

Construction of GCM hypersurfaces in perturbations of Kerr

Dawei Shen*

May 9, 2023

Abstract. *This is a follow-up of [5] on the general covariant modulated (GCM) procedure in perturbations of Kerr. In this paper, we construct GCM hypersurfaces, which play a central role in extending GCM admissible spacetimes in [7] where decay estimates are derived in the context of nonlinear stability of Kerr family for $|a| \ll m$. As in [4], the central idea of the construction of GCM hypersurfaces is to concatenate a 1-parameter family of GCM spheres of [5] by solving an ODE system. The goal of this paper is to get rid of the symmetry restrictions in the GCM procedure introduced in [4] and thus remove an essential obstruction in extending the results to a full stability proof of the Kerr family.*

Keywords. *Frame transformations, GCM spheres, GCM hypersurfaces, Kerr stability.*

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Stability of Kerr conjecture	4
1.2	Stability of Schwarzschild in the polarized case	4
1.2.1	GCM admissible spacetimes in [4]	4
1.2.2	The role played by GCM admissible spacetimes	6

*Email adress: dawei.shen@polytechnique.edu

Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, Sorbonne Université, 75252 Paris, France

1.3	Review of the main results of [5]	6
1.3.1	Background space	6
1.3.2	Null frame transformation	7
1.3.3	Basis of $\ell = 1$ modes	7
1.3.4	Definition of GCM spheres	8
1.3.5	Deformations of spheres and frame transformations	9
1.3.6	GCM spheres with $\ell = 1$ modes in [5]	9
1.4	First version of the main theorem	10
1.5	Sketch of the proof of the main theorem	13
1.6	Structure of the paper	15
2	Geometric set-up	15
2.1	Ricci and curvature coefficients	15
2.2	Basic equations for the renormalized quantities	18
2.3	Commutation lemmas	19
2.4	Hodge operators	20
2.5	Definition of $\ell = 1$ modes	21
2.6	Elliptic estimates	22
2.7	General frame transformations	24
2.8	Background spacetime	26
2.8.1	Adapted coordinates	26
2.8.2	Background spacetime region \mathcal{R}	29
2.8.3	Main assumptions for \mathcal{R}	30

2.9	Deformation of surfaces in \mathcal{R}	31
3	GCM spheres	34
3.1	GCM spheres with $\ell = 1$ modes in [5]	34
3.2	Linearized GCM equations	37
3.3	GCM spheres with more general $\ell = 1$ modes	38
4	Construction of GCM hypersurfaces	39
4.1	Definition of a family of hypersurfaces Σ	43
4.2	Estimates for the transition functions $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$	55
4.3	Extrinsic properties of Σ	65
4.4	ODE system for $(\Psi, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$	75
4.5	Proof of Theorem 4.1	91
4.6	Proof of Corollary 4.2	94
A	Proof of Lemma 4.6	104
B	Proof of Lemma 4.7	106
C	Proof of Lemma 4.8	109
D	Proof of Lemma 4.9	111
	Declarations	113
	References	113

1 Introduction

1.1 Stability of Kerr conjecture

In this paper, we construct general covariant modulated (GCM) hypersurfaces, which play a central role in the proof of the nonlinear stability of Kerr family for $|a| \ll m$.

Conjecture (Stability of Kerr conjecture). *Vacuum initial data sets, sufficiently close to Kerr initial data, have a maximal development with complete future null infinity¹ and with domain of outer communication which approaches (globally) a nearby Kerr solution.*

The paper builds on the strategy laid out in [4] in the context of the nonlinear stability of Schwarzschild for axially symmetric polarized perturbations. The central new idea of [4] was the introduction and construction of GCM spheres and GCM hypersurfaces on which specific geometric quantities take Schwarzschildian values. This was made possible by taking into account the full general covariance of the Einstein vacuum equations. The construction, however, also made essential use of the polarization assumption.

The goal of this, and its companion papers [5] and [6], is to get rid of the symmetry restriction in the GCM procedure and thus remove an essential obstruction in extending the result in [4] to a full stability proof of the Kerr family.

1.2 Stability of Schwarzschild in the polarized case

1.2.1 GCM admissible spacetimes in [4]

In [4], Klainerman and Szeftel proved the nonlinear stability of the Schwarzschild space under axially symmetric polarized perturbations. The final spacetime in [4] was constructed as the limit of a continuous family of finite GCM admissible spacetimes as represented in Figure 1 below, whose future boundaries consist of the union $\mathcal{A} \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}_* \cup \mathcal{C}_* \cup \Sigma_*$ where \mathcal{A} and Σ_* are spacelike, $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_*$ is incoming null, and \mathcal{C}_* outgoing null. The boundary \mathcal{A} is chosen so that, in the limit when \mathcal{M} converges to the final state, it is included inside the black hole region of the limit spacetime. The spacetime \mathcal{M} also contains a timelike hypersurface \mathcal{T} which divides \mathcal{M} into an exterior region we call $^{(ext)}\mathcal{M}$ and an interior one $^{(int)}\mathcal{M}$. Both $^{(ext)}\mathcal{M}$ and $^{(int)}\mathcal{M}$ are foliated by 2-surfaces as follows.

¹This means, roughly, that observers which are far away from the black hole may live forever.




Figure 1: The GCM admissible space-time \mathcal{M} of [4]

- (i) The far region $^{(ext)}\mathcal{M}$ is foliated by a geodesic foliation $S(u, s)$ induced by an outgoing optical function u initialized on Σ_* with s the affine parameter along the null geodesic generators of $^{(ext)}\mathcal{M}$. We denote by $r = r(u, s)$ the area radius of $S(u, s)$. On the boundary Σ_* of $^{(ext)}\mathcal{M}$ we also assume that r is sufficiently large.
- (ii) The near region $^{(int)}\mathcal{M}$ is foliated by a geodesic foliation induced by an incoming optical function \underline{u} initialized at \mathcal{T} such that its level sets on \mathcal{T} coincide with those of u .

To prove convergence to the final state one has to establish precise decay estimates for all Ricci and curvature coefficients decomposed relative to the null geodesic frames associated to the foliations in $^{(ext)}\mathcal{M}$ and $^{(int)}\mathcal{M}$. The decay properties of both Ricci and curvature coefficients in $^{(ext)}\mathcal{M}$ depend heavily on the choice of the boundary Σ_* as well as on the choice of the cuts of the optical function u on it. As such, the central idea of [4] was the introduction and construction of GCM hypersurfaces on which specific geometric quantities take Schwarzschildian values.

1.2.2 The role played by GCM admissible spacetimes

As mentioned above the final spacetime was constructed as the limit of a continuous family of finite GCM admissible spacetimes. At every stage one assumes that all Ricci and curvature coefficients of a fixed GCM admissible spacetime \mathcal{M} verify precise bootstrap assumptions. One makes use of the GCM admissibility properties of Σ_* and the smallness of the initial conditions to show that all the bounds of the Ricci and curvature coefficients of \mathcal{M} depend only on the size of the initial data and thus, in particular, improve the bootstrap assumptions. This allows to extend the spacetime to a larger one \mathcal{M}' in which the bootstrap assumptions are still valid. To make sure that the extended spacetime is admissible, one has to construct a new GCM hypersurface $\tilde{\Sigma}_*$ in $\mathcal{M}' \setminus \mathcal{M}$ and use it to define a new extended GCM admissible spacetime $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

The goal of the present work is to extend the construction of Σ_* of Section 9.8 of [4], for polarized perturbations of Schwarzschild, to the case of general perturbations of Kerr.

1.3 Review of the main results of [5]

The main building block of our GCM hypersurface are the GCM spheres constructed in [5] which we now review.

1.3.1 Background space

As in [5], we consider spacetime regions \mathcal{R} foliated by a geodesic foliation $S(u, s)$ induced by an outgoing optical function u with s a properly normalized affine parameter along the null geodesic generators of $L = -\mathbf{g}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta u \partial_\alpha$ where \mathbf{g} is the spacetime metric. We denote by $r = r(u, s)$ the area radius of $S(u, s)$ and let (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) be an adapted null frame with e_4 proportional to L and e_1, e_2 tangent to spheres $S = S(u, s)$, see Section 2.8. The main assumptions made in [5] were that the Ricci and curvature coefficients, relative to the adapted null frame, have the same asymptotics in powers of r as in Schwarzschild space. Note that these assumptions hold true in the far region of Kerr and is expected to hold true for the far region of realistic perturbations of Kerr. The actual size of the perturbation from Kerr is measured with respect to a small parameter $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} > 0$, see sections 2.8.2 and 2.8.3 for precise definitions.

1.3.2 Null frame transformation

In general, two null frames (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) and (e'_3, e'_4, e'_1, e'_2) are related by a frame transformation of the following form:²

$$\begin{aligned} e'_4 &= \lambda \left(e_4 + f^b e_b + \frac{1}{4} |f|^2 e_3 \right), \\ e'_a &= \left(\delta_{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{f}_a f_b \right) e_b + \frac{1}{2} \underline{f}_a e_4 + \left(\frac{1}{2} f_a + \frac{1}{8} |f|^2 \underline{f}_a \right) e_3, \\ e'_3 &= \lambda^{-1} \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{2} f \cdot \underline{f} + \frac{1}{16} |f|^2 |\underline{f}|^2 \right) e_3 + \left(\underline{f}^b + \frac{1}{4} |f|^2 f^b \right) e_b + \frac{1}{4} |\underline{f}|^2 e_4 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

where the scalar λ and the 1-forms f and \underline{f} are called the transition coefficients from (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) to (e'_3, e'_4, e'_1, e'_2) .

1.3.3 Basis of $\ell = 1$ modes

We introduce the following generalization of the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics of the standard sphere³.

Definition 1.1. *On a sphere S , an ϵ° -approximated basis of $\ell = 1$ modes is a triplet of functions $J^{(p)}$ on S verifying*

$$\begin{aligned} (r^2 \Delta + 2) J^{(p)} &= O(\epsilon^\circ), \quad p = 0, +, -, \\ \frac{1}{|S|} \int_S J^{(p)} J^{(q)} &= \frac{1}{3} \delta_{pq} + O(\epsilon^\circ), \quad p, q = 0, +, -, \\ \frac{1}{|S|} \int_S J^{(p)} &= O(\epsilon^\circ), \quad p = 0, +, -, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\epsilon^\circ > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant.

Remark 1.2. *For simplicity, throughout this paper, $J^{(p)}$ is called a basis of $\ell = 1$ modes.*

Assuming the existence of such a basis $J^{(p)}$, $p \in \{-, 0, +\}$, we define, for a scalar function h ,

$$(h)_{\ell=1}^S := \left\{ \int_S h J^{(p)}, \quad p = -, 0, + \right\}. \quad (1.3)$$

²See Lemma 2.13 for a precise statement.

³Recall that on the standard sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , in spherical coordinates (θ, φ) , these are $J^{(0, \mathbb{S}^2)} = \cos \theta$, $J^{(+, \mathbb{S}^2)} = \sin \theta \cos \varphi$, $J^{(-, \mathbb{S}^2)} = \sin \theta \sin \varphi$.

A scalar function h is said to be supported on $\ell \leq 1$ modes, i.e. $(f)_{\ell \geq 2}^S = 0$, if there exist constants A_0, B_-, B_0, B_+ such that

$$h = A_0 + B_- J^{(-)} + B_0 J^{(0)} + B_+ J^{(+)}.$$
 (1.4)

1.3.4 Definition of GCM spheres

The null expansions $\kappa := \text{tr}\chi$ and $\underline{\kappa} := \text{tr}\underline{\chi}$ relative to the adapted null frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) are defined by

$$\text{tr}\chi := \mathbf{g}^{ab}\chi_{ab}, \quad \text{tr}\underline{\chi} := \mathbf{g}^{ab}\underline{\chi}_{ab},$$

where

$$\chi_{ab} := \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{e_a}e_b, e_b), \quad \underline{\chi}_{ab} := \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{e_a}e_3, e_b).$$

The mass aspect function μ is defined by

$$\mu := -\text{div}\zeta - \rho + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\chi} \cdot \hat{\underline{\chi}},$$

where the shears $\hat{\chi}, \hat{\underline{\chi}}$, the torsion ζ and the curvature components ρ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\chi}_{ab} &:= \chi_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab}\kappa, & \hat{\underline{\chi}}_{ab} &:= \underline{\chi}_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab}\underline{\kappa}, \\ \zeta_a &:= \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{e_a}e_4, e_3), & \rho &:= \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{R}(e_3, e_4, e_3, e_4). \end{aligned}$$

In an outgoing geodesic foliation of Schwarzschild spacetime, we have:

$$\kappa = \frac{2}{r}, \quad \underline{\kappa} = -\frac{2\Upsilon}{r}, \quad \mu = \frac{2m}{r^3},$$
 (1.5)

where $\Upsilon = 1 - \frac{2m}{r}$ and r, m denote the area radius and Hawking mass of S , i.e.

$$r := \sqrt{\frac{|S|}{4\pi}}, \quad \frac{2m}{r} := 1 + \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \kappa \underline{\kappa}.$$
 (1.6)

The idea to construct GCM spheres is to mimic the condition (1.5) in the perturbed spacetimes. More precisely, the GCM spheres are topological spheres \mathbf{S} embedded in \mathcal{R} endowed with a null frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ adapted to \mathbf{S} (i.e. $e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}}$ tangent to \mathbf{S}), relative to which the null expansions $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = \text{tr}\chi^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} = \text{tr}\underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and mass aspect function $\mu^{\mathbf{S}}$ satisfy:

$$\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} = 0, \quad \left(\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0, \quad \left(\mu^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0,$$
 (1.7)

where $r^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $m^{\mathbf{S}}$ denote the area radius and Hawking mass of \mathbf{S} .

1.3.5 Deformations of spheres and frame transformations

The construction of GCM spheres in [5] was obtained by deforming a given sphere $\mathring{S} = S(\mathring{u}, \mathring{s})$ of the background foliation of \mathcal{R} . An $O(\mathring{\delta})$ deformation of \mathring{S} is defined by a map $\Psi : \mathring{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S} \subset \mathcal{R}$ of the form

$$\Psi(\mathring{u}, \mathring{s}, y^1, y^2) = \left(\mathring{u} + U(y^1, y^2), \mathring{s} + S(y^1, y^2), y^1, y^2 \right) \quad (1.8)$$

with (U, S) smooth functions on \mathring{S} , vanishing at a fixed point of \mathring{S} , of size proportional to the small constant $\mathring{\delta}$ and (y^1, y^2) are spherical coordinates on \mathring{S} . Given such a deformation we identify, at any point on \mathbf{S} , two important null frames.

1. The null frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) of the background foliation of \mathcal{R} .
2. A null frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ obtained from (1.1) adapted to \mathbf{S} , (i.e. $e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}}$ tangent to \mathbf{S}).

Remark 1.3. *Throughout this paper, we denote (f, f, λ) the transition coefficients from the background frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) of \mathcal{R} to the null frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ adapted to \mathbf{S} .*

1.3.6 GCM spheres with $\ell = 1$ modes in [5]

Here is a short version of the main result in [5].

Theorem 1.4 (Existence of GCM spheres in [5]). *Let \mathcal{R} be fixed spacetime region, endowed with an outgoing geodesic foliation $S(u, s)$, verifying specific asymptotic assumptions⁴ expressed in terms of two parameters $0 < \mathring{\delta} \leq \mathring{\epsilon}$. In particular we assume that the GCM quantities of the background spheres in \mathcal{R} , i.e.*

$$\kappa - \frac{2}{r}, \quad \left(\frac{\kappa}{r} + \frac{2\Upsilon}{r} \right)_{\ell \geq 2}, \quad \left(\mu - \frac{2m}{r^3} \right)_{\ell \geq 2}, \quad (1.9)$$

are small with respect to the parameter $\mathring{\delta}$. Let $\mathring{S} = S(\mathring{u}, \mathring{s})$ be a fixed sphere of the foliation with \mathring{r} and \mathring{m} denoting respectively its area radius and Hawking mass, with \mathring{r} sufficiently large. Then, for any fixed triplets $\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ verifying

$$|\Lambda|, |\underline{\Lambda}| \lesssim \mathring{\delta}, \quad (1.10)$$

⁴Compatible with small perturbations of Kerr.

there exists a unique sphere $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$, together with a null frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$, which is GCM, i.e. \mathbf{S} is a deformation of \mathring{S} , such that⁵

$$\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} = 0, \quad \left(\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0, \quad \left(\mu^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0, \quad (1.11)$$

and

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda}, \quad (1.12)$$

where $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$ denote the transition coefficients of the transformation (1.1) from the background frame of \mathcal{R} to the frame adapted to \mathbf{S} .

Remark 1.5. The conditions (1.9), (1.11) and (1.12) depend on the definition of $\ell = 1$ modes respectively on \mathring{S} and \mathbf{S} . In [5], once a choice of $\ell = 1$ modes on \mathring{S} is made, it is then extended to \mathbf{S} using the background foliation. As a consequence, the GCM spheres of Theorem 1.4 depend on the particular choice of $\ell = 1$ modes on \mathring{S} .

1.4 First version of the main theorem

The goal of this paper is to construct hypersurfaces which are suitable concatenations of the spheres of Theorem 1.4. We give below a simplified version of our main theorem, see Theorem 4.1 for the precise version.

Theorem 1.6 (Existence of GCM hypersurfaces, first version). *Let \mathcal{R} be fixed spacetime region, endowed with an outgoing geodesic foliation $S(u, s)$, verifying same assumptions as Theorem 1.4. Assume in addition that $e_3(J^{(p)})$, $(\operatorname{div} \eta)_{\ell=1}$, $(\operatorname{div} \underline{\xi})_{\ell=1}$, $r-s$ and $e_3(r) - e_3(s)$ are small with respect to the parameter $\mathring{\delta}$.*

Let \mathbf{S}_0 be a fixed sphere included in the region \mathcal{R} , let a pair of triplets $\Lambda_0, \underline{\Lambda}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$|\Lambda_0|, |\underline{\Lambda}_0| \lesssim \mathring{\delta},$$

and let $J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)}$ a basis of $\ell = 1$ modes on \mathbf{S}_0 , such that we have on \mathbf{S}_0

$$\kappa^{\mathbf{S}_0} - \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}_0}} = 0, \quad \left(\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}_0} + \frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}_0}}{r^{\mathbf{S}_0}} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0, \quad \left(\mu^{\mathbf{S}_0} - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}_0}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}_0})^3} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0,$$

⁵Note that the GCM conditions (1.11) require a choice of $\ell = 1$ modes on \mathbf{S} , see Remark 1.5.

and

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}_0} f)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda_0, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}_0} \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda}_0,$$

where (f, \underline{f}) denote the transition coefficients of the transformation (1.1) from the background frame of \mathcal{R} to the frame adapted to \mathbf{S}_0 .

Then, there exists a unique, local, smooth, spacelike hypersurface Σ_0 passing through \mathbf{S}_0 , a scalar function $u^{\mathbf{S}}$ defined on Σ_0 , whose level surfaces are topological spheres denoted by \mathbf{S} , a smooth collection of triplets of constants $\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and a triplet of functions $J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$ defined on Σ_0 verifying,

$$\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}_0} = \Lambda_0, \quad \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}_0} = \underline{\Lambda}_0, \quad J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}|_{\mathbf{S}_0} = J^{(\mathbf{S}_0,p)},$$

such that the following conditions are verified:

1. The surfaces \mathbf{S} of constant $u^{\mathbf{S}}$, together with a null frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$, verify

$$\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} = 0, \quad \left(\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0, \quad \left(\mu^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} \right)_{\ell \geq 2} = 0, \quad (1.13)$$

and

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad (1.14)$$

for the triplets of constants $\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\ell = 1$ modes $J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$.

2. The following transversality conditions

$$\xi^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \omega^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \underline{\eta}^{\mathbf{S}} = -\zeta^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad (1.15)$$

and

$$e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = 0, \quad e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = 1 \quad (1.16)$$

are assumed on Σ_0 .

3. We have, for some constant c_0 ,

$$u^{\mathbf{S}} + r^{\mathbf{S}} = c_0, \quad \text{along } \Sigma_0. \quad (1.17)$$

4. Let $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ be the unique vectorfield tangent to the hypersurface Σ_0 , normal to \mathbf{S} , and normalized by $\mathbf{g}(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}) = -2$. Let $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ be the unique scalar function on Σ_0 such that $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ is given by

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}. \quad (1.18)$$

The following normalization condition holds true

$$\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} = -1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \quad (1.19)$$

where $\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}$ is the average value of $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ over \mathbf{S} and $m_{(0)}$ is a constant.

5. We have the following identities on Σ_0 :

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} = 0, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} = 0. \quad (1.20)$$

6. The transition functions $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$, area radius $r^{\mathbf{S}}$ and Hawking mass $m^{\mathbf{S}}$ verify appropriate estimates.

Remark 1.7. Theorem 1.6 is the generalization of Theorem 9.52 in [4] in the absence of symmetry. It plays a central role in the proof of Theorem M6 and M7 in [7], see sections 8.4 and 8.5 in [7].

Remark 1.8. We provide below more explanations for the statements 1-5 in Theorem 1.6:

1. Since we concatenate a family of GCM spheres $\mathbf{S}(\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}})$ emanating from \mathbf{S}_0 to construct the GCM hypersurfaces Σ_0 , by Theorem 1.4, we have automatically (1.13) and (1.14) on every \mathbf{S} .
2. The transversality conditions (1.15) and (1.16) are consistent with a local extension by an outgoing geodesic foliation initialized on Σ_0 , see item 1 in Remark 4.12. The role of these transversality conditions is to make sense of $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}$ on Σ_0 , see item 5 below.
3. $u^{\mathbf{S}}$ should be chosen to be constant on the GCM spheres foliating Σ_0 . The choice (1.17) is simple and fulfills this condition but other choices making Σ_0 spacelike are possible.
4. The value $\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}$ is free and should be prescribed. Note that the choice (1.19) coincides with the value for the hypersurface $\{u + r = c_0\}$ in Schwarzschild spacetime.
5. In (1.20), $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}$ are defined intrinsically on Σ_0 by

$$\eta_a^{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_a^{\mathbf{S}}), \quad \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_a^{\mathbf{S}}) + b^{\mathbf{S}} \zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

These definitions are consistent with the standard ones provided Σ_0 satisfies (1.15) which is equivalent to extending Σ_0 locally by an outgoing geodesic foliation, see item 2 in Remark 4.12. In the sequel, (1.20) will be enforced thanks to a special choice of $\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}}$, see Section 1.5 for more explanations.

Remark 1.9. As in Section 9.8 of [4], Σ_0 is chosen to be spacelike. One may wonder whether Σ_0 could be chosen to be null⁶. The reason for choosing it to be spacelike is that it allows more flexibility: all spheres foliating Σ_0 in Theorem 1.6 are GCM spheres, while only one could be a GCM sphere on a null hypersurface.

1.5 Sketch of the proof of the main theorem

The idea of the proof is to construct Σ_0 as a 1-parameter union of GCM spheres.

Step 1. For every background sphere $S(u, s)$ in \mathcal{R} , every pair of triplets $(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$ and every triplet of functions $\tilde{J}^{(p)}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{p=0,+,-} \|J^{(p)} - \tilde{J}^{(p)}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S(u,s))} \lesssim r\delta^\circ,$$

where $J^{(p)}$ is the $\ell = 1$ modes on $S(u, s)$ and $\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S(u, s))$ denotes the Sobolev space on $S(u, s)$ of order s_{max} , we construct by Theorem 1.4 a unique GCM sphere $\mathbf{S}[u, s, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \tilde{J}^{(p)}]$, as a deformation of $S(u, s)$ with $\ell = 1$ modes in the definition of (1.11) and (1.12) computed w.r.t. $\tilde{J}^{(p)}$. In particular, (1.11) and (1.12) are verified and we have $\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{S}[\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}, \Lambda_0, \underline{\Lambda}_0, \tilde{J}^{(p)}]$, provided we choose $\tilde{J}^{(p)}|_{\mathbf{S}_0} = J^{(\mathbf{S}_0,p)}$.

Step 2. Given $(\Psi(s), \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s))$ such that

$$\Psi(\overset{\circ}{s}) = \overset{\circ}{u}, \quad \Lambda(\overset{\circ}{s}) = \Lambda_0, \quad \underline{\Lambda}(\overset{\circ}{s}) = \underline{\Lambda}_0,$$

We construct, relying on Step 1 and a Banach fixed-point argument, see Theorem 4.10, a family of basis of $\ell = 1$ modes $\tilde{J}(s)$ and of GCM spheres $\mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)]$ verifying

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\tilde{J}(s)) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \quad \tilde{J}^{(p)}(\overset{\circ}{s}) = J^{(\mathbf{S}_0,p)},$$

where the hypersurface Σ is given by

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_s \mathbf{S}(s) = \bigcup_s \mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)],$$

and where $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ is the unique vectorfield tangent to Σ with $\mathbf{g}(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}) = -2$ and normal to $\mathbf{S}(s)$, see Figure 2 for a geometric description.

⁶In the context of the stability of Minkowski, the last slice in the original proof by Christodoulou and Klainerman in [2] is spacelike, while it is null in the proof by Klainerman and Nicolò in [3] in the case of the exterior of an outgoing null cone.




Figure 2: The GCM hypersurface Σ_0 as a deformation of $\Sigma_\# = \{u = \Psi(s)\}$

Step 3. We then derive for $(\Psi, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$ an ODE system of the following type:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Psi'(s)} \Lambda'(s) &= (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} - \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} \Lambda(s) - \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \frac{1}{\Psi'(s)} \underline{\Lambda}'(s) &= (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \xi^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \Psi'(s) &= -1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} + 1 + \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) + \text{l. o. t.}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.21}$$

where l. o. t. denote lower order terms, see Section 4.4 for the precise statement.

Step 4. We look for a special choice $(\check{\Psi}(s), \check{\Lambda}(s), \check{\underline{\Lambda}}(s))$ such that the additional GCM conditions (1.19) and (1.20) are verified. These conditions lead, in view of Step 3, to an ODE system for $(\check{\Psi}(s), \check{\Lambda}(s), \check{\underline{\Lambda}}(s))$, with prescribed initial conditions at $\overset{\circ}{s}$ which allows us to uniquely determine the desired hypersurface Σ_0 .

Remark 1.10. *The proof of Theorem 1.6 is largely analogous to that of Theorem 9.52 in [4]. Below, we compare the proof in this paper and that in Section 9.8 of [4].*

- *In Step 1 and Step 2, we show that, in general, one can choose the approximate basis of $\ell = 1$ modes so that they are transported along the normal direction to the*

GCM spheres $\mathbf{S}(s)$ on Σ . This contrasts with [4] where the basis of $\ell = 1$ modes is fixed by the polarized symmetry.

- Once the choice of $\ell = 1$ modes is made, in **Step 3**, we derive the system of ODEs (1.21). Note that the coefficients of linear terms of $\Lambda(s)$ and $\underline{\Lambda}(s)$ on the R.H.S. of (1.21) are different from that of (9.8.74) in [4], which is due to the different choice of $\ell = 1$ modes.⁷
- **Steps 1-3** are significantly more involved than the corresponding in [4] due to the absence of symmetry, while **Step 4** is similar to that in [4].

1.6 Structure of the paper

The structure of the paper is as follows:

- In Section 2, we review the geometric set-up of [5].
- In Section 3, we review the main result of [5] on the construction of GCM spheres.
- In Section 4, we prove our main theorem concerning the construction of GCM hypersurfaces.

2 Geometric set-up

2.1 Ricci and curvature coefficients

As in [5], we consider given a vacuum spacetime \mathcal{R} with metric \mathbf{g} endowed with an outgoing geodesic foliation by spheres $S(u, s)$ of fixed (u, s) , where u is an outgoing optical function⁸ with $L = -\mathbf{g}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\beta u \partial_\alpha$ its null geodesic generator and s chosen such that

$$L(s) = \frac{1}{\varsigma}, \quad L(\varsigma) = 0.$$

Let $e_4 = \varsigma L$ and e_3 the unique null vectorfield orthogonal to $S(u, s)$ and such that $\mathbf{g}(e_3, e_4) = -2$. We then let (e_1, e_2) be an orthogonal basis of the tangent space of

⁷More precisely, the basis of $\ell = 1$ modes in [4], fixed by polarized symmetry, is not transported along the vectorfield $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$.

⁸That is $\mathbf{g}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta u = 0$.

