $C^{d,r}$ -family and assume that g_a has a homoclinic tangency at a point Y_a (depending C^d -continuously on a) associated with a sectional dissipative saddle Q_a for any parameter $a \in a_0 + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k$. Then, for any $\rho > 0$ and $\kappa > 1$, there exists a sequence of families $g_n = (g_{na})_a$ approaching g in the $C^{d,r}$ -topology such that $g_{na} = g_a$ if $a \notin a_0 + (-\kappa\alpha, \kappa\alpha)^k$ and g_n is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n in $a_0 + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k$ for n large enough.*

Before proving this result, let us show how to obtain Proposition 2.4 from the above lemma:

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Consider a family $f = (f_a)_a$ in \mathcal{D} . Definition 1.1 provides an open cover of \mathbb{I}^k where f has a persistent homoclinic tangency in each open set of parameters in this cover. Let $L > 0$ be a Lebesgue number⁶ of this open cover. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0 = L/2k$. Choose in \mathbb{I}^k finitely many pairwise disjoint open balls of the form $I'_j = a_j + (-\kappa_j\alpha, \kappa_j\alpha)^k$ for some $a_j \in \mathbb{I}^k$, $1 < \kappa_j \leq (1 + \alpha)^{1/k}$ such that the union of these balls is of full measure in \mathbb{I}^k . Set $I_j = a_j + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k$. Clearly $|I_j| = \alpha^k |\mathbb{I}^k| \leq \alpha |\mathbb{I}^k|$ (for any $0 < \alpha < 1$). On the other hand, since $|\mathbb{I}^k| = |\cup_j I'_j| \leq (1 + \alpha) |\cup_j I_j|$, we have

$$|\mathbb{I}^k \setminus \cup_j I_j| = |\mathbb{I}^k| - |\cup_j I_j| \leq (1 - \frac{1}{1 + \alpha}) |\mathbb{I}^k| \leq \alpha |\mathbb{I}^k|.$$

Note that since α is less than $L/2k$, we have that the diameter of any $I_j = a_j + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k$ is smaller than L and thus is contained in one of the open balls of the covering. Consequently, f has a persistent homoclinic tangency in I_j . That is, f_a has a homoclinic tangency at a point Y_a (depending C^d -continuously on a) associated with a sectional dissipative saddle Q_a for any parameter $a \in I_j$. Taking into account that $\{I'_j\}_j$ are pairwise disjoint sets, we can apply Lemma 2.7 in each of these sets of parameters. Thus, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough

⁶For every open cover U of a compact metric space X there is a positive real number L , called a Lebesgue number, such that every subset of X of diameter less than L is contained in some element of U .

(depending on ϵ , ρ , f and α) we get an ϵ -perturbation $g_n = (g_{na})_a$ of f in the $C^{d,r}$ -topology which is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period n in any I_j . This concludes the proof. \square

Finally, to complete the proof, we will prove Lemma 2.7.

Proof of Lemma 2.7. By assumption, the map g_a has a homoclinic tangency at a point Y_a associated with a sectional dissipative periodic point Q_a for all $a \in a_0 + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k$. Actually, the tangency must be smoothly continued until $\|a - a_0\|_\infty = \alpha$. By means of an arbitrarily small $C^{d,r}$ -perturbation of the family around the tangency point, we can assume that the tangency Y_a is simple in the sense of [GST08]. That is, the tangency is quadratic, of codimension one, and, in the case of dimension $m > 3$, any extended unstable manifold is transverse to the leaf of the strong stable foliation that passes through the tangency point. Since Q_a is a sectional dissipative saddle, if we denote the leading multipliers of this periodic point by λ_a and $\gamma_a \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$|\lambda_a| < 1 < |\gamma_a| \quad \text{and} \quad |\lambda_a \gamma_a| < 1.$$

On the other hand, we can consider a generic one-parameter unfolding $g_{a,\mu}$ of the homoclinic tangency of g_a . To be more specific, we consider the one-parameter unfolding $g_{a,\mu}$ of g_a where μ is the parameter that controls the splitting of the tangency. We can take local coordinates (x, y) with $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ in a neighborhood of Q_a which corresponds to the origin such that $W_{loc}^s(Q_a)$ and $W_{loc}^u(Q_a)$ acquire the form $\{y = 0\}$ and $\{x = 0\}$ respectively. Moreover, by considering, if necessary, iterated, the tangency point Y_a is represented by $(x^+, 0)$ in these coordinates. Let us consider a C^∞ -bump function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with support in $[-1, 1]$ and equal to 1 on $[-1/\kappa, 1/\kappa]$. Let

