

On the analyticity of the nonlinear Fourier transform of the Benjamin-Ono equation on \mathbb{T}

P. Gérard, T. Kappeler* and P. Topalov†

September 21, 2021

Abstract

We prove that the nonlinear Fourier transform of the Benjamin-Ono equation on \mathbb{T} , also referred to as Birkhoff map, is a real analytic diffeomorphism from the scale of Sobolev spaces $H_0^s(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, $s > -1/2$, to the scale of weighted ℓ^2 -sequence spaces, $\mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$, $s > -1/2$. As an application we show that for any $-1/2 < s < 0$, the flow map of the Benjamin-Ono equation $\mathcal{S}_0^t : H_0^s(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H_0^s(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ is *nowhere locally uniformly continuous* in $H_0^s(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$.

Keywords: Benjamin-Ono equation, nonlinear Fourier transform, real analytic, well-posedness, solution map, nowhere locally uniformly continuous maps

2020 MSC: 37K15 primary, 47B35 secondary

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	7
3	Analytic extension of the pre-Birkhoff map	13
4	Poisson relations	23
5	Analytic extension of the Birkhoff map	26
6	Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2	30
7	Analyticity of the delta map	40

*T.K. partially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

†P.T. partially supported by the Simons Foundation, Award #526907.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the Benjamin-Ono equation on the torus $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$,

$$\partial_t u = H(\partial_x^2 u) - 2u\partial_x u, \quad (1)$$

where $u \equiv u(x, t)$, $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, is real valued and H denotes the Hilbert transform $H : H_c^\beta \rightarrow H_c^\beta$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{v}(n) e^{inx} \mapsto -i \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{sign}(n) \widehat{v}(n) e^{inx},$$

with $\text{sign}(n)$ being defined as $\text{sign}(\pm n) = \pm 1$ for $n > 0$, $\text{sign}(0) = 0$, and $\widehat{v}(n)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, being the Fourier coefficients of the element v in the Sobolev space $H_c^\beta \equiv H^\beta(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C})$. Equation (1) was introduced by Benjamin [2] and Davis & Acrivos [4] as a model for an asymptotic regime of internal gravity waves at the interface of two fluids. It is well known that (1) possesses a Lax pair representation (cf. [19]) and that by the use of the Gardner bracket, it can be written in Hamiltonian form. Equation (1) has been extensively studied, in particular its wellposedness in Sobolev spaces - see [6], [21] and references therein.

Using the Lax pair representation of (1), it was proved in [5, 6] that the Benjamin-Ono equation on \mathbb{T} admits a nonlinear Fourier transform, also referred to as Birkhoff map. More precisely, according to [5, Theorem 1] and [6, Theorem 6, Proposition 5], there exists a map

$$\Phi : \bigsqcup_{s > -1/2} H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{s > -1/2} h_{r,0}^{s+1/2}, \quad u \mapsto \Phi(u) = (\Phi_n(u))_{n \neq 0}, \quad (2)$$

$$\Phi_{-n}(u) = \overline{\Phi_n(u)}, \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

so that for any $s > -\frac{1}{2}$, $\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow h_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is a homeomorphism, which transforms the trajectories of (1) into straight lines. Furthermore, these trajectories evolve on the isospectral sets of potentials of the Lax operator (see (10) below). Here $H_r^\beta \equiv H^\beta(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, is the Sobolev space with exponent β of real valued functions on the torus,

$$H_{r,0}^\beta := H_r^\beta \cap H_{c,0}^\beta, \quad H_{c,0}^\beta := \{u \in H_c^\beta \mid \widehat{u}(0) = 0\},$$

and

$$\mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^\beta := \{z \in \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^\beta \mid z_{-n} = \bar{z}_n \quad \forall n \geq 1\} \quad (3)$$

is a real subspace of the complex weighted ℓ^2 -sequence space

$$\mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^\beta = \{(z_n)_{n \neq 0} \mid \sum_{n \neq 0} |n|^{2\beta} |z_n|^2 < \infty\}. \quad (4)$$

The map Φ can be considered as a nonlinear Fourier transform since it allows to solve (1) by quadrature. In particular, we used it to prove that for any $-1/2 <$

$s < 0$, (1) is globally C^0 -wellposed in $H_{r,0}^s$ ([6, Theorem 1]) and illposed in $H_{r,0}^s$ for $s \leq -1/2$ ([6, Theorem 2]), improving previously known wellposedness results (see [16, 18, 1]). In addition, the Birkhoff map has been applied to show the almost periodicity of the solutions of (1) and the orbital stability of the traveling waves of the Benjamin-Ono equation on \mathbb{T} (see [6, Theorem 3 and Theorem 4]). We refer to the components $\Phi_n(u)$, $n \neq 0$, of Φ as Birkhoff coordinates.

The main goal of the present paper is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $s > -1/2$, the nonlinear Fourier transform of the Benjamin-Ono equation*

$$\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2},$$

introduced in [5, 6], is a real analytic diffeomorphism.

Important applications of Theorem 1.1 concern the study of perturbations of (1) (cf. [11], [14] (KdV equation), [3] and references therein (NLS equation)) and the study of regularity properties of the solution map of (1).

In this paper, we apply Theorem 1.1 to prove the following result on the regularity of the solution map of (1). To state it we first have to introduce some more notation. Assume that $s > -1/2$. For $u_0 \in H_{r,0}^s$, denote by $t \mapsto u(t) \equiv u(t, u_0)$ the solution of (1) with initial data u_0 , constructed in [6]. For given $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $T > 0$, consider the *flow map*

$$\mathcal{S}_0^t : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow H_{r,0}^s, \quad u_0 \mapsto u(t, u_0),$$

and the *solution map*

$$\mathcal{S}_{0,T} : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow C([-T, T], H_{r,0}^s), \quad u_0 \mapsto u(\cdot, u_0)|_{[-T, T]},$$

of (1). A continuous map $F : X \rightarrow Y$ between two Banach spaces X and Y is said to be *nowhere locally uniformly continuous* in an open neighborhood U in X if the restriction $F|_V : V \rightarrow Y$ of F to any open neighborhood $V \subseteq U$ is *not* uniformly continuous. In a similar way one defines the notion of a *nowhere locally Lipschitz* map in an open neighborhood $U \subseteq X$.

Theorem 1.2. (i) *For any $-1/2 < s < 0$ and $t \neq 0$, the flow map $\mathcal{S}_0^t : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow H_{r,0}^s$ of the Benjamin-Ono equation (1) is nowhere locally uniformly continuous in $H_{r,0}^s$. In particular, $\mathcal{S}_0^t : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow H_{r,0}^s$ is nowhere locally Lipschitz in $H_{r,0}^s$.*

(ii) *For any $s \geq 0$ and $T > 0$, the solution map $\mathcal{S}_{0,T} : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow C([-T, T], H_{r,0}^s)$ is real analytic.*

Addendum to Theorem 1.2(ii). *For any $k \geq 1$, $s > -1/2 + 2k$, and $T > 0$, the solution map*

$$\mathcal{S}_{0,T} : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \bigcap_{j=0}^k C^j([-T, T], H_{r,0}^{s-2j})$$

is well-defined and real analytic in $H_{r,0}^s$.

Remark 1.1. Item (i) of Theorem 1.2 improves on the result by Molinet in [16, Theorem 1.2], saying that for any $s < 0$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the flow map \mathcal{S}_0^t (if it exists at all) is not of class $C^{1,\alpha}$ for any $\alpha > 0$. Item (ii) of Theorem 1.2 improves on the result by Molinet, saying that for any $s \geq 0$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the flow map \mathcal{S}_0^t is real analytic near zero ([16, Theorem 1.2], [17]).

Remark 1.2. Any solution u of (1) in $H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$, constructed in [6], has the property that for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $u(t, x - 2ct) + c$ is again a solution with constant mean value c . It is straightforward to see that for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, Theorem 1.2 holds on the affine space $\{u \in H_r^s \mid \widehat{u}(0) = c\}$. We remark that the solution map of (1) is known to be nowhere locally uniformly continuous on the Sobolev space H_r^s for any $s > -1/2$. (A transparent proof of this fact can be obtained using Birkhoff coordinates – cf. [13, Appendix A].)

Remark 1.3. In [8], we proved a local version of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 near 0. The version of Theorem 1.1 near 0 says that for any $s > -1/2$, there exists a neighborhood U of 0 in $H_{c,0}^s$ so that the Birkhoff map $\Phi : U \cap H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ extends to an analytic diffeomorphism $\Phi : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2}$ onto its image $\Phi(U)$. As an application it is shown in [8] that equation (1) admits an analytic Birkhoff normal form near 0.

Ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on the approximation of any element in $H_{r,0}^s$ by finite gap potentials and on properties of the spectrum of the Lax operator, associated to finite gap potentials. To explain all this in more detail, let us first recall the construction of the Birkhoff map $\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ as described in [5, 6]. It is based on the Lax operator $L_w = -i\partial_x - T_w$, an unbounded operator on the Hardy space H_+ . Here H_+ is defined in (8) below and T_w denotes the Toeplitz operator with symbol $w \in H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$. We refer to Section 2 below for a review of the terminology and the results about this operator, established in our previous papers [5], [6], and [7]. At this point, we only mention that the spectrum of L_w is discrete and consists of a sequence of simple, real eigenvalues, bounded from below, $\lambda_0(w) < \lambda_1(w) < \dots$. In addition, the eigenvalues are separated from each other by a distance of at least one, $\gamma_n(w) := \lambda_n(w) - \lambda_{n-1}(w) - 1 \geq 0$ for any $n \geq 1$. Associated to these eigenvalues are L^2 -normalized eigenfunctions $f_n \equiv f_n(w)$, which are uniquely determined by the normalization conditions

$$\dagger\sqrt{\kappa_0(w)} := \langle f_0 | 1 \rangle > 0, \quad \dagger\sqrt{\mu_n(w)} := \langle e^{ix} f_{n-1} | f_n \rangle > 0, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (5)$$

The components of the Birkhoff map Φ are then defined as

$$\Phi_n(w) = \frac{\langle 1 | f_n(w) \rangle}{\dagger\sqrt{\kappa_n(w)}}, \quad \Phi_{-n}(w) = \overline{\Phi_n(w)}, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad (6)$$

where $\kappa_n(w) > 0$, $n \geq 1$, are scaling factors (cf. Section 4), determined by

$$|\langle 1 | f_n(w) \rangle|^2 = \gamma_n(w) \kappa_n(w), \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (7)$$

For $w = 0$, one has

$$\lambda_n(0) = n, \quad f_n(0) = e^{inx}, \quad \kappa_n(0) = 1, \quad \forall n \geq 0,$$

and hence

$$\gamma_n(0) = 0, \quad \mu_n(0) = 1, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Note that $f_n(0)$, $n \geq 0$, is the Fourier basis of the Hardy space H_+ . In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we need to show in a first step that for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$, Φ extends to an analytic map on a neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^s$. To this end, we approximate w by a finite gap potential in \mathcal{U}_N with $N \geq 1$ sufficiently large. We recall from [5] that an element $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ is said to be a finite gap potential if $\{n \geq 1 : \gamma_n(w) > 0\}$ is finite and that for any $N \geq 1$, \mathcal{U}_N is the set of finite gap potentials, satisfying $\gamma_N > 0$ and $\gamma_n = 0$ for any $n > N$. It is shown in [5] that finite gap potentials are C^∞ -smooth and that $\cup_{N \geq 1} \mathcal{U}_N$ is dense in $H_{r,0}^s$ for any $s > -1/2$. Furthermore, for any $w \in \mathcal{U}_N$, $N \geq 1$, (cf. [5], [7, Appendix A])

$$\lambda_n(w) = n, \quad f_n(w) = g_\infty(w)e^{inx}, \quad \forall n \geq N,$$

where $g_\infty(w) := e^{i\partial_x^{-1}w}$. Hence up to finitely many eigenfunctions, $f_n(w)$, $n \geq 0$, is the Fourier basis of H_+ , perturbed by $g_\infty(w)$. Note that $g_\infty(w)$ is a C^∞ -smooth function, does not depend on n , and takes values in the circle $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$.

For any given $w \neq 0$ in $H_{r,0}^s$, we choose $w_N \in \mathcal{U}_N$ with $N \geq 1$ sufficiently large, to be the potential, uniquely determined by

$$\Phi_n(w_N) = \Phi_n(w), \quad \forall 1 \leq n \leq N, \quad \Phi_n(w_N) = 0, \quad \forall n > N.$$

Using that $f_n(w_N)$, $n \geq 0$, is a perturbed Fourier basis of H_+ in the sense described above, we show that one can apply perturbation theory to prove that Φ extends to an analytic map on a neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^s$.

Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us outline the main steps of the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the case where $-1/2 < s \leq 0$. In [7] we proved that for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$, $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, there exists a neighborhood $U^s \equiv U_w^s$ of w in $H_{c,0}^s$ so that for any $u \in U^s$, the spectrum of L_u consists of simple eigenvalues $\lambda_n(u)$, $n \geq 0$. These eigenvalues are analytic functions on U^s . By shrinking U^s , if needed, one infers from standard perturbation theory, that for any given $0 \leq n_0 < \infty$, the first n_0 eigenfunctions f_n , $0 \leq n < n_0$, extend as H_+^{s+1} -valued analytic functions to U^s (cf. Lemma 4.2 below). One of the main difficulties is to show that one can choose the neighborhood U^s independently of n so that the components of the Birkhoff map extend to U^s with the appropriated decay in n as $|n| \rightarrow \infty$. For any $n \geq n_0$ with n_0 sufficiently large, the Riesz projectors

$$P_n : U^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_+^s, H_+^{s+1}), u \mapsto P_n(u),$$

onto the one dimensional eigenspace, corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_n , is analytic and admits a Taylor expansion at w_N in terms of $v = u - w_N$ where

w_N is the approximating finite gap potential described above. See (8) below for the definition of the Hardy spaces H_+^β , $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, and Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 in Section 2 for a review of these results. Choosing N and $n_0 > N$ sufficiently large, one infers that for any $n \geq n_0$, $h_n(u) := P_n(u)f_n(w_N)$ is a nonvanishing analytic function $U^s \rightarrow H_+^{s+1}$ and hence an eigenfunction of L_u , corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_n(u)$ of L_u . In general, the eigenfunctions $h_n(u)$ will not satisfy the normalization conditions of the eigenfunctions $f_n(u)$. In Section 3 we introduce the pre-Birkhoff map

$$\Psi(u) = (\Psi_n(u))_{n \geq n_0}, \quad \Psi_n(u) := \langle h_n(u) | 1 \rangle, \quad \forall n \geq n_0,$$

where $n_0 > N$ will be chosen sufficiently large. With the help of the Taylor expansion of $P_n(u)$, $n \geq n_0$, at w_N , we show that for any $u \in U^s$, $\Psi(u) \in \mathfrak{h}_{\geq n_0}^{s+1}$ and that $\Psi : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{\geq n_0}^{s+1}$ is analytic. Here $\mathfrak{h}_{\geq n_0}^{s+1}$ is the sequence space defined in (9) below. In order to relate the Birkhoff map Φ to the pre-Birkhoff map Ψ , we record in Section 4 results about the scaling factors $\kappa_n(u)$, $n \geq 0$, and $\mu_n(u)$, $n \geq 1$, introduced in [5] and further analyzed in [7]. Using these results together with the ones proved for the pre-Birkhoff map, we then show in Section 5 that the Birkhoff map $H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is real analytic, where $\mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is considered as a real Hilbert space.¹ An important ingredient is Proposition 5.1 (Vanishing Lemma). The delicate and quite technical proof of this proposition is given in Section 7. Theorem 1.1 is then proved in Section 6. To show that Φ is a local diffeomorphism at a given potential $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ we use the canonical relations of the Birkhoff coordinates (cf. [5, 6]) to prove that $d_w \Phi$ is onto and we approximate w by a sequence of finite gap potentials to show that $d_w \Phi$ is Fredholm.

Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.2. Theorem 1.2 is proved in Section 6 with the help of Theorem 1.1.

Related work. The result saying that the Birkhoff map $\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ of the Benjamin-Ono equation is a real analytic diffeomorphism for the appropriate range of s , shows that similarly as for the KdV equation (cf. [11], [13]) and the defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation (cf. [10]), the Benjamin-Ono equation on \mathbb{T} is integrable in the strongest possible sense. We point out that the proof of the analyticity of the Birkhoff map in the case of the Benjamin-Ono equation significantly differs from the one in the case of the KdV and NLS equations due to the fact that the Benjamin-Ono equation is not a partial differential equation.

Notation. In this paragraph we summarize the most frequently used notations in the paper. For any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, H_c^β denotes the Sobolev space $H^\beta(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C})$ of complex valued functions on the torus $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ with regularity exponent β . The norm in H_c^β is given by

$$\|u\|_\beta := \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle n \rangle^{2\beta} |\widehat{u}(n)|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \langle n \rangle := \max\{1, |n|\},$$

¹This convention of the notion of a real analytic map is used throughout the paper.

where $\widehat{u}(n)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, are the Fourier coefficients of $u \in H_c^\beta$. For $\beta = 0$ and $u \in H_c^0 \equiv L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C})$ we set $\|u\| \equiv \|u\|_0$. By $H_{c,0}^\beta$ we denote the complex subspace in H_c^β of functions with mean value zero,

$$H_{c,0}^\beta = \{u \in H_c^\beta \mid \widehat{u}(0) = 0\}.$$

For $f \in H_c^\beta$ and $g \in H_c^{-\beta}$, define the sesquilinear and bilinear pairings,

$$\langle f|g \rangle := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{f}(n) \overline{\widehat{g}(n)}, \quad \langle f, g \rangle := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{f}(n) \widehat{g}(-n).$$

The positive Hardy space H_+^β with regularity exponent $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$H_+^\beta := \{f \in H_c^\beta \mid \widehat{f}(n) = 0 \ \forall n < 0\}, \quad H_+ \equiv H_+^0. \quad (8)$$

For any $1 \leq p < \infty$, denote by $\ell_+^p \equiv \ell^p(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \mathbb{C})$ the Banach space of complex valued sequences $z = (z_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with finite norm

$$\|z\|_{\ell_+^p} := \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} |z_n|^p \right)^{1/p} < \infty$$

and by $\ell_+^\infty \equiv \ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \mathbb{C})$ the Banach space of complex valued sequences with finite supremum norm $\|z\|_{\ell_+^\infty} := \sup_{n \geq 1} |z_n|$. More generally, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we introduce the Banach space

$$\ell_{\geq m}^p \equiv \ell^p(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m}, \mathbb{C}), \quad \mathbb{Z}_{\geq m} := \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq m\},$$

as well as the space $\ell_c^p \equiv \ell^p(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C})$, defined in a similar way. Furthermore, denote by $\mathfrak{h}_{\geq m}^\beta$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, the Hilbert space of complex valued sequences $z = (z_n)_{n \geq m}$ with

$$\|z\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{\geq m}^\beta} := \left(\sum_{n \geq m} \langle n \rangle^{2\beta} |z_n|^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty. \quad (9)$$

For convenience of notation, we often write $\|z\|_\beta$ for $\|z\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{\geq m}^\beta}$ and in the case where $m = 1$, \mathfrak{h}_+^β for $\mathfrak{h}_{\geq 1}^\beta$.

