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Abstract

Given $l > 2\nu > 2d \geq 4$, we prove the persistence of a Cantor–family of KAM tori of measure $O(\varepsilon^{1/2-\nu/l})$ for any non–degenerate nearly integrable Hamiltonian system of class $C^l(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$, where $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded domain, provided that the size $\varepsilon$ of the perturbation is sufficiently small. This extends a result by D. Salamon in [Sal04] according to which we do have the persistence of a single KAM torus in the same framework. Moreover, it is well–known that, for the persistence of a single torus, the regularity assumption can not be improved.
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1 Introduction

KAM Theory asserts that, for sufficiently regular non–degenerate nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems, a Cantor–like family of KAM tori of the unperturbed part survive any perturbation, being only slightly deformed, provided the perturbation is small enough. Moreover, the family of KAM tori of the perturbed system is of positive Lebesgue measure and tends to fill up the phase space as the perturbation tends to zero. A natural question is:

**Question 1** In a fixed degrees of freedom $d$, how regular has to be the integrable Hamiltonian and the perturbation in order to get KAM tori?

It was Arnold [Arn63], inspired by the breakthrough of Kolmogorov [Kol54], who first proved the persistence of positive measure set of KAM tori of a real-analytic integrable Hamiltonian under a real-analytic perturbation, provided the latter is small enough. In 1962, J. Moser [Mos62b, Mos62a] proved in the framework of area–preserving twist mappings of an annulus, the persistence of invariant curves of integrable analytic systems under $C^k$ perturbation, but for $k$ very high ($k = 333$); which, later on, was brought down by H. Rüssmann [RKN70] to 5, which is very close to the optimal value $4 + \iota$, $\iota > 0$. It is worth mentioning that M. Herman [Her86] gave a counterexample of an area–preserving twist mappings of an annulus of class $C^{3-\iota}$ without any invariant curve. Translated into the Hamiltonian context, its corresponds to $d = 2$. Moser [Mos69] proved the continuation of a single torus of an integrable real–analytic Hamiltonian under a perturbation of class $C^{l+2}$, with $l > 2d$. Then Pöschel [Pös80, Pös82], following an idea due to Moser, showed that a Cantor–like family of KAM tori, of positive measure, of a non-degenerate
integrable real–analytic Hamiltonian survive any sufficiently small perturbation of class $C^k$, provided $k > 3d - 1$, and also showed that, for the persistence of a single torus of an integrable real–analytic Hamiltonian, it is sufficient to require the perturbation to be of class $C^l$, provided $l > 2d$. Later, refining this idea of Moser, D. Salamon [Sal04] showed that, for the persistence of single torus, it sufficient that both of the integrable and perturbed part are of class $C^l$, with $l > 2d$. And, regarding the continuation of a single torus of the integrable system, the regularity assumption $l > 2d$ turns out to be also sharp (see e.g. [Her86, CW13]). Then it has been widespread that

**Conjecture 2** In $d$–degrees of freedom, a small perturbation of class $C^l$ of a non–degenerate integrable Hamiltonian which is also of class $C^l$, exhibits a positive measure set of KAM tori iff $l > 2d$.

Albrecht has proven in [Alb07] the persistence of KAM tori of a non–degenerate real–analytic integrable system under small enough perturbations of class $C^{2d}$. Yet, the KAM tori of the perturbed system form a zero measure set.

Given $\alpha > 0$, $\tau > 0$, a vector $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is called $(\alpha, \tau)$–Diophantine if

$$|\omega \cdot k| \geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|^\tau}, \quad \forall \ k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}.$$  

In this paper, we prove the “if” part of the Conjecture 2 i.e., roughly speaking:

**Theorem 3** Consider a Hamiltonian of the form $H(y, x) = K(y) + P(y, x)$ where $K, P \in C^l(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a non–empty and bounded domain.\footnote{A domain is an open and connected set.} If $K$ is non–degenerate and $l > 2\nu > 2d$ then, all the KAM tori of the integrable system $K$ whose frequency are $(\alpha, \tau)$–Diophantine, with $\alpha \approx \varepsilon^{1/2-\nu/l}$ and $\tau := \nu - 1$, do survive, being only slightly deformed, where $\varepsilon$ is the $C^l$–norm of the perturbation $P$. Moreover, letting $\mathcal{K}$ be the corresponding family of KAM tori of $H$, we have $\text{meas}(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \mathcal{K}) = O(\varepsilon^{1/2-\nu/l})$.

To our best knowledge, the best result in this direction is due to A. Bounemoura and consigned in his nice paper [Bou18], where he proved the persistence of positive measure set filled by the KAM tori of $H$ under the assumptions $K \in C^{l+2}$ and $P \in C^l$, with $l > 2d$. Bounemoura also pointed out that the region free of KAM tori is of measure $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. However this latter is not very clear to us. Indeed, in his proof, the Diophantine constant $\alpha$ (corresponding to $\gamma$ in [Bou18]) has been rescaled to one and this does not allow to keep track of the power of $\alpha$ relatively to $\varepsilon$ which is crucial for the measure estimate. The point is that many other parameters of the KAM scheme, such as the analyticity domain of each of the real–analytic approximations of the perturbation, do depend upon $\varepsilon$ and
that need to be taken into account in the smallness condition and, in particular, in the measure estimate.
In the present paper, under the sharper assumption \(K, P \in C^l\) and reasonable carefullness, the measure estimate of the region free of KAM tori we are able to get is of \(O(\varepsilon^{1/2-\nu/l})\), which, netherless, yields in the limit \(l \to \infty\) the optimal bound in the real–analytic case i.e. \(O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})\) (see e.g. [Kou19, CK19]).

The proof shares two main features with [Bou18]. Firstly, our proof uses also a quantitative approximation method of smooth functions by analytic functions introduced by Moser; however, here we have to approximate not only the pertubed part, but also the integrable part at each step of the KAM scheme as, unlike [Bou18], we do not linearize the integrable part. Secondly, we also use the refined approximation given in [Rüs01, Theorem 7.2, page 134] instead of truncating the Fourier expansion of the perturbation at each step of the KAM scheme. But, unlike [Bou18], in this paper we use a KAM scheme à la Arnold.\(^2\)

The strategy is to prove a general quantitative KAM Step for real–analytic perturbation of non–degenerate real–analytic integrable Hamiltonian systems (see Lemma 6). Then, one approximates, in a quantitative manner, both the integrable and perturbed part by a sequence of real–analytic functions on complex strips of widths decreasing to zero (see Lemma 7), yielding a suitable real–analytic approximation of the perturbed Hamiltonian, to each of which we apply the KAM Step. Then, one proves that indeed the procedure converges.

### 2 Notation

- For \(d \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}\) and \(x, y \in \mathbb{C}^d\), we let \(x \cdot y := x_1\bar{y}_1 + \cdots + x_d\bar{y}_d\) be the standard inner product; \(|x| := \sum_{j=1}^d |x_j|\) be the 1–norm, and \(|x| := \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |x_j|\) be the sup–norm.
- \(\mathbb{T}^d := \mathbb{R}^d/2\pi\mathbb{Z}^d\) is the \(d\)–dimensional (flat) torus.
- For \(\alpha > 0, \tau \geq d - 1 \geq 1,\)

\[
\Delta^\tau_\alpha := \left\{ \omega \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\omega \cdot k| \geq \frac{\alpha}{|k|_1}, \ \forall \ 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \right\},
\]

(1)
is the set of \((\alpha, \tau)\)–Diophantine numbers in \(\mathbb{R}^d\).
- We denote by \(\text{meas}\), the Lebesgue (outer) measure on \(\mathbb{R}^d\).

