

REGULARITY RESULTS ON THE FLOW MAPS OF PERIODIC DISPERSIVE BURGERS TYPE EQUATIONS AND THE GRAVITY-CAPILLARY EQUATIONS

AYMAN RIMAH SAID

ABSTRACT. In the first part of this paper we prove that the flow associated to a dispersive Burgers equation with a non local term of the form $|D|^{\alpha-1} \partial_x u$, $\alpha \in [1, +\infty[$ is Lipschitz from bounded sets of $H_0^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$ to $C^0([0, T], H_0^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}))$ for $T > 0$ and $s > \lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - \frac{1}{2}$, where H_0^s are the Sobolev spaces of functions with 0 mean value, proving that the result obtained in [37] is optimal on the torus. The proof relies on a paradifferential generalization of a complex Cole-Hopf gauge transformation introduced by T.Tao in [43] for the Benjamin-Ono equation.

For this we prove a generalization of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula for flows of hyperbolic paradifferential equations and prove the stability of the class of paradifferential operators modulo more regular remainders, under conjugation by such flows. For this we prove a new characterization of paradifferential operators in the spirit of Beals [9].

In the second part of this paper we use a paradifferential version of the previous method to prove that a re-normalization of the flow of the one dimensional periodic gravity capillary equation is Lipschitz from bounded sets of H^s to $C^0([0, T], H^{s-\frac{1}{2}})$ for $T > 0$ and $s > 3 + \frac{1}{2}$. This proves that the result obtained in [37] is optimal for the water waves system.

Keywords— Flow map, Regularity, Quasi-linear, nonlinear Burgers type dispersive equations, Water Waves system, Gravity-Capillary equations, Cole-Hopf Gauge transform.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Study of the model problems	10
3.	Flow map regularity for the periodic gravity capillary equation	13
4.	Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula: composition and commutator estimates	18
	Appendix A. Paradifferential Calculus	31
	References	37

1. INTRODUCTION

In our study of the quasi-linearity of the water waves system in [37] we studied the flow map regularity for some model nonlinear dispersive equations of the form:

$$\partial_t u + u \partial_x u + |D|^{\alpha-1} \partial_x u = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{D}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{T} , $\alpha \in [0, 2[$ and $|D|$ is the Fourier multiplier with symbol $|\xi|$. We proved that they are quasi-linear. We based our work on the following distinction between semi-linearity and quasi-linearity given in [31]:

- A partial differential equation is said to be semi-linear if its flow map is regular (at least C^1).
- A partial differential equation is said to be quasi-linear if its flow map is not Lipschitz.

More precisely we proved that:

- the flow map associated to (1.1) fails to be uniformly continuous from bounded sets of $H^s(\mathbb{D})$ to $C^0([0, T], H^s(\mathbb{D}))$ for $T > 0$ and $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$.

The drawback of this test of quasi-linearity, where we only analyse the uniform continuity of the flow map, is that it does not show the effect of the dispersive term. The natural question is then to ask if one can know α exactly by having a more refined analysis of the regularity of the flow map.

For this we can start by noticing that independently of α the flow map is Lipschitz from bounded sets of $H^s(\mathbb{D})$ to $C^0([0, T], H^{s-1}(\mathbb{D}))$ and ask: can the space $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{D})$ be replaced by $H^{s-\mu}(\mathbb{D})$ with $\mu < 1$ depending on α ? Again in [37] we proved that the best μ one can hope for is $\mu = 1 - (\alpha - 1)^+$, where $a^+ := \max(a, 0)$, more precisely we showed that:

- the flow map cannot be Lipschitz from bounded sets of $H^s(\mathbb{D})$ to $C^0([0, T], H^{s-1+(\alpha-1)^++\epsilon}(\mathbb{D}))$ for $\epsilon > 0$.

Looking at the literature to assess the optimality of the result, first in [39] the equation (1.1) is actually shown to be quasi-linear for $\alpha \in [0, 3[$ and becomes semi-linear for $\alpha = 3$, that is the Korteweg-de Vries equation, when $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{R}$ suggesting that our results are sub-optimal. Then when $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{T}$, in [32], for the case $\alpha = 2$ and the Benjamin–Ono equation, the flow map is shown to be Lipschitz (and even has analytic regularity) on bounded subsets of H_0^s the (Sobolev spaces of functions with 0 mean value). Which suggests that our results could be optimal but with a subtlety in the low frequencies.

The aim of the current paper is to prove that the results obtained in [37] are optimal on the torus and for the full periodic water waves system with surface tension, that is the gravity capillary equation.

Before we give the main results of this paper, it is important to place the question of the flow map regularity in the vast and rich literature that studies equations of the form (1.1), for a comprehensive and complete overview of those equations and their link to other problems coming from mechanical fluids and dispersive non linear equations in physics we refer to Saut’s [39, 40]. Beyond the starting point of hyperbolic local well-posedness of (1.1) in $H^s, s > 1 + \frac{1}{2}$, three natural questions are: (1) is the problem globally well-posed or is there blow up in finite time? (2) What is the smallest s for which we still have local well-posedness? (3) Is the continuous dependence on the initial datum optimal, that is, is the equation semi/quasi-linear? The first two questions are usually closely connected due to the existence of conservation laws and form some of the most important problems in PDE today. Understanding them demands a better understanding of the equation beyond the basic hyperbolic structure. For the equations analysed in this paper, this means that a refined understanding of the interaction between the dispersive and nonlinear transport terms is needed to answer those questions. For $\alpha \leq 1$ and $\alpha \geq 2$ the problem for equation (1.1) is now very well understood. Indeed for $\alpha \leq 1$ the equation is known to exhibit finite time blow up and does so through a wave breaking scenario [12, 19, 20, 21, 35, 41]. For $\alpha \geq 2$ the equation is globally well-posed and the optimal threshold s_c is known [43, 27, 29, 23, 33, 22], for the special cases where (1.1) is integrable that is the Benjamin–Ono equation ($\alpha = 2$) and the KdV equation ($\alpha = 3$) the equation is even better understood due to the remarkable construction of Birkhoff coordinates [15, 24, 25]. For $1 < \alpha < 2$, the global Cauchy problem is not as well understood, a numerical study was carried out by Klein and Saut in [26] and they conjectured that there is blow up for $1 < \alpha \leq \frac{3}{2}$ and that the equations are globally well-posed for $\alpha > \frac{3}{2}$. To the best of the author’s knowledge the only progress towards answering this conjecture was given in [34] where the authors proved global well posedness for $\alpha > 1 + \frac{6}{7}$. One of the main goals of the current work is to show that a refined understanding of the third question

sheds some light on some interactions between the dispersive and nonlinear terms. This understanding could later be used to give answers to the first two questions. Indeed determining α here through the understanding of the exact regularity of the flow map required us to construct a generalized Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula for hyperbolic paradifferential equations. We use those tools developed here in a subsequent work [38] to answer global Cauchy type questions.

1.1. On the torus. We show that the flow map associated to (1.1) is Lipschitz from bounded sets of $H_0^s(\mathbb{T})$ to $C^0([0, T], H_0^{s-1+(\alpha-1)^+}(\mathbb{T}))$. We begin by recalling a classical result in the literature ([30, 39]).

Theorem 1.1. *Consider three real numbers $\alpha \in [0, 2[$, $s \in]2 + \frac{1}{2}, +\infty[$, $r > 0$ and $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{D})$. Then there exists $C_s > 0$ such that for $0 < T < \frac{C_s}{r + \|\partial_x u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{D})}}$ and all v_0 in the ball $B(u_0, r) \subset H^s(\mathbb{D})$ there exists a unique $v \in C^0([0, T], H^s(\mathbb{D}))$ solving the Cauchy problem:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + v \partial_x v + |D|^{\alpha-1} \partial_x v = 0 \\ v(0, \cdot) = v_0(\cdot). \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

Moreover, for all $\mu \in [0, s]$, $\exists C_\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that:

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \|v(t)\|_{H^\mu(\mathbb{D})} \leq e^{C_\mu \|\partial_x v\|_{L^1([0, t], L^\infty(\mathbb{D}))}} \|v_0\|_{H^\mu(\mathbb{D})}. \quad (1.3)$$

Taking $v_0 \in B(u_0, r)$, and assuming moreover that $u_0 \in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{D})$ then:

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \|(u - v)(t)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{D})} \leq e^{C_s (\|\partial_x(u, v)\|_{L^1([0, t], L^\infty(\mathbb{D}))} + C_s \|u\|_{L^1([0, t], H^{s+1}(\mathbb{D}))})} \|u_0 - v_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{D})}, \quad (1.4)$$

where u is the solution emanating from u_0 .

In [37] we studied the regularity of the flow map and proved the following.

Theorem 1.2 ([37]). *Consider three real numbers $\alpha \in [0, 2[$, $s \in]2 + \frac{1}{2}, +\infty[$, $r > 0$ and $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$. Let C_s be given by Theorem 1.1 and $0 < T < \frac{C_s}{r + \|\partial_x u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{D})}}$.*

- Then the flow map associated to the Cauchy problem (1.2):

$$\begin{aligned} B(u_0, r) &\rightarrow C^0([0, T], H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})) \\ v_0 &\mapsto v \end{aligned}$$

is continuous but not uniformly continuous.

- Moreover for all $\epsilon > 0$ the flow map:

$$\begin{aligned} B(u_0, r) &\rightarrow C^0([0, T], H^{s-1+(\alpha-1)^+ + \epsilon}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})) \\ v_0 &\mapsto v \end{aligned}$$

is not Lipschitz.

Here we prove that these results are essentially optimal on the torus, more precisely we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Consider three real numbers $\alpha \in]1, 2[$, $s \in]\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - \frac{1}{2}, +\infty[$, $r > 0$ and $u_0 \in H_0^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$. Let C_s be given by Theorem 1.1 and $0 < T < \frac{C_s}{r + \|\partial_x u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{D})}}$. Then the flow map associated to the Cauchy problem (1.2)*

$$\begin{aligned} B(u_0, r) \cap H_0^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow C^0([0, T], H_0^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})) \\ v_0 &\mapsto v \end{aligned}$$

is Lipschitz, more precisely we have the a priori estimate for $t \in [0, T]$

$$\|(u - v)(t)\|_{H^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}(\mathbb{D})} \leq e^{Cte^{Ct\|(u,v)\|_{L_t^\infty W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}}}} \|v_0\|_{H^s} \|u_0 - v_0\|_{H^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}(\mathbb{D})}.$$

Several remarks are in order.

- (1) As a corollary of Theorem 1.3 we prove in Section 2.2 the following.

Corollary 1.1. *Consider three real numbers $\alpha \in]1, 2[$, $s > \lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - \frac{1}{2}$, $r > 0$, and $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$. Let C_s be given by Theorem 1.1 and $0 < T < \frac{C_s}{r + \|\partial_x u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{D})}}$.*

- Then the flow map associated to the Cauchy problem (1.2):

$$\begin{aligned} B(u_0, r) &\rightarrow C^0([0, T], H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})) \\ v_0 &\mapsto v \end{aligned}$$

is continuous but not uniformly continuous.

- For all $\epsilon > 0$ the flow map:

$$\begin{aligned} B(u_0, r) &\rightarrow C^0([0, T], H^{s-1+\epsilon}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})) \\ v_0 &\mapsto v \end{aligned}$$

is not C^1 .

- (2) The case $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$ is closely related to the system obtained after reduction and para-linearization of the periodic water waves system in dimension 1 obtained in [2] Proposition 3.3 by Alazard, Burq and Zuily, which we will treat in the second part of this paper.
- (3) The case $\alpha = 2$ and the Benjamin-Ono equation on the circle was obtained by Molinet in [32]. Though Molinet's result extends to the Cauchy problem on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ and only studied the flow map regularity for data with 0 mean value.

The main language and techniques used in this article is that of paraproducts, paracomposition paradifferential operators and paradifferential calculus for which a rigorous review is given in Appendix A.2. We give an intuitive interpretation of those concepts in the following paragraph so that the reader unfamiliar with this language can get a good grasp of the statements without having to go through Appendix A.2 first.

• **Paraproducts, paracomposition and Paradifferential operators.** For the sake of this discussion let us pretend that ∂_x is left-invertible with a choice of ∂_x^{-1} that acts continuously from H^s to H^{s+1} . We follow here analogous ideas to the ones presented by Shnirelman in [42]. One way to define the paraproduct of two functions $f, g \in H^s$ with s sufficiently large is: we differentiate fg k times, using the Leibniz formula, and then restore the function fg by the k -th power of ∂_x^{-1} :

$$\begin{aligned} fg &= \partial_x^{-k} \partial_x^k (fg) \\ &= \partial_x^{-k} (g \partial_x^k f + k \partial_x g \partial_x^{k-1} f + \dots + k \partial_x f \partial_x^{k-1} g + g \partial_x^k f) \\ &= T_g f + T_f g + R, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$T_g f = \partial_x^{-k} (g \partial_x^k f), \quad T_f g = \partial_x^{-k} (f \partial_x^k g),$$

and R is the sum of all remaining terms. The key observation is that if $s > \frac{1}{2} + k$, then $g \mapsto T_g f$ is a continuous operator in H^s for $f \in H^{s-k}$. The remainder R is a continuous bilinear operator from H^s to H^{s+1} . The operator $T_g f$ is called the paraproduct of g and f and can be interpreted as follows. The term $T_g f$ takes into play high frequencies of g compared to those of f and demands more regularity in

$g \in H^s$ than $f \in H^{s-k}$ thus the term $T_f g$ bears the "singularities" brought on by g in the product fg . Symmetrically $T_g f$ bears the "singularities" brought on by f in the product fg and the remainder R is a smoother function (H^{s+1}) and does not contribute to the main singularities of the product. Notice that this definition uses a "general" heuristic from PDE that is the worst terms are the highest order terms (ones involving the highest order of differentiation). Now to make such a definition rigorous, we quantify this frequency comparison. The starting point is the product formula:

$$fg(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{ix \cdot (\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi_1) \mathcal{F}(g)(\xi_2) d\xi_1 d\xi_2.$$

Now if for some parameters $B > 1, b > 0$ one defines a cut-off function:

$$\psi^{B,b}(\eta, \xi) = 0 \text{ when } |\xi| < B|\eta| + b, \text{ and } \psi^{B,b}(\eta, \xi) = 1 \text{ when } |\xi| > B|\eta| + b + 1,$$

then one can rigorously define the paraproduct as

$$T_g^{B,b} f(x) = T_g f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi^{B,b}(\xi_2, \xi_1) e^{ix \cdot (\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \mathcal{F}(f)(\xi_1) \mathcal{F}(g)(\xi_2) d\xi_1 d\xi_2.$$

To get a good intuition of a paradifferential operator T_p with symbol $p \in \Gamma_\rho^\beta$, as a first gross approximation, one can think of T_p as the composition of a paraproduct T_f with Fourier multiplier $m(D)$, that is:

$$T_p \approx T_f m(D), \text{ with } f \in W^{\rho, \infty} \text{ and } m \text{ is of order } \beta.$$

Indeed following Coifman and Meyer's symbol reduction Proposition 5 of [13], one can show that linear combinations of composition of a paraproduct with a Fourier multiplier are dense in the space of paradifferential operators.

Finally for the paracomposition operation we again work with $f \in H^s$ and $g \in C^s$ with s large and consider the composition of two functions $f \circ g$ which bears the singularities of both f and g , and our goal is to separate them. We proceed as before by differentiating $f \circ g$ k times, using the Faá di Bruno's formula, and then restore the function fg by the k -th power of ∂_x^{-1} :

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ g &= \partial_x^{-k} \partial_x^k (f \circ g) \\ &= \partial_x^{-k} ((\partial_x^k f \circ g) \cdot (\partial_x g)^k + \dots + (\partial_x f \circ g) \cdot \partial_x^k g) \\ &= g^* f + T_{\partial_x f \circ g} g + R, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$g^* f = \partial_x^{-k} ((\partial_x^k f \circ g) \cdot (\partial_x g)^k) \text{ is the paracomposition of } f \text{ by } g$$

and R is the sum of all remaining terms. Again the key observation is that if $s > \frac{1}{2} + k$, then $f \mapsto g^* f$ is a continuous operator in H^s for $g \in C^{s-k}$. Thus this term bears essentially the singularities of f in $f \circ g$. As before $T_{\partial_x f \circ g} g$ bears essentially the singularities of g in $f \circ g$. The remainder R is a continuous bilinear operator from H^s to H^{s+1} . Thus we have separated the singularities of the composition $f \circ g$.

1.2. The periodic gravity capillary equation. We follow here the presentation in [2], [6] and [5].

1.2.1. *Assumptions on the domain.* We consider a domain with free boundary, of the form:

$$\{(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : (x, y) \in \Omega_t\},$$

where Ω_t is the domain located between a free surface:

$$\Sigma_t = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : y = \eta(t, x)\}$$

and a given (general) bottom denoted by $\Gamma = \partial\Omega_t \setminus \Sigma_t$. More precisely we assume that initially ($t = 0$) we have the hypothesis (H_t) given by:

- The domain Ω_t is the intersection of the half space, denoted by $\Omega_{1,t}$, located below the free surface Σ_t ,

$$\Omega_{1,t} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : y < \eta(t, x)\} \quad (H_t)$$

and an open set $\Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+1}$ such that Ω_2 contains a fixed strip around Σ_t , which means that there exists $h > 0$ such that,

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : \eta(t, x) - h \leq y \leq \eta(t, x)\} \subset \Omega_2. \quad (H_t)$$

We shall assume that the domain Ω_2 (and hence the domain $\Omega_t = \Omega_{1,t} \cap \Omega_2$) is connected.

