

Full dimensional tori in C^∞ vector fields over \mathbb{T}^∞

Zhicheng Tong ^{‡,1}, Yong Li ^{*,§,1,2}

Abstract

We consider linearization of perturbed vector field $\omega + P$ over infinite dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^∞ and give sharp regularity requirement for perturbation P under which there is a nearly identical transformation conjugating the unperturbed one ω onto $\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P$ via a small modifying term $\tilde{\omega}$. Besides discussing the Diophantine type introduced by Bourgain [11], we also investigate the universal nonresonance and provide weakest regularity of perturbations known so far for which KAM applies. Lower than analyticity, our results allow Gevrey or even only C^∞ , and the new KAM scheme with a balancing sequence to overcome non-polynomial nonresonance is shown to be non-Newtonian that differs from the usual ones. Thereby, we answer the fundamental question of what is the minimum regularity required for KAM in infinite dimensional case. Additionally, our linearization could also be employed to deal with quasi periodic case over \mathbb{T}^n .

Keywords: Full dimensional tori, non-Newtonian KAM iteration, Diophantine nonresonance, Gevrey regularity, C^∞ regularity.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 37K20, 37K55.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	3
3	State of main results	5
4	Application to quasi periodic case	5
5	Proof of results	6
5.1	Some basic lemmas	6
5.2	Linearization of vector fields over \mathbb{T}^∞ via non-Newtonian iteration	9
5.2.1	Abstract KAM Theorem	9
5.2.2	Main strategy	10
5.2.3	KAM Step	11
5.2.4	KAM Iteration	15
5.2.5	Uniform convergence	18
5.3	Proof of Theorem 3.1	18
5.4	Proof of Theorem 3.2	20

* The corresponding author.

‡ E-mail address : tongzc20@mails.jlu.edu.cn

§ E-mail address : liyong@jlu.edu.cn

¹ School of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun 130012, People's Republic of China.

² School of Mathematics and Statistics, Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, People's Republic of China.

1 Introduction

The celebrated KAM theory established by Kolmogorov and Arnold [3–5,19], Moser [25,26], mainly concerns the preservation of invariant tori of a Hamiltonian function or a vector field under small perturbations, and indeed has a history of more than sixty years. So far, KAM theory has been well developed and widely applied to a variety of dynamical systems and PDEs. On these aspect, see Kuksin [21], Eliasson [14], Pöschel [28], Wayne [35], Bourgain [9,10], Kuksin and Pöschel [23] and Salamon [32] for some fundamental developments. As to recent work on PDEs involving nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS), wave equation, beam equation as well as Euler equation via KAM approaches, we mention the work of Bourgain [11], Khesin et al [18], Eliasson et al [15], Biasco et al [7], Berti et al [6], Montalto and Procesi [24], Guardia et al [16] and the references therein. We also refer to the overview of KAM theory for PDEs by Kuksin [22], and finite and infinite dimensional systems by Chierchia and Procesi [13].

However, as commented in [23], work on abstract KAM theory in infinite dimensional tori case is very few in the light of difficulties caused by small divisors and spatial structure, let alone proving the persistence of full dimensional tori and reducing regularity for perturbations over \mathbb{T}^∞ . The latter, being as a fundamental question in KAM theory, has caused a surge in the study of *how smooth the perturbation has to be to ensure KAM persistence*. In the n dimensional case ($2 \leq n < +\infty$), it is well known that finitely differentiability is enough, namely C^{2n} (plus certain Dini modulus of continuity) for perturbed Hamiltonian functions, and C^{n-1} for perturbed vector fields, see Albrecht [1] and Pöschel [29] for KAM theory, and Herman [17], Cheng and Wang [12] and Wang [34] for counterexamples with lower regularity. It shall be emphasized that the above regularity is actually sharp, and therefore when considering infinite dimensional situation, finitely differentiable perturbations would destroy KAM invariant tori. As a result, one demands at least C^∞ smoothness under almost periodic setting. Regularity usually available for KAM at this case is analyticity, and to the best of our knowledge, there do not exist any abstract Gevrey KAM except for very few results concerning with Gevrey dependent potential in specific PDEs via Diophantine nonresonance introduced by Bourgain in [11], namely

$$|k \cdot \omega| > \gamma^* \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{(1 + |k_j|^\mu \langle j \rangle^\mu)}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ satisfying } 0 < \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |k_j| < +\infty \quad (1.1)$$

with $0 < \gamma^* < 1$ and $\mu > 1$, and $\langle j \rangle := \max\{1, |j|\}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, which we refer to Biasco et al [7] and Procesi and Stolovitch [30] for relevant work. It seems that, such Diophantine frequencies are indeed related to Gevrey smoothness for perturbations over \mathbb{T}^∞ denoted by P , and we mention that for given nonresonance, the minimum regularity of P should depend on it as well as certain spatial structure due to almost periodicity. Therefore, reducing regularity must base on explicitly constructed nonresonance. To answer the previous addressed fundamental question on minimum KAM regularity via almost periodicity, we investigate linearization of perturbed vector fields over \mathbb{T}^∞ without Hamiltonian structure for simplicity and present two main sharp results in this paper:

- With Diophantine nonresonance in (1.1) it is shown that non-analytic Gevrey type regularity is enough to obtain KAM conjugacy, and the Gevrey exponent is indeed sharp even for finite dimensional case;
- For almost all vector fields, certain C^∞ regularity beyond Gevrey is enough to guarantee full dimensional tori, and it is also sharp in view of the fact that C^∞ cannot be reduced to finite differentiability.

Obviously, achieving sharp results for infinite dimensional KAM is not simple. To this end, via specific spatial structure we extend Pöschel’s non-Newtonian KAM scheme for quasi periodicity in [29] to the almost periodic case, that is, being different from the usual superexponential convergence, our iteration possesses arbitrarily slow convergence rate and therefore weakens regularity assumption as much as possible. To be more precise, we solve a nonlinear equation by employing the Banach contraction theorem at each KAM step rather than linearizing the conjugacy equation under consideration. An essential fact should be stressed that Pöschel’s KAM only applies to *finite dimensional Diophantine* vector fields, therefore we have to propose a *balancing sequence* to deal with the small divisor in infinite dimension, and this is a main difference. As you will see, choosing an appropriate balancing sequence allows one to derive sharp regularity (not given in advance) for which KAM applies, and this is indeed different from the usual case where one has to first assume regularity (e.g., analyticity or Gevrey). Apart from above, instead of applying Jackson type approximation theorem in the finite dimensional case to finitely differentiable KAM, we combine certain KAM coordinate transformations with the analytic smoothing approach to construct a special m -weighted norm that reveals explicit regularity about perturbation over \mathbb{T}^∞ . *Thereby, we provide an effective and universal approach to reduce regularity in infinite dimensional case for the first time.* Furthermore, our results are of real physical interest. For example, as Arnaiz used linearization theorem of perturbed vector fields over \mathbb{T}^n to study semiclassical KAM as well as renormalization theorem based on counterterms (acting as the ‘modifying term’ in our paper) in [2], certain semiclassical measures and quantum limits could be well characterized. As a consequence, our infinite dimensional linearization theorems would play an important role in further touching such physical related problems in the almost periodic sense, even considering less regular symbols (see Remark 1 in [2]).

The rest of paper is organized as follows. Towards almost periodicity, we introduce nonresonance, spatial structure and Fourier analysis as preliminaries in Section 2. Then our main results, namely Gevrey type KAM Theorem 3.1 concerning with Diophantine nonresonance and C^∞ type KAM Theorem 3.2, are stated in Section 3, respectively. Our approach is also valid for quasi periodic case and shown to be sharp, as explained by Theorem 4.1 in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to the proof of all results, and we shall provide a guideline for readers: some basic lemmas that are crucial in KAM theory are constructed firstly, aiming to establish an Abstract m -weighted KAM Theorem 5.1; then Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 4.1 are direct corollaries of Theorem 5.1, by successfully and appropriately selecting balancing sequences as already mentioned.

2 Preliminaries

Let us recall the approximation function, infinite dimensional Diophantine nonresonance, weighted norm for vector, \mathbb{T}_σ^∞ torus and the analyticity on it to be studied in this paper. Denote by $|\cdot|$ the sup-norm on infinite dimensional vector space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (or finite dimensional vector space \mathbb{R}^n with $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$).

Definition 2.1 (Approximation function). *A function $\Delta : [1, +\infty) \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$ is said to be an approximation function, if it is continuous, strictly monotonic increasing, and satisfies $\Delta(+\infty) = +\infty$.*

Such approximation functions will be used to characterize certain universal nonresonance in infinite dimensional case (see Section 5.4) beyond Diophantine type below, as well as weight that embodies the spatial structure (see Theorem 3.2).

Definition 2.2 (Diophantine nonresonance). *Given $\gamma^* \in (0, 1)$ and $\mu > 1$, the Diophantine*

nonresonance of frequency $\omega \in [1, 2]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is given by

$$|k \cdot \omega| > \gamma^* \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{(1 + |k_j|^\mu \langle j \rangle^\mu)}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \quad 0 < \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |k_j| < +\infty, \quad (2.1)$$

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

Let us denote by $D_{\gamma^*, \mu}$ the set containing Diophantine frequencies in infinite dimensional case. Fortunately, it turns out that there exists a constant $C(\mu) > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}\left([1, 2]^{\mathbb{Z}} \setminus D_{\gamma^*, \mu}\right) \leq C(\mu) \gamma^*$, that is, almost all frequencies are of Diophantine type in a measure-theoretical sense. See more details from [7, 11, 24, 30].

Next, we shall introduce the infinite dimensional torus and Fourier expansion series on it. For $\eta, \sigma > 0$, the thickened infinite dimensional torus is define by

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

In particular, it represents the usual torus \mathbb{T}^∞ when σ degenerates to 0. For given $\eta > 0$, we define the set of infinite integer vectors with finite support

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

Such a spatial structure like this is not necessary in the finite dimensional case, but cannot be removed under infinite dimensional setting, otherwise the Fourier series would explode. It is worth mentioning that similar spatial structure appears in Theorem 3.2. Via the above notations, analyticity on \mathbb{T}_σ^∞ with exponential weighted norm could be given.

