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Abstract. This is the first in a series of papers exploring rigidity prop-
ties of exceptional algebraic actions. We show $C^{\infty}$ local rigidity for a
class of new examples of solvable algebraic partially hyperbolic actions
on $G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_k / \Gamma$, where $G_1 = SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, $n \geq 3$. These ex-
amples include rank-one partially hyperbolic actions and actions enjoy
minimal hyperbolicity. The method of proof is a combination of KAM
type iteration scheme and representation theory. The principal differ-
ence with previous work that used KAM scheme is very general nature
of the proof: no specific information about unitary representations of $G$
or $G_1$ is required.

1. Introduction

1.1. Algebraic actions and rank one actions. Suppose $A$ is a group. Let
$G$ be a connected Lie group, $S \subseteq G$ a closed subgroup which is isomorphic
to $A$, and $\Gamma$ a (cocompact) torsion free lattice in $G$. Then $S$ acts by left
translation on the compact space $X = G/\Gamma$, which is called an algebraic $A$
action. Coarse Lyapunov distributions of a (partially) hyperbolic $A$
action are defined as minimal non-trivial intersections of stable distribu-
tions of various action elements.

Definition 1.1. An $A$-action $\alpha$ is a non-trivial rank one action, if there is a
proper rank one subgroup $A'$ of $A$ such that the coarse Lyapunov foliations
for $\alpha(A)$ is the same as for action $\alpha(A')$.

1.2. History of the rigidity problem. Significant progress has been made
over the past decades in the study of $C^{\infty}$ local rigidity for higher rank ac-
tions. For algebraic Anosov actions the problem was successfully resolved
in the mid-1990s [8]. Similar questions to partially hyperbolic algebraic
actions are much more difficult and are not completely resolved. Most ex-
isting rigidity results for partially hyperbolic algebraic actions require that
the actions satisfy the genuinely higher-rank condition: the projection of
the acting group to each simple factor of $G$ at least has rank two; some
of the highlights are [6], [4], [36], [37], [34], [35]. We call the following ac-
tions exceptional actions: higher rank but not genuinely higher-rank actions,
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non-trivial rank one actions, and parabolic actions (actions totally absence of hyperbolicity). Rigidity results for exceptional actions are substantially more difficult to obtain. As a result, much less is known about them. The difficulty is from two aspects. Firstly, the tools and theories developed so far rely on the strong geometric robustness of coarse Lyapunov foliations to provide a Hölder conjugacy. Generally, the strong geometric condition (like genuinely higher-rank condition) is more restrictive than the higher rank assumption. In [1] only a special example of non-trivial rank one actions is considered; and it seems unlikely to extend the result to other types of homogeneous spaces. Secondly, in the smoothing step, generally the higher rank condition is essential to show that the Hölder conjugacy obtained is $C^\infty$.

It is natural to ask whether $C^\infty$ local rigidity holds or not for exceptional actions. One potential method to treat these actions is the adapted KAM scheme, which was first introduced in [5]. In that paper an approach based on classical KAM-type iteration scheme [24] was used to prove $C^\infty$ local rigidity for higher rank partially hyperbolic automorphisms on torus. The approach was further applied in [7] to prove weak $C^\infty$ local rigidity for parabolic $\mathbb{R}^2$ actions on $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times SL(2,\mathbb{R})/\Gamma$. It provides a useful and general scheme proving local rigidity for algebraic actions. For example, in [30] the $C^\infty$ (weak) local rigidity results for higher rank parabolic flows (maps) are claimed on Heisenberg nilmanifolds by using this adapted KAM scheme. There are two key steps in the scheme:

(i) classifying obstructions to solving the linearized conjugacy equation (which decomposes into (twisted) cohomological equations over the algebraic action) and obtaining tame estimates for the solutions;

(ii) finding a good approximation of an almost (twisted) coboundary by a (twisted) coboundary. An approximation is good if its Sobolev norms are quadratically small with respect to those of the error in each iterative step. This the most difficult part of the scheme.

Both steps need the representation theory of $G$, which limited the potential application of the scheme only to some special models. In [5] Fourier analysis on torus allowed explicit computation in the dual space. In [7] and [30], the unitary dual of $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ and Heisenberg groups were used respectively. However, the application of the KAM scheme even to the most basic semisimple situations other than $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ looked very problematic. In general, the unitary dual of many higher rank simple Lie groups is not completely classified, and even when the classification is known, it is too complicated to apply. For example, unitary dual of $SL(3,\mathbb{R})$ is well-understood [31], but there was no known way to make use of it in the KAM scheme. Another problem with the scheme was that it required consideration of simple Lie groups case-by-case. Probably, specific information from representation theory would be needed that may be available for some semisimple Lie groups and not for others. Only in the present work new
insights and tools that are developed in analysis and representation theory make possible applications of the KAM scheme to all semisimple and various other cases. The results and techniques are of independent interest and have wide applicability.

1.3. Method of the paper. The main result of this paper presents local $C^\infty$ rigidity for a large class of higher-rank but not genuinely higher-rank actions, see Theorem 2.4 and non-trivial rank one actions of semisimple types, see Theorem 2.3 and 2.5. Further, examples of Theorem 2.5 failing to satisfy the generic condition: the coarse Lyapunov foliations generate the tangent space. So far, all $C^\infty$ rigidity results on semisimple type homogeneous spaces rely on this condition.

The method of proof is a combination of KAM type iteration scheme and representation theory. Step (i) was resolved by the author in a series of papers studying (twisted) cohomology over various flows considered in the paper [38], [39], [40] by representation theory. To obtain a good approximation of a set of almost (twisted) coboundaries described in Step (ii), firstly we make a new study of the irreducible representations of $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ by using $K$-finite vectors, which is totally different from the method in [38]. We carry out explicit computation both to the partially hyperbolic and the unipotent flows. This is the analytic novelty of the paper.

Based on the analysis, we construct the approximations inside various suitable subgroups instead of the whole group $G$. The main technical problem we face is that if an approximation is constructed inside a subgroup, then probably it is only smooth inside the subgroup instead of globally smooth. This is the reason in previous work the representation theory of the whole group $G$ has to be considered. One main innovation from representation theory is a construction of smoothing operators based on projection-valued measure, which is used to obtain a globally smooth approximation from one which is only smooth inside a subgroup. Section 11.4, where the smoothing operators are defined and their properties are studied, and Sections 12 and 13, how the smoothing operators work, are the heart and the main technical part of the present paper.

1.4. Comments on the application of method in the paper. After some modifications the results of the paper can be extended to the cases where $G_1$ is of the following type: $SL(n,\mathbb{R})$, $SO_o(m,m)$, $E_6(6)$, $E_7(7)$ and $E_8(8)$, $n \geq 3$, $m \geq 4$. The method of the paper only relies on the unitary representation theory of semidirect product $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ and $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}$ instead of that of the entire $G$. These subgroups build up all simple Lie groups listed above for $G_1$ up to local isomorphisms. Due to the length restriction, we only study the case of $SL(n,\mathbb{R})$ in the current paper. It is known that there are only finite types of semidirect products composing all higher-rank simple Lie groups. Then it is reasonable to expect that the method can be applied to all semisimple situations after a study of various types of semidirect products.
The treatment of unipotent actions needs a further development of representation theory and the modification of KAM scheme, which will appear in another paper [41].

2. Background, definition, and statement of results

In this paper, $G$ denotes a higher-rank semisimple Lie group without compact factors satisfying: $G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_k$, where $G_1 = SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, $n \geq 3$. $\Gamma$ is a cocompact irreducible lattice of $G$. For any subgroup $A$ of $G$ we use $\alpha_A$ to denote the the action of $A$ by left translations on $X = G/\Gamma$. We use $\mathfrak{g}$ to denote the Lie algebra of $G$, $\Phi_1$ to denote the set of roots of $G_1$ and $u_\phi$ to denote the root space of $\phi \in \Phi_1$. We note that each $u_\phi$ is one-dimensional. Set $h_\phi = [u_\phi, u_{-\phi}]$.

Definition 2.1. We say that $z \in \mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent (resp. semisimple) if $\text{ad}_z$ is nilpotent (resp. $z$ is in a split Cartan subalgebra).

Definition 2.2. We say that $\alpha_A$ is $C^{\infty, \ell_0, \infty}$ locally rigid, i.e., for any $C^\infty$ perturbation $A$-action $\hat{\alpha}$ which is sufficiently $C^{\ell_0}$ close to $\alpha_A$ on a compact generating set of $A$, there is $h \in \text{Diff}^\infty(X)$ such that for any $x \in X$ and $a \in A$ we have

$$h(\hat{\alpha}(a, x)) = \alpha_A(i(a), h(x)),$$

where $i$ is an automorphism of $A$.

2.1. Statement of the results. Fix $X \in h_\phi$, $\phi \in \Phi_1$. Set $d_1 = \{X, u_\mu : \mu(X) > 0\}$ and $d_2 = \{u_{\mu_1}, u_{\mu_2} : \mu_1(X) = \mu_2(X) = 0 \text{ and } \pm \mu_1 \pm \mu_2 \notin \Phi_1\}$. Let $A_i$ be the subgroup of $G_1$ with its Lie algebra spanned by elements in $d_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

Theorem 2.3. Suppose $G = G_1 = SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, $n \geq 6$. Let $A$ be the subgroup generated by $A_1$ and $A_2$. Then there is $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the action $\alpha_A$ is $C^{\infty, \ell_0, \infty}$ locally rigid.

Suppose $G \neq G_1$ and $G_2 \times \cdots \times G_k = G_3 \times \cdots \times G_l$, where each $G_i$ is semisimple, $3 \leq i \leq l$. Suppose $X_i$ is in a $\mathbb{R}$-split Cartan subalgebra of $G_i$ with its projection to each simple factor of $G_i$ is non-trival, $3 \leq i \leq l$. Then we has the eigenspace decomposition for $\text{ad}_{X_i}

\text{ad}_G = \sum_{\mu \in \Delta(X_i)} g_{\mu, X_i}$, where $\Delta(X_i)$ is the set of eigenvalues and $g_{\mu, X_i}$ is the eigenspace for eigenvalue $\mu$.

Theorem 2.4. ($G \neq G_1$ type I) Let $A_i$ be the subgroup generated by $X_i$ and $\sum_{\mu > 0} g_{\mu, X_i}$, $i \geq 3$. Set $A = A_1 \times A_3 \times \cdots \times A_l$. There is $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the action $\alpha_A$ is $C^{\infty, \ell_0, \infty}$ locally rigid.

Theorem 2.5. ($G \neq G_1$ type II) Suppose $G_i = SL(n, k)$, $i \geq 2$ $n \geq 4$, $k = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$; and $A_{j+1}$ is a maximal abelian subgroup of $G_j$, $j \geq 2$. Set $A = A_1 \times A_3 \times \cdots \times A_l$. There is $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the action $\alpha_A$ is $C^{\infty, \ell_0, \infty}$ locally rigid.
Remark 2.6. Actions in all these theorems are exceptional. It is known that any maximal abelian subgroup in $SL(n,k)$, $n \geq 4$ is unique (up to automorphisms), and is unipotent [18]. Then the actions in Theorem 2.3 and 2.5 are non-trivial rank one actions.

The paper is organized as follows: The crucial step in proving the main results of the paper is Theorem 13.1. After a detailed study of the cohomological equation over the partially hyperbolic flow (see Section 6 to Section 10) we can reduce Theorem 13.1 to Θ-finite vectors. This part is based on the analysis in irreducible components of $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$. From the study of the cohomological equation over unipotent flows, we construct new smoothing operators, by which we can further reduce Theorem 13.1 to various Θ-finite small vectors (see Section 11, 12). This part is based on group algebra. Finally, these smoothing operators provide the desired approximation by acting on the approximation which is only smooth inside a subgroup.

3. Preliminaries on unitary representation theory

3.1. Sobolev space and elliptic regularity theorem. Let $\pi$ be a unitary representation of a Lie group $G$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\pi)$.

Definition 3.1. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{H}^k(\pi)$ consists of all $v \in \mathcal{H}(\pi)$ such that the $\mathcal{H}$-valued function $g \rightarrow \pi(g)v$ is of class $C^k$ ($\mathcal{H}^0 = \mathcal{H}$). For $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, $d\pi(X)$ denotes the infinitesimal generator of the one-parameter group of operators $t \rightarrow \pi(\exp tX)$, which acts on $\mathcal{H}$ as an essentially skew-adjoint operator. For any $v \in \mathcal{H}$, we also write $Xv := d\pi(X)v$.

We shall call $\mathcal{H}^k = \mathcal{H}^k(\pi)$ the space of $k$-times differentiable vectors for $\pi$ or the Sobolev space of order $k$. The following basic properties of these spaces can be found, e.g., in [25] and [26]:

1. $\mathcal{H}^k = \bigcap_{m \leq k} D(d\pi(Y_{j_1}) \cdots d\pi(Y_{j_m}))$, where $\{Y_j\}$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}$, and $D(T)$ denotes the domain of an operator on $\mathcal{H}$.
2. $\mathcal{H}^k$ is a Hilbert space, relative to the inner product
   $$\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle_{G,k} := \sum_{1 \leq m \leq k} \langle Y_{j_1} \cdots Y_{j_m} v_1, Y_{j_1} \cdots Y_{j_m} v_2 \rangle + \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle$$
3. The spaces $\mathcal{H}^k$ coincide with the completion of the subspace $\mathcal{H}^\infty \subset \mathcal{H}$ of infinitely differentiable vectors with respect to the norm
   $$\|v\|_{G,k} = \left\{ \|v\|^2 + \sum_{1 \leq m \leq k} \|Y_{j_1} \cdots Y_{j_m} v\|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
   induced by the inner product in (2). The subspace $\mathcal{H}^\infty$ coincides with the intersection of the spaces $\mathcal{H}^k$ for all $k \geq 0$. 
(4) $\mathcal{H}^{-k}$, defined as the Hilbert space duals of the spaces $\mathcal{H}^k$, are subspaces of the space $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})$ of distributions, defined as the dual space of $\mathcal{H}^\infty$.

We write $\|v\|_k := \|v\|_{G,k}$ and $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle_k := \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle_{G,k}$ if there is no confusion. Otherwise, we use subscripts to emphasize that the regularity is measured with respect to $G$. If we want to consider the restricted representation on a subgroup $S$ of $G$ we use $\mathcal{H}^k_S$ to denote the Sobolev space of order $k$ with respect to $S$.

For any $u_1, u_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{H}^k$ set $\|u_1, u_2, \ldots\|_k = \max\{\|u_1\|_k, \|u_2\|_k, \ldots\}$. For any set $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|\cdot\|_{C^r, \mathcal{O}}$ stands for $C^r$ norm for functions having continuous derivatives up to order $r$ on $\mathcal{O}$. We also write $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$ if there is no confusion.

We list the well-known elliptic regularity theorem which will be frequently used in this paper (see [28] Chapter I, Corollary 6.5 and 6.6):

**Theorem 3.2.** Fix a basis $\{Y_j\}$ for $\mathfrak{g}$ and set $L_{2m} = \sum Y_j^{2m}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\|v\|_{2m} \leq C_m(\|L_{2m}v\| + \|v\|), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$$

where $C_m$ is a constant only dependent on $m$ and $\{Y_j\}$.

Suppose $\Gamma$ is an irreducible torsion-free cocompact lattice in $G$. Denote by $\mathcal{O}$ the regular representation of $G$ on $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O}) = L^2(G/\Gamma)$. Then we have the following subelliptic regularity theorem (see [17]):

**Theorem 3.3.** Fix $\{Y_j\}$ in $\mathfrak{g}$ such that commutators of $Y_j$ of length at most $r$ span $\mathfrak{g}$. Also set $L_{2m} = \sum Y_j^{2m}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O})$. If $L_{2m}f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O})$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $f \in \mathcal{H}^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ and satisfies

$$\|f\|_{2m-1} \leq C_m(\|L_{2m}f\| + \|f\|), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$$

where $C_m$ is a constant only dependent on $m$ and $\{Y_j\}$.

3.2. Extended representation. The adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ is isomorphic to a subset of $\dim(\mathfrak{g}) \times \dim(\mathfrak{g})$ matrices. Let $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the set of $(\dim(\mathfrak{g}) \times 1)$ matrices with entries from $\mathcal{H}$. Then the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ has a natural action on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})$. For any $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})$, we can write $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{\dim(\mathfrak{g})})$. Then the unitary representation $\pi$ has a natural extension on $\mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})$ by acting on each coordinate: $\pi(\xi) = (\pi(\xi_1), \ldots, \pi(\xi_{\dim(\mathfrak{g})}))$. We say that $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})^s$, if $\xi_i \in \mathcal{H}^s$, $1 \leq i \leq \dim(\mathfrak{g})$. Set $\|\xi\|_s = \max_{1 \leq i \leq \dim(\mathfrak{g})}\|\xi_i\|_s$. For any subgroup $S$ of $G$, $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})^s_S$ and $\|\xi\|_{S,s}$ are defined similarly.

3.3. Direct decompositions of Sobolev space. For any Lie group $G$ of type $I$, there is a decomposition of $\pi$ into a direct integral $\pi = \int_Z \pi_z d\mu(z)$ of irreducible unitary representations for some measure space $(Z, \mu)$ (we refer to [12] Chapter 2.3 or [23] for more detailed account for the direct integral theory). All the operators in the enveloping algebra are decomposable with respect to the direct integral decomposition. Hence there exists for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$
an induced direct decomposition of the Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{H}^s = \int_Z \mathcal{H}_z^s d\mu(z)$ with respect to the measure $d\mu(z)$.

The existence of the direct integral decompositions allows us to reduce our analysis of the cohomological equation to irreducible unitary representations. This point of view is essential for our purposes.

3.4. Weak containment and tempered representation. $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ is said to be strongly $L^p$ if there is a dense subset $V$ of $\mathcal{H}$ such that for any $u$ and $v$ in $V$, the matrix coefficient $g \to \langle \pi(g)v, w \rangle$ lies in $L^p(G)$. We say $\pi$ is strongly $L^{p+\epsilon}$ if it is strongly $L^q$ for any $q > p$.

Suppose $G$ is semisimple with finite center. $\pi$ is said to be tempered if $\pi$ strongly $L^{2+\epsilon}$. If $G$ is semisimple of non-compact type, then it is well-known that every tempered representation of $G$ has a spectral gap (i.e. tempered representations are outside a fixed neighborhood of the trivial representation in the Fell topology). For example, if $S = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, then the discrete series and principal series representations are tempered, while the complementary series representations are not (see [15]). The following follows from (the proof) of [3, Lemma 14], [12, Theorem 2.4], [13, Lemma 6.2]:

**Theorem 3.4.** Suppose $\pi = \int_Z \pi_x d\mu(x)$ is a unitary representation of $G$, then $\pi$ is tempered if and only if $\pi_z$ is for almost all $z \in Z$.

At the end of the section, we recall the Howe-Moore theorem [14] which will be frequently used in the paper: if $G$ is a simple Lie group with finite center and $\pi$ is a unitary representation of $G$ such that the restriction of $\pi$ to any simple factor of $G$ has a spectral gap. The for any closed non-compact subgroup $M$ of $G$, $\pi$ has no $M$-invariant vector.

4. Preparatory steps and notations

We will use notations from this section throughout subsequent sections. So the reader should consult this section if an unfamiliar symbol appears. In what follows, $C$ will denote any constant that depends only on the given group $G$, the manifolds $\mathcal{X}$ and the action $A$. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ denote the Lie algebra of $G$. $C_{x,y,z,\cdots}$ will denote any constant that in addition to the above depends also on parameters $x, y, z, \cdots$.

4.1. Conjugacy problem and linearization. The main part of the proof of our theorem is carried out via a KAM-type iteration scheme. Now we proceed to deduce linearized conjugacy equation over $\alpha_A$, the algebraic $A$-action. We follow the procedure outlined in a general form in [6]. Let $\mathcal{X} = G/\Gamma$, where $\Gamma$ is an irreducible cocompact lattice in $G$.

Set $\text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$ to be the space of $C^\infty$ vector fields on $\mathcal{X}$. Suppose $a = (o_1, \cdots, o_d)$ is a basis of $\text{Lie}(A)$. We consider smooth $A$-action $\tilde{\alpha}_A$ generated by vectors fields $\tilde{E}_o = (\tilde{E}_{o_1}, \cdots, \tilde{E}_{o_d})$, namely $\tilde{E}_{o_i} = \frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \tilde{\alpha}(\exp(t o_i), x)$. Suppose $\alpha_A$ is generated by vectors fields $E_o = (E_{o_1}, \cdots, E_{o_d})$. Then we
have the regenerating relations: for $1 \leq i, j \leq d$

\begin{equation}
[E_{o,i}, E_{o,j}] = a_{o,i,j}E_{o(i,j)}, \quad \text{where } [o_i, o_j] = a_{o,i,j}o_{i(j)}.
\end{equation}

We note that $i(j) = 1$ and $a_{i,j} = 0$ if $[o_i, o_j] = 0$. We also write $E = (E_1, \cdots, E_d)$ or $E = (o_1, \cdots, o_d)$ if there is no confusion. It is clear that we can identify these vector fields with elements $E_1, \cdots, E_d \in \mathfrak{g}$, which generate the group $A$. For any linear map $T = (T_{i,j})_{d \times d}$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and any smooth $A$-perturbation $\tilde{A}$ of the action $\alpha_A$ generated by vector fields $\tilde{E}_o = (\tilde{E}_{o_1}, \cdots, \tilde{E}_{o_d})$, we have a new basis of $\text{Lie}(A)$: $\tilde{T} := ((T_{o_1}), \cdots, (T_{o_d}))$, where $T_{o_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{d} T_{i,j} o_j$; and a generating vector fields $\tilde{E}_{T_o} := ((T \tilde{E}_{T_o})(T_{o_i}))$, $\cdots, (T \tilde{E}_{T_o})(T_{o_d}))$, where $(T \tilde{E}_{T_o})(T_{o_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} T_{i,j} \tilde{E}_{o_j}$. Then $T$ incudes a coordinate change for $\tilde{E}_o$. We note that if the induced linear map $\mathcal{T}$ on $\text{Lie}(A)$ is a Lie algebra homomorphism, then $T \tilde{E}_{T_o}$ still satisfy the regenerating relations in (4.1), i.e.,

\begin{equation}
[TE_{o_i}, TE_{o_j}] = a_{o,i,j}TE_{o(i,j)}, \quad \text{where } [To_i, To_j] = a_{o,i,j}To_{i(j)}.
\end{equation}

On the other hand, any linear map $\mathcal{T}$ on $\text{Lie}(A)$ induces a $T = (T_{i,j})_{d \times d}$ with respect to the basis $o$.

We write $\tilde{E} = E + p$ (with coordinates $\tilde{E}_k = E_k + p_k$, $1 \leq k \leq d$) on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying $[\tilde{E}_i, \tilde{E}_j] = a_{i,j} \tilde{E}_{i(j)}$. A diffeomorphism $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ induces a map $h_*$ on $\text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$, the space of $C^\infty$ vector fields on $\mathcal{X}$: $(h_* Y)(x) = (Dh)_{h^{-1}(x)} Y \circ h^{-1}(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Define operators $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ in the following way:

\begin{equation*}
\text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})^d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}} \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})^{d \times d}, \quad \text{where } h \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} h_* E = (h_* E_1, \cdots, h_* E_d), \quad \text{and } \quad Y = (Y_1, \cdots, Y_d) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}} (M_{i,j}(Y) = [Y_i, Y_j] - a_{i,j} Y_{i(j)})_{d \times d},
\end{equation*}

if $h = \exp(\mathfrak{h})$. Obviously, $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{L} = 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ the nonlinear sequence of operators defined as above. Linearizing the sequence $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ at $h = 0$ and at $E = (E_1, \cdots, E_d) \in \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})^d$ the linearized sequence is given as follows: $\text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})^d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}} \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})^{d \times d}$, where

\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{h} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} (\mathcal{L}_E, \mathfrak{h}, \cdots, \mathcal{L}_{E_d} \mathfrak{h}), \quad p = (p_1, \cdots, p_d) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}} (M_{i,j}(p) = \mathcal{L}_{E_i} p_j - \mathcal{L}_{E_j} p_i - a_{i,j} p_{i(j)})_{d \times d}.
\end{equation*}

To emphasize the dependence of $M$ and $\mathcal{M}$ on $o$ we also write $M_o$, $M_{o,i,j}$ and $\mathcal{M}_o$, $\mathcal{M}_{o,i,j}$. It is clear that $M \circ L = 0$. For any $Y_1, Y_2 \in \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$ we have

\begin{equation}
||[Y_1, Y_2]||_{C^t} \leq C_t (||Y_1||_{C^t}||Y_2||_{C^{t+1}} + ||Y_1||_{C^{t+1}}||Y_2||_{C^t}), \quad t \geq 0.
\end{equation}

For any $Y \in \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$ set $\text{Ave}(Y)$ to be the vector in $\mathfrak{g}$ by taking the averages of coordinates $\int_{\mathcal{X}} Y_i(x) dx$, $1 \leq i \leq \dim(\mathfrak{g})$ with respect to the Haar measure $dx$. As a direct consequence of (4.2) we have
Lemma 4.1. If $\tilde{V}_p = E + p \in \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})^d$, where $p$ is a basis of Lie(A) (probably $p \neq 0$) satisfies $[p_i, p_j] = a_{o,i,j}p_{i(j)}$ for some $i, j$, then

$$
\|M_{o,i,j}(p)\|_{C^t} \leq C_t\|p\|_{C^0}\|p\|_{C^{t+1}}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad
\|M_{o,i,j}(\text{Ave}(p) + E)\| \leq C\|p\|_{C^0}\|p\|_{C^1}.
$$

4.2. Partial operators. We define partial operators $\hat{M}$ over the actions $A$ described in Section 2.1. For the case of $G \neq G_1$ type I: set $\hat{M}_{i,j} = \hat{M}_{i,j}$ if $E_i$ and $E_j$ are both in Lie($G_k$) with one of them $X_k$, $3 \leq k \leq 4$; or $E_i$ and $E_j$ are in different Lie($G_k$); or $E_i$ and $E_j$ are both in $G_1$, otherwise zero. For the case of $G \neq G_1$ type II and $G = G_1$: set $\hat{M} = M$.

4.3. Smoothing operators and some norm inequalities. There exists a collection of smoothing operators $s_t : \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X}) \to \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$, $t > 0$, such that for any $s \geq s' \geq 0$, the following holds:

$$
\|s_t Y\|_{C^{s+s'}} \leq C_{s,s'}|s''|\|F\|_{C^s}, \quad \|(I - s_t) Y\|_{C^{s+s'}} \leq C_{s,s'}|s''|\|F\|_{C^s}.
$$

Sobolev embedding theorem on compact manifolds $\mathcal{X}$ shows that: there exists $\beta > 0$ (which is only dependent on $\mathcal{X}$) such that for any $Y \in \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X})$

$$
\|Y\|_s \leq C_s\|Y\|_{C^s} \leq C_{s,1}\|Y\|_{C^{s+\beta}}, \quad \forall s \geq 0.
$$

4.4. Various subgroups of $G$. Let $G_1$ denote the subgroup of $G_1$ generated by the root groups of $u_{L_1-L_2}$ and $u_{L_2-L_1}$ inside $G_1$, which is isomorphic to $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$. We use $X, U, V$ where $U \in u_{L_1-L_2}$ and $V \in u_{L_2-L_1}$ to denote the basis of $G_1$ as in (4.1). Set $\Phi = U - V$. Let $g_1^+ = \{v \in g : [v, u_{L_1-L_2}] = 0\}$ and let $G_1^+$ be the connected subgroup with Lie algebra $g_1^+$. It is clear that $G_2 \times \cdots \times G_k$ is a subgroup of $G_1^+$. We use $g_1$ to denote the Lie algebra of $G_1$. Fix an inner product on $g$. Let $g^1$ be the set of unit vectors in $g$.

There exists subgroups $S_1, \cdots, S_q$ of $G_1$ isomorphic to $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $G_1$ is inside each $S_i$, and Lie($S_i$), $1 \leq i \leq q$, as well as Lie($G_1 \cap G_1$) span $g_1$. Let $u_\phi$ denote the root spaces corresponding to the $\mathbb{R}^2$ part of $S_i$, i.e., $\phi_i(X) = 1$ and $\psi_i(X) = -1$. Set $s_i = \{Y_{1,i}, Y_{2,i}\}$, where $Y_{1,i} \in u_{\phi_i} \cap g^1$ and $Y_{2,i} \in u_{\psi_i} \cap g^1$ such that $\{X, U, V, Y_{1,i}, Y_{2,i}\}$ span a basis of Lie algebra of $S_i$ as described in Section 7.1. We define subsets of $\Phi_1$:

$$
D_1 = \{L_1 - L_j : 3 \leq j \leq n\}, \quad D_2 = \{L_j - L_2 : 3 \leq j \leq n\},
$$

$$
F_1 = \{L_1 - L_j : 3 \leq j \leq 4\}, \quad F_2 = \{L_1 - L_j : n - 1 \leq j \leq n\},
$$

$$
F_3 = \{L_j - L_2 : 3 \leq j \leq 4\}, \quad F_4 = \{L_j - L_2 : n - 1 \leq j \leq n\}.
$$

If $G \neq G_1$ set $B_0 = \{v\}$, where $v$ is semisimple or nilpotent inside the Lie algebra of $G_2 \times \cdots \times G_k$. If $G = SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, $n \geq 6$, set $B_0 = \{v_1, v_2\}$, where $v_1 \in u_{L_3-L_4} \cap g^1$ and $v_2 \in u_{L_{n-1}-L_n} \cap g^1$. Set

$$
B_i = \{Y_{1,i} : \phi_j \in D_i\}, \quad B = \cup_{i \geq 0} B_i;
$$

$$
E_i = \{Y_{2,i} : \phi_j \in D_i\}, \quad H_i = \{Y_{1,i}, Y_{2,i} : \phi_j \in F_i\}.
$$

For the case of $G_1 = SL(n, \mathbb{R})$: set $\mathfrak{U} = B_1 \cup E_1$, $\mathfrak{U}_1 = \mathfrak{U} \setminus H_1$, $\mathfrak{U}_2 = \mathfrak{U} \setminus H_2$, $\mathfrak{W} = B_2 \cup E_2$, $\mathfrak{W}_1 = \mathfrak{W} \setminus H_3$, $\mathfrak{W}_2 = \mathfrak{W} \setminus H_4$;
for all cases: It is harmless to assume that $X$ and elements in $B$ span $\text{Lie}(A_1)$ and elements in $B_0$ span $\text{Lie}(A_2)$. We use $(G_1^+)^{\perp}$ to denote the subgroup generated by $S = G_1^+ \times G_1$ and $\exp(\mathfrak{g})$. If $|B_0| = 1$, set $S_0 = G$; if $|B_0| = 2$, set $S_0$ to be the subgroup generated by $G_1$ and the one parameter groups $\{\exp(\pm t\mathbf{v}_1)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ and $\{\exp(\pm t\mathbf{v}_2)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, which is isomorphic to $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R})$.

