

On k -summable normal forms of vector fields with one zero eigenvalue

Peter De Maesschalck¹ and Kristian Uldall Kristiansen²

¹Hasselt University, Campus Diepenbeek, Agoralaan Gebouw D, 3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium

²Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

¹`peter.demaesschalck@uhasselt.be`

²`krkri@dtu.dk`

December 5, 2025

Abstract

In this paper, we study normal forms of analytic saddle-nodes in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} with any Poincaré rank $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The approach and the results generalize those of Bonckaert and De Maesschalck from 2008 that considered $k = 1$. In particular, we introduce a Banach convolutional algebra that is tailored to study differential equations in the Borel plane of order k . One of the subtleties that we take care of in this paper, is that nontrivial Jordan blocks are allowed in the linear part of the vector field. We anticipate that our approach can stimulate new research and be used to study different normal forms in future work.

Keywords: normal forms, center manifolds, Gevrey properties, summability, saddle-nodes;

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 34C23, 34C45, 37G05, 37G10

1 Introduction

The reference [5] studied normal forms of analytic vector fields in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} , for which the origin is an isolated singularity with one single zero eigenvalue of the linearization. In particular, the authors proved – under the additional assumption that all other eigenvalues were distinct and satisfied a nonresonance condition – that formal changes of coordinates to normal form satisfy Gevrey growth estimates. Note that in the paper, the authors used a blow-up transformation (and a regular coordinate change combined with a change of time) to arrive at the pre-normal form:

$$\dot{x} = \frac{1}{k}x^{k+1}, \quad \dot{y} = Ay + xf(x, y). \quad (1)$$

The constant k is called the Poincaré rank, see [2]. When $k = 1$ the authors of [5] also proved (under stronger resonance conditions) that the formal normal form transformation is 1-summable. For this statement, the authors set up a fix-point equation for the Borel-transform of the normalizing transformation, working on spaces of analytic functions $H = H(w)$ that have at most exponential growth (of order 1), i.e. there exists a $\mu > 0$ and a $C > 0$ such that

$$|H(w)|e^{-\mu|w|} \leq C \quad \forall w \in S(\theta, \alpha).$$

Here

$$S(\theta, \alpha) := \{x \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Arg}(x) - \theta| < \alpha/2\}.$$

is a complex sector centered along the direction $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi)$ and of opening $\alpha \in (0, 2\pi)$ in the complex plane. The desired normal form transformation is then obtained through the Laplace transform

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta(H)(x) = \int_0^{\theta\infty} H(w)e^{-w/x}dw.$$

Here $\mathcal{L}_\theta(H)$ can be analytically continued to an analytic function on a local sector $B(\nu) \cap S(\theta, \alpha + \pi)$, with $B(\nu)$ being the open ball centered at the origin with radius $\nu > 0$, see further details below.

The novelty of [5] lies in the introduction of a norm turning the space of analytic functions of exponential growth (as above) into a Banach convolutional algebra. Similar norms have been used by different authors, see e.g. [9, 15], but not in a systematic way for equations of the type (1). We refer to [10] for an interesting application of the convolutional algebra in the context of slow-fast equations.

In this paper, we consider the general case of (1) with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which was left open by the authors of [5]. At the same time, we will allow A to have nontrivial Jordan blocks. In contrast to the belief expressed by the authors of [5], we show that this extension does not rely on multi-summability, see [8]. Instead, we can simply work with a generalized Laplace transform of order $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H)(x) := \int_0^{\theta\infty} H(w)e^{-w^k/x^k}kdw.$$

For more general references on multi-summability and exact asymptotics in the context of complex linear systems, we refer to [3, 12, 14, 17].

Remark 1. *In contrast to the Laplace transforms in [2] or [8], this version does not commute with the ramification operator $R_k: w \mapsto w^{1/k}: \mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H) \circ R_k \neq \mathcal{L}_{k\theta,1}(H \circ R_k)$. Instead, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H) \circ R_k = \mathcal{L}_{k\theta,1}(\tilde{H} \circ R_k)$$

with $\tilde{H}(w) = H(w).w^{1-k}$. There are some advantages to using our version of the Laplace transform, but also some disadvantages: the multiplication with w^{1-k} in the above commutation causes mild singular behaviour at the origin and as a result several properties proven in [5] and notions introduced there for $k = 1$ cannot be directly transported to the general case.

Notice that this definition of $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}$ agrees with the usual one for $k = 1$ ($\mathcal{L}_{\theta,1} = \mathcal{L}_\theta$). Moreover, $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}$ is for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ defined on the space analytic functions $H = H(w)$ that have at most exponential growth of order k , i.e. functions H for which there exists a $\mu^k > 0$ and a $C > 0$ such that

$$|H(w)|e^{-\mu^k|w|^k} \leq C \quad \forall w \in S(\theta, \alpha),$$

see further details below.

Note that we have

$$H(w) = w^n \implies \mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H)(x) = x^{n+1}\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{k}\right), \quad (2)$$

which explains that formally, Laplace transforms of convergent series may produce divergent series, or vice-versa, the inverse Laplace operator (Borel transform) may take away divergent behaviour for the same reason. Note that the shift in exponents ($w^n \mapsto x^{n+1}$) restricts the Borel transform to those series that are $O(x)$. It is a small price to pay, especially considering the fact that the more traditional Laplace transform in [8] only transforms to series that are $O(x^k)$, which would form a somewhat bigger nuisance. The Laplace transform of [2] avoids this problem as well, but seems to be more difficult w.r.t. finding a suitable norm in which the convolution operator is bounded, see Remark 7 later.

The vector field (1) for which we claim to provide a simpler form is an example of a so-called 1-resonant system: there is only one source of resonance (namely the zero eigenvalue in the x variable). The simpler form in our case has the intent to reduce the number of nonresonant terms in the expression; in a narrow interpretation of the concept “normal form”, our results would not arrive at such a normal form except in the cases where *all* nonresonant terms are being canceled. See for example [6] for a similar situation where such simpler forms may converge to actual normal forms under extra diophantine conditions. Likewise, under extra diophantine conditions, summable normal forms of (1) have been

obtained in [7] (and [18]). Systems that are not 1-resonant are far more difficult to study, and only some cases have been dealt with; we refer for example to the 2-resonant vector field that occurs in the study of the Painlevé system, see [4]. For a more general overview on normal forms we refer to [19].

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we first present our definitions and then subsequently state our main result Theorem 2.1 on the normal form of (1). In section 3, we prove Theorem 2.1 by extending the procedure in [5] (for $k = 1$) to the general case. We have tried to find a balance between self-containment and compactness, and often chose, for the sake of readability, to reprove some arguments rather than to merely call upon their similarity to those in [5]. The treatment of the non semi-simple case is the part where this paper diverges the most from [5]. Note that by relaxing the conditions on A , our results also generalize the $k = 1$ case. In section 4, we study an application to a real analytic zero-Hopf. Finally, in section 5 we conclude the paper. Here we also point out a misleading interpretation of the results in [5] (stated as remark) and discuss potential future directions.

PDM acknowledges support from FWO project G0F1822N.

2 Definitions and statement of the main result

Let $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. In the following, we often consider $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and as usual define

$$|\mathbf{j}| := j_1 + \dots + j_n \geq 0, \quad \langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m} \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^n s_i m_i \quad \forall \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, \forall \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

For $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we use the norm $|z| = \max\{|z_1|, \dots, |z_n|\}$ and write

$$z^{\mathbf{j}} := z_1^{j_1} \dots z_n^{j_n} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n. \quad (3)$$

We also let $B^n(r)$ denote the ball in \mathbb{C}^n centered at $z = 0$ and of radius $r > 0$. (We drop the superscript on B^n in the case $n = 1$.) Finally, we define $\mathcal{A}^{n,m}(r)$ as the set of analytic functions defined on $B^n(r)$ with values in \mathbb{C}^m . We equip these spaces with the Banach norm:

$$\|h\| := \sup_{z \in B^n(r)} |h(z)| \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{A}^{n,m}(r).$$

Next, we consider formal series

$$\widehat{h}(x, z) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{\ell}(z) x^{\ell} \quad \text{with} \quad h_{\ell} \in \mathcal{A}^{n,m}, \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0; \quad (4)$$

notice that the sum starts with $\ell = 1$ and consequently $\widehat{h}(0, \cdot) = 0$.

Definition 1. $\widehat{h}(x, z)$ is Gevrey- $\frac{1}{k}$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ if there exists constants $K, T > 0$ such that

$$\|h_{\ell}\| \leq K T^{\ell-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{\ell}{k}\right) \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In this paper, we define the Borel transform \mathcal{B}_k (with respect to x , leaving z fixed) of order k as follows: Let \widehat{h} be a formal series, see (4). Then

$$\mathcal{B}_k(\widehat{h})(w, z) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_{\ell}(z)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\ell}{k}\right)} w^{\ell-1}. \quad (5)$$

It is clear that if \widehat{h} is Gevrey- $\frac{1}{k}$ then $H := \mathcal{B}_k(\widehat{h})$ defines an absolutely convergent series in the disc $|w| < T^{-1}$:

$$|H(w, z)| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|h_{\ell}\|}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\ell}{k}\right)} w^{\ell-1} \leq \frac{K}{1 - T|w|}.$$

It follows that $H : B(T^{-1}) \times B^n(r) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$ is an analytic function.

