

# HERMAN'S CONVERSE KAM MECHANISM REVISITED

YI LIU AND LIN WANG

**ABSTRACT.** In his celebrated counterexample to the KAM theorem, Herman introduced a perturbation of an integrable system consisting of two components: a hyperbolic term and a bump function. He also remarked that it was unclear whether the bump function was truly necessary [Her83, p. 78, Remark 4.7.3]. In this note, we prove that the bump function is indeed necessary when more natural hyperbolic perturbations are considered. The proof of this necessity relies on an improved Siegel–Brjuno estimate and a parameter-dependent renormalization of resonances within the direct KAM method.

## CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Herman's converse KAM mechanism	2
1.2. On the necessity of the second perturbation	3
1.3. Statement of main results	4
1.4. Remarks on Herman's counterexample	6
2. Construction of the bump	7
2.1. Gevrey- $\alpha$ function	7
2.2. Construction of $\xi_m$	8
3. Destruction of $\Gamma_\omega$ for $F_{m,a}$	9
3.1. Basic tools from Aubry–Mather theory	9
3.2. A lower bound of the Peierls barrier	10
3.3. The modulus of continuity of the Peierls barrier	12
4. A reduction of Theorem 2	14
5. Persistence of $\Gamma_{\bar{\omega}}$ for $f_{m,a}$	15
5.1. The tree expansion	17
5.2. The cluster and $m$ -resonance	18
5.3. The arithmetics and counting	19
5.4. Sketch proof of Theorem 4	21
Appendix A. Renormalization of resonances	22
A.1. The generations of resonances	22
A.2. Cancellation in three cases	23
References	28

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Area-preserving twist maps of the cylinder, introduced by Poincaré, capture the essential dynamics of the restricted three-body problem. Aubry–Mather theory establishes that, under very general conditions, the invariant sets of such maps are compact and non-empty, and possess a well-defined “order structure.” These invariant sets, known as Aubry–Mather sets, are characterized by the rotation number (also called frequency)—or more generally, the rotation symbol of their orbits. When the frequency is irrational, an Aubry–Mather set may be either an invariant circle (i.e., a homotopically non-trivial invariant curve) or a Cantor set. A celebrated result by Birkhoff [Bir20] states that for  $C^1$  maps, any invariant circle must

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37J40; Secondary 37E40.

*Key words and phrases.* Herman's converse KAM mechanism, Gevrey regularity, Invariant circles.

be the graph of a Lipschitz function. Due to the fundamental importance of invariant circles in dynamics, determining their existence remains one of the central problems in the theory of area-preserving twist maps.

The most significant approach to this problem is the KAM theory, initiated by Kolmogorov, Arnold, and Moser. This theory applies to nearly integrable systems: Herman [Her86] proved that if the perturbation of an integrable system is sufficiently small in the  $C^3$  topology, then invariant circles with frequencies of constant type persist. This result is optimal, since Herman [Her83] also constructed examples showing that for any invariant circle of an integrable system, an arbitrarily small perturbation in the  $C^{3-\varepsilon}$  topology can destroy it. Constant-type frequencies are those which are approximated by rationals at the slowest possible rate; if one considers frequencies admitting faster approximation, the required topology for the perturbation can be made finer (see [For94, Mat88]).

**1.1. Herman's converse KAM mechanism.** The investigation of invariant circle non-existence constitutes a central theme in converse KAM theory, with Herman's mechanism representing a foundational contribution. Herman's method proceeds through two carefully designed perturbations of an integrable system. *The first perturbation generates a hyperbolic periodic orbit, while the second—implemented via a bump function—ensures transverse intersection of the stable and unstable manifolds, a phenomenon known as separatrix splitting. This process creates a stochastic layer of controlled width that destroys invariant circles with specific rotation numbers near the hyperbolic orbit. Through appropriate coordinate transformations, the analysis reduces to studying the dynamics near the hyperbolic fixed point and its homoclinic orbits.* The construction requires precise balancing between the perturbation sizes and the arithmetic properties of the invariant circle's rotation number.

Subsequent work on the breakup of invariant circles for twist maps, and of invariant tori for Hamiltonian systems with multiple degrees of freedom, in the  $C^r$  topology ( $r \in [0, +\infty] \cup \{\omega\}$ ), essentially draws inspiration from Herman's mechanism (see, e.g., [Bes01, BF19, CW13, For94, Mat88, Wan12, Wan15, Wan22]).

In [Her83, Chapter II], Herman defined the maps

$$f_{n,a}(x, y) = (x + y, y + \varphi_{\delta_n}(x + y)), \quad \text{where } \delta_n = \frac{1}{n^a}, \quad a > 1,$$

$$F_{n,a}(x, y) = (x + y, y + \varphi_{\delta_n}(x + y) + \eta_n(x + y)).$$

In this construction,  $a > 1$  is a parameter. The function  $\varphi_{\delta_n}$  is a  $C^\infty$  hyperbolic perturbation whose  $C^k$ -norm is bounded by  $\delta_n$  for any  $k \geq 0$ . To facilitate precise geometric estimates, Herman requires that  $\varphi_{\delta_n}$  be linear in a neighborhood of the hyperbolic fixed point. See Fig. 1. The function  $\eta_n$  is a bump function.




FIGURE 1. The hyperbolic perturbation in Herman's counterexample

**Remark 1.1.** In Herman's counterexample, the parameter is denoted by  $\lambda_n$  and defined as  $\lambda_n := n^{-a/2}$ . The parameter  $\delta_n := \lambda_n^2$  is introduced here for notational simplicity in the subsequent exposition.

**1.2. On the necessity of the second perturbation.** Herman proved [Her83, p.71, Theorem 4.6] that for every

$$(1) \quad 0 < |\omega| < n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}-\varepsilon},$$

there exists a sufficiently large  $N_0$  such that for all  $n \geq N_0$ , the map  $F_{n,a}$  admits no invariant circle with rotation number  $\omega$ . Using the variational methods from Aubry–Mather theory, one can overcome the technical limitations of geometric approaches and consider replacing  $\varphi_{\delta_n}$  with a more natural hyperbolic perturbation, for example  $\delta_n \sin 2\pi x$  (see [Wan12]).

In [Her83, p. 78, Remark 4.7.3], Herman noted: *C'est parce que je ne sais pas si le difféomorphisme  $f_{n,a}$  vérifie le Théorème 4.6 (avec  $\omega \neq 0$ ) qu'il a été nécessaire de perturber  $f_{n,a}$  en  $F_{n,a}$ .* (It is because I do not know whether the diffeomorphism  $f_{n,a}$  satisfies Theorem 4.6 (for  $\omega \neq 0$ ) that it was necessary to perturb  $f_{n,a}$  into  $F_{n,a}$ .)

In this note, we aim to show that  $f_{n,a}$  by itself cannot destroy the invariant circle of rotation number  $\omega$  satisfying (1) upon replacing  $\varphi_{\delta_n}(x)$  with  $\delta_n \sin 2\pi x$ . A detailed discussion of Herman's original counterexample is provided in Subsection 1.4. In fact, it is evident from the proof that the conclusion also holds for perturbations of the form  $\delta_n \sin(Mx)$ , where  $M$  is a constant independent of  $n$ . Specifically, we prove that there exist a subsequence  $\{N_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  and a corresponding sequence of rotation numbers  $\{\omega_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying

$$0 < |\omega_m| < N_m^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}-\varepsilon},$$


such that  $f_{N_m,a}$  preserves the invariant circle of rotation number  $\omega_m$ , while  $F_{N_m,a}$  destroys it. A precise formulation is given in Theorem 2 below.

Loosely speaking, the difficulty in answering Herman's question—regardless of whether the perturbation is  $\varphi_{\delta_n}(x)$  or  $\delta_n \sin 2\pi x$ —lies in the following aspects:

- For proving *persistence*, classical KAM methods are inapplicable since both  $f_{n,a}$  and  $F_{n,a}$  are perturbations of the same integrable system with small magnitudes in the same topology. However, for rotation numbers  $\omega$  satisfying (1), the perturbation sizes exceed the range where classical KAM theory applies. Hence, these methods cannot determine whether  $f_{n,a}$  preserves invariant circles of rotation number  $\omega$ .
- For proving *destruction*, variational methods from Aubry–Mather theory are inadequate. Although Mather's criterion characterizes the existence of an invariant circle with rotation number  $\omega$  by the vanishing of the corresponding Peierls barrier, it remains undecidable—under only the hyperbolic perturbation—whether this barrier vanishes identically for such  $\omega$ .

Both  $\varphi_{\delta_n}(x)$  and  $\delta_n \sin 2\pi x$  produce hyperbolic fixed points, yet they exhibit essential differences: with  $\varphi_{\delta_n}(x)$ , the separatrix remains unbroken and homoclinic intersections are absent, making the persistence of nearby invariant circles with irrational frequencies plausible. By contrast, for  $\delta_n \sin 2\pi x$ , it is known from classical studies of the standard map (e.g., [Laz93]) that homoclinic intersections arise for any  $\delta_n > 0$ . Hence, the preservation of invariant circles with irrational frequencies under this perturbation is a more subtle phenomenon. Further discussion of this comparison can be found in Remark 1.4.

Within the framework of Aubry–Mather theory, we prove the destruction of invariant circles with specific rotation numbers for the system  $F_{N_m,a}$ . For the system  $f_{N_m,a}$ , however, the persistence of invariant circles with corresponding rotation numbers requires tools that lie between Aubry–Mather theory and classical KAM theory; we establish this using the direct KAM method (see Subsection 1.3.2). Although it is commonly believed that invariant circles detected by the direct KAM method should also be accessible via classical KAM techniques, we demonstrate that for certain rotation numbers the direct method provides distinct advantages—despite its stricter requirements, such as real-analyticity and specific perturbation structures. The judicious choice of rotation numbers is essential to exploiting this advantage. A schematic overview of the theoretical tools used in analyzing  $F_{N_m,a}$  and  $f_{N_m,a}$  is provided in Fig. 2. In the figure, the dashed line indicates uncertainty regarding whether the persistence of invariant circles for  $f_{N_m,a}$  can be established via classical KAM methods, while the shaded region represents dynamical objects—such as non-KAM invariant circles (see [GLW25])—that lie beyond the quantitative scope of both KAM theory and Aubry–Mather theory.

FIGURE 2. Theoretical tools for handling  $F_{N_m,a}$  and  $f_{N_m,a}$ 

1.3. **Statement of main results.** Let  $\alpha > 1$ . Consider the subsequence defined by

$$(2) \quad n_m := \left\lfloor \exp \left( \frac{b}{a} m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right) \right\rfloor,$$

where  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to  $x$ , the letter  $b$  is also a parameter and the requirement  $b > 4$  is needed by the Siegel-Brjuno estimate (see Lemma 5.7 below). Define the perturbation size as

$$(3) \quad \delta_m := \exp(-bm^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}).$$

Now, consider the generating functions:

$$(4) \quad h_m(x, x') := \frac{1}{2}(x - x')^2 + \delta_m(1 - \cos 2\pi x').$$

$$(5) \quad H_m(x, x') := \frac{1}{2}(x - x')^2 + \delta_m(1 - \cos 2\pi x') + \xi_m(x'),$$

The map  $F_{m,a} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$  is generated by  $H_m$ , while  $f_{m,a} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$  is generated by  $h_m$ , where  $\eta_m$  denotes the derivative of  $\xi_m$ . We denote, once and for all,  $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  be a flat circle. Explicitly, the maps are given by:

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{m,a}(x, y) &= (x + y, y + \delta_m \sin 2\pi(x + y)), \\ F_{m,a}(x, y) &= (x + y, y + \delta_m \sin 2\pi(x + y) + \eta_m(x + y)). \end{aligned}$$

Let us also define the integrable twist map

$$(7) \quad T(x, y) = (x + y, y).$$

1.3.1. **On the destruction.** By applying the variational framework of Aubry-Mather theory together with refined estimates on the Peierls barrier, we obtain the following result:

**Theorem 1.** Fix  $a > 1$ ,  $b > 0$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . There exists  $M_0 > 0$  such that for every  $m \geq M_0$  and every rotation number  $\omega$  satisfying

$$(8) \quad 0 < |\omega| < n_m^{-\frac{a}{2} - \varepsilon},$$

where  $n_m$  is defined in (2), the map  $F_{m,a}$  admits no invariant circle with rotation number  $\omega$ . Moreover, for any  $\alpha > 1 + \frac{a}{\varepsilon}$  and  $L \in (0, b)$ ,

$$\|F_{m,a} - T\|_{\alpha, L} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

In Theorem 1, the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha, L}$  is defined in (11) below. Bounemoura and Féjoz [BF19] studied an analogous problem for Hamiltonian systems with  $d$  degrees of freedom using Bessi's variational approach [Bes01]. Comparably, Theorem 1 offers a more explicit characterization of the parameter dependencies.

**1.3.2. On the persistence.** Proving the persistence of invariant circles with rotation numbers satisfying (8) in the absence of bump perturbations requires a more involved approach. Loosely speaking, classical KAM methods, which rely on iterative coordinate transformations, are insensitive to the specific structure of the perturbation and depend only on its magnitude in a given topology. Consequently, these techniques are inapplicable for establishing the persistence of invariant circles under perturbations without bumps within the same topology as in Theorem 1.

Inspired by Berretti and Gentile [BG01], we adopt the direct KAM method, initially introduced by Eliasson (following a reexamination of Siegel's method [Sie42]) and subsequently refined by Gallavotti, Chierchia, Falcolini and others (see, e.g., [BG99, BG01, Eli96, CF94, Gal93, GM96]). Specifically, we establish the following result:

**Theorem 2.** *Fix  $a > 1$ ,  $b > 4$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . There exists a sequence  $\{\omega_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying*

$$0 < |\omega_m| < n_{j_m}^{-\frac{a}{2}-\varepsilon},$$

where  $n_{j_m}$  is defined by replacing  $m$  with  $j_m$  in (2), and a sufficiently large  $M_1$  such that for all  $m \geq M_1$ , the map  $f_{j_m, a}$  admits an invariant circle with rotation number  $\omega_m$ .

In Theorem 2, the specific choices of  $\omega_m$  and  $j_m$  are given in (29) below. The proof of Theorem 2 is primarily inspired by [BG01], with key innovations including an improved Siegel–Brjuno estimate (see [BG01, Lemma 5]), a refined notion of resonance, and an adapted multi-scale decomposition and renormalization scheme.