Definition 2.3. For $\sigma > 0$, the Banach space containing analytic functions or maps on \mathbb{T}_σ^∞ is defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma^\infty) := \left\{ u(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \hat{u}(k) e^{ik \cdot x} : \|u\|_\sigma := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{u}(k)| e^{\sigma |k|_\eta} < +\infty \right\}.$$

Remark 2.1. It follows from the definition of norm $\|\cdot\|_\sigma$ that $\|e^{ik \cdot x}\|_\sigma = e^{\sigma |k|_\eta}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty$, and $\|X\|_\sigma = \|X\|_0 = |X|$ holds for X being constant.

Finally, let us introduce a special m -weighted norm that will be used to construct the regularity of perturbations as weak as possible in KAM. We say that $m = \{m_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty}$ is a weight, if $m_k = m(|k|_\eta) \geq 0$ is non-decreasing for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty$. We always denote by m a weight rather than a non-negative number (e.g., σ in Definition 2.3) throughout this paper. Based on weight m , one could consider certain m -weighted norm from our non-Newtonian KAM that has weaker regularity than analyticity (e.g., Gevrey or even C^∞).

Definition 2.4. Consider a map with Fourier expansion series $f = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \hat{f}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}$. Then for a weight $m = \{m_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty}$, define the m -weighted norm of f as

$$\|f\|_m := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{f}(k)| m_k.$$

Remark 2.2. As an example, $m_k = |k|_\eta^a$ corresponds to the Gevrey regularity with $0 < a < 1$ and analyticity with $a = 1$, respectively. We also mention the finite dimensional Gevrey regularity proposed by Popov in [27].

3 State of main results

As usual, let us first discuss the Diophantine vector field in the almost periodic case. It is shown that, assuming Gevrey type regularity depending on Diophantine nonresonance for perturbation is enough to ensure the KAM linearization via modifying term. Compared with the well known fact in the finite dimensional case, that is, the critical regularity in KAM theory strongly depends on Diophantine exponent admitted by frequency (e.g., see Salamon [32]), our infinite dimensional result also reveals the similar point. Moreover, the Gevrey exponent obtained below is indeed *sharp*, even in the quasi periodic case, see Section 4 for explanations.

Theorem 3.1 (Gevrey type KAM). *Let $\eta > 0$ be given. Assume that $\omega \in \mathbb{T}^\infty$ satisfies the infinite dimensional Diophantine condition in Definition 2.2. Then for all $0 < \eta' < \eta$, as long as the perturbation P is sufficiently small in the sense that*

$$\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{P}(k)| \exp\left(|k| \frac{1}{\eta^{1+\eta'}}\right) \ll 1,$$

there exist a modifying term $\tilde{\omega}$ and a nearly identical transformation Ψ such that $\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P$ is conjugated to ω , i.e.,

$$\Psi^*(\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P) = \omega.$$

Now we consider the nonresonance beyond Diophantine, for which almost all vector fields hold, and we say that it is *universal*. One sees later that the *non-Gevrey* regularity for perturbation is explicitly shown, but we shall emphasize, it could be weaker, as long as the weight added in (3.1) is larger than any polynomial's form, see details from Remark 3.1 and Section 5.4. This fact reveals the *sharpness*, since in the almost periodic case, polynomial's nonresonance or regularity *do not* ensure KAM persistence, which we refer to the counterexamples constructed by Herman [17], Cheng and Wang [12], Wang [34] and the references therein (as the dimension tends to infinity). *Thereby, the following theorem provides the weakest regularity—namely C^∞ (since C^∞ case has to admit this weight structure) for which KAM applies in the universal sense over \mathbb{T}^∞ , and therefore fills the gap of results on this aspect.*

Theorem 3.2 (C^∞ type KAM). *For almost all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{Z}$, there exists a uniform approximation function w , as long as the perturbation P is sufficiently small in the sense that*

$$\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{P}(k)| \exp(\kappa(\ln \|k\|_w)^a) \ll 1, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\|k\|_w := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} w(\langle j \rangle) |k_j|$ and $\kappa > 0, a > 1$, then the KAM conjugacy in Theorem 3.1 holds.

Remark 3.1. *The approximation function w could also be explicitly determined, see Section 5.4. The regularity in (3.1) could also be weakened to*

$$\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{P}(k)| \Delta(\|k\|_u) \ll 1,$$

provided with any approximation function Δ larger than any polynomial's type and certain weight u depending on it, which implies that C^∞ regularity is enough to ensure KAM conjugacy. We prefer not to state here for the sake of clarity.

4 Application to quasi periodic case

It shall be pointed out that our result (namely the Abstract m -weighted KAM Theorem 5.1 in Section 5.2.1) also applies to quasi periodic case given below.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and an approximation function Δ be given. Assume that $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ satisfies the finite dimensional nonresonant condition*

$$|k \cdot \omega| > \frac{\gamma^*}{\Delta(|k|)}, \quad 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad \gamma^* > 0.$$

Suppose that any of the followings is satisfied:

(i) Δ is Diophantine, i.e.,

$$\Delta(x) \sim x^\beta, \quad \beta \geq \begin{cases} 1, & n = 1, \\ n - 1, & n \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

and the perturbation P admits polynomial regularity $\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\hat{P}(k)| |k|^{\beta+1} < +\infty$;

(ii) Δ is subexponential, i.e., $\Delta(x) \sim \exp(x^\zeta)$ for some $0 < \zeta < 1$, and the perturbation P admits Gevrey regularity $\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\hat{P}(k)| \exp(|k|^{\zeta'}) < +\infty$ with any $\zeta' > \zeta$;

(iii) $\Delta(x) \sim \exp((\ln x)^a)$ with some $a > 1$, and the perturbation P admits same type regularity $\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\hat{P}(k)| \exp(\kappa(\ln |k|)^a) < +\infty$ with any $\kappa > 1$.

Then there exist a modifying term $\tilde{\omega}$ and a nearly identical transformation Ψ such that $\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P$ is conjugated to ω , i.e.,

$$\Psi^*(\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P) = \omega.$$

When $n \geq 2$ in (i), although our regularity is higher than Pöschel's in his preprint [29] (our method is somewhat different from his, under which $n \geq 2$ is necessary—due to Rüssmann's estimates in [31]), it is still nearly critical, thanks to counterexamples of Herman [17] and etc. More precisely, $\beta = n - 1$ with $n \geq 2$ only yields C^n smoothness, while C^{n-1} is the critical case. Our results also cover the case $n = 1$. So far we have discussed the Diophantine nonresonance in all dimensions, i.e., from 1 to $+\infty$. Besides considering Diophantine nonresonance, both of (ii) and (iii) are sharp and concise, see Bounemoura [8] for optimal Gevrey instance about vector fields (our sharpness is reflected in the exponent, i.e., $\zeta' > \zeta$ could be arbitrarily chosen, while Bounemoura's KAM allows optimal case $\zeta' = \zeta$. Actually, our result would achieve this critical case whenever one chooses the balancing sequence more carefully, but we prefer not to calculate this point for simplicity, since some parameters must be very complicated as Bounemoura provided), and see Salamon [32], Koudjina [20] and Tong and Li [33] for universal nonresonance considering Hamiltonian systems.

5 Proof of results

Proof of all results are given in this section. We have to establish some basic lemmas via infinite dimensional structure introduced forego in detail before proving. Throughout this paper, we always denote by id the identity operator without causing ambiguity, and we denote by \mathbb{I} the infinite dimensional identity matrix, that is, $D(\text{id}) = \mathbb{I}$. Moreover, \vee and \wedge represent the maximum operator and minimum operator, respectively.

5.1 Some basic lemmas

Lemma 5.1 (Neumann Lemma). *Let φ be a self map the torus \mathbb{T}^∞ . If $\mu = \|D\varphi - \mathbb{I}\|_\sigma < 1$, then φ is a diffeomorphism, and its inverse ψ satisfies*

$$\|D\psi\|_\sigma \leq \frac{1}{1 - \mu}, \quad \|D\psi - \mathbb{I}\|_\sigma \leq \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu}.$$

Lemma 5.2 (Transformation Lemma). *Consider a diffeomorphism φ of the torus \mathbb{T}^∞ extending to \mathbb{T}_σ^∞ with $\sigma > 0$. If $\|\varphi - \text{id}\|_\sigma \leq a$ for some $a \geq 0$, then for $f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma^\infty)$, it holds*

$$\|f \circ \varphi\|_\sigma \leq \|f\|_{\sigma+a}.$$

Proof. With

$$f \circ \varphi(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \hat{f}(k) \exp(ik \cdot x) \cdot \exp(k \cdot (\varphi(x) - \text{id}))$$

we have

$$\|f \circ \varphi\|_\sigma \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{f}(k)| \|\exp(ik \cdot x)\|_\sigma \cdot \|\exp(k \cdot (\varphi(x) - \text{id}))\|_\sigma.$$

By Remark 2.1 one obtains $\|\exp(ik \cdot x)\|_\sigma = e^{\sigma|k|_\eta}$. On the other hand, with $|k| \leq |k|_\eta$ and triangle inequality we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\exp(k \cdot (\varphi(x) - \text{id}))\|_\sigma &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} \|k \cdot (\varphi(x) - \text{id})\|_\sigma^j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{|k|_\eta^j}{j!} \|\varphi(x) - \text{id}\|_\sigma^j \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{a^j |k|_\eta^j}{j!} = e^{a|k|_\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\|f \circ \varphi\|_\sigma \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{f}(k)| e^{(\sigma+a)|k|_\eta} = \|f\|_{\sigma+a},$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 5.3 (Cauchy's estimate Lemma). *Let $f, \varphi \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma^\infty)$ be given. Then for $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\sigma > 0$, it holds*

$$\|Df \cdot \varphi\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \frac{1}{e(1-\alpha)\sigma} \|f\|_\sigma \|\varphi\|_{\alpha\sigma}.$$