Next, we turn to the definition of k -summability and the Laplace transform of order $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

Definition 2. Suppose that $H = \mathcal{B}_k(\widehat{h})$ can be analytically continued to $(w, y) \in S(\theta, \alpha) \times B^n(r)$, where $S(\theta, \alpha) \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the sector centered along the complex direction θ with opening $\alpha \in (0, \pi)$. Suppose additionally that H has at most exponential growth of order $k \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. there is a $\mu > 0$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|H(w, z)e^{-\mu^k|w|^k}| \leq C \quad \forall w \in S(\theta, \alpha), z \in B^n(r). \quad (6)$$

Then we say that \widehat{h} , see (4), is k -summable in the direction θ and its Laplace transform of order k :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta, k}(H)(x, z) = \int_0^{\theta\infty} H(w, z)e^{-w^k/x^k} k dw, \quad (7)$$

is its k -sum.

The integral in (7) can be analytically continued to

$$x \in \omega_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha) := B(\nu) \cap S(\theta, \alpha + \pi/k), \quad (8)$$

for $\nu > 0$ small enough, see Fig. 1(b), Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.6 below for further details.

We will define k -sums of $H : S(\theta, \alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (that are independent of z) and $H = (H_1, \dots, H_n) : S(\theta, \alpha) \times B^n(r) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ completely analogously (in the latter case, when Definition 2 applies to each component).

2.1 Main result

We will describe our main result in terms of (1) under the following assumption:

Assumption 1. A is in Jordan normal form:

$$A = \Lambda + \Xi, \quad (9)$$

where

1. $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, with all λ_i being nonzero
2. Ξ vanishes for $n = 1$ and is nilpotent otherwise with all nonzero elements on the super-diagonal:

$$(\Xi)_{i,j} =: \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \neq i+1, \\ \xi_i & \text{if } j = i+1, \end{cases} \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Here

$$\xi_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \quad \text{and} \quad (\xi_i = 1, i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}) \implies \lambda_{i+1} = \lambda_i. \quad (10)$$

The remaining assumptions of the following result are similar to those of [5, Theorem 3]. In particular, (12) replaces the condition stated after [5, Eq. (9)].

Theorem 2.1. Consider (1), satisfying Assumption 1 with f being analytic near the origin, and any $C > 0$. We then define $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(C)$ by

$$\mathcal{R} := \{(i, \mathbf{j}) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \mathbb{N}_0^n : |\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{j}|)\}. \quad (11)$$

Moreover, let θ be a complex direction, so that the following holds for some $\xi > 0$ small enough:

$$\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle \notin S(k\theta, \xi) \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}, \quad (12)$$

Then there exist $R > 0$, $\nu > 0$ and an $\alpha > 0$, all small enough, and two analytic functions $\phi = \phi(x, z)$ and $g = g(x, z)$ with the following properties:

- (i) ϕ and g are k -sums of formal series $\widehat{\phi}$ and \widehat{g} , respectively;

(ii) ϕ and g are defined on $x \in \omega_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha)$, $z \in B^n(R)$ (see (8));

(iii) ϕ and g extend continuously to the closure of the domain in (ii),

such that the following holds true:

1. $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$ has a convergent power series expansion defined by

$$g_i(x, z) = \sum_{\mathbf{j}: (i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}} g_{i, \mathbf{j}}(x) z^{\mathbf{j}}, \quad x \in \omega_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha), z \in B^n(R),$$

with $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

2. The x -fibered diffeomorphism $(x, z) \mapsto (x, y)$ defined by

$$y = z + x\phi(x, z), \tag{13}$$

locally conjugates (1) with

$$\dot{x} = \frac{1}{k} x^{k+1}, \quad \dot{z} = Az + xg(x, z). \tag{14}$$

Remark 2. Notice that there is clearly a $C > 0$ large enough such that

$$|\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{j}|) \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \mathbb{N}_0^n,$$

and therefore

$$\mathcal{R} = \{1, \dots, n\} \times \mathbb{N}_0^n.$$

However, in this case no terms are removed in (14). In practice, one is interested in applying the result with the "smallest possible" resonant set \mathcal{R} (and a small C).

Remark 3. For $n = 1$ with $A = \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, then

$$|(j-1)\lambda| \geq \frac{1}{3}|\lambda|(1+j) \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \{1\}.$$

Consequently, we can take $\mathcal{R} = \{1\} \times \{1\}$ (corresponding to $j = 1$) and $C = \frac{1}{3}$ and for any $k\theta \notin \mathbb{Z}$, we then obtain the following normal form

$$\dot{x} = \frac{1}{k} x^{k+1}, \quad \dot{z} = (\lambda + xg_1(x))z.$$

It is subsequently possible to achieve $g_1(x) = \mu_k x^{k-1}$ if we allow division of the right hand side by a nonzero function, in agreement with [13]. This leads to the same normal form for saddle-nodes in dimension two by Martinet and Ramis [13], upon which their analytic classification was based.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

To prove Theorem 2.1, we solve the conjugation equation for $g = g(x, z)$ and $\phi = \phi(x, z)$:

$$g - A\phi + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \phi \cdot Az + \frac{1}{k} x^{k+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi = f(x, z + x\phi) - x \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \phi \cdot g - \frac{1}{k} x^k \phi, \tag{15}$$

by setting up (following [5]) an associated equation for the Borel transforms (with respect to x , leaving z fixed) Φ and G of ϕ and g , respectively. (Notice that to obtain (15), we simply differentiate (13) with respect to x , use (1) and (14) and rearrange.) It is important to notice that (15) for $x = 0$ reduces to:

$$g(0, z) - A\phi(0, z) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \phi(0, z) Az = f(0, z),$$

which can be solved in the usual way by writing $g(0, z) = (g_{01}(z), \dots, g_{0n}(z))$ and $\phi(0, z)$ as convergent power series in $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, see also [5, Lemma 10]; here $g_{0i}(z)$ only contain monomials $g_{0ij}z^{\mathbf{j}}$ with $(i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}$ in agreement with the statement of Theorem 2.1. In this way, by performing a z -dependent shift of g and ϕ , we may in fact assume that $g(0, \cdot) = 0$ and $\phi(0, \cdot) = 0$ in (15), see [5, Lemma 10], so that these functions do indeed have well-defined Borel transforms G and Φ . (Recall (5).)

To deal with the case where $\Xi \neq 0$, see Assumption 1, $n \geq 2$, it will be important for us that

$$A = \Lambda + r\Xi, \quad (16)$$

for $r > 0$. This form is obtained from (9) by applying the scaling $z \mapsto (z_1, rz_2, \dots, r^{n-1}z_n)$. We will prove Theorem 2.1 by working in these coordinates with $r > 0$ fixed small enough; this clearly does not change the statement of the theorem. It is important to note that $r > 0$ will be fixed independently of the separate parameter $\mu > 0$ that we introduce below.

We present the equation for Φ and G in Section 3.3 but first we extend some lemmas from [5] to the general case k . Theorem 2.1 in the semi-simple case then follows the $k = 1$ case of [5]. The details of the non-semi-simple case $\Xi \neq 0$ is treated in a separate section (section 3.6).

3.1 The Borel plane and Laplace transforms

Let

$$\Omega = \Omega(\nu, \theta, \alpha) := B(\nu) \cup S(\theta, \alpha), \quad \nu > 0, \alpha > 0, \theta \in (0, 2\pi), \quad (17)$$

see Fig. 1. We then first consider the space $\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{G}_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha, \mu)$ of analytic functions $H : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ and equip this space with the μ -dependent Banach norm

$$\|H\|_{\mu, k} := \sup_{w \in \Omega} |H(w)| (1 + \mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}) e^{-\mu^k|w|^k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \mu > 0. \quad (18)$$

Remark 4. Notice that in the case $k = 1$, this norm agrees with the one in [5, p. 312]. One could define the norm for general $k \in \mathbb{N}$ using the ramification operator $R_k(w) = w^{1/k}$. Notice in this regard that

$$\dot{x} = x^2 \iff \dot{R}_k(x) = \frac{1}{k} R_k(x)^{k+1}.$$

But still the general case $k \in \mathbb{N}$ does not follow from [5], since the set of functions $\{H \circ R_k : H \in \mathcal{G}_k\}$ is larger than \mathcal{G}_1 .

In the following, we will take $\nu > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ small and μ large enough. For this purpose, it is important to note that the following holds:

$$\mathcal{G}_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha, \mu') \subset \mathcal{G}_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha, \mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \|H\|_{\mu', k} \leq \|H\|_{\mu, k} \quad \forall \mu' \geq \mu, H \in \mathcal{G}_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha, \mu).$$

This just follows from the monotonicity of $Q(s) = (1 + s^2|w|^{2k}) e^{-s|w|^k}$:

$$Q'(s) = -|w|^k(1 - s|w|^k)^2 e^{-s|w|^k} \leq 0 \quad \forall s \geq 0, |w| \geq 0.$$

Lemma 3.1. $\mathcal{L}_{\theta, k}$, given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta, k}(H)(x) = \int_0^{\theta\infty} H(w) e^{-w^k/x^k} k dw, \quad (19)$$

defines a bounded linear operator from \mathcal{G}_k to the space of analytic functions defined on the local sector:

$$\omega_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha) := B(\nu) \cap S(\theta, \alpha + \pi/k),$$

recall (8), for $0 < \nu < \mu^{-1} \sqrt[k]{\sin \frac{k\alpha}{4}}$ small enough. In particular, the operator norm satisfies:

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\theta, k}\| \leq \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \frac{\nu}{\sqrt[k]{\sin \frac{k\alpha}{4} - \mu^k \nu^k}}.$$




Figure 1: Illustrations of the different domains Ω and ω_k . Fig. (a) is in the “Borel plane” $w \in \mathbb{C}$, whereas Fig. (b) is in the x -domain. Here ω_k is the complex domain upon which the Laplace transform of \mathcal{G}_k -functions on Ω are defined, see Lemma 3.1.

