

Exact Perturbative Existence and Uniqueness Theorem

Nikita Nikolaev

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

22 August 2022

Abstract

We prove a general existence and uniqueness theorem for holomorphic perturbative solutions of singularly perturbed nonlinear complex differential systems of the form $\hbar \partial_x f = F(x, \hbar, f)$ where \hbar is a small complex perturbation parameter. Specifically, we give conditions that allow us to promote, in a unique and precise sense, a formal perturbative solution $\hat{f}(x, \hbar)$ to a holomorphic solution $f(x, \hbar)$ whose perturbative expansion is \hat{f} . Furthermore, we prove that f is the uniform Borel resummation of \hat{f} . As sample applications, we analyse the Painlevé I equation as well as derive exact WKB solutions for a generalised 3rd-order Airy equation.

Keywords: exact perturbation theory, singular perturbation theory, Borel resummation, Borel-Laplace theory, asymptotic analysis, Gevrey asymptotics, resurgence, exact WKB analysis, nonlinear ODEs, existence and uniqueness, nonlinear systems, Painlevé equations

2020 MSC: 34M60 (primary), 34M04, 34M30, 34E15, 34E20, 34A12, 34A34

Contents

0	Introduction	2
1	Perturbation Theory	7
1.1	Setting	7
1.2	Formal Perturbation Theory	8
1.3	Leading-Order Jacobian Eigenvalues and Normal Forms	10
1.4	Convergence of the Formal Borel Transform	13
1.5	Trajectories of the Leading-Order Jacobian Eigenvalues	13
1.6	Exact Perturbation Theory	15
2	Proofs	18
2.1	Formal Perturbation Theory: Proof of Theorem 1	18
2.2	Convergence of the Formal Borel Transform: Proof of Theorem 2	21
2.3	Exact Perturbation Theory: Proof of Theorem 3	25
2.4	Method of Successive Approximations: Proof of Lemma 5	31
3	Examples	36
3.1	An Explicit Example of Rank 2	36
3.2	Painlevé I	41
3.3	A Generalised Airy Equation of Order 3	43
Appendix A	Background Information	50
A.1	Gevrey Asymptotics	50
A.2	Borel-Laplace Theory	51
A.3	Complex Flows	53
A.4	Some Useful Elementary Estimates	56

§ 0. Introduction

Consider the following 1st-order singularly perturbed nonlinear differential system:

$$\hbar \partial_x f = F(x, \hbar, f) \quad (1)$$

where F is an N -dimensional holomorphic vector function of a single complex variable x , a small complex perturbation parameter \hbar , and the unknown holomorphic N -dimensional vector function $f = f(x, \hbar)$. Suppose F is a polynomial in \hbar , or more generally admits an asymptotic expansion \widehat{F} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in some sector.

By expanding this equation in power series in \hbar , we can construct *formal perturbative solutions* $\widehat{f} = \widehat{f}(x, \hbar)$. However, it is a well-known phenomenon in singular perturbation theory that such solutions generically have zero radius of convergence and therefore are not analytic objects. Our main result ([Theorem 3](#)) is an existence and uniqueness theorem that gives precise conditions under which a formal perturbative solution \widehat{f} can be promoted, in a unique and precise sense, to an *exact perturbative solution*; i.e., a holomorphic solution f whose perturbative expansion is \widehat{f} . In other words, f admits \widehat{f} as its uniform asymptotic expansion as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in some sector. In fact, we prove that f is the uniform [Borel resummation](#) of \widehat{f} . This is a remarkable property that permits one to deduce a lot of refined information about the highly transcendental solution f from the much more explicitly defined formal solution \widehat{f} .

¶1. **Motivation.** The problem of promoting formal perturbative data to analytic data in an effective way is fundamental in what may be referred to as *exact perturbation theory*, by which we mean singular perturbation theory reinforced with techniques from resurgent asymptotic analysis. The latter includes the more classical [theory of Borel-Laplace transforms](#) which is what we employ in this article. Recently there has been a remarkable surge of interest in exact perturbation theory. For example, it sits at the heart of attempts to construct a new mathematical approach to quantum systems and to quantisation that goes “beyond perturbation theory”; see, for instance, some recent references such as [[GMP16](#), [IMS19](#), [GGM20](#), [DPMSS21](#), [Mar21](#)]. Techniques from exact perturbation theory are also emerging in a variety of subjects including algebraic geometry [[KS22](#), [AHT22](#)], low-dimensional topology [[GGM21](#), [AM22](#)], and even superconductivity in condensed matter physics [[MR19](#)].

These advances follow in the footsteps of the success of the *exact WKB method* [[Vor83](#), [Sil85](#), [KT05](#), [GMN13](#), [IN14](#), [Nik21](#)]. In fact, one of our main motivations is to finally establish rigorous exact WKB method for singularly perturbed linear differential equations of higher order. This has been a major open problem in the subject for the best part of the last three or four decades. In [§3.3](#), as an application of our main result, we analyse the 3rd-order generalised Airy equation $\hbar^3 \partial_x^3 \psi = x\psi$ to explain how [Theorem 3](#) can be used to prove existence and uniqueness of exact WKB solutions. Similar analysis for linear equations of any order will appear elsewhere.

Our [Theorem 3](#) can also be used to establish rigorous exact WKB method for more general singularly perturbed linear differential systems and meromorphic connections on nontrivial vector bundles over Riemann surfaces. Here, a canonical exact perturbative solution of a nonlinear system (1) defines a holomorphic gauge transformation (over a Stokes region in the x -plane and a sector in the \hbar -plane with good

asymptotics as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$) that puts a given differential system or meromorphic connection into an upper-triangular or filtered form. This operation defines a basis of exact WKB solutions. A special case of this construction was obtained in [Nik19]. Thanks to the uniqueness clause of Theorem 3, these constructions are entirely geometric; i.e., they are independent of chosen coordinates and trivialisations, and can be carried out over arbitrary Riemann surfaces.

¶2. **Brief Overview of the Main Result.** To get a feel for what this paper is about, let us give a brief narrative account of our results without delving into too much detail or generality. All the details can be found in §1. In §3.1 we also present a walk-through of most of this paper via a simple but nontrivial explicit example of a nonlinear system of rank- $N = 2$ in as concrete terms as possible.

For the purposes of this greatly simplified introductory discussion, suppose that the N -dimensional vector function $F = F(x, \hbar, y)$ is actually independent of \hbar and polynomial in the components of $y \in \mathbb{C}^N$. Such situations are far from artificial: examples where the righthand side of equation (1) has very mild or no explicit dependence on \hbar are ubiquitous, yet they already require much of the power of our main result. For example, the Painlevé I equation analysed in §3.2 and the generalised 3rd-order Airy equation analysed in §3.3 lead to systems precisely of this form.

The leading-order part in \hbar of system (1) is simply the functional equation $F(x, y) = 0$. Suppose a point (x_0, y_0) is such that $F(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and the Jacobian matrix $\partial F / \partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) . This is a familiar hypothesis from the ordinary Implicit Function Theorem which guarantees the existence of a holomorphic solution $y = f^{(0)}(x)$ near the point x_0 satisfying $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. Slightly less familiar is the Formal Perturbative Existence and Uniqueness Theorem (Theorem 1) which says that under the same hypothesis, system (1) has a unique formal perturbative solution $\hat{f}(x, \hbar)$ near x_0 whose leading-order part is $f^{(0)}$. In fact, all the higher-order terms of \hat{f} are recursively determined by $f^{(0)}$ via an explicit recursive formula (Corollary 2) which is essentially matrix multiplication. However, \hat{f} is generically a divergent power series in \hbar and therefore has no direct analytic meaning.

Our goal is to promote \hat{f} to something analytic in a unique way. First, our system is linearised to leading order around $f^{(0)}$ by the change of variables $f = f^{(0)} + g$ to obtain a new nonlinear system of the form $\hbar \partial_x g = J(g + G(x, \hbar, g))$. Here, $J = J(x)$ is the Jacobian matrix $\partial F / \partial y$ evaluated at the leading-order solution $y = f^{(0)}$, and $G(x, \hbar, y)$ is a (linear) polynomial in \hbar and at least quadratic in the components of y . Let us assume for simplicity that J has distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$ near x_0 and that in fact it is already in diagonal form $J = \Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$. This can always be achieved by a suitable gauge transformation.

One of our main hypotheses has a geometric nature: it involves regularity on non-local domains swept out by certain trajectories in the x -space determined by the eigenvalues of J . This can be explained as follows. By assumption, the Jacobian J is invertible near the basepoint x_0 ; points where J fails to be invertible are called *turning points*. Away from turning points, the eigenvalues of J define N holomorphic vector fields $V_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \partial_x$. We use each V_i to flow a small neighbourhood of the basepoint x_0 for positive time. Suppose that, for each i , this flow is unobstructed

(i.e., a small neighbourhood of x_0 can flow under V_i for infinitely long positive time) and that the i -th component G_i of G is bounded along this flow. Then, under these simplifying hypotheses, our main result ([Theorem 3](#)) can be formulated as follows.

¶3. **Corollary 1 (of [Theorem 3](#)).** *The nonlinear system (1) has a canonical exact perturbative solution f near x_0 whose perturbative expansion is \widehat{f} . Namely, there is a neighbourhood $U_0 \subset \mathbb{C}_x$ of x_0 and a sectorial domain $S_0 \subset \mathbb{C}_h$ with opening arc $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2})$ such that the nonlinear system (1) has a unique holomorphic solution $f = f(x, h)$ on $U_0 \times S_0$ which admits \widehat{f} as its uniform [Gevrey asymptotic expansion](#)*

$$f(x, h) \simeq \widehat{f}(x, h) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0 \text{ in the closed right halfplane, unif. } \forall x \in U_0 . \quad (2)$$

Moreover, f is the uniform [Borel resummation](#) of its perturbative expansion \widehat{f} :

$$f(x, h) = \mathcal{S}[\widehat{f}](x, h) \quad \forall (x, h) \in U_0 \times S_0 . \quad (3)$$

All the necessary background information on Gevrey asymptotics and the theory of Borel-Laplace transforms is recalled in [Appendix A](#). In particular, what (3) means in other words is that f can be written as a Laplace transform:

$$f = \mathcal{S}[\widehat{f}] = f^{(0)} + h\mathcal{L}[\varphi] = f^{(0)} + h \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\xi/h} \varphi \, d\xi , \quad (4)$$

where $\varphi = \varphi(x, \xi)$ is (the analytic continuation of) the [Borel transform](#) of the formal power series \widehat{f} :

$$\varphi = \varphi(x, \xi) = \mathfrak{B}[\widehat{f}](x, \xi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} f^{(k+1)}(x) \xi^k . \quad (5)$$

We show in [Theorem 2](#) that (even under much milder assumptions than those of [Theorem 3](#)) the Borel transform (5) is a uniformly convergent power series in ξ . Even so, it is far from obvious that it can be analytically continued to the positive real line, let alone such that the integral in (4) is convergent.

To construct the analytic continuation φ , we make a coordinate change $x \mapsto z$ in which all the vector fields V_i become the constant coordinate vector field ∂_z . In this coordinate, the nonlinear system (1) takes on a particularly simple form that we are able to solve using the Borel-Laplace method as follows. Applying the Borel transform to our system, we obtain a nonlinear partial integro-differential equation for φ . Using another simple change of variables, we convert it into an integral equation which we then proceed to solve using the method of successive approximations. To show that this sequence of approximations $\{\varphi_n\}$ converges to an actual solution φ , we give an estimate on its terms by employing the ordinary Holomorphic Implicit Function Theorem in an interesting way. This estimate also allows us to conclude that the solution φ has a well-defined Laplace transform and therefore defines a holomorphic solution f to our system via identity (4). Furthermore, from the general Borel-Laplace theory (specifically, a [theorem of Nevanlinna](#)), it then follows that f is the unique holomorphic function with the asymptotic property (3).

¶4. **Singular Perturbation Theory: a quick refresher.** The fact that exact perturbative solutions exist at all is a classical result in singular perturbation theory. Let us emphasise, however, that this fact is *not* used in our analysis, so the disinterested reader may safely skip to §0¶6. Nevertheless, we mention it here in order to highlight the fact that this celebrated theory comes with a number of significant disadvantages, and to draw contrast with our results. This well-known perturbation theory fact may be formulated as follows (see e.g. [Was76, Theorem 26.1] or [HS99, Chapter XII]).

¶5. **Theorem 0 (Perturbative Existence Theorem).** *Consider the nonlinear system (1) where $F(x, \hbar, y)$ is a complex vector function which is holomorphic for x in a disc around the origin, for y in a ball around the origin, and for \hbar in some sector S where it admits a uniform asymptotic expansion \widehat{F} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. Suppose the leading-order part $F^{(0)}$ of \widehat{F} satisfies $F^{(0)}(0, 0) = 0$ and the Jacobian matrix $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ is invertible at $(0, 0)$. If (1) has a formal perturbative solution \widehat{f} near $x = 0$ with leading-order part $f^{(0)} = 0$, then it has an exact perturbative solution f which is holomorphic for x in a disc around the origin and for \hbar in some subsector $S' \subset S$ where it admits \widehat{f} as its uniform asymptotic expansion as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$.*

The main idea behind every proof known to us is to first choose *some* holomorphic function $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}(x, \hbar)$ whose asymptotic expansion as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in S is the formal perturbative solution \widehat{f} . Then the change of variables $g = f - \tilde{f}$ transforms the given nonlinear system to a new nonlinear system for g , and so the problem is reduced to finding a solution g whose asymptotic expansion as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ is 0.

A function \tilde{f} always exists if the opening angle of S is not too large. However, it is inherently highly nonunique, because asymptotic expansions (especially in the sense of Poincaré) cannot detect the so-called exponential corrections (i.e., analytic functions with zero asymptotic expansions). The solution g is highly dependent on the chosen function \tilde{f} , hence so is the resulting exact perturbative solution f . Consequently, the solution f is also inherently nonunique and largely non-constructive. Therefore, the *Perturbative Existence Theorem is an existence result only*. The situation is only made worse by the fact that there is little to no control on the size of the opening angle of the sector $S' \subset S$ (e.g., see the remark in [Was76, p.144], immediately following Theorem 26.1), rendering it virtually impossible to describe the set of all possible exact perturbative solutions in any reasonable manner.

In contrast, our main theorem gives precise conditions on F that allow us to promote a formal perturbative solution \widehat{f} to an exact perturbative solution f in a *unique* way. On top of that, this unique f is the Borel resummation of \widehat{f} , which means in particular that it is constructible to a reasonable extent. More importantly, it means that a considerable amount of analysis can be carried out using the formal perturbative solution \widehat{f} (which is essentially defined algebraically through a sequence of completely computable operations that amount to little more than finite-dimensional matrix algebra) and then deduced for the exact perturbative solution f using the general properties of Borel resummation.

¶6. **Remarks and discussion.** Our constructions employ relatively basic and classical techniques from complex analysis which form the basis for the more modern and sophisticated theory of resurgent asymptotic analysis à la Écalle [Éca85]; see also for instance [Cos09, Sau14, LR16]. Namely, we use the Borel-Laplace method which is briefly reviewed in §A.2. We stress that the Borel-Laplace method “is nothing other than the theory of Laplace transforms, written in slightly different variables”, echoing the words of Alan Sokal [Sok80]. As such, we have tried to keep our presentation very hands-on and self-contained, so the knowledge of basic complex analysis should be sufficient to follow.

What we call *Gevrey asymptotics* (such as in (2)) is often called *1-Gevrey asymptotics*. It is part of an entire hierarchy of asymptotic regularity classes, first introduced by Watson [Wat11] and further developed by Nevanlinna [Nev18]. See [Ram78, Ram80] as well as [LR16, §1.2] and [HS99, §XI-2]. However, arguments about other Gevrey classes can usually be reduced to arguments about 1-Gevrey asymptotics via a simple fractional transformation in the \hbar -space. Therefore, we believe it is not difficult to extend our results to all other Gevrey asymptotic classes. We leave this as a natural open problem.

We reverberate the opinion of Ramis and Sibuya [RS89] that in the theory of complex-analytic differential equations (with or without a complex perturbation parameter), the more appropriate notion of asymptotic expansions is Gevrey asymptotics rather than the more classical theory in the sense of Poincaré. The aforementioned work of Ramis and Sibuya is in connection with solutions of complex-analytic differential equations near an irregular singularity, but the same point of view is apparent in other related subjects including (to cite only a few) the works of Écalle on resurgent functions [Éca84, Éca85] and of Malgrange, Martinet, and Ramis on analytic diffeomorphisms [Mal82, MR83].

Our proof represents a combination of techniques developed in [Nik20] (where a special case of Theorem 3 for the scalar Riccati equation is proved) and [Nik22] but many of the ideas underpinning all these works originated in [Nik19]. However, this paper is self-contained and does not rely on the results in these references.

¶7. **Notation and conventions.** A brief summary of our notation, conventions, and definitions from Gevrey asymptotics and Borel-Laplace theory can be found in Appendix A. We adopt the notation, common in perturbation theory, that coefficients of \hbar -expansions are labelled by “ $^{(0)}, ^{(1)}, ^{(n)}$ ”, etc.. The symbol \mathbb{N} stands for nonnegative integers $0, 1, 2, \dots$. We will use boldface letters to denote nonnegative integer vectors; i.e., $\mathbf{m} := (m_1, \dots, m_N) \in \mathbb{N}^N$, etc., and we put $|\mathbf{m}| := m_1 + \dots + m_N$. Unless otherwise indicated, all sums over unbolded indices n, m, \dots are taken to run over \mathbb{N} , and all sums over boldface letters $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}, \dots$ are taken to run over \mathbb{N}^N .

¶8. **Acknowledgements.** The author wishes to thank Dylan Allegretti, Francis Bischoff, Alberto García-Raboso, Marco Gualtieri, Kohei Iwaki, Olivier Marchal, Andrew Neitzke, Nicolas Orantin, Kento Osuga, and Shinji Sasaki for helpful discussions during various stages of this project. Special thanks also go to Marco Gualtieri for the many suggestions to improve the manuscript. This work was supported by the EPSRC Programme Grant *Enhancing RNG*.

§ 1. Perturbation Theory

§ 1.1. Setting

¶1. **Background assumptions.** Unless stated otherwise, we assume the following general setting throughout the paper. Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}_x$ be any domain, such as a coordinate domain on some Riemann surface. Let $S \subset \mathbb{C}_h$ be either an open neighbourhood of the origin or a [sectorial domain](#) with vertex at the origin and opening arc $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$. Consider the singularly perturbed nonlinear differential system (1), which is

$$\hbar \partial_x f = F(x, \hbar, f) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $F = F(x, \hbar, y)$ is an N -dimensional holomorphic vector function of (x, \hbar, y) in $X \times S \times \mathbb{C}^N$. If S is an open neighbourhood of the origin, let

$$\widehat{F}(x, \hbar, y) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x, y) \hbar^k \quad (6)$$

be its Taylor series expansion in \hbar at the origin. If S is a sectorial domain, then we assume in addition that F admits \widehat{F} as its locally uniform asymptotic expansion

$$F(x, \hbar, y) \sim \widehat{F}(x, \hbar, y) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \Theta, \text{ loc.unif. } \forall (x, y) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^N \quad . \quad (7)$$

We will sometimes refer to \widehat{F} as the ***perturbative expansion*** of F .

¶2. **Examples 1.** The simplest nontrivial but important example is the singularly perturbed scalar Riccati equation

$$\hbar \partial_x f = a_2(x) f^2 + a_1(x) f + a_0(x) \quad (8)$$

which was treated in detail in [Nik20] and which formed the basis for many of the ideas implemented in the present paper.

In §3.1, we study a concrete example of a rank-two system on the Riemann sphere with singularities at 0 and ∞ .

Recall that any scalar nonlinear equation of order N can be written equivalently as a 1st-order rank- N nonlinear system (1) by introducing higher-order derivatives as new variables. Thus, for example, our results apply to all six singularly perturbed Painlevé equations. In §3.2, we give a sample application of our results (in detail and in as concrete terms as possible) to Painlevé I:

$$\hbar^2 \partial_x^2 q = 6q^2 + x + c\hbar \quad . \quad (9)$$

Similar analysis of the entire deformed Painlevé hierarchy will appear elsewhere.

Our results also apply to singularly perturbed linear ODEs, but not in the straightforward sense of considering linear functions F of y . Instead, the analysis goes through the WKB method, see §3.3 where we study the 3rd-order generalised Airy equation

$$\hbar^3 \partial_x^3 \psi = x\psi \quad . \quad (10)$$

Let us now state precisely what we mean by *exact perturbative solutions*.

¶3. **Definition 1.** Fix a phase $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. An **exact perturbative solution** in the direction θ (or a **θ -exact perturbative solution**) of (1) near a point $x_0 \in X$ is any holomorphic solution $f = f(x, \hbar)$, defined in a neighbourhood $U_0 \subset X$ of x_0 and a sectorial domain $S_0 \subset S$ whose opening Θ_0 contains the direction θ , such that f admits a uniform asymptotic expansion \hat{f} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in S_0 . We will often refer to \hat{f} as the **perturbative expansion** of f .

A **θ -exact perturbative solution** on a domain $U \subset X$ is a holomorphic solution $f = f(x, \hbar)$, defined on a domain $\mathbf{U} \subset U \times S$, which is θ -exact near every point in U ; that is, for every $x_0 \in U$, there is an open neighbourhood $U_0 \subset U$ and a sectorial domain $S_0 \subset S$ with opening $\Theta_0 \ni \theta$ such that $U_0 \times S_0 \subset \mathbf{U}$ and f admits an asymptotic expansion \hat{f} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in S_0 uniformly for all $x \in U_0$.

If f is an exact perturbative solution, then its perturbative expansion \hat{f} also satisfies equation (1) in a formal sense; i.e., with differentiation ∂_x done order-by-order in \hbar . For this to make sense when F is not holomorphic at $\hbar = 0$, the righthand side of (1) must be replaced with the perturbative expansion \hat{F} . More generally, we have the following definition.