1.2.2. *The equations.* We consider an incompressible inviscid liquid, having unit density. The equations of motion are given by the Euler system of the velocity field v :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + v \cdot \nabla v + \nabla P = -ge_y & \text{in } \Omega_t, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where $-ge_y$ is the acceleration of gravity ($g > 0$) and where the pressure term P can be recovered from the velocity by solving an elliptic equation. The problem is then coupled with the boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} v \cdot n = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \partial_t \eta = \sqrt{1 + (\partial_x \eta)^2} v \cdot \nu & \text{on } \Sigma_t, \\ P = -\kappa H(\eta) & \text{on } \Sigma_t, \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

where n and ν are the exterior normals to the bottom Γ and the free surface Σ_t , κ is the surface tension and $H(\eta)$ is the mean curvature of the free surface:

$$H(\eta) = \partial_x \left(\frac{\partial_x \eta}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial_x \eta)^2}} \right).$$

We are interested in the case with surface tension and take $\kappa = 1$. The first condition in (1.6) expresses the fact that the particles in contact with the rigid bottom remain in contact with it. As no hypothesis is made on the regularity of Γ , this condition makes sense in a weak variational meaning due to the hypothesis (H_t), for more details on this we refer to Section 2 in [2].

The fluid motion is supposed to be irrotational and Ω_t is supposed to be simply connected thus the velocity v field derives from some potential ϕ that is $v = \nabla \phi$ and:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \phi = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_n \phi = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases}$$

The boundary condition on ϕ becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_n \phi = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \partial_t \eta = \partial_y \phi - \partial_x \eta \partial_x \phi & \text{on } \Sigma_t, \\ \partial_t \phi = -g\eta + H(\eta) - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla_{x,y} \phi|^2 & \text{on } \Sigma_t. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

Following Zakharov [46] and Craig-Sulem [14] we reduce the analysis to a system on the free surface Σ_t . If ψ is defined by

$$\psi(t, x) = \phi(t, x, \eta(t, x)),$$

then ϕ is the unique variational solution of

$$\Delta\phi = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_t, \quad \phi|_{y=\eta} = \psi, \quad \partial_n\phi = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma.$$

Define the Dirichlet-Neumann operator by

$$\begin{aligned} (G(\eta)\psi)(t, x) &= \sqrt{1 + (\partial_x\eta)^2} \partial_n \phi|_{y=\eta}(t, x) \\ &= (\partial_y\phi)(t, x, \eta(t, x)) - \partial_x\eta(t, x) \partial_x\phi(t, x, \eta(t, x)). \end{aligned}$$

For the case with rough bottom we refer to [1], [2] and [6] for the well-posedness of the variational problem and the Dirichlet-Neumann operator. Now (η, ψ) (see for example [14]) solves:

$$\partial_t\eta = G(\eta)\psi, \tag{1.8}$$

$$\partial_t\psi = -g\eta + H(\eta) + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x\psi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_x\eta \partial_x\psi + G(\eta)\psi}{1 + (\partial_x\eta)^2}.$$

The system is completed with initial data

$$\eta(0, \cdot) = \eta_{in}, \quad \psi(0, \cdot) = \psi_{in}.$$

We consider the case when η, ψ are 2π -periodic in the space variable x .

1.2.3. Flow map regularity. In [2] and [6], Alazard, Burq, and Zuily perform a parilinearization and symmetrization of the the water waves system that takes the form:

$$\partial_t u + T_V \cdot \nabla u + iT_\gamma u = f,$$

where γ is an elliptic symbol of order $\frac{3}{2}$ which closely resembles the model problem we presented on \mathbb{T} but with an extra non-linearity in γ . The parilinearization and symmetrization of the system was used to prove the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem in the optimal threshold $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$ in which the velocity field v is Lipschitz. We will complete this and our result in [37] by giving the precise regularity of the flow map. First we recall some previously known results on the Cauchy problem from [6, 2].

Theorem 1.4 (From [6, 2]). *Consider two real numbers $r > 0, s \in]2 + \frac{1}{2}, +\infty[$ and $(\eta_0, \psi_0) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$ such that,*

$$\forall (\eta'_0, \psi'_0) \in B((\eta_0, \psi_0), r) \subset H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$$

the assumption $(H_t)_{t=0}$ is satisfied. Then there exists $T > 0$ such that the Cauchy problem (1.8) with initial data $(\eta'_0, \psi'_0) \in B((\eta_0, \psi_0), r)$ has a unique solution

$$(\eta', \psi') \in C^0([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}))$$

and such that the assumption (H_t) is satisfied for $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover the flow map $(\eta'_0, \psi'_0) \mapsto (\eta', \psi')$ is continuous.

In [37] we completed this by the following.

Theorem 1.5. *Consider two real numbers $r > 0, s \in]2 + \frac{1}{2}, +\infty[$ and $(\eta_0, \psi_0) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$ such that,*

$$\forall (\eta'_0, \psi'_0) \in B((\eta_0, \psi_0), r) \subset H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$$

the assumption $(H_t)_{t=0}$ is satisfied.

Then for all $R > 0$ the flow map associated to the Cauchy problem (1.8):

$$\begin{aligned} B(0, R) &\rightarrow C^0([0, T], H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})) \\ (\eta'_0, \psi'_0) &\mapsto (\eta', \psi') \end{aligned}$$

is not uniformly continuous.

And at least a loss of $\frac{1}{2}$ derivative is necessary to have Lipschitz control over the flow map, that is for all $\epsilon' > 0$ the flow map

$$\begin{aligned} B(0, R) &\rightarrow C^0([0, T], H^{s+\epsilon'}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon'}(\mathbb{T})) \\ (\eta'_0, \psi'_0) &\mapsto (\eta', \psi') \end{aligned}$$

is not Lipschitz.

Here it is shown that those results are sufficient after suitable re-normalization of the flow map.

Theorem 1.6. Consider two real numbers $r > 0$, $s \in]3 + \frac{1}{2}, +\infty[$ and $(\eta_0, \psi_0) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$ such that,

$$\forall (\eta'_0, \psi'_0) \in B((\eta_0, \psi_0), r) \subset H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$$

the assumption $(H_t)_{t=0}$ is satisfied. Define (η, ψ) and (η', ψ') as the solutions to the Cauchy problem (1.8) on $[0, T]$, $T > 0$. Define the following change of variables:

$$\chi(t, x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial_x \eta(t, y))^2}} dy - \int_0^t \int_{\Sigma_s} \left[\frac{1}{1 + (\partial_x \eta(s, y))^2} + \partial_x \phi \right] d\Sigma_s \quad (1.9)$$

where $d\Sigma_t$ is the surface measure on Σ_t and χ' is defined analogously from (η', ψ') . Then for r sufficiently small and $t \in [0, T]$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (\eta, \psi)^* - (\eta', \psi')^*(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \eta'_0, \psi'_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0)^* - (\eta'_0, \psi'_0)^* \right\|_{H^s \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

where $*$ and $'$ are the paracomposition by χ and χ' , which we recall it's definition in A.3.

The time integral in the re-normalization (1.9) is to ensure that the mean value of the transport term vanishes. This re-normalization is used here to compensate the non-linearity in the dispersive term T_γ of order $\frac{3}{2}$.

1.3. Strategy of the proof. For Theorem 1.3, we first work on H_0^s and the main idea is to conjugate (1.1) to a semi-linear dispersive equation of the form:

$$\partial_t w + |D|^{\alpha-1} \partial_x w = Ru,$$

where R is continuous from H^s to itself. For the viscous Burgers equation such a result is obtained by the Cole-Hopf transformation that reduces the problem to a one dimensional heat equation. In [43], T.Tao used a complex version of the Cole-Hopf transformation to reduce the problem on the Benjamin-Ono equation to a one dimensional Schrödinger type equation, this idea was extensively used to lower the regularity needed for the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem as in Molinet's work in [32]. A generalized pseudodifferential form of this transformation was used in [4] to reduce the one dimensional water waves system to a one dimensional semi-linear Schrödinger type system.

Formally if we follow the same lines of those previous papers, the transformation we will have to use is a pseudodifferential transformation of the form:

$$\begin{cases} w = \text{Op}(a)u, \\ a = e^{\frac{1}{i\alpha}\xi|\xi|^{1-\alpha}U}, \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

where U is a real valued periodic primitive of u that exists because u has mean value 0 and $\text{Op}(a)$ is the pseudo-differential operator with symbol a .

The main problem is that such an operator belongs to a Hörmander symbol class of the form $S_{\alpha-1,2-\alpha}^0$, see Remark 4.2 for a formal definition, for $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$ this becomes $S_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}^0$ which is a “bad” symbol class with no general symbolic calculus rules. Thus we have to treat this transformation with care.

The idea here is inspired by the particular form of the formal computation, we express the desired operator as the time one of a flow map associated to a hyperbolic equation, that is $a = e^{iT_p}$ where $(e^{iT_p})_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}}$ is defined as the group generated by the paradifferential operator iT_p where p is a real valued symbol of order smaller than 1. This is inspired by previous results of Alazard, Baldi and P.Gérard [7].

Take a different operator T_b . The main new idea is to apply a Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula. Formally this allows one to express $e^{iT_p}T_b e^{-iT_p}$ as a series of successive Lie derivatives $[iT_p, \dots, [iT_p, T_b]]$. The same kind of computations go for $[e^{iT_p}, T_b]$. The convergence of such a series is a non trivial problem, equivalent to solving a linear ODE in the Fréchet space of paradifferential symbol classes $\Gamma_{+\infty}^m$ defined in Appendix A.2. Such an ODE is generally not well posed and to solve such a problem one usually has to look at a Nash-Moser type scheme. Though in our case we have an explicit ODE that can be solved locally with loss of derivative inspired by Hörmander’s [18] and Beals in [9], we prove the existence of a symbol b_p^τ such that $e^{iT_p}T_b e^{-iT_p} = \text{Op}(b_p^\tau)$, moreover b_p^τ is shown to have an asymptotic expansion given by the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula. The use of paradifferential operators is the key here, as in Hörmander’s [18], because the continuity of paradifferential operators given by Theorem A.2 insures that we do not need to control an infinite number of semi-norms as would have been the case for pseudodifferential operators.

Finally the adequate choice of T_p eliminates the transport term of order 1 and gives a term of order $2 - \alpha$ which is enough to get the desired estimate.

Passing from H_0^s to H^s we use the following gauge transform:

$$\tilde{u}(t, x) = u(t, x - t \int u_0) - \int u_0, \quad \text{where } \int u_0 = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|} \int_{\mathbb{T}} u_0,$$

which we will prove is continuous on H^s but not uniformly continuous and C^1 only from H^s to H^{s-1} .

For the Gravity-Capillary equation the problem is more delicate. Indeed the model problems we study are for the parilinearized and symmetrized system, though the change of variable from the original system to the parilinearized and symmetrized one is known to be Lipschitz on H^s for $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$ ([6, 2]). Thus the problem is reduced to the study of the flow map regularity of an equation of the form

$$\partial_t u + T_V \cdot \partial_x u + iT_\gamma u = f.$$

In the same spirit as [4, 5] we perform a para-change of variable, that is we para-compose with χ defined by (1.9), to get:

$$\partial_t[\chi^* u] + T_W \cdot \partial_x(\chi^* u) + iT_{|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}}\chi^* u = f, \quad \text{with } W = \frac{V \circ \chi}{\partial_x \chi} \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{T}} W = 0.$$

We then proceed exactly as for Equation (1.1) (with the 0 mean value hypothesis insured by the choice of χ).

- Transformation (1.11), in which we use a primitive of the solution is called a gauge transform in the literature.
- As for the Cole-Hopf transformation, this gauge transform (1.11) is essentially one dimensional.
- It is interesting to note that the gauge transformation can be iterated to eliminate the term of order $2-\alpha$ and get at the step of order k a remainder of order $k+1-k\alpha$ which is an improvement at each step as $\alpha > 1$. Choosing $k = \lceil \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \rceil$, we get a residual term that is bounded from H^s to H^s when one pays the “price” of working in high enough regularity that is $s > 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha-1}$. In [38] we use this iteration to prove that for $2 < \alpha < 3$, the paradifferential version of (1.1) can be transformed to a semi-linear equation with a regularizing remainder, that is:

$$\partial_t u + T_u \partial_x u + \partial_x |D|^{\alpha-1} u = 0 \Rightarrow \partial_t Au + \partial_x |D|^{\alpha-1} Au = R(u),$$

where the operator norm of $R(u)$ is controlled by $\|u\|_{L^\infty([0,T], C_*^{2-\alpha})}$.

1.4. Acknowledgement. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Thomas Alazard. I would also like to thank the referees for their valuable input that greatly improved the manuscript.

2. STUDY OF THE MODEL PROBLEMS

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3, the estimates on H_0^s . We keep the notations of Theorem 1.3, fixing $u_0 \in H_0^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$ and $r > 0$ and taking:

$$v_0, w_0 \in B(u_0, r) \subset H_0^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}).$$

As the mean value is conserved by the flow of (1.2) we consider the solutions $u, v, w \in C^0([0, T]; H_0^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}))$ to (1.2) with initial data u_0, v_0, w_0 and on a uniform small interval $[0, T]$.

The main goal of the proof is to show the following estimate:

$$\|v(t, \cdot) - w(t, \cdot)\|_{H^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}} \leq e^{Cte} \underset{L_t^\infty W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}}{Ct\|(v,w)\|} \|w_0\|_{H^s} \|v_0 - w_0\|_{H^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}}. \quad (2.1)$$

The final simplification we make in this paragraph is that given the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem in H^s , and the density of $H^{+\infty}$ in H^s , it suffice to prove (2.1) for $v_0, w_0 \in H^{+\infty}$, which henceforth we will suppose.

We start by applying the parilinearization Theorem A.2 to the term $u\partial_x v$ to get:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v + T_{vi\xi} v + T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi} v = R_0(v)v, \\ v(0, \cdot) = v_0(\cdot), \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$R_0(v)\cdot = -T_{\partial_x v} \cdot - R(v, \partial_x \cdot) + \left(T_{i\xi|\xi|^{\alpha-1}} - \partial_x |D|^{\alpha-1} \right) \cdot.$$

Now we reduce $H^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}$ estimates to L^2 ones by defining $f_1 = \langle D \rangle^{s-(2-\alpha)^+} v$. Commuting $\langle D \rangle^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}$ with (2.2), using the symbolic calculus rules of Theorem A.2, we get that:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f_1 + T_{vi\xi} f_1 + T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi} f_1 = R_1(v)f_1 \\ f_1(0, \cdot) = \langle D \rangle^{s-(2-\alpha)^+} v_0(\cdot), \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$R_1(v)\cdot = \left[\langle D \rangle^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}, T_{vi\xi} \right] \cdot + \langle D \rangle^{s-(2-\alpha)^+} R_0(v)\cdot.$$

We define analogously $g_1 = \langle D \rangle^{s-(2-\alpha)^+} w$ and notice that by definition:

$$\|f_1 - g_1\|_{L^2} = \|v - w\|_{H^{s-(2-\alpha)^+}},$$

thus the problem is reduced to getting L^2 estimates on $f_1 - g_1$.

Here we give the full proof using estimates that will be proved in Section 4.

2.1.1. *Gauge transform and Energy estimate.* The goal of this section is to find an operator A such that

$$\partial_t[Af_1] + T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}Af_1 + AT_{vi\xi}f_1 + [A, T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}]f_1 = (\partial_t A)f_1 + AR_1(f_1)f_1,$$

and $AT_{vi\xi} + [A, T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}]$ is a hyperbolic operator of order $(2 - \alpha)^+ < 1$.

If we define $V = \partial_x^{-1}v$ which is the periodic zero mean value primitive of v , then

$$\hat{V}(0) = 0 \text{ and } \hat{V}(\xi) = \frac{\hat{v}(\xi)}{i\xi}, \text{ for } \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^*,$$

and we define analogously W from w . Then a formal computation shows that one can choose $A = T_{\frac{1}{e^{i\alpha}\xi}|\xi|^{1-\alpha}V} \in S_{\alpha-1, 2-\alpha}^0(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{Z})$ which is a symbol class with no general symbolic calculus rules. Here we will define A differently ¹.

