

Quantitative phase mixing for Hamiltonians with trapping

M. Hadžić*, G. Rein†, M. Schrecker‡, C. Straub§

June 5, 2024

Abstract

We prove quantitative decay estimates of macroscopic quantities generated by the solutions to linear transport equations driven by a general family of Hamiltonians. The associated particle trajectories are all trapped in a compact region of phase-space and feature a non-degenerate elliptic stagnation point. The analysis covers a large class of Hamiltonians generated by the radially symmetric compactly supported equilibria of the gravitational Vlasov-Poisson system. Working in radial symmetry, our analysis features both the 1+2-dimensional case and the harder 1+1-dimensional case, where all the particles have the same value of the modulus of angular momentum. The latter case is also of importance in both the plasma physics case and two dimensional incompressible fluid flows.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Motivation: the gravitational Vlasov-Poisson system	2
1.1.1	Steady states	3
1.1.2	Stability theory	4
1.2	Main results	6
1.2.1	The 1+1-dimensional case	6
1.2.2	The general radially symmetric case	9
1.3	Action-angle variables	11
1.4	Related literature and ideas of the proof	13
2	Regularity in action-angle variables	16
2.1	The 1+1-dimensional case	16
2.2	The radially symmetric case	28
3	Decay in the 1+1-dimensional case	38
4	Decay in the radially symmetric case	49

*University College London, UK. Email: m.hadzic@ucl.ac.uk

†University of Bayreuth, Germany. Email: gerhard.rein@uni-bayreuth.de

‡University of Bath, UK. Email: mris21@bath.ac.uk

§University of Bayreuth, Germany. Email: christopher.straub@uni-bayreuth.de

1 Introduction

We derive quantitative decay-in-time estimates for the potential generated by the phase-space density f satisfying the transport equation

$$\partial_t f(t, r, w, L) + \mathcal{D}f(t, r, w, L) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where the anti-symmetric transport operator \mathcal{D} takes the form

$$\mathcal{D} := w\partial_r - \Psi'_L(r)\partial_w. \quad (1.2)$$

Here we shall use potentials $(0, \infty) \ni r \mapsto \Psi_L(r) \in \mathbb{R}$ with parameter $L > 0$ generated by compactly supported spherical steady states of the gravitational Vlasov-Poisson system, the characteristic orbits of which are therefore bounded in both space and velocity.

We shall also be interested in the harder, restricted case

$$\partial_t f(t, r, w) + \mathcal{D}f(t, r, w) = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where we drop the dependence on the angular momentum L and the anti-symmetric transport operator \mathcal{D} takes the form

$$\mathcal{D} := w\partial_r - \Psi'(r)\partial_w. \quad (1.4)$$

We refer to (1.4) as the 1+1-dimensional case. The problem (1.3)–(1.4) arises in the study of several Hamiltonian transport problems, including the gravitational Vlasov-Poisson system when all the stars have a fixed modulus of angular momentum. Related questions appear in the Vlasov-Poisson system in the electrostatic case describing space-inhomogeneous plasmas and the two-dimensional incompressible Euler equation. Our results apply to a general class of potentials Ψ_L and Ψ that satisfy certain qualitative properties, which will be listed below.

1.1 Motivation: the gravitational Vlasov-Poisson system

The gravitational Vlasov-Poisson system is a fundamental Newtonian model of galaxy dynamics [5]. The basic unknown is the phase space density $f: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, i.e., $f = f(t, x, v) \geq 0$ is a function of time $t \in \mathbb{R}$, position $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and velocity (or momentum) $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We restrict ourselves to radial symmetry where f can be expressed as a function of t and

$$r = |x|, \quad w = \frac{x \cdot v}{r}, \quad L = |x \times v|^2,$$

and the Vlasov-Poisson system takes the form

$$\partial_t f + w\partial_r f - \Psi'_L(t, r)\partial_w f = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

$$\left(\partial_{rr} + \frac{2}{r}\partial_r\right)U(t, r) = 4\pi\rho(t, r), \quad \rho(t, r) = \frac{\pi}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{(0, \infty)} f(t, r, w, L) dL dw. \quad (1.6)$$

In the above $\Psi_L(t, r)$ is the so-called effective potential which takes the form

$$\Psi_L(t, r) := U_{\text{ext}}(r) + U(t, r) + \frac{L}{2r^2}, \quad (1.7)$$

where $U: \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the gravitational potential induced by the distribution of matter in the galaxy and U_{ext} a time-independent external gravitational potential. The most interesting cases are when U_{ext} is identically zero or when U_{ext} is the potential of a point mass $M > 0$ located at the origin $r = 0$:

$$U_{\text{ext}}(x) = U_{\text{ext}}(r) = -\frac{M}{r}, \quad |x| = r > 0. \quad (1.8)$$

The choice (1.8) gives a Newtonian model of a galaxy featuring a large gravitational source (e.g. black hole) in the centre. Finally, to ensure that we are describing an isolated galaxy, we impose the boundary condition

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} U(t, r) = 0. \quad (1.9)$$

1.1.1 Steady states

The system (1.5)–(1.7), (1.9) possesses a plethora of steady states whose stability properties are of great interest in the astrophysics literature [5]. Due to the assumption of spherical symmetry, the phase space density of these steady states is always of the form

$$\mathring{f}(r, w, L) = \varphi(E, L), \quad E(r, w, L) = \frac{1}{2}w^2 + \frac{L}{2r^2} + U_0(r) + U_{\text{ext}}(r), \quad (1.10)$$

where $E(r, w, L)$ is the local particle energy and U_0 the self-induced gravitational potential [3]. Here the function φ can be thought of as a microscopic equation of state. In the so-called *regular* case $U_{\text{ext}} = 0$, it is well-known [3, 23] that finite-mass compactly supported solutions of the form (1.10) exist if, for example,

$$\varphi(E, L) = (E_0 - E)_+^k (L - L_0)_+^\ell \quad (\text{polytropic galaxy}), \quad (1.11)$$

$$0 < k < 3\ell + \frac{7}{2}, \quad \ell > -\frac{1}{2}, \quad (1.12)$$

where $E_0 < 0$ is a suitable cut-off energy whose value depends on the solution itself and $L_0 \geq 0$ a given cut-off angular momentum. We notice that the regularity of the steady states (1.11) at the vacuum (corresponding to $E = E_0$ or $L = L_0$) is limited by the size of the polytropic exponents k, ℓ and this limited regularity is a generic feature of the problem.

On the other hand, in the point mass case $U_{\text{ext}} = -\frac{M}{r}$ with $M > 0$, the set of steady states is even larger with less stringent regularity constraints at the vacuum boundary.

There exist finite mass steady states supported on a compact shell around the galactic center of the form

$$\varphi(E) = \varepsilon(E_0 - E)_+^k (L - L_0)_+^\ell \quad (\text{polytropic galaxy with a central delta mass}), \quad (1.13)$$

$$k > 0, \ell > -\frac{1}{2}, L_0 > 0, \quad (1.14)$$

cf. [27, Sc. 6.2], where the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ controls the size of the steady state compared to the point mass. The interior of the phase space support of such steady states is given by

$$\Omega := \{(r, w, L) \mid E(r, w, L) < E_0, L > L_0\}. \quad (1.15)$$

The closure of the spatial support corresponds to an interval $[R_{\min}, R_{\max}] \subset (0, \infty)$. This implies that these steady states feature a vacuum region around the centre and are hence referred to as *shells*. In the regular case (1.11) we also restrict ourselves here to shell-shaped steady states by choosing $L_0 > 0$, cf. [27, Sc. 2.2]. This removes some technical issues arising at the spatial origin $r = 0$, but it is straight-forward to relax this assumption.

Restricted (1+1-d) case. We consider now a symmetry reduction wherein all stars in the galaxy are constrained to have the same squared modulus of the angular momentum $L = \bar{L} > 0$. This is a dynamically consistent constraint as the function $L(x, v)$ is conserved along the characteristics. The quantity $L > 0$ becomes a fixed parameter and the phase space coordinates are reduced to (r, w) . In this setting, it is straight-forward to show that analogues of the steady states of the form (1.11) and (1.13) also exist provided that $k > \frac{1}{2}$ due to regularity reasons [12]. Specifically, in the case with the point mass potential $U_{\text{ext}}(r) = -\frac{M}{r}$, we consider steady states of the form

$$\mathring{f}(r, w) = \varphi(E) = \varepsilon(E_0 - E)_+^k, \quad k > \frac{1}{2}, \quad (1.16)$$

with the interior of its compact support given by

$$\Omega := \{(r, w) \mid E(r, w) < E_0\}, \quad (1.17)$$

where $E = E(r, w)$ is defined similarly to (1.10). Just as in the above, the spatial extent of $\bar{\Omega}$ is given by some interval $[R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$, where $0 < R_{\min} < R_{\max}$, cf. [12]. We warn the reader that we largely keep the same notation for both the radially symmetric and the 1+1-dimensional case for analogous quantities; no confusion should arise in the process.

1.1.2 Stability theory

A classical condition that implies the spectral stability of the above class of steady states is referred to as the Antonov stability condition [1, 5, 8, 14] and, modulo suitable assumptions on the regularity of φ , it reads

$$\varphi' := \partial_E \varphi < 0 \quad \text{inside the support of the steady state.} \quad (1.18)$$

Examples (1.11), (1.13), and (1.16) clearly satisfy (1.18). Due to the energy subcritical nature of the problem, solutions satisfying (1.18) are in fact known to be nonlinearly orbitally stable [10, 16, 17].

By contrast, almost nothing is known about the asymptotic stability of the above family of steady states. To understand the problem, we linearise the Vlasov-Poisson system around a steady state (1.10) to obtain

$$\partial_t f + \mathcal{D}f + \mathcal{B}f = 0, \quad (1.19)$$

where \mathcal{D} is given by (1.2) and the potential U appearing in (1.7) is the steady state potential U_0 . The operator \mathcal{B} is nonlocal, formally of lower order than \mathcal{D} , and given by

$$\mathcal{B}f = |\varphi'(E, L)| \mathcal{D}U_f,$$

where U_f is the solution of the Poisson equation $\Delta U_f = 4\pi \int f \, dv$ satisfying the boundary condition (1.9). The process of equilibration of macroscopic quantities generated by the solutions of (1.19) is referred to as *gravitational relaxation* [5, 18, 19]. Numerical simulations show that macroscopic damping at the full non-linear level is accurately described by the this effect [28].

The natural Hilbert space in the stability analysis is given by

$$H := \left\{ f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \int_{\Omega} \frac{f(r, w, L)^2}{|\varphi'(E, L)|} \, d(r, w, L) < \infty \right\},$$

or

$$\tilde{H} := \left\{ f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \frac{f(r, w)^2}{|\varphi'(E)|} \, d(r, w) < \infty \right\}$$

in the 1+1-dimensional case. The transport operator \mathcal{D} can be realised as an anti-selfadjoint operator on H (or \tilde{H}) [24], and \mathcal{B} is relatively compact with respect to \mathcal{D} (see, e.g., [11]). Therefore the essential spectra of \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{B}$ are the same so that in particular the decay induced by \mathcal{D} accounts for dispersive effects induced by the continuous part of the spectrum. We emphasise that the pure transport problem (1.1)–(1.2) however does *not* correspond to the linearised Vlasov-Poisson dynamics except in the special case of a vanishing steady state $\mathring{f} \equiv 0$ with an external potential, e.g., $U_{\text{ext}} = -\frac{M}{r}$.

Moreover, as proven in [11, 12], there are examples of steady states of the form (1.11) where the linearised operator $\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{B}$ possesses purely oscillatory eigenmodes (and thus there is no decay for generic initial data), even though the solutions of the pure transport problem (1.3) will generically decay. We refer the reader to [12, 27, 28] for a detailed discussion of the role of the steady state regularity (as measured by the polytropic exponents k, ℓ in (1.11) and (1.13) and the value of k in (1.16)) in discerning oscillatory vs. damped behaviour.

Remark 1.1. Since $(E, L) \mapsto |\varphi'(E, L)|$ is supported on the support $\overline{\Omega}$ of the steady state \mathring{f} , it is natural to consider perturbations of the form $f = |\varphi'(E, L)|g$. This recasts (1.19) into the form $\partial_t g + \mathcal{D}g + \mathcal{D}U_{|\varphi'(E, L)|g} = 0$. We now see that the linearised dynamics (1.19) formally preserve the property $f(t, \cdot) = |\varphi'(E, L)|g(t, \cdot)$ if imposed initially as $f(0, \cdot) = |\varphi'(E, L)|g(0, \cdot)$.

1.2 Main results

We now return to the main objectives of this note – the decay properties of macroscopic quantities generated by the flows (1.1) and (1.3). We emphasise again that this is not the true linearised Vlasov-Poisson dynamics around the equilibrium, but instead its leading order part. The analysis of (1.1) and (1.3) is both conceptually and technically easier than the analysis of the full linearisation (1.19). Moreover, it is not clear to what extent the linearised dynamics is expected to qualitatively look like the one generated by (1.1) and (1.3), cf. [28, Obs. 4.6].

The two canonical macroscopic quantities in the study of gravitational relaxation are the macroscopic density

$$\rho_f(t, r) := \frac{\pi}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{(0, \infty)} f(t, r, w, L) \, dL \, dw \quad (1.20)$$

and the gravitational potential U_f generated by the density distribution ρ_f . It is defined as the unique solution of the Poisson equation

$$\Delta U_f = 4\pi\rho_f, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} U_f(t, r) = 0. \quad (1.21)$$

In the 1+1-dimensional setting (1.3) the macroscopic density is given by the formula

$$\rho_f(t, r) := \frac{\pi}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t, r, w) \, dw. \quad (1.22)$$

The goal of this note is to establish quantitative decay rates for these quantities under the flow (1.1) or (1.3).

1.2.1 The 1+1-dimensional case

In this case, the transport operator \mathcal{D} has a nontrivial kernel [12, 24] given by

$$\ker(\mathcal{D}) = \{f(r, w) = \phi(E) \mid \|f\|_H < \infty\},$$

where $E = E(r, w)$ is given by (1.10); recall that $L = \bar{L} > 0$ is a fixed constant. It follows that equation (1.3) possesses infinitely many steady states that are simply given as any function of E (in the right Hilbert space). Therefore, to meaningfully address the decay of solutions to (1.3) we must either mod out the kernel by considering data in its orthogonal

complement $\ker(\mathcal{D})^\perp$ in H , or consider the decay of the time-differentiated spatial density $\partial_t \rho_f$ and gravitational potential $\partial_t U_f$.

Assumptions on Ψ . The steady states of the form (1.16) lead to an effective potential

$$\Psi(r) = -\frac{M}{r} + U_0(r) + \frac{\bar{L}}{2r^2}, \quad (1.23)$$

cf. [12]. For concreteness, we assume Ψ in (1.3) to be of the form (1.23). The graph of Ψ is qualitatively depicted in Figure 1. In particular, Ψ has a unique global minimum at a radius $r_* \in (R_{\min}, R_{\max})$ [12] such that

$$E_{\min} := \Psi(r_*) < 0, \quad \Psi'(r_*) = 0, \quad \Psi''(r_*) > 0. \quad (1.24)$$

We additionally assume that

$$\Psi \in C^3(0, \infty) \cap C^\infty(R_{\min}, R_{\max}). \quad (1.25)$$

This is, for example, true when the gravitational potential U_0 is generated by steady states of the form (1.16) with $k > \frac{1}{2}$; see [12, Sc. 3] for similar arguments. Below, we will impose a few further assumptions on Ψ via the characteristic flow it generates.




Figure 1: The qualitative shape of the effective potential Ψ in the 1+1-dimensional case.

Remark 1.2. Assuming the specific form (1.23) of the effective potential is not essential. Modulo regularity assumptions on Ψ , our fundamental requirements are 1) conditions (1.24) and 2) the requirement that all particle orbits generated by the Hamiltonian $E(r, w)$ with negative energy values are bounded in phase-space and have a strictly monotone period function viewed as a function of E , cf. below. Assumptions (1.24) guarantee that the characteristic dynamical system features a single nondegenerate elliptic stagnation point. Potentials with these features also naturally appear in fluid mechanics [4, 6, 22, 25] and plasma physics (see [9] and the references therein). We point to more references in the work [6] where enhanced dissipation in the presence of diffusion and elliptic points is studied.

Theorem 1.3. Let $k > \frac{1}{2}$ and, for any $g_0 \in W^{3,\infty}(\bar{\Omega})$, consider the initial data of the form

$$f_0(r, w) = |\varphi'(E(r, w))|g_0(r, w), \quad (1.26)$$

where φ is given by (1.16). Let the operator \mathcal{D} be given by (1.4) with $r \mapsto \Psi(r)$ as described above. Let $f(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ be the solution to (1.3) with initial data $f(0, r, w) = f_0(r, w)$.

(a) There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$|\partial_t U_f(t, r)| \leq C \|g_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}} \frac{1 + |\log |r - r_*||}{1 + t^{\min\{2, k\}}}, \quad r \neq r_*, \quad (1.27)$$

$$\|\partial_t \partial_r U_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq \frac{C \|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}}}{1 + t^{\min\{\frac{3}{2}, k\}}}, \quad (1.28)$$

$$\|\partial_t \rho_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq \frac{C \|g_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}}}{1 + t^{\min\{\frac{1}{2}, k - \frac{1}{2}\}}}. \quad (1.29)$$

If additionally $g_0 \in W^{4,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $k \geq \frac{5}{2}$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\partial_t U_f(t, r)| \leq C \|g_0\|_{W^{4,\infty}} \frac{(r - r_*)^{-1}}{1 + |t|^{\frac{5}{2}}}, \quad r_* < r \leq R_{\max}. \quad (1.30)$$

(b) Moreover, if $f_0 \in \ker(\mathcal{D})^\perp$, then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\|\rho_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq \frac{C \|g_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}}}{1 + t^{\min\{\frac{1}{2}, k - \frac{1}{2}\}}}, \quad (1.31)$$

$$\|\partial_r U_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq \frac{C \|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}}}{1 + t^{\min\{\frac{3}{2}, k\}}}. \quad (1.32)$$

The theorem is proven in Section 3. The proof of (1.29) and (1.31) is the content of Proposition 3.2. The proofs of (1.27) and (1.30) are contained in Proposition 3.6. The proofs of (1.32) and (1.28) are contained in Proposition 3.3 and Corollary 3.5, respectively.

Remark 1.4 ($(1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ -decay). The theorem shows that for sufficiently smooth data and the potential Ψ , the force field decays like $t^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. The improvement from t^{-1} to the integrable $t^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ rate is delicate and relies on a precise description of certain derivative singularities of the characteristic flow near the turning points $w = 0$. The rate $(1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ is likely optimal.

Remark 1.5. The estimates (1.27) and (1.30) feature constants that degenerate as the spatial radius approaches the stationary radius r_* . This is a quantitative description of the trapping effect coming from the elliptic point $E = E_{\min}$ of the characteristic flow. Interestingly, our proof shows that in the outer region $\{r > r_*\}$ of the galaxy/plasma the gravitational/electrostatic potential enjoys a decay which is enhanced by a power of $t^{\frac{1}{2}}$ compared to the inner region $\{r < r_*\}$, at the expense of constants that blow up at $r = r_*$.

