

THE DERIVATION OF THE BOLTZMANN EQUATION FROM QUANTUM MANY-BODY DYNAMICS

XUWEN CHEN AND JUSTIN HOLMER

ABSTRACT. We consider the quantum many-body dynamics at the weak-coupling scaling. We derive rigorously the quantum Boltzmann equation, which contains the classical hard sphere model and, effectively, the inverse power law model, from the many-body dynamics assuming a physical and optimal regularity bound. The regularity bound we find, on the one hand, is satisfied by quasi-free solutions and comes from calculations regarding the local Maxwellian solution, in which we also prove that 2-body molecular chaos never happens unless $N = +\infty$; on the other hand, it arises from the well-posedness threshold of the limiting Boltzmann equation below which we prove ill-posedness. That is, the regularity cannot be higher at the N -body level, cannot be lower in the limit, and is hence a double criticality. To work with this borderline case, we analyze all four sides, with respect to the Fourier transform, of the BBGKY hierarchy sequence with new tools and techniques. We prove well-definedness, compactness, convergence, and uniqueness of hierarchies right at the criticality to complete an optimal derivation. In particular, we have proved that, for physical N -particle solutions, the Boltzmann equation emerges as the mean-field limit and time is hence irreversible, from first principles of quantum mechanics.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. The cycle regularity condition	7
1.2. Statement of the Main Theorem	10
1.3. Optimality of the Main Theorem	11
1.4. Incorporation of the hard-sphere and the inverse power law models	13
2. Proof of the Main Theorem	15
2.1. The quantum set-up and the trivial limit puzzle	15
2.2. Four sides of the Boltzmann equation	16
2.3. Proof of the Main Theorem	18
3. Preparation for N -body Analysis	23
3.1. BBGKY in the four spaces and basic operator estimates	23
3.2. Duhamel formulations	25
3.3. Collision operator $Q_N^{(k+1)}$	26
3.4. Remainder operator $R_N^{4(k+1)}$	29
3.5. Remainder operator $R_N^{5(k+2)}$	33

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35Q20, 76P05, 81Q05, 81T27, 81V70; Secondary 35A01, 35C05, 35R25, 82C40.

Key words and phrases. Quantum Boltzmann Equation, Weak-coupling limit, Quantum Many-body Dynamic, Hilbert's 6th Problem, Time Irreversibility.

3.6.	Limiting collision operator $Q^{(k+1)}$: definition and forms	38
3.7.	Limiting collision operator estimates	42
3.8.	Permutation coordinates and associated norms	47
3.9.	Estimates in permutation coordinates for $k = 1$	50
4.	Compactness of the BBGKY Family	61
5.	Convergence to the Boltzmann Hierarchy	65
6.	Unconditional Uniqueness of the Boltzmann Hierarchy	72
6.1.	Proof of the Klainerman-Machedon board game	75
6.2.	Bilinear estimates	81
6.3.	Iteration of bilinear estimates	84
7.	Justification of Physicality: Regularity from the Local Maxwellian Viewpoint	86
7.1.	A N -body construction of the local Maxwellian	87
7.2.	The structure of marginals $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$	91
7.3.	Effect of collisions	94
8.	Proof of Optimality: Well/Ill-posedness Separation of the Limit Equation	97
8.1.	Well-posedness	97
8.2.	Ill-posedness	100
	References	102

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1872, Boltzmann devised the now so-called Boltzmann (transport) equation, a fundamental equation in kinetic theory which describes the time-evolution of the statistical behavior of a thermodynamic system away from a state of equilibrium in the mesoscopic regime, accounting for both dispersion under the free flow and dissipation as the result of collisions. Let the probability distribution for the position and velocity of a typical particle be denoted by f . Under the molecular chaos assumption, he wrote the collision as

$$Q(f, f) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u - v| I(|u - v|, \omega) [f(u^*)f(v^*) - f(u)f(v)] dud\omega$$

where I is the differential cross section of the collision, u, v are the incoming velocities for a pair of particles, $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^2$ is a parameter for the deflection angle in the collision of these particles, and the outgoing velocities are u^*, v^* :

$$(1.1) \quad u^* = u + [\omega \cdot (v - u)]\omega \quad \text{and} \quad v^* = v - [\omega \cdot (v - u)]\omega.$$

Together with the transport part, the Boltzmann equation reads

$$(1.2) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f = Q(f, f) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{1+6}.$$

Equation (1.2) sits between the law of motion of the microscopic particles (atoms, molecules, ...) and the macroscopic phenomena (and is hence called mesoscopic). For example, the Navier–Stokes equations and the Euler equations in fluid dynamics are special limits of (1.2).

(See, e.g. [54, 69] for a physics oriented and [81] for a mathematics oriented discussion.) Moreover, it naturally carries the nondecreasing quantity, entropy, written as

$$S = - \int f \ln f dv$$

in the Gibbs entropy form. That is, equation (1.2) is time irreversible while the laws of motion of the microscopic particles are time reversible. Thus, rigorously justifying the emergence of (1.2) from first principles of the microscopic mechanics connects the microscopic and macroscopic theories and establishes time irreversibility, and is hence a fundamental problem.


This problem is also specifically mentioned in Hilbert's explanation to his 6th problem. The explicit statement of the 6th problem of Hilbert, raised in 1900, reads:

Mathematical Treatment of the Axioms of Physics. The investigations on the foundations of geometry suggest the problem: To treat in the same manner, by means of axioms, those physical sciences in which already today mathematics plays an important part; in the first rank are the theory of probabilities and mechanics.

Hilbert gave the further explanation of this problem and its possible specific forms as the following:

As to the axioms of the theory of probabilities, it seems to me desirable that their logical investigation should be accompanied by a rigorous and satisfactory development of the method of mean values in mathematical physics, and in particular in the kinetic theory of gases. . . . Boltzmann's work on the principles of mechanics suggests the problem of developing mathematically the limiting processes, there merely indicated, which lead from the atomistic view to the laws of motion of continua.

One version of the contemporary understanding of the program is the following.



Here, there is not a definitive answer to the so called “first time irreversible model”, and that is why some surveys (e.g. [2, 87]) about time irreversibility state that deriving the Boltzmann equation for a long time (from N -body systems) would prove the time irreversibility but proving time irreversibility may not require the derivation of the Boltzmann equation.

In this paper, we consider part of the problem. We consider the rigorous derivation of a version of the Boltzmann equation (1.2) and hence the time irreversibility from quantum N -body dynamics.

It is evident that the “mechanics” and the “atomistic view” in Hilbert's explanation should be Newtonian mechanics (it may mean specifically the hard sphere model, but that is much less clear) as quantum mechanics was still one of the two “clouds”¹ described by Lord Kelvin

¹There are many versions of the record in many different textbooks and papers. But all of them says one “cloud” became relativity and the other “cloud” became quantum mechanics.

in April of the same year 1900. Again at the same year, Planck produced the now called Planck's law and quantum theory was born. Hence, Hilbert could not have had accounted for another development in his 1900 statement, that is, the existence of a more accurate time-reversible but probabilistic microscopic theory, since the probabilistic interpretation of the wave function was only raised by Born [10] in 1926.² While quantum theory has become the concurrently most accurate microscopic model, any modern understanding of Hilbert's program should allow quantum theory, in which the probabilistic feature is an axiom but the time-irreversibility problem stands still, to be a microscopic starting point, as well as Newtonian mechanics.

On the other hand, deriving (1.2) from quantum theory sounds like an even more challenging problem as (1.2) is largely regarded as classical. Because it has been proven many times that there is no obvious gap between quantum theory and classical mechanics, there is no reason not to use a more accurate model. For example, one could derive the Euler equations directly from quantum N -body dynamics without passing through any Boltzmann equations [38, 39, 42, 73].³ Interestingly, in 1877, Boltzmann also suggested that the energy of a particle could be discrete; in 1896, he replied to Zermelo [9, Vol. III, paper 119] that “the Maxwell distribution law (and hence the Boltzmann theory) is not a theorem from ordinary mechanics⁴ and cannot be proven from mechanical assumptions”.⁵ In fact, the large number of quantum “dice”,⁶ might contribute to the time irreversibility. (See also, the on-going development of quantum thermodynamics and hence entropy, in for example, [60, 89].)

We denote the microscopic interparticle interaction by the 2-body radial interaction ϕ . As assumed in basic kinetic theory, the interaction should be repelling ($\phi > 0$) if the distance between 2 particles is small while it should be attractive ($\phi < 0$) if the distance is large. We further assume that $\int \phi = 0$ to avoid zero momentum exchanges. While $\int \phi \neq 0$ is certainly allowed in quantum mechanics⁷, our desired limit is classical and hence the model has to be compatible with it.

Put $\mathbf{y}_N = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ as the position vector of N particles in \mathbb{R}^3 . We write the N -body Hamiltonian at the weak-coupling scaling as

$$(1.3) \quad H_{N,\varepsilon} = \sum_{j=1}^N -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta_{y_j} + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \phi\left(\frac{y_i - y_j}{\varepsilon}\right) \text{ with } N = \varepsilon^{-3}.$$

Denoting the k -th marginal densities by $\gamma_N^{(k)}$, we consider the N -body dynamic

$$(1.4) \quad i\varepsilon \partial_t \gamma_N^{(N)} = \left[H_{N,\varepsilon}, \gamma_N^{(N)} \right],$$

²The main object of study in our paper, the Schrödinger equations, are deterministic, and the probabilistic feature is an interpretation of the solutions.

³See also [51, 76, 77] for derivations of fluid equations directly from systems with probabilistic features.

⁴Judging from the time, this “ordinary mechanics” by Boltzmann should also mean Newtonian mechanics.

⁵These replies to Zermelo were recommended as “superbly clear and right on the money” by Lebowitz [70].

⁶Dice as described by Einstein.

⁷It is even one of the starting points, e.g. the hydrogen atom.

under the normalization condition that

$$\gamma_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{y}_k; \mathbf{y}_k) \geq 0 \text{ and } \int \gamma_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{y}_k; \mathbf{y}_k) d\mathbf{y}_k = 1,$$

and the symmetric condition that, $\forall \sigma \in S_k$, the permutation group of k -elements

$$\gamma_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{y}_k; \mathbf{y}'_k) = \gamma_N^{(k)}(y_{\sigma(1)} \cdots y_{\sigma(k)}; y'_{\sigma(1)} \cdots y'_{\sigma(k)}) \text{ and } \gamma_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{y}'_k; \mathbf{y}_k) = \overline{\gamma_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{y}_k; \mathbf{y}'_k)},$$

if $\gamma_N^{(k)}$ is put in kernel form.

We need the (x, v) phase space picture (to state the limit in the common format⁸), thus we consider the Wigner transform $\{f_N^{(k)}\}$ of $\{\gamma_N^{(k)}\}$ defined as

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} f_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) &= W_\varepsilon(\gamma_N^{(k)}) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{3k} \int e^{i\boldsymbol{\xi}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k} \gamma_N^{(k)}\left(\mathbf{x}_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\boldsymbol{\xi}_k; \mathbf{x}_k - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\boldsymbol{\xi}_k\right) d\boldsymbol{\xi}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Via direct computation, we have that the family $\{f_N^{(k)}\}$ solves the quantum Bogoliubov-Born-Green-Kirkwood-Yvon (BBGKY) hierarchy

$$(1.6) \quad \left(\partial_t + \sum_{j=1}^k v_j \cdot \nabla_{x_j}\right) f_N^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} A_\varepsilon^{(k)} f_N^{(k)} + \frac{N}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} B_\varepsilon^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)},$$

where the two inhomogeneous terms are given by

$$A_\varepsilon^{(k)} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} A_{i,j}^\varepsilon, \text{ if } k \geq 2, \text{ and } A_\varepsilon^{(1)} = 0,$$

$$B_\varepsilon^{(k+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^k B_{j,k+1}^\varepsilon,$$

with

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} A_{i,j}^\varepsilon f_N^{(k)} &= \frac{-i}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dh e^{\frac{ih \cdot (x_i - x_j)}{\varepsilon}} \hat{\phi}(h) \\ & f_N^{(k)}\left(t, \mathbf{x}_k, v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_i - \sigma \frac{h}{2}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_{j-1}, v_j + \sigma \frac{h}{2}, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_k\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} B_{j,k+1}^\varepsilon f_N^{(k+1)} &= \frac{-i}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dx_{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dv_{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dh e^{\frac{ih \cdot (x_j - x_{k+1})}{\varepsilon}} \hat{\phi}(h) \\ & f_N^{(k+1)}\left(t, \mathbf{x}_k, x_{k+1}, v_1, \dots, v_{j-1}, v_j - \sigma \frac{h}{2}, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_{k+1} + \sigma \frac{h}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This model has been studied by many prominent authors in both the inhomogeneous and the homogeneous cases. See, for example, [6–8] by Benedetto, Castella, Esposito, and Pulvirenti and [47] by Erdős, Salmhofer and Yau. One of the original motivation was the possibility of the emergence of the Uehling-Uhlenbeck equation [86] in the quasi-free case. It

⁸We actually work in 4 representations of the problem.

was X.Chen and Guo [25] who noticed that is not possible formally. Then, for the spatial homogeneous case, under the quasi-free assumption at the initial condition, T.Chen and Hott [20] proved that quasi-freeness persists approximately in time and that the conclusion in [25] holds. Moreover, they found a density condition such that the Uehling-Uhlenbeck equation emerges.

We use the casual A, B notation for the two inhomogeneous terms in (1.6) as they individually do not generate the Boltzmann collision kernel and they tend to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ if applied to smooth functions. This is very different from the usual hierarchy analysis in which a formal limit is first found in the smooth setting without well-definedness issues, and was raised as a question in [6] and more specifically [8, p.11]. We answer this question in detail during the proof. In short, the answer would be, in order to arise from an N -body solution, $f_N^{(k)}$ must satisfy a physically reasonable regularity requirement related to quantum quasi-freeness, under which the B term will not tend to 0 (though without a clear form for the limit due to the effect of the irregular parts making the hierarchy unbalanced.) Then, another coupling provides a balanced hierarchy mainly on the core part and a recognizable limit via a special combination of A and B while the irregular effects vanish. This is also a reason and benefit that one works in the critical regularity, which also happens to be physical for this problem.

Another problem of the analysis of hierarchy (1.6) is that it is not clear if hierarchy (1.6) is a well-defined equation and if $f_N^{(k)}$ is nonnegative real-valued immediately from its definition, being the Wigner transform⁹ of (1.4). See, for example, the dv_{k+1} integration in (1.8) and the i 's in (1.7) and (1.8). It turns out that the functions spaces we are forced to work in, to be compatible with the quantum quasi-freeness, is also where hierarchy (1.6) is at the borderline of well-definedness, and this is one aspect of the optimality of our derivation.

Our target is the following quantum version of (1.2)

$$(1.9) \quad (\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x) f = Q(f, f)$$

in which the quantum collision operator Q is given by

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{aligned} Q(f, g) &\equiv Q^+(f, g) - Q^-(f, g) \\ &= \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} du \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} dS_\omega |\omega \cdot (v - u)| \left| \hat{\phi}((\omega \cdot (v - u)) \omega) \right|^2 \\ &\quad [f(t, x, v^*) g(t, x, u^*) - f(t, x, v) g(t, x, u)]. \end{aligned}$$

which would arise as the “not-so-obvious” mean-field limit of hierarchy (1.6). As pointed out in [8], the classical collision cross section in (1.10) proves the macroscopic effects of quantum microscopic interaction, it directly shows a transition rate which is independent of time and is proportional to the strength of the coupling between the initial and final densities of states of the system, and it is hence a representation of the “Fermi Golden Rule” which is the quantum version of “Stosszahlansatz” in the physics point of view or time irreversibility.

⁹If one considers the Husimi transform instead, the marginals would be nonnegative but with more complicated equations. Thus, it is expected that $f_N^{(k)}$ is nonnegative (or provides nonnegative limits.)

1.1. The cycle regularity condition. We will work with hierarchy space-time bounds¹⁰ built to be compatible with the quantum quasi-freeness, which is required as $f_N^{(k)}$ are the Wigner transforms of quantum N -body states, and to be compatible with the single particle norms in the molecular chaos case $f^{(k)} = f^{\otimes k}$, which happens in the limit. As we are interested in $N \rightarrow \infty$ behaviors, we look for regularity conditions uniform in N (or for all large enough N). Though, for each N , $f_N^{(k)}$ could be a very smooth function, the uniform in N regularity of the family is in fact far from being high. Our main working space and topology, is based on the usual $H_x^r L_v^{2,s}$ norm, which, when defined for a single particle distribution function, is

$$\|f\|_{H_x^r L_v^{2,s}}^2 = \int |\langle \nabla_x \rangle^r \langle v \rangle^s f(x, v)|^2 dx dv.$$

Considering the limit, it is usually customary to work with space-time bounds like

$$(1.11) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{x_j} \rangle^r \langle v_j \rangle^s \right) f_N^{(k)} \right\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq C^k,$$

but the situation we consider in this paper requires us to work with a more general and less regular setting as assuming (1.11) will lead to a trivial limit if $r > 1$ (let alone it is in fact unphysical) or an ill-posed limiting equation (let alone things becoming not well-defined) if simply putting $r < 1$. In fact, the customary bound only holds at most for $r = \frac{3}{4}$ even when $f_N^{(k)}$ tends to a local Maxwellian.¹¹ We would need to work under a physical N -body regularity implied by the quantum quasi-free condition. As noted in much literature¹² the physical situation is quasi-free (or restricted quasi-free).

Denote π a permutation in the k -permutation group S_k , we assume the quantum BBGKY hierarchy sequence (1.6) has the wave packet structure that, at each time t , it decomposes into a sum

$$(1.12) \quad f_N^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{\pi \in S_k} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t)$$

(where each $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t)$ is not necessarily quasi-free) and we assume the regularity that, there exists a constant C so that

$$(1.13) \quad \forall N \geq 0, t \in [0, T], \pi \in S_k, \quad \text{we have} \quad \|f_{N,\pi}(t)\|_{X_\pi} \leq C^k$$

where the norm X_π is specified below. In the decomposition (1.12), the term $f_{N,I}$ corresponding to the identity $\pi = I$ is called the *core* term, and the analysis ultimately shows that it is the only term that has a nontrivial limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and the terms $f_{N,\pi}(t)$ with $\pi \neq I$ are called “irregular” (in terms of the customary bounds (1.11)) or “cycle” terms. It is not assumed that the decomposition (1.12) is unique.

¹⁰As pointed out by Cercignani, this is one important part of the hierarchy analysis.

¹¹ $r = \frac{3}{4}$ also happens to be the regularity we need to prove the emergence of the collision kernel.

¹²See, for example, [8, p.4], [47, p.2], and [61].

For the core term $f_{N,I}^{(k)}$, we assume the $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,\frac{1}{2}+} \cap L_v^{\infty,2+} \cap L_v^1)$ energy condition, that is, there exists a $C > 0$ independent of k or N such that, $\forall k > 0$, we have

$$(1.14) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{x_j} \rangle^{1+} \langle v_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \right) f_{N,I}^{(k)} \right\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \leq C^k,$$

$$(1.15) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{x_j} \rangle^{1+} \langle v_j \rangle^{2+} \right) f_{N,I}^{(k)} \right\|_{L_x^2(L_v^\infty)} \leq C^k,$$

$$(1.16) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{x_j} \rangle^{1+} \right) f_{N,I}^{(k)} \right\|_{L_x^2 L_v^1} \leq C^k.$$

On the other hand, though they are considered errors to the core term $f_{N,I}^{(k)}$ and will vanish in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit process, the cycle terms $f_{N,\pi}(t)$ with $\pi \neq I$, are irregular in the sense that (1.11) only holds with $r = \frac{3}{4}$ even in the local Maxwellian case. However, they can be up to H^{1+} in what we call the permutation coordinates depending on the permutation π . That is why we call them the cycle terms.