¶4. **Definition 2.** A **formal perturbative solution** of (1) on a domain $U \subset X$ is any formal power series

$$\hat{f} = \hat{f}(x, \hbar) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f^{(n)}(x) \hbar^n \quad (11)$$

with holomorphic coefficients $f^{(n)} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$, which formally satisfies the nonlinear differential system

$$\hbar \partial_x \hat{f} = \hat{F}(x, \hbar, \hat{f}) . \quad (12)$$

§ 1.2. Formal Perturbation Theory

The starting point in our analysis of the nonlinear system (1) is to construct its formal perturbative solutions. This is expressed in the following more or less well-known result (see, e.g., [HS99, Theorem XII-5-2]).

¶5. **Theorem 1 (Formal Perturbative Existence and Uniqueness Theorem).**

Consider the nonlinear system (1). Fix a point $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^N$ and suppose that $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and the leading-order Jacobian $\partial F^{(0)}/\partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) . Then there exists a unique formal perturbative solution \hat{f} near x_0 whose leading-order part satisfies $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. In fact, all **higher-order corrections** $f^{(n)}$ are uniquely determined by the **leading-order solution** $f^{(0)}$ through an explicit recursive formula. In particular, the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$ is the unique holomorphic solution of the implicit equation $F^{(0)}(x, f^{(0)}) = 0$ satisfying $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$, and the next-to-leading-order correction $f^{(1)}$ is the unique solution of

$$J f^{(1)} = \partial_x f^{(0)} - F^{(1)}(x, f^{(0)}) , \quad (13)$$

where $J = J(x) := (\partial F^{(0)}/\partial y)|_{y=f^{(0)}(x)}$.

For completeness, the proof is presented in §2.1. The argument amounts to plugging the solution ansatz (11) into the corresponding formal system (12) which is then solved order-by-order in \hbar . The key that makes this possible is that at each order in \hbar system (12) is no longer a differential system because the derivative term $\hbar \partial_x$ depends only on the lower-order information. Each higher-order coefficient $f^{(n)}$ is then the unique solution to an inhomogeneous algebraic linear system if and only if

the Jacobian matrix $\partial F^{(0)}/\partial y$ at (x_0, y_0) is invertible.

¶6. **Definition 3.** A point $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{C}^N$ is called a **regular point** for system (1) if $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and $\partial F^{(0)}/\partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) . In contrast, (x_0, y_0) is called a **turning point** if $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ but the Jacobian $\partial F^{(0)}/\partial y$ is *not* invertible at (x_0, y_0) . Thus, the main hypothesis of Theorem 1 is to fix a regular point (x_0, y_0) .

¶7. **Remark 1.** If (x_0, y_0) is a turning point, often by abuse of terminology one refers to just the point x_0 as the *turning point*. It is important, however, to keep in mind that if $y'_0 \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is another point satisfying $F^{(0)}(x_0, y'_0) = 0$, it may be (and often is) the case that (x_0, y_0) is a turning point whilst (x_0, y'_0) is not. That being the case, often one speaks of the turning point x_0 of some *type* in reference to the value y_0 that makes (x_0, y_0) a turning point. See, for example, §3.1 where turning points in the x -plane are labelled coinciding pairs of eigenvalues of some holomorphic family of cubic polynomials.

¶8. **Formula for the formal perturbative solution.** In order to write down the explicit recursive formula defining the higher-order corrections $f^{(n)}$, let us introduce the following notation (recall also our notational conventions in §0¶7). First, let us expand the perturbative expansion \hat{F} as a multi-power series in \hbar and the components of y as follows:

$$\hat{F}(x, \hbar, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}(x) \hbar^k y^{\mathbf{m}}, \quad (14)$$

where $F_{\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} y^{\mathbf{m}} := F_{m_1 \dots m_N}^{(k)} y_1^{m_1} \dots y_N^{m_N}$. Second, for any $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^N$, introduce the following shorthand notation:

$$\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(\mathbf{n})} := \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1}^{j_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1}} f_1^{(j_{1,1})} \dots f_1^{(j_{1,m_1})} \right) \dots \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N}^{j_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N}} f_N^{(j_{N,1})} \dots f_N^{(j_{N,m_N})} \right), \quad (15)$$

where we wrote each index vector $j_i \in \mathbb{N}^{m_i}$ in components as $(j_{i,1}, \dots, j_{i,m_i})$. Note that the empty sum evaluates to 0, so $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(\mathbf{n})} = 0$ whenever $m_i = 0$ but $n_i > 0$ for some i . Note also that $\mathbf{f}_0^{(0)} = 1$. Then the following corollary is a direct consequence of the proof of Theorem 1.

¶9. **Corollary 2.** All the higher-order corrections $f^{(n)}$, $n \geq 1$, for the formal perturbative solution from Theorem 1 are given by the following formula:

$$J f^{(n)} = \partial_x f^{(n-1)} - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left(\sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n}^{n_1, \dots, n_N \neq n} F_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(\mathbf{n})} + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} F_{\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(\mathbf{n})} \right). \quad (16)$$

¶10. **Remark 2.** Although formula (16) may seem rather unwieldy, it is entirely explicit (insofar as the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$ is explicit) and involves essentially only finite-dimensional matrix algebra. In particular, it involves no integration! It can therefore be used to calculate the formal perturbative solution \hat{f} to any desirable order in \hbar with the aid of a computer or boundless patience and persistence.

For example, let us examine this formula for $n = 2$ and $N = 2$. For the first sum inside the big brackets, the only possible index vector \mathbf{n} is $(1, 1)$, so formula (15) simplifies to $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(\mathbf{n})} = (f_1^{(1)})^{m_1} (f_2^{(1)})^{m_2}$. Similarly, for the second sum inside the big

brackets, the only two index vectors \mathbf{n} satisfying $|\mathbf{n}| = 1$ are $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$, so $\sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=1} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(\mathbf{n})} = (f_1^{(1)})^{m_1} (f_2^{(0)})^{m_2} + (f_1^{(0)})^{m_1} (f_2^{(1)})^{m_2}$. Thus, formula (16) in this case becomes

$$Jf^{(2)} = \partial_x f^{(1)} - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left(F_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} (f_1^{(1)})^{m_1} (f_2^{(1)})^{m_2} + F_{\mathbf{m}}^{(1)} \left((f_1^{(1)})^{m_1} (f_2^{(0)})^{m_2} + (f_1^{(0)})^{m_1} (f_2^{(1)})^{m_2} \right) + F_{\mathbf{m}}^{(2)} (f_1^{(0)})^{m_1} (f_2^{(0)})^{m_2} \right) .$$

¶11. **Remark 3.** It is clear from formula (16) that the definition domain in the x -plane of the formal perturbative solution \hat{f} is limited only by the size of the definition domain of the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$ and the turning points. In other words, if the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$ is well-defined on a neighbourhood $U \subset X$ of the basepoint x_0 , then the corresponding formal perturbative solution \hat{f} is well-defined on $U \setminus \{\text{turning points}\}$. At the turning points, the coefficients of \hat{f} typically develop singularities of increasing severity (e.g., poles of increasingly high orders). As is well-known in uniform asymptotics, this means in particular that generically \hat{f} cannot be the uniform perturbative expansion (even in the meromorphic sense) of any holomorphic (or meromorphic) function in any neighbourhood of a turning point.

§ 1.3. Leading-Order Jacobian Eigenvalues and Normal Forms

Fix a regular point $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^N$; i.e., suppose that $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and that $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) .

¶12. **Leading-order Jacobian.** Let $f^{(0)}$ be the unique holomorphic leading-order solution of the nonlinear system (1) satisfying $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. Then we can consider the *leading-order Jacobian* evaluated at $y = f^{(0)}(x)$:

$$J(x) := \left. \frac{\partial F^{(0)}}{\partial y} \right|_{y=f^{(0)}(x)} . \quad (17)$$

It is a holomorphic invertible $N \times N$ -matrix. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$ be its eigenvalues (not necessarily distinct), which we call the *leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues* of the nonlinear system (1) with respect to the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$. They are non-vanishing holomorphic functions near the basepoint x_0 . Put:

$$\Lambda := \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) . \quad (18)$$

If not all eigenvalues are distinct, then we assume that they have been labelled such that equal eigenvalues are consecutive.

¶13. **Normal form with distinct eigenvalues.** If the leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues are all distinct, then there is a holomorphic invertible matrix $P = P(x)$ which diagonalises J :

$$P^{-1} J P = \Lambda . \quad (19)$$

Introduce the change of the unknown variable

$$f \mapsto g \quad \text{given by} \quad f = f^{(0)} + P g . \quad (20)$$

In other words, this is a linearisation of the nonlinear system to leading-order around the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$, followed by a gauge transformation. Then, upon left

multiplication by P^{-1} , our system is transformed into

$$\hbar \partial_x g = \Lambda(g + G(x, \hbar, g)) , \quad (21)$$

where G is the vector function defined by

$$\Lambda(y + G(x, \hbar, y)) = P^{-1}F(x, \hbar, f^{(0)} + Py) - \hbar(P^{-1}\partial_x P)y - \hbar P^{-1}\partial_x f^{(0)} . \quad (22)$$

Notice that G also admits an asymptotic expansion \widehat{G} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ and that the leading-order part $G^{(0)}(x, y)$ of G is at least quadratic in the components of y ; i.e.,

$$G^{(0)}(x, 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{\partial G^{(0)}}{\partial y} \right|_{y=0} = 0 . \quad (23)$$

We will say that our nonlinear system has been transformed to a *normal form*.

- ¶14. **Definition 4.** For us, a **normal form** is any nonlinear system of the form (21) where Λ is a diagonal invertible holomorphic matrix, and G is a holomorphic vector function which admits a locally uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion \widehat{G} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ and whose leading-order part $G^{(0)}$ satisfies (23).
- ¶15. Normal forms in this sense are not unique. If $M = M(x)$ is any invertible holomorphic matrix that commutes with Λ , then the gauge transformation $P' := PM$ also sends our system to a normal form

$$\hbar \partial_x g' = \Lambda(g' + G'(x, \hbar, g')) , \quad (24)$$

where G' and G are related by $G'(x, \hbar, y) = M^{-1}G(x, \hbar, My) - (M^{-1}\partial_x M)y$.

- ¶16. **Normal form with indistinct eigenvalues.** If the leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues are not all distinct, we assume¹ that there is a holomorphic invertible matrix $P = P(x)$ near x_0 such that $P^{-1}JP = \Lambda + H$, for a constant nilpotent matrix H (with 1's in some or all entries above the diagonal and 0's everywhere else) such that $\Lambda(x_0) + H$ is the Jordan normal form of the constant matrix $J(x_0)$. Then the change of variables $f \mapsto \tilde{g}$ given by $f = f^{(0)} + P\tilde{g}$ leads to the system

$$\hbar \partial_x \tilde{g} = (\Lambda + H)(\tilde{g} + \tilde{G}(x, \hbar, \tilde{g})) . \quad (25)$$

whose righthand side is given by the exact same formula as the righthand side in (22) and hence \tilde{G} still satisfies the properties (23). If $H = 0$, then this is of course a normal form (21) (i.e., $\tilde{g} = g$ and $\tilde{G} = G$). If the nilpotent matrix H is nonzero, it is still always possible to remove it by making a further change of variables in order to put our system in normal form. To explain how, it is sufficient to consider a system (25) consisting of a single 2-by-2 Jordan block such as

$$\hbar \partial_x \tilde{g} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix} (\tilde{g} + \tilde{G}(x, \hbar, \tilde{g})) . \quad (26)$$

¹Note that even if J with indistinct eigenvalues has a Jordan normal form at every point in a neighbourhood of x_0 , it is not automatic that such a *holomorphic* matrix P exists. The question of holomorphic similarity of nondiagonalisable matrices is somewhat intricate; see, e.g., [Was62, Lei17].

If we take the zero leading-order solution $\tilde{g}^{(0)} = 0$ (which is available because \tilde{G} satisfies (23)), and let $\tilde{g}^{(1)}$ be the corresponding next-to-leading-order solution, then it is easy to check that the change of variables

$$\tilde{g} \mapsto g \quad \text{given by} \quad \tilde{g}_1 = g_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}_2 = \hbar(\tilde{g}_2^{(1)} + g_2) \quad (27)$$

yields the desired new system

$$\hbar \partial_x g = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix} (g + G(x, \hbar, g)) \quad (28)$$

¶17. **Definition 5.** A given nonlinear system (1) with a leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$ is said to **admit a normal form** with respect to $f^{(0)}$ if there is a holomorphic invertible matrix $P = P(x)$ such that the change of variables $f = f^{(0)} + P\tilde{g}$, possibly followed by a transformation of the form (27), transforms it to a normal form (21) with Λ being the diagonal matrix of its leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues with respect to the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$.

It is clear from the calculation in §1¶13 that if the eigenvalues of the constant matrix $J(x_0)$ are all distinct, then the given nonlinear system admits a normal form with respect to $f^{(0)}$ near x_0 .

¶18. **Reduced normal form.** A normal form (21) can always be further simplified, in a canonical way, to a system of the form

$$\hbar \partial_x w = \Lambda \left(w + \hbar W(x, \hbar, w) \right) \quad (29)$$

where $W(x, \hbar, y)$ is any holomorphic vector function with locally uniform Gevrey asymptotics as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ (and no other restrictions). This **reduced normal form** is useful for theoretical purposes (e.g., we use it in the proof of our main result) but it is not needed to state our theorems and it is not used in our examples.

To obtain (29) from (21), we take the zero leading-order solution $g^{(0)} = 0$ (which is available thanks to (23)) and let $g^{(1)}$ be the corresponding next-to-leading-order solution. Then (29) is obtained by the change of variables

$$g \mapsto w \quad \text{given by} \quad g = \hbar(g^{(1)} + w) \quad (30)$$

Indeed, direct substitution yields

$$\hbar^2 \partial_x w = \hbar \Lambda w + \hbar \Lambda g^{(1)} + \Lambda G(x, \hbar, \hbar(g^{(1)} + w)) - \hbar^2 \partial_x g^{(1)} \quad (31)$$

Now, $G^{(0)}(x, y)$ is at least quadratic in y , so $G(x, \hbar, \hbar(g^{(1)} + w))$ is at least of order \hbar^1 , and its order \hbar^1 part is $G^{(1)}(x, 0)$. Examining (21) at order \hbar^1 yields the identity $0 = \Lambda g^{(1)} + \Lambda G^{(1)}(x, 0)$. Thus, $\hbar g^{(1)} + G(x, \hbar, \hbar(g^{(1)} + w))$ is of order at least \hbar^2 . So if we let

$$\hbar^2 W(x, \hbar, y) := \hbar g^{(1)} + G(x, \hbar, \hbar(g^{(1)} + w)) - \hbar^2 \Lambda^{-1} \partial_x g^{(1)} \quad (32)$$

then, upon dividing both sides by \hbar , equation (31) becomes (29).

In particular, when the eigenvalues of the leading-order Jacobian are all distinct, the transformation that takes (1) to a reduced normal form (29) is

$$f \mapsto w \quad \text{given by} \quad f = f^{(0)} + \hbar(f^{(1)} + Pw) \quad (33)$$

§ 1.4. Convergence of the Formal Borel Transform

Even if F is constant in \hbar , the formal perturbative solution \hat{f} from [Theorem 1](#) is generically a divergent power series in \hbar . However, it is not an arbitrary formal series, because (as we prove next) its coefficients $f^{(n)}$ essentially grow at most like $n!$. That is, \hat{f} is a [Gevrey power series](#) in \hbar . Equivalently, its formal Borel transform

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x, \xi) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}[\hat{f}](x, \xi) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} f_{n+1}(x) \xi^n \quad (34)$$

is a convergent power series in the Borel variable ξ . This property remains true if F is holomorphic at $\hbar = 0$, and more generally we have the following theorem.

¶19. Theorem 2. *Consider the nonlinear system (1). Fix a point $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathsf{X} \times \mathbb{C}^N$ and suppose that $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and the leading-order Jacobian $\partial F^{(0)}/\partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) . Assume that (1) admits a normal form with respect to the unique leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$ that satisfies $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. If S is a sectorial domain, then suppose in addition that the perturbative expansion (6) is locally uniformly Gevrey:*

$$F(x, \hbar, y) \simeq \widehat{F}(x, \hbar, y) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \Theta, \text{ loc.unif. } \forall (x, y) \in \mathsf{X} \times \mathbb{C}^N. \quad (35)$$

Then the unique formal perturbative solution \hat{f} with leading-order $f^{(0)}$ is a locally uniformly Gevrey power series in \hbar . In particular, its formal Borel transform (34) is a locally uniformly convergent power series in ξ .

The proof is presented in [§2.2](#). Note, however, that [Theorem 2](#) is not needed for the proof of [Theorem 3](#) below (see [Remark 9](#)).

Let $\mathsf{U} \subset \mathsf{X}$ be the definition domain of \hat{f} . Concretely, [Theorem 2](#) says that if, for any compact subsets $\mathsf{K} \subset \mathsf{U}$ and $\mathsf{K}' \subset \mathbb{C}^N$, there are real constants $A, B > 0$ satisfying

$$|F^{(k)}(x, y)| \leq AB^k k! \quad \forall k \geq 0, \forall (x, y) \in \mathsf{K} \times \mathsf{K}', \quad (36)$$

then there are constants $C, M > 0$ such that

$$|f^{(k)}(x)| \leq CM^k k! \quad \forall x \in \mathsf{K}, \forall k \geq 0. \quad (37)$$

§ 1.5. Trajectories of the Leading-Order Jacobian Eigenvalues

Fix again a regular point $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathsf{X} \times \mathbb{C}^N$ for the nonlinear system (1), let $f^{(0)}$ be the unique leading-order solution with $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$, and let J be the leading-order Jacobian evaluated at $f^{(0)}$, as in (17).

¶20. The leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues define N nonvanishing holomorphic vector fields near x_0 :

$$V_i := \frac{1}{\lambda_i(x)} \partial_x, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (38)$$

Notice that these vector fields appear in normal form (21). For any phase θ , they generate N complex flows Φ_i^θ . Complex flows are similar to flows in real differential geometry or dynamical systems, but not quite as on everyone's lips: a crash course can be found in [§A.3](#). Explicit examples are discussed in [§3](#).

Let Γ_i^+ be the θ -ray (a.k.a. the forward θ -trajectory) of V_i based at the basepoint x_0 . Recall from §A¶15 that Γ_i^+ can be described explicitly as follows:

$$\Gamma_i^+ = \left\{ x \mid \operatorname{Im}\left(e^{-i\theta}\varphi_i(x)\right) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Re}\left(e^{-i\theta}\varphi_i(x)\right) \geq 0 \right\}. \quad (39)$$

where φ_i is a (possibly multivalued) holomorphic function defined by the formula

$$\varphi_i(x) := \int_{x_0}^x \lambda_i(x') dx' \quad (40)$$

The number $z = \varphi_i(x)$ is the complex flow time. The real number $t = \operatorname{Re}(e^{-i\theta}\varphi_i(x))$ is the real flow time parameterising the forward flow interval $I_i^+ := e^{i\theta}[0, t_i^+)$ of Γ_i^+ . The inverse $\gamma_i^+ : z \mapsto x(z) = \varphi_i^{-1}(z)$ is a univalued and conformal map that restricts to a surjection $I_i^+ \rightarrow \Gamma_i^+$.

¶21. **Closed trajectories.** The θ -ray Γ_i^+ is **closed** (or **periodic**) if it is a simple closed curve in X . This means $t_i^+ = \infty$ and there is a real number τ_i such that $\gamma_i^+(t + \tau_i) = \gamma_i^+(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. The period is the smallest nonzero such number τ_i . In this case, φ_i is a particular branch of the multivalued inverse of γ_i^+ . We will also make use of the following fact: *if Γ_i^+ is closed, then all nearby θ -rays are also closed with the same period* (see, e.g., [Str84, §9]). This means that x_0 has a neighbourhood $U_0 \subset X$ such that for every point $x'_0 \in U$ the θ -ray $\Gamma_i'^+$ of V_i based at x'_0 is also closed. The union $\Xi_i^+ \subset X$ of these nearby rays has the topology of an annulus, and $\gamma_i^+ : \Omega_i^+ \rightarrow \Xi_i^+$ is a holomorphic covering map from a forward-invariant subset $\Omega_i^+ \subset \mathbb{C}_z$ for the vector field $e^{-i\theta}\partial_z$ containing the ray $e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+$; i.e., Ω_i^+ has the property that if $z \in \Omega_i^+$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ then $z + e^{i\theta}t \in \Omega_i^+$.

¶22. **Infinite trajectories.** The θ -ray Γ_i^+ is **infinite** if it is not closed but $t_i^+ = \infty$. In this case φ_i is a (univalued) biholomorphism along the ray Γ_i^+ sending $\Gamma_i^+ \rightarrow I_i^+ = e^{i\theta}[0, +\infty)$ bijectively². In general, there is nothing to guarantee that the nearby rays are also infinite, and in fact this is a much studied behaviour for holomorphic vector fields on compact Riemann surfaces (see, e.g., [Str84, §11]).

We will say that Γ_i^+ is **stably infinite** if it is infinite and all nearby θ -rays are also infinite. That is, x_0 has a neighbourhood $U_0 \subset X$ such that for every point $x'_0 \in U$, the θ -ray $\Gamma_i'^+$ of V_i based at x'_0 is also infinite. The union $\Xi_i^+ \subset X$ of these nearby trajectories is a simply connected domain, and the map $\varphi_i : \Xi_i^+ \rightarrow \Omega_i^+$ is a biholomorphism onto a forward-invariant subset $\Omega_i^+ \subset \mathbb{C}_z$ for the vector field $e^{-i\theta}\partial_z$ containing the ray $e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+$.

A ray which is neither infinite nor closed is called a **finite ray**. Typically, finite rays converge to a turning point in finite time (in which case they are also often called **critical rays**). See §3 for examples.

²This definition uses the implicit assumption that Γ_i^+ is maximal in the sense that if Γ_i^+ is neither closed nor infinite then the forward flow interval I_i^+ is necessarily bounded and cannot be extended to any larger interval

§ 1.6. Exact Perturbation Theory

We are now ready to state the main result of this paper.

