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Abstract. The existence of lower dimensional KAM tori is shown for a class of nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems where the second Melnikov’s conditions are relaxed, at the cost of the stronger regularity of the perturbed nonlinear term. As a consequence, it is proved that there exist many linearly stable invariant tori and thus quasi-periodic solutions for nonlinear wave equations of non-local nonlinearity and of higher spatial dimension.

1. Introduction and main results.

Let us begin with the non-linear wave (NLW) equation

\[ u_{tt} - u_{xx} + V(x)u + h(x,u) = 0 \quad (1.1) \]

subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions. The existence of solutions, periodic in time, for NLW equations has been studied by many authors. See [B-P, Br, L-S] and the references therein, for example. While finding quasi-periodic solutions, the so-called small divisor difficulty arises. The KAM (Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser) theory is a very powerful tool to overcome the difficulty. This theory deals with the existence of invariant tori for nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems. In order to obtain the quasi-periodic solutions of a partial differential equation, we may show the existence of the lower (finite) dimensional invariant tori for the infinitely dimensional Hamiltonian system defined by the equation. Assume the hamiltonian is of the form:

\[ H = (\omega, y) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Omega_j z_j \bar{z}_j + R(x, y, z, \bar{z}) \]

with tangential frequencies \( \omega = (\omega_1, ..., \omega_n) \) and normal frequencies \( \Omega = (\Omega_1, ..., \Omega) \). When \( R \equiv 0 \), there is a trivial invariant torus \( x = \omega t, y = 0, z = \bar{z} = 0 \). The KAM theory guarantees the persistence of the trivial invariant torus for sufficiently small perturbation \( R \), provided that the well-known Melnikov conditions are fulfilled:

\[ (k, \omega) - \Omega_j \neq 0 \quad \text{(the first Melnikov’s)} \]

for all \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) and \( 1 \leq j < \infty \), and

\[ (k, \omega) + \Omega_{j1} - \Omega_{j2} \neq 0 \quad \text{(the second Melnikov’s)} \]

Supported by NNSFC and in part by the grant of STCSM: 03JC14013.

Typeset by \textsf{A4AS-TEX}
for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $1 \leq j_1, j_2 < \infty, j_1 \neq j_2$. See [E,K1,P1,W] for the details. This KAM theorem can be applied to a wide array of Hamiltonian partial differential equations of 1-dimensional spatial variable, including (1.1). Kuksin\cite{K1,2} shows that there are many quasi-periodic solutions of (1.1), assuming that the potential $V$ depends on an $n$-dimensional external parameter in some non-degenerate way. Wayne\cite{W} obtains also the existence of the quasi-periodic solutions of (1.1), when the potential $V$ is lying on the outside of the set of some “bad” potentials. In \cite{W}, the set of all potentials is given some Gaussian measure and then the set of “bad” potentials is of small measure. Bobenko & Kuksin\cite{Bo-K} and Pöschel\cite{P2} investigate the case $V(x) \equiv m \in (0, \infty)$. By the remark in \cite{P2}, the same result holds also true for the parameter values $-1 < m < 0$. When $m \in (-\infty, -1) \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, it is shown in \cite{Y1} that there are many hyperbolic-elliptic invariant tori. More recently, the existence of invariant tori (thus quasi-periodic solutions) of (1.1) are shown for any prescribed potential\footnote{This potential $V$ contains no parameter.} $V(x) \neq 0$ in \cite{Y2} and for $V(x) \equiv 0$ in \cite{Y3}. In \cite{C-Y} and \cite{Br-K-S}, the equation (1.1) subject to periodic boundary conditions is investigated.

For NLW equation (1.1) of spatial dimension 1, the multiplicity of normal frequency $\Omega_j$ is 1 in Dirichlet boundary condition or 2 in periodic boundary condition. Considering PDE’s with spatial dimension $> 1$, a significant new problem arises due to the presence of clusters of normal frequencies of the Hamiltonian system defined by the PDEs. In this case, the multiplicity of $\Omega_j$ goes to $\infty$ as $|j| \to \infty$; consequently, the second Melnikov’s conditions is destroyed seriously, preventing the application of the KAM theorems mentioned above to Hamiltonian partial differential equations of higher spatial dimension. Bourgain\cite{Bo1-4} developed another profound approach, originally proposed by Craig-Wayne in \cite{C-W}, and successfully obtained the existence of quasi-periodic solutions of the nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equations and NLW equations of higher dimension in space. This method is called C-W-B method in some references. The techniques used in \cite{C-W} and \cite{Bo1-4} are based on not KAM theory, but rather on a generalization of Lyapunov-Schmidt procedure and on techniques by Fröhlich and Spencer\cite{F-S}.

The advantage of the KAM approach is, from one hand, to possibly simplify the proof and, on the other hand, to allow the construction of local normal forms closed to the considered torus, which could be useful for the better understanding of the dynamics. For example, in generally, one can easy check the linear stability and the vanishing Lyapunov exponents.

Naturally, we should ask that whether or not one can establish a new KAM theorem for some nonlinear partial differential equations, such as NLW and NLS, of higher spatial dimension.

In a private talk, the present author was told that Eliasson and Kuksin got a new KAM theorem which could be applied to NLS equations. This is an excited news! In the present paper, we will prove a variant of the KAM theorem due to Kuksin\cite{K1} and Pöschel\cite{P1}. In the variant, the requirements of the normal frequencies $\Omega_j$’s are weaker than those in \cite{K1,P1}, at the expense of stronger regularity of nonlinearity. Consequently, we can show that there are many invariant tori which are linearly stable, for the NLW equations of non-local nonlinear term and higher spatial dimension:

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u + V(x)u + \Psi((\Psi u)^3) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, 2\pi)^d$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)
and
\[ u_{tt} - \Delta u + M_\xi u + \Psi((\Psi u)^3) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, 2\pi)^d \] (1.3)
subject to Dirichlet boundary condition
\[ u(t, x)|_{x \in \partial[0,2\pi]^d} = 0 \] (1.4)
where \( \Delta \) is \( d \)-Laplacian, the potential \( V \) depends on parameter \( \xi \) in some kind of non-degenerate way, and \( M_\xi \) is a Fourier multiplier, i.e.,
\[ M_\xi e^{\sqrt{-1}(j,x)} = \xi_j e^{\sqrt{-1}(j,x)}, \quad \xi_j \in \mathbb{R}, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \] (1.5)
and \( \Psi : u \mapsto \psi \ast u \) is a convolution operator with a function \( \psi \), even in each entry of \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Assume the operator \( \Psi \) is smoothing of order \( \kappa > 0 \).

The variant of the KAM theorem also applies to nonlinear Schrödinger equations of higher spatial dimension:
\[ \sqrt{-1}u_{tt} + Au + \Psi((\Psi u)^3) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, 2\pi)^d \] (1.7)
subject to b. c. (1.4) where \( A = -\Delta + M_\xi \) or \( A = -\Delta + V(x, \xi) \). Geng and You\cite{G-Y} also show the existence of stable invariant tori of (1.7) with the regularity \( \kappa > 0 \).

The requirement of the regularity in \cite{G-Y} is weaker than ours, but our result can apply to nonlinear wave equations (1.2) and (1.3). In addition, Pöschel\cite{P3} shows that there are many almost periodic solutions of (1.7) when \( d = 1 \). The non-local condition is not satisfactory. It is an interesting problem that whether or not the non-local condition can be removed.

The paper is organized as follows: In §2, we formulate a general infinitely dimensional KAM theorem designed to deal with the presence of clusters of normal frequencies of the Hamiltonian system. In §3, we show how to apply the preceding KAM theorem to NLW equation (1.3) with b. c. (1.4). Sect.4-8 are devoted to the proof of the KAM theorem. In §4, the homological equations are reduced and solved; in §5, the symplectic transform \( X_1^f \) is given out and the new perturbed term \( R_+ \) is estimated; in §6, the iterative lemma is given out; in §7, The KAM theorem is proven by using the iterative lemma in §8, the measure estimates for the parameter sets is given out. Some technical lemmas are provided in §9 – 10.

2. A variant of the KAM theorem due to Kuksin and Pöschel.

2.1. Some notations. Denote by \((\ell^2, ||||)\) the usual space of the square summable sequences, and by \((L^2, ||||)\) the space of the square integrable functions. By \(|\cdot|\) the Euclidian norm. Let \( a \geq 0 \) and \( p \geq d/2 \). For a sequence \( u = (u_j \in \mathbb{C}^* : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \) with \(* = 1 \) or 2, we define its norm as follows:
\[ ||u||_{a,p} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |j|^{2p} e^{2a|j|}|u_j|^2. \] (2.1)
Let $\ell^{a,p}$ be the set of all sequences satisfying (2.1). It is easy to see that $\ell^{a,p}$ is a Hilbert space with an inner product corresponding to (2.1). When $a = 0$, we sometimes write $\ell^{0,p} = \ell^p$ and $\| \cdot \|_{0,p} = \| \cdot \|_p$. Introduce the phase space:

$$\mathcal{P} := (\mathbb{C}^n / 2\pi \mathbb{Z}^n) \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \ell^p,$$

where $n$ is a given positive integer. We endow $\mathcal{P}$ with a symplectic structure

$$dx \wedge dy + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} du_j^1 \wedge du_j^2, \quad (x, y, u) \in \mathcal{P},$$

where $u = (u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ with $u_j = (u_j^1, u_j^2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_0^n = (\mathbb{R}^n / 2\pi \mathbb{Z}^n) \times \{ 0 \} \times \{ 0 \} \subset \mathcal{P}.$$

Then $\mathcal{T}_0^n$ is an torus in $\mathcal{P}$. Introduce a complex neighborhoods of $\mathcal{T}_0^n$ in $\mathcal{P}$:

$$D(s, r) := \{ (x, y, u) \in \mathcal{P} : |\text{Im} x| < s, |y| < r^2, \| u \|_p < r \}$$

where $r, s > 0$ are constants.

Recall $\tilde{p} = p + \kappa$ in (1.6). For $\tilde{p} = p$ or $\tilde{p} = \bar{p}$, let

$$\mathcal{P}^{a,\tilde{p}} := \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \times \ell^{a,\tilde{p}}, \quad \forall a \geq 0.$$

Then for $\tilde{r} > 0$ we define the weighted phase norms

$$\tilde{r} |W|_{a,\tilde{p}} = |X| + \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^2} |Y| + \frac{1}{\tilde{r}} |U|_{a,\tilde{p}}$$

for $W = (X, Y, U) \in \mathcal{P}^{a,\tilde{p}}$. Let $\Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be compact and of positive Lebesgue measure. For a map $W : D(s, r) \times \Pi \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{a,\tilde{p}}$, set

$$\tilde{r} |W|_{a,\tilde{p}, D(s, r) \times \Pi} := \sup_{(x, \xi) \in D(s, r) \times \Pi} \tilde{r} |W(x, \xi)|_{a,\tilde{p}}$$

and

$$\tilde{r} |W|_{a,\tilde{p}, D(s, r) \times \Pi} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sup_{(x, \xi) \in D(s, r) \times \Pi} \tilde{r} |\partial_{\xi_j} W(x, \xi)|_{a,\tilde{p}}, \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n).$$

Denote by $\mathcal{B}(\ell^{a_1,\tilde{p}_1}, \ell^{a_2,\tilde{p}_2})$ the set of all bounded linear operators from $\ell^{a_1,\tilde{p}_1}$ to $\ell^{a_2,\tilde{p}_2}$ and by $\| \cdot \|_{a_1, a_2, \tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2}$ the operator norm.

In the whole of this paper, by $C$ or $c$ a universal constant, whose size may be different in different place. If $f \leq C g$, we write this inequality as $f \preceq g$ when we dot not care the size of the constant $C$. Similarly, if $f \geq C g$ we write $f \succeq g$.

2.2. The statement of the KAM theorem. For two vectors $b, c \in \mathbb{C}^k$ or $\mathbb{R}^k$, we write $(b, c) = \sum_{j=1}^k b_j c_j$. Consider an infinitely dimensional Hamiltonian in the parameter dependent normal form

$$N_0 = (\omega^0(\xi), y) + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Omega^0_j(\xi) u_j^2, \quad (x, y, u) \in \mathcal{P}$$
where \( u_j^2 = u_{j_1}^2 + u_{j_2}^2 \) with \( u_j = (u_{j_1}, u_{j_2}) \) and the phase space \( \mathcal{P} \) is endowed with the symplectic form
\[
\text{dx} \wedge \text{dy} + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} du_{j_1} \wedge du_{j_2}.
\]
The tangent frequencies \( \omega^0 = (\omega_1^0, \cdots, \omega_n^0) \) and the normal frequencies \( \Omega^0 = (\Omega_j^0 : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \) depend on \( n \) parameters \( \xi \in \Pi_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \), \( \Pi_0 \) a given compact set of positive Lebesgue measure. Let \( J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \) and
\[
J_m = \text{diag}(J, \cdots, J), \quad J_j = \text{diag}(J, \cdots, J), \quad J_\infty = \text{diag}(\ldots, J, \ldots, \ldots).
\]
The Hamiltonian equation of motion of \( N_0 \) are
\[
\dot{x} = \omega^0(\xi), \quad \dot{y} = 0, \quad \dot{u} = J_\infty \Omega^0(\xi) u.
\]
Hence, for each \( \xi \in \Pi_0 \), there is an invariant \( n \)-dimensional torus \( T_0^n = T^n \times \{0\} \times \{0\} \) with frequencies \( \omega(\xi) \). The aim is to prove the persistence of the torus \( T_0^n \), for “most” (in the sense of Lebesgue measure) values of parameter \( \xi \in \Pi_0 \), under small perturbations \( R \) of the Hamiltonian \( N_0 \). To this end the following assumptions are required.

**Assumption A:** (Multiplicity.) Give \( \nu_0 > 0 \). Let \( \mathcal{O}_0 \) be the \( \nu_0 \)-neighborhood of \( \Pi_0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Assume that \(^3\) for all \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_0 \),
\[
\Omega_j^0(\xi) = \Omega^0_j(\xi) \quad \text{if} \quad |i| = |j|.
\]

Set
\[
\mathcal{N} = \{ |j| : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \} \subset \mathbb{R}_+.
\]
It is easy to see that the set \( \mathcal{N} \) is countable. For \( j \in \mathcal{N} \), let
\[
S_j = \{ j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |j| = j \}
\]
and denote by \( \mathcal{j} \) the cardinality of the set \( S_j \). it is well known that for \( d \geq 2 \) we have \( \mathcal{j} \leq j^d - 2 + \mathcal{c} \) where \( \mathcal{c} > 0 \) is a small constant, and it can be removed if \( d \geq 5 \). By Assumption A, we can let \( \Omega_j^0 = \Omega_j^0 \) if \( j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) and \( |j| = j \). And let \( \Omega^0 = (\Omega_j^0 : j \in \mathcal{N}) \) and \( \Lambda_j^0 = \text{diag} (\Omega_j^0 : |j| = j) \). Notice that \( \Lambda_j^0 = \Omega_j^0 E_{\mathcal{j}} \) where \( E_{\mathcal{j}} \) is the unit matrix of order \( \mathcal{j} \). Let \( u_j \) be the vector consisting in the entries of \( u_j \) with \( |j| = j \). Thus \( u_j \) is a vector of order \( \mathcal{j} \). Then we can rewrite \( N_0 \) as
\[
N_0 = (\omega^0(\xi), y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (\Lambda_j^0 u_j, u_j).
\]

**Assumption B:** (Non-degeneracy.) There are two absolute constant \( c_1, c_2 > 0 \) such that
\[
\sup_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\det \partial_\xi \omega^0(\xi)| \geq c_1, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\partial_\xi^j \omega| \leq c_2, \quad j = 0, 1.
\]

\(^3\)This assumption can be relaxed to that the multiplicity of \( \Omega_j^0 \) is bounded by \( \mathcal{c} |j|^{\mathcal{c}} \) with constant \( \mathcal{c}, \mathcal{c} > 0 \). However, this general assumption is not necessary in finding quasi-periodic solutions of NLS and NLW equations.
Moreover, assume that both $\omega^0(\xi)$ and $\tilde{\Omega}^0(\xi)$ are real analytic in each entry $\xi_l$ ($l = 1, \ldots, n$) of the variable vector $\xi \in \mathcal{O}_0$.

**Assumption C.** (Bounded conditions of Normal frequencies.) Assume that there exists constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\mathcal{O}_0} \tilde{\Omega}_j^0 \geq c_3, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{O}_0} |\partial_\xi \tilde{\Omega}_j^0| \leq c_4 \ll 1$$

uniformly for all $j$. In addition, assume there is a constant $c_5 > 0$ such that the following spectra gap conditions hold true:

$$|\tilde{\Omega}_i^0(\xi) - \tilde{\Omega}_j^0(\xi)| \geq c_5 r^{-d-j^{-d}}, \quad i > j, \forall \xi \in \mathcal{O}_0.$$

**Assumption D:** (Regularity.) Give $s_0, r_0$, and $0 < \epsilon_0 \ll 1$. Let $\epsilon_m = \epsilon_0(4/3)^m$ and $\varsigma_m = \epsilon_0^{4/(2k-d)}$. Assume the perturbation $R^0(x, y, u; \xi)$ can be decomposed into

$$R^0 = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} R^{0m}(x, y, u; \xi),$$

and each term $R^{0m}$ is defined on the domain $D(s_0, r_0) \times \mathcal{O}_0$ is analytic in the space coordinates and also analytic in each entry $\xi_l$ ($l = 1, \ldots, n$) of the parameter vector $\xi \in \mathcal{O}_0$, and is real for real argument, as well as, for each $\xi \in \mathcal{O}_0$ its Hamiltonian vector field $X_{R^{0m}} := (R^{0m}_y, -R^{0m}_x, J_0 R^{0m}_u)^T$ defines a analytic map

$$X_{R^{0m}} : D(s_0, r_0) \subset \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{m,p}.$$ 

Also assume that $X_{R^{0m}}$ is analytic in each entry of $\xi \in \mathcal{O}_0$.

