Full-dimensional KAM torus with frequency-preserving in infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems

Zhicheng Tong[‡], Yong Li[§]

Abstract

In this paper, we present two infinite-dimensional KAM theorems with frequency-preserving for a nonresonant frequency of Diophantine type or even weaker. To be more precise, under a nondegenerate condition for an infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian system, we prove the persistence of a full-dimensional KAM torus with the specified frequency independent of any spectral asymptotics, by advantage of the generating function method. This appears to be the first Kolmogorov type result in the infinite-dimensional context. As a direct application, we provide a positive answer to Bourgain's conjecture: full-dimensional invariant tori for 1D nonlinear Schrödinger equations do exist.

Keywords: Infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems, full-dimensional KAM tori, frequencypreserving, Bourgain's conjecture.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 37K55, 35Q55.

Contents

1	Introduction		2
	1.1	KAM with infinite-dimensional Diophantine frequency-preserving	4
	1.2	KAM with infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine frequency-preserving	5
	1.3	Some preliminary lemmas	9
	1.4	Further discussion on the spatial structure	9
2	Ap	plication to Bourgain's conjecture	10
3	KAM via infinite-dimensional Diophantine nonresonance: Proof of Theorem 1.1 13		
4	KA	KAM via infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine nonresonance: Proof of Theorem 1.2 25	

5 Appendix

 $[\]mathbf{26}$

[‡] School of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun 130012, P. R. China. tongzc20@mails.jlu.edu.cn

[§] The corresponding author. School of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun 130012, P. R. China; School of Mathematics and Statistics, Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, P. R. China. liyong@jlu.edu.cn

1 Introduction

As Kuksin and Pöschel pointed out in [20], there was no genuine infinite-dimensional KAM theory yet to establish the persistence of infinite-dimensional rotational tori for Hamiltonians in PDEs. Regrettably, this continues to be the situation up to the present day. As a consequence, for various PDEs, one has to construct compatible KAM theorems to obtain full-dimensional (almost periodic) invariant tori, or finite-dimensional (quasi-periodic) invariant tori such as lower-dimensional ones in Melnikov's persistence. Furthermore, in the context of infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems, the requirement of the bidirectional Lipschitz property of the frequency mapping with respect to parameters, along with the consideration of spectral asymptotics, may introduce additional difficulties and potentially limit the scope of applicability.

The motivation of this paper is to develop abstract KAM theorems that eliminate the requirement for *spectral asymptotics* (thus allowing for direct application to infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian lattice systems), and are applicable to certain PDEs with nondegeneracy, such as the nonlinear Schrödinger equation subject to periodic boundary conditions. Specifically, our invariant KAM torus is *full-dimensional*, and fills the gap in the Kolmogorov-type result (*frequency-preserving* KAM) in the infinite-dimensional setting, a perspective that, to the best of our knowledge, has not been explored in the literature.

It is worth noting that preserving the specified nonresonant frequency associated with the fulldimensional torus is a challenging task that necessitates certain nondegeneracy. In contrast to the truncation method commonly used in KAM theory, we employ the *generating function approach* based on the nondegenerate Hessian of the Hamiltonian system, ensuring that the frequency remains unchanged throughout the KAM iteration process, in the spirit of Kolmogorov and Salamon. Furthermore, tackling the equilibrium among small divisors, regularity (analyticity in our context) and the spatial structure also presents additional challenges.

Before presenting our KAM results, let us first recall the definition for the infinite-dimensional Diophantine frequency initialed by Bourgain [9]. For more details on this aspect, see also Biasco el al [6] and Montalto and Procesi [21] for instance.

Definition 1.1 (Infinite-dimensional Diophantine frequency). For $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $\mu > 1$, the infinite-dimensional Diophantine nonresonance for $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is defined as

$$|\omega \cdot \ell| > \gamma \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{(1 + |\ell_j|^{\mu} \langle j \rangle^{\mu})}, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ with } 0 < \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\ell_j| < +\infty,$$

where $\langle j \rangle := \max\{1, |j|\}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

To show the universality of the infinite-dimensional Diophantine nonresonance, let us consider the Diophantine set $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu} := \left\{ \omega \in [1,2]^{\mathbb{Z}} : \ \omega \text{ is an infinite-dimensional Diophantine frequency as in Definition 1.1} \right\}.$$

Fortunately, following Bourgain [9] and also Biasco et al [6], one has the estimate of probability measure: there exists a positive constant $C(\mu)$ only depending on μ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left([1,2]^{\mathbb{Z}} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu}\right) \leqslant C\left(\mu\right)\gamma = \mathcal{O}\left(\gamma\right), \text{ as } \gamma \to 0^{+}$$

Therefore, the Diophantine nonresonance is indeed *universal* (or *typical*) in a probability measure theoretical sense, i.e., $\mathbb{P}\left([1,2]^{\mathbb{Z}}\setminus\bigcup_{0<\gamma<1}\mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu}\right)=0$. Nevertheless, throughout the present paper, we do not require the range restriction $[1,2]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of ω , and hence we might assume $0 \neq \omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (also in $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu}$).

Next, let us first provide some basic notations on spaces endowed with specific norms. For $\sigma > 0$ and $\eta \ge 2$, define the infinite-dimensional *thickened torus* as

$$\mathbb{T}_{\sigma}^{\infty} := \left\{ x = (x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} : x_j \in \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re} x_j \in \mathbb{T}, |\operatorname{Im} x_j| \leqslant \sigma \langle j \rangle^{\eta} \right\}.$$
(1.1)

Based on the thickened torus $\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma}$, we define the space of analytic functions $u: \mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma} \to \mathbb{C}$ as

$$\mathcal{G}\left(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma}\right) := \left\{ u\left(x\right) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{\infty}_{*}} \hat{u}\left(\ell\right) \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\langle\ell,x\rangle} : \|u\|_{\sigma} := \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{\infty}_{*}} |\hat{u}\left(\ell\right)| \mathrm{e}^{\sigma|\ell|_{\eta}} < +\infty \right\},\tag{1.2}$$

provided with the set of infinite integer vectors with finite support:

$$\mathbb{Z}^{\infty}_* := \left\{ \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}} : \ |\ell|_{\eta} := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle j \rangle^{\eta} \, |\ell_j| < +\infty \right\}.$$

One observes that for $u \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$, the radius of analyticity of each angle x_j increases as $|j| \to +\infty$. Such spatial structures, such as the partition of the set $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, effectively ensure the feasibility of Fourier analysis in the infinite-dimensional context. We also denote by $\mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$ the space for analytic functions with vanishing Fourier constants:

$$\mathcal{G}_0\left(\mathbb{T}^\infty_\sigma\right) := \left\{ u : \ u \in \mathcal{G}\left(\mathbb{T}^\infty_\sigma\right), \ \hat{u}_0 = 0 \right\}.$$

Moreover, for $\varsigma > 0$, denote by

$$\mathscr{D}_r := \left\{ \left(y_j \right)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} : \ y_j \in \mathbb{C}, \ \|y\|_{\varsigma}^* := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |y_j| \left\langle j \right\rangle^{\varsigma} < r \right\}$$

the complex neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, and denote by

$$\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,r} := \mathbb{T}_{\sigma}^{\infty} \times \mathscr{D}_{r} \subseteq \left(\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}})\right) \times \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}}$$

the complex neighborhood of $\mathbb{T}^{\infty} \times \{0\}$. Hereafter, we always regard \mathbb{T}^{∞} as $\mathbb{T}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ throughout this paper. For an analytic function u = u(x, y) on $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,r}$, we define its weighted norm as

$$\left\| u\left(x,y\right) \right\|_{\sigma,r} := \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} \sup_{y \in \mathscr{D}_{r}} \left| u_{\ell} \right| \mathrm{e}^{\sigma\left|\ell\right|_{\eta}}, \ u_{\ell} := \hat{u}_{\ell}\left(y\right).$$

Similarly, for a matrix valued function $\mathscr{A}(x,y) = \left(\mathscr{A}^{(i,j)}(x,y)\right)_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with $\mathscr{A}^{(i,j)}(x,y)\in\mathbb{C}$ on $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,r}$, we define its weighted norms as

$$\left\|\mathscr{A}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma} := \sup_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}} \left\|\mathscr{A}^{\left(i,j\right)}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma}, \ \left\|\mathscr{A}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma,r} := \sup_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}} \left\|\sup_{y\in\mathscr{D}_{r}} \left|\mathscr{A}^{\left(i,j\right)}\left(x,y\right)\right|\right\|_{\sigma}.$$

1.1 KAM with infinite-dimensional Diophantine frequency-preserving

With the previous preparation, we are now able to present for infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems the following KAM persistence theorem regarding full-dimensional invariant tori with frequency-preserving.

Theorem 1.1 (KAM via infinite-dimensional Diophantine nonresonance). Set $0 < \sigma < 1, \eta \ge 2$ and assume that the frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies the infinite-dimensional Diophantine condition in Definition 1.1. Suppose that $\mathscr{H}(x, y)$ is a real analytic Hamiltonian function defined on $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$, with period 1 in the variables $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and satisfies

$$\left\| \mathscr{H}(x,0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}(\xi,0) \,\mathrm{d}\xi \right\|_{\sigma} \leq \mathrm{e}^{-K},\tag{1.3}$$

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right)-\omega\right\|_{\sigma} \leqslant e^{-K\sigma^{-2/\eta}},\tag{1.4}$$

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}\left(x,y\right) - \mathscr{Q}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma,\sigma} \leqslant \sigma^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{-K},\tag{1.5}$$

where K > 0 is a sufficiently large constant independent of σ , and $\mathscr{Q}(x,y) \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}}$ is a Hermite and analytic matrix valued function on $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$ satisfying

$$\left\|\mathscr{Q}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma,\sigma} \leqslant M, \quad \left\|\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{Q}\left(x,0\right) \mathrm{d}x\right)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma}} \leqslant M \tag{1.6}$$

with M > 0 independent of σ . Then there exists a real analytic symplectic transformation $z = \phi(\zeta)$ of the form

$$z = (x, y), \ \zeta = (\xi, \kappa), \ x = u(\xi), \ y = v(\xi) + u_{\xi}^{\top}(\xi)^{-1}\kappa_{\xi}$$

mapping $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4}$ into $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$, such that $u(\xi) - \xi$ and $v(\xi)$ are of period 1 in all variables, and the Hamiltonian function $\mathscr{W} = \mathscr{H} \circ \phi$ satisfies

$$\mathscr{W}_{\xi}\left(\xi,0\right)=0, \quad \mathscr{W}_{\kappa}\left(\xi,0\right)=\omega.$$

Moreover, ϕ and \mathcal{W} satisfy the estimates:

$$\left\|\phi\left(\zeta\right)-\zeta\right\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4}\leqslant\frac{2\sigma^{2/\kappa}}{K},\ \left\|\phi_{\zeta}\left(\zeta\right)-\mathbb{I}\right\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4}\leqslant\frac{8\sigma^{2/\kappa-1}}{K},$$

and

$$\left\|\mathscr{W}_{\kappa\kappa}\left(\zeta\right)-\mathscr{Q}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4} \leqslant \frac{2\sigma^{2/\kappa-1}}{K}$$

Remark 1.1. The full-dimensional (almost periodic in time) KAM torus obtained in (Kolmogorov type) Theorem 1.1 keeps the specified frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ in the unperturbed Hamiltonian system unchanged, due to the nondegeneracy in (1.6), thereby filling the gap in the literature regarding frequency-preserving results in the infinite-dimensional context. This differs significantly from [27], in which the authors investigated linearization with frequency-drifting of C^{∞} perturbed vector fields over \mathbb{T}^{∞} , following the same spatial structure.