Finally, for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$, we denote by $\sqrt[4]{z}$ or \sqrt{z} the principal branch of the square root of z , defined by $\operatorname{Re}(\sqrt[4]{z}) > 0$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we review results about the Lax operator L_u of the Benjamin-Ono equation, needed in this paper. Most of these results were established in [7]. We point out that in the context of this paper, it turned out to be advantageous to alter some of the notations introduced in [7].

For $u \in H_c^s$ with $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, consider the pseudo-differential expression

$$L_u := D - T_u, \quad D = -i\partial_x, \quad (10)$$

acting on the Hardy space H_+^s , where T_u is the Toeplitz operator with symbol u , $T_u f := \Pi(uf)$, and $\Pi \equiv \Pi^+ : H_c^\beta \rightarrow H_+^\beta$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, is the Szegő projector

$$\Pi : H_c^s \rightarrow H_+^s, \quad \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{v}(n) e^{inx} \mapsto \sum_{n \geq 0} \widehat{v}(n) e^{inx}.$$

It follows from Lemma 1 in [7] that L_u defines an operator in H_+^s with domain H_+^{s+1} so that the map $L_u : H_+^{s+1} \rightarrow H_+^s$ is bounded. The following result follows from [7, Theorem 1] and [6].

Proposition 2.1. *For any $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, there exists an open neighborhood $W \equiv W^s$ of $H_{r,0}^s$ in $H_{c,0}^s$ so that for any $u \in W$, the operator L_u is a closed operator in H_+^s with domain H_+^{s+1} . The operator has a compact resolvent and all its eigenvalues are simple. When appropriately listed, $\lambda_n(u)$, $n \geq 0$, satisfy*

$$\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_n(u)) < \operatorname{Re}(\lambda_{n+1}(u)), \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\lambda_n(u) - n| = 0.$$

For $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, the eigenvalues are real valued and $\gamma_n(u) := \lambda_n(u) - \lambda_{n-1}(u) - 1 \geq 0$ for $n \geq 1$.

In addition to the information provided by Proposition 2.1, we need rather precise estimates on the spectrum of L_u , established in [7]. First, we record estimates of the eigenfunctions of the Lax operator L_w for real valued potentials $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$. Recall that in [5] ($s = 0$), [6] ($-1/2 < s < 0$), we introduced for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$, $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, the L^2 -normalized eigenfunctions $f_n \equiv f_n(w)$, $n \geq 0$, of L_w , corresponding to the eigenvalues $\lambda_n(w)$, uniquely determined by the normalization conditions (cf. (5))

$$\langle f_0 | 1 \rangle > 0, \quad \langle e^{ix} f_{n-1} | f_n \rangle > 0, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (11)$$

The eigenfunctions f_n , $n \geq 0$, are in H_+^{s+1} and hence

$$g_n(w) := f_n(w) e^{-inx} \in H_c^{1+1}, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

By Proposition 9 in [6, Appendix A], $g_\infty(w) := e^{i\partial_x^{-1}w}$ is in H_c^{s+1} . Furthermore, $g_n \equiv g_n(w)$, $n \geq 0$, and $g_\infty \equiv g_\infty(w)$ satisfy the equations (cf. [6, (80), (82)])

$$Dg_n = (\lambda_n - n)g_n + \Pi_{\geq -n}(wg_n), \quad Dg_\infty = wg_\infty, \quad (12)$$

where for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\Pi_{\geq k}$ denotes the projection

$$H_c^\beta \rightarrow H_c^\beta, \quad h = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{h}(n) e^{inx} \mapsto \Pi_{\geq k}(h) = \sum_{n \geq k} \widehat{h}(n) e^{inx}.$$

Our first result concerns the regularity of the functions $g_n(w)$ and $g_\infty(w)$ for $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$ arbitrary.

Lemma 2.1. For any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$,

$$g_n(w) \in H_c^{s+1}, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad g_\infty(w) \in H_c^{s+1}.$$

Proof. The claimed statements follow in a straightforward way from the discussion above, (12), and well known results on the multiplication of elements in Sobolev spaces, recorded below in a form convenient for our purposes. \square

The following lemma is well known (cf. e.g. [7, Lemma 1]).

Lemma 2.2. For any $s > -1/2$, there exists a constant $C_{s,1} \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that the following holds:

(i) For any $s > -1/2$,

$$\|fg\|_s \leq C_{s,1} \|f\|_s \|g\|_{1+s-\tau}, \quad \forall f \in H_c^s, g \in H_c^{s+1-\tau}, \quad (13)$$

where $\tau := \min\{\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2} + s), \frac{1}{4}\}$.

(ii) For any $s > 1/2$,

$$\|fg\|_s \leq C_{s,1} \|f\|_s \|g\|_s, \quad \forall f, g \in H_c^s. \quad (14)$$

We choose $C_{s,1}$ in such a way that it is nondecreasing in s on the interval $[0, \infty)$.

Remark 2.1. For any $s_1, s_2 \geq 0$ and any $s \leq \min(s_1, s_2)$ with $s_1 + s_2 - s > 1/2$,

$$H_c^{s_1} \times H_c^{s_2} \rightarrow H_c^s, (f_1, f_2) \mapsto f_1 f_2$$

is a bounded bilinear map.

In the sequel, we need bounds of $\|g_n(w)\|_{1+s}$ in terms of $\|w\|_s$, which are uniform in $n \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.3. For any $s > -1/2$, there exists a constant $C_{s,2} \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that for any $n \geq 0$ and any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$,

$$\|g_n(w)\|_{1+s} \leq C_{s,2} (1 + \|w\|_s)^{\eta(s)}, \quad \|g_\infty(w)\|_{1+s} \leq C_{s,2} (1 + \|w\|_s)^{\eta(s)},$$

where

$$\eta(s) := \begin{cases} \frac{4(1+s)}{1+2s} & \forall -\frac{1}{2} < s \leq 0 \\ 4 & \forall 0 < s \leq 1 \\ 2+2s & \forall s > 1. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

We choose $C_{s,2}$ in such a way that it is nondecreasing in s on the interval $[0, \infty)$.

Remark 2.2. We have chosen the exponent $\eta(s)$ to be nondecreasing in s on the interval $[0, \infty)$. This is needed for our scheme of proof of Theorem 1.1, whereas the size of $\eta(s)$ is of no importance for our purposes.

Proof. The proof of the claimed estimates of $\|g_n(w)\|_{1+s}$ and $\|g_\infty(w)\|_{1+s}$ are similar, hence we concentrate on the ones of $\|g_n(w)\|_{1+s}$. For notational convenience, we do not indicate the dependence of quantities such as λ_n and g_n on w in this proof and we fix $n \geq 0$.

Case $-1/2 < s \leq 0$. First note that for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$,

$$\|g_n\|_s \leq \|g_n\| = \|f_n e^{-inx}\| = 1, \quad |\langle g_n | 1 \rangle| \leq \|g_n\| = 1. \quad (16)$$

By (12), one has

$$\|Dg_n\|_s \leq |\lambda_n - n| \|g_n\|_s + \|wg_n\|_s.$$

Hence using (16) and the estimate $n - \lambda_n = \sum_{k \geq n+1} \gamma_k \leq |\lambda_0|$ (cf. [5, (3.13)], [6, Section 3]), it follows that

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq 1 + \|Dg_n\|_s \leq 1 + |\lambda_0| + \|wg_n\|_s. \quad (17)$$

By Lemma 2.2 with $C_1 := C_{s,1}$,

$$\|wg_n\|_s \leq C_1 \|w\|_s \|g_n\|_{1+s-\tau}, \quad \tau \equiv \tau(s) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + s\right)/2.$$

Interpolating between L_c^2 and H_c^{s+1} , and since $\|g_n\|_0 = 1$, one obtains

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s-\tau} \leq C_2 (\|g_n\|_{1+s})^{1-\frac{1}{q}}, \quad \frac{1}{q} := \frac{\tau}{1+s},$$

where $C_2 \geq 1$ is a constant, only depending on s . By Young's inequality,

$$\|wg_n\|_s \leq C_1 C_2 \|w\|_s (\|g_n\|_{1+s})^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \leq \frac{1}{q} (C_1 C_2 \|w\|_s)^q + \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \|g_n\|_{1+s}$$

and in turn

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq q + q|\lambda_0| + (C_1 C_2 \|w\|_s)^q.$$

By [6, (19), (31)-(32)], there exists $C_3 \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that

$$|\lambda_0| \leq 1 + C_3 (1 + \|w\|_s)^{\frac{2}{1+2s}}.$$

(For $s = 0$, one has by the trace formula $|\lambda_0| \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} (k\gamma_k) = \frac{1}{2}\|w\|$ (cf. [5, Proposition 3.1].) Since $\frac{2}{1+2s} < 4\frac{1+s}{1+2s} = q$ and $q = \eta(s)$, we thus conclude that there exists a constant $C_4 \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq C_4 (1 + \|w\|_s)^{\eta(s)}.$$

Case $0 < s \leq 1/2$. Note that by the trace formula, mentioned above, one has $|\lambda_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2$ and $g_n \in H_c^1$. Hence by (12),

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 \|g_n\|_s + \|wg_n\|_s. \quad (18)$$

By Remark 2.1 (use $\frac{1+s}{2} > \frac{1}{2}$ for $0 < s \leq 1/2$), there exists $C_5 \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that

$$\|wg_n\|_s \leq C_5 \|w\|_s \|g_n\|_{\frac{1+s}{2}}.$$

Interpolating between L_c^2 and H_c^{s+1} , and since $\|g_n\| = 1$, there exists $C_6 \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that

$$\|g_n\|_{\frac{1+s}{2}} \leq C_6 (\|g_n\|_{1+s})^{1/2}$$

and, since $0 < s \leq 1/2$, $\|w\|^2 \|g_n\|_s \leq \|w\|_s^2 \|g_n\|_{\frac{1+s}{2}}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_n\|_{1+s} &\leq 1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\|w\|_s^2 + C_5\|w\|_s\right) \|g_n\|_{\frac{1+s}{2}} \\ &\leq 1 + C_6 \left(\frac{1}{2}\|w\|_s^2 + C_5\|w\|_s\right) (\|g_n\|_{1+s})^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and in turn

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_n\|_{1+s} &\leq 1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\|w\|_s^2 + C_5\|w\|_s\right) \|g_n\|_{\frac{1+s}{2}} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} C_6^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}\|w\|_s^2 + C_5\|w\|_s\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|g_n\|_{1+s}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that there exists a constant $C_7 \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq C_7 (1 + \|w\|_s)^4.$$

Case $s > 1/2$. By (12) and Lemma 2.2 (ii) with $C_1 = C_{s,1}$

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq 1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\|w\|_s^2 + C_1\|w\|_s\right) \|g_n\|_s,$$

Interpolating between L_c^2 and H_c^{s+1} , it follows that there exists a constant $C_8 \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that $\|g_n\|_s \leq C_8 \|g_n\|_{\frac{1+s}{2}}$. By Young's inequality one then infers that

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{1+s} (C_8 \frac{1}{2} \|w\|_s^2 + C_8 C_1 \|w\|_s)^{1+s} + \frac{s}{1+s} \|g_n\|_{1+s}$$

and in turn concludes that there exists a constant $C_9 \geq 1$, only depending on s , so that

$$\|g_n\|_{1+s} \leq C_9 (1 + \|w\|_s)^{2+2s}.$$

The claimed estimates now follow by setting $C_{s,2} := \max(C_4, C_7, C_9)$ ($\forall -1/2 < s \leq 0$) and $C_{s,2} := \sup\{C_4, C_7, C_9, C_{s'} : s' < s\}$ ($\forall s > 0$). \square

To state the refined estimates on the spectrum of L_u we introduce some more notation. For any $M > 0$ and $s > -1/2$, let

$$C_{M,s} := \rho C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)}, \quad \rho \equiv \rho_{M,s} := 8C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \geq 8 \cdot 2^8, \quad (19)$$

where $\eta(s)$ is given by (15), $C_{s,1}$ by Lemma 2.2, and $C_{s,2}$ by Lemma 2.3. Note that $C_{M,s}$, $\rho_{M,s}$, and $8C_{M,s}/\rho_{M,s} = C_{s,1}^3$ are nondecreasing functions in s on the interval $[0, \infty)$. Furthermore,

$$C_{s,1} \geq 1, \quad C_{s,2} \geq 1, \quad C_{M,s} \geq 1. \quad (20)$$

For any $w \in H_{r,0}^s \setminus \{0\}$, $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, and $N \geq 1$ with $\gamma_N(w) > 0$, denote by w_N the element in \mathcal{U}_N , defined by

$$\Phi_n(w_N) = \Phi_n(w), \quad \forall n \leq N, \quad \Phi_n(w_N) = 0, \quad \forall n > N. \quad (21)$$

For any $M > 0$ and $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$, we choose $N \equiv N(w) \geq 1$ so large that

$$\|w - w_N\|_s \leq \frac{1}{2C_{M,s}} \quad (22)$$

where $C_{M,s}$ is the constant introduced in (19).

Finally, for any $v \in H_{c,0}^s$, we denote by $B_{c,0}^s(v, r)$ the ball in $H_{c,0}^s$ of radius $r > 0$, centered at v . Furthermore, for any $r > 0$ and $n \geq 0$, we introduce the following subsets of \mathbb{C} ,

$$\text{Vert}_n(r) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda - n| \geq r, |\text{Re}(\lambda) - n| \leq 1/2\}, \quad (23)$$

$$D_n(r) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\lambda - n| < r\}, \quad (24)$$

and denote by $\partial D_n(r)$ the counterclockwise oriented boundary of $D_n(r)$ in \mathbb{C} and by $\text{Vert}_n^0(r)$ the interior of $\text{Vert}_n(r)$ in \mathbb{C} .

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 16 in [7], one gets the following

Lemma 2.4. *Let $-1/2 < s \leq 0$ and $M > 0$. Then for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$, w_N defined as in (21), and N chosen so that $\|w - w_N\|_s < 1/2C_{M,s}$ (cf. (22)), there exists $n_0 > N$ so that for any $v \in H_{c,0}^s$ and $n \geq n_0$,*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \text{Vert}_n(1/4)} \|T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{H_+^{s;n} \rightarrow H_+^{s;n}} \leq \frac{8}{\rho} C_{M,s} \|v\|_s,$$

where $H_+^{s;n}$ is the Hilbert space H_+^s , endowed with the inner product, associated with the shifted norm $\|\cdot\|_{s;n}$.

Remark 2.3. *We recall that the shifted norm is defined as*

$$\|f\|_{s;n} := \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} \langle n - k \rangle^{2s} |\widehat{f}(k)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

It is equivalent to the standard norm in H_+^s (cf. [7, Lemma 3]).

The Counting Lemma [7, Theorem 4 with $\rho = 1/4$] then implies the following

Proposition 2.2. *Let $-1/2 < s \leq 0$ and $M > 0$. For any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$, choose $w_N \in \mathcal{U}_N$ as in (21) with $N \geq 1$ satisfying (22), and $n_0 > N$ as in Lemma 2.4. Then there exists a neighborhood $U^s \equiv U_w^s$ of w in $H_{c,0}^s$ with $U^s \subset B_{c,0}^s(w, 1/2C_{M,s}) \subset B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$ and the following properties:*

(i) *For any $u \in U^s$, the operator L_u is a closed operator in H_+^s with domain H_+^{s+1} and has a compact resolvent. The spectrum $\text{spec}(L_u)$ of L_u is discrete and consists of simple eigenvalues only.*

(ii) *For any $n \geq n_0$ and any $u \in U^s$,*

$$\#(\text{spec}(L_u) \cap D_n(1/4)) = 1, \quad \text{spec}(L_u) \cap \text{Vert}_n(1/4) = \emptyset.$$

Furthermore, for any $n \geq n_0$, the resolvent map

$$U^s \times \text{Vert}_n^0(1/4) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_+^s, H_+^{s+1}), \quad (u, \lambda) \mapsto (L_u - \lambda)^{-1},$$

is analytic and

$$(L_u - \lambda)^{-1} = (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (\text{Id} - T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{-1}, \quad v := u - w_N. \quad (25)$$

The Neumann series

$$(\text{Id} - T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{-1} = \sum_{m \geq 0} (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m \quad (26)$$

converges uniformly on $U^s \times \text{Vert}_n(1/4)$ with respect to the operator norm, induced by the shifted norm $\|\cdot\|_{s;n}$ in H_+^s as well as with respect to the standard operator norm.

Proposition 2.2 yields the following

Corollary 2.1. *Let $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, $M > 0$, and $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$. Assume that $U^s \equiv U_w^s$ and $n_0 > N$ are given as in Proposition 2.2. Then for any $u \in U^s$ and $n \geq n_0$, the Riesz projector $P_n(u)$ is well-defined,*

$$P_n(u) := -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} (L_u - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(H_+^s, H_+^{s+1}), \quad D_n := D_n(1/3), \quad (27)$$

and the map

$$P_n : U^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_+^s, H_+^{s+1}), \quad u \mapsto P_n(u). \quad (28)$$

is analytic.

3 Analytic extension of the pre-Birkhoff map

In this section we introduce the pre-Birkhoff map and study its properties. Throughout the section, we assume that $M > 0$, $s > -1/2$, and w is a potential

in $H_{r,0}^s$, satisfying $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$. The finite gap potential w_N is defined as in (21) and N chosen so that (cf. (22))

$$\|w - w_N\|_s < \frac{1}{2C_{M,s}} \quad (29)$$

where $C_{M,s}$ is given by (19). Furthermore, define

$$\sigma \equiv \sigma(s) := \min(s, 0) \quad (30)$$

and let $n_0 > N$ be given as in Lemma 2.4 so that for any $v \in H_{c,0}^\sigma$,

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \text{Vert}_n(1/4)} \|T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{H_+^{\sigma;n} \rightarrow H_+^{\sigma;n}} \leq \frac{8}{\rho_{M,\sigma}} C_{M,\sigma} \|v\|_\sigma.$$

By Corollary 2.1, for any $s > -1/2$, $u \in U^\sigma$, and $n \geq n_0$, the Riesz projector

$$P_n(u) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} (L_u - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(H_+^\sigma, H_+^{\sigma+1}),$$

is well-defined and the map $U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_+^\sigma, H_+^{\sigma+1})$, $u \mapsto P_n(u)$, is analytic. Here $U^\sigma \equiv U_w^\sigma$ is the open neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^\sigma$, given by Corollary 2.1 and ∂D_n is the counterclockwise oriented boundary of D_n , defined as (cf. (24))

$$D_n \equiv D_n(1/3).$$

Hence, for any $n \geq n_0$, the map

$$U^\sigma \rightarrow H_+^{\sigma+1}, \quad u \mapsto h_n(u), \quad (31)$$

is analytic where

$$h_n(u) := P_n(u)f_n \in H_+^{\sigma+1}, \quad f_n := f_n(w_N). \quad (32)$$

where w_N is the finite gap potential, defined as in (29).