A basis of $\text{Lie}(A)$: For $G = SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, $o = (X, U, Y_{1,1}, \ldots, Y_{1,q}, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$:

for $G \neq G_1$ type I: the coordinate vectors for $o$ are: $X, U, Y_{1,1}, \ldots, Y_{1,q}, X_i, 3 \leq i \leq l$, $u_{\mu_j,1}, \ldots, u_{\mu_j,\dim_{g_{\mu_j}}X_k}$, for all $k, j$ where $u_{\mu_j, i} \in g_{\mu_j}X_k$ with $\mu_j > 0$ (see Theorem 5.1).

for $G \neq G_1$ type II: the coordinate vectors for $o$ are: $X, Y_{1,1}, \ldots, Y_{1,q}, u_{j,i}$, for all $3 \leq i \leq l$, where $\{u_{1,i}, u_{2,i} \cdots\}$ is a basis of $\text{Lie}(A_i)$.

4.5. Change of coordinates. For a set of vectors $S = (v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_l)$ and $c \geq 0$, we define $\|S\| = \sum_{i=1}^l \|v_i\|$. We say that $S' = (v'_1, v'_2, \cdots, v'_l)$ is a $c$-perturbation of $S$ if $\|S' - S\| = \sum_{i=1}^l \|v_i - v'_i\| \leq c$. For $G \neq G_1$ type I: we say that a perturbation $o'$ is standard if $(X', U', Y_{1,1}', \ldots, Y_{1,q}') = (X, U, Y_{1,1}, \ldots, Y_{1,q})$, $X_i' = X_i$, $3 \leq i \leq l$, and $u_{\mu_j, i} \in g_{\mu_j}X_k$ for all $j, i$. For $G \neq G_1$ type II and $G = G_1$, we say that a perturbation $o'$ is standard if $o' = o$. We postpone the proof the next lemma to Appendix A.

Lemma 4.2. There is $\delta > 0$ such that for any standard $\delta$-perturbation $o'$ of $o$ and any $c$-perturbation $o''$ of $o'$, if $\|\mathcal{M}_o(o'')\| < \gamma$ (see Section 4.2), there is a coordinate change $T$ of $A$ with $\|T - I\| \leq Cc$ such that $\mathcal{M}_o(To') = 0$ and $\|To'' - o_1\| < C\gamma_1$ for some standard $o_1$, where $\gamma_1 = \gamma + c^2$.

5. Important results for cohomological equations

In this part we review some important results concerning cohomological equations in semisimple Lie groups which will serve as ready references later. We also use these results to obtain Sobolev estimates for extended representations. In this section, $G$ denotes a semisimple Lie group of non-compact type with finite center and $\Gamma$ is an irreducible lattice of $G$. Fix an inner product $|\cdot|$ on $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$. Let $\mathfrak{g}^1$ be the set of unit vectors in $\mathfrak{g}$. The following result is quoted from [20], which is derived from [9], [21] and [29].

Theorem 5.1. Suppose $G = P_1 \times \cdots \times P_k$ where $P_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ is a simple factor of $G$. Then the restriction of $L^2(A)$, the subspace of $L^2(G/\Gamma)$ orthogonal to constants, to each $P_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ has a spectral gap (outside a fixed neighborhood of the trivial representation of $P_i$ in the Fell topology).

5.1. Cohomological equations over unipotent flows. Below, we summarize conclusions from [27] and [38] for cohomological equations over unipotent flows.

Definition 5.2. For any nilpotent element $v \in \mathfrak{g}^1$, pick up an element $v' \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that $\{v, v', [v, v']\}$ span a three-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_e$ isomorphic
Theorem 5.6. Suppose representations, follows from the above lemma and Theorem 3.3: \( H \) lattice and \( G \) dent only on equation \( v f \neq 0 \) for any \( 0 \neq f \in H \). 

(5.1) 

For any semisimple element \( v \), set \( A_v(\text{ad}_v) = \{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i \lambda_i : \lambda_i \) is an eigenvalue of \( \text{ad}_v \), \( \delta_i \in \{0, \pm1\} \).

**Remark 5.3.** Generally, \( g_v \) is not unique. Since \( G_1 \) is simple and \( R \)-split, for any \( 0 \neq v \in u_{\phi} \), there is a unique \( v' \in u_{-\phi} \) such that \{\( v, v', [v, v'] \}\} span a three-dimensional Lie algebra \( g_v \) isomorphic to \( \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \). We refer to this unique \( g_v \) if \( G = G_1 \) and \( v \) is in a root space.

**Lemma 5.4.** (Proposition 6.5 of [38]) Suppose \( v \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \) is nilpotent and \( (\pi, \mathcal{H}) \) is a unitary representation of \( G \) such that the restriction of \( \pi \) to each simple factor of \( G \) has a spectral gap. Set \( G' = G \times S \), where \( S \) is a subgroup of \( G \) with its Lie algebra spanned by non-compact vectors. If \( f \in \mathcal{H}_{G'}^s \), \( s \geq 3 \) satisfies the cohomological equation \( v f = g \), then \( \|f\|_{G', t} \leq C_t \|g\|_{G', t+2} \), for any \( 0 \leq t \leq s - 2 \).

**Lemma 5.5.** (Theorem B’ of [27]) Suppose \( v \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \) is nilpotent. Then there exist a set of vectors \( \{u_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\} \) in \( \mathfrak{g}^1 \) whose commutators span \( \mathfrak{g} \) such that: for any unitary representation \( (\pi, \mathcal{H}) \) of \( G \) that the restriction of \( \pi \) to each simple factor of \( G \) has a spectral gap, if \( f \in \mathcal{H}^s \), \( s \geq 3 \) satisfies the cohomological equation \( v f = g \), then 

\[
\|u_i^m f\| \leq C_m \|g\|_{m+2}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \quad m \leq s - 2.
\]

The next result provides global estimates for the solution of the regular representations, follows from the above lemma and Theorem 3.3.

**Theorem 5.6.** Suppose \( v \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \) is nilpotent. If \( \Gamma \) is a cocompact irreducible lattice and \( \mathcal{H} = L^2_0(G/\Gamma) \), then there are constants \( s_1 > 0 \) and \( s_2 > 1 \) dependent only on \( G \) and \( \mathcal{H} \) such that if \( f \in \mathcal{H}^s \), \( s \geq s_1 \) satisfies the cohomological equation \( v f = g \), then \( \|f\|_t \leq C_t \|g\|_{s_2 t + s_1} \), for any \( 0 \leq t \leq \frac{s_1}{s_2 - 1} \).

We note that the estimates of the solution in Theorem 5.6 are not tame. The next result shows that for some special types of \( G \) the solution enjoys tame estimates. From Theorem 6.6 in [38] and Lemma 5.4 we get the following result by noting that \( G_1 \) is generated by subgroups isomorphic to \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R} \):

**Theorem 5.7.** Suppose \( G = G_1 \) and \( (\pi, \mathcal{H}) \) is a unitary representation of \( G \) without non-trivial \( G \)-invariant vectors. Then for any \( t > 0 \) exists \( \delta(t) > 8 \) dependent only on \( t\) and \( G \) such that for any \( v \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \) inside a root space and \( g \in \mathcal{H}^s \), \( s \geq \delta \), if the cohomological equation \( v f = g \), has a solution \( f \in \mathcal{H} \), then \( f \in \mathcal{H}^t \) and satisfies the Sobolev estimate 

\[
\|f\|_t \leq C_t \|g\|_{t+8}, \quad t \leq l.
\]

On the other hand, if the cohomological equation \( v f = g \) has a solution \( f \in \mathcal{H}^s \), \( s \geq 9 \), then \( f \) satisfies

\[
(5.1) \quad \|f\|_t \leq C_t \|g\|_{t+8}, \quad t \leq s - 9.
\]
Corollary 5.8. Suppose \( G = P_1 \times \cdots \times P_k \), where \( P_1 = \mathbb{G}_1 \) and \( (\pi, \mathcal{H}) \) is a unitary representation of \( G \) such that the restriction of \( \pi \) to \( P_1 \) has no non-trivial \( P_1 \)-invariant vectors. Let \( v \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \) inside a root space of \( P_1 \). Then for any \( l > 0 \) exists \( \delta_1(l) > 0 \) dependent only on \( l \) and \( P_1 \) such that for any \( g \in \mathcal{H}_s, s \geq \delta_1 \), if the cohomological equation \( vf = g \), has a solution \( f \in \mathcal{H} \), then \( f \in \mathcal{H}_l \) and satisfies the Sobolev estimate
\[
\|f\|_t \leq C_l \|g\|_{t+9}, \quad t \leq l.
\]
On the other hand, if the cohomological equation \( vf = g \), has a solution \( f \in \mathcal{H}_s, s \geq 10 \), then \( f \) satisfies
\[
\|f\|_t \leq C_l \|g\|_{t+9}, \quad t \leq s - 10.
\]

Proof. Set \( \delta_1(l) = \delta(l+1) + (l+1) \), where \( \delta(l+1) \) is as defined in Theorem 5.7. Let \( \mathcal{G} \) denote the Lie algebra of \( P_2 \times \cdots \times P_k \). Suppose \( u \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathfrak{g}^1 \) is non-compact, i.e., the one-parameter subgroup \( H_u \) with Lie algebra \( u \) is non-compact. We consider the subgroup \( S = \mathbb{G}_1 \times H_u \). Irreducible unitary representations of \( S \) are of the form \( \rho \otimes \zeta_a \), where \( (\rho, \mathcal{O}) \) is an irreducible unitary representation of \( \mathbb{G}_1 \) and \( \zeta_a, a \in \mathbb{R} \) is an irreducible unitary representation of \( \mathbb{R} \colon \zeta_a(t) = e^{int} \). The discussion in Section 3.3 allows us to reduce our analysis of the cohomological equation \( vf = g \) to each irreducible component \( (\rho \otimes \zeta_a, \mathcal{O}) \) (note that \( \mathcal{O} \otimes \mathbb{C} = \mathcal{O} \) that appears in \( \pi \). By assumption, we can assume that \( \rho \) has non-trivial \( \mathbb{G}_1 \)-invariant vectors. Suppose in \( \rho \otimes \zeta_a \) the equation has the form: \( vf_{\rho,a} = g_{\rho,a} \). Then
\[
(5.4) \quad v(u^k f_{\rho,a}) = v((ia)^k f_{\rho,a}) = (ia)^k g_{\rho,a} = u^k g_{\rho,a}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},
\]
If \( k \leq l + 1 \), then \( u^k g_{\rho,a} \in \rho^{\delta(l+1)} \). Then it follows from Theorem 5.7 that
\[
\|u^k f_{\rho,a}\|_{\mathcal{G}_1,t} \leq C \|u^k g_{\rho,a}\|_{\mathcal{G}_1,t+8}, \quad t \leq l + 1.
\]
Hence we have
\[
\|u^k f\|_{\mathcal{G}_1,t} \leq C \|u^k g\|_{\mathcal{G}_1,t+8} \leq C \|g\|_{k+8+t}, \quad k \leq l + 1, \quad t \leq l + 1.
\]
We note that the Lie algebra of \( P_2 \times \cdots \times P_k \) can be spanned by non-compact vectors. Then (5.2) follows from the above estimates and Theorem 3.2. Then we finish the proof of the first part.

For the second part, from (5.4) we see that for any \( k \leq s - 9 \), it follows from Theorem 5.7 that
\[
(5.5) \quad \|u^k f\| \leq C \|u^k g\|_8 \leq C \|g\|_{k+8}.
\]
Then (5.3) follows from the above estimates, (5.1) of Theorem 5.7 and Theorem 3.2. Hence we finish the proof.

□

Remark 5.9. The “centralizer trick” presented in the above proof will be frequently used in next sections. We will consider different types of direct products \( S_1 \times H_u \), where \( S_1 \) stands for \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \) or \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \).
5.2. (Twisted)-cohomological equations over partially hyperbolic flows. In this part we suppose $v \in \mathfrak{g}^1$ is inside a split Cartan subalgebra.

**Lemma 5.10.** Suppose $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ is a unitary representation of $G$ such that the restriction of $\pi$ to each simple factor of $G$ has a spectral gap. Then there exists a constants $s_3 > 0$ dependent only on $G$ and $v$ such that for any $g, f \in \mathcal{H}^s$, $s \geq s_3$, if they satisfy the (twisted) cohomological equation $(v + a)f = g$, $a \in \mathcal{A}_3(\text{ad}_v)$ (see Definition 5.2), then

$$
\|f\|_t \leq C_t \|g\|_{t+s_3} \quad t \leq s - s_3.
$$

**Proof.** The case of $a = 0$: by Corollary 4.3 of [40], there is $\sigma > 0$ such that if $s \geq \sigma$, then

$$
(5.6) \quad \|f\|_t \leq C_t \|g\|_{t+\sigma} \quad t \leq s - \sigma.
$$

The case of $a \neq 0$: We will use the following fact: $(*)$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the twisted equation $(v + s)\psi = \omega$ has a unique solution $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|\psi\| \leq |s|^{-1} \|\omega\|$. We postpone the proof to the end.

$\mathfrak{G}$ has the eigenspace decomposition for $\text{ad}(v)$: $\mathfrak{G} = \sum_{\mu \in \Delta(v)} \mathfrak{g}_\mu$ where $\Delta(v)$ is the set of eigenvalues and $\mathfrak{g}_\mu$ is the eigenspace for eigenvalue $\mu$. For any $t \leq s - \sigma$ and $u \in \mathfrak{g}_\mu \cap \mathfrak{g}^1$ we have

$$(v + a - t\mu)u^t f = u^t(v + a)f = u^t g.$$ 

If $a - t\mu = 0$, then from we have (5.6) we have

$$
\|u^t f\| \leq \|u^t g\| \leq \|g\|_{t+\sigma}.
$$

If $a - t\mu \neq 0$, then from $(*)$ we have

$$
\|u^t f\| \leq |a - t\mu|^{-1} \|u^t g\| \leq |a - t\mu|^{-1} \|g\|_t.
$$

Then the estimates for $f$ follow directly from the above estimates and Theorem 3.2.

**Proof of $(*)$:** For the one-parameter subgroup $\{\exp(tv)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ we have a direct integral decomposition

$$
\varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_\chi du(\chi), \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{H}.
$$

where $u$ is a regular Borel measure; and $\pi(\exp(tv))\varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi(t)\varphi_\chi du(\chi)$. Set

$$
\psi_\chi = (s + \chi'(0))^{-1} \omega_\chi, \quad \chi \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}.
$$

We see that $\psi = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (s + \chi'(0))^{-1} \omega_\chi du(\chi)$ is a formal solution of the equation $(v + s)\psi = \omega$. Next, we will show that $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\chi'(0) \in i\mathbb{R}$,

$$
(5.7) \quad |s + \chi'(0)| \geq |s|, \quad \forall \chi \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}.
$$

Then

$$
\|\psi\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |s + \chi'(0)|^{-2} \|\omega_\chi\|^2 du(\chi) \leq |s|^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\omega_\chi\|^2 du(\chi) = |s|^{-2} \|\omega\|^2.
$$
This shows that $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$. On the other hand, if $(v + s)\psi = 0$ with $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, then we have

$$(s + \chi'(0))\psi = 0$$

for almost every $\chi \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ with respect to $u$. Then from (5.7) we see that $\psi = 0$ for almost every $\chi \in \hat{\mathbb{R}}$. This means that $\psi = 0$. Hence we showed the uniqueness of the solution of the twisted equation. This completes the proof of $(\ast)$.

\[
\square
\]

5.3. (Twisted)-cohomological equations over vector fields. In this part we focus on the study of (extended) regular representations of $G$. The following summarizes results from previous sections:

**Corollary 5.11.** Suppose $\Gamma$ is a cocompact irreducible lattice and $\mathcal{H} = L^2_0(\mathbb{G}/\Gamma)$. If $Z \in \mathfrak{g}^1$ is nilpotent or semisimple, there exist $\sigma_1, \sigma > 0$ such that for any $u, w \in \mathcal{H}^s$, $s \geq \sigma$ satisfying the cohomological $(Z + \lambda)u = w$, the following estimates hold:

\[
\|u\|_t \leq C_t\|w\|_{\sigma_1 t + \sigma}, \quad t \leq \frac{s - \sigma}{\sigma_1},
\]

where $\lambda \in A_3(ad_v)$. We note that $\sigma_1 = 1$ if $Z$ is semisimple; or $Z$ is inside a root space of $G_1$.

We can obtain corresponding results for extended regular representations:

**Lemma 5.12.** There exists $\sigma_2 > 0$ such that for any $u, v \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})^s$, $s \geq \sigma_2$ satisfying the equation

\[
(Z + ad_Z + \lambda)u = v, \quad \lambda \in A_3(ad_v).
\]

(1) If $Z$ is semisimple: we have $\|u\|_t \leq C_t\|v\|_{t + \sigma}, \quad t \leq s - \sigma$;

(2) If $Z$ is nilpotent: we have $\|u\|_t \leq C_t\|v\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_2}, \quad t \leq \frac{s - \sigma}{\gamma_1}$, where $\gamma = \sigma_1^{\text{dim}(\mathfrak{g})}$. If $Z$ is inside a root space of $G_1$ then $\sigma_1 = 1$.

**Proof.** For the case of $Z$ semisimple. Equation (5.9) splits into finitely many equations of the form $(Z + \lambda)u = w$, where $u, w \in \mathcal{H}^s$ and $\lambda \in A_3(ad_v)$. Then the conclusion follows directly from Corollary 5.11.

For the case of $Z$ nilpotent. Choose a basis in which $ad_Z$ has its Jordan normal form. Note that all eigenvalues of $ad_Z$ are 0. Let $J_Z = (z_{i,j})$ be an $m \times m$ matrix which consists of blocks of $ad_Z$; i.e., let $z_{i,i} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, m$ and $z_{i,i+1} = *_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, m - 1$. Then the $m$-th equation of (5.9) is $Zu_m = v_m$. Then the estimates

\[
\|u_m\|_t \leq C_t\|v_m\|_{\sigma_1 t + \sigma}, \quad t \leq \frac{s - \sigma}{\sigma_1},
\]

follow from Corollary 5.11. The $(m - 1)$-th equation in (5.9) is $Zu_{m-1} + *_{m-1}u_m = v_{m-1}$. 

Then we obtain \( Z_{u_{m-1}} = \nu_{m-1} - *_{m-1} u_m \). By Corollary 5.11, the following estimates hold: for any \( t \leq \frac{-c_{\sigma_1+1}}{\sigma_1} \),

\[
\|u_{m-1}\|_t \leq C_t \|\nu_{m-1} - *_{m-1} u_m\|_{\sigma_1 t + \sigma} \leq C_t \|\nu\|_{\sigma_1 t + (\sigma_1+1)\sigma}.
\]

Set \( p_0(\sigma_1, \sigma) = \sigma \). We can obtain a sequence \( p_1(\sigma_1, \sigma), \cdots, p_{m-1}(\sigma_1, \sigma) \) using a recursive rule:

\[
p_{i+1}(\sigma_1, \sigma) = \sigma_1 \cdot p_i(\sigma_1, \sigma) + \sigma.
\]

Inductively, we can show that for \( 1 \leq k \leq m-1 \) we have

\[
\|u_k\|_t \leq C_t \|\nu\|_{\sigma_1^{m-k+1} t + p_{m-k}(z, \sigma)} , \quad t \leq \frac{s - p_{m-k}(1, \sigma)}{\sigma_{m-k+1}}.
\]

Hence we finish the proof on \( J_Z \). If repeated for all Jordan blocks we get the result. It is clear that \( \sigma_2 \) is the maximum of \( p_{m-1}(1, \sigma) \) where \( p_{m-1} \) ranges over all Jordan blocks. Hence we finish the proof for the case of \( Z \) nilpotent. If \( Z \) is inside a root space of \( G_1 \) then clearly, we have \( \sigma_1 = 1 \).

\( \square \)

The next result follows immediately from Lemma 5.24 and the proof of the above lemma by changing \( G \) to \( G' \):

**Corollary 5.13.** Suppose \( v \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \) is nilpotent and \((\pi, \mathcal{H})\) is a unitary representation of \( G \) such that the restriction of \( \pi \) to each simple factor of \( G \) has a spectral gap. Set \( G' = G_v \times S \), where \( S \) is a subgroup of \( G \) with its Lie algebra spanned by non-compact vectors. There exists \( \sigma_2 > 0 \) such that for any \( f \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H})_{G'}^* \), \( s \geq \sigma_2 \) and \( g \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{H}) \) satisfy the cohomological equation \( vf = g \), we have \( \|f\|_{G',t} \leq C_t \|g\|_{G',t + \sigma_2}, t \leq s - \sigma_2 \).

**Remark 5.14.** We use the same \( \sigma_2 \) as in Lemma 5.12 to simplify notations.

6. **THE TWISTED EQUATION \((X + n)f = g\) IN \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\)**

6.1. **Unitary dual of \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\).** We recall the conclusions in [15] and [11]. We choose as generators for \( \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \) the elements

\[
X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

The Casimir operator is then given by \( \Box := -X^2 - 2(UV + VU) \), which generates the center of the enveloping algebra of \( \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \). The Casimir operator \( \Box \) acts as a constant \( u \in \mathbb{R} \) on each irreducible unitary representation space and its value classifies them into three classes except the trivial representation. For Casimir parameter \( u \) of \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \), let \( \nu = \sqrt{1 - u} \) be a representation parameter. We denote by \((\pi_\nu, \mathcal{H}_\nu)\) the following models for the principal series \((\nu \in i\mathbb{R})\) complementary series \((\nu \in (-1,1) \setminus 0)\), discrete series \((\nu \in \mathbb{Z})\) representation spaces. We use \( \rho_d \) to denote the trivial representation. In this paper, we only consider principal series and discrete series (see the explanation in Section 8). For discrete series sometimes we only state results about holomorphic case. The results for anti-holomorphic
case can be derived correspondingly because there is a complex antilinear isomorphism between two series of the same Casimir parameter.

6.2. Orthogonal basis and sobolev norms. Set \( \Theta = U - V \). There exists an orthogonal basis \( \{u_k\} \) in \( \mathcal{H}_\nu \), basis of eigenvectors of the operator \( \Theta \) and hence of the Laplacian operator \( \Delta = \Box - 2\Theta^2 \), satisfying:

\[
(6.2) \quad \Theta u_k = i k u_k, \quad \Delta u_k = (u + 2k^2) u_k;
\]

and the norms of the \( u_k \) are given recursively by

\[
(6.3) \quad \| u_k \|^2 = \begin{cases} \| u_{k-1} \|^2, & \nu \in i \mathbb{R} \\ \frac{|k| - 1 - \nu}{|k| + 1 + \nu} \| u_{k-2} \|^2, & \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases}
\]

see [10] (here we make a slight change of the normalizations of the basis in [10]. For example for the spherical series, \( u_k \) here is indexed by \( 2 \mathbb{Z} \) while in [10] is indexed by \( \mathbb{Z} \).) We write \( u_{\nu,k} \) to emphasize dependence on the parameter \( \nu \) if needed.

Let \( I_\nu = 2\mathbb{Z} \) or \( 2\mathbb{Z} + 1 \) if \( \mu \) parametrizes the principal series, or let \( I_\nu = [n, \infty] \subset \mathbb{Z}^+ \) or \( I_\nu = (-\infty, n] \subset \mathbb{Z}^- \) if \( \mu \) parametrizes the discrete series. For the principal series we write \((\pi^+, \mathcal{H}^+)\) (resp. \((\pi^-, \mathcal{H}^-)\)) emphasize the spherical model (resp. non-spherical model). For the discrete series we write \((\pi^+, \mathcal{H}^+)\) (resp. \((\pi^-, \mathcal{H}^-)\)) emphasize the holomorphic case (resp. anti-holomorphic case). \( u_{\nu,k}^+ \) and \( I_{\nu,k}^+ \) are defined similarly.

By defining \( \Pi_{\nu,k} = \prod_{j=i_\nu}^{k-1} \frac{|j| - 1 - \nu}{|j| + 1 + \nu} \), for any integer \( k \geq i_\nu = 1 + |\Re(\nu)| \) (Empty products are set equal to 1; hence, if \( k = i_\nu \), then \( \Pi_{\nu,k} = 1 \) in all cases) we get that \( \| u_k \|^2 = |\Pi_{\nu,k}| \). Then the Sobolev norm of a vector \( f = \sum_{k \in I_\nu} f_k u_k \in \mathcal{H}_\nu \) is:

\[
(6.4) \quad \| f \|_s = \left( \sum_{k \in I_\nu} (1 + u + 2k^2)^s |\Pi_{\nu,k}| |f_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

6.3. Twisted equations. In this part we review results concerning (twisted) cohomological equation \((X + m)g = f, m \in \mathbb{R} \) of the classical geodesic flow. The action of operator \( X \) on the basis element \( \{u_k\} \) is given by:

**Lemma 6.1.** (Lemma 3.4 of [10]) We have

\[
(X + m)u_k = \frac{k + 1 + \nu}{2} u_{k+2} + mu_k - \frac{k - 1 - \nu}{2} u_{k-2}, \quad \forall k \in I_\nu.
\]

For \( \nu = n - 1 \) and \( k = n \), the above equation must be read as \((X + m)u_n = mu_n + nu_{n+2}\).

Let \( f = \sum_k f_k u_k \) and \( g = \sum_k g_k u_k \). So the twisted equation becomes

\[
(6.5) \quad f_k = -\frac{k + 1 + \nu}{2} g_{k+2} + mg_k + \frac{k - 1 + \nu}{2} g_{k-2}
\]

for all \( k \in I_\nu \); for \( \nu = n - 1 \) (discrete series) and \( k = n \) equation (6.5) should be read as \( f_n = mg_n - gn_{n+2} \).

For any irreducible representation \((\pi, \mathcal{H}) \) of \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \) let \( \mathcal{H}^{-k}_{X,-m} = \{ D \in \mathcal{H}^{-k} : L_{X,-m} D = 0 \} \). For any \( f = \sum_{k \in I_\nu} f_k u_k \in \mathcal{H}_\nu \) and \( n \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\} \), set
where a there exists a linear map
\[ f|_n = \begin{cases} 
0, & n \notin I_\nu; \\
\sum_{k \in I_\nu, k \geq n} f_k u_k, & n \in I_\nu, n > 0; \\
\sum_{k \in I_\nu, k < n} f_k u_k, & n \in I_\nu, n < 0;
\end{cases} \]
and \( f(n) = \begin{cases} 
0, & n \notin I_\nu; \\
f_n u_n, & n \in I_\nu.
\end{cases} \)

Set \( S^+_\nu = \{0, 2\} \) (resp. \( S^-_\nu = \{-1, 1\} \) if \( \nu \in \mathbb{R} \); and \( S^+_\nu = \{\nu + 1\} \) (resp. \( S^-_\nu = \{\nu - 1\} \)) if \( \nu \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup 0 \) (resp. \( \nu \in \mathbb{Z}^- \cup 0 \)).

**Theorem 6.2.** (Theorem 2.2 of [39]) In any non-trivial irreducible representation \((\pi_\nu, \mathcal{H}_\nu)\), \( \delta = \pm, \nu \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{Z} \) of \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \), there exists \( \mathcal{D}^\delta_{\nu,n} \in (\mathcal{H}_\nu)^{\frac{|\nu|+8}{2}} \) where \( n \in S^\delta_\nu \) such that for any \( f \in (\mathcal{H}_\nu)^s \), \( s \geq 0 \) we have

1. if \( s \geq \frac{|\nu|+8}{2} \), \( \|\mathcal{D}^\delta_{\nu,n} (f) u_n\|_t \leq C_m \|\Theta^{\frac{|\nu|+8}{2}} f\|_t \), for any \( 0 \leq t \leq s - \frac{|\nu|+8}{2} \);

2. if \( s \geq \frac{|\nu|+8}{2} \), the equation \((X + m)g = f + \sum_{n \in S^\delta_\nu} \mathcal{D}^\delta_{\nu,n} (f) u_n \) has a solution \( g \in \mathcal{H}_\nu^{s - \frac{|\nu|}{2} - 3} \) with estimates

\[
\|g\|_t \leq C_m \|f\|_{t + \frac{|\nu|}{2} + 3}, \quad t \leq s - \frac{|\nu|}{2} - 3.
\]

Furthermore, if we write \( g = \sum_{n \in I_\nu} g_n u_n \in \mathcal{H}_\nu \) we have

\[
\|g\|_n \|_t \leq C_m \|\Theta^{\frac{|\nu|}{2}} (f|_n + \ast_n)\|_t, \quad t \leq s - \frac{|\nu|}{2} - 3
\]
where \( \Theta = U - V \), and \( \ast_n = 1 \) if \( n > 0 \) and \( \ast_n = -1 \) if \( n \leq 0 \);

\( \mathcal{R}^\delta_{\nu,m} (f) = \sum_{n \in S^\delta_\nu} \mathcal{D}^\delta_{\nu,n} (f) u_n. \)

The cases of \( m = 0 \) is also proved in [19].

The following result is from Theorem 2.3 of [39]:

**Theorem 6.3.** Suppose \( f \in (\mathcal{H}_\nu)^s \), \( \nu \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{Z} \), \( s \geq \frac{|\nu|}{2} + 8 \). For any \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \) there exists a linear map

\[
\mathcal{F}_{m,n}(f) = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } n \notin I_\nu \text{ or } |n| < |\Re(\nu)| + 3; \\
a_1 u_n + a_2 u_{n-2}, & \text{if } n \in I_\nu, n \geq |\Re(\nu)| + 3 \\
b_1 u_n + b_2 u_{n+2}, & \text{if } n \in I_\nu, n \leq -(|\Re(\nu)| + 3),
\end{cases}
\]

where \( a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{C} \) such that the equation

\((X + m)g = f|_n - \mathcal{F}_{m,n}(f) = f|_n - \mathcal{F}_{m,n}(f|_n)\)
where \(|n| \geq |\Re(\nu)| + 3\), has a solution \(g \in (\mathcal{H}_\nu)^s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 3\) satisfying \(g = g|_n\) with estimates
\[
\|g\|_t \leq \|f|_n\|_{s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 3}, \quad t \leq s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 3; \quad \text{and}
\|\mathcal{F}_{m,n}(f)\|_t \leq C_m \|f|_n\|_{s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 4}, \quad t \leq s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 4.
\]

6.4. Constructions in tempered unitary representation of \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\).

Set \(K\) to be the compact subgroup of \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\) with its Lie algebra spanned by \(\Theta\). Let \(\hat{K}\) denote the unitary dual of \(K\). Note that we can identify \(\hat{K}\) with \(Z\). For any unitary representation \((\pi, \mathcal{H})\) of \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\) we have the decomposition \(\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \hat{K}} \mathcal{H}_\mu\), where \(\mathcal{H}_\mu\) is \(\pi(K)\)-invariant and the action of \(K\) on \(\mathcal{H}_\mu\) is equivalent to \(n\mu\) where \(n\) is an integer or \(+\infty\), called the multiplicity of \(\mu\) in \(\mathcal{H}\).

