

EMERGENCE OF GAUSSIAN FIELDS IN NOISY QUANTUM CHAOTIC DYNAMICS

MAXIME INGREMEAU AND MARTIN VOGEL

ABSTRACT. We study the long time Schrödinger evolution of Lagrangian states f_h on a compact Riemannian manifold (X, g) of negative sectional curvature. We consider two models of semiclassical random Schrödinger operators $P_h^\alpha = -h^2\Delta_g + h^\alpha Q_\omega$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, where the semiclassical Laplace-Beltrami operator $-h^2\Delta_g$ on X is subject to a small random perturbation $h^\alpha Q_\omega$ given by either a random potential or a random pseudo-differential operator. Here, the potential or the symbol of Q_ω is bounded, but oscillates and decorrelates at scale h^β , $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$. We prove a quantitative result that, under appropriate conditions on α, β , in probability with respect to ω the long time propagation

$$e^{\frac{i}{h}t_h P_h^\alpha} f_h, \quad o(|\log h|) = t_h \rightarrow \infty, \quad h \rightarrow 0,$$

rescaled to the local scale of h around a uniformly at random chosen point x_0 on X , converges in law to an isotropic stationary monochromatic Gaussian field – the Berry Gaussian field. We also provide an ω -almost sure version of this convergence along sufficiently fast decaying subsequences $h_j \rightarrow 0$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Main results	4
3. Semiclassical analysis on smooth manifolds	10
4. Classical dynamics	15
5. WKB Ansatz	26
6. Sobolev estimates of the WKB solution	37
7. Local expansions for the propagated Lagrangian states	46
8. Independence of the phases	52
9. Proof of the main results	57
References	65

1. INTRODUCTION

Background. The theory of quantum chaos aims at understanding the nature of a quantum system when its associated classical Hamiltonian system is chaotic. A guiding example is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on a negatively curved smooth Riemannian manifold X . There the geodesic flow has the Anosov property [14] which, in a sense, is the ideal chaotic behavior. The corresponding quantum dynamics is given, in the high-energy or semiclassical limit, by the unitary group generated by the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_g on $L^2(X)$. The chaotic nature of the geodesic flow is conjectured (and indeed proven in some cases) to have equidistributing influence on the spectral properties of the Laplacian. For instance, the random matrix conjecture by Bohigas-Giannoni-Schmit [7, 8, 6] states that the fluctuations of the high-lying eigenvalues should resemble those of large Wigner random matrices. The corresponding eigenfunctions are conjectured by Rudnick-Sarnack to be *uniquely quantum ergodic* [30] (see also [33]). More precisely, it is conjectured that the family of eigenfunctions $\{\psi_\lambda\}_\lambda$ of Δ_g indexed by their corresponding

Date: June 21, 2023.

Key words and phrases. Quantum chaos; Random perturbations.

eigenvalue satisfies

$$\langle \text{Op}_h(a)\psi_\lambda | \psi_\lambda \rangle \rightarrow \int_{S^*X} a d\rho, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.1)$$

for any $a \in C^\infty(S^*X)$. This conjecture is motivated by the quantum ergodicity theorem of Šnirel'man [32], Zelditch [34] and Colin de Verdière [10], claiming that (1.1) holds for a density one sequence of eigenvalues λ . We refer the reader to [12] for an account of recent advances regarding the quantum unique ergodicity conjecture.

Another way of understanding the delocalization properties of the Laplacian's eigenfunctions is covered by *Berry's random wave conjecture* [3]. It claims that, in the high energy limit, quantum chaotic eigenfunctions should resemble at a local scale a random superposition of plane waves. For decades, this statement, comparing a sequence of deterministic objects with a random object, was considered as a heuristic rather than a precise mathematical statement. However, motivated by the Benjamini-Schramm convergence in the theory of large random graphs, and by work by Bourgain [5] on the torus, it was recently suggested in [1, 21] that to make sense of the randomness in Berry's heuristic one should look at the eigenfunctions near a random point. More precisely, when ψ_λ – an eigenfunction of the Laplacian at energy λ – is rescaled to the scale of the wavelength $\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ around a randomly chosen point on the manifold, it defines a family of random functions, whose law should converge weakly to that of an isotropic stationary monochromatic Gaussian random field. See section 2.3 for definitions and for a more precise statement. Note that this interpretation of Berry's conjecture implies the quantum unique ergodicity conjecture, as is proven in [21].

The setting: Quantum chaotic propagation. In the present work we will adopt a semiclassical point of view. Rescaling the eigenvalue equation $(-\Delta_g - \lambda)\psi_\lambda = 0$ by the eigenvalue $\lambda = h^{-2}$ we get the semiclassical equation $(-h^2\Delta_g - 1)\psi_h = 0$ where $h > 0$ denotes the semiclassical parameter. Moreover, in this paper, we will not be concerned with genuine eigenfunctions of the Laplacian but rather with another important question in quantum chaos: understanding the long-time behaviour of the Schrödinger equation for highly oscillating initial data. We wish to study the long-time evolution of highly oscillatory initial data under the Schrödinger evolution semigroup $e^{-iht_h\Delta_g} f_h$ which is the solution to

$$\begin{cases} ih\partial_t u = -h^2\Delta_g u, \\ u|_{t=0} = f_h = ae^{\frac{i}{h}\phi}. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

For such long-time propagated quantum objects, one can sometimes prove properties analogous to those of genuine eigenfunctions. For instance, in [29], Schubert considered Lagrangian states f_h associated to Lagrangian manifolds that are transverse to the stable directions of the dynamics (see section 2.1), on a manifold of negative sectional curvature. He could show that the analogue of (1.1) holds, with ψ_λ replaced with $e^{-iht_h\Delta_g} f_h$, where t_h goes to infinity as $h \rightarrow 0$, while remaining smaller than some constant times $|\log h|$. Hence, the large-time evolution of Lagrangian states under the semiclassical Schrödinger equation (1.2) satisfies quantum unique ergodicity. It is thus natural to wonder if such functions do also satisfy an analogue of Berry's conjecture.

This question was first raised in [22], and was given a partial positive answer. Namely, in [22], the authors considered Lagrangian states with a *generic* phase, and first took the limit $h \rightarrow 0$, and then $t \rightarrow \infty$ to obtain convergence to a Gaussian field. This result is probably not optimal, and it seems natural to conjecture that the family of functions $e^{-iht_h\Delta_g} f_h$ satisfy Berry's conjecture as soon as f_h is a Lagrangian state associated to Lagrangian manifold that is transverse to the stable directions of the dynamics, and as soon as $t_h \rightarrow \infty$ with $t_h \leq c|\log h|$, for some small enough c .

The result: noisy quantum chaotic propagation. The aim of this paper is to prove a result of this kind, not for the genuine semiclassical Laplacian $-\frac{h^2}{2}\Delta_g$, but for generic small perturbations of the form

$$P_{h,\omega} = -\frac{h^2}{2}\Delta_g + h^\alpha Q_\omega, \quad \alpha > 0,$$

where Q_ω is either a bounded random potential or a bounded semiclassical random pseudo-differential operator obtained from the quantization of a random symbol oscillating at scale h^β , $\beta \in]0, 1/2[$. The presence of a small noise term can be motivated by the fact that in genuine physical situations an “ideal” evolution operator can be perturbed by many different sources, many of which are uncontrolled by the experimentalist. It therefore seems relevant on its own to study the propagation of initial data under the Schrödinger evolution semi-group induced by $P_{h,\omega}$.

The aim of this paper is to study the family of functions

$$e^{it_h P_{h,\omega}} f_h$$

where f_h is a Lagrangian state associated to a Lagrangian manifold that is close enough to the unstable directions of the dynamics. Following our interpretation of Berry’s conjecture, we rescale the propagated Lagrangian state to the microscale h around a uniformly at random chosen x point on X . This rescaling around x makes $e^{it_h P_{h,\omega}} f_h$ a random smooth function that depends on the *additional* random parameter ω

Our main result (Theorem 2.10 below) states that, whenever $t_h \rightarrow \infty$ with $t_h \ll |\log h|$ and under appropriate conditions on α and β , the law of the randomly rescaled smooth function ($e^{it_h P_{h,\omega}} f_h$) converges in probability (with respect to ω), to an isotropic stationary monochromatic Gaussian field – the Berry Gaussian field.

The quantitative nature of our result shows (Corollary 2.12) that, for any sufficiently fast decaying subsequence $h_j \rightarrow 0$, the randomly rescaled smooth function ($e^{it_h P_{h,\omega}} f_h$) satisfies Berry’s conjecture ω -almost surely.

The idea of adding a small generic perturbation to the semiclassical Laplace-Beltrami operator to obtain additional properties on the propagator is not new. For instance, in [16, 9], the authors propagate eigenfunctions by Schrödinger equation perturbed by a random perturbation, and obtain improved L^p bounds by averaging over the perturbation; however, these results do not give information about the eigenfunctions (or propagated eigenfunctions) of a genuine Schrödinger operator. In a similar spirit, in [15], the authors perturbed the Laplace-Beltrami operator on a manifold of negative sectional curvature, by adding to it a small random potential of size $\gg h^{1/2}$. They show that, for any initial data which is microlocalized near the energy layer there is a high probability that its propagation up to time $O(|\log h|)$ by the perturbed Schrödinger equation satisfies some form of quantum ergodicity.

Note that the kind of perturbations we use is somehow different from those of [16, 9, 15]. The perturbations imposed in these papers are always large enough to modify the underlying classical dynamics: a wave packet microlocalized around (x_0, ξ_0) , when propagated by the perturbed Schrödinger equation in the time scales under consideration in these papers, is not microlocalized around the image of (x_0, ξ_0) by the corresponding geodesic flow. In contrast, we permit much smaller perturbations, which do not affect the classical dynamics, but which will only modify the phases of wave packets.

This allows for some delicate phase cancellations between wave packets, which we believe to be a good toy model for quantum chaos. It should thus be easier to prove quantum chaotic properties for eigenfunctions of $P_{h,\omega}$ with a generic ω than for the genuine Laplacian; such considerations will be pursued elsewhere.

Acknowledgements. This article was influenced by discussions with Alejandro Rivera, and we would like to thank him for that. The authors would also like to thank Stéphane Nonnenmacher for suggesting Remark 5.2, as well as Ofer Zeitouni for a helpful discussion. Both authors were partially funded by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche, through the project ADYCT (ANR-20-CE40-0017).

2. MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Lagrangian states. Let (X, g) be a smooth compact connected Riemannian manifold without boundary and of negative sectional curvature. A *Lagrangian state* on X is a family of functions $f_h \in C^\infty(X)$ indexed by $h \in]0, 1]$, defined by

$$f_h(x) = a(x)e^{i\phi(x)/h}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ for some connected and simply connected open subset $\mathcal{O} \subset X$ and $a \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{O})$. To a Lagrangian state we can associate a *Lagrangian manifold*

$$\Lambda_\phi := \{(x, d_x\phi); x \in \mathcal{O}\} \subset T^*X.$$

A Lagrangian state is called *monochromatic* if $\Lambda_\phi \subset S^*X := \{(x, \xi) \in T^*X; |\xi|_x = 1\}$, i.e. if

$$|d_x\phi| = 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{O}. \quad (2.2)$$

As we will explain in Section 4.2, the dynamics of the geodesic flow is hyperbolic on S^*X , so for any $\rho \in S^*X$ we may decompose the tangent spaces $T_\rho S^*X$ into *unstable*, *neutral* and *stable directions*

$$T_\rho S^*X = E_\rho^+ \oplus E_\rho^0 \oplus E_\rho^-.$$

Definition 2.1. For every $\eta > 0$, we say that a Lagrangian manifold $\Lambda_\phi \subset S^*X$ is η -unstable if, for every $\rho \in \Lambda_\phi$ and for every $v \in T_\rho\Lambda$, writing $v = (v_+, v_-, v_0) \in E_\rho^+ \oplus E_\rho^- \oplus E_\rho^0$, we have

$$|(0, v_-, 0)|_\rho \leq \eta|v|_\rho.$$

Recall that the intrinsic distance $\text{dist}_\Lambda(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ between two points $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda$ is the minimal length of curves in Λ joining ρ_1 and ρ_2 , the length being computed using an arbitrary metric on T^*X (see section 2.6). We define the *distortion* of Λ as

$$\text{distortion}(\Lambda) := \sup_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda} \frac{\text{dist}_\Lambda(\rho_1, \rho_2)}{\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_1, \rho_2)}. \quad (2.3)$$

2.2. Noisy propagation of Lagrangian states. Let $h > 0$ and let $0 \leq \delta = \delta(h) \ll 1$. Consider the Schrödinger-type operator

$$P_h^\delta := -\frac{h^2}{2}\Delta_g + \delta Q_\omega, \quad (2.4)$$

where Δ_g denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator on (X, g) and where Q_ω is a random perturbation described in detail below. The aim of this paper is to study the large-time evolution of monochromatic Lagrangian states f_h on X under the Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{cases} ih\partial_t u = P_h^\delta u, \\ u|_{t=0} = f_h. \end{cases}$$

In other word we are interested in the propagated Lagrangian state

$$u = e^{i\frac{t}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h, \quad \text{for } t \gg 1. \quad (2.5)$$

We will consider the two types of random perturbations Q_ω :

1. The case where Q_ω is the operator of multiplication by a random real-valued function

$$q_\omega : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{Random Potential case})$$

2. The case where Q_ω is a pseudo-differential operator given by the quantization

$$Q_\omega := \text{Op}_h(q_\omega) \quad (\text{Random } \Psi\text{DO case})$$

of a random real-valued function

$$q_\omega : T^*X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

belonging to the symbol class $S_\beta^{-\infty}(T^*X)$ (cf. Section 3.1 for definition of this notion).

Let us now describe what models of random functions q_ω we consider. Fix a parameter $\beta \in]0, 1/2[$, let $J_h \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a set of indices of cardinality $|J_h| = O(h^{-M})$, for some $M > 0$, and let $\{q_j\}_{j \in J_h}$ be a family of possibly h -dependent smooth compactly supported functions on X , when we are in the [Random Potential case](#), or on T^*X when we are in the [Random \$\Psi\$ DO case](#). To construct a random function on X (resp. on the phase space T^*X) from the single-site potentials q_j , we let $\omega = \{\omega_j\}_{j \in J_h}$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed (iid) random variables (the precise assumptions we make on the $\{\omega_j\}$ will be described in Hypothesis 2.6 below) and we set

$$\begin{aligned} q_\omega(\rho) &:= \sum_{j \in J_h} \omega_j q_j(\rho), & \text{in the [Random \$\Psi\$ DO case](#),} \\ q_\omega(x) &:= \sum_{j \in J_h} \omega_j q_j(x), & \text{in the [Random Potential case](#).} \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

We make the following additional assumptions.

Hypothesis 2.2 (Hypotheses on the single-site potential).

- i. Each q_j is compactly supported, with a support of diameter $O(h^\beta)$ uniformly in $j \in J_h$.
- ii. There exists $C > 0$, independent of h , such that for all $\rho \in X$ (resp. $\rho \in T^*X$), ρ belongs to the support of at most C functions q_j .
- iii. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $C_k > 0$ such that

$$\|q_j\|_{C^k} \leq C_k h^{-\beta k} \quad \forall j \in J_h. \tag{2.7}$$

- iv. There exists $c_0 > 0$ such that, for any $T > 0$ and any $\rho \in S^*X$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in J_h} \int_0^T q_j(\Phi^t(\rho)) dt \geq c_0 T, \tag{2.8}$$

in the [Random \$\Psi\$ DO case](#). Here, $\Phi^t : T^*X \rightarrow T^*X$ denotes the geodesic flow. In the [Random Potential case](#), we work with the same assumption but with $q_j(\Phi^t(\rho))$ replaced by $q_j(\pi_X \circ \Phi^t(\rho))$, where $\pi_X : T^*X \rightarrow X$ denotes the projection on the base manifold X .

Example 2.3. To build such a family of single-site potentials, one may for instance cover X (resp. S^*X) by geodesic balls $B(\rho_j, h^\beta)$ of radius h^β and centred at ρ_j , such that each point belongs to at most C balls. We may then take

$$q_j = \chi \left(h^{-\beta} \text{dist}(\rho_{j,h}, \rho) \right),$$

where $\chi \in C_c^\infty([0, \infty); [0, 1])$ takes value 1 on $[0, 1]$, and where dist means either dist_X or dist_{T^*X} .

Hypothesis 2.4. We suppose that there exists $0 < \varepsilon_0 < \frac{1}{4}$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \leq h_0$, we have

$$\delta h^{-2\beta - \varepsilon_0} \leq 1, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\delta^2 h^{\beta - 2} \geq h^{-\varepsilon_0}. \tag{2.10}$$

In the [Random Potential case](#), we will also need to assume that

$$\delta h^{\beta - 1} \leq h^{\varepsilon_0}. \tag{2.11}$$

Remark 2.5. It is natural to consider the case $\delta = h^\alpha$ with $2\beta \leq \alpha$. However, we will stick with a coupling constant δ for the sake of generality.

Note that when $\delta = h^\alpha$, conditions (2.9) and (2.10) rewrite

$$0 < \beta < \min \left(\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2 - 2\alpha \right),$$

while (2.11) rewrites

$$\beta > 1 - \alpha.$$

These conditions are plotted on Figure 1.

Finally, we need some assumption on the probability distributions ω_j .




Figure 1. Admissible parameters α and β , see Hypothesis 2.4. The dark grey region is admissible for the [Random Potential](#) case and the [Random \$\Psi\$ DO](#) case, while the light grey region is only admissible in the [Random \$\Psi\$ DO](#) case.

Hypothesis 2.6. We suppose that the iid random variables $(\omega_j)_{j \in J_n}$ satisfy the following assumptions:

- (1) The ω_j are bounded.
- (2) $\text{Var}(\omega_j) > 0$.
- (3) If (2.11) does not hold, we suppose that each ω_j has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

2.3. Randomization, local weak limits and the Berry Gaussian field. The aim of this paper is to compare a noisily propagated Lagrangian state $u = e^{i\frac{t}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h$ (2.5) locally near a *randomly chosen point* on X with a stationary isotropic smooth monochromatic Gaussian stochastic process. To do this we will – roughly speaking – pick a point x_0 of X uniformly at random, rescale u near x_0 to the microscopic scale h in local geodesic coordinates, and then compare this now probabilistic rescaled version of u with a Gaussian stochastic process. To make this precise we will recall notions introduced in [22].

2.3.1. Random smooth functions. In what follows we equip the space $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the topology of the convergence of all derivatives over all compact sets, i.e. for the topology induced by the family of seminorms

$$\|f\|_n := \max_{x \in B(0,n)} \max_{|\alpha| \leq n} |\partial^\alpha f(x)|, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Notice that $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a separable Fréchet, and therefore a Polish, space. The above topology can metrized with the distance

$$d(f, g) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \min(\|f - g\|_n, 1). \quad (2.12)$$

We equip $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$. A *random smooth function on \mathbb{R}^d* is a random variable with values in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We refer the reader to the review [27, Appendix A] for more details on this notion.

We highlight the notion of *convergence in law*. A sequence of random smooth functions $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on \mathbb{R}^d is said to converge in law to a random smooth function f on \mathbb{R}^d , i.e.

$$f_n \xrightarrow{d} f, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

if the laws of the random functions converge weakly. More explicitly, this means that for all bounded continuous functions $F \in C_b(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(f_n)] \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[F(f)], \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

2.3.2. *Randomization and local weak limits.* Our aim is to study the convergence of a sequence of deterministic smooth functions on X near a randomly chosen point at the scale $h > 0$. To avoid any topological difficulties, we define this convergence locally, though all of our results will hold regardless of the choice of localization.

Let $\mathcal{U} \subset X$ be a small enough open set so that we can define an orthonormal frame $V = (V_1, \dots, V_d)$ on it, that is to say a family of smooth sections $(V_i)_{i=1, \dots, d} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow TX$ such that, for each $x \in \mathcal{U}$, $(V_1(x), \dots, V_d(x))$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_x X$. If $x \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we will write $\mathbf{y}V(x) := \mathbf{y}_1 V_1(x) + \dots + \mathbf{y}_d V_d(x) \in T_x X$, and

$$\exp_x(\mathbf{y}) := \exp_x(\mathbf{y}V(x)). \quad (2.13)$$

Here \exp_x denotes the exponential map restricted to $T_x X$. Note that the map (2.13) is well defined for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ since the underlying Riemannian manifold is complete. All the constructions in this section will depend on the choice of the local frame V , and will hence not be intrinsic.

With the above quantities and definitions in mind, we can define our notion of *local weak limit*.

Definition 2.7. (*Local weak limit*) Let (X, g) be a compact smooth Riemannian manifold. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset X$ be an open set and V an orthonormal frame on \mathcal{U} as in (2.13). Let $\{f_h\}_{h>0}$ be a family of functions in $C^\infty(X)$, and let \mathfrak{f} be a smooth random function on $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let x be a random variable with values in \mathcal{U} uniformly distributed with respect to the Riemannian volume measure on \mathcal{U} .

Then, we say that \mathfrak{f} is the local weak limit of $\{f_h\}_h$ in the frame V if the random smooth function $\mathfrak{f}_{x,h}(\mathbf{y}) := f_h(\exp_x(h\mathbf{y}))$ on \mathbb{R}^d converges in law to \mathfrak{f} as $h \rightarrow 0$, i.e. if

$$\mathfrak{f}_{x,h} \xrightarrow{d} \mathfrak{f}, \quad h \rightarrow 0.$$

Let us give some remarks on that definition: $\mathfrak{f}_{x,h}$ is a well defined $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ random function \mathbb{R}^d . We refer the reader to the review [27, Appendix A] for more details on this notion. Furthermore, we recall that, by definition, saying that \mathfrak{f} is the local weak limit of $\{\mathfrak{f}_{x,h}\}_h$ in the frame V means that, for any bounded continuous functional $F : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x[F(\mathfrak{f}_{x,h})] := \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\mathfrak{f}_{x,h}) dv_g(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[F(\mathfrak{f})] \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.14)$$

where dv_g denotes the Riemannian volume measure on X .

2.3.3. *The Berry Gaussian field.* An almost surely (or a.s.) C^∞ (centered) Gaussian field on \mathbb{R}^d is a random variable \mathfrak{f} taking, up to a set of probability 0, values in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for any finite collection of points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the random vector $(\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{x}_k)) \in \mathbb{C}^d$ is (centered) Gaussian. We say that two fields \mathfrak{f}_1 and \mathfrak{f}_2 are *equivalent* if they have the same law. In the sequel, unless otherwise stated, we will always identify fields which are equivalent.

Let \mathfrak{f} be an a.s. C^∞ , centered Gaussian field on \mathbb{R}^d . Then, its *covariance kernel* $K : (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{x})\overline{\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{y})}]$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is *positive definite*, meaning that for each k -tuple $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$, the matrix $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)_{i,j}$ is positive. As explained for instance in Appendix A.11 of [27], the function K belongs to $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and there is actually a one-to-one correspondence (up to equivalence) between smooth covariance kernels and a.s. C^∞ centred Gaussian fields on \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition 2.8. *The Berry Gaussian field with normalization constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, denoted by BGF_λ , is the unique (up to equivalence) a.s. C^∞ stationary Gaussian field on \mathbb{R}^d whose covariance kernel is $\lambda \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} d\sigma(\xi)$, where σ is the uniform probability measure on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} .*

If $F : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded continuous functional, its expectation with respect to the BGF_λ will be denoted by $\mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_\lambda}[F]$.

We remark that the Berry Gaussian field BGF_λ is the unique (up to equivalence) *normalized monochromatic stationary isotropic Gaussian field* with normalization $\mathbb{E}[|\text{BGF}_\lambda(0)|^2] = \lambda$. Indeed, stationary means that its covariance kernel depends only on the difference $(x - y)$. Isotropic means that the covariance kernel is invariant under (the same) rotation of x and y , so it only depends on $|x - y|$. Monochromatic means that the covariance kernel satisfies $-\Delta K = K$ with respect to both variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , corresponding to the fact that a realization f of the Berry Gaussian field satisfies $-\Delta f = f$ a.s.

2.4. The main results. Let f_h be a monochromatic Lagrangian state whose associated Lagrangian manifold is η -unstable for η small enough. We study the local weak limit of the propagated Lagrangian state $u_h = e^{i\frac{t}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h$ (2.5). Following Definition 2.7 we are interested in studying the limiting law of the random function

$$\left(e^{i\frac{t}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h \right) (\exp_x(h\mathbf{y})) \quad (2.15)$$

where \mathbf{x} is a uniformly distributed random variable in $\mathcal{U} \subset X$. Notice that in this expression we have two different sources of randomness: one coming from the perturbation Q_ω and one coming from \mathbf{x} . To make this distinction clear we will denote the expectation with respect to \mathbf{x} by $\mathbb{E}_\mathbf{x}$, see (2.14), and the probability with respect to the law of ω by \mathbb{P}_ω . Accordingly we will denote the associated expectation by \mathbb{E}_ω .

Our first result shows that when fixing \mathbf{x} , away from a set of asymptotically negligible measure, the random function (2.15) converges in law to a BGF.

Theorem 2.9. *Let X be a compact connected Riemannian manifold with negative sectional curvature and without boundary. Let P_h^δ be as in (2.4) and suppose that Hypotheses 2.2, 2.4 and 2.6 are satisfied. Let $D > 0$. There exists $\eta = \eta(D) > 0$ such that the following holds.*

Let $f_h = ae^{\frac{i}{h}\phi}$ be a monochromatic Lagrangian state associated to a Lagrangian manifold which is η -unstable, has distortion $\leq D$ and satisfies $\|\phi\|_{C^3} \leq D$. There exists $X_h^0 \subset X$, with $\text{Vol}(X_h^0) \rightarrow 0$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, such that the following holds: Let $\mathcal{U} \subset X$ be an open set, and V be an orthonormal frame on \mathcal{U} . Let $(t_h)_{h>0}$ be such that $t_h \rightarrow +\infty$, as $h \rightarrow 0$, and $|t_h| = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(|\log h|)$. Then, for every $x \in \mathcal{U} \setminus X_h^0$

$$\left(e^{i\frac{t_h}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h \right) (\exp_x(h\cdot)) \xrightarrow{d} \text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}$$

with $\lambda_a = \frac{\|a\|^2}{\text{Vol}(X)}$.

The assumption on the distortion of Λ (as defined in (2.3)) is purely technical, and it automatically follows from bounds on $\|\phi\|_{C^2}$ if ϕ is defined on a convex set. We insist here on the fact that the convergence in law stated in Theorem 2.9 is with respect to the ω random variables coming from the random perturbation and for fixed x .

Our second main result concerns the random smooth function

$$\left(e^{i\frac{t}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h \right) (\exp_x(h\mathbf{y})) \quad (2.16)$$

where \mathbf{x} is a uniformly distributed random variable in $\mathcal{U} \subset X$. The random variable \mathbf{x} generates the law of (2.16) which depends on ω . Indeed, this law is, with respect to ω a random probability measure. The result below states that this random law converges weakly in probability (with respect to ω) to the law of the BGF.

Theorem 2.10. *Let X be a compact connected Riemannian manifold with negative sectional curvature and without boundary. Let P_h^δ be as in (2.4) and suppose that Hypotheses 2.2, 2.4 and 2.6 are satisfied. Let $D > 0$. There exists $\eta = \eta(D) > 0$ such that the following holds:*

Let $\mathcal{U} \subset X$ be an open set, and V be an orthonormal frame on \mathcal{U} . Let $f_h = ae^{\frac{i}{h}\phi}$ be a monochromatic Lagrangian state associated to a Lagrangian manifold which is η -unstable, has distortion $\leq D$ and satisfies $\|\phi\|_{C^3} \leq D$. Let $(t_h)_{h>0}$ be such that $t_h \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} +\infty$ and $|t_h| = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(|\log h|)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $F \in C_b(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$ we have that for $h > 0$ small enough

$$\mathbb{P}_\omega \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{x}[F(e^{i\frac{t_h}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h(\exp_x(h\cdot)))] - \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right] = O(h^\infty) \quad (2.17)$$

where $\lambda_a = \frac{\|a\|^2}{\text{Vol}(X)}$.

Remark 2.11. *The assumption $|t_h| = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(|\log h|)$ can be slightly weakened. Indeed, the proof of Theorem 2.10 actually shows that for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $c_L > 0$ such that, if $t_h \leq c_L |\log h|$,*

we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $F \in C_b(C^L(\mathbb{R}^d))$ we have that for $h > 0$ small enough

$$\mathbb{P}_\omega \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_x[F(e^{\frac{i}{h}t_h} P_h^\delta f_h(\exp_x(h \cdot)))] - \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right] = O(h^\infty). \quad (2.18)$$

Here $F : C^L(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded functional which is continuous for the topology of convergence of derivatives over compact sets.

The possibility of extending our results to longer time scales will be further discussed in Remark 5.2.

Corollary 2.12. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.10 we have that for any sequence $h_j \rightarrow 0$, $j \rightarrow \infty$, such that there exists an $M > 0$ such that $(h_j^M)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N})$, we have that every $F \in C_b(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$*

$$\mathbb{E}_x[F(e^{\frac{i}{h_j}t_{h_j}} P_{h_j}^\delta f_{h_j}(\exp_x(h_j \cdot)))] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F], \quad j \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.19)$$

ω -almost surely. In particular, ω -almost surely, BGF_{λ_a} is the local weak limit of $\{e^{\frac{i}{h_j}t_{h_j}} P_{h_j}^\delta f_{h_j}\}_{h_j}$ in the frame V .

While the first part of Corollary 2.12 follows readily from Theorem 2.10 and the Borel-Cantelli lemma, the second part (about the local weak limit) is slightly more involved, and will be proved at the end of section 9.

2.5. Ideas of the proof and organization of the paper. The central tool to obtain the results of the previous paragraph is the WKB method, which gives a precise description of the evolution of a Lagrangian state by the semiclassical Schrödinger equation. Namely, when working on the universal cover \tilde{X} of a manifold of negative curvature, it is standard that the function $e^{i\frac{t}{h} \tilde{P}_h^\delta} \tilde{f}_h$ can be well-approximated by another Lagrangian state:

$$\tilde{a}(\tilde{x}; t, h, \delta) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{x}; t, h, \delta)}. \quad (2.20)$$

We will show that for the perturbations described in subsection 2.2, we may actually write

$$e^{i\frac{t}{h} \tilde{P}_h^\delta} \tilde{f}_h(\tilde{x}) \approx a(\tilde{x}; t) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi(\tilde{x}; t)} e^{i\frac{\delta}{h} \tilde{\Theta}(\tilde{x}; t, h, \delta)}, \quad (2.21)$$

so that the randomness of P_h^δ appears only through the random phase $\tilde{\Theta}$. Actually, $\tilde{\Theta}$ can be written as the integral of q_ω over a geodesic going from $\tilde{\Lambda}_\phi$ to \tilde{x} .

When working on the initial manifold X , we need to sum contributions coming from different sheets in the universal cover, so that we get

$$e^{i\frac{t}{h} P_h^\delta} f_h(x) \approx \sum_k a_k(x; t) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_k(x; t)} e^{i\frac{\delta}{h} \Theta_k(x; t, h, \delta)}, \quad (2.22)$$

where the number of terms grows exponentially with k . When performing a rescaling at scale h , we get

$$\left(e^{i\frac{t}{h} P_h^\delta} f_h \right) (\exp_x(h\mathbf{y})) \approx \sum_k a_k(x; t) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_k(x; t)} e^{i\frac{\delta}{h} \Theta_k(x; t, h, \delta)} e^{i\mathbf{y} \cdot \nabla \phi_k(x; t)}. \quad (2.23)$$

This is thus the sum of a large number of plane waves (in the \mathbf{y} variable) with random phases. We will show that the phases can be made independent by excluding a set of points x of small measure, so that Theorem 2.9 will follow from the Central Limit Theorem.

To obtain Theorem 2.10, we will show that, if x and x' are at a distance $h^{\beta-\varepsilon}$ from each other, then the phases $\Theta_k(x; t, h, \delta)$ and $\Theta_k(x'; t, h, \delta)$ are independent from each other, for most choices of x and x' . This will allow us to transfer the randomness coming from P_h^δ to spatial randomness, obtained by picking the point x at random.

In section 3, we will recall some facts about semiclassical analysis, and about the functional spaces we will use. Section 4 will be devoted to the description of the classical dynamics of the geodesic flow, and of the Hamiltonian flow induced by the perturbation q_ω . Section 5 will present the WKB method on the universal cover, describing the functions \tilde{a} and $\tilde{\phi}$ appearing in (2.20). In section 6, we will prove precise regularity estimates on \tilde{a} and $\tilde{\phi}$, so as to be able to reach the simpler expression (2.21). In section 7, we will project the WKB state obtained in the previous sections on the base manifold X and perform local rescalings, in order to derive expressions like

(2.22) and (2.23). Section 8 is devoted to the delicate issues of independence between the phases $\Theta_k(x)$. Finally, in section 9, we will prove Theorems 2.9 and 2.10.

2.6. Notations and conventions. In the sequel, (X, g) will be a smooth connected Riemannian manifold of negative sectional curvature without boundary. We denote by r_I its injectivity radius, which is a finite positive number as soon as X is compact.

We write $\chi_1 \succ \chi_2$ if $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in C_c^\infty$ take values in $[0, 1]$ and $\text{supp } \chi_2 \subset \mathfrak{C} \text{supp } (1 - \chi_1)$. Similarly, we write for an open relatively compact set K that $\chi \succ \mathbf{1}_K$ and $\mathbf{1}_K \succ \chi$, if $\overline{K} \subset \mathfrak{C} \text{supp } (1 - \chi)$ and $\text{supp } \chi \subset K$, respectively.

If M is a matrix, its transpose will be denoted by M^\dagger . If A is a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^d or of a Riemannian manifold, its volume will be denoted either by $\text{Vol}(A)$ or by $|A|$. If A is a finite set, we will denote its cardinality by $\text{Card}(A)$ or $|A|$. Writing $a \asymp b$ means that there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that $C^{-1}a \leq b \leq Ca$.

Cotangent space. We denote by dist_X the geodesic distance on X . We denote by T^*X the cotangent bundle of X , and by $\pi_X : T^*X \rightarrow X$ the canonical projection. We recall that the cotangent space T^*X can be equipped in a canonical way with a symplectic form σ .

By $|\cdot|_x$ and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$ we denote the norm and scalar product on T_x^*X (respectively on T_xX whenever convenient) induced by the metric g . Furthermore, we equip the cotangent bundle T^*X with an arbitrary metric g_0 such that the induced geodesic distance dist_{T^*X} on T^*X is so that $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_1, \rho_2) \geq c \text{dist}_X(\pi_X(\rho_1), \pi_X(\rho_2))$ for some fixed constant $c > 0$. This is for instance the case when we take g_0 to be the Sasaki metric on T^*X induced by g .

We will denote by $S^*X \subset T^*X$ the unit cotangent bundle, and by $\Phi^t : T^*X \rightarrow T^*X$ the geodesic flow. We will denote by the same letter its restriction $\Phi^t : S^*X \rightarrow S^*X$.

Universal cover. We will denote the universal cover of X by $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$. Since X is a connected Riemannian manifold of negative sectional curvature, \tilde{X} is a simply-connected manifold of negative sectional curvature. We equip \tilde{X} and $T^*\tilde{X}$ with the lifted Riemannian metrics \tilde{g} and \tilde{g}_0 , respectively. We denote by $\tilde{\pi} : T^*\tilde{X} \rightarrow T^*X$ the local diffeomorphism given by $\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{\xi}) = (\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x}), (d_{\tilde{x}}\tilde{\pi})^{-T}\tilde{\xi})$.

