ON THE FLOW MAP OF THE BENJAMIN-ONO EQUATION ON THE TORUS
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Abstract. We prove that for any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), the flow map \( S^t \) of the Benjamin-Ono equation on the torus continuously extends to the Sobolev space \( H^{-s}_r \) for any \( 0 < s < 1/2 \), but does not do so to \( H^{-s}_r \) for \( s > 1/2 \). Furthermore, we show that \( S^t \) is sequentially weakly continuous on \( H^{-s}_r \) for any \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \). Note that \(-1/2\) is the critical Sobolev exponent of the Benjamin-Ono equation.
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1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the Benjamin-Ono (BO) equation on the torus,
\[
\partial_t u = H \partial_x^2 u - \partial_x(u^2), \quad x \in \mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},
\]
where \( u \equiv u(t,x) \) is real valued and \( H \) denotes the Hilbert transform, defined for \( f = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(n)e^{inx} \), \( \hat{f}(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(x)e^{-inx}dx \), by
\[
Hf(x) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} -i \text{sign}(n) \hat{f}(n) e^{inx}
\]
with \( \text{sign}(\pm n) := \pm 1 \) for any \( n \geq 1 \), whereas \( \text{sign}(0) := 0 \). This pseudo-differential equation (ΨDE) in one space dimension has been introduced
by Benjamin [2] and Ono [15] to model long, one-way internal gravity waves in a two-layer fluid. It has been extensively studied, including the corresponding wellposedness problem, both on the real line and on the torus. In particular, the BO equation on the torus is globally in time well-posed on the space of \( L^2\)-integrable functions (cf. [12], [14]).

For an excellent survey, including the derivation of (1), we refer to the recent article by J.C. Saut [16].

On appropriate Sobolev spaces, the BO equation (1) can be written in Hamiltonian form

\[
\partial_t u = \partial_x (\nabla H(u)), \quad H(u) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left[ \frac{1}{2}(|\partial_x|^1/2 u)^2 - \frac{1}{3} u^3 \right] dx
\]

where \(|\partial_x|^{1/2}\) is the square root of the Fourier multiplier operator \(|\partial_x|\) given by

\[
|\partial_x|f(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |n| \hat{f}(n)e^{inx}.
\]

Note that the \( L^2\)-gradient \( \nabla H \) of \( H \) can be computed to be \(|\partial_x|u - u^2\) and that \( \partial_x \nabla H \) is the Hamiltonian vector field corresponding to the Gardner bracket, defined for any two functionals \( F, G : L^2 \to \mathbb{C} \) with sufficiently regular \( L^2\)-gradients by

\[
\{F, G\} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} (\partial_x \nabla F) \nabla G dx.
\]

In [4], it is shown that the BO equation admits global Birkhoff coordinates and hence is an integrable \( \Psi \)DE in the strongest possible sense. For what follows we need to state this result more precisely. This requires to introduce first some notation. Denote by \( L^2 \) the \( \mathbb{C}-\)Hilbert space \( L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C}) \) of \( L^2\)-integrable, complex valued functions with the standard inner product

\[
(2) \quad \langle f | g \rangle := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(x)g(x) dx
\]

and the corresponding norm \( \|f\| := \langle f | f \rangle^{1/2} \). Furthermore, we denote by \( L^2 \) the \( \mathbb{R}-\)Hilbert space \( L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}) \), consisting of elements \( u \in L^2 \) which are real valued and let

\[
L^2_{r,0} := \{u \in L^2 \mid \langle u|1 \rangle = 0\}.
\]

For any subset \( J \subset \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) and any \( s \in \mathbb{R} \), \( h^s(J) \equiv h^s(J, \mathbb{C}) \) denotes the weighted \( \ell^2\)-sequence space

\[
h^s(J) = \{(z_n)_{n \in J} \subset \mathbb{C} : \|(z_n)_{n \in J}\|_s < \infty\}
\]
where

\[ \| (z_n)_{n \in J} \| := \left( \sum_{n \in J} \langle n \rangle^{2s} |z_n|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \langle n \rangle := \max\{1, |n|\}. \]

By \( h^s(J, \mathbb{R}) \), we denote the real subspace of \( h^s(J, \mathbb{C}) \), consisting of real sequences \( (z_n)_{n \in J} \). In case where \( J = \mathbb{N} := \{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geq 1 \} \) we write \( h^s_n \) instead of \( h^s(\mathbb{N}) \). If \( s = 0 \), we also write \( L^2_n \) instead of \( h^0_n \).

In the sequel, we view \( h^s_n \) as the \( \mathbb{R} \)-Hilbert space \( h^s(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}) \oplus h^s(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}) \) by identifying a sequence \( (z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in h^s_n \) with the pair of sequences \( (\text{Re } z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (\text{Im } z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( h^s(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}) \oplus h^s(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}) \).

The following result was proved in [4, Theorem 1]:

**Theorem 1.** There exists a homeomorphism

\[ \Phi : L^2_{r,0} \to h^{1/2}_+, \ u \mapsto (\zeta_n(u))_{n \geq 1} \]

so that the following holds:

1. **(B1)** For any \( n \geq 1 \), \( \zeta_n : L^2_{r,0} \to \mathbb{C} \) is real analytic.
2. **(B2)** The Poisson brackets between the coordinate functions \( \zeta_n \) are well-defined and for any \( n, k \geq 1 \),
   \[
   \{ \zeta_n, \overline{\zeta_k} \} = -i \delta_{nk}, \quad \{ \zeta_n, \zeta_k \} = 0.
   \]

It implies that the functionals \( |\zeta_n|^2, n \geq 1 \), pairwise Poisson commute,

\[ \{ |\zeta_n|^2, |\zeta_k|^2 \} = 0, \quad \forall n, k \geq 1. \]

3. **(B3)** On its domain of definition, \( \mathcal{H} \circ \Phi^{-1} \) is a (real analytic) function, which only depends on the actions \( |\zeta_n|^2, n \geq 1 \). As a consequence, for any \( n \geq 1 \), \( |\zeta_n|^2 \) is an integral of \( \mathcal{H} \), \( \{ \mathcal{H} \circ \Phi^{-1}, |\zeta_n|^2 \} = 0 \).

The coordinates \( \zeta_n \), \( n \geq 1 \), are referred to as complex Birkhoff coordinates and the functionals \( |\zeta_n|^2 \), \( n \geq 1 \), as action variables.

**Remark 1.** (i) For any bounded subset \( B \) of \( L^2_{r,0} \), the image \( \Phi(B) \) by \( \Phi \) is bounded in \( h^{1/2}_+ \). This is a direct consequence of the trace formula, saying that for any \( u \in L^2_{r,0} \) (cf. [4, Proposition 3.1]),

\[ \| u \|^2 = 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n |\zeta_n|^2. \]

(ii) When restricted to submanifolds of finite gap potentials (cf. [4, Definition 2.2]), the map \( \Phi \) is a canonical, real analytic diffeomorphism onto corresponding Euclidean spaces – see [4, Theorem 3] for details.

Theorem 1 can be used to solve the initial value problem of (1) in \( L^2_{r,0} \). Indeed, when expressed in the Birkhoff coordinates \( \zeta = (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \), equation (1) reads

\[ \partial_t \zeta_n = \{ \mathcal{H} \circ \Phi^{-1}, \zeta_n \} = i \omega_n \zeta_n, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \]

where \( \omega_n, n \geq 1 \), are the BO frequencies,

\[ \omega_n = \partial_{|\zeta_n|^2} \mathcal{H} \circ \Phi^{-1}. \]
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Since the frequencies only depend on the actions $|\zeta_k|^2$, $k \geq 1$, they are conserved and hence (5) can be solved by quadrature,

$$\zeta_n(t) = \zeta_n(0) e^{it\omega_n(\zeta(0))}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad n \geq 1.$$  

By [4, Proposition 8.1]), $H_B := H \circ \Phi^{-1}$ can be computed as

$$H_B(\zeta) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^2 |\zeta_k|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{p=k}^{\infty} |\zeta_p|^2 \right)^2,$$

implying that $\omega_n$ is given by

$$\omega_n(\zeta) = n^2 - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \min(n, k) |\zeta_k|^2, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$  

Remarkably, for any $n \geq 1$, $\omega_n$ depends linearly on the actions $|\zeta_k|^2$, $k \geq 1$. Furthermore, while the Hamiltonian $H_B$ is defined on $h_1^+$, the frequencies $\omega_n$, $n \geq 1$, given by (7) for $\zeta \in h_1^+$, extend to bounded functionals on $\ell^2_r$,

$$\omega_n : \ell^2_r \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \zeta = (\zeta_k)_{k \geq 1} \mapsto \omega_n(\zeta).$$

It then follows that the initial value problem of the integrable system with phase space $h_1^+$, endowed with the standard Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$, and Hamiltonian $H_B$ can be solved on the extended phase space $h_1^{1/2}$.

The corresponding flow map,

$$S^t_B : h_1^{1/2} \to h_1^{1/2}, \quad \zeta = (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \mapsto (e^{it\omega_n(\zeta)} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}$$

is continuous. By Theorem 1, $\Phi : L^2_{r,0} \to h_1^{1/2}$ and its inverse $\Phi^{-1} : h_1^{1/2} \to L^2_{r,0}$ are continuous maps. It then follows that the flow map of the Benjamin-Ono equation on $L^2_{r,0}$, defined for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$S^t = \Phi^{-1} S^t_B \Phi : L^2_{r,0} \to L^2_{r,0}, \quad u \mapsto u(t) := S^t(u)$$

is continuous as well. The map $t \mapsto u(t)$ can be approximated in $L^2_{r,0}$ by classical solutions of equation (1) (cf. Remark 1(ii)). Hence $t \mapsto u(t)$ coincides with the solution, obtained by Molinet in [12] (cf. also [14]). In [4], we deduce from Theorem 1 that all these solutions are almost periodic in time (cf. [4, Theorem 2]):

**Theorem 2.** For every initial data $u(0)$ in $L^2_{r,0}$, the solution

$$t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto u(t) \in L^2_{r,0}$$

is almost periodic. Its orbit is relatively compact in $L^2_{r,0}$.

**Remark 2.** Since the average is conserved by (1), the results of Theorem 2 easily extend to solutions with initial data in $L^2_r$.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the flow map $S^t$ further. Our first result says that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $S^t$ is also sequentially weakly continuous.
Theorem 3. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the flow map $S^t : L^2_{r,0} \to L^2_{r,0}$ is sequentially weakly continuous.

Remark 3. Theorem 1.1 in [13] states that the flow map $S^t : L^2_{r,0} \to L^2_{r,0}$ of the Benjamin-Ono equation is not sequentially weakly continuous. It turned out that the proof is incorrect and the author withdrew the paper – see [13].

We deduce Theorem 3 from (9) by proving that the Birkhoff map and its inverse are sequentially weakly continuous, a result which is of independent interest:

Theorem 4. The Birkhoff map $\Phi : L^2_{r,0} \to h^{1/2} +$ and its inverse $\Phi^{-1} : h^{1/2} + \to L^2_{r,0}$ are sequentially weakly continuous.

Our second result on the flow map $S^t$ concerns its extension to the Sobolev spaces of distribution $H^{-s}_{r,0}$ with $0 < s < 1/2$. To this end we first prove the following important result concerning the extension of the Birkhoff map $\Phi$ to $H^{-s}_{r,0}$:

Theorem 5. (Extension of $\Phi$) For any $0 < s < 1/2$, the Birkhoff map $\Phi$ of Theorem 1 admits an extension, also denoted by $\Phi$,

$$\Phi : H^{-s}_{r,0} \to h^{1/2-s} +, \quad u \mapsto \Phi(u) := (\zeta_n(u))_{n \geq 1},$$

which is bijective. $\Phi$ and its inverse are continuous, sequentially weakly continuous and map bounded subsets into bounded subsets.