Remark 1.6. Assumption (1.26) encodes the vanishing (or the absence thereof) of $f_0, \partial_E f_0, \partial_{EE} f_0$ at the vacuum boundary $\partial\Omega$. This assumption is physically natural as explained in Remark 1.1. We can replace the assumption (1.26) by the requirement

$$\text{supp}(f_0) \Subset \Omega, \quad f_0 \in W^{3,\infty}(\Omega),$$

which in turn implies infinite-order vanishing of the initial data near the vacuum boundary.

1.2.2 The general radially symmetric case

Here we work with potentials Ψ_L of the form

$$\Psi_L(r) = -\frac{M}{r} + U_0(r) + \frac{L}{2r^2}, \quad r > 0, \quad (1.33)$$

with the parameter $L > 0$ which correspond to effective potentials induced by the steady states of the form (1.13). With $M = 0$ in (1.33), one obtains the effective potentials corresponding to regular steady states (1.11). For each $L > 0$, the graph of Ψ_L qualitatively resembles the graph of Ψ defined by (1.23) (see Figure 1). It is straight-forward to prove [27] that for any $L > 0$ there exist a unique radius $r_L > 0$ such that

$$\Psi'_L(r_L) = 0, \quad E_{\min}^L := \Psi_L(r_L) < 0, \quad \Psi''_L(r_L) > 0.$$

Moreover, for any $L > 0$ and $E_{\min}^L < E < 0$, there exist two unique solutions $r_-(E, L) < r_L < r_+(E, L)$ of $\Psi_L(r_\pm(E, L)) = E$. These radii determine the radial support of the steady state via $R_{\min} = r_-(E_0, L_0)$ and $R_{\max} = r_+(E_0, L_0)$. The support of the squared modulus of angular momentum L is of the form $[L_0, L_{\max}]$, where L_{\max} is uniquely determined via $E_{\min}^{L_{\max}} = E_0$; see Figure 3 for a visualisation.

In the (E, L) -space, the interior of the steady state support is

$$J := \{(E, L) \mid L > L_0, E_{\min}^L < E < E_0\}. \quad (1.34)$$

As depicted in Figure 2, this set qualitatively resembles a “triangle”. Its topological boundary naturally splits into

$$\partial J_{\text{vac}} := \{E_0\} \times [L_0, L_{\max}] \cup [E_{\min}^{L_0}, E_0] \times \{L_0\} \quad (1.35)$$

$$\partial J_{\text{trap}} := \{(E_{\min}^L, L) \mid L \in [L_0, L_{\max}]\}. \quad (1.36)$$

The set ∂J_{vac} coincides with the vacuum boundary $\partial\Omega$ where the steady state \mathring{f} vanishes to varying orders depending on the size of k and ℓ in (1.13). Geometrically, it is the union of the two straight sides of J , see Figure 2. The curve ∂J_{trap} is the purple (curved) side of the action support triangle J which corresponds to the (E, L) -pairs for which the associated dynamical system has a stagnation point. We note that $k + \ell + \frac{3}{2} > j \in \mathbb{N}$ implies [27]

$$\Psi_L \in C^{j+2}([R_{\min}, R_{\max}]). \quad (1.37)$$

Compared to Theorem 1.3, in this radially symmetric case, the force field generated by solutions to (1.1) decays faster, provided the data is sufficiently regular.




Figure 2: The (E, L) -support J of a spherically symmetric steady state (gray). The purple and blue parts of the boundary of J depict ∂J_{trap} and ∂J_{vac} , respectively.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $k > 1$ and $\ell > 0$. For any $g_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$, consider the initial data of the form*

$$f_0(r, w, L) = |\varphi'(E(r, w, L), L)| g_0(r, w, L), \quad (1.38)$$

where φ is given by (1.13). Let the operator \mathcal{D} be given by (1.2) with $r \mapsto \Psi_L(r)$ as described above. Let $f(t, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ be the solution to (1.1) with initial data $f(0, r, w, L) = f_0(r, w, L) \in \ker(\mathcal{D})^\perp$.

(a) *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,*

$$|\partial_r U_f(t, r)| \leq C \|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \begin{cases} \frac{1+|\log t|}{t^2}, & k \geq 2, \ell \geq 1, \\ \frac{1}{t^{\min\{\ell+1, k\}}}, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (1.39)$$

and

$$|\rho_f(t, r)| \leq C \|g_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \frac{|\log t|}{t}. \quad (1.40)$$

(b) *Assume that the data g_0 is supported strictly away from both the trapping set ∂J_{trap} and the vacuum boundary ∂J_{vac} . Then, for any $g_0 \in C^j(\bar{\Omega})$, where $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C = C_j$ such that*

$$\|\partial_r U_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq \frac{C \|g_0\|_{W^{j,\infty}}}{1+t^j}. \quad (1.41)$$

The proof of Theorem 1.7 is presented in Section 4.

Remark 1.8. *Part (b) of the theorem states that once the trapping is removed from the dynamics, the only obstruction to higher algebraic decay comes from the regularity of the*

initial data and the regularity of the potential Ψ_L . In particular, since our potentials are C^∞ inside J (but of finite regularity on \bar{J}), one can prove arbitrarily fast decay for arbitrarily smooth initial data assuming that the data is supported strictly away from the trapping set, or that it vanishes there to infinite order.

Even though the no-trapping assumption in part (b) is preserved by the dynamics of (1.3), it is **not** preserved by the dynamics of the true linearised Vlasov-Poisson dynamics (1.19) around the equilibria (1.13). It is therefore very important to understand the decay without such an assumption; as we see from part (a), the presence of trapping puts a severe limitation on the decay rate.




Figure 3: Shapes of L -dependent effective potentials Ψ_L . The figure illustrates the definitions of $R_{\min} = r_-(E_0, L_0)$ and $R_{\max} = r_+(E_0, L_0)$ as well as that $L_{\max} > 0$ is defined via $E_{\min}^{L_{\max}} = E_0$. On the r -axis, it is further visualised that the trapping region $[r_{L_0}, r_{L_{\max}}]$ (green) is compactly contained in the radial steady state support $[R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ (purple).

1.3 Action-angle variables

The basic tool to study decay is the action-angle variables associated to the steady state. These allow us to reparametrise the support Ω of the steady state \bar{f} and provide a convenient way of describing the trapping of the particles in the potential well of the steady state, see Figures 1 and 3.

Full radial case. In the action-angle description, the actions (E, L) range in (the closure of) the set J ; recall (1.34) and Figure 2. For fixed $L > 0$ and $E_{\min}^L \leq E < 0$, let $(R, W)(\cdot, E, L): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ be the global solution to the characteristic system

$$\dot{r} = w, \quad \dot{w} = -\Psi_L'(r), \quad \dot{L} = 0 \quad (1.42)$$

satisfying the initial condition $(R, W)(0, E, L) = (r_-(E, L), 0)$. In the case $E = E_{\min}^L$ we set $r_-(E_{\min}^L, L) := r_L$ and there the solution takes the form $(R, W)(\cdot, E_{\min}^L, L) \equiv (r_L, 0)$. For $0 > E > E_{\min}^L$, the solution $(R, W)(\cdot, E, L)$ is time-periodic with period

$$T(E, L) := 2 \int_{r_-(E, L)}^{r_+(E, L)} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{2E - 2\Psi_L(r)}}.$$

Due to (1.37), $T: \bar{J} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ can be shown to be in $C^{j+1}(\bar{J})$ with

$$T(E_{\min}^L, L) = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\Psi''(r_L)}}, \quad (1.43)$$

cf. [15, 27]. Moreover, in the regime $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in (1.16), it is shown in [27] that $\partial_E T(E, L) > T'_{\min}(L) := \partial_E T(E_{\min}^L, L) > 0$ for $(E, L) \in J$. This motivates the following crucial monotonicity assumption

$$\partial_E T(E, L) > 0, \quad (E, L) \in \bar{J}. \quad (1.44)$$

Additionally, we assume that there exists a sufficiently small constant $\eta > 0$ such that

$$|\partial_L T(E, L)| \leq \eta, \quad (E, L) \in \bar{J}. \quad (1.45)$$

Assumption (1.45) is satisfied for example in the case $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ in (1.13) by [27], where it can be shown that $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. It is also trivially satisfied for the class of potentials where the period T is L -independent. This happens for example in the limiting case $\varepsilon = 0$, which corresponds to the gravitational point mass potential.

Remark 1.9. *Numerical simulations [28] indicate that (1.44)–(1.45) hold for many steady states of the form (1.11).*

We let now for any $L \in [L_0, L_{\max}]$

$$(r, w): \mathbb{S}^1 \times (E_{\min}^L, 0) \rightarrow (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (r, w)(\theta, E, L) := (R, W)(\theta T(E, L), E, L).$$

This mapping defines a one-to-one change of variables between $(r, w, L) \in \Omega^* := \Omega \setminus \{(r_L, 0, L) \mid L \in [L_0, L_{\max}]\}$ and $(\theta, E, L) \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times J$, cf. [11, 15]. The variables (θ, E, L) are called *action-angle variables*. By slight abuse of notation, we write $g = g(r, w, L) = g(\theta, E, L)$ for functions on Ω^* . In these variables, equation (1.1) takes the form

$$\partial_t f + \omega(E, L) \partial_\theta f = 0, \quad (1.46)$$

cf. [11, 15], where

$$\omega(E, L) = \frac{1}{T(E, L)}, \quad (E, L) \in \bar{J},$$

defines the frequency function.

Remark 1.10. *As shown in [11, 15], the orthogonal complement of the nullspace of \mathcal{D} in H is very easily characterised in action-angle variables: for $f \in H$,*

$$f \in (\ker \mathcal{D})^\perp \quad \text{iff} \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} f(\theta, E, L) \, d\theta = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (E, L) \in J. \quad (1.47)$$

1+1-dimensional case. In this case we define the action-variables analogously to above, where we fix $L = \bar{L}$. The energies (actions) E range in the interval $[E_{\min}, E_0]$ and we denote its interior by

$$I := (E_{\min}, E_0).$$

The associated characteristic system coincides with (1.42) with a fixed choice $L = \bar{L}$ and for $E \in (E_{\min}, 0)$, we define the radii $r_-(E) < r_+(E)$ as the unique solutions of $\Psi(r_{\pm}(E)) = E$, corresponding to the turning points of the periodic orbits. In the case $E = E_{\min}$ we set $r_-(E_{\min}) := r_*$ and there the solution takes the form $(R, W)(\cdot, E_{\min}) \equiv (r_*, 0)$. Like above, the period is given by the formula $T(E) := 2 \int_{r_-(E)}^{r_+(E)} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{2E - 2\Psi(r)}}$ for $E_{\min} < E < 0$. Due to the assumptions (1.24)–(1.25) and the behaviour of Ψ close to $\{R_{\min}, R_{\max}\}$, the mapping $T: \bar{I} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ can be shown [12, 15, 27] to be in $C^3(\bar{I})$ with

$$T_{\min} = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\Psi''(r_*)}}. \quad (1.48)$$

Moreover, in the regime $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in (1.16), we have shown in [12] that $T'_{\min} := T'(E_{\min}) > 0$. By analogy to (1.44) we impose the monotonicity assumption

$$T'(E) > 0, \quad E \in \bar{I}, \quad (1.49)$$

which is satisfied [12] in the case $\varepsilon \ll 1$ in (1.16) because the smallness of ε implies that the period function to the leading order corresponds to the period function of the pure point mass potential, which is proportional to $|E|^{-\frac{3}{2}}$. Analogously to the above the map

$$(r, w): \mathbb{S}^1 \times (E_{\min}, 0) \rightarrow (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (r, w)(\theta, E) := (R, W)(\theta T(E), E)$$

defines a one-to-one change of variables between $(r, w) \in \Omega^* := \Omega \setminus \{(r_*, 0)\}$ and $(\theta, E) \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times I$ and we then refer to (θ, E) as the action-angle variables. Now the equation (1.3) takes the form

$$\partial_t f + \omega(E) \partial_\theta f = 0, \quad (1.50)$$

cf. [11, 12, 15], where

$$\omega(E) = \frac{1}{T(E)}, \quad E_{\min} \leq E < 0,$$

is the frequency function.

1.4 Related literature and ideas of the proof

The basic mechanism that leads to the decay of solutions to (1.1), called *gravitational phase mixing*, was discovered by Lynden-Bell in his pioneering discussion [18] in 1962. In particular Lynden-Bell used the action-angle variables to suggest an equilibration of action-averaged observables associated to the pure transport flow (see also [13, 2]). At a rigorous

level, phase mixing for equations of the form (1.1) or (1.3) was first studied by Rioseco and Sarbach [26] who obtained a weak convergence result for action averages of the solutions of pure transport equations. Such a result is morally related to H^{-1} -mixing in the spirit of ergodic theory. In 1-d, Chaturvedi and Luk [7] proved quantitative decay rates for the gravitational/electrostatic potential and its derivative, where an explicit external potential is imposed. The associated period function satisfies the qualitative features satisfied by our $E \mapsto T(E)$. The authors make the assumption that the initial data are supported uniformly away from the elliptic point $E = E_{\min}$ and use the vector-field method to obtain $\frac{1}{1+t}$ decay rate for the associated force field. Also using the vector-field method, quantitative decay rates for action averages were obtained by Moreno, Rioseco, and Van Den Bosch [20]; there the authors instead use test functions supported strictly away from the elliptic point. In particular, the trapping effects at $(r, w) = (r_*, 0)$ are effectively removed from [7, 20].

Equations (1.46) and (1.50) can be solved explicitly via the formulas

$$f(t, \theta, E, L) = f_0(\theta - \omega(E, L)t, E, L), \quad f_0(\theta, E, L) := f(0, \theta, E), \quad (1.51)$$

$$f(t, \theta, E) = f_0(\theta - \omega(E)t, E), \quad f_0(\theta, E) := f(0, \theta, E), \quad (1.52)$$

respectively. We denote the mixing semigroups appearing in (1.51) and (1.52) by T_t and \tilde{T}_t , respectively, i.e., for any $t \geq 0$ we let

$$T_t(\theta, E, L) := (\theta - \omega(E, L)t, E, L), \quad (1.53)$$

$$\tilde{T}_t(\theta, E) := (\theta - \omega(E)t, E). \quad (1.54)$$

One of the main advantages of the action-angle variables is the availability of Fourier analysis in the angle $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$. As usual, for a suitable function $g = g(\theta, E, L)$ on Ω^* , the Fourier coefficients are given by

$$\hat{g}(m, E, L) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} g(\theta, E, L) e^{-2\pi i m \theta} d\theta, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, (E, L) \in J, \quad (1.55)$$

and the similar definition applies to functions $g = g(\theta, E)$. Applying the Fourier transform in θ to equation (1.50) gives

$$\partial_t \hat{f}(t, m, E, L) + 2\pi i m \omega(E, L) \hat{f}(t, m, E, L) = 0. \quad (1.56)$$

We can solve this explicitly to obtain the mode-by-mode formula for the semigroup propagator:

$$\hat{f}(t, m, E, L) = e^{-2\pi i m \omega(E, L)t} \hat{f}_0(m, E, L), \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, (E, L) \in J. \quad (1.57)$$

Of course, the analogous formula holds in the 1+1-dimensional case

$$\hat{f}(t, m, E) = e^{-2\pi i m \omega(E)t} \hat{f}_0(m, E), \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, E \in I. \quad (1.58)$$

One of the most interesting features of phase-mixing generated by the potential well above is the presence of the so-called elliptic point $E = E_{\min}$ in the 1+1-d case (1.3) or a curve of elliptic points $L \mapsto E_{\min}^L$ in the general case (1.1) at the smallest particle energy supported by the steady state of a given angular momentum L .

For example, in the restricted case (1.3), the stars that start on the cylinder $r = r_*$ with radial velocity $w = 0$ always stay there and present a possible obstruction to decay. A manifestation of this is that the change of variables $(r, w) \mapsto (\theta, E)$ becomes singular precisely at the elliptic point. Thus with trapping comes a loss of smoothness at $E = E_{\min}$, which places severe restrictions on the decay rates. Various regularity properties of the action-angle variables and quantitative estimates near $E = E_{\min}$ and the turning points of the flow $w = 0$ are studied in Section 2. An important consequence is that the decay rates stated in Theorem 1.3 do not improve if we assume more regularity on the initial density distribution f_0 . This is in sharp contrast to the well-known phenomenon of phase-mixing near space-homogeneous equilibria of the Vlasov-Poisson system [21], where improved regularity of initial data leads to faster decay rates.

Our approach to the proof of Theorem 1.3 is classical. We use the explicit formulas (1.52) and (1.58) and then resort to a nonstationary phase type argument to obtain quantitative decay rates. Schematically speaking, a good model problem is to think of the time-decay of integrals of the general form

$$\int_a^b e^{i\omega(E)t} F(E) dE. \quad (1.59)$$

By a simple integration by parts argument we obtain $\frac{1}{t}$ decay if $\partial_E F(E)$ is in L^1 , the boundary terms $F(a)$ and $F(b)$ vanish, and $\omega' \neq 0$ which is where the monotonicity assumption (1.49) comes in crucially. We will see that the trapping referred to above can cause either of the first two properties to fail, thus placing a limitation on decay rates for generic initial data. We comment that the trapping at $E = E_{\min}$ can be removed by choosing initial data supported away from the minimal energy $E = E_{\min}$. However, this property is not preserved by the full linearised flow (1.19) which highlights the need to understand the decay properties in the presence of trapping. The key tool in our analysis is a precise description of the fundamental solution to the Poisson equation in radial symmetry, using the action-angle variables. This is essentially the content of Section 2.1, where we carefully track the behaviour of the action-angle $\theta(r, E)$ and its E -derivatives near the turning points $E = \Psi(r)$, where they degenerate.

In the general case (1.1) the situation is slightly better, as there is more “room” for efficient phase-mixing. The schematic analogue of (1.59) is now

$$\int_J e^{i\omega(E,L)t} F(E, L) d(E, L). \quad (1.60)$$

In addition to the ideas highlighted above, we take advantage of the presence of the angular

momentum which allows us to effectively trade ∂_E and ∂_L derivatives to improve upon decay.

Plan of the paper. In Section 2 we study various regularity properties of the action-angle variables. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.3 and in Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.7.

Acknowledgments. M. Hadžić's research is supported by the EPSRC Early Career Fellowship EP/S02218X/1. M. Schrecker's research is supported by the EPSRC Postdoctoral Research Fellowship EP/W001888/1.

2 Regularity in action-angle variables

The behaviour of various key quantities near the elliptic point of the flow is crucial to the proof of quantitative decay rates. The purpose of this section is to capture the singular behaviour near $E = E_{\min}$ through a series of lemmas which will then be used to prove the main theorems.