3. SEMICLASSICAL ANALYSIS ON SMOOTH MANIFOLDS

We present a brief review of the calculus of semiclassical pseudo-differential operators on a smooth d -dimensional manifold X . For the material reviewed here as well as further details we refer to the standard literature [19, 18, 26, 35, 13].

3.1. Semiclassical pseudo-differential operators. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $\eta \in [0, 1/2[$. We consider the class of symbols

$$S_\eta^m(T^*X) = \left\{ a(\cdot; h) \in C^\infty(T^*X); h \in]0, 1], |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a(x, \xi; h)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} h^{-\eta(|\alpha| + |\beta|)} \langle \xi \rangle^{m - |\beta|} \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\langle \xi \rangle = (1 + |\xi|_x^2)^{1/2}$.

We will define the symbol space of order $-\infty$ by $S_\eta^{-\infty}(T^*X) := \bigcap_m S_\eta^m(T^*X)$. A linear continuous map $R = R_h : \mathcal{E}'(X) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ is called *negligible* if its distribution kernel K_R is smooth and each of its $C^\infty(X \times X)$ seminorms is $O(h^\infty)$, i.e. it satisfies

$$\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta K_R(x, y) = O(h^\infty), \quad (3.2)$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$, when expressed in local coordinates.

A linear continuous map $P_h : C_c^\infty(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(X)$ is called a *semiclassical pseudo-differential operator* belonging to the space $\Psi_{h, \eta}^m$ if and only if we can express P_h as

$$P_h = \sum_{k \in K} \chi_k \kappa_k^* \text{Op}_h(p_k) (\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k + K_h, \quad (3.3)$$

where $p_k \in S_\eta^m(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$, K_h is negligible, the $\kappa_k : U_k \rightarrow V_k$ are a collection of diffeomorphisms between open sets $U_k \subset X$ and $V_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with the collection of U_k being locally finite, and $\chi_k \in C_c^\infty(U_k)$. We will refer to the induced family $(\kappa_k, \chi_k)_k$ as *cut-off charts*. In (3.3) we use the standard semiclassical quantization of the symbols p_k

$$\text{Op}_h(p_k)u(x) = \frac{1}{(2h\pi)^d} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{\frac{i}{h}\langle x-y, \xi \rangle} p_k(x, \xi; h) u(y) dy d\xi, \quad u \in C_c^\infty(V_k), \quad (3.4)$$

seen as an oscillatory integral. Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the Euclidean scalar product on \mathbb{R}^d .

Equivalently, a linear continuous map $P_h : C_c^\infty(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'(X)$ is in $\Psi_{h,\eta}^m$ if and only if the following two conditions hold:

- (1) $\phi P_h \psi$ is negligible for all $\phi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ with $\text{supp } \phi \cap \text{supp } \psi = \emptyset$ (*pseudolocality*);
- (2) for every cut-off chart (κ, χ) there exists a symbol $p_\kappa \in S_\eta^m(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\chi P_h \chi = \chi \kappa^* \text{Op}_h(p_\kappa) (\kappa^{-1})^* \chi. \quad (3.5)$$

The property of pseudolocality can be extended to h -dependent cut-off functions $\phi, \psi \in C_c^\infty$ with support contained in some h -independent compact set, with $|\partial^\alpha \phi(x)|, |\partial^\alpha \psi(x)| \leq O_\alpha(h^{-\varepsilon|\alpha|})$, for some $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/2$ and $\text{dist}(\text{supp } \phi, \text{supp } \psi) \geq h^{\varepsilon_0}/C$, $0 \leq \varepsilon_0 < 1/2$, $C > 0$.

Given a symbol $p \in S_\eta^m(T^*X)$ one can obtain an operator $P_h \in \Psi_{h,\eta}^m$, for instance, in the following way: Take a partition of unity $\{\psi_k\}_{k \in K}$ subordinate to a locally finite covering of X by coordinate charts $\{\kappa_k : X \supset U_k \rightarrow V_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d\}_{k \in K}$ such that $\sum \psi_k^2 = 1$. Then

$$P_h = \sum_{k \in K} \psi_k \kappa_k^* \text{Op}_h(p_{\kappa_k}) (\kappa_k^{-1})^* \psi_k \in \Psi_{h,\eta}^m, \quad (3.6)$$

where $p_{\kappa_k} = p \circ \widehat{\kappa}_k^{-1}$ is the pullback of p to T^*V_k via the symplectomorphism $\widehat{\kappa}_k^{-1} : T^*V_k \rightarrow T^*U_k$ defined by $\widehat{\kappa}_k^{-1}(x, \xi) = (\kappa_k^{-1}(x), (d_x \kappa_k^{-1})^{-T} \xi)$. Given a symbol $p \in \Psi_{h,\eta}^m$, we will often write

$$P_h = \text{Op}_h(p), \quad (3.7)$$

for a pseudo-differential operator P_h with principal symbol $\sigma(P_h) = p$.

The correspondence $P_h \mapsto p$ is not globally well-defined, but it gives rise to a bijection

$$\Psi_{h,\eta}^m / h^{1-2\eta} \Psi_{h,\eta}^{m-1} \longrightarrow S_\eta^m(T^*X) / h^{1-2\eta} S_\eta^{m-1}(T^*X). \quad (3.8)$$

The image σ_P of P under the map (3.8) is called *principal symbol* of P .

3.2. Semiclassical Sobolev spaces. We now recall the definition of *semiclassical Sobolev spaces* on X . First of all, when $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, we define for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the *semiclassical Sobolev space* $H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as the space of all tempered distributions $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\text{Op}_h(\langle \xi \rangle^s) u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty.$$

When X is a smooth manifold, we define for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the *local semiclassical Sobolev space* $H_{h,\text{loc}}^s(X) \subset \mathcal{D}'(X)$ as the set of all distributions $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ such that

$$(\kappa^{-1})^* \chi u \in H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

for all local coordinate charts $\kappa : X \supset U \rightarrow V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and cut-off functions $\chi \in C_c^\infty(U)$. We can turn $H_{h,\text{loc}}^s(X)$ into a Fréchet space by equipping it with the countable family of seminorms $\{\|(\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k u\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}\}_{k \in K}$, for any fixed, open and locally finite countable covering of X with coordinate charts $\{\kappa_k : X \supset U_k \rightarrow V_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d\}_{k \in K}$ and subordinate partition of unity $\{\chi_k\}_{k \in K}$, $\chi_k \in C_c^\infty(U_k)$. The topology on $H_{h,\text{loc}}^s(X)$ induced by such a family of seminorms is independent of the choice of open locally finite covering, coordinate charts and partition of unity.

We denote by $H_{h,\text{comp}}^s(X)$ the space of all elements of $H_{h,\text{loc}}^s(X)$ which are supported inside some h -independent compact subset of X . When we are dealing with the case $h = 1$ in the local Sobolev norms, we will simply write $H_{\text{comp}}^s(X)$ and $H_{\text{loc}}^s(X)$ for the corresponding spaces. We

note the following regularity result: each $A \in \Psi_{h,\eta}^m(X)$ is bounded uniformly in h on compact sets as an operator

$$A = \text{Op}_h(a) : H_{h,\text{comp}}^s(X) \longrightarrow H_{h,\text{loc}}^{s-m}(X). \quad (3.9)$$

When X is compact then

$$H_{h,\text{comp}}^s(X) = H_{h,\text{loc}}^s(X) =: H_h^s(X)$$

and we can equip it with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H_h^s(X)}^2 = \sum_{k \in K} \|(\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k u\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2, \quad \text{Card}(K) < +\infty, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\{\kappa_k\}$ is a finite collection of coordinate charts with a subordinate partition of unity $1 = \sum_k \chi_k$ as above. This norm is not intrinsically defined, but taking different coordinate patches and cut-off functions in (3.10) yields an equivalent norm.

Similarly we define, for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, the C^L norms on X , by

$$\|u\|_{C^L(X)} = \max_{k \in K} \|(\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k u\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (3.11)$$

Since X is compact it follows that taking different coordinate patches and cut-off functions in (3.11) yields an equivalent norm. By standard arguments one gets the Sobolev inequalities

$$\|u\|_{C^L(X)} = O_{d,s,L}(1) h^{-d/2-L} \|u\|_{H_h^s(X)} \quad \text{for } s > L + d/2. \quad (3.12)$$

On non-compact manifolds it is more delicate to obtain well-defined Sobolev norms. For the following discussion we refer the reader to [31, Appendix A].

A smooth Riemannian manifold X is called a *manifold of bounded geometry* if it has a strictly positive injectivity radius $r_{\text{inj}} > 0$ and every covariant derivative of the Riemann curvature tensor R is bounded, i.e. for every $m = 0, 1, \dots$ there exists a $C_m > 0$ such that $|\nabla^m R| \leq C_m$.

Let X be a manifold of bounded geometry and denote by dv_g the Riemannian density on X . We define the semiclassical Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{H_h^s(X)}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, on $C_c^\infty(X)$ by

$$\|u\|_{H_h^s(X)}^2 = \sum_{m=0}^s \int_X |(h\nabla)^m u|^2 dv_g, \quad (3.13)$$

where $|\cdot|$ is understood as the norm on tensors induced by the Riemannian metric g .

We then define the Sobolev space $H_h^s(X)$ to be the completion of $C_c^\infty(X)$ with respect to the norm (3.13). The space $H_h^s(X)$ has a natural structure of a Hilbert space, and it is naturally included in the space of distributions $\mathcal{D}'(X)$. In particular $H_h^0(X) = L^2(X, dv_g)$, where the latter is defined via the L^2 norm with respect to the integration measure dv_g . The usual embedding theorems hold, i.e. $H_h^s(X) \subset C_b^k(X)$ if $s > k + d/2$.

Since by assumption X has a strictly positive injectivity radius, we have the following result essentially due to M. Gromov [17], see also [31, Lemma A.1.2] for a proof.

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be a smooth Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry and put $\varepsilon_0 = r_{\text{inj}}/3$. Then, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there exists a countable covering of X by balls of radius ε such that $X = \bigcup_{k \in K} B(x_k, \varepsilon)$ and such that the covering of X by balls $B(x_k, 2\varepsilon)$ with double radius and the same centres satisfies that the maximal number of the balls with non-empty intersection is finite.*

This result implies the existence of a ‘‘uniform’’ partition of unity of X subordinate to the covering by balls from the above Lemma. Indeed, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, with $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ as in the Lemma above, there exists a partition of unity $1 = \sum_k \chi_k$ on X such that $\chi_k \in C_c^\infty(X; [0, \infty[)$ with $\text{supp } \chi_k \subset B(x_k, 2\varepsilon)$ (the points x_k as in the above Lemma) and such that for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d$ there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ such that $|\partial_y^\alpha \chi_k(y)| \leq C_\alpha$ in geodesic normal coordinates and uniformly with respect to k .

Using this partition of unity we can give an alternative definition of the semiclassical Sobolev norm $\|u\|_{h,s}$. Indeed, let $\kappa_k : B(x_k, 2\varepsilon) =: U_k \rightarrow V_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the local geodesic coordinate chart

in $B(x_k, 2\varepsilon)$, then we can define for $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\|u\|_{H_h^s(X)}^2 = \sum_{k \in K} \|(\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k u\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \quad (3.14)$$

The norms (3.13) and (3.14) are equivalent for $s \in \mathbb{N}$.

Similarly we define the C^L norms on an open set $\mathcal{U} \subset X$, i.e. for $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|u\|_{C^L(\mathcal{U})} := \sup_{k \in K} \|(\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k u\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d \cap \kappa_k(\mathcal{U} \cap U_k))}. \quad (3.15)$$

Furthermore, we have the Sobolev inequalities

$$\|u\|_{C^L(X)} = O_{d,s,L}(1) h^{-d/2-L} \|u\|_{H_h^s(X)}, \quad \text{for } s > L + d/2. \quad (3.16)$$

In this paper we will be working with a compact smooth Riemannian manifold X of negative sectional curvature and with its universal cover \tilde{X} . Let $\kappa_k : U_k \rightarrow V_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $k = 1, \dots, M$, be the local geodesic coordinates on X with $U_k = B(x_k, 2\varepsilon)$ as in the discussion above (3.14), such that the coordinate patches U_k , $k = 1, \dots, M$, form a finite open covering of X . Furthermore, let $\chi_k \in C_c^\infty(X; [0, 1])$, $k = 1, \dots, M$, be a finite partition of unity of X subordinate to this open covering. Using that the covering map is a local isometry, we find that the lifted coordinate charts $\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\ell} = \tilde{\pi}_{k,\ell}^* \kappa_k$, where $\tilde{\pi}_{k,\ell} := \tilde{\pi}|_{\tilde{U}_{k,\ell}} : \tilde{U}_{k,\ell} \rightarrow U_k$, as in the beginning of Section 3.3, are local geodesic coordinates on \tilde{X} , the universal covering of X , with coordinate patches $\tilde{U}_{k,\ell} = B(\tilde{\pi}_{k,\ell}^{-1}(x_k), 2\varepsilon)$. Furthermore, the coordinate patches form a locally finite open covering of \tilde{X} . The lifted cut-off functions $\chi_{k,\ell}$ form a locally finite partition of unity on \tilde{X} , i.e. $\sum_{k,\ell} \tilde{\chi}_{k,\ell} = 1$ on \tilde{X} . We will be working mostly with the following Sobolev and C^L norms: let $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \subset \tilde{X}$ be an open set, then

$$\|u\|_{H_h^s(\tilde{X})}^2 = \sum_{k,\ell} \|(\kappa_{k,\ell}^{-1})^* \chi_{k,\ell} u\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2, \quad \|u\|_{C^L(\tilde{\mathcal{U}})} := \max_{k,\ell} \|(\kappa_{k,\ell}^{-1})^* \chi_{k,\ell} u\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d \cap \kappa_{k,\ell}(\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \cap \tilde{U}_{k,\ell}))}. \quad (3.17)$$

Furthermore, the Sobolev inequalities (3.16) remain valid.

3.3. Lifting pseudodifferential operators to the universal cover. We will be working not only on a compact connected smooth Riemannian manifold X of negative sectional curvature, but also on its universal cover \tilde{X} . It will be useful to discuss lifting a pseudo-differential operator P on X to a pseudo-differential operator \tilde{P} on \tilde{X} .

Recall the covering map $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ and the map $\hat{\pi} : T^*\tilde{X} \rightarrow T^*X$ defined in Section 2.6. By the covering property we have that if $U \subset X$ is a sufficiently small open set, then $\tilde{\pi}^{-1}(U) = \bigsqcup_{\ell \in I} \tilde{U}_\ell$ is a countable union of disjoint open sets. Furthermore, the restriction $\tilde{\pi}_\ell := \tilde{\pi}|_{\tilde{U}_\ell} : \tilde{U}_\ell \rightarrow U$ is a diffeomorphism. Hence, we may lift a chart $\phi : U \rightarrow V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to a chart $\tilde{\phi}_\ell := (\tilde{\pi}_\ell^{-1})^* \phi : \tilde{U}_\ell \rightarrow V$ on \tilde{X} . Similarly, we can lift a function $\chi \in C_c^\infty(U)$ to $\tilde{\chi}_\ell := (\tilde{\pi}_\ell^{-1})^* \chi \in C_c^\infty(\tilde{U}_\ell)$. Slightly abusing notation, we will also denote by $\tilde{\chi}_\ell$ its extension by 0 outside its support to a smooth compactly supported function on \tilde{X} .

3.3.1. Lifting a pseudo-differential operator. Given a semiclassical pseudo-differential operator $P \in \Psi_{h,\eta}^m(X)$ with principal symbol $\sigma(P) = p \in S_\eta^m(T^*X)$, we say that $\tilde{P} \in \Psi_{h,\eta}^m(\tilde{X})$ is a lift of P to the universal cover \tilde{X} if the following three conditions hold:

- (1) the principal symbol of \tilde{P} is given by lifted principal symbol of P , i.e.

$$\sigma(\tilde{P}) = \hat{\pi}^* \sigma(P) \in S_\beta^m(T^*\tilde{X}); \quad (3.18)$$

- (2) for every cut-off chart (κ, χ) on X such that (3.5) holds with $p_\kappa \in S_\eta^m(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have that

$$(\tilde{\kappa}_\ell^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_\ell \tilde{P} \tilde{\chi}_\ell \tilde{\kappa}_\ell^* = \chi \circ \kappa^{-1} \text{Op}_h(p_\kappa) \chi \circ \kappa^{-1}. \quad (3.19)$$

(3) for every $\phi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ with $\text{supp } \phi \cap \text{supp } \psi = \emptyset$ which may depend on h as in the paragraph after (3.5), we have that $\tilde{\phi}_{\iota'} \tilde{P}_h \tilde{\psi}_\iota$ is negligible and that for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\tilde{\phi}_{\iota'} \tilde{P}_h \tilde{\psi}_\iota = O_{\phi, \psi, N}(h^\infty) : H_h^{-N}(\tilde{X}) \rightarrow H_h^N(\tilde{X}). \quad (3.20)$$

In other words $\tilde{\phi}_{\iota'} \tilde{P}_h \tilde{\psi}_\iota$ is a bounded operator $H_h^{-N}(\tilde{X}) \rightarrow H_h^N(\tilde{X})$ with operator norm $= O_{\phi, \psi, N}(h^\infty)$ which is independent of ι, ι' .

Given a $P \in \Psi_{h, \eta}^m(X)$, such a lift \tilde{P} always exists. For instance, we may construct \tilde{P} from the non-canonical quantization (3.6) by lifting the cut-off charts. More precisely

$$\tilde{P}_h = \sum_{k \in K, \iota \in I} \psi_{k, \iota} \kappa_{k, \iota}^* \text{Op}_h(p_{\kappa_k})(\kappa_{k, \iota}^{-1})^* \psi_{k, \iota} \in \Psi_{h, \eta}^m(\tilde{X}) \quad (3.21)$$

satisfies (3.18–3.20).

3.3.2. Lifting a differential operator. Lifting a differential operator to \tilde{X} is more straightforward since they are local operators: the lift of the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_g on X to the cover \tilde{X} is given by $\Delta_{\tilde{g}}$. Indeed, one can easily check that for $f \in C^\infty(X)$

$$\Delta_{\tilde{g}} \tilde{\pi}^* f = \tilde{\pi}^* \Delta_g f. \quad (3.22)$$

We will drop the metric in the subscript whenever it is clear which Laplacian we are using.

We then define the lifted Schrödinger operator (2.4) by

$$\tilde{P}_h^\delta := -\frac{h^2}{2} \Delta_{\tilde{g}} + \delta \tilde{Q}_\omega. \quad (3.23)$$

3.3.3. Mapping properties of the pull-back $\tilde{\pi}^*$. The pull-back action $\tilde{\pi}^*$ via the covering map $\tilde{\pi}$ is a continuous linear map $C^n(X) \rightarrow C^n(\tilde{X})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $L^2(X, dv_g) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^2(\tilde{X}, dv_{\tilde{g}})$, and $H_h^k(X) \rightarrow H_{h, \text{loc}}^k(\tilde{X})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, take the countable family of lifted cut-off chart $(\kappa_{k, \iota}, \chi_{k, \iota})$ defined in the paragraph above (3.17), then

$$\|(\kappa_{k, \iota}^{-1})^* \chi_{k, \iota} \tilde{\pi}^* u\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|(\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k u\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (3.24)$$

The formal adjoint ${}^t \tilde{\pi}^*$ of $\tilde{\pi}^*$ is given by

$$({}^t \tilde{\pi}^* u)(x) = \sum_{\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x})=x} u(\tilde{x}), \quad u \in C_c^\infty(\tilde{X}), \quad (3.25)$$

mapping $C_c^\infty(\tilde{X}) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ linearly. Let $u \in H_{h, \text{comp}}^k(\tilde{X})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|{}^t \tilde{\pi}^* u\|_{H_h^k(X)} &\leq \sum_{k, \iota} \|\chi_k (\pi_{k, \iota}^{-1})^* u\|_{H_h^k(X)} \\ &= \sum_{k, \iota} \|(\kappa_k^{-1})^* \chi_k (\pi_{k, \iota}^{-1})^* u\|_{H_h^k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= \sum_{k, \iota} \|(\kappa_{k, \iota}^{-1})^* \chi_{k, \iota} u\|_{H_h^k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{H_h^k(\tilde{X})}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

where $C > 0$ only depends on the support of u . Hence, ${}^t \tilde{\pi}^*$ is bounded uniformly in $h > 0$ on compact sets as an operator

$${}^t \tilde{\pi}^* : H_{h, \text{comp}}^k(\tilde{X}) \longrightarrow H_h^k(X). \quad (3.27)$$

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval and let $u \in C^\infty(I \times \tilde{X})$ be such that $\text{supp } u(\tau, \cdot)$ is compact for every $\tau \in I$. A straightforward computation in local coordinates shows that

$$(i\partial_\tau + \Delta_g)({}^t \tilde{\pi}^* u) = {}^t \tilde{\pi}^* (i\partial_\tau + \Delta_{\tilde{g}})u \in C_c^\infty(I \times X). \quad (3.28)$$

4. CLASSICAL DYNAMICS

4.1. Hamiltonian flows. Let (X, g) be a compact connected manifold of negative sectional curvature and let q_ω be as in (2.6). Let $h \in]0, h_0]$ with $h_0 > 0$ sufficiently small. For $\delta = \delta(h) \in [0, \delta_0]$, with $\delta_0 \ll 1$, we put

$$p(x, \xi; \delta) := \frac{1}{2} |\xi|_x^2 + \delta q_\omega(x, \xi). \quad (4.1)$$

This (δ -dependent and therefore possibly h -dependent) Hamiltonian induces a Hamiltonian vector field H_p which may be defined by the pointwise relation $H_p \lrcorner \sigma = -dp$, or in canonical symplectic coordinates by

$$H_p = \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{\partial p}{\partial \xi_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} - \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_k}. \quad (4.2)$$

Hence, H_p is a smooth section of TT^*X . For $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$ we define the energy layers

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda} &:= \{(x, \xi) \in T^*X; p(x, \xi; \delta) = \lambda\} \subset T^*X \\ \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)} &:= \{(x, \xi) \in T^*X; \lambda_1 < p(x, \xi; \delta) < \lambda_2\} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)} \mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Similarly we define $\mathcal{E}_{\delta, [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]}$ by replacing the strict inequalities with non strict ones. When $\delta > 0$, these sets depend on the random parameter ω , though we do not write it explicitly.

For every $\delta > 0$, we denote by

$$\Phi_\delta^t := \exp(tH_p)$$

the Hamiltonian flow on T^*X generated by the vector field H_p . Furthermore, for every $\lambda > 0$, we denote by $\Phi_\delta^{t, \lambda} = \Phi_\delta^t|_{\mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}}$ its restriction to $\mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}$. We will often write Φ^t for the flow $\Phi_0^{t, 1}$, which is simply the geodesic flow acting on $\mathcal{E}_{0, \frac{1}{2}} = S^*X$.

Notice that there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that, for all $0 \leq \delta < \delta_0$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{0, \frac{1}{2}} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)} \subset \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{8}, 2)}. \quad (4.4)$$

Until further notice, we will always assume that δ_0 is small enough so that (4.4) holds.

4.2. Hyperbolicity. Since X has negative curvature, we have that for every $\lambda > 0$ the Hamiltonian flow $\Phi_0^{t, \lambda}$ is Anosov [14]. This implies that for each $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0, \lambda}$, there exist subspaces $E_\rho^+, E_\rho^-, E_\rho^0$ of $T_\rho \mathcal{E}_{0, \lambda}$ – respectively called the *unstable*, *stable* and *neutral* direction at ρ – such that:

- $T_\rho \mathcal{E}_{0, \lambda} = E_\rho^+ \oplus E_\rho^- \oplus E_\rho^0$ for every $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0, \lambda}$.
- The distributions E_ρ^+, E_ρ^- and E_ρ^0 depend Hölder-continuously on ρ .
- The distribution E_ρ^0 is one dimensional and generated by $\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0} \Phi_0^{t, \lambda}(\rho)$.
- E_ρ^+ and E_ρ^- are both $(d-1)$ -dimensional, and for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$d_\rho \Phi_0^{t, \lambda}(E_\rho^\pm) = E_{\Phi_0^{t, \lambda}(\rho)}^\pm. \quad (4.5)$$

- There exists $C_0 > 0$ and $A_0 > 1$ such that for each $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0, \lambda}$, $t > 0$, $\xi^+ \in E_\rho^+$ and $\xi^- \in E_\rho^-$,

$$\begin{aligned} |d_\rho \Phi_0^{-t, \lambda}(\xi^+)|_{\Phi_0^{-t, \lambda}(\rho)} &\leq C_0 A_0^{-t} |\xi^+|_\rho \\ |d_\rho \Phi_0^{t, \lambda}(\xi^-)|_{\Phi_0^{t, \lambda}(\rho)} &\leq C_0 A_0^{-t} |\xi^-|_\rho. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

For $\rho = (x, \xi) \in \mathcal{E}_{0, \lambda}$, for some $\lambda > 0$, write

$$\hat{E}_\rho^0 := \{(x, s\xi); s \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Then

$$T_\rho T^*X = E_\rho^+ \oplus E_\rho^0 \oplus E_\rho^- \oplus \hat{E}_\rho^0. \quad (4.8)$$

The structural stability lemma ([25, Theorem 18.2.3]) implies that, if δ_0 is taken small enough, then for all $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$ and all ω , the Hamiltonian flow $\Phi_\delta^{t, \lambda}$ is also an Anosov flow on each energy level $\mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}$ for $\lambda \in (\frac{1}{4}, 1)$, satisfying properties analogous to those stated above. In particular, if

$\lambda \in (\frac{1}{4}, 1)$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda} \subset \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{8}, 2)}$, the Hamiltonian flow $\Phi_\delta^{t, \lambda}$ has stable, unstable and neutral directions at ρ which are denoted by $E_{\delta, \rho}^\pm$ and $E_{\delta, \rho}^0$ respectively. Furthermore, the map

$$[0, \delta_0] \times \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)} \ni (\delta, \rho) \mapsto (E_{\delta, \rho}^-, E_{\delta, \rho}^+, E_{\delta, \rho}^0) \text{ is continuous.} \quad (4.9)$$

Thus, for δ_0 small enough, we find that for any $\lambda \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, any $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$ and all $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}$,

$$T_\rho T^* X = E_{\delta, \rho}^+ \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^0 \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^- \oplus \hat{E}_\rho^0.$$

By compactness and (4.9) we may find $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that if $v = (v_+, v_0, v_-, \hat{v}_0) \in T_\rho T^* X = E_{\delta, \rho}^+ \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^0 \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^- \oplus \hat{E}_\rho^0$, we have

$$c_1 |v|_\rho \leq |v_+|_\rho + |v_0|_\rho + |v_-|_\rho + |\hat{v}_0|_\rho \leq c_2 |v|_\rho. \quad (4.10)$$

Here, we identify v_+ with $(v_+, 0, 0, 0) \in T_\rho T^* X$ and similarly for v_0, v_- and \hat{v}_0 . Furthermore, in a basis adapted to this decomposition, we have

$$d_\rho \Phi_\delta^t = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\rho, \delta, t} & 0 & 0 & r_{1; \delta, t}(\rho) \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \lambda t + r_{2; \delta, t}(\rho) \\ 0 & 0 & (M_{\rho, \delta, t}^{-1})^\dagger & r_{3; \delta, t}(\rho) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 + r_{4; \delta, t}(\rho) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.11)$$

where $M_{\rho, \delta, t}$ is a $(d-1) \times (d-1)$ matrix such that $\|M_{\rho, \delta, t} v\| \geq CA^t |v|_\rho$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Here, the constants $C > 0$ and $A > 1$ can be chosen independent of $\delta \in [0, \delta_0)$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$. Furthermore, it follows from (4.9) that for every $j \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ and every $T > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{8}, 2)}} \|r_{j; \delta, t}(\rho)\| \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Continuing, we define the weak stable and unstable directions by

$$E_{\delta, \rho}^{\pm, 0} := E_{\delta, \rho}^\pm \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^0.$$

4.3. Dynamics on the universal cover. Let X be as in the previous section. Recall that its universal cover is denoted $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$.

We may lift the Hamiltonian p (4.1) to a Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{p}(x, \xi; \delta) := \tilde{p} = \tilde{\pi}^* p : T^* \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.12)$$

and define corresponding lifted energy layers

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta, \lambda} := \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)} := \tilde{\pi}^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}) \subset T^* \tilde{X}. \quad (4.13)$$

Notice that this direct definition is equivalent to the definition of these energy layers similar to (4.3) *mutatis mutandis*. The lifted Hamiltonian \tilde{p} induces a Hamiltonian vector field $H_{\tilde{p}}$, defined by the pointwise relation

$$H_{\tilde{p}} \lrcorner \tilde{\sigma} = -d\tilde{p}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}$ is the canonical symplectic form on $T^* \tilde{X}$. We denote by $\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t$ the Hamiltonian flow generated by $H_{\tilde{p}}$. Notice that

$$\tilde{\pi} \circ \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t = \Phi_\delta^t \circ \tilde{\pi}. \quad (4.15)$$

In particular, these dynamics enjoy all the local properties described in Section 4.2.

4.4. Bounds on the derivatives of the flow. Let $\frac{1}{4} < \lambda < 1$, and let $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}$. We would like to control the derivatives of $\Phi_\delta^t(\rho)$ with respect to t . To this end, recall that $\mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)} \subset \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{8}, 2)}$ provided δ is small enough, and consider a covering of $\mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{8}, 2)}$ by finitely many open sets \mathcal{U}_j , each of them endowed with a local chart $\kappa_j : \mathcal{U}_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, which is a diffeomorphism onto its image.

Let $\rho \in \mathcal{U}_{j_0} \cap \mathcal{E}_\lambda$. For every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let us denote by $J_h(t)$ the set of indices j such that $\Phi_\delta^t(\rho) \in \mathcal{U}_j$. Hence, for every t' in a neighbourhood of t and every $j \in J_h(t)$, the map $\Phi_{\delta, j}^t := \kappa_j \circ \Phi_\delta^t \circ \kappa_{j_0}^{-1}$ is a smooth map from $\mathbb{R}^{2d} \supset \kappa_{j_0}(\mathcal{U}_{j_0})$ to $\kappa_j(\mathcal{U}_j) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. We then define, for every $L \geq 1$

$$g_{\rho, L, h}(t) := \max_{j \in J_h(t)} \max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}; 1 \leq |\gamma| \leq L} \left| \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta, j}^t(\rho) \right|,$$

computed using the Euclidean structure on $\mathbb{R}^{2d} \supset \kappa_j(\mathcal{U}_j)$.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, any $\lambda > 0$ and any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, such that, there exists $C_L > 0$ such that the following holds: For all $h \in (0, 1]$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|t| \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$ and all $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0,\lambda}$,*

$$g_{\rho,L,h}(t) \leq C_L h^{-\varepsilon} \left(1 + h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)(L+1)} \delta \right).$$

Proof. Let us denote by $\mathbf{H}_{h,j}$ the Hamiltonian vector field generating the dynamics, written in coordinate chart κ_j . By (4.1), we have $\|\mathbf{H}_{h,j}\|_{C^L} \leq C(L)(1 + \delta h^{-\beta(L+1)})$.

For any multi-index $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|\gamma| \leq L$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left| \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right|^2 &= 2 \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho), \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right\rangle \\ &= 2 \left| \left\langle \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} [\mathbf{H}_{h,j}(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho))], \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq 2g_{\rho,L,h}(t) \left| \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} [\mathbf{H}_{h,j}(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho))] \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Note that, in the second equality, $\mathbf{H}_{h,j}(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho))$ is a vector field evaluated at $\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)$; it is thus a vector, whose scalar product we take with the vector $\frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)$. It should not be thought of as a derivative acting on $\frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)$.

First of all, we apply (4.16) with $L = 1$, integrate over time and take the maximum over j to obtain

$$g_{\rho,1,h}(t) \leq C + C(1 + \delta h^{-2\beta}) \int_0^t g_{\rho,1,h}(s) ds.$$

In particular, thanks to (2.9), there exists $h_0 > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$ such that, for all $h \in (0, h_0]$,

$$g_{\rho,1,h}(t) \leq C + c_0 \int_0^t g_{\rho,1,h}(s) ds.$$

and hence, thanks to Grönwall's lemma

$$g_{\rho,1,h}(t) \leq C e^{c_0 t}.$$

for some $C > 0$, provided (2.9) is satisfied. In particular, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$, we have $|g_{\rho,1,h}(t)| \leq C_1 h^{-\varepsilon}$.

Next, we use equation (4.16) to estimate recursively $g_{\rho,L,h}(t)$. More precisely, we will prove inductively that for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, and all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d}_L > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}_L |\log h|]$, we have

$$g_{\rho,L,h}(t) \leq C_L h^{-\varepsilon} \left(1 + h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)(L+1)} \delta \right), \quad (4.17)$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} [\mathbf{H}_{h,j}(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho))] \right| \leq C'_L g_{\rho,L,h}(t) + O(\delta h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)(L+1)}). \quad (4.18)$$

We have already proved (4.17) for $L = 1$.

Now, let us suppose that (4.18) holds at rank L . Using (4.16), we get, for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|\gamma| \leq L$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right|^2 &\leq C + 2 \int_0^t g_{\rho,L,h}(s) \left| \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} [\mathbf{H}_{h,j}(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho))] \right| ds \\ &\leq C + 2 \int_0^t \left[C'_L g_{\rho,L,h}^2(s) + g_{\rho,L,h}(s) (1 + O(\delta h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)(L+1)})) \right] ds \\ &\leq C + 2 \left(C'_L + \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_0^t g_{\rho,L,h}^2(s) ds + t (1 + O(\delta h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)(L+1)}))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the maximum over j and γ and using Grönwall's lemma, we get

$$g_{\rho,L,h}(t) \leq C_L e^{(C_L + \frac{1}{2})t} \left(1 + \delta h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)L}\right), \quad (4.19)$$

from which (4.17) follows.

Hence, (4.17) holds at rank L provided (4.18) holds at rank L . All we have to show is that (4.17) at rank L implies (4.18) at rank $L+1$. To do this, we decompose $\mathbf{H}_{h,j} = \mathbf{H}_{h,j}^0 + \delta \mathbf{H}_{h,j}^\omega$, and use the chain rule $|\gamma|$ times to compute $\frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \left[\mathbf{H}_{h,j} \left(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right) \right]$. We see that this contains one $|\gamma|^{\text{th}}$ derivative of $\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)$, through the term $d_{\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)} \mathbf{H}_{h,j} \left(\frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial \rho^\gamma} \Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right)$. Now, $d_{\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)} \mathbf{H}_{h,j}$ is bounded by c_0 : this gives the $c_0 g_{\rho,L,h}(t)$ contribution in (4.18). Concerning the other terms, they contain a smaller number of derivatives of $\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)$ at a power at most L , times derivatives of $\mathbf{H}_{h,j}$ of order at most L . More precisely:

- Each time we differentiate $\mathbf{H}_{h,j}^\omega \left(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right)$, we gain a power $h^{-\beta}$, and a first derivative of $\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)$, so that if $t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$, we gain a factor $O(h^{-\beta-\varepsilon})$.
- Each time we differentiate a derivative of $\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho)$, we must use the estimate for $g_{\rho,L+1,h}$ instead of $g_{\rho,L+1,h}$, so that we gain a factor $O(h^{-\beta-\varepsilon})$ thanks to (4.17).
- Differentiating $\mathbf{H}_{h,j}^0 \left(\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) \right)$ only gives a factor $O(h^{-\varepsilon})$.