$$\varphi : a = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{I}^k \mapsto \phi(a_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \phi(a_k) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Take $\delta > 0$ such that the 2δ -neighborhoods in local coordinates of Y_a , $g_a(Y_a)$ and $g_a^{-1}(Y_a)$ are disjoint. In particular, we denote by U the 2δ -neighborhood of Y_a in these local coordinates. We write

$$g_{a,\mu} = H_{a,\mu} \circ g_a$$

where $H_{a,\mu}$ in this local coordinates takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x} &= x \\ \bar{y} &= y + \varphi\left(\frac{a - a_0}{\kappa\alpha}\right) \phi\left(\frac{\|(x, y) - (x^+, 0)\|}{2\delta}\right) \mu \end{aligned}$$

and it is the identity otherwise. Observe that if $a \notin a_0 + (-\kappa\alpha, \kappa\alpha)^k$ then $g_{a,\mu} = g_a$. Also, if $(x, y) \notin g_a^{-1}(U)$ then $g_{a,\mu} = g_a$.

Let us define the first return map associated with the simple homoclinic tangency of $g_{a,\mu}$ at $\mu = 0$ (see [GST08, Sec. 1, p. 928]). As usual, $T_0 = T_0(a, \mu)$ denotes the local map for $a \in a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$. In our case, since we are assuming that Q_a is a fixed point, T_0 corresponds to $g_{a,\mu}$ at a neighborhood of this fixed point. By $T_1 = T_1(a, \mu)$ we denote the map $g_{a,\mu}^{k_1}$ from a neighborhood Π_a^- of a tangent point $Y_a^- \in W_{loc}^u(Q_a)$ to a neighborhood Π_a of $Y_a = g_a^{k_1}(Y_a^-) \in$

$W_{loc}^s(Q_a)$. Then, one defines the first-return map as $T_n = T_1 \circ T_0^n$ for sufficiently large n on $\sigma_n(a) = \Pi_a \cap T_0^{-n}(\Pi_a^-)$. Since the tangency point Y_a depends C^d -continuously on $a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$, we find that this first-return map $T_n = T_n(a, \mu)$ also depends smoothly as a function of the parameter a on $a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$.

Lemma 2.8 (Parametrized rescaling lemma). *There are a sequence of open sets Δ_n in the (a, μ) -parameter space with $\overline{\Delta_n}$ accumulating on $(a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k) \times \{0\}$ such that for any $(a, \mu) \in \overline{\Delta_n}$ there is a smooth transformation of coordinates which brings the first-return map T_n in local coordinates on $\sigma_n(a)$ the following form:*

$$\bar{x} = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{y} = M - y^2 + o(1)$$

where the $o(1)$ -terms tends to zero (uniformly on a) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ along with all the derivatives up to the order r with respect to the coordinates (x, y) and up to $d \leq r - 2$ with respect to the rescaled parameter M . The domain of definition of T_n in these coordinates is an asymptotically large region that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, covers all finite values of (x, y) . The rescaled parameter M is at least C^d -smooth function of (a, μ) which for large enough n is given by

$$M \sim \gamma_a^{2n}(\mu + O(\gamma_a^{-n})). \quad (5)$$

Proof. This result follows from [GST08, Lemma 1]. To see this, let us analyze the proof of the rescaling lemma in [GST08] for the sectional dissipative case $(1, 1)$. We observe that we can perform the proof line by line and the transformation of coordinates [GST08, Eq. (3.4) and (3.7)] can be done smoothly on the parameter $a \in a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$. On the other hand, the constants on the O -terms will depend on the parameter a but these can be uniformly bounded due to the compactness of the parameter space $a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$ and the continuity of all the coefficients with respect to a . \square

Notice that the parameter M in (5) can take arbitrarily finite values when μ varies close to $\mu_n^0(a) = O(\gamma_a^{-n})$. To be more precisely, the parameter $\mu_n^0(a)$ was introduced in [GST08] so that $M_{n,a}(\mu_n^0(a)) = 0$ where $M_{n,a}$ is the function given in (5) for fixed n and a . Actually, an explicit expression of M in (5) is provided in [GST08, after Eq. (3.8)] which, up to multiplicative constants, is basically the right hand of (5) where the O -function does not depend on μ and its i -th partial derivatives with respect to the variable a are of order $O(n^i \gamma_a^{-n})$. Thus, we can calculate the derivative with respect to μ of $M_{n,a}$ for n large enough as $\partial_\mu M_{n,a} \sim \gamma_a^{2n} \gg 1$. Hence, we obtain that $M_{n,a}$ is an invertible expanding map with an arbitrarily large uniform expansion on $a \in a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$. Thus, for n large enough, we can assume that

$$\Phi_n(a, \mu) = (a, M_{n,a}(\mu))$$

is a diffeomorphism between the set $\overline{\Delta_n}$ given above in the lemma and $(a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k) \times [-10, 10]$.