**1.3.3. On the arithmetics of the rotation number.** For real analytic systems, Rüssmann showed in a series of papers, culminating in [Rüs91], that the Diophantine condition on the rotation number  $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  can be replaced by a weaker condition that still guarantees the existence of invariant circles with rotation number  $\omega$ . Let  $\{p_n/q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence of convergents in the continued fraction expansion of  $\omega$ . The Diophantine condition can be expressed in terms of this expansion as

$$(9) \quad \ln q_{n+1} \leq C \ln q_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Rüssmann proved that the condition

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n} < +\infty,$$

previously introduced by Brjuno in the context of classical perturbation theory in Hamiltonian mechanics and known as the *Brjuno condition*, suffices for the existence of invariant circles. For Gevrey- $\alpha$  systems, it is natural to introduce another arithmetic condition on the rotation number. For  $\alpha \geq 1$ , the number  $\omega$  is called an  $\alpha$ -Brjuno–Rüssmann number if it satisfies the condition

$$(10) \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n^{1/\alpha}} < +\infty.$$

In particular, when  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\omega$  is referred to as a Brjuno number. We denote by  $\mathcal{B}$  the set of Brjuno numbers, and by  $\mathcal{BR}_\alpha$  the set of  $\alpha$ -Brjuno–Rüssmann numbers.

Define the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_{m, a} &:= \left( x + y, y + \frac{\delta_{q_m}}{q_m} \sin(2\pi q_m(x + y)) + \frac{1}{q_m} \eta_{q_m}(q_m(x + y)) \right), \\ \bar{f}_{m, a} &:= \left( x + y, y + \frac{\delta_{q_m}}{q_m} \sin(2\pi q_m(x + y)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By a finite covering argument [Her83, p. 78, 4.8] (see also Lemma 4.1 below), in combination with Theorems 1 and 2, we obtain the following result:

**Theorem 3.** *Fix  $a > 1$ ,  $b > 4$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . For any  $\alpha > 1 + \frac{a}{\varepsilon}$ , there exists  $\bar{\omega} \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{BR}_\alpha$  such that all sufficiently large  $m$ , the invariant circle with rotation number  $\bar{\omega}$  is destroyed by  $\bar{F}_{m, a}$  but preserved by  $\bar{f}_{m, a}$ . Moreover, for any  $L \in (0, b)$ , we have*

$$\|\bar{F}_{m, a} - T\|_{\alpha, L} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the dynamics of  $\bar{f}_{m, a}$  restricted to the invariant circle is  $C^\omega$ -conjugate to the rigid rotation  $R_{\bar{\omega}}(x) := x + \bar{\omega}$ .

**Remark 1.2.** By applying Jackson’s approximation and Bernstein’s estimate, the Gevrey- $\alpha$  bump function in  $\bar{F}_{m,a}$  can be replaced by a trigonometric polynomial while preserving the validity of Theorem 3 without any modification to its statement. For technical details, we refer to [Wan22, Wan23].

**1.4. Remarks on Herman’s counterexample.** In Herman’s original construction, the following two conditions are required:

1. The perturbation  $\varphi_{\delta_n}$  is of class  $C^\infty$ , and linear in a neighborhood of the hyperbolic fixed point;
2. The Aubry set with rotation symbol  $0_\pm$  is an invariant circle.

Both requirements are designed to facilitate geometric estimates. The variational method employed to prove the non-existence of invariant circles with specific rotation numbers under the combined influence of hyperbolic and bump perturbations can be directly adapted to Herman’s construction. This adaptability stems from the fact that Mather’s variational approach depends mainly on the dynamics near the hyperbolic fixed point and is insensitive to whether the Aubry set with rotation symbol  $0_\pm$  constitutes an invariant circle. Hence, Theorem 1 still holds.

Conversely, the direct KAM method for establishing the existence of invariant circles under purely hyperbolic perturbations (without bump perturbations) relies more substantially on the structural properties of the hyperbolic perturbation itself. In Herman’s construction, the mode labels assigned to nodes in the tree expansion (see Section 5.1) exhibit greater complexity, and the renormalization procedure for resonances demands more intricate technical modifications, which we do not detail here (see [BG00, Sections 2–5] for relevant technical details).

Under the more natural perturbation  $\delta_n \sin 2\pi x$  we consider, the system (6) becomes the Chirikov standard map, where the Aubry set with rotation symbol  $0_\pm$  is already disrupted and fails to form an invariant circle [Laz93]. Specifically, transverse homoclinic intersections emerge, creating a complex orbital structure—commonly termed a stochastic layer—near the Aubry set of rotation symbol  $0_\pm$ . This complexity heightens the challenge of preserving invariant circles with rotation numbers close to 0. Nevertheless, we have established that such invariant circles are indeed preserved. By analogy, it is reasonable to expect that in Herman’s counterexample without bump perturbations, the invariant circles should similarly persist, though a rigorous proof remains under investigation due to technical obstacles. Fig. 3 provides a schematic comparison of the dynamics for the integrable system (7) under perturbations  $\varphi_{\delta_n}$  and  $\delta_n \sin 2\pi x$ , with the blue dashed line in the left panel indicating a plausible conjecture.




FIGURE 3. Schematic description of dynamics caused by two perturbations

**Organization of this note.** The structure of this note is as follows. Section 2 presents the construction of a sequence of Gevrey- $\alpha$  bump functions  $\xi_m$  with  $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha,L}$ -norms decaying to zero as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . In Section 3, through lower-bound estimates of the perturbed Peierls barrier and an analysis of its dependence on the rotation symbol, we demonstrate the destruction of invariant circles at specified rotation numbers under combined hyperbolic and bump perturbations, thus establishing Theorem 1. Section 4 develops an appropriate selection of rotation numbers and, via Herman’s finite covering argument, reframes the proof of invariant circle existence. This reformulation enables a more effective application of the arithmetic properties

of the rotation numbers. Section 5 employs the tree expansion method for Lindstedt series, incorporating an  $m$ -dependent multi-scale decomposition and resonance structure, which yields an enhanced Siegel-Brjuno estimate and refined control of non-resonant contributions in tree values, thereby concluding the proof of Theorem 2. Appendix A provides technical details on the renormalization of resonances. The presentation adapts and mildly modifies the framework of [BG01, Sec. 4-5]; for the reader's convenience, we include a self-contained exposition in the appendix.

**Acknowledgement.** This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12122109) and the Beijing Natural Science Foundation (Grant No. QY25241). The authors are also grateful to Professor Giovanni Forni for his invaluable suggestions and to Junhao Li for his assistance in preparing Fig. 3.

**Data Availability Statement.** The authors state that this manuscript has no associated data and there is no conflict of interest.

## 2. CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUMP

**2.1. Gevrey- $\alpha$  function.** We fix  $\alpha > 1$ . Let

$$(11) \quad \|\phi\|_{\alpha,L} := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{L^{k\alpha}}{k!^\alpha} \|\partial^k \phi\|_{C^0(\mathbb{T})},$$

$$G^{\alpha,L}(\mathbb{T}) := \{\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \mid \|\phi\|_{\alpha,L} < \infty\}, \quad G^\alpha(\mathbb{T}) := \bigcup_{L>0} G^{\alpha,L}(\mathbb{T}).$$

Following [MS03], Gevrey- $\alpha$  function is defined as follow.

**Definition 2.1.** A function  $\phi$  is called Gevrey- $\alpha$  function on  $\mathbb{T}$  if  $\phi \in G^\alpha(\mathbb{T})$ .

From the Leibniz rule, it follows that for  $L > 0$ ,  $\phi, \psi \in G^{\alpha,L}(\mathbb{T})$ ,

$$(12) \quad \|\phi\psi\|_{\alpha,L} \leq \|\phi\|_{\alpha,L} \|\psi\|_{\alpha,L}.$$

We construct a Gevrey- $\alpha$  perturbation  $\xi_m$  as follows. First, for each  $\lambda > 0$ , we define a function  $f_\lambda \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  by:

$$(13) \quad f_\lambda(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \leq 0, \\ \exp\left(-\lambda\sqrt{2}x^{-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}\right), & x > 0. \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $p = \frac{1}{\alpha-1}$  and  $\sigma := \frac{\pi}{4} \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{p}\right\}$ . For any given  $L > 0$ , if

$$\lambda > \frac{(2L^\alpha / \sin \sigma)^p}{p},$$

then  $f_\lambda(x)$  is a Gevrey- $\alpha$  function on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ , we have  $p \in (0, \infty)$  and

$$(14) \quad f_\lambda(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \leq 0, \\ \exp(-\lambda\sqrt{2}x^{-p}), & x > 0. \end{cases}$$

Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x > 0$ . Note that  $f_\lambda|_{\mathbb{R}^+}$  extends to a holomorphic function on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ . Let  $\Sigma_\sigma = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\arg z| \leq \sigma\}$ . The closed disk  $D_z$  centered at  $x$  with radius  $x \sin \sigma$  is the largest disk centered at  $x$  contained in  $\Sigma_\sigma$ . By the Cauchy estimate,

$$\left|f_\lambda^{(k)}(x)\right| \leq \frac{k!}{(x \sin \sigma)^k} \max_{D_z} |f_\lambda|.$$

Let  $z = re^{i\theta} \in D_z$ . Since  $|\theta| \leq \sigma = \frac{\pi}{4} \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{p}\right\}$ , we have

$$\Re(z^{-p}) = r^{-p} \cos(p\theta) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|z|^p}, \quad \text{and} \quad |z| \leq 2x.$$

Hence,

$$\max_{D_z} |f_\lambda| \leq \exp \left( -\frac{\lambda}{(2x)^p} \right).$$

The maximum of the function  $y \mapsto y^k e^{-\lambda y^p}$  is  $\left(\frac{k}{\lambda p e}\right)^{k/p}$ , so we obtain

$$(15) \quad \left| f_\lambda^{(k)}(x) \right| \leq \left( \frac{2}{\sin \sigma} \right)^k \left( \frac{k}{\lambda p e} \right)^{k/p} k!.$$

By Stirling's formula, for any given  $L > 0$ , if

$$\lambda > \frac{(2L^\alpha / \sin \sigma)^p}{p},$$

then

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{L^{k\alpha}}{k!^\alpha} \left\| f_\lambda^{(k)}(x) \right\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R})} < \infty.$$

Therefore,  $f_\lambda(x)$  is a Gevrey- $\alpha$  function on  $\mathbb{R}$ . □

**2.2. Construction of  $\xi_m$ .** Define

$$\Delta_m := \exp \left( -\frac{b}{2} m^\beta \right) = \sqrt{\delta_m}.$$

Fix  $\alpha > 1 + \frac{a}{\varepsilon}$  and  $L \in (0, b)$ . Let  $\lambda_0$  be as in Lemma 2.2, and set

$$\lambda := \lambda_0 + 1.$$

For  $x \in [0, 1]$ , define the function

$$v_m(x) = \begin{cases} \Delta_m^2 f_\lambda \left( \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m - \frac{1}{2} + x \right) f_\lambda \left( \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m + \frac{1}{2} - x \right), & x \in \left[ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m \right], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

More explicitly, on the interval  $\left[ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m \right]$ ,

$$v_m(x) = \Delta_m^2 \exp \left( -\lambda \sqrt{2} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m - \frac{1}{2} + x \right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} + \left( \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m + \frac{1}{2} - x \right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \right] \right),$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  is independent of  $m$ . Extend  $v_m$  periodically to  $\mathbb{R}$  via  $v_m(x+1) = v_m(x)$ . By Lemma 2.2,  $v_m$  is a Gevrey- $\alpha$  function on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and by the choice of  $\lambda$ ,

$$\|v_m\|_{\alpha, L} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

A direct computation from the definition of  $v_m$  shows that for  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ ,

$$(16) \quad \max_{x \in [0, 1]} v_m(x) = v_m \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = \Delta_m^2 \exp \left( -\lambda 2^{\frac{3}{\alpha-1} + \frac{1}{2}} \Delta_m^{-\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \right).$$

To estimate the lower bound of  $P_{0+}^{H_m}$  (see Subsection 3.1.2) at a specific point, we shift the axis of symmetry of  $v_m$  to a point  $\tau$  satisfying (19) below. Define

$$\xi_m(x) := v_m \left( x - \left( \tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right).$$

Then

$$\text{supp } \xi_m = \left[ \tau - \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m, \tau + \frac{1}{8} \Delta_m \right],$$

and, as in (16),

$$\xi_m(\tau) = \max_x \xi_m(x) = v_m \left( \frac{1}{2} \right).$$



3. DESTRUCTION OF  $\Gamma_\omega$  FOR  $F_{m,a}$ 

**3.1. Basic tools from Aubry–Mather theory.** Let  $G$  be a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  denoted by  $G(x, y) = (X(x, y), Y(x, y))$ . Let  $G$  satisfy:

- *Lift condition:*  $G$  is isotopic to the identity;
- *Twist condition:* the map  $\psi : (x, y) \mapsto (x, X(x, y))$  is a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ;
- *Exact symplectic:* there exists a real-valued function  $h$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with  $h(x+1, y) = h(x, y)$  such that

$$YdX - ydx = dh.$$

Then  $G$  induces a map on the cylinder denoted by  $g : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ .  $g$  is called an exact area-preserving twist map. The function  $h : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called a generating function of  $G$ , namely  $G$  is generated by the following equations

$$\begin{cases} y = -\partial_1 h(x, x'), \\ y' = \partial_2 h(x, x'), \end{cases}$$

where  $G(x, y) = (x', y')$ .