Remark 1.2. The frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ does not require any spectral asymptotics (e.g., Bourgain [9], and Kuksin and Pöschel [20]), and the components can also tend to infinity, as long as they do not exceed polynomials of finite order. That is, there exists some fixed $\varsigma > 0$ such that $\omega_j = \mathcal{O}(|j|^{\varsigma})$ (to ensure that $\langle \omega, y \rangle$ is well defined, see Section 2 for instance).

Remark 1.3. The analytic unperturbed system might be non-integrable, a distinction from the majority of known results. To be more precise, the coefficient of the 2-order term in $\mathscr{H}(x,y)$ with respect to y could depend on x, e.g.,

$$\mathscr{H}(x,y) = \underbrace{\langle \omega, y \rangle + \langle \mathscr{A}(x) y, y \rangle}_{the non-integrable unperturbed system} + \underbrace{\cdots}_{the perturbation}.$$

The same is true of Theorem 1.2.

1.2 KAM with infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine frequency-preserving

Since the generating function method is essentially Newtonian, the resulting convergence rate is often super-exponential. Building on this key observation, we are able to establish in this section a weaker form of KAM persistence for infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems: full-dimensional KAM tori with *weak* Diophantine nonresonance-preserving.

As usual, in infinite-dimensional settings, the small divisors—the hardest part to deal with in KAM theory, arise from the following analytic homological equation

$$\omega \cdot \partial_x f = g, \ x \in \mathbb{T}^\infty_\sigma, \tag{1.7}$$

where $f \in \mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma}), g \in \mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma+\rho})$ with $\sigma, \rho > 0$, and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a fixed nonresonant frequency. To characterize the effect of nonresonance, we introduce the following *control function*.

Definition 1.2 (Control function). A monotonically decreasing continuous function $\mathscr{E} : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is called a control function, if there exists a positive sequence $\{\delta_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta_m < +\infty, \quad \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathscr{E}^{-1} \left(\mathrm{e}^{2^m \delta_m} \right) < +\infty.$$
(1.8)

We will explain the two boundedness conditions for the control function in the subsequent comment (1). As can be seen later, using the control function to directly deal with the homological equation via general nonresonance beyond Diophantine can simplify the analysis of the KAM iteration.

Definition 1.3 (Infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine frequency). A frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is called to satisfy the weak Diophantine condition, if the unique solution $f \in \mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$ in (1.7) can be estimated as

$$\|f\|_{\sigma} \leqslant \mathscr{E}(\rho) \|g\|_{\sigma+\rho},$$

where \mathcal{E} is a control function in Definition 1.2 independent of f and g.

With the above notions, our second main result reads:

Theorem 1.2 (KAM via infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine nonresonance). Let $\sigma > 0$ be sufficiently large, and assume that the frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies the infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine condition in Definition 1.3. Then there exists $\epsilon^* > 0$ such that the followings hold for every $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon^*$. Suppose that $\mathscr{H}(x, y)$ is a real analytic Hamiltonian function defined on $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$, with period 1 in the variables $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and satisfies

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}(x,0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}(\xi,0) \,\mathrm{d}\xi\right\|_{\sigma}, \left\|\mathscr{H}_{y}(x,0) - \omega\right\|_{\sigma}, \left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}(x,y) - \mathscr{Q}(x,y)\right\|_{\sigma,\sigma} \leq \epsilon,$$
(1.9)

where $\mathscr{Q}(x,y) \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}}$ is a Hermite and analytic matrix valued function on $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$ satisfying

$$\left\|\mathscr{Q}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma,\sigma} \leqslant M, \ \left\|\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}}\mathscr{Q}\left(x,0\right)\mathrm{d}x\right)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma}} \leqslant M$$

with some M > 0. Then there exists a real analytic symplectic transformation $z = \phi(\zeta)$ of the form

$$z = (x, y), \ \zeta = (\xi, \kappa), \ x = u(\xi), \ y = v(\xi) + u_{\xi}^{\top}(\xi)^{-1}\kappa,$$

mapping $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4}$ into $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$, such that $u(\xi) - \xi$ and $v(\xi)$ are of period 1 in all variables, and the Hamiltonian function $\mathscr{W} = \mathscr{H} \circ \phi$ satisfies

$$\mathscr{W}_{\xi}(\xi,0) = 0, \quad \mathscr{W}_{\kappa}(\xi,0) = \omega.$$

Moreover, ϕ and \mathscr{W} satisfy the estimates

$$\|\phi\left(\zeta\right)-\zeta\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4}, \|\phi_{\zeta}\left(\zeta\right)-\mathbb{I}\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4}, \|\mathscr{W}_{\kappa\kappa}\left(\zeta\right)-\mathscr{Q}\left(\zeta\right)\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4} \leqslant \epsilon.$$

$$(1.10)$$

Let us make some further comments.

- (1) The two boundedness conditions in (1.8) ensure the existence of the contraction sequence $\{\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu}\}_{\nu\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the convergence of the KAM error $\{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\nu}\}_{\nu\in\mathbb{N}}$ (refer to Section 4 for the definition) through the KAM iteration, respectively. However, in non-analytic cases (such as Gevrey regularity or lower C^{∞} regularity-note that at least C^{∞} regularity is required for the infinite-dimensional case, due to historical counterexamples), these boundedness conditions need to change accordingly. We also refer to a completely different technique in [27], where the authors obtained equilibrium conditions regarding regularity and nonresonance without the action variable y, in the sense of preserving full-dimensional invariant tori.
- (2) By utilizing the weak Diophantine condition, we are able to achieve the frequency-preserving KAM persistence in Theorem 1.2. However, it would be difficult to explicitly characterize the smallness (1.9) and (1.10) (e.g., in terms of σ), which differs somewhat from the quantitative estimates provided in Theorem 1.1.
- (3) We show that our infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine condition in Definition 1.3 is indeed a 'weaker' one. Consider the Diophantine case in $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu}$ for the homological equation (1.7), and note (1.15) in Lemma 1.4. It is evident to derive

$$\exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho}\right)\right) = \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho^{1/\eta}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - 1/\eta}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho}\right)^{1 - 1/\eta}\right)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho^{1/\eta}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - 1/\eta} \left(\frac{\tau}{\rho}\right)^{1 - 1/\eta}\right)$$
$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{\tau}}{\rho}\right) - 1 := \mathscr{E}\left(\rho\right)$$

with some $\tilde{\tau} > 0$ independent of ρ . Then $\mathscr{E}^{-1}(\rho) = \frac{\tilde{\tau}}{\log(1+\rho)}$. By choosing $\delta_m := 2^{-m}m^2$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, one verifies that $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta_m < +\infty$, and

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathscr{E}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{e}^{2^m \delta_m}\right) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathscr{E}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{e}^{m^2}\right) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{\tau}}{\log\left(1 + \mathrm{e}^{m^2}\right)} \leqslant \tilde{\tau}\left(\frac{1}{\log 2} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^2}\right) < +\infty,$$

i.e., both conditions in (1.8) are satisfied. It turns out that our weak Diophantine nonresonance covers the classical Diophantine case.

(4) We further investigate the relationship between arithmetical properties of frequencies and homological equations. Assume that the nonresonant frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies

$$|\langle k, \omega \rangle| > \frac{\gamma}{\mathscr{R}(|k|_{\eta})}, \quad 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^{\infty}, \tag{1.11}$$

where $\mathscr{R}: [1, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is an approximation function, i.e., it is continuous, strictly monotonically increasing, and tends to positive infinity. We further assume that

$$\sup_{x \ge 1} \left\{ \mathscr{R}(x) e^{-\rho x} \right\} \leqslant \mathscr{E}(\rho)$$
(1.12)

with properties of the control function $\mathscr{E}(\rho)$ given in (1.8). Then the frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ above satisfies the weak Diophantine condition, due to the estimate for the unique solution $f \in \mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$ of the homological equation (1.7) (which is somewhat looser than the style demonstrated in [26] in the finite-dimensional context):

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\sigma} &= \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} \left| \hat{f}_{k} \right| \mathrm{e}^{\sigma|k|_{\eta}} = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} \frac{|\hat{g}_{k}|}{|\langle k, \omega \rangle|} \mathrm{e}^{\sigma|k|_{\eta}} \leqslant \gamma^{-1} \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} |\hat{g}_{k}| \,\mathscr{R}\big(|k|_{\eta}\big) \mathrm{e}^{\sigma|k|_{\eta}} \\ &\leqslant \gamma^{-1} \mathscr{E}\left(\rho\right) \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} |\hat{g}_{k}| \,\mathrm{e}^{(\sigma+\rho)|k|_{\eta}} = \gamma^{-1} \mathscr{E}\left(\rho\right) \|g\|_{\sigma+\rho}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we give a critical case. For $\lambda > 0$, consider the approximation function

$$\mathscr{R}(x) \sim \exp\left(\frac{x}{\left(\log\left(1+x\right)\right)^{1+\lambda}}\right), \ x \to +\infty.$$
 (1.13)

Then we can take the control function as

$$\mathscr{E}(\rho) = \exp\left(\exp\left(\rho^{-\tilde{\lambda}}\right)\right)$$

for some $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0,1)$, see details from Lemma 5.2. Let $\delta_m = (m+1)^{-2}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then it follows that $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta_m < +\infty$, and

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathscr{E}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{e}^{2^{m}\delta_{m}}\right) \leqslant C \sum_{m} \frac{1}{\left(\log\log\left(\mathrm{e}^{2^{m}\delta_{m}}\right)\right)^{1/\tilde{\lambda}}} \leqslant C \sum_{m} \frac{1}{m^{1/\tilde{\lambda}}} < +\infty$$

due to $1/\tilde{\lambda} \in (1, +\infty)$. This implies that all frequencies ω satisfying (1.11) along with (1.13) are of the weak Diophantine type. As we will see later, (1.11) and (1.13) with $\lambda = 1$ will play a crucial role in proving the existence of the nonresonant frequency in Bourgain's conjecture (it might be difficult to determine if the classical infinite-dimensional Diophantine condition in Definition 1.1 can achieve the goal in our approach).