A straightforward application of Theorem 5 is the following result on isospectral potentials. To state it, we first need to introduce some additional notation. For any $\zeta \in h^{1/2-s} +$, define

$$\text{Tor}(\zeta) := \{ z \in h^{1/2-s} + : |z_n| = |\zeta_n| \ \forall n \geq 1 \}.$$ 

Note that $\text{Tor}(\zeta)$ is an infinite product of circles and a compact subset of $h^{1/2-s} +$. Furthermore, for any $u \in H^{-s}_{r,0}$, let

$$\text{Iso}(u) := \{ v \in H^{-s}_{r,0} : \text{spec}(L_v) = \text{spec}(L_u) \}$$

where $\text{spec}(L_u)$ denotes the spectrum of the Lax operator $L_u$, acting on the Hardy space $H^+$, $L_u := -i\partial_x - \Pi(u \cdot)$, and $\Pi$ is the orthogonal projector of $L^2$ onto $H^+$. We refer to Section 4 where for any $u \in H^{-s}_{r,0}$, the operator $L_u$ is defined and its spectrum characterized in terms of its gaps. An immediate consequence of Theorem 5 is then the following

Corollary 1. For any $u \in H^{-s}_{r,0}$ with $0 < s < 1/2$,

$$\Phi(\text{Iso}(u)) = \text{Tor}(\Phi(u)).$$

By the continuity of $\Phi^{-1}$ it then follows that $\text{Iso}(u)$ is a compact, connected subset of $H^{-s}_{r,0}$. 
Theorem 5 will be applied to prove the following result about the extension of the solution map of the BO equation to Sobolev spaces with negative index:

**Theorem 6. (Extension of \(S^i\))** For any \(0 < s < \frac{1}{2}\) the following holds:

(i) **Extension:** For any \(u_0\) in \(H_{r,0}^{-s}\) there exists a map \(t \mapsto u(t)\) with \(u(0) = u_0\) satisfying the following properties:

(i1) The map \(\mathbb{R} \to H_{r,0}^{-s}, t \mapsto u(t)\) is continuous.

(i2) For any sequence \((u_0^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}\) in \(L^2_{r,0}\), converging to \(u_0\) in \(H_{r,0}^{-s}\), it follows that for any \(t \in \mathbb{R}\), \(u^{(k)}(t) \to u(t)\) in \(H_{r,0}^{-s}\). Here, for any \(k \geq 1\), \(t \mapsto u^{(k)}(t)\) denotes the solution of the BO equation \((1)\) with \(u^{(k)}(0) = u_0^{(k)}\) (cf. \((9)\)). In particular, the map \(t \mapsto u(t)\) is uniquely determined by the initial data \(u_0\) and hence for any \(t \in \mathbb{R}\), the extension of the flow map \(S^i\) to \(H_{r,0}^{-s}\),

\[
S^i : H_{r,0}^{-s} \to H_{r,0}^{-s}, u_0 \mapsto u(t),
\]

is well-defined.

(ii) **Bound:** There exists an increasing function \(F_s : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\) so that for any \(u(0) \in H_{r,0}^{-s}\)

\[
(10) \quad \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \| u(t) \|_{-s} \leq F_s(\| \Phi(u(0)) \|_{1/2-s}).
\]

(iii) **Continuity, weak continuity:** For any \(t \in \mathbb{R}\), \(S^i : H_{r,0}^{-s} \to H_{r,0}^{-s}\) is continuous and sequentially weakly continuous.

**Remark 4.** (i) By the trace formula \((3)\), for any \(u(0) \in L^2_{r,0}\), estimate \((10)\) can be improved as follows,

\[
\| u(t) \| = \sqrt{2} \| \Phi(u(0)) \|_{1/2} = \| u(0) \|, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

(ii) In a recent, very interesting paper [17], Talbut proved by the method of perturbation determinants, developed for the KdV and the NLS equations by Killip, Visan, and Zhang in [10], that for any \(0 < s < 1/2\), there exists a constant \(C_s > 0\), only depending on \(s\), so that any sufficiently smooth solution \(t \mapsto u(t)\) of \((1)\) satisfies the estimate

\[
\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \| u(t) \|_{-s} \leq C_s (1 + \| u(0) \|_{1-s}^{-2})^s \| u(0) \|_{-s}.
\]

Note however that the latter estimate does not suffice to prove that the inverse image of an arbitrary bounded subset of \(h^{1/2-s}\) by the extension of the Birkhoff map of Theorem 5 is bounded in \(H_{r,0}^{-s}\).

For recent work on a priori bounds for Sobolev norms of smooth solutions of the KdV equation and/or the NLS equation in 1d and their applications to the initial value problem of these equations, see also [9], [11].
Comments: Note that the critical Sobolev exponent of the Benjamin-Ono equation equals $-1/2$. Hence it is expected that the solution map $S^t$ cannot be extended to $H_{r,0}^{-s}$ for $s > 1/2$. The following example of travelling wave solutions shows that such an extension cannot be continuous not even in a weak sense – see below for a precise statement.

Without further reference, we will use notations and results from [4, Appendix B], where one gap potentials have been studied. Consider the following one parameter family of one gap potentials of average zero, $u_{0,q}(x) = 2\text{Re}(qe^{ix}/(1 - qe^{ix}))$, $0 < q < 1$.

They satisfy $\gamma_{1,q} := \gamma_1(u_{0,q}) = q^2/(1 - q^2)$ and $\gamma_n(u_{0,q}) = 0$ for any $n \geq 2$. The frequency $\omega_{1,q} := \omega_1(u_{0,q})$ is thus given by (cf. (7))

$$\omega_{1,q} = 1 - 2\gamma_{1,q} = \frac{1 - 3q^2}{1 - q^2}.$$ 

The travelling wave solution of the BO equation with initial data $u_{0,q}$ is then given by

$$u_q(t, x) = u_{0,q}(x + \omega_{1,q}t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$ 

Note that for any $s > 1/2$, $\lim_{q\to 1} u_{0,q} = 2\text{Re}(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{ikx})$ strongly in $H_{r,0}^{-s}$. Since $\omega_{1,q} \to -\infty$ as $q \to 1$, it then follows that for any $t \neq 0$, $u_q(t, \cdot)$ does not converge in the sense of distributions as $q \to 1$.

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2, presented in [4, Section 8], Theorem 6 can be used to prove the following

**Theorem 7.** For every initial data $u(0)$ in $H_{r,0}^{-s}$, $0 < s < 1/2$, the solution of the BO equation constructed in Theorem 6,

$$t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto u(t) \in H_{r,0}^{-s},$$

is almost periodic. Its orbit is contained in $\text{Iso}(u(0))$ and hence is relatively compact in $H_{r,0}^{-s}$.

**Related work:** By similar methods, results of the type stated in Theorem 6 have been obtained for other integrable PDEs such as the KdV equation, the KdV2 equation, and the mKdV equation – see e.g. [7],[8], [5], [6].

**Organisation:** Theorem 4 and Theorem 3 are proved in Section 3 whereas in Section 2 we collect results related to the spectrum of the Lax operator $L_u$ of the Benjamin-Ono equation which will be used for the proofs of the two theorems. Since it is quite long, the proof of Theorem 5 is split up into Section 4, Section 5, and Section 6. Finally, Theorem 6 is proved in Section 7. By and large, we will use the notation established in [4]. In particular, the $H^s$–norm of an element $v$ in
the Sobolev space $H^s \equiv H^s(T, \mathbb{C})$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, will be denoted by $\|v\|_s$. It is defined by

$$\|v\|_s = \left( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle n \rangle^{2s} |\hat{v}(n)|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \langle n \rangle = \max\{1, |n|\}.$$ 

For $\|v\|_0$, we usually write $\|v\|$. By $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, we will also denote the extension of the $L^2$–inner product, introduced in (2), to $H^{-s} \times H^s$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, by duality. By $H^+$ we denote the Hardy space, consisting of elements $f \in L^2(T, \mathbb{C})$ with the property that $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ for any $n < 0$. More generally, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $H^+_s$ denotes the subspace of $H^s$ consisting of elements $f \in H^s$ with the property that $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ for any $n < 0$.

2. Preliminaries

First we need to review some material, presented in detail in [4]. For any $u \in L^2_{r,0}$, denote by $L_u$ the Lax operator acting on the Hardy space $H^+$. It is given by $L_u = -i\partial_x - T_u$ where $T_u$ is the Toeplitz operator with symbol $u$. The operator $L_u$ is an unbounded self-adjoint operator with domain given by the Sobolev space $H^+_1 = H^1 \cap H^+$ and bounded from below. Its spectrum $\text{spec}(L_u)$ is discrete and all its eigenvalues are real and simple. We list them in increasing order, $\lambda_0(u) < \lambda_1(u) < \cdots$.

The $n$th gap length is defined by

$$\gamma_n \equiv \gamma_n(u) := \lambda_n(u) - \lambda_{n-1}(u) - 1 \geq 0, \quad n \geq 1.$$ 

It satisfies $\gamma_n(u) = |\zeta_n(u)|^2$ and for $\lambda_n \equiv \lambda_n(u)$ one has

$$\lambda_n = n - \sum_{p=n+1}^{\infty} \gamma_p.$$ 

By $H_\lambda$ we denote the generating function,

$$H_\lambda : L^2_{r,0} \to \mathbb{C}, \ u \mapsto \langle (L_u + \lambda)^{-1} 1 | 1 \rangle.$$ 

For any given $u \in L^2_{r,0}$, $H_\lambda(u)$ is a meromorphic function in $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with possible poles at the eigenvalues of $L_u$. It admits the following product representation (cf. [4, Proposition 3.1])

$$H_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{\lambda_0 + \lambda} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{\lambda_n + \lambda} \right).$$ 

Lemma 1. (i) For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, $H_\lambda : L^2_{r,0} \to \mathbb{C}$ is sequentially weakly continuous.

(ii) $(\sqrt{\gamma_n})_{n \geq 1} : L^2_{r,0} \to h^{1/2}_+$ is sequentially weakly continuous. In particular, for any $n \geq 0$, $\lambda_n : L^2_{r,0} \to \mathbb{R}$ is sequentially weakly continuous.