**Definition 6.4.** Call a vector \(v = \sum_{\mu \in \hat{K}} v_\mu \in \mathcal{H}\) \(\Theta\)-finite (or \(l\)-\(\Theta\)-finite) if there is \(l \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(v_\mu = 0\) if \(|\mu| \geq l + 1\).

Suppose \((\pi, \mathcal{O})\) is a tempered unitary representation of \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\). By general arguments in Section 3.3, there is a direct decomposition of \(\mathcal{O} = \int_Z \mathcal{O}_z d\mu(z)\) of irreducible unitary representations of \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\) for some measure space \((Z, \mu)\). By Theorem 3.4, \(\mathcal{O}_z = \mathcal{H}_p(z)\) where \(p(z) \in i\mathbb{R} \cup \mathbb{Z}\) for each \(z\) and \(*_z \in \{+, -\}\). This allows us to apply results in Section 6.1. For any \(f = \int_Z f_z d\mu(z) \in \mathcal{O}\) and any \(l \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus 0, \, \ell \geq 2\) set
\[
f|_l = \int_Z f_z|_l d\mu(z), \quad f(l) = \int_Z (f_z)(l) d\mu(z), \quad \mathcal{D}_l(f) = \int_Z g_z d\mu(z),
\]
where
\[
g_z = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \ell > |\Re(p(z))| + 1 \text{ or } \pm \ell \notin I_{\rho(z)}; \\ f_z, & \text{if } \ell \leq |\Re(p(z))| + 1, \text{ and } \ell \in I_{\rho(z)} \text{ or } -\ell \in I_{\rho(z)}; \end{cases}
\]
for any \(z \in Z\). We note that \(\mathcal{D}_l(f)\) only contains the components of discrete series with the parameter \(\nu + 1 \geq \ell\) or \(\nu - 1 \leq -\ell\). It follows from arguments in Section 3.3 and (6.1) that

**Lemma 6.5.** If \(f \in \mathcal{O}^s, \, s \geq 0\), then: for \(0 \leq t \leq s\) we have
\[
\|f|_l, f(l)\|_t \leq \|f\|_t, \quad \|f|_l, f(l)\|_{s-t} \leq \|f\|_s \cdot \|\mathcal{D}_l(f)\|_t \leq \|f\|_t.
\]

The next result follows from arguments in Section 3.3 and Theorem 6.2

**Lemma 6.6.** If \(f \in \mathcal{O}^s, \, s \geq \frac{|m|+8}{2}\), and the equation \((X + m)g = f\) has a solution \(g \in \mathcal{O}^{s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 3}\), then \(g \in \mathcal{O}^{s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 3}\) with estimates
\[
\|g\|_t \leq C_t \|f\|_{t+\frac{|m|}{2}+3}, \quad t \leq s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 3.
\]
Furthermore, if we denote \(*_l = 1\) if \(l > 0\) and \(*_l = -1\) if \(l \leq 0\), then we have
\[
\|g|_l\| \leq C_t \|\Theta_{\frac{|m|}{2}}(f|_{l+_l})\|_t, \quad t \leq s - \frac{|m|}{2} - 3.
\]
For any $f \in O^s$, $s \geq 5$, $n \in \{\pm 1, 0, \pm 2, \pm 3, \pm 4\}$ set
\[
D^{(n)}(f) = \int_Z R^\delta_{p(z)}(f_z)d\mu(z) \quad \text{and} \quad D^{(n)}(f) = \int_Z R^\delta_{p(z)}(g_z)d\mu(z)
\]
(see (6.7) and (6.6)). It follows from arguments in Section 3.3 and Theorem 6.2 that

**Lemma 6.7.** If $f \in O^s$, $s \geq 6$, then

1. $D^{(n)}(f), D^{(n)}(f) \in O^{s-6}$ with estimates
\[
\|D^{(n)}(f), D^{(n)}(f)\|_t \leq C_t\|f\|_{t+6}, \quad t \leq s-6;
\]

2. the equation $(X+n)g = f + D^{(n)}(f)$ has a solution $g \in O^{s-6}$ with estimates $\|g\|_t \leq C_t\|f\|_{t+5}, \quad t \leq s-6$;

3. if the equation $(X+n)g = f$ has a solution $g \in O^6$, then $D^{(n)}(f) = 0$;

4. the equation $(X+n)g = D^t(f) + D^{(n)}(f)$ has a solution $g \in O^{s-6}$ with estimates $\|g\|_t \leq C_t\|f\|_{t+5}, \quad t \leq s-6$;

5. if the equation $(X+n)g = D^t(f)$ has a solution $g \in O^6$, then $D^{(n)}(f) = 0$.

For any $f \in O^s$, $s \geq 10$, $n \in \{\pm 1, 0, \pm 2, \pm 3, \pm 4\}$ and $l \in Z$ with $|l| \geq 5$ set $F_{n,l}(f) = \int_Z F_{n,l}(f_z)d\mu(z)$. The next result follows immediately by arguments in Section 3.3, Theorem 6.3 and Lemma 6.7

**Lemma 6.8.** If $f \in O^s$, $s \geq 10$, then $F_{n,l}(f) \in O^{s-6}$ with estimates
\[
\|F_{n,l}(f)\|_t \leq C_t\|f\|_{t+5}, \quad \forall t \leq s-6.
\]

Further, the equations
\[
(X+n)g_1 = f|_l - (D|_l)(f)|_l - F_{n,l}(f) \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
(X+n)g_2 = f|_l - (D^{(n)}|_l)(f)|_l - F_{n,l}(f)
\]
have solutions $g_1, g_2 \in O^{s-6}$ such that $g_1 = g_1|_l$ and $g_2 = g_2|_l$ with estimates $\|g_1, g_2\|_t \leq \|f|_l\|_{t+5}, \quad t \leq s-6$.

7. $D^{(n)}$ and Unipotent Flows in $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$

In this section, we make a further study of $D^{(n)}|_l$, as well as other linear operators defined in Section 6.4 and cohomological equation over unipotent flows in $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$, whose roles will be clear from the subsequent development.

We recall the unitary dual of $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ with no non-trivial $\mathbb{R}^2$-fixed vectors computed in [38]. Write the group in the form \( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \), where \( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \) and \( \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \).
Lemma 7.1. The irreducible representations of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ without non-trivial $\mathbb{R}^2$-fixed vectors are parameterized by $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and the group action is defined by

$$
\rho_t : \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathcal{B}(E_t)
$$

$$
\rho_t(v)f(x, y) = e^{(v_2x - v_1y)/\sqrt{-1}} f(x, y),
$$

$$
\rho_t(g)f(x, y) = e^{bt(\sqrt{d-x^2} - by)} f(dx - by, -cx + ay);
$$

and $\|f\|_{E_t} = \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$, where $(g, v) = \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$.

If $t = 0$, the representation is called the degenerate series. We choose a basis for $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ as in (6.1) and a basis for $\mathbb{R}^2$ to be $Y_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $Y_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then we get

$$
X = -x \partial_x + y \partial_y, \quad U = x^{-2}t \sqrt{-1} - y \partial_x, \quad V = -x \partial_y
$$

$$
Y_1 = -y \sqrt{-1}, \quad Y_2 = x \sqrt{-1}; \quad \text{and}
$$

$$
7.1. \quad t \sqrt{-1} = Y_1^2 V - Y_2^2 U - Y_1 Y_2 X.
$$

Observation 7.2. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in E_t$, the equation $(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2)^l g = Y_1^{2l} f$ has a unique solution $g \in E_t$ with the estimate $\|g\| \leq \|f\|$. We denote $g$ by $Y_1^{2l} f / (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2)^l$.

7.1. $K$-eigenvector space decomposition. By using polar coordinates $r$ and $\theta$: $x = r \cos \theta$ and $y = r \sin \theta$, the vector fields in Lemma 7.1 are

$$
X = -\cos 2\theta r \partial_r + \sin 2\theta \partial_\theta, \quad U = \frac{r \sqrt{-1}}{r^2 \cos^2 \theta} + \sin^2 \theta \partial_\theta - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\theta r \partial_r,
$$

$$
V = -\frac{1}{2} \sin 2\theta r \partial_r - \cos 2\theta \partial_\theta, \quad Y_1 = -r \sin \theta \sqrt{-1}, \quad Y_2 = r \cos \theta \sqrt{-1},
$$

and $\|f\|_{E_t}^2 = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\infty |f(r, \theta)|^2 rdrd\theta$. Set $\mathbb{E} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, rdr)$.

We recall that $\Theta = U - V$. Direct computation shows that the $n$ $\Theta$-eigenvectors in $E_t$ has the form:

$$
f(r) e^{in\theta} e^{-itr^2 \tan \theta}, \quad \text{where } f \in \mathbb{E}.
$$

Furthermore, for any $n$ and $f \in \mathbb{E}$ set

$$
(7.2) \quad \mathcal{K}_n(f) = f(r) e^{in\theta} e^{-itr^2 \tan \theta}.
$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{K}_n$ is a bijection between $\mathbb{E}$ and $n$ $\Theta$-eigenvectors in $E_t$; and it is an isometry. For any $f \in E_t$, we can write

$$
(7.3) \quad f(r, \theta) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_n(r) e^{in\theta} e^{-itr^2 \tan \theta},
$$

and $\|f\|_{E_t}^2 = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_n\|_{\mathbb{E}}^2$. Then we have

Lemma 7.3. If $f \in E_t^s$, then $\|f(t), f||_{\mathbb{R}^2,t} \leq \|f\|_{\mathbb{R}^2,t}$, for any $t \leq s$.  

Observation 7.4. For any unitary representation \((\pi, \mathcal{H})\) of \(\mathbb{G}\) satisfying Howe-Moore, if \(\xi \in \mathcal{H}\) is \(\ell\)-\(\Theta\) finite and \(Z \in \mathfrak{g}\), then:

1. if \(Z\) commutes with \(\text{Lie}(G_1)\), from the proof of Corollary 5.8 (also see Remark 5.9) we see that \(Z\xi\) is also \(\ell\)-\(\Theta\) finite;
2. if \(Z\) is inside a root space of \(G_1\), then \(\text{Lie}(G_1)\) and \(Z\) either span a subalgebra isomorphic to \(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}\); or they are inside a subalgebra isomorphic to \(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2\). For the former case, \(Z\xi\) is also \(\ell\)-\(\Theta\) finite; for the latter case, the \(\Theta\)-eigenvector analysis and polar coordinate vector fields show that \(Z\xi\) is \((\ell+1)\)-\(\Theta\) finite;
3. if \(Z = X, \) Lemma 6.7 shows that \(Z\xi\) is \((\ell+1)\)-\(\Theta\) finite.

For any \(n \in \mathbb{Z}\) and \(t \in \mathbb{R}\) set operators \(p_{n, t}\) and \(q_{n, t}\) on \(\mathbb{E}\) as follows:

\[
p_{n, t} = -\frac{1}{2} r \partial_r + \frac{n}{2} - tr^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad q_{n, t} = -\frac{1}{2} r \partial_r - \frac{n}{2} + tr^{-2}.
\]

By the polar vector coordinates vector fields, direct computation shows that for any \(g \in \mathbb{E}\)

\[
(7.4) \quad (X + m)(K_n(g)) = \mathcal{K}_{n+2}(p_{n, t}(g)) + m\mathcal{K}_n(g) + \mathcal{K}_{n-2}(q_{n, t}(g)).
\]

Remark 7.5. We note that \(p_{n, t} = q_{-n, -t}\). To study the (twisted) cohomological equation \((X + m)g = f\) (a detailed study will be carried out in Section 8) it suffice to consider \((\rho_t, \mathcal{E}_t), t \geq 0\).

7.2. Cohomological equation over the unipotent flow. Below we study the cohomological equation \(Y_1 \omega = \xi\) by using the polar coordinate vector fields. Suppose \(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t\) is \(\Theta\)-finite. We say that \(\xi\) satisfies condition (\(\star\)) if \(\sum_j \xi_j(r) = 0\) and \(\sum_j \xi_{j+1}(r) = 0\).

Lemma 7.6. Suppose \(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t\) is \(m\)-\(\Theta\)-finite, \(m \geq 2\). Set \(\xi_{(0)} = \mathcal{K}_0(\sum_j \xi_j(r))\) and \(\xi_{(1)} = \mathcal{K}_1(\sum_j \xi_{j+1}(r))\).

1. If the equation \(\eta \cdot \sin \theta = \xi\) has a solution \(\eta \in \mathcal{E}_t\), then it is unique and is \((m-1)\)-\(\Theta\)-finite. Further, if \(\xi\) satisfies condition (\(\star\)), then the equation \(\eta \cdot \sin \theta = \xi\) has a solution \(\eta \in \mathcal{E}_t\) with estimates \(\|\eta\| \leq C\|\Theta^2 \xi\|\).
2. If \(\xi\) satisfies condition (\(\star\)), and \(\xi(r, \theta) = 0\) if \(r \leq a\) for some \(a > 0\), then the equation \(Y_1 \omega = \xi\) has a solution \(\omega \in \mathcal{E}_t\) satisfying \(\omega(r, \theta) = 0\) if \(r \leq a\) with estimates \(\|\omega\| \leq Ca^{-1}\|\Theta^2 \xi\|\).
3. If the equation \(\eta \cdot \sin \theta = \xi\) has a solution \(\eta \in \mathcal{E}_t\), then \(\xi\) satisfies condition (\(\star\)).
4. If the equation \(Y_1 \omega = \xi\) has a solution \(\omega \in \mathcal{E}_t\), then \(\xi\) satisfies condition (\(\star\)) and is \((m-1)\)-\(\Theta\)-finite.
5. The equation \(\eta \cdot \sin \theta = \xi - \xi_{(0)} - \xi_{(1)}\) has a \((m-1)\)-\(\Theta\) finite solution \(\eta \in \mathcal{E}_t\) with estimates \(\|\eta\| \leq C\|\Theta^2 \xi\|\).
6. Suppose \(\xi(r, \theta) = 0\) if \(r \leq a\) for some \(a > 0\). Then the equation \(Y_1 \omega = \xi - \xi_{(0)} - \xi_{(1)}\) has a \((m-1)\)-\(\Theta\) finite solution \(\omega \in \mathcal{E}_t\) satisfying \(\omega(r, \theta) = 0, r \leq a\) with estimates \(\|\omega\| \leq Ca^{-1}\|\Theta^2 \xi\|\).
Proof. \((\mathbb{I})\): The first part is obvious. To prove the second part, set \(\eta_n = 2i \sum_{j \geq 0} \xi_{n+2j+1}(r)\). If \(n \geq 0\), then
\[
\|\eta_n\|_E \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^\infty \|\xi_{n+2j+1}(r)\|_E \leq 2(n + 1)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \sum_{j=0}^\infty (n + 2j + 1)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|\Theta^2 \xi_{n+2j+1}(r)\|_E \leq C(n + 1)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|\Theta^2 \xi\|.
\]
Here in the last step we use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

If \(n < 0\), by assumption \(\eta_n = -2i \sum_{j < 0} \xi_{n+2j+1}(r)\). Similar to the above arguments, we also have
\[
\|\eta_n\|_E \leq C(|n| + 1)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|\Theta^2 \xi\|, \quad n < 0.
\]
Set \(\eta = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \eta_j(r) e^{ij\theta} e^{-itr^2 \tan \theta}\). The above estimates show that
\[
\|\eta\|^2 = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\eta_n\|^2 \leq C \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left((|n| + 1)^{-\frac{7}{4}} \|\Theta^2 \xi\|\right)^2 \leq C_1 \|\Theta^2 \xi\|^2.
\]
Hence we have \(\|\eta\| \leq C\|\Theta^2 \xi\|\). It is clear that \(\eta \cdot \sin \theta = \xi\). Hence we get the result.

(2) Let \(\omega = \frac{\eta}{r}\), where \(\eta\) is as defined in \((\mathbb{I})\). We note that \(\eta(r, \theta) = 0\) if \(r \leq a\). Then the result follows immediately.

(3): Since \(\xi\) is \(\Theta\)-finite, \(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |n\xi_n(r)|^2 < \infty\) for almost all \(r \in (0, \infty)\), from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we see that \(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\xi_n(r)| < \infty\) for almost all \(r \in (0, \infty)\). This shows that \((\xi(r, \cdot)) \in C^0[0, 2\pi]\) for almost all \(r \in (0, \infty)\). Then \(\eta = \frac{\xi}{\sin \theta} \in \mathcal{E}_t\) implies that \(\xi(r, 0) = 0\) and \(\xi(r, \pi) = 0\) for almost all \(r \in (0, \infty)\). Hence we get the result.

(4): We have \((-\sqrt{1 - \omega} \cdot r) \sin \theta = \xi\). Since \(-\sqrt{1 - \omega} \cdot r \in \mathcal{E}_t\) by assumption, the result follows from (3) and \((\mathbb{I})\).

(5) and (6): are direct consequence of the above arguments. \(\square\)

Observation 7.7. For any \(\ell\)-\(\Theta\)-finite \(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t\), set
\[
\mathcal{P}_t(\xi) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\frac{2^{2m} |Y_1|^{2m} \xi(2m)}{(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2)^m}\right)_{(0)} + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\frac{2^{2m} |Y_1|^{2m} \xi(2m+1)}{(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2)^m}\right)_{(1)}.
\]
By using the polar coordinate vector fields, we see that \(\mathcal{P}_t(\xi) = \xi_{(0)} + \xi_{(1)}\).

7.3. Discrete series in non-degenerate series. We recall notations in Section 6.1. The Whittaker model shows that restricted on \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\) we have a direct integral decomposition of \((\rho_t, \mathcal{E}_t)\):
\[
(7.5) \quad \rho_t = \begin{cases} \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \pi^+ \, d\nu^+(\nu) + \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \pi^- \, d\nu^-(\nu) + \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \pi^+_{\nu}, & t > 0, \\ \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \pi^+ \, d\nu^+(\nu) + \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \pi^- \, d\nu^-(\nu) + \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^-} \pi^-_{\nu}, & t < 0, \\ \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \pi^+ \, d\nu^+(\nu) + \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \pi^- \, d\nu^-(\nu), & t = 0, \end{cases}
\]
Proof. According to Lemma 7.10, the results follow immediately.

Remark 7.8. The decomposition shows that if $t = 0$, $\rho_t$ only contains principal series; if $t > 0$ (resp. $t < 0$) $\rho_t$ contains principal series and holomorphic series $\nu \geq 1$ (resp. anti-holomorphic series $\nu \leq -1$), and each series appears only once.

Next we carry out explicit computation for the discrete series.

**Lemma 7.9.**

1. If $t > 0$, for $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq 0$, the $(n + 2m)$ $\Theta$-eigenvector of $\pi_{n-1}^+$ in $\mathcal{E}_t$ has the following form up to a constant:

$$r^{-n}e^{-tr^{-2}}P_{n,m}(tr^{-2})e^{i(n+2m)\theta}e^{-itr^{-2}\tan \theta}$$

where $P_{n,m}$ is a polynomial of degree $m$.

2. If $t < 0$, for $n \leq -2$ and $m \leq 0$, the $(n + 2m)$ $\Theta$-eigenvector of $\pi_{n+1}^-$ in $\mathcal{E}_t$ has the following form up to a constant:

$$r^n e^{tr^{-2}}Q_{n,m}(tr^{-2})e^{i(n+2m)\theta}e^{-itr^{-2}\tan \theta}$$

where $Q_{n,m}$ is a polynomial of degree $m$.

**Proof.** By (7.4) we note that $\mathcal{K}_n(f)$, $f \in \mathcal{E}$ is an $n$ $\Theta$-eigenvector of $\pi_{n-1}^+$ (resp. $\pi_{n+1}^-$) if and only if $q_n f = 0$ ($p_n f = 0$). This implies that $f = cr^{-n}e^{-tr^{-2}}$ (resp. $f = cr^n e^{-tr^{-2}}$), $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence we see that $f \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only of $n \geq 2$ (resp. $n \leq -2$).

Set $P_{n,m,t} = p_{n+2m,t} \cdots p_{n+2,t}p_{n,t}$ and $Q_{n,m,t} = q_{n+2m,t} \cdots q_{n-2,t}q_{n,t}$. Then $\mathcal{K}_n(g)$ is an $n + 2m$ $K$-eigenvector of $\pi_{n-1}^+$ (resp. $\pi_{n+1}^-$) if and only if $g = P_{n,m,t}(cr^{-n}e^{-tr^{-2}})$ (resp. $g = Q_{n,m,t}(cr^n e^{-tr^{-2}})$), $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the results follow immediately.

**Lemma 7.10.** Suppose $f \in \mathcal{E}_t$, $s \geq 6 + l$, $l \geq 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell \geq \max\{\frac{2(s-6)}{3}, 2, 3\}$. Then $D^{(n)}_\ell(f) \in \mathcal{H}^{\frac{2(s-6)}{3}}$ with estimates

$$||\Theta^{\frac{\ell-1}{2}}(D^{(n)}_\ell(f))||_t^k \leq C_{k,t} ||f||_{\frac{2(s-6)}{3}+l}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq \frac{2(s-6-l)}{3}.$$ 

**Proof.** From decomposition (7.5) we have

$$D^{(n)}_\ell(f) = \begin{cases} \sum_{\nu \geq \ell-1} D^{+n}_{\nu,\nu+1}(f_{\nu}^+)u_{\nu+1}, & t > 0, \\ \sum_{\nu \leq -(\ell-1)} D^{-n}_{\nu,\nu-1}(f_{\nu}^-)u_{\nu-1}, & t < 0, \\ 0, & t = 0. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 7.9 we see that

$$u_{\nu \pm 1} = \frac{r^{-|\nu\pm 1|}e^{-|t|r^{-2}}e^{i(\nu \pm 1)\theta}e^{-itr^{-2}\tan \theta}}{||r^{-|\nu\pm 1|}e^{-|t|r^{-2}}||_t^c}.$$
For any \( n \geq 3 \) we have: for \( 1 \leq k \leq n - 2 \),

\[
(7.7) \quad \frac{2^n |t|^\frac{k}{2}}{\prod_{j=n}^{n+k-1}(j-2)^2} \| r^{-n} e^{-|t|r^{-2}} \|_E = \| r^{-n+k} e^{-|t|r^{-2}} \|_E.
\]

Next we will give the estimates of \( D^{(n)}(f) \) for \( t > 0 \). The case of \( t < 0 \) follows in a similar way. For \( t > 0 \) and \( k \leq \frac{2(s-6-t)}{3} \) we have

\[
\| \Theta^k \left( D^{(n)}(f) \right) \cdot r^k \|^2 = \sum_{\nu \geq \ell - 1} (\nu + 1)^2 \| D^{+,n}_{\nu,\nu+1}(f^+_\nu) \|^2 \| u_{\nu+1} \cdot r^k \|^2
\]

\[
\leq (1) \sum_{\nu \geq \ell - 1} C_k (\nu + 1)^2 |t|^k \| D^{+,n}_{\nu,\nu+1}(f^+_\nu) \|^2 \| u_{\nu+1} \|^2
\]

\[
= \sum_{\nu \geq \ell - 1} C_k (\nu + 1)^2 \| D^{+,n}_{\nu,\nu+1}( |t|^\frac{k}{2} f^+_\nu ) u_{\nu+1} \|^2
\]

\[
= C_k \| \Theta^k \left( D^{(n)}( |t|^\frac{k}{2} f ) \right) \|^2 \leq C_{k,l} \| |t|^\frac{k}{2} f \|^2 \leq C_{k,l} \| f \|^2 \cdot 6 + l.
\]

Here (1) follows from (7.6) and (7.7) by noting that \( \ell \geq 3 \); (2) follows from (1) of Lemma 7.7 and in (3) we use (7.7) of Lemma 7.11.

**Corollary 7.11.** Suppose \((\pi, H)\) is a unitary representation of \( SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \) without non-trivial \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)-fixed vectors. If \( f \in H^s \), \( s \geq 0 \), then

1. \( \| f_1(t), f_2 \|_{\mathbb{R}^2,t} \leq \| f \|_{\mathbb{R}^2,t}, \) for any \( t \leq s \).

2. If \( k \in \mathbb{N}, k \leq \frac{2(s-12)}{3} \) and \( \ell \geq k+3 \), then \( D^{(n)}(f) \in H^k \) with estimates

\[
\| \Theta^k \left( D^{(n)}(f) \right) \|_{H^k} \leq C_k \| f \|_{\mathbb{R}^2+12}.
\]

**Proof.** By arguments in Section 3.3 it suffices to assume \( \pi = \rho_t \). Then (1) is clear from Lemma 7.7. To prove (2), by Remark 7.5 it suffices to consider \( \rho_t, t \geq 0 \). It follows from Lemma 7.10 that

\[
\| \Theta^k \left( D^{(n)}(f) \right) \|_{\mathbb{R}^2,k+1} \leq C_k \| f \|_{\frac{4}{9}+12},
\]

for any \( 0 \leq k \leq \frac{2(s-12)}{3} \). From (1) of Lemma 6.7 we have

\[
\| \Theta^k \left( D^{(n)}(f) \right) \|_{SL(2,\mathbb{R}),k+1} \leq C_k \| f \|_{\frac{4}{9}+12},
\]

for any \( 0 \leq k \leq \frac{2(s-12)}{3} \). Then (2) follows from Theorem 3.2.

**Remark 7.12.** \( f + D^{(n)}(f) \) is a traditional approximation of the twisted equation. Similar constructions appeared in [7]. However, Lemma 7.9 shows that \( D^{(n)}(f) \notin \mathcal{E}^k \) even though \( f \in \mathcal{E}^\infty \) because \( D^{(n)}(f) \notin \mathcal{E}^k \), if \( s \geq \ell - 1 \). Then the natural idea is that we split \( f \) into two parts:

\[
(f - f_1(t)) - f_1(t) = (f_1(t) + f_1(t+1)) + (f_1(t) + f_1(t+1)).
\]
For the second part, $D^{(n)}(f)$ would enjoy high Sobolev regularity if $\|l\|$ is large enough. This is the reason that we introduced the operator $F_{n, t}$. The study of cohomological equations over unipotent flows in Section 7.2 serves as preparative steps for treating $\ell$-$\Theta$ finite vectors.

8. THE TWISTED EQUATION $(X + n)f = g$ in $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$

From Section 7.3 we see that any representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ of $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ without non-trivial $\mathbb{R}^2$-fixed vectors, $\pi|_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}$ is tempered. This allows us to use the construction and results in Section 6.4. The subsequent discussion in this section will be devoted to the proof of the following result:

**Theorem 8.1.** Suppose $f \in \mathcal{H}$ is $\Theta$-finite and $m \in 2\mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 24$. Also suppose $f \in \mathcal{H}^{\infty}_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}_{2}^{m, 2}$. For any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ set $a_{l, m} = \|f|_{l+2}\|_{SL(2, \mathbb{R}), m+5} + \|f|_{l+2} \cdot r^m\|_{K, \mathbb{R}^2}^{5 + 5}$, where $n = 1$ if $l > 0$ and $n = -1$ if $l \leq 0$. Then:

1. Suppose $|l| \geq 5$ and $D^{(n)}_{l}(f) = 0$. Then $F_{n, t}(f) \in \mathcal{H}^{m-2}$ has estimates $\|F_{n, t}(f)\|_{m-2} \leq C_{m}a_{l, m}$. Further, the equation

\[(X + n)g = f|_{l} - F_{n, t}(f)\]

has a solution $g = g|_{l} \in \mathcal{H}^{m-2}$ with estimates $\|g\|_{m-2} \leq C_{m}a_{l, m}$.

2. Suppose $(X + n)g = f$ has a solution $g \in \mathcal{H}_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}^{\infty}$. Then we have

\[\|g|_{l}\|_{m-2} \leq C_{m}\|f|_{l+2}\|_{K, \mathbb{R}^2}^{5 + 5}\]

3. If $|l| \geq m + 3$, then $F_{n, t}(f) \in \mathcal{H}^{m-2}$ has estimates

\[\|F_{n, t}(f)\|_{m-2} \leq C_{m}\|f\|_{K, \mathbb{R}^2}^{5 + 5} + 12\]

Further, the equation

\[(X + n)g = f|_{l} - (D^{(n)}_{l}(f))|_{l} - F_{n, t}(f)\]

has a solution $g = g|_{l} \in \mathcal{H}^{m-2}$ with estimates $\|g\|_{m-2} \leq C_{m}\|f\|_{K, \mathbb{R}^2}^{5 + 5} + 12$.

From Section 8.1 to Section 8.3 we will give a detailed study of the the equation $(X + n)g = f$. As we explained in Remark 7.5, we only consider the irreducible representations $(\rho, \mathcal{E})$, $t \geq 0$. The crucial step in proving Theorem 8.1 is:

**Proposition 8.2.** Suppose $f \in \mathcal{E}_{t}, t \geq 0$ and $f$ is $\Theta$-finite. Also suppose $f \in (\mathcal{E}_{t})_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}^{\infty}$ and $f \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_{t}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For the the equation: (*)

\[(X + n)g = f|_{l} - F_{n, t}(f),\]

we have

1. If $l \leq -5$, then $F_{n, t}(f) \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_{t}$. Moreover, the equation (*) has a solution $g \in (\mathcal{E}_{t})_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}^{\infty}$ with $g \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_{t}$.

2. If $l \geq 5$ and $D^{(n)}_{l}(f) = 0$, then $F_{n, t}(f) \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_{t}$. Moreover, the equation (*) has a solution $g \in (\mathcal{E}_{t})_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}^{\infty}$ with $g \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_{t}$.

3. If $|l| \geq 5$ and the equation $(X + n)g = f|_{l} - F_{n, t}(f)$ has a solution $g \in (\mathcal{E}_{t})_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}^{\infty}$. Then $g \in (\mathcal{E}_{t})_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}^{\infty}$ with $g \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_{t}$.
(4) If \( f \) is \( \ell \cdot \Theta \)-finite for some \( \ell \geq 2 \) and the equation \((X + n)g = f\) has a solution \( g \in (E_l)^{\delta}_{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}\), then
\[
\|z_{l,t}(g_{l}) \cdot r^m\| \leq C_l\|f\|_{l^{+}\cdot 2} \cdot r^m
\]
where \( z_{l,t} \) stands for \( p_{l,t} \) or \( q_{l,t} \) or identity. Here \( *_l = 1 \) if \( l > 0 \), and \( *_l = -1 \) if \( l \leq 0 \).

**Remark 8.3.** From Remark 7.8 we see that if \( t = 0 \), \( D^0(f) = 0 \) for any \( \ell \geq 0 \). If \( t > 0 \) since \( \rho_t \) only has holomorphic series, \( D^n(0) = 0 \) implies that \( D^{\nu,n}_{\nu,\nu+1}(f^+_{\nu}) = 0 \) for any \( \nu + 1 - \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{+} \cup 0 \).