¶23. Theorem 3 (Exact Perturbative Existence and Uniqueness Theorem).

Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}_x$ be a domain. Fix a point $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^N$ and a phase θ , and let $S \subset \mathbb{C}_h$ be either a neighbourhood of the origin or a *sectorial domain* with opening $\Theta = (\theta - \frac{\pi}{2}, \theta + \frac{\pi}{2})$. Consider the nonlinear differential system (1), which is

$$\hbar \partial_x f = F(x, \hbar, f) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $F = F(x, \hbar, y) : X \times S \times \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ is a holomorphic map. If S is a neighbourhood of the origin, let $F^{(0)}(x, y) := F(x, 0, y)$. If S is a sectorial domain, assume that F admits a locally uniform *Gevrey asymptotic expansion* as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the closed arc $\bar{\Theta}$:

$$F(x, y, \hbar) \simeq \hat{F}(x, y, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \bar{\Theta}, \text{ loc.unif. } \forall (x, y) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^N \quad . \quad (41)$$

Suppose (x_0, y_0) is a *regular point*; i.e., suppose that $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and that $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) . Let \hat{f} be the unique formal perturbative solution such that $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$, and suppose (1) admits a *normal form* with respect to $f^{(0)}$:

$$\hbar \partial_x g = \Lambda(g + G(x, \hbar, g)) \quad . \quad (42)$$

In addition, for each i , assume that each θ -ray Γ_i^+ is either closed or stably infinite and has a neighbourhood $\Xi_i^+ \subset X$ of nearby θ -rays such that one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- (a) If G is a polynomial in \hbar and the components of y , then the i -th component of each polynomial coefficient is bounded on Ξ_i^+ .
- (b) If S is a neighbourhood of the origin, then the i -th component $G_i(x, \hbar, y)$ of $G(x, \hbar, y)$ is bounded on Ξ_i^+ , uniformly for all \hbar near the origin, and locally uniformly for all $y \in \mathbb{C}^N$.
- (c) If S is a sectorial domain, then the Gevrey asymptotic expansion $G_i \simeq \hat{G}_i$ of the i -th component of G is valid uniformly on Ξ_i^+ :

$$G_i(x, \hbar, y) \simeq \hat{G}_i(x, \hbar, y) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \bar{\Theta}, \text{ unif. } \forall x \in \Xi_i^+, \text{ loc.unif. } \forall y \in \mathbb{C}^N \quad .$$

Then the nonlinear system (1) has a canonical θ -exact perturbative solution f near x_0 whose perturbative expansion is \hat{f} . Namely, there is a subdomain $U_0 \subset X$ containing x_0 and a sectorial subdomain $S_0 \subset S$ with the opening Θ such that the nonlinear system (1) has a unique holomorphic solution $f = f(x, \hbar)$ on $U_0 \times S_0$ which admits \hat{f} as its uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the closed arc $\bar{\Theta}$:

$$f(x, \hbar) \simeq \hat{f}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \bar{\Theta}, \text{ unif. } \forall x \in U_0 \quad . \quad (43)$$

Moreover, f is the uniform *Borel θ -resummation* of its perturbative expansion \hat{f} :

$$f(x, \hbar) = \mathcal{S}_\theta[\hat{f}](x, \hbar) \quad \forall (x, \hbar) \in U_0 \times S_0 \quad . \quad (44)$$

The proof is presented in §2.3. In brief, the strategy is to apply the analytic Borel

transform to (42), rewrite it as an integral equation, find a solution using the method of successive approximations, and then apply the Laplace transform. We now make a few remarks and draw some conclusions.

¶24. **Remark 4** (uniqueness). The uniqueness of the solution f is a direct consequence of the asymptotic property (43); in particular, of the fact that its the Gevrey asymptotics are valid along the *closed* arc $\overline{\Theta}$ of opening angle π . A [theorem of Nevanlinna](#) ([Nev18, pp.44-45]; see also [Nik20, Theorem B.11]) explains how this asymptotic property eliminates exponential corrections that obstruct uniqueness, as mentioned in [Theorem 0](#). The fact that a solution with such a strong asymptotic property exists is the difficult part of [Theorem 3](#).

¶25. **Remark 5** (maximal domains). Since [Theorem 3](#) is an existence and *uniqueness* result (rather than a mere existence result such as [Theorem 0](#)), the exact perturbative solution f can be extended to a maximal domain $U \subset X$ containing x_0 such that

$$f(x, \hbar) \simeq \widehat{f}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \overline{\Theta}, \text{ loc.unif. } \forall x \in U \quad (45)$$

That is, f is a holomorphic solution on some domain $U \subset X \times S$ with $\text{pr}_1(U) = U$ and with the property that every point $x'_0 \in U$ has a neighbourhood $U'_0 \subset U$ such that there is a sectorial domain $S'_0 \subset S$ such that $U'_0 \times S'_0 \subset U$ and f admits \widehat{f} as a uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along $\overline{\Theta}$. Furthermore, f is the locally uniform Borel θ -resummation of \widehat{f} on U :

$$f(x, \hbar) = \mathcal{S}_\theta[\widehat{f}](x, \hbar) \quad \forall (x, \hbar) \in U \quad (46)$$

Examples of such extensions can be found in [§3](#).

¶26. **Remark 6** (Borel summability). Recall from [§A.2](#) that property (44) explicitly means the following. The formal Borel transform of the formal solution \widehat{f} ,

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x, \xi) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}[\widehat{f}](x, \xi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} f^{(k+1)}(x) \xi^k \quad (47)$$

(which is a priori only a formal power series in ξ) is in fact a convergent power series in ξ (uniformly for all $x \in U_0$), and furthermore admits an analytic continuation $\varphi(x, \xi)$ along the ray $e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+ \subset \mathbb{C}_\xi$ such that

$$f(x, \hbar) = f^{(0)}(x) + \hbar \mathfrak{L}_\theta[\varphi](x, \hbar) = f^{(0)}(x) + \hbar \int_{e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi(x, \xi) e^{-\xi/\hbar} d\xi \quad (48)$$

for all $(x, \hbar) \in U_0 \times S_0$. In particular, [Theorem 3](#) implies the Borel summability of the formal perturbative solutions. To be precise, we state it as the following corollary.

¶27. **Corollary 3 (Borel Summability of Formal Solutions)**. Assume all the hypotheses of [Theorem 3](#). Then the formal perturbative solution \widehat{f} is a uniformly Borel θ -summable series near the basepoint x_0 .

¶28. **Remark 7**. Assumptions (a-c) in [Theorem 3](#) are listed in a strictly increasing order of generality: (a) implies (b) which implies (c). However, situations where the easier to state Assumptions (a) or (b) are satisfied are ubiquitous in applications, so we

our judgement is that their importance warrants them being highlighted separately. In particular, Assumption (a) means that G can be written as

$$G(x, y, \hbar) = \sum_{k=0}^{\text{finite}} G^{(k)}(x, y) \hbar^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\text{finite}} \sum_{m=0}^{\text{finite}} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} G_{\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}(x) \hbar^k y^{\mathbf{m}}, \quad (49)$$

where $G_{\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} y^{\mathbf{m}} := G_{m_1 \dots m_N}^{(k)} y_1^{m_1} \dots y_N^{m_N}$. The i -th components $G_{i, \mathbf{m}}^{(k)}$ are what is being referred to in (a). Let us remark also that, unfortunately, the stricter Assumptions (a) or (b) do not seem to lead to any additional special properties of the solution f that can be expressed as a general rule.

¶29. **Remark 8.** Another important situation, often encountered on compact Riemann surfaces, is when all N rays $\Gamma_1^+, \dots, \Gamma_N^+$ are closed. If this is the case, then the hypotheses of [Theorem 3](#) are considerably simplified because any closed trajectory is necessarily contained in an annulus Ξ_i^+ which can always be chosen so thin as to be compactly contained in X . If, in addition, we assume that the leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues are all distinct, then we are guaranteed to be able to find a holomorphic invertible matrix P on the union of all annuli Ξ_i^+ that sends our nonlinear system to a normal form. Furthermore, as each Ξ_i^+ is compactly contained in X , Assumption (c) is automatically satisfied because of (41). Thus, the great advantage of this situation is that in order to verify the hypotheses of [Theorem 3](#), it is not even necessary to explicitly construct and examine a normal form of system (1).

¶30. **Corollary 4 (Distinct Eigenvalues and Closed Trajectories).**

Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}_x$ be a domain. Fix a point $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^N$ and a phase θ , and let $S \subset \mathbb{C}_\hbar$ be either a neighbourhood of the origin or a sectorial domain with opening $\Theta = (\theta - \frac{\pi}{2}, \theta + \frac{\pi}{2})$. Consider the nonlinear differential system (1), where $F = F(x, \hbar, y)$ is a holomorphic map $X \times S \times \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$. If S is a sectorial domain, assume in addition that F admits a locally uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion (41). Suppose that $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and that $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) with distinct eigenvalues. Let \hat{f} be the unique formal perturbative solution such that $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. Finally, assume that each θ -ray Γ_i^+ is closed. Then all the conclusions of [Theorem 3](#) hold verbatim.

¶31. **Remark 9.** Our proof of [Theorem 3](#) does not require [Theorem 2](#). This is because the convergence of the formal Borel transform $\hat{\varphi}$ of \hat{f} follows from [Corollary 3](#) and the general properties of the Borel transform. However, note that the hypotheses of [Theorem 2](#) are much milder than those of [Theorem 3](#); for example, Assumption (c) in [Theorem 3](#) is not imposed in [Theorem 2](#).

§ 2. Proofs

§ 2.1. Formal Perturbation Theory: Proof of Theorem 1

In this subsection we supply a complete proof of the Formal Existence and Uniqueness Theorem (Theorem 1). In fact, this is really a statement about \hbar -formal differential equations, so Theorem 1 is an immediate consequence of the following slightly more general assertion.

¶1. **Lemma 1.** *Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}_x$ be a domain and fix a point $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times \mathbb{C}^N$. Consider the following nonlinear system in formal power series in \hbar :*

$$\hbar \partial_x \hat{f} = \hat{F}(x, \hbar, \hat{f}) , \quad (50)$$

where

$$\hat{F}(x, \hbar, y) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F^{(k)}(x, y) \hbar^k \quad (51)$$

is any formal power series in \hbar with holomorphic coefficients $F^{(k)} : X \times \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$. Assume that $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$ and the Jacobian $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ is invertible at (x_0, y_0) .

Then there exists a unique solution \hat{f} near x_0 with leading-order $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. More precisely, there is a subdomain $U \subset X$ containing x_0 such that (50) has a unique formal power series solution

$$\hat{f} = \hat{f}(x, \hbar) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f^{(n)}(x) \hbar^n \quad (52)$$

with holomorphic coefficients $f^{(n)} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ with $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. In fact, all higher-order corrections $f^{(n)}$ are uniquely determined by the leading-order solution $f^{(0)}$ via an explicit recursive formula.

Proof. First, let us note down a few formulas in order to proceed with the calculation. See §0¶7 for our notational conventions.

¶2. **Step 0: Collect some formulas.** Write the double power series expansion of each component \hat{F}_i as

$$\hat{F}_i(x, \hbar, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}(x) \hbar^k y^{\mathbf{m}} , \quad (53)$$

where $F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} y^{\mathbf{m}} := F_{i,m_1 \dots m_N}^{(k)} y_1^{m_1} \dots y_N^{m_N}$. In particular, the expansion of the leading-order part $F^{(0)}$ is

$$F_i^{(0)}(x, y) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}(x) y^{\mathbf{m}} . \quad (54)$$

For every $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^N$, we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} y^{\mathbf{m}} = \frac{m_j}{y_j} y^{\mathbf{m}}$, so the (i, j) -component of the Jacobian matrix $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ can be written as

$$\left[\frac{\partial F^{(0)}}{\partial y} \right]_{ij} = \frac{\partial F_i^{(0)}}{\partial y_j} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} y^{\mathbf{m}} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \frac{m_j}{y_j} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}(x) y^{\mathbf{m}} . \quad (55)$$

Next, the \mathbf{m} -th power $\hat{f}^{\mathbf{m}}$ of the power series ansatz (52) expands as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f^{(n)} \hbar^n \right)^m &= \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} f_1^{(n_1)} \hbar^{n_1} \right)^{m_1} \cdots \left(\sum_{n_N=0}^{\infty} f_N^{(n_N)} \hbar^{n_N} \right)^{m_N} \\
&= \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|j_1|=n_1} f_1^{(j_1,1)} \cdots f_1^{(j_1,m_1)} \hbar^{n_1} \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{n_N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|j_N|=n_N} f_N^{(j_N,1)} \cdots f_N^{(j_N,m_N)} \hbar^{n_N} \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|n|=n} \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1} f_1^{(j_1,1)} \cdots f_1^{(j_1,m_1)} \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N} f_N^{(j_N,1)} \cdots f_N^{(j_N,m_N)} \right) \hbar^n .
\end{aligned}$$

In these formulas, we have denoted the components of each vector $j_i \in \mathbb{N}^{m_i}$ by $(j_{i,1}, \dots, j_{i,m_i})$. Let us introduce the following shorthand notation:

$$f_m^{(n)} := \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1} f_1^{(j_1,1)} \cdots f_1^{(j_1,m_1)} \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N} f_N^{(j_N,1)} \cdots f_N^{(j_N,m_N)} \right) . \quad (56)$$

We note the following simple but useful identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_0^{(0)} &= 1 ; \quad f_m^{(0)} = f_m^{(0)} = (f_1^{(0)})^{m_1} \cdots (f_N^{(0)})^{m_N} ; \\
f_m^{(n)} &= 0 \text{ whenever } m_i = 0 \text{ but } n_i > 0 \text{ for some } i .
\end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The last identity in particular means $f_0^{(n)} = 0$ whenever $|n| > 0$. Using this notation, the formula for \hat{f}^m can be written much more compactly:

$$\hat{f}^m = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f^{(n)} \hbar^n \right)^m = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|n|=n} f_m^{(n)} \hbar^n . \quad (58)$$

¶3. Step 1: Expand order-by-order. Now, we plug the solution ansatz (11) into the differential equation $\hbar \partial_x \hat{f} = \hat{F}(x, \hbar, \hat{f})$. Using (53) and (58), we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \partial_x f_i^{(n)} \hbar^{n+1} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|m|=m} F_{i,m}^{(k)}(x) \hbar^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|n|=n} f_m^{(n)} \hbar^n , \\
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \partial_x f_i^{(n-1)} \hbar^n &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{|n|=n-k} \sum_{|m|=m} F_{i,m}^{(k)} f_m^{(n)} \hbar^n \quad (i = 1, \dots, N) .
\end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

We solve this system of equations for $f^{(n)}$ order-by-order in \hbar .

¶4. Step 2: Leading-order part. First, at order $n = 0$, equation (59) yields:

$$0 = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|m|=m} F_{i,m}^{(0)}(x) f_0^m \quad (i = 1, \dots, N) . \quad (60)$$

Comparing with (54), these equations are simply the components of the equation $F^{(0)}(x, f^{(0)}) = 0$. By the Holomorphic Implicit Function Theorem, there is a domain $U \subset X$ containing x_0 such that there is a unique holomorphic map $f^{(0)} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ that satisfies $F^{(0)}(x, f^{(0)}(x)) = 0$ and $f^{(0)}(x_0) = y_0$. In fact, the domain U can be chosen so small that the Jacobian $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ remains invertible at $(x, y) = (x, f^{(0)}(x))$

for all $x \in U$. Thus, we can define a holomorphic invertible $N \times N$ -matrix J on U by

$$J(x) := \frac{\partial F^{(0)}}{\partial y} \Big|_{(x, f^{(0)}(x))} \quad (61)$$

The (i, j) -component of J is:

$$[J]_{ij} = \frac{\partial F_i^{(0)}}{\partial y_j} \Big|_{(x, f^{(0)}(x))} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \frac{m_j}{f_j^{(0)}} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{m}} \quad (62)$$

¶5. Step 3: Next-to-leading-order part. For clarity, let us also examine equation (59) at order $n = 1$. First, let us note that if $|\mathbf{n}| = 1$, then $\mathbf{n} = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ with the only 1 in some position j , in which case notation (56) reduces to:

$$\mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{n})} = (f_1^{(0)})^{m_1} \dots (m_j f_j^{(1)}) (f_j^{(0)})^{m_j-1} \dots (f_N^{(0)})^{m_N} = \frac{m_j}{f_j^{(0)}} \mathbf{f}^{(0)} f_j^{(1)} \quad (63)$$

Then at order $n = 1$, equation (59) comprises two main summands corresponding to $k = 0$ and $k = 1$, which simplify using identities (62) and (63):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x f_i^{(0)} &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=1} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{n})} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(1)} \mathbf{f}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{m}} \quad , \\ \partial_x f_i^{(0)} &= \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \frac{m_j}{f_j^{(0)}} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}^{(0)} f_j^{(1)} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(1)} \mathbf{f}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{m}} \quad , \\ \partial_x f_i^{(0)} &= \sum_{j=1}^N [J]_{ij} f_j^{(1)} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(1)} \mathbf{f}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}^{\mathbf{m}} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Observe that the blue term is nothing but the i -th component of the vector $J f^{(1)}$:

$$J f^{(1)} = \partial_x f^{(0)} - F^{(1)}(x, f^{(0)}) \quad (65)$$

Since J is an invertible matrix, multiplying the system of N equations (64) on the left by J^{-1} , we solve uniquely for a holomorphic vector $f^{(1)}$ on U .

¶6. Step 4: Inductive step. Suppose now that $n \geq 1$ and we have already solved equation (59) for holomorphic vectors $f^{(0)}, f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(n-1)}$ on U . Similar to (63), we have that if $\mathbf{n} = (0, \dots, n, \dots, 0)$ with the only nonzero entry in some position j , then

$$\mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{n})} = (f_1^{(0)})^{m_1} \dots (m_j f_j^{(n)}) (f_j^{(0)})^{m_j-1} \dots (f_N^{(0)})^{m_N} = \frac{m_j}{f_j^{(0)}} \mathbf{f}^{(0)} f_j^{(n)} \quad (66)$$

Then at order n in \hbar , we first separate out the $k = 0$ summand from which we then take out all the terms with $\mathbf{n} = (0, \dots, n, \dots, 0)$, and simplify using (62) and (66):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x f_i^{(n-1)} &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{n})} \quad , \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{n})} + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{n})} \right) \quad , \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \frac{m_j}{f_j^{(0)}} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} f_j^{(n)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n}^{n_1, \dots, n_N \neq n} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} \right), \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N [J]_{ij} f_j^{(n)} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n}^{n_1, \dots, n_N \neq n} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} F_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The term in blue is nothing but the i -th component of the vector $Jf^{(n)}$. Observe that the remaining part of this expression involves only the already-known components of the lower-order vectors $f^{(0)}, \dots, f^{(n-1)}$. Therefore, since J is invertible, multiplying this system of N equations on the left by J^{-1} , we can solve uniquely for the holomorphic vector $f^{(n)}$ on U . \blacksquare

§ 2.2. Convergence of the Formal Borel Transform: Proof of Theorem 2

In this subsection, we supply a proof of Theorem 2. Since the nonlinear system (1) admits a normal form by assumption, it is sufficient to prove Theorem 2 for nonlinear systems in *reduced normal form*. Recall that these are systems of the form

$$\hbar \partial_x w = \Lambda \left(w + \hbar W(x, \hbar, w) \right), \quad (67)$$

where $W(x, \hbar, y)$ is any holomorphic vector function with locally uniform Gevrey asymptotics as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, and $\Lambda = \Lambda(x)$ is a holomorphic invertible diagonal matrix. Furthermore, Theorem 2 is really a statement about \hbar -formal differential equations, so it follows immediately from the following slightly more general assertion.

¶7. Lemma 2. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{C}_x$ be a domain and fix a point $(x_0, y_0) \in U \times \mathbb{C}^N$. Consider the following nonlinear system in formal \hbar -power series \widehat{w} :*

$$\hbar \partial_x \widehat{w} = \Lambda \left(\widehat{w} + \hbar \widehat{W}(x, \hbar, \widehat{w}) \right), \quad (68)$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$ is a holomorphic invertible diagonal matrix on U , and

$$\widehat{W}(x, \hbar, y) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} W^{(k)}(x, y) \hbar^k \quad (69)$$

is any locally uniformly Gevrey power series in \hbar on $U \times \mathbb{C}^N$. Then the unique formal \hbar -power series solution \widehat{w} is also locally uniformly Gevrey. In particular, its formal Borel transform $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}[\widehat{w}](x, \xi)$ is a locally uniformly convergent power series in ξ .

Proof. Using a very similar computation as in the proof of Theorem 1, we can deduce that the unique formal power series solution of (68) is

$$\widehat{w} = \widehat{w}(x, \hbar) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} w^{(n)}(x) \hbar^n \quad (70)$$

whose terms are given by the following recursive formula:

$$w_i^{(n+1)} = \lambda_i^{-1} \partial_x w_i^{(n)} - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} w_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} \quad (71)$$

Here, $W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} = W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}(x)$ are the coefficients of the double power series

$$\widehat{W}_i(x, \hbar, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}(x) \hbar^k y^{\mathbf{m}}, \quad (72)$$

and we have introduced the shorthand notation

$$\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} := \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1}^{j_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1}} w_1^{(j_{1,1})} \dots w_1^{(j_{1,m_1})} \right) \dots \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N}^{j_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N}} w_N^{(j_{N,1})} \dots w_N^{(j_{N,m_N})} \right). \quad (73)$$

Indeed, the fact that $w^{(0)} \equiv 0$ is obvious, and if we plug the solution ansatz (70) into the double power series expansion (72) of \widehat{W}_i , then the righthand side of equation (68) expands as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \hbar^k \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} w^{(n)} \hbar^n \right)^m &= \hbar \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} \hbar^{k+n} \\ &= \hbar \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)} \hbar^n. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbb{D}_R \subset \mathbb{U}$ be any sufficiently small disc of radius $R > 0$ such that there are constants $A, B > 0$ that give the following bounds: for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, all $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$, all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^N$ with $|\mathbf{m}| = m$, and all $x \in \mathbb{D}_R$,

$$|W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}(x)| \leq \rho_m A B^{k+m} k! \quad \text{and} \quad |\lambda_i^{-1}(x)| \leq A, \quad (74)$$

where ρ_m is a normalisation constant defined by

$$\frac{1}{\rho_m} := \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} 1 = \binom{m+N-1}{N-1}. \quad (75)$$

It will be convenient for us to assume without loss of generality that $A \geq 3$ and $R < 1$. We shall prove that the solution \widehat{w} is a uniformly Gevrey power series on any compactly contained subset of \mathbb{D}_R . In fact, we will prove something a little bit stronger as follows. For any $r \in (0, R)$, denote by $\mathbb{D}_r \subset \mathbb{D}_R$ the concentric subdisc of radius r . Then our assertions follow from the following lemma.