**3.1.1. Minimal configuration.** The function  $G$  gives rise to a dynamical system whose orbits are given by the images of points of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  under the successive iterates of  $G$ . The orbit of the point  $(x_0, y_0)$  is the bi-infinite sequence

$$\{\dots, (x_{-k}, y_{-k}), \dots, (x_{-1}, y_{-1}), (x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k), \dots\},$$

where  $(x_k, y_k) = G(x_{k-1}, y_{k-1})$ . The sequence

$$(\dots, x_{-k}, \dots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k, \dots)$$

denoted by  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is called a stationary configuration if it satisfies the identity

$$\partial_1 h(x_i, x_{i+1}) + \partial_2 h(x_{i-1}, x_i) = 0, \text{ for every } i \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Given a sequence of points  $(z_i, \dots, z_j)$ , we can associate its action

$$h(z_i, \dots, z_j) = \sum_{i \leq s < j} h(z_s, z_{s+1}).$$

A configuration  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is called minimal if for any  $i < j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the segment  $(x_i, \dots, x_j)$  minimizes  $h(z_i, \dots, z_j)$  among all segments  $(z_i, \dots, z_j)$  of the configuration satisfying  $z_i = x_i$  and  $z_j = x_j$ . It is easy to see that every minimal configuration is a stationary configuration. There is a visual way to describe configurations. A configuration  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a function from  $\mathbb{Z}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . One can interpolate this function linearly and obtain a piecewise affine function  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denoted by  $t \mapsto x_t$ . The graph of this function is sometimes called the Aubry diagram of the configuration. By [Ban88], minimal configurations satisfy a group of remarkable properties as follows:

- Two distinct minimal configurations seen as the Aubry diagrams cross at most once, which is so called Aubry's crossing lemma.
- For every minimal configuration  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , the limit

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_{i+n} - x_i}{n}$$

exists and doesn't depend on  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .  $\rho(\mathbf{x})$  is called the frequency of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

- For every  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a minimal configuration with frequency  $\omega$ . Following the notations of [Ban88], the set of all minimal configurations with frequency  $\omega$  is denoted by  $M_\omega^h$ , which can be endowed with the topology induced from the product topology on  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . If  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a minimal configuration, considering the projection  $pr : M_\omega^h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $pr(\mathbf{x}) = x_0$ , we set  $\mathcal{A}_\omega^h = pr(M_\omega^h)$ .
- If  $\omega \in \mathbb{Q}$ , say  $\omega = p/q$  (in lowest terms), then it is convenient to define the rotation symbol to detect the structure of  $M_{p/q}^h$ . If  $\mathbf{x}$  is a minimal configuration with frequency  $p/q$ , then the rotation symbol  $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$  of  $\mathbf{x}$  is defined as follows

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} p/q+, & \text{if } x_{i+q} > x_i + p \text{ for all } i, \\ p/q, & \text{if } x_{i+q} = x_i + p \text{ for all } i, \\ p/q-, & \text{if } x_{i+q} < x_i + p \text{ for all } i. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we set

$$M_{p/q^+}^h := \{\mathbf{x} \text{ is a minimal configuration with rotation symbol } p/q \text{ or } p/q^+\},$$

$$M_{p/q^-}^h := \{\mathbf{x} \text{ is a minimal configuration with rotation symbol } p/q \text{ or } p/q^-\},$$

then both  $M_{p/q^+}^h$  and  $M_{p/q^-}^h$  are totally ordered. Namely, every two configurations in each of them (seen as Aubry diagrams) do not cross. We denote  $pr(M_{p/q^+}^h)$  and  $pr(M_{p/q^-}^h)$  by  $\mathcal{A}_{p/q^+}^h$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{p/q^-}^h$  respectively.

- If  $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  is a minimal configuration with frequency  $\omega$ , then  $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \omega$  and  $M_\omega^h$  is totally ordered.
- $\mathcal{A}_\omega^h$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  for every rotation symbol  $\omega$ .

**3.1.2. Peierls's barrier.** In [Mat87], Mather introduced the notion of Peierls's barrier and gave a criterion of existence of invariant circle. Namely, the exact area-preserving twist map generated by  $h$  admits an invariant circle with frequency  $\omega$  if and only if the Peierls barrier  $P_\omega^h(\xi)$  vanishes identically for all  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ . The Peierls barrier is defined as follows:

- If  $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_\omega^h$ , we set  $P_\omega^h(\xi) = 0$ .
- If  $\xi \notin \mathcal{A}_\omega^h$ , since  $\mathcal{A}_\omega^h$  is a closed set in  $\mathbb{R}$ , then  $\xi$  belongs to some complementary interval  $(\xi^-, \xi^+)$  of  $\mathcal{A}_\omega^h$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{A}_\omega^h$ , there exist minimal configurations with rotation symbol  $\omega$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^- = (x_i^-)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $\mathbf{x}^+ = (x_i^+)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  satisfying  $x_0^- = \xi^-$  and  $x_0^+ = \xi^+$ . For every configuration  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  satisfying  $x_i^- \leq x_i \leq x_i^+$ , we set

$$G_\omega(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_I (h(x_i, x_{i+1}) - h(x_i^-, x_{i+1}^-)),$$

where  $I = \mathbb{Z}$ , if  $\omega$  is not a rational number, and  $I = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ , if  $\omega = p/q$ .  $P_\omega^h(\xi)$  is defined as the minimum of  $G_\omega(\mathbf{x})$  over the configurations  $\mathbf{x} \in \Pi = \prod_{i \in I} [x_i^-, x_i^+]$  satisfying  $x_0 = \xi$ . Namely

$$P_\omega^h(\xi) := \min_{\mathbf{x}} \{G_\omega(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{x} \in \Pi \text{ and } x_0 = \xi\}.$$

By [Mat87],  $P_\omega^h(\xi)$  is a non-negative periodic function of the variable  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$  with the modulus of continuity with respect to  $\omega$  and its modulus of continuity with respect to  $\omega$  can be bounded from above. Due to the periodicity of  $P_\omega^h(\xi)$  with respect to  $\xi$ , we only need to consider it in the interval  $[0, 1]$ .

**3.2. A lower bound of the Peierls barrier.** Recall

$$h_m(x, x') := \frac{1}{2}(x - x')^2 + \delta_m(1 - \cos 2\pi x').$$

$$H_m(x, x') := \frac{1}{2}(x - x')^2 + \delta_m(1 - \cos 2\pi x') + \xi_m(x'),$$

Let

$$u_m(x) := \delta_m(1 - \cos 2\pi x) = \exp(-bm^\beta)(1 - \cos 2\pi x).$$

We first estimate the lower bound of the Peierls barrier  $P_{0^+}^{H_m}$  at a given point. To do this, we need to estimate the distances between pairwise adjacent elements of the minimal configuration. More precisely, we have:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a minimal configuration of  $h_m$  with rotation symbol  $\omega > 0$ . Then*

$$x_{i+1} - x_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\Delta_m \quad \text{for } x_i \in \left[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\right].$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume  $x_i \in [0, 1]$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . By Aubry's crossing lemma, we have

$$\cdots < x_{i-1} < x_i < x_{i+1} < \cdots.$$

Consider the configuration  $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  defined by

$$\xi_j = \begin{cases} x_j, & j < i, \\ x_{j+1}, & j \geq i. \end{cases}$$

Since  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is minimal, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} h_m(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} h_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) \geq 0.$$

By the definitions of  $h_m$  and  $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} h_m(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} h_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) \\ &= h_m(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}) - h_m(x_{i-1}, x_i) - h_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) \\ &= (x_{i+1} - x_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}) - u_m(x_i). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$u_m(x_i) \leq (x_{i+1} - x_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}) \leq \frac{1}{4}(x_{i+1} - x_{i-1})^2.$$

Therefore,

$$(17) \quad x_{i+1} - x_{i-1} \geq 2\sqrt{u_m(x_i)}.$$

For  $x_i \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}]$ , we have  $u_m(x_i) \geq \Delta_m^2$ , hence

$$(18) \quad x_{i+1} - x_{i-1} \geq 2\Delta_m.$$

Since  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a stationary configuration, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i+1} - x_i &= -\partial_1 h_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) \\ &= \partial_2 h_m(x_{i-1}, x_i) \\ &= x_i - x_{i-1} + u'_m(x_i). \end{aligned}$$

As  $u'_m(x) = \exp(-bm^\beta) \sin x$ , it follows from (18) that

$$x_{i+1} - x_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\Delta_m, \quad \text{for } x_i \in \left[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\right].$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

Let  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a minimal configuration of

$$h_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) = h_0(x_i, x_{i+1}) + u_m(x_{i+1})$$

with rotation symbol  $0^+$ . From Lemma 3.1, we have

$$x_{i+1} - x_i \geq \frac{1}{2}v_m\left(\frac{1}{2}\right), \quad \text{for } x_i \in \left[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\right].$$

Hence, there exists  $\tau \in [\frac{3}{8}, \frac{5}{8}]$  such that

$$(19) \quad (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \cap \text{supp } \xi_m = \emptyset.$$

Moreover, for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\xi_m(x_i) = 0.$$

Based on [Mat88] (pp. 207–208), the Peierls barrier  $P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau)$  is defined as

$$P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau) = \min_{\xi_0=\tau} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}) - \min \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(z_i, z_{i+1}),$$

where  $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $(z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are monotone increasing configurations limiting to 0 and 1, respectively.

Let  $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $(z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be minimal configurations of  $H_m$  (defined in (5)) with rotation symbol  $0^+$ , satisfying  $\xi_0 = \tau$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (H_m(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}) - H_m(z_i, z_{i+1})) \\
& \geq \xi_m(\tau) + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} h_m(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(z_i, z_{i+1}) \\
& \geq \xi_m(\tau) + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} h_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(z_i, z_{i+1}) \\
& \geq \xi_m(\tau) + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} h_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(x_i, x_{i+1}) \\
& = \xi_m(\tau) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_m(x_{i+1}) \\
& = \xi_m(\tau),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because  $\xi_m \geq 0$ , the second because  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a minimal configuration of  $h_m$ , the third because  $(z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a minimal configuration of  $H_m$ , and the last equality because  $\xi_m(x_i) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Therefore,

$$P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau) \geq \xi_m(\tau).$$

It follows that

$$(20) \quad P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau) \geq \Delta_m^2 \exp \left( -\lambda 2^{\frac{3}{\alpha-1} + \frac{1}{2}} \exp \left( \frac{b}{2(\alpha-1)} m^\beta \right) \right).$$

**3.3. The modulus of continuity of the Peierls barrier.** Following a similar argument as [Wan12], one can obtain an improvement in the modulus of continuity of the Peierls barrier based on the hyperbolicity of  $H_m$ . More precisely, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Fix  $a > 1$ ,  $b > 0$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . For every irrational rotation symbol  $\omega$  satisfying*

$$0 < \omega < \exp \left( - \left( \frac{b}{2} + \frac{b}{a} \varepsilon \right) m^\beta \right),$$

*we have*

$$(21) \quad \left| P_\omega^{H_m}(\tau) - P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau) \right| \leq C \exp \left( -2 \exp \left( \frac{b\varepsilon}{2a} m^\beta \right) \right),$$

*where  $\tau \in [3/8, 5/8]$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\tau \in \mathcal{A}_\omega^{H_m}$ , then  $P_\omega^{H_m}(\tau) = 0$ . Hence, it suffices to consider the case  $\tau \notin \mathcal{A}_\omega^{H_m}$ . Since the proof of Lemma 3.2 is similar to Lemma 5.1 in [Wan12], we only provide a sketch to highlight the main differences. For simplicity, denote

$$\epsilon_m := \exp \left( - \exp \left( \frac{b\varepsilon}{2a} m^\beta \right) \right).$$

The proof proceeds in three steps.

**Step 1.** We show that each of the intervals  $[0, \epsilon_m]$  and  $[1 - \epsilon_m, 1]$  contains a large number of elements of the minimal configuration  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $H_m$  with irrational rotation symbol

$$0 < \omega < \exp \left( - \left( \frac{b}{2} + \frac{b}{a} \varepsilon \right) m^\beta \right).$$

Let

$$\Sigma_m = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x_i \in [\epsilon_m, 1 - \epsilon_m]\}.$$

By an argument similar to Lemma 5.2 in [Wan12], we have

$$(22) \quad \#\Sigma_m \leq C \exp \left( \frac{b}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{a} \right) m^\beta \right),$$

where  $\#\Sigma_m$  denotes the number of elements in  $\Sigma_m$ . Let  $I$  be an interval of length 1, and define  $\Omega_\omega := \{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x_i \in I\}$ . Since  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a minimal configuration with irrational rotation number  $\omega$ , Lemma 5.3 in [Wan12] implies

$$\frac{1}{\omega} - 1 \leq \#\Omega_\omega \leq \frac{1}{\omega} + 1.$$

Combining this with (22), we obtain

$$\#\Omega_\omega \geq C \exp\left(\left(\frac{b}{2} + \frac{b}{a}\varepsilon\right)m^\beta\right) \gg C \exp\left(\frac{b}{2}\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{a}\right)m^\beta\right).$$

Hence, for large  $m$ , each of the intervals  $[0, \epsilon_m]$  and  $[1 - \epsilon_m, 1]$  contains many elements of  $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  (see Lemma 5.4 in [Wan12]).