(5) In fact, one can further weaken the approximation function (1.13) in comment (4) to

$$\mathscr{R}(x) \sim \exp\left(\frac{x}{\left(\log x\right)\cdots\left(\underbrace{\log \cdots \log x}_{\ell}x\right)^{1+\lambda}}\right), x \to +\infty$$
 (1.14)

with arbitrary $2 \leq \ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\lambda > 0$, hence the control function $\mathscr{E}(\rho)$ in (1.12) can be taken as

$$\mathscr{E}(\rho) = \exp\left(\exp\left(\frac{1}{\rho\left(\log\rho^{-1}\right)\cdots\left(\underbrace{\log\cdots\log\rho^{-1}}_{\ell-1}\right)^{1+\bar{\lambda}}}\right)\right), \quad \rho \to 0^+$$

for some $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$ in a similar way. Under this setting, one also verifies that the frequencies satisfying (1.11) along with (1.14) still exhibit weak Diophantine characteristics. It is worth mentioning that this is almost optimal in the finite-dimensional case, as the parameter $\lambda > 0$ in (1.14) cannot degenerate to 0, otherwise the optimal (at least for the 2-dimensional case) Bruno condition for the KAM persistence will no longer be satisfied, i.e.,

$$\int_{1}^{+\infty} \frac{\log \mathscr{R}(x)}{x^2} \mathrm{d}x \ge C \int_{M}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{x(\log x) \cdots (\log \cdots \log x)} \mathrm{d}x = +\infty.$$

- (6) As previously mentioned, our weak Diophantine frequency-preserving eliminates the need for enforcing *bidirectional Lipschitz properties* of the frequency mapping with respect to parameters, as well as the consideration of *spectral asymptotics*, when applying our KAM Theorem 1.2 to PDEs (such as Lattice systems, NLS, etc.), which is significant. However, to ensure the invertibility of the matrix in our KAM normal form (also understood as an infinitedimensional Kolmogorov's normal form), an explicit nondegenerate Birkhoff normal form for the specific PDE must be provided, as shown in Section 2, for instance.
- (7) Furthermore, in addition to PDEs, our results are still of real physical interest. For example, Arnaiz [1] directly applied KAM theorems to study semiclassical KAM as well as renormalization theorems based on counterterms (or modifying terms), enabling the characterization of certain semiclassical measures and quantum limits. As a consequence, our infinite-dimensional KAM Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 would play an important role in further addressing such physically related problems in the almost periodic sense, as well as in the frequency-preserving sense.

1.3 Some preliminary lemmas

Here we provide some basic lemmas without proofs as a foundation. Detailed proofs can be found in Montalto and Procesi [21] (Lemmas 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, respectively), for instance. The first three aspects, namely the Banach algebra property for the space $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$, the definition of the Fourier constant, and the Cauchy's estimate associated with the higher order derivatives, exhibit similarities to the finite-dimensional case. The final aspect, namely the homological equation via a Diophantine frequency belonging to $\mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu}$, differs significantly from the finite-dimensional case. This is due to the finite-dimensional Diophantine nonresonance being characterized by some finiteorder polynomial, and consequently, the coefficient of control in the homological equation there also exhibits polynomial characteristics (not the exponential type in Lemma 1.4 for the infinitedimensional case), as illustrated by Salamon in [25] (refer to Lemma 2).

Lemma 1.1 (The Banach algebra property). Let $u, v \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$, then $uv \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$ and $||uv||_{\sigma} \leq ||u||_{\sigma} ||v||_{\sigma}$.

Lemma 1.2 (The Fourier constant). Let $u \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$, then there holds

$$\hat{u}_0 = \int_{\mathbb{T}^\infty} u(x) \, \mathrm{d}x := \lim_{N \to +\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^N} \int_{\mathbb{T}^N} u(x) \, \mathrm{d}x_1 \cdots \mathrm{d}x_N.$$

Lemma 1.3 (The Cauchy's estimate). Let $\sigma, \rho > 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma+\rho})$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k-th differential $D_x^k u$ satisfies the following estimate with c(k) > 0 depending only on the order k:

$$\left\| D_x^k u \right\|_{\sigma} \leq c(k) \rho^{-k} \left\| u \right\|_{\sigma+\rho}.$$

Lemma 1.4 (The Diophantine homological equation). Let $\mu, \eta, \sigma, \rho > 0$ and a Diophantine frequency $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma,\mu}$ be given. Then there exists a constant $\tau = \tau(\eta, \mu) > 0$ such that for every $g \in \mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma+\rho})$, the homological equation (1.7) admits a unique solution $f \in \mathcal{G}_0(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$, and

$$\|f\|_{\sigma} \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho}\right)\right) \|g\|_{\sigma+\rho}.$$
(1.15)

1.4 Further discussion on the spatial structure

As previously mentioned, certain spatial structures are essential in the infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian context. This has given rise to numerous challenges and many open questions. For example, in the study of the reducibility of a linear Schrödinger equation subject to a small unbounded almost periodic perturbation on the thickened torus $\mathbb{T}_{\sigma}^{\infty}$ (see (1.1)) with analyticity, as discussed in [21], it is unknown that whether the analyticity radius there can be weakened, e.g., $|\operatorname{Im} x_j| \leq \sigma \log(1 + \langle j \rangle)^p$ with some $p \gg 1$ instead of $|\operatorname{Im} x_j| \leq \sigma \langle j \rangle^{\eta}$, for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, following the spirit of Moser, the profound interplay among nonresonance, regularity, and the spatial structure in infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems remains largely unexplored. A recent advancement in this direction can be attributed to [27], where the authors gave the sharp regularity for Gevrey and even C^{∞} infinite-dimensional vector fields, ensuring the preservation of full-dimensional tori. Notably, the authors observed at times, the spatial structure is not limited to the usual thickened torus $\mathbb{T}_{\sigma}^{\infty}$, provided a specific equilibrium condition is satisfied. Here, we briefly demonstrate that a similar phenomenon holds true for our KAM theorems, thereby addressing the unresolved problem in [21] within the abstract infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian framework.

Recall the previous notations for the spatial structure. Let us first modify the thickened torus $\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma}$ in (1.1) to

$$\mathbb{T}_{\sigma}^{\infty} := \left\{ x = (x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} : x_j \in \mathbb{C}, \operatorname{Re} x_j \in \mathbb{T}, |\operatorname{Im} x_j| \leqslant \sigma \varphi \left(\langle j \rangle^{\eta} \right) \right\},\$$

provided a monotonically increasing function φ defined on \mathbb{R}^+ . Then, we similarly define the analytic space $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma})$ on the torus as in (1.2) with the norm of ℓ given by $|\ell|_{\varphi} := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi(\langle j \rangle) |\ell_j|$. It is evident to verify that $|\ell|_{\varphi} \ge |\ell| := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\ell_j|$, and except for Lemma 1.4 (just for the Diophantine case), lemmas in Section 1.3 still hold. The only point that needs to be stressed is the definition of the weighted norm of the action variable y, as this is relatively special in the KAM iteration process, see Section 3 for details. To be more precise, let $||y||_{\iota}^* := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |y_j| \varphi^{\iota}(\langle j \rangle)$ for some $\iota > 0$ if φ tends to $+\infty$, and let $||y||^* := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |y_j|$ if φ is constant (recall that φ is monotonically increasing). The weighted norms for (matrix valued) analytic functions and the infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine nonresonance can also be defined in a similar way. With the above replacement, we present the following KAM Theorem 1.3 without proof:

Theorem 1.3. Suppose that the infinite-dimensional setting is replaced by the above, and that the assumptions in Theorem 1.2 hold. Then the full-dimensional KAM torus with frequency-preserving survives small perturbations.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we utilize Theorem 1.2 to prove Bourgain's conjecture regarding the persistence of full-dimensional invariant tori in 1-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations subject to periodic boundary conditions, without the presence of additional frequency parameters arsing from the random Fourier multipliers. We then prove our main KAM Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in Sections 3 and 4 by advantage of the generating function approach instead of the traditional truncation method.

2 Application to Bourgain's conjecture

Consider the 1-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1D NLS for short)

$$iu_t - u_{xx} + m_0 u + f(|u|^2)u = 0, \ m_0 \in \mathbb{R}$$
(2.1)

subject to periodic boundary conditions

$$u(t, x + 2\pi) = u(t, x), \qquad (2.2)$$

where f is a real analytic function in some neighborhood of the origin with f(0) = 0 and $f'(0) \neq 0$. In what follows, we assume that f'(0) = 1 for simplicity without loss of generality. Under these grounds, we will touch the open problem in [9]: Whether the above 1D NLS exists a full-dimensional tours (almost periodic solution)? Bourgain [9] obtained full-dimensional tori for the 1D NLS with random Fourier multipliers which are considered to be as external parameters. Precisely speaking, consider

$$iu_t - u_{xx} + V * u + \varepsilon u|u|^4 = 0$$
(2.3)

subject to periodic boundary conditions (2.2) in 1D, where the random Fourier multipliers $(V_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ are independently chosen in [-1, 1]. The role of $(V_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is essential to ensure appropriate nonresonance properties of the modulated frequencies along the iteration. Related works such as higher-dimensional NLS have also been well studied, see Berti et al [4], Bourgain [7,8,10], Cong et al [11], Eliasson and Kuksin [13,14], Geng et al [17,18], Procesi et al [24], Zhang and Si [28,29], Biasco et al [5] for analytic nonlinearities, and see Berti and Bolle [3], Feola and Procesi [15] and references therein for finitely differentiable nonlinearities. Similarly, the full-dimensional invariant tori for wave equations are also well studied, and the substantial work on this aspect can be seen from Cong and Yuan [12].

However, Bourgain's conjecture becomes much more difficult in the absence of external parameters (random Fourier multipliers). Surprisingly, the difficulties could be overcome by employing the Birkhoff normal form of order 4 and our infinite-dimensional KAM theorem with frequencypreserving established before (namely Theorem 1.2).

First, let us revisit Bourgain's result in [9]. It is worth mentioning that, our KAM theorems avoid iterative processing of external parameters, so one just needs to find a *suitable* weak Diophantine frequency which will remain unchanged, which is the key point. In view of this, Bourgain's result can be directly obtained when introducing the random Fourier multipliers $(V_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$, i.e., (2.3) (subject to (2.2)) admits a full-dimensional torus by employing our KAM Theorem 1.1. Next, we solve the harder problem with (2.1) and (2.2) in the absence of random multipliers, and provide a positive answer to Bourgain's conjecture: the full-dimensional invariant tori for the 1D NLS do exist.

Theorem 2.1 (Bourgain's conjecture). The 1D NLS (2.1) subject to periodic boundary conditions (2.2) admits full-dimensional invariant tori with small amplitude.

Proof. The proof involves two key points: one is the utilization of the Birkhoff normal form of order 4, and the other is the construction of a fixed universal frequency with certain properties related to homological equations. The latter is to avoid the potential difficulties arising from frequency drift in the absence of random Fourier multipliers.

