

Quantitative KAM theory, with an application to the three-body problem

Gabriella Pinzari*, Xiang Liu

February 2, 2023

Abstract

Based on quantitative “KAM theory”, we state and prove two theorems about the continuation of maximal and whiskered quasi-periodic motions to slightly perturbed systems exhibiting proper degeneracy. Next, we apply such results to prove that, in the three-body problem, there is a small set in phase space where it is possible to detect both such families of tori. We also estimate the density of such motions in proper ambient spaces.

Up to our knowledge, this is the first proof of co-existence of stable and whiskered tori in a physical system.

Key-words: Properly-degenerate Hamiltonian, symplectic coordinates, symmetry reductions.

MSC 2020: 37J40, 37J11, 37J06.

Contents

1 Overview	2
Aknowledgments	5
2 Ellipticity and hyperbolicity closely to co-planar, co-circular, outer retrograde configuration	5
2.1 Ellipticity (with BNF)	6
2.2 Hyperbolicity	9
2.3 Existence and co-existence of two families of tori	10
2.4 Proof of Propositions 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5	13
3 Quantitative KAM theory	17
3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1	17
3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2	18
3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.1	21
3.4 Normal Form Theory	30
References	34

*Department of Mathematics, University of Padova, pinzari@math.unipd.it

1 Overview

1.1 Two KAM theorems for properly-degenerate Hamiltonian systems We deal with Hamiltonians which meet the demand of being close-to-be-integrable (see, e.g., [15]), but, in addition, with the number of degrees of freedom of perturbing term being possibly larger than the one of the unperturbed part. Such kind of Hamiltonians often arise in problems of celestial mechanics, and are referred to as “properly-degenerate”, after [2]. We denote them as

$$H(I, \varphi, p, q; \mu) = H_0(I) + \mu P(I, \varphi, p, q; \mu),$$

where the coordinates $(I, \varphi) = (I_1, \dots, I_n, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ are of “action-angle” kind (after a possible application of the Liouville–Arnold theorem to the unperturbed term), while (for our needs) the $(p, q) = (p_1, \dots, p_m, q_1, \dots, q_m)$ are “rectangular”, namely, take value in a small ball (say, of radius ε) about some point (say, the origin). The symplectic form is standard:

$$\Omega = dI \wedge d\varphi + dp \wedge dq = \sum_{i=1}^n dI_i \wedge d\varphi_i + \sum_{i=1}^m dp_i \wedge dq_i.$$

We work in the real-analytic framework, which means that we assume that H admits a holomorphic extension on a complex neighbourhood of the real “phase space” (namely, the domain)

$$\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon := V \times \mathbb{T}^n \times B_\varepsilon^{2m},$$

where $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is bounded, open and connected, $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{T})$ is the “flat torus”, B_ε^{2m} is the $2m$ -dimensional ball around 0 of radius ε , relatively to some norm in \mathbb{R}^{2m} .

In this framework, we present¹ two “KAM theorems” which deal with different situations. A basic assumption, common to both statements, and often referred to as “Kolmogorov condition”, is:

(A₁) the map $I \rightarrow \partial_I H_0(I)$ is a diffeomorphism of V .

However, due to the proper degeneracy mentioned above, such assumption is to be reinforced with some statement concerning the perturbing term, or, more precisely, its Lagrange average

$$P_{\text{av}}(I, p, q; \mu) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{[0, 2\pi]^n} P(I, \varphi, p, q; \mu) d^n \varphi$$

with respect to the φ -coordinates. Such extra-assumption will be different in the two statements, therefore we quote them below.

The first result is a revisit of the so-called “Fundamental Theorem” by V.I. Arnold, [2]. Such theorem has been already studied, generalised and extended in previous works [6, 20]. Here we deal with the situation (not considered in the aforementioned papers) where P_{av} admits a “Birkhoff Normal Form” (BNF hereafter) about $(p, q) = (0, 0)$ of high² order; say s . As expected, a higher order of BNF allows to improve the measure of the “Kolmogorov set”, namely the set given by the union of all KAM tori. We shall prove³ the following

Theorem 1.1 *Assume (A₁) above and the following conditions:*

(A₂) $P_{\text{av}}(I, p, q) = \sum_{j=1}^s \mathcal{P}_j(r; I) + O_{2s+1}(p, q; I)$, with $r_i := \frac{p_i^2 + q_i^2}{2}$ and $\mathcal{P}_j(r; I)$ being a polynomial of degree j in $r = (r_1, \dots, r_m)$, for some $2 \leq s \in \mathbb{N}$.

¹We refer to specialized literature for historical notices and constructive approaches to KAM theory: see, e.g., [16, 14, 3, 8] and references therein.

²[2, 6, 20] deal with the “minimal” case $s = 2$. The case $s = 2$ is called here “minimal” as we work in the framework of generalizations of the Kolmogorov condition (A₁) above. In [23, 12], using different techniques, the case $s = 1$ has been considered.

³For simplicity of notations, we do not write μ among the arguments of the functions in Theorem 1.1 and 1.2.

(A₃) the $m \times m$ matrix $\beta(I)$ of the coefficients of the second-order term $\mathcal{P}_2(r; I) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m \beta_{ij}(I) r_i r_j$ is non degenerate: $|\det \beta(I)| \geq \text{const} > 0$ for all $I \in V$.

Then, there exist positive numbers $\varepsilon_* < \varepsilon_0$, C_* and c_* such that, for

$$0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_* , \quad 0 < \mu < \frac{\varepsilon^{2s+2}}{C_*(\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{c_*}} . \quad (1)$$

one can find a set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ formed by the union of H -invariant n -dimensional Lagrangian tori, on which the H -motion is analytically conjugated to linear Diophantine quasi-periodic motions with frequencies $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ with $\omega_1 = O(1)$ and $\omega_2 = O(\mu)$. The set \mathcal{K} has positive Liouville–Lebesgue measure and satisfies

$$\text{meas} \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon > \text{meas} \mathcal{K} > \left(1 - C_* \varepsilon^{s-\frac{3}{2}}\right) \text{meas} \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon . \quad (2)$$

The second result deals with lower-dimensional quasi-periodic motions, the so-called “whiskered tori”. These are n -dimensional quasi-periodic motions (in a phase space of dimension $2n + 2m$), approached or reached at an exponential rate. For simplicity, and in view of our application, we focus on the case $m = 1$. In addition, we allow a further degeneracy in the Hamiltonian: the unperturbed term H_0 may possibly depend not on all the I 's, but only on a part of them.

Theorem 1.2 Let $m = 1$, and let H_0 depend on the components $I_1 = (I_{11}, \dots, I_{1n_1})$ of the $I = (I_1, I_2)$'s, with $1 \leq n_1 \leq n := n_1 + n_2$. Assume (A₁) with I_1 replacing I and, in addition, that

$$(A'_2) \quad P_{\text{av}}(I, p, q; \mu) = P_0(I, pq; \mu) + P_1(I, \varphi, p, q; \mu) \text{ with } \|P_1\| \leq a \|P_0\|;$$

$$(A'_3) \quad |\partial_{pq} P_0| \geq \text{const} > 0 \text{ and } |\det \partial_{I_2}^2 P_0| \geq \text{const} > 0, \text{ if } n_2 \neq 0.$$

Fix $\eta > 0$. Then, there exist positive numbers a_* , $\varepsilon_* < \varepsilon_0$, C_* and c_* such that, if

$$0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_* , \quad 0 < a < a_* \varepsilon^4 , \quad 0 < \mu < \frac{C_*(a \|P_0\|)^{1+\eta}}{(\log a^{-1})^{c_*}} \quad (3)$$

one can find a set \mathcal{K} formed by the union of H -invariant n -dimensional Lagrangian tori, on which the H -motion is analytically conjugated to linear Diophantine quasi-periodic motions with frequencies $(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ with $\omega_1 = O(1)$ and $\omega_2 = O(\mu)$. The projection \mathcal{K}_0 of set \mathcal{K} on $\mathcal{P}_0 := V \times \mathbb{T}^n$ has positive Liouville–Lebesgue measure and satisfies

$$\text{meas} \mathcal{P}_0 > \text{meas} \mathcal{K}_0 > \left(1 - C_* \sqrt{a}\right) \text{meas} \mathcal{P}_0 . \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, for any $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{K}$ there exist two $(n + 1)$ -dimensional invariant manifolds $\mathcal{W}_u, \mathcal{W}_s \subset \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon_*}$ such that $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{W}_u \cap \mathcal{W}_s$ and the motions on $\mathcal{W}_u, \mathcal{W}_s$ leave, approach \mathcal{T} at an exponential rate.

Before we go on with describing how we aim to use the theorems above, we premise some comment.

- (i) The conditions involving μ in (1) and (3) are not optimal. With a procedure similar to the one shown in [6, proof of Theorem 1.2, steps 1–4], one can show that they can be relaxed to, respectively

$$\mu < \frac{1}{C_*(\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{2b}} , \quad \mu < \frac{1}{C_*(\log(a \|P_0\|)^{-1})^{2b}}$$

with some $C_*, b > 0$.

- (ii) The careful bounds on the measure of the invariant sets provided in (2) and (4) are needed in view of our application. Indeed, we shall apply both the theorems above in order to prove that, in the three-body problem, closely to the *co-planar, co-circular, outer retro-grade configuration* (see below for the exact definition), full-dimensional and “whiskered” quasi-periodic tori co-exist (the result was conjectured in [19]). In the application, ε will correspond to the maximum eccentricity or inclination; a the semi-major axes ratio, and the use of a high-order BNF in Theorem 1.1 will be necessary because the size of the set goes to 0 with some power of ε ($s = 4$ will be enough for our application).
- (iii) Following [5], Theorem 1.2 might be extended to prove the existence of “diffusion paths” and “whisker ladders”. We shall not do, as proving Arnold instability (in the sense of [1]) for the system (5) below is not the purpose of this paper. We however remark that such kind of instability has been found for the *four-body problem* in a very similar framework [9]. We remark that proofs of chaos or Arnold instability in celestial mechanics are quite recent [13, 10].
- (iv) Another important aspect in view of the application described above is a rather standard consequence of the proof of Theorem 1.2: If P (namely, P_1) has an equilibrium at $(p, q) = 0$, then, along the motions of \mathcal{K} , the coordinates (p, q) remain fixed at $(0, 0)$ (rather than varying closely to it), namely

$$\mathcal{K} \subset V \times \mathbb{T}^n \times \{(0, 0)\}.$$

More generally, the stable and unstable invariant manifolds do not shift from the unperturbed ones:

$$\mathcal{W}_s \subset \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \{q = 0\}, \quad \mathcal{W}_u \subset \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon \cap \{p = 0\}.$$

1.2 Application to the three-body problem After the “heliocentric reduction” of translational invariance, the three-body problem Hamiltonian with gravitational masses equal to m_0 , μm_1 and μm_2 and Newton constant $\mathcal{G} \equiv 1$, takes the form of the two-particle system (see, e.g, [12, 18] for a derivation):

$$H_{3b} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\frac{|y^{(i)}|^2}{2m_i} - \frac{m_i M_i}{|x^{(i)}|} \right) + \mu \left(-\frac{m_1 m_2}{|x^{(1)} - x^{(2)}|} + \frac{y^{(1)} \cdot y^{(2)}}{m_0} \right) \quad (5)$$

with suitable values of $m_i = m_i + O(\mu)$, $M_i = m_0 + O(\mu)$. We consider the system in the Euclidean space, namely we take, in (5), $y^{(i)}, x^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, with $x^{(1)} \neq x^{(2)}$.

We call *Kepler maps* the class of symplectic⁴ coordinate systems $\mathcal{C} = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ell_1, \ell_2, y, x)$ for the Hamiltonian (5), where $y = (y_1, \dots, y_4)$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_4)$, such that:

- $\Lambda_i = m_i \sqrt{M_i a_i}$, where a_i denotes the semi-major axis of the i^{th} instantaneous⁵ ellipse;
- $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ are conjugated to Λ_1, Λ_2 . Such angles are defined in a different way according to the choice of \mathcal{C} . In all known examples, they are related to the area spanned by the planet along the instantaneous ellipse.

⁴Namely verifying

$$\Omega = d\Lambda \wedge d\ell + dy \wedge dx = \sum_{i=1}^2 d\Lambda_i \wedge d\ell_i + \sum_{i=1}^4 dy_i \wedge dx_i.$$

⁵With reference to the three-body Hamiltonian (5), the i^{th} *instantaneous ellipse* is the orbit generated by $h_i := \frac{|y^{(i)}|^2}{2m_i} - \frac{m_i M_i}{|x^{(i)}|}$ in a region of phase space where h_i is negative.

Using a Kepler map, the Hamiltonian (5) takes the form

$$H_C = -\frac{m_1^3 M_1^2}{2\Lambda_1^2} - \frac{m_2^3 M_2^2}{2\Lambda_2^2} + \mu f_C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ell_1, \ell_2, \hat{y}, \hat{x}) \quad (6)$$

where \hat{y}, \hat{x} include the couples (y_i, x_i) such⁶ that nor y_i nor x_i is negligible. \hat{y}, \hat{x} are often called *degenerate coordinates*, because they do not appear in (6) when μ is set to zero. In other words, H_C is a properly-degenerate close-to-be-integrable system, in the sense of the previous paragraph.

We call *co-planar, co-circular, outer retrograde configuration* the configuration of two planets in circular and co-planar motions, with the the angular momentum of the outer planet having opposite verse to the resulting one. In [19] it has been pointed out that, under a careful choice of C such configuration plays the rôle of an equilibrium for the (ℓ_1, ℓ_2) -averaged perturbing function

$$\bar{f}_C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \hat{y}, \hat{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{[0, 2\pi]^2} f_C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \ell_1, \ell_2, \hat{y}, \hat{x}) d\ell_1 d\ell_2.$$

But what matters more is that, closely to such equilibrium, there exist two such C_i 's such that the Hamiltonian H_{C_1} is suited to Theorem 1.1, while H_{C_2} is suited to Theorem 1.2. This leads to the following result, which states co-existence of stable and whiskered quasi-periodic motions in the three-body problem. It will be made more precise (see Theorem 2.1 below) and proved along the paper.

Theorem A *In the vicinity of the co-planar, co-circular, outer retrograde configuration, and provided that the masses of the planets and the semi-axes ratio are small, there exists a positive measure set \mathcal{K}_1 made of 5-dimensional quasi-periodic motions \mathcal{T}_1 's "surrounding" (in a sense which will be specified) 3-dimensional quasi-periodic motions \mathcal{T}_2 's, each equipped with two invariant manifolds, called, respectively, unstable, stable manifold, where the motions are respectively asymptotic to the \mathcal{T}_2 's in the past, in the future.*

We conclude with saying how this paper is organized.

- In Sections 2.1 and 2.2 we recall the main arguments of the discussion in [19], which lead to put the system (5) to a form suited to apply Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.
- In Sections 2.3 and 2.4 we check that the two domains where Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 apply have a non-empty intersection, and such intersection includes both families of tori. This check is subtle, because of the difference of the frameworks used.
- In Section 3 we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 via a carefully quantified KAM theory.

Acknowledgments G.P. is indebted to G. Gallavotti for many highlighting discussions. Theorem 1.1 is part of the MSc thesis of X.L. This research is funded by the PRIN project "New frontiers of Celestial Mechanics: theory and applications" and has been developed under the auspices of INdAM and GNFM.

The authors confirm that the manuscript has no associated data.

2 Ellipticity and hyperbolicity closely to co-planar, co-circular, outer retrograde configuration

Putting the system in a form suited to Theorem 1.1 requires identifying an elliptic equilibrium; while Theorem 1.2 calls for a hyperbolic one.

⁶The reason of this is that the Hamiltonian (5) has first integrals, as recalled in the next section.

Denoting as $C^{(i)} := x^{(i)} \times y^{(i)}$ the angular momenta of the planets, we proceed to study motions evolving from initial data close to the manifold

$$\mathcal{M}_\pi := \left\{ (y, x) : C^{(1)} \parallel (-C^{(2)}) \parallel C, \text{ and } x^{(1)}, x^{(2)} \text{ describe circular motions.} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

The sub-fix “ π ” recalls that $C^{(1)}$ and $C^{(2)}$ are opposite. In the two next sections, we recall material from [19], which highlights a sort of “double (elliptic, hyperbolic) nature” of \mathcal{M}_π .

2.1 Ellipticity (with BNF)

Basically⁷, the construction of the elliptic equilibrium – and of its associated BNF – proceeds as in [7]. We briefly resume the procedure here.