Considering the previous trichotomy L times, we see that (4.18) holds at rank $L+1$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 4.2. In Lemma 5.4, we may suppose that each \mathcal{U}_j is a geodesic ball equipped with geodesic coordinates. The open sets \mathcal{U}_j may be lifted to open sets $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{j,\iota} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{0,(\frac{1}{4},4)}$, equipped with charts $\kappa_{j,\iota}$. We may then define $\Phi_{\delta,j,\iota}^t$, and $g_{\rho,L,h}(t)$ in a similar fashion. Using (4.15), we see that we also have

$$g_{\rho,L,h}(t) \leq C_L h^{-\varepsilon} \left(1 + h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)(L+1)} \delta\right).$$

4.5. Comparing the dynamics.

Lemma 4.3. Let $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \infty$. Let $\delta_0, h_0 > 0$ be as in the beginning of Section 4.1 and sufficiently small. There exists C_0 such that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$, all $0 \leq \delta' \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$, all $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_\delta^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')) \leq C_0 e^{C_0 |t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') + C_0 \delta h^{-\beta} \left(e^{C_0 |t|} - 1 \right). \quad (4.20)$$

The same statement holds on the universal cover $T^*\tilde{X}$.

Proof. 1. We begin with the case when X is compact. As in (4.4), we see that for $\delta_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, we have that

$$\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta^{(l)}, (\lambda_1/2, 2\lambda_2)} \subset \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1/4, 4\lambda_2)}. \quad (4.21)$$

The Hamilton vector field H_p (4.2) is tangent to $\mathcal{E}_{\delta,\lambda}$, $\lambda > 0$, so the induced flow Φ_δ^t preserves $\mathcal{E}_{\delta,\lambda}$, and we deduce that

$$\Phi_\delta^t(\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta,(\lambda_1/2, 2\lambda_2)}, \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.22)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\Phi_{\delta'}^t(\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta',(\lambda_1/2, 2\lambda_2)}, \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.23)$$

By compactness we know that the injectivity radius of $\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1/4, 4\lambda_2)}$ (for the metric g_0 on T^*X restricted to $\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1/4, 4\lambda_2)}$) is bounded below by some $r_0 > 0$. Let $\tau = r_0/6$. Take a finite set of points $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^N \subset \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1/4, 4\lambda_2)}$ such that for any point $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1/4, 4\lambda_2)}$ we have that $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho_k) \leq \tau$ for some ρ_k . For each k take an open ball $U_k = B(\rho_k, r_0)$ centred at ρ_k , and corresponding geodesic coordinates $\kappa_k : U_k \rightarrow V_k \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. By construction the U_k form a finite open covering of $\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1/4, 4\lambda_2)}$. By (4.1) and the fact that $q_\omega \in S_\beta^{-\infty}(T^*X)$ it follows that the coefficients of the Hamilton vector field H_p (4.2) are bounded in each chart κ_j by $C(1 + \delta h^{-\beta})$. This bound is uniform in j , since we only consider finitely many charts.

Recall from Section 2.6 that we have equipped T^*X with the Riemannian metric g_0 . We denote by $|\cdot|_{g_0}$ the norm on $T_\rho T^*X$ induced by g_0 . Then, by (4.21), (4.22), we see that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_\delta^t(\rho), \rho) &\leq \int_0^t |\dot{\Phi}_\delta^s(\rho)|_{g_0} ds \\ &= \int_0^t |H_p(\Phi_\delta^s(\rho))|_{g_0} ds \\ &\leq O(|t|)(1 + \delta h^{-\beta}) \\ &= O(|t|). \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

where in the last step we used (2.9). Notice that the estimate is uniform in $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$, $h \in]0, h_0]$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$. Furthermore, note that (4.24) holds also with δ replaced by δ' .

2. Assume first that

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') \geq \tau. \tag{4.25}$$

The triangular inequality and (4.24) yield that there exists a $C > 0$ such that for all $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$ satisfying (4.25), all $h \in]0, h_0]$, all $0 \leq \delta' \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_\delta^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')) &\leq \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_\delta^t(\rho), \rho) + \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') + \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho'), \rho') \\ &\leq O(|t|) + \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') \\ &\leq e^{C|t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho'). \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

3. Next, we work with

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') < \tau. \tag{4.27}$$

Since we covered $\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$ with local coordinate patches U_j , we have that any two points $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$ satisfying (4.27) are contained in the same U_j , for some k , with $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho^{(l)}, \rho_j) < 2\tau$. Hence the distance of ρ, ρ' to the boundary of $B(\rho_j, 2r_0/3)$ is bounded from below by $r_0/2$. The local coordinate chart is $\kappa_j : U_j \rightarrow V_j \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. We denote by $\rho^{(l)}$ the coordinate representation of $\rho^{(l)}$, by $H_{\delta, j}$ the Hamilton vector fields in these coordinates, and by $\Phi_{\delta, j}^t = (\Phi_{\delta, j, 1}^t, \dots, \Phi_{\delta, j, d}^t)$ the Hamiltonian flow in these coordinates with $t \in [-t_1, s_1]$, $t_1, s_1 > 0$, and similarly with δ replaced by δ' . Here, s_1 is the first time that either $\Phi_\delta^t(\rho)$ or $\Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')$ hits the boundary of $B(\rho_j, 2r_0/3)$ and similarly for negative times $-t_1$. The latter condition on t not only guarantees that $\Phi_\delta^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho') \in U_j$ for all $t \in [-t_1, s_1]$, but also gives a lower bound on the length of the time intervals $[0, s_1]$ and $[-t_1, 0]$. Indeed, without loss of generality we can assume that $\Phi_{\delta'}^{s_1}(\rho) \in \partial B(\rho_k, 2r_0/3)$. By computation similar to (4.24), we know that the length of the segment

$$\ell(\{\Phi_\delta^s(\rho); s \in [0, s_1]\}) \asymp |s_1|, \quad k = 0, 1,$$

with constants independent of ρ , $h > 0$ and of the chart U_k . Moreover, notice that

$$r_0/2 - 2\tau \leq \ell(\{\Phi_\delta^s(\rho); s \in [0, s_1]\}) \leq r_0/2.$$

Performing a similar computation for t_1 , we find that there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$, independent of ρ , $h > 0$ and of the chart U_k , such that

$$\frac{r_0}{C_0} \leq |t_1|, |s_1| \leq C_0 r_0. \tag{4.28}$$

Continuing, we have for every $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_{\delta, j, k}^t(\rho) - \Phi_{\delta', j, k}^t(\rho') \right) \right| &\leq \|H_{\delta, j}(\Phi_{\delta, j}^t(\rho)) - H_{\delta', j}(\Phi_{\delta', j}^t(\rho'))\| \\ &\leq C \|\Phi_{\delta, j}^t(\rho) - \Phi_{\delta', j}^t(\rho')\| + C\delta \|q_\omega\|_{C^1} \\ &\leq C \|\Phi_{\delta, j}^t(\rho) - \Phi_{\delta', j}^t(\rho')\| + C\delta h^{-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. Notice here that the constant only depends on the estimates on the coefficients of the Hamilton vector field in $\mathcal{E}_{0,(\lambda_1/4,4\lambda_2)}$. Hence, we may take a constant $C > 0$ which is independent of t, ρ, ρ', j and $h > 0$. This yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\Phi_{\delta,j,k}^t(\rho) - \Phi_{\delta',j,k}^t(\rho')\|^2 \leq C \|\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) - \Phi_{\delta',j}^t(\rho')\|^2 + C\delta^2 h^{-2\beta},$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of t, ρ, ρ', j and $h > 0$.

Continuing, we deduce from Grönwall's lemma that,

$$\|\Phi_{\delta,j}^t(\rho) - \Phi_{\delta',j}^t(\rho')\| \leq e^{C|t|} \|\rho - \rho'\| + C\delta h^{-\beta} (e^{C|t|} - 1),$$

for all $t \in [-t_1, s_1]$. Since the geodesic distance and Euclidean distance are comparable in local coordinates up to a constant factor depending only on the metric g_0 and j , we deduce, since j takes only finitely many values, that for all $t \in [-t_1, s_1]$,

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta}^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')) \leq C' e^{C'|t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') + C' \delta h^{-\beta} (e^{C'|t|} - 1) \quad (4.29)$$

for some $C' > 1$ independent of t, ρ, ρ', j and $h > 0$.

Taking $|t| \ll 1$ sufficiently small, we see that

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta}^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')) \leq \tau. \quad (4.30)$$

Let $I := [-\tau_0, \tau_1] \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be the largest interval such that (4.30) holds for all $t \in I' = I \cap \mathbb{R}$. Now we may iterate our previous construction in the following way to conclude that (4.29) holds for all $t \in I'$. We will work only with positive times, as the negative times can be treated analogously. Indeed, by the above construction we know that (4.29) holds for t in some interval $[0, s_1] \subset I$. Either $s_1 \geq \tau_1$, or (4.30) still holds at $t = t'_1$. In the latter case we restart our construction with $\rho^{(l)}$ replaced by $\Phi_{\delta^{(l)}}^{s_1}(\rho^{(l)})$ and by passing to a new coordinates system. Like this, we find a $s_2 > s_1$ such that for all $t \in [s_1, s_2]$

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta}^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')) \leq (C')^2 e^{C'|t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_0, \rho_1) + (C')^2 \delta h^{-\beta} e^{C'|t|} + C' \delta h^{-\beta} (e^{C'|t|} - 1). \quad (4.31)$$

Similar to (4.28) we find that

$$\frac{r_0}{C_0} \leq |s_2 - s_1| \leq C_0 r_0. \quad (4.32)$$

Again, either $s_2 \geq \tau_1$, or (4.30) still holds at $t = s_2$ and we continue as above. Like this, we find a strictly increasing sequence of times $\{s_n\}_{n=0}^N$, with $s_0 = 0$, $N \geq 1$, and such that

- $N < +\infty$ when $\tau_1 < +\infty$ and $s_N \geq \tau_1$;
- $N = +\infty$ when $\tau_1 = +\infty$ and $s_n < \tau_1$ for all n ;
- for all $0 \leq n < N$

$$r_0/C_0 \leq |s_{n+1} - s_n| \leq C_0 r_0; \quad (4.33)$$

- for all $0 \leq n < N$ and $t \in [s_n, s_{n+1}]$

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta}^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')) \leq (C')^{n+1} e^{C'|t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') + \delta h^{-\beta} e^{C'|t|} \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} (C')^k. \quad (4.34)$$

By (4.33) we know that $nr_0/C_0 \leq |s_n| \leq C_0 r_0 n$. So when $t \in [s_n, s_{n+1}]$, we find that $n \leq |t|C_0/r_0$. Plugging this into (4.34) we get for all $t \in [0, s_N]$, when $N < \infty$, and all $t \in [0, \infty[$, when $N = \infty$, that

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta}^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho')) \leq (C'') e^{C''|t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') + \delta h^{-\beta} e^{C''|t|}, \quad (4.35)$$

for some $C'' > 1$ independent of t, ρ, ρ', j and $h > 0$.

Now, when $N = +\infty$ we are done. When $N < +\infty$ we know that when $t \in [0, s_N]$ (4.35) holds, and that when $t = s_N \geq \tau_1$ we have

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta}^t(\rho_0), \Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho_1)) > \tau.$$

Similar to step 2 above, the triangular inequality then yields that for all $t > t'_N$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_\delta^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^{s_N}(\rho')) &\leq \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_\delta^t(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^{s_N}(\rho)) + \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta'}^{s_N}(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^{s_N}(\rho')) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta'}^t(\rho'), \Phi_{\delta'}^{s_N}(\rho')) \\ &\leq O(|t - s_N|) + \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_{\delta'}^{s_N}(\rho), \Phi_{\delta'}^{s_N}(\rho')) \\ &\leq C''' e^{C''|t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') + \delta h^{-\beta} e^{C''|t|}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

for some $C''' > 1$ independent of t, s_N, ρ, ρ', j and $h > 0$. This concludes the proof when X is compact.

4. When we are working on the universal cover \tilde{X} we can follow the exact same steps with all quantities replaced by their lifted counterparts. Let us just insist on two subtleties: since we are working on the universal cover the injectivity radius on $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{0, [\lambda_1/4, 4\lambda_2]} \subset T^*\tilde{X}$ is still bounded below by some $r_0 > 0$, as this is case on the base manifold. Furthermore, the estimates on the coefficients of the lifted Hamilton vector field still only depends on a finite number of charts, as this is the case on the base manifold.

This concludes the proof of the Lemma. \square

We conclude this paragraph by noting that Lemma 4.3 implies the classical fact that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\forall \rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{8}, 2)}, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi^t(\rho), \Phi^t(\rho')) \leq C e^{C|t|} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho'). \quad (4.37)$$

4.6. Dynamics of Lagrangian manifolds.

4.6.1. Lagrangian manifolds and instability.

Definition 4.4. Let $\eta > 0, \delta \geq 0$, and let $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$ be a submanifold. We shall say that Λ is $(\delta; \eta, \kappa)$ -unstable if, for any $\rho \in \Lambda$ and any $v = (v_+, v_0, v_-, \hat{v}_0) \in T_\rho \Lambda \subset T_\rho T^*X = E_{\delta, \rho}^+ \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^0 \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^- \oplus \hat{E}_{\delta, \rho}^0$, we have that

$$|v_-|_\rho \leq \eta |v|_\rho.$$

$$|\hat{v}_0|_\rho \leq \kappa |v|_\rho.$$

Lemma 4.5. There exists $\gamma, T, \kappa_0, \eta_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that the following holds. For all $0 \leq \delta < \delta_0, 0 \leq \kappa < \kappa_0$ and all $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$, if $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$ is $(\delta; \eta, \kappa)$ -unstable, then for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda)$ is $(\delta; \gamma\eta, \gamma\kappa)$ unstable. Furthermore, $\Phi_\delta^T(\Lambda)$ is $(\delta; \eta, \gamma\kappa)$ unstable.

We postpone the proof of this lemma until after the following Corollary.

Corollary 4.6. There exists $\gamma, T, \kappa_0, \eta, \delta_0 > 0$ such that the following holds. For every $\kappa_1 < \kappa_0$, the following holds for every $\delta \in [0, \delta_0)$. If $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$ is (δ, η, κ_1) -unstable, then $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda)$ is $(\delta, \gamma\eta, \kappa_0)$ -unstable for all $0 \leq t \leq T \left(1 + \ln \left(\frac{\kappa_0}{\kappa_1}\right) \ln \gamma\right)$.

Furthermore, there exists $C, c > 0$ such that, for all $\rho_0 \in \Lambda$ and all $w \in T_{\rho_0} \Lambda$, if we write $d_{\rho_0} \Phi_\delta^t(w) = (\Phi_\delta^t(\rho_0), v_t)$, we have

$$|v_t|_{\Phi_\delta^t(\rho_0)} \geq C c^t |w|_{\rho_0}. \quad (4.38)$$

Proof of Corollary 4.6. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $t \in (nT, (n+1)T)$. In particular, the assumption on t implies that

$$\gamma^n \kappa_1 < \kappa_0.$$

We may thus apply Lemma 4.5 n times to obtain the first part of the result.

Equation (4.38) follows from iterations of equation (4.42) below. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Let $t \geq 0$, let $\rho \in \Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda)$, and let $v \in T_\rho \Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda)$. By definition, there exists $\rho_0 \in \Lambda$ such that $\rho = \Phi_\delta^t(\rho_0)$, and $w \in T_{\rho_0} \Lambda$ such that $d_{\rho_0} \Phi_\delta^t(w) = v$. Let us write $\lambda = p(\rho, \delta) \in (\frac{1}{2}, 2)$.

Let us write $w = (w_+, w_0, w_-, \hat{w}_0) \in E_{\delta, \rho_0}^+ \oplus E_{\delta, \rho_0}^0 \oplus E_{\delta, \rho_0}^- \oplus \hat{E}_{\delta, \rho_0}^0$. By assumption, we have $|w_-|_\rho \leq \eta|w|_\rho$ and $|\hat{w}_0|_\rho \leq \kappa|w|_\rho$. Now, thanks to (4.11), we have $v = (v_+, v_0, v_-, \hat{v}_0) \in E_{\delta, \rho}^+ \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^0 \oplus E_{\delta, \rho}^- \oplus \hat{E}_{\delta, \rho}^0$, with

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_+ \\ v_0 \\ v_- \\ \hat{v}_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\rho, \delta, t} w_+ + r_{1; \delta, t}(\rho) \hat{w}_0 \\ w_0 + \lambda t \hat{w}_0 + r_{2; \delta, t}(\rho) \hat{w}_0 \\ (M_{\rho, \delta, t}^{-1})^\dagger w_- + r_{3; \delta, t}(\rho) \hat{w}_0 \\ \hat{w}_0 + r_{4; \delta, t}(\rho) \hat{w}_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Recall that, for any $T > 0$, we may find $\delta(T) > 0$ such that, for all $0 \leq \delta < \delta(T)$, all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $j \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, we have

$$\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{2}, 2)}} |r_{j; \delta, t}(\rho)|_\rho \leq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (4.39)$$

In particular,

$$|\hat{v}_0|_\rho \leq \frac{5}{4} |\hat{w}_0|_{\rho_0} \leq \frac{5\kappa}{4} |w|_{\rho_0} \quad (4.40)$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} |v|_\rho &\geq c_2^{-1} [|v_+|_\rho + |v_0|_\rho] \\ &\geq c_2^{-1} \left[CA^t |w_+|_{\rho_0} + |w_0|_{\rho_0} - \left(\lambda t + \frac{1}{2}\right) |\hat{w}_0|_{\rho_0} \right] \\ &\geq c_2^{-1} \left[CA^t |w_+|_{\rho_0} + |w_0|_{\rho_0} - \kappa \left(\lambda t + \frac{1}{2}\right) |w|_{\rho_0} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Recall that by assumption, we have $|w_-|_{\rho_0} + |\hat{w}_0|_{\rho_0} \leq c_2(\kappa + \eta)|w|_{\rho_0}$, so that $|w_+|_{\rho_0} + |w_0|_{\rho_0} \geq (c_1 - (\kappa + \eta)c_2)|w|_{\rho_0}$. Therefore, there exists $c_3 = c_3(C, c_1, c_2) > 0$ such that, for all $T > 0$, there exists $\kappa(T) > 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$ such that, if $\kappa < \kappa(T)$, $\eta < \eta_0$ and $\delta < \delta(T)$ with $\delta(T)$ as in (4.39), we have

$$|v|_\rho \geq c_3 |w|_{\rho_0}. \quad (4.42)$$

In particular, combined with (4.40), this implies that

$$|\hat{v}_0|_\rho \leq \frac{5c_3\kappa}{4} |v|_\rho.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$|v_-|_\rho = \left| (M_{\rho, \delta, t}^{-1})^\dagger w_- \right|_{\rho_0} \leq Cc_1^{-1} A^{-t} |w_-|_{\rho_0} \leq Cc_3c_1^{-1} A^{-t} \eta |v|_\rho.$$

We thus take T such that $Cc_3c_1^{-1} A^{-t} < 1$, $\delta_0 := \delta(T)$ such that (4.39) holds, and $\kappa_0 = \kappa(T)$ such that (4.42) holds. This gives us the result. \square

Let us now rephrase the results of this section in terms of the Lagrangian states appearing in Theorem 2.10.

Proposition 4.7. *There exists $c, c_0 > 0$, $\eta > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ such that the following holds.*

*Let $\Lambda \subset S^*X$ be a monochromatic Lagrangian manifold which is η -unstable, as in section 2.1. Then for every $\delta < \delta_0$, for all $0 \leq t < c_0 \ln \delta$, $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda)$ is $(\delta, c\eta, c\eta)$ -unstable.*

Proof. We claim that there exists $c_1, \delta_1 > 0$ such that, for all $0 \leq \delta < \delta_1$, Λ is $(\delta, 2\eta, c_1\delta)$ -unstable. This follows from the continuity relation (4.9), and from the fact that the maps $\delta \mapsto T_\rho \mathcal{E}_{\delta, \lambda}$ and $\delta \mapsto \hat{E}_\rho^0$ are smooth. We may thus apply Corollary 4.6 to deduce the result. \square

4.6.2. Unstability and projectability. Let Y be a d -dimensional Riemannian manifold (not necessarily compact). Recall that a Lagrangian submanifold is a submanifold $\Lambda \subset T^*Y$ of dimension d , such that the canonical symplectic form of T^*Y vanishes on $T_\rho\Lambda$ for any $\rho \in \Lambda$, see for instance [11, Chapter 1]. In what follows, we will focus on a special family of Lagrangian submanifolds, which can be written as graphs:

Definition 4.8. Let $\Lambda \subset T^*Y$ be a submanifold with $\dim \Lambda = \dim Y$ and let $\rho \in \Lambda$. We call Λ projectable at a point $\rho \in \Lambda$ if $\pi_Y|_\Lambda : \Lambda \rightarrow Y$ is a local diffeomorphism near ρ , in the sense that each ρ has a neighbourhood in Λ which is mapped diffeomorphically by π onto a neighbourhood of $\pi(\rho)$.

We call Λ locally projectable if $\pi_Y|_\Lambda : \Lambda \rightarrow Y$ is a local diffeomorphism in the sense that each point $\rho \in \Lambda$ has a neighbourhood in Λ which is mapped diffeomorphically by π onto a neighbourhood of $\pi(\rho)$.

Similarly, we call Λ projectable if $\pi_Y|_\Lambda : \Lambda \rightarrow \pi_Y(\Lambda)$ is a diffeomorphism.

Remark 4.9. The Poincaré Lemma shows that a projectable submanifold $\Lambda \subset T^*Y$ with $\dim \Lambda = \dim Y$ is Lagrangian if and only if it is locally given by the graph of a gradient. In other words, Λ is Lagrangian if and only if for each point $\rho \in \Lambda$, we can find a real-valued C^∞ function $\phi(x)$ defined near $\pi(\rho)$, such that Λ coincides near ρ with the manifold $\{(x, d_x\phi); x \in \text{some neighbourhood of } \pi(\rho)\}$.

Also note that by the inverse function theorem, Λ is projectable at $\rho = (x, \xi) \in \Lambda$ if and only if the manifolds Λ and T_x^*Y are transverse.

Remark 4.10. If Λ is connected, locally projectable, and if $\pi_Y(\Lambda)$ is simply connected, then Λ is projectable.

Next, we show that unstable Lagrangian submanifolds are projectable.

Lemma 4.11. Let (X, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold of negative sectional curvature. There exists $\eta_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that, if $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$ and $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$ is a (δ, η_0, η_0) -unstable Lagrangian submanifold, then Λ is locally projectable.

Proof. It is well known that for any $\rho = (x, \xi) \in T^*X$, $\xi \neq 0$, any one distribution E_ρ^\bullet , $\bullet \in \{+, -, 0\}$, and T_x^*X are transverse submanifolds of T^*X , see for instance [20, Lemma 4.6]. It follows, that for any $v \in E_\rho^\bullet$ and any $w \in T_\rho T_x^*X$, we have $|\langle v, w \rangle_\rho| \neq |v|_\rho |w|_\rho$. By compactness we may thus find a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$, and for any $v \in E_\rho^\bullet$, $\bullet \in \{+, -, 0\}$, and any $w \in T_\rho T_x^*X$, we have

$$|\langle v, w \rangle_\rho| \leq (1 - c_0)|v|_\rho |w|_\rho.$$

From the continuity (4.9), we deduce that, if δ_0 is small enough, for all $\rho \in \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$, and for any $v \in E_{\delta, \rho}^{+0}$ and any $w \in T_\rho T_x^*X$, we have

$$|\langle v, w \rangle_\rho| \leq \left(1 - \frac{c_0}{2}\right) |v|_\rho |w|_\rho.$$

Let Λ be (δ, η_0) -unstable for some $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$, let $\rho = (x, \xi) \in \Lambda$, let $v \in T_\rho\Lambda$ and $w \in T_\rho T_x^*X$ with $|v|_\rho = |w|_\rho = 1$. By the instability assumption, if η is small enough, there exists $v' \in E_{\delta, \rho}^{+0}$ with $|v'|_\rho = 1$ such that $|v - v'|_\rho \leq \frac{c_0}{4}$. We thus have

$$|\langle v, w \rangle_\rho| \leq |\langle v', w \rangle_\rho| + \frac{c_0}{4} \leq 1 - \frac{c_0}{4}.$$

In particular, we have $v \neq w$, so that $T_\rho\Lambda \cap T_\rho T_x^*X = \{0\}$. The second observation in Remark 4.9 then implies that Λ is projectable at ρ . Since the above argument holds for any $\rho \in \Lambda$ we conclude the statement. \square

4.6.3. Expandingness of Lagrangian manifolds in negative curvature. Let us recall a standard result concerning manifolds of negative curvature (see [23, Theorem 4.8.2]).

Lemma 4.12. Let (X, g) be a simply connected and connected manifold of nonpositive sectional curvature, and let $\rho, \rho' \in T^*X$. Then the map $\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto \text{dist}_X^2(\Phi^t(\rho), \Phi^t(\rho'))$ is convex.

In particular, we have the following result.

Corollary 4.13. *Let (X, g) be a connected manifold of nonpositive sectional curvature, and let $\rho, \rho' \in T^*X$. Suppose that $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval such that for all $t \in I$, $\text{dist}_X(\Phi^t(\rho), \Phi^t(\rho')) < r_I$. Then the map $I \ni t \mapsto \text{dist}_X^2(\Phi^t(\rho), \Phi^t(\rho'))$ is convex.*

Thus, as long as ρ and ρ' remain close to each other, the square of their distance (on the basis X) is a convex function. This convex function could be constant: this is the case when ρ and ρ' belong to the same geodesic. However, the following lemma guaranties that, if ρ, ρ' belong to an unstable Lagrangian manifold and do not belong to the same (short) geodesic segment, then the distance between them is ultimately increasing.

Lemma 4.14. *Let (X, g) be a compact manifold of negative curvature. There exist $\varepsilon > 0$, $\eta_0 > 0$, $t_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\Lambda \subset S^*X$ be an η_0 -unstable Lagrangian manifold, and let $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda$ be such that $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_1, \rho_2) < \varepsilon$. Then there exist $\tau \in (-C\varepsilon, C\varepsilon)$ such that for all $\tau' \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, we have*

$$\text{dist}_X(\Phi^{t_0}(\rho_1), \Phi^{t_0+\tau'}(\rho_2)) > 2\text{dist}_X(\rho_1, \Phi^\tau(\rho_2))$$

and $\text{dist}_X(\Phi^t(\rho_1), \Phi^{t+\tau}(\rho_2)) \leq C\varepsilon$ for all $t \in [0, t_0]$.

Proof. First of all, since the distributions E_ρ^{-0} are transverse to the vertical fibres of T^*X , and since X is compact, there exists $C_1, C_2, \varepsilon, \eta > 0$ such that, if Λ is a Lagrangian manifold which is η -unstable, and if $\rho, \rho' \in \Lambda$ with $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') < \varepsilon$, then we have

$$C_1 \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') \leq \text{dist}_X(\rho, \rho') \leq C_2 \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho'). \quad (4.43)$$

Next, for every $\rho \in S^*X$, we introduce coordinates (u_ρ, s_ρ, n_ρ) in a neighbourhood of ρ in S^*X that are *adapted*, in the sense that

- For every ρ' , the map $\rho \mapsto (u_\rho(\rho'), s_\rho(\rho'), n_\rho(\rho'))$ is continuous in a neighbourhood of ρ' .
- $(u_\rho(\rho'), n_\rho(\rho')) = (0, 0) \iff \rho' \in W_\rho^+$. We then have $|s_\rho(\rho')| = \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho')$.
- $(s_\rho(\rho'), n_\rho(\rho')) = (0, 0) \iff \rho' \in W_\rho^-$. We then have $|u_\rho(\rho')| = \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho')$.
- $(u_\rho(\rho'), s_\rho(\rho')) = (0, 0) \iff \Phi^{n_\rho(\rho')}(\rho) = \rho'$. (u_ρ, s_ρ, n_ρ) is a diffeomorphism from a neighbourhood of ρ in S^*X to a neighbourhood of the origin in \mathbb{R}^{2d-1} .

Since the vector spaces E_ρ^\bullet depend continuously on ρ and are transverse, we deduce by compactness that there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\rho, \rho' \in S^*X$ with $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') < \varepsilon$, we have

$$c_1 (|u_\rho(\rho')| + |s_\rho(\rho')| + |n_\rho(\rho')|) \leq \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') \leq c_2 (|u_\rho(\rho')| + |s_\rho(\rho')| + |n_\rho(\rho')|). \quad (4.44)$$

Let $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda_0$, with $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_1, \rho_2) < \varepsilon$. Then there exists a time τ such that $n_\rho(\Phi^\tau(\rho_2)) = 0$. We then write $\rho_3 := \Phi^\tau(\rho_2)$. Since $\rho_3 \in \Lambda_0$, we have

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_3, \rho_1) \leq C_3 |u_\rho(\rho_3)| \quad (4.45)$$

provided ε and η_0 are small enough. Now, thanks to (4.11), there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $t > 0$, we have (provided ε is small enough)

$$|u_{\Phi^t(\rho_1)}(\Phi^{t+\tau'}(\rho_2))| \geq C' e^t |u_{\rho_1}(\rho_2')|. \quad (4.46)$$

We may then deduce the result by taking t large enough, using (4.43), (4.44) and (4.45). \square

4.6.4. Projectability of Lagrangian manifolds on the universal cover. We shall say that a Lagrangian manifold $\Lambda \subset T^*X$ is D -controlled if it can be put in the form $\Lambda = \{(x, d_x\phi), x \in U\}$ with $\|\phi\|_{C^3} \leq D$.

Our aim in this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.15. *There exists $\mathfrak{d}_0 > 0$ such that, for all $D \geq 0$, we may find $\eta(D), \delta_0(D) > 0$ such that the following holds for all $\delta \in [0, \delta_0]$.*

*Let $\Lambda \subset S^*X$ be a simply connected and connected monochromatic Lagrangian manifold which is η -unstable, D controlled and has distortion $\leq D$, as in section 2.1.*

Consider a lift $\tilde{\Lambda} \subset S^\tilde{X}$. Then, for all $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}_0 |\log \delta|$, $\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\tilde{\Lambda}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{4}, 1)}$ is a simply connected and connected Lagrangian submanifold which is projectable.*

Before proving this proposition, we first need to prove results about the evolution of Λ by $\tilde{\Phi}^t$.

Lemma 4.16. *Let $\varepsilon, D > 0$. There exists $T_0, T_1 \geq 0$ such that, for all $T \geq T_0$, there exists $\eta(T) > 0$ such that, if $\Lambda \subset S^*\tilde{X}$ is an η -unstable Lagrangian manifold that is D -controlled, the following holds. If $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda$, we may find $T_2 \in [T - T_1, T + T_1]$ such that $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T_2}(\rho_2)) \leq \varepsilon \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.*

Proof. If $\rho \in S^*\tilde{X}$, we define the unstable manifold at ρ as

$$W_\rho^+ := \{\rho' \in S^*\tilde{X}; \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho), \tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho')) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow -\infty} 0\}.$$

At ρ , the manifold W_ρ^+ is tangent to the space E_ρ^+ introduced in section 4.2 (see [25, §17.4]), while the weak unstable manifold $W_\rho^{+0} := \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \tilde{\Phi}^t(W_\rho^+)$ has tangent space at ρ $E_\rho^+ \oplus E_\rho^0$.

Recall that $\Lambda = \{(x, d_x\phi), x \in U\}$ with $\|\phi\|_{C^3} \leq D$, while, since W_ρ^{+0} is locally projectable, we may write W_ρ^{+0} as $\{(x, d_x\psi)\}$ in a neighbourhood of $\rho = (x_0, \xi_0)$, for some smooth function ψ . By definition, we have $d_{x_0}\psi = d_{x_0}\phi$, while, thanks to the η -instability hypothesis, we have $d_{(x_0, d_{x_0}\psi)}d\psi - d_{(x_0, d_{x_0}\phi)}d\phi = O(\eta)$. Finally, the D -control hypothesis implies that third derivatives are bounded. Therefore, we may find $\varepsilon_1(\eta) > 0$ such that, if $\rho, \rho' \in \Lambda$ with $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho, \rho') < \varepsilon_1$, then $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho', W_\rho^{+0}) < 2\eta \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho, \rho')$. In particular, there exists $\rho'' \in W_\rho^+$ and $\tau \in (-c\varepsilon_1, c\varepsilon_1)$ such that $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho', \tilde{\Phi}^\tau(\rho'')) < 2\eta \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho, \rho')$ and $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho'') < c \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho')$. Here, c depends only on the manifold (X, g) .

Now, by definition of unstable manifolds, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $T_0 \geq 0$ such that, for all $s \geq T_0$, we have $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-s}(\rho), \tilde{\Phi}^{-s}(\rho'')) < \varepsilon \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho, \rho'')$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T-\tau}(\rho), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho')) &\leq \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T-\tau}(\rho), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T-\tau}(\rho'')) + \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho'), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T-\tau}(\rho'')) \\ &\leq c\varepsilon \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho, \rho') + Ce^{CT} \eta \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho, \rho'), \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (4.37). This quantity may thus be made smaller than $(c+1)\varepsilon \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho, \rho'')$ if η is chosen smaller than some η_0 depending on ε and T , but not on ρ, ρ' .

From now on, we fix a $\varepsilon > 0$, a $T \geq T_0$, an $\eta < \eta_0(\varepsilon, T)$, and a corresponding $\varepsilon_1(\eta)$. The assumption on the distortion implies that if $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda$, there exists a curve in Λ of length $\leq D \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ joining ρ_1 and ρ_2 . Taking points at a distance $\approx \varepsilon_1$ on this curve, we see that there exists $N \leq C(D)\varepsilon_1^{-1} \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ and $\rho_1 = \rho'_1, \rho'_2, \dots, \rho'_N = \rho_2$ with $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho'_j, \rho'_{j+1}) < \varepsilon_1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho'_j, \rho'_{j+1}) \leq C'(D) \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Using the previous construction, we build a sequence of times t_1, \dots, t_N with $t_1 = T$, $|t_j - t_{j+1}| \leq c\varepsilon_1$ with $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-t_j}(\rho'_j), \tilde{\Phi}^{-t_{j+1}}(\rho'_{j+1})) < (c+1)\varepsilon \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho'_j, \rho'_{j+1})$, so that the triangular inequality yields $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-t_1}(\rho'_1), \tilde{\Phi}^{-t_N}(\rho'_N)) < C''(D)\varepsilon \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Note that $|t_N - t_1| \leq C(D) \times c$ and recall that $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ and $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ are comparable thanks to the hypothesis of D -control. Taking ε possibly smaller, and setting $T'_2 = t_n$, we deduce the result. \square

Corollary 4.17. *Let $D > 0$. There exists $\eta > 0$ such that, if $\Lambda \subset S^*\tilde{X}$ is an η -unstable Lagrangian manifold that is D -controlled, the following holds. For all $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda$ and for all $t \geq 0$, we have $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_2)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that there exist $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda$ and $t > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_2)) < \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2). \quad (4.47)$$

Thanks to Lemma 4.16, we know (provided η is small enough) that there exists T arbitrarily large such that, for all $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Lambda$, we may find T' at a bounded distance from T such that $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T'}(\rho_2)) \leq \frac{1}{4} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

Suppose that $T \geq T'$ (the case $T \leq T'$ is treated similarly). We have, using the fact that \tilde{X} is a simply connected manifold of negative curvature (so that geodesics minimize the distance between

their endpoints):

$$\begin{aligned} t + T &= \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_1) \right) \\ &\leq \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_2) \right) + \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}^t(\rho_2), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T'}(\rho_2) \right) + \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T'}(\rho_2), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_1) \right) \\ &< t + T' + \frac{3}{4} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2), \end{aligned}$$

so that $|T' - T| < \frac{3}{4} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_2) \right) &\leq \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_1), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T'}(\rho_2) \right) + \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}^{-T'}(\rho_2), \tilde{\Phi}^{-T}(\rho_2) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2) + |T' - T| \\ &< \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1, \rho_2). \end{aligned}$$

This inequality, along with (4.47), contradicts Lemma 4.12. \square

We may now proceed with the proof of Proposition 4.15.