Proof. (i) We argue similarly as in the proof of the properness of the moment map $\Gamma$ in [4, Proposition 3.2]. Let $(u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence in
$L^2_{r,0}$ with $u^{(k)} \to u$ weakly in $L^2_{r,0}$ as $k \to \infty$. By (3), there exists $M > 0$ so that for any $k \geq 1$

$$
\|u\|, \|u^{(k)}\| \leq M \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\gamma_n}(u), \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\gamma_n}(u^{(k)}) \leq M.
$$

By passing to a subsequence, if needed, we may assume that

\begin{equation}
\gamma_n(u^{(k)})^{1/2}_{n \geq 1} \to (\eta_n^{1/2})_{n \geq 1}
\end{equation}

weakly in $h^{1/2}(N, \mathbb{R})$ where $\eta_n \geq 0$ for any $n \geq 1$. It then follows that

$$
(\gamma_n(u^{(k)}))_{n \geq 1} \to (\eta_n)_{n \geq 1}
$$

strongly in $\ell^1(N, \mathbb{R})$. Define

$$
\nu_n := n - \sum_{p=n+1}^{\infty} \eta_p, \quad \forall n \geq 0.
$$

Then for any $n \geq 1$, $\nu_n = \nu_{n-1} + 1 + \eta_n$ and $\lambda_n(u^{(k)}) \to \nu_n$ uniformly in $n \geq 0$. Since $L_{u^{(k)}} \geq \lambda_0(u^{(k)})$ we infer that there exists $c > | - \nu_0 + 1|$ so that for any $k \geq 1$ and $\lambda \geq c$,

$$
L_{u^{(k)}} + \lambda : H^1_+ \to H^+
$$

is a linear isomorphism whose inverse is bounded uniformly in $k$. Therefore

$$
w^{(k)}_\lambda := (L_{u^{(k)}} + \lambda)^{-1}[1], \quad \forall k \geq 1,
$$

is a well-defined, bounded sequence in $H^1_+$. Let us choose an arbitrary countable subset $\Lambda \subset [c, \infty)$ with one cluster point. By a diagonal procedure, we extract a subsequence of $(w^{(k)}_\lambda)_{k \geq 1}$, again denoted by $(w^{(k)}_\lambda)_{k \geq 1}$, so that for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, the sequence $(w^{(k)}_\lambda)$ converges weakly in $H^1_+$ to some element $v_\lambda \in H^1_+$. By Rellich’s theorem

$$
(L_{u^{(k)}} + \lambda)w^{(k)}_\lambda \to (L_u + \lambda)v_\lambda
$$

weakly in $L^2_\Lambda$ as $k \to \infty$. Since by definition, $(L_{u^{(k)}} + \lambda)w^{(k)}_\lambda = 1$ for any $k \geq 1$, it follows that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $(L_u + \lambda)v_\lambda = 1$ and thus by the definition of the generating function

$$
\mathcal{H}_\lambda(u^{(k)}) = \langle w^{(k)}_\lambda | 1 \rangle \to \langle v_\lambda | 1 \rangle = \mathcal{H}_\lambda(u), \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda.
$$

Since $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(u^{(k)})$ and $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(u)$ are meromorphic functions whose poles are on the real axis, it follows that the convergence holds for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. This proves item (i).

(ii) We apply item (i) (and its proof) as follows. As mentioned above, $\lambda_n(u^{(k)}) \to \eta_n$, uniformly in $n \geq 0$. By the proof of item (i) one has for any $c \leq \lambda < \infty$,

$$
\mathcal{H}_\lambda(u^{(k)}) \to \frac{1}{\nu_0 + \lambda} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\eta_n}{\nu_n + \lambda}\right)
$$
and we conclude that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_0(u) + \lambda} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma_n(u)}{\lambda_n(u) + \lambda} \right) = \mathcal{H}_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{\nu_0 + \lambda} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{\eta_n}{\nu_n + \lambda} \right).$$

Since $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(u)$ as well as the latter infinite product are meromorphic functions in $\lambda$, the functions are equal. In particular, they have the same zeroes and the same poles. Since the sequences $(\lambda_n(u))_{n \geq 0}$ and $(\nu_n(u))_{n \geq 0}$ are both listed in increasing order it follows that $\lambda_n(u) = \nu_n$ for any $n \geq 0$, implying that for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\gamma_n(u) = \lambda_n(u) - \lambda_{n-1}(u) - 1 = \nu_n - \nu_{n-1} - 1 = \eta_n.$$

By (13) we then conclude that

$$(\gamma_n(u^{(k)})^{1/2})_{n \geq 1} \to (\gamma_n(u)^{1/2})_{n \geq 1}$$

weakly in $h^{1/2}(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R})$. □

By [4, Corollary 3.1], the functionals $\kappa_n : L^2_{r,0} \to \mathbb{R}$, $n \geq 1$, are given by

(14) $$\kappa_n = \frac{1}{\lambda_n - \lambda_0} \prod_{p \neq n} \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma_p}{\lambda_p - \lambda_n} \right)$$

**Corollary 2.** For any $n \geq 1$, $\kappa_n : L^2_{r,0} \to \mathbb{R}$ is sequentially weakly continuous.

**Proof.** Let $(u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence in $L^2_{r,0}$ with $u^{(k)} \to u$ weakly in $L^2_{r,0}$ as $k \to \infty$. By (11), one has for any $p < n$,

$$\lambda_p(u^{(k)}) - \lambda_n(u^{(k)}) = p - n - \sum_{j=p+1}^{n} \gamma_j(u^{(k)})$$

whereas for $p > n$

$$\lambda_p(u^{(k)}) - \lambda_n(u^{(k)}) = p - n + \sum_{j=n+1}^{p} \gamma_j(u^{(k)}).$$

By Lemma 1, one then concludes that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \left( \lambda_p(u^{(k)}) - \lambda_n(u^{(k)}) \right) = \left( \lambda_p(u) - \lambda_n(u) \right) = 0$$

uniformly in $p, n \geq 0$. By the product formula (14) for $\kappa_n$ it then follows that for any $n \geq 1$

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \kappa_n(u^{(k)}) = \kappa_n(u).$$

□

Denote by $f_n(x, u) \in H^1_+$ the $L^2$–normalized eigenfunction of $L_u$, corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_n(u)$. It is uniquely determined by normalizing its phase as described in [4, Definition 2.1].
Lemma 2. For any \( n \geq 0 \), \( f_n : L^2_{r,0} \to H^1_+ \) is sequentially weakly continuous.

Proof. Fix \( n \geq 0 \) and let \((u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}\) be a sequence in \( L^2_{r,0} \) with \( u^{(k)} \rightharpoonup u \) weakly in \( L^2_{r,0} \) as \( k \to \infty \). By Lemma 3 below, \((f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}))_{k \geq 1}, 0 \leq p \leq n\), are bounded sequences in \( H^1_+ \). By passing to a subsequence, if needed, we can assume without loss of generality that there exist \( h_p \in H^1_+, 0 \leq p \leq n \), so that for any \( 0 \leq p \leq n \), \( f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}) \rightharpoonup h_p \) weakly in \( H^1_+ \). Note that

\[
L_{u^{(k)}} f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}) = \lambda_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}) f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}).
\]

Since by Lemma 1, \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \lambda_p(u^{(k)}) = \lambda_p(u) \) one has

\[
\lambda_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}) \rightharpoonup \lambda_p(u) h_p(\cdot, u)
\]

weakly in \( H^1_+ \) for any \( 0 \leq p \leq n \). Denote by \( \Pi : L^2 \to H^+ \) the Szegő projector. By Rellich’s theorem, one then infers that \( \Pi(u^{(k)} f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)})) \rightharpoonup \Pi(u h_p) \) weakly in \( L^2_+ \), implying that \( L_{u^{(k)}} f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}) \rightharpoonup L_u h_p \) weakly in \( L^2_+ \) as well. From what we have proved so far it follows that \( L_u h_p = \lambda_p(u) h_p \). Since \( \|f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)})\| = 1 \) and \( f_p(\cdot, u^{(k)}) \rightharpoonup h_p \) strongly in \( H^+ \), one has \( \|h_p\| = 1 \). By the same reasoning one argues inductively that \( \langle 1 | h_0 \rangle \geq 0 \), \( \langle h_1 | e^{ix} h_0 \rangle \geq 0 \), \ldots , \( \langle h_n | e^{ix} h_{n-1} \rangle \geq 0 \). Since \( h_p \) is an eigenfunction of \( L_u \), corresponding to \( \lambda_p(u) \) one knows that \( \langle 1 | h_0 \rangle \not= 0 \) and for any \( 1 \leq p \leq n \), \( \langle h_p | e^{ix} h_{p-1} \rangle \not= 0 \) \cite[Definition 2.1]{4}], implying that for any \( 0 \leq p \leq n \), the eigenfunction \( h_p \) coincides with \( f_p(\cdot, u) \). This proves that \( \lim_{k \to \infty} f_n(\cdot, u^{(k)}) = f_n(\cdot, u) \) weakly in \( H^1_+ \). \( \square \)

The following lemma is used in the proof of Lemma 2 above.

Lemma 3. For any \( u \in L^2_{r,0} \) and any \( n \geq 0 \),

\[
\|f_n(\cdot, u)\|_1 \leq 1 + 2n + 8\|u\| + 4\|u\|^2.
\]

Proof. By the normalisation of the eigenfunctions, one has \( \|f_n\| = 1 \). Since \( f_n \) is an eigenfunction, corresponding to the eigenvalue \( \lambda_n \), one has

\[
-i \partial_x f_n = L_u f_n + T_u f_n = \lambda_n f_n + T_u f_n,
\]

implying that \( \|\partial_x f_n\| \leq \|\lambda_n\| + \|T_u f_n\| \). Note that by the trace formulas for \( \lambda_n \) and \( \|u\| \),

\[
|\lambda_n| \leq \max\{n, |\lambda_0|\}, \quad |\lambda_0| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n \leq \|u\|^2
\]

and that for any \( \epsilon > 0 \) \cite[Lemma C.1]{4}]

\[
\|T_u f_n\| \leq \|u\| (\epsilon \|\partial_x f_n\| + (1 + 1/\epsilon) \|f_n\|).
\]

By choosing \( \epsilon = \frac{1}{2T_u \|u\|} \) one then concludes that

\[
\|\partial_x f_n\| \leq n + \|u\| + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial_x f_n\| + \|u\|(1 + 2(1 + \|u\|)).
\]
Proof of Theorem 4: It is to prove that the Birkhoff map $\Phi$ and its inverse are weakly sequentially continuous. Let us first consider $\Phi$ and assume that $(u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ is a sequence in $L^2_{r,0}$ with $u^{(k)} \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $L^2_{r,0}$ as $k \to \infty$. Let $\zeta^{(k)} := \Phi(u^{(k)})$ and $\zeta := \Phi(u)$. Since $(u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded in $L^2_{r,0}$ and $\Phi$ maps bounded subsets of $L^2_{r,0}$ to bounded subsets of $h^{1/2}_{+}$ (cf. Remark 1(i)), the sequence $(\zeta^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded in $h^{1/2}_{+}$. To show that $\zeta^{(k)} \rightharpoonup \zeta$ weakly in $h^{1/2}_{+}$, it then suffices to prove that for any $\zeta : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, 
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \langle \Phi(u^{(k)}), \zeta \rangle = \langle \Phi(u), \zeta \rangle.
\]
To see that $\Phi^{-1}$ is sequentially weakly continuous, consider a sequence $(\zeta^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ in $h^{1/2}_{+}$ with $\zeta^{(k)} \rightharpoonup \zeta$ weakly in $h^{1/2}_{+}$ and let $u^{(k)} := \Phi^{-1}(\zeta^{(k)})$ and $u := \Phi^{-1}(\zeta)$. By (3), $(u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^2_{r,0}$. Hence there exists a subsequence of $(u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$, again denoted by $(u^{(k)})_{k \geq 1}$, and $v \in L^2_{r,0}$, so that $u^{(k)} \rightharpoonup v$ weakly in $L^2_{r,0}$. We then conclude from the weak continuity of $\Phi$, established above, that $\lim_{k \to \infty} \Phi(u^{(k)}) = \Phi(v)$, implying that $\Phi(v) = \zeta = \Phi(u)$. Hence $v = u$ and $u^{(k)} \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $L^2_{r,0}$. $\square$

Theorem 4 is now used to show Theorem 3. First we need to consider the frequencies $\omega_n(\zeta)$, $n \geq 1$, of the Benjamin-Ono equation. Recall that by (7),
\[
\omega_n(\zeta) = n^2 - 2 \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \min(n, p)|\zeta_p|^2.
\]
We record the following properties of the frequencies.