2.1 The 1+1-dimensional case

We start with the 1+1-d case and emphasise that all results established here can be trivially modified to also capture the L -dependent setting. Further extensions to the full radial setting will be proven in Section 2.2. We start with a basic observation which clarifies the behaviour of Fourier coefficients (1.55) of smooth functions near $E = E_{\min}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $g = g(r, w) \in W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)$ for some $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending on the steady state, such that*

$$|\widehat{g}(m, E)| \leq C \frac{\|g\|_{W^{k, \infty}(\Omega)} \sqrt{E - E_{\min}}}{|m|^k}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}^*, E \in I. \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. We first recall from [12, Lemma 3.5] that there exists $C > 0$ as above such that

$$|r(\theta, E) - r_*| + |\partial_\theta r(\theta, E)| \leq C \sqrt{E - E_{\min}}, \quad (\theta, E) \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times I.$$

Moreover, from the definition of the characteristic flow, we have

$$|\partial_\theta w(\theta, E)| = T(E) |\Psi'(r(\theta, E))| \leq C |r(\theta, E) - r_*| \leq C \sqrt{E - E_{\min}}.$$

For $m \neq 0$, we make the trivial estimate $|m|^{2k} |\widehat{g}(m, E)|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |\partial_\theta^k g(\theta, E)|^2 d\theta$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{g}(m, E)|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{m^2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |\partial_\theta g(\theta, E)|^2 d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{2}{m^2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} (|(\partial_r g)(\theta, E)|^2 |\partial_\theta r|^2 + |(\partial_w g)(\theta, E)|^2 |\partial_\theta w|^2) d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{C}{m^2} \|g\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)}^2 (E - E_{\min}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the estimate in the case $k = 1$. To prove the case $k = 2$ in (2.1), we apply the chain rule once more and use that

$$|\partial_\theta^2 r(\theta, E)| + |\partial_\theta^2 w(\theta, E)| \leq C \sqrt{E - E_{\min}}. \quad \square$$

By assuming further regularity of g (and suitable smoothness of the potential Ψ), one could obtain arbitrarily many additional $\frac{1}{|m|}$ -factors on the right-hand side of (2.1). However, this would not lead to faster decay due to the trapping mechanisms explained before.

Let us next derive suitable representations for the functions whose decay we aim to prove.

Lemma 2.2 (Representation formulas for the gravitational potential). *Let $t \mapsto f(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ be a classical solution of the pure transport equation (1.3) and let the gravitational potential U_f be given by (1.21). Then the following formulae hold:*

$$\partial_t U_f(t, R) = 4\pi^2 \iint f(t, r, w) w g_R(r) \, d(r, w), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\partial_R U_f(t, R) = \frac{4\pi^2}{R^2} \iint f(t, r, w) h_R(r) \, d(r, w), \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$g_R(r) := \frac{1}{r^2} \chi_{r \geq R}(r), \quad (2.4)$$

$$h_R(r) := \chi_{r \leq R}(r). \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. The formula (2.3) follows classically by radially integrating the Poisson equation. Differentiating (2.3) w.r.t. t and radially integrating the resulting identity yields (2.2); recall the boundary condition included into (1.21). \square

Remark 2.3. *As explained in the discussion of the properties of the set Ω (1.17) in Section 1, the spatial extent of Ω is contained in the interval $[R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ with $R_{\min} > 0$. We will therefore frequently use the bound $\frac{1}{r} < C$ on Ω .*

Motivated by Lemma 2.2, it will be particularly important to describe the set $\{r(\theta, E) \geq R\}$ in the action-angle variables for any given $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$. For $E \in [\Psi(R), E_0]$, let $\theta(R, E) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ be the unique angle such that

$$r(\theta(R, E), E) = R. \quad (2.6)$$

In particular, for $E \in (E_{\min}, E_0]$ and $R \geq r_*$,

$$r(\theta, E) \geq R \text{ iff } E \in [\Psi(R), E_0] \wedge \theta \in [\theta(R, E), 1 - \theta(R, E)], \quad (2.7)$$

while for $R < r_*$,

$$r(\theta, E) \geq R \text{ iff } E \leq \Psi(R) \vee (E \in [\Psi(R), E_0] \wedge \theta \in [\theta(R, E), 1 - \theta(R, E)]). \quad (2.8)$$

Note that for all $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ and $E \in (\Psi(R), E_0]$ we have $\theta(R, E) > 0$. Moreover,

$$\theta(R, \Psi(R)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & R > r_*, \\ 0, & R < r_*, \end{cases} \quad R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}] \setminus \{r_*\}. \quad (2.9)$$

This equation expresses the fact that the angles $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ correspond to the turning points of any characteristic orbit.

Lemma 2.4 (Regularity of $E \mapsto \theta(R, E)$). *For any $R \in (R_{\min}, R_{\max})$, the map $(\Psi(R), E_0] \ni E \mapsto \theta(R, E)$ is continuously differentiable and there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending only on the steady state, such that*

$$|\partial_E \theta(R, E)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{E - \Psi(R)} \sqrt{E - E_{\min}}}, \quad E \in (\Psi(R), E_0].$$

Proof. Basic ODE theory shows $r \in C^1(\mathbb{S}^1 \times I)$ and for $(\theta, E) \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times I$ we have $\partial_{\theta} r(\theta, E) = 0$ iff $\theta \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$. By (2.6), (2.9), and the implicit function theorem we hence deduce $\theta(R, \cdot) \in C^1((\Psi(R), E_0])$ with

$$T(E) w(\theta(R, E), E) \partial_E \theta(R, E) = -\partial_E r(\theta(R, E), E). \quad (2.10)$$

We now recall the bound [12, Lemma 3.5]:

$$|\partial_E r(\theta, E)| + |\partial_E w(\theta, E)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}}, \quad E \in I, \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1; \quad (2.11)$$

the bound for $\partial_E w$ is not explicitly stated in [12], but follows with the same arguments as the bound for $\partial_E r$ and will be useful later. Together with $T_{\min} > 0$, the claim follows. \square

The next lemma gives a precise description of the leading order rates of degeneration of the characteristic flow as one approaches $E = E_{\min}$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\alpha := \sqrt{\Psi''(r_*)}$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$, the following bounds hold uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ as $E \searrow E_{\min}$:*

$$\frac{r(\theta, E) - r_*}{(E - E_{\min})^{\frac{1}{2}}} = -\frac{\sqrt{2} \cos(2\pi\theta)}{\alpha} + \frac{\Psi'''(r_*)}{6\alpha^4} (\cos(4\pi\theta) - 3) \sqrt{E - E_{\min}} + \mathcal{O}(E - E_{\min}), \quad (2.12)$$

$$\frac{w(\theta, E)}{(E - E_{\min})^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \sqrt{2} \sin(2\pi\theta) - \frac{\Psi'''(r_*)}{3\alpha^3} \sin(4\pi\theta) \sqrt{E - E_{\min}} + \mathcal{O}(E - E_{\min}). \quad (2.13)$$

Proof. We will only show here how to derive the expansions up to the order $\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}$; the higher order behaviour can be obtained by iterating the arguments below.

For $E_{\min} \leq E < 0$ let $z = z(\cdot, E): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the unique global solution of

$$\ddot{z} = -\Psi''(R(\cdot, E))z, \quad z(0) = 1, \quad \dot{z}(0) = 0. \quad (2.14)$$

In particular, because $R(\cdot, E_{\min}) \equiv r_*$ it follows that

$$z(s, E_{\min}) = \cos(\alpha s), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We now consider the function $Z(s, E) := z(s, E) - \cos(\alpha s)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $E \in [E_{\min}, 0)$ which solves the nonhomogeneous linear ODE

$$\ddot{Z}(s, E) = -\alpha^2 Z(s, E) + (\alpha^2 - \Psi''(R(s, E)))z(s, E)$$

with initial condition $Z(0, E) = 0 = \dot{Z}(0, E)$. Denoting the corresponding semigroup by e^{sA} , $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\alpha^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, it follows that

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z(s) \\ \dot{Z}(s) \end{pmatrix} = \int_0^s e^{A(s-\sigma)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ (\alpha^2 - \Psi''(R(\sigma, E)))z(\sigma, E) \end{pmatrix} d\sigma, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.15)$$

Since $|z(s, E)| \leq C$ for $s \in [0, T_{\max}]$ and $E \in [E_{\min}, E_0]$ and $|\alpha^2 - \Psi''(R(s, E))| \leq C\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}$, it follows from (2.15) that

$$|Z(s, E)| + |\dot{Z}(s, E)| \leq C\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}, \quad E \in [E_{\min}, E_0], \quad s \in [0, T_{\max}]. \quad (2.16)$$

For any $E, \tilde{E} \in I$ we then have via the mean value theorem

$$\begin{aligned} r(\theta, E) - r(\theta, \tilde{E}) &= \int_{\tilde{E}}^E \partial_e r(\theta, e) de \\ &= \int_{\tilde{E}}^E W(\theta T(e), e) \theta T'(e) + \partial_e R(\theta T(e), e) de \\ &= \theta \int_{\tilde{E}}^E W(\theta T(e), e) T'(e) de + \int_{\tilde{E}}^E \partial_e r_-(e) z(\theta T(e), e) de. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} z(\theta T(e), e) &= z(\theta T_{\min}, E_{\min}) + z(\theta T(e), e) - z(\theta T_{\min}, e) + Z(\theta T_{\min}, e) \\ &= \cos(2\pi\theta) + z(\theta T(e), e) - z(\theta T_{\min}, e) + Z(\theta T_{\min}, e) \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

since $T_{\min} = T(E_{\min}) = \frac{2\pi}{\alpha}$ by (1.48). Since \dot{z} is uniformly bounded and $T \in C^1(\bar{I})$, it follows that $|z(\theta T(e), e) - z(\theta T_{\min}, e)| \leq C(e - E_{\min})$. Together with (2.16) and (2.18) we hence deduce

$$z(\theta T(e), e) = \cos(2\pi\theta) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{e - E_{\min}}), \quad (2.19)$$

and the bound is uniform in $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$. We also recall that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_e r_-(e) &= \frac{1}{\Psi'(r_-(e))} = \frac{1}{\Psi''(r_*)(r_-(e) - r_*)} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}_{e \rightarrow E_{\min}}(\sqrt{e - E_{\min}})\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha}(e - E_{\min})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}_{e \rightarrow E_{\min}}(\sqrt{e - E_{\min}})\right).\end{aligned}\quad (2.20)$$

From the uniform boundedness of W , (2.17), (2.19), and (2.20) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}r(\theta, E) - r(\theta, \tilde{E}) &= \int_{\tilde{E}}^E \mathcal{O}_{e \rightarrow E_{\min}}(1) \, de + \cos(2\pi\theta) \int_{\tilde{E}}^E \partial_e r_-(e) \, de \\ &\quad + \int_{\tilde{E}}^E \partial_e r_-(e) \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{e - E_{\min}}) \, de \\ &= -\frac{\cos(2\pi\theta)}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \int_{\tilde{E}}^E (e - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \, de + \mathcal{O}(E - \tilde{E}).\end{aligned}\quad (2.21)$$

We now let $\tilde{E} \searrow E_{\min}$ and upon dividing by $(E - E_{\min})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ we obtain the first expansion term in (2.12). In order to obtain (2.13), first note $\partial_E W(\theta T(E), E) = \partial_E r_-(E) \dot{z}(\theta T(E), E)$. We hence proceed as above and write

$$w(\theta, E) - w(\theta, \tilde{E}) = -\theta \int_{\tilde{E}}^E \Psi'(r(\theta, e)) T'(e) \, de + \int_{\tilde{E}}^E \partial_e r_-(e) \dot{z}(\theta T(e), e) \, de \quad (2.22)$$

for $E, \tilde{E} \in I$. After letting $\tilde{E} \searrow E_{\min}$, the first term on the right-hand side is $\mathcal{O}(E - E_{\min})$. For the second one, differentiating (2.18) with respect to θ gives

$$T_{\min} \dot{z}(\theta T(e), e) = -\alpha T_{\min} \sin(2\pi\theta) + T_{\min} (\dot{z}(\theta T(e), e) - \dot{z}(\theta T_{\min}, e)) + T_{\min} \dot{Z}(\theta T_{\min}, e).$$

The boundedness of \dot{z} , $T \in C^1(\bar{I})$, and (2.15) yield

$$|\dot{z}(\theta T(e), e) - \dot{z}(\theta T_{\min}, e)| + |\dot{Z}(\theta T_{\min}, e)| \leq C(e - E_{\min})^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and so

$$\dot{z}(\theta T(e), e) = -\alpha \sin(2\pi\theta) + \mathcal{O}_{e \rightarrow E_{\min}}(\sqrt{e - E_{\min}}).$$

Inserting this expansion and (2.20) into (2.22) yields the first expansion term in (2.13) upon letting $\tilde{E} \searrow E_{\min}$. \square

Remark 2.6. Notice that we have proven (2.12) and (2.13) by integrating the expansion formulae for the E -derivatives of r and w , respectively. This means that naïvely differentiating (2.12) and (2.13) w.r.t. E indeed yields the correct expansions of $\partial_E^k r$ and $\partial_E^k w$, respectively, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$.

The previous lemma allows us to capture effective cancellations that will be important in the proof of the main theorem.

Lemma 2.7. As $E \searrow E_{\min}$, the following bounds hold uniformly in $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \mathbb{S}^1$:

$$\begin{aligned} w(\theta, E)w(\tilde{\theta}, E) &= 2 \sin(2\pi\theta) \sin(2\pi\tilde{\theta}) (E - E_{\min}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\sqrt{2}\Psi'''(r_*)}{3\alpha^3} \left(\sin(2\pi\theta) \sin(4\pi\tilde{\theta}) + \sin(4\pi\theta) \sin(2\pi\tilde{\theta}) \right) (E - E_{\min})^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}((E - E_{\min})^2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} w(\theta, E)\Psi'(r(\tilde{\theta}, E)) &= -2\alpha \sin(2\pi\theta) \cos(2\pi\tilde{\theta}) (E - E_{\min}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2}\Psi'''(r_*)}{3\alpha^2} \left(2 \sin(2\pi\theta) \cos(4\pi\tilde{\theta}) + \sin(4\pi\theta) \cos(2\pi\tilde{\theta}) \right) (E - E_{\min})^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}((E - E_{\min})^2); \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

recall that $\alpha = \sqrt{\Psi''(r_*)}$. Similar to Remark 2.6, naïvely differentiating both sides of (2.23) and (2.24) once or twice w.r.t. E results in the correct expansion formulae of $\partial_E^k(w(\theta, E)w(\tilde{\theta}, E))$ and $\partial_E^k(w(\theta, E)\Psi'(r(\tilde{\theta}, E)))$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$. In particular, the functions $I \ni E \mapsto w(\theta, E)w(\tilde{\theta}, E)$ and $I \ni E \mapsto w(\theta, E)\Psi'(r(\tilde{\theta}, E))$ extend to continuously differentiable functions at $E = E_{\min}$ and their derivatives are $C^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$ on \bar{I} .

Proof. Both expansions follow directly from Lemma 2.5; the second one further relies on an expansion of Ψ' around r_* . \square

Lemma 2.8. Let $f_0 \in W^{3, \infty}(\Omega)$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}^*$, $E \in I$, and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ the following bounds hold:

$$\left| \partial_E \left(\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w(\theta, E) \right) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|}, \quad (2.25)$$

$$\left| \partial_E^2 \left(\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w(\theta, E) \right) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{3, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\left| \partial_E \left(\widehat{f}_0(m, E)\partial_E r(\theta, E) \right) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.27)$$

Proof. We first integrate by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{f}_0(m, E)w(\theta, E) &= w(\theta, E) \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} f_0(\tilde{\theta}, E) e^{-2\pi i m \tilde{\theta}} d\tilde{\theta} = \frac{w(\theta, E)}{2\pi i m} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \partial_{\tilde{\theta}} f_0(\tilde{\theta}, E) e^{-2\pi i m \tilde{\theta}} d\tilde{\theta} \\ &= \frac{T(E)}{2\pi i m} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \left(\partial_r f_0(\tilde{\theta}, E) w(\tilde{\theta}, E) - \partial_w f_0(\tilde{\theta}, E) \Psi'(r(\tilde{\theta}, E)) \right) w(\theta, E) e^{-2\pi i m \tilde{\theta}} d\tilde{\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Our aim is study the rates of degeneracy as $E \searrow E_{\min}$ of all terms in the latter expression.

In order to derive the expansions of $\partial_r f_0$ and $\partial_w f_0$, first note that for any $h \in W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_E h(\theta, E) &= \partial_r h(\theta, E) \partial_E r(\theta, E) + \partial_w h(\theta, E) \partial_E w(\theta, E) = \\ &= -\partial_r h(\theta, E) \frac{\cos(2\pi\theta)}{\sqrt{2}\alpha} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \partial_w h(\theta, E) \frac{\sin(2\pi\theta)}{\sqrt{2}} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}(1) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ as $E \searrow E_{\min}$; recall Remark 2.6. Integrating this bound w.r.t. E yields

$$h(\theta, E) = h(r_*, 0) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{E - E_{\min}});$$

note that $h(\theta, E_{\min}) = h(r_*, 0)$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Iterating this argument once more leads to

$$g(\theta, E) = g(r_*, 0) + \left(-\partial_r g(r_*, 0) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\alpha} \cos(2\pi\theta) + \partial_w g(r_*, 0) \sqrt{2} \sin(2\pi\theta) \right) \sqrt{E - E_{\min}} + \mathcal{O}(E - E_{\min})$$

for $g \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ as $E \searrow E_{\min}$. Inserting the latter bound with $g = \partial_r f_0$ and $g = \partial_w f_0$, Lemma 2.7, and the obvious expansion $T(E) = T_{\min} + \mathcal{O}(E - E_{\min})$ into (2.28) results in

$$\widehat{f}_0(m, E) w(\theta, E) = \frac{T_{\min}}{2\pi im} (E - E_{\min}) \beta_1(\theta, m) + \frac{T_{\min}}{2\pi im} (E - E_{\min})^{\frac{3}{2}} \beta_2(\theta, m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(E - E_{\min})^2}{|m|}\right) \quad (2.29)$$

uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ as $E \searrow E_{\min}$. Here, $\beta_1(\cdot, m), \beta_2(\cdot, m) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1; \mathbb{C})$ are suitable combinations of trigonometric functions which are bounded by $C\|f_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$ and $C\|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}}$, respectively.

Due to Remark 2.6, naïvely differentiating (2.29) yields the correct expansions of $\partial_E(\widehat{f}_0(m, E) w(\theta, E))$ and $\partial_E^2(\widehat{f}_0(m, E) w(\theta, E))$. We thus conclude (2.25) and (2.26).

The remaining bound (2.27) follows similarly by employing the expansion of $\partial_E r(\theta, E)$ established in Remark 2.6. More precisely,

$$\widehat{f}_0(m, E) \partial_E r(\theta, E) = \frac{T_{\min}}{2\pi im} \gamma_1(\theta, m) + \frac{T_{\min}}{2\pi im} \sqrt{E - E_{\min}} \gamma_2(\theta, m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{E - E_{\min}}{|m|}\right) \quad (2.30)$$

uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ as $E \searrow E_{\min}$, where γ_1 and γ_2 are functions with similar properties to β_1 and β_2 . Furthermore, the expansion of $\partial_E(\widehat{f}_0(m, E) \partial_E r(\theta, E))$ can again be obtained by naïvely differentiating (2.30), and we conclude (2.27). \square

We recall the definitions (2.4) and (2.5) of g_R and h_R , respectively. The Fourier description of these functions in the action-angle variables plays a key role in the understanding of the decay-in- t of the gravitational potential.