We fix a domain $\mathcal{D}_C \subset \mathbb{R}^{12}$ for impulse–position “Cartesian” coordinates

$$c = (y, x) := (y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}, x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})$$

of two point masses relatively to a prefixed orthonormal frame $(k^{(1)}, k^{(2)}, k^{(3)})$ in \mathbb{R}^3 . As a first step, we switch to a set of coordinates, well known in the literature, which we name JRD, after C. G. J. Jacobi, R. Radau and A. Deprit [17, 22, 11], who at different stages, contributed to their construction.

We fix a region of phase space where the orbits $t \rightarrow (x^{(j)}(t), y^{(j)}(t))$ generated by the unperturbed “Kepler” Hamiltonians

$$h_k^{(j)} := \frac{|y^{(j)}|^2}{2m_j} - \frac{m_j M_j}{|x^{(j)}|}$$

in (5) are ellipses with non-vanishing eccentricity. Then we denote as $P^{(j)}$ the unit vectors pointing in the directions of the perihelia; as a_j the semi–major axes; as ℓ_j the “mean anomaly” of $x^{(j)}$ (which, we recall, is defined as area of the elliptic sector from $P^{(j)}$ to $x^{(j)}$ “normalized at 2π ”); as $C^{(j)} = x^{(j)} \times y^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2$, the angular momenta of the two planets and $C := C^{(1)} + C^{(2)}$ the total angular momentum integral. We assume that the “nodes”

$$\nu_1 := k^{(3)} \times C, \quad \nu := C \times C^{(1)} = C^{(2)} \times C^{(1)} \quad (8)$$

do not vanish, anytime. Such condition is equivalent to ask that the planes determined by the instantaneous ellipses and the $(k^{(1)}, k^{(2)})$ plane never pairwise coincide. As in previous works, we use the following notations. For three vectors u, v, w with $u, v \perp w$, we denote as $\alpha_w(u, v)$ the angle formed by u to v relatively to the positive (counterclockwise) orientation established by w . Then the JRD coordinates are here denoted with the symbols

$$\text{JRD} := \left(\widehat{\text{JRD}} := (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, G_1, G_2, \ell_1, \ell_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2), (G, Z, \gamma, \zeta) \right) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{T}^4 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2 \quad (9)$$

and defined via the formulae

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Z := C \cdot k^{(3)} \\ G := \|C\| \\ G_1 := \|C^{(1)}\| \\ G_2 := \|C^{(2)}\| \\ \Lambda_j := M_j \sqrt{m_j a_j} \end{array} \right. \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \zeta := \alpha_{k^{(3)}}(k^{(1)}, \nu_1) \\ \gamma := \alpha_C(\nu_1, \nu) \\ \gamma_1 := \alpha_{C^{(1)}}(\nu, P^{(1)}) \\ \gamma_2 := \alpha_{C^{(2)}}(\nu, P^{(2)}) \\ \ell_j := \text{mean anomaly of } x^{(j)} \end{array} \right. \quad (10)$$

⁷As pointed out in [19], the only note–worthy difference with the case studied in [7] (which deals with prograde motions of the planets, namely, revolving all in the same verse) is that here the elliptic character of the equilibrium does not follow for free from the symmetry of the Hamiltonian, but is checked manually.

The main point of JRD is that Z , ζ and γ are ignorable coordinates and G is constant along the motions of $\text{SO}(3)$ -invariant systems. Therefore, most of motions of $\text{SO}(3)$ -invariant systems are effectively described by the “reduced” coordinates $\widehat{\text{JRD}}$. This strong property cannot be exploited in the case study of the paper, as the manifold \mathcal{M}_π in (7) is a singularity of the change (10). More generally, any co-planar or circular⁸ configuration is so. Pretty similarly as in [7], we bypass such difficulty switching to new coordinates denoted as

$$\text{RPS}_\pi := \left(\widehat{\text{RPS}}_\pi := (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \eta_1, \eta_2, \xi_1, \xi_2, p, q), (Z, \zeta) \right)$$

where the Λ_j 's, Z and ζ are the same⁹ as in (9), while

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1 = \ell_1 + \gamma_1 + \gamma \\ \lambda_2 = \ell_2 + \gamma_2 - \gamma \\ \eta_1 + i\xi_1 = \sqrt{2(\Lambda_1 - G_1)} e^{-i(\gamma_1 + \gamma)} \\ \eta_2 + i\xi_2 = -\sqrt{2(\Lambda_2 - G_2)} e^{i(-\gamma_2 + \gamma)} \\ p + iq = -\sqrt{2(G + G_2 - G_1)} e^{i\gamma} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

As in JRD, (Z, ζ) is a cyclic couple in $\text{SO}(3)$ -invariant Hamiltonians but now no more cyclic coordinates but it appears. This leaves the system with 5 degrees of freedom and an extra-integral: the action G written using RPS_π :

$$G_{\text{RPS}_\pi} := \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \frac{\eta_1^2 + \xi_1^2}{2} + \frac{\eta_2^2 + \xi_2^2}{2} + \frac{p^2 + q^2}{2}. \quad (12)$$

We denote as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{RPS}_\pi} &:= -\frac{m_1^3 M_1^2}{2\Lambda_1^2} - \frac{m_2^3 M_2^2}{2\Lambda_2^2} + \mu \left(-\frac{m_1 m_2}{|x_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^{(1)} - x_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^{(2)}|} + \frac{y_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^{(1)} \cdot y_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^{(2)}}{m_0} \right) \\ &=: h_k(\Lambda) + \mu f_{\text{RPS}_\pi}(\Lambda, \lambda, z) \quad z := (\eta, \xi, p, q) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

the Hamiltonian (5) written in RPS_π coordinates, and worry about it. We note that the manifold \mathcal{M}_π in (7) is now given by

$$\mathcal{M}_\pi = \{ \text{RPS}_\pi : z = 0 \}.$$

Then we consider a neighborhood of \mathcal{M}_π of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{RPS}_\pi, \varepsilon_0} := \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times B_{\varepsilon_0}^6(0),$$

where $B_{\varepsilon_0}^6$ is the 6-ball centred at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$ with radius ε_0 ; $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ and \mathcal{L} is defined as

$$\mathcal{L} := \left\{ \Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) : \Lambda_- < \Lambda_2 < \Lambda_+, \quad k_- \Lambda_2 < \Lambda_1 < k_+ \Lambda_2 \right\}. \quad (14)$$

⁸Circular configurations correspond to $G_i = \Lambda_i$; co-planar configurations correspond to $G = \sigma_1 G_1 + \sigma_2 G_2$, with $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \{\pm 1\}^2 \setminus \{(-1, -1)\}$.

⁹There is an inessential difference between the definition (11) and the one in [20, Eqs. (25), (26)]. Denoting as $\overline{\text{RPS}}_\pi := \left((\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_2, \bar{\eta}_1, \bar{\eta}_2, \bar{\xi}_1, \bar{\xi}_2, \bar{p}, \bar{q}), (P, Q) \right)$ the coordinates defined in [20], we have the following relations:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1 + \zeta \\ \bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2 - \zeta \\ \bar{\eta}_1 + i\bar{\xi}_1 = (\eta_1 + i\xi_1) e^{-i\zeta} \\ \bar{\eta}_2 + i\bar{\xi}_2 = (\eta_2 + i\xi_2) e^{i\zeta} \\ \bar{p} + i\bar{q} = (p + iq) e^{i\zeta} \\ P + iQ = \sqrt{2(G - Z)} e^{-i\zeta} \end{cases}$$

But as (Z, ζ) , (P, Q) and ζ do not appear in the Hamiltonian, its expression does not change.

Here, $0 < \Lambda_- < \Lambda_+$ are arbitrarily taken (more conditions on such numbers will be specified in the course of the paper) and, for fixed positive¹⁰ numbers $0 < \alpha_- < \alpha_+ < 1$, k_{\pm} are constants depending on α_{\pm} and the masses via

$$k_{\pm} := \frac{m_1}{m_2} \sqrt{\frac{m_0 + \mu m_2}{m_0 + \mu m_1}} \alpha_{\pm}. \quad (15)$$

We now take $0 < \delta < 1$ and¹¹ and assume

$$0 < \frac{m_2}{m_1} < \min \left\{ \sqrt{(1-\delta)\alpha_-}, 1-\delta \right\}, \quad 0 < \mu < \mu_0(\delta) := \frac{\delta m_0}{m_1(1-\delta) - m_2} \quad (16)$$

Then we¹² have

Proposition 2.1 ([19, Section III and Appendix A]) *One can find $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, depending only on $\Lambda_-, \delta, \alpha_-, m_1, m_2$ such that the function $H_{\text{RPS}\pi}$ in (13) is real-analytic¹³ for $(\Lambda, \lambda, \eta, \xi, p, q) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{RPS}\pi, \varepsilon_0}$. In addition, for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a positive number $\alpha^{\#}$ such that, if $\alpha_+ < \alpha^{\#}$, there exists a positive number $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ and a real-analytic canonical transformation*

$$\phi_{\text{BNF}} : (\Lambda, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{p}, \bar{q}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{RPS}\pi, \varepsilon_1} \rightarrow (\Lambda, \lambda, \eta, \xi, p, q) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{RPS}\pi, \varepsilon_0}$$

which carries $(\bar{\eta}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{p}, \bar{q}) = 0$ to $(\eta, \xi, p, q) = 0$ for all $(\bar{\Lambda}, \bar{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathbb{T}^2$, such that, if

$$H_{\text{BNF}} := H_{\text{RPS}\pi} \circ \phi_{\text{BNF}} = h_{\text{k}}(\Lambda) + \mu f_{\text{BNF}}(\Lambda, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{p}, \bar{q}) \quad (17)$$

¹⁰Observe that α_- and α_+ have the meaning of lower and upper bound for the semi-major axes ratio $\alpha = a_1/a_2$, namely,

$$\alpha_- \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_+ \quad \forall (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Indeed, from the formula

$$\frac{\Lambda_1}{\Lambda_2} = \frac{m_1}{m_2} \sqrt{\frac{m_0 + \mu m_2}{m_0 + \mu m_1}} \alpha$$

we find

$$\alpha \leq \left(\frac{m_2}{m_1} \right)^2 \frac{m_0 + \mu m_1}{m_0 + \mu m_2} k_+^2 = \alpha_+$$

and, similarly, $\alpha \geq \alpha_-$.

¹¹The reader might ask the reason of inequalities in (16). This is related to the fact that we want to investigate a region of phase space where the inner planet, labeled as “1”, has a larger angular momentum, namely, $G_1 > G_2$, and, simultaneously, the masses of the planets, as well as their eccentricities and mutual inclination are small. As, when eccentricities and mutual inclination go to zero, the G_i reduce to Λ_i , by (14), the number k_- in (15) needs to be strictly larger than 1. Conditions (16) are apt to ensure this, as in fact they immediately imply

$$1 - \delta \leq \frac{m_0 + \mu m_2}{m_0 + \mu m_1} \leq 1 + \delta$$

hence, by (15),

$$k_- \geq \frac{m_1}{m_2} \sqrt{(1-\delta)\alpha_-} > 1.$$

¹²The proof in [19, Appendix A] is given with $\delta = 1 - \frac{1}{4\chi^2} \geq \frac{3}{4}$, but works well also for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Indeed, for $(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}$,

$$\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 = \Lambda_2 \left(\frac{\Lambda_1}{\Lambda_2} - 1 \right) \geq \Lambda_- (k_- - 1) \geq \Lambda_- \left(\frac{m_1}{m_2} \sqrt{(1-\delta)\alpha_-} - 1 \right).$$

Therefore, for (Λ_1, Λ_2) on a complex neighborhood of \mathcal{L} depending on $\Lambda_-, m_1, m_2, \alpha_-$ and δ we shall have $|\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2| \geq \frac{\Lambda_-}{2} \left(\frac{m_1}{m_2} \sqrt{(1-\delta)\alpha_-} - 1 \right)$ and, as in the proof of [19, Proposition III.2], one can take $\varepsilon_0 < \frac{\Lambda_-}{2} \left(\frac{m_1}{m_2} \sqrt{(1-\delta)\alpha_-} - 1 \right)$ in order that the denominators of the functions c_1^*, c_2, c_2^* in [19, Appendix A] do not vanish, and so small that collisions are excluded.

¹³Namely, analytic on a complex neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{RPS}\pi, \varepsilon_0}$ and real-valued on $\mathcal{M}_{\text{RPS}\pi, \varepsilon_0}$.

then the averaged perturbing function

$$f_{\text{BNF}}^{\text{av}}(\Lambda, \bar{\eta}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{p}, \bar{q}) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f(\Lambda, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{p}, \bar{q}) d\bar{\lambda}_1 d\bar{\lambda}_2$$

“is in Birkhoff Normal Form of order s ”, namely:

$$f_{\text{BNF}}^{\text{av}} = C_0(\Lambda) + \Omega \cdot \bar{\tau} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\tau} \cdot \mathbb{T}(\Lambda) \bar{\tau} + \mathbb{1}_{s \geq 3} \sum_{j=3}^s \mathcal{P}_j(\bar{\tau}; \Lambda) + \mathcal{O}_{2s+1}(\bar{\eta}, \bar{\xi}, \bar{p}, \bar{q}; \Lambda)$$

where $\Omega(\Lambda) = (\Omega_1(\Lambda), \Omega_2(\Lambda), \Omega_3(\Lambda))$; $\mathcal{P}_j(\bar{\tau}; \Lambda)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree j in $\bar{\tau} := \left(\frac{\bar{\eta}_1^2 + \bar{\xi}_1^2}{2}, \frac{\bar{\eta}_2^2 + \bar{\xi}_2^2}{2}, \frac{\bar{p}^2 + \bar{q}^2}{2} \right)$ and the determinant of the 3×3 matrix $\mathbb{T}(\Lambda)$ does not identically vanish. Moreover, ϕ_{BNF} leaves $\mathbb{G}_{\text{RPS}_\pi}$ unvaried, meaning that the function

$$\bar{G} := \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - \frac{\bar{\eta}_1^2 + \bar{\xi}_1^2}{2} + \frac{\bar{\eta}_2^2 + \bar{\xi}_2^2}{2} + \frac{\bar{p}^2 + \bar{q}^2}{2}$$

is still a first integral to $\bar{\mathbb{H}}$.

2.2 Hyperbolicity

The hyperbolic character appears using a set of canonical coordinates, named *perihelia reduction* (*P-coordinates*). This is further set of canonical coordinates

$$\mathbb{P} := \left(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, (\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{G}, \zeta, \mathfrak{g}) \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{3n-2} \times \mathbb{T}^{3n-2} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2 \quad (18)$$

performing full reduction of $\text{SO}(3)$ invariance for a n -particle system, which, in addition keeps regular for co-planar motions. The \mathbb{P} -coordinates have been firstly introduced in [20], to which we refer for the proof of their canonical character. We remark that in (18), \mathbb{G} , \mathbb{Z} and ζ are the same as in JRD in (10). The coordinate \mathfrak{g} , conjugated to \mathbb{G} , is not the same as in (10), but of course $(\mathbb{Z}, \zeta, \mathfrak{g})$ are again ignorable and \mathbb{G} is constant in $\text{SO}(3)$ invariant systems. For the 3-body problem, namely, $n = 2$, the 8-plet $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ is given by

$$\hat{\mathbb{P}} := (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathbb{G}_2, \Theta, \ell_1, \ell_2, \mathfrak{g}_2, \vartheta)$$

with Λ_j , ℓ_j , \mathbb{G}_2 as in (10). To define Θ , \mathfrak{g} , ϑ and \mathfrak{g}_2 , we assume that

$$\nu_1 := k^{(3)} \times \mathbb{C}, \quad \mathfrak{n}_1 := \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{P}^{(1)}, \quad \nu_2 := \mathbb{P}^{(1)} \times \mathbb{C}^{(2)}, \quad \mathfrak{n}_2 = \mathbb{C}^{(2)} \times \mathbb{P}^{(2)} \quad (19)$$

do not vanish. Note that ν_1 in (19) is the same as in (8). We¹⁴ let (under the same notations as in the previous section)

$$\Theta := \mathbb{C} \cdot \mathbb{P}^{(1)} = \mathbb{C}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbb{P}^{(1)} \quad \begin{cases} \vartheta := \alpha_{\mathbb{P}^{(1)}}(\mathfrak{n}_1, \nu_2) \\ \mathfrak{g} := \alpha_{\mathbb{C}}(\nu_1, \mathfrak{n}_1) \\ \mathfrak{g}_2 := \alpha_{\mathbb{C}^{(2)}}(\nu_2, \mathfrak{n}_2) \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

We now describe the rôle of the \mathbb{P} -coordinates in the Hamiltonian (5). We denote as

$$\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{P}} = h_k(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) + \mu f_{\mathbb{P}}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathbb{G}_2, \Theta; \ell_1, \ell_2, \mathfrak{g}_2, \vartheta; \mathbb{G})$$