The cycle coordinates are actually coordinates such that the operator $\sum_{j=1}^k v_j \cdot \nabla_{x_j}$ is invariant. To explain it, it is easier to go back to the Schrödinger picture (1.3)-(1.4) in which the hyperbolic Laplacian reads

$$\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\Delta_{y'_j} - \Delta_{y_j} \right).$$

Given $\pi \in S_k$, define the cycle coordinates by

$$(1.17) \quad p_j^\pi = y'_j + y_{\pi(j)} \quad q_j^\pi = (y'_j - y_{\pi(j)})/\varepsilon,$$

Then the hyperbolic Laplacian and the evolution become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^k (\Delta_{y'_j} - \Delta_{y_j}) &= \sum_{j=1}^k \nabla_{p_j} \cdot \nabla_{q_j} \\ e^{\frac{1}{4} i \varepsilon t (\Delta_{y'_k} - \Delta_{y_k})} &= e^{i t \nabla_{p_k} \cdot \nabla_{q_k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the fact that, the Wigner transform (1.5) is but a Fourier transform with shifts, if we denote ξ the inverse Fourier variable to v , then $\sum_{j=1}^k v_j \cdot \nabla_{x_j}$ in (1.6) becomes $\sum_{j=1}^k \nabla_{\xi_j} \cdot \nabla_{x_j}$ with

$$x_j = y'_j + y_j \quad \xi_j = (y'_j - y_j)/\varepsilon.$$

That is, the (x, v) coordinate is the special $\pi = I$ case of the cycle coordinates (1.17).

For $\pi \neq I$, we assume the H^{1+} cycle regularity that, there exists $C > 0$ independent of π , k or N , such that

$$(1.18) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{p_j^\pi} \rangle^{1+} \right) (W_\varepsilon^{-1} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}) \right\|_{L_{p^\pi, q^\pi}^2} \leq C^k$$

where W_ε^{-1} is the inverse Wigner transform which takes the (x, v) picture back to the (y, y') picture and the derivative and integrations are in (1.17) coordinates. It is pretty low and not

in the usual coordinates. But there are some extra good things about the cycle / irregular terms.

The cycle terms are representations of a type of quantum symmetry. We can quantify such symmetries. Given $\pi \neq I$ in which (i_π, j_π) is a 2-cycle in its cycle decomposition, we define the interchange/substitution operator $T_{(i_\pi, j_\pi)}$ acting on the function $\tilde{g}^{(k)}$ with $(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi)$ variables by

$$T_{(i_\pi, j_\pi)} \tilde{g}^{(k)}(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi) = \tilde{g}^{(k)}((i_\pi, j_\pi) \mathbf{p}_k^\pi, (i_\pi, j_\pi) \mathbf{q}_k^\pi),$$

that is, $T_{(i_\pi, j_\pi)}$ interchanges the $(p_{i_\pi}^\pi, q_{i_\pi}^\pi)$ and $(p_{j_\pi}^\pi, q_{j_\pi}^\pi)$ variables inside the function $\tilde{g}^{(k)}$. Let

$$W_\varepsilon^{-1} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{y}'_k) = \tilde{g}_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi),$$

then $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$ has the symmetry measurement¹³ that,

$$(1.19) \quad \sup_t \left\| \left\langle \nabla_{p_{j_\pi}^\pi} \right\rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \left(\tilde{g}_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi) - T_{(i_\pi, j_\pi)} \tilde{g}^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi) \right) \right\|_{L_{p_{j_\pi}^\pi, q_{j_\pi}^\pi}^2} \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_t \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \left\langle \nabla_{p_j^\pi} \right\rangle^{1+} \right) (W_\varepsilon^{-1} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}) \right\|_{L_{p^\pi, q^\pi}^2}$$

Moreover, due to the high number of collisions of our model and hence high number of interactions between the cycle terms and the core term, we have many times in $[0, T]$ such that the symmetry strengthens (actually “jitters”¹⁴ as explained in §7.) To realize such a symmetry strengthening (gain), we would like to assume that for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a subset $E_\varepsilon \subset [0, T]$ such that, given any open interval I_ε with length at least $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have $E_\varepsilon \cap I_\varepsilon$ is nonempty, and for each $t_0 \in E_\varepsilon$, we have the symmetry difference strengthens to,

$$(1.20) \quad \left\| \left\langle \nabla_{p_{j_\pi}^\pi} \right\rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \left(\tilde{g}_N^{(k)}(t_0, \mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi) - T_{(i_\pi, j_\pi)} \tilde{g}^{(k)}(t_0, \mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi) \right) \right\|_{L_{(p_{j_\pi}^\pi, q_{j_\pi}^\pi)}^2} \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^\mu \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \left\langle \nabla_{p_j^\pi} \right\rangle^{1+} \right) (W_\varepsilon^{-1} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}) \right\|_{L_{p^\pi, q^\pi}^2}.$$

for some $\mu > \frac{1}{2}$.

The assumptions above certainly need more explanation. We will justify why the regularities cannot be higher or lower and how the permutation coordinates come in via sharp technical estimates, ill-posedness results, and matching computations regarding constructions of the local Maxwellian from quantum N -body solutions, throughout the whole paper and more specifically in §3.8-3.9 and §7. In particular, our assumptions hold (and are implied) if $f_N^{(k)}(t)$ is generalized quasi-free, or just quasi-free. That is, our assumptions is general and covers the physical cases.

¹³It is a measurement of symmetry as (1.19) would be zero if $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$ is fully symmetric.

¹⁴“Jitters” as in electrical engineering (EE).

1.2. Statement of the Main Theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Main Theorem). *Let $\{f_N^{(k)}\}$ be the N -body dynamic given by the BBGKY hierarchy (1.6) with a pair interaction ϕ in Schwartz class with zero integration and $\hat{\phi}$ vanishes at zero up to the 1st order. Assume*

(i) *The initial datum to (1.6) is of asymptotic molecular chaos, that is, for some one-particle density $f_0(x, v) \in H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$, for all k , we have,*

$$(1.21) \quad f_N^{(k)}|_{t=0} \rightharpoonup \prod_{j=1}^k f_0(x, v) \text{ weakly in } L_{x_k}^2 L_{v_k}^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

(ii) *In the time interval $[0, T]$, $f_N^{(k)} \geq 0$.*

(iii) *In the time interval $[0, T]$, the sequence $\left\{ \left\{ f_N^{(k)} \right\}_{k=1}^N \right\}_{N=1}^\infty$ satisfies the cycle regularity condition specified in §1.1.*

Then we have propagation of chaos that $\forall k$ and $\forall t \in [0, T]$

$$(1.22) \quad f_N^{(k)}(t) \rightharpoonup \prod_{j=1}^k f(t, x, v) \text{ weakly in } L_{x_k}^2 L_{v_k}^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $f \in H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$ solves (1.9) with initial condition $f|_{t=0}(x, v) = f_0(x, v)$. Moreover, if $f_0 \in L_{x,v}^1$, then the concluded limit $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N^{(k)}(t) \in L_{x,v}^1$.

We have not assumed the well-posedness of (1.9) in $[0, T]$ in the statement of Theorem 1.1. On the one hand, we prove a local $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,0+}) \cap H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$ unconditional well-posedness result for (1.9). On the other hand, the limit process actually generates a $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$ solution $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N^{(1)}(t)$ to (1.9) and is hence the only possible everywhere in time solution subject to the initial condition at this regularity. This is not surprising due to two reasons: (1) it is known that if the initial datum takes the form of (1.21) then the first marginal of the infinite Boltzmann hierarchy (2.5) is a formal solution to (1.9); (2) due to our method, if, *a priori*, the $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$ norm of solution(s) to (1.9) (if exists) is known to be finite in $[0, T]$, one can construct a $C([0, T], H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}))$ solution to (1.9).¹⁵

From the above discussion, our proof of Theorem 1.1 does not directly rely on (1.21) to conclude a limit exists for the BBGKY sequence. That is indeed the case.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $\{f_N^{(k)}\}$ be the N -body dynamic given by the BBGKY hierarchy (1.6) with a pair interaction ϕ in Schwartz class with zero integration and $\hat{\phi}$ vanishes at zero up to the 1st order. Assume (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 1.1 and*

(i') *The initial datum to (1.6) has a $L_x^2 L_v^2$ weak limit which is in $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$, that is there is a family $\{f_0^{(k)}\}$ such that*

$$(1.23) \quad f_N^{(k)}|_{t=0} \rightharpoonup f_0^{(k)} \text{ weakly in } L_{x_k}^2 L_{v_k}^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

¹⁵See [41] for the global well-posedness at such low regularities which is also sharp as ill-posedness starts to happen below it.

for some $f_0^{(k)}$ satisfying the customary bound (1.11) with $r = 1+$ and $s = \frac{1}{2}+$. Then there is a unique family $\{f^{(k)}\}$ in $[0, T]$ such that $\forall k$ and $\forall t \in [0, T]$

$$(1.24) \quad f_N^{(k)}(t) \rightharpoonup f^{(k)} \text{ weakly in } L_{\mathbf{x}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and $\{f^{(k)}\}$ solves the infinite quantum Boltzmann hierarchy (2.5) with initial condition $f^{(k)}|_{t=0}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = f_0^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)$ and satisfies the customary bound (1.11) with $r = 1+$ and $s = \frac{1}{2}+$.

1.3. Optimality of the Main Theorem. The derivation in Theorem 1.1 is optimal. The low regularity setting (1.12)-(1.20) is physically required and a mathematically critical spot needed for a long time derivation as we explain below. We remark that assuming instead, finite second moments like energy and variance, will not lower the requirement. On the other hand, interestingly, assuming much more smoothness does not help to simplify the argument and might even run into the problem that it forces (1.6) to have a trivial limit as pointed out in [6, 8] (and is in fact nonphysical). As usual, the critical regularity argument tells most of the story and high regularity theory actually relies on it.

It is self-evident that the justification of any mean-field limits should be settled in settings pertinent to their physical backgrounds which have made these problems fundamental. We calculate in §7 that, for the quantum N -body density $f_N^{(k)}$ to converge to a local Maxwellian, the most well-known stable solution to (1.9), as $N \rightarrow \infty$, the regularity of $f_N^{(k)}$ checks our assumptions in §1.1 and cannot be higher. In fact, we prove in Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.13, that if $f_N^{(k)}$ was a bit more regular, then the B term in (1.8) tends to zero and the limit of (1.6) is trivial. Thus our regularity assumption is physical and is even at the critical physical regularity. It is usually expected that the critical physical regularity is set higher than the lowest regularity¹⁶ reachable by mathematics proofs after one sees the formal limit assuming a high regularity. That is not the case here and we are in a physically enforced low regularity situation. Moreover, as suggested by the first ill-posedness result regarding the Boltzmann equation in [36] by the authors, and as explained below, the problem studied in this paper happens to have these two regularities coincide and thus creates a double criticality and makes things extremely delicate and difficult.¹⁷

After showing the regularity assumptions are physical and cannot be higher, one needs to have a corresponding and compatible low regularity theory for the N -body analysis and the limiting Boltzmann equation (1.9) so that, in the end, one could identify the N -body limit with (1.9). To start, one needs to prove hierarchy (1.6) and equation (1.9) are well-defined as PDEs under this low regularity. A good parallel problem to the general audience is the well-definedness problem of the free boundaries in the hard sphere models [15, 52, 68] when N is finite. To this end, the $L_v^{\infty, 2}$ part can be seen from hierarchy (1.6); the $L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}$ part can be better understood in the analysis of the limiting hierarchy (2.5) and equation (1.9) at the collision operator (1.10), mainly due to the “all integrals are well-defined” confusion caused

¹⁶Depending on the systems, some might be known, some might still be unknown.

¹⁷If one considers the particle system as a dynamical system, it's known that the analysis gets more and more rigid as regularity drops.

by the Schwartz assumption on the interaction potential ϕ ; away from the quantum N -body requirement, the H_x^{1+} part is actually caused by both the well-definedness of the x -trace in the hierarchy definition and the collision operator (1.10), but it is easier to realize it from the definition of the solution. We refer readers to §3-5 for the details.

Once the well-definedness of hierarchy (1.6) and equation (1.9) is settled, we need to prove the solutions being discussed to hierarchy (1.6) and equation (1.9) solve these PDEs everywhere in time. That is, an almost everywhere in time with respect to some measure solution is not acceptable since it would be kind of weird that the laws in physics only hold with respect to some measure. It is better to see this from the well-posedness theory of equation (1.9) in §8: equation (1.9) is in fact locally well-posed in $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,0+})$ but such solutions would only solve the PDE a.e. in time, while $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,0+}) \cap H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+}(L_v^{2,\frac{1}{2}+})$ is the borderline regularity to solve the PDE everywhere in time. $(H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,0+}) \cap H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+}(L_v^{2,\frac{1}{2}+}))$ is also the borderline regularity for equation (1.9) to be unconditionally well-posed.¹⁸⁾

Last but not least, the limiting equation must be well-posed in the working space as well. Here, by well-posedness, we mean existence, uniqueness and the uniform continuity of the datum to solution map. It is well known that, for large k , limits like (1.22) are not stable in norms against small perturbations. If the solution map for equation (1.9) is not uniformly continuous, then the targeted limit (1.22) and the believed approximation, hierarchy (1.6), could change very much as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and invalidate the limit process. In §8, we prove equation (1.9) is locally well-posed in $H_x^s(L_v^{2,0+})$ for all $s > 1$ and ill-posed in $H_x^s(L_v^{2,s_1})$ for any $s < 1$ and all $s_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$.^{19,20} That is, we are indeed working at the borderline of well-posedness of equation (1.9). We remark that, the low regularity well-posedness for (1.9) here is required to identify the N -body limit and (1.9) because, physically, the N -body limit process has to be done at such a low regularity though the limit itself could be very smooth like the local Maxwellian. It just also happens that it is also the sharp well/ill-posedness separation point.²¹

The L^2 weak limit in Theorem 1.1 cannot be upgraded to strong either. The cycle terms with $\pi \neq I$, are $O(1)$ in L^2 (the Jacobian is $O(1)$). The weak limit is only possible because the $O(1)$ sized quasifree terms are geometrically stretched. More specifically, an $O(1)$ ball

¹⁸T. Kato raised the unconditional well-posedness notion in 1995 [62] when strong but a.e. in time solutions became popular. So far, all unconditional well-posedness, even for NLS and NLW, were proved for everywhere in time solutions.

¹⁹The “bad” implosion solution family we consider has uniformly bounded second moments, so assuming in addition finite second moments will not improve.

²⁰Though implosion solutions cause blow ups for the compressible Euler equations, as proved here and first by [36], they are no problem for (1.9), except norm deflations causing ill-posedness at low regularity. We thank Jiajie Chen for discussion related to this matter.

²¹Apparently, the N -body analysis requires such low regularity well-posedness results and thus provides the physical background for these results as well. T. Chen, Denlinger, and Pavlović [16–18] might be the first to systematically use dispersive analysis and reach such low regularity well-posedness for Boltzmann type equations, which is then proved to be the sharp well/ill-posedness separation points in [36] by X.C. and J.H. See [40, 41] for further developments along this line.

in $(\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{q}_k)$ space (coordinates depending on N) gets stretched and flattened upon transformation to $(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ in such a way that its intersection with an $O(1)$ ball in $(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ space has volume tending to 0.

We do admit that, it would be better to prove the energy assumptions (or (restricted) quasi-freeness)²² in Theorem 1.1 for a general class of initial data and could be considered a drawback. As explained and proven, these assumptions are the minimal and necessary requirement and the physical cases fit exactly here. As long as the assumption remains valid (which is the case for (generalized) quasifree solutions), the long time derivation of (1.9), and hence the time-irreversibility from the microscopic law of motion, is now justified. We also recall again Boltzmann's 1896 comment [9, Vol. III, paper 119] that “the Maxwell distribution law (and hence the Boltzmann theory) is not a theorem from ordinary mechanics and cannot be proven from mechanical assumptions”. The derivation in this paper automatically applies to any future work using higher regularities while a higher regularity is always more difficult to prove to hold than a lower one and may not be true physically (and might lead to trivial limits). Again, we point out in §7 that local Maxwellians, and their small perturbations, are qualified data for Theorem 1.1 in the limit, and we expect that, counting in the damping effects,²³ we will be able to prove the energy assumption for this class of datum and that is our next step.

1.4. Incorporation of the hard-sphere and the inverse power law models . Equation (1.9) incorporates the celebrated hard-sphere model and effectively the inverse power law model of power -1 (the $\gamma = -1$ model) at the same time. It extends both models and interconnects them together as temperature changes, as predicted in theoretical physics and observed in experiments.

For demonstration purposes, let us assume $|\hat{\phi}|^2$ is a bump function supported in $[\frac{\mathbf{c}_1}{2}, 2\mathbf{c}_2]$ and is 1 in $[\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2]$. Then the collision kernel in (1.10) equals exactly the hard sphere collision kernel $|v \cdot \omega|$ for $v \in [\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2]$. For the $\gamma = -1$ model part, it is not so obvious. It is easier to see this from the loss term. Consider the angular integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} dS_\omega |v \cdot \omega| \left| \hat{\phi}((\omega \cdot v) \omega) \right|^2,$$

for large $|v|$ in which $|\hat{\phi}|^2$ is like a bump function. For the integrand to be nonzero, one would need $\left| \omega \cdot \frac{v}{|v|} \right| = \cos \theta \sim 1/|v| \ll 1$. By the geometry, if say $\frac{v}{|v|}$ is pointing at the north pole, and ω is on \mathbb{S}^2 , then the set on \mathbb{S}^2 almost perpendicular to $\frac{v}{|v|}$ is basically the equator times the width $1/|v|$. Hence, the measure of the ω integration set is like $1/|v|$, thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} dS_\omega |v \cdot \omega| \left| \hat{\phi}((\omega \cdot v) \omega) \right|^2 \sim 1/|v|.$$

²²This is noted to be very difficult in [47, p.2]. Progress has been made in a similar situation in [20].

²³The equation derived from this physical model is with an angular cut-off, so we do not expect hypoelliptic structure(s) coming from the non-cut-off case. How to derive a non-cut-off equation which generated many nice work, for example, [1, 72], is also open.

That is, formally, we expect the $\gamma = -1$ model behaviors for large $|v|$. These two models have been tested countless times in their regimes of validity. The famous hard-sphere model is in the regime of moderate/atmospherical temperature, in which, it also implies the classical ideal gas laws and Newton's cooling law,^{24,25} and its rigorous derivation from Newtonian N -body dynamics has been studied in many work, see, for example, [15, 52, 68] using analytic methods (hence does not need *a priori* bounds and is up to a sufficiently small time). The $\gamma = -1$ model applies to high temperature situations while, to the best of the authors' knowledge, this paper offers the first rigorous derivation of an inverse power law model (effectively and with a cut-off though) from N -body systems.

Let us recall the fact that the mean speed of the molecules in a gas is proportional to the temperature and the speed is distributed fairly close to the mean speed with variance also proportional to the temperature. That is, equation (1.9) interconnects the hard-sphere and $\gamma = -1$ models in the sense (at least formally) that it behaves like the hard-sphere model at moderate/atmospherical temperature and the $\gamma = -1$ model at high²⁶ temperature.

The paper [26] by X. C. and L. He justifies mathematically the above observation on \mathbb{T}^3 . For initial condition near a Maxwellian, they prove that, for large²⁷ \mathbf{c}_2 , solutions to (1.9) and the hard-sphere model are close for a long time depending on \mathbf{c}_2 , and if $\mathbf{c}_1^{-1}, \mathbf{c}_2 \rightarrow \infty$, (1.9) converges to the hard sphere model. Moreover, they prove that, for fixed \mathbf{c}_2 and fixed background temperature, solutions to (1.9) will tend to equilibrium at a exponential rate (signature of the hard potentials and Maxwellian particles) for a long time depending on \mathbf{c}_2 and the background temperature, then at a polynomial rate (signature of soft potentials) determined by the datum's energy and the $\gamma = -1$ model. This hints at the physical fact that the specific heat capacity (and hence the adiabatic index) of matter increases as temperature increases (hence it takes longer to reach equilibrium).²⁸

That is, (1.9), derived from quantum N -body dynamics, in its regime of validity, rigorously interconnects and enhances the hard-sphere and the inverse power law models. A further goal is to uncover the physical meanings of \mathbf{c}_1 and \mathbf{c}_2 or, more specifically, to determine the empirical correspondence of regions in which $|\hat{\phi}|^2 \sim O(1)$ or $|\hat{\phi}|^2 \sim o(1)$. In general, there are many interpretations and models about the microscopic interactions, but experimental science tends to verify their effects and implications instead of providing a direct observational window. We plan to investigate how the heat capacity depends on \mathbf{c}_1 and \mathbf{c}_2 in (1.9). To gain more insight into this topic, a toy problem could be testing numerically if one could match more digits of the heat capacity using Boltzmann theory by varying \mathbf{c}_1 and \mathbf{c}_2 .