**Step 2.** We approximate  $P_\omega^{H_m}(\tau)$  for  $\tau \in [3/8, 5/8]$  by the difference of actions of segments of a given length. Let  $(\xi^-, \xi^+)$  be the complementary interval of  $\mathcal{A}_\omega^{H_m}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  containing  $\tau$ . Let  $(\xi_i^\pm)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be minimal configurations with rotation symbol  $\omega$  satisfying  $\xi_0^\pm = \xi^\pm$ , and let  $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a minimal configuration with rotation symbol  $\omega$  satisfying  $\xi_0 = \tau$  and  $\xi_i^- \leq \xi_i \leq \xi_i^+$ . Define  $d(x) := \min\{|x|, |x - 1|\}$ . By Step 1, there exist  $i^-, i^+$  such that

$$(23) \quad d(\xi_i^-) < \epsilon_m \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_{i+1}^- - \xi_{i-1}^- \leq \epsilon_m \quad \text{for} \quad i = i^-, i^+.$$

By Aubry's crossing lemma,  $\xi_i^- \leq \xi_i \leq \xi_i^+ \leq \xi_{i+1}^-$ , so

$$\xi_i - \xi_i^- \leq \epsilon_m \quad \text{for} \quad i = i^-, i^+.$$

Define the configuration:

$$y_i = \begin{cases} \xi_i, & i^- < i < i^+, \\ \xi_i^-, & i \leq i^-, i \geq i^+. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\tau \in [3/8, 5/8] \subset [\epsilon_m, 1 - \epsilon_m]$  for large  $m$ , the point  $\xi_0 = \tau$  is contained in  $(y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  up to index rearrangement. By a direct calculation (see (11)–(15) in [Wan12]), we have

$$(24) \quad P_\omega^{H_m}(\tau) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (H_m(y_i, y_{i+1}) - H_m(\xi_i^-, \xi_{i+1}^-)) \leq P_\omega^{H_m}(\tau) + C\epsilon_m^2.$$

**Step 3.** We compare  $P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau)$  with  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (H_m(y_i, y_{i+1}) - H_m(\xi_i^-, \xi_{i+1}^-))$ . By [Mat88],

$$P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau) = \min_{\xi_0 = \tau} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}) - \min_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum H_m(z_i, z_{i+1}),$$

where  $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $(z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are monotone increasing configurations limiting to 0 and 1, respectively. Let

$$K(\tau) = \min_{\xi_0 = \tau} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}), \quad K = \min_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum H_m(z_i, z_{i+1}).$$

By a direct calculation (see (17)–(28) in [Wan12]), we have

$$(25) \quad \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(\xi_i^-, \xi_{i+1}^-) - K \right| \leq C\epsilon_m^2, \quad \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(y_i, y_{i+1}) - K(\tau) \right| \leq C\epsilon_m^2.$$

From (24) and (25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| P_\omega^{H_m}(\tau) - P_{0^+}^{H_m}(\tau) \right| &\leq \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(y_i, y_{i+1}) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(\xi_i^-, \xi_{i+1}^-) + K - K(\tau) \right| + C_1\epsilon_m^2 \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(y_i, y_{i+1}) - K(\tau) \right| + \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} H_m(\xi_i^-, \xi_{i+1}^-) - K \right| + C_1\epsilon_m^2 \\ &\leq C\epsilon_m^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (21), completing the proof of Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

Comparing (20) and (21), we obtain a contradiction if  $\alpha > 1 + \frac{a}{\varepsilon}$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

## 4. A REDUCTION OF THEOREM 2

The analysis for a given irrational rotation number can be reduced to the case of a sufficiently small rotation number, and vice versa, via a finite covering argument [Her83, p. 78, 4.8]. This reduction is made precise in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $H_P$  be a generating function of the form*

$$H_P(x, x') = H_0(x, x') + P(x'),$$

*where  $P$  is a 1-periodic function. Define the rescaled function*

$$Q(x) = q^{-2}P(qx), \quad q \in \mathbb{N}.$$

*Then the exact area-preserving monotone twist map generated by*

$$H_Q(x, x') = H_0(x, x') + Q(x')$$

*admits an invariant circle with rotation number  $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  if and only if the exact area-preserving monotone twist map generated by  $H_P$  admits an invariant circle with rotation number  $q\omega - p$  for some  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ .*

Let  $\bar{\omega}$  be an irrational number. Let  $\{p_n/q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence of convergents in the continued fraction expansion of  $\bar{\omega}$ . Then  $q_n$  satisfies the recurrence relation:

$$(26) \quad q_{n+1} = a_{n+1}q_n + q_{n-1}.$$

By applying Lemma 4.1, we consider the generating functions corresponding to (4) and (6) as follows:

$$\tilde{h}_m(x, x') = \frac{1}{2}(x - x')^2 + \frac{\delta_{q_m}}{q_m^2}(1 - \cos(2\pi q_m x')),$$

$$\tilde{f}_{m,a}(x, y) = \left( x + y, y + \frac{\delta_{q_m}}{q_m} \sin(2\pi q_m(x + y)) \right).$$

For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , define the distance to the nearest integer by

$$(27) \quad \|x\| = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} |x - y|.$$

The proof of Theorem 2 reduces to establishing the following result.

**Theorem 4.** *Fix  $a > 1$ ,  $b > 4$  and  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ . There exists an irrational number  $\bar{\omega}$  satisfying*

$$(28) \quad 0 < \|q_m \bar{\omega}\| < n_{q_m}^{-\frac{a}{2} - \varepsilon},$$

*where  $n_{q_m}$  is determined by (2), such that for all  $m \geq M_0$  (with  $M_0$  sufficiently large), the map  $\tilde{f}_{m,a}$  admits an invariant circle with rotation number  $\bar{\omega}$ .*

To align the corresponding parameters, we define

$$(29) \quad |\omega_m| := \|q_m \bar{\omega}\|, \quad n_{j_m} := n_{q_m}.$$

Theorem 2 then follows directly from Theorem 4.

We now proceed to specify the explicit construction of  $\bar{\omega}$ . Let  $\beta := \frac{1}{a}$ . Recall that  $\{p_n/q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  denote the sequence of convergents in the continued fraction expansion of  $\bar{\omega} = [a_0; a_1, \dots, a_n, \dots]$ . Define a sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  by

$$(30) \quad a_{n+1} = \lfloor \exp(bq_n^\beta) \rfloor,$$

where

$$q_{n+1} = a_{n+1}q_n + q_{n-1}, \quad q_0 = p_0 = 0, \quad p_1 = q_0 = 1, \quad q_1 = a_1.$$

This construction ensures that the tail sum

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+m+1}}{q_{n+m}}$$

is dominated by its first term. For notational clarity, we adopt the following conventions throughout:

- $u \lesssim v$  (resp.  $u \gtrsim v$ ) denotes  $u \leq Cv$  (resp.  $u \geq Cv$ )
- $u \sim v$  means  $\frac{1}{C}v \leq u \leq Cv$

for some positive constant  $C$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\bar{\omega}$  be determined by (30). Then  $\bar{\omega} \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{BR}_\alpha$  satisfies (28) and*

$$(31) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+m+1}}{q_{n+m}} \lesssim q_m^{\beta-1}.$$

*Proof.* From the recurrence relation (26),

$$q_m \lfloor \exp(bq_m^\beta) \rfloor < q_{m+1} \leq q_m (\lfloor \exp(bq_m^\beta) \rfloor + 1),$$

which yields

$$\|q_m \bar{\omega}\| < \frac{1}{q_{m+1}} < \lfloor \exp(bq_m^\beta) \rfloor^{-1} < \exp\left(-\left(\frac{a}{2} + \varepsilon\right) \frac{b}{a} q_m^\beta\right) \leq n_m^{-\frac{a}{2} - \varepsilon}.$$

Applying (26) again gives

$$\frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n} \leq \frac{\ln q_n}{q_n} + \frac{\ln 2}{q_n} + \frac{\ln a_{n+1}}{q_n}.$$

By construction, the sequence  $\frac{\ln q_{n+m+1}}{q_{n+m}}$  decays at least exponentially in  $n$ . Indeed, even for the golden ratio—the irrational with slowest denominator growth—we have  $q_n \geq (\sqrt{2})^n$ . Consequently, the sum is dominated by its first term:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+m+1}}{q_{n+m}} \lesssim \frac{\ln q_{m+1}}{q_m} \lesssim q_m^{\beta-1}.$$

In particular, this implies  $\bar{\omega} \in \mathcal{B}$ .

To prove  $\bar{\omega} \notin \mathcal{BR}_\alpha$ , note that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n^\beta} \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln a_{n+1}}{q_n^\beta} \geq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln \lfloor \exp(bq_{n_k}^\beta) \rfloor}{q_{n_k}^\beta} \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b \rightarrow +\infty.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** An alternative, weaker definition of  $\mathcal{BR}_\alpha$  requires

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \ln q_{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{q_n^\beta} - \frac{1}{q_{n+1}^\beta} \right) < \infty.$$

Fortunately,  $\bar{\omega}$  still satisfies  $\bar{\omega} \notin \mathcal{BR}_\alpha$  under this definition, since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \ln q_{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{q_n^\beta} - \frac{1}{q_{n+1}^\beta} \right) &\geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \ln a_{n+1} \left( \frac{1}{q_n^\beta} - \frac{1}{q_{n+1}^\beta} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\ln \lfloor \exp(bq_{n_k}^\beta) \rfloor}{q_{n_k}^\beta} - \frac{\ln \lfloor \exp(bq_{n_k+1}^\beta) \rfloor}{q_{n_k+1}^\beta} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b \left( 1 - \left( \frac{q_{n_k}}{q_{n_k+1}} \right)^\beta \right) \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{q_{n_k}}{q_{n_k+1}} \right)^\beta \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{a_{n_k+1}} \right)^\beta \leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-b\beta q_{n_k}^\beta} < +\infty.$$

## 5. PERSISTENCE OF $\Gamma_{\bar{\omega}}$ FOR $f_{m,a}$

We define the parameter  $\varepsilon_m := \delta_{q_m}/q_m$ . For notational simplicity, we write  $\omega$  in place of  $\bar{\omega}$  and  $\varepsilon$  in place of  $\varepsilon_m$ . In these terms, the map  $\tilde{f}_{m,a}(x, y) = (x', y')$  takes the form:

$$(32) \quad \begin{cases} x' = x + y, \\ y' = y + \varepsilon \sin(2\pi q_m(x + y)). \end{cases}$$

The invariant circle  $\Gamma_{\varepsilon, \omega}$  of rotation number  $\omega$  for the map  $\tilde{f}_{\varepsilon, a}$  can be studied via a coordinate transformation on  $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}$ :

$$(33) \quad \begin{cases} x = \theta + u(\theta, \varepsilon, \omega), \\ y = \omega + v(\theta, \varepsilon, \omega). \end{cases}$$

Under this change of variables, the dynamics in  $(\theta, \omega)$  is given by the rigid rotation:

$$\begin{cases} \theta' = \theta + \omega, \\ \omega' = \omega. \end{cases}$$

The transformation (33) conjugates the dynamics on the invariant curve to a rotation; the function  $u$  is referred to as the conjugating function. From (32), we obtain the relation

$$y' = x' - x + \varepsilon \sin(2\pi q_m x'),$$

which implies the following identity for the function  $v$ :

$$v(\theta, \varepsilon, \omega) = u(\theta, \varepsilon, \omega) - u(\theta - \omega, \varepsilon, \omega) + \varepsilon \sin(2\pi q_m(\theta + u(\theta, \varepsilon, \omega))).$$

A direct computation shows that  $u$  satisfies the functional equation:

$$(34) \quad D_\omega^2 u(\theta, \varepsilon, \omega) = \varepsilon \sin(2\pi q_m(\theta + u(\theta, \varepsilon, \omega))),$$

where the operator  $D_\omega^2$  is defined on functions of  $\theta$  by

$$D_\omega^2 \phi(\theta) = \phi(\theta + \omega) - \phi(\theta) + \phi(\theta - \omega).$$

By imposing that  $u$  has zero average over  $\theta$ , the formal solutions of (34) are unique and odd in  $\theta$ . Each smooth solution corresponds to an invariant curve  $\Gamma_{\varepsilon, \omega}$ , and the smoothness of  $u$  determines that of  $\Gamma_{\varepsilon, \omega}$ . For simplicity, we shall often suppress the dependence on  $\omega$  and write  $u(\theta, \varepsilon)$ .

The conjugating function  $u$  admits a formal power series expansion—known as the Lindstedt series—of the form:

$$(35) \quad u(\theta, \varepsilon) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} u_\nu(\varepsilon) e^{i2\pi\nu\theta} = \sum_{k \geq 1} u^{(k)}(\theta) \varepsilon^k = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} u_\nu^{(k)} e^{i2\pi\nu\theta} \varepsilon^k.$$

The convergence of the series is obstructed by the small divisors problem. To analyze this, let  $\omega \in [0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  be an irrational rotation number, and let  $\{p_n/q_n\}$  denote the sequence of convergents arising from its continued fraction expansion.

Substituting the formal series (35) into (34) and equating coefficients yields the following recurrence relation for the Fourier–Taylor coefficients  $u_\nu^{(k)}$ :

$$(36) \quad u_\nu^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\gamma(\nu)} \sum_{l \geq 0} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_l = \nu \\ k_1 + \dots + k_l = k-1}} \left( -\frac{i\nu_0}{2q_m} \right) (i\nu_0)^l \prod_{j=1}^l u_{\nu_j}^{(k_j)},$$

where  $\nu_0 = \pm q_m$  and

$$(37) \quad \gamma(\nu) = 2(\cos(2\pi\omega\nu) - 1).$$

For  $\nu \neq 0$ , we have  $u_0^{(k)} = 0$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . The case  $m = 0$  in (36) is interpreted as  $u_\nu^{(k)} = \left( -i \frac{\nu_0}{q_m} \right) / \gamma(\nu)$ , which requires  $k = 1$  and  $\nu = \nu_0$ .

We have the estimate

$$(38) \quad |\gamma(\nu)| = 2|\cos(2\pi\omega\nu) - 1| \gtrsim \|\omega\nu\|^2.$$

The small divisors problem arises because  $\gamma(\nu)$  may become arbitrarily small when  $\omega$  is irrational, and vanishes when  $\omega$  is rational.

The radius of convergence of the Lindstedt series is defined as

$$\rho(\omega) = \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} \left( \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |u^{(k)}(\theta)|^{1/k} \right)^{-1}.$$



**5.1. The tree expansion.** As in [BG01], the coefficients  $u_\nu^{(k)}$  in (34) admit a graphical representation in terms of *trees*. Here we briefly recall the essential definitions and notations, referring to [BG01] and related references for complete details of the tree expansion formalism adapted to our context.

A tree  $\vartheta$  is defined as a collection of lines connecting a partially ordered set of points (nodes), with the partial order  $\preceq$  defined as follows: for two nodes  $u, v$ , we write  $v \preceq u$  if  $u$  lies on the path from  $v$  to the root  $r$  of the tree (including the case  $v = u$ ); we write  $v \prec u$  if  $v \preceq u$  and  $v \neq u$ . Thus, our trees are rooted trees.

Each line  $\ell$  connects two nodes  $u$  and  $u'$ , with an arrow pointing from the higher node to the lower node according to the order  $\preceq$ . If  $u \prec u'$ , we say that  $\ell$  exits  $u$  and enters  $u'$ , and  $u'$  is the immediate successor of  $u$ . We denote by  $u'_0 = r$  the root, although  $r$  is not formally considered a node. Every node  $u$  has exactly one exiting line and  $m_u \geq 0$  entering lines. There is a bijection between lines and nodes: each node  $u$  is associated with the line  $\ell_u$  exiting from it. The line  $\ell_{u_0}$  exiting the last node  $u_0$  is called the root line. Each line  $\ell_u$  may be viewed as the root line of the subtree consisting of all nodes  $v$  with  $v \preceq u$ . The order  $k$  of the tree is the total number of nodes.