¹⁴The second equality in the first equation in (20) is implied by $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}^{(1)} + \mathbb{C}^{(2)}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbb{P}^{(1)} = 0$.

where

$$h_k(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = -\frac{m_1^3 M_1^2}{2\Lambda_1^2} - \frac{m_2^3 M_2^2}{2\Lambda_2^2}, \quad f_P = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{|x_P^{(1)} - x_P^{(2)}|} + \frac{y_P^{(1)} \cdot y_P^{(2)}}{m_0}.$$

the Hamiltonian (5) expressed in terms of P, and

$$f_P^{\text{av}} := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{[0, 2\pi]^2} f_P d\ell_1 d\ell_2$$

the doubly averaged perturbing function. We look at the expansion

$$f_P^{\text{av}} = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{a_2} \left(1 + \alpha^2 P + O(\alpha^3) \right)$$

where $\alpha := \frac{a_1}{a_2}$ is the semi-major axes ratio. We focus on the function P. Let \mathcal{L} as in (14); $c \in (0, 1)$, and put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_P(\mathbf{G}) &:= \left\{ \Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L} : \begin{aligned} &\Lambda_1 > \mathbf{G} + \frac{2}{c} \sqrt{\alpha_+} \Lambda_2 \\ &5\Lambda_1^2 \mathbf{G} - (\mathbf{G} + \frac{2}{c} \sqrt{\alpha_+} \Lambda_1)^2 (4\mathbf{G} + \frac{2}{c} \sqrt{\alpha_+} \Lambda_1) > 0, \\ &5\Lambda_1^2 \mathbf{G} - (\mathbf{G} + \Lambda_2)(4\mathbf{G} + \Lambda_2) > 0 \\ &\Lambda_2 > \mathbf{G}, \quad \Lambda_1 > 2\mathbf{G} \end{aligned} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_P(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathbf{G}) := \left\{ \mathbf{G}_2 : \max\left\{\frac{2}{c} \sqrt{\alpha_+} \Lambda_2, \mathbf{G}\right\} < \mathbf{G}_2 < \Lambda_2 \right\} \quad (22)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_P(\mathbf{G}) := \left\{ (\Theta, \vartheta) : |\Theta| < \frac{\mathbf{G}}{2}, |\vartheta| < \frac{\pi}{2} \right\}$$

and finally

$$\mathcal{A}_P(\mathbf{G}) := \left\{ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \mathbf{G}_2) : (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_P(\mathbf{G}), \mathbf{G}_2 \in \mathcal{G}_P(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \right\}$$

Moreover, we let

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{G}) := \mathcal{A}_P(\mathbf{G}) \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathcal{B}_P(\mathbf{G}), \quad \mathcal{N}_0(\mathbf{G}) := \mathcal{A}_P(\mathbf{G}) \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \{0, 0\}. \quad (23)$$

Note that phase points in \mathcal{N}_0 has the geometrical meaning of co-planar motions with the outer planet in retrograde motion.

Proposition 2.2 ([19, Section IV]) *The 4 degrees of freedom Hamiltonian H_P is real-analytic in \mathcal{N} . It has an equilibrium on \mathcal{N}_0 . Such equilibrium turns to be hyperbolic¹⁵ for P.*

2.3 Existence and co-existence of two families of tori

Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 can now be used to prove the existence of both full-dimensional and whiskered, co-dimension 2 tori in the three-body problem. Indeed:

¹⁵In [20] a slightly more general result is proved: the equilibrium is hyperbolic when \mathcal{L}_P in (21) is defined without the inequality

$$5\Lambda_1^2 \mathbf{G} - (\mathbf{G} + \Lambda_2)(4\mathbf{G} + \Lambda_2) > 0 \quad (24)$$

and \mathcal{G}_P in (22) is taken to be $\left\{ \mathbf{G}_2 : \max\left\{\frac{2}{c} \sqrt{\alpha_+} \Lambda_2, \mathbf{G}\right\} < \mathbf{G}_2 < \min\{\Lambda_2, \mathbf{G}^*\} \right\}$, with \mathbf{G}^* the unique root of the polynomial $\mathbf{G}_2 \rightarrow 5\Lambda_1^2 \mathbf{G}_2 - (\mathbf{G} + \mathbf{G}_2)(4\mathbf{G} + \mathbf{G}_2)$. But as (24) ensures $\Lambda_2 < \mathbf{G}^*$, under such restriction, \mathcal{G}_P can be taken as in (22).

- Under conditions (1), by Theorem 1.1, an invariant¹⁶ set $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon$ for the Hamiltonian H_{RPS_π} with 5–dimensional frequencies is found, whose measure satisfies

$$\text{meas}\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon > \text{meas}\mathcal{F} > \left(1 - C_*\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+\bar{s}}\right) \text{meas}\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon \quad (25)$$

where $\bar{s} = s - 2$.

- Under conditions (3) with $a = \alpha_+$, by Theorem 1.2, for any $G \in \mathbb{R}_+$, one finds an invariant set $\mathcal{H}(G) \subset \mathcal{N}_0(G)$ with 3–dimensional frequencies for H_P and equipped with 4–dimensional stable and unstable manifolds¹⁷, whose measure satisfies

$$\text{meas}\mathcal{N}_0(G) > \text{meas}\mathcal{H}(G) > \left(1 - C_*\sqrt{\alpha_+}\right) \text{meas}\mathcal{N}_0(G) . \quad (26)$$

In the next, we show that the invariant sets \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{H}(G)$ constructed above “have a common domain of existence”. We have to make this assertion more precise, mainly because \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{H}(G)$ have been constructed with different formalisms.

Let

$$\phi_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^P : \text{RPS}_\pi \rightarrow P \quad (27)$$

the canonical change of coordinates between RPS_π and P , well defined in a full measure set.

Let \mathbb{G}_* , \mathbb{G}_0 the respective images under the function (12):

$$\mathbb{G}_0 := G_{\text{RPS}_\pi}(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon) , \quad \mathbb{G}_* := G_{\text{RPS}_\pi}(\mathcal{F})$$

of the sets \mathcal{M}_ε , \mathcal{F} . As $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon$, then $\mathbb{G}_* \subset \mathbb{G}_0$. For any $G_0 \in \mathbb{G}_0$, $G_* \in \mathbb{G}_*$, let

$$\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(G_0) := \mathcal{M}_\varepsilon \cap \{G_{\text{RPS}_\pi} = G_0\} , \quad \mathcal{F}(G_*) := \mathcal{F} \cap \{G_{\text{RPS}_\pi} = G_*\}$$

$\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(G_0)$ and $\mathcal{F}(G_*)$ are invariant sets because G_{RPS_π} is conserved along the motions of H_{RPS} .

Define:

$$\mathcal{M}'_\varepsilon(G_0) := \phi_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^P(\mathcal{M}_\varepsilon(G_0)) , \quad \mathcal{F}'(G_*) := \phi_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^P(\mathcal{F}(G_*)) .$$

At the cost of eliminating zero–measure sets from \mathbb{G}_0 , \mathbb{G}_* , the sets $\mathcal{F}'(G_*)$, $\mathcal{M}'_\varepsilon(G_0)$ are well–defined, for all $G_0 \in \mathbb{G}_0$, $G_* \in \mathbb{G}_*$. Then split

$$\mathcal{M}'_\varepsilon(G_0) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_0) \times \{G = G_0, g \in \mathbb{T}\} \quad \mathcal{F}'(G_*) = \widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*) \times \{G = G_*, g \in \mathbb{T}\}$$

The volume–preserving property of $\phi_{\text{RPS}_\pi}^P$ in (27), the monotonicity of the Lebesgue integral and the bounds in (25) guarantee that

$$\text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*) > \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*) > \left(1 - C_1\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+\bar{s}}\right) \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*) \quad \forall G_* \in \mathbb{G}_* . \quad (28)$$

with some $C_1 > 0$.

Recall now the definition of $\mathcal{N}(G)$, $\mathcal{N}_0(G)$ in (23) and $\mathcal{H}(G)$ in (26). The main result of the paper is the following

¹⁶More precisely, Theorem 1.1 is applied to the Hamiltonian H_{BNF} in (17), hence with

$$n_1 = 2, \quad n_2 = 3, \quad V = \mathcal{L}, \quad \varepsilon = \varepsilon_1, \quad H_0 = h_k, \quad P = f_{\text{BNF}}$$

corresponding to the image under $\bar{\phi}$ of the invariant set obtained through the thesis of Theorem 1.1.

¹⁷Theorem 1.2 is applied to the Hamiltonian H_P of Proposition 2.2, hence with

$$n_1 = 2, \quad n_2 = 1, \quad V = \mathcal{A}_P(G) \\ H_0 = h_k - \frac{m_1 m_2}{a_2}, \quad P_0 = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{a_2} \alpha^2 P, \quad P_1 = -\frac{m_1 m_2}{a_2} O(\alpha^3), \quad a = \alpha_+$$

Theorem 2.1 *Let $\sigma > 0$ half-integer. There exist $\varepsilon_*, c_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that, if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_*$, $G_* \in \mathbb{G}_*$, $G_* > c_0^{-1}\varepsilon^2$, $\alpha_+ \leq c_0\varepsilon^{12}$ and μ verifies (1), (3) with $a = \alpha_+$ and $s = \sigma + \frac{7}{2}$, then there exists a non-empty set $\mathcal{A}_*(G_*)$ such that, letting*

$$\mathcal{Q}(G_*) := \mathcal{A}_*(G_*) \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathcal{B}_1(\varepsilon, G_*), \quad \mathcal{Q}_0(G_*) := \mathcal{A}_*(G_*) \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \{(0, 0)\}$$

and denoting $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'_*(G_*)$, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_*(G_*)$ the respective intersections of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*)$, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(G_*)$ with $\mathcal{Q}(G_*)$, $\mathcal{Q}_0(G_*)$ then $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'_*(G_*)$, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_*(G_*)$ are non-empty and in fact verify

$$\text{meas}\mathcal{Q}(G_*) \geq \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'_*(G_*) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon^\sigma}{\varepsilon_*^\sigma}\right) \text{meas}\mathcal{Q}(G_*) \quad (29)$$

$$\text{meas}\mathcal{Q}_0(G_*) \geq \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_*(G_*) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_+}{c_0\varepsilon^{12}}\right) \text{meas}\mathcal{Q}_0(G_*). \quad (30)$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 relies on some technical result (Propositions 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 below) which we now state and prove later.

Proposition 2.3 *Let, for a suitable pure number $\underline{k} \in (1, 2)$, $\Lambda_- < G$, $k_- \leq \underline{k}$, $k_+ \geq 2$, $\alpha_+ \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}$. Choose Λ_+ as the unique value of $\Lambda_2 > G$ such that \mathcal{C} and the straight line $\Lambda_1 = 2\Lambda_2$ meet at $(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = (2\Lambda_+, \Lambda_+)$. Let*

$$\mathcal{L}_0(G) := \left\{ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) : G \leq \Lambda_2 \leq \Lambda_+, \quad (G + \Lambda_2)\sqrt{\frac{4G + \Lambda_2}{5G}} < \Lambda_1 < \min\{k_+ \Lambda_2, 2\Lambda_+\} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_0(G) := \left\{ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, G_2) : (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_0(G), G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_p(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \right\}$$

Then the set

$$\mathcal{N}_0(G) := \mathcal{A}_0(G) \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathcal{B}_p(G)$$

is a subset of $\mathcal{N}(G)$.

Proposition 2.4 *There exists $c_1 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on Λ_+/G , Λ_-/G such that, letting, for any $\gamma < c_1^2\varepsilon^2$,*

$$\mathcal{L}_1(G) := \left\{ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad |\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2 - G| < c_1^2\varepsilon^2 \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_1(\Lambda_2) := \left\{ G_2 : \Lambda_2 - c_1^2\varepsilon^2 < G_2 < \Lambda_2 - \gamma \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1(G) := \left\{ (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, G_2) : (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{L}_1, \quad G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_1(\Lambda_2) \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_1(G, \varepsilon) := \left\{ (\Theta, \vartheta) : \Theta^2 < c_1^2G\varepsilon^2, \quad \vartheta^2 < c_1^2\frac{\varepsilon^2}{G} \right\}$$

then the set

$$\mathcal{N}_1(G, \varepsilon) := \mathcal{A}_1(G) \times \mathbb{T}^3 \times \mathcal{B}_1(G, \varepsilon)$$

is a subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G)$.

Proposition 2.5 *Assume $G \geq 10c_1^2\varepsilon^2$ and $\alpha_+ < \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_0(G)$ and $\mathcal{A}_1(G)$ have a non-empty intersection $\mathcal{A}_*(G)$, verifying*

$$\text{meas}(\mathcal{A}_*(G)) \geq \frac{9}{10}(c_1^2\varepsilon^2 - \gamma)c_1^4\varepsilon^4$$

We prove how Theorem 2.1 follows from the above propositions. $\mathcal{Q}(G_*)$ is a subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*)$ and $\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon(G_*)$, and

$$\text{meas}\mathcal{Q}(G_*) = C_1\varepsilon^8 = C_2\varepsilon^2 \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon.$$

The bound in (28) guarantees that

$$\text{meas}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*) \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*)\right) < C_3\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+\overline{s}} \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*) \quad \forall G_* \in \mathbb{G}_*.$$

On the other hand, if $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*) \cap \mathcal{Q}(G_*)$ was empty, we would have

$$\text{meas}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*) \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*)\right) \geq \text{meas}\mathcal{Q}(G_*) = C_2\varepsilon^2 \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*)$$

which contradicts the previous inequality if $\overline{s} > \frac{3}{2}$ and ε is small. Finally, if $G_* \in \mathbb{G}_*$,

$$\text{meas}\left(\mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon(G_*) \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*)\right) \leq \text{meas}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*) \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{F}}'(G_*)\right) < C_3\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+\overline{s}} \text{meas}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}'_\varepsilon(G_*) = C_4\varepsilon^{\overline{s}-\frac{3}{2}} \text{meas}\mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon(G_*)$$

and we have (29) with $\sigma = \overline{s} - \frac{3}{2} = s - \frac{7}{2}$, with $s \geq 4$. The proof of (30) is similar.

2.4 Proof of Propositions 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5

Proof of Proposition 2.3 We only need to prove that $\mathcal{L}_0(G) \subset \mathcal{L}_p(G)$. We switch to the coordinates

$$y := \frac{\Lambda_1}{G}, \quad x := \frac{\Lambda_2}{G}.$$

We denote as $\mathcal{X}_p := G^{-1}\mathcal{L}_p$ the domain of (y, x) , and as

$$x_- := \frac{\Lambda_-}{G}, \quad x_+ := \frac{\Lambda_+}{G}$$

\mathcal{X}_p can be written as the intersection of the three sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_1 &:= \left\{ (y, x) : 1 \leq x \leq x_+, \quad y > 2, \quad \max\{k_-x, (1+x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}}\} < y < k_+x \right\} \\ \mathcal{X}_2 &:= \left\{ (y, x) : 1 \leq x \leq x_+, \quad y > 1 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+x} \right\} \\ \mathcal{X}_3 &:= \left\{ (y, x) : 1 \leq x \leq x_+, \quad y > 2, \quad 5y^2 - \left(1 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+y}\right)^2 \left(4 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+y}\right) > 0 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We prove $\mathcal{X}_0 := G^{-1}\mathcal{L}_0$ is a subset of all of them. The curve

$$\mathcal{C} : \quad y = (1+x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}} \quad x \geq 1$$

passes through $P_0 = (1, 2)$. We denote as \underline{k} the slope of the straight line $y = kx$ which is tangent at \mathcal{C} at P_0 . The slope of the straight line $y = kx$ through P_0 is obviously $\bar{k} = 2$. We assume that

$$k_- \leq \underline{k}, \quad k_+ \geq \bar{k}$$




Figure 1: The blue curve is \mathcal{C} ; the orange line has slope k_- , the green one has slope k_+ (MATHEMATICA).

and choose (x_+, y_+) as the only (x, y) with $x > 1$ such that \mathcal{C} meets $y = 2x$ at (x, y) . Under such assumptions, we have:

$$\mathcal{X}_1 = \left\{ (y, x) : 1 \leq x \leq x_+, \quad (1+x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}} < y < k_+ x \right\} \supset \mathcal{X}_0$$

The straight line which is tangent at \mathcal{C} at $P_0 = (1, 2)$ has equation

$$y = \frac{6}{5}x + \frac{4}{5}$$

Since we $\alpha_+ < \frac{c^2}{4}$, $x > 1$ and \mathcal{C} is convex, we have

$$1 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+}x \leq 1 + x \leq \frac{6}{5}x + \frac{4}{5} \leq (1+x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{X}_2 \supset \mathcal{X}_0$. As for \mathcal{X}_3 , we note that for

$$\alpha_+ \leq \frac{c^2}{16}$$

it is

$$5y^2 - \left(1 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+}y\right)^2 \left(4 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+}y\right) \geq 5y^2 - \left(1 + \frac{y}{2}\right)^2 \left(4 + \frac{y}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{4}(y-2)(y-y_-)(y_+ - y).$$

with

$$y_{\pm} = 13 \pm \sqrt{185}.$$

As $y_- < 0$ and $(y-2)(y_+ - y) \geq 0$ on \mathcal{X}_0 , we have that $\mathcal{X}_3 \supset \mathcal{X}_0$. \square

Remark 2.1 The numbers \underline{k} , Λ_+ of Proposition 2.3 can be chosen as

$$\Lambda_+ = \frac{G}{2} \left(13 + \sqrt{185}\right), \quad \underline{k} = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{3}{10}(69 + 11\sqrt{33})} \sim 1.57$$




Figure 2: $\mathcal{L}_0(G)$ (blue) and $\mathcal{L}_1(G)$ (green).