**Theorem 2.1.** Suppose $H = N_0 + R^0$ satisfies assumptions A, B, C and D, and smallness assumption:

$$r_0|\tilde{\Omega}_{s_0,r_0}\big|_{\mathcal{O}_0} \leq \epsilon_m, \quad r_0|X_{R^{0m}}|_{\mathcal{O}_0} \leq \epsilon_m^{1/3}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$$

Then, for given $\alpha \ll 1$, there is a Cantor set $\Pi_{\alpha} \subset \Pi_0$ with

$$\text{Meas } \Pi_{\alpha} \geq (\text{Meas } \Pi_0)(1 - O(\alpha)),$$

a family of torus embedding $\Phi : \mathbb{T}^n \times \Pi_{\alpha} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ and a map $\omega_{\ast} : \Pi_{\alpha} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ where $\Phi(\cdot, \xi)$ and $\omega_{\ast}(\xi)$ is analytic in each entry $\xi_l$ of the parameter vector $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n)$ for other arguments fixed, such that for each $\xi \in \Pi_{\alpha}$ the map $\Phi$ restricted to $\mathbb{T}^n \times \{\xi\}$ is a analytic embedding of a rational torus with frequencies $\omega_{\ast}(\xi)$ for the Hamiltonian $H$ at $\xi$.

Each embedding is analytic on $D(s_0/2) := \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : |\Im x| < s_0/2\}$, and

$$r_0|\Phi - \Phi_0|_{0, p, D(s_0/2) \times \Pi_{\alpha}} \leq c\epsilon_0, \quad r_0|\Phi - \Phi_0|^\mathcal{L}_{0, p, D(s_0/2) \times \Pi_{\alpha}} \leq c\epsilon_0^{1/3},$$

$$|\omega_{\ast} - \omega| \leq c\epsilon_0, \quad |\omega_{\ast} - \omega|^\mathcal{L} \leq c\epsilon_0^{1/3},$$

where $\Phi_0$ is the trivial embedding $\mathbb{T}^n \times \Pi_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\} \times \{0\}$, and $c > 0$ is a constant depending on $n, \alpha$, and $r_0|\Phi_0|_{0, p, D(s_0/2) \times \Pi_{\alpha}}$ is defined in the way similar to $r_0|\Phi|_{a,p,D(x,r) \times \Pi}$. 
3. Application to nonlinear wave equations of higher dimension.

For technical simplicity, we consider (1.3) instead of (1.2). Essentially, our results hold true for (1.4). We study equation (1.3) as an infinitely dimensional Hamiltonian system. Since the quasi-periodic solutions to be constructed are of small amplitude, (1.3) may be considered as the linear equation $u_{tt} = Au$ with a small nonlinear perturbation $\Psi((\Psi u)^3)$ where $A = -\triangle + M_\xi$. Let $u_j(x)$ and $\mu_j^0$ ($j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$) be the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the operator $A$, respectively. By a simple computation,

$$\phi_j(x) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \sin(j, x),$$

and

$$\mu_j^0 = |j|^2 + \xi_j, \quad |j|^2 = j_1^2 + \cdots + j_d^2.$$

Then every solution of the linear system is the superposition of their harmonic oscillations and of the form

$$u(t, x) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} q_j(t)\phi_j(x), \quad q_j(t) = y_j^0 \cos(\mu_j^0 t)$$

with amplitude $y_j^0 \geq 0$. The solution $u(t, x)$ is time-periodic, quasi-periodic or almost periodic of the linear equation, depending on whether one, finitely many or infinitely many modes are excited, respectively. In particular,

$$N_n = \{ j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 \leq |j| \leq n_0 \},$$

where $n_0 \in \bigcup_j S_j = \bigcup_j \{ j = |j| : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \}$ is given and $n = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n_0} j_d$. The reason why we choose this $N_n$ is just for convenience. Essentially, we can choose any finite subset $N_n$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Consider the Fourier multiplier $M_\xi$ in (1.5). Let

$$\{ \sqrt{\mu_j^0}(\xi) : j \in N_n \} = \{ \omega_l^0(\xi) : 1 \leq l \leq n \}$$

and

$$\{ \phi_j(x) : j \in N_n \} = \{ \phi_l^0 : 1 \leq l \leq n \}.$$

Let $\omega^0 = (\omega_1^0, \ldots, \omega_n^0)$. Then

$$u_0(t, x) = \sum_{l=1}^n y_l^0 \cos \omega_l t \cdot \phi_l^0(x)$$

is a quasi-periodic solution of the linear equation $u_{tt} = -Au$ for any $\xi \in \Pi_0$ and $y^0 = (y_1^0, \ldots, y_n^0) \in \mathbb{R}_n^+$. Upon restoring the nonlinearity $\Psi((\Psi u)^3)$ the quasi-periodic solutions will not persist in their entirety due to resonance among the
modes and the strong perturbing effect of $\Psi((\Psi u)^3)$ for large amplitudes. In a sufficiently small neighborhood of $u = 0$ in the space $H^p([0, 2\pi])$, however, it will be shown that there does persist the quasi-periodic solutions $u_0(t, x)$’s which are only slightly deformed for “most” $\xi \in \Pi_0$.

We study the nonlinear NLW equation (1.3) as an infinite dimensional Hamiltonian system. Since the solutions to be constructed are of small amplitude, we can rewrite (1.3) as

$$u_{tt} - \Delta u + M_uu + \epsilon \Psi((\Psi u)^3) = 0, \quad \text{in} \; \mathbb{R} \times (0, 2\pi)^d$$

(1.3*)

by re-scaling $u = \sqrt{\epsilon} u$. To apply Theorem 2.1, we let $\epsilon = \epsilon_0$.

As the phase space one may take, for example, the product of the usual Sobolev space $H_0^0([0, 2\pi]^d) \times L^2([0, 2\pi]^d)$ with coordinates $u$ and $v = u_t$. The Hamiltonian is then

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \langle v, v \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle Au, u \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \int_0^{2\pi} (\Psi u)^4 \, dx$$

(3.0)

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the usual scalar product in $L^2$. Here the Hamiltonian structure is $du \wedge dv$. Note that the Dirichlet boundary condition (1.4) is equivalent to

$$x \in \mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d/(2\pi \mathbb{Z})^d \quad \text{and} \quad u(-x) = -u(x).$$

Let $L^2_2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ be the subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ satisfying $u(x) = -u(-x)$, and $\ell_{20}$ be the subspace of $\ell_2$ satisfies $q_j = -q_{-j}$. Let

$$\mathcal{F} : \ell_{20} \rightarrow L^2_0, \quad q \mapsto \mathcal{F} q = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} q_j \sqrt{-1}^{(j, x)} e^{\sqrt{-1}(j, x)}, \quad q_{-j} = -q_j$$

be the inverse discrete Fourier transform, which defines an isometry between the two space, and $\mathcal{F}$ can be extended into a isometry from $\ell_2$ to $L^2$. It is obvious that $q \in \ell_0^{0, p} \subset \ell_2$ if and only if $\mathcal{F} q \in H^p([0, 2\pi]^d) \subset L^2([0, 2\pi]^d)$. Let

$$\tilde{\Psi} q = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \Psi(\mathcal{F} q), \quad \forall \; q \in \ell_0^{0, p}.$$ 

Since $\psi$ is even, we have $\Psi(\mathcal{F} q) \in L^2_0$ if $\mathcal{F} (q) \in L^2_0$.

Formally, letting

$$u = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{q}_j(t) \phi_j(x)$$

(3.1)

and inserting it into (1.3*) and noting $\{\phi_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ is a real basis of $L^2_0$ we get

$$\frac{d^2 \tilde{q}_j}{dt^2} + \mu_j^0 \tilde{q}_j + \epsilon \langle \Psi((\Psi u)^3), \phi_j \rangle = 0, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$ 

(3.2)

Let

$$q_j = \sqrt{\mu_j^0} \tilde{q}_j, \quad p_j = \sqrt{\mu_j^0} \frac{d \tilde{q}_j}{dt}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$ 

(3.3)

Then we get a Hamiltonian system

$$\dot{p}_j = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_j}, \quad \dot{q}_j = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

(3.4)
where
\[ H(p, q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sqrt{\mu_j^0 (p_j^0 + q_j^0)} + G(\tilde{\Psi} q) \] (3.5)
with
\[ G(q) = \sum_{i,j,k,l} G_{ijkl} q_i q_j q_k q_l \] (3.6)
\[ G_{ijkl} = \epsilon_4 (\mu_i^0 \mu_j^0 \mu_k^0 \mu_l^0)^{-1/2} \int_{[0,2\pi]^d} \phi_i \phi_j \phi_k \phi_l dx. \] (3.7)

Since \( \phi_j(x) = \sin(j, x) \), it is not difficult to verify that \( G_{ijkl} = 0 \) unless \( i \pm j \pm k \pm l = 0 \) for some combination of plus and minus signs. Hence the sum in (3.6) is restricted to indices \( i, j, k, l \) such that \( i \pm j \pm k \pm l = 0 \). Let \( \partial_q G \) and \( \partial^2_q G \) are the first and second derivatives of \( G \), respectively. Then, obviously,
\[ \partial_q G(q) = (\partial_q G)_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^d}, \quad \partial_q G = 4 \sum_{i,j,k,l} G_{ijkl} q_i q_j q_k q_l, \] (3.8)
and
\[ \partial^2_q G(q) = \left( \partial^2_q G \right)_{k,l \in \mathbb{Z}^d}, \quad \partial^2_q G = 12 \sum_{i,j,k,l} G_{ijkl} q_i q_j q_k q_l. \] (3.9)

**Lemma 3.1.** For any \( a \geq 0, p > d/2 \) and \( q \in \ell^{a,p} \), we have \( \partial_q G(q) \in \ell^{a,p} \) with
\[ ||\partial_q G(q)||_{a,p} \leq \epsilon ||q||_{3,a,p}^3; \] (3.10)
moreover, \( \partial^2_q G(q) \) is a bounded linear operator from \( \ell^{a,p} \) to \( \ell^{a,p} \) with
\[ ||\partial^2_q G(q)||_{a,a,p,p} \leq \epsilon ||q||_{a,p}^2. \] (3.11)

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we assume the sum in (3.8) is restricted to \( i + j = k = l \) and the sum in (3.9) is restricted to \( i - j = k - l \). For convenience, let \( |k| = 1 \) if \( k \) is a zero vector. Let
\[ \eta_{lk}(l) = \frac{|i + k - l| |i||k| e^{a/|p|(|i+k-l|+|i|+|k|-|l|)}}{|l|} \] (3.12)
It is easy to verify that for any \( l \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) and \( p > d/2 \),
\[ \sum_{i,k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{\eta_{lk}(l)^{2p}} < 1. \] (3.13)
For any \( u, v, w \in \ell^{a,p} \), let \( S(u, v, w) = (S_l)_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \) with
\[ S_l = \sum_{i-j+k=l} G_{ijkl} u_i v_j w_k. \] (3.14)
By the Schwarz inequality,
\[
\|S(u,v,w)\|_{a,p}^2 \\
= \sum_l |l|^{2p} e^{2a|l|} \left| \sum_{i-j+k=l} G_{ijkl} u_i v_j w_k \right|^2 \\
= \sum_l G_{ijkl} |l|^{2p} e^{2a|l|} \left| \sum_{i,j,k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\eta_{ij}(l)^p u_i v_j w_k}{\eta_{ij}(l)} \right|^2 \\
\leq C \varepsilon \sum_l \sum_{i,j,k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |i+k-l|^{2p} e^{2a|i+k-l|} |v_i|^{2p} e^{2a|v_i|} |w_k|^{2p} e^{2a|w_k|} \\
\leq C \varepsilon \|u\|_{a,p}^2 \|v\|_{a,p}^2 \|w\|_{a,p}^2.
\] (3.15)

Note \(\partial_q G(q) = S(q,q,q)\). Thus, the proof of (3.10) is completed by (3.15). For any \(u \in \ell^{a,p}\), observing that
\[
\sum_l \sum_{i-j=k-l} G_{ijkl} q_i q_j u_l = \sum_{i-j+l=k} G_{ijkl} q_i q_j u_l,
\]
we get
\[
(\partial_q^2 G(q)) u = S(q,q,u).
\]
By (3.15),
\[
\|\partial_q^2 G(q)u\|_{a,p} \leq C \varepsilon \|q\|_{a,p}^2 \|u\|_{a,p}.
\]
This implies that (3.11) holds true. \(\Box\)

In Sect. 10, we will construct a family of operators \(T_m : \ell_2 \supset \ell^{0,\bar{p}} \rightarrow \ell^{a,p} \subset \ell_2\) which satisfy Lemma B.3. Now we introduce a Hamiltonian \(\hat{R}\):
\[
R(q) = R_0(q) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} R_m(q) := G(T_0 \hat{\Psi}(q)) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (G(T_m \hat{\Psi}(q)) - G(T_{m-1} \hat{\Psi}(q)))
\] (3.16)

**Lemma 3.2.** For \(q \in \ell^{0,p}\) with \(\|q\|_{a,p} < 1\), we have that
\[
G(\hat{\Psi}(q)) = R(q)
\] (3.17)
\[
\|\partial_q R_m(q)\|_{a,p} \leq \varepsilon_m
\] (3.18)
where \(\varepsilon_m = \varepsilon^m (4/3)^m \) and \(\varepsilon_m = \varepsilon_{m/2(2\kappa-d)} \) \((m = 0, 1, 2, ...)

**Proof.** For \(\theta \in [0,1]\), let
\[
q^* := \hat{\Psi}(q) + \theta(T_m \hat{\Psi}(q) - \hat{\Psi}(q)).
\]
Note that for any \(a \geq 0\) and \(\bar{p} \geq p > d/2\), we have
\[
\|q\|_{a,p} \geq \|q\|_{a,p} \geq \|q\|_{\ell_2}, \ q \in \ell^{a,p},
\]
and
\[ ||q||_{0,p} \leq ||q||_{0,\tilde{p}}, \quad q \in \ell^{0,\tilde{p}}. \]

By the definition of \( \Psi \), we have
\[ ||\tilde{\Psi}(q)||_{0,p} \leq ||\tilde{\Psi}(q)||_{0,\tilde{p}} \ll ||q||_{0,p}. \]

In view of Lemma B.3 (10.13),
\[ ||\theta(T_m \tilde{\Psi}(q) - \tilde{\Psi}(q))||_{0,p} \leq ||\tilde{\Psi}(q)||_{0,\tilde{p}} \ll ||q||_{0,p}. \]

Thus,
\[ ||q^*||_{0,p} \ll ||q||_{0,p}. \]

Using Taylor’s formula, we get
\[ |G(T_m \tilde{\Psi}(q)) - G(\tilde{\Psi}(q))| \]
\[ = |(\partial_q G(q^*), (T_m - 1) \tilde{\Psi}(q))\epsilon_2| \]
\[ \leq ||\partial_q G(q^*)||\epsilon_2||(T_m - 1) \tilde{\Psi}(q)||\epsilon_2 \]
\[ \leq ||\partial_q G(q^*)||_{0,p}||(T_m - 1) \tilde{\Psi}(q)||_{0,p} \]
\[ \leq ||q^*||_{0,p}^3 \epsilon_{m+1} ||\tilde{\Psi}(q)||_{0,p} \ll \text{Lemma 3.1, B.3(10.13)} \]
\[ \leq ||q||_{0,p}^4 \epsilon_{m+1} \ll \epsilon_{m+1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty. \]

This proves (3.17). We are position to show (3.18). Let \( q_m = T_m \tilde{\Psi}(q) \) and \( n = m - 1 \). By Lemma B.2, \( ||q_m||_{0,p} \leq ||q_m||_{\varsigma_m,p} \ll ||q||_{0,p} \). It will be shown in Lemma B.4 in Sect. 10 that \( T_m \tilde{\Psi} \) is self-adjoint in \( \ell_2 \). Then
\[ \partial_q R_0 = T_0 \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_0} G(q_0)), \]
\[ \partial_q R_m = T_n \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_n} G(q_n)) - T_m \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_n} G(q_n)). \]

Furthermore, by (3.10) and Lemma B.2(10.14),
\[ ||\partial_q R_0||_{\varsigma_0,p} \leq ||\tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_0} G(q_0))||_{0,p} \ll ||\tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_0} G(q_0))||_{0,\tilde{p}} \]
\[ \leq ||\partial_{q_0} G(q_0)||_{0,p} \leq \epsilon ||q_0||_{0,p}^3 \ll \epsilon = \epsilon_0, \]

and
\[ ||\partial_q R_m||_{\varsigma_m,p} = ||\partial_q G(T_m \tilde{\Psi}(q)) - G(T_n \tilde{\Psi}(q))||_{\varsigma_m,p} \]
\[ = ||T_m \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_m} G(q_m)) - T_n \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_n} G(q_n))||_{\varsigma_m,p} \]
\[ \leq ||(T_m - T_n) \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_m} G(q_m))||_{\varsigma_m,p} \]
\[ + ||T_n \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_n} G(q_n))||_{\varsigma_m,p} \] (3.19)
\[ \leq ||T_n \tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_n} G(q_n))||_{\varsigma_m,p}. \] (3.20)