Proof of Proposition 4.15. Since simple connectedness is preserved by homeomorphism, $\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is simply connected and connected. We need to show that

$$\forall \rho_1, \rho_2 \in \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\tilde{\Lambda}), (\rho_1 \neq \rho_2) \implies (\pi_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1) \neq \pi_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_2)), \quad (4.48)$$

which implies that $\pi_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\tilde{\Lambda}))$ is simply connected. The result then follows from Proposition 4.7, Lemma 4.11 and Remarks 4.9, 4.10.

To prove (4.48), we suppose that there exists $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\tilde{\Lambda})$, such that $\pi_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_1) = \pi_{\tilde{X}}(\rho_2)$, and we write $\rho'_j = \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^{-t}(\rho_j) \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ for $j = 1, 2$. We separate two cases:

- Suppose first that $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) > h^{\beta/2}$. Since $\rho'_1, \rho'_2 \in \tilde{\Lambda}$, we thus have $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) > Ch^{\beta/2}$. Using Lemma 4.3, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_0^t(\rho'_1), \tilde{\Phi}_0^t(\rho'_2) \right) &\leq \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_0^t(\rho'_1), \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\rho'_1) \right) + \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\rho'_1), \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\rho'_2) \right) + \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\rho'_2), \tilde{\Phi}_0^t(\rho'_2) \right) \\ &\leq C\delta h^{-\beta-\varepsilon'} \quad \text{for any } \varepsilon' > 0, \text{ if } \mathfrak{d}_0 \text{ is chosen small enough} \\ &< \frac{1}{2} h^{\beta/2} \end{aligned}$$

if h is small enough, thanks to (2.9). This contradicts Corollary 4.17.

- Suppose next that $\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho'_1, \rho'_2) < h^{\beta/2}$. Then, there exists $s_0 \leq C(D)h^{\beta/2}$ and a curve $\varrho(s)$ in $\tilde{\Lambda}$, with $\varrho(0) = \rho'_1$, $\varrho(s_0) = \rho'_2$ and $|\varrho'(s)| = 1$ for all t . Using coordinates on T^*X near ρ_1 , the bounds on derivatives of $\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t$ derived in Remark 4.2 imply that, in coordinates, $\rho_2 = \rho_1 + s_0 d_{\rho'_1} \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\varrho'(0)) + O(s_0^2 h^{-\varepsilon})$. Now, thanks to Proposition 4.7 and Lemma 4.11, which imply that $\tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is locally projectable, the angle between $d_{\rho'_1} \tilde{\Phi}_\delta^t(\varrho'(0))$ and the vertical leaves is bounded from below: hence, (4.48) follows. \square

5. WKB ANSATZ

We still consider a compact connected smooth Riemannian manifold (X, g) and (\tilde{X}, \tilde{g}) its universal cover equipped with the lifted Riemannian metric. In this section, we shall work on the universal cover \tilde{X} and with the lifted quantities \tilde{p} (4.12), $\tilde{\Phi}_h^t$ (4.15), \tilde{q}_ω , \tilde{P}_h^δ and \tilde{Q}_ω , cf. Section 3.3. To ease the notation we will suppress the \sim notation until further notice.

Let $h \in]0, h_0]$. Let $\mathcal{O} \subset X$ be a connected and simply connected open relatively compact set and let $\phi_0 : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth map as in (2.2), with $|d_x \phi_0| = 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$. We consider an initial Lagrangian state

$$f_h(x) = a(x; h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_0(x)}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $a(\cdot; h)$ is a smooth compactly supported map on \mathcal{O} with $\|a(\cdot; h)\|_{C^L} = O_L(1)$ and such that $a(x; h) \sim a_0(x) + ha_1(x) + \dots$ where a_n are smooth compactly supported maps on \mathcal{O} . We assume that there exists a compact h -independent set $K \Subset \mathcal{O}$ such that

$$\text{supp } a(\cdot; h) \subset K \quad (5.2)$$

for all $h \in]0, h_0]$. As discussed in Section 2.1, this represents a Lagrangian state supported on the Lagrangian manifold

$$\Lambda_0 := \{(y, d_y \phi_0); y \in \mathcal{O}\} \subset S^*X$$

which is assumed to be a monochromatic, D -controlled Lagrangian manifold of distortion $\leq D$, that is η -unstable for some $\eta \leq \eta_0(D)$, as in Section 2.1.

The main aim of this section is to approximate the propagated state

$$\tilde{u}(t, x; h) = e^{i\frac{t}{h}P_h^\delta} f(x) \quad (5.3)$$

by a WKB state, cf. (5.11) below.

Before doing so, let us introduce auxiliary cut-off functions which will be useful in this section. First of all, it will be useful to consider two intermediate open relatively compact sets $\mathcal{O}', \mathcal{O}'' \subset \mathcal{O}$, independent of h , with

$$K \subset \mathcal{O}' \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}'} \subset \mathcal{O}'' \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}''} \subset \mathcal{O}. \quad (5.4)$$

We can construct a sequence of cut-off functions $\psi, \psi_i \in C_c^\infty(X; [0, 1])$, $i = 0, \dots, N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}''} \succ \psi \succ \psi_N \succ \dots \succ \psi_0 \succ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}'}. \quad (5.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x^\alpha \psi(x)| &\leq O_\alpha(1), \\ |\partial_x^\alpha \psi_i(x)| &\leq O_{\alpha, N}(1) \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d, i = 0, \dots, N, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in local coordinates. We write

$$\Lambda_0^\bullet = \{(y, d_y \phi_0(y)); y \in \mathcal{O}^\bullet\}, \quad \bullet \in \{', ''\}$$

and

$$\Phi_\delta^t(y, d_y \phi_0) = (x_\delta^t(y), \xi_\delta^t(y)) =: \rho_\delta^t(y). \quad (5.6)$$

We know from Proposition 4.15 that there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ such that for any $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, the Lagrangian submanifold $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0)$ is projectable and simply connected. Hence, for any $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, there exists a smooth map $\phi_{t, \delta} : \mathcal{O}_{t, \delta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_t &:= \Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0) = \{(x, d_x \phi_{t, \delta}); x \in \mathcal{O}_{t, \delta}\} \\ \Lambda_t^\bullet &:= \Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0^\bullet) = \{(x, d_x \phi_{t, \delta}); x \in \mathcal{O}_{t, \delta}^\bullet\}, \quad \bullet \in \{', ''\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{t, \delta} = \pi_X(\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0))$, $\mathcal{O}_{t, \delta}^\bullet = \pi_X(\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0^\bullet)) \subset X$ are open sets. For $t = 0$ we have not evolved the initial Lagrangian manifold Λ_0 , so $\phi_{0, \delta} = \phi_0$ and $\mathcal{O}_{0, \delta}^\bullet = \mathcal{O}^\bullet$, $\mathcal{O}_{0, \delta} = \mathcal{O}$. Now, using Lemma 4.3, we see that, if $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$ for \mathfrak{d} and h small enough, we have

$$\mathcal{O}'_{t, \delta} \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}'_{t, \delta}} \subset \mathcal{O}''_{t, \delta} \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}''_{t, \delta}} \subset \mathcal{O}_{t, 0}. \quad (5.8)$$

Indeed, thanks to Lemma 4.3, we see that, for \mathfrak{d} small enough, there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that all points of $\overline{\mathcal{O}''_{t, \delta}}$ are at a distance at most $O(h^\gamma)$ from points of $\overline{\mathcal{O}''_{t, 0}}$. Now, using Lemma 4.3 again, we deduce that $\pi_X \Phi_0^{-t}(\overline{\mathcal{O}''_{t, \delta}})$ is in a neighbourhood of size $O(h^\gamma)$ of \mathcal{O}'' , which is thus included in \mathcal{O} for h small enough. Other inclusions are proved analogously.

Continuing, we note by (5.8) that the map ϕ_0 is well-defined on $\mathcal{O}''_{t, \delta}$. Moreover, since $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0)$ is projectable, the map $y \mapsto x_\delta^t(y)$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image and we shall denote its inverse by $y_\delta^{-t}(x)$. Then, the functions

$$\psi_t := \psi \circ y_\delta^{-t}, \quad \psi_{i, t} := \psi_i \circ y_\delta^{-t}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N, \quad (5.9)$$

are smooth functions in x and t and satisfy

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}''_{\delta, t}} \succ \psi_t \succ \psi_{N, t} \succ \dots \succ \psi_{0, t} \succ \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}'_{\delta, t}}. \quad (5.10)$$

In particular $\phi_{t,\delta}$ is well defined on $\text{supp } \psi_t$ and on $\text{supp } \psi_{i,t}$, $i = 0, \dots, N$. We will give estimates on their derivatives further below in the text.

From now on, we will slightly abuse notations whenever convenient, and forget the primes, assuming that ϕ_0 , $\phi_{t,\delta}$ and the cut-off functions $\psi_{i,t}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and ψ_t are well-defined on a small open neighbourhood of $\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$.

The aim of this section is to prove the following statement, which describes a WKB approximation $u_\delta(t, x; h)$ to the propagated state $\tilde{u}(t, x; h)$, cf. (5.3).

Proposition 5.1. *Let \tilde{X} be the universal cover of a compact connected smooth Riemannian manifold X of negative sectional curvature. Let q_ω be as in (2.6) and let \tilde{Q}_ω be either a lift of $\text{Op}_h(q_\omega)$ (in the *Random Ψ DO case*) or the multiplication operator with the function $\tilde{q}_\omega = \tilde{\pi}^* q_\omega$ (in the *Random Potential case*). Let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \subset \tilde{X}$ be a connected and simply connected relatively compact open set, and let $\phi_0 : \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth map such that the Lagrangian manifold*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_0 := \{(y, d_y \phi_0(y)); y \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\}$$

is D -controlled, has distortion $< D$ and is η -unstable for some $\eta < \eta_0(D)$, as in Proposition 4.15. Let $a(x; h)$ be a smooth compactly supported function on $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ with $\|a(\cdot; h)\|_{C^L} = O_L(1)$ and such that $a(x; h) \sim a_0(x) + ha_1(x) + \dots$ where the a_n are smooth compactly supported maps on $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ such that (5.2) holds. Let $\psi_t, \chi_{n,t}$ be as in (5.9), (5.10).

Then, the function

$$u_\delta(t, x; h) = e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} b(t, x; \delta, h) = e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h^n b_n(t, x; \delta) \quad (5.11)$$

with $\text{supp } b(t, \cdot; h, \delta) \Subset \mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$, b_n given in (5.45), (5.46), and phase $\phi_{t,\delta}$ given in (5.7), satisfies

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} ih\partial_t u - \tilde{P}_h^\delta u = -\frac{ih^{N+1}}{2} e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \Delta_{\tilde{g}} b_{N-1} + \delta \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} h^n \psi_t (1 - \psi_{n,t}) \tilde{Q}_\omega e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} b_{n-1} \\ \quad + \delta h^{N-1} e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} b_{N-1} \\ u(0, x; \delta) = e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_0(x)} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h^n a_n(x). \end{array} \right. \quad (5.12)$$

where $\tilde{P}_h^\delta := -h^2 \Delta_{\tilde{g}} + \delta \psi_t \tilde{Q}_\omega$ and

$$\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} := \psi_t \left(e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \tilde{Q}_\omega e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} - \tilde{q}_\omega(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}(x)) - \frac{h}{i} H_{\phi_{t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 - \frac{h}{2i} \text{div}_{\tilde{g}}(H_{\phi_{t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1) \right), \quad (5.13)$$

and the vector field $H_{\tilde{q}_\omega}^1$ is defined in local canonical coordinates by

$$H_{\phi_{t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 := \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{\partial \tilde{q}_\omega(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta})}{\partial \xi_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}.$$

We will present detailed results concerning the regularity of this WKB solution and a precise remainder estimate in Section 6 below. For now, we turn to the proof of the above proposition which will take up the rest of the current section.

Recall that, to ease the notation, we shall drop the tilde notation, until it becomes relevant to distinguish between the lifted and non-lifted quantities.

5.1. The WKB Ansatz. Let us now explain how, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the state (5.3) can be approximated by the WKB state u_δ defined in (5.11). We note that each b_n can also depend on $h > 0$ when $\delta > 0$, but we will not denote this explicitly. We want u_δ to solve $ih\partial_t u_\delta = P_h^\delta u_\delta$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & (-b\partial_t \phi_{t,\delta} + ih\partial_t b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [b|d_x \phi_{t,\delta}|_x^2 - ihb\Delta_g \phi_{t,\delta} - 2ih\langle d_x \phi_{t,\delta}, d_x b \rangle_x - h^2 \Delta_g b] + \delta \psi_t e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}} Q_\omega e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}} b, \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

up to a small remainder.

Case 1: Q_ω is a random potential. Consider first the case where Q_ω is the operator of multiplication by the function q_ω . Then $H_{\phi_t, \delta, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 \equiv 0$ and $\mathcal{R}_\omega \equiv 0$. Hence, \tilde{P}_h^δ is a differential operator and we can solve equation (5.14) on $\mathcal{O}_{\delta, t}^1$. There, $\psi_t = 1$. Furthermore,

$$\left(e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_t, \delta} Q_\omega e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_t, \delta} b \right) (x) = q_\omega(x) b(x).$$

Expanding b as in (5.11) and regrouping the terms in (5.14) according to matching powers of h , we see that the functions ϕ_t and b_n must satisfy the following differential equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi_{t, \delta} &= -p(x, d_x \phi_{t, \delta}(x); \delta), \\ \partial_t b_0 &= -\frac{1}{2} b_0 \Delta_g \phi_{t, \delta} - \langle d_x \phi_{t, \delta}, d_x b_0 \rangle_x \\ \partial_t b_n &= -\frac{1}{2} b_n \Delta_g \phi_{t, \delta} - \langle d_x \phi_{t, \delta}, d_x b_n \rangle_x + \frac{i}{2} \Delta_g b_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

The initial condition $\tilde{u}|_{t=0} = f$ implies that we must require that $\phi_{0, \delta} = \phi_0$ and that $b_n|_{t=0} = a_n$. This gives us initial conditions for each of equation in (5.15). Suppose that we have solved these differential equations up to order $n = N$, then the function $u_\delta(t, x; h)$ of (5.11) satisfies (5.12).

Case 2: Q_ω is a random pseudo-differential operator. When Q_ω is a pseudo-differential operator we follow formally the same strategy as above and solve the pseudo-differential equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi_{t, \delta} &= -p(x, d_x \phi_{t, \delta}(x); \delta), \\ \partial_t b_0 &= \mathcal{L} b_0 \\ \partial_t b_n &= \mathcal{L} b_n + \frac{i}{2} \Delta_g b_{n-1} - i h^{-2} \delta \psi_{n, t} \mathcal{R}_{\omega, t} b_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.16)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the differential operator defined by

$$\mathcal{L} u := -\frac{1}{2} u \Delta_g \phi_{t, \delta} - \langle d_x \phi_{t, \delta}, d_x u \rangle_x - \delta (H_{\phi_t, \delta, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 u) - \frac{\delta}{2} \operatorname{div}_g (H_{\phi_t, \delta, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 u). \quad (5.17)$$

The initial condition $\tilde{u}|_{t=0} = f$ implies that we require that $\phi_{0, \delta} = \phi_0$ and that $b_n|_{t=0} = a_n$. This gives us initial conditions for each of equation in (5.16). Suppose furthermore that the support of b_n is contained in the support of $\psi_{n, t}$ for every $n = 1, \dots, N$, and that we have solved the equations (5.16), then the function $u_\delta(t, x; h)$ of (5.11) satisfies (5.12).

The first equation in (5.15) and (5.16) is called the *Hamilton-Jacobi equation*, whereas the second and the third equations are called the 0^{th} order and n^{th} order *transport equations*, respectively. In Section 5.2 below, we will solve the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, in Section 5.3 we will discuss estimates on the derivatives of the solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, and in Section 5.4 below, we will solve the transport equations iteratively.

Remark 5.2. *When writing a function as a Lagrangian state $a(x) e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi(x)}$ with a and ϕ depending on h , there is some freedom in the choice of a and ϕ : the only essential requirement is that the amplitude $a(x)$ should oscillate at a scale $\ll \sqrt{\hbar}$, to remain in a nice symbol class. In particular, equation (5.14) will also be satisfied up to a remainder $O(h^N)$ if we have*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \phi_t &= -p(x, d_x \phi_t(x); 0), \\ \partial_t b_0 &= -\frac{1}{2} b_0 \Delta \phi_t - \langle d_x \phi_t, d_x b_0 \rangle_x - i h^{-1} \delta e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_t, \delta} Q_\omega e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_t, \delta} b_0, \\ \partial_t b_n &= -\frac{1}{2} b_n \Delta \phi_{t, \delta} - \langle d_x \phi_t, d_x b_n \rangle_x + \frac{i}{2} \Delta b_{n-1} - i h^{-1} \delta e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_t, \delta} Q_\omega e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_t, \delta} b_n, \quad n \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.18)$$

With such a formulation, the phase ϕ_t does not depend on the perturbation, while the amplitudes are multiplied by a phase depending on the perturbation.

Using techniques analogue to those of [28], it should be possible to use the formulation (5.18) to describe the propagation of Lagrangian states by $U_h^\delta(t)$ up to times $M|\log h|$ for an arbitrary $M > 0$, while in the sequel, we will only be able to consider times that are $\mathfrak{d}|\log h|$ for some small \mathfrak{d} . Such an approach could thus be a starting point to extend Theorem 2.10 to larger times; this will be pursued elsewhere.

However, to have a good control over the functions b_n starting from (5.18), we need the phase

depending on the perturbation to oscillate less rapidly than \sqrt{h} , for which we need to have $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$. This is thus more restrictive than the situation covered by Hypothesis 2.4. This is why we focus on the formulation (5.16) in this paper.

Furthermore, the independence considerations of Section 8 give strong constraints on the time scales on which we are working, making it complicated to extend Theorems 2.9 and 2.10 up to arbitrary logarithmic times.

5.2. Solving the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

5.2.1. *Applying the method of characteristics.* Since $\Phi_h^t(\Lambda_0)$ is projectable, the map $y \mapsto x_\delta^t(y)$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image and we shall denote its inverse by $y_\delta^{-t}(x)$. Hence,

$$d_x \phi_{t,\delta} = \xi_\delta^t(y_\delta^{-t}(x)), \quad (5.19)$$

or, equivalently,

$$d_{x_\delta^t(y)} \phi_{t,\delta} = \xi_\delta^t(y). \quad (5.20)$$

Using the same notational abuse as before, we will assume that y_0^{-t} is well-defined on all of $\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$, provided δ is small enough and $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$ with \mathfrak{d} small enough.

Let $y_0 \in \mathcal{O}_0$ and let $t_0 > 0$. Fix a system of local coordinates (y^1, \dots, y^d) for y near y_0 , and fix another system of local coordinates (x^1, \dots, x^d) for x in a small neighbourhood of $x_\delta^{t_0}(y_0) \in \mathcal{O}_{t_0,\delta}$. Notice that by taking a small enough neighbourhood around $x_\delta^{t_0}(y_0)$ we can arrange so that this system of coordinates (x^1, \dots, x^d) is a system of coordinates near $x_\delta^t(y_0)$ for all $t \in]t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon[$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. We also take the canonical coordinates (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_d) in $T_x^* \mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$ induced by the coordinate system (x^1, \dots, x^d) . Notice that both those coordinate systems are independent of $t \in]t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon[$. We shall write $(x_{\delta,1}^t(y), \dots, x_{\delta,d}^t(y))$ for the coordinates of $x_\delta^t(y)$, and $(\xi_{\delta,1}^t(y), \dots, \xi_{\delta,d}^t(y))$ for the coordinates of $\xi_\delta^t(y)$, in this system.

In local coordinates, equation (5.20) takes the form

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \phi_{t,\delta} \right) (x_\delta^t(y)) = \xi_{\delta,i}^t(y),$$

and the Hamilton equations $\frac{d}{dt} \Phi_\delta^t(\rho_\delta^t) = H_p|_{\rho_\delta^t}$ take the form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} x_{\delta,i}^t = \partial_{\xi_i} p(\rho_\delta^t; \delta), \\ \frac{d}{dt} \xi_{\delta,i}^t = -\partial_{x_i} p(\rho_\delta^t; \delta) \end{cases} \quad (5.21)$$

Thus, using the Einstein summation convention, we obtain in local coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^j} \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi_{t,\delta} \right) (x_\delta^t(y)) \right] &= \frac{\partial x_{\delta,i}^t(y)}{\partial y^j} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t \partial x^i} \phi_{t,\delta} \right) (x_\delta^t(y)) \\ &= \frac{\partial x_{\delta,i}^t(y)}{\partial y^j} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \phi_{t,\delta} \right) (x_\delta^t(y)) \right) - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_{\delta,k}^t(y) \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^k} \phi_{t,\delta} \right) (x_\delta^t(y)) \right] \\ &= \frac{\partial x_{\delta,i}^t(y)}{\partial y^j} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \xi_{\delta,i}^t(y) - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} x_{\delta,k}^t(y) \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^k} \phi_{t,\delta} \right) (x_\delta^t(y)) \right] \\ &= \frac{\partial x_{\delta,i}^t(y)}{\partial y^j} \left[- \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} p \right) (\rho_\delta^t(y); \delta) - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^k} p \right) (\rho_\delta^t(y); \delta) \times \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^k} \phi_{t,\delta} \right) (x_\delta^t(y)) \right] \\ &= - \frac{\partial}{\partial y^j} p(\rho_\delta^t(y); \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$d_y(\partial_t \phi_{t,\delta} \circ x_\delta^t(y)) = -d_y p(\rho_\delta^t(y); \delta), \quad (5.22)$$

i.e. the maps $y \mapsto (\partial_t \phi_{t,\delta})(x_\delta^t(y))$ and $p(\rho_\delta^t(y); \delta)$ have the same gradient, so they must coincide up to a constant $c_\delta(t)$, which we can take equal to zero, since $\phi_{t,\delta}$ is defined up to an additive constant. Therefore,

$$(\partial_t \phi_{t,\delta})(x_\delta^t(y)) = -p(\rho_\delta^t(y); \delta) = -p(y, d_y \phi_0(y); \delta),$$

since p is invariant under the action of the flow Φ_δ^t .

If $x \in \mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$, we may thus take $y = y_\delta^{-t}(x)$ to obtain that

$$\partial_t \phi_{t,\delta}(x) = -p(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta).$$

Therefore, the map $\phi_{t,\delta}(x)$ is a solution of the system

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi_{t,\delta}(x) = -p(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta) \\ \psi_h|_{t=0} = \phi_0. \end{cases} \quad (5.23)$$

5.2.2. *An approximate solution for the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.* Let $x \in \mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$. We claim that

$$\phi_{t,\delta}(x) = \phi_{t,0}(x) - \delta \int_0^t q_\omega(\Phi_\delta^{-s}(x, d_x \phi_{s,\delta})) ds. \quad (5.24)$$

Indeed, both expressions coincide when $t = 0$, and the derivative with respect to t of the right-hand side is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} - \delta q_\omega(\Phi_\delta^{-t}(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta})) &= \frac{1}{2} |d_{y_\delta^{-t}(x)} \phi_0|^2 + \delta q_\omega(\Phi_\delta^{-t}(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta})) \quad (\text{since } \phi_0 \text{ is monochromatic}) \\ &= p(y_\delta^{-t}(x), d_{y_\delta^{-t}(x)} \phi_0; \delta) \\ &= p(\Phi_\delta^{-t}(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}); \delta) \\ &= p(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta). \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we used that $p(\cdot, \cdot; \delta)$ is invariant under Φ_δ^t , the flow generated by the Hamilton vector field (4.14).

We will now give an effective approximation of (5.24), using the fact that $\Phi_\delta^{-s}(x, d_x \phi_{s,\delta})$ and $\Phi_0^{-s}(x, d_x \phi_{s,0})$ are close to each other.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ are as in (2.9). Then for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$, we have for all $x \in \mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$*

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}((x, d_x \phi_{t,0}), (x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta})) \leq \delta h^{-\beta-\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Let us write $y := y_\delta^{-t}(x)$, and $\rho_0 := (x, d_x \phi_{t,0})$, $\rho_\delta := (x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta})$. By definition, we have $\rho_0 = \Phi_0^t(y, d_y \phi_0)$. Thanks to Lemma 4.3, we know that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, provided \mathfrak{d} is small enough, we have $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_\delta^t(y, d_y \phi_0), \rho_0) \leq \delta h^{-\beta-\varepsilon}$. But, since $\Phi_\delta^t(y, d_y \phi_0)$ is a point of $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0)$, it is of the form $(x', d_{x'} \phi_{t,\delta})$, and we must thus have $\text{dist}_X(x, x') \leq \delta h^{-\beta-\varepsilon}$. We may then use equation (5.28) below with $L = 2$ to deduce that

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}((x', d_{x'} \phi_{t,\delta}), (x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta})) \leq C(1 + h^{-\varepsilon}) \text{dist}_X(x, x') \leq C \delta h^{-\beta-2\varepsilon}, \quad (5.25)$$

provided \mathfrak{d} is small enough. The result follows by the triangular inequality, and by taking $\varepsilon > 0$ and thus $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ smaller. \square

Combining Lemmas 5.3 and 4.3, we obtain that for any $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$ and any $s \in [0, t]$, we have

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi_0^{-s}(x, d_x \phi_{t,0}), \Phi_\delta^{-s}(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta})) \leq \delta h^{-\beta-2\varepsilon},$$

provided \mathfrak{d} is small enough. Therefore, (up to taking ε and \mathfrak{d} smaller), we obtain from (5.24) that

$$\phi_{t,\delta}(x) = \phi_{t,0}(x) - \delta \int_0^t q_\omega(\Phi_0^{-s}(x, d_x \phi_{t,0})) ds + O\left(\delta^2 h^{-2\beta-2\varepsilon}\right). \quad (5.26)$$

5.3. **Controlling the derivatives of the phase.** In this section we provide estimates on C^L norms of the time evolved phase $\phi_{t,\delta}$.

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose that $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ are as in (2.9). For any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, and $h_0 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$ we have that*

$$\|\phi_{t,\delta}\|_{C^1(\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta})} \leq C_1. \quad (5.27)$$

and, if $L \geq 2$

$$\|\phi_{t,\delta}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta})} \leq C_L h^{-(L-2)(\beta+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}. \quad (5.28)$$

Before proving the proposition, we shall prove two lemmas concerning estimates on compositions of functions, which we will use several times in the sequel.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $f_h : \mathbb{R}^d \supset \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ and $g_h : \mathbb{R}^d \supset \Omega' \rightarrow \Omega$ be smooth functions. Suppose that there exists $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3 \geq 0$ with $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \geq \sigma_3$ such that for all $k \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_h\|_{C^k} &= O(h^{-\sigma_3 - (k-1)\sigma_1}) \\ \|g_h\|_{C^k} &= O(h^{-\sigma_2 - (k-1)\sigma_1}) + O(\|f_h \circ g_h\|_{C^{k-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\|f_h \circ g_h\|_{C^k} = O(h^{-\sigma_3 - k\sigma_2 - (k-1)\sigma_1}).$$

Proof. The bounds on $\|f_h \circ g_h\|_{C^1}$ and $\|f_h \circ g_h\|_{C^2}$ follow from a direct computation, since

$$\|f_h \circ g_h\|_{C^2} \leq \|g_h\|_{C^1}^2 \|f_h\|_{C^2} + \|g_h\|_{C^2} \|f_h\|_{C^1}.$$

The C^k bounds are proved recursively. The k^{th} derivatives of $(f_h \circ g_h)$ at x may be written as linear combinations of derivatives of f_h evaluated at $g_h(x)$, and of powers of derivatives of g_h at x . When going from k^{th} derivatives of $(f_h \circ g_h)$ to $(k+1)^{\text{th}}$ derivatives, we use Leibniz rule:

- Each time we differentiate a derivative of f_h at $g_h(x)$, we gain a factor $O(\|g_h\|_{C^1}) = O(h^{-\sigma_2})$, and we replace a L^{th} derivative of f_h with a $(L+1)^{\text{th}}$ derivative of f_h , making us gain a factor $O(h^{-\sigma_1})$. All in all, we gain a factor $O(h^{-\sigma_1 - \sigma_2})$.
- When we differentiate a derivative of g_h of order ≥ 2 , we gain a factor $O(h^{-\sigma_1}) + O(h^{-\sigma_1 - \sigma_2})$.

The result follows by induction. \square

Corollary 5.6. *Let $\psi_h : \mathbb{R}^d \supset \Omega \rightarrow \Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth diffeomorphism. Let $\partial\psi_h$ denote the Jacobian of ψ_h . Suppose that there exists $\sigma, \sigma', \sigma'' \geq 0$ with $\sigma \geq \sigma'$ such that*

$$\|(\partial\psi_h)^{-1}\|_{C^0} = O(h^{-\sigma'}),$$

and for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\|\psi_h\|_{C^k} = O(h^{-\sigma - (k-1)\sigma''}).$$

Then, we have

$$\|(\psi_h)^{-1}\|_{C^1} = O(h^{-\sigma})$$

and, for $k \geq 2$,

$$\|(\psi_h)^{-1}\|_{C^k} = O(h^{-(k-1)(2\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'') - \sigma'}).$$

Proof. We shall set $f_h(x) = (d_x\psi_h)^{-1}$ and $g_h = \psi_h^{-1}$. We start by recalling that

$$d_x\psi_h^{-1} = f_h \circ g_h, \tag{5.29}$$

so that we must estimate $\|g_h\|_{C^k} = \|f_h \circ g_h\|_{C^{k-1}}$.

We deduce from (5.29) that $\|g_h\|_{C^1} = O(h^{-\sigma})$, and a direct computation implies that

$$\|f_h\|_{C^1} = O(h^{-2\sigma' - \sigma - \sigma''}).$$

Furthermore, an application of the Lemma 5.5 (to compose the inverse map with $d_x\psi_h$, taking $\sigma_1 = \sigma''$, $\sigma_3 = 2\sigma'$, $\sigma_2 = \sigma + \sigma'$) implies that, for $k \geq 2$,

$$\|f_h\|_{C^k} = O(h^{-2\sigma' - k(\sigma + \sigma') - (k-1)\sigma''}).$$

We may then apply Lemma 5.5 with $\sigma_1 = \sigma + \sigma' + \sigma''$, $\sigma_2 = \sigma$ and $\sigma_3 = 2\sigma' + \sigma + \sigma''$. We deduce that

$$\|f_h \circ g_h\|_{C^k} = O(h^{-2\sigma' - \sigma - \sigma'' - k\sigma - (k-1)(\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'')}) = O(h^{-k(2\sigma + \sigma' + \sigma'') - \sigma'}),$$

and the result follows. \square

We may now proceed with the proof of Proposition 5.4.

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Recall that equation (5.20) implies that

$$(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}) = \Phi_\delta^t \left(y_{\delta,\Lambda_t}^{-t}(x), d_{y_{\delta,\Lambda_t}^{-t}(x)} \phi_0 \right), \quad (5.30)$$

and (5.27) directly follows from the fact that H_p preserves the energy layers $\mathcal{E}_{\delta,\lambda} \subset T^*X$ which are lifts of bounded energy layers in T^*X . Here, we modified our notation a bit: by adding Λ_0 and Λ_t to the subscript we insist on the fact that $x_{\delta,\Lambda_0}^t : \pi_X(\Lambda_0) \rightarrow \pi_X(\Lambda_t)$ and $y_{\delta,\Lambda_t}^{-t} : \pi_X(\Lambda_t) \rightarrow \pi_X(\Lambda_0)$, respectively.

To estimate $\|\phi_{t,\delta}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_t)}$, we must first estimate the derivatives of $y_{\delta,\Lambda_t}^{-t}$. More precisely, if $(k, \iota), (k', \iota')$ are as in (3.17), we define

$$x_{\delta,\Lambda_0,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^t = \kappa_{k,\iota} \circ x_{\delta,\Lambda_0}^t \circ \left(\kappa_{k',\iota'}^{-1} \right) : \kappa_{k',\iota'}(\tilde{U}_{k',\iota'} \cap \mathcal{O}_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \kappa_{k,\iota}(\tilde{U}_{k,\iota} \cap \mathcal{O}_t) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \quad (5.31)$$

$$y_{\delta,\Lambda_t,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^{-t} = \kappa_{k',\iota'} \circ y_{\delta,\Lambda_t}^{-t} \circ \left(\kappa_{k,\iota}^{-1} \right) : \kappa_{k,\iota}(\tilde{U}_{k,\iota} \cap \mathcal{O}_t) \longrightarrow \kappa_{k',\iota'}(\tilde{U}_{k',\iota'} \cap \mathcal{O}_0), \quad (5.32)$$

and we want to bound $\|y_{\delta,\Lambda_t,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^{-t}\|_{C^L}$.

First, using Lemma 4.1 and the smoothness of ϕ_0 , we see that there exists $C_L, \mathfrak{d}_L > 0$ such that if $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}_L |\log h|]$, we have

$$\|x_{\delta,\Lambda_0,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^t\|_{C^L} \leq C_L h^{-\varepsilon} \left(1 + h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)(L+1)} \delta \right). \quad (5.33)$$

In particular, thanks to (2.9) and (4.15), we have $\|x_{\delta,\Lambda_0,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^t\|_{C^1} = O(h^{-\varepsilon})$ with constants independent of (k, ι, k', ι') .

Next, if $\partial_{\mathbf{y}} x_{\delta,\Lambda_0,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^t$ denotes the Jacobian matrix of $x_{\delta,\Lambda_0,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^t$ at \mathbf{y} , we claim that there exists $C, c > 0$, independent of k, ι, k', ι', t and $\mathbf{y} \in \kappa_{k',\iota'}(\tilde{U}_{k',\iota'} \cap \mathcal{O}_0)$, such that

$$\left\| \left(\partial x_{\delta,\Lambda_0,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^t \right)^{-1}(\mathbf{y}) \right\| \leq C c^t. \quad (5.34)$$

Indeed, if $y \in \mathcal{O}_0$ and $u \in T_y \mathcal{O}_0$, let us write $w := (u, \partial d_y \phi_0 u) \in T_{(y, d_y \phi_0)} T^*X$. Then we know from (4.38) that $\|d_{(y, d_y \phi_0)} \Phi_\delta^t(w)\| \geq C c_0^t \|w\| \geq C c_0^t \|u\|$ for some $c_0 > 0$. Now, $d_{(y, d_y \phi_0)} \Phi_\delta^t(w)$ is a vector of $T_{\Phi_\delta^t(y, d_y \phi_0)} \Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0)$, and we know that $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0)$ is projectable, so that we also have $\|\pi_{TX} d_{(y, d_y \phi_0)} \Phi_\delta^t(w)\| \geq C' c_0^t \|u\|$. Noting that, for any $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $(\partial_{\mathbf{y}} x_{\delta,\Lambda_0,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^t)(w)$ can be identified with a $\pi_{TX} d_{(y, d_y \phi_0)} \Phi_\delta^t(w)$ written in coordinates gives us equation (5.34).