We point out that in the course of our arguments, the neighborhood might be shrunk. The main objective in this section is to prove the following

Proposition 3.1. *For any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$ and $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$, there exists an open neighborhood $U^s \equiv U_w^s$ of w in $H_{c,0}^s$ so that the following holds:*

(i) *The map*

$$\Psi : U^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{\geq n_0}^{s+1}, \quad u \mapsto (\langle h_n(u)|1 \rangle)_{n \geq n_0}, \quad (33)$$

is analytic where $h_n(u)$, $n \geq n_0$ are given by (32) and n_0 by Corollary 2.1. We refer to Ψ as the (local) pre-Birkhoff map near w .

(ii) *For any $n \geq n_0$, the map $U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $u \mapsto \langle h_n(u)|f_n(w_N) \rangle$, is analytic and*

$$|\langle h_n(u)|f_n(w_N) \rangle - 1| \leq 1/2, \quad \forall n \geq n_0, u \in U^\sigma.$$

The neighborhood U^s can be chosen as $U_w^\sigma \cap B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$ where U_w^σ is the open neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^\sigma$, given by Corollary 2.1.

To prove Proposition 3.1, we first need to make some preliminary considerations. By the definition of the set \mathcal{U}_N of finite gap potentials in [5], the eigenvalues $\lambda_n \equiv \lambda_n(w_N)$ and eigenfunctions $f_n \equiv f_n(w_N)$ of L_{w_N} satisfy

$$\lambda_n = n - \sum_{k>n} \gamma_k, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad \gamma_n \equiv \gamma_n(w_N) = \lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1} - 1, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad (34)$$

$$\lambda_n = n, \quad \forall n \geq N, \quad \gamma_N > 0, \quad \gamma_n = 0, \quad \forall n > N, \quad (35)$$

$$f_n = g_n e^{inx}, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad \langle f_n | 1 \rangle = 0, \quad \forall n > N, \quad (36)$$

$$g_n \equiv g_n(w_N) = g_\infty, \quad \forall n \geq N, \quad g_\infty \equiv g_\infty(w_N) = e^{i\partial_x^{-1} w_N}. \quad (37)$$

Since $\langle f_n | 1 \rangle = 0$ for any $n > N$ and $(f_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is an orthonormal basis of H_+ ,

$$1 = \sum_{0 \leq \alpha \leq N} \langle 1 | f_\alpha \rangle f_\alpha \quad (38)$$

and since by (31), $U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, u \mapsto \langle h_n(u) | 1 \rangle$ is analytic, item (i) of Proposition 3.1 follows once we show that there exist $n_1 \geq n_0 (> N)$ and a neighborhood $U^s \equiv U_w^s$ of w in $H_{c,0}^s$ so that for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$,

$$\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2+2s} |\langle h_n(u) | f_\alpha \rangle|^2 < \infty$$

locally uniformly on U^s . By the definitions of $h_n(u)$ and $P_n(u)$,

$$\langle h_n(u) | f_\alpha \rangle = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \langle (L_u - \lambda)^{-1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle d\lambda, \quad \forall n \geq n_0,$$

or, expanding $(L_u - \lambda)^{-1} = (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (\text{Id} - T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{-1}$ as a Neumann series (cf. (25), (26)),

$$\langle h_n(u) | f_\alpha \rangle = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle \sum_{m \geq 0} (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{\lambda_\alpha - \lambda} d\lambda.$$

Since $\langle f_n | f_\alpha \rangle = 0$ for any $n > N$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$, the term $m = 0$ in the latter sum vanishes, yielding after changing the index of summation from m to $m - 1$,

$$\langle h_n(u) | f_\alpha \rangle = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{m+1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{\lambda - \lambda_\alpha} d\lambda.$$

To show Proposition 3.1 (i) it suffices to show that there exists $n_1 \geq n_0 (> N)$ so that for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$ and any $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$,

$$\sum_{m \geq 0} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{m+1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{\lambda - \lambda_\alpha} d\lambda \right)_{n \geq n_1}$$

is absolutely and uniformly summable in $\mathfrak{h}_{\geq n_1}^{s+1}$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{m \geq 0} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2+2s} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{m+1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{\lambda - \lambda_\alpha} d\lambda \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty \quad (39)$$

uniformly for $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$. For $m = 0$, the integrand in (39) can be computed as

$$\frac{\langle T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{\lambda - \lambda_\alpha} = \frac{\langle v f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{(\lambda - \lambda_\alpha)(n - \lambda)} = \frac{\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n)}{(\lambda - \lambda_\alpha)(n - \lambda)}.$$

Since $|n - \lambda| = \frac{1}{3}$ for $\lambda \in \partial D_n$ and $\lambda_\alpha \leq \alpha \leq N$ (cf. (34) - (35)), one has

$$|\lambda - \lambda_\alpha| \geq n - \frac{1}{3} - N \geq \frac{2}{3}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0, \forall \lambda \in \partial D_n, \quad (40)$$

yielding

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{\lambda - \lambda_\alpha} d\lambda \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{3} \sup_{\lambda \in \partial D_n} \frac{|\langle T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle|}{|\lambda - \lambda_\alpha|} \leq \frac{|\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n)|}{n - \frac{1}{3} - N} \end{aligned}$$

and in turn

$$\left(\sum_{n \geq n_0} \frac{n^{2+2s}}{(n - \frac{1}{3} - N)^2} |\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{n_0}{n_0 - \frac{1}{3} - N} \|v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha\|_s.$$

By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 and using that $\|w_N\|_s \leq \|w\|_s + 1 \leq M + 1$

$$\|v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha\|_s \leq C_{s,1}^2 C_{s,2}^2 (1 + \|w_N\|_s)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s \leq C_{s,1}^2 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

for any $u = w_N + v$ with $\|v\|_s \leq 1/C_{M,s}$ (cf. (19), (20)).

It thus remains to consider the terms in (39) with $m \geq 1$. One computes, using the basis $(f_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of H_+ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{m+1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle \\ & = \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \frac{\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(k_1 - n) \widehat{v g_{k_1} \bar{g}_{k_2}}(k_2 - k_1) \cdots \widehat{v g_{k_m} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - k_m)}{(n - \lambda) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m} (\lambda_{k_j} - \lambda)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda_k \leq k$ for any $0 \leq k \leq N$ and $\lambda_k = k$ for any $k \geq N$ (cf. (34) (35)), one has

$$\inf_{\lambda \in \partial D_n} |\lambda_k - \lambda| \geq \frac{|k - n| + 1}{5}.$$

Together with the estimate (40), the two latter estimates lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{m+1} f_n | f_\alpha \rangle}{\lambda - \lambda_\alpha} d\lambda \right| \\ & \leq \frac{5^m}{n - \frac{1}{3} - N} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \frac{|v \widehat{g_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(k_1 - n)| |v \widehat{g_{k_1} \bar{g}_{k_2}}(k_2 - k_1)| \cdots |v \widehat{g_{k_m} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - k_m)|}{\prod_{1 \leq j \leq m} (|k_j - n| + 1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

To establish (39) it thus suffices to prove the following lemma, which in view of Section 7 is stated in a slightly stronger form than needed here.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists $n_1 \geq n_0$ so that for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$,*

$$\sum_{m \geq 1} 8^m \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} S_u(n; k_1, \dots, k_m, \alpha) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty$$

uniformly for $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$ where

$$S_u(n; k_1, \dots, k_m, \alpha) := \frac{|v \widehat{g_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(k_1 - n)| |v \widehat{g_{k_1} \bar{g}_{k_2}}(k_2 - k_1)| \cdots |v \widehat{g_{k_m} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - k_m)|}{\prod_{1 \leq j \leq m} (|k_j - n| + 1)}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1 We fix $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$ throughout the proof. Let us first consider the summands with $m = 1$ and $m = 2$.

Summand with $m = 1$. Since for $k_1 \geq N$, $g_{k_1} = g_\infty$, we split the sum

$$\sum_{k_1 \geq 0} S_u(n; k_1, \alpha) = \sum_{k_1 \geq 0} \frac{|v \widehat{g_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(k_1 - n)| |v \widehat{g_{k_1} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - k_1)|}{(|k_1 - n| + 1)} \quad (42)$$

into two parts, $\sum_{k_1 \geq 0} = \sum_{k_1 \geq N} + \sum_{k_1 < N}$. Introducing $\ell_1 := k_1 - n$ as summation index instead of k_1 and using that $g_\infty(x) \bar{g}_{k_1}(x) = g_\infty(x) \bar{g}_\infty(x) = 1$ for $k_1 \geq N$, one has

$$\sum_{k_1 \geq N} \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\widehat{v}(\ell_1)| |v \widehat{g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_1)|}{|\ell_1| + 1}, \quad (43)$$

$$\sum_{k_1 < N} \leq \frac{1}{(n - N)^\tau} \sum_{0 \leq k_1 < N} \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|v \widehat{g_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(\ell_1)| |v \widehat{g_{k_1} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_1)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)^{1-\tau}}, \quad (44)$$

where $\tau \equiv \tau(s) > 0$ is defined in Lemma 2.2 (i) and where we used that for any $0 \leq k_1 < N$,

$$|k_1 - n| + 1 = (|k_1 - n| + 1)^\tau (|k_1 - n| + 1)^{1-\tau} \geq (n - N)^\tau (|k_1 - n| + 1)^{1-\tau}.$$

(We remark that since we have no control over N in terms of $\|w\|_s$, the terms $|k_1 - n| + 1$ with $k_1 < N$ in the denominator of (42) are split up as above.) We now choose $n_1 \geq n_0$ so large that $(n_1 - N - \frac{2}{3})^\tau \geq N$ and hence

$$\frac{1}{(n - N - \frac{2}{3})^\tau} \leq \frac{1}{N}, \quad \forall n \geq n_1. \quad (45)$$

As a consequence, $\sum_{k_1 < N} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq \beta_1 < N} \mathfrak{S}_{\beta_1}$ where

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\beta_1} := \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\widehat{vg_\infty \bar{g}_{\beta_1}}(\ell_1)| |\widehat{vg_{\beta_1} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_1)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)^{1-\tau}}. \quad (46)$$

We then conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{k_1 \geq 0} S_u(n; k_1, \alpha) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{k_1 \geq N} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sup_{0 \leq \beta_1 < N} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} (\mathfrak{S}_{\beta_1})^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and, using Lemma 2.2, Lemma 2.3, and $\|w_N\|_s \leq \|w_N - w\|_s + \|w\|_s \leq 1 + M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{k_1 \geq N} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} & \leq \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\widehat{v}(\ell_1)| |\widehat{vg_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_1)|}{|\ell_1| + 1} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C_{s,1} \|v\|_s \|vg_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha\|_s \\ & \leq C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (1 + \|w_N\|_s)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s^2 \\ & \leq (C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} (\mathfrak{S}_{\beta_1})^2 \right)^{1/2} & \leq \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\widehat{vg_\infty \bar{g}_{\beta_1}}(\ell_1)| |\widehat{vg_{\beta_1} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_1)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)^{1-\tau}} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C_{s,1} \|vg_\infty \bar{g}_{\beta_1}\|_s \|vg_{\beta_1} \bar{g}_\alpha\|_s \\ & \leq C_{s,1}^5 C_{s,2}^4 (1 + \|w_N\|_s)^{4\eta(s)} \|v\|_s^2 \\ & \leq (C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we thus have proved that

$$\left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{k_1 \geq 0} S_u(n; k_1, \alpha) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 2(C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^2. \quad (47)$$

Summand with $m = 2$. The term $S_u(n; k_1, k_2, \alpha)$ is given by

$$S_u(n; k_1, k_2, \alpha) = \frac{|\widehat{vg_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(k_1 - n)| |\widehat{vg_{k_1} \bar{g}_{k_2}}(k_2 - k_1)| |\widehat{vg_{k_2} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - k_2)|}{\prod_{1 \leq j \leq 2} (|k_j - n| + 1)}.$$

We split the sum $\sum_{k_1, k_2 \geq 0} S_u(n; k_1, k_2, \alpha)$ into two parts $\sum_{k_1 \geq 0, k_2 \geq N}$ and $\sum_{k_1 \geq 0, k_2 < N}$. Similarly, we write $\sum_{k_1 \geq 0, k_2 \geq N} = \sum_{k_1, k_2 \geq N} + \sum_{k_1 < N, k_2 \geq N}$. Arguing in the same way as in the case of the summand with $m = 1$, one sees that $\sum_{k_2, k_1 \geq N}$ can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k_2, k_1 \geq N} &\leq \sum_{k_2 \geq N} \left(\sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\widehat{v}(\ell_1)| |\widehat{v}(k_2 - n - \ell_1)| |vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\alpha}(\alpha - k_2)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)(|k_2 - n| + 1)} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell_2, \ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\widehat{v}(\ell_1)| |\widehat{v}(\ell_2 - \ell_1)| |vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_2)|}{|\ell_1| + 1} \frac{1}{|\ell_2| + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\sum_{k_1 < N, k_2 \geq N}$ by $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq \beta_1 < N} \mathfrak{S}_{k_2 \geq N, \beta_1}$ where

$$\mathfrak{S}_{k_2 \geq N, \beta_1} := \sum_{\ell_2, \ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\beta_1}(\ell_1)| |vg_{\beta_1} \overline{g}_{\infty}(\ell_2 - \ell_1)| |vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_2)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)^{1-\tau} |\ell_2| + 1}.$$

To estimate $\sum_{k_2 < N}$, we write $\sum_{k_2 < N} = \sum_{k_2 < N, k_1 \geq N} + \sum_{k_2, k_1 < N}$. The term $\sum_{k_2 < N, k_1 \geq N}$ is bounded by $\sum_{k_2 < N, k_1 \geq N} \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq \beta_2 < N} \mathfrak{S}_{\beta_2, k_1 \geq N}$ where

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\beta_2, k_1 \geq N} := \sum_{\ell_2, \ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|\widehat{v}(\ell_1)| |vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\beta_2}(\ell_2 - \ell_1)| |vg_{\beta_2} \overline{g}_{\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_2)|}{|\ell_1| + 1} \frac{1}{(|\ell_2| + 1)^{1-\tau}},$$

and $\sum_{k_2, k_1 < N} \leq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{0 \leq \beta_2, \beta_1 < N} \mathfrak{S}_{\beta_2, \beta_1}$ with

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\beta_2, \beta_1} := \sum_{\ell_2, \ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{|vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\beta_1}(\ell_1)| |vg_{\beta_1} \overline{g}_{\beta_2}(\ell_2 - \ell_1)| |vg_{\beta_2} \overline{g}_{\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell_2)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)^{1-\tau} (|\ell_2| + 1)^{1-\tau}}.$$

Similarly as in the case of the summand with $m = 1$, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{k_2 \geq N, k_1 \geq N} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq C_{s,1}^2 \|v\|_s^2 \|vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\alpha}\|_s \\ &\leq C_{s,1}^4 C_{s,2}^2 (1 + \|w_N\|_s)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s^3 \\ &\leq (C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^3, \\ \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} (\mathfrak{S}_{k_2 \geq N, \beta_1})^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq C_{s,1}^2 \|vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\beta_1}\|_s \|vg_{\beta_1} \overline{g}_{\infty}\|_s \|vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\alpha}\|_s \\ &\leq C_{s,1}^8 C_{s,2}^6 (1 + \|w_N\|_s)^{6\eta(s)} \|v\|_s^3 \\ &\leq (C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^3, \\ \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} (\mathfrak{S}_{\beta_2, k_1 \geq N})^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq C_{s,1}^2 \|v\|_s \|vg_{\infty} \overline{g}_{\beta_2}\|_s \|vg_{\beta_2} \overline{g}_{\alpha}\|_s \\ &\leq C_{s,1}^6 C_{s,2}^4 (1 + \|w_N\|_s)^{4\eta(s)} \|v\|_s^3 \\ &\leq (C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^3, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} (\mathfrak{G}_{\beta_2, \beta_1})^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq C_{s,1}^2 \|vg_\infty \bar{g}_{\beta_1}\|_s \|vg_{\beta_1} \bar{g}_{\beta_2}\|_s \|vg_{\beta_2} \bar{g}_\alpha\|_s \\
&\leq (C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^3,
\end{aligned}$$

We then conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{k_2, k_1 \geq 0} S_u(n; k_1, k_2, \alpha) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq 4(C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^3 \\
&\leq (2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^3
\end{aligned}$$

Summand with $m \geq 3$. Our computations for the summands with $m = 1$ and $m = 2$ suggest to introduce the map $Q : (\mathfrak{h}_c^s)^{N+1} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{h}_c^s)^{N+1}$, defined as follows. Writing an element in $(\mathfrak{h}_c^s)^{N+1}$ in the form $\widehat{\xi} = (\widehat{\xi}_\beta)_{0 \leq \beta \leq N}$ where for any $0 \leq \beta \leq N$, $\widehat{\xi}_\beta$ is a sequence of Fourier coefficients $(\widehat{\xi}_\beta(\ell))_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of the function $\xi_\beta \in H_c^s$. Then

$$Q : (\mathfrak{h}_c^s)^{N+1} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{h}_c^s)^{N+1}, \quad \widehat{\xi} = (\widehat{\xi}_\beta)_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \mapsto \widehat{\zeta} = (\widehat{\zeta}_\beta)_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \quad (48)$$

is defined as follows: $\widehat{\zeta}_N = (\widehat{\zeta}_N(\ell))_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is given by

$$\widehat{\zeta}_N(\ell) := \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\widehat{\xi}_N(\ell_1) |\widehat{v}(\ell - \ell_1)|}{|\ell_1| + 1} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq \beta_1 < N} \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\widehat{\xi}_{\beta_1}(\ell_1) |\widehat{vg_{\beta_1} \bar{g}_\infty}(\ell - \ell_1)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)^{1-\tau}} \quad (49)$$

and for any $0 \leq \beta < N$, $\widehat{\zeta}_\beta = (\widehat{\zeta}_\beta(\ell))_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is given by

$$\widehat{\zeta}_\beta(\ell) := \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\widehat{\xi}_N(\ell_1) |\widehat{vg_\infty \bar{g}_\beta}(\ell - \ell_1)|}{|\ell_1| + 1} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq \beta_1 < N} \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\widehat{\xi}_{\beta_1}(\ell_1) |\widehat{vg_{\beta_1} \bar{g}_\beta}(\ell - \ell_1)|}{(|\ell_1| + 1)^{1-\tau}} \quad (50)$$