Lemma 2.9 (Action-angle descriptions of the supports of g_R and h_R). *The supports Ω_{g_R} and Ω_{h_R} of g_R and h_R in action-angle variables are respectively given by*

$$\Omega_{g_R} = \begin{cases} \cup_{E \in [\Psi(R), E_0]}([\theta(R, E), 1 - \theta(R, E)] \times \{E\}), & R > r_*, \\ \cup_{E \in (\Psi(R), E_0]}([\theta(R, E), 1 - \theta(R, E)] \times \{E\}) \cup (\mathbb{S}^1 \times [E_{\min}, \Psi(R)]), & R \leq r_*, \end{cases}$$

$$\Omega_{h_R} = \begin{cases} \cup_{E \in (\Psi(R), E_0]}([-\theta(R, E), \theta(R, E)] \times \{E\}) \cup (\mathbb{S}^1 \times [E_{\min}, \Psi(R)]), & R \geq r_*, \\ \cup_{E \in [\Psi(R), E_0]}([-\theta(R, E), \theta(R, E)] \times \{E\}), & R < r_*. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $g_R(r(\theta, E)) = \frac{1}{r(\theta, E)^2} \chi_{\Omega_{g_R}}(\theta, E)$ and $h_R(r(\theta, E)) = \chi_{\Omega_{h_R}}(\theta, E)$.

Proof. The characterisations of Ω_{g_R} and Ω_{h_R} are due to (2.7) and (2.8). \square

Lemma 2.10 (Fourier descriptions of wg_R and h_R). *Let $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ be given. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$ we have the following formulae for the Fourier coefficients of wg_R and h_R :*

$$\widehat{wg_R}(m, E) = \begin{cases} \int_{\theta(R, E)}^{1-\theta(R, E)} \frac{w}{r^2} e^{-2\pi i m \theta} d\theta, & \text{if } E \in (\Psi(R), E_0], \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{w}{r^2} e^{-2\pi i m \theta} d\theta, & \text{if } E_{\min} < E \leq \Psi(R) \wedge R < r_*, \\ 0, & \text{if } E_{\min} < E \leq \Psi(R) \wedge R > r_*, \end{cases} \quad (2.31)$$

$$\widehat{h_R}(m, E) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{m\pi} \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)), & \text{if } E \in (\Psi(R), E_0], \\ 0 & \text{if } E \in [E_{\min}, \Psi(R)]. \end{cases} \quad (2.32)$$

Proof. We use the formula

$$\widehat{wg_R}(m, E) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{w}{r^2} \chi_{\{r(\theta, E) \geq R\}} e^{-2\pi i m \theta} d\theta$$

and Lemma 2.9 to obtain (2.31). To show (2.32) we use the formula

$$\widehat{h_R}(m, E) = \int_{-\theta(R, E)}^{\theta(R, E)} e^{-2\pi i m \theta} d\theta, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_*,$$

where we note that in the region $r \geq R_*$ for any $E \in [E_{\min}, \Psi(R)]$, we have $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_R(\theta, E) e^{-2\pi i m \theta} d\theta = \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} e^{-2\pi i m \theta} d\theta = 0$. \square

To prove quantitative decay of the solution, we need to carefully describe the regularity of the maps, defined for a given $f_0: \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$G_{f_0}(m, \cdot): I \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad G_{f_0}(m, E) := \widehat{f_0}(m, E) \overline{\widehat{wg_R}(m, E)}, \quad (2.33)$$

$$H_{f_0}(m, \cdot): I \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad H_{f_0}(m, E) := \widehat{f_0}(m, E) \overline{\widehat{h_R}(m, E)}, \quad (2.34)$$

for $m \in \mathbb{Z}^*$ near the elliptic point $E = E_{\min}$. To that end we first write down the expressions for the first derivatives of $G_{f_0}(m, \cdot)$ and $H_{f_0}(m, \cdot)$ as well as the second derivative of $G_{f_0}(m, \cdot)$.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ and $f_0 \in W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)$ be given. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$ and $E \in (\Psi(R), E_0]$ the following identities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dE} G_{f_0}(m, E) \\ &= \int_{\theta(R, E)}^{1-\theta(R, E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) w}{r^2} \right) e^{2\pi i m \theta} d\theta + \frac{2i \widehat{f_0}(m, E) \partial_E r(\theta(R, E), E)}{T(E) R^2} \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dE} H_{f_0}(m, E) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi m} \partial_E \widehat{f_0}(m, E) \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) + 2 \widehat{f_0}(m, E) \cos(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) \partial_E \theta(R, E), \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d^2}{dE^2} G_{f_0}(m, E) \\
&= \int_{\theta(R, E)}^{1-\theta(R, E)} \frac{d^2}{dE^2} \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w}{r^2} \right) e^{2\pi i m \theta} d\theta \\
&\quad - \partial_E \theta(R, E) \left[\partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w}{r^2} \right) \Big|_{\theta=1-\theta(R, E)} e^{-2\pi i m \theta(R, E)} + \partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w}{r^2} \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta(R, E)} e^{2\pi i m \theta(R, E)} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2i \partial_E \theta(R, E) \widehat{f}_0(m, E)}{R^2} (\partial_E \theta r(\theta(R, E), E) \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) + 2\pi m \partial_E r(\theta(R, E), E) \cos(2\pi m \theta(R, E))) \\
&\quad + \frac{2i}{R^2} \partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E) \partial_E r(s, E)}{T(E)} \right) \Big|_{s=\theta(R, E)} \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)). \tag{2.37}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Differentiating $G_{f_0}(m, E)$ with respect to E we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dE} G_{f_0}(m, E) &= \int_{\theta(R, E)}^{1-\theta(R, E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w}{r^2} \right) e^{2\pi i m \theta} d\theta \\
&\quad - \frac{2i \widehat{f}_0(m, E)w(\theta(R, E), E)}{R^2} \partial_E \theta(R, E) \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)). \tag{2.38}
\end{aligned}$$

Upon plugging (2.10) into (2.38), we obtain the claimed identity (2.35). Identity (2.36) is trivial; it follows from the product rule and the formula (2.32). Identity (2.37) follows by taking a further derivative. \square

Lemma 2.12. *Let $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ and $f_0 \in W^{3, \infty}(\Omega)$ be given. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \frac{d}{dE} G_{f_0}(m, E) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|}, \quad E \in (\Psi(R), E_0], \tag{2.39}$$

$$\left| \frac{d^2}{dE^2} G_{f_0}(m, E) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{3, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} \frac{1}{(E - E_{\min})^{\frac{1}{2}} (E - \Psi(R))^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad E \in (\Psi(R), E_0]. \tag{2.40}$$

If $R \in [R_{\min}, r_*)$ then

$$\left| \frac{d}{dE} G_{f_0}(m, E) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|}, \quad E \in (E_{\min}, \Psi(R)], \tag{2.41}$$

$$\left| \frac{d^2}{dE^2} G_{f_0}(m, E) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{3, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad E \in (E_{\min}, \Psi(R)]. \tag{2.42}$$

Moreover, for any $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ we have the bound

$$\left| \frac{d}{dE} H_{f_0}(m, E) \right| \leq \frac{C \|f_0\|_{W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad E \in (\Psi(R), E_0] \tag{2.43}$$

Proof. The bound (2.39) follows by plugging the expansions (2.29) and (2.30) established in the proof of Lemma 2.8 as well as the expansion of $\partial_E r$ given by Remark 2.6 into (2.35).

In the same way, we can bound the first line on the right-hand side of (2.37) by

$$\left| \int_{\theta(R,E)}^{1-\theta(R,E)} \frac{d^2}{dE^2} \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m,E)w}{r^2} \right) e^{2\pi im\theta} d\theta \right| \leq \frac{C\|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.44)$$

By additionally using Lemma 2.4, we can bound the second line on the right-hand side of (2.37) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \partial_E \theta(R, E) \left[\frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w}{r^2} \right) \Big|_{\theta=1-\theta(R,E)} e^{-2\pi im\theta(R,E)} + \partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w}{r^2} \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta(R,E)} e^{2\pi im\theta(R,E)} \right] \right| \\ & \leq \frac{C\|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4 as well as (2.11), we conclude that the third line on the right-hand side of (2.37) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{2\partial_E \theta(R, E) \widehat{f}_0(m, E)}{R^2} (\partial_{E\theta} r(\theta(R, E), E) \sin(2\pi m\theta(R, E)) + 2\pi m \partial_E r(\theta(R, E), E) \cos(2\pi m\theta(R, E))) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{C\|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}; \end{aligned}$$

to estimate the second term, we used the case $k = 2$ in Lemma 2.1.

Finally, using (2.27) we have the bound

$$\left| \frac{2}{R^2} \partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E) \partial_E r(s, E)}{T(E)} \right) \Big|_{s=\theta(R,E)} \sin(2\pi m\theta(R, E)) \right| \leq \frac{C\|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)}}{|m|} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.45)$$

Summing (2.44)–(2.45) and using (2.37), we conclude (2.40).

For $R \in [R_{\min}, r_*)$ we have

$$G_{f_0}(m, E) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E)w}{r^2} e^{2\pi im\theta} d\theta, \quad E \in (E_{\min}, \Psi(R)],$$

by (2.31), so (2.41) and (2.42) follow in the same way as (2.39) and (2.44), respectively. It remains to show (2.43). This follows from Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4 together with the bound

$$\left| \partial_E \widehat{f}_0(m, E) \right| \leq \frac{C\|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}}}{|m|\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}}, \quad (2.46)$$

which can be obtained similarly to Lemma 2.1 using (2.11). \square

In order to obtain the fractional gain in decay as stated in (1.30) and (1.32), we shall need a precise control on even higher-order E -derivatives of functions $G(m, \cdot)$ and $H(m, \cdot)$.

Lemma 2.13 (Higher-order regularity). *Let $f_0 \in W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$, $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$, and $E \in (\Psi(R), E_0]$ the following bounds hold:*

$$\left| \partial_E \left((E - \Psi(R))^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_E^2 G_{f_0}(m, E) \right) \right| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)} (E - E_{\min})^{-1} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.47)$$

$$\left| \partial_E \left((E - \Psi(R))^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_E H_{f_0}(m, E) \right) \right| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.48)$$

Proof. Let us start by proving the easier bound (2.48). The relations $\sqrt{E - \Psi(R)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w(\theta(R, E), E)$ and (2.10) as well as (2.36) yield

$$\begin{aligned} (E - \Psi(R))^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_E H_{f_0}(m, E) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi m}} w(\theta(R, E), E) \partial_E \widehat{f}_0(m, E) \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) \\ &\quad - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{T(E)} \partial_E r(\theta(R, E), E) \widehat{f}_0(m, E) \cos(2\pi m \theta(R, E)). \end{aligned}$$

Estimating the E -derivative of this expression is based on the boundedness of T and T' , the bound on $\partial_E \theta(R, E)$ from Lemma 2.4, the bounds on $w(\theta, E)$, $\Psi'(R) = \Psi'(r(\theta(R, E), E))$, $\partial_E r(\theta, E)$, and $\partial_E w(\theta, E)$ from Lemma 2.5 and Remark 2.6, the bound on $\partial_E(\widehat{f}_0(m, E) \partial_E r(\theta, E))$ from Lemma 2.8, as well as the bounds on $\widehat{f}_0(m, E)$ and $\partial_E \widehat{f}_0(m, E)$ from Lemma 2.1 and (2.46). Together with the additional estimate

$$\left| \partial_E \left(\partial_E \widehat{f}_0(m, E) w(\theta, E) \right) \right| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1,$$

which can be obtained similarly to Lemma 2.8, we conclude (2.48).

In order to prove (2.47), we first rewrite the factor $(E - \Psi(R))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in the same way as

above and use (2.37) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
(E - \Psi(R))^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_E^2 G_{f_0}(m, E) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \int_{\theta(R, E)}^{1-\theta(R, E)} \partial_E^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) w(\theta, E)}{r(\theta, E)^2} \right) w(\theta(R, E), E) e^{2\pi i m \theta} d\theta \\
&+ \frac{\partial_E r(\theta(R, E), E)}{\sqrt{2} T(E)} \left[\partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) w}{r^2} \right) \Big|_{\theta=1-\theta(R, E)} e^{-2\pi i m \theta(R, E)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) w}{r^2} \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta(R, E)} e^{2\pi i m \theta(R, E)} \right] \\
&- \frac{\sqrt{2} i \partial_E r(\theta(R, E), E) \widehat{f_0}(m, E)}{T(E) R^2} \left(\partial_{E\theta} r(\theta(R, E), E) \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\pi m \partial_{Er}(\theta(R, E), E) \cos(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) \right) \\
&+ \frac{\sqrt{2} i}{R^2} w(\theta(R, E), E) \partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) \partial_{Er}(\theta, E)}{T(E)} \right) \Big|_{\theta=\theta(R, E)} \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) \\
&=: I + II + III + IV.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimating the E -derivative of this expression requires some additional bounds compared to the above.

Concretely, to estimate $\partial_E I$, first observe that Remark 2.6 and an expansion formula similar to (2.29) from the proof of Lemma 2.8 yield

$$\partial_E^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) w(\theta, E)}{r(\theta, E)^2} \right) = \tilde{\beta}_1(\theta, m) (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \tilde{\beta}_2(\theta, m) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}) \quad (2.49)$$

as $E \searrow E_{\min}$ uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$, where $\tilde{\beta}_1(\cdot, m), \tilde{\beta}_2(\cdot, m) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1)$ are suitable combinations of trigonometric functions which can be bounded uniformly in $\|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}}$ and $\|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}}$, respectively. This expansion obviously yields the bound

$$\left| \partial_E^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) w(\theta, E)}{r(\theta, E)^2} \right) \right| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Furthermore, combined with the expansion of w from Lemma 2.5, (2.49) indicates

$$\left| \partial_E \left[w(\tilde{\theta}, E) \partial_E^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f_0}(m, E) w(\theta, E)}{r(\theta, E)^2} \right) \right] \right| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.50)$$

The estimate (2.50) can indeed be proven by extending the results from Remark 2.6 from second-order to third-order E -derivatives by iterating the arguments from the proof of Lemma 2.5 once more. In the same way as shown in Lemma 2.8, this allows to derive an

analogue of (2.49) for the third-order E -derivative, which then leads to (2.50). Combining all these bounds yields

$$|\partial_E I| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.51)$$

Similarly to (2.25) we derive the following estimate for $\partial_E II$:

$$|\partial_E II| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}} (E - E_{\min})^{-1} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.52)$$

Similarly, by additionally applying (2.27) and the case $k = 2$ from Lemma 2.1, it follows that

$$|\partial_E III| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}} (E - E_{\min})^{-1} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.53)$$

In order to estimate $\partial_E IV$, observe that generalizing the arguments from Lemma 2.8 similarly to (2.50) yields

$$\left| \partial_E \left[w(\tilde{\theta}, E) \partial_E \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, E) \partial_E r(\theta, E)}{T(E)} \right) \right] \right| \leq \frac{C}{|m|} \|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

which leads to

$$|\partial_E IV| \leq C \|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}} (E - E_{\min})^{-1} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.54)$$

We thus conclude (2.47) by combining (2.51)–(2.54). \square

2.2 The radially symmetric case

We now analyse the regularity of the action-angle variables in the general radially symmetric case. To that end, we suppose henceforth that we are working with a steady state of the form (1.13) with polytropic exponents k, ℓ and smallness parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ and we introduce some further notation. For a sufficiently smooth function $F : J \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by

$$\partial^{(j)} F$$

the collection of all derivatives of the form $\partial_E^n \partial_L^{j-n} F$, $n \in \{0, \dots, j\}$.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $k > 1$, $\ell > 0$. Then for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, k + \ell + \frac{5}{2})$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \partial^{(j)} r(\theta, E, L) \right| \leq C (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-j}, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1, (E, L) \in J. \quad (2.55)$$

Moreover, $r(\theta, E, L)$ admits the following expansion. Let $\alpha_L := \sqrt{\Psi_L''(r_L)}$ for $L > 0$. Then

$$r(\theta, E, L) - r_L = -\frac{\sqrt{2} \cos(2\pi\theta)}{\alpha_L} \sqrt{E - E_{\min}^L} + \mathcal{O}(E - E_{\min}^L) \quad (2.56)$$

as $E \rightarrow E_{\min}^L$ locally uniformly in $L > 0$. Moreover, if we set

$$(\partial_{Er})_0 = -\frac{\cos(2\pi\theta)}{\sqrt{2}\alpha_L\sqrt{E - E_{\min}^L}}, \quad (\partial_{Lr})_0 = \frac{\cos(2\pi\theta)}{2\sqrt{2}r_L^2\alpha_L\sqrt{E - E_{\min}^L}}, \quad (2.57)$$

the derivatives satisfy

$$\partial_{Er}(\theta, E, L) = (\partial_{Er})_0 + \widetilde{\partial_{Er}}, \quad (2.58)$$

$$\partial_{Lr}(\theta, E, L) = (\partial_{Lr})_0 + \widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}, \quad (2.59)$$

where

$$\left| \partial^{(j)} \widetilde{\partial_{Er}}(\theta, E, L) \right| + \left| \partial^{(j)} \widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}(\theta, E, L) \right| \leq C(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-j}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ with } j < k + \ell + \frac{3}{2} \quad (2.60)$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and $(E, L) \in J$.

Finally, $T, \omega \in C^\infty(J) \cap C^j(\bar{J})$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, k + \ell + \frac{5}{2})$.

Proof. It has already been shown in [27, Rem. A.3.5] that $r(\theta, \cdot, \cdot) \in C^j(\bar{J})$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, k + \ell + \frac{5}{2})$. Similarly, the claim (2.55) in the case $j = 1$ has been shown in [27, Lemma 6.3.2]. It follows by differentiating the characteristic flow with respect to E and L , which promptly implies that the leading order singular behaviour near the elliptic point E_{\min}^L is described by the $\partial_{Er-}(E, L)$ and $\partial_{Lr-}(E, L)$ near (E_{\min}^L, L) . This in turn is easily seen to be proportional to the inverse of $\Psi'_L(r)$ near $r = r_L$, which gives (2.55) with $j = 1$. The bounds on higher derivatives now follow by similar arguments, differentiating the characteristic flow. The limitation $j < k + \ell + \frac{5}{2}$ comes simply from the regularity of the potential Ψ_L , which at the boundary of $[R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ is in C^j for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap (0, k + \ell + \frac{7}{2})$, see [27].

The expansions (2.56)–(2.59) follow similarly to Lemma 2.5; see [15, Sc. A.3] for a detailed discussion of the properties of $\partial_L R$. We observe that, close to a trapping point r_L , the potential Ψ_L is actually smooth, and hence the limitation on the regularity occurs only at the boundary points, $\{R_{\min}, R_{\max}\}$, leading to the claimed restriction on the number of derivatives. The regularity statement for the period function T (and therefore the frequency function ω) now follow by arguments analogous to [15, Ch. 3] and [27, App. A]. \square

We introduce the change of variables

$$(E, L) \mapsto (q(E, L), L), \quad q(E, L) = \omega(E, L).$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial(q, L)}{\partial(E, L)} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega' & \partial_L \omega \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{\partial(E, L)}{\partial(q, L)} = \begin{pmatrix} (\omega')^{-1} & -\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where we recall the monotonicity assumption (1.44). As in (1.18), the symbol $'$ always denotes the E -derivative of a function depending on (E, L) . Further note that $\omega' = O(1)$

and $\partial_L \omega = O(\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ by [27, Sc. 6.2.1]. Given $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$, we introduce the notations

$$\omega_R(L) = \omega(\Psi_L(R), L), \quad \omega_*(L) = \omega(E_L^{\min}, L), \quad \omega_0(L) = \omega(E_0, L),$$

as well as $\omega_*^{\min} := \inf_J \omega$ and $\omega_0^{\max} := \sup_J \omega$.

