

WEAK SOBOLEV ALMOST PERIODIC SOLUTIONS FOR THE 1D NLS

LUCA BIASCO, JESSICA ELISA MASSETTI, AND MICHELA PROCESI

ABSTRACT. All the almost periodic solutions for non integrable PDEs found in the literature are very regular (at least C^∞) and, hence, very close to quasi periodic ones. This fact is deeply exploited in the existing proofs. However, for physical motivations, one is interested in lowering the regularity. Here we consider the one dimensional analytic NLS with external parameters and construct almost periodic solutions which have only Sobolev regularity both in time and space. Moreover many of our solutions are so only in a weak sense. This is the first result on existence of weak, i.e. non classical, solutions for non integrable PDEs in KAM theory.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Main results	4
3. Proof of Theorem 1	10
4. Functional setting	12
5. Degree decompositions, projections and normal forms	15
6. Proof of Theorems 3 and 4	17
7. Small divisors and homological equation	19
8. Iterative Lemma and Proof of Theorem 5	25
9. Measure estimates	30
Appendix A. Technicalities	35
Appendix B. Topology, measure and continuous functions on infinite product spaces	38
References	40

1. INTRODUCTION

We present here the first result on existence of weak, i.e. non classical, solutions for non integrable PDEs in KAM theory. More precisely we study NLS equations on the circle finding almost periodic solutions, i.e. solutions which are limit (in the uniform topology in time) of time-quasi-periodic functions. We work on models with external parameters of the form:

$$(NLS_V) \quad i\mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{u}_{xx} - V * \mathbf{u} + f(|\mathbf{u}|^2)\mathbf{u} = 0, \quad \mathbf{u}(t, x) = \mathbf{u}(t, x + 2\pi),$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ and $f(y)$ is real analytic in y in a neighborhood of $y = 0$ with $f(0) = 0$. The Fourier multiplier $V*$ is defined as the bounded¹ linear operator $V* : \mathcal{F}(\ell^1) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\ell^1)$ by²

$$(1.1) \quad u(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} u_j e^{ijx} \mapsto (V * u)(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} V_j u_j e^{ijx}, \quad V = (V_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} \subset \ell^\infty(\mathbb{R}),$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\ell^1)$ is the Banach space of 2π -periodic functions³ having Fourier coefficients in $\ell^1 = \ell^1(\mathbb{C}) := \{u := (u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}} : |u|_{\ell^1} := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |u_j| < \infty\}$ endowed with the corresponding norm $|u(\cdot)|_{\mathcal{F}(\ell^1)} := |u|_{\ell^1}$.

¹Clearly the operator norm is $\|V\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}(\ell^1), \mathcal{F}(\ell^1))} = |V|_\infty := \sup_j |V_j|$.

²More precisely $(V * \mathbf{u})(t, x) := (V * \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot))(x)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

³Note that all such functions are continuous.

Besides classical solutions, namely functions \mathbf{u} admitting continuous derivatives \mathbf{u}_t and \mathbf{u}_{xx} solving (NLS_V) , we are particularly interested in weak solutions according to the following

Definition 1.1 (weak solutions). A function $\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is 2π -periodic in x and such that the map $t \mapsto \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{F}(\ell^1)$ is continuous is a weak solution of (NLS_V) if for any smooth compactly supported function $\chi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$(1.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (-i\chi_t + \chi_{xx})\mathbf{u} - (V * \mathbf{u} + f(|\mathbf{u}|^2)\mathbf{u})\chi \, dx \, dt = 0.$$

Note that according to our definition a weak solution is a continuous⁴ function on \mathbb{R}^2 .

Local well posedness for equations as (NLS_V) is well known even in lower regularity (see, e.g. [Bou93] and [Bou94]). In the context of integrable PDEs there are various results on weak almost-periodic solutions, we mention [KM18] for the KdV, [GH17] for the Szegő equation and [GKT] for the Benjamin-Ono. Here we work close to the elliptic fixed point $\mathbf{u} = 0$, we consider (NLS_V) as a small perturbation of the (integrable) linear Schrödinger equation and prove the persistence of almost-periodic solutions.

Theorem 1. *For almost every Fourier multiplier there exist infinitely many small-amplitude weak almost-periodic solutions of (NLS_V) . Infinitely many of such solutions are not classical.*

Here by *almost every* we mean a full measure set with respect to the *product probability measure* on $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$. The Borel sets on such measure are respect to the product topology on $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (see Appendix B).

Before describing in more detail our results, we briefly motivate why one is interested in almost-periodic solutions and particularly in those of low regularity.

In the study of finite dimensional nearly-integrable Hamiltonian systems KAM Theorems play a pivotal role, casting a light that illuminates the picture quite clearly. Indeed under some (generic) non-degeneracy assumptions most of the phase space of such systems is foliated by maximal invariant tori, whose dimension is half of the one of the whole space. In particular the system is not ergodic and the majority of initial data give rise to quasi-periodic solutions that densely fill some invariant torus and are, therefore, perpetually stable. Possible chaotic behaviour is restricted to a set of small measure.

On the other hand, in the infinite dimensional setting, for example in the PDEs case, the general picture is so far rather obscure and the main questions still remain unanswered. The typical solutions of an infinite dimensional integrable system are the *almost-periodic* ones that lie on maximal infinite dimensional invariant tori; what is their fate under perturbation? Is it still true that the majority of initial data produce perpetually stable solutions? The meaning and possible answers to these questions are deeply related to the regularity of the phase space in which one looks for solutions. These questions are completely open and only very partial answers are available. In particular the known results are on spaces of very high regularity (containing C^∞). On the other hand the natural setting for hamiltonian PDEs are Sobolev spaces. For instance the persistence of Sobolev almost periodic solutions is the first open problem on KAM for PDEs mentioned by S. Kuksin in [Kuk04] (see e.g. Problem 7.1).

As is usual in KAM Theory, a key point in the study of the dynamics in the neighborhood of these invariant tori, consists in controlling the spectral properties of appropriate linear operators and dealing with the connected problem of small-divisor. The main difficulty is then to guarantee that suitable arithmetic (Diophantine) conditions on the frequencies are fulfilled all along the scheme, so that small-divisors can be bounded accordingly and the almost-periodic dynamics controlled. Extending diophantine (or similar) estimates, which strongly depend on the dimension, to the infinite dimension is not straightforward. In fact all the results on almost-periodic solution for PDEs only deal with special model cases and consider parameter dependent equations.

External parameter vs. regularity issues. Quoting Bourgain [Bou05]: “the role of this parameter is essential to ensure appropriate non-resonance properties of the (modulated) frequencies along the iteration. In the

⁴Indeed $|\mathbf{u}(t, x) - \mathbf{u}(t_0, x_0)| \leq |\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) - \mathbf{u}(t_0, \cdot)|_{\mathcal{F}(\ell^1)} + |\mathbf{u}(t_0, x) - \mathbf{u}(t_0, x_0)|$.

absence of exterior parameters, these conditions need to be realized from amplitude-frequency modulation and suitable restriction of the action-variables. This problem is harder. Indeed, a fast decay of the action-variables (enhancing convergence of the process) allows less frequency modulation and worse small divisors”.

As we shall see below, in all the existent literature, the external parameters have rather low regularity (giving a good frequency modulation) while the almost periodic solutions have an *extremely fast* decay in their Fourier coefficients, which approach zero super-exponentially, exponentially or sub-exponentially (Gevrey). This means that those solutions are “very close” to quasi-periodic ones.

For example Pöschel in [Pös02], studies an NLS with a multiplicative potential in L^2 (producing an infinite set of free parameters) and smoothing nonlinearity and constructs almost-periodic solutions iteratively, through successive small perturbations of finite (but at each step higher) dimensional invariant tori. This leads to a very strong compactness property: in order to overcome the dependence of the KAM estimates on the dimension, the distances of these tori have to shrink super-exponentially, this leading to very regular solutions. See also [GX13] for a generalization of Pöschel’s approach to the analytic category, by using Töplitz-Lipschitz function techniques. In his pioneering work [Bou05] on the quintic NLS with Fourier multipliers (providing external parameters in ℓ^∞), Bourgain proposed a different approach which does not rely on approximations by quasi-periodic functions by working directly in Fourier space, and relying on a Diophantine condition which is tailored for the infinite dimension. For most choices of the parameters, this leads to the construction of almost periodic invariant tori which support Gevrey solutions (see also [BMP21], [CY20]).

Summarizing the possibility of constructing almost-periodic solutions for a *fixed* PDE, i.e. “eliminating” the external parameters through amplitude-frequency modulation, appears to be intimately related to the regularity issues. Moreover, in the context of completely integrable PDEs, the invertibility of the amplitude-frequency map is known only in spaces of very low regularity (see [KMMT16]). It then becomes fundamental to look for almost-periodic solutions in lower regularity spaces if we want to bypass the introduction of external parameters. While it is possible to lower the regularity beyond the Gevrey class (see [Con]) up to now all the known solutions are at least C^∞ . On the other hand finding *finite regularity* solutions appears to be a very difficult question, due to extremely small divisors.

Comparable difficulties in tackling the Sobolev case appear in Birkhoff Normal Form theory for PDEs leading to two different types of results. In the analytic or Gevrey case one has sub-exponential stability times (see [FG13] and [CMW20]), whereas in the Sobolev case the stability times seem to be controlled by the Sobolev exponent (see [BG06], [FI], [BD18], [BMP20a]).

The counterpart of total and long time stability results is the construction of unstable trajectories, which undergo growth of the Sobolev norms, see [Bou96, CKS⁺10, GK15, GHH⁺18, GGMP].

Comparison with the quasi-periodic case. In the context of quasi-periodic solutions there is a wide literature regarding the finite regularity case (starting from the seminal paper [Kuk88]). A good strategy, which works also for fully-nonlinear PDEs, is to apply a Nash-Moser scheme and prove tame estimates on the inverse of the linearized equation at an approximate solution. This method was proposed in [BB13] (generalizing the seminal works [CW93], [Bou99] concerning the analytic case) via multiscale analysis, see also [BB15] or [BBM16] for a reducibility approach.

Note that in literature such solutions are always classical and appear in the case of a non-linearity with finite regularity or in integrable PDEs (see [GKT]). Indeed one typically looks for an *invariant embedded finite* dimensional torus in a fixed phase space of x -dependent functions. Then the regularity of the embedding is clearly related to the one of the non-linearity, which, in the Nash-Moser schemes, is required to be high enough increasing with the dimension of the torus. This is not surprising since in n -dimensional hamiltonian systems the minimal regularity of the hamiltonian vector field in order to construct a maximal diophantine torus is essentially C^n (see [Her86], [Kou20], [Pös]). For analytic nonlinearities one obtains analytic (or, at least, C^∞) embedded tori and hence smooth in time solutions. By bootstrap arguments, smoothness in space follows.

A conceptual novelty of [BMP21] was to look directly for an ⁵ *infinite dimensional invariant torus*. The strategy developed in [BMP21] applies also to non maximal tori both of infinite and finite dimension. The persistence result was achieved through an abstract normal form theorem “à la Herman” (in finite dimensional systems see [Mas19, Mas18]), whose estimates are *uniform in the dimension* of the desired torus (see [BMP21, Theorems 3 and 7.1]).

Note that in looking for infinite tori the topology of the phase space plays a fundamental role. In particular the analyticity of the embedded torus does not necessarily imply the analyticity in time of the solution, since the map $t \mapsto \omega t$ is typically not continuous⁶ in (any reasonable) norm-topology.

Small divisors for infinite frequencies in finite regularity. As discussed above, lowering the regularity of the phase space requires dealing with very small divisors. In order to apply the general approach of [BMP21] in a phase space with finite regularity some new ideas are in order. Here our strategy is to look for *special tori which are approximately supported, in Fourier space, on a sparse subset of \mathbb{Z}* called “tangential sites” (see Definition 2.1). Actually our solutions are supported on such sites, see (3.5), up to a close to identity change of variables. The point is that the choice of tangential sites provides an extra set of parameters which can be used in order to avoid resonances, simplify small divisor estimates, etc...(see for instance [PP15], [HP17]). This idea allows us to impose *very strong* Diophantine conditions, see Definition 2.2, so that our small divisors can be controlled similarly to the Gevrey case of [Bou05, BMP21].

Having constructed an invariant torus contained in the phase space, we show that it is the support of weak almost periodic solutions. Finally we prove that many tori support almost periodic solutions which are not classical.

2. MAIN RESULTS

It is convenient to exploit the Hamiltonian nature of (NLS_V) . As was shown by Bourgain in [Bou05] it is most convenient to use as phase space a product space. To this purpose we introduce the scale of Banach spaces⁷

$$(2.1) \quad \mathfrak{w}_p := \left\{ u := (u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{C}) : |u|_p := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |u_j| |j|^p < \infty \right\}, \quad p > 1, \quad [j] := \max\{2, |j|\}.$$

In the following we systematically identify 2π -periodic functions with their Fourier coefficients writing, e.g. ℓ^1 instead of $\mathcal{F}(\ell^1)$ or \mathfrak{w}_p instead of $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{w}_p)$ etc.

The following immersion properties are standard⁸. For $0 \leq k < p - 1$ we have $C^p \subset H^p \subset \mathfrak{w}_p \subset C^k$ with estimate

$$(2.2) \quad c \max\{\|u^{(k)}\|_{L^\infty}, \|u\|_{L^\infty}\} \leq |u|_{\mathfrak{w}_p} \leq 2 \max\{\|u^{(p)}\|_{L^2}, \|u\|_{L^2}\}$$

where the first inequality holds for $u \in \mathfrak{w}_p$ and the second one for $u \in C^p$ and where $c^{-1} := \sum_j [j]^{k-p}$.

We define the NLS Hamiltonian⁹

$$(2.3) \quad H_V(u) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (j^2 + V_j) |u_j|^2 + P, \quad \text{with} \quad P := \int_{\mathbb{T}} F(|\sum_j u_j e^{ijx}|^2) dx, \quad F(y) := \int_0^y f(s) ds.$$

Note that \mathfrak{w}_p is a Banach algebra w.r.t convolution and moreover $V* : \mathfrak{w}_p \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_p$ is a linear bounded operator with norm $|V|_\infty$. This implies (see Proposition 4.2) that (2.3) is an analytic function on $\mathfrak{w}_p \cap H^1$.

⁵In the infinite-dimensional case, whether this is an embedding depends strongly on the chosen topology. See discussion after Theorem 3

⁶At least if $\sup_j |\omega_j| = \infty$ as it is typical in PDEs.

⁷Obviously one could also take the more standard weight $\langle j \rangle := \max\{1, |j|\}$ instead of $[j]$, which generates the same Banach space. We made such choice for merely technical reasons.

⁸For $u \in \mathfrak{w}_p$ we have $\|u\|_{L^\infty}, \|u^{(k)}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \sum_j \langle j \rangle^k |u_j| \leq \sum_j [j]^{k-p} |u|_{\mathfrak{w}_p}$. Moreover if $u \in H^p$ then, by Parseval equality, $\sum_j |j|^{2p} |u_j|^2 = \|u^{(p)}\|_{L^2}^2$ and $\sum_j |u_j|^2 = \|u\|_{L^2}^2$, so that $\sup_j |j|^p |u_j| \leq \|u^{(p)}\|_{L^2}$ and $|u_0| \leq \|u\|_{L^2}$, proving the second inequality in (2.2).

⁹We endow $\mathfrak{w}_p \subset \ell^2$ with the symplectic structure inherited from ℓ^2 .

By (2.2), if $p > 3/2$ then $\mathfrak{w}_p \subset H^1$. Otherwise, for $1 < p < 3/2$ we might have infinite energy. However, as usual, one only needs that the Hamiltonian vector field is well defined and the flow is locally well-posed, which holds true in \mathfrak{w}_p , for $p > 1$.

As explained before our invariant tori are approximately supported on sparse sets $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 2.1 (Admissible tangential sites). Let \mathcal{S} be any unbounded subset of \mathbb{N} . Let $s(i)$ be a smooth strictly increasing function¹⁰ $s : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that $\mathcal{S} = s(\mathbb{N})$. We call $i(s)$ the inverse function of $s(i)$. Assume that there exist $i_* \geq 21$ such that

$$(2.4a) \quad s(i) \geq e^{(\log i)^{1+\eta}}, \quad \forall i \geq i_*, \quad \text{for some given } 1 < \eta \leq 2;$$

$$(2.4b) \quad s(i + i') \geq s(i) + s(i'), \quad s(hi) \geq hs(i), \quad \forall h \geq 1, \quad i, i' \geq i_*;$$

$$(2.4c) \quad s(i^2) \geq s^2(i), \quad \forall i \geq i_*.$$

We call *tangential site* a site s belonging to \mathcal{S} .

Remark 2.1. 1) Definition 2.1 above gives a quantitative control on how "sparse" the set \mathcal{S} should be. In particular by (2.4a) the function $s(i)$ must grow faster than any polynomial; for example we can choose¹¹ $s(i) = 2^i$ or a slower growth such as $s(i) = \lceil e^{(\log i)^{1+\eta}} \rceil$ ($\lceil \cdot \rceil$ being the integer part).

2) If $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ are admissible tangential sites (according to Definition 2.1) and \mathcal{S}_0 is any bounded subset of \mathbb{Z} , then we can consider also admissible tangential sites of the form $-\mathcal{S}_1, (-\mathcal{S}_1) \cup \mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_0, (-\mathcal{S}_1) \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_0$.

In what follows, given a sequence indexed over \mathbb{Z} we systematically decompose it over \mathcal{S} and $\mathcal{S}^c := \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathcal{S}$; for example, for the potential V we write

$$V = (V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}), \quad V_{\mathcal{S}} := (V_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}}, \quad V_{\mathcal{S}^c} := (V_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c}.$$

Analogously, we define the set of *tangential frequencies* as

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} := \left\{ \nu = (\nu_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}} : |\nu_j - j^2| < \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

The cube $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}$ inherits the product topology¹² and the product probability measure $\text{meas}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}}$ from $[-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathcal{S}}$ through the map

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^* : \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow [-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathcal{S}}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S},j}^*(\nu) := \nu_j - j^2, \quad j \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Moreover the above map also endows $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}$ with the ℓ^∞ -metric, which induces a finer topology.

Finally, given $r > 0$ we define the *tangential actions*

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{I}(p, r) := \{ I \in B_{r^2}(\mathfrak{w}_{2p}) \text{ with } I_j = 0 \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{S}^c, \quad I_j \geq 0 \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{S} \}.$$

We are now ready to state our main dynamical result.

Theorem 2. *For all $p_* > 1, r > 0$ sufficiently small, $I \in \mathcal{I}(p_*, r), V_{\mathcal{S}^c} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$, there exists a Cantor-like set \mathcal{C} of positive Lebesgue measure such that the following holds.*

For all frequencies $\nu \in \mathcal{C}$, there exist a potential $V_{\mathcal{S}} \in [-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathcal{S}}$ and a symplectic diffeomorphism Φ analytic on a small ball in \mathfrak{w}_{p_} such that for all $\nu \in \mathcal{C}$*

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{T}_I := \{ u \in \mathfrak{w}_p : |u_j|^2 = I_j \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z} \}$$

is a KAM torus of frequency ν for $H_V \circ \Phi$, with $V = (V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})$. Namely, the Hamiltonian vector field of $H_V \circ \Phi$ is well defined and, restricted to the invariant torus \mathcal{T}_I , its flow is

$$u_j(t) = u_j(0)e^{i\nu_j t}, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{S} \quad \text{and} \quad u_j(t) = 0, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{S}^c, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

¹⁰The function $s(i)$ is obviously not unique but its restriction to \mathcal{S} is unique. The same holds for its inverse $i(s)$.

¹¹See [BMP20b]

¹²Recall that if $X_i, i \in I$, are topological metrizable spaces, the product topology on $X := \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is the topology of the pointwise convergence, meaning that a sequence $x^{(k)} = (x_i^{(k)})_{i \in I}$ converges iff $x_i^{(k)}$ converges for all $i \in I$.

Thus, the (NLS_V) has invariant tori on which the dynamics is the linear translation by νt .

The statement above is a typical KAM Theorem, regarding the existence of an invariant torus. The fact that we are looking for an infinite torus however introduces various new difficulties, in particular related to the regularity of the dependence on ν, I, V_{S^c} . This appears immediately when one wishes to prove that the Cantor set \mathcal{C} of “good frequencies” is measurable (and of positive measure) with respect to the product probability measure $\text{meas}_{\mathcal{Q}_S}$ on \mathcal{Q}_S . The σ -algebra of such measure, which is the natural one in this context, is given by the Borel sets of the product topology, which is coarser than the one induced by the ℓ^∞ -metric. Then a crucial point is that a function $f : \mathcal{Q}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is Lipschitz (with respect to the ℓ^∞ -metric) might be non continuous with respect to the product topology and, hence, non measurable. As typical in KAM schemes \mathcal{C} is defined as the intersection of sets of the form $\{|f(\nu)| > \alpha > 0\}$ (see (9.1) and (9.2)) and $f : \mathcal{Q}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz function. As explained above this does not assure measurability¹³.

So we reformulate our theorem in a more technical way, carefully keeping track of the regularity w.r.t. all the parameters. To avoid working with functions defined only on a Cantor set, we suitably (see Lemma 4.1) extend all the functions so that they are defined for $\nu \in \mathcal{Q}_S$. To summarize, the parameter dependences we need to control are:

- continuity w.r.t. the product topology for measure estimates both in ν and in V ;
- Lipschitz dependence (w.r.t. ℓ^∞ -metric) for implicit function theorems/contractions/extensions (see Lemma B.1).

The smallness condition (i.e. how close are our solutions to zero) is tied to the size of the non-linearity and to the regularity of the solution we are looking for. Recall that, since f is analytic, for some $R > 0$ we have

$$(2.9) \quad f(y) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} f^{(d)} y^d, \quad |f|_R := \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} |f^{(d)}| R^d < \infty.$$

Theorem 3. *Let $p_* > 1$ and $0 < \gamma \leq |f|_R$. There exists $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(p_*) > 0$ and $C = C(p_*) > 1$ such that, for all $r > 0$ satisfying*

$$(2.10) \quad \varepsilon := \frac{|f|_R}{\gamma R} r^2 \leq \varepsilon_*$$

and for every

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{p_* + 1}{2} \leq p \leq p_*$$

the following holds. There exist:

i) a map

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{V}_S : \mathcal{Q}_S \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{S^c} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r) \rightarrow [-1/2 - \gamma, 1/2 + \gamma]^S, \quad (\nu, V_{S^c}, I) \mapsto \mathcal{V}_S(\nu, V_{S^c}, I)$$

which is continuous in ν, V_{S^c} w.r.t. the product topology and Lipschitz in all its variables w.r.t. the ℓ^∞ metric. More precisely it is Lipschitz $C\varepsilon\gamma$ -close w.r.t. ν to the map \mathcal{V}_S^* ;

ii) a map

$$\Phi : B_{3r}(\mathbf{w}_p) \times \mathcal{Q}_S \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{S^c} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r) \rightarrow B_{4r}(\mathbf{w}_p), \quad (u; \nu, V_{S^c}, I) \mapsto \Phi(u; \nu, V_{S^c}, I)$$

which is Lipschitz in all its variables and $r/16$ -close to the identity w.r.t. u ;

iii) a Cantor-like Borel set $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma) \subset \mathcal{Q}_S$, with¹⁴

$$(2.13) \quad \text{meas}_{\mathcal{Q}_S}(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma)) \leq C_0\gamma, \quad \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^S}(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma), V_{S^c}, I)) \leq C_0\gamma,$$

¹³This problem does not appear if f actually depends only on a finite number of variables as in the case of maximal tori, where $f(\nu) = \nu \cdot \ell$, with $|\ell| < \infty$.