Let us first revisit the Birkhoff normal form of the 1D NLS (2.1) subject to (2.2), which were investigated by Kuksin and Pöschel [20], and also Geng [16]. Consider the Fourier expansion of u(x,t):

$$u(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q_n(t) e^{inx}$$

Then (2.1) subject to (2.2) can be written as

$$u_t = \mathrm{i} \frac{\partial \mathscr{H}}{\partial \bar{u}}$$

with the Hamiltonian function given by

$$\mathscr{H} = \int_0^{2\pi} \left(|u_x|^2 + m_0 |u|^2 \right) \mathrm{d}x + \int_0^{2\pi} g(|u|^2) \mathrm{d}x.$$
(2.4)

Geng [16] observed that there exists a real analytic, symplectic change of coordinates $\overline{\Gamma}$ in a neighborhood of the origin which transforms the Hamiltonian (2.4) into its Birkhoff normal form of order 4, i.e.,

$$\mathscr{H} \circ \bar{\Gamma} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(n^2 + m_0 \right) |q_n|^2 - \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |q_n|^4 + \cdots$$
 (2.5)

This becomes more explicit in the Birkhoff normal form presented by Kuksin and Pöschel in [20], where the second term $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \bar{G}_{ij} |q_i|^2 |q_j|^2$ with some \bar{G}_{ij} uniquely determined, is derived. It is important to note that the 2-order term $-\frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |q_n|^4$ in (2.5) is crucial for the application of our Theorem 1.2.

For $\varsigma \ge 2$, introduce an appropriate (which will be specified later) external parameter $\vartheta = (\vartheta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma/8}$ with some $\sigma > 0$, as well as the symplectic polar and real coordinates by setting

$$q_n = \sqrt{I_n + \vartheta_n} e^{i\theta_n}, \ \bar{q}_n = \sqrt{I_n + \vartheta_n} e^{i\theta_n}, \ n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then the Hamiltonian (2.5) formally becomes

$$\tilde{\mathscr{H}} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(n^2 + m_0 \right) \left(I_n + \vartheta_n \right) - \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(I_n + \vartheta_n \right)^2 + \cdots$$
$$= \tilde{e} + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(n^2 + m_0 - \frac{1}{2\pi} \vartheta_n \right) I_n - \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} I_n^2 + \cdots$$
$$= \tilde{e} + \langle \tilde{\omega}, I \rangle - \frac{1}{4\pi} |I|^2 + \cdots, \qquad (2.6)$$

where $\tilde{\mathscr{H}}$ is analytic on $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$, \tilde{e} is a constant, and

$$\tilde{\omega} = (\tilde{\omega}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} := \left(n^2 + m_0 - \frac{1}{2\pi} \vartheta_n \right)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

It is evident that both \tilde{e} and $\langle \tilde{\omega}, I \rangle$ are well defined due to our choice of $\vartheta \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma/8}$ with $\varsigma \ge 2$. For example,

$$\langle \tilde{\omega}, I \rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\omega}_n I_n = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} I_n n^2\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} I_n n^\varsigma\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\|I\|_\varsigma^*\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(1\right)$$

Next, the most important step is to choose an appropriate $\vartheta \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma/8}$ such that $\tilde{\omega}$ is a weak Diophantine frequency satisfying (1.11) and (1.13) with $\lambda = 1$, i.e., the approximation function is $\mathscr{R}(x) = \exp\left(\frac{x}{\log^2(1+x)}\right)$. Then $\mathscr{E}(\rho) = \exp\left(\exp\left(\rho^{-\tilde{\lambda}}\right)\right)$ with some $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$ can be chosen as the corresponding control function since $\{\delta_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}} := \{(m+1)^{-2}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ ensures (1.8), see comment (4) for details. In this context,

$$|\langle k,\vartheta\rangle| > \gamma \exp\left(-\frac{|k|_{\eta}}{\log^2\left(1+|k|_{\eta}\right)}\right), \ \gamma > 0, \ 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\infty}_*,$$

and we observe that

$$\gamma \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^{\infty}} \frac{1}{|k|} \exp\left(-\frac{|k|_{\eta}}{\log^2\left(1+|k|_{\eta}\right)}\right)$$

$$= \gamma \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|k|_{\eta}=\nu} \frac{1}{|k|} \exp\left(-\frac{|k|_{\eta}}{\log^2\left(1+|k|_{\eta}\right)}\right)$$
(2.7)

$$\leqslant \gamma \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{\log^2(1+\nu)}\right) \cdot \sum_{|k|_{\eta}=\nu} 1$$

$$= \gamma \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{\log^2(1+\nu)}\right) \cdot \#\left\{k: 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\infty}_*, |k|_{\eta}=\nu \in \mathbb{N}^+\right\}$$

$$\leqslant \gamma \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\nu} \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{\log^2(1+\nu)}\right) \cdot C_{\eta} \nu^{\nu^{1/\eta}}$$

$$= \gamma C_{\eta} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{\log^2(1+\nu)} + \nu^{1/\eta} \log \nu - \log \nu\right)$$

$$\leqslant \gamma C_{\eta} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\nu^{3/4}\right) \quad (\text{since } \eta \ge 2)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(\gamma), \text{ as } \gamma \to 0^+,$$

$$(2.8)$$

where Lemma 5.3 is used in (2.8). This implies that such parameters with weak nonresonance form a set of full probability measure in $\mathscr{D}_{\sigma/8}$, thereby enabling us to choose $\tilde{\omega}$ as a weak Diophantine type frequency whenever ϑ is selected appropriately. Recalling the Birkhoff normal form (2.6), one verifies that all conditions in Theorem 1.2 are satisfied in this case. Therefore, we obtain the full-dimensional torus with frequency-preserving for Bourgain's conjecture.

Remark 2.1. The approach to dealing with the 1D NLS subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions remains the same, as the Birkhoff normal form is similar. It is important to note that when the nonlinearity explicitly depends on the space variable x, there will be non-integrable terms in the Birkhoff normal form. These non-integrable terms may pose a challenge in proving the existence of full-dimensional invariant tori, as mentioned in Remark 1 in Geng's work [16]. However, this obstacle can be overcome by utilizing our KAM theorems, as the unperturbed systems could be non-integrable, as shown in Remark 1.3.

Remark 2.2. In contrast to the 1D NLS, Pöschel [23] pointed out that when considering the wave equation

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} + mu \pm u^3 = 0$$

subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions, no complete normal form of order 4 is available due to asymptotic resonances among the frequencies. Berti et al [2] also observed this fact. Consequently, we are unable to directly obtain full-dimensional tori for the wave equation by utilizing our KAM theorems.

3 KAM via infinite-dimensional Diophantine nonresonance: Proof of Theorem 1.1

Now let us prove Theorem 1.1, and the proof is divided into six steps. Without loss of generality, we will introduce some universal constants that are independent of the iterative process and may vary in the context. In particular, if necessary, we will indicate which variables they depend on. We also emphasize that after balancing spatial structure, regularity, and frequency non-resonance,

KAM analysis in the infinite-dimensional context (not necessarily dependent on specific PDEs) is indeed similar to that in the finite-dimensional context. Refer to Pöschel [22], Tong and Li [27] and references therein for further insights on this aspect.

Step1: For any fixed $2^{-\eta} < q < 2^{-1} (2^{-\eta} + 1)$, let us define the contraction sequence as

$$\sigma_{\nu} := \frac{1}{2}\sigma\left(1+q^{\nu}\right), \ \nu \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is evident to verify $\sigma_0 = \sigma, \sigma_\infty = \sigma/2$ and that

$$\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1} = \frac{1}{2}\sigma\left(1 - q\right)q^{\nu}, \ \nu \in \mathbb{N}$$

As we will see later, the appropriately selected contraction sequence ensures that our KAM iteration is super-exponentially convergent.

In order to obtain the desired symplectic and analytic transformations in the KAM iteration, we construct the following partial differential equations for $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_{\nu}}^{\infty}$ in the ν th step according to the generating function method used by Kolmogorov [19] (see also Salamon [25]):

$$\omega \cdot \partial_x a\left(x\right) = \int_{\mathbb{T}_{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(\xi,0\right) \mathrm{d}\xi - \mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(x,0\right),\tag{3.1}$$

$$\omega = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu}(\xi, 0) + \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}(\xi, 0) \left(\alpha + a_{x}(\xi)\right) \right) \mathrm{d}\xi, \qquad (3.2)$$
$$\omega \cdot \partial_{x} b\left(x\right) = \omega - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu}\left(x, 0\right) - \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(x, 0\right) \left(\alpha + a_{x}\left(x\right)\right),$$

where $a(x) = a_{\nu}(x)$ and $b(x) = b_{\nu}(x)$ are 1-periodic in all variables, and $\alpha = \alpha_{\nu}$ is an infinitedimensional constant vector. To shorten notations, we omit the lower corner label ν . It should be emphasized that, with the nondegeneracy in (1.6), the second one (3.2) (and also the equivalent third one) plays an essential role in *preserving* the specified frequency of the unperturbed Hamiltonian system. Without this, the frequency may *drift* in each step of the KAM iteration.

Let us define the error $\varepsilon_{\nu} > 0$ in the ν th step of the KAM iteration to be the smallest number such that

$$\left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(x,0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(\xi,0) \,\mathrm{d}\xi \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \leqslant \varepsilon_{\nu},\tag{3.3}$$

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu}(x,0)-\omega\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu},\tag{3.4}$$

and assume that

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu},\sigma_{\nu}} \leqslant M_{\nu} \leqslant M, \quad \left\|\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}}\mathscr{H}_{yy}\left(x,0\right)\mathrm{d}x\right)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}}\to\mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{\sigma_{\nu}}} \leqslant M_{\nu} \leqslant M$$

for a universal constant M > 0. It will be demonstrated that, by advantage of the typical Neumann series argument, the aforementioned reversibility could be preserved throughout the KAM process due to the smallness of the perturbation of each step.

Step2: Define $\rho_j := ((8-j)\sigma_{\nu} + j\sigma_{\nu+1})/8$ for $0 \leq j \leq 4$. Then it follows that $\rho_0 = \sigma_{\nu}$ and $\rho_4 = (\sigma_{\nu} + \sigma_{\nu+1})/2$. We aim to establish the following estimates for a(x) and b(x) derived from the generating function method:

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\left(x\right)\|_{(\sigma_{\nu}+\sigma_{\nu+1})/2} &\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\left(\sigma_{\nu}+\sigma_{\nu+1}\right)/2-\sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu},\\ \|a_{x}\|_{(\sigma_{\nu}+\sigma_{\nu+1})/2} &\leqslant c\exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu},\\ \|\alpha+a_{x}\left(x\right)\|_{(\sigma_{\nu}+\sigma_{\nu+1})/2} &\leqslant cM\exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu},\\ \|b_{x}\left(x\right)\|_{(\sigma_{\nu}+\sigma_{\nu+1})/2} &\leqslant cM\exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu},\end{aligned}$$

where c = c(1) > 0 is the constant given in Lemma 1.3, and we could regard it as a universal constant.