²⁴Both of them are known to be invalid outside of some temperature range so there is no contradiction.

²⁵The regime of validity of the ideal gas laws is well-known. The failure of the exponential to equilibrium law at high temperature might be first documented by Dalton [78].

²⁶The "high" here is relative as it is well below the noticeable ionization temperature $\sim 3 \times 10^3 \text{K}$ at which point some Vlasov theory comes into play.

²⁷This "large" is also relative as particle speeds in (1.9) and the hard-sphere model are all 4-5 digits smaller than the speed of light in reality and one could say they both have bounded collision kernels in practice. However, the unboundedness of the hard-sphere collision kernel has indeed motivated many innovations in mathematics theory and have propelled mathematics forward.

²⁸ H_2O could be the most checked example, though this has also been observed for He.

Acknowledgements. X.C. was supported in part by the NSF grant DMS-2005469 and the Simons Fellowship #916862. J.H. was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-2055072.

2. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

2.1. The quantum set-up and the trivial limit puzzle. Write the propagator as $S^{(k)}(t) \equiv \prod_{j=1}^k e^{-tv_j \cdot \nabla_{x_k}}$, we first rewrite (1.6) in Duhamel form:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f_N^{(k)}(t_k) &= S^{(k)}(t_k) f_N^{(k)}(0) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) A_\varepsilon^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}(t_{k+1}) dt_{k+1} \\ &\quad + \frac{N}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) B_\varepsilon^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1}) dt_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Iterating relation (2.1) once, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f_N^{(k)}(t_k) &= S^{(k)}(t_k) f_N^{(k)}(0) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) A_\varepsilon^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}(t_{k+1}) dt_{k+1} \\ &\quad + \frac{N}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) B_\varepsilon^{(k+1)} S^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1}) f_N^{(k+1)}(0) dt_{k+1} \\ &\quad + \frac{N}{\varepsilon} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) B_\varepsilon^{(k+1)} \left(\int_0^{t_{k+1}} S^{(k)}(t_{k+1} - t_{k+2}) A_\varepsilon^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(t_{k+2}) dt_{k+2} \right) dt_{k+1} \\ &\quad + \frac{N^2}{\varepsilon} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) B_\varepsilon^{(k+1)} \left(\int_0^{t_{k+1}} S^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1} - t_{k+2}) B_\varepsilon^{(k+2)} f_N^{(k+2)}(t_{k+2}) dt_{k+2} \right) dt_{k+1} \\ &\equiv S^{(k)}(t_k) f_N^{(k)}(0) + R_N^{2(k)} f_N^{(k)}(t_k) + R_N^{3(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(t_k) + (R_N^{4(k+1)} + Q_N^{(k+1)}) f_N^{(k+1)}(t_k) \\ &\quad + R_N^{5(k+2)} f_N^{(k+2)}(t_k). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} R_N^{4(k+1)}(t_k) &\equiv \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq k+1 \\ (i,j) \neq (\ell, k+1)}} R_{N,l,i,j}^{4(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(t_k) \\ &= \frac{N}{\varepsilon} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq k+1 \\ (i,j) \neq (\ell, k+1)}} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) B_{l,k+1}^\varepsilon \\ &\quad \left(\int_0^{t_{k+1}} S^{(k)}(t_{k+1} - t_{k+2}) A_{i,j}^\varepsilon f_N^{(k+1)}(t_{k+2}) dt_{k+2} \right) dt_{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.4) \quad Q_N^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(t_k) &\equiv \sum_{j=1}^k Q_{j,k+1}^\varepsilon f_N^{(k+1)}(t_k) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{N}{\varepsilon} \int_0^{t_k} S^{(k)}(t_k - t_{k+1}) B_{j,k+1}^\varepsilon \\
&\quad \left(\int_0^{t_{k+1}} S^{(k)}(t_{k+1} - t_{k+2}) A_{j,k+1}^\varepsilon f_N^{(k+1)}(t_{k+2}) dt_{k+2} \right) dt_{k+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hierarchies (2.1) and (2.2) are equivalent by definition. On the one hand, (2.2) is longer and more complicated than (2.1). On the other hand, testing the formal limit under smooth condition is usually the first thing to try in dealing with mean-field limits. Interestingly, for a very smooth $f_N^{(k)}$, the A, B terms in (2.1) actually tend to zero. In fact, one just needs the customary bound (1.11) to hold with $r > 1$, then $N\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}B$ and $\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}A$ tend to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, that is, (2.1) yields a trivial limit at regularity higher than H_x^{1+} . At the same time, (2.2) will produce a nontrivial limit with (1.9) as the mean-field equation if tested using smooth functions. While the Boltzmann equation (1.9) certainly does not agree with a trivial transport equation, the iteration of (2.1) yielding (2.2) also looks especially suspicious. This is the trivial limit puzzle stated in [6] and more specifically [8, p.11].

This puzzle should be the first thing to solve in the derivation of (1.9) and we answer it in detail in §7 and §3.9. It turns out, the quantum N -body solutions to (2.1) coming from (1.4) is not smooth at all. The simplest and nontrivial example is to check the regularity using the local Maxwellian. On the one hand, we prove that $f_N^{(k)}$ can never be a direct tensor product of local Maxwellians unless $N \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, we compute the expectations of the Sobolev regularity of the quantum N -body states converging to a direct tensor product of local Maxwellians and we found the regularity conditions in §1.1. This computation thus proves that the N -body solution cannot be more regular for the problem considered in this paper.²⁹ It also turns out that, if the solution is quantum quasi-free, then it satisfies the regularity conditions. That is, the low regularity setting we seek is not only mathematical, but also physical.

Under such physical regularity conditions, we prove that $N\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}B$ is actually an $O(1)$ quantity. That is, the limit is not trivial for solutions under the problem's setting. On the other hand, the limit of $N\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}B$ is unclear, thus we iterate (2.1) once to its equivalent form (2.2) from which we can conclude a cleanly formatted limit.³⁰ Thence the trivial limit puzzle is solved. (A more quantitative puzzle can be provided once one finishes §3.)

2.2. Four sides of the Boltzmann equation. As Theorem 1.1 is optimal, its proof is extremely rigid and tight. One needs to explore and invoke every ε room of play to avoid

²⁹One might argue that quantum states far away from the local Maxwellian might be even rougher, but it would result in the limiting equation being ill-posed and hence unlikely physically.

³⁰Such iterations of basic hierarchy yielding a manageable limit has a similar scenario in the NLS case, which is only formally realized by X.C. & J.H. in [35], (see also [42]), was implicitly used in [24, 28, 31], and might be first hinted in [22] by T. Chen & Pavlovic.

failing the proof or losing the optimality (and the physicality at the same time as they are tied together). One thing we do is to explore all four sides of the Boltzmann equation (not counting the cycle coordinates (1.17)).

The usual side (t, x, v) is associated with the kinetic transport operator $\partial_t + v \cdot \nabla_x$. To be very honest, they are not exactly used anywhere in our proof. We use this side solely to state the results in their usual format.

The (t, x, ξ) or the \sim side is associated with the hyperbolic symmetric Schrödinger operator $i\partial_t + \nabla_\xi \cdot \nabla_x$. We denote functions on this side with a \sim . It is obtained by applying the inverse Fourier transform to v of the usual (t, x, v) side. It is not new and has been used by many authors before. (See [16,17] for the Wigner transform version.) In our setting, this side sort of undoes the Wigner transform and gives a more Schrödinger-like equation for which there are Strichartz estimates [63]. One preconception about this side is that it requires the Fourier transform of the collision kernel, which is only explicit in some cases, to work. However, the vantage point of the equation $i\partial_t + \nabla_\xi \cdot \nabla_x$ suggests to consider estimates in the $X_{s,b}$ spaces which are carried out on the dual side and thus do not require computing the Fourier transform of the collision kernel. We study the remainder term $R_N^{2(k)}$ in (2.2) and the well/ill-posedness of (1.9) on this side. For the quasifree terms, the cycle coordinates (p^π, q^π) associated to a permutation π are also most naturally related to the (x, ξ) coordinates.

The (τ, η, v) or the \wedge side is associated with the multiplication operator $\tau + v \cdot \eta$. We denote functions on this side with a \wedge . It is obtained by applying the Fourier transform on (t, x) of the usual (t, x, v) side or on the whole (t, x, ξ) of the (t, x, ξ) side. That is, we construct the $X_{s,b}$ Fourier restriction norm spaces as in [5, 11, 66, 80] for (1.9), and prove multilinear estimates regarding Q in $X_{s,b}$, to obtain bilinear improvements over the Strichartz estimates in the (t, x, ξ) side. As one works on the characteristic surface on this side, it does not need the Fourier transform of the collision kernel and gives a direct treatment of the problem in terms of multilinear estimates without oscillation. This perspective was used in [36] to obtain the first separation of well/ill-posedness of Boltzmann type equations. A drawback is that direct analysis can involve numerous cases and technical geometrical decompositions. We use this side to deal with one of the difficulties, the so called remainder term $R_N^{5(k)}$ in (2.2).

The (t, η, ξ) or the \vee side is associated with the intertwined kinetic transport operator $\partial_t + \eta \cdot \nabla_\xi$. We denote functions on this side with a \vee , and it is obtained by applying the Fourier transform to x of the (t, x, ξ) side. We find the representation of the B operator on this side more convenient, especially when B is composed with other operators (Duhamel, an A , or another B). This side has oscillatory terms but most of them vanish in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit, meaning that these oscillations cannot be important for uniform estimates. We carry out many key N -body estimates and estimates regarding the collision kernel on this side. It is still a bit mysterious why this is effective while the other transport side (x, v) typically involves oscillations that cannot be ignored. Even more unexpected is that we found, in the uniqueness proof, an application of the so-called kinetic transport Strichartz estimates [12, 13, 75] on this side although they were originally conceived for application on the usual (t, x, v) transport side. This side might need further investigation in the future.

Before we start the proof of the main theorem, an interesting point to reflect upon is whether these four sides provide new information or if they can shed light on the classical hard-sphere model. The (τ, η, v) and (t, η, ξ) sides seem very difficult to define in the hard-sphere model, due to the freely moving billiards and their free boundaries in space. That is, even in terms of techniques, the quantum problem here is indeed very different from the classical problem. Each has its own beauty although the quantum problem should ultimately incorporate the classical problem in a limiting regime as explained in §1.4. Maybe one could understand the hard sphere model better by changing the model a bit to define the (τ, η, v) and (t, η, ξ) sides.

2.3. Proof of the Main Theorem. Having given an overview of the trivial limit puzzle and the existence of solutions with suitable regularity, we now turn to a discussion of the proof.

Due to the double criticality – the N -body solution cannot carry higher regularity and the limiting Boltzmann equation cannot admit lower regularity as one has to stay physical and the other one has to remain well-posed – there are few off-the-shelf lemmas available to employ. A problem sharing similar “endpoint” flavor is the derivation of the H^1 -critical NLS at H^1 -regularity [33, 34] by X.C. and J.H., which was constructed on the scaffold of prior work [19, 21–24, 27–32, 35, 37, 42, 43, 53, 57, 58, 64, 67, 82] by many authors, on the derivation of the H^1 -subcritical NLS at H^1 -regularity with the hierarchy method, pioneered by Erdős, Schlein, and Yau [48–50]. However, even at the critical level, the structures, methodologies, and analysis of the Boltzmann equation and NLS are totally different. For example, unlike the NLS cases, we do not have a “subcritical” case to refer to, and the Boltzmann equations’ well-posedness threshold does not lie at the scaling criticality.³¹ Thus, we have to build much of our analysis from scratch.

2.3.1. Step 1. Preparation of the N -body analysis and estimates of term sizes in §3. Recall that the BBGKY family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N = \{f_N^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ satisfies hierarchy (2.2) under the (cycle) regularity conditions specified in §1.1, and the main object of study is the limit of f_N if there is one. The first step is analyzing the sizes of the terms in (2.2), which are all highly oscillatory integrals on the (x, v) side, so that one can arrange the proof later. This is where the four sides in §2.2 naturally come in for estimating and comparing. This is done in §3.

We warm up by estimating the $\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}A$ operator in the (x, ξ) side in Lemma 3.1. We can immediately see that the (x, ξ) representation is more convenient than the (x, v) representation. For $\frac{3}{4}$ derivatives which is applicable to the whole $f_N^{(k)}$, we prove that the $\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}A$ operator and $R_N^{2(k)}$ tend to zero strongly. We then prove that the $N\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}B$ operator also tends to zero strongly if one has H_x^{1+} derivative, in Lemma 3.2, by working on the (η, ξ) side. The operator B expressed on the (η, ξ) side only involves oscillation with an ε coefficient that vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and thus the estimate reduces to managing positive weights, and is readily shown to be sharp. Lemma 3.2 together with §3.8-3.9, and §7 settles the trivial limit puzzle and justifies the low regularity assumption at which $N\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}B$ is $O(1)$ but without a clear limit.

³¹Though [36] is on the Boltzmann equation using dispersive techniques, it is simultaneously an example on how different the Boltzmann equations and the usual dispersive equations, NLS/NLW, are.

(As assumption of uniform smoothness of the densities gives a zero limit and thus hinders a formal computation of the limit.) We can now legitimately go to the next iteration (2.2) and find the limit by tending to the main difficult terms, $Q_N^{(k+1)}$, $R_N^{4(k+1)}$, and $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ which are part of the technical highlights.

We prove in Proposition 3.3 that the $Q_N^{(k+1)}$ operator is strongly bounded at the price of just $3/4$ derivative, so that we can take the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit later on. Even though the proof is done in the (η, ξ) side which admits a convenient representation for B , the proof is more difficult than the preliminary estimates mentioned above mainly due to the role of the time integration coming from the Duhamel operator sandwiched between the B and A operators. Rescaling this time variable produces an ϵ gain factor at the expense of leaving a rescaled time integral that must be carried out effectively over the whole real line. It turns out when L_ξ^p norms are brought to the inside by Minkowski's integral inequality, scaling produces a power of this rescaled time that is integrable provided $p = 3 \pm$. Proposition 3.3 is at the same time a foundational estimate for the limit collision operator (2.6), which we will use for the analysis of the infinite hierarchy and the limiting equation. We recall that the needed $3/4$ x -derivative in Proposition 3.3 is the borderline regularity satisfied by the N -body solution as a whole instead of only the core part. This unexpected match of regularity thus checks again that our analysis is optimal and physical.

After the proof of Proposition 3.3 regarding where the collision kernel should arise, we deal with $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ in Proposition 3.4. We again work in the (η, ξ) side, with a careful analysis of all the cases, we prove that $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ tends to zero weakly in L_x^2 but strongly in $H_x^{-\frac{3}{4}}$ at the price of $1/3$ x -derivative, hence it applies to both the core term and the irregular parts of $f_N^{(k)}$. An interesting comment to Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 is that they could also be proved using Strichartz estimates on the (x, ξ) side and this suggests further investigation of the relation between the (η, ξ) and (x, ξ) sides.

For the last term in (2.2), $R_N^{5(k+2)}$, we work in the (η, v) side. $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ is the most complicated term in (2.2), though it is not particularly bad from the perspective of the ending estimate, which is in fact better than $R_N^{4(k+1)}$. The estimate regarding $R_N^{5(k+2)}$, despite being a strong L^2 estimate, requires the Duhamel operator to hold, that is, it is actually a dual $X_{s,b}$ type Strichartz estimate in disguise. The direct $X_{s,b}$ analysis reveals the exact mechanism of gaining an ϵ from the Duhamel iteration sandwiched in the two B 's in term $R_N^{5(k)}$ and justifies that the (η, v) side is the right place to work it out. Proposition 3.5 records this dual Strichartz estimate³² for analysis regarding the Boltzmann equation and proves that $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ tends to zero for the core term. Then an advantage of $X_{s,b}$ techniques surfaces: such a direct frequency argument allows the derivatives at different variables to be freely redistributed and creates the flexibility to fit in the irregular part of $f_N^{(k)}$.

We can now take the formal limit of (2.2) mainly regarding $Q_N^{(k+1)}$. On the new (η, ξ) side, its formal limit is very obvious and in clean format as no oscillation forms are present. We

³²To the best of the authors' knowledge, the $X_{s,b}$ analysis for the Boltzmann equation was started in [36] in which there is no dual Strichartz.

can then compute the limit in the (x, ξ) side which will be needed later, and then in the usual (x, v) form, in §3.6. They are actually new representations of the collision operator.

Taking the limit also yields Proposition 3.8 which is the $\varepsilon = 0$ version of Proposition 3.3. In fact, carefully examining the new form of the collision operator in §3.6 inspires new estimates which will lead to the optimal unconditional well-posedness of (1.9) in §6 and 8. We record the new estimate as Proposition 3.10, a fixed-time L^p bilinear estimate. Different from other technical estimates in §3, Proposition 3.10 is a L^p estimate and hence we call in some very different and delicate L^p harmonic analysis and the Littlewood-Paley square function³³ to prove it.

We are now left with the size estimates for $R_N^{3(k+1)}$, $Q_N^{(k+1)}$ and $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ applied to the irregular parts, $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$ with $\pi \neq I$, under the cycle regularity condition, as $R_N^{2(k)}$ and $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ are already compatible with the roughness. We do so in §3.8-3.9. We 1st set up more suitable notations and provide examples to the cycle regularity for $\pi \neq I$ in §3.8. We also prove (generalized) quantum quasi-freeness implies the regularity assumptions in §1.1 there. We then compute and handle $R_N^{3(k+1)} f_{N,\pi}^{(k+1)}$ and $Q_N^{(k+1)} f_{N,\pi}^{(k+1)}$ with the cycle regularity in complete detail in §3.9. In particular, we prove (2.1) has a $O(1)$ B -term while (2.2) has a tending to zero $R_N^{3(k+1)}$ terms as the extra iteration provides the chance of hitting a minuscule better symmetry spot in the time interval due to the high number of collisions. We omit the handling of the $R_N^{5(k+2)} f_{N,\pi}^{(k+2)}$ term as, it should be clear that it follows a similar pattern we have demonstrated in other estimates.

So far, in §3, we have completed the full picture of the sizes and inner mechanism of (2.2) and ready to put them to use in §4-6. The calculation in §3 also provides a quantitative answer to the trivial limit puzzle: (1) physically, $f_N^{(k)}$ has 2 parts, the core term and the “goes-to-zero” but irregular part; (2) the irregular part, though it goes to 0, is not small under the B operator so (2.1) is unbalanced and has no clear limit; (3) Q_N applied to the irregular part is small hence (2.2) is balanced and effectively a hierarchy of the core term from which the limit can be obtained and is nontrivial.

2.3.2. Step 2. Compactness in §4. With the preparation done in §3, we define a metric space (Λ^*, ρ) to study the limit based on the $H_x^{1+} L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}$ space. Different from usual, due to the $\pi \neq I$ cycle terms, the sequence \mathcal{F} is not in a very good space for compactness. Hence, the compactness and convergence parts of this paper are also unusual. We study the projected sequence $P\mathcal{F} = \left\{ P_N f_N = \left\{ P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)} \right\}_{k=1}^N \right\}_{N=1}^\infty$ first, then comeback in Step 3 / §5 to conclude $\left\{ f_N^{(k)} \right\}$ has the same limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We prove in §4 that $P\mathcal{F}$ is compact in our metric space (Λ^*, ρ) based on a relatively crude estimate that

$$\|P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}\|_{C([0,T]; H_{x_k}^{1+} L_{v_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})} \leq 2^{-k} C^k k!.$$

Hence, limit points of $P\mathcal{F}$ are well-defined. The above crude estimate is also good enough for the convergence part, but not enough for the uniqueness part. Thus we prove a finer

³³See [84].

estimate

$$\|P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}\|_{C([0,T]; H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{v_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})} \leq 2^{-k} C^k \left(1 + \sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_k \\ \pi \neq I}} \epsilon^{(\ell(\pi) - m(\pi))/2}\right)$$

in Lemma 4.3 for the $\pi \neq I$ cycle terms so that we can conclude a proper regularity bound of the limit points.