Proof. It is obvious that

$$Df \cdot \varphi = i \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} (k \cdot \varphi) \hat{f}(k) e^{ik \cdot x} = i \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} (k \cdot \hat{\varphi}(\ell)) \hat{f}(k) e^{i(k+\ell) \cdot x}.$$

Recalling Remark 2.1 we have

$$\|\exp(i(k+\ell) \cdot x)\|_{\alpha\sigma} = \exp(\alpha\sigma|k+\ell|_\eta) \leq \exp(\alpha\sigma|k|_\eta + \alpha\sigma|\ell|_\eta) = e^{\alpha\sigma|k|_\eta} \cdot e^{\alpha\sigma|\ell|_\eta}.$$

Therefore, by $|k| \leq |k|_\eta$ one derives the conclusion as

$$\begin{aligned} \|Df \cdot \varphi\|_{\alpha\sigma} &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |k| |\hat{\varphi}(\ell)| |\hat{f}(k)| \|\exp(i(k+\ell) \cdot x)\|_{\alpha\sigma} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |k|_\eta |\hat{\varphi}(\ell)| |\hat{f}(k)| e^{\alpha\sigma|k|_\eta} \cdot e^{\alpha\sigma|\ell|_\eta} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |k|_\eta e^{-(1-\alpha)\sigma|k|_\eta} \cdot |\hat{f}(k)| e^{\sigma|k|_\eta} \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{\varphi}(\ell)| e^{\alpha\sigma|\ell|_\eta} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{e(1-\alpha)\sigma} \|f\|_\sigma \|\varphi\|_{\alpha\sigma}, \quad (5.1)$$

where the following trivial fact is employed in (5.1):

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \left(|k|_\eta e^{-(1-\alpha)\sigma|k|_\eta} \right) \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(t e^{-(1-\alpha)st} \right) = \frac{1}{e(1-\alpha)\sigma}.$$

□

Let a map $f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma^\infty)$ be given. Then for $K \in \mathbb{N}$, let us define the truncation map \mathcal{T}_K as well as the residual map \mathcal{R}_K as

$$\mathcal{T}_K f = \sum_{|k|_\eta \leq K} \hat{f}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad \mathcal{R}_K f = \sum_{|k|_\eta > K} \hat{f}(k) e^{ik \cdot x},$$

respectively. Therefore $\mathcal{T}_K + \mathcal{R}_K = \text{id}$ holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $\mathcal{T}_K + \mathcal{R}_K = \text{id}$ for all maps f without Fourier constants and $K \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

Lemma 5.4 (Cauchy type Lemma). *Given a map $f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma^\infty)$ without Fourier constant term, then it holds*

$$\|D\mathcal{T}_k f\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq K \|\mathcal{T}_k f\|_{\alpha\sigma}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|Df\|_0 \leq \frac{1}{e\sigma} \|f\|_\sigma.$$

Proof. Using $|k| \leq |k|_\eta$ and recalling 2.1 one directly proves that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D\mathcal{T}_k f\|_\sigma &\leq \sum_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K} |k| |\hat{F}(k)| \|e^{ik \cdot x}\|_\sigma \leq \sum_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K} |k|_\eta |\hat{F}(k)| e^{\sigma|k|_\eta} \\ &\leq K \sum_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K} |\hat{F}(k)| e^{\sigma|k|_\eta} = K \|\mathcal{T}_k f\|_\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by $|k| \leq |k|_\eta$ and $et \leq e^t$ it is shown that

$$\|Df\|_0 \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |k|_\eta |\hat{f}(k)| \leq \frac{1}{e\sigma} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{f}(k)| e^{\sigma|k|_\eta} = \frac{1}{e\sigma} \|f\|_\sigma.$$

□

Lemma 5.5 (Small divisor Lemma). *Let a nonresonant frequency $\omega \in \mathbb{T}^\infty$ be given. Then for $f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma^\infty)$ without Fourier constant term, the unique solution for the homological truncation equation*

$$\omega \cdot \partial g = \mathcal{T}_K f, \quad g := \mathcal{L}\mathcal{T}_K f \quad (5.2)$$

satisfies the estimate

$$\|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{T}_K f\|_\sigma \leq \left(\max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \right) \|f\|_\sigma.$$

Proof. The unique solution of the homological truncation equation (5.2) can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{T}_K f = \sum_{0 \neq |k|_\eta \leq K} \frac{\hat{f}(k)}{ik \cdot \omega} e^{ik \cdot x}.$$

As a consequence, one concludes

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{T}_K f\|_\sigma &\leq \sum_{0 \neq |k|_\eta \leq K} \frac{|\hat{f}(k)|}{|k \cdot \omega|} \|e^{ik \cdot x}\|_\sigma \leq \left(\max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \right) \left(\sum_{0 \neq |k|_\eta \leq K} |\hat{f}(k)| e^{\sigma|k|_\eta} \right) \\ &= \left(\max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \right) \|\mathcal{T}_K f\|_\sigma \end{aligned}$$

due to Remark 2.1, which proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.6 (Residual term Lemma). *Given $f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{T}_\sigma^\infty)$, then for $0 < \alpha < 1$, it holds*

$$\|\mathcal{R}_K f\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq e^{-(1-\alpha)\sigma K} \|\mathcal{R}_K f\|_\sigma.$$

Proof. With Remark 2.1 we prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_K f\|_{\alpha\sigma} &\leq \sum_{|k|_\eta > K} |\hat{f}(k)| \|e^{ik \cdot x}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \sum_{|k|_\eta > K} |\hat{f}(k)| e^{\alpha\sigma|k|_\eta} \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{|k|_\eta > K} e^{(\alpha-1)\sigma|k|_\eta} \right) \left(\sum_{|k|_\eta > K} |\hat{f}(k)| e^{\sigma|k|_\eta} \right) \leq e^{-(1-\alpha)\sigma K} \|\mathcal{R}_K f\|_\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

\square

5.2 Linearization of vector fields over \mathbb{T}^∞ via non-Newtonian iteration

In what follows, we will always assume that the perturbation P of a constant vector field ω on \mathbb{T}^∞ has Fourier series expansion as $P = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \hat{P}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}$, and possesses certain different regularity under different nonresonance for frequencies ω , which will be determined in Section 5.2.4.

5.2.1 Abstract KAM Theorem

To prove the specific KAM theorems in this paper, let us first show an abstract m -weighted KAM result. As one will see later, our convergence rate is *arbitrarily slow* (it depends on the convergence rate of series $\sum_0^\nu \Delta_j \varepsilon_j$ in Iterative Lemma 5.8). In the KAM history, the iteration is always be of Newtonian, i.e., superexponential. However, when weakening smoothness is considered, such rapid convergence will become resistance. As done in [1, 29, 33], the convergence rate could also be arbitrarily slow, therefore sharp regularity (in view of counterexamples) has been achieved. Our Theorem 5.1 follows from the same viewpoint, and as a consequence, we obtain such sharp result in the infinite dimensional case for the first time.

Theorem 5.1 (Abstract m -weighted KAM). *Let $b > 1$ and a nonresonant constant vector field $\omega \in \mathbb{T}^\infty$ be given.*

(I) *Suppose that there exists some $0 < q < 1$ and a non-negative sequence $\{d_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1} < b$ such that*

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} q^\nu \exp \left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j \right) b^\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} < +\infty, \quad (5.3)$$

where $\gamma = \frac{3}{4}(1-\lambda)$ and $\lambda = b^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1}$. Then there exists a weight m , as long as the perturbation P is sufficiently small in the sense that $\|P\|_m \ll 1$, one has a modifying term $\tilde{\omega}$ and a nearly identical transformation Ψ such that $\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P$ is conjugated to ω , i.e.,

$$\Psi^*(\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P) = \omega.$$

(II) The weight m could be chosen as

$$\overline{\lim}_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(\mu) e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}}}{m(b^{\mu-1})} < +\infty$$

with

$$\rho(\mu) = \sum_{\nu=\mu}^{\infty} q^{\nu-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^{\nu} \max_{0 < |k|_{\eta} \leq b^{\nu}} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1}.$$

The proof of Abstract KAM Theorem 5.1 will be shown in detail from Sections 5.2.2 to 5.2.5.

5.2.2 Main strategy

Firstly, let us present the classical KAM strategy of our proof. It should be noted that although we apply the idea of Pöschel in his preprint [29], it is indeed different in many details, e.g., in the construction of iterative sequences (especially, we introduce a balancing sequence $\{d_{\nu}\}_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}}$ to overcome nonresonance, because Pöschel's idea indeed only works for Diophantine nonresonance in the finite dimensional case) as well as infinite dimensional structure.

Assume that we have constructed a modifying term $\tilde{\omega}$ and a coordinate transformation Ψ such that

$$\Psi^*(\omega + P - \tilde{\omega}) = \omega + Q, \quad (5.4)$$

where P is a finitely order Fourier series of the original perturbation (namely at most of order $|k|_{\eta} > K$ and without constant term). Then using the Banach contraction theorem (indeed, Pöschel employed Brouwer fixed point theorem in [29], but we have to apply Banach contraction theorem instead of it because the dimension is infinite) on a ball \mathcal{B} via special metric, we obtain another modifying term ω' and a coordinate transformation Φ (note that they admit uniqueness) such that

$$\Phi^*(\omega + Q - \Psi^*\omega') = \omega + Q^+, \quad (5.5)$$

here Q^+ is an intermediate quantity, and moreover we could obtain accurate estimates for ω' and Φ due to the quantitative property of \mathcal{B} . Now define the new modifying term $\tilde{\omega}_+ := \tilde{\omega} + \omega'$ and the coordinate transformation $\Psi_+ := \Psi \circ \Phi$. Then it follows from (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_+^*(\omega + P - \tilde{\omega}_+) &= \Phi^*(\Psi^*(\omega + P - \tilde{\omega}) - \Psi^*\omega') \\ &= \Phi^*(\omega + Q - \Psi^*\omega') \\ &:= \omega + Q^+, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_+^*(\omega + P_+ - \tilde{\omega}_+) &= \omega + Q^+ + \Psi_+^*(P_+ - P) \\ &:= \omega + Q_+, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where the order of P_+ is larger than P and tends to infinite order during the iteration process. Recall (5.4), therefore (5.6) provides one cycle of the KAM iteration. Finally, we will prove the uniform convergence of (5.6), which implies the desired conjugacy as

$$\Psi_{\infty}^*(\omega + P_{\infty} - \tilde{\omega}_{\infty}) = \omega + Q_{\infty} = \omega.$$

Here we measure the original perturbation P_{∞} (note that P_+ tends to P_{∞} because it is indeed a truncation of P_{∞}) by a special m -norm instead of the usual analytic norm, and therefore the regularity of it might be Gevrey or even C^{∞} .