¶8. Lemma 3. *There is a real constant $M > 0$ such that, for all $r \in (0, R)$,*

$$|w_i^{(n+1)}(x)| \leq M^{n+1} (R-r)^{-n} n! \quad (76)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all $i = 1, \dots, N$, and uniformly for all $x \in \mathbb{D}_r$. (The constant M is independent of r, x, n , but may depend on R, A, B .) In particular, for any $r \in (0, R)$, the power series \widehat{w} is uniformly Gevrey on \mathbb{D}_r .

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to proving Lemma 3. The bound (76) will be demonstrated in two main steps. First, we will recursively construct a sequence $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of nonnegative real numbers such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all $i =$

$1, \dots, N$, all $r \in (0, R)$, and all $x \in \mathbb{D}_r$, we have the bound

$$|w_i^{(n+1)}(x)| \leq M_{n+1} \delta^{-n} n! , \quad (77)$$

where we put $\delta := R - r$. Then we will show that there is a constant $M > 0$ (independent of r) such that $M_n \leq M^n$ for all n .

¶**9. Step 1: Construction of $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$.** Let $M_0 := 0$. Now we use induction on n and formula (71).

¶**10. Step 1.1: Inductive hypothesis.** Assume that we have already constructed nonnegative real numbers M_0, \dots, M_n such that, for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, all $k = 0, \dots, n-1$, all $r \in (0, R)$, and all $x \in \mathbb{D}_r$, we have the bound

$$|w_i^{(k+1)}(x)| \leq M_{k+1} \delta^{-k} k! \quad (78)$$

¶**11. Step 1.2: Bounding the derivative.** In order to derive an estimate for $w_i^{(n+1)}$, we first need to estimate the derivative term $\partial_x w_i^{(n)}$, for which we use Cauchy estimates as follows. We claim that for all $r \in (0, R)$ and all $x \in \mathbb{D}_r$,

$$|\partial_x w_i^{(n)}(x)| \leq A M_n \delta^{-n} n! . \quad (79)$$

Indeed, for every $r \in (0, R)$, we define

$$\delta_n := \delta \frac{n}{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad r_n := R - \delta_n .$$

Then inequality (78) holds in particular with $k = n-1$ and $r = r_n$, yielding

$$|w_i^{(n)}(x)| \leq M_n \delta_n^{1-n} (n-1)! = M_n \delta^{1-n} \frac{n}{n+1} \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^n (n-1)! \leq A M_n \delta^{-n} n! \frac{\delta}{n+1} .$$

Here, we have used the estimate $(1 + 1/n)^n \leq e \leq A$. Finally, notice that for every $x \in \mathbb{D}_r$, the closed disc centred at x of radius $r_n - r = (R - \delta_n) - (R - \delta) = \delta - \delta_n = \frac{\delta}{n+1}$ is contained inside the disc \mathbb{D}_{r_n} . Therefore, Cauchy estimates imply (79).

¶**12. Step 1.3: Bounding $w_m^{(n)}$.** Let us estimate each $w_m^{(n)}$ separately using formula (73):

$$\begin{aligned} |w_m^{(n)}| &\leq \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1}^{j_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1}} |w_1^{(j_{1,1})}| \cdots |w_1^{(j_{1,m_1})}| \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N}^{j_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N}} |w_N^{(j_{N,1})}| \cdots |w_N^{(j_{N,m_N})}| \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1}^{j_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1}} M_{j_{1,1}} \cdots M_{j_{1,m_1}} \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N}^{j_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N}} M_{j_{N,1}} \cdots M_{j_{N,m_N}} \right) \delta^{-n} (|n| - |m|)! , \end{aligned}$$

where we repeatedly used the inequality $i!j! \leq (i+j)!$. Introduce the following shorthand:

$$M_n^m := \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1}^{j_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1}} M_{j_{1,1}} \cdots M_{j_{1,m_1}} \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N}^{j_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N}} M_{j_{N,1}} \cdots M_{j_{N,m_N}} \right) . \quad (80)$$

Then the above estimate for $w_m^{(n)}$ becomes simply $|w_m^{(n)}| \leq M_n^m \delta^{-n} (|n| - |m|)!$.

¶13. **Step 1.4: Inductive step.** Now we can finally estimate $w_i^{(n+1)}$ using formula (71):

$$\begin{aligned}
|w_i^{(n+1)}| &\leq |\lambda_i^{-1} \partial_x w_i^{(n)}| + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} |W_{i,\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}| \cdot |\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{m}}^{(n)}| \\
&\leq A^2 M_n \delta^{-n} n! + \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \rho_m A B^{k+m} k! M_{\mathbf{n}}^m \delta^{-n} (n-k-m)! \\
&\leq A^2 \left(M_n + \sum_{k=0}^n B^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \rho_m B^m M_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right) \delta^{-n} n! .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can define

$$M_{n+1} := A^2 \left(M_n + \sum_{k=0}^n B^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \rho_m B^m M_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right) . \quad (81)$$

¶14. **Step 2: Construction of M .** To see that $M_n \leq M^n$ for some $M > 0$, we argue as follows. Consider the following pair of power series in an abstract variable t :

$$\widehat{p}(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M_n t^n \quad \text{and} \quad Q(t) := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} B^m t^m . \quad (82)$$

Notice that $\widehat{p}(0) = M_0 = 0$ and that $Q(t)$ is convergent. We will show that $\widehat{p}(t)$ is also convergent. The key is the observation that they satisfy the following equation, which was found by trial and error:

$$\widehat{p}(t) = A^2 \left(t \widehat{p}(t) + t Q(t) Q(\widehat{p}(t)) \right) = A^2 \left(t \widehat{p}(t) + t Q(t) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} B^m \widehat{p}(t)^m \right) . \quad (83)$$

¶15. **Step 2.1: Verification.** In order to verify this equality, we rewrite the power series $Q(t)$ in the following way:

$$Q(t) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m B^m t^{\mathbf{m}} ,$$

where $t^{\mathbf{m}} := t^{m_1} \dots t^{m_N} = t^m$. Then (83) is straightforward to check directly by substituting the power series $\widehat{p}(t)$ and $Q(t)$ and comparing the coefficients of t^{n+1} using the defining formula (81) for M_{n+1} . Indeed, using the notation introduced in (80), we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{p}(t)^{\mathbf{m}} &= \widehat{p}(t)^{m_1} \dots \widehat{p}(t)^{m_N} \\
&= \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} M_{n_1} t^{n_1} \right)^{m_1} \dots \left(\sum_{n_N=0}^{\infty} M_{n_N} t^{n_N} \right)^{m_N} \\
&= \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{j}_1|=n_1} M_{j_{1,1}} \dots M_{j_{1,m_1}} t^{n_1} \right) \dots \left(\sum_{n_N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{j}_N|=n_N} M_{j_{N,1}} \dots M_{j_{N,m_N}} t^{n_N} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j}_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1} \\ |\mathbf{j}_1|=n_1}} M_{j_{1,1}} \cdots M_{j_{1,m_1}} \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j}_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N} \\ |\mathbf{j}_N|=n_N}} M_{j_{N,1}} \cdots M_{j_{N,m_N}} \right) t^n \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m t^n .
\end{aligned}$$

Then the bracketed expression on the righthand side of (83) expands as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&t\hat{p}(t) + t \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B^k t^k \right) \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m B^m (\hat{p}(t))^m \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M_n t^{n+1} + t \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B^k t^k \right) \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m B^m \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m t^n \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M_n t^{n+1} + t \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B^k t^k \right) \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n t^n \right) \quad \text{where} \quad C_n := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \rho_m B^m M_{\mathbf{n}}^m t^n \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M_n t^{n+1} + t \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n B^k C_{n-k} t^n \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(M_n + \sum_{k=0}^n B^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-k} \rho_m B^m M_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right) t^{n+1} ,
\end{aligned}$$

which matches with (81).

¶16. **Step 2.2: Implicit Function Theorem argument.** Now, consider the following holomorphic function in two complex variables (t, p) :

$$P(t, p) := -p + A^2 t p + A^2 t Q(t) Q(p) .$$

It has the following properties:

$$P(0, 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{\partial P}{\partial p} \right|_{(t,p)=(0,0)} = -1 \neq 0 .$$

By the Holomorphic Implicit Function Theorem, there exists a unique holomorphic function $p(t)$ near $t = 0$ such that $p(t) = 0$ and $P(t, p(t)) = 0$. Thus, $\hat{p}(t)$ must be the convergent Taylor series expansion at $t = 0$ for $p(t)$, and so its coefficients grow at most exponentially: i.e., there is a constant $M > 0$ such that $M_n \leq M^n$. ■

§ 2.3. Exact Perturbation Theory: Proof of Theorem 3

In this subsection, we present a proof of our main result, [Theorem 3](#).

Proof of Theorem 3: Uniqueness. The uniqueness of f follows from the asymptotic property (43). Indeed, suppose f' is another such solution. Then their difference $f - f'$ is a holomorphic map $U_0 \times S_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ which is uniformly Gevrey asymptotic to the zero map as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the closed arc $\bar{\Theta}$ of opening angle π . By [Nevanlinna's Theorem](#), there can only be one holomorphic function on S_0 (namely, the constant function 0) which is Gevrey asymptotic to 0 as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along $\bar{\Theta}$, so $f - f'$ must be the zero map. ■

Proof of Theorem 3: Existence. We reduce our problem to solving a much simpler system on a horizontal halfstrip. We do so in several steps.

¶17. **Step 1: Normal form.** A solution g of normal form (42) yields a solution f of (1) by undoing the transformations that brought (1) to normal form (42), as described in §1.3. Therefore, it is sufficient to find a holomorphic solution $g = g(x, \hbar)$, defined on $U_0 \times S_0$ as in the theorem statement, which admits a uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion \widehat{g} with $g^{(0)} = 0$ as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the closed arc $\overline{\Theta}$:

$$g(x, \hbar) \simeq \widehat{g}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \overline{\Theta}, \text{ unif. } \forall x \in U_0 . \quad (84)$$

Moreover, this solution g is to have the property that it is the uniform Borel θ -resummation of the formal perturbative solution \widehat{g} :

$$g(x, \hbar) = \mathcal{S}_\theta[\widehat{f}](x, \hbar) \quad \forall (x, \hbar) \in U_0 \times S_0 . \quad (85)$$

¶18. **Step 2: Reduced normal form.** Recall from §1¶18 that normal form (42) can be further simplified to a reduced normal form

$$\hbar \partial_x w = \Lambda \left(w + \hbar W(x, \hbar, w) \right) . \quad (86)$$

where $W(x, \hbar, y)$ is a holomorphic vector function with locally uniform Gevrey asymptotics as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along $\overline{\Theta}$ and with the same regularity along the trajectories Γ_i^+ as G ; namely, that its i -th component W_i satisfies:

$$W_i(x, \hbar, y) \simeq \widehat{W}_i(x, \hbar, y) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \overline{\Theta}, \text{ unif. } \forall x \in \Xi_i^+, \text{ loc.unif. } \forall y \in \mathbb{C}^N .$$

Therefore, to find a solution g to normal form (42) with the asserted properties, it is in fact sufficient to find a solution $w = w(x, \hbar)$ to reduced normal form (86), defined on $U_0 \times S_0$ as in the theorem statement, which admits a uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion with $w^{(0)} = 0$ as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the closed arc $\overline{\Theta}$:

$$w(x, \hbar) \simeq \widehat{w}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \overline{\Theta}, \text{ unif. } \forall x \in U_0 . \quad (87)$$

Moreover, this solution w must be the uniform Borel θ -resummation of the formal perturbative solution \widehat{w} :

$$w(x, \hbar) = \mathcal{S}_\theta[\widehat{w}](x, \hbar) \quad \forall (x, \hbar) \in U_0 \times S_0 . \quad (88)$$

¶19. **Step 3: Simplify the domain.** By a simple rotation in the \hbar -plane, we can assume without loss of generality that $\theta = 0$. We also immediately restrict our attention to a Borel sector in the \hbar -plane of some radius $r > 0$; i.e., let $S = \{ \hbar \mid \operatorname{Re}(1/\hbar) > 1/r \}$.

Recall from §1.5 that each neighbourhood Ξ_i^+ comes with a local biholomorphism $\gamma_i^+ : \Omega_i^+ \rightarrow \Xi_i^+$ (in fact, an actual biholomorphism if Γ_i^+ is not closed) from a forward-invariant subset $\Omega_i^+ \subset \mathbb{C}_z$ containing the positive real ray $\mathbb{R}_+ \subset \mathbb{C}_z$. That is, Ω_i^+ has the property that $z + t \in \Omega_i^+$ whenever $z \in \Omega_i^+$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Any such set Ω_i^+ contains a tubular neighbourhood Ω of \mathbb{R}_+ of small enough radius $R > 0$. Therefore, no generality is lost if we assume from the start that each Ω_i^+ is such a

tubular neighbourhood:

$$\Omega_i^+ = \Omega := \left\{ z \mid \text{dist}(z, \mathbb{R}_+) < R \right\} . \quad (89)$$

In the interest of clarity, let us drop from now on the superscript “+” in “ Ξ_i^+ ”, “ γ_i^+ ”, and “ Γ_i^+ ”, and consider the fact that we have N local biholomorphisms $\gamma_i : \Omega \rightarrow \Xi_i$. If the trajectory Γ_i is not closed, then γ_i is a biholomorphism; otherwise, replace Ξ_i with a covering space on which the distinguished local inverse φ_i , given by formula (40), is univalued. In any case, we can assume that each $\gamma_i : \Omega \rightarrow \Xi_i$ is a biholomorphism. They further yield biholomorphisms

$$\gamma_{ij} := \gamma_j \circ \gamma_i^{-1} : \Xi_i \rightarrow \Xi_j . \quad (90)$$

¶20. Step 4: Coordinate transformation. Differential system (86) is a system of N equations in N variables w_1, \dots, w_N :

$$\hbar \frac{1}{\lambda_i(x)} \partial_x w_i = w_i + \hbar W_i(x, \hbar, \dots, w_j, \dots) . \quad (91)$$

Restrict to Ξ_1 and make another change of the unknown variables $\tilde{w}_i = \gamma_{i1}^* w_i$:

$$\hbar \frac{1}{\lambda_i(x)} \partial_x (\gamma_{i1}^* \tilde{w}_i) = \gamma_{i1}^* \tilde{w}_i + \hbar W_i(x, \hbar, \dots, \gamma_{i1}^* \tilde{w}_j, \dots) . \quad (92)$$

Let $x_i := \gamma_{i1}(x)$, interpreted as a new coordinate on the domain Ξ_i . Then the pullback by γ_{i1} of the i -th equation is

$$\hbar \frac{1}{\lambda_i(x_i)} \partial_{x_i} \tilde{w}_i = \tilde{w}_i + \hbar W_i(x_i, \hbar, \dots, \gamma_{ij}^* \tilde{w}_j, \dots) . \quad (93)$$

Finally, pulling back the i -th equation to Ω by γ_i , and using the property that $(\gamma_i)_* \partial_z = \lambda_i^{-1}(x_i) \partial_{x_i}$, yields a new system

$$\hbar \partial_z s = s + \hbar A(z, \hbar, s) , \quad (94)$$

on $\Omega \times S$ where $s_i = \gamma_i^* \tilde{w}_i$ and $A_i = \gamma_i^* W_i$. It follows that $A = A(z, \hbar, y)$ is a holomorphic vector function on $\Omega \times S \times \mathbb{C}^N$ which admits a Gevrey asymptotic expansion \hat{A} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along $[-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2}]$, uniformly for all $z \in \Omega$ and locally uniformly for all $y \in \mathbb{C}^N$. Therefore, [Theorem 3](#) follows immediately from the following general lemma. ■

¶21. Lemma 4 (Exact Perturbative Existence and Uniqueness on a Halfstrip).

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}_z$ be an open positive halfstrip and $S \subset \mathbb{C}_\hbar$ a Borel sector bisected by the positive real axis:

$$\Omega := \{ z \mid \text{dist}(z, \mathbb{R}_+) < R \}, \quad S := \{ \hbar \mid \text{Re}(1/\hbar) > 1/r \} ,$$

for some $R, r > 0$. Let $A = A(z, \hbar, y)$ be a holomorphic map $\Omega \times S \times \mathbb{C}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$ which admits a Gevrey asymptotic expansion \hat{A} as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in the closed right halfplane,

uniformly in $z \in \Omega$ and locally uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{C}^N$:

$$A(z, \hbar, y) \simeq \widehat{A}(z, \hbar, y) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } [-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2}] . \quad (95)$$

Then the nonlinear system

$$\hbar \partial_z s = s + \hbar A(z, \hbar, s) \quad (96)$$

has a canonical exact perturbative solution s on Ω . Namely, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, R)$, there is a $\delta \in [0, r)$ such that (96) has a unique holomorphic solution $s = s(z, \hbar)$ on

$$\Omega_\varepsilon \times S_\delta := \{z \mid \text{dist}(z, \mathbb{R}_+) < R - \varepsilon\} \times \{\hbar \mid \text{Re}(1/\hbar) > 1/(r - \delta)\} \subset \Omega \times S$$

which admits a uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion \widehat{s} with $s^{(0)} = 0$ as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in the closed right halfplane:

$$s(x, \hbar) \simeq \widehat{s}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } [-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2}], \text{ unif. } \forall z \in \Omega_\varepsilon . \quad (97)$$

Proof. The strategy to construct s is as follows. In Step 1, we apply the (analytic) Borel transform to system (96). This leads to a first-order nonlinear partial integro-differential equation (that is, a PDE with convolution). In Step 2, we rewrite this equation as an integral equation. Then in Step 3, we use the method of successive approximations to solve this integral equation, with most of the heavy lifting done in the proof of Lemma 5. Finally, in Step 4, we apply the Laplace transform to the solution of this integral equation to obtain the desired solution s .

¶22. Step 0: Expansion. Each component A^i of A can be expressed as a uniformly convergent multipower series in the components y_1, \dots, y_N of y :

$$A^i(z, \hbar, y) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} A_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z, \hbar) y^{\mathbf{m}} , \quad (98)$$

where $A_{\mathbf{m}}^i y^{\mathbf{m}} := A_{m_1 \dots m_N}^i y_1^{m_1} \dots y_N^{m_N}$. It is convenient to separate the $m = 0$ term from the sum:

$$A^i(z, \hbar, y) = A_{\mathbf{0}}^i + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} A_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z, \hbar) y^{\mathbf{m}} , \quad (99)$$

where $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)$. Then the system of equations (96) can be written as

$$\hbar \partial_z s_i - s_i = \hbar A_{\mathbf{0}}^i + \hbar \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} A_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z, \hbar) s^{\mathbf{m}} . \quad (100)$$

¶23. Step 1: The analytic Borel transform. Let $a_{\mathbf{m}}^i = a_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z)$ be the \hbar -leading-order part of $A_{\mathbf{m}}^i$ and let $\alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z, \xi) := \mathfrak{B}[A_{\mathbf{m}}^i](z, \xi)$. By assumption, there is some real number $\rho > 0$ such that each $\alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i$ is a holomorphic function on $\Omega \times \Sigma$, where

$$\Sigma := \{\xi \mid \text{dist}(\xi, \mathbb{R}_+) < \rho\} \subset \mathbb{C}_\xi ,$$

with uniformly at-most-exponential growth at infinity in ξ , and such that

$$A_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z, \hbar) = a_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z) + \mathfrak{L}[\alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i](z, \hbar) \quad (101)$$

for all $(z, \hbar) \in \Omega \times S$ provided that the radius r of S is sufficiently small.

Dividing each equation (100) by \hbar and applying the analytic Borel transform, we obtain the following system of N coupled nonlinear differential equations with convolution:

$$\partial_z \sigma^i - \partial_\xi \sigma^i = \alpha_0^i + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left(a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}} \right), \quad (102)$$

where $\sigma^{*\mathbf{m}} := (\sigma^1)^{*m_1} * \dots * (\sigma^N)^{*m_N}$ and the unknown variables s_i and σ^i are related by $\sigma^i = \mathfrak{B}[s_i]$ and $s_i = \mathfrak{L}[\sigma^i]$.