2.3.3. Step 3. Convergence and the emergence of the collision kernel in §5. With the preparation done in §3, we prove that every limit point $\{f^{(k)}\}$ of $P\mathcal{F}$ in (Λ^*, ρ) coming from §4 satisfies the infinite Boltzmann hierarchy

$$(2.5) \quad (\partial_t + \mathbf{v}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k}) f^{(k)} = Q^{(k+1)} f^{(k+1)}$$

where the collision term can be decomposed into

$$Q^{(k+1)} f^{(k+1)} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^k Q_{j,k+1} f^{(k+1)}$$

if we write the collision operator pieces into the gain/loss terms,

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} Q_{j,k+1} f^{(k+1)} &\equiv Q_{j,k+1}^+ f^{(k+1)} - Q_{j,k+1}^- f^{(k+1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dv_{k+1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} dS_\omega |\omega \cdot (v - u)| \left| \hat{\phi}((\omega \cdot (v - u)) \omega) \right|^2 \\ &\quad f(\mathbf{x}_k, x_{k+1}, v_1, \dots, v_{j-1}, v_j^*, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_k, v_{k+1}^*) - f(\mathbf{x}_k, x_{k+1}, \mathbf{v}_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, together with Lemma 4.3, we conclude for some $C > 0$ that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|f^{(k)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{v_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}} \leq C^k$$

to be ready for the uniqueness argument in Step 4 / §6. We also prove that if there is only 1 limit point $\{f^{(k)}\}$ of $P\mathcal{F}$, then $f_N^{(k)}$ also converges weakly in $L_x^2 L_v^2$ to $f^{(k)}$.

Looking back from this point, one might ask why whether we could have based (Λ^*, ρ) on $L_{x,v}^2$ and simplify the argument by removing the projections. This seems not possible – we need the test functions in §4-5 to be very weak, due to fact that a test function at tier $k+1$ is generated from a smooth test function at tier k and the adjoint of the collision operator, and the resulting composed tier $k+1$ test function cannot lie in $L_{x,v}^2$. The unusual compactness and convergence argument is a minor novelty compared to the estimates in §3.

2.3.4. Step 4. Uniqueness in §6. We prove a $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,0+}) \cap H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$ uniqueness theorem regarding the infinite Boltzmann hierarchy (2.5). As the weak limit coming from the core of the N -body solution and the solution to (1.9) both verify the $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,0+}) \cap H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+}(L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})$ regularity, on the one hand we conclude that all limits points from Step 2 / §4 actually agree, that is, there is only one limit point $\{f^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ for $P\mathcal{F}$ and the sequence actually converges in (Λ^*, ρ) ; on the other hand, the limit is determined by

$$\{f^{(k)}\} = \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^k f(t, x_i, v_i) \right\} \text{ for all } t \in [0, T_0]$$

where f solves (1.9), that is, propagation of (quantum) molecular chaos and the derivation of the Boltzmann equation.

The proof of the uniqueness of hierarchy (2.5) is by adopting the recently perfected scheme for the NLS case in [34]. Though this is the first time such a scheme is fully carried out for the Boltzmann case, the grand scheme is not new. Arkeryd, Caprino & Ianiri has suggested using the Hewitt-Savage theorem to prove uniqueness for Boltzmann hierarchies in [3]. The scheme in [34] actually matured from [19] which creatively adds the quantum de Finetti theorem to the Klainerman-Machedon board game and the dispersive multilinear estimates originated in [67] for the NLS case.

The new find in the uniqueness proof is not in its scheme, but its enactment. Despite the L^2 disguise in many aspects, the core of the estimates is, for the first time, a L^p estimate, Proposition 3.10. It then unexpectedly enables the utilization of the Strichartz estimates [75] for the intertwined kinetic transport operator $\partial_t + \eta \cdot \nabla_\xi$ in the (t, η, ξ) side for the Boltzmann bilinear estimates for the collision operator in §6.2. In fact, a more surprising aspect and yet another sign of optimality is, though being a (η, ξ) fixed time estimate, Proposition 3.10 lands right by the (false) endpoint of the intertwined kinetic Strichartz estimates. On the other hand, we have obtained the first unconditional uniqueness result for the Boltzmann equation. We believe the uniqueness result is optimal because the uniqueness space lies exactly at the borderline at which solutions to (1.9) satisfy the equation everywhere in time instead of almost everywhere in time, and the fact that so far, no one has been able to prove an unconditional uniqueness result for almost everywhere in time solutions for any equation.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is finished at this step but for completeness, we have two more steps.

2.3.5. Step 5. Justification of physicality / regularity from the viewpoint of the local Maxwellian, a quasi-free construction in §7. In §7, we construct some quantum N -body solutions converging to the local Maxwellian as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We also compute the regularities for these N -body solutions. It turns out that even without interactions and in a supposedly very smooth case, in order to be a quantum N -body solution, $f_N^{(k)}$ can only have the customary uniform-in- N regularity (1.11) up to $r = \frac{3}{4}$, and its whole regularity takes the form we assumed in §1.1. It is surprising that such a low regularity still happens even for such a basic and supposedly smooth example. Moreover, based on the combinatorics, we find the inner symmetry and hence the cycle regularity condition for the irregular part. Last but not least, we include a computation in §7.3 to calculate the frequency of the changes of symmetry in cycle terms. Recall that we have proved that our assumed (cycle) regularity which comes from this local Maxwellian computation is compatible with the quantum quasi-free condition in §3.8. Thus we see Theorem 1.1 is physical and optimal in the sense that the N -body solution cannot be more regular.

2.3.6. Step 6. Proof of optimality / well-posedness and ill-posedness of (1.9) in §8. In §8, we prove that (1.9) is locally well-posed in $H_x^s L_v^{2,0+}$ for $s > 1$, and ill-posed in $H_x^s L_v^{2,0+}$ for $s < 1$. Moreover, the solution constructed in $H_x^s L_v^{2,0+}$, for $s > 1$, is nonnegative and in L_{xv}^1 if the initial datum carries these properties. Together with §6, we conclude that (1.9) is

locally unconditionally well-posed in $H_x^{1+}(L_v^{2,0+}) \cap H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+}(L_v^{2,\frac{1}{2}+})$ which is also the borderline regularity to allow everywhere in time solutions to (1.9). The proof of the well-posedness follows from a dispersive bilinear estimate also used in §6³⁴ based on the (t, η, ξ) side analysis, while the ill-posedness is adapted from [36] (See [40] for a more detailed proof.) The new mechanical contribution is the proof that such low regularity solutions belong to L^1 if the initial datum is in L^1 . This step in §8, on the one hand, proves that there is a solution to (1.9) in the space of the N -body limit, on the other hand proves that the regularity of the limiting Boltzmann equation cannot be lower, which is yet another aspect of the optimality of our proof.

Steps 5-6 are not involved³⁵ in the proof of Theorem 1.1 but they are part of the inspiration of Theorem 1.1. With Steps 5-6 done, the whole overview of Theorem 1.1 is now completed.

3. PREPARATION FOR N -BODY ANALYSIS

3.1. BBGKY in the four spaces and basic operator estimates. Recall (2.1), the quantum BBGKY hierarchy is, for $1 \leq k \leq N$,

$$(3.1) \quad \partial_t f_N^{(k)} + \mathbf{v}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} f_N^{(k)} = \epsilon^{-1/2} A_\epsilon^{(k)} f_N^{(k)} + N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_\epsilon^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}$$

where the cumulative interaction operators are

$$\epsilon^{-1/2} A_\epsilon^{(k)} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \epsilon^{-1/2} A_{i,j}^\epsilon, \quad N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_\epsilon^{(k+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^k N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_{j,k+1}^\epsilon$$

with components defined by

$$[\epsilon^{-1/2} A_{i,j}^\epsilon f_N^{(k)}](t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = -i \epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_h e^{ih \cdot (x_i - x_j)/\epsilon} \hat{\phi}(h) f_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, v_1, \dots, v_i - \sigma \frac{h}{2}, \dots, v_j + \sigma \frac{h}{2}, \dots, v_k) dh$$

and

$$[N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_{j,k+1}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)}](t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = -i N \epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{x_{k+1}, v_{k+1}, h} e^{ih \cdot (x_j - x_{k+1})/\epsilon} \hat{\phi}(h) f_N^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}, v_1, \dots, v_j - \sigma \frac{h}{2}, \dots, v_{k+1} + \sigma \frac{h}{2}) dx_{k+1} dv_{k+1} dh$$

The above is the $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)$ formulation. We shall need the alternative formulations, and let us start with the $(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ formulation. The hierarchy becomes, for $1 \leq k \leq N$,

$$\partial_t \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} - i \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} = \epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{A}_\epsilon^{(k)} \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} + N \epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{B}_\epsilon^{(k+1)} \tilde{f}_N^{(k+1)}$$

³⁴The scheme in [34] developed from [19] has this feature which seems to imply that, at critical regularity, unconditional uniqueness is always stronger than Strichartz well-posedness. The first work carrying such a feature is [59] regarding the NLS.

³⁵This is why some lengthy details in §7-8 are left in another paper or available upon request.

The components of the operators are

$$(3.2) \quad [\epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{A}_{i,j}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}](t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = -i\epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \phi\left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma}{2}(\xi_i - \xi_j)\right) \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & [N\epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{B}_{j,k+1}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_N^{(k+1)}](t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \\ &= -iN\epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{x_{k+1}} \phi\left(\frac{x_j - x_{k+1}}{\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\xi_j\right) \tilde{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) dx_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

where the last 0 means that ξ_{k+1} is set = 0.

In $(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ form, it is straightforward to derive a typical estimate for the A -operator that sacrifices derivatives in exchange for the gain of ϵ factors.

Lemma 3.1 (*A estimate*). *For any $0 \leq s < \frac{3}{2}$,*

$$\|[\epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{A}_{i,j}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}](t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)\|_{L^2_{\mathbf{x}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}} \lesssim \epsilon^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \| |\nabla_{x_i}|^{s/2} |\nabla_{x_j}|^{s/2} \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \|_{L^2_{\mathbf{x}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}}$$

Proof. Let $p = \frac{3}{s}$. We divide into two cases, depending upon the relative size of the frequency of $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$ in x_i versus the size of the frequency of $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$ in x_j and thus, by symmetry of the argument that follows, might as well assume that the frequency in x_j dominates the frequency in x_i . This allows us to transfer derivatives in x_i to derivatives in x_j at the end of the argument. From (3.2), by Hölder in x_i between ϕ and $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$

$$\|[\epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{A}_{i,j}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}](t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)\|_{L^2_{x_i}} \lesssim \epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \left\| \phi\left(\frac{x_i - x_j}{\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma}{2}(\xi_i - \xi_j)\right) \right\|_{L^p_{x_i}} \| \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \|_{L^q_{x_i}}$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2}$. Scaling out in the ϕ term yields the factor ϵ^s . Since $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{s}{3}$, Sobolev embedding implies

$$\lesssim \epsilon^{-1/2} \epsilon^s \| \phi \|_{L^p} \| |\nabla_{x_i}|^s \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \|_{L^q_{x_i}}$$

Following through with the $L^2_{x_j}$ norm, transferring half of the s -derivatives in x_i to x_j , then applying the remaining L^2 norms, yields the claim. \square

In $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ coordinates,

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} [\tilde{A}_{i,j}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}](t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &= -i\epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_y \hat{\phi}(y) e^{i\sigma(\xi_i - \xi_j) \cdot y/2} \\ & \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \epsilon^{-1}y, \dots, \eta_j + \epsilon^{-1}y, \dots, \eta_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) dy \end{aligned}$$

For the B -operator, we apply Plancherel $x_{k+1} \mapsto \eta_{k+1}$ in the integral in (3.3), we obtain

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & [N\epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{B}_{j,k+1}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_N^{(k+1)}](t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \\ &= -iN\epsilon^{5/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) e^{i\sigma\epsilon\xi_j\eta_{k+1}/2} \tilde{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) d\eta_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $N\epsilon^{5/2} = \epsilon^{-1/2}$ when $N = \epsilon^{-3}$. In $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ form, it is straightforward to derive a typical estimate for the B -operator that sacrifices derivatives in exchange for the gain of ϵ

factors. Notice that Lemma 3.2 is significantly weaker than the estimate in Lemma 3.1 for A , but nevertheless Lemma 3.2 with $s = \frac{1}{2}+$ gives a bound that decays as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and has right side in the space $H_x^{1+}(L_v^2 \cap L_v^1)$.

Lemma 3.2 (*B estimate*). *Let $N = \epsilon^{-3}$. If for some $s \geq 0$, there holds $|\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \lesssim |\zeta|^s$ for $|\zeta| \leq 1$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \langle \eta_j \rangle^{-\left(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\right)} [N \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{j,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}](t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \| \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $s = \frac{1}{2}+$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \langle \eta_j \rangle^{-1} [N \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{j,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}](t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{0+} \| \langle \eta_j \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying $|\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \lesssim |\zeta|^s$,

$$\begin{aligned} & | [N \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{j,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}](t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) | \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\eta_{k+1}} |\eta_{k+1}|^s |\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0)| d\eta_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Apply the $L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2$ norm and Minkowski's integral inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \langle \eta_j \rangle^{-\left(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\right)} [N \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{j,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}](t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\eta_{k+1}} |\eta_{k+1}|^s \| \langle \eta_j + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\left(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\right)} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} d\eta_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Writing $1 = \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-3/2-} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{+3/2+}$ and applying Cauchy-Schwarz in η_{k+1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \langle \eta_j \rangle^{-\left(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\right)} [N \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{j,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}](t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \| \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{s+\frac{3}{2}+} \langle \eta_j + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\left(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\right)} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \end{aligned}$$

By dividing into the three cases $|\eta_{k+1}| \ll |\eta_j|$, $|\eta_{k+1}| \gg |\eta_j|$ and $|\eta_{k+1}| \sim |\eta_j|$, we see that in any case

$$\langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{s+\frac{3}{2}+} \langle \eta_j + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\left(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}\right)} \lesssim \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{s}{2} + \frac{3}{4}+}$$

□

3.2. Duhamel formulations. To start the analysis of (2.2), we shorten its notation. Let

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{D}^{(k)} f^{(k)}(t) = \int_0^t S^{(k)}(t-t') f^{(k)}(t') dt'$$

In this notation, the *first Duhamel iterate* (2.1) reads:

$$f_N^{(k)}(t) = S^{(k)}(t) f_N^{(k)}(0) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)} [\epsilon^{-1/2} A_\epsilon^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}](t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)} [N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_\epsilon^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}](t)$$

and the *second Duhamel iterate* (2.2) is

$$\begin{aligned}
f_N^{(k)}(t) &= S^{(k)}(t)f_N^{(k)}(0) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}[\epsilon^{-1/2}A_\epsilon^{(k)}f_N^{(k)}](t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+1)}S^{(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(0)] \\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+1)}\mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_\epsilon^{(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}] \\
(3.7) \quad &\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+1)}\mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+2)}f_N^{(k+2)}] \\
&= S^{(k)}(t)f_N^{(k)}(0) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{2(k)}f_N^{(k)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{3(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(t) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}(Q_N^{(k+1)} + R_N^{4(k+1)})f_N^{(k+1)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{5(k+2)}f_N^{(k+2)}(t)
\end{aligned}$$

The last two terms contain the composite operators

$$\begin{aligned}
(Q_N^{(k+1)} + R_N^{4(k+1)})f_N^{(k+1)} &= N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+1)}\mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_\epsilon^{(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)} \\
(3.8) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \ell \leq k \\ 1 \leq i < j \leq k+1}} N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_{\ell, k+1}^\epsilon \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_{i, j}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$(3.9) \quad R_N^{5(k+2)}f_N^{(k+2)} = N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+1)}\mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+2)}f_N^{(k+2)}$$

We define $Q_N^{(k+1)}$ and $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ as the following components of the sum indicated in (3.8). The operator $Q_N^{(k+1)}$ corresponds to $\ell = i$ and $j = k + 1$:

$$(3.10) \quad Q_N^{(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_{i, k+1}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)}$$

where

$$Q_{i, k+1}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)} = N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_{i, k+1}^\epsilon \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_{i, k+1}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)}$$

The operator $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ corresponds to the remaining terms in the sum (3.8):

$$(3.11) \quad R_N^{4(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \ell \leq k \\ 1 \leq i < j \leq k+1 \\ \text{except } \ell=i, j=k+1}} R_{\ell, i, j, k+1}^{4, N} f_N^{(k+1)}$$

where

$$R_{\ell, i, j, k+1}^{4, N} f_N^{(k+1)} = N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_{\ell, k+1}^\epsilon \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_{i, j}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)}$$

The operators defined in (3.10), (3.11), and (3.9) and are studied in the next three subsections.

3.3. Collision operator $Q_N^{(k+1)}$.

Proposition 3.3 ($Q_N^{(k+1)}$ estimates). *The operator $Q_N^{(k+1)}$ defined by (3.10) satisfies the bound*

$$\|\check{Q}_N^{(k+1)}\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_t^\infty L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^k \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_t^\infty L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2}$$

This bound is uniform in N but does not have an ϵ^{0+} prefactor.

Proof. Now we study $Q_N^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(t)$ defined by (3.10). Recall (3.5),

$$(3.12) \quad N\epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{\ell,k+1}^\epsilon \check{g}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = -iN\epsilon^{5/2} \sum_{\alpha=\pm 1} \alpha \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) e^{i\alpha\epsilon\xi_\ell\eta_{k+1}/2} \check{g}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) d\eta_{k+1}$$

By (3.4),

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \check{g}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) &= \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)} \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{A}_{i,j}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) \\ &= -i\epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_y \hat{\phi}(y) e^{i\sigma(\xi_i - \xi_j) \cdot y/2} e^{-i\sigma(t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_j) \cdot y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y/\epsilon, \dots, \eta_j + y/\epsilon, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1} - (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}) dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the form of $Q_{i,k+1}^\epsilon$, which is the composition of (3.12) and (3.13) in the case $\ell = i$ and $j = k+1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha\epsilon\xi_i\eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma(t-t')(\eta_i - 2\eta_{k+1})y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} - \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} + \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \\ &\quad \xi_i - (t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Now change variable $\eta_{k+1} \mapsto \eta_{k+1} - \frac{y}{\epsilon}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha\epsilon\xi_i(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y)/2} e^{i\sigma\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma(t-t')(\epsilon\eta_i - 2\epsilon\eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/(2\epsilon)} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \\ &\quad \xi_i - (t-t')(\epsilon\eta_i - \epsilon\eta_{k+1} + y)/\epsilon, \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y)/\epsilon) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Now change $t' \mapsto s$ where $s = (t-t')/\epsilon$ to obtain

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha\epsilon\xi_i(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y)/2} e^{i\sigma\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s(\epsilon\eta_i - 2\epsilon\eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s\eta_1, \dots, \\ &\quad \xi_i - sy - \epsilon s\eta_i + \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, sy - \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds \end{aligned}$$

Let $L_{\eta_i}^2$ denote the $L_{\eta_q}^2$ norm for all $1 \leq q \leq k$ except $q = i$. Apply the $L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2$ norm to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\lesssim \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y)| |\hat{\phi}(y)| \\ &\|\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, sy - s\epsilon\eta_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} d\eta_{k+1} dy ds \end{aligned}$$

Bring the y integration to the inside and Hölder between the three factors $|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y)|$, $|\hat{\phi}(y)|$, and $\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(\dots, sy - s\epsilon\eta_{k+1})$. This can be done in two ways, that generate different factors $s^{-\mu}$ after rescaling $\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}$, as in the following table

$ \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y) $	$ \hat{\phi}(y) $	$ \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(\dots, sy - s\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) $	rescaling $\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}$	use when
L_y^{3-}	L_y^{3-}	L_y^{3+}	s^{-1+}	$s \leq 1$
L_y^{3+}	L_y^{3+}	L_y^{3-}	s^{-1-}	$s \geq 1$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\lesssim \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \\ &\|\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{(L_{\xi_{k+1}}^{3-} \cap L_{\xi_{k+1}}^{3+}) L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} d\eta_{k+1} ds \end{aligned}$$

Apply Sobolev embedding in ξ_{k+1} :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\lesssim \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \\ &\|\langle \xi_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2} d\eta_{k+1} ds \end{aligned}$$

For fixed η_i , divide the η_{k+1} integration into two pieces depending upon which of the two quantities $|\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}|$ and $|\eta_{k+1}|$ is maximum. Since both cases are similar, we will just assume $|\eta_{k+1}|$ is maximum. In this case,

$$1 \lesssim \langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} \langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+}$$

can be inserted. This allows Cauchy-Schwarz in η_{k+1} giving

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\lesssim \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \|\langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \\ &\langle \xi_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2} ds \end{aligned}$$

where we note that $L_{\eta_k}^2$ norm on $\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}$ has been replaced by $L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2$, which means the $L_{\eta_q}^2$ norm for all $1 \leq q \leq k+1$ except $q = i$. Now apply the $L_{\eta_i}^2$ norm to obtain

$$\|\check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \lesssim \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} s^{-1+\langle s \rangle^{0-}} \|\langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \xi_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2} ds$$

Taking sup in the t -component of $\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}$ and carrying out the s -integral gives the result. \square

3.4. Remainder operator $R_N^{4(k+1)}$.

Proposition 3.4 ($R_N^{4(k+1)}$ estimates). *The operator $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ defined by (3.11) satisfies the following estimate:*

$$\|\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_k \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}-} \check{R}_N^{4(k+1)} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \lesssim \epsilon^{0+} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \int_{t'=0}^t \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} dt'$$

Proof. There are four cases.