The next lemma enables us to exchange q derivatives of $\widehat{h}_R(m, E(q, L), L)$ for an L derivative at the cost of a less singular remainder term. This will be crucial in using L regularity to obtain enhanced decay.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$. Then there exist functions $Q_i(E, L)$, $Q_i \in C^2(J)$, $i = 1, 2$, bounded on \bar{J} and satisfying*

$$|\partial^{(j)} Q_1(E, L)| + (E - E_{\min}^L)^{j-\frac{1}{2}} |\partial^{(j)} Q_2(E, L)| \leq C, \quad (E, L) \in J, \quad (2.61)$$

for $1 \leq j < k + \ell + \frac{1}{2}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_q(\widehat{h}_R(m, E(q, L), L)) &= Q_1(E(q, L), L) \partial_L(\widehat{h}_R(m, E(q, L), L)) \\ &\quad + Q_2(E(q, L), L) \cos(2\pi m \theta(R, E(q, L), L)) \partial_L(w(R, E(q, L), L)) \end{aligned}$$

for (q, L) with $(E(q, L), L) \in J$ and $E(q, L) \in (\Psi_L(R), E_0]$, i.e., $q < \omega_R(L)$.

Proof. We begin by expanding the E and L derivatives of $\theta(R, E, L)$. Noting the simple identities

$$\partial_E \theta(R, E, L) = -\frac{\partial_{Er}(\theta(R, E, L), E, L)}{T(E, L)w(R, E, L)}, \quad (2.62)$$

$$\partial_L \theta(R, E, L) = -\frac{\partial_{Lr}(\theta(R, E, L), E, L)}{T(E, L)w(R, E, L)}, \quad (2.63)$$

we then apply (2.57)–(2.59) to decompose the derivatives ∂_{Er} and ∂_{Lr} and observe

$$\left| \partial^{(j)} \left(\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \right) \right| \leq C, \quad j = 0, 1, 2. \quad (2.64)$$

Thus

$$\partial_E \theta(R, E, L) = -\frac{\partial_{Er}}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \frac{(\partial_{Lr})_0}{Tw} = \frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \left(\partial_L \theta + \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}}{Tw} \right) - \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Er}}}{Tw}.$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_L(\widehat{h}_R(m, E(q, L), L)) &= 2 \cos(2\pi m \theta(R, E(q, L), L)) \partial_L(\theta(R, E(q, L), L)) \\ &= 2 \cos(2\pi m \theta(R, E(q, L), L)) \left((\partial_E \theta)(R, E(q, L), L) \left(-\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} \right) + (\partial_L \theta)(R, E(q, L), L) \right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\partial_q(\widehat{h}_R(m, E(q, L), L)) = 2 \cos(2\pi m\theta(R, E(q, L), L))(\partial_E\theta)(R, E(q, L), L)\frac{1}{\omega'}.$$

Now, setting

$$\mu(E, L) := -\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \frac{\partial_L\omega}{\omega'} \left(1 - \frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \frac{\partial_L\omega}{\omega'}\right)^{-1} = O(\varepsilon),$$

where we note that μ is bounded in $C^2(\bar{J})$ by (2.64), we expand

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_E\theta)(R, E(q, L), L)\frac{1}{\omega'} &= \mu \partial_E\theta \frac{1}{\omega'} + \frac{1-\mu}{\omega'} \left[\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \left(\partial_L\theta + \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}}{T}\right) - \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Er}}}{Tw} \right] \\ &= \frac{(1-\mu)}{\omega'} \frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \left((\partial_E\theta) \left(-\frac{\partial_L\omega}{\omega'}\right) + (\partial_L\theta) \right) + \frac{1-\mu}{\omega'} \left[\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}}{Tw} - \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Er}}}{Tw} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that $w(R, E(q, L), L) = \sqrt{2(E(q, L) - \Psi_L(R))}$, so that

$$\partial_L(w(R, E(q, L), L)) = \frac{\partial_L(E(q, L)) - \partial_L(\Psi_L(R))}{w} = -\frac{1}{w} \left(\frac{\partial_L\omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right). \quad (2.65)$$

Again using that $\omega_L = O(\varepsilon)$, the factor on the right hand side is uniformly bounded away from zero. We therefore re-write

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1-\mu}{\omega'} \left[\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}}{T} - \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Er}}}{T} \right] \frac{1}{w} \\ &= -\left(\frac{\partial_L\omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \frac{1-\mu}{\omega'} \left[\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}}{T} - \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Er}}}{T} \right] \partial_L(w(R, E(q, L), L)). \end{aligned}$$

Now setting

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(E, L) &= \frac{(1-\mu)}{\omega'} \frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0}, \\ Q_2(E, L) &= \left(\frac{\partial_L\omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \frac{1-\mu}{\omega'} \left[\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{(\partial_{Lr})_0} \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Lr}}}{T} - \frac{\widetilde{\partial_{Er}}}{T} \right], \end{aligned}$$

we have obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_q(\widehat{h}_R(m, E(q, L), L)) &= 2 \cos(2\pi m\theta(R, E(q, L), L))(\partial_E\theta)(R, E(q, L), L)\frac{1}{\omega'} \\ &= 2 \cos(2\pi m\theta(R, E(q, L), L)) \left(Q_1 \partial_L(\theta(R, E(q, L), L)) + Q_2 \partial_L(w(R, E(q, L), L)) \right) \\ &= Q_1 \partial_L(\widehat{h}_R(m, E(q, L), L)) + 2 \cos(2\pi m\theta(R, E(q, L), L)) Q_2 \partial_L(w(R, E(q, L), L)), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed, where the bounds on Q_1 and Q_2 come from (2.64), (2.60), and the smoothness of ω . \square

Lemma 2.16 (Integral identities). *Let $F : J \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a C^1 -function that vanishes on ∂J_{vac} , see (1.35). Then the following identities hold*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \widehat{h}_R(m, q, L) F \, dq \, dL \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \mathcal{A}_1 F + w \cos(2\pi m \theta) \mathcal{A}_2 F \right] \, dq \, dL \end{aligned} \quad (2.66)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 F &:= \partial_L (Q_1 F) + 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\frac{\partial_{E^r}}{\omega'} + \partial_L r \right) \frac{Q_2 F}{T} - \partial_q F, \\ \mathcal{A}_2 F &:= \partial_L (Q_2 F). \end{aligned} \quad (2.67)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} w \cos(2\pi m \theta) F \, dq \, dL \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \mathcal{B}_1 F + w \cos(2\pi m \theta) \mathcal{B}_2 F \right] \, dq \, dL, \end{aligned} \quad (2.68)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1 F &:= -2\pi^2 m^2 \frac{\partial_{E^r}}{T \omega'} F - 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\frac{\partial_{E^r}}{\omega'} + \partial_L r \right) \frac{F}{\omega' \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right) T}, \\ \mathcal{B}_2 F &:= -\partial_q F - \partial_L \left(\frac{F}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.69)$$

Proof. Integrating-by-parts we get

$$\int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \widehat{h}_R F \, dq \, dL = \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \partial_q \left(\widehat{h}_R F \right) \, dq \, dL,$$

where we have used that F vanishes on ∂J_{vac} to eliminate the boundary terms in the integration by parts due to $F(E(\omega_0(L), L), L) = F(E_0, L) = 0$. We also used

$$\sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E(\omega_R(L), L), L)) = \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, \Psi_L(R), L)) = 0. \quad (2.70)$$

Distributing derivatives, recalling that $\widehat{h}_R(m, E, L)$ is real-valued, and applying Lemma 2.15 gives

$$\partial_q \left(\widehat{h}_R F \right) = \widehat{h}_R \partial_q F + \partial_q \left(\widehat{h}_R \right) F = \widehat{h}_R \partial_q F + Q_1 \partial_L \left(\widehat{h}_R \right) F + Q_2 \cos(2\pi m \theta) \partial_L (w) F.$$

We next wish to integrate-by-parts with respect to L . To do that we use Fubini's theorem; to change the domain of integration, we observe that the boundary segment $\{(q, L) = (\omega_R(L), L)\}$ corresponds to the curve $E = \Psi_L(R)$, at which w and

$\sin(2\pi m\theta(R, E, L))$ both vanish. Moreover, as $|\omega'| \geq c_0 > 0$ and $\partial_L \omega = O(\varepsilon)$, we find that $\omega_R(L)$ is an invertible function of L in the regime $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left(Q_1 \partial_L (\widehat{h}_R) F + Q_2 \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L (w) F \right) dq dL \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\omega_*^{\min}}^{\omega_0^{\max}} \int_{L_0}^{\omega_R^{-1}(q)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left(\widehat{h}_R \partial_L (Q_1 F) + w \partial_L (Q_2 \cos(2\pi m\theta) F) \right) dL dq \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\omega_*^{\min}}^{\omega_0^{\max}} \left[e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left(Q_1 \widehat{h}_R F + w Q_2 \cos(2\pi m\theta) F \right) \right] \Big|_{L=L_0}^{L=\omega_R^{-1}(q)} dq \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left(\widehat{h}_R \partial_L (Q_1 F) + w \partial_L (Q_2 \cos(2\pi m\theta) F) \right) dq dL,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the above remark to eliminate the upper boundary term, and the lower boundary term vanishes because F vanishes on ∂J_{vac} . We have again applied Fubini's theorem in the last line. To further simplify one of the resulting terms, we observe that for any sufficiently smooth function $j : J \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_L \left(\cos(2\pi m\theta) j \right) &= -2\pi m \sin(2\pi m\theta) w \left(\partial_E \theta \frac{1}{\omega'} + \partial_L \theta \right) j + w \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L j \\
&= 2\pi^2 m^2 \widehat{h}_R \left(\frac{\partial_E r}{\omega'} + \partial_L r \right) \frac{j}{T} + w \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L j,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.71}$$

where we have again used (2.62) and (2.63).

Altogether, we have obtained

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \widehat{h}_R F dq dL \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \partial_L (Q_1 F) + w \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L (Q_2 F) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\pi^2 m^2 \widehat{h}_R \left(\frac{\partial_E r}{\omega'} + \partial_L r \right) \frac{Q_2}{T} F - \widehat{h}_R \partial_q F \right] dq dL \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \left[\partial_L (Q_1 F) + 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\frac{\partial_E r}{\omega'} + \partial_L r \right) \frac{Q_2}{T} F - \partial_q F \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + w \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L (Q_2 F) \right] dq dL,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have also used (2.71) with $j = Q_2 F$. This is precisely (2.66).

We note that, by (2.65),

$$\partial_q (w(R, E(q, L), L)) = -\frac{1}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \partial_L (w(R, E(q, L), L)),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_q (w \cos(2\pi m\theta)(R, E(q, L), L)) \\
&= -\frac{1}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L(w) + 2\pi m \sin(2\pi m\theta) \frac{\partial_{Er}}{T\omega'} \\
&= -\frac{1}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L(w) + 2\pi^2 m^2 \widehat{h}_R \frac{\partial_{Er}}{T\omega'},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the chain rule and re-written $\partial_q \theta = \partial_E \theta \frac{1}{\omega'}$ and $\partial_E \theta = -\frac{\partial_{Er}}{T\omega'}$. Therefore, with the test function F vanishing at ∂J_{vac} and w vanishing at $q = \omega_R(L)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} w \cos(2\pi m\theta) F \, dq \, dL \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\partial_q (w \cos(2\pi m\theta)) F + w \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_q F \right] dq \, dL \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[-\frac{1}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \cos(2\pi m\theta) F \partial_L(w) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \widehat{h}_R 2\pi^2 m^2 \frac{\partial_{Er}}{T\omega'} F + w \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_q F \right] dq \, dL. \quad (2.72)
\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Fubini and integrate by parts with respect to L in the first term above to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \frac{1}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \cos(2\pi m\theta) F \partial_L(w) \, dq \, dL \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\omega_*^{\min}}^{\omega_0^{\max}} \int_{L_0}^{\omega_R^{-1}(q)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \frac{1}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \cos(2\pi m\theta) F \partial_L(w) \, dL \, dq \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[2\pi^2 m^2 \widehat{h}_R \left(\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'} + \partial_L r \right) \frac{F}{\omega' \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right) T} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + w \cos(2\pi m\theta) \partial_L \left(\frac{F}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1} \right) \right] dq \, dL, \quad (2.73)
\end{aligned}$$

where no boundary terms are present due to $F = 0$ on ∂J_{vac} , and the fact that both \widehat{h}_R and w vanish at $E = \Psi_L(R)$. In the last line above we used (2.71) with $j = \frac{F}{\omega'} \left(\frac{\partial_L \omega}{\omega'} + \frac{1}{2R^2} \right)^{-1}$. We now combine (2.72)–(2.73) to obtain (2.68). \square

We now iterate the previous lemma to obtain a suitable high-order version of it, which will be used to obtain the time-decay of the gravitational force field.

Lemma 2.17. *Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$, and $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ be given. Assume that for any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$, the map $(E, L) \mapsto r(\theta, E, L) \in C^{p+1}(\bar{J})$, $T \in C^{p+1}(\bar{J})$. Moreover, let $F \in C^p(J)$ and assume that for all $j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, $\partial^{(j)} F$ vanishes on ∂J_{vac} (see (1.35)). Then the following formula holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \widehat{h}_R(m, E, L) \widehat{f}_0 T \, dE \, dL \\ &= \frac{1}{(-2\pi i m t)^p} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \mathcal{P}_p \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) + w \cos(2\pi m \theta) \mathcal{Q}_p \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) \right] dq \, dL, \end{aligned}$$

as long as the integrand of the right-hand side belongs to $L^1(J)$. Here the operators $\mathcal{P}_p, \mathcal{Q}_p$ are given through the following formula

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{P}_p \\ \mathcal{Q}_p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_1 & \mathcal{B}_1 \\ \mathcal{A}_2 & \mathcal{B}_2 \end{pmatrix}^{p-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_1 \\ \mathcal{A}_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.74)$$

Proof. Changing variables to (q, L) we obtain

$$\int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E, L) t} \widehat{h}_R \widehat{f}_0 T \, dE \, dL = \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \widehat{h}_R \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \, dq \, dL.$$

We now apply Lemma 2.16 successively p -times and the above formula follows. The vanishing at vacuum assumptions are used to eliminate the boundary integrals arising at $E = E_0$ and $L = L_0$. At turning points of the flow, which represent another boundary contribution from the integration, the radial velocity w vanishes and we also use the identity (2.70), which implies that \widehat{h}_R vanishes at those points. \square

Lemma 2.18. *Let $k > 1$ and $\ell > 0$ be the given polytropic indices of the steady state (1.13).*

(a) *Given $f_0 = |\varphi'(E, L)| g_0$ for some $g_0 \in W^{N, \infty}(\Omega)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$ we have, for $(E, L) \in J$, $j \leq N$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \partial^{(j)} \widehat{f}_0(m, E, L) \right| \\ & \leq C \sum_{n=0}^j \frac{1}{|m|^{N-n}} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-n} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{j-n} (E_0 - E)^{k-1-s} (L - L_0)^{\ell-(j-n-s)} \right). \quad (2.75) \end{aligned}$$

(b) *Under the assumptions of part (a) with $g_0 \in W^{2, \infty}(\Omega)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$*

such that for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$ we have, for $(E, L) \in J$,

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| \leq C |\varphi'| \left(\sum_{n=0}^1 \frac{1}{|m|^{2-n}} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-n} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{1-n} (E_0 - E)^{-s} (L - L_0)^{-(1-n-s)} \right) + 1 \right) \quad (2.76)$$

$$\left| \mathcal{Q}_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| \leq C |\varphi'| \left(\sum_{n=0}^1 \frac{1}{|m|^{2-n}} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-n} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{1-n} (E_0 - E)^{-s} (L - L_0)^{-(1-n-s)} \right) \right) \quad (2.77)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{P}_2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| &\leq C |\varphi'| \left(\sum_{n=0}^2 \frac{1}{|m|^{2-n}} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-n} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{2-n} (E_0 - E)^{-s} (L - L_0)^{-(2-n-s)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |m| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{-1} + (L - L_0)^{-1} + m^2 (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{|m^2 \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)|}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.78)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{Q}_2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| &\leq C |\varphi'| \left(\sum_{n=0}^2 \frac{1}{|m|^{2-n}} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-n} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{2-n} (E_0 - E)^{-s} (L - L_0)^{-(2-n-s)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| m \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right| + (E_0 - E)^{-1} + (L - L_0)^{-1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.79)$$

Proof. Claim (2.75) is a trivial consequence of the explicit structures of f_0 and φ and Lemma 2.1 which with trivial modifications applies to functions on $\mathbb{S}^1 \times J$ and, by Lemma 2.14, also to their derivatives with respect to E and L .

The estimate (2.76) follows now directly from (2.75) and the formulae (2.67), (2.69), and (2.74). More precisely, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) &= \mathcal{A}_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \\ &= \partial_L \left(Q_1 \frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) + 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right) \frac{Q_2 \widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{\omega'} - \partial_q \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We note that $|\partial_{Er}|, |\partial_{Lr}| \lesssim (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and since $g_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ we also have $|\widehat{g}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot)| \leq \frac{C\sqrt{E - E_{\min}^L}}{m^2}$ by Lemma 2.1. Since Q_2 is bounded on \bar{J} by Lemma 2.15, the second summand above is bounded by a constant multiple of $|\varphi'(E, L)|$. Since $|\partial^{(1)} \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|m|} |\partial^{(1)} \widehat{\partial_\theta g_0}| \lesssim \frac{1}{|m|} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, the third term on the right-hand side above is bounded by

$$\left| \partial_q \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{|m|} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\varphi'(E, L)| + \frac{1}{|m|^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-2} (L - L_0)^\ell (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and similarly,

$$|\partial_L \left(Q_1 \frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|m|} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\varphi'(E, L)| + \frac{1}{|m|^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The estimate (2.77) also follows by a bound similar to the latter one.

To verify the bound (2.78), we further distribute derivatives, as

$$\mathcal{P}_2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) = \mathcal{A}_1 \mathcal{A}_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) + \mathcal{B}_1 \mathcal{A}_2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right).$$

We demonstrate the estimate for the first summand on the right, as the second follows from similar considerations. Expanding from (2.67), we observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{A}_1^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \\ &= \partial_L \left(Q_1 \partial_L (Q_1 \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}) \right) - \partial_q \partial_L (Q_1 \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}) - \partial_L \left(Q_1 \partial_q \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) \right) - \partial_q^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) \\ &+ 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\partial_L \left(Q_1 \left(\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right) Q_2 \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) - \partial_q \left(\left(\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right) Q_2 \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) \right) \\ &+ 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right) \frac{Q_2}{T} \left(\partial_L (Q_1 F) - \partial_q F \right) + 4\pi^4 m^4 \left(\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right)^2 Q_2^2 \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.80}$$

The first line is easily bounded using (2.75) to control the derivatives of \widehat{f}_0 , using also that $T \in C^3$, $|\partial^{(j)} Q_i| \leq C(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}-j}$ for $i, j = 1, 2$. We therefore focus on the remaining terms. Starting with the middle line, we first apply (2.60) and (2.61) to estimate

$$\left| \partial^{(1)} \left(\left(\widetilde{\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'}} + \widetilde{\partial_{Lr}} \right) Q_1 Q_2 \right) \right| \leq C(E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \partial^{(1)} \left(Q_1 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right) \frac{Q_2 \widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \partial^{(1)} \left(Q_1 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\frac{(\partial_{Er})_0}{\omega'} + (\partial_{Lr})_0 \right) \frac{Q_2 \widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \partial^{(1)} \left(Q_1 2\pi^2 m^2 \left(\widetilde{\frac{\partial_{Er}}{\omega'}} + \widetilde{\partial_{Lr}} \right) \frac{Q_2 \widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right| \\ & \leq C \left(|m| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^\ell + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} (L - L_0)^\ell + (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we notice that

$$\left| \left(\frac{m^2 \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right| + (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right| \leq C \|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}},$$

by arguments similar to Lemma 2.8. The remaining m^2 -terms can be estimated in the same way.