To each node  $u \in \vartheta$  we assign a mode label  $\nu_u = \pm q_m$ . The momentum flowing through the line  $\ell_u$  is defined as:

$$(39) \quad \nu_{\ell_u} = \sum_{w \prec u} \nu_w, \quad \nu_w = \pm q_m.$$

Note that  $\nu_{\ell_u} \neq 0$  for all lines  $\ell_u$ , since  $u_0^{(k)} = 0$  in (34).

Following [BG01], we perform a multi-scale decomposition of the momenta associated to each line. Let  $\chi(x)$  be a  $C^\infty$ , non-increasing function on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  with compact support, satisfying:

$$(40) \quad \chi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \leq 1, \\ 0, & x \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define:

$$(41) \quad \begin{cases} \chi_0(x) = 1 - \chi(96q_{m+1}x), \\ \chi_n(x) = \chi(96q_{n+m}x) - \chi(96q_{n+m+1}x), \quad n \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then for any line  $\ell$ , we decompose the propagator as:

$$(42) \quad g(\nu_\ell) \equiv \frac{1}{\gamma(\nu_\ell)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\chi_n(\|\omega\nu_\ell\|)}{\gamma(\nu_\ell)} \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_n(\nu_\ell),$$

where  $g_n(\nu_\ell)$  is called the propagator on scale  $n$ .

Given a tree  $\vartheta$ , we assign to each line  $\ell$  a scale label  $n_\ell$  via the decomposition (42), selecting the term with  $n = n_\ell$ . We say that the line  $\ell$  is on scale  $n_\ell$ . If a line  $\ell$  has momentum  $\nu_\ell$  and scale  $n_\ell$ , then:

$$(43) \quad \frac{1}{96q_{n_\ell+m+1}} \leq \|\omega\nu_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{48q_{n_\ell+m}},$$

provided that  $\chi_{n_\ell}(\|\omega\nu_\ell\|) \neq 0$ .

**Remark 5.1.** The choice of the numerical constants (such as 96, 48, and later 768, 8, 24 etc.) is essentially based on certain multiples of the constant 4 appearing in Lemma 5.5. We refer to [BG02, Section 6] for a detailed explanation.

An equivalence relation is introduced on trees via a group  $G$  generated by permutations of the subtrees attached to each node with at least one entering line. Specifically,  $G$  is a Cartesian product of symmetric groups acting on the branches. Two trees that are equivalent under the action of  $G$  are considered identical.

Let  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$  denote the set of distinct trees of order  $k$ , with nonvanishing value and total momentum  $\nu_{\ell_{u_0}} = \nu$ , where  $u_0$  is the last node. Denote  $\#\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$  the cardinality of  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$ . Accounting for the choices of mode labels per node (2 possibilities) and scale labels per line (2 possibilities), along with the combinatorial bound  $2^{2k}$  for the number of semitopological trees of order  $k$ , we have

$$(44) \quad \#\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k} \leq 2^{4k}.$$

Then, as derived in [BG01], the coefficients admit the tree expansion:

$$(45) \quad u_\nu^{(k)} = \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}} \text{Val}(\vartheta), \quad \text{Val}(\vartheta) = -i \left[ \prod_{u \in \vartheta} \frac{\nu_u^{m_u+1}}{m_u! q_m} \right] \left[ \prod_{\ell \in \vartheta} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell) \right].$$

Here, the factors  $g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell)$  are the propagators on scale  $n_\ell$ , and  $\text{Val}(\vartheta)$  is called the value of the tree  $\vartheta$ .

## 5.2. The cluster and $m$ -resonance.

**Definition 5.2** (Cluster). *Given a tree  $\vartheta$ , a cluster  $T$  of scale  $n$  is a maximal connected set of lines on scale  $\leq n$  containing at least one line on scale exactly  $n$ . The lines belonging to  $T$  are called internal lines of  $T$ , denoted  $\ell \in T$ . A node  $u$  is internal to  $T$  (written  $u \in T$ ) if at least one of its entering lines or its exiting line is in  $T$ . Each cluster has  $l_T \geq 0$  entering lines and exactly one or zero exiting lines; these are called external lines of  $T$  and all have scale  $> n$ . We denote by  $n_T$  the scale of the cluster  $T$ , by  $n_T^i$  the minimum scale among the lines entering  $T$ , by  $n_T^o$  the scale of the line exiting  $T$  (if it exists), and by  $k_T$  the number of nodes in  $T$ .*

Following [BG01], we introduce the notion of resonance relative to a fixed  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$(46) \quad \kappa(n) := \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid q_m k \geq q_{m+n}\}.$$

**Definition 5.3** ( $m$ -Resonance). *A cluster  $V$  in a tree  $\vartheta$  is called a resonance with resonance-scale  $n_V^R := \min\{n_V^i, n_V^o\}$  if the following conditions hold:*

(i) *The sum of the mode labels of its nodes is zero:*

$$(47) \quad \nu_V \equiv \sum_{u \in V} \nu_u = 0.$$

(ii) *All entering lines of  $V$  are on the same scale, except possibly one which may be on a higher scale.*

(iii) *If  $l_V \geq 2$ , then  $n_V^i \leq n_V^o$ ; if  $l_V = 1$ , then  $|n_V^i - n_V^o| \leq 1$ .*

(iv)  *$k_V < \kappa(n)$ .*

(v) *If  $q_{n+m+1} \leq 4q_{n+m}q_m$ , then  $l_V = 1$ .*

(vi) *If  $q_{n+m+1} > 4q_{n+m}q_m$  and  $l_V \geq 2$ , then letting  $k_0$  be the total order of subtrees of order  $< q_{n+m+1}/(4q_m)$  entering  $V$ , either:*

- (a) *there is exactly one entering subtree of order  $k_1 \geq q_{n+m+1}/(4q_m)$  and  $k_0 < q_{n+m+1}/(8q_m)$ , or*
- (b) *there is no such subtree and  $k_0 + k_V < q_{n+m+1}/(4q_m)$ .*

Note that for any resonance  $V$ , one has  $n_V^R \geq n_V + 1$ , where  $n_V$  is the scale of  $V$  as a cluster.

In the subsequent analysis, we will need to consider trees where a line  $\ell$  is assigned a scale  $n_\ell$  even when its momentum violates (43). Although the value of such a tree  $\vartheta$  vanishes (due to  $\chi_{n_\ell}(\|\omega\nu_\ell\|) = 0$ ), it is advantageous to decompose  $\text{Val}(\vartheta)$  into two potentially non-zero terms: one that cancels analogous contributions from other trees, and another that requires explicit bounds. Consequently, we will work with trees containing lines  $\ell$  with momentum  $\nu_\ell$  and scale  $n_\ell$  that do not satisfy (43). Nevertheless, such lines can be shown to obey the weaker bound

$$(48) \quad \frac{1}{768q_{n_\ell+m+1}} \leq \|\omega\nu_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{8q_{n_\ell+m}}.$$

Furthermore, for fixed  $\nu_\ell$ , the number of admissible scales is bounded by an absolute constant, as established in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\nu$  be an integer satisfying*

$$(49) \quad \frac{1}{768q_{n+m+1}} \leq \|\omega\nu\| \leq \frac{1}{8q_{n+m}}.$$

*Then  $\chi_{n'}(\|\omega\nu\|) \neq 0$  only for scales  $n'$  in the range  $n - 8 \leq n' \leq n + 8$ .*

*Proof.* The result follows from the properties  $q_{n+1} > q_n$  and  $q_{n+2} > 2q_n$  for all  $n > 0$ , which imply

$$\frac{1}{48q_{n+m+1}} < \frac{1}{768q_{n+m}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{96q_{n+m-1}} > \frac{1}{8q_{n+m}}.$$

Thus, the support conditions of the cutoff functions  $\chi_{n'}$  restrict  $n'$  to the interval  $[n - 8, n + 8]$ .  $\square$

Let  $N_n(\vartheta)$  denote the number of lines in  $\vartheta$  on scale  $n$ . Then, for any tree  $\vartheta$ , we have the trivial bound:

$$(50) \quad |\text{Val}(\vartheta)| \lesssim (2q_m)^k \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (768q_{n+m+1})^{2N_n(\vartheta)}.$$

For a tree  $\vartheta$ , let  $N_n^R(\vartheta)$  denote the number of resonances with resonance-scale  $n$ , and let  $P_n(\vartheta)$  denote the number of resonances on scale  $n$ . Note that  $N_0^R = 0$  by definition.

**5.3. The arithmetics and counting.** Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . The following elementary lemmata contain all the arithmetic facts we shall need, and are essentially adapted from [Dav94].

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $v \in \mathbb{Z}$  satisfy  $\|\omega v\| \leq 1/(4q_{n+m})$ . Then:*

- (i) *Either  $v = 0$  or  $|v| \geq q_{n+m}$ .*
- (ii) *Either  $|v| \geq q_{n+m+1}/4$  or  $v = sq_{n+m}$  for some integer  $s$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\{q_n\}$  be the denominators of the convergents of  $\omega$ . Then (see, e.g., [Her79, Chapter 5]):

$$(51) \quad \frac{1}{2q_{n+1}} < \|\omega q_n\| < \frac{1}{q_{n+1}},$$

and for any nonzero integer  $v$  with  $|v| < q_{n+1}$  and  $v \neq q_n$ , one has:

$$(52) \quad \|\omega v\| > \|\omega q_n\|.$$

To prove (i), assume  $v \neq 0$ . If  $|v| < q_{n+m}$ , then by (51) and (52),

$$\|\omega v\| \geq \|\omega q_{n+m-1}\| > \frac{1}{2q_{n+m}}.$$

But this contradicts the hypothesis  $\|\omega v\| \leq 1/(4q_{n+m})$ . Hence  $|v| \geq q_{n+m}$ .

To prove (ii), again assume  $v \neq 0$  and suppose  $|v| < q_{n+m+1}/4$ . If  $v$  is not an integer multiple of  $q_{n+m}$ , write  $v = lq_{n+m} + r$  with  $0 < r < q_{n+m}$  and  $l < q_{n+m+1}/(4q_{n+m})$ . Then by (51),

$$\|\omega lq_{n+m}\| \leq l\|\omega q_{n+m}\| < \frac{l}{q_{n+m+1}} < \frac{1}{4q_{n+m}},$$

and by (52),

$$\|\omega r\| \geq \|\omega q_{n+m-1}\| > \frac{1}{2q_{n+m}}.$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\|\omega v\| \geq \|\omega r\| - \|\omega lq_{n+m}\| > \frac{1}{4q_{n+m}},$$

contradicting the hypothesis. The case of negative  $v$  is similar since  $\|\cdot\|$  is even.  $\square$

Recall that  $\kappa(n)$  is defined in (46).

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If a tree  $\vartheta$  has order  $k < \kappa(n)$ , then  $N_n(\vartheta) = 0$  and  $P_{n-1}(\vartheta) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $k < \kappa(n)$ , then for any line  $\ell \in \vartheta$ , one has  $|\nu_\ell| \leq q_m k < q_{n+m}$ . By (51) and (52),

$$\|\omega \nu_\ell\| \geq \|\omega q_{n+m-1}\| > \frac{1}{2q_{n+m}},$$

so  $n_\ell < n$ , hence  $N_n(\vartheta) = 0$ . The absence of lines on scale  $\geq n$  implies that no cluster (and hence no resonance) on scale  $n-1$  can exist apart from the entire tree itself.  $\square$

The following ‘‘counting lemma’’ is also known as the Siegel–Brjuno estimate.

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $\vartheta$  be a tree of order  $k$ , and define  $M_n(\vartheta) = N_n(\vartheta) + P_n(\vartheta)$ . Then*

$$(53) \quad M_n(\vartheta) \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta),$$

where  $N_n^R(\vartheta)$  is the number of resonances with resonance-scale  $n$ .

*Proof.* For  $k < \kappa(n)$ , Lemma 5.6 gives  $M_n(\vartheta) = 0$ , so (53) is trivially satisfied. We now prove by induction on  $k$  that

$$(54) \quad M_n(\vartheta) \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - 1 + N_n^R(\vartheta)$$

for  $k \geq \frac{1}{2}\kappa(n)$ . The base case  $\frac{1}{2}\kappa(n) \leq k < \kappa(n)$  follows from earlier bounds. Assuming  $k \geq \kappa(n)$  and that (54) holds for all trees of order less than  $k$ , we analyze the structure of  $\vartheta$  in several cases.

**Case A:** The root line  $\ell$  has scale different from  $n$  and is not the entering line of a resonance on scale  $n$ . Let  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_l$  be the lines entering the last node  $u_0$ , with corresponding subtrees  $\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_l$ . Then

$$M_n(\vartheta) = \sum_{j=1}^l M_n(\vartheta_j), \quad N_n^R(\vartheta) = \sum_{j=1}^l N_n^R(\vartheta_j).$$

By the induction hypothesis,

$$M_n(\vartheta) \leq \sum_{j=1}^l \left( \frac{2q_m k_j}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta_j) \right) = \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta),$$

since  $\sum k_j = k$ .

**Case B:** The root line  $\ell$  has scale  $n$ . Let  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_l$  be the lines on scale at least  $n$  that are nearest to  $\ell$ , with corresponding subtrees  $\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_l$ . These enter a cluster  $T$  (possibly a single node) whose exiting line is  $\ell$ . Then

$$M_n(\vartheta) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^l M_n(\vartheta_j).$$

By the induction hypothesis,

$$M_n(\vartheta) \leq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^l \left( \frac{2q_m k_j}{q_{n+m}} - 1 + N_n^R(\vartheta_j) \right).$$

- If  $l \geq 2$ , then

$$M_n(\vartheta) \leq 1 + \frac{2q_m(k - k_T)}{q_{n+m}} - l + \sum_{j=1}^l N_n^R(\vartheta_j) \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - 1 + N_n^R(\vartheta),$$

since  $k_T \geq 1$ .

- If  $l = 0$ , then  $M_n(\vartheta) = 1$  and  $N_n^R(\vartheta) = 0$ . As  $k \geq \kappa(n)$ ,

$$1 \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - 1 \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - 1 + N_n^R(\vartheta).$$

- If  $l = 1$ , then

$$M_n(\vartheta) \leq \frac{2q_m k_1}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta_1).$$

Let  $\nu$  and  $\nu_1$  be the momenta of  $\ell$  and  $\ell_1$ , respectively, so that  $\nu_T = \nu - \nu_1$  satisfies  $\|\omega \nu_T\| \leq 1/(2q_{n+m})$ . By Lemma 5.5, either  $|\nu_T| \geq q_{n+m}$  or  $\nu_T = 0$ .