$S(u, s)$. The corresponding connection coefficients relative to the null frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) are denoted by $\chi, \underline{\chi}, \xi, \underline{\xi}, \omega, \underline{\omega}, \eta, \underline{\eta}, \zeta$ and the null components of the curvature tensor by $\alpha, \underline{\alpha}, \beta, \underline{\beta}, \rho, {}^*\rho$. For the convenience of the reader we recall their definition below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\chi}_{ab} &= \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a e_3, e_b), & \chi_{ab} &= \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a e_4, e_b), \\
\underline{\xi}_a &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_3 e_3, e_a), & \xi_a &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_4 e_4, e_a), \\
\underline{\omega} &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_3 e_3, e_4), & \omega &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_4 e_4, e_3), \\
\underline{\eta}_a &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_4 e_3, e_a), & \eta_a &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_3 e_4, e_a), \\
\underline{\zeta}_a &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{e_a} e_4, e_3),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{ab} &= \mathbf{R}(e_a, e_4, e_b, e_4), & \underline{\alpha}_{ab} &= \mathbf{R}(e_a, e_3, e_b, e_3), \\
\beta_a &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{R}(e_a, e_4, e_3, e_4), & \underline{\beta}_a &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{R}(e_a, e_3, e_3, e_4), \\
\rho &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{R}(e_3, e_4, e_3, e_4), & {}^*\rho &= \frac{1}{4} {}^*\mathbf{R}(e_3, e_4, e_3, e_4),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where ${}^*\mathbf{R}$ denotes the Hodge dual of \mathbf{R} . The null second fundamental forms $\chi, \underline{\chi}$ are further decomposed in their traces $\kappa = \text{tr}\chi$ and $\underline{\kappa} = \text{tr}\underline{\chi}$, and traceless parts $\hat{\chi}$ and $\hat{\underline{\chi}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa &:= \text{tr}\chi = \delta^{ab} \chi_{ab}, & \hat{\chi}_{ab} &:= \chi_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab} \kappa, \\
\underline{\kappa} &:= \text{tr}\underline{\chi} = \delta^{ab} \underline{\chi}_{ab}, & \hat{\underline{\chi}}_{ab} &:= \underline{\chi}_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab} \underline{\kappa}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

We define the horizontal covariant operator ∇ as follows:

$$\nabla_X Y := \mathbf{D}_X Y - \frac{1}{2} \underline{\chi}(X, Y) e_4 - \frac{1}{2} \chi(X, Y) e_3.$$

We also define $\nabla_4 X$ and $\nabla_3 X$ to be the horizontal projections:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_4 X &:= \mathbf{D}_4 X - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(X, \mathbf{D}_4 e_3) e_4 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(X, \mathbf{D}_4 e_4) e_3, \\
\nabla_3 X &:= \mathbf{D}_3 X - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(X, \mathbf{D}_3 e_3) e_3 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(X, \mathbf{D}_3 e_4) e_4.
\end{aligned}$$

As a direct consequence of (2.1), we have the Ricci formulas:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{D}_a e_b &= \nabla_a e_b + \frac{1}{2} \chi_{ab} e_3 + \frac{1}{2} \underline{\chi}_{ab} e_4, \\
\mathbf{D}_a e_3 &= \underline{\chi}_{ab} e_b + \zeta_a e_3, \\
\mathbf{D}_a e_4 &= \chi_{ab} e_b - \zeta_a e_4, \\
\mathbf{D}_3 e_a &= \nabla_3 e_a + \eta_a e_3 + \underline{\xi}_a e_4, \\
\mathbf{D}_4 e_a &= \nabla_4 e_a + \underline{\eta}_a e_4 + \xi_a e_3, \\
\mathbf{D}_3 e_3 &= -2\underline{\omega} e_3 + 2\underline{\xi}_b e_b, \\
\mathbf{D}_3 e_4 &= 2\underline{\omega} e_4 + 2\underline{\eta}_b e_b, \\
\mathbf{D}_4 e_3 &= -2\omega e_3 + 2\xi_b e_b, \\
\mathbf{D}_4 e_4 &= 2\omega e_4 + 2\underline{\eta}_b e_b.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

We recall, see Lemma 2.4 in [5], that the geodesic nature of the foliation implies

$$\omega = \xi = 0, \quad \underline{\eta} = -\zeta, \quad \varsigma = \frac{2}{e_3(u)}.$$

We denote

$$\underline{\Omega} := e_3(r), \quad z := e_3(u) = \frac{2}{\varsigma}. \tag{2.5}$$

The area radius $r = r(u, s)$ is defined such that the volume of S is given by $4\pi r^2$. The Hawking mass $m = m(u, s)$ of $S = S(u, s)$ is given by the formula

$$\frac{2m}{r} = 1 + \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_S \kappa \underline{\kappa}. \tag{2.6}$$

The Gauss curvature of S is denoted by K . It verifies the Gauss equation

$$K = -\rho - \frac{1}{4} \kappa \underline{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\chi} \cdot \widehat{\underline{\chi}}. \tag{2.7}$$

The mass aspect function μ is defined by

$$\mu := -\operatorname{div} \zeta - \rho + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\chi} \cdot \widehat{\underline{\chi}}. \tag{2.8}$$

As in [5], we define the renormalized quantities⁹

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\operatorname{tr}} \chi &:= \operatorname{tr} \chi - \frac{2}{r}, & \widetilde{\operatorname{tr}} \underline{\chi} &:= \operatorname{tr} \underline{\chi} + \frac{2\underline{\Upsilon}}{r}, & \widetilde{\underline{\omega}} &:= \underline{\omega} - \frac{m}{r^2}, \\
\widetilde{K} &:= K - \frac{1}{r^2}, & \widetilde{\rho} &:= \rho + \frac{2m}{r^3}, & \widetilde{\mu} &:= \mu - \frac{2m}{r^3}, \\
\widetilde{\underline{\Omega}} &:= \underline{\Omega} + \Upsilon, & \widetilde{\varsigma} &:= \varsigma - 1, & \widetilde{z} &:= z - 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

⁹Renormalized quantities are obtained by subtracting their Schwarzschild values.

where

$$\Upsilon := 1 - \frac{2m}{r},$$

and the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_g &:= \left\{ \check{\kappa}, \hat{\chi}, \zeta, \check{\underline{\kappa}}, r\check{\mu}, r\check{\rho}, r^*\rho, r\beta, r\alpha, r\check{K} \right\}, \\ \Gamma_b &:= \left\{ \eta, \hat{\underline{\chi}}, \check{\underline{\omega}}, \underline{\xi}, r\underline{\beta}, \underline{\alpha}, r^{-1}\check{\underline{\Omega}}, r^{-1}\check{\zeta}, r^{-1}\check{z}, r^{-1}(e_3(r) + \Upsilon) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 2.1. *The renormalized Ricci coefficients are divided into two groups Γ_g and Γ_b according to their r -weights. See Remark 4.24 for more details.*

2.2 Basic equations for the renormalized quantities

We recall some of the null structure equations and Bianchi identities for the renormalized quantities, see Proposition 5.1.17 in [7].

Proposition 2.2. *In an outgoing geodesic foliation, the following null structure equations hold true*

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_4 \check{\kappa} + \frac{2}{r} \check{\kappa} &= \Gamma_g \cdot \Gamma_g, \\ \nabla_4 \hat{\chi} + \frac{2}{r} \hat{\chi} &= -\alpha + \Gamma_g \cdot \Gamma_g, \\ \nabla_4 \zeta + \frac{2}{r} \zeta &= -\beta + \Gamma_g \cdot \Gamma_g, \\ \nabla_4 \check{\underline{\kappa}} + \frac{1}{r} \check{\underline{\kappa}} &= -2 \operatorname{div} \zeta + 2\check{\rho} + \frac{\Upsilon}{r} \check{\kappa} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g, \\ \nabla_4 \hat{\underline{\chi}} + \frac{1}{r} \hat{\underline{\chi}} &= \frac{\Upsilon}{r} \hat{\chi} - \nabla \hat{\otimes} \zeta + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_3 \check{\kappa} - \frac{\Upsilon}{r} \kappa &= 2 \operatorname{div} \eta + 2\check{\rho} - \frac{1}{r} \check{\kappa} + \frac{4}{r} \check{\omega} + \frac{2m}{r^2} \check{\kappa} + \frac{2}{r^2} \check{y} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b, \\
\nabla_3 \check{\kappa} - \frac{2\Upsilon}{r} \check{\kappa} &= 2 \operatorname{div} \underline{\xi} + \frac{4\Upsilon}{r} \check{\omega} - \frac{2m}{r^2} \check{\kappa} - \left(\frac{2}{r^2} - \frac{8m}{r^3} \right) \check{y} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b, \\
\nabla_3 \hat{\chi} - \frac{2\Upsilon}{r} \hat{\chi} &= -\underline{\alpha} - \frac{2m}{r^2} \hat{\chi} + \nabla \hat{\otimes} \underline{\xi} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b, \\
\nabla_3 \zeta - \frac{\Upsilon}{r} \zeta &= -\underline{\beta} - 2\nabla \check{\omega} + \frac{\Upsilon}{r} (\eta + \zeta) + \frac{1}{r} \underline{\xi} + \frac{2m}{r} (\zeta - \eta) + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b, \\
\nabla_3 \hat{\chi} - \frac{\Upsilon}{r} \hat{\chi} &= \nabla \hat{\otimes} \eta - \frac{1}{r} \hat{\chi} + \frac{2m}{r^2} \hat{\chi} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b.
\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{curl} \eta &= {}^* \rho + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g, \\
\operatorname{curl} \underline{\xi} &= \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b, \\
\check{\mu} &= -\operatorname{div} \zeta - \check{\rho} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g.
\end{aligned}$$

The Bianchi identities are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_3 \alpha - \frac{\Upsilon}{r} \alpha &= \nabla \hat{\otimes} \beta + \frac{4m}{r^2} \alpha + \frac{6m}{r^3} \hat{\chi} + \Gamma_b \cdot (\alpha, \beta) + r^{-1} \Gamma_g \cdot \Gamma_g, \\
\nabla_4 \beta + \frac{4}{r} \beta &= -\operatorname{div} \alpha + r^{-1} \Gamma_g \cdot \Gamma_g, \\
\nabla_3 \beta - \frac{2\Upsilon}{r} \beta &= (\nabla \rho + {}^* \nabla^* \rho) + \frac{2m}{r^2} \beta - \frac{6m}{r^3} \eta + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g, \\
\nabla_4 \check{\rho} + \frac{3}{r} \check{\rho} &= \operatorname{div} \beta + \frac{3m}{r^3} \check{\kappa} + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g, \\
\nabla_3 \check{\rho} - \frac{3\Upsilon}{r} \check{\rho} &= -\operatorname{div} \underline{\beta} + \frac{3m}{r^3} \check{\kappa} - \frac{6m}{r^4} \check{\omega} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\chi} \cdot \underline{\alpha} + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b, \\
\nabla_4 {}^* \rho + \frac{3}{r} {}^* \rho &= -\operatorname{curl} \beta + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g, \\
\nabla_3 {}^* \rho - \frac{3\Upsilon}{r} {}^* \rho &= -\operatorname{curl} \underline{\beta} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\chi} \cdot {}^* \underline{\alpha} + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_b.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows immediately from the standard null structure equations and Bianchi identities (see Propositions 7.3.2 and 7.4.1 in [2]) and the definition (2.9) of the renormalized quantities, see Proposition 5.1.17 in [7] for more details. \square

2.3 Commutation lemmas

We recall the following commutation lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *For any tensor on a sphere S , the following commutation formulas hold true*

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_3, \nabla_a]f &= -\frac{1}{2}tr\chi \nabla_a f + (\eta_a - \zeta_a) \nabla_3 f - \hat{\chi}_{ab} \nabla_b f + \underline{\xi}_a \nabla_4 f + (\underline{F}[f])_a, \\ [\nabla_4, \nabla_a]f &= -\frac{1}{2}tr\chi \nabla_a f + (\underline{\eta}_a + \zeta_a) \nabla_4 f - \hat{\chi}_{ab} \nabla_b f + \xi_a \nabla_3 f + (F[f])_a, \end{aligned}$$

where the tensors $F[f]$ and $\underline{F}[f]$ have the following schematic form

$$F[f] = (\beta, \chi \cdot \underline{\eta}, \underline{\chi} \cdot \xi) \cdot f, \quad \underline{F}[f] = (\underline{\beta}, \underline{\chi} \cdot \eta, \chi \cdot \underline{\xi}) \cdot f.$$

Proof. See Lemma 7.3.3 in [2]. □

Lemma 2.4. *The following commutation formulas hold true for any tensor f on a sphere S :*

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_3, \nabla]f &= \frac{\Upsilon}{r} \nabla f + \Gamma_b \cdot \nabla_3 f + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} f, \\ [\nabla_4, \nabla]f &= -\frac{1}{r} \nabla f + r^{-1} \Gamma_g \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} f, \\ [\nabla_\nu, \nabla]f &= \frac{2}{r} \nabla f + \Gamma_b \cdot \nabla_\nu f + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} f, \\ [\nabla_\nu, \Delta]f &= \frac{4}{r} \nabla f + r^{-1} \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} (\Gamma_b \cdot \nabla_\nu f + r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \mathfrak{d} f), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{d} \in \{\nabla_3, r\nabla_4, \mathfrak{d}\}, \quad \mathfrak{d} := r\nabla, \quad \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} f := (f, \mathfrak{d} f). \quad (2.11)$$

Proof. See Lemma 5.1.19 in [7]. □

2.4 Hodge operators

We recall the following Hodge operators acting on 2-surface S (see Chapter 2 in [2]):

Definition 2.5. *We define the following Hodge operators:*

1. The operator \mathfrak{d}_1 takes any 1-form f into the pair of functions $(\operatorname{div} f, \operatorname{curl} f)$.
2. The operator \mathfrak{d}_2 takes any symmetric traceless 2-tensor f into the 1-form $\operatorname{div} f$.
3. The operator \mathfrak{d}_1^* takes any pair of scalars $(h, {}^*h)$ into the 1-form $-\nabla h + {}^*\nabla {}^*h$.

4. The operator \mathcal{d}_2^* takes any 1-form f into the symmetric traceless 2-tensor $-\frac{1}{2}\nabla\widehat{\otimes}f$.

One can easily check that \mathcal{d}_k^* is the formal adjoint on $L^2(S)$ of \mathcal{d}_k for $k = 1, 2$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{d}_1^*\mathcal{d}_1 &= -\Delta_1 + K, & \mathcal{d}_1\mathcal{d}_1^* &= -\Delta_0, \\ \mathcal{d}_2^*\mathcal{d}_2 &= -\frac{1}{2}\Delta_2 + K, & \mathcal{d}_2\mathcal{d}_2^* &= -\frac{1}{2}(\Delta_1 + K),\end{aligned}\tag{2.12}$$

where Δ_k , $k = 0, 1, 2$ is the Laplace operator on scalars, 1-forms and symmetric traceless 2-tensors.

2.5 Definition of $\ell = 1$ modes

Definition 2.6. On a sphere S , a (suitable $\mathring{\epsilon}$ -approximation of) basis of $\ell = 1$ modes is a triplet of functions $J^{(p)}$ on S satisfying¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned}(r^2\Delta + 2)J^{(p)} &= O(\mathring{\epsilon}), & p &= 0, +, -, \\ \frac{1}{|S|} \int_S J^{(p)} J^{(q)} &= \frac{1}{3}\delta_{pq} + O(\mathring{\epsilon}), & p, q &= 0, +, -, \\ \frac{1}{|S|} \int_S J^{(p)} &= O(\mathring{\epsilon}), & p &= 0, +, -, \end{aligned}\tag{2.13}$$

where $\mathring{\epsilon} > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant.

Remark 2.7. For simplicity, throughout this paper, $J^{(p)}$ is called a basis of $\ell = 1$ modes.

Proposition 2.8. For a basis of $\ell = 1$ modes $J^{(p)}$ defined in Definition 2.6, we have

$$\mathcal{d}_2^*\mathcal{d}_1^*J^{(p)} = r^{-2}O(\mathring{\epsilon}).\tag{2.14}$$

Proof. See Lemma 5.2.8 in [7]. □

Definition 2.9. Given a scalar function f defined on a sphere S , we define the $\ell = 1$ modes of f by the triplet

$$(f)_{\ell=1} := \left\{ \int_S f J^{(p)}, \quad p = 0, +, - \right\}.$$

¹⁰The properties (2.13) of the scalar functions $J^{(p)}$ are motivated by the fact that the $\ell = 1$ spherical harmonics on the standard sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , given by $J^{(0, \mathbb{S}^2)} = \cos \theta$, $J^{(+, \mathbb{S}^2)} = \sin \theta \cos \varphi$, $J^{(-, \mathbb{S}^2)} = \sin \theta \sin \varphi$, satisfy (2.13) with $\mathring{\epsilon} = 0$. Note also that on \mathbb{S}^2 , there holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (\cos \theta)^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (\sin \theta \cos \varphi)^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} (\sin \theta \sin \varphi)^2 = \frac{4\pi}{3}, \quad |\mathbb{S}^2| = 4\pi.$$

2.6 Elliptic estimates

For a tensor f on a sphere S , we define the following norms for any integer $k \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} &:= \sum_{j=0}^k \|\mathfrak{d}^j f\|_{L^2(S)}, \\ \|f\|_{\infty,k} &:= \sum_{j=0}^k \|\mathfrak{d}^j f\|_{L^\infty(S)},\end{aligned}\tag{2.15}$$

Under the assumptions

$$\|\Gamma_g\|_{\infty,k} \leq \epsilon r^{-2}, \quad \|\Gamma_b\|_{\infty,k} \leq \epsilon r^{-1},\tag{2.16}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, we have the following coercive properties of the operators $\mathfrak{d}_1, \mathfrak{d}_2, \mathfrak{d}_1^*$.

Lemma 2.10. *Consider a sphere S such that its Gauss curvature K satisfies*

$$\left\| K - \frac{1}{r^2} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \lesssim \epsilon,\tag{2.17}$$

Then, the following estimates hold for all integer $k \leq s_{max}$:

1. *If f is a 1-form*

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(S)} \lesssim r \|\mathfrak{d}_1 f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.\tag{2.18}$$

2. *If v is a symmetric traceless 2-tensor*

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(S)} \lesssim r \|\mathfrak{d}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.\tag{2.19}$$

3. *If $(h, {}^*h)$ is a pair of scalars*

$$\|(h - \bar{h}, {}^*h - \overline{{}^*h})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(S)} \lesssim r \|\mathfrak{d}_1^*(h, {}^*h)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.\tag{2.20}$$

Proof. See Lemma 2.20 in [5]. □

Lemma 2.11. *On a fixed sphere S for which (2.17) holds, we have for any 1-form f and integer $0 \leq k \leq s_{max}$:*

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(S)} \lesssim r \|\mathfrak{d}_2^* f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + |(f)_{\ell=1}|,\tag{2.21}$$

where the $\ell = 1$ modes are given by Definition 2.9.

Proof. See Lemma 2.19 in [5] for the case $k = 0$. Assume that (2.21) holds for $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$, we have from standard elliptic regularity that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n+1}(S)} &\lesssim r^2 \|\Delta f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n-1}(S)} \\
&\lesssim r^3 \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \Delta f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n-2}(S)} + r^2 |(\Delta f)_{\ell=1}| \\
&\lesssim r^3 \|\Delta \mathcal{D}_2^* f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n-2}(S)} + r^3 \|[\Delta, \mathcal{D}_2^*] f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n-2}(S)} + r^2 \left| \int_S (\Delta f) J^{(p)} \right| \\
&\lesssim r \|\mathcal{D}_2^* f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_n(S)} + \|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_n(S)} + r^2 \left| \int_S f(\Delta J^{(p)}) \right| \\
&\lesssim r \|\mathcal{D}_2^* f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_n(S)} + |(f)_{\ell=1}|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.21) in the case of $k = n - 1$ and (2.13) at the last step. By induction, we deduce (2.21) for $k = n$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.11. \square

The following corollary will be useful in Section 4.3.

Corollary 2.12. *On a fixed sphere S for which (2.17) holds for ϵ° small enough, we have for any symmetric traceless 2-tensor v and integer $0 \leq k \leq s_{\max} - 1$:*

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+2}(S)} \lesssim r^2 \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}, \quad (2.22)$$

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+2}(S)} \lesssim r^2 \left\| \left(\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 + \frac{1}{r^2} \right) v \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}. \quad (2.23)$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(S)} &\lesssim r \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + |(\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 v)_{\ell=1}| \\
&\lesssim r \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + \left| \int_S (\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 v) J^{(p)} \right| \\
&\lesssim r \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + \left| \int_S v(\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_1^* J^{(p)}) \right| \\
&\lesssim r \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + \epsilon^\circ \|v\|_{\infty, k},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used integration by parts and (2.14). Then, we apply Lemma 2.10 to conclude

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+2}(S)} \lesssim r \|\mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(S)} \lesssim r^2 \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + \epsilon^\circ r \|v\|_{\infty, k},$$

which implies, together with Sobolev and $\epsilon^\circ > 0$ small enough,

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+2}(S)} \lesssim r^2 \|\mathcal{D}_2^* \mathcal{D}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.$$

This concludes (2.22).

Since $\not{d}_2^* \not{d}_2$ is a positive operator on $L^2(S)$, the case $k = 0$ of (2.23) follows immediately from (2.22). Assuming that (2.23) holds true for $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{n+2}(S)} &\lesssim r^2 \|\not{d}_2^* \not{d}_2 v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_n(S)} \\ &\lesssim r^2 \left\| \left(\not{d}_2^* \not{d}_2 + \frac{1}{r^2} \right) v \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_n(S)} + \|v\|_{\mathfrak{h}_n(S)} \\ &\lesssim r^2 \left\| \left(\not{d}_2^* \not{d}_2 + \frac{1}{r^2} \right) v \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_n(S)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.23) for $k = n-2$. By induction, we obtain (2.23) for all $0 \leq k \leq s_{\max} - 1$. This concludes the proof of Corollary 2.12. \square

2.7 General frame transformations

We recall below Lemma 3.1 in [5].

Lemma 2.13. *Given a null frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) , a general null transformation from the null frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) to another null frame (e'_3, e'_4, e'_1, e'_2) can be written in the form,*

$$\begin{aligned} e'_4 &= \lambda \left(e_4 + f^b e_b + \frac{1}{4} |f|^2 e_3 \right), \\ e'_a &= \left(\delta_{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{f}_a f_b \right) e_b + \frac{1}{2} \underline{f}_a e_4 + \left(\frac{1}{2} f_a + \frac{1}{8} |f|^2 \underline{f}_a \right) e_3, \quad a = 1, 2, \\ e'_3 &= \lambda^{-1} \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{2} f \cdot \underline{f} + \frac{1}{16} |f|^2 |\underline{f}|^2 \right) e_3 + \left(\underline{f}^b + \frac{1}{4} |\underline{f}|^2 f^b \right) e_b + \frac{1}{4} |\underline{f}|^2 e_4 \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

where λ is a scalar, f and \underline{f} are horizontal 1-forms on the sphere generated by (e'_1, e'_2) . The dot product and magnitude $|\cdot|$ are taken with respect to the standard Euclidean norm of \mathbb{R}^2 .¹¹ We call $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$ the transition coefficients of the change of frame. We denote

$$F := (f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}), \quad \overset{\circ}{\lambda} := \lambda - 1.$$

We recall some of the identities of Proposition 3.3 in [5].

¹¹Here f and \underline{f} are 1-forms defined on a sphere, we use an orthonormal basis of the sphere to define the dot product and magnitude w.r.t. the standard Euclidean norm of \mathbb{R}^2 .

Proposition 2.14. *Under a general transformation of type (2.24), the Ricci coefficients transform as follows:*

- The transformation formula for ξ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{-2}\xi' &= \xi + \frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\lambda^{-1}e'_4}f + \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\chi f + \omega f + \text{Err}(\xi, \xi'), \\ \text{Err}(\xi, \xi') &= \frac{1}{2}f \cdot \widehat{\chi} + \frac{1}{4}|f|^2\eta + \frac{1}{2}(f \cdot \zeta) \underline{f} - \frac{1}{4}|f|^2\underline{\eta} \\ &\quad + \lambda^{-2} \left(\frac{1}{2}(f \cdot \xi') \underline{f} + \frac{1}{2}(f \cdot \underline{f}) \xi' \right) + \text{l. o. t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.25}$$

- The transformation formula for $\underline{\xi}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^2\underline{\xi}' &= \underline{\xi} + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\nabla'_3\underline{f} + \underline{\omega}\underline{f} + \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\chi\underline{f} + \text{Err}(\underline{\xi}, \underline{\xi}'), \\ \text{Err}(\underline{\xi}, \underline{\xi}') &= \frac{1}{2}\underline{f} \cdot \widehat{\chi} - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{f} \cdot \zeta)\underline{f} + \frac{1}{4}|\underline{f}|^2\underline{\eta} - \frac{1}{4}|\underline{f}|^2\underline{\eta}' + \text{l. o. t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.26}$$

- The transformation formula for $\text{tr}\chi$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{-1}\text{tr}\chi' &= \text{tr}\chi + \text{div}' f + f \cdot \eta + f \cdot \zeta + \text{Err}(\text{tr}\chi', \text{tr}\chi), \\ \text{Err}(\text{tr}\chi', \text{tr}\chi) &= \underline{f} \cdot \xi + \frac{1}{4}\underline{f} \cdot f \text{tr}\chi + \omega(f \cdot \underline{f}) - \underline{\omega}|f|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}|f|^2 \text{tr}\chi - \frac{1}{4}(f \cdot \underline{f})\lambda^{-1}\text{tr}\chi' + \text{l. o. t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.27}$$

- The transformation formula for ζ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta' &= \zeta - \nabla'(\log \lambda) - \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\chi f + \omega \underline{f} - \underline{\omega} f + \frac{1}{4}\underline{f} \text{tr}\chi + \text{Err}(\zeta, \zeta'), \\ \text{Err}(\zeta, \zeta') &= -\frac{1}{2}\widehat{\chi} \cdot f + \frac{1}{2}(f \cdot \zeta)\underline{f} - \frac{1}{2}(f \cdot \eta)\underline{f} + \frac{1}{4}\underline{f}(f \cdot \eta) + \frac{1}{4}\underline{f}(f \cdot \zeta) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}^* \underline{f}(f \wedge \eta) + \frac{1}{4}^* \underline{f}(f \wedge \zeta) + \frac{1}{4}\underline{f} \text{div}' f + \frac{1}{4}^* \underline{f} \text{curl}' f + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{-1}\underline{f} \cdot \widehat{\chi}' \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{16}(f \cdot \underline{f})\underline{f}\lambda^{-1}\text{tr}\chi' + \frac{1}{16}^* \underline{f}\lambda^{-1}(f \wedge \underline{f})\text{tr}\chi' + \text{l. o. t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.28}$$

- The transformation formula for η is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\eta' &= \eta + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\nabla'_3 f + \frac{1}{4}\underline{f} \text{tr}\chi - \underline{\omega} f + \text{Err}(\eta, \eta'), \\ \text{Err}(\eta, \eta') &= \frac{1}{2}(f \cdot \underline{f})\eta + \frac{1}{2}\underline{f} \cdot \widehat{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}f(\underline{f} \cdot \zeta) - (\underline{f} \cdot f)\eta' + \frac{1}{2}\underline{f}(f \cdot \eta') + \text{l. o. t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.29}$$

- The transformation formula for $\underline{\eta}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\eta}' &= \underline{\eta} + \frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\lambda^{-1}e'_4}\underline{f} + \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}\underline{\chi}\underline{f} - \omega\underline{f} + \text{Err}(\underline{\eta}, \underline{\eta}'), \\ \text{Err}(\underline{\eta}, \underline{\eta}') &= \frac{1}{2}\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\widehat{\chi}} + \frac{1}{2}(\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\eta})\underline{f} - \frac{1}{4}(\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\zeta})\underline{f} - \frac{1}{4}|\underline{f}|^2\lambda^{-2}\underline{\xi}' + \text{l.o.t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

- The transformation formula for ω is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{-1}\omega' &= \omega - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{-1}e'_4(\log \lambda) + \frac{1}{2}\underline{f} \cdot (\underline{\zeta} - \underline{\eta}) + \text{Err}(\omega, \omega'), \\ \text{Err}(\omega, \omega') &= -\frac{1}{4}|\underline{f}|^2\underline{\omega} - \frac{1}{8}\text{tr}\underline{\chi}|\underline{f}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{-2}\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\xi}' + \text{l.o.t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.31}$$

- The transformation formula for $\underline{\omega}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\underline{\omega}' &= \underline{\omega} + \frac{1}{2}\lambda e'_3(\log \lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\zeta} - \frac{1}{2}\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\eta} + \text{Err}(\underline{\omega}, \underline{\omega}'), \\ \text{Err}(\underline{\omega}, \underline{\omega}') &= \underline{f} \cdot \underline{f}\underline{\omega} - \frac{1}{4}|\underline{f}|^2\underline{\omega} + \frac{1}{2}\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\xi} + \frac{1}{8}(\underline{f} \cdot \underline{f})\text{tr}\underline{\chi} - \frac{1}{8}|\underline{f}|^2\text{tr}\underline{\chi} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}\lambda\underline{f} \cdot \nabla'_3\underline{f} + \frac{1}{2}(\underline{f} \cdot \underline{f})(\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\eta}') - \frac{1}{4}|\underline{f}|^2(\underline{f} \cdot \underline{\eta}') + \text{l.o.t.}\end{aligned}\tag{2.32}$$

where, for the transformation formulas of the Ricci coefficients above, l.o.t. denote expressions of the type

$$\text{l.o.t.} = O((\underline{f}, \underline{f})^3)\Gamma + O((\underline{f}, \underline{f})^2)\check{\Gamma}$$

containing no derivatives of \underline{f} , \underline{f} , Γ and $\check{\Gamma}$.

Proof. See Appendix A of [5]. □

2.8 Background spacetime

2.8.1 Adapted coordinates

Recall that we consider given a vacuum spacetime \mathcal{R} and endowed with of (u, s) foliation, see Section 2.1. A coordinate system (u, s, y^1, y^2) on \mathcal{R} is said to be adapted to an outgoing geodesic foliation as above if $e_4(y^1) = e_4(y^2) = 0$. In that case the spacetime metric can be written in the form, see Lemma 2.6 in [5],

$$\mathbf{g} = -2\varsigma du ds + \varsigma^2 \underline{\Omega} du^2 + g_{ab}(dy^a - \varsigma \underline{B}^a du)(dy^b - \varsigma \underline{B}^b du),\tag{2.33}$$

where

$$\underline{\Omega} = e_3(s), \quad \underline{B}^a = \frac{1}{2}e_3(y^a), \quad g_{ab} = \mathbf{g}(\partial_{y^a}, \partial_{y^b}). \quad (2.34)$$

Relative to these coordinates

$$\partial_s = e_4, \quad \partial_u = \varsigma \left(\frac{1}{2}e_3 - \frac{1}{2}\underline{\Omega}e_4 - \underline{B}^a\partial_{y^a} \right), \quad \partial_{y^a} = \sum_{c=1,2} Y_{(a)}^c e_c, \quad a = 1, 2, \quad (2.35)$$

with coefficients $Y_{(a)}^b$ verifying

$$g_{ab} = \sum_{c=1,2} Y_{(a)}^c Y_{(b)}^c.$$

As a direct consequence of (2.35), we have¹²

$$e_4 = \partial_s, \quad e_3 = z\partial_u + \underline{\Omega}\partial_s + 2\underline{B}^a\partial_{y^a}, \quad e_c = X_{(c)}^a\partial_{y^a}, \quad (2.36)$$

where $X_{(a)}^c$ is defined by

$$\sum_{c=1,2} X_{(c)}^a Y_{(a)}^c = 1.$$

As in [5], we assume that \mathcal{R} is covered by two coordinate systems, i.e. $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_N \cup \mathcal{R}_S$, such that:

1. The North coordinate chart \mathcal{R}_N is given by the coordinates (u, s, y_N^1, y_N^2) with $(y_N^1)^2 + (y_N^2)^2 < 2$ while the South coordinate chart \mathcal{R}_S is given by the coordinates (u, s, y_S^1, y_S^2) with $(y_S^1)^2 + (y_S^2)^2 < 2$.
2. The two coordinate charts intersect in the open equatorial region $\mathcal{R}_{Eq} := \mathcal{R}_N \cap \mathcal{R}_S$ in which both coordinate systems are defined.
3. In \mathcal{R}_{Eq} the transition functions between the two coordinate systems are given by the smooth functions φ_{SN} and $\varphi_{NS} = \varphi_{SN}^{-1}$.