By (3.1) and Lemma 1.4, we have

$$\|a(x)\|_{\rho_{1}} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\rho_{0}-\rho_{1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho_{0}-\rho_{1}}\right)\right) \left\|\mathscr{H}^{\nu}(x,0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}}\mathscr{H}^{\nu}(\xi,0)\,\mathrm{d}\xi\right\|_{\rho_{0}}$$
$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{8^{1/\eta}\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{8\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu}$$
$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu},\tag{3.5}$$

provided $\tau = \tau (\eta, \mu) > 0$ being a universal constant. Therefore, by Lemma 1.3 and (3.5), we obtain

$$\|a_x\|_{\rho_2} \leq c(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^{-1} \|a\|_{\rho_1}$$

$$\leq \frac{8c}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}$$

$$= c \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right) + \log\left(\frac{8}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}$$

$$\leq c \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}.$$
(3.6)

Note that by (3.2) we have the following relation

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}(\xi, 0) \, \alpha \mathrm{d}\xi = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \left(\omega - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu}(\xi, 0) \right) \mathrm{d}\xi + \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}(\xi, 0) \, a_{x}(\xi) \, \mathrm{d}\xi.$$

Then we arrive at

$$\|\alpha\|_{\rho_{2}} \leq M\left(\left\|\omega - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu}(x,0)\right\|_{\rho_{2}} + M \|a_{x}(x)\|_{\rho_{2}}\right)$$

$$\leq cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu},\tag{3.7}$$

and therefore

$$\|\alpha + a_x(x)\|_{\rho_2} \leq \|\alpha\|_{\rho_2} + \|a_x(x)\|_{\rho_2} \leq cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_\nu - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_\nu - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_\nu.$$
 (3.8)

Further, combining (3.7), (3.8) and Lemma 1.4, we have

$$\begin{split} \|b(x)\|_{\rho_{3}} &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\rho_{2}-\rho_{3})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\rho_{2}-\rho_{3}}\right)\right) \|\omega-\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu}(x,0)-\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}(x,0)\left(\alpha+a_{x}\left(x\right)\right)\|_{\rho_{2}} \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \left(\|\omega-\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu}(x,0)\|_{\rho_{2}}+\left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}(x,0)\left(\alpha+a_{x}\left(x\right)\right)\right\|_{\rho_{2}}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \cdot cM\exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu} \\ &\leq cM\exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu}. \end{split}$$
(3.9)

Finally, by (3.9) and Lemma 1.3, there holds

$$\|b_{x}(x)\|_{\rho_{4}} \leq c(\rho_{3} - \rho_{4})^{-1} \|b(x)\|_{\rho_{3}}$$

$$\leq \frac{8c}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \cdot cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}$$

$$\leq cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}.$$
(3.10)

Step3: We have constructed functions by advantage of generating functions

$$\mathscr{U}^{\nu}(x) = \langle \alpha, x \rangle + a(x), \quad \mathscr{V}^{\nu}(x) = x + b(x).$$

Next we define the symplectic and analytic transformation as follows:

$$z = \psi^{\nu}(\zeta), \quad z = (x, y), \quad \zeta = (\xi, \kappa) \Leftrightarrow \xi = x + b(x), \quad y = \alpha + a_x(x) + \kappa + b_x^{\top}(x)\kappa.$$

We will prove that $z = \psi^{\nu}(\zeta)$ is well defined, maps $(\xi, \kappa) \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma_{\nu+1}, \sigma_{\nu+1}}$ into $(x, y) \in \mathscr{D}_{(\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/2, (\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/2}$, and satisfies the following estimates for $(\xi, \kappa) \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma_{\nu+1}, \sigma_{\nu+1}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\psi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right)-\zeta\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1},\sigma_{\nu+1}} &\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}},\\ \left\|\psi^{\nu}_{\zeta}\left(\zeta\right)-\mathbb{I}\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1},\sigma_{\nu+1}} &\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where K > 0 is a universal constant independent of $\sigma > 0$.

With the estimates of ε_{ν} in Step5 for convenience, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - \xi\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} &= \|b\left(x\right)\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \leqslant cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu} \\ &\leqslant cM \exp\left(\frac{2^{1/\eta}\tau}{\left(\sigma\left(1 - q\right)q^{\nu}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{2\tau}{\sigma\left(1 - q\right)q^{\nu}}\right)\right) \cdot e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \\ &\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta} + \varrho^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \leqslant \frac{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}{8}, \end{aligned}$$
(3.11)

here $\rho < 2$ is an appropriate constant due to our choice of q, i.e., $q > 2^{-1/\eta}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|b_x(x)\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} &\leqslant cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu} \\ &\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \leqslant \frac{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$||x - \xi||_{(\sigma_{\nu+1} + \sigma_{\nu})/2}, ||b_x(x)||_{(\sigma_{\nu+1} + \sigma_{\nu})/2} \leq e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \leq \frac{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}{8}.$$

Now let $(\xi, \kappa) \in \mathscr{D}_{(3\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/4, (3\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/4}$ and let $x \in \mathbb{T}^{\infty}_{(\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/2}$ be the unique vector such that $x + b(x) = \xi$, and define

$$y := \alpha + a_x \left(x \right) + \kappa + b_x^\top \left(x \right) \kappa.$$
(3.12)

With infinite-dimensional Fourier analysis, we could prove that $||y||_{\varsigma}^{\ast} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |y_j| \langle j \rangle^{\varsigma}$ is small with respect to ν . Recalling (3.12), it suffices to show the smallness of a (namely the smallness of a_j with respect to j and ν). Note that

$$a(x) = a_{\nu}(x) = (\omega \cdot \partial_x)^{-1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(\xi, 0) \,\mathrm{d}\xi - \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(x, 0) \right).$$

Here $(\omega \cdot \partial_x)^{-1}$ is the familiar linear differential operator giving rise to small divisors, see also comment (4) below Theorem 1.2. Then

$$\|a\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} \frac{\left|\hat{\mathscr{H}}_{k}^{\nu}(0)\right|}{|\langle k, \omega \rangle|} \mathrm{e}^{\sigma_{\nu}|k|_{\eta}}$$

admits the estimate in (3.5). Similarly, a_x admits a Fourier expansion form with the estimate in (3.6). Below let us assume $\eta \ge \varsigma + 2$ without loss of generality. Now, with $|k|_{\eta} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \ell \rangle^{\eta} |k_{\ell}| \ge \langle j \rangle^{\eta} |k_j|$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we obtain for $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_{\nu}}^{\infty}$ that

$$\left| (a_x)_j \right| \leq \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^{\infty}} \frac{\left| \hat{\mathscr{H}}_k^{\nu}(0) \right|}{|\langle k, \omega \rangle|} |k_j| \left| e^{i\langle k, x \rangle} \right|$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^{\eta}} \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^{\infty}} \frac{\left| \hat{\mathscr{H}}_k^{\nu}(0) \right|}{|\langle k, \omega \rangle|} \langle j \rangle^{\eta} |k_j| \left| \exp\left(\sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} k_s \left| \operatorname{Im} x_s \right| \right) \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^{\eta}} \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} \frac{\left| \hat{\mathscr{H}}_{k}^{\nu}(0) \right|}{|\langle k, \omega \rangle|} |k|_{\eta} \left| \exp \left(\sigma \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle s \rangle^{\eta} k_{s} \right) \right|$$

$$= \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^{\eta}} \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}} \frac{\left| \hat{\mathscr{H}}_{k}^{\nu}(0) \right|}{|\langle k, \omega \rangle|} |k|_{\eta} e^{\sigma |k|_{\eta}}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^{\eta}} \exp \left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log \left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \right) \right) \varepsilon_{\nu},$$

$$(3.13)$$

and this leads to

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \left| (a_x)_j \right| \langle j \rangle^{\varsigma} \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^{\eta-\varsigma}} \\ \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \cdot \left(\varepsilon_{\nu} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^2}\right) \\ \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right),$$
(3.14)

as promised. As to the general case $\varsigma > 0$, let us choose $w \in \mathbb{N}^+$ sufficiently large such that $w\eta \ge \varsigma + 2$. With the Cauchy's estimate in the KAM process, we could prove that $D^m a$ also admits the same estimate in (3.6), or a slightly stronger version

$$\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^{\infty}} \frac{\left|\hat{\mathscr{H}}_k^{\nu}(0)\right|}{\left|\langle k, \omega \rangle\right|} \left|k\right|_{\eta}^m e^{\sigma \left|k\right|_{\eta}} \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}$$

This allows us to adjust the leading coefficient in (3.13) to be $\langle j \rangle^{-w\eta}$, in a similar way. Then the smallness in (3.14) is ensured by $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle j \rangle^{-(w\eta-\varsigma)} \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle j \rangle^{-2} < +\infty$. It should be pointed out that the analysis of a_j (or further y_j) in this context is independent of the algebraic property of the specified frequency ω , therefore it remains valid in Theorem 1.2. We also note that the smallness of a_j could potentially be improved, as whenever k_j appears, we have $|k|_{\eta} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \ell \rangle^{\eta} |k_{\ell}| \geq \langle j \rangle^{\eta} |k_j| \geq \langle j \rangle^{\eta}$, indicating that we only require the estimate for the tail of the Fourier expansion (namely $\sum_{|k|_{\eta} \geq \langle j \rangle^{\eta}} \cdots$). However, we do not further investigate this possibility.

Moreover, by (3.8) and (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y - \kappa\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} &\leq \|\alpha + a_{x}\left(x\right)\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} + \left\|b_{x}^{\top}\left(x\right)\kappa\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &\leq \|\alpha + a_{x}\left(x\right)\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} + \|b_{x}\left(x\right)\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \cdot |\kappa| \\ &\leq cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu} \\ &+ cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu} \cdot \frac{\sigma_{\nu} + 3\sigma_{\nu+1}}{4} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq cM \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}$$
$$\leq e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}.$$
(3.15)

Then, from (3.15), (3.11) and (3.15), we prove that

$$\begin{split} \|\psi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right) - \zeta\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1},\sigma_{\nu+1}} &\leqslant \|\psi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right) - \zeta\|_{(3\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/4,(3\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/4} \\ &\leqslant \|x - \xi\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} + \|y - \kappa\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}. \end{split}$$

Finally, using similar analysis of (3.11) and applying Lemma 1.3, we have

$$\begin{split} \left\|\psi_{\zeta}^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right) - \mathbb{I}\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1},\sigma_{\nu+1}} &\leqslant \frac{8c}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \left\|\psi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right) - \zeta\right\|_{(3\sigma_{\nu+1} + \sigma_{\nu})/4, (3\sigma_{\nu+1} + \sigma_{\nu})/4} \\ &\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu} \cdot e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \\ &\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}. \end{split}$$