\(^2\)Usually, in the literature, Moser’s idea is combined with his own KAM scheme (like [Pös80, Pös82, Bou18]) or with Kolmogorov scheme (like [Sal04, Chi12]).
• Given \( l \in \mathbb{R} \), we shall denote its integer part by \([l]\) and its fractional part by \{l\};

• For \( l > 0 \), \( A \) an open subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) or of \( \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d \), we denote by \( C^l(A) \) the set of continuously differentiable functions \( f \) on \( A \) up to the order \([l]\) such that \( f^{[l]} \) is Hölder–continuous with exponent \([l]\) and with finite \( C^l\)–norm define by:

\[
\| f \|_{C^l(A)} := \max\{ \| f \|_{C^0(A)} , \| f^l \|_{C^0(A)} \} , \quad \| f \|_{C^0(A)} := \max_{0 \leq |k| \leq [l]} \sup_A |\partial_y^k f| ,
\]

\[
\| f^l \|_{C^0(A)} := \max_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sup_{y_1,y_2 \in A |y_1 - y_2| < 1} |\partial_y^k f(y_1) - \partial_y^k f(y_2)|/|y_1 - y_2|^{[l]} .
\]

When \( A = \mathbb{R}^d \) or \( A = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d \), we will simply write \( \| f \|_{C^l} \) for \( \| f \|_{C^l(A)} \).

• For \( l > 0 \), \( A \) any subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \), we denote by \( C^l_W(A) \), the set of functions of class \( C^l \) on \( A \) in the sense of Whitney.\(^3\)

• For \( r, s > 0 \), \( y_0 \in \mathbb{C}^d \), \( \emptyset \neq \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d \), we denote:

\[
\mathbb{T}_s := \{ x \in \mathbb{C}^d : |\text{Im} x| < s \} / 2\pi \mathbb{Z}^d , \quad B_r(y_0) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |y - y_0| < r \} , \quad (y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d) ,
\]

\[
D_r(y_0) := \{ y \in \mathbb{C}^d : |y - y_0| < r \} , \quad D_{r,s}(y_0) := D_r(y_0) \times \mathbb{T}_s , \quad D_{r,s}(\mathcal{D}) := \bigcup_{y_0 \in \mathcal{D}} D_{r,s}(y_0) .
\]

• If \( \mathbb{1}_d := \text{diag}(1) \) is the unit \((d \times d)\) matrix, we denote the standard symplectic matrix by

\[
\mathbb{J} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\mathbb{1}_d \\ \mathbb{1}_d & 0 \end{pmatrix} .
\]

• For \( \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d \), \( \mathcal{A}_{r,s}(\mathcal{D}) \) denotes the Banach space of real–analytic functions with bounded holomorphic extensions to \( D_{r,s}(\mathcal{D}) \), with norm

\[
\| \cdot \|_{r,s,\mathcal{D}} := \sup_{D_{r,s}(\mathcal{D})} | \cdot | .
\]

• We equip \( \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}^d \) with the canonical symplectic form

\[
\varpi := dy \wedge dx = dy_1 \wedge dx_1 + \cdots + dy_d \wedge dx_d ,
\]

and denote by \( \phi^t_H \) the associated Hamiltonian flow governed by the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}(y, x) , y, x \in \mathbb{C}^d \).

\(^3\)We refer the reader for instance to [Kou19, Appendix E, page 207] for details.
Given a linear operator $L$ from the normed space $(V_1, \| \cdot \|_1)$ into the normed space $(V_2, \| \cdot \|_2)$, its “operator–norm” is given by

$$\|L\| := \sup_{x \in V_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|Lx\|_2}{\|x\|_1},$$

so that $\|Lx\|_2 \leq \|L\| \|x\|_1$ for any $x \in V_1$.

Given $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the directional derivative of a $C^1$ function $f$ with respect to $\omega$ is given by

$$D_\omega f := \omega \cdot f_x = \sum_{j=1}^d \omega_j f_{x,j}.$$ 

If $f$ is a (smooth or analytic) function on $\mathbb{T}^d$, its Fourier expansion is given by

$$f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f_k e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad f_k := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x) e^{-ik \cdot x} \, dx,$$

(where, as usual, $e := \exp(1)$ denotes the Neper number and $i$ the imaginary unit). We also set:

$$\langle f \rangle := f_0 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x) \, dx.$$ 

3 Assumptions

- Let $l > 2\nu := 2(\tau + 1) > 2d \geq 4$, and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non–empty, bounded domain.

- On the phase space $\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d$, consider the Hamiltonian

$$H(y, x) := K(y) + P(y, x),$$

where $K, P \in C^l(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ are given functions with finite $l$–norms $\|K\|_{C^l(\mathcal{D})}$ and $\varepsilon := \|P\|_{C^l(\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d)}$.

- Assume that $K_y$ is locally–uniformly invertible; namely that $\det K_{yy}(y) \neq 0$ for all $y \in \mathcal{D}$ and

$$T := \|T\|_{C^0(\mathcal{D})} < \infty, \quad T(y) := K_{yy}(y)^{-1}.$$

Set\(^4\)

$$K := \max \{1, \|K\|_{C^l(\mathcal{D})}\}, \quad \theta := TK \geq 1.$$ 

\(^4\)Indeed, $\theta \geq \|T(y_0)\| \|K_{yy}(y_0)\| = \|T(y_0)\| \|T(y_0)^{-1}\| \geq 1$, for any $y_0 \in \mathcal{D}$. 
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\* Let \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) and set

\[
\alpha_* := \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-2\nu}}, \quad \mathcal{D} := \{ y \in \mathcal{D} : B_{\alpha}(y) \subseteq \mathcal{D} \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_\alpha := \{ y \in \mathcal{D} : K_y(y) \in \Delta^\alpha \} .
\]

\* Finally, set

\[
\sigma := \left( \frac{\varepsilon^{3/2}}{\theta^{2(1/\nu)\alpha}K} \right)^{1/(l+\nu)} , \quad \beta_0 := \min \left\{ \frac{l}{2\nu} - 1 + \frac{1}{\nu} , 2 \right\} .
\]

4 Theorem

Under the notations and assumptions of \( \S \ 2 \) and 3, the following Theorem holds.

**Theorem 4**

**Part I:** There exist positive constants \( c = c(d, \tau, l) < 1 \) and \( c' = c'(d, \tau, l) < 1 \) such that, if

\[
\alpha \leq c K , \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \leq c K^{\frac{l+2\nu}{1-2\nu}} .
\]

(2)

where \( a := (l - 2\nu)^{-1} \max\{ (6 + 2l\nu^{-1})l + \nu \} - 2l(l - \nu) - 2l(l + 3\nu)\nu^{-1} \}, then, the following holds. There exist \( \mathcal{D}_* \subset \mathcal{D} \) having the same cardinality as \( \mathcal{D}_\alpha \), a lipcomorphism \( G^* : \mathcal{D}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_* \), a function \( K_* \in C^2_w(\mathcal{D}_*, \mathbb{R}) \) and an embedding \( \phi_* : \mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{K} := \phi_*(\mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}) \subset \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d \) of class \( C^\beta_w \) (for any \( 0 < \beta < \beta_0 \)) such that

\[
\partial_y K_* \circ G^* = \partial_y K , \quad \text{on} \ \mathcal{D}_* ,
\]

(3)

\[
H \circ \phi_* (y, x) = K_* (y), \quad \forall (y, x) \in \mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d .
\]

(4)

Furthermore,

\[
\| G^* - \text{id} \|_{\mathcal{D}_*} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{\nu}{2(l+\nu)}} \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-2\nu}} K^{\frac{l+\nu}{2(l+\nu)}}, \quad \| G^* - \text{id} \|_{L, \mathcal{D}_*} < 1/2 ,
\]

(5)

\[
\sup_{\mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d} \max\{ \| W(\phi_* - \text{id}) \| , \| \pi_2(\partial_x \phi_* - 1) \| \} \leq 8 \theta^{-2} (\log \rho^{-1})^{-2\nu} < 1 ,
\]

(6)

where \( \rho := (\varepsilon^{l-2\nu}\alpha^{2\nu}K^l\theta^l) \) and \( W := \text{diag}(K(\alpha\theta)^{-1}1_d, \sigma^{-1}1_d) \).

Moreover, \( B_{\alpha*/2}(\mathcal{D}_*) \subset \mathcal{D} \), \( \mathcal{K} \) is foliated by KAM tori of \( H \).