**8.1. Operators \( q_{n,t} \) and \( p_{n,t} \), \( t \geq 0 \).** From (7.4), we see that the study of these two operators is as a first step towards the proof of Proposition 8.2.

**Lemma 8.4.** Suppose \( f \in \mathbb{E} \) and \( f \cdot r^s \in \mathbb{E}, s \geq 0 \). If \( n \leq -2 \), the equation \( q_{n+2,t}(g) = f \) has a unique solution \( g \in \mathbb{E} \) with estimates
\[
\|g \cdot r^s\|_{\mathbb{E}} \leq \frac{2}{|n-s|-1} \|f \cdot r^s\|_{\mathbb{E}}; \quad \text{and}
\|p_{n+2,t}(g) \cdot r^s\|_{\mathbb{E}} \leq (1 + \frac{2s}{|n-s|-1}) \|f \cdot r^s\|_{\mathbb{E}}.
\]

**Proof.** Uniqueness of the solution: For any \( l \in \mathbb{Z} \) we note that the solution of the equation \( q_{l,t}(\phi) = 0 \) has the form
\[
(8.2) \quad \phi = cr^{-l}e^{-tr^{-2}} \quad c \in \mathbb{C}.
\]
If \( l \leq 0 \), then \( \phi \in \mathbb{E} \) if and only if \( \phi = 0 \). This implies the uniqueness.

**Construction of the solution:** From the decomposition (7.5) we see that
\[
\mathcal{K}_n(f) = \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{K}_n(f))^{\delta}_{\nu}u^{\delta}_{\nu,n}\mu^{\delta}(\nu),
\]
where \( \delta = + \) if \( n \in 2\mathbb{Z} \) and \( \delta = - \) if \( n \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1 \). Let
\[
\tilde{g} = \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} -\frac{2}{n+1-\nu}(\mathcal{K}_n(f))^{\delta}_{\nu}u^{\delta}_{\nu,n+2}\mu^{\delta}(\nu); \quad \text{and}
\tilde{w} = \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{n+3+\nu}{n+1-\nu}(\mathcal{K}_n(f))^{\delta}_{\nu}u^{\delta}_{\nu,n+2}\mu^{\delta}(\nu).
\]
It is clear that \( \tilde{w}, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{E}_l \) with estimates
\[
(8.3) \quad \|\tilde{g}\| \leq \frac{2}{|n|-1} \|f\|, \quad \|\tilde{w}\| \leq \|f\|.
\]
From (6.5) it is clear that \( X\tilde{g} = \mathcal{K}_n(f) + \tilde{w} \). Let \( g = \mathcal{K}^{-1}_{n+2}(\tilde{g}) \). By (7.4) the above equation implies that
\[
(8.4) \quad q_{n+2,t}(g) = f \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}^{-1}_{n+2}(\tilde{w}) = p_{n+2,t}(g).
\]
Then for \( s = 0 \), the result follows immediately from (8.3) since \( \mathcal{K}_l \) are isometries for all \( l \in \mathbb{Z} \).

**Sobolev estimates of the solution:** If \( f \cdot r^s \in \mathbb{E} \) the above arguments show that the equation
\[
(8.5) \quad q_{n+2-s,t}(g_1) = f \cdot r^s
\]
has a solution $g_1 \in \mathbb{E}$ with estimates

$$
\|g_1\|_E \leq \frac{2}{[n-s-1]} \|f \cdot r^s\|_E \quad \text{and} \quad \|p_{n+2-s,t}(g_1)\|_E \leq \|f \cdot r^s\|_E.
$$

We note that $g \cdot r^s$ satisfies the equation \((8.5)\). By \((8.2)\) we have

$$
g \cdot r^s = g_1 + cr^{-(n+2-s)}e^{-tr^{-2}},
$$

which gives $g = g_1 \cdot r^{-s} + cr^{-(n+2)}e^{-tr^{-2}}$. Since $\int_1^\infty |g(r) - g_1(r)| \cdot r^{-s} \cdot e^{-tr^{-2}} \, dr < \infty$ we can conclude that $c = 0$. This proves that $g \cdot r^s = g_1$. Hence we finish the proof of the first inequality. To prove the second one, we note that

$$
p_{n+2,s,t}(g) \cdot r^s = p_{n+2-s,t}(g \cdot r^s) + sg \cdot r^s = p_{n+2-s,t}(g_1) + sg_1 = p_{n+2-s,t}(g_1) + sg_1.
$$

From \((8.6)\) we have $\|p_{n+2,s,t}(g) \cdot r^s\|_E \leq (1 + \frac{2s}{[n-s-1]})\|f \cdot r^s\|_E$. Hence we finish the proof.

\[\square\]

**Lemma 8.5.** Suppose $t > 0$. Also suppose $f \in \mathbb{E}$ and $f \cdot r^s \in \mathbb{E}$, $s \geq 0$. If $n \geq 3$, the equation $p_{n-2,t}(g) = f$ has a solution $g \in \mathbb{E}$ if and only if the following solvable condition holds: \((*)\) \(\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} f(r) r^{-n} e^{-tr^{-2}} \, dr = 0\). If the solution $g \in \mathbb{E}$ exists, then it is unique with estimates

$$
\|g \cdot r^s\|_E \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2}{n+s-1}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+s-2}} \right\} \|f \cdot r^s\|_E \quad \text{and} \quad \|q_{n-2,s,t}(g) \cdot r^s\|_E \leq (1 + \max \left\{ \frac{2s}{n+s-1}, \frac{s}{\sqrt{n+s-2}} \right\}) \|f \cdot r^s\|_E.
$$

**Proof.** Uniqueness of the solution: For any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ we note that solutions of the equation $p_{l,t}(\phi) = 0$ have the forms

$$
\phi = cr^l e^{-tr^{-2}}, \quad c \in \mathbb{C}.
$$

If $l \geq 0$ then $\phi \in \mathbb{E}$ if and only if $\phi = 0$. This implies the uniqueness of the solution once the solution in $\mathbb{E}$ exists.

**Solvable condition of the solution:** Suppose $g \in \mathbb{E}$ is the solution of the equation $p_{n-2,t}(g) = f$. Then the discrete series components for $K_{n-2}(g)$ and $K_n(f)$ have the following forms respectively:

$$
\sum_{1 \leq m \leq \frac{n-s}{2}} g_{n-2m-1,n-2}^+ u_{n-2m-1,n-2}^+; \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{0 \leq m \leq \frac{n-s}{2}} (K_n(f))_{n-2m-1,n}^+ u_{n-2m-1,n}^+.
$$

If $n = 3$, the first one reads as 0. Comparing \((7.4)\) and the equations in Lemma 6.1, we see that $p_{n-2,t}(g) = f$ implies that

1. $(n - m - 1)g_{n-2m-1,n-2}^+ = (K_n(f))_{n-2m-1,n}^+$, $1 \leq m \leq \frac{n-2}{2};$
2. $(n - m - 1)g_{n-2m-1,n-2}^+ = (K_n(f))_{n-2m-1,n}^+$, which is equivalent to the solvable condition \((*)\) by Lemma 7.9.
Construction of the solution: Suppose condition (*) holds. Let
\[
\tilde{g} = \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{2}{n-1+\nu} (K_n(f))^\delta v^\delta u^\delta_{\nu, n-2} d\mu^\delta(\nu) + \sum_{1 \leq m \leq 2} \frac{1}{n-m-1} (K_n(f))^{+}_{n-2m-1, n} u^{+}_{n-2m-1, n-4} \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\tilde{w} = \int_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} -\frac{n-3-\nu}{n-1+\nu} (K_n(f))^\delta v^\delta u^\delta_{\nu, n-4} d\mu^\delta(\nu) + \sum_{2 \leq m \leq 2} \frac{m-1}{n-m-1} (K_n(f))^{+}_{n-2m-1, n} u^{+}_{n-2m-1, n-4},
\]
where \( \delta = + \) if \( n \in 2\mathbb{Z} \) and \( \delta = - \) if \( n \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1 \). If \( n \leq 5 \) the discrete series components for \( \tilde{w} \) reads as 0. We note that
\[
\frac{1}{n-m-1} \| u^+_{n-2m-1, n-2} \| \stackrel{(1)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-m-1)m}} \| u^+_{n-2m-1, n} \| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-2}} \| u^+_{n-2m-1, n} \|, \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\frac{m-1}{n-m-1} \| u^+_{n-2m-1, n-4} \| \stackrel{(1)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-m-2}} \frac{\sqrt{n-m-2}}{\sqrt{m}} \| u^+_{n-2m-1, n} \| \leq \| u^+_{n-2m-1, n} \|.
\]
Here in (1) we use \([6,3]\). Then it follows that \( \tilde{w}, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{E}_t \) with estimates
\[
\| \tilde{g} \|_E \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2}{n-1}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-2}} \right\} \| f \|_E \quad \text{and} \quad \| \tilde{w} \|_E \leq \| f \|_E.
\]
Since condition (*) implies \((K_n(f))^{\delta+}_{n-1, n} = 0\), by \([6,5]\) we have \( X \tilde{g} = \tilde{f} + \tilde{w} \).

Let \( g = K^{-1}_{n-2}(\tilde{g}) \). As a direct consequence of \([7,4]\) we have
\[
p_{n-2, t}(g) = f \quad \text{and} \quad K^{-1}_{n-2}(\tilde{w}) = q_{n-2, t}(g).
\]
Then for \( s = 0 \), the result follows immediately from \([8,8]\).

Sobolev estimates of the solution: Condition (*) is equivalent to condition (**): \( \int_\mathbb{R} (f(r) \cdot r^s) r^{-(n+s)} e^{-tr^2} rdr = 0 \). By Lemma \([7,9]\) condition (*) means \((K_{n+s}(f \cdot r^s))^{\frac{1}{n+s-1, n+s}} = 0\). Since \( f \cdot r^s \in \mathcal{E} \) and satisfies the solvable condition (**), the above arguments show that the equation
\[
p_{n-2+s, t}(g_1) = f \cdot r^s
\]
has a solution \( g_1 \in \mathcal{E} \) with estimates
\[
\| g_1 \|_E \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2}{n+s-1}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+s-2}} \right\} \| f \cdot r^s \|_E \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\| q_{n-2+s, t}(g_1) \|_E \leq \| f \cdot r^s \|_E.
\]
We note that \( g \cdot r^s \) also satisfies equation \([8,9]\). By \([8,1]\) we see that
\[
g \cdot r^s = g_1 + cr^{n-2+s} e^{-tr^2}, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
It is clear that \( g = g_1 \cdot r^{-s} + cr^{n-2} e^{-tr^2} \). Since \( \int_1^\infty |g(r) - g_1(r) \cdot r^{-s}|^2 rdr < \infty \) we conclude that \( c = 0 \). This proves that \( g \cdot r^s = g_1 \). Hence we finish the
proof of the first inequality. To prove the second one, we note that
\[
q_{n-2,t}(g) \cdot r^s = q_{n-2,s,t}(g) - sg \cdot r^s = q_{n-2,s,t}(g_1) - sg_1.
\]
This with (8.10) show that
\[
\|q_{n-2,t}(g) \cdot r^s\|_E \leq (1 + \max \left\{ \frac{2s}{n+s-1}, \frac{s}{\sqrt{n+s-2}} \right\}) \|f \cdot r^s\|_E.
\]
Hence we finish the proof. \(\square\)

**Corollary 8.6.** Suppose \(t = 0\). Also suppose \(f \in \mathcal{E} \) and \(f \cdot r^s \in \mathcal{E}, s \geq 0\). If \(n \geq 2\), the equation \(p_{n-2,t}(g) = f\) has a solution \(g \in \mathcal{E}\). Furthermore, the solution is unique with estimates
\[
\|g \cdot r^s\|_E \leq \frac{2}{n+s-1} \|f \cdot r^s\|_E
\]
\[
\|q_{n-2,t}(g) \cdot r^s\|_E \leq (1 + \frac{2s}{n+s-1}) \|f \cdot r^s\|_E.
\]

**Proof.** We follow the proof line of Lemma 8.5. By noting that if \(t = 0\) then \((\mathcal{K}_n(f))^+ = 0\) for any \(\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^+\), we see that the solution of the equation \(p_{n-2,t}(g) = f\) exists and is unique. The estimates is a directly consequence of (8.10) by getting rid of \(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n+s-2}}\), which is from the discrete series components. \(\square\)

At the end of this section, we list the following results which are useful for later proofs.

**Remark 8.7.** Suppose \(\ell \geq 2\). If \(g\) has the following expression
\[
g(r, \theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} g_{-\ell+2k}(r)e^{i(-\ell+2k)\theta}e^{-itr^2\tan \theta},
\]
and satisfies the equation \((X+n)g = f\), from (7.4) we have the recursive relations:
\[
p_{\ell}g_{\ell} = f_{\ell+2}, \quad p_{\ell-2}g_{\ell-2} = f_{\ell} - ng_{\ell}
\]
\[
p_{\ell-2k}g_{\ell-2k} = f_{\ell-2(k-1)} - q_{\ell-2(k-2)}g_{\ell-2(k-2)} - ng_{\ell-2(k-1)},
\]
for \(0 \leq 2k \leq \ell - 1\); and
\[
q_{-\ell}g_{-\ell} = f_{-\ell-2}, \quad q_{-\ell+2}g_{-\ell+2} = f_{-\ell} - ng_{-\ell}
\]
\[
p_{-\ell+2k}g_{-\ell+2k} = f_{-\ell+2(k+1)} - q_{-\ell+2(k+2)}g_{-\ell+2(k+2)} - ng_{-\ell+2(k+1)},
\]
for \(0 \leq 2k \leq \ell\).

**8.2. Proof of Proposition 8.2**. Proof of (1) and (2): For \(l < 0\) (resp. \(l > 0\)) by Lemma 8.8 and Remark 8.3 the equation \((X+n)g = f|_{t - \mathcal{F}_{n,l}(f)}\) has a solution \(g = g|_{t \in (E_{\ell})_{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}}\). Since \(f\) is \(\Theta\)-finite, by Lemma 6.6 there exists \(-\ell < l\) (resp. \(\ell > l\)) such that \(g_k = 0\) if \(k \leq -\ell\) (resp. \(k \geq \ell\)). We note that \((\mathcal{F}_{n,l}(f))_{q} = 0\) if \(q \neq l, l + 2\) (resp. if \(q \neq l, l - 2\)). From the recursive relations of the second part (resp. the first part) of Remark 8.7 by keeping using Lemma 8.4 (resp. Lemma 8.5) we see that \((z_{n,t}g_n) \cdot r^m \in E_{\ell}, \ldots\)
for \(-\ell \leq n \leq l\) (resp. \(l \leq n \leq \ell\)), where \(z_{n,\ell}\) stands for \(p_{n,\ell}\) or \(q_{n,\ell}\) or identity. This shows that \(g \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_t\). Further, from the recursive relations we have

\[
\begin{align*}
q_{t,gl} &= -\left(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)\right)_{t+2}, \\
p_{t,gl} &= f_t - p_{t-2,t}g_{t-2} - \left(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)\right)_{t}.
\end{align*}
\]

(resp. \(q_{t,gl} = -\left(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)\right)_{t+2}, \quad p_{t,gl} = f_t - q_{t+2,t}g_{t+2} - \left(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)\right)_{t}\))

we see that \(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f) \cdot r^m \in \mathcal{E}_t\).

**Proof of (3):** From (1), we only need to consider the case of \(\ell > 0\). The assumption implies that the equation \((X + n)g_1 = \mathcal{D}_t(f)\) has a solution \(g_1 \in (\mathcal{E}_t)_{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}^6\). From (5) of Lemma 6.7 we see that \(\mathcal{D}_t^0(f) = 0\). Then the result follows directly from (2).

**Proof of (4):** By Lemma 6.6 we see that \(g\) is \((\ell - 1)\)-finite. For \(g_n, n \geq 1\) (resp. \(n \leq 0\)) from the recursive relations in the first part (resp. the second part) of Remark 8.7, by letting \(0 \leq 2k \leq \ell - 1 - n\) (resp. \(0 \leq 2k \leq \ell - 1 + n\)) and keeping using Lemma 6.5 (resp. Lemma 6.4), we get the result for the case of \(n \geq 1\) (resp. \(n \leq 0\)).

### 8.3. Proof of Theorem 8.1

By arguments in Section 3.3 it suffices to assume \(\pi = \rho_t\). By Remark 7.3 it suffices to consider \(\rho_t, t \geq 0\).

**Lemma 8.1:** By Lemma 6.8 the equation (8.1) has a solution \(g = g_t \in (\mathcal{E}_t)_{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}^\infty\). Further, Proposition 8.2 shows that both \(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)\) and \(g\) are in \((\mathcal{E}_t)^{2m}_{\mathbb{R}}\). Then it follows from Theorem 3.2 that both \(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)\) and \(g\) are in \((\mathcal{E}_t)^{2m}\). By the commutator relations \(XY_1 - Y_1X = Y_1\) and \(XY_2 - Y_2X = -Y_2\), from (8.1) we see that \(Y_1^2kY_2^{m-2k}g\) where \(0 \leq k \leq \frac{m}{2}\) satisfies the equation

\[
(X + n + m - 4k)(Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}g) = Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}(f|_t - \mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)).
\]

We will use the following facts: (τ) \(Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}(h - h|_{l+s_1,2})|_{l+s_1(m+2)} = 0\) for any \(h \in \mathcal{E}_t\); and (τ1) \(\left(\mathcal{F}_{n,t}(f)\right)_{q} = 0\) if \(q \neq l, l - s_1, 2\). It follows from Lemma 6.6 that

\[
\left\|\left(Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}g\right)|_{l+s_1m}\right\|^2 \leq C_m\left\|\left(Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}(f|_t)\right)|_{l+s_1(m+2)}\right\|_{K, \frac{m}{2} \pm 5} \tag{1}
\]

\[
\leq C_m \left\|\left(Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}(f|_{l+s_1,2})\right)|_{l+s_1(m+2)}\right\|_{K, \frac{m}{2} \pm 5} \tag{2}
\]

\[
\leq C_m, 1 \left\|f|_{l+s_1,2} \cdot r^m\right\|_{K, \frac{m}{2} \pm 5}.
\]

In (1) we use both (τ) and (τ1); and in (2) we use (τ). By noting that \(r^m = (r^2 \sin \theta^2 + r^2 \cos \theta^2)^{\frac{m}{2}} = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \frac{m}{2}} C_{\frac{m}{2}} (-1)^{m/2} Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}\),

It follows from the above estimates that

\[
\left\|g \cdot r^m\right\|_{l+s_1m} \leq C_m \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \frac{m}{2}} \left\|\left(Y_1^{2k}Y_2^{m-2k}g\right)|_{l+s_1m}\right\|
\]

\[
(8.11) \leq C_m, 1 \left\|f|_{l+s_1,2} \cdot r^m\right\|_{K, \frac{m}{2} \pm 5}.
\]
From (8.1) and fact $(\tau_1)$, by Lemma 6.6 we have

$$\|g|_{l + \epsilon m}\|_{SL(2, \mathbb{R}), s} \leq C_t \|f|_{l + \epsilon (m + 2)}\|_{SL(2, \mathbb{R}), s + 5}, \quad s \geq 0.$$  

This together with (8.11) show that

$$\|g|_{l + \epsilon m}\|_m \leq C_m \|f|_{l + \epsilon (m + 2)}\|_{SL(2, \mathbb{R}), m + 5}$$

$$+ C_m \|f|_{l + \epsilon, 2} \cdot r^m\|_{K, \frac{m}{2} + 5} \leq C_m a_{l, m}.$$  

Here in (1) we use Theorem 3.2 in (2) we use Lemma 6.5

Set \(\tilde{g} = g - g|_{l + \epsilon m}\). Then we have \((X + n)\tilde{g} = \tilde{f}\), where

$$\tilde{f} = f|_{l} - F_{n, l}(f) + (X + n)(g|_{l + \epsilon m}).$$

We note that \(\tilde{g}\) is \(|l + \epsilon m| - \Theta\) finite. Next, we suppose \(l > 0\). By (4) of Proposition 8.2 for \(0 \leq k \leq \frac{m}{2}\) we have

$$\|(z_{l + 2k, l} g_{l + 2k}) \cdot r^{m - 1}\| \leq C_m \|\tilde{f}|_{l + 2} \cdot r^{m - 1}\|$$

for \(0 \leq k \leq \frac{m}{2}\), where \(z_{n, t}\) stands for \(p_{n, t}, q_{n, t}\) and identity. Here in (1) we use \((\tau_1)\); in (2) we use (8.12).

The above estimates together with (8.11) gives

$$\|g|_l \cdot r^{m - 1}\| \leq C_m a_{l, m}.$$  

Further, from (7.3) we see that

$$F_{n, l}(f))|_{l - 2} = q_{l, t} g_{l}, \quad (F_{n, l}(f))|_l = n g_l + q_{l + 2, t} g_{l + 2}.$$

Then it follows from (8.13) that

$$\|F_{n, l}(f) \cdot r^{m - 1}\| \leq C_m a_{l, m}.$$  

Then the result is an immediate consequence of (8.14), (8.15), Lemma 6.8 (providing estimates inside \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\)) and Theorem 3.2. The proof of the case of \(l < 0\) follows in a similar way.

(2): From (1) of Proposition 8.2 we see that \(g \in (E_t)^{2m}_{\mathbb{R}^2}\) and is \(\Theta\)-finite. From Lemma 6.6 we have \(g \in (E_t)^{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}_{\mathbb{R}}\). Following the same proof line in (1), we can also get (8.14). This together with Lemma 6.6 (providing estimates inside \(SL(2, \mathbb{R})\)) and Theorem 3.2 gives the result.

(3): Set \(\tilde{f} = f|_l - D_{l}^{(n)}(f)|_l\). We note that \(D_{l}^{(n)}(\tilde{f}) = 0\) and \(F_{n, l}(\tilde{f}) = F_{n, l}(f)\). From (2) of Corollary 7.11 and (1) of Lemma 6.7 we have

$$\|\tilde{f}|_{l + \epsilon, 2}\|_{SL(2, \mathbb{R}), m + 5} + \|\tilde{f}|_{l + \epsilon, 2} \cdot r^m\|_{K, \frac{m}{2} + 5} \leq C_m \|f\|_{\frac{3m}{2} + 12}.$$  

Then the result follows from (1) immediately.
9. Global estimates of constructions from $G_1$

In this section, we assume that $(\pi, O)$ is a unitary representation of $G$ such that the restriction of $\pi$ to each simple factor of $\mathbb{G}$ has a spectral gap. By Howe-Moore for any $1 \leq i \leq q$, the restricted representation $\pi|_{S_i}$ has no-nontrivial $\mathbb{R}^2$-fixed vectors. By arguments at the beginning of Section 8 we see that $\pi|_{G_1}$ is tempered. If $\xi \in \mathcal{O}^0$, then for $l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 0$ and $\ell \geq 2$ we can define $\xi[l], \mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi), \mathcal{D}_l^{(n)}(\xi), \mathcal{F}_{n,l}(\xi)$ as described in Section 6.4.

**Lemma 9.1.** Set $S = G_1 \times G_1^\perp$. If $\xi \in \mathcal{O}^s_1$, $s \geq 6$, then:

1. $\mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi) \in \mathcal{O}^{s-7}_1$ with estimates $\|\mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi)\|_{S,t} \leq C_l \|\xi\|_{S,t+7}, t \leq s-7$; further, the equation $(X+n)\eta_1 = \xi + \mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi)$ has a solution $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{O}^{s-7}_1$ with estimates $\|\eta_1\|_{S,t} \leq C_l \|\xi\|_{S,t+7}$, for any $t \leq s-7$;

2. $\xi[l], \xi[l]_l$ are in $\mathcal{O}^{s-1}_1$ with estimates $\|\xi[l]\|_l \leq C_l \|\xi\|_{l-1}$, $t \leq s-1$;

3. if $s \geq 48$ and $l \geq \frac{s}{2} + 3$, $\mathcal{D}^{(n)}_l(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{n,l}(\xi)$ are in $\mathcal{O}^{s-3}_1$ with estimates $\|\mathcal{D}^{(n)}_l(\xi), \mathcal{F}_{n,l}(\xi)\|_{S,3} \leq C_l \|\xi\|_{s+12}$;

4. if $s \geq 48$ and $(X+n)\omega = \xi$ has a solution $\omega \in \mathcal{H}^6_{G_1}$. For any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, if we denote $\ast_1 = 1$ if $l > 0$, and $\ast_1 = -1$ if $l \leq 0$, then we have

$$\|\omega[l]\|_{s-3} \leq C_s \|\xi[l\ast_1]\|_{s+5}.$$

**Proof.** From the proof of Corollary 5.8 (also see Remark 5.9), we see that for any non-compact $v \in \mathfrak{g}_1^\perp \cap \mathfrak{g}^\ast_1$ and any $v \in \mathcal{O}$ we have $v \mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi)$ is tempered. If $v \mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi)$ is tempered, then for any $k \geq 0$, where $p$ stands for the linear operators mentioned at the beginning of this section. Then by Lemmas from 6.5 to 6.8 we have

$$\|v^k(\xi[l]), v^k(\xi[l]_l)\| \leq C \|v^k \xi\|,$$

and

$$\|v^k(\mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi)), v^k(\mathcal{D}_l^{(n)}(\xi)), v^k(\mathcal{F}_{n,l}(\xi)), v^k \phi\| \leq C_l \|v^k \xi\|_{G_1,6}$$

for any $k \leq s - 6$, where $\phi$ stands for $\eta_i, i = 1, 2$ and $\omega[l]$.

We also note that $\mathfrak{g}_1^\perp$ can be spanned by non-compact vectors. Hence if we use $P$ to denote $G_1^\perp$, then we have

$$\|\xi[l], \xi[l]_l\|_{P,k} \leq C \|\xi\|_{P,k},$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{D}^{(n)}(\xi), \mathcal{D}_l^{(n)}(\xi), \mathcal{F}_{n,l}(\xi), \phi\|_{P,k} \leq C_l \|\xi\|_{S_1,6+k}.$$

Lemmas from 6.5 to 6.8 show that the above estimates still hold if $P$ denotes $G_1$. Then (1) is a direct consequence of (6.2) and Theorem 6.2.

Choose $S_i, 1 \leq i \leq q$; and we use $S_i|_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ to denote the $\mathbb{R}^2$ part of $S_i$. We consider the restricted representation of $\pi$ on $S_i$. Then it follow from (1) of Theorem 8.1 that

$$\|\xi[l], \xi[l]_l\|_{S_i|_{\mathbb{R}^2},t} \leq \|f\|_{S_i|_{\mathbb{R}^2},t}, t \leq s.$$
Since the Lie algebras of the \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) part of each \( S_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq q \), as well as Lie algebras of \( G_1 \) and \( G_1^\perp \) span \( \mathfrak{g} \), Proposition 10.1 follows (9.1), (9.3) and Theorem 3.2.

From Theorem 3.1 for \( |l| \geq \frac{q}{2} + 3 \) we have

\[
\|D_{[l]}^{(n)}(\xi), \mathcal{F}_{u,l}(\xi)\|_{S_i, \frac{q}{2} - 2} \leq C_s\|\xi\|_{S_i, \frac{q}{2} + 12}, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\|\psi[l]\|_{S_i, \frac{q}{2} - 2} \leq C_s\|\xi\|_{l + 12}, \quad l \in \mathbb{Z};
\]

and the equation \((X + n)\eta_2 = \xi|_{l} - D_{[l]}^{(n)}(\xi) - \mathcal{F}_{u,l}(\xi)\) has a solution \( \eta_2 = \eta_2|_{l} \) with estimates \( \|\eta_2\|_{S_i, \frac{q}{2} - 2} \leq C_s\|\xi\|_{S_i, \frac{q}{2} + 12} \).

Proof. We choose sufficiently large \( \varepsilon \) such that:

(9.4) together with (9.1) gives the first part of (3) as a direct consequence of Theorem 3.2. (4) follows directly from (9.2), (9.5) and Theorem 3.2.

10. Estimates from almost twisted HP-coboundaries

We use \( \pi \) to denote the regular representation of \( G \) on the homogeneous space \( \mathcal{O} = L_0^2(\mathbb{G}/\mathcal{T}) \) this this section. We note that \( \pi \) satisfies Howe-Moore, see Theorem 5.1. In this section suppose \( \mathcal{Z} \in \mathfrak{g}^1 \) such that:

(10.1) \( \) estimates (5.8) hold for the cohomological equation \((Z + \lambda)u = w, \lambda \in \mathcal{A}_i(ad_u)\). The purpose of this section is to prove the following result:

**Proposition 10.1.** Suppose \( \mathcal{Z} \) commutes with \( \text{Lie}(G_1) \). Also suppose \( p, v, w \) are in \( \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O})^s, s \geq \max\{50, 6 + 2\sigma_2\} \) satisfying

\[
(Z + ad_Z)p - (X + ad_X)v = w.
\]

Then there exist \( \eta, \mathcal{R}_X(p) \) in \( \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O})^{s-3} \) with estimates

\[
\|\eta, \mathcal{R}_X(p)\|_t \leq C_t\|p\|_{\frac{2}{3}t + 12}, \quad t \leq \frac{s - 6}{2}; \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\|\mathcal{R}_X(p)\|_t \leq C_t\|w\|_{\frac{2}{3}t + 12}, \quad t \leq \frac{s - 6 - 2\sigma_2}{2\gamma},
\]

where \( \sigma_6 = \frac{2\gamma}{\gamma} + 8s \), such that if we set \( p' = p - (X + ad_X)\eta - \mathcal{R}_X(p) \), then \( p' \) is \([\frac{q}{2} + 5]\) - \( \Theta \) finite, where \([ \cdot ] \) is the floor function.

The next two results are dedicated to the proof of the above proposition.

**Lemma 10.2.** For any \( u \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O})^s, s \geq 2 \) and any \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( \Theta \)-finite vector \( u^o \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O})^{s-2} \) such that \( \|u - u^o\|_{s-2} \leq \epsilon \).

Proof. We choose sufficiently large \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \frac{1}{m}\|u\|_{m} \leq \epsilon_1 \), where \( \epsilon_1 \) satisfies \( 4l_1\epsilon_1 \leq \max\{1, \|u\|_{s}\} \leq \epsilon \), where \( l_1 \) comes from (10.3) below \( (l_1 \gamma \) depends only on \( s \) and \( \mathcal{X} \)). By Lemma 6.5 for any \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( |k| \geq m \) we have

\[
\|u|_k\| \leq |k|^{-1}\|u\|_1 \leq \epsilon_1.
\]

By (2) of Lemma 9.1 we have \( u|_k \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O})^{s-1} \) with estimates \( \|u|_k\|_{s-1} \leq C_s\|u\|_{s} \). Then by interpolation inequalities (see [16]) we have

\[
\|u|_k\|_{s-2} \leq l_1\epsilon_1 \frac{1}{\gamma} \|u|_k\|^1_{\frac{2}{3} + 1} \cdot \|u|_k\|^\frac{2}{3} \leq l_1\epsilon_1 \frac{1}{\gamma} \max\{1, \|u\|_{s}\} \leq \epsilon_4
\]

(10.3)


Set \( u^0 = u - (u|_m + u|_{m+1} + u|_{-m} + u|_{-(m+1)}) \). Then \( u^0 \) is \( \Theta \)-finite and the estimate follows from above inequality.