¹⁴By $\text{meas}_{\mathcal{Q}_S}$ and $\text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^S}$ we denote the product probability measures on \mathcal{Q}_S and $[-1/4, 1/4]^S$, respectively. For brevity we write $\text{meas}_{\mathcal{Q}_S}(A)$ for $\text{meas}_{\mathcal{Q}_S}(A \cap \mathcal{Q}_S)$ and similarly for $\text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^S}$.

for a suitable absolute constant $C_0 > 0$.

Moreover for any $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$, $V_{S^c} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{S^c}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma)$, the map $\Phi(\cdot; \nu, V_{S^c}, I)$ is an analytic symplectic change of variables.

Finally, for $\nu \in \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma)$, \mathcal{T}_I defined in (2.8) is a KAM torus of frequency ν for $H_V \circ \Phi$ with $V = (V_S(\nu, V_{S^c}, I), V_{S^c})$.

We now reformulate our result in terms of the Fourier multiplier V (for the proof see Section 9)

Corollary 2.1. *For $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$, with p, r as in the previous Theorem, let*

$$\mathcal{G}(I, \gamma) := \{V \equiv (V_S, V_{S^c}) \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} : V_S \in \mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma), V_{S^c}, I)\}.$$

$\mathcal{G}(I, \gamma)$ is a Borel set in $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with measure greater than $1 - C_0\gamma$ (C_0 is the constant in (2.13)).

Therefore for all $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ and all $V \in \mathcal{G}(I, \gamma)$ the equation (NLS $_V$) has an invariant torus.

Invariant tori and regularity of our almost periodic solutions. Given any $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ the map

$$(2.14) \quad \mathbf{i} : \mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_I \subset \mathfrak{w}_p, \quad \varphi = (\varphi_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \mapsto \mathbf{i}(\varphi), \quad \text{with } \mathbf{i}_j(\varphi) := \sqrt{I_j} e^{i\varphi_j} \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \mathbf{i}_j(\varphi) := 0 \text{ otherwise,}$$

is analytic provided that we endow $\mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{S}}$ with the ℓ^∞ -topology (see Lemma B.2 below for details). Then by composition so is the map $\Phi \circ \mathbf{i}$ and the invariant torus $\Phi(\mathbf{i}(\varphi); \nu, V_{S^c}, I)$ is analytic. Of course the map \mathbf{i} is not injective if some of the I_j 's are zero; however, defining $\mathcal{S}' := \{j \in \mathcal{S} : I_j \neq 0\}$, the map $\mathbf{i}' := \mathbf{i}|_{\mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{S}'}}$ is an injective immersion¹⁵.

By construction the NLS dynamics on the torus \mathcal{T}_I is $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi + \nu t$ so our candidate for an almost periodic solution is $\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) := \Phi(\mathbf{i}(\nu t); \nu, V_{S^c}, I)$. If $p > 3$ the fact that $\mathbf{u}(t, x)$ is a (classical) solution is indeed standard but dealing with lower regularity requires more attention, see section 3.

We wish to stress that analyticity of $\Phi(\mathbf{i}(\varphi))$ in the angles does not imply analyticity in time, since the map $t \mapsto \nu t \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{S}}$ is not even continuous (endowing $\mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{S}}$ with the ℓ^∞ -topology). Of course the regularity of $t \mapsto \mathbf{i}(\nu t)$ depends on the choice of the actions I_j . If we take for instance $\sqrt{I_j} = \langle j \rangle^{-p}$, for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ and $I_j = 0$ for $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$, then $\mathbf{i}(\nu \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_p$ is not continuous w.r.t. the strong¹⁶ topology, see also [KM18]. On the other hand, for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$, the map

$$t \mapsto \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \langle j \rangle^{-p} e^{i(jx - \nu_j t)} =: v(t, x)$$

is continuous (recall that $p > 1$) and is $C^k(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C})$ for all $k < \frac{p-1}{2}$, but not for $k \geq \frac{p-1}{2}$. Note that for every fixed t

$$v(t, \cdot) \in \mathfrak{w}_p \quad \text{but} \quad v(t, \cdot) \notin \mathfrak{w}_{p'}, \quad \forall p' > p.$$

The Cantor set \mathcal{C} . We can be rather explicit in our description of the set \mathcal{C} of Theorem 3. We start by fixing the hypercube

$$(2.15) \quad \mathcal{Q} := \left\{ \omega = (\omega_j)_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}} : |\omega_j - j^2| < \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_S \times \mathcal{Q}_{S^c},$$

endowed with the product topology, and by introducing the following closed set

Definition 2.2 (Diophantine condition). Let $\tau > 1$. We say that a vector $\omega \in \mathcal{Q}$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}$ if it satisfies

$$(2.16) \quad |\omega \cdot \ell| \geq \gamma \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_s|^2 \langle i(s) \rangle)^{2\tau}}, \quad \forall \ell : 0 < |\ell| < \infty, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\ell_j| \leq 2, \quad \pi(\ell) = \mathbf{m}(\ell) = 0,$$

where¹⁷ $i(s)$ is the inverse function of $s(i)$, $\pi(\ell) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} j \ell_j$ is the ‘‘momentum’’ and $\mathbf{m}(\ell) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \ell_j$ is the ‘‘mass’’.

¹⁵Assuming also that $\inf_j \sqrt{I_j} \langle j \rangle^p > 0$ the map \mathbf{i}' is an embedded torus. Otherwise, \mathbf{i} is an homeomorphism on the image only if we endow both source and target spaces with the product topology

¹⁶Note that the map is continuous endowing \mathfrak{w}_p with the product topology, which coincides with the weak * topology on bounded sets.

¹⁷As usual for integer vector $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we set $|\ell| = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\ell_j|$.

From now on we fix $\tau = 3/2$.

Theorem 4. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 3, there exists a Lipschitz map $\Omega : \mathcal{Q}_S \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ which is continuous with respect to the product topology on $\mathcal{Q}_S \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$ and¹⁸ for every $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$ satisfies*

$$(2.17) \quad |\Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - j^2 - V_j| \leq C\gamma\varepsilon$$

and the Lipschitz estimates

$$(2.18) \quad \sup_{\nu' \neq \nu} \frac{|\Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - \Omega_j(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)|}{|\nu - \nu'|_\infty} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \sup_{I' \neq I} \frac{|\Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - \Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I')|}{|I - I'|_{2p}} \leq C\gamma r^{-2}\varepsilon.$$

Moreover we can choose in Theorem 3

$$(2.19) \quad \mathcal{C}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma) := \{\nu \in \mathcal{Q}_S : \omega(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}\}, \quad \text{where } \omega(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) := (\nu, \Omega(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)).$$

In this way, the torus \mathcal{T}_I defined in (2.8) is an elliptic invariant torus in the sense that its linearized dynamics in the “normal” directions is $\dot{u}_j = i\Omega_j u_j$ for $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$.

Remark 2.2. Note that (2.16) is a much stronger diophantine condition than the one proposed in [Bou05] (or [BMP21]), where the denominators were of the form $1 + |\ell_j|^2 j^2$. Of course the reasons why we can impose such strong diophantine conditions, still obtaining a positive measure set, are the structure of the set \mathcal{S} and the fact that we only need to consider denominators with $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\ell_j| \leq 2$.

2.1. Plan of the paper, strategy and main novelties. Deducing Theorem 1 from Theorems 3 and 4 is a self contained argument, which we present in section 3. The proof is developed as follows: $V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I$ being fixed, we first construct a set $\mathcal{C}'(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_S$ of large relative measure such that for all $\nu \in \mathcal{C}'(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma)$ the function $\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) := \Phi(i\nu t; \nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)$ is almost-periodic since it is uniform limit of quasi periodic functions. Such approximating functions are in fact classical solutions of the approximate equation (NLS_{V_n}) with $V_n = V_n(\nu) \rightarrow V(\nu)$. Secondly we show that \mathbf{u} is a weak solution in the sense of (1.2), for such $V = V(\nu)$. We next reformulate our result in terms of the external parameters V instead of the frequencies ν , namely we prove that for every V in a large measure set $\mathcal{G}(I, \gamma) \subseteq [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we can solve (1.2). A main point is to show that $\mathcal{G}(I, \gamma)$ is measurable. Next, taking the union over γ we obtain a full measure set, thus showing that for a.e. V there exists at least one solution. Finally moving \mathcal{S} and suitably choosing I we produce, for a.e. V , countably many different solutions.

In order to prove Theorems 3 and 4 (see end of Section 6) we follow the general strategy of [BMP21], which we revisit keeping track of the regularity w.r.t. the various parameters. To this purpose, in section 4 we start by defining the Poisson algebra of “regular Hamiltonians” (basically a space of normally analytic functions H such that the corresponding Hamiltonian vector field X_H is a normally analytic map¹⁹ $B_r(\mathfrak{w}_p) \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_p$) and further introduce the space of parameter depending regular Hamiltonians (see definitions 4.3 and 4.4). In particular, we set our ambient space as the closure, w.r.t. a suitable norm (see (4.10) together with (4.13)-(4.14)), of functions depending only on a finite number of frequencies. A Lipschitz extension result is given in Lemma 4.1.

In order to prove the dynamical Theorems 3-4 we first put H_V in (2.3) in a suitable normal form with counter terms in the spirit of Herman through Theorem 5, which contains the main KAM difficulties in dealing with Sobolev regularity. Roughly speaking, this normal form theorem states that, under appropriate smallness conditions, for all $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}$, $V_{\mathcal{S}^c} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ there exist $\lambda \in \ell^\infty$ and a symplectic change of variables Ψ (see (6.3)) such that

$$\left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (\omega_j + \lambda_j) |u_j|^2 + P \right) \circ \Psi = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \omega_j |u_j|^2 + O(|u|^2 - I)^2,$$

where $R = O(|u|^2 - I)^2$ means that R is a regular Hamiltonian which has a zero of order at least 2 at the torus \mathcal{T}_I defined in (2.8) (we formalize this definition in Section 5, introducing an appropriate degree decomposition).

¹⁸The constant C is the one of Theorem 3.

¹⁹We denote by $B_r(\mathfrak{w}_p)$ the open ball of radius r centered at the origin of \mathfrak{w}_p .

In order to deduce Theorems 3-4 we need to eliminate the counter terms (see equations in (6.9)): the main point is that we can solve with respect only to the tangential variables $V_{\mathcal{S}} \leftrightarrow \nu$.

Coming back to the counter-term Theorem 5, let us explain the main new issues related to Sobolev regularity. As is habitual, the map Ψ is constructed as the composition of a sequence of changes of coordinates whose generating function S at every step is determined by solving a homological equation

$$(2.20) \quad L_{\omega} S := \left\{ \sum_j \omega_j |u_j|^2, S \right\} = F,$$

where F is a given analytic function on the phase space \mathfrak{w}_p (see definition 4.4) which is at most quadratic in the normal variables ($j \notin \mathcal{S}$). At a formal level, a solution $S = L_{\omega}^{-1} F$ of (2.20) is readily determined. In order to prove that S is in fact analytic, one has to control the contribution given by small divisors (i.e. the eigenvalues of L_{ω}). This is possible by imposing the arithmetic Melnikov conditions on the frequencies (2.16), where the constraint $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\ell_j| \leq 2$ comes from the fact that F is at most quadratic in the normal variables, while the zero mass and momentum conditions come from the presence of two quadratic constants of motion.

Also in this Sobolev context, due to the presence of small divisors, one bounds the solution S at the cost of some “loss of information”. More explicitly, if the hamiltonian vector field X_F maps $B_r(\mathfrak{w}_p) \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_p$, then X_S maps $B_r(\mathfrak{w}_{p+\delta}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_{p+\delta}$ (with $\delta > 0$), this meaning that S is analytic in a *smaller* domain, since $\mathfrak{w}_{p+\delta} \subset \mathfrak{w}_p$. Then, at each iteration, one is able to define the solutions S only on a (ball of a) smaller phase space of the Banach scale $(\mathfrak{w}_p)_{p>1}$, the target space shrinking accordingly. Resembling the finite dimensional case, we call δ the “loss of regularity”

Of course, the convergence of a KAM scheme is achieved only if one loses a *summable, amount of regularity* δ_n at each step n . Nonetheless the typical characteristic of the Sobolev case is the presence of a *lower bound* on the loss of regularity, so that a KAM scheme based only on such bound cannot converge. In KAM schemes for quasi-periodic Sobolev solutions a similar problem arises but it is bypassed by using tame estimates, or approximation by analytic functions. In the present context it is not clear if one can exploit similar ideas, since we are already working with analytic nonlinearities. Our point of view is to bypass this problem by taking full advantage of the fact that the tangential sites set \mathcal{S} is sparse (recall Definition 2.1). In order to get an intuition of our strategy take for simplicity $\mathcal{S} = \{s(i) = 2^i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and start by considering a toy model with a nonlinearity for which the set

$$(2.21) \quad \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}} := \{u \in \mathfrak{w}_p : u_j = 0 \quad \forall j \notin \mathcal{S}\} \approx \{v \in \ell^{\infty} \text{ s.t. } \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |v_i| 2^{ip} < \infty\}$$

is invariant for the dynamics; so that we may study the equation restricted to \mathcal{S} . Then we are essentially in the analytic case (or Gevrey or slightly less if we take a slower growth for $s(i)$) and the Bourgain strategy in [Bou05] (or [BMP21], [Con]) applies²⁰. Of course for the NLS equation (NLS $_V$) the set $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is not invariant and the main difficulties arise from interaction between tangential and normal modes.

In the Diophantine estimates, to deal with the terms ℓ not supported only on the tangential sites, we use the constants of motion and the dispersive nature of the equation ($\omega_k \sim k^2$). Once one has guessed the correct Diophantine conditions (2.16), the proof of Lemma 7.1 (i.e. controlling the solution of the homological equation 2.20) is the real core of our result. Again the proof is simple if F is supported only on \mathcal{S} or \mathcal{S}^c , on the other hand dealing with the interaction between tangential and normal sites requires a careful case analysis.

The final goal is to control the norm of X_S as a map $B_r(\mathfrak{w}_{p+\delta}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_{p+\delta}$, for arbitrarily small δ . This should be compared with the corresponding estimate on X_S in [BMP20a] Proposition 7.1 item (M). In the latter paper we take $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{Z}$ and then, in order to control $L_{\omega}^{-1} F$ we cannot take any $\delta > 0$ but instead must require $\delta \geq \tau_1$, where $\tau_1 > 0$ is some fixed quantity. As one can expect the less *sparse* is \mathcal{S} the worst bounds one gets. The quantitative condition in Definition 2.1 is needed in order to ensure convergence of the iterative KAM scheme. We suitably choose the values of the parameter at each iterative step $n \in \mathbb{N}$, in particular the loss of regularity δ_n must be summable, e.g. $\delta_n \sim n^{-c}$, for some $c > 1$. Then the divergence due to small divisors, which is

²⁰Note that Bourgain’s Diophantine condition reads $|\omega \cdot \ell| \geq \gamma \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (1 + \ell_i^2)^{-1}$. This coincides with (2.16) when ℓ is supported only on \mathcal{S} , modulo the renaming of the indexes in 2.21

of order $\exp(\exp(n^{c/\eta}))$ by (7.3) and with η defined in (2.4a), must be compensated by the superexponential convergence $\exp(-\exp(Cn))$ given by the KAM quadratic scheme. This forces $c < \eta$ and $\eta > 1$.

The super-linearity assumptions (2.4b) and (2.4c) are essential for our estimate on the homological equation to work. The asymptotic growth in (2.4a) is only needed in the KAM step. A slower growth would give rise to a too large estimate on the solution of the homological equation which would not be compensated anymore by the quadratic convergence of the KAM scheme.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The solutions of Theorem 1 are constructed as the limit of sequences of smooth quasi-periodic functions. Fix $p_* > 1$ and an admissible set of tangential sites \mathcal{S} . Fix $\gamma > 0$ and take r such that (2.10) holds. For any potential $V_{\mathcal{S}^c} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(p_*, r)$, we apply Theorem 3 and obtain, for all frequencies $\nu \in \mathcal{C}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma)$, an invariant torus.

Now define $I^{(n)} = \left(I_j^{(n)} \right)$ by setting $I_j^{(n)} = I_j$ if $|j| \leq n$ and $I_j^{(n)} = 0$ otherwise. We apply Theorem 3 with $I \rightsquigarrow I^{(n)}$, $\gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma/2$ and set $\mathcal{V}^{(n)}(\cdot) := (\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\cdot, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I^{(n)}), V_{\mathcal{S}^c})$ a $\Phi_n(\cdot; \cdot) := \Phi(\cdot; \cdot, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I^{(n)})$. We have obtained a sequence of NLS equations with potentials $\mathcal{V}^{(n)}(\nu)$ for $\nu \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}}$; each equation admits a finite dimensional invariant torus with frequency ν , for all $\nu \in \mathcal{C}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I^{(n)}, \gamma/2)$. It is not hard to see that each torus supports a smooth quasi-periodic solution.

The idea is to show that (at least up to a subsequence) the limit over n is the desired almost-periodic solution.

First step (construction of the Cantor set). In order to apply Theorem 3 for each n (with the same frequency) we take the “good frequencies” in the (countable) intersection of the Cantor-like sets where all the tori are defined. Correspondingly, we define the set of “good potentials”. This is the content of the following result, which is proved in Section 9.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a subsequence $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ (independent of $V_{\mathcal{S}^c}$) such that the following holds. Defining the Borel sets*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{C}'(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma) := \mathcal{C}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma) \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I^{(n_k)}, \gamma/2)$$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma) := [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}} \bigcap \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{C}'(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma), V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)$$

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{G}(I, \gamma) := \{V = (V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}) \in [1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ s.t. } V_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma)\}$$

we have the estimates

$$(3.4) \quad \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma)) \geq 1 - C_0\gamma, \quad \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}}(\mathcal{G}(I, \gamma)) \geq 1 - C_0\gamma,$$

where C_0 is defined in Theorem 3

Second step (construction of the convergent subsequence). We now prove that for every $V \in \mathcal{G}(I, \gamma)$ we can solve (1.2) with $V = (V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})$. Indeed for every $V_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{S}}(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma)$ there exists $\nu \in \mathcal{C}'(V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I, \gamma)$ such that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) = V_{\mathcal{S}}$. We claim that

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbf{u}(t, x) := \Phi(v(t, x); \nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I), \quad \text{where} \quad v(t, x) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sqrt{I_j} e^{i(jx - \nu_j t)}, \quad \text{satisfies (1.2)}$$

and, moreover, it is the uniform limit of the C^∞ -quasi-periodic functions

$$\mathbf{u}_k(t, \cdot) := \Phi_{n_k}(v_k(t, \cdot); \nu) \quad \text{where} \quad v_k(t, x) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}, |j| \leq n_k} \sqrt{I_j} e^{i(jx - \nu_j t)}.$$

Note that by construction $v, \mathbf{u} \in \mathfrak{w}_{p_*}$ while $t \mapsto \Phi_{n_k}(v_k(t, \cdot); \nu) =: \mathbf{u}_k(t, \cdot)$ is a classical (actually C^∞) quasi-periodic solution of $(\text{NLS}_{\mathcal{V}^{(n_k)}})$ with $V^{(n_k)} = (\mathcal{V}^{(n_k)}(\nu), V_{\mathcal{S}^c})$. Thus each \mathbf{u}_k satisfies (1.2) with $V^{(n_k)}$ in place

of V .

Taking $p < p_*$ satisfying (2.11) we get

$$c_k := \sup_{|j| > n_k} \sqrt{|I_j|} |j|^p \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

and, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|v(t, \cdot) - v_k(t, \cdot)|_p = c_k, \quad |I - I^{(n_k)}|_{2p} = c_k^2.$$

Since the map $I \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)$ is Lipschitz then $V^{(n_k)} \rightarrow V$ in ℓ^∞ . Moreover since Φ is also Lipschitz (w.r.t. u and I), for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$|\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) - \mathbf{u}_k(t, \cdot)|_p = |\Phi(v(t, \cdot); \nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - \Phi(v_k(t, \cdot); \nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I^{(n_k)})|_p \leq L(|v(t, \cdot) - v_k(t, \cdot)|_p + |I - I^{(n_k)}|_{2p}) \leq L(c_k + c_k^2)$$

for a suitable²¹ $L > 0$. Then $\mathbf{u}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ uniformly²² in \mathbb{R}^2 . In order to prove that \mathbf{u} satisfies (1.2) we have to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (-i\chi_t + \chi_{xx})(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_k) - (V * \mathbf{u} - V^{(n_k)} * \mathbf{u}_k)\chi - (f(|\mathbf{u}|^2)\mathbf{u} - f(|\mathbf{u}_k|^2)\mathbf{u}_k)\chi \, dx \, dt \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This follows since $\mathbf{u}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{u}$ uniformly and observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \|V^{(n_k)} * \mathbf{u}_k - V * \mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} &\leq \|V^{(n_k)} * \mathbf{u}_k - V * \mathbf{u}_k\|_p \leq \|(V^{(n_k)} - V) * \mathbf{u}_k - V * (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_k)\|_p \\ &\leq \|V^{(n_k)} - V\|_{\ell^\infty} \|\mathbf{u}_k\|_p + \|V\|_{\ell^\infty} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_k\|_p \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim in (3.5).

Third step (A set of good potentials). We now show that for almost every $V \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ there exists at least one solution of (1.2). For every integer $h \geq 1$ take $\gamma_h = |f|_{\mathbb{R}}/h$ and r_h such that (2.10) holds as an equality, namely $r_h := \sqrt{\varepsilon_* \mathbf{R}/|f|_{\mathbb{R}}} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_* \mathbf{R}/h}$. For every given sequence $I_h \in \mathcal{I}(p_*, r_h)$ we set

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{G} := \bigcup_{h \geq 1} \mathcal{G}(I_h, \gamma_h).$$

By (3.4) \mathcal{G} has full measure in $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$. This implies that for almost every $V \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ there exists an integer $h \geq 1$ such that $V \in \mathcal{G}(I_h, \gamma_h)$. Then (3.5) (with $I = I_h$) gives a solution of (1.2).

Fourth step (Abundance of solutions). In order to find infinitely many solutions for almost every V in $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ we proceed as follows. First we choose in (3.6) $\sqrt{|I_h|_j} := \frac{1}{2} r_h |j|^{-p_*}$. All the above construction depends on the choice of the set \mathcal{S} of admissible tangential sites; in particular this holds for the set \mathcal{G} above. Let us consider infinitely many countable different \mathcal{S} and call \mathcal{G}_* the countable intersection of the corresponding sets \mathcal{G} . The set \mathcal{G}_* has full measure in $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ as well. Then for every $V \in \mathcal{G}_*$ we construct infinitely many solutions corresponding to different \mathcal{S} 's. Note that for a given $V \in \mathcal{G}_*$ the solutions corresponding to different \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' are different. In particular there exist h, h' such that $V \in \mathcal{G}(I_h, \gamma_h) \cap \mathcal{G}'(I_{h'}, \gamma_{h'})$, where $\mathcal{G}'(I, \gamma)$ is the set defined in the last line of (3.3) corresponding to \mathcal{S}' . Let us call \mathbf{u}, v, Φ and \mathbf{u}', v', Φ' the functions defined in (3.5), respectively for \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' . Since by Theorem 3 (point *ii*) the maps Φ and Φ' are $\bar{r}/16$ -close to the identity where $\bar{r} := \max\{r_h, r_{h'}\}$, then

$$|\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) - \mathbf{u}'(t, \cdot)|_{p_*} \geq |v(t, \cdot) - v'(t, \cdot)|_{p_*} - \bar{r}/8 \geq \bar{r}/2 - \bar{r}/8 > 0.$$

The same holds for any translations $\mathbf{u}(t + t_0, x + x_0)$ and $\mathbf{u}'(t, x)$.