¶24. Step 2: The integral equation. The lefthand side of (102) has constant coefficients, so it is easy to rewrite it as an equivalent integral equation as follows. Consider the holomorphic change of variables

$$(z, \xi) \xrightarrow{T} (\zeta, t) := (z + \xi, \xi) \quad \text{and its inverse} \quad (\zeta, t) \xrightarrow{T^{-1}} (z, \xi) = (\zeta - t, t).$$

Explicitly, for any function $\alpha = \alpha(z, \xi)$ of two variables,

$$T^* \alpha(z, \xi) := \alpha(T(z, \xi)) = \alpha(z + \xi, \xi) \quad \text{and} \quad T_* \alpha(\zeta, t) := \alpha(T^{-1}(\zeta, t)) = \alpha(\zeta - t, t).$$

Note that $T^* T_* \alpha = \alpha$. Under this change of coordinates, the differential operator $\partial_z - \partial_\xi$ transforms into $-\partial_t$, and so the lefthand side of (102) becomes $-\partial_t (T_* \sigma^i)$. Integrating from 0 to t , imposing the initial condition $\sigma^i(z, 0) = a_0^i(z)$, and then applying T^* , we convert system (102) into the following system of integral equations:

$$\sigma^i = a_0^i - T^* \int_0^t T_* \left(\alpha_0^i + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left(a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}} \right) \right) du. \quad (103)$$

More explicitly, this integral equation reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^i(z, \xi) = a_0^i(z) - \int_0^\xi \left[\alpha_0^i(z + \xi - u, u) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left(a_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z + \xi - u, u) \cdot \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}}(z + \xi - u, u) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + (\alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}})(z + \xi - u, u) \right) \right] du. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the integration is done along a straight line segment in Σ from 0 to ξ . Note also that the convolution products are with respect to the second argument; i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha * \alpha')(t_1, t_2) &= \int_0^{t_2} \alpha(t_1, t_2 - y) \alpha'(t_1, y) dy, \\ (\alpha * \alpha' * \alpha'')(t_1, t_2) &= \int_0^{t_2} \alpha(t_1, t_2 - y) \int_0^y \alpha'(t_1, y - y') \alpha''(t_1, y') dy' dy. \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the following notation: for any function $\alpha = \alpha(z, \xi)$ of two variables,

$$I[\alpha](z, \xi) := -T^* \int_0^t T_* \alpha \, du = - \int_0^\xi \alpha(z + \xi - u, u) \, du = \int_0^\xi \alpha(z + t, \xi - t) \, dt \quad , \quad (104)$$

where as before the integration path is the straight line segment connecting 0 to ξ . Then the system of integral equations (103) can be written more succinctly as follows:

$$\sigma^i = a_0^i + I \left[\alpha_0^i + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left(a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sigma^{*\mathbf{m}} \right) \right] \quad . \quad (105)$$

¶25. **Step 3: Method of successive approximations.** To solve this system, we use the method of successive approximations. To this end, define a sequence of holomorphic maps $\{\sigma_n = (\sigma_n^1, \dots, \sigma_n^N) : \Omega \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, as follows: for each $i = 1, \dots, N$, let

$$\sigma_0^i := a_0^i \quad , \quad \sigma_1^i := I \left[\alpha_0^i + \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sigma_0^{\mathbf{m}} \right] \quad , \quad (106)$$

$$\sigma_n^i := I \left[\sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left(a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{m}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{m}} \right) \right] \quad (n \geq 2) \quad . \quad (107)$$

Here, we have introduced the following notation: for any $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^N$,

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{m}} := \left(\sum_{|j_1|=n_1}^{j_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1}} \sigma_{j_{1,1}}^1 * \dots * \sigma_{j_{1,m_1}}^1 \right) * \dots * \left(\sum_{|j_N|=n_N}^{j_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N}} \sigma_{j_{N,1}}^N * \dots * \sigma_{j_{N,m_N}}^N \right) \quad . \quad (108)$$

Let us also note the following simple but useful identities:

$$\sigma_0^0 = 1 \quad ; \quad \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^0 = 0 \text{ whenever } |\mathbf{n}| > 0 \quad ; \quad (109)$$

$$\sigma_0^{\mathbf{m}} = (\sigma_0^1)^{*m_1} * \dots * (\sigma_0^N)^{*m_N} = \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sigma_0^{\mathbf{m}} \xi^{m-1} \quad . \quad (110)$$

The crux of the argument is the following lemma.

¶26. **Lemma 5.** Fix any $\varepsilon \in (0, R)$ and let $\Omega_\varepsilon := \{z \mid \text{dist}(z, \mathbb{R}_+) < R - \varepsilon\} \subset \Omega$. Let ρ (which is the thickness of the halfstrip Σ) be so small that $\rho < \varepsilon$. Then the infinite series

$$\sigma(z, \xi) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n(z, \xi) \quad (111)$$

defines a holomorphic solution of the system of integral equations (105) on the domain

$$\Omega := \{(z, \xi) \in \Omega \times \Sigma \mid z + \xi \in \Omega\} \quad ,$$

where it has uniformly at-most-exponential growth at infinity in ξ ; more precisely, there are constants $D, K > 0$ such that

$$|\sigma(x, \xi)| \leq D e^{K|\xi|} \quad \forall (x, \xi) \in \Omega \quad . \quad (112)$$

Furthermore, the formal Borel transform

$$\widehat{\sigma}(z, \xi) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}[\widehat{s}](z, \xi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} s_{n+1}(z) \xi^n \quad (113)$$

of the formal perturbative solution $\widehat{s}(z, \hbar)$ of (96) is the Taylor series expansion of σ at $\xi = 0$. In particular, σ is a well-defined holomorphic solution on $\Omega_\varepsilon \times \Sigma \subset \Omega$ where it satisfies the exponential estimate (112).

We will prove this lemma in the next subsection. Let us explain how it completes the proof of Lemma 4 and hence Theorem 3.

¶27. **Step 4: Laplace transform.** Assuming Lemma 5, only one step remains and that is to apply the Laplace transform to σ :

$$s(z, \hbar) := \mathfrak{L}[\sigma](z, \hbar) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\xi/\hbar} \sigma(z, \xi) d\xi \quad (114)$$

Thanks to the exponential estimate (112), this Laplace integral is uniformly convergent for all $z \in \Omega_\varepsilon$ provided that $\operatorname{Re}(1/\hbar) > K$. Thus, if we take $\delta \in [0, r)$ such that $1/(r - \delta) > K$, then formula (114) defines a holomorphic solution of differential equation (96) on the domain $\Omega_\varepsilon \times S_\delta$ where $S_\delta := \{\hbar \mid \operatorname{Re}(1/\hbar) > 1/(r - \delta)\}$. Furthermore, Nevanlinna's Theorem implies that s admits a uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion on Ω_ε as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along $\bar{\Theta}$, and this asymptotic expansion is the formal perturbative solution \widehat{s} of differential equation (96). ■

§ 2.4. Method of Successive Approximations: Proof of Lemma 5

The only unresolved step remaining in the proof of Lemma 4 and hence of Theorem 3 is Lemma 5, which we prove now.

Proof of Lemma 5. First, assuming that the infinite series σ is uniformly convergent for all $(z, \xi) \in \Omega$, we will verify in Step 1 that it satisfies the integral equation (105) by direct substitution. Then in Step 2 we will prove that σ is uniformly convergent.

¶28. **Step 1: Solution check.** The righthand side of (105) becomes:

$$a_0^i + I \left[\alpha_0^i + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \right)^{*m} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \right)^{*m} \right] \quad (115)$$

Using the notation introduced in (108), the m -fold convolution product of the infinite series σ expands as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \right)^{*m} \\ &= \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \sigma_{n_1}^1 \right)^{*m_1} * \cdots * \left(\sum_{n_N=0}^{\infty} \sigma_{n_N}^N \right)^{*m_N} \\ &= \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{j}_1|=\mathbf{n}_1}^{j_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1}} \sigma_{j_1,1}^1 * \cdots * \sigma_{j_1,m_1}^1 \right) * \cdots * \left(\sum_{n_N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{j}_N|=\mathbf{n}_N}^{j_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N}} \sigma_{j_N,1}^N * \cdots * \sigma_{j_N,m_N}^N \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j}_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{m_1} \\ |\mathbf{j}_1|=n_1}} \sigma_{j_{1,1}}^1 * \cdots * \sigma_{j_{1,m_1}}^1 \right) * \cdots * \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j}_N \in \mathbb{N}^{m_N} \\ |\mathbf{j}_N|=n_N}} \sigma_{j_{N,1}}^N * \cdots * \sigma_{j_{N,m_N}}^N \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m.
\end{aligned}$$

Use this to rewrite the blue terms in (115), separating out first the $m = 1$ part and then the $(m, n) = (1, 1)$ part using identity (110):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}} \right)^{*m} \\
&= \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m \\
&= \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sigma_0^m + \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this back into (115) and using (106), we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_0^i + \sigma_1^i + I \left[\sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right. \\
\left. + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right]. \quad (116)
\end{aligned}$$

The goal is to show that the integral in (116) is equal to $\sum_{n \geq 2} \sigma_n^i$. Focus on the expression inside the integral:

$$\sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m.$$

Shift the summation index n up by 1 in the black sum, by m in the blue sum, and by $m + 1$ in the green sum (shifted indices are highlighted in orange):

$$\sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m.$$

Notice that all terms in the blue sum with $n < m$ are zero, so we can start the summation over n from $n = 2$ (which is the lowest possible value of m) without altering the result. Similarly, all terms in the green sum with $n < m + 1$ are zero, so we may as well start from $n = 2$. The black sum is left unaltered. Thus, we get:

$$\sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m.$$

The advantage of this way of expressing the sums is that we can now interchange the summations over m and n to obtain:

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} a_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right\}.$$

Observe that the black sum fits well into the blue sum over m to give the $m = 1$ term. So we get:

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left\{ a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right\}.$$

Finally, notice that both sums are empty for $m > n$, so we get:

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left\{ a_{\mathbf{m}}^i \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i * \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m-1} \sigma_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right\}.$$

The sum over m is precisely the expression inside the integral in (107) defining σ_n^i . This shows that σ satisfies the integral equation (105).

¶29. Step 2: Convergence. Now we show that σ is a uniformly convergent series on Ω and therefore defines a holomorphic map $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$. In the process, we also establish the estimate (112).

Let $B, C, L > 0$ be such that for all $(z, \xi) \in \Omega$, all $j = 1, \dots, N$, and all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^N$,

$$|a_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z)| \leq \rho_m C B^m \quad \text{and} \quad |\alpha_{\mathbf{m}}^i(z, \xi)| \leq \rho_m C B^m e^{L|\xi|}, \quad (117)$$

where $m = |\mathbf{m}|$ and ρ_m is the normalisation constant (75). We claim that there are constants $D, M > 0$ such that for all $(z, \xi) \in \Omega$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\sigma_n^i(z, \xi)| \leq D M^n \frac{|\xi|^n}{n!} e^{L|\xi|}. \quad (118)$$

If we achieve (118), then the uniform convergence and the exponential estimate (112) both follow at once because

$$|\sigma^i(z, \xi)| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\sigma_n^i(z, \xi)| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} D M^n \frac{|\xi|^n}{n!} e^{L|\xi|} \leq D e^{(M+L)|\xi|}.$$

To demonstrate (118), we proceed in two steps. First, we construct a sequence of positive real numbers $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $(z, \xi) \in \Omega$,

$$|\sigma_n^i(z, \xi)| \leq M_n \frac{|\xi|^n}{n!} e^{L|\xi|}. \quad (119)$$

We will then show that there are constants D, M such that $M_n \leq D M^n$ for all n .

¶30. Step 2.1: Construction of $\{M_n\}$. We can take $M_0 := C$ and $M_1 := C(1 + B M_0)$ because $\sigma_0^i = a_0^i$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_1^i| &\leq \int_0^\xi \left(|\alpha_0^i| + \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} |a_{\mathbf{m}}^i| |\sigma_0^m| \right) |dt| \leq \int_0^\xi \left(C e^{L|t|} + C^2 B \rho_1 \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=1} 1 \right) |dt| \\ &\leq C(1 + B M_0) \int_0^{|\xi|} e^{Ls} ds \leq C(1 + B M_0) |\xi| e^{L|\xi|}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the final step we used [Lemma 6](#). Now, let us assume that we have already constructed the constants M_0, \dots, M_{n-1} such that $|\sigma_k^i| \leq M_k \frac{|\xi|^k}{k!} e^{L|\xi|}$ for all $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ and all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then we use formula (107) together with [Lemma 6](#) and [Lemma 7](#) in order to derive an estimate for σ_n .

First, let us write down an estimate for σ_n^m using formula (108). Thanks to [Lemma 7](#), we have for each $i = 1, \dots, N$ and all n_i, m_i :

$$\sum_{|j_i|=n_i}^{j_i \in \mathbb{N}^{m_i}} \left| \sigma_{j_{i,1}}^i * \dots * \sigma_{j_{i,m_i}}^i \right| \leq \sum_{|j_i|=n_i}^{j_i \in \mathbb{N}^{m_i}} M_{j_{i,1}} \dots M_{j_{i,m_i}} \frac{|\xi|^{n_i+m_i-1}}{(n_i+m_i-1)!} e^{L|\xi|}.$$

Then, for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}^N$, using the shorthand introduced in (80),

$$|\sigma_n^m| \leq M_n^m \frac{|\xi|^{|n|+|m|-1}}{(|n|+|m|-1)!} e^{L|\xi|}. \quad (120)$$

Therefore, formula (107) gives the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_n^i| &\leq \int_0^\xi \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|m|=m} \left\{ |a_m^i| \sum_{|n|=n-m} |\sigma_n^m| + \sum_{|n|=n-m-1} |\alpha_m^i * \sigma_n^m| \right\} |dt| \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{|m|=m} \left\{ \rho_m C B^m \sum_{|n|=n-m} M_n^m + \rho_m C B^m \sum_{|n|=n-m-1} M_n^m \right\} \int_0^\xi \frac{|t|^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{L|t|} |dt| \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^n \rho_m C B^m \sum_{|m|=m} \left\{ \sum_{|n|=n-m} M_n^m + \sum_{|n|=n-m-1} M_n^m \right\} \frac{|\xi|^n}{n!} e^{L|\xi|}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, this expression allows us to define the constant M_n for $n \geq 2$. In fact, a quick glance at this formula reveals that it can be extended to $n = 0, 1$ by defining

$$M_n := \sum_{m=0}^n \rho_m C B^m \sum_{|m|=m} \left\{ \sum_{|n|=n-m} M_n^m + \sum_{|n|=n-m-1} M_n^m \right\} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (121)$$

Indeed, if $m = 0$, then the two sums inside the brackets can only possibly be nonzero when $n = 0$, in which case the second sum is empty and the first sum is 1, so we recover $M_0 = C$. Likewise, if $n = 1$, then the $m = 0$ term is $0 + C$ and the $m = 1$ term is $CBM_0 + 0$, so again we recover the constant M_1 defined previously.

¶31. Step 2.2: Bounding M_n . To see that $M_n \leq DM^n$ for some $D, M > 0$, consider the following two power series in an abstract variable t :

$$\hat{p}(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M_n t^n \quad \text{and} \quad Q(t) := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} C B^m t^m. \quad (122)$$

Notice that $Q(t)$ is convergent and $Q(0) = C = M_0$. We will show that $\hat{p}(t)$ is also a convergent power series. The key observation is that \hat{p} satisfies the following functional equation:

$$\hat{p}(t) = (1+t)Q(t\hat{p}(t)). \quad (123)$$

This equation was found by trial and error. In order to verify it, we rewrite the power series $Q(t)$ in the following way:

$$Q(t) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m C B^m t^{\mathbf{m}} . \quad (124)$$

Then (123) is straightforward to verify by direct substitution and comparing the coefficients of t^n using the defining formula (121) for M_n . Thus, the righthand side of (123) expands as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1+t) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m C B^m \left(t \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M_n t^n \right)^m \\ &= (1+t) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m C B^m t^m \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} M_{n_1} t^{n_1} \right)^{m_1} \cdots \left(\sum_{n_N=0}^{\infty} M_{n_N} t^{n_N} \right)^{m_N} \\ &= (1+t) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m C B^m \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m t^{n+m} \\ &= (1+t) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \rho_m C B^m \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m t^n \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \rho_m C B^m \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left\{ \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m t^n + \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m t^{n+1} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^n \rho_m C B^m \sum_{|\mathbf{m}|=m} \left\{ \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m + \sum_{|\mathbf{n}|=n-m-1} M_{\mathbf{n}}^m \right\} t^n . \end{aligned}$$

In the final equality, we once again noticed that both sums inside the curly brackets are zero whenever $m > n$.

Now, consider the following holomorphic function in two variables (t, p) :

$$H(t, p) := -p + (1+t)Q(tp) . \quad (125)$$

It has the following properties:

$$H(0, C) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} \right|_{(t,p)=(0,C)} = -1 \neq 0 .$$

By the Holomorphic Implicit Function Theorem, there exists a unique holomorphic function $p(t)$ near $t = 0$ such that $p(0) = C$ and $H(t, p(t)) = 0$. Therefore, $\hat{p}(t)$ must be the convergent Taylor series expansion of $p(t)$ at $t = 0$, so its coefficients grow at most exponentially: i.e., there are constants $D, M > 0$ such that $M_n \leq DM^n$. This completes the proof of Lemma 5 and hence of Lemma 4 and Theorem 3. ■

§ 3. Examples

§ 3.1. An Explicit Example of Rank 2

The following example is attractive because it is nontrivial yet explicit, almost entirely computable ‘by hand’, involves (almost) no branch cuts, and clearly demonstrates how the hypotheses in our theorems are verified.

¶1. **Setup.** Introduce the following three meromorphic functions on the Riemann sphere:

$$\lambda_1 := -x + x^{-1}, \quad \lambda_2 := +x + x^{-1} - 2i, \quad \lambda_3 := -x - x^{-1} + 2i. \quad (126)$$

Note that $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$ and that these are the three roots of the cubic polynomial

$$p(\lambda) := \lambda^3 - \lambda_1 \lambda^2 + \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \lambda - \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3. \quad (127)$$

Let us also, for future reference, introduce their differences:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ij} &:= \lambda_i - \lambda_j; \\ \text{so } \lambda_{21} &= +2(x - i), \quad \lambda_{31} = -2(x^{-1} - i), \quad \lambda_{32} = -2(x + x^{-1} - 2i). \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

Let $X := \mathbb{C}_x^*$ and $S := \mathbb{C}_h$, and fix a basepoint $x_0 := 1 \in X$ and a phase $\theta = 0$. Consider the following holomorphic map $X \times S \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, h, y) &:= F^{(0)}(x, y) + hF^{(1)}(x, y), \\ F^{(0)}(x, y) &:= - \begin{bmatrix} -y_2 \\ p(y_1) + 3y_1 y_2 - \lambda_1 y_2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ F^{(1)}(x, y) &:= + \begin{bmatrix} A(x) + B(x) \\ \lambda_{21} A(x) + \lambda_{31} B(x) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

where we put $A(x) := x e^{1/x}$ and $B(x) := x^{-1} e^x$. The main thing to note at this point is that the components of $F^{(1)}$ are independent of y but have essential singularities at $x = 0, \infty$. We intend to apply our Exact Perturbative Existence and Uniqueness Theorem ([Theorem 3](#)) to the singularly perturbed nonlinear system

$$h \partial_x f = F(x, h, f). \quad (130)$$

¶2. **Leading-order analysis.** The leading-order equation $F^{(0)}(x, y) = 0$ and the leading-order Jacobian $\partial F^{(0)} / \partial y$ are as follows:

$$\begin{cases} y_2 = 0 \\ p(y_1) = 0 \end{cases}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F^{(0)}}{\partial y} = - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ p'(y_1) + 3y_2 & 3y_1 - \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (131)$$

where $p'(y_1) = 3y_1^2 - 2\lambda_1 y_1 + \lambda_2 \lambda_3$. At the basepoint $x_0 = 1$, there are three points $(x_0, y_0) = (1; 0, 0), (1; 0, 2 - 2i), (1; 0, -2 + 2i)$ satisfying $F^{(0)}(x_0, y_0) = 0$, and the leading-order Jacobian is invertible at all three of them. In fact, the determinant of the leading-order Jacobian matrix is $-p'(y_1) - 3y_2$, so the turning points for this system are located at all points (x, y) satisfying

$$y_2 = 0, \quad p(y_1) = 0, \quad p'(y_1) = 0. \quad (132)$$

It follows that the turning points correspond to coincidences of the roots of the polynomial $p(\lambda)$; i.e., they correspond to the zeros of the differences λ_{ij} introduced in (128). In the x -plane, the turning points corresponding to each label $(ij) = (ji)$ are located at the following places:

$$(12) : +i ; \quad (13) : -i ; \quad (23) : a_{\pm} := i(1 \pm \sqrt{2}) . \quad (133)$$

Away from turning points, we get three distinct leading-order solutions $f^{(0)}$, labelled as follows:

$$f_{[i]}^{(0)} := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} . \quad (134)$$

In fact, they are defined and holomorphic everywhere in \mathbb{C}_x^* , they only fail to be distinct at the turning points.