– If  $|\nu_T| \geq q_{n+m}$ , then  $q_m k_T \geq q_{n+m}$ , and

$$M_n(\vartheta) \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - \frac{2q_m k_T}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta_1) + 1 \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - 1 + N_n^R(\vartheta).$$

– If  $\nu_T = 0$  and  $k_T \geq \kappa(n)$ , the same argument applies.

– If  $\nu_T = 0$  and  $k_T < \kappa(n)$ , then  $T$  is a resonance with resonance-scale  $n$ , so  $N_n^R(\vartheta) = 1 + N_n^R(\vartheta_1)$ .

Hence

$$M_n(\vartheta) \leq \frac{2q_m k_1}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta_1) = \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - \frac{2q_m k_T}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta) \leq \frac{2q_m k}{q_{n+m}} - 1 + N_n^R(\vartheta).$$

**Case C:** The root line  $\ell$  has scale greater than  $n$  and is the exiting line of a resonance  $V_n$  on scale  $n$ . Let  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_l$  be the lines on scale at least  $n$  nearest to  $\ell$ , with corresponding subtrees  $\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_l$ . Then

$$M_n(\vartheta) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^l M_n(\vartheta_j).$$

The cluster  $T$  formed by these lines lies inside  $V_n$ . If  $T$  is not a resonance, then  $N_n^R(\vartheta) = \sum N_n^R(\vartheta_j)$ , and the argument follows as in Case B. If  $T$  is a resonance, then  $N_n^R(\vartheta) = 1 + \sum N_n^R(\vartheta_j)$ , and a similar computation yields the bound.

In every case, (53) is verified, completing the induction.  $\square$

**5.4. Sketch proof of Theorem 4.** By Lemma 5.7, the bound (50) for tree values can be rewritten as

$$(55) \quad |\text{Val}(\vartheta)| \lesssim (2q_m)^k \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (768q_{n+m+1})^{2(M_n(\vartheta) - P_n(\vartheta))}$$

$$(56) \quad \lesssim (2q_m)^k \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (768q_{n+m+1})^{2\left(\frac{2q_mk}{q_{n+m}} + N_n^R(\vartheta) - P_n(\vartheta)\right)}.$$

We now introduce a resummation procedure. For each resonance  $V$ , this procedure yields a factor  $(768q_{n_V+m+1})^2$  from one of the external lines on scale  $n_V^R$ . To formalize this step, we apply a sequence of transformations to the trees, generating additional trees and extending  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$  to an enlarged set  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*$ .

As a result of resummation, the factor

$$\prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (768q_{n+m+1})^{2N_n^R(\vartheta)}$$

can be replaced by

$$e^{6k} \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (768q_{n+m+1})^{2P_n(\vartheta)}.$$

The cardinality of  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*$  is controlled by  $C^k \cdot \#\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$ . In fact, Lemma 5.4 restricts each line to at most 17 possible scale assignments. Consequently, the total number of distinct trees in  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*$  satisfies:

$$\#\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^* \leq 2^{4k} \cdot 17^k = 272^k.$$

More details on the resummation procedure will be provided in Appendix A. Thus, for sufficiently large  $m$ ,

$$(57) \quad \begin{aligned} |u^{(k)}(\theta)| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{|\nu| \leq q_mk} \sum_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}} \text{Val}(\vartheta) \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{|\nu| \leq q_mk} \sum_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*} \text{Val}(\vartheta) \right| \\ &\lesssim (2q_m)^{2k} \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (768q_{n+m+1})^{4q_mk/q_{n+m}} \\ &\lesssim (2q_m)^{2k} \exp \left( 4q_mk \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+m+1}}{q_{n+m}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (31), we know that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+m+1}}{q_{n+m}} \lesssim q_m^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1}.$$

Hence,

$$|u^{(k)}(\theta)| \lesssim (2q_m)^{2k} \exp \left( 4kq_m^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right).$$

Choosing  $b > 4$  in (3), we conclude that for sufficiently large  $m$ , the parameter  $\varepsilon$  lies within the radius of convergence of the Lindstedt series, i.e.,  $\varepsilon < \rho(\omega)$ .

## APPENDIX A. RENORMALIZATION OF RESONANCES

The operation in this appendix will be carried out by adapting the argument in [BG01, Section 4 and 5] to the present context. The main distinction lies in Lemma A.4 and Proposition A.5; for the sake of completeness and the reader's convenience, we retain the remaining content of [BG01, Section 4 and 5].

**A.1. The generations of resonances.** Given a tree  $\vartheta$ , we first introduce the notion of *maximal resonances*, i.e. those resonances that are not contained in any larger one. We refer to them as *first-generation resonances*. Within each first-generation resonance, we then consider the next maximal resonances, namely those not contained in any larger resonance other than the first-generation ones; these are called *second-generation resonances*. Proceeding inductively, we define the  $j^{\text{th}}$ -generation resonances ( $j \geq 2$ ) as resonances that are maximal within resonances of generation  $j - 1$ .

Let  $\mathbf{V}$  denote the set of all resonances of a tree  $\vartheta$ , and let  $\mathbf{V}_j$  denote the set of all resonances of generation  $j$ , with  $j = 1, \dots, G$ , where  $G$  is an integer depending on  $\vartheta$ .

Consider a resonance  $V \in \mathbf{V}_j$  with  $l_V$  entering lines. Define  $V_0$  as the set of nodes and lines internal to  $V$  but external to any sub-resonance contained in  $V$ . Let

$$L_V = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{l_V}\}$$

be the set of entering lines of  $V$ . Among these, define  $L_V^R \subseteq L_V$  as those lines that enter a resonance of higher generation within  $V$ , and  $L_V^0 = L_V \setminus L_V^R$  as those that enter nodes in  $V_0$ .

For each  $\ell_l \in L_V^R$ , let  $V(\ell_l)$  denote the minimal resonance containing the node into which  $\ell_l$  enters (i.e. the resonance of highest generation containing that node). Define  $V_0(\ell_l)$  as the set of nodes and lines internal to  $V(\ell_l)$  but external to resonances contained in  $V(\ell_l)$ . We set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(V) = \{\tilde{V} \subset V : \tilde{V} = V(\ell_l) \text{ for some } \ell_l \in L_V^R\}.$$

Let  $l_{V_0} = |L_V^0|$ . The number of lines in  $L_V^R$  entering the same resonance  $\tilde{V} \in \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(V)$  is always equal to 1, as ensured by the following result (see [BG01, Lemma 6]).

**Lemma A.1.** *For  $j \geq 1$ , if  $W \in \mathbf{V}_{j+1}$  is contained inside a resonance  $V \in \mathbf{V}_j$ , then among the lines entering  $W$ , at most one can also be an entering line of  $V$ .*

We now define the *resonance family*  $\mathcal{F}_V(\vartheta)$  of  $V \in \mathbf{V}$  in  $\vartheta$ . This is the set of trees obtained from  $\vartheta$  by applying the transformations generated by a group  $P_V$ , consisting of the following operations:

1. **Line reattachments.** Detach the line  $\ell_1$ . - If  $\ell_1 \in L_V^R$ , reattach it to any node internal to  $V_0(\ell_1)$ . - If  $\ell_1 \in L_V^0$ , reattach it to any node in  $V_0$ . Repeat this operation for  $\ell_2, \dots, \ell_{l_V}$ .

2. **Permutations of entering lines.** For each node  $u \in V$  with  $m_u$  entering lines, let  $s_u$  denote those internal to  $V$ , and  $r_u = m_u - s_u$  the remaining lines entering  $V$ . We act on the set of lines entering  $u$  by the group of permutations of all  $m_u$  entering lines, modulo permutations of the  $s_u$  internal and the  $r_u$  external lines. This yields

$$\binom{m_u}{s_u} = \frac{m_u!}{s_u! r_u!}$$

distinct trees.

3. **Mode-label inversion.** Simultaneously change the sign of all mode labels of nodes internal to  $V$ .

We refer to operations of type (1)–(3) as *renormalization transformations*.

Let  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{V}_1}(\vartheta)$  denote the family obtained by composing the resonance families  $\mathcal{F}_{V_1}(\vartheta)$  for all  $V_1 \in \mathbf{V}_1$ . For any tree  $\vartheta_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{V}_1}(\vartheta)$ , let  $V_2 \in \mathbf{V}_2$  and define  $\mathcal{F}_{V_2}(\vartheta_1)$  as the resonance family of  $V_2$  in  $\vartheta_1$ . Iterating this construction for all  $V_2 \in \mathbf{V}_2$  and all  $\vartheta_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{V}_1}(\vartheta)$ , we obtain the family  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{V}_2}(\vartheta)$ .

Proceeding recursively through the third generation, and so on up to the  $G^{\text{th}}$  generation, we arrive at a family  $\mathcal{F}(\vartheta)$ . This consists of all trees obtained by applying the renormalization transformations associated with each resonance  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ , defined inductively through the families  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{V}_j}(\vartheta)$ .

**Remark A.2.** Given a tree  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$  and its resonance family  $\mathcal{F}(\vartheta)$ , if we select another tree  $\vartheta' \in \mathcal{F}(\vartheta)$  with nonvanishing value  $\text{Val}(\vartheta')$ , then by construction  $\mathcal{F}(\vartheta') = \mathcal{F}(\vartheta)$ . Note, however, that  $\mathcal{F}(\vartheta)$  may also contain trees of vanishing value, e.g. those containing lines  $\ell$  such that  $\chi_{n_\ell}(\|\omega v_\ell\|) = 0$ .

We can write

$$(58) \quad \sum_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}} \text{Val}(\vartheta) = \sum_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}(\vartheta)|} \sum_{\vartheta' \in \mathcal{F}(\vartheta)} \text{Val}(\vartheta'),$$

where the factors  $|\mathcal{F}(\vartheta)|$  serve to avoid overcounting (see Remark A.2). The sum implicitly defines the set  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*$ , namely the set of inequivalent trees contained in  $\cup_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}} \mathcal{F}(\vartheta)$ . Thus, if  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*$ , then  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{F}(\vartheta_0)$  for some  $\vartheta_0 \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$ . However, unlike  $\vartheta_0$ , the value of  $\vartheta$  may vanish.

**A.2. Cancellation in three cases.** In general, a tree may contain multiple resonances, which can be nested within one another.

Consider a tree  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*$  as in (58). For each resonance  $V$  (of any generation), we define a pair of *derived lines*  $\ell_V^1, \ell_V^2$  internal to  $V$  (possibly coinciding), subject to the following compatibility condition: if  $V$  is contained in some other resonance  $W$ , then the set  $\{\ell_V^1, \ell_V^2\}$  must include those lines of  $\{\ell_W^1, \ell_W^2\}$  that lie inside  $V$ . Depending on whether 0, 1, or 2 such lines are present, we say that  $V$  is of type 2, 1, or 0, respectively.

We label the type of  $V$  by  $z_V \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . Additionally, we associate to each resonance  $V$  a pair of entering lines  $\ell_l^V, \ell_{l'}^V$  if  $z_V = 2$ , or a single entering line  $\ell_l^V$  if  $z_V = 1$ , where  $l, l' = 1, \dots, l_V$ .

For each resonance we introduce an interpolation parameter  $t_V$  and a measure  $\pi_{z_V}(t_V)dt_V$  defined by:

$$(59) \quad \pi_z(t) = \begin{cases} 1-t, & z=2, \\ 1, & z=1, \\ \delta(t-1), & z=0. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\mathbf{t} = \{t_V\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$  denote the collection of all interpolation parameters.

In what follows, we shall always consider the quantities  $\omega v$ ,  $v \in \mathbb{Z}$ , modulo 1, and by  $\omega v$  we mean the representative of the equivalence class in the interval  $(-1/2, 1/2]$ .

For a node  $u \in V$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_u$  denote the set of lines entering  $V$  whose endpoints are nodes preceding  $u$ . The momentum flowing through a line  $\ell_u$  internal to a resonance  $V$  is defined recursively as:

$$(60) \quad \nu_{\ell_u}(\mathbf{t}) = \nu_{\ell_u}^0 + t_V \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{E}_u} \nu_{\ell}(\mathbf{t}), \quad \nu_{\ell_u}^0 = \sum_{\substack{w \in V \\ w \preceq u}} \nu_w.$$

Note that  $\nu_{\ell_u}(t)$  depends only on the interpolation parameters of resonances containing  $\ell_u$ .

For later convenience, we write

$$(61) \quad U_V(\vartheta) = \prod_{u \in V} \frac{\nu_u^{m_u+1}}{m_u! q_m}.$$

The resonance factor  $\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta)$  is defined case by case according to  $z_V$ :

- For  $z_V = 2$ :

$$(62) \quad \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta) = U_V(\vartheta) \left[ \prod_{\ell \in V} g_{n_{\ell}}(\nu_{\ell}(\mathbf{t})) \right].$$

- For  $z_V = 1$  (with  $\ell_V^1$  being the derived line shared with a containing resonance  $W$ ):

$$(63) \quad \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta) = U_V(\vartheta) \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} g_{n_{\ell}}(\nu_{\ell_V}(\mathbf{t})) \right) \left( \prod_{\substack{\ell \in V \\ \ell \neq \ell_V^1}} g_{n_{\ell}}(\nu_{\ell}(\mathbf{t})) \right) \right].$$

- For  $z_V = 0$  with  $\ell_V^1 = \ell_V^2$ :

$$(64) \quad \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta) = U_V(\vartheta) \left[ \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mu \partial \mu'} g_{n_{\ell}}(\nu_{\ell_V}(\mathbf{t})) \right) \left( \prod_{\substack{\ell \in V \\ \ell \neq \ell_V^1}} g_{n_{\ell}}(\nu_{\ell}(\mathbf{t})) \right) \right].$$

- For  $z_V = 0$  with  $\ell_V^1 \neq \ell_V^2$ :

$$(65) \quad \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta) = U_V(\vartheta) \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_{\ell_V}(\mathbf{t})) \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu'} g_{n_\ell^2}(\nu_{\ell_V^2}(\mathbf{t})) \right) \left( \prod_{\substack{\ell \in V \\ \ell \neq \ell_V^1, \ell_V^2}} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell(\mathbf{t})) \right) \right].$$

In (63)–(65), the symbols  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  denote  $\omega\nu_{\ell_l^W}$  and  $\omega\nu_{\ell_{l'}^W}$ , respectively, where  $\ell_l^W$  and  $\ell_{l'}^W$  (possibly coinciding) are entering lines of resonances  $W$  and  $W'$  (possibly coinciding) that contain  $V$ .