Case 1. $\ell \neq i$ and $j = k+1$. Composing (3.12) and (3.13) in this case gives

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_{\ell,i,k+1,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_\ell \eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma(\xi_i - \xi_{k+1})y/2} e^{-i\sigma(t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_{k+1})y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}\left(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} + \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_\ell - (t-t')(\eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}\right) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Change variables $y \mapsto \epsilon y$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_{\ell,i,k+1,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^2 \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_\ell \eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma \epsilon (\xi_i - \xi_{k+1})y/2} e^{-i\sigma \epsilon (t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_{k+1})y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}\left(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} + y, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_\ell - (t-t')(\eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}\right) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\check{R}_{\ell,i,k+1,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)| &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)| \\ &\quad |\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} + y, \\ &\quad \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_\ell - (t-t')(\eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1})| d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Start by applying $L_{\xi_k}^2$, applying Minkowski's integral inequality, and sup-out in the ξ_{k+1} entry:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{\ell,i,k+1,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)| \\ &\quad \|\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} + y, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Let $L_{\eta_k^*}^2$ indicate the L^2 norm over all η_q for $1 \leq q \leq k$ *except* $q = i$ and $q = \ell$. By Minkowski's integral inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{\ell,i,k+1,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k^*}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)| \\ &\quad \|\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} + y, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_k^*}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Divide the η_{k+1} , y integration space into three regions depending upon the relative size of $|\eta_i - y|$, $|\eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}|$, and $|\eta_{k+1} + y|$. In the case when the quantity $|\eta_i - y|$ is the largest of the three, we use

$$1 \leq \langle \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-} \langle \eta_{k+1} + y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-} \langle \eta_i - y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} + y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+}$$

From here, it is similar to the conclusion of Case 3.

Case 2. $\ell = i$ and $j \leq k$. Aside from altering inconsequential phase factors, this case is identical to Case 3 below.

Case 3. $\ell = j$ and $j \leq k$. In this case, we obtain the bound (3.16) below. Composing (3.12) and (3.13) in this case gives

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_{j,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha\epsilon\xi_j\eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma(\xi_i - \xi_j)y/2} e^{-i\sigma(t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_j + \eta_{k+1})y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \\ &\quad \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_j - (t-t')(\eta_j - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Change variables $y \mapsto \epsilon y$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_{j,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^2 \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha\epsilon\xi_j\eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma\epsilon(\xi_i - \xi_j)y/2} e^{-i\sigma\epsilon(t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_j + \eta_{k+1})y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \\ &\quad \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_j - (t-t')(\eta_j - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\check{R}_{j,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)| &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{t'=0}^t |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)| \\ &|\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \\ &\xi_1 - (t - t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_j - (t - t')(\eta_j - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t - t')\eta_k, -(t - t')\eta_{k+1})| d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Let $L_{\eta_k}^2$ indicate the L^2 norm over all η_q for $1 \leq q \leq k$ *except* $q = i$ and $q = j$. Start by applying $L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2$, applying Minkowski's integral inequality, and sup-out in the ξ_{k+1} entry:

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{j,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)| \\ &\|\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

For fixed η_i and η_j , we can divide the η_{y+1} , y integration space into three pieces depending on the relative size of the three quantities $|\eta_i - y|$, $|\eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y|$, and $|\eta_{k+1}|$. Since all three cases are similar, we will just present one of them. If $|\eta_i - y|$ is largest, then we use

$$1 \leq \langle \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-} \langle \eta_i - y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+}$$

Apply Hölder in y on the inside using that for fixed η_j and η_{k+1} , the quantity $\|\langle \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-}\|_{L_y^{6-}}$ is finite (uniformly in η_j and η_{k+1}), then Hölder in η_{k+1} using that $\|\langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}-}\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^{6-}}$ is finite, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{j,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{t'=0}^t \|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^{3+}} \|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)\|_{L_y^{3+}} \\ &\|\langle \eta_i - y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \\ &\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+1} + y, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_y^2 L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} dt' \end{aligned}$$

Scale the norms on $\hat{\phi}$, which reduces ϵ^2 to ϵ^{0+} . Apply the $L_{\eta_j}^\infty L_{\eta_i}^2$ norm, and on the right-side, bring the $L_{\eta_i}^2$ norm to the inside by Minkowski's integral inequality. On the inside the norms in the order $L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_y^2 L_{\eta_i}^2$ admit translational change of variables that yield:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{j,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_j}^\infty L_{\eta_i}^2 L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t'=0}^t \\ &\|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} dt' \end{aligned}$$

The same result can be obtained by applying the $L_{\eta_i}^\infty L_{\eta_j}^2$ norm instead of the $L_{\eta_j}^\infty L_{\eta_i}^2$ norm. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{j,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{(L_{\eta_j}^\infty L_{\eta_i}^2 \cap L_{\eta_i}^\infty L_{\eta_j}^2) L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t'=0}^t \\ &\|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} dt' \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude by applying Schur's test on the left side in the form

$$\|\langle u \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}} \langle v \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}} h(u, v)\|_{L^2_{uv}} \lesssim \|h\|_{L^2_u L^2_v}^{1/2} \|h\|_{L^\infty_v L^2_u}^{1/2}$$

to obtain

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}} \check{R}_{\ell, i, j, k+1}^{4, N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L^2_{\eta_k} L^2_{\xi_k}} \leq \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t'=0}^t \\ & \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L^2_{\eta_{k+1}} L^2_{\xi_k} L^\infty_{\xi_{k+1}}} dt' \end{aligned}$$

Case 4. $\ell \notin \{i, j\}$ and $j \leq k$. This case results in the inequality (3.17) below. Composing (3.12) and (3.13) in this case gives

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_{\ell, i, j, k+1}^{4, N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(y) \\ & e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_\ell \eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma(\xi_i - \xi_j)y/2} e^{-i\sigma(t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_j)y/2} \\ & \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_j + \frac{y}{\epsilon}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \\ & \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_\ell - (t-t')(\eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Change variables $y \mapsto \epsilon y$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_{\ell, i, j, k+1}^{4, N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= -\epsilon^2 \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon y) \\ & e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_\ell \eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma \epsilon (\xi_i - \xi_j)y/2} e^{-i\sigma \epsilon (t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_j)y/2} \\ & \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_j + y, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \\ & \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_\ell - (t-t')(\eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\check{R}_{\ell, i, j, k+1}^{4, N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)| &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)| \\ & |\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_j + y, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \\ & \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \xi_\ell - (t-t')(\eta_\ell - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1})| d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Let $L^2_{\eta_k^*}$ indicate the L^2 norm over all η_q for $1 \leq q \leq k$ *except* $q = i$ and $q = j$. Applying $L^2_{\eta_k^*} L^2_{\xi_k}$, applying Minkowski's integral inequality, and sup-out in the ξ_{k+1} entry:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{\ell, i, j, k+1}^{4, N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L^2_{\eta_k^*} L^2_{\xi_k}} &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y)| \\ & \|\check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_j + y, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L^2_{\eta_k^*} L^2_{\xi_k} L^\infty_{\xi_{k+1}}} d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

For fixed η_i , we divide the y integration space into two cases depending upon which of the two quantities $|\eta_i - y|$ or $|\eta_j + y|$ is minimum. The two cases are similar so we just present

one and assume $|\eta_i - y|$ is minimum. In this case we use

$$1 \leq \langle \eta_i - y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}-} \langle \eta_i - y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j + y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+}$$

Insert this bound, and also $1 \leq \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}-} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+}$, and Cauchy-Schwarz in y and η_{k+1} :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{\ell,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^2 \int_{t'=0}^t \|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}-}\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2} \|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y) \langle \eta_i - y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}-}\|_{L_y^2} \\ &\quad \|\langle \eta_i - y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j + y \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - y, \dots, \eta_j + y, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_y^2 L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

where now $L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2$ indicate the L^2 norm over all η_q for $1 \leq q \leq k+1$ except $q = i$ and $q = j$. By Hölder and scaling,

$$\|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta) \langle \eta \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}-}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\hat{\phi}\|_{L^{\frac{18}{7}+}} \epsilon^{-\frac{7}{6}+}, \quad \|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y) \langle y \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}-}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\hat{\phi}\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}+}} \epsilon^{-\frac{5}{6}+}$$

which can be inserted above. Following through with the norm $L_{\eta_i}^\infty L_{\eta_j}^2 \cap L_{\eta_j}^\infty L_{\eta_i}^2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{R}_{\ell,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{(L_{\eta_i}^\infty L_{\eta_j}^2 \cap L_{\eta_j}^\infty L_{\eta_i}^2) L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t'=0}^t \\ &\quad \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude by applying Schur's test on the left side in the form

$$\|\langle u \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}-} \langle v \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}-} h(u, v)\|_{L_{uv}^2} \lesssim \|h\|_{L_u^\infty L_v^2}^{1/2} \|h\|_{L_v^\infty L_u^2}^{1/2}$$

to obtain

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}-} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{-\frac{3}{4}-} \check{R}_{\ell,i,j,k+1}^{4,N} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} &\leq \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t'=0}^t \\ &\quad \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}+} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty} d\eta_{k+1} dy dt' \end{aligned}$$

□

3.5. Remainder operator $R_N^{5(k+2)}$.

Proposition 3.5 ($R_N^{5(k+2)}$ estimates). *Assume $|\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \lesssim |\zeta|^{1-}$ for ζ near zero, the operator $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ defined by (3.9) satisfies the following estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_N^{5(k+2)} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{0+} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{t''=0}^t \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle \mathbf{v}_{k+1} \rangle^{2+} \\ &\quad \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2}, \mathbf{v}_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+1}}^\infty L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+2}}^1} dt'' \\ &+ \epsilon^{0+} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \int_{t''=0}^t (t - t'') \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \\ &\quad \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2}, \mathbf{v}_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+1}}^1 L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+2}}^1} dt'' \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Now we study $R_N^{5(k+2)} f_N^{(k+2)}(t)$ defined by (3.9). This expands as the sum

$$R_N^{5(k+2)} f_N^{(k+2)}(t) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 1 \leq j \leq k+1}} R_{i,j,k+2}^{N,5} f_N^{(k+2)}(t)$$

where

$$R_{i,j,k+2}^{N,5} f_N^{(k+2)} = N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)} N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_{j,k+2}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+2)}$$

To prepare for calculating the composition, let us rewrite (3.5) with indices $(i, k+1)$ and then again with indices $(j, k+2)$:

$$(3.18) \quad N \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{g}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = -i N \epsilon^{5/2} \sum_{\alpha=\pm 1} \alpha \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_i \eta_{k+1}/2} \\ \check{g}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) d\eta_{k+1}$$

$$(3.19) \quad \check{g}_N^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) = \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)} N \epsilon^{-1/2} \check{B}_{j,k+2}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) \\ = -i N \epsilon^{5/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_0^t \int_{\eta_{k+2}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) e^{i\sigma \epsilon (\xi_j - (t-t') \eta_j) \eta_{k+2}/2} \\ \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+2}, \dots, \eta_{k+2}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1} - (t-t') \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, 0) d\eta_{k+2} dt'$$

There are three cases

Case 1. $j = k+1$. This case results in the bound (3.20) below. For this case, we assume $|\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \lesssim |\zeta|^{0+}$ for $|\zeta| \leq 1$. Combining (3.18) and (3.19) gives

$$\check{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t) \\ = -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}} \sigma \alpha \int_0^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_{\eta_{k+2}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_i \eta_{k+1}/2} e^{-i\sigma \epsilon (t-t') \eta_{k+1} \eta_{k+2}/2} \\ \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \xi_1 - (t-t') \eta_1, \dots, \\ \xi_i - (t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t') \eta_k, -(t-t') \eta_{k+1}, 0) d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt'$$

On $\check{f}_N^{(k+2)}$, pass to the Fourier side in $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+2} \mapsto \mathbf{v}_{k+2}$, and on the left side, pass to the Fourier side in $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k \mapsto \mathbf{v}_k$. The result is the hat form for this remainder term:

$$\hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t) = -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}} \sigma \alpha \int_0^t \int_{\substack{\eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2} \\ v_{k+1}, v_{k+1}}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) \\ e^{-i\sigma \epsilon (t-t') \eta_{k+1} \eta_{k+2}/2} e^{-i(t-t') \boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k} e^{-i(t-t') \eta_{k+1} v_{k+1}} e^{i(t-t') \eta_{k+1} v_i} \\ \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \\ v_1, \dots, v_i - \alpha \epsilon \eta_{k+1}/2, \dots, v_{k+1}, v_{k+2}) dv_{k+1} dv_{k+2} d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt'$$

Now we must add the additional Duhamel operator, for which we replace the old t' with t'' and the old t with t' . The propagator associated with this Duhamel term places a new phase

factor $e^{-i(t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t) &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{-1,1\}} \sigma \alpha \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{t''=0}^{t'} \int_{\substack{\eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2} \\ v_{k+1}, v_{k+1}}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) \\ &e^{-i(t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k} e^{-i\sigma \epsilon (t'-t'')\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2}/2} e^{-i(t'-t'')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k} e^{-i(t'-t'')\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \mathbf{v}_{k+1}} e^{i(t''')\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \mathbf{v}_i} \\ &\hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \\ &v_1, \dots, v_i - \alpha \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}/2, \dots, v_{k+1}, v_{k+2}) dv_{k+1} dv_{k+2} d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt'' dt' \end{aligned}$$

Now we switch the order of the t' and t'' integrals, which allows us to bring the t' integral onto the phase factors:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t) &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{-1,1\}} \sigma \alpha \int_{t''=0}^t \int_{\substack{\eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2} \\ v_{k+1}, v_{k+2}}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) \\ &\int_{t'''}^t e^{-i(t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k} e^{-i\sigma \epsilon (t'-t'')\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2}/2} e^{-i(t'-t'')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k} e^{-i(t'-t'')\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \mathbf{v}_{k+1}} e^{i(t''')\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \mathbf{v}_i} dt' \\ &\hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \\ &v_1, \dots, v_i - \alpha \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}/2, \dots, v_{k+1}, v_{k+2}) dv_{k+1} dv_{k+2} d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt'' \end{aligned}$$

For $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{t'''}^t e^{-i(t-t')\mu} e^{-i(t''')\nu} dt' = \frac{e^{-i(t-t'')\nu} - e^{-i(t-t'')\mu}}{i(\mu - \nu)}$$

which implies

$$\left| \int_{t'''}^t e^{-i(t-t')\mu} e^{-i(t''')\nu} dt' \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{\langle \mu - \nu \rangle}$$

provided $t \leq 1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)| &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \int_{t''=0}^t \int_{\substack{\eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2} \\ v_{k+1}, v_{k+2}}} |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2})| \\ &\langle \eta_{k+1} \cdot (\frac{1}{2} \sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2} + v_i + v_{k+1}) \rangle^{-1} \\ &|\hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \\ &v_1, \dots, v_i - \alpha \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}/2, \dots, v_{k+1}, v_{k+2})| dv_{k+1} dv_{k+2} d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt'' \end{aligned}$$

Insert $1 \leq \langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{-2-} \langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{2+}$, grouping the $\langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{2+}$ factor with $\hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}$, and then sup this factor out in v_{k+1} :

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)| &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \int_{t''=0}^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2}} |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2})| |\eta_{k+1}|^{-1+} \\ &\| \langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{2+} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \\ &v_1, \dots, v_i - \alpha \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}/2, \dots, v_{k+1}, v_{k+2}) \|_{L_{v_{k+1}}^\infty L_{v_{k+2}}^1} d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt'' \end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$\int_{v_{k+1}} \langle \eta_{k+1} \cdot (\frac{1}{2} \sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2} + v_i + v_{k+1}) \rangle^{-1} \langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{-2-} dv_{k+1} \lesssim |\eta_{k+1}|^{-1+}$$

Now we proceed depending on which of the three quantities is maximum among $|\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}|$, $|\eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}|$ and $|\eta_{k+2}|$. Since all three cases are similar, we will just assume $|\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}|$ is maximum. In this case, we insert

$$1 \leq \langle \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} \langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+}$$

and apply Cauchy-Schwarz:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)| &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \int_{t''=0}^t \|\langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2} \\ &\|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})|\eta_{k+1}|^{-1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-}\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^\infty L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2} \\ &\|\langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{2+} \\ &\hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \\ &\quad v_1, \dots, v_i - \alpha \epsilon \eta_{k+1}/2, \dots, v_{k+1}, v_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2 L_{v_{k+1}}^\infty L_{v_{k+2}}^1} dt'' \end{aligned}$$

Now use $|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2})| \lesssim \epsilon^{0+} |\eta_{k+2}|^{0+}$ and $|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| \lesssim \epsilon^{1-} |\eta_{k+1}|^{1-}$, where $0+$ and $1-$ are selected to sum to $1+$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)| &\lesssim \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t''=0}^t \\ &\|\langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{2+} \\ &\hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \eta_{k+2}, \\ &\quad v_1, \dots, v_i - \alpha \epsilon \eta_{k+1}/2, \dots, v_{k+1}, v_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2 L_{v_{k+1}}^\infty L_{v_{k+2}}^1} dt'' \end{aligned}$$

Now apply $L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{v_k}^2$ and Minkowski's integral inequality to obtain

$$(3.20) \quad \|\hat{\mathcal{D}}^{(k)} \hat{R}_{i,k+1,k+2}^{N,5} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{v_k}^2} \lesssim \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t''=0}^t \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle v_{k+1} \rangle^{2+} \hat{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t'', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2}, \mathbf{v}_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2 L_{v_k}^2 L_{v_{k+1}}^\infty L_{v_{k+2}}^1} dt''$$

Case 2. $j \leq k$ and $i = j$. This case results in the bound (3.21) below. For this case, we assume $|\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \lesssim |\zeta|^{0+}$ for $|\zeta| \leq 1$. Combining (3.18) and (3.19) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\check{R}_{i,i,k+2}^{N,5} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t) \\ &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}} \sigma \alpha \int_0^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_{\eta_{k+2}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_i \eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma \epsilon (\xi_i - (t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_{k+1})) \eta_{k+2}/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} - \eta_{k+2}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2}, \xi_1 - (t-t')\eta_1, \dots, \\ &\quad \quad \xi_i - (t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t')\eta_k, -(t-t')\eta_{k+1}, 0) d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt' \end{aligned}$$

This is handled similarly to Case 1.