Step4: In view of Step3, let us define the transformed Hamiltonian function $\mathscr{H}^{\nu+1} := \mathscr{H}^{\nu} \circ \psi^{\nu}$ in the $(\nu + 1)$ th step. Then we aim to establish the induction for ε_{ν} , i.e., the following inequalities are satisfied with ν replaced by $\nu + 1$:

$$\left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(x,0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(\xi,0) \,\mathrm{d}\xi \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \leq \varepsilon_{\nu},$$
$$\left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu}_{y}(x,0) - \omega \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu},$$

and

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(z\right)-\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu},\sigma_{\nu}}\leqslant\sigma^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}},$$

provided with a universal constant K > 0 independent of $\sigma > 0$, where $\mathscr{Q}^0 := \mathscr{Q}$ and $\mathscr{Q}^{\nu} = \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu-1}$. Denote $z := (x, \alpha + a_x) := \psi^{\nu}(\xi, 0)$ with $\xi \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma_{\nu+1}}^{\infty}$. Then it follows that $(x, y) \in \mathscr{D}_{(\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/2, (\sigma_{\nu+1}+\sigma_{\nu})/2}$. Firstly, by (3.4), (3.8) and Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\begin{split} & \left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(\xi,0\right) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(\chi,0\right) \mathrm{d}\chi \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1}} \\ & \leq \left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(\xi,0\right) - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(\chi,0\right) \mathrm{d}\chi + \omega \cdot \alpha\right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ & + \left\| \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \left(\mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(\zeta,0\right) - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(\chi,0\right) \mathrm{d}\chi + \omega \cdot \alpha\right) \right) \mathrm{d}\zeta \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ & \leq 2 \left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(\xi,0\right) - \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(\chi,0\right) \mathrm{d}\chi + \omega \cdot \alpha\right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \end{split}$$

$$=2\left\|\mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(x,\alpha+a_{x}\right)-\mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(x,0\right)-\omega\cdot\partial_{x}a\left(x\right)-\omega\cdot\alpha\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}\right)$$

$$=2\left\|\mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(x,\alpha+a_{x}\right)-\mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(x,0\right)-\left\langle\mathscr{H}^{\nu}_{y}\left(x,0\right),\alpha+a_{x}\right\rangle+\left\langle\mathscr{H}^{\nu}_{y}\left(x,0\right)-\omega,\alpha+a_{x}\right\rangle\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}\right)$$

$$\leq2\left(\left\|\mathscr{H}^{\nu+1}\left(x,\alpha+a_{x}\right)-\mathscr{H}^{\nu}\left(x,0\right)-\left\langle\mathscr{H}^{\nu}_{y}\left(x,0\right),\alpha+a_{x}\right\rangle\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}+\left\|\left\langle\mathscr{H}^{\nu}_{y}\left(x,0\right)-\omega,\alpha+a_{x}\right\rangle\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}\right)\right)$$

$$\leq2\left(M\left\|\alpha+a_{x}\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}^{2}+\left\|\mathscr{H}^{\nu}_{y}\left(x,0\right)-\omega\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}\cdot\left\|\alpha+a_{x}\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}\right)\right)$$

$$\leq2\left(c^{2}M^{2}\exp\left(\frac{2\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu}\cdot cM\exp\left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu}\right)$$

$$\leq\exp\left(\frac{\tau^{*}}{(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau^{*}}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu}^{2},$$

where $\tau^* = \tau^*(\tau, c, M, \eta, \mu) > 0$ is a universal constant independent of $\sigma > 0$. Recalling (3.3), the above estimate implies that

$$\varepsilon_{\nu+1} \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2.$$
(3.16)

Secondly, with (3.4), (3.8), (3.10) and Lemma 5.1, we obtain that

$$\begin{split} & \left\| \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu+1}(\xi,0) - \omega \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1}} \\ &= \left\| (\mathbb{I} + b_{x}) \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, \alpha + a_{x} \right) - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) - \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \left(\alpha + a_{x} \right) \right) \\ &+ b_{x} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, \alpha + a_{x} \right) - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \right) \\ &+ b_{x} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, \alpha + a_{x} \right) - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \right) \\ &+ b_{x} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, \alpha + a_{x} \right) - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) - \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \left(\alpha + a_{x} \right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &+ \left\| b_{x} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, \alpha + a_{x} \right) - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &+ \left\| b_{x} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, \alpha + a_{x} \right) - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &+ \left\| b_{x} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, \alpha + a_{x} \right) - \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &+ \left\| b_{x} \left(\mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) \right) - \omega \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &\leq \frac{M \left\| \alpha + a_{x} \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}^{2}}{\sigma_{\nu} - \left\| \alpha + a_{x} \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}} + \left\| b_{x} \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \cdot M \left\| \alpha + a_{x} \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} + \left\| b_{x} \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \cdot \left\| \mathscr{H}_{y}^{\nu} \left(x, 0 \right) - \omega \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &\leq \frac{8c^{2}M^{3}}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \exp \left(\frac{2\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log \left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \right) \right) \varepsilon_{\nu} \\ &+ cM \exp \left(\frac{2\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log \left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \right) \right) \varepsilon_{\nu} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{\tau}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log \left(\frac{\tau}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}} \right) \right) \varepsilon_{\nu} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu}^2$$

Recalling (3.4), we have

$$\exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\left(\sigma_{\nu+1}-\sigma_{\nu+2}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\sigma_{\nu+1}-\sigma_{\nu+2}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu+1}\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\left(\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{\nu}^2,$$

which yields that

$$\varepsilon_{\nu+1} \leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\left(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}\right)^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2, \ \nu \in \mathbb{N},\tag{3.17}$$

i.e., the same as (3.16). We assert that the convergence rate of ε_{ν} is super-exponential, and the detailed proof will be given in Step5.

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(z\right) - \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu},\sigma_{\nu}} &= \left\|\frac{1}{2\pi \mathrm{i}} \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \frac{1}{\lambda\left(\lambda-1\right)} \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(\zeta+\lambda\left(z-\zeta\right)\right) \mathrm{d}\lambda\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu},\sigma_{\nu}} \\ &\leqslant \frac{M}{2\pi} \max\left\{\frac{\|x-\xi\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}}{\sigma_{\nu}-\|\xi\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}-\|x-\xi\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}}, \frac{\|y-\kappa\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}}{\sigma_{\nu}-\|\kappa\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}-\|y-\kappa\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}}\right\} \\ &\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon_{\nu}}{\sigma_{\nu}-\sigma_{\nu+1}} \leqslant \frac{2\mathrm{e}^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}}{\sigma\left(1-q\right)q^{\nu}} \leqslant \sigma^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}, \end{aligned}$$
(3.18)

where we use the estimates for ε_{ν} given in Step5, and the curve $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\Gamma} := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda| = \min \left\{ \frac{\sigma_{\nu} - \|\xi\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}}{\|x - \xi\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}}, \frac{\sigma_{\nu} - \|\kappa\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}}{\|y - \kappa\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}} \right\} > 1 \right\}.$$

On the other hand, note that

$$\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu+1}\left(\xi,\kappa\right) = \left(\mathbb{I} + b_x(x)\right)\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(x,y\right)\left(\mathbb{I} + b_x^{\top}(x)\right).$$

Then by (3.10) and the estimates in Step5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu+1}\left(\zeta\right) - \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(z\right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1},\sigma_{\nu+1}} \\ \leqslant 2 \left\| b_x\left(x\right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \cdot \left\| \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(z\right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu},\sigma_{\nu}} + \left\| b_x\left(x\right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu}}^2 \cdot \left\| \mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(z\right) \right\|_{\sigma_{\nu},\sigma_{\nu}} \\ \leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.19)$$

By summing up (3.18) and (3.19) and comparing the order, we arrive at

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(x,y\right)-\mathscr{Q}^{\nu}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1},\sigma_{\nu+1}} \leqslant \sigma^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}.$$

Recalling the estimates for ψ^{ν} and $\mathscr{H}^{\nu+1} = \mathscr{H}^{\nu} \circ \psi^{\nu}$ in Step3, one can easily verify that there exists a universal constant M^* such that $M_{\nu} \leq M^*$, which completes the proof of the induction.

Further, in view of the definition of the KAM error ε_{ν} , we only have to require the initial conditions in (1.3), (1.4) and (1.5) to be satisfied:

$$\left\| \mathscr{H}(x,0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}(\xi,0) \,\mathrm{d}\xi \right\|_{\sigma} \leqslant \varepsilon_0 \leqslant \mathrm{e}^{-K\sigma^{-2/\eta}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathscr{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right) - \omega \right\|_{\sigma} &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\tau^{*}}{\left(\sigma_{0} - \sigma_{1}\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{\tau^{*}}{\sigma_{0} - \sigma_{1}}\right)\right)\varepsilon_{0} \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\tau^{*}}{\left(2^{-1}\sigma\left(1 - q\right)\right)^{1/\eta}}\log\left(\frac{2\tau^{*}}{\sigma\left(1 - q\right)}\right)\right) \cdot e^{-K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \\ &\leq e^{-K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left\|\mathscr{H}_{yy}\left(x,y\right)-\mathscr{Q}\left(x,y\right)\right\|_{\sigma,\sigma} \leqslant \sigma^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{-K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}$$

Step 5: Now we prove that the KAM error ε_{ν} is super-exponentially convergent, i.e.,

$$\varepsilon_{\nu} \leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}, \ \nu \in \mathbb{N},$$

where K > 0 is a universal constant independent of $\sigma > 0$.

Note that $1/2 < q^{1/\eta} < 1$ since we have required that $2^{-\eta} < q < 2^{-1} (2^{-\eta} + 1)$. Hence there exists some $\delta = \delta(\eta) > 0$ such that $1 < d := (q^{1/\eta} - \delta)^{-1} < 2$. Recalling (3.16) and (3.17), we arrive at

$$\begin{split} \varepsilon_{\nu+1} &\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{(\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{\sigma_{\nu} - \sigma_{\nu+1}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2 \\ &\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{(2^{-1}\sigma(1-q)\,q^{\nu})^{1/\eta}} \log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{2^{-1}\sigma(1-q)\,q^{\nu}}\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2 \\ &\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{(\sigma(1-q)\,q^{\nu})^{1/\eta}} \left(\log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{q^{\nu}}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\sigma(1-q)}\right)\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2 \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{(q^{1/\eta})^{\nu}(\sigma(1-q))^{1/\eta}} \left(\log\left(\frac{\tau^*}{q^{\nu}}\right) + \eta\log\left(\frac{1}{(\sigma(1-q))^{1/\eta}}\right)\right)\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2 \\ &\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{(q^{1/\eta} - \delta)^{\nu}(\sigma(1-q))^{1/\eta}} \cdot \frac{\eta}{(\sigma(1-q))^{1/\eta}}\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2 \\ &\leqslant \exp\left(\frac{\tau^*}{(q^{1/\eta} - \delta)^{\nu}\sigma^{2/\eta}}\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2 \\ &= \exp\left(\tau^*\sigma^{-2/\eta}d^{\nu}\right) \varepsilon_{\nu}^2. \end{split}$$
(3.20)

Therefore, with (3.20) we have

$$\log \varepsilon_{\nu+1} \leqslant \tau^* \sigma^{-2/\eta} d^{\nu} + 2\log \varepsilon_{\nu},$$

which is equivalent to (note that 1 < d < 2)

$$\log \varepsilon_{\nu+1} + \frac{\tau^* \sigma^{-2/\eta}}{2-d} d^{\nu+1} \leqslant 2 \left(\log \varepsilon_{\nu} + \frac{\tau^* \sigma^{-2/\eta}}{2-d} d^{\nu} \right).$$
(3.21)

It is important to emphasize that we carefully select the value of q in Step 1 to ensure the superexponential property in this context. If $0 < q \leq 2^{-\eta}$, then the previously used technique fails. Now, we derive from (3.21) that

$$\varepsilon_{\nu} \leqslant \exp\left(2^{\nu}\left(\log \varepsilon_{0} + \frac{\tau^{*}\sigma^{-2/\eta}}{2-d}\right) - \frac{\tau^{*}\sigma^{-2/\eta}}{2-d}d^{\nu}\right),$$

and this implies the super-exponential property of ε_{ν} as

$$\varepsilon_{\nu} \leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}, \ \nu \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $K = K(\tau^*) = K(\tau, c, M, \eta, \mu) > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant independent of $\sigma > 0$, whenever we require the initial error ε_0 to be sufficiently small (see Step 4) so that

$$\log \varepsilon_0 + \frac{\tau^* \sigma^{-2/\eta}}{2-d} \ll -1$$

This shows that the convergence rate of our KAM iteration is super-exponential.