In order to conclude the proof we discuss the actual regularity of our solutions. By (3.5) and (2.2) we know that if $p_* > 3$ then v_t and v_{xx} are continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^2 . Moreover, by analyticity of $v \rightarrow \Phi(v; \nu, I)$, also \mathbf{u}_t and \mathbf{u}_{xx} are continuous function on \mathbb{R}^2 . Therefore u is a classical solution. On the other hand, when $p_* \leq 2$ and $\sqrt{|I_j|} = (r/2)\langle j \rangle^{-p_*}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$, for every t the function $\mathbf{u}_{xx}(t, \cdot)$ is not in L^2 . Otherwise its Fourier coefficients $(\mathbf{u}_{xx}(t, \cdot))_j = -j^2(\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot))_j$ would belong to ℓ_2 . Since Φ is close to the identity (in \mathfrak{w}_{p_*}) $\Phi = Id + \Phi_1$ with $\|\Phi_1\|$ uniformly $\bar{r}/16$ -small, we have that $\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) := \Phi(v(t, \cdot)) = v(t, \cdot) + \Phi_1(v(t, \cdot))$ and its Fourier coefficients satisfies $|(\mathbf{u}(t, \cdot))_j| \geq (r/4)\langle j \rangle^{-p_*}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$; since \mathcal{S} is an infinite set this is a contradiction. \square

²¹We can take $L = 2$ since Φ is $C\varepsilon$ -close to the identity.

²²Given $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we have $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |f(t, \cdot)|_p$ for every $p \geq 1$.

4. FUNCTIONAL SETTING

Let us introduce the spaces of Hamiltonians used in the paper.

Definition 4.1 (Multi-index notation). In the following we denote, with abuse of notation, by $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ the set of multi-indexes α, β etc. such that $|\alpha| := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha_j$ is finite. As usual $\alpha! := \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha_j \neq 0} \alpha_j!$. Moreover $\alpha \preceq \beta$ means $\alpha_j \leq \beta_j$ for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\binom{\beta}{\alpha} := \frac{\beta!}{\alpha! (\beta - \alpha)!}$. Finally take $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_n$ such that $\alpha_j \neq 0$ if and only if $j = j_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, as usual we set $\partial^\alpha f := \partial_{u_{j_1}}^{\alpha_{j_1}} \dots \partial_{u_{j_n}}^{\alpha_{j_n}} f$; analogously for $\partial_{\bar{u}}^\beta f$.

Definition 4.2 (regular Hamiltonians). Consider a formal power series expansion

$$(4.1) \quad H(u) = \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} H_{\alpha, \beta} u^\alpha \bar{u}^\beta, \quad u^\alpha := \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} u_j^{\alpha_j},$$

where

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{M} := \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \text{ s.t. } |\alpha| = |\beta| < +\infty, \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} j(\alpha_j - \beta_j) = 0 \right\}$$

satisfying the reality condition

$$(4.3) \quad H_{\alpha, \beta} = \overline{H_{\beta, \alpha}}, \quad \forall (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}.$$

We say that $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r, p}$ for $p > 1, r > 0$ if

$$(4.4) \quad |H|_{r, p} := \frac{1}{r} \left(\sup_{|u|_p \leq r} |X_{\underline{H}}|_p \right) < \infty,$$

where $X_{\underline{H}}$ denotes the hamiltonian vector field of the majorant $\underline{H}(u) := \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha, \beta}| u^\alpha \bar{u}^\beta$ of $H(u)$.

Finally we denote by $\mathcal{H}_{r, p}(\mathbb{C})$ the space of H satisfying (4.1) and (4.4) but not necessarily the reality condition (4.3).

Note that by Lemma 2.1 of [BMP21]

$$(4.5) \quad |H|_{r, p} = \frac{1}{2} \sup_j \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha, \beta}| (\alpha_j + \beta_j) u_p^{\alpha + \beta - 2e_j},$$

where $u_p = u_p(r)$ is defined as

$$(4.6) \quad u_{p, j}(r) := r |j|^{-p}.$$

Remark 4.1. Regarding \mathcal{M} in (4.2) we note that the condition $|\alpha| = |\beta|$, i.e. $\mathfrak{m}(\alpha - \beta) = 0$, corresponds to mass conservation, namely the H Poisson commutes with the mass $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |u_j|^2$; moreover $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} j(\alpha_j - \beta_j) = 0$, i.e. $\pi(\alpha - \beta) = 0$, corresponds to momentum conservation, namely H Poisson commutes with the momentum $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} j |u_j|^2$.

Note that $|\cdot|_{r, p}$ is a seminorm on $\mathcal{H}_{r, p}$ and a norm on its subspace

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{H}_{r, p}^0 := \{ H \in \mathcal{H}_{r, p} \text{ with } H(0) = 0 \},$$

endowing $\mathcal{H}_{r, p}^0$ with a Banach space structure. Moreover the space $\mathcal{H}_{r, p}$ enjoys the following algebra property with respect to Poisson brackets.

Proposition 4.1 (Poisson structure). *For any $F, G \in \mathcal{H}_{r+\rho, p}$, with $\rho > 0$,*

$$(4.8) \quad F, G \in \mathcal{H}_{r, p} \implies \{F, G\} \in \mathcal{H}_{r, p}^0$$

and the following bound holds

$$(4.9) \quad |\{F, G\}|_{r, p} \leq 8 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{r}{\rho} \right\} |F|_{r+\rho, p} |G|_{r+\rho, p}.$$

The proof is given in Appendix A. Of course the same estimates hold in $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}(\mathbb{C})$.

The next result controls the norm of the NLS nonlinearity P defined in (2.3) and it is based on the algebra property of \mathfrak{w}_p , $p > 1$, with respect to convolution.

Proposition 4.2 (Proposition 2.1 of [BMP21]). *There exist $c_1, c_2 > 1$ continuously depending on $p > 1$ such that if $c_1 r^2 \leq \mathbb{R}$ then, recalling (2.9),*

$$|P|_{r,p} \leq c_2 \frac{|f|_{\mathbb{R}}}{\mathbb{R}} r^2.$$

4.1. Parameter families of regular Hamiltonians. Throughout the paper our Hamiltonians will depend on two parameters, the frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ and the action $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$. In order to control the regularity w.r.t these parameters throughout the iterative scheme, we will introduce an appropriate weighted norm as follows.

Given a closed (w.r.t. the product topology) subset $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ and an open subset \mathcal{I} of some Banach space, for $f : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $(\omega, I) \mapsto f(\omega, I)$ we set

$$(4.10) \quad |f|^\gamma = |f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}} := \sup_{\substack{\omega \in \mathcal{O} \\ I \in \mathcal{I}}} |f(\omega, I)| + \gamma \sup_{\substack{\omega \neq \omega' \in \mathcal{O} \\ I \in \mathcal{I}}} |\Delta_{\omega, \omega'} f|,$$

where as usual

$$(4.11) \quad \Delta_{\omega, \omega'} f := \frac{f(\omega, I) - f(\omega', I)}{|\omega - \omega'|_\infty}.$$

Definition 4.3. Given \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{I} as above let $C_{\text{Lip}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ be the Banach space of functions $f : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, which have finite norm $|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ and which are:

- continuous w.r.t the product topology in \mathcal{O} ;
- analytic in \mathcal{I} .

In $C_{\text{Lip}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ we consider the subalgebra $F(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ of functions which depend only on a finite number of ω_j 's. The subalgebra $F(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ can be described as follows. Given $f \in F(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$, which depends only on the variables $(\omega_{-k}, \dots, \omega_k)$, there exists a function $\hat{f} : P_k(\mathcal{O}) \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where P_k is the projection $P_k : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k+1}$ defined as $P_k(\omega) := (\omega_{-k}, \dots, \omega_k)$, such that $f(\omega, I) = \hat{f}(\omega_{-k}, \dots, \omega_k, I)$ for every $(\omega, I) \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}$. Finally denote the closure of $F(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ in $C_{\text{Lip}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$.

The spaces $C_{\text{Lip}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ are Banach algebras (i.e. multiplicative algebras with constant equal to 1) w.r.t. the norm $|\cdot|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$.

The following extension result will be proved in the Appendix.

Lemma 4.1 (Lipschitz extension). *Given $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ and a ball B_ρ in some complex Banach space E and $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times B_\rho)$ there exists an extension $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{Q} \times B_{\rho/2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\tilde{f}|^{\gamma, \mathcal{Q} \times B_{\rho/2}} \leq 2|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}$, \tilde{f} is continuous w.r.t the product topology in \mathcal{Q} , \tilde{f} is Lipschitz on $B_{\rho/2}$ with estimate*

$$|\tilde{f}(\omega, I) - \tilde{f}(\omega, I')| \leq 4\rho^{-1} |f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho} |I - I'|_E, \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{Q}, \quad I, I' \in B_{\rho/2}.$$

In the following we mainly consider $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ (see (2.7)), however in order to use Lemma 4.1 we need to pass to the complex. Then we define

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C}) := \{ I \in B_{r^2}(\mathfrak{w}_{2p}) \quad \text{with} \quad I_j = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j \in \mathcal{S}^c \},$$

which we systematically identify with the open ball of radius r^2 centered at the origin of the Banach space $\{w = (w_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} : \sup_{j \in \mathcal{S}} |w_j| |j|^{2p} < \infty\}$.

Definition 4.4 (Real and complex Hamiltonians). Let $0 < r_0 \leq r$, $p_0 \geq p > 1$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{r,p} = \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ with $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p_0, r_0)$ be the space of parameter depending *real* regular hamiltonians $H : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I} \ni (\omega, I) \mapsto H(\omega, I) \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$ such that

$$(4.13) \quad H_{\alpha,\beta} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}), \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{H}_\gamma := \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha,\beta}|^\gamma u^\alpha \bar{u}^\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}.$$

We set

$$(4.14) \quad \|H\|_{r,p} = \|H\|_{r,p}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}} := |\underline{H}_\gamma|_{r,p} \stackrel{(4.5)}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sup_j \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha,\beta}|^\gamma (\alpha_j + \beta_j) u_p^{\alpha+\beta-2e_j}.$$

Respectively for $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{I}(p_0, r_0, \mathbb{C})$ we define the space $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C})}$ of parameter depending *complex* hamiltonians $H : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C}) \ni (\omega, I) \mapsto H(\omega, I) \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying (4.13) with $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C})$ instead of \mathcal{I} and verifying the reality condition $H(\omega, I) \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$ when $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

Finally we denote by $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0$, resp. $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0(\mathbb{C})$ the subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}$, resp. of $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}(\mathbb{C})$, such that $H|_{u=0} = 0$.

The following result is proved in Appendix A

Lemma 4.2. $(\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0, \|\cdot\|_{r,p})$ is a Banach-Poisson algebra in the following sense:

1. $(\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0, \|\cdot\|_{r,p})$ is a Banach space
2. for any $F, G \in \mathcal{H}_{r+\rho,p}$ the following bound holds

$$(4.15) \quad \|\{F, G\}\|_{r,p} \leq 8 \max\left\{1, \frac{r}{\rho}\right\} \|F\|_{r+\rho,p} \|G\|_{r+\rho,p}.$$

Proposition 4.3 (Monotonicity). *The norm $\|\cdot\|_{r,p}$ is monotone decreasing in p and monotone increasing in r :*

$$(4.16) \quad \|\cdot\|_{r,p+\delta} \leq \|\cdot\|_{r+\rho,p} \quad \forall \rho, \delta \geq 0.$$

The fact that this norm is increasing in r follows directly from mass conservation and the fact that $H(0) = 0$. Concerning the monotonicity in p , we refer the reader to [BMP20a, Proposition 6.3], where the proof is contained, written in the case of $\|\cdot\|_{r,p}$. The fact that it holds also in the Lipschitz frame, follows trivially.

Proposition 4.4 (Hamiltonian flow). *Let $S \in \mathcal{H}_{r+\rho,p} = \mathcal{H}_{r+\rho,p}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ with*

$$(4.17) \quad \|S\|_{r+\rho,p} \leq \delta := \frac{\rho}{16e(r+\rho)}.$$

Then, for all $(\omega, I) \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}$ the time 1-Hamiltonian flow of $S = S(\cdot, \omega, I)$ is well defined, analytic, symplectic; more precisely $\Phi_S^1 : B_r(\mathfrak{w}_p) \rightarrow B_{r+\rho}(\mathfrak{w}_p)$ with

$$(4.18) \quad \sup_{u \in B_r(\mathfrak{w}_p)} |\Phi_S^1(u) - u|_{r,p} \leq (r+\rho) \|S\|_{r+\rho,p} \leq \frac{\rho}{16e}.$$

For any $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r+\rho,p}$ we have that²³ $H \circ \Phi_S^1 = e^{\{S, \cdot\}} H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$, $e^{\{S, \cdot\}} H - H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0$ and

$$(4.19) \quad \left\| e^{\{S, \cdot\}} H \right\|_{r,p} \leq 2 \|H\|_{r+\rho,p},$$

$$(4.20) \quad \left\| \left(e^{\{S, \cdot\}} - \text{Id} \right) H \right\|_{r,p} \leq \delta^{-1} \|S\|_{r+\rho,p} \|H\|_{r+\rho,p},$$

$$(4.21) \quad \left\| \left(e^{\{S, \cdot\}} - \text{Id} - \{S, \cdot\} \right) H \right\|_{r,p} \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta^{-2} \left(\|S\|_{r+\rho,p} \right)^2 \|H\|_{r+\rho,p}$$

More generally for any $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and any sequence $(c_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $|c_k| \leq 1/k!$, we have

$$(4.22) \quad \left\| \sum_{k \geq h} c_k \text{ad}_S^k(H) \right\|_{r,p} \leq 2 \|H\|_{r+\rho,p} \left(\|S\|_{r+\rho,p} / 2\delta \right)^h,$$

²³ $e^{\{S, \cdot\}} H := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ad}_S^k(H) / k!$, where $\text{ad}_S = \{S, \cdot\}$.

where $\text{ad}_S(\cdot) := \{S, \cdot\}$.

The proof is based on (4.15) and on the Lie series expansion for $e^{\{S, \cdot\}}$, see [BMP20a] Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.1 for details.

Remark 4.2. If we are working in $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}(\mathbb{C})$ all the estimates in Lemma 4.2, Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4 still hold except for (4.18) which holds only for real I . Indeed without the reality condition (4.3) the generating function S does not define anymore a hamiltonian flow satisfying the reality condition $\bar{u}(t) = \bar{u}(t)$.

5. DEGREE DECOMPOSITIONS, PROJECTIONS AND NORMAL FORMS

We want to prove that, in suitable variables, \mathcal{T}_I introduced in (2.8) is an invariant torus on which the flow is linear. To this purpose we introduce a suitable degree decomposition, whose main idea is to make a *power series expansion centered at I* without introducing a singularity in order to highlight the terms which prevent \mathcal{T}_I from being a KAM torus. This seminal idea was proposed in [Bou05] and further formalized in [BMP21, Section 4]. For convenience of the reader, we sketch here the main features of this decomposition. The main novelty here is to control the regularity with respect to the parameters.

Fix \mathcal{S} as in (2.1). Consider a Hamiltonian $H(u)$ expanded in Taylor series at $u = 0$ and tautologically rewrite H as

$$(5.1) \quad H = \sum_{\substack{m, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{S}} \\ \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset \\ a, b \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{S}^c}}} H_{m, \alpha, \beta, a, b} |v|^{2m} v^\alpha \bar{v}^\beta z^a \bar{z}^b$$

where, by slight abuse of notation²⁴, $u = (v, z)$ with $v = (v_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} := (u_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}}$ and $z = (z_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} := (u_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c}$.

Then introduce the auxiliary ‘‘action’’ variables $w = (w_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}}$ substituting $|v|^{2m} v^\alpha \bar{v}^\beta z^a \bar{z}^b \rightsquigarrow w^m v^\alpha \bar{v}^\beta z^a \bar{z}^b$ in (5.1). Now we Taylor expand the Hamiltonian with respect to w and z at the point $w_j = I_j$ for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ and $z = 0$ respectively.

Definition 5.1 (Degree decomposition). Let $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ (recall (2.7)). For every integer $d \geq -2$ and any regular Hamiltonian $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$ we define the following projection:

$$(5.2) \quad (\Pi^d H)(u) = (\Pi_I^d H)(u) = H^{(d)}(u) := \sum_{\substack{m, \alpha, \beta, \delta \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{S}}, a, b \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{S}^c} \\ \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset, \delta \leq m \\ 2|\delta| + |a| + |b| = d + 2}} H_{m, \alpha, \beta, a, b} \binom{m}{\delta} I^{m-\delta} (|v|^2 - I)^\delta v^\alpha \bar{v}^\beta z^a \bar{z}^b.$$

where $\delta \preceq m$ means that $\delta_s \leq m_s$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $|v|^2 = (|v_s|^2)_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$, while the multiindex notations are introduced in Definition 4.1. We also set $\Pi^{\leq d} := \sum_{d'=-2}^d \Pi^{d'}$ and $\Pi^{\geq d} := \text{Id} - \Pi^{< d}$, analogously for $\Pi^{< d}$ and $\Pi^{> d}$. Moreover we define, e.g., $H^{(\leq d)} := \Pi^{(\leq d)} H$ and also $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^d := \Pi^d \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$ and, e.g., $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\leq d} := \Pi^{\leq d} \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$.

Note that, if $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{Z}$, projections coincide with the ones of Section 4 of [BMP21], while if $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$, $H^{(d)}$ represents the usual homogeneous degree at $z = 0$.

In this way, given $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$, then

$$(5.3) \quad H = H^{(\leq 0)} + H^{(\geq 1)} \equiv H^{(-2)} + H^{(-1)} + H^{(0)} + H^{(\geq 1)}$$

where $H^{(-2)}$ consists of terms which are constant w.r.t. both z and the ‘‘auxiliary action’’ $w = |v|^2$, $H^{(-1)}$ is independent of the action but linear in the z_j , while $H^{(0)}$ contributes with two terms: the one linear in the action and independent of z , the second one quadratic in z and independent of the action. Finally, $H^{(\geq 1)}$ is what is left and $X_{H^{(\geq 1)}}$ vanishes on \mathcal{T}_I .

The operators Π^d define continuous projections (see Section 4 of [BMP21] and also Proposition 5.1) satisfying $\Pi^d \Pi^d = \Pi^d$ and $\Pi^{d'} \Pi^d = \Pi^d \Pi^{d'} = 0$ for every $d' \neq d$, $d' \geq -2$. Moreover, this decomposition enjoys all the

²⁴Consisting in a reordering of the indexes j .

crucial properties required for a KAM scheme to converge, in particular they behave well with respect to Poisson brackets, that is:

$$\forall F, G \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p} \quad \{F, G^{\geq 1}\}^{(-2)} = 0$$

and

$$F^{(-2)} = 0 \implies \{F, G^{\geq 1}\}^{(\leq -1)} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad F^{(-1)} = 0 = F^{(-2)} \implies \{F, G^{\geq 1}\}^{(\leq 0)} = 0.$$

Note also that if $\Pi^{<d_1} F = \Pi^{<d_2} G = 0$, then $\Pi^{<d_1+d_2} \{F, G\} = 0$; moreover

$$(5.4) \quad H = \{F^{(0)}, G^{(d)}\} \implies H = H^{(d)}.$$

For all the properties of the projections see [BMP21] Proposition 4.1 and 4.2.

As is standard, on $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}$ we define the projections

$$(5.5) \quad \Pi^{\mathcal{K}} H := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}} H_{\alpha, \alpha} |u|^{2\alpha}, \quad \Pi^{\mathcal{R}} H := H - \Pi^{\mathcal{K}} H.$$

Note that $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{K}} \subseteq \ker L(\omega)$ and if $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}$ then the two spaces coincide.

Correspondingly, we define the following subspaces of $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}$:

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{K}} := \{H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p} : \Pi^{\mathcal{K}} H = H\}, \quad \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{R}} := \{H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p} : \Pi^{\mathcal{R}} H = H\}.$$

these projections are continuous on $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}$. Moreover, e.g. $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\leq 0, \mathcal{R}} := \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\leq 0} \cap \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{R}}$.

Note that by (5.2) and (5.5) we have

$$(5.7) \quad d \text{ odd} \implies \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{d, \mathcal{K}} = \{0\}.$$

In Lemma 4.3 of [BMP21] we proved that the map $\lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ defined by

$$(5.8) \quad \Lambda = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \lambda_j (|v_j|^2 - I_j) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} \lambda_j |z_j|^2$$

is a linear isometry from ℓ^∞ to $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{0, \mathcal{K}}$ for every r, p .

The projections defined in (5.2) naturally extend to $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$ or $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}(\mathbb{C})$ setting

$$(5.9) \quad (\Pi^d H)(u, \omega, I) := (\Pi_7^d H(\omega, I))(u).$$

Similarly for (5.5).

The following result is proved in Appendix A

Proposition 5.1. *For every $d \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-2, -1\}$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r',p} = \mathcal{H}_{r',p}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ where $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ with $r' \geq \sqrt{2}r$ the following holds.*

(i) *The projection operators $\Pi^d : \mathcal{H}_{r',p} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{r',p}$ are continuous with bound*

$$(5.10) \quad \|\Pi^d H\|_{r',p} \leq 3^{\frac{d}{2}+1} \|H\|_{r',p}.$$

(ii) *Moreover the following representation formula holds*

$$(5.11) \quad \Pi^{\geq d} H(u) = \sum_{\substack{\delta \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{S}}, a, b \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{S}^c} \\ 2|\delta| + |a| + |b| = d+2}} (|v|^2 - I)^\delta z^a \bar{z}^b \check{H}_\delta(u) \quad \text{for } |u|_p < r',$$

where $\check{H}_\delta(u)$ are analytic in $B_{r'}(\mathfrak{w}_p)$ and can be written in totally convergent power series in every ball $|u|_p \leq \kappa_* r'$ with $\kappa_* < 1$.

Analogous statements hold for the complex case $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r',p}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{H}_{r',p}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C})}$ where $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$ (recall formula (4.12)).

As above for $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}$ we define the corresponding subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^d, \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{K}}, \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{R}}$, etc. of $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}$. Analogously for the complex case $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}(\mathbb{C})$. In particular we discuss the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{0, \mathcal{K}}$.

Definition 5.2. We denote by $\mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ the space of maps

$$\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I} \ni (\omega, I) \rightarrow \lambda(\omega, I) \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_j \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ endowed with the norm (recall (4.10))

$$(5.12) \quad \|\lambda\|_\infty := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\lambda_j|^\gamma.$$

Then by (5.8) $\mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}$ is isometrically equivalent to $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{0,\mathcal{K}}$ for all r, p . Similarly in the complex case $\mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C}))$.