Case 3. $j \leq k$ and $i \neq j$. This case results in the bound (3.21) below. For this case, we assume $|\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \lesssim |\zeta|^{\frac{1}{2}+}$ for $|\zeta| \leq 1$. Combining (3.18) and (3.19) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \check{R}_{i,j,k+2}^{N,5} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t) \\ &= -\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}} \sigma \alpha \int_0^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_{\eta_{k+2}} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) e^{i\alpha \epsilon \xi_i \eta_{k+1}/2} e^{i\sigma \epsilon (\xi_j - (t-t') \eta_j) \eta_{k+2}/2} \\ & \quad \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+2}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2}, \xi_1 - (t-t') \eta_1, \dots, \\ & \quad \xi_i - (t-t')(\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}), \dots, \xi_k - (t-t') \eta_k, -(t-t') \eta_{k+1}, 0) d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt' \end{aligned}$$

Let $L_{\eta_k}^2$ denote all $L_{\eta_q}^2$ except $q = i$ and $q = j$. By Minkowski's integral inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\check{R}_{i,j,k+2}^{N,5} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \leq \epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_{\eta_{k+2}} d\eta_{k+1} d\eta_{k+2} dt' |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1})| |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2})| \\ & \quad \|\check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_j - \eta_{k+2}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \eta_{k+2}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty L_{\xi_{k+2}}^\infty} \end{aligned}$$

We proceed depending upon the relative size of $|\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}|$ and $|\eta_{k+1}|$ on the one hand, and also depending upon the relative size of $|\eta_j - \eta_{k+2}|$ and $|\eta_{k+2}|$ on the other hand. Thus, there are four cases in total, although all are similar, so we just present one. Suppose that both $|\eta_{k+1}| \geq |\eta_i - \eta_{k+1}|$ and $|\eta_{k+2}| \geq |\eta_j - \eta_{k+2}|$. Then we use

$$1 \leq \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-2-} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_i - \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+}$$

and

$$1 \leq \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{-2-} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_j - \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+}$$

Inserting these two inequalities, apply Cauchy-Schwarz in both η_{k+1} and η_{k+2} , and then apply $L_{\eta_i}^2 L_{\eta_j}^2$ to the entire expression to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\check{R}_{i,j,k+2}^{N,5} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \leq \epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t \\ & \quad \|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1}) \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-2-}\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2} \|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+2}) \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{-2-}\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2} \\ & \quad \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty L_{\xi_{k+2}}^\infty} dt' \end{aligned}$$

Since we have assumed the pointwise bound $|\hat{\phi}(y)| \lesssim |y|^{\frac{1}{2}+}$ for $|y| \leq 1$, it follows that $\|\hat{\phi}(\epsilon y) \langle y \rangle^{-2-}\|_{L_y^2} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+}$

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\check{R}_{i,j,k+2}^{N,5} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \leq \epsilon^{0+} \int_0^t \\ & \quad \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_j \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \eta_{k+2} \rangle^{1+} \check{f}_N^{(k+2)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+2}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+2})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+2}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^\infty L_{\xi_{k+2}}^\infty} dt' \end{aligned}$$

□

3.6. Limiting collision operator $Q^{(k+1)}$: definition and forms . Recall that $Q_N^{(k+1)}$ has been defined by (3.10) as

$$Q_N^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_{i,k+1}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)}$$

where

$$Q_{i,k+1}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)} = N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)} \epsilon^{-1/2} A_{i,k+1}^\epsilon f_N^{(k+1)}$$

A direct formula for $\check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon$ has been computed in (3.14), that we repeat here:

$$(3.22) \quad \check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) = - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) e^{i\alpha \xi_i (\epsilon \eta_{k+1} - y)/2} e^{i\sigma \xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s (\epsilon \eta_i - 2\epsilon \eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/2} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s \eta_1, \dots, \xi_i - s y - \epsilon s \eta_i + \epsilon s \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s \eta_{k+1}, s y - \epsilon s \eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds$$

We can formally set $\epsilon = 0$ in this expression to obtain the *defining* expression for collision operator component $\check{Q}_{i,k+1}$:

Definition 3.6 (limit form of the collision operator). *Let*

$$(3.23) \quad Q^{(k+1)} f^{(k+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_{i,k+1} f^{(k+1)}$$

where the components $Q_{i,k+1} f^{(k+1)}$ take the form of (3.22) with $\epsilon = 0$, using that since ϕ is real-valued, $\widehat{\phi}(y) = \widehat{\phi}(-y)$:

$$(3.24) \quad \check{Q}_{i,k+1} \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i(\sigma - \alpha) \xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s |y|^2} \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_i - s y, \dots, \xi_k, s y) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds$$

Alternative forms for (3.24) are derived below and given as (3.26), (3.27) and the gain minus loss representation of Proposition 3.7.

By taking the formal $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the quantum BBGKY hierarchy defined in (3.1), we obtain the Boltzmann (infinite) hierarchy

$$(3.25) \quad \partial_t f^{(k)} + \mathbf{v}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} f^{(k)} = Q^{(k+1)} f^{(k+1)}, \quad k \geq 1$$

From (3.24), it is straightforward to take the inverse Fourier transform $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \mapsto \mathbf{x}_k$ to obtain the $(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ form of the operator

$$(3.26) \quad \check{Q}_{i,k+1} \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_y \int_{s=0}^{\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i(\sigma - \alpha) \xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s |y|^2} \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, x_i, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_i - s y, \dots, \xi_k, s y) dy ds$$

Applying the Fourier transform $\xi_k \mapsto \mathbf{v}_k$, we obtain the $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)$ form

$$(3.27) \quad Q_{i,k+1} f^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_y \int_{v_{k+1}} \int_{s=0}^{\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{isy(v_{k+1}-v_i)} e^{-i(\sigma+\alpha)s|y|^2/2} f^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, x_i, v_1, \dots, v_i + \frac{\alpha - \sigma}{2}y, \dots, v_{k+1}) dy dv_{k+1} ds$$

It is customary to rewrite (3.27) in terms of a gain and loss operator that involve a collision kernel.

Proposition 3.7 (representation of $Q_{i,k+1}$ in terms of gain minus loss). $Q_{i,k+1}$ decomposes as the difference of a gain and loss term

$$Q_{i,k+1} = Q_{i,k+1}^+ - Q_{i,k+1}^-$$

where the loss term is

$$Q_{i,k+1}^- f^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{v_{k+1}} \int_{\omega \in S^2} |r| |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 \Big|_{r=\omega \cdot (v_i - v_{k+1})} f^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, x_i, \mathbf{v}_{k+1}) d\omega dv_{k+1}$$

and the gain term is

$$Q_{i,k+1}^+ f^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{v_{k+1}} \int_{\omega \in S^2} |r| |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 \Big|_{r=\omega \cdot (v_i - v_{k+1})} f^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, x_i, v_1, \dots, v_i^*, \dots, v_k, v_{k+1}^*) \Big|_{\substack{v_i^* = v_i + r\omega \\ v_{k+1}^* = v_{k+1} - r\omega}} \Big|_{r=\omega \cdot (v_{k+1} - v_i)} d\omega dv_{k+1}$$

which are (2.6).

Proof. For expository convenience, we will write out the proof only in the case $k = 2$. In this case, (3.27) takes the form

$$Qf^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = - \sum_{\substack{\sigma = \pm 1 \\ \alpha = \pm 1}} \alpha \sigma \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{-i\frac{\sigma+\alpha}{2}s|y|^2} e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1 + \frac{\alpha - \sigma}{2}y, v_2) ds dy dv_2$$

We decompose this as

$$Q = Q^+ - Q^-$$

where the gain operator Q^+ would be:

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \sum_{\substack{(\alpha, \sigma) = (1, -1), \\ (-1, 1)}} \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{-i\frac{\sigma+\alpha}{2}s|y|^2} e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1 + \frac{\alpha - \sigma}{2}y, v_2) ds dy dv_2$$

and the loss operator is Q^- would be:

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \sum_{\substack{(\alpha, \sigma) = (1, 1), \\ (-1, -1)}} \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{-i\frac{\sigma+\alpha}{2}s|y|^2} e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} \\ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1 + \frac{\alpha - \sigma}{2}y, v_2) ds dy dv_2$$

The above is another version of the gain/loss collision operators in (x, v) coordinates. We now rewrite them in the more standard format.

We reexpress the loss operator Q^- as follows:

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 (e^{is|y|^2} + e^{-is|y|^2}) e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} \\ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1, v_2) ds dy dv_2$$

Split the sum into two integrals, and in the second integral change variables $s \mapsto -s$ and $y \mapsto -y$. Since this transformed second integral is now over $-\infty < s < 0$, the two integrals now combine to give a single integral over $-\infty < s < \infty$:

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=-\infty}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{is|y|^2} e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1, v_2) ds dy dv_2$$

Carrying out the s integral:

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 \delta(|y|^2 - y \cdot (v_1 - v_2)) f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1, v_2) dy dv_2$$

Introduce polar coordinates $y = r\omega$

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_{\omega \in S^2} \int_{r=0}^{\infty} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 \delta(r^2 - r\omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)) f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1, v_2) r^2 dr d\omega dv_2$$

Use the homogeneity $r\delta(r^2 - r\omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)) = \delta(r - \omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2))$:

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_{\omega \in S^2} \int_{r=0}^{\infty} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 \delta(r - \omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)) f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1, v_2) r dr d\omega dv_2$$

The δ term reduces the r integration to evaluation at $r = \omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)$ when this quantity is positive:

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_{\substack{\omega \in S^2: \\ \omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2) > 0}} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 r \Big|_{r=\omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1, v_2) d\omega dv_2$$

By even extension:

$$Q^- f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{v_2} \int_{\omega \in S^2} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 |r| \Big|_{r=\omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1, v_2) d\omega dv_2$$

which is the standard form for the loss operator.

Now we derive the standard form of the gain operator

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} \\ (f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1 + y, v_2) + f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1 - y, v_2)) ds dy dv_2$$

Split the sum into two integrals, and in the second integral change variables $s \mapsto -s$ and $y \mapsto -y$. Since this transformed second integral is now over $-\infty < s < 0$, the two integrals now combine to give a single integral over $-\infty < s < \infty$:

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=-\infty}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1 + y, v_2) ds dy dv_2$$

To avoid confusion, we change notation $v_2 \mapsto v_2^*$ and also we can set $v_1^* = v_1 + y$.

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2^*} \int_y \int_{s=-\infty}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2^*)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1^*, v_2^*) \Big|_{v_1^* = v_1 + y} ds dy dv_2^*$$

Now move the v_2^* integration to the inside and (for fixed y) change variable $v_2^* \rightarrow v_2$ where $v_2 = v_2^* + y$

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_y \int_{s=-\infty}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{-isy \cdot (v_1 - v_2 + y)} f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1^*, v_2^*) \Big|_{\substack{v_1^* = v_1 + y \\ v_2^* = v_2 - y}} ds dy dv_2$$

Now carry out the s integral

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) = \int_{v_2} \int_y \hat{\phi}(-y) \hat{\phi}(y) \delta(|y|^2 + y \cdot (v_1 - v_2)) f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1^*, v_2^*) \Big|_{\substack{v_1^* = v_1 + y \\ v_2^* = v_2 - y}} dy dv_2$$

Change to polar coordinates $y = r\omega$

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) \\ = \int_{v_2} \int_{\omega \in S^2} \int_{r=0}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 \delta(r^2 + r\omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)) f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1^*, v_2^*) \Big|_{\substack{v_1^* = v_1 + y \\ v_2^* = v_2 - y}} r^2 dr d\omega dv_2$$

By homogeneity $\delta(r^2 + r\omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2))r = \delta(r + \omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2))$,

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) \\ = \int_{v_2} \int_{\omega \in S^2} \int_{r=0}^{+\infty} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 \delta(r + \omega \cdot (v_1 - v_2)) r f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1^*, v_2^*) \Big|_{\substack{v_1^* = v_1 + y \\ v_2^* = v_2 - y}} dr d\omega dv_2$$

The δ term reduces the r integration to evaluation at $r = \omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)$ when this quantity is positive:

$$Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) \\ = \int_{v_2} \int_{\substack{\omega \in S^2 \\ \omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1) > 0}} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 r f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1^*, v_2^*) \Big|_{\substack{v_1^* = v_1 + r\omega \\ v_2^* = v_2 - r\omega}} \Big|_{r = \omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)} d\omega dv_2$$

By even extension

$$\begin{aligned} & Q^+ f^{(2)}(t, x_1, v_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{v_2} \int_{\omega \in S^2} |\hat{\phi}(r\omega)|^2 |r| f^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_1, v_1^*, v_2^*) \Big|_{\substack{v_1^* = v_1 + r\omega \\ v_2^* = v_2 - r\omega}} \Big|_{r = \omega \cdot (v_2 - v_1)} d\omega dv_2 \end{aligned}$$

as needed. \square

3.7. Limiting collision operator estimates. Analogous to Proposition 3.3, we have the following, which is proved by the same methods as Proposition 3.3.

Proposition 3.8 ($Q^{(k+1)}$ estimates in L^2). *The operator $Q^{(k+1)}$ defined by (3.23) (with components (3.24)) satisfies the bound*

$$\|\check{Q}^{(k+1)} \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t)\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^k \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2}$$

uniformly in t .

Proposition 3.10 below is an L^p based bilinear estimate that is needed in later sections with $p > 2$. Its proof requires use of the Littlewood-Paley square function.

Lemma 3.9 (Littlewood-Paley square function estimate). *Let $\chi(\xi) \geq 0$ be a smooth function with support contained in $\{\xi : \frac{1}{2} < |\xi| < 2\}$ such that there exists $C \geq 1$ for which*

$$(3.28) \quad \forall \xi \neq 0, \quad C^{-1} \leq \sum_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} \chi(\xi/M) \leq C$$

Let P_M be the Fourier multiplier operator with symbol $\chi(\xi/M)$. Then there exists a constant $C_p \geq 1$ such that

$$C_p^{-1} \|f\|_{L^p} \leq \|Sf\|_{L^p} \leq C_p \|f\|_{L^p}$$

where the square function S is

$$(3.29) \quad Sf = \left(\sum_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} |P_M f|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

Proposition 3.10 ($Q^{(k+1)}$ estimates in L^p). *For any $2 \leq p < \infty$ and $0 \leq r \leq 1$, we have the following bound for fixed t, \mathbf{x}_k , and $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}, \dots, \xi_k)$:*

$$\|L \langle \nabla_{\xi_i} \rangle^r \tilde{Q}_{i,k+1} \tilde{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)\|_{L_{\xi_i}^p} \lesssim \|L \langle \nabla_{\xi_i} \rangle^r \tilde{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, x_i, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{(L_{\xi_{k+1}}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi_{k+1}}^{3-}) L_{\xi_i}^p}$$

where L is any (possibly fractional) derivative operator in \mathbf{x}_k and/or $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}, \dots, \xi_k)$. The bound is uniform in t, \mathbf{x}_k , and $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}, \dots, \xi_k)$.

Proof. Since the L operator carries directly onto $\tilde{f}^{(k+1)}$, we might as well take $L = I$. From (3.26), we see that if $\alpha = \sigma$, the $\langle \nabla_{\xi_i} \rangle^r$ passes directly onto $\tilde{f}^{(k+1)}$. Thus let us assume that $(\alpha, \sigma) \in \{(-1, 1), (1, -1)\}$. Both cases are similar, so for convenience we will take $(\alpha, \sigma) = (-1, 1)$.

$$\tilde{Q}_{i,k+1} \tilde{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_i y} e^{-i\sigma s |y|^2} \tilde{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, x_i, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{i-sy}, \dots, \xi_k, sy) dy ds$$

By Minkowski's integral inequality, we see that it suffices to consider, for fixed $s > 0$, the operator \tilde{U}_s that acts on $\tilde{g}(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ and returns a function of ξ_1 , given by

$$(3.30) \quad \tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1) = \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_1 y} \tilde{g}(\xi_1 - sy, sy) dy = \int_{v_1} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_1(v_1+y)} \hat{g}(v_1, sy) dy$$

(where, for the purposes of this proof, \hat{g} denotes the Fourier transform of \tilde{g} in $\xi_1 \mapsto v_1$ only). Our goal is to show that

$$(3.31) \quad \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{g}(\xi_1, \xi_2)\|_{(L_{\xi_2}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3-}) L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

First, we treat the case of $r = 0$. By Minkowski,

$$\|\tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 \|\tilde{g}(\xi_1, sy)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} dy$$

Then we do Hölder in y , depending on the value of s :

$ \hat{\phi}(y) ^2$	$\ \tilde{g}(\xi_1, sy)\ _{L_{\xi_1}^p}$	rescaling generates	use when
$L_y^{3/2-}$	L_y^{3+}	s^{-1+}	$s \leq 1$
$L_y^{3/2+}$	L_y^{3-}	s^{-1-}	$s \geq 1$

This gives

$$\|\tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \|\tilde{g}(\xi_1, \xi_2)\|_{(L_{\xi_2}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3-}) L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

which completes the proof in the $r = 0$ case.

Next, we treat the case of $r = 1$.

$$\|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^1 \tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \sim \|\tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} + \|\nabla_{\xi_1} \tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

The first term is treated by the $r = 0$ case. For the second term, we compute from the definition (3.30) of \tilde{U}_s that

$$\nabla_{\xi_1} \tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1) = \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_1 y} (iy + \nabla_{\xi_1}) \tilde{g}(\xi_1 - sy, sy) dy$$

This splits into two terms, the first is like the $r = 0$ case with $|\hat{\phi}(y)|^2$ replaced by $y|\hat{\phi}(y)|^2$, and the second is like the $r = 0$ case with \tilde{g} replaced by $\nabla_{\xi_1} \tilde{g}$. This completes the proof in the $r = 1$ case.

For general $0 < r < 1$, we first dispose of low frequencies.

$$\|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\lesssim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\lesssim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

and the proof is completed by appealing to the $r = 1$ case and using that

$$\|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r P_{\lesssim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1, \xi_2)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{g}(\xi_1, \xi_2)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

Next, note that

$$\|P_{\lesssim 1} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim \|\tilde{U}_s \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

and thus the proof reduces to the case of $r = 0$.

In view of the above considerations, it suffices to prove

$$(3.32) \quad \|P_{\gtrsim 1} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r \tilde{g}(\xi_1, \xi_2) \|_{(L_{\xi_2}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3-}) L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

By the $L^p \rightarrow L^p$ boundedness of the operators

$$P_{\gtrsim 1} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^r |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^{-r} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\gtrsim 1} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{-r} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r$$

(which follows by the Mihklin multiplier theorem) it suffices to prove the analogous result with homogeneous derivative operators:

$$\|P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p} \lesssim s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \| |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{g}(\xi_1, \xi_2) \|_{(L_{\xi_2}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3-}) L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

Take any smooth $\chi(\xi)$ as in the statement of Lemma 3.9 with the property that³⁶

$$\forall \xi \neq 0, \quad \sum_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} \chi(\xi/M) = 1$$

which is stronger than (3.28) and also implies that

$$(3.33) \quad \sum_{R \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} P_R = I$$

For each $M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$,

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\gtrsim 1} &= P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s (P_{M/2} + P_M + P_{2M}) P_{\gtrsim 1} \\ &\quad + P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s [I - (P_{M/2} + P_M + P_{2M})] P_{\gtrsim 1} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\chi}(\xi_1) = |\xi|^r \chi(\xi_1)$ and let

$$\tilde{\tilde{\chi}}(\xi_1) = |\xi|^{-r} (\chi(2\xi_1) + \chi(\xi_1) + \chi(2\xi_1))$$

Let \tilde{P}_M be the Fourier multiplier with symbol $\tilde{\chi}(\xi_1/M)$, and let $\tilde{\tilde{P}}_M$ be the Fourier multiplier with symbol $\tilde{\tilde{\chi}}(\xi_1/M)$. Then

$$(3.35) \quad P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s (P_{M/2} + P_M + P_{2M}) P_{\gtrsim 1} = \tilde{P}_M \tilde{U}_s \tilde{\tilde{P}}_M P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r$$

by exchanging M^r from the left P operator to the right P operator. Note how this effectively moves the $|\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r$ operator past \tilde{U}_s while preserving exact equality. Let

$$h_j(\xi_1) = \sum_{M \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}+j}} \tilde{\tilde{\chi}}(\xi_1/M), \quad j = 0, 1, 2$$

(In other words, $j = 0$ sums over $M = \dots, \frac{1}{8}, 1, 8, \dots$, while $j = 1$ sums over $M = \dots, \frac{1}{4}, 2, 16, \dots$ and $j = 2$ sums over $M = \dots, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{2}, 4, 32, \dots$). It follows $h_j(\xi) = h_j(8\xi)$

³⁶One can construct such a χ as follows. Take any smooth $0 \leq \chi^0(\xi) \leq 1$ with $\text{supp } \chi^0 \subset \{ \xi : \frac{1}{2} < |\xi| < 2 \}$ such that $\chi^0(\xi) = 1$ on $A = \{ \xi : \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \leq |\xi| \leq \sqrt{2} \}$. Let $m(\xi) = \sum_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} \chi^0(\xi/M)$. For $\xi \in A$, $m(\xi) = \chi^0(2\xi) + \chi^0(\xi) + \chi^0(\xi/2)$ since all other terms vanish. Thus $1 \leq m(\xi) \leq 3$ for $\xi \in A$. From the definition of $m(\xi)$, we have $m(2\xi) = m(\xi)$. Thus $1 \leq m(\xi) \leq 3$ for all $\xi \neq 0$. Now let $\chi(\xi) = \chi^0(\xi)/m(\xi)$. It follows that $\frac{1}{3} \leq \chi(\xi) \leq 1$ on A , that $\sum_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} \chi(\xi/M) = 1$ for $\xi \neq 0$, and that $\text{supp } \chi \subset \{ \xi : \frac{1}{2} \leq |\xi| \leq 2 \}$.