The metric coefficients for the two coordinate systems are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g} &= -2\varsigma du ds + \varsigma^2 \underline{\Omega} du^2 + g_{ab}^N (dy_N^a - \varsigma \underline{B}_N^a du) (dy_N^b - \varsigma \underline{B}_N^b du), \\ \mathbf{g} &= -2\varsigma du ds + \varsigma^2 \underline{\Omega} du^2 + g_{ab}^S (dy_S^a - \varsigma \underline{B}_S^a du) (dy_S^b - \varsigma \underline{B}_S^b du), \end{aligned}$$

¹²Recall that $z := \frac{2}{\varsigma}$ is defined in (2.5).

where

$$\underline{\Omega} = e_3(s), \quad \underline{B}_N^a = \frac{1}{2}e_3(y_N^a), \quad \underline{B}_S^a = \frac{1}{2}e_3(y_S^a).$$

For a $S(u, s)$ -tangent tensor f , we consider the following norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_\infty &:= \|f\|_{L^\infty(S)}, & \|f\|_2 &:= \|f\|_{L^2(S)}, \\ \|f\|_{\infty, k} &= \sum_{i=0}^k \|\mathfrak{d}^i f\|_\infty, & \|f\|_{2, k} &= \sum_{i=0}^k \|\mathfrak{d}^i f\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

where \mathfrak{d}^i stands for any combination of length i of operators of the form $e_3, re_4, r\nabla$.

Finally, we recall the following lemma for geodesic foliations.

Lemma 2.15. *For the background geodesic foliation of \mathcal{R} and any scalar function h defined on \mathcal{R} , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} e_4 \left(\int_S h \right) &= \int_S (e_4(h) + \kappa h), \\ e_3 \left(\int_S h \right) &= z \int_S (z^{-1}e_3(h) - z^{-1}\underline{\Omega}e_4(h) + z^{-1}\underline{\kappa}h - z^{-1}\underline{\Omega}\kappa h) + \underline{\Omega} \int_S (e_4(h) + \kappa h). \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

In particular, we have for the area radius r :

$$e_4(r) = \frac{r}{2}\bar{\kappa}, \quad e_3(r) = \frac{r}{2} \left(z\overline{z^{-1}\underline{\kappa}} - z\overline{z^{-1}\underline{\Omega}\kappa} + \underline{\Omega}\bar{\kappa} \right). \quad (2.39)$$

Proof. Firstly, recall from (2.35) that we have

$$e_4 \left(\int_S h \right) = \partial_s \left(\int_S h \right) = \int_S \partial_s h + \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a \partial_s, \partial_b) h = \int_S (e_4(h) + \kappa h) \quad (2.40)$$

as stated. Next, recall from (2.35) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u \left(\int_S h \right) &= \int_S \partial_u h + \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a \partial_u, \partial_b) h \\ &= \int_S z^{-1}e_3(h) - z^{-1}\underline{\Omega}e_4(h) - \frac{2}{z}\underline{B}^c \partial_c(h) + \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a(z^{-1}e_3), \partial_b) h \\ &\quad - \int_S \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a(z^{-1}\underline{\Omega}e_4), \partial_b) h + \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g} \left(\mathbf{D}_a \left(\frac{2}{z}\underline{B}^c \partial_c \right), \partial_b \right) h \\ &= \int_S z^{-1}e_3(h) - z^{-1}\underline{\Omega}e_4(h) + z^{-1}\underline{\kappa}h - z^{-1}\underline{\Omega}\kappa h \\ &\quad - \int_S \frac{2}{z}\underline{B}^c \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a \partial_c, \partial_b) h + \nabla_c \left(\frac{2}{z}\underline{B}^c h \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the divergence theorem implies that

$$\int_S \nabla_c \left(\frac{2}{z} \underline{B}^c h \right) = 0.$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_a \partial_c, \partial_b) &= \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_c \partial_a, \partial_b) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_c \partial_a, \partial_b) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_c \partial_b, \partial_a) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{D}_c(\mathbf{g}_{ab}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_c(\mathbf{g}^{ab} \mathbf{g}_{ab}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\partial_u \left(\int_S h \right) = \int_S z^{-1} e_3(h) - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} e_4(h) + z^{-1} \underline{\kappa} h - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} \kappa h.$$

Together with (2.35) and (2.40), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} e_3 \left(\int_S h \right) &= z \partial_u \left(\int_S h \right) + \underline{\Omega} e_4 \left(\int_S h \right) \\ &= z \int_S (z^{-1} e_3(h) - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} e_4(h) + z^{-1} \underline{\kappa} h - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} \kappa h) + \underline{\Omega} \int_S (e_4(h) + \kappa h) \end{aligned}$$

as stated. Taking $h = 1$, we obtain (2.39). This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.15. \square

2.8.2 Background spacetime region \mathcal{R}

In the following definition, we specify the background spacetime region \mathcal{R} .

Definition 2.16. *Let $m_0 > 0$ a constant. Let $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} > 0$ a sufficiently small constant, and let $(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}, \overset{\circ}{r})$ three real numbers with $\overset{\circ}{r}$ sufficiently large so that*

$$\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \ll m_0, \quad \overset{\circ}{r} \gg m_0. \quad (2.41)$$

We define \mathcal{R} to be the region

$$\mathcal{R} := \left\{ |u - \overset{\circ}{u}| \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}, \quad |s - \overset{\circ}{s}| \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \right\}, \quad (2.42)$$

such that assumptions **A1-A4** below with constant $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ on the background foliation of \mathcal{R} , are verified.

2.8.3 Main assumptions for \mathcal{R}

Given an integer $s_{max} \geq 5$, we assume¹³ the following:

A1. For $k \leq s_{max}$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Gamma_g\|_{k,\infty} &\leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-2}, \\ \|\Gamma_b\|_{k,\infty} &\leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.43}$$

A2. The Hawking mass $m = m(u, s)$ of $S(u, s)$ verifies

$$\sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left| \frac{m}{m_0} - 1 \right| \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}.\tag{2.44}$$

A3. In the region of their respective validity¹⁴ we have

$$\underline{B}_N^a, \underline{B}_S^a \in r^{-1}\Gamma_b, \quad Z_N^a, Z_S^a \in \Gamma_b, \quad r^{-2}\check{g}_{ab}^N, r^{-2}\check{g}_{ab}^S \in r\Gamma_g, \tag{2.45}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\check{g}_{ab}^N &= g_{ab}^N - \frac{4r^2}{(1 + (y_N^1)^2 + (y_N^2)^2)} \delta_{ab}, \\ \check{g}_{ab}^S &= g_{ab}^S - \frac{4r^2}{(1 + (y_S^1)^2 + (y_S^2)^2)} \delta_{ab}, \\ Z^c &= \underline{B}^a Y_{(a)}^c.\end{aligned}$$

A4. We assume the existence of a smooth family of scalar functions $J^{(p)} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for $p = 0, +, -$, verifying the following properties

(a) On the sphere $\overset{\circ}{S}$ of the background foliation, there holds (2.13) with $\epsilon = \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\left((\overset{\circ}{r})^2 \overset{\circ}{\Delta} + 2 \right) J^{(p)} &= O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \quad p = 0, +, -, \\ \frac{1}{|\overset{\circ}{S}|} \int_{\overset{\circ}{S}} J^{(p)} J^{(q)} &= \frac{1}{3} \delta_{pq} + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \quad p, q = 0, +, -, \\ \frac{1}{|\overset{\circ}{S}|} \int_{\overset{\circ}{S}} J^{(p)} &= O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \quad p = 0, +, -.\end{aligned}\tag{2.46}$$

¹³In view of (2.43), we will often replace Γ_g by $r^{-1}\Gamma_b$.

¹⁴That is the quantities on the left verify the same estimates as those for Γ_b , respectively Γ_g .

(b) We extend $J^{(p)}$ from $\overset{\circ}{S}$ to \mathcal{R} by $\partial_s J^{(p)} = \partial_u J^{(p)} = 0$, i.e.

$$J^{(p)}(u, s, y^1, y^2) = J^{(p)}(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}, y^1, y^2). \quad (2.47)$$

Remark 2.17. We note that the assumptions **A1**, **A2**, **A3**, **A4**, are expected to be valid in the far regions, i.e. r large, of a perturbed Kerr. In particular, they hold in far regions of Kerr, see Lemma 2.10 in [5].

2.9 Deformation of surfaces in \mathcal{R}

Definition 2.18. We say that \mathbf{S} is a deformation of $\overset{\circ}{S}$ if there exist smooth scalar functions U, S defined on $\overset{\circ}{S}$ and a map $\Psi : \overset{\circ}{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ verifying, on any coordinate chart (y^1, y^2) of $\overset{\circ}{S}$,

$$\Psi(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}, y^1, y^2) = \left(\overset{\circ}{u} + U(y^1, y^2), \overset{\circ}{s} + S(y^1, y^2), y^1, y^2 \right). \quad (2.48)$$

Definition 2.19. Given a deformation $\Psi : \overset{\circ}{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ we say that a new frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ on \mathbf{S} , obtained from the standard frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) via the transformation (2.24), is \mathbf{S} -adapted if the vectorfields $e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}}$ are tangent to \mathbf{S} and the vectorfields $e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$ are orthogonal to \mathbf{S} .

Definition 2.20. Let $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathcal{R}$ be a compact 2-sphere, which is a deformation of a leaf $S(u, s)$ of the background geodesic foliation of \mathcal{R} and let $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ the null frame adapted to \mathbf{S} . Then, we denote

- by $\chi^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \zeta^{\mathbf{S}}, \dots$, the corresponding Ricci coefficients,
- by $\alpha^{\mathbf{S}}, \beta^{\mathbf{S}}, \rho^{\mathbf{S}}, \dots$, the corresponding curvature coefficients,
- by $r^{\mathbf{S}}, m^{\mathbf{S}}, K^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\mu^{\mathbf{S}}$ respectively the corresponding area radius, Hawking mass, Gauss curvature and mass aspect function,
- by $\nabla^{\mathbf{S}}$ the corresponding covariant derivative.

Definition 2.21. We will work with the following weighted Sobolev norms on \mathbf{S}

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{S})} := \sum_{i=0}^s \|(\vartheta^{\mathbf{S}})^i f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{S})}, \quad \vartheta^{\mathbf{S}} = r^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla^{\mathbf{S}}. \quad (2.49)$$

We will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.22. Let $\mathring{S} \subset \mathcal{R}$. Let $\Psi : \mathring{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ be a deformation generated by the functions (U, S) as in Definition 2.18 and denote by $g^{\mathbf{S}, \#}$ the pull back of the metric $g^{\mathbf{S}}$ to \mathring{S} . Assume the bound

$$\|(U, S)\|_{L^\infty(\mathring{S})} + r^{-1} \|(U, S)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{\max}+1}(\mathring{S})} \lesssim \mathring{\delta}. \quad (2.50)$$

Then

1. We have

$$\|g^{\mathbf{S}, \#} - \mathring{g}\|_{L^\infty} + r^{-1} \|g^{\mathbf{S}, \#} - \mathring{g}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{\max}}(\mathring{S})} \lesssim \mathring{\delta} r. \quad (2.51)$$

2. For any tensor h on \mathcal{R}

$$\|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left(|\mathring{\partial}^{\leq s} h| + \mathring{\delta} |\mathring{\partial}^{\leq s} h| \right), \quad 0 \leq s \leq s_{\max}. \quad (2.52)$$

3. If $V \in \mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{S})$ and $V^\#$ is its pull-back by Ψ , we have for all $0 \leq s \leq s_{\max}$,

$$\|V\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{S})} = \|V^\#\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathring{S}, g^{\mathbf{S}, \#})} = \|V^\#\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathring{S}, \mathring{g})} (1 + O(r^{-1} \mathring{\delta})). \quad (2.53)$$

4. As a corollary of (2.53) (choosing $V = 1$ and $s = 0$), we deduce

$$\frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{r} = 1 + O(r^{-1} \mathring{\delta}) \quad (2.54)$$

where $r^{\mathbf{S}}$ is the area radius of \mathbf{S} and \mathring{r} that of \mathring{S} .

5. We also have

$$|m - m^{\mathbf{S}}| = O(\mathring{\delta}). \quad (2.55)$$

Proof. See Lemma 5.8, Proposition 5.10 and Corollary 5.17 in [5]. □

We also have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.23. Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 2.22, the following estimate holds for a scalar function F defined on \mathcal{R} ,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbf{S}} F - \int_{\mathring{S}} F \right| \lesssim \mathring{\delta} r \left(\sup_{\mathcal{R}} |F| + r \sup_{\mathcal{R}} (|\partial_u F| + |\partial_s F|) \right).$$

Proof. See Corollary 5.9 in [5]. □

We introduce the following schematic presentation of the error terms which appear in various calculations below.

Definition 2.24. We denote by Err_k , $k = 1, 2$, error terms¹⁵ which can be written schematically in the form,

$$\begin{aligned} rErr_1 &= F \cdot (r\Gamma_b) + F^2 + F \cdot (r\nabla^{\mathbf{S}})F = F \cdot (r\Gamma_b) + F \cdot (r\nabla^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 1}F, \\ r^2Err_2 &= (r\nabla^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 1}(rErr_1) + F \cdot r\mathfrak{d}\Gamma_b, \end{aligned} \quad (2.56)$$

where

$$F := (f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}), \quad \overset{\circ}{\lambda} = \lambda - 1.$$

We recall the following identities, see Corollary 4.6 in [5].

Proposition 2.25. The following relations hold true for any adapted frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ to a given sphere \mathbf{S} connected to the reference frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) by the transition coefficients $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} f &= -Err_1[\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} f], \\ \operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} &= -Err_1[\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}], \\ \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \kappa \overset{\circ}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \overset{\circ}{b} &= \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} - \left(\kappa - \frac{2}{r} \right) - Err_1[\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f] - \frac{2(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}{r(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}, \\ \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} - \underline{\kappa} \overset{\circ}{\lambda} + \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \overset{\circ}{b} &= \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} - \left(\underline{\kappa} + \frac{2}{r} \right) - Err_1[\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}] + \frac{2(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}{r(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}, \\ \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda} + V \overset{\circ}{\lambda} &= \mu^{\mathbf{S}} - \mu - \left(\underline{\omega} + \frac{1}{4} \underline{\kappa} \right) (\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - \kappa) + \left(\omega + \frac{1}{4} \kappa \right) (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\kappa}) + Err_2[\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda}], \\ \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{b} &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \left(\underline{f} - \Upsilon f + Err_1[\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{b}] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.57)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \overset{\circ}{b} &:= r - r^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ V &:= - \left(\frac{1}{2} \kappa \underline{\kappa} + \kappa \underline{\omega} + \underline{\kappa} \omega \right), \end{aligned}$$

¹⁵Note however that the precise error terms differ in each particular case and that we only emphasize here their general structure.

and the error terms $Err_1[\text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} f]$, $Err_1[\text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} f]$, $Err_1[\text{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f]$, $Err_1[\text{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f]$ and $Err_1[\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{b}]$ are consistent with Err_1 in Definition 2.24 whereas the error term $Err_2[\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda}]$ is consistent with Err_2 in Definition 2.24.

Proof. The first two identities in (2.57) follow from the fact that ${}^{(a)}\kappa := \epsilon^{ab} \chi_{ab} = 0$ and ${}^{(a)}\underline{\kappa} := \epsilon^{ab} \underline{\chi}_{ab} = 0$. The third, fourth and fifth identities in (2.57) follow from the transformation formulae for κ , $\underline{\kappa}$ and ζ . See Lemma 4.3 in [5] for a detailed proof. The last identity in (2.57) is proven in Corollary 4.6 in [5]. \square

3 GCM spheres

3.1 GCM spheres with $\ell = 1$ modes in [5]

We review below Theorem 6.1 of [5] on existence and uniqueness of GCM spheres in the context of an arbitrary choice of a $\ell = 1$ modes on $\overset{\circ}{S}$, denoted $J^{(p)}$, which verify the assumptions **A4** given in Section 2.8.3.

Theorem 3.1 (GCM spheres with $\ell = 1$ modes in [5]). *Let $m_0 > 0$ a constant. Let $0 < \overset{\circ}{\delta} \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ two sufficiently small constants, and let $(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}, \overset{\circ}{r})$ three real numbers with $\overset{\circ}{r}$ sufficiently large so that*

$$\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \ll m_0, \quad \overset{\circ}{r} \gg m_0.$$

*Let a fixed spacetime region \mathcal{R} , as in Definition 2.16, together with a (u, s) outgoing geodesic foliation verifying the assumptions **A1-A4**. Let $\overset{\circ}{S} = S(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s})$ be a fixed sphere from this foliation with $\overset{\circ}{r}$ and $\overset{\circ}{m}$ denoting its area radius and Hawking mass. Assume that the GCM quantities $\kappa, \underline{\kappa}, \mu$ of the background foliation verify the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \frac{2}{r} + \dot{\kappa}, \\ \underline{\kappa} &= -\frac{2\Upsilon}{r} + \underline{C}_0 + \sum_p \underline{C}^{(p)} J^{(p)} + \dot{\underline{\kappa}}, \\ \mu &= \frac{2m}{r^3} + M_0 + \sum_p M^{(p)} J^{(p)} + \dot{\mu}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where the scalar functions $\underline{C}_0 = \underline{C}_0(u, s)$, $\underline{C}^{(p)} = \underline{C}^{(p)}(u, s)$, $M_0 = M_0(u, s)$ and $M^{(p)} = M^{(p)}(u, s)$, defined on the spacetime region \mathcal{R} , depend only on the coordinates (u, s) , and

where $\dot{\kappa}$, $\underline{\dot{\kappa}}$ and $\dot{\mu}$ satisfy the following estimates

$$\sup_{\mathcal{R}} |\pmb{\vartheta}^{\leq s_{max}}(\dot{\kappa}, \underline{\dot{\kappa}})| \lesssim r^{-2} \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{R}} |\pmb{\vartheta}^{\leq s_{max}} \dot{\mu}| \lesssim r^{-3} \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\pmb{\vartheta} = r\nabla$. Then for any fixed triplets $\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ verifying

$$|\Lambda|, |\underline{\Lambda}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (3.3)$$

there exists a unique GCM sphere $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$, which is a deformation of $\overset{\circ}{S}$, such that there exist constants $\underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S},p)}, M_0^{\mathbf{S}}, M^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$, $p \in \{-, 0, +\}$ for which the following GCM conditions are verified

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \\ \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} &= -\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} J^{(p)}, \\ \mu^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} + M_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} J^{(p)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Relative to these modes we also have

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda}. \quad (3.5)$$

The resulting deformation has the following additional properties:

1. The triplet $(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ verifies

$$\|(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (3.6)$$

2. The GCM constants $\underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S},p)}, M_0^{\mathbf{S}}, M^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$, $p \in \{-, 0, +\}$ verify

$$\begin{aligned} |\underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\underline{C}}_0^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} - \overline{\underline{C}^{(p)}}^{\mathbf{S}}| &\lesssim r^{-2} \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \\ |M_0^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{M}_0^{\mathbf{S}}| + |M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} - \overline{M^{(p)}}^{\mathbf{S}}| &\lesssim r^{-3} \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

3. The volume radius $r^{\mathbf{S}}$ verifies

$$\left| \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{\overset{\circ}{r}} - 1 \right| \lesssim r^{-1} \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (3.8)$$

4. The parameter functions U, S of the deformation verify

$$\|(U, S)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathring{S})} \lesssim r\mathring{\delta}. \quad (3.9)$$

5. The Hawking mass $m^{\mathbf{S}}$ of \mathbf{S} verifies the estimate

$$|m^{\mathbf{S}} - \mathring{m}| \lesssim \mathring{\delta}. \quad (3.10)$$

6. The well defined¹⁶ Ricci and curvature coefficients of \mathbf{S} verify,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \mathring{\epsilon}r^{-1}, \\ \|\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \mathring{\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

7. The transition parameters $f, \underline{f}, \underline{\lambda}$ are continuously differentiable with respect to $\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \Lambda} &= O(r^{-1}), & \frac{\partial f}{\partial \underline{\Lambda}} &= O(\mathring{\delta}r^{-1}), & \frac{\partial \underline{f}}{\partial \Lambda} &= O(\mathring{\delta}r^{-1}), & \frac{\partial \underline{f}}{\partial \underline{\Lambda}} &= O(r^{-1}), \\ \frac{\partial \underline{\lambda}}{\partial \Lambda} &= O(\mathring{\delta}r^{-1}), & \frac{\partial \underline{\lambda}}{\partial \underline{\Lambda}} &= O(\mathring{\delta}r^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

8. The parameter functions (U, S) of the deformation are continuously differentiable with respect to $\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}$ and

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial \Lambda} = O(1), \quad \frac{\partial U}{\partial \underline{\Lambda}} = O(1), \quad \frac{\partial S}{\partial \Lambda} = O(1), \quad \frac{\partial S}{\partial \underline{\Lambda}} = O(1). \quad (3.13)$$

9. Relative to the coordinate system induced by Ψ the metric $g^{\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}}$ of $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$ is continuous with respect to the parameters $\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}$ and verifies

$$\|\partial_{\Lambda} g^{\mathbf{S}}, \partial_{\underline{\Lambda}} g^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim O(r^2). \quad (3.14)$$

Remark 3.2. The conclusions of Theorem 3.1 still hold if we replace (3.2) with the weaker condition¹⁷

$$\|(\dot{\kappa}, \dot{\underline{\kappa}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r^{-1}\mathring{\delta}, \quad \|\dot{\mu}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r^{-2}\mathring{\delta}, \quad (3.15)$$

for any deformed sphere \mathbf{S} with (U, S) satisfying (3.9), where (3.15) is uniform w.r.t such spheres. See Remark 6.2 in [5].

¹⁶Note that while the Ricci coefficients $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}, \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \hat{\underline{\chi}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \zeta^{\mathbf{S}}$ as well as all curvature components and mass aspect function $\mu^{\mathbf{S}}$ are well defined on \mathbf{S} , this is not the case of $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\eta}^{\mathbf{S}}, \xi^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \omega^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$ which require the derivatives of the frame in the $e_3^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$ directions.

¹⁷Note that (3.2) implies (3.15) in view of (2.52).

3.2 Linearized GCM equations

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathcal{R}$ a smooth $O(\epsilon^\circ)$ -sphere. We say that $F = (f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ verifies the inhomogeneous linearized GCM system on \mathbf{S} if the following holds true:

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} f &= h_1 - \overline{h}_1^{\mathbf{S}}, \\
\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} &= \underline{h}_1 - \overline{\underline{h}}_1^{\mathbf{S}}, \\
\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \overset{\circ}{b} &= h_2, \\
\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda} + \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \overset{\circ}{b} &= \underline{\dot{C}}_0 + \sum_p \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + \underline{h}_2, \\
\left(\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \right) \overset{\circ}{\lambda} &= \dot{M}_0 + \sum_p \dot{M}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + \frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \left(\underline{\dot{C}}_0 + \sum_p \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right) + h_3, \\
\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{b} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\underline{f} - f) &= h_4 - \overline{h}_4^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad \overline{\overset{\circ}{b}}^{\mathbf{S}} = b_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

for some choice of constants $\underline{\dot{C}}_0, \dot{M}_0, \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)}, \dot{M}^{(p)}, b_0$, and scalar functions $h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4, \underline{h}_1, \underline{h}_2$.

The following proposition provides a priori estimates for the linearized GCM system (3.16), which play a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (see the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [5]).

Proposition 3.4. Assume \mathbf{S} is a given $O(\epsilon^\circ)$ -sphere in \mathcal{R} . Assume given a solution $(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \underline{\dot{C}}_0, \dot{M}_0, \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)}, \dot{M}^{(p)}, \overset{\circ}{b})$ of the system (3.16), and verifying

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda}.$$

Then, the following a priori estimates are verified, for $3 \leq s \leq s_{\max} + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda} - \overline{\overset{\circ}{\lambda}}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{S})} + \sum_p \left(r^2 |\underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)}| + r^3 |\dot{M}^{(p)}| \right) \\
& \lesssim r \|(h_1 - \overline{h}_1^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{h}_1 - \overline{\underline{h}}_1^{\mathbf{S}}, h_2 - \overline{h}_2^{\mathbf{S}}, h_2 - \overline{\underline{h}}_2^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& \quad + r^2 \|h_3 - \overline{h}_3^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-2}(\mathbf{S})} + r \|h_4 - \overline{h}_4^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-3}(\mathbf{S})} + |\Lambda| + |\underline{\Lambda}|,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
r^2 |\underline{\dot{C}}_0| + r^3 |\dot{M}_0| + r \left| \overline{\overset{\circ}{\lambda}}^{\mathbf{S}} \right| & \lesssim r \|(h_1 - \overline{h}_1^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{h}_1 - \overline{\underline{h}}_1^{\mathbf{S}}, h_2 - \overline{h}_2^{\mathbf{S}}, h_2 - \overline{\underline{h}}_2^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& \quad + r^2 \|h_3 - \overline{h}_3^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-2}(\mathbf{S})} + r \|h_4 - \overline{h}_4^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-3}(\mathbf{S})} + |\Lambda| + |\underline{\Lambda}| + |b_0|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Proof. See Proposition 4.13 in [5]. □

Proposition 3.4 will be used in Sections 4.5 and 4.6.

3.3 GCM spheres with more general $\ell = 1$ modes

We have the following corollary of Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.5. *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1, assume moreover that there exists a triplet of scalar functions $\tilde{J}^{(p)}$ verifying*

$$\sum_p \left\| J^{(p)} - \tilde{J}^{(p)} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{smax}(\overset{\circ}{S})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$\partial_u \tilde{J}^{(p)}(u, s, y^1, y^2) = \partial_s \tilde{J}^{(p)}(u, s, y^1, y^2) = 0. \quad (3.20)$$

Then, for any fixed triplets $\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ verifying

$$|\Lambda|, |\underline{\Lambda}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (3.21)$$

there exists a unique GCM sphere $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \tilde{J}^{(p)})$, which is a deformation of $\overset{\circ}{S}$, such that there exists constants $\underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}}, M_0^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}, M^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}$, $p \in \{-, 0, +\}$ for which the following GCM conditions are verified

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \\ \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} &= -\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \tilde{J}^{(p)}, \\ \mu^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} + M_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \tilde{J}^{(p)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Moreover,

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda}, \quad (3.23)$$

where $(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f)_{\ell=1}, (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f})_{\ell=1}$ are defined with respect to $\tilde{J}^{(p)}$. Finally, the resulting deformation verifies all the properties 1-9 of Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Notice that (3.19), (3.20) and (2.46) implies that $\tilde{J}^{(p)}$ satisfies Assumption A4. Then, it suffices to apply Theorem 3.1 with $\tilde{J}^{(p)}$ replacing $J^{(p)}$. □

4 Construction of GCM hypersurfaces

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

Theorem 4.1 (Existence of GCM hypersurfaces, version 2). *Let $m_0 > 0$ a constant. Let $0 < \overset{\circ}{\delta} \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ two sufficiently small constants, and let $(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}, \overset{\circ}{r})$ three real numbers with $\overset{\circ}{r}$ sufficiently large so that*

$$\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \ll m_0, \quad \overset{\circ}{r} \gg m_0.$$

*Let a fixed space-time region \mathcal{R} as in Definition 2.16, together with a (u, s) outgoing geodesic foliation and a basis of $\ell = 1$ modes $J^{(p)}$ verifying assumptions **A1-A4** in Section 2.8.3. We further assume that*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{R}} r \left| \widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s_{\max}+1} e_3(J^{(p)}) \right| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad s_{\max} \geq 5, \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}} := (e_3 - (z + \underline{\Omega})e_4, \mathfrak{d}), \quad \mathfrak{d} = r\nabla,$$

denotes the weighted derivatives tangent to the level hypersurfaces of $u + s$. In addition, we assume on \mathcal{R} , the estimates

$$\sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left| \widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s_{\max}+1} (\dot{\kappa}, \underline{\dot{\kappa}}) \right| \lesssim r^{-2} \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left| \widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s_{\max}+1} \dot{\mu} \right| \lesssim r^{-3} \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$|(\operatorname{div} \eta)_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad |(\operatorname{div} \underline{\xi})_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.3)$$

We also assume

$$|r - s| + |e_3(r) - e_3(s)| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.4)$$

as well as the existence of a constant $m_{(0)}$ such that we have on \mathcal{R} ,

$$\left| \overline{z + \underline{\Omega}} - 1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} \right| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $\overline{z + \underline{\Omega}}$ denotes the average of $z + \underline{\Omega}$ on the sphere $S(u, s)$.

Let \mathbf{S}_0 be a fixed sphere included in the region \mathcal{R} , let a pair of triplets $\Lambda_0, \underline{\Lambda}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$|\Lambda_0|, |\underline{\Lambda}_0| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.6)$$

and let $J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)}$ be a basis of $\ell = 1$ modes on \mathbf{S}_0 satisfying

$$\|J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)} - J^{(p)}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.7)$$

Assume that we have on \mathbf{S}_0

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}_0} &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}_0}}, \\ \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}_0} &= -\frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}_0}}{r^{\mathbf{S}_0}} + \underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}_0} + \sum_p \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)}, \\ \mu^{\mathbf{S}_0} &= \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}_0}}{r^{\mathbf{S}_0}} + M_0^{\mathbf{S}_0} + \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

as well as

$$(\operatorname{div} f_0)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda_0, \quad (\operatorname{div} \underline{f}_0)_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda}_0, \quad (4.9)$$

with (f_0, \underline{f}_0) corresponding to the coefficients from the background frame to the frame adapted to \mathbf{S}_0 , and the $\ell = 1$ modes being taken w.r.t. the basis $J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)}$.

Then, there exists a unique, local, smooth, spacelike hypersurface Σ_0 passing through \mathbf{S}_0 , a scalar function $u^{\mathbf{S}}$ defined on Σ_0 , whose level surfaces are topological spheres denoted by \mathbf{S} with adapted frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$, a smooth collection of constants $\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and a triplet of functions $J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}$ defined on Σ_0 verifying

$$\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}_0} = \Lambda_0, \quad \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}_0} = \underline{\Lambda}_0, \quad J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}|_{\mathbf{S}_0} = J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)},$$

such that the following conditions are verified:

1. The following GCM conditions hold on Σ_0

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \\ \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} &= -\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}, \\ \mu^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} + M_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

2. Denoting $r^{\mathbf{S}}$ to be the area radius of the spheres \mathbf{S} we have, for some constant c_0 ,

$$u^{\mathbf{S}} + r^{\mathbf{S}} = c_0, \quad \text{along } \Sigma_0. \quad (4.11)$$

3. Let $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ be the unique vectorfield tangent to the hypersurface Σ_0 , normal to \mathbf{S} , and normalized by $\mathbf{g}(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}) = -2$. There exists a unique scalar function $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ on Σ_0 such that $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ is given by

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Then, the following normalization condition holds true on every sphere \mathbf{S}

$$\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} = -1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \quad (4.12)$$

where $\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}$ denotes the average of $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ on the sphere \mathbf{S} .