Lemma 4. (i) For any $n \geq 1$, $\omega_n : \ell^2_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and
\[
|\omega_n(\zeta) - n^2| \leq 2n\|\zeta\|_0^2, \quad \forall \zeta \in \ell^2_+ ; \quad |\omega_n(\zeta) - n^2| \leq 2\|\zeta\|_{1/2}^2, \quad \forall \zeta \in h^{1/2}_{+}.
\]
(ii) For any $0 \leq s < 1/2$, $\omega_n : h^{1/2-s}_{+} \to \mathbb{R}$ is sequentially weakly continuous.

Proof. Item (i) follows in a straightforward way from the formula (7). Since for any $0 \leq s < 1/2$, $h^{1/2-s}_{+}$ compactly embeds into $\ell^2_+$, item (ii) follows from (i). $\square$
By (8) the flow map of the Benjamin-Ono equation, when expressed in Birkhoff coordinates, is given by

\[ S_B^t : h_+^{1/2} \to h_+^{1/2}, \quad \zeta = (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \mapsto (e^{i\omega_n(t)} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}. \]

**Lemma 5.** For any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), the flow map \( S_B^t : h_+^{1/2} \to h_+^{1/2} \) is sequentially weakly continuous.

**Proof.** Consider a sequence \( (\zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1} \) in \( h_+^{1/2} \) with \( \zeta^{(k)} \equiv (\zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1} \mapsto \zeta \equiv (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \) weakly in \( h_+^{1/2} \). To simplify notation, write \( \omega_n^{(k)} := \omega_n(\zeta^{(k)}) \) and \( \omega_n := \omega_n(\zeta) \). Then there exists \( M \geq 1 \) so that for any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), and \( k \geq 1 \)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n|e^{i\omega_n^{(k)}(t)} \zeta_n^{(k)}|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n|\zeta_n^{(k)}|^2 \leq M.
\]

Hence for any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), the sequence \( (e^{i\omega_n^{(k)}(t)} \zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1} \) is bounded in \( h_+^{1/2} \). Since by Lemma 4(ii), one has \( \lim_{k \to \infty} e^{i\omega_n^{(k)}(t)} \zeta_n^{(k)} = e^{i\omega_n(t)} \zeta_n \) for any \( n \geq 1 \), one then infers that \( (e^{i\omega_n^{(k)}(t)} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \to (e^{i\omega_n(t)} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \) weakly in \( h_+^{1/2} \). \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 3:** By Theorem 4, \( \Phi \) and its inverse \( \Phi^{-1} \) are sequentially weakly continuous and by Lemma 5, so is \( S_B^t : h_+^{1/2} \to h_+^{1/2} \). Since the flow map \( S^t : L_r^2 \to L_r^2 \) is given by the composition \( \Phi^{-1} S_B^t \Phi \), it then follows that it is sequentially weakly continuous as well. \( \square \)

## 4. Extension of \( \Phi \). Part 1

In this section we prove the first part of Theorem 5, which we state as a separate theorem:

**Theorem 8. (Extension of \( \Phi \). Part 1)** For any \( 0 < s < 1/2 \), the Birkhoff map \( \Phi \) of Theorem 1 admits an extension, also denoted by \( \Phi \),

\[ \Phi : H_{r,0}^{-s} \to h_+^{1/2-s}, \quad u \mapsto \Phi(u) := (\zeta_n(u))_{n \geq 1}, \]

which is sequentially weakly continuous, one-to-one, and maps bounded subsets of \( H_{r,0}^{-s} \) to bounded subsets of \( h_+^{1/2-s} \).

First we need to establish some auxiliary results related to the Lax operator \( L_u \).

**Lemma 6.** Let \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \). Then for any \( f, g \in H_+^{1/2} \), the following estimates hold:

(i) There exist a constant \( C_{1,s} > 0 \) only depending on \( s \), so that

\[
\|fg\|_s \leq C_{1,s}^2 \|f\|_\sigma \|g\|_\sigma, \quad \sigma := (1/2 + s)/2.
\]

(ii) The expression \( \langle u|f\theta \rangle \) is well defined and satisfies the estimate

\[
|\langle u|f\theta \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{1/2}^2 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}) \|f\|^2.
\]
where
\begin{equation}
\eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}) := \|u\|_{-s}(2(1 + \|u\|_{-s}))^\alpha C_{2,s}, \quad \alpha := \frac{1 + 2s}{1 - 2s}
\end{equation}
and $C_{2,s} > 0$ is a constant, only depending on $s$.

Proof. (i) Estimate (15) is obtained from standard estimates of paramultiplication (cf. e.g. [1, Exercise II.A.5], [3, Theorem 2.82, Theorem 2.85]). (ii) By item (i), $\langle u|f\rangle$ is well defined by duality and satisfies
\[ |\langle u|f\rangle| \leq \|u\|_{-s}\|f\|_s \leq C_{2,s}^2\|f\|_s^2. \]
In order to estimate $\|f\|_s^2$, note that by interpolation one has $\|f\|_\sigma \leq \|f\|^{1/2+s}_1 \|f\|^{1/2-s}_2$ and hence
\begin{equation}
C_{1,s}\|f\|_\sigma \leq \|f\|^{1/2+s}_1 (C_{2,s}\|f\|)^{1/2-s}
\end{equation}
for some constant $C_{2,s} > 0$. Young’s inequality then yields for any $\varepsilon > 0$
\begin{equation}
(C_{1,s}\|f\|_\sigma)^2 \leq \varepsilon \|f\|_1^{2} + \varepsilon^{-\alpha}(C_{2,s}\|f\|)^{2}, \quad \alpha := \frac{1 + 2s}{1 - 2s}.
\end{equation}
The claimed estimate (16) then follows from (19) by choosing $\varepsilon = (2(1 + \|u\|_{-s}))^{-1}$.

Note that estimate (16) implies that the sesquilinear form $\langle T_u|f\rangle$ on $H^{1/2}_+$, obtained from the Toeplitz operator $T_u f := \Pi(u f)$ with $u \in L^2_{r,0}$, can be defined for any $u \in H^{-s}_{r,0}$ with $0 \leq s < 1/2$ by setting $\langle T_u|f\rangle := \langle u|g\rangle$ and that it is bounded. For any $u \in H^{-s}_{r,0}$, we then define the sesquilinear form $Q_u^+$ on $H^{1/2}_+$ as follows
\begin{equation}
Q_u^+(f, g) = \langle -i\partial_x f|g\rangle - \langle T_u f|g\rangle + (1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}))\langle f|g\rangle
\end{equation}
where $\eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})$ is given by (17). The following lemma says that the quadratic form $Q_u^+(f, f)$ is equivalent to $\|f\|_1^{2}$.

Lemma 7. For any $u \in H^{-s}_{r,0}$ with $0 \leq s < 1/2$, $Q_u^+$ is a positive, sesquilinear form, satisfying
\[ \frac{1}{2}\|f\|_1^{2} \leq Q_u^+(f, f) \leq (3 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}))\|f\|_1^{2}, \quad \forall f \in H^{1/2}_+. \]

Proof. Using that $u$ is real valued, one verifies that $Q_u^+$ is sesquilinear. The claimed estimates are obtained from (16) as follows: since $\langle n \rangle \leq 1 + |n|$ one has $\|f\|_1^{2} \leq \langle -i\partial_x f|f\rangle + \|f\|_1^{2}$, and hence by (16),
\[ |\langle T_u f|f\rangle| \leq \frac{1}{2}\langle -i\partial_x f|f\rangle + \langle \frac{1}{2} + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})\|f\|_1^{2}. \]
By the definition (20), the claimed estimates then follow. In particular, the lower bound for $Q_u^+(f, f)$ shows that $Q_u^+$ is positive. \qed
Denote by \( \langle f | g \rangle_{1/2} \equiv \langle f | g \rangle_{H^1_+} \) the inner product, corresponding to the norm \( \| f \|_{1/2} \). It is given by

\[
\langle f | g \rangle_{1/2} = \sum_{n \geq 0} \langle n | \hat{f}(n)\bar{\hat{g}}(n) \rangle, \quad \forall f, g \in H^{1/2}_+.
\]

Furthermore, denote by \( D : H^t_+ \to H^{t-1}_+ \) and \( \langle D \rangle : H^t_+ \to H^{t-1}_+ \), \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), the Fourier multipliers, defined for \( f \in H^t_+ \) with Fourier series \( f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{f}(n)e^{inx} \) by

\[
Df := -i\partial_x f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n\hat{f}(n)e^{inx}, \quad \langle D \rangle f := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle n | \hat{f}(n) \rangle e^{inx}.
\]

**Lemma 8.** For any \( u \in H^{s}_{r_0} \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \), there exists a bounded linear isomorphism \( A_u : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^{1/2}_+ \) so that

\[
\langle A_u f | g \rangle_{1/2} = Q_u^+(f, g), \quad \forall f, g \in H^{1/2}_+.
\]

The operator \( A_u \) has the following properties:

(i) \( A_u \) and its inverse \( A_u^{-1} \) are symmetric, i.e., for any \( f, g \in H^{1/2}_+ \),

\[
\langle A_u f | g \rangle_{1/2} = \langle f | A_u g \rangle_{1/2}, \quad \langle A_u^{-1} f | g \rangle_{1/2} = \langle f | A_u^{-1} g \rangle_{1/2}.
\]

(ii) The linear isomorphism \( B_u \), given by the composition

\[
B_u := \langle D \rangle A_u : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^{-1/2}_+
\]

satisfies

\[
Q_u^+(f, g) = \langle B_u f | g \rangle, \quad \forall f, g \in H^{1/2}_+.
\]

By Lemma 7, the operator norm of \( B_u \) and the one of its inverse can be bounded uniformly on bounded subsets of elements \( u \) in \( H^{s}_{r_0} \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 7, the sesquilinear form \( Q_u^+ \) is an inner product on \( H^{1/2}_+ \), equivalent to the inner product \( \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{1/2} \). Hence by the theorem of Fréchet-Riesz, for any \( g \in H^{1/2}_+ \), there exists a unique element in \( H^{1/2}_+ \), which we denote by \( A_u g \), so that

\[
\langle A_u g | f \rangle_{1/2} = Q_u^+(g, f), \quad \forall f \in H^{1/2}_+.
\]

Then \( A_u : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^{1/2}_+ \) is a linear, injective operator, which by Lemma 7 is bounded, i.e., for any \( f, g \in H^{1/2}_+ \),

\[
|\langle A_u g | f \rangle_{1/2} | = |Q_u^+(g, f)| \leq Q_u^+(g, g)^{1/2}Q_u^+(f, f)^{1/2}
\]

\[
\leq (3 + \eta_r(\|u\|_{-s}))\|g\|_{1/2}\|f\|_{1/2},
\]

implying that \( \|A_u g\|_{1/2} \leq (3 + \eta_r(\|u\|_{-s}))\|g\|_{1/2} \).