and there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that for $j = 0, 1, 2$, we have³⁷

$$(3.36) \quad C^{-1} \leq h_j(\xi_1) \leq C \quad \text{for } \xi_1 \neq 0$$

Let H_j be the Fourier multiplier operator with symbol h_j . Then

$$H_j = \sum_{M \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}+j}} \tilde{P}_M$$

and each H_j should be thought of as a near-identity operator. Substituting

$$\tilde{P}_M = H_j - (H_j - \tilde{P}_M), \quad j = \log_2 M \pmod 3$$

into (3.35), we obtain

$$P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s (P_{M/2} + P_M + P_{2M}) P_{\gtrsim 1} = \tilde{P}_M \tilde{U}_s H_j P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r - \tilde{P}_M \tilde{U}_s (H_j - \tilde{P}_M) P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r$$

Plug this into (3.34) to obtain

$$P_{\gtrsim 1} P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\gtrsim 1} = V_M^1 + V_M^2 + V_M^3$$

where, again with $j = \log_2 M \pmod 3$, we define the components:

$$\begin{aligned} V_M^1 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{P}_M \tilde{U}_s H_j P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \\ V_M^2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{P}_M \tilde{U}_s (H_j - \tilde{P}_M) P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \\ V_M^3 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{\gtrsim 1} P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s [I - (P_{M/2} + P_M + P_{2M})] P_{\gtrsim 1} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.9 for the collection $\{P_M\}_M$ and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} &\lesssim \|P_{\gtrsim 1} P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} \\ &\lesssim \|V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} + \|V_M^2 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} + \|V_M^3 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} \end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality, we can split the norm on the main term $V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)$ according to the partition $\mathbb{Z} = 3\mathbb{Z} \cup (3\mathbb{Z} + 1) \cup (3\mathbb{Z} + 2)$ as

$$\|V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} \leq \|V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}}}^2} + \|V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}+1}}^2} + \|V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}+2}}^2}$$

For each of the terms on the right-side, $j = \log_2(M) \pmod 3$ is a constant, and thus Lemma 3.9 with respect to the collection $\{\tilde{P}_M\}_M$ can be applied to each term separately to give

$$\|V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^2 \|\tilde{U}_s H_j P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{g}\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

By the $r = 0$ case of the estimate and the $L^p \rightarrow L^p$ boundedness of H_j (which follows by the Mihlin multiplier theorem)

$$\|V_M^1 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} \lesssim \|P_{\gtrsim 1} |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{g}\|_{(L_{\xi_2}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3-}) L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

³⁷Indeed, following the construction of $\chi(\xi)$ given in the previous footnote and the definition of $\tilde{\chi}(\xi)$, we have $2^{-r} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \leq \tilde{\chi}(\xi)$ for $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \leq |\xi| \leq 2\sqrt{2}$, that $\text{supp } \tilde{\chi} \subset \{ \xi : \frac{1}{4} \leq |\xi| \leq 4 \}$, and that for all ξ , $0 \leq \tilde{\chi}(\xi) \leq 3 \cdot 4^r$. Summing over $M \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}+j}$, at most 3 copies overlap for any given ξ , so $h_j(\xi) \leq 9 \cdot 4^r$. By the definition of $h_j(\xi)$, we have the periodicity $h_j(\xi) = h_j(8\xi)$, and from this, (3.36) follows.

It remains only to treat the error terms $V_M^2 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)$ and $V_M^3 \tilde{g}(\xi_1)$. The proof for V_M^2 relies on the fact that

$$(3.37) \quad H_j - \tilde{P}_M = \sum_{\substack{R \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}+j} \\ R \neq M}} \tilde{P}_R, \quad j = \log_2 M \pmod{3}$$

and the proof for V_M^3 relies on the fact that

$$(3.38) \quad I - P_M = \sum_{\substack{R \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}} \\ R \notin \{M/2, M, 2M\}}} P_R$$

Letting $\sigma(A)$ denote the symbol associated to the operator A , the key property of (3.37) and (3.38) is the following of separation of supports: for $R \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ but $R \notin \{M/2, M, 2M\}$:

$$\text{dist}(\text{supp } \sigma(P_M), \text{supp } \sigma(P_R)) \sim \max(M, R)$$

and for $R \in 2^{3\mathbb{Z}+j}$, $j = \log_2 M \pmod{3}$, and $R \neq M$,

$$\text{dist}(\text{supp } \sigma(\tilde{P}_M), \text{supp } \sigma(\tilde{P}_R)) \sim \max(M, R)$$

Since both proofs are similar, we will just complete the proof of the estimate for V_M^3 . By (3.30), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P_M \tilde{U}_s P_R \tilde{g}(\xi_1) &= P_M \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_1 y} (P_R \tilde{g})(\xi_1 - sy, sy) dy \\ &= \int_{v_1} \int_y \chi(v_1/M) \chi((v_1 + y)/R) |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_1(v_1 + y)} \hat{g}(v_1, sy) dy \\ &= \int_{v_1} \int_{y, |y| \sim \max(M, R)} \chi(v_1/M) \chi((v_1 + y)/R) |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_1(v_1 + y)} \hat{g}(v_1, sy) dy \\ &= P_M \int_{y, |y| \sim \max(M, R)} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i\xi_1 y} (P_R \tilde{g})(\xi_1 - sy, sy) dy \end{aligned}$$

By following the proof of the $r = 0$ case, but also using that

$$\|\hat{\phi}(y)\|_{L^q_{|y| \sim \max(M, R)}} \sim \frac{1}{\max(M, R)} \| |y| \hat{\phi}(y) \|_{L^q_{|y| \sim \max(M, R)}}$$

we obtain

$$(3.39) \quad \|P_M \tilde{U}_s P_R \tilde{g}(\xi_1)\|_{L^p_{\xi_1}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\max(M, R)} s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \|P_R \tilde{g}\|_{(L^3_{\xi_2} \cap L^3_{\xi_2}) L^p_{\xi_1}}$$

By Minkowski's integral inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_M^3 \tilde{g}\|_{L^p_{\xi_1} \ell^2_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}} &= \left\| \sum_R P_{\gtrsim 1} P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s P_R P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1) \right\|_{L^p_{\xi_1} \ell^2_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}} \\ &\lesssim \left\| P_{\gtrsim 1} P_M |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r \tilde{U}_s P_R P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{g}(\xi_1) \right\|_{\ell^2_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} \ell^1_{R \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}} L^p_{\xi_1}} \end{aligned}$$

By (3.39),

$$\|V_M^3 \tilde{g}\|_{L_{\xi_1}^p \ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}}^2} \lesssim \left\| \frac{M^r}{R^r \max(M, R)} \right\|_{\ell_{M \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}}^2 \ell_{R \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}}^1} s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} \| |\nabla_{\xi_1}|^r P_{\gtrsim 1} \tilde{g} \|_{(L_{\xi_2}^{3-} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3+}) L_{\xi_1}^p}$$

where $2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has been replaced by $2^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ due to the $P_{\gtrsim 1}$ projections. The indicated double norm in M, R is finite for $r < 1$ completing the proof. \square

3.8. Permutation coordinates and associated norms. For a given $\pi \in S_k$, below we introduce a transformed coordinate system, and then use it to define an associated norm X_π . In the case $\pi = I = \text{Identity}$, the transformation is the identity – we use the original coordinates $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)$, and the associated norm

$$X_I = H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} (L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+} \cap L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^1 \cap L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{\infty, 2+})$$

It is easiest to describe the transformation starting from the $(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ coordinate system. Given π , we introduce new coordinates

$$(3.40) \quad p_j^\pi = \frac{1}{2}(x_j + x_{\pi(j)}) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(\xi_j - \xi_{\pi(j)}), \quad q_j^\pi = \frac{1}{2}(\xi_j + \xi_{\pi(j)}) + \frac{1}{2}(x_j - x_{\pi(j)})/\epsilon$$

for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Notice that, for any particular j ,

$$\pi(j) = j \quad \implies \quad p_j^\pi = x_j, \quad q_j^\pi = \xi_j$$

and thus if $\pi = \text{Identity}$, then $(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi) = (\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$. Let

$$\tilde{g}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi) = \tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$$

meaning that when the function $\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ is reexpressed in terms of the coordinates $(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi)$, it will be denoted by $\tilde{g}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi)$ to avoid confusion. The norm X_π is defined to be

$$\|\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}\|_{X_\pi} = \|\tilde{g}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{p}_k^\pi}^{1+} H_{\mathbf{q}_k^\pi}^{1/2+}}$$

Note that since the transformation (3.40) is ϵ -dependent, typically

$$\|\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}\|_{X_\pi} \not\sim \|\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}\|_{X_I}$$

meaning the the comparability bounds are not uniform in ϵ , and in fact there are examples of functions $\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}$ for which $\|\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}\|_{X_\pi}$ remains bounded as $N \rightarrow \infty$ while $\|\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}\|_{X_I} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. An example is easily given in the case $\pi = (12)$ using quasi-free states.

Definition 3.11. A density $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ is called quasi-free if

$$(3.41) \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} = \sum_{\pi \in S^k} \tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}$$

with

$$\tilde{f}_{N, \pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \prod_{j=1}^k \tilde{g}_0(p_j^\pi, q_j^\pi)$$

for some \tilde{g}_0 independent of N (and thus independent of ϵ). A density $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ is generalized quasi-free if (3.41) holds with

$$(3.42) \quad \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \tilde{g}_\pi^{(k)}(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi)$$

where $\tilde{g}_\pi^{(k)}$ is independent of N (and ϵ). In other words, it is quasi-free but we do not assume factorization in the $(\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{q}_k)$ coordinates.

Example 1 (2-cycles). An important case is when $\pi \in S_k$ contains a 2-cycle. To simplify matters, let us consider $k = 2$ and $\pi = (12)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(\xi_1 - \xi_2) & q_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(\xi_1 + \xi_2) + \frac{1}{2}(x_1 - x_2)/\epsilon \\ p_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(x_2 + x_1) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(\xi_2 - \xi_1) & q_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(\xi_2 + \xi_1) + \frac{1}{2}(x_2 - x_1)/\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

The conversion $(x_1, x_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) \leftrightarrow (p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$ is clearly ϵ -dependent. However, the conversion $(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) \leftrightarrow (y_{12}, y_1, \mu_{12}, \mu_1)$ is ϵ independent, where

$$\begin{aligned} y_{12} &= p_1 + p_2 = x_1 + x_2 & \mu_{12} &= q_1 + q_2 = \xi_1 + \xi_2 \\ y_1 &= q_1 - q_2 = (x_1 - x_2)/\epsilon & \mu_1 &= p_1 - p_2 = \epsilon(\xi_1 - \xi_2) \end{aligned}$$

In the coordinates $(y_{12}, y_1, \mu_{12}, \mu_1)$ the geometrical distortion is easier to see. Indeed, if

$$|y_{12}| \lesssim 1 \quad |y_1| \lesssim 1, \quad |\mu_{12}| \lesssim 1, \quad |\mu_1| \lesssim 1$$

then

$$|x_1 + x_2| \lesssim 1, \quad |x_1 - x_2| \lesssim \epsilon, \quad |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim 1, \quad |\xi_1 - \xi_2| \lesssim \epsilon^{-1}$$

In particular, it is possible that $|\xi_j| \sim \epsilon^{-1}$ for either $j = 1$ and/or $j = 2$. And if η_1, η_2 denote the Fourier dual variables to x_1, x_2 , then likewise the induced effective support properties are

$$|\eta_1 + \eta_2| \lesssim 1, \quad |\eta_1 - \eta_2| \lesssim \epsilon^{-1}$$

Let us write

$$\tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(x_1, x_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) = \tilde{h}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(y_{12}, y_1, \mu_{12}, \mu_1)$$

Now suppose that $\tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ is taken to be a smooth compactly supported function independent of N (and thus $\epsilon = N^{-1/3}$). It follows that $\tilde{h}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ is also a smooth compactly supported function independent of N (and thus $\epsilon = N^{-1/3}$). However, the support of $\tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ will vary with ϵ , and as a result of the tight separation of x_1, x_2 , derivatives in x_1 or x_2 will generate ϵ^{-1} factor losses. Even in an ideal situation, where one has restricted the support of ξ_1, ξ_2 , we have

$$(3.43) \quad \|\langle \xi_1 \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} \langle \xi_2 \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} |\nabla_{x_1}|^s |\nabla_{x_2}|^s \tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}\|_{L_{x_2}^2 L_{\xi_2}^2} \sim \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}-2s}$$

Thus, one has only that $\tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ is uniformly bounded in $H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{3/4}$, but grows in $H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^s$ for $s > \frac{3}{4}$. In this sense, the term is irregular. In fact, when we do not restrict the ξ support, the situation is even worse:

$$\|f_N^{(2)}\|_{X_I} \sim \epsilon^{-2-} \quad \text{while} \quad \|f_N^{(2)}\|_{X_{(12)}} \sim 1$$

Thus it is essential to estimate such a density in the $X_{(12)}$ norm rather than the X_I norm.

The hypothesis of our main theorem is that the given densities can be, at each time t , decomposed into a sum

$$(3.44) \quad f_N^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{\pi \in S_k} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t)$$

(where each $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t)$ is not necessarily quasi-free) but there exists a constant C so that

$$(3.45) \quad \forall N \geq 0, t \in [0, T], \pi \in S_k, \quad \text{we have} \quad \|f_{N,\pi}(t)\|_{X_\pi} \leq C^k$$

The term $f_{N,I}$ corresponding to $\pi = I = \text{Identity}$ is called the *core*, and the analysis ultimately shows that it is the only term that has a nontrivial limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. It is not assumed that the decomposition (3.44) is unique. It should be noted that (3.45) holds when $f_N^{(k)}(t)$ is generalized quasi-free, where the $g_\pi^{(k)}$ terms in (3.42) are allowed to be time dependent but are assumed to be independent of N .

Another hypothesis is needed for the main theorem regarding $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$ when π contains one or more 2-cycles. It is a symmetry condition that must hold on an $\epsilon^{1/2+}$ -dense set of times. For example, if $\pi = (12)$, then

$$(3.46) \quad f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t, x_1, x_2, \mathbf{x}_{k-3}, \xi_1, \xi_2, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k-3}) = f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t, x_2, x_1, \mathbf{x}_{k-3}, \xi_2, \xi_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k-3})$$

In other words, (x_1, x_2) and (ξ_1, ξ_2) are simultaneously flipped to (x_2, x_1) and (ξ_2, ξ_1) while other coordinates remain unchanged. We note that this property is only required to hold on an $\epsilon^{1/2+}$ dense set of times. Specifically, there must exist a subset of times $\{t_u\}$ on which (3.46) holds with the property that for any $t \in [0, T]$, there exists a u such that $|t - t_u| \leq \epsilon^{1/2+}$. The fact that (3.46) is not required to hold for all t resolves the trivial limit puzzle, as discussed in §7, and there it is further argued that in a collisional environment, (3.46) can only be expected to hold on an ϵ dense set of times and typically (on a time set of large measure) (3.46) does not hold.

Consider now the Schrödinger coordinates

$$y_j = \frac{1}{2}x_j - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\xi_j \quad y'_j = \frac{1}{2}x_j + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\xi_j$$

Then

$$x_j = y'_j + y_j \quad \xi_j = (y'_j - y_j)/\epsilon$$

whereas

$$p_j^\pi = y'_j + y_{\pi(j)} \quad q_j^\pi = (y'_j - y_{\pi(j)})/\epsilon$$

By the chain rule,

$$\nabla_{y_{\pi(j)}} = \nabla_{p_j} - \epsilon^{-1}\nabla_{q_j} \quad \nabla_{y'_j} = \nabla_{p_j} + \epsilon^{-1}\nabla_{q_j}$$

By reindexing,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{4}\epsilon \sum_{j=1}^k (\Delta_{y'_j} - \Delta_{y_j}) &= \frac{1}{4}\epsilon \sum_{j=1}^k (\Delta_{y'_j} - \Delta_{y_{\pi(j)}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4}\epsilon \sum_{j=1}^k (\nabla_{y'_j} + \nabla_{y_{\pi(j)}}) \cdot (\nabla_{y'_j} - \nabla_{y_{\pi(j)}}) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \nabla_{p_j} \cdot \nabla_{q_j}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the semiclassical propagators have the conversion

$$e^{\frac{1}{4}i\epsilon t(\Delta_{y'_k} - \Delta_{y_k})} = e^{it\nabla_{p_k} \cdot \nabla_{q_k}}$$

3.9. Estimates in permutation coordinates for $k = 1$. In the case $\pi = (12)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 = y'_1 + y_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(\xi_1 - \xi_2) & q_1 = (y'_1 - y_2)/\epsilon &= \frac{1}{2}(\xi_1 + \xi_2) + \frac{1}{2}(x_1 - x_2)/\epsilon \\
p_2 = y'_2 + y_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(x_2 + x_1) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(\xi_2 - \xi_1) & q_2 = (y'_2 - y_1)/\epsilon &= \frac{1}{2}(\xi_2 + \xi_1) + \frac{1}{2}(x_2 - x_1)/\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

equivalently

$$\begin{aligned}
2y_1 = p_2 - \epsilon q_2 &= x_1 - \epsilon \xi_1 & 2y'_1 = p_1 + \epsilon q_1 &= x_1 + \epsilon \xi_1 \\
2y_2 = p_1 - \epsilon q_1 &= x_2 - \epsilon \xi_2 & 2y'_2 = p_2 + \epsilon q_2 &= x_2 + \epsilon \xi_2
\end{aligned}$$

equivalently

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1 = y'_1 + y_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + p_2) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(q_1 - q_2) & \xi_1 = (y'_1 - y_1)/\epsilon &= \frac{1}{2}(q_1 + q_2) + \frac{1}{2}(p_1 - p_2)/\epsilon \\
x_2 = y'_2 + y_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(p_2 + p_1) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(q_2 - q_1) & \xi_2 = (y'_2 - y_2)/\epsilon &= \frac{1}{2}(q_2 + q_1) + \frac{1}{2}(p_2 - p_1)/\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

In the case $k = 1$, the second Duhamel iterate (3.7) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.47) \quad f_N^{(1)}(t) &= S^{(1)}(t)f_N^{(1)}(0) + \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(2)}S^{(2)}f_N^{(2)}(0)] \\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(2)}\mathcal{D}^{(2)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_\epsilon^{(2)}f_N^{(2)}] \\
&\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(2)}\mathcal{D}^{(2)}N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(3)}f_N^{(3)}]
\end{aligned}$$

In §4 we need to estimate the weak pairing of $f_N^{(k)}(t) - f_N^{(k)}(s)$ by $|t - s|^\alpha$, and in §5, we need to estimate the weak pairing of $f_N^{(k)}(t) - f^{(k)}(t)$, where $f^{(k)}(t)$ is the weak limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$, by ϵ^{0+} (the relevant topologies are defined in §4). Recall also that

$$f_N^{(k)} = \sum_{\pi \in S^k} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$$

Thus in (3.47), the right side involves

$$f_N^{(2)}(t) = f_{N,\text{Id}}^{(2)}(t) + f_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t)$$

(2 terms) and

$$f_N^{(3)}(t) = f_{N,\text{Id}}^{(3)}(t) + f_{N,(12)}^{(3)}(t) + f_{N,(13)}^{(3)}(t) + f_{N,(23)}^{(3)}(t) + f_{N,(123)}^{(3)}(t) + f_{N,(213)}^{(3)}(t)$$

(6 terms). The components $f_{N,\text{Id}}^{(2)}(t)$ and $f_{N,\text{Id}}^{(3)}(t)$ are the core terms, and they are estimated, using the estimates in the earlier subsections of §3, for general k as explained in §4-5. In this section, we explain that the term $f_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t)$ gives negligible contribution, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, in the terms of (3.47). Specifically, for a fixed Schwartz class function $J(x_1, v_1)$, we consider

$$\text{III}_L(t) = \langle J, \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(2)}S^{(2)}f_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(0)](t) \rangle$$

in Corollary 3.14 and

$$\text{IV}(t) = \langle J, \mathcal{D}^{(1)}[N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(2)}\mathcal{D}^{(2)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_\epsilon^{(2)}f_{N,(12)}^{(2)}](t) \rangle$$

in Proposition 3.16. Term $\text{III}(t)$ (which is $\text{III}_L(t)$ without the inner linear propagator) defined below, is a template that is used in both Corollary 3.14 and Proposition 3.16, and also used to explain the trivial limit puzzle in Remark 3.15.