$A = e^{iT_{p_v}}$, that is, it is defined as the time one of the flow map generated by $T_{i p_v}$ with

$$p_v = -\frac{1}{\alpha}\xi|\xi|^{1-\alpha}V \in \Gamma_{\lfloor \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rfloor}^{2-\alpha}(\mathbb{T}),$$

which is well defined by Proposition 4.1. We define analogously $e^{iT_{p_w}}$ and p_w from w . Now introduce:

$$f_2 = e^{iT_{p_v}}f_1, \quad g_2 = e^{iT_{p_w}}g_1. \quad (2.4)$$

As $e^{-iT_{p_v}}$ and $e^{-iT_{p_w}}$ are the time -1 generated by the flow map p_v, p_w respectively we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1 - g_1\|_{L^2} &= \|e^{-iT_{p_v}}f_2 - e^{-iT_{p_w}}g_2\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|e^{-iT_{p_v}}[f_2 - g_2]\|_{L^2} + \|(e^{-iT_{p_v}} - e^{-iT_{p_w}})g_2\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying estimate (1) of Proposition 4.1 and estimate (4.4):

$$\|f_1 - g_1\|_{L^2} \leq e^{C\|v\|_{L^\infty}} \|f_2 - g_2\|_{L^2} + e^{C\|(v,w)\|_{L^\infty}} \|V - W\|_{L^\infty} \|g_2\|_{H^{(2-\alpha)^+}}. \quad (2.5)$$

The goal now is getting an L^2 estimates on $f_2 - g_2$. To get the equations on f_2 and g_2 we commute $e^{iT_{p_v}}$ and $e^{iT_{p_w}}$ with (2.3), we make the computations for f_2 , those for g_2 are obtained by symmetry:

$$e^{iT_{p_v}}\partial_t f_1 + e^{iT_{p_v}}T_{vi\xi}f_1 + e^{iT_{p_v}}T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}f_1 = e^{iT_{p_v}}R_1(v)f_1, \text{ thus,}$$

$$\partial_t(e^{iT_{p_v}}f_1) + T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}e^{iT_{p_v}}f_1 + (e^{iT_{p_v}}T_{vi\xi} - [T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}, e^{iT_{p_v}}])f_1 + [e^{iT_{p_v}}, \partial_t]f_1 = e^{iT_{p_v}}R_1(v)f_1.$$

By definition of p_v and Proposition 4.4 we have:

$$\partial_\xi(\xi|\xi|^{\alpha-1})\partial_x p_v = v\xi \text{ and } [e^{iT_{p_v}}, \partial_t] = -e^{iT_{p_v}} \int_0^1 e^{-irT_{p_v}} T_{i\partial_t p_v} e^{irT_{p_v}} dr.$$

Thus

$$\partial_t f_2 + T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}f_2 = R_2(v)f_2 + e^{iT_{p_v}}R_1(v)e^{-iT_{p_v}}f_2, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$R_2(v) \cdot = -(e^{iT_{p_v}}T_{vi\xi} - [T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}\xi}, e^{iT_{p_v}}])e^{-iT_{p_v}} \cdot + [e^{iT_{p_v}}, \partial_t]e^{-iT_{p_v}} \cdot.$$

In Corollary 4.2 we show that we have the estimates

$$\|\operatorname{Re}(R_2(v))\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq e^{\|v\|_{L^\infty}} \|v\|_{W^{1,\infty}},$$

¹Similar ideas were used in Appendix C of [4] to get estimates on a change of variable operator which are still in the usual symbol classes $S_{1,0}^m$, the difficulty here being that we are no longer in those symbol classes.

$$\| [R_2(v) - R_2(w)]g_2 \|_{L^2} \leq e^{C\|(v,w)\|_{W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}}} \|v - w\|_{W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}} \|g_2\|_{H^{(2-\alpha)^+}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \| [e^{iT_{pv}} R_1(v) e^{-iT_{pv}} - e^{iT_{pw}} R_1(w) e^{-iT_{pw}}] g_2 \|_{L^2} \\ \leq e^{C\|(v,w)\|_{W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}}} \|v - w\|_{W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}} \|g_2\|_{H^{(2-\alpha)^+}}. \end{aligned}$$

We get analogously on g_2 ,

$$\partial_t g_2 + T_{i|\xi|^{\alpha-1}} g_2 = R_2(w)g_2 + e^{iT_{pw}} R_1(w) e^{-iT_{pw}} g_2. \quad (2.7)$$

Taking the difference between (2.6) and (2.7) and performing an energy estimate gives for $0 \leq t \leq T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f_2 - g_2)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} &\leq e^{C\|(v,w)\|_{W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}}} \|g_2\|_{H^{(2-\alpha)^+}} \Big\|_{L_t^1} \|(f_2 - g_2)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq e^{Cte} \Big\|_{L_t^\infty W_x^{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1, \infty}} \|w_0\|_{H^s} \|(f_2 - g_2)(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which injected back in (2.5) concludes the proof.

2.2. Proof of Corollary 1.1, the estimates on H^s . The starting point is noticing that the mean value is preserved by (1.2) and by doing the change of unknowns:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}(t, x) = u(t, x - tf u_0) - f u_0 \\ \tilde{v}(t, x) = v(t, x - tf v_0) - f v_0 \end{cases}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $f u_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} u_0$ is the mean value. We can reduce the Cauchy problem for general data to ones with 0 mean value by verifying that $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in H_0^s$ still solve (1.2). Thus the main goal is to prove that the change of variable (2.8) is not regular. More precisely we will show that there exists a positive constant C and two sequences (u_ϵ^λ) and (v_ϵ^λ) solutions of 1.2 in $C^0([0, 1], H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ such that for every $t \leq T$, where T is a uniform small time,

$$\sup_{\lambda, \epsilon} \left\| u_\epsilon^\lambda \right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T})(t, \cdot)} + \left\| v_\epsilon^\lambda(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T})} \leq C,$$

$(u_{\epsilon, \tau}^\lambda)$ and $(v_{\epsilon, \tau}^\lambda)$ satisfy initially:

$$\lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty \\ \epsilon \rightarrow 0}} \left\| u_\epsilon^\lambda(0, \cdot) - v_\epsilon^\lambda(0, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T})} = 0,$$

but,

$$\liminf_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty \\ \epsilon \rightarrow 0}} \left\| u_\epsilon^\lambda(t, \cdot) - v_\epsilon^\lambda(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T})} \geq c > 0.$$

Which proves the non uniform continuity. Considering a weaker control norm we want to get, for all $\delta > 0$ and for $t > 0$:

$$\liminf_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow +\infty \\ \epsilon \rightarrow 0}} \frac{\left\| u_\epsilon^\lambda(t, \cdot) - v_\epsilon^\lambda(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{s-1+\delta}(\mathbb{T})}}{\left\| u_\epsilon^\lambda(0, \cdot) - v_\epsilon^\lambda(0, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T})}} = +\infty.$$

2.2.1. *Definition of the Ansatz.* Take $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ such that for $x \in [0, 2\pi]$:

$$\omega(x) = 1 \text{ if } |x| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \omega(x) = 0 \text{ if } |x| \geq 1.$$

Let (λ, ϵ) be two positive real sequences such that:

$$\lambda \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda\epsilon \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.9)$$

Put for $x \in [0, 2\pi]$,

$$u_0(x) = \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}-s}\omega(\lambda x), \quad v_0(x) = u_0(x) + \epsilon\omega(x), \quad (2.10)$$

and extend u^0 and v^0 periodically. The main trick here will be to use the time reversibility of equation (1.2) by defining \tilde{u}, \tilde{v} as the solution of (1.2) with data fixed at time $t > 0$ given by

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}(t, x) = u_0 - \mathcal{F} u_0 \\ \tilde{v}(t, x) = v_0 - \mathcal{F} v_0 \end{cases}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $t \leq t_0$ is chosen small enough for the equations to be well-posed. Finally, define u and v by (2.8).

2.2.2. *Main estimates.* First the estimates at time 0, for $\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - \frac{3}{2} \leq s-1 \leq \nu \leq s$:

$$\|u(0, x) - v(0, x)\|_{H^\nu} = \left\| \tilde{u}(0, x) - \tilde{v}(0, x) + \mathcal{F} u_0 - \mathcal{F} v_0 \right\|_{H^\nu}$$

By the estimate (2.1) and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\|u(0, x) - v(0, x)\|_{H^\nu} \leq C e^{C\lambda^{\nu-s+(2-\alpha)^+}} \epsilon. \quad (2.12)$$

Now the estimates at a fixed time $t > 0$, by construction:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t, x) - v(t, x)\|_{H^\nu} &= \left\| u_0(x + t\mathcal{F} u_0) - v_0(x + t\mathcal{F} v_0) \right\|_{H^\nu} \\ &= \left\| u_0(x + t\mathcal{F} u_0) - u_0(x + t\mathcal{F} v_0) \right\|_{H^\nu} + O_{H^\nu}(\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

Now by hypothesis $\lambda\epsilon \rightarrow +\infty$ and $t\mathcal{F}\omega > 0$, thus $u_0(\cdot + t\mathcal{F} u_0)$ and $u_0(\cdot + t\mathcal{F} v_0)$ have disjoint supports, thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t, x) - v(t, x)\|_{H^\nu} &= \left\| u_0(x + t\mathcal{F} u_0) \right\|_{H^\nu} + \left\| u_0(x + t\mathcal{F} v_0) \right\|_{H^\nu} + O_{H^\nu}(\epsilon) \\ &= C\lambda^{\nu-s} + O_{H^\nu}(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Now to conclude the proof we differentiate the cases:

- in the case of non uniform continuity we take ϵ such that $\epsilon e^{C\lambda^{(2-\alpha)^+}} \rightarrow 0$ and apply the previous estimates with $\nu = s$.
- In the case of non Lipschitz control we take ϵ such that $\lambda^{-1+\delta}\epsilon^{-1} \rightarrow +\infty$ and apply the previous estimates with $\nu = s - 1 + \delta$.

3. FLOW MAP REGULARITY FOR THE PERIODIC GRAVITY CAPILLARY EQUATION

3.1. Prerequisites from the Cauchy problem. We start by recalling the a priori estimates given by Proposition 5.2 of [2] combined with the results of [6]. We keep the notations of Theorem 1.6.

Proposition 3.1. (From [2] and [6]) Consider a real number $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$. Then there exists a non decreasing function C such that, for all $T \in]0, 1]$ and all solution (η, ψ) of (1.8) such that:

$$(\eta, \psi) \in C^0([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})) \text{ and } (H_t) \text{ is verified for } t \in [0, T],$$

we have:

$$\|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s)} \leq C((\eta_0, \psi_0)_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s}) + TC(\|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s)}).$$

The proof will relies on the para-linearized and symmetrized version of (1.8) given by Proposition 4.8 and corollary 4.9 of [2] which are valid on \mathbb{T} as shown in [6]. Before we recall this, for clarity as in [2], we introduce a special class of operators $\Sigma^m \subset \Gamma_0^m$ given by:

Definition 3.1. (From [2, §4]) Given $m \in \mathbb{R}$, Σ^m denotes the class of symbols a of the form

$$a = a^{(m)} + a^{(m-1)},$$

with,

$$a^{(m)} = F(\partial_x \eta(t, x), \xi),$$

$$a^{(m-1)} = \sum_{|k|=2} G_\alpha(\partial_x \eta(t, x), \xi) \partial_x^k \eta(t, x),$$

such that

- (1) T_a maps real valued functions to real-valued functions;
- (2) F is of class C^∞ real valued function of $(\zeta, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0)$, homogeneous of order m in ξ ; and such that there exists a continuous function $K = K(\zeta) > 0$ such that

$$F(\zeta, \xi) \geq K(\zeta) |\xi|^m,$$

for all $(\zeta, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0)$;

- (3) G_α is a C^∞ complex valued function of $(\zeta, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0)$, homogeneous of order $m - 1$ in ξ .

Σ^m enjoys all the usual symbolic calculus properties in the sense of Proposition A.2 modulo acceptable remainders that we define by the following:

Definition-Notation 3.1. (From [2, Def 4.2]) Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider two families of operators of order m ,

$$\{A(t) : t \in [0, T]\}, \quad \{B(t) : t \in [0, T]\}.$$

We shall say that $A \sim B$ if $A - B$ is of order $m - \frac{3}{2}$ and satisfies the following estimate: for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a continuous function C such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|A(t) - B(t)\|_{H^\mu \rightarrow H^{\mu-m+\frac{3}{2}}} \leq C(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}}).$$

In the next proposition we recall the different symbols that appear in the para-linearization and symmetrization of the water waves equations.

Proposition 3.2. (From [2, §4.2]) We work under the hypothesis of Proposition 3.1. Put

$$\lambda = \lambda^{(1)} + \lambda^{(0)}, \quad l = l^{(2)} + l^{(1)} \text{ with,}$$

$$\begin{cases} \lambda^{(1)} = |\xi|, \\ \lambda^{(0)} = \frac{1+|\partial_x \eta|^2}{2|\xi|} \left\{ \partial_x \left(\alpha^{(1)} \partial_x \eta \right) + i \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \partial_x \alpha^{(1)} \right\}, \\ \alpha^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|\partial_x \eta|^2}} \left(|\xi| + i \partial_x \eta \xi \right). \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

$$\begin{cases} l^{(2)} = (1 + |\partial_x \eta|^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \xi^2, \\ l^{(1)} = -\frac{i}{2} (\partial_x \cdot \partial_\xi) l^{(2)}. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Now let $q \in \Sigma^0$, $p \in \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\gamma \in \Sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} q &= (1 + |\partial_x \eta|^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ p &= \underbrace{(1 + |\partial_x \eta|^2)^{-\frac{5}{4}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{:=p^{(\frac{1}{2})}} + p^{(-\frac{1}{2})}, \\ \gamma &= \underbrace{\sqrt{l^{(2)} \lambda^{(1)}}}_{:=\gamma^{(\frac{3}{2})}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{\frac{l^{(2)} \operatorname{Re} \lambda^{(0)}}{\lambda^{(1)}}}}_{:=\gamma^{(\frac{1}{2})}} - \frac{i}{2} (\partial_\xi \cdot \partial_x) \sqrt{l^{(2)} \lambda^{(1)}}, \\ p^{(-\frac{1}{2})} &= \frac{1}{\gamma^{(\frac{3}{2})}} \left\{ q l^{(1)} - \gamma^{(\frac{1}{2})} p^{(\frac{1}{2})} + i \partial_\xi \gamma^{(\frac{3}{2})} \cdot \partial_x p^{(\frac{1}{2})} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$T_q T_\lambda \sim T_\gamma T_q, \quad T_q T_l \sim T_\gamma T_p, \quad T_\gamma \sim (T_\gamma)^*,$$

where $(T_\gamma)^*$ is the adjoint of T_γ .

Now we can write the parilinearization and symmetrization of the equations (1.8) after a change of variable:

Corollary 3.1. (From [2, Corollary 4.9]) Under the hypothesis of Proposition 3.1, introduce the unknowns²

$$U = \psi - T_B \eta, \quad \Phi_1 = T_p \eta \text{ and } \Phi_2 = T_q U,$$

where we recall,

$$\begin{cases} B = (\partial_y \phi)|_{y=\eta} = \frac{\partial_x \eta \cdot \partial_x \psi + G(\eta) \psi}{1 + (\partial_x \eta)^2}, \\ V = (\partial_x \phi)|_{y=\eta} = \partial_x \psi - B \partial_x \eta. \end{cases}$$

Then $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in C^0([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi_1 + T_V \times \partial_x \Phi_1 - T_\gamma \Phi_2 = f_1, \\ \partial_t \Phi_2 + T_V \times \partial_x \Phi_2 + T_\gamma \Phi_1 = f_2, \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

with $f_1, f_2 \in L^\infty(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$, and f_1, f_2 have C^1 dependence on (Φ_1, Φ_2) verifying:

$$\|(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{T}))} \leq C(\|(\eta, \psi)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s(\mathbb{T}))}).$$

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.6. Corollary 3.1 shows that the parilinearization and symmetrization of the equations (1.8) are of the form of the equations treated in Theorem 1.3, so the proof will follow the same lines but with more care in treating the non-linearity in the dispersive term.

We keep the notations of Theorem 1.6, fixing $(\eta_0, \psi_0) \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$ and $r > 0$. We begin by taking $(\tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \in B((\eta_0, \psi_0), r) \subset H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T})$ and consider the solutions $(\eta, \psi), (\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\psi}) \in C^0([0, T]; H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ to (1.2) with initial data

²U is commonly called the "good" unknown of Alinhac. Introduced by Alazard-Metivier in [1], following earlier works by Lannes in [28].

$(\eta_0, \psi_0), (\tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0)$, on a uniform small interval $[0, T]$ where the hypothesis (H_t) is also supposed to be verified. Define the following change of variables:

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(t, x) &= \int_0^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial_x \eta(t, y))^2}} dy - \int_0^t \int_{\Sigma_s} \left[\frac{1}{1 + (\partial_x \eta(s, y))^2} + \partial_x \phi \right] d\Sigma_s ds \\ &= \int_0^x \sqrt{1 + (\partial_x \eta(t, y))^2} dy - \int_0^t \int_0^{2\pi} \left[\frac{1}{1 + (\partial_x \eta)^2} + \partial_x \phi \right] \sqrt{1 + (\partial_x \eta)^2} dy ds\end{aligned}\quad (3.4)$$

and $\tilde{\chi}$ is defined analogously from $(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\psi})$.

The main goal of the proof is to show the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\| (\eta, \psi)^*(t, \cdot) - (\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\psi})^{\tilde{*}}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0)^* - (\tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0)^{\tilde{*}} \right\|_{H^s \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}},\end{aligned}\quad (3.5)$$

where $*$ and $\tilde{*}$ are the paracomposition operators defined by χ and $\tilde{\chi}$ respectively. We recall that the definition of the paracomposition operator is given in Section A.3.