Similarly, by the theorem of Fréchet-Riesz, for any \( h \in H^{1/2}_+ \), there exists a unique element in \( H^{1/2}_+ \), which we denote by \( E_u h \), so that

\[
\langle h | f \rangle_{1/2} = Q_u^+(E_u h, f), \quad \forall f \in H^{1/2}_+.
\]
Then $E_u : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^{1/2}_+$ is a linear, injective operator, which by Lemma 7 is bounded, i.e.,
\[ \frac{1}{2} \| E_u h \|_{1/2}^2 \leq Q^+_u(E_u h, E_u h) = \langle h|E_u h \rangle_{1/2} \leq \| h \|_{1/2}^2 \| E_u h \|_{1/2}, \]
implying that $\| E_u h \|_{1/2} \leq 2 \| h \|_{1/2}$. Note that $A_u(E_u h) = h$ and hence $E_u$ is the inverse of $A_u$. Therefore, $A_u : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^{1/2}_+$ is a bounded linear isomorphism. Next we show item (i). For any $f, g \in H^{1/2}_+$,
\[ \langle g|A_u f \rangle_{1/2} = \frac{\langle A_u f|g \rangle_{1/2}}{Q^+_u(f, g)} = Q^+_u(g, f) = \langle A_u g|f \rangle_{1/2}. \]
The symmetry of $A_u^{-1}$ is proved in the same way. Towards item (ii), note that for any $f, g \in H^{1/2}_+$, $\langle f|g \rangle_{1/2} = \langle (D)f|g \rangle$ and therefore
\[ \langle A_u g|f \rangle_{1/2} = \langle (D)A_u g|f \rangle, \]
implying that the operator $B_u = (D)A_u : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^{-1/2}_+$ is a bounded linear isomorphism and that
\[ (B_u g|f) = Q^+_u(g, f), \quad \forall g, f \in H^{1/2}_+. \]
\[ \square \]

We denote by $L_u^+$ the restriction of $B_u$ to $\text{dom}(L_u^+)$, defined as
\[ \text{dom}(L_u^+) := \{ g \in H^{1/2}_+ : B_u g \in H^+ \}. \]
We view $L_u^+$ as an unbounded linear operator on $H^+$ and write $L_u^+ : \text{dom}(L_u^+) \to H^+$.

**Lemma 9.** For any $u \in H^{-s}_{r,0}$ with $0 \leq s < 1/2$, the following holds:
\[ (i) \text{ dom}(L_u^+) \text{ is a dense subspace of } H^{1/2}_+ \text{ and hence of } H^+. \]
\[ (ii) \text{ dom}(L_u^+) \to H^+ \text{ is bijective and the right inverse of } L_u^+, \]
\[ (L_u^+)^{-1} : H^+ \to H^+, \text{ is compact. Hence } L_u^+ \text{ has discrete spectrum.} \]
\[ (iii) \text{ (}L_u^+\text{)}^{-1} \text{ is symmetric and } L_u^+ \text{ is self-adjoint and positive.} \]

**Proof.** (i) Since $H^+$ is a dense subspace of $H^{-1/2}_+$ and $B_u^{-1} : H^{-1/2}_+ \to H^{1/2}_+$ is a linear isomorphism, $\text{dom}(L_u^+) = B_u^{-1}(H^+)$ is a dense subspace of $H^{1/2}_+$, and hence also of $H$.

(ii) Since $L_u^+$ is the restriction of the linear isomorphism $B_u$, it is one-to-one. By the definition of $L_u^+$, it is onto. The right inverse of $L_u^+$, denoted by $(L_u^+)^{-1}$, is given by the composition $\iota \circ B_u^{-1}|H^+$, where $\iota : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^+$ is the standard embedding which by Sobolev's embedding theorem is compact. It then follows that $(L_u^+)^{-1} : H^+ \to H^+$ is compact as well.

(iii) For any $f, g \in H^+$
\[ \langle (L_u^+)^{-1} f|g \rangle = \langle A_u^{-1} (D)^{-1} f|g \rangle = \langle A_u^{-1} (D)^{-1} f| (D)^{-1} g \rangle_{1/2}. \]
By Lemma 8, $A_u^{-1}$ is symmetric with respect to the $H^{1/2}-$inner product. Hence
\[ \langle (L_u^+)^{-1} f|g \rangle = \langle (D)^{-1} f|A_u^{-1} (D)^{-1} g \rangle_{1/2} = \langle f|(L_u^+)^{-1} g \rangle, \]
showing that \((L_u^+)\) is symmetric. Since in addition, \((L_u^+)\) is bounded it is also self-adjoint. By Lemma 7 it then follows that

\[
\langle L_u^+ f | f \rangle = \langle (D) A_u f | f \rangle = \langle A_u f | f \rangle_{1/2} = Q_u^+(f, f) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{1/2}^2,
\]

implying that \(L_u^+\) is a positive operator. \(\square\)

We now define for any \(u \in H_{r,0}^-\) with \(0 \leq s < 1/2\), the operator \(L_u\) as a linear operator with domain \(\text{dom}(L_u) := \text{dom}(L_u^+)\) by setting

\[
L_u := L_u^+ - (1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_s)) : \text{dom}(L_u) \to H^+.
\]

Lemma 9 yields the following

**Corollary 3.** For any \(u \in H_{r,0}^-\) with \(0 \leq s < 1/2\), the operator \(L_u : \text{dom}(L_u) \to H^+\) is densely defined, self-adjoint, bounded from below, and has discrete spectrum. It thus admits an \(L^2\)-normalized basis of eigenfunctions, contained in \(\text{dom}(L_u)\) and hence in \(H_{r,0}^{1/2}\).

**Remark 5.** Let \(u \in H_{r,0}^-\) with \(0 \leq s < 1/2\) be given. Since \(\text{dom}(L_u^+)\) is dense in \(H_{r,0}^{1/2}\) and \(L_u^+\) is the restriction of \(B_u : H_{r,0}^{1/2} \to H_{r,0}^{-1/2}\) to \(\text{dom}(L_u^+)\), the symmetry

\[
\langle L_u^+ f | g \rangle = \langle f | L_u^+ g \rangle, \quad \forall f, g \in \text{dom}(L_u^+)
\]

can be extended by a straightforward density argument as follows

\[
\langle B_u f | g \rangle = \langle f | B_u g \rangle, \quad \forall f, g \in H_{r,0}^{1/2}.
\]

Note that for any \(f, g \in H_{r,0}^{1/2}\),

\[
\langle B_u f | g \rangle = \langle (D) A_u f | g \rangle = \langle A_u f | g \rangle_{1/2}
\]

and hence by (20),

\[
\langle B_u f | g \rangle = Q_u^+(f, g) = \langle Df - T_uf + (1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_s))f | g \rangle.
\]

Viewed as elements in \(H_{r,0}^{-1/2}\), one thus has

\[
B_u f = Df - T_uf + (1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_s))f, \quad \forall f \in H_{r,0}^{1/2}.
\]

Given \(u \in H_{r,0}^-\) with \(0 \leq s < 1/2\), let us consider the restriction of \(B_u\) to \(H_{r,0}^{1-s}\).

**Proposition 1.** Let \(u \in H_{r,0}^-\) with \(0 \leq s < 1/2\). Then \(B_u(H_{r,0}^{1-s}) \subset H_{r,0}^-\) and the restriction \(B_{u;1-s} := B_u|H_{r,0}^{1-s} : H_{r,0}^{1-s} \to H_{r,0}^-\) is a linear isomorphism. The operator norm of \(B_{u;1-s}\) and the one of its inverse can be uniformly bounded on bounded subsets of elements \(u \in H_{r,0}^-\).

**Proof.** By arguing in Fourier space and using standard convolution estimates in sequence spaces, one sees that for any \(f \in H_{r,0}^{1-s}\)

\(\text{where } \sigma = (1/2 + s)/2\)

\[
\|\Pi(uf)\|_{-s} \leq C_{s,\sigma}\|u\|_{-s}\|f\|_{1-\sigma},
\]

for some constant \(C_{s,\sigma}\), implying that

\[
T_u : H_{r,0}^{1-\sigma} \to H_{r,0}^-\quad f \mapsto \Pi(uf)
\]
is a well-defined, bounded linear operator. Since \( H^{1-\sigma}_+ \) is an algebra, \( fT \in H^{1-\sigma}_+ \) and one has \( \langle u | fT \rangle = \langle u | f \rangle = \langle Tu | f \rangle \). Therefore, for any \( f \in H^{1-\sigma}_+ \),

\[
B_u f = Df - Tu f + (1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_\infty))f \in H^{1-\sigma}_+
\]

and \( B_u|_{H^{1-\sigma}_+} : H^{1-\sigma}_+ \to H^{1-\sigma}_+ \) is bounded. Being the restriction of an injective operator, it is injective as well. In view of the Banach-Steinhaus theorem it remains to prove that \( B_u|_{H^{1-\sigma}_+} \) has \( H^{1-\sigma}_+ \) as its image. To this end consider an arbitrary element \( h \in H^{1-\sigma}_+ \). We need to show that the solution \( f \in H^{1/2}_+ \) of \( B_u f = h \) is actually in \( H^{1-\sigma}_+ \). Write

\[
(24) \quad Df = h + (1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_\infty))f + Tu f.
\]

Note that \( h + (1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_\infty))f \) is in \( H^{1-\sigma}_+ \) and it remains to study \( Tu f \). By Lemma 6 one infers that for any \( g \in H^s_+ \),

\[
|\langle Tu f | g \rangle| = |\langle u | g T \rangle| \leq \|u\|_{\infty} \|g T\|_{\infty} \leq C^2_{1,s} \|u\|_{\infty} \|g\|_\sigma \|f\|_\sigma,
\]

implying that \( Tu f \in H^{1-\sigma}_- \) and hence by (24), \( f \in H^{1-\sigma}_- \). But then we deduce from (23) that \( Tu f \in H^{1+}_+ \). Thus applying (24) once more we conclude that \( f \in H^{1+}_- \). This shows that \( B_u|_{H^{1-\sigma}_+} : H^{1-\sigma}_+ \to H^{1-\sigma}_+ \) is onto. Going through the arguments of the proof one verifies that the operator norm of \( B_u|_{H^{1-\sigma}_+} \) and the one of its inverse can be uniformly bounded on bounded subsets of elements \( u \in H^{1-\sigma}_- \). This completes the proof of the proposition.

\[\square\]

Proposition 1 has the following important

**Corollary 4.** For any \( u \in H^{r_\infty}_- \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \), \( \text{dom}(L^+_u) \subset H^{1-s}_+ \). In particular, any eigenfunction of \( L^+_u \) (and hence of \( L_u \)) is in \( H^{1-s}_+ \).

**Proof.** Since \( H^+ \subset H^{1-s}_+ \), one has by Proposition 1,

\[
\text{dom}(L^+_u) = B^{-1}_u(H^+) \subset B^{-1}_u(H^{1-s}_+) = H^{1-s}_+.
\]

\[\square\]

With the results obtained so far, it is straightforward to verify that many of the results of [4] extend to the case where \( u \in H^{r_\infty}_- \). More precisely, let \( u \in H^{r_\infty}_- \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \). We already know that the spectrum of \( L_u \) is discrete, bounded from below, and real. When listed in increasing order and with their multiplicities, the eigenvalues of \( L_u \) satisfy \( \lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \). Arguing as in the proof of [4, Proposition 2.1], it follows that \( \lambda_n \geq n \lambda_{n-1} + 1, n \geq 1 \), and following [4, (2.10)] we define

\[
\gamma_n(u) := \lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1} - 1 \geq 0.
\]

It then follows that for any \( n \geq 1 \), \( \lambda_n = n + \lambda_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k \geq n + \lambda_0 \). Since [4, Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2] continue to hold for \( u \in H^{r_\infty}_- \), we can introduce eigenfunctions \( f_n(x,u) \) of \( L_u \), corresponding to the
eigenvalues \( \lambda_n \), which are normalized as in [4, Definition 2.1]. The identities [4, (2.13)] continue to hold,

\[
\lambda_n \langle 1 | f_n \rangle = - \langle u | f_n \rangle
\]

as does [4, Lemma 2.4], stating that \( \gamma_n = 0 \) if and only if \( \langle 1 | f_n \rangle = 0 \). Furthermore, the definition [4, (3.1)] of the generating function \( H_\lambda(u) \) extends to the case where \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \) with \( 0 < s < 1/2 \) and so do the identity [4, (3.2)], the product representation of \( H_\lambda(u) \), stated in [4, Proposition 3.1(i)], and the identity in [4, Proposition 3.1(ii)],

\[
- \lambda_0(u) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n(u).
\]

Since \( \gamma_n(u) \geq 0 \) for any \( n \geq 1 \), one infers that for any \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \), the sequence \( (\gamma_n(u))_{n \geq 1} \) is in \( \ell_1^0 \equiv \ell^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}) \) and

\[
\lambda_n(u) = n - \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \gamma_k(u) \leq n.
\]

By (20) and (21) we infer that \( - \lambda_0 \leq 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}) \) and with (26) we obtain from (27) the estimate

\[
n - 1 - \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}) \leq \lambda_n(u) \leq n, \quad \forall n \geq 0.
\]

In a next step we want consider the linear isomorphism

\[
B_{u;1-s} = B_u|_{H_+^{1-s}} : H_+^{1-s} \to H_+^{-s}
\]

on the scale of Sobolev spaces. By duality, \( B_{u;1-s} \) extends as a bounded linear isomorphism, \( B_{u,s} : H_+^s \to H_+^{1+s} \) and hence by complex interpolation, for any \( s \leq \theta \leq 1 - s \), the restriction of \( B_{u,s} \) to \( H_+^s \) gives also rise to a bounded linear isomorphism, \( B_{u,\theta} : H_+^\theta \to H_+^{1+\theta} \). All these operators satisfy the same bound as \( B_{u;1-s} \) (cf. Lemma 1). To state our next result, it is convenient to introduce the notation \( \mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). Recall that \( h^\tau(\mathbb{N}_0) = h^\tau(\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{C}), \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \) and that we write \( \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \) instead of \( h^0(\mathbb{N}_0) \).