4. The triplet of functions $J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}$ verifies on Σ_0 ¹⁸

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}) = 0, \quad p = 0, +, -. \quad (4.13)$$

5. The following transversality conditions are assumed¹⁹

$$\xi^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \omega^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \underline{\eta}^{\mathbf{S}} = -\zeta^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad (4.14)$$

and

$$e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = 1, \quad e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

6. In view of (4.14), the Ricci coefficients $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}$ are well defined for every $\mathbf{S} \subset \Sigma_0$. They verify

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} = 0, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

7. The transition coefficients from the background foliation to that of Σ_0 verify

$$\|(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \|\mathfrak{d}(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.17)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{d} \in \{\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}, r\nabla^{\mathbf{S}}, r\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}\}.$$

¹⁸A basis of $\ell = 1$ modes verifying (4.13) can simplify the transport equations along $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ for the $\ell = 1$ modes of the transition functions (f, \underline{f}) , see Lemma 4.34 for more details.

¹⁹A priori, the quantities $\xi^{\mathbf{S}}, \omega^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\eta}^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}})$ and $e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}})$ do not make sense on Σ_0 . The conditions (4.14) and (4.15) are in fact consistent with a local extension of Σ_0 by an outgoing geodesic foliation, see Remark 4.12.

We state the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *Let \mathcal{R} be a fixed spacetime region with a background foliation verifying the assumption of Theorem 4.1, including (4.1)-(4.5). Also, assume given a GCM hypersurface $\Sigma_0 \subset \mathcal{R}$ foliated by surfaces \mathbf{S} such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \\ \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} &= -\frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}, \\ \mu^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} + M_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}, \\ (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} &= (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1} = 0, \quad \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) = 0, \quad p = 0, +, -, \end{aligned}$$

where the $\ell = 1$ modes are defined w.r.t. $J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$. Assume moreover

$$|\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s_{max}}(\operatorname{div} \eta)_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad |\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s_{max}}(\operatorname{div} \underline{\xi})_{\ell=1}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$|\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s_{max}}(e_3(r) - e_3(s))| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.19)$$

where $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}} \in \{e_3 - (z + \underline{\Omega})e_4, \mathfrak{p}\}$. Then:

1. If we assume in addition that for a given sphere \mathbf{S}_0 on Σ_0 , the transition coefficients $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$ from the background foliation to \mathbf{S}_0 verify

$$\|(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.20)$$

then

$$\|\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s_{max}+1}(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{L^2(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}.$$

2. If we assume in addition that for a given sphere \mathbf{S}_0 on Σ_0 , the transition coefficients $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$ from the background foliation to \mathbf{S}_0 verify

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} + (r^{\mathbf{S}_0})^{-1} \|(f, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.21)$$

then

$$\|\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s_{max}+1} f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{S}_0)} + (r^{\mathbf{S}_0})^{-1} \|\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s_{max}+1}(f, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{L^2(\mathbf{S}_0)} + \|\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s_{max}} \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{L^2(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}.$$

Remark 4.3. Theorem 4.1 is the generalization of Theorem 9.52 in [4] and Corollary 4.2 is the generalization of Corollary 9.53 in [4] in the absence of symmetry. Theorem 4.1 plays a central role in the proof of Theorems M6 and M7 in [7], see Section 8.4 and 8.5 in [7]. Note that Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.2 are restated as Theorem 8.1.10 and Corollary 8.1.11 in [7].

Remark 4.4. The proof of Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.2 is similar to the one of Theorem 9.52 in [4] and Corollary 9.53 in [4]. The main differences are:

- the absence of symmetry in Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.2 while [4] relies on axial polarization,
- the dependance of the construction on the choice of the basis of $\ell = 1$ modes, while the basis of $\ell = 1$ modes in [4] is fixed by the polarized symmetry.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is given in Sections 4.1-4.5 and the proof of Corollary 4.2 is given in Section 4.6.

4.1 Definition of a family of hypersurfaces Σ

As stated in Theorem 4.1, we assume given a spacetime region

$$\mathcal{R} = \{|u - \overset{\circ}{u}| \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}, |s - \overset{\circ}{s}| \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}\}$$

endowed with a background foliation such that the conditions **A1-A4** and (4.1)-(4.5) hold true. We also assume given a sphere \mathbf{S}_0 , triplets $(\Lambda_0, \underline{\Lambda}_0)$ and a basis of $\ell = 1$ modes $J^{(p, \mathbf{S}_0)}$ satisfying (4.6)-(4.7). In view of the uniqueness in Corollary 3.5, note that \mathbf{S}_0 is in fact the deformation sphere

$$\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{S}[\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}, \Lambda_0, \underline{\Lambda}_0, J^{(p)}[\mathbf{S}_0]]$$

of the given sphere $\overset{\circ}{S} = S(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s})$ of the background foliation provided by Corollary 3.5. Our goal is to construct, in a small neighborhood of \mathbf{S}_0 , a spacelike hypersurface Σ_0 passing through \mathbf{S}_0 verifying all the desired properties of Theorem 4.1. To this end, we first define more general families of hypersurfaces within which we will make a suitable choice of Σ_0 in Section 4.5. We start with the following definition.

Definition 4.5. Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 4.1, let $\Psi(s)$ be a real valued function, $\Lambda(s)$, $\underline{\Lambda}(s)$ triplet of functions satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda(s)|, |\Lambda'(s)|, |\underline{\Lambda}(s)|, |\underline{\Lambda}'(s)|, |\Psi(s) + s - c_0|, |\Psi'(s) + 1| &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, & s \in \overset{\circ}{I}, \\ \Lambda(\overset{\circ}{s}) &= \Lambda_0, & \underline{\Lambda}(\overset{\circ}{s}) &= \underline{\Lambda}_0, & \Psi(\overset{\circ}{s}) &= \overset{\circ}{u}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

where

$$c_0 := \overset{\circ}{u} + \overset{\circ}{s}, \quad \overset{\circ}{I} := [\overset{\circ}{s}, s_1],$$

with s_1 verifying $|s_1 - \overset{\circ}{s}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$. Then, we denote

$$\Sigma_{\#} := \bigcup_{s \in \overset{\circ}{I}} S(\Psi(s), s),$$

and $\nu_{\#}$ is the unique tangent vector to $\Sigma_{\#}$ normal to $S(\Psi(s), s)$ with $\mathbf{g}(\nu_{\#}, e_4) = -2$. By definition, $\Sigma_{\#}$ is the hypersurface $\{u = \Psi(s), s \in \overset{\circ}{I}\}$.

Let a triplet of functions \tilde{J} defined on $\Sigma_{\#}$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in \overset{\circ}{I}} \sum_p \|\tilde{J}^{(p)}(s) - J^{(p)}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S(\Psi(s), s))} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad \tilde{J}(s) := \tilde{J}|_{S(\Psi(s), s)}. \quad (4.23)$$

For every $s \in \overset{\circ}{I}$, we apply Corollary 3.5 to the background sphere $S(\Psi(s), s)$ and the triplet $\tilde{J}(s)$ ²⁰ to obtain a GCM sphere $\mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)]$. The deformation map is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{\tilde{J}}(s) : S(\Psi(s), s) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)] \subset \mathcal{R}, \\ (\Psi(s), s, y^1, y^2) &\longrightarrow (\Psi(s) + U^{\tilde{J}}(\Psi(s), s, y^1, y^2), s + S^{\tilde{J}}(\Psi(s), s, y^1, y^2), y^1, y^2). \end{aligned}$$

The adapted null frame of $\mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)]$ is denoted by $(e_3^{\tilde{J}}, e_4^{\tilde{J}}, e_1^{\tilde{J}}, e_2^{\tilde{J}})$ and the transition functions are denoted by

$$F^{\tilde{J}}(s) := \left(f^{\tilde{J}}(s), \underline{f}^{\tilde{J}}(s), \overset{\circ}{\lambda}^{\tilde{J}}(s) \right).$$

Moreover, we denote

$$F^{\tilde{J}, \#}(s) := \left(f^{\tilde{J}, \#}(s), \underline{f}^{\tilde{J}, \#}(s), \overset{\circ}{\lambda}^{\tilde{J}, \#}(s) \right) := (\Phi^{\tilde{J}}(s))^{\#} \left(f^{\tilde{J}}(s), \underline{f}^{\tilde{J}}(s), \overset{\circ}{\lambda}^{\tilde{J}}(s) \right).$$

Then, we define

$$\Sigma_{\tilde{J}} := \bigcup_{s \in \overset{\circ}{I}} \mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)]. \quad (4.24)$$

²⁰For every s , we extend $\tilde{J}(s)$ to \mathcal{R} by (3.20) in order to apply Corollary 3.5.

Let $\nu^{\tilde{J}}$ the unique vectorfield tangent to the hypersurface $\Sigma_{\tilde{J}}$ such that $\mathbf{g}(\nu^{\tilde{J}}, e_4^{\tilde{J}}) = -2$ and normal to $\mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)]$. We define

$$\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}} := \left((\Phi^{\tilde{J}})^{-1} \right)_{\#} (\nu^{\tilde{J}}),$$

which is a tangent vectorfield on $\Sigma_{\#}$, where $\Phi^{\tilde{J}} : \Sigma_{\#} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\tilde{J}}$ is defined by

$$\Phi^{\tilde{J}}|_{S(\Psi(s), s)} = \Phi^{\tilde{J}}(s).$$

In the sequel, we denote

$$S := S(\Psi(s), s), \quad \overset{\circ}{S} := S(\overset{\circ}{u}, \overset{\circ}{s}). \quad (4.25)$$

We will need the following four lemmas.

Lemma 4.6. *For a triplet of functions \tilde{J} on $\Sigma_{\#}$ satisfying (4.23), we define $(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}}, \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}})$ as in Definition 4.5. Then, we have*

$$\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}} = \left(1 + A(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}, \#}) \right) \nu_{\#} + B^a(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}, \#}) \partial_{y^a}, \quad (4.26)$$

where

$$A(U, S, F) = O(\mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U, S), F), \quad B^a(U, S, F) = \overset{\circ}{e} r^{-2} O(\mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U, S), F),$$

with

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\#} := \{ \emptyset, \nu_{\#} \}.$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Lemma 4.7. *For a triplet of functions \tilde{J} on $\Sigma_{\#}$ satisfying (4.23), we define $(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}}, \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}})$ as in Definition 4.5. In addition, we assume that*

$$\left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) \right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Sigma_{\#})} \leq 1. \quad (4.27)$$

Then, we have

$$\left\| \nu_{\#}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(s)} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq s_{max}. \quad (4.28)$$

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Lemma 4.8. *For two triplets of functions \tilde{J} and \hat{J} on $\Sigma_{\#}$ satisfying (4.23), we define $(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}}, \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}})$ and respectively $(U^{\hat{J}}, S^{\hat{J}}, F^{\hat{J}}, \nu_{\#}^{\hat{J}})$ as in Definition 4.5. In addition, we assume that*

$$\left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}, \hat{J}) \right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Sigma_{\#})} \leq 1. \quad (4.29)$$

Then, we have

$$r^{-1} \|(U^{\tilde{J}} - U^{\hat{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}} - S^{\hat{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}(S)} + \|F^{\tilde{J}, \#} - F^{\hat{J}, \#}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}(S)} \lesssim \epsilon r^{-1} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}, \quad (4.30)$$

for all $0 \leq s \leq s_{max}$ and

$$\|\nu_{\#}(U^{\tilde{J}} - U^{\hat{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}} - S^{\hat{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}(S)} \lesssim \epsilon \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \epsilon \|\nu_{\#}(\tilde{J} - \hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}, \quad (4.31)$$

for all $0 \leq s \leq s_{max} - 1$.

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Lemma 4.9. *For a triplet of functions \tilde{J} satisfying (4.23), we define $\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}$ as in Definition 4.5. Then, for any scalar function h and $0 \leq k \leq s_{max}$, we have*

$$\sup_{S \subset \Sigma_{\#}} \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} \leq (1 + O(\epsilon)) \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathring{S})} + \sup_{S \subset \Sigma_{\#}} \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(h) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}. \quad (4.32)$$

Proof. See Appendix D. □

The following theorem will allow us to introduce a suitable family of hypersurfaces in Definition 4.11.

Theorem 4.10. *There exists a unique \tilde{J} satisfying (4.23) and verifying*

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\tilde{J}} \left(\left((\Phi^{\tilde{J}})^{-1} \right)^{\#} \tilde{J} \right) &= 0, & \text{on } \Sigma_{\tilde{J}}, \\ \left((\Phi^{\tilde{J}})^{-1} \right)^{\#} \tilde{J}^{(p)} &= J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)}, & \text{on } \mathbf{S}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

Proof. The proof follows from a standard Banach fixed-point argument. More precisely, we construct a map T which sends a triplet of functions \tilde{J} on $\Sigma_{\#}$ to another triplet of functions $T(\tilde{J})$ on $\Sigma_{\#}$. By taking a suitable choice of the domain of T , we prove that T is a contraction map and hence admits a unique fixed point. Finally, we conclude that the fixed point of T satisfies (4.33).

Step 1. Construction of the map T .

For a triplet of functions \tilde{J} defined on $\Sigma_{\#}$ satisfying (4.23), we define the triplet of functions $T(\tilde{J})$ on $\Sigma_{\#}$ by the following transport equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J})) &= 0, & \text{on } \Sigma_{\#}, \\ T(\tilde{J})^{(p)} &= J^{(p)}[\mathbf{S}_0], & \text{on } \mathring{S},\end{aligned}\tag{4.34}$$

where $J^{(p)}[\mathbf{S}_0]$ is the extension of $J^{(\mathbf{S}_0, p)}$ to \mathcal{R} by $\partial_u(J^{(p)}[\mathbf{S}_0]) = \partial_s(J^{(p)}[\mathbf{S}_0]) = 0$.

We define the following norms for triplets of functions $H^{(p)}$ on $\Sigma_{\#}$ and $1 \leq s \leq s_{max}$:

$$\|H\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} := \sup_{S \subset \Sigma_{\#}} \sum_p (\|H^{(p)}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \|\nu_{\#}(H^{(p)})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-1}(S)}). \tag{4.35}$$

We denote $H \in \mathcal{X}_s$ if $\|H\|_{\mathcal{X}_s} < +\infty$. Then \mathcal{X}_s is a Banach space for $1 \leq s \leq s_{max}$.

Recalling $\partial_u(J^{(p)}) = \partial_s(J^{(p)}) = 0$, we can rewrite (4.7) as follows:

$$\sum_p \|J^{(p)}[\mathbf{S}_0] - J^{(p)}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathring{S})} \leq C_0 \mathring{r} \mathring{\delta}, \tag{4.36}$$

where C_0 is a given constant. We define

$$\mathcal{X} := \left\{ \tilde{J} \in \mathcal{X}_{s_{max}} \mid \|\tilde{J} - J\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}}} \leq 2C_0 \mathring{r} \mathring{\delta}, \quad \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) \right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Sigma_{\#})} \leq 1 \right\}. \tag{4.37}$$

By definition, \mathcal{X} is a closed subset of $\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}$.

Step 2. Boundedness of T .

Notice that for $\tilde{J} \in \mathcal{X}$, (4.23) holds true. Thus, T is well-defined on \mathcal{X} . Moreover (4.27) holds, and we can thus apply Lemma 4.7 to obtain

$$\|\nu_{\#}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} \lesssim r \mathring{\delta}. \tag{4.38}$$

Moreover, (3.6) and (3.9), together with Lemma 2.22²¹, imply

$$r^{-1} \|(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(S)} + \|(F^{\tilde{J}, \#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(S)} \lesssim \mathring{\delta}. \tag{4.39}$$

²¹Lemma 2.22 allows to compare the norms $\|F^{\tilde{J}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S})}$ and $\|F^{\tilde{J}, \#}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(S)}$.

Recalling (4.1), (4.26), (4.34), (4.38) and $\|J\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(S)} \lesssim r$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J}) - J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} &= \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} \\ &\lesssim \|\nu_{\#}(J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} + \mathring{\epsilon} \mathring{\delta} r^{-2} \|\partial_{y^a}(J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} \\ &\lesssim \mathring{\delta} + \mathring{\epsilon} \mathring{\delta} \lesssim \mathring{\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

Applying Lemma 4.9 with $h = T(\tilde{J}) - J$ and recalling (4.36), for $\mathring{\epsilon}$ small enough and \mathring{r} large enough, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\tilde{J}) - J\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} &\leq (1 + O(\mathring{\epsilon})) \|T(\tilde{J}) - J\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathring{S})} + \sup_S \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J}) - J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} C_0 \mathring{\delta} \mathring{r}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Moreover, recalling (4.26), (4.38), (4.39)²², (4.40) and (4.41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}) - J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} &\lesssim \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J}) - J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} + \mathring{\epsilon} r^{-2} \|\partial_{y^a}(T(\tilde{J}) - J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \\ &\lesssim \mathring{\delta} + \mathring{\epsilon} r^{-2} \mathring{\delta} \|T(\tilde{J}) - J\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} \lesssim \mathring{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for \mathring{r} large enough, we obtain

$$\|\nu_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}) - J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \leq \frac{1}{2} C_0 \mathring{\delta} \mathring{r}. \quad (4.42)$$

From (4.41) and (4.42) we obtain

$$\|T(\tilde{J}) - J\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(S)} + \|\nu_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}) - J)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \leq 2C_0 \mathring{\delta} \mathring{r}, \quad (4.43)$$

which implies

$$\|T(\tilde{J}) - J\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}}} \leq 2C_0 \mathring{\delta} \mathring{r}. \quad (4.44)$$

Moreover, (4.43) implies that

$$\|\mathfrak{d}_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \lesssim r. \quad (4.45)$$

²²(4.38) and (4.39) imply the boundedness of A and B in (4.26).

Next, recalling (4.26), (4.34), (4.35), (4.43), (4.45) and applying Lemma 4.8, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \nu_{\#}^{T(\tilde{J})}(T(\tilde{J})) \right| &= \left| \nu_{\#}^{T(\tilde{J})}(T(\tilde{J})) - \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J})) \right| \\
&\lesssim \left| A(U^{T(\tilde{J})}, S^{T(\tilde{J})}, F^{T(\tilde{J}),\#}) - A(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J},\#}) \right| |\nu_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}))| \\
&+ \left| B(U^{T(\tilde{J})}, S^{T(\tilde{J})}, F^{T(\tilde{J}),\#}) - B(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J},\#}) \right| |\partial_{y^a}(T(\tilde{J}))| \\
&\lesssim \left| \mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U^{T(\tilde{J})} - U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{T(\tilde{J})} - S^{\tilde{J}}) \right| + \left| F^{T(\tilde{J}),\#} - F^{\tilde{J},\#} \right| \\
&\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|T(\tilde{J}) - \tilde{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_2(S)} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}) - \tilde{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_2(S)} \\
&\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|T(\tilde{J}) - \tilde{J}\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}}} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies for $\overset{\circ}{\delta}$ small enough

$$\left\| \nu_{\#}^{T(\tilde{J})}(T(\tilde{J})) \right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Sigma_{\#})} \leq 1. \quad (4.46)$$

Notice that (4.44) and (4.46) imply $T(\tilde{J}) \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence, we have $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$.

Step 3. T is a contraction map.

For two triplets of functions \tilde{J} and \hat{J} in \mathcal{X} , we have

$$\|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} = \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J})) - \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\hat{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} = \|(\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}} - \nu_{\#}^{\hat{J}})(T(\tilde{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)}.$$

Recall from (4.26) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}} - \nu_{\#}^{\hat{J}} &= O\left(\mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U^{\tilde{J}} - U^{\hat{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}} - S^{\hat{J}}), F^{\tilde{J},\#} - F^{\hat{J},\#}\right) \nu_{\#} \\
&+ \frac{\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}}{r^2} O\left(\mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U^{\tilde{J}} - U^{\hat{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}} - S^{\hat{J}}), F^{\tilde{J},\#} - F^{\hat{J},\#}\right) \partial_{y^a}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 4.8, (4.35) and (4.45), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} &\lesssim \|\mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U^{\tilde{J}} - U^{\hat{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}} - S^{\hat{J}}), F^{\tilde{J},\#} - F^{\hat{J},\#}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \\
&\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \left(\|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} + \|\nu_{\#}(\tilde{J} - \hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-2}(S)} \right) \\
&\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}}.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

Applying Lemma 4.9 with $h = T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J})$ and Recalling that $T(\tilde{J}) = T(\hat{J})$ on $\overset{\circ}{S}$, we obtain

$$\|T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}}. \quad (4.48)$$

Moreover, we have from (4.26), (4.35) and (4.47)

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nu_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-2}(S)} &\lesssim \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-2}(S)} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-2} \|T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} \\ &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining with (4.48), we obtain

$$\|T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-1}(S)} + \|\nu_{\#}(T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}-2}(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}}.$$

Hence, by (4.35) and for $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough, we have

$$\|T(\tilde{J}) - T(\hat{J})\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}}, \quad (4.49)$$

which implies that T is a contraction map on $(\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}})$.

Step 4. Fixed point of T .

Since \mathcal{X} is a closed subset of $\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}$, we deduce that $(\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}_{s_{max}-1}})$ is a complete metric space. Then, applying Banach fixed-point theorem to $T : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we obtain a unique fixed point $\tilde{J} \in \mathcal{X}$ of T , i.e.

$$T(\tilde{J}) = \tilde{J}. \quad (4.50)$$

Injecting (4.50) into (4.34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) &= 0, & \text{on } \Sigma_{\#}, \\ \tilde{J}^{(p)} &= J^{(p)}[\mathbf{S}_0], & \text{on } \overset{\circ}{S}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\nu^{\tilde{J}}\left((\Phi^{\tilde{J}})^{-1}\right)^{\#}(\tilde{J}) = (\Phi^{\tilde{J}})_{\#}(\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}})\left((\Phi^{\tilde{J}})^{-1}\right)^{\#}(\tilde{J}) = \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) = 0,$$

which implies (4.33). This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.10. \square

Definition 4.11. Let $P(s) := (\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s))$ be a curve satisfying (4.22). By Theorem 4.10, we define a triplet of functions $\tilde{J}^{(p)}$ and a hypersurface of the form

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_{s \geq \overset{\circ}{s}} \mathbf{S}[P(s)] = \bigcup_{s \geq \overset{\circ}{s}} \mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}^{(p)}]. \quad (4.51)$$

We define the following family of triplets on Σ :

$$J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} := (\Phi^{-1})^{\#}(\tilde{J}^{(p)}). \quad (4.52)$$

According to the construction in (4.51), there is an \mathbf{S} -adapted null frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ on every GCM sphere $\mathbf{S}[P(s)]$.

We also assume the transversality conditions:

$$\xi^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \omega^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \underline{\eta}^{\mathbf{S}} = -\zeta^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \quad (4.53)$$

and

$$e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = 1, \quad e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \quad (4.54)$$

where $u^{\mathbf{S}}$ is defined as

$$u^{\mathbf{S}} := c_0 - r^{\mathbf{S}} \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \quad u^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\mathbf{S}_0} = \overset{\circ}{u}. \quad (4.55)$$

Remark 4.12. Let us provide below justifications for introducing the transversality conditions (4.53) and (4.54):

1. (4.53) and (4.54) are consistent with a local extension by an outgoing geodesic foliation initialized on Σ . The use of transversality conditions instead of a local extension is chosen here to have intrinsic definitions on Σ .
2. The role of the transversality conditions (4.53) is to make sense of the Ricci coefficients $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}$, $\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$ on Σ through the formulae:²³

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_a^{\mathbf{S}}) &= 2\eta_a^{\mathbf{S}} + 2b^{\mathbf{S}} \xi_a^{\mathbf{S}} = 2\eta_a^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_a^{\mathbf{S}}) &= 2\underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}} + 2b^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\eta}_a^{\mathbf{S}} = 2\underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}} - 2b^{\mathbf{S}} \zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{D}_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}) &= 4\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - 4b^{\mathbf{S}} \omega^{\mathbf{S}} = 4\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.56)$$

3. The role of the transversality conditions (4.54) is to make sense of $e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}})$ and $e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}})$ on Σ through the formulae:

$$\begin{aligned} e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) &= \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) - b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) - b^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) &= \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) - b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.57)$$

We have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.13. Let Σ a hypersurface given by Definition 4.11. Then, the following properties hold:

²³Note that the L.H.S. of (4.56) are well defined on Σ since $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ is tangent to Σ .

1. The curve $\gamma(s) = (\Psi(s), s, 0, 0)$ of South Poles of the background spheres $S(\Psi(s), s)$ verifies $\gamma(s) \subset \Sigma$, $s \in \overset{\circ}{I}$.
2. On \mathbf{S} , the following GCM conditions hold

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \\ \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} &= -\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{C}_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p \underline{C}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}, \\ \mu^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^3} + M_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)},\end{aligned}\tag{4.58}$$

where $J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$ is defined by (4.52). Moreover,

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f)_{\ell=1} = \Lambda, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \underline{\Lambda},\tag{4.59}$$

where $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$ are the transition parameters of the frame transformation from the background frame (e_3, e_4, e_1, e_2) to the adapted frame $(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}, e_1^{\mathbf{S}}, e_2^{\mathbf{S}})$ and the $\ell = 1$ modes are defined w.r.t. $J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$. The triplets of constants $\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}}$ depend smoothly on the surfaces \mathbf{S} and

$$\Lambda^{\mathbf{S}_0} = \Lambda_0, \quad \underline{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{S}_0} = \underline{\Lambda}_0.$$

3. There are two maps $\Xi_S : \mathcal{R}_S \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ and $\Xi_N : \mathcal{R}_N \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_{S,N} : (u, s, y_{S,N}^1, y_{S,N}^2) &\mapsto \\ (u + U_{S,N}(y_{S,N}^1, y_{S,N}^2, u, s, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}), s + S_{S,N}(y_{S,N}^1, y_{S,N}^2, u, s, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}), y_{S,N}^1, y_{S,N}^2) &\end{aligned}\tag{4.60}$$

with U_S, S_S vanishing at South Pole and verify the following transition condition

$$\Xi_N = \Xi_S \circ \varphi_{NS},$$

where φ_{NS} is the transition map between the 2 coordinates charts. Using these two maps, we can define a map $\Xi : S(u, s) \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$ by

$$\Xi = \Xi_S \text{ on } \mathcal{R}_S, \quad \Xi = \Xi_N \text{ on } \mathcal{R}_N.\tag{4.61}$$

4. Let $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ be the unique vectorfield tangent to the hypersurface Σ , normal to \mathbf{S} , and normalized by $\mathbf{g}(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, e_4^{\mathbf{S}}) = -2$. There exists a unique scalar function $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ on Σ such that $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ is given by

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

5. The transversality conditions hold:

$$\xi^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \omega^{\mathbf{S}} = 0, \quad \underline{\eta}^{\mathbf{S}} = -\zeta^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad \text{on } \Sigma,$$

and

$$e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = 1, \quad e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma.$$

6. The Ricci coefficients $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}, \widehat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\widehat{\chi}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \zeta^{\mathbf{S}}$ are well defined on each sphere \mathbf{S} of Σ , and hence on Σ . The same holds true for all curvature coefficients $\alpha^{\mathbf{S}}, \beta^{\mathbf{S}}, \rho^{\mathbf{S}}, \star\rho^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\beta}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\alpha}^{\mathbf{S}}$. Taking into account our transversality conditions (4.53) on Σ , we remark that all the Ricci coefficients are well defined on Σ including $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$, see item 2 in Remark 4.12.

7. The $\ell = 1$ modes $J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$ verify:

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) = 0, \quad J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}|_{\mathbf{S}_0} = J^{(\mathbf{S}_0,p)}, \quad p = 0, +, -.$$

8. The hypersurface Σ constructed above is a smooth hypersurface.

Remark 4.14. Since we always work on the hypersurface Σ , with no risk of confusion, we denote

$$\Xi_{S,N}(s, y_{S,N}^1, y_{S,N}^2) := \Xi_{S,N}(\Psi(s), s, y_{S,N}^1, y_{S,N}^2) \quad (4.62)$$

in the following context.

Proof of Proposition 4.13. Properties 1-7 are immediate consequences of Definition 4.11. So we only prove Property 8. For this purpose, we first prove the smoothness of the functions Ξ_p for $p = S, N$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) &= (\Psi'(s) + \partial_P U_p(\cdot) P'(s), 1 + \partial_P S_p(\cdot) P'(s), 0, 0), \\ \partial_{y_p^a} \Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) &= (\partial_{y_p^a} U_p(\cdot), \partial_{y_p^a} S_p(\cdot), \delta_{a1}, \delta_{a2}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.63)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_P U_p(\cdot) P'(s) &= \Psi'(s) \partial_u U_p(\cdot) + \partial_s U_p(\cdot) + \Lambda'(s) \partial_\Lambda U_p(\cdot) + \underline{\Lambda}'(s) \partial_{\underline{\Lambda}} U_p(\cdot), \\ \partial_P S_p(\cdot) P'(s) &= \Psi'(s) \partial_u S_p(\cdot) + \partial_s S_p(\cdot) + \Lambda'(s) \partial_\Lambda S_p(\cdot) + \underline{\Lambda}'(s) \partial_{\underline{\Lambda}} S_p(\cdot). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in view of the smoothness of U_p, S_p w.r.t. the parameters $\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}$ and u, s , which are statements 7-9 in Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 6.11 in [5], we deduce that Ξ_p for $p = S, N$ are smooth and they are immersions at every point. Recall that

$$\Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) = (\Psi(s) + U(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)), s + S(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)), y_p^1, y_p^2).$$

According to (4.63) and the implicit function theorem, at every point (s, y_p^1, y_p^2) , its inverse map is locally given by

$$\Xi_p^{-1}(h(z_p, y_p^1, y_p^2), z_p, y_p^1, y_p^2) = (s(z_p, y_p^1, y_p^2), y_p^1, y_p^2), \quad (4.64)$$

where $h(z_p, y_p^1, y_p^2), s(z_p, y_p^1, y_p^2)$ are smooth functions.