**Part II:** Assume furthermore that the boundary \( \partial \mathcal{D} \) of \( \mathcal{D} \) is a smooth hypersurface of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and

\[
0 < \alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{R(\mathcal{D})}{6} , \frac{1}{2} \inf \text{foc}(\partial \mathcal{D}) \right\} ,
\]

(7)

\[5\text{Notice that the derivatives are taken in the sense of Whitney.}\]

\[6\text{See (i) in Remark 5 below.}\]
where \( \text{minfoc}(\partial \mathcal{D}) \) denotes the minimal focal distance of \( \partial \mathcal{D} \) and \( R(\mathcal{D}) := \sup \{ R > 0 : B_R(y) \subseteq \mathcal{D}, \text{ for some } y \in \mathcal{D} \} \). Then, the following measure estimate holds:
\[
\text{meas} (\mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^{d} \setminus \mathcal{K}) \leq (3\pi)^d \left( 2\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(\partial \mathcal{D}) \varepsilon + C \varepsilon^2 + \text{meas}(\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_\alpha) \right),
\]
(8)
where \( \mathbf{R}^{\mathcal{D}} \) denotes the curvature tensor of \( \partial \mathcal{D} \), \( \mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{R}^{\mathcal{D}}) \), the \((2j)\)–th integrated mean curvature of \( \partial \mathcal{D} \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \),
\[
\hat{\varepsilon} := \max \left\{ \varepsilon^3 \frac{l+1}{\alpha l+\vartheta} K^{\frac{\alpha}{l+\vartheta}} \theta^{-1-\frac{2\vartheta}{l+\vartheta}}, \alpha \right\},
\]
and
\[
C = C(d, \tau, l, \varepsilon, \alpha, T, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{R}^{\mathcal{D}}) := 2 \sum_{j=1}^{[\frac{d+1}{2}]} \varepsilon^{2j-1} \mathbf{k}_2(j) \mathbf{R}^{\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{1 \cdot 3 \cdots (2j+1)}.
\]
Remark 5 (i) From (3) and (4), one deduces that the embedded \( d \)-tori
\[
\mathcal{T}_{\omega, \varepsilon} := \phi_\ast \left( y_\ast, \mathbb{T}^d \right), \quad y_\ast \in \mathcal{D}_\ast, \quad \omega_\ast := \hat{\varepsilon} y_\ast K_\ast(y_\ast) \in \Delta_\ast^\varepsilon,
\]
(9)
are non-degenerate, invariant, Lagrangian Kronecker tori of class \( C_{W}^{\beta} (0 < \beta < \beta_0) \) for \( H \), i.e. KAM tori, with Diophantine frequency \( \omega_\ast \) i.e.
\[
\phi^t_H \circ \phi_\ast (y_\ast, x) = \phi_\ast (y_\ast, x + \omega_\ast t), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^d.
\]
(10)
Indeed, as each \( \phi^j \) is symplectic, we have
\[
\phi^t_{H_{j-1} \circ \phi} = \phi^t \circ \phi^t_{H_{j-1} \circ \phi}.
\]
(11)
Now, pick \( y_\ast \in \mathcal{D}_\ast \) and \( y_j \in \mathcal{D}_j \) converging to \( y_\ast \). Letting \( \omega_\ast := \hat{\varepsilon} y_\ast K_\ast(y_\ast) \), we have
\[
\phi^t_{H_{j-1} \circ \phi}(y_j, x) = (25) (y_j, x + t\omega_\ast) + O(r_j^{-1} \| P_j \| r_j, \gamma, \mathcal{\mathcal{G}}_j + |y_j - y_\ast|), \quad \lim_{j \to \infty} r_j^{-1} \| P_j \| r_j, \gamma, \mathcal{\mathcal{G}}_j = 0.
\]
(29)
Then, recalling that \( \mathcal{H}_j \) converges uniformly to \( H \) on \( \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d \), we have, for any \( x \in \mathbb{T}^d \),
\[
\phi^t_H \circ \phi_\ast (y_\ast, x) = \lim_{j \to \infty} \phi^t_{H_{j-1} \circ \phi}(y_j, x) = \phi^t \circ \phi^t_{H_{j-1} \circ \phi}(y_j, x)
\]
(11)
\[
= \lim_{j \to \infty} \phi^t \circ \phi^t_{H_{j-1} \circ \phi}(y_j, x) = \phi_\ast (y_\ast, x + t\omega_\ast),
\]
(12)
\footnote{Observe that the condition \( \alpha \leq R(\mathcal{D})/6 \) ensures that the interior of \( \mathcal{D}_\ast \) is non–empty. \footnote{We refer the reader to \cite{CK19, Kou19} for more details.}}
and (10) is proven. 

(ii) Choosing $\alpha \simeq \varepsilon^{1/2-\nu/l}$ in (2), we get $\hat{\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{1/2-1/l})$ and therefore, plugging them into (8), we obtain
\[
\text{meas}(\mathcal{D}\setminus \mathcal{K}) = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}-\nu}),
\]
which agrees for $l \to \infty$ with the sharp measure of KAM tori for smooth Hamiltonian systems i.e. $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$.

It is worth mentioning that, in order to get (13), the smoothness assumption on the boundary of the domain can be removed using a different argument. The argument consists in slicing the domain into small pieces, then construct in each of those pieces a family of KAM tori and estimate their respective relative measures, and finally sum them all up (see [CK19, Kou19] for more details).

5 Proof of Theorem 4

5.1 General step of the KAM scheme

Lemma 6 Let $r > 0$, $0 < 2s_0 \leq 2\sigma < s \leq 1$, $\mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty, bounded domain. Consider the Hamiltonian
\[
H(y, x) := K(y) + P(y, x),
\]
where $K, P \in A_{r,s}(\mathcal{D}_2)$. Assume that
\[
\begin{align*}
\det K_{yy}(y) \neq 0, & \quad T(y) := K_{yy}(y)^{-1}, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{D}_2, \\
\|K_{yy}\|_{r,\mathcal{D}_2} \leq K, & \quad \|T\|_{\mathcal{D}_2} \leq T, \\
\|P\|_{r,s,\mathcal{D}_2} \leq \varepsilon, & \quad K_\nu(\mathcal{D}_2) \subset \Delta_\nu^r. 
\end{align*}
\]
Assume that
\[
\sigma^{-\nu} \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha r} \leq \rho \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad r \leq \frac{\alpha}{K} \sigma^\nu.
\]

Let
\[
\begin{align*}
\theta := TK, & \quad \lambda := \log \rho^{-1}, \quad \kappa := 6\sigma^{-1}\lambda, \quad \tilde{r} \leq \frac{r}{32dTK}, \quad \tilde{r} \leq \min\left\{ \frac{\alpha}{2dK_\nu}, \tilde{r} \right\}, \\
\tilde{\sigma} \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_0}, & \quad \tilde{s} := \frac{\tilde{r}\tilde{\sigma}}{16dTK}, \quad s := s - \frac{2}{3}\sigma, \quad s' := s - \sigma, \quad L := C_0 \frac{\theta T \varepsilon}{r \tilde{r}}.
\end{align*}
\]
Assume:
\[
L \leq \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{3}.
\]
Then, there exists a diffeomorphism $G : D_{\tilde{r}}(D_\tau) \rightarrow G(D_{\tilde{r}}(D_\tau))$, a symplectic change of coordinates

$$\phi' = \text{id} + \tilde{\phi} : D_{\tilde{r}/2,s'}(D'_\tau) \rightarrow D_{\tilde{r}+r\sigma/3,s}(D_\tau),$$

such that

$$\begin{cases} H \circ \phi' =: H' =: K' + P', \\ \partial_y K' \circ G = \partial_y K, \quad \det \partial_y^2 K' \circ G \neq 0 \quad \text{on } D_\tau, \end{cases}$$

with $K'(y') := K(y') + \tilde{K}(y') := K(y') + \langle P(y', \cdot) \rangle$. Indeed, $G = (\partial_y^2 K')^{-1} \circ K_y$. Moreover, letting $(\partial_y^2 K'(y'))^{-1} =: T(y') + \tilde{T}(y')$, $y' \in G(D'_\tau)$, the following estimates hold.

$$\begin{eqnarray*}
\| \partial_y^2 \tilde{K} \|_{r/2,\mathcal{D}_s} & \leq & KL, \\
\| G - \text{id} \|_{r,\mathcal{D}_s} & \leq & rL, \\
\| \tilde{T} \|_{\mathcal{D}_s} & \leq & TL, \\
\max\{ \| W \tilde{\phi} \|_{r/2,s',\mathcal{D}_{s'}} , \| \pi_2 \partial_x \partial_y \tilde{\phi} \|_{r/2,s',\mathcal{D}_{s'}} \} & \leq & L, \\
\| P' \|_{r/2,s',\mathcal{D}_{s'}} & \leq & C_1 \rho \varepsilon,
\end{eqnarray*}$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_s' := G(\mathcal{D}_s), \quad (\partial_y^2 K'(y'))^{-1} =: T \circ G^{-1}(y') + \tilde{T}(y'), \quad \forall \ y' \in \mathcal{D}_s',$$

$$W := \text{diag}(r^{-1}I_d, \sigma^{-1}I_d).$$

**Proof** The proof follows essentially the same lines as the one of the KAM Step in [Kou19] (see also [CK19]) modulo two changes:

(i) To construct the generating function, as in [Bou18], we use the approximation given in [Rüs01, Theorem 7.2, page 134] instead of truncating the Fourier expansion of $P$.