Put $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ the unknowns obtained from (η, ψ) after parilinearization and symmetrization of the equations as in Corollary 3.1. Define analogously $\tilde{\Phi} = (\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_2)$ from $(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\psi})$. Let us notice that, in order to prove (3.5), it suffice to get estimates on $\Phi - \tilde{\Phi}$. Indeed we write

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_1^* = T_{p^*} \eta^* \\ \Phi_2^* = T_{q^*} U^* \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \eta^* = T_{\frac{1}{p^*}} \Phi_1^* - (T_{\frac{1}{p^*}} T_{p^*} - Id) \eta^* \\ U^* = T_{\frac{1}{q^*}} \Phi_2^* - (T_{\frac{1}{q^*}} T_{q^*} - Id) U^* \end{cases}.$$

then by the ellipticity of the symbols p and q combined with the immediate L^2 estimates (as $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\| (\eta, \psi)^*(t, \cdot) - (\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\psi})^{\tilde{*}}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| \Phi^*(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\Phi}^{\tilde{*}}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}},\end{aligned}\quad (3.6)$$

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\| \Phi^*(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\Phi}^{\tilde{*}}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| (\eta, \psi)^*(t, \cdot) - (\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\psi})^{\tilde{*}}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^s \times H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}.\end{aligned}\quad (3.7)$$

3.2.1. *Gauge transform.* Again, as $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$ we have an immediate L^2 estimates on $\Phi - \tilde{\Phi}$, thus we only need to get $\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \times \dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}$ estimates. Let us start by writing $\Phi = \Phi_1 + i\Phi_2$ in equation (3.3):

$$\partial_t \Phi + T_V \cdot \partial_x \Phi + iT_\gamma \Phi = R_1(\Phi) \Phi, \quad (3.8)$$

Where R_1 verifies

$$\begin{cases} \left\| R_1(\Phi) \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right), \\ \left\| [R_1(\Phi) - R_1(\tilde{\Phi})] \tilde{\Phi} \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| \Phi - \tilde{\Phi} \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{cases}$$

Indeed the first estimate on R_1 is a rephrasing of Corollary 3.1. The difference estimates on R_1 follow from the fact that the change of variable to parilinearize and symmetrize the water waves system involves only taking paraproducts and Fourier

multipliers which is a Lipschitz operation under sufficient regularity which is the case here given the hypothesis $s > 2 + \frac{1}{2}$. This is immediate for all of the terms in (1.8) except for the Dirichlet-Neumann operator for which this follows from Proposition 3.14 of [2].

The next step is to perform the change of variable by χ , by Theorem A.5 we get:

$$\partial_t \Phi^* + T_W \cdot \partial_x \Phi + iT_{|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}} \Phi^* = R'_1(\Phi^*) \Phi^*, \text{ with } W = \frac{V \circ \chi}{\partial_x \chi} \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{T}} W = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Where $R'_1 = (R_1)^* + T_{i|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}} - T_{i\gamma^*}$ where $(R_1)^*$ and $T_{i\gamma^*}$ are the pull-back by χ , Then R'_1 verifies

$$\left\| [R'_1(\Phi^*) - R_1(\tilde{\Phi}^*)] \tilde{\Phi}^* \right\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| \Phi^* - \tilde{\Phi}^* \right\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

We get the same equation on $\tilde{\Phi}^*$ by symmetry. The difference estimates on R'_1 follows from the fact that R'_1 is the pullbacks of R_1 by the paracomposition of χ and the structure of R_1 noted above.

Introduce the following gauge transform $e^{iT_{p_\Phi}}$ as the time one of the flow map defined by Propositions 4.1 with

$$p_\Phi = \frac{2}{3} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_x^{-1} W \in \Gamma_2^{2-\alpha}(\mathbb{T}),$$

and put,

$$\theta = e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} \Phi^*. \quad (3.10)$$

We define analogously $e^{iT_{\tilde{p}_\Phi}}$ and $\tilde{\theta}$ from $\tilde{\Phi}^*$. From Proposition 4.1 the change of variable (3.10) is Lipschitz from $H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}$ to $H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}$ but under H^s control on $(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi})$ which is equivalent by Theorem A.2 to a control on $\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s}$. We have:

$$\left\| \Phi^*(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\Phi}^*(t, \cdot) \right\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| \theta(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\theta}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\left\| \theta(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\theta}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| \Phi^*(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\Phi}^*(t, \cdot) \right\|_{\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (3.12)$$

To get the equations on θ and $\tilde{\theta}$ we commute $e^{iT_{p_\Phi}}$ and $e^{iT_{\tilde{p}_\Phi}}$ with (3.9), we make the computations for θ , those for $\tilde{\theta}$ are obtained by symmetry:

$$e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} \partial_t \Phi^* + e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} T_W \cdot \partial_x \Phi^* + ie^{iT_{p_\Phi}} T_{|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}} \Phi^* = e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} R'_1(\Phi^*) \Phi^*$$

$$\partial_t e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} \Phi^* + iT_{|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} \Phi^* + (e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} T_W \partial_x - [iT_{|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}}, e^{iT_{p_\Phi}}]) \Phi^* - (\partial_t e^{iT_{p_\Phi}}) \Phi^* = e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} R'_1(\Phi^*) \Phi^*$$

By the definition of p_Φ and Proposition 4.4 we have:

$$\partial_\xi (|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}) \partial_x p_\Phi = W \xi \text{ and } \partial_t e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} = e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} \int_0^1 e^{-irT_{p_\Phi}} T_{i\partial_t p_\Phi} e^{irT_{p_\Phi}} dr.$$

thus by Corollary 4.2 we get:

$$\partial_t \theta + iT_{|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}} \theta = R_2(\theta) \theta + e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} R_1(\Phi^*) e^{-iT_{p_\Phi}} \Phi^*, \text{ with} \quad (3.13)$$

$$R_2(\theta) \cdot = -(e^{iT_{p_\Phi}} T_W \partial_x - [iT_{|\xi|^{\frac{3}{2}}}, e^{iT_{p_\Phi}}]) e^{-iT_{p_\Phi}} \cdot + (\partial_t e^{iT_{p_\Phi}}) e^{-iT_{p_\Phi}} \cdot.$$

Now as in the case of the model problem above by Corollary 4.2 R_2 and $e^{iT_{p\Phi}} R_1(\Phi) e^{-iT_{p\Phi}}$ and as $s > 3 + \frac{1}{2}$ they verify:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\operatorname{Re}(R_2(\theta))\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} &\leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right), \\ \|[R_2(\theta) - R_2(\tilde{\theta})]\tilde{\theta}\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} &\leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| \theta(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\theta}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| [e^{iT_{p\Phi}} R'_1(\Phi^*) e^{-iT_{p\Phi}} - e^{iT_{p\tilde{\Phi}}} R'_1(\tilde{\Phi}^*) e^{-iT_{p\tilde{\Phi}}}] \tilde{\theta} \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq C \left(\left\| (\eta_0, \psi_0, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0) \right\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \times H^s} \right) \left\| \theta(t, \cdot) - \tilde{\theta}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have succeeded to eliminate the term $T_V \cdot \partial_x$ of order 1 in (3.9) and got a term of order $\frac{1}{2}$. The result then follows from a standard energy estimate.

4. BAKER-CAMPBELL-HAUSDORFF FORMULA: COMPOSITION AND COMMUTATOR ESTIMATES

We will start by giving the propositions defining the operators used in the gauge transforms and the symbolic calculus associated to them. From those propositions we will deduce the direct estimates used in Sections 2.1.1 and 3.2.1.

Notation 4.1. *To compute the conjugation and commutation of operators with a flow map, we introduce Lie derivatives, i.e commutators. More precisely we introduce the following notations for commutation between operators:*

$$\mathfrak{L}_a^0 b = b, \quad \mathfrak{L}_a b = [a, b] = a \circ b - b \circ a, \quad \mathfrak{L}_a^2 b = [a, [a, b]], \quad \mathfrak{L}_a^k b = \underbrace{[a, [\dots, [a, b]] \dots]}_{k \text{ times}}.$$

In the following proposition the variable $t \in [0, T]$ is the generic time variable that appeared in the previous section and a new variable $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ will be used and they should not be confused. Finally by abuse of notation $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ will designate $C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ in the case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{D}$.

We start with the proposition defining the flow map and its standard properties.

Proposition 4.1. *Consider two real numbers $\delta < 1$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and a real valued symbol $p \in \Gamma_1^\delta(\mathbb{D})$. The following linear hyperbolic equation is globally well-posed:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau h - iT_p h = 0, \\ h(0, \cdot) = h_0(\cdot) \in H^s(\mathbb{D}). \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

For $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, define $e^{i\tau T_p}$ as the flow map associated to 4.1 i.e:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\tau T_p} : H^s(\mathbb{D}) &\rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{D}) \\ h_0 &\mapsto h(\tau, \cdot). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Then for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ we have,

(1) $e^{i\tau T_p} \in \mathcal{L}(H^s(\mathbb{D}))$ and

$$\|e^{i\tau T_p}\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^s} \leq e^{C|\tau|M_1^\delta(p)}.$$

(2)

$$iT_p \circ e^{i\tau T_p} = e^{i\tau T_p} \circ iT_p, \quad e^{i(\tau+\tau')T_p} = e^{i\tau T_p} e^{i\tau' T_p}.$$

(3) $e^{i\tau T_p}$ is invertible and,

$$(e^{i\tau T_p})^{-1} = e^{-i\tau T_p}.$$

Moreover,

$$(e^{i\tau T_p})^* = e^{-i\tau(T_p)^*} = e^{-i\tau T_p} + R,$$

where R is a $\delta - 1$ regularizing operator and $e^{i\tau(T_p)^*}$ is the flow generated by the Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau h - i(T_p)^* h = 0, \\ h(0, \cdot) = h_0(\cdot) \in H^s(\mathbb{D}). \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

(4) Taking a real valued symbol $\tilde{p} \in \Gamma_1^\delta(\mathbb{D})$ we have:

$$\| [e^{i\tau T_p} - e^{i\tau T_{\tilde{p}}}] h_0 \|_{H^s} \leq C |\tau| e^{C|\tau| M_1^\delta(p, \tilde{p})} M_0^\delta(p - \tilde{p}) \|h_0\|_{H^{s+\delta}}. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. To prove point (1) we commute $\langle D \rangle^s$ with the equation and make an energy estimate to get:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|h(t, \cdot)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq [\| [\langle D \rangle^s, iT_p] \|_{H^s \rightarrow H^s} + \| T_p - (T_p)^* \|_{H^s \rightarrow H^s}] \|h(t, \cdot)\|_{H^s}^2,$$

From Appendix A.2 we have as $\delta \leq 1$ and $p \in \Gamma_1^\delta(\mathbb{D})$

$$\| [\langle D \rangle^s, iT_p] \|_{H^s \rightarrow H^s} \leq K M_1^\delta(p),$$

moreover p being real valued we have

$$\| T_p - (T_p)^* \|_{H^s \rightarrow H^s} \leq K M_1^\delta(p).$$

The desired estimate then follows from the Gronwall lemma. The identities in point (2) and the inverse and adjoint identities in point (3) are the standard algebraic identities for semi-groups. As for the residual term R in point (3) it is given explicitly by

$$R = i \int_0^\tau e^{i(r-\tau)T_p} [T_p - (T_p)^*] e^{-ir(T_p)^*} dr.$$

and $H^s \rightarrow H^{s+\delta-1}$ estimate again follows from Appendix A.2. Point (4) comes by writing:

$$\partial_\tau [e^{i\tau T_p} - e^{i\tau T_{\tilde{p}}}] h_0 - iT_p [e^{i\tau T_p} - e^{i\tau T_{\tilde{p}}}] h_0 = iT_{p-\tilde{p}} e^{i\tau T_{\tilde{p}}} h_0,$$

and making the usual energy estimate. \square

The hypothesis $p \in \Gamma_1^\delta$ can be relaxed to $p \in \Gamma_\delta^\delta$, which is the minimal hypothesis needed to ensure well posedness in Sobolev spaces of (4.1).

At the moment the only bounds we obtained on $e^{i\tau T_p}$ are the continuity bounds on Sobolev spaces, in order to study it's symbol and the symbol of conjugated operators we need to transfer those continuity bounds to estimates on the symbol's seminorms. This was first done by Beals in [9] for pseudodifferential operators in the class $S_{\rho, \rho}^m$ with $\rho < 1, m \in \mathbb{R}$. The following lemma gives explicitly the key estimate adapted from [9] given by (4.5), and we give one new estimate (4.6) that can then be directly applied to the paradifferential setting.

Lemma 4.1. *Consider an operator A continuous from $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D})$ to $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D})$ and let $a \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D} \times \hat{\mathbb{D}})$ be the unique symbol associated to A (cf [10] for the uniqueness), that is if you let K be the kernel associated to A then*

$$\text{for } u, v \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}), (Au, v) = K(u \otimes v) \text{ and } a(x, \xi) = \mathcal{F}_{y \rightarrow \xi} K(x, x - y).$$

- If A is continuous from H^m to L^2 , with $m \in \mathbb{R}$, and $[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A]$ is continuous from $H^{m+\delta}$ to L^2 with $\delta \in (-\infty, 1)$, then $(1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a(x, \xi) \in L_{x, \xi}^\infty(\mathbb{D} \times \hat{\mathbb{D}})$ and we have the estimate:

$$\|(1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a\|_{L_{x, \xi}^\infty} \leq C_m \left[\|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} + \left\| \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A \right] \right\|_{H^{m+\delta} \rightarrow L^2} \right]. \quad (4.5)$$

- If A is continuous from H^m to L^2 , with $m \in \mathbb{R}$, and $[ix, A]$ is continuous from $H^{m-\rho}$ to L^2 with $\rho \geq 0$, then $(1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a(x, \xi) \in L_{x, \xi}^\infty(\mathbb{D} \times \hat{\mathbb{D}})$ and we have the estimate:

$$\|(1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a\|_{L_{x, \xi}^\infty} \leq C_m [\|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} + \|[ix, A]\|_{H^{m-\rho} \rightarrow L^2}]. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. First without loss of generality through a standard mollification argument we work with $a \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D} \times \hat{\mathbb{D}})$. We study the cases on \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} separately.

Operators defined on \mathbb{T} . The first key observation is the following:

$$(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{Z}, \quad e^{-ix \cdot \xi} A e^{ix \cdot \xi} = a(x, \xi), \quad (4.7)$$

which one can write as $e^{ix \cdot \xi} \in L_x^2(\mathbb{T})$. Thus taking L^2 norms in x we get:

$$\|a(\cdot, \xi)\|_{L_x^2} \leq \|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} \left\| e^{ix \cdot \xi} \right\|_{H_x^m} \leq C_m \|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} (1 + |\xi|)^m. \quad (4.8)$$

Now to get the analogue of (4.8) but in the ξ variable we observe that the continuity hypothesis reads for $(u, v) \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{Z}} e^{ix \cdot \xi} a(x, \xi) (1 + |\xi|)^{-m} \mathcal{F}(v)(\xi) u(x) dx d\xi \right| \leq \|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} \|\mathcal{F}(v)\|_{L_\xi^2} \|u\|_{L_x^2},$$

Thus for all $u \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$

$$\left\| \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{ix \cdot \xi} (1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a(x, \xi) u(x) dx \right\|_{L_\xi^2} \leq C_m \|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} \|u\|_{L_x^2}.$$

Fixing $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ and choosing $u(x) = \mathbb{1}_{x_0 \pm \epsilon}$, for ϵ sufficiently small we get by continuity of a the analogous estimate to (4.8):

$$\|(1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a(x, \xi)\|_{L_x^\infty L_\xi^2} \leq C_m \|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2}. \quad (4.9)$$

The second key observation is:

$$e^{-ix \cdot \xi} \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A \right] e^{ix \cdot \xi} = \partial_x a(x, \xi), \quad e^{-ix \cdot \xi} [ix, A] e^{ix \cdot \xi} = \partial_\xi a(x, \xi). \quad (4.10)$$

Making the previous computations again with $\partial_x a$ and $\partial_\xi a$ instead of a we get:

$$\|\partial_x a(\cdot, \xi)\|_{L_x^2} \leq C_m (1 + |\xi|)^{m+\delta} \left\| \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A \right] \right\|_{H^{m+\delta} \rightarrow L^2}, \quad (4.11)$$

and as $\rho \geq 0$:

$$\|\partial_\xi [(1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a(x, \xi)]\|_{L_x^\infty L_\xi^2} \leq C_m [\|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} + \|[ix, A]\|_{H^{m-\rho} \rightarrow L^2}]. \quad (4.12)$$

By the Sobolev embedding (4.9) and (4.12) give the desired result (4.6) on the torus.

To get (4.5) we introduce as in [9]:

$$b(x, \xi, \xi_0) = a\left(\frac{x}{(1 + |\xi_0|)^\delta}, (1 + |\xi_0|)^\delta \xi\right).$$

Thus (4.8) becomes

$$\|b(\cdot, \xi)\|_{L_x^2} \leq C_m \|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} (1 + |\xi|)^m.$$

As $\delta < 1$ we have that $(1 + |\xi|)^\delta \sim (1 + |\xi_0|)^\delta$ for $|\xi - \xi_0| \leq c(1 + |\xi_0|)^\delta$ for some fixed $c > 0$. Thus (4.11) becomes

$$\|\partial_x b(\cdot, \xi)\|_{L_x^2} \leq C_m \frac{(1 + |\xi|)^{m+\delta}}{(1 + |\xi_0|)^\delta} \left\| \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A \right] \right\|_{H^{m+\delta} \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_m \left\| \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A \right] \right\|_{H^{m+\delta} \rightarrow L^2},$$

Considering b as a function of (x, ξ) on $\mathbb{T} \times B(\xi_0, c)$ by the Sobolev embedding we get:

$$\|b(x, \xi)\|_{L_x^\infty} \leq C_m \left[\|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} + \left\| \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A \right] \right\|_{H^{m+\delta} \rightarrow L^2} \right] (1 + |\xi|)^m, \quad (4.13)$$

which transferred back to a give the desired result (4.5) on the torus.