Thus,
\[ (3.19) \ll \epsilon_m ||\tilde{\Psi}(\partial_{q_m} G(q_m))||_{0,\tilde{p}} \ll \text{Lemma B.(10.12)} \]
\[ \ll \epsilon_m ||\partial_{q_n} G(q_m)||_{0,p} \ll \text{Definition of } \Psi \]
\[ \ll \epsilon_m ||q_m||_{0,p}^3 \ll (3.10) \]
\[ \leq \epsilon_m ||q||_{0,p}^3. \]
Let \( q^* := q_n + \theta (q_m - q_n) \) with \( \theta \in [0, 1] \). We have

\[
(3.20) \quad \| T_n \tilde{\psi} (\partial_{q_m} G(q_m) - \partial_{q_n} G(q_n)) \|_{s_m, p}, \quad s_m < s_n
\]

\[
\leq \| \tilde{\psi} (\partial_{q_m} G(q_m) - \partial_{q_n} G(q_n)) \|_{0, p} (\Leftarrow \text{Lemma B.3(10.14)})
\]

\[
\leq \| \tilde{\psi} (\partial_{q_m} G(q_m) - \partial_{q_n} G(q_n)) \|_{0, \tilde{p}}
\]

\[
\leq \| \partial_{q_m}^2 G(q^*) (q_m - q_n) \|_{0, p} (\Leftarrow \text{Definition of } \psi)
\]

\[
= \| \partial_{q_m}^2 G(q^*) (q_m - q_n) \|_{0, p} (\Leftarrow \text{Taylor’s formula})
\]

\[
\leq \epsilon \| q^* \|_{0, p}^2 \|(T_m - T_n) \tilde{\psi}(q)\|_{0, p}
\]

\[
\leq \epsilon \| q \|_{0, p}^2 \|(T_m - T_n) \tilde{\psi}(q)\|_{s_m, p}
\]

\[
\leq \varepsilon_m \| q \|_{0, p}^2 \| \tilde{\psi}(q)\|_{0, p} (\Leftarrow \text{Lemma B.3(10.12)})
\]

\[
\leq \varepsilon_m \| q \|_{0, p}^3.
\]

Consequently, if \( \| q \|_{0, p} < 1 \)

\[
\| \partial_q R_m \|_{s_m, p} \leq \varepsilon_m \| q \|_{0, p}^3 \leq \varepsilon_m.
\]

This completes the proof of this lemma. \( \Box \)

Observe that for \( 1 \leq l \leq n \), there is a \( j \in N_n \) such that

\[
\omega^0_j (\xi) = \sqrt{|j|^2 + \xi},
\]

and for \( j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus N_n \),

\[
\Omega^0_j = \sqrt{\mu^0_j} = j.
\]

It follows from (3.21.22) that Assumptions A, B, C of Theorem 2.1 are fulfilled. Now let us check Assumption D of Theorem 2.1. Write \( q = (q, \bar{q}) \) with \( q = (q_j)_{j \in N_n} \) and \( \bar{q} = (q_j)_{j \notin N_n} \). Let

\[
q_j = \sqrt{2(y^0_j + y_j)} \cos x_j, \quad p_j = \sqrt{2(y^0_j + y_j)} \sin x_j, \quad j \in N_n, \quad y \in [0, 1]^n.
\]

Then, in view of (3.17), Hamiltonian (3.5) is transformed into

\[
H = (\omega(\xi), y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \notin N_n} \Omega^0_j (p_j^2 + q_j^2) + R^0 (x, y, \bar{q})
\]

where

\[
R^0 (x, y, \bar{q}) = R(q(x, y), \bar{q}) = \sum_{m=0}^\infty R_m (q(x, y), \bar{q})
\]

with \( q(x, y) \) defined by (3.23). Observe that for \( |\Im x| \leq s_0, |y| \leq r_0 < 1 \),

\[
|\partial_x R_m(x, y, \bar{q})|, |\partial_y R_m(x, y, \bar{q})|, |\partial_{\bar{q}} R_m(x, y, \bar{q})|_{a, p} \ll |\partial_q R(q)|_{a, p}.
\]
Let \( u = (u_j : j \notin N_n) \) with \( u_j = (p_j, q_j) \) and
\[
X_{R_m} = (\partial_x R_m, -\partial_y R_m, J_\infty \partial_u R_m), \quad \partial u_j = (\partial p_j, \partial q_j).
\]
It follows from Lemma 3.2 that the Assumption D is fulfilled and
\[
r_0 |X_{R_m}|_{\tau_\text{m}, \eta, D(s, 0, r_0) \times \mathcal{O}_0} < \epsilon_m.
\]
Using the fact \( \mu_j^0 = |j|^2 + \xi_j \) and (3.6) and (3.7), we get that the vector field \( X_{R_m} \)
is analytic in each entry of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_0 \) and
\[
r_0 |X_{R_m}|^{\tau_\text{m}, \eta, D(s, 0, r_0) \times \mathcal{O}_0} < \epsilon_m.
\]
By invoking Theorem 2.1, we get the invariant torus and thus quasi-periodic solutions for (1.3).

**Theorem 3.3.** For any \( 0 < \alpha \ll 1 \), there is a set \( \Pi_\alpha \subset \Pi_0 \) with
\[
\text{Meas} \left( \Pi \setminus \Pi_\alpha \right) \leq \tilde{c} \alpha
\]
(here \( \tilde{c} > 0 \) is an absolute constant) such that for any \( \xi \in \Pi_\alpha \), the NLW equation (1.3) \( \xi \in \Pi_\alpha \) possesses a smooth quasi-periodic solution \( u(t, x) \) of frequencies \( \omega_* \) which satisfies
\[
|u(t, x) - u_0(t, x)| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}
\]
and
\[
|\omega_* - \omega_0| \leq \epsilon.
\]
Besides, the solution \( u(t, x) \) is linearly stable.

**4. The linearized equation.**

4.1. split and estimate for small perturbation. Recall that for \( j \in \mathcal{N} \), the notation \( j^t \) denotes the number of the elements of the set \( \{ j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |j| = j \} \), and \( u_j \) is
the vector consisting of \( u_j \) with \( j \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) and \( |j| = j \). Let \( E_j \) be the unit matrix of order \( j^t \). Let \( \mathcal{O} \) be an open set in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Consider two infinitely dimensional vectors \( u = (u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \) and \( v = (v_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \) where both \( u_j \) and \( v_j \) are in \( \mathbb{C}^2 \). Define \( \langle u, v \rangle = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \langle u_j, v_j \rangle \). Therefore, if write \( u = (u_j)_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \) and \( v = (v_j)_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \) where both \( u_j \) and \( v_j \) are \( j^t \)-dimensional vectors, then \( \langle u, v \rangle = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \langle u_j, v_j \rangle \). Let \( N \) be an integrable Hamiltonian:
\[
N = \langle \omega(\xi), y \rangle + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \langle \hat{\Omega}_j(\xi) E_j u_j, u_j \rangle + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \langle B_{jj}(\xi) u_j, u_j \rangle
\]
where \( B_{jj}(\omega) \) is a real symmetric matrix of order \( j^t \) for any \( \omega \in \mathcal{O} \), and all of the coefficients \( \omega(\xi), \hat{\Omega}_j(\xi) \) and \( B_{jj}(\xi) \) are analytic in each entry \( \xi_j \) \( (j = 1, \ldots, n) \) of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \). Moreover, we assume \( |\det \frac{\partial \omega(\xi)}{\partial \xi_j} | > c > 0 \) for all \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \). If we write \( \Lambda = \text{diag}(\hat{\Omega}_j(\xi) E_j : j \in \mathcal{N}) \) and \( B = \text{diag}(B_{jj} : j \in \mathcal{N}) \), then
\[
N = \langle \omega(\xi), y \rangle + \langle \Lambda u, u \rangle + \langle B u, u \rangle.
\]
We now consider a perturbation \( H = N + \hat{R} \) where \( \hat{R} = \hat{R}(x, y, u; \xi) \) is a Hamiltonian defined on \( D(s, r) \) and depends on the parameter \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \). We assume that there are
quantities \( \varepsilon = \varepsilon(r, s, \mathcal{O}) \) and \( \varepsilon^\mathcal{L} = \varepsilon^\mathcal{L}(r, s, \mathcal{O}) \) which are dependent on \( r, s, \mathcal{O} \) such that
\[ r|X_{\mathcal{R}}|_{c,p,D(s,r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon, \quad r|X_{\mathcal{R}}|^\mathcal{L}_{c,p,D(s,r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon^\mathcal{L}, \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon^\mathcal{L} \ll 1. \] (4.1)

For \( u = (u_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \) with \( u_j = (u^1_j, u^2_j) \), write \( u^1 = (u^1_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \) and \( u^2 = (u^2_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \). Let
\[ R = \sum_{2|m+|q_1+q_2| \leq 2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} R_{kmq_1q_2} \varepsilon^Y \sum_{n} R_{kmq_1q_2} e^{\sqrt{-1}(k \cdot x)} y^n u^1(u^1)^{q_1} u^2(u^2)^{q_2}, \]
with the Taylor-Fourier coefficients \( R_{kmq_1q_2} \) of \( \tilde{R} \) depending on \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \), and being analytic in each entry \( \xi_j \) of \( \xi \), such that the vector field \( X_{\mathcal{R}} : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}^{c,p} \) is real, analytic in \( (x, y, u) \) in \( D(s, r) \), and in each entry of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \). We will approximate \( \tilde{R} \) by its partial Taylor-Fourier expansion \( R \). For convenience we decompose \( R = R^0 + R^1 + R^2 \), where \( R^j \)’s \( j = 0, 1, 2 \) comprises all terms with \( |q + q'| = j \), and furthermore,
\[ R^0 = R^x + (R^y, y), \]
\[ R^1 = (R^u, u), \]
\[ R^2 = (R^{uu} u, u), \]
where \( R^x, R^y, R^{uu} \) depend on \( x, \xi \). Let \( D(s) = \{ x \in \mathbb{C}^n / 2\pi \mathbb{Z}^n : |3x| < s \} \). In order to derive the linearized equation, we need some notations. For any operator \( Y : \ell^p \to \ell^{c,p} \subset \ell^p \), we regard it as a matrix of infinite dimension. Denote by \( Y^{ij} \)'s the elements of this matrix. For any \( i, j \in \mathcal{N} \), let \( Y_{ij} \) be the sub-matrix of \( Y \) with \( Y_{ij} = (Y^{ij})_{|i|=n,|j|=n} \). Denote by \( Y_{ij} \) the elements of the sub-matrix \( Y_{ij} \). We split the matrix \( Y \) as follows:
\[ Y = Y_g + Y_{ng} \]
where \( R_g \) is a quasi-diagonal matrix with \( Y_g = (Y_{ij})_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \) and \( Y_{ng} \) is a non-diagonal matrix with \( Y_{ng} = Y - Y_g \). Denote by \( Y_{ng}^{ij} \) the elements of matrix \( Y_{ng} \). Thus, \( Y_{ng}^{ij} = 0 \) if \( |i| = |j| = n \). For any vector or matrix \( Y \) dependent on \( x \in D(s) \), let
\[ [Y] = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} Y(x) \, dx. \]
Besides, we suppose that \( [R^x] = 0 \) without loss of generality, since the Hamiltonian dynamics will not be changed by adding (or removing) a constant to (or from) the Hamiltonian function. Now we give some estimates of \( \tilde{R} \).

**Lemma 4.0.**
\[ r|X_{\mathcal{R}}|_{c,p,D(s,r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq r|X_{\mathcal{R}}|^*_{c,p,D(s,r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon^*, \] (4.2)
\[ \nu|X_{\mathcal{R}} - X_{\mathcal{R}}|_{c,p,D(s,4\eta r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \eta \nu|X_{\mathcal{R}}|^*_{c,p,D(s,4\eta r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \eta^* \varepsilon^*, \] (4.3)
for any \( 0 < \eta \ll 1 \), where * = the blank or \( \mathcal{L} \), for example, \( \varepsilon^* = \varepsilon \) or \( \varepsilon^\mathcal{L} \).

**Proof.** The proof is similar to that of formula (7) of [P1,129].

**Lemma 4.1.** Under the smallness assumption on \( \tilde{R} \), the following estimates hold true:
\[ |\partial_x R^x|_{D(s) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq r^2 \varepsilon, \quad |\partial_x R^x|^\mathcal{L}_{D(s) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq r^2 \varepsilon^\mathcal{L}, \]
\[ |R^y|_{D(s) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon, \quad |R^y|^\mathcal{L}_{D(s) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon^\mathcal{L} \] (4.5)
\[
||R^u||_{c,p;D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq r\varepsilon, \quad ||R^u||^2_{c,p;D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq r\varepsilon^2
\]  
(4.6)

\[
\|\|R^u\|\|_{0,c,p;p;D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|\|R^u\|\|_{c,p;D(s)\times \mathcal{O}}^2 \leq \varepsilon^2
\]  
(4.7)

**Proof.** Consider \(R^u\). Observe that \(R^u = \partial_u \partial_u R\) \([u=0]\) with \(\partial_u j = (\partial_{u_j}, \partial_{u_j})\) and \(u_j = (u_j^1, u_j^2)\). By the generalized Cauchy inequality (See Lemma A.3 in \([P1]\)),

\[
\|\|R^u\|\|_{0,c,p;p;D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|\partial_u R\|_{c,p,D(s,r)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon X_R_{c,p,D(s,r)\times \mathcal{O}} < \varepsilon.
\]

The remaining proof is simple. We omit the details. \(\square\)

It follows from Lemma 4.2 that \(R^u\) is a bounded linear operator from \(\ell^p\) to \(\ell^2\) for any \(x \in D(s)\). Write \(R^u = (R_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d)\) where \(R_{ij}\)'s are \(2 \times 2\) complex matrix. In fact, 

\[
R_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix}
\partial_{u_i} \partial_{u_j} R & \partial_{u_i} \partial_{u_j} R \\
\partial_{u_i} \partial_{u_j} R & \partial_{u_i} \partial_{u_j} R
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

We see that \(R^T_j = R_{ij}\) where \(t\) means the transpose of matrix. Therefore, \(R^u\) is a symmetric operator. Besides, \(R^u\) is real for real \(x\). Recall \(R_{ij}\) is a \(2 \times 2\) matrix. Denote by \(|R_{ij}|\) the maximum norm of matrix.

**Lemma 4.2.** For \(|i| \geq |j|\), we have

\[
|R_{ij}|_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}}, |R_{ji}|_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq e^{-\varsigma|i|} |i|^{-p} |j|^{-p} \varepsilon. \]  
(4.8)

\[
|R_{ij}|^2_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}}, |R_{ji}|^2_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq e^{-\varsigma|i|} |i|^{-p} |j|^{-p} \varepsilon^2. \]  
(4.9)

**Proof.** Let \(u = (u_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}\) with \(u_j = |j|^{-p}(1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2})\) and \(u_k = 0\) for \(k \neq j\). Then \(||u||_p = 1\). In terms of the definition of the operator norm \(\|\|\|\|_{0,c,p,p}\) and (4.7), we have

\[
\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{2|t|} |t|^{2p} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} R_{tk} u_k |R_{ij}|^2_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq \|\|R^u\|\|_{0,c,p,p}^2 \leq \varepsilon^2,
\]

that is,

\[
\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{2|t|} |t|^{2p} |R_{ij}|^2_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \leq \varepsilon^2,
\]

in particular, for \(|i| > |j|\),

\[
|R_{ij}| \leq e^{-\varsigma|i|} |i|^{-p} |j|^{-p} \varepsilon.
\]

The remaining proof is similar. This completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Lemma 4.3.** For \(j \in \mathcal{N}\),

\[
\sup_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \|R_{ij}\|_{2} \leq j^{(d-1)/2} e^{-\varsigma j} \varepsilon. \]  
(4.10)

\[
\sup_{D(s)\times \mathcal{O}} \|R_{ij}\|^2_{2} \leq j^{(d-1)/2} e^{-\varsigma j} \varepsilon^2. \]  
(4.11)
Proof. Observe a well-known fact in matrix theory:

\[ ||R_{ij}||_2^2 \leq \max_{|j|=j} \sum_{|i|=j} |R_{ij}| \cdot \max_{|i|=|j|=j} |R_{ij}| \]

Note that the cardinality of the set \( \{j : |j| = j\} \) is bounded by \( j^{d-2+\varepsilon} \leq j^{d-1} \). By Lemma 4.2, we have

\[ ||R_{ij}||_2 \leq \sqrt{\sum_{|j|=j} 1 \cdot \max_{|i|=|j|=j} |R_{ij}|} < j^{(d-1)/2} e^{-s_j \varepsilon} \]

The proof of the another estimate is the same.