Notice that the linear rescaling $b(M)$ given in Definition 2.2 takes, on $a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$, the form

$$b(M) = 2\alpha M - 3\alpha + \pi_k(a_0) \quad \text{for } M \in [1, 2]$$

where $\pi_k : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the projection on the k -th coordinate. Consider the inverse map

$$\widehat{M}(b) = \frac{b + 3\alpha - \pi_k(a_0)}{2\alpha} \quad \text{for } b \in \pi_k(a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k).$$

Now since Φ_n is a diffeomorphism, we find a C^d -function μ_n on $a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$ defined as

$$\Phi_n^{-1}(a, \widehat{M}(\pi_k(a))) = (a, \mu_n(a)) \quad a \in a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k.$$

In particular,

$$M_{n,a}(\mu_n(a)) = \widehat{M}(\pi_k(a)) \quad \text{for } a \in a_0 + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k. \quad (6)$$

Extending smoothly μ_n to \mathbb{I}^k (c.f. [Lee12, Lemma 2.26]) we can consider the sequence of families $g_n = (g_{n,a})_a$ where

$$g_{n,a} = g_{a, \mu_n(a)} \quad \text{for } a \in \mathbb{I}^k \text{ and } n \text{ large enough.}$$

Observe that $g_{n,a} = g_a$ for $a \notin a_0 + (-\kappa\alpha, \kappa\alpha)^k$. Moreover, according to Lemma 2.8 and Equation (6), there is a smooth family $R = (R_a)_a$ of smooth transformation of coordinates R_a on $\sigma_n(a)$ such that bring the first-return map $T_n = T_n(a, \mu_n(a))$ of $g_{n,a}$ into $R_a^{-1} \circ T_n \circ R_a$ which has the form

$$\bar{x} = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{y} = \widehat{M}(\pi_k(a)) - y^2 + o(1) \quad \text{for } a \in a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k.$$

Substituting the parameter a by the linear rescaling $a(M) = (\bar{a}, b(M)) \in a_0 + [-\alpha, \alpha]^k$ and taking into account that $\widehat{M}(\pi_k(a(M))) = \widehat{M}(b(M)) = M$ for all $M \in [1, 2]$ we obtain that $\varphi_n = R_{a(M)}^{-1} \circ T_n(a(M), \mu_n(a(M))) \circ R_{a(M)}$ takes the form

$$\bar{x} = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{y} = M - y^2 + o(1) \quad \text{for } M \in [1, 2].$$

Since the $o(1)$ -terms above tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ along with all derivatives up to the order r with respect to the coordinates (x, y) and up to $s \leq d \leq r - 2$ with respect to M , we get $\|\varphi_n - \Phi\|_{C^{s,s+2}} = o(1)$ where $\Phi = (\Phi_M)_M$ is the parabola family. This proves that for n large enough, g_n is a ρ - C^s -Hénon-like family after renormalization of period $\tilde{n} = n + k_1$ in $a_0 + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k$. For short and simplicity, we can relabel the sequence of families to simply say that the renormalization period of g_n is n .

To conclude the proof of the lemma, we only need to show that g_n converges to g in the $C^{d,r}$ -topology. To do this, notice that the $C^{d,r}$ -norm

$$\|g_n - g\| = \|(I - H_{a, \mu_n(a)}) \circ g_a\| \leq \|I - H_{a, \mu_n(a)}\| \|g\|$$

where I denotes the identity. Thus, we only need to calculate the $C^{d,r}$ -norm of the family $(I - H_{a, \mu_n(a)})_a$. Since $H_{a, \mu_n(a)} = I$ if $a \notin a_0 + (-\kappa\alpha, \kappa\alpha)^k$ or $(x, y) \notin U$ then

$$\|I - H_{a, \mu_n(a)}\| \leq \left\| \varphi \left(\frac{a - a_0}{\kappa\alpha} \right) \phi \left(\frac{\|(x, y) - (x^+, 0)\|}{2\delta} \right) \mu_n(a) \right\|.$$

Then to estimate the $C^{d,r}$ -norm above it suffices to show that the function

$$G_{n,\alpha}(a) = \varphi \left(\frac{a - a_0}{\kappa\alpha} \right) \mu_n(a) \quad \text{for } a \in a_0 + (-\kappa\alpha, \kappa\alpha)^k$$

have C^d -norm small when n is large. To do this, using the multi-index notation for partial derivatives and the Leibnitz rule,

$$\partial_a^\ell G_{n,\alpha}(a) = \sum_{j \leq \ell} \binom{\ell}{j} \partial_a^{\ell-j} \varphi\left(\frac{a-a_0}{\kappa\alpha}\right) \cdot \partial_a^j \mu_n(a) \quad \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+^k = (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^k \text{ with } |\ell| \leq d. \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, recall that as we have indicated before, the μ variable in (5) varies close to $\mu_n^0(a) = O(\gamma_a^{-n})$. Moreover, $|\mu_n(a) - \mu_n^0(a)| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we also get $\mu_n(a) = O(\gamma_a^{-n})$.