**Proposition 2.** Let \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \) and let \( (f_n)_{n \geq 0} \) be the basis of \( L_+^2 \), consisting of eigenfunctions of \( L_u \) with \( f_n, n \geq 0 \), corresponding to the eigenvalue \( \lambda_n \) and normalized as in [4, Definition 2.1]. Then for any \( -1 + s \leq \theta \leq 1 - s \),

\[
K_{u,\theta} : H_+^\theta \to h^\theta(\mathbb{N}_0), \; f \mapsto (\langle f | f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0}
\]

is a linear isomorphism. In particular, for \( f = \Pi u \in H_+^{-s} \), one obtains that \( (\Pi u | f_n)_{n \geq 0} \in h^{-s}(\mathbb{N}_0) \). The operator norm of \( K_{u,\theta} \) and the one of its inverse can be uniformly bounded for \( -1 + s \leq \theta \leq 1 - s \) and for bounded subsets of elements \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \).
Proof. Let \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \). By the definition of a \( L^2 \)-orthonormal basis,
\[
K_{u,0} : L^2_+ \to \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0), \quad f \mapsto (\langle f|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0}
\]
is a linear isometry. Its inverse is given by
\[
K_{u,0}^{-1} : \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \to L^2_+, \quad (z_n)_{n \geq 0} \mapsto f := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z_n f_n
\]
and one has \( \langle f|f_n \rangle = z_n \) for any \( n \geq 0 \). Next we consider \( Q_u^+(f,f) \) for \( f \in H^{1/2}_+ \) (cf. Lemma 7). For any \( N \geq 1 \), decompose \( f \) in \( H^{1/2}_+ \) as \( f = f^{(N)} + f^{(N)}_\perp \) where
\[
f^{(N)} = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \langle f|f_n \rangle f_n \in H^{1/2}_+, \quad f^{(N)} = f - f^{(N)} \in H^{1/2}_+.
\]
Note that by the definition of \( B_u \) and Lemma 7
\[
\langle B_u f|f \rangle = Q_u^+(f,f) \geq \frac{1}{2} \| f \|^2_{H^{1/2}_+}.
\]
Using that for any \( n \geq 0 \), \( B_u f_n = (\lambda_n(u) + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})) f_n \) and \( \langle f^{(N)}|f^{(N)}_\perp \rangle = 0 \), one sees that
\[
\langle B_u(f^{(N)} + f^{(N)}_\perp)|f^{(N)} + f^{(N)}_\perp \rangle = \langle B_u f^{(N)}|f^{(N)} \rangle + \langle B_u f^{(N)}_\perp|f^{(N)}_\perp \rangle,
\]
implicating that for any \( N \geq 1 \),
\[
0 \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N} (\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})) \| f|f_n \|^2 \leq Q_u^+(f,f).
\]
By (28) one then deduces that \( \langle n \rangle^{1/2} \langle f|f_n \rangle \rangle_{n \geq 0} \) is a sequence in \( \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \), meaning that \( \langle (f|f_n) \rangle_{n \geq 0} \) is in \( h^{1/2}_+(\mathbb{N}_0) \). Hence
\[
K_{u,1/2} : H^{1/2}_+ \to h^{1/2}(\mathbb{N}_0), \quad f \mapsto (\langle f|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0}
\]
is a linear, injective operator, which by Lemma 7 is bounded. We claim that \( K_{u,1/2} \) is onto. Indeed, let \( (w_n)_{n \geq 0} \) be a sequence in \( h^{1/2}(\mathbb{N}_0) \) and set
\[
z_n := (\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}))^{1/2} w_n, \quad \forall n \geq 0.
\]
Then \( (z_n)_{n \geq 0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0) \) and hence there exists a unique \( g \in L^2_+ \) with \( g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z_n f_n \). Let \( f := B_u^{-1/2} g \) where
\[
B_u^{-1/2} g := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}))^{-1/2} z_n f_n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} w_n f_n.
\]
Let \( f^{(N)} := \sum_{n=0}^{N} w_n f_n \). Then \( f^{(N)} \in H^{1/2}_+ \) and
\[
Q_u^+(f^{(N)},f^{(N)}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} |w_n|^2 (\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} |z_n|^2.
\]
Since \( f = \lim_{N \to \infty} f^{(N)} \) it then follows from Lemma 7 that the sequence \( (f^{(N)})_{N \geq 1} \) weakly converges in \( H_{+}^{1/2} \), yielding that \( f \in H_{+}^{1/2} \).

Altogether we have proved that
\[
K_{u;1/2} : H_{+}^{1/2} \to h_{+}^{1/2}(\mathbb{N}_0), f \mapsto (\langle f|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0}
\]
is a linear isomorphism. Its inverse is given by
\[
K_{u;1/2}^{-1} : h_{+}^{1/2}(\mathbb{N}_0) \to H_{+}^{1/2}, (z_n)_{n \geq 0} \mapsto f := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z_n f_n
\]
and one has \( \langle f|f_n \rangle = z_n \) for any \( n \geq 0 \). By interpolation we infer that for any \( 0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2 \), \( K_{u;\theta} : H_{+}^{\theta} \to h^{\theta}(\mathbb{N}_0) \) is a linear isomorphism. Taking the transpose of \( K_{u;1/2}^{-1} \) it then follows that for any \( 0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2 \),
\[
K_{u;1/2}^{-1} : h_{+}^{1/2}(\mathbb{N}_0) \to H_{+}^{\theta}(\mathbb{N}_0), f \mapsto (\langle f|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0},
\]
is also a linear isomorphism. It remains to discuss the remaining range of \( \theta \), stated in the proposition. By Proposition 1, the restriction of \( B_{u}^{-1} \) to \( H_{+}^{-s} \) gives rise to a linear isomorphism \( B_{u;1-s}^{-1} : H_{+}^{-s} \to H_{+}^{-s} \). For any \( f \in H_{+}^{-s} \), one then has
\[
B_{u;1-s}^{-1} f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\langle f|f_n \rangle}{\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})} f_n.
\]
Since by our considerations above, \( (\langle f|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0} \in h^{-s}(\mathbb{N}_0) \) one concludes that the sequence \( (\frac{\langle f|f_n \rangle}{\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})})_{n \geq 0} \) is in \( h^{-s}(\mathbb{N}_0) \). Conversely, assume that \( (z_n)_{n \geq 0} \in h^{-s}(\mathbb{N}_0) \). Then \( (\langle \lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s}) \rangle z_n)_{n \geq 0} \) is in \( h^{-s}(\mathbb{N}_0) \). Hence by the considerations above on \( K_{u;1-s} \), there exists \( g \in H_{+}^{-s} \) so that
\[
\langle g|f_n \rangle = (\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})) z_n, \quad \forall n \geq 0.
\]
Hence
\[
g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z_n (\lambda_n + 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})) f_n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z_n B_u f_n
\]
and \( f := B_u^{-1} g \) is in \( H_{+}^{1-s} \) and satisfies \( f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z_n f_n \). Altogether we have thus proved that
\[
K_{u;1-s} : H_{+}^{1-s} \to h_{+}^{-s}(\mathbb{N}_0), f \mapsto (\langle f|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0},
\]
is a linear isomorphism. Interpolating between \( K_{u;1-s} \) and \( K_{u;1-s} \) and between the adjoints of their inverses shows that for any \(-1 + s \leq \theta \leq 1-s\),
\[
K_{u;\theta} : H_{+}^{\theta} \to h^{\theta}(\mathbb{N}_0), f \mapsto (\langle f|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0},
\]
is a linear isomorphism. Going through the arguments of the proof one verifies that the operator norm of \( K_{u;\theta} \) and the one of its inverse can be uniformly bounded for \(-1 + s \leq \theta \leq 1-s \) and for bounded subsets of elements \( u \in H_{r;0}^{s} \). □
Proof of Theorem 8. Without further reference we use the results obtained so far in this section. Let \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \) with \( 0 \leq s < 1/2 \). By [4, Corollary 3.1], for any \( n \geq 1 \),

\[
|\langle 1|f_n \rangle^2 = \gamma_n \kappa_n, \quad \kappa_n = \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_0} \prod_{p \neq n} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_p}{\lambda_p - \lambda_n}\right).
\]

Note that the infinite product is absolutely convergent since the sequence \((\gamma_n(u))_{n \geq 1}\) is in \( \ell_1 \) (cf. (26)). Furthermore, since

\[
1 - \frac{\gamma_p}{\lambda_p - \lambda_n} \geq \frac{\lambda_p - 1}{\lambda_p} > 0, \quad \forall p \neq n
\]

it follows that \( \kappa_n > 0 \) for any \( n \geq 1 \). Following [4, (4.1)], we define for \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \) the Birkhoff coordinates as

\[
\zeta_n(u) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_n(u)}} \langle 1|f_n(\cdot, u) \rangle.
\]

By (25) one has (cf. also [4, (2.13)])

\[
\lambda_n \langle 1|f_n \rangle = -\langle u|f_n \rangle = -\langle \Pi u|f_n \rangle.
\]

Since by Proposition 2, \((\langle \Pi u|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 0} \in h^{-s}(\mathbb{N}_0)\) and by (28)

\[
n - 1 - \eta_n(\|u\|_{-s}) \leq \lambda_n(u) \leq n, \quad \forall n \geq 0,
\]

one concludes that

\[
(\langle 1|f_n \rangle)_{n \geq 1} \in h_1^{1-s}, \quad \kappa_n^{-1/2} = \sqrt{n} + o(1)
\]

and hence \((\zeta_n(u))_{n \geq 1} \in h_1^{1/2-s}\). In summary, we have proved that for any \( 0 < s < 1/2 \), the Birkhoff map \( \Phi : L^2_{r,0} \to h_1^{1/2-s} \) of Theorem 1 can be extended to a map

\[
H_{r,0}^{-s} \to h_1^{1/2-s}, \quad u \mapsto (\zeta_n(u))_{n \geq 1},
\]

which we again denote by \( \Phi \). Going through the arguments of the proof one verifies that \( \Phi \) is bounded. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4 and using Lemma 10 below instead of Lemma 3, saying that for any \( n \geq 0 \), \( \|f_n\|_{1-s} \) is uniformly bounded on bounded subsets of \( H_{r,0}^{-s} \), one sees that \( \Phi : H_{r,0}^{-s} \to h_1^{1/2-s} \) is sequentially weakly continuous.