Now we recall the following result, see Theorem 2.1.2 in [1] for a proof.

Theorem 4.15. *V is a d -dimensional smooth submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n if for every point $x \in V$, there exists an open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of x , an open domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a map $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

1. *g is a smooth map.*
2. *g is homeomorphism from Ω to $U \cap V$.*
3. *g is an immersion at every point of Ω .*

For every $x \in \Sigma$, without loss of generality, we assume that x can be written as

$$x = \Xi_S(s_0, y_0^1, y_0^2) = (\Psi(s_0) + U(y_0^1, y_0^2, P(s_0)), s_0 + S(y_0^1, y_0^2, P(s_0)), y_0^1, y_0^2)$$

in the South coordinate chart. We define

$$U_x := B(x, \varepsilon) := \left\{ q \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \|q - x\|_{\mathbb{R}^4} \leq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Then, for every²⁴

$$q = (\Psi(s) + U(y^1, y^2, P(s)), s + S(y^1, y^2, P(s)), y^1, y^2) \in U_x \cap \Sigma,$$

we have

$$|s + S(y^1, y^2, P(s)) - s_0 - S(y_0^1, y_0^2, P(s_0))|, |y^1 - y_0^1|, |y^2 - y_0^2| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Thus, in view of the smallness dependence of S w.r.t. the parameters (s, y^1, y^2) , we deduce that $q \in \mathcal{N}$ where

$$\mathcal{N} := \{(s, y^1, y^2) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid |s - s_0|, |y^1 - y_0^1|, |y^2 - y_0^2| \leq 2\varepsilon\}.$$

For ε small enough, Ξ_S is a homeomorphism from \mathcal{N} to its image. We then denote

$$\Omega := \Xi_S^{-1}(U_x \cap \Sigma) \subset \mathcal{N},$$

where Ξ_S^{-1} is defined in (4.64). Hence, the map

$$\Xi_S|_{\Omega} : \Omega \mapsto U_x \cap \Sigma,$$

is smooth, homeomorphism and is an immersion. The similar conclusion holds for Ξ_N . Applying Theorem 4.15, we deduce that Σ is a smooth hypersurface as stated. This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.13. \square

²⁴By taking ε small enough, q can be written in the South coordinate chart.

4.2 Estimates for the transition functions $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$

Let Σ be a smooth spacelike hypersurface defined as in Definition 4.11. We define the scalars²⁵

$$z^{\mathbf{S}} := e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}), \quad \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} := e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}), \quad (4.65)$$

and the renormalized quantities

$$\tilde{z}^{\mathbf{S}} := z^{\mathbf{S}} - 2, \quad \tilde{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} := \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} + \Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}. \quad (4.66)$$

We define the following quantities along Σ

$$B^{\mathbf{S}} := (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1}, \quad \underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}} := (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1}, \quad D^{\mathbf{S}} := \overline{\tilde{b}^{\mathbf{S}}} = \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} + 1 + \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \quad (4.67)$$

where the $\ell = 1$ modes are defined w.r.t. $J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}$.

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 4.22. To this end, we first prove a series of lemmas which will be used throughout this paper.

Lemma 4.16. *We have the following identities:*

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(z^{\mathbf{S}}) &= (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})z^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}) &= (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ b^{\mathbf{S}} &= -z^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.68)$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, we have

$$[e_a, e_3] = \frac{1}{2}\underline{\kappa}e_a + \widehat{\chi}_{ab}e_b - \nabla_3 e_a + (\zeta_a - \eta_a)e_3 - \underline{\xi}_a e_4.$$

Since $e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = 0$, $e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = 1$ and $e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = 0$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}})) &= [e_a^{\mathbf{S}}, e_3^{\mathbf{S}}]u^{\mathbf{S}} = \left[\frac{1}{2}\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}e_a^{\mathbf{S}} + \widehat{\chi}_{ab}^{\mathbf{S}}e_b^{\mathbf{S}} - \nabla_{e_3^{\mathbf{S}}}e_a^{\mathbf{S}} + (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})e_3^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}} \right] u^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &= (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}), \\ e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}})) &= [e_a^{\mathbf{S}}, e_3^{\mathbf{S}}]r^{\mathbf{S}} = \left[\frac{1}{2}\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}e_a^{\mathbf{S}} + \widehat{\chi}_{ab}^{\mathbf{S}}e_b^{\mathbf{S}} - \nabla_{e_3^{\mathbf{S}}}e_a^{\mathbf{S}} + (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})e_3^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}} \right] r^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &= (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) - \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

²⁵Recall that (4.54) allows to make sense of $e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}})$ and $e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}})$, see item 3 in Remark 4.12.

We deduce, in view of the definition of $z^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(z^{\mathbf{S}}) &= e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}})) = (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})z^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}) &= e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}})) = (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.69)$$

which implies the first two identities in (4.68).

Next, we prove the last identity in (4.68). In view of the definition of $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $z^{\mathbf{S}}$ we make use of (4.54) to deduce

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) + b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = z^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

On the other hand, since $u^{\mathbf{S}} = c_0 - r^{\mathbf{S}}$ along Σ , we have

$$z^{\mathbf{S}} = \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(u^{\mathbf{S}}) = -\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = -e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) - b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = -\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - b^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad (4.70)$$

where we used (4.54) and (4.65). This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.16. \square

Lemma 4.17. *For every scalar function h , we have the formula*

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}\left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} h\right) = z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(h) + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}\kappa^{\mathbf{S}})h). \quad (4.71)$$

In particular

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}\kappa^{\mathbf{S}})},$$

where the average is with respect to \mathbf{S} .

Proof. See Lemma 5.2.2 in [7]. \square

Lemma 4.18. *We have the following properties for the transition coefficients $(f, \underline{f}, \lambda)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(f) &= 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) - \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\underline{f} + b^{\mathbf{S}}f) + 2f\underline{\omega} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{f}) &= 2(\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}) - \frac{1}{2}\underline{f}\underline{\kappa} - 2\underline{\omega}(\underline{f} - b^{\mathbf{S}}f) + b^{\mathbf{S}}\left(2\nabla^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}\underline{f}\kappa\right) \\ &\quad + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda) &= 2(\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\omega}) - 2\underline{\omega}\overset{\circ}{\lambda} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.72)$$

*where l. o. t. denotes terms which are linear in Γ_g, Γ_b and linear and higher order in F .*²⁶

²⁶Here l. o. t. is different from that of Proposition 2.14.

Proof. Schematically, from the transformation formulas for η , $\underline{\xi}$ and $\underline{\omega}$ in Proposition 2.14, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}(f) &= 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) - \frac{1}{2}\underline{f}\kappa + 2\underline{\omega}f + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{f}) &= 2(\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}) - \frac{1}{2}\underline{f}\underline{\kappa} - 2\underline{\omega}\underline{f} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda) &= 2(\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\omega}) - 2\underline{\omega}\overset{\circ}{\lambda} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.},\end{aligned}$$

where $F = (f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ and l. o. t. denotes terms which are linear in Γ_g, Γ_b and linear and higher order in F . Recall also that the $e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$ derivatives of F are fixed by our transversality condition (4.14). More precisely we have from (4.14) and the transformation formulas of ξ , ω , $\underline{\eta}$ and ζ of Proposition 2.14

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(f) &= -\frac{1}{2}\kappa f + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{f}) &= 2\nabla^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda) + 2\underline{\omega}f - \frac{1}{2}\underline{f}\kappa + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda) &= F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}\end{aligned}\tag{4.73}$$

Using $\nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$, we obtain (4.72). This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.18. \square

Lemma 4.19. *We have, for any scalar function h on \mathcal{R} , and any $1 \leq l \leq s$,*

$$\|(\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left(|\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s} h| + \overset{\circ}{\delta} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s} h| \right) + \|(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(F, b^{\mathbf{S}} - b)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-l}(\mathbf{S})} \sup_{\mathcal{R}} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s} h|,$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{d}} := (e_3 - (z + \underline{\Omega})e_4, \emptyset), \quad b := -z - \underline{\Omega}.$$

Proof. We denote

$$\nu_{\mathcal{R}} := e_3 + be_4.$$

By definition, we have

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(h) - \nu_{\mathcal{R}}(h) = (e_3^{\mathbf{S}} - e_3)h + b^{\mathbf{S}}(e_4^{\mathbf{S}} - e_4)h + (b^{\mathbf{S}} - b)e_4(h).$$

Applying Lemma 2.13, we have

$$e_4^{\mathbf{S}}h - e_4h = O(F)(\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}h), \quad e_3^{\mathbf{S}}h - e_3h = O(F)(\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}h).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(h) - \nu_{\mathcal{R}}(h) = O(F)\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(h) + O(b^{\mathbf{S}} - b)\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(h).$$

More generally, for $1 \leq l \leq s$ we have

$$(\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(h) - (\nu_{\mathcal{R}})^l(h) = O\left((\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\leq l-1}(F, b^{\mathbf{S}} - b))\mathfrak{d}^{\leq l}(h)\right),$$

which implies

$$\|(\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(h) - (\nu_{\mathcal{R}})^l(h)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \|(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\leq l-1}(F, b^{\mathbf{S}} - b))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-l}(\mathbf{S})} \sup_{\mathcal{R}} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s} h|. \quad (4.74)$$

Next, applying (2.52), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\nu_{\mathcal{R}})^l(h)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-l}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim r \sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left(|\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s-l}(\nu_{\mathcal{R}})^l(h)| + \mathring{\delta} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s-l}(\nu_{\mathcal{R}})^l(h)| \right) \\ &\lesssim r \sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left(|\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s} h| + \mathring{\delta} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s} h| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.75)$$

Combining (4.74) and (4.75), we deduce

$$\|(\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left(|\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s} h| + \mathring{\delta} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s} h| \right) + \|(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\leq l-1}(F, b^{\mathbf{S}} - b))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s-l}(\mathbf{S})} \sup_{\mathcal{R}} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s} h|$$

as stated. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.19. \square

In the remainder of this section, we denote $K := s_{max} + 1$ and

$$\nu := \nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Lemma 4.20. *Under the assumption (4.2), we have for $0 \leq l \leq K$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu^l(\dot{k}, \underline{\dot{k}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim r^{-1} \mathring{\delta} + r^{-1} \mathring{\epsilon} |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + r^{-1} \mathring{\epsilon} \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})}, \\ \|\nu^l(\dot{\mu})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim r^{-2} \mathring{\delta} + r^{-2} \mathring{\epsilon} |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + r^{-2} \mathring{\epsilon} \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.76)$$

Proof. Notice that we have from (3.13) and (4.22)

$$z^{\mathbf{S}} - z, b^{\mathbf{S}} - b = O(1),$$

which implies from Lemma 4.16 that

$$|b^{\mathbf{S}}|, |z^{\mathbf{S}}|, |\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}| \lesssim 1. \quad (4.77)$$

Applying Lemma 4.16 and (4.77), we infer that $(z^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{z^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (z - \overline{z})$ and $(\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (\underline{\Omega} - \overline{\underline{\Omega}})$ can be estimated by $\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta$ and $\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}$. Thus, these quantities can be controlled by $\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f})$ thanks to Lemma 4.18 and hence

$$\left\| (z^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{z^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (z - \overline{z}), (\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (\underline{\Omega} - \overline{\underline{\Omega}}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_K(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r \|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.78)$$

Combining (4.78) and Lemma 4.16, we obtain

$$\left\| (b^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (b - \overline{b}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_K(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r \|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.79)$$

Recalling (4.5) and Lemma 2.22, we deduce

$$\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} - \overline{b} = D^{\mathbf{S}} - 1 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + 1 + \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} = D^{\mathbf{S}} + r^{-1}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \quad (4.80)$$

Thus, we have

$$\|b^{\mathbf{S}} - b\|_{\mathfrak{h}_K(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + r \|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.81)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}} - b)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l-1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + r \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(f, \underline{f})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.82)$$

Applying Proposition 2.2, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} e_4 \dot{\kappa} &= -\frac{2}{r} \dot{\kappa} + \Gamma_g \cdot \Gamma_g = r^{-3} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \\ e_4 \dot{\underline{\kappa}} &= -\frac{1}{r} \dot{\underline{\kappa}} - 2 \operatorname{div} \zeta + 2 \check{\rho} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g = r^{-3} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \\ e_4 \dot{\mu} &= e_4 (-\operatorname{div} \zeta - \check{\rho} + \Gamma_b \cdot \Gamma_g) = r^{-4} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (4.2), we obtain

$$\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s}(\dot{\kappa}, \dot{\underline{\kappa}}) = r^{-2} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \quad \mathfrak{d}^{\leq s} \dot{\mu} = r^{-3} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}). \quad (4.83)$$

Applying Lemma 4.19 with $h = (\dot{\kappa}, \underline{\dot{\kappa}})$ and $s = K$, combining with (4.2), (4.82) and (4.83), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu^l(\dot{\kappa}, \underline{\dot{\kappa}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{s})} &\lesssim r \sup_{\mathcal{R}} \left(|\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}^{\leq s}(\dot{\kappa}, \underline{\dot{\kappa}})| + \delta^\circ |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s}(\dot{\kappa}, \underline{\dot{\kappa}})| \right) + \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(F, b^{\mathbf{S}} - b)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{s})} \sup_{\mathcal{R}} |\mathfrak{d}^{\leq s}(\dot{\kappa}, \underline{\dot{\kappa}})|, \\ &\lesssim r^{-1} \delta^\circ + r^{-2} \epsilon \left(r \delta^\circ + r |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + r \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{s})} \right) \\ &\lesssim r^{-1} \delta^\circ + r^{-1} \epsilon |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + r^{-1} \epsilon \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{s})}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the first estimate in (4.76). The second estimate in (4.76) is similar. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.20. \square

Lemma 4.21. *In view of the GCM conditions (3.4), the system (2.57) can be written in the following form:*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} f &= h_1 - \overline{h_1}^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ \operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} &= \underline{h_1} - \overline{\underline{h_1}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \overset{\circ}{b} &= h_2, \\ \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda} + \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \overset{\circ}{b} &= \underline{\dot{C}_0} + \sum_p \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + \underline{h_2}, \\ \left(\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \right) \overset{\circ}{\lambda} &= \dot{M}_0 + \sum_p \dot{M}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + \frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \left(\underline{\dot{C}_0} + \sum_p \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right) + h_3, \\ \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{b} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\underline{f} - f) &= h_4 - \overline{h_4}^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad \overset{\circ}{\overline{b}}^{\mathbf{S}} = b_0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.84}$$

where

$$\overset{\circ}{b} := r - r^{\mathbf{S}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nu^l(h_1, \underline{h_1}, h_2, \underline{h_2}, h_4)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{s})} + r \|\nu^l(h_3)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{s})} \\ &\lesssim r^{-1} \delta^\circ + (\epsilon r^{-1} + r^{-2}) \left(\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{s})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{s})} \right) \\ &+ r^{-1} \left(\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{s})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^{\leq l-1} \overset{\circ}{b}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{s})} \right) + r^{-2} \delta^\circ \|\nu^{\leq l-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{s})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.85}$$

Proof. See Remark 4.10 in [5] for the proof of (4.84) and the explicit expressions of $(h_1, \underline{h}_1, h_2, \underline{h}_2, h_3, h_4)$. Remark that (4.85) is a direct consequence of GCM conditions (3.4), Remark 4.11 in [5] and Lemma 4.20. \square

Proposition 4.22. *We have the following estimate*

$$\|F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}} F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}|. \quad (4.86)$$

Proof. In view of the construction of Σ and (3.6), for every $\mathbf{S} \subset \Sigma$, we have

$$\|F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.87)$$

To derive the remaining tangential derivatives of F along Σ_0 , we commute the GCM system (4.84) with respect to $\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}$. Applying $\nu(J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) = 0$ and $|\nu(r^{\mathbf{S}})| \lesssim 1^{27}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f) &= \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(h_1 - \overline{h}_1^{\mathbf{S}}) + [\text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]f, \\ \text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{f}) &= \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{h}_1 - \overline{\underline{h}}_1^{\mathbf{S}}) + [\text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]\underline{f}, \\ \text{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f) + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) - \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\overset{\circ}{b}) &= \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(h_2) + [\text{div}^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]f + r^{-2}O(F) + r^{-3}O(\overset{\circ}{b}), \\ \text{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{f}) + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) + \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\overset{\circ}{b}) &= \nu(\dot{\underline{C}}_0) + \sum_p \nu(\dot{\underline{C}}^{(p)})J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{h}_2) \\ &\quad + [\text{div}^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]\underline{f} + r^{-2}O(F) + r^{-3}O(\overset{\circ}{b}), \\ \left(\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}\right) (\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda}) &= \nu(\dot{M}_0) + \sum_p \nu(\dot{M}^{(p)})J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \left(\nu(\dot{\underline{C}}_0) + \sum_p \nu(\dot{\underline{C}}^{(p)})J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right) + \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(h_3) \\ &\quad + [\Delta^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]\overset{\circ}{\lambda} + r^{-3}O(F) + r^{-2}O(\dot{\underline{C}}_0, \dot{\underline{C}}^{(p)}), \\ \Delta^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{b}) - \frac{1}{2} \text{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \left(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} - \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}} f \right) &= \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(h_4 - \overline{h}_4^{\mathbf{S}}) + [\Delta^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]\overset{\circ}{b} + [\text{div}^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}](F), \\ b_0^{(1)} &:= \overline{\overset{\circ}{b}}^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.88)$$

Recalling that

$$F = r^{-1}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}), \quad \overset{\circ}{b} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}),$$

²⁷Notice that we have from (3.13) and (4.22) that $\nu(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = O(1)$.

and using Lemma 2.4, we have

$$([\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]F, [\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]F) = r^{-3}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) + r^{-1}O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]F &= r^{-4}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) + r^{-1}\mathfrak{P}^{\leq 1}(\Gamma_b \cdot \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}F) = r^{-4}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) + r^{-2}O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})\mathfrak{P}^{\leq 1}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)), \\ [\Delta^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}]\overset{\circ}{b} &= r^{-3}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) + r^{-1}\mathfrak{P}^{\leq 1}(\Gamma_b \cdot \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}\overset{\circ}{b}) = r^{-3}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) + r^{-2}O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})\mathfrak{P}^{\leq 1}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\overset{\circ}{b})). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, applying Proposition 3.4 to (4.84), we deduce

$$(\dot{\underline{C}}_0, \dot{\underline{C}}^{(p)}) = r^{-2}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \quad (4.89)$$

Thus, applying Proposition 3.4 to (4.88), in view of (4.85), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f}), \nu(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) - \overline{\nu(\overset{\circ}{\lambda})}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}f)_{\ell=1}| + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}\underline{f})_{\ell=1}| \\ &+ (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1}\|\nu(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.90)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} r \left| \overline{\nu(\overset{\circ}{\lambda})}^{\mathbf{S}} \right| &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}f)_{\ell=1}| + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}\underline{f})_{\ell=1}| + |b_0^{(1)}| \\ &+ (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1}\|\nu(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.91)$$

To estimate the $\ell = 1$ modes of $(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})(f, \underline{f})$, we make use of the equations (4.72) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})(f)J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} &= 2 \int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta)J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \text{l. o. t.} \\ &= 2B^{\mathbf{S}} - \int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div} \eta)J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div} \eta - \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta)J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \text{l. o. t.} \\ &= 2B^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.3), (4.67), Lemmas 2.22 and 2.23 at the last step. Similarly, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})(\underline{f})J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} = 2\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}),$$

Thus, we deduce from (4.90) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f}), \nu \overset{\circ}{\lambda} - \overline{\nu \overset{\circ}{\lambda}}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\left\| \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \left\| \nu(\overset{\circ}{b}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.92)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} r \left| \overline{\nu \overset{\circ}{\lambda}}^{\mathbf{S}} \right| & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |b_0^{(1)}| \\ & + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\left\| \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \left\| \nu(\overset{\circ}{b}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.93)$$

In the sequel, we denote for $1 \leq l \leq s_{max} + 1$.

$$\mathcal{E}_l := \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\left\| (\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \left\| \nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \right), \quad (4.94)$$

Next, we consider $b_0^{(1)} = \overline{\nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})}^{\mathbf{S}}$. Applying Lemmas 2.15, 4.17, (2.24), (4.2), (3.6) and (4.70), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}}) &= e_3(r) + b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4(r) - \nu(r^{\mathbf{S}}) + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) \\ &= \frac{r}{2} \left(\underline{\Omega} \overline{\kappa} + z \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\kappa}} - z \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\Omega}} \right) + b^{\mathbf{S}} \frac{r}{2} \overline{\kappa} - \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}})}^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) \\ &= \underline{\Omega} + \frac{rz}{2} \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\kappa}} - z \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\Omega}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}} + z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} + z^{\mathbf{S}})}^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) \\ &= \underline{\Omega} + \frac{rz}{2} \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\kappa}} - z \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\Omega}} - \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}} + z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall from Lemma 2.22 and Proposition 2.14 that

$$r - r^{\mathbf{S}} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}), \quad \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\kappa} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \quad (4.95)$$

Notice that (4.81) and (4.92) imply

$$|b - b^{\mathbf{S}}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \left\| \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} = O(\mathcal{E}_1). \quad (4.96)$$

Recall that Lemma 2.23 allows us to compare the average on \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{S} . Thus, we may assume from now on that all averages are on \mathbf{S} . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}}) &= \underline{\Omega} + \frac{rz}{2} \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\kappa}} - z \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\Omega}} - \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{r}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\kappa}} + z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) \\ &= -b + \frac{rz}{2} \overline{z^{-1} \underline{\kappa}} + z \overline{z^{-1} b} + b^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{rz^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\kappa}} - z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} b^{\mathbf{S}}} + O(\mathcal{E}_1) \\ &= \overline{zz^{-1} \left(\frac{r}{2} \underline{\kappa} + b \right)} - z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left(\frac{r}{2} \underline{\kappa} + b \right)} + O(\mathcal{E}_1). \end{aligned}$$

We denote

$$\frac{r}{2}\underline{\kappa} + b := -2 + h_0, \quad h_0 = r\Gamma_b = O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}).$$

Thus, we deduce

$$\nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}}) = -2 \left(\overline{zz^{-1}} - z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}} \right) + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) \overline{z - z^{\mathbf{S}}} + O(\mathcal{E}_1). \quad (4.97)$$

Taking the average of (4.97) on \mathbf{S} , recalling that $\overline{ab} = \overline{a}\overline{b} + \overline{(a - \overline{a})(b - \overline{b})}$ and applying (4.78), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})} &= -2 \left(\overline{\overline{zz^{-1}}} - \overline{z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}}} \right) + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) |z - z^{\mathbf{S}}| + O(\mathcal{E}_1) \\ &= 2 \left(\overline{(z - \overline{z})(z^{-1} - \overline{z^{-1}})} - \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{z^{\mathbf{S}}}) \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}} \right)} \right) + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) |z - z^{\mathbf{S}}| + O(\mathcal{E}_1) \\ &= O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) \overline{z - z^{\mathbf{S}}} + O(\mathcal{E}_1). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we apply (4.2), (4.4), (4.70), (4.96) and Lemma 2.15 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}}) &= e_3(r) + b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4(r) - b^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) = e_3(r) + b \frac{r}{2} \overline{\kappa} + z^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\mathcal{E}_1) \\ &= e_3(r) - e_3(s) + \underline{\Omega} + b + z^{\mathbf{S}} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) = e_3(r) - e_3(s) + z^{\mathbf{S}} - z + O(\mathcal{E}_1) \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}} - z + O(\mathcal{E}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we deduce

$$\overline{z^{\mathbf{S}} - z} = \overline{\nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})} + O(\mathcal{E}_1) = O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}} - z)} + O(\mathcal{E}_1), \quad (4.98)$$

which implies

$$\overline{z - z^{\mathbf{S}}} = O(\mathcal{E}_1), \quad \overline{\nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})} = O(\mathcal{E}_1),$$

and hence, recalling (4.94) and Lemma 2.23, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b_0^{(1)} &= \overline{\nu(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})} + O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) \\ &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| \\ &\quad + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\nu(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.99)$$

Finally, we recall the equation of $\overset{\circ}{b}$ in (4.88). By (4.85) and Lemma 2.10, we have

$$\left\| \nu(\overset{\circ}{b}) - \overline{\nu(\overset{\circ}{b})}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r \|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \|\nu(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.100)$$

Thus, from (4.92), (4.93) (4.99) and (4.100), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \left\| \nu(\overset{\circ}{b}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\left\| \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(F) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \left\| \nu(\overset{\circ}{b}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ and small enough and $\overset{\circ}{r}$ large enough, we deduce (4.86). This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.22. \square

4.3 Extrinsic properties of Σ

The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.23. *We assume that*

$$|B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (4.101)$$

Then, the following estimates hold true for all $k \leq s_{max}$:

1. *The Ricci coefficients $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$ verify*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}|, \\ \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}|, \\ \|\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}|. \end{aligned}$$

2. *The scalar $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ verifies*

$$(r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \|\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}|.$$

3. *We also have*

$$\begin{aligned} (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \|\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}|, \\ (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \|\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}|. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.24. *We split the Ricci and curvature coefficients as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}} &= \left\{ \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}, \widehat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \zeta^{\mathbf{S}}, \check{\underline{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}}, r\check{\rho}^{\mathbf{S}}, r^{\star}\rho^{\mathbf{S}}, r\beta^{\mathbf{S}}, r\alpha^{\mathbf{S}}, r\check{\mu}^{\mathbf{S}}, r\check{K}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\}, \\ \Gamma_{b,w}^{\mathbf{S}} &= \left\{ \widehat{\underline{\chi}}^{\mathbf{S}}, r\beta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\alpha}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\}, \\ \Gamma_{b,i}^{\mathbf{S}} &= \left\{ \eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since all the terms in $\Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}} \cup \Gamma_{b,w}^{\mathbf{S}}$ are well-defined on a sphere, as a direct consequence of Corollary 3.5, see also (3.11), we have the following estimates for $k \leq s_{\max}$.

$$\|\Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1}, \quad \|\Gamma_{b,w}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}. \quad (4.102)$$

By the null structure equations and Bianchi equations introduced in Proposition 2.2, we obtain immediately²⁸

$$\|\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-2}, \quad \|\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}} \Gamma_{b,w}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1}. \quad (4.103)$$

Remark 4.25. In the sequel, unless stated otherwise, we admit the following conventions:

- For a scalar quantity $h^{\mathbf{S}}$ defined on \mathbf{S} , we denote $\overline{h^{\mathbf{S}}}$ for its average over the sphere \mathbf{S} ;
- For a background scalar quantity h , we denote \overline{h} for its average over the background sphere $S(u, s)$;
- For any scalar quantity h , we denote $\overline{h^{\mathbf{S}}}$ for its average over the sphere \mathbf{S} .

Recalling that $\overset{\circ}{\delta} \leq \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$, applying Proposition 4.22, (4.101) and Lemma 4.18, we deduce the following estimates for $k \leq s_{\max}$

$$\|\Gamma_{b,i}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (4.104)$$

Notice that we have

$$\|\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{2}{3}} r^{-1}, \quad \|\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{2}{3}}, \quad (4.105)$$

as a direct consequence of (4.104) and Proposition 2.2.

To prove Proposition 4.23, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.26. Under the GCM conditions (4.58) on Σ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} (\not\!d_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not\!d_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}}) &= r^{-5} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \\ \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} (\nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) &= 0, \\ \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} \left((\not\!d_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not\!d_2^{\mathbf{S},*} + 2K^{\mathbf{S}}) \not\!d_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not\!d_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) &= r^{-6} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

²⁸As explained in Remark 4.12, the transversality conditions are consistent with extension by local outgoing geodesic foliation initialized on Σ . Hence, the equations in Proposition 2.2 are valid on Σ .

Lemma 4.27. *The following estimates hold true for $k \leq s_{\max} - 5$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1}, \\ \|\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1}, \\ \|\not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} + r^{-1} \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.106)$$

Lemma 4.28. *We have the following identity for $\overline{\underline{\omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}$.*

$$\overline{\underline{\omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} = \overline{\underline{\omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} = -\frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \overline{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \left(\overline{\underline{\mu}}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\eta^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \eta^{\mathbf{S}}} + \overline{\frac{b^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}} \right).$$

Lemma 4.29. *We have the following estimate for $k \leq s_{\max}$:*

$$\left\| (\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}, \check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}, \check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (4.107)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.26. Recalling that

$$\check{\mu}^{\mathbf{S}} = M_0^{\mathbf{S}} + \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}, \quad (4.108)$$

we infer

$$\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}} = \sum_p M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}).$$

Therefore,

$$\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}}) = \nu^{\mathbf{S}} (M^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}). \quad (4.109)$$

Firstly, we estimate $\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)})$. Recall that $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) = 0$, By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) &= [\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*}] J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \\ &= [\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}] \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} [\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*}] J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \\ &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathfrak{d} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \\ &\quad + \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathfrak{d} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right) \\ &= \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-2} O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that (see Lemma 2.8 and also Corollary 5.2.10 in [7]).

$$|\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}| \lesssim \frac{\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}}{r^2}, \quad M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \in r^{-1} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

According to (4.109), we deduce

$$\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}}) = (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-5} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}),$$

which implies the first estimate. The third estimate is similar and left to the reader. Finally, the second estimate follows immediately from the GCM condition $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.26. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.27. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}(\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}}), \\ C_2 &= \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}), \\ C_3 &= \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}(\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} + 2K^{\mathbf{S}}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.110}$$

Recalling that $\nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$, we obtain in view of Lemma 4.26

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= -b^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}}) + r^{-5} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \\ C_2 &= -b^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}), \\ C_3 &= -b^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}} \left(M^{(\mathbf{S},p)} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} + 2K^{\mathbf{S}}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) + r^{-6} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-3}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-5}, \\ \|\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-2}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-3}, \\ \left\| \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}} \left((\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} + 2K^{\mathbf{S}}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-5}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-6}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.111}$$

Indeed, making use of Lemma 2.4 and (4.103), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} &= [\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla^{\mathbf{S}}] \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + \nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &= -r^{-1} \nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + r^{-1} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + r^{-1} \mathfrak{d} \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}) \\ &= r^{-4} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the second estimate in (4.111). The first and third estimates in (4.111) are similar and left to the reader.