For any $m \geq 2$, the term $\sum_{k_j \geq 0} S_u(n; k_1, \dots, k_m, \alpha)$ is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} S_u(n; k_1, \dots, k_m, \alpha) &\leq \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (Q^{m-1}[\widehat{\xi}^{(0)}])_N(\ell) \frac{|\widehat{vg_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell)|}{|\ell| + 1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq \beta < N} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} (Q^{m-1}[\widehat{\xi}^{(0)}])_\beta(\ell) \frac{|\widehat{vg_\beta \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n - \ell)|}{(|\ell| + 1)^{1-\tau}}
\end{aligned}$$

where the starting point $\widehat{\xi}^{(0)} = (\widehat{\xi}_\beta^{(0)})_{0 \leq \beta \leq N}$ is given by (cf. (43), (44))

$$\widehat{\xi}_N^{(0)} := \widehat{v}, \quad \widehat{\xi}_\beta^{(0)} := \widehat{vg_\infty \bar{g}_\beta}, \quad 0 \leq \beta < N. \quad (51)$$

For any $m \geq 2$, we then obtain from Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} S_u(n; k_1, \dots, k_m, \alpha) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq C_{s,1} \| (Q^{m-1}[\widehat{\xi}])_N \|_s \| v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha \|_s + C_{s,1} \sup_{0 \leq \beta < N} \| (Q^{m-1}[\widehat{\xi}^{(0)}])_\beta \|_s \| v g_\beta \bar{g}_\alpha \|_s \\
& \leq 2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s \sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \| (Q^{m-1}[\widehat{\xi}^{(0)}])_\beta \|_s. \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us establish bounds for the map Q . By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \widehat{\zeta}_N \|_s & \leq C_{s,1} \| v \|_s \| \widehat{\xi}_N \|_s + C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s \sup_{0 \leq \beta_1 < N} \| \widehat{\xi}_{\beta_1} \|_s \\
& \leq 2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s \cdot \sup_{0 \leq \beta_1 \leq N} \| \widehat{\xi}_{\beta_1} \|_s,
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly, for any $0 \leq \beta < N$,

$$\| \widehat{\zeta}_\beta \|_s \leq 2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s \cdot \sup_{0 \leq \beta_1 \leq N} \| \widehat{\xi}_{\beta_1} \|_s.$$

Altogether, we have proved that

$$\sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \| \widehat{\zeta}_\beta \|_s \leq 2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s \cdot \sup_{0 \leq \beta_1 \leq N} \| \widehat{\xi}_{\beta_1} \|_s. \tag{53}$$

Similarly, by (51), one has for any $0 \leq \beta < N$,

$$\| \widehat{\xi}_\beta^{(0)} \|_s \leq C_{s,1} \| v \|_s \| g_\infty \bar{g}_\beta \|_{1+s} \leq C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s,$$

and hence

$$\sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \| \widehat{\xi}_\beta^{(0)} \|_s \leq C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s. \tag{54}$$

By induction, it then follows from (53) and (54) that for any $m \geq 2$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \| (Q^{m-1}[\widehat{\xi}^{(0)}])_\beta \|_s \leq (2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s)^m. \tag{55}$$

Combining (47), (52), and (55) we have thus shown that for any $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{m \geq 1} 8^m \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} S_u(n; k_1, \dots, k_m, \alpha) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} (16C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \| v \|_s)^{m+1} \leq \frac{1}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used definition (19) of $C_{M,s}$. This proves Lemma 3.1. \square

For later reference we record the estimate (53) of the operator Q , obtained in the proof of Lemma 3.1. Recall that $s > -1/2$, $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$, and w_N is the finite gap potential, defined at the beginning of this section.

Lemma 3.2. *The operator Q , defined by (48)-(50), satisfies for any $v \in H_{c,0}^s$ and any $\widehat{\xi} = (\widehat{\xi}_\beta)_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \in (\mathfrak{h}_c^s)^{N+1}$ the following estimate,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \|(Q[\widehat{\xi}])_\beta\|_s \leq 2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s \cdot \sup_{0 \leq \beta_1 \leq N} \|\widehat{\xi}_{\beta_1}\|_s.$$

With these preparations, we are now ready to prove Proposition 3.1. Without further reference, we use the notation introduced in this section.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. (i) The claimed statements follow from the arguments above: the neighborhood $U^\sigma \equiv U_w^\sigma$ of w in $H_{c,0}^s$ (cf. (31) - (32)) has the property that $U^\sigma \rightarrow H_+^{\sigma+1}$, $u \mapsto h_n(u)$ is analytic for any $n \geq n_0$ and so is the map $U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $u \mapsto \langle h_n(u)|f_\alpha \rangle$ for any $n \geq n_0$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$. Since by (38), $1 = \sum_{0 \leq \alpha \leq N} \langle 1|f_\alpha \rangle f_\alpha$, it then remains to show that there exists $n_1 \geq n_0$ with the property that for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq N$, $\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2+2s} |\langle h_n(u)|f_\alpha \rangle|^2 < \infty$ is uniformly bounded in some neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^s$, contained in U^σ . But this follows from (39), (41), and Lemma 3.1 for any $u = w_N + v$ in $U_w^s := U^\sigma \cap B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$.

(ii) First note that without loss of generality we can assume that $-1/2 < s \leq 0$. Recall that by (32) one has for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$\langle h_n(u)|f_n \rangle = \langle P_n(u)f_n|f_n \rangle = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \langle (L_u - \lambda)^{-1} f_n|f_n \rangle d\lambda.$$

Since $(L_u - \lambda)^{-1} = (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (\text{Id} - T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{-1}$ and by (26)

$$(\text{Id} - T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{-1} = \text{Id} + \sum_{k \geq 1} (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^k$$

uniformly on $U^s \times \text{Vert}_n(1/4)$ and since by Cauchy's theorem, for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \langle (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_n|f_n \rangle d\lambda = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle f_n|f_n \rangle}{n - \lambda} d\lambda = 1$$

it follows that for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h_n(u)|f_n \rangle - 1| &\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_n|f_n \rangle}{n - \lambda} d\lambda \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{m \geq 1} \sup_{\lambda \in \partial D_n} \|e^{-inx} (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_n\|_s \|g_\infty\|_{-s}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $f_n = g_\infty e^{inx}$ for any $n \geq n_0$ ($> N$). For any $\lambda \in \partial D_n$, one has by the definition of the shifted norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{-inx} (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_n\|_s &= \|(T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_n\|_{s;n} \\ &\leq \|T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{H_+^{s;n} \rightarrow H_+^{s;n}}^m \|f_n\|_{s;n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we assume $-1/2 < s \leq 0$,

$$\|f_n\|_{s;n} = \|e^{-inx} f_n\|_s = \|g_\infty\|_s \leq \|g_\infty\| = 1,$$

it then follows that

$$\|e^{-inx} (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_n\|_s \leq \|T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{H_+^{s;n} \rightarrow H_+^{s;n}}^m.$$

By Lemma 2.4, one has for any $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$ that

$$\sum_{m \geq 1} \|T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1}\|_{H_+^{s;n} \rightarrow H_+^{s;n}}^m \leq \frac{8/\rho}{1 - 8/\rho} = \frac{8}{\rho - 8}$$

and hence by the estimate $\rho \geq 2^{11}$ (cf. (19))

$$|\langle h_n(u) | f_n \rangle - 1| \leq \frac{8}{\rho - 8} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

4 Poisson relations

The goal of this section is to show that for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$, $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, there exists a neighborhood $U^s \equiv U_w^s$ of w in $H_{c,0}^s$ with the property that the normalized eigenfunctions $f_n(u)$, $n \geq 0$, of L_u extend to analytic functions on U^s . Since the case $w = 0$ has been treated in [8], we concentrate on the case $w \neq 0$. As an application we show that the components of the Birkhoff map Φ satisfy canonical relations.

First recall that for any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$, the eigenfunctions $f_n(u)$, $n \geq 1$, satisfy the normalisation conditions (5),

$$f_n(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_n(u)}} P_n(u) (S f_{n-1}(u)). \quad (56)$$

See [5, Remark 4.4] ($u \in L_{r,0}^2$) and [7, Proposition 5] ($u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $-1/2 < s < 0$).

As in Section 3, we assume that $M > 0$, $s > -1/2$, and w is a potential in $H_{r,0}^s$, satisfying $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$. The finite gap potential w_N is defined as in (21) with N chosen so that $\|w - w_N\|_s < \frac{1}{2C_{M,s}}$ (cf. (22)) where $C_{M,s}$ is given by (19). Furthermore, we define $\sigma \equiv \sigma(s) := \min(s, 0)$ and let $n_0 > N$ be given as in Lemma 2.4. We recall that for any $s > 0$, $C_{M,s} \geq C_{M,\sigma}$ (cf. (19) and the choice of the constants $C_{s,1}$ and $C_{s,1}$ in Lemma 2.2 and respectively, Lemma 2.3). Denote by $U^\sigma \equiv U_w^\sigma$ an open ball in $H_{c,0}^\sigma$, centered at w , with the following properties,

(NBH1) Proposition 2.2 (Counting Lemma) and [7, Theorem 5]² (Moment Map $\Gamma : u \mapsto (\gamma_n(u))_{n \geq 1}$) hold on $U^\sigma \subset B_{c,0}^\sigma(w, 1/2C_{M,\sigma})$.

²See also arXiv:2006.11864 for an updated version of [7].

We point out that in the course of our arguments, the neighborhood might be shrunk. Furthermore, recall that $n_1 \geq n_0$ denotes the integer, introduced in (45). For the convenience of the reader, we record the following results from [7] on the scaling factors κ_n and μ_n (cf. (5), (7)).

Lemma 4.1. ([7, Proposition 8]) *There exists $n_2 \geq n_1$ so that for any $n > n_2$, the scaling factors $\kappa_n, \mu_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are analytic maps and satisfy the estimates*

$$|n\kappa_n(u) - 1| \leq \frac{7}{12}e^{1/3} < 1,$$

$$|\mu_n(u) - 1| \leq \frac{7}{6}e^{1/3}|\gamma_n(u)| \leq \frac{7}{12}e^{1/3} < 1.$$

By the arguments used in the proof of Lemma 5.2 in [5] in the case $s = 0$ and by [7, Proposition 8(ii)], one shows that the following lemma holds.

Lemma 4.2. *By shrinking the ball U^σ of Lemma 4.1, if needed, it follows that for any $0 \leq n \leq n_2$ with n_2 given as in Lemma 4.1, the n th eigenfunction $f_n(u)$ of the Lax operator L_u extends to an analytic map $f_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow H_+^{\sigma+1}$, satisfying*

$$L_u f_n(u) = \lambda_n(u) f_n(u), \quad f_n(u) \neq 0, \quad \forall u \in U^\sigma.$$

Furthermore, for any $1 \leq n \leq n_2$ and $u \in U^\sigma$,

$$|\kappa_n(u) - \kappa_n(w)| < \kappa_n(w)/2$$

and the map $U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $u \mapsto 1/\sqrt[\dagger]{\kappa_n(u)}$ is analytic.

In the remaining part of this section, $U^\sigma \equiv U_w^\sigma$ denotes an open ball in $H_{c,0}^\sigma$, centered at w , satisfying (NBH1) and

(NBH2) Lemma 4.2 holds on U^σ .

Now we are ready to state the main result of this section.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $w \in H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$, and let $U^\sigma \equiv U_w^\sigma$ be a neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^\sigma$, satisfying (NBH1) - (NBH2). Then for any $n \geq 0$, the n th eigenfunction $f_n(u)$ of L_u extends to an analytic map $f_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow H_+^{\sigma+1}$, satisfying $L_u f_n(u) = \lambda_n(u) f_n(u)$. Furthermore, $f_n(u) \neq 0$ for any $0 \leq n \leq n_2$.*

Proof. For $0 \leq n \leq n_2$, the claimed results follow by Lemma 4.2. For $n > n_2$, we argue as follows. By Corollary 2.1 and since $n_2 \geq n_0 > N$, the Riesz projector $P_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_+^\sigma, H_+^{\sigma+1})$ is analytic for any $n > n_2$. By Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, it then follows that (56) extends to an analytic map

$$f_{n_2+1} : U^\sigma \rightarrow H_+^{\sigma+1}, u \mapsto f_{n_2+1}(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt[\dagger]{\mu_{n_2+1}(u)}} P_{n_2+1}(u)(Sf_{n_2}(u)).$$

We then argue by induction to conclude that in fact (56) extends for any $n > n_2$ to an analytic map

$$f_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow H_+^{\sigma+1}, u \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt[\dagger]{\mu_n(u)}} P_n(u)(Sf_{n-1}(u)). \quad (57)$$

Since $P_n(u)$ is the projector of H_{\pm}^q onto the one dimensional eigenspace of L_u , corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_n(u)$, it follows that $(L_u - \lambda_n(u))f_n(u) = 0$ for any $n > n_2$ and $u \in U^\sigma$. \square

To show that the Poisson brackets between components of the Birkhoff map $\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ with $-1/2 < s \leq 0$ are well defined, we need to extend two lemmas, obtained in [5] in the case $s = 0$. We recall that the gradient $\nabla_0 F$ of a C^1 -smooth functional $F : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined with respect to the bilinear pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ between $H_{c,0}^s$ and $H_{c,0}^{-s}$, $\langle \nabla_0 F(u), v \rangle := d_u F[v]$ for any $v \in H_{r,0}^s$. In case F is the restriction of a C^1 -smooth functional $\tilde{F} : H_r^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to $H_{c,0}^s$, one has

$$\nabla_0 F(u) = \nabla \tilde{F}(u) - \langle \nabla \tilde{F}(u) | 1 \rangle,$$

where $\nabla \tilde{F}(u)$ denotes the gradient of \tilde{F} with respect to the bilinear paring $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ between H_c^s and H_c^{-s} .

Remark 4.1. *In case the context permits, we sometimes write $\nabla F(u)$ instead of $\nabla_0 F(u)$ and do not distinguish between F and \tilde{F} .*

Lemma 4.4. *For any $-1/2 < s \leq 0$ and any $n \geq 0$ the following holds:*

(i) *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $\nabla_0 \langle 1 | f_n \rangle(u)$ is in $H_{c,0}^{s+1}$ and $\nabla_0 \langle 1 | f_n \rangle : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow H_{c,0}^{s+1}$ is real analytic.*

(ii) *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $\nabla_0 \kappa_n(u)$ is in $H_{c,0}^{s+1}$ and $\nabla_0 \kappa_n : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow H_{c,0}^{s+1}$ is real analytic.*

Proof. The statements of items (i) and (ii) for $s = 0$ are proved in [5, Lemma 5.4] and [5, Lemma 5.7], respectively. In view of Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2, and Lemma 4.3, the arguments of the proof of [5, Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.7] can be used to show that the results in the case $-1/2 < s < 0$. \square

Corollary 4.1. *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, and any $n \geq 1$, the gradient of the n th component of Φ , $\Phi_n(u) = \frac{\langle 1 | f_n(u) \rangle}{\sqrt{\kappa_n(u)}}$ (cf. (6)), is in $H_{c,0}^{s+1}$ and*

$$\nabla_0 \Phi_n : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow H_{c,0}^{s+1}$$

is real analytic.

Proof. The stated result for $s = 0$ is proved in [5, Proposition 5.9]. For $-1/2 < s < 0$ one argues as follows: by the chain rule, one has for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\nabla_0 \Phi_n(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_n(u)}} \nabla_0 \langle 1 | f_n \rangle(u) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle 1 | f_n(u) \rangle}{\kappa_n(u)^{3/2}} \nabla_0 \kappa_n(u)$$

and the results follow from Lemma 4.4 together with Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2, and Lemma 4.3. \square

For any $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, the Gardner bracket of functionals $F, G : H_{r,0}^{-s} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with sufficiently regular L^2 -gradients is defined as (cf. Remark 4.1)

$$\{F, G\} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \partial_x \nabla F \cdot \nabla G \, dx.$$

Proposition 4.1. *For any $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, the Poisson brackets between the components of $\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ are well-defined and for any $n, k \geq 1$*

$$\{\Phi_n, \Phi_k\} = 0, \quad \{\Phi_n, \overline{\Phi_k}\} = -i\delta_{nk}.$$

Proof. For $s = 0$, the stated results are the content of [5, Corollary 7.3] and it remains to consider $-1/2 < s < 0$. Note that by Corollary 4.1, the Poisson brackets $\{\Phi_n, \Phi_k\}$ and $\{\Phi_n, \overline{\Phi_k}\}$ are well-defined and real analytic for any $n, k \geq 1$. Since $L_{r,0}^2$ is dense in $H_{r,0}^s$, the claimed canonical relations then follow in the case $-1/2 < s < 0$ from the case $s = 0$ by continuity. \square

5 Analytic extension of the Birkhoff map

The goal of this section is to show that for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s \setminus \{0\}$ with $s > -1/2$, there exists a neighborhood U_w^s of w in $H_{c,0}^s$ so that $\Phi : U_w^s \cap H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ extends to an analytic map on U_w^s .

As in Section 3, we assume that $M > 0$, $s > -1/2$, and w is a potential in $H_{r,0}^s$, satisfying $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$. The finite gap potential w_N is defined as in (21) with N chosen so that $\|w - w_N\|_s < \frac{1}{2C_{M,s}}$ (cf. (22)) where $C_{M,s}$ is given by (19). Furthermore, we define $\sigma \equiv \sigma(s) := \min(s, 0)$ and let $n_0 > N$ be given as in Lemma 2.4. We recall that for any $s > 0$, $C_{M,s} \geq C_{M,\sigma}$. Denote by $U^\sigma \equiv U_w^\sigma$ an open ball in $H_{c,0}^\sigma$, centered at w , satisfying (NBH1) and (NBH2) of Section 4. For $s > 0$, let $U^s \equiv U_w^s$ be the neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^s$, given by

$$U^s := U^\sigma \cap B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s}). \quad (58)$$

Note that U^s is ball, centered at w , which invariant under complex conjugation, i.e., for any $u \in U^s$, one has $\bar{u} \in U^s$.