5.2.3 KAM Step

In this section we establish Step Lemma 5.7 that will serve as a crucial induction step in KAM iteration.

Lemma 5.7 (Step Lemma). *Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha := 2^{-1}(\lambda + 1) \in (0, 1)$ be given. Consider $\Psi^*(\omega + P) = \omega + Q$. Assume that*

$$4\Delta\|Q\|_\sigma \leq \kappa := \frac{1}{4} \wedge \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1\right), \quad \|D\Psi - \mathbb{I}\|_\sigma \leq \frac{1}{7} \quad (5.7)$$

with $\Delta := K \max_{|k|, |\eta| \leq K} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1}$ and $\sigma K \geq (1 - \lambda)^{-1}$. Then one can find a (unique) modifying term ω' and a (unique) transformation Φ satisfying

$$\Delta|\omega'| \vee K \|\Phi - \text{id}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq 4\Delta\|Q\|_\sigma \leq \kappa, \quad (5.8)$$

such that

$$\Phi^*\Psi^*(\omega + P - \omega') = \omega + Q^+. \quad (5.9)$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\|Q^+\|_{\lambda\sigma} \leq 12e^{-\gamma\sigma K}\|Q\|_\sigma, \quad \gamma := \frac{3}{4}(1 - \lambda) > 0. \quad (5.10)$$

Proof. Recall (5.5), i.e.,

$$\Phi^*(\omega + Q - \Psi^*\omega') = \omega + Q^+.$$

Then letting $\Phi = \text{id} + \hat{\Phi}$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} D\hat{\Phi} \cdot \omega + D\Phi \cdot Q^+ &= D\hat{\Phi} \cdot (\omega + Q^+) - \omega \\ &= (\omega + Q - \Psi^*\omega') \circ \Phi - \omega \\ &= (Q - \Psi^*\omega') \circ \Phi. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

We solve the following equations

$$\begin{cases} D\hat{\Phi} \cdot \omega = \mathcal{T}_K(Q - \Psi^*\omega') \circ \Phi, \\ D\Phi \cdot Q^+ = \mathcal{R}_K(Q - \Psi^*\omega') \circ \Phi \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

instead of solving (5.11). Consider the first equation in (5.12), with

$$\Theta := D\Psi^{-1}(D\Psi - \mathbb{I}) \quad (5.13)$$

and the map given by

$$\mathcal{S}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) := (Q + \Theta\omega') \circ (\text{id} + \hat{\Phi}), \quad (5.14)$$

one calculates the equivalent form as

$$\begin{aligned} D\hat{\Phi} \cdot \omega + \omega' &= \mathcal{T}_K(Q - \Psi^*\omega') \circ \Phi + \omega' \\ &= \mathcal{T}_K(Q - \omega' + \Theta\omega') \circ \Phi + \omega' \\ &= \mathcal{T}_K((Q + \Theta\omega') \circ \Phi - \omega') + \omega' \\ &= \mathcal{T}_K(Q + \Theta\omega') \circ (\text{id} + \hat{\Phi}) \\ &= \mathcal{T}_K\mathcal{S}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that ω' is constant, we therefore solve the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} D\hat{\Phi} \cdot \omega = (\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T}_0) \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}), \\ \omega' = \mathcal{T}_0 \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}). \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

Since the operator $D \cdot \omega = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i \partial_{x_i} = \omega \cdot \partial$ yields the small divisors and there is no constant term in the first equation in (5.15), then by Lemma 5.5 we have

$$\begin{cases} \omega' = \mathcal{T}_0 \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}), \\ \hat{\Phi} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T}_0) \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}). \end{cases} \quad (5.16)$$

With the fact that $\|X\|_\sigma = \|X\|_0 = |X|$ holds for constant X in mind, then solution for (5.16) is equivalent to the fixed point of map \mathcal{Q}

$$\mathcal{Q}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) := \begin{cases} \omega'_1 = \mathcal{T}_0 \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}), \\ \hat{\Phi}_1 = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T}_0) \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) \end{cases} \quad (5.17)$$

in a ball \mathcal{B} defined as

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ (\omega', \hat{\Phi}) \in \Omega : \Delta|\omega'| \vee K \|\hat{\Phi}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq 4\Delta\|Q\|_\sigma \leq \kappa \right\}, \quad (5.18)$$

where the space Ω is chosen as

$$\Omega := \left\{ (\omega', \hat{\Phi}) : \omega' = \text{constant}, \hat{\Phi} = \sum_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K} \hat{\Phi}_k e^{ik \cdot x} \right\}.$$

And this inspires us to apply the Banach contraction theorem because one easily verifies that \mathcal{B} is indeed a Banach space endowed with the metric in (5.18). To this end, we should verify that for every $(\omega'_1, \hat{\Phi}_1)$ arising from initial value $(\omega', \hat{\Phi})$ under the map \mathcal{Q} defined in (5.17) still belongs to the ball \mathcal{B} , in the sense of given metric.

By (5.13), Neumann Lemma 5.1 and smallness assumption (5.7) we have

$$\|\Theta\|_\sigma = \|D\Psi^{-1}(D\Psi - \mathbb{I})\|_\sigma \leq \|D\Psi^{-1}\|_\sigma \|D\Psi - \mathbb{I}\|_\sigma \leq \frac{1/7}{1 - 1/7} = \frac{1}{6}, \quad (5.19)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q + \Theta\omega'\|_\sigma &\leq \|Q\|_\sigma + \|\Theta\omega'\|_\sigma \leq \|Q\|_\sigma + \|\Theta\|_\sigma |\omega'| \\ &\leq \|Q\|_\sigma + \frac{1}{6} \cdot 4\|Q\|_\sigma \leq 2\|Q\|_\sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

because ω' is constant. In view of $\sigma K \geq (1 - b^{-1})^{-1}$, one then concludes from (5.18) that

$$\|\hat{\Phi}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \frac{1}{4K} \leq \frac{1 - \lambda}{4} \sigma = \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \sigma. \quad (5.21)$$

Therefore, it follows from (5.14), (5.20), (5.21) and Transformation Lemma 5.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) \right\|_{\alpha\sigma} &= \left\| (Q + \Theta\omega') \circ (\text{id} + \hat{\Phi}) \right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \|Q + \Theta\omega'\|_{\alpha\sigma + 2^{-1}(1-\alpha)\sigma} \\ &= \|Q + \Theta\omega'\|_{2^{-1}(1+\alpha)\sigma} \leq \|Q + \Theta\omega'\|_\sigma \leq 2\|Q\|_\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

On these grounds, one can observe from (5.17) and (5.22) that

$$\Delta|\omega'_1| = \Delta\|\omega'_1\|_{\alpha\sigma} = \Delta\left\|\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi})\right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \Delta\left\|\mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi})\right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq 4\Delta\|Q\|_{\sigma},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} K\|\hat{\Phi}_1\|_{\alpha\sigma} &= K\left\|\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T}_0)\mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi})\right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \\ &\leq K\max_{0 < |k|_q \leq K} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \left\|(\mathcal{T}_k - \mathcal{T}_0)\mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi})\right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \\ &\leq \Delta\left\|\mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi})\right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq 4\Delta\|Q\|_{\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

These imply that the map \mathcal{L} is indeed a self map in the Banach space \mathcal{B} . We are now in a position to prove its contraction property.

With (5.14) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) - \mathcal{T}(\omega'', \hat{\Phi}') &= (Q + \Theta\omega') \circ (\text{id} + \hat{\Phi}) - (Q + \Theta\omega'') \circ (\text{id} + \hat{\Phi}') \\ &= [(Q + \Theta\omega') \circ \Phi - (Q + \Theta\omega'') \circ \Phi'] + [(\Theta(\omega' - \omega'')) \circ \Phi'] \\ &:= \mathcal{J}_1 + \mathcal{J}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

By recalling $\hat{\Phi}$ is a truncated Fourier series, it follows from (5.18) and Cauchy type Lemma 5.4 that

$$\|D\hat{\Phi}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq K\|\hat{\Phi}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \alpha^{-1} - 1,$$

then similarly by Neumann Lemma 5.1 one has

$$\|D\Phi\|_{\alpha\sigma} \vee \|D\Phi^{-1}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \alpha^{-1}. \quad (5.25)$$

Note (5.25) implies that any map in \mathcal{B} maps $\mathbb{T}_{\alpha\sigma}^{\infty}$ into $\mathbb{T}_{\sigma}^{\infty}$. Then by Cauchy's estimate in Lemma 5.4 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{J}_1\|_{\alpha\sigma} &\leq \frac{1}{e(1-\alpha)\sigma} \|Q + \Theta\omega'\|_{\sigma} \|\Phi - \Phi'\|_{\alpha\sigma} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{e(1-\alpha)\sigma K} \cdot 2\|Q\|_{\sigma} K \|\Phi - \Phi'\|_{\alpha\sigma} \\ &\leq 4\|Q\|_{\sigma} K \|\Phi - \Phi'\|_{\alpha\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

where $\sigma K \geq (1-\lambda)^{-1}$ is used in (5.26). Besides, one observes that (5.21) also holds for $\hat{\Phi}'$, then the Transformation Lemma 5.2 gives (similar to (5.22))