Λ_+ is related to the number x_+ computed along the proof via $\Lambda_+ = x_+G$. \underline{k} is defined as the slope of the straight line $y = kx$ which is tangent at \mathcal{C} . We can compute it eliminating y between the two equations, we obtain the cubic equation

$$x^3 + (6 - 5k^2)x^2 + 9x + 4 = 0. \quad (31)$$

The tangency condition is imposed identifying this equation with

$$(x - a)^2(x - b) = 0 \quad (32)$$

where a is the abscissa of the tangency point. Equating the respective coefficients of (31) and (32), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} -(b + 2a) = 6 - 5k^2 \\ 2ab + a^2 = 9 \\ -a^2b = 4 \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

Eliminating b through the second and the third equations, we obtain

$$a^3 - 9a - 8 = 0$$

which has the following three roots:

$$a_0 = -1, \quad a_{\pm} = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{33}}{2}.$$

The only admissible value is then

$$a = a_+ = \frac{1 + \sqrt{33}}{2}.$$

In correspondence of this value for a , solving the system in (33), we find

$$b = \frac{-17 + \sqrt{33}}{32}, \quad k = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{3}{10}(69 + 11\sqrt{33})} = \underline{k}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 2.4 From (11), we get

$$|z|^2 = \eta_1^2 + \xi_1^2 + \eta_2^2 + \xi_2^2 + p^2 + q^2 = 2(G + G_2 - G_1) + 2(\Lambda_1 - G_1) + 2(\Lambda_2 - G_2).$$

From the equality

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= \sqrt{G^2 + G_2^2 - 2\Theta^2 + 2\sqrt{G^2 - \Theta^2}\sqrt{G_2^2 - \Theta^2}\cos\vartheta} \\ &= G + G_2 + O\left(\frac{\Theta^2}{G + G_2}\right) + O\left(\frac{\Theta^2 G_2}{G(G + G_2)}\right) + O\left(\frac{\Theta^2 G}{G_2(G + G_2)}\right) + O\left(\frac{\vartheta^2 G G_2}{G + G_2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and the definition of $\Lambda_1(G)$, the assertion trivially follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.5 Let Λ_2^* be the abscissa, in the plane (Λ_2, Λ_1) , of the intersection point between the curves

$$\Lambda_1 = (G + \Lambda_2)\sqrt{\frac{4G + \Lambda_2}{5G}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 + G + c_1^2 \varepsilon^2.$$

Using the coordinate $x := \frac{\Lambda_2}{G}$. With $x^* := \frac{\Lambda_2^*}{G}$, $\theta := \frac{c_1^2 \varepsilon^2}{G}$, $\zeta := \frac{\gamma}{G}$, where $\zeta < \theta$, the set $\mathcal{A}_\star(G) := \mathcal{A}_0(G) \cap \mathcal{A}_1(G)$ has measure

$$\text{meas}(\mathcal{A}_\star(G)) = G^3 \int_{1+\zeta}^{x^*} F_1(x) F_2'(x) dx$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(x) &= \min\{2x, x + 1 + \theta\} - (1 + x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}} \\ F_2(x) &= \min\{\theta - \zeta, x - 1 - \zeta, mx - \zeta\} \end{aligned}$$

and where, for short, we have let $m := 1 - \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+}$. Then,

$$\text{meas}(\mathcal{A}_\star(G)) \geq G^3 \int_{1+\zeta}^{x^*} F_1(x) F_2(x) dx. \quad (34)$$

To go further, we need a quantitative bound on x^* . Indeed we have

Claim 2.1 *If $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{10}$, then $1 + 4\theta < x^* < 1 + 6\theta$.*

The proof of the claim is postponed below, in order not to interrupt the main proof.

Since we have assumed $G \geq 10c_1^2 \varepsilon^2$ and $\alpha_+ \leq \frac{c^2}{16}$, then $G \geq \frac{\frac{12}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+}}{1 - \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\alpha_+}} c_1^2 \varepsilon^2$. In the new variables, this is $\theta \leq \frac{m}{6(1-m)}$. But then

$$x^* < 1 + 6\theta \leq \frac{1}{1-m} \quad \implies \quad x - 1 - \zeta \leq mx - \zeta \quad \forall x < x^*$$

whence

$$F_2(x) = \begin{cases} x - 1 - \zeta & \text{if } 1 + \zeta \leq x \leq 1 + \theta \\ \theta - \zeta & \text{if } 1 + \theta < x \leq x^* \end{cases}$$

Observe that the second inequality is well put, because $x^* > 1 + 4\theta$, as said. The function $F_1(x)$ splits in the same intervals:

$$F_1(x) = \begin{cases} 2x - (1 + x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}} & \text{if } 1 + \zeta \leq x \leq 1 + \theta \\ x + 1 + \theta - (1 + x)\sqrt{\frac{4+x}{5}} & \text{if } 1 + \theta < x \leq x^* \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

Since $\zeta < \theta$, a lower bound to the integral in (34) is given by

$$\int_{1+\zeta}^{x^*} F_1(x)F_2(x)dx \geq \int_{1+\theta}^{x^*} F_1(x)F_2(x)dx = (\theta - \zeta) \int_{1+\theta}^{x^*} F(x)dx$$

with

$$F(x) := x + 1 + \theta - (1 + x)\sqrt{\frac{x+4}{5}} \quad (36)$$

the function in the second line in (35). Since F is the difference of a linear function and a convex one, it is concave. Then we have

$$F(x) \geq F(1) + \frac{F(x^*) - F(1)}{x^* - 1}(x - 1) \quad \forall 1 \leq x \leq x^*$$

since $F(x^*) = 0$ and $F(1) = \theta$, this inequality becomes

$$F(x) \geq \frac{x^* - x}{x^* - 1}\theta \quad \forall 1 \leq x \leq x^*$$

hence

$$\int_{1+\theta}^{x^*} F(x)dx \geq \frac{\theta}{x^* - 1} \int_{1+\theta}^{x^*} (x^* - x)dx = \frac{\theta}{2} \frac{(x^* - 1 - \theta)^2}{x^* - 1} \geq \frac{9}{10}\theta^2$$

having used $1 + 4\theta < x^* < 1 + 6\theta$.

It remains to prove Claim 2.1. x^* is defined as the zero of the function F in (36) in the range $(1, +\infty)$. Multiplying the left hand side of Equation

$$x + 1 + \theta - (1 + x)\sqrt{\frac{x+4}{5}} = 0$$

by $x + 1 + \theta + (1 + x)\sqrt{\frac{x+4}{5}}$, we obtain the algebraic equation of degree three

$$x^3 + x^2 + (1 + 10\theta)x - 1 - 10\theta - 5\theta^2 = 0$$

which, for $x \geq -1$ is completely equivalent to the initial equation. We aim to apply a bisection argument to the function at left hand side, which we denote as $G(x)$. We have

$$G(1 + 4\theta) = \theta(64\theta^2 + 19\theta - 4), \quad G(1 + 6\theta) = \theta(216\theta^2 + 79\theta + 4)$$

and it is immediate to check that

$$G(1 + 4\theta) < 0 \quad G(1 + 6\theta) > 0 \quad \forall 0 < \theta < \frac{-19 + \sqrt{1385}}{128} = 0.142\dots$$

To prove uniqueness, just observe that the function $x \in (0, +\infty) \rightarrow G(x)$ is increasing for all $\theta > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

3 Quantitative KAM theory

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on an application of [6, Proposition 3]. The method is completely analogous to the one used in the proof of [6, Theorem 1.3], so we shall only say what

to change in the proof of [6, Theorem 1.3] in order to obtain the proof of Theorem 1.1. The polynomial $N(I, r)$ in the first non numbered formula in [6, Section 4] is to be changed as

$$N(I, r) = P_0(I) + \sum_{i=1}^m \Omega_i(I) r_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m \beta_{ij}(I) r_i r_j + \mathbb{1}_{s \geq 3} \sum_{j=3}^s \mathcal{P}_j(r; I). \quad (37)$$

Equations (60) and (61) in [6] can be modified, respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{B_\varepsilon^{2m} \times V_{\rho_0}} |\tilde{P}_{\text{av}}| &\leq C \varepsilon^{2s+1} \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 \\ \mu < \frac{\varepsilon^{2s+2}}{(\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{2\tau+1}} \quad \bar{\gamma} > \left(\frac{6(2s+1)}{s_0} \right)^{\tau+\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\sqrt{\mu} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{\tau+\frac{1}{2}}}{\varepsilon^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Analogously to [6], one next applies Lemma A.1 in [6], but modifying the choice of K as

$$K = \frac{6(2s+1)}{s_0} \log \varepsilon^{-1} \quad (39)$$

and leaving the other quantities unvaried. A bound as in Equation (62) in [6] is so obtained, with H_0 as in [6], $N(\bar{I}, \bar{r})$ as in (37), $\mu \tilde{P}_{\text{av}}(\bar{p}, \bar{q}, \bar{I}) = f_{\text{BNF}}(I, \bar{p}, \bar{q}) - N(\bar{I}, \bar{r})$ uniformly bounded by $C \mu \varepsilon^{2s+1}$, by (A₂). Due to the choice of K in (39) and the one for $\bar{\gamma}$ in (38), a bound similar to the one in Equation (63) in [6] holds, with the right hand side replaced by $\bar{C} \mu \varepsilon^{2s+1}$. At this point, one follows the indications in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [6]. Namely, one has to repeat the procedure in Steps 5 and 6 of the proof Theorem 1.4 (previously proved in [6]), with the following modification. The annulus $\mathcal{A}(\varepsilon)$ in Equation (47) in [6] is to be taken as

$$\mathcal{A}(\varepsilon) = \left\{ J \in \mathbb{R}^m : \check{c}_1 \varepsilon^{s+\frac{1}{2}} < J_i < \check{c}_2 \varepsilon^2, \quad 1 < i < m \right\}$$

and the number $\check{\rho}$ in Equation (48) in [6] is to be replaced with $\check{\rho} := \min\{\check{c}_1 \varepsilon^{s+\frac{1}{2}}/2, \bar{\rho}/48\}$. The other quantities remain unvaried. In the remaining Steps 5 and 6 of the proof of Theorem 1.4 in [6] replace the number “5” appearing in all the formulae with $(2s+1)$ and $\varepsilon^{n_2/2}$ in Equation (56) (and the formulae below) in [6] with $\varepsilon^{m(s-\frac{3}{2})}$. \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

The proof of Theorem 1.2 proceeds along the same lines as the proof of Theorem 1.1, apart for being based on a generalization (Theorem 3.1 below) of [6, Proposition 3] which now we state. As in [6] $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the set of vectors $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ satisfying for any $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}^{n_2} \setminus \{0\}$, inequality

$$|\omega_1 \cdot k_1 + \omega_2 \cdot k_2| \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma_1}{|k|^\tau} & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0; \\ \frac{\gamma_2}{|k_2|^\tau} & \text{if } k_1 = 0, \quad k_2 \neq 0. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Theorem 3.1 *Let $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $n := n_1 + n_2$, $\tau > n$, $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 > 0$, $0 < s \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon+\varepsilon}$, $\rho > 0$, $A := D_\rho \times B_{\varepsilon+\varepsilon}^2$, and let*

$$\mathbf{H}(I, \psi, p, q) = \mathbf{h}(I, pq) + \mathbf{f}(I, \psi, p, q)$$

be real-analytic on $A \times \mathbb{T}_{\varepsilon+s}^n$. Let

$$I = (I_1, I_1), \quad \varpi(I, pq) := \partial_{(I, pq)} \mathbf{h}(I, pq) = (\omega_1(I_1, I_2, pq), \omega_2(I_1, I_2, pq), \nu(I_1, I_2, pq))$$

with $\omega_k(I_1, I_2, pq) := \partial_{I_k} h(I_1, I_2, pq)$, and assume that the map $I \in D_\rho \rightarrow \omega(I, J)$ is a diffeomorphism of D_ρ for all $J = pq$, with $(p, q) \in B_\varepsilon^2$, with non singular Hessian matrix $U(I, J) := \partial_{I,J}^2 h(I, J)$. Let¹⁸

$$M \geq \|\partial\omega\|_A, \quad \widehat{M} \geq \|\partial\omega_1\|_A, \quad \overline{M} \geq \|U^{-1}\|_A, \quad E \geq \|f\|_{\rho, \overline{s}+s}, \quad \lambda \leq \inf |\operatorname{Re} \nu|_A.$$

Assume, for¹⁹ simplicity,

$$2 \frac{s^\tau \gamma_2}{6^\tau \lambda} \leq 1. \quad (41)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{c} &:= 2^7 (n+1) (24)^\tau, \quad \widetilde{c} := 2^6 \\ K &:= \frac{32}{s} \log_+ \left(\frac{EM^2 L}{\gamma_1^2} \right)^{-1} \quad \text{where} \quad \log_+ a := \max\{1, \log a\} \\ \widehat{\rho} &:= \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1}{2MK^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\gamma_2}{2\widehat{M}K^{\tau+1}}, \rho \right\}, \quad \widetilde{\rho} := \min \left\{ \widehat{\rho}, \frac{\varepsilon^2}{s} \right\} \\ L &:= \max \left\{ \overline{M}, M^{-1}, \widehat{M}^{-1} \right\} \\ \widehat{E} &:= \frac{EL}{\widetilde{\rho} \rho}, \quad \widetilde{E} := \frac{E}{\lambda \varepsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $\overline{M}_1, \overline{M}_2$ upper bounds on the norms of the sub-matrices $n_1 \times n, n_2 \times n$ of U^{-1} of the first n_1 , last n_2 rows²⁰. Assume the perturbation f so small that the following ‘‘KAM conditions’’ hold

$$\widehat{c} \widehat{E} < 1, \quad \widetilde{c} \widetilde{E} < 1 \quad (42)$$

Then, for any $(\pi, \kappa) \in B_\varepsilon^2$ and any $\omega_* \in \Omega_*(\pi, \kappa) := \omega(D, \pi, \kappa) \cap \mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau}$, one can find a unique real-analytic embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\omega_*} : \mathbb{T}^n \times \{(\pi, \kappa)\} &\rightarrow \operatorname{Re}(D_r) \times \mathbb{T}^n \times B_{\overline{\varepsilon}+r}^2 \\ (\vartheta, \pi, \kappa) &\rightarrow \left(v(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), \vartheta + u(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), \pi + w(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), \kappa + y(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

such that $\mathcal{M}_{\omega_*} := \phi_{\omega_*}(\mathbb{T}^n \times B_\varepsilon^2)$ is a real-analytic $(n+2)$ -dimensional manifold, on which the H -flow is analytically conjugated to

$$(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times B_\varepsilon^2 \rightarrow (\vartheta + \omega_* t, \pi \rightarrow \pi e^{-\nu_*(\omega_*, \pi, \kappa)t}, \kappa \rightarrow \kappa e^{\nu_*(\omega_*, \pi, \kappa)t}). \quad (44)$$

In particular, the manifolds

$$\mathbb{T}_{\omega_*} := \phi_{\omega_*}(\mathbb{T}^n \times \{(0, 0)\})$$

are real-analytic n -dimensional H -invariant tori embedded in $\operatorname{Re}(D_r) \times \mathbb{T}^n \times B_\varepsilon^2$, equipped with $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifolds

$$\mathcal{M}_u := \phi_{\omega_*}(\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\} \times B_\varepsilon^1), \quad \mathcal{M}_s := \phi_{\omega_*}(\mathbb{T}^n \times B_\varepsilon^1 \times \{0\})$$

on which the motions leave, approach \mathbb{T}_{ω_*} at an exponential rate. Let $\mathbb{T}_{\omega_*, 0}$ denote the projection of \mathbb{T}_{ω_*} on the (I, φ) -variables, and $\mathbb{K}_0 := \bigcup_{\omega_* \in \Omega_*} \mathbb{T}_{\omega_*, 0}$. Then \mathbb{K}_0 satisfies the following measure²¹ estimate:

$$\operatorname{meas}_{2n}(\operatorname{Re}(D_r) \times \mathbb{T}^n \setminus \mathbb{K}_0) \leq c_n \left(\operatorname{meas}(D \setminus D_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau} \times \mathbb{T}^n) + \operatorname{meas}(\operatorname{Re}(D_r) \setminus D) \times \mathbb{T}^n \right), \quad (45)$$

¹⁸The norms will be specified in the next Section 3.3.