By (6), for any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, the n th component $\Phi_n(u)$, $n \geq 1$, of the Birkhoff map Φ is given

$$\Phi_n(u) = \frac{\langle 1 | f_n(u) \rangle}{\sqrt[n]{\kappa_n(u)}} = \frac{\langle \overline{f_n(u)} | 1 \rangle}{\sqrt[n]{\kappa_n(u)}}.$$

Since for any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ and $n \geq 0$, the eigenvalue $\lambda_n(u)$ and the scaling factor $\kappa_n(u)$ are real valued, it then follows that for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\Phi_{-n}(u) = \frac{\langle f_n(u) | 1 \rangle}{\sqrt[n]{\kappa_n(u)}}, \quad \Phi_n(u) = \overline{\Phi_{-n}(\bar{u})}. \quad (59)$$

Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2, and Proposition 4.3 then yield the following

Corollary 5.1. *For any $w \in H_{r,0}^s \setminus \{0\}$, $s > -1/2$, and $n \geq 1$, the components Φ_n and Φ_{-n} extend to analytic maps $U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, given by*

$$\Phi_{-n}(u) = \sqrt[n]{n} \frac{\langle f_n(u) | 1 \rangle}{\sqrt[n]{n\kappa_n(u)}}, \quad \Phi_n(u) = \overline{\Phi_{-n}(\bar{u})}.$$

Next we want to prove that for any $u \in U^s$, $(\Phi_n(u))_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\Phi_{-n}(u))_{n \geq 1}$ are in $\mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ and that $(\Phi_n(u))_{n \geq 1}, (\Phi_{-n}(u))_{n \geq 1} : U^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is analytic. By Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2, and Corollary 5.1, this will hold if

$$\sum_{n > n_2} n^{2+2s} |\langle f_n(u) | 1 \rangle|^2 < \infty \quad (60)$$

locally uniformly for $u \in U^s$, where n_2 is given by Lemma 4.1. To prove (60), we use Proposition 3.1, implying that $(\langle h_n(u) | 1 \rangle)_{n > n_2}$ is in $\mathfrak{h}_{>n_2}^{s+1}$ locally uniformly for u in U^s . Note that $h_n(u)$ is an eigenfunction of L_u , corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda_n(u)$. Recall that by (57)

$$f_n(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt[+]{\mu_n(u)}} P_n(u) (S f_{n-1}(u)), \quad \forall n > n_2, \forall u \in U^\sigma.$$

and by Proposition 3.1(ii),

$$|\langle h_n(u) | f_n(w_N) \rangle - 1| \leq 1/2, \quad \forall n \geq n_0, \forall u \in U^\sigma.$$

Since $\lambda_n(u)$, $n \geq 0$, are simple eigenvalue of L_u , it follows that for any $n \geq n_2$

$$f_n(u) = a_n(u) h_n(u), \quad a_n(u) := \frac{\langle f_n(u) | f_n(w_N) \rangle}{\langle h_n(u) | f_n(w_N) \rangle}, \quad (61)$$

and for any $n > n_2$, $P_n(u) (S h_{n-1}(u)) = \nu_n(u) h_n(u)$ where

$$\nu_n(u) := \frac{\langle P_n(u) (S h_{n-1}(u)) | f_n(w_N) \rangle}{\langle h_n(u) | f_n(w_N) \rangle}.$$

Note that by Corollary 2.1 and Proposition 3.1, $\nu_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic for any $n > n_2$. The factors $a_n(u)$ can be computed in terms of the $\nu_n(u)$ inductively. For notational convenience, in the formulas below, we will not indicate the dependence on u . For any $n > n_2$ one obtains

$$\sqrt[+]{\mu_n} a_n h_n = \sqrt[+]{\mu_n} f_n = P_n(S f_{n-1}) = P_n(S a_{n-1} h_{n-1}) = a_{n-1} \nu_n h_n.$$

Since $h_n \neq 0$ (cf. Proposition 3.1) and $\mu_n \neq 0$ (cf. Lemma 4.1), one infers that

$$a_n = \frac{\nu_n}{\sqrt[+]{\mu_n}} a_{n-1}.$$

By induction it then follows that for any $n_3 \geq n_2$ and $n > n_3$

$$a_n = a_{n_3} \prod_{k=n_3+1}^n \frac{\nu_k}{\sqrt[+]{\mu_k}} \quad (62)$$

and in turn, for any $n > n_2$ one has by (61),

$$\langle f_n(u) | 1 \rangle = a_n(u) \langle h_n(u) | 1 \rangle, \quad a_n(u) = a_{n_2}(u) \prod_{k=n_2+1}^n \frac{\nu_k(u)}{\sqrt[+]{\mu_k(u)}}. \quad (63)$$

Note that for any $n \geq n_2$, $a_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic by (61) Corollary 2.1, Lemma 4.3, and Proposition 3.1(ii). In view of the first identity in (63) and Proposition 3.1(i), the estimate (60) will follow if we show that there exists $n_3 \geq n_2$ so that

$$U^\sigma \rightarrow \ell_{>n_3}^\infty, \quad u \mapsto (a_n(u))_{n>n_3}$$

is locally uniformly bounded for u in U^σ . We begin by estimating $\nu_n(u)$, $n > n_2$. For notational convenience, write $f_n \equiv f_n(w_N)$. Then

$$\nu_n(u) = \frac{\langle P_n(u)(Sh_{n-1}(u)) | f_n \rangle}{\langle h_n(u) | f_n \rangle} = 1 + \frac{\delta_n(u)}{\alpha_n(u)} \quad (64)$$

where

$$\alpha_n(u) := \langle h_n(u) | f_n \rangle$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n(u) &:= \langle P_n(u)(Sh_{n-1}(u)) - h_n(u) | f_n \rangle \\ &= \langle P_n(u)(SP_{n-1}(u)f_{n-1} - f_n) | f_n \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where we used that $h_n(u) = P_n(u)f_n$. By Corollary 2.1 and Proposition 3.1, $\delta_n : U^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic for any $n > n_2$.

Proposition 5.1. *For any $u \in U^\sigma$, $(\delta_n(u))_{n>n_2} \in \ell_{>n_2}^1$ and*

$$\delta : U^\sigma \rightarrow \ell_{>n_2}^1, \quad u \mapsto (\delta_n(u))_{n>n_2}, \quad (66)$$

is analytic and bounded.

The proof of Proposition 5.1, which is quite delicate and a bit technical, is deferred to Section 7. We remark that a local version of Proposition 5.1 near $w = 0$ is given in [8, Proposition 4.1].

We now use Proposition 5.1 to prove the following

Lemma 5.1. *For any $u \in U^\sigma$, the sequence $(a_n(u))_{n>n_2} \in \ell_{>n_2}^\infty$ is bounded and the map*

$$a : U^\sigma \rightarrow \ell_{>n_2}^\infty, \quad u \mapsto (a_n(u))_{n>n_2} \quad (67)$$

is analytic.

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $-1/2 < s \leq 0$ and hence $s = \sigma$. Since for any $n > n_2$, $a_n : U^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic, the claim follows by [11, Theorem A.3], once we show that there exists $n_3 \geq n_2$ so that $(a_n(u))_{n>n_3}$ is a sequence in $\ell_{>n_3}^\infty$, which is bounded uniformly for $u \in U^s$. In view of the formula (62) for $a_n(u)$, it suffices to show that there exists $n_3 \geq n_2$ so that the two sequences $(\prod_{k=n_3+1}^n \nu_k(u))_{n>n_3}$ and $(\prod_{k=n_3+1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_k(u)}})_{n>n_3}$ in (62) are sequences in $\ell_{>n_3}^\infty$, which are bounded uniformly for $u \in U^s$. By Proposition 5.1, there exists $n_3 \geq n_2$ and $C_1 \geq 1$ so that for any $u \in U^s$,

$$\sum_{k=n_3+1}^{\infty} |\delta_k(u)| \leq C_1, \quad |\delta_n(u)| \leq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \forall n > n_3. \quad (68)$$

Since by Proposition 3.1,

$$|\alpha_n(u)| \geq 1/2, \quad \forall n \geq n_2, \quad (69)$$

it then follows that

$$\left| \frac{\delta_n(u)}{\alpha_n(u)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \forall n > n_3, \forall u \in U^s.$$

We then conclude from (64), (68), and (69) that there exists $C_2 \geq 1$ so that for any $u \in U^s$ and any $k > n_3$, $\log \nu_k(u)$ is well-defined and for any $n > n_3$,

$$\sum_{k=n_3+1}^n |\log \nu_k(u)| = \sum_{k=n_3+1}^n \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{\delta_k(u)}{\alpha_k(u)} \right) \right| \leq C_2,$$

where \log denotes the standard branch of the (natural) logarithm on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$. As a consequence, for any $u \in U^s$ and $n > n_3$

$$\left| \prod_{k=n_3+1}^n \nu_k(u) \right| \leq \exp \left(\sum_{k=n_3+1}^n |\log \nu_k(u)| \right) \leq e^{C_2}.$$

Let us now turn towards $\prod_{k=n_3+1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt[\pm]{\mu_k(u)}}$. By Lemma 4.1, $\log \mu_n(u) = \log(1 - (1 - \mu_n(u)))$ is well-defined for any $n > n_3$ and any $u \in U^s$. By the property (NHB1) of U^s it follows that Theorem 5 of [7] holds. Hence by the estimate for $|1 - \mu_n(u)|$ of Lemma 4.1, there exists $C_3 \geq 1$ so that

$$\sum_{k=n_3+1}^{\infty} |\log \mu_k(u)| \leq C_3, \quad \forall u \in U^s.$$

This implies that for any $u \in U^s$ and $n > n_3$

$$\left| \prod_{k=n_3+1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt[\pm]{\mu_k(u)}} \right| \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=n_3+1}^n |\log \mu_k(u)| \right) \leq e^{C_3/2},$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Combining Corollary 5.1, formula (63), Proposition 3.1, and Lemma 5.1, we arrive at

Proposition 5.2. *Let $s > -1/2$, $M > 0$, and $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $0 < \|w\|_s \leq M$ and let U^s be the neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^s$, introduced at the beginning of the section (cf. (58)). Then*

$$\Phi : U^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad u \mapsto ((\Phi_{-n}(u))_{n \geq 1}, (\Phi_n(u))_{n \geq 1}),$$

is analytic.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1, stated in Section 1, and then use it to show Theorem 1.2.

By [8, Theorem 1.1] (near zero) and Proposition 5.2 (away from zero), the Birkhoff map

$$\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}, u \mapsto ((\overline{\Phi_{-n}(\bar{u})})_{n \leq -1}, (\Phi_n(u))_{n \geq 1})$$

is real analytic for any $s > -1/2$, where by (6),

$$\Phi_n(u) = \frac{\langle 1 | f_n(u) \rangle}{\sqrt{\kappa_n(u)}}, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (70)$$

In a first step we prove the following

Proposition 6.1. *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$, the differential of Φ at u , $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$, is a linear isomorphism.*

The proof of Proposition 6.1 is split up into the following three lemmas.

Lemma 6.1. *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$, $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$, is a Fredholm operator of index 0.*

Lemma 6.2. *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$, is a linear isomorphism.*

Lemma 6.3. *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > 0$, $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$, is a linear isomorphism.*

Lemma 6.3 follows from Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2. We prove it first.

Proof of Lemma 6.3. Let $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > 0$. First note that $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is the restriction of $d_u \Phi : L_{r,0}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{1/2}$ to $H_{r,0}^s$ and hence by Lemma 6.2, $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is one-to-one. By Lemma 6.1, it then follows that $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is a linear isomorphism. \square

Let us now turn to the proof of Lemma 6.2. It uses Lemma 6.1 and the canonical relations, recorded in Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Let $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $-1/2 < s \leq 0$. According to Lemma 6.1, $d_u \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$, is a Fredholm operator of index 0. Hence it is a linear isomorphism, once we show that it is onto, or equivalently, that the transpose $(d_u \Phi)^\top$ of $d_u \Phi$ is one-to-one. Note that $(d_u \Phi)^\top : \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{-s-1/2} \rightarrow H_{r,0}^{-s}$ is given by

$$(d_u \Phi)^\top(\bar{z}, z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \bar{z}_n \nabla_0 \bar{\zeta}_n(u) + z_n \nabla_0 \zeta_n(u), \quad z = (z_n)_{n \geq 1} \in h_+^{-s-1/2},$$

where $\bar{z} = (\bar{z}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and where $\nabla_0 \zeta_n$ is the $L^2_{r,0}$ -gradient of $\zeta_n = \Phi_n$. By Corollary 4.1, $\nabla_0 \zeta_n \in H^s_{c,0}$ and hence $\partial_x \nabla_0 \zeta_n \in H^s_{c,0}$ for any $n \geq 1$. Now assume that $(\bar{z}, z) \in \mathfrak{h}^{-s-1/2}_{r,0}$ is in the kernel of $(d_u \Phi)^\top$, $(d_u \Phi)^\top(\bar{z}, z) = 0$. Taking the inner product with $\partial_x \nabla_0 \zeta_k$, $k \geq 1$, one gets

$$0 = \sum_{n \geq 1} \bar{z}_n \langle \nabla_0 \bar{\zeta}_n | \partial_x \nabla_0 \zeta_k \rangle + z_n \langle \nabla_0 \zeta_n | \partial_x \nabla_0 \zeta_k \rangle, \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (71)$$

Since by Proposition 4.1,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \partial_x \nabla_0 \bar{\zeta}_k \cdot \nabla_0 \zeta_n dx = \{\bar{\zeta}_k, \zeta_n\} = i\delta_{kn}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \partial_x \nabla_0 \bar{\zeta}_k \cdot \nabla_0 \bar{\zeta}_n dx = \{\bar{\zeta}_k, \bar{\zeta}_n\} = 0,$$

it then follows from (71) that $z_k = 0$ for any $k \geq 1$ and hence $z = 0$. This shows that $(d_u \Phi)^\top$ is one-to-one. \square

It remains to prove Lemma 6.1. First we need to make some preliminary considerations. We begin by computing

$$d_u \Phi_n[v] = \langle \nabla_0 \zeta_n(u), v \rangle = \langle \nabla_0 \zeta_n(u) | v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^s_{r,0}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

By (70) we have

$$\langle \nabla_0 \zeta_n(u) | v \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta \kappa_n}{\kappa_n(u)} \zeta_n(u) + \frac{\langle 1 | \delta f_n \rangle}{\sqrt{\kappa_n(u)}}, \quad (72)$$

where $\delta \kappa_n = d_u \kappa_n[v]$ and similarly, $\delta f_n = d_u f_n[v]$. The latter can be computed as follows. From $(L_u - \lambda_n) f_n(u) = 0$, one gets

$$(L_u - \lambda_n) \delta f_n - T_v f_n - (\delta \lambda_n) f_n = 0,$$

where for notational convenience, we do not always indicate the dependence on u and v . Taking the inner product of both sides of the latter identity with f_n and using that L_u is self-adjoint, one gets

$$0 - \langle T_v f_n | f_n \rangle - (\delta \lambda_n) \langle f_n | f_n \rangle = 0.$$

Since $\langle f_n | f_n \rangle = 1$ one concludes that $\delta \lambda_n = -\langle T_v f_n | f_n \rangle$ and therefore

$$(L_u - \lambda_n) \delta f_n = T_v f_n - \langle T_v f_n | f_n \rangle f_n = P_n^\perp T_v f_n,$$

where $P_n^\perp \equiv P_n(u)^\perp = \text{Id} - P_n(u) : H_+ \rightarrow H_+$. We conclude that

$$P_n^\perp \delta f_n = (L_u - \lambda_n)^{-1} P_n^\perp (T_v f_n)$$

and in turn, with $\delta f_n = P_n \delta f_n + P_n^\perp \delta f_n$,

$$\langle 1 | \delta f_n \rangle = \langle f_n | \delta f_n \rangle \langle 1 | f_n \rangle + \langle P_n^\perp 1 | (L_u - \lambda_n)^{-1} P_n^\perp (T_v f_n) \rangle,$$

where we used that $\langle f_n | P_n \delta f_n \rangle = \langle f_n | \delta f_n \rangle$. Altogether, (72) then becomes

$$\langle \nabla_0 \zeta_n | v \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta \kappa_n}{\kappa_n} \zeta_n + \langle f_n | \delta f_n \rangle \zeta_n + \frac{\langle (L_u - \lambda_n)^{-1} P_n^\perp 1 | P_n^\perp (T_v f_n) \rangle}{\sqrt{\kappa_n}}. \quad (73)$$

For $u \in \mathcal{U}_N$, the latter formula simplifies. For any $n > N$, one has

$$\lambda_n = n, \quad \gamma_n = 0, \quad \langle 1 | f_n \rangle = 0, \quad \zeta_n = 0, \quad f_n = g_\infty e^{inx}, \quad g_\infty(x) = e^{i\partial_x^{-1} u(x)}. \quad (74)$$

In particular, for any $n > N$,

$$1 = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} \langle 1 | f_k \rangle f_k = P_n^\perp 1. \quad (75)$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{\lambda_k - n} = -\frac{1}{n} \frac{\lambda_k}{n(1 - \lambda_k/n)}, \quad \forall 0 \leq k \leq N,$$

it then follows from (75) that

$$(L_u - \lambda_n)^{-1} P_n^\perp 1 = -\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} \frac{\lambda_k}{n(1 - \lambda_k/n)} \langle 1 | f_k \rangle f_k, \quad \forall n > N.$$

This together with (73) and (74) then imply that for any $n > N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla_0 \zeta_n | v \rangle &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \langle v \bar{g}_\infty | e^{inx} \rangle + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \langle v \bar{g}_\infty | e^{inx} \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} \frac{\lambda_k \langle 1 | f_k \rangle}{1 - \lambda_k/n} \langle v \bar{g}_\infty | f_k | e^{inx} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

The latter formula suggests to introduce for any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$,

$$G(u) : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}, \quad v \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \widehat{v \bar{g}_\infty}(n) \right)_{n \geq 1}. \quad (77)$$

Remark 6.1. In [8], we computed the differential of Φ at $u = 0$, to be the weighted Fourier transform

$$d_0 \Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}, \quad v \mapsto \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{|n|}} \widehat{v}(n) \right)_{n \neq 0}.$$

Note that for $u = 0$, $g_\infty \equiv 1$ and hence $(d_0 \Phi_n)_{n \geq 1} = -G(0)$.

One verifies in a straightforward way that $G(u) \in \mathcal{L}(H_{r,0}^s, \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2})$ and that

$$G : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_{r,0}^s, \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}), u \mapsto G(u),$$

is continuous with respect to the operator norm topology on $\mathcal{L}(H_{r,0}^s, \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2})$. Define $\pi_{r,0} : \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^s$, $(z_n)_{n \neq 0} \mapsto (z_n)_{n \geq 1}$, and for any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$, $s > -1/2$,

$$A(u) := \pi_{r,0} d_u \Phi + G(u). \quad (78)$$

It follows that $A(u) \in \mathcal{L}(H_{r,0}^s, \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2})$ and that

$$A : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_{r,0}^s, \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}), u \mapsto A(u)$$

is continuous.