Finally, we control the terms containing a power m^4 by simply estimating

$$\left| 4\pi^4 m^4 \left(\frac{\partial_{E^r}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right)^2 \frac{Q_2^2 \widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(\omega')^2} \right| \leq C \frac{m^2}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{|m^2 \widehat{f}_0(m, E, L)|}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

This concludes the proof of (2.78). To prove (2.79) we note that by Lemma 2.17 we have $Q_2 = \mathcal{A}_2 \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_2 \mathcal{A}_2$, where we recall (2.67) and (2.69). Focusing first on $\mathcal{A}_2 \mathcal{A}_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_2 \mathcal{A}_1 \left(Q_1 \frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) &= \partial_L \left(Q_2 \partial_L \left(Q_1 \frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right) - \partial_L \left(Q_2 \partial_q \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot) T}{\omega'} \right) \right) \\ &+ 2\pi^2 m^2 \partial_L \left(Q_2 \left(\frac{\partial_{E^r}}{\omega'} + \partial_{Lr} \right) \frac{Q_2 \widehat{f}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{\omega'} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.81)$$

The first line is again easily bounded using (2.75) to control the derivatives of \widehat{f}_0 , and is bounded by the first line of the right-hand side of (2.79). To control the second line of (2.81), we notice that it retains the same singular structure as the second line on the right-hand side of (2.80). Similar argument applies to the term $\mathcal{B}_2 \mathcal{A}_2$. Using the same ideas as above, we obtain (2.79). \square

3 Decay in the 1+1-dimensional case

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3 concerning decay for the 1+1-dimensional case.

Our first goal is to obtain a quantitative decay estimate for the time-derivative of the spatial density $\rho_f(t, r)$ defined in (1.20). To that end, we shall need to be careful in the vicinity of the elliptic point $r = r_*$ (see Figure 1), so we first introduce a pair of useful integral estimates.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\alpha, \beta < 0$, $A > 0$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}A)$. Then, for any $a \in [4\delta, A]$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending on A, α, β , but independent of δ, a , such that*

$$\int_{\delta}^{a-\delta} (a-x)^{\alpha} x^{\beta} dx \leq C \delta^{\alpha+\beta+1}, \quad \text{if } \alpha + \beta < -1, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\int_{\delta}^{2\delta} (a-x)^{\alpha} x^{\beta} dx \leq C \delta^{\alpha+\beta+1}, \quad \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in (-1, 0). \quad (3.2)$$

The proof follows from direct evaluation of the integrals and the standard properties of hypergeometric functions.

Proposition 3.2 (Decay of macroscopic density). *Let f be the solution to the pure transport equation (1.3) with initial data $f_0 = |\varphi'(E)|g_0$ for some $g_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and suppose $k > \frac{1}{2}$. Then there exists a constant $C = C\|g_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\bar{\Omega})} > 0$, depending on k , such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\|\partial_t \rho_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq C \begin{cases} (1 + |t|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & k \geq 1, \\ (1 + |t|)^{-(k-\frac{1}{2})}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1). \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, if f_0 additionally satisfies the orthogonality condition $f_0 \in \ker \mathcal{D}^\perp$ (recall (1.47)), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq C \begin{cases} (1 + |t|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & k \geq 1, \\ (1 + |t|)^{-(k-\frac{1}{2})}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1). \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. For the purpose of proving decay of $\partial_t \rho_f$ it is equivalent to work with the modified density

$$\tilde{\rho}(t, r) := \int f \, dw = \frac{r^2}{\pi} \rho_f(t, r).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{\rho} &= - \int \omega(E) \partial_\theta f \, dw \\ &= - \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} \omega(E) \frac{\partial_\theta f(t, \theta(r, E), E) + \partial_\theta f(t, 1 - \theta(r, E), E)}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi(r))}} \, dE =: \tilde{\rho}_{t1} + \tilde{\rho}_{t2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where we have used the change of variables $w \mapsto E$ for a given fixed r . An immediate consequence of (3.5) is that

$$\|\partial_t \rho_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq C, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.6)$$

As for the decay estimate (3.3), we focus on the first term $\tilde{\rho}_{t1}$ on the right-hand side of (3.5). The estimates for the second term $\tilde{\rho}_{t2}$ follow in the same way by replacing the initial value f_0 with $(\theta, E) \mapsto f_0(1 - \theta, E)$. We first recall the solution formula (1.52)–(1.54) to infer

$$\partial_E(f_0 \circ T_t) = (\theta_E - \omega'(E)t) \partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t + \partial_E f_0 \circ T_t, \quad (3.7)$$

which yields the identity

$$\partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t = \frac{-1}{\omega'(E)t} (\partial_E(f_0 \circ T_t) - \partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t \theta_E - \partial_E f_0 \circ T_t). \quad (3.8)$$

Note that the left-hand side of (3.8) is precisely $\partial_\theta f$ by (1.52) and therefore from (3.5) and (3.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{t1}(t, r) &= - \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} \omega(E) \frac{\partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi(r))}} dE \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} \frac{\omega(E)}{\omega'(E)} \frac{\partial_E(f_0 \circ T_t) - \partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t \theta_E - \partial_E f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi(r))}} dE.\end{aligned}\quad (3.9)$$

We now recall that $f_0 = |\varphi'(E)|g_0$, where $g_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\bar{\Omega})$, and so

$$|\partial_\theta f_0| \leq C\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}(E_0 - E)^{k-1}.$$

Let $\delta = \frac{1}{t} > 0$. Now, in the case that $E_0 - \Psi(r) \leq 4\delta$, we easily obtain

$$|\tilde{\rho}_{t1}(t, r)| \leq C \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} \frac{(E_0 - E)^{k-1}}{\sqrt{E - \Psi(r)}} dE \leq \begin{cases} C\delta^{k-\frac{1}{2}}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1], \\ C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, & k > 1, \end{cases}\quad (3.10)$$

where we have applied (3.2) in the first case.

We now suppose that $E_0 - \Psi(r) \geq 4\delta$. Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Psi(r) + \frac{\delta}{2}, E_0 - \frac{\delta}{2})$ be such that $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$, $\phi(E) \equiv 1$ for $E \in (\Psi(r) + \delta, E_0 - \delta)$, and $|\phi'(E)| \leq \frac{4}{\delta}$. For convenience of notation, we define

$$I_\delta = (\Psi(r) + \frac{\delta}{4}, E_0 - \frac{\delta}{4}).$$

First we re-write (3.9) as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{t1}(t, r) &= \frac{2}{t} \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} \frac{\phi(E)\omega(E)}{\omega'(E)} \frac{\partial_E(f_0 \circ T_t)}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi(r))}} dE \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{t} \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} \frac{\phi(E)\omega(E)}{\omega'(E)} \frac{(\partial_\theta f_0) \circ T_t \theta_E + (\partial_E f_0) \circ T_t}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi(r))}} dE \\ &\quad - \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} (1 - \phi(E))\omega(E) \frac{\partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi(r))}} dE \\ &=: I(t, r) + II(t, r) + III(t, r).\end{aligned}$$

The main term is $I(t, r)$, and so we first treat this. Observing that ϕ vanishes at both end-points of the interval, we integrate by parts with respect to E and obtain

$$I(t, r) = - \frac{2}{t} \int_{\Psi(r)}^{E_0} \left(\partial_E \left(\frac{\phi(E)\omega(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \frac{f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi(r))}} - \frac{\phi(E)\omega(E)}{\omega'(E)} \frac{f_0 \circ T_t}{(2(E - \Psi(r)))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) dE$$

Recall that $T \in C^2(I)$ and hence $\omega \in C^2(I)$ also by [12, Lemma 3.4]. Thus, we obtain the simple estimate

$$\left| \partial_E \left(\frac{\phi(E)\omega(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right| \leq \begin{cases} C\delta^{-1}, & E \in (\Psi(r) + \frac{\delta}{2}, \Psi(r) + \delta) \cup (E_0 - \delta, E_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}), \\ C, & E \in [\Psi(r) + \delta, E_0 - \delta]. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, as $|f_0| \leq C(E_0 - E)^{k-1}$, we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|I(t, r)| &\leq \frac{C}{\delta t} \left(\int_{\Psi(r)+\frac{\delta}{2}}^{\Psi(r)+\delta} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (E - \Psi(r))^{-\frac{1}{2}} dE + \int_{E_0-\delta}^{E_0-\frac{\delta}{2}} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (E - \Psi(r))^{-\frac{1}{2}} dE \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{C}{t} \int_{\Psi(r)+\delta}^{E_0-\delta} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (E - \Psi(r))^{-\frac{3}{2}} dE \\
&\leq C \begin{cases} t^{-1} \delta^{k-\frac{3}{2}} = Ct^{-(k-\frac{1}{2})}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1), \\ t^{-1} \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} = Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & k \geq 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where we have applied (3.1)–(3.2) to estimate the integrals in the first case.

For term $II(t, r)$, we first obtain the estimate

$$|(\partial_\theta f_0) \circ T_t \theta_E + (\partial_E f_0) \circ T_t| \leq \frac{C(E_0 - E)^{k-1}}{\sqrt{E - \Psi(r)}} + C(E_0 - E)^{k-2},$$

where we have used that $|\theta_E| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{E - E_{\min}} \sqrt{E - \Psi(r)}}$ by Lemma 2.4, $|\partial_\theta f_0| \leq C(E_0 - E)^{k-1} \sqrt{E - E_{\min}}$, and

$$|\partial_E f_0| \leq |\varphi'| |\partial_E g_0| + |\varphi''| |g_0| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}} + C(E_0 - E)^{k-2},$$

along with $\Psi(r) \geq E_{\min}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|II(t, r)| &\leq \frac{C}{|t|} \int_{\Psi(r)+\frac{\delta}{2}}^{E_0-\frac{\delta}{2}} \left(\frac{(E_0 - E)^{k-1}}{E - \Psi(r)} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} \right) dE \\
&\leq C \begin{cases} t^{-1} \delta^{k-1} = t^{-k}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \\ t^{-1} |\log \delta| = \frac{\log t}{t}, & k \geq 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where we have again applied (3.1).

Finally, for $III(t, r)$, we again use $|\partial_\theta f_0| \leq C(E_0 - E)^{k-1}$ to obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
|III(t, r)| &\leq C \int_{\Psi(r)}^{\Psi(r)+\delta} \frac{(E_0 - E)^{k-1}}{\sqrt{E - \Psi(r)}} dE + C \int_{E_0-\delta}^{E_0-\frac{\delta}{2}} \frac{(E_0 - E)^{k-1}}{\sqrt{E - \Psi(r)}} dE \\
&\leq C \begin{cases} \delta^{k-\frac{1}{2}} = t^{-(k-\frac{1}{2})}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1), \\ \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} = -t^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & k \geq 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where we have applied (3.2).

Thus, recalling (3.10) and combining (3.11)–(3.13), overall, we have obtained

$$|\rho_t(t, r)| \leq C \begin{cases} t^{-(k-\frac{1}{2})}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1), \\ t^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & k \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

which, combined with (3.6), yields (3.3).

We next show (3.4). Since the assumption (1.47) is dynamically preserved by the solutions of (1.50), it follows that $f(t, \cdot, \cdot) \in (\ker \mathcal{D})^\perp$, and therefore there exists a unique $g(t, \cdot, \cdot) \in (\ker \mathcal{D})^\perp$ [11] such that

$$f = -\mathcal{D}g,$$

and moreover $g(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ is a solution of the transport equation (1.50). It follows that

$$\rho_f = - \int \omega(E) \partial_\theta g \, dw$$

and we may now follow the proof of (3.3) verbatim. \square

We next establish the decay for the gradient of the gravitational potential.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $f_0 = |\varphi'(E)|g_0$ where $g_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ be such that $f_0 \in \ker \mathcal{D}^\perp$ and suppose $k > \frac{1}{2}$. Let $f(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ be the solution to (1.3) with initial data $f(0, \cdot, \cdot) = f_0(\cdot, \cdot)$. Then there exists a constant $C = C\|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}}$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\|\partial_r U_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq \begin{cases} C(1+|t|)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, & k \geq \frac{3}{2}, \\ C(1+|t|)^{-k}, & k \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}). \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. We prove the theorem in the case $k \geq 1$ as the remaining case, $k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ follows from similar arguments. Our starting point is the representation formula (2.3). Switching to the action-angle variables and using the Parseval identity, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} R^2 \partial_R U_f(t, R) &= 4\pi^2 \int_I \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_R(r(\theta, E)) f T(E) \, d\theta \, dE \\ &= 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_I \widehat{f}(t, m, E) \overline{\widehat{h}_R(m, E)} T(E) \, dE \\ &= 4\pi \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} H_{f_0}(m, E) T(E) \, dE, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where we recall the formula (1.58), use Lemma 2.10, and recall the function $H_{f_0}(m, E)$ from (2.34). Using the nonstationary phase argument, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} H_{f_0}(m, E) T(E) \, dE \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(H_{f_0}(m, E) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \, dE \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \widehat{f}_0(m, E) \sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E)) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \Big|_{E=\Psi(R)}^{E=E_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

The boundary term at $E = \Psi(R)$ vanishes since there $\theta(R, E) = \theta(R, \Psi(R)) = \frac{1}{2}$ and therefore $\sin(2\pi m\theta(R, \Psi(R))) = 0$.

In the case $k = 1$, the boundary term at E_0 is merely bounded by $C|m|^{-2}$ from (2.1) and the identity $f_0 = \varepsilon k(E_0 - E)^{k-1}g_0$. We then estimate the remaining integral term in this case by a further $C|m|^{-2}$ by noting that $\partial_E H_{f_0} = \varepsilon \partial_E H_{g_0}$ and applying (2.43) to see that the integral converges.

When $k > 1$, we notice that the boundary term at $E = E_0$ vanishes due to $f_0 = \varepsilon k(E_0 - E)^{k-1}g_0$, and therefore only the integral remains in (3.16). To obtain (3.14), we first take $\delta > 0$ to be chosen later and separate the cases $E_0 - \Psi(R) \leq 4\delta$ and $E_0 - \Psi(R) > 4\delta$. In the former case, noting that $H_{f_0} = |\varphi'(E)|H_{g_0}$ and applying estimate (2.43), we obtain

$$\left| \frac{d}{dE} H_{f_0}(m, E) \right| \leq \frac{C}{|m|} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{C}{|m|^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-2}. \quad (3.17)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} H_{f_0}(m, E) T(E) dE \right| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t} \int_{E_0 - 4\delta}^{E_0} \left((E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} \right) dE \\ &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t} (\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{k-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

In the remaining case $E_0 - \Psi(R) > 4\delta$, we introduce a cut-off function $\varphi_\delta(E) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $0 \leq \varphi_\delta \leq 1$, $\varphi_\delta(E) = 0$ for $E \leq \Psi(R) + \delta$ and $E \geq E_0 - \delta$, $\varphi_\delta(E) = 1$ for $\Psi(R) + 2\delta \leq E \leq E_0 - 2\delta$, and $|\varphi'_\delta(E)| \leq \frac{2}{\delta}$. Then, arguing further from (3.16),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} H_{f_0}(m, E) T(E) dE \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \partial_E \left(\varphi_\delta(E) \frac{d}{dE} \left(H_{f_0}(m, E) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) dE \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} (1 - \varphi_\delta(E)) \frac{d}{dE} \left(H_{f_0}(m, E) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) dE \\ &=: I_m + II_m. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we observe that $H_{f_0}(m, E) = |\varphi'(E)|H_{g_0}(m, E)$, so that from Lemma 2.13, specifically (2.48), we obtain the bounds, for $\Psi(R) + \delta \leq E \leq E_0 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{d}{dE} \left(H_{f_0}(m, E) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) \right| \\ &\leq C(E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - \Psi(R))^{-1} + \frac{C}{|m|} (E_0 - E)^{k-2} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{C}{m^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-3}, \\ &|\varphi'_\delta(E)| \left| \frac{d}{dE} \left(H_{f_0}(m, E) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right| \leq \frac{C}{\delta |m|} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{C}{m^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $|H_{g_0}(m, E)| \leq \frac{C}{m^2}$, $k > 1$, and $T \in C^3(\bar{I})$. The latter follows by arguments similar to [12, Lemma 3.4] and [28, Sc. A.4], where we use the boundary regularity $(\partial_r^4 \Psi)(r) \sim (r - R_{\min})^{k-\frac{3}{2}}$ and similarly when $r \sim R_{\max}$.

Moreover, we note the support of $\varphi'_\delta(E)$ on $[\Psi(R), E_0]$ is contained in $[\Psi(R) + \delta, \Psi(R) + 2\delta] \cup [E_0 - 2\delta, E_0 - \delta]$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |I_m| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \left(\int_{\Psi(R)+\delta}^{E_0-\delta} \left((E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{3}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{k-3} \right) dE \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{\Psi(R)+\delta}^{\Psi(R)+2\delta} \left((E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} \right) dE \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{E_0-2\delta}^{E_0-\delta} \left((E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} \right) dE \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} (\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{k-2}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where, if $k \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$, we apply (3.1) to estimate the middle term in the integrand on the first line, and if $k \geq \frac{3}{2}$, we note this term gives rise to a uniformly bounded contribution.

On the other hand, we may apply (3.17) so that

$$\begin{aligned} |II_m| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t} \left(\int_{\Psi(R)}^{\Psi(R)+2\delta} \left((E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} \right) dE \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{E_0-2\delta}^{E_0} \left((E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2} \right) dE \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t} (\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \delta^{k-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Combining (3.18)–(3.20) with (3.15) and choosing $\delta = \frac{1}{t}$, we have obtained, for $k \geq \frac{3}{2}$,

$$|R^2 \partial_R U_f(t, R)| \leq \frac{C}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \frac{1}{m^2} \leq \frac{C}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad t > 0, \tag{3.21}$$

while if $k \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$, we obtain instead

$$|R^2 \partial_R U_f(t, R)| \leq \frac{C}{t^k} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \frac{1}{m^2} \leq \frac{C}{t^k}, \quad t > 0, \tag{3.22}$$

□

Remark 3.4. *It follows from the above proof that if $g_0 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ then there exists a constant $C = C \|g_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$ such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\|\partial_r U_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^\infty} \leq \frac{C}{1 + |t|}. \tag{3.23}$$

The boost in regularity of g_0 does give a faster decay by a factor of $|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ as shown in Proposition 3.3, but unlike the classical Landau damping [21], we do not expect to obtain faster decay-in-time of the gravitational force $\partial_r U_f$ with more regular initial data g_0 .