It remains to show that \( \Phi : H_{r,0}^{-s} \to h_1^{1/2-s} \) is one-to-one. In the case where \( u \in L^2_{r,0} \), it was verified in the proof of [4, Proposition 4.2] that the Fourier coefficients \( \hat{u}(k) \), \( k \geq 1 \), of \( u \) can be explicitly expressed in terms of the components \( \zeta_n(u) \) of the sequence \( \zeta(u) = \Phi(u) \). These formulas continue to hold for \( u \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \). This completes the proof of Theorem 5. \( \square \)

It remains to prove the following lemma, used in the proof of Theorem 8.
Lemma 10. Given $0 \leq s < 1/2$, $M > 0$ and $n \geq 0$, there exists a constant $C_{s,M,n} \geq 1$ so that for any $u \in H_{r,0}^{-s}$ with $\|u\|_{-s} \leq M$ and any $n \geq 0$

\begin{equation}
\|f_n(\cdot,u))\|_{1-s} \leq C_{s,M,n}.
\end{equation}

Proof. By the normalisation of $f_n$, $\|f_n\| = 1$. Since $f_n$ is an eigenfunction, corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_n$, one has $-i\partial_x f_n = Lu f_n + Tu f_n = \lambda_n f_n + Tu f_n$, implying that

\begin{equation}
\|\partial_x f_n\|_{-s} \leq |\lambda_n| + \|Tu f_n\|_{-s}.
\end{equation}

Note that by the estimates (28),

\begin{equation}
|\lambda_n| \leq \max\{n, |\lambda_0|\} \leq n + |\lambda_0|, \quad |\lambda_0| \leq 1 + \eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})
\end{equation}

where $\eta_s(\|u\|_{-s})$ is given by (17). Furthermore, by (22) - (23),

\begin{equation}
\|Tu f_n\|_{-s} \leq C_{s,\sigma}\|u\|_{-s}\|f_n\|_{1-\sigma}
\end{equation}

where $1 - \sigma = 1 - s - (1/2 - s)/2$. Using interpolation and Young’s inequality (cf. (18), (19)), (33) yields an estimate, which together with (31) and (32) leads to the claimed estimate (30). \qed

5. Extension of $\Phi$. Part 2

In this section we prove the second part of Theorem 5, which we again state as a separate theorem.

Theorem 9. (Extension of $\Phi$. Part 2) For any $0 < s < 1/2$, the Birkhoff map $\Phi : H_{r,0}^{-s} \rightarrow h_{+}^{1/2-s}$ has the following additional properties:

(i) The inverse image of $\Phi$ of any bounded subset of $h_{+}^{1/2-s}$ is a bounded subset in $H_{r,0}^{-s}$.

(ii) $\Phi$ is onto and the inverse of $\Phi$, $\Phi^{-1} : h_{+}^{1/2-s} \rightarrow H_{r,0}^{-s}$, is sequentially weakly continuous.

Proof of Theorem 9(i). Let $0 < s < 1/2$ and $u \in H_{r,0}^{-s}$. Recall that by Corollary 3, $L_u$ is a self-adjoint operator with domain $\text{dom}(L_u) \subset H^+$, has discrete spectrum and is bounded from below. Thus $L_u - \lambda_0(u) + 1 \geq 1$ where $\lambda_0(u)$ denotes the smallest eigenvalue of $L_u$. By the construction of $L_u$ in Section 4, $L_u$ extends to a bounded operator $L_u : H_{+}^{1/2} \rightarrow H_{+}^{-1/2}$ and satisfies

$$\langle L_u f | f \rangle = \langle Df | f \rangle - \langle u | f \rangle, \quad \forall f \in H_{+}^{1/2}.$$ 

By Lemma 6(i) one has $|\langle u | f \rangle| \leq C_{1,s}^2 \|u\|_{-s} \|f\|_{1/2}^2$ for any $f \in H_{+}^{1/2}$ and hence

$$\|f\|^2 \leq \langle (L_u - \lambda_0(u) + 1) f | f \rangle$$

$$\leq \langle Df | f \rangle + C_{1,s}^2 \|u\|_{-s} \|f\|_{1/2}^2 + (-\lambda_0(u) + 1) \|f\|^2,$$

yielding the estimate

$$\|f\|^2 \leq \langle (L_u - \lambda_0(u) + 1) f | f \rangle \leq M_u \|f\|_{1/2}^2,$$
where
\begin{equation}
M_u := C_{1,s}^2 \|u\|_{-s} + (2 - \lambda_0(u)).
\end{equation}
To shorten notation, we will for the remainder of the proof no longer indicate the dependence of spectral quantities such as \(\lambda_n\) or \(\gamma_n\) on \(u\) whenever feasible. The square root of the operator \(L_u - \lambda_0 + 1\),
\[R_u := (L_u - \lambda_0 + 1)^{1/2} : H^{1/2}_+ \to H^+,
\]
can then be defined in terms of the basis \(f_n \equiv f_n(\cdot, u), n \geq 0\), of eigenfunctions of \(L_u\) in a standard way as follows: By Proposition 2, any \(f \in H^{1/2}_+\) has an expansion of the form \(f = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \langle f|f_n\rangle f_n\) where \((\langle f|f_n\rangle)_{n \geq 0}\) is a sequence in \(h^{1/2}(\mathbb{N}_0)\). \(R_u f\) is then defined as
\[R_u f := \sum_{n=0}^\infty (\lambda_n - \lambda_0 + 1)^{1/2} \langle f|f_n\rangle f_n\]
Since \((\lambda_n - \lambda_0 + 1)^{1/2} \approx \sqrt{n}\) (cf. (28)) one has
\[
(\lambda_n - \lambda_0 + 1)^{1/2} (\langle f|f_n\rangle)^{1/2})_{n \geq 0} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)
\]
implying that \(R_u f \in H^+\) (cf. Proposition 2). Note that
\[
\|f\|^2 \leq \langle R_u f|R_u f \rangle = \langle R_u^2 f|f \rangle \leq M_u \|f\|_{1/2}^2, \quad \forall f \in H^{1/2}_+,
\]
and that \(R_u\) is a positive self-adjoint operator when viewed as an operator with domain \(H^{1/2}_+\), acting on \(H^+\). By complex interpolation (cf. e.g. [18, Section 1.4]) one then concludes that for any \(0 \leq \theta \leq 1\)
\[R_u^\theta : H^{\theta/2}_+ \to H^+, \quad \|R_u^\theta f\|^2 \leq M_u^\theta \|f\|_{\theta/2}^2, \quad \forall f \in H^{\theta/2}_+.
\]
Since by duality,
\[R_u^\theta : H^+ \to H^{\theta/2}_-, \quad \|R_u^\theta g\|^2_{\theta/2} \leq M_u^\theta \|g\|^2, \quad \forall g \in H^+,
\]
one infers, using that \(R_u^\theta : H^+ \to H^{\theta/2}_+\) is boundedly invertible, that for any \(f \in H^{\theta/2}_-\),
\[\|f\|^2_{\theta/2} \leq M_u^\theta \|R_u^{-\theta} f\|^2, \quad R_u^{-\theta} := (R_u^\theta)^{-1}.
\]
Applying the latter inequality to \(f = \Pi u\) and \(\theta = 2s\) and using that \(\Pi u = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \langle \Pi u|f_n\rangle f_n\) and \(\langle \Pi u|f_n\rangle = -\lambda_n \langle 1|f_n\rangle\) one sees that
\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{-s} = \|\Pi u\|_{-s}^2 \leq M_u^{2s} \Sigma
\end{equation}
where
\[
\Sigma := \sum_{n=1}^\infty \lambda_n^2 (\lambda_n - \lambda_0 + 1)^{-2s} |\langle 1|f_n\rangle|^2.
\]
We would like to deduce from (35) an estimate of \(\|u\|_{-s}\) in terms of the \(\gamma_n\)’s. Let us first consider \(M_u^{2s}\). By (34) one has
\[M_u^{2s} = 2^{2s} \max\{\lambda_0^2(u), (2 - \lambda_0(u))^{2s}\},
\]
yielding
\begin{equation}
M_{2s}^2 \leq (\|u\|_{-s}^2s^2(2C^2_{1,s})^{2s} + (2(2 - \lambda_0(u)))^{2s}).
\end{equation}

Applying Young’s inequality with $1/p = s$, $1/q = 1 - s$ one obtains
\begin{equation}
(\|u\|_{-s}^2s^2(2C^2_{1,s})^{2s}) \leq \frac{1}{4}\|u\|_{-s}^2 + \left((4C^2_{1,s})^{2s}\Sigma\right)^{1/(1-s)},
\end{equation}
which when combined with (35) and (36), leads to
\[\frac{1}{4}\|u\|_{-s}^2 \leq \left((4C^2_{1,s})^{2s}\Sigma\right)^{1/(1-s)} + (2(2 - \lambda_0(u)))^{2s}\Sigma.\]
The latter estimate is of the form
\begin{equation}
\|u\|_{-s}^2 \leq C_{3,s}\Sigma^{1/(1-s)} + C_{4,s}(2 - \lambda_0(u))^{2s}\Sigma,
\end{equation}
where $C_{3,s}, C_{4,s} > 0$ are constants, only depending on $s$. Next let us turn to $\Sigma = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \lambda_n^2(\lambda_n - \lambda_0 + 1)^{-2s}\|\langle 1|f_n\rangle\|^2$. Since
\[\lambda_n = n - \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \gamma_k, \quad \|\langle 1|f_n\rangle\|^2 = \gamma_n\kappa_n,\]
and
\begin{equation}
\kappa_n = \frac{1}{\lambda_n - \lambda_0} \prod_{p \neq n} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_p}{\lambda_p - \lambda_n}\right),
\end{equation}
the series $\Sigma$ can be expressed in terms of the $\gamma_n$’s. To obtain a bound for $\Sigma$ it remains to estimate the $\kappa_n$’s. Note that
\[\prod_{p \neq n} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_p}{\lambda_p - \lambda_n}\right) \leq \prod_{p < n} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_p}{\lambda_n - \lambda_p}\right) \leq e^{\sum_{p=1}^n \gamma_p} \leq e^{-\lambda_0}.\]
Since $(\lambda_n - \lambda_0)^{-1} = (n + \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k)^{-1} \leq n^{-1}$, it then follows that
\[0 < \kappa_n \leq \frac{e^{-\lambda_0}}{n}, \quad \forall n \geq 1.\]
Combining the estimates above we get
\[\Sigma \leq e^{-\lambda_0} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \lambda_n^2 n^{-2s-1}\gamma_n.\]
By splitting the sum $\Sigma$ into two parts, $\Sigma = \sum_{n < -\lambda_0(u)} + \sum_{n \geq -\lambda_0(u)}$ and taking into account that $\lambda_n \leq n$ for any $n \geq \lambda_0$ and $|\lambda_n| \leq -\lambda_0$ for any $1 \leq n < \lambda_0$, one has
\[\Sigma \leq (1 - \lambda_0)e^{-\lambda_0} \sum_{n=1}^\infty n^{1-2s}\gamma_n.\]
Together with the estimate (38) this shows that the inverse image by $\Phi$ of any bounded subset of sequences in $h^{1/2-s}$ is bounded in $H_{r,0}$. \qed
Proof of Theorem 9(ii). Let 0 < s < 1/2. First we prove that
Φ : H_{r,0}^{-s} → h_+^{1/2-s} is onto. Given z = (z_n)_{n≥1} in h_+^{1/2-s}, consider the
sequence ζ(k) = (ζ_n(k))_{n≥1}, defined for any k ≥ 1 by
ζ_n(k) = z_n ∀1 ≤ n ≤ k, ζ_n(k) = 0 ∀n > k.
Clearly ζ(k) → z strongly in h^{1/2-s}. Since for any k ≥ 1, ζ(k) ∈ h^{1/2-s}.
Theorem 1 implies that there exists a unique element u(k) ∈ L^2_{r,0} with
Φ(u(k)) = ζ(k). By Theorem 9(i), sup_{k≥1}∥u(k)∥_s < ∞. Choose a weakly convergent subsequence (u(k))_{j≥1} of (u(k))_{k≥1} and denote its
weak limit in H_{r,0}^{-s} by u. Since by Theorem 8, Φ : H_{r,0}^{-s} → h_+^{1/2-s} is
sequentially weakly continuous, Φ(u(k)) → Φ(u) weakly in h_+^{1/2-s}. On the other hand, Φ(u(k)) = ζ(k) → z strongly in h^{1/2-s}, implying that
Φ(u) = z. This shows that Φ is onto.
It remains to prove that Φ^{-1} is sequentially weakly continuous. Assume
that (ζ(k))_{k≥1} is a sequence in h^{1/2-s}, weakly converging to ζ ∈ h^{1/2-s}.
Let u(k) := Φ^{-1}(ζ(k)). By Theorem 9(i), (u(k))_{k≥1} is a bounded sequence in
H_{r,0}^{-s} and thus admits a weakly convergent subsequence (u^s)_{j≥1}.
Denote its limit in H_{r,0}^{-s} by u. Since by Theorem 8, Φ is sequentially
weakly continuous, Φ(u^s) → Φ(u) weakly in h_+^{1/2-s}. On the other hand, by assumption, Φ(u^s) → ζ and hence u = Φ^{-1}(ζ) and u is independent of the chosen subsequence (u^s)_{j≥1}. This shows that
Φ^{-1}(ζ(k)) → Φ^{-1}(ζ) weakly in H_{r,0}^{-s}. □