We can regard the resonance factor as a function of the quantities  $\mu_1 = \omega\nu_{\ell_1}, \dots, \mu_{l_V} = \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}$ , where  $\nu_{\ell_1}, \dots, \nu_{\ell_{l_V}}$  are the momenta carried by the lines  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{l_V}$  entering  $V$ . More precisely, we set

$$(66) \quad \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta) \equiv \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}, \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}),$$

and decompose

$$(67) \quad \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}, \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}) = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}, \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}) + \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}, \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}).$$

The renormalization operator  $\mathcal{R}$  is defined type-wise:

- For  $z_V = 2$ :

$$(68) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}(\mathbf{t}), \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}(\mathbf{t})) &= \sum_{l, l'=1}^{l_V} \omega\nu_{\ell_l}(\mathbf{t}) \omega\nu_{\ell_{l'}}(\mathbf{t}) \\ &\cdot \int_0^1 dt_V (1-t_V) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mu_l \partial \mu_{l'}} \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta, t_V \omega\nu_{\ell_1}(\mathbf{t}), \dots, t_V \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}(\mathbf{t})). \end{aligned}$$

- For  $z_V = 1$ :

$$(69) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}(\mathbf{t}), \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}(\mathbf{t})) &= \sum_{l=1}^{l_V} \omega\nu_{\ell_l}(\mathbf{t}) \\ &\cdot \int_0^1 dt_V \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu_l} \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta, t_V \omega\nu_{\ell_1}(\mathbf{t}), \dots, t_V \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}(\mathbf{t})). \end{aligned}$$

- For  $z_V = 0$ :

$$(70) \quad \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}(\mathbf{t}), \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}(\mathbf{t})) = \mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta; \omega\nu_{\ell_1}(\mathbf{t}), \dots, \omega\nu_{\ell_{l_V}}(\mathbf{t})).$$

In all cases, set  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{I} - \mathcal{R}$  where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the *localization operator*, while  $\mathcal{R} = 1 - \mathcal{L}$  is the *renormalization operator*.

Performing the renormalization transformations in  $\mathcal{P}_V$ , we find that for all trees obtained by the action of  $\mathcal{P}_V$ , the contribution to the localized factor from  $L_V(\vartheta)$  is the same, i.e.,

$$(71) \quad \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta) = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta'), \quad \forall \vartheta' \in \mathcal{F}_V(\vartheta).$$

Therefore we may consider

$$(72) \quad \sum_{\vartheta' \in \mathcal{F}_V(\vartheta)} \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta').$$

The sum of localized factors over all trees in the resonance family  $\mathcal{F}_V(\vartheta)$  vanishes, so only the renormalized part contributes. More precisely:

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $\vartheta$  be a tree and  $V \subset \vartheta$  a resonance. Then the localized resonance factor satisfies*

$$\sum_{\vartheta' \in \mathcal{F}_V(\vartheta)} \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}_V(\vartheta') = 0.$$

The proof of Lemma A.3 is identical to that of [BG01, Lemma].

If a resonance  $V$  has resonance-scale  $n_V^R$ , then there exists an entering line  $\ell_V^0$  on scale  $n_V^R$  such that  $\|\omega\nu_\ell\| \leq \|\omega\nu_{\ell_V^0}\|$  for all  $\ell$  entering  $V$ .

To each derived line  $\ell$  we associate the corresponding entering lines  $\ell_l(\ell)$  and (if applicable)  $\ell_{l'}(\ell)$  with respect to which the propagator  $g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell(\mathbf{t}))$  is differentiated. Let  $V$  be the minimal resonance containing  $\ell$ .



If  $\ell$  is derived once, let  $W$  be the resonance for which  $\ell_l(\ell)$  is an entering line; if derived twice, let  $W$  and  $W'$  (with  $W' \subseteq W$ ) be the resonances corresponding to  $\ell_l(\ell)$  and  $\ell_{l'}(\ell)$ , respectively.

Define the following chains of resonances:

- For a singly-derived line  $\ell$ , let  $W_0, \dots, W_p$  be the resonances satisfying

$$(73) \quad V = W_0 \subset W_1 \subset \dots \subset W_p = W.$$

The set  $\mathbf{W}(\ell) = \{W_0, \dots, W_p\}$  is called the *simple cloud* of  $\ell$ .

- For a doubly-derived line  $\ell$ , let  $W_0, \dots, W_p$  be such that

$$(74) \quad V = W_0 \subset W_1 \subset \dots \subset W_{p'} = W' \subset \dots \subset W_p = W, \quad p' \leq p.$$

Then  $\mathbf{W}_-(\ell) = \{W_0, \dots, W_{p'}\}$  is the *minor cloud*, and  $\mathbf{W}_+(\ell) = \{W_0, \dots, W_p\}$  the *major cloud* of  $\ell$ .

It may happen that in  $\vartheta_0$  a line internal to  $\vartheta$  carries a scale  $n_\ell$  and momentum  $\tilde{\nu}_\ell$  such that  $\chi_{n_\ell}(\|\omega\tilde{\nu}_\ell\|) \neq 0$ , whereas the momentum  $\nu_\ell$  of the corresponding line in  $\vartheta$  (the conjugate of the line in  $\vartheta_0$ ) satisfies  $\chi_{n_\ell}(\|\omega\nu_\ell\|) = 0$  (see Remark A.2). In this situation, condition (43) fails for that line. Nevertheless, the momentum  $\nu_\ell$  cannot deviate too far from  $\tilde{\nu}_\ell$ ; more precisely, one has

$$(75) \quad \frac{1}{768q_{n_\ell+m+1}} \leq \|\omega\nu_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{24q_{n_\ell+m}},$$

as will be established below, relying on the following lemma.

**Lemma A.4.** *Let  $\vartheta_0 \in \mathcal{T}_{v,k}$  be a tree associated with a resonance  $V$ , and let  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{v,k}^*$  be a tree obtained from  $\vartheta_0$  through the action of  $\mathcal{P}_V$ , i.e.  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{F}_V(\vartheta_0)$ . Suppose that for each entering line  $\ell_l$  of  $V$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, l_V$ , the inequality  $\|\omega\nu_{\ell_l}\| \leq 1/(8q_{n_V^R+m})$  holds. Then, for any line  $\ell \in V$ , with momenta  $\nu_\ell$  and  $\tilde{\nu}_\ell$  flowing through  $\ell$  in  $\vartheta$  and  $\vartheta_0$ , respectively, one has*

$$(76) \quad \|\omega\nu_\ell\| - \|\omega\tilde{\nu}_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}}, \quad \|\omega\nu_\ell\| \geq \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}}, \quad \|\omega\tilde{\nu}_\ell\| \geq \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $V$  is a resonance, for each line  $\ell \in V$  one has  $|\nu_\ell^0| \leq q_m k_V < q_{n_V^R+m}$  (see Item (iv) in Definition 5.3). Therefore,

$$(77) \quad \|\omega\nu_\ell^0\| \geq \|\omega q_{n_V^R+m-1}\| > \frac{1}{2q_{n_V^R+m}},$$

by (51) and (52). On the other hand,

$$(78) \quad \|\omega\nu_\ell - \omega\nu_\ell^0\| \leq \sum_{l=1}^{l_V} \|\omega\nu_{\ell_l}\|,$$

where  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{l_V}$  denote the momenta along the lines  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{l_V}$  entering  $V$ . By assumption,

$$(79) \quad \|\omega\nu_{\ell_l}\| \leq \frac{1}{8q_{n_V^R+m}}, \quad \forall l = 1, \dots, l_V.$$

If  $l_V \geq 2$ , then  $q_{n_V^R+m+1} > 4q_{n_V^R+m}q_m$  (see Item (v) in Definition 5.3). In this case, if an entering line (say  $\ell_1$ ) is the root line of a subtree of order  $\geq q_{n_V^R+m+1}/(4q_m)$ , then all remaining entering lines correspond to subtrees of orders  $k_2, \dots, k_{l_V}$  with  $k_0 = k_2 + \dots + k_{l_V} < q_{n_V^R+m+1}/(8q_m)$  (see Item 6). Furthermore, for  $l = 2, \dots, l_V$ , one has  $k_l \geq \kappa(n_V^R)$ , otherwise  $\ell_l$  would not be on scale  $\geq n_V^R$ . By Lemma 5.5,  $\nu_{\ell_l} = s_l q_{n_V^R+m}$  with  $s_l \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and

$$(80) \quad |s_2| + \dots + |s_{l_V}| \leq \frac{q_m k_0}{q_{n_V^R+m}} \leq \frac{q_{n_V^R+m+1}}{8q_{n_V^R+m}}.$$

Hence,

$$(81) \quad \sum_{l=1}^{l_V} \|\omega\nu_{\ell_l}\| \leq \frac{1}{8q_{n_V^R+m}} + \sum_{l=2}^{l_V} |s_l| \|\omega q_{n_V^R+m}\| \leq \frac{1}{8q_{n_V^R+m}} + \frac{1}{8q_{n_V^R+m}} = \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}},$$

using (51). Therefore, upon replacing  $\vartheta_0$  by  $\vartheta$ , the bounds in (76) follow.

If no entering line of  $V$  is the root line of a tree of order  $\geq q_{n_V^R+m+1}/(4q_m)$  and the tree rooted at the exiting line of  $V$  is of order  $k < q_{n_V^R+m+1}/(4q_m)$  (see Item (vi) in Definition 5.3), then

$$(82) \quad \sum_{l=1}^{l_V} |s_l| q_{n_V^R+m} \leq q_m(k_1 + \dots + k_{l_V}) = q_m(k - k_V) < q_m k \leq \frac{q_{n_V^R+m+1}}{4},$$

which implies

$$(83) \quad \sum_{l=1}^{l_V} \|\omega \nu_{\ell_l}\| \leq \sum_{l=1}^{l_V} |s_l| \|\omega q_{n_V^R}\| \leq \frac{q_{n_V^R+m+1}}{4q_{n_V^R+m}} \cdot \frac{1}{q_{n_V^R+m+1}} = \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}},$$

and thus (76) again follows. The case  $l_V = 1$  is immediate from (78) and (79).  $\square$

**Proposition A.5.** *Let  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}^*$  be a renormalized tree obtained from  $\vartheta_0 \in \mathcal{T}_{\nu,k}$  via the iterative replacement procedure described above. Then the lines of  $\vartheta$  inherit the scales of their conjugate lines in  $\vartheta_0$ , and a line  $\ell \in \vartheta$  with scale  $n_\ell$  satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{768q_{n_\ell+m+1}} \leq \|\omega \nu_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{24q_{n_\ell+m}}.$$

*Proof.* The first claim follows by construction. The second is proved by induction on the resonance generation.

Firstly, we establish the base case (first-generation resonances). Note that since the entering lines of  $V$  satisfy (43), hence also (48), Lemma A.4 applies. Moreover, within  $V$  in  $\vartheta_0$ , only lines of scale  $n_\ell$  such that  $1/(48q_{n_\ell+m}) > 1/(4q_{n_V^R+m})$  are possible, by the second inequality in (76) and the definition of scale (see (43)). Consequently, for a line  $\ell$  internal to  $V$  with scale  $n_\ell$ , one has

$$(84) \quad \|\omega \nu_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{48q_{n_\ell+m}} + \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}} \leq \frac{1}{48q_{n_\ell+m}} + \frac{1}{48q_{n_\ell+m}} = \frac{1}{24q_{n_\ell+m}}.$$

Similarly, if  $1/(96q_{n_\ell+m+1}) > 2/(q_{n_V^R+m})$ , then

$$(85) \quad \|\omega \nu_\ell\| \geq \frac{1}{96q_{n_\ell+m+1}} - \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}} \geq \frac{1}{96q_{n_\ell+m+1}} - \frac{1}{768q_{n_\ell+m+1}} = \frac{7}{768q_{n_\ell+m+1}},$$

while if  $1/(96q_{n_\ell+m+1}) < 2/(q_{n_V^R+m})$ , then

$$(86) \quad \|\omega \nu_\ell\| \geq \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}} \geq \frac{1}{768q_{n_\ell+m+1}},$$

by the third inequality in (76). Thus (75) follows, showing in particular that the momentum  $\nu_\ell$  of any  $\ell \in \vartheta$  still satisfies (48).

Now assume that (49) holds for all resonances of generation  $j' < j$ . Consider a line  $\ell$  contained in a resonance  $V \in \mathbf{V}_j$  but outside any  $\mathbf{V}_{j+1}$ -resonance inside  $V$ . Let  $V \equiv W_1 \subset \dots \subset W_j$  be the chain of resonances containing  $\ell$ . Denote by  $\tilde{\nu}_\ell$  the momentum through  $\ell$  in  $\vartheta_0$ , and by  $\nu_\ell$  the momentum through its conjugate line in  $\vartheta$ . Then:

$$(87) \quad \frac{1}{96q_{n_\ell+m+1}} - \sum_{i=1}^j \frac{1}{4q_{n_{W_i}^R+m}} \leq \|\omega \tilde{\nu}_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{48q_{n_\ell+m}} + \sum_{i=1}^j \frac{1}{4q_{n_{W_i}^R+m}}.$$

Let  $\vartheta_0^V \in F_{\mathbf{V}_j}(\vartheta_0)$  be the tree containing  $V$ , and  $\vartheta^V$  the tree in  $F_V(\vartheta_0^V)$  obtained via  $P_V$ . Since (48) holds before renormalizing  $V$ , for each entering line  $\ell_l$  ( $l = 1, \dots, l_V$ ) we have  $\|\omega \nu_{\ell_l}\| < 1/(8q_{n_{\ell_l}+m})$ . Then, arguing as in Lemma A.4, we obtain:

$$(88) \quad \left| \|\omega \nu_\ell\| - \|\omega \tilde{\nu}_\ell\| \right| \leq \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}}, \quad \|\omega \nu_\ell\| \geq \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}}, \quad \|\omega \tilde{\nu}_\ell\| \geq \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}},$$

where  $\nu_\ell$  is the momentum in  $\vartheta^V$ .