Proof. The proof follows [5, Proposition 3]: Given $x \in \omega_k$, so that $x \in S(\theta, \alpha + \pi/k)$ and $|x| \leq \nu$, see Fig. 1, it is clear that there is a $\tilde{\theta} \in (\theta - \alpha/2, \theta + \alpha/2)$ so that $x \in S(\tilde{\theta}, \pi/k - \alpha/2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\theta},k})(H))(x)| &\leq \|H\|_{\mu,k} \int_0^{\tilde{\theta}} e^{\mu^k |w|^k} e^{-\operatorname{Re}(w^k/x^k)} k |dw| \\ &\leq \|H\|_{\mu,k} \int_0^\infty e^{\mu^k t^k} e^{-t^k/|x|^k \cos(k(\tilde{\theta} - \operatorname{Arg}(x)))} k dt \end{aligned}$$

We have $|\tilde{\theta} - \operatorname{Arg}(x)| < \frac{\pi}{2k} - \frac{\alpha}{4}$ and therefore

$$\cos(k(\tilde{\theta} - \operatorname{Arg}(x))) \geq \sin \frac{k\alpha}{4}.$$

Consequently, for any $|x| < \nu < \mu^{-1} \sqrt[k]{\sin \frac{k\alpha}{4}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty e^{\mu^k t^k} e^{-t^k/|x|^k \cos(k(\tilde{\theta} - \operatorname{Arg}(x)))} k dt &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{\mu^k t^k} e^{-t^k/|x|^k \sin \frac{k\alpha}{4}} k dt \\ &= \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \frac{|x|}{\sqrt[k]{\sin \frac{k\alpha}{4} - \mu^k |x|^k}} \\ &= \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{k}\right) \frac{\nu}{\sqrt[k]{\sin \frac{k\alpha}{4} - \mu^k \nu^k}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the statement since $\theta \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}$ corresponds to a deformation of the complex path integral (used to analytically continue $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H)$). \square

We now define the convolution operator of order k as

$$(H \star_k J)(w) := w \int_0^1 \mathbb{K}(s) H(w(1-s)^{1/k}) J(ws^{1/k}) ds, \quad (20)$$

with the kernel

$$\mathbb{K}(s) := (s(1-s))^{\frac{1-k}{k}},$$

Remark 5. For $k = 1$, it is the traditional convolution which is known to work well with the Laplace transform of order $k = 1$: the convolution of two functions transforms to the product of the transforms of the two functions. The expression above arises after imposing the following commutation rule at order k :

$$(\widetilde{H \star_k J}) \circ R_k = (\tilde{H} \circ R_k) \star_1 (\tilde{J} \circ R_k)$$

where $\tilde{\cdot}$ means a multiplication with a function $w \mapsto w^{1-k}$ and where R_k is the ramification operator $R_k(w) = w^{1/k}$.

Lemma 3.2. For any $H, J \in \mathcal{G}_k$, we have that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H \star_k J) = (\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}H)(\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}J), \quad (21)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{k}x^{k+1}\frac{d}{dx}\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H)(x) = \mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}((\cdot)^k H)(x), \quad (22)$$

with $(\cdot)^k H$ denoting the function $w \mapsto w^k H(w)$.

Proof. The proof of (22) follows from a straightforward calculation, using the absolute convergence of $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}$. For (21), we proceed as in the standard proof for the classical convolution: Firstly, it is without loss of generality to take $\theta = 0$. We then consider the right hand side

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}H)(x)(\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}J)(x) &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int \int_{0 \leq w, u \leq L} k^2 H(w)J(u) e^{-(w^k+u^k)/x^k} dw du \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int \int_{w, u \geq 0, 0 \leq w+u \leq L} k^2 H(w)J(u) e^{-(w^k+u^k)/x^k} dw du, \end{aligned}$$

using that H and J belong to \mathcal{G}_k in the second equality. We then use the substitution:

$$w = p(1-s)^{1/k}, \quad u = ps^{1/k},$$

so that $w^k + u^k = p^k$. The Jacobian of this transformation is given by

$$\frac{1}{k}p\mathbb{K}(s).$$

Consequently,

$$(\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}H)(x)(\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}J)(x) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^L ke^{-p^k/x^k} (H \star_k J)(p) dp,$$

as desired. □

Lemma 3.3. The convolution \star_k given by (20) defines a continuous bilinear operator $\mathcal{G}_k \times \mathcal{G}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_k$ for all $\mu > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$q_k := \frac{2^{\frac{4k-1}{k}}\pi}{2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi(k-1)}{2k}\right)}.$$

Then $q_k > 0$ and for any $H, J \in \mathcal{G}_k$, we have the following estimate

$$\|H \star_k J\|_{\mu,k} \leq \frac{q_k}{\mu} \|H\|_{\mu,k} \|J\|_{\mu,k}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |(H \star_k J)(w)| &\leq \|H\|_{\mu,k} \|J\|_{\mu,k} \int_0^1 \mathbb{K}(s) \frac{|w|e^{\mu^k|w|^k}}{(1+\mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}(1-s)^2)(1+\mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}s^2)} ds \\ &\leq \|H\|_{\mu,k} \|J\|_{\mu,k} \frac{e^{\mu^k|w|^k}}{1+\mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}} \left[8 \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{K}(s) \frac{|w|}{1+\mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}s^2} ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality, we have used a symmetry argument, based upon

$$\mathbb{K}(s) = \mathbb{K}(1-s) \quad \forall s \in [0, 1],$$

and the fact that

$$1 + \mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}(1-s)^2 > \frac{1}{4}(1 + \mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}) \quad \forall s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1],$$

following [5, Proposition 4]. We now estimate the remaining integral. For this we first use that $\mathbb{K}(s) \leq 2^{\frac{k-1}{k}} s^{\frac{1-k}{k}}$ for $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{K}(s) \frac{|w|}{1 + \mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}s^2} ds &\leq 2^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} s^{\frac{1-k}{k}} \frac{|w|}{1 + \mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}s^2} ds \\ &\leq \frac{2^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{\mu} \int_0^\infty \frac{u^{\frac{1-k}{k}}}{1 + u^2} du \\ &= \frac{2^{\frac{k-1}{k}}}{\mu} \frac{\pi}{2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi(k-1)}{2k}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have also used the substitution $u = \mu^k |w|^k s$ in the second inequality. Combining these estimates, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|H \star_k J\|_{\mu,k} &\leq \|H\|_{\mu,k} \|J\|_{\mu,k} \left[8 \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{K}(s) \frac{|w|}{1 + \mu^{2k}|w|^{2k}s^2} ds \right] \\ &\leq \|H\|_{\mu,k} \|J\|_{\mu,k} \left[\frac{1}{\mu} \frac{2^{\frac{4k-1}{k}} \pi}{2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi(k-1)}{2k}\right)} \right] \\ &:= \|H\|_{\mu,k} \|J\|_{\mu,k} \frac{q_k}{\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Remark 6. For $k = 1$ we have $q_1 = 4\pi$ in agreement with the estimate in [5, Proposition 4].

Remark 7. It is for having a convenient proof of the bilinearity of the convolution operator that we have preferred not to work with the Laplace transform of [2]: there the convolution is a bit more involved, even at order 1:

$$(H \star J)(w) = \frac{d}{dw} \int_0^w H(s) J(w-s) ds.$$

The need for computing a derivative is an extra obstruction in proving boundedness.

We now turn to the Borel transform. First we need an auxiliary result.