Writing $b^{\mathbf{S}} = \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - 1 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}$, recall the bootstrap assumptions (4.104) and making use of product estimates we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|C_1\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-3}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-4}, \\ \|C_2\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-2}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-3}, \\ \|C_3\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k-5}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-5}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate the error terms

$$\begin{aligned} E_k &:= r^{-1} \|\Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim r^{-2} \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1} \|\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \|\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim r^{-1} \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}, \quad \forall k \leq s_{max}. \end{aligned}$$

We cite the following identities, see Propositions 5.1.21 and 5.1.22 in [7]:

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} &= - \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\beta}^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &\quad + (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-5} (\not{\varphi}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 4} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}} + (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-4} (\not{\varphi}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 4} (\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}), \\ 2 \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}} &= \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} + 2K^{\mathbf{S}}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \mu^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\beta}^{\mathbf{S}} + (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-5} (\not{\varphi}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 4} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}} + (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-4} (\not{\varphi}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 4} (\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}), \\ 2 \nabla^{\mathbf{S}} \omega^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{1}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \xi^{\mathbf{S}} - \nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \zeta^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\beta}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{1}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}} + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that

$$\not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S}} = 2 \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} + 2K,$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} &= 2 \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} (\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} + K) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &= 2 \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{2}{r^2} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &\quad + 2 \check{K} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + 2 \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} (\check{K}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \check{K} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} &= O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-3}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ 2 \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} (\check{K}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} &= O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-4}) \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.102). Thus, by Corollary 2.12, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim r^4 \|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + r^2 \|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} \\ &\lesssim r^4 \|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\mathcal{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*}\mathcal{d}_1^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + O(\epsilon) \|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+2}(S)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r^4 \|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\mathcal{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*}\mathcal{d}_1^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.$$

Using (4.102), (4.103) and (4.104), we deduce

$$\|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \|C_2\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+3}(\mathbf{S})} + r^3 \|C_1\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \epsilon r^{-1} + E_{4+k} \lesssim \epsilon r^{-1}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|\mathcal{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r^4 \|C_3\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + r^3 \|C_1\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+3}(\mathbf{S})} + \epsilon r^{-1} + E_{4+k} \lesssim \epsilon r^{-1}.$$

Finally, recalling that $r\underline{\beta}^{\mathbf{S}} \in \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}$ is well-defined on a sphere, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*}\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim r^{-1} \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \epsilon + E_{4+k} \\ &\lesssim r^{-1} \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

as stated. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.27. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.28. We recall the following null structure equation, see Proposition 7.4.1 in [2],

$$\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = 2 \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} + 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}})^2 + 2\rho^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Making use of the GCM condition $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}} \left[\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} - 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}})^2 - 2\rho^{\mathbf{S}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}} \left[\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) - b^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} - 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}})^2 - 2\rho^{\mathbf{S}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}} \left[-2 \frac{e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) + b^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \left(\frac{1}{2} (\kappa^{\mathbf{S}})^2 + |\hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}|^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} - 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}})^2 - 2\rho^{\mathbf{S}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}} \left[-\frac{2e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}})}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} + b^{\mathbf{S}} |\hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} - 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}})^2 - 2\rho^{\mathbf{S}} \right] \\ &= -\frac{e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}})}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \frac{1}{4} b^{\mathbf{S}} r^{\mathbf{S}} |\hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{4} [-2 \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} - 2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}})^2 - 2\rho^{\mathbf{S}}], \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = 1, \quad \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}), \quad e_4^{\mathbf{S}}(\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) = -\frac{1}{2}(\kappa^{\mathbf{S}})^2 - |\hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}|^2.$$

Taking the average over \mathbf{S} , and recalling that $\mu^{\mathbf{S}} = -\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \zeta^{\mathbf{S}} - \rho^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and (4.116), we obtain

$$\overline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} = -\frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \overline{\check{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \overline{\mu^{\mathbf{S}} - (\eta^{\mathbf{S}})^2 + \frac{b^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} |\hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}|^2},$$

or

$$\overline{\check{\omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} = \overline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{m^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} = -\frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \overline{\check{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} + \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \left(\overline{\check{\mu}^{\mathbf{S}}} - \overline{\eta^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \eta^{\mathbf{S}}} + \overline{\frac{b^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\chi}^{\mathbf{S}}} \right).$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.28. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.29. We have from Proposition 4.22, (4.79) and (4.3) that

$$\left\| (\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (\check{b} - \overline{\check{b}}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \delta^{\circ} + r |D^{\mathbf{S}}| \lesssim r \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

which implies

$$\|\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} + r |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \|\check{b} - \overline{\check{b}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (4.112)$$

We have from Lemma 4.28 and (4.104)

$$\left| \overline{\check{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} \right| \lesssim r |\overline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}| + r^2 \left| \overline{\check{\mu}^{\mathbf{S}}} \right| + r^2 |\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}| \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Next, we have from Proposition 4.22, (4.78) and (4.3) that

$$\left\| \left(\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) - (\check{\underline{\Omega}} - \overline{\check{\underline{\Omega}}}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \delta^{\circ} + r |D^{\mathbf{S}}| \lesssim r \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

which implies

$$\|\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} + \left\| \check{\underline{\Omega}} - \overline{\check{\underline{\Omega}}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (4.113)$$

Finally, we have from (4.68) that

$$\begin{aligned} \check{z}^{\mathbf{S}} &= z^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 = -b^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 \\ &= -b^{\mathbf{S}} - 1 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} - \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - 1 + \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \\ &= -\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.114)$$

which implies from (4.112) and (4.113)

$$\|\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \|\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r\epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (4.115)$$

Combining (4.112), (4.113) and (4.115), this concludes the proof of Lemma 4.29. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.23.

Proof of Proposition 4.23. We start with the estimate of $\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}$. We first note that the GCM condition $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}$ together with the definition of the Hawking mass

$$\frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} = 1 + \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}$$

implies that,

$$\overline{\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}} = -\frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \quad (4.116)$$

where $\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}} = 1 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}$. Thus, in view of Lemma 4.17, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - 2 &= \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} = \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) \\ &= \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left(\underline{\check{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \left(\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - 1 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) \\ &= \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left(\underline{\check{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \frac{2\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) \\ &= \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\check{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}}} - 2z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}} + z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by $(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}$ and taking the average over \mathbf{S} , we infer

$$\overline{\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}} = \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \underline{\check{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}}}.$$

We write

$$\frac{1}{z^{\mathbf{S}}} = \frac{1}{2 + \check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}} = \frac{1}{2} + O(\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}),$$

and hence, recalling that $\overline{\underline{\check{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}}} = 0$, we infer

$$\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}} = \overline{O(\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}) \check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}} + r^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{O(\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}) \underline{\check{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}}}. \quad (4.117)$$

Combining Lemma 4.16 and (4.117), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}) &= (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ \overline{\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}} &= \overline{O(\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}})\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}} + r\Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 4.29 and (4.102), we deduce for $k \leq s_{max} - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-1}\|\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + r^2\|\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \mathring{\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.118)$$

Applying Lemma 2.10 to the equation

$$e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(z^{\mathbf{S}}) = (\zeta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta^{\mathbf{S}})z^{\mathbf{S}},$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-1}\|z^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{z}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \|(\zeta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta^{\mathbf{S}})z^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim \|(\zeta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta^{\mathbf{S}})\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \mathring{\epsilon} \\ &\lesssim \mathring{\epsilon} + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.119)$$

Next, we estimate $\overline{\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}}$. For this, we have from (4.114)

$$\overline{\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}} = -\overline{\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}} - \overline{\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}} = -D^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}}.$$

Then, applying (4.118), we obtain

$$|\overline{\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}}| \lesssim |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \|\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \mathring{\epsilon}.$$

By (4.119) and the above estimate, we conclude

$$r^{-1}\|\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \mathring{\epsilon}. \quad (4.120)$$

Finally, according to (4.114), we have

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-1}\|\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim r^{-1}\|\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1}\|\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \mathring{\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.121)$$

It remains to estimate $(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \check{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})$. Recall from Lemma 4.27 that, $\forall k \leq s_{max} - 5$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \mathring{\epsilon}r^{-1}, \\ \|\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},*}\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \mathring{\epsilon}r^{-1}, \\ \|\not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*}\omega^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \mathring{\epsilon}r^{-1} + r^{-1}\|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1}\|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+4}(\mathbf{S})}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the definition of $B^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and Lemma 2.11, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+5}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |(\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1}|, \\ \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+5}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |(\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}})_{\ell=1}|.\end{aligned}\tag{4.122}$$

Recall from Proposition 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} &= {}^* \rho^{\mathbf{S}} + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}}, \\ \operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}} &= \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying (4.102) and (4.104), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} &= r^{-3} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \\ \operatorname{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}} &= r^{-2} O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (4.122) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+5}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}|, \\ \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+5}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}|.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we have from Lemma 4.28 that

$$\begin{aligned}|\overline{\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}}| &\lesssim (r^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \|\overline{\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{S})} + \Gamma_g^{\mathbf{S}} + r^{\mathbf{S}} \|\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{S})}^2 \\ &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} + r^{-1} \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})}.\end{aligned}$$

Together with the above estimate for $\not{d}_1^{\mathbf{S},*} \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$ and Lemma 2.10, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + r |\overline{\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}}}| \\ &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}|, \quad k \leq s_{max} - 1,\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the statement 1 of Proposition 4.23.

We can then go back to the preliminary estimates (4.118), (4.120) and (4.121) obtained above to derive

$$\begin{aligned}r^{-1} \|\check{\underline{\Omega}}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}|, \\ r^{-1} \|\check{z}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}|, \\ r^{-1} \|\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{k+1}(\mathbf{S})} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| + \|\eta^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} + \|\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}|.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the remaining statements 2 and 3 of Proposition 4.23. \square

4.4 ODE system for $(\Psi, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$

The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition which provides an ODE system for $(\Psi, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda})$.

Proposition 4.30. *Let Σ a smooth spacelike hypersurface as in Definition 4.11. We define $r(s), B(s), \underline{B}(s)$ and $D(s)$ on $\mathbf{S} := \mathbf{S}(s) = \mathbf{S}[P(s)]$ as*

$$r(s) := r^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad B(s) := B^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad \underline{B}(s) := \underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}, \quad D(s) := \bar{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + 1 + \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}, \quad (4.123)$$

where $B^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}$ are given by (4.67).

Then we have the following equations for the functions $D(s), r(s)$ and the triplets $\Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), B(s), \underline{B}(s)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{-1 + \psi'(s)} \Lambda'(s) &= B(s) + G(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + N(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s), \\ \frac{1}{-1 + \psi'(s)} \underline{\Lambda}'(s) &= \underline{B}(s) + \underline{G}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + \underline{N}(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s), \\ \psi'(s) &= -\frac{1}{2} D(s) + H(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + M(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\psi(s) := \Psi(s) + s - c_0, \quad (4.124)$$

and $G, \underline{G}, H, N, \underline{N}, M$ satisfy the following properties:

- G, \underline{G} are $O(1)$ -Lipschitz functions of $(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$;
- H is a $O(1)$ -Lipschitz function of $(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$;
- M, N, \underline{N} are $O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})$ -Lipschitz functions of $(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$.

Before proving this proposition, we first study some properties of the derivation $\frac{d}{ds}$. Recall that, according to Section 4.1, we have

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_{p=\{S, N\}} \left\{ \Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) \middle/ s \geq \overset{\circ}{s}, (y_p^1)^2 + (y_p^2)^2 < 2 \right\}, \quad (4.125)$$

where the maps $\Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2)$, $p = S, N$ are defined in (4.62).

Definition 4.31. We define the vectorfield X_p along Σ as the push forward of $\frac{d}{ds}$ by Ξ_p , i.e, for every scalar function h , we define

$$X_p(h) := \frac{d}{ds} h(\Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2)). \quad (4.126)$$

Proposition 4.32. We have the following expression for X_p

$$X_p|_{(s, y_p^1, y_p^2)} = \left(\Psi'(s) + \check{A}_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) \right) \partial_u + \left(1 + \check{B}_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) \right) \partial_s,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \check{A}_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) &:= \partial_P U_p(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)) P'(s), \\ \check{B}_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) &:= \partial_P S_p(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)) P'(s), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_P U_p(\cdot) P'(s) &= \Psi'(s) \partial_u U_p(\cdot) + \partial_s U_p(\cdot) + \Lambda'(s) \cdot \partial_\Lambda U_p(\cdot) + \underline{\Lambda}'(s) \cdot \partial_{\underline{\Lambda}} U_p(\cdot) + \partial_J U_p \cdot J'(s), \\ \partial_P S_p(\cdot) P'(s) &= \Psi'(s) \partial_u S_p(\cdot) + \partial_s S_p(\cdot) + \Lambda'(s) \cdot \partial_\Lambda S_p(\cdot) + \underline{\Lambda}'(s) \cdot \partial_{\underline{\Lambda}} S_p(\cdot) + \partial_J S_p \cdot J'(s). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Clearly,

$$\partial_s \Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2) = \left(\Psi'(s) + \partial_P U_p(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)) P'(s), 1 + \partial_P S_p(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)) P'(s), 0, 0 \right).$$

Given a function on Σ , we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} h(\Xi_p(s, y_p^1, y_p^2)) &= \left(\Psi'(s) + \partial_P U_p(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)) P'(s) \right) \partial_u h \\ &\quad + \left(1 + \partial_P S_p(y_p^1, y_p^2, P(s)) P'(s) \right) \partial_s h \\ &= X_p(h), \end{aligned}$$

as stated. \square

Lemma 4.33. Let $\gamma(s)$ be the curve of the South Poles of the background²⁹ that intersect the spheres foliating Σ , i.e.

$$\gamma(s) = (\Psi(s), s, 0, 0) \quad (4.127)$$

in the south coordinates chart.

Then, for a function h defined on $\gamma(s)$:

$$h(s) := h(\Psi(s), s, 0, 0),$$

²⁹By the construction of GCM spheres in Theorem 3.1, the South poles of GCM spheres coincide with that of background spheres. Hence, we have $\gamma(s) \subset \Sigma$.

we have (recall $\nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$)

$$X|_{\gamma(s)}(h) = C(s)\nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)}(h), \quad (4.128)$$

where

$$C(s) = \frac{\lambda}{z}\Psi'(s)\Big|_{\gamma(s)} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + O(F^2), \quad (4.129)$$

and

$$F := (f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}), \quad \overset{\circ}{\lambda} = \lambda - 1.$$

Moreover, we have the following expression for $b^{\mathbf{S}}$:

$$b^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} = \frac{z - \underline{\Omega}\Psi'(s)}{\lambda^2\Psi'(s)}\Big|_{\gamma(s)} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + O(F^2). \quad (4.130)$$

Here $f, \underline{f}, \lambda$ are the transition coefficients and $z, \underline{\Omega}$ correspond to the background foliation.

Proof. Note that $U(0, 0, P(s)) = S(0, 0, P(s)) = 0$, so we have

$$\check{A}(s, 0, 0) = \check{B}(s, 0, 0) = 0$$

in Proposition 4.32. Thus, we have

$$X|_{\gamma(s)} = \Psi'(s)\partial_u + \partial_s.$$

Note that X is tangent to Σ . Thus, we have

$$\mathbf{g}(X, N^{\mathbf{S}})|_{\gamma(s)} = 0, \quad N^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} - b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}},$$

since the vectorfield $N^{\mathbf{S}}$ is normal to Σ . Now, applying (2.35), (2.24) and $Z^c \in \Gamma_b^{30}$, and recalling that $z = \frac{2}{\varsigma}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}(X, N^{\mathbf{S}}) &= \mathbf{g}(\Psi'(s)\partial_u + \partial_s, e_3^{\mathbf{S}} - b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}) \\ &= \mathbf{g}\left(\Psi'(s)\left(\frac{1}{z}e_3 - \frac{\underline{\Omega}}{z}e_4 - \frac{2}{z}Z^ce_c\right) + e_4, \lambda^{-1}e_3 + \lambda^{-1}\underline{f}^ce_c - b^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda e_4 + \lambda f^ce_c)\right) + O(F^2) \\ &= \mathbf{g}\left(\frac{\Psi'}{z}e_3 + \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\Omega}\Psi'}{z}\right)e_4 - \frac{2\Psi'Z^c}{z}e_c, \lambda^{-1}e_3 - \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4 + (\lambda^{-1}\underline{f}^c - \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}}f^c)e_c\right) + O(F^2) \\ &= -\frac{2}{\lambda}\left(1 - \frac{\underline{\Omega}\Psi'}{z}\right) + 2\lambda b^{\mathbf{S}}\frac{\Psi'}{z} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + O(F^2). \end{aligned}$$

³⁰See mentioned in Assumption **A3**.

Since $\mathbf{g}(X, N^{\mathbf{S}})|_{\gamma(s)} = 0$, we deduce

$$\left[-\frac{2}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\Omega}\Psi'}{z} \right) + 2\lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} \frac{\Psi'}{z} \right] \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = F \cdot \Gamma_b + O(F^2),$$

which implies

$$b^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} = \frac{z - \underline{\Omega}\Psi'}{\lambda^2 \Psi'} \Big|_{\gamma(s)} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + O(F^2),$$

as stated in (4.130).

In view of $\nu^{\mathbf{S}} = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$, (2.24) and (2.36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\mathbf{S}} &= e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &= \lambda^{-1} (e_3 + \underline{f}^b e_b) + b^{\mathbf{S}} \lambda (e_4 + f^b e_b) + O(F^2) \\ &= \lambda^{-1} e_3 + \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} e_4 + (\lambda^{-1} \underline{f}^c + \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} f^c) e_c + O(F^2) \\ &= \lambda^{-1} (z \partial_u + \underline{\Omega} \partial_s + 2 \underline{B}^a \partial_{y^a}) + \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} \partial_s + (\lambda^{-1} \underline{f}^c + \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} f^c) X_{(c)}^a \partial_{y^a} + O(F^2) \\ &= \frac{z}{\lambda} \partial_u + \left(\frac{\underline{\Omega}}{\lambda} + \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \partial_s + (2\lambda^{-1} \underline{B}^a + (\lambda^{-1} \underline{f}^c + \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} f^c) X_{(c)}^a) \partial_{y^a} + O(F^2). \end{aligned} \tag{4.131}$$

Applying (4.131) to a function $h(s) = h(\Psi(s), s, 0, 0)$, we obtain

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)}(h) = \frac{z}{\lambda} \partial_u(h) + \left(\frac{\underline{\Omega}}{\lambda} + \lambda b^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \partial_s(h). \tag{4.132}$$

Recalling (4.130) and comparing (4.132) to $X|_{\gamma(s)} = \Psi'(s) \partial_u + \partial_s$, we obtain

$$X|_{\gamma(s)}(h) = C(s) \nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)}(h),$$

where

$$C(s) = \frac{\lambda}{z} \Psi'(s) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} + F \cdot \Gamma_b + O(F^2),$$

as stated in (4.128). This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.33. \square

Now, we derive the following equations for $\Lambda(s)$ and $\underline{\Lambda}(s)$.

Lemma 4.34. *We have the following identities*

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)}\Lambda(s) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \Lambda(s) + E(s), \\ \nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)}\underline{\Lambda}(s) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + \underline{E}(s),\end{aligned}\tag{4.133}$$

with error terms³¹

$$\begin{aligned}E(s) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \\ &\quad + z^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) \left(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f \right) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}, \\ \underline{E}(s) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \\ &\quad + z^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) \left(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}) - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} + \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} \right) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. According to Lemma 4.17 we have

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} h \right) = z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(h) + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) h \right).$$

Thus, choosing $h = (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)}(\Lambda) &= \nu^{\mathbf{S}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}((\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} b^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \left(b^{\mathbf{S}} + 1 + \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) - \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} (-\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}} + 2) - \frac{2\Upsilon^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \\ &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}.\end{aligned}$$

³¹For a scalar function h defined on \mathbf{S} , $h - h|_{\gamma(s)}$ is the scalar function define on \mathbf{S} by subtracting its value at South pole $\gamma(s)$.

Since $\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) = 0$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)}(\Lambda) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} (\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}})(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) \\
&\quad + z^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) (\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}})(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \breve{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \breve{\underline{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right) \\
&\quad + z^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) \left(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \breve{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \breve{\underline{\kappa}}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f \right) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S},p)} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \Lambda(s) + E(s),
\end{aligned}$$

as stated. The proof for $\underline{\Lambda}(s)$ is similar and left to the reader. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.34. \square

Recall that in Proposition 4.23 we have made the auxiliary assumption (4.101), i.e.

$$|B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}| \leq \epsilon^{\circ \frac{2}{3}}.$$

Moreover, recalling the definition (4.67) of $D^{\mathbf{S}}$ and (4.123) of $D(s)$ and applying Assumption **A1** and (4.5), we have

$$\left| \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} \right| \lesssim \left| \overline{\breve{z} + \breve{\underline{\Omega}}} \right| + \delta^{\circ} \lesssim \epsilon^{\circ} + \delta^{\circ} \lesssim \epsilon^{\circ}.$$

Recall from (2.55) that

$$|m - m^{\mathbf{S}}| \lesssim \delta^{\circ},$$

thus, we obtain

$$|D^{\mathbf{S}} - D(s)| = \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} |m^{\mathbf{S}} - m_{(0)}| \lesssim \frac{1}{r} |m - m_{(0)}| \lesssim \epsilon^{\circ},$$

so we have the estimate

$$|B(s)| + |\underline{B}(s)| + |D(s)| \lesssim \epsilon^{\circ \frac{2}{3}}.$$

The following notation is very useful in the proof of Proposition 4.30.

Definition 4.35. For a function h of $(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$, we denote

$$h = \text{Good},$$

if

$$h = O(\epsilon^\circ), \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial v} = O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}\circ}), \quad \forall v \in \{B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi\}.$$

Lemma 4.36. We have

$$\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(F \cdot \Gamma_b) = r^{-2} \text{Good}, \quad F \cdot F = r^{-2} \text{Good}, \quad \text{Err}_1 = r^{-2} \text{Good}, \quad (4.134)$$

where Err_1 is defined in Definition 2.24 and Good is defined in Definition 4.35. We also have

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\text{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) \cdot \Gamma_b = r^{-3} \text{Good}. \quad (4.135)$$

Finally, for the following background quantities, we have

$$\left(\int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\text{div } \eta) J^{(p)}, \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\text{div } \underline{\xi}) J^{(p)}, \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} \Delta(\tilde{\kappa}) J^{(p)} \right) = \text{Good}, \quad (4.136)$$

and

$$\overline{z + \underline{\Omega}} - 1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} = \text{Good}. \quad (4.137)$$

Proof. Notice that (4.134) is a direct consequence of Definitions 2.24, 4.35, Assumption A1 and (3.6).

Since $\text{div } \eta$, $\text{div } \underline{\xi}$, $\Delta(\tilde{\kappa})$ and $J^{(p)}$ only depend on the background foliation, the quantities in (4.136) only depend on ψ . Recalling (4.104), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\psi \left(\int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\text{div } \eta) J^{(p)} \right) &= \partial_u \left(\int_{S(u, s)} (\text{div } \eta) J^{(p)} \right) \\ &= \partial_u \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}} \sqrt{\det \mathbf{g}(s)} (\text{div } \eta) J^{(p)} dy^1 dy^2 \right) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}} \partial_u (\sqrt{\det \mathbf{g}(s)} J^{(p)}) (\text{div } \eta) dy^1 dy^2 + \int_{S(u, s)} \partial_u (\text{div } \eta) J^{(p)} \\ &= r \mathfrak{d}(\Gamma_b) + r \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 2}(\Gamma_b) = O(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}\circ}). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling from (4.3) that $(\operatorname{div} \eta)_{\ell=1} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta})$, we conclude

$$\int_{S(u,s)} (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} = \text{Good}.$$

Similarly, using (4.3) and (4.2), we have

$$\int_{S(u,s)} (\operatorname{div} \xi) J^{(p)} = \text{Good}, \quad \int_{S(u,s)} (\Delta \check{\kappa}) J^{(p)} = \text{Good}.$$

This concludes (4.136).

Next, Recall that (4.5) implies

$$\overline{z + \underline{\Omega}} - 1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}).$$

Since $z, \underline{\Omega}, r$ only depends on the background foliation, $\overline{z + \underline{\Omega}} - 1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r}$ only depends on ψ . We have

$$\partial_u \left(\overline{z + \underline{\Omega}} - 1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} \right) = r \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} \Gamma_b = O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

which implies (4.137).

We have from Proposition 4.22 that

$$\|\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |B^{\mathbf{S}}| + |\underline{B}^{\mathbf{S}}| + |D^{\mathbf{S}}|, \quad (4.138)$$

Applying Lemma 2.4, (4.134) and (4.138), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) &= [\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}] f + \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f) \\ &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f + r^{-1} \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1} f + r^{-1} \mathfrak{J}^{\leq 1}(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f) \\ &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) + r^{-1} \mathfrak{J}^{\leq 1}(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f) + r^{-2} \text{Good}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) \cdot \Gamma_b &= r^{-1} \mathfrak{J}^{\leq 1}(f) \cdot \Gamma_b + r^{-1} \mathfrak{J}^{\leq 1}(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f) \cdot \Gamma_b + r^{-3} \text{Good} \\ &= r^{-3} \text{Good}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.134) and (4.138). This concludes the proof of (4.135), and hence concludes the proof of Lemma 4.36. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.30.

Proof of Proposition 4.30. Step 1 Firstly, we prove the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} &= 2B(s) + 3r^{-1}\Lambda(s) - r^{-1}\underline{\Lambda}(s) + \Lambda(s)O(r^{-2}) + \text{Good}, \\ \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} &= 2\underline{B}(s) + 5r^{-1}\underline{\Lambda}(s) + r^{-1}\Lambda(s) + O(r^{-2})(\Lambda(s) + \underline{\Lambda}(s)) + \text{Good}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.139)$$

In order to prove the first identity in (4.139), we write

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) = [\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}]f + \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} f),$$

According to (4.72), Proposition 4.23 and Lemma 4.36, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} f) &= \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \left(2(\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) - \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\underline{f} + b^{\mathbf{S}} f) + 2f\underline{\omega} \right) + r^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(F \cdot \Gamma_b) + \text{l. o. t.} \\ &= 2\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - 2\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta - \frac{1}{r}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\underline{f} - \frac{b^{\mathbf{S}}}{r}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + \frac{2m}{r^2}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + r^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(F \cdot \Gamma_b) + \text{l. o. t.} \\ &= 2\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - 2\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta - \frac{1}{r}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\underline{f} + \frac{1}{r}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + \frac{4m}{r^2}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + r^{-3}\text{Good}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by Lemma 2.4 and (4.138), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}]f &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + \Gamma_b \cdot \nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}} f + r^{-1}\Gamma_b \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}f + \text{l. o. t.} \\ &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + r^{-3}\text{Good}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling from Lemma 2.22 that $|r^{\mathbf{S}} - r| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}$, we obtain

$$\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) = 2\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - 2\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\eta - \frac{1}{r}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}\underline{f} + \frac{3}{r}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + \frac{4m}{r^2}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + r^{-3}\text{Good}. \quad (4.140)$$

Thus, recalling from Lemma 2.22 that $|m^{\mathbf{S}} - m| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = 2B(s) - 2 \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + \left(\frac{1}{3r} + \frac{4m}{r^2} \right) \Lambda(s) - \frac{1}{r} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + r^{-1} \text{Good}.$$

We claim that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} \right| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.141)$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} \right| \\
& \lesssim \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta - \operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} \operatorname{div} \eta (J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - J^{(p)}) \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} - \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term can be estimated by Lemma 2.22. The second term can be estimated by (4.23). The last term can be estimated by Lemma 2.23. Hence,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} \right| \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2} \circ} \delta.$$

Recalling its structure and Definition 4.35, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} = \text{Good}.$$

Applying (4.136), we deduce

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = \text{Good}. \quad (4.142)$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} \nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = 2B(s) + 3r^{-1} \Lambda(s) - r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + \Lambda(s) O(r^{-2}) + \text{Good}.$$

Similarly, starting with

$$\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}(\underline{f}) = 2(\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\xi}) - \frac{1}{2} \underline{f} \underline{\kappa} - 2\underline{\omega}(\underline{f} - b^{\mathbf{S}} f) + b^{\mathbf{S}} \left(2\nabla^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2} \underline{f} \underline{\kappa} \right) + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.},$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} \nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} &= 2\underline{B}(s) - 2 \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + 4r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + 2 \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \lambda) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \\
&\quad + O(r^{-2})(\Lambda(s) + \underline{\Lambda}(s)) + r^{-1} \text{Good}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (4.141), we can prove

$$\left| \int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\operatorname{div} \underline{\xi}) J^{(p)} \right| \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2} \circ} \delta, \quad (4.143)$$

and thus,

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \int_{S(\Psi(s), s)} (\operatorname{div} \underline{\xi}) J^{(p)} = \text{Good}.$$

Applying (4.136), we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\xi}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = \text{Good}.$$

Next, we recall the transformation formula for κ in Proposition 2.14:

$$\lambda^{-1} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = \kappa + \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}$$

Applying Definition 4.35 and Lemma 4.36, recalling $\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}$ and from Lemma 2.22 that $|r - r^{\mathbf{S}}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \overset{\circ}{\lambda} &= \lambda - 1 = \frac{\kappa^{\mathbf{S}}}{\kappa + \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + F \cdot \Gamma_b + \text{l. o. t.}} - 1 \\ &= \frac{\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}}{\frac{2}{r} + \check{\kappa} + \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \text{Good}} - 1 \\ &= \frac{r}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \left(1 - \frac{r}{2} \check{\kappa} - \frac{r}{2} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \text{Good} \right) - 1 \\ &= \frac{r - r^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} - \frac{r^2}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{\kappa} - \frac{r^2}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \text{Good} \\ &= \frac{r - r^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} - \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \check{\kappa} - \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \text{Good}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} &= \frac{1}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} (r - r^{\mathbf{S}}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} (\check{\kappa}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \\ &\quad - \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + \text{Good}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.144}$$

Similary as (4.141) and applying (4.136), we obtain

$$\frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} (\check{\kappa}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = \text{Good}.$$

Applying Proposition 2.8 and Lemma 2.22, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(f) \Delta^{\mathbf{S}} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \\ &= -\frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} + \text{Good} \\ &= -\frac{2}{r^2} \Lambda(s) + \text{Good}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (2.57), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \Delta^{\mathbf{S}}(r - r^{\mathbf{S}}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \left(\underline{f} - \Upsilon f + \operatorname{Err}_1[\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{b}] \right) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \underline{\Lambda}(s) - \frac{1}{2} \Lambda(s) + O(r^{-2}) \Lambda(s) + r \operatorname{Good}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (4.144) we deduce

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} (\Delta^{\mathbf{S}} \overset{\circ}{\lambda}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = \frac{1}{2r} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + \frac{1}{2r} \Lambda(s) + O(r^{-2}) \Lambda(s) + \operatorname{Good}.$$

Finally, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}(s)} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = 2\underline{B}(s) + 5r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + r^{-1} \Lambda(s) + O(r^{-2})(\Lambda(s) + \underline{\Lambda}(s)) + \operatorname{Good}.$$

This concludes the proof of (4.139).