Corollary 3.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, there exists a constant $C = C\|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}}$ so that*

$$\|\partial_t \partial_r U_f(t, \cdot)\|_{L_r^2} \leq \frac{C}{1+t^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \quad (3.24)$$

Proof. We note that due to (1.3) and Remark 1.10 $\partial_t f \in \ker(\mathcal{D})^\perp$ and therefore the claim follows from Proposition 3.3. \square

We next turn to the question of decay of the time-derivative of the gravitational potential $\partial_t U_f$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $f_0 = |\varphi'(E)|g_0$ for some $g_0 \in W^{3,\infty}(\Omega)$ and let $f(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ be the solution to (1.3) with initial data $f(0, r, w) = f_0(r, w)$. Then, for $k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 2)$, there exists a constant $C = C\|g_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}}$ such that*

$$|\partial_t U_f(t, r)| \leq C(1+t)^{-k}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad r \neq r_*. \quad (3.25)$$

For $k \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C = C(\|f_0\|_{W^{3,\infty}})$ such that

$$|\partial_t U_f(t, r)| \leq C \frac{1 + |\log|r - r_*||}{1+t^2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad r \neq r_*. \quad (3.26)$$

Moreover, if $g_0 \in W^{4,\infty}(\Omega)$, $k \geq \frac{5}{2}$, then in the outer region of the galaxy the pointwise decay rate are improved, i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\partial_t U_f(t, r)| \leq \frac{C|r - r_*|^{-1}}{1 + |t|^{\frac{5}{2}}}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad r > r_*. \quad (3.27)$$

Proof. Our starting point is the representation formula (2.2). Switching to the action-angle variables and using the Parseval identity, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t U_f(t, R) &= 4\pi^2 \int_I \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \frac{w}{r^2} \chi_{r(\theta, E) \geq R} f T(E) \, d\theta \, dE \\ &= 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_I \widehat{f}(t, m, E) \overline{\widehat{w g_R}(m, E)} T(E) \, dE \\ &= 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_I e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \widehat{f_0}(m, E) \overline{\widehat{w g_R}(m, E)} T(E) \, dE \\ &= 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_I e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E) \, dE, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall the formula (1.58), and the definitions (2.33) and (2.4) of $G_{f_0}(m, E)$ and g_R , respectively. Let

$$L(t, m; R) := \int_I e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E) dE. \quad (3.28)$$

Our goal is to integrate-by-parts in (3.28) to recover algebraic decay of $L(t, m; R)$. In the case that $k \in (\frac{1}{2}, 2)$, arguments entirely analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.3, but using now estimates for G_{f_0} in the place of the corresponding estimates for H_{f_0} , yields (3.25). We therefore focus on (3.26)–(3.27).

Suppose that $k \geq 2$. If $R \in (r_*, R_{\max}]$, we have, by (2.31),

$$\begin{aligned} L(t, m; R) &= \frac{-1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} \frac{d}{dE} \left(e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \right) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} G_{f_0}(m, E) dE \\ &= \frac{-1}{2\pi i m t} \left[e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{G_{f_0}(m, E) T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right]_{E=\Psi(R)}^{E=E_0} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) dE \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) dE. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Notice that the boundary terms in the second equality vanishes due to

$$\widehat{f}_0(m, E_0) = |\varphi'(E)| \widehat{g}_0(m, E) = 0$$

as $k \geq 2$ and $\theta(R, \Psi(R)) = \frac{1}{2}$ by (2.9). Integrating-by-parts again we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} L(t, m; R) &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \left[e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right]_{E=\Psi(R)}^{E=E_0} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) dE. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

Note that the lower boundary term vanishes by using the formula (2.35) and the equality $\Theta(R, \Psi(R)) = \frac{1}{2}$ since $R > r_*$. On the other hand, if $k = 2$, the upper boundary term is bounded, while it vanishes if $k > 2$ as $\partial_E f_0 = -\varphi'' g_0 + \varphi' \partial_E g_0$, and \widehat{g}_R is a bounded function.

From the assumptions on $\omega(E) = T(E)^{-1}$, the identity $G_{f_0} = |\varphi'(E)| G_{g_0}$, and crucially Lemma 2.12, we conclude that the argument inside the integral on the right-most side

of (3.30) is bounded by

$$\left| \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E)G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) \right| \leq \frac{C}{|m|} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{C}{|m|^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-3},$$

where the second term is present only if $k > 2$ due to the vanishing of $\frac{d^3}{dE^3} \varphi'(E)$ if $k = 2$. In particular, this is integrable since $R \neq r_*$. In fact, the following bound holds

$$\int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} (E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}} dE \leq C(1 + |\log(\Psi(R) - E_{\min})|),$$

which can be easily verified by a direct calculation. Since $\Psi(R) = E_{\min} + \frac{1}{2}\Psi''(r_*)(R - r_*)^2 + O(|R - r_*|^3)$ and $\frac{1}{2}\Psi''(r_*) \neq 0$ (recall that E_{\min} is a non-degenerate elliptic point), we conclude that there exists a constant C such that

$$|L(t, m; R)| \leq C \frac{1 + |\log |R - r_*||}{|m|^3 t^2}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}^*, R \in (r_*, R_{\max}], t \in \mathbb{R}^*. \quad (3.31)$$

If $R \in [R_{\min}, r_*)$, we repeat the above strategy, but keep in mind that the integration domain is all of I and it splits naturally into regions $I = (E_{\min}, \Psi(R)] \cup (\Psi(R), E_0]$. As in (3.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & L(t, m; R) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \left(\int_{E_{\min}}^{\Psi(R)} + \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} \right) \frac{d}{dE} \left(e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \right) \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)} G_{f_0}(m, E) dE \\ &= \frac{-1}{2\pi i m t} \left[e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{G_{f_0}(m, E) T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right]_{E=\Psi(R)}^{E=E_0} - \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \left[e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{G_{f_0}(m, E) T(E)}{\omega'(E)} \right]_{E=E_{\min}}^{E=\Psi(R)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \left(\int_{E_{\min}}^{\Psi(R)} + \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} \right) e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E)G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) dE \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \left(\int_{E_{\min}}^{\Psi(R)} + \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} \right) e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E)G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) dE. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Here, the boundary term vanishes due to $\hat{f}(m, E_0) = \hat{f}(m, E_{\min}) = 0$ (recall $m \in \mathbb{Z}^*$ and Lemma 2.1), and the two boundary terms at $E = \Psi(R)$ appear with exactly the opposite

sign. We now run the integration-by-parts argument again and obtain just like above

$$\begin{aligned}
L(t, m; R) &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \left[e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right]_{E=\Psi(R)}^{E=E_0} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \left[e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right]_{E=E_{\min}}^{E=\Psi(R)} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) dE \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \int_{E_{\min}}^{\Psi(R)} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) dE \\
&= -\frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \left[e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right]_{E=E_{\min}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \int_{\Psi(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) dE \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi^2 m^2 t^2} \int_{E_{\min}}^{\Psi(R)} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{1}{\omega'(E)} \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{T(E) G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\omega'(E)} \right) \right) dE.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Here we see that, unlike (3.30), not all the boundary terms vanish. The boundary term at $E = E_{\min}$ survives and we use the bound (2.41) to infer that this boundary term is bounded by $\frac{C}{|m|^3 t^2}$. The remaining boundary terms do indeed vanish if $k > 2$ or are bounded if $k = 2$; at $E = E_0$ we use $\partial_E \widehat{f}_0(m, E_0) = k\varepsilon(E_0 - E)^{k-2} \widehat{g}_0(m, E)$. At $E = \Psi(R)$ the boundary terms appear with the opposite sign and the function $\frac{d}{dE} H(m, \cdot)$ is continuous at $E = \Psi(R) > E_{\min}$ due to (2.35) and $\Theta(R, \Psi(R)) = 0$ for $R \in [R_{\min}, r_*)$.

Finally, just like above, using (2.39)–(2.42) we conclude

$$|L(t, m; R)| \leq C \frac{1 + |\log |R - r_*||}{|m|^3 t^2}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}^*, R \in [R_{\min}, r_*), t \in \mathbb{R}^*. \tag{3.34}$$

Since $\partial_t U_f = 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} L(t, m; R)$, it follows from (3.31) and (3.34) that there exists a constant C such that (3.26) holds.

Proof of (3.27). To obtain the improved bound (3.27), we suppose $k \geq \frac{5}{2}$ and we rely on the following key observation. As a consequence of Lemma 2.12, the integrand on the right-most side of (3.30) features an inverse square root singularity of the form $(E - \Psi(R))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ at the leading order, near $E = \Psi(R)$. More precisely, since $T \in C^3(\bar{I})$ the most singular term in the integrand is of the form

$$e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E)t} \frac{T(E)}{\omega'(E)^2} \frac{\sqrt{E - \Psi(R)} \frac{d^2}{dE^2} G_{f_0}(m, E)}{\sqrt{E - \Psi(R)}},$$

where the absolute value of the numerator $|\sqrt{E - \Psi(R)} \frac{d^2}{dE^2} G_{f_0}(m, E)|$ is bounded by $\frac{C}{|m|\sqrt{E - E_{\min}}} + \frac{C}{|m|^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-3}$ by Lemma 2.12 and therefore non-singular when $R \neq r_*$. To establish the higher decay, we again employ a cut-off argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.3, using now the key estimate

$$\left| \frac{d}{dE} \left(\frac{d^2}{dE^2} G_{f_0}(m, E) \right) \right| \leq C(E - E_{\min})^{-1} (E - \Psi(R))^{-1} + C(E_0 - E)^{k-4}$$

from Lemma 2.13. Comparing to the analogous estimate in the proof of Proposition 3.3, we see that we have an additional singular factor of $(E - E_{\min})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ supported on the region $E > \Psi(R)$. This precisely contributes the additional singular term $|R - r_*|^{-1}$ in the final bound. \square

4 Decay in the radially symmetric case

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.7 using the results from Section 2, in particular, Section 2.2. We first derive the following additional lemma concerning the integrability properties of the Green's function $h_R(\theta, E, L)$.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $R \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$, the Green's function h_R satisfies the weighted L^2 bound*

$$\int_J \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \left| \frac{h_R(\theta, E, L)^2}{E - E_{\min}^L} \right| d\theta dE dL \leq C.$$

Proof. As the estimate is most singular when R is a trapping radius, i.e., $R = r_{L_*}$ for some $L_* \in [L_0, L_{\max}]$, we focus on this case. Radially Taylor expanding the effective potential yields

$$\Psi_L(R) = E_{\min}^L + \frac{\alpha_L^2}{2} (R - r_L)^2 + \mathcal{O}(R - r_L)^3.$$

Because $L \mapsto r_L$ is linear [27, (2.2.61)], it hence follows that there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on L_0 and L_{\max} such that

$$\frac{1}{C} |L - L_*|^2 \leq |\Psi_L(R) - \Psi_L(r_L)| \leq C |L - L_*|^2, \quad L \in [L_0, L_{\max}]. \quad (4.1)$$

We recall that h_R is identically 1 on the interval $\theta \in [-\theta(R, E, L), \theta(R, E, L)]$ when $E \geq \Psi_L(R)$ and vanishes otherwise. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_J \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \left| \frac{h_R(\theta, E, L)^2}{E - E_{\min}^L} \right| d\theta dE dL &= \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} 2\theta(R, E, L) (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-1} dE dL \\ &\leq C + \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} |\log(\Psi_L(R) - E_{\min}^L)| dL \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $0 \leq \theta(R, E, L) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and (4.1) to see that the final integral is finite. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. We argue in the case $\ell > 0$, $k > 1$, as the remaining cases are somewhat simpler.

Proof of (1.39). To estimate $\partial_R U_f$ we use the representation formula

$$\begin{aligned}
R^2 \partial_R U_f(t, R) &= 4\pi^2 \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{E_{\min}^L}^{E_0} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_R(r(\theta, E, L)) fT(E, L) d\theta dE dL \\
&= 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{E_{\min}^L}^{E_0} \widehat{f}(t, m, E, L) \overline{\widehat{h}_R(m, E, L)} T(E, L) dE dL \\
&= 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E, L) t} \widehat{f}_0(m, E, L) \widehat{h}_R(m, E, L) T(E, L) dE dL, \\
&= 4\pi^2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \widehat{h}_R(m, q, L) \frac{\widehat{f}_0(m, q, L) T}{\omega'} dq dL \quad (4.2)
\end{aligned}$$

where we recall (1.57) and Lemma 2.10. Notice that the $m = 0$ terms vanish because $f_0 \perp \ker(\mathcal{D})$ and recall Remark 1.10.

As the greatest restriction on the decay rate occurs when R is a trapping radius, i.e., $R = r_{L_*}$ for some $L_* \in [L_0, L_{\max}]$, we prove the decay bound for this range of R . In the remaining case, the proof is considerably easier.

We first apply Lemma 2.16 (specifically (2.66)) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E, L) t} \widehat{h}_R(m, E, L) \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} dE dL \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \mathcal{A}_1 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) + w \cos(2\pi m \theta) \mathcal{A}_2 \left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} \right) \right] dq dL. \quad (4.3)
\end{aligned}$$

We now introduce two cut-off functions, one in E and one in L as follows. Let $0 < \delta \ll 1$ to be chosen later. In the case that $L_* - L_0 < 2\delta$, we define a cut-off $\phi_\delta \in C_c^\infty((L_0 - 1, L_{\max} + 1))$ such that $\phi_\delta = 0$ on $B_{4\delta}(L_*)$, $\phi_\delta = 1$ on $[L_0, L_{\max}] \setminus B_{8\delta}(L_*)$, $0 \leq \phi_\delta \leq 1$, $|\phi'_\delta(L)| \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$. Note that such a cut-off vanishes on the interval of radius 2δ around L_0 also.

In the case that $L_* - L_0 \geq 2\delta$, we instead take $\phi_\delta \in C_c^\infty((L_0 - 1, L_{\max} + 1))$ such that $\phi_\delta = 0$ on $B_{\delta/2}(L_*) \cup B_{\delta/2}(L_0)$, $\phi_\delta = 1$ on $[L_0, L_{\max}] \setminus (B_\delta(L_*) \cup B_\delta(L_0))$ and again $0 \leq \phi_\delta \leq 1$ and $|\phi'_\delta| \leq \frac{3}{\delta}$.

Finally, we introduce the cut-off $\psi_\delta \in C_c^\infty((E_{\min}^{L_0} - 1, E_0 + 1))$ such that $\psi_\delta = 0$ on $B_\delta(E_0)$, $\psi_\delta = 1$ on $[E_{\min}^{L_0}, E_0] \setminus B_{2\delta}(E_0)$, $0 \leq \psi_\delta \leq 1$, $|\psi'_\delta| \leq \frac{2}{\delta}$.

We split the integral on the right hand side of (4.3) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} e^{-2\pi m i \omega(E,L)t} \widehat{h}_R(m, E, L) \frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'} dE dL \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E) e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \mathcal{A}_1\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) + w \cos(2\pi m \theta) \mathcal{A}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right] dq dL \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i m t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} (1 - \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E)) e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \mathcal{A}_1\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) + w \cos(2\pi m \theta) \mathcal{A}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right] dq dL \\
&=: \tilde{I}(m) + \tilde{J}(m). \tag{4.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Treating the terms \tilde{I} and \tilde{J} separately, we first integrate by parts once more in \tilde{I} , using the definition of the cut-offs to see the vanishing condition at L_0 and E_0 , respectively, and Lemma 2.16, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{I}(m) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi i m t)^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\omega_R(L)}^{\omega_0(L)} e^{-2\pi m i q t} \left[\widehat{h}_R \left(\mathcal{A}_1\left(\phi_\delta \psi_\delta \mathcal{A}_1\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right)\right) + \mathcal{B}_1\left(\phi_\delta \psi_\delta \mathcal{A}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right)\right) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + w \cos(2\pi m \theta) \left(\mathcal{A}_2\left(\phi_\delta \psi_\delta \mathcal{A}_1\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right)\right) + \mathcal{B}_2\left(\phi_\delta \psi_\delta \mathcal{A}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right)\right) \right) \right] dq dL.
\end{aligned}$$

Distributing derivatives, applying (2.75) (with $N = 2, j = 0, 1, 2$), and applying Fubini's theorem to return to (E, L) -coordinates, this yields the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{I}(m)| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \left[\int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} (|\widehat{h}_R| + |w|) |\phi'_\delta(L)| \psi_\delta(E) \left(\left| \mathcal{A}_1\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right| + \left| \mathcal{A}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right| \right) dE dL \right. \\
&\quad + \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} (|\widehat{h}_R| + |w|) \phi_\delta(L) |\psi'_\delta(E)| \left(\left| \mathcal{A}_1\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right| + \left| \mathcal{A}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right| \right) dE dL \\
&\quad + \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E) |\widehat{h}_R| \left| \mathcal{P}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right| dE dL \\
&\quad + \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E) |w| \left| \mathcal{Q}_2\left(\frac{\widehat{f}_0 T}{\omega'}\right) \right| dE dL \Big] \\
&=: \tilde{I}_1 + \tilde{I}_2 + \tilde{I}_3 + \tilde{I}_4,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied the Leibniz rule to distribute the derivative contributions from the operators $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{B}_1$ and \mathcal{B}_2 and used that Q_1 and Q_2 are bounded functions by Lemma 2.15.

Before bounding $\tilde{I}_1 - \tilde{I}_4$, we first give a useful auxiliary estimate on a key integral:

$$\int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \phi_\delta(L) (\Psi_L(R) - \Psi_L(r_L))^{-\frac{1}{2}} dL \leq C \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \phi_\delta(L) |L - L_*|^{-1} dL \leq C |\log \delta|, \tag{4.5}$$

by (4.1) and the definition of ϕ_δ .

Now, to bound \tilde{I}_1 , we recall that the support of $\phi'_\delta(L)$ is at most of size 8δ , while as $k > 1$, all of the E -integrands are integrable, so that, applying (2.76)–(2.77),

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{I}_1| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} + \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} |\phi'_\delta(L)| \psi_\delta(E) \left(\frac{1}{|m|} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{m^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-2} + \frac{1}{m^2} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} \right) dE dL \\ &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} + \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} |\phi'_\delta(L)| (1 + (L - L_0)^{\ell-1}) dL \leq C \frac{(1 + \delta^{\ell-1})}{m^2 t^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where we note that the support of ϕ'_δ contains an annulus (pair of intervals) centred on L_* , which may or may not be close to L_0 . The integral containing $(E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ has been estimated similarly to Lemma 4.1.

To bound \tilde{I}_2 , we recall that the support of ψ'_δ is of size $\leq 2\delta$, that on the support we have $E_0 - E > \delta$, and that $|\psi'_\delta| \leq \frac{2}{\delta}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{I}_2| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} + \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \phi_\delta(L) |\psi'_\delta(E)| \left(\frac{1}{|m|} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{m^2} (E_0 - E)^{k-2} + \frac{1}{m^2} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} \right) dE dL \\ &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} + \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \phi_\delta(L) \left((\Psi_L(R) - \Psi_L(r_L))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} + \delta^{k-2} \right) dL \leq \\ &\leq C \frac{|\log \delta| + \delta^{k-2}}{m^2 t^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where we have bounded $(E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq (\Psi_L(R) - \Psi_L(r_L))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and then applied (4.5).