Lemma 6.4. *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$, $A(u) : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is a compact operator.*

Proof. Let $s > -1/2$. Since the set of compact operators $H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{L}(H_{r,0}^s, \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2})$, the operator $A : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H_{r,0}^s, \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2})$ is continuous, and $\cup_{N \geq 0} \mathcal{U}_N$ is dense in $H_{r,0}^s$ (cf. [5, Theorem 1], [6, Theorem 6, Proposition 5]), it suffices to prove that for any $u \in \mathcal{U}_N$, $N \geq 1$, $A(u) : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is compact. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}_N$ for some $N \geq 1$. By (76) and (78), the components $A_n(u)[v]$ of $A(u)[v] = (A_n(u)[v])_{n \geq 1}$ with $n > N$ can be written as

$$A_n(u)[v] = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}\right) G_n(u)[v] - \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq N} \frac{\lambda_k \langle 1|f_k \rangle}{1 - \lambda_k/n} \langle v \bar{g}_\infty f_k | e^{inx} \rangle.$$

We estimate the two terms separately. By the product representation of κ_n (cf. [5, Corollary 3.4]) and since $\gamma_n = 0$ for $n > N$,

$$n\kappa_n = \frac{n}{n - \lambda_0} \prod_{1 \leq p \leq N} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_p}{n - \lambda_p}\right), \quad \forall n > N.$$

Since $-\lambda_0 = |\lambda_0|$ (cf. (74)), one gets for any $n > N$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} &= \left(\frac{n + |\lambda_0|}{n}\right)^{1/2} \left(\prod_{1 \leq p \leq N} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_p}{n - \lambda_p}\right)\right)^{-1/2} \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{|\lambda_0|}{n}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq N} \log\left(1 + \frac{\gamma_p}{n - \lambda_p}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

By the elementary estimates for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \geq 0$,

$$|e^x - 1| = \left| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} e^{tx} dt \right| \leq |x| e^{|x|}, \quad |\log(1 + y)| = \left| \int_0^y \frac{1}{1+t} dt \right| \leq y,$$

it then follows with

$$x = \frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{|\lambda_0|}{n}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq N} \log\left(1 + \frac{\gamma_p}{n - \lambda_p}\right)$$

that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} - 1 \right| \leq |x|e^{|x|} \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\lambda_0|}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq N} \frac{\gamma_p}{1 - p/n} \right) e^x,$$

where we used that for $0 \leq p \leq N$, $\lambda_p \leq p$ (cf. (74)). Hence there exists a constant $C_1 \geq 1$ so that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{C_1}{n}, \quad \forall n > N.$$

This implies that for u given as above,

$$H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{>N}^{s+1/2+1}, \quad v \mapsto \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}\right) G_n(u)[v] \right)_{n>N}$$

is a bounded map. Furthermore, for any $0 \leq k \leq N$,

$$H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{>N}^{s+1/2+1}, \quad v \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} \frac{\lambda_k \langle 1|f_k \rangle}{1 - \lambda_k/n} \langle v \bar{g}_\infty f_k | e^{inx} \rangle \right)_{n>N}$$

is a bounded map as well. Since the embedding $\mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2+1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is compact, we then conclude that

$$H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}, \quad v \mapsto (A_n(u)[v])_{n \geq 1}$$

is compact. \square

For the proof of Lemma 6.1 we need to make some further preparations. For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$, let

$$T_{\bar{g}_\infty} : H_+^s \rightarrow H_+^s, \quad f \mapsto \Pi(\bar{g}_\infty f), \quad H_{\bar{g}_\infty} : H_-^s \rightarrow H_+^s, \quad f \mapsto \Pi(\bar{g}_\infty f), \quad (79)$$

denote the Toeplitz operator and respectively, the Hankel operator with symbol \bar{g}_∞ . Here H_-^s denotes the complex conjugate of the Hardy space H_+^s ,

$$H_-^s := \{f \in H_c^s : \hat{f}(n) = 0 \forall n \geq 1\}.$$

Furthermore let

$$H_{+,0}^s := \{f \in H_+^s : \langle f|1 \rangle = 0\}$$

and introduce the inclusion $\iota_+ : H_{+,0}^s \rightarrow H_+^s$, the projection

$$\Pi_{\geq 1} : H_+^s \rightarrow H_{+,0}^s, \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} \hat{v}(n) e^{inx} \mapsto \sum_{n \geq 1} \hat{v}(n) e^{inx},$$

and the following version of the restriction of the Toeplitz operator to $H_{+,0}^s$,

$$T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)} := \Pi_{\geq 1} T_{\bar{g}_\infty} \iota_+ : H_{+,0}^s \rightarrow H_{+,0}^s. \quad (80)$$

It follows from the well known fact that the Toeplitz operator $T_{\bar{g}_\infty} : H_+^s \rightarrow H_+^s$ is a linear isomorphism (cf. e.g. [15, Theorem 10, p 309]) that the same is true for $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)}$. For the convenience of the reader we include a proof.

Lemma 6.5. *For any $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$, the following holds:*

- (i) $T_{\bar{g}_\infty} : H_+^s \rightarrow H_+^s$ is a linear isomorphism.
- (ii) $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)} : H_{+,0}^s \rightarrow H_{+,0}^s$ is a linear isomorphism.
- (iii) $H_{\bar{g}_\infty}^s : H_-^s \rightarrow H_+^s$ is a compact operator.

Remark 6.2. (i) *The Hankel operator $H_{\bar{g}_\infty}$ can be shown to have smoothing properties which imply that it is compact – see e.g. [9, Appendix A]. However, for our purposes, such smoothing properties are not needed.*

(ii) *The inverse $(T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)})^{-1} : H_{+,0}^s \rightarrow H_{+,0}^s$ of $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)}$ is given for any $f \in H_{+,0}^s$ by*

$$(T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)})^{-1}(f) = f_1 - \langle f_1 | 1 \rangle g_+, \quad f_1 := g_+ \Pi[g_- f],$$

where g_\pm are defined in (81) below.

Proof. Let u be in $H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$. Then $g_\infty = e^{i\partial_x^{-1}u(x)}$ is an element in H_c^{s+1} , hence in particular it is continuous. For notational convenience, we write g instead g_∞ and decompose it as

$$g = g_+ \cdot g_-, \quad g_+(x) := e^{i\partial_x^{-1}\Pi u(x)}, \quad g_-(x) := e^{i\partial_x^{-1}(\text{Id}-\Pi)u(x)}. \quad (81)$$

Since u is real valued one has

$$\bar{g}_\infty = e^{-i\partial_x^{-1}u(x)} = e^{-i\partial_x^{-1}\Pi u(x)} e^{-i\partial_x^{-1}(\text{Id}-\Pi)u(x)} = \frac{1}{g_+} \frac{1}{g_-}.$$

Note that $|g_\pm(x)| = 1$ for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$. Furthermore, using the Taylor expansion of e^{iy} at $y = 0$ and Lemma 2.2(ii), one sees that $g_\pm \in H_\pm^{s+1}$ and $\frac{1}{g_\pm} \in H_\pm^{s+1}$.

(i) Since $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}$ is bounded, it suffices to show that it is bijective. First let us show that $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}$ is one-to-one. Assume that $T_{\bar{g}_\infty} f = 0$ for some f in H_+^s . It means that there exists $h \in H_c^s$ with $\Pi(h) = 0$ so that $\bar{g}_\infty f = h$. Multiplying both sides of the latter equation by g_- , yields $\frac{1}{g_+} f = g_- h$. Since g_- is in H_-^{s+1} it follows that $\Pi(g_- h) = 0$. On the other hand, $\Pi(\frac{1}{g_+} f) = \frac{1}{g_+} f$, implying that $\frac{1}{g_+} f = 0$ and hence $f = 0$.

To show that $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}$ is onto, let $f_0 \in H_+^s$ and define

$$f := g_+ \Pi[g_- f_0] \in H_+^s.$$

We claim that f is a solution of $T_{\bar{g}_\infty} f = f_0$. Indeed, by the definition of f there exists $h \in H_c^s$ with $\Pi(h) = 0$ so that $\frac{1}{g_+} f = g_- f_0 + h$. Multiplying both sides

of the equation by $\frac{1}{g_-}$, one obtains $\bar{g}_\infty f = f_0 + \frac{1}{g_-}h$. Since $\Pi(\frac{1}{g_-}h) = 0$ it then follows that

$$T_{\bar{g}_\infty} f = \Pi(\bar{g}_\infty f) = \Pi f_0 + 0 = f_0.$$

(ii) Using the Taylor expansion of e^{iy} and taking into account that $\langle u|1 \rangle = 0$, one sees that $\Pi g_-^{-1} = 1$ and $\Pi g_- = 1$. It then follows from item (i) that

$$T_{\bar{g}_\infty} g_+ = \Pi\left(\frac{1}{g_-}\right) = 1, \quad T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{-1} 1 = g_+ \Pi g_- = g_+. \quad (82)$$

Let $E_+^s := T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{-1}(H_{+,0}^s)$. Since by item (i), $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{-1} : H_+^s \rightarrow H_+^s$ is a linear isomorphism, any element $f \in H_{+,0}^s$ can be written in a unique way as a linear combination of g_+ and an element f_1 of E_+^s , $f = c g_+ + f_1$ where $c = -\langle f_1|1 \rangle$.

First let us show that $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)}$ is one-to-one. Assume that $f \in H_{+,0}^s$ with $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)} f = 0$. Representing f as $f = -\langle f_1|1 \rangle g_+ + f_1$ with $f_1 \in E_+^s$, it then follows from (82) that $T_{\bar{g}_\infty} f = -\langle f_1|1 \rangle + T_{\bar{g}_\infty} f_1$, implying that $0 = T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)} f = T_{\bar{g}_\infty} f_1$. Hence by item (i), $f_1 = 0$ and in turn $f = 0$.

To see that $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)}$ is onto, take $h \in H_{+,0}^s$ and let $f_1 := T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{-1} h$. Then $f := -\langle f_1|1 \rangle g_+ + f_1$ is an element in $H_{+,0}^s$, and $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)} f = T_{\bar{g}_\infty} f_1 = h$.

(iii) To prove that the Hankel operator $H_{\bar{g}_\infty}$ is compact, we approximate \bar{g}_∞ by $\bar{g}_{\infty,j} := \sum_{k \leq j} \widehat{\bar{g}_\infty}(k) e^{ikx}$, $j \geq 1$. One has $\bar{g}_\infty = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \bar{g}_{\infty,j}$ in H_c^{s+1} and hence $H_{\bar{g}_{\infty,j}} \rightarrow H_{\bar{g}_\infty}$ in operator norm (cf. Lemma 2.2, Remark 2.1). Since $H_{\bar{g}_{\infty,j}}$ is an operator of rank $j + 1$, it is compact and hence so is $H_{\bar{g}_\infty}$. \square

We are now ready to prove Lemma 6.1.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. By Lemma 6.4, it remains to prove that for any given $u \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$, $G(u) : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is a Fredholm operator of index 0. For any $v \in H_{r,0}^s$, write $v = \Pi v + (\text{Id} - \Pi)v$. Hence by the definition (77) of $G(u)[v]$, one has

$$G(u)[v] = \mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+(\Pi[\bar{g}_\infty \Pi v]) + \mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+(\Pi[\bar{g}_\infty (\text{Id} - \Pi)v])$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+$ denotes the weighted partial Fourier transform

$$\mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+ : H_c^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}, \quad f \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{\langle n \rangle^{1/2}} \widehat{f}(n) \right)_{n \geq 1}.$$

In view of the definitions (79) and (80), $G(u)[v]$ can be expressed in terms of the restriction $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)}$ of the Toeplitz operator $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}$ and the Hankel operator $H_{\bar{g}_\infty}$,

$$G(u)[v] = \mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+(T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)}[\Pi v]) + \mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+(H_{\bar{g}_\infty}[(\text{Id} - \Pi)v]).$$

By Lemma 6.5(ii), $T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)} : H_{+,0}^s \rightarrow H_{+,0}^s$ is a linear isomorphism and hence so is

$$H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}, \quad v \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+(T_{\bar{g}_\infty}^{(1)}[\Pi v]).$$

Since by Lemma 6.5(iii),

$$H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}, v \mapsto \mathcal{F}_{1/2}^+(H_{\bar{g}_\infty}[(\text{Id} - \Pi)v])$$

is compact, we then conclude that $G(u) : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is a Fredholm operator of index 0. \square

All the pieces of the proof of Theorem 1.1 are now in place and it remains to put them together.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $s > -1/2$. By [8, Theorem 1.1] (near 0) and Proposition 5.2 (away from 0), the Birkhoff map (cf. (59))

$$\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}, u \mapsto ((\overline{\Phi_{-n}(\bar{u})})_{n \leq -1}, (\Phi_n(u))_{n \geq 1})$$

is real analytic. By Proposition 6.1, $\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is a local diffeomorphism. Finally, by [5, Theorem 1.1] ($s = 0$) and [6, Theorem 6, Proposition 5] ($s > -1/2$), $\Phi : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is bijective. \square

To prove Theorem 1.2, we follow the strategy developed in [8, Section 6] for showing the results of Theorem 1.2 near 0. Recall that the Benjamin-Ono equation is globally well-posed in $H_{r,0}^s$ for any $s > -1/2$ (cf. [6] for details and references). For any given $t \in \mathbb{R}$, denote by \mathcal{S}_0^t the flow map of the Benjamin-Ono equation on $H_{r,0}^s$, $\mathcal{S}_0^t : H_{r,0}^s \rightarrow H_{r,0}^s$ and by $\mathcal{S}_B^t : \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ the version of \mathcal{S}_0^t obtained, when expressed in the Birkhoff coordinates $(\zeta_n)_{n \geq 1}$. To describe \mathcal{S}_B^t more explicitly, recall that the n th frequency ω_n , $n \geq 1$, of the Benjamin-Ono equation is the real valued, affine function defined on $\mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ (cf. [5], [6]),

$$\omega_n(\zeta) = n^2 - 2 \sum_{k=1}^n k |\zeta_k|^2 - 2n \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |\zeta_k|^2. \quad (83)$$

For any initial data $\zeta(0) \in \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ with $s > -1/2$, $\mathcal{S}_B^t(\zeta(0))$ is given by

$$\mathcal{S}_B^t(\zeta(0)) := (\zeta_n(0) e^{it\omega_n(\zeta(0))})_{n \geq 1}. \quad (84)$$

The key ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1.2(i) is the following result, established in [8, Lemma 6.1].

Lemma 6.6. *For any $t \neq 0$ and any $-1/2 < s < 0$, $\mathcal{S}_B^t : \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_+^{s+1/2}$ is nowhere locally uniformly continuous. In particular, it is not locally Lipschitz.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2(i). The claimed result follows directly from Lemma 6.6 and Theorem 1.1. \square

To outline the proof of Theorem 1.2(ii), we first make some preliminary considerations. Denote by $\ell_{c,0}^\infty$ the space $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, \mathbb{C})$ of bounded complex

valued sequences $z = (z_n)_{n \neq 0}$, endowed with the supremum norm. It is a subspace of ℓ_c^∞ and a Banach algebra with respect to the multiplication,

$$\ell_{c,0}^\infty \times \ell_{c,0}^\infty \rightarrow \ell_{c,0}^\infty, \quad (z, w) \mapsto z \cdot w := (z_n w_n)_{n \neq 0}. \quad (85)$$

Similarly, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the bilinear map

$$\mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^s \times \ell_{c,0}^\infty \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^s, \quad (z, w) \mapsto z \cdot w, \quad (86)$$

is bounded. For any given $T > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, introduce the complex Banach spaces

$$\mathcal{C}_{T,s} := C([-T, T], \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^s) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_{T,\infty} := C([-T, T], \ell_{c,0}^\infty),$$

endowed with the supremum norm. Elements of these spaces are denoted by ξ , or more explicitly, $\xi(t) = (\xi_n(t))_{n \neq 0}$. The multiplication in (85) and (86) induces in a natural way the following bounded, bilinear maps (cf. [8, Section 6])

$$\mathcal{C}_{T,\infty} \times \mathcal{C}_{T,\infty} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{T,\infty}, \quad \mathcal{C}_{T,s} \times \mathcal{C}_{T,\infty} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{T,s}, \quad \mathcal{C}_{T,s} \times \ell_{c,0}^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{T,s}. \quad (87)$$

The following lemma can be shown in a straightforward way.

Lemma 6.7. *The map $\mathcal{C}_{T,\infty} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{T,\infty}$, $\xi \mapsto e^\xi := (e^{\xi_n})_{n \neq 0}$, is analytic.*

For any $s > -1/2$ and any $n \geq 1$, the n th frequency (83) of the Benjamin-Ono equation extends from $\mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ to an analytic function on $\mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2}$ given by

$$\omega_n(\zeta) = n^2 + \Omega_n(\zeta), \quad (88)$$

where

$$\Omega_n(\zeta) := -2 \sum_{k=1}^n k \zeta_{-k} \zeta_k - 2n \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \zeta_{-k} \zeta_k, \quad \zeta = (\zeta_k)_{k \neq 0} \in \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2}. \quad (89)$$

For $n \leq -1$ we set

$$\Omega_n(\zeta) := -\Omega_{-n}(\zeta), \quad \zeta \in \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2}. \quad (90)$$

In [8, Lemma 6.3] we prove the following

Lemma 6.8. *For any $s \geq 0$ the map*

$$\Omega : \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2} \rightarrow \ell_{c,0}^\infty, \quad \zeta \mapsto (\Omega_n(\zeta))_{n \neq 0}, \quad (91)$$

is analytic.

We now consider the curves $\xi^{(1)}, \xi^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_{T,\infty}$, defined by

$$\xi^{(1)} : [-T, T] \rightarrow \ell_{c,0}^\infty, \quad \xi_n^{(1)}(t) := e^{i \operatorname{sign}(n) n^2 t}, \quad n \neq 0, \quad (92)$$

and, respectively,

$$\xi^{(2)} : [-T, T] \rightarrow \ell_{c,0}^\infty, \quad \xi_n^{(2)}(t) := t, \quad n \neq 0. \quad (93)$$

The following corollary, proved in [8, Section 6], follows from Lemma 6.7, Lemma 6.8, and the boundedness of the bilinear maps in (87).

Corollary 6.1. *For any $s \geq 0$, the map (cf. (84))*

$$\mathcal{S}_{B,T} : \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{T,s+1/2}, \quad \zeta \mapsto \zeta \cdot \xi^{(1)} \cdot e^{i\Omega(\zeta) \cdot \xi^{(2)}}, \quad (94)$$

is analytic.