**Lemma 10.3.** Suppose \( p, v, w \) are in \( \mathfrak{g}(O)^s \), \( s \geq 48 \) satisfying

\[
(X + ad_X - a)v - p = w,
\]

where \( a \) is an eigenvalue of \( ad_X \). If \( p \) is \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite, then there is \( (\ell - 1) \)-\( \Theta \) finite \( v^0 \in \mathfrak{g}(O)^{s-1} \) such that

\[
\|v^0 - v\|_{\frac{s}{2} - 3} \leq C_l \|w\|_{\frac{s}{2} + 6}; \quad \text{and} \quad \|v^0 - v\|_{t} \leq \|v\|_{t+1}, \quad t \leq s - 1.
\]

**Proof.** Since \( ad_X \) is semisimple, Equation (10.4) splits into finitely many equations of the form \( (X + \lambda_i - a)v_i = w_i + p_i \), where \( v_i \), \( w_i \), and \( p_i \) are coordinate functions of \( v \), \( w \) and \( p \) respectively, in the basis in which \( ad_X \) is in its diagonal form, and \( \lambda_i \) is the \( i \)-th eigenvalue of \( ad_X \). We note that \( \lambda = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2 \). Then for any \( l \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( |l| \geq \ell \) we have

\[
\|v_i|_l\|_{\frac{s}{2} - 3} \leq C_l \|v_i + p_i|_{l + \sigma_2}\|_{\frac{s}{2} + 5} = C_l \|v_i|_{l + \sigma_2}\|_{\frac{s}{2} + 5} \leq C \|v_i\|_{\frac{s}{2} + 6}.
\]

In (1) we use (4) of Lemma 9.1 in (2) we use (2) of Lemma 9.1.

Set \( v^0_i = v_i - \frac{v_i|_{-\ell} - v_i|_{-\ell}}{3} - v_i|_{-\ell} - v_i|_{-\ell} \). Then \( v^0_i \) is \( (\ell - 1) \)-\( \Theta \)-finite. Set \( v^0 \) to be the vector with coordinates \( v^0_i \). Hence we proved the first part of the result. Then second part is a direct consequence of (2) of Lemma 9.1. Hence we finish the proof.

**Proof of Proposition 10.7.** By Lemma 10.2 it suffices to assume that \( p, v \) are \( \Theta \)-finite and are in \( \mathfrak{g}(O)^{s-2} \). We continue to use notations in the proof of the Lemma 10.3. Set \( l = \lfloor \frac{s}{2} + 5 \rfloor + 2 \). For any \( \Theta \)-finite \( \lambda_i \in \mathfrak{g}(O) \) with coordinate functions \( \lambda_i \) and \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( |k| \geq 3 \), we set \( D^{(\lambda_i)}_{|k|}(\lambda_i) \) (resp. \( F_{\lambda_i,k}(\lambda_i) \)) to be the vector with coordinate functions \( D^{(\lambda_i)}_{|k|}(\lambda_i) \) (resp. \( F_{\lambda_i,k}(\lambda_i) \)).

It follows from (4) of Lemma 9.1 that

\[
\|D^{(\lambda_i)}_{|k|}(\lambda_i), F_{\lambda_i,k}(\lambda_i)\|_t \leq \|\lambda_i\|_{\frac{s}{2} + 48}, \quad t \leq \frac{s}{2} - 3,
\]

where \( \lambda_i \) stands for \( p \) or \( w \) and \( k = \pm 1, \pm t \); and the equation

\[
(X + ad_X)\eta = p|_{l} + p|_{-l} + p|_{l+1} + p|_{-l-1} - D^{(\lambda)}_{l}(p) - D^{(\lambda)}_{l+1}(p) - F_{\lambda,l}(p) - F_{\lambda,-l+1}(p) - F_{\lambda,-l-1}(p)
\]

has a solution \( \eta \in \mathfrak{g}(O)^{\frac{s}{2} - 3} \) with estimates \( \|\eta\|_t \leq C_l \|p\|_{\frac{s}{2} + 48}, \quad t \leq \frac{s}{2} - 3 \).

From (10.2) we have

\[
D^{(\lambda)}_{k}((Z + ad_Z)p) - D^{(\lambda)}_{k}((X + ad_X)v) = D^{(\lambda)}_{k}(w), \quad k = l, l + 1
\]

\[
\implies D^{(\lambda)}_{k}((Z + ad_Z)p) = D^{(\lambda)}_{k}(w) \quad \implies (Z + ad_Z)D^{(\lambda)}_{k}(p) = D^{(\lambda)}_{k}(w)
\]

\[
\|D^{(\lambda)}_{k}(p)\|_t \leq C_l \|D^{(\lambda)}_{k}(w)\|_{t+\sigma_2} \leq C_l \|w\|_{\frac{s}{2} + 3\sigma_2 + 48}, \quad t \leq \frac{s - 6 - 2\sigma_2}{2\gamma}.
\]

(1) is from (3) of Lemma 6.7 following the proof line of Corollary 5.8 we have (2); in (3) we use (10.11) and in (4) we use (10.5).
Set $\mathcal{R}_X(p) = D_{t}^{(\lambda)}(p) + D_{t+1}^{(\lambda)}(p)$. Then it is clear that $p'$ is $[\frac{2}{7} + 5]-\Theta$ finite. Hence we finish the proof.

We end this section with a result whose role will be clear from the subsequent section.

**Corollary 10.4.** Suppose $p, v$ are in $g(O)^l_S$ (see Section 4.4), $l \geq \sigma_2$ satisfying

$$\tag{10.6} (Z + ad_Z)p - (X + ad_X)v = w.$$ 

there exist $\eta, \mathcal{R}$ in $g(O)$ such that $p - (X + ad_X)\eta = \mathcal{R}$ with estimates

$$\|\eta, \mathcal{R}\|_{S,t_1} \leq C_t \|p\|_{S,t_1+7}; \text{ and } \|\mathcal{R}\|_{S,t_2} \leq C_t \|m\|_{S,\gamma t_2+\sigma_2},$$

where $t_1 \leq l - 7$ and $t_2 \leq \frac{l - 1 - \gamma}{\gamma}$.

**Proof.** We continue to use notations in the proof of the Lemma 10.3. For any $j \in g(O)$ with coordinate functions $j_i$, we set $D^{(\lambda)}(j_i)$ to be the vector with coordinate functions $D^{(\lambda)}(j_i)$. From (11) of Lemma 9.1 we see that

$$\|D^{(\lambda)}(j)\|_{S,t} \leq C_t \|j\|_{S,t+7}, \quad t \leq l - 7,$$

where $z$ stands for $p$ and $w$. Further, the equation $(X+\lambda_i)\eta_i = p_i + D^{(\lambda_i)}(p_i)$ has a solution $\eta_i \in O^{l-7}_S$ with estimates

$$\|\eta_i\|_{S,t} \leq C_t \|p_i\|_{S,t+7}, \quad t \leq l - 7.$$

Let $\eta$ be the vector with coordinate functions $\eta_i$. Then we get the first part of the result. From (10.6) we have

$$D^{(\lambda)}((Z + ad_Z)p) - D^{(\lambda)}((X + ad_X)v) = D^{(\lambda)}(w)$$

$$(1) \rightarrow D^{(\lambda)}((Z + ad_Z)p) = D^{(\lambda)}(w) \stackrel{(2)}{\rightarrow} (Z + ad_Z)D^{(\lambda)}(p) = D^{(\lambda)}(w)$$

$$\Rightarrow \|D^{(\lambda)}(p)\|_t \leq C_t \|D^{(\lambda)}(w)\|_{\gamma t+\sigma_2}, \quad t \leq \frac{l - 1 - \sigma_2}{\gamma}. $$

(1) is from (3) of Lemma 6.7 following the proof line of Corollary 5.8 (also see Remark 5.9) we have (2); (10.11) gives (3).

Set $\mathcal{R} = D^{(\lambda)}(p)$. Then we finish the proof. \qed

11. Global estimates of constructions from $S_i$, $1 \leq i \leq q$

In Section 11 and 12 we will center on the study cohomological equations over unipotent flows. Results in Section 7.2 suggests that for equation $Y_1\omega = \xi$, we split $\xi$ into two parts: $\xi = f(r)\xi + (f(r) - 1)\xi$, where $f \in C\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ is a characteristic function with support inside $[0, 1]$. This part realizes this idea by using representation theory.

We assume notations at the beginning of Section 9. We consider the restriction of $\pi$ on $S_i$. By general arguments in Section 3.3 from Observation 7.2 and 7.7 and Lemma 7.6 we have

**Lemma 11.1.** Suppose $\xi \in O$ is $\ell$-$\Theta$ finite. Then:

1. If the equation $Y_1, i\omega = \xi$ has a solution $\omega \in O^1$, then $P_i(\xi) = 0$. 
(2) for any \( l \in \mathbb{N} \) the equation \((Y_{1,1}^2 + Y_{2,2}^2)^l g = Y_{1,1}^{2l} \xi \) has a unique solution \( g \in \mathcal{O} \) with the estimate \( \|g\| \leq \|\xi\| \). We denote \( g \) by \( \frac{Y_{1,1}^{2l} \xi}{(Y_{1,1}^2 + Y_{2,2}^2)^l} \).

(3) set \( \mathcal{P}_1(\xi) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \frac{2^{2m} Y_{1,1}^{2m} \xi (2m)}{(Y_{1,1}^2 + Y_{2,2}^2)^m} \right) + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \frac{2^{2m} Y_{1,1}^{2m} \xi (2m+1)}{(Y_{1,1}^2 + Y_{2,2}^2)^{m+1}} \right) \), then \( \|\mathcal{P}_1(\xi)\| \leq C_\ell \|\xi\|, \; 1 \leq i \leq q \). Further, the equation

\[
(11.1)
Y_{1,1} \omega = \xi - \mathcal{P}_1(\xi)
\]

has a \((\ell - 1)\)-\(\Theta\) solution \( \omega \in \mathcal{H} \) with the estimate \( \|\omega\| \leq C_\ell \|\xi\| \).

Generally, even though \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}^\infty \) the global smoothness of \( g, \mathcal{P}_1(\xi), \omega \) can’t be guaranteed. Next, we will construct smooth solution of the equation (11.1) based on the study of group algebra.

11.1. Group algebra of unipotent subgroups. In this part we construct new operators based on nilpotent vectors by using group algebra; and we obtain the Sobolev regularity. The applications of these operators will be presented in Sections 11.2 and 11.3.

We assume notations at the beginning of Section 5. We say that a subgroup of \( G \) is of \textit{unipotent type} if its Lie algebra is spanned by nilpotent vectors. Let \( S \) be an abelian closed subgroup of \( G \) of unipotent type which is isomorphic to \( \mathbb{R}^m \). Fix a set of generators \( u = \{u_1, \cdots, u_m\} \) of \text{Lie}(S). We use \( \exp(u) \) to denote \( S \). For any \( t = (t_1, \cdots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m \), set \( \exp(t) = \exp(t_1 u_1 + \cdots + t_m u_m) \) and \( \pi(t) = \pi(\exp(t)) \).

Definition 11.2. Fix \( 0 < a < b \). For \( f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) \), we say that \( f \) is \((a, b)\)-related to \( u \) if \( f(t) = 1 \) for \( \sum_{i=1}^m t_i^2 \leq a \) and \( f(t) = 0 \) for \( \sum_{i=1}^m t_i^2 \geq b \). We say that \( f \) is \((a, b)\)-\textit{reversely} related to \( u \) if \( f = 1 - g \), where \( g \) is \((a, b)\)-related to \( u \).

Choose \( f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \) satisfying \( f(x) = 1 \) if \( x \leq a \) and \( f(t) = 0 \) if \( x \geq b \). We say that \( f \) is \((a, b)\)-uniformly related (resp. reversely uniformly related) to \( u \) (with respect to \( f \)) if \( f(t) = f(\sum_{i=1}^m t_i^2) \) (resp. \( f(t) = 1 - f(\sum_{i=1}^m t_i^2) \)).

For \( \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H} \), consider the corresponding matrix coefficients of \( \pi \mid_S \): \( \phi_{\xi, \eta}(t) = \langle \pi(t) \xi, \eta \rangle, \; t \in \mathbb{R}^m \). There exists a regular Borel measure \( \mu \) on \( \mathbb{R}^m \), called the associated measure of \( \pi \) (with respect to \( \mathbb{R}^m \)), such that \( \xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \chi d\mu(\chi) \), and

\[
(11.2)
\phi_{\xi, \eta}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \chi(-t) \langle \xi, \eta \rangle d\mu(\chi).
\]

Note that \( \chi(t) = e^{ia \cdot t} \) for some \( a \in \mathbb{R}^m \). Hence we can identify \( \mathbb{R}^m \) and \( \mathbb{R}^m \).

We use \( S(\mathbb{R}^m) \) to denote the Schwartz space of \( \mathbb{R}^m \). The representation \( \pi \mid_S \) extends to a \(*\)-representation on \( S(\mathbb{R}^m) \): for any \( f(x) \in S(\mathbb{R}^m) \), \( \pi_u(f) \) is the operator on \( \mathcal{H} \) for which

\[
\langle \pi_u(f) \xi, \eta \rangle = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(t) \phi_{\xi, \eta}(t) dt, \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}.
\]
Further we have
\begin{equation}
(11.3) \quad \langle \pi_u(f)\xi, \eta \rangle = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(t)\langle \pi(t)\xi, \eta \rangle dt \\
= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(t)\chi(-t)\langle \xi, \eta \rangle d\mu(\chi) dt \\\n= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle \left( \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(t)\chi(-t) dt \right) d\mu(\chi)
\end{equation}

(11.4) \quad = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \hat{f}(\chi)\langle \xi, \eta \rangle d\mu(\chi).

This shows that \( \|\pi_u(f)\| \leq \|\hat{f}\|_\infty \) for any \( f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m) \). We define \( \hat{\pi}_u(f) = \pi_u(\hat{f}) \) for any \( f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m) \). Then
\begin{equation}
(11.5) \quad \|\hat{\pi}_u(f)\| \leq \|f\|_\infty, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m),
\end{equation}

which allows us to extend \( \hat{\pi}_u \) from \( \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m) \) to \( L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) \) by taking strong limits of operators and pointwise monotone increasing limits of non-negative functions (see [22] for a detailed treatment). Hence \( \hat{\pi}_u \) is a homomorphism of \( L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) \) to bounded operators on \( \mathcal{H} \). It is easy to check that the following property holds:
\begin{equation}
(11.6) \quad \hat{\pi}_u(f_1)\hat{\pi}_u(f_2) = \hat{\pi}_u(f_1f_2), \quad \forall f_1, f_2 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m).
\end{equation}

**Definition 11.3.** \( v \in \mathcal{H} \) is a \((a, b)\)-\( u \) small vector if \( \hat{\pi}_u(f)v = v \), for any \( f \) \((a, b)\)-related to \( u \). If \( S = \{e\} \) or \( u = 0 \) then any vector is \((a, b)\) small.

**Observation 11.4.** If \( \hat{\pi}_u(f)v = v \), where \( f \) is \((a, b)\)-related to \( u \). Then (11.6) shows that \( v \) is \((b, c)\)-\( A \) small for any \( c > b \) and any \( A \subset u \).

**Lemma 11.5.** If \( f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m) \) and \( \xi \in \mathcal{H} \). Then \( \pi_u(f)\xi \in \mathcal{H}^S_\infty \) with estimates
\[ \|\pi_u(f)\xi\|_{S, l} \leq C_{f, l}\|\xi\|, \quad l \geq 0. \]

**Proof.** From (11.4) we see that
\begin{equation}
(11.7) \quad u^{k_1} \cdots u^{k_m}_m(\pi_u(f)\xi) = \hat{\pi}_u(f_{k_1, \ldots, k_m})\xi
\end{equation}
where \( f_{k_1, \ldots, k_m}(t) = f(t)(-t_1)^{k_1} \cdots (-t_m)^{k_m} \) for any \( k_i \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq m \).
Hence the result follows immediately. \( \square \)

Set \( \hat{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{R}^m) = \{f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) : \partial_{t_1}^{j_1} \cdots \partial_{t_m}^{j_m} f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m), \forall j_i \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq m \}. \)

**Lemma 11.6.** Suppose \( \xi \in \mathcal{H}^s, s \geq 1 \). If \( f \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{R}^m) \) then \( \pi_u(f)\xi \in \mathcal{H}^s \) with
\[ \|\pi_u(f)\xi\|_\ell \leq C_{f, \ell}\|\xi\|_\ell, \quad 0 \leq \ell \leq s. \]

**Proof.** Since \( u_i, 1 \leq i \leq m \) are nilpotent, \( (\text{ad}_{u_i})^{\dim \Phi} = 0 \), \( 1 \leq i \leq m \). Set
\[ B_{l, i} = \sum_{j=0}^{\dim \Phi - 1} \frac{(-1)^j}{j!} \text{ad}_{u_i}^j, 1 \leq i \leq m, l \in \mathbb{R}. \]
Then we can write
\[ B_{l_1, 1} \cdots B_{l_m, m} = \sum_{0 \leq j_1, \ldots, j_m \leq \dim \Phi - 1} c_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} t_1^{j_1} \cdots t_m^{j_m} \text{ad}_{u_i}^{j_1} \cdots \text{ad}_{u_m}^{j_m}. \]
We note that $v\pi(t)\xi = \pi(t)(B_{i_1,1} \cdots B_{i_m,m}(v))\xi$, $v \in \mathfrak{G}$. Then we have

$$
\langle v(\hat{\pi}_u(f)\xi), \eta \rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \langle \hat{f}(t)v(\pi(t)\xi), \eta \rangle dt
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \langle \hat{f}(t)\pi(t)(B_{i_1,1} \cdots B_{i_m,m}(v))\xi, \eta \rangle dt
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^m} \sum_{0 \leq j_1, \ldots, j_m \leq \dim \mathfrak{G} - 1} c_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \langle \hat{f}(t)\xi, \eta \rangle dt
$$

$$
= \sum_{0 \leq j_1, \ldots, j_m \leq \dim \mathfrak{G} - 1} c'_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} \langle \hat{\pi}(\partial_{j_1} \cdots \partial_{j_m} f)(\text{ad}_{j_1} \cdots \text{ad}_{j_m} v)\xi, \eta \rangle
$$

where $c'_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} = c_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} \sum_{i=1}^m j_i$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Here in (1) we use (11.3).

This shows that for any $v \in \mathfrak{G}$ and any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ we have

$$
(11.8) \quad v(\hat{\pi}_u(f)\xi) = \sum_{0 \leq j_1, \ldots, j_m \leq \dim \mathfrak{G} - 1} c'_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} \langle \hat{\pi}(\partial_{j_1} \cdots \partial_{j_m} f)(\text{ad}_{j_1} \cdots \text{ad}_{j_m} v)\xi, \eta \rangle.
$$

Inductively we can show that for any vectors $v_i \in \mathfrak{G}$, $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, $\ell \leq s$ we have

$$
v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_\ell}(\hat{\pi}_u(f)\xi) = \sum_{0 \leq j_1, \ldots, j_m \leq \dim \mathfrak{G} - 1} c_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} \langle \hat{\pi}(\partial_{j_1} \cdots \partial_{j_m} f)(\text{ad}_{j_1} \cdots \text{ad}_{j_m} v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_\ell})\xi, \eta \rangle,
$$

where $j_i = \sum_{k=1}^\ell j_{i,k}$ and $v_{j_1,j_2,\ldots,j_m,l} = \text{ad}_{j_1} \cdots \text{ad}_{j_m,l}(v_i)$, $1 \leq l \leq m$, which gives $\|v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_\ell}(\hat{\pi}_u(f)\xi)\| \leq C_{f,\ell}\|\xi\|_{\ell}$, $\ell \leq s$, for any $v_i \in \mathfrak{G}^1$, $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. By arguments below (11.5), we can extend (11.9) from $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Hence we finish the proof.

\begin{observation}
From (11.9) and (11.6) we see that if $\xi$ is $(a,b)$-u small, then for any $v \in \mathfrak{G}$, $v\xi$ is also $(b,c)$-u small for any $c > b$.
\end{observation}

\subsection{Application I: smoothing operators}
In this part we will show how to obtain a globally smooth vector from a vector that is only smooth inside a subgroup. This part plays a crucial role in the construction of the approximation in Section 13.

\begin{corollary}
Suppose $Q$ and $Q_1$ are subgroups of $G$ and $S$ is an abelian subgroups of $G$ of unipotent type which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^m$. Set $u$ to be a set of generators of Lie($S$). Suppose $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{Q_1}^s$, $s \geq 0$. If Lie($Q$) = Lie($Q_1$) $\oplus$ Lie($S$) (in the sense of linear space sum), then for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $\xi' = \pi_u(f)\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{Q_1}^s$ with estimates

$$
\|\xi'\|_{Q_1,t} \leq C_{f,t}\|\xi\|_{Q_1,t}, \quad t \leq s.
$$
\end{corollary}
Proof. For any \( v \in \text{Lie}(Q_1) \), from (11.9) of Lemma 11.6 we have
\[
v \pi_u(f) = \sum_{0 \leq j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_m \leq \dim \mathfrak{g} - 1} c_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} \pi_u(f_{j_1, \ldots, j_m}) v_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} + \pi_u(f)v,\]
where \( f_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m) \) and \( v_{j_1, \ldots, j_m} = \text{ad}_{u_1}^{j_1} \ldots \text{ad}_{u_m}^{j_m}(v) \), where \( u_1, \ldots, u_m \) are elements in \( u_\pi \).

From the above relation, (11.7) and we have the observation: the vector \( v_1 v_2 \ldots v_k \pi_u(f) \xi \), where \( v_i \in \text{Lie}(Q) \cap \mathfrak{g}^1 \), is a linear combination of vectors of the forms: \( \pi_u(f_i)(u_1 \ldots u_l \xi) \) and \( \pi_u(f_n)(\xi) \), where \( f_i, f_n \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m) \) and \( u_j \in \text{Lie}(Q_1) \), \( 1 \leq j \leq l \) with \( l \leq k \). By Lemma 11.6
\[
\|v_1 v_2 \ldots v_k \pi_u(f) \xi\| \leq \sum_{i,l} \|\pi_u(f_i)(u_1 \ldots u_l \xi)\| + \sum_{n} \|\pi_u(f_n)(\xi)\| \leq C_{f,k}\|\xi\|Q_{1,k}.
\]
Hence we finish the proof. \( \square \)

**Corollary 11.9.** Suppose \( f \) is \((a, b)\)-related to \( \mathfrak{g} \); and \( g \) is \((a, b)\)-related to \( \mathfrak{g} \). If \( \xi \in \mathcal{H}_s \), \( s \geq 0 \), then:

1. \( \xi' = \pi_{\mathfrak{g}_1}(f) \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{s1}^{1} \) with estimates \( \|\xi'\|_{(G^1_1)} \leq C_{t,f}\|\xi\|_{S,t}, \quad t \leq s; \)
2. \( \xi'' = \pi_{\mathfrak{g}_1}(g) \xi' \in \mathcal{H}_s^{1} \) with estimates
\[
\|\xi''\|_t \leq C_{t,g}\|\xi'\|_{(G^1_1)} \leq C_{t,f,g}\|\xi\|_{S,t}, \quad t \leq s.
\]

**Proof.** We note that \( \text{Lie}(G_1^1) = \text{Lie}(\mathcal{S}) \oplus \mathfrak{g} \) and \( g = \text{Lie}(G^1_1) \oplus \mathfrak{g} \). Then the results follow directly from Corollary 11.8 \( \square \)

Assume \( |B_0| = 2 \). Suppose \( f_i \) is \((a, b)\)-related to \( \mathfrak{g}_i \), \( i = 1, 2 \). It is clear that \( f_1 \) is also \((a, b)\)-related to \( \mathfrak{g}_i \). Set \( U_i, \ i = 1, 2 \) to be the subgroup generated by \( S_0 \) and \( \exp(C_i) \), where \( C \) could \( \mathfrak{g}_i \) or \( \mathfrak{g} \). Then:

**Corollary 11.10.** \( \quad \)

1. Suppose \( \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{S_0}^{s}, \ s \geq 0 \). Then \( \xi' = \pi_{\mathfrak{g}_1}(f_1) \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{S_0}^{s1} \) with estimates \( \|\xi'\|_{U_1,t} \leq C_{t,f_1}\|\xi\|_{S_0,t}, \quad t \leq s. \)
2. Suppose \( \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{S}^{s}, \ s \geq 0 \). Then \( \xi' = \pi_{\mathfrak{g}_1}(f_1)\pi_{\mathfrak{g}_2}(f_2) \xi \in \mathcal{H}_{S_0}^{s1} \) and \( \xi'' = \pi_{\mathfrak{g}_1}(f_1)\pi_{\mathfrak{g}_2}(f_2) \xi' \in \mathcal{H}_s^{1} \) with estimates:
\[
\|\xi''\|_{(G^1_1)} \leq C_{t,f_1,f_2}\|\xi\|_{S,t}, \quad t \leq s; \quad \text{and} \quad \|\xi''\|_t \leq C_{t,f_1,f_2}\|\xi\|_{S,t}, \ t \leq s.
\]

**Proof.** (1): it is a direct consequence of Corollary 11.8 by noting that \( U_1 = S_0 \rtimes \mathfrak{g}_i \). \( \square \) (2): It follows from Corollary 11.9 by noting that \( \pi_{\mathfrak{g}_1}(f_1)\pi_{\mathfrak{g}_2}(f_2) = \pi_{\mathfrak{g}}(f_1,f_2). \)

The next result plays an essential role in studying the global smoothness of the operators \( P_i \) (Lemma 11.11), which is the central part of Section 11.3.

**Lemma 11.11.** Suppose \( \xi \in \mathcal{H}_s, \ s \geq 0 \) and \( b > a > 0 \). Also suppose \( u = (u_1, u_2) \) and \( f \) is \((a, b)\)-reversely related to \( u \).

1. For any \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) the equation \( (u_1^2 + u_2^2)^m g = u_2^{2m} \xi \) has a solution \( g \in \mathcal{H} \) with estimates \( \|g\| \leq \|\xi\| \). We denote \( g \) by \( u_2^{2m} \xi (u_1^2 + u_2^2)^m. \)
(2) If \( \hat{\pi}_u(f)\xi = \xi \), then for any \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) the equation \((u_1^2 + u_2^2)^m g = u_1^{2m} \xi \) has a solution \( g \in \mathcal{H}^s \) with estimates \( \|g\|_t \leq C_{f,t,m} \|\xi\|_t, t \leq s \).

**Proof.** Set \( F(t) = \frac{t^2}{(t_1^2 + t_2^2)^m} \). From (11.3), \( \hat{\pi}_u(F)\xi \in \mathcal{H} \) with estimates \( \|\pi_u(F)\xi\| \leq \|\xi\| \). Set \( g = \pi_u(F)\xi \). From (11.4) we see that \( g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{x_1^{2m}}{(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^m} \xi_1 d\mu(\chi) \) and:

\[
(u_1^2 + u_2^2)^m g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{x_1^{2m}}{(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^m} (-x_1^2 - x_2^2)^m \xi_1 d\mu(\chi)
\]

\[= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (-x_1^2)^m \xi_1 d\mu(\chi) = u_1^{2m} \xi, \]

which gives (11).

**2:** Set \( F(t) = f(t) \cdot \frac{t^2}{(t_1^2 + t_2^2)^m} \). It is clear that \( F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \) satisfying

\[ \partial_1^i \partial_2^j f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2), \sum_{i=1}^2 j_i \geq 0. \]

By Lemma 11.6, \( \hat{\pi}_u(F)\xi \in \mathcal{H}^s \) with estimates \( \|\pi_u(F)\xi\|_\ell \leq C_{f,\ell,m} \|\xi\|_\ell, \ell \leq s \). Set \( g = \pi_u(F)\xi \). It is clear that \( g \) is a solution of the equation. Hence we finish the proof. \( \square \)

11.3. **Application II: reduction to small vectors.** In this part we make a further study of the equation (11.11) in \( \mathcal{O} \).

**Lemma 11.12.** Suppose \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}^s, s \geq 0 \) and is \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite. Suppose \( f \) is \((a,b)\)-reversely uniformly related to \( \mathfrak{s}_i \) (see Section 11.4) with respect to \( \hat{f} \). Then \( \hat{\pi}_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi \) is also \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite, \( 1 \leq i \leq q \) with estimates \( \|\pi_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi\|_\ell \leq C_{f,\ell}\|\xi\|_\ell, t \leq s \).

**Proof.** We consider the restriction of \( \pi \) on \( S_i \). By general arguments in Section 11.3 there is a direct decomposition of \( \mathcal{O} = \int_S \mathcal{O}_z d\mu(z) \) of irreducible unitary representations of \( SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \) without nontrivial \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)-fixed vectors for some measure space \((\mathbb{Z}, \mu)\). Then \( \mathcal{O}_z = \mathcal{E}_{p(z)}, \) where \( p(z) \in \mathbb{R} \) for all \( z \in \mathbb{Z} \). Then we can write \( \xi = \int_S \xi_z d\mu(z), \) where \( \xi_z = \sum_j \xi_j(z) j(r) e^{ij\theta} e^{-ip(z)r^2 \tan \theta} \) (see (7.3)). From the polar coordinates vector fields in Lemma 7.1 we see that for \( \pi_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi = \int_S (\hat{\pi}_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi)_z d\mu(z), \) where

\[
(\hat{\pi}_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi)_z = \sum_j f(r^2)(\xi_z)_j(r) e^{ij\theta} e^{-ip(z)r^2 \tan \theta}.
\]

Since \( \xi \) is \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite, \( \xi_z \) is also \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite for almost all \( z \). Then it is clear that \( (\hat{\pi}_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi)_z \) is also \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite for almost all \( z \). Hence \( \hat{\pi}_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi \) is \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite. The estimates follow directly from Lemma 11.6. \( \square \)

**Lemma 11.13.** Suppose \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}^s, s \geq 0 \) and is \( \ell \)-\( \Theta \)-finite.

1. If \( f \) is \((a,b)\)-reversely uniformly related to \( \mathfrak{s}_i \) and \( \hat{\pi}_{\mathfrak{s}_i}(f)\xi = \xi \), then \( \mathcal{P}_t(\xi) \in \mathcal{O}^{s-1} \) satisfying \( \|\mathcal{P}_t(\xi)\|_t \leq C_{f,t,\ell}\|\xi\|_{t+1}, \) for any \( 0 \leq t \leq s - 1, 1 \leq i \leq q \).