We will show that $\partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a) = O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^{-n})$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+^k$ by induction in $|\ell|$. To do this, assume that $\partial_a^j \mu_n(a) = O(n^{|j|} \gamma_a^{-n})$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+^k$ with $j \leq \ell$ and $|j| < |\ell|$. Notice that (6) can be written as

$$\widehat{M}(\pi_k(a)) \sim \gamma_a^{2n} (\mu_n(a) + O(\gamma_a^{-n}))$$

where the equivalence is actually an equality up to multiplicative constants (independent of a). Moreover, the i -th partial derivatives with respect to the variable a of the above O -function is of order $O(n^i \gamma_a^{-n})$ for all $i \geq 0$. Thus, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_a^\ell \widehat{M}(\pi_k(a)) &= O(1) \sim O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^n) + \sum_{j \leq \ell} \binom{\ell}{j} \partial_a^{\ell-j} (\gamma_a^{2n}) \cdot \partial_a^j \mu_n(a) \\ &= O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^n) + \gamma_a^{2n} \cdot \partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a) + \sum_{j \leq \ell, j \neq \ell} O(n^{|\ell|-|j|} \gamma_a^{2n}) \cdot O(n^{|j|} \gamma_a^{-n}) \\ &= O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^n) + \gamma_a^{2n} \cdot \partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a). \end{aligned}$$

From here it follows that $\partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a) = O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^{-n})$. Indeed, if $\partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a)$ is not a $O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^{-n})$, then negating the definition of O -function, for every $K > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n \geq n_0$ such that $|\partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a)| > Kn^{|\ell|} |\gamma_a|^{-n}$. In particular, $\partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a) = \Omega(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^{-n})$ where Ω denotes the Big Omega of Hardy-Littlewood. Hence, we obtain that $\partial_a^\ell \widehat{M}(\pi_k(a))$, which is a $O(1)$ -function, is also of order $O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^n) + \gamma_a^{2n} \cdot \Omega(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^{-n}) = O(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^n) + \Omega(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^n) = \Omega(n^{|\ell|} \gamma_a^n)$ obtaining a contradiction.

Substituting the above estimate of $\partial_a^\ell \mu_n(a)$ into (7), we get that $\partial_a^\ell G_{n,\alpha}(a) = O((\kappa\alpha)^{-d} n^d \gamma_a^{-n})$. In particular, we get

$$\|G_{n,\alpha}\|_{C^d} = O((\kappa\alpha)^{-d} n^d \gamma_a^{-n})$$

for some $1 < \gamma \leq \gamma_a$ for all $a \in a_0 + (-\alpha, \alpha)^k$. Observe that this assertion completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Acknowledgements. We thank E. R. Pujals for his guidance, and the encouragement he gave us to write this paper providing many ideas to go ahead. The second author also especially thanks to his supervisor E. R. Pujals for his unconditional friendship and enriching talks on mathematics among other things during his doctorate. Finally, the first author thanks A. Raibekas for his tireless patience and friendship during many difficult moments throughout the process of writing and revising the preliminary versions.

The first author was partially supported by CNPq, FAPERJ and grants MTM2017-87697-P and PID2020-113052GB-I00 funded by MCIN (Spain).