(ii) We use systematically the estimate in 2. of Lemma A.2 to estimate the generating function as well as its derivatives.

Those two modifications improve a lot the KAM Step; in particular it yields the optimal power of the lost of regularity $\sigma$, which is crucial in the KAM Theory for finitely differentiable Hamiltonian systems, at least from the Moser’s “analyticing” idea point of view. We refer the reader to Appendix B for an outline of the proof.

### 5.2 Characterization of smooth functions by mean of real–analytic functions

The following two Lemmata, which will be needed from Lemma 9 on and may be found in [Chi03, Sal04].
Lemma 7 (Jackson, Moser, Zehnder) Given $l > 0$, there exists $C_1 = C_1(d, l) > 0$ such that for any $f \in C^l(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for any $s > 0$, there exists a real-analytic function $f_s: \mathcal{O}_s := \{(y, x) \in \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}^d : |\text{Im} \,(y, x)| < s\} \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying the following:

$$\sup_{\mathcal{O}_s} |f_s| \leq C_1 \|f\|_{C^0}, \quad \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d} \sup_{|\alpha| \leq s'} \|\partial^\alpha f_s - \partial^\alpha f_s| \leq C_1 \|f\|_{C^l} s^{-l'}, \quad \|f - f_s\|_{C^{l'}} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{C^l} s'^{-l'},$$

(21)

for any $0 < s' < s$ and any $0 \leq l' \leq l$ with $l' \in \mathbb{N}$. If, in addition, $f$ is periodic in some component $y_j$ or $x_j$, then so is $f_s$ in that component.

Lemma 8 (Bernstein, Moser) Assume that $\{f_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ is a sequence of real-analytic functions defined respectively on $\mathcal{O}_j := \{(y, x) \in \mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}^d : |\text{Im} \,(y, x)| < s_j\}$ such that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{O}_j} |f_j - f_{j-1}| \leq \gamma s_{j-1}, \quad \forall \, j \geq 1,$$

where $l \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, $\gamma > 0$ and $s_j := s_0 c_j$, with $s_0 > 0$ and $0 < \xi < 1$. Then, $f_j$ converges uniformly on $\mathbb{R}^d$ to a function $f \in C^l(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d)$. Moreover, if all the $f_j$ are periodic in some component $y_i$ or $x_i$, then so is $f$ in that component.

5.3 Iteration of the KAM step and convergence

Let $K$, $T$, $\theta$, $\epsilon$, $\sigma$, $\rho$, $\alpha_\ast$ be as in §3 and 4. Let $0 < \nu \leq 1 - 2\nu/l$, $0 < m < l/2 - \nu$, $0 < \tilde{m} < \min\{(m + 1)/\nu, 2\}$, $\tilde{m} > 1$, $l' := \max\{(3 + 2\tilde{m} + 2l/\nu)(l + \nu)/(l - 2\nu) - 2l(l - \nu)/(l - 2\nu), 2l(l + 3\nu)/(\nu(l - 2\nu))\}$ and for $j \geq 0$, let

$$\sigma_0 := C_2^{-1} \sigma, \quad s_0 := 4\sigma_0, \quad r_0 := \alpha\sigma_0^\nu/(2K), \quad \lambda := \log \rho^{-1},$$

$$\xi := (\theta^{1/\nu}\lambda)^{-1}, \quad \sigma_j := \sigma_0 c_j, \quad s_j := 4\sigma_j s_j, \quad \sigma_j := (\sigma_j/\sigma_0)^m = \xi^{m_j}, \quad k_j := 6\sigma_j^{-1} \lambda,$$

$$r_j := r_0 \xi^{m_j}, \quad r_{j+1} := \frac{r_0 \xi^{m_j}}{64d\theta^2}, \quad \tilde{r}_{j+1} := \frac{r_0 \xi^{m_j}}{211d\theta^2 s^{(\nu + m)}/j}, \quad \xi_0 := s_0, \quad \xi_{j+1} := \sigma_j,$$

$$\mathcal{S}_j := \{y \in \mathbb{C}^d : |\text{Im} \,(y)| < \xi_j\}, \quad \mathcal{O}_j := \{(y, x) \in \mathbb{C}^d \times (\mathbb{C}^d / \mathbb{T}^d) : |\text{Im} \,(y, x)| < \xi_j\},$$

$$\|\cdot\|_{\xi_j} := \sup_{\mathcal{O}_j} |\cdot|.$$

First of all, we extend $K$ and $P$ to the whole phase space $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d$.

5.3.1 Extension of $K$ and $P$ to the whole space

First of all, there exist $C_0 = C_0(d, l) > 0$ and a Cut-off $\chi \in C(\mathbb{C}^d) \cap C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, $\text{supp} \, \chi \subset D_{\alpha_\ast}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\chi \equiv 1$ on $D_{\alpha_\ast/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|k|_1 \leq l$,

$$\|\partial^k_y \chi\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \leq C_0 \alpha_\ast^{-|k|_1}.$$

$^9$see for instance [Kou19, Lemma 2.2.1]
By the Fàa Di Bruno’s Formula[CS96], there exists $C_1 = C_1(d, l) > 0$ such that for any $f \in C^l(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d)$, we have

$$\|\chi \circ \pi_1 \cdot f\|_{C^l} \leq C_1 \alpha_*^{-l} \|f\|_{C^l}. \quad (22)$$

Let $\tilde{K} \in C^l(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that\(^{10}\) $\|T\|_{\mathcal{D}} \|\tilde{K} - K\|_{C^l(\mathcal{D})} \leq C_1^{-1} \alpha_*^l / 4$. Thus, $\tilde{K}_{yy} = K_{yy}(\mathbb{1}_d + T(\tilde{K}_{yy} - K_{yy}))$ is invertible on $\mathcal{D}$ and $\|(\tilde{K}_{yy})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 2\|T\|_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then, $K := \tilde{K} + \chi \cdot (K - \tilde{K}) \in C^l(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d)$, $K \equiv K$ on $D_{\alpha_*/2}(\mathcal{D}')$ and

$$\|K\|_{C^l} \overset{(22)}{\leq} \|K\|_{C^l} + C_1 \alpha_*^{-l} \|\tilde{K} - K\|_{C^l} \leq \|K\|_{C^l} + \|T\|_{C^l}/4 < 2\|K\|_{C^l}$$

and

$$\|(\tilde{K}_{yy})^{-2}(\chi \cdot (K - \tilde{K}))\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq \|(\tilde{K}_{yy})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \cdot C_1 \alpha_*^{-l} \|\tilde{K} - K\|_{C^l} \leq 1/2.$$  

Therefore, $K_{yy}$ is in particular invertible and $\|(K_{yy})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 2\|(\tilde{K}_{yy})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 4\|T\|_{\mathcal{D}}$. Similarly, one extends $P$ to a function $P \in C^l(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d)$ such that $K \equiv K$ on $D_{\alpha_*/2}(\mathcal{D}')$ and $\|P\|_{C^l} \leq 2\|P\|_{C^l}$. Now, letting $H := K + P$, we have $H|_{D_{\alpha_*/2}(\mathcal{D}')} = H$. Hence, it does not make any difference for us replacing $H$ by $H$ since the invariant tori we shall construct live precisely in $D_{\alpha_*/2}(\mathcal{D}')$ as $r_0 < \alpha_* / 2$.