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{J}_2\|_{\alpha\sigma} &= \|(\Theta(\omega' - \omega'')) \circ \Phi'\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \|\Theta(\omega' - \omega'')\|_{\sigma} \\ &\leq \|\Theta\|_{\sigma} \|\omega' - \omega''\|_{\sigma} \leq \frac{1}{4} |\omega' - \omega''|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

because $\omega' - \omega''$ is constant, where (5.19) is employed in (5.27). Now, substituting (5.26) and (5.27) into (5.24) yields

$$K\|\hat{\Phi}_1 - \hat{\Phi}'_1\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq \Delta\left\|\mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) - \mathcal{T}(\omega'', \hat{\Phi}')\right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \quad (5.28)$$

$$\leq \Delta\|\mathcal{J}_1\|_{\alpha\sigma} + \Delta\|\mathcal{J}_2\|_{\alpha\sigma} \quad (5.29)$$

$$\leq 4\Delta\|Q\|_{\sigma} K \|\hat{\Phi} - \hat{\Phi}'\|_{\alpha\sigma} + \frac{1}{4} \Delta |\omega' - \omega''|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(K \|\hat{\Phi} - \hat{\Phi}'\|_{\alpha\sigma} + \Delta |\omega' - \omega''| \right) \quad (5.30)$$

due to (5.23) and linearity, and one uses $4\Delta\|Q\|_s \leq 1/4$ from the definition of the Banach ball \mathcal{B} in (5.18). Similarly, from (5.28) and (5.30) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta |\omega'_1 - \omega''_1| &= \Delta \left\| \mathcal{T}_0 \left(\mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) - \mathcal{T}(\omega'', \hat{\Phi}'') \right) \right\|_0 \\ &\leq \Delta \left\| \mathcal{T}(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) - \mathcal{T}(\omega'', \hat{\Phi}'') \right\|_{\alpha\sigma} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(K \|\hat{\Phi} - \hat{\Phi}'\|_{\alpha\sigma} + \Delta |\omega' - \omega''| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

because $\omega'_1 - \omega''_1$ is also constant. Combining (5.30) and (5.31) one concludes that the map \mathcal{Q} is indeed a $1/2$ -contraction in the Banach ball \mathcal{B} with respect to the norm

$$K \|\hat{\Phi} - \hat{\Phi}'\|_{\alpha\sigma} \vee \Delta |\omega' - \omega''|.$$

At this case, applying Banach contraction theorem one obtains a unique fixed point $(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) \in \mathcal{B}$ of the map \mathcal{Q} , which corresponds to the solution of the first equation in (5.12) as we forego. Moreover, the ball \mathcal{B} provides the estimate for $(\omega', \hat{\Phi}) \in \mathcal{B}$ as

$$\Delta |\omega'| \vee K \|\hat{\Phi}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \leq 4\Delta \|Q\|_\sigma \leq \kappa. \quad (5.32)$$

Finally, note that Q^+ is determined by the second equation in (5.12), then

$$Q^+ = D\Phi^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{R}_K(Q - \Psi^*\omega') \circ \Phi. \quad (5.33)$$

Recall $\|D\Psi - \mathbb{I}\|_\sigma \leq 1/7$. It follows from Neumann Lemma 5.1 and (5.32) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi^*\omega'\|_\sigma &= \|D\Psi^{-1} \cdot \omega' \circ \Psi\|_\sigma = \|D\Psi^{-1} \cdot Z\|_\sigma \\ &\leq \|D\Psi^{-1}\|_\sigma \|\omega'\|_\sigma = \|D\Psi^{-1}\|_\sigma |\omega'| \\ &\leq \frac{7}{6} |\omega'| \leq \frac{7}{6} \cdot 4 \|Q\|_\sigma = \frac{14}{3} \|Q\|_\sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

because ω' is constant. Therefore by (5.33) we prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^+\|_{\lambda\sigma} &\leq \|D\Phi^{-1}\|_{\alpha\sigma} \|\mathcal{R}_K((Q - \Psi^*\omega') \circ \Phi)\|_{\lambda\sigma} \\ &\leq \alpha^{-1} \|\mathcal{R}_K(Q - \Psi^*\omega')\|_{\lambda\sigma + 2^{-1}(1-\alpha)\sigma} \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \alpha^{-1} \|\mathcal{R}_K(Q - \Psi^*\omega')\|_{4^{-1}(1+3\lambda)\sigma} \\ &\leq \alpha^{-1} e^{-(1-4^{-1}(1+3\lambda)\sigma)\sigma K} \|Q - \Psi^*\omega'\|_\sigma \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

$$= 2(1+\lambda)^{-1} e^{-\frac{3}{4}(1-\lambda)\sigma K} \|Q - \Psi^*\omega'\|_\sigma, \quad (5.37)$$

where (5.25) and Transformation Lemma 5.2 are employed in (5.35) (similar to that in (5.22)), (5.36) is due to Residual term Lemma 5.6 (with $\alpha = 4^{-1}(1+3\lambda) \in (0, 1)$). Therefore, by observing

$$\|Q - \Psi^*\omega'\|_\sigma \leq \|Q\|_\sigma + \|\Psi^*\omega'\|_\sigma \leq \|Q\|_\sigma + \frac{14}{3} \|Q\|_\sigma = \frac{17}{3} \|Q\|_\sigma$$

through (5.34), we could conclude the desired estimate from (5.37) that

$$\|Q^+\|_{\lambda\sigma} \leq \frac{34}{3(1+\lambda)} e^{-\frac{3}{4}(1-\lambda)\sigma K} \|Q\|_\sigma \leq 12e^{-\gamma\sigma K} \|Q\|_\sigma,$$

provided with $\gamma := \frac{3}{4}(1-\lambda) > 0$. This completes the proof of Step Lemma 5.7. \square

5.2.4 KAM Iteration

Let $r > 0$ sufficiently large and $b > 1$ be given. For a non-negative sequence $\{d_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ satisfying $\overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1} < b$, let us define

$$K_\nu = b^\nu, \quad \sigma_\nu = b^{-\nu} (r + d_\nu), \quad \Delta_\nu = K_\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K_\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1}, \quad \nu \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.38)$$

Then it follows that $\sigma_\nu K_\nu \geq r$, and we have $\sigma_{\nu+1} \leq \lambda \sigma_\nu$ with $\lambda := b^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1} \in (0, 1)$ by the assumption on d_ν without loss of generality. As we will see later, such a balancing sequence $\{d_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ will overcome the nonresonance beyond polynomial's type. Besides, Cauchy type Lemma 5.4 and Small divisor Lemma 5.5 provide

$$K_\nu \|\mathcal{L} \mathcal{T}_{K_\nu} f\|_{\sigma_\nu} \vee \|D \mathcal{L} \mathcal{T}_{K_\nu} f\|_{\sigma_\nu} \leq \Delta_\nu \|\mathcal{T}_{K_\nu} f\|_{\sigma_\nu},$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{K_\nu} f\|_{\alpha \sigma_\nu} \leq e^{-(1-\alpha)r} \cdot e^{-(1-\alpha)d_\nu} \|\mathcal{R}_{K_\nu} f\|_{\sigma_\nu}.$$

On these grounds, one could obtain Step Lemma 5.7 under above setting (namely (5.38)), whenever $r \gg 1$. Now let us introduce a non-negative weight $m = \{m_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty}$, and set

$$\mathcal{K}_\nu := \left\{ 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n : K_{\nu-1} < |k|_\eta \leq K_\nu \right\}$$

for all $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. One will see later that the weight m could be appropriately and explicitly chosen from a bounded series function. For the given perturbation

$$P = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \hat{P}(k) e^{ik \cdot x},$$

we shall use the K_ν -truncation term defined as

$$P_\nu := \sum_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq K_\nu} \hat{P}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad \nu \geq 0$$

to approximate the original perturbation P . In particular, $P_\infty = P$. Moreover, define $\Delta^* P_0 := P_0$ and the difference term $\Delta^* P_\nu := P_\nu - P_{\nu-1}$ for $\nu \geq 1$. Then the above notations yield

$$\Delta^* P_\nu = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_\nu} \hat{P}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}.$$

Now we are in a position to establish Iterative Lemma 5.8.

Lemma 5.8 (Iterative Lemma). *Suppose that there exists some $0 < q < 1$ and a non-negative sequence $\{d_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (5.38) with $\overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1} < b$ such that*

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} q^\nu \exp \left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j \right) \Delta_\nu < +\infty, \quad (5.39)$$

where $\gamma = \frac{3}{4}(1-\lambda)$ and $\lambda = b^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1}$. Then there exists a weight m such that the followings hold, whenever the perturbation P of ω is sufficiently small in the sense that $\varepsilon = \|P\|_m \ll 1$. For each P_ν there exists a modifying term $\tilde{\omega}_\nu$ and a transformation Ψ_ν such that

$$\Psi_\nu^* (\omega + P_\nu - \tilde{\omega}_\nu) = \omega + Q_\nu \quad (5.40)$$

with the estimates

$$\|Q_\nu\|_{\sigma_\nu} \leq \varepsilon_\nu := C \sum_{\mu=0}^{\nu} q^{\nu-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) \frac{e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}}}{m(b^{\mu-1})} \|\Delta^* P_\mu\|_m, \quad (5.41)$$

provided with some universal constant $C > 0$, and

$$\|D\Psi_\nu - \mathbb{I}\|_{\sigma_\nu} \leq \delta_\nu := \prod_{\mu=0}^{\nu-1} (1 + 4\Delta_\mu \varepsilon_\mu) - 1. \quad (5.42)$$

Moreover, one has

$$|\tilde{\omega}_{\nu+1} - \tilde{\omega}_\nu| \leq 4\varepsilon_\nu, \quad (5.43)$$

and

$$\|D\Psi_{\nu+1} - D\Psi_\nu\|_0 \leq 12\Delta_\nu \varepsilon_\nu. \quad (5.44)$$

Remark 5.1. *Indeed, one could choose the weight m for which the boundedness holds*

$$\overline{\lim}_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(\mu) e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}}}{m(b^{\mu-1})} < +\infty, \quad \rho(\mu) := \sum_{\nu=\mu}^{\infty} q^{\nu-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1}.$$

Proof. For $\nu = 0$, let us set $Y_0 = 0$, $\Psi_0 = \text{id}$. Therefore $\Psi_0 - \text{id} = 0$, $Q_0 = P_0 = \Delta^* P_0$, and all estimates for $\nu = 0$ are satisfied if one defines $m(b^{-1}) := 1$ and $d_{-1} := 0$, and the universal $C > 0$ is chosen sufficiently large. Next we will complete the proof by induction.