REFERENCES

- [BC85] M. Benedicks and L. Carleson. On iterations of $1 - ax^2$ on $(-1, 1)$. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 1–25, 1985.
- [BC91] M. Benedicks and L. Carleson. The dynamics of the Hénon map. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 73–169, 1991.
- [BD12] C. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz. Abundance of C^1 -homoclinic tangencies. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 264:5111–5148, 2012.
- [Ber16] P. Berger. Generic family with robustly infinitely many sinks. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 205(1):121–172, 2016.
- [Ber17] P. Berger. Emergence and non-typicality of the finiteness of the attractors in many topologies. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 297(1):1–27, May 2017.
- [Ber19] P. Berger. Strong regularity. Abundance of non-uniformly hyperbolic Hénon-like endomorphisms. *Astérisque*, 410:53–177, 2019.
- [BR17] P. G. Barrientos and A. Raibekas. Robust tangencies of large codimension. *Nonlinearity*, 30(12):4369, 2017.
- [BR21] P. G. Barrientos and A. Raibekas. Robust degenerated unfoldings of cycles and tangencies. *Journal Dynamics Differential Equations*, 33:177–209, 2021.
- [BR22] P. G. Barrientos and A. Raibekas. Berger domains and Kolmogorov typicality of infinitely many invariant circles. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [Col98] E. Colli. Infinitely many coexisting strange attractors. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré-Nonlinear Analysis*, 15(5):539–580, 1998.
- [DRV96] L. Díaz, J. Rocha, and M. Viana. Strange attractors in saddle-node cycles: prevalence and globality. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 125(1):37–74, 1996.
- [GST93a] S. V. Gonchenko, L. P. Shilnikov, and D. V. Turaev. Dynamical phenomena in multi-dimensional systems with a structurally unstable homoclinic Poincaré curve. *Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math*, 47(3):410–415, 1993.
- [GST93b] S. V. Gonchenko, L. P. Shilnikov, and D. V. Turaev. On an existence of Newhouse regions near systems with non-rough Poincaré homoclinic curve (multidimensional case). *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, 329(4):404–407, 1993.
- [GST08] S. V. Gonchenko, L. P. Shilnikov, and D. V. Turaev. On dynamical properties of multidimensional diffeomorphisms from Newhouse regions: I. *Nonlinearity*, 21(5):923, 2008.
- [Hén76] M. Hénon. A two-dimensional mapping with a strange attractor. In *The Theory of Chaotic Attractors*, pages 94–102. Springer, 1976.
- [HK10] B. R. Hunt and V. Y. Kaloshin. Prevalence. In *Handbook of dynamical systems*, volume 3, pages 43–87. Elsevier, 2010.
- [Jak81] M. V. Jakobson. Absolutely continuous invariant measures for one-parameter families of one-dimensional maps. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 81(1):39–88, 1981.
- [Lea08] B. Leal. High dimension diffeomorphisms exhibiting infinitely many strange attractors. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 25(3):587–607, 2008.
- [Lee12] J. Lee. *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*, volume 218. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [MV93] L. Mora and M. Viana. Abundance of strange attractors. *Acta Math.*, 171(1):1–71, 1993.
- [New70] S. E. Newhouse. Nondensity of axiom A(a) on S^2 . In *Global Analysis (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XIV, Berkeley, Calif., 1968)*, pages 191–202. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1970.
- [New79] S. E. Newhouse. The abundance of wild hyperbolic sets and nonsmooth stable sets for diffeomorphisms. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 50:101–151, 1979.
- [Pal00] J. Palis. A global view of dynamics and a conjecture on the denseness of finitude of attractors. *Astérisque*, 261(xiiiiv):335–347, 2000.
- [PR97] A. Pumariño and J. A. Rodríguez. *Coexistence and persistence of strange attractors*, volume 1658 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.

- [PR01] A. Pumariño and J. A. Rodríguez. Coexistence and persistence of infinitely many strange attractors. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 21(5):1511–1523, 2001.
- [PT93] J. Palis and F. Takens. *Hyperbolicity and sensitive chaotic dynamics at homoclinic bifurcations*, volume 35 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. Fractal dimensions and infinitely many attractors.
- [PV94] J. Palis and M. Viana. High dimension diffeomorphisms displaying infinitely many periodic attractors. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 140(1):207–250, 1994.
- [Rob83] C. Robinson. Bifurcation to infinitely many sinks. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 90(3):433–459, 1983.
- [Roj17] J. D. Rojas. *Generic families exhibiting infinitely many non-uniform hyperbolic attractors for a set of total measure of parameters*. PhD thesis, Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA), 2017.
- [Rom95] N. Romero. Persistence of homoclinic tangencies in higher dimensions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 15(4):735–757, 1995.
- [Shu70] J. Shuster. On the Borel-Cantelli problem. *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, 13(2):273–275, 1970.
- [Via93] M. Viana. Strange attractors in higher dimensions. *Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática-Bulletin/Brazilian Mathematical Society*, 24(1):13–62, 1993.

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, UFF

RUA MÁRIO SANTOS BRAGA s/N - CAMPUS VALONGUINHOS, NITERÓI, BRAZIL

Email address: pgbarrientos@id.uff.br

UNIVERSIDAD DEL ROSARIO, ESCUELA DE INGENIERIA, CIENCIA Y TECNOLOGIA

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA.

Email address: juandavi.rojas@urosario.edu.co