Since we are mainly interested in the decomposition (5.3), we remark (see Proposition 5.1) that for $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r',p'}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ with $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ and $r' \geq \sqrt{2}r$, $p' \leq p$, one has

$$(5.13) \quad \|\Pi^0 H\|_{r',p'}, \|\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}} H\|_\infty \leq 3\|H\|_{r',p'}, \quad \|\Pi^{-1} H\|_{r',p'}, \|\Pi^{-2} H\|_{r',p'} \leq \|H\|_{r',p'}, \quad \|\Pi^{\geq 1} H\|_{r',p'} \leq 6\|H\|_{r',p'}.$$

Analogous estimates hold in the complex case $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r',p'}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C})}$ with $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$ (see (4.12)).

6. PROOF OF THEOREMS 3 AND 4

Definition 6.1 (Normal Forms). Let $D : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the linear map defined as

$$D = D(\omega) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \omega_j |u_j|^2.$$

Let $0 < r < r_0$, $1 < p_0 \leq p$ and $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p, r)$, as in (2.7). We will say that N is an analytic family of normal forms if $N - D \in \mathcal{H}_{r_0,p_0}^{\geq 1, \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$. We denote such affine space by $\mathcal{N}_{r_0,p_0}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$. Same definition in the corresponding complex spaces.

Remark 6.1. Given $N \in \mathcal{N}_{r_0,p_0}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ for every $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ the flat torus \mathcal{T}_I is invariant for the dynamics of $N(\omega, I)$.

Let us state our counterterm KAM result.

Theorem 5. Fix $0 < \gamma < 1$, \mathcal{S} as in (2.1), $r > 0$ and $p > 1$. Set $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mathcal{S}}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p, r)$. Consider $r_0, \rho, \delta > 0$ and $p_0 > 1$ with

$$(6.1) \quad \rho \leq \frac{r_0 - r}{4}, \quad r \leq \frac{r_0}{2}, \quad \delta \leq \frac{p - p_0}{4}.$$

There exists $\bar{\epsilon}, 1/\bar{C} > 0$, decreasing functions of ρ/r_0 and δ such that the following holds. Consider $N_0 \in \mathcal{N}_{r_0,p_0}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$, $H \in D + \mathcal{H}_{r_0,p_0}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ and assume that

$$(6.2) \quad (1 + \Theta)^5 \epsilon \leq \bar{\epsilon}, \quad \text{where} \quad \epsilon := \gamma^{-1} \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}(p,r)} \|H - N_0\|_{r_0,p_0}, \quad \Theta := \gamma^{-1} \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}(p,r)} \|D - N_0\|_{r_0,p_0}.$$

Then there exist a $\rho/4$ -close to the identity symplectic diffeomorphism in u , Lipschitz in ω and analytic in I

$$(6.3) \quad \Psi : B_{r_0-\rho}(\mathfrak{w}_p) \times \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow B_{r_0}(\mathfrak{w}_p), \quad (u; \omega, I) \mapsto \Psi(u; \omega, I)$$

and a counterterm $\lambda \in \mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$, with

$$(6.4) \quad \|\lambda\|_\infty \leq \bar{C}\gamma(1 + \Theta)^2 \epsilon,$$

such that $\Psi(\mathcal{T}_I; \omega, I)$ is an invariant torus for the dynamics of $\Lambda(\omega, I) + H(\omega)$ for every $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mathcal{S}}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$. More precisely there exists an analytic family of normal forms $N \in \mathcal{N}_{r_0-\rho,p_0+\delta}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$, such that

$$(6.5) \quad (\Lambda + H) \circ \Psi - N = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \Lambda = \sum_j \lambda_j (|u_j|^2 - I_j).$$

Finally if N_0 and H admit a complex extension on $\mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$ satisfying (6.2), then also the counterterm λ extends to an holomorphic map in $\mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C}))$ satisfying (6.4).

Remark 6.2. By (6.4) and Cauchy estimates we get that λ is uniformly Lipschitz in $\mathcal{I}(p, r/2)$

$$(6.6) \quad \frac{|\lambda(\omega, I) - \lambda(\omega, I')|_\infty}{|I - I'|_{2p}} \leq 4\bar{C}(1 + \Theta)^2 \gamma r^{-2} \epsilon, \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}, \quad I, I' \in \mathcal{I}(p, r/2), \quad I \neq I'.$$

Proof of Theorem 3 and 4. Theorem 3 follows from Theorem 5 in a straightforward way. Fix $p_0 = p - (p-1)/2$, $r_0 = 2r = 4r$, $\rho = r/8$ and $\delta = (p_* - 1)/16$. Note that by these choices

$$(6.7) \quad \text{the constants } \bar{\epsilon} \text{ and } \bar{C} \text{ depend only on } p_*.$$

One first rewrites H_V in (2.3) as $D + \Lambda + P$ by setting $\lambda_j = j^2 - \omega_j + V_j$. Set $H = D + P$ and $N_0 = D$ so that by definition $\Theta = 0$. Since the Hamiltonian $P \in \mathcal{H}_{r_0, p_0}(\mathbb{C})$ does not depend on ω, I , trivially $P \in \mathcal{H}_{r_0, p_0}(\mathbb{C})$. Since by hypothesis $\gamma \leq |f|_{\mathbb{R}}$ we have by (2.10) that $r^2/\mathbb{R} \leq \varepsilon_*$; then the hypothesis $c_1 r^2 \leq \mathbb{R}$ of Proposition 4.2 holds for all p satisfying (2.11) taking ε_* small enough. Then, by Proposition 4.2,

$$(6.8) \quad \epsilon = \gamma^{-1} \|P\|_{r_0, p_0} = \gamma^{-1} |P|_{r_0, p_0} \leq \gamma^{-1} |P|_{2r, (p_*+3)/4} \leq c(p_*) \epsilon$$

for some²⁵ $c(p_*) > 1$ by (2.10). Again taking $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(p_*)$ in (2.10) small enough, condition (6.2) is satisfied and Theorem 5 gives us the desired change of variables provided that $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}^{0, \mathcal{K}}(\mathbb{C})$ is fixed accordingly.

Now we denote $\omega_j = \nu_j$ if $j \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\omega_j = \Omega_j$ otherwise. We get the equations

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{cases} \Omega_j + \lambda_j(\nu, \Omega, I) = j^2 + V_j, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{S}^c \\ \nu_j + \lambda_j(\nu, \Omega, I) = j^2 + V_j, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{S}, \end{cases}$$

for $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$. By Lemma 4.1 we Lipschitz extend the map λ to the whole $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$, (where, recall, $r = r/2$) in such a way that (6.4) and (6.6) hold for $\omega, \omega' \in \mathcal{Q}$ (with $\bar{C} \rightsquigarrow 2\bar{C}$). From now on we can work only on the real²⁶ case $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$. By (6.4) and taking $\varepsilon_*(p_*)$ small enough such that $2\bar{C}\epsilon \leq 2\bar{C}c(p_*)\varepsilon_*(p_*) \leq 1/2$ (recall (6.8)) we use the Contraction Lemma (recall Lemma²⁷ B.1), we solve the first equation finding $\Omega : \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ which is continuous in the product topology of $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$ and satisfies

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |\Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - j^2 - V_{\mathcal{S}^c, j}| &\leq 2\bar{C}\gamma\epsilon, & \sup_{\nu' \neq \nu} \frac{|\Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - \Omega_j(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)|}{|\nu - \nu'|_\infty} &\leq 4\bar{C}\epsilon, \\ \sup_{V_{\mathcal{S}^c}' \neq V_{\mathcal{S}^c}} \frac{|\Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}', I) - \Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)|}{|V_{\mathcal{S}^c}' - V_{\mathcal{S}^c}|_\infty} &\leq 4\bar{C}\epsilon, & \sup_{I' \neq I} \frac{|\Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - \Omega_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I')|}{|I - I'|_{2p}} &\leq 2\bar{C}\gamma r^{-2}\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for every $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$ and where the first three estimates follows from (6.4) (recalling (5.12) and (4.10)) and the last one from (6.6). By (6.10) and (6.8) we prove (2.17) and (2.18) taking $C \geq 4\bar{C}c(p_*)$. Note that this condition depends only on p_* .

Finally the second equation in (6.9) defines

$$(6.11) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}, j}(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) = \nu_j + \lambda_j(\nu, \Omega(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I), I) - j^2$$

for $j \in \mathcal{S}$.

Analogously, by Kirszbraun's Theorem, we can Lipschitz extend the map $\Psi : B_{r_0 - \rho}(\mathfrak{w}_p) \times \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r) \rightarrow B_{r_0}(\mathfrak{w}_p)$ on $B_{r_0 - \rho}(\mathfrak{w}_p) \times \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r)$. Then $\Phi(u; \nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) := \Psi(u; \omega(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I), I)$ (where $\omega(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)$ was defined in (2.19)). The map Φ conjugates the NLS Hamiltonian H_V to normal form for all ν such that $\omega(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}$, namely for $\nu \in \mathcal{C}$ (recalling (2.19)). Then the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 are concluded provided that one shows that the set \mathcal{C} defined in (2.19) satisfies (2.13). This is the content of Lemma 9.1 proved in Section Section 9, where all the measure estimates are discussed. \square

²⁵Note that the constants c_1, c_2 in Proposition 4.2 continuously depend on p , which belongs to the compact $[(p_* + 1)/2, p_*]$.

²⁶Obviously the same statements hold also in the complex case

²⁷We use it with $F_j(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w) := -\lambda_j(\nu, q + V_{\mathcal{S}^c} + w)$, $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$, where $q = (j^2)_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c}$ and $r := \bar{C}\gamma\epsilon$.

7. SMALL DIVISORS AND HOMOLOGICAL EQUATION

The proof of Theorem 5 is based on an iterative scheme that kills out the obstructing terms, namely terms belonging to $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{-2}$, $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0$, by solving homological equations of the form

$$(7.1) \quad LF^{(d)} = G^{(d)}, \quad G^{(d)} \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^d, \quad d = -2, -1, 0.$$

where

$$L(\omega)[\cdot] := \left\{ \sum_j \omega_j |u_j|^2, \cdot \right\}, \quad LH = \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}} \omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta) H_{\alpha, \beta}(\omega, I) u^\alpha \bar{u}^\beta.$$

The convergence of the iterative KAM scheme comes from a good control of the solution $L_\omega^{-1}G^{(d)}$ in the set $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}$.

For $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}$ the Lie derivative operator $L(\omega)$ is formally invertible on the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{R}}$ with inverse

$$(7.2) \quad (L^{-1}(\omega)H)_{\alpha, \beta} := \frac{-iH_{\alpha, \beta}}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)}.$$

We now show that the inverse is well defined also at a non formal level.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ and set $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\leq 0, \mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\leq 0, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$. For every $0 < \delta < 1$, (7.2) defines a bounded linear operator $L^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\leq 0, \mathcal{R}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{r,p+\delta}^{\leq 0, \mathcal{R}}$ with estimate²⁸*

$$(7.3) \quad \|L^{-1}H\|_{r,p+\delta} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \exp \left(c \exp \left(\left(\frac{2}{\delta} \right)^{1/\eta} \right) \right) \|H\|_{r,p},$$

for some constants i_*, η are introduced in Definition in 2.1. $c = c(i_*)$, with i_*, η introduced in Definition in 2.1. The same estimate holds in the corresponding complex spaces.

Proof. Let us first prove that if $H_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ then the same holds for $(L^{-1}H)_{\alpha, \beta}$. Indeed, since $|\alpha| = |\beta| < \infty$, the expression $\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)$ depends only on a finite number of frequencies ω_i and hence is continuous w.r.t. the product topology. As for the Lipschitz dependence, $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}$ implies that $1/\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)$ is C^∞ and the result follows, since the product of Lipschitz functions is Lipschitz.

By (7.2) and (4.14) we get

$$(7.4) \quad \|L^{-1}H\|_{r,p+\delta} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} K \|H\|_{r,p},$$

where

$$(7.5) \quad K = \gamma \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}_j} \left(\frac{|j|^2}{\prod_s |s|^{\alpha_s + \beta_s}} \right)^\delta \left| \frac{1}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)} \right|^\gamma,$$

and (recall that $H \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\leq 2, \mathcal{R}}$)

$$(7.6) \quad \mathcal{M}_j := \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M} \text{ s.t. } \alpha \neq \beta, \sum_{s \in S^c} \alpha_s + \beta_s \leq 2, \alpha_j + \beta_j \neq 0 \right\}.$$

We now separate two cases. We define

$$(7.7) \quad \mathcal{M}'_j := \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}_j, \text{ such that } \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_s - \beta_s) s^2 \right| < 2 \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} |\alpha_s - \beta_s| \right\},$$

and consider

$$(7.8) \quad K_1 = \gamma \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}'_j} \left(\frac{|j|^2}{\prod_s |s|^{\alpha_s + \beta_s}} \right)^\delta \left| \frac{1}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)} \right|^\gamma$$

²⁸ η was introduced in (2.4a).

and

$$(7.9) \quad K_2 = \gamma \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}_j \setminus \mathcal{M}'_j} \left(\frac{\lfloor j \rfloor^2}{\prod_s \lfloor s \rfloor^{\alpha_s + \beta_s}} \right)^\delta \left| \frac{1}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)} \right|^\gamma$$

Note that, by (2.15),

$$|\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)| \geq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} s^2 |\alpha_s - \beta_s| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} |\alpha_s - \beta_s|.$$

so

$$(7.10) \quad \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_s - \beta_s) s^2 \right| \geq 2 \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} |\alpha_s - \beta_s| \quad \implies \quad |\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)| \geq |\alpha - \beta| \geq 1$$

Remark 7.1. In the following we will strongly use the fact that the involved functions depend only on a *finite* number of ω_j . In this case the Lipschitz semi-norm is bounded by the ℓ^1 -norm of the gradient.

Let us first study K_2 . If $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}_j \setminus \mathcal{M}'_j$ then $|\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)| \geq |\alpha - \beta| \geq 1$. Therefore

$$\left| \frac{1}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)} \right|^\gamma \leq \sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}} \frac{1}{|\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)|} + \gamma \sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}} \frac{|\alpha - \beta|}{(\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta))^2} \leq 2,$$

so that in conclusion $K_2 \leq 2$. Otherwise if $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}'_j$, then (recall Definition 2.2)

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}} \left| \frac{1}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)} \right| \leq \frac{2}{\gamma \mathfrak{d}(\alpha - \beta)}, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathfrak{d}(\ell) := \frac{1}{(1 + \lfloor \ell_s \rfloor^2 \langle i(s) \rangle^2)^\tau};$$

as for the Lipschitz variation we estimate it as

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}} \sum_j \left| \partial_{\omega_j} \frac{1}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)} \right| \leq \sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}} \frac{|\alpha - \beta|}{(\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta))^2} \leq \frac{4}{\gamma^2 (\mathfrak{d}(\alpha - \beta))^3},$$

where the last inequality comes from $|\alpha - \beta| \leq (\mathfrak{d}(\alpha - \beta))^{-1}$. Note that the sum in the left hand side above is over a *finite* number of indexes j 's. In conclusion we have proved that for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}'_j$

$$\left| \frac{1}{\omega \cdot (\alpha - \beta)} \right|^\gamma \leq \frac{14}{\gamma (\mathfrak{d}(\alpha - \beta))^3},$$

and hence, recalling the definition of η in (2.4a), we have

$$(7.11) \quad K_1 \leq 14 \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}'_j} \left(\frac{\lfloor j \rfloor^2}{\prod_s \lfloor s \rfloor^{\alpha_s + \beta_s}} \right)^\delta \prod_{s \in S} \left(1 + \langle i(s) \rangle^2 |\alpha_s - \beta_s|^2 \right)^{3\tau}.$$

To bound this last term, we need some basic results and notations coming from [BMP20a]

Definition 7.1. Given a vector $v \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, $0 < |v| < \infty$, we denote by $\hat{n} = \hat{n}(v)$ the vector $(\hat{n}_l)_{l \in I}$ (where $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ is finite) which is the decreasing rearrangement of

$$\{\mathbb{N} \ni h > 1 \text{ repeated } v_h + v_{-h} \text{ times}\} \cup \{1 \text{ repeated } v_1 + v_{-1} + v_0 \text{ times}\}$$

Remark 7.2. A good way of envisioning this list is as follows. Given the set of (commutative) variables $(x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, we consider a monomial (recall (4.1))

$$x^v = \prod_i x_i^{v_i} = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{x_{|v|}},$$

then $\hat{n}(v)$ is the decreasing rearrangement of the list $(\langle j_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle j_{|v|} \rangle)$. As an example consider

$$v = (v_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{with} \quad v_{-6} = 1, v_{-3} = 4, v_{-1} = v_0 = 1, v_1 = v_6 = 2, \quad \text{and} \quad v_j = 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

then $\hat{n}(v) = (6, 6, 6, 3, 3, 3, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1)$.

Given $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathcal{M}$ with $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = |\boldsymbol{\beta}| > 1$, from now on we define

$$\widehat{n} := \widehat{n}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

We observe that there exists a choice of $\sigma_i = \pm 1, 0$ such that by momentum conservation

$$(7.12) \quad \sum_l \sigma_l \widehat{n}_l = 0.$$

with $\sigma_l \neq 0$ if $\widehat{n}_l \neq 1$. Indeed we recall that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} j(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) = \sum_{h \in \mathbb{N}} h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_h + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-h} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{-h} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_h))$$

and that each $h > 1$ appears exactly $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_h + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{-h} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_h + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-h}$ times in the sequence \widehat{n} . Hence we assign the value $\sigma = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_h + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-h}$ times to the $\widehat{n}_l = h$ (and $\sigma = -1$ the remaining times). The value $h = 1$ instead appears in the sequence \widehat{n} , $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{-1} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-1} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ times. Hence we assign the value $\sigma = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-1}$ times, the value $\sigma = -1$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{-1} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_1$ times and $\sigma = 0$ all the remaining times.

From (7.12) we deduce

$$(7.13) \quad \widehat{n}_1 \leq \sum_{l \geq 2} \widehat{n}_l.$$

Indeed, if $\sigma_1 = \pm 1$, the inequality follows directly from (7.12); if $\sigma_1 = 0$, then $\widehat{n}_1 = 1$ and consequently $\widehat{n}_l = 1 \forall l$. Since the mass is conserved, the list \widehat{n} has at least two elements, and the inequality is achieved.

We need the following elementary result (see Lemma C.2 of [BMP20a])

Lemma 7.2. *Let $0 < a < 1$ and $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_N \geq 2$. Then*

$$\frac{\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} x_\ell}{\prod_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} x_\ell^a} \leq x_1^{1-a} + \frac{2}{ax_1^a}.$$

For $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathcal{M}_j$ by Lemma 7.2 (with $a = 1/2$) we can write

$$(7.14) \quad \frac{|j|^2}{\prod_s |s|^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_s + \boldsymbol{\beta}_s}} \leq \frac{[\widehat{n}_1]}{\prod_{l \geq 2} [\widehat{n}_l]} \stackrel{(7.13)}{\leq} \frac{\sum_{l \geq 2} [\widehat{n}_l]}{\prod_{l \geq 2} [\widehat{n}_l]} \leq \frac{4 + [\widehat{n}_2]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\prod_{l \geq 2} [\widehat{n}_l]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \frac{3}{\prod_{l \geq 3} [\widehat{n}_l]^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Now, by (7.14) and (2.16)

$$(7.15) \quad K_{1/14} \stackrel{(7.11)}{\leq} K'_1 := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathcal{M}'_j} \left(\frac{3}{\prod_{l \geq 3} [\widehat{n}_l]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^\delta \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left(1 + \langle i(s) \rangle^2 |\boldsymbol{\alpha}_s - \boldsymbol{\beta}_s|^2 \right)^{\tau_1}, \quad \tau_1 := 3\tau.$$

In the following we call $j_1, j_2 \in \mathcal{S}^c$ with $|j_1| \geq |j_2|$ the possible normal sites. Let us set

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{s(i)}, \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_i = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{s(i)}.$$

Lemma 7.3. *If $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $|\ell| < \infty$, satisfies $\mathbf{m}(\ell) = \pi(\ell) = 0$, then $|\ell|$ is even and $|\ell| \neq 2$.*

Proof. As usual we write in a unique way $\ell = \ell^+ - \ell^-$ where $\ell_s^\pm \geq 0$ and $\ell_s^+ \ell_s^- = 0$ for every $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathbf{m}(\ell) = 0$ we get $|\ell^+| = |\ell^-|$, therefore $|\ell| = |\ell^+| + |\ell^-|$ is even.

Now assume by contradiction that $|\ell^+| = |\ell^-| = 1$. Then $\ell^+ = e_i, \ell^- = e_j$ for some $i \neq j$ and $\pi(\ell) = i - j$, which contradicts $\pi(\ell) = 0$. \square

By Lemma 7.3, the constraint $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}^c} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_s + \boldsymbol{\beta}_s \leq 2$ implies that there exists at least one $s \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_s + \boldsymbol{\beta}_s \neq 0$. We denote the largest in absolute value $s \in \mathcal{S}$ with this property as s_M and $i_M := i(s_M)$. We divide the proof in six cases:

Case 1. $\widehat{n}_2 > s_M$. Here, since there are at most two normal sites we get

$$\Pi_{l \geq 3}[\widehat{n}_l] = \prod_{i \leq i_M} [s(i)]^{\alpha_i + \beta_i}.$$

Recalling that

$$\langle i(s) \rangle |\alpha_s - \beta_s| = \langle i \rangle |\alpha_i - \beta_i| \leq \langle i \rangle (\alpha_i + \beta_i), \quad \text{if } s = s(i), \quad i \in \mathbb{Z},$$

we get

(7.16)

$$\log K_1' \leq \log(3^\delta) + \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \left(-\frac{\delta}{2} \sum_{i \leq i_M} (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \log [s(i)] + \tau_1 \sum_{i \leq i_M} \log (1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2) \right) = \log(3^\delta) + \tau_1 \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}} A_k,$$

where, for $k \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we define

$$(7.17) \quad A_k := \sum_{i \leq i_M, k_i \geq 1} -\bar{\delta} k_i \log [s(i)] + \log (1 + \langle i \rangle^2 k_i^2), \quad \bar{\delta} := \frac{\delta}{2\tau_1},$$

meaning that the sum over i is restricted to the indexes such that $k_i \geq 1$. We split the sum into two terms $A_k = A_k^* + A_k^>$, with

$$A_k^* := \sum_{i < i_*, k_i \geq 1} -\bar{\delta} k_i \log [s(i)] + \log (1 + \langle i \rangle^2 k_i^2), \quad A_k^> := \sum_{i_* \leq i \leq i_M, k_i \geq 1} -\bar{\delta} k_i \log [s(i)] + \log (1 + \langle i \rangle^2 k_i^2),$$

Regarding the first term we get, recalling that $s(i) \geq i$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_k^* &\leq \sum_{i < i_*, k_i \geq 1} -\bar{\delta} k_i \log [i] + 1 + 2 \log \langle i \rangle + 2 \log k_i \leq 8i_* \log i_* + \sum_{i < i_*, k_i \geq 1} -(\bar{\delta} \log 2)k_i + 2 \log k_i \\ &\leq 8i_* \left(\log i_* + \log \frac{1}{\bar{\delta}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

using that $\max_{x \geq 1} -(\bar{\delta} \log 2)x + 2 \log x \leq 2 \log 1/\bar{\delta}$.