Lemma 3.4. The function $H : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$H(w) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{w^{m-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)}, \quad w \in \mathbb{C},$$

is entire and belongs to \mathcal{G}_k for any $\mu > 1$:

$$\|H\|_{\mu,k} \leq C_k, \quad C_k > 0;$$

specifically, if $\mu > \sqrt[k]{2}$ then we have the following explicit form of the constant C_k :

$$\frac{C_k}{k} = 384e^{-2 - \frac{\sqrt{15}}{2}} (4 + \sqrt{15})^2 \approx 465. \tag{23}$$

Proof. We write

$$H(w) = \sum_{m=1}^{2k-1} \frac{w^{m-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)} + \sum_{m=2k}^{\infty} \frac{w^{m-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)}. \quad (24)$$

The finite sum can be estimated as

$$\sum_{m=1}^{2k-1} \frac{|w|^{m-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)} \leq 2(2k-1) \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, 2k+1\}} |w|^{m-1} < 4k(1 + |w|^{2k}),$$

since $\frac{1}{2} < \min_{t>0} \Gamma(t) \approx 0.9$ the minimum of the Γ -function. For the second term, we will use that $\Gamma(t)$ is increasing for $t \geq 2$:

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{k\ell + m}{k}\right) \geq \Gamma(\ell + 1) = \ell!$$

for any $m \geq k$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. For $|w| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the second term in (24) is clearly bounded by the geometric series $\sum_{m=2k}^{\infty} 2^{1-m} = 2^{2(1-k)} \leq 1$. Next, for $|w| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{m=2k}^{\infty} \frac{w^{m-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)} \right| &\leq \sum_{\ell=2}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{|w|^{k\ell+m-1}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{k\ell+m}{k}\right)} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{|w|^{k\ell}}{\ell!} \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} |w|^{m-1} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{|w|^{k\ell}}{\ell!} |w|^{-1} k \max_{m \in \{0, \dots, 2k\}} |w|^m \\ &\leq 2ke^{|w|^k} (1 + |w|^{2k}), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

using in the last inequality that $|w| \geq \frac{1}{2}$. In turn, using the estimate for $|w| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we find that the estimate (25) in fact holds for all $w \in \mathbb{C}$. In this way, we obtain the following bound on H :

$$|H(w)| \leq 6k(1 + |w|^{2k})e^{|w|^k},$$

valid for all $w \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore for all $\mu > 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|H\|_{\mu, k} &\leq 6k \sup_{r \geq 0} (1 + r^2) e^{(1-\mu^k)r} (1 + \mu^{2k} r^2) \\ &\leq 6k \sup_{r \geq 0} e^{(1-\mu^k)r} (1 + \mu^{2k} r^2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly bounded. Specifically for $\frac{1}{2}\mu^k > 1 \Leftrightarrow \mu > \sqrt[k]{2}$, a simple calculation gives the following

$$e^{(1-\mu^k)r} (1 + \mu^{2k} r^2)^2 \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu^k r} (1 + \mu^{2k} r^2)^2 \leq 64e^{-2-\frac{\sqrt{15}}{2}} (4 + \sqrt{15})^2,$$

for all $r \geq 0$. Here we have used that

$$p(s) := e^{-\frac{1}{2}s} (1 + s^2)^2 \leq \max_{s \geq 0} p(s) = p(s_0) \quad \forall s \geq 0$$

where $s_0 := 4 + \sqrt{15}$. This gives the desired result and (23). □

Lemma 3.5. *Consider*

$$h(x) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h_m x^m,$$

with

$$|h_m| \leq KT^{m-1} \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N},$$

for some $K, T > 0$, such that $h : B(T^{-1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic. Then

$$\mathcal{B}_k(h) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{h_m}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)} (\cdot)^{m-1},$$

belongs to \mathcal{G}_k with norm

$$\|\mathcal{B}_k(h)\|_{\mu,k} \leq KC_k \quad \forall \mu > T,$$

for some C_k ; specifically, we may take $C_k > 0$ to be given by (23) whenever $\mu > \sqrt[k]{2}T$.

Proof. The result easily follows from Lemma 3.4. \square

Under the conditions of the lemma, we also have that

$$(\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k} \circ \mathcal{B}_k)(h) = h. \quad (26)$$

This follows from (19) and (5) and the absolute convergence of $\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}$.

As in [5], we define \mathcal{G}_k^n completely analogously as the space of analytic functions $H : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, $H = (H_1, \dots, H_n)$, with each component $H_\ell \in \mathcal{G}_k$, $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The following norm

$$\|H\|_{\mu,k} := \sup_{\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \|H_\ell\|_{\mu,k}, \quad (27)$$

is a Banach norm on \mathcal{G}_k^n and all of the results above extend with little effort to these generalized spaces.

Let $H = (H_1, \dots, H_n) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n$ and $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Then we will also define $H^{\star_k \mathbf{j}}$ in the obvious way:

$$H^{\star_k \mathbf{j}} = \underbrace{H_1 \star_k \dots \star_k H_1}_{j_1 \text{ times}} \star_k \dots \star_k \underbrace{H_\ell \star_k \dots \star_k H_\ell}_{j_\ell \text{ times}} \star_k \dots \star_k \underbrace{H_n \star_k \dots \star_k H_n}_{j_n \text{ times}}.$$

In this way, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H^{\star_k \mathbf{j}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H_1)^{j_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H_n)^{j_n} := \mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H)^{\mathbf{j}},$$

as desired, see Lemma 3.1 and recall the notation introduced in (3).

3.2 Definition of the space $\mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}$

The space $\mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}$ consists of uniformly convergent series in z with coefficients in \mathcal{G}_k^n :

$$H(w, z) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} H_{\mathbf{j}}(w) z^{\mathbf{j}}, \quad H_{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{G}_k^n, \quad \forall \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n,$$

and we equip this space with the Banach norm:

$$\|H\|_{\mu,k} := \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \|H_{\mathbf{j}}\|_{\mu,k} \mu^{-|\mathbf{j}|} \quad \text{with } \|H_{\mathbf{j}}\|_{\mu,k} \text{ given by (27),}$$

see [5, Section 6.2]. Analytic functions $h(x, z)$ with $h(0, \cdot) = 0$ have Borel transforms (with respect to x , leaving z fixed) that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mu,k}^n\{z\}$ for $\mu > 0$ large enough. In particular, we have the following (which is a simple consequence of Lemma 3.5, see also [5, Lemma 7]).

Lemma 3.6. *Consider*

$$h(x, z) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} h_{\ell \mathbf{j}} x^\ell z^{\mathbf{j}},$$

a convergent series with coefficients $h_{\ell \mathbf{j}} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, and suppose that

$$|h_{\ell \mathbf{j}}| \leq K T^{\ell-1+|\mathbf{j}|} \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n.$$

Then the Borel transform of h (with respect to x , leaving z fixed)

$$\mathcal{B}_k(h)(w, z) := \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_{\ell \mathbf{j}}}{\Gamma(\frac{\ell}{k})} w^{\ell-1} \right) z^{\mathbf{j}}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{G}_{\mu, k}^n\{z\}$ for all $\mu > T$, and

$$\|\mathcal{B}_k(h)\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2^n K C_k,$$

for some $C_k > 0$. Furthermore,

$$(\mathcal{L}_{\theta, k} \circ \mathcal{B}_k)(h)(x, z) = h(x, z) \quad \forall x \in \omega_k(\nu, \theta, \alpha), z \in B^n(\mu^{-1}),$$

recall (8), where $0 < \nu < \mu^{-1} \sqrt[k]{\sin \frac{k\alpha}{4}}$.

The final lemma deals with the Borel transform of terms of the form $h(x, z + x\phi(x, z))$ which appear in (15).

Lemma 3.7. *Consider the same assumptions as in Lemma 3.6. Fix any $\xi > 0$ and define*

$$h^*(\Psi)(w, z) := \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_{\ell \mathbf{j}}}{\Gamma(\frac{\ell}{k})} w^{\ell-1} \right) \star_k (z + \Psi(w, z))^{\star_k \mathbf{j}}, \quad \Psi \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}.$$

Then the following holds: $h^*(\Psi)$ is well-defined for all $\|\Psi\|_{\mu, k} \leq \xi$ for all $\mu \gg 1$, satisfying $\|h^*(\Psi)\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2^n K C_k$ and

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta, k}(h^*(\Psi))(x, z) = h(x, z + \mathcal{L}_{\theta, k}(\Psi)(x, z)).$$

Proof. Given Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.6, the proof of Lemma 3.7 follows from [5, Proposition 5] and further details are therefore left out. \square

3.3 The conjugacy equation in the Borel plane

We are now in position to formulate (15) in the Borel plane for the Borel transforms G and Φ of g and ϕ . For the left hand side, we use Lemma 3.2 (in particular (21) and (22)) and obtain

$$\text{LHS}(G, \Phi)(w, z) := G(w, z) - A\Phi(w, z) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Phi(w, z) A z + w^k \Phi(w, z), \quad (28)$$

whereas for the Borel transform of the right hand side of (15), we use Lemma 3.7 for the first term and (21) on the remaining terms:

$$\text{RHS}(G, \Phi)(w, z) := f^*(1 \star_k \Phi)(w, z) - 1 \star_k \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Phi(w, z) \star_k G(w, z) - \frac{1}{k} w^{k-1} \star_k \Phi(w, z). \quad (29)$$

We solve the associated equation $\text{LHS} = \text{RHS}$ as in [5] through a fixed-point argument, that involves a particular inversion of LHS:

Consider the auxiliary problem

$$\text{LHS}(G, \Phi) = H \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}, \quad (30)$$

with LHS given by (28) and $H(w, z) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} H_{\mathbf{j}}(w) z^{\mathbf{j}}$, $H_{\mathbf{j}} = (H_{1\mathbf{j}}, \dots, H_{n\mathbf{j}}) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n$ fixed. We write

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} G_{\mathbf{j}}(w) z^{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}, \quad \Phi = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \Phi_{\mathbf{j}}(w) z^{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}, \\ G_{\mathbf{j}} &= (G_{1\mathbf{j}}, \dots, G_{n\mathbf{j}}) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n, \quad \Phi_{\mathbf{j}} = (\Phi_{1\mathbf{j}}, \dots, \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}}) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Our particular inverse $\text{LHS}^{-1} : H \mapsto (G, \Phi)$ is then defined by

$$G_{i\mathbf{j}} = 0 \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} = 0 \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (32)$$

For the following lemma, we will need a final Banach space: Let $\mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\} \subset \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}$ denote the subspace consisting of functions $\Phi \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}$ such that also

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} \Phi \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

and equip this space with the Banach norm

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mu,k,1} := \max \left\{ \|\Phi\|_{\mu,k}, \mu^{-1} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \Phi \right\|_{\mu,k}, \dots, \mu^{-1} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n} \Phi \right\|_{\mu,k} \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, there exists an $r > 0$ small enough, recall (16), such that the linear mapping*

$$\text{LHS}^{-1} : \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\} \times \mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}, \quad H \mapsto (G, \Phi),$$

defined by (30) and (32), is uniformly bounded with respect to $\mu > 0$.