We may thus apply Corollary 5.6 with $\sigma = \sigma' = \varepsilon$, $\sigma'' = \beta + \varepsilon$, and we deduce that

$$\|y_{\delta,\Lambda_t,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^{-t}\|_{C^1} \leq C h^{-\varepsilon} \quad (5.35)$$

and, for $L \geq 2$,

$$\|y_{\delta,\Lambda_t,k,\iota,k',\iota'}^{-t}\|_{C^L} \leq C_L h^{-(L-1)(\beta+4\varepsilon)-5\varepsilon}, \quad (5.36)$$

with constants independent of k, ι, k', ι' .

Coming back to (5.30), we may apply Lemma 5.5 (along with Lemma 4.1) with $\sigma_1 = \beta + 4\varepsilon$, $\sigma_2 = 5\varepsilon$, $\sigma_3 = \varepsilon$ to deduce that

$$\|\phi_{t,\delta}\|_{C^2} = O(h^{-6\varepsilon})$$

and, for all $L \geq 1$

$$\|d\phi_{\delta,t}\|_{C^L} = O(h^{-\varepsilon-5L\varepsilon-(L-1)(\beta+4\varepsilon)}).$$

We deduce the result by taking ε smaller. \square

5.4. Solving the transport equations. In this section, we follow a general approach to solving the transport equations, see for instance [2]. From Proposition 4.15 we know that the transported Lagrangian manifold $\Phi_\delta^t(\Lambda_0)$ (5.7) is projectable for all times $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$ for some $\mathfrak{d} > 0$. Hence, the flow (5.6) induces a flow (defined only for times $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$)

$$x_{\delta,\Lambda_s}^t : \mathcal{O}_{s,\delta} \ni y \mapsto x_{\delta,\Lambda_s}^t(y) \in \mathcal{O}_{t+s,\delta}, \quad s \geq 0. \quad (5.37)$$

This flow has the property that $x_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+\tau}}^t \circ x_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^\tau = x_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^{t+\tau}$. In view of the discussion after (5.7), we write for the inverse of x_{δ, Λ_s}^t

$$y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t} : \mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta} \ni x \mapsto y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{s, \delta}. \quad (5.38)$$

We now estimate the derivatives of x_{δ, Λ_s}^t and $y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}$. To this end, we introduce $x_{\delta, \Lambda_s, k, \iota, k', \iota'}^t$ and $y_{\delta, \Lambda_{t+s}, k, \iota, k', \iota'}^{-t}$ just as in (5.31, 5.32).

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose that $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ are as in (2.9). We have that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, and $h_0 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $s, t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, with $s + t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, we have for all k, ι, k', ι' and all $L \geq 1$*

$$\|x_{\delta, \Lambda_s, k, \iota, k', \iota'}^t\|_{C^L}, \|y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}, k, \iota, k', \iota'}^{-t}\|_{C^L} \leq C_L (h^{-(L-1)(\beta+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}), \quad (5.39)$$

with constants independent of k, ι, k', ι' .

Proof. Observing that $x_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^t = x_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^{t+s} \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^{-s}$ and $y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t} = x_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^s \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-(s+t)}$, the result follows by applying Lemma 5.5 to the estimates (5.33), (5.35) and (5.36). \square

Remark 5.8. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Applying Lemma 5.5 to (5.9) with $\sigma_1 = (\beta + \varepsilon)$, $\sigma_2 = \varepsilon$, $\sigma_3 = 0$, yields that there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $s \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$,*

$$\|\psi_t\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{t, \delta})}, \|\psi_{n,t}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{t, \delta})} \leq C_L (h^{-(L-1)(\beta+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}), \quad L \geq 1. \quad (5.40)$$

When $L = 0$ we trivially obtain a uniform bound of order $O(1)$ since $|\psi_t|, |\psi_{n,t}| \leq 1$, see the paragraph above (5.5).

For $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$ and $s \geq 0$ (cf. (5.37)), we introduce the unitary operator T_{δ, Λ_s}^t , mapping functions f on $\mathcal{O}_{s, \delta} = \pi_{\tilde{X}} \Lambda_s$ into functions on $\mathcal{O}_{t+s, \delta} = \pi_{\tilde{X}} \Lambda_{t+s}$, defined by

$$(T_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^t f)(x) := f \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x) \left(J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x) \right)^{1/2}, \quad (5.41)$$

where f is a smooth function on $\mathcal{O}_{s, \delta}$ and $J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x)$ is the inverse of the Jacobian of the map $x_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^t$ at the point x with respect to the Riemannian volume on \tilde{X} . In local coordinates we find that

$$J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x) = \frac{\sqrt{\det g(y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x))} \left| \det \frac{\partial y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} \right|}{\sqrt{\det g(x)}}. \quad (5.42)$$

Proposition 5.9. *The quantity $J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x)$ defined in (5.42) satisfies*

$$J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^{-t} \left(\Delta_g \phi_{s+\tau+t, \delta}(y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^\tau(x)) + \delta \operatorname{div}_g(H_{\phi_{s+\tau'+t, \delta, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1}(y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^\tau(x))) \right) d\tau \right\}. \quad (5.43)$$

Moreover, suppose that $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ are as in (2.9). For any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, and $h_0 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $s, t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, with $s + t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, we have that

$$\|\log J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta})} \leq C_L h^{-\varepsilon-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}. \quad (5.44)$$

Here, the C^L norms are to be understood as in (3.15)

We postpone the proof of this Proposition to the end of this section. Before going on we remark that when $\delta = 0$ the formula (5.43) has already been stated in [2, Equation (3.9)]. Furthermore, notice that when Q_ω is the operator of multiplication by q_ω , then $H_{q_\omega}^1 = 0$, so the second integrand in (5.43) vanishes.

Continuing, recall from the discussion after (5.1) that $a(x; h) \sim a_0(x) + ha_1(x) + \dots$ where a, a_n are smooth compactly supported maps on \mathcal{O} . Furthermore, recall that the support of $a(\cdot; h)$ is assumed to be contained in a compact subset of \mathcal{O} independently of h .

Proposition 5.10. 1. The 0^{th} order transport equation in (5.16) and in (5.15) (depending on which case of Q_ω we consider) is explicitly solved by

$$b_0(t, x; \delta) = (T_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^t a_0)(x), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (5.45)$$

with initial condition $b_0(0, x; \delta) = a_0(x)$. Furthermore, $\text{supp } b_0(t, \cdot; \delta) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{0,t}$.

2. The higher order transport equations are solved iteratively for $n \geq 1$ by

$$b_n(t, x; \delta) = (T_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^t a_n)(x) + \frac{i}{2} \int_0^t \left(T_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^{t-s} \Delta b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta) - 2h^{-2} \delta T_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^{t-s} \psi_{n,s} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,s} b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta) \right) (x) ds, \quad (5.46)$$

with initial condition $b_n(0, x; \delta) = a_n(x)$. Furthermore, $\text{supp } b_n(t, \cdot; \delta) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{n,t}$. Additionally we have that when Q_ω is a multiplication operator then $\mathcal{R}_{\omega,s} = 0$ and $\text{supp } b_n(t, \cdot; \delta) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{0,t}$.

Proof of Proposition 5.10. 1. The second assertion of the Lemma follows immediately from the first by applying Duhamel's formula.

2. We check that (5.45) solves the 0^{th} order transport equation in (5.16) in local coordinates. By continuity we can arrange to take the same local coordinates for a small open time interval $t \in]t_0 - \varepsilon_0, t_0 + \varepsilon_0[\cap]0, +\infty[$ with $t_0 \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. To ease the notation we will drop the subscripts of x_{δ, Λ_0}^t , $y_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}$ and $J_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x)$. In the following computations if $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\nabla_x f$ is to be understood as a $n \times 1$ matrix while $\nabla_x^\dagger f$ is its transpose (a $1 \times n$ matrix), and \cdot denotes either the matrix product or the usual scalar product in \mathbb{R}^d (which needs not coincide with the Riemannian scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$).

A direct computation yields

$$\partial_t b_0(t, x) = (J^{-t}(x))^{1/2} \times \left(\nabla_x^\dagger a_0(x) \cdot (\partial_t y^{-t}(x)) \right) + a_0(y^{-t}(x)) \times \partial_t (J^{-t}(x))^{1/2}, \quad (5.47)$$

and

$$\nabla_x b_0(t, x) = (J^{-t}(x))^{1/2} \times \left(\frac{\partial y^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} \right)^\dagger \cdot \nabla_x a_0(x) + a_0(y^{-t}(x)) \nabla_x (J^{-t}(x))^{1/2}. \quad (5.48)$$

Applying $\frac{d}{dt}$ to the relation $x^t(y^{-t}(x)) = x$ yields the identity

$$(\partial_t x^t)(y^{-t}(x)) = -\frac{\partial x^t}{\partial y}(y^{-t}(x)) \cdot \partial_t y^{-t}(x). \quad (5.49)$$

Since $\frac{\partial y^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} = \left(\frac{\partial x^t}{\partial y}(y^{-t}(x)) \right)^{-1}$, we get by combining (5.47–5.49) that

$$\partial_t b_0(t, x) = -\nabla_x b_0(t, x) \cdot (\partial_t x^t)(y^{-t}(x)) + \frac{b_0(t, x)}{2} (\partial_t + (\partial_t x^t)(y^{-t}(x)) \cdot \nabla_x) \log(J^{-t}(x)). \quad (5.50)$$

Next, we focus on the second term on the right hand side of (5.50). Write $L := (\partial_t x^t)(y^{-t}(x)) \cdot \nabla_x$. By (5.42) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t + L) \log(J^{-t}(x)) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[g(y^{-t}(x))^{-1} (\partial_t + L) g(y^{-t}(x)) \right] \\ &\quad + \text{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\partial y^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} (\partial_t + L) \left(\frac{\partial y^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} \right) \right] \\ &\quad - L \log \sqrt{\det g(x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

Here in the traces the differential operator $\partial_t + L$ is applied componentwise to the matrices.

Using (5.49), a straightforward computation shows that

$$(\partial_t + L) g(y^{-t}(x)) = 0.$$

Turning to the second term on the right hand side of (5.51), we first note that (5.21) implies that

$$(\partial_t x^t)(y^{-t}(x)) = (d_\xi p)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta). \quad (5.52)$$

Using this fact along with (5.49) and the symmetry of the Hessian (with respect to x) of y^{-t} and get that

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{\partial y^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} \right) = -L \left(\frac{\partial y^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} \right) - \left(\frac{\partial y^{-t}(x)}{\partial x} \right) \cdot M,$$

where M is the $d \times d$ matrix whose entries are given by

$$M_{m,n} = \partial_{x_m} [(\partial_{\xi_n} p)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta)].$$

Hence,

$$(\partial_t + L) \log(J^{-t}(x)) = -\text{tr}[M] - L \log \sqrt{\det g(x)}. \quad (5.53)$$

Using (5.52), (4.1), and plugging (5.53) into (5.50), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t b_0(t, x) &= -\nabla_x b_0(t, x) \cdot (d_\xi p)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta) - \frac{b_0(t, x)}{2} \nabla_x \cdot (d_\xi p)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta) \\ &\quad - \frac{b_0(t, x)}{2} (d_\xi p)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}; \delta) \cdot \left(\nabla_x \log \det \sqrt{\det g(x)} \right) \\ &= -\langle d_x \phi_{t,\delta}, d_x b_0 \rangle_x - \frac{1}{2} b_0 \Delta_g \phi_{t,\delta} - \delta \nabla_x b_0(t, x) \cdot (\nabla_\xi q_\omega)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\delta b_0(t, x)}{2} \left[((\nabla_\xi q_\omega)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_x) \log \sqrt{\det g(x)} + \nabla_x \cdot (\nabla_\xi q_\omega)(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}) \right] \\ &= -\langle d_x \phi_{t,\delta}, d_x b_0 \rangle_x - \frac{1}{2} b_0 \Delta_g \phi_{t,\delta} - \delta (H_{\phi_{t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 b_0)(x) - \frac{\delta}{2} \text{div}_g (H_{\phi_{t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 b_0). \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

Hence, (5.45) solves the 0^{th} order transport equation in (5.16). To end the proof of (5.45) we note that $b(0, x) = a_0(x)$. Finally, the fact that $\text{supp } b_0(t, \cdot; \delta) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{0,t}$ follows from equation (5.45) and Lemma 4.3. \square

We end this section with the Proof of Proposition 5.9.

Proof of Proposition 5.9. 1. Recall the local coordinate representation (5.42) of $J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x)$ and write $K(t, x) = \log J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x)$.

First note that $K(0, x) = 0$. We know from (5.53) that

$$(\partial_t + L)K(t, x) = -\nabla_x \cdot (\nabla_\xi p(x, d_x \phi_{s+t,\delta}; \delta)) - L \log \sqrt{\det g(x)}. \quad (5.55)$$

Strictly speaking (5.55) has been proven in (5.53) only for the case $s = 0$, however, one can easily check that it also holds in the case $s \geq 0$.

Recall from the discussion before (5.50) that $L = (\partial_t x_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^t)(y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x)) \cdot \nabla_x$. Hence, the homogeneous form of the equation (5.55) is solved by $(y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t})^* f$, $f \in C^1$. However, since $y_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^0(x) = x$, the initial condition $K(0, x) = 0$ implies that the homogeneous solution is constantly equal to 0. The unique solution to equation (5.55) with initial condition $K(0, x) = 0$ can then be obtained by Duhamel's formula:

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, x) &= - \int_0^t (y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau-t})^* \left(\nabla_x \cdot (\nabla_\xi p)(x, d_x \phi_{s+\tau,\delta}; \delta) + (\nabla_\xi p)(x, d_x \phi_{s+\tau,\delta}; \delta) \cdot \nabla_x \log \sqrt{\det g(x)} \right) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^{-t} \left(\Delta_g \phi_{s+\tau'+t,\delta} (y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau'}(x)) + \delta \text{div}_g (H_{\phi_{s+\tau'+t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1) (y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau'}(x)) \right) d\tau'. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we performed the linear change of variables $\tau = t + \tau'$ followed by a direct computation similar to the last line of (5.54). Taking the exponential of $K(t, x)$ implies (5.43).

2. Let us now turn to the regularity estimate. Let $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ be as in (2.9). Using Lemma 5.5, Proposition 5.4, Lemma 5.7 and (2.7), we find that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, and $h_0 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that for

all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $s, t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, with $(s+t) \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\Delta_g \phi_{s+\tau'+t, \delta}) \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau'}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta})} = O_L(h^{-\varepsilon-L(\beta+2\varepsilon)}), \\ & \|\delta(\nabla_\xi q_\omega)(x, d_x \phi_{s+\tau, \delta}; \delta) \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau'}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta})} = O_L(\delta h^{-\beta-L(\beta+3\varepsilon)}), \\ & \|\delta[\nabla_x(\nabla_\xi q_\omega)(x, d_x \phi_{s+\tau, \delta}; \delta)] \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau'}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta})} = O_L(\delta h^{-2\beta-2\varepsilon-L(\beta+3\varepsilon)}), \\ & \left\| (\nabla_x \log \sqrt{\det g}) \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau'} \right\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta})} = \begin{cases} O(1), & L = 0, \\ O_L(h^{\beta+\varepsilon-L(\beta+2\varepsilon)}), & L \geq 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5.56)$$

where in the last line we used as well that the derivatives of $\log \det g(x)$ are uniformly bounded on $\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta}$ with respect to h since g is the lifted metric from the underlying compact manifold.

The product rule shows that

$$\delta \left\| \left[(\nabla_\xi q_\omega)(x, d_x \phi_{s+\tau, \delta}; \delta) \cdot (\nabla_x \log \sqrt{\det g}) \right] \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{\tau'} \right\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta})} = O_L(\delta h^{-\beta-L(\beta+3\varepsilon)}). \quad (5.57)$$

After potentially increasing the constant in the error estimate, we see that (5.57) is bounded by the right hand of the third line of (5.56). By (2.9) we see the second line in (5.56) is bounded by $O_L(h^{-\varepsilon-L(\beta+3\varepsilon)})$. Thus,

$$\|K(t, \cdot)\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta})} \leq C_L |\log h| h^{-\varepsilon-L(\beta+3\varepsilon)}.$$

The estimate (5.44) follows by taking $\varepsilon > 0$, and hence $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, smaller. \square

6. SOBOLEV ESTIMATES OF THE WKB SOLUTION

In all the sequel, we will suppose that $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ are as in Hypothesis 2.4. In this section we continue working with a smooth connected compact Riemannian manifold X and its universal cover \tilde{X} , see the beginning of Section 5. We will largely use the notations from section 3.3.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose that $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ are as in (2.9) and let T_{δ, Λ_s}^t be as in (5.41). If $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ such that the following holds uniformly in $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $t, s \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, with $s+t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$:*

Let $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{O}_{s, \delta})$ such that, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that

$$\|f\|_{C^L} \leq C_L h^{-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}.$$

Then, there exists a constant $C'_L > 0$ such that

$$\|T_{\delta, \Lambda_s}^t f\|_{C^L} \leq C'_L h^{-L(\beta+2\varepsilon)}. \quad (6.1)$$

Proof. By (5.41) and the product rule, it is sufficient to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(\cdot) \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{C^L} \leq C_L h^{-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}, \\ & \left\| f \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(\cdot) \right\|_{C^L} \leq C_L h^{-L(\beta+2\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Let $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Then we know from the second assertion of Proposition 5.9 that there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $s, t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, with $s+t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, we have that (5.44) holds. The chain and product rule, in combination with an induction argument, yields that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$, $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $s, t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, with $s+t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$,

$$\partial_x^\alpha J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x) = O_{|\alpha|} \left(h^{-|\alpha|(\beta+2\varepsilon)} \right) J_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(x), \quad (6.3)$$

uniformly on $\mathcal{O}_{s+t, \delta}$. Notice here that the same estimate holds also with J^{-t} replaced by $(J^{-t})^{1/2}$. This gives us the first estimate in (6.2).

To obtain the second part of (6.2), we use Lemma 5.5, with $\sigma_2 = \varepsilon$, and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_3 = \beta + \varepsilon$, obtaining

$$\left\| f \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^{-t}(\cdot) \right\|_{C^L} \leq C_L h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)-L\varepsilon-(L-1)(\beta+\varepsilon)},$$

as announced. \square

Next, we present the following technical result.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ be as in (2.9) and let $\psi_{N+1,t} := \psi_t, \psi_{N,t}, \dots, \psi_{0,t}$ be as in (5.9). For any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ such that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_0 > 0$ small enough we have that for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, all $h \in]0, h_0]$ and all $n = 0, \dots, N$*

$$\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{t,\delta}'' \cap \text{supp}(1 - \psi_{n+1,t}), \text{supp} \psi_{n,t}) \geq h^{2\varepsilon}. \quad (6.4)$$

Proof. Given $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0[$, thanks to Lemma 4.3, we may take $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ small enough such that for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$ and all $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in \mathcal{E}_{\delta, (\frac{1}{2}, 2)}$

$$\text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\Phi_\delta^{-t}(\rho_0), \Phi_\delta^{-t}(\rho_1)) \leq h^{-\varepsilon/2} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_0, \rho_1) + C\delta h^{-\beta} h^{-\varepsilon/2}. \quad (6.5)$$

Suppose now that (6.4) does not hold. So there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $h_0 > 0$ there exists a $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, an $h \in]0, h_0]$ and a $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ such that

$$\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{t,\delta}'' \cap \text{supp}(1 - \psi_{n+1,t}), \text{supp} \psi_{n,t}) < h^{2\varepsilon}. \quad (6.6)$$

Let $x_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_{t,\delta}'' \cap \text{supp}(1 - \psi_{n+1,t})$ and $x_1 \in \text{supp} \psi_{n,t}$. Put $y_k = y_\delta^{-t}(x_k)$, $k = 0, 1$, and $\rho_k = \rho_\delta^t(y_\delta^{-t}(x_k))$, cf (5.6). Plugging this into (6.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}((y_0, d_{y_0} \phi_{0,\delta}), (y_1, d_{y_1} \phi_{0,\delta})) &\leq h^{-\varepsilon/2} \text{dist}_{T^*\tilde{X}}(\rho_0, \rho_1) + C\delta h^{-\beta} h^{-\varepsilon/2} \\ &\stackrel{(5.25)}{\leq} Ch^{-3\varepsilon/2} \text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(x_0, x_1) + C\delta h^{-\beta} h^{-\varepsilon/2} \\ &\stackrel{(6.6)}{\leq} Ch^{\varepsilon/2} + C\delta h^{-\beta} h^{-\varepsilon/2} \\ &\stackrel{(2.9)}{\leq} h^{\varepsilon/2} + Ch^{\varepsilon/2+\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (5.5), the left hand side of the first line is bounded from below by some positive constant. Since we can take $h_0 > 0$, and therefore $h > 0$, arbitrarily small, we have a contradiction which concludes the proof. \square

Next, we need to understand better the operator $\psi_t e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \tilde{Q}_\omega e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(\cdot)}$ appearing in (5.12), when working in the **Random Ψ DO case**.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ be as in (2.9) with $\beta + \varepsilon_0 < 1/2$. Let $Q_\omega \in \Psi_{h,\beta}^{-\infty}(X)$ be as in the **Random Ψ DO case** with principal symbol q_ω , and let $\tilde{Q}_\omega \in \Psi_{h,\beta}^{-\infty}(\tilde{X})$ be a lift of Q_ω with principal symbol $\tilde{q}_\omega = \hat{\pi}^* q_\omega$ and satisfying (3.18), (3.19), (3.20). Let $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ small enough, and let $\psi_t, \psi_{n,t}$, $n = 0, \dots, N$ be as in (5.10). Let $\phi_{t,\delta}$ be as in (5.19), (5.23) and let $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$.*

Then, there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$

$$\tilde{Q}_{t,\omega} := \psi_t e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \tilde{Q}_\omega e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta}(\cdot)} \psi_{n,t} \in \Psi_{h,\beta+\varepsilon}^{-\infty}(\tilde{X}) \quad (6.7)$$

with principal symbol $\tilde{q}_{t,\omega,n}^t(x, \xi) := \psi_t(x)(\hat{\pi}^ q)(x, \xi + d_x \phi_{t,\delta}) \psi_{n,t}(x) \in S_{\beta+\varepsilon}^{-\infty}(T^*\tilde{X})$.*

Moreover, for each lifted cut-off chart $(\tilde{\kappa}_\iota, \tilde{\chi}_\iota)$, $\iota \in I$, on \tilde{X} , see Section 3.3 for the definition, we have that

$$(\tilde{\kappa}_\iota^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_\iota \tilde{Q}_{t,\omega} \tilde{\chi}_\iota \tilde{\kappa}_\iota^* = \chi \circ \kappa^{-1} \text{Op}_h(\tilde{q}_{\kappa,\iota,\omega,n}^t) \chi \circ \kappa^{-1}, \quad (6.8)$$

with

$$(\chi \circ \kappa^{-1} \tilde{q}_{\kappa,\iota,\omega,n}^t)(x, \xi; h) = (\kappa^* \chi q_\omega)(x, \xi + d_x(\tilde{\kappa}_\iota^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta}) \psi_{t,\iota}(x) \chi_{n,t,\iota}(x) + O(h^{1-2(\beta+\varepsilon)}) \in S_{\beta+\varepsilon}^{-\infty}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (6.9)$$

for $h \in]0, h_0]$ and with the constant in the symbol estimates uniform in $(x, \xi) \in T^\mathbb{R}^d$ and in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$ and independent of ι .*

Furthermore, if $\theta, \varphi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ are such that $\text{supp} \theta \cap \text{supp} \varphi = \emptyset$, then for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\tilde{\theta}_\iota \tilde{Q}_{t,\omega} \tilde{\varphi}_\iota = O_{\theta,\varphi,N}(h^\infty) : H_h^{-N}(\tilde{X}) \rightarrow H_h^N(\tilde{X}). \quad (6.10)$$

Proof of Proposition 6.3. 1. To prove the last point of the proposition, we first consider the case when $\theta, \varphi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ have sufficiently small supports so that their lifts $\tilde{\theta}_\iota, \tilde{\varphi}_\iota \in C_c^\infty(\tilde{X})$ are well defined. It follows from (4.6) that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\text{vol}_{\tilde{g}}(\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}) = O(h^{-C\mathfrak{d}}) \quad (6.11)$$

for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. Take a locally finite partition of unity of \tilde{X} by a lifted partition of unity of X , as in the paragraph above (3.17). We see that we can cover $\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta}$ by $O(h^{-C\mathfrak{d}})$ many cut-off functions from the lifted partition of unity. Combining this observation with (3.20), (5.40) and Proposition 5.4 yields (6.10).

2. Let $(\tilde{\kappa}_\iota, \tilde{\chi}_\iota)$ be a lifted cut-off chart such that $\text{supp } \chi \circ \kappa^{-1}$ is convex and such that $\text{supp } \tilde{\chi}_\iota \cap \text{supp } \psi_{n,t} \neq \emptyset$. The case of a general cut-off function can be recovered by a partition of unity. By (3.19),

$$(\tilde{\kappa}_\iota^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_\iota \tilde{Q}_{t,\omega} \tilde{\chi}_\iota \tilde{\kappa}_\iota^* = \chi_\kappa \psi_{t,\iota} e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta,\iota}} \text{Op}_h((q_\omega)_\kappa) e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta,\iota}} \psi_{n,t,\iota} \chi_\kappa. \quad (6.12)$$

where $\psi_{t,\iota} := \psi_t \circ \tilde{\kappa}_\iota^{-1}$, $\psi_{n,t,\iota} := \psi_{n,t} \circ \tilde{\kappa}_\iota^{-1}$, $\chi_\kappa = (\kappa^{-1})^* \chi$, and $\phi_{t,\delta,\iota} := \phi_{t,\delta} \circ \tilde{\kappa}_\iota^{-1}$.

We will recover the symbol $\tilde{q}_{\kappa,\iota,\omega,n}^t$ in each coordinate patch (k,ι) by the method of oscillatory testing [35, Theorem 4.19]. Let $C_c^\infty(X) \ni \chi' \succ \chi$ with support in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the support of χ such that the support of $\chi'_\kappa = (\kappa^{-1})^* \chi'$ is convex. Set

$$\begin{aligned} r_{k,\iota,t}(x, \xi; h) &:= e^{-\frac{i}{h}x \cdot \xi} \psi_{t,\iota} e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta,\iota}} \chi'_\kappa \text{Op}_h((q_\omega)_\kappa) \left(\chi'_\kappa(y) e^{-\frac{i}{h}\phi_{t,\delta,\iota}(y)} \psi_{n,t,\iota}(y) e^{\frac{i}{h}y \cdot \xi} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2h\pi)^d} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{\frac{i}{h}(\eta-\xi) \cdot (x-y) + \frac{i}{h}(\phi_{t,\delta,\iota}(y) - \phi_{t,\delta,\iota}(x))} (q_\omega)_\kappa(x, \eta; h) \psi_{t,\iota}(x) \chi'_\kappa(x) \chi'_\kappa(y) \psi_{n,t,\iota}(y) dy d\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Notice that $r_{k,\iota,t}$ depends on ι only through the phases $\phi_{t,\delta,\iota}$ and the cut-off functions $\psi_{t,\iota}$, $\psi_{n,t,\iota}$.

Our aim is now to show that $r_{k,\iota,t} \in S_{\beta+\varepsilon}^{-\infty}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$, and that it has the form (6.9). Once this is shown, (6.8) follows from [35, Theorem 4.19] and (6.7) follows from using additionally (6.10) and a partition of unity.

3. To evaluate (6.13), we use Kuranishi's trick and write

$$\phi_{t,\delta,\iota}(y) - \phi_{t,\delta,\iota}(x) = \langle F_{t,\delta}(x, y), (y - x) \rangle,$$

with

$$F_{t,\delta}(x, y) = \int_0^1 \nabla \phi_{t,\delta,\iota}(\tau y + (1-\tau)x) d\tau.$$

Performing a linear change of variable in (6.13), we get

$$r_{k,\iota,t}(x, \xi; h) = \frac{1}{(2h\pi)^d} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{\frac{i}{h}(\eta-\xi) \cdot (x-y)} \check{q}_{\omega,\kappa}(x, y, \eta; h) \psi_{t,\iota}(x) \chi'_\kappa(x) \chi'_\kappa(y) \psi_{n,t,\iota}(y) dy d\eta. \quad (6.14)$$

with $\check{q}_{\omega,\kappa}(x, y, \eta; h) := (q_\omega)_\kappa(x, \eta + F_{t,\delta}(x, y); h)$.

By Proposition 5.4 we have that for $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$

$$\|F_{t,\delta}\|_{C^L} = \begin{cases} O(1), & L = 0, \\ O(h^{-\varepsilon - (L-1)(\beta+\varepsilon)}), & L \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. Notice here that the constant in the error estimate can be taken independently of ι .

Recall that $q_\omega \in S_\beta^{-\infty}(T^*X)$ and notice that since $\|F_{t,\delta}\|_{C^0} = O(1)$, we find that for each $M \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $C_M > 0$ (independent of ι) such that for all $\eta \in T_x\mathbb{R}^d$, all $x, y \in \text{supp } \chi \circ \kappa^{-1}$ and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$

$$\langle \eta + F_{t,\delta}(x, y) \rangle^{-M} \leq C_M \langle \eta \rangle^{-M}.$$

The product and chain rule then yield that for all $\alpha, \gamma, \tau \in \mathbb{N}^d$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau,M} > 0$ independent of ι such that for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\gamma \partial_\eta^\tau \check{q}_{\kappa,\iota}(x, y, \eta; h)| \leq C_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau,M} h^{-(|\alpha|+|\gamma|)(\beta+\varepsilon) - |\tau|\beta} \langle \eta \rangle^{-M}. \quad (6.15)$$

The method of stationary phase applied to (6.14) yields

$$r_{k,\iota,t}(x, \xi; h) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} r_{k,\iota,t,n}(x, \xi; h) + R_{k,\iota,t,N}(x, \xi; h), \quad (6.16)$$

where

$$r_{k,\iota,t,n}(x, \xi; h) = \frac{h^n i^n}{n!} (\partial_y \cdot \partial_\eta)^n \check{q}_{\omega,\kappa}(x, y, \eta; h) \psi_{t,\iota}(x) \chi'_\kappa(x) \chi'_\kappa(y) \psi_{n,t,\iota}(y) \Big|_{\substack{y=x \\ \eta=\xi}}. \quad (6.17)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{k,\iota,t,N}(x, \xi; h) \\ &= O(h^N) \sum_{|k+\beta| \leq 2d+1} \|\partial_y^k \partial_\eta^\beta (\partial_y \cdot \partial_\eta)^N \check{q}_{\omega,\kappa}(x, y, \eta; h) \psi_{t,\iota}(x) \chi'_\kappa(x) \chi'_\kappa(y) \psi_{n,t,\iota}(y)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}_y^d \times \mathbb{R}_\eta^d)}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

where the constant in the estimate depends only on the dimension d and N .

Using (6.15) and Remark 5.8 along with the rapid decay of q in the ξ variable, we obtain by the product rule that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$ there exists a constant $C_{\alpha,\gamma,m,n} > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} \log h]$ and all $(x, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\gamma r_{k,\iota,t,n}(x, \xi; h)| \leq C_{\alpha,\gamma,m,n} h^{n(1-2\beta-4\varepsilon)} h^{-(|\alpha|+|\gamma|)(\beta+2\varepsilon)} \langle \xi \rangle^{-m}, \quad (6.19)$$

and

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\gamma R_{k,\iota,t,N}(x, \xi; h)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta,m,N} h^N h^{-(2d+1+2N)(\beta+2\varepsilon)} h^{-(2d+1+2N+|\alpha|+|\gamma|)(\beta+2\varepsilon)} \langle \xi \rangle^{-m}. \quad (6.20)$$

We insist here on the fact that the symbol estimates are independent of ι indexing the sheet in the universal cover to which we have lifted the cut-off chart (κ, χ) .

Taking $\varepsilon > 0$, and hence $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, smaller, the symbol estimates (6.19) and (6.20) hold with 2ε replaced by ε . By Borel summation we find that

$$r_{k,\iota,t}(x, \xi; h) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_{k,\iota,t,n}(x, \xi; h) \quad \text{in } S_{\beta+\varepsilon}^{-\infty}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d) \quad (6.21)$$

with the constant in the symbol estimates uniform in $(x, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^d$ and in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} \log h]$ and independent of ι . Due to the factor χ_κ in (6.12) we can restrict the symbol $r_{k,\iota,t}(\cdot, \xi; h)$ to the support of χ_κ where $\chi'_\kappa \equiv 1$. This implies (6.8). In particular, we have

$$r_{k,\iota,t,0}(x, \xi; h) = (q_\omega)_{\kappa,\chi}(x, \xi + \nabla \phi_{t,\delta,\iota}(x); h) \psi_{t,\iota}(x) \psi_{n,t,\iota}(x)$$

which yields the formula for the leading part in (6.9) and thus yields the formula for the principal symbol of (6.7). \square

Now, we may use the previous proposition to give estimates on the operator $\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}$ defined in (5.13).

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon_0$ be as in (2.9) with $\beta + \varepsilon_0 < 1/2$. Let $\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}$ be as in (5.13). For every $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ such that the following holds uniformly in $h \in]0, h_0]$ and $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} \log h]$: Let $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta})$ such that, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that*

$$\|f\|_{C^L} \leq C_L h^{-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}. \quad (6.22)$$

Then, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $n = 1, \dots, N$ there exists a constant $C_{n,L} > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} \psi_{n-1,t} f\|_{C^L} \leq C_{n,L} h^{1-(L+2)(\beta+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}. \quad (6.23)$$

Proof. 1. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, let $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ be small enough, let $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} \log h]$. Recall the discussion and quantities in the paragraph above (3.17). Let $\chi'_k \succ \chi_k$ with support in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the support of χ_k . Then we have the relation $\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} \succ \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}$, $\iota \in I$, for the lifted cut-off functions and

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}f\|_{C^L} \leq \sum_{\substack{k \in K \\ \iota \in I}} \left(\|\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}f\|_{C^L} + \|(1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}f\|_{C^L} \right). \quad (6.24)$$

Here K is finite and I is a countable set. However, it follows from (6.11) and from the fact that $\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}$ contains a ψ_t prefactor that the sum in (6.24) is over at most $O(h^{-2C_0})$ many terms. This is bounded by $O(h^{-\varepsilon})$ for \mathfrak{d} small enough and both estimates are uniform in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$.

Since the supports of $(1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})$ and $\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}$ are disjoint, it follows from (6.7), (5.13) that

$$(1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} = (1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\tilde{Q}_{t,\omega}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}. \quad (6.25)$$

Hence, keeping in mind (6.11), it follows from (6.10) that for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in K \\ \iota \in I}} \|(1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}f\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})} \leq \sum_{\substack{k', \iota' \in K \\ \iota', \iota \in I}} \|(1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k',\iota'})\tilde{Q}_{t,\omega}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}f\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})} = O_L(h^\infty), \quad (6.26)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. By the Sobolev inequalities (3.16) and (6.26), we find that

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in K \\ \iota \in I}} \|(1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}f\|_{C^L} = O_L(h^\infty). \quad (6.27)$$

Here, we used (6.11) which implies that $\|\psi_{n,t}\|_{H_h^0(\tilde{X})} = O(h^{-C_0\mathfrak{d}/2})$ uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$.