Let $\mathcal{K}_j$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_j$) be the real–analytic approximation $K_{\xi_j}$ (resp. $P_{\xi_j}$) of $K$ (resp. $P$) defined on $\mathcal{O}_j$ given by Lemma 7. Then, the following holds.

**Lemma 9** Set $\mathcal{D}_0 := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \partial_y \mathcal{K}_0(y) \in \partial_y K(\mathcal{D}_j)\}$. Assume that

$$\alpha \leq C_3^{-1} \mathcal{K} \quad \text{and} \quad C_3 \in K^{\frac{1}{1+2\alpha}} \mathcal{P}^{\frac{-2}{1-2\alpha}} \leq 1. \quad (23)$$

Then the following assertions ($\mathcal{P}_j$), $j \geq 1$, hold. There exist a sequence of sets $\mathcal{D}_j$, a sequence of diffeomorphisms $G_j : D_{r_j}(\mathcal{D}_{j-1}) \to G_j(D_{r_j}(\mathcal{D}_{j-1}))$, a sequence of real–analytic symplectic transformations

$$\phi_j : D_{r_j, s_j}(\mathcal{D}_j) \to D_{\sigma_j, \sigma_{j-1}}(\mathcal{D}_{j-1}), \quad (24)$$

such that, setting $H_j := K_{j-1} + \mathcal{P}_{j-1}$, we have

$$G_j(\mathcal{D}_{j-1}) = \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}_{r_j}, \quad G_j = (\partial_y K_{j-1})^{-1} \circ \partial_y K_{j-1},$$

$$\det \partial_y^2 K_{j-1} \neq 0, \quad T_j(y) := \partial_y^2 K_{j-1}(y)^{-1}, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{D}_j,$$

$$H_j := H_{j-1} \circ \phi_j =: K_j + P_j \quad \text{on} \quad D_{r_j, s_j}(\mathcal{D}_j), \quad (25)$$

\(^{10}\)Observe that $C_1^{-1} \alpha_*^l / 4 < 1/4.$
where \( \phi^j := \phi_1 \circ \phi_2 \circ \cdots \circ \phi_j \) and \( K_0 := K_0 \).

Moreover,

\[
\|G_j - \text{id}\|_{\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_{j-1}} \leq \tilde{\tau}_j \xi^{(2^{\tilde{m} - 1})^j \xi^{m(j-1)}} , \quad \|\nabla \phi G_j - \text{id}\|_{\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_{j-1}} \leq 4T \xi^{(2^{\tilde{m} - 1})^j \xi^{m(j-1)}} , \quad (27)
\]

\[
\|\nabla^2 \phi G_j\|_{\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_{j-1}} < 2K , \quad \|T_j\|_{\mathcal{D}_j} < 2T , \quad T_j := (\nabla^2 \phi G_j)^{-1} , \quad (28)
\]

\[
\|P_j\|_{\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_{j-2}, \mathcal{D}_{j-1}} \leq C_1 K \xi_{j-1} , \quad (29)
\]

\[
\max \left\{ \|W_j(\phi_j - \text{id})\|_{\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_{j-1}} , \|\pi_2 \partial_x (\phi_j - \text{id})\|_{\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_{j-1}} \right\} \leq \xi^{(2^{\tilde{m} - 1})^j \xi^{m(j-1)}} , \quad (30)
\]

where \( W_j := \text{diag} \left( r_{j-1}^{-1} \text{1}_d , \sigma_{j-1}^{-1} \text{1}_d \right) \).

**Remark 10** Observe that

\[
s_j + \sigma_{j-1}/3 = (3\xi + 1)\sigma_{j-1}/3 < 2\sigma_{j-1}/3 < \sigma_{j-1}/2 , \quad (31)
\]

\[
2r_j + r_{j-1}\sigma_{j-1}/3 < r_{j-1}/4 + r_{j-1}/6 < r_{j-1}/2 , \quad (32)
\]

\[
2r_j + r_{j-1}\sigma_{j-1}/3 < \sigma_0^j \xi^j + \sigma_{j-1}/3 = \sigma_0^j \sigma_j + \sigma_{j-1}/3 < \sigma_j , \quad (33)
\]

which combined with (18) imply

\[
\phi_j(D_{r_j, s_j}(\mathcal{D}_j)) \subset D_{\sigma_{j-1}/2, s_j/(2^{j})}(\mathcal{D}_j-1) \cap D_{r_{j-1}/2, s_{j-1}/2}(\mathcal{D}_j-1) , \quad (34)
\]

and, in particular, (24).

**Proof**

**Step 1:** We check (\( \mathcal{P}_1 \)). We have

\[
\|P_0\|_{\mathcal{D}_0} \leq \|P_0\|_{\xi_0} \overset{(21)}{\leq} C_1 \|P\|_{C^0} . \quad (35)
\]

From

\[
\nabla^2 \phi G_0 = \nabla^2 \phi (\text{1}_d + T \nabla^2 \phi (K_0 - K))
\]

and

\[
\|T \nabla^2 \phi (K_0 - K)\|_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_0} \leq \sup_{x_0} \|T \nabla^2 \phi (K_0 - K)\| \overset{(21)}{\leq} C_1 \theta s_0^{-2} \leq \frac{1}{2} ,
\]

it follows that \( \nabla^2 \phi G_0 \) is invertible, \( \|\nabla^2 \phi G_0\|_{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_0} \leq 2K \) and

\[
\| (\nabla^2 \phi G_0)^{-1} - I \|_{\mathcal{D}_0} \leq 2TC_1 \theta s_0^{-2} < T , \quad \| (\nabla^2 \phi G_0)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}_0} < 2T . \quad (36)
\]

Thus, thanks to (23), we can apply Lemma 6 and get (\( \mathcal{P}_1 \)).
Step 2: We assume \( (\mathcal{P}_j) \) holds for some \( j \geq 1 \) and check \( (\mathcal{P}_{j+1}) \). Write

\[
\mathcal{H}_j := K_j + \mathcal{P}_j = \mathcal{H}_{j-1} + (K_j - K_{j-1}) + (\mathcal{P}_j - \mathcal{P}_{j-1}).
\]

By the inductive assumption and (34), we have

\[
\mathcal{H}_j \circ \phi^j = \mathcal{H}_{j-1} \circ \phi^j + (K_j - K_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j + (\mathcal{P}_j - \mathcal{P}_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j
\]

\[
= K_j + \mathcal{P}_j + (K_j - K_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j + (\mathcal{P}_j - \mathcal{P}_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j
\]

where \( K_j := K_j \) and \( \mathcal{P}_j := \mathcal{P}_j + (K_j - K_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j + (\mathcal{P}_j - \mathcal{P}_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j \), with

\[
\| \partial_y^2 \mathcal{K}^j \|_{r_j, \mathcal{S}_j} < 2K, \quad \| (\partial_y^2 \mathcal{K}^j)^{-1} \|_{\mathcal{S}_j} < 2T
\]

(37) and

\[
\| \mathcal{P}^j \|_{r_j, s_j, \mathcal{S}_j} \leq \| \mathcal{P}_j \|_{r_j, s_j, \mathcal{S}_j} + \| (K_j - K_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j \|_{r_j, s_j, \mathcal{S}_j} + \| (\mathcal{P}_j - \mathcal{P}_{j-1}) \circ \phi^j \|_{r_j, s_j, \mathcal{S}_j}
\]

(24)+(29)+(34)

\[
\leq C_1 K \xi^j_{j-1} + \| K_j - K_{j-1} \| \xi_j + \| \mathcal{P}_j - \mathcal{P}_{j-1} \| \xi_j
\]

(21)

\[
\leq C_1 K \xi^j_{j-1} + C_1 K \xi^j_{j-1} + C_1 \epsilon \xi^j_{j-1}
\]

(23)

\[
\leq 3C_1 K \xi^j_{j-1}.
\]

(38)

Now, in order to apply Lemma 6 to \( \mathcal{H}_j \circ \phi^j = K_j + \mathcal{P}_j \), we need only to check (15) and (17) as

\[
\partial_y^2 \mathcal{K}^j (\mathcal{D}_j) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \partial_y^2 \mathcal{K}_j (G_j (\mathcal{D}_{j-1})) = \partial_y^2 \mathcal{K}_{j-1} (\mathcal{D}_{j-1}) = \cdots = \partial_y^2 \mathcal{K}_0 (\mathcal{D}_0) \subset \Delta^\alpha.
\]