Operators defined on \mathbb{R} . The main problem we face on \mathbb{R} when adapting the previous proof is we can no longer use $e^{ix \cdot \xi}$ as a test function as it no longer belongs to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. One way to get over this was given by Beals in [9], we choose g in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $g(0) = 1$, $\mathcal{F}(g)$ is supported in $\{|\xi| \leq 1\}$ and $g(x) = g(-x)$. Let $g_x(y) = g(y - x)$ and compute for $u \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$u(x) = u(x)g_x(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} g_x(y) u(y) dy d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} e^{-iy \cdot \xi} e^{ix \cdot \xi} g_y(x) u(y) dy d\xi.$$

We now compute an analogue of (4.7):

$$\begin{aligned} Au(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} e^{-iy \cdot \xi} A(e^{ix \cdot \xi} g_y)(x) u(y) dy d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} a_0(x, y, \xi) u(y) dy d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{ix \cdot \xi} a(x, \xi) \mathcal{F}(u)(\xi) d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$a_0(x, y, \xi) = e^{-ix \cdot \xi} A(e^{ix \cdot \xi} g_y)(x),$$

and,

$$a(x, \xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} e^{i(x-y) \cdot (\eta - \xi)} a_0(x, y, \eta) d\eta dy.$$

Applying the same arguments as in the periodic case we get:

$$\left\| (1 + |\xi|)^{-m} \partial_y^k a_0 \right\|_{L_{x,y,\xi}^\infty} \leq C_{m,k} \left[\|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} + \left\| \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, A \right] \right\|_{H^{m+\delta} \rightarrow L^2} \right], k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (4.14)$$

and,

$$\left\| (1 + |\xi|)^{-m} \partial_y^k a_0 \right\|_{L_{x,y,\xi}^\infty} \leq C_{m,k} [\|A\|_{H^m \rightarrow L^2} + \|[ix, A]\|_{H^{m-\rho} \rightarrow L^2}], k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.15)$$

Thus to conclude the proof we need to transfer the information on the amplitude a_0 to the symbol a which is a simple application of Oscillatory Integrals. Indeed it

suffices to write:

$$\begin{aligned}
a(x, \xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} e^{i(x-y) \cdot (\eta - \xi)} a_0(x, y, \eta) d\eta dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\langle \xi - \eta \rangle^2} (I - \Delta_y) e^{i(x-y) \cdot (\eta - \xi)} a_0(x, y, \eta) d\eta dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\langle \xi - \eta \rangle^2} e^{i(x-y) \cdot (\eta - \xi)} (I - \Delta_y)^* a_0(x, y, \eta) d\eta dy,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired result as $a_0(x, y, \eta)$ and all of its y derivatives are y integrable. \square

Remark 4.1. *To get a good intuition behind Beals type estimates, it is worth noting that if instead of Sobolev continuity bounds we had Hölder continuity estimates on A with $m \notin \mathbb{N}$, then combined with the identity in the torus*

$$e^{-ix \cdot \xi} A e^{ix \cdot \xi} = a(x, \xi).$$

we get directly the analogue of estimates (4.5) and (4.6) that is

$$\|(1 + |\xi|)^{-m} a\|_{L^\infty_{x, \xi}} \leq C_m \|A\|_{W^{m, \infty} \rightarrow L^\infty}.$$

Analogously to Beals characterization of pseudodifferential operators through the continuity of the successive commutators $\text{Op}(x)$, $\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}$ with A on Sobolev spaces, we give the following characterization of Paradifferential operators through estimate (4.6).

Corollary 4.1. *Consider two real numbers m and $\rho \geq 0$ and the spaces of paradifferential symbols $\Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbb{D})$ equipped with the topology induced by the seminorms $M_\rho^m(\cdot; k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ defined in A.5 giving it a Fréchet space structure.*

For $p \in \Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbb{D})$ we introduce the following family of seminorms:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_0^m(p; k) &= \sum_{j=0}^k \left\| \mathfrak{L}_{ix}^j T_p \right\|_{H^m \rightarrow H^j}, \\
H_n^m(p; k) &= \sum_{l=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^k \left\| \mathfrak{L}_{ix}^j \mathfrak{L}_{\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}}^l T_p \right\|_{H^m \rightarrow H^j}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq \rho,
\end{aligned}$$

and if $\rho \notin \mathbb{N}$:

$$H_\rho^m(p; k) = H_{[\rho]}^m(p; k) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{n(\rho - [\rho])} \sum_{j=0}^k \left\| \mathfrak{L}_{ix}^j \mathfrak{L}_{\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}}^{[\rho]} T_p P_{\leq n}(D) \right\|_{H^m \rightarrow H^j}.$$

Then $H_\rho^m(p; k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ induces an equivalent Fréchet topology to $M_\rho^m(\cdot; k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ on:

$$\psi^{B, b} \left(\Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbb{D}) \right) = \left\{ \sigma_p^{B, b}, p \in \Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbb{D}) \right\}.$$

Proof. Taking $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \geq 0$ and $p \in \Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbb{D})$ then Theorem A.1 gives for $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$

$$H_\rho^m(p; k) \leq K M_\rho^m(p; k + 1), \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}$$

and the case $\rho \geq 0$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{N}$ is obtained from the characterization of H^ρ and $W^{\rho, \infty}$ spaces by a dyadic decomposition on balls in the frequency space given by Propositions A.3 and A.4 and the observation that there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$T_p P_{\leq n}(D) = T_{P_{\leq n-N}(D) p} P_{\leq n}(D)$$

where $P_{\leq n-N}(D)$ is applied to p in the x variable. Now by Lemma 4.1 for $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$

$$M_\rho^m(\sigma_p^{B,b}; k+1) \leq H_\rho^m(p; k), \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and the case ρ non integer is treated exactly as before which gives the equivalence of the desired topologies on the subspace

$$\psi^{B,b}\left(\Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbb{D})\right) = \left\{ \sigma_p^{B,b}, p \in \Gamma_\rho^m(\mathbb{D}) \right\},$$

by noticing that $\sigma_{\sigma_p^{B,b}}^{B,b} = \sigma_p^{B,b} + \sigma_{(1-\psi^{B,b})\psi^{B,b}p}^{B+\epsilon,b}$, thus estimates on $\sigma_{\sigma_p^{B,b}}^{B,b}$ and $\sigma_p^{B,b}$ are equivalent. \square

In order to give the key symbolic calculus results in Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 we need to introduce the paradifferential analogue of the Hörmander symbol class $S_{1-\delta}^0$. For this we follow §1.1 Chapter 1 of [45] and introduce the space of non regular symbols:

Definition-Proposition 4.1. Consider $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, for $0 \leq \delta, \rho < 1$, we say:

$$p \in W^{s,\infty} S_{\rho,\delta}^m(\mathbb{D}) \iff \begin{cases} \left\| D_\xi^k p(\cdot, \xi) \right\|_{W^{s,\infty}} \leq C_{k,0} \langle \xi \rangle^{m-\rho k} \\ \left| D_x^{\lfloor s \rfloor + n} D_\xi^k p(x, \xi) \right| \leq C_{k,n} \langle \xi \rangle^{m-\rho k + (n+\lfloor s \rfloor - s)\delta} \end{cases}, (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{D} \times \hat{\mathbb{D}}, \quad (4.16)$$

for $k \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$. The best constants $C_{k,n}$ in (4.16) define a family of seminorms denoted by ${}^{\rho,\delta} M_{n,s}^m(\cdot; k)$, $(k, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ where k is the number of derivatives we make on the frequency variable ξ and n is that in the x variable. We also define the seminorm ${}^{\rho,\delta} M_s^m(\cdot; k) = {}^{\rho,\delta} M_{0,s}^m(\cdot; k)$ and define analogously $W^{s,\infty} S_{\rho,\delta}^m(\mathbb{D}^* \times \hat{\mathbb{D}})$.

Analogously to Corollary 4.1 we introduce the following family of seminorms:

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\rho,\delta} H_{0,s}^m(p; k) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\lfloor s \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^k \left\| \mathfrak{L}_{ix}^j \mathfrak{L}_{\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}}^l \text{Op}(p) \right\|_{H^m \rightarrow H^{j\rho}} \\ &\quad + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{n(s-\lfloor s \rfloor)} \sum_{j=0}^k \left\| \mathfrak{L}_{ix}^j \mathfrak{L}_{\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}}^{\lfloor s \rfloor} [P_n(D) \text{Op}(p)] \right\|_{H^m \rightarrow H^{j\rho}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_n(D)$ is applied to p in the x variable. And for $n \geq 1$

$${}^{\rho,\delta} H_{n,s}^m(p; k) = {}^{\rho,\delta} H_{0,s}^m(p; k) + \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^k \left\| \mathfrak{L}_{ix}^j \mathfrak{L}_{\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}}^{\lfloor s \rfloor + l} \text{Op}(p) \right\|_{H^m \rightarrow H^{j\rho - (l+\lfloor s \rfloor - s)\delta}}.$$

Then ${}^{\rho,\delta} H_{n,s}^m(\cdot; k)_{(n,k) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ induces an equivalent Fréchet topology to ${}^{\rho,\delta} M_{n,s}^m(\cdot; k)_{(n,k) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ on $W^{s,\infty} S_{\rho,\delta}^m$.

Proof. The L^2 continuity of such operators and control by their symbol seminorms is given in Appendix B of [38] and the reciprocal is given by Lemma 4.1. \square

Remark 4.2. We note that for the standard Hörmander symbol classes and paradifferential symbols classes we have respectively

$$S_{\rho,\delta}^m = \cap_{s \geq 0} W^{s,\infty} S_{\rho,\delta}^m \text{ and } \Gamma_\rho^m = W^{\rho,\infty} S_{1,0}^m.$$

Now all of the ingredients are in place to give the key commutation and conjugation result.

Proposition 4.2. Consider three real numbers $\delta < 1$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \geq 1$, a real valued symbol $p \in \Gamma_\rho^\delta(\mathbb{D})$. Let $e^{i\tau T_p}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ be the flow map defined by Proposition 4.1 and take a symbol $b \in \Gamma_\rho^\beta(\mathbb{D})$ with $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$.

(5) There exists $b_\tau^p \in W^{\rho, \infty} S_{1-\delta, \delta}^\beta(\mathbb{D})$ such that:

$$e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} = \text{Op}(b_\tau^p). \quad (4.17)$$

Moreover we have the estimates:

$$\left\| \text{Op}(b_\tau^p) - \sum_{k=0}^{\lceil \rho-1 \rceil} \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{i T_p}^k T_b \right\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-\beta-\lceil \rho \rceil \delta + \rho}} \leq C_\rho e^{C|\tau| M_1^\delta(p)} M_\rho^\beta(b) M_\rho^\delta(p)^{\lceil \rho \rceil}, \quad (4.18)$$

$${}^{1-\delta, \delta} H_\rho^\beta(b_\tau^p; k) \leq C_k (M_1^\delta(p)) H_\rho^\beta(b; k) \left[\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} H_\rho^\delta(p; k)^{k-i} \right], \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.19)$$

(6) There exists ${}^c b_\tau^p \in W^{\rho-1, \infty} S_{1-\delta, \delta}^{\beta+\delta-1}(\mathbb{D})$ such that:

$$[e^{i\tau T_p}, T_b] = e^{i\tau T_p} \text{Op}({}^c b_\tau^p) \iff \text{Op}({}^c b_\tau^p) = T_b - \text{Op}(b_{-\tau}^p). \quad (4.20)$$

Moreover we have the estimates:

$$\left\| \text{Op}({}^c b_\tau^p) - \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil \rho-1 \rceil} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{i T_p}^k T_b \right\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-\beta-\lceil \rho \rceil \delta + \rho}} \leq C_\rho e^{C|\tau| M_1^\delta(p)} M_\rho^\beta(b) M_\rho^\delta(p)^{\lceil \rho \rceil}, \quad (4.21)$$

$${}^{1-\delta, \delta} H_{\rho-1}^{\beta+\delta-1}({}^c b_\tau^p; k) \leq C_k (M_1^\delta(p)) H_\rho^\beta(b; k) \left[\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} H_\rho^\delta(p; k)^{k-i} \right], \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.22)$$

Remark 4.3. • It is important to notice that the main result of this proposition is the factorization of the $e^{i\tau T_p}$ terms in (4.17) and (4.20) where the right hand sides contain symbols in the usual classes modulo a more regular remainder. This was not a priori the case of the left hand sides containing $e^{i\tau T_p}$. In other words we prove the stability of Γ_ρ^m under the conjugation by $e^{i\tau T_p}$ modulo more regular remainders.

This is crucial when studying the regularity of the flow map for:

$$s > \left\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \right\rceil - \frac{1}{2}.$$

Indeed if p depends on a parameter λ , $D_\lambda e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p}$ is a priori an operator of order $\beta + \delta$ by (4.4), but $D_\lambda \text{Op}(b_\tau^p)$ is shown in proposition 4.5 to be an operator of order β .

- In the language of pseudodifferential operators, $\text{Op}(b_\tau^p)$ is the asymptotic sum of the series $(\frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{i T_p}^k T_b)$ i.e the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formal series. Though $\text{Op}(b_\tau^p)$ is not necessarily equal to this sum, for this sum need not converge.

Proof. The structure of the proof is as follows:

- (I) We will give a proof of the estimate (4.18) assuming b_τ^p exists.
- (II) We will prove the existence of $b_\tau^p \in W^{\rho, \infty} S_{1-\delta, \delta}^\beta(\mathbb{D})$ which is the subtle part of the proof.
- (III) Finally we will deduce point (6) from point (5).

Point (I). For point (5) we compute,

$$\partial_\tau [e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p}] = iT_p \circ e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} - e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ iT_p \circ e^{-i\tau T_p}$$

Using (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau [e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p}] &= e^{i\tau T_p} \circ iT_p \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} - e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ iT_p \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \\ &= e^{i\tau T_p} [iT_p, T_b] e^{-i\tau T_p}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

As $e^{i0T_p} = Id$, integrating on $[0, \tau]$ we get:

$$e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} = T_b + \int_0^\tau \underbrace{e^{irT_p} [iT_p, T_b] e^{-irT_p}}_* dr.$$

Iterating the computation in $*$ we get for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^k T_b + \int_0^\tau \frac{(\tau-r)^n}{n!} e^{irT_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{n+1} T_b e^{-irT_p} dr. \quad (4.24)$$

Now the key point is the continuity of paradifferential operators given by Theorem A.1 and the symbolic calculus rules given by Theorem A.2. By Lemma 4.2:

$$\left\| \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{[\rho]} T_b \right\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-\beta-[\rho]\delta+\rho}} \leq C_\rho M_\rho^\beta(b) M_\rho^\delta(p)^{[\rho]}, \text{ for } \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (4.25)$$

where $[\rho]$ is the upper integer part of ρ .

Thus applying point (1) combined with (4.25) we get (4.18).

Point (II). The constant C_ρ in (4.25) is estimated "brutally" by Lemma 4.2: $O(2^\rho \times [\rho]!)$, thus even though one has a $\frac{1}{[\rho]!}$ in (4.24) the convergence result is non trivial. To get past this let us express explicitly the difficulty in the problem. Rearranging the terms in (4.23) we see that:

$$\partial_\tau [e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p}] = e^{i\tau T_p} [iT_p, T_b] e^{-i\tau T_p} = [iT_p, e^{i\tau T_p} T_b e^{-i\tau T_p}], \quad (4.26)$$

thus we have to solve the following Cauchy problem in $\mathcal{L}(H^s(\mathbb{D}), H^{s-\beta}(\mathbb{D}))$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau f(\tau) = [iT_p, f(\tau)] \in \Gamma_{\rho-1}^\beta(\mathbb{D}), \\ f(0) = T_b \in \Gamma_\rho^\beta(\mathbb{D}). \end{cases} \quad (4.27)$$

This amounts to the non trivial problem of solving a linear ODE in the Fréchet space $\Gamma_{+\infty}^\beta(\mathbb{D})$, indeed such a problem need not have a solution in general, and even if it does, it need not be unique. To solve such a problem one usually has to look at a Nash-Moser type scheme, though in our case we have an explicit ODE that can be solved with a series and a loss of derivative. Thus inspired by Hörmander's [18], we remark another key estimate given by the continuity of paradifferential operators given by Theorem A.1 and the symbolic calculus in Theorem A.2 summarised in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Consider two real numbers $\delta, \beta, \rho \geq 0$, and two symbols $p \in \Gamma_\rho^\delta(\mathbb{D})$ and $b \in \Gamma_\rho^\beta(\mathbb{D})$ then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that:*

$$\left\| \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{[\rho]} T_b \right\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-\beta-[\rho]\delta+\rho}} \leq C^{[\rho]+1} 2^{[\rho]} [\rho]! M_\rho^\beta(b) M_\rho^\delta(p)^{[\rho]}, \text{ for } \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (4.28)$$

$$\left\| \mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^{[\rho]} T_b \right\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-\beta-[\rho]\delta}} \leq C^{[\rho]} M_0^\beta(b) M_0^\delta(p)^{[\rho]}, \text{ for } \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (4.29)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.2. For (4.29), expanding $\mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^{[\rho]} T_b$ as polynomial in T_p and T_b and counting with repetitions, we see that it contains at most $2^{[\rho]}$ terms of the form:

$$\pm T_p \circ \dots \circ \underbrace{T_b}_{\text{position } i} \circ \dots \circ T_p, \quad i \in [0, [\rho]].$$

Now by the continuity of paradifferential operators given in Theorem A.1 and A.2 we have:

$$\|T_p \circ \dots \circ T_b \circ \dots \circ T_p\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-\beta-[\rho]\delta}} \leq K^{[\rho]} M_0^\beta(b) M_0^\delta(p)^{[\rho]},$$

which gives (4.29).