2. If \( s \geq \delta_i(l) + 1 \) (see Corollary 5.8), then equation (11.11) has a solution \( \omega \in \mathcal{O}^l \) with estimates \( \|\omega\|_t \leq C_{f,t,\ell}\|\xi\|_{t+9}, \) for any \( 0 \leq t \leq l \).
Proof. (1): it is a direct consequence of Lemma 6.5 and (2) of Lemma 11.11.

(2): (6) of Lemma 7.6 shows that the equation (11.1) has a solution \( \omega \in \mathcal{O} \). Then the result follows from Corollary 5.8.

\[ \]
12. Almost coboundaries over unipotent flows

We assume notations of at the beginning of Section 10 until the end of the paper. Next, we will obtain estimates from almost coboundaries over nilpotent vectors in $\mathcal{O}$, as well as in the extended space $g(\mathcal{O})$.

Lemma 12.1. Fix $l, \ell \geq 2$. Suppose $Z$ commutes with $\text{Lie}(S_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq q$ and $f$ is $(a,b)$ reversely related to $s_i$. Also suppose $u, v$ are $\ell$-$\Theta$ finite in $\mathcal{O}^{s+1}$, $s \geq \delta(l+1) + 1$ (see Lemma 11.13); and satisfy $\hat{\pi}_{s_i}(f) v = v$, where $v$ stands for $u, v, \omega$. If

$$ (12.1) \quad (Z + \lambda_1)u - Y_{1,i}v = \omega $$

where $\lambda_1$ is an eigenvalue of $\text{ad} Z$ then there exists $(\ell - 1)$-$\Theta$ finite $\eta \in \mathcal{O}^{l}$ with estimates

$$ \left\| \eta \right\|_t \leq C_{f,t,\ell} \left\| u \right\|_{t+10}, \quad t \leq l, $$

such that both $v - (Z + \lambda_1) \eta$ and $u - Y_{1,i} \eta$ are $\ell$-$\Theta$ finite with estimates

$$ \left\| v - (Z + \lambda_1) \eta, u - Y_{1,i} \eta \right\|_t \leq C_{f,t,\ell} \left\| \omega \right\|_{\sigma_1 t + \sigma + 1}, \quad t \leq \min \left\{ \frac{s - 1 - \sigma}{\sigma_1}, l \right\}, \quad \text{and} $$

$$ \left\| v - (Z + \lambda_1) \eta, u - Y_{1,i} \eta \right\|_t \leq C_{f,t,\ell} \left\| u, \omega \right\|_{t+10}, \quad t \leq l. $$

Proof. It is clear that $\omega \in \mathcal{O}^s$. From (12.1) we have

$$ \mathcal{P}_i((Z + \lambda_1)u) - \mathcal{P}_i(Y_{1,i}v) = \mathcal{P}_i(\omega) \overset{(1)}{=} \mathcal{P}_i((Z + \lambda_1)u) = \mathcal{P}_i(\omega) \overset{(2)}{=} (Z + \lambda_1)\mathcal{P}_i(u) = \mathcal{P}_i(\omega). $$

Here (1) is from (12.1); following the arguments in the proof of Corollary 5.8 we have (2). Then (10.11) gives

$$ \left\| \mathcal{P}_i(u) \right\|_t \leq C_l \left\| \mathcal{P}_i(\omega) \right\|_{\sigma_1 t + \sigma} \leq C_{f,t,\ell} \left\| \omega \right\|_{\sigma_1 t + \sigma + 1}, \quad t \leq \frac{s - 1 - \sigma}{\sigma_1}. $$

Here in the last inequality we use (11) of Lemma 11.13. Further, (2) of Lemma 11.13 shows that the equation $Y_{1,i} \eta = u - \mathcal{P}_i(u)$ has a $(\ell - 1)$-$\Theta$ finite solution $\eta \in \mathcal{O}^{l}$ with estimates

$$ \left\| \eta \right\|_t \leq C_{f,t,\ell} \left\| u \right\|_{t+10}, \quad t \leq l + 1. $$

By substituting $u = Y_{1,i} \eta + \mathcal{P}_i(u)$ into (12.1) we obtain

$$ Y_{1,i}((Z + \lambda_1) \eta - v) = \omega - (Z + \lambda_1)\mathcal{P}_i(u) = \omega - \mathcal{P}_i(\omega). $$

Observation 7.3 shows that $(Z + \lambda_1) \eta - v$ is $\ell$-$\Theta$ finite. Corollary 5.8 shows that

$$ \left\| v - (Z + \lambda_1) \eta \right\|_t \leq C_l \left\| \omega - \mathcal{P}_i(\omega) \right\|_{t+9} \leq C_{f,t,\ell} \left\| \omega \right\|_{t+10} $$

for any $t \leq l$. Here in the last inequality we use (11) of Lemma 11.13. Hence we finish the proof.

□
For any \( l > 0 \), we can obtain a sequence \( l_n \) by using a recursive rule: 
\[
l_0 = l \quad \text{and} \quad l_{n+1} = \max \{ \delta_l (l_n + 1) + 1, \sigma_1^l l_n + p_n (\sigma_1, \sigma + 1), l + 1 \} \text{ for any } n \geq 1 \quad (\text{see } (5.11) \text{ of Lemma } 5.12).
\]

**Proposition 12.2.** Fix \( l, \ell \geq 2 \). Suppose \( Z \) commutes with \( \text{Lie}(S_i) \) for some \( 1 \leq i \leq q \) and \( f \) is \((a, b)\)-reversely related to \( s_i \). Suppose \( p, v \) are \( \ell-\Theta \) finite in \( g(O)^{s+1} \), \( s \geq l_{\dim(g)} \). Also suppose \( \tilde{\pi}_s(f) \sigma = \sigma \), where \( \sigma \) stands for \( p, v, w \), if
\[
(Z + ad_Z)p - (Y_{1,i} + ad_{Y_{1,i}})v = w, 
\]
then there exists \((\ell - 1)\)-\( \Theta \) finite \( \eta \in g(O)^{l} \) with estimates
\[
\| \eta \|_t \leq C_{f, t, \ell} \| p, v \|_{t + 10 \dim(g)}, \quad t \leq l 
\]
such that \( v - (Z + ad_Z)\eta = R(v) \) and \( p - (Y_{1,i} + ad_{Y_{1,i}})\eta = R(p) \) with estimates
\[
\| R(v), R(p) \|_t \leq C_{f, t, \ell} \| p, v \|_{\gamma t + \sigma_3}, \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\| R(v), R(p) \|_t \leq C_{f, t, \ell} \| p, v, w \|_{t + 10 \dim(g)},
\]
\( t \leq l \), where \( \sigma_3 \) is a constant only dependent on \( G \).

**Proof.** Choose a basis in which \( Y_{1,i} \) has its Jordan normal form. Let \( J_{Y_{1,i}} = (u_{k,j}) \) be an \( m \times m \) matrix which consists of blocks of \( Y_{1,i} \), i.e., let \( u_{k,k} = 0 \) for all \( k = 1, \cdots, m \) and \( u_{k,k+1} = *_k \in \{0, 1\} \) for all \( k = 1, \cdots, m - 1 \). Let \( J_Z = (z_{k,j}) \) be the corresponding block of \( ad_Z \) where \( z_{k,k} = \chi \) for all \( k = 1, \cdots, m \) (\( \chi \) is an eigenvalue of \( ad_Z \)) and \( z_{k,j} = 0 \) for all \( m \geq k > j \geq 1 \). Then because of the fact that \( ad_{Y_{1,i}} \) and \( ad_Z \) commute, by simply comparing coefficients, it is easy to obtain the following relation which the coefficients of \( ad_Z \) must satisfy: \( (\ast) *_{j} z_{k,j} = *_{k} z_{k+1,j+1} \) for any fixed \( k \) between 1 and \( m - 1 \) and for all \( j = k + 1, \cdots, m - 1 \). 

\( (12.2) \) splits into \( m \) equations. For the \( m \)-th equation we have
\[
(Z + \chi)p_m - Y_{1,i}v_m = w_m.
\]

Then by Lemma \[12.1\] we have
\[
(12.3) \quad v_m = (Z + \chi)\eta_m + R(v_m), \quad p_m = Y_{1,i}\eta_m + R(p_m),
\]
where \( \eta_m \) is \((\ell - 1)\)-\( \Theta \) finite satisfying the estimates
\[
\| \eta_m \|_t \leq C_{f, t, \ell} \| p, v \|_{t + 10}, \quad t \leq l_{(\dim(g) - 1)}; 
\]
and
\[
\| R(v_m), R(p_m) \|_p \leq C_{f, t, \ell} \| v \|_{\sigma_1 p + \sigma + 1}, 
\]
\[
\| R(v_m), R(p_m) \|_t \leq C_{f, t, \ell} \| p, v, w \|_{t + 10},
\]
for any \( t \leq l_{(\dim(g) - 1)} \) and \( p \leq \min \{ \frac{l_{(\dim(g) - 1)}}{\sigma_1}, l_{(\dim(g) - 1)} \} = l_{(\dim(g) - 1)} \) by assumption. For every \( k = 1, \cdots, m - 1 \) we have the following equation:
\[
(12.4) \quad (Z + \chi)p_k + \sum_{k+1 \leq j \leq m} z_{k,j}p_j = (Y_{1,i}v_k + *_{k} v_{k+1}) = w_k.
\]
Now we proceed by induction. Fix $k$ between 1 and $m - 1$ and assume that for all $j = k + 1, \ldots, m$ we already have the the following

$$v_j = (Z + \chi)\eta_j + \sum_{j + 1 \leq l \leq m} z_{j,l} \eta_l + \mathcal{R}(v_j),$$

(12.5)

$$p_j = Y_{1,i} \eta_j + *_{j} \eta_{j + 1} + \mathcal{R}(p_j),$$

where $\eta_j$ is $(\ell - 1)-\Theta$ finite satisfying the estimates

$$\|\eta_j\| \leq C_{f,t,\ell}\|p, v\|_{t + 10(m-j+1)};$$

(12.6)

$$\|\mathcal{R}(v_j), \mathcal{R}(p_j)\| \leq C_{f,t,\ell}\|p, v, w\|_{t + 10(m-j+1)};$$

for any $t \leq l(dim(g) - (m-j+1)).$

By substituting from (12.3) and (12.5) the expressions for $v_j$ and $p_j$ for all $j = k + 1, \ldots, m$ into (12.4), we have

$$(Z + \chi)(p_k - *_{k} \eta_{k+1}) - Y_{1,i}(v_k - \sum_{k + 1 \leq j \leq m} z_{k,j} \eta_j) + \mathcal{R} = w_k - \sum_{k + 1 \leq j \leq m} z_{k,j} \mathcal{R}(p_j) + *_{k} \mathcal{R}(v_{k+1}).$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \sum_{j = k+1}^{m} *_{j} z_{k,j} \eta_{j+1} - *_{k} \sum_{j = k+2}^{m} z_{k,j+1} \eta_j.$ By using (2) we see that $\mathcal{R} = 0.$ Then by Lemma 12.1 we obtain $\eta_k$ which is $(\ell - 1)-\Theta$ such that

$$v_k = (Z + \chi)\eta_k + \sum_{k + 1 \leq j \leq m} z_{k,j} \eta_j + \mathcal{R}(v_k),$$

$$p_k = Y_{1,i} \eta_k + *_{k} \eta_{k+1} + \mathcal{R}(p_k)$$

with estimates following from (12.6)

$$\|\eta_k\| \leq C_{f,t,\ell}\|p, v\|_{t + 10(m-k+1)}$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{R}(v_k), \mathcal{R}(p_k)\| \leq C_{f,t,\ell}\|p, v, w\|_{t + 10(m-k+1)};$$

for any $t \leq l(dim(g) - (m-k+1));$ and

$$\|\mathcal{R}(v_k), \mathcal{R}(p_k)\| \leq C_{f,t,\ell}\|w\|_{\sigma_{1}^{-m-k+1} + p_{m-k}(\sigma_1 + 1)},$$

for any $t \leq \min\left\{ \frac{l(dim(g) - (m-k)) - p_{m-k+1}(\sigma_1 + 1)}{\sigma_{1}^{-m-k+1}}, l(dim(g) - (m-k+1)) \right\} = l(dim(g) - (m-k+1)).$

Hence we finish the case of $k.$ We repeat the above arguments to all Jordan blocks. It is clear that $\sigma_3$ is the maximum of $p_{m-1}(\sigma_1 + 1)$ where $p_{m-1}$ ranges over all Jordan blocks. Hence we get $\eta, \mathcal{R}(p)$ and $\mathcal{R}(v)$ which satisfy the conditions and the estimates in the statement by noting that the maximal size of a Jordan block of $Y_{1,i}$ is less than $\dim(g).$ \hfill \square

**Proposition 12.3.** Fix $l, \ell \geq 2$ and $b > a > 0.$ Suppose $Y_{1,i} \in \mathfrak{C} \cap B, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p = \left\lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \right\rfloor,$ where $\mathfrak{C}$ could be $\mathfrak{U}$ or $\mathfrak{V}.$ Also suppose $v_i, v_z \in g(\mathfrak{O})^{* + 1},$
There exists $(\ell - 1)\Theta$ finite $\eta \in g(O)$ with estimates
\[ \|\eta\|_t \leq C_{t,\ell,a,b}\|v\|_{t+10\dim(g)} \]
for any $t \leq l$, such that
\[ v_i - (Y_{1,i} + \text{ad} Y_{1,i})\eta = \xi_i + R_i, \quad \text{for any } Y_{1,i} \in \mathfrak{C} \cap B, \]
where $\xi_i$ and $R_i$ are all $\ell\Theta$ finite with estimates
\[ \|R_i\|_{t_1} \leq C_{t_1,\ell,a,b}\|v\|_{\gamma t_1 + \sigma_4}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\xi_i\|_{t_2} \leq C_{t_2,\ell,a,b}\|v\|_{t_2}, \]
where $t_1 \leq l$, $t_2 \leq s$ and $\sigma_4 = \gamma(\sigma_2 + 1) + \sigma_3$. Furthermore, all $\xi_i$ are $(a,b)\mathfrak{C}$ small vectors (see Definition 11.3).

Proof. We can assume that $\mathfrak{C}$ is non-empty and $\mathfrak{C} \cap B = (Y_{1,1}, Y_{1,2}, \ldots, Y_{1,p})$ for the convenience of notations. Fix $h$ which is $(1,2)$-reversely uniformly related to $s_1$. It is clear that: $(\ast)$ $g(t) = h(\frac{2t}{p})$ is $(\frac{2t}{p}, \frac{1}{p})$-reversely uniformly related to $s_i$, $1 \leq i \leq p$. Next we will prove: $(\ast\ast)$ for any $1 \leq k \leq p$, there exists $(\ell - 1)\Theta$ finite $\omega_k$ with estimates $\|\omega_k\|_t \leq C_{h,t,\ell}\|v\|_{t+10\dim(g)}$, $t \leq l+1$ such that for
\[ R_{i,k} = v_i - v_{i,k} - (Y_{1,i} + \text{ad} Y_{1,i})\omega_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p, \]
we have $\|R_{i,k}\|_t \leq C_{h,t,\ell}\|v\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_4}$, $t \leq l$, where $v_{i,k} = \pi_{s_i}(1 - g) \cdots \pi_{s_i}(1 - g)v_i$, $1 \leq k \leq p$.
We prove $(\ast\ast)$ by induction. (12.8) gives
\[ (Y_{1,1} + \text{ad} Y_{1,1})\pi_{s_i}(g)v_z - (z + \text{ad} z)(\pi_{s_i}(g)v_1) = \pi_{s_i}(g)v_{z,1}, \]
where $z \in B_0$ commuting with $\text{Lie}(S_i)$. By Proposition 12.2, Lemma 11.12 and $(\ast)$ we have: there exists $(\ell - 1)\Theta$ finite $\eta_1 \in g(O)^{l+1}$ with estimates
\[ \|\eta_1\|_t \leq C_{h,t,\ell,a}\|v\|_{t+10\dim(g)} \]
for any $t \leq l + 1$, such that
\[ \pi_{s_i}(g)v_1 - (Y_{1,1} + \text{ad} Y_{1,1})\eta_1 = \Omega_{1,1} \]
with estimates
\[ \|\Omega_{1,1}\|_t \leq C_{h,t,\ell,a}\|v\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_4}, \quad t \leq l + 1. \]
From (12.7), we have
\[ (Y_{1,i} + \text{ad} Y_{1,i})\pi_{s_i}(g)v_1 - (Y_{1,i} + \text{ad} Y_{1,i})\pi_{s_i}(g)v_i = \pi_{s_i}(g)v_{1,i}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq p. \]
Set $R_{i,1} = \hat{\pi}_{s_1}(g)v_i - (Y_{i,i} + \text{ad}Y_{i,i})\eta_1$, $2 \leq i \leq p$. By substituting from the expression for $\hat{\pi}_{s_1}(g)v_1$ in (12.10) into the above equations we have
\[-(Y_{1,1} + \text{ad}Y_{1,1})R_{i,1} = \hat{\pi}_{s_1}(g)w_{i,i} - (Y_{i,i} + \text{ad}Y_{i,i})\Omega_{1,i},\]
\[\Rightarrow \|R_{i,1}\|_t \leq C_{h,t}\|w_{i,i}, (Y_{i,i} + \text{ad}Y_{i,i})\Omega_{1,i}\|_{t+\sigma_2}
\]
(12.12)
for any $t \leq l$. Here in (1) we use Lemma 5.12 and Lemma 11.6 in (2) we use (12.11).

Set $\omega_1 = \eta_1$, $v_{i,1} = \hat{\pi}_{s_1}(1-g)v_i$, $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $R_{1,1} = \Omega_{1,1}$. By Lemma 11.12 Observation 7.4 and (*), $R_{i,1}$ and $v_{i,1}$, $1 \leq i \leq p$ are all $\ell$-$\Theta$ finite; and the estimates follow from the above analysis. Thus we proved (**) for $k = 1$. Suppose the statement holds for $k \geq 1$. From (12.8) we have
\[(Y_{1,k+1} + \text{ad}Y_{1,k+1})v'_z - (z + \text{ad}z)\hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)v_{k+1,k} = w'_{z,k+1},\]
where $z \in B_0$ commutes with $S_{k+1}$; and
\[(12.13)\]
\[u' = \hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)\hat{\pi}_{s_k}(1-g)\cdots \hat{\pi}_{s_1}(1-g)u,\]
here $u$ stands for $v_z$, $v_{z,k+1}$ and $w_{i,j}$. Then by Proposition 12.2, Lemma 11.12 and (*) we see that there exists $(\ell-1)$-$\Theta$ finite $\eta_{k+1}$ with estimates
\[\|\eta_{k+1}\|_t \leq C_{h,t,f,a}\|v\|_{t+10\dim(g)}\]
for any $t \leq l+1$, such that
\[(12.14)\]
\[\hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)v_{k+1,k} - (Y_{1,k+1} + \text{ad}Y_{1,k+1})\eta_{k+1} = \Omega_{k+1,k+1}\]
with estimates $\|\Omega_{k+1,k+1}\|_t \leq C_{h,t,f,a}\|v\|_{t+\sigma_3}$, $t \leq l+1$.

From (12.7), we have the following equations ($q_i$), $1 \leq i \leq p$, $i \neq k+1$:
\[(Y_{1,i} + \text{ad}Y_{1,i})\hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)v_{k+1,k} - (Y_{1,k+1} + \text{ad}Y_{1,k+1})\hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)v_{i,k} = w'_{i,k+1,i},\]
($w'_{i,k+1,i}$ is defined in (12.13)). Set $\Omega_{i,k+1} = \hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)v_{i,k} - (Y_{i,i} + \text{ad}Y_{i,i})\eta_{k+1}$, $i \neq k+1$. By substituting the expressions for $\hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)v_{j,k}$ from above and (12.14) into equations ($q_i$) we have
\[-(Y_{1,k+1} + \text{ad}Y_{1,k+1})\Omega_{i,k+1} = w'_{i,k+1,i} - (Y_{i,i} + \text{ad}Y_{i,i})\Omega_{k+1,k+1},\]
similar to (12.12) which gives $\|\Omega_{i,k+1}\|_t \leq C_{h,t,f,a}\|v\|_{t+\sigma_4}$, $t \leq l$, $i \neq k+1$.

Set $\omega_{k+1} = \eta_{k+1} + \omega_k$, $R_{i,k+1} = R_{i,k} + \Omega_{i,k+1}$. By Lemma 11.12 and Observation 7.4 and (*), $R_{i,k+1}$ and $v_{i,k+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq p$ are all $\ell$-$\Theta$ finite; and the estimates follow from the the above analysis and induction assumption. Then we proved the case of $k+1$. Further, from (12.9) for $1 \leq i \leq p$ we have
\[R_{i,k} = v_i - \hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(g)v_{i,k} - \hat{\pi}_{s_{k+1}}(1-g)v_{i,k} - (Y_{i,i} + \text{ad}Y_{i,i})\omega_k\]
\[\Rightarrow R_{i,k+1} = v_i - v_{i,k+1} - (Y_{i,i} + \text{ad}Y_{i,i})\omega_{k+1}.\]
Hence (***) is proved. Set $\eta = \omega_p$, $R_i = R_{i,p}$ and $\bar{z}_i = v_{i,p}$, $1 \leq i \leq p$. Then we get the result. \qed
Lemma 12.4. Suppose $Z$ commutes with $C$, where $C$ could be $U$ or $W$. Also suppose $v_j, w \in g(O)^s$, $j = 1, 2$, $s \geq 0$ and satisfy the almost cohomological equation

$$v_1 - (Z + ad_Z)v_2 = w.$$ 

If $\pi_C(f)v_1 = v_1$, where $f$ is $(a, b)$-related to $C$ and $v_2$ is $l$-$\Theta$ finite, then $v_2 = v_{2,1} + v_{2,2}$, where $v_{2,2}$ is $l$-$\Theta$ finite and is $(b|C|, c)$-$C$ small (see Definition [11.3]) for any $c > b|C|$ and the following estimates hold:

$$\|v_{2,1}\|_t \leq C_{t,a,b}\|v\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_2}, \ t \leq \frac{s - \sigma_2}{\gamma} \ \text{and} \ \|v_{2,2}\|_t \leq C_{t,a,b}\|v_2\|_t, \ t \leq s. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ (12.16)$$

Proof. We assume notations in proof of Proposition [12.3].\n
Set $\hat{v} = v$. Then (12.16) are small vectors, with estimates

$$\|v_{2,1}\|_t \leq C_{t,a,b}\|v\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_2}, \ t \leq \frac{s - \sigma_2}{\gamma} \ \text{and} \ \|v_{2,2}\|_t \leq C_{t,a,b}\|v_2\|_t, \ t \leq s.$$ 

Here in (1) we use (10.1) and in (2) we use Lemma [11.6]. Set $v_{2,1} = v_2 - v'_{2}$ and $v_{2,2} = v'_{2}$. Lemma [11.2] shows that $v_{2,2}$ is also $l$-$\Theta$ finite with estimates $\|v_{2,2}\|_t \leq C_{t,b,h}\|v_2\|_t, \ t \leq s$. Hence we finish the proof. \qed

Corollary 12.5. Fix $l, \ell \geq 2$. There exist $s_0(l), \sigma_5, \gamma_1 \geq 0$ such that for any $l$-$\Theta$ finite vectors $p_{X,1}, p_{v,1}, v \in B$ in $g(O)^s$, $s \geq s_0 + (\sigma + 1)$ satisfying relations

$$(12.15) \quad (v + ad_v)p_{X,1} - (X + ad_x - a)p_{v,1} = w_{X,v,1}$$

where $v \in B$ with $[X, v] = av$, there exist $\eta_i, R_{v,i} \in g(O)^l, i = 2, 3, v = X$ or $v \in B$ with estimates

$$\|\eta_i\|_t \leq C_{l,t}\|p\|_{t + \sigma_5}, \ \ |R_{v,i}|_t \leq C_{l,t}\|v\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_5}$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq l$, where $\|p\|_t = \max\{\|p_{v,1}\|_t : v = X$ or $v \in B\}$ and $\|w\|_t = \max\{\|w_{X,u}\|_t : u \in B\}$, such that for $i = 2, 3$

$$p_{v,1} = p_{v,i-1} - (v + ad_v)\eta_i + R_{v,i}, \quad v = X$ or $v \in B,$

are $l$-$\Theta$ finite satisfying: $p_{v,2}$ are $(1, 2)$-$U$-small vectors and $p_{v,3}$ are $(1, 2)$-$V$-small vectors, with estimates

$$\|p_{v,i}\|_t \leq C_{l,t}\|p\|_{t + \sigma_5}, \ t \leq l, \ v = X$, or $v \in B.$$

Proof. We prove: (*) for any $v_1, v_2 \in B$ with $[v_1, v_2] = 0$, if we write

$$(12.16) \quad (v_1 + ad_{v_2})p_{v_2,1} - (v_2 + ad_{v_2})p_{v,1,1} = w_{v_2,v,1},$$

then $\|w_{v_2,v,1}\|_t \leq C_{l}\|w\|_{t + \sigma + 1}, t \leq s - \sigma - 1.$
We suppose \( [X, v_i] = a_i v_i, \ i = 1, 2. \) From (12.15) we have
\[
- (X + \operatorname{ad}_X - a_1 - a_2)((v_2 + \operatorname{ad}_{v_2})p_{v_1,1} - (v_1 + \operatorname{ad}_{v_1})p_{v_2,1})
= (v_2 + \operatorname{ad}_{v_2})m_{X,v_1,1} - (v_1 + \operatorname{ad}_{v_1})m_{X,v_2,1}.
\]

Then (*) follows from Lemma (5.12).

We suppose \( s_0 \geq (l + 1)_{\dim(\mathfrak{g})} + 1. \) Let \( c = |\mathfrak{U}|. \) By (12.15) and (12.16) it follows from Proposition (12.3) that there exists \((\ell - 1)\)-\( \Theta \) finite \( \eta_2 \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O}) \) with estimates
\[
\|\eta_2\| t \leq C_{t,\ell} \|p\|_{t+10 \dim(\mathfrak{g})}, \quad t \leq l
\]
such that: \( p_{v,1} - (v + \operatorname{ad}_v)\eta_2 = p_{v,2} + \mathcal{R}_{v,2}, \) where \( p_{v,2} \) and \( \mathcal{R}_{v,2} \) are both \( \ell\)-\( \Theta \) finite for any \( v \in \mathfrak{U} \cap B \) with estimates
\[
\|\mathcal{R}_{v,2}\| t \leq C_{t,\ell} \|m\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_4} \quad \text{and} \quad \|p_{v,2}\| t \leq C_{t,\ell} \|p\|_t, \quad t \leq l;
\]

furthermore, all \( p_{v,2} \) are \((\frac{1}{4\gamma t + \sigma_4}, \frac{1}{\gamma t} )\)-\( \mathfrak{U} \) small vectors. Set
\[
p'_{v,2} = p_{v,1} - (v + \operatorname{ad}_v)\eta_2, \quad v \in B \setminus \mathfrak{U}, \ \text{or} \ v = X.
\]

Choose \( v \in \mathfrak{U} \cap B. \) From (12.15) we have
\[
(v + \operatorname{ad}_v)p'_{X,2} - (X + \operatorname{ad}_X - 1)p_{v,2} = m_{X,v} + (X + \operatorname{ad}_X - 1)\mathcal{R}_{v,2}.
\]

By Observation (11.7), \( (X + \operatorname{ad}_X - 1)p_{v,2} \) is \((\frac{1}{4\gamma t + \sigma_4}, \frac{1}{\gamma t} )\)-\( \mathfrak{U} \) small. By Lemma (12.3) we have a decomposition \( p'_{X,2} = p_{X,2} + \mathcal{R}_{X,2}, \) where \( p_{X,2} \) is \( \ell\)-\( \Theta \) finite and is \((1, 2)\)-\( \mathfrak{U} \) small; and
\[
\|p_{X,2}\| t \leq C_t \|p'_{X,2}\| t \overset{(1)}{=} C_{t,\ell} \|p\|_{t+10 \dim(\mathfrak{g}) + 1}, \ \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{R}_{X,2}\| t \leq C_t \|m, \mathcal{R}_{X,2}\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_2 + 1} \overset{(2)}{=} C_{t,\ell} \|m\|_{\gamma \gamma t + \sigma_4},
\]
\( \sigma_4' = \gamma (\sigma_2 + 1) + \sigma_4, \ t \leq l - 1. \) Here in (1) and (2) we also use (12.17) and (12.18) respectively.

For any \( u \in B \setminus \mathfrak{U}, \) there is \( u \in \mathfrak{U} \cap B \) such that \( [u, u] = 0. \) From (12.16) we have \( (u + \operatorname{ad}_u)p'_{u,2} - (u + \operatorname{ad}_u)p_{u,2} = m_{u,u} + (u + \operatorname{ad}_u)\mathcal{R}_u. \) Similarly, we have a decomposition \( p'_{u,2} = p_{u,2} + \mathcal{R}_{u,2}, \) where \( p_{u,2} \) is \((\ell + 1)\)-\( \Theta \) finite and is \((\frac{1}{4\gamma t}, \frac{2}{\gamma t} )\)-\( \mathfrak{U} \) small, and for any \( t \leq l - 1,
\]
\[
\|p_{u,2}\| t \leq C_{t,\ell} \|v\|_{t+10 \dim(\mathfrak{g}) + 1}, \ \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{R}_{u,2}\| t \leq C_{t,a,b} \|m\|_{\gamma \gamma t + \sigma_4'}.
\]

We use \( \mathfrak{C} \) to stand for \( \mathfrak{U} \) or \( \mathfrak{V}. \) We note that for any \( v \in \mathfrak{B} \setminus \mathfrak{C}, \) there is \( u \in \mathfrak{C} \cap B, \) such that \( [u, v] = 0. \) This implies that the above arguments still holds if we change \( \mathfrak{U} \) to \( \mathfrak{V}. \) Hence we can let \( s_0 \) be sufficiently large and keep repeating the above process to get the result. \( \text{□} \)
13. Construction of tame splittings

**Theorem 13.1.** For any $l \geq 2$ there exist constants $\gamma_2, \gamma_3 > 0$ dependent only on $G$; and $\bar{s} \geq \max\{50, 6 + 2\sigma_2, 2s_0(l_0) + 10\} + \sigma + 1$, where $l_0 > \sigma_2 + \gamma(8 + \sigma_2) + 8 \gamma_2(\sigma_2 + 1 + l) + 8$ such that: for any $p_v \in \mathfrak{g}(O)^\bar{s}$, $v \in B$ or $v = X$, if

\[(v + \text{ad}_v)p_X - (X + \text{ad}_X - a)p_v = w_{X,v}\]

where $v \in B$ with $[X,v] = av$, there exist $\omega$, $R_X, \, \mathcal{R}_v \in \mathfrak{g}(O)$, such that

\[p_X = (X + \text{ad}_X)\omega + \mathcal{R}_X\]

with estimates: for $t \leq l$

\[
\|\omega\|_t \leq C_{t,s}\|p\|_{\gamma_2 + \gamma_2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|R_X\|_{s_0,t} \leq C_{t,s}\|w\|_{\gamma_3 t + \gamma_2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{R}_v\|_t \leq C_{t}\|R_X, \, w_{X,v}\|_{t + \sigma + 1}, \quad v \in B
\]

where $\|p\|_t = \max\{\|p\|_t : v = X \text{ or } v \in B\}$ and $\|w\|_t = \max_{w \in B}\{\|w_{X,u}\|_t\}$.