It is obvious that (5.39) implies the function $\rho(\mu)$ in Remark 5.1 is well defined, and the weight m could be suitably chosen from the boundedness condition (also note that this is indeed achievable)

$$\overline{\lim}_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(\mu) e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}}}{m(b^{\mu-1})} < +\infty.$$

Next we shall establish a crucial fact via the smallness assumption for the perturbation, i.e., $\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \Delta_\nu \varepsilon_\nu \ll 1$. By exchanging the order of summation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \Delta_\nu \varepsilon_\nu &\leq C \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} b^\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \left(\sum_{\mu=0}^{\nu} q^{\nu-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) \frac{e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}} \|\Delta^* P_\mu\|_m}{m(b^{\mu-1})} \right) \\ &= C \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \frac{\rho(\mu) e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}}}{m(b^{\mu-1})} \|\Delta^* P_\mu\|_m = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \|\Delta^* P_\mu\|_m\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\|P\|_m) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

At this case, Step Lemma 5.7 is valid for all Ψ_ν and Q_ν with $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ as long as $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Applying Step Lemma 5.7 we obtain a modifying term ω'_ν and a transformation Φ_ν satisfying

$$|\omega'_\nu| \leq 4\|Q_\nu\|_{\sigma_\nu} \leq 4\varepsilon_\nu \quad (5.45)$$

and (also using Cauchy type Lemma 5.4)

$$K\|\Phi_\nu - \text{id}\|_{\alpha\sigma_\nu} \vee \|D\Phi_\nu - \mathbb{I}\|_{\alpha\sigma_\nu} \leq 4\Delta_\nu \|Q_\nu\|_{\sigma_\nu} \leq 4\Delta_\nu \varepsilon_\nu. \quad (5.46)$$

Setting the new modifying term $\tilde{\omega}_{\nu+1} = \tilde{\omega}_\nu + \omega'_\nu$ and the new transformation $\Psi_{\nu+1} = \Psi_\nu \circ \Phi_\nu$ and recalling (5.6) we get

$$\Psi_{\nu+1}^*(\omega + P_{\nu+1} - \tilde{\omega}_{\nu+1}) = \omega + Q_\nu^+ + \Psi_{\nu+1}^* \Delta^* P_{\nu+1}$$

$$:= \omega + Q_{\nu+1}. \quad (5.47)$$

With (5.47) in mind, we next establish the induction for $\|Q_\nu\|_{\sigma_\nu} \leq \varepsilon_\nu$. Let $r > 0$ be chosen sufficiently large such that $12e^{-\gamma r} \leq q \in (0, 1)$. On the one hand, Step Lemma 5.7 provides the estimate

$$\|Q_\nu^+\|_{\lambda\sigma_\nu} \leq qe^{-\gamma d_\nu} \|Q_\nu\|_{\sigma_\nu} \quad (5.48)$$

with $\lambda = b^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1} \in (0, 1)$. On the other hand, one could derive the following similar to the arguments forego

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_{\nu+1}^* \Delta^* P_{\nu+1}\|_{\lambda\sigma_\nu} &= \|D\Psi_{\nu+1}^{-1} \cdot \Delta^* P_{\nu+1} \circ \Psi_{\nu+1}\|_{\lambda\sigma_\nu} \leq 2\|\Delta^* P_{\nu+1}\|_{\alpha\sigma_\nu} \\ &= 2 \left\| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\nu+1}} \hat{P}(k) e^{ik \cdot x} \right\|_{\alpha\sigma_\nu} \leq 2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\nu+1}} |\hat{P}(k)| e^{\alpha\sigma_\nu K_{\nu+1}} \\ &\leq 2e^{\alpha b(r+d_\nu)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\nu+1}} |\hat{P}(k)| \leq \frac{2e^{\alpha b(r+d_\nu)}}{m(b^\nu)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{\nu+1}} |\hat{P}(k)| m_k \\ &= \frac{2e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)b(r+d_\nu)}}{m(b^\nu)} \|\Delta^* P_{\nu+1}\|_m, \end{aligned} \quad (5.49)$$

here $\alpha = 2^{-1}(\lambda + 1)$, and the fact $K_{\nu+1} = bK_\nu$ is used. *This turns the usual exponential weighted norm depending on the iterative sequence in KAM to the m -weighted norm introduced in this paper, which allows us to determine the concrete regularity for perturbation more feasible and convenient.* Now, it follows from (5.48) and (5.49) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{\nu+1}\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1}} &\leq \|Q_\nu^+\|_{\lambda\sigma_\nu} + \|\Psi_{\nu+1}^* \Delta^* P_{\nu+1}\|_{\lambda\sigma_\nu} \\ &\leq qe^{-\gamma d_\nu} \|Q_\nu\|_{\sigma_\nu} + \frac{2e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)b(r+d_\nu)}}{m(b^\nu)} \|\Delta^* P_{\nu+1}\|_m \\ &\leq qe^{-\gamma d_\nu} \varepsilon_\nu + \frac{2e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_\nu}}{m(b^\nu)} \|\Delta^* P_{\nu+1}\|_m \\ &= C \sum_{\mu=0}^{\nu} q^{\nu+1-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu} d_j\right) \frac{e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}} \|\Delta^* P_\mu\|_m}{m(b^{\mu-1})} + \frac{2e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_\nu} \|\Delta^* P_{\nu+1}\|_m}{m(b^\nu)} \\ &\leq C \sum_{\mu=0}^{\nu+1} q^{\nu+1-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu} d_j\right) \frac{e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}} \|\Delta^* P_\mu\|_m}{m(b^{\mu-1})} \\ &= \varepsilon_{\nu+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the induction for $\|Q_\nu\|_{\sigma_\nu} \leq \varepsilon_\nu$ in (5.41). \square

Moreover, note that both Φ_ν and Ψ_ν are nearly identical transformations, and $\Psi_{\nu+1} = \Psi_\nu \circ \Phi_\nu$. Therefore direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} D\Psi_{\nu+1} - \mathbb{I} &= D\Psi_\nu \circ \Phi_\nu \cdot D\Phi_\nu - \mathbb{I} \\ &= D\Psi_\nu \circ \Phi_\nu + D\Psi_\nu \circ \Phi_\nu \cdot (D\Phi_\nu - \mathbb{I}) - \mathbb{I} \circ \Phi_\nu \\ &= (D\Psi_\nu - \mathbb{I}) \circ \Phi_\nu + D\Psi_\nu \circ \Phi_\nu \cdot (D\Phi_\nu - \mathbb{I}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

Similar to that in (5.21), by (5.42), (5.46) and the fact that r is sufficiently large we get

$$\|\Phi_\nu - \text{id}\|_{\alpha\sigma_\nu} \leq \frac{4\Delta_\nu \varepsilon_\nu}{K_\nu} \leq \frac{4\alpha(r+d_\nu)}{K_\nu} = \alpha\sigma_\nu \leq \sigma_\nu. \quad (5.51)$$

Hence it follows from Neumann Lemma 5.1 and (5.46) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D\Psi_{\nu+1} - \mathbb{I}\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1}} &\leq \|D\Psi_{\nu} - \mathbb{I}\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} + \|D\Psi_{\nu}\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \|D\Phi_{\nu} - \mathbb{I}\|_{\sigma_{\nu+1}} \\
&\leq \delta_{\nu} + (1 + \delta_{\nu}) \cdot 4\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu} \\
&= (1 + \delta_{\nu})(1 + 4\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu}) - 1 \\
&= \left(\prod_{\mu=0}^{\nu-1} (1 + 4\Delta_{\mu}\varepsilon_{\mu}) \right) (1 + 4\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu}) - 1 \\
&= \prod_{\mu=0}^{\nu} (1 + 4\Delta_{\mu}\varepsilon_{\mu}) - 1 \\
&= \delta_{\nu+1},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (5.42) for all $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$.

As to (5.43), it suffices to recall the relation $\tilde{\omega}_{\nu+1} = \tilde{\omega}_{\nu} + \omega'_{\nu}$ and the estimate (5.45) derived from Step Lemma 5.7.