Next, to bound \tilde{I}_3 , we observe the following simple integral estimate:

$$\int_{E_{\min}^L}^{E_0 - \delta} (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E_0 - E)^{k-2} dE \leq C(1 + \delta^{k-\frac{3}{2}}). \quad (4.8)$$

Thus, estimating \mathcal{P}_2 with (2.78) (and neglecting superfluous powers of m), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{I}_3| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E) |\widehat{h}_R| \left((E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{3}{2}} + (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ((L - L_0)^{\ell-1} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (L - L_0)^{\ell-2} + (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} (E_0 - E)^{k-2} + (E_0 - E)^{k-3} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |m| |\varphi'| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + m^2 |\varphi'| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{|m^2 \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)|}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right) dE dL. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

We estimate the first two lines of the right hand side first, using the estimate $|\widehat{h}_R| \leq 1$ to bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E) |\widehat{h}_R| \left((E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{3}{2}} + (E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ((L - L_0)^{\ell-1} + (E_0 - E)^{k-2}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (L - L_0)^{\ell-2} + (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} (E_0 - E)^{k-2} + (E_0 - E)^{k-3} \right) dE dL \\
& \leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \phi_\delta(L) \left((\Psi_L(R) - \Psi_L(r_L))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} + 1 + \delta^{k-\frac{3}{2}} + (L - L_0)^{\ell-2} + \delta^{k-2} \right) dL \\
& \leq C \frac{|\log \delta| + \delta^{k-2} + \delta^{\ell-1}}{m^2 t^2}, \tag{4.10}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied (4.5) and (4.8). To estimate the final terms in \tilde{I}_3 , we employ the improved estimate $|\widehat{h}_R| \leq \frac{1}{|m|}$ (recall $\widehat{h}_R(m, E, L) = \frac{\sin(2\pi m \theta(R, E, L))}{\pi m}$) in the first term and Hölder's inequality in the second to see

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E) |\widehat{h}_R| \left(\frac{|m| |\varphi'|}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{m^2 |\varphi'|}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{|m^2 \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)|}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) dE dL \\
& \leq \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} + \frac{C}{t^2} \left\| \frac{\widehat{h}_R(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2(J)} \left\| \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \widehat{g}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2(J)}. \tag{4.11}
\end{aligned}$$

In order to bound \tilde{I}_4 , we observe by comparing (2.78) to (2.79) that most terms in \tilde{I}_4 can also be bounded using the estimate (4.10) with the exception of one term which must be bounded separately:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{C}{m^2 t^2} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(R)}^{E_0} \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E) |\varphi'| \left| m \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right| dE dL \\
& \leq \frac{C}{|m| t^2} \left(\int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} |\log(\Psi_L(R) - \Psi_L(r_L))| dL \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\|_{L^2(J)} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{|m| t^2} \left\| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\|_{L^2(J)}; \tag{4.12}
\end{aligned}$$

see the proof of Lemma 4.1 for the latter estimate.

Thus, combining the estimates (4.6)–(4.12), we have obtained

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{I}(m)| & \leq C \frac{|\log \delta| + \delta^{k-2} + \delta^{\ell-1}}{m^2 t^2} + \frac{C}{t^2} \left\| \frac{\widehat{h}_R(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2(J)} \left\| \frac{\partial_\theta^2 \widehat{g}_0(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2(J)} \\
& \quad + \frac{C}{|m| t^2} \left\| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g}_0(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\|_{L^2(J)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing in m and applying the Plancherel theorem, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} |\tilde{I}(m)| &\leq \frac{C}{t^2} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \frac{|\log \delta| + \delta^{k-2} + \delta^{\ell-1}}{m^2} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \left\| \frac{\widehat{h}_R(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2(J)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \left\| \frac{\widehat{\partial_\theta^2 g_0}(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2(J)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \frac{1}{m^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \left\| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g_0}(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\|_{L^2(J)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \frac{|\log \delta| + \delta^{k-2} + \delta^{\ell-1}}{t^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where we have applied Lemma 4.1 and used the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \left\| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial^{(1)} \left(\frac{m \widehat{g_0}(m, E, L)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\|_{L^2(J)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C \|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)}, \\
\left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} \left\| \frac{\widehat{\partial_\theta^2 g_0}(m, \cdot, \cdot)}{(E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2(J)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq C \|g_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

which both follow from the Plancherel theorem and the regularity of r and w as functions of E, L , as given by Lemma 2.14; see Lemma 2.8 for similar arguments.

Turning now to the integral $\tilde{J}(m)$ from (4.4), we simply estimate using (2.76)–(2.77) with $N = 2$, $j = 0, 1$, and split the domain of integration into $A_1 \cup A_2$, where

$$A_1 := \{(E, L) \mid E \in (\Psi_L(R), E_0), L \in (L_0, L_{\max})\} \cap \{\phi_\delta(L) = 1\},$$

and

$$A_2 := \{(E, L) \mid E \in (\Psi_L(R), E_0), L \in (L_0, L_{\max})\} \cap \{\phi_\delta(L) < 1\}.$$

Then, applying the estimates (2.76)–(2.77) and $|\widehat{h}_R| \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{J}(m)| &\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t} \left(\int_{A_1} + \int_{A_2} \right) (1 - \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E)) \left((E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^\ell \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((E_0 - E)^{k-2} (L - L_0)^\ell + (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} + 1 \right) \right) dE dL.
\end{aligned}$$

For the integral on A_1 , we observe that, on this set, the support of $1 - \phi_\delta \psi_\delta$ is contained in the set $E_0 - E < 2\delta$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{C}{m^2 t} \int_{A_1} (1 - \psi_\delta(E)) \left((E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^\ell \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((E_0 - E)^{k-2} (L - L_0)^\ell + (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} + 1 \right) \right) dE dL \\
&\leq \frac{C}{m^2 t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \delta^{k-1} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} dL \leq \frac{C \delta^{k-1}}{m^2 t}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we uniformly estimate the E -integrals in the integral on A_2 to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{C}{m^2 t} \int_{A_2} (1 - \phi_\delta(L) \psi_\delta(E)) \left((E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^\ell \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left((E_0 - E)^{k-2} (L - L_0)^\ell + (E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^{\ell-1} + 1 \right) \right) dE dL \\ & \leq \frac{C}{m^2 t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} (1 - \phi_\delta(L)) (1 + (L - L_0)^{\ell-1}) dL \leq \frac{C(\delta + \delta^\ell)}{m^2 t}; \end{aligned}$$

in the last estimate we used the structure of $\{\phi_\delta \neq 1\}$. Thus, upon summing over $m \in \mathbb{Z}_*$ we obtain

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_*} |\tilde{J}(m)| \leq \frac{C\delta^{k-1}}{t} + \frac{C(\delta + \delta^\ell)}{t}.$$

Choosing $\delta = \frac{1}{t}$ above and in (4.13), we conclude

$$|\partial_R U_f(t, R)| \leq C \begin{cases} \frac{1 + |\log t|}{t^2}, & k \geq 2, \ell \geq 1, \\ \frac{1}{t^{\min\{\ell+1, k\}}}, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

thus proving (1.39).

Proof of (1.41). When the data f_0 is supported strictly away from the trapping set ∂J_{trap} the operators \mathcal{P}_j and \mathcal{Q}_j applied to $\frac{\hat{f}_0^T}{\omega_f}$ experience no singularities. The only regularity limitation can therefore come from the vacuum boundary ∂J_{vac} , but since the data is strictly supported away from ∂J_{vac} and all the coefficients appearing in $\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{Q}_j$ are smooth in J , we may integrate-by-parts in (4.2) arbitrary many times to conclude (1.41).

Proof of (1.40). For the purpose of proving decay of ρ_f , as in the 1+1-dimensional case, it is sufficient to prove the decay of $\partial_t \rho_f$, due to the orthogonality assumption $f_0 \in \ker(\mathcal{D})^\perp$. For convenience, we work with the modified density

$$\tilde{\rho}(t, r) := \iint f \, dw \, dL = \frac{r^2}{\pi} \rho_f(t, r).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{\rho}(t, r) &= - \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int \omega(E, L) \partial_\theta f \, dw \, dL \\ &= - \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(r)}^{E_0} \omega(E, L) \frac{\partial_\theta f(t, \theta(r, E, L), E, L) + \partial_\theta f(t, 1 - \theta(r, E, L), E, L)}{w(r, E, L)} dE \, dL =: \tilde{\rho}_{t1} + \tilde{\rho}_{t2}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

where we have used the change of variables $(w, L) \mapsto (E, L)$ for a given fixed r . To prove the decay estimate (1.40), we focus on the first term $\tilde{\rho}_{t1}$ on the right-hand side of (4.14). The

estimates for the second term $\tilde{\rho}_{t2}$ follow in the same way by replacing the initial value f_0 with $(\theta, E, L) \mapsto f_0(1 - \theta, E, L)$.

We make a further change of variables, recalling the definition of $q = \omega(E, L)$ from above and now setting $p = 2(E - \Psi_L(r))$ (i.e. $p = w^2$). The Jacobian matrices for the coordinate transformation are then

$$\frac{\partial(q, p)}{\partial(E, L)} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega' & \partial_L \omega \\ 2 & -\frac{1}{r^2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{\partial(E, L)}{\partial(q, p)} = \frac{1}{1 + 2\frac{r^2 \partial_L \omega}{\omega'}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\omega'} & \frac{r^2 \partial_L \omega}{\omega'} \\ \frac{2r^2}{\omega'} & -r^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

From the smallness assumption on $\partial_L \omega$, these are clearly invertible. We denote by \mathcal{K} the domain $J \cap \{E \geq \Psi_L(r)\}$.

We now recall the solution formula (1.51), (1.53) to infer that in the (p, q) coordinates,

$$\partial_q(f_0 \circ T_t) = (\theta_q - t) \partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t + \partial_q f_0 \circ T_t, \quad (4.15)$$

which yields the identity

$$\partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t = \frac{-1}{t} (\partial_q(f_0 \circ T_t) - \partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t \theta_q - \partial_q f_0 \circ T_t). \quad (4.16)$$

Note that the left-hand side of (4.16) is precisely $\partial_\theta f$ by (1.52) and therefore from (4.14) and (4.16) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{t1}(t, r) &= - \int_{\mathcal{K}} q \frac{\partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{p}} \left(\frac{\omega'}{r^2} + 2\partial_L \omega \right)^{-1} dq dp \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \int_{\mathcal{K}} q \left(\frac{\omega'}{r^2} + 2\partial_L \omega \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial_q(f_0 \circ T_t) - \partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t \theta_q - \partial_q f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{p}} dq dp. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

We now introduce three cut-off functions. We introduce the cut-off parameter $\bar{\delta} > 0$ to be chosen later and let $\phi_{\bar{\delta}} \in C_c^\infty([-1, E_0 - \Psi_{L_0}(r) + 1])$ be such that $0 \leq \phi_{\bar{\delta}} \leq 1$,

$$\phi_{\bar{\delta}}(p) = \begin{cases} 0, & p \leq \bar{\delta}, \\ 1, & 2\bar{\delta} \leq p \leq E_0 - \Psi_{L_0}(r), \end{cases}$$

and with $|\phi'_{\bar{\delta}}(p)| \leq \frac{C}{\bar{\delta}}$. Now we set

$$F(p, q) = \frac{1}{\frac{\omega'}{r^2} + 2\partial_L \omega} \in C^1(\bar{\mathcal{K}}),$$

and re-write (4.17) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{t1}(t, r) &= -\frac{2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{K}} \phi_{\bar{\delta}}(p) q F \frac{\partial_q (f_0 \circ T_t)}{\sqrt{p}} dq dp \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{K}} \phi_{\bar{\delta}}(p) q F \frac{(\partial_\theta f_0) \circ T_t \theta_q + (\partial_q f_0) \circ T_t}{\sqrt{p}} dq dp \\
&\quad - \int_{\mathcal{K}} q F (1 - \phi_{\bar{\delta}}(p)) \frac{\partial_\theta f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{p}} dq dp \\
&=: I(t, r) + II(t, r) + III(t, r).
\end{aligned}$$

We focus first on $I(t, r)$. Observing that, due to the cut-off function $\phi_{\bar{\delta}}$, the integrand vanishes on ∂J_{trap} . We integrate by parts with respect to q to get

$$\begin{aligned}
I(t, r) &= \frac{2}{t} \int_{\mathcal{K}} \phi_{\bar{\delta}}(q \partial_q F + F) \frac{f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{p}} dq dp \\
&= \frac{2}{t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(r)}^{E_0} \phi_{\bar{\delta}} \left(\omega \frac{\partial_q F}{F} + 1 \right) \frac{f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi_L(r))}} dE dL, \tag{4.18}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the assumptions $k > 1, \ell > 0$, and (1.38) to make sure that the boundary terms corresponding to the vacuum boundary $E(p, q) = E_0$ and $L(p, q) = L_0$ vanish. To bound the right hand side of (4.18), we estimate as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{2}{t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(r)}^{E_0} \phi_{\bar{\delta}} \left(\omega \frac{\partial_q F}{F} + 1 \right) \frac{f_0 \circ T_t}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi_L(r))}} dE dL \right| \\
&\leq \frac{C}{t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(r)}^{E_0} \frac{(E_0 - E)^{k-1} (L - L_0)^\ell}{\sqrt{2(E - \Psi_L(r))}} dE dL \leq \frac{C}{t},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have again used that $k > 1, \ell > 0$. Thus we have obtained

$$|I(t, r)| \leq \frac{C}{t}. \tag{4.19}$$

To bound $II(t, r)$, we first note that

$$|\partial_q \theta| \leq |\theta_E| \left| \frac{\partial E}{\partial q} \right| + |\theta_L| \left| \frac{\partial L}{\partial q} \right| \leq C(E - E_{\min}^L)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (E - \Psi_L(r))^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

while $|\partial_\theta f_0| = |\varphi'| |\partial_\theta g_0| \leq C|\varphi'| (E - E_{\min}^L)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and hence

$$|II(t, r)| \leq \frac{C}{t} \int_{L_0}^{L_{\max}} \int_{\Psi_L(r)+\bar{\delta}}^{E_0} \frac{1}{E - \Psi_L(r)} dE \leq \frac{C|\log \bar{\delta}|}{t}. \tag{4.20}$$

Finally, to control $III(t, r)$, we revert to (E, L) coordinates and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |III(t, r)| &\leq \int_{\{\phi_{\bar{\delta}} < 1\}} \left| \omega F(1 - \phi_{\bar{\delta}}) \frac{\partial_{\theta} f_0 \circ T_t}{w} \right| d(E, L) \leq C \int_{\{\phi_{\bar{\delta}} < 1\}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{E - \Psi_L(r)}} d(E, L) \\ &\leq C \bar{\delta}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where we have used that the domain has measure at most $\bar{\delta}$. Combining (4.19), (4.20) and (4.21), we have obtained

$$|\rho_t(t, r)| \leq C \left(\frac{|\log \bar{\delta}|}{t} + \bar{\delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right).$$

Taking $\bar{\delta} = \frac{1}{t^2}$, we conclude the claimed estimate.

References

- [1] Antonov, V. A., Remarks on the problems of stability in stellar dynamics. *Soviet Astronom. AJ* **4**, 859–867 (1960).
- [2] Barré, J., Yamaguchi, Y. Y., On algebraic damping close to inhomogeneous Vlasov equilibria in multi-dimensional spaces. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **46** 225501 (2013).
- [3] Batt, J., Faltenbacher, W., Horst, E., Stationary Spherically Symmetric Models in Stellar Dynamics. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **93**, 159–183 (1986).
- [4] Bedrossian, J., Coti Zelati, M., Vicol, V., Vortex axisymmetrization, inviscid damping, and vorticity depletion in the linearized 2D Euler equations. *Ann. PDE* **5**, 1–192 (2019)
- [5] Binney, J., Tremaine, S., *Galactic Dynamics* (second edition), Princeton Series in Astrophysics **4**, Princeton University Press 2008.
- [6] Bruè, E., Coti Zelati, M., Marconi, E., Enhanced dissipation for two-dimensional Hamiltonian flows. *Preprint arXiv:2211.14057*, 23 pp. (2022).
- [7] Chaturvedi, S., Luk, J., Phase mixing for solutions to 1D transport equation in a confining potential. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **15**, 403–416 (2022).
- [8] Doremus, J.-P., Feix, M. R., Baumann, G., Stability of Encounterless Spherical Stellar Systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 725–728 (1971).
- [9] Guo, Y., Lin, Z., The existence of stable BGK waves. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **352**, 1121–1152 (2017).
- [10] Guo, Y., Rein, G., A non-variational approach to nonlinear stability in stellar dynamics applied to the King model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **271**, 489–509 (2007).

- [11] Hadžić, M., Rein, G., Straub, C., On the Existence of Linearly Oscillating Galaxies. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **243**, 611–696 (2022).
- [12] Hadžić, M., Rein, G., Schrecker, M., Straub, C., Damping versus oscillations for a gravitational Vlasov-Poisson system. *Preprint arXiv:2301.07662*, 49 pp. (2023).
- [13] Kalnajs, A. J., Dynamics of flat galaxies. I. *Astrophys. J.* **166**, 275–293 (1971).
- [14] Kandrup, H. E., Sygnet, J. F., A simple proof of dynamical stability for a class of spherical clusters. *Astrophys. J.* **298**, 27–33 (1985).
- [15] Kunze, M., *A Birman-Schwinger Principle in Galactic Dynamics*, Prog. Math. Phys. **77**. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham 2021.
- [16] Lemou, M., Méhats, F., Raphaël, P., A new variational approach to the stability of gravitational systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **302**, 161–224 (2011).
- [17] Lemou, M., Méhats, F., Raphaël, P., Orbital stability of spherical galactic models. *Invent. Math.* **187**, 145–194 (2012).
- [18] Lynden-Bell, D., The stability and vibrations of a gas of stars. *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **124**, 279–296 (1962).
- [19] Lynden-Bell, D., Statistical mechanics of violent relaxation in stellar systems. *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **136**, 101–121 (1967).
- [20] Moreno, M., Rioseco, P., Van Den Bosch, H., Mixing in anharmonic potential well. *J. Math. Phys.* **63**, 071502 (2022).
- [21] Mouhot, C., Villani, C., On Landau damping. *Acta Math.* **207**, 29–201 (2011).
- [22] Nadirashvili, N., On Stationary Solutions of Two-Dimensional Euler Equation. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **209**, 729–745 (2013).
- [23] Ramming, T., Rein, G., Spherically Symmetric Equilibria for Self-Gravitating Kinetic or Fluid Models in the Nonrelativistic and Relativistic Case—A Simple Proof for Finite Extension. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **45**, 900–914 (2013).
- [24] Rein, G., Straub, C., On the transport operators arising from linearizing the Vlasov-Poisson or Einstein-Vlasov system about isotropic steady states. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **13**, 933–949 (2020).
- [25] Rhines, P. B., Young, W. R., How rapidly is a passive scalar mixed within closed streamlines? *J. Fluid Mech.* **133**, 133–145 (1983).
- [26] Rioseco, P., Sarbach, O., Phase space mixing in an external gravitational central potential. *Classical Quantum Gravity* **37**, 195027 (2020).

- [27] Straub, C., *Pulsating Galaxies*, Doctoral thesis, Universität Bayreuth 2024.
- [28] Straub, C., Numerical experiments on stationary, oscillating, and damped spherical galaxy models. *Preprint arXiv:2405.01235*, 39 pp. (2024).