For  $\ell$  to be contained in  $V = W_1$ , we must have  $1/(48q_{n_\ell+m}) \geq 1/(4q_{n_V^R+m})$ . Set  $j_1 = \lfloor (j-1)/2 \rfloor$  and  $j_2 = \lfloor j/2 \rfloor$ . Using  $q_{n+1} \geq q_n$  and  $q_{n+2} \geq 2q_n$ , we have:

$$(89) \quad q_{n_{W_1}^R+m} \leq \frac{q_{n_{W_3}^R+m}}{2} \leq \dots \leq \frac{q_{n_{W_{j_1}}^R+m}}{2^{j_1}}, \quad q_{n_{W_2}^R+m} \leq \frac{q_{n_{W_4}^R+m}}{2} \leq \dots \leq \frac{q_{n_{W_{j_2}}^R+m}}{2^{j_2}}.$$

Then:

$$(90) \quad \|\omega\nu_\ell\| \leq \frac{1}{48q_{n_\ell+m}} + \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{j_1} \frac{1}{2^i} + \sum_{i=0}^{j_2} \frac{1}{2^i} \right) \leq \frac{1}{48q_{n_\ell+m}} + \frac{1}{q_{n_V^R+m}} \leq \frac{5}{48q_{n_\ell+m}}.$$

Similarly:

$$(91) \quad \|\omega\nu_\ell\| \geq \frac{1}{96q_{n_\ell+m+1}} - \frac{1}{4q_{n_V^R+m}} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{j_1} \frac{1}{2^i} + \sum_{i=0}^{j_2} \frac{1}{2^i} \right) \geq \frac{1}{96q_{n_\ell+m+1}} - \frac{1}{q_{n_V^R+m}}.$$

The lower bound is at least  $1/(192q_{n_\ell+m+1})$  if  $1/(96q_{n_\ell+m+1}) > 2/q_{n_V^R+m}$ , and at least  $1/(768q_{n_\ell+m+1})$  otherwise.

Thus, (49) holds for any line  $\ell$  inside  $V \in \mathbf{V}_j$ . Since subsequent renormalizations (on resonances of generation  $j' > j$ ) do not affect  $\ell$ , the momentum  $\nu_\ell$  remains unchanged, completing the induction.  $\square$

Define the map  $\Lambda : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \Lambda(\mathbf{V}) = \{z_V, \ell_V^1, \ell_V^2, \{\ell_l^V, \ell_{l'}^V\}^*\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$ , which associates to each resonance  $V$  its derived lines  $\ell_V^1, \ell_V^2$  and the set

$$\{\ell_l^V, \ell_{l'}^V\}^* = \begin{cases} \{\ell_l^V, \ell_{l'}^V\}, & z_V = 2, \\ \ell_l^V, & z_V = 1, \\ \emptyset, & z_V = 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $l, l' = 1, \dots, l_V$  and  $\ell_V^1, \dots, \ell_{l_V}^V$  are the lines entering  $V$ .

The map  $\Lambda$  induces a decomposition  $L = L_0 \cup L_1 \cup L_2$  of the line set, where  $L_j$  consists of lines derived  $j$  times. By Lemma A.3:

$$(92) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Val}(\vartheta) = & \sum_{\Lambda \mathbf{V}} \left( \prod_{V \in \mathbf{V}} \int_0^1 \pi_{z_V}(t_V) dt_V \right) \left( \prod_{u \in \vartheta} \frac{\nu_u^{m_u+1}}{m_u! q_m} \right) \\ & \cdot \left( \prod_{\ell \in L_0} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell(\mathbf{t})) \right) \left( \prod_{\ell \in L_1} \omega \nu_{\ell_l(\ell)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu_l} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell(\mathbf{t})) \right) \\ & \cdot \left( \prod_{\ell \in L_2} \omega \nu_{\ell_l(\ell)} \omega \nu_{\ell_{l'}(\ell)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mu_l \partial \mu_{l'}} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell(\mathbf{t})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition A.5, after full renormalization, the bound (48) still holds for the momenta in  $\vartheta$ . Thus, in (92) we can estimate:

For  $\ell \in L_1$  with simple cloud  $\mathbf{W}(\ell) = \{W_0, \dots, W_p\}$ :

$$(93) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \omega \nu_{\ell_l(\ell)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu_l} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell(\mathbf{t})) \right| & \lesssim \|\omega \nu_{\ell_l(\ell)}\| (768q_{n_\ell+m+1})^3 \\ & \lesssim (768q_{n_\ell+m+1})^2 \left[ \prod_{i=0}^p \|\omega \nu_{\ell_{W_i}^0}\| \prod_{i=0}^p (768q_{n_{W_i}+m+1}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\ell \in L_2$  with minor cloud  $\mathbf{W}_-(\ell) = \{W_0, \dots, W_p\}$  and major cloud  $\mathbf{W}_+(\ell) = \{W_0, \dots, W_p\}$ :

$$(94) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \omega \nu_{\ell_l(\ell)} \omega \nu_{\ell_{l'}(\ell)} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mu_l \partial \mu_{l'}} g_{n_\ell}(\nu_\ell(\mathbf{t})) \right| & \lesssim \|\omega \nu_{\ell_l(\ell)}\| \|\omega \nu_{\ell_{l'}(\ell)}\| (768q_{n_\ell+m+1})^4 \\ & \lesssim (768q_{n_\ell+m+1})^2 \left[ \prod_{i=0}^p \|\omega \nu_{\ell_{W_i}^0}\| \prod_{i=0}^p (768q_{n_{W_i}+m+1}) \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

This follows by observing that for any line  $\ell \in V$ , one has  $n_\ell \leq n_V$ , together with the estimates:

$$(95) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^p}{\partial \mu^p} \chi_n(\|\omega \nu_\ell\|) \right| \lesssim (768q_{n+m+1})^p, \quad p = 1, 2,$$

which imply:

$$(96) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^p}{\partial \mu^p} g_n(\nu_\ell) \right| \lesssim (768q_{n+m+1})^{p+2}, \quad p = 0, 1, 2.$$

The bounds (93) and (94) yield a factor

$$(97) \quad \|\omega\nu_{\ell_{W_i}^0}\| (768q_{n_{W_i}+m+1})$$

for each resonance  $W_i$  in the cloud of  $\ell$ . Since each resonance belongs to the cloud of some internal line and contains either two derived lines or one doubly-derived line, we obtain the square of (97) for each resonance.

Taking into account that each underived propagator can be bounded using (96) with  $p = 0$ , we can summarize the bounds (93) and (94) as follows: for each resummed tree  $\vartheta$ ,

- each resonance  $V$  contributes a factor  $\|\omega\nu_{\ell_V}\|^2 \cdot (768q_{n_V+m+1})^2$ ;
- each line  $\ell$  contributes a factor  $(768q_{n_\ell+m+1})^2$ .

The presence of the factors  $\|\omega\nu_{\ell_V}\|^2$  allows us to disregard the propagator corresponding to a line entering a resonance with resonance-scale  $n_V^R$ , provided it is replaced by a factor  $(768q_{n_V+m+1})^2$ , where  $n_V$  denotes the scale of the resonance when viewed as a cluster. This mechanism aligns with the reasoning leading to (57).

After bounding individual terms in (92), it remains to control the number of terms in the sum.

Applying Lemma A.1 yields systematic bounds on term proliferation. For a resonance  $V \in \mathbf{V}_j$  with  $j \geq 1$ , denote by  $\mathcal{M}_V$  the number of  $(j+1)^{\text{th}}$ -generation subresonances contained within  $V$ . Let  $V_0$  represent the set of lines internal to  $V$  but external to all proper subresonances, with cardinality  $k_{V_0} = |V_0|$ .

Lemma A.1 provides the following quantitative controls:

- For first-generation resonances  $V$ : at most  $l_V$  terms per sum.
- For resonances  $V' \in \mathbf{V}_{j+1}$  inside  $V \in \mathbf{V}_j$ : at most  $k_{V_0} + \mathcal{M}_V$  terms.

Incorporating all generational contributions and including the summation over derived lines, we obtain the global bound:

$$(98) \quad \left[ \prod_{V \in \mathbf{V}_1} k_V^2 \right] \left[ \prod_{V \in \mathbf{V}_1} l_V^2 \right] \left[ \prod_{V \in \mathbf{V}} (k_{V_0} + \mathcal{M}_V)^2 \right] \leq e^{6k},$$

where  $k$  denotes the order of the tree  $\vartheta$ .

## REFERENCES

- [Ban88] V. Bangert. *Mather sets for twist maps and geodesics on tori*. Dynamics Reported 1 (1988), 1-45.
- [BG99] A. Berretti, G. Gentile. *Scaling Properties for the Radius of Convergence of a Lindstedt Series: The Standard Map*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 78 (1999), no. 2, 159-176.
- [BG00] A. Berretti, G. Gentile. *Scaling properties for the radius of convergence of Lindstedt series: generalized standard maps*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 79 (2000), no. 7, 691-713.
- [BG01] A. Berretti, G. Gentile. *Bryuno function and the standard map*. Comm. Math. Phys., 220 (2001), no. 3, 623-656.
- [BG02] A. Berretti, G. Gentile. *Periodic and quasi-periodic orbits for the standard map*. Comm. Math. Phys. 231 (2002), no. 1, 135-156.
- [Bes01] U. Bessi. *An analytic counterexample to the KAM theorem*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 20 (2000), 317-333.
- [Bir20] G. D. Birkhoff. *Surface transformations and their dynamical applications*. Acta Mathematicae 43 (1920) 44-47 Collected Mathematical Papers of G.D. Birkhoff, vol. II, p. 195-202, Dover, New York (1968).
- [BF19] A. Bounemoura and J. Féjoz. *KAM,  $\alpha$ -Gevrey regularity and the  $\alpha$ -Bruno-Rüssmann condition*. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 19 (2019), no. 4, 1225-1279.
- [CF94] L. Chierchia and C. Falcolini. *A direct proof of a theorem by Kolmogorov in Hamiltonian systems*. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 21 (1994), no. 4, 541-593.
- [CW13] C.-Q. Cheng and L. Wang. *Destruction of Lagrangian torus for positive definite Hamiltonian systems*. Geom. Funct. Anal. 23 (2013), 848-866.
- [Dav94] A. Davie. *The Critical Function for the Semistandard Map*. Nonlinearity 7, (1994), 219-229.
- [Eli96] H. Eliasson. *Absolutely convergent series expansions for quasi-periodic motions*. University of Stockholm preprint (1988), and Math. Phys. Elect. J. 2, No. 4 (1996),

- [For94] G. Forni. *Analytic destruction of invariant circles*. Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. 14 (1994), 267-298.
- [Gal93] G. Gallavotti. *Invariant tori: a field-theoretic point of view of Eliasson's work*. in Advances in dynamical systems and quantum physics (Capri, 1993), 117-132, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1995.
- [GM96] G. Gentile, V. Mastropietro. *Methods for the analysis of the Lindstedt series for KAM tori and renormalizability in classical mechanics*. A review with some applications, Rev. Math. Phys. 8 (1996), 393-444
- [GLW25] J. Guo, Y. Liu and L. Wang. *On non-KAM invariant circles for area-preserving twist maps*. arXiv:2510.21098 [math.DS].
- [Her79] M. R. Herman. *Sur la conjugation différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle à des rotations*. Publ. Math. IHES 49 (1979), 5-233.
- [Her83] M.R. Herman. *Sur les courbes invariantes par les difféomorphismes de l'anneau*. Astérisque 103-104 (1983), 1-221.
- [Her86] M. R. Herman. *Sur les courbes invariantes par les difféomorphismes de l'anneau*. Astérisque 144 (1986), 1-243.
- [Laz93] V. F. Lazutkin. *Recent results on the separatrix splitting for the standard map*. Séminaire de Théorie spectrale et géométrie, 11(1992-1993), 157-165
- [MS03] J. P. Marco and D. Sauzin. *Stability and instability for Gevrey quasi-convex near-integrable Hamiltonian systems*. Publ. Math. IHES 96 (2003), 199-275.
- [Mat87] J. N. Mather. *Modulus of continuity for Peierls's barrier*. Periodic Solutions of Hamiltonian Systems and Related Topics. ed. P.H.Rabinowitz *et al.* NATO ASI Series C 209. Reidel: Dordrecht, (1987), 177-202.
- [Mat88] J. N. Mather. *Destruction of invariant circles*. Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. 8 (1988), 199-214.
- [Mos62] J. Moser. *On invariant curves of area-preserving mappings of an annulus*. Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen, II. Math-Phys. Kl. 1 (1962), 1-20.
- [Rüs70] H. Rüssman. *Kleine Nenner. I. Über invariante Kurven differenzierbarer Abbildungen eines Kreisringes*. Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen Math.-Phys. Kl. II(1970), 67-105.
- [Rüs83] H. Rüssman. *On the existence of invariant curves of twist mappings of an annulus*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. 1007 (1983), 677-718.
- [Rüs91] H. Rüssman. *On the frequencies of quasi-periodic solutions of nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems*. Euler International Mathematical Institute, St. Petersburg, Dynamical Systems, 14-27 October 1991.
- [Sie42] C. Siegel. *Iteration of analytic functions*. Ann. of Math. (2) 43 (1942), 607-612.
- [Wan12] L. Wang. *Variational destruction of invariant circles*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 32 (2012), 4429-4443.
- [Wan15] L. Wang. *Destruction of invariant circles for Gevrey area-preserving twist maps*. J. Dynam. Differential Equations, 27 (2015), 283-295.
- [Wan22] L. Wang. *Quantitative destruction of invariant circles*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 42 (2022), 1569-1583.
- [Wan23] L. Wang. *Quantitative Destruction and Persistence of Lagrangian Torus in Hamiltonian Systems*. arXiv:2312.01695v3 [math.DS]
- [Yoc84] J.-C. Yoccoz. *Conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle dont le nombre de rotation vérifie une condition diophantienne*. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 17 (1984), no. 3, 333-359.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING 100081, CHINA  
 Email address: yiliu111@foxmail.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING 100081, CHINA  
 Email address: lwang@bit.edu.cn