For (4.28), we start by the case $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is a an integer. We first notice that again by Theorem A.1 we have:

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^1 T_b \in \Gamma_{k-1}^{\beta+\delta-1}, \\ M_{k-1}^{\beta+\delta-1}(\mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^1 T_b) \leq C M_k^\beta(b) M_k^\delta(p). \end{cases}$$

Thus iterating this formula we get:

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^k T_b \in \Gamma_0^{\beta+k\delta-k}, \\ M_0^{\beta+\delta-k}(\mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^k T_b) \leq C_k M_k^\beta(b) \prod_{i=1}^k M_i^\delta(p), \end{cases}$$

and C_k verifies:

$$C_k = 2k C_{k-1} \Rightarrow C_k = C 2^k k!,$$

Thus giving the result in the case k integer. For $\rho \geq 0$, it suffice to see that for $\rho \leq 1$ again by Theorem A.1 we have:

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^1 T_b \in \Gamma_0^{\beta+\delta-\rho}, \\ M_0^{\beta+\delta-\rho}(\mathfrak{L}_{T_p}^1 T_b) \leq C M_\rho^\beta(b) M_\rho^\delta(p), \end{cases}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

This means that if we can compensate the loss of $\beta + \lceil \rho \rceil \delta$ derivatives with a cost negligible in comparison to $\lceil \rho \rceil!$, we would have a convergent series in (4.24). A first approach would be to interpolate (4.25) and (4.29) which gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathfrak{L}_{i T_p}^{\lceil \rho \rceil} T_b \right\|_{H^s \rightarrow H^{s-\beta}} &\leq C \frac{\rho - \lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho} \lceil \rho \rceil M_0^\beta(b) \frac{\rho - \lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho} M_0^\delta(p) \frac{\rho - \lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho} \lceil \rho \rceil \\ &\times C^{(\lceil \rho \rceil + 1)} \frac{\lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho} 2^{\lceil \rho \rceil} \frac{\lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho} \lceil \rho \rceil! \frac{\lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho} M_\rho^\beta(b) \frac{\lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho} M_\rho^\delta(p) \lceil \rho \rceil \frac{\lceil \rho \rceil \delta}{\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

This indeed solves the cost $\lceil \rho \rceil!$ of (4.25) but depends on M_ρ norms of b and p . An idea to control those norms in a cost negligible in comparison to $\lceil \rho \rceil!$ would be to mollify p and b using an analytic mollifier, this might work but we found it better to mollify differently.

For this we introduce a mollification with the Gaussian function $\phi_\epsilon(D)$ with symbol:

$$\phi_\epsilon(\xi) = \frac{1}{\epsilon \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2\epsilon^2}}, \epsilon > 0. \quad (4.31)$$

Other than the standard properties of mollifiers, we have the following properties:

- For $h \in H^s(\mathbb{D})$, $\phi_\epsilon(D)h$ is real analytic.
- The moments of the Gaussian can be explicitly computed by, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\xi|^k e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} d\xi = \frac{2^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{k+1}{2})}{\sqrt{\pi}} = (k-1)!! \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \end{cases}.$$

- From the moments of the Gaussian we deduce that, for $h \in H^s(\mathbb{D})$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\left\| \partial_x^k \phi_\epsilon(D) h \right\|_{H^s} \leq C_k \epsilon^{-k} \|h\|_{H^s},$$

and C_k verifies for all $K > 0$, $K^k C_k = o(k!)$.

Now by the symbolic calculus rules given by Theorem A.2 and the fact that the class $\Psi_{1,1}^0(\mathbb{D}) = S_{1,1}^0(\mathbb{D}) \cap (S_{1,1}^0(\mathbb{D}))^*$ is closed under composition, for $\epsilon > 0$, there exists ${}^\epsilon b_\tau^p \in \Psi_{1,1}^0(\mathbb{D})$ such that:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{i T_p}^k T_b \phi_\epsilon(D) = \text{Op}({}^\epsilon b_\tau^p), \text{ with,}$$

$$M_\rho^0({}^\epsilon b_\tau^p) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} C^k C_k \frac{|\tau|^k}{k!} \epsilon^{-k\delta-\beta} M_\rho^\beta(b) M_\rho^\delta(p)^k. \quad (4.32)$$

In order to pass to the limit in ϵ we will express ${}^\epsilon b_\tau^p$ differently, for all $\epsilon > 0$, $\sum_{k=0}^n \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^k T_b \phi_\epsilon(D)$ converges in $\mathcal{L}(H^s(\mathbb{D}))$, thus by uniqueness of the limit:

$$e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \phi_\epsilon(D) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^k T_b \phi_\epsilon(D). \quad (4.33)$$

Thus,

$$e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \phi_\epsilon(D) = \text{Op}({}^\epsilon b_\tau^p). \quad (4.34)$$

Now we estimate the $\delta^{-1} H_\rho^\beta(\cdot; k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ norms of ${}^\epsilon b_\tau^p$. To do so we need, in the word of Hörmander [17], a result which interpolates between information on the norm a of an operator and bounds for the derivatives of it's symbol. This was exactly the goal of Lemma 4.1.

By commuting $\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}$ and ix with (4.34) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, \text{Op}({}^\epsilon b_\tau^p) \right] &= \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \phi_\epsilon(D) \right] + e^{i\tau T_p} \circ \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, T_b \right] \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \phi_\epsilon(D) \\ &\quad + e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, e^{-i\tau T_p} \right] \phi_\epsilon(D) + e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \left[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, \phi_\epsilon(D) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} [ix, \text{Op}({}^\epsilon b_\tau^p)] &= [ix, e^{i\tau T_p}] \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \phi_\epsilon(D) + e^{i\tau T_p} \circ [ix, T_b] \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} \phi_\epsilon(D) \\ &\quad + e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ [ix, e^{-i\tau T_p}] \phi_\epsilon(D) + e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} [ix, \phi_\epsilon(D)]. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $[\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, e^{i\tau T_p}]$ and $[ix, e^{i\tau T_p}]$ we get back to (4.1) and see that:

$$\begin{cases} [\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, e^{i\tau T_p}] = \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} [\frac{1}{i} \frac{d}{dx}, T_{ip}] e^{irT_p} dr, \\ [ix, e^{i\tau T_p}] = \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} [ix, T_{ip}] e^{irT_p} dr. \end{cases} \quad (4.35)$$

Thus by iteration, the continuity of $e^{i\tau T_p}$ and Lemma 4.1 we get:

$${}^{1-\delta, \delta} H_{m,n}^\beta({}^\epsilon b_\tau^p; k) \leq C_{n,k} (M_1^\delta(p)) H_\rho^\beta(b; k) \left[\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} H_\rho^\delta(p; k)^{k-i} \right], \quad (k, n, m) \in \mathbb{N}^3.$$

Thus we can pass to the limit in ϵ in (4.34), there exist $b_\tau^p \in W^{0, \infty} S_{1-\delta, \delta}^\beta$ such that:

$$e^{i\tau T_p} \circ T_b \circ e^{-i\tau T_p} = \text{Op}(b_\tau^p). \quad (4.36)$$

Moreover if $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ we get $b_\tau^p \in W^{\rho, \infty} S_{1-\delta, \delta}^\beta$.

The ${}^{1-\delta, \delta} H_{m,\rho}^\beta(b_\tau^p; k)$, $\rho \notin \mathbb{N}$ estimates are obtained by interpolation. Indeed by Proposition 4.1 the sequence of seminorms

$$\left({}^{1-\delta, \delta} H_{m,n}^\beta(\cdot; k) \right)_{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{N}^3} \quad \text{and} \quad \left({}^{1-\delta, \delta} M_{m,n}^\beta(\cdot; k) \right)_{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{N}^3}$$

are equivalent. Thus we deduce $\left({}^{1-\delta, \delta} M_{m,n}^\beta(\cdot; k) \right)$ estimates. Now for $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\left({}^{1-\delta, \delta} M_{m,\rho}^\beta(\cdot; k) \right)$ are interpolation norms which give $\left({}^{1-\delta, \delta} M_{m,\rho}^\beta(\cdot; k) \right)$ estimates and the existence of $b_\tau^p \in W^{\rho, \infty} S_{1-\delta, \delta}^\beta$ for $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$.

Point (III). For point (6) we compute:

$$\partial_\tau[e^{i\tau T_p}, T_b] = [iT_p \circ e^{i\tau T_p}, T_b] = iT_p[e^{i\tau T_p}, T_b] + [iT_p, T_b]e^{i\tau T_p}.$$

Thus by the definition of $e^{i\tau T_p}$ as the flow map we get the following Duhamel formula,

$$\begin{aligned} [e^{i\tau T_p}, T_b] &= \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} [iT_p, T_b] e^{irT_p} dr, \\ &= e^{i\tau T_p} \int_0^\tau \underbrace{e^{-irT_p} [iT_p, T_b] e^{irT_p}}_\star dr. \end{aligned}$$

Applying point (5) to \star we get:

$$\begin{aligned} [e^{i\tau T_p}, T_b] &= e^{i\tau T_p} \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{k-1} \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^k T_b \\ &\quad + (-1)^n e^{i\tau T_p} \int_0^\tau \frac{(\tau-r)^n}{n!} e^{-irT_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{n+1} T_b e^{irT_p} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Again applying point (1) combined with (4.25) we get (4.21).

To get (4.20) we inject (4.17) in \star , which concludes the proof. \square

We give a result on the symbol of $e^{i\tau T_p}$

Proposition 4.3. *Consider two real numbers $\delta < 1$, $\rho \geq 1$ and a real valued symbol $p \in \Gamma_\rho^\delta(\mathbb{D})$.*

Let $e^{i\tau T_p}, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ be the flow map defined by Proposition 4.1, then there exists a symbol $e_\otimes^{i\tau p} \in W^{\rho, \infty} S_{1-\delta, \delta}^0(\mathbb{D}^ \times \hat{\mathbb{D}})$ such that:*

$$e^{i\tau T_p} = \text{Op}(e_\otimes^{i\tau p}). \quad (4.37)$$

Moreover we have the identity:

$$e^{i\tau T_p} = Id + T_{e^{i\tau p-1}} + \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-s)T_p} (T_{ip} T_{e^{isp}} - T_{ipe^{isp}}) ds. \quad (4.38)$$

Proof. The idea is that morally $\text{Op}(e_\otimes^{i\tau p})$ should be defined by the asymptotic series:

$$\text{Op}(e_\otimes^{i\tau p}) \sim \sum \frac{i^k \tau^k}{k!} (T_p)^k = \sum \frac{i^k \tau^k}{k!} T_{\otimes p}^k,$$

where $T_{\otimes p}^k$ is defined by Theorem A.2. To make this series converge we again introduce the Gaussian multiplier $\phi_\epsilon(D)$ defined by (4.31), as we still have the factor $\frac{1}{k!}$ as in Proposition 4.2.

As in the proof of Proposition 4.2 there exists a symbol ${}^\epsilon e_\otimes^{i\tau p} \in \Psi_{1,1}^0(\mathbb{D})$ such that:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{i^k \tau^k}{k!} (T_p)^k \phi_\epsilon(D) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{i^k \tau^k}{k!} T_{\otimes p}^k \phi_\epsilon(D) = \text{Op}({}^\epsilon e_\otimes^{i\tau p}), \quad (4.39)$$

$${}^{1-\delta, \delta} M_\rho^0({}^\epsilon e_\otimes^{i\tau p}) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} C^k C_k \frac{|\tau|^k}{k!} \epsilon^{-k\delta} M_\rho^\delta(p)^k, \quad (4.40)$$

where C_k verifies for all $K > 0$, $K^k C_k = o(k!)$.

Now in order to pass to the limit in ϵ we need to get uniform estimates on ${}^{1-\delta,\delta}H_{n,s}^0(\epsilon e_{\otimes}^{i\tau p}; k)$ for $(k, n) \in \mathbb{N}$. To do so we see that:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tau}[\text{Op}(\epsilon e_{\otimes}^{i\tau p})h_0] = iT_p \text{Op}(\epsilon e_{\otimes}^{i\tau p})h_0, \\ \text{Op}(\epsilon e_{\otimes}^{i\tau p})h_0|_{\tau=0} = \phi_{\epsilon}(D)T_1h_0, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } h_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{D}), s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.41)$$

Thus a standard energy estimate combined with the commutation identities (4.35) and Lemma 4.1 we get:

$${}^{1-\delta,\delta}H_{m,n}^0(\epsilon e_{\otimes}^{i\tau p}; k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \leq C_{k,n}(M_1^{\delta}(p; k))M_n^{\delta}(p; k), \quad (k, m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^3.$$

Thus if of $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ we can pass to the limit in ϵ and get $e_{\otimes}^{i\tau p} \in W^{\rho,\infty}S_{1-\delta,\delta}^0(\mathbb{D}^* \times \hat{\mathbb{D}})$. For $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \mathbb{N}$ follows by interpolation as in point (II) of the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Identity (4.38) comes from the following computation. Fix an $h_0 \in H^s, s \in \mathbb{R}$, then $[e^{i\tau T_p} - T_{e^{i\tau p}}]h_0$ solves:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{\tau}([e^{i\tau T_p} - T_{e^{i\tau p}}]h_0) - iT_p([e^{i\tau T_p} - T_{e^{i\tau p}}]h_0) = (T_{ip}T_{e^{i\tau p}} - T_{ip e^{i\tau p}})h_0, \\ ([e^{i\tau T_p} - T_{e^{i\tau p}}]h_0)(0, \cdot) = (Id - T_1)h_0(\cdot), \end{cases} \quad (4.42)$$

which by definition of $e^{i\tau T_p}$ gives (4.38). \square

We will now compute the different Gateaux derivatives of the operators defined above.

Proposition 4.4. *Consider two real numbers $\delta < 1, \rho \geq 1$, two real valued symbols $p, p' \in \Gamma_{\rho}^{\delta}(\mathbb{D})$. Let $e^{i\tau T_p}, e^{i\tau T_{p'}}, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ be the flow maps defined by Proposition 4.1, then for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:*

$$e^{i\tau T_p} - e^{i\tau T_{p'}} = \int_0^{\tau} e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} iT_{p'-p} e^{ir T_{p'}} dr. \quad (4.43)$$

Another way to see this is with the Gateaux derivative of $p \mapsto e^{i\tau T_p}$ on the Fréchet space $\Gamma_{\rho}^{\delta}(\mathbb{D})$ is given by:

$$D_p e^{i\tau T_p}(h) = \int_0^{\tau} e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} T_{ih} e^{ir T_p} dr. \quad (4.44)$$

Moreover consider an open interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, and a real valued symbols $p \in C^1(I, \Gamma_{\rho}^{\delta}(\mathbb{D}))$. Let $e^{i\tau T_p}, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ be the flow map defined by Proposition 4.1 then for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}, z \in I$ we have:

$$\partial_z e^{i\tau T_p} = \int_0^{\tau} e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} T_{i\partial_z p} e^{ir T_p} dr. \quad (4.45)$$

Proof. Fix $h_0 \in H^s, s \in \mathbb{R}$ then:

$$\partial_{\tau}[e^{i\tau T_p} h_0] - iT_p[e^{i\tau T_p} h_0] = 0 \Rightarrow \partial_{\tau}[\partial_z e^{i\tau T_p} h_0] - iT_p[\partial_z e^{i\tau T_p} h_0] - T_{i\partial_z p}[e^{i\tau T_p} h_0] = 0,$$

which gives (4.45) by the definition of $e^{i\tau T_p}$ and the Duhamel formula. The identities (4.43) and (4.44) are obtained in the same way. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Consider two real numbers $\delta < 1, \rho \geq 1$, two real valued symbols $p, p' \in \Gamma_{\rho}^{\delta}(\mathbb{D})$. Let $e^{i\tau T_p}, e^{i\tau T_{p'}}, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ be the flow maps defined by Proposition 4.1*

and take a symbol $b \in \Gamma_\rho^\beta(\mathbb{D})$ with $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ then for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:

$$\text{Op}(b_\tau^p) - \text{Op}(b_\tau^{p'}) = \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_{p-p'}} \text{Op}(b_r^{p'}) e^{i(r-\tau)T_p} dr \quad (4.46)$$

$$= i \int_0^\tau \mathfrak{L}_{T_p - \text{Op}(p'_{\tau-r})} \text{Op}((b_r^{p'})_{\tau-r}^p) dr. \quad (4.47)$$

Another way to see this is with the Gateaux derivative of $p \mapsto \text{Op}(b_\tau^p)$ on the Fréchet space $\Gamma_\rho^\delta(\mathbb{D})$ is given by:

$$D_p \text{Op}(b_\tau^p)(h) = \int_0^\tau \mathfrak{L}_{i \text{Op}(h_{\tau-r}^p)} \text{Op}(b_\tau^p) dr = \mathfrak{L}_{i \int_0^\tau \text{Op}(h_{\tau-r}^p) dr} \text{Op}(b_\tau^p). \quad (4.48)$$