Proof of Theorem 1.2(ii). Let $s \geq 0$, $T > 0$, and $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ and define $\xi := \Phi(w) \in \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$. Since the curve $t \mapsto \mathcal{S}_B^t(\xi) \in \mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$ is continuous,

$$K := \{\mathcal{S}_B^t(\Phi(w)) \mid |t| \leq T\}$$

is compact in $\mathfrak{h}_{r,0}^{s+1/2}$. Choose an open neighborhood V of K in $\mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2}$ so that Φ^{-1} extends to an analytic map $V \rightarrow H_{c,0}^s$ and has the property that $\Phi^{-1} : V \rightarrow U := \Phi^{-1}(V)$ is a bianalytic diffeomorphism. Since K is compact there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ so that for any $\zeta \in K$ the ball $\{\zeta' \in \mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2} \mid \|\zeta' - \zeta\|_{s+1/2} < \varepsilon\}$ is contained in V . By Corollary 6.1, there exists a neighborhood V_ξ of ξ in $\mathfrak{h}_{c,0}^{s+1/2}$ so that for any $\zeta \in V_\xi$ and any $t \in [-T, T]$, $\|\mathcal{S}_B^t(\zeta) - \mathcal{S}_B^t(\xi)\|_{s+1/2} < \varepsilon$ and hence $\mathcal{S}_B^t(\zeta) \in V$. By shrinking V_ξ , if needed, we can assume that $V_\xi \subseteq V$. Hence $U_w := \Phi^{-1}(V_\xi)$ is well-defined and an open neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^s$. Furthermore, for any $u \in U_w$ and $|t| \leq T$, $(\Phi^{-1} \circ \mathcal{S}_{B,T}(t) \circ \Phi)(u)$ is well-defined. The claimed result then follows from Corollary 6.1, Theorem 1.1, and from Lemma 6.9 below. \square

For the convenience of the reader, we record the following lemma of [8, Section 6], used in the proof of Theorem 1.2(ii). To state it, we first need to introduce some more notation. Let X be a complex Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\| \equiv \|\cdot\|_X$. For any $T > 0$, denote by $C([-T, T], X)$ the Banach space of continuous functions $x : [-T, T] \rightarrow X$, endowed with the supremum norm $\|x\|_{T,X} := \sup_{t \in [-T, T]} \|x(t)\|$. Furthermore, for any open neighborhood U of X , denote by $C([-T, T], U)$ the subset of $C([-T, T], X)$, consisting of continuous functions $[-T, T] \rightarrow X$ with values in U . The following lemma can be shown in a straightforward way. For the convenience of the reader it is proved in [8, Section 6].

Lemma 6.9. *Let $f : U \rightarrow Y$ be an analytic map from an open neighborhood U in X where X and Y are complex Banach spaces. Then for any $T > 0$, the associated pushforward map*

$$f_* : C([-T, T], U) \rightarrow C([-T, T], Y), \quad [t \mapsto x(t)] \mapsto [t \mapsto f(x(t))],$$

is analytic.

The proof of the Addendum to Theorem 1.2 (ii), stated in Section 1, is proved as its local version in [8].

7 Analyticity of the delta map

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 5.1 of Section 5, saying that for any $w \in H_{r,0}^s$ with $s > -1/2$, the map

$$\delta : U_w^\sigma \rightarrow \ell_{>n_2}^1, \quad u \mapsto (\delta_n(u))_{n>n_2},$$

is analytic where $\delta_n(u)$ is given by (65). We recall that $U^\sigma \equiv U_w^\sigma$, $\sigma = \min\{s, 0\}$, is the neighborhood of w in $H_{c,0}^\sigma$, satisfying the properties (NBH1) - (NBH2), introduced in Section 4, and that $n_2 \geq n_0 > N$ is given by Lemma 4.1. Note that without loss of generality, we can assume that $-1/2 < s \leq 0$, implying that $\sigma = s$ and hence throughout this section we assume that $-1/2 < s \leq 0$.

The proof of Proposition 5.1 is based on a vanishing lemma, which has been established in [8]. We already know (cf. Section 5) that each component of δ ,

$$\delta_n(u) = \langle P_n(u)(SP_{n-1}(u)f_{n-1} - f_n) | f_n \rangle \in \mathbb{C}, \quad n > n_2, \quad (95)$$

is analytic on U^s , where $f_n \equiv f_n(w_N)$. Hence it suffices to show that there exists $n_3 \geq n_2$ so that

$$\sum_{n>n_3} |\delta_n(u)| < \infty$$

locally uniformly for u in U^s . First we make some preliminary considerations. Recall that we write $u \in U^s$ as $u = w_N + v$. For any $\lambda \in \partial D_{n-1}$ and any $n \geq n_2 > N$, one has by the resolvent identity,

$$(L_u - \lambda)^{-1} = (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} + (L_u - \lambda)^{-1} T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1}. \quad (96)$$

Since $P_{n-1}(u) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} (L_u - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda$ and $Sf_{n-1} = f_n$, it then follows by

Cauchy's theorem that

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} S(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_{n-1} d\lambda = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \frac{1}{n-1-\lambda} d\lambda f_n = f_n$$

and hence by (95) and (96),

$$\delta_n(u) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \langle P_n(u) S(L_u - \lambda)^{-1} T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_{n-1} | f_n \rangle d\lambda.$$

Expanding

$$(L_u - \lambda)^{-1} = (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (\text{Id} - T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \quad (97)$$

in the formula above in terms of the Neumann series for $(\text{Id} - T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^{-1}$ and writing P_n for $P_n(u)$, one obtains

$$\delta_n(u) = -\sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \langle P_n S(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_{n-1} | f_n \rangle d\lambda.$$

By expressing $(T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^m f_{n-1}$ in terms of the basis f_n , $n \geq 0$, one obtains

$$\delta_n(u) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k[1, m]) \langle P_n S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle, \quad (98)$$

where

$$k[1, m] := k_1, \dots, k_m.$$

The coefficients $C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k[1, m])$ can be computed as follows. For $m = 1$ one has

$$(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_{n-1} = \sum_{k_1 \geq 0} \frac{\langle v f_{n-1} | f_{k_1} \rangle}{(n-1-\lambda)(\lambda_{k_1} - \lambda)} f_{k_1},$$

where $\lambda_{k_1} \equiv \lambda_{k_1}(w_N)$ and where we used that $\lambda_{n-1} = n-1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \langle P_n S (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} f_{n-1} | f_n \rangle d\lambda \\ = \sum_{k_1 \geq 0} C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k_1) \langle P_n S f_{k_1} | f_n \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k_1) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \frac{\langle v f_{n-1} | f_{k_1} \rangle}{(n-1-\lambda)(\lambda_{k_1} - \lambda)} d\lambda.$$

Next let us compute the term $m = 2$ in (98). One has

$$(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^2 f_{n-1} = (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ j=1,2}} \frac{\langle v f_{n-1} | f_{k_1} \rangle \langle v f_{k_1} | f_{k_2} \rangle}{(n-1-\lambda)(\lambda_{k_1} - \lambda)} f_{k_2},$$

yielding

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \langle P_n S (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (T_v (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^2 f_{n-1} | f_n \rangle d\lambda \\ = \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ j=1,2}} C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k_1, k_2) \langle P_n S f_{k_2} | f_n \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k_1, k_2) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \frac{\langle v f_{n-1} | f_{k_1} \rangle \langle v f_{k_1} | f_{k_2} \rangle}{(n-1-\lambda)(\lambda_{k_1} - \lambda)(\lambda_{k_2} - \lambda)} d\lambda.$$

Arguing similarly as in the cases $m = 1$ and $m = 2$, for any $m \geq 1$ and $(k_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$, the coefficient $C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k[1, m])$ can be computed as

$$C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k[1, m]) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_{n-1}} \frac{\langle v f_{n-1} | f_{k_1} \rangle \cdots \langle v f_{k_{m-1}} | f_{k_m} \rangle}{(n-1-\lambda) \prod_{j=1}^m (\lambda_{k_j} - \lambda)} d\lambda.$$

By passing to the variable $\mu := \lambda - n + 1$ in the contour integral above we get

$$C_{u,n-1}(n-1, k[1, m]) = A(0, k_{\lambda;n-1}[1, m])B_u(n-1, k[1, m])$$

where for any $\ell \geq 1$, $k_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq j \leq \ell$,

$$B_u(k[1, \ell]) := \langle v f_{k_1} | f_{k_2} \rangle \langle v f_{k_2} | f_{k_3} \rangle \cdots \langle v f_{k_{\ell-1}} | f_{k_\ell} \rangle$$

and any z_1, \dots, z_ℓ with $z_j \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \partial D_0$,

$$A(z_1, \dots, z_\ell) := -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_0} \frac{d\mu}{\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (z_j - \mu)} \quad (99)$$

and

$$k_\lambda[1, m] := \lambda_{k_1}, \dots, \lambda_{k_m}, \quad k_{\lambda;j}[1, m] := \lambda_{k_1} - j, \dots, \lambda_{k_m} - j.$$

For the sequel, it is convenient to define the corresponding sequences when $[1, m]$ is replaced by $(1, m)$, $(1, m)$, \dots ,

$$k(1, m) := k[2, m], \quad k(1, m) := k[2, m-1], \quad \dots \quad .$$

Altogether, we obtain the following formula,

$$\delta_n(u) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} A(0, k_{\lambda;n-1}[1, m])B_u(n-1, k[1, m])\langle P_n S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle. \quad (100)$$

Now let us turn to the expression $\langle P_n S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle$. An expansion of P_n corresponding to the one of P_{n-1} yields

$$\langle P_n S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle = -\sum_{r \geq 0} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \langle (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} (T_v(L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1})^r S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle d\lambda. \quad (101)$$

For the term $r = 0$ in the latter series, one has

$$\langle (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle = \frac{\langle S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle}{n - \lambda} = \frac{\langle f_{k_m} | f_{n-1} \rangle}{n - \lambda}$$

where we used that $S^* f_n = e^{-ix} f_n = f_{n-1}$ since $n-1 \geq N$. Hence by Cauchy's theorem

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \langle (L_{w_N} - \lambda)^{-1} S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle d\lambda = \delta_{k_m(n-1)}.$$

To compute the terms with $r \geq 1$ in the latter series, we distinguish between the case $k_m \geq N$ and the case $k_m < N$.

Case $k_m \geq N$. In this case, $S f_{k_m} = S e^{ik_m x} g_\infty = f_{k_m+1}$ and hence by (101),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P_n S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle &= \delta_{k_m(n-1)} + C_{u,n}(k_m + 1, n) \\ &\quad + \sum_{r \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}} C_{u,n}(k_m + 1, \ell[1, r], n), \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

where passing to the integration variable $\mu := \lambda - n$, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{u,n}(k_m + 1, n) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle v f_{k_m+1} | f_n \rangle}{(k_m + 1 - \lambda)(n - \lambda)} d\lambda \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_0} \frac{\langle v f_{k_m+1} | f_n \rangle}{(k_m + 1 - n - \mu) - \mu} d\mu = A(k_m + 1 - n, 0) B_u(k_m + 1, n). \end{aligned}$$

Passing from r to $r - 1$ as summation index in the sum (102) one gets for $r \geq 1$,

$$C_{u,n}(k_m + 1, \ell[1, r], n) = A(k_m + 1 - n, \ell_{\lambda;n}[1, r], 0) \cdot B_u(k_m + 1, \ell[1, r], n).$$

Writing k_{m+j} for ℓ_j , $1 \leq j \leq r$, and setting $k[j, j'] := \emptyset$ for any $j > j'$, we arrive at the following formula in the case $k_m \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P_n S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle &= \delta_{k_m(n-1)} + \\ &\sum_{r \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ m < j \leq m+r}} A(k_m + 1 - n, k_{\lambda;n}(m, m+r], 0) \cdot B_u(k_m + 1, k(m, m+r], n). \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Case $k_m < N$. For convenience we set $\alpha := k_m$. Then $0 \leq \alpha < N$. Since $\langle S f_\alpha | f_{k+1} \rangle = \langle f_\alpha | f_k \rangle = 0$ for any $k \geq N$, one has

$$\langle P_n S f_\alpha | f_n \rangle = \sum_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \langle S f_\alpha | f_\beta \rangle \langle P_n f_\beta | f_n \rangle. \quad (104)$$

We now expand $\langle P_n f_\beta | f_n \rangle$, $0 \leq \beta \leq N$. Since $\langle f_\beta | f_n \rangle = 0$ for any $n > N$ one infers from (97) that

$$\langle P_n f_\beta | f_n \rangle = \sum_{r \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}} C_{u,n}(\beta, \ell[1, r], n).$$

For $r = 0$ (recall that by definition, $\ell[1, 0] = \emptyset$)

$$C_{u,n}(\beta, n) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle v f_\beta | f_n \rangle}{(\lambda_\beta - \lambda)(n - \lambda)} d\lambda = A(\lambda_\beta - n, 0) B_u(\beta, n)$$

and for any $r \geq 1$,

$$C_{u,n}(\beta, \ell[1, r], n) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D_n} \frac{\langle v f_\beta | f_{\ell_1} \rangle \cdots \langle v f_{\ell_r} | f_n \rangle}{(\lambda_\beta - \lambda)(n - \lambda) \prod_{j=1}^r (\lambda_{\ell_j} - \lambda)} d\lambda.$$

By passing to the integration variable $\mu := \lambda - n$ in the contour integrals, one arrives at

$$\langle P_n f_\beta | f_n \rangle = \sum_{r \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}} A(\lambda_\beta - n, \ell_{\lambda;n}[1, r], 0) \cdot B_u(\beta, \ell[1, r], n). \quad (105)$$

For notational convenience, we suppress u in quantities such as B_u or $\delta_n(u)$ in the sequel. By combining (100) and (103) - (105), one sees that

$$\delta_n = I_n + II_n \quad (106)$$

where

$$I_n := \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m]) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, m]) \delta_{k_m(n-1)},$$

$$II_n := \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m]) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, m]) (\langle P_n S f_{k_m} | f_n \rangle - \delta_{k_m(n-1)}).$$

We rewrite I_n and II_n as

$$I_n = \delta_n^{(0)} + \mathcal{R}_n^{(0)}, \quad II_n = \delta_n^{(1)} + \mathcal{R}_n^{(1)}, \quad (107)$$

with $\delta_n^{(0)}$, $\delta_n^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{R}_n^{(0)}$, and $\mathcal{R}_n^{(1)}$ defined as follows: the term $\delta_n^{(0)}$ is obtained by passing from m to $d := m-1$ as summation index and using that for $d=0$, $A(0, 0) \cdot B(n-1, n-1) = 0$,

$$\delta_n^{(0)} := \sum_{d \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq N, 1 \leq j \leq d \\ (k_{d+1} = n-1)}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, d], 0) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, d], n-1), \quad (108)$$

whereas

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n^{(1)} := & \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1 \\ r \geq 0}} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0, 1 \leq j \leq m \\ k_m \geq N}} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ m < j \leq m+r}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m]) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, m]) \\ & \cdot A(k_m + 1 - n, k_{\lambda; n}(m, m+r], 0) \cdot B(k_m + 1, k(m, m+r), n), \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{(0)} := \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}, \quad \mathcal{R}_n^{(1)} := \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha < N \\ 0 \leq \beta \leq N}} \langle S f_\alpha | f_\beta \rangle \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha, \beta}^{(1)},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(0)} := & A(0, \lambda_\alpha - n + 1, 0) \cdot B(n-1, \alpha, n-1) \\ & + \sum_{d \geq 2} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq N, 1 \leq j < i, k_i = \alpha \\ k_j \geq 0, i < j \leq d}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, d], 0) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, d], n-1) \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha, \beta}^{(1)} := & \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1 \\ r \geq 0}} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0, 1 \leq j < m \\ (k_m = \alpha)}} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m], \lambda_\alpha - n + 1) \\ & \cdot B(n-1, k[1, m], \alpha) \cdot A(\lambda_\beta - n, \ell_{\lambda; n}[1, r], 0) \cdot B(\beta, \ell[1, r], n). \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

We now expand $\delta_n^{(1)}$, given by (109), further,

$$\delta_n^{(1)} = \delta_n^{(2)} + \mathcal{R}_n^{(2,1)} + \mathcal{R}_n^{(2,2)}, \quad (112)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n^{(2)} := & \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1 \\ r \geq 0}} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq N \\ 1 \leq j \leq m+r}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m]) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, m]) \\ & \cdot A(k_m + 1 - n, k_{\lambda; n}(m, m+r], 0) \cdot B(k_m + 1, k(m, m+r], n). \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

The remainders are given by

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{(2,1)} := \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,1)}, \quad \mathcal{R}_n^{(2,2)} := \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,2)}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,1)} := & \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq N, 1 \leq j < i, k_i = \alpha \\ k_j \geq 0, i < j < m, k_m \geq N}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m]) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, m]) \\ & \cdot \sum_{r \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ m < j \leq m+r}} A(k_m + 1 - n, k_{\lambda; n}(m, m+r], 0) \cdot B(k_m + 1, k(m, m+r], n) \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,2)} := & \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq N \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m]) \cdot B(n-1, k[1, m]) \\ & \cdot \sum_{r \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{\substack{\ell_j \geq N, 1 \leq j < i \\ \ell_i = \alpha, \ell_j \geq 0, i < j \leq r}} A(k_m + 1 - n, \ell_{\lambda; n}[1, r], 0) \cdot B(k_m + 1, \ell[1, r], n). \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

Combining (106) (definition of δ_n), (107) (definition I_n, II_n) with (108) - (115), we obtain the following expansion of δ_n ,

$$\delta_n = \delta_n^{(0)} + \delta_n^{(2)} + \mathcal{R}_n, \quad (116)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_n = \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(0)} + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha < N \\ 0 \leq \beta \leq N}} \langle S f_\alpha | f_\beta \rangle \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha, \beta}^{(1)} + \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} (\mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,1)} + \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,2)}). \quad (117)$$

Let us now consider $\delta_n^{(0)}$ and $\delta_n^{(2)}$ in more detail. We begin with $\delta_n^{(0)}$. Introducing $\ell_j := k_j - n + 1$, $1 \leq j \leq d$, and using that $f_k = g_\infty e^{ikx}$, $\lambda_k = k$ for any $k \geq N$ (since $w_N \in \mathcal{U}_N$) and that $|g_\infty(x)| = 1$, it follows that $B(n-1, k[1, d], n-1)$ in the formula (108) for $\delta_n^{(0)}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} B(n-1, k[1, d], n-1) &= \langle v f_{n-1} | f_{k_1} \rangle \cdots \langle v f_{k_d} | f_{n-1} \rangle \\ &= \widehat{v}(k_1 - n + 1) \widehat{v}(k_2 - k_1) \cdots \widehat{v}(n - 1 - k_d) = G_v(0, \ell[1, d], 0) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$G_v(0, \ell[1, d], 0) := \widehat{v}(\ell_1) \widehat{v}(\ell_2 - \ell_1) \cdots \widehat{v}(\ell_d - \ell_{d-1}) \widehat{v}(-\ell_d).$$

(Recall that $u = w_N + v$ and hence G_v depends on v , but not on w_N .) As a consequence,

$$\delta_n^{(0)} = \sum_{d \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j > N-n \\ 1 \leq j \leq d}} A(0, \ell[1, d], 0) \cdot G_v(0, \ell[1, d], 0).$$

Similarly, we obtain a formula for $\delta_n^{(2)}$. Introducing

$$\ell_j := k_j - n + 1, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m, \quad \ell_j := k_j - n, \quad m < j \leq m + r,$$