13.1. **Proof of Theorem 13.1 when $G \neq G_1$.** In this case, $B_0 = \{v\}$. Sometime we still write $v \in B_0$ instead of $v$ for the purpose of parallel extension to the proof for $G = G_1$. We note that:

\[(13.2) \quad v \text{ commutes with } X \text{ and all elements of } \mathfrak{U} \text{ and } \mathfrak{V}.
\]

**Step 0:** By (13.1) it follows from (s) of Corollary 12.5 that

\[(13.3) \quad (v_1 + \text{ad}_{v_1})p_{v_2} - (v_2 + \text{ad}_{v_2})p_{v_1} = w_{v_2,v_1},
\]

where $v_1, v_2 \in B$ with $[v_1, v_2] = 0$ with $\|w_{v_2,v_1}\|_t \leq C_{t}\|w\|_{t + \sigma + 1}$, $t \leq \bar{s} - \sigma - 1$. Set $s = \bar{s} - \sigma - 1$.

**Step 1:** **Reduction to $[\frac{\sigma}{2} + 5]$-\(\Theta\)-finite vectors.** From (13.1) and (13.2) we have

\[(v + \text{ad}_v)p_X - (X + \text{ad}_X)p_v = w_{X,v}, \quad v \in B_0.
\]

By Proposition 10.1 there exist $\eta_1$, $R_{X,1}$ in $\mathfrak{g}(O)^{[\sigma] - 3}$ with estimates

\[(13.4) \quad \|\eta_1, R_{X,1}\|_{t_1} \leq C_{t_1}\|p\|_{\frac{\sigma}{2} + 48}, \quad \|R_{X,1}\|_{t_2} \leq C_{t_2}\|w\|_{\frac{\sigma}{2} + \sigma_6}
\]

for $t_1 \leq \frac{\sigma}{2} - 3$, and $t_2 \leq \frac{\sigma - 6 - 2\sigma_2}{2\gamma}$, such that

\[(13.5) \quad p_{X,1} = p_X - (X + \text{ad}_X)\eta_1 - R_{X,1}
\]

is $[\frac{\sigma}{2} + 5]$-\(\Theta\) finite. Set

\[(13.6) \quad p_{v,1} = p_v - (v + \text{ad}_v)\eta_1, \quad v \in B.
\]

By substituting from the above expressions for $p_X$ and $p_v, v \in B$ into (13.1) we have

\[(v + \text{ad}_v)p_{X,1} - (X + \text{ad}_X - a)p_{v,1} = w_{X,v} - (v + \text{ad}_v)\mathcal{R}_{X,1}
\]
where \( v \in B \) with \([X, v] = av\). By Observation 7.3 \((v + \text{ad}_v)p_{X,1}\) is \([\frac{\gamma}{2} + 6]\)-\(\Theta\) finite. Hence it follows from Lemma 10.3 there are \([\frac{\gamma}{2} + 5]\)-\(\Theta\) finite \(p_{v,1} \in g(O)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-4}, \ v \in B \) such that

\[
\|(p_{v,1} - p'_{v,1})\|_{t} \leq \|p'_{v,1}\|_{t+1}, \quad t \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} - 4; \quad \text{and} \quad \|p_{v,1} - p'_{v,1}\|_{t} \leq C_{t}\|w_{X,v} - (v + \text{ad}_v)R_{X,1}\|_{\frac{\gamma}{2} + 42}
\]

(13.7)

and

\[
\leq C_{t}\|w, R_{X,1}\|_{\frac{\gamma}{2} + 43} \leq C_{t}\|w\|_{\frac{\gamma}{2} + \sigma_{7}}, \quad t \leq \frac{\gamma}{3\gamma} - \sigma_{8}
\]

(13.8)

where \(\sigma_{7} = \frac{12s}{2\gamma} + \sigma_{6}, \sigma_{8} = \frac{64s}{3\gamma} + 30\). Here in (1) we use the second part of (13.4). Set

\[
(v + \text{ad}_v)p_{X,1} - (X + \text{ad}_X - a)p_{v,1} = w_{X,v,1}
\]

(13.9)

where \(v \in B \) with \([X, v] = av\); and

\[
(v_{1} + \text{ad}_{v_{2}})p_{v_{2},1} - (v_{2} + \text{ad}_{v_{2}})p_{v_{1},1} = w_{v_{2},v_{1},1}
\]

(13.10)

where \(v_{1}, v_{2} \in B \) with \([v_{1}, v_{2}] = 0\); and

\[
R_{u,1} = p_{u,1} - (p_{u} - (u + \text{ad}_u)\eta_{1}), \quad u \in B \text{ or } u = X;
\]

and \(\|w_{u,1}\|_{t} = \max\{\|w_{v,u,1}\|_{t} : v = X \text{ or } v, u \in B\}, \|p_{1}\|_{t} = \max\{\|p_{v,1}\|_{t} : v = X \text{ or } v, u \in B\}\) and \(\|R_{1}\|_{t} = \max\{\|R_{v,1}\|_{t} : v = X \text{ or } v, u \in B\}\). In the later part, \(\|w_{u,1}\|_{t}, \|p_{v,1}\|_{t} \text{ and } \|R_{v,1}\|_{t}, \ i \geq 2 \) are defined accordingly.

The above analysis shows that \(p_{u,1} \) are \([\frac{\gamma}{2} + 5]\)-\(\Theta\) finite, \(u \in B \) or \(u = X\), and the following estimates hold:

\[
\|p_{1}\|_{t} \leq C_{t}\|p'_{1}\|_{t}, \quad \|p_{X} - (X + \text{ad}_X)\eta_{1} - R_{X,1}\|_{t+1} \leq (13.12)
\]

for any \(0 \leq t \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} - 5\); and

\[
\|w_{1}\|_{t} \leq C_{t}\max_{v \in B}\|w, p_{v,1} - p'_{v,1}, R_{X,1}\|_{t+1} \leq (13.13)
\]

for any \(0 \leq t \leq \frac{\gamma}{3\gamma} - \sigma_{8} - 1\); and

\[
\|w_{1}\|_{t} \leq C_{t}\|p_{1}\|_{t+1} \leq (13.14)
\]

for any \(0 \leq t \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} - 6\); and

\[
\|R_{1}\|_{t} \leq C_{t}\max_{v \in B}\|p_{v,1} - p'_{v,1}, R_{X,1}\|_{t} \leq (13.15)
\]

for any \(0 \leq t \leq \frac{\gamma}{3\gamma} - \sigma_{8}\).

Here in (1) we use (13.5) and (13.7); in (2) we use (13.4); in (3) and (6) we use second part of (13.4) and (13.8); (4) is from (13.12); (5) is from (13.5) and (13.16).
Step 2: Reduction to (1, 2)-\(\mathfrak{U}\) and \(\mathfrak{U}\)-small vectors. By Corollary 12.5 there exist \(\eta_i, R_{v,i} \in g(\mathcal{O})^B\), \(i = 2, 3\), \(v = X\) or \(v \in B\) with estimates

\[
\|\eta_i\|_t \leq C_{t,s}\|p_1\|_{t+\sigma_5}, \quad \|R_{v,i}\|_t \leq C_{t,s}\|w_1\|_{\gamma_1t+\sigma_5}
\]

for any \(0 \leq t \leq l_0\), \(i = 2, 3\), such that

\[
p_{v,i} = p_{v,i-1} - (v + \text{ad}_v)\eta_i + R_{v,i}, \quad v = X \text{ or } v \in B,
\]

is \(\frac{5}{7} + \Theta\) finite satisfying: (\#) \(p_{v,2}\) are \((1, 2)\)-\(\mathfrak{U}\)-small vectors and \(p_{v,3}\) are \((1, 2)\)-\(\mathfrak{U}\)-small vectors, where \(v = X\), or \(v \in B\) with estimates

\[
\|p_{v,i}\|_t \leq C_{t,t}\|p_1\|_{t+\sigma_5}, \quad t \leq l_0.
\]

For \(j = 2, 3\) set

\[
(v + \text{ad}_v)p_{X,j} - (X + \text{ad}_X - a)p_{v,j} = w_{X,v,j}
\]

where \(v \in B\) with \([X, v] = av\); and

\[
(v_1 + \text{ad}_{v_1})p_{v_2,j} - (v_2 + \text{ad}_{v_2})p_{v_1,j} = w_{v_2,v_1,j}
\]

where \(v_1, v_2 \in B\) with \([v_1, v_2] = 0\). The above analysis shows that

\[
\|w_j\|_t \leq C_t \max_{2 \leq i \leq T} \|m_1, R_i\|_{t+1} \leq C_{t,s}\|w_1\|_{\gamma_1(t+1)+\sigma_5}
\]

for any \(0 \leq t \leq l_0 - 1\), \(j = 2, 3\).

Step 3: Existence of \(S\) tame splitting for \(v \in B_0\). From (13.19) we have the equation

\[
(v + \text{ad}_v)p_{X,3} - (X + \text{ad}_X)p_{v,3} = w_{X,v,3}, \quad v \in B_0.
\]

By Corollary 10.3, we can find \(\eta, R_X\) in \(g(\mathcal{O})^B\) such that

\[
p_{X,3} - (X + \text{ad}_X)\eta = R_X
\]

with estimates

\[
\|\eta, R_X\|_{s,t_1} \leq C_t\|p_3\|_{t_1+7}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|R_X\|_{s,t_2} \leq C_t\|m_3\|_{\gamma_2t+\sigma_2},
\]

for any \(0 \leq t_1 \leq l_0 - 7\) and any \(0 \leq t_2 \leq \frac{l_0 - 7 - \eta}{\gamma_2 + \sigma_2}\). Set

\[
E_v = p_{v,3} - (v + \text{ad}_v)\eta, \quad v \in B_0.
\]

By substituting the above expression for \(p_{v,3}, v \in B_0\) into (13.22) we have

\[
-(X + \text{ad}_X)E_v = w_{X,v,3} - (v + \text{ad}_v)R_X, \quad v \in B_0.
\]

Then it follows from (3) of Lemma 6.7 and (1) of Lemma 9.1 that

\[
\|E_v\|_{s,t} \leq C_t\|w_{X,v,3} - (v + \text{ad}_v)R_X\|_{s,t+7} \leq C_t\|m_3\|_{\gamma_2 t + \sigma_9}
\]

for any \(0 \leq t \leq \frac{l_0 - 7 - \eta}{\gamma_2 + \sigma_2} - 7\) and \(v \in B_0\), where \(\sigma_9 = \sigma_2 + 8\gamma\).

Step 4: Existence of \((G_{\mathfrak{I}}^1)^1\) tame splitting for \(v \in B_0\). Recall \(B_0 = \{v\}\). Fix \(g\) which are \((1, 2)\)-related to \(\mathfrak{U}\). From (13.24) we have

\[
\tilde{\pi}_{\mathfrak{I}}(g)E_v \overset{(1)}{=} \tilde{\pi}_{\mathfrak{I}}(g)p_{v,3} - (v + \text{ad}_v)\tilde{\pi}_{\mathfrak{I}}(g)\eta
\]

\[
\overset{(2)}{=} p_{v,3} - (v + \text{ad}_v)\tilde{\pi}_{\mathfrak{I}}(g)\eta.
\]
Here in (1) we use (13.2) and (11.9) of Lemma 11.6 in (2) we use the fact that \( p_{v,3} \) is \((1,2)\)-\( \Sigma \) small (see \(*\) in Step 2). Hence we showed that
\[
(13.27) \quad p_{v,3} = \tilde{\pi}_3(g)E_v + (v + ad_v)\tilde{\pi}_3(g)\eta = (v + ad_v)\eta_0 + R_{v,o},
\]
where we set \( \eta_0 = \tilde{\pi}_3(g)\eta \) and \( R_{v,o} = \tilde{\pi}_3(g)E_v \). Set \( \sigma_{10} = \gamma_1(\sigma_9 + 1) + \sigma_5 \). Then for any \( t \leq \frac{\omega_1 - \sigma_9}{2} - 7 \), we have
\[
(13.28) \quad \|R_{v,o}\|_{(G_1^+)^{1,t}} \leq C_t\|E_v\|_{s,t} \leq C_t,s\|m_1\|_{\gamma_1 t + \sigma_{10}},
\]
Here in (1) we use (13.25) and (13.16). We also have
\[
(13.29) \quad \|\eta_0\|_{(G_1^+)^{1,t}} \leq C\|\eta\|_{s,t} \leq C_t,s\|p_1\|_{t + \sigma_5 + 7}
\]
for any \( t \leq l_0 - 7 \). Here in (3) we use (13.23), (13.18) and (13.16).

**Step 5: Existence of global tame splitting for \( v \in B_0 \).** From (13.17) we have
\[
p_{v,2} = p_{v,3} + (v + ad_v)\eta_3 - R_{v,3} \equiv (v + ad_v)(\eta_3 + \eta_0) + R_{v,o} - R_{v,3}
\]
Here in (1) we use (13.27). We note \( g \) is also \((1,2)\)-related to \( \Sigma \). Since \( p_{v,2} \) is \((1,2)\)-\( \Sigma \) small, by following the same proof line as in Step 4 we have
\[
p_{v,2} = (v + ad_v)(\tilde{\pi}_3(g)\eta_0 + \tilde{\pi}_3(g)\eta_3) + \tilde{\pi}_3(g)R_{v,o} - \tilde{\pi}_3(g)R_{v,3}
\]
(13.30)
\[
= (v + ad_v)\eta_{-1} - R_{v,1},
\]
by letting \( \eta_{-1} = \tilde{\pi}_3(g)(\eta_0 + \eta_3) \) and \( R_{v,1} = \tilde{\pi}_3(g)(R_{v,o} - R_{v,3}) \).

Then by (2) of Corollary 11.9 and Lemma 11.6, for \( t \leq \frac{\omega_1 - \sigma_9}{2} - 7 \) we have
\[
(13.31) \quad \|R_{v,1}\|_{t} \leq C_t(\|R_{v,o}\|_{(G_1^+)^{1,t}} + \|R_{v,3}\|_{t}) \leq C_{t,s}\|m_1\|_{\gamma_1 t + \sigma_{10}}.
\]
Here in (1) we use (13.28) and (13.16). We also have
\[
(13.32) \quad \|\eta_{-1}\|_{t} \leq C_t(\|\eta_0\|_{(G_1^+)^{1,t}} + \|\eta_3\|_{t}) \leq C_{t,s}\|p_1\|_{t + \sigma_5 + 7}
\]
for any \( 0 \leq t \leq l_0 - 7 \). Here in (2) inequality we use (13.29) and (13.16).

We set \( \omega = \eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_{-1} \) and \( R_v = R_{v,1} - R_{v,2} - R_{v,3} \). From (13.17) for \( i = 2 \) and (13.11) we have
\[
(13.33) \quad R_v = p_v - (v + ad_v)\omega, \quad \text{with estimates}
\]
\[
(13.34) \quad \|\omega\|_{t} \leq C_{t,s}(\|p\|_{\frac{t}{4} + 48} + \|p_1\|_{t + \sigma_5 + 7}) \leq C_{t,s,1}\|p\|_{\frac{t}{4} + \sigma_{11}}
\]
for any \( 0 \leq t \leq l_0 - 7 \), where \( \sigma_{11} = \frac{3(\omega_1 + 7)}{4} + 51 \); and
\[
(13.35) \quad \|R_v\| \leq C_{t,s}(\|m_1\|_{\gamma_1 t + \sigma_{10}} + \|w\|_{\frac{t}{4} + \sigma_7}) \leq C_{t,s,1}\|w\|_{\gamma_1 t + \sigma_{12}}
\]
for any \( 0 \leq t \leq \frac{\omega_1 - \sigma_9}{2} - 7 \), where \( \gamma_7 = \frac{9\sigma_1}{4} \), \( \sigma_{12} = \frac{9(\omega_1 + 7)}{4} + \sigma_7 \). Here in (1) we use (13.32), (13.16), (13.33); in (2) we use (13.12); in (3) we use (13.31), (13.16), (13.15); in (4) we use (13.13).
Step 6: Existence of global tame splitting for \( v \in B \) or \( v = X \). Set 
\[
R_v = p_v - (v + \text{ad}_v)\omega, \quad v \in B \text{ or } v = X.
\]
By substituting from (13.33) the expression for \( R_v \) into (13.1) we have 
\[
(v + \text{ad}_v)R_X = w_{X,v} + (X + \text{ad}_X)R_v.
\]
It follows from Lemma 5.12 and (13.35) that
\[
\|R_X\| \leq C \|w, R_v\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_2 + 0} \leq C_{t, \gamma} \|w\|_{\gamma t + \sigma_2},
\]
for \( t \leq \frac{(t + 1 + \sigma_2 + 2)}{2} \), where \( \gamma_3 = \gamma_3' \gamma \) and \( \gamma_2 = \max\{\gamma_3'(\sigma_2 + 1) + \sigma_2, \sigma_1\} \).
By assumption we see that \( \min\{\frac{(t + 1 + \sigma_2 + 2)}{2}, l_0 - 7\} \geq l + \sigma_2 + 1 \). From (13.31) again, we have
\[
(X + \text{ad}_X - a)R_v = (v + \text{ad}_v)R_X - w_{X,v},
\]
where \( v \in B \) with \( [X, v] = av \). By Lemma 5.12 and (13.36), we have
\[
\|R_v\|_t \leq C \|R_X, w_{X,v}\|_{t + \sigma_2 + 1}, \quad v \in B
\]
for any \( 0 \leq t \leq l \). Hence this together with (13.34) finishes the proof.

13.2. Proof of Theorem 13.1 when \( G = SL(n, \mathbb{R}) \), \( n \geq 6 \). We repeat Step 0 to Step 3 in Section 13.1. Fix \( f \) which is \( (2, 4) \)-related to \( \mathcal{U}_i \). We note that \( f \) is also \( (2, 4) \)-related to \( \mathcal{U}_i \) and \( \mathcal{W}_i, i = 1, 2 \).

Step 4: Existence of \( (G^+)^1 \) tame splitting for \( v \in B_0 \). From (13.24) and (13.20), by noting that \( p_{v, i, 3} \) is \( (1, 2)-\mathcal{W} \) small, \( i = 1, 2 \), as a direct consequence of Lemma 11.15 we have
\[
p_{v, i, 3} - (v_1 + \text{ad}_{v_1})\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{W}_1}(f)\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{W}_2}(f)\eta = R_{i, 3}, \quad i = 1, 2
\]
with estimates
\[
\|R_{i, 3}\|_{S_0, t} \leq C \|w, \mathcal{E}_{v_2}\|_{S_0, t + 2\sigma_2 + 2} \leq C_{t, \gamma} \|m_1\|_{t + \sigma_1},
\]
for any \( 0 \leq t \leq 3\sigma_2 - 9 \), where \( \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 + 2\sigma_2 + 3 + \sigma_5 \). Here in (1) we use (13.25) and (13.21) by noting that \( \gamma = \gamma_1 = 1 \). Further, we have
\[
\|\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{W}_1}(f)\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{W}_2}(f)\eta\|_{(G^+)^1, t} \leq C \|\eta\|_{S, t}, \quad t \leq l_0 - 7.
\]
Here in (1) we use (2) of Corollary 11.10.
By substituting from (13.38) the expressions for \( p_{v, j, 3}, j = 1, 2 \) into (13.17) for \( i = 3 \) we have
\[
R_{1, 3} - R_{v_1, 3} = p_{v_1, 2} - (v_1 + \text{ad}_{v_1})\eta_3', \quad \text{and }
\]
\[
R_{2, 3} - R_{v_2, 3} = p_{v_2, 2} - (v_2 + \text{ad}_{v_2})\eta_3',
\]
where \( \eta_3 = \eta_3 + \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{W}_1}(f)\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{W}_2}(f)\eta \) with estimates
\[
\|\eta_3\|_{(G^+)^1, t} \leq C \|p_1\|_{t + \sigma_2 + 7}, \quad t \leq l_0 - 7.
\]
Here we use (13.30), (13.36), (13.23) and (13.18).
**Step 5:** Existence of global tame splitting for \( v \in B_0 \). From (13.41) and (13.20), by noting that \( p_{v_2} \) is \((1,2)\)-small, \( i = 1, 2 \), as a direct consequence of Lemma 11.15 we have

\[
p_{v_2} = R_{v_2} + (v_1 + \text{ad} v_1) \eta_{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2,
\]

where \( \eta_{-1} = \hat{\pi}_{1,t}(f) \hat{\pi}_{2,t}(f) n^3 \); and for any \( t \leq l_0 - 5\sigma_2 - 11 \)

\[
\| R_{v_2} \|_{S_0,t} \leq C_{t,s} \| \omega_2 \|, \quad R_{v_1} - R_{v_1,2} - R_{v_1,1}, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

In (1) we use (13.45), (13.16), (13.4); in (2) we use (13.12); in (3) we use Corollary 5.13 instead of Lemma 5.12, we have

\[
\| \eta_{-1} \| t \leq (1) C_t \| \eta_{q_0+4}'(C_{1,t} t) \| \| p_1 \| t+\sigma_2+3+\sigma_5, \quad t \leq l_0 - 7.
\]

Here in (1) we use (2) of Corollary 11.10 in (2) we use (13.42).

We set \( \omega = \eta + \eta_1 + \eta_2 + \eta_1 - 1 \) and \( R_{v_i} = R_{v_i,2} - R_{v_i,1}, \quad i = 1, 2 \). From (13.43), (13.17) for \( i = 2 \) and (13.11) we have \( R_{v_i} = p_{v_i} - (v_i + \text{ad} v_i) \omega_i \), with estimates

\[
\| \omega \| t \leq (1) C_{t,s} \| p_1 \| t+\sigma_2+3+\sigma_5, \quad (2) C_{t,s} \| p_1 \| t+\sigma_5, \quad (3) C_{t,s} \| p_1 \| t+\sigma_5+7, \quad t \leq l_0 - 7.
\]

for \( t \leq l_0 - 5\sigma_2 - 11 \), where \( \sigma_{14} = \frac{3(\sigma_5 + 7)}{2} + 51 \), \( \sigma_{15} = \frac{9(\sigma_4 + 2\sigma_2 + 4 + \sigma_5)}{4} + \sigma_7 \). Here in (1) we use (13.45), (13.16), (13.4); in (2) we use (13.12); in (3) we use (13.44), (13.16), (13.15); in (4) we use (13.13).

Finally, we repeat Step 6 of Section 13.1 Similar to (13.36), where we use Corollary 5.13 instead of Lemma 5.12 we have

\[
\| R_{v_i} \|_{S_0,t} \leq C_{t} \| p \|, \quad R_{v_1} - R_{v_1,2} - R_{v_1,1}, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

for \( t \leq l_0 - 6\sigma_2 - 12 \); and further we also get (13.37). Let \( \gamma_2 = \max \{ \sigma_{14}, \sigma_{15} \} \) and \( \gamma_3 = \frac{9}{4} \). By assumption we see that \( l_0 - 6\sigma_2 - 12 \geq \gamma \). Hence we finish the proof.

**Remark 13.2.** From the proof we see that if we change \( B \) to any finite set containing \( B \), the result still holds.

14. Convergence

14.1. **Iterative step and the error estimate.** In the following proposition we use indices \( n \) and \( n + 1 \) which is parallel to the iterative step of the construction of conjugacy. These same notations are used in the convergence proof in the next section. What is in fact proved here is that, given a perturbation of the action \( \alpha_A \) satisfying a certain set of conditions, one constructs a conjugacy such that the new family of actions satisfies another set of conditions. Suppose \( \alpha_A \) is as described in Section 2.1 We recall notations in Section 4.3.
Proposition 14.1. There exist 0 < \bar{c} < 1 such that the following holds: for any \( l \geq r_0 = \max\{3\beta + \sigma + 1, \frac{3(\beta + \sigma + 3)}{2} + \gamma_2\} \) and \( t_n > 1 \), any perturbation \( \bar{\alpha}_A \) of \( \alpha_A \) generated by \( C^\infty \) vector fields \( \bar{E}_n^{(n)} = E_{d_n} + \bar{p}^{(n)} \), where \( d_n \) is standard with \( \|d_n\| \leq 2 \) and \( \mathcal{M}_o(o_n) = 0 \). If \( \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \leq \bar{c} \), there exists a linear map \( \bar{T}_n \) on \( \text{Lie}(A) \) and \( h_n \in \text{Vect}^\infty(\mathcal{X}) \) such that for \( h_n = \exp(h_n) \) and

\[
\bar{E}_n^{(n+1)} = (h_n)_*(\bar{T}_n\bar{E}^{(n)}) = E_{d_{n+1}} + \bar{p}^{(n+1)},
\]

where \( o_{n+1} = T_n o_n \), we have:

(a) \( \|h_n\|_{C^l} \leq C_l t_n^{\frac{\bar{r}}{l} + r_0} \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^l} \) and \( \|h_n\|_{C^1} \leq C_l \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{r_0 + \frac{\bar{r}}{l}} \);

(b) \( \|\bar{T}_n - I\| \leq C \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \), \( \|\log h_n\|_{C^1} \leq C_l \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{r_0 + \frac{\bar{r}}{l}} \) and \( \mathcal{M}_o(o_{n+1}) = 0 \)

and \( d_{n+1} \) is standard with

\[
\|d_{n+1} - d_n\| \leq C \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^1} + C \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^0};
\]

(c) \( \|\bar{p}^{(n+1)}\|_{C^l} \leq C_l t_n^{\frac{\bar{r}}{l} + r_0} \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^l} \) and

\[
\|\bar{p}^{(n+1)}\|_{C^0} \leq C_l t_n^{\frac{\bar{r}}{l} + r_0} \left( \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^0} + t_n^{-(l-r_0)} \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^l} \right)^{\frac{l-r_0}{l}} \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^l}^\gamma_2
\]

\[
+ \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \left( 1 + \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^1} + C_l t_n^{-(l-r_0)} \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^l} \right) + C \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \|\bar{p}^{(n)}\|_{C^1};
\]

Proof. We write \( p_n^{(n)} = s(t_n) p_u^{(n)} + (I - s(t_n)) p_u^{(n)} \), \( u \in d_n \). Set \( p'_u = s(t_n) p_u^{(n)} - \text{Ave}(s(t_n) p_u^{(n)}) \). We write

\[
L_v p'_X - L_X p'_v + a p'_v = w_{X,v}
\]

where \( v \in d_n \) with \([X,v] = av\). Then for \( r \leq l\):

\[
\|w\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \|\bar{M}_o(s(t_n) p_u^{(n)})\|_{C^r} + \|\bar{M}_o(\text{Ave}(s(t_n) p_u^{(n)}))\|
\]

\[
\leq C_r \|\bar{M}_o(p_u^{(n)})\|_{C^r} + \|\bar{M}_o((I - s(t_n)) p_u^{(n)})\|_{C^r} + C \|\bar{M}_o(\text{Ave}((I - s(t_n)) p_u^{(n)}))\|
\]

\[
\leq C_r \|p_u^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \|p_u^{(n)}\|_{C^r+1} + C_r t_n^{-(l-r_0)} \|p_u^{(n)}\|_{C^r};
\]

for any \( m \in \mathbb{N} \). Here in (0) we use Lemma 4.1 and 4.3).

Then from (4.11), we see that there exist \( \omega, \mathcal{R}_v, \mathcal{R}_X \in \mathfrak{g}(\mathcal{O}) \), \( v \in d_n \) such that \( p'_v = L_v \omega + \mathcal{R}_v \) with estimates: for any \( r \leq l\),

\[
\|\omega, \mathcal{R}_v, \mathcal{R}_X\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \|\omega\|, \mathcal{R}_v, \mathcal{R}_X\|_{r + \beta, \mathcal{R}_v, \mathcal{R}_X}\|_{r + \beta} \leq C_{r,l} \|p'_v\|_{3(r + \beta, \mathcal{R}_v, \mathcal{R}_X) + \gamma_2}
\]

(14.2)

\[
\|\mathcal{R}_v\|_{C^r}, \mathcal{R}_X\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \|\mathcal{R}_v\|_{C^r} \|\mathcal{R}_v\|_{r + \beta, \mathcal{R}_v, \mathcal{R}_X}\|_{r + \beta} \leq C_{r,l} \|p'_v\|_{3(r + \beta, \mathcal{R}_v, \mathcal{R}_X) + \gamma_2}
\]

(14.3)
\[ \leq C t_n^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} + C^2 \left( \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} + t_n^{-(l-r_0)} \right) \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} + \left( \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} + C t_n^{-(l-r_0)} \right) \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^1}. \]

Here (1) is from (4.1); (2) is from Theorem 13.1 and Remark 13.2; (3) is from (4.3); in (4) we use interpolation inequalities; (5) is from (0), (3); (6) is from (5), (0).