¹⁹(41) is a simplifying assumption. It may be relaxed.

²⁰I.e., $\overline{M}_i \geq \sup_{D_\rho} \|T_i\|$, $i = 1, 2$, if $U^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

²¹ meas_n denotes the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure.

where $D^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau}$ denotes the $\omega_0(\cdot, 0)$ -preimage of $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau}$ and c_n can be taken to be $c_n = (1 + (1 + 2^{8n} n E)^{2n})^2$.

Finally, the following uniform estimates hold for the embedding ϕ_{ω_*} :

$$\begin{aligned} |v_1(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*) - I_1^0(\pi\kappa; \omega_*)| &\leq 6n \left(\frac{\overline{M}_1}{\overline{M}} + \frac{\widehat{M}}{\overline{M}} \right) \widehat{E} \tilde{\rho} \\ |v_2(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*) - I_2^0(\pi\kappa; \omega_*)| &\leq 6n \left(\frac{\overline{M}_2}{\overline{M}} + \frac{\widehat{M}}{\overline{M}} \right) \widehat{E} \tilde{\rho}, \\ |u(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*)| &\leq 2 \widehat{E} s, \quad |w(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*)| \leq 2 \widehat{E} \varepsilon \\ |y(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*)| &\leq 2 \widehat{E} \varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $v(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*) = (v_1(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), v_2(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*))$ and $I^0(\pi\kappa; \omega_*) = (I_1^0(\pi\kappa; \omega_*), I_2^0(\pi\kappa; \omega_*)) \in D$ is the $\omega(\cdot, \pi\kappa)$ -pre-image of $\omega_* \in \Omega_*(\pi\kappa)$. where $r := 8n\widehat{E}\tilde{\rho}$, $r' = 2\widehat{E}\varepsilon$

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is deferred to the next Section 3.3. Here we prove how Theorem 1.2 follows from it.

As said, we follow the same ideas of the proof of Theorem 3.1, which in turn follows [6, Theorem 1.3]. By (A'_2) ,

$$P_{\text{av}}(I, p, q) = P_0(I, pq) + P_1(I, p, q) \quad \text{where} \quad |P_1| \leq a \|P_0\| =: \varepsilon. \quad (47)$$

At this point, proceeding as in [6, Proof of Theorem 1.3, Step 1] but with ε^5 replaced by ε , under condition

$$\mu < \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{(\log(\varepsilon^{-1}))^{2\tau+1}}, \quad \overline{\gamma} \geq C \left(\frac{6}{s_0} \right)^{\tau+\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\sqrt{\mu} (\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{\tau+\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}},$$

by an application of [6, Lemma A.1], with $\overline{K} = \frac{6}{s_0} \log \varepsilon^{-1}$, $r_p = r_q = \varepsilon_0$, $r = 4\rho = \overline{\rho} := \min \left\{ \frac{\overline{\gamma}}{2\overline{M}\overline{K}^{\tau+1}}, \rho_0 \right\}$ (with $\overline{M} := \sup |\partial_{I_1}^2 H_0|$), $\rho_p = \rho_q = \varepsilon_0/4$, $\sigma = s_0/4$, $\ell_1 = n_1$, $\ell_2 = 0$, $m = n_2$, $h = H_0$, $g \equiv 0$, $f = \mu P$, $A = \overline{D} := \omega_0^{-1} \mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \tau}$ (where ω_0 is as in A_1 and $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma, \tau}$ is the usual Diophantine set in \mathbb{R}^n , namely the set (40) with $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$), $B = B' = \{0\}$, $s = s_0$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \overline{\alpha} = \frac{\overline{\gamma}}{2\overline{K}^\tau}$, and $\Lambda = \{0\}$, on the domain $W_{\overline{v}, \overline{s}}$ where $\overline{v} = (\overline{\rho}/2, \varepsilon_0/2)$ and $\overline{s} = s_0/2$, one finds a real-analytic and symplectic transformation $\overline{\phi}$ which carries H to

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{H}(\overline{I}, \overline{\varphi}, \overline{p}, \overline{q}) &:= H \circ \overline{\phi}(\overline{I}, \overline{\varphi}, \overline{p}, \overline{q}) \\ &= H_0(\overline{I}) + \mu P_0(\overline{I}, \overline{p}\overline{q}) + \mu P_1(\overline{I}, \overline{\varphi}, \overline{p}, \overline{q}) + \tilde{P}(\overline{I}, \overline{\varphi}, \overline{p}, \overline{q}) \\ &= H_0(\overline{I}) + \mu P_0(\overline{I}, \overline{p}\overline{q}) + \mu \overline{P}(\overline{I}, \overline{\varphi}, \overline{p}, \overline{q}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|\tilde{P}\|_{\overline{v}, \overline{s}} \leq \overline{C} \mu \max \left\{ \frac{\mu \overline{K}^{2\tau+1}}{\overline{\gamma}^2}, \frac{\mu \overline{K}^\tau}{\overline{\gamma}} e^{-\overline{K} s_0/2} \right\} \leq \overline{C} \mu \varepsilon = \overline{C} \mu a \|P_0\|,$$

whence (by (47)) also $\overline{P} = \mu \tilde{P}_{\text{av}} + \tilde{P}$ is bounded by $C \mu a \|P_0\|$ on $W_{\overline{v}, \overline{s}}$.

The next step is to apply Theorem 3.1 to the Hamiltonian \overline{H} . Since we can take

$$\begin{aligned} M &= C, \quad \widehat{M} = C \mu \|P_0\|, \quad \overline{M} = C(\mu \|P_0\|)^{-1}, \quad E = C \mu a \|P_0\| \\ \overline{M}_1 &= C, \quad \overline{M}_2 = C(\mu \|P_0\|)^{-1}, \quad \lambda = C^{-1} \mu \|P_0\| \end{aligned}$$

the numbers L , K , $\widehat{\rho}$ and $\tilde{\rho}$ can be bounded, respectively, as

$$L \leq C(\mu \|P_0\|)^{-1}, \quad K \leq C \log(a/\gamma_1^2)^{-1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\rho} &\geq c \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1}{(\log(a/\gamma_1^2)^{-1})^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\overline{\gamma}_2}{(\log(a/\gamma_1^2)^{-1})^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\overline{\gamma}}{(\log \epsilon^{-1})^{\overline{\tau}+1}}, \rho_0 \right\} \\ \widetilde{\rho} &\geq c \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1}{(\log(a/\gamma_1^2)^{-1})^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\overline{\gamma}_2}{(\log(a/\gamma_1^2)^{-1})^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\overline{\gamma}}{(\log \epsilon^{-1})^{\overline{\tau}+1}}, \rho_0, \epsilon^2 \right\}\end{aligned}$$

having let $\gamma_2 := \mu \|P_0\| \overline{\gamma}_2$. Condition (41) is trivially satisfied for any $\overline{\gamma} < 1$, $s \leq 6$, while, from the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{cE} &\leq Ca \max \left\{ \frac{(\log(a/\gamma_1^2)^{-1})^{2(\tau+1)}}{\gamma_1^2}, \frac{(\log(a/\gamma_1^2)^{-1})^{2(\tau+1)}}{\overline{\gamma}_2^2}, \frac{(\log \epsilon)^{-1}{}^{2(\tau+1)}}{\overline{\gamma}^2}, \frac{1}{\rho_0^2}, \frac{1}{\epsilon^4} \right\}, \\ \widetilde{cE} &\leq C \frac{a}{\epsilon^2}\end{aligned}$$

one sees that conditions (42) hold taking

$$\overline{\gamma} = \gamma_1 = \overline{\gamma}_2 = \widehat{C} \sqrt{a}, \quad a < \widehat{C}^{-1} \epsilon^4$$

with a suitable $\widehat{C} > 1$. By the thesis of Theorem 3.1, we can find a set of n -dimensional invariant tori $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{P}$ whose projection \mathcal{K}_0 on \mathcal{P}_0 satisfies the measure estimate

$$\text{meas} \mathcal{P}_0 \geq \text{meas} \mathcal{K}_0 \geq (1 - C'(\overline{\gamma} + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2)) \text{meas} \mathcal{P}_0 \geq (1 - C\sqrt{a}) \text{meas} \mathcal{P}_0. \quad \square$$

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We fix the following notations.

- in \mathbb{R}^n we fix the 1-norm: $|I| := |I|_1 := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} |I_i|$;
- in \mathbb{T}^n we fix the “sup-metric”: $|\varphi| := |\varphi|_\infty := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\varphi_i| \pmod{2\pi}$;
- in \mathbb{R} we fix the sup norm: $|(p, q)| := |(p, q)|_\infty := \max\{|p|, |q|\}$;
- for matrices we use the “sup-norm”: $|\beta| := |\beta|_\infty := \max_{i,j} |\beta_{ij}|$;
- we denote as $B_\epsilon^n(z_0)$ the complex ball having radius ϵ centered at $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. If $z_0 = 0$, we simply write B_ϵ^n .
- if $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and $r > 0$, we denote by $A_r := \bigcup_{x_0 \in A} B_r^n(x_0)$ the complex r -neighborhood of A (according to the prefixed norms/metrics above);
- given $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and positive numbers r, ϵ, s , we let

$$v := (r, \epsilon), \quad U_v := A_r \times B_\epsilon^2, \quad W_{v,s} := U_v \times \mathbb{T}_s^n$$

- if f is real-analytic on a complex domain of the form W_{v_0, s_0} , with $v_0 = (r_0, \epsilon_0)$, $r_0 > r$, $\epsilon_0 > \epsilon$, $s_0 > s$, we denote by $\|f\|_{v,s}$ its “sup-Taylor-Fourier norm”:

$$\|f\|_{v,s} := \sum_{k, \alpha, \beta} \sup_{U_v} |f_{\alpha, \beta, k}| e^{|k|s} \epsilon^{|\alpha, \beta|} \quad (48)$$

with $|k| := |k|_1$, $|\alpha, \beta| := |\alpha|_1 + |\beta|_1$, where $f_{k, \alpha, \beta}(I)$ denotes the coefficients in the expansion

$$f = \sum_{\substack{(k, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \\ \alpha_i \neq \beta_i \forall i}} f_{k, \alpha, \beta}(I) e^{ik \cdot \varphi} p^\alpha q^\beta;$$

- if f is as in the previous item, $K > 0$ and \mathbb{L} is a sub-lattice of \mathbf{Z}^n , $T_K f$ and $\Pi_{\mathbb{L}} f$ denote, respectively, the K -truncation and the \mathbb{L} -projection of f :

$$T_K f := \sum_{\substack{(k, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbf{Z}^n \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \\ \alpha_i \neq \beta_i \forall i, |k|_1 \leq K}} f_{k, \alpha, \beta}(I) e^{ik \cdot \varphi} p^\alpha q^\beta, \quad \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} f := \sum_{\substack{(k, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbf{Z}^n \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \\ \alpha_i \neq \beta_i \forall i, k \in \mathbb{L}}} f_{k, \alpha, \beta}(I) e^{ik \cdot \varphi} p^\alpha q^\beta$$

with $f_{k, \alpha, \beta}(I) := f_{k, \alpha, \beta}(I, 0, 0)$. We say that f is (K, \mathbb{L}) in normal form if $f = \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} T_K f$. If \mathbb{L} is strictly larger than $\{0\}$, we say that f is resonant normal form.

Proposition 3.1 (Partially hyperbolic averaging theory) *Let $H = h(I_1, I_2, pq) + f(I, \varphi, p, q)$ be a real-analytic function on W_{v_0, s_0} , with $v_0 = (r_0, \varepsilon_0)$. Let $K, r, s, \varepsilon, \hat{r}, \hat{s}$, positive numbers, with $\hat{r} < r/4$, $\hat{s} < s/4$ and $\hat{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon/4$. Put $\hat{\sigma} := \min\{\hat{s}, \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon}\}$. Assume there exist positive numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$, with $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2$, such that, for all $k = (k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}$, $0 < |k| \leq K$ and for all $(I, p, q) \in U_{r, \varepsilon}$,*

$$|\omega_1 \cdot k_1 + \omega_2 \cdot k_2 - ik_3 \nu| \geq \begin{cases} \alpha_1 & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0 \\ \alpha_2 & \text{if } k_1 = 0, (k_2, k_3) \neq (0, 0) \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

and

$$K \hat{\sigma} \geq 8 \log 2, \quad \frac{2^3 c_1 K \hat{\sigma}}{\alpha_2 \delta} \|f\|_{r, s, \varepsilon} < 1, \quad \delta := \min\{\hat{r} \hat{s}, \hat{\varepsilon}^2\} \quad (50)$$

with a suitable number c_1 . Then, one can find a real-analytic and symplectic transformation

$$\Phi_* : W_{r_*, s_*, \varepsilon_*} \rightarrow W_{r, s, \varepsilon}$$

with $r_* = r - 4\hat{r}$, $s_* = s - 4\hat{s}$, $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon - 4\hat{\varepsilon}$, which conjugates H to

$$H_*(I, \varphi, p, q) := H \circ \Phi_* = h(I, pq) + g(I, \varphi, p, q) + f_*(I, \varphi, p, q),$$

where g is $(K, \{0\})$ in normal form, and g, f verify

$$\begin{aligned} \|g - \Pi_0 T_K f\|_{r_*, s_*, \varepsilon_*} &\leq \frac{8c_1 \|f\|_{r, s, \varepsilon}^2}{\alpha_2 \delta} \\ \|f_*\|_{r_*, s_*, \varepsilon_*} &\leq e^{-K \hat{\sigma}/4} \|f\|_{r, s, \varepsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Finally, Φ_* verifies

$$\max\{\alpha_1 \hat{s} |I_1 - I_1'|, \alpha_2 \hat{s} |I_2 - I_2'|, \alpha_2 \hat{r} |\varphi - \varphi'|, \alpha_2 \hat{\varepsilon} |p - p'|, \alpha_2 \hat{\varepsilon} |q - q'|\} \leq 2c_1 E. \quad (52)$$

Proposition 3.1 is an extension of the Normal Form Lemma by J. Pöschel [21]. The extension pertains at introducing the (p, q) coordinates in the integrable part and leaving the amounts of analyticity \hat{r} , \hat{s} and $\hat{\varepsilon}$ as independent. This is needed in order to construct the motions (44), where the coordinates (π, κ) are not set to $(0, 0)$, but take value in a small neighborhood of it. A more complete statement implying Proposition 3.1 is quoted and proved in Section 3.4.

Below, we let $B := B_{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}(0)$; therefore, B_ε will stand for $B_{\frac{2}{\varepsilon+\varepsilon}}(0)$.