Writing, $\text{Op}(b_\tau^p) = T_b - \text{Op}(b_{-\tau}^p)$, and, $\text{Op}(b_\tau^{p'}) = T_b - \text{Op}(b_{-\tau}^{p'})$ we get:

$$\text{Op}(b_\tau^p) - \text{Op}(b_\tau^{p'}) = - \int_0^{-\tau} e^{-i(\tau+r)T_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_{p-p'}} \text{Op}(b_r^{p'}) e^{i(\tau+r)T_p} dr \quad (4.49)$$

$$= -i \int_0^{-\tau} \mathfrak{L}_{T_p - \text{Op}(p'_{-\tau-r})} \text{Op}((b_r^{p'})_{-\tau-r}^p) dr. \quad (4.50)$$

$$D_p \text{Op}(b_\tau^p)(h) = - \int_0^{-\tau} \mathfrak{L}_{i \text{Op}(h_{-\tau-r}^p)} \text{Op}(b_{-\tau}^p) dr = - \mathfrak{L}_{i \int_0^{-\tau} \text{Op}(h_{-\tau-r}^p) dr} \text{Op}(b_{-\tau}^p). \quad (4.51)$$

Proof. From (4.26) and (4.27) we have:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau [\text{Op}(b_\tau^p) - \text{Op}(b_\tau^{p'})] = \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p} (\text{Op}(b_\tau^p) - \text{Op}(b_\tau^{p'})) + \mathfrak{L}_{iT_{p-p'}} \text{Op}(b_\tau^{p'}), \\ \text{Op}(b_0^p) - \text{Op}(b_0^{p'}) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.52)$$

Thus the Duhamel formula gives (4.46) and (4.47). For the Gateaux derivative passing to the limit in (4.46) we have:

$$D_p \text{Op}(b_\tau^p)(h) = \int_0^\tau e^{i(\tau-r)T_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_h} \text{Op}(b_r^p) e^{i(r-\tau)T_p} dr,$$

which gives (4.48). \square

Corollary 4.2. Consider three real numbers $\alpha > 1$, $\beta < \alpha$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, two real valued symbols $a \in \Gamma_{\lfloor \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\beta} \rfloor}^\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ and $b \in \Gamma_{\lfloor \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\beta} \rfloor - 1}^\beta(\mathbb{D})$. Suppose that there exists a real valued symbol $p \in \Gamma_{\lfloor \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\beta} \rfloor}^{\beta+1-\alpha}(\mathbb{D})$ such that:

$$b = -\partial_\xi p \partial_x a + \partial_x p \partial_\xi a. \quad (4.53)$$

Define $e^{i\tau T_p}(u)$ as the flow map generated by iT_p from Proposition 4.1. For $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$R_\tau = \tau T_{ib} + \int_0^\tau e^{-isT_p} [T_{ip}, T_{ia}] e^{isT_p} ds, \quad (4.54)$$

and,

$$\tilde{R}_\tau = e^{i\tau T_p} R_\tau e^{-i\tau T_p} = \tau e^{i\tau T_p} i T_{ib} e^{-i\tau T_p} + [e^{i\tau T_p}, T_{ia}] e^{-i\tau T_p}. \quad (4.55)$$

Then $R_\tau, \tilde{R}_\tau \in \mathcal{L}(H^{s+(\beta+1-\alpha)^+}(\mathbb{D}), H^s(\mathbb{D}))$ and

$$\left\| (R_\tau, \tilde{R}_\tau) \right\|_{H^{s+(\beta+1-\alpha)^+} \rightarrow H^s} \leq C \underbrace{M_{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\beta} \rceil}^\alpha(a) M_{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\beta} \rceil - 1}^\beta(b) M_{\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\beta} \rceil}^{\beta+1-\alpha}(p)}_{:=F(a,b,p)}.$$

Moreover taking three different symbols a', b' and p' and defining analogously R'_τ, \tilde{R}'_τ , we have for $h \in H^s$:

$$\left\| [R_\tau - R'_\tau]h \right\|_{H^s} \leq CF(a, b, p)F(a', b', p')F(a - a', b - b', p - p') \|h\|_{H^{s+(\beta+1-\alpha)^+}},$$

where F is defined in (4.55) and,

$$\left\| [\tilde{R}_\tau - \tilde{R}'_\tau]h \right\|_{H^s} \leq CF(a, b, p)F(a', b', p')F(a - a', b - b', p - p') \|h\|_{H^{s+(\beta+1-\alpha)^+}}.$$

Proof. First we notice that by definition R_τ, \tilde{R}_τ are of order β . Now to show that they are actually of order $(\beta + 1 - \alpha)^+$ indeed as p, a and b have a regularity of $2 + \frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha-1}$ and $\lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1$ respectively we write by (4.24) for $n = \lceil \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \rceil - 1$:

$$R_\tau = \tau \underbrace{(T_{ib} + [T_{ip}, T_{ia}])}_{:=T_{r_\tau}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(-1)^k \tau^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{k+1} T_{ia}}_{:=T_{r_\tau}^{(\beta+1-\alpha)}} - \underbrace{\int_0^\tau \frac{(\tau-r)^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} e^{irT_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{n+1} T_{ia} e^{-irT_p} dr}_{:=R_\tau^{\alpha+n(1-\alpha)}}.$$

The key observation is that by Theorem A.2, T_{r_τ} and $T_{r_\tau}^{(\beta+1-\alpha)}$ are of order $\beta + 1 - \alpha$ and $R_\tau^{\alpha+n(1-\alpha)}$ is order $\alpha + n(1 - \alpha)$. Now T_{r_τ} and $T_{r_\tau}^{(\beta+1-\alpha)}$ are operators in the usual paradifferential classes and thus their differential with respect to p do not generate the undesired loss of $1 + \beta - \alpha$ derivatives. On the other hand for $D_p R_\tau^{\alpha+n(1-\alpha)}$ is of order $\beta + 1 - \alpha$ by Proposition 4.5. Which gives the desired estimates on R_τ . We get the estimates on \tilde{R}_τ by writing analogously

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_\tau &= \tau (T_{ib} + [T_{ip}, T_{ia}]) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\tau^{k+1}}{k!} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^k T_{ib} - \int_0^\tau \frac{(\tau-r)^n}{n!} e^{irT_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^n T_{ib} e^{-irT_p} dr \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\tau^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{k+1} T_{ia} - \int_0^\tau \int_0^s \frac{(\tau-s-r)^n}{n!} e^{irT_p} \mathfrak{L}_{iT_p}^{n+1} T_{ia} e^{-irT_p} dr ds. \end{aligned}$$

□

APPENDIX A. PARADIFFERENTIAL CALCULUS

In this paragraph we review classic notations and results about paradifferential and pseudodifferential calculus that we need in this paper. We follow the presentations in [16], [17], [44], and [30] which give an accessible and complete presentation.

Notation A.1. *In the following presentation we will use the usual definitions and standard notations for regular functions C^k , C_b^k for bounded ones and C_0^k for those with compact support, the distribution space \mathcal{D}' , \mathcal{E}' for those distribution with compact support, $\mathcal{D}^k, \mathcal{E}^k$ for distributions of order k , L^p Lebesgue spaces, H^s and $W^{p,q}$ Sobolev spaces and finally \mathcal{S} for the Schwartz class and it's dual \mathcal{S}' . All of those spaces are equipped with their standard topologies. We also use the Landau notation $O_{\|\cdot\|}(X)$.*

For the definition of the periodic symbol classes we will need the following definitions and notations.

Notation A.2. We will use \mathbb{D} to denote \mathbb{T} or \mathbb{R} and $\hat{\mathbb{D}}$ to denote their duals that is \mathbb{Z} in the case of \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} in the case of \mathbb{R} . For concision an integral on \mathbb{Z} i.e $\int_{\mathbb{Z}}$ should be understood as $\sum_{\mathbb{Z}}$. A function a is said to be in $C^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{Z})$ if for every $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a(\cdot, \xi) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. The partial derivative ∂_ξ should be understood as the forward difference operator, i.e

$$\partial_\xi a(\xi) = a(\xi + 1) - a(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We recall the following simple identities for the Fourier transform on the Torus:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}}(\partial_x^\alpha f)(\xi) = \xi^\alpha \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}}(f)(\xi), \xi \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}}((e^{-2i\pi x} - 1)^\alpha f)(\xi) = \xi^\alpha \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{T}}(f)(\xi), \xi \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

A.1. Littlewood-Paley Theory.

Definition A.1 (Littlewood-Paley decomposition). Pick $P_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that:

$$P_0(\xi) = 1 \text{ for } |\xi| < 1 \text{ and } P_0(\xi) = 0 \text{ for } |\xi| > 2.$$

We define a dyadic decomposition of unity by:

$$\text{for } k \geq 1, \quad P_{\leq k}(\xi) = P_0(2^{-k}\xi), \quad P_k(\xi) = P_{\leq k}(\xi) - P_{\leq k-1}(\xi).$$

Thus,

$$P_{\leq k}(\xi) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} P_j(\xi) \text{ and } 1 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_j(\xi).$$

Introduce the operator acting on $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D}^d)$:

$$P_{\leq k} u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(P_{\leq k}(\xi)u) \text{ and } u_k = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(P_k(\xi)u).$$

Thus,

$$u = \sum_k u_k.$$

Finally put for $k \geq 1$, $C_k = \text{supp } P_k$ the set of rings associated to this decomposition.

An interesting property of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition is that even if the decomposed function is merely a distribution the terms of the decomposition are regular, indeed they all have compact spectrum and thus are entire functions. On classical functions spaces this regularization effect can be "measured" by the following inequalities due to Bernstein.

Proposition A.1 (Bernstein's inequalities). Suppose that $a \in L^p(\mathbb{D}^d)$ has its spectrum contained in the ball $\{|\xi| \leq \lambda\}$.

Then $a \in C^\infty$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $1 \leq p \leq q \leq +\infty$, there is $C_{\alpha,p,q}$ (independent of λ) such that

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha a\|_{L^q} \leq C_{\alpha,p,q} \lambda^{|\alpha| + \frac{d}{p} - \frac{d}{q}} \|a\|_{L^p}.$$

In particular,

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha a\|_{L^q} \leq C_\alpha \lambda^{|\alpha|} \|a\|_{L^p}, \text{ and for } p = 2, p = \infty$$

$$\|a\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \lambda^{\frac{d}{2}} \|a\|_{L^2}.$$

If moreover a has its spectrum is included in $\{0 < \mu \leq |\xi| \leq \lambda\}$ then:

$$C_{\alpha,q}^{-1} \mu^{|\alpha|} \|a\|_{L^q} \leq \|\partial_x^\alpha a\|_{L^q} \leq C_{\alpha,q} \lambda^{|\alpha|} \|a\|_{L^q}.$$

Proposition A.2. For all $\mu > 0$, there is a constant C such that for all $\lambda > 0$ and for all $\alpha \in W^{\mu,\infty}$ with spectrum contained in $\{|\xi| \geq \lambda\}$. one has the following estimate:

$$\|a\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \lambda^{-\mu} \|a\|_{W^{\mu,\infty}}.$$

Definition A.2 (Zygmund spaces on \mathbb{D}^d). For $r \in \mathbb{R}$ we define the space:

$$C_*^r(\mathbb{D}^d) \subset \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D}^d), \quad C_*^r(\mathbb{D}^d) = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D}^d), \|u\|_{C_*^r} = \sup_q 2^{qr} \|u_q\|_{L^\infty} < \infty \right\}$$

equipped with its canonical topology giving it a Banach space structure.

It's a classical result that for $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $C_*^r(\mathbb{D}^d) = W^{r,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^d)$ the classic Hölder spaces.

Proposition A.3. Let B be a ball with center 0. There exists a constant C such that for all $r > 0$ and for all $(u_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D}^d)$ verifying:

$$\forall q, \text{supp } \hat{u}_q \subset 2^q B \text{ and } (2^{qr} \|u_q\|_\infty)_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is bounded,}$$

$$\text{then, } u = \sum_q u_q \in C_*^r(\mathbb{D}^d) \text{ and } \|u\|_{C_*^r} \leq \frac{C}{1 - 2^{-r}} \sup_{q \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{qr} \|u_q\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Definition A.3 (Sobolev spaces on \mathbb{D}^d). It is also a classical result that for $s \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$H^s(\mathbb{D}^d) = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D}^d), \|u\|_s = \left(\sum_q 2^{2qs} \|u_q\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty \right\}$$

with the right hand side equipped with its canonical topology giving it a Hilbert space structure and $\|\cdot\|_s$ is equivalent to the usual norm on H^s .

Proposition A.4. Let B be a ball with center 0. There exists a constant C such that for all $s > 0$ and for all $(u_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{D}^d)$ verifying:

$$\forall q, \text{supp } \hat{u}_q \subset 2^q B \text{ and } (2^{qs} \|u_q\|_{L^2})_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is in } L^2(\mathbb{N}),$$

$$\text{then, } u = \sum_q u_q \in H^s(\mathbb{D}^d) \text{ and } \|u\|_s \leq \frac{C}{1 - 2^{-s}} \left(\sum_q 2^{2qs} \|u_q\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We recall the usual nonlinear estimates in Sobolev spaces:

- If $u_j \in H^{s_j}(\mathbb{D}^d)$, $j = 1, 2$, and $s_1 + s_2 > 0$ then $u_1 u_2 \in H^{s_0}(\mathbb{D}^d)$ and if

$$s_0 \leq s_j, j = 1, 2 \text{ and } s_0 \leq s_1 + s_2 - \frac{d}{2},$$

$$\text{then } \exists K \in \mathbb{R}, \|u_1 u_2\|_{H^{s_0}} \leq K \|u_1\|_{H^{s_1}} \|u_2\|_{H^{s_2}},$$

where the last inequality is strict if s_1 or s_2 or $-s_0$ is equal to $\frac{d}{2}$.

- For all C^∞ function F vanishing at the origin, if $u \in H^s(\mathbb{D}^d)$ with $s > \frac{d}{2}$, then

$$\|F(u)\|_{H^s} \leq C(\|u\|_{H^s}),$$

for some non decreasing function C depending only on F .

A.2. Paradifferential operators. We start by the definition of symbols with limited spatial regularity. Let $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{S}'$ be a Banach space.

Definition A.4. Given $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{W}}^m(\mathbb{D})$ denotes the space of locally bounded functions $a(x, \xi)$ on $\mathbb{D} \times (\mathbb{D} \setminus 0)$, which are C^∞ with respect to ξ for $\xi \neq 0$ and such that, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $\xi \neq 0$, the function $x \mapsto \partial_\xi^\alpha a(x, \xi)$ belongs to \mathcal{W} and there exists a constant C_α such that, for all $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\forall |\xi| > \epsilon, \|\partial_\xi^\alpha a(\cdot, \xi)\|_{\mathcal{W}} \leq C_{\alpha, \epsilon} (1 + |\xi|)^{m - |\alpha|}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The spaces $\Gamma_{\mathcal{W}}^m(\mathbb{D})$ are equipped with their natural Fréchet topology induced by the semi-norms defined by the best constants in (A.1).

For quantitative estimates we introduce as in [30]:

Definition A.5. For $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in \Gamma_{\mathscr{W}}^m(\mathbb{D})$, we set

$$M_{\mathscr{W}}^m(a; n) = \sup_{|\alpha| \leq n} \sup_{|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}} \left\| (1 + |\xi|)^{m - |\alpha|} \partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} a(\cdot, \xi) \right\|_{\mathscr{W}}, \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For $\mathscr{W} = W^{\rho, \infty}$, $\rho \geq 0$, we write:

$$\Gamma_{W^{\rho, \infty}}^m(\mathbb{D}) = \Gamma_{\rho}^m(\mathbb{D}) \text{ and } M_{W^{\rho, \infty}}^m(a) = M_{W^{\rho, \infty}}^m(a; 1).$$

Moreover we introduce the following spaces equipped with their natural Fréchet space structure:

$$C_b^{\infty}(\mathbb{D}) = \cap_{\rho \geq 0} W^{\rho, \infty}, \quad \Gamma_{\infty}^m(\mathbb{D}) = \cap_{\rho \geq 0} \Gamma_{\rho}^m(\mathbb{D}), \quad \Gamma_{\rho}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{D}) = \cap_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \Gamma_{\rho}^m(\mathbb{D}) \text{ and,} \\ \Gamma_{\infty}^{-\infty}(\mathbb{D}) = \cap_{\rho \geq 0} \cap_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \Gamma_{\rho}^m(\mathbb{D}).$$

In higher dimensions the 1 in the definition of M_{ρ}^m should be replaced by $1 + \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$.

Definition A.6. Define an admissible cutoff function as a function $\psi^{B, b} \in C^{\infty}(\hat{D}^2)$, $B > 1, b > 0$ that verifies:

(1)

$$\psi^{B, b}(\xi, \eta) = 0 \text{ when } |\xi| < B|\eta| + b, \text{ and } \psi^{B, b}(\eta, \xi) = 1 \text{ when } |\xi| > B|\eta| + b + 1.$$

(2) for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \mathbb{N}^d$, there is $C_{\alpha, \beta}$, with $C_{0, 0} \leq 1$, such that:

$$\forall (\xi, \eta) : \left| \partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} \partial_{\eta}^{\beta} \psi^{B, b}(\xi, \eta) \right| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} (1 + |\xi|)^{-|\alpha| - |\beta|}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Definition A.7. Consider a real numbers $m \in \mathbb{R}$, a symbol $a \in \Gamma_{\mathscr{W}}^m$ and an admissible cutoff function $\psi^{B, b}$ define the paradifferential operator T_a by:

$$\widehat{T_a u}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \psi^{B, b}(\xi - \eta, \eta) \hat{a}(\xi - \eta, \eta) \hat{u}(\eta) d\eta,$$

where $\hat{a}(\eta, \xi) = \int e^{-ix \cdot \eta} a(x, \xi) dx$ is the Fourier transform of a with respect to the first variable. In the language of pseudodifferential operators:

$$T_a u = \text{Op}(\sigma_a)u, \text{ where } \mathcal{F}_x \sigma_a(\xi, \eta) = \psi^{B, b}(\xi, \eta) \mathcal{F}_x a(\xi, \eta).$$

An important property of paradifferential operators is their action on functions with localized spectrum.