Finally, direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
D\Psi_{\nu+1} - D\Psi_{\nu} &= D(\Psi_{\nu} \circ \Phi_{\nu}) - D\Psi_{\nu} \\
&= D\Psi_{\nu} \circ \Phi_{\nu} \cdot D\Phi_{\nu} - D\Psi_{\nu} \\
&= (D\Psi_{\nu} \circ \Phi_{\nu} - D\Psi_{\nu}) + (D\Psi_{\nu} \circ \Phi_{\nu} \cdot (D\Phi_{\nu} - \mathbb{I})).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.52}$$

For the first term in (5.52), Cauchy type Lemma 5.4 as well as (5.46) provide

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D\Psi_{\nu} \circ \Phi_{\nu} - D\Psi_{\nu}\|_0 &\leq \|D^2\Psi_{\nu}\|_0 \|\Phi_{\nu} - \text{id}\|_0 \leq \frac{1}{e\sigma_{\nu}} \|D\Psi_{\nu}\|_{\sigma_{\nu}} \|\Phi_{\nu} - \text{id}\|_0 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{e\sigma_{\nu}} \|\Phi_{\nu} - \text{id}\|_{\alpha\sigma_{\nu}} \leq \frac{2\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu}}{e\sigma_{\nu}K_{\nu}} \leq \frac{2}{er} \Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu} \leq 4\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.53}$$

whenever $r \geq (2e)^{-1}$. For the second term in (5.52), it follows from (5.42) and (5.46) that

$$\|D\Psi_{\nu} \circ \Phi_{\nu} \cdot (D\Phi_{\nu} - \mathbb{I})\|_0 \leq \|D\Psi_{\nu}\|_{\alpha\sigma_{\nu}} \|D\Phi_{\nu} - \mathbb{I}\|_0 \leq \Delta_{\nu} \cdot 4\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu} \leq 8\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu}, \tag{5.54}$$

because $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Now substituting (5.53) and (5.54) into (5.52) one finally proves (5.44):

$$\|D\Psi_{\nu+1} - D\Psi_{\nu}\|_0 \leq 12\Delta_{\nu}\varepsilon_{\nu}.$$

5.2.5 Uniform convergence

The uniform convergence in Iterative Lemma 5.8 for KAM conjugacy is easy to see, that is, the modifying terms $\tilde{\omega}_{\nu}$ admit a limit denoted as $\tilde{\omega}$, the transformations Ψ_{ν} have a C^1 limit Ψ (at least C^1 , because $D\Psi$ is continuous, and Ψ might admit higher regularity), and $Q_{\nu} \rightarrow 0$ in the $\|\cdot\|_0$ norm. As a consequence, the limit form of (5.6) is

$$\Psi^*(\omega - \tilde{\omega} + P) = \omega,$$

which proves the desired KAM conjugacy for infinite dimensional vector field ω .

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We shall employ Abstract m -weighted KAM Theorem 5.1 to prove Theorem 3.1. For given $b, \eta > 1$, setting the balancing sequence as $d_j = \theta^j$ with $1 < b^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} < \theta < b$. Then it is not difficult to verify

that $\lambda = b^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} d_\nu^{-1} d_{\nu+1} = b^{-1}\theta$ and $\gamma = \frac{3}{4}(1 - \lambda) = \frac{3}{4}(1 - b^{-1}\theta)$. On the one hand, it follows that

$$\exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) = \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} \theta^j\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left(-\frac{3(1-b^{-1}\theta)}{4b(\theta-1)}\theta^\nu\right)\right). \quad (5.55)$$

On the other hand, Lemma 6.1 yields the small divisor estimate

$$b^\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \leq b^\nu \exp\left(C(\eta, \mu, b) \nu b^{\frac{\nu}{1+\eta}}\right). \quad (5.56)$$

Now one observes the following fact with some $0 < \eta' < \eta$ for $\nu \gg 1$:

$$\frac{3(1-b^{-1}\theta)}{4b(\theta-1)}\theta^\nu \geq b^{\frac{\nu}{1+\eta'}} \geq C(\eta, \mu, b) \nu b^{\frac{\nu}{1+\eta}},$$

hence (5.55) and (5.56) provide the boundedness in Theorem 5.1 for all $q \in (0, 1)$:

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} q^\nu \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} q^\nu\right) = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad (5.57)$$

which implies the existence of weight m admitted by perturbation P . More explicitly, by recalling (II) in Theorem 5.1 the weight could be chosen as $m_k = m(|k|_\eta) = \exp(|k|_\eta^{\frac{1}{1+\eta'}})$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty$ due to the fact

$$\overline{\lim}_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(\mu) e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}}}{m(b^{\mu-1})} < +\infty,$$

because one notices that $e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}} = \exp(\mathcal{O}(\theta^{\mu-1}))$ whenever $\mu \gg 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\mu) &= \sum_{\nu=\mu}^{\infty} q^{\nu-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{\nu=\mu}^{\infty} q^{-\mu} \exp\left(\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\mu-1} d_j\right) \cdot q^\nu \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu \max_{0 < |k|_\eta \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(q^{-\mu} \exp\left(\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\mu-1} d_j\right)\right) = \exp(\mathcal{O}(\theta^{\mu-1})) \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

with the help of (5.57), and we stress that $\exp(\mathcal{O}(\theta^{\mu-1})) = \mathcal{O}(m(b^{\mu-1}))$. Finally, the regularity for perturbation P is immediately derived from m_k , i.e., assuming

$$\|P\|_m = \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} |\hat{P}(k)| \exp\left(|k|_\eta^{\frac{1}{1+\eta'}}\right) \ll 1$$

for any $0 < \eta' < \eta$ (since $\theta \in (b^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}}, b)$ could be arbitrarily chosen for fixed b, η) is sufficient to obtain KAM conjugacy. This proves the desired conclusion.

Remark 5.2. *One may observe that our choice for weight m is somewhat loose, and it is indeed improvable by using more elaborate asymptotic analysis. We prefer not to state it here for the sake of simplicity.*

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3.2

The proof is based on the observation that the weighted norm for vector $k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty$ employed in our Abstract m -weighted KAM Theorem 5.1, i.e., $|k|_\eta := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle j \rangle^\eta |k_j| < +\infty$, could be replaced by any norm $\|k\|_w := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} w(\langle j \rangle) |k_j|$ with certain approximation function w , because we only use the property $|k| \leq |k|_\eta$ throughout the analysis, see lemmas given in Section 5.1 for instance. Now, it is crucial to construct a nonresonant condition for which almost all frequencies in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ hold. For weight (approximation functions) Δ and w to be determined, setting the small divisor condition as

$$|k \cdot \omega| > \frac{\gamma^*}{\Delta(\|k\|_w)}, \quad \gamma^* > 0, \quad 0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty.$$

It suffices to require $\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \frac{\gamma^*}{\Delta(\|k\|_w)} = o(1)$ as $\gamma^* \rightarrow 0^+$. Now we are in a position to establish a cardinality estimate. For $\nu \gg 1$, we observe that the largest j such that $|k_j| \neq 0$ under assumption $\|k\|_w \in [\nu - 1, \nu)$ must satisfy $j_{\max} \leq w^{-1}(\nu)$, because $w(\langle j \rangle) |k_j| \leq \|k\|_w \leq \nu$. As a consequence, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \# \{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty : \|k\|_w \in [\nu - 1, \nu)\} \\ & \leq \# \{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty : |k_0| + |k_{-1}| + |k_1| + \cdots + |k_{-[w^{-1}(\nu)]}| + |k_{[w^{-1}(\nu)]}| = \nu\} \\ & \leq 2^{2[w^{-1}(\nu)]+1} \# \{k_j \in \mathbb{N} : k_0 + k_{-1} + k_1 + \cdots + k_{-[w^{-1}(\nu)]} + k_{[w^{-1}(\nu)]} = \nu\} \\ & \leq 2^{2[w^{-1}(\nu)]+1} C_{\nu+[w^{-1}(\nu)]}^\nu. \end{aligned} \tag{5.59}$$

With (5.59) and $\gamma^* \ll 1$ one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_*^\infty} \frac{\gamma^*}{\Delta(\|k\|_w)} &= \gamma^* \sum_{\nu \geq 0} \sum_{\|k\|_w \in [\nu-1, \nu)} \frac{1}{\Delta(\|k\|_w)} \\ &= \gamma^* \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{\nu \geq 0} \frac{2^{2[w^{-1}(\nu)]+1} C_{\nu+[w^{-1}(\nu)]}^\nu}{\Delta(\nu)} \right) = \mathcal{O}(\gamma^*) = o(1) \end{aligned} \tag{5.60}$$

as desired, whenever Δ is larger than arbitrarily given polynomial's type, i.e., $\Delta(x) \gg x^L$ with any $L > 0$, and w depending on Δ could be suitably chosen to increase rapid enough, thus at this case $[w^{-1}(\nu)]$ is small (but tends to $+\infty$) and it could be killed by $\Delta(\nu)^{-1}$, we therefore obtain the boundedness of series in (5.60) (as well as global smallness if $\gamma^* \ll 1$). As a remark, in this infinite dimensional case, $\Delta(x) \gg x^L$ is essential due to the counterexamples (as the dimension tends to $+\infty$) constructed by Herman [17] and etc. This can also be seen in our argument, i.e., assuming $\Delta(x) = x^L$ with some $L > 0$, we have to require that $[w^{-1}(\nu)] = \mathcal{O}(1)$ by the properties of the combinations, which contradicts with the assumption on weight (approximation function) w , since it must tend to $+\infty$. It's also worth emphasizing that, the Jackson type approximation theorem for finitely differentiable maps admits *optimal* error estimate, and the control constant depending on dimension n indeed tends to $+\infty$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, even if there do exist nonresonant condition of polynomial's type under infinite dimensional setting, people have no way to deal with them.

Based on the above preparation, we are now ready to choose an *explicit* approximation function Δ admitted by almost all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Although the implicit case could be weaker, we prefer to choose an explicit one in order to highlight the result and avoid complexity. As an illustration, let $\Delta(x) \sim \exp((\ln x)^a)$ with some $a > 1$. One easily verifies that it is larger than any polynomial's type. It remains to construct regularity for perturbation via (I) and (II) in Theorem 5.1. For $b > 1$, setting $d_j = Aj^{a-1}$ yields $\lambda = b^{-1} \overline{\lim}_{j \rightarrow \infty} d_j^{-1} d_{j+1} = b^{-1}$ and $\gamma = \frac{3}{4}(1 - \lambda) = \frac{3}{4}(1 - b^{-1})$.