$B(n - 1, k[1, m])$ and $B(k_m + 1, k(m, m + r), n)$ in (109) can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} B(n - 1, k[1, m]) &= \langle v f_{n-1} | f_{k_1} \rangle \cdots \langle v f_{k_{m-1}} | f_m \rangle \\ &= \widehat{v}(k_1 - n + 1) \widehat{v}(k_2 - k_1) \cdots \widehat{v}(k_m - k_{m-1}) \\ &= \widehat{v}(\ell_1) \widehat{v}(\ell_2 - \ell_1) \cdots \widehat{v}(\ell_m - \ell_{m-1}) = G_v(0, \ell[1, m]) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B(k_m + 1, k(m, m + r), n) &= \langle v f_{k_m+1} | f_{k_{m+1}} \rangle \cdots \langle v f_{k_{m+r}} | f_n \rangle \\ &= \widehat{v}(k_{m+1} - k_m - 1) \widehat{v}(k_{m+2} - k_{m+1}) \cdots \widehat{v}(n - k_{m+r}) \\ &= \widehat{v}(\ell_{m+1} - \ell_m) \widehat{v}(\ell_{m+2} - \ell_{m+1}) \cdots \widehat{v}(-\ell_{m+r}) = G_v(\ell[m, m + r], 0). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$G_v(0, \ell[1, m]) \cdot G_v(\ell[m, m + r], 0) = G_v(0, \ell[1, m + r], 0)$$

it follows that

$$\delta_n^{(2)} = \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1 \\ r \geq 0}} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j > N-n, 1 \leq j \leq m \\ \ell_j \geq N-n, m < j \leq m+r}} A(0, \ell[1, m]) \cdot A(\ell[m, m + r], 0) \cdot G_v(0, \ell[1, m + r], 0).$$

Arguing as in [8, Section 5], we write $\delta_n^{(2)} = \delta_n^{(3)} + \mathcal{R}_n^{(3)}$ where (taking again into account that $\lambda_k = k$ for $k \geq N$)

$$\delta_n^{(3)} = \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1 \\ r \geq 0}} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j > N-n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m+r}} A(0, \ell[1, m]) \cdot A(\ell[m, m + r], 0) \cdot G_v(0, \ell[1, m + r], 0).$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_n^{(3)} &= \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1 \\ r \geq 0}} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j > N-n \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{\substack{\ell_{m+j} > N-n, 1 \leq j < i, \ell_{m+i} = N-n \\ \ell_{m+j} \geq N-n, i < j \leq r}} A(0, \ell[1, m]) \\ &\quad \cdot A(\ell[m, m + r], 0) \cdot G_v(0, \ell[1, m + r], 0). \end{aligned}$$

We then arrive at

$$\delta_n^{(0)} + \delta_n^{(2)} = \delta_n^{(0)} + \delta_n^{(3)} + \mathcal{R}_n^{(3)}$$

where

$$\delta_n^{(0)} + \delta_n^{(3)} = \sum_{d \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{\ell_j > N-n \\ 1 \leq j \leq d}} \mathcal{D}(\ell[1, d]) \cdot G_v(0, \ell[1, d], 0)$$

and $\mathcal{D}(\ell[1, d])$ is given by [8, (72)],

$$\mathcal{D}(\ell[1, d]) = \sum_{1 \leq m \leq d} (A(0, \ell[1, m])A(\ell[m, d], 0) + A(0, \ell[1, d], 0)).$$

(Note the change in notation when compared with [8].) By [8, Lemma 5.1 (Vanishing Lemma)], $\mathcal{D}(\ell[1, d]) = 0$. Hence by (116)-(117), one gets

$$\delta_n = \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(0)} + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha < N \\ 0 \leq \beta \leq N}} \langle Sf_\alpha | f_\beta \rangle \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha, \beta}^{(1)} + \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} (\mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,1)} + \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(2,2)}) + \mathcal{R}_n^{(3)}. \quad (118)$$

Arguing as in the proof of [8, Lemma 5.2] one sees that for some constant $C \geq 1$, only depending on s ,

$$\sum_{n > n_2} |\mathcal{R}_n^{(3)}| \leq C \|v\|_s^3, \quad \forall u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$$

The remaining terms in (118) are estimated, using the results of Section 3.

Estimate of $\sum_{\substack{0 \leq \alpha < N \\ 0 \leq \beta \leq N}} \langle Sf_\alpha | f_\beta \rangle \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha, \beta}^{(1)}$. First note that

$$|\langle Sf_\alpha | f_\beta \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |e^{ix} f_\alpha \overline{f_\beta}| dx \leq \|f_\alpha\| \|f_\beta\| = 1$$

and that by Cauchy-Schwarz, $\sum_{n > n_2} |\mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha, \beta}^{(1)}|$ (cf. (111)) can be estimated as

$$\sum_{n > n_2} |\mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha, \beta}^{(1)}| \leq \sum_{m \geq 1} (I_{m, \alpha}^{(1)})^{1/2} \cdot \sum_{r \geq 0} (II_{r, \beta}^{(1)})^{1/2}$$

where

$$I_{m, \alpha}^{(1)} := \sum_{n > n_2} \left(\sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0, 1 \leq j < m \\ k_m = \alpha}} |A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m], \lambda_\alpha - n + 1)| \cdot |B(n-1, k[1, m], \alpha)| \right)^2,$$

$$II_{r, \beta}^{(1)} := \sum_{n > n_2} \left(\sum_{\substack{\ell_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}} |A(\lambda_\beta - n, \ell_{\lambda; n}[1, r], 0)| \cdot |B(\beta, \ell[1, r], n)| \right)^2.$$

To bound $II_{r, \beta}^{(1)}$, we estimate $\sup_{\mu \in \partial D_0}$ of the absolute value of the integrand in the expression for $A(\lambda_\beta - n, \ell_{\lambda; n}[1, r], 0)$ (cf. (99)), using that

$$\sup_{\mu \in \partial D_0} \frac{1}{|\lambda_\beta - n - \mu|} \leq \frac{1}{n - \frac{1}{3} - N} \leq C_1 \frac{1}{n} \leq C_1 n^{2s}, \quad \forall n > n_2 \quad (119)$$

$$\sup_{\mu \in \partial D_0} \frac{1}{|\lambda_\ell - n - \mu|} \leq \frac{5}{|\ell - n| + 1}, \quad \forall \ell \geq 0, \quad n > n_2.$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |A(\lambda_\beta - n, \ell_{\lambda; n}[1, r], 0)| \cdot |B(\beta, \ell[1, r], n)| &\leq C_1 n^s \frac{5^r |\langle v f_\beta | f_{\ell_1} \rangle| \cdots |\langle v f_{\ell_r} | f_n \rangle|}{\prod_{j=1}^r (|\ell_j - n| + 1)} \\ &\leq C_1 n^s \frac{5^r |\widehat{v g_\beta \bar{g}_{\ell_1}}(\ell_1 - \beta)| |\widehat{v g_{\ell_1} \bar{g}_{\ell_2}}(\ell_2 - \ell_1)| \cdots |\widehat{v g_{\ell_r} \bar{g}_\infty}(n - \ell_r)|}{\prod_{j=1}^r (|\ell_j - n| + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 one concludes that $\sum_{r \geq 0} (II_{r, \beta}^{(1)})^{1/2}$ is bounded by

$$C_1 \sum_{r \geq 0} 5^r \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{\substack{\ell_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j \leq r}} \frac{|\widehat{v g_\beta \bar{g}_{\ell_1}}(\ell_1 - \beta)| \cdots |\widehat{v g_{\ell_r} \bar{g}_\infty}(n - \ell_r)|}{\prod_{j=1}^r (|\ell_j - n| + 1)} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty$$

locally uniformly for $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$. Similarly, one can bound $\sum_{m \geq 1} (I_{m, \alpha})^{1/2}$. Indeed, for any $0 \leq \alpha < N$ one has

$$\frac{1}{|\lambda_\alpha - \lambda|} \leq \frac{1}{(n-1) - \frac{1}{3} - (N-1)} \leq \frac{1}{n - \frac{1}{3} - N} \leq C_1 n^{2s} \quad (120)$$

and hence for any $n \geq n_1$

$$\begin{aligned} |A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, m], \lambda_\alpha - n + 1)| \cdot |B(n-1, k[1, m], \alpha)| \\ \leq C_1 n^s \frac{5^m |\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(k_1 - n + 1)| \cdots |\widehat{v g_{k_{m-1}} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - k_{m-1})|}{\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (|k_j - n + 1| + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Again arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 one concludes that $\sum_{m \geq 0} (I_{m, \alpha}^{(1)})^{1/2}$ is bounded by

$$C_1 \sum_{m \geq 0} 5^m \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} \left(\sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ 1 \leq j < m}} \frac{|\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_{k_1}}(k_1 - n + 1)| \cdots |\widehat{v g_{k_{m-1}} \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - k_{m-1})|}{\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (|k_j - n + 1| + 1)} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty$$

locally uniformly for $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$.

Estimate of $\sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}$. Let us first consider the term

$$A(0, \lambda_\alpha - n + 1, 0) \cdot B(n-1, \alpha, n-1)$$

in (110). By Cauchy-Schwarz and (120),

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n \geq n_2} |A(0, \lambda_\alpha - n + 1, 0)| \cdot |B(n-1, \alpha, n-1)| \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq n_2} \frac{|\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n + 1)| |\widehat{v g_\alpha \bar{g}_\infty}(n-1-\alpha)|}{n - \frac{1}{3} - N} \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} |\widehat{v g_\infty \bar{g}_\alpha}(\alpha - n + 1)|^{2s} \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} |\widehat{v g_\alpha \bar{g}_\infty}(n-1-\alpha)|^{2s} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C_2 \|v\|_s^2 \end{aligned}$$

where C_2 is a constant, only depending on s and M . (Here we used Lemma 2.3 to bound $g_\alpha \equiv g_\alpha(w_N)$ and $g_\infty \equiv g_\infty(w_N)$.) By estimating $\sup_{\mu \in \partial D_0}$ of the absolute value of the integrand in the expression for $A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, d], 0)$ (cf. (99)) and using (120), one obtains in the case $k_i = \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |A(0, k_{\lambda; n-1}[1, d], 0)| \cdot |B(n-1, k[1, d], n-1)| \\ & \leq C_1 n^{2s} 5^d \frac{|vg_\infty \widehat{g}_{k_1}(k_1 - n + 1)| |vg_{k_1} \widehat{g}_{k_2}(k_2 - k_1)| \cdots |vg_{k_d} \widehat{g}_\infty(n-1 - k_d)|}{\prod_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq d \\ j \neq i}} (|k_j - n + 1| + 1)}, \end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$\sum_{n \geq n_2} |\mathcal{R}_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}| \leq C_2 \|v\|_s^2 + C_1 \sum_{d \geq 2} 5^d \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \sum_{n \geq n_2} n^s I_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) \cdot n^s II_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) \quad (121)$$

where

$$I_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) := \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq N \\ 1 \leq j < i}} \frac{|vg_\infty \widehat{g}_{k_1}(k_1 - n + 1)| \cdots |vg_{k_{i-1}} \widehat{g}_\alpha(\alpha - k_{i-1})|}{\prod_{1 \leq j < i} (|k_j - n + 1| + 1)}$$

and

$$II_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) := \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ i < j \leq d}} \frac{|vg_\alpha \widehat{g}_{k_{i+1}}(k_{i+1} - \alpha)| \cdots |vg_{k_d} \widehat{g}_\infty(n-1 - k_d)|}{\prod_{i < j \leq d} (|k_j - n + 1| + 1)}.$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n \geq n_2} n^s I_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) \cdot n^s II_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} (I_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i))^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_1} n^{2s} (II_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i))^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 3.2 one has for any $1 \leq i < d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} (I_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i))^2 \right)^{1/2} & \leq \sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \|(Q^{i-1}[(|vg_\infty \widehat{g}_k|)_{0 \leq k \leq N}])_\beta\|_s \\ & \leq (2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^i, \\ \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} (II_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i))^2 \right)^{1/2} & \leq \sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \|(Q^{d-i}[(|vg_k \widehat{g}_\infty|)_{0 \leq k \leq N}])_\beta\|_s \\ & \leq (2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^{d-i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

implying that (use $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} 1 \leq d \leq 2^d$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{d \geq 2} 5^d \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \sum_{n \geq n_2} n^s I_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) \cdot n^s II_{n, \alpha}^{(0)}(d, i) \\ & \leq \sum_{d \geq 2} (20C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^{d+1} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for any $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$. When combined with (121) we proved that for any $0 \leq \alpha < N$, $\sum_{n>n_2} |\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}^{(0)}| < \infty$ uniformly for any $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$.

Estimate of $\sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}$. Since $k_m \geq N$, the term with $m = 1$ in the sum (114) vanishes. Furthermore, for any $n > n_2$ and $k \in Z_{\geq 0}$,

$$\sup_{\mu \in \partial D_0} \frac{1}{|k - n - \mu|} \leq \frac{5}{|k - n| + 1}, \quad \sup_{\mu \in \partial D_0} \frac{1}{|k - n + 1 - \mu|} \leq \frac{8}{|k - n| + 1}.$$

It then follows by (120) that

$$\sum_{n>n_2} \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)} \leq C_1 \sum_{m \geq 2, r \geq 0} 8^{m+r} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{n>n_2} n^s I_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r) \cdot n^s II_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r) &:= \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq N, 1 \leq j < i \\ k_i = \alpha}} \frac{|\widehat{v}(k_1 - n + 1)| |\widehat{v}(k_2 - k_1)| \cdots |vg_\infty \widehat{g}_\alpha(\alpha - k_{i-1})|}{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (|k_j - n + 1| + 1)}, \\ I_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r) &:= \sum_{\substack{k_i = \alpha, k_m \geq N \\ k_j \geq 0, i < j < m}} \frac{|vg_\alpha \widehat{g}_{k_{i+1}}(k_{i+1} - \alpha)| \cdots |vg_{k_{m-1}} \widehat{g}_\infty(k_m - k_{m-1})|}{\prod_{i < j \leq m} (|k_j - n| + 1)} \\ &\cdot \sum_{\substack{k_j \geq 0 \\ m < j \leq m+r}} \frac{|vg_\infty \widehat{g}_{k_{m+1}}(k_{m+1} - (k_m + 1))| \cdots |vg_{k_{m+r}} \widehat{g}_\infty(n - (k_{m+r}))|}{(|k_m - n| + 1) \prod_{m < j \leq m+r} (|k_j - n| + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n>n_2} n^s I_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r) \cdot n^s II_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{n>n_2} n^{2s} (I_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r))^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n>n_2} n^{2s} (II_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r))^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 3.2 one has for any $1 \leq i < m$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} (I_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r))^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq \sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \|(Q^{i-1}[(|vg_\infty \widehat{g}_k|)_{0 \leq k \leq N}])\|_\beta \|s\| \\ &\leq (2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^i, \\ \left(\sum_{n \geq n_2} n^{2s} (II_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)}(i, m, r))^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq \sup_{0 \leq \beta \leq N} \|(Q^{m+r-i}[(|vg_k \widehat{g}_\infty|)_{0 \leq k \leq N}])\|_\beta \|s\| \\ &\leq (2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2 + M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^{m+r-i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking $d := m + r$ and m as summation indices and using that

$$\sum_{m=2}^d \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} 1 \leq d^2 \leq 2^{d+1},$$

one concludes that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n > n_2} \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}^{(2,1)} &\leq C_1 \sum_{m \geq 2, r \geq 0} 8^{m+r} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (2C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^{m+r+1} \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{d \geq 2} (32C_{s,1}^3 C_{s,2}^2 (2+M)^{2\eta(s)} \|v\|_s)^{m+r+1} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for any $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$.

Estimate of $\sum_{0 \leq \alpha < N} \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}^{(2,2)}$. Using the same arguments as in the previous paragraph, one shows that $\sum_{n > n_2} \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}^{(2,2)}$ is uniformly summable for any $u = w_N + v \in B_{c,0}^s(w_N, 1/C_{M,s})$.

References

- [1] J. ANGULO PAVA, S. HAKKAEV, *Illposedness for periodic nonlinear dispersive equations*, Elec. J. Differential Equations 2010(2010), no. 119, 1-19
- [2] T. Benjamin, *Internal waves of permanent form in fluids of great depth*, J. Fluid Mech. 29(1967), 559-592
- [3] M. Berti, T. Kappeler, R. Montalto, *Large KAM tori for perturbations of the defocusing NLS equation*, Astérisque 403, 2018
- [4] R. Davis, A. Acrivos, *Solitary internal waves in deep water*, J. Fluid Mech. 29(1967), 593-607
- [5] P. Gérard, T. Kappeler, *On the integrability of the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 74(2021), no. 8, 1685-1747
- [6] P. Gérard, T. Kappeler, P. Topalov, *Sharp well-posedness results of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^s(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and qualitative properties of its solutions*, to appear in Acta Math., arXiv:2004.04857
- [7] P. Gérard, T. Kappeler, P. Topalov, *On the spectrum of the Lax operator of the Benjamin-Ono equation on the torus*, J. Funct. Anal. 279(2020), no. 12, 108762
- [8] P. Gérard, T. Kappeler, P. Topalov, *On the analytic Birkhoff normal form of the Benjamin-Ono equation and applications*, arXiv:2103.07981
- [9] P. Gérard, T. Kappeler, P. Topalov, *On smoothing properties of the Benjamin-Ono equation and Tao's gauge transform*, arXiv:2109.00610

- [10] B. Grébert, T. Kappeler, *The defocusing NLS and its normal form*, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics, Eur. Math. Soc., 2014
- [11] T. Kappeler, J. Pöschel, *KdV & KAM*, 45, Springer, 2003
- [12] T. Kappeler, J. Molnar, *On the wellposedness of the KdV/KdV2 equations and their frequency maps*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 35(2018), no. 1, 101-160
- [13] T. Kappeler, P. Topalov, *Global well-posedness of KdV in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$* , Duke Math. J. 135(2006), no. 2, 327-360
- [14] S. Kuksin, *Analysis of Hamiltonian PDEs*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 19, Oxford University Press, 2000
- [15] P. Lax, *Functional Analysis*, John Wiley, 2002
- [16] L. Molinet, *Global well-posedness in L^2 for the periodic Benjamin-Ono equation*, American J. Math. 130(2008), no. 3, 635-683
- [17] L. Molinet, *Private communication*
- [18] L. Molinet, D. Pilod, *The Cauchy problem for the Benjamin-Ono equation in L^2 revisited*, Anal. and PDE 5(2012), no. 2, 365-395
- [19] A. Nakamura, *A direct method of calculating periodic wave solutions to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Exact two-periodic wave solutions*, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 47(1979), 1701-1705
- [20] J. Pöschel, E. Trubowitz, *Inverse Spectral Theory*, Academic Press, 1978
- [21] J.-C. Saut, *Benjamin-Ono and intermediate long wave equations: modeling, IST, and PDE*, Fields Institute Communications, 83, Springer, 2019

Patrick Gérard, Laboratoire de Mathématiques d'Orsay, CNRS,
 Université Paris–Saclay, 91405 Orsay, France,
 email: patrick.gerard@universite-paris-saclay.fr

Thomas Kappeler, Institut für Mathematik, Universität Zürich,
 Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zurich, Switzerland
 email: thomas.kappeler@math.uzh.ch

Petar Topalov, Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University,
 567 LA (Lake Hall), Boston, MA 0215, USA
 email: p.topalov@northeastern.edu