Step 2 Now, we prove that the error terms $E(s), \underline{E}(s)$ defined in Lemma 4.34 satisfy

$$E(s) = \operatorname{Good}, \quad \underline{E}(s) = \operatorname{Good}. \quad (4.145)$$

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} E(s) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \\ &\quad + z^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) \left(\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f \right) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) = r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(f), \quad (4.146)$$

we obtain from Lemma 4.36

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = \operatorname{Good}. \quad (4.147)$$

Also, since $z^{\mathbf{S}} = 2 + r\Gamma_b$ and

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) \left(-\frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f + \left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f \right) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = r^{-1} \Gamma_b \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(f),$$

we obtain from Lemma 4.36 that

$$z^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) \left(-\frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \check{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} \right) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = \text{Good}. \quad (4.148)$$

Next, recalling $z^{\mathbf{S}} = 2 + r\Gamma_b$ and applying Lemma 4.36, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} \left((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} - (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}|_{\gamma(s)} \right) \nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = \text{Good}. \quad (4.149)$$

Combining (4.147), (4.148) and (4.149), we deduce

$$E(s) = \text{Good}$$

as stated. The proof for $\underline{E}(s)$ is similar and left to the reader. This concludes the proof of (4.145).

Step 3 Recall from (4.133) that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \Lambda(s) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \Lambda(s) + E(s), \\ \nu^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} \underline{\Lambda}(s) &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} \nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} - \frac{4}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + \underline{E}(s). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (4.128), (4.139) and (4.145), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Psi'(s)} \Lambda'(s) &= \frac{C(s)}{\Psi'(s)} (2B(s) - r^{-1} \Lambda(s) - r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + O(r^{-2}) \Lambda(s) + \text{Good}), \\ \frac{1}{\Psi'(s)} \underline{\Lambda}'(s) &= \frac{C(s)}{\Psi'(s)} (2\underline{B}(s) + r^{-1} \Lambda(s) + r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + O(r^{-2}) (\Lambda(s) + \underline{\Lambda}(s)) + \text{Good}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $z = 2 + O(\epsilon^\circ)$ and also $\lambda = 1 + O(r^{-1} \delta^\circ)$, thus, in view of (4.129)

$$\frac{C(s)}{\Psi'(s)} = \left(\frac{\lambda}{z} \right) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} + O(\delta^\circ) = \frac{1 + O(r^{-1} \delta^\circ)}{2 + O(\epsilon^\circ)} + O(\delta^\circ) = \frac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon^\circ).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Psi'(s)} \Lambda'(s) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon^\circ) \right) (2B(s) - r^{-1} \Lambda(s) - r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + \Lambda(s) O(r^{-2}) + \text{Good}) \\ &= B(s) - \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} \Lambda(s) - \frac{1}{2} r^{-1} \underline{\Lambda}(s) + \Lambda(s) O(r^{-2}) + \text{Good}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})B(s) = \text{Good}.$$

Recalling that $\Psi(s) = -s + \psi(s) + c_0$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{-1 + \psi'(s)} \Lambda'(s) = B(s) + G(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + N(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s)$$

where

$$G(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) = -\frac{1}{2}r^{-1}\Lambda(s) - \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}\underline{\Lambda}(s) + O(r^{-2})\Lambda(s), \quad N = \text{Good},$$

verify the properties mentioned in Proposition 4.30.

In the same manner, we derive

$$\frac{1}{-1 + \psi'(s)} \underline{\Lambda}'(s) = \underline{B}(s) + \underline{G}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + \underline{N}(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s),$$

where

$$\underline{G}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) = \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}\Lambda(s) + \frac{1}{2}r^{-1}\underline{\Lambda}(s) + O(r^{-2})(\Lambda(s) + \underline{\Lambda}(s)), \quad \underline{N} = \text{Good},$$

verify the properties mentioned in Proposition 4.30.

Step 4 It remains to derive the equation of $\psi'(s)$. In view of (4.130) and Lemma 4.36, we have

$$\Psi'(s) = \left[\frac{z}{\lambda^2 b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} \right] \Big|_{\gamma(s)} + \text{Good}. \quad (4.150)$$

By Definition 4.35, $z^{\mathbf{S}} = 2 + r\Gamma_b$, $b^{\mathbf{S}} = -1 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + r\Gamma_b$ and $\underline{\Omega} = -\Upsilon + r\Gamma_b$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{z}{\lambda^2 b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} &= \frac{z}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + (\lambda^2 - 1)b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} = \frac{z}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{(\lambda^2 - 1)b^{\mathbf{S}}}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}}} \right) \\ &= \frac{z}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} - \frac{2z\overset{\circ}{\lambda}b^{\mathbf{S}}}{(b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega})^2} + \text{Good} \\ &= \frac{z}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} - \frac{4\overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(-1 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right)}{\left(-2 - \frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \frac{2m}{r} \right)^2} + \text{Good} \\ &= \frac{z}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} + \overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{r} \right) + \text{Good}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\psi'(s) = \Psi'(s) + 1 = \left[\frac{b^{\mathbf{S}} + z + \underline{\Omega}}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} \right] \Big|_{\gamma(s)} + \overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{r} \right) + \text{Good}.$$

Recall that

$$\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} = D(s) - 1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}.$$

Applying (4.137), we infer³²

$$\begin{aligned} (b^{\mathbf{S}} + z + \underline{\Omega})|_{\gamma(s)} &= (b^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}})|_{\gamma(s)} + \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} + (z + \underline{\Omega} - \overline{z + \underline{\Omega}})|_{\gamma(s)} + \overline{z + \underline{\Omega}} \\ &= D(s) - \left(\frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} \right) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} + (\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}})|_{\gamma(s)} \\ &\quad + (z + \underline{\Omega} - \overline{z + \underline{\Omega}})|_{\gamma(s)} + \text{Good} \\ &= D(s) + H_1(s) + H_2(s) + H_3(s) + \text{Good}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) &:= \left(\frac{2m_{(0)}}{r} - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \right) \Big|_{\gamma(s)}, \\ H_2(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) &:= (\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\check{b}^{\mathbf{S}}})|_{\gamma(s)}, \\ H_3(s) &:= (z + \underline{\Omega} - \overline{z + \underline{\Omega}})|_{\gamma(s)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.14) and Assumption **A1**, we deduce that H_1 is $O(1)$ -Lipschitz on $(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$.

We then consider $H_2 = (b^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}})|_{\gamma(s)}$. Applying Lemma 4.16, we obtain

$$e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(b^{\mathbf{S}}) = (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Taking another choice of $(\tilde{\Lambda}, \tilde{\underline{\Lambda}}, \tilde{\psi})$, we construct by Definition 4.11 another hypersurface $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Denoting \tilde{X} the associated quantity of X on $\tilde{\Sigma}$, we have for $a = 1, 2$:³³

$$e_a^{\mathbf{S}}(b^{\mathbf{S}}) - e_a^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}}(\tilde{b}^{\mathbf{S}}) = (\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta_a^{\mathbf{S}})(b^{\mathbf{S}} - \tilde{b}^{\mathbf{S}}) + \left((\zeta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \tilde{\zeta}_a^{\mathbf{S}}) - (\eta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \tilde{\eta}_a^{\mathbf{S}}) \right) \tilde{b}^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \tilde{\underline{\xi}}_a^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.13, (3.12) and elliptic estimate, we deduce

$$(b^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (\tilde{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{\tilde{b}^{\mathbf{S}}}) = O(r) \left(\eta_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \tilde{\eta}_a^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{S}} - \tilde{\underline{\xi}}_a^{\mathbf{S}} \right) + O(1)(\Lambda - \tilde{\Lambda}, \underline{\Lambda} - \tilde{\underline{\Lambda}}, \psi - \tilde{\psi}).$$

³²Recall that $\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}$ is the average of $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ over \mathbf{S} while $\overline{z + \underline{\Omega}}$ is the average of $z + \underline{\Omega}$ on $S(\Psi(s), s)$.

³³Recall that we extended $r^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $u^{\mathbf{S}}$ to \mathcal{R} in Definition 4.11. Thus, $z^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$ are well defined in \mathcal{R} by (4.65) and hence $b^{\mathbf{S}}$ is also well defined in \mathcal{R} by $b^{\mathbf{S}} = -z^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}$.

which implies that $b^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}$ is $O(r)$ -dependent on $\eta^{\mathbf{S}}$ and $\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}$. Next, we proceed as in the proofs of Lemma 4.27 and Proposition 4.23 to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},\star} \eta_{ab}^{\mathbf{S}} - \widetilde{\not{d}_2^{\mathbf{S},\star} \eta_{ab}^{\mathbf{S}}} &= O(r^{-1})(\Lambda - \widetilde{\Lambda}, \underline{\Lambda} - \widetilde{\underline{\Lambda}}, \psi - \widetilde{\psi}), \\ \text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \widetilde{\text{curl}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}} &= O(r^{-1})(\Lambda - \widetilde{\Lambda}, \underline{\Lambda} - \widetilde{\underline{\Lambda}}, \psi - \widetilde{\psi}). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemmas 2.11, 2.13 and 2.22, we deduce that

$$(b^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}) - (\widetilde{b^{\mathbf{S}}} - \widetilde{\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}}) = O(1)(B - \widetilde{B}, \underline{B} - \widetilde{\underline{B}}, \Lambda - \widetilde{\Lambda}, \underline{\Lambda} - \widetilde{\underline{\Lambda}}, \psi - \widetilde{\psi}).$$

Thus, H_2 is $O(1)$ -Lipschitz on $(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$ but independent on D . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \frac{2m_{(0)}(r^{\mathbf{S}} - r)}{rr^{\mathbf{S}}} = r^{-2}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}), \\ H_2 &= b^{\mathbf{S}} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} = \check{b}^{\mathbf{S}} - \widetilde{\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}} = O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}), \\ H_3 &= r\Gamma_b = O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega})|_{\gamma(s)} &= D(s) - 1 - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} + \left(b^{\mathbf{S}}|_{\gamma(s)} - \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}\right) + \check{\underline{\Omega}}|_{\gamma(s)} - \Upsilon|_{\gamma(s)} \\ &= D(s) - 2 + H_2(s) + H_4(s), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_4(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) := \left(\frac{2m}{r} - \frac{2m_{(0)}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\right)|_{\gamma(s)} + \check{\underline{\Omega}}|_{\gamma(s)}.$$

By Assumption **A2**, (3.8), (3.10) and (3.11), we have

$$H_4(s) = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}) + r\Gamma_b = O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}).$$

Remark that $H_4(s)$ is $O(1)$ -Lipschitz on $(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$.

Then, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi'(s) &= \frac{b^{\mathbf{S}} + z + \underline{\Omega}}{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}} \Big|_{\gamma(s)} + \overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{r} \right) + \text{Good} \\
&= \frac{D(s) + H_1(s) + H_2(s) + H_3(s) + \text{Good}}{D(s) - 2 + H_2(s) + H_4(s)} + \overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{r} \right) + \text{Good} \\
&= (D(s) + H_1(s) + H_2(s) + H_3(s) + \text{Good}) \left(-\frac{1}{2} + O(D(s), H_2(s), H_4(s)) \right) \\
&\quad + \overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{r} \right) + \text{Good} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}D(s) - \frac{1}{2}(H_1(s) + H_2(s) + H_3(s)) + O(\mathbf{H}(s)^2) + \overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{r} \right) \\
&\quad + O(D(s)\mathbf{H}(s)) + O(D(s)^2) + \text{Good},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}(s) := (H_1(s), H_2(s), H_3(s), H_4(s))$$

is $O(1)$ -Lipschitz on $(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$. Thus, we can write

$$\psi'(s) = -\frac{1}{2}D(s) + H(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + M(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
H(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) &= -\frac{1}{2}(H_1(s) + H_2(s) + H_3(s)) + O(\mathbf{H}(s)^2) + \overset{\circ}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{r} \right), \\
M(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) &= O(D(s)\mathbf{H}(s)) + O(D(s)^2) + \text{Good},
\end{aligned}$$

verify the properties stated in Proposition 4.30. This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.30. \square

4.5 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Step 1. From Proposition 4.30, we have the following closed system of equations in $(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{-1 + \psi'(s)} \Lambda'(s) &= B(s) + G(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + N(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s), \\
\frac{1}{-1 + \psi'(s)} \underline{\Lambda}'(s) &= \underline{B}(s) + \underline{G}(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + \underline{N}(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s), \\
\psi'(s) &= -\frac{1}{2}D(s) + H(B, \underline{B}, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s) + M(B, \underline{B}, D, \Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)(s),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.151}$$

with initial conditions

$$\psi(\overset{\circ}{s}) = 0, \quad \Lambda(\overset{\circ}{s}) = \Lambda_0, \quad \underline{\Lambda}(\overset{\circ}{s}) = \underline{\Lambda}_0, \quad (4.152)$$

see Proposition 4.30 for the properties of $G, \underline{G}, H, N, \underline{N}, M$.

The system (4.151) is verified for all hypersurface Σ as in Definition 4.11, and hence for any choice of $(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$. We now make a suitable choice to obtain the GCM hypersurface Σ_0 .

Consider in particular the system obtained from (4.151) by setting B, \underline{B}, D to zero, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{-1 + \check{\psi}'(s)} \check{\Lambda}'(s) &= G(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s) + \check{N}(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s), \\ \frac{1}{-1 + \check{\psi}'(s)} \check{\underline{\Lambda}}'(s) &= \underline{G}(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s) + \check{\underline{N}}(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s), \\ \check{\psi}'(s) &= H(0, 0, \check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s) + \check{M}(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s), \end{aligned} \quad (4.153)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \check{N}(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s) &:= N(0, 0, 0, \check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s), \\ \check{\underline{N}}(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s) &:= \underline{N}(0, 0, 0, \check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s), \\ \check{M}(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s) &:= M(0, 0, 0, \check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})(s). \end{aligned}$$

We initialize the system at $s = \overset{\circ}{s}$ as in (4.152), i.e.

$$\check{\psi}(\overset{\circ}{s}) = 0, \quad \check{\Lambda}(\overset{\circ}{s}) = \Lambda_0, \quad \check{\underline{\Lambda}}(\overset{\circ}{s}) = \underline{\Lambda}_0.$$

Proposition 4.30 implies that $G, \underline{G}, H, \check{N}, \check{\underline{N}}, \check{M}$ are $O(1)$ -Lipschitz functions of $(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})$. Applying Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem, we deduce that the system admit a unique solution $(\check{\Lambda}(s), \check{\underline{\Lambda}}(s), \check{\psi}(s))$ defined in a small neighborhood $\overset{\circ}{I}$ of $\overset{\circ}{s}$, which satisfies

$$|(\check{\Lambda}(s), \check{\underline{\Lambda}}(s), \check{\psi}(s))| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}.$$

The desired hypersurface Σ_0 is given from this solution $(\check{\Lambda}(s), \check{\underline{\Lambda}}(s), \check{\psi}(s))$ by:

$$\Sigma_0 := \bigcup_{s \in \overset{\circ}{I}} \mathbf{S}[\check{\psi}(s), s, \check{\Lambda}(s), \check{\underline{\Lambda}}(s)].$$

Step 2. Next, we show that the functions B, \underline{B}, D vanish on the hypersurface Σ_0 defined above. Since the system (4.151) is verified for all functions and triplets $(\Lambda, \underline{\Lambda}, \psi)$ and

in particular by $(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})$, and since $(\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi})$ satisfies (4.153), we deduce, taking the difference of (4.151) and (4.153),

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2}\check{D}(s) + H(\check{B}, \check{\underline{B}}, \check{P})(s) + M(\check{B}, \check{B}, \check{D}, \check{P})(s) &= H(0, 0, \check{P})(s) + M(0, 0, 0, \check{P})(s), \\ \check{B}(s) + N(\check{B}, \check{\underline{B}}, \check{D}, \check{P})(s) &= N(0, 0, 0, \check{P})(s), \\ \check{\underline{B}}(s) + \underline{N}(\check{B}, \check{\underline{B}}, \check{D}, \check{P})(s) &= \underline{N}(0, 0, 0, \check{P})(s), \end{aligned} \quad (4.154)$$

where

$$\check{P} := (\check{\Lambda}, \check{\underline{\Lambda}}, \check{\psi}).$$

The first equation and the properties of M and H stated in Proposition 4.30 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |\check{D}(s)| &\lesssim |H(\check{B}, \check{\underline{B}}, \check{P})(s) - H(0, 0, \check{P})(s)| + |M(\check{B}, \check{\underline{B}}, \check{D}, \check{P})(s) - M(0, 0, 0, \check{P})(s)| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{B}(s)| + \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{\underline{B}}(s)| + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{D}(s)|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supreme over $\overset{\circ}{I}$, for $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough, we obtain

$$\sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{D}(s)| \lesssim \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{B}(s)| + \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{\underline{B}}(s)|. \quad (4.155)$$

The properties of N, \underline{N} imply, together with (4.155), that

$$\begin{aligned} |N(\check{B}, \check{\underline{B}}, \check{D}, \check{P})(s) - N(0, 0, 0, \check{P})(s)| &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{B}(s)| + \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{\underline{B}}(s)| \right), \\ |\underline{N}(\check{B}, \check{\underline{B}}, \check{D}, \check{P})(s) - \underline{N}(0, 0, 0, \check{P})(s)| &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{B}(s)| + \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{\underline{B}}(s)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the second and third equations of (4.154) imply that

$$\sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{B}(s)| + \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{\underline{B}}(s)| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{B}(s)| + \sup_{\overset{\circ}{I}} |\check{\underline{B}}(s)| \right),$$

and thus, for $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough,

$$\check{B} = 0, \quad \check{\underline{B}} = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_0. \quad (4.156)$$

Finally, (4.155) and (4.156) imply that

$$\check{D} = 0, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_0. \quad (4.157)$$

In view of the definition of B , \underline{B} and D , this implies that the desired identities (4.12) and (4.16) hold on Σ_0 .

Step 3. Σ_0 satisfies the statements 1,2,4,5 of Theorem 4.1 by Proposition 4.13. Also, it satisfies the statements 3,6 of Theorem 4.1 by Step 2. Thus, it only remains to derive the estimates in the statement 7 which we recall below for convenience:

$$\|(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{s})} + \|\mathfrak{d}(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{s})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.158)$$

To this end, we first apply Proposition 4.22 to obtain

$$\|F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{s})} + \|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}} F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{s})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad (4.159)$$

where we used (4.156) and (4.157). Next, we recall the following null transformation formulae (4.73)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-2} \xi^{\mathbf{S}} &= \xi + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_{\lambda^{-1} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f + r^{-1} O(F) + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \zeta^{\mathbf{S}} &= \zeta - \nabla^{\mathbf{S}} (\log \lambda) + r^{-1} O(F) + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \underline{\eta}^{\mathbf{S}} &= \underline{\eta} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_{\lambda^{-1} e_4^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{f} + r^{-1} O(F) + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ \lambda^{-1} \omega^{\mathbf{S}} &= \omega - \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{-1} e_4^{\mathbf{S}} (\log \lambda) + r^{-1} O(F) + \text{l. o. t.}, \end{aligned}$$

where l. o. t. denotes terms decay better. Combining with (4.14), we deduce

$$\|\nabla_{e_4^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{s})} \lesssim r^{-1} \|F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{s})} \lesssim r^{-1} \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.160)$$

Then, we have from (4.159) and (4.160)

$$\|\nabla_{e_3^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{s})} \lesssim \|\nabla_{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{s})} + \|b^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{e_4^{\mathbf{S}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}}(\mathbf{s})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.161)$$

Combining (4.159), (4.160) and (4.161), we obtain (4.158) as stated. This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

4.6 Proof of Corollary 4.2

Step 1. Consider first the simpler case where

$$\|(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{s}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta},$$

so that the estimates (4.87) holds true for \mathbf{S}_0 . We then proceed exactly as Proposition 4.22 to derive the estimates for $\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}_0}(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ for our distinguished sphere \mathbf{S}_0 . Note that \mathbf{S}_0 can be viewed as a deformation of the unique background sphere sharing the same south pole. In the sequel, we denote

$$\mathbf{S} := \mathbf{S}_0, \quad \nu := \nu^{\mathbf{S}} = \nu^{\mathbf{S}_0}.$$

The proof of the estimates for $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ in the cases $l \geq 2$ is similar so we only provide a sketch:

1. Elliptic estimates.

We commute the GCM system (4.84) by $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)$ and obtain the analog of (4.88) for $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l F$. All the commutators can be estimated by Lemma 2.4 as before, remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}([\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}]f) &= \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}\left(\frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(f)\right) + \text{l. o. t.} \\ &= \nu\left(\frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\right)(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f) + \frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}f) \\ &\quad + \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}}) \cdot \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(f) + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^2(f) + \text{l. o. t.} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in the cases $l \geq 2$, we obtain the new terms $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})$ from the commutators. Notice also that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^2\left(\frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\overset{\circ}{\lambda}\right) &= \frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\nu^2(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) + 2\nu\left(\frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\right)\nu(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) + \nu^2\left(\frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\right)\overset{\circ}{\lambda} \\ &= \frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\nu^2(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) + r^{-2}\nu(F) - 2\nu\left(\frac{b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}}{(r\mathbf{S})^2}\right)\overset{\circ}{\lambda} \\ &= \frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}}\nu^2(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) + r^{-2}\nu(F) + r^{-2}\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}} + \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})F + r^{-3}F. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (4.70), in the cases $l \geq 2$, we have the new terms $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})$ in

the R.H.S. of the analog of (4.88) for $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)$. Applying Proposition 3.4, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(f, \underline{f}), \nu^l(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) - \overline{\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{\lambda})}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l f)_{\ell=1}| + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l \underline{f})_{\ell=1}| \\
& + \overset{\circ}{\delta} r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|\nu^{j-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \overset{\circ}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^l \|\nu^{j-1}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \right), \tag{4.162}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& r \left| \overline{\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{\lambda})}^{\mathbf{S}} \right| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l f)_{\ell=1}| + |(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l \underline{f})_{\ell=1}| + |b_0^{(l)}| \\
& + \overset{\circ}{\delta} r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|\nu^{j-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \overset{\circ}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^l \|\nu^{j-1}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \right), \tag{4.163}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$b_0^{(l)} := \overline{\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})}^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.10 for the equation of $\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b}) - \overline{\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})}^{\mathbf{S}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r \|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \|\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + \overset{\circ}{\delta} r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|\nu^{j-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \overset{\circ}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^l \|\nu^{j-1}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})}. \tag{4.164}
\end{aligned}$$

2. Estimates for the $\ell = 1$ modes of $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(f, f)$.

Applying Lemmas 2.4, 4.17, 4.18 and $B = \bar{0}$, we infer, since ν is tangent to Σ_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \nu(B(s)) = \nu \left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right) \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left(\nu \left((\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right) + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right) \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}) + [\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}] \eta^{\mathbf{S}} + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \eta^{\mathbf{S}}) \right) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.165)$$

Recall from (4.18) that we have

$$\nu \left(\int_S (\operatorname{div} \eta) J^{(p)} \right) = O(\delta^\circ).$$

Similarly, applying Lemmas 2.4, 2.22, 2.23, 4.17, 4.18 and

$$(b^{\mathbf{S}} - b, \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\kappa}, z^{\mathbf{S}} - z, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} - \underline{\Omega}, \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} - \kappa) = O(\delta^\circ),$$

which is proved in Proposition 4.22, combining with (4.165) and the fact that $J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}$ verifies (4.23), we deduce

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} \left(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta)) + [\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}] (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) \right) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = O(\delta^\circ).$$

Recalling from Lemma 4.18 that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(f) &= \eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta + r^{-1} O(F) + \text{l. o. t.}, \\ (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^2(f) &= \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) + r^{-1} O(F) \nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}) + r^{-1} \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(F) + \text{l. o. t.}, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce

$$(\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta)) = (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(f)) + r^{-3} O(\delta^\circ) = r^{-3} O(\delta^\circ),$$

and from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}] (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) &= \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta) + \text{l. o. t.} \\ &= r^{-3} O(\delta^\circ) + O(\epsilon) r^{-1} (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^2(F) + r^{-3} O(\delta^\circ) \nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} \left(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}} (\eta^{\mathbf{S}} - \eta)) \right) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} = O(\delta^\circ) + r O(\epsilon) (\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^2(F) + O(\delta^\circ) \nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^2(f) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right| &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r^{-1} \overset{\circ}{\delta} \|\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\quad + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^2(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-2}(\mathbf{S})}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}} \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^2(\underline{f}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right| &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r^{-1} \overset{\circ}{\delta} \|\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} + \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\quad + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^2(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-2}(\mathbf{S})}. \end{aligned}$$

These are the desired estimates for $l = 2$. The cases of $l \geq 3$ are similar. Hence, we have for $l \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l(f))_{\ell=1} \right| + \left| (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l(\underline{f}))_{\ell=1} \right| \\ &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + r^{-1} \overset{\circ}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^l \|\nu^{j-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \quad (4.166) \\ &\quad + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})}. \end{aligned}$$

3. Boundedness of $\nu^{\leq l-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})$ and $(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})$.

Recall that the $\ell = 1$ modes of $\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}})$ are estimated in the previous step. Then, we commute the equations in the proof of Lemmas 4.27 and 4.28 with ν to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}), \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}), \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1} \overset{\circ}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nu^{j-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \sum_{j=1}^2 \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.167) \end{aligned}$$

We commute equations (4.69) and (4.70) with ν to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}) - \overline{\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}})}, \nu(z^{\mathbf{S}}) - \overline{\nu(z^{\mathbf{S}})}, \nu(\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}) - \overline{\nu(\underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim r \|\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}), \nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}}(\underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r + \overset{\circ}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^2 \|\nu^{j-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + r \sum_{j=1}^2 \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.168) \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $\overline{\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}})}$, we apply Lemma 4.17 and $D = 0$ to deduce

$$\nu(\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}) = -\nu\left(\frac{2m^{\mathbf{S}}}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\right) = -\frac{1}{16\pi}\nu\left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}\right) = O(1).$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(\overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}}) &= \frac{1}{|S|} \nu \left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} b^{\mathbf{S}} \right) - \frac{\nu(|S|)}{|S|} \overline{b^{\mathbf{S}}} \\
&= \frac{1}{|S|} z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}) + (\underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \kappa^{\mathbf{S}}) b^{\mathbf{S}}) + O(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{|S|} z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}} (\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}})) + O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these three estimates, we obtain

$$\overline{\nu(b^{\mathbf{S}})} = O(1). \quad (4.169)$$

To prove the boundedness of $\overline{\nu(z^{\mathbf{S}})}$, we start from

$$-z^{\mathbf{S}} = \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} = \nu(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}}}{2} z^{\mathbf{S}} \overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}})},$$

which implies

$$\int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}) = -8\pi r^{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\nu \left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}) \right) = -8\pi \nu(r^{\mathbf{S}}) = O(1). \quad (4.170)$$

Then, applying Lemma 4.17 and (4.169), we can deduce

$$|\overline{\nu((z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1})}| \lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})},$$

details are left to the reader. Then (4.168) and (4.70) imply that, for $\overset{\circ}{\delta}$ small enough

$$r^{-1} \left\| \nu(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-1}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^2 \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (4.171)$$

Similarly, we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{l-1}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \left\| \nu^{l-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \\
&\lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})}.
\end{aligned} \quad (4.172)$$

Notice that (4.162), (4.166) and (4.172) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \overline{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda)}^{\circ} - \overline{\nu^l(\lambda)}^{\circ} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.173}$$

4. Estimate for $b_0^{(l)}$.

We need to prove that

$$b_0^{(l)} := \overline{\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})}^{\mathbf{S}} = \overline{\nu^l(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})}^{\circ} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \tag{4.174}$$

Similar to (4.97), we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^l(r - r^{\mathbf{S}}) &= -2\nu^{l-1} \left(z\overline{z^{-1}} - z^{\mathbf{S}}\overline{(z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1}} \right) + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})\overline{\nu^{l-1}(z - z^{\mathbf{S}})} \\
&+ O(\mathcal{E}_l) + O\left(\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq l-1}(F)\| + O(\nu^{\leq l-1}(r - r^{\mathbf{S}}))\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{E}_l is defined in (4.94). Similar to (4.98), we can obtain

$$\overline{\nu^{l-1}(z - z^{\mathbf{S}})}^{\circ} = O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})\overline{\nu^{l-1}(z - z^{\mathbf{S}})} + O(\mathcal{E}_l).$$

Thus, we have

$$\overline{\nu^{l-1}(z - z^{\mathbf{S}})}^{\circ} = O(\mathcal{E}_l).$$

By iteration, we conclude (4.174). The details of the proof is tedious but straightforward and is similar to the case of $l = 1$. We leave to the reader. Notice that (4.163), (4.166), (4.172) and (4.174) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \overline{\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(\lambda)}^{\circ} \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^l \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^{j-1}(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j+1}(\mathbf{S})} \\
& + (\overset{\circ}{\epsilon} + r^{-1}) \left(\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.175}$$

5. Conclusion.

Combining all the above estimates, we obtain for $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough and $\overset{\circ}{r}$ large enough,

$$\|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^l F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^l(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \|\nu^j(\overset{\circ}{b})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S})},$$

which, together with (4.87), yields by iteration the desired estimates for all tangential derivatives

$$\|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}, \quad \forall l \leq K. \quad (4.176)$$

Notice that (4.176) implies for $1 \leq l \leq K$

$$\|(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^{l-1}(\eta^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\xi}^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} + r^{-1} \|\nu^{l-1}(b^{\mathbf{S}}, z^{\mathbf{S}}, \underline{\Omega}^{\mathbf{S}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-l}(\mathbf{S})} = O(1). \quad (4.177)$$

Next, remark that the estimates for $(\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)$ follows directly from the transversality conditions (4.14) and the null transformation formulas (4.73). Then, the estimates for $(\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)$ follows directly from $\nu = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$ and the estimates for $\nu^{\leq l}(b^{\mathbf{S}})$.