Then we let $A > a\gamma^{-1}(\ln b)^a$. Besides, one easily checks that

$$A\gamma a^{-1}(\nu-1)^a = A\gamma \int_0^{\nu-1} s^{a-1} ds \leq \gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j \leq A\gamma \int_0^{\nu} s^{a-1} ds = A\gamma a^{-1}\nu^a. \quad (5.61)$$

At this case, assuming $q \in (0, b^{-1})$ leads to the boundedness in (I)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} q^\nu \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu \max_{0 < \|k\|_w \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \\ & \leq \gamma^{*-1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} (qb)^\nu \exp(-A\gamma a^{-1}(\nu-1)^a + (\ln b)^a \nu^a) \\ & = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} (qb)^\nu\right) = \mathcal{O}(1) \end{aligned}$$

due to our choice of A . Moreover, similar to the argument in (5.58), we derive

$$\rho(\mu) = \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left(\left((\ln b)^a + \epsilon\right)\mu^a\right)\right)$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, and $e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}} = o(\exp(\mu^a))$. Note that $b > 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ could be arbitrarily chosen, therefore for any $\kappa > 1$, letting $m_k = m(\|k\|_w) \sim \exp(\kappa(\ln \|k\|_w)^a)$ is enough to obtain the relation

$$\overline{\lim}_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(\mu) e^{2^{-1}(1+\lambda)bd_{\mu-1}}}{m(b^{\mu-1})} < +\infty$$

in (II), and this yields the explicit regularity requirement for perturbation:

$$\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_\infty} |\hat{P}(k)| \exp(\kappa(\ln \|k\|_w)^a) \ll 1.$$

Finally, one easily checks that $\kappa > 1$ could be replaced by $\kappa' > 0$ in the above conclusion, if we modify the approximation $\Delta(x) \sim \exp((\ln x)^a)$ by $\Delta(x) \sim \exp((\kappa' \ln x)^a)$ for sufficiently small $\kappa'' > 0$. This proves the theorem.

5.5 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Consider (i). It is well known that frequencies satisfying finite dimensional Diophantine nonresonance in (4.1) do exist, and admit full Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R}^n . Similar to the arguments in Section 5.4, Abstract m -weighted KAM Theorem 5.1 do work for finite dimensional case, because $|k| \leq |k|$ (note that the weight w being some approximation function is only required for infinite dimensional case). Therefore, with the Diophantine assumption (4.1) for vector field, setting the balancing sequence $d_j \equiv 0$ yields

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} q^\nu \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=0}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu \max_{0 < \|k\| \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1} \leq \gamma^{*-1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} q^\nu b^{(\beta+1)\nu} = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

for all $q \in (0, b^{-\beta-1})$ and $b > 1$. Besides, by the exponential property one obtains that

$$\rho(\mu) = \sum_{\nu=\mu}^{\infty} q^{\nu-\mu} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{j=\mu}^{\nu-1} d_j\right) b^\nu \max_{0 < \|k\| \leq b^\nu} |k \cdot \omega|^{-1}$$

$$= \sum_{\nu=\mu}^{\infty} q^{\nu-\mu} b^{(\beta+1)\nu} = q^{-\mu} \sum_{\nu=\mu}^{\infty} (qb^{\beta+1})^{\nu} = \mathcal{O}\left(q^{-\mu} \cdot (qb^{\beta+1})^{\mu}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(b^{(\beta+1)\mu}\right),$$

which shows that taking the weight m as $m_k = m(|k|) = |k|^{\beta+1}$ is enough to achieve the requirement of (II) in Theorem 5.1. Therefore, the KAM conjugacy could be proved whenever $\sum_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\hat{P}(k)| |k|^{\beta+1} \ll 1$. This proves (i).

As to (ii) and (iii), it is obvious that the almost periodic results, i.e., Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, could be valid for quasi periodic case, as long as one modifies the nonresonant conditions. For example, the infinite dimensional Diophantine nonresonance gives small divisor estimate in Lemma 6.1, and after replacing $|k|_{\eta}$ by $|k|$ in the quasi periodic situation, one observes that it corresponds to $\Delta(x) \sim \exp(x^{\zeta})$ with $0 < \zeta < 1$ (because $\frac{1}{1+\eta} \in (0, 1)$ for $\eta > 0$). Therefore the desired conclusion follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1. Similarly, (iii) is promised by the proof of Theorem 3.2.

6 Appendix

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\mu > 1$. We have the following small divisor estimate for $N \gg 1$:*

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\infty} : |k|_{\eta} < N} \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + \langle j \rangle^{\mu} |k_j|^{\mu}) \leq \exp\left(C(\eta, \mu) N^{\frac{1}{1+\eta}} \ln(1 + N)\right)$$

Proof. See Lemma B.2 in [24]. □

Acknowledgements

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

References

- [1] J. ALBRECHT, *On the existence of invariant tori in nearly-integrable Hamiltonian systems with finitely differentiable perturbations*, Regul. Chaotic Dyn., 12 (2007), pp. 281–320, <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1560354707030033>.
- [2] V. Arnaiz, *Spectral stability and semiclassical measures for renormalized KAM systems*, Nonlinearity 33 (2020), pp. 2562–2591, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6544/ab7724>.
- [3] V. I. ARNOLD, *Small denominators. I. Mapping the circle onto itself*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat., 25 (1961), pp. 21–86.
- [4] V. I. ARNOLD, *Proof of a theorem of A. N. Kolmogorov on the preservation of conditionally periodic motions under a small perturbation of the Hamiltonian*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk, 18 (1963), pp. 13–40.
- [5] V. I. ARNOLD, *Small denominators and problems of stability of motion in classical and celestial mechanics*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk, 18 (1963), pp. 91–192.

- [6] M. BERTI, T. KAPPELER, R. MONTALTO, *Large KAM tori for quasi-linear perturbations of KdV*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 239 (2021), pp. 1395–1500, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-020-01596-2>.
- [7] 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, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-019-03618-x>.
- [8] A. BOUNEMOURA, *Optimal linearization of vector fields on the torus in non-analytic Gevrey classes*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire 39 (2022), pp. 501–528, <https://doi.org/10.4171/aihpc/12>.
- [9] J. BOURGAIN, *Construction of quasi-periodic solutions for Hamiltonian perturbations of linear equations and applications to nonlinear PDE*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 11 (1994), pp. 475–497, <https://doi.org/10.1155/S1073792894000516>.
- [10] J. BOURGAIN, *Construction of periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations in higher dimension*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 5 (1995), pp. 629–639, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01902055>.
- [11] J. BOURGAIN, *On invariant tori of full dimension for 1D periodic NLS*, J. Funct. Anal. 229 (2005), pp. 62–94, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2004.10.019>.
- [12] C.-Q. CHENG, L. WANG, *Destruction of Lagrangian torus for positive definite Hamiltonian systems*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 23 (2013), pp. 848–866, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-013-0213-z>.
- [13] L. CHIERCHIA, M. PROCESI, *Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser (KAM) theory for finite and infinite dimensional systems* Perturbation theory—mathematics, methods and applications, pp. 247–289, Encycl. Complex. Syst. Sci., Springer, New York, [2022] ©2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-2621-4_302.
- [14] L. H. ELIASSON, *Perturbations of stable invariant tori for Hamiltonian systems*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 15 (1988), pp. 115–147 (1989), http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASNSP_1988_4_15_1_115_0.
- [15] L. H. ELIASSON, B. GRÉBERT, S. B. KUKSIN, *KAM for the nonlinear beam equation*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 26 (2016), pp. 1588–1715, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-016-0390-7>.
- [16] M. GUARDIA, Z. HANI, E. HAUS, A. MASPERO, M. PROCESI, *Strong nonlinear instability and growth of Sobolev norms near quasiperiodic finite gap tori for the 2D cubic NLS equation*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 25 (2023), pp. 1497–1551, <https://doi.org/10.4171/jems/1200>.
- [17] M.-R. HERMAN, *Sur les courbes invariantes par les difféomorphismes de l’anneau. Vol. 2*, Astérisque, 103 (1986), pp. 248.
- [18] B. A. KHESIN, S. B. KUKSIN, D. PERALTA-SALAS, *KAM theory and the 3D Euler equation*, Adv. Math. 267 (2014), pp. 498–522, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2014.09.009>.
- [19] A. N. 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.
- [20] C. E. KOUDJINAN, *A KAM theorem for finitely differentiable Hamiltonian systems*, J. Differential Equations, 269 (2020), pp. 4720–4750, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2020.03.044>.
- [21] S. B. KUKSIN, *Hamiltonian perturbations of infinite-dimensional linear systems with imaginary spectrum*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. 21 (1987), pp. 22–37.

- [22] S. B. KUKSIN, *Fifteen years of KAM for PDE*, Geometry, topology, and mathematical physics, pp. 237–258, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 212, Adv. Math. Sci., 55, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1090/trans2/212/12>.
- [23] S. B. KUKSIN, J. PÖSCHEL, *Invariant Cantor manifolds of quasi-periodic oscillations for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Ann. of Math. (2) 143 (1996), pp. 149–179, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2118656>.
- [24] R. MONTALTO, M. PROCESI, *Linear Schrödinger equation with an almost periodic potential*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 53 (2021), pp. 386–434, <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1320742>.
- [25] J. MOSER, *A rapidly convergent iteration method and non-linear partial differential equations. I*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3), 20 (1966), pp. 265–315.
- [26] J. MOSER, *A rapidly convergent iteration method and non-linear differential equations. II*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3), 20 (1966), pp. 499–535.
- [27] G. POPOV, *KAM theorem for Gevrey Hamiltonians*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 24 (2004), pp. 1753–1786, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143385704000458>.
- [28] J. PÖSCHEL, *Small divisors with spatial structure in infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems*, Comm. Math. Phys. 127 (1990), pp. 351–393, <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.cmp/1104180143>.
- [29] J. PÖSCHEL, *KAM below C^n* , <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.01866>.
- [30] M. PROCESI, L. STOLOVITCH, *About linearization of infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems*, Comm. Math. Phys. 394 (2022), pp. 39–72, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-022-04398-7>.
- [31] H. RÜSSMANN, *Note on sums containing small divisors*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 29 (1976), pp. 755–758, <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160290615>.
- [32] D. A. SALAMON, *The Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser theorem*, Math. Phys. Electron. J. 10 (2004), Paper 3, pp. 37.
- [33] Z. C. TONG, Y. LI, *Towards continuity: Universal frequency-preserving KAM persistence and remaining regularity*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.14361>.
- [34] L. WANG, *Quantitative destruction of invariant circles*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 42 (2022), pp. 1569–1583, <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2021164>.
- [35] C. E. WAYNE, *Periodic and quasi-periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations via KAM theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. 127 (1990), pp. 479–528, <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.cmp/1104180217>.