Lemma A.1. Consider two real numbers $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \geq 0$, a symbol $a \in \Gamma_0^m(\mathbb{D})$, an admissible cutoff function $\psi^{B, b}$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{D}^d)$.

• For $R \gg b$, if $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}u \subset \{|\xi| \leq R\}$, then:

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F}T_a u \subset \left\{ |\xi| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{B}\right)R - \frac{b}{B} \right\}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

• For $R \gg b$, if $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}u \subset \{|\xi| \geq R\}$, then:

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F}T_a u \subset \left\{ |\xi| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{B}\right)R + \frac{b}{B} \right\}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The main features of symbolic calculus for paradifferential operators are given by the following theorems taken from [30] and [36].

Theorem A.1. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}$. if $a \in \Gamma_0^m(\mathbb{D})$, then T_a is of order m . Moreover, for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a constant K such that:

$$\|T_a\|_{H^{\mu} \rightarrow H^{\mu - m}} \leq KM_0^m(a), \text{ and,} \\ \|T_a\|_{W^{\mu, \infty} \rightarrow W^{\mu - m, \infty}} \leq KM_0^m(a), \mu \notin \mathbb{N}.$$

Theorem A.2. Let $m, m' \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\rho > 0$, $a \in \Gamma_{\rho}^m(\mathbb{D})$ and $b \in \Gamma_{\rho}^{m'}(\mathbb{D})$.

- *Composition:* Then $T_a T_b$ is a paradifferential operator with symbol:

$$a \otimes b \in \Gamma_\rho^{m+m'}(\mathbb{D}), \text{ more precisely,}$$

$$T_a^{\psi^{B,b}} T_b^{\psi^{B',b}} = T_{a \otimes b}^{\psi^{\frac{BB'}{B+B'+1},b}}.$$

Moreover $T_a T_b - T_{a \# b}$ is of order $m + m' - \rho$ where $a \# b$ is defined by:

$$a \# b = \sum_{|\alpha| < \rho} \frac{1}{i^{|\alpha|} \alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha a \partial_x^\alpha b,$$

and there exists $r \in \Gamma_0^{m+m'-\rho}(\mathbb{D})$ such that:

$$M_0^{m+m'-\rho}(r) \leq K(M_\rho^m(a)M_0^{m'}(b) + M_\rho^m(a)M_0^{m'}(b)),$$

and we have

$$T_a^{\psi^{B,b}} T_b^{\psi^{B',b}} - T_{a \# b}^{\psi^{\frac{BB'}{B+B'+1},b}} = T_r^{\psi^{\frac{BB'}{B+B'+1},b}}.$$

- *Adjoint:* The adjoint operator of T_a , T_a^* is a paradifferential operator of order m with symbol a^* defined by:

$$a^* = \sum_{|\alpha| < \rho} \frac{1}{i^{|\alpha|} \alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\alpha \bar{a}.$$

Moreover, for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a constant K such that

$$\|T_a^* - T_{a^*}\|_{H^\mu \rightarrow H^{\mu-m+\rho}} \leq K M_\rho^m(a).$$

If $a = a(x)$ is a function of x only then the paradifferential operator T_a is called a paraproduct. It follows from Theorem A.2 and the Sobolev embedding that:

- If $a \in H^\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ and $b \in H^\beta(\mathbb{D})$ with $\alpha, \beta > \frac{d}{2}$, then

$$T_a T_b - T_{ab} \text{ is of order } - \left(\min \{ \alpha, \beta \} - \frac{d}{2} \right).$$

- If $a \in H^\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ with $\alpha > \frac{d}{2}$, then

$$T_a^* - T_{a^*} \text{ is of order } - \left(\alpha - \frac{d}{2} \right).$$

- If $a \in W^{r,\infty}(\mathbb{D})$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$ then:

$$\|au - T_a u\|_{H^r} \leq C \|a\|_{W^{r,\infty}} \|u\|_{L^2}.$$

An important feature of paraproducts is that they are well defined for function $a = a(x)$ which are not L^∞ but merely in some Sobolev spaces H^r with $r < \frac{d}{2}$.

Proposition A.5. *Let $m > 0$. If $a \in H^{\frac{d}{2}-m}(\mathbb{D})$ and $u \in H^\mu(\mathbb{D})$ then $T_a u \in H^{\mu-m}(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover,*

$$\|T_a u\|_{H^{\mu-m}} \leq K \|a\|_{H^{\frac{d}{2}-m}} \|u\|_{H^\mu}$$

A main feature of paraproducts is the existence of paralinearisation theorems which allow us to replace nonlinear expressions by paradifferential expressions, at the price of error terms which are smoother than the main terms.

Theorem A.3. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\alpha, \beta > \frac{d}{2}$, then*

- *Bony's Linearization Theorem:* For all C^∞ function F , if $a \in H^\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ then;

$$F(a) - F(0) - T_{F'(a)} a \in H^{2\alpha-\frac{d}{2}}(\mathbb{D}).$$

- If $a \in H^\alpha(\mathbb{D})$ and $b \in H^\beta(\mathbb{D})$, then $ab - T_a b - T_b a \in H^{\alpha+\beta-\frac{d}{2}}(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover there exists a positive constant K independent of a and b such that:

$$\|ab - T_a b - T_b a\|_{H^{\alpha+\beta-\frac{d}{2}}} \leq K \|a\|_{H^\alpha} \|b\|_{H^\beta}.$$

A.3. Paracomposition. We recall the main properties of the paracomposition operator first introduced by S. Alinhac in [8] to treat low regularity change of variables. Here we present the results we reviewed and generalized in some cases in [36].

Theorem A.4. Let $\chi : \mathbb{D}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^d$ be a C^{1+r} diffeomorphism with $D\chi \in W^{r,\infty}$, $r > 0, r \notin \mathbb{N}$ and take $s \in \mathbb{R}$ then the following map is continuous:

$$\begin{aligned} H^s(\mathbb{D}^d) &\rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{D}^d) \\ u &\mapsto \chi^* u = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{l \geq 0 \\ k-N \leq l \leq k+N}} P_l(D) u_k \circ \chi, \end{aligned}$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $2^N > \sup_{k, \mathbb{D}^d} |\Phi_k D\chi|^{-1}$ and $2^N > \sup_{k, \mathbb{D}^d} |\Phi_k D\chi|$.

Taking $\tilde{\chi} : \mathbb{D}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^d$ a $C^{1+\tilde{r}}$ diffeomorphism with $D\tilde{\chi} \in W^{\tilde{r},\infty}$ map with $\tilde{r} > 0$, then the previous operation has the natural functorial property:

$$\forall u \in H^s(\mathbb{D}^d), \chi^* \tilde{\chi}^* u = (\chi \circ \tilde{\chi})^* u + Ru,$$

with, $R : H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow H^{s+\min(r,\tilde{r})}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ continuous.

We now give the key parilinearization theorem taking into account the paracomposition operator.

Theorem A.5. Let u be a $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^d)$ map and $\chi : \mathbb{D}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^d$ be a C^{1+r} diffeomorphism with $D\chi \in W^{r,\infty}$, $r > 0, r \notin \mathbb{N}$. Then:

$$u \circ \chi(x) = \chi^* u(x) + T_{Du \circ \chi} \chi(x) + R_0(x) + R_1(x) + R_2(x)$$

where the paracomposition given in the previous theorem verifies the estimates:

$$\forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \|\chi^* u(x)\|_{H^s} \leq C(\|D\chi\|_{L^\infty}) \|u(x)\|_{H^s},$$

$$u' \circ \chi \in \Gamma_{W^{0,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^d)}^0(\mathbb{D}^d) \text{ for } u \text{ Lipschitz,}$$

and the remainders verify the estimates:

$$\|R_0\|_{H^{1+r+\min(1+\rho,s-\frac{d}{2})}} \leq C \|D\chi\|_{C_*^r} \|u\|_{H^{1+s}}$$

$$\|R_1\|_{H^{1+r+s}} \leq C(\|D\chi\|_{L^\infty}) \|D\chi\|_{C_*^r} \|u\|_{H^{1+s}}.$$

$$\|R_2\|_{H^{1+r+s}} \leq C(\|D\chi\|_{L^\infty}, \|D\chi^{-1}\|_{L^\infty}) \|D\chi\|_{C_*^r} \|u\|_{H^{1+s}}.$$

Finally the commutation between a paradifferential operator $a \in \Gamma_\beta^m(\mathbb{D}^d)$ and a paracomposition operator χ^* is given by the following

$$\chi^* T_a u = T_{a^*} \chi^* u + T_{q^*} \chi^* u \text{ with } q \in \Gamma_0^{m-\beta}(\mathbb{D}^d),$$

where a^* has the local expansion:

$$a^*(x, \xi) \sim \sum_{\substack{\alpha \\ |\alpha| \leq \lfloor \min(r,\rho) \rfloor}} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \partial^\alpha a(\chi(x), D\chi^{-1}(\chi(x))^\top \xi) Q_\alpha(\chi(x), \xi) \in \Gamma_{\min(r,\beta)}^m(\mathbb{D}^d), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where,

$$P_\alpha(x', \xi) = D_{y'}^\alpha (e^{i(\chi^{-1}(y') - \chi^{-1}(x') - D\chi^{-1}(x')(y' - x')) \cdot \xi})|_{y'=x'}$$

and Q_α is polynomial in ξ of degree $\leq \frac{|\alpha|}{2}$, with $Q_0 = 1, Q_1 = 0$.

Remark A.1. *The simplest example for the paracomposition operator is when $\chi(x) = Ax$ is a linear operator and in that case we see that if N is chosen sufficiently large in the definition of χ^* :*

$$u(Ax) = (Ax)^*u, \text{ and } T_{u'(Ax)}Ax = 0.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Alazard, G. Metivier: *Paralinearization of the Dirichlet to Neumann operator, and regularity of diamond waves*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 34 (2009), no. 10-12, 1632-1704.
- [2] T. Alazard, N. Burq, C. Zuily: *On the water waves equations with surface tension*, Duke Math. J. 158(3), 413-499 (2011).
- [3] T. Alazard, N. Burq, C. Zuily: *The water-waves equations: from Zakharov to Euler*, Studies in Phase Space Analysis with Applications to PDEs. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications Volume 84, 2013, pp 1-20.
- [4] T. Alazard, P. Baldi,: *Gravity capillary standing water waves*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 217 (2015), no 3, 741-830.
- [5] T. Alazard, P. Baldi, D. Han-Kwan: *Control for water waves*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 20 (2018) 657-745.
- [6] T. Alazard, N. Burq, C. Zuily,: *Cauchy theory for the gravity water waves system with non localized initial data*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 33 (2016), 337-395.
- [7] Previous results of T. Alazard, P. Baldi, P. Gérard, Personal communication by T. Alazard.
- [8] S. Alinhac *Paracomposition et opérateurs paradifférentiels*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 1986,11:1, 87-121.
- [9] R. Beals: *Characterization of pseudodifferential operators and applications*, Duke Math. J, Volume 44, Number 1 (1977), 45-57.
- [10] JM. Bony: *On the Characterization of Pseudodifferential Operators (Old and New)*, Studies in Phase Space Analysis with Applications to PDEs. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications, vol 84. Birkhäuser, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-6348-1_2
- [11] J. Bourgain: *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations*, Geom. Funct.Anal.3(1993), 3: 209. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01895688>.
- [12] A. Castro, D. Córdoba, Francisco Gancedo, *Singularity formation in a surface wave model*, Nonlinearity, 2010.
- [13] R. Coifman, Y. Meyer, *Au-delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels*. Astérisque, no. 57 (1978), 210 p. http://numdam.org/item/AST_1978__57__1_0/
- [14] W. Craig, C. Sulem: *Numerical simulation of gravity water waves*, J. Comput. Phys. 108(1), 73-83 (1993).
- [15] P. Gérard, Thomas Kappeler, *On the Integrability of the Benjamin-Ono Equation on the Torus*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 2020.
- [16] L. Hörmander, *Fourier integral operators. I*, Acta Math. 127 (1971), 79-183.
- [17] L. Hörmander: *Lectures on nonlinear hyperbolic differential equations*, Berlin ; New York : Springer, 1997.

- [18] L. Hörmander, *The Nash-Moser theorem and paradifferential operators*, Analysis, et cetera, 429-449, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1990.
- [19] V. M. Hur, *On the formation of singularities for surface water waves*, Communications in pure and applied analysis, volume 11, Number 4, (2012) .
- [20] V. M. Hur, *Wave Breaking in the Whitham equation*, Advances in Mathematics 317 (2017) 410-437 .
- [21] V. M. Hur, L. Tao *Wave Breaking in a Shallow Water Model*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 50(1), 354-380.
- [22] M. Ifrim, D. Tataru *Well-posedness and dispersive decay of small data solutions for the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Annales scientifiques de l'ENS, (4) 52 (2019), no. 2, 297-335.
- [23] A. D. Ionescu, C.E. Kenig *Global well posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in low-regularity spaces*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., **20** (2007), 753-798.
- [24] T. Kappeler, P. Topalov *Global wellposedness of KdV in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$* , Duke Math. J. Volume 135, Number 2 (2006), 327-360.
- [25] R. Killip, M. Viřsan, *KdV is well-posed in H^{-1}* , Annals of Mathematics Vol. 190, No. 1 (July 2019), pp. 249-305.
- [26] C. Klein, and J.-C. Saut, *A numerical approach to blow-up issues for dispersive perturbations of Burgers' equation*, Phys. D 295/296 (2015), pp. 46–65.
- [27] H. Koch and N. Tzvetkov, *On the local well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$* , Int. Math. Res. Not., 26 (2003), 1449-1464.
- [28] D. Lannes, *Well-posedness of the water waves equations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 18(3):605-654 (electronic), 2005.
- [29] F. Linares, D. Pilod and J.-C. Saut, *Dispersive perturbations of Burgers and hyperbolic equations I: local theory*, SIAM J. Math. Analysis, **46** (2014), 1505-1537.
- [30] G. Metivier, *Para-differential calculus and applications to the Cauchy problem for non linear systems*, Ennio de Giorgi Math. res. Center Publ., Edizione della Normale, 2008.
- [31] L. Molinet, J. C. Saut and N. Tzvetkov *Well-posedness and ill-posedness results for the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili-I equation*, Duke Math. J. Volume 115, Number 2 (2002), 353-384.
- [32] L. Molinet, *Global Well-Posedness in L^2 for the Periodic Benjamin-Ono Equation*, American Journal of Mathematics, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008, 130 (3), pp.635-683.
- [33] L. Molinet, *Sharp ill-posedness results for the KdV and mKdV equations on the torus*, Advances in Mathematics Volume 230, Issues 4-6, July-August 2012, Pages 1895-1930.
- [34] L. Molinet, D. Pilod, S. Vento, *On well-posedness for some dispersive perturbations of Burgers' equation*, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire, Volume 35, Issue 7, November 2018, Pages 1719-1756.
- [35] F. Pasqualotto, Sung-Jin Oh *Gradient blow-up for dispersive and dissipative perturbations of the Burgers equation*, Preprint: [arXiv:2107.07172](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07172), 2021.
- [36] A. R. Said: *On Paracomposition and change of variables in Paradifferential operators*, arXiv preprint, [arXiv:2002.02943](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.02943).
- [37] A. R. Said: *A geometric proof of the Quasi-linearity of the Water-Waves system and the incompressible Euler equations*, To appear in SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis.

- [38] A. R. Said: *On the Cauchy problem of dispersive Burgers type equations*, to appear in Indiana University Mathematics Journal.
- [39] J. C. Saut *Asymptotic Models for Surface and Internal waves*, 29 Brazilian Mathematical Colloquia, IMPA Mathematical Publications ,2013.
- [40] J. C. Saut *Benjamin-Ono and Intermediate Long Wave equation : modeling, IST and PDE*, arXiv preprint, [arXiv:1811.08652](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.08652), 2018.
- [41] J. C. Saut, Y. Wang *The Wave Breaking for Whitham-Type Equations Revisited*, arXiv preprint, [arXiv:2006.03803](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03803).
- [42] A. Shnirelman: *Microglobal Analysis of the Euler Equations*, J. math. fluid mech. (2005) 7(Suppl 3): S387. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00021-005-0167-5>.
- [43] T. Tao: *Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$* , *J. Hyperbolic Differ, Equ* **1** (2004), 27-49.
- [44] M. E. Taylor, *Tools for PDE: Pseudodifferential Operators, Paradifferential Operators, and Layer Potentials*, American Mathematical Soc., 2007.
- [45] M. E. Taylor, *Pseudodifferential Operators and Nonlinear PDE*, Brickhauser, Boston, 1991.
- [46] V.E. Zakharov: *Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on the surface of a deep fluid*, J. Appl. Mech. Techn. Phys. 9(2), 190-194 (1968).