Indeed, we have,

\[
r_j = r_0 \epsilon^{\omega_j} \leq \frac{\alpha}{2K} \sigma_j^{\omega_j} \|
\]

(37)

\[
\sigma_1^{-\nu} \| \mathcal{P}^1 \|_{r_1, s_1, \mathcal{S}_1} \rho^{-1} \leq C_2 \sigma_0^{l-2\nu} \frac{K^2}{\alpha^2} \lambda^{2(\nu + m)} (23)
\]

\[
3C_0 \theta T \| \mathcal{P}^1 \|_{r_1, s_1, \mathcal{S}_1} \leq C_2 \sigma_0^{l-2\nu} \frac{\theta^{6+m} K^2}{\alpha^2} \lambda^{2(\nu + m)} (23)
\]

\[
\xi^{(2\nu-1)\nu},
\]

and, for \( j \geq 2 \),

\[
\sigma_j^{-\nu} \| \mathcal{P}^j \|_{r_j, s_j, \mathcal{S}_j} \rho^{-1} \leq C_2 \sigma_0^{l-2\nu} \frac{K}{\epsilon^2} \lambda^{(l-2\nu)j-2l} \leq C_2 \sigma_0^{l-2\nu} \xi^{-2l} (23)
\]

\[
1.
\]
Now, observe that
\[
C_1 \rho \cdot 3C_1 K_j \xi_{j-1}^l = C_1 K_j \xi_{j-1}^l \cdot C_1 \rho (\theta^{1/\nu} \log \rho^{-1})^l \leq C_1 K_j \xi_{j-1}^l \cdot C_1 \theta^{l/\nu} \rho^{l/2} \leq C_1 K_j.
\]

Therefore, applying Lemma 6, we get \( (\mathcal{P}_{j+1}) \). □

### 5.3.2 Convergence of the procedure

Now, we are in position to prove the convergence of the KAM scheme.

**Lemma 11** Under the assumptions and notation in Lemma 9, the following holds.

(i) the sequence \( G^j := G_j \circ G_{j-1} \circ \cdots \circ G_2 \circ G_1 \) converges uniformly on \( \mathcal{D}_0 \) to a lioeomorphism \( G_* : \mathcal{D}_0 \to \mathcal{D}_* := G_*(\mathcal{D}_0) \subset \mathcal{D} \) and \( G_* \in C^1_{W}(\mathcal{D}_0) \).

(ii) \( P_j \) converges uniformly to 0 on \( \mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}_d \) in the \( C^2_{W} \) topology.

(iii) \( \phi^j \) converges uniformly on \( \mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d \) to a symplectic transformation
\[
\phi_* : \mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d \longrightarrow \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{T}^d;
\]
with \( \phi_* \in C^m_{W}(\mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d) \) and \( \sup_{\mathcal{D}_*} |W_1(\phi_* - \text{id})| \leq 8 \xi^{(2m-1)\nu} \).

(iv) \( K_j \) converges uniformly on \( \mathcal{D}_* \) to a function \( K_* \in C^2_{W}(\mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d) \), with
\[
\partial_y \partial_y K_* \circ G_* = \partial_y \partial_y K_0, \quad \text{on} \mathcal{D}_0, \quad (39)
\]
\[
H \circ \phi_*(y_*, x) = K_*(y_*), \quad \forall (y_*, x) \in \mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d. \quad (40)
\]

**Proof** The proof is essentially the same as for [Kou19, Lemma 6.3.3, page. 167], which, in turn, is based on [Kou19, Lemma E.2, page. 207]. For the reader’s convenience, we give the proof for \( \phi^j \); the proofs for \( G^j \) and \( P_j \) are similar. First of all, observe that, for any \( j \geq 1 \),
\[
\|W_j W_{j+1}^{-1}\| = \xi \quad \text{and} \quad \|W_j(D\phi_j - 1_{2d})W_j^{-1}\|_{r_j/2, s_j/2, \mathcal{D}_j} \leq 2 \xi^{2(\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \xi^{m(j-1)} \quad (30). \]

\[
\|W_j W_{j+1}^{-1}\| = \xi \quad \text{and} \quad \|W_j(D\phi_j - 1_{2d})W_j^{-1}\|_{r_j/2, s_j/2, \mathcal{D}_j} \leq 2 \xi^{2(\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \xi^{m(j-1)} \quad (41).
\]
Thus, observing $W_1 D\phi^j W_j^{-1} = (W_1 D\phi_1 W_1^{-1})(W_1 W_2^{-1}) \cdots (W_j D\phi_j W_j^{-1})$, we then get from (41):

$$
\|W_1 D\phi^j W_j^{-1}\|_{r_j/s_j/2,2} \leq \xi^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^j (1 + 2 \xi^{2(m-1)\nu} \xi^{m(i-1)})
$$

$$
\leq \xi^{-1} \exp(4\xi^{2(m-1)\nu}) \lesssim 2\xi^{-1}, \quad (42)
$$

so that, writing $\phi^j - \phi^{j-1} = \phi^{j-1} \circ \phi_j - \phi^{j-1}$, it follows, for any $j \geq 2$,

$$
\|W_1 (\phi^j - \phi^{j-1})\|_{r_j/s_j,2} \leq \|W_1 D\phi^{j-1} W_{j-1}^{-1}\|_{r_{j-1}/s_{j-1}/2,2} \|W_{j-1} W_j^{-1}\| \|W_j (\phi_j - \text{id})\|_{r_j,s_j,2} \lesssim 4\xi^{2(m-1)\nu} \xi^{(m+1)(j-1)},
$$

so that

$$
\sum_{j \geq 2} \|W_1 (\phi^j - \phi^{j-1})\|_{r_j/s_j,2} \lesssim 4\xi^{2(m-1)\nu} \xi^{(m+1-\tilde{m}\nu)(j-1)} < \infty,
$$

from which we conclude that $\phi_* \in C^\tilde{m}_{\text{tv}}(\mathcal{D}_* \times \mathbb{T}^d)$, and, in particular,

$$
\sup_{\mathcal{D}_*} |W_1 (\phi_* - \text{id})| \lesssim 8\xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu}.
$$

Now, by Lemma 8, it follows that the sequence $\mathcal{H}_j$ converges in the $C^\ell$-topology uniformly to $H$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{T}^d$. Thus, passing letting $j \to \infty$ in $K_j = \mathcal{H}_j \circ \phi^j - P_j$ yields (39) and (40).

\[ \blacksquare \]

5.4 Completion of the Proof of Theorem 4

Choose $\tilde{m} := 3/2$, $\beta := \tilde{m}$. Then, one checks easily that (2) implies (23) and, therefore, Lemmata 9 and 11 hold. Thus, the map $G_0 := (\partial_y K_0|_{B_{\tilde{r}_1/4}(\mathcal{D}_0)})^{-1} \circ \partial_y K$ is well-defined on $B_{\tilde{r}_0}(\mathcal{D}_0)$ and satisfies

$$
G_0(B_{\tilde{r}_0}(\mathcal{D}_0)) \subset B_{\tilde{r}_1/2}(\mathcal{D}_0), \quad \max \{\|G_0 - \text{id}\|_{\tilde{r}_0,2}, \|\partial_y G_0 - 1_d\|_{\tilde{r}_0,2}\} \lesssim 2C_1 \theta^{\ell-1}, \quad (43)
$$

where $K_0 := \mathcal{K}_0$ and $\tilde{r}_0 := \tilde{r}_1/(16d\theta)$. Indeed, fix $y_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0$ and consider the auxiliary function $f : B_{\tilde{r}_1/4}(y_0) \times B_{\tilde{r}_0}(y_0) \ni (y,z) \mapsto \partial_y K_0(y) - \partial_y K(z).$ Then, for any $(y,z) \in B_{\tilde{r}_1/4}(y_0) \times B_{\tilde{r}_0}(y_0)$

$$
\|1_d - T(y_0)f(y,z)\| \leq \|T(y_0)\| \|\partial_y^2(K_0 - K)(y_0) + (\partial_y^2 K_0(y) - \partial_y^2 K_0(y_0))\| \lesssim T(C_1 K\ell^{-2} + 2dC_1 K\ell^{-1}\tilde{r}_1/4) \lesssim 2C_1(\theta\sigma_0^{\ell-2} + c\sigma_0^{-\alpha}) \lesssim \frac{1}{2},
$$

\[ (21) \]
and

\[ 2\|T(y_0)\|f(y_0, z)\| \leq 2T|\partial_y(K_0 - K)(y_0) + (\partial_y K(y_0) - \partial_y K(z))| \]

\[ \leq 2T(C_1K_0^{l-1} + dK_0) < 4d\theta = \tilde{r}_1/4. \]