6. Extension of Φ. Part 3

In this section we prove the third part of Theorem 5, which we again state as a separate theorem.

Theorem 10. (Extension of Φ. Part 3) For any 0 < s < 1/2, the
Birkhoff map Φ : H_{r,0}^{-s} → h_+^{1/2-s} and its inverse Φ^{-1} : h_+^{1/2-s} → H_{r,0}^{-s},
are continuous.

Before proving Theorem 10, let us recall the following well known
characterization of relatively compact subsets of H_{r,0}^{-s} in terms of the
Fourier expansion u(x) = ∑_{n≠0} ̂u(n)e^{inx} of an element u in H_{r,0}^{-s}.

Lemma 11. (i)Let 0 < s < 1/2 and A ⊂ H_{r,0}^{-s}. Then A is relatively
compact in H_{r,0}^{-s} if and only if for any ε > 0, there exist N_ε ≥ 1 and
R_ε > 0 so that for any u ∈ A,
( ∑_{|n|>N_ε} |n|^{-2s}| ̂u(n)|^2 )^{1/2} < ε , ( ∑_{0<|n|≤N_ε} | ̂u(n)|^2 )^{1/2} < R_ε .

(ii) Obviously, an analogous characterization of relatively compact sub-
sets of h^{-s}(N_0), 0 < s < 1/2, holds.
Using Lemma 11 and Proposition 2 we now prove Theorem 10.

**Proof of Theorem 10.** By Theorem 8, \( \Phi : H_{r,0}^{1/2-s} \to h_+^{1/2-s} \) is weakly continuous. To show that this map is continuous it then suffices to prove that the image \( \Phi(A) \) of any relatively compact subset \( A \) of \( H_{r,0}^{1/2-s} \) is relatively compact in \( h_+^{1/2-s} \). For any given \( \epsilon > 0 \), choose \( N \equiv N_s \geq 1 \) and \( R \equiv R_s > 0 \) as in Lemma 11(i). Decompose \( u \in A \) as \( u = u_N + u_\perp \) where

\[
  u_N := \sum_{0<|n| \leq N_s} \hat{u}(n) e^{inx}, \quad u_\perp := \sum_{|n| > N_s} \hat{u}(n) e^{inx}.
\]

By Lemma 11(i), \( \|u_N\| < R_\epsilon \) and \( \|u_\perp\|_{-s} < \epsilon \). By Proposition 2, applied with \( \theta = -s \), one has

\[
  K_{u,-s}(\Pi u) = K_{u,-s}(\Pi u_N) + K_{u,-s}(\Pi u_\perp) \in h^{-s}(N_0)
\]

where \( K_{u,-s}(\Pi u_N) = K_{u,0}(\Pi u_N) \) since \( \Pi u_N \in H^+ \). Proposition 2 then implies that there exists \( C_A > 0 \), independent of \( u \in A \), so that

\[
  \|K_{u,0}(\Pi u_N)\| \leq C_A R_\epsilon, \quad \|K_{u,-s}(\Pi u_\perp)\|_{-s} \leq C_A \epsilon.
\]

Since \( \epsilon > 0 \) can be chosen arbitrarily small, it then follows by Lemma 11(ii) that \( K_{u,-s}(\Pi(A)) \) is relatively compact in \( h^{-s}(N_0) \). Since by definition, \( K_{u,-s}(\Pi u) \in h^{-s}(N_0) \) with

\[
  (K_{u,-s}(\Pi u))_n = \langle \Pi u|f_n(\cdot, u) \rangle, \quad \forall n \geq 0,
\]

and since by (25),

\[
  \zeta_n(u) \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \langle \Pi u|f_n(\cdot, u) \rangle \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty
\]

uniformly with respect to \( u \in A \), it follows that \( \Phi(A) \) is relatively compact in \( h_+^{1/2-s} \).

Now let us turn to \( \Phi^{-1} \). By Theorem 9, \( \Phi^{-1} : h_+^{1/2-s} \to H_{r,0}^s \) is weakly continuous. To show that this map is continuous it then suffices to prove that the image \( \Phi^{-1}(B) \) of any relatively compact subset \( B \) of \( h_+^{1/2-s} \) is relatively compact in \( H_{r,0}^s \). By the same arguments as above one sees that \( \Phi^{-1} : h_+^{1/2-s} \to H_{r,0}^s \) is also continuous. \( \square \)

7. Proof of Theorem 6

Using Theorem 5, we prove in this section Theorem 6. First we consider the BO flow map in Birkhoff coordinates,

\[
  S_B^t : h_+^{1/2} \to h_+^{1/2}, \quad \zeta = (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \mapsto (e^{i\omega_n t} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}.
\]

By Lemma 4(ii), for any \( 0 < s < 1/2 \), the frequencies \( \omega_n, n \geq 0 \), are weakly continuous maps, \( \omega_n : h_+^{1/2-s} \to \mathbb{R} \). Hence for any \( \zeta = (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \) in \( h_+^{1/2-s} \), the sequence \( S_B^t(\zeta) \), given by \( (e^{i\omega_n t} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1} \), is welldefined.
Lemma 12. Let $0 < s < 1/2$. Then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the map $S_B^t : h_+^{1/2-s} \to h_+^{1/2-s}$ is continuous and sequentially weakly continuous.

Proof. Let us first establish that $S_B^t : h_+^{1/2-s} \to h_+^{1/2-s}$ is sequentially weakly continuous. Consider a sequence $(\zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1}$ in $h_+^{1/2-s}$ with $\zeta^{(k)} \equiv (\zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1} \to \zeta \equiv (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ weakly in $h_+^{1/2-s}$. To simplify notation, let $\omega_n^{(k)} := \omega_n(\zeta^{(k)})$ and $\omega_n := \omega_n(\zeta)$. Then there exists $M \geq 1$ so that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $k \geq 1$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t^{1-2s} |e^{i\omega_n^{(k)} t} \zeta_n^{(k)}|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{1-2s} |\zeta_n^{(k)}|^2 \leq M.$$ 

Hence for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the sequence $(e^{i\omega_n^{(k)} t} \zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded in $h_+^{1/2-s}$. Since by Lemma 4(ii), one has $\lim_{k \to \infty} e^{i\omega_n^{(k)} t} \zeta_n^{(k)} = e^{i\omega_n t} \zeta_n$ for any $n \geq 1$ one then infers that $(e^{i\omega_n^{(k)} t} \zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1} \to (e^{i\omega_n t} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ weakly in $h_+^{1/2-s}$. Now let us show that $S_B^t : h_+^{1/2-s} \to h_+^{1/2-s}$ is continuous. Consider a sequence $(\zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1}$ in $h_+^{1/2-s}$ with $\zeta^{(k)} \equiv (\zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1} \to \zeta \equiv (\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ strongly in $h_+^{1/2-s}$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there then exists $N_\varepsilon \geq 1$ so that for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{n > N_\varepsilon} n^{1-2s} |e^{i\omega_n^{(k)} t} \zeta_n^{(k)}|^2 = \sum_{n > N_\varepsilon} n^{1-2s} |\zeta_n^{(k)}|^2 < \varepsilon.$$ 

Since $S_B^t$ is sequentially weakly continuous it then follows easily that $(e^{i\omega_n^{(k)} t} \zeta_n^{(k)})_{n \geq 1} \to (e^{i\omega_n t} \zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ strongly in $h_+^{1/2-s}$.

□

Proof of Theorem 6. The proof is split up into several steps.

Step 1: Extension of $S^t$. Let $0 < s < 1/2$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By Theorem 5, $\Phi : H_{r,0}^{-s} \to h_+^{1/2-s}$ and $\Phi^{-1} : h_+^{1/2-s} \to H_{r,0}^{-s}$ are both continuous and sequentially weakly continuous and by Lemma 12, so is $S_B^t : h_+^{1/2-s} \to h_+^{1/2-s}$. In particular it follows that the composition $\Phi^{-1} \circ S_B^t \circ \Phi$ is a well-defined map on $H_{r,0}^{-s}$. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we then extend the flow map $S^t$ by defining $S^t = \Phi^{-1} \circ S_B^t \circ \Phi$. Hence $S^t : H_{r,0}^{-s} \to H_{r,0}^{-s}$ is continuous and sequentially weakly continuous.

Step 2: A priori estimate. For any $u(0) \in H_{r,0}^{-s}$, let $u(t) := S^t(u(0))$. Since $u(t) = \Phi^{-1}S_B^t \Phi(u(0))$ it follows from Theorem 5 that there exists a constant $C_s > 0$ so that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|u(t)\|_{-s} \leq C_s \|\Phi(u(0))\|_{1/2-s}$$

where $C_s$ can be chosen uniformly on bounded subsets of $H_{r,0}^{-s}$. Hence there exists an increasing function $F_s : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ so that for any $u(0) \in H_{r,0}^{-s}$

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|u(t)\|_{-s} \leq F_s(\|\Phi(u(0))\|_{1/2-s}).$$
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Step 3: Continuity of the solution \( t \mapsto u(t) \). It is straightforward to verify that for any \( u(0) \in H_{r,0}^{-s} \), the curve \( t \mapsto S_t^t \Phi(u(0)) \) is continuous in \( h^{1/2-s} \). This implies that \( t \mapsto u(t) = \Phi^{-1}S_t^t \Phi(u(0)) \) is a continuous curve in \( H_{r,0}^{-s} \). This completes the proof of the theorem. □
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