Consider now the second term. By (2.4a) we get

$$A_k^> \leq \sum_{i_* \leq i \leq i_M, k_i \geq 1} -\bar{\delta} k_i \log^{1+\eta} |i| + \log (1 + \langle i \rangle^2 k_i^2) \leq A_{k,1}^> + A_{k,2}^>,$$

where

$$A_{k,1}^> := \sum_{i_* \leq i \leq i_M, k_i \geq 28/\bar{\delta}} 2f(i, k_i), \quad A_{k,2}^> := \sum_{i_* \leq i \leq i_M, 1 \leq k_i < 28/\bar{\delta}} 2f(i, k_i),$$

and²⁹

$$(7.18) \quad f(i, k) := -\bar{\delta} k \log^{1+\eta} i + 3 \log i + 2 \log(\bar{\delta} k) + 2 \log(1/\bar{\delta}).$$

When $k_i \geq 28/\bar{\delta}$ we have³⁰

$$f(i, k_i) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \bar{\delta} k_i \log^{1+\eta} i + 2 \log(\bar{\delta} k_i) + 2 \log(1/\bar{\delta}) \leq -\frac{1}{4} \bar{\delta} k_i \log^{1+\eta} i + 2 \log(1/\bar{\delta}) \leq -7 \log^{1+\eta} i + 2 \log(1/\bar{\delta}),$$

which is negative for $i \geq 1/\bar{\delta}$. Then we get

$$A_{k,1}^> \leq \frac{4}{\bar{\delta}} \log(1/\bar{\delta}).$$

We finally consider the term $A_{k,2}^>$, namely when $k_i < 28/\bar{\delta}$. In this case

$$f(i, k_i) \leq \left(3 - \bar{\delta} \log^\eta i \right) \log i + 7 + 2 \log(1/\bar{\delta}).$$

²⁹Recall that $i_* \geq 3$.

³⁰Using that $-\frac{1}{4}x + 2 \log x \leq 0$ for $x \geq 28$ and $\log i \geq \log i_* \geq 1$.

We claim that the last quantity is negative for $i \geq \exp(4\bar{\delta}^{-1/\eta})$. Indeed, since $\eta \leq 2$

$$f(i, k_i) \leq -\frac{4}{\sqrt{\bar{\delta}}} + 7 + 2\log(1/\bar{\delta}) \leq 0$$

for $\bar{\delta} \leq 1/2$. On the other hand for $i < \exp(4\bar{\delta}^{-1/\eta})$ we have

$$f(i, k_i) \leq \frac{12}{\bar{\delta}} + 7 + 2\log(1/\bar{\delta}) \leq \frac{20}{\bar{\delta}}.$$

So we finally get

$$A_{k,2}^{\geq} \leq \frac{40}{\bar{\delta}} \exp(4\bar{\delta}^{-1/\eta}) \leq 40 \exp(5\bar{\delta}^{-1/\eta}).$$

Recollecting we get

$$\log K_1' \leq c \exp(5\bar{\delta}^{-1/\eta}),$$

where, here and in the remaining part of the proof c is a suitably large constant depending only on i_*, τ_1 .

Case 2. $\hat{n}_1 > s_M = \hat{n}_2$ and only one normal site. We have $\sum_{i \in S^c} \alpha_i + \beta_i = 1$ and the normal site must be \hat{n}_1 . Moreover

$$(7.19) \quad \prod_{l \geq 3} [\hat{n}_l] = [s(i_M)]^{\alpha_{i_M} + \beta_{i_M} - 1} \prod_{i < i_M} [s(i)]^{\alpha_i + \beta_i}.$$

so

$$(7.20) \quad K_1' \leq 3^\delta \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \prod_{i < i_M} [s(i)]^{-(\alpha_i + \beta_i)\delta/2} [s(i_M)]^{-(\alpha_{i_M} + \beta_{i_M} - 1)\delta/2} \left(1 + \langle i_M \rangle^2 |\alpha_{i_M} - \beta_{i_M}|^2\right)^{\tau_1} \prod_{i < i_M} \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2\right)^{\tau_1}.$$

If $\alpha_{i_M} = \beta_{i_M}$ and hence i_M does not appear in the small divisors, then we proceed as in case 1.

(a) If $\alpha_{i_M} + \beta_{i_M} \geq 2$ then we claim that

$$(7.21) \quad \log \left([s(i_M)]^{-(\alpha_{i_M} + \beta_{i_M} - 1)\delta/2} \left(1 + \langle i_M \rangle^2 |\alpha_{i_M} - \beta_{i_M}|^2\right)^{\tau_1} \right) \leq \frac{c}{\bar{\delta}}.$$

In order to prove our claim we consider two cases $i_M \leq i_*$ and $i_M > i_*$. In the first case, letting $x = \alpha_{i_M} + \beta_{i_M} - 1 \geq 1$, the left hand side of (7.21) is bounded by

$$\tau_1 \left(-\bar{\delta} x \log 2 + \log(1 + i_*^2(x+1)^2) \right),$$

which is negative for $x \geq c/\bar{\delta}^2$ and, therefore, bounded by $c \log \bar{\delta}$.

Consider now the case $i_M > i_*$. By (2.4a) the left hand side of (7.21) is bounded by³¹

$$\tau_1 \left(-\bar{\delta} x \log^{1+\eta} i_M + \log(1 + i_M^2(x+1)^2) \right) \leq \tau_1 f(i_M, x),$$

with f defined in (7.18). Reasoning as above we can estimate $f(i_M, x)$ by $c/\bar{\delta}$ obtaining (7.21).

By (7.20) and (7.21) we have

$$\log K_1' \leq \log(3^\delta) + \frac{c}{\bar{\delta}} + \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \left(-\frac{\delta}{2} \sum_{i < i_M} (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \log [s(i)] + \tau_1 \sum_{i < i_M} \log(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2) \right),$$

and we proceed as in case 1.

(b) If $\alpha_{i_M} + \beta_{i_M} = 1$ (then $|\alpha_{i_M} - \beta_{i_M}| = 1$), here the second factor in (7.20) is equal to one. Thus in order to bound the third factor (i.e. $(1 + \langle i_M \rangle^2)^{\tau_1} \leq 2^{\tau_1} i_M^{2\tau_1}$) we distinguish two cases: $i_M \leq i_*$ and $i_M > i_*$. In the first case $2^{\tau_1} i_M^{2\tau_1} \leq 2^{\tau_1} i_*^{2\tau_1}$ and the estimate of K_1' in (7.20) proceeds as in the case 1 above. On the other hand when $i_M > i_*$ we need a different argument.

Given $u \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, with $|u| < \infty$, consider the set

$$\{j \neq 0, \text{ repeated } |u_j| \text{ times}\},$$

³¹Recalling that $i_M > i_* \geq 21$ and $\log 21 \geq 3$.

where $D < \infty$ is its cardinality. Define the vector $m = m(u)$ as the reordering of the elements of the set above such that $|m_1| \geq |m_2| \geq \dots \geq |m_D| \geq 1$. Given $\alpha \neq \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, with $|\alpha| = |\beta| < \infty$ we consider $m = m(\alpha - \beta)$ and³² $\hat{n} = \hat{n}(\alpha + \beta)$.

Lemma 7.4 (Lemma C.4 of [BMP20a]). *Given $\alpha \neq \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, with $1 \leq |\alpha| = |\beta| < \infty$ and satisfying (7.7), we have*

$$(7.22) \quad |m_1| \leq 31 \sum_{l \geq 3} \hat{n}_l^2.$$

Recalling that $|\alpha_{i_M} - \beta_{i_M}| = |\alpha_{s_M} - \beta_{s_M}| = 1$ where $s_M = s(i_M)$, we have that $s_M \leq |m_1|$. Then

$$(7.23) \quad \begin{aligned} s(i_M) &= s_M \leq |m_1| \leq 31 \sum_{l \geq 3} \hat{n}_l^2 = 31 \sum_{i < i_M} [s(i)]^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \leq 31 \sum_{i \leq i_*} [s(i)]^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i) + 31 \sum_{i_* < i < i_M} s^2(i) (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \\ &\leq 31 \sum_{i \leq i_*} s_*^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i) + 31 \sum_{i_* < i < i_M} s^2(i) (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \end{aligned}$$

using that $s(i)$ is increasing. By (2.4a)-(2.4c), for the inverse function $i(s)$ we have for integer $j \geq 1$ and $s, s' \geq s_* := s(i_*)$

$$(7.24) \quad i(s + s') \leq i(s) + i(s'), \quad i(js) \leq ji(s), \quad i(s^2) \leq i^2(s).$$

Applying the inverse function $i(s)$ to the inequalities in (7.23) and using (7.24) we get

$$(7.25) \quad i_M \leq 31 i_*^2 \sum_{i \leq i_*}^* (\alpha_i + \beta_i) + 31 \sum_{i_* < i < i_M}^* i^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \leq c \sum_{i < i_M}^* i^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \leq c \prod_{i < i_M} (1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2)$$

where by \sum^* we mean that the sum is only over the indexes i such that $\alpha_i + \beta_i \geq 1$. By (7.20) we get

$$(7.26) \quad \log K'_1 \leq c + \log(3^\delta) + \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \sum_{i < i_M} \left(-\frac{\delta}{2} \log [s(i)] + 3\tau_1 \log \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right) \right).$$

Again we proceed as in case 1.

Case 3. $\hat{n}_1 > s_M = \hat{n}_2$ and two normal sites.

Now

$$(7.27) \quad \prod_{l \geq 3} [\hat{n}_l] = [j_2] [s(i_M)]^{\alpha_{h_M} + \beta_{h_M} - 1} \prod_{i < i_M} [s(i)]^{\alpha_i + \beta_i},$$

where j_2 is the smallest³³ normal site. We have

$$(7.28) \quad K'_1 \leq 3^\delta [j_2]^{-\delta/2} \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \prod_{i < i_M} [s(i)]^{-(\alpha_i + \beta_i)\delta/2} [s(i_M)]^{-(\alpha_{h_M} + \beta_{h_M} - 1)\delta/2} \left(1 + \langle i_M \rangle^2 |\alpha_{i_M} - \beta_{i_M}|^2 \right)^{\tau_1} \prod_{i < i_M} \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right)^{\tau_1}.$$

(a) If $\alpha_{h_M} = \beta_{h_M}$, or if $\alpha_{h_M} + \beta_{h_M} \geq 2$ then we proceed as in case 2-(a), since $[j_2]^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} \leq 1$ and does not bother.

(b) Let now $\alpha_{h_M} + \beta_{h_M} = 1$. The analog of (7.25) is

$$(7.29) \quad i_M \leq c \left(i([j_2]) \right)^2 \prod_{i < i_M} \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right).$$

Then by (7.28) we get

$$(7.30) \quad \log K'_1 \leq c + \log(3^\delta) + 4\tau_1 \log i([j_2]) - \frac{\delta}{2} \log [j_2] + \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \sum_{i < i_M} \left(-\frac{\delta}{2} \log [s(i)] + 3\tau_1 \log \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right) \right).$$

³²The relation between m and \hat{n} is the following. If we denote by D the cardinality of m and by N the one of \hat{n} , respectively, we have $D + \alpha_0 + \beta_0 \leq N$ and $(|m_1|, \dots, |m_D|, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{N-D \text{ times}}) \preceq (\hat{n}_1, \dots, \hat{n}_N)$, recalling Definition 4.1.

³³In absolute value.

Since

$$\sup_{x \geq 2} \left(4\tau_1 \log i(x) - \frac{\delta}{2} \log x \right) = \sup_{y \geq i(2)} \left(4\tau_1 \log y - \frac{\delta}{2} \log s(y) \right) \stackrel{(2.4a)}{\leq} c + \sup_{y \geq i_*} \left(4\tau_1 \log y - \frac{\delta}{2} \log^2 y \right) \leq c + \frac{8\tau_1^2}{\delta},$$

we obtain

$$\log K'_1 \leq c + \log(3^\delta) + \frac{8\tau_1^2}{\delta} + \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \sum_{i < i_M} \left(-\frac{\delta}{2} \log[s(i)] + 3\tau_1 \log \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right) \right).$$

Again we conclude as in case 1.

Case 4 $\widehat{n}_1 = s_M$ and the (eventual) normal sites are $< \widehat{n}_2$. Let us start with the case of two normal sites j_1, j_2 . We get

$$(7.31) \quad \Pi_{l \geq 3}[\widehat{n}_l] = \lfloor j_1 \rfloor \lfloor j_2 \rfloor [s(i_M)]^{\alpha_{h_M} + \beta_{h_M} - 1} \prod_{i < i_M} [s(i)]^{\alpha_i + \beta_i},$$

which contributes with the additional factor $\lfloor j_1 \rfloor^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}$ in the expression (7.28).

(a) If $\alpha_{h_M} = \beta_{h_M}$, or if $\alpha_{h_M} + \beta_{h_M} \geq 2$ then we are reduced to case 3-(a)

(b) If $\alpha_{h_M} + \beta_{h_M} = 1$ then, we proceed as in case 3-(b) and apply Lemma C.4³⁴. The analogous of (7.29) is

$$(7.32) \quad i_M \leq c \left(i(\lfloor j_1 \rfloor) \right)^2 \left(i(\lfloor j_2 \rfloor) \right)^2 \prod_{i < i_M} \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right) \leq c \left(i(\lfloor j_1 \rfloor) \right)^4 \prod_{i < i_M} \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right).$$

Then the analogous of (7.30) is

$$\log K'_1 \leq c + \log(3^\delta) + 8\tau_1 \log i(\lfloor j_1 \rfloor) - \frac{\delta}{2} \log \lfloor j_1 \rfloor + \sup_{\alpha, \beta} \sum_{i < i_M} \left(-\frac{\delta}{2} \log[s(i)] + 3\tau_1 \log \left(1 + \langle i \rangle^2 (\alpha_i + \beta_i)^2 \right) \right).$$

We conclude as in case 3-(b).

If there is only one normal site or if there is none, then the same arguments apply word by word with the only "advantage" that there is only one $\lfloor j_1 \rfloor$ or none in (7.31)

Case 5 $\widehat{n}_1 = s_M$ and only one normal site $j_1 = \widehat{n}_2$. Here (7.19) holds and we proceed as in case 2.

Case 6 $\widehat{n}_1 = s_M, j_1 = \widehat{n}_2$ and two normal sites. The proof follows word by word the one of case 3.

This concludes the proof of (7.4). □

8. ITERATIVE LEMMA AND PROOF OF THEOREM 5

Let $r, r_0, p, p_0, \rho, \delta$ be as in (6.1) and $1 < \eta \leq 2$ as in Definition 2.1. Let $\{\rho_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\delta_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the summable³⁵ sequences:

$$(8.1) \quad \rho_n = \frac{\rho}{6} 2^{-n}, \quad \delta_0 = \frac{\delta}{8}, \quad \delta_n = c_\eta \delta n^{-\frac{1+\eta}{2}} \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad c_\eta^{-1} := \frac{8}{5} \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-\frac{1+\eta}{2}} > 4$$

Let us define recursively

$$(8.2) \quad \begin{aligned} r_{n+1} &= r_n - 3\rho_n \rightarrow r_\infty := r_0 - \rho \geq 7r/4 && \text{(decreasing)} \\ p_{n+1} &= p_n + 3\delta_n \rightarrow p_\infty := p_0 + \delta \leq p && \text{(increasing)}, \end{aligned}$$

recalling (6.1).

Set $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$ (recall (2.16), (2.7) and (4.12)). Since these sets are fixed, we omit to write them explicitly in the notations of this section. For instance we denote $\mathcal{H}_{r_n, p_n} = \mathcal{H}_{r_n, p_n}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}}$ and

³⁴in the notation of [BMP20a] $\widehat{n}_1 = |m_1|$

³⁵Note that $\frac{1+\eta}{2} > 1$.

$$\mathcal{H}_{r_n, p_n}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathcal{H}_{r_n, p_n}^{\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{C})}.$$

By (5.13) and (8.2), we can use projections $\Pi^0, \Pi^{-1}, \Pi^{\geq 1}$, on these spaces for all n .

Remark 8.1. A crucial point for the convergence of the algorithm is that, thanks to (5.13), no small divisor appears in the estimate of the counterterms, see (8.22) and (8.24) below.

Let

$$(8.3) \quad H_0 := D + G_0 + \Lambda_0, \quad G_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{r_0, p_0}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{0, \mathcal{K}}(\mathbb{C}),$$

where D is defined in (6.1) and the counterterms Λ_0 are free parameters. We define

$$(8.4) \quad \varepsilon_0 := \gamma^{-1} \left(\|G_0^{(0, \mathcal{K})}\|_{\infty} + \|G_0^{(0, \mathcal{R})}\|_{r_0, p_0} + \|G_0^{(-2)}\|_{r_0, p_0} + \|G_0^{(-1)}\|_{r_0, p_0} \right), \quad \Theta_0 := \gamma^{-1} \|G_0^{\geq 2}\|_{r_0, p_0} + \varepsilon_0$$

Lemma 8.1 (Iterative step). *There exists a constant $\mathfrak{C} > 1$ large enough³⁶ such that if*

$$(8.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon_0 &\leq (1 + \Theta_0)^{-5} \mathfrak{K}^{-3}, \quad \mathfrak{K} := \mathfrak{C} \left(\frac{r_0}{\rho} \right)^6 \sup_n 2^{6n} \exp \left(\zeta^{n^\xi} - \chi^n (1 - \chi/2) \right), \quad \text{where} \\ \zeta &:= 2c \exp \left(\left(\frac{2}{c_\eta \delta} \right)^{1/\eta} \right), \quad \xi := \frac{1 + \eta}{2\eta} < 1, \quad \chi := 3/2, \end{aligned}$$

(η as in (2.4a), c defined in Lemma 7.1 and c_η in (8.1)) then we can iteratively construct a sequence of generating functions $S_i = S_i^{(-2)} + S_i^{(-1)} + S_i^{(0)} \in \mathcal{H}_{r_i - \rho_i, p_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C})$ and a sequence of counterterms $\bar{\Lambda}_i \in \mathcal{H}^{0, \mathcal{K}}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the following holds, for $n \geq 0$.

(1) For all $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, S}$, $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$, for all $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ and all $p' \geq p_{i+1}$ the time-1 hamiltonian flow Φ_{S_i} generated by $S_i = S_i(\omega, I)$ satisfies

$$(8.6) \quad \sup_{u \in \bar{B}_{r_{i+1}}(\mathfrak{w}_{p'})} |\Phi_{S_i}(u) - u|_{p'} \leq \rho 2^{-2i-7}.$$

Moreover

$$(8.7) \quad \Psi_n := \Phi_{S_0} \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{S_{n-1}}$$

is a well defined, analytic map $\bar{B}_{r_n}(\mathfrak{w}_{p'}) \rightarrow \bar{B}_{r_0}(\mathfrak{w}_{p'})$ for all $p' \geq p_n$ with the bound

$$(8.8) \quad \sup_{u \in \bar{B}_{r_n}(\mathfrak{w}_{p'})} |\Psi_n(u) - \Psi_{n-1}(u)|_{p'} \leq \rho 2^{-2n-3}.$$

(2) We set $\mathcal{L}_0 := 0$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$(8.9) \quad \mathcal{L}_i + \text{Id} := e^{\{S_{i-1}, \cdot\}} (\mathcal{L}_{i-1} + \text{Id}), \quad \Lambda_i := \Lambda_{i-1} - \bar{\Lambda}_{i-1}, \quad H_i = e^{\{S_{i-1}, \cdot\}} H_{i-1}$$

where Λ_{i-1} are free parameters and $\mathcal{L}_i : \mathcal{H}^{0, \mathcal{K}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{r_i, p_i}(\mathbb{C})$ are bounded linear operators. We have

$$(8.10) \quad H_i = D(\omega) + G_i + (\text{Id} + \mathcal{L}_i) \Lambda_i, \quad G_i \in \mathcal{H}_{r_i, p_i}(\mathbb{C}).$$

Setting for $i = 0, \dots, n$

$$(8.11) \quad \varepsilon_i := \gamma^{-1} \left(\|G_i^{(0, \mathcal{K})}\|_{\infty} + \|G_i^{(0, \mathcal{R})}\|_{r_i, p_i} + \|G_i^{(-2)}\|_{r_i, p_i} + \|G_i^{(-1)}\|_{r_i, p_i} \right), \quad \Theta_i := \gamma^{-1} \|G_i^{\geq 1}\|_{r_i, p_i} + \varepsilon_i,$$

we have

$$(8.12) \quad \varepsilon_i \leq \varepsilon_0 e^{-\chi^i + 1}, \quad \Theta_i \leq \Theta_0 \sum_{j=0}^i 2^{-j}$$

$$(8.13) \quad \|(\mathcal{L}_i - \mathcal{L}_{i-1})h\|_{r_i, p_i} \leq \mathfrak{K} \varepsilon_0 (1 + \Theta_0)^2 2^{-i} \|h\|_{\infty}, \quad \|\mathcal{L}_i h\|_{r_i, p_i} \leq \mathfrak{K} (1 + \Theta_0)^2 \varepsilon_0 \sum_{j=1}^i 2^{-j} \|h\|_{\infty},$$

for all $h \in \mathcal{H}^{0, \mathcal{K}}(\mathbb{C})$. Finally the counter-terms satisfy the bound

$$(8.14) \quad \|\bar{\Lambda}_{i-1}\|_{\infty} \leq \gamma \mathfrak{K} \varepsilon_{i-1} (1 + \Theta_0)^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

³⁶Depending only on i_* defined in (2.4a).

Proof of Theorem 5. Starting from the Hamiltonian H satisfying (6.2), we set $G_0 = H - D$ in (8.3). The smallness conditions (8.5) are met, provided that we choose $\bar{\varepsilon}$ and \bar{C} appropriately.

Using (8.8) we define Ψ as the limit of the Ψ_n (which define a Cauchy sequence) and $\Lambda = \Lambda_0 = \sum_j \bar{\Lambda}_j < \infty$. Note that the series is summable by (8.14). For more details see [BMP21, Section 6]. \square

Proof of the iterative Lemma. We start with a Hamiltonian $H_0 = D + \Lambda_0 + G_0$ with $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}$ and D .

At the n 'th step we have an expression of the form

$$H_n = D + (\text{Id} + \mathcal{L}_n)\Lambda_n + G_n$$

with $G_n \in \mathcal{H}_{r_n, p_n}$,

To proceed to the step $n + 1$ we apply the change of variables $e^{\{S_n, \cdot\}}$. The generating function S_n and the counterterm $\bar{\Lambda}_n$ are fixed as the unique solutions of the Homological equation

$$(8.15) \quad \Pi^{\leq 0}(\{S_n, D + G_n^{\geq 1}\} + (\text{Id} + \mathcal{L}_n)\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n) = G_n^{(-2,\mathcal{K})},$$

recalling that $G_n^{(-1,\mathcal{K})} = 0$ by (5.7). This equation can be written componentwise as a triangular system and solved consequently. Indeed we have

$$(8.16) \quad \{S_n^{(-2)}, D\} + \Pi^{-2,\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{(-2,\mathcal{R})} = 0$$

$$(8.17) \quad \{S_n^{(-1)}, D\} + \Pi^{-1}\{S_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\} + \Pi^{-1}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{(-1)} = 0$$

$$(8.18) \quad \Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\{S_n^{(-2)} + S_n^{(-1)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\} + \bar{\Lambda}_n + \Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{(0,\mathcal{K})} = 0$$

$$(8.19) \quad \{S_n^{(0,\mathcal{R})}, D\} + \Pi^{0,\mathcal{R}}\{S_n^{(-2)} + S_n^{(-1)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\} + \Pi^{0,\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{(0,\mathcal{R})} = 0.$$

We start by solving the equations for S_n it "modulo $\bar{\Lambda}_n$ ", then we determine the counter-term by inversion of an appropriate linear operator resulting from inserting the equations for S_n into equation (8.18).