Next, we consider the coordinate change. Since \( \mathcal{M}_T(o_n) = 0 \) and \( \mathcal{M}_T(d_n) = 0 \) (since \( d_n \) is standard), by Lemma 4.1 we have

\[ \| \mathcal{M}_T(Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n}) \| \leq C \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^1}. \] (14.3)

It follows from Lemma 4.2 that there exists a linear map \( T_n \) on \( \text{Lie}(A) \) such that: (\( * \)) \( \| T_n - I \| \leq C \| Ave(p^{(n)}) \| \leq C \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} \); (\( ** \)) \( \mathcal{M}_T(T_n o_n) = 0 \) and \( T_n o_n \) is appropriate; and there is \( d_{n+1} \) standard satisfying

\[ \| E_{d_{n+1}} - T_n \left( Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n} \right) \| \leq C \| \mathcal{M}_T(Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n}) \| + C \| Ave(p^{(n)}) \|^2 \]

\[ \leq C \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^1}. \] (7)

Here in (7) we use (14.3) and Lemma 4.1. Hence we have

\[ \| E_{d_{n+1}} - E_{d_n} \| \leq \| E_{d_{n+1}} - T_n \left( Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n} \right) \| + \| (I - T_n) E_{d_n} \| \]

\[ \leq C \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^1} + C \| Ave(p^{(n)}) \|. \] (8)

Here in (8) we use (7) and (\( * \)). Then we set \( h_n = \omega, h_n = \exp(h_n) \). Then (a) and (b) follow from the above discussion immediately. We assume that \( \tilde{c} \) is sufferably small such that \( h_n \) is inventible. For \( r \leq l \) we have

\[ \| p^{(n+1)} \|_{C^r} \leq \| (h_n)_* (T_n E^{(n)}) - T_n \left( Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n} \right) \|_{C^r} \]

\[ \leq C \| (h_n)_* (E_{d_n} + p^{(n)}) - (Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n}) \|_{C^r} + C \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^0} \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^1} \]

\[ \leq C \| (h_n)_* (E_{d_n} + p^{(n)}) - (Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n}) \|_{C^r} + C \| p^{(n)} \|_{C^r}. \] (9)

Here (9) is from (\( ** \)); in (10) we use (14.2). Hence we get the \( C^l \) norm of (c). Further, (9) shows that to get the \( C^0 \) norm of (c) it suffices to get the \( C^0 \) norm of \( Q = (h_n)_* (E_{d_n} + p^{(n)}) - (Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n}) \), which we rewrite as

\[ Q = E_{d_n} + p^{(n)} + \omega E_{d_n} + \omega p^{(n)} - (Ave(p^{(n)}) + E_{d_n}) + E_L \]

\[ = \mathcal{R} - Ave((I - s_{t_n}) p^{(n)}) + E_L + \omega p^{(n)} + (I - s_{t_n}) p^{(n)}, \]
where $E_L = (h_n)^*(E_{d_n} + p^{(n)}) - (E_{d_n} + p^{(n)}) - [\omega, (E_{d_n} + p^{(n)})]$, the error of linearization. We have

$$\|E_L\|_{C^0} \leq C\|\omega\|_{C^1} \|\omega\|_{C^2} \|E_{d_n} + p^{(n)}\|_{C^2}$$

(11)

$$\leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^{r_0+3}}\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^{r_0 + \frac{3}{2}} (1 + \|p^{(n)}\|_{C^2})}, \quad \text{and}
$$

$$\|[\omega, p^{(n)}] - \text{Ave}(I - s_{t_n})p^{(n)} + (I - s_{t_n})p^{(n)}\|_{C^0}$$

(12)

$$\leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^{r_0 + \frac{3}{2}}} + C\|t_n\|\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^1}.$$

Here in (11) we use (14.2), (12) is from (11), (12), (**) and (6).

\[\square\]

14.2. The iteration scheme and convergence. We consider the action $\alpha_A$ as described in Theorem 2.3. In what follows we set an iterative scheme and show the convergence of the process to a smooth conjugacy between the initial perturbation $\tilde{\alpha}_A$ and $\alpha_A$ up to a coordinate change. We assume notations in Section 14.1. To set up the iterative process we first let: $p^{(0)} = p$, $\tilde{\alpha}^{(0)} = \tilde{\alpha}$ and $t^{(0)} = 1$.

For a start, let $\epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}$ and set $\epsilon_n = \epsilon^{(\frac{3}{2})^n}$ such that $\|p\|_{C^0} \leq \epsilon_0$, $\|p\|_{C^{r_0}} \leq \epsilon_0^{-\frac{1}{11}}$, where $\epsilon_0 > 218(r_0 + 2)$, and $E = \alpha$. The proof proceeds by induction. Suppose: $\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \leq \epsilon_n$, $\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^{r_0}} \leq \epsilon_n^{-\frac{1}{11}}$, $t_n = \epsilon_n^{-\frac{t_0}{12}}$ and $d_n$ standard with $\|d_n - d_{n-1}\| \leq \epsilon_n^{-\frac{3}{2}}$.

Set $a = \epsilon_n^{(\frac{3}{2})^n}$. By assumption $a < \frac{1}{218}$. By interpolation inequalities we have

$$\|p^{(n)}\|_{r_0 + \frac{3}{2}} \leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{r_0 + \frac{3}{2}} \leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^0} \leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^{r_0}} \leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^{r_0+\frac{3}{2}}} < \epsilon_n^{-1-\frac{1}{12a}} \leq \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

By Proposition 14.1 and (14.4) we have the following estimates:

1. $\|T_n - I\| \leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^0} < \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}}$, $\|\log h_n\|_{C^1} \leq C\|p^{(n)}\|_{r_0 + \frac{3}{2}} < \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}}$; and $\|d_{n+1} - d_n\| \leq C\epsilon_n\epsilon_n^{-1-12a} + C\epsilon_n < \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}}$;

2. $\|p^{(n)}\|_{C^{r_0}} \leq C\epsilon_n\epsilon_n^{-\frac{t_0}{12}} + \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}} \epsilon_n^{-\frac{1}{11}} < \epsilon_n^{-1-\frac{1}{12a}} < \epsilon_n^{-11}$; and $\|p^{(n+1)}\|_{C^{r_0}} \leq C\epsilon_n\epsilon_n^{-\frac{t_0}{12}} + \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}} \epsilon_n^{-\frac{1}{11}} \left(\epsilon_n^{2-24a} + \epsilon_n^{\frac{t_0}{12} - \frac{1}{11}}\epsilon_n^{1-12a}\right) + C\epsilon_n^{2(1-12a)}$.

Since $\epsilon_n^{\frac{t_0}{12} - \frac{1}{11}} \epsilon_n^{-\frac{1}{11}} \leq \epsilon_n^{(2-24a)}$ and

$$\epsilon_n^{2-24a} < \epsilon_n^{10.8a^2 - 43.6a + 2} < \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

$$\epsilon_n^{10.8a^2 - 43.6a + 2} = \epsilon_n^{10.8a^2 - 43.6a + 2} < \epsilon_n^{\frac{3}{2}},$$


Proof. (1): It is harmless to assume that for any element in a linear combination of the following vectors $h_1$ to a standard basis $\text{Lie}(A)$. Lemma A.1. (1) that $\exp(\log H)$ converges in $C^1$ topology to a $C^1$ conjugacy $h$ between $\alpha_A$ and $\alpha_A$; $\iota_n$ converges to an invertible linear map $\iota$ of $\text{Lie}(A)$; and $d_n$ converges to a standard basis $d$ of $\text{Lie}(A)$. The convergence step shows that: for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$

$$h \circ \tilde{\alpha}_A(\exp(t(\iota o_i)), h^{-1}x) = \alpha_A(\exp(td_i), x).$$

This equation shows that $\iota$ and $d$ determine an automorphism $i$ of $A$ such that

$$h \circ \tilde{\alpha}_A(i(a), h^{-1}x) = \alpha_A(a, x), \quad \text{for all } a \in A, x \in \mathcal{X}.$$ 

To see that the constructed conjugacy $h$ is of class $C^\infty$, interpolation inequalities are applied exactly as in [5, end of Section 5.4] and [24]. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5.

APPENDIX A.

We assume notations in Theorem 2.3. Suppose $G = G_3$. We choose a basis $u_{\mu,1}, \ldots, u_{\mu,\dim g_\mu}$ of $g_{\mu,X_3} \cap \text{Lie}(G_3)^1$ for each $\mu \in \Delta(X_3)$ where $\text{Lie}(G_3)^1$ denotes the set of unit vectors in $\text{Lie}(G_3)$. Then:

Lemma A.1. (1) If $v \in g_{0,X_3}$ and $[v,u] = 0$ for any $u \in \sum_{\mu > 0} g_{\mu,X_3}$ then $v = 0$.

(2) Suppose $\gamma > 0$. If $v \in g_{0,X_3}$ and $\|ad_v| g_{\mu,X_3}\| \leq \gamma$ for any $\mu > 0$, then $\|v\| \leq C\gamma$.

(3) Suppose $\gamma > 0$ and $v \in \text{Lie}(G_3)$ and $\mu \in \Delta(X_3)$. If $\|[X_3,v] - \mu v\| \leq \gamma$, then $\|v - v| g_{\mu,X_3}\| \leq C\gamma$.

(4) There is $c > 0$ such that for any $\gamma > 0$, any $v \in \text{Lie}(G_3)$ and any set of vectors $S = \{X_3', u_{\mu,j}', \mu \in \Delta(X_3), 1 \leq j \leq \dim g_\mu\}$ with $\|u_{\mu,j}' - u_{\mu,j}\| + \|[X_3 - X_3']\| \leq c$, for any $\mu \in \Delta(X_3)$, $1 \leq j \leq \dim g_\mu$, if $\|[v,u]\| \leq \gamma$ for any $u \in S$ then $\|v\| \leq C\gamma$.

(5) We assume conditions in (4). If further, $\|[X_3', u_{\mu,j}'] - \mu u_{\mu,j}'\| \leq \gamma$ for all $\mu > 0$, $1 \leq j \leq \dim g_{\mu,X_3}$, then there is $g \in G_3$ with $\|g - I\| \leq Cc$ such that $\|u_{\mu,j}' - u_{\mu,j}\| g_{\mu,X_3} \| + \|[X_3 - X_3']\| \leq C\gamma$, where $u_{\mu,j}' = Ad_g(u_{\mu,j})$ and $X_3'' = Ad_g(X_3')$.

Proof. (1): It is harmless to assume that $G_3$ is simple. Suppose $[v,u] = 0$ for any $u \in \sum_{\mu > 0} g_{\mu,X_3}$ but $v \neq 0$. By Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt theorem any element in $U(\text{Lie}(G))$, the universal enveloping algebra of $\text{Lie}(G)$, is a linear combination of the following vectors $h_1 \cdots h_i u_1 \cdots u_s$, where $h_i \in \text{Lie}(A)$. ...
Lemma A.2. There is $\delta > 0$ such that for any appropriate $c$-perturbation $o'$ of $o$ satisfying $\|M_o(o')\| < \gamma$, where $c < \delta$, there is a coordinate change $T$ of $A$ with $\|T - I\| \leq Cc$ such that $M_o(To) = 0$ and $\|To' - o\| < C\gamma_1$, where $\gamma_1 = \gamma + c^2$. 

\[ \sum_{\mu \geq 0} g_{\mu,X_3}, u_i \in \sum_{\mu > 0} g_{\mu,X_3}. \] If we see that $\pi \in \sum_{\mu \leq 0} g_{\mu,X_3}$ for any $c \in U(\text{Lie}(G))$, which contradicts the irreducibility of the adjoint representation.

(2): By (1) we see that: $\text{ad}: g_{0,X_3} \to \text{End}(\sum_{\mu > 0} g_{\mu,X_3})$ is injective. This gives the result.

(3): The result is obvious.

(4): From (2) we see that the centralizer of $A$ in $G$ is trivial. Then if $c$ is small enough, then the centralizer of $S$ is also trivial. This implies (1).

(5): Up to an inner automorphism of $\text{Lie}(G_3)$, we can write $X'_3 = x_3 + n + \mathfrak{t}$ for 3 commuting elements, where $\mathfrak{t}$ is compact, $x_3$ and $X_3$ are in the same split Cartan algebra, $n$ is nilpotent. Let $a = \min\{|\mu - \mu_1| : \mu, \mu_1 \in \Delta(X_3), \mu \neq \mu_1\}$. We can choose $c$ so small such that:

(i) $\sum_j g_{\mu_j,n} = g_{\mu,X_3}$, where $\mu_j \in (\mu - \frac{3}{2}, \mu + \frac{3}{2}) \cap \Delta(X_3)^+$;

(ii) $\|u'_{\mu,j}\| \geq \frac{1}{3}, 1 \leq j \leq \dim g_{\mu,X_3}$, and these $u'_{\mu,j}$ form a basis of $g_{\mu,X_3}$.

The above two claims and the assumption implies $\|\text{ad}_{x_3 - \mu I}\|_{g_{\mu,X_3}} < C\gamma$, if $\mu > 0$, which gives $\|\text{ad}_{(x_3 - x_3)}\|_{g_{\mu,X_3}} < C_1\gamma$ and $\|\text{ad}_{(n + t)}\|_{g_{\mu,X_3}} < C_1\gamma$ if $\mu > 0$. By (2) we can assume $x_3 = X_3$, which gives $\|u'_{\mu,j} - u''_{\mu,j}\|_{g_{\mu,X_3}} < C\gamma$ by (3). Hence we get the result.

For $G = SL(n,k)$, $k = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, we use $u_{i,j}$ to denote the $n \times n$ matrix with all entries 0 except the $(i,j)$ entry to be 1. We use $V$ to denote the subspace spanned by $u_{1,j}$, $3 \leq j \leq n$ and $D$ to denote the subspace spanned by $u_{j,2}$, $3 \leq j \leq n$.

Case I: Let $o = (X, U, u_{1,3}, \cdots, u_{1,n}, u_{3,2}, \cdots, u_{n,2})$. For a $c$-perturbation $o' = (X', U', u'_{1,3}, \cdots, u'_{1,n}, u'_{3,2}, \cdots, u'_{n,2})$ of $o$, we say that $o'$ is appropriate if $X' = X$, $U' = U$, $u'_{i,i} \in V$, $3 \leq i \leq n$ and $u'_{i,2} \in D$, $3 \leq i \leq n$. It is clear that for $o$, the nontrivial commutator relations are: $[X, U] = 2U$, $[X, u_{i,j}] = u_{i,j}$, $[X, u_{i,2}] = u_{i,2}$, $[u_{1,i}, u_{i,2}] = U$, $3 \leq i \leq n$.

Case II: Let $o = (X, U, u_{1,3}, \cdots, u_{1,n}, u_{3,2}, \cdots, u_{n,2}, v_1, v_2)$. For a $c$-perturbation $o' = (X', U', u'_{1,3}, \cdots, u'_{1,n}, u'_{3,2}, \cdots, u'_{n,2}, v'_1, v'_2)$ of $o$, we say that $o'$ is appropriate if $X' = X$, $U' = U$, $u'_{i,i} \in V$, $3 \leq i \leq n$ and $u'_{i,2} \in D$, $3 \leq i \leq n$, and $v'_1 = v_1$, $v'_2 = v_2$. Compared to $o$, there are 4 more nontrivial commutator relations: $[v_1, u_{1,3}] = -u_{1,4}$, $[v_1, u_{4,2}] = u_{3,2}$, $[v_2, u_{1,n-1}] = -u_{1,n}$, $[v_2, u_{n,2}] = u_{n-1,2}$.

Case III: $o = (\cdots, u_{i,j}, \cdots)$ where $u_{i,j}$ generate a maximal abelian subalgebra in $\mathfrak{sl}(n,k)$, $n \geq 4$.

For all cases, let $A$ be the subalgebra spanned by $o$. For the proofs of Lemma A.2 and A.3 we center on case I; and modifications for case II are added in corresponding parts. We prove case III separately in Section A.1.
Proof. Since $\rho'$ is appropriate, there is $g \in \mathfrak{g}_{0,X}$ with $\|g - I\| \leq Cc$ such that $\text{Ad}_g(\rho')$ is appropriate and $\text{Ad}_g u'_{i,i} = u_{1,i},$ $3 \leq i \leq n.$ It is clear that $\mathcal{M}_o(\rho') = \mathcal{M}_o(\text{Ad}_g(\rho')).$ Then it is harmless to assume that $u'_{i,i} = u_{1,i},$ $3 \leq i \leq n.$ For any $u'_{i,2},$ write $u'_{i,2} = \sum_{j=3}^n a_j u_{j,2}.$ Since $\|u'_{i,2}, u_{1,j}\| < C\gamma$ for each $j \neq i,$ we have $|a_j| < C\gamma$ for each $j \neq i.$ Since $\|u'_{i,2}, u_{1,j}\| + \|U\| < C\gamma$ we have $|a_i - 1| < C\gamma.$ Hence we can assume $u'_{i,2} = u_{i,2},$ $3 \leq i \leq n.$ This implies the result (for case II, we need to show that $\|\text{Ad}_g v_1 - v_1\| + \|\text{Ad}_g v_2 - v_2\| < C\gamma.$ Since the commutator relations show that $\|\text{ad}_{\text{Ad}_g v_1 - v_1} g_{0,X}\| + \|\text{ad}_{\text{Ad}_g v_1 - v_1} g_{0,X}\| < C\gamma$ for all $\mu > 0,$ and $\text{Ad}_g v_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{0,X},$ $i = 1, 2,$ the claim follows directly from (2) of Lemma A.1.

For $G = \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}),$ we have a more simpler observation compared to (2) of Lemma A.1 (a) if $v \in \mathfrak{g}_{0,X}$ and $\|\langle v, U \rangle\| + \|\text{ad}_v |V\| \leq \gamma,$ then $\|v\| \leq C\gamma.$

**Lemma A.3.** There is $\delta > 0$ such that for any $c$-perturbation $\rho'$ of $\rho,$ $c < \delta,$ if $\|\mathcal{M}_o(\rho')\| < \gamma,$ there is a coordinate change $T$ of $A$ with $\|T - I\| \leq Cc$ such that $\mathcal{M}_o(T \rho) = 0$ and $\|T \rho' - o\| < C\gamma'_1,$ where $\gamma'_1 = \gamma + c^2.$

**Proof.** We can assume $c < 1/2.$ By (5) of Lemma A.1 there is $g \in G$ with $\|g - I\| \leq Cc$ such that we can assume that $\text{Ad}_g(X') = X,$ $\text{Ad}_g(U') = U$ and $u'_{i,i}, u'_{i,2} \in V + D,$ $3 \leq i \leq n.$ (For case II, we add $v'_1, v'_2 \in \mathfrak{g}_{0,X}.$ Further, we note that there is there is $g \in \mathfrak{g}_{0,X}$ with $\|g - I\| \leq Cc$ such that $\text{Ad}_g$ fixed $X, U$ and $\text{Ad}_g(u'_{i,i}) = u_{1,i}, 3 \leq i \leq n.$ Hence we can assume that $u'_{i,2}|V = u_{1,2},$ $3 \leq i \leq n.$ We have the observation: (G) for every $v \in \mathfrak{g}_{0,X},$ $[v, V] \subseteq V,$ $[v, L] \subseteq L.$ This implies that $\|\text{ad}_v |V\| \leq C\gamma,$ $i = 1, 2.$ We also note that $\text{ad}_{v'_1 - v_1}(U) = 0,$ $i = 1, 2.$ Hence by (a) we can assume that $v'_i = v_i, i = 1, 2.$

Next, we want to show that: for $1 \leq k \leq n - 2$ we have $\mathcal{M}_o(T_k) = 0,$ and for $\rho'_{(k)} = T_k (\rho'),$ we have $\|\mathcal{M}_o(\rho'_{(k)})\| < C\gamma,$ and $\rho'_{(k)} = (X, U, u_{1,1}^{(k)}, \ldots, u_{n,1}^{(k)}, u_{1,2}^{(k)}, \ldots, u_{n,2}^{(k)})$ (for case II), $\rho'_{(k)} = (X, U, u_{1,1}^{(k)}, \ldots, u_{n,1}^{(k)}, u_{1,2}^{(k)}, \ldots, u_{n,2}^{(k)}, v_1, v_2)),$ where $u_{1,3}, \ldots, u_{1,k+2} \in V.$ We proceed by induction.

By assumption there are $a_i \in k$ with $|a_i| \leq c_1, 3 \leq i \leq n$ such that $u'_{1,3} - \sum_{i=3}^n a_i u'_{i,2} \in V.$ Set $u_{1,3}^{(1)} = u_{1,3} - \sum_{i=3}^n a_i u'_{i,2}; u_{1,i} = u'_{1,i} - a_i u_{i,3};$ and $u_{i,2} = u'_{i,2}$ for case II we need to add $v_1^{(1)} = v_1$ and $v_2^{(1)} = v_2$ and denote this new base by $\rho'_{(1)}$ and the corresponding coordinate change by $T_1.$ Then we have $\|\mathcal{M}_o(\rho'_{(1)})\| < C\gamma$ and $\|\mathcal{M}_o(T_1 \rho)\| = 0.$ (For case II, we need to check the condition $\|\mathcal{M}_o(\rho'_{(2)})\| < C\gamma.$ We further write $u_{1,3} = \sum_{i=3}^n a_i u_{i,3} + \sum_{i=3}^n b_i u_{i,3};$ and $u_i = u_{i,3}$ for case II we need to add $v_1^{(1)} = v_1$ and $v_2^{(1)} = v_2$ and denote this new base by $\rho'_{(2)}$ and the corresponding coordinate change by $T_2.$ Then we have $\|\mathcal{M}_o(\rho'_{(2)})\| < C\gamma$ and $\|\mathcal{M}_o(T_2 \rho)\| = 0.$
by noting that \( \|a_4u_{3,2} - a_4u'_{3,2}\| < Cc^2 \). We have

\[
[u_{1,3}', u_{1,4}'] = \sum_{i=3}^{n} [a_iu_{i,2}', u_{i,4}'] + \sum_{i=3}^{n} [b_iu_{1,i}, b_3u_{1,4} - a_4u_{3,2}].
\]

By using \( \|M_o(o')\| < C\gamma \), we have \( \|-a_4U - a_4b_3U\| < C\gamma_1 \), which gives \( |a_4| < C\gamma_1 \). Hence we can assume that: \( (\star') u_{1,4}' = u_{1,4} \in V \). This justifies the relations involving \( v_1 \). For \( v_1^{(2)} \), we need to show that \( |a_n| < C\gamma \). Since \( \|u_{1,3}', v_2\| = \|u_{1,3}' + \sum_{i=3}^{n} a_iu_{i,2}', v_2\| < \gamma \), we have \( \|u_{1,3}', v_2\| - a_nu_{n-1,2}' < C\gamma \). Since \( u_{1,3}' \in V \), by \( (\star) \) we see that

\[
(A.1) \quad (1-c)|a_n| \leq \|a_nu_{n-1,2}'\| = \|u_{1,3}', v_2\| - a_nu_{n-1,2}' < C\gamma,
\]

which gives \( |a_n| < C\gamma \). Hence we prove the case of \( k = 1 \).

Suppose it holds for \( k \). (For case II, the induction begins with \( k \geq 2 \). By \( (\star') \) we set \( o^{(2)} = o^{(1)}. \) We write \( u_{1,k+3}' = v + \sum_{i=3}^{n} b_iu_{i,2} \), where \( v \in V \). By the assumption \( \|M_o(o^{(k)})\| < C\gamma \), we have \( \|u_{1,k+3}', u_{1,i}'\| < C\gamma \), \( 3 \leq i \leq k + 2 \). This implies that \( \|b_i\| \leq C\gamma, 3 \leq i \leq k + 2 \) by noticing that \( u_{1,3}', \ldots, u_{1,k+2}' \in V \). Then it is harmless to assume that \( b_i = 0 \), \( 3 \leq i \leq k + 2 \). Set \( u_{1,k+3}' = u_{1,k+3} - \sum_{i=k+3}^{n} b_iu_{i,2} ; u_{1,i}' = u_{1,i} - b_iu_{k+3,2} \), \( k + 4 \leq i \leq n \); \( u_{1,2}' = u_{1,2} \), \( 3 \leq i \leq n \); (for case II we need to add \( v_1^{(k+1)} = v_1 \) and \( v_2^{(k+1)} = v_2 \); and denote this new base by \( o^{(k+1)} \). Then we have \( \|M_o(o^{(k+1)})\| < C\gamma \) and \( \|M_o(T_{k+1}o)\| = 0 \) (For case II, for \( 5 \leq k + 3 < n - 1 \), to check the condition \( \|M_o(o^{(k+1)})\| < C\gamma_1 \), for the relations involving \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) we need to show that \( |b_4| + |b_n| < C\gamma_1 \), which follows the similar way as in \( (A.1) \). If \( k + 3 = n - 1 \), the relations involving \( v_1 \) is clear; for \( v_2 \), following the case way as we treat \( k = 1 \) we can show that \( |b_n| < C\gamma_1 \) and we can assume \( u_{1,n}^{(k+1)} \in V \). Then we prove the case of \( k + 1 \). Finally, set \( o^{(n-2)} = o^{(n-3)} \). Thus we finish the proof.) Hence we prove the case of \( k + 1 \).

Then for \( o^{(n-2)} = (X, U, u_{1,n}', \ldots, u_{1,n}^{(n-2)}, u_{1,n}', u_{1,n}', u_{1,n}^{(n-2)}, \ldots, u_{1,n}') \) (for case II \( o^{(n-2)} = (X, U, u_{1,n}', \ldots, u_{1,n}', u_{1,n}', u_{1,n}', u_{1,n}', v_1, v_2) \), we have \( u_{1,3}', \ldots, u_{1,n}' \in V \). Similarly, we can show that: for \( 1 \leq k \leq n - 2 \) we have \( T_{n-2+k} \) with \( \|T_{n-2+k} - I\| \leq Cc_1 \) such that \( M_o(T_{n-2+k}o) = 0 \); and for \( o^{(n-2+k)} = T_{n-2+k}(o') \), we have \( \|M_o(o^{(n-2+k)})\| < C\gamma_1 \), and \( o^{(n-2+k)} = (X, U, u_{1,n}', \ldots, u_{1,n}', u_{1,n}', u_{1,n}', v_1, v_2) \), where \( u_{1,3}', \ldots, u_{k+2,2}' \in D \), and \( u_{1,i}' \in V, 3 \leq i \leq n \). Since \( T_{2(n-2)}(o') \) is appropriate, the result follows from Lemma \( A.2 \).

□
A.1. Proof of Lemma A.3 for case III. We say that \((i, j)\) is a pair if \(i \neq j\). We say that a pair \((i, j)\) is good if \(i\) is odd and \(j\) is even. By Remark 2.6, we can assume that \(A\) is spanned by \(u_{i,j}\), where \((i, j)\) is good. We note that for any \(t \in k\) and a pair \((i, j)\),

\[
\|\text{Ad}_{u_{i,j}} o' - o' - \text{tad}_{u_{i,j}} o\| \leq C\|o' - o\|^2, \quad \text{if } |t| \leq \|o - o'\|.
\]

Then it is harmless do the following: (*) substitute \(o'\) by \(o' + \text{tad}_{u_{i,j}} o\), if \(|t| \leq \|o - o'\| \leq c\).

We write \(u'_{i,j} = u_{i,j} + p_{i,j}\); and write \(p_{i,j} = \sum_{k,l} p_{i,j,k,l} u_{k,l}\). The assumption shows that: for good pairs \((i, j)\) and \((k, l)\)

\[
(**) \quad \|[u_{i,j}, p_{k,l}] - [u_{k,l}, p_{i,j}]\| \leq C(\|\mathcal{M}(o')\| + \|o' - o\|^2).
\]

We note that the image of \(\text{ad}_{u_{i,j}}\) is spanned by \(\{u_{1,3}, \ldots, u_{1,n}, u_{3,2}, \ldots, u_{n,2}, u_{1,1} - u_{2,2}\}\). Then by (*) we can assume that: (*)' \(p_{1,2,k,l} = 0 \mod A\) if \(l = 2\) or \(k = 1\) if \(k \neq l\); and \(p_{1,2,2,2} = p_{1,2,3,3}\).

We note that the image of \(\text{ad}_{u_{i,j}}\), \(i \geq 3\) includes the space spanned by \(\{u_{i,3}, \ldots, u_{i,n}\}\); and \([u_{i,j}, u_{i,j}] = u_{i,j}\) and \([u_{i,j}, u_{i,2}] = 0\) if \(j \geq 3\). Then by (*) we can assume that: \(p_{1,i,i,j} = 0 \mod A\), if \(i \geq 4\) and \(j \geq 3\). This together with (*)' show that: (*)'\(\prime p_{1,2,k,2} = 0 \mod A\) if \(2 \neq k\); and \(p_{1,i,1,j} = 0 \mod A\), if \(i \geq 2\), \(j \geq 2\); and \(p_{1,2,2,2} = p_{1,2,3,3}\).

Fix a good pair \((i, j)\). Next, we will obtain useful information from (**) by choosing different good pairs \((k, l)\).

1. Choose \(k \neq i\) and \(l \neq j\). By checking the coefficient of \(u_{k,l}\) in (**), we conclude that it is harmless to assume \(p_{i,j,k,k} = p_{i,j,l,l}\).

2. We note that for any pair \((p, m)\) not good with \(p \neq i\) and \(m \neq j\), there is a good pair \((k, l)\) such that \([u_{k,l}, u_{p,m}]\) is not the image of \(\text{ad}_{i,j}\). This shows that it is harmless to assume \(p_{i,j,p,m} = 0\).

3. For any pairs \((i, p)\) and \((j, m)\) with \(p\) odd and \(m\) even, set \((k, l) = (p, m)\). By checking the coefficient of \(u_{i,m}\) in (**), we conclude that it is harmless to assume \(p_{i,j,i,p} = -p_{p,m,j,m}\).

4. For any pair \((i, p)\) with \(p\) odd, set \((k, l) = (p, j)\). By checking the coefficient of \(u_{i,j}\) in (**), we conclude that it is harmless to assume \(p_{i,j,i,p} = p_{p,j,i,i} - p_{p,j,j,j}\). This together with 3 also gives: \(-p_{p,m,j,m} = p_{p,j,i,i} - p_{p,j,j,j}, p \neq i, m \neq j\).

5. For any pair \((l, j)\) with \(l\) even, set \((k, l) = (i, l)\). By checking the coefficient of \(u_{i,j}\) in (**), we conclude that it is harmless to assume \(p_{i,j,l,j} = -p_{i,l,i,i} + p_{i,l,j,j}\).

Next, we begin the arguments by using the above facts. From 4 we have: \(p_{1,m,j,m} = p_{1,2,j,2} = 0\) if \(j \neq 2\). We also have

\[-p_{1,m,2,m} \overset{(a)}{=} p_{1,2,i,i} - p_{1,2,2,2} \overset{(b)}{=} 0.
\]

Here in (a) we use 4; in (b) we use (**) and 1. By 2 we have for \(m \geq 2\), \(p_{1,m} = \sum_{l} p_{1,m,l,l,\mod A}\). Further, by 5 we have \(0 = -p_{1,j,l,j} = p_{1,l,1,1} - p_{1,l,j,j}, l \neq j\); and by 4 we have \(0 = p_{1,m,j,m} = p_{1,j,i,i} - p_{1,j,j,j}, 1 \neq i, m \neq j\). These
together with 1 give \( p_{1,j,1} = p_{1,i,i} \) for any \( i \). Hence \( p_{1,i,i} = 0 \) for any \( i \).

Then we have \( p_{1,m} = 0 \) mod \( A \), \( m \geq 2 \).

By 3 we have 0 = \( p_{1,j,1,p} = p_{p,m,j,m} \), \( p \neq 1 \), \( m \neq j \); and \( p_{i,j,i,p} = -p_{p,m,j,m} \), \( p \neq i \), \( m \neq j \). By 1 we have \( p_{i,j} = \sum_{l} p_{i,j,l,l} \) mod \( A \). Further, by 4 we have 0 = \( -p_{i,j,l,j} = p_{l,i,l,i} - p_{i,l,j,j} \), \( l \neq j \); and by 4 0 = \( p_{i,j,i,p} = p_{p,j,i,i} - p_{p,j,j,j} \), \( p \neq i \). These with 1 show that \( p_{i,j,l,l} = 0 \) for any \( l \). Hence we have \( p_{i,j} = 0 \) mod \( A \). Since \( A \) is abelian we get the result.

A.2. Proof of Lemma A.2

For \( G = \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}) \) the result is from Lemma A.3; for \( G \neq \mathbb{G}_1 \) type II the result is from Lemma A.3, (4) and the fact that \( A \), \( i \geq 3 \) is maximal abelian; for \( G \neq \mathbb{G}_1 \) type I the result is from Lemma A.3, (4), (5).
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