2. Next we turn to the first term on the right hand side of (6.24). By (3.14)

$$\|\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}f\|_{C^L} = \max_{k' \in K, \iota' \in I} \|(\tilde{\kappa}_{k',\iota'}^{-1})^*(\tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'}\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}\psi_{n-1,t}f\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (6.28)$$

By Lemma 3.1 we know that the maximal number of the balls $\tilde{U}_{k,\iota}$ with non-empty intersection is bounded by a constant $0 < C_0 < \infty$. Given an index pair (k, ι) there are at most C_0 many index pairs (k', ι') such that $\text{supp } \tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'} \cap \text{supp } \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} \neq \emptyset$. We will denote this condition by the relation $(k, \iota) \sim (k', \iota')$. Now, if $(k, \iota) \sim (k', \iota')$, we have

$$(\tilde{\kappa}_{k',\iota'}^{-1})^*(\tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'}\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}) = \left((\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}) \circ (\tilde{\kappa}_{k',\iota'}^{-1}) \right)^* (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'}\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}).$$

The map $\left((\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}) \circ (\tilde{\kappa}_{k',\iota'}^{-1}) \right)^*$ is a diffeomorphism on the support of $\tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'}\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}$, and its derivatives as well as the derivatives of its inverse are all bounded independently of ι, ι' . We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}f\|_{C^L} &\leq O(1) \max_{(k',\iota') \sim (k,\iota)} \|(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'}\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}\psi_{n-1,t}f\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= O(1) \|(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}\psi_{n-1,t}f)\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.29)$$

Let us write $\psi_{n-1,t,k,\iota} := (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}\psi_{n-1,t}) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Expanding the term $\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}$ as in (5.13), we get from (6.8), (6.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}\psi_{n-1,t}f) \\ &= (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\psi_t\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}) \left(\text{Op}_h(\tilde{q}_{\kappa,\chi,\iota,\omega,n-1}^t) - (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\tilde{q}_\omega(x, d_x\phi_{t,\delta}(x))) - \mathcal{L}_{\kappa_{k,\iota,t}} \right) \psi_{n-1,t,k,\iota}(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*f, \end{aligned} \quad (6.30)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_{\kappa_{k,\iota,t}} := (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \left(\frac{h}{i} H_{\phi_{t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1 + \frac{h}{2i} \text{div}_{\tilde{g}}(H_{\phi_{t,\delta}, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1) \right) (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota})^*.$$

3. We first estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_{k,\iota} &:= \|(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*(\psi_t\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota})\mathcal{L}_{\kappa_{k,\iota,t}}\psi_{n-1,t,k,\iota}(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*f\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= \|\mathcal{L}_{\kappa_{k,\iota,t}}\psi_{n-1,t,k,\iota}(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^*f\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \end{aligned}$$

since $(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^*(\psi_t \tilde{\chi}'_{k,l}) \equiv 1$ on the support of $\psi_{n-1,t,k,l}$. Using the observation after (6.28), it readily follows that

$$\|(\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}'_{k,l} f\|_{C^L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq O_k(1) \|f\|_{C^L}, \quad (6.31)$$

uniformly in ι .

Next, recall that $\tilde{q}_\omega = \hat{\pi}^* q_\omega$ and that q_ω is given by $q_{\omega,\kappa_k} = (\tilde{\kappa}_k^{-1})^* q_\omega$ in the local coordinate chart κ_k . A direct computation shows that $(\kappa_{k,l}^{-1})^* \tilde{q}_\omega(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}) = q_{\omega,\kappa_k}(x, d_x (\kappa_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta})$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\kappa_{k,l},t} := \left(\frac{h}{i} (\nabla_\xi q_{\omega,\kappa_k})(x, d_x (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_x + \frac{h}{2i} \operatorname{div}_g((\nabla_\xi q_{\omega,\kappa_k})(x, d_x (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta})) \right).$$

The symbol estimates (6.15) (with $x = y$ and $\eta = 0$) and Remark 5.8 yield that for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_{n-1,t,k,l} q_{\omega,\kappa_k}(\cdot, d_x (\kappa_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta})\|_{C^L} &\leq O_L(h^{-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}), \\ \|\psi_{n-1,t,k,l} (\nabla_{\xi_j} q_{\omega,\kappa_k})(\cdot, d_x (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta})\|_{C^L} &\leq O_L(h^{-\beta-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}), \\ \|(\nabla_\xi q_{\omega,\kappa_k})(\cdot, d_x (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta}) \cdot \nabla_x \psi_{n-1,t,k,l}\|_{C^L} &\leq O_L(h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}), \\ \|\psi_{n,t,k,l} \operatorname{div}_g((\nabla_\xi q_{\omega,\kappa_k})(\cdot, d_x (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta})) \psi_{n-1,t,k,l}\|_{C^L} &\leq O_L(h^{-2(\beta+\varepsilon)-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}), \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. Hence, combining (6.31) and (6.32) with the product rule and assumption (6.22) yields that

$$I_{k,l} \leq O_L(h^{1-2(\beta+\varepsilon)-L(\beta+\varepsilon)}) \quad (6.33)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, uniformly in k (since there are only finitely many) and in ι .

4. In view of (6.29), (6.30) it remains to estimate

$$\left\| (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^*(\psi_t \tilde{\chi}'_{k,l}) \left(\operatorname{Op}_h(\tilde{q}_{\kappa_{k,l},\omega,n-1}^t) - (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \tilde{q}_\omega(x, d_x \phi_{t,\delta}(x)) \right) \psi_{n-1,t,k,l} (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* f \right\|_{C^L}.$$

Put $v := \psi_{n-1,t,k,l} (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,l}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}'_{k,l} f$. Remembering (6.31) and Remark 5.8, we see that the C^L norms of v satisfy the same estimates as those of f , and that it suffices to prove that

$$\|\operatorname{Op}_h(r_{k,l,t})v\|_{C^L(\operatorname{supp} \chi_k)} \leq C_{n,L} h^{1-(L+2)(\beta+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}, \quad (6.34)$$

where

$$r_{k,l,t}(x, \xi) := \tilde{q}_{\kappa_{k,l},\omega,n-1}^t(x, \xi) - q_{\omega,\kappa_k}(x, d_x (\kappa_{k,l}^{-1})^* \phi_{t,\delta}).$$

Taylor expanding the leading part of $\tilde{q}_{\kappa_{k,l},\omega,n}^t$ as in (6.9), we find that

$$q_{\omega,\kappa_k}(x, d_x (\phi_t \circ \kappa_{k,j}^{-1}) + \xi) = q_{\omega,\kappa_k}(x, d_x (\phi_t \circ \kappa_{k,l}^{-1})(x)) + e_{t,\kappa,l}(x, \xi) \xi \quad (6.35)$$

with

$$e_{t,\kappa,l}(x, \xi) := \int_0^1 \nabla_\xi q_{\omega,\kappa_k}(x, d_x (\phi_t \circ \kappa_{k,l}^{-1})(x) + \tau \xi) d\tau.$$

Combining (6.9) and (6.35), we find that

$$r_{k,l,t}(x, \xi; h) = e_{t,\kappa,l}(x, \xi) \xi + h^{1-2(\beta+\varepsilon)} s_{\kappa,l,t}(x, \xi) \quad (6.36)$$

for some symbol $s_{\kappa,l,t} \in S_{\beta+\varepsilon}^{-\infty}(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$. The symbol estimates (6.15) show that $e_{t,\kappa,l} \in h^{-\beta} S_{\beta+\varepsilon}^0(T^*\mathbb{R}^d)$. Integration by parts shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Op}_h(r_{\kappa,l,t})v(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2h\pi)^d} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{\frac{i}{h}\xi \cdot (x-y)} \left(e_{t,\kappa,l}(x, \xi) \xi + h^{1-2(\beta+\varepsilon)} s_{\kappa,l,t}(x, \xi) \right) v(y) dy d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{(2h\pi)^d} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{\frac{i}{h}\xi \cdot (x-y)} \left(e_{t,\kappa,l}(x, \xi) \left(\frac{1 + \xi \cdot hD_y}{1 + \xi^2} \right)^{d+1} hD_y v(y) + h^{1-2(\beta+\varepsilon)} s_{\kappa,l,t}(x, \xi) v(y) \right) dy d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

The integral in the last line is absolutely convergent since $\operatorname{supp} v \subset \operatorname{supp} \kappa'_k$ and since

$$\left(\frac{1 + \xi \cdot hD_y}{1 + \xi^2} \right)^{d+1} hD_y v(y) = O_L(h^{1-(\beta+\varepsilon)}) \left(\frac{1}{1 + |\xi|} \right)^{d+1}.$$

When we apply derivatives ∂_x^α to $\text{Op}_h(r_{k,\iota,t})v(x)$ they either fall onto the symbols $e_{t,\kappa,\iota}$ and $s_{\kappa,\iota,t}$, or onto the exponential. In the latter case we use that $\partial_x e^{\frac{i}{h}\xi \cdot (x-y)} = -\partial_y e^{\frac{i}{h}\xi \cdot (x-y)}$ and integration by parts which makes the derivative fall onto v . Using (6.31), (6.22) we find that for $|\alpha| \leq L$

$$\partial_y^\alpha \left(\frac{1 + \xi \cdot hD_y}{1 + \xi^2} \right)^{d+1} hD_y v(y) = O_L(h^{1-(L+1)(\beta+\varepsilon)}) \left(\frac{1}{1 + |\xi|} \right)^{d+1}.$$

Using additionally Remark 5.8, we see that v has a support of size $O(h^{-\varepsilon})$, so that

$$\|\text{Op}_h(r_{k,\iota})v\|_{C^L(\text{supp } \chi_k)} = O_{k,L}(1)h^{1-(L+2)(\beta+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}.$$

In particular, the constant in the estimate only depends on k and L . Combining (6.34), (6.33), (6.29), (6.24), (6.27)

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t}\psi_{n-1,t}f\|_{C^L} = O_L(1)h^{1-(L+2)(\beta+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}, \quad (6.37)$$

which ends the proof of the proposition. \square

Proposition 6.5. *Let $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \frac{1}{2} - \beta$ and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$, such that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$, all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, all $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and all $L \in \mathbb{N}$, the solution b_n given in (5.45) and (5.46) satisfies*

$$\|b_n\|_{C^L} = O(h^{-(2n+L)(\beta+\varepsilon_1)}). \quad (6.38)$$

Proof. We will show by induction that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}(\varepsilon)|\log h|]$, we have

$$\|b_n\|_{C^L} \leq Ch^{-L(\beta+2^n\varepsilon)}A_n \quad (6.39)$$

for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and all n such that $\beta + 2^n\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, where $A_n \geq 1$ is a quantity that depends on h and n , but not on L .

Let us prove the claim by induction over n . When $n = 0$, it is a consequence of Proposition 6.1 and equation (5.45). Suppose that (6.38) holds up to index $n - 1$, for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying Proposition 6.1 and recalling that $t = O(|\log h|)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|b_n\|_{C^L} &\leq \|T_{\delta,\Lambda_0}^t a_n\|_{C^L} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|T_{\delta,\Lambda_s}^{t-s} \Delta b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta) - 2h^{-2} \delta T_{\delta,\Lambda_s}^{t-s} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta)\|_{C^L} ds \\ &\leq O(h^{-(\beta+2\varepsilon)L}) + O(|\log h|) \left(\|T_{\delta,\Lambda_s}^{t-s} \Delta b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta)\|_{C^L} + O(h^{-2} \delta T_{\delta,\Lambda_s}^{t-s} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta)\|_{C^L} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6.40)$$

Now, by assumption, we have for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|\Delta b_{n-1}\|_{C^k} \leq Ch^{-(k+2)(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)}A_{n-1}^{-1}$, so we may apply Proposition 6.1 with $f = A_{n-1}h^{2(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)}\Delta b_{n-1}$ and $2^{n-1}\varepsilon$ playing the role of ε to obtain

$$|\log h| \|T_{\delta,\Lambda_s}^{t-s} \Delta b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta)\|_{C^L} \leq C |\log h| A_{n-1} h^{-2(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)} h^{-L(\beta+2^n\varepsilon)}.$$

To deal with the last term, we first recall that, by the induction hypothesis, we have $\|b_{n-1}\|_{C^k} \leq CA_{n-1}h^{-k(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)}$. We may thus apply Proposition 6.4 with $f = A_{n-1}^{-1}b_{n-1}$ and $2^{n-1}\varepsilon$ playing the role of ε to deduce that, for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} b_{n-1}(s, \cdot; \delta)\|_{C^L} \leq C_L A_{n-1} h^{1-2(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)-2^{n-1}\varepsilon-L(\beta+2^n\varepsilon)}.$$

All in all, we have obtained that

$$\|b_n\|_{C^L} \leq Ch^{-(\beta+2^n\varepsilon)L} \left(1 + |\log h| A_{n-1} h^{-2(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)} + |\log h| h^{-2} \delta A_{n-1} h^{1-2\beta-3 \times 2^{n-1}\varepsilon} \right).$$

Now, thanks to (2.4), the second term is the largest, provided ε is small enough. Therefore, setting $A_n = A_{n-1} \times |\log h| h^{-2(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)}$, we deduce (6.39) at step $n + 1$. In particular, we see that we may take $A_n = h^{-2n(\beta+2^{n-1}\varepsilon)}$, and that this quantity is smaller than $h^{-n(2\beta+\varepsilon_1)}$, provided ε (and thus \mathfrak{d}) are chose small enough. \square

We may deduce an estimate on the error term in the WKB method, appearing in (5.12).

Corollary 6.6. *Let us write*

$$R_N := -\frac{i\hbar^{N+1}}{2} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \Delta_{\tilde{g}} b_{N-1} + \delta \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \hbar^n \psi_t(1 - \psi_{n,t}) \tilde{Q}_\omega e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} b_{n-1} + \delta \hbar^{N-1} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} b_{N-1}.$$

For every $L, M \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $N(M, L) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ small enough, we have that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$

$$\|R_N\|_{H^L} = O(\hbar^M). \quad (6.41)$$

Proof. 1. Using Proposition 5.4 in combination with repeated differentiation and the product rule show that for all $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}}\|_{C^L(\mathcal{O}_{t,\delta})} \leq O_L(\hbar^{-L}), \quad (6.42)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$.

2. Using a partition of unity of lifted cut-off functions as in the discussion after (3.21), we get

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \hbar^n \psi_t(1 - \psi_{n,t}) \tilde{Q}_\omega e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}} b_{n-1} \right\|_{H^L} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \hbar^n \sum_{k,\iota,k',\iota'} \|\psi_t(1 - \psi_{n,t}) \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega \tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}} b_{n-1}\|_{H^L},$$

where the sum is over $O(\hbar^{-C\mathfrak{d}})$ many terms. Recall from Proposition 5.10 that $\text{supp } b_{n-1}(t, \cdot; \delta) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{n-1,t}$, so the supports of $b_{n-1}(t, \cdot; \delta)$ and $(1 - \psi_{n,t})$ are disjoint. Using Lemma 6.2, we see that, for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, if $t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$ for \mathfrak{d} and h small enough, we have

$$\text{dist}(\text{supp}(1 - \psi_{n,t})\psi_t, \text{supp } b_{n-1}(t, \cdot; \delta)) \geq \hbar^{2\varepsilon}/C.$$

Using (3.20) and Remark 5.8 we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_t(1 - \psi_{n,t}) \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega \tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}} b_{n-1}\|_{H^L} &\leq O_{k,k',L}(\hbar^\infty) \|e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}} b_{n-1}\|_{H^0} \\ &= O_{k,k',L}(\hbar^\infty), \end{aligned}$$

which is a $O(\hbar^\infty)$, thanks to (6.38) and to the fact that the support of b_{n-1} has a diameter bounded polynomially with respect to h . All in all

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \hbar^n \psi_t(1 - \psi_{n,t}) \tilde{Q}_\omega e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}} b_{n-1} \right\|_{H^L} = O(\hbar^\infty).$$

3. To deal with the first term in R_N , we apply (6.42) along with Proposition 6.5, which gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| -\frac{i\hbar^{N+1}}{2} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}} \Delta_{\tilde{g}} b_{N-1} \right\|_{C^L} &= O(\hbar^{N+1}) \|e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}} b_{N-1}\|_{C^{L+2}} \\ &= O(\hbar^{1+2\beta+\varepsilon_0-(L+2)+N(1-2\beta-\varepsilon_0)}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, this term can be made smaller than any power of h by taking N large enough.

4. To deal with the last term in R_N , we note that Propositions 6.4 and 6.5 imply that, for any $k, N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} b_{N-1}\|_{C^k} \leq C_{n,k} \hbar^{1-(k+2)(\beta+\varepsilon_0)-\varepsilon_0} \hbar^{-(N-1)(2\beta+\varepsilon_0)},$$

so that

$$\left\| \delta \hbar^{N-1} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\phi_{t,\delta}(x)} \mathcal{R}_{\omega,t} b_{N-1} \right\|_{C^L} = O(\delta \hbar^{(N-1)(1-2\beta-\varepsilon_0)+(1-2\beta-3\varepsilon_0)L}).$$

In particular, for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$, this term can also be made smaller than any power of h by taking N large enough. \square

Proposition 6.7. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. There exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \in (0, h_0]$ and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, if we write $\mathcal{O}_{t,0} = \pi_{\tilde{\chi}}(\Phi_h^t(\Lambda_0))$ as in (5.7), then $\text{supp } b_0(t, \cdot; \delta), \text{supp } b_0(t, \cdot; 0) \subset \mathcal{O}_{t,0}$. Moreover,*

$$|b_0(t, x; \delta) - b_0(t, x; 0)| = O(\delta \hbar^{-2\beta-\varepsilon}),$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$ and $x \in \mathcal{O}_{t,0}$.

Proof. The first statement has already been proved in Proposition 5.10, following (5.45) and Lemma 4.3.

Recall from (5.45) that $b_0(t, x; \delta) = (T_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^t a_0)(x)$, with

$$(T_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^t f)(x) = f \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x) \left(J_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x) \right)^{1/2},$$

cf. (5.41), and where $J_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x)$ is as in (5.43).

1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed but arbitrary and let $h > 0$. Let $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and let $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$. By Lemma 4.3 it follows that for $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ small enough

$$\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(x_{\delta}^t(y), x_0^t(y)) \leq O(\delta h^{-\beta-\varepsilon}), \quad (6.43)$$

for all $y \in \mathcal{O}$ and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$. Put $y_0 = y_{0, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x)$, $y_1 = y_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x)$. Thanks to Lemmas 4.3 and 5.3, we know that if \mathfrak{d} is small enough,

$$\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(y_0, y_1) = O(\delta h^{-\beta-2\varepsilon}), \quad (6.44)$$

and, by Taylor expansion, we get

$$|a_0 \circ x_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^{-t}(x) - a_0 \circ x_{0, \Lambda_0}^{-t}(x)| = O(\delta h^{-\beta-2\varepsilon}). \quad (6.45)$$

Both estimates (6.44), (6.45) are uniform in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$ and $x \in K_t$.

2. Next, using Proposition 5.4, Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 5.5, we deduce from (5.24) that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ such that for all $t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$,

$$\Delta \phi_{t, \delta}(x) = \Delta \phi_{t, 0}(x) + O(\delta h^{-2\beta-\varepsilon} |\log h|).$$

Noting that $\delta \text{div}_g(H_{\phi_{s+\tau'+t, \delta, \tilde{q}_\omega}^1}(y_{\delta, \Lambda_{s+t}}^\tau(x))) = O(\delta h^{-2\beta})$, we may perform a Taylor expansion in (5.43) to obtain

$$(J_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x))^{1/2} = \left(1 + O(\delta h^{-2\beta-\varepsilon} |\log h|) \right) \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{-t} \Delta_g \phi_{\tau+t, 0}(y_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^\tau(x)) d\tau \right\}. \quad (6.46)$$

Using Proposition 5.4 and (6.44), we deduce that

$$(\Delta \phi_{t, 0})(y_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^{-t}(x)) = (\Delta \phi_{t, 0})(y_{0, \Lambda_0}^{-t}(x)) + O(\delta h^{-2\beta-3\varepsilon}), \quad (6.47)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$ and $x \in K_t$. Notice that the exponential in (6.46) is bounded by an arbitrarily small negative power of h provided that we choose $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ small enough. Combining (6.46), (6.47) and (6.45), we conclude that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ sufficiently small, such that for $h > 0$ small enough

$$\left| a_0 \circ y_{\delta, \Lambda_0}^{-t}(x) \left(J_{\delta, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x) \right)^{1/2} - a_0 \circ y_{0, \Lambda_0}^{-t}(x) \left(J_{0, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x) \right)^{1/2} \right| = O(\delta h^{-2\beta-\varepsilon}), \quad (6.48)$$

for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$ and all $x \in K_t$. This proves the result. \square

Corollary 6.8. *There exists $c, C > 0$ such that, if $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ is small enough, we have for all $h \in]0, h_0[$ and all $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$*

$$\sup_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_t} |b_0(t, x; 0)| \leq C e^{-ct}.$$

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 6.7, it suffices to prove the result for $b_0(t, x; 0)$ instead of $b_0(t, x; \delta)$. Now, with the notations of (5.38) and (5.41), we have

$$b_0(t, x; 0) = a_0 \circ y_{0, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x) \left(J_{0, \Lambda_t}^{-t}(x) \right)^{1/2},$$

where J_{0, Λ_t}^{-t} is the Jacobian determinant of y_{0, Λ_t}^{-t} , or, in other words, the inverse of the Jacobian determinant of x_{0, Λ_0}^t .

We will now show that this Jacobian determinant grows exponentially. If $y \in \mathcal{O}$, let us write $\rho = (y, d_y \phi_0)$. If $w \in T_y X$, we have

$$d_y x_{0, \Lambda_0}^t(w) = d_{\Phi_0^t(\rho)} \pi_X \circ d_\rho \Phi_0^t(w, d_y^2 \phi_0(w)). \quad (6.49)$$

We will now explain why $d_{\Phi_0^t(\rho)}\pi_X \circ d_\rho\Phi_0^t$ has eigenvalues growing exponentially with t , except one which remains bounded from below. Let $v \in T_{(y, d_y\phi_0)}\Lambda_0$.

- If $v \in E_{0,\rho}^0$, then $|d_\rho\Phi_0^t(v)|_{\Phi_0^t(\rho)}$ is bounded from above and from below independently of t , as follows from (4.10) and (4.11). Furthermore, since $E_{0,\rho}^0$ is transverse to the vertical fibres of T^*X , we obtain that $|d_{\Phi_0^t(\rho)}\pi_X \circ d_\rho\Phi_0^t(v)|$ is bounded from below independently of t .
- If $v \in E_{0,\rho}^+ \oplus E_{0,\rho}^-$, using the fact that Λ_0 is transverse to the stable directions, we deduce from (4.10) and (4.11) that $d_\rho\Phi_0^t(v)$ is a vector whose norm is $\geq Ce^{ct}$ for some $C, c > 0$, and that this vector is very close to the unstable direction $E_{\Phi_0^t(\rho)}^-$. Therefore, using the fact that the unstable directions are transverse with the vertical fibres, we deduce that

$$d_{\Phi_0^t(\rho)}\pi_X \circ d_\rho\Phi_0^t(v) \geq C'e^{ct}.$$

It follows from this that the Jacobian determinant of x_{0,Λ_0}^t grows exponentially with t . The statement follows. \square

7. LOCAL EXPANSIONS FOR THE PROPAGATED LAGRANGIAN STATES

7.1. To the universal cover and back again. As in the previous sections, let (X, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold of negative sectional curvature. Let $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_0 \subset X$ be an open, connected, simply connected relatively compact set, and let $\phi_0 : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a monochromatic smooth function as in (2.2) such that the hypotheses of Proposition 4.15 are satisfied. Consider the Lagrangian state

$$f_h(x) = a(x; h)e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_0(x)}, \quad (7.1)$$

where $a(\cdot; h)$ is a smooth compactly supported map on \mathcal{O} with $\|a(\cdot; h)\|_{C^L} = O_L(1)$ and such that $a(x; h) \sim a_0(x) + ha_1(x) + \dots$ where a_n are smooth compactly supported maps on \mathcal{O} . We assume that there exists a compact h -independent set $K \Subset \mathcal{O}$ such that

$$\text{supp } a(\cdot; h) \subset K \quad (7.2)$$

for all $h \in]0, h_0]$.

The aim of this section is to construct a WKB approximation of the propagated state

$$u(t, x; h) = e^{i\frac{t}{h}P_h^\delta} f_h(x) \quad (7.3)$$

on X . In other words, we want to construct an approximate solution to

$$\begin{cases} ih\partial_t u = P_h^\delta u \\ u|_{t=0} = f_h. \end{cases} \quad (7.4)$$

Before we proceed, let us give a brief outline of the general strategy to achieve this goal. First we lift all quantities to the universal cover \tilde{X} of X . There, we will use Proposition 5.1 to obtain an approximate solution u_δ to the lifted equation

$$\begin{cases} ih\partial_t \tilde{u} = \tilde{P}_h^\delta \tilde{u} \\ \tilde{u}|_{t=0} = \tilde{f}_h. \end{cases} \quad (7.5)$$

on \tilde{X} . Then, using (3.25), we “project” the approximate solution u_δ back down to the base manifold X , and we show that this yields the desired approximate solution to (7.4).

Lifting to the universal cover \tilde{X} . Recall from section 2.6 that we denote by (\tilde{X}, \tilde{g}) the universal cover of (X, g) , which is thus a simply connected (non-compact) manifold of negative curvature, and we denote by $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ the covering map.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_0, \tilde{K} \subset \tilde{X}$ be lifts of \mathcal{O}_0, K , respectively. That is to say, a connected relatively compact open subset of \tilde{X} such that $\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_0) = \mathcal{O}_0$ and $\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{K}) = K$. We lift ϕ_0 to a smooth function $\tilde{\phi}_0$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_0$

such that $\tilde{\phi}_0 = \tilde{\pi}^* \phi_0$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_0$. Similarly, we lift a and a_n to smooth compactly supported functions \tilde{a} and \tilde{a}_n on $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_0$ with support in \tilde{K} such that $\tilde{a} = \tilde{\pi}^* a$, $\tilde{a}_n = \tilde{\pi}^* a_n$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_0$.

Recall from Section 3.3 how we lift the pseudo-differential operator Q_ω to a pseudo-differential operator \tilde{Q}_ω on the universal cover \tilde{X} . When Q_ω is a multiplication operator on X by the function q_ω , then \tilde{Q}_ω is simply the multiplication operator on \tilde{X} by the lifted function $\tilde{q}_\omega := \tilde{\pi}^* q_\omega$. Furthermore, recall from (3.23) the definition of the lifted Schrödinger operator \tilde{P}_h^δ .

The above lifts yield a monochromatic Lagrangian state

$$\tilde{f}_h(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{a}(\tilde{x}; h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_0(\tilde{x})} \text{ on } \tilde{X},$$

satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 5.1, so, given $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function

$$u_\delta(t, \tilde{x}; \delta) := b_N(t, \tilde{x}; \delta, h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t, \delta}(\tilde{x})} := e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t, \delta}(\tilde{x})} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h^n b_n(t, \tilde{x}; \delta),$$

with b_n given in (5.45), (5.46), and phase $\tilde{\phi}_{t, \delta}$ given in (5.7), (5.23), so that

$$\begin{cases} ih \partial_t u_\delta = \tilde{P}_h^\delta u_\delta + R_N \\ u_\delta(0, \tilde{x}; \delta) = e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_0(\tilde{x})} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h^n \tilde{a}_n(\tilde{x}). \end{cases}$$

Here, by Corollary 6.6, we have that for every $L, M \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $N(M, L) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ small enough, we have for all $h \in]0, h_0]$ and all $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$,

$$\|R_N\|_{H^L} = O(h^M). \quad (7.6)$$

We know from Proposition 5.10, that $\text{supp } b_N(t, \cdot; \delta, h) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{N-1, t}$, see also (5.10), (5.9). In particular, when \tilde{Q}_ω is a multiplication operator then we have $\text{supp } b_N(t, \cdot; \delta, h) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{0, t}$. Recall the discussion from two paragraphs after (5.10). We see that $b_N(t, \cdot; \delta, h)$ is compactly supported in $\mathcal{O}_{t, \delta}$, and that $\tilde{\phi}_0$ and $\tilde{\phi}_{t, \delta}$ are well-defined in a small neighbourhood of $\mathcal{O}_{t, \delta}$. Furthermore, we know from (6.11), that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ there exist $\mathfrak{d}, h_0 > 0$ such that

$$\text{vol}_{\tilde{g}}(\mathcal{O}_{t, \delta}) = O(h^{-\varepsilon}) \quad (7.7)$$

uniformly in $h \in]0, h_0]$ and in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$.

Back to the base manifold X . The aim now is to show that “projecting” the WKB state u_δ back down to the base manifold X yields a good approximation of the solution $u(t, x; h)$ of (7.3). Recall (3.25), (3.27) and define

$$\hat{u}_{h, N}(t, x) := ({}^t \tilde{\pi}^* u_\delta(t, \cdot; h))(x) = \sum_{\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x})=x} u_\delta(t, \tilde{x}; h) = \sum_{\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x})=x} b_N(t, \tilde{x}; \delta, h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t, \delta}(\tilde{x})}, \quad x \in X. \quad (7.8)$$

Since $a(x; h) \sim a_0(x) + h a_1(x) + \dots$, it follows that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a smooth compactly supported function $r_N(x; h)$ with $\text{supp } r_N(\cdot; h) \subset K$ and $\|r(\cdot; h)\|_{C^L} = O_L(1)$, such that

$$a(x; h) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h^n a_n(x) + h^N r(x; h).$$

Note that

$$\hat{u}_{h, N}(0, x) = f_h(x) - h^N r(x; h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_0(x)} \quad (7.9)$$

with f_h as in (7.1).

Recall the quantities introduced in the paragraph after (3.16). By (7.8) we find that

$$\hat{u}_{h, N} = \sum_{k \in K, t \in I_k} (\tilde{\pi}_{k, t}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k, t} b_N e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t, \delta}}, \quad (7.10)$$

where the sum is finite since b_N has compact support. More precisely K is finite independently of h , and $|I_k| = O(h^{-\varepsilon})$ for all $h \in]0, h_0]$ and $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d} |\log h|]$, provided \mathfrak{d} is smaller than some $\mathfrak{d}(\varepsilon)$. The estimate on the cardinality of I_k is a direct consequence of (7.7).

Since differential operators are local operators, we deduce from (3.28) that when Q_ω is as in the [Random Potential case](#)

$$(ih\partial_t + \frac{h^2}{2}\Delta_g + \delta Q_\omega)\widehat{u}_{h,N} = \sum_{k,\iota} (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}(ih\partial_t + \frac{h^2}{2}\Delta_{\tilde{g}}\delta\tilde{Q}_\omega)b_N e^{\frac{i}{h}\tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}}. \quad (7.11)$$

When Q_ω is as in the [Random \$\Psi\$ DO case](#), then its action on $\widehat{u}_{h,N}$ requires a little bit more work. Let $\chi'_k, \chi''_k \in C_c^\infty(U_k; [0, 1])$ be so that χ'_k is equal to 1 on a small neighbourhood of $\text{supp } \chi_k$ and so that χ''_k is equal to 1 on a small neighbourhood of $\text{supp } \chi'_k$. We then define $\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}$ and $\tilde{\chi}''_{k,\iota}$ similarly to $\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}$.

By the pseudolocality of Q_ω , cf. Section 3.1, we have that for every $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$Q_\omega\widehat{u}_{h,N}(t, x) = \sum_k \chi_k Q_\omega \chi'_k \widehat{u}_{h,N}(t, x) + O_L(h^\infty) \|\widehat{u}_{h,N}(t, \cdot)\|_{H_h^L(X)}, \quad (7.12)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$.

By (7.8), we get

$$\chi'_k \widehat{u}_{h,N} = \sum_{\iota \in I_k} (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} u_\delta(t, \tilde{x}; h). \quad (7.13)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_k Q_\omega \chi'_k \widehat{u}_{h,N} &= \sum_{\iota \in I_k} \chi_k \chi''_k Q_\omega \chi''_k (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} u_\delta \\ &\stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \sum_{\iota \in I_k} \chi_k \kappa_k^* \text{Op}(q_{\kappa_k}) (\kappa_k^{-1})^* (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} u_\delta \\ &= \sum_{\iota \in I_k} (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^* \text{Op}(q_{\kappa_k}) (\tilde{\kappa}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} u_\delta \\ &\stackrel{(3.19)}{=} \sum_{\iota \in I_k} (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{\chi}''_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} u_\delta \\ &= \sum_{\iota \in I_k} (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega u_\delta - \sum_{\iota \in I_k} (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega (1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}) u_\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

By (3.24) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega (1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}) u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(X)} &= O(1) \|\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega (1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}) u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})} \\ &\leq O(1) \sum_{k', \iota' \in I_{k'}} \|\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega (1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}) \tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'} u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

where the constant in the error estimate is independent of k and ι . Since $\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota} \circ \tilde{\pi}_{k',\iota'}^{-1}$ is the identity on $U_{k'} \cap U_k$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{k',\iota'}^{-1} \circ \tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}$ is the identity on $U_{k',\iota'} \cap U_{k,\iota}$, it follows that

$$\tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota} \tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'} = \tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1} (\chi'_k \chi_{k'}).$$

So (7.15), together with (3.20) and the fact that the index set K is finite independently of h and that $|I_k| = O(h^{-\varepsilon})$, yields

$$\|(\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega (1 - \tilde{\chi}'_{k,\iota}) u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(X)} = O_L(h^\infty) \|u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})}, \quad (7.16)$$

where the constant in the error estimate is independent of k and ι . Plugging this into (7.14), while keeping in mind that $|I_k| = O(h^{-\varepsilon})$, gives

$$\chi_k Q_\omega \chi'_k \widehat{u}_{h,N} = \sum_{\iota \in I_k} (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega u_\delta + O_L(h^\infty) \|u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})}. \quad (7.17)$$

Next, recall (5.10) and in particular that $\psi_{N,t} \succ \psi_{N-1,t}$. As discussed in the paragraph after (7.7) we have that $\text{supp } b_N(t, \cdot; h, \delta) \subset \text{supp } \psi_{N-1,t}$. So

$$(\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \tilde{Q}_\omega u_\delta = (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} \psi_t \tilde{Q}_\omega u_\delta + (\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota} (1 - \psi_t) \tilde{Q}_\omega \psi_{N,t} u_\delta. \quad (7.18)$$

Using (3.24), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}(1 - \psi_t) \tilde{Q}_\omega \psi_{N-1,t} u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(X)} &= O(1) \|\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}(1 - \psi_t) \tilde{Q}_\omega \psi_{N,t} u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})} \\ &\leq O(1) \sum_{k',\iota' \in I_{k'}} \|\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}(1 - \psi_t) \tilde{Q}_\omega \psi_{N,t} \tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'} u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

We can see each $\tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}(1 - \psi_t)$ and $\psi_{N,t} \tilde{\chi}_{k',\iota'}$ as lifted cut-off functions with compact support independent of h . Furthermore, by Lemma 6.2 the distance between their supports is bounded from below by $h^{2\varepsilon}$, for $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, and their derivatives are bounded by the right hand side of (5.40). Since $\beta + \varepsilon_0 < 1/2$, we may then use (3.20), while keeping in mind that $|I_k| = O(h^{-\varepsilon})$, and deduce that

$$\|(\tilde{\pi}_{k,\iota}^{-1})^* \tilde{\chi}_{k,\iota}(1 - \psi_t) \tilde{Q}_\omega \psi_{N,t} u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(X)} = O_L(h^\infty) \|u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})}. \quad (7.19)$$

We insist here on the fact that the constant in the error term is independent of ι by (3.20), and uniform in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$.