Let \( Y : \ell_2 \rightarrow \ell_2 \) be a matrix of infinity order. Write \( Y = (Y_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \). For \( M > 0 \), let \( \Upsilon_M Y : \ell_2 \rightarrow \ell_2 \) be a matrix of infinity order whose matrix elements are defined by

\[ (\Upsilon_M Y)_{ij} = \begin{cases} Y_{ij}, & |i| \leq M \text{ and } |j| \leq M \\ 0, & |i| > M \text{ or } |j| > M. \end{cases} \]

If \( Y = (Y_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \) be a vector in \( \ell_2 \). Let \( \Upsilon_M Y = ((\Upsilon Y)_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \) is a vector in \( \ell_2 \) defined by

\[ (\Upsilon_M Y)_j = \begin{cases} Y_j, & |j| \leq M \\ 0, & |j| > M. \end{cases} \]

Lemma 4.4. For \( 0 < \eta < 1 \) and \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \), let \( M = 4|\ln \eta \sigma n|/\varsigma \). Then

\[ ||(1 - \Upsilon_M)R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, p, D(s) \times O} \leq \varepsilon \eta^2, \ ||(1 - \Upsilon_M)R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, p, D(s) \times O} \leq \eta^2 \sigma^2 \varepsilon \]

Proof. By (4.6) and the definition of \( \Upsilon \),

\[ ||(1 - \Upsilon_M)R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, p, D(s) \times O} \leq e^{cM/2} ||R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, D(s) \times O} \leq \varepsilon \eta^2 \sigma^2. \]

The remaining inequality is proven similarly. \( \square \)

Lemma 4.5. For \( 0 < \eta < 1 \), let \( M = 4|\ln \eta \sigma n|/\varsigma \). Then

\[ ||(1 - \Upsilon_M)R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, p, D(s) \times O} \leq \sigma^2 \varepsilon \eta^2, \ ||(1 - \Upsilon_M)R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, p, D(s) \times O} \leq \eta^2 \sigma^2 \varepsilon \]

Proof. By (4.8) and the definition of \( \Upsilon \),

\[ ||(1 - \Upsilon_M)R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, p, D(s) \times O} \leq e^{cM/2} ||R_{uu}||_{\ell_2, D(s) \times O} \leq \varepsilon \eta^2 \sigma^2. \]

By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma A.2 in Appendix A, we complete the proof of the first inequality of this lemma. The remaining proof is similar. \( \square \)
Lemma 4.6. Suppose that \( r = r_0 \eta \) with a absolute constant \( r_0 > 0 \) defined in Theorem 2.1. Let

\[ R_M = \langle (1 - \Upsilon_M)R^u, u \rangle + \langle (1 - \Upsilon_M)R^{uu}u, u \rangle. \]

Then

\[ \eta r ||| X_{R_M} |||_{c/2,p,D(s-\sigma,\eta r)} \leq \eta \varepsilon, \quad \eta r ||| X_{R_M} |||_{L_{c/2,p,D}(s-\sigma,\eta r)} \leq \eta \varepsilon. \]

Proof. This is an easy corollary of Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5.

For \( K > 0 \) and a function \( f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(k)e^{\sqrt{-1}(k,x)} \), define a function \( \Gamma_K f \) by

\[ (\Gamma_K f)(x) = \sum_{|k| \leq K} \hat{f}(k)e^{\sqrt{-1}(k,x)}. \]

Lemma 4.7. Let \( K = |\ln \eta|/\sigma \) and \( R_K = (R - R_M) - \Gamma_K(R - R_M) \). We have

\[ r ||| X_{R_K} |||_{c,p,D(s-\sigma,r)} \leq \eta \varepsilon, \quad r ||| X_{R_K} |||_{L_{c,p,D}(s-\sigma,r)} \leq \eta \varepsilon. \]

Proof. Write \( R_K = R^x_K + (R^y_K, y) + \langle R^u_K, u \rangle + \langle R^{uu}_K u, u \rangle \). Note that the terms \( R^x_K, R^y_K, \) and so on, are analytic in \( x \in D(s) \). Then by Cauchy’s formula, we have \( |R^x_K(k)| \leq e^{-s|k|} \sup_{D(s)} |R^x| \), and so on. Observe that \( |k| > K \) in those Fourier coefficients \( R^x_K(k) \)’s. We can get

\[ r ||| X_{R_K} |||_{c,p,D(s-\sigma,r)} \leq e^{-\sigma K} r ||| X_{R} |||_{c,p,D(s-\sigma,r)} \leq \eta \varepsilon^* \]

where \(* = \) the blank or \( L \).

Finally, let \( R = \Gamma_K(R - R_M) \). Then

\[ R = R + R_M + R_K. \]

Also write

\[ R = R^x + \langle R^y, y \rangle + \langle R^u, u \rangle + \langle R^{uu}u, u \rangle. \]

By Lemma 4.6 and 4.7 we see that Lemmas 4.0, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 hold still true after replacing \( R \) by \( R \).

4.2. Derivation of homological equations. The KAM theorem is proven by the usual Newton-type iteration procedure which involves an infinite sequence of coordinate changes. Each coordinate change is obtained as the time-1 map \( X_F^t |_{t=1} \) of a Hamiltonian vector field \( X_F \). Its generating Hamiltonian \( F \) solves the linearized equation

\[ \{ F, N \} = [R] \]

where \( \{ \cdot, \cdot \} \) is Poisson bracket with respect to the symplectic structure \( dx \wedge dy + du^1 \wedge du^2 \) and \([R]\) is defined as

\[ [R] = \langle [R^y], y \rangle + \langle [R^{uu}u], u \rangle. \]
It is easy to see that
\[
[[R]] = \sum_{0 \leq |m| \leq 1, |r| = |j|} R_{0mij} y^m u^1_i u^2_j
\]
which is of the same form as \(N\). We are now in position to find a solution of this equation and give some estimates for the solution. To this end, we suppose that \(F\) is of the same form as \(R - [[R]]\), that is, \(F = F^0 + F^1 + F^2\), where
\[
\begin{align*}
F^0 &= F^x + (F^y, y), \\
F^1 &= \langle F^u, u \rangle, \\
F^2 &= \langle F^{uu} u, u \rangle,
\end{align*}
\]
with \(F^x, F^y, F^{uu}\) depending on \(x, \xi\). We furthermore suppose that \([[F]] = 0\) where the definition of \([[F]]\) is the same as \([[R]]\). Set \(A_{jj}(\xi) = \Omega_j(\xi) E_j + B_{jj}(\xi), \quad A = \text{diag}(A_{jj} : j \in \mathcal{N})\).

As in [K1, p.62], now the linearized equation is reduced to the following equations:
\[
\begin{align*}
\partial F^x / \partial \omega &= R^x(x, \xi), \quad (4.12) \\
\partial F^y / \partial \omega &= R^y(x, \xi) - [R^y](\xi), \quad (4.13) \\
\partial F^u / \partial \omega - AJ_\infty F^u &= R^u(x, \xi), \quad (4.14) \\
\partial F^{uu} / \partial \omega + F^{uu} J_\infty A - AJ_\infty F^{uu} &= R^{uu}(x, \xi) - [R^{uu}](\xi), \quad (4.15*)
\end{align*}
\]
where \(\partial / \partial \omega = (\omega, \partial_x)\), for example, \(\partial F^y / \partial \omega = (\omega, \partial_y)\). Observe that both \(A\) and \(J_\infty\) are quasi-diagonal. We can split (4.15*) into the following systems:
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} F^{uu}_{ij} A_{jj} - A_{ij} F^{uu}_{ij} = R^{uu}_{ij}, \quad [R^{uu}_{jj}] = 0, i, j \leq M. \quad (4.15)
\]
Recall \(X_R : D(s, r) \subset \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{x, \nu}\) is real analytic in \((x, y, u) \in D(s, r)\) and each entry of \(\xi \in \mathcal{O}\).

4.3. Solutions of the homological equations.

Proposition 1. (Solution of (4.12).) Assume that uniformly on \(\xi \in \mathcal{O}\),
\[
|(k, \omega(\xi))| > \frac{\alpha}{|k|}, \quad \text{for all } 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, |k| \leq K
\]
(4.16)
where \(\alpha > 0\) and \(\tau > n\). Then on \(D(s - \sigma) \times \mathcal{O}\) with \(0 < \sigma < s\), the equation (4.12) has a solution \(F^x(x, \xi)\) which is analytic in \(x \in D(s - \sigma)\) for \(\xi\) fixed and analytic in each \(\xi_j, (j = 1, \ldots, n)\) for other variables fixed, and which is real for real argument, such that
\[
|\partial_x F^x|_{D(s - \sigma) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \frac{r^2 \varepsilon}{\alpha \sigma^{\tau + n}}, \quad |\partial_x F^x|^2_{D(s - \sigma) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \frac{r^2 \varepsilon^2}{\alpha \sigma^{2(\tau + n)}}. \quad (4.17)
\]
Proof. Expanding \(\partial_x R^x\) into Fourier series
\[
\partial_x R^x = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, |k| \leq K} \partial_x R^x(k) e^{\sqrt{-1}(k,x)}.
\]
Since $\partial_x R^{x}$ is analytic in $x \in D(s)$, we get that the Fourier coefficients $\hat{\partial_x R^{x}}(k)$'s decay exponentially in $k$, that is,

$$|\hat{\partial_x R^{x}}(k)| \ll |\partial_x R^{x}||_{D(s) \times O}e^{-s|k|} \ll e^{-s|k|}r^2 \varepsilon,$$

where we have used (4.4), since Lemma 4.1 holds true not only for $R$ but also for $\mathcal{R}$. Expanding $\partial_x F^{x}$ into Fourier series as that of $\partial_x R^{x}$ and putting them into (4.12), we get

$$\partial_x F^{x}(x, \xi) = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, |k| \leq K} \frac{\hat{\partial_x R^{x}}(k)}{\sqrt{-1(k, \omega)}} e^{\sqrt{-1}(k, x)}.$$  

By (4.16), (4.18) as well as Lemma A.1, we get that for $x \in D(s - \sigma)$,

$$|\partial_x F^{x}(x, \xi)| \ll \frac{r^2 \varepsilon}{\alpha} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |k|^\tau e^{-|k|\sigma} \ll \frac{r^2 \varepsilon}{\alpha} \sigma^{-\tau - n}.$$  

Applying $\partial_{t_j}$ to both sides of (4.12) and using a method similar to the above, we can get

$$|\partial_{t_j} F^{x}(x, \xi)|^2 \ll \frac{r^2 \varepsilon}{\alpha \sigma^{2(\tau + n)}}.$$  

**Proposition 2.** (Solution of (4.13).) Assume (4.16) holds true. Then on $D(s - \sigma) \times O$ with $0 < \sigma < s$, the equation (4.13) has a solution $F^{y}(x, \xi)$ which is analytic in $x \in D(s - \sigma)$ for $\xi$ fixed and analytic in each $t_j$, $(j = 1, ..., n)$ for other variables fixed, and which is real for real argument, such that

$$|F^{y}|_{D(s - \sigma) \times O} \ll \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha \sigma^{\tau + n}}, \quad |F^{y}|_{D(s - \sigma) \times O} \ll \frac{\varepsilon \xi}{\alpha \sigma^{2(\tau + n)}}.$$  

*Proof.* The proof is the same as that of Prop. 1. We omit it. \[Q.E.D.\]

We are now in position to find the solution of (4.14). Recall that $A = \text{diag}(A_{jj} : j \in \mathcal{N})$ with $A_{jj} = \tilde{\Omega}_j E_j + \tilde{B}_{jj}$. We assume that $B_{jj}$ is symmetric and $\min_j \tilde{\Omega}_j \geq c > 0$ and $||B_{jj}||_2 \leq \epsilon_0^{1/2}$. Let

$$\tilde{A}_{jj} = E_j + \tilde{\Omega}_j^{-1}B_{jj} := E_j + \tilde{B}_{jj}.$$  

Then $\tilde{A}_{jj}$ and $\tilde{B}_{jj}$ are symmetric and $A_{jj} = \tilde{\Omega}_j \tilde{A}_{jj}$. In addition, we will assume that $||\tilde{B}_{jj}||_2 \leq \epsilon_0^{1/2}$. It is easy to see that $\tilde{A}_{jj}$ is positively definite and $||\tilde{A}_{jj}||_2 \leq 1 + C \epsilon_0$. Write $R^{u} = (R_{j})_{j \in \mathcal{N}}$ with $R_{j} = (R^{u}_{j})_{|j|=j}$. Similarly, write $F^{u} = (F_{j})_{j \in \mathcal{N}}$. Then (4.14) can be written as a system of equations:

$$\partial F_{j}/\partial \omega - A_{jj} J_{j} F_{j} = R_{j}, \quad j \in \mathcal{N}, j \leq M. \tag{4.19}$$  

Multiplying both sides of the above equation by a scalar $e^{s/2} J^{j}$ and letting

$$e^{s/2} J^{j} F_{j} = \tilde{F}_{j}, \quad e^{s/2} J^{j} R_{j} = \tilde{R}_{j}. \tag{4.20}$$  

Then

$$\partial \tilde{F}_{j}/\partial \omega - \tilde{\Omega}_j \tilde{A}_{jj} J_{j} \tilde{F}_{j} = \tilde{R}_{j}, \quad j \leq M. \tag{4.21}$$
Let \( \widehat{R} = (\widehat{R}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) and \( \widehat{F} = (\widehat{F}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \).

Letting \( \widehat{F}_j = \tilde{A}_j^{-1/2}\tilde{F}_j \) and \( \widehat{R}_j = \tilde{A}_j^{-1/2}\tilde{R}_j \) and \( \tilde{A}_{jj} = \sqrt{-1}\tilde{A}_j^{1/2}J_j\tilde{A}_j^{1/2} \), then, by noting \( \tilde{\Omega}_j \) is a scalar, we get

\[
\partial\tilde{F}_j/\partial\omega + \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\Omega}_j\tilde{F}_j = \tilde{R}_j, \tag{4.22}
\]

Since \( \tilde{A}_{jj} \) is (real) symmetric and \( J_j \) is skew-symmetric, we get \( \tilde{A}_{jj} \) is hermitian. Since \( B_{jj}(\xi) \) is analytic in \( \xi_j (j = 1, ..., n) \), it is easy to see that \( \tilde{A}_{jj} = \tilde{A}_{jj}(\xi) \) is analytic in \( \xi_j \). Therefore we have the following lemma which will be used in estimating the measure of some non-resonance sets.

**Lemma 4.8.** Assume \( B_{jj}(\xi) \) is real symmetric and

\[
\sup_{\mathcal{O}} ||B_{jj}(\xi)||_2 < \epsilon_0 j^{-d}, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{O}} ||\partial_\xi B_{jj}(\xi)||_2 < j^{-d/3} \epsilon_0, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{O}} |\partial_\xi \tilde{\Omega}_j| \leq Cj^{-d}, \quad C \ll 1.
\]

Let \( \Lambda_j = \{ \lambda_j : |j| = j \} \) be the collection of all eigenvalues of \( \tilde{\Omega}_j \tilde{A}_{jj} \) and \( \Lambda = \cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_j \). Then for any \( \lambda_j \in \Lambda_j \), it is a function of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \) and is analytic in each entry\(^4\) \( \xi_l \)'s \((l = 1, ..., n)\) of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \). Moreover,

\[
|\lambda_j(\xi) \pm \tilde{\Omega}_j| < j^{-d} \epsilon_0, \quad |j| = j
\]

and

\[
\sup_{\mathcal{O}} |\partial_\xi \lambda_j(\xi)| \leq Cj^{-d}, \quad |j| = j, 0 < C \ll 1.
\]

**Proof.** By the assumption, we can write

\[
\tilde{\Omega}_j\tilde{A}_{jj} = \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\Omega}_jJ_j + \tilde{B}_{jj},
\]

with

\[
\sup_{\mathcal{O}} ||\tilde{B}_{jj}||_2 \leq \epsilon_0 j^{-d}, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{O}} ||\partial_\xi \tilde{B}_{jj}||_2 \leq \epsilon_0^{1/3} j^{-d}.
\]

Note that the eigenvalues of \( \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\Omega}_jJ_j \) are \( \pm \tilde{\Omega}_j \)'s. The proof is finished by the combination of Lemmas A.3, 4, 5 in Section 9. \( \square \)

**Proposition 3.** Suppose that for any \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) and \( j \geq 0 \), \( \lambda_j \in \Lambda_j \) and \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \), the following inequality holds true:

\[
|(k, \omega(\xi)) \pm \lambda_j| > \alpha/(j^d|k|^7), \quad |k| \leq K, j \leq M, \quad (\text{1st Melnikov's}) \tag{4.23}
\]

where we take \(|0\rangle\) as 1 for convenience. Then equation \((4.1')\) has a solution \( F^u(x, \xi) \) which is analytic in \( x \in D(s - \sigma) \) for \( \xi \) fixed and analytic in each \( \xi_j, (j = 1, ..., n) \) for other variables fixed, and which is real for real argument, such that

\[
||F^u||_{L^2/2,D(s-\sigma)\times\mathcal{O}} \leq \zeta^{-d} \alpha^{-1} \sigma^{-r-n} \epsilon_z, \tag{4.24}
\]

\[
||F^u||_{L^2/2,D(s-\sigma)\times\mathcal{O}} \leq \zeta^{-d} \alpha^{-1} \sigma^{-2(r+n)} \epsilon_z. \tag{4.25}
\]