Step6: It remains to establish the uniform convergence of the sequence

$$\phi^{
u} := \psi^0 \circ \psi^1 \circ \cdots \circ \psi^{
u}$$

for $(\xi, \kappa) \in \mathcal{D}_{\sigma/4, \sigma/4}$, and also the estimates of the transformed Hamiltonian function in Theorem 1.1.

It can be obtained from Step3 that if $(\xi, \kappa) \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma_{\nu}, \sigma_{\nu}}$ and $z := \psi^{\ell+1} \circ \psi^{\ell} \circ \cdots \circ \psi^{\nu-1}(\zeta)$, then $(x, y) \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma_{\ell+1}, \sigma_{\ell+1}}$, and therefore

$$\left\|\psi_{\zeta}^{\ell}\left(\psi^{\ell+1}\circ\psi^{\ell}\circ\cdots\circ\psi^{\nu-1}\left(\zeta\right)\right)\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2}\leqslant1+\mathrm{e}^{-2^{\ell}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}},$$

which implies that (recall that $0 < \sigma < 1$)

$$\left\|\psi_{\zeta}^{\nu-1}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} \leqslant \prod_{j=0}^{\nu-1} \left(1 + e^{-2^{j}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}\right) = \exp\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} \log\left(1 + e^{-2^{j}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}\right)\right)$$
$$\leqslant \exp\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{e^{2^{j}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}}\right) \leqslant \exp\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{j}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{2\sigma^{2/\eta}}{K}\right) \leqslant 2.$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\phi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right)-\phi^{\nu-1}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} &= \left\|\left(\psi^{0}\circ\cdots\circ\psi^{\nu-1}\right)\circ\psi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right)-\phi^{\nu-1}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} \\ &= \left\|\phi^{\nu-1}\left(\psi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right)\right)-\phi^{\nu-1}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} \\ &\leqslant 2\left\|\psi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right)-\zeta\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} \\ &\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

This also holds for $\nu = 0$ if we define $\phi^{-1} := id$.

Now the limit function $\phi := \lim_{\nu \to \infty} \phi^{\nu}$ satisfies

$$\begin{split} \|\phi\left(\zeta\right) - \zeta\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} &\leqslant \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \left\|\phi^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right) - \phi^{\nu-1}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} \\ &\leqslant \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} e^{-2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \leqslant \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\nu}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \leqslant \frac{2\sigma^{2/\eta}}{K} \end{split}$$

Then by Lemma 1.3, we obtain that

$$\left\|\phi_{\zeta}\left(\zeta\right)-\mathbb{I}\right\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4} \leqslant \frac{4}{\sigma} \left\|\phi\left(\zeta\right)-\zeta\right\|_{\sigma/2,\sigma/2} \leqslant \frac{8\sigma^{2/\eta-1}}{K}.$$

This implies that ϕ is indeed an analytic diffeomorphism, and also a symplectic one.

Thus, the transformed Hamiltonian function can be written as

$$\mathscr{W}(\zeta) := \mathscr{H} \circ \phi(\zeta) = \lim_{\nu \to \infty} \mathscr{H} \circ \phi^0 \circ \cdots \circ \phi^\nu = \lim_{\nu \to \infty} \mathscr{H}^\nu$$

for $(\xi, \kappa) \in \mathscr{D}_{\sigma/4, \sigma/4}$, which satisfies

$$\mathscr{W}_{\xi}(\xi,0) = 0, \quad \mathscr{W}_{\kappa}(\xi,0) = \omega,$$

and

$$\begin{split} \|\mathscr{W}_{\kappa\kappa}\left(\zeta\right) - \mathscr{Q}\left(\zeta\right)\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4} &= \lim_{\nu \to \infty} \left\|\mathscr{W}_{yy}^{\nu}\left(\zeta\right) - \mathscr{Q}^{0}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4} \\ &\leqslant \lim_{\nu \to \infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\nu} \left\|\mathscr{W}_{yy}^{\ell}\left(\zeta\right) - \mathscr{Q}^{\ell}\left(\zeta\right)\right\|_{\sigma/4,\sigma/4} \\ &\leqslant \lim_{\nu \to \infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\nu} \sigma^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{-2^{\ell}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \\ &\leqslant \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma 2^{\ell}K\sigma^{-2/\eta}} \\ &\leqslant \frac{2\sigma^{2/\eta-1}}{K}. \end{split}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

4 KAM via infinite-dimensional weak Diophantine nonresonance: Proof of Theorem 1.2

As we previously mentioned, the convergence of the Newton iteration is always to be superexponential, and that's the essential reason we could generalize the classical infinite-dimensional Diophantine condition in Definition 1.1 to a weaker one, as seen in Definition 1.3. The basic framework is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1, so we omit the details here. We also mention the rigorous analysis of the finite-dimensional version in [26]. The key point here is to construct an appropriate contraction sequence and prove the uniform convergence through the KAM process, by employing the boundedness in (1.8), i.e.,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \delta_m < +\infty, \quad \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathscr{E}^{-1} \left(\mathrm{e}^{2^m \delta_m} \right) < +\infty.$$

Recall (1.8) and that $\sigma > 0$ is sufficiently large, let $\sigma \ge 64 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathscr{E}^{-1} \left(e^{2^m \delta_m} \right)$ without loss of generality. Then we construct the desired contraction sequence as

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu} = \sigma - 8 \sum_{m=0}^{\nu} \mathscr{E}^{-1} (\mathrm{e}^{2^m \delta_m}), \ \nu \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

Denote $\mathscr{G}_{\nu} := C\mathscr{E}^6\left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu} - \tilde{\sigma}_{\nu+1}}{8}\right)$ with C > 0 being some universal constant. In view of (1.8), one can verify that

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{\log \mathscr{G}_{\nu}}{2^{\nu}} = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\nu}} \left(\log C + 6 \log \left(\mathscr{E} \left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu} - \tilde{\sigma}_{\nu+1}}{8} \right) \right) \right)$$
$$= \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\nu}} \left(\log C + 6 \cdot 2^{\nu+1} \delta_{\nu+1} \right)$$
$$= 2 \log C + 12 \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \delta_{\nu+1} < +\infty.$$
(4.1)

Similar to (3.3) and (3.4), let $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\nu}$ be the smallest number such that

$$\left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(x,0) - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{\infty}} \mathscr{H}^{\nu}(\xi,0) \,\mathrm{d}\xi \right\|_{\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu}} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\nu},$$
$$\left\| \mathscr{H}^{\nu}_{y}(x,0) - \omega \right\|_{\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu}} \leq \mathscr{E}\left(\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu} - \tilde{\sigma}_{\nu+1}\right) \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\nu}.$$

Then via a modified KAM iteration, we obtain from (4.1) that

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\nu+1} \leqslant \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\nu} \mathscr{G}_{\nu-j}^{2^{j}}\right) \tilde{\varepsilon}_{0}^{2^{\nu+1}}$$
$$= \exp\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\nu} 2^{j} \log \mathscr{G}_{\nu-j} + (2\log \tilde{\varepsilon}_{0}) 2^{\nu}\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\nu} \frac{\log \mathscr{G}_{\nu-j}}{2^{\nu-j}} + (2\log\tilde{\varepsilon}_0)\right) 2^{\nu}\right)$$
$$= \exp\left(\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\nu} \frac{\log \mathscr{G}_j}{2^j} + (2\log\tilde{\varepsilon}_0)\right) 2^{\nu}\right)$$
$$\leqslant \exp\left(\left(\sup_{\nu\geqslant 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\nu} \frac{\log \mathscr{G}_j}{2^j} + (2\log\tilde{\varepsilon}_0)\right) 2^{\nu}\right)$$
$$\leqslant e^{-2^{\nu+1}K},$$

provided a constant $K \gg -\sup_{\nu \ge 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\nu} \frac{\log \mathscr{G}_j}{2^j} - 2\log \tilde{\varepsilon}_0 > 0$ whenever $\tilde{\varepsilon}_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small. Finally, by advantage of the super-exponential property $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\nu} \le e^{-2^{\nu}K}$ for $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, it is evident to verify the uniform convergence of the transformation.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

5 Appendix

Here we give a lemma for Taylor estimates, which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 5.1. Give $\sigma, M > 0$. Then for a complex function $\mathcal{H}(x, y)$ on $\mathcal{D}_{\sigma,\sigma}$ with $\|\mathcal{H}_{yy}(x, y)\|_{\sigma,\sigma} \leq M$, there hold (where y could be a function of x):

$$\left\|\mathcal{H}\left(x,y\right) - \mathcal{H}\left(x,0\right) - \mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right)y\right\|_{\sigma} \leqslant M \left\|y\right\|_{\sigma}^{2},\tag{5.1}$$

$$\left\|\mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,y\right) - \mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right)\right\|_{\sigma} \leqslant M \left\|y\right\|_{\sigma},\tag{5.2}$$

$$\left\|\mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,y\right) - \mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right) - \mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,0\right)y\right\|_{\sigma} \leq \frac{M\left\|y\right\|_{\sigma}^{2}}{r - \left\|y\right\|_{\sigma}}.$$
(5.3)

Proof. According to Taylor's formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{H}\left(x,y\right) - \mathcal{H}\left(x,0\right) - \mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right)y\right\|_{\sigma} &= \left\| \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{t} y^{\top} \mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,sy\right)y \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}t \right\|_{\sigma} \\ &\leq \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{t} \left\| y^{\top} \mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,sy\right)y\right\|_{\sigma} \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leq \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{t} \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{H}_{yy}^{(i,j)}\left(x,sy\right)y_{i}y_{j} \right\|_{\sigma} \mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leq M \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\| y_{j} \right\|_{\sigma} \cdot \sup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\| y_{i} \right\|_{\sigma} \\ &\leq M \left\| y \right\|_{\sigma}^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (5.1). As to (5.2), we have

$$\left\|\mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,y\right)-\mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right)\right\|_{\sigma}=\left\|\int_{0}^{1}\mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,ty\right)y\mathrm{d}t\right\|_{\sigma}\leqslant\int_{0}^{1}\left\|\mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,ty\right)y\right\|_{\sigma}\mathrm{d}t$$

$$= \int_0^1 \sup_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}} \left\| \mathcal{H}_{yy}^{(i,j)}\left(x,ty\right) y_j \right\|_{\sigma} \mathrm{d}t \leqslant M \sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \left\| y_j \right\|_{\sigma} \leqslant \left\| y \right\|_{\sigma}.$$

Finally, by considering the curve $\Gamma := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda| = r/ \|y\|_{\sigma} > 1\}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,y\right) - \mathcal{H}_{y}\left(x,0\right) - \mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,0\right)y\right\|_{\sigma} &= \left\| \int_{0}^{1} \left(\mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,ty\right)y - \mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,0\right)y\right) \mathrm{d}t \right\|_{\sigma} \\ &= \left\| \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{2\pi \mathrm{i}} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{1}{\lambda\left(\lambda - 1\right)} \mathcal{H}_{yy}\left(x,\lambda ty\right)y \mathrm{d}\lambda \mathrm{d}t \right\|_{\sigma} \\ &\leqslant \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot |\Gamma| \cdot \frac{1}{|\lambda|\left(|\lambda| - 1\right)} \cdot \sup_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\| \mathcal{H}_{yy}^{(i,j)}\left(x,\lambda ty\right)y_{j} \right\|_{\sigma} \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot 2\pi \frac{r}{\|y\|_{\sigma}} \cdot \frac{1}{|\lambda|\left(|\lambda| - 1\right)} \cdot M \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|y_{j}\|_{\sigma} \\ &\leqslant \frac{M \|y\|_{\sigma}^{2}}{r - \|y\|_{\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (5.3).