¶3. **Formal perturbation theory.** By Theorem 1, we can expect three formal perturbative solutions $\hat{f}_{[i]}$, defined near the basepoint x_0 , with corresponding leading-order parts $f_{[i]}^{(0)}$. Let $J_{[i]}$ be the leading-order Jacobian with respect to the leading-order solution $f_{[i]}^{(0)}$:

$$J_{[i]} := - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ p'(\lambda_i) & 3\lambda_i - \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with inverse} \quad J_{[i]}^{-1} = - \frac{1}{p'(\lambda_i)} \begin{bmatrix} 3\lambda_i - \lambda_1 & 1 \\ -p'(\lambda_i) & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \quad (135)$$

Using formula (16), one can compute the higher-order corrections $f_{[i]}^{(n)}$ to any order in \hbar . We will content ourselves with the next-to-leading-order solutions $f_{[i]}^{(1)}$, which are given by formula (13) that in our case becomes:

$$f_{[i]}^{(1)} = - \frac{\partial_x \lambda_i}{p'(\lambda_i)} \begin{bmatrix} 3\lambda_i - \lambda_1 \\ -p'(\lambda_i) \end{bmatrix} - J_{[i]}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A(x) + B(x) \\ \lambda_{21}A(x) + \lambda_{31}B(x) \end{bmatrix} . \quad (136)$$

¶4. **Leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues.** The eigenvalues of the leading-order Jacobian $J_{[i]}$ are the differences λ_{ji} and λ_{ki} for the two distinct indices $j, k \neq i$. This can be verified by a direct computation or by recalling the relationship between a polynomial's discriminant and the resultant of it and its derivative. Away from the relevant turning points ($\pm i$ for [1]; $+i, a_{\pm}$ for [2]; $-i, a_{\pm}$ for [3]), the matrix $J_{[i]}$ has distinct eigenvalues and is therefore holomorphically diagonalisable. Put:

$$\Lambda_{[i]} := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{ji} & \\ & \lambda_{ki} \end{bmatrix} , \quad i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \quad \text{with} \quad j < k; \quad j, k \neq i . \quad (137)$$

¶5. **Normal form.** If we put

$$P_{[i]} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_{ji} & \lambda_{ki} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with its inverse} \quad P_{[i]}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{kj}} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{ki} & -1 \\ -\lambda_{ji} & 1 \end{bmatrix} , \quad (138)$$

then $P_{[i]}^{-1} J_{[i]} P_{[i]} = \Lambda_{[i]}$. Then the change of variables (20) takes the following form:

$$\begin{cases} f_1 = \lambda_i + g_1 + g_2 \\ f_2 = \lambda_{ji}g_1 + \lambda_{ki}g_2 \end{cases} . \quad (139)$$

Applying this to our system yields a normal form $\hbar \partial_x g = \Lambda_{[i]}(g + G_{[i]}(x, \hbar, g))$, where $G_{[i]}(x, \hbar, y) = G_{[i]}^{(0)}(x, y) + \hbar G_{[i]}^{(1)}(x, y)$ is as follows:

$$G_{[i]}^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} +\frac{1}{\lambda_{ji}} \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_{ki}} \end{bmatrix} \left(\frac{3\lambda_j - \lambda_1}{\lambda_{kj}} y_1^2 + \frac{3\lambda_j + 3\lambda_k - 2\lambda_1}{\lambda_{kj}} y_1 y_2 + \frac{3\lambda_k - \lambda_1}{\lambda_{kj}} y_2^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_{kj}} (y_1 + y_2)^3 \right),$$

$$G_{[i]}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\lambda_{ki}}{\lambda_{ji}} \\ +\frac{\lambda_{ji}}{\lambda_{ki}} \end{bmatrix} \frac{\partial_x \lambda_i}{\lambda_{kj}} + \begin{bmatrix} +\frac{\lambda_{ki} - \lambda_{21}}{\lambda_{kj} \lambda_{ji}} A + \frac{\lambda_{ki} - \lambda_{31}}{\lambda_{kj} \lambda_{ji}} B \\ -\frac{\lambda_{ji} - \lambda_{21}}{\lambda_{kj} \lambda_{ki}} A - \frac{\lambda_{ji} - \lambda_{31}}{\lambda_{kj} \lambda_{ki}} B \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} +\frac{1}{\lambda_{ji}} \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_{ki}} \end{bmatrix} \left(\frac{\partial_x \lambda_{ji}}{\lambda_{kj}} y_1 + \frac{\partial_x \lambda_{ki}}{\lambda_{kj}} y_2 \right).$$

In particular, for $[i] = [1]$, this simplifies to the following:

$$G_{[1]}^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} +\frac{1}{\lambda_{21}} \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_{31}} \end{bmatrix} \left(\frac{3\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_{32}} y_1^2 - \frac{2\lambda_1}{\lambda_{32}} y_1 y_2 + \frac{3\lambda_3 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_{32}} y_2^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_{32}} (y_1 + y_2)^3 \right),$$

$$G_{[1]}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\lambda_{31}}{\lambda_{21}} \\ +\frac{\lambda_{21}}{\lambda_{31}} \end{bmatrix} \frac{\partial_x \lambda_1}{\lambda_{32}} + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda_{21}} A \\ \frac{1}{\lambda_{31}} B \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} +\frac{1}{\lambda_{21}} \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_{31}} \end{bmatrix} \left(\frac{2}{\lambda_{32}} y_1 + \frac{\partial_x \lambda_{31}}{\lambda_{32}} y_2 \right). \quad (140)$$

¶6. Trajectories. The trajectory structure for all six eigenvalues λ_{ij} is presented in [Fig. 1](#). In this figure, the basepoint $x_0 = 1$ is indicated by a **green dot**. Turning points $\pm i$ and a_{\pm} are indicated by **orange dots**. The pole at 0 is indicated by a hollow **red dot**. Finite rays are highlighted in **orange**; trajectories passing through the basepoint x_0 are highlighted in **green**.

As explained in [§A¶15](#), trajectories for λ_{ij} can be described explicitly as the imaginary level sets of the integral

$$\varphi_{ij}(x) := \int_1^x \lambda_{ij} ;$$

so


$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{21} &= x^2 - 2ix - 1 + 2i, & \varphi_{31} &= -2 \log x + 2ix - 2i, \\ \varphi_{32} &= -x^2 - 2 \log x + 4ix + 1 - 4i. \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

We have chosen a branch of logarithm such that $\log(i) = i\pi/2$. In polar coordinates $x = re^{i\theta}$, these level sets are given by the following equations:


$$\begin{aligned} (21) : & \quad r^2 \sin(2\theta) - 2r \cos(\theta) = \text{const} , \\ (31) : & \quad \theta - r \cos(\theta) = \text{const} , \\ (32) : & \quad r^2 \sin(2\theta) + 2\theta - 4r \cos(\theta) = \text{const} . \end{aligned}$$

To work out the correct orientations of the trajectories (as shown in [Fig. 1](#)), we need to consult the real part $\text{Re}(\varphi_{ij})$: forward orientation corresponds to the direction along which the real part increases. Since these are trajectories of a vector field, in practice it is usually enough to work out the orientation of a single trajectory and then fill in the rest in a consistent way. For example, for the eigenvalue λ_{21} , to work out the orientation of the trajectory passing through the origin (which is on the imaginary axis, see [Fig. 1a](#)), we plug $x = it$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}$ into $\text{Re}(\varphi_{21})$ to get $-t^2 + 2t - 1 = -(t-1)^2$. This function is increasing for $t < 1$, so this ray's orientation coincides with the orientation of the imaginary axis.


Clearly, all black and green rays are stably infinite. This includes the λ_{31} ray emanating from the basepoint $x_0 = 1$ and falling into the pole at 0 (see [Fig. 1b](#)). This ray may not look infinite, but the point is that it takes infinitely long for it to fall into the




(a) solution [1], eigenvalue $\lambda_{21} = +2(x - i)$




(b) solution [1], eigenvalue $\lambda_{31} = -2(x^{-1} - i)$




(c) solution [2], eigenvalue $\lambda_{12} = -2(x - i)$



(d) solution [2], eigenvalue $\lambda_{32} = -2(x + x^{-1} - 2i)$



(e) solution [3], eigenvalue $\lambda_{13} = +2(x^{-1} - i)$



(f) solution [3], eigenvalue $\lambda_{23} = +2(x + x^{-1} - 2i)$

Figure 1: Real flow lines with phase $\theta = 0$ for system (130). Notation is explained in §3¶6.

pole, because the time it takes to flow the basepoint to the pole 0 is $\operatorname{Re} \varphi_{31}(0) = +\infty$. Example neighbourhoods Ξ_{21}^+ and Ξ_{31}^+ of the basepoint x_0 consisting of nearby stably infinite rays are pictured in Fig. 1a and 1b.

¶7. **Exact perturbation theory.** Let us focus on the case $[i] = [1]$ and verify the remaining hypotheses of Theorem 3. The relevant figures are 1a and 1b. Notice that all rays for λ_{21} emanating from near the basepoint go off to ∞ , whilst those for λ_{31} converge to the pole at 0. Since $G_{[1]}$ is polynomial in \hbar, y_1, y_2 , it is enough to check hypothesis (a); namely, that the coefficients in the 1st row are bounded as $x \rightarrow \infty$ in Ξ_{21}^+ , and that the coefficients in the 2nd row are bounded as $x \rightarrow 0$ in Ξ_{31}^+ . To this end, we use the following table of orders of magnitude (independent of direction of approach), all of which are easy to compute:

	$x \rightarrow \infty$	$x \rightarrow 0$		$x \rightarrow \infty$	$x \rightarrow 0$		$x \rightarrow \infty$	$x \rightarrow 0$
λ_{21}	x	1	$\partial_x \lambda_{21}$	1	1	λ_i	x	x^{-1}
λ_{31}	1	x^{-1}	$\partial_x \lambda_{31}$	x^{-2}	x^{-2}	$\partial_x \lambda_i$	1	x^{-2}
λ_{32}	x	x^{-1}	$\partial_x \lambda_{32}$	1	x^{-2}	$3\lambda_i - \lambda_1$	x	x^{-1}

All the coefficients of $G_{[1]}$, apart from those involving A and B , have polynomial or logarithmic behaviour at ∞ and 0, which means their growth rate is independent of the direction of approach. Using the information from the table above, it is then easy to check that every coefficient in the 1st row of (140) (apart from the one involving A) is indeed bounded on Ξ_{21}^+ , and similarly every coefficient in the 2nd row (apart from B) is bounded on Ξ_{31}^+ . For example, the coefficient $\frac{3\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_{21}\lambda_{32}}$ of y_1^2 in the 1st row behaves like x^{-1} as $x \rightarrow \infty$, whilst the coefficient $\frac{3\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_{31}\lambda_{32}}$ of y_1^2 in the 2nd row behaves like x as $x \rightarrow 0$.

On the other hand, the behaviour of the coefficients involving A and B may depend on the direction of approach because these functions have essential singularities. However, we are only interested in the behaviour of A as $x \rightarrow \infty$ and of B as $x \rightarrow 0$, both points being their respective poles. The coefficient $\frac{1}{\lambda_{21}}A$ in the 1st row behaves like 1 as $x \rightarrow \infty$, and the coefficient $\frac{1}{\lambda_{31}}B$ in the 2nd row behaves like 1 as $x \rightarrow 0$. We have therefore verified that all the hypotheses of Theorem 3 are satisfied.

Therefore, by Theorem 3, there exists a canonical exact perturbative solution $f_{[1]}$ near x_0 with perturbative expansion $\widehat{f}_{[1]}$. Namely, it is the unique holomorphic solution, defined for x in a small disc U_0 around x_0 and for \hbar in a sufficiently small Borel sector S_0 bisected by the positive real axis, which admits $\widehat{f}_{[1]}$ as its uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansion as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the closed arc $[-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2}]$:

$$f_{[1]}(x, \hbar) \simeq \widehat{f}_{[1]}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } [-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2}], \text{ unif. } \forall x \in U_0 .$$

Moreover, $f_{[1]}$ is the uniform Borel resummation of $\widehat{f}_{[1]}$:

$$f_{[1]}(x, \hbar) = \mathcal{S}[\widehat{f}_{[1]}](x, \hbar) \quad \forall (x, \hbar) \in U_0 \times S_0 .$$

Furthermore, using Theorem 3 repeatedly at various basepoints, we can extend this solution $f_{[1]}$ to the domain $U \subset X$ containing the basepoint $x_0 = 1$ and bounded by the finite rays for λ_{21} and λ_{31} , as pictured in Fig. 2.




Figure 2: Domain of definition of the exact perturbative solution $f_{[1]}$.

§ 3.2. Painlevé I

For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$, consider the following *singularly perturbed* Painlevé I equation:

$$\hbar^2 \partial_x^2 q = 6q^2 + x + c\hbar. \quad (142)$$

If we set $\hbar = 1$ and $c = 0$, this is the usual Painlevé I. In this subsection, we describe a sample application of [Theorem 3](#) to obtain the following result.

¶8. **Proposition 1 (exact perturbation theory for Painlevé I).** *The singularly perturbed Painlevé I equation (142) has two formal perturbative solutions \hat{q}_+, \hat{q}_- , with leading-order parts $q_{\pm}^{(0)} = \pm \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} \sqrt{x}$, defined on \mathbb{C}_x in the complement of a branch cut going out from the origin. Let $U_+ := \{-\frac{\pi}{5} < \arg(x) < \frac{3\pi}{5}\}$ and $U_- := \{-\frac{3\pi}{5} < \arg(x) < \frac{\pi}{5}\}$. Then there are canonical exact perturbative solutions q_+ on U_+ and q_- on U_- with asymptotics as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in the right halfplane given by \hat{q}_+, \hat{q}_- respectively. Namely, q_{\pm} is the unique exact perturbative solution on U_{\pm} such that*

$$q_{\pm}(x, \hbar) \simeq \hat{q}_{\pm}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } [-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2}], \text{ loc.unif. } \forall x \in U_{\pm}. \quad (143)$$

Moreover, q_{\pm} is the locally uniform Borel resummation of \hat{q}_{\pm} : for any compactly contained subset $U_0 \subset U_{\pm}$, there is a Borel sector $S_0 = \{\hbar \mid \operatorname{Re}(1/\hbar) > 1/\delta\}$ for some $\delta > 0$ such that

$$q_{\pm}(x, \hbar) = \mathcal{S}[\hat{q}_{\pm}](x, \hbar) \quad \forall (x, \hbar) \in U_0 \times S_0. \quad (144)$$

¶9. **Associated nonlinear system.** Rewrite the 2nd-order scalar ODE (142) as a 1st-order system of the form (1) by introducing a new variable $p := \hbar \partial_x q$:

$$\hbar \partial_x \begin{bmatrix} q \\ p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} p \\ 6q^2 + x + c\hbar \end{bmatrix}. \quad (145)$$

In this case, $X = \mathbb{C}_x$, $S = \mathbb{C}_{\hbar}$, $N = 2$, and F is a polynomial in \hbar and in the components of y :

$$F(x, \hbar, y) = \hat{F}(x, \hbar, y) = F^{(0)}(x, y) + F^{(1)}(x, y)\hbar, \\ F^{(0)}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} y_2 \\ 6y_1^2 + x \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad F^{(1)}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{bmatrix}.$$

For concreteness, let us fix a basepoint $x_0 = 1$ and a phase $\theta = 0$.

¶10. **Leading-order analysis.** The leading-order equations and Jacobian are:

$$\begin{cases} y_2 = 0 \\ 6y_1^2 + x = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F^{(0)}}{\partial y} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 12y_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (146)$$

It follows that there is only one turning point for this system, located at $x = 0$. The two points $(x_0, y_0) = (1; \pm \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}, 0)$ are both regular.

Fix a branch of the square-root $x^{1/2}$. Then there are two holomorphic leading-order solutions $f^{(0)}$ in the complement U of the branch cut, which for concreteness we take along the negative real axis. We label them as follows:

$$f_{\pm}^{(0)}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} q_{\pm}^{(0)} \\ p_{\pm}^{(0)} \end{bmatrix} := \pm \begin{bmatrix} \kappa \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} x^{1/2} \quad \text{where} \quad \kappa := \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}. \quad (147)$$

¶11. **Formal perturbative solutions.** The corresponding formal solutions $\hat{f} = \hat{f}_{\pm}$ are actually easier to derive by expanding original the scalar equation (142) and using the fact that $p^{(k)} = \partial_x q^{(k-1)}$. Thus, at order \hbar^1 , we have $12q^{(0)}q^{(1)} + c = 0$ which gives

$$f_{\pm}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} q_{\pm}^{(1)} \\ p_{\pm}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} = \pm \begin{bmatrix} -c/12\kappa \\ \kappa/2 \end{bmatrix} x^{-1/2}. \quad (148)$$

More generally, $f^{(k)}$ for $k \geq 2$ can be deduced from the formulas

$$q^{(k)} = -\frac{1}{2q^{(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^{(i)} q^{(k-i)}. \quad (149)$$

¶12. **Leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues.** The leading-order Jacobian $J = J_{\pm}$ at $f_{\pm}^{(0)}$ is then

$$J_{\pm}(x) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 12q_{\pm}^{(0)} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \pm 12\kappa x^{1/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (150)$$

So J_+ and J_- are both holomorphic and invertible in the complement of a branch cut with two distinct eigenvalues

$$\pm \lambda_+ := \pm \sqrt{12\kappa} x^{1/4} = \pm \rho e^{\pi i/4} x^{1/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \pm \lambda_- := \pm i \sqrt{12\kappa} x^{1/4} = \pm \rho e^{3\pi i/4} x^{1/4},$$

respectively, where $\rho := \sqrt{12/\sqrt{6}}$. This nonlinear system therefore admits a normal form with respect to each of its two leading-order solutions.

¶13. **Normal form.** Put $\Lambda_{\pm} := \text{diag}(-\lambda_{\pm}, +\lambda_{\pm})$. If we choose

$$P_{\pm} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -\lambda_{\pm} & +\lambda_{\pm} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with inverse} \quad P_{\pm}^{-1} := \frac{1}{2\lambda_{\pm}} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{\pm} & -1 \\ \lambda_{\pm} & +1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (151)$$

then $P_{\pm} J_{\pm} P_{\pm}^{-1} = \Lambda_{\pm}$. The change of variables $f = f_{\pm}^{(0)} + P_{\pm} g$ is as follows:

$$\begin{cases} f_1 = \pm \kappa x^{1/2} + g_1 + g_2 \\ f_2 = -\lambda_{\pm} g_1 + \lambda_{\pm} g_2 \end{cases}. \quad (152)$$

Substitution into (145) yields, after a bit of simple manipulation, a system in normal form $\hbar \partial_x g = \Lambda_\pm (g + G_\pm(x, \hbar, g))$ with $G(x, \hbar, y) = G^{(0)}(x, y) + \hbar G^{(1)}(x, y)$ given by

$$G_\pm^{(0)}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \frac{3}{\epsilon_\pm^2} x^{-1/2} (y_1 + y_2)^2 ,$$

$$G_\pm^{(1)}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa}{2\epsilon_\pm} x^{-3/4} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \frac{c}{2\epsilon_\pm^2} x^{-1/2} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \frac{1}{8\epsilon_\pm} x^{-5/4} (y_1 - y_2) ,$$

where we put $\epsilon_+ := \sqrt{12\kappa}$ and $\epsilon_- := i\sqrt{12\kappa}$.

¶14. **Trajectories.** The trajectory structure for all four eigenvalues $\pm\lambda_\pm$ is presented in Fig. 3. Trajectories for $\pm\lambda_+$ and $\pm\lambda_-$ can be respectively described explicitly as the imaginary level-sets of the functions

$$\varphi_+(x) := \int_0^x \lambda_+ = \frac{4}{5} \rho e^{\pi i/4} x^{5/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_-(x) := \int_0^x \lambda_- = \frac{4}{5} \rho e^{3\pi i/4} x^{5/4} .$$

In polar coordinates $x = r e^{i\theta}$, they are respectively given by equations

$$r^{5/4} \sin\left(\frac{5\theta}{4} + \frac{\pi}{4}\right) = \text{const} \quad \text{and} \quad r^{5/4} \sin\left(\frac{5\theta}{4} + \frac{3\pi}{4}\right) = \text{const} . \quad (153)$$

Every trajectory in the open sector $U_+ := \{-\frac{\pi}{5} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{5}\}$ containing the basepoint $x_0 = 1$ is stably infinite for both eigenvalues $\pm\lambda_+$. Similarly, every trajectory in the open sector $U_- := \{-\frac{3\pi}{5} < \arg(x) < \frac{\pi}{5}\}$ containing the basepoint $x_0 = 1$ is stably infinite for both eigenvalues $\pm\lambda_-$.

¶15. **Exact perturbation theory.** All infinite trajectories go off to infinity, and G is a polynomial in \hbar and y_1, y_2 , so we just need to check that its coefficients are bounded as $x \rightarrow \infty$. And indeed they clearly are. Therefore, Theorem 3 yields a pair of canonical exact perturbative solutions q_+, q_- near the basepoint x_0 whose asymptotics are the formal perturbative solutions \hat{q}_+, \hat{q}_- . That is, let $U_0 := \{|x - x_0| < \frac{1}{2}\}$ (notice that this is compactly contained in both U_+ and U_-), then there is a Borel sector $S_0 = \{\hbar \mid \text{Re}(1/\hbar) > 1/\delta\}$ for some $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, such that the deformed Painlevé I equation (142) has exactly two holomorphic solutions q_+, q_- defined on $U_0 \times S_0$ and admitting \hat{q}_+, \hat{q}_- respectively as their uniform Gevrey asymptotic expansions as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the closed right halfplane. Moreover, they are the uniform Borel resummations of their asymptotic expansions. In other words, the formal perturbative solutions \hat{q}_\pm are uniformly Borel summable on U_0 . By choosing different basepoints and repeating the analysis, we can use Theorem 3 to extend these solutions to a larger domain in the x -plane.

§ 3.3. A Generalised Airy Equation of Order 3

The singularly perturbed Airy equation is the differential equation $\hbar \partial_x^2 \psi = x\psi$. In analogy, the singularly perturbed *generalised Airy equation* of type (n, m) is often defined as the differential equation $\partial_x^n \psi = x^m \psi$. Let us analyse the one of type $(3, 1)$. Thus, consider the following third-order scalar linear equation:

$$\hbar^3 \partial_x^3 \psi = x\psi . \quad (154)$$




Figure 3: PAINLEVÉ I. Real flow lines in the x -plane with $\theta = 0$. Branch cut is along the negative real axis, indicated by the **dashed red line**. The basepoint $x_0 = 1$ is indicated by the **green dot**, and the turning point at $x = 0$ indicated by the **orange dot**. Stably infinite rays indicated in **black**; the trajectory passing through the basepoint x_0 is **green**. Finite rays, indicated in **orange**, are the straight rays $\arg(x) = -\frac{\pi}{5}$ in (a); $\arg(x) = -\pi$ and $\arg(x) = \frac{3\pi}{5}$ in (b); $\arg(x) = +\pi$ and $\arg(x) = -\frac{3\pi}{5}$ in (c); $\arg(x) = \frac{\pi}{5}$ in (d). The region shaded **yellow** in (a) and (b) is $U_+ = \{-\frac{\pi}{5} < \arg(x) < \frac{3\pi}{5}\}$. The region shaded **blue** in (c) and (d) is $U_- = \{-\frac{3\pi}{5} < \arg(x) < \frac{\pi}{5}\}$.

In this subsection, we describe a sample application of [Theorem 3](#) to obtain the following result.