\(^4\)The function \( \lambda_i \) is not necessarily analytic in the whole of \( \xi \). See [Ka] for a example.
Proof. By (4.23), we get
\[ \|(k, \omega)E_j + \hat{\Omega}_j \hat{A}_j\|_2 \leq j^d|k|^\tau/\alpha, \ j \leq M, |k| \leq K. \]
Expand $\bar{R}_j$ and $\bar{F}_j$ into Fourier series and putting then into (4.22), we get
\[ \bar{F}_j = \sum_{|k| \leq K} ((k, \omega)E_j + \hat{\Omega}_j \hat{A}_j)^{-1} \bar{R}_j(k)e^{\sqrt{z}(k,x)}, \ j \leq M. \quad (4.26) \]
Since $\bar{R}_j$ is analytic in $x \in D(s)$, we have $\|\hat{\bar{R}}_j(k)\|_2 \leq e^{-s|k|} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \|\bar{R}_j\|_2$. Therefore, for $x \in D(s - \sigma)$,
\[ \|\bar{F}_j(x)\|_2 \leq \alpha^{-1} j^d \sup_{D(s) \times O} \|\bar{R}_j\|_2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |k|^\tau e^{-\sigma|k|} \leq j^d \alpha^{-1} e^{-\sigma} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \|\bar{R}_j\|_2. \]
Notice that $\|\hat{\bar{A}}_{j-1/2}\|_2 = 1 + o(1)$. It follows that
\[ \|\bar{F}_j(x)\|_2 \leq \|\bar{F}_j(x)\|_2, \ \|\bar{R}_j(x)\|_2 \leq \|\bar{R}_j(x)\|_2. \]
We get
\[ \|\bar{F}_j(x)\|_2 \leq j^d \alpha^{-1} e^{-\sigma} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \|\bar{R}_j\|_2. \]
Recalling that
\[ e^{\xi j/2} j^p F_j = \bar{F}_j, \ e^{\xi j/2} j^p R_j = \bar{R}_j. \]
Hence,
\[ \|F_j(x)\|_2 \leq j^d \alpha^{-1} e^{-\sigma} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \|\bar{R}_j\|_2. \]
Finally, noting a simple fact
\[ \sup_{0 \leq t} t^\beta e^{-\alpha t} = (\beta/\alpha)^\beta e^{-\beta}, \ \text{for any} \ \beta, \alpha > 0, \]
we have
\[ \|F^n(x)\|_{\ell/2,p} = \sqrt{\sum_{j \leq M} e^{\xi j} j^{2p} \|F_j(x)\|^2_2} \]
\[ \leq \alpha^{-1} e^{-\sigma} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \sqrt{\sum_{j \leq M} (j^{2d} e^{-\omega j})(e^{2\xi j} j^{2p} \|\bar{R}_j\|^2_2)} \]
\[ \leq \alpha^{-1} e^{-\sigma} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \sqrt{\sum_{j \leq M} e^{2\xi j} j^{2p} \|\bar{R}_j\|^2_2} \]
\[ = \alpha^{-1} e^{-\sigma} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \|\bar{R}_j\|_{\ell, 2} \]
\[ \leq \alpha^{-1} e^{-\sigma} \sup_{D(s) \times O} \|\bar{R}_j\|_{\ell, p} \]
where (4.6) is used in the last inequality, since Lemma 4.1 holds true not only for $\bar{R}$ but also for $\bar{R}$. Differentiating (4.22) with respect to $\xi$ and repeating the procedure above, we can prove (4.25). □
Finally we turn to the solutions of the homological equation (4.15). Recall that, we have let
\[ \tilde{A}_{jj} = E_j + \tilde{\Omega}_j^{-1}B_{jj} := E_j + \tilde{B}_{jj}. \]
Thus \( A_{jj} = \tilde{\Omega}_j \tilde{A}_{jj} \). Note that \( \tilde{\Omega}_j \) is a scalar. Therefore, the equation (4.15) can be written as
\[ \partial F_{ij}/\partial \omega + \tilde{\Omega}_j F_{ij} J \tilde{A}_{jj} - \tilde{\Omega}_j \tilde{A}_{ii} F_{ij} = R_{ij}(x, \xi), \quad (4.27) \]
where we omit the superscript \( uu \) of \( F^{uu} \) and \( R^{uu} \). Let
\[ \tilde{A}_{jj} = \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}_{jj}/2 J \tilde{A}_{jj}^{1/2}. \]
Notice that \( \tilde{B}_{jj} \) is real symmetric and \( ||\tilde{B}_{jj}||_2 < \epsilon_0 \). It is easy to see that both \( \tilde{A}_{jj} \) and \( \tilde{A}_{jj} \) are hermitian and positive and
\[ ||\tilde{A}_{jj}||_2, ||\tilde{A}_{jj}^{1/2}||_2, ||\tilde{A}_{jj}||_2, ||\tilde{A}_{jj}^{-1/2}||_2 = 1 + o(1). \]

**Lemma 4.9.** Let \( M \) and \( N \) be \( m \times n \) and \( n \times l \) matrices, respectively. Denote by \( ||\cdot||_\infty \) the maximum norm of matrix. Then
\[ ||M||_\infty \leq ||M||_2, \quad ||MN||_\infty \leq n||M||_\infty||N||_\infty. \]

**Proof.** The proof is rather simple.

Let
\[ \hat{F}_{ij} = \tilde{A}_{ii}^{-1/2}F_{ij} \tilde{A}_{jj}^{-1/2}, \quad \hat{R}_{ij} = \tilde{A}_{ii}^{-1/2}R_{ij} \tilde{A}_{jj}^{-1/2}. \]
Then (4.27) is changed into
\[ \partial \hat{F}_{ij}/\partial \omega - \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\Omega}_i \tilde{F}_{ij} \tilde{A}_{jj} + \sqrt{-1}\tilde{\Omega}_i \tilde{A}_{ii} \tilde{F}_{ij} = \hat{R}_{ij}(x, \xi), \quad |R_{jj}| = 0, \quad i, j \leq M \quad (4.31) \]
Recall that we have denoted by \( \Lambda_j \), the collection of the eigenvalues of \( \tilde{\Omega}_j \tilde{A}_{jj} \). Write \( \Lambda_j = \{\lambda_j : |j| = j\} \). By abuse of notation, we also by \( \Lambda_j \) the diagonal matrix \( \text{diag}(\lambda_j : |j| = j) \). Then there is a unitary matrix \( Q_{jj} \) such that
\[ \tilde{\Omega}_j \tilde{A}_{jj} = Q_{jj}^*\Lambda_j Q_{jj}. \]
Let
\[ \hat{E}_{ij} = Q_{ii} \hat{F}_{ij} Q_{jj}^*, \quad \hat{R}_{ij} = Q_{ii} \hat{R}_{ij} Q_{jj}^*. \]
Then (4.31) is changed into
\[ \partial \hat{E}_{ij}/\partial \omega - \sqrt{-1}(\hat{E}_{ij} \Lambda_j - \Lambda_j \hat{E}_{ij}) = \hat{R}_{ij}(x, \xi), \quad |R_{jj}| = 0, \quad i, j \leq M \quad (4.34) \]
Recall that both \( \hat{E}_{ij} \) and \( \hat{R}_{ij} \) are \( i \times j \)-matrices. Denote by \( \hat{E}_{ij}^{ik} \) and \( \hat{R}_{ij}^{ik} \) the elements of the matrix \( \hat{E}_{ij} \) and \( \hat{R}_{ij} \), respectively. Expanding \( \hat{E}_{ij}^{ik} \) and \( \hat{R}_{ij}^{ik} \) into Fourier series and putting them into (4.31) we get
\[ \hat{E}_{ij}^{ik}(k) = -\sqrt{-1} \frac{\hat{R}_{ij}^{ik}(k)}{(k, \omega) + \lambda_i + \lambda_j}, \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |i| = |j| = j \leq M, 0 \neq |k| \leq K \\ |i| \neq |j|, i, j \leq M, |k| \leq K. \end{array} \right. \]
(4.35)
In order to that (4.35) is solvable, we need the 2nd Melnikov’s conditions: \(^5\)
Assume that for any \(\xi \in \mathcal{O}, \lambda_i, \lambda_j \in \Lambda_j\), we have
\[
| (k, \omega) + \lambda_i \pm \lambda_j | > \alpha/(d^d |k|), \quad \begin{cases} |i| = |j| = j \leq M, 0 \neq |k| \leq K \\ |i| \neq |j|, i, j \leq M, |k| \leq K. \end{cases} \tag{4.36}
\]
We assume \(|i| \geq |j|\) without loss of generality. By Lemma 4.2 and Cauchy’s theorem, we get
\[
|R_{ij}^k(k)| < e^{-|k|s}e^{-ct_i^{-p}p_j \varepsilon}, |i| \geq |j|. \tag{4.37}
\]
Note that (4.30,33) and the fact \(Q_\varepsilon\) is unitary and of order \(s^2 \leq s^{d-2+\varepsilon}\) with some constant \(0 < \varepsilon \ll 1\). Using Lemma 4.9, we have
\[
|\hat{R}_{ij}^k(k)| \leq |\hat{R}_{ij}^k(k)|(\sqrt{s} p_j)^2 \leq e^{-|k|s}e^{-ct_i \tau 4(d-1) - p_j \varepsilon}, |i| \geq |j| \tag{4.38}
\]
Using (4.32,33,34) we get
\[
|\hat{E}_{ij}^k(x, \xi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, |k| \leq K} |\hat{R}_{ij}^k(k)|e^{\sqrt{s} t_k(x, \xi)}| \leq e^{-|k|s}e^{-ct_i \tau 6d-4 - p_j \varepsilon}, |i| \geq |j|; |i|, |j| \leq M; |k| \leq K \tag{4.39}
\]
Moreover, the function
\[
E_{ij}^k(x, \xi) \text{ is well-defined on a small domain } D(s - \sigma) \times \mathcal{O} \text{ and on this domain}
\]
\[
|E_{ij}^k(x, \xi)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha s^{|\tau + \tau|}} e^{-c t_i \tau 6d-4 - p_j \varepsilon}, |i| \geq |j|; |i|, |j| \leq M \tag{4.40}
\]
where Lemma A.1 is used. Using Lemma 4.9 and (4.30,33), we get
\[
|E_{ij}^k(x, \xi)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha s^{|\tau + \tau|}} e^{-c t_i \tau 10d-8 - p_j \varepsilon}, |i| \geq |j|; |i|, |j| \leq M \tag{4.41}
\]
Note that \(E_{ij}^k(k), \omega, \lambda_i\) and \(\lambda_j\) are analytically dependent on \(\xi_j (j = 1, ..., n)\).

Applying \(\partial_{\xi_j}\) to (4.34) and using the same method as the above, we get
\[
|E_{ij}^k(x, \xi)|^\xi \leq \frac{\varepsilon^\xi}{\alpha s^{2|\tau + \tau|}} e^{-c t_i \tau 10d-8 - p_j \varepsilon}, |i| \geq |j|; |i|, |j| \leq M. \tag{4.42}
\]

Using Lemma A.2 in Appendix A, we have the follow lemma.

**Proposition 4.** Assume that the non-resonant conditions (4.5) and (5.12) hold true. Then there is an operator \(F^{uu}(x, \xi)\) defined on \(D(s - \sigma) \times \mathcal{O}\) solves (4.4*) and
\[
||| F^{uu}(x, \xi)|||_{0, s/2, p, p} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\chi^{12d-8 s^2 + \tau}} \tag{4.43}
\]
and
\[
||| F^{uu}(x, \xi)|||_{0, s/2, p, p} \leq \frac{\varepsilon^\xi}{\chi^{12d-8 s^2 2(\tau + \tau)}} \tag{4.44}
\]

\(^5\)These conditions are weaker than the usual second Melnikov’s ones as in [P1], but similar to ones in [B,B-B,B-G].
5. Symplectic change of variables.

In this section, our procedure is standard and almost the same as that of Section 3 in [P1, p.128-132]. Here we give out the outline of the procedure. See [P1] for the details.

Coordinate transformation. By Propositions 1-4, we get a Hamiltonian \( F \) on \( D(s-\sigma, r) \) where

\[
F = F^x + (F^y, y) + \langle F^u, u \rangle + \langle F^{uu}u, u \rangle
\]

and give estimates of \( F^x, F^y, F^u \) and \( F^{uu} \). Let \( X_F \) be the vector field corresponding to the Hamiltonian \( F \), that is,

\[
X_F = (-\partial_y F, \partial_x F, J_\infty \partial_u F),
\]

here \( \partial_u \) is the usual \( \ell^2 \)-gradient. It follows from Prop. 1, 2, 3 and 4 that for \((x, y, u; \xi) \in D(s-\sigma, r) \times \xi \in \mathcal{O} \),

\[
\| \partial_y F \|_{\mathcal{O}} + \frac{1}{r^2} \| \partial_x F \|_{\mathcal{O}} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha \sigma^{n+\tau} \varsigma^{12d-8}} \cdot \varepsilon,
\]

where we have used \( 0 < \varsigma < 1 \) and \( \| u \|_p < r \). That is,

\[
r \| X_F \|_{\mathcal{O}} \leq Q \varepsilon,
\]

where

\[
Q = \frac{1}{\alpha \sigma^{2(n+\tau) \varsigma^{12d-8}}}. \tag{5.2}
\]

Similarly, we have

\[
r \| X_F \|_{\mathcal{O}} \leq Q \varepsilon \tag{5.3}
\]

As in [P1, p.129], we introduce the operator norm

\[
r \| L \|_{a,p} = \sup_{W \neq 0} \frac{r \| LW \|_{a,p}}{r \| W \|_{a,p}}.
\]

Using (5.1), (5.3) and the generalized Cauchy’s inequality (See Lemma A.3 of [P1, p.147]) and the observation that every point in \( D(s-2\sigma, r/2) \) has at least \( \| \cdot \|_{p,r} \)-distance \( \sigma/2 \) to the boundary of \( D(s-\sigma, r) \), we get

\[
\sup_{D(s-2\sigma, r/2, \varsigma/2) \times \mathcal{O}} r \| DX_F \|_{\varsigma/2, p} \leq \sigma^{-1} r \| X_F \|_{\varsigma/2, p, D(s-\sigma, r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \sigma^{-1} Q \varepsilon. \tag{5.4}
\]

\[
\sup_{D(s-2\sigma, r/2, \varsigma/2) \times \mathcal{O}} r \| DX_F \|_{\varsigma/2, p} \leq \sigma^{-1} r \| X_F \|_{\varsigma/2, p, D(s-\sigma, r) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \sigma^{-1} Q \varepsilon \tag{5.5}
\]
where $DX_F$ is the differential of $X_F$. Assume that $\sigma^{-1}Q\varepsilon$ and $\sigma^{-1}Q\varepsilon\mathcal{C}$ are small enough. (These assumptions will be fulfilled in the following KAM iterations. Also see (5.12).) Arbitrarily fix $\xi \in \mathcal{O}$. By (5.1), the flow $X^t_F$ of the vector field $X_F$ exists on $D(s - 3\sigma, r/4)$ for $t \in [-1, 1]$ and takes the domain into $D(s - 2\sigma, r/2)$, and by Lemma A.4 of [P1, p.147], we have

\[ r\|X^t_F - id\|_{c/2,p,D(s-3\sigma,r/4)\times\mathcal{O}} \ll r\|X_F\|_{c/2,p,D(s-\sigma,r)\times\mathcal{O}} \ll Q\varepsilon \]  

and

\[ r\|X^t_F - id\|_{\mathcal{C},c/2,p,D(s-3\sigma,r/4)\times\mathcal{O}} < \exp(r\|DX_F\|_{c/2,p,D(s-2\sigma,r/2)\times\mathcal{O}}) \cdot r\|X_F\|_{\mathcal{C},c/2,p,D(s-\sigma,r)\times\mathcal{O}} \ll \exp(\sigma^{-1}Q\varepsilon)Q\varepsilon\mathcal{C} \ll Q\varepsilon\mathcal{C}, \]  

for $t \in [-1, 1]$. Furthermore, by the generalized Cauchy’s inequality,

\[ r\|DX^t_F - I\|_{c/2,p,D(s-4\sigma,r/8)\times\mathcal{O}} \ll \sigma^{-1}Q\varepsilon, \]  

and

\[ r\|DX^t_F - I\|_{\mathcal{C},c/2,p,D(s-4\sigma,r/8)\times\mathcal{O}} \ll \sigma^{-1}Q\varepsilon\mathcal{C}, \]  

The new error term. Subjecting $H = N + \hat{R}$ to the symplectic transformation $\Phi = X^t_F|_{t=1}$ we get the new Hamiltonian scale $H_+ := H \circ \Phi = H \circ X^1_F$ on $D(s-5\sigma, \eta r)$ where $0 < \eta < 1/8$. By Taylor’s formula

\[
H_+ = (N + R + (\hat{R} - R)) \circ X^1_F
= (N + R + R_M + R_K + (\hat{R} - R)) \circ X^1_F
= N - \{F, N\} + \int_0^1 \{t\{F, N\}, F\} \circ X^1_F \; dt
+ R + \int_0^1 \{R, F\} \circ X^1_F \; dt + (R_M + R_K + (\hat{R} - R)) \circ X^1_F.
\]

Recall that $F$ solves the linearized equation

\[ \{F, N\} = \mathcal{R} - [[\mathcal{R}]]. \]