Lemma 3.1 (KAM Step Lemma) *Under the same assumptions and notations as in Theorem 3.1, there exists a sequence of numbers $\rho_j, \varepsilon_j, s_j$; of domains*

$$(W_j)_{\rho_j, \varepsilon_j, s_j} = (A_j)_{\rho_j, \varepsilon_j} \times \mathbb{T}_{\frac{n}{s_j + s_j}}^n, \quad \text{with } (A_j)_{\rho_j, \varepsilon_j} := \bigcup_{(p_j, q_j) \in B_{\varepsilon_j}} (D_j(p_j q_j))_{\rho_j} \times \{(p_j, q_j)\}$$

and a real-analytic and symplectic transformations

$$\Psi_{j+1} : (I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) \in (W_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}, s_{j+1}} \rightarrow (I_j, \varphi_j, p_j, q_j) \in (W_j)_{\rho_j, \varepsilon_j, s_j} \quad (53)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) &= \mathbb{H}_j \circ \Psi_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) \\ &= \mathbb{h}_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) + \mathbb{f}_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) \end{aligned}$$

and such that the following holds. Letting $E_0 := E$, $(M_0, \overline{M}_0, \widehat{M}_0, L_0) = (M, \overline{M}, \widehat{M}, L)$, $s_0 := s$, $\rho_0 := \rho$, $\varepsilon_0 := \varepsilon$, $\lambda_0 := \lambda$ and, given, for $0 \leq j \in \mathbb{Z}$, E_j , $(M_j, \overline{M}_j, \widehat{M}_j, L_j)$, s_j , ρ_j , ε_j , λ_j , define

$$K_j := \frac{32}{s_j} \log_+ \left(\frac{E_j L_j M_j^2}{\gamma_1^2} \right)^{-1} \quad (54)$$

$$\widehat{\rho}_j := \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1}{2M_j K_j^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\gamma_2}{2\widehat{M}_j K_j^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\lambda_j}{2M_j K_j}, \frac{\lambda_j}{2\widehat{M}_j K_j}, \rho_j \right\}, \quad (55)$$

$$\widetilde{\rho}_j := \min \left\{ \widehat{\rho}_j, \frac{\varepsilon_j^2}{s_j} \right\}, \quad \widehat{E}_j := \frac{E_j L_j}{\widetilde{\rho}_j \widehat{\rho}_j} \quad (56)$$

$$E_{j+1} := \frac{E_j L_j M_j^2}{\gamma_1^2}, \quad (M_{j+1}, \overline{M}_{j+1}, \widehat{M}_{j+1}, L_{j+1}) = 2(M_j, \overline{M}_j, \widehat{M}_j, L_j)$$

$$\rho_{j+1} := \frac{\widehat{\rho}_j}{4}, \quad \varepsilon_{j+1} := \frac{\varepsilon_j}{4}, \quad \lambda_{j+1} := \lambda_j - 2^8 \frac{E_j}{\varepsilon_j^2}, \quad s_{j+1} := \frac{s_j}{4}.$$

Then, for all $(p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) \in B_{\varepsilon_{j+1}}$,

(i) $D_{j+1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) \subseteq (D_j(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}))_{\widehat{\rho}_j/4}$. Letting

$$\varpi_{j+1} := \partial_{(I_{j+1}, p_{j+1}q_{j+1})} \mathbb{h}_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) = (\omega_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, p_{j+1}q_{j+1}), \nu_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, p_{j+1}q_{j+1}))$$

the map $I_{j+1} \rightarrow \omega_{j+1}(I_{j+1}, p_{j+1}q_{j+1})$ is a diffeomorphism of $(D_{j+1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}))_{\rho_j}$ verifying

$$\omega_{j+1}(D_{j+1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}), p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) = \omega_j(D_j(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}), p_{j+1}q_{j+1}).$$

The map

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\iota}_{j+1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) &= (\widehat{\iota}_{j+1,1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}), \widehat{\iota}_{j+1,2}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1})) : \\ D_j(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) &\rightarrow D_{j+1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) \\ I_j(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) &\rightarrow I_{j+1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) := \omega_{j+1}^{-1}(\omega_j(I_j, p_{j+1}q_{j+1}), p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) \end{aligned}$$

verifies

$$\sup_{D_j} |\widehat{\iota}_{j+1,1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) - \text{id}| \leq 3n \frac{\overline{M}_1}{M} \widehat{E}_j \widetilde{\rho}_j \leq 3n \widehat{E}_j \widetilde{\rho}_j,$$

$$\sup_{D_j} |\widehat{\iota}_{j+1,2}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) - \text{id}| \leq 3n \frac{\overline{M}_2}{M} \widehat{E}_j \widetilde{\rho}_j \leq 3n \widehat{E}_j \widetilde{\rho}_j \quad (57)$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\widehat{\iota}_{j+1}(p_{j+1}q_{j+1}) - \text{id}) \leq 2^9 n \widehat{E}_j \quad (58)$$

(ii) the perturbation f_j has sup-Fourier norm

$$\|f_j\|_{(W_j)_{\rho_j, \varepsilon_j, s_j}} \leq E_j$$

(iii) the real-analytic symplectomorphisms Ψ_{j+1} in (53) verify

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{(W_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}, s_{j+1}}} |I_{j,1}(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) - I_{j+1,1}| &\leq \frac{3}{4} \frac{\widehat{M}_j}{M_j} \widehat{E}_j \widetilde{\rho}_j \\
\sup_{(W_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}, s_{j+1}}} |I_{j,2}(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) - I_{j+1,2}| &\leq \frac{3}{4} \widehat{E}_j \widetilde{\rho}_j \\
\sup_{(W_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}, s_{j+1}}} |\varphi_j(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) - \varphi_{j+1}| &\leq \frac{3}{4} \widehat{E}_j s_j \\
\sup_{(W_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}, s_{j+1}}} |p_j(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) - p_{j+1}| &\leq \frac{3}{4} \widehat{E}_j \varepsilon_j \\
\sup_{(W_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}, s_{j+1}}} |q_j(I_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+1}, p_{j+1}, q_{j+1}) - q_{j+1}| &\leq \frac{3}{4} \widehat{E}_j \varepsilon_j. \tag{59}
\end{aligned}$$

The rescaled dimensionless map $\check{\Phi}_{j+1} := \text{id} + \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{\rho}_0^{-1}, s_0^{-1}, \varepsilon_0^{-1}} (\Phi_{j+1} - \text{id}) \circ \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{\rho}_0, s_0, \varepsilon_0}$ has Lipschitz constant on $(W_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}/\widehat{\rho}_0, \varepsilon_{j+1}/\varepsilon_0, s_{j+1}/s_0}$

$$\mathcal{L}(\check{\Phi}_{j+1} - \text{id}) \leq 6(n+1)(12 \cdot (24)^\tau)^j \widehat{E}_j; \tag{60}$$

(iv) for any $j \geq 0$, $\widehat{E}_{j+1} < \widehat{E}_j^2$, $\lambda_j \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{2}$.

Proof The proof of this proposition is obtained generalizing [6, Lemma B.1]. We shall limit ourselves to describe only the different points, leaving to the interested reader the easy work of completing details.

We construct the transformations (53) by recursion, based on Proposition 3.1. For simplicity of notations, we shall systematically eliminate the sub-fix “ j ” and replace “ $j+1$ ” with a “+”. As an example, instead of (53), we shall write

$$\Psi_+ : W_+ \rightarrow W.$$

When needed, the base step will be labeled as “0” (e.g, (76) below). Let us assume (inductively) that

$$\omega(D, pq) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau} \quad \forall (p, q) \in B_\varepsilon \tag{61}$$

$$\widehat{cE} < 1 \tag{62}$$

$$\lambda \geq \max \left\{ \frac{\gamma_2}{K^\tau}, \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \right\}. \tag{63}$$

Condition (61) is verified at the base step provided one takes $D_0 = \omega_0^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau}, p_0 q_0)$; (62) is so by assumption, while (63) follows from (41):

$$\lambda_0 \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \geq \frac{s_0^\tau \gamma_2}{6^\tau} \geq \frac{\gamma_2}{K_0^\tau}. \tag{64}$$

We aim to apply Proposition 3.1 with ε, s of Proposition 3.1 corresponding now to $\bar{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon, \bar{s} + s$, and

$$r = \widehat{\rho}, \quad \widehat{r} = \frac{\widehat{\rho}}{8}, \quad \widehat{s} := \frac{s}{8}, \quad \widehat{\varepsilon} := \frac{\varepsilon}{8}, \quad \mathbb{L} = \{0\}.$$

We check that that (61) and (62) imply conditions (49) and (50). We start with (49). If $(I, p, q) = (I_1, I_2, p, q) \in A_{\widehat{\rho}, \varepsilon}$ and $k \in \mathbf{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, with $|k|_1 \leq K$, then there exists some $I_0(pq) = (I_{01}(pq), I_{02}(pq))$ such that $|I - I_0(pq)| < \widehat{\rho}$ and $\omega(I_0(pq), pq) = (\omega_{01}, \omega_{02}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\omega}(I, pq) \cdot k| &= \left| \omega_{01} \cdot k_1 + \omega_{02} \cdot k_2 + (\omega_1(I, pq) - \omega_1(I(pq), pq)) \cdot k_1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\omega_2(I, pq) - \omega_2(I(pq), pq)) \cdot k_2 - i\nu(I, pq)k_3 \right| \\ &\geq \begin{cases} \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1}{2K^\tau}, \frac{\lambda}{2} \right\} & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0 \\ \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma_2}{2K^\tau}, \frac{\lambda}{2} \right\} & \text{if } k_1 = 0, k_2 \neq 0 \\ \lambda & \text{if } k_1 = k_2 = 0, k_3 \neq 0 \end{cases} \\ &\geq \begin{cases} \alpha_1 := \frac{\gamma_1}{2K^\tau} & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0 \\ \alpha_2 := \frac{\gamma_2}{2K^\tau} & \text{if } k_1 = 0, (k_2, k_3) \neq (0, 0) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

having used (63). The bounds above have been obtained considering separately the cases $k_3 \neq 0$ and $k_3 = 0$, and:

- if $k_3 \neq 0$, taking the infimum of the modulus of the imaginary part of the expression between the $|$'s; observing that $\overline{\omega}_0 = (\overline{\omega}_{01}, \overline{\omega}_{02})$ are real and bounding the differences $|\operatorname{Im}(\omega_i(I, pq) - \omega_i(I(pq), pq))|$ with $MK\widehat{\rho}$ (when $i = 1$), $\widehat{MK}\widehat{\rho}$ (when $i = 2$) and using the definition of $\widehat{\rho}$ in (55).
- if $k_3 = 0$, using the Diophantine inequality and again bounding the differences $|\operatorname{Im}(\omega_i(I, pq) - \omega_i(I(pq), pq))|$ as in the previous case and using the definition $\widehat{\rho}$.

We now check condition (50). The inequality $Ks > 8 \log 2$ is trivial by definition of K (see (54)) and also the smallness condition (50) is easily met, since $\widehat{\sigma} = \min\{\frac{1}{8}\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon+\varepsilon}, \frac{s}{8}\} = \frac{s}{8}$, $\delta = 2^{-6} \min\{\widehat{\rho}s, \varepsilon^2\} = 2^{-6}\widetilde{\rho}s$ (by the definition of $\widetilde{\rho}$ in (56)), whence

$$2^3 c_1 \frac{K \frac{s}{8}}{\alpha_2 \delta} \|f\|_{W_{\widehat{\rho}, \varepsilon, s}} \leq 2^6 c_1 \frac{EL}{\widehat{\rho}\widehat{\rho}} \leq \widehat{c}\widehat{E} < 1$$

having used $L \geq \widehat{M}^{-1}$, M^{-1} , so $\alpha_2 \geq KL^{-1}\widehat{\rho}$, $2^6 c_1 < \widehat{c}$, and (62). Thus, by Proposition 3.1, H may be conjugated to

$$H_+ := H \circ \Psi_+ = h_+(I_+, p_+ q_+) + f_+(I_+, \varphi_+, p_+, q_+)$$

where

$$h_+(I_+, p_+ q_+) = h(I_+, p_+ q_+) + g(I_+, p_+ q_+)$$

while, by (51) and the choice of K ,

$$\|f_+\|_{\widehat{\rho}/2, \varepsilon/2, s/2} \leq e^{-Ks/32} E \leq \frac{ELM^2}{\gamma_1^2} E = E_+. \quad (65)$$

The conjugation is realized by an analytic transformation

$$\Psi_+ : (I_+, \varphi_+, p_+, q_+) \in W_{\widehat{\rho}/2, \varepsilon/2, s/2} \rightarrow (I, \varphi, p, q) \in W_{\widehat{\rho}, \varepsilon, s}.$$

Using (52), $\widetilde{\rho} \leq \varepsilon^2/s$, $\alpha_1 \geq MK\widehat{\rho}$, $\alpha_2 = \frac{\gamma_2}{2K^\tau} \geq L^{-1}K\widehat{\rho}$, $Ks \geq 6$ and the definition of \widehat{E} , we obtain the bound (59) with, at the left hand side, the set $W_{\widehat{\rho}/2, \varepsilon/2, s/2}$. Below we shall prove that

$W_{+\rho_+, \varepsilon_+, s_+} \subset W_{\widehat{\rho}/2, \varepsilon/2, s/2}$, so we shall have (59).
We now evaluate the generalized frequency

$$\varpi_+(I_+, p_+q_+) := \partial_{I_+, p_+q_+} h_+(I_+, p_+q_+) = (\omega_+(I_+, p_+q_+), \nu_+(I_+, p_+q_+)).$$

with

$$\omega_+(I_+, p_+q_+) := \partial_{I_+} h_+(I_+, p_+q_+) = \partial_{I_+} h(I_+, p_+q_+) + \partial_{I_+} g(I_+, p_+q_+) \quad (66)$$

(the ‘‘new frequency map’’) and

$$\nu_+(I_+, p_+q_+) := \partial_{p_+q_+} h_+(I_+, p_+q_+) = \nu(I_+, p_+q_+) + \partial_{p_+q_+} g(I_+, p_+q_+) \quad (67)$$

(the ‘‘new Lyapunov exponent’’).

Lemma 3.2 *Let $(p_+, q_+) \in B_{\varepsilon/2}$. The new frequency map ω_+ is injective on $D(p_+q_+)_{\widehat{\rho}/2}$ and maps $D(p_+q_+)_{\widehat{\rho}/4}$ over $\omega(D, p_+q_+)$. The map $\widehat{t}_+(p_+q_+) = (\widehat{t}_{+1}(p_+q_+), \widehat{t}_{+2}(p_+q_+)) := \omega_+^{-1} \circ \omega|_{D(p_+q_+)}$ which assigns to a point $I_0 \in D(p_+q_+)$ the $\omega_+(\cdot, p_+q_+)$ -preimage of $\omega(I_0, p_+q_+)$ in $D(p_+q_+)_{\widehat{\rho}/4}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(A_+)_{\rho_+, \varepsilon_+}} |\widehat{t}_{+1}(p_+q_+) - \text{id}| &\leq 3n \frac{\overline{M}_1 E}{\widehat{\rho}} \leq 3n \frac{\overline{M} E}{\widehat{\rho}}, \\ \sup_{(A_+)_{\rho_+, \varepsilon_+}} |\widehat{t}_{+2}(p_+q_+) - \text{id}| &\leq 3n \frac{\overline{M}_2 E}{\widehat{\rho}} \leq 3n \frac{\overline{M} E}{\widehat{\rho}}, \\ \mathcal{L}(\widehat{t}_+(p_+q_+) - \text{id}) &\leq 2^9 n \frac{\overline{M} E}{\widehat{\rho}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

The Jacobian matrix $U_+ := \partial_{I_+}^2 h_+(I_+, p_+q_+)$ is non singular on $D_{\widehat{\rho}/4} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2$ and the following bounds hold

$$\begin{aligned} M_+ &:= 2M \geq \sup_{(A_+)_{\rho_+, \varepsilon_+}} \|U_+\|, \quad \widehat{M}_+ := 2\widehat{M} \geq \sup_{(A_+)_{\rho_+, \varepsilon_+}} \|\widehat{U}_+\|, \\ \overline{M}_+ &:= 2\overline{M} \geq \sup_{(A_+)_{\rho_+, \varepsilon_+}} \|U_+^{-1}\|, \quad \overline{M}_{i_+} := 2\overline{M}_i \geq \sup_{(A_+)_{\rho_+, \varepsilon_+}} \|T_{i_+}\|, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where $U_+^{-1} =: \begin{pmatrix} T_{+1} \\ T_{+2} \end{pmatrix}$. Finally, the new Lyapunov exponent $\nu_+(I_+, p_+q_+)$ satisfies

$$\lambda_+ := \lambda - 2^4 \frac{E}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \inf_{(A_+)_{\rho_+, \varepsilon_+}} |\text{Re } \nu_+|. \quad (70)$$

Postponing for the moment the proof of this Lemma, we let $\rho_+ := \widehat{\rho}/2$, $s_+ := s/2$, $\varepsilon_+ = \varepsilon/2$ and $D_+(p_+q_+) := \widehat{t}_+(p_+q_+)(D(p_+q_+))$. By Lemma 3.2, D_+ is a subset of $D_{\widehat{\rho}/4}$ and hence

$$(D_+)_{\rho_+} \subset D_{\widehat{\rho}/2}. \quad (71)$$

We prove that $\widehat{E}_+ = \frac{E_+ L_+}{\widehat{\rho}_+^2} \leq \widehat{E}^2$. Since

$$s_+ = \frac{s}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad x_+ := \left(\frac{E_+ L_+ M_+^2}{\gamma_1^2} \right)^{-1} = \frac{x^2}{8} \quad \text{where} \quad x := \left(\frac{ELM^2}{\gamma_1^2} \right)^{-1} \quad (72)$$

we have

$$K_+ = \frac{2^5}{s_+} \log x_+ = \frac{2^7}{s} \log \frac{x^2}{8} = \frac{2^8}{s} \log_+ x - \frac{3 \cdot 2^7}{s} \log_+ 2 < 8K. \quad (73)$$