Combining (7.12), (7.17), (7.18) and (7.19) gives

$$Q_\omega \hat{u}_{h,N}(t, x) = \sum_{\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x})=x} \psi_t \tilde{Q}_\omega u_\delta + O_L(h^\infty) \|u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})} \quad (7.20)$$

Putting together (7.11) and (7.20) shows

$$\begin{aligned} \left(ih\partial_t + \frac{h^2}{2} \Delta_g - \delta Q_\omega \right) \hat{u}_{h,N}(x) &= \sum_{\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x})=x} \left(ih\partial_t + \frac{h^2}{2} \Delta_{\tilde{g}} - \delta \psi_0 \tilde{Q}_\omega \right) u_\delta + O_L(h^\infty) \|u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})} \\ &=: \hat{R}_{N,t}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we can use (3.13), to see that $\|g\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})} = O(1)h^{-L} \|g\|_{H^L(\tilde{X})}$ for all $g \in H^L(\tilde{X})$. Hence, we may replace the semiclassical Sobolev norm $\|u_\delta\|_{H_h^L(\tilde{X})}$ above by $\|u_\delta\|_{H^L(\tilde{X})}$. Next, notice that each term in the sum satisfies (7.6) in any H^L norm. The number of terms is $O(h^{-\varepsilon})$ provided $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$ for some $0 < \mathfrak{d} \leq \mathfrak{d}(\varepsilon)$. So, we deduce from (6.41) that, for any $M, L \in \mathbb{N}$, we may find $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ small enough, we have that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$

$$\|\hat{R}_{N,t}\|_{H^L(X)} = O(h^M), \quad (7.21)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. Since P_h^δ is the infinitesimal generator of the unitary group $U_h^\delta(t)$, it follows that these two operators commute. Using additionally that $\delta Q_\omega = O(\delta) : L^2(X) \rightarrow L^2(X)$, we find that for $f \in C^\infty(X)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta U_h^\delta(t) f\|_{L^2(X)} &= h^{-2} \|h^2 \Delta U_h^\delta(t) f\|_{L^2(X)} \\ &\leq h^{-2} \left(\|P_h^\delta U_h^\delta(t) f\|_{L^2(X)} + \|\delta Q_\omega U_h^\delta(t) f\|_{L^2(X)} \right) \\ &\leq h^{-2} \left(\|h^2 \Delta f\|_{L^2(X)} + O(\delta) \|f\|_{L^2(X)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

Since $Q_\omega \in \Psi_{h,\beta}^{-\infty}$, we have that $\delta(h^2 \Delta)^n Q_\omega = O(\delta) : L^2(X) \rightarrow L^2(X)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using this, we may iterate the argument in (7.22) and get

$$\|\Delta^n U_h^\delta(t) f\|_{L^2(X)} \leq O(h^{-2n}) \sum_{k=0}^n \|h^{2k} \Delta^k f\|_{L^2(X)}. \quad (7.23)$$

In view of (7.9), Duhamel's principle implies

$$\hat{u}_{h,N}(t) = U_h^\delta(t) \left(f_h - h^N r(\cdot; h) e^{\frac{i}{h} \phi_0} \right) + \frac{1}{ih} \int_0^t U_h^\delta(t-s) \hat{R}_{N,s} ds,$$

so that, for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|U_h^\delta(t)f_h - \widehat{u}_{h,N}\|_{H^{2n}(X)} &\leq \frac{1}{h} \int_0^t \left\| U_h^\delta(t-s) \widehat{R}_{N,s} \right\|_{H^{2n}(X)} ds + h^N \|U_h^\delta(t)r(\cdot; h)e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_0}\|_{H^{2n}(X)} \\
&\stackrel{(7.23)}{\leq} O(|\log h|h^{-1-2n}) \sum_{k=0}^n \|h^{2k} \Delta^k \widehat{R}_{N,s}\|_{L^2(X)} + O(h^{N-2n}) \sum_{k=0}^n \|h^{2k} \Delta^k r(\cdot; h)e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi_0}\|_{H^{2n}(X)} \\
&= O(h^M)
\end{aligned} \tag{7.24}$$

thanks to (7.21), up to taking N larger and therefore $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ smaller. In the last line we also used all derivatives of ϕ_0 and $r(\cdot; h)$ are bounded independently of h .

Now, since M and n are arbitrary, we deduce from the Sobolev inequalities (3.16) that the remainder can be made arbitrarily small in any C^L norm, by taking N large enough and $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ smaller. In other words, for every $M, L \in \mathbb{N}$, we may find a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ small enough, we have that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$

$$U_h^\delta(t)f_h = \sum_{\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x})=x} b_N(t, \tilde{x}; \delta, h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\tilde{x})} + O_{C^L}(h^M), \tag{7.25}$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$.

For each $x \in X$ and $t \geq 0$ we set

$$A_{x,t} := \{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{t,\delta} \text{ with } \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x}) = x\}. \tag{7.26}$$

Since the manifold X is compact, there exists $c > 0$ such that $[\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x}')] \Rightarrow [(x = x') \text{ or } \text{dist}(x, x') > c]$. Therefore, we have that the cardinality of $A_{x,t}$ is bounded by

$$|A_{x,t}| \leq Ce^{Ct}. \tag{7.27}$$

Thus,

$$\widehat{u}_{h,N}(t, x) = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_N(t, \tilde{x}; \delta, h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\tilde{x})}, \tag{7.28}$$

and (7.25) becomes

$$U_h^\delta(t)f_h = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_N(t, \tilde{x}; \delta, h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\tilde{x})} + O_{C^L}(h^M).$$

7.2. Taylor expansions. Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set. We shall write

$$\psi_{h,t,\delta} := U_h^\delta(t)f_h.$$

Let $\mathcal{U} \subset X$ be an open subset on which there exists a family of vector fields (V_1, \dots, V_d) forming an orthonormal frame of the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{U}$. Given $x \in \mathcal{U}$, we write $\exp_x(\mathbf{y}) := \exp_x(\sum_{j=1}^d y_j V_j(x))$, and if $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}$ is a lift of x , we denote by $\widetilde{\exp}_{\tilde{x}}(\mathbf{y})$ a lift of $\exp_x(\mathbf{y})$ depending continuously on \mathbf{y} and such that $\widetilde{\exp}_{\tilde{x}}(\mathbf{0}) = \tilde{x}$.

If $x \in \mathcal{U}$, we then write, for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{K}$ and any $L, M \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ small enough, we have that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$ and all $t \in [0, \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}(\mathbf{y}) &:= \psi_{h,t,\delta}(\exp_x(h\mathbf{y})) \\
&= \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_N(t, \widetilde{\exp}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}); \delta, h) e^{\frac{i}{h}\tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\widetilde{\exp}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}))} + O_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})}(h^M).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we also assumed tacitly that $h > 0$ is small enough (depending on \mathfrak{K}) so that $\widetilde{\exp}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{t,\delta}$. From now on we work with $L, M, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ as above.

First order approximation of the amplitudes Recall that

$$b_N(t, \widetilde{\exp}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}); \delta, h) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h^n b_n(t, \widetilde{\exp}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}); \delta).$$

Now, thanks to Proposition 6.5, for any $n \geq 1$, the $C^L(\mathfrak{K})$ norm of $\mathbf{y} \mapsto h^n b_n(t, \widetilde{\text{exp}}_x(h\mathbf{y}); \delta)$ is $O(h^\gamma)$, for some $\gamma > 0$ independent of n . This comes from the fact that $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, and that, when we differentiate $\mathbf{y} \mapsto b_n(t, \widetilde{\text{exp}}_x(h\mathbf{y}))$ L times, we gain a factor h^L which balances the $h^{-(\beta+\varepsilon)L}$ in (6.38).

We thus have

$$\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_0(t, \widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}); \delta) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}))} + O_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})}(h^\gamma)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$.

Now, Proposition 6.5 along with a Taylor expansion also implies that, upon potentially further decreasing $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$,

$$\|b_0(t, \widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}); \delta) - b_0(t, \tilde{x}; \delta)\|_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})} = O(h^\gamma)$$

for some (possibly smaller) $\gamma > 0$ and uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. Combining this with Proposition 6.7, we obtain

$$\|b_0(t, \widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}); \delta) - b_0(t, \tilde{x}; 0)\|_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})} = O(h^\gamma),$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. Summing up, we have shown in this paragraph that for any compact set $\mathfrak{K} \Subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $L, M \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ small enough, there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$ and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$

$$\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_0(t, \tilde{x}; 0) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}))} + O_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})}(h^\gamma), \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{K}, \quad (7.29)$$

In particular, in this first-order expansion, the amplitude does not depend on \mathbf{y} .

First order approximation of the phases. Let $\mathfrak{K} \Subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set as above. For each $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$, let us write

$$\xi_{t,\tilde{x},\delta} := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right|_{\mathbf{y}=0} \tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(\mathbf{y})) \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

By (5.27) we know that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$, all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$ and all $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$

$$|\xi_{t,\tilde{x},\delta}| \leq C. \quad (7.30)$$

By Taylor expansion,

$$\tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y})) = \tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\tilde{x}) + h\xi_{t,\tilde{x},\delta} \cdot \mathbf{y} + r_{\tilde{x},h}(\mathbf{y}).$$

It follows from (5.28) that for $\mathfrak{d}, h_0 > 0$ small enough

$$\|r_{\tilde{x},h}\|_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})} = O_{\mathfrak{K}}(h^{1+\gamma})$$

for some $\gamma > 0$ and uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$. Therefore, we may write

$$e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\widetilde{\text{exp}}_{\tilde{x}}(h\mathbf{y}))} = e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\tilde{x}) + i\xi_{t,\tilde{x},\delta} \cdot \mathbf{y}} + O_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})}(h^\gamma)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{K}$.

Now, recall from (5.26) that for $\mathfrak{d}, h_0 > 0$ small enough

$$\tilde{\phi}_{t,\delta}(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{\phi}_{t,0}(\tilde{x}) = \delta\theta_t(\tilde{x}) + O\left(\delta^2 h^{-2\beta-2\varepsilon}\right), \quad (7.31)$$

uniformly in $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, with

$$\theta_t(\tilde{x}) := - \int_0^t q_\omega\left(\tilde{\Phi}_0^{-s}(\tilde{x}, d_{\tilde{x}}\tilde{\phi}_{t,0})\right) ds. \quad (7.32)$$

Furthermore, Lemma 5.3 implies that

$$|\xi_{t,\tilde{x},\delta} - \xi_{t,\tilde{x},0}| = O(h^\gamma)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$.

All in all, we have shown the following result:

Proposition 7.1. *For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and any compact set $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, there exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that, for all $h \in]0, h_0]$, all $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$ and all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{K}$*

$$\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_0(t, \tilde{x}; 0) e^{\frac{i}{h} \tilde{\phi}_{t,0}(\tilde{x})} e^{i \frac{\delta}{h} \theta_t(\tilde{x})} e^{i \xi_{t,\tilde{x},0} \cdot \mathbf{y}} + O_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})}(h^\gamma).$$

This expression deserves several comments:

- Up to a $O_{C^L}(h^\gamma)$ remainder, the function $\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}$ can be written as a sum of plane waves, with $O(h^{c_0})$ terms. In particular, the dependence on the variable \mathbf{y} is only in the exponentials $e^{i \xi_{t,\tilde{x},0} \cdot \mathbf{y}}$.
- The amplitudes $b_0(t, \tilde{x}; 0)$ and the directions of propagation $\xi_{t,\tilde{x},0}$ do not depend on δ , and hence do not depend on the random parameter ω . The only quantities which depend on the random parameter ω are the phases $\theta_t(\tilde{x})$.

In the sequel, we will often need to have \tilde{x} vary in an open set, and in particular in a ball of small radius; we will then think of it as a random variable, being picked uniformly in the open set. So, let $x_0 \in X$, and let $\vartheta > 0$. Thanks to Propositions 5.4 and 6.5, we know that, there exists $\gamma(\vartheta) > 0$ such that, for all $x \in B(x_0, h^\vartheta)$, we have for all lifts \tilde{x}, \tilde{x}_0 of x, x_0 with $\tilde{x} \in B(\tilde{x}_0, h^\vartheta)$:

$$\begin{aligned} |b_0(t, \tilde{x}; 0) - b_0(t, \tilde{x}_0; 0)| &= O(h^\gamma) \\ |\xi_{t,\tilde{x},0} - \xi_{t,\tilde{x}_0,0}| &= O(h^\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we write

$$\Theta_t(\tilde{x}; \omega) := \tilde{\phi}_{t,0}(\tilde{x}) + \delta \theta_t(\tilde{x}), \quad (7.33)$$

we have the following result:

Corollary 7.2. *For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, any compact $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $\vartheta > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that, for all $x_0 \in X$, all $h \in]0, h_0]$, all $x \in B(x_0, h^\vartheta)$ and all $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d} |\log h|$, and for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{K}$*

$$\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_0(t, \tilde{x}_0; 0) e^{\frac{i}{h} \Theta_t(\tilde{x}; \omega)} e^{i \xi_{t,\tilde{x}_0,0} \cdot \mathbf{y}} + O_{C^L(\mathfrak{K})}(h^\gamma). \quad (7.34)$$

Note that, in the expression above, the phases $\Theta_t(\tilde{x}; \omega)$ are the only quantities depending on the random parameter ω and on the quasi-random parameter \tilde{x} . This remark will be essential in the next two sections.

8. INDEPENDENCE OF THE PHASES

From Corollary 7.2 we see that, up to a small error, the propagated Lagrangian state is given by the superposition of random functions where the randomness comes from the phases Θ_t , introduced in (7.32), (7.33). To derive Theorem 2.10 from this expression we will use a Central Limit Theorem. However, the principal obstacle is that the family of random variables $(\Theta_t(\tilde{x}; \omega))_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}}$ is in general not independent. For instance, in the [Random Potential case](#), two lifts $\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}' \in A_{x,t}$ may correspond to trajectories which cross (or come close to each other) on X , making (part of) the phases $\Theta_t(\tilde{x}; \omega)$, $\Theta_t(\tilde{x}'; \omega)$ dependent. This issue is remedied in Section 8.2 by removing the ‘‘exceptional times’’ at which trajectories cross, and thus defining new phases $\Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x})$.

Actually, even in the [Random \$\Psi\$ DO case](#), two lifts $\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}' \in A_{x,t}$ may correspond to trajectories which come close to each other *in the phase space* S^*X , making the random variables $\Theta_t(\tilde{x}; \omega)$ and $\Theta_t(\tilde{x}'; \omega)$ dependent: this phenomenon is illustrated in Figure 2. However, we will show in Section 8.1 that this happens only for a small set of points $x \in X$, which we may thus neglect when proving Theorem 2.10. The aim of this section is thus to replace (7.34) by an expansion where, around most points of X , the different terms in the sum are independent.

This is the content of the following proposition. The proposition also states that most close points yield independent phases. To make this second point more precise, we need to introduce the following sets for every $x \in X$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$:

$$\mathcal{V}_{t,\varepsilon}(x) := \{y \in X; \exists s \in [-t, t], \exists \tilde{x} \in A_{x,t} \text{ with } \text{dist}_X(\pi_X \Phi^s(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), y) < h^{\beta-\varepsilon}\}. \quad (8.1)$$




Figure 2. An example where the phases $\Theta_t(\tilde{x})$ and $\Theta_t(\tilde{x}')$ are not independent. Here, Λ_0 is a piece of the unstable manifold of the periodic point ρ_0 to which ρ and ρ' both belong. There are two lifts of x , \tilde{x} and \tilde{x}' such that $\rho_{\tilde{x}}$ and $\rho_{\tilde{x}'}$ originate respectively from the points ρ and ρ' ; since ρ and ρ' belong to the same geodesic, the phases $\Theta_t(\tilde{x})$ and $\Theta_t(\tilde{x}')$ are dependent, since the integrals in (7.32) defining them contain a part which is equal.

This is thus a set of points in X which may be approached by trajectories passing through x . In (8.1) we used the following notation: For every $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$, see (7.26), we define

$$\rho_{\tilde{x}} := \widehat{\pi}(\tilde{x}, d_{\tilde{x}}\phi_{t,0}) \in T^*X,$$

so that (7.32) rewrites $\theta_t(\tilde{x}) := -\int_0^t q_\omega(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})) ds$.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathfrak{K} \Subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set. There exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, $C_0, c_0 > 0$, $\mathfrak{d}(\varepsilon) > 0$, $h_0 > 0$, such that the following holds for all $h \in (0, h_0]$. We may write*

$$X = \left(\bigsqcup_{i \in \widehat{I}_h} \widehat{X}_i \right) \sqcup X_h^0,$$

where each \widehat{X}_i has a diameter $\leq C_0 h^{\beta-\varepsilon_1}$ and has volume $\geq c_0 h^{d(\beta-\varepsilon_1)}$, and where $\text{Vol}(X_h^0) = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1)$.

Furthermore, for every $x \in \widehat{X}_i$, we have

$$\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_0(t, \tilde{x}; 0) e^{\frac{i}{h} \Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x})} e^{i \xi_{t,\tilde{x},0} \cdot \mathbf{y}} + O_{C^k(\mathfrak{K})}(h^\gamma), \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{K}, \quad (8.2)$$

uniformly in $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$. Here $\Theta_{\omega,t}^0$ is defined in (8.13) below and

- for each fixed $x \in X$, the phases $(\Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x}))_{\{\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}; \widehat{\pi}(\tilde{x})=x\}}$ are independent.
- Let $x_1, \dots, x_p \in X_i$ be such that, for all $1 \leq j, j' \leq p$, we have $x_j \notin \mathcal{V}_{t,\varepsilon}(x_{j'})$. Then the phases $(\Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x}_j))_{j=1,\dots,p; \tilde{x}_j \in \tilde{X}; \widehat{\pi}(\tilde{x}_j)=x_j}$ are independent.

Remark 8.2. *Thanks to Corollary 7.2, it is possible, in (8.2), to replace for every $x \in \widehat{X}_i$ the amplitude $b_0(t, \tilde{x}; 0)$ by $b_0(t, \tilde{x}_i; 0)$, where x_i is a fixed point in \widehat{X}_i , and where \tilde{x}_i corresponds to the lift of x_i in the same sheet as \tilde{x} , i.e., the point $\tilde{x}_i \in \tilde{X}$ such that $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}_i) = \text{dist}_X(x, x_i)$. (This point is unique as soon as h is small enough such that the diameter of \widehat{X}_i is smaller than the radius of injectivity r_I .)*

Proving Proposition 8.1 will take the rest of Section 8.

8.1. Removing exceptional points. The first step in the proof of Proposition 8.1 is to remove exceptional points, which will correspond to the set X_h^0 .

Next, we define the *bad* set

$$X_{T_0, T, \gamma} := \left\{ x \in X \text{ such that } \exists t_1 \in [T_0, T], \exists t_2 \in [r_I, T] \right. \\ \left. \text{such that } \exists \tilde{x} \in A_{x,t_1} \text{ with } \text{dist}_X(\pi_X(\Phi^{t_2}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})), x) < h^\gamma \right\}. \quad (8.3)$$

Roughly speaking, the bad set contains all points $x \in X$ which are attained by some trajectory of the time evolution of Λ_0 , and which are closely approached by the same trajectory at a future time.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $0 < \gamma < \gamma'$. There exists $T_1 > 0$, $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ such that, if $0 < h \leq h_0$, $T_1 \leq T_0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, and $x \in X \setminus X_{T_0, t, \gamma}$, the following holds. For all $\tilde{x} \neq \tilde{x}' \in A_{x, t}$ and all $0 \leq s_1, s_2 \leq t$, we have*

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi^{-s_1}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-s_2}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'})) \geq h^{\gamma'}.$$

Taking $\gamma' < \beta$, this implies in particular, in the **Random Ψ DO case**, that the phases $\theta_t(\tilde{x})$ and $\theta_t(\tilde{x}')$ in (7.33) are independent, see also (7.32).

Proof. Let $0 < \gamma < \gamma'$. We will make an argument by contradiction. Suppose that the result is false, so that for any $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ and $h > 0$ arbitrarily small, we may find $s_1, s_2 \in [0, t]$ such that $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi^{-s_1}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-s_2}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'})) < h^{\gamma'}$.

Let us take $0 < \varepsilon < \gamma$ such that $\gamma + \varepsilon < \gamma'$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $s_2 \geq s_1$. Thanks to Lemma 4.3, we have $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi^{s_2-s_1}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \rho_{\tilde{x}'}) < h^{\gamma'-\varepsilon} < h^\gamma$, provided \mathfrak{d} is small enough.

Now, we claim that, for h and \mathfrak{d} small enough,

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}, \rho_{\tilde{x}'}) > h^\varepsilon. \quad (8.4)$$

Indeed, if $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}, \rho_{\tilde{x}'}) \leq h^\varepsilon$, then taking \mathfrak{d} small enough and using Lemma 4.3, we would have $\text{dist}_X(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'})) < r_I$ for all $s \in [0, t]$. By Lemma 4.14, there would exist $t_0, \tau > 0$ such that for all τ' small enough, $\text{dist}_X^2(\Phi^{-t+t_0}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-t+t_0+\tau'}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'})) > 4\text{dist}_X^2(\Phi^{-t}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-t+\tau}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'}))$. Let us write $\Phi^{-t+\tau}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'}) = (x_0, \xi_0)$, and set $\rho' = (x_0, \lambda\xi_0)$, with $\lambda = \frac{t}{t-\tau_0}$, so that $\pi_X(\Phi^t(\rho')) = x$. The map $f : [0, t] \ni s \mapsto \text{dist}_X^2(\Phi^s(\rho'), \Phi^s(\Phi^{-t}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})))$ would then be non-negative, convex (by Corollary 4.13), and satisfy $f(t) = 0$, and $f(t_0) > 4f(0)$, which gives a contradiction (provided we assumed that $T_0 \geq T_1 := t_0$).

In particular (8.4) implies that we cannot have $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi^s(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \rho_{\tilde{x}'}) < h^\gamma$ for $s < h^\varepsilon$. On the other hand, thanks to Corollary 4.13, we cannot have $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi^s(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \rho_{\tilde{x}'}) < h^\gamma$ either for $h^\varepsilon < s < r_I$. Therefore, we must have $s_2 - s_1 \geq r_I$, which contradicts the assumption that $x \in X_{T_0, t, \gamma}$. \square

Next, we show that the bad set (8.3) has small measure.

Proposition 8.4. *For any $\gamma > 0$, there exists $T_1 > 0$, $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $r > 0$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that, for all $h \leq h_0$, if $T_1 \leq T_0 \leq T \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, then*

$$\text{Vol}(X_{T_0, T, \gamma}) < h^r.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_1, T, \gamma > 0$, let $\rho_0 \in S^*X$ and $r_I \leq T_1, T_2 \leq T$. Define

$$X_{T, \gamma, \rho_0, T_1, T_2, \varepsilon_1} := \{x \in X \text{ such that } \exists t_1 \in [T_1 - h^{\varepsilon_1}, T_1 + h^{\varepsilon_1}], \exists t_2 \in [T_2 - h^{\varepsilon_1}, T_2 + h^{\varepsilon_1}], \exists \tilde{x} \in A_{x, t_1} \\ \text{with } \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}, \rho_0) < h^{\varepsilon_1} \text{ and } \text{dist}_X(\Phi^{t_2}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), x) < h^\gamma\}.$$

We see that $X_{T_0, T, \gamma}$ is included in the union of at most $O(h^{-c\varepsilon_1})$, for some $c > 0$, sets $X_{T, \gamma, \rho_0, T_1, T_2, \varepsilon_1}$, so that it suffices to show that, for ε_1 small enough, each $X_{T, \gamma, \rho_0, T_1, T_2, \varepsilon_1}$ has volume $O(h^r)$ with r independent of ε_1 .

Let $x, x' \in X_{T, \gamma, \rho_0, T_1, T_2, \varepsilon_1}$, let t_1, t_2, t'_1, t'_2 be the associated times and let $\rho_x, \rho_{x'}$ be the associated points in S^*X .

By assumption, we have $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho_x, \rho_{x'}) < 2h^{\varepsilon_1}$. Write $\rho := \Phi^{-t_1}(\rho_x) \in \Lambda_0$, and $\rho' := \Phi^{-t'_1}(\rho_{x'}) \in \Lambda_0$. Thanks to Lemma 4.14, we know (provided T_0 is large enough) that there exists a (small) $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all small τ' , we have $\text{dist}_X(\Phi^{t_1}(\rho_1), \Phi^{t_1+\tau'}(\rho_2)) > 2\text{dist}_X(\rho_1, \Phi^\tau(\rho_2))$.

Thanks to Corollary 4.13, this implies that there exists $c > 0$ such that, for any λ close enough to 1,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \text{dist}_X(\Phi^t(\rho_x), \Phi^{\lambda t}(\rho_{x'})) > c \text{dist}_X(\rho_1, \Phi^\tau(\rho_2)).$$

Thanks to Corollary 4.13, we deduce that for any $0 < t < \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$,

$$\text{dist}_X \left(\Phi^t(\rho_x), \Phi^{\lambda t}(\rho_{x'}) \right) - \text{dist}_X(x, x') > c(t - t_1) \text{dist}_X(\rho_1, \Phi^\tau(\rho_2)).$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h^\gamma > \text{dist}_X(\Phi^{t_2}(\rho_x), x) &= \text{dist}_X(\Phi^{t_2}(\rho_x), \rho_x) \\ &\geq \text{dist}_X(\Phi^{t_2}(\rho_x), \Phi^{t'_2}(\rho_{x'})) - \text{dist}_X(\rho_{x'}, \Phi^{t'_2}(\rho_{x'})) - \text{dist}_X(\rho_x, \rho_{x'}) \\ &\geq c t_2 \text{dist}_X(\rho_1, \Phi^\tau(\rho_2)) - 2h^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $t_2 \geq r_I$, we deduce that

$$\text{dist}_X(\rho_1, \Phi^\tau(\rho_2)) < Ch^\gamma.$$

Therefore, if ρ_1 is fixed, ρ_2 must belong to the neighbourhood of size $O(h^\gamma)$ a geodesic segment containing ρ_1 , which has volume $O(h^{(2d-2)\gamma})$ in S^*X . This implies that, if x and ρ_x are fixed, then $\rho_{x'}$ must belong to a neighbourhood of size $O(h^{\gamma-\varepsilon})$ of the geodesic segment containing ρ_x , for any $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, x' must belong to a set of volume $O(h^{(d-1)(\gamma-\varepsilon)})$. The result follows. \square

8.2. Removing dependent times in the Random Potential case. Given $x, y \in X$, $t \geq 0$ and $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$, $\tilde{y} \in A_{y,t}$, let us write

$$\mathfrak{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \varepsilon, t} := \left\{ s \in [0, t] \text{ such that } \exists s' \in [0, t] \text{ with } \text{dist}_X \left(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-s'}(\rho_{\tilde{y}}) \right) < h^{\beta-\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

This is thus the set of times s at which $\Phi^s(\rho_{\tilde{x}})$ is be approached by $\Phi^{s'}(\rho_{\tilde{y}})$ for some time s' .

Lemma 8.5. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ such that, for all $0 \leq t \leq \mathfrak{d}|\log h|$, for all $x \in X$, for all $y \in X \setminus \mathcal{V}_{t, 2\varepsilon}(x)$, we have*

$$\forall \tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}, \forall \tilde{y} \in A_{y,t}, \quad \mathfrak{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \varepsilon, t} = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $x \in X$, $y \in X \setminus \mathcal{V}_{t, 2\varepsilon}(x)$, and let $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$, $\tilde{y} \in A_{y,t}$. Suppose for contradiction that there exists $s \in \mathfrak{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \varepsilon, t}$, so that there exists $s' \in [0, t]$ such that $\text{dist}_X \left(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-s'}(\rho_{\tilde{y}}) \right) < h^{\beta-\varepsilon}$. Using (4.37), we deduce that $\text{dist}_X \left(\Phi^{-s+s'}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \rho_{\tilde{y}} \right) < h^{\beta-2\varepsilon}$, which contradicts the fact that $y \notin \mathcal{V}_{t, 2\varepsilon}(x)$. \square

We then set

$$\mathfrak{J}_{x, \varepsilon, t} := \bigcup_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}' \in A_{x,t}} \mathfrak{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t}.$$

Proposition 8.6. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exist $\mathfrak{d} > 0$, $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$, for all $T_0 \geq r_I$ and all $x \in X \setminus X_{T_0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|, \varepsilon}$, and all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|]$, we have,*

$$|\mathfrak{J}_{x, \varepsilon, t}| \leq h^{\beta-5\varepsilon}. \quad (8.5)$$

Furthermore, there exists $0 < \gamma_0 < \beta$ such that, for any $x_0 \in X$, we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{x \in B(x_0, h^{\gamma_0}) \setminus X_{T_0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|, \varepsilon}} \mathfrak{J}_{x, \varepsilon, t} \right| \leq h^{\beta-6\varepsilon}. \quad (8.6)$$

Here $B(x_0, h^{\gamma_0})$ denotes the geodesic ball of radius h^{γ_0} around x_0 .

Proof of Proposition 8.6. 1. Thanks to (4.37), there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{E}_{0, (\frac{1}{2}, 2)}$, if $\text{dist}_X(\rho, \rho') < \frac{r_I}{3}$, then for all $\tau \in (-t_0, t_0)$, we have $\text{dist}_X(\Phi^\tau(\rho), \Phi^\tau(\rho')) < r_I$.

Let us write, for $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}' \in A_{x,t}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t, k, k'} &:= \left\{ s \in [0, t] \cap [kt_0, (k+1)t_0] \text{ such that } \exists s' \in [0, t] \cap [k't_0, (k'+1)t_0] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{with } \text{dist}_X \left(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^{-s'}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'}) \right) < h^{\beta-\varepsilon} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.7)$$

Since the sets $\mathfrak{J}_{x, \varepsilon, t}$ are unions of $\mathfrak{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t, k, k'}$ over $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}$, with $k, k' \leq O(|\log h|)$ and over $O(h^{-C\mathfrak{d}})$ (by (7.27)) many \tilde{x} and \tilde{x}' , it is sufficient to prove bounds on $|\mathfrak{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t, k, k'}|$.

2. Let $s \in \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t, k, k'}$, and let $s' \in [0, t] \cap [k't_0, (k'+1)t_0]$ be the associated time for \tilde{x}' . Let us write

$$\rho := \Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}}) \quad \rho' := \Phi^{-s'}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'}),$$

so that

$$\text{dist}_X(\rho, \rho') < h^{\beta-\varepsilon}. \quad (8.8)$$

We claim that, for $\mathfrak{d} > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') > h^{2\varepsilon}. \quad (8.9)$$

To prove (8.9), we argue by contradiction. Suppose that $\text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho, \rho') \leq h^{2\varepsilon}$. Since $\tilde{x} \neq \tilde{x}'$, we must have $|s - s'| \geq r_I$ (see the end of the proof of Lemma 8.3). Suppose that $s \geq s'$. Then, thanks to (4.37), we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_X(\Phi^{s-s'}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'}), x) &= \text{dist}_X(\Phi^{s-s'}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'}), \Phi^s(\rho)) \leq h^{-C\mathfrak{d}} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\Phi^{-s'}(\rho_{\tilde{x}'}), \rho) \\ &= h^{-C\mathfrak{d}} \text{dist}_{T^*X}(\rho', \rho) \leq h^{2\varepsilon-C\mathfrak{d}}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that $x \notin X_{T_0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|, \varepsilon}$, provided \mathfrak{d} is chosen small enough. We reach a contradiction in the same way if we suppose that $s' \geq s$.

3. Equations (8.8) and (8.9) imply that ρ and ρ' are close when projected on the base manifold X , but at a much larger distance in T^*X . Working in a local chart, we see that this implies that there exists $\tau \in [0, h^{\beta-4\varepsilon}]$ such that (provided h is small enough), we have

$$\text{dist}_X(\Phi^\tau(\rho), \Phi^\tau(\rho')) > h^{\beta-\varepsilon}. \quad (8.10)$$

Now, we know that, for all $\tau \in [0, t_0]$, we have $\text{dist}_X(\Phi^\tau(\rho), \Phi^\tau(\rho')) < r_I$, so that $[0, t_0] \ni \tau \mapsto \text{dist}_X^2(\Phi^\tau(\rho), \Phi^\tau(\rho'))$ is convex thanks to Corollary 4.13. We deduce from (8.10) that for all $t \in [h^{\beta-4\varepsilon}, t_0]$, we have $\text{dist}_X(\Phi^t(\rho), \Phi^t(\rho')) > h^{\beta-\varepsilon}$, so that $[s + h^{\beta-4\varepsilon}, t_0] \cap \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t, k, k'} = \emptyset$. Since this holds for all $s \in \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t, k, k'}$, the first part of the statement follows readily.

4. For the second part, we note that Lemma 4.3 implies that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\left(\text{dist}_X(x, y) < h^\beta \right) \implies \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}', \varepsilon, t, k, k'} \subset \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{y}_{\tilde{x}}, \tilde{y}'_{\tilde{x}'}, \varepsilon + c\mathfrak{d}, t, k, k'},$$

where $\tilde{y}_{\tilde{x}}$ is a lift of y such that $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{y}_{\tilde{x}}, \tilde{x}) = \text{dist}_X(y, x)$, and similarly for $\tilde{y}'_{\tilde{x}'}$. The set defined in (8.6) is thus contained in

$$\bigcup_{x_j} \mathcal{J}_{x_j, \varepsilon + c\mathfrak{d}, t},$$

where the x_j are at a distance $< h^\beta$ from each other, with $x_j \in B(x_0, h^{\gamma_0}) \setminus X_{T_0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|, \varepsilon}$. In particular, if γ_0 is taken slightly smaller than β , the number of sets in the union is a $O(h^{-\varepsilon_1})$ for an ε_1 arbitrarily small.

Now, each $|\mathcal{J}_{x_j, \varepsilon + c\mathfrak{d}, t}|$ can be bounded just as in the first part of the proof, and the result follows by taking ε_1 small enough. \square

8.3. Proof of Proposition 8.1. In the sequel, we let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ which will be fixed below, and write

$$X = \bigsqcup_{i \in I_h} X_i,$$

where each X_i has a diameter $\leq Ch^{\beta-\varepsilon_1}$ and has volume $\geq ch^{d(\beta-\varepsilon_1)}$. Such a partition can be obtained by using finitely many local charts, and by using cubes of size $h^{\beta-\varepsilon_1}$ in each chart.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ (which we will also fix below), take T_0 large enough so that Lemma 8.3 and Proposition 8.4 apply, set

$$\widehat{X}_i := X_i \setminus X_{T_0, \mathfrak{d}|\log h|, \varepsilon},$$

and write

$$\widehat{I}_h := \left\{ i \in I_h \text{ such that } \text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i) \geq \frac{c}{2} h^{d(\beta-\varepsilon_1)} \right\}.$$

Note that $I_h \setminus \widehat{I}_h = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(|I_h|)$, so that if we write $X_h^0 = X_{h,\varepsilon}^0 := X \setminus \bigsqcup_{i \in \widehat{I}_h} \widehat{X}_i$, we have, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\text{Vol}(X_{h,\varepsilon}^0) = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1).$$

For every $i \in \widehat{I}_h$, we will define sets $\mathfrak{J}_{i,t} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

- In the **Random Ψ DO case**, we may take any $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1 > 0$, and we set

$$\mathfrak{J}_{i,t} := \emptyset.$$

- In the **Random Potential case**, we take $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough so that

$$\delta h^{\beta-6\varepsilon} = O(h^{1+\varepsilon}), \quad (8.11)$$

which is possible thanks to (2.11). For each $i \in \widehat{I}_h$ we then define

$$\mathfrak{J}_{i,t} := \bigcup_{x \in \widehat{X}_i} \mathfrak{J}_{x,\varepsilon,t}.$$

Proposition 8.6 gives us the existence of a $\gamma_0(\varepsilon) > 0$. Taking $\varepsilon_1 = \beta - \gamma_0 > 0$, we deduce from the proposition that

$$|\mathfrak{J}_{i,t}| \leq h^{\beta-6\varepsilon}. \quad (8.12)$$

We then set, for each $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_t$ with $\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{x}) \in \widehat{X}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x}) &:= \tilde{\phi}_{t,0}(\tilde{x}) + \delta \int_{[0,t] \setminus \mathfrak{J}_{i,t}} q_\omega(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})) ds \\ \Theta_{\omega,t}^1(\tilde{x}) &:= \delta \int_{\mathfrak{J}_{i,t}} q_\omega(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (8.13)$$

so that

$$\Theta_t(\tilde{x}; \omega) = \Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x}) + \Theta_{\omega,t}^1(\tilde{x}).$$

In the **Random Ψ DO case**, we have $\Theta_{\omega,t}^1(\tilde{x}) \equiv 0$, while in the **Random Potential case**, equations (8.12) and (8.11) imply that

$$|\Theta_{\omega,t}^1(\tilde{x})| \leq C\delta h^{\beta-6\varepsilon} = O(h^{1+\varepsilon}).$$

This proves equation (8.2). The first point of Proposition 8.1 then follows from the definition of $\mathfrak{J}_{i,t}$ along with the first point of Hypothesis 2.2. The second point of Proposition 8.1 (with an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, provided \mathfrak{d} is taken small enough) follows from Lemma 8.5.

9. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

The aim of this section is to prove Theorems 2.9 and 2.10. The starting point is formula (8.2). From now on, we fix $\mathcal{U} \subset X$ an open set, and V an orthonormal frame on \mathcal{U} .

9.1. Varying ω with x fixed. Recall from the previous section that we decomposed

$$X = \left(\bigsqcup_{i \in \widehat{I}_h} \widehat{X}_i \right) \sqcup X_h^0,$$

with $\text{Vol}(X_h^0) = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1)$.

Notice that up to taking X_h^0 slightly larger (but still of negligible volume), we can arrange so that \widehat{X}_i is either inside \mathcal{U} or in its complement.

For each $\ell \in \widehat{I}_h$, each $x \in \widehat{X}_\ell$, and all $0 \leq t \leq o_{h \rightarrow 0}(|\log h|)$, we write

$$\psi_{h,t,x,\omega}^0(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} b_0(t, \tilde{x}_\ell; 0) e^{\frac{i}{h} \Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x})} e^{i\xi_{t,\tilde{x}_\ell,0} \cdot \mathbf{y}}, \quad (9.1)$$

so that (8.2), refined as described in Remark 8.2, now reads as

$$\psi_{h,t,x,\delta}(\mathbf{y}) = \psi_{h,t,x,\omega}^0(\mathbf{y}) + R_h, \quad \text{with } R_h = O_{C^k(\mathbb{R})}(h^\gamma). \quad (9.2)$$

We deduce that, for any $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and any continuous bounded functional $F : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $F(\chi \psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) = F(\chi \psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1)$. Now, recalling (2.12), both $d(\chi \psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}, \psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega})$

and $d(\chi\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0, \psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0)$ can be made smaller than any $\varepsilon > 0$, by taking χ equal to 1 in a large set depending on ε , but not on h . Using the continuity of F , we deduce that

$$F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) = F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1). \quad (9.3)$$

In the rest of this section we fix $x \in \widehat{X}_\ell$, and we will see the phases $\Theta_{\omega,t}^0(\tilde{x})$ as random variables with respect to ω , i.e. the random parameter coming from the random perturbation q_ω . Therefore, we see $\mathbb{R}^d \ni \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \psi_{h,t,x,\omega}^0(\mathbf{y})$ as a random smooth function on \mathbb{R}^d . To emphasize that, in this section, we compute expectations with respect to the random variable ω , we will write \mathbb{E}_ω . The aim of this subsection is to prove the following proposition. Recall that $C^L(U)$ is equipped with the topology of convergence of derivatives of order $\leq L$ on all compact subsets of U .

Proposition 9.1. *Let $t_h > 0$ be such that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} t_h = +\infty$ and $t_h = o(|\log h|)$. Let $\ell \in \widehat{I}_h$ and let $x \in \widehat{X}_\ell$. Then, for every bounded continuous map $F : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega[F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega})] \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F].$$

with $\lambda_a = \frac{\|a_0\|^2}{\text{Vol}(X)}$.

This result immediately implies Theorem 2.9. In order to prove Proposition 9.1, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $t_h > 0$ be such that $t_h = o(|\log h|)$ and $\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} t_h > 0$. Then for all $x \in X \setminus X_h^0$ and all $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t_h}$, we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\omega \left[e^{i \frac{\delta}{h} \Theta_{\omega,t_h}^0(\tilde{x})} \right] \right| = O(h^\infty). \quad (9.4)$$

Remark 9.3. *Following the exact same steps of the proof below, we can show that for all $x \in X$ and all $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t_h}$*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\omega \left[e^{i \frac{\delta}{h} \Theta_{\omega,t_h}(\tilde{x})} \right] \right| = O(h^\infty).$$

Proof of Lemma 9.2. Let $x \in \widehat{X}_k$ for some $k \in \widehat{I}_h$, and let $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t_h}$. Recalling (8.13) and (8.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \frac{\delta}{h} \Theta_{\omega,t_h}^0(\tilde{x})} \right] \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(i \frac{\delta}{h} \int_{[0,t_h] \setminus \mathcal{J}_{k,t_h}} q_\omega(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})) ds \right) \right] \right| \\ &= \prod_{j \in J_h} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left(i \frac{\delta}{h} \omega_j \int_{[0,t_h] \setminus \mathcal{J}_{k,t_h}} q_j(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})) ds \right) d\mu(\omega_j) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where μ is the common law of the variables ω_j . In other words, if we write $\bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} := \int_{[0,t_h] \setminus \mathcal{J}_{i,t_h}} q_j(\Phi^{-s}(\rho_{\tilde{x}})) ds$, we must evaluate

$$\prod_{j \in J_h} \left| \mathcal{F}(\mu) \left(-\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right) \right|.$$

Now, thanks to Hypothesis 2.2, there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}$, we have

$$\forall j \in J_h, |\bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}}| \leq C |t_h| h^\beta. \quad (9.5)$$

Thanks to (2.8), there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in J_h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \geq c_0 |t_h|.$$

We then deduce from (9.5) that there exists $c'_0, c_1 > 0$ and a subset $J'_h(\tilde{x})$ with $|J'_h(\tilde{x})| \geq c'_0 h^{-\beta}$ such that

$$\forall j \in J'_h(\tilde{x}), \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \geq c_1 h^\beta. \quad (9.6)$$

To estimate $|\mathcal{F}(\mu) \left(-\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right)|$, we may suppose, without loss of generality, that

$$(\mathcal{F}(\mu))'(0) = -i \int x d\mu = 0.$$

Indeed, if this is not the case, we may just consider a translation of μ , which will only multiply $\mathcal{F}(\mu)$ by a complex number of modulus one. Let us write

$$\lambda_2 := \int x^2 d\mu > 0.$$

We need now to separate two cases. Suppose first that $\delta h^{\beta-1}$ is small (how small will be made precise in equation (9.7) below). We deduce from (9.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\mu) \left(-\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right) &= \mathcal{F}(\mu)(0) - \frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} (\mathcal{F}(\mu))'(0) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right)^2 (\mathcal{F}(\mu))''(0) + O \left(\left(\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right)^3 \right) \\ &= 1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right)^2 + O \left(\left(\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right)^3 \right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, there exists $\eta_0, c > 0$ such that, if $\delta h^{\beta-1} < \eta_0$, we have for all $j \in J'_h(n)$

$$\left| \mathcal{F}(\mu) \left(-i \frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right) \right| \leq 1 - c \left(\delta h^{\beta-1} \right)^2 \quad (9.7)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j \in J_h} \left| \mathcal{F}(\mu) \left(-\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right) \right| &\leq \left(1 - c \left(\delta h^{\beta-1} \right)^2 \right)^{|J'_h(n)|} \\ &\leq \exp \left[c_0 h^{-\beta} \log \left(1 - c \left(\delta h^{\beta-1} \right)^2 \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[-c' \delta^2 h^{\beta-2} \right] \\ &= O(h^\infty), \end{aligned} \quad (9.8)$$

thanks to (2.10). The result follows, in the case when $\delta h^{\beta-1} < \eta_0$.

Suppose next that $\delta h^{\beta-1} > \eta_0$. In particular (2.11) does not hold, so that, by Hypothesis 2.6, the random variable ω_j has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We deduce from Lemma 9.4 below that there exists $c \in (0, 1)$ independent of h such that $|\mathcal{F}(\mu) \left(-\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right)| < c$. We then deduce that $\prod_{j \in J_h} |\mathcal{F}(\mu) \left(-\frac{\delta}{h} \bar{q}_{j,\tilde{x}} \right)| = O(h^\infty)$. \square

Lemma 9.4. *Let μ be a probability measure on \mathbb{R} that has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Let $\mathcal{F}(\mu)(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{ix\xi} d\mu(x)$ denote its Fourier transform. For all $\eta_0 > 0$, there exists $\eta \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $|\xi| > \eta_0$, we have $|\mathcal{F}(\mu)(\xi)| < \eta$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{F}(\mu)(\xi)$ is continuous and goes to zero at infinity by the Riemann-Lebesgue theorem, it is sufficient to show by compactness that, for every $|\xi| > \eta_0$, we have $|\mathcal{F}(\mu)(\xi)| < 1$. Suppose for contradiction that $|\mathcal{F}(\mu)(\xi)| = 1$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\mathcal{F}(\mu)(\xi) = 1$. The integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{ix\xi} - 1) d\mu(x)$ is thus zero with a non-positive real part of the integrand. Since μ has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure, we deduce that $x \mapsto e^{ix\xi} - 1$ must vanish almost everywhere in an open set, which would imply that $\xi = 0$. \square

We may now proceed with the proof of Proposition 9.1.

Proof of Proposition 9.1. Recall that thanks to (9.3), it is sufficient to prove the proposition with $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}$ replaced by $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0$. We will prove the result in two steps: first we will show that $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0$ converges to the BGF in finite dimensional distributions. That is to say that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k \in U$ the random vector $(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, \psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0(\mathbf{y}_k))$ converges in law to the random vector $(\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, \mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{y}_k))$ where \mathfrak{f} is a random function following the law of the Berry Gaussian field BGF_{λ_a} , as in Definition 2.8. In other words, we will show that

$$(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, \psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0(\mathbf{y}_k)) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, \mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{y}_k)), \quad h \rightarrow 0. \quad (9.9)$$

Secondly, we will show that the sequence of random functions $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0 \in C^\infty(U)$ is *tight* which, by Prokhorov's theorem [24, Theorem 14.3], is equivalent to relative compactness in distribution. Hence any subsequence of the sequence of random functions $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0$ has a further subsequence which converges in distribution. Its limit must coincide with the limit of the convergence in finite dimensional distribution (9.9). So we may conclude the statement of the proposition that $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0$ converges to the BGF $_{\lambda_a}$ in distribution.

1. To prove (9.9) we wish to apply a multivariate Lindeberg Central Limit Theorem to the sum over $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$ of the random vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\tilde{x}}(t_h, h) &= (\eta_{\tilde{x}}^1(t_h, h), \dots, \eta_{\tilde{x}}^k(t_h, h)) \\ &:= \left(b_0(t_h, \tilde{x}; 0) e^{\frac{i}{h} \Theta_{\omega, t_h}^0(\tilde{x})} e^{i \xi_{t_h, \tilde{x}, 0} \cdot \mathbf{y}_1}, \dots, b_0(t_h, \tilde{x}; 0) e^{\frac{i}{h} \Theta_{\omega, t_h}^0(\tilde{x})} e^{i \xi_{t_h, \tilde{x}, 0} \cdot \mathbf{y}_k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By construction, the family of random variables $(\eta_{\tilde{x}}(t_h, h))_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}}$ is independent (see Proposition 8.1). Thanks to (9.4), we have for each $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\eta_{\tilde{x}}^\ell(t_h, h)] &= O(h^\infty) \quad \forall \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\} \\ \mathbb{E}[\eta_{\tilde{x}}^\ell(t_h, h) \overline{\eta_{\tilde{x}}^{\ell'}(t_h, h)}] &= |b_0(t_h, \tilde{x}; 0)|^2 e^{i \xi_{t_h, \tilde{x}, 0} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_\ell - \mathbf{y}_{\ell'})} \quad \forall \ell, \ell' \in \{1, \dots, k\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9.10)$$

Let us denote by $M^{h,t_h} = (m_{\ell, \ell'}^{h,t_h})_{\ell, \ell'}$ the sum of the covariance matrices of the vectors $\eta_{\tilde{x}}(t_h, h)$. Equation (9.10) implies that it depends on h only through t_h , as

$$m_{\ell, \ell'}^{h,t_h} = \sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t_h}} |b_0(t_h, \tilde{x}; 0)|^2 e^{i \xi_{t_h, \tilde{x}, 0} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_\ell - \mathbf{y}_{\ell'})}. \quad (9.11)$$

Now, applying Lemma 3.9 in [22] we get that

$$m_{\ell, \ell'}^{h,t_h} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} m_{\ell, \ell'} = \frac{\|a_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{Vol}(X)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^d} e^{i \xi \cdot (\mathbf{y}_\ell - \mathbf{y}_{\ell'})} d\xi. \quad (9.12)$$

But the matrix $(m_{\ell, \ell'})_{\ell, \ell'}$ is the covariance matrix of the random vector $(\mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{y}_1), \dots, \mathfrak{f}(\mathbf{y}_k))$ where \mathfrak{f} is a random function following the law of the Berry Gaussian field, as in Definition 2.8, with normalization constant $\lambda_a = \frac{\|a_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{Vol}(X)}$. In particular, the matrix M^{h,t_h} is invertible for small enough h .

Lastly, by Corollary 6.8,

$$\sup_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} |b_0(t_h, \tilde{x}; 0)| \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

So all assumptions of the multivariate Lindeberg Central Limit Theorem hold¹. Thus, as $h \rightarrow 0$, the vector $\sum_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t_h}} \eta_{\tilde{x}}(t_h, h)$ converges in law to a Gaussian random vector with covariance $(m_{\ell, \ell'})_{\ell, \ell'}$ and expectation 0. This concludes the proof of (9.9).

2. It remains to prove *tightness*. The sequence of random smooth functions $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be tight if

$$\sup_{\mathcal{K}} \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}[\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0 \in \mathcal{K}] = 1, \quad (9.13)$$

where the supremum is taken over all compact subset $\mathcal{K} \subseteq C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_{k,\ell})_{k,\ell \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers depending on two parameters and consider the set

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{a}) := \{f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \forall n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \|f\|_{C^\ell(\overline{B(0,n)})} \leq a_{k,\ell}\}. \quad (9.14)$$

It follows from the Arzela-Ascoli theorem that $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{a})$ is a compact subset of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for the topology of convergence of all derivatives over all compact sets. In view of (7.30), we deduce from (9.10), (9.11) and (9.12), that

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega[\|\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0\|_{H^k(U)}^2] = O_k(1)$$

¹Thanks to the Cramér-Wold Theorem [4, Theorem 29.4], the multivariate Lindeberg Central Limit Theorem follows from the usual Lindeberg Central Limit Theorem [4, Chapter 27]

uniformly in $h \in]0, h_0]$. By the Sobolev embeddings, we then conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega[\|\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0\|_{C^k(K_n)}] = C_{k,n}$$

for some constant $C_{k,n} > 0$, uniformly in $h \in]0, h_0]$. By the Markov inequality we find that for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_\omega[\|\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0\|_{C^k(K_n)} > C_{k,n}2^{k+n}\varepsilon^{-1}] \leq \varepsilon 2^{-(k+n)}.$$

Now for $\varepsilon > 0$ put $a_{k,\ell} := C_{k,\ell}2^{k+\ell}\varepsilon^{-1}$ for $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{K}} \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}[\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0 \in \mathcal{K}] &\geq \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}[\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{a})] \\ &= 1 - \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}[\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{a})^c] \\ &\geq 1 - \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \sum_{k,\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}_\omega[\|\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}\|_{C^k(K_\ell)} > C_{k,\ell}2^{k+\ell}\varepsilon^{-1}] \\ &\geq 1 - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily, we conclude (9.13). This concludes the proof of Proposition 9.1. \square

9.2. Picking x at random. Our aim in this section is to prove Theorem 2.10. We thus fix a family of times t_h with $t_h \rightarrow \infty$, $t_h = o(|\log h|)$.

Recall that we want to study the statistics of the random function $\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}(\mathbf{y})$ when x is chosen uniformly at random in $\mathcal{U} \subset X$. To this end, we partitioned X as

$$X = \left(\bigsqcup_{i \in \widehat{I}_h} \widehat{X}_i \right) \sqcup X_h^0,$$

where each \widehat{X}_i has a diameter $\leq Ch^{\beta-\varepsilon_1}$ and has volume $\geq ch^{d(\beta-\varepsilon_1)}$ and is contained either inside \mathcal{U} or in its complement, and where $\text{Vol}(X_h^0) = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1)$. Let us denote by \widehat{I}_h the set of indices $i \in \widehat{I}_h$ such that $\widehat{X}_i \subset \mathcal{U}$. If F is a continuous bounded functional over $C^\infty(U)$, we find by (9.3) that

$$\frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) dx + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1). \quad (9.15)$$

Further, since F is bounded and $\text{Vol}(X_h^0) = o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1)$, we find that ω -almost surely

$$\frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx = \sum_{i \in \widehat{I}_h} \left(\frac{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \times \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{\widehat{X}_i} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) dx \right) + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1). \quad (9.16)$$

Thanks to Proposition 9.1 and to the dominated convergence theorem, we know that

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega \left[\frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F] + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1). \quad (9.17)$$

So ω -almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx - \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F] \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx - \mathbb{E}_\omega \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx \right| + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (9.18)$$

By (9.16) and the dominated convergence theorem we find that ω -almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx - \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F] \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{i \in \widehat{I}_h} \frac{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \left| \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{\widehat{X}_i} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) dx - \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{\widehat{X}_i} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) dx \right| \\ & + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (9.19)$$

We will show below that there exists an $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that for all $i \in \widehat{I}_h$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\omega} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{\widehat{X}_i} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) dx - \mathbb{E}_{\omega} \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{\widehat{X}_i} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0) dx \right| \geq h^{\varepsilon_2} \right] = O(h^{\infty}). \quad (9.20)$$

Assuming (9.20), and using the fact that $|\widehat{I}_h|$ only grows polynomially in h^{-1} , as well as

$$\sum_{i \in \widehat{I}_h} \frac{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} = 1 + o_{h \rightarrow 0}(1),$$

we conclude from (9.19) that every $\eta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\omega} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{U})} \int_{\mathcal{U}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx - \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F] \right| \geq \eta \right] = O(h^{\infty}), \quad (9.21)$$

for $h > 0$ small enough. This proves Theorem 2.10, provided that we have shown (9.20) which will be our task for the rest of this paper.

Picking x at random locally Our aim is now to prove (9.20). Let $i \in \widehat{I}_h$ and let $x_0 \in \widehat{X}_i$. We may partition \widehat{X}_i further, as

$$\widehat{X}_i = \bigsqcup_{j \in J_{h,i}} X_{i,j},$$

with $|J_{h,i}|$ of the order of $h^{-d\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}}$, each $X_{i,j}$ having diameter at most $ch^{\beta - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}}$.

Let F be a continuous bounded functional over $C^{\infty}(U)$. We may write

$$\frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{\widehat{X}_i} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \sum_{j \in J_{h,i}} \int_{X_{i,j}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx.$$

Let us define

$$Z := \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{\widehat{X}_i} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx, \quad \text{and} \quad Z_j := \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{X_{i,j}} F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}) dx,$$

which are random variable depending on ω . We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega}(Z_j) = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\widehat{X}_i)} \int_{X_{i,j}} \mathbb{E}_{\omega} [F(\psi_{h,t_h,x,\omega}^0)] dx.$$

Next, we want to show that Z_j is independent from most $Z_{j'}$.

Lemma 9.5. *There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that the following holds. For each $j \in J_{h,i}$, there exists $\mathcal{C}_j \subset J_{h,i}$ with*

$$\text{Card}(\mathcal{C}_j) \leq h^{-d\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \gamma}$$

such that Z_j is independent from $\{Z_{j'}\}_{j' \in J_{h,i} \setminus \mathcal{C}_j}$.

Proof. For every $x \in X_{i,j}$, $\eta > 0$ and every $\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}$, we define

$$\mathcal{V}_{t,\eta}(\tilde{x}) := \{y \in X; \exists s \in [-t, t] \text{ such that } \text{dist}_X(\Phi^s(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), y) < h^{\eta}\}.$$

This set is the h^{η} -neighbourhood of a geodesic segment of length $2t$, so that it intersects at most $O(th^{d\eta}) = O(h^{d\eta - c\theta})$ different sets $X_{i,j'}$, for some $c > 0$.

Now, let $x' \in X_{i,j}$, so that $\text{dist}_X(x, x') < h^{\beta - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}}$, and let $\tilde{x}'_{\tilde{x}}$ be a lift of \tilde{x}' such that $\text{dist}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}') = \text{dist}_X(x, x')$. Thanks to Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\text{dist}_X(\Phi^s(\rho_{\tilde{x}}), \Phi^s(\rho_{\tilde{x}'})) < h^{\beta - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_1 - c'\mathfrak{d}},$$

for some $c' > 0$, provided h is small enough. Hence,

$$\mathcal{V}_{t,\eta}(\tilde{x}'_{\tilde{x}}) \subset \mathcal{V}_{t,\eta-\varepsilon_2}(\tilde{x}),$$

for any $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, provided that \mathfrak{d} is small enough and that

$$\eta < \beta - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_1.$$

Therefore, the set $\bigcup_{\tilde{x} \in A_{x,t}} \bigcup_{x' \in X_{i,j}} \mathcal{V}_{t,\eta}(\tilde{x}'_{\tilde{x}})$ intersects at most $O(h^{d\eta - c'\mathfrak{d}})$ different sets $X_{i,j'}$. Taking $\eta = \beta - \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon_1$ and using Proposition 8.1, the result follows. \square

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\omega \left[|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]|^{2p} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \left[\left| \sum_{j \in J_{h,i}} (Z_j - \mathbb{E}[Z_j]) \right|^{2p} \right] \\ &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_p \in J_{h,i}} \mathbb{E}_\omega \left[(Z_{j_1} - \mathbb{E}[Z_{j_1}]) \cdots \overline{(Z_{j_{2p}} - \mathbb{E}[Z_{j_{2p}}])} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last p factors come with complex conjugates. Let us write

$$\mathcal{J}_p := \left\{ (j_1, \dots, j_{2p}) \in (J_{h,i})^{2p} \text{ such that } \mathbb{E}_\omega \left[(Z_{j_1} - \mathbb{E}[Z_{j_1}]) \cdots \overline{(Z_{j_{2p}} - \mathbb{E}[Z_{j_{2p}}])} \right] \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Lemma 9.6. *We have*

$$|\mathcal{J}_p| = O\left(h^{p(-d\varepsilon_1 + \gamma)}\right).$$

We will prove Lemma 9.6 below. For now we continue with the proof of (9.20).

Using the fact that

$$|Z_j| \leq \sup |F| \times \frac{\text{Vol}(X_{i,j})}{\text{Vol}(\tilde{X}_i)} \leq \sup |F| \times Ch^{\frac{d\varepsilon_1}{2}},$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\omega \left[|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]|^{2p} \right] &\leq |\mathcal{J}_p| (\sup |F| \times Ch^{\frac{d\varepsilon_1}{2}})^{2p} \\ &\leq C(p, F) h^{p\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

We may then apply Markov inequality to deduce that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]| > h^{\frac{d\varepsilon_1}{4}} \right] \leq C_p h^{dp\frac{\varepsilon_1}{4}}.$$

Since this is valid for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have found an $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} [|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]| > h^{\varepsilon_2}] = O(h^\infty),$$

proving (9.20).

Proof of Lemma 9.6. Given $k \in \{0, \dots, 2p - 2\}$ and $(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}) \in \{1, \dots, 2p\} \times J_{h,i}$, let us write

$$\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k})} := \left\{ (j_1, \dots, j_p) \in \mathcal{J}_p \text{ with } j'_{i_\ell} = j_{i_\ell} \text{ for all } \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\} \right\}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{J}_p = \mathcal{J}_{p, \emptyset}$, corresponding to $k = 0$. We shall write

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{p,k} := \max_{(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k})} |\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k})}|.$$

We have $\mathfrak{J}_{p,2p} = 1$. We will thus do a descending recurrence to estimate $\mathfrak{J}_{p,k}$. First of all, note that, for any $k \in \{0, \dots, 2p-2\}$, any $(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}) \in \{1, \dots, 2p\} \times J_{h,i}$ and any $i_{k+1} \in \{1, \dots, 2p\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, we have

$$|\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k})}| \leq \sum_{j'_{i_{k+1}}} |\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_{k+1}, j'_{i_{k+1}})}|,$$

so that

$$\mathfrak{J}_{p,k} \leq |J_{h,i}| \times \mathfrak{J}_{p,k+1}. \quad (9.22)$$

We shall write more a precise recurrence estimate, using independence. Indeed, suppose that $(j_1, \dots, j_{2p}) \in \mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k})}$ for some $k \leq 2p-2$, and let $i_{k+1} \in \{1, \dots, 2p\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$.

Suppose that $j_{i_{k+1}} \notin \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}$. Then, there must exist $i_{k+2} \in \{1, \dots, 2p\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}\}$ with $j_{i_{k+2}} \in \mathcal{C}_{j_{i_{k+1}}}$. Indeed, if this were not the case, the variable $Z_{i_{k+1}} - \mathbb{E}_\omega[Z_{i_{k+1}}]$ (or its complex conjugate) would be independent from all the other variables appearing in

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega \left[(Z_{j_1} - \mathbb{E}_\omega[Z_{j_1}]) \cdots \overline{(Z_{j_{2p}} - \mathbb{E}_\omega[Z_{j_{2p}}])} \right],$$

so that the expectation would be zero. Therefore, if $j_{i_{k+1}} \notin \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}), (i_{k+1}, j_{i_{k+1}})} \subset \bigcup_{i_{k+2} \in \{1, \dots, 2p\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_{k+1}\}} \bigcup_{j_{i_{k+2}} \in \mathcal{C}_{j_{i_{k+1}}}} \mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}), (i_{k+2}, j_{i_{k+2}})},$$

so that

$$\forall j_{i_{k+1}} \notin \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}, \quad |\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}), (i_{k+1}, j_{i_{k+1}})}| \leq Ch^{-d\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \gamma} \mathfrak{J}_{p,k+2}. \quad (9.23)$$

All in all, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k})}| &\leq \sum_{j_{i_{k+1}} \in J_{h,i}} |\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}), (i_{k+1}, j_{i_{k+1}})}| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{j_{i_{k+1}} \in J_{h,i} \\ j_{i_{k+1}} \in \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}}} |\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}), (i_{k+1}, j_{i_{k+1}})}| \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{j_{i_{k+1}} \in J_{h,i} \\ j_{i_{k+1}} \notin \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}}} |\mathcal{J}_{p;(i_1, j'_{i_1}), \dots, (i_k, j'_{i_k}), (i_{k+1}, j_{i_{k+1}})}| \\ &\stackrel{(9.23)}{\leq} Ch^{-d\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \gamma} \mathfrak{J}_{p,k+1} + \sum_{j_{i_{k+1}} \in J_{h,i}} Ch^{d\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \gamma} \mathfrak{J}_{p,k+2} \\ &\leq Ch^{-d\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \gamma} |J_{h,i}| \mathfrak{J}_{p,k+2}, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (9.22).

We conclude that

$$\mathfrak{J}_{p,k} \leq Ch^{-d\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \gamma} |J_{h,i}| \times \mathfrak{J}_{p,k+2} \leq Ch^{-d\varepsilon_1 + \gamma} \times \mathfrak{J}_{p,k+2},$$

and the lemma follows by a descending induction. \square

We may now conclude with the proof of the second part of Corollary 2.12.

Proof of Corollary 2.12. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Thanks to (7.23) along with (the proof of) [21, Lemma 1], there exists a compact set $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all ω ,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{\frac{i}{h_j} t_{h_j} P_{h_j}^\delta f_{h_j}(\exp_x(h_j \cdot))} \notin \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon] < \varepsilon.$$

The space $C_b(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon)$ is separable, so we may take a sequence of functionals (F_n) that is dense in $C_b(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon)$. We may extend each F_n to $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\|F_n\|_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|F_n\|_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}$.

By the first part of Corollary 2.12, ω -almost surely, we have for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}_x[F_n(e^{\frac{i}{h_j} t_{h_j} P_{h_j}^\delta} f_{h_j}(\exp_x(h_j \cdot)))] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F_n], \quad j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now, let $F \in C_b(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d))$, and let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $|F(\psi) - F_{n_0}(\psi)| < \varepsilon$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$. In particular, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all ω , we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_x[(F - F_n)(e^{\frac{i}{h_j} t_{h_j} P_{h_j}^\delta} f_{h_j}(\exp_x(h_j \cdot)))] \right| \leq \varepsilon(1 + \|F\| + \|F_n\|) \leq \varepsilon(2 + 2\|F\|),$$

so that, ω -almost surely,

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_x[F(e^{\frac{i}{h_j} t_{h_j} P_{h_j}^\delta} f_{h_j}(\exp_x(h_j \cdot)))] - \mathbb{E}_{\text{BGF}_{\lambda_a}}[F] \right| \leq \varepsilon(2 + 2\|F\|).$$

Since this is true for all F and all ε , the result follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Abert, N. Bergeron, and E. Le Masson, *Eigenfunctions and random waves in the Benjamini-Schramm limit*, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1810.05601](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.05601), 2018.
- [2] N. Anantharaman, S. Nonnenmacher, *Half-delocalization of eigenfunctions for the Laplacian on an Anosov manifold*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **57** (7), (2007) 2465-2523.
- [3] M.V. Berry, *Regular and irregular semiclassical wavefunctions*, J. Phys. A **10** (12) (1977), p. 2083.
- [4] P. Billingsley, *Probability and measure*, John Wiley & Sons (2008).
- [5] J. Bourgain, *On toral eigenfunctions and the random wave model*, Isr. J. Math. **201**(2) (2014), 611-630
- [6] O. Bohigas. *Random matrix theories and chaotic dynamics*, Chaos et physique quantique (Les Houches 1989), North-Holland, Amsterdam, p. 87-199 (1991).
- [7] O. Bohigas, M. J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit. *Characterization of Chaotic Quantum Spectra and Universality of Level Fluctuation Laws*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, No. 1 (1984).
- [8] O. Bohigas, M. J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit. *Spectral properties of the Laplacian and random matrix theories*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, p. 1015-1022 (1984).
- [9] Y. Canzani, D. Jakobson, J. A. Toth, *On the distribution of perturbations of propagated Schrödinger eigenfunctions*, 2014, J. Spectr. Theory, **4**(2), 283-307.
- [10] Y. Colin de Verdière, *Ergodicité et fonctions propres du laplacien*, Comm. Math. Phys. **102** (1985) 497-502.
- [11] M. Dimassi, J. Sjostrand. *Spectral asymptotics in the semi-classical limit*, Cambridge university press, **268** (1999).
- [12] S. Dyatlov, *Macroscopic limits of chaotic eigenfunctions*, arXiv preprint [arXiv:2109.09053](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.09053) (2021).
- [13] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski, *Mathematical theory of scattering resonances*, Amer. Math. Soc., 2019.
- [14] P. Eberlein, *Geodesic flows in manifolds of nonpositive curvature*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **69** (2001), 525-572.
- [15] S. Eswarathan, G. Rivière, *Perturbation of the semiclassical Schrödinger equation on negatively curved surfaces*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu, Vol. 16, No. 4 (2017), 787-835.
- [16] S. Eswarathan, J. A. Toth *Averaged pointwise bounds for deformations of Schrödinger eigenfunctions*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **14**(3), (2013), 611-637.
- [17] M. Gromov, *Curvature, diameter and Betti numbers*, Comment Math. Helvetici **56** (1981), 179-195.
- [18] A. Grigis and J. Sjöstrand, *Microlocal Analysis for Differential Operators*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 196, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [19] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators III*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 274, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [20] M. Ingremeau, *Distorted plane waves on manifolds of nonpositive curvature* Communications in Mathematical Physics, **350**(2), (2017), 845-891.
- [21] M. Ingremeau, *Local Weak Limits of Laplace Eigenfunctions*, Tunis. J. Math., **3**(3), (2021), 481-515.
- [22] M. Ingremeau, A. Rivera, *How Lagrangian states evolve into random waves*, Journal de l'École polytechnique—Mathématiques, **9**, (2022), 177-212.
- [23] J. Jost, *Riemannian geometry and geometric analysis*, Springer (2008).
- [24] O. Kallenberg, *Foundations of modern probability*, Probability and its Applications, Springer, 1997.
- [25] A. Katok, B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*. No. 54. Cambridge university press, 1997.
- [26] A. Martinez, *An introduction to semiclassical and microlocal analysis*, Springer, 2002.
- [27] F. Nazarov, M. Sodin, *Asymptotic laws for the spatial distribution and the number of connected components of zero sets of Gaussian random functions*, J. Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **12**, No. 3, (2016), 205-278.
- [28] S. Nonnenmacher, M. Zworski, *Quantum decay rates in chaotic scattering*, Acta Math. **203**(2), (2009), 149-233.
- [29] R. Schubert *Semiclassical behaviour of expectation values in time evolved Lagrangian states for large times*, Comm. Math. Phys. **256**(1), (2005), 239-254.

- [30] Z. Rudnick and P. Sarnak, *The behaviour of eigenstates of arithmetic hyperbolic manifolds*, Comm. Math. Phys. **161** (1994), no. 1, p. 195–213.
- [31] M. A. Shubin, *Spectral theory of elliptic operators on non-compact manifolds*, Astérisque, tome **207** (1992), 35–108.
- [32] A. I. Šnirel'man, *Ergodic properties of eigenfunctions*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk, **29** (1974) 181–182.
- [33] A. Voros, *Semiclassical ergodicity of quantum eigenstates in the Wigner representation*, in Stochastic behavior in classical and quantum Hamiltonian systems (Vikta Memorial Conf., Como, 1977), Lec. Notes in Phys., vol. **93**, Springer-Berlin (1979), p. 3326–333.
- [34] S. Zelditch, *Uniform distribution of eigenfunctions on compact hyperbolic surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **55** (1987) 919–941.
- [35] M. Zworski, *Semiclassical analysis*, American Mathematical Society (2012).

(Maxime Ingremeau) LABORATOIRE J. A. DIEUDONNÉ UMR CNRS-UNS 351, UNIVERSITÉ CÔTE D'AZUR, PARC VALROSE, 06108 NICE CEDEX 2, FRANCE.

Email address: `Maxime.Ingremeau@univ-cotedazur.fr`

(Martin Vogel) INSTITUT DE RECHERCHE MATHÉMATIQUE AVANCÉE - UMR 7501, UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG ET CNRS, 7 RUE RENÉ-DESCARTES, 67084 STRASBOURG CEDEX, FRANCE.

Email address: `vogel@math.unistra.fr`