Thus, by Lemma A.2, \( G_0 = (\partial_y K_0)^{-1} \circ \partial_y K \) is well-defined\(^{11} \) on \( B_{\tilde{r}_0}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) \) and the first part of (43) holds and we now prove its second part. In fact, for any \( y \in B_{\tilde{r}_0}(y_0) \),

\[ |G_0(y) - y| = |(\partial_y K_0)^{-1}(K_y(y)) - (\partial_y K_0)^{-1}(K_y(y) + \partial_y (K_0 - K)(y))| \]

\[ \leq \|(\partial^2_y K_0)^{-1}\|r_{1/4, 2\alpha}\|\partial_y (K_0 - K)\|_{C_i} \leq 2TC_1K_0^{l-1}. \]

Moreover

\[ \|\partial_y G_0 - 1_d\|_{r_0, 2\alpha} = \|(1_d + T\partial^2_y(K_0 - K))^{-1} - 1_d\|_{r_0, 2\alpha} \leq 2T\|\partial^2_y(K_0 - K)\|_{r_0, 2\alpha} \leq 2C_1\theta \xi_0^{l-2}, \]

which completes the proof of (43).

Now, let\(^{12} \) \( G^* := G_0 \circ G_0 \). Thus, \( \mathcal{D}_0 \cap B_{\tilde{r}_0/4}(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) = G_0(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) \) and, therefore, denoting \( G^*(\mathcal{D}_\alpha) \) again by \( \mathcal{D}_* \), the relations (3) and (4) then follows. Next, we estimate \( \phi_* \). We have, for any \( i \geq 2 \),

\[ \|W_1(\phi^i - \text{id})\|_{r_{i, s_i, \mathcal{D}_i}} \leq \|W_1(\phi^{i-1} \circ \phi_i - \phi_i)\|_{r_{i, s_i, \mathcal{D}_i}} + \|W_1(\phi_i - \text{id})\|_{r_{i, s_i, \mathcal{D}_i}} \]

\[ \leq \|W_1(\phi^{i-1} - \text{id})\|_{r_{i-1, s_{i-1}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1}}} + \left( \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \|W_jW_{j+1}^{-1}\| \right) \|W_i(\phi_i - \text{id})\|_{r_{i, s_i, \mathcal{D}_i}} \]

\[ \leq \|W_1(\phi^{i-1} - \text{id})\|_{r_{i-1, s_{i-1}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1}}} + \xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \xi^{(m+1)(i-1)}, \]

when iterated, yields

\[ \|W_1(\phi^i - \text{id})\|_{r_{i, s_i, \mathcal{D}_i}} \leq \xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \sum_{j \geq 1} \xi^{(m+1)(j-1)} \leq 2\xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu}. \]

Therefore, taking the limit over \( i \) completes the proof of (6).

Next, we prove (5). Set \( G^0 := G_0, G^{-1} := \text{id} \) and \( \mathcal{D}_{-1} := \mathcal{D}_\alpha \). Then, for any \( j \geq 0 \),

\[ \|G^j - \text{id}\|_{\mathcal{D}_0} = \sum_{i \geq 0} \|G^{i+1} - G^i\|_{\mathcal{D}_0} \leq \sum_{i \geq 0} \|G_{i+1} \circ G^i - G^i\|_{\mathcal{D}_0} \]

\[ = \sum_{i \geq 0} \|G_{i+1} - \text{id}\|_{\mathcal{D}_i} \leq \sum_{i \geq 0} \|G_{i+1} - \text{id}\|_{r_{i+1, \mathcal{D}_i}} \]

\[ \leq 2^{2l-1}C_1\theta \xi_0^{l-1} + 2\tilde{r}_1 \xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \leq \alpha \sigma_0^\tau / \theta^2, \]

\(^{11}\)In fact, the graph of \( G_0 \) is precisely the set of solutions of the equation \( f(y, z) = 0 \).

\(^{12}\)Observe that \( G^* \) is well-defined by (43).
then, letting \( j \to \infty \) yields the first part of (5).

Next, we show that \( \|G^* - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} < 1 \), which will imply that\(^{13} G^*: \mathcal{D}_0 \to \mathcal{D}_* \) is a lipeomorphism. Indeed, for any \( j \geq 0 \), we have

\[
\|G^j - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1 = \|(G_j - \text{id}) \circ G^{j-1} + (G^{j-1} - \text{id})\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1
\leq \|G_j - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} \|G^{j-1}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + \|G^{j-1} - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1
\leq \|G_j - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} \|G^{j-1} - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1 + \|G^{j-1} - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1
\leq (\|\partial_x G_j - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1)(\|G^{j-1} - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1)
\]

which iterated and using Cauchy’s estimate leads to\(^{14} \)

\[
\|G^j - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} \leq -1 + \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} (\|\partial_x G_j - \text{id}\|_{L, \mathcal{D}_0} + 1)
\leq -1 + \exp \left( 2^{2l-3} C_1 \theta \sigma_0^{l-2} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \xi^m(i-1) \right)
\leq -1 + \exp \left( 2^{2l-3} C_1 \theta \sigma_0^{l-2} + 2\xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \right) < 1/2.
\]

Thus, letting \( j \to \infty \), we get that \( G^* \) is Lipschitz continuous and (5) is proven. Let us now prove the bound on \( \pi_2(\partial_x \phi_* - \text{id}) \) in (6). For, set

\[
\tilde{u}_j := \partial_x \pi_2(\phi_j - \text{id}), \quad U^j := \partial_x \pi_2 \phi^j = (\text{id} + \tilde{u}_1) \circ \cdots \circ (\text{id} + \tilde{u}_j).
\]

Then, for any \( j \geq 1 \), we have

\[
\|U^j\|_{s_j} \leq (1 + \|\tilde{u}_1\|_{s_1}) \cdots (1 + \|\tilde{u}_j\|_{s_j}) \leq \exp \left( \sum_{k \geq 1} \xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \xi^m(j-1) \right) \leq \exp(2\xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu}) < e,
\]

so that

\[
\|U^j+1 - U^j\|_{s_*} = \|U^j(\text{id} + \tilde{u}_{j+1}) - U^j\|_{s_*} \leq \|U^j\|_{s_{j+1}} \|\tilde{u}_{j+1}\|_{s_{j+1}} \leq e\xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \xi^m(j-1),
\]

which implies

\[
\|U^j - \text{id}\|_{s_*} \leq 2 e \xi^{(2\tilde{m}-1)\nu} \leq \frac{1}{2}
\]

and then letting \( j \to \infty \), we get the estimate on \( \pi_2(\partial_x \phi_* - \text{id}) \). Finally, observe that, thanks to [Kou19, Theorem 6.2.2, page 148] (see also [CK19]), (5) yields (8) \[\square\]

\(^{13}\)See [Zeh10, Proposition II.2].

\(^{14}\)Recall that \( e^x - 1 \leq xe^x, \forall x \geq 0 \).
Appendix

A  Reminders

A.1 Classical estimates (Cauchy, Fourier, Cohomological Equation)

Lemma A.1 ([CC95]) 1. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $r, s > 0, y_0 \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and $f$ a real-analytic function $D_{r,s}(y_0)$ with
\[
\|f\|_{r,s} := \sup_{D_{r,s}(y_0)} |f|.
\]

Then,
(i) For any multi-index $(l, k) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|l| + |k| \leq p$ and for any $0 < r' < r$, $0 < s' < s$,\(^{15}\)
\[
\|\partial_y^l \partial_x^k f\|_{r', s'} \leq p! \|f\|_{r,s}(r - r')^{|l|}(s - s')^{|k|}.
\]
(ii) For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and any $y \in D_r(y_0)$
\[
|f_k(y)| \leq e^{-|k|s}\|f\|_{r,s}.
\]

2. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \Delta_d^\tau$ and $f \in A_{r,s}$ and $\langle f \rangle = 0$. Then, for any $0 < \sigma < s$, the system
\[
D_\omega g = f, \quad \langle g \rangle = 0
\]
has a unique solution in $A_{r,s-\sigma}$ such that for any multi-index $k \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|k| = l$
\[
\|\partial_x^k g\|_{r,s-\sigma} \leq C_l \|f\|_{s-\sigma}^{-\tau - (r+l)},
\]
where $C_l := 2^{d+1-\tau - l} \sqrt{\Gamma(2(l + \tau + 1))}$ (see [Rüs75, CC95]).