We will prove Lemma 3.8 in sections 3.5 and 3.6 below. In particular, in section 3.5 we consider the semi-simple case $\Xi = 0$ (independent of r) and then in the subsequent section 3.6 we consider $\Xi \neq 0$. Both cases rest upon the following fact: For $\nu > 0$ small enough, there is a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{|\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k|} \leq \frac{K}{1 + |\mathbf{j}|}, \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}, \quad w \in \Omega(\nu, \theta, \alpha). \quad (33)$$

This follows directly from the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, in particular (12). In fact, it corresponds directly to [5, Lemma 3] (upon replacing their w by our w^k and their right hand side of [5, Eq. (9)] by our $C(1 + |\mathbf{j}|)$ (in line with our assumption (12))).

In fairness, the semi-simple case also follows from the non-semi-simple case (it corresponds to $r = 0$), but we prefer to separate the proof nonetheless. This is motivated by the fact that $\Xi = 0$ is substantially easier and follows [5] closely. For $\Xi \neq 0$, we will need to introduce some new notation and some additional auxiliary results (from [10]).

3.4 Completing the proof of Theorem 2.1

Given Lemma 3.8, we can now complete the proof of Theorem 2.1: Fix $r > 0$ small enough. Then the particular inverse $\text{LHS}^{-1} : H \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\} \mapsto (G, \Phi) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\} \times \mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}$ in Lemma 3.8 is well-defined and uniformly bounded with respect to $\mu > 0$. This then leads to the fixed point equation

$$(G, \Phi) = (\text{LHS}^{-1} \circ \text{RHS})(G, \Phi),$$

for a solution (G, Φ) of $\text{LHS} = \text{RHS}$, recall the definition of RHS in (29).

Proposition 3.9. *There is an $\xi > 0$ and a $\mu > 0$ large enough such that $(G, \Phi) \mapsto (\text{LHS}^{-1} \circ \text{RHS})(G, \Phi)$ is a contraction on the closed subset of $\mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\} \times \mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}$ defined by $\|G\|_{\mu,k} \leq \xi, \|\Phi\|_{\mu,k,1} \leq \xi$.*

Proof. The result follows from [5, Proposition 8] as each argument there now carries over to our general setting for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, all the necessary estimates rely on Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8 which generalize Proposition 4, Proposition 6 and Proposition 7 in [5]. \square

Theorem 2.1 follows, setting $g = \mathcal{L}_{k,\theta}(G)$ and $\phi = \mathcal{L}_{k,\theta}(\Phi)$, once we finish the proof of Lemma 3.8.

3.5 Proof of Lemma 3.8 in the semi-simple case

Here we prove Lemma 3.8 in the semi-simple case:

$$A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \text{ where all } \lambda_i \text{'s are nonzero.} \quad (34)$$

Then a simple calculation shows that the equation (30) with LHS defined by (28) is equivalent with

$$G_{i\mathbf{j}}(w) - (\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k) \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}}(w) = H_{i\mathbf{j}}(w) \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n. \quad (35)$$

Indeed, we just insert (31) into (28) and collect terms. Our particular inverse $\text{LHS}^{-1} : H \mapsto (G, \Phi)$ of LHS, defined by (32), is then simply given by

$$G_{i\mathbf{j}} = H_{i\mathbf{j}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} = 0 \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (36)$$

and

$$G_{i\mathbf{j}}(w) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}}(w) = -\frac{H_{i\mathbf{j}}(w)}{\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k} \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}, w \in \Omega. \quad (37)$$

LHS^{-1} has two components and the G -component is clearly a projection and therefore to prove Lemma 3.8 under the assumption (34), we only have to treat the Φ -component. For this we use (33) and (37), to obtain

$$\|\Phi_i\|_{\mu, k} = \sum_{\mathbf{j} : (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}} \|\Phi_{i\mathbf{j}}\|_{\mu, k} \mu^{-|\mathbf{j}|} \leq K \sum_{\mathbf{j} : (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}} \frac{\|H_{i\mathbf{j}}\|_{\mu, k}}{1 + |\mathbf{j}|} \mu^{-|\mathbf{j}|} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

In this way, we have that

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mu, k} \leq K \|H\|_{\mu, k}.$$

For the derivatives, let $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and denote by \mathbf{e}_q the n -tuple with one single nonzero element $(\mathbf{e}_q)_q = 1$ at the q 'th position. Then we notice that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_q} \Phi_i = \sum_{\mathbf{j} : (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}} \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} j_q z^{\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{e}_q}, \quad (38)$$

and upon estimating and using (37) and (33), we obtain

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial z_q} \Phi_i \right\|_{\mu, k} \leq K \sum_{\mathbf{j} : (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}} \frac{\|H_{i\mathbf{j}}\|_{\mu, k}}{1 + |\mathbf{j}|} j_q \mu^{-|\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{e}_q|} \leq K \mu \|H\|_{\mu, k} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, q \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Here we have also used the definition of the norm on $\mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}$ and that $\frac{j_q}{1+|\mathbf{j}|} \leq 1$ for all $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Subsequently, using the definition of the norm on $\mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}$, we complete the proof.

3.6 Proof of Lemma 3.8 for $\Xi \neq 0$

We now turn to the proof of Lemma 3.8 in the non-semi-simple case $\Xi \neq 0$. Recall that $C > 0$ and that

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(i, \mathbf{j}) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \mathbb{N}_0^n : |\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{j}|)\}. \quad (39)$$

Recall also that A (cf. (16) and the discussion around there) is in the (scaled) Jordan normal form:

$$A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) + r\Xi.$$

Let

$$\chi_s(\mathbf{j}) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j_s = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } j_s \neq 0 \end{cases} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n,$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}_s := (0, \dots, 0, \underset{\text{sth}}{1}, -1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, \quad (40)$$

for all $s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. It is then a simple calculation to show that our particular solution (G, Φ) (satisfying (32)) of $\text{LHS}(G, \Phi) = H$ with $H_{\mathbf{j}} = (H_{1\mathbf{j}}, \dots, H_{n\mathbf{j}}) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n$ given, is equivalently determined by the following equations for the coefficients: For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$:

$$G_{i\mathbf{j}} - (\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k) \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} = H_{i\mathbf{j}} + r \xi_i \Phi_{(i+1)\mathbf{j}} - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \Phi_{i(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, \quad (41)$$

and for $i = n$:

$$G_{n\mathbf{j}} - (\lambda_n - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k) \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} = H_{n\mathbf{j}} - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \Phi_{n(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n. \quad (42)$$

Indeed (as in the semi-simple case), we just insert (31) into (28), rearrange and collect terms of order $z^{\mathbf{j}}$.

Lemma 3.10. *Consider (41) and (42) and suppose (32). Then:*

$$G_{i\mathbf{j}} = H_{i\mathbf{j}} \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (43)$$

and for all $(i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$:

$$-(\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k) \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} = H_{i\mathbf{j}} + r \xi_i \Phi_{(i+1)\mathbf{j}} - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \Phi_{i(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)}. \quad (44)$$

Finally, for $i = n$ the following holds true

$$-(\lambda_n - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k) \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} = H_{n\mathbf{j}} - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \Phi_{n(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} : (n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}. \quad (45)$$

Proof. We only have to show (43), since (44) and (45) are just (41) and (42), respectively, with $G_{i\mathbf{j}} = 0$ for $(i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}$, see (32). For $(i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}$, we have $\Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} = 0$ (by (32)) and

$$G_{i\mathbf{j}} = H_{i\mathbf{j}} + r \xi_i \Phi_{(i+1)\mathbf{j}} - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \Phi_{i(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} : (i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}, i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \quad (46)$$

and

$$G_{n\mathbf{j}} = H_{n\mathbf{j}} - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \Phi_{n(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} : (n, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (47)$$

by (41) and (42), respectively. From (10) and (39), we have

$$((i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } \xi_i = 1) \implies (i+1, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}.$$

Consequently, by (32) we have that

$$\xi_i \Phi_{(i+1)\mathbf{j}} = 0 \quad \forall (i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (48)$$

Similarly, if $\xi_s = 1$ so that $\lambda_{s+1} = \lambda_s$ by (10), then

$$\langle \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s, \lambda \rangle = \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle + \lambda_s - \lambda_{s+1} = \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle,$$

using the definition of \mathbf{d}_s , see (40). This means that

$$((i, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } \xi_s = 1) \implies (i, \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s) \in \mathcal{R},$$

recall (39). In turn, the sums in (46) and (47) vanish and by (48) equations (46) and (47) reduce to (43) as claimed. \square