Thus,

\[ H_+ = N_+ + \hat{R}_+ \]

where

\[ N_+ = N + [[\mathcal{R}]] \]

\[ \hat{R}_+ = R_M \circ X^1_F + R_K \circ X^1_F + (\hat{R} - R) \circ X^1_F + R_K \circ X^1_F + \int_0^t \{\mathcal{R}(t), F\} \circ X^1_F \; dt \]

with

\[ \mathcal{R}(t) = \mathcal{R} + t(\mathcal{R} - [[\mathcal{R}]]). \]

Hence, the new perturbing vector field is

\[ X_{\hat{R}_+} = (X^1_F)^* (X_R - X_R + R_M + R_K) + \int_0^t (X^1_F)^* [X_{\mathcal{R}(t)}, X_F] \; dt, \]
where \((X^t_F)^*\) is the pull-back of \(X^t_F\) and \([\cdot, \cdot]\) is the commutator of vector fields. We are now in position to estimate the new perturbing vector field \(X^{\hat{R}_{l+}}\). Let \(Y : D(s - \sigma, r) \subset \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{a,p}\) be a vector field on \(D(s - \sigma, r)\), depending on the parameter \(\xi \in \mathcal{O}\). Let \(U = D(s - 5\sigma, \eta r) \times \mathcal{O}\) and \(V = D(s - 4\sigma, 2\eta r) \times \mathcal{O}\). By (5.9) and the “proof of estimate (12)” of \([P1, p.131-132]\), we have that for any \(a > 0\),

\[
\eta r|Y|_{a,p,U} \ll \eta r|Y|_{a,p,V}
\]

and

\[
\eta r|(X^t_F)^*Y|_{a,p,U} \ll \eta r|Y|_{a,p,V} + \frac{1}{\sigma \eta^2} \eta r|Y|_{a,p,W} \cdot \eta r|X^t_F|_{a,p,V}.
\]

We assume that

\[
\varepsilon Q/\sigma \eta^2 \leq \varepsilon Q/\sigma^2 \eta^2 \ll 1.
\]

These assumptions will be fulfilled in the KAM iterative lemma later. By (4.3) and (5.10,11),

\[
\eta r|(X^t_F)^*(X_R - X_R)|_{k/2,p,D_2} \ll \eta r|X_R - X_R|_{k/2,p,V} \ll \eta \varepsilon
\]

and

\[
\eta r|(X^t_F)^*(X_R - X_R)|_{k/2,p,D_2} \ll \eta \varepsilon^L + \frac{\varepsilon \eta}{\sigma \eta^2} Q \varepsilon^L \ll \eta \varepsilon^L.
\]

Let \(D_l = D(s - l\sigma, r/l) \times \mathcal{O}\) \((l = 1, 2, ...\). Recall that (4.2) holds still true after replacing \(R\) by \(R\). By (4.2) and (5.4,5) and using the generalized Cauchy estimate, following \([P1,p.130-131]\) we get

\[
\eta r|[X^t_R(t), X^t_F]|_{k/2,p,D_2} \ll \sigma^{-1} \eta r|X^t_R|_{k/2,p,D_1} \cdot \eta r|X^t_F|_{k/2,p,D_1}
\]

\[
\ll \sigma^{-1} \eta r|X^t_R|_{k/2,p,D_1} \cdot \eta r|X^t_F|_{k/2,p,D_1}
\]

\[
\ll \sigma^{-1} Q \varepsilon^2 < \eta \varepsilon
\]

and

\[
\eta r|\sigma^{-1} \varepsilon L Q \varepsilon + \sigma^{-1} \varepsilon Q \varepsilon^L < \sigma^{-1} \varepsilon L Q \varepsilon + \sigma^{-1} \varepsilon Q \varepsilon^L < \eta \varepsilon^L
\]

Finally, we have

\[
\eta r|Y|_{k/2,p,D_1} \ll \eta^{-2} \eta r|Y|_{k/2,p,D_1}, \quad \eta r|Y|_{k/2,p,D_1} \ll \eta^{-2} \eta r|Y|_{k/2,p,D_1};
\]

for any vector field \(Y\) on \(D_l\)'s \((l = 1, 2, ...)\). Collecting all terms above and Lemma 4.6 and 4.7, we then arrive at the estimates

\[
\eta r|X^t_R|_{k/2,p,D(s-5\sigma, \eta r) \times \mathcal{O}} \ll \eta \varepsilon, \quad \eta r|X^t_R|_{k/2,p,D(s-5\sigma, \eta r) \times \mathcal{O}} \ll \eta \varepsilon^L.
\]

The new normal form. This is \(N_\omega = N + [\mathcal{R}]\). Recall

\[
N = (\omega(\xi), y) + (\Lambda u, u) + (B u, u)
\]
and
\[ [\mathcal{R}] = ([\mathcal{R}^y], y) + ([\mathcal{R}^u]_{y} u, u). \]

Let
\[ \omega_+ = \omega + [\mathcal{R}^y] \]
and
\[ B_+ = B + [\mathcal{R}^u]. \]

Then
\[ N_+ = (\omega_+, y) + (\Lambda u, u) + (B_+ u, u). \]

6. Iterative lemma.
6.1. Iterative constants. As usual, the KAM theorem is proven by the Newton-type iteration procedure which involves an infinite sequence of coordinate changes. In order to make our iteration procedure run, we need the following iterative constants:

1. \( \epsilon_0 = \epsilon, \epsilon_m = \epsilon_0^m (4/3)^m, m = 1, 2, \ldots; \)
2. \( \alpha_0 = \alpha, \alpha_m = \alpha/m^2, m = 1, 2, \ldots; \)
3. \( \eta_m = \epsilon_0^{1/3}, m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots; \)
4. \( \epsilon_0 = 0, \epsilon_m = (1^{-2} + \cdots + m^{-2})/2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-2}, \) (thus, \( \epsilon_m \leq 1/2 \) for all \( m \in \mathbb{N} \));
5. \( s_0 = s, s_m = s_0 (1 - \epsilon_m), m = 1, 2, \ldots, \) (thus, \( s_m > s_0/2 \) for all \( m \in \mathbb{N} \));
6. \( \sigma_m = (s_m - s_{m+1})/10, m = 1, 2, \ldots, \) (thus, \( s_m - \ell \sigma_m > s_{m+1} \) for \( 1 \leq \ell \leq 6 \) and \( \sigma^{-1}_m = O(m^2) \));
7. \( \varsigma_m = \epsilon_m^{4/(2\alpha - d)} = \epsilon_0^{1/144d}, \) (Recall \( \kappa = 577d/2 \));
8. \( r_0 = r, r_m = \eta_m r_0, m = 1, 2, \ldots; \)
9. \( M_m = 2|\ln(\sigma_m^{1/\eta_m})|/\varsigma_m; \)
10. \( K_0 = |\ln \eta_m|/\varsigma_m; \)
11. \( \nu_m = \alpha_m/(2M_m^d K_m^{-1}); \)
12. \( \Pi_0 = [1, 2]^{d}, \) and \( \Pi_m (m = 1, 2, \ldots) \) are defined in Section 8. \( \mathcal{O} \)'s are the \( \nu_m \)-neighborhood of \( \Pi_m \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

6.2. Iterative Lemma. Consider a family of Hamiltonian functions \( H_l (0 \leq l \leq m) \):
\[ H_l = (\omega_l(\xi), y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (\Omega^0_{l,j} u_j, u_j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (B_{l,j}^l(\xi) u_j, u_j) + \sum_{\nu \geq l} i^{\nu l} (x, y; \xi), \]

where the following conditions are imposed:
(1.1.) the parameter sets \( \Pi_0 \supset \cdots \supset \Pi_l \supset \cdots \Pi_m \) with
\[ \text{Meas } \Pi_l \geq (\text{Meas } \Pi_0)(1 - \alpha_l/(1 + l)^2); \]
The map \( \xi \mapsto \omega_l(\xi) \) is analytic in each entry of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_l, \) \( \mathcal{O}_l \) is the \( \nu_l \)-neighborhood of \( \Pi_l \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \)) and
\[ \inf_{\mathcal{O}_l} \left| \partial \omega_l \right| \geq (1 - e_l) c_1, \sup_{\mathcal{O}_l} \left| \partial^2 \omega_l \right| \leq e_l c_2, j = 0, 1. \]

(1.2.) \( B_{l,j}^l \) is real symmetric matrix of order \( \hat{j} \) and analytic in each entry \( \xi_k (k = 1, \ldots, n) \) of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_l, \) and
\[ \sup_{\mathcal{O}_l} \| B_{l,j}^l \|_2 \leq j^{-\hat{j}d} e_1 e_0, \sup_{\mathcal{O}_l} \| B_{l,j}^l \|_2 \leq j^{-\hat{j}d} e_1 e_0^{1/3}, \text{ for any } j \in \mathcal{N}. \]
In addition, $B^0_{ij} \equiv 0$.

(1.3). For $\varphi \geq l$ and $0 \leq l \leq m$, the perturbation $\dot{R}^{\varphi}(x,y,u;\xi)$ is analytic in the space coordinate domain $D(s_{\varphi},r_{\varphi})$ and also analytic in each entry $\xi_k$ $(k = 1, \ldots, n)$ of the parameter vector $\xi \in \mathcal{O}$, and is real for real argument; moreover, its Hamiltonian vector field $X_{\dot{R}^{\varphi}} := (\dot{R}_y^{\varphi}, -\dot{R}_x^{\varphi}, J_\infty \dot{R}_u^{\varphi})^T$ defines on $D(s_{\varphi},r_{\varphi})$ a analytic map

$$X_{\dot{R}^{\varphi}} : D(s_1,r_1) \subset \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}^{s_{\varphi},p}.$$  

In addition, the vector field $X_{\dot{R}^{\varphi}}$ is analytic in the domain $D(s_{\varphi},r_{\varphi})$ with small norms

$$r_{\varphi} |X_{\dot{R}^{\varphi}}|_{C^{2,p},D(s_1,r_1) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \epsilon_{\varphi}, \quad r_{\varphi} |X_{\dot{R}^{\varphi}}|_{C^{2,p},D(s_1,r_1) \times \mathcal{O}} \leq \epsilon_{\varphi}^{1/3}. \quad (6.6)$$

Then there is is an absolute positive constant $\epsilon^*$ enough small such that, if $0 < \epsilon_0 < \epsilon^*$, there is a set $\Pi_{m+1} \subset \Pi_m$, and a change of variables $\Phi_{m+1} : \mathcal{D}_{m+1} := D(s_{m+1},r_{m+1}) \times \mathcal{O}_{m+1} \to D(s_m,r_m)$ being real, analytic in $(x,y,u) \in D(s_{m+1},r_{m+1})$ and each entry $\xi \in \mathcal{O}_{m+1}$, as well as following estimates holds true:

$$r_{m+1} |\Phi_{m+1} - id|_{C^{2/3,2,p},D_{m+1}} \leq \epsilon_{m}^{1/2}$$  

and

$$r_{m+1} |\Phi_{m+1} - id|_{C^{4,2,p},D_{m+1}} \leq \epsilon_{m}^{1/4}. \quad (6.8)$$

Furthermore, the new Hamiltonian $H_{m+1} := H_m \circ \Phi_{m+1}$ of the form

$$H_{m+1} = (\omega_{m+1}, y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (\Omega^0_j u_j, u_j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (B^m_{jj} u_j, u_j) + \sum_{\varphi \geq m+1} \dot{R}^{m+1\varphi} \quad (6.9)$$

satisfies all the above conditions (1.1, 2.3) with $l$ being replaced by $m+1$.

6.3. Proof of The Iterative Lemma.

As stated as in the iterative lemma, we have got a family of Hamiltonian functions $H_l$'s ($l = 0, 1, \ldots, m$) which satisfy the conditions (1.1, 2.3). We now consider the Hamiltonian $H_m$. That is,

$$H_m = (\omega_m, y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (\Omega^0_j u_j, u_j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (B^m_{jj} u_j, u_j) + \sum_{\varphi \geq m} \dot{R}^{m\varphi} \quad (6.10)$$

which satisfy the conditions (m.1, 2.3). First, let us consider

$$\tilde{H}_m := (\omega_m, y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (\Omega^0_j u_j, u_j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (B^m_{jj} u_j, u_j) + \dot{R}^{mm} \quad (6.11)$$

instead of $H_m$. Let $s = s_m$, $\eta = \eta_m$, $r = r_m = \eta_m r_0$, $\xi = \epsilon_m$, $\epsilon^c = \epsilon_m^{1/3}$, $\sigma = \sigma_m$, $\varsigma = \varsigma_m$, $\omega = \omega_m$, $\Lambda = \text{diag} (\Omega^0_j : j \in \mathcal{N})$, $B = \text{diag} (B^m_{jj} : j \in \mathcal{N})$, and $\dot{R} = \dot{R}^{mm} := R_m$. Clearly, $\epsilon < \epsilon^c$. Let

$$\Pi = \Pi_{m+1} := \{ \xi \in \Pi_m : \text{non-resonant conditions (4.16, 23, 36) hold.} \} \quad (6.12)$$

---

6The word “real” means $\Phi_{m+1}(z,\xi) = \Phi_{m+1}(\bar{z},\xi)$ for any $(z,\xi) \in \mathcal{D}_{m+1}$. 
Set

$$Q = Q_m = \frac{1}{\alpha \sigma_m^{2(n+\tau)}}.$$  

Then

$$\epsilon_m Q_m / (\sigma_m^2 \eta_m^2) \ll m^{(n+\tau+1)} \epsilon_m^{1/2} \alpha \ll \epsilon_m^{1/4} \leq 1,$$

if $\alpha \ll \epsilon_0$. This implies that (5.12) holds true.

By means of the arguments in Section 5, we got that there is a Hamiltonian $F_m$ defined on $D(s_m - 4\sigma_m, r_m/8) \times O_{m+1}$ and a symplectic change of variables $\Phi_{m+1} = X^1_{F_m} |_{t=1}$ with

\[ r_m |\Phi_{m+1} - id|_{c_{m/2}, p, D_{m+1}} \ll Q_m \epsilon_m < \epsilon_m^{1/2} \] (6.13)

and

\[ r_m |D\Phi_{m+1} - id|_{c_{m/2}, p, D_{m+1}} \ll \epsilon_m^{-1} Q_m \epsilon_m^{1/3} < \epsilon_m^{1/4} \] (6.14)

\[ r_m |D\Phi_{m+1} - id|_{c_{m/2}, p, D_{m+1}} \ll \epsilon_m^{-1} Q_m \epsilon_m^{1/3} < \epsilon_m^{1/4} \] (6.15)

\[ r_m |D\Phi_{m+1} - id|_{c_{m/2}, p, D_{m+1}} \ll \epsilon_m^{-1} Q_m \epsilon_m^{1/3} < \epsilon_m^{1/4} \] (6.16)

such that

$$H_+ := \tilde{H}_m \circ \Phi_{m+1} = N_{m+1} + \tilde{R}_{m+1}$$ (6.17)

where

$$N_{m+1} := N_+ = (\omega_{m+1}, y) + (Au, u) + \frac{1}{2} (B^{m+1} u, u)$$ (6.18)

$$\omega_{m+1} = \omega_m + \|R_y^p\|$$ (6.19)

$$B^{m+1} = B^m + [(R_m^{uu})_g], \text{ or } B^{m+1}_{jj} = B^m_{jj} + [(R_m)_j]$$ (6.20)

and

\[ r_m |X_{R_{m+1}}^1|_{c_{m+1}, p, D_{m+1}} \ll \eta_m \epsilon_m = \epsilon_{m+1}, \] (6.21)

\[ r_m |X_{R_{m+1}}^1|_{c_{m+1}, p, D_{m+1}} \ll \eta_m \epsilon_m^{1/3} < \epsilon_{m+1}^{1/3}. \] (6.22)

**Verification of the condition ((m + 1).1).** According the condition (m.1) we have $\inf_{O_m} | \det \partial_x \omega_m | > (1 - e_m) c_1$. Using $|R^p_{m+1}|_{c_{m+1}, p, D_{m+1}} \leq \epsilon^{1/3}_m$ (See (4.5)), we have that $|\partial_x [R_{m+1}^p]| \leq \epsilon^{1/3}_m$. Thus,

$$|\det \partial_x \omega_{m+1}| \geq (1 - e_m) c_1 - C_{\epsilon_m^{1/3}} (1 - e_{m+1}) c_1.$$ (6.23)

In addition, we will verify in Section 9 that

$$\text{Meas } \Pi_{m+1} \geq \text{Meas } \Pi_0 (1 - \alpha / (m + 1)^2).$$ (6.24)

---

7. Note $D_{m+1} := D(s_{m+1}, r_{m+1}) \times \Pi_{m+1} \subset D(s_m - 4\sigma_m, r_m/8) \times O_{m+1}$.

8. See (5.6-9).

9. (6.13,14) has fulfilled (6.7,8).

10. See (5.19,20,21).

11. Note $\sigma_m < \eta_m$ and $\eta_r = \eta_m r_m < r_{m+1}$ and $|X|_{a,b} \leq |X|_{b,b}$ if $a \leq b$.
Hence, the condition \(((m + 1).1\)) is verified for the tangential frequency \(\omega_{m+1}\).