A.2 Implicit and Inverse function Theorems

Firstly, we recall the classical implicit function Theorem, in a quantitative framework.

Lemma A.2 [Chi12] Let $r, s > 0, n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $(y_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m$ and\(^{16}\)
\[
F : (y, x) \in D^n_r(y_0) \times D^m_s(x_0) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+m} \rightarrow F(y, x) \in \mathbb{C}^n
\]

\(^{15}\)As usual, $\partial_x^l := \frac{\partial^{l_1}}{\partial y_1^{l_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{l_d}}{\partial y_d^{l_d}}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, l \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$

\(^{16}\)Here, $D^n_r(z_0)$ denotes the ball in $\mathbb{C}^n$ centered at $z_0$ and with radius $r.$
be continuous with continuous Jacobian matrix \( F_y \). Assume that \( F_y(y_0, x_0) \) is invertible with inverse \( T := F_y(y_0, x_0)^{-1} \) such that

\[
\sup_{D^n_r(y_0) \times D^n_s(x_0)} \| 1_n - TF_y(y, x) \| \leq c < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{D^n_r(y_0)} | F(y_0, \cdot) | \leq \frac{(1 - c)r}{\| T \|}. \tag{A.1}
\]

Then, there exists a unique continuous function \( g : D^m_s(x_0) \to D^n_r(y_0) \) such that the following are equivalent

(i) \((y, x) \in D^n_r(y_0) \times D^m_s(x_0) \) and \( F(y, x) = 0 \);

(ii) \( x \in D^m_s(x_0) \) and \( y = g(x) \).

Moreover, \( g \) satisfies

\[
\sup_{D^m_s(x_0)} | g - y_0 | \leq \frac{\| T \|}{1 - c} \sup_{D^m_s(x_0)} | F(y_0, \cdot) |. \tag{A.2}
\]

\section{Outline of the proof of Lemma 6}

Here, we aim to sketch the proof of the general KAM step. We refer the reader to \cite{CK19, Kou19} for more details.

\textbf{Step 1: Construction of the Arnold’s transformation} The symplectomorphism \( \phi' \) is generated by the real–analytic map \( y' \cdot x + \varepsilon g(y', x) \) i.e.

\[
\phi' : \begin{cases}
  y = y' + \varepsilon g_y(y', x) \\
  x' = x + \varepsilon g_x(y', x),
\end{cases} \tag{B.1}
\]

in such a way that

\[
\begin{cases}
  H' := H \circ \phi' = K' + \varepsilon^2 P', & \text{on } D_{r_1, s_1}(\mathcal{D}_x'), \\
  \det \tilde{\partial}_y^2 K'(y') \neq 0, & \forall y' \in \mathcal{D}_x', \\
  \tilde{\partial}_y K'(\mathcal{D}_x') = \tilde{\partial}_y K(\mathcal{D}_x'),
\end{cases} \tag{B.2}
\]

with

\[
\begin{aligned}
P'(y', x') := P_+(y', \varphi(y', x')), & \quad P_+ := P^{(1)} + P^{(2)} + P^{(3)}, \quad P^{(3)} := \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(P - \hat{P}), \\
P^{(1)} := \int_0^1 (1 - t)Ky_y(\varepsilon t g_x) \cdot g_x \cdot g_x dt, & \quad P^{(2)} := \int_0^1 P_y(y' + \varepsilon t g_x, x) \cdot g_x dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}
\]
where \( \varphi(y', \cdot) \) is the inverse of the map \( x' \mapsto x + \varepsilon g_y(y', x) \) and \( \hat{P} \) is the approximation of \( P \) given in [Rüsch01, Theorem 7.2].\(^{17}\) Moreover,

\[
K_y(y') \cdot n \neq 0, \quad \forall 0 < |n|_1 \leq \kappa, \quad \forall y' \in D_{r_1}(\mathcal{D}^1_t) \quad (\subset D_{r}(\mathcal{D}^1_t)),
\]

and the generating function \( g \) is given by

\[
g(y', x) := \sum_{0 < |n|_1 \leq \kappa} \left( -\hat{P}_n(y') \cdot n \right) e^{in \cdot x}.
\]

**Step 2** Now, we provide the construction performed in **Step 1** with quantitative estimate. First of all, notice that \(^{18}\)

\[
\|P - \hat{P}\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t} \leq 2\rho M, \quad \|
\]

\[
\|P\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t} + \|P - \hat{P}\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t} \leq (1 + 2\rho)M.
\]

Observe also that for any \( y \in \mathcal{D}_t, 0 < |n|_1 \leq \kappa \) and \( y' \in D_{r}(y), \)

\[
|K_y(y') \cdot n| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|n|_1^\tau}.
\]

Now, using Lemma A.1–2. and (B.6), we get

\[
\|g\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t} \leq C_0 \frac{(1 + 2\rho)M}{\sigma^{\tau}}, \quad \|g_x\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t} \leq C_0 \frac{(1 + 2\rho)M}{\alpha \sigma^{\tau + 1}}, \quad \max \{\|g_y'^t\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t}, \|g_y'^t y\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t}, \|g_y'^t y y\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t}, \|g_y'^t y y y\|_{r, \mathcal{D}_t}\} \leq \Gamma,
\]

where

\[
\Gamma := 2C_0 \frac{(1 + 2\rho)M}{\alpha r} \sigma^{\tau}.
\]

we have

\[
\|\mathring{\partial}_y'K\|_{r/2, \mathcal{D}_t} \leq \frac{2M}{r}, \quad \|\mathring{\partial}_y'^t y K\|_{r/2, \mathcal{D}_t} \leq \frac{4M}{\rho^2} \leq \left(\frac{17}{3}\right) \kappa \sigma^\tau.
\]

Next, we construct \( \mathcal{D}_t' \) in (B.2). For, fix \( y \in \mathcal{D}_t \) and consider

\[
F: D_{r}(y) \times D_{r}(y) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^d
\]

\[
(y, z) \longmapsto K_y(y) + \varepsilon \mathring{K}_y'(y) - K_y(z).
\]

---

\(^{17}\)With the choices \( \beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_d = 1/2, T = \kappa \) and \( \delta = \rho \leq 1/4. \)

\(^{18}\)By definition of \( \hat{P} \), see [Rüsch01, Theorem 7.2].
Then, one checks easily that Lemma A.2 applies. Thus, we get that $F^{-1}(\{0\})$ is given by the graph of a real–analytic map $G_y: D_y(y) \to D_y(y)$. Afterwards, one checks that the pieces of the family $\{G_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{D}_2}$ matches, yielding therefore a global map $G$ on $D_y(\mathcal{D}_2)$ and that, in fact, $G$ is bi–real–analytic.\footnote{i.e. an invertible real–analytic map whose inverse is real–analytic as well.} Next, one shows that the expression $(K_y + \varepsilon \tilde{K}_y)^{-1} \circ K_y$ defines a map on $D_y(y)$ by means of the Inversion Function Lemma A.2. As a consequence, we get an explicit formula for $G$:

$$G = (K_y + \varepsilon \tilde{K}_y)^{-1} \circ K_y \quad \text{on} \quad D_y(y),$$

and $\mathcal{D}'_2 = G(\mathcal{D}_2)$. The reminder of the proof then goes exactly as in [CK19] (see also [Kou19]).

**Acknowledgments.** We are grateful to Prof. Luigi Chierchia for useful discussions. The work of this paper was mainly done while the author was visiting the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics in Trieste, Italy.

**References**