Finally, (42), (70) and the definition of \tilde{E} imply $\lambda_+ \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}$. Collecting all bounds, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_+ &= \min \left\{ \frac{\gamma_1}{2M_+K_+^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\gamma_2}{2\hat{M}_+K_+^{\tau+1}}, \frac{\lambda_+}{2M_+K_+}, \frac{\lambda_+}{2\hat{M}_+K_+}, \rho_+ = \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2} \right\} \geq \frac{\hat{\rho}}{2 \cdot 8^{\tau+1}} \\ \tilde{\rho}_+ &= \min \left\{ \hat{\rho}_+, \frac{\varepsilon_+^2}{s_+} \right\} \geq \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{2 \cdot 8^{\tau+1}}\end{aligned}\quad (74)$$

and

$$\hat{E}_+ = \frac{E_+L_+}{\hat{\rho}_+\tilde{\rho}_+} \leq \frac{E^2LM^2}{\gamma_1^2} \frac{2L}{\tilde{\rho}\hat{\rho}} 4 \cdot 8^{2(\tau+1)} = 8 \cdot 8^{2(\tau+1)} \frac{ELM^2}{\gamma_1^2} \hat{E}$$

Now, using, in the last inequality, the bound

$$\frac{ELM^2}{\gamma_1^2} \leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{s}{6}\right)^{2(\tau+1)} \frac{EL}{\hat{\rho}^2} \leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{s}{6}\right)^{2(\tau+1)} \hat{E}$$

(since $\hat{\rho} \leq \frac{\gamma_1}{2MK^{\tau+1}}$ and $K \geq 6/s$) we find

$$\hat{E}_+ \leq 2 \left(\frac{4}{3}s\right)^{\tau+1} \hat{E}^2 < \hat{E}^2 \quad (75)$$

(having used $s \leq 1/2$). We now prove that $\lambda_+ \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{2}$. Iterating (70) and using $\hat{\rho}_k \leq \hat{\rho}_{k-1}/4$, $\tilde{\rho}_k \leq \tilde{\rho}_{k-1}/4$, $\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon_{k-1}/4$, $L_k = 2L_{k-1}$, (75) and the second condition in (42) with $\tilde{c} = 2^6$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_+ &= \lambda_{j+1} = \lambda_0 - 2^4 \sum_{k=1}^j \frac{E_k}{\varepsilon_k^2} \geq \lambda_0 - 2^4 \sum_{k=1}^j \hat{E}_k \frac{\hat{\rho}_k \tilde{\rho}_k}{\varepsilon_k^2 L_k} \geq \lambda_0 - 2^4 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0 \tilde{\rho}_0}{\varepsilon_0^2 L_0} \sum_{k=1}^j \hat{E}_k \geq \lambda_0 - 2^5 \frac{\hat{\rho}_0 \tilde{\rho}_0}{\varepsilon_0^2 L_0} \hat{E}_0 \\ &= \lambda_0 - 2^5 \frac{E_0}{\varepsilon_0^2} \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{2}.\end{aligned}\quad (76)$$

This allows to check (63) at the next step: using (64) and (73), we have

$$\lambda_+ \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \geq \frac{\gamma_2}{K_0^\tau} \geq \frac{\gamma_2}{K_+^\tau}.$$

Finally, (57) and (58) follow from (68), while the estimate in (60) is a consequence of (59), (71), (72), (74), inequality $LM \geq 1$ and Cauchy estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\check{\Phi}_{j+1} - \text{id}) &\leq 2(n+1) \sup_{(\check{W}_{j+1})_{\rho_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}, s_{j+1}}} \|D(\check{\Phi}_{j+1} - \text{id})\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2(n+1) \frac{\frac{3}{4} \hat{E}_j \max\{\hat{\rho}_j/\rho_0, s_j/s_0, \varepsilon_j/\varepsilon_0\}}{\min\{\hat{\rho}_j/(4\hat{\rho}_0), s_j/(4s_0), \varepsilon_j/(4\varepsilon_0)\}} \\ &\leq 2(n+1) \frac{3/4(1/4)^j}{1/4 \left(\frac{1}{2(24)^{\tau+1}}\right)^j} \hat{E}_j = 6(n+1) (12 \cdot (24)^\tau)^j \hat{E}_j. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2 The proof of this proposition is obtained generalizing [6, Lemma B.2]. As above, we limit to discuss only the different parts.
By (51),

$$\sup_{D_{\hat{\rho}/2} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2} |g| \leq \sup_{D_{\hat{\rho}/2} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2} |g - \bar{f}| + \sup_{D_{\hat{\rho}/2} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2} |\bar{f}| \leq \frac{3}{2} E,$$

(where \bar{f} denotes the average of f). Therefore we may bound

$$\sup_{D_{\widehat{\rho}/4} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2} \|(\partial_{I_+}^2 h)^{-1} \partial_{I_+}^2 g\| \leq 2\overline{M} \frac{\frac{3}{2}E}{(\widehat{\rho}/4)^2} \leq 2^6 \frac{\overline{M}E}{\widehat{\rho}^2} \leq 2^6 \frac{\overline{M}E}{\widehat{\rho}^2} < \frac{1}{2}$$

This shows that the function (66) has a Jacobian matrix

$$\partial_{I_+} \omega_+(I_+, p_+, q_+) = \partial_{I_+}^2 h_+(I_+, p_+, q_+) = \partial_{I_+}^2 h(I_+, p_+, q_+) + \partial_{I_+}^2 g(I_+, p_+, q_+)$$

which is invertible for all $(p_+, q_+) \in B_{\varepsilon/2}^2$ and satisfies

$$\overline{M}_+ := \sup_{D_{\widehat{\rho}/4} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2} \left\| \left(\partial_{I_+} \omega_+(I_+, p_+, q_+) \right)^{-1} \right\| \leq 2\overline{M}$$

In a similar way one proves (69). Next, for any fixed $(p_+, q_+) \in B_{\varepsilon/2}^2$ and $\overline{\omega} = \omega(I(p_+, q_+), p_+, q_+) \in \omega(D, p_+, q_+)$ with $I(p_+, q_+) \in D$, we want to find $I_+ = I_+(p_+, q_+) \in D_+$ such that

$$\omega_+(I_+(p_+, q_+), p_+, q_+) = \overline{\omega} = \omega(I(p_+, q_+), p_+, q_+) \quad (77)$$

To this end, we consider the function

$$I_+ \in D_{\widehat{\rho}/2} \rightarrow F(I_+, p_+, q_+) := \omega_+(I_+, p_+, q_+) - \overline{\omega} \quad (p_+, q_+) \in B_{\varepsilon/2}^2$$

As F differs from ω_+ by a constant, we have

$$m := \sup_{D_{\widehat{\rho}/4} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2} \left\| \left(\partial_{I_+} F(I_+, p_+, q_+) \right)^{-1} \right\| = \sup_{D_{\widehat{\rho}/4} \times B_{\varepsilon/2}^2} \left\| \left(\partial_{I_+} \omega_+(I_+, p_+, q_+) \right)^{-1} \right\| \leq 2M.$$

Similarly, we bound the quantities

$$Q := |\partial_{I_+}^2 F(I)| = |\partial_{I_+}^2 g(I_+, p_+, q_+)| \leq 6 \frac{\frac{3}{2}E}{(\widehat{\rho}/4)^3} < 2^{10} \frac{E}{\widehat{\rho}^3}.$$

and

$$P := |F(I(p_+, q_+))| = |\partial_{I_+} g(I(p_+, q_+), p_+, q_+)| \leq \frac{\frac{3}{2}E}{(\widehat{\rho}/4)} \leq 2^3 \frac{E}{\widehat{\rho}}.$$

Putting everything together, we get

$$4m^2 PQ \leq 2^{16} \frac{M^2 E^2}{\widehat{\rho}^4} \leq c^2 \widehat{E}^2 < 1$$

By the Implicit Function Theorem (e.g., [4, Theorem 1 and Remark 1]), Equation (77) has a unique solution

$$(p_+, q_+) \in B_{\varepsilon/2} \rightarrow I_+(p_+, q_+) \in B_r(I(p_+, q_+)),$$

with

$$r = 2mP \leq 2^5 \frac{ME}{\widehat{\rho}} \leq \frac{\widehat{\rho}}{4}$$

so we can take

$$D_+(p_+, q_+) = \bigcup_{\overline{\omega} \in \omega(D, p_+, q_+)} \{I_+(p_+, q_+)\}$$

This ensures that (61) holds also for D_+ .

Finally, the real part of the function (67) satisfies the lower bound

$$\inf_{D_{\widehat{\rho}/2} \times B_{\varepsilon/4}^2} |\operatorname{Re} \nu_+| \geq \lambda - \frac{E}{(\varepsilon/4)^2} = \lambda_+.$$

The proof of (68) proceeds as in [6, proof of Lemma B.2]. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

Step 1 *Construction of the “generalised limit actions”*

Let $(\pi, \kappa) \in B_0 = B_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^2 = \bigcap_{j \geq 0} B_{\varepsilon_j}$. Define, on $D_0(\pi\kappa) = \omega_0^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau, \rho}) \cap D$,

$$\check{l}_j(\pi\kappa) := \widehat{l}_j(\pi\kappa) \circ \widehat{l}_{j-1}(\pi\kappa) \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{l}_1(\pi\kappa) \quad j \geq 1.$$

Then $\check{l}_j(\pi\kappa)$ converge uniformly to a $\check{l}(\pi, \kappa) = (\check{l}_1(\pi, \kappa), \check{l}_2(\pi, \kappa))$ verifying

$$\sup_{D_0(\pi\kappa)} |\check{l}_1(\pi\kappa) - \text{id}| \leq 6n \frac{\overline{M}_1}{M} \widetilde{\rho}_0 \widehat{E}_0, \quad \sup_{D_0(\pi\kappa)} |\check{l}_2(\pi\kappa) - \text{id}| \leq 6n \frac{\overline{M}_i}{M} \widetilde{\rho}_0 \widehat{E}_0. \quad (78)$$

Moreover, as

$$\sup |\widehat{l}_j(\pi\kappa) - \widehat{i}(\pi\kappa)| \leq 6n \widehat{E}_j \widetilde{\rho}_j < \frac{6n}{c} \widehat{\rho}_j < \rho_j$$

we have

$$D_*(pq) := \check{i}(\pi\kappa)(D_0(\pi\kappa)) \subset \bigcap_j D_j(\pi\kappa)_{\rho_j}. \quad (79)$$

In particular, taking $j = 0$,

$$D_*(\pi\kappa) \subset (D_0(\pi\kappa))_{6n \widehat{E}_0 \widetilde{\rho}_0}. \quad (80)$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{L}(\check{i}(\pi\kappa) - \text{id}) \leq 2^8 n \widehat{E}.$$

So $\check{i}(\pi\kappa)$ is bi-Lipschitz, with

$$\mathcal{L}_-(\check{i}(\pi\kappa)) \geq 1 - 2^8 n \widehat{E}, \quad \mathcal{L}_+(\check{i}(\pi\kappa)) \leq 1 + 2^8 n \widehat{E}.$$

Step 2 *Construction of ϕ_{ω_*} .* For each $j \geq 1$, the transformation

$$\Phi_j := \Psi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \Psi_j$$

is defined on $(W_j)_{\rho_j, s_j, \varepsilon_j}$. If

$$A_* := \bigcup_{|(\pi, \kappa)| < \bar{\varepsilon}} D_*(\pi\kappa) \times \{(\pi, \kappa)\}, \quad W_* := A_* \times \mathbb{T}^n.$$

then, by (79), $W_* \subset \bigcap_j (W_j)_{\rho_j, s_j, \varepsilon_j}$. The sequence Φ_j converges uniformly on W_* to a map Φ . We then let

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\omega_*}(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa) &= \left(v(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), \vartheta + u(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), \pi + w(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), \kappa + y(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*) \right) \\ &:= \Phi \left(\check{l}(\omega_0^{-1}(\omega_*, \pi\kappa)), \vartheta, \pi, \kappa \right) \end{aligned}$$

with $v(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*) := (v_1(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*), v_2(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega_*))$. Since (59) imply, on W_* ²²,

$$\sup_{W_*} |\Pi_{I_1} \Phi - \text{id}|_1 \leq 2n \frac{\widehat{M}_0}{M_0} \widehat{E}_0 \widetilde{\rho}_0 \quad (81)$$

²² Π_z denotes the projection on the z -variables.

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{W_*} |\Pi_{I_2} \Phi - \text{id}|_1 &\leq 2n \widehat{E}_0 \widetilde{\rho}_0, & \sup_{W_*} |\Pi_\varphi \Phi - \text{id}|_\infty &\leq 2 \widehat{E}_0 s_0, \\ \sup_{W_*} |\Pi_p \Phi - \text{id}|_\infty &\leq 2 \widehat{E}_0 \varepsilon_0, & \sup_{W_*} |\Pi_q \Phi - \text{id}|_\infty &\leq 2 \widehat{E}_0 \varepsilon_0 \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

then, in view of (78), (81), (82), the definition of W_* and the triangular inequality, we have (46). Equations (80), (81), (82) also imply

$$\mathbb{T}_{\omega_*} := \phi_{\omega_*}(\mathbb{T}^n, 0, 0) \subset (D_*(0))_{2\widehat{E}_0\widetilde{\rho}_0} \times \mathbb{T}^n \times B_{r'}^2 \subset (D_0(0))_r \times \mathbb{T}^n \times B_r^2 \quad (83)$$

where

$$r = 8n \widehat{E}_0 \widetilde{\rho}_0, \quad r' = 2 \widehat{E}_0 \varepsilon_0$$

Finally, with similar arguments as in Step 1, by (84), the rescaled map

$$\check{\Phi} := \text{id} + \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{\rho}_0^{-1}, s_0^{-1}, \varepsilon_0^{-1}} (\Phi - \text{id}) \circ \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{\rho}_0, s_0, \varepsilon_0}$$

has Lipschitz constant

$$\mathcal{L}(\check{\Phi} - \text{id}) \leq 2^6 (n+1) \widehat{E}_0. \quad (84)$$

In particular, $\check{\Phi}$, hence, Φ , and, finally, the map $(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa; \omega) \rightarrow \phi_\omega(\vartheta, \pi, \kappa)$ are bi-Lipschitz, hence, injective.

Step 3 For any $\omega_* \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \tau} \cap \omega_0(D, 0)$, \mathbb{T}_{ω_*} in (83) is a n -dimensional \mathbb{H} -invariant torus with frequency ω_* . This assertion is a trivial generalization of its analogue one in [6, Proof of Proposition 3, Step 3], therefore its proof is omitted.