We hence have by Lemma 7.1

$$(8.20) \quad \begin{aligned} S_n^{(-2)} &= L^{-1}\left(\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{(-2)}\right) \\ S_n^{(-1)} &= L^{-1}\left(\Pi^{-1}\{S_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\} + \Pi^{-1}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{(-1)}\right) \\ S_n^{(0,\mathcal{R})} &= L^{-1}\left(\Pi^{0,\mathcal{R}}\{S_n^{(-2)} + S_n^{(-1)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\} + \Pi^{0,\mathcal{R}}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{(0,\mathcal{R})}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging them into (8.18) we thus get

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\{L^{-1}(\Pi^{\leq -1}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n + \Pi^{-1}\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n, G_n^{\geq 1}\}), G_n^{\geq 1}\} + \bar{\Lambda}_n + \Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{L}_n\bar{\Lambda}_n = \\ &- \Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\{L^{-1}\left(G_n^{\leq -1} + \Pi^{-1}\{L^{-1}G_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\right), G_n^{\geq 1}\} - G_n^{(0,\mathcal{K})}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the left hand side of the equation above can be written as $(\text{Id} + M_n)\bar{\Lambda}_n$, where $M_n : \mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{0,\mathcal{K}}$ is the operator defined as

$$(8.21) \quad M_n : h \mapsto M_n h = \Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\{L^{-1}(\Pi^{\leq -1}\mathcal{L}_n h + \Pi^{-1}\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_n h, G_n^{\geq 1}\}), G_n^{\geq 1}\} + \Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{L}_n h.$$

Similarly to Lemma 6.2 of [BMP21] one has

$$(8.22) \quad \|M_n h\|_\infty \leq \|h\|_\infty / 2.$$

In order to prove (8.22), we treat the three summands of M_n separately, we recall that by (5.13), (8.13) and by the smallness condition in (8.5)

$$\|\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{L}_n h\|_\infty \leq 3\|\mathcal{L}_n h\|_{r_n, p_n} \leq 3\mathcal{K}(1 + \Theta)^2 \varepsilon_0 \sum_{j=1}^n 2^{-j} \|h\|_\infty < \frac{1}{6} \|h\|_\infty.$$

In the other summands we use the identification $\|\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}F\|_\infty \leq 3\|F\|_{r',p'}$ for any r',p' (see formulas (5.8) and (5.13) such that $r' \geq r\sqrt{2}$ and $p' \leq p$).

We have by (4.16), (5.13), Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 7.1

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\{\Pi^{\leq -1}L_\omega^{-1}\mathcal{L}_nh, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_\infty \leq 3\|\{\Pi^{\leq -1}L_\omega^{-1}\mathcal{L}_nh, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_{\sqrt{2}r,p} \\
& \stackrel{(4.15),(8.2)}{\leq} 120\|\Pi^{\leq -1}L_\omega^{-1}\mathcal{L}_nh\|_{r_n,p}\|G_n^{\geq 1}\|_{r_n,p} \stackrel{(8.11)}{\leq} 240\gamma\|L_\omega^{-1}\mathcal{L}_nh\|_{r_n,p}\Theta_n \\
(8.23) \quad & \stackrel{(6.1),(8.2),(7.3)}{\leq} 240\exp\left(c\exp\left(\left(\frac{2}{3\delta}\right)^{1/\eta}\right)\right)\|\mathcal{L}_nh\|_{r_n,p_n}\Theta_n \stackrel{(8.5),(8.13)}{\leq} \frac{1}{6}K^2\varepsilon_0(1+\Theta_0)^3\|h\|_\infty \stackrel{(8.5)}{\leq} \frac{1}{6}\|h\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where, in order to control the exponential term we used the definition of K given in (8.5) and the fact that $c_\eta < 1/4$ (recall (8.1)).

Now we estimate the remaining term in (8.21). We have, again by (4.16), (5.13), (8.11), Proposition 4.1 and Lemma (7.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-1}\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_nh, G_n^{\geq 1}\}, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_\infty \leq 3\|\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-1}\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_nh, G_n^{\geq 1}\}, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_{\sqrt{2}r,p} \\
& \stackrel{(4.15),(8.2)}{\leq} 400\|L^{-1}\Pi^{-1}\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_nh, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_{3r/2,p}\|G_n^{\geq 1}\|_{3r/2,p} \\
& \stackrel{(8.11)}{\leq} 400\gamma\|L^{-1}\Pi^{-1}\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_nh, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_{3r/2,p}\Theta_n \\
& \stackrel{(5.13),(7.3)}{\leq} 400\exp\left(c\exp\left(\left(\frac{4}{3\delta}\right)^{1/\eta}\right)\right)\|\{L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_nh, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_{3r/2,(p+p_n)/2}\Theta_n \\
& \stackrel{(4.15),(8.11)}{\leq} 2^{14}\gamma\exp\left(c\exp\left(\left(\frac{4}{3\delta}\right)^{1/\eta}\right)\right)\|L^{-1}\Pi^{-2}\mathcal{L}_nh\|_{r_n,(p+p_n)/2}\Theta_n^2 \\
& \stackrel{(5.13),(7.3)}{\leq} 2^{14}\exp\left(2c\exp\left(\left(\frac{4}{3\delta}\right)^{1/\eta}\right)\right)\|\mathcal{L}_nh\|_{r_n,p_n}\Theta_n^2 \stackrel{(8.5),(8.13)}{\leq} \frac{1}{6}K^2\varepsilon_0(1+\Theta_0)^4\|h\|_\infty \stackrel{(8.5)}{\leq} \frac{1}{6}\|h\|_\infty
\end{aligned}$$

noting that by (6.1) and (8.2)

$$r_n - \frac{3}{2}r \geq r_\infty - \frac{3}{2}r \geq \frac{r}{4}, \quad \frac{p-p_n}{2} \geq \frac{p-p_\infty}{2} \geq \frac{3}{2}\delta$$

and estimating the exponential term as in (8.23). This concludes the proof of (8.22).

Then we have that:

$$(8.24) \quad \bar{\Lambda}_n = -(\text{Id} + M_n)^{-1} \left(\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}} \left\{ L^{-1} \left(G_n^{\leq -1} + \Pi^{-1} \left\{ L^{-1} G_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\} \right), G_n^{\geq 1} \right\} + G_n^{(0,\mathcal{K})} \right)$$

is well defined. In order to prove (8.14) we split (8.24) in three terms and note that by (8.22) the operator norm of $(\text{Id} + M_n)^{-1}$ is bounded by 2. Regarding the first one we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\text{Id} + M_n)^{-1}\Pi^{0,\mathcal{K}}\{L_\omega^{-1}G_n^{\leq -1}, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_\infty \leq 6\|\{L_\omega^{-1}G_n^{\leq -1}, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_{\sqrt{2}r,p} \\
& \stackrel{(4.15),(8.2)}{\leq} 240\|L_\omega^{-1}G_n^{\leq -1}\|_{r_n,p}\|G_n^{\geq 1}\|_{r_n,p} \stackrel{(8.11)}{\leq} 240\gamma\|L_\omega^{-1}G_n^{\leq -1}\|_{r_n,p}\Theta_n \\
(8.25) \quad & \stackrel{(6.1),(8.2),(7.3)}{\leq} 240\exp\left(c\exp\left(\left(\frac{2}{3\delta}\right)^{1/\eta}\right)\right)\|G_n^{\leq -1}\|_{r_n,p_n}\Theta_n \stackrel{(8.5),(8.11),(8.13)}{\leq} \frac{1}{4}K\gamma\varepsilon_n(1+\Theta_0),
\end{aligned}$$

taking \mathfrak{C} large enough here and below. Regarding the second term we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\text{Id} + M_n)^{-1} \Pi^{0, \mathcal{K}} \left\{ L^{-1} \Pi^{-1} \left\{ L^{-1} G_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\} \|_{\infty} \leq 6 \left\| L^{-1} \Pi^{-1} \left\{ L^{-1} G_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\|_{\sqrt{2}r, p} \\
& \stackrel{(4.15), (8.2)}{\leq} 800 \|L^{-1} \Pi^{-1} \left\{ L^{-1} G_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\}\|_{3r/2, p} \|G_n^{\geq 1}\|_{3r/2, p} \\
& \stackrel{(8.11)}{\leq} 800 \gamma \|L^{-1} \Pi^{-1} \left\{ L^{-1} G_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\}\|_{3r/2, p} \Theta_n \\
& \stackrel{(5.13), (7.3)}{\leq} 800 \exp \left(c \exp \left(\left(\frac{4}{3\delta} \right)^{1/\eta} \right) \right) \left\| \left\{ L^{-1} G_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1} \right\} \right\|_{3r/2, (p+p_n)/2} \Theta_n \\
& \stackrel{(4.15), (8.11)}{\leq} 2^{15} \gamma \exp \left(c \exp \left(\left(\frac{4}{3\delta} \right)^{1/\eta} \right) \right) \|L^{-1} G_n^{(-2)}\|_{r_n, (p+p_n)/2} \Theta_n^2 \\
& \stackrel{(5.13), (7.3)}{\leq} 2^{15} \exp \left(2c \exp \left(\left(\frac{4}{3\delta} \right)^{1/\eta} \right) \right) \|G_n^{(-2)}\|_{r_n, p_n} \Theta_n^2 \stackrel{(8.5), (8.11), (8.13)}{\leq} \frac{1}{4} \mathfrak{K} \gamma \varepsilon_n (1 + \Theta_0)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally for the third term we get

$$\|(\text{Id} + M_n)^{-1} G_n^{0, \mathcal{K}}\|_{\infty} \stackrel{(8.11)}{\leq} 2\gamma \varepsilon_n$$

so (8.14) follows.

By substituting in the equations (8.20) we get the final expressions for $S_n^{(-2)}$ and $S_n^{(-1)}$ and finally $S_n^{(0, \mathcal{R})}$ which by (4.15), (7.3), (8.11), (8.13), (8.5) and (8.14) yield the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|S_n^{(-2)}\|_{r_n, p_n + \delta_n} \leq (1 + \mathfrak{K}^2 (1 + \Theta_0)^4 \varepsilon_0) \mathfrak{D}_n \varepsilon_n \leq 2\mathfrak{D}_n \varepsilon_n \\
& \|S_n^{(-1)}\|_{r_n - \rho_n, p_n + 2\delta_n} \leq (1 + 16r_0 \rho_n^{-1} \mathfrak{D}_n \Theta_0) 2\mathfrak{D}_n \varepsilon_n \\
(8.26) \quad & \|S_n^{(0)}\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_n + 3\delta_n} \leq (1 + 16r_0 \rho_n^{-1} \mathfrak{D}_n \Theta_0)^2 3\mathfrak{D}_n \varepsilon_n
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{D}_n := \exp \left(c \exp \left(\left(\frac{2}{\delta_n} \right)^{1/\eta} \right) \right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \zeta^{n^\xi} \right)$$

(ζ and ξ defined in (8.5)) systematically using the inductive hypothesis and the first bound in (8.5). The final bound thus reads (recall (8.1) and (8.2))

$$(8.27) \quad \|S_n\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \leq \frac{r_0^2}{\rho^2} 4^{n+8} \exp \left(\zeta^{n^\xi} \right) \varepsilon_n (1 + \Theta_0)^2 \stackrel{(8.5), (8.12)}{\leq} \frac{\rho}{2^{2n+10} r_0}.$$

Then we can apply Proposition 4.4 since (4.17) is satisfied by S_n with $\rho \rightarrow \rho_n$ and $r \rightarrow r_{n+1}$. Then item (1) of Lemma 8.1 is easily proved. In particular (8.6) follows by (4.18) and (8.27) (for complete details see the analogous proof of [BMP21, Lemma 6.1]).

Regarding item (2), by construction we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{n+1} - \mathcal{L}_n = \left(e^{\{S_n, \cdot\}} - \text{Id} \right) \circ (\mathcal{L}_n + \text{Id})$$

hence by (4.20), (4.17), (8.1) and (5.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
(8.28) \quad & \|(\mathcal{L}_{n+1} - \mathcal{L}_n)h\|_{r_{n+1}, p_{n+1}} \leq \frac{r_0 2^{n+9}}{\rho} \|S_n\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \|(\mathcal{L}_n + \text{Id})h\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \\
& \stackrel{(8.27), (8.5), (8.13)}{\leq} \frac{r_0^3}{\rho^3} 8^{n+9} \exp \left(\zeta^{n^\xi} \right) \varepsilon_n (1 + \Theta_0)^2 \|h\|_{\infty},
\end{aligned}$$

which by (8.5) proves (8.13).

As for the expression of G_{n+1} , by (8.10) and (8.9) we have

$$G_{n+1} = e^{\{S_n, \cdot\}} H_n - [D + (\text{Id} + \mathcal{L}_{n+1}) \Lambda_{n+1}].$$

Since S_n solves the Homological equation (8.15), we have that by (8.9)

$$(8.29) \quad \begin{aligned} G_{n+1} &= G_n^{(-2, \mathcal{K})} + G_n^{\geq 1} + \Pi^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{L}_{n+1}\bar{\Lambda}_n + \{S_n, G_n^{\geq 1}\}) + G_{n+1,*} \\ G_{n+1,*} &= \{S_n, G_n^{\leq 0}\} + \Pi^{\leq 0}(\mathcal{L}_{n+1} - \mathcal{L}_n)\bar{\Lambda}_n + \left(e^{\{S_n, \cdot\}} - \text{Id} - \{S_n, \cdot\} \right) G_n \\ &\quad - \sum_{h=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\text{ad } S_n)^{h-1}}{h!} \left(\Pi^{\leq 0}(\text{Id} + \mathcal{L}_n)\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{\leq 0} + \Pi^{\leq 0}\{S_n^{(-1)} + S_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

using that $\Pi^{\leq 0}(\{S_n, D\}) = (\{S_n, D\})$ by (5.4) and that $\{S_n, G_n^{(-2, \mathcal{K})}\} = 0$. Note that $G_{n+1,*}$ is quadratic in $S_n \sim G_n^{\leq 0}$.

Recalling (8.1), (8.2), (4.15), (5.13), (8.5), (8.11), (8.13), (8.14) and Proposition 4.4 (which can be applied by (8.27))

$$(8.28) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|G_{n+1,*}\|_{r_{n+1}, p_{n+1}} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{n+6}r_0}{\rho} \|S_n\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \gamma \varepsilon_n + \frac{r_0^3}{\rho^3} 8^{n+9} \exp\left(\zeta^{n^\xi}\right) \varepsilon_n (1 + \Theta_0)^2 \|\bar{\Lambda}_n\|_\infty + \frac{2^{2n+21}r_0^2}{\rho^2} \|S_n\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}}^2 \gamma \Theta_0 \\ &\quad + \frac{2^{n+10}r_0}{\rho} \|\Pi^{\leq 0}(\text{Id} + \mathcal{L}_n)\bar{\Lambda}_n + G_n^{\leq 0} + \Pi^{\leq 0}\{S_n^{(-1)} + S_n^{(-2)}, G_n^{\geq 1}\}\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \|S_n\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \\ (8.27), (8.26) \quad &\leq 2^{6n+55} \frac{r_0^6}{\rho^6} \exp\left(2\zeta^{n^\xi}\right) \varepsilon_n^2 (1 + \Theta_0)^5 \gamma \\ &\quad + \frac{2^{n+24}r_0}{\rho} \left(\|\bar{\Lambda}_n\|_\infty + \gamma \varepsilon_n + 2^n \frac{r_0^2}{\rho^2} \Theta_0^2 \varepsilon_n \exp\left(\zeta^{n^\xi}\right) \gamma \right) \|S_n\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \\ (8.27), (8.14) \quad &\leq 2^{6n+55} \frac{r_0^6}{\rho^6} \left(\exp\left(\zeta^{n^\xi}\right) + \mathbf{K} \right) \exp\left(\zeta^{n^\xi}\right) \varepsilon_n^2 (1 + \Theta_0)^5 \gamma \\ (8.5) \quad &\leq 2^{57} \frac{\gamma}{\mathbf{K}^2} \left(\exp\left(\zeta^{n^\xi}\right) + 1 \right) e^{-\chi^{n+1}/2} \varepsilon_n \leq 2^{60} \frac{\gamma}{\mathbf{K}} e^{-\chi^{n+1}} \varepsilon_0 \leq \gamma e^{-\chi^{n+1}} \varepsilon_0, \end{aligned}$$

taking \mathfrak{C} large enough. Recalling (8.11) and (8.29) this implies³⁷ the first estimates in (8.12).

By the above estimate and recalling (8.11) and (8.29) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{n+1} &\leq \varepsilon_{n+1} + \Theta_n + e^{-\chi^{n+1}} \varepsilon_0 + \gamma^{-1} \|\Pi^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{L}_{n+1}\bar{\Lambda}_n + \{S_n, G_n^{\geq 1}\})\|_{r_{n+1}, p_{n+1}} \\ &\leq \Theta_n + 4e^{-\chi^{n+1}} \varepsilon_0 + 2^4 \varepsilon_n + 2^{n+7} r_0 \rho^{-1} \|S_n\|_{r_n - 2\rho_n, p_{n+1}} \Theta_0 \leq \Theta_n + \Theta_0 2^{-n-1} \end{aligned}$$

again by (5.13), (8.5), (8.13), (8.14), (4.15), (8.27). This finally implies the second estimates in (8.12).

The analyticity of Ψ_n and Λ_n follows by Lemma 7.1, point (ii) of Proposition 5.1 and recalling Remark 4.2. \square

9. MEASURE ESTIMATES

Lemma 9.1 (Measure estimates). *The set \mathcal{C} defined in (2.19) satisfies (2.13), namely*

$$\text{meas}_{\mathcal{Q}_S}(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma)) \leq C_0 \gamma, \quad \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^S}(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma), V_{S^c}, I)) \leq C_0 \gamma.$$

Proof. We start proving the first estimate in (2.13).

Take $\gamma \leq 1/2$. For $\ell \neq 0$ with $|\ell| < \infty$, $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\ell_s| \leq 2$, $\pi(\ell) = 0$ and $\mathfrak{m}(\ell) = 0$ we define the resonant set

$$(9.1) \quad \mathcal{R}_\ell = \mathcal{R}_\ell(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma) := \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{Q}_S : |\omega(\nu, V_{S^c}, I) \cdot \ell| \leq \gamma \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_s|^2 \langle i(s) \rangle)^2} =: \gamma \mathfrak{d}(\ell) \right\}$$

Recalling the definition of $\omega(\nu, V_{S^c}, I)$ in (2.19) we note that by the continuity with respect to the product topology of the functions $\nu \mapsto \Omega_j(\nu, V_{S^c}, I)$ with $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$, $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ (and since $|\ell| < \infty$) we have the crucial fact that the sets \mathcal{R}_ℓ are closed (w.r.t. the product topology) and, therefore, *measurable with respect to the product*

³⁷Recall that the seminorm of the constant term $G_n^{(-2, \mathcal{K})}$ is zero.

probability measure on \mathcal{Q}_S . Moreover, since \mathcal{Q}_S is compact all the \mathcal{R}_ℓ are compact too. In the following we will often omit to write the immaterial dependence on V_{S^c} and I . Set $\mathbf{q}(\ell) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{N}} s^2 \ell_s$. If $|\mathbf{q}(\ell)| \geq |\ell|$ then

$$|\omega \cdot \ell| \geq \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{N}} s^2 \ell_s \right| - \frac{1}{2} |\ell| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\ell| < \frac{1}{2}$$

and $\mathcal{R}_\ell = \emptyset$. Recall the definition of the set \mathcal{C} given in (2.19) and (2.16). Denoting by meas the product probability measure on \mathcal{Q}_S , we have

$$(9.2) \quad \mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{\ell \in A} \mathcal{R}_\ell, \quad \text{which implies} \quad \text{meas}(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}) \leq \sum_{\ell \in A} \text{meas}(\mathcal{R}_\ell),$$

where

$$(9.3) \quad A := \left\{ \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}} : 0 < |\ell| < \infty, \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\ell_s| \leq 2, \mathbf{m}(\ell) = \pi(\ell) = 0, |\mathbf{q}(\ell)| < |\ell| \right\}.$$

Fix $\ell \in A$. We note that

$$(9.4) \quad \exists \bar{s} = \bar{s}(\ell) \in \mathcal{S} \quad (\text{depending only on } \ell) \text{ such that } \ell_{\bar{s}} \neq 0,$$

otherwise $0 < |\ell| = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\ell_s| \leq 2$, which contradicts Lemma 7.3. Since $\omega(\nu) = (\nu, \Omega(\nu))$, we get

$$|t|^{-1} |(\omega(\nu + t e_{\bar{s}}) \cdot \ell) - (\omega(\nu) \cdot \ell)| \geq |\ell_{\bar{s}}| - 2 \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\Omega_s|^{\text{lip}} \stackrel{(2.18)}{\geq} 1 - 2C\varepsilon \geq 1/2,$$

taking $\varepsilon_*(p_*)$ small enough in (2.10). Set $\hat{\nu} = (\nu_s)_{s \neq \bar{s}}$. Then for every $\hat{\nu}$ there exist $a_\ell(\hat{\nu}) = a_\ell(\hat{\nu}, V_{S^c}, I, \gamma) < b_\ell(\hat{\nu}) = b_\ell(\hat{\nu}, V_{S^c}, I, \gamma)$ satisfying

$$(9.5) \quad \{ \nu_{\bar{s}} \text{ s.t. } (\nu_{\bar{s}}, \hat{\nu}) \in \mathcal{R}_\ell \} \subseteq (a_\ell(\hat{\nu}), b_\ell(\hat{\nu})), \quad \text{with } b_\ell(\hat{\nu}) - a_\ell(\hat{\nu}) \leq 4\gamma \mathbf{d}(\ell),$$

which implies

$$\text{meas}\{ \nu_{\bar{s}} \text{ s.t. } (\nu_{\bar{s}}, \hat{\nu}) \in \mathcal{R}_\ell \} \leq 4\gamma \mathbf{d}(\ell).$$

Since \mathcal{R}_ℓ is measurable, by Fubini's Theorem we have that

$$\text{meas}(\mathcal{R}_\ell) \leq 4\gamma \mathbf{d}(\ell) = 4\gamma \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_s|^2 \langle i(s) \rangle^2)^\tau} = 4\gamma \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_{s(i)}|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^\tau}.$$

Therefore

$$(9.6) \quad \text{meas}(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}) \leq 4\gamma \sum_{\ell \in A} \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_{s(i)}|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^\tau}.$$

We claim that

$$(9.7) \quad \sum_{\ell \in A} \mathbf{d}(\ell) = \sum_{\ell \in A} \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_{s(i)}|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^\tau} \leq C_0/17,$$

taking C_0 large enough³⁸.