We now focus on solving (44) and (45). For this purpose, we adapt the approach of [10, Lemma 3.19]. To present the results, we use some notation from [10]: Let $\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. Then $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_\ell) \in \mathbb{N}_0^\ell$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is called a *path from \mathbf{m} to \mathbf{j}* if

$$\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{m} - \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{d}_{p_s}.$$

Given $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then

$$\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j}) := \left\{ \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n : \exists \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0, \exists p_1, \dots, p_\ell \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{m} - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{d}_{p_i} \right\},$$

is the set of all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ for which there exists a path from \mathbf{m} to \mathbf{j} . Clearly,

$$\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j}) \implies |\mathbf{m}| = |\mathbf{j}|, \quad (49)$$

where $|\mathbf{j}| = j_1 + \dots + j_n$. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j}) := \left\{ (p_1, \dots, p_{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})}) \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} : (p_1, \dots, p_{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})}) \text{ is a path from } \mathbf{m} \text{ to } \mathbf{j} \right\},$$

is the set of all paths from \mathbf{m} to \mathbf{j} ; obviously $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})$ may be empty but it is always well-defined. In particular, the length $\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})$ is independent of the path, see [10, Proposition 3.14].

Finally, define $\mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}] : \mathcal{G}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_k$ and $\mathcal{K}[i, s, \mathbf{j}] : \mathcal{G}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_k$ as follows

$$\mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}](h)(w) := \frac{-h(w)}{\lambda_i - \langle \mathbf{j}, \lambda \rangle - w^k} \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{G}_k, (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R},$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}[i, s, \mathbf{j}](h)(w) := -r\xi_s(j_s + 1)\mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}](h) \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{G}_k, i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n, r > 0.$$

From (33), we obtain that

$$\|\mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}](h)\|_{\mu, k} \leq \frac{K}{1 + |\mathbf{j}|} \|h\|_{\mu, k} \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{G}_k, (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}. \quad (50)$$

In turn, it follows that

$$\|\mathcal{K}[i, s, \mathbf{j}](h)\|_{\mu, k} \leq \frac{rK(j_s + 1)}{1 + |\mathbf{j}|} \|h\|_{\mu, k} \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{G}_k, s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, r > 0. \quad (51)$$

We then use $\mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}]$ to write (44) and (45) in the equivalent forms

$$\Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} = \mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}](H_{i\mathbf{j}} + r\xi_i\Phi_{(i+1)\mathbf{j}}) - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j})\xi_s(j_s + 1)\mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}](\Phi_{i(\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{d}_s)}) \quad \forall \mathbf{j} : (i, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}, \quad (52)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and

$$\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} = \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](H_{n\mathbf{j}}) - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j})\xi_s(j_s + 1)\mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](\Phi_{n(\mathbf{j}+\mathbf{d}_s)}) \quad \forall (n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}, \quad (53)$$

for $i = n$. We first solve (53) (using $\mathcal{K}[n, s, \mathbf{j}]$) and here is why: If $\Phi_{(i+1)\mathbf{j}}$ is known then (52) takes the same form as (53) (using $H_{i\mathbf{j}} + r\xi_i\Phi_{(i+1)\mathbf{j}} \leftrightarrow H_{n\mathbf{j}}, \Phi_{i\mathbf{j}} \leftrightarrow \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}}, i \leftrightarrow n$). Therefore once we have solved (53), we can solve for (52) for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ inductively.

Notice that (53) reduces to

$$\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} = \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](H_{n\mathbf{j}}) \quad \forall \mathbf{j} = (j_1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \{0\}^{n-1}, \quad (54)$$

since $\chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) = 0, s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, for all such \mathbf{j} , and that

$$\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j}) = \emptyset \quad \forall \mathbf{j} = (j_1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \{0\}^{n-1}; \quad (55)$$

this latter fact follows from $(j_1, 0, \dots, 0) + \mathbf{d}_s \notin \mathbb{N}_0^n$ for all $s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, recall (40).

Lemma 3.11. Consider (53) with $H_{n\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{G}_k$ for all $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. Then

$$\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} = \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](H_{n\mathbf{j}}) + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \left(\prod_{u=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \mathcal{K}[n, p_u, \mathbf{m} - \sum_{v=1}^u \mathbf{d}_{p_v}] \circ \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{m}] \right) (H_{n\mathbf{m}}) \quad \forall \mathbf{j} : (n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}, \quad (56)$$

where

$$\prod_{u=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \mathcal{K}[n, p_u, \mathbf{m} - \sum_{v=1}^u \mathbf{d}_{p_v}],$$

is understood as the composition of the operators $\mathcal{K}[n, p_u, \mathbf{m} - \sum_{v=1}^u \mathbf{d}_{p_v}]$ (which commute since $\mathcal{T}[i, \mathbf{j}]$ is defined by multiplication) and where the sums in (56) are understood to vanish for all $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \{0\}^{n-1}$ (where the summation index sets are empty, recall (55)).

Proof. The proof is by induction, with $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, 0, \dots, 0)$ being the base case (which is true by (54)). The induction step then follows [10, Lemma 3.19] and we will therefore only sketch the proof. It is based upon an ordering on \mathbb{N}_0^n defined as follows: $\mathbf{m} < \mathbf{j}$ if the first nonzero value (starting from the right) of $\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{m}$ is positive. Clearly, $\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s < \mathbf{j}$ for all $s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and all $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, recall (40), and the induction hypothesis therefore assumes that (56) holds true for $\Phi_{n(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)}$ for all $s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. To complete the induction step, we have to show that (56) holds true for all $\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}}$. To proceed, we then use [10, p. 374] to rewrite the sum in the definition of $\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}}(w)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} &= \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](H_{n\mathbf{j}}) + \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \mathcal{K}[n, s, \mathbf{j}] \circ \left[\mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s](H_{n(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \left(\prod_{u=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \mathcal{K}[n, p_u, \mathbf{m} - \sum_{v=1}^u \mathbf{d}_{p_v}] \circ \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{m}] \right) (H_{n\mathbf{m}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This rests upon the simple fact that $\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j})$ if and only if $\chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) = 1$. Then by using the definition of $\mathcal{K}[i, s, \mathbf{j}]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} &= \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](H_{n\mathbf{j}}) - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}] \circ \left[\mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s](H_{n(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \left(\prod_{u=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)} \mathcal{K}[n, p_u, \mathbf{m} - \sum_{v=1}^u \mathbf{d}_{p_v}] \circ \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{m}] \right) (H_{n\mathbf{m}}) \right] \\ &= \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](H_{n\mathbf{j}}) - r \sum_{s=1}^{n-1} \chi_{s+1}(\mathbf{j}) \xi_s(j_s + 1) \mathcal{T}[n, \mathbf{j}](\Phi_{n(\mathbf{j} + \mathbf{d}_s)}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the induction hypothesis in the last equality. The result therefore follows. \square

In the following, we will fix

$$r = \frac{1}{2K(n-1)}. \quad (57)$$

We then have:

Lemma 3.12. Consider

$$\Phi_n(w, z) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} : (n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}} \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}}(w) z^{\mathbf{j}},$$

with $\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}}$ given by (56) for all $(n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}$ and suppose that $H_n = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} H_{n\mathbf{j}}(w) z^{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{G}_k\{z\}$. Then

$$\|\Phi_n\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2K \|H_n\|_{\mu, k} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_{z_q} \Phi_n\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2K \mu \|H_n\|_{\mu, k} \quad \forall q \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (58)$$

Proof. First, from (56) we directly obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}}\| &\leq \frac{K}{1+|\mathbf{j}|} \left(\|H_{n\mathbf{j}}\| + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} (rK)^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \|H_{n\mathbf{m}}\| \right) \\ &\leq K \left(\|H_{n\mathbf{j}}\| + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \left(\frac{1}{2(n-1)} \right)^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \|H_{n\mathbf{m}}\| \right) \quad \forall \mathbf{j} : (n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R},\end{aligned}$$

using (49), (50), (57) and

$$\prod_{r=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \frac{rK((\mathbf{m} - \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{d}_{p_l})_{p_r} + 1)}{1 + |\mathbf{m}|} = \prod_{r=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \frac{rK(\mathbf{m} - \sum_{l=1}^{r-1} \mathbf{d}_{p_l})_{p_r}}{1 + |\mathbf{m}|} \leq (rK)^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})};$$

this last estimate follows from (49) and (51), see also [10, p. 376]. The estimate for $\|\Phi_n\|$ then follows directly from the computations on [10, p. 377]. When comparing with [10] notice that in our case we have

$$r_m := \mu^{-1} r^m \quad \forall m \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad \implies \quad \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{r_{m+1}}{r_m} = (n-1)r = \frac{1}{2K},$$

recall (57). (r_m are quantities from [10] and Proposition 3.20 in this reference assumes that $\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{r_{m+1}}{r_m} \leq \frac{1}{2K}$; the constant relating to K is denoted by \mathcal{N}^{-1} in [10]).