¶16. **Proposition 2 (exact WKB analysis for 3rd-order Airy equation).** *The deformed generalised Airy equation (154) has a basis of exact WKB solutions near $x_0 = 1$. That is, let*

$$\begin{aligned} U_{[1]} &:= \left\{ -\frac{3\pi}{8} < \arg(x) < +\frac{7\pi}{8} \right\} , \\ U_{[2]} &:= \left\{ -\frac{7\pi}{8} < \arg(x) < +\frac{3\pi}{8} \right\} , \\ U_{[3]} &:= \left\{ -\frac{\pi}{8} < \arg(x) < +\frac{\pi}{8} \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (155)$$

Then there is an exact WKB solution $\psi_{[i]}$ on $U_{[i]}$ normalised at x_0 (i.e., $\psi_{[i]}(x_0, \hbar) = 1$) whose (exponential) perturbative expansion in the right halfplane is the formal WKB solution $\widehat{\psi}_{[i]}$. That is, $\psi_{[i]}$ is a holomorphic solution with (exponential) Gevrey asymptotics

$$\psi_{[i]}(x, \hbar) \simeq \widehat{\psi}_{[i]}(x, \hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2}\right], \text{ loc.unif. } \forall x \in U_{[i]} . \quad (156)$$

Furthermore, $\psi_{[i]}$ is given by formula (168), and it is the locally uniform (exponential) Borel resummation of the formal WKB solution $\widehat{\psi}_{[i]}$:

$$\psi_{[i]}(x, \hbar) = \mathcal{S}[\widehat{\psi}_{[i]}](x, \hbar) \quad \text{loc.unif. } \forall x \in U_{[i]} . \quad (157)$$

In other words, the formal WKB solution $\widehat{\psi}_{[i]}$ is locally uniformly Borel summable on $U_{[i]}$. Finally, the three exact WKB solutions $\psi_{[1]}, \psi_{[2]}, \psi_{[3]}$ form a basis of solutions on the triple intersection domain $U_{[123]} := U_{[1]} \cap U_{[2]} \cap U_{[3]} = U_{[3]}$.

¶17. **The WKB ansatz and the associated nonlinear system.** We search for solutions in the form of the WKB ansatz

$$\psi(x, \hbar) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{x_0}^x s(t, \hbar) dt\right) . \quad (158)$$

Here, s is the new unknown variable which, upon plugging (158) into (154), is required to satisfy the following nonlinear 2nd-order equation:

$$\hbar^2 \partial_x^2 s + 3s(\hbar \partial_x s) + s^3 - x = 0 . \quad (159)$$

Now we rewrite it as a 1st-order system by introducing $f_1 := s$ and $f_2 := \hbar \partial_x s$:

$$\hbar \partial_x \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f_2 \\ x - f_1^3 - 3f_1 f_2 \end{bmatrix} . \quad (160)$$

In this case, $X = \mathbb{C}_x$, $S = \mathbb{C}_\hbar$, $N = 2$, and

$$F(x, \hbar, y) = F^{(0)}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} y_2 \\ x - y_1^3 - 3y_1 y_2 \end{bmatrix} .$$

For concreteness, let us fix a basepoint $x_0 = 1$ and a phase $\theta = 0$.

¶18. **Leading-order analysis.** The leading-order equation and its Jacobian are

$$\begin{cases} y_2 = 0 \\ y_1^3 = x \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -3y_1^2 - 3y_2 & -3y_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows that there is only one turning point, located at $x = 0$. The three points $(x_0, y_0) = (1, 1), (1, e^{2\pi i/3}), (1, e^{4\pi i/3})$ are regular.

Fix a branch of the cubic root $x^{1/3}$. Then there are three holomorphic leading-order solutions $f^{(0)}$ in the complement U of a branch cut, which for concreteness we take along the negative real axis. Let us label them as follows: for $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$f_{[i]}^{(0)} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \lambda_i \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_i(x) := \omega^i x^{1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega := e^{2\pi i/3}. \quad (161)$$

In particular, we have three holomorphic leading-order solutions of the scalar equation (159), labelled as

$$s_{[i]}^{(0)}(x) := \lambda_i(x). \quad (162)$$

¶19. **Formal perturbation theory.** The corresponding formal perturbative solutions $\hat{f} = \hat{f}_{[i]}$ are again easiest to derive by expanding the scalar differential equation (159). Thus, we plug a power series $\hat{s} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} s^{(n)} \hbar^n$ into (159) and solve order-by-order in \hbar . Here are some useful formulas involved in the computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar \partial_x \hat{s} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \partial_x s^{(n-1)} \hbar^n, & \hbar^2 \partial_x^2 \hat{s} &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \partial_x^2 s^{(n-2)} \hbar^n \\ \hat{s} \hbar \partial_x \hat{s} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{\substack{j \neq 0 \\ i+j=n}} s^{(i)} \partial_x s^{(j-1)} \right) \hbar^n, & \hat{s}^3 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i+j+k=n} s^{(i)} s^{(j)} s^{(k)} \right) \hbar^n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, at order \hbar^1 , we get $3s^{(0)} \partial_x s^{(0)} + 3s^{(1)} s^{(0)} s^{(0)} = 0$, and therefore the next-to-leading-order solution is

$$s_{[i]}^{(1)} = -\partial_x \log \lambda_i = -\frac{1}{3} x^{-1} \quad \text{and hence} \quad f_{[i]}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} -\partial_x \log \lambda_i \\ \partial_x \lambda_i \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{bmatrix} -x^{-1} \\ \omega^i x^{-2/3} \end{bmatrix}.$$

At order \hbar^2 , we get $\partial_x^2 s^{(0)} + 3s^{(1)} \partial_x s^{(0)} + 3s^{(0)} \partial_x s^{(1)} + 3s^{(2)} s^{(0)} s^{(0)} + 3s^{(1)} s^{(1)} s^{(0)} = 0$, so after some simplification we get

$$s_{[i]}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{3\omega^i} \left(\frac{14}{9} x^{-1} + 1 \right) x^{-4/3} \quad \text{and hence} \quad f_{[i]}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{3\omega^i} \begin{bmatrix} \left(\frac{14}{9} x^{-1} + 1 \right) x^{-4/3} \\ \omega^i x^{-2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

More generally, for $n \geq 2$, the higher-order corrections $s^{(n)}$ and hence $f^{(n)}$ can be determined from the recursive formula

$$s^{(n)} = -\frac{1}{3s^{(0)} s^{(0)}} \left(\partial_x^2 s^{(n-2)} + 3 \sum_{\substack{j \neq 0 \\ i+j=n}} s^{(i)} \partial_x s^{(j-1)} + \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \neq n \\ i+j+k=n}} s^{(i)} s^{(j)} s^{(k)} \right). \quad (163)$$

The formal perturbative solutions $\widehat{s}_{[1]}, \widehat{s}_{[2]}, \widehat{s}_{[3]}$ give rise to **formal WKB solutions**

$$\widehat{\psi}_{[i]}(x, \hbar) := \exp\left(\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{x_0}^x \widehat{s}_{[i]}(t, \hbar) dt\right) \quad (164)$$

of the linear differential equation (154). These expressions are interpreted as formal *exponential* power series (see, e.g., [Nik21, Appendix B]).

¶20. **Leading-order Jacobian eigenvalues.** Let $J_{[i]}$ be the leading-order Jacobian with respect to the leading-order solution $f_{[i]}^{(0)}$:

$$J_{[i]} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -3\lambda_i^2 & -3\lambda_i \end{bmatrix}. \quad (165)$$

Each $J_{[i]}$ has two distinct eigenvalues in the complement of a branch cut, so our nonlinear system admits a normal form with respect to each leading-order solution $f_{[i]}^{(0)}$. Put

$$\lambda_{ij} := \lambda_i - \lambda_j = \omega^{ij} x^{1/3} \quad \text{where} \quad \omega^{ij} := \omega^i - \omega^j. \quad (166)$$

It is easy to verify that $J_{[1]}$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_{21}, \lambda_{31}$; $J_{[2]}$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_{12}, \lambda_{32}$; and $J_{[3]}$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_{13}, \lambda_{23}$. Here are some helpful relations that are used in the verification:

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i \lambda_j = \lambda_k^2.$$

¶21. **Normal form.** Denote the diagonal matrices of leading-Jacobian eigenvalues in each case by

$$\Lambda_{[1]} := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{21} & \\ & \lambda_{31} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_{[2]} := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{12} & \\ & \lambda_{32} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_{[3]} := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{13} & \\ & \lambda_{23} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we put

$$P_{[i]} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ \lambda_{ji} & \lambda_{ki} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with inverse} \quad P_{[i]}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{kj}} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{ki} & -1 \\ -\lambda_{ji} & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

with j, k are chosen appropriately for each i , then $P_{[i]} J_{[i]} P_{[i]}^{-1} = \Lambda_{[i]}$. Here, we have used the identity $\lambda_{ki} - \lambda_{ji} = \lambda_{kj}$. The change of variables $f = f_{[i]}^{(0)} + P_{[i]} g$ takes the form

$$\begin{cases} f_1 = \lambda_i + g_1 + g_2, \\ f_2 = \lambda_{ji} g_1 + \lambda_{ki} g_2. \end{cases}$$

Substitution into (160) yields, after some simplification, a system in normal form $\hbar \partial_x g = \Lambda_{[i]}(g + G_{[i]}(x, \hbar, g))$ with $G_{[i]}(x, \hbar, y) = G_{[i]}^{(0)}(x, y) + \hbar G_{[i]}^{(1)}(x, y)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} G_{[i]}^{(0)}(x, y) &= \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{bmatrix} x^{-1/3} (y_1^2 + a_3 y_1 y_2 + a_4 y_2^2) + \begin{bmatrix} a_5 \\ a_6 \end{bmatrix} x^{-2/3} (y_1 + y_2)^3 \\ G_{[i]}^{(1)}(x, y) &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} a_7 \hbar x^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} a_8 \\ a_9 \end{bmatrix} x^{-4/3} y_1 + \begin{bmatrix} a_{10} \\ a_{11} \end{bmatrix} x^{-4/3} y_2 \end{aligned}$$

for some complex numbers $a_1, \dots, a_{11} \in \mathbb{C}$ whose precise values are not important to work out for our analysis.

¶22. **Trajectories.** The trajectory structure for all six eigenvalues λ_{ij} is presented in Fig. 4. Trajectories for λ_{ij} can be described explicitly as the imaginary level-sets of the functions

$$\varphi_{ij}(x) := \int_0^x \lambda_{ij} = \frac{4}{3} \omega^{ij} x^{4/3} . \quad (167)$$

In polar coordinates $x = r e^{i\theta}$, they are given by equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{12}, \lambda_{21} : \quad & r^{4/3} \sin\left(\frac{4\theta}{3} + \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = \text{const} , \\ \lambda_{13}, \lambda_{31} : \quad & r^{4/3} \sin\left(\frac{4\theta}{3} + \frac{5\pi}{6}\right) = \text{const} , \\ \lambda_{23}, \lambda_{32} : \quad & r^{4/3} \sin\left(\frac{4\theta}{3} - \frac{5\pi}{6}\right) = \text{const} . \end{aligned}$$

For every eigenvalue, every trajectory is clearly stably infinite except a small number of critical trajectories indicated in orange in Fig. 4. They are all straight rays emanating from the origin given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad & \arg(x) = -\frac{3\pi}{8} , & \text{(b)} \quad & \arg(x) = -\frac{5\pi}{8}, \arg(x) = +\frac{7\pi}{8} , \\ \text{(c)} \quad & \arg(x) = +\frac{3\pi}{8} , & \text{(d)} \quad & \arg(x) = -\frac{7\pi}{8}, \arg(x) = +\frac{5\pi}{8} , \\ \text{(e)} \quad & \arg(x) = +\frac{\pi}{8} , & \text{(f)} \quad & \arg(x) = -\frac{\pi}{8} . \end{aligned}$$

Let us take a closer look at the trajectory structure for solution [1] (see (a) and (b) in Fig. 4). Consider the open sectors³

$$U_{21} := \left\{ -\frac{3\pi}{8} < \arg(x) < +\frac{9\pi}{8} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad U_{31} := \left\{ -\frac{5\pi}{8} < \arg(x) < +\frac{7\pi}{8} \right\} .$$

Every ray for λ_{21} is stably infinite in U_{21} ; the same is true of λ_{31} in U_{31} . Therefore, in the intersection


$$U_{[1]} := U_{21} \cap U_{31} = \left\{ -\frac{3\pi}{8} < \arg(x) < +\frac{7\pi}{8} \right\}$$

every point has the property both rays for λ_{21} and λ_{31} emanating from this point are stably infinite. In particular, our chosen basepoint $x_0 = 1$ is contained in $U_{[1]}$.


¶23. **Exact perturbation theory.** Notice that the expression in the big brackets is a polynomial in \hbar, g_1, g_2 . All infinite trajectories in $U_{[1]}$ go off to infinity, so we just need to check that the coefficients of this polynomial are bounded as $x \rightarrow \infty$, which they clearly are. Therefore, Theorem 3 yields a canonical exact perturbative solution $s_{[1]}$ of (159) near the basepoint x_0 whose asymptotic expansion is the formal perturbative solution $\widehat{s}_{[1]}$. Moreover, this solution is the uniform Borel resummation of $\widehat{s}_{[1]}$. In other words, the formal perturbative solution $\widehat{s}_{[1]}$ is uniformly Borel summable near x_0 . The exact same analysis can be performed to obtain exact perturbative solutions $s_{[2]}, s_{[3]}$ near x_0 . Finally, each exact perturbative solution $s_{[i]}$ yields an **exact WKB solution** near x_0 of the deformed generalised Airy equation (154) using the WKB ansatz (158):

$$\psi_{[i]}(x, \hbar) := \exp\left(\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{x_0}^x s_{[i]}(t, \hbar) dt\right) . \quad (168)$$


³A small part of sector U_{21} is hidden behind the branch cut.




(a) solution [1], eigenvalue $\lambda_{21} = -\sqrt{3}e^{\pi i/2}x^{1/3}$




(b) solution [1], eigenvalue $\lambda_{31} = -\sqrt{3}e^{5\pi i/6}x^{1/3}$




(c) solution [2], eigenvalue $\lambda_{12} = \sqrt{3}e^{\pi i/2}x^{1/3}$



(d) solution [2], eigenvalue $\lambda_{32} = -\sqrt{3}e^{-5\pi i/6}x^{1/3}$



(e) solution [3], eigenvalue $\lambda_{13} = \sqrt{3}e^{5\pi i/6}x^{1/3}$



(f) solution [3], eigenvalue $\lambda_{23} = \sqrt{3}e^{-5\pi i/6}x^{1/3}$

Figure 4: GENERALISED AIRY OF ORDER 3. Real flow lines in the x -plane with $\theta = 0$. Colours bear the same meaning as in Fig. 3 and in §3¶6.

By computing the Wronskian of these three holomorphic solutions at the basepoint x_0 , we can conclude that they are linearly independent and hence form a basis of solutions. Furthermore, by choosing different basepoints and repeating the analysis, we can use [Theorem 3](#) to extend these solutions to their respectively maximal domains in the x -plane containing the basepoint x_0 .

Appendix A. Background Information

Our notation, conventions, and definitions from Gevrey asymptotics and Borel-Laplace theory are consistent with those given in Appendices A and B in [\[Nik20\]](#). Here, we give a brief summary to make this paper self-contained.

§ A.1. Gevrey Asymptotics

- ¶1. A **sectorial domain** at the origin in \mathbb{C}_h is a simply connected domain $S \subset \mathbb{C}_h^* = \mathbb{C}_h \setminus \{0\}$ whose closure \bar{S} in the real-oriented blowup $[\mathbb{C}_h : 0]$ intersects the boundary circle \mathbb{S}^1 in a closed arc $\bar{\Theta} \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ with nonzero length. The open arc Θ is called the **opening** of S , and its length $|\Theta|$ is called the **opening angle** of S . A **Borel sector of radius** $r > 0$ is the sectorial domain $S = \{h \in \mathbb{C}_h \mid \operatorname{Re}(1/h) > 1/r\}$. Its opening is $\Theta = (-\frac{\pi}{2}, +\frac{\pi}{2})$. Likewise, a Borel sector bisected by a direction $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is the sectorial domain $S = \{h \in \mathbb{C}_h \mid \operatorname{Re}(e^{i\theta}/h) > 1/r\}$. Its opening is $\Theta = (\theta - \frac{\pi}{2}, \theta + \frac{\pi}{2})$.
- ¶2. A holomorphic function $f(h)$ on a sectorial domain S admits a power series $\hat{f}(h)$ as its **asymptotic expansion as $h \rightarrow 0$ along Θ** (or **as $h \rightarrow 0$ in S**) if, for every $n \geq 0$ and every compactly contained subarc $\Theta_0 \Subset \Theta$, there is a sectorial subdomain $S_0 \subset S$ with opening Θ_0 and a real constant $C_{n,0} > 0$ such that

$$\left| f(h) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f^{(k)} h^k \right| \leq C_{n,0} |h|^n \quad (169)$$

for all $h \in S_0$. The constants $C_{n,0}$ may depend on n and the opening Θ_0 . If this is the case, we write

$$f(h) \sim \hat{f}(h) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \Theta. \quad (170)$$

If the constants $C_{n,0}$ in (169) can be chosen uniformly for all compactly contained subarcs $\Theta_0 \Subset \Theta$ (i.e., independent of Θ_0 so that $C_{n,0} = C_n$ for all n), then we write

$$f(h) \sim \hat{f}(h) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \bar{\Theta}. \quad (171)$$

- ¶3. We also say that the holomorphic function f admits \hat{f} as its **Gevrey asymptotic expansion as $h \rightarrow 0$ along Θ** if the constants $C_{n,0}$ in (169) depend on n like $C_0 M_0^n n!$. More explicitly, for every compactly contained subarc $\Theta_0 \Subset \Theta$, there is a sectorial domain $S_0 \subset S$ with opening $\Theta_0 \Subset \Theta$ and real constants $C_0, M_0 > 0$ which give the bounds

$$\left| f(h) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f^{(k)} h^k \right| \leq C_0 M_0^n n! |h|^n \quad (172)$$

for all $h \in S_0$ and all $n \geq 0$. In this case, we write

$$f(h) \simeq \hat{f}(h) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \Theta. \quad (173)$$

If in addition to (172), the constants C_0, M_0 can be chosen uniformly for all $\Theta_0 \in \Theta$, then we will write

$$f(\hbar) \simeq \widehat{f}(\hbar) \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } \overline{\Theta} . \quad (174)$$

¶4. A formal power series $\widehat{f}(\hbar) = \sum f^{(n)} \hbar^n$ is a **Gevrey power series** if there are constants $C, M > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$|f^{(n)}| \leq CM^n n! . \quad (175)$$

¶5. All the above definitions translate immediately to cover vector-valued holomorphic functions on S by using, say, the Euclidean norm in all the above estimates. In fact, it is a classical fact that for finite-dimensional vector-valued functions, these definitions are independent of the choice of norm.

§ A.2. Borel-Laplace Theory

¶6. Let $\Xi_\theta := \{\xi \in \mathbb{C}_\xi \mid \text{dist}(\xi, e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+) < \varepsilon\}$, where $e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+$ is the real ray in the direction θ . Let $\varphi = \varphi(\xi)$ be a holomorphic function on Ξ_θ . Its **Laplace transform** in the direction θ is defined by the formula:

$$\mathfrak{L}_\theta[\varphi](\hbar) := \int_{e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi(\xi) e^{-\xi/\hbar} d\xi . \quad (176)$$

When $\theta = 0$, we write simply \mathfrak{L} . Clearly, φ is Laplace-transformable in the direction θ if φ has **at-most-exponential growth** as $|\xi| \rightarrow +\infty$ along the ray $e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+$. Explicitly, this means there are constants $A, L > 0$ such that for all $\xi \in \Xi_\theta$,

$$|\varphi(\xi)| \leq A e^{L|\xi|} . \quad (177)$$

¶7. The convolution product of two holomorphic functions φ, ψ is defined by the following formula:

$$\varphi * \psi(\xi) := \int_0^\xi \varphi(\xi - y) \psi(y) dy , \quad (178)$$

where the path of integration is a straight line segment from 0 to ξ .

¶8. Let f be a holomorphic function on a Borel sector $S = \{\hbar \in \mathbb{C}_\hbar \mid \text{Re}(e^{i\theta}/\hbar) > 1/R\}$. The (analytic) **Borel transform** (a.k.a., the **inverse Laplace transform**) of f in the direction θ is defined by the following formula:

$$\mathfrak{B}_\theta[f](x, \xi) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\theta f(x, \hbar) e^{\xi/\hbar} \frac{d\hbar}{\hbar^2} , \quad (179)$$

where the integral is taken along the boundary of any Borel sector

$$S' = \left\{ \hbar \in \mathbb{C}_\hbar \mid \text{Re}(e^{i\theta}/\hbar) > 1/R' \right\} \subset S$$

of strictly smaller radius $R' < R$, traversed anticlockwise (i.e., emanating from the singular point $\hbar = 0$ in the direction $\theta - \pi/2$ and reentering in the direction $\theta + \pi/2$). When $\theta = 0$, we write simply \mathfrak{B} .

The fundamental fact that connects Gevrey asymptotics and the Borel transform is the following (cf. [Nik20, Lemma B.5]). If $f = f(\hbar)$ is a holomorphic function defined on a sectorial domain S with opening angle $|\Theta| = \pi$ and f admits Gevrey asymptotics as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ along the *closed* arc $\overline{\Theta}$, then the analytic Borel transform $\varphi(\xi) = \mathfrak{B}_\theta[f](\xi)$ defines a holomorphic function on a tubular neighbourhood Ξ_θ of some thickness $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, its Laplace transform in the direction θ is well-defined and satisfies $\mathfrak{L}_\theta[\varphi] = f$.