Given $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $|k| < \infty$ we define $\ell^k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ supported on \mathcal{S} setting

$$\ell_s^k := k_{i(s)}, \quad \text{for } s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \ell_s = 0 \quad \text{for } s \notin \mathcal{S}.$$

Now for each $\ell \in A$ there exist unique $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $|k| < \infty$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S}^c$ and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 = \pm 1, 0$ such that

$$(9.8) \quad \ell = \ell^k + \sigma_1 \mathbf{e}_{s_1} + \sigma_2 \mathbf{e}_{s_2}.$$

³⁸The quantity on the left hand side of (9.7) depends only on τ , but we fixed $\tau = 3/2$.

On the other hand, given $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $|k| < \infty$, there exist at most $36(|k| + 2)$ vectors $\ell \in A$ satisfying (9.8). Indeed we prove that, given $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 = \pm 1, 0$, there exist at most³⁹ $4(|k| + 2)$ couples $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{S}^c \times \mathcal{S}^c$ such that ℓ in (9.8) belongs to A . Indeed they have to satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_1 s_1 + \sigma_2 s_2 = -\pi(\ell^k) \\ \sigma_1 s_1^2 + \sigma_2 s_2^2 = -\mathbf{q}(\ell^k) + h, \end{cases} \quad \text{for some } |h| < |\ell| \leq |k| + 2.$$

Then by (9.6) we get

$$\sum_{\ell \in A} \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_{s(i)}|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^\tau} \leq 36\gamma \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}: 0 < |k| < \infty} (|k| + 2) \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + |k_i|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^\tau}.$$

Since

$$|k| + 2 \leq 2 \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (1 + |k_i|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^{1/2}$$

we get

$$\sum_{\ell \in A} \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_{s(i)}|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^\tau} \leq 72\gamma \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}: 0 < |k| < \infty} \prod_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + |k_i|^2 \langle i \rangle^2)^{\tau-1/2}}.$$

where the last sum converges (see [Bou05] or Lemma 4.1 of [BMP20a]) provided that $\tau > 1$. This concludes the proof of (9.7) taking C_0 large enough and, by (9.6), the proof of the first estimate in (2.13).

Let us now prove the second estimate in (2.13). Set for brevity

$$(9.9) \quad \text{meas}'(E) := \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}}} (E \cap [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}})$$

the product probability measure on $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}}$. Since $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}$ (defined in (2.12)) is Lipschitz $C\varepsilon\gamma$ -close to the map $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^*$ (defined in (2.6)) we have that

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I') \supset [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}}$$

for every $V_{\mathcal{S}^c} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$ and⁴⁰ $I' \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$. The function $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)$ is invertible (w.r.t. ν). In particular there exists a function

$$(9.10) \quad g : [-3/8, 3/8]^{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c} \times \mathcal{I}(p, r) \ni (V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) \rightarrow g(V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) \in [-4\bar{C}\gamma\varepsilon, 4\bar{C}\gamma\varepsilon]^{\mathcal{S}},$$

which is continuous w.r.t. the product topology in $[-3/8, 3/8]^{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$ and satisfies

$$(9.11) \quad \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(q + V_{\mathcal{S}} + g(V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I), V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) = V_{\mathcal{S}}, \quad \text{where } q = (q_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}}, \quad q_j := j^2,$$

with Lipschitz estimates

$$(9.12) \quad |g(V_{\mathcal{S}}', V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I) - g(V_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I)|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}}^\infty} \leq 6\bar{C}\varepsilon |V_{\mathcal{S}}' - V_{\mathcal{S}}|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}}^\infty}.$$

Indeed recalling (6.11) g satisfies the fixed point equation (e.g. by a slightly modified version of Lemma B.1)

$$g = -\lambda(q + V_{\mathcal{S}} + g, \Omega(q + V_{\mathcal{S}} + g, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, I), I);$$

then (9.10) and (9.12) follow from (6.4) (recalling (5.12) and (4.10)).

For the remaining of the proof we drop the dependence on $V_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ and γ . Fix $\ell \in A$, first we note that for all $I, I' \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ the set $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{R}_\ell(I); I')$ is measurable since $\mathcal{R}_\ell(I)$ is closed and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is continuously invertible. Recalling (9.1) we have

$$(9.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{R}_\ell(I), I') \cap [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}} = \{V_{\mathcal{S}} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}} \text{ s.t. } \exists \nu \in \mathcal{R}_\ell(I) \text{ with } V_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\nu, I')\} \\ & \stackrel{(9.11)}{=} \{V_{\mathcal{S}} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}} \text{ s.t. } |\omega(q + V_{\mathcal{S}} + g(V_{\mathcal{S}}, I'), I) \cdot \ell| \leq \gamma d(\ell)\} =: \mathbf{E}. \end{aligned}$$

³⁹Note that there are 9 possible choices of $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 = \pm 1, 0$.

⁴⁰In the present proof we actually take $I' = I$. We have introduced I' for estimate (9.15) that will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.1.

As usual we set $\ell =: (\ell_S, \ell_{S^c})$ and note that, since $\ell \in A$ by (9.4) we get $|\ell_S| \geq 1$ and $|\ell_{S^c}| \leq 2$. Let $\bar{S} := \{j \in S : \ell_j \neq 0\}$. We split $\ell_S =: (\ell_S, 0)$. Define $\bar{\ell}_S$ by $\bar{\ell}_{S,j} = \text{sign } \ell_j$ for $j \in \bar{S}$; then $\bar{\ell}_S \cdot \ell_S = |\ell_S| = |\ell_S| \geq 1$ and $|\bar{\ell}_S|_\infty = 1$.

Decomposing $V_S = (V_{\bar{S}}, V_{S \setminus \bar{S}})$ we set

$$\mathbf{E}(V_{S \setminus \bar{S}}) := \{V_{\bar{S}} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\bar{S}} : (V_{\bar{S}}, V_{S \setminus \bar{S}}) \in \mathbf{E}\}.$$

We claim that for every $V_{S \setminus \bar{S}} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{S \setminus \bar{S}}$

$$(9.14) \quad \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^{\bar{S}}}(\mathbf{E}(V_{S \setminus \bar{S}})) \leq 16\gamma d(\ell).$$

Then by Fubini's theorem we get

$$(9.15) \quad \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^S}(\mathbf{E}) = \text{meas}'(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{R}_\ell(I), I')) \leq 16\gamma d(\ell).$$

Then

$$\text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^S}(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(I), I')) \leq \sum_{\ell \in A} 16\gamma d(\ell)$$

and the second estimate in (2.13) follows by (9.7) and taking $I' = I$.

Let us finally prove the claim in (9.14). Fix $V_{S \setminus \bar{S}} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{S \setminus \bar{S}}$. Setting for brevity⁴¹

$$\begin{aligned} f(V_{\bar{S}}) &:= \omega(q + V_S + g(V_S, I'), I) \cdot \ell \\ &\stackrel{(2.19)}{=} V_{\bar{S}} \cdot \ell_{\bar{S}} + (q + g(V_S, I')) \cdot \ell_S + \Omega(q + V_S + g(V_S, I'), I) \cdot \ell_{S^c}, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$|t|^{-1} |f(V_{\bar{S}} + t\bar{\ell}_{\bar{S}}) - f(V_{\bar{S}})| \geq |\ell_S| - 16\bar{C}\epsilon |\ell_S| \geq |\ell_S|/2.$$

by (9.12) and (6.10) and taking $\varepsilon_*(p_*)$ in (2.10) small enough such that $16\bar{C}\epsilon \leq 16\bar{C}c(p_*)\varepsilon \leq 1/2$ (recall (6.8),(6.7)) Then we get that

$$\text{meas}\{t \in \mathbb{R} : V_{\bar{S}} + t\bar{\ell}_{\bar{S}} \in \mathbf{E}(V_{S \setminus \bar{S}})\} \leq 4\gamma d(\ell)/|\ell_S|.$$

We need the following (finite dimensional) result proved in the Appendix

Lemma 9.2. *Let $E \subset [-1/4, 1/4]^n$ be a measurable set. Let $\xi = (\hat{\xi}, -1)$ with $\hat{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Assume that for every $x \in [-1/4, 1/4]^n$ we have⁴² $\text{meas}_{\mathbb{R}}\{t \in \mathbb{R} : x + t\xi \in E\} \leq \delta$. Then $\text{meas}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(E) \leq 2^{1-n}\delta|\xi|_2^2$, where $|\cdot|_2$ denotes the Euclidean norm.*

Then (9.14) follows by the above lemma with⁴³

$$E = \mathbf{E}(V_{S \setminus \bar{S}}), \quad n = \#\bar{S}, \quad \xi = \bar{\ell}_{\bar{S}}, \quad x = V_{\bar{S}}, \quad \delta = 4\gamma d(\ell)/|\ell_S|$$

and noting that $|\bar{\ell}_S|_2^2 = n \leq |\ell_S|$ and $\text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^n}(A) = 2^n \text{meas}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(A)$ for every $A \subseteq [-1/4, 1/4]^n$. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.1. It is equivalent to prove that

$$(9.16) \quad \mathcal{B}(I, \gamma) := \{V \equiv (V_S, V_{S^c}) \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} : V_S \in \mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma), V_{S^c}, I)\}$$

is a Borel set in $[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with measure bounded by $C_0\gamma$ (C_0 is the constant in (2.13)).

The function $h : [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_S \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{S^c}$ defined by⁴⁴

$$h(V) := (q + V_S + g(V_S, V_{S^c}, I), V_{S^c})$$

⁴¹Recall (2.19) and (9.11).

⁴² $\text{meas}_{\mathbb{R}}$, resp. $\text{meas}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$, being the standard Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R} , resp \mathbb{R}^n .

⁴³Here we consider the case when $\bar{\ell}_S = -1$ the +1 case is analogous.

⁴⁴ g was defined in (9.10). By (9.11) h is the inverse of the function $(\nu, V_{S^c}) \mapsto (\mathcal{V}_S(\nu, V_{S^c}), V_{S^c})$.

is continuous with respect to the product topology. Then, for every $\ell \in A$ (recall (9.3)), the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\ell(I, \gamma) &:= \{V \equiv (V_S, V_{S^c}) \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} : |\omega(h(V)) \cdot \ell| \leq \gamma \mathfrak{d}(\ell)\} \\ &\stackrel{(9.1), (9.11)}{=} \{V \equiv (V_S, V_{S^c}) \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} : V_S \in \mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{R}_\ell(V_{S^c}, I), V_{S^c}, I)\} \end{aligned}$$

is closed and, therefore, measurable. Then by Fubini's theorem and (9.15) (with $I = I'$) we get $\text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}}(\mathcal{B}_\ell) \leq 16\gamma \mathfrak{d}(\ell)$. Since \mathcal{B} defined in (9.16) can be written as $\mathcal{B} = \cup_{\ell \in A} \mathcal{B}_\ell$ (recall (9.2)), by (9.7) we get $\text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}}}(\mathcal{B}) \leq C_0\gamma$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The first estimate in (3.4) is equivalent to

$$(9.17) \quad \text{meas}_{[-1/4, 1/4]^S} \left(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}'(V_{S^c}, I, \gamma), V_{S^c}, I) \right) \leq C_0\gamma,$$

where C_0 was defined in Theorem 3.

In the following we drop the dependence on V_{S^c} . We first note that recalling (9.1), (9.3) and setting $L := Cr^{-2}\epsilon$, we get

$$(9.18) \quad |I - I'|_{2p_*} \leq \mathfrak{d}(\ell)/4L \quad \implies \quad \mathcal{R}_\ell(I', \gamma/2) \subset \mathcal{R}_\ell(I, \gamma), \quad \forall \ell \in A.$$

Indeed, since $\ell \in A$,

$$|\omega(\nu, I) \cdot \ell| \stackrel{(2.18)}{\leq} |\omega(\nu, I') \cdot \ell| + 2\gamma L |I - I'|_{2p_*} \leq \gamma \mathfrak{d}(\ell)/2 + 2\gamma L |I - I'|_{2p_*} \leq \gamma \mathfrak{d}(\ell).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \left(\mathcal{C}(I, \gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}(I', \gamma/2) \right) &= \left(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(I, \gamma) \right) \cup \left(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}(I', \gamma/2) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(9.2), (9.18)}{=} \bigcup_{\ell \in A} \mathcal{R}_\ell(I, \gamma) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{\ell \in A, \\ \mathfrak{d}(\ell) < 4L|I - I'|_{2p_*}}} \mathcal{R}_\ell(I', \gamma/2). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}'(I, \gamma) := \bigcup_{\ell \in A} \mathcal{R}_\ell(I, \gamma) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{\ell \in A, \\ \mathfrak{d}(\ell) < 4L|I - I^{(n_k)}|_{2p_*}}} \mathcal{R}_\ell(I^{(n_k)}, \gamma/2)$$

and (recalling the notation in (9.9))

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{meas}' \left(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{Q}_S \setminus \mathcal{C}'(I, \gamma); I) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell \in A} \text{meas}'(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{R}_\ell(I, \gamma); I)) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{\substack{\ell \in A, \\ \mathfrak{d}(\ell) < 4L|I - I^{(n_k)}|_{2p_*}}} \text{meas}'(\mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{R}_\ell(I^{(n_k)}, \gamma); I)) \\ &\stackrel{(9.15)}{\leq} 16\gamma \sum_{\ell \in A} \mathfrak{d}(\ell) + 16\gamma \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{\substack{\ell \in A, \\ \mathfrak{d}(\ell) < 4L|I - I^{(n_k)}|_{2p_*}}} \mathfrak{d}(\ell) \leq 17\gamma \sum_{\ell \in A} \mathfrak{d}(\ell) \stackrel{(9.7)}{\leq} C\gamma \end{aligned}$$

taking the subsequence $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ growing fast enough⁴⁵. This proves (9.17). The second estimate in (3.4) follows from the first one and Fubini Theorem provided that $\mathcal{G}(I, \gamma)$ is a Borel set. This holds true since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(I, \gamma) &= \cap_k \{V = (V_S, V_{S^c}) \in [1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ s.t. } V_S \in \mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{C}(I^{(n_k)}, \gamma/2), V_{S^c}, I^{(n_k)})\} \\ &\quad \cap \{V = (V_S, V_{S^c}) \in [1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ s.t. } V_S \in \mathcal{V}_S(\mathcal{C}(I, \gamma), V_{S^c}, I)\} \\ &= [1/4, 1/4]^{\mathbb{Z}} \setminus \left(\cup_k \mathcal{B}(I^{(n_k)}, \gamma/2) \cup \mathcal{B}(I, \gamma) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The Borel sets $\mathcal{B}(I^{(n_k)}, \gamma/2)$, $\mathcal{B}(I, \gamma)$ are defined in (9.16). \square

⁴⁵Since the positive term series in (9.7) converges.

APPENDIX A. TECHNICALITIES

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let us consider first the case $f \in F(\mathcal{O} \times B_\rho)$, namely when f depends only on a finite number of ω_j 's. By definition this means that, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $\hat{f} : P_k(\mathcal{O}) \times B_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where P_k is the projection $P_k : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2k+1}$ defined as $P_k(\omega) := (\omega_{-k}, \dots, \omega_k)$, such that $f(\omega, I) = \hat{f}(\omega_{-k}, \dots, \omega_k, I)$ for every $(\omega, I) \in \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho$. By Cauchy estimates

$$|\hat{f}(\omega, I) - \hat{f}(\omega, I')| \leq 2\rho^{-1}|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}|I - I'|_E, \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{O}, \quad I, I' \in B_{\rho/2}.$$

We need the following

Lemma A.1 (Lipschitz extension). *Let X be a metric space endowed with the metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq X$. Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\sup_U |f| =: M < \infty$ be a L -Lipschitz function, namely $|f(u) - f(v)| \leq Ld(u, v)$ for every $u, v \in U$. There exists an extension $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of f such that $\tilde{f}(u) = f(u)$ for every $u \in U$, $\sup_X |\tilde{f}| = M$ and \tilde{f} is L -Lipschitz. Explicitly*

$$\tilde{f} := \max\{-M, \min\{\bar{f}, M\}\}, \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{f}(x) := \inf_{u \in U} f(u) + Ld(x, u).$$

Before proving Lemma A.1 we conclude the proof of Lemma 4.1. Then Lemma A.1 with $X = P_k(\mathcal{Q}) \times B_{\rho/2}$, distance $d((\omega, I), (\omega', I')) = |\omega - \omega'|_\infty + 2\gamma\rho^{-1}|I - I'|_E$, $U = P_k(\mathcal{O}) \times B_{\rho/2}$, $f = \hat{f}$, $L = \gamma^{-1}|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}$ implies Lemma 4.1 in the case $f \in F(\mathcal{O} \times B_\rho)$. Note in particular that, since $P_k(\mathcal{Q})$ is finite dimensional the product topology on it coincides with one induced by the norm $|\cdot|_\infty$. Then the extended function $\tilde{f} \in F(\mathcal{Q} \times B_{\rho/2})$ and its continuity in ω follows by its Lipschitz-continuity in ω . Moreover, in this case, $|\tilde{f}|^{\gamma, \mathcal{Q} \times B_{\rho/2}} = |f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}$ and

$$|\tilde{f}(\omega, I) - \tilde{f}(\omega, I')| \leq 2\rho^{-1}|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}|I - I'|_E, \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{Q}, \quad I, I' \in B_{\rho/2}.$$

Consider now the case of a general $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times B_\rho)$. By definition there exists a sequence $f_n \in F(\mathcal{O} \times B_\rho)$ such that $|f_n - f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho} \leq 4^{-n-1}|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}$ and $g_0 := f_0$, $g_n := f_n - f_{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$. Then $f = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n$. Moreover $|g_0|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho} \leq 5/4|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}$, $|g_n|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho} = |f_n - f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho} + |f - f_{n-1}|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho} \leq 5 \cdot 4^{-n-1}|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}$ and $g_n \in F(\mathcal{O} \times B_\rho)$. Then there exist extensions $\tilde{g}_n \in F(\mathcal{Q} \times B_{\rho/2})$, $n \geq 0$ such that $\tilde{g}_n = g_n$ on $\mathcal{O} \times B_{\rho/2}$, $|\tilde{g}_n|^{\gamma, \mathcal{Q} \times B_{\rho/2}} \leq 5 \cdot 4^{-n-1}|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}$, \tilde{g}_n is continuous w.r.t the product topology in \mathcal{O} , finally \tilde{g}_n is Lipschitz on $B_{\rho/2}$ with estimate

$$|\tilde{g}_n(\omega, I) - \tilde{g}_n(\omega, I')| \leq 10\rho^{-1}4^{-n-1}|f|^{\gamma, \mathcal{O} \times B_\rho}|I - I'|_E, \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{Q}, \quad I, I' \in B_{\rho/2}.$$

Finally set $\tilde{f} := \sum_{n \geq 0} \tilde{g}_n$. □

Proof of Lemma A.1. We first prove that \bar{f} is well defined, namely that $\bar{f}(x) > -\infty$ for all $x \in X$. Indeed for every $u, v \in U$ we have

$$f(u) + Ld(x, u) = f(v) + f(u) - f(v) + Ld(x, u) \geq f(v) + L(d(x, u) - d(u, v)) \geq f(v) - Ld(x, v).$$

Taking the $\inf_{u \in U}$ on both sides we get $\bar{f}(x) \geq f(v) - Ld(x, v) > -\infty$.

Now we prove that $\bar{f}(x) = f(x)$ for every $x \in U$. Indeed, trivially, $\bar{f}(x) \leq f(x)$. By contradiction, if $\bar{f}(x) < f(x)$ then there exists $u \in U$ such that $f(u) + Ld(x, u) < f(x)$. Therefore

$$Ld(x, u) < f(x) - f(u) \leq Ld(x, u),$$

which is a contradiction.

Now we prove that \bar{f} is L -Lipschitz. Fix $x, y \in X$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $u \in U$ such that $\bar{f}(y) \geq f(u) + Ld(y, u) - \varepsilon$. Then

$$\bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}(y) \leq \bar{f}(x) - f(u) - Ld(y, u) + \varepsilon \leq L(d(x, u) - d(y, u)) + \varepsilon \leq Ld(x, y) + \varepsilon$$

by the triangular inequality. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary we get $\bar{f}(x) - \bar{f}(y) \leq Ld(x, y)$. Analogously we prove that $\bar{f}(y) - \bar{f}(x) \leq Ld(x, y)$.

The facts that $\tilde{f}(u) = f(u)$ for every $u \in U$ and $\sup_X |\tilde{f}| = M$ trivially follow by $-M \leq f(u) = \tilde{f}(u) \leq M$.

The fact that \tilde{f} is L -Lipschitz follows applying twice the following result:

Given a L -Lipschitz $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ the functions $\bar{g} := \max\{g, c\}$ and $\underline{g} := \min\{g, c\}$ are L -Lipschitz.