**Verification of the condition \(((m + 1).2\).** By the condition \((m.2\)) and Lemma 4.3, it follows from (6.20) that
\[
\|B_{jj}^{m+1}\|_2 \leq \|B_{jj}^m\|_2 + \|(R_{jj})\|_2 \\
\leq \epsilon_m \epsilon_0 j^{-d} + \epsilon_m^{-2d} \epsilon_m \omega^{j-d} \leq \epsilon^{j-d} \epsilon_{m+1} \epsilon_0.
\]  
(6.25)

Similarly, we have
\[
\|B_{jm}^{m+1}\|_2 \leq \epsilon^{j-d} \epsilon_{m+1} \epsilon_0^{1/3}.
\]  
(6.26)

The combination of (6.25) and (6.26) verifies the condition \(((m + 1).2\)). This also fulfills the assumptions in Lemma 4.8.

**Verification of the condition \(((m + 1).3\).** Let us consider
\[
H_{m+1} := H_m \circ \Phi_{m+1}.
\]  
(6.27)

According to (6.10,11) and (6.17) we get
\[
H_{m+1} = N_{m+1} + \hat{R}_{m+1} + \sum_{\varphi \geq m+1} \hat{R}^{\varphi} \circ \Phi_{m+1}.
\]  
(6.28)

Observe that
\[
X_{\hat{R}^{\varphi} \circ \Phi_{m+1}} = (\Phi_{m+1})^* X_{\hat{R}^{\varphi}} = D\Phi_{m+1}^{-1} X_{\hat{R}^{\varphi}} \circ \Phi_{m+1}.
\]  
(6.29)

By (6.15), we have
\[
r_m \|D\Phi_{m+1}^{-1}\|_{\kappa_m p, D_{m+1}} \leq 1.
\]  
(6.30)

Furthermore, by means of (6.6) with \(l = m\), we get that for \(\varphi \geq m + 1\)
\[
r_m X_{\hat{R}^{\varphi}} \circ \Phi_{m+1} \|_{\kappa_m p, D_{m+1}} \leq r_m X_{\hat{R}^{\varphi}} \circ \Phi_{m+1} \|_{\kappa_m p, D(s_m + r_m)}
\leq r_m \|D\Phi_{m+1}^{-1}\|_{\kappa_m p, D_{m+1}} \cdot \|X_{\hat{R}^{\varphi}} \circ \Phi_{m+1} \|_{\kappa_m p, D(s_m, r_m)} \leq \epsilon_{\varphi}.
\]  
(6.31)

Similarly, by means of (6.8) with \(l = m\) and (6.16), we get
\[
r_m X_{\hat{R}^{\varphi} \circ \Phi_{m+1}} \|_{\kappa_m p, D(s_m + r_m + 1)} \leq \epsilon_{\varphi}^{1/3}, \quad \varphi \geq m + 1.
\]  
(6.32)

Let
\[
\hat{R}^{(m+1)(m+1)} = \hat{R}_{m+1} + \hat{R}^{(m+1)} \circ \Phi_{m+1},
\]  
(6.33)
\[
\hat{R}^{(m+1)\varphi} = \hat{R}^{\varphi} \circ \Phi_{m+1}, \varphi \geq m + 2.
\]  
(6.34)

By (6.28),
\[
H_{m+1} = N_{m+1} + \sum_{\varphi \geq m+1} \hat{R}^{(m+1)\varphi}.
\]  
(6.35)

By combination of (6.21,22) and (6.31,32), we conclude that (6.6) holds true with \(l = m + 1\). It is plain that (6.5) holds true with \(l = m + 1\). This complete the verification of \((l.3)\) with \(l = m + 1\). Therefore, the proof of the iterative lemma is complete. □
7. Proof of the theorem 2.1.

The proof is similar to that of [P1]. Here we give an outline. By Assumptions A, B, C, D and the smallness assumption in Theorem 2.1, the conditions (l.1, 2, 3) in the iterative lemma in Section 6.2 are fulfilled with \( l = 0 \). Hence the iterative lemma applies to \( \hat{H} \). Inductively, we get what as follows:

(i) Domains: for \( m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \),

\[
\mathcal{D}_m := D(s_m, r_m) \times \mathcal{O}_m, \quad \mathcal{D}_{m+1} \subset \mathcal{D}_m;
\]

(ii) Coordinate changes:

\[
\Psi^m = \Phi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_{m+1} : \mathcal{D}_{m+1} \to D(s_0, r_0),
\]

(iii) Hamiltonian functions \( \hat{H}_m \) \( (m = 0, 1, \ldots) \) satisfy the conditions (l.1, 2, 3) with \( l \) replaced by \( m \);

Let \( \Pi__\infty = \cap_{m=0}^\infty \Pi_m, \mathcal{D}_\infty = \cap \mathcal{D}_m \). By the same argument as in [P1, pp.134], we conclude that \( \Psi^m, D \Psi^m, \hat{H}_m, X_{\hat{H}_m} \) converges uniformly on the domain \( \mathcal{D}_\infty \), and \( X_{\hat{H}_\infty} \circ \Psi^\infty = D \Psi^\infty \cdot X_\omega \) where

\[
\hat{H}_\infty := \lim_{m \to \infty} \hat{H}_m = (\omega_\ast(\xi), y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (\Lambda^0_j u_j, u_j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (B_j^\infty(\xi) u_j, u_j)
\]

here \( B_j^\infty = \lim_{m \to \infty} B_j^m \) and \( X_\omega \) is the constant vector field \( \omega_\ast \) on the torus \( \mathbb{T}^n \).

Thus, \( \mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\} \times \{0\} \) is an embedding torus with rotational frequencies \( \omega_\ast(\xi) \in \omega_\ast(\Pi_\infty) \) of the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_\infty \). Returning the original Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \), it has an embedding torus \( \Psi^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n \times \{0\} \times \{0\}) \) with frequencies \( \omega_\ast(\xi) \). This proves the Theorem. \( \square \)

8. Verification of Non-resonant conditions—estimate of measure.

In estimating the measure of the resonant zones it is not necessary to distinguish between the various perturbations \( \omega_l \) and \( \Omega_l \) of the frequencies, since only the size of the perturbation matters. Therefore, now we write \( \omega \) and \( \Omega \) for all of them, and by Assumptions B and C as well as (6.3) and Lemma 4.8 we have that the map \( \xi \mapsto \omega(\xi) \) is analytic in each entry of \( \xi \in \mathcal{O} \) for all \( \mathcal{O} \) is a \( \nu \)-neighborhood of \( \Pi \), and there are two absolute constants \( c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c > 0 \) such that

\[
\inf_{\mathcal{O}} \left| \det \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \xi} \right| \geq c_1, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{O}} |\partial_\xi^j \omega_l| \leq c_2, \quad j = 0, 1, \tag{8.1}
\]

\[
\inf_{\mathcal{O}} \lambda_j \geq c_3 > 0, \quad \sup_{\mathcal{O}} |\partial_\xi \lambda_j| \leq c_4 \ll 1. \tag{8.2}
\]

and

\[
\inf_{\mathcal{O}} |\lambda_i - \lambda_j| \geq c_5 |i|^{-d} |j|^{-d}, \quad c > 0, |i| > |j|. \tag{8.3}
\]

Lemma 8.1. Under the condition (8.1), there is a subset \( \Xi^1 \) of \( \Pi \) with Lebesgue measure \( \text{Meas} \Xi^1 < \alpha \) such that for any \( \xi \in \Pi \setminus \Xi^1 \), the non-resonant condition (4.16) is fulfilled, i.e.,

\[
|\{k, \omega(\xi)\}| > \frac{\alpha}{|k|}, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}^n \text{ with } 0 \neq |k| \leq K
\]

where \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( \tau > n \).

Proof. The proof is standard in KAM theory. We omit it. \( \square \)
Lemma 8.2. Under the condition (8.1) and (8.2), there is a subset \( \Xi^2 \) of \( \Pi \) with \( \text{Meas } \Xi^2 < \alpha \) such that for any \( \xi \in \Pi \setminus \Xi^2 \), the non-resonant condition (4.23) is fulfilled, i.e.,
\[
| (k, \omega(\xi)) \pm \lambda_j(\xi) | > \frac{\alpha}{j^d |k|^\tau}, \quad |k| \leq K, j \leq M
\]
where \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( \tau > n \) and \( \lambda_j \in \Lambda^{12} \).

Proof. Let
\[
\Xi^2_{k,j} = \{ \xi \in \Pi : | (k, \omega(\xi)) \pm \lambda_j(\xi) | < \frac{\alpha}{j^d |k|^\tau} \}, \quad \Xi^2 = \bigcup_{|k| \leq K, |j| \leq M} \Xi^2_{k,j},
\]
and
\[
\tilde{\Xi}^2_{k,j} = \{ \eta \in \omega(\Pi) : | (k, \eta) \pm \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) | < \frac{\alpha}{j^d |k|^\tau} \}, \quad \tilde{\Xi}^2 = \bigcup_{|k| \leq K, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{\Xi}^2_{k,j}.
\]
By (8.1) and (8.2),
\[
\text{sup}_{\omega(\Pi)} | \partial_n \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) | \ll 1 \quad (8.4)
\]
and
\[
\text{inf}_{\omega(\Pi)} \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) > c > 0. \quad (8.5)
\]
Again by (8.1), we have \( \text{Meas } \Xi^2 \ll \text{Meas } \tilde{\Xi}^2 \). Observe that the set \( \tilde{\Xi}^2_{k,j} \) is empty when \( k = 0 \) and \( 0 < \alpha \ll 1 \), in view of (8.5). In the following argument, suppose that \( k \neq 0 \). Write \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_n) \). Suppose \( k_1 \neq 0 \) without loss of generality. By Lemma (8.4),
\[
| \partial_n (k, \eta) \pm \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) | = | k_1 \pm \partial_n \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) | \geq 1/2.
\]
It follows that
\[
\text{Meas } \tilde{\Xi}^2_{k,j} \ll \frac{\alpha}{j^d |k|^\tau}.
\]
Hence,
\[
\text{Meas } \Xi^2 \leq \text{Meas } \tilde{\Xi}^2 \leq \text{Meas } \bigcup_{|k| \leq K, |j| \leq M} \tilde{\Xi}^2_{k,j} \ll \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\alpha}{j^d |k|^\tau} < \alpha. \quad \square
\]

Lemma 8.3. Under the condition (8.1) and (8.2), there is a subset \( \Xi^3 \) of \( \Pi \) with \( \text{Meas } \Xi^3 < \alpha \) such that for any \( \xi \in \Pi \setminus \Xi^3 \), the non-resonant condition (4.36) is fulfilled, i.e.,
\[
| (k, \omega(\xi)) \pm \lambda_i(\xi) \pm \lambda_j(\xi) | > \frac{\alpha}{(d^d j^d |k|^\tau)}, \quad \begin{cases}
|i| = |j| = j \leq M, 0 \neq |k| \leq K \\
|i| \neq |j|, |i|, |j| \leq M, |k| \leq K
\end{cases}
\]

Proof. Let
\[
\Xi^3_{k,i,j} = \left\{ \xi \in \Pi : | (k, \omega(\xi)) \pm \lambda_i(\xi) \pm \lambda_j(\xi) | < \frac{\alpha}{1 + |k|^\tau d^d j^d} \right\},
\]
\footnote{See Lemma 4.8 for the definition of \( \Lambda \).}
This implies that the non-resonant conditions in Lemma 8.3 hold true for
Consequently, for \( \xi \in O \), since
Proof. Let \( \Pi \) be a subset of \( \omega(\Pi) = \{ (k, \eta) : |(k, \eta) + \lambda_i(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) + \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta))| < \frac{\alpha}{1 + |k|^d} \} \), and
\[
\Xi^3 = \bigcup_{|k| \leq K, |i|, |j| \leq M} \Xi^3_{k,i,j},
\]
where \( k \neq 0 \) when \( |i| = |j| \). It follows from (8.3) that the set \( \Xi^3_{k,i,j} \) is empty when \( k = 0 \) and \( |i| \neq |j| \). Therefore assume \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_n) \neq 0 \). Suppose \( k_1 \neq 0 \) without loss of generality. Let
\[
\Xi^3_{k,i,j} = \left\{ \eta \in \omega(\Pi) : |(k, \eta) + \lambda_i(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) + \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta))| < \frac{\alpha}{1 + |k|^d} \right\},
\]
and
\[
\Xi^3 = \bigcup_{|k| \leq K, |i|, |j| \leq M} \Xi^3_{k,i,j},
\]
where \( k \neq 0 \) when \( |i| = |j| \). By (8.1), we have \( \text{Meas} \Xi^3 \ll \text{Meas} \Xi^3. \) By 8.4, we have
\[
|\partial_{\eta_i}(k, \eta) + \lambda_i(\omega^{-1}(\eta)) + \lambda_j(\omega^{-1}(\eta))| = |k_1 + \partial_{\eta_i} \lambda_i + \partial_{\eta_j} \lambda_j| \geq 1/2.
\]
It follows that
\[
\text{Meas} \Xi^3_{k,i,j} \ll \frac{\alpha}{|k|^d}.
\]
Hence
\[
\text{Meas} \Xi^3 \leq \text{Meas} \bigcup_{0 < |k| \leq K, |i|, |j| \leq M} \Xi^3_{k,i,j} \ll \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\alpha}{|k|^d} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{|i|^d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{|j|^d} < \alpha. \quad \square
\]

Lemma 8.4. There is a subset \( \Pi_+ \subset \Pi \) with
\[
\text{Meas} \Pi_+ \geq \left( \text{Meas} \Pi \right)(1 - C\alpha).
\] (8.6)
And there is a positive \( \nu_+ \) such that for any \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_+ \), a \( \nu_+ \)-neighborhood of \( \Pi_+ \), all resonant conditions in Lemmas 8.1, 2, 3 hold true.
Proof. Let \( \Pi_+ = \Pi \setminus (\Xi^3 \cup \Xi^2 \cup \Xi^3) \). Then (8.6) holds true clearly. Let
\[
\nu_+ = \alpha/(2M^{2d}K^d+1).
\]
Since \( \nu_+ < \nu \), we get \( \mathcal{O}_+ \subset \mathcal{O} \). Let
\[
f(\xi) = (k, \omega(\xi)) + \lambda_i(\xi) + \lambda_j(\xi), |k| \leq K, |i|, |j| \leq M.
\]
Then, by (8.1) and (8.2),
\[
\sup_{\mathcal{O}} |\partial_{\xi} f(\xi)| \leq |k|c_2 + 2c_4 < K.
\]
Since \( \mathcal{O}_+ \) is the \( \nu_+ \)-neighborhood of \( \Pi_+ \), we get that for any \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_+ \), there is a \( \xi_0 \in \Pi_+ \) such that \( |\xi - \xi_0| < \nu_+ \). Thus,
\[
|f(\xi) - f(\xi_0)| \leq \sup_{\mathcal{O}} |\partial_{\xi} f(\xi)||\xi - \xi_0| \leq K\nu_+ \leq \frac{\alpha}{2M^{2d}K^d}.
\]
Consequently, for \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_+ \) and \( |k| \leq K, |i|, |j| \leq M \), we have
\[
|f(\xi)| \geq |f(\xi_0)| - |f(\xi) - f(\xi_0)| > \frac{\alpha}{|i|^d |j|^d |k|^d} - \frac{\alpha}{2M^{2d}K^d} \geq \frac{\alpha}{2|i|^d |j|^d |k|^d}.
\]
This implies that the non-resonant conditions in Lemma 8.3 hold true for \( \xi \in \mathcal{O}_+ \). The remaining proof is similar to that above. \( \square \)

**Lemma A.1.** For \( \mu > 0, \nu > 0 \), the following inequality holds true:

\[
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-2|k|\mu} |k|^\nu \leq \left(\frac{\nu}{\mu}\right)^\nu \frac{1}{\mu^{\nu+d}} (1 + e)^d.
\]

*Proof.* This Lemma can be found in [B-M-S].