This concludes the proof of the statement 1 of Corollary 4.2.

Step 2. It remains to prove Corollary 4.2 in the more difficult case where

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} + (r^{\mathbf{S}_0})^{-1} \|(\underline{f}, \underline{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.178)$$

In view of the control (4.178) for $(f, \underline{f}, \underline{\lambda})$, we may apply Lemma 7.3 in [5], which yields

$$\left| \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}_0}}{\overset{\circ}{r}} - 1 \right| + \sup_{\mathbf{S}_0} \left| \frac{r^{\mathbf{S}_0}}{r} - 1 \right| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}$$

so that r and $r^{\mathbf{S}_0}$ are comparable, and hence

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} + r^{-1} \|(\underline{f}, \underline{\lambda})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s_{max}+1}(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.179)$$

Next, we introduce as in Proposition 4.22 the notations $K = s_{max} + 1$ and $\nu := \nu^{\mathbf{S}_0}$. Note that \mathbf{S}_0 can be viewed as a deformation of the unique background sphere sharing the same south pole. We proceed exactly as Step 1 to derive the desired estimates for our distinguished sphere $\mathbf{S} := \mathbf{S}_0$.

In the following, we revisit all the terms estimated in Step 1, and explain that we can obtain the same estimates for $(\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}})^l(F)$ when $l \geq 1$ under the weaker assumption (4.179).

1. Commutators.

Applying Lemma 2.4, we have

$$[\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla^{\mathbf{S}}]F = \frac{2}{r} \nabla^{\mathbf{S}}(F) + \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(F) + r^{-1} \Gamma_b^{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(F),$$

which implies³⁴

$$\|[\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, \nabla^{\mathbf{S}}]F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_l(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \frac{1}{r^2}\|F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{l+1}(\mathbf{S})} + \frac{\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}}{r}\|\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_l(S)}.$$

Similarly, by Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\|[\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}, \Delta^{\mathbf{S}}]F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_l(\mathbf{S})} \lesssim \frac{1}{r^3}\|F\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{l+2}(\mathbf{S})} + \frac{\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}}{r^2}\|\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_l(S)}.$$

Observe that the terms of F on the R.H.S. gain a power of r^{-1} when compared to the terms of $\nabla_\nu^{\mathbf{S}}(F)$, which is consistent with the anomalous behavior of $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ ³⁵.

2. Coefficients $(\underline{\dot{C}}_0, \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)})$.

Recalling (4.89), we have

$$(\underline{\dot{C}}_0, \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)}) = r^{-1}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}),$$

according to the anomalous behavior of $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \left(\frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \left(\underline{\dot{C}}_0 + \sum_p \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right) \right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right) \left(\underline{\dot{C}}_0 + \sum_p \underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right) + \frac{1}{2r^{\mathbf{S}}} \left(\nu(\underline{\dot{C}}_0) + \sum_p \nu(\underline{\dot{C}}^{(p)}) J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Remark that the first term on the R.H.S. has order $r^{-3}O(\overset{\circ}{\delta})$, which is consistent with the estimates (4.85). Thus, we can obtain the same estimates as Step 1.³⁶

3. Error terms in $(h_1, \underline{h}_1, h_2, \underline{h}_2, h_3, h_4)$.

We recall Definition 2.24:

$$\begin{aligned} r\text{Err}_1 &= F \cdot (r\Gamma_b) + F \cdot (r\nabla^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 1} F, \\ r^2\text{Err}_2 &= (r\nabla^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 1} (r\text{Err}_1) + F \cdot r\mathfrak{d}\Gamma_b. \end{aligned}$$

³⁴Recall that $\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(F)$ can be easily estimated by (4.73).

³⁵In (4.21), the decay of $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ lose a power of r^{-1} when compared to the decay of f , it is called anomalous behavior of $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$

³⁶The second term on the R.H.S. appears on the L.H.S when applying Proposition 3.4.

According to the anomalous behavior of $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$, we lose one power of r^{-1} in $F \cdot (r\Gamma_b)$. But if we inspect all the error terms in (2.57) carefully (see Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 4.6 in [5] for their expressions), we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Err}_1 &= f \cdot \Gamma_b + (\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}) \cdot \Gamma_g + r^{-1} F \cdot F + F \cdot \nabla^{\mathbf{S}} F, \\ \text{Err}_2 &= (r\nabla^{\mathbf{S}})^{\leq 1}(r\text{Err}_1) + f \cdot r\partial\Gamma_g + (\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}) \cdot r\partial\Gamma_b.\end{aligned}$$

According to Assumption **A1** and (4.179), we have

$$\nu(\text{Err}_1) = \nu(F) \cdot \Gamma_b + r^{-2}O(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}) + r^{-1}O(f) + r^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{\leq 1}(F \cdot \nu(F)) + r^{-2}F \cdot F.$$

Thus, we gain a power of r^{-1} for $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$ when comparing to the other terms. The estimate for $\nu(\text{Err}_2)$ is similar.

4. Nonlinear terms in $(h_1, \underline{h}_1, h_2, \underline{h}_2, h_3, h_4)$.

The nonlinear terms include (see Remark 4.10 in [5]):

$$\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \quad \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}\overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \quad \left(\kappa - \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\right)\overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \quad \left(\underline{\kappa} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\right)\overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \quad \left(V - \frac{2}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}\right)\overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \quad (4.180)$$

and

$$\frac{2(r - r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}{r(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}, \quad \underline{\ddot{C}}_0 + \sum_p \ddot{C}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}, \quad \ddot{M}_0 + \sum_p \ddot{M}^{(p)} J^{(\mathbf{S}, p)}, \quad (4.181)$$

where

$$V := -\left(\frac{1}{2}\kappa\underline{\kappa} + \kappa\underline{\omega} + \underline{\kappa}\omega\right).$$

We also have

$$\nu\left(\frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\overset{\circ}{\lambda}\right) = -\frac{2\nu(r^{\mathbf{S}})}{(r^{\mathbf{S}})^2}\overset{\circ}{\lambda} + \frac{2}{r^{\mathbf{S}}}\nu(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}) = O\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right)\overset{\circ}{\lambda} + O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)\nu(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}).$$

Remark that the first term on the R.H.S. gains a power of r^{-1} . The estimates for the other terms in (4.180) are similar. The first term in (4.181) can be estimated as before. The other two terms in (4.181) can be estimated by Corollary 5.20 in [5], Recalling that their estimates gain a power of r^{-1} for \underline{f} and are independent on $\overset{\circ}{\lambda}$.

5. The remaining terms in $(h_1, \underline{h}_1, h_2, \underline{h}_2, h_3, h_4)$.

According to Remark 4.11 in [5], the remaining terms in $(h_1, \underline{h}_1, h_2, \underline{h}_2, h_3, h_4)$ either

depend on $(\dot{\kappa}, \dot{\underline{\kappa}}, \dot{\underline{\mu}})$ or contain an additional power of r^{-1} compared to the other terms. The latter can be ignored since we obtain the desired estimate despite the anomalous behavior of $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$.

Notice that $\nu^l(\dot{\kappa}, \dot{\underline{\kappa}}, \dot{\underline{\mu}})$ can be estimated by Lemma 4.20 as before, Recalling that its proof gains a power of r^{-1} for $\overset{\circ}{\delta}$, which is consistent with the anomalous behavior of $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$.

6. Estimate for $|b_0|$.

To estimate b_0 , we proceed exactly as Proposition 4.22, just Recalling that (4.95) also holds under the weaker assumption for $(\underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda})$.

In summary, we can obtain, as in Step 1, the following estimate

$$\sum_{j=1}^K \|(\nabla_{\nu}^{\mathbf{S}})^j(F)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{K-j}(\mathbf{S}_0)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (4.182)$$

To complete the proof of statement 2, we use the transversality conditions (4.14) and the null transformation formulas (4.73) to deduce the estimates of $\nabla_4^{\mathbf{S}}(F)$, and then recover the estimates of $\nabla_3^{\mathbf{S}}(F)$ from $\nu = e_3^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}}e_4^{\mathbf{S}}$. This concludes the proof of Corollary 4.2.

A Proof of Lemma 4.6

We denote

$$X_0 := \Psi'(s)\partial_u + \partial_s.$$

Notice that X_0 is tangent to $\Sigma_{\#}$ and recall that $\nu_{\#}$ is the unique tangent vectorfield to $\Sigma_{\#}$, normal to S such that $\mathbf{g}(\nu_{\#}, e_4) = -2$. Together with (2.35), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &= \Psi'(s)\partial_u + \partial_s = \Psi'(s) \left(\frac{1}{z}e_3 - \frac{\underline{\Omega}}{z}e_4 - \frac{2}{z}\underline{B}^a\partial_{y^a} \right) + e_4 \\ &= \frac{\Psi'(s)}{z}e_3 + \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\Omega}\Psi'(s)}{z} \right) e_4 - \frac{2\Psi'(s)}{z}\underline{B}^a\partial_{y^a} \\ &= \frac{\Psi'(s)}{z}\nu_{\#} - \frac{2\Psi'(s)}{z}\underline{B}^a\partial_{y^a}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$\nu_{\#} = e_3 + b_{\#}e_4, \quad b_{\#} = \frac{z}{\Psi'(s)} \left(1 - \frac{\underline{\Omega}\Psi'(s)}{z} \right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Notice that $\Phi_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(X_0, \partial_{y^1}, \partial_{y^2})$ forms a basis of the tangent space of $\Sigma_{\tilde{J}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(X_0) &= \left(\Psi'(s) + X_0(U^{\tilde{J}}) \right) \partial_u + \left(1 + X_0(S^{\tilde{J}}) \right) \partial_s, \\ \Phi_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\partial_{y^a}) &= \partial_{y^a}(U^{\tilde{J}}) \partial_u + \partial_{y^a}(S^{\tilde{J}}) \partial_s + \partial_{y^a}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.13 and (2.35), we can express $\nu^{\tilde{J}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\tilde{J}} &= e_3^{\tilde{J}} + b^{\tilde{J}}e_4^{\tilde{J}} \\ &= e_3 + b^{\tilde{J}}e_4 + O(F^{\tilde{J}})(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4) \\ &= z\partial_u + \underline{\Omega}\partial_s + 2\underline{B}^a\partial_{y^a} + b^{\tilde{J}}\partial_s + O(F^{\tilde{J}})(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4) \\ &= A_{\tilde{J}}\Phi_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(X_0) + B_{\tilde{J}}^a\Phi_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\partial_{y^a}), \end{aligned}$$

for suitable $A_{\tilde{J}}$ and $B_{\tilde{J}}^a$. In order to compute $A_{\tilde{J}}$ and $B_{\tilde{J}}^a$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\tilde{J}}\Phi_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(X_0) + B_{\tilde{J}}^a\Phi_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\partial_{y^a}) &= \left(A_{\tilde{J}}\Psi'(s) + A_{\tilde{J}}X_0(U^{\tilde{J}}) + B_{\tilde{J}}^a\partial_{y^a}(U^{\tilde{J}}) \right) \partial_u \\ &\quad + \left(A_{\tilde{J}} + A_{\tilde{J}}X_0(S^{\tilde{J}}) + B_{\tilde{J}}^a\partial_{y^a}(S^{\tilde{J}}) \right) \partial_s + B_{\tilde{J}}^a\partial_{y^a}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the coefficients of ∂_u and ∂_{y^a} with the above expression of $\nu^{\tilde{J}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\tilde{J}} &= \frac{z}{\Psi'(s)} + A_0(U^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}}), \\ B_{\tilde{J}}^a &= 2\underline{B}^a + B_0(F^{\tilde{J}}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_0(U, F) = O(\emptyset(U), X_0(U), F), \quad B_0(F) = O(F). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Thus, we have

$$\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}} = A_{\tilde{J}}^{\#}X_0 + (B_{\tilde{J}}^a)^{\#}\partial_{y^a}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where

$$A_{\tilde{J}}^{\#} = \frac{z \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}}{\Psi'(s)} + A_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}, \quad (B_{\tilde{J}}^a)^{\#} = 2\underline{B}^a \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} + B_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In view of (A.1), (A.4) and (A.5), we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}} &= \left(\frac{z \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}}{\Psi'(s)} + A_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} \right) X_0 + \left(2\underline{B}^a \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} + B_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} \right) \partial_{y^a} \\
&= \left(\frac{z \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}}{\Psi'(s)} + A_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} \right) \left(\frac{\Psi'(s)}{z} \nu_{\#} - \frac{2\Psi'(s)}{z} \underline{B}^a \partial_{y^a} \right) + \left(2\underline{B}^a \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} + B_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} \right) \partial_{y^a} \\
&= \left(\frac{z \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}}{z} + \frac{\Psi'(s)}{z} A_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} \right) \nu_{\#} + \left(2\underline{B}^a \left(\frac{z - z \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}}{z} \right) + 2(\underline{B}^a \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} - \underline{B}^a) + D_0 \right) \partial_{y^a},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$D_0 = -\frac{2\Psi'(s)}{z} \underline{B}^a (A_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}) + (B_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \frac{z \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} - z}{z} + \frac{\Psi'(s)}{z} A_0 \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}, \\
B^a &= 2\underline{B}^a \left(\frac{z - z \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}}}{z} \right) + 2(\underline{B}^a \circ \Phi^{\tilde{J}} - \underline{B}^a) + D_0.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Applying Taylor formula, recalling $\tilde{z} \in r\Gamma_b$, $\underline{B} \in r^{-1}\Gamma_b$, (A.3) and (A.6), we have

$$A(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J},\#}) = O(\mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}), F^{\tilde{J},\#}), \quad B(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J},\#}) = \frac{\mathring{\epsilon}}{r^2} O(\mathfrak{d}_{\#}^{\leq 1}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}), F^{\tilde{J},\#}).$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.6.

B Proof of Lemma 4.7

Firstly, notice that (3.6), (3.9) and Lemma 2.22 imply

$$r^{-1} \|(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{smax+1}(S)} + \|(f^{\tilde{J},\#}, \underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}^{\tilde{J},\#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{smax+1}(S)} \lesssim \mathring{\delta}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Recall that the GCM system (4.88) is defined on $\mathbf{S} := \mathbf{S}[\Psi(s), s, \Lambda(s), \underline{\Lambda}(s), \tilde{J}(s)]$. We pull it back by $\Phi^{\tilde{J}}$ to obtain a GCM system for $\nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#}(f^{\tilde{J},\#}, \underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}^{\tilde{J},\#})$ on $S := S(\Psi(s), s)$.

Similar as (4.90) and (4.100), we have, for $\mathring{\epsilon}$ small enough and \mathring{r} large enough

$$\|\nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#}(f^{\tilde{J},\#}, \underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \mathring{\delta} + \left| \left(\text{div}^{\mathbf{S},\#} \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#} f^{\tilde{J},\#} \right)_{\ell=1} \right| + \left| \left(\text{div}^{\mathbf{S},\#} \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#} \underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#} \right)_{\ell=1} \right|, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where the $\ell = 1$ modes are computed w.r.t. $\tilde{J}^{(p)}(s)$. Recall from Lemma 4.33 that

$$|\nu^{\tilde{J}}(\Lambda(s))| \lesssim |\Lambda'(s)| \lesssim \delta^\circ.$$

Denoting

$$\tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} := \left((\Phi^{\tilde{J}})^{-1} \right)^\# (\tilde{J}^{(p)}),$$

we have from (4.27)

$$\left| \nu^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) \right| = \left| \Phi_\#^{\tilde{J}}(\nu_\#^{\tilde{J}}) \left(\left((\Phi^{\tilde{J}})^{-1} \right)^\# \tilde{J}^{(p)} \right) \right| = |\nu_\#^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}^{(p)})| \leq 1, \quad \text{on } \Sigma_\#. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Applying Lemmas 2.4, 4.17 and (B.3), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{\tilde{J}}(\Lambda(s)) &= \nu^{\tilde{J}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right) \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \left[\nu^{\tilde{J}} \left((\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right) + (\kappa^{\mathbf{S}} + b^{\mathbf{S}} \underline{\kappa}^{\mathbf{S}}) (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right] \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} \nu^{\tilde{J}} \left((\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right) + z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \nu^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)}) + r^{-1} O(\delta^\circ) \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} ([\nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}}, \operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}}] f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + O(\delta^\circ) \\ &= z^{\mathbf{S}} \int_{\mathbf{S}} (z^{\mathbf{S}})^{-1} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \epsilon r O(\nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) + O(\delta^\circ) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} + \epsilon r O(\nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) + O(\delta^\circ), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S},\#} \nabla_{\nu_\#^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#} f^{\tilde{J},\#} \right)_{\ell=1} \right| &= \sum_p \left| \int_{\mathbf{S}} (\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S}} \nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}} f^{\tilde{J}}) \tilde{J}^{(\mathbf{S},p)} \right| \\ &\lesssim |\nu^{\tilde{J}}(\Lambda(s))| + \delta^\circ + \epsilon \|\nabla_{\nu^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S}}(f^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\mathbf{S})} \\ &\lesssim \delta^\circ + \epsilon \|\nabla_{\nu_\#^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#}(f^{\tilde{J},\#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left| \left(\operatorname{div}^{\mathbf{S},\#} \nabla_{\nu_\#^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#} \underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#} \right)_{\ell=1} \right| \lesssim \delta^\circ + \epsilon \|\nabla_{\nu_\#^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#}(\underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}.$$

Thus, (B.2) implies that for $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough

$$\|\nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#}(f^{\tilde{J},\#}, \underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Next, we recall that

$$\partial_{y^a} U^{\tilde{J}} = \left(\mathcal{U}(f^{\tilde{J}}, \underline{f}^{\tilde{J}}, \Gamma)_b Y_{(a)}^b \right)^{\#}, \quad \partial_{y^a} S^{\tilde{J}} = \left(\mathcal{S}(f^{\tilde{J}}, \underline{f}^{\tilde{J}}, \Gamma)_b Y_{(a)}^b \right)^{\#}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where

$$\mathcal{U}(f, \underline{f}, \Gamma) = f + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})(f, \underline{f}), \quad \mathcal{S}(f, \underline{f}, \Gamma) = \frac{1}{2} (-\Upsilon f + \underline{f}) + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})(f, \underline{f}),$$

see Proposition 5.14 and Remark 5.15 in [5]. Commuting (B.5) with $\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}$ and using Lemma 2.4, (B.1) and (B.4), we obtain

$$r^{-1} \|\mathfrak{P}(\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}))\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + \|\nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#}(f^{\tilde{J},\#}, \underline{f}^{\tilde{J},\#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We deduce

$$r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} + \left| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} \right|, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where $\gamma(s)$ is the curve of South Poles of $S(\Psi(s), s)$.

Next, we estimate $\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}) \Big|_{\gamma(s)}$. Recall that we have

$$U^{\tilde{J}}(\gamma(s)) = 0, \quad S^{\tilde{J}}(\gamma(s)) = 0.$$

Then, we have

$$\nu_{SP}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = 0,$$

where ν_{SP} is the tangent vector field along $\gamma(s)$. Notice that ν_{SP} is parallel to $X_0 = \Psi'(s)\partial_u + \partial_s$. Combining with (A.1) and (B.1), we obtain

$$\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = 2\underline{B}^a \partial_{y^a}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Applying (4.26), (B.1) and (B.8), we infer

$$\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}) \Big|_{\gamma(s)} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Thus, (B.7) and (B.9) yield

$$r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

To conclude, it remains to prove (B.10) with $\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}$ replaced by $\nu_{\#}$. To this end, we consider the connected open component $\varpi_{\lambda} \subset S$ centered at $\gamma(s)$, i.e.

$$\varpi_{\lambda} := \{p \in S / d(p, \gamma(s)) \leq \lambda\},$$

where d is the geodesic distance on S induced by \mathbf{g} and $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. Define $\Omega \subset (0, +\infty)$ the set of λ such that the following holds:

$$r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\varpi_{\lambda})} \leq \overset{\circ}{\delta}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Notice that (B.8) implies that (B.11) holds for ϖ_{λ} when λ small enough, thus Ω is non-empty. Note also that Ω is closed. Recalling (B.1) and (B.11), we have for $\lambda \in \Omega$

$$\|A(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}, \#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\varpi_{\lambda})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|B(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}}, F^{\tilde{J}, \#})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\varpi_{\lambda})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \overset{\circ}{\delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{-1}.$$

Together with (4.26), (B.1) and (B.10), we have for $\overset{\circ}{\delta}$ small enough

$$\|\nu_{\#}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\varpi_{\lambda})} \lesssim \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\varpi_{\lambda})} + \|\partial_{y^a}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(\varpi_{\lambda})} \lesssim r \overset{\circ}{\delta} \leq \frac{1}{2} r \overset{\circ}{\delta}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Thus, we have $\lambda + \epsilon \in \Omega$ for ϵ small enough. By definition of Ω , we obtain $(0, \lambda + \epsilon) \subset \Omega$, which implies that Ω is open in $(0, +\infty)$. Hence Ω is a open-closed non-empty subset of $(0, +\infty)$, which implies $\Omega = (0, +\infty)$. Since S is compact, there exists a $\lambda \in \Omega$ large enough such that $\varpi_{\lambda} = S$. Finally, injecting $\varpi_{\lambda} = S$ into (B.12), we obtain

$$r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}(U^{\tilde{J}}, S^{\tilde{J}})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.7.

C Proof of Lemma 4.8

Notice that (4.30) is a direct consequence of Corollary 6.11 in [5]. Also, the proof of (4.31) is similar to (4.30) and Lemma 4.7, so we only provide a sketch.

We denote

$$\begin{aligned}\delta H^\# &:= H^{\tilde{J},\#} - H^{\hat{J},\#}, & H \in \{f, \underline{f}, \overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \overset{\circ}{b}\}, \\ \delta h &:= h^{\tilde{J}} - h^{\hat{J}}, & h \in \left\{ \dot{\underline{C}}_0, \dot{\underline{C}}^{(p)}, M_0, M^{(p)}, h_1, \underline{h}_1, h_2, \underline{h}_2, h_3, h_4 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We recall the following GCM system, see (C.1)-(C.5) in [5],

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{curl}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \delta f &= \delta h_1, \\ \operatorname{curl}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \delta \underline{f} &= \delta \underline{h}_1, \\ \operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \delta f + \frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}} \delta \overset{\circ}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{(r\mathbf{S})^2} \delta \overset{\circ}{b} &= \delta h_2, \\ \operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \delta \underline{f} + \frac{2}{r\mathbf{S}} \delta \overset{\circ}{\lambda} + \frac{2}{(r\mathbf{S})^2} \delta \overset{\circ}{b} &= \delta \underline{h}_2, \\ \left(\Delta^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} + \frac{2}{(r\mathbf{S})^2} \right) \delta \overset{\circ}{\lambda} &= \delta M_0 + \sum_p \delta M^{(p)} J^{(p)} + \frac{1}{2r\mathbf{S}} \left(\delta \underline{C}_0 + \sum_p \delta \underline{C}^{(p)} J^{(p)} \right) \delta h_3, \\ \Delta^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \delta \overset{\circ}{b} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} (\delta \underline{f} - \delta f) &= \delta h_4,\end{aligned}\tag{C.1}$$

and

$$(\operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \delta f)_{\ell=1} = \delta \Lambda, \quad (\operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \delta \underline{f})_{\ell=1} = \delta \underline{\Lambda}.\tag{C.2}$$

See Appendix C in [5] for the structures of $(\delta h_1, \delta \underline{h}_1, \delta h_2, \delta \underline{h}_2, \delta h_3, \delta h_4)$. We can deduce the following analog of (4.85):

$$\|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta h_1, \delta \underline{h}_1, \delta h_2, \delta \underline{h}_2, \delta h_4)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + r\|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta h_3)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-2} \|(\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}})^{\leq 1}(\tilde{J} - \hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}.\tag{C.3}$$

We commute the GCM system (C.1) with $\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}$ to obtain the following analog of (B.2):

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} (\delta f, \delta \underline{f}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}(S)} &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J} - \hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \\ &+ \left| \left(\operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#} (\delta f) \right)_{\ell=1} \right| + \left| \left(\operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} (\delta \underline{f}) \right)_{\ell=1} \right|.\end{aligned}\tag{C.4}$$

Recalling (B.25) in [5] for a similar structure of $(\delta \Lambda, \delta \underline{\Lambda})$, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta \Lambda, \delta \underline{\Lambda})| &\lesssim \overset{\circ}{\delta} \left\| \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} (\delta f, \delta \underline{f}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \|(\delta f, \delta \underline{f})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \\ &+ r^{-1}(r^{-1} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta U, \delta S) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + r^{-1} \|(\delta U, \delta S)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}.\end{aligned}\tag{C.5}$$

Then, we proceed as in (B.4) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\mathbf{S},\#}(\delta f) \right)_{\ell=1} \right| + \left| \left(\operatorname{div}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#} \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#}(\delta \underline{f}) \right)_{\ell=1} \right| \\ & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \left\| \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#}(\delta f, \delta \underline{f}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \|(\delta f, \delta \underline{f})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + r^{-1}(r^{-1} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta U, \delta S) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + r^{-1} \|(\delta U, \delta S)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}. \end{aligned}$$

Injecting it in (C.4) and applying (4.30), for $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#}(\delta f, \delta \underline{f}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}(S)} & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J} - \hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \\ & + r^{-1}(r^{-1} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}) \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta U, \delta S) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Then, relying (B.5) and using (4.30), we easily obtain the following analog of (B.6),

$$r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta U, \delta S)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \left\| \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#}(\delta f, \delta \underline{f}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)}. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Then, (C.6) and (C.7) imply, for $\overset{\circ}{r}$ large enough and $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough

$$\begin{aligned} & r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta U, \delta S)\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}(S)} + \left\| \nabla_{\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{S}},\#}(\delta f, \delta \underline{f}) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}(S)} \\ & \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\tilde{J} - \hat{J}\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} r^{-1} \|\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J} - \hat{J})\|_{\mathfrak{h}_s(S)} + r^{-1} \left| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta U, \delta S)|_{\gamma(s)} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Recalling (B.5), proceeding as (B.8) and (B.9), we obtain the following estimate:

$$\nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(\delta U, \delta S)|_{\gamma(s)} = O(\overset{\circ}{\delta}). \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Finally (C.8) and (C.9) yield (4.31). This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.8.

D Proof of Lemma 4.9

For any integer k , applying Lemma 2.15 we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{\#} \left(\int_S |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2 \right) & = (e_3 + b_{\#} e_4) \left(\int_S |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2 \right) \\ & = z \int_S (z^{-1} e_3(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} e_4(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + z^{-1} \underline{\kappa} |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2 - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} \kappa |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) \\ & + \underline{\Omega} \int_S (e_4(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + \kappa |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + b_{\#} \int_S (e_4(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + \kappa |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling from (A.2) that $b_{\#} + \underline{\Omega} = \frac{z}{\Psi'(s)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{\#} \left(\int_S |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2 \right) &= z \int_S (z^{-1} e_3(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} e_4(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + z^{-1} \underline{\kappa} |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2 - z^{-1} \underline{\Omega} \kappa |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) \\
&+ z \int_S z^{-1} (b_{\#} + \underline{\Omega}) (e_4(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + \kappa |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) \\
&= z \int_S z^{-1} (\nu_{\#}(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + (\underline{\kappa} + b_{\#} \kappa) |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) \\
&= z \int_S z^{-1} \nu_{\#}(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + O(r^{-1}) \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemmas 2.4, 4.6, 4.7, $\tilde{z} \in r\Gamma_b$ and the divergence theorem, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
z \int_S z^{-1} \nu_{\#}(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) &= z \int_S z^{-1} (1+A)^{-1} \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) - z \int_S z^{-1} (1+A)^{-1} B^a \partial_{y^a} (|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) \\
&= z \int_S z^{-1} (1+A)^{-1} \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + z \int_S \operatorname{div} (z^{-1} (1+A)^{-1} B) |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2 \\
&= z \int_S z^{-1} (1+A)^{-1} \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) + O(\delta) \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two identities and applying Lemma 2.4, we infer

$$\left| \nu_{\#} \left(\int_S |\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2 \right) \right| \lesssim \int_S \left| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(|\mathfrak{P}^k h|^2) \right| + \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}^2 \lesssim \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(h) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}^2,$$

which implies

$$\left| \nu_{\#} (\|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}) \right| \lesssim \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(h) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.$$

Integrating it from $S = \overset{\circ}{S}$ and recalling that $|\overset{\circ}{I}| \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$, we infer

$$\|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} - \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\overset{\circ}{S})} \lesssim \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \sup_S \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(h) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} + \overset{\circ}{\epsilon} \sup_S \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.$$

Taking the supremum over $S \subset \Sigma_{\#}$, for $\overset{\circ}{\epsilon}$ small enough, we have

$$\sup_{S \subset \Sigma_{\#}} \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)} \leq (1 + O(\overset{\circ}{\epsilon})) \|h\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(\overset{\circ}{S})} + \sup_{S \subset \Sigma_{\#}} \left\| \nu_{\#}^{\tilde{J}}(h) \right\|_{\mathfrak{h}_k(S)}.$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.9.

Declarations

Acknowledgements. The author is very grateful to Jérémie Szeftel for his support, discussions, encouragements and patient guidance.

Funding. This work was partially supported by the ERC grant ERC-2016 CoG 725589 EPGR.

Competing Interest statements. Conflict of interest does not exist in the manuscript.

References

- [1] M. Berger, B. Gostiaux, *Differential geometry: manifolds, curves, and surfaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 115, Springer, (1987).
- [2] D. Christodoulou, S. Klainerman, *The global nonlinear stability of the Minkowski space*, Princeton University Press (1993).
- [3] S. Klainerman, F. Nicolò, *The Evolution Problem in General Relativity*, Progress in Mathematical Physics, Vol. **25**, (2003).
- [4] S. Klainerman, J. Szeftel, *Global nonlinear stability of Schwarzschild spacetime under polarized perturbations*. Annals of Mathematics Studies 210, Princeton University Press, (2020).
- [5] S. Klainerman, J. Szeftel, *Construction of GCM spheres in perturbations of Kerr*, Ann. PDE **8** (2), Art. 17, 153 pp, 2022.
- [6] S. Klainerman, J. Szeftel, *Effective results on uniformization and intrinsic GCM spheres in perturbations of Kerr*, Ann. PDE **8** (2), Art. 18, 89 pp, 2022.
- [7] S. Klainerman, J. Szeftel, *Kerr Stability for small angular momentum*, arXiv:2104.11875.