For the estimate for $\|\frac{\partial}{\partial z_q} \Phi_n\|$, we proceed completely analogously using (38), repeated here for convenience

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_q} \Phi_n = \sum_{\mathbf{j} : (n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}} \Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} j_q z^{\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{e}_q},$$

and therefore by (56):

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Phi_{n\mathbf{j}} j_q\| &\leq \frac{K j_q}{1+|\mathbf{j}|} \left(\|H_{n\mathbf{j}}\| + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} (rK)^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \|H_{n\mathbf{m}}\| \right) \\ &\leq K \left(\|H_{n\mathbf{j}}\| + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} (rK)^{\ell(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{j})} \|H_{n\mathbf{m}}\| \right) \quad \forall \mathbf{j} : (n, \mathbf{j}) \notin \mathcal{R}.\end{aligned}$$

□

We are now in a position to complete the proof of Lemma 3.8 in the case where $\Xi \neq 0$:

Completing the proof of Lemma 3.8. We will show the following:

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2^n K \|H\|_{\mu, k}, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial z_q} \Phi \right\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2^n K \mu \|H\|_{\mu, k} \quad \forall q \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (59)$$

By Lemma 3.10, we only have to treat the Φ -component of LHS^{-1} (as in the semi-simple case) and the estimates (59) will therefore complete the proof of Lemma 3.8. By (58) we have already established that

$$\|\Phi_n\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2K \|H_n\|_{\mu, k} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_{z_q} \Phi_n\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2K \mu \|H_n\|_{\mu, k} \quad \forall q \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (60)$$

Then in the same way (as described above Lemma 3.11), we obtain from (52) that

$$\|\Phi_i\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2K (\|H_i\|_{\mu, k} + r \|\Phi_{i+1}\|_{\mu, k}) \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \quad (61)$$

and

$$\|\partial_{z_q} \Phi_i\|_{\mu, k} \leq 2K \mu (\|H_i\|_{\mu, k} + r \|\Phi_{i+1}\|_{\mu, k}) \quad \forall q \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (62)$$

We now claim that

$$\|\Phi_{n-i}\|_{\mu,k} \leq 2^{i+1}K\|H\|_{\mu,k}, \quad \|H\|_{\mu,k} = \sup_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \|H_i\|_{\mu,k} \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}.$$

The proof is by induction. It is true for $i = 0$ (base case) by (60). Now for the induction step, we use (61) _{$i \rightarrow n-i$} :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_{n-i}\|_{\mu,k} &\leq 2K (\|H\|_{\mu,k} + r\|\Phi_{n-(i-1)}\|_{\mu,k}) \\ &\leq 2K\|H\|_{\mu,k} (1 + r2^iK) \\ &\leq 2K\|H\|_{\mu,k} (1 + 2^{i-1}) \\ &\leq 2K\|H\|_{\mu,k} 2^i, \end{aligned}$$

using the induction hypothesis and $r \leq \frac{1}{2K}$, recall (57). Therefore

$$\|\Phi_{n-i}\|_{\mu,k} \leq 2^{i+1}K\|H\|_{\mu,k} = 2^n K\|H\|_{\mu,k} \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}.$$

which completes the proof of the first estimate in (59). The estimates for $\|\partial_{z_q}\Phi\|_{\mu,k}$ are identical using (62). \square

4 Application to the zero-Hopf

In this section, we consider a real analytic zero-Hopf singularity in \mathbb{R}^3 with eigenvalues $0, \pm ib$, $b > 0$, of the linearization. Under the assumption that the origin is an isolated singularity, we obtain the following pre-normal form (see (1)):

$$\frac{1}{k}x^{k+1}\frac{dy}{dx} = Ay + xf(x, y), \quad A = \text{diag}(-ib, ib), \quad (63)$$

for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $y = (y_1, y_2) \in B^2(R)$, and where $f = (f_1, f_2)$ satisfies the following property

$$(P): \quad f_2(x, y_1, \bar{y}_1) = \overline{f_1(x, y_1, \bar{y}_1)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \cap B(\nu), y_1 \in B(R). \quad (64)$$

Here \bar{z} denotes the complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Indeed, to realize the normal form (63) satisfying the property (P), see (64), we first proceed as in [5] to write the system in the pre-normal form

$$\frac{1}{k}x^{k+1}\frac{du}{dx} = Bu + xh(x, u), \quad (65)$$

for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Here $u = (u_1, u_2) \in B^2(R)$, $h = (h_1, h_2)$, $h = (h_1, h_2)$ is a pair of real analytic functions defined locally near the origin, and

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ -b & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b > 0.$$

We then obtain (63) with (64) by setting $y_1 := u_1 + iu_2$, $y_2 := u_1 - iu_2$ and

$$f_1(x, y) := (h_1 + ih_2)(x, u), \quad f_2(x, y) := (h_1 - ih_2)(x, u).$$

A consequence of property (P) is obviously that

$$y_2 = \bar{y}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \cap B(\nu),$$

defines an invariant set of (63).

Proposition 4.1. *Consider the system (63) with f satisfying property (P). Then Theorem 2.1 applies with both $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$ and where $C > 0$ and $\mathcal{R} \subset \{1, 2\} \times \mathbb{N}_0^2$ are so that*

$$\begin{cases} |j_1 - (j_2 + 1)| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{j}|) & \iff (1, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}, \\ |j_2 - (j_1 + 1)| \leq C(1 + |\mathbf{j}|) & \iff (2, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{R}, \end{cases} \quad (66)$$

so that in both cases ($\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$) the resulting g - and ϕ -functions of Theorem 2.1 (which we denote by g^θ and ϕ^θ , $\theta = 0, \pi$, respectively) satisfy property (P):

$$g_2^\theta(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1) = \overline{g_1^\theta(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2^\theta(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1) = \overline{\phi_1^\theta(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \cap \omega_k, z_1 \in B(R).$$

Proof. First, we consider (30) and suppose that $H = (H_1, H_2)$ satisfies property (P):

$$H_2(w, z_1, \bar{z}_1) = \overline{H_1(w, z_1, \bar{z}_1)} \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R} \cap \Omega, z_1 \in B(R),$$

or equivalently at the level of the power series expansion of H with respect to $z = (z_1, z_2)$:

$$H_{2j_1j_2}(w) = \overline{H_{1j_2j_1}(w)} \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R} \cap \Omega, \mathbf{j} = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2.$$

It then easily follows that the inverse LHS^{-1} , defined by (36) and (37) with $A = \text{diag}(-ib, ib)$, preserves the property (P). Specifically, from (37) with $\lambda_1 = -ib, \lambda_2 = ib$, we have that

$$\overline{\Phi_{1j_1j_2}(w)} = -\frac{\overline{H_{1j_1j_2}(w)}}{ib + (j_1 - j_2)ib - w^k} = -\frac{H_{2j_2j_1}(w)}{ib - (j_2 - j_1)ib - w^k} = \Phi_{2j_2j_1} \quad \forall \mathbf{j} = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2,$$

when $w \in \mathbb{R}$. In other words, let $\mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}(\text{P}) \subset \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}(\text{P}) \subset \mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}$ denote the subspaces defined by functions that satisfy the (P) property. These subspaces are clearly closed spaces and the restriction of LHS^{-1} :

$$\text{LHS}^{-1}|_{\text{P}} : \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}(\text{P}) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}(\text{P}) \times \mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}(\text{P}),$$

is well-defined and uniformly bounded with respect to μ . A similar result holds true for RHS , see (29), insofar that it maps $(G, \Phi) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}(\text{P}) \times \mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}(\text{P})$ to $\text{RHS}(G, \Phi) \in \mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}(\text{P})$; for this we just use that for $w \in \mathbb{R}$ then $(\overline{H} \star_k \overline{G})(w) = \overline{(H \star_k G)}(w)$ for all $H, G \in \mathcal{G}_k$. In this way, Proposition 3.9 holds true on a closed subset of $\mathcal{G}_k^n\{z\}(\text{P}) \times \mathcal{G}_{k,1}^n\{z\}(\text{P})$. To complete the proof, we notice that

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(H)(x)} = \int_0^{\theta\infty} \overline{H}(w) e^{-w^k/x^k} k dw = \mathcal{L}_{\theta,k}(\overline{H})(x) \quad \forall H \in \mathcal{G}_k,$$

when $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap \omega_k$ and the integration is along the positive real axis ($\theta = 0$) or the negative real axis ($\theta = \pi$). \square

Corollary 4.2. *Consider the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 and fix any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there is a choice of $C(N) > 0$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(N)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x, z) &= z_1 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{10}(x) (z_1 z_2)^j + (z_1 z_2)^N h_{11}(x, z_1, z_2) \right), \\ g_2(x, z) &= z_2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h_{20}(x) (z_1 z_2)^j + (z_1 z_2)^N h_{21}(x, z_1, z_2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $h_{20}(x) = \overline{h_{10}(x)}$ and $h_{21}(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1) = \overline{h_{11}(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1)}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap \omega_k$ and $z_1 \in B(R)$. In particular, we have the following real normal form:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} x^{k+1} \frac{dr}{dx} &= x \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Re}(h_{10}(x)) r^{2j} + r^{2N} \text{Re}(h_{11}(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1)) \right) r, \\ \frac{1}{k} x^{k+1} \frac{d\phi}{dx} &= -b + x \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Im}(h_{10}(x)) r^{2j} + r^{2N} \text{Im}(h_{11}(x, z_1, \bar{z}_1)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap \omega_k$, in the polar coordinates r, ϕ defined by $z_1 = re^{i\phi}$.