**Lemma A.2.** Suppose that an operator \( Y = Y(x, \xi) : \ell^a,p \rightarrow \ell^a,p \) is analytically dependent on \( x \in D(s_*) = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : |\exists x| < s_*\} \) and each \( \xi_l (l = 1, ..., n) \) of \( \xi \in \Pi \), and suppose that following estimates hold true

\[
|Y_{ij}|_{D(s_*) \times \Pi}, |Y_{ji}|_{D(s_*) \times \Pi} \leq e^{-\varsigma|i||j|^{\beta}}|j|^{p\varepsilon_*}, \quad |i| \geq |j|,
\]

and

\[
|Y_{ij}|_{\mathcal{L}^\mathcal{L}(D(s_*) \times \Pi)} \leq e^{-\varsigma|i||j|^{\beta}}|j|^{p\varepsilon_*^{\mathcal{L}}}, \quad |i| \geq |j|,
\]

where constants \( \varsigma, \beta, \varepsilon_* \) and \( \varepsilon_*^{\mathcal{L}} \) are positive. Then we have

\[
\sup_{D(s_*) \times \Pi} ||Y||_{0,\varsigma/2,p,p} \leq \varsigma^{-2d-\beta}\varepsilon_*^{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \sup_{D(s_*) \times \Pi} ||Y||_{\mathcal{L}} \leq \varsigma^{-2d-\beta}\varepsilon_*^{\mathcal{L}}.
\]

*Proof.* Let \( w_i = e^{\varsigma/2i^2}|i|^p \). Let \( J = \{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |j| \leq |i|\} \) and \( J' = \{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |j| > |i|\} \). Let \( I = \{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |i| \geq |j|\} \) and \( I_j = \{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |i| < |j|\} \). For any \( u \in \ell_p \) with \( ||u||_p = 1 \), we have

\[
||Yu||_{\varsigma/2,p}^2 = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_i^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |Y_{ij}u_j|^2 \leq \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{j \in J} |Y_{ij}||u_j| + \sum_{j \in J'} |Y_{ij}||u_j| \right)^2 \right) \leq \left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left( \sum_{j \in J} |Y_{ij}||u_j| \right)^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{j \in J'} |Y_{ij}||u_j| \right)^2 := (1) + (2),
\]

where \( Y_{ij} \)’s are the matrix elements of \( Y \). Note that \( \{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |j| = j\} \leq j^{d-1} \) where \( \sharp \) is the cardinality of the set. By assumption (*), we have

\[
\sum_{J} |Y_{ij}|e^{\varsigma|i|/2}|j|^p|j|^{-p} \leq \sum_{J} e^{-\varsigma|i|/2}|i|^{\beta}\varepsilon_* \leq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} d^{l+\beta-1} e^{-\varsigma l/2\varepsilon_*} \leq \varsigma^{-2d-\beta}\varepsilon_*^{\mathcal{L}},
\]

where Lemma A.1 is used in the last inequality. Similarly,

\[
\sum_{J} |Y_{ij}|e^{\varsigma|i|/2}|j|^p|j|^{-p} \leq \varsigma^{-2d-\beta}\varepsilon_*^{\mathcal{L}},
\]

and

\[
\sum_{J} |Y_{ij}|e^{\varsigma|i|/2}|j|^p|j|^{-p} \leq \varsigma^{-2d-\beta}\varepsilon_*^{\mathcal{L}},
\]
and
\[ \sum_{j} |Y_{ij}| e^{\varepsilon |j|/2} |j|^p |i|^{-p} \ll \varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^*_. \]

By Hölder inequality, we have
\[ (1) \leq \sum_{i} e^{\varepsilon |i|/2} \sum_{j} |Y_{ij}| e^{-\varepsilon |i|/2} |j|^p |i|^{-p} \leq \sum_{i} e^{\varepsilon |i|/2} \sum_{j} |Y_{ij}| e^{-\varepsilon |i|/2} |j|^p |u_j|^2 \]
\[ \ll \varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^* \sum_{j} |Y_{ij}| e^{\varepsilon |i|/2} |i|^p |j|^{-p} |j|^2 |u_j|^2 \]
\[ \ll (\varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^*)^2 \sum_{j} |j|^2 |u_j|^2 = (\varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^*)^2 |u|^2_p = \varepsilon^{-4d} \varepsilon^*_2. \]

We are now in position to estimate (2). Again by Hölder inequality we have
\[ (2) \leq \sum_{i} w_i^2 \sum_{j} |Y_{ij}| e^{\varepsilon |j|/2} |j|^p |i|^{-p} \sum_{j} |Y_{ij}| e^{-\varepsilon |j|/2} |j|^p |i|^{-p} |u_j|^2 \]
\[ \ll \varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^* \sum_{j} \left( \sum_{i} |Y_{ij}| e^{\varepsilon |i|/2} |i|^{2p} |i|^{-p} \right) |j|^2 |u_j|^2 \]
\[ \leq \varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^* \sum_{j} \left( \sum_{i} |Y_{ij}| e^{\varepsilon |i|/2} |i|^{2p} |i|^{-p} \right) |j|^2 |u_j|^2 \]
\[ \leq \varepsilon^{-4d} \varepsilon^* \sum_{j} |j|^2 |u_j|^2 = \varepsilon^{-4d} \varepsilon^*_2. \]

Consequently, we get that for any \((x, \xi) \in D(s) \times \Pi,\)
\[ ||Y(x, \xi)u||_{s/2,p} \ll \varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^*_p, \text{ for } ||u||_p = 1. \]

That is,
\[ \sup_{D(s) \times \Pi} |||Y|||_{0,s/2,p,p} \ll \varepsilon^{-2d} \varepsilon^*_p. \]

Using the same arguments as above for \(\partial_{\xi} Y_{nm} \) with \(j = 1, ..., n\) and using (**), we can get the estimates for \(|||Y|||_{0,s/2,p,p}^\xi. \) This completes the proof. \(\Box\)

**Lemma A.3.** Suppose that \(Y = X + Z\) where both \(X\) and \(Z\) are hermitian matrices of order \(m\), and the eigenvalues of \(Y\) and \(X\) are \(\lambda_1 \geq ... \geq \lambda_m\) and \(\mu_1 \geq ... \geq \mu_m\), respectively. Then
\[ |\lambda_l - \mu_l| \leq ||Z||_2, \quad l = 1, ..., m. \]

**Proof.** The proof can be found in most text books on matrix theory.
Lemma A.4. Consider an \( n \times n \) complex matrix function \( Y(\xi) \) which depends on the real parameter \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \). Let \( Y(\xi) \) be a matrix function satisfying conditions:

(i) \( Y(\xi) \) is self-adjoint for every \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \); i.e., \( Y(\xi) = (Y(\xi))^* \), where star denotes the conjugate transpose matrix;

(ii) \( Y(\xi) \) is an analytic function of the real variable \( \xi \).

Then there exist scalar functions \( \mu_1(\xi), \ldots, \mu_n(\xi) \) and a matrix-valued function \( U(\xi) \), which are analytic for real \( \xi \) and possess the following properties for every \( \xi \in \mathbb{R} \):

\[
Y(\xi) = U(\xi) \text{diag}(\mu_1(\xi), \ldots, \mu_n(\xi)) U^*(\xi), \quad U(\xi)(U(\xi))^* = E.
\]

Proof. See [pp.394-396, G-L-R]. \( \square \)

It is worth to point out that this lemma does not hold true for \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^k \) with \( k > 1 \). See [Ka].

Lemma A.5. Under the same assumptions as in Lemma A.4, we have

\[
|\mu_l^i(\xi)| \leq \|Y'(\xi)\|_2, \quad l = 1, \ldots, m, \text{ here } = \frac{d}{d\xi}.
\]

Proof. See [Ka, p.125]. \( \square \)

10. Appendix B. Theorem on regularity of linear operator.

In order to overcome the difficulty arising from the delicate small divisors of the form \( \langle k, \omega \rangle + \lambda_i - \lambda_j \) with \( |i| \neq |j| \), we have to raise up the regularity of the linear operator \( R^{uu} \) coming from the second term \( \langle R^{uu} u, u \rangle \) of the perturbed Hamiltonian. We start with some notation and definitions. For \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \), we denote \( D_j = \partial/\partial x_j \), \( D_k = D_1^k \circ D_2^k \circ \cdots \circ D_d^k \), \( |k| = \sum_{j=1}^d k_j \). We define the complex strips \( U_a \) for all \( a > 0 \) as follows:

\[
U_a = \{ x \in \mathbb{C}^d/(2\pi \mathbb{Z})^d : |\sum x_j| < a, j = 1, \ldots, d \}.
\]

For a function \( u : U_a \to \mathbb{C} \) and integers \( p^* \geq 0 \), we introduce the seminorms

\[
|u|_{a,p^*} = \sup_{x \in U_a, |k| = p} |D^k u(x)|.
\]

When \( a = 0 \), we write \( |u|_{0,p^*} \) as \( |u|_{p^*} \). Let \( C^{p^*} (T) \) be the set of all functions defined on \( T \) with \( \sup_{x \in T, |k| = p} |D^k u(x)| < \infty \). For \( p^* \geq 0 \), the Banach spaces \( A(a, C^{p^*}) \) are then defined as spaces of real holomorphic functions \( u \) on \( U_a \) (\( u \) being real means \( u(x) = u(\bar{x}) \)), with period \( 2\pi \) in each variable and such that \( |u|_{a,p} < \infty \). Take a function \( \hat{s} \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}) \), vanishing outside a compact set and identically equal to 1 in a neighborhood of 0, and let \( s \) be its Fourier transform. Moreover, we can require \( s(x) \) is even function. When \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \), by a slight abuse of notation, we denote \( s(x) = s(x_1) \cdots s(x_d) \). For \( a > 0 \) we introduce the families of linear operators \( S_a : C^p(\mathbb{T}^d) \to A(a, C^p) \), by means of the convolution \( S_a u = s_a \hat{u}, s_a(z) = a^{-d} s(a^{-1}z) \):

\[
s_a \hat{u}(z) = a^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} s \left( \frac{y-z}{a} \right) u(y) \, dy, \quad u \in C^p(\mathbb{T}^d).
\]

It is clear that \( S_a u \) is an entire real holomorphic function on \( \mathbb{C}^d \) and has period \( 2\pi \) since \( u \) has period \( 2\pi \).
Lemma B.1. There exists a constant $C = C(p,d) \geq 1$ depending only on positive integers $p$ and $d$ such that, for all $0 \leq \sigma \leq a$, 
\[
|(S_a - S_\sigma)u|_{p^*,p} \leq C|u|_{p^*}a^{p^* - p^*}, \quad 0 \leq p^* \leq p^*
\]
and for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|\alpha| \leq p^*$,
\[
\sup_{|\beta| \leq p^* - |\alpha|} \frac{D^{\alpha+\beta}u(0)}{\beta!}(\sqrt{-\Delta}x)^\beta \leq C|u|_{p^*}a^{p^* - |\alpha|},
\]
in particular, for $|\alpha| = p^*$,
\[
|S_a u|_{a,p^*} = \sup_{|\beta| \leq p^*} |D^\alpha S_a u(x)| \leq (1 + C)|u|_{p^*}.
\]

Proof. This lemma is the so-called Jackson’s analytic approximation theorem. The proof consists in a direct check based on standard tools from calculus and some simple properties of Fourier transform. Refer to [Z].

Remark. If $u$ depends on some parameter $\xi \in \Pi \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and if the Lipschitz seminorm of $u$ and its $x$–derivatives are uniformly bounded by $|u|_{\ell^p,\Pi}$, then all estimates in Lemma 8.1 hold true with $| \cdot |$ replaced by $| \cdot |_{\ell^p,\Pi}$. The proof in [Z] is still valid here only if $| \cdot |$ is replaced by $| \cdot |_{\ell^p,\Pi}$.

Let 
\[
H^{p^*}(\mathbb{T}^d) = \{ u \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d) : |u|_{p^*}^2 = \sum_j |j|^{2p^*} |\hat{u}(k)|^2 < \infty \}.
\]

Define $\mathcal{F} : \ell^{p^*} \to H^{p^*}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ by
\[
\mathcal{F}(q) = \sum_j q_j e^{i\langle j,x \rangle}, \quad q \in \ell^{p^*}.
\]

By means of Parseval equality, $\mathcal{F} : \ell^{p^*} \to H^{p^*}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is isometric.

Lemma B.2. If $u \in H^{p^*}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $p^* > d/2$, then $u \in C^{p^* - d/2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and there is an absolute constant $C$ such that $|u|_{p^* - d/2} \leq C||u||_{p^*}$.

Proof. Formally, for $k \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ with $|k| = p^* - d/2$ and $u \in H^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$,
\[
D^k u = \sum_j \hat{u}(j)(\sqrt{-1j})^k e^{i\langle j,x \rangle}.
\]

Then
\[
\sum_j \sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^d} |\hat{u}(j)(\sqrt{-1j})^k e^{i\langle j,x \rangle}| \leq \sum_j |\hat{u}(j)||j|^{p^* - d/2}
\]
\[
\leq (\sum_j |\hat{u}(j)|^2 |j|^{2p^*})^{1/2} \cdot (\sum_j 1/|j|^d)^{1/2} \leq C||u||_{p^*},
\]
so $u \in C^{p^*-d/2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $|u|_{p^*-d/2} \leq C||u||_{p^*}$. 

A VARIANT OF KAM THEOREM 37
Let us now take \( q \in \ell^\beta \). Then \( u(x) = \mathcal{F}(q) \in H^p \). It is plain that \((\hat{u}(j))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} = q\). By Lemma B.2, we have \( u \in C^\alpha(-d) (\mathbb{T}^d) \) and \(|u|_{\alpha-d} \leq C||u||_{\beta} \). By Lemma 7.1, for any \( 0 < \tau < \sigma \), the functions \( S_\tau u, S_\sigma u \) are entire real holomorphic functions on \( \mathbb{C}^d \) and has period \( 2\pi \); moreover, letting \( p^* = \bar{p} - d/2 \) and \( p_\tau = p \) and recalling \( \bar{p} - p = \kappa \) and using Lemmas B.1 and B.2 we have the following estimates hold:

\[
| (S_\sigma - S_\tau) u |_{\tau,p} \leq |u|_{\bar{p}-d/2, \kappa-(d/2)} \leq ||u||_{\bar{p}} \sigma^{\kappa-(d/2)}, \tag{10.1}
\]

and

\[
| (S_\tau - 1) u |_{\tau} \leq |u|_{\bar{p}, \kappa-(d/2)} \leq ||u||_{\bar{p}} \sigma^{\kappa-(d/2)},
\]

\[
|S_\sigma u|_{\sigma,p} \leq |u|_p. \tag{10.2}
\]

Note that \((S_\tau - S_\sigma) u\) is analytic in the strip \(|3x| \leq \tau\). By means of Cauchy’s formula and (10.1) we get

\[
|j|^p | \hat{S_\tau} u(j) - \hat{S_\sigma} u(j) | \leq e^{-\tau |j|} \cdot ||u||_{\bar{p}} \sigma^{\kappa-(d/2)}.
\]

It follows that

\[
\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |j|^{2p} e^{\tau |j|} | \hat{S_\tau} u(j) - \hat{S_\sigma} u(j) |^2 \leq ||u||_{\bar{p}}^2 \sigma^{2\kappa-d}. \tag{10.4}
\]

By (10.2), we have

\[
|q_\sigma - q_\tau||_{\tau,p} \leq ||q||_{\bar{p}} \sigma^{\kappa-(d/2)} = ||q||_{\bar{p}} \sigma^{\kappa-(d/2)}. \tag{10.5}
\]

Using (10.3), we get

\[
|q_\sigma|_{\sigma,p} \leq |q|_p. \tag{10.7}
\]

For any \( 0 < \sigma \), we define an operator \( T_\sigma : \ell^\beta \to \ell^\alpha \) by means of

\[
T_\sigma q = q_\sigma, \quad q \in \ell^\beta.
\]

In view of (10.7), the operator is well defined and bounded. It is plain that \( T_\sigma = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \circ S_\sigma \circ \mathcal{F} \), and it is linear since \( S_\sigma \) and \( \mathcal{F} \) are linear. We can now rewrite (10.5-7) as

\[
|||T_\sigma - T_\tau|||_{0,\tau,p} \leq \sigma^{\kappa-(d/2)}, \tag{10.8}
\]

\[
|||T_\sigma - 1|||_{0,0,p} \leq \sigma^{\kappa-(d/2)}. \tag{10.9}
\]

By (10.10), we get a family of bounded linear operators \( T_m := T_{\overline{\sigma}} \) from \( \ell^p \) to \( \ell^{\overline{\alpha}} \).

\[13\text{See Section 6.1 for } \overline{\sigma} \text{ and } \epsilon_m.\]
Lemma B.3. There are a family of operators $T_m : l^{0,p} \to l^{\varsigma_m,p}$ ($m = 0, 1, ...$) such that
\begin{align}
|||T_m - T_{m+1}|||_{0,\varsigma_{m+1},p,p} & \leq \epsilon_m^2 < \epsilon_{m+1}, \quad (10.12) \\
|||T_m - 1|||_{0,0,p,p} & \leq \epsilon_{m+1}, \quad (10.13) \\
|||T_m|||_{0,\sigma,p,p} & \leq 1, \quad \forall \ 0 \leq \sigma \leq \varsigma_m. \quad (10.14)
\end{align}

Proof. This lemma is a direct result of (10.8,9,10). □

Lemma B.4. The composition $T_m \circ \tilde{\Psi}$ of $T_m$ and $\tilde{\Psi}$ is self-adjoint in $\ell_{20}$.\(^{14}\)

Proof. Let $S_m := S_{\varsigma_m}$. Then the operator $T_m \circ \tilde{\Psi}$ is self-adjoint in $\ell_{20}$ if and only if the operator $S_m := S_m \circ \Psi$ is self-adjoint in $L^0_0$. It is easy to verify that
\begin{equation}
S_m \circ \Psi(u) = (s_{a} \tilde{\psi}) \ast u, \quad a = \varsigma_m.
\end{equation}

For any $u, v \in L^2_0$, (We can assume $u, v$ are real without loss of generality.), then
\begin{align}
\langle S_m u, v \rangle &= \int_0^{2\pi} v(z)(s_{a} \tilde{\psi}) \ast u(z) \ dz \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} v(z)(s_{a} \tilde{\psi})(z - t)u(t) \ dt \ dz \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} u(t) \int_0^{2\pi} (s_{a} \tilde{\psi})(z - t)v(z) \ dz \ dt \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} u(t) \int_0^{2\pi} (s_{a} \tilde{\psi})(t - z)v(z) \ dz \ dt \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} u(t)(s_{a} \tilde{\psi}) \ast v(z) \ dz \\
&= \langle u, S_m v \rangle,
\end{align}

where the fact $s_a(-x) = s(x)$ and $\tilde{\psi}(-x) = \psi(x)$ are used in the fourth equality. Note the operator $S$ is bounded. The proof is complete. □
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