We prove it only for \bar{g} , the other case being analogous. We first note that $\bar{g} = (g + c + |g - c|)/2$. Then

$$|\bar{g}(x) - \bar{g}(y)| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|g(x) - g(y)| + ||g(x) - c| - |g(y) - c||) \leq |g(x) - g(y)| \leq Ld(x, y).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.1

The proof reduces to prove the following bound

$$(A.1) \quad |\{F, G\}|_{r,p} \leq 8 \max\left\{1, \frac{r}{\rho}\right\} |F|_{r+\rho,p} |G|_{r+\rho,p}.$$

Writing $F = \sum F_{\alpha', \beta'} u^{\alpha'} \bar{u}^{\beta'}$ and $G = \sum G_{\alpha'', \beta''} u^{\alpha''} \bar{u}^{\beta''}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{F, G\} &= \sum_{\alpha', \beta', \alpha'', \beta''} F_{\alpha', \beta'} G_{\alpha'', \beta''} \sum_j (\alpha'_j \beta''_j - \beta'_j \alpha''_j) u^{\alpha' + \alpha'' - e_j} \bar{u}^{\beta' + \beta'' - e_j} \\ &=: H = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} H_{\alpha, \beta} u^{\alpha} \bar{u}^{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(A.2) \quad H_{\alpha, \beta} := \sum_j \sum_{\substack{\alpha' + \alpha'' - e_j = \alpha \\ \beta' + \beta'' - e_j = \beta}} F_{\alpha', \beta'} G_{\alpha'', \beta''} (\alpha'_j \beta''_j - \beta'_j \alpha''_j)$$

Recalling (4.5) we have

$$(A.3) \quad |\{F, G\}|_{r,p} \leq \sup_{\ell} \sum_j \sum_{\alpha', \beta', \alpha'', \beta''} |F_{\alpha', \beta'}| |G_{\alpha'', \beta''}| (\alpha'_j \beta''_j + \alpha''_j \beta'_j) (\beta'_\ell + \beta''_\ell) \times u_p^{\alpha' + \beta' - 2e_\ell + \alpha'' + \beta'' - 2e_j},$$

where $u_p = u_p(r)$ was defined in (4.6). We split in four terms the right hand side of (A.3) according to the splitting

$$(\alpha'_j \beta''_j + \alpha''_j \beta'_j) (\beta'_\ell + \beta''_\ell) = \alpha'_j \beta''_j \beta'_\ell + \alpha'_j \beta''_j \beta''_\ell + \alpha''_j \beta'_j \beta'_\ell + \alpha''_j \beta'_j \beta''_\ell;$$

we will consider only the term

$$A := \sup_{\ell} \sum_j \sum_{\alpha', \beta', \alpha'', \beta''} |F_{\alpha', \beta'}| |G_{\alpha'', \beta''}| \alpha'_j \beta''_j \beta'_\ell \times u_p^{\alpha' + \beta' - 2e_\ell + \alpha'' + \beta'' - 2e_j},$$

the others being analogous. Noting that $\forall j \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\sum_{\alpha'', \beta''} |G_{\alpha'', \beta''}| \beta''_j u_p^{\alpha'' + \beta'' - 2e_j} \leq |G|_{r,p},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &\leq |G|_{r,p} \sup_{\ell} \sum_{\alpha', \beta'} |F_{\alpha', \beta'}| \sum_j \alpha'_j \beta'_\ell u_p^{\alpha' + \beta' - 2e_\ell} = |G|_{r,p} \sup_{\ell} \sum_{\alpha', \beta'} |F_{\alpha', \beta'}| |\alpha'| \beta'_\ell u_p^{\alpha' + \beta' - 2e_\ell} \\ &\leq |G|_{r,p} \sup_{\ell} \sum_{\alpha', \beta'} |F_{\alpha', \beta'}| \beta'_\ell \tilde{u}_p^{\alpha' + \beta' - 2e_\ell} |\alpha' + \beta'| \left(\frac{r}{r + \rho}\right)^{|\alpha' + \beta'| - 2}, \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{u}_p is short for $u_p(r + \rho)$ (recall (4.6)). Since⁴⁶

$$\sup_{|\alpha'|=|\beta'|} |\alpha' + \beta'| \left(\frac{r}{r + \rho} \right)^{|\alpha' + \beta'| - 2} \leq \sup_{x \geq 2} x \left(\frac{r}{r + \rho} \right)^{x - 2} \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{r}{\rho} \right\}$$

we get

$$A \leq 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{r}{\rho} \right\} |G|_{r,p} \sup_{\ell} \sum_{\alpha', \beta'} |F_{\alpha', \beta'}| |\beta'_\ell \tilde{u}_p^{\alpha' + \beta' - 2e_\ell}| = 2 \max \left\{ 1, \frac{r}{\rho} \right\} |G|_{r,p} |F|_{r+\rho,p}.$$

This complete the proof of (A.1). \square

Remark A.1. Note that Proposition 4.1 and its proof hold for any ℓ^∞ -weighted norm, namely with norm $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} w_j |u_j|$, with $w_j \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let us first prove the Banach structure. Consider a Cauchy sequence of Hamiltonians $H^{(n)} \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{O},0}$. For all $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$, $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $H^{(n)}(\omega, I)$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0$ then we define

$$H(\omega, I) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}} H_{\alpha, \beta}(\omega, I) u^\alpha \bar{u}^\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}^0$$

for all $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$, $I \in \mathcal{I}$, one has pointwise convergence $H^{(n)}(\omega, I) \rightarrow H(\omega, I) \in \mathcal{H}_{r,p}$. Moreover, for all α, β the sequence $H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)}$ is a Cauchy sequence w.r.t the norm $|\cdot|^\gamma$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$ is Banach, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$ $H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} \rightarrow H_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{I})$.

By hypothesis $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ there exist N such that for all $n, m > N$ one has

$$\frac{1}{2} \sup_j \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} - H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(m)}|^\gamma (\alpha_j + \beta_j) u_p^{\alpha + \beta - 2e_j} = \|H^{(n)} - H^{(m)}\|_{r,p} < \varepsilon$$

so taking the liminf on m we get for all j

$$\frac{1}{2} \liminf_m \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} - H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(m)}|^\gamma (\alpha_j + \beta_j) u_p^{\alpha + \beta - 2e_j} < \varepsilon$$

Then, for all α, β one has

$$(A.4) \quad |H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} - H_{\alpha, \beta}|^\gamma \leq \liminf_m |H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} - H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(m)}|^\gamma$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} - H_{\alpha, \beta}|^\gamma (\alpha_j + \beta_j) u_p^{\alpha + \beta - 2e_j} &\leq \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} \liminf_m |H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} - H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(m)}|^\gamma (\alpha_j + \beta_j) u_p^{\alpha + \beta - 2e_j} \\ &\leq \liminf_m \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{M}} |H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n)} - H_{\alpha, \beta}^{(m)}|^\gamma (\alpha_j + \beta_j) u_p^{\alpha + \beta - 2e_j} < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

by Fatou's lemma. Taking the supremum over j we have proved that $H^{(n)} \rightarrow H$ in the $\mathcal{H}_{r,p}^{\mathcal{O},0}$ norm.

Concerning the Poisson algebra property, it suffices to use the fact that $|\cdot|^\gamma$ has the algebra property with respect to standard multiplication and from (A.2) we deduce

$$(A.5) \quad |H_{\alpha, \beta}|^\gamma \leq \sum_j \sum_{\substack{\alpha' + \alpha'' - e_j = \alpha \\ \beta' + \beta'' - e_j = \beta}} |F_{\alpha', \beta'}|^\gamma |G_{\alpha'', \beta''}|^\gamma (\alpha'_j \beta''_j + \beta'_j \alpha''_j).$$

Then the proof follows verbatim the one of Proposition 4.1. \square

⁴⁶Indeed, setting $y := \rho/r$, we have that $\sup_{x \geq 2} x \left(\frac{r}{r + \rho} \right)^{x - 2} = \sup_{x \geq 2} x(1 + y)^{2 - x} = 2$ if $y \geq \sqrt{e} - 1$. On the other hand, when $0 < y < \sqrt{e} - 1$ we have

$$\sup_{x \geq 2} x(1 + y)^{2 - x} = \frac{(1 + y)^2}{e \ln(1 + y)} \leq \frac{1}{y} \sup_{0 < y < \sqrt{e} - 1} \frac{(1 + y)^2 y}{e \ln(1 + y)} = \frac{2}{y}.$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Items (i) and (ii) directly follow by Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 of [BMP21], respectively. Here we only discuss the analyticity with respect to I . By formula (4.30) in and recalling the notations in (5.1) we get the representation formula for every $|u|_p \leq r'$

(A.6)

$$H^{(d)}(u, \omega, I) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta, \zeta, a, b \\ 2|\zeta| + |a| + |b| \leq d+2}} \sum_{\substack{\delta \geq \zeta \\ 2|\delta| + |a| + |b| = d+2}} \sum_{m \geq \delta} \binom{m}{\delta} \binom{\delta}{\zeta} (-1)^{|\delta - \zeta|} I^{m - \zeta} H_{m, \alpha, \beta, a, b}(\omega, I) |v|^{2\zeta} v^\alpha \bar{v}^\beta z^a \bar{z}^b,$$

where $m, \alpha, \beta, \zeta, \delta \in \mathbb{N}^S$, $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^{S^c}$, $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$.

Set for brevity $X := X_{\Pi^d H}$ the hamiltonian vector field of $\Pi^d H$ (recall (5.9)). Then define Y componentwise for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ as

$$Y_j := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta, \zeta, a, b \\ 2|\zeta| + |a| + |b| \leq d+2}} \sum_{\substack{\delta \geq \zeta \\ 2|\delta| + |a| + |b| = d+2}} \sum_{m \geq \delta} \binom{m}{\delta} \binom{\delta}{\zeta} I_p^{m - \zeta} |H_{m, \alpha, \beta, a, b}|^\gamma \xi_j u_p^{\xi - 2e_j},$$

with $\xi := 2\zeta + \alpha + \beta + a + b$ and again $m, \alpha, \beta, \zeta, \delta \in \mathbb{N}^S$, $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^{S^c}$, $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$ and where $u_p = u_p(r')$ was defined in (4.6) and $I_p := u_p^2/2$. By the formula after (4.30) in [BMP21] we have $Y \in \mathfrak{w}_p$ with $|Y|_p \leq 3^{\frac{d}{2}+1} |H|_{r,p}$ and $|X_j(u, \omega, I)| \leq Y_j$ for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $u \in B_{r'}(\mathfrak{w}_p)$, $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$, $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r)$ (resp. $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$ in the complex case). Therefore $H^{(d)}$ is analytic in $\mathcal{I}(p, r)$ (resp. $I \in \mathcal{I}(p, r, \mathbb{C})$ in the complex case) since can be written in a totally (a fortiori uniformly) convergent series (see e.g. Theorem 2, Appendix A of [PT87]). \square

Proof of Lemma 9.2. Set $x =: (\hat{x}, x_n)$. Let introduce the portion of hyperplane (which is a graph over \hat{x})

$$P := \{(\hat{x}, \hat{\xi} \cdot \hat{x}) \mid \hat{x} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{n-1}\},$$

orthogonal to ξ . Note that for every $y \in E$ there exist unique $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{x} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{n-1}$ such that $y = (\hat{x}, \hat{\xi} \cdot \hat{x}) + t\xi$. Then by Fubini's theorem we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{meas}(E) &= |\xi|_2 \int_P \text{meas}\{t \in \mathbb{R} : (\hat{x}, \hat{\xi} \cdot \hat{x}) + t\xi \in \mathbb{E}\} d\sigma \leq |\xi|_2 \delta \int_P d\sigma = |\xi|_2 \delta \int_{[-1/4, 1/4]^{n-1}} \sqrt{1 + |\hat{\xi}|_2^2} d\hat{x} \\ &= 2^{1-n} \delta |\xi|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

\square

APPENDIX B. TOPOLOGY, MEASURE AND CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS ON INFINITE PRODUCT SPACES

Product topology. Let us consider the set $[-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ endowed with the *product topology*, namely the coarsest topology (i.e. the topology with the fewest open sets) for which all the projections $\pi_j : [-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow [-1/2, 1/2]$, with $\pi_j(\omega) := \omega_j$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, are continuous.

We call *cylinder* a subset $\bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ of $[-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $A_n \subseteq [-1/2, 1/2]$ with $A_n \neq [-1/2, 1/2]$ only for finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then a basis of the product topology is given by the open cylinders, namely cylinders $\bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$, where A_n are open.

By the Tychonoff's theorem $[-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with the product topology is a compact Hausdorff space.

Product measures. The *product σ -algebra (of the Borel sets)* of $[-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is defined as the set of cylinders $\bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$, where A_n are Borel sets (w.r.t. the standard topology on $[-1/2, 1/2]$).

The *probability product measure* μ on product σ -algebra of $[-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is defined by

$$\mu\left(\bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) := \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |A_n|$$

where $|A_n|$ denotes the usual Lebesgue measure of the Borel set A_n .

Through the bijective map

$$\mathcal{V}^* : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow [-1/2, 1/2]^{\mathbb{Z}}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{V}_j^*(\nu) := \nu_j - j^2, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z},$$

we induce the product topology and the probability product measure on the set \mathcal{Q} . Analogously for $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$.

Product measures. Given a compact Hausdorff space X and a Banach space E we denote by $C(X, E)$ the Banach space of continuous functions $f : X \rightarrow E$ endowed with the uniform norm

$$|f|_{C(X, E)} := \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|_E = \max_{x \in X} |f(x)|_E.$$

Lemma B.1 (Lipschitz fixed point). *Let \mathcal{C} be the closed subset of the Banach space $C(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}, \ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty})$ (with the product topology on $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$) defined as*

$$\mathcal{C} := \{w \in C(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}, \ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad |w|_{C(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}, \ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty})} \leq r\},$$

for some $0 < r < 1/4$. Let $F \in C(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \times [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c} \times [-r, r]^{\mathcal{S}^c}, \ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty})$ with

$$|F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w)|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} \leq r, \quad |F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w) - F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w')|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} \leq 1/2 |w - w'|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}}, \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, \quad w, w' \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}^c}.$$

Then there exists a unique $w \in \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})).$$

Moreover if F is L -Lipschitz for some $L > 0$ w.r.t. $\nu \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}$ (endowed with the ℓ^{∞} -metric) then w is $2L$ -Lipschitz in ν . Analogously if F is L' -Lipschitz w.r.t. some other parameter I in some Banach space then w is $2L'$ -Lipschitz in I .

Proof. First note that if $w \in \mathcal{C}$ then $F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})) \in \mathcal{C}$, since the product topology in $[-r, r]^{\mathcal{S}^c}$ is weaker than the one induced by the ℓ^{∞} -norm. Set $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ by

$$(\Phi(w))(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}) := F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})).$$

Let us check that Φ is a contraction on \mathcal{C} . Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(w) - \Phi(w')|_{\mathcal{C}} &= \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}} |F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})) - F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w'(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}))|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, V_{\mathcal{S}^c} \in [-1/4, 1/4]^{\mathcal{S}^c}} |w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}) - w'(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} = \frac{1}{2} |w - w'|_{\mathcal{C}}. \end{aligned}$$

The existence of the fixed point follows from the Contraction Mapping Theorem on Banach spaces.

Assume now that F is L -Lipschitz for some $L > 0$ w.r.t. $\nu \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}$ (endowed with the ℓ^{∞} -metric d_{∞}). Then

$$\begin{aligned} |w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}) - w(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c})|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} &\leq \\ |F(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})) - F(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}))|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} &+ |F(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c})) - F(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c}, w(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c}))|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} \leq \\ Ld_{\infty}(\nu, \nu') + \frac{1}{2} |w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}) - w(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c})|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$|w(\nu, V_{\mathcal{S}^c}) - w(\nu', V_{\mathcal{S}^c})|_{\ell_{\mathcal{S}^c}^{\infty}} \leq 2Ld_{\infty}(\nu, \nu').$$

□

The next lemma regards the analyticity of the map \mathbf{i} in (2.14). Without loss of generality we consider here only the case $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{Z}$ since we are not assuming $I_j \neq 0$.

Lemma B.2. *For $\sqrt{I} \in \bar{B}_r(\mathfrak{w}_p)$ the map \mathbf{i} in (2.14) can be extended to an analytic map*

$$\mathbf{i} : \mathbb{T}_s^{\infty} \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_p(\mathbb{C}), \quad [\varphi] = [(\varphi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}] \mapsto (\sqrt{I_j} e^{i\varphi_j})_{j \in \mathbb{Z}},$$

for any $s > 0$.

Proof. Let us first define $\mathbb{C}_s^\infty := \{\varphi = (\varphi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{ with } |\operatorname{Im} \varphi_j| < s, \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and the equivalence relation $\varphi \sim \varphi'$ iff $\varphi - \varphi' \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. We set $\mathbb{T}_s^\infty := \mathbb{C}_s^\infty / \sim$. For $\varphi \in \mathbb{C}_s^\infty$ we denote by $[\varphi] \in \mathbb{T}_s^\infty$ the equivalence class of φ . \mathbb{T}_s^∞ is a metric space endowed with the distance

$$d([\varphi], [\psi]) := \min_{\psi' \in [\psi]} |\varphi - \psi'|_\infty,$$

where $|\cdot|_\infty$ is the norm on $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{C})$. Moreover it is a Banach manifold. Indeed given every point $[\varphi] \in \mathbb{T}_s^\infty$, set $\rho := \min\{1, s - |\operatorname{Im} \varphi|\}/2$ and consider the open ball $B_\rho([\varphi]) \subset \mathbb{T}_s^\infty$ of radius ρ centered in $[\varphi]$ and the open ball U_ρ of radius ρ centered at the origin of $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{C})$; then a local chart is $\Phi : B_\rho([\varphi]) \rightarrow U_\rho$ defined so that $\Phi^{-1}(\psi) := [\varphi + \psi]$. We claim that

$$g := i \circ \Phi^{-1} : U_\rho \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}_p(\mathbb{C}), \quad g(\psi) := (\sqrt{I_j} e^{i(\varphi_j + \psi_j)})_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

is analytic since the Frechet derivative $Dg : U_\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\ell^\infty(\mathbb{C}), \mathfrak{w}_p(\mathbb{C}))$ is continuous. Indeed for every $\psi' \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{C})$

$$Dg(\psi)[\psi'] = (i\sqrt{I_j} e^{i(\varphi_j + \psi_j)} \psi'_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

and for $\psi, \tilde{\psi} \in U_\rho$ the operator norm (recall $\sqrt{I} \in \bar{B}_r(\mathfrak{w}_p)$) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|Dg(\psi) - Dg(\tilde{\psi})\|_{\text{op}} &= \sup_{\psi' \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{C}), |\psi'|=1} |(i\sqrt{I_j} e^{i\varphi_j} (e^{i\psi_j} - e^{i\tilde{\psi}_j}) \psi'_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}|_{\mathfrak{w}_p(\mathbb{C})} \\ &\leq r e^{|\operatorname{Im} \varphi| + \rho} |(1 - e^{i(\tilde{\psi}_j - \psi_j)})_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq r e^{|\operatorname{Im} \varphi| + 2\rho} |\tilde{\psi} - \psi|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{C})}. \end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [BB13] M. Berti and Ph. Bolle. Quasi-periodic solutions for Schrödinger equations with Sobolev regularity of NLS on T^d with a multiplicative potential. *J. European Math. Society*, 15:229–286, 2013.
- [BB15] Massimiliano Berti and Philippe Bolle. A Nash-Moser approach to KAM theory. In *Hamiltonian partial differential equations and applications*, volume 75 of *Fields Inst. Commun.*, pages 255–284. Fields Inst. Res. Math. Sci., Toronto, ON, 2015.
- [BBM16] P. Baldi, M. Berti, and R. Montalto. KAM for autonomous quasilinear perturbations of KdV. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 33:1589–1638, 2016.
- [BD18] M. Berti and J.M. Delort. *Almost global existence of solutions for capillarity-gravity water waves equations with periodic spatial boundary conditions*. Springer, 2018.
- [BG06] D. Bambusi and B. Grébert. Birkhoff normal form for partial differential equations with tame modulus. *Duke Math. J.*, 135(3):507–567, 2006.
- [BMP20a] L. Biasco, J. E. Massetti, and M. Procesi. An Abstract Birkhoff Normal Form Theorem and Exponential Type Stability of the 1d NLS. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 375(3):2089–2153, 2020.
- [BMP20b] L. Biasco, J. E. Massetti, and M. Procesi. A note on the construction of Sobolev almost periodic invariant tori for the 1d NLS. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.*, 31(4):981–993, 2020.
- [BMP21] L. Biasco, J.E. Massetti, and M. Procesi. Almost-periodic invariant tori for the NLS on the circle. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 38(3):711–758, 2021.
- [Bou93] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Schrödinger equations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 3(2):107–156, 1993.
- [Bou94] J. Bourgain. Periodic nonlinear Schrödinger equation and invariant measures. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 166(1):1–26, 1994.
- [Bou96] J. Bourgain. On the growth in time of higher Sobolev norms of smooth solutions of Hamiltonian PDE. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (6):277–304, 1996.
- [Bou99] J. Bourgain. *Global solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, volume 46 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [Bou05] J. Bourgain. On invariant tori of full dimension for 1D periodic NLS. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 229(1):62–94, 2005.
- [CKS⁺10] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Transfer of energy to high frequencies in the cubic defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Invent. Math.*, 181(1):39–113, 2010.
- [CMW20] H. Cong, L. Mi, and P. Wang. A Nekhoroshev type theorem for the derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 268(9):5207–5256, 2020.
- [Con] Hongzi Cong. The existence of full dimensional KAM tori for Nonlinear Schrödinger equation. arXiv:2103.14777.
- [CW93] W. Craig and C. E. Wayne. Newton’s method and periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 46(11):1409–1498, 1993.

- [CY20] H. Cong and X. Yuan. The existence of full dimensional invariant tori for 1-dimensional nonlinear wave equation. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 38, 09 2020.
- [FG13] E. Faou and B. Grébert. A Nekhoroshev-type theorem for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the torus. *Anal. PDE*, 6(6):1243–1262, 2013.
- [FI] R. Feola and F. Iandoli. Long time existence for fully nonlinear NLS with small Cauchy data on the circle. To appear on *Annali della SNS, classe di Scienze*. DOI:10.2422/2036 – 2145.201811003.
- [GGMP] F. Giuliani, M. Guardia, P. Martin, and S. Pasquali. Chaotic-like transfers of energy in hamiltonian PDEs. arXiv:2006.09309.
- [GH17] P. Gerard and Koch H. The cubic Szegő flow at low regularity., volume Exp. No. XIV of Séminaire Laurent Schwartz Équations aux dérivées partielles et applications. Année 2016/2017. Ed. Éc. Polytech., Palaiseau, 2017.
- [GHH⁺18] M. Guardia, Z. Hani, E. Haus, A. Maspero, and M. Procesi. Strong nonlinear instability and growth of Sobolev norms near quasiperiodic finite-gap tori for the 2D cubic NLS equation. arXiv:1810.03694, to appear on *JEMS*, 2018.
- [GK15] M. Guardia and V. Kaloshin. Growth of Sobolev norms in the cubic defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(1):71–149, 2015.
- [GKT] P. Gérard, T. Kappeler, and P. Topalov. On the Benjamin-Ono equation on \mathbb{T} and its periodic and quasiperiodic solutions. arXiv:2103.09291.
- [GX13] J. Geng and X. Xu. Almost periodic solutions of one dimensional Schrödinger equation with the external parameters. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 25(2):435–450, 2013.
- [Her86] M. Herman. Sur les courbes invariantes par les difféomorphismes de l'anneau. Vol. 2. *Astérisque*, (144):248, 1986. With a correction to: it On the curves invariant under diffeomorphisms of the annulus, Vol. 1 (French) [*Astérisque* No. 103-104, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1983; MR0728564 (85m:58062)].
- [HP17] E. Haus and M. Procesi. KAM for beating solutions of the quintic NLS. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 354(3):1101–1132, 2017.
- [KM18] T. Kappeler and J. Molnar. On the wellposedness of the kdv equation on the space of pseudomeasures. *Sel. Math. New Ser.*, 24:1479–1526, 2018.
- [KMMT16] Thomas Kappeler, Alberto Maspero, Jan Molnar, and Peter Topalov. On the convexity of the KdV Hamiltonian. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 346(1):191–236, 2016.
- [Kou20] C. E. Koudjina. A KAM theorem for finitely differentiable Hamiltonian systems. *J. Differential Equations*, 269(6):4720–4750, 2020.
- [Kuk88] S. B. Kuksin. Perturbation of conditionally periodic solutions of infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 52(1):41–63, 240, 1988.
- [Kuk04] Sergei B. Kuksin. Fifteen years of KAM for PDE. In *Geometry, topology, and mathematical physics*, volume 212 of *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2*, pages 237–258. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.
- [Mas18] J. E. Massetti. A normal form à la Moser for diffeomorphisms and a generalization of Rüssmann's translated curve theorem to higher dimensions. *Anal. PDE*, 11(1):149–170, 2018.
- [Mas19] J. E. Massetti. Normal forms for perturbations of systems possessing a Diophantine invariant torus. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 39(8):2176–2222, 2019.
- [Pös] J. Pöschel. KAM below C^n . arXiv:2104.01866.
- [Pös02] J. Pöschel. On the construction of almost periodic solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 22(5):1537–1549, 2002.
- [PP15] M. Procesi and C. Procesi. A KAM algorithm for the non-linear Schrödinger equation. *Advances in Math.*, 272:399–470, 2015.
- [PT87] Jürgen Pöschel and Eugene Trubowitz. *Inverse spectral theory*, volume 130 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1987.

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI ROMA TRE
Email address: biasco@mat.uniroma3.it

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI ROMA TRE
Email address: jmassetti@mat.uniroma3.it

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI ROMA TRE
Email address: procesi@mat.uniroma3.it