Lemma 5.2. Give $0 < \rho \ll 1$ and $\lambda > 0$. Then there exists some $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\exp\left(\frac{x}{\left(\log\left(1+x\right)\right)^{1+\lambda}}\right) \cdot e^{-\rho x} \leq \exp\left(\exp\left(\rho^{-\tilde{\lambda}}\right)\right).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\exp\left(\frac{x}{\left(\log\left(1+x\right)\right)^{1+\lambda}}\right) \cdot e^{-\rho x} = \exp\left(\frac{x}{\left(\log\left(1+x\right)\right)^{1+\lambda}} - \rho x\right) := \exp\left(\varpi\left(x\right)\right).$$

Then it is evident to verify that there exists a unique $x^* \in (1, +\infty)$ such that $\varpi(x^*) = \max_{x \ge 1} \varpi(x)$, and $\log x^* \sim \rho^{-\frac{1}{1+\lambda}}, \rho \to 0^+$. We therefore have

$$\max_{x \ge 1} \exp\left(\varpi\left(x\right)\right) = \exp\left(\varpi\left(x^*\right)\right) \leqslant \exp\left(x^*\right) \leqslant \exp\left(\exp\left(\rho^{-\tilde{\lambda}}\right)\right)$$

with some $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$. This proves the lemma.

Lemma 5.3. Given $\eta \ge 2$, there exists some $C_{\eta} > 0$ such that

$$\#\left\{k: 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\infty}_{*}, |k|_{\eta} = \nu \in \mathbb{N}^{+}\right\} \leqslant C_{\eta} \nu^{\nu^{1/\eta}}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$C_{\nu+\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]}^{\nu} = \frac{\left(\nu + \left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]\right)!}{\nu! \left(\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]\right)!} \sim \frac{\sqrt{2\pi \left(\nu + \left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]\right)} \left(\frac{\nu + \left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]}{e}\right)^{\nu + \left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]}}{\sqrt{2\pi\nu} \left(\frac{\nu}{e}\right)^{\nu} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi \left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]} \left(\frac{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]}{e}\right)^{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]}}$$

$$\begin{split} &\sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\nu^{1/\eta}}} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}{\nu}\right)^{\nu} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu}{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}\right)^{[\nu^{1/\eta}]} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}{\nu}\right)^{[\nu^{1/\eta}]} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\nu^{1/\eta}}} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu}{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}\right)^{[\nu^{1/\eta}]} \cdot \exp\left(\nu \log\left(1 + \frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}{\nu}\right)\right) \\ &\quad \cdot \exp\left(\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right] \log\left(1 + \frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}{\nu}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\nu^{1/\eta}}} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu}{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}\right)^{[\nu^{1/\eta}]} \cdot \exp\left(\nu \left(\frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}{\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]^2}{\nu^2} + \cdots\right)\right) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \exp\left(\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right] \left(\frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}{\nu} + \cdots\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\nu^{1/\eta}}} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu}{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}\right)^{[\nu^{1/\eta}]} \cdot \exp\left(\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right] - \frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]^2}{2\nu} + \cdots\right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{[\nu^{1/\eta}]^2}{\nu} + \cdots\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\nu^{1/\eta}}} \cdot \left(\frac{\nu}{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}\right)^{[\nu^{1/\eta}]} \cdot \exp\left(\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right] + \mathcal{O}(1)\right) \cdot \exp\left(\mathcal{O}(1)\right) \quad (\text{since } \eta \ge 2) \\ &\leqslant C_{\eta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu^{1/\eta}}} \cdot \nu^{(1-1/\eta)(\nu^{1/\eta+1})} \cdot e^{[\nu^{1/\eta}]}. \end{split}$$

Then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\left\{k: 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}, |k|_{\eta} = \nu \in \mathbb{N}^{+}\right\} \\ &\leqslant \#\left\{k: 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}, |k_{0}| + |k_{1}| + \dots + |k_{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]}| = \nu \in \mathbb{N}^{+}\right\} \\ &\leqslant 2^{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]+1} \cdot \#\left\{k: 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{*}^{\infty}, k_{j} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{N}, k_{0} + k_{1} + \dots + k_{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]} = \nu \in \mathbb{N}^{+}\right\} \\ &= 2^{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]+1} \cdot C_{\nu+\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]} \\ &\leqslant 2^{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]+1} \cdot C_{\eta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu^{1/\eta}}} \cdot \nu^{(1-1/\eta)\left(\nu^{1/\eta}+1\right)} \cdot e^{\left[\nu^{1/\eta}\right]} \\ &\leqslant C_{\eta} \nu^{\nu^{1/\eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by National Basic Research Program of China (Grant No. 2013CB834100), National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12071175, 11171132, 11571065), Project of Science and Technology Development of Jilin Province (Grant Nos. 2017C028-1, 20190201302JC), and Natural Science Foundation of Jilin Province (Grant No. 20200201253JC).

References

- V. Arnaiz, Spectral stability and semiclassical measures for renormalized KAM systems. Nonlinearity 33 (2020), pp. 2562–2591. MR4105369
- M. Berti, L. Biasco, M. Procesi, KAM theory for the Hamiltonian derivative wave equation. Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) 46 (2013), pp. 301–373 (2013). MR3112201
- [3] M. Berti, P. Bolle, Quasi-periodic solutions with Sobolev regularity of NLS on T^d with a multiplicative potential. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 15 (2013), pp. 229–286. MR2998835
- M. Berti, T. Kappeler, R. Montalto, Large KAM tori for perturbations of the defocusing NLS equation. Astérisque 2018, viii+148 pp. ISBN: 978-2-85629-892-3 MR3869671
- [5] L. Biasco, J. Massetti, M. Procesi, Almost periodic invariant tori for the NLS on the circle. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire 38 (2021), pp. 711–758. MR4227050
- [6] L. Biasco, J. Massetti, M. Procesi, An abstract Birkhoff normal form theorem and exponential type stability of the 1d NLS. Comm. Math. Phys. 375 (2020), pp. 2089–2153. MR4091501
- [7] J. Bourgain, Construction of approximative and almost periodic solutions of perturbed linear Schrödinger and wave equations. Geom. Funct. Anal. 6 (1996), pp. 201–230. MR1384610
- [8] J. Bourgain, Green's function estimates for lattice Schrödinger operators and applications. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 158. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2005. x+173 pp. ISBN: 0-691-12098-6 MR2100420
- [9] J. Bourgain, On invariant tori of full dimension for 1D periodic NLS. J. Funct. Anal. 229 (2005), pp. 62–94. MR2180074
- [10] J. Bourgain, Quasi-periodic solutions of Hamiltonian perturbations of 2D linear Schrödinger equations. Ann. of Math. (2) 148 (1998), pp. 363–439. MR1668547
- [11] H. Cong, J. Liu, Y. Shi, X. Yuan, The stability of full dimensional KAM tori for nonlinear Schrödinger equation. J. Differential Equations 264 (2018), pp. 4504–4563. MR3758530
- [12] H. Cong, X. Yuan, The existence of full dimensional invariant tori for 1-dimensional nonlinear wave equation. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire 38 (2021), pp. 759–786. MR4227051
- [13] L. Eliasson, S. Kuksin, KAM for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Ann. of Math. (2) 172 (2010), pp. 371–435. MR2680422
- [14] L. Eliasson, S. Kuksin, On reducibility of Schrödinger equations with quasiperiodic in time potentials. Comm. Math. Phys. 286 (2009), pp. 125–135. MR2470926
- [15] R. Feola, M. Procesi, Quasi-periodic solutions for fully nonlinear forced reversible Schrödinger equations. J. Differential Equations 259 (2015), pp. 3389–3447. MR3360677
- [16] J. Geng, Invariant tori of full dimension for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation. J. Differential Equations 252 (2012), pp. 1–34. MR2852196

- [17] J. Geng, X. Xu, J. You, An infinite dimensional KAM theorem and its application to the two dimensional cubic Schrödinger equation. Adv. Math. 226 (2011), pp. 5361–5402. MR2775905
- [18] J. Geng, J. You, A KAM theorem for Hamiltonian partial differential equations in higher dimensional spaces. Comm. Math. Phys. 262 (2006), pp. 343–372. MR2200264
- [19] A. Kolmogorov, On conservation of conditionally periodic motions for a small change in Hamilton's function. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) 98, (1954), pp. 527–530. MR0068687
- [20] S. Kuksin, J. Pöschel, Invariant Cantor manifolds of quasi-periodic oscillations for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Ann. of Math. (2) 143 (1996), pp. 149–179. MR1370761
- [21] R. Montalto, M. Procesi, Linear Schrödinger equation with an almost periodic potential. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 53 (2021), pp. 386–434, MR4201442
- [22] J. Pöschel, Small divisors with spatial structure in infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems. Comm. Math. Phys. 127 (1990), pp. 351–393. MR1037110
- [23] J. Pöschel, Quasi-periodic solutions for a nonlinear wave equation. Comment. Math. Helv. 71 (1996), pp. 269–296. MR1396676
- [24] C. Procesi, M. Procesi, A KAM algorithm for the resonant non-linear Schrödinger equation. Adv. Math. 272 (2015), pp. 399–470. MR3303238
- [25] D. Salamon, The Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser theorem. Math. Phys. Electron. J. 10 (2004), Paper 3, 37 pp. MR2111297
- [26] Z. Tong, Y. Li, KAM Theorem towards the Weak Diophantine Condition. To appear in Commun. Math. Sci.
- [27] Z. Tong, Y. Li, Towards sharp regularity: Full dimensional tori in C^{∞} vector fields over \mathbb{T}^{∞} . 2023. Submitted. arXiv:2306.08211
- [28] M. Zhang, J. Si, Construction of quasi-periodic solutions for the quintic Schrödinger equation on the two-dimensional torus T². Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 374 (2021), pp. 4711–4780. MR4273175
- [29] M. Zhang, J. Si, KAM tori for the two-dimensional completely resonant Schrödinger equation with the general nonlinearity. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 170 (2023), pp. 150–230. MR4532963