Step 4 Measure Estimates (proof of (45)) The proof of (45) proceeds as in [6, Proof of Proposition 3, Step 4], just replacing the quantities that in [6, Proof of Proposition 3, Step 4] are called

$$D_0, \quad D_*, \quad \check{\iota}, \quad \check{\Phi}, \quad \mathbb{K}$$

with the quantities here denoted as

$$D_0(0), \quad D_*(0), \quad \check{\iota}(0), \quad \check{\Phi}|_{(\pi, \kappa)=(0,0)}, \quad \mathbb{K}_0. \quad \square$$

3.4 Normal Form Theory

Proposition 3.1 can be obtained from the more general Proposition 3.2 below, taking $m = 1$, $\mathbb{L} = \{0\}$ and changing coordinates as follows

$$p = \frac{p_1 - iq_1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad q = \frac{p_1 + iq_1}{\sqrt{2}i}.$$

We define c_m to be the smallest number such that, for any two functions, real-analytic in $W_{r,s,\varepsilon}$ and any choice of $\hat{r} < r$, $\hat{s} < s$, $\hat{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$,

$$\|\{f, g\}\|_{r-\hat{r}, s-\hat{s}, \varepsilon-\hat{\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{c_m}{\delta} \|f\|_{r,s,\varepsilon} \|g\|_{r,s,\varepsilon} \quad \text{with } \delta := \min\{\hat{r}\hat{s}, \hat{\varepsilon}^2\}.$$

Proposition 3.2 Let $\{0\} \subset \mathbb{L} \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Proposition 3.1 holds true taking

$$H(I, \varphi, p, q) = h(I_1, I_2, J(p, q)) + f(I, \varphi, p, q), \quad J(p, q) := \left(\frac{p_1^2 + q_1^2}{2}, \dots, \frac{p_m^2 + q_m^2}{2} \right)$$

replacing c_1 with c_m , Π_0 with $\Pi_{\mathbb{L}}$ and condition (49) with

$$|\omega_1 \cdot k_1 + \omega_2 \cdot k_2| \geq \begin{cases} \alpha_1 & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0 \\ \alpha_2 & \text{if } k_1 = 0, k_2 \neq 0 \end{cases} \quad (85)$$

$$\forall k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}^{n_2+m} \setminus \mathbb{L} \neq (0, 0), |k|_1 \leq K, \quad \forall (I_1, I_2, p, q) \in V_r \times B_\varepsilon^{2m}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= (\omega_1, \omega_2) \\ &:= (\partial_{I_1} h(I_1, I_2, J(p, q)), \partial_{(I_2, J(p, q))} h(I_1, I_2, J(p, q))) . \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\hat{r} < r/2$, $\hat{s} < s/2$, $\hat{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon/2$ and $\delta := \min\{\hat{r}\hat{s}, \hat{\varepsilon}^2\}$. Let*

$$H(u, \varphi, p, q) = h(I, p, q) + g(u, \varphi, p, q) + f(u, \varphi, p, q) \quad g(u, \varphi, p, q) = \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(u, \varphi, p, q)$$

be real-analytic on $W_{v,s,\varepsilon}$. Assume that inequality (85) and

$$\|f\|_{v,s,\varepsilon} < \frac{\alpha_2 \delta}{c_m}$$

are satisfied. Then one can find a real-analytic and symplectic transformation

$$\Phi : W_{v-2\hat{v}, s-2\hat{s}, \varepsilon-2\hat{\varepsilon}} \rightarrow W_{v,s,\varepsilon}$$

defined by the time-one flow²³ $X_\phi^1 f := f \circ \Phi$ of a suitable ϕ verifying

$$\|\phi\|_{v,s,\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{v,s,\varepsilon}}{\alpha_2}$$

such that

$$H_+ := H \circ \Phi = h + g + \Pi_1 T_K f + f_+$$

and, moreover, the following bounds hold

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_+\|_{v-2\hat{v}, s-2\hat{s}, \varepsilon-2\hat{\varepsilon}} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{c_m}{\alpha_2 \delta} \|f\|_{v,s,\varepsilon}\right)^{-1} \left[\frac{c_m}{\alpha_2 \delta} \|f\|_{v,s,\varepsilon}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max \left\{ e^{-K\hat{s}/2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon - \hat{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon}\right)^{K/2} \right\} \|f\|_{v,s,\varepsilon} + \|\{\phi, g\}\|_{v-\hat{v}, s-\hat{s}, \varepsilon-\hat{\varepsilon}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for any real-analytic function F on $W_{v,s,\varepsilon}$,

$$\|F \circ \Phi - F\|_{v-2\hat{v}, s-2\hat{s}, \varepsilon-2\hat{\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{\|\{\phi, F\}\|_{v-\hat{v}, s-\hat{s}, \varepsilon-\hat{\varepsilon}}}{1 - \frac{c_m \|f\|_{v,s,\varepsilon}}{\alpha_2 \delta}}. \quad (86)$$

Sketch of proof Lemma 3.3 is a straightforward generalization of [21, Iterative Lemma]. To obtain such generalization, just replace the norm defined in [21, Section 1] with the norm (48), where

$$f = \sum_{\substack{(k, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \times \mathbb{N}^\ell \\ \alpha_i \neq \beta_i \forall i}} f_{k, \alpha, \beta}(I) e^{ik \cdot \varphi} \left(\frac{p - iq}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{p + iq}{i\sqrt{2}}\right)^\beta, \quad (87)$$

²³The time-one flow generated by ϕ is defined as the differential operator

$$X_\phi^1 := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{L}_\phi^k}{k!}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_\phi^0 f := f$ and $\mathcal{L}_\phi^k f := \{\phi, \mathcal{L}_\phi^{k-1} f\}$, with $k = 1, 2, \dots$.

and bound the “ultraviolet remainders”, namely the norm of the functions whose expansion (87) includes only terms with $|(k, \alpha - \beta)|_1 > K$, as follows. Observe that, if $|(k, \alpha - \beta)|_1 > K$, then either $|k|_1 > K/2$ or $|\alpha - \beta|_1 > K/2$. In the latter case, a fortiori, $|\alpha|_1 + |\beta|_1 \geq |\alpha - \beta|_1 > K/2$. Then we have, for such functions, $\|f\|_{r, s-\hat{s}, \varepsilon-\hat{\varepsilon}} \leq \max \left\{ e^{-K\hat{s}/2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon-\hat{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} \right)^{K/2} \right\} \|f\|_{r, s, \varepsilon}$. Other details are omitted.

Proof of Proposition 3.2 Let

$$r_1 := r_0 - 2\hat{r}_0, \quad s_1 := s_0 - 2\hat{s}_0, \quad \varepsilon_1 := \varepsilon_0 - 2\hat{\varepsilon}_0.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we find a canonical transformation $\Phi_1 = X_{\phi_1}$ which is real-analytic on $W_{r_1, s_1, \varepsilon_1}$ and conjugates $H = H_0$ to $H_1 = H_0 \circ \Phi_1 = h + g_1 + f_1$, where $g_1 = \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} T_K f_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1\|_{v_1, s_1, \varepsilon_1} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{c_m E_0}{\alpha_2 \delta_0}\right)^{-1} \left[\frac{c_m E_0}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} + \max \left\{ e^{-K\hat{s}_0/2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0 - \hat{\varepsilon}_0}{\varepsilon_0} \right)^{K/2} \right\} \right] E_0 \\ &\leq 2 \left[\frac{c_m E_0}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} + e^{-K\hat{\sigma}_0/2} \right] E_0 \end{aligned}$$

having used

$$\left(\frac{\varepsilon_0 - \hat{\varepsilon}_0}{\varepsilon_0} \right)^{K/2} = e^{\frac{K}{2} \log(1 - \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{\varepsilon_0})} \leq e^{-\frac{K}{2} \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{\varepsilon_0}}.$$

We now focus on the case

$$\frac{c_m E_0}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} < e^{-K\hat{\sigma}_0/2}$$

otherwise the lemma is²⁴ proved. Then we have

$$\|f_1\|_{v_1, s_1, \varepsilon_1} \leq 4 \frac{c_m E_0^2}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} =: E_1.$$

Note that

$$E_1 < \frac{E_0}{4}.$$

Assume now that, for some $j \geq 1$, it is $H_j = H_{j-1} \circ \Phi_j = h + g_j + f_j$, where

$$g_j = \sum_{h=0}^{j-1} \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} T_K f_h, \quad \|f_j\|_{v_j, s_j, \varepsilon_j} \leq E_j \leq \min \left\{ \frac{E_0}{4^j}, 4 \frac{c_m E_0^2}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} \right\}. \quad (88)$$

We have just proved this is true when $j = 1$. Let $L := \left\lceil \frac{K\hat{\sigma}_0}{8 \log 2} \right\rceil$. We prove that (88) is true for $j + 1$, for all $1 \leq j \leq L$. Let

$$\hat{r}_j := \frac{\hat{r}_0}{L}, \quad \hat{s}_j := \frac{\hat{s}_0}{L}, \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_j := \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{L} \quad \text{hence} \quad \delta_j = \frac{\delta_0}{L^2} \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq L.$$

Note that, for all $1 \leq j \leq L$, it is $\hat{r}_j < \frac{r_j}{2}$:

$$r_j = r_1 - 2(j-1) \frac{\hat{r}_0}{L} \geq r_1 - 2(1-1/L)\hat{r}_0 = r_0 - 4\hat{r}_0 + 2\hat{r}_j > 2\hat{r}_j.$$

Similarly, $\hat{s}_j < \frac{s_j}{2}$, $\hat{\varepsilon}_j < \frac{\varepsilon_j}{2}$. Let then

$$r_{j+1} = r_j - 2 \frac{\hat{r}_0}{L}, \quad s_{j+1} = s_j - 2 \frac{\hat{s}_0}{L}, \quad \varepsilon_{j+1} = \varepsilon_j - 2 \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{L}$$

²⁴Indeed, in such case,

$$\|f_1\|_{v_1, s_1, \varepsilon_1} \leq 4e^{-K\hat{\sigma}_0/2} \leq e^{-K\hat{\sigma}_0/4}$$

because $e^{-K\hat{\sigma}_0/4} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ having chosen $K\hat{\sigma}_0 \geq 8 \log 2$.

so that $r_j = r_1 - 2(j-1)\frac{\hat{r}_0}{L}$, etc, for all $1 \leq j \leq L$. Then

$$c_m \frac{E_j}{\alpha_2 \delta_j} \leq 4 \frac{c_0^2 E_0^2}{\alpha_2^2 \delta_0^2} L^2 < \frac{1}{16} \quad (89)$$

and Lemma 3.3 applies again, and H_j can be conjugated to $H_{j+1} = H_j \circ \Phi_{j+1} = h + g_{j+1} + f_{j+1}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} g_{j+1} &= g_j + \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} T_K f_j = \sum_{h=0}^j \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} T_K f_h \\ \|f_{j+1}\|_{r_{j+1}, s_{j+1}, \varepsilon_{j+1}} &\leq \left(1 - \frac{c_m}{\alpha_2 \delta_j} E_j\right)^{-1} \left[\frac{c_m}{\alpha_2 \delta_j} E_j^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max \left\{ e^{-K\hat{s}_j/2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_j - \hat{\varepsilon}_j}{\varepsilon_j}\right)^{K/2} \right\} E_j + \|\{\phi_j, g_j\}\|_{r_j - \hat{r}_j, s_j - \hat{s}_j, \varepsilon_j - \hat{\varepsilon}_j} \right] \end{aligned}$$

To bound the right hand side of the latter expression, we use (89) and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-K\hat{s}_j/2} &= e^{-\frac{K}{2L}\hat{s}_0} \leq \frac{1}{16} \\ \left(\frac{\varepsilon_j - \hat{\varepsilon}_j}{\varepsilon_j}\right)^{K/2} &= \left(1 - \frac{\frac{\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{L}}{\varepsilon_1 - 2(j-1)\frac{\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{L}}\right)^{K/2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{\varepsilon_1 L}\right)^{K/2} \leq e^{-\frac{K\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{2\varepsilon_1 L}} \leq \frac{1}{16} \end{aligned}$$

having used $e^{-\frac{K\hat{s}_0}{2L}} \leq e^{-\frac{K\hat{\sigma}_0}{2L}}$, $e^{-\frac{K\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{2\varepsilon_1 L}} \leq e^{-\frac{K\hat{\varepsilon}_0}{2\varepsilon_0 L}} \leq e^{-\frac{K\hat{\sigma}_0}{2L}}$ and $L \leq \frac{K\hat{\sigma}_0}{8 \log 2}$. Moreover, writing

$$g_j = \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} T_K f_0 + \mathbb{1}_{j \geq 2} \sum_{h=1}^{j-1} \Pi_{\mathbb{L}} T_K f_h =: f_0^{\mathbb{L}, K} + f_{j-1}^{\mathbb{L}, K}$$

with $f_0^{\mathbb{L}, K}$ real-analytic on $W_{r_0, s_0, \varepsilon_0}$, while $f_{j-1}^{\mathbb{L}, K}$ real-analytic on $W_{r_{j-1}, s_{j-1}, \varepsilon_{j-1}}$ and verifying

$$\|f_0^{\mathbb{L}, K}\|_{r_0, s_0, \varepsilon_0} \leq E_0, \quad \|f_{j-1}^{\mathbb{L}, K}\|_{r_{j-1}, s_{j-1}, \varepsilon_{j-1}} \leq \sum_{h=1}^{j-1} \frac{E_1}{4^{j-1}} \leq \frac{4}{3} E_1$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{\phi_j, g_j\}\|_{r_j - \hat{r}_j, s_j - \hat{s}_j, \varepsilon_j - \hat{\varepsilon}_j} &\leq \frac{c_m L}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} E_0 E_j + \frac{4}{3} \frac{c_m L^2}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} E_1 E_j \\ &\leq \left(\frac{c_m L}{\alpha_2 \delta_0} E_0 + \frac{16}{3} \frac{c_m^2 L^2}{\alpha_2^2 \delta_0^2} E_0^2 \right) E_j \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{32} + \frac{1}{32} \right) E_j = \frac{E_j}{16} \end{aligned}$$

Collecting all such bounds we get

$$E_{j+1} \leq \frac{16}{15} \frac{3}{16} E_j < \frac{E_j}{4}.$$

The inductive claim $j \rightarrow j+1$ is thus proved, for all $1 \leq j \leq L$. Letting now $\Phi_* := \Phi_1 \circ \dots \circ \Phi_{L+1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H_* &:= H_{L+1} = h + g_{L+1} + f_{L+1} =: h + g_* + f_* \\ r_* &:= r_{L+1} = r - 4\hat{r}, \quad s_* := s_{L+1} = s - 4\hat{s}, \quad \varepsilon_* := \varepsilon_{L+1} = \varepsilon - 4\hat{\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

and using $L + 1 > \frac{K\hat{\sigma}_0}{8\log 2}$, we get

$$\|f_*\|_{r_*, s_*, \varepsilon_*} \leq \frac{E_0}{4^{L+1}} = e^{-2(L+1)\log 2} E_0 < e^{-\frac{K\hat{\sigma}_0}{4}} E_0$$

$$\|g_* - \Pi_{\perp} T_K f_0\|_{r_*, s_*, \varepsilon_*} \leq \frac{4}{3} E_1 < 8 \frac{c_m E_0^2}{\alpha_2 \delta_0}$$

as claimed. The bounds (52) are obtained from (86), by usual telescopic arguments. \square

References

- [1] V. I. Arnold. Instability of dynamical systems with many degrees of freedom. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 156:9–12, 1964.
- [2] V.I. Arnold. Small denominators and problems of stability of motion in classical and celestial mechanics. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 18(6):85–191, 1963.
- [3] F. Bonetto, G. Gallavotti, G. Gentile, and V. Mastropietro. Lindstedt series, ultraviolet divergences and Moser’s theorem. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Cl. Sci., IV. Ser.*, 26(3):545–593, 1998.
- [4] A. Celletti and L. Chierchia. Construction of stable periodic orbits for the spin-orbit problem of celestial mechanics. *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 3(3):107–121, 1998. J. Moser at 70 (Russian).
- [5] L. Chierchia and G. Gallavotti. Drift and diffusion in phase space. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.*, 60(1):144, 1994.
- [6] L. Chierchia and G. Pinzari. Properly–degenerate KAM theory (following V.I. Arnold). *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 3(4):545–578, 2010.
- [7] L. Chierchia and G. Pinzari. The planetary N -body problem: symplectic foliation, reductions and invariant tori. *Invent. Math.*, 186(1):1–77, 2011.
- [8] L. Chierchia and M. Procesi. *Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser (KAM) Theory for Finite and Infinite Dimensional Systems*, pages 1–45. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2019.
- [9] A. Clarke, J. Féjoz, and M. Guardia. Why are inner planets not included? *ArXiv: 2210.11311v1*, 2022.
- [10] A. Delshams, V. Kaloshin, A. de la Rosa, and T. M. Seara. Global instability in the restricted planar elliptic three body problem. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 366(3):1173–1228, 2019.
- [11] A. Deprit. Elimination of the nodes in problems of n bodies. *Celestial Mech.*, 30(2):181–195, 1983.
- [12] J. Féjoz. Démonstration du ‘théorème d’Arnold’ sur la stabilité du système planétaire (d’après Herman). *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 24(5):1521–1582, 2004.
- [13] J. Féjoz, M. Guardia, V. Kaloshin, and P. Roldan. Kirkwood gaps and diffusion along mean motion resonances in the restricted planar three body problem. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 2014.
- [14] G. Gentile G. Gallavotti. Majorant convergence for twistless KAM tori. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 15(5):587–869, 1995.
- [15] G. Gallavotti. Quasi-integrable mechanical systems. In *Phénomènes critiques, systèmes aléatoires, théories de jauge, Part I, II (Les Houches, 1984)*, pages 539–624. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [16] G. Gallavotti. Twistless KAM tori. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 164(1):145–156, 1994.
- [17] C. G. J. Jacobi. Sur l’élimination des noeuds dans le problème des trois corps. *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Bd XX:81–102, 1842.
- [18] J. Laskar and P. Robutel. Stability of the planetary three-body problem. I. Expansion of the planetary Hamiltonian. *Celestial Mech. Dynam. Astronom.*, 62(3):193–217, 1995.
- [19] G. Pinzari. On the co-existence of maximal and whiskered tori in the planetary three-body problem. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 59(5):052701, May 2018.
- [20] G. Pinzari. Perihelia reduction and global Kolmogorov tori in the planetary problem. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 255(1218), 2018.
- [21] J. Pöschel. Nekhoroshev estimates for quasi-convex Hamiltonian systems. *Math. Z.*, 213(2):187–216, 1993.
- [22] R. Radau. Sur une transformation des équations différentielles de la dynamique. *Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup.*, 5:311–375, 1868.
- [23] H. Rüssmann. Invariant tori in non-degenerate nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems. *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.*, 6(2):119–204, 2001.