Proof. We simply apply Proposition 4.1 with $C > 0$ small enough. In further details, let \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 denote the projections of \mathcal{R} onto $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, respectively. We then notice by (66) that $\mathcal{R}_1 = \{(j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : j_1 = j_2 + 1\}$ and $\mathcal{R}_2 = \{(j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : j_2 = j_1 + 1\}$ for $C = 0$. Consequently, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $C > 0$ small enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1 \cap \{(j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : j_2 \leq N-1 \text{ or } j_1 \leq N\} &= \{(j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : j_1 = j_2 + 1 \text{ and } j_2 \leq N-1\}, \\ \mathcal{R}_2 \cap \{(j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : j_1 \leq N-1 \text{ or } j_2 \leq N\} &= \{(j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : j_2 = j_1 + 1 \text{ and } j_1 \leq N-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

For \mathcal{R}_1 this simply means that it is a subset of the purple region in Fig. 2. For \mathcal{R}_2 , we reflect the region around the bisector. This gives the expansion of g_1 and g_2 upon application of Proposition 4.1. \square

In the normal form of Corollary 4.2, $g(x, 0) = 0$ for all $x \in \omega_k$. In other words, $z = 0$ defines an invariant set of (14) for $x \in \omega_k$. Given that ϕ satisfies the property (P) when either $\theta = 0$ or $\theta = \pi$, it follows that in the u -coordinates, recall (65), the resulting invariant manifolds

$$\theta = 0 : \quad \begin{cases} u_1 &= \frac{1}{2}x(\phi_1^0(x, 0) + \phi_2^0(x, 0)) \\ u_2 &= \frac{1}{2i}x(\phi_1^0(x, 0) - \phi_2^0(x, 0)) \end{cases} \quad \text{for } x \in \omega_k(\nu, 0, \alpha), \quad (67)$$

and

$$\theta = \pi : \quad \begin{cases} u_1 &= \frac{1}{2}x(\phi_1^\pi(x, 0) + \phi_2^\pi(x, 0)) \\ u_2 &= \frac{1}{2i}x(\phi_1^\pi(x, 0) - \phi_2^\pi(x, 0)) \end{cases} \quad \text{for } x \in \omega_k(\nu, \pi, \alpha), \quad (68)$$

are *real* when $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap \omega_k$.

In the case $k = 1$, the invariant manifolds (67) and (68) correspond to the invariant manifolds of [1, Theorem 2.13] used in the analysis of the analytic unfolding of the zero-Hopf (notice that the authors use $s = x^{-1}$ as the independent variable, with x being denoted \bar{z} in [1], see [1, Eq. (6)] with $\mu = 0$). It is important for the analysis in [1] that in the $k = 1$ case the domains $\omega_k(\nu, 0, \alpha)$ and $\omega_k(\theta, \pi, \alpha)$ have non-empty intersection along the imaginary axis ($\phi^0(\cdot, 0) \neq \phi^\pi(\cdot, 0)$ in general there), recall Fig. 1; this does not hold true in general in the case where $k \geq 2$. It would be interesting in future work to analyze what implications this has for higher co-dimensions versions of the phenomena in [1].

The reference [4] obtains a stronger normal form (where the nonlinearity only depends upon resonant monomials) in the case $k = 1$ for resonant saddle-nodes with eigenvalues $-\lambda, \lambda, 0$ under a separate condition on terms of the form xy .




Figure 2: For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a $C > 0$ small enough so that the projection \mathcal{R}_1 of \mathcal{R} onto $i = 1$ is a subset of the purple region. The case $i = 2$ is obtained by reflecting the $i = 1$ case around the bisector.

5 Discussion

In this final section, we would like to restrict our attention to the case where all nonzero eigenvalues belong to the Poincaré domain, i.e. all of them belong to a common complex halfplane, for example

the halfplane to the left of the imaginary axes. Without a zero eigenvalue, reduction to normal form is well-known from a classical theorem of Poincaré: reduction to normal form can be done analytically and the normal form only contains a finite number of resonant monomials.

In [5], their Theorem 3 was casted as a possible generalization of this result, claiming that in the presence of one zero-eigenvalue, in the generic case $k = 1$, one obtains 1-summability of the normal form transformation in the real direction. This is not true (it is not proven and even not true in general). In fact, we would like to pose it as a research question:

Problem 1. *Consider (1) satisfying Assumption 1 with f being analytic near the origin and let all nonzero eigenvalues have strictly negative real part. Then there exists a formal change of coordinates bringing the vector field in the form*

$$\frac{1}{k}x^{k+1}\frac{dz}{dx} = Az + xg_{res}(x, z) + xg_{nonres}(x, z) \quad (69)$$

where the Taylor series w.r.t. z of $g_{res}(x, z)$ only contains a finite number of resonant monomials of the form $xg_k(x)z^k$, and where $g_{nonres}(x, z)$ is “as close to annihilation as possible”. Try to capture the convergence or divergence properties of these transformations, possibly balancing the terms that can be annihilated in g_{nonres} .

In the simplest setting the question relates to the analytic normalizing transformation

$$x^2\frac{dy}{dx} = -y + xf(x, y) \quad \longrightarrow \quad x^2\frac{dz}{dx} = -z + xg(z). \quad (70)$$

Because there is only one nonzero eigenvalue, it trivially belongs to the Poincaré domain. There are no resonant terms here, and in the proposed normal form, the nonresonant terms are almost completely annihilated in the sense that $x.g_k$ only contains a single linear term in x for all k . Allowing nonresonant terms with linear coefficients allows Frank Loray to prove in [11, Theorem 1] that the normalizing transformation is convergent (and real analytic). Later, the result has been generalized in [16]. In [5] the authors prove that the normal form with $xg(z) = g_1xz$ is obtainable in a Gevrey-1 way, but unlike what the authors claim typically not in a 1-summable way in the positive real direction.

We speculate that the general *Banach space and Borel–Laplace approach* of the present paper may provide a route for such general results and we are presently working in this direction. Our intention is to ensure (by adjusting g_{res}) that all complex singularities of the normalizing transformation in the Borel plane are removable. When all singularities disappear, the Laplace transform becomes convergent!

References

- [1] I. Baldomá, O. Castejón, and T. M. Seara. Exponentially small heteroclinic breakdown in the generic hopf-zero singularity. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 25(2):335–392, 2013.
- [2] W. Balser. *Formal Power Series and Linear Systems of Meromorphic Ordinary Differential Equations*. Springer, 2000.
- [3] W. Balser, B. L. J. Braaksma, J.-P. Ramis, and Y. Sibuya. Multisummability of formal power series solutions of linear ordinary differential equations, 1991.
- [4] A. Bittmann. Doubly-resonant saddle-nodes in $(C3,0)$ and the fixed singularity at infinity in painlevé equations: Analytic classification. *Annales De L’institut Fourier*, 68(4):1715–1830, 2018.
- [5] P. Bonckaert and P. De Maesschalck. Gevrey normal forms of vector fields with one zero eigenvalue. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 344(1):301–321, 2008.
- [6] P. Bonckaert and F. Verstringe. Renormalization of planar analytic saddles. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 24(3):569–593, 2012.
- [7] B. Braaksma and L. Stolovitch. Small divisors and large multipliers. *Annales De L’institut Fourier*, 57(2):603–628, 2007.
- [8] B. L. J. Braaksma. Multisummability of formal power-series solutions of nonlinear meromorphic differential-equations. *Annales De L Institut Fourier*, 42(3):517–540, 1992.
- [9] O. Costin. *Asymptotics and Borel summability*, volume 141 of *Chapman & Hall/CRC Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2009.
- [10] P. De Maesschalck and K. Kenens. Gevrey asymptotic properties of slow manifolds. *Nonlinearity*, 33(1):341–387, 2020.
- [11] F. Loray. Versal deformation of the analytic saddle-node. *Asterisque*, 297:167–187, 2004.
- [12] B. Malgrange and J.P. Ramis. Multisummable functions. *Annales De L Institut Fourier*, 42(1-2):353–368, 1992.
- [13] J. Martinet and J.-P. Ramis. Classification analytique des équations différentielles non linéaires résonnantes du premier ordre. *Annales Scientifiques De L’école Normale Supérieure*, 16(4):571–621, 1983.
- [14] M. Put and M. F. Singer. *Galois Theory of Linear Differential Equations*. Springer, 2003.
- [15] D. Sauzin. Nonlinear analysis with resurgent functions. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 48(3):667–702, 2015.
- [16] R. Schäfke and L. Teyssier. Analytic normal forms for convergent saddle-node vector fields. *Annales De L’institut Fourier*, 65(3):933–974, 2015.
- [17] Y. Sibuya. *Linear Differential Equations in the Complex Domain: Problems of Analytic Continuation*, volume 82 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.
- [18] L. Stolovitch. Classification analytique de champs de vecteurs 1-résonnants de $(cn, 0)$. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 12(2):91–143, 1996.
- [19] L. Stolovitch. Progress in normal form theory. *Nonlinearity*, 22(7):R77–R99, 2009.