¶9. Similarly, for a power series $\widehat{f}(\hbar)$, the (formal) **Borel transform** is defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(\xi) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}[\widehat{f}](\xi) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varphi_k \xi^k \quad \text{where} \quad \varphi_k := \frac{1}{k!} \widehat{f}^{(k+1)} . \quad (180)$$

The fundamental fact that connects Gevrey power series and the formal Borel transform is the following (cf. [Nik20, Lemma B.8]). If \widehat{f} is a Gevrey power series, then its formal Borel transform $\widehat{\varphi}$ is a convergent power series in ξ . Furthermore, a Gevrey power series $\widehat{f}(\hbar)$ is called a **Borel summable series** in the direction θ if its convergent Borel transform $\widehat{\varphi}(\xi)$ admits an analytic continuation $\varphi(\xi) = \text{AnCont}_\theta[\widehat{\varphi}](\xi)$ to a tubular neighbourhood Ξ_θ of the ray $e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}_+$ with at-most-exponential growth in ξ at infinity in Ξ_θ . If this is the case, the Laplace transform $\mathfrak{L}_\theta[\varphi](\hbar)$ is well-defined and defines a holomorphic function $f(\hbar)$ on some Borel sector S bisected by the direction θ , and we say that $f(\hbar)$ is the **Borel resummation** in direction θ of the formal power series $\widehat{f}(\hbar)$, and we write

$$f = \mathcal{S}_\theta[\widehat{f}] .$$

If $\theta = 0$, we write simply \mathcal{S} . Expressly, we have the following formulas:

$$\mathcal{S}_\theta[\widehat{f}](\hbar) = f^{(0)} + \mathfrak{L}_\theta[\varphi](\hbar) = f^{(0)} + \mathfrak{L}_\theta[\text{AnCont}_\theta[\widehat{\varphi}]](\hbar) .$$

Thus, Borel resummation \mathcal{S}_θ can be seen as a map from the set of (germs of) holomorphic functions f on S with $|\Theta| = \pi$ satisfying (174) to the set of Borel summable power series. One of the most fundamental theorems in Gevrey asymptotics and Borel-Laplace theory is a theorem of Nevanlinna [Nev18, pp.44-45]⁴, which says that this map \mathcal{S}_θ is invertible and its inverse is the asymptotic expansion \mathfrak{a} .

¶10. **Theorem 4 (Nevanlinna's Theorem).** *For any phase θ , the asymptotic expansion map \mathfrak{a} restricts to an algebra isomorphism*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{holomorphic functions} \\ \text{admitting Gevrey asymptotics} \\ \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow 0 \text{ along } [\theta - \frac{\pi}{2}, \theta + \frac{\pi}{2}] \end{array} \right\} \xrightleftharpoons[\mathcal{S}_\theta]{\mathfrak{a}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Borel summable} \\ \text{power series} \\ \text{in the direction } \theta \end{array} \right\} . \quad (181)$$

⁴It was rediscovered and clarified decades later by Sokal [Sok80]; see also [Mal95, p.182], [LR16, Theorem 5.3.9], as well as [Nik20, §B.3].

§ A.3. Complex Flows

In this subsection, we give a crash course on complex flows, mainly to introduce some terminology and set the notation. For more information about complex flows, see e.g., [Reb96]; reference [LMnR00] may also be helpful.

¶11. **Global flows.** A *global complex flow* on a complex manifold X is a holomorphic complex-one-parameter group of biholomorphisms $\Phi_z : X \rightarrow X$. That is, it is a holomorphic map

$$\Phi : \mathbb{C} \times X \rightarrow X \quad \text{sending} \quad (z, p) \mapsto \Phi_z(p) := \Phi(z, p)$$

satisfying the following properties:

$$\Phi_0 = \text{id} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{z_1+z_2} = \Phi_{z_1} \circ \Phi_{z_2} \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C} .$$

Its *global complex flow curves* (or *complex integral curves* or *complex orbits*) are the complex curves $\Phi(p) : z \mapsto \Phi_z(p)$. That is, for any point $p \in X$, the *complex flow curve based at p* is the (image of the) holomorphic map

$$\gamma_p : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X \quad \text{sending} \quad z \mapsto \gamma_p(z) := \Phi_z(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_p := \{\gamma_p(z) \mid z \in \mathbb{C}\} \subset X .$$

Note that $\gamma_p(0) = p$. The parameter z is termed the *complex flow time* of Φ even though of course it does not have a sense of direction.

For real flows, flow curves are also called trajectories, but for complex flows these notions are separate. Write $z = t + is$, its real and imaginary parts. Then the *global trajectories* of Φ (or its *real integral curves* or *real orbits*) are the real curves $t \mapsto \Phi_t(p)$. That is, for any point $p \in X$, the *trajectory based at p* is the (image of the) restriction map

$$\gamma_p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X \quad \text{sending} \quad t \mapsto \gamma_p(t) = \Phi_t(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_p := \{\gamma_p(t) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset X .$$

The parameter t is termed the *real flow time* of Φ and it gives Γ a sense of direction. The *global forward trajectory* or *ray* and the *global backward trajectory* based at p are respectively the subsets

$$\Gamma_p^+ := \{\gamma_p(t) \mid t \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_p^- := \{\gamma_p(t) \mid t \leq 0\} .$$

Further, given a phase $\theta \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, a *θ -trajectory* of Φ based at p is the image of the straight real line $e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R} := \{z = te^{i\theta} \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset \mathbb{C}$:

$$\gamma_p^\theta : e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R} \rightarrow X \quad \text{sending} \quad te^{i\theta} \mapsto \gamma_p^\theta(t) := \Phi_{te^{i\theta}}(p); \quad \text{i.e.:} \quad \Gamma_p^\theta := \{\gamma_p^\theta(t) \mid t \in e^{i\theta}\mathbb{R}\} .$$

One can do a rotation in the z -plane to define a new flow $\Phi^\theta(z, p) := \Phi(e^{i\theta}z, p)$. Then the θ -trajectories of Φ are the trajectories of Φ^θ .

¶12. **Flow velocity fields.** The **complex velocity vector** of Φ at $p \in X$ is the complex tangent vector V_p to X at p obtained by differentiating the holomorphic map γ_p at $z = 0$. That is, thinking of the holomorphic tangent space $T_p X$ as the vector space of derivations of local holomorphic functions, the derivation V_p is defined by the formula

$$V_p(f) := \left. \frac{d}{dz} f(\gamma_p(z)) \right|_{z=0}$$

for any holomorphic function f defined in a neighbourhood of $p \in X$. Then the **global complex velocity field** of Φ is the holomorphic vector field V on X which is the complex velocity vector to the complex flow curves at all points.

If γ and γ' are two complex flow curves that both pass through the same point p , then there is some $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\gamma' = \gamma(z + z_0)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Consequently, the complex velocity vectors to γ and γ' at p coincide. As a result, if $q \in \Xi_p$ so that $q = \gamma_p(z_0)$ for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, then V_q is also the complex velocity vector to γ_p at complex time $z = z_0$:

$$V_q(f) := \left. \frac{d}{dz} f(\gamma_p(z)) \right|_{z=z_0}$$

for any holomorphic function f defined in a neighbourhood of $q \in X$. We express this property as follows:

$$\gamma_* \frac{d}{dz} = V|_{\Gamma} . \quad (182)$$

This equality is a complex ODE for γ . Namely, in local coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ on X , a complex flow curve γ is a holomorphic vector function $z \mapsto x(z)$, and the complex velocity field V is $\sum_i a_i(x) \partial_{x_i}$ for some holomorphic functions a_i . Then (182) is the differential system

$$\frac{dx_i}{dz} = a_i(x(z)) \quad i = 1, \dots, n . \quad (183)$$

Choosing a point $p \in X$ to fix $\gamma = \gamma_p$ (i.e., such that $\gamma(0) = p$) is like choosing an initial condition for (183).

¶13. **Local flows.** Conversely, we can generate a complex flow by integrating a holomorphic vector field. However, global complex flows are rare, especially those generated by vector fields. Instead, every vector field generates a **local complex flow** (or simply **complex flow** from now on), which is a holomorphic map $\Phi : \Omega \rightarrow X$ from an open subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C} \times X$ containing $\{0\} \times X$ with the property

$$\Phi_0 = \text{id} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{z_1+z_2}(p) = \Phi_{z_1}(\Phi_{z_2}(p))$$

for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $(z_1, p), (z_2, p), (z_1 + z_2, p) \in \Omega$. Here, $\Phi_z(p) := \Phi(z, p)$.

Define the **complex flow strip** based at $p \in X$ to be the set

$$\Omega_p := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid (z, p) \in \Omega\}^{\text{cco}} ,$$

where the superscript “cco” indicates taking the connected component of the origin. Then the **complex flow curve** based at $p \in X$ is the (image of the) holomorphic map

$$\gamma_p : \Omega_p \rightarrow \Xi_p \quad \text{sending} \quad z \mapsto \gamma_p(z) := \Phi_z(p) \quad \text{where} \quad \Xi_p := \{\gamma_p(z) \mid z \in \Omega_p\} \subset X .$$

Define the **real flow interval** based at $p \in X$ to be the (possibly unbounded) open interval

$$I_p = (t_p^-, t_p^+) := \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid (t, p) \in \Omega\}^{\text{cco}} \subset \Omega_p .$$

Then the **trajectory** of Φ based at p is the (image of the) restriction map

$$\gamma_p : I_p \rightarrow X \quad \text{sending} \quad t \mapsto \gamma_p(t) = \Phi_t(p) \quad \text{where} \quad \Gamma_p := \{\gamma_p(t) \mid t \in I_p\} \subset \Xi_p .$$

Similarly, the **forward trajectory** or **ray** and the **backward trajectory** based at p are respectively the subsets

$$\Gamma_p^+ := \{\gamma_p(t) \mid t \in I_p^+\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_p^- := \{\gamma_p(t) \mid t \in I_p^-\} ,$$

where $I_p^+ := [0, t_p^+)$ and $I_p^- := (t_p^-, 0]$ are the **forward** and **backward flow intervals**. Note: we reserve the term “**ray**” to only mean “forward trajectory” and not “backward trajectory”.

¶14. **Flows generated by vector fields.** Let V be a holomorphic vector field on X . Then there is a complex flow $\Phi : \Omega \rightarrow X$ such that V is its complex velocity field. Indeed, a holomorphic map $\gamma : Z \rightarrow X$ from a domain $Z \subset \mathbb{C}$ containing $z = 0$ is a **complex integral curve** of V if it satisfies, for all $z \in Z$,

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dz}(z) = V_{\gamma(z)} .$$

In local coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, this is a complex ODE exactly like in (183). Thus, by the Existence and Uniqueness Theorem for ODEs (applied in local coordinate charts and glued from chart to chart), for every $p \in X$ there is a unique maximal complex integral curve γ_p satisfying $\gamma_p(0) = p$. Its domain and codomain are denoted by Ω_p and Ξ_p . Then Ω is the union of all Ω_p , $p \in X$, and the map Φ is defined by $\Phi(z, p) := \gamma_p(z)$.

¶15. **Calculating flows in one complex dimension.** Now suppose X is a Riemann surface with a holomorphic vector field V . In practice, to describe the complex flow Φ of $V = a(x)\partial_x$ in a local coordinate x , we need to solve differential system (183) which is a single scalar equation $dx/dz = a(x(z))$. Fixing an initial condition $x(0) = p$, the solution $x(z)$ gives a formula for $\gamma_p(z)$ in the coordinate x , but as this is a nonlinear equation the formula is usually not explicit.

On the other hand, if the vector field V is non-vanishing, then the map $\gamma_p : \Omega_p \rightarrow \Xi_p$ is conformal and therefore admits a local holomorphic inverse on a neighbourhood $\Xi_p^0 \subset \Xi_p$ of p . Let $\varphi_p := \gamma_p^{-1} : \Xi_p^0 \rightarrow \Omega_p$ be the local inverse with the property that $\varphi_p(p) = 0$. The above scalar differential equation can be inverted to give an explicit formula $z(x)$ for φ_p in the coordinate x :

$$\varphi_p(x) = z(x) := \int_p^x \frac{dx'}{a(x')} .$$

In fact this formula extends the local inverse φ_p to a multivalued holomorphic inverse on all of Ξ_p . For any $q \in \Xi_p$, the complex number $\varphi_p(q)$ is the complex time required in order to travel from p to q along the vector field V .

The trajectory Γ_p (or at least the part of it contained in the coordinate chart x) is understood as the zero-level set of the imaginary part of φ_p :

$$\Gamma_p = \left\{ x \mid \operatorname{Im} \varphi_p(x) = \operatorname{Im} \left(\int_p^x \frac{dx'}{a(x')} \right) = 0 \right\}.$$

Furthermore, other level sets of $\operatorname{Im} \varphi_p$ describe the nearby trajectories: a trajectory Γ_q for some nearby point q is understood as the level set $\Gamma_q = \{x \mid \operatorname{Im} \varphi_p(x) = c\}$ where $c = \operatorname{Im} \varphi_p(q)$. Likewise, the forward and backward trajectories Γ_p^+, Γ_p^- are the parts where the real part of φ_p is nonnegative or nonpositive, respectively:

$$\Gamma_p^\pm = \left\{ x \mid \pm \operatorname{Re} \varphi_p(x) = \pm \operatorname{Re} \left(\int_p^x \frac{dx'}{a(x')} \right) \geq 0 \right\}.$$

In the same way, θ -trajectories are the level sets of $\operatorname{Im} e^{-i\theta} \varphi_p$:

$$\Gamma_p^\theta = \left\{ x \mid \operatorname{Im} e^{-i\theta} \varphi_p(x) = \operatorname{Im} \left(e^{-i\theta} \int_p^x \frac{dx'}{a(x')} \right) = 0 \right\}.$$

§ A.4. Some Useful Elementary Estimates

Here, for reference, we collect some elementary estimates used in this paper. Their proofs are straightforward (see [Nik20, Appendix C.4]).

¶16. **Lemma 6.** *For any $R \geq 0$, any $L \geq 0$, and any nonnegative integer n ,*

$$\int_0^R \frac{r^n}{n!} e^{Lr} dr \leq \frac{R^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} e^{LR}.$$

¶17. **Lemma 7.** *Let j_1, \dots, j_m be nonnegative integers and put $n := j_1 + \dots + j_m$. Let f_{j_1}, \dots, f_{j_m} be holomorphic functions on $\Sigma := \{\xi \mid \operatorname{dist}(\xi, \mathbb{R}_+) < \varepsilon\}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. If there are constants $M_{j_1}, \dots, M_{j_m}, L \geq 0$ such that*

$$|f_{j_i}(\xi)| \leq M_{j_i} \frac{|\xi|^{j_i}}{j_i!} e^{L|\xi|} \quad \forall \xi \in \Sigma,$$

then their total convolution product satisfies the following bound:

$$|f_{j_1} * \dots * f_{j_m}(\xi)| \leq M_{j_1} \dots M_{j_m} \frac{|\xi|^{n+m-1}}{(n+m-1)!} e^{L|\xi|} \quad \forall \xi \in \Sigma.$$

References

- [AHT22] M. Alim, L. Hollands, and I. Tulli, *Quantum curves, resurgence and exact WKB*, [arXiv:2203.08249](#) [hep-th].
- [AM22] J. E. Andersen and W. E. Mistegård, *Resurgence analysis of quantum invariants of Seifert fibered homology spheres*, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **105** no. 2, (2022) 709–764, [arXiv:1811.05376](#) [math.DG].
- [Cos09] O. Costin, *Asymptotics and Borel summability*, vol. 141 of *Chapman & Hall/CRC Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2009.
- [DPMSS21] L. Di Pietro, M. Mariño, G. Sberveglieri, and M. Serone, *Resurgence and $1/N$ expansion in integrable field theories*, *J. High Energy Phys.* no. 10, (2021) Paper No. 166, 55, [arXiv:2108.02647](#) [hep-th].

- [Éca84] J. Écalle, *Singularités irrégulières et résurgence multiple, Cinq Applications des Fonctions Résurgentes*, Preprint No. 84T62 (Prepub. Math. d'Orsay) (1984) .
- [Éca85] J. Écalle, “Les fonctions resurgentes, vols. I-III.” Publ. Math. Orsay 85-05, 585 p., 1985.
- [GGM20] A. Grassi, J. Gu, and M. Mariño, *Non-perturbative approaches to the quantum Seiberg-Witten curve*, *J. High Energy Phys.* no. 7, (2020) 106, 50, [arXiv:1908.07065 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GGM21] S. Garoufalidis, J. Gu, and M. Mariño, *The resurgent structure of quantum knot invariants*, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **386** no. 1, (2021) 469–493, [arXiv:2007.10190 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GMN13] D. Gaiotto, G. W. Moore, and A. Neitzke, *Wall-crossing, Hitchin systems, and the WKB approximation*, *Adv. Math.* **234** (2013) 239–403, [arXiv:0907.3987 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [GMP16] S. Gukov, M. Mariño, and P. Putrov, *Resurgence in complex Chern-Simons theory*, [arXiv:1605.07615 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [HS99] P.-F. Hsieh and Y. Sibuya, *Basic Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*. Universitext. Springer, 1999.
- [IMS19] K. Ito, M. Mariño, and H. Shu, *TBA equations and resurgent quantum mechanics*, *J. High Energy Phys.* no. 1, (2019) 228, front matter+44, [arXiv:1811.04812 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [IN14] K. Iwaki and T. Nakanishi, *Exact WKB analysis and cluster algebras*, *J. Phys. A* **47** no. 47, (2014) 474009, 98, [arXiv:1401.7094 \[math.CA\]](#).
- [KS22] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Analyticity and resurgence in wall-crossing formulas*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **112** no. 2, (2022) Paper No. 32, 56, [arXiv:2005.10651 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [KT05] T. Kawai and Y. Takei, *Algebraic analysis of singular perturbation theory*, vol. 227 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005. Translated from the 1998 Japanese original by Goro Kato, Iwanami Series in Modern Mathematics.
- [Lei17] J. Leiterer, *On the Jordan structure of holomorphic matrices*, [arXiv:1703.09535 \[math.CV\]](#).
- [LMnR00] J. L. López and J. Muciño Raymundo, *On the problem of deciding whether a holomorphic vector field is complete*, in *Complex analysis and related topics (Cuernavaca, 1996)*, vol. 114 of *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, pp. 171–195. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.
- [LR16] M. Loday-Richaud, *Divergent series, summability and resurgence. II*, vol. 2154 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, [Cham], 2016. Simple and multiple summability, With prefaces by Jean-Pierre Ramis, Éric Delabaere, Claude Mitschi and David Sauzin.
- [Mal82] B. Malgrange, *Travaux d'Écalle et de Martinet-Ramis sur les systèmes dynamiques*, in *Bourbaki Seminar; Vol. 1981/1982*, vol. 92 of *Astérisque*, pp. 59–73. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982.
- [Mal95] B. Malgrange, *Sommation des séries divergentes.*, *Expo. Math.* **13** no. 2-3, (1995) 163–222.
- [Mar21] M. Mariño, *Advanced Topics in Quantum Mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [MR83] J. Martinet and J.-P. Ramis, *Classification analytique des équations différentielles non linéaires résonnantes du premier ordre*, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **16** no. 4, (1983) 571–621 (1984).
- [MR19] M. Mariño and T. Reis, *Resurgence for superconductors*, *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.* no. 12, (2019) 123102, 41, [arXiv:1905.09569 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [Nev18] F. Nevanlinna, *Zur Theorie der asymptotischen Potenzreihen*. No. v. 1 in *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*. Series A. Alexander University of Finland, 1918.
- [Nik19] N. Nikolaev, *Triangularisation of Singularly Perturbed Logarithmic Differential Systems of Rank 2*, [arXiv:1909.04011 \[math.CA\]](#).
- [Nik20] N. Nikolaev, *Exact Solutions for the Singularly Perturbed Riccati Equation and Exact WKB Analysis*, [arXiv:2008.06492 \[math.CA\]](#).
- [Nik21] N. Nikolaev, *Existence and Uniqueness of Exact WKB Solutions for Second-Order Linear ODEs*, [arXiv:2106.10248 \[math.AP\]](#).
- [Nik22] N. Nikolaev, *Gevrey Asymptotic Implicit Function Theorem*, to appear in *L'Enseignement Mathématique* (2022) , [arXiv:2112.08792 \[math.CV\]](#).

- [Ram78] J.-P. Ramis, *Déviage Gevrey*, in *Journées Singulières de Dijon (Univ. Dijon, Dijon, 1978)*, vol. 59 of *Astérisque*, pp. 4, 173–204. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1978.
- [Ram80] J.-P. Ramis, *Les séries k -sommables et leurs applications*, in *Complex analysis, microlocal calculus and relativistic quantum theory (Proc. Internat. Colloq., Centre Phys., Les Houches, 1979)*, vol. 126 of *Lecture Notes in Phys.*, pp. 178–199. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1980.
- [Reb96] J. C. Rebelo, *Singularités des flots holomorphes*, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **46** no. 2, (1996) 411–428.
- [RS89] J.-P. Ramis and Y. Sibuya, *Hukuhara domains and fundamental existence and uniqueness theorems for asymptotic solutions of Gevrey type*, *Asymptotic Anal.* **2** no. 1, (1989) 39–94.
- [Sau14] D. Sauzin, *Introduction to 1-summability and resurgence*, [arXiv:1405.0356 \[math.DS\]](#).
- [Sil85] H. J. Silverstone, *JWKB connection-formula problem revisited via Borel summation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** no. 23, (1985) 2523–2526.
- [Sok80] A. D. Sokal, *An improvement of Watson’s theorem on Borel summability*, *J. Math. Phys.* **21** no. 2, (1980) 261–263.
- [Str84] K. Strebel, *Quadratic differentials*, vol. 5 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [Vor83] A. Voros, *The return of the quartic oscillator: The complex WKB method*, *Annales de l’I.H.P. Physique théorique* **39** no. 3, (1983) 211–338.
- [Was62] W. Wasow, *On holomorphically similar matrices*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **4** (1962) 202–206.
- [Was76] W. Wasow, *Asymptotic expansions for ordinary differential equations*. Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., Huntington, N.Y., 1976. Reprint of the 1965 edition.
- [Wat11] G. N. Watson, *A Theory of Asymptotic Series*, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A, Contain. Pap. Math. Phys. Character* **211** (1911) 279–313.