First, we consider the form of the operator $\tilde{B}_{1,2}^\epsilon$ acting on a 2-density and returning a 1-density, but reexpressed in terms of (p, q) coordinates when $\pi = (12)$. With, as usual,

$$\tilde{F}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', x_1, x_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$$

we have

Lemma 3.12 ($\pi = (12)$ form for B).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III}(t) &= \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{x_1, \xi_1} \tilde{J}(x_1, \xi_1) e^{i(t-t')\nabla_{x_1} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_1}} (N\epsilon^{-1/2}\tilde{B}_{1,2}^\epsilon \tilde{F}_{N,(12)}^{(2)})(t', x_1, \xi_1) dx_1 d\xi_1 dt' \\ (3.48) \quad &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{p_1, q_1, q_2} \mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1 + q_2) (\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \\ &\quad \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) dp_1 dq_1 dq_2 dt' \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.49) \quad \mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1 + q_2) = \int_{v_1} e^{iv_1(q_1+q_2)} e^{i(t-t')\epsilon\Delta_{p_1}} J(p_1 + (t-t')v_1, v_1) dv_1$$

For any $n \geq 0$, assuming $|t| \lesssim 1$,

$$(3.50) \quad |\mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1 + q_2)| \lesssim_n \langle p_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_1 + q_2 \rangle^{-n}$$

Proof. The $\tilde{B}_{1,2}^\epsilon$ introduces an integral over x_2 and also assigns $\xi_2 = 0$, equivalently

$$(3.51) \quad y_2 = y_2'$$

equivalently

$$p_2 = p_1 - \epsilon(q_1 + q_2)$$

We convert coordinates

$$(x_1, x_2, \xi_1) \leftrightarrow (p_1, q_1, q_2)$$

The differential conversion is

$$dx_1 dx_2 d\xi_1 = 2\epsilon^3 dp_1 dq_1 dq_2$$

and in this setting,

$$4\nabla_{x_1} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_1} = \epsilon\Delta_{p_1} + 2 \cdot \nabla_{p_1} \cdot \nabla_{q_1} + \epsilon^{-1}\Delta_{q_1} - \epsilon^{-1}\Delta_{q_2}$$

In the $\tilde{B}_{1,2}^\epsilon$ operator, the inner potential terms are evaluated at

$$\frac{y_1 - y_2}{\epsilon} = \frac{y_1 - y_2'}{\epsilon} = -q_2, \quad \frac{y_1' - y_2'}{\epsilon} = \frac{y_1' - y_2}{\epsilon} = q_1$$

where the restriction (3.51) is employed, and thus the potential term is $\phi(-q_2) - \phi(q_1)$. Since ϕ is radial, $\phi(-q_2) = \phi(q_2)$. On the outside of the propagator, the test function is evaluated at (x_1, ξ_1) , which converts as

$$\tilde{J}(x_1, \xi_1) = \tilde{J}(p_1 - \epsilon q_2, q_1 + q_2)$$

This yields the formula

$$(3.52) \quad \text{III}(t) = \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{p_1, q_1, q_2} \tilde{J}(p_1, q_1 + q_2) e^{i(t-t')(\epsilon \Delta_{p_1} + 2 \nabla_{p_1} \cdot \nabla_{q_1} + \epsilon^{-1} \Delta_{q_1} - \epsilon^{-1} \Delta_{q_2})} \\ (\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) dp_1 dq_1 dq_2 dt'$$

after shifting $p_1 \mapsto p_1 + \epsilon q_2$. To proceed to (3.48), we need to write

$$\tilde{J}(p_1 - \epsilon q_2, q_1 + q_2) = \int J(p_1 - \epsilon q_2, v_1) e^{iv_1(q_1 + q_2)} dv_1$$

and upon substitution into (3.52), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III}(t) &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{p_1, v_1} J(p_1, v_1) \int_{q_1, q_2} e^{iv_1(q_1 + q_2)} e^{i(t-t')(\epsilon \Delta_{p_1} + 2 \nabla_{p_1} \cdot \nabla_{q_1} + \epsilon^{-1} \Delta_{q_1} - \epsilon^{-1} \Delta_{q_2})} \\ &\quad (\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) dq_1 dq_2 dp_1 dv_1 \\ &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{p_1, v_1} J(p_1, v_1) \int_{q_1, q_2} e^{iv_1(q_1 + q_2)} e^{i(t-t')\epsilon \Delta_{p_1}} e^{-2(t-t')v_1 \cdot \nabla_{p_1}} \\ &\quad (\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) dq_1 dq_2 dp_1 dv_1 \\ &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{p_1, v_1} e^{i(t-t')\epsilon \Delta_{p_1}} J(p_1 + (t-t')v_1, v_1) \int_{q_1, q_2} e^{iv_1(q_1 + q_2)} \\ &\quad (\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) dq_1 dq_2 dp_1 dv_1 \end{aligned}$$

which results in (3.48). Straightforward estimates resulting from transferring derivatives to the test function J yield (3.50). \square

The following is an analogue of Lemma 3.2 (for $k = 1$ and in weak form) for the case $\pi = (12)$.

Corollary 3.13 ($\pi = (12)$ estimate for B with symmetry assumption). *Let E_2 be the symmetry remainder:*

$$(3.53) \quad E_2(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) := \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) - \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_2, p_1, q_2, q_1)$$

Suppose that there exists $\mu \geq 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that, for all $T_1 < T_2$,

$$(3.54) \quad \|\langle \mathbf{p}_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle \mathbf{q}_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_2} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} E_2(t, \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)\|_{L_t^1 [T_1, T_2] L_{\mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{q}_2}^2} \\ \lesssim \epsilon^\mu (T_2 - T_1)^\alpha \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{p_2} \rangle^{1+} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L_t^\infty L_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}^2}$$

Then the quantity $III(t)$ from Lemma 3.12 is estimated as

$$(3.55) \quad III(t) \lesssim (\epsilon^{\mu-\frac{1}{2}}t^\alpha + \epsilon^{0+t}) \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{p_2} \rangle^{1+} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L_t^\infty L_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}^2}$$

The value of μ is addressed in the remark below.

Proof. Let u_j be the frequency variable corresponding to p_j under the Fourier transform. Introduce the partition of (p_1, p_2) space

$$(3.56) \quad I = P_{1<2,L} + P_{1<2,H} + P_{1>2,L} + P_{1>2,H}$$

according to frequencies, where

- $P_{1<2,L}$ is the projection onto the frequency set $|u_1| < |u_2|$ and $\min(|u_1|, |u_2|) = |u_1| < \epsilon^{-1}$.
- $P_{1<2,H}$ is the projection onto the frequency set $|u_1| < |u_2|$ and $\min(|u_1|, |u_2|) = |u_1| > \epsilon^{-1}$

and analogously define $P_{1>2,L}$ and $P_{1>2,H}$. In (3.48), insert the decomposition (3.56) on $\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ to obtain

$$III(t) = III_{1<2,L}(t) + III_{1<2,H}(t) + III_{2<1,L}(t) + III_{2<1,H}(t)$$

The treatment of the last two terms is completely analogous to the first two terms, so we will only address the first two terms, $III_{1<2,L}(t)$ and $III_{1<2,H}(t)$.

For $III_{1<2,H}(t)$, we do not need to use the symmetry assumption (3.53) since we can effectively use that $1 \leq \epsilon |\nabla_{p_1}|$ to gain $\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+}$ at the expense of $\frac{1}{2}+$ derivatives, which we now describe. By (3.50) and the bound $|\phi(q)| \lesssim \langle q \rangle^{-2n}$, we obtain

$$(3.57) \quad |\mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1+q_2)\phi(q_1)| \lesssim_n \langle p_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_1+q_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_1 \rangle^{-2n} \lesssim \langle p_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_2 \rangle^{-n}$$

and similarly

$$(3.58) \quad |\mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1+q_2)\phi(q_2)| \lesssim_n \langle p_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_1+q_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_2 \rangle^{-2n} \lesssim \langle p_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle q_2 \rangle^{-n}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$|III_{1<2,L}(t)| \leq \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \|P_{1<2,H} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2)\|_{L_{p_1 q_1 q_2}^2} dt'$$

Sup out in the p_1 coordinate and then apply Sobolev embedding to obtain

$$|III_{1<2,L}(t)| \leq \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} P_{1<2,H} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}^2} dt'$$

Since $|u_1| \geq \epsilon^{-1}$, we can trade $\frac{1}{2}+$ derivatives in p_1 in change for $\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+}$:

$$|III_{1<2,L}(t)| \leq \epsilon^{0+} \int_{t'=0}^t \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{2+} P_{1<2,H} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}^2} dt'$$

Since $|u_1| \leq |u_2|$, we can share the 2+ derivatives, obtaining the second part on the right-side of (3.55) in this case.

For $\text{III}_{1<2,L}(t)$, we will need to use the symmetry assumption (3.54). Take (3.48), split into two pieces, and in the second piece swap q_1 and q_2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III}(t) &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{p_1, q_1, q_2} \mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1+q_2)(\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \\ &\quad [P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) \\ &\quad - P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_1, p_1 - \epsilon q_2, q_2, q_1)] dp_1 dq_1 dq_2 dt' \end{aligned}$$

Appealing to the definition of E_2 above,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III}_{1<2,L}(t) &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{p_1, q_1, q_2} \mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1+q_2)(\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \\ &\quad [P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) \\ &\quad - P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 - \epsilon q_2, p_1 + \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) \\ &\quad + P_{1<2,L}E_2(t', p_1 - \epsilon q_2, p_1 + \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2)] dp_1 dq_1 dq_2 dt' \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\theta=-1}^1 \int_{p_1, q_1, q_2} \mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1+q_2)(\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \\ &\quad \left[\frac{d}{d\theta} P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon\theta q_2, p_1 - \epsilon\theta q_1, q_1, q_2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + P_{1<2,L}E_2(t', p_1 - \epsilon q_2, p_1 + \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) \right] dp_1 dq_1 dq_2 dt' d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\theta=-1}^1 \int_{p_1, q_1, q_2} \mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1+q_2)(\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \\ &\quad \left[(q_2 \cdot \nabla_{p_1} - q_1 \cdot \nabla_{p_2}) P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon\theta q_2, p_1 - \epsilon\theta q_1, q_1, q_2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + P_{1<2,L}E_2(t', p_1 - \epsilon q_2, p_1 + \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) \right] dp_1 dq_1 dq_2 dt' d\theta \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.57), (3.58) and applying Cauchy-Schwarz, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{III}_{1<2,L}(t)| &\lesssim \epsilon^{1/2} \int_{\theta=-1}^1 \int_{t'=0}^t \|\nabla_{p_2} |P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon\theta q_2, p_1 - \epsilon\theta q_1, q_1, q_2)\|_{L^2_{p_1 q_1 q_2}} dt' d\theta \\ &\quad + \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \|P_{1<2,L}E_2(t', p_1 - \epsilon q_2, p_1 + \epsilon q_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L^2_{p_1 q_1 q_2}} dt' \end{aligned}$$

In both terms, sup out in the p_1 coordinate, and apply Sobolev embedding to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{III}_{1<2,L}(t)| &\lesssim \epsilon^{1/2} \int_{\theta=-1}^1 \int_{t'=0}^t \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} |\nabla_{p_2} |P_{1<2,L}\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}} dt' d\theta \\ &\quad + \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} P_{1<2,L}E_2(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}} dt' \end{aligned}$$

In the first term, we use that $|u_1| \leq \epsilon^{-1}$ to trade $\frac{1}{2}-$ derivatives for $\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$, giving

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{III}_{1<2,L}(t)| &\lesssim \epsilon^{0+} \int_{\theta=-1}^1 \int_{t'=0}^t \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{1+} |\nabla_{p_2}| P_{1<2,L} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}} dt' d\theta \\ &\quad + \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t'=0}^t \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} P_{1<2,L} E_2(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}} dt' \end{aligned}$$

In the second term, we transfer $\frac{3}{4}+$ derivatives from the p_1 term to the p_2 term. Applying (3.54) in the case $n = 0$ to the second term, we obtain the right-side of (3.55). In (3.54) is only available for some $n \geq 1$, then one can modify the above argument to capture some additional decay from (3.57), (3.58). \square

Corollary 3.14 (Term III for $\pi = (12)$ with linear propagator). *Let e_2 be the symmetry remainder:*

$$(3.59) \quad e_2(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) := \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) - \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_2, p_1, q_2, q_1)$$

Suppose that there exists $\mu \geq 0$ and a time t_0 such that

$$(3.60) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|\langle \mathbf{p}_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle \mathbf{q}_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle \nabla_{p_2} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} e_2(t_0, \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2)\|_{L^2_{p_2 q_2}} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^\mu \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{p_2} \rangle^{1+} \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L_t^\infty L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}} \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\text{III}_{L,t_0}(t) = \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{x_1, \xi_1} \tilde{J}(x_1, \xi_1) e^{i(t-t') \nabla_{x_1} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_1}} (N \epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{B}_{1,2}^\epsilon e^{i(t'-t_0) \nabla_{x_2} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_2}} \tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)})(t_0, x_1, \xi_1) dx_1 d\xi_1 dt'$$

Then

$$(3.61) \quad \text{III}_{L,t_0}(t) \lesssim (\epsilon^{\mu-\frac{1}{2}} t^\alpha + \epsilon^{0+t}) \|\langle \nabla_{p_1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{p_2} \rangle^{1+} \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)\|_{L_t^\infty L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ be the linear evolution starting from t_0 , i.e.

$$\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) = e^{i(t-t_0) \nabla_{p_2} \cdot \nabla_{q_2}} \tilde{g}_N(t_0, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$$

Then with E_2 as defined in (3.53), it follows that (3.54) holds (and hence so does (3.55)) with the same value of μ as in (3.60). \square

Remark 3.15. *Now suppose that $\tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t)$ represents the component for $\pi = (12)$ of the BBGKY $k = 2$ density $\tilde{f}_N^{(2)}$ and correspondingly $\tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ is the expression in (p, q) coordinates. Take $\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)} = \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ in Corollary 3.13. If (3.54) holds with $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$, then (3.55) gives an $O(1)$ bound on $\text{III}(t)$. Thus, we expect that this bound is indeed inherited from the N -body model. If (3.54) holds with $\mu = \frac{1}{2}+$, then (3.55) gives an $O(\epsilon^{0+})$ bound on $\text{III}(t)$, and thus we do not expect this improved bound in general, since it results in a trivial limit (zero collisional effects). Now assume that both of the following hold*

- (1) (3.54) holds with $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$ and no higher value of μ .
- (2) There exists one time t_0 such that (3.60) holds with $\mu = \frac{1}{2}+$.

Note that (1) and (2) can indeed simultaneously hold, since (3.54) involves an integral in t and thus does not “see” a better bound that holds on a small measure set. Now when both (1) and (2) hold, Corollary 3.13, 3.14 imply that both

- (1) $III(t) = O(1)$.
- (2) $III_{L,t_0}(t) = O(\epsilon^{0+})$

This resolves the trivial limit puzzle.

Notice that in Lemma 3.2 (pertaining to $\pi = \text{Identity}$, the core terms) the needed $\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+}$ gain is obtained from the vanishing of $\hat{\phi}(\xi)$ at $\xi = 0$. In Corollary 3.13/3.14 the $\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}/\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+}$ gain is instead obtained from the symmetry assumption. Thus the symmetry assumption is the “faucet” that determines the extent of ϵ gain in the $\pi = (12)$ terms, and this faucet must be tuned precisely as described above.

Replacing $\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ in (3.48) with $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}\epsilon^{-1/2}A_{1,2}^\epsilon\tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$, we can obtain the expression for Term IV in $\pi = (12)$ coordinates.

Proposition 3.16 (Term IV for $\pi = (12)$). *Consider the weak form of Term IV:*

$$IV(t) = \int_{x_1, \xi_1} \tilde{J}(x_1, \xi_1) \int_{t'=0}^t e^{i(t-t')\nabla_{x_1} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_1}} N \epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{B}_{1,2}^\epsilon \left[\int_{t''=0}^{t'} e^{i(t'-t'')(\nabla_{x_1} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_1} + \nabla_{x_2} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_2})} \epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{A}_{1,2}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_{N,(12)}(t'') dt'' \right] dt' dx_1 d\xi_1$$

Implement the coordinate conversion to the $\pi = (12)$ frame,

$$(3.62) \quad \tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', x_1, x_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$$

Let e_2 be the symmetry remainder:

$$(3.63) \quad e_2(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) := \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) - \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t, p_2, p_1, q_2, q_1)$$

Assume that

$$(3.64) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\langle \mathbf{p}_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle \mathbf{q}_2 \rangle^{-n} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_2} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} e_2(t, \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{q}_2) \|_{L^1_{t \in [T_1, T_2]} L^2_{\mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{q}_2}} \\ & \lesssim \epsilon^{0+} (T_2 - T_1)^\alpha \|\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_2} \rangle^{1+} \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) \|_{L_t^\infty L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}} \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$|IV(t)| \lesssim t^{1-} \epsilon^{0+} \|\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_2} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle q_1 \rangle^{0+} \langle q_2 \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) \|_{L_{t''}^\infty L^2_{p_1 p_2 q_1 q_2}}$$

Proof. Let

$$\tilde{F}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t') = \int_{t''=0}^{t'} e^{i(t'-t'')(\nabla_{x_1} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_1} + \nabla_{x_2} \cdot \nabla_{\xi_2})} \epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{A}_{1,2}^\epsilon \tilde{f}_{N,(12)}(t'') dt''$$

We convert coordinates

$$\tilde{F}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', x_1, x_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$$

The converted expression, using (3.62), is

$$(3.65) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t''=0}^{t'} e^{i(t'-t'')(\nabla_{p_1} \cdot \nabla_{q_1} + \nabla_{p_2} \cdot \nabla_{q_2})} \\ &\sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \phi \left(\sigma \frac{p_2 - p_1}{\epsilon} + q_1 - q_2 \right) \tilde{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) dt'' \end{aligned}$$

Substituting into (3.48),

$$(3.66) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{IV}(t) &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{p_1, q_1, q_2} \mathcal{J}(t-t', p_1, q_1+q_2)(\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \\ &\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) dp_1 dq_1 dq_2 dt' \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ is given by (3.65). Note that

$$(3.67) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{p_1} e^{-ip_1 u_1} \tilde{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', p_1 + \epsilon q_2, p_1 - \epsilon q_1, q_1, q_2) dp_1 \\ &= \int_{u_2} e^{i\epsilon q_2 \cdot u_1} e^{-i\epsilon(q_1+q_2) \cdot u_2} \check{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', u_1 - u_2, u_2, q_1, q_2) du_2 \end{aligned}$$

In (3.66), move the p_1 integration to the inside, apply Plancherel $p_1 \mapsto u$, and insert (3.67), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IV}(t) &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{u_1, u_2, q_1, q_2} \check{\mathcal{J}}(t-t', u_1, q_1+q_2)(\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \\ &e^{i\epsilon q_2 \cdot u_1} e^{-i\epsilon(q_1+q_2) \cdot u_2} \check{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', u_1 - u_2, u_2, q_1, q_2) du_1 du_2 dq_1 dq_2 dt' \end{aligned}$$

Shift $u_2 \mapsto u_2 + \frac{1}{2}u_1$ to obtain the more symmetric expression

$$(3.68) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{IV}(t) &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{u_1, u_2, q_1, q_2} \check{\mathcal{J}}(t-t', u_1, q_1+q_2)(\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) e^{\frac{1}{2}i\epsilon(q_2-q_1) \cdot u_1} \\ &e^{-i\epsilon(q_1+q_2) \cdot u_2} \check{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2, \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2, q_1, q_2) du_1 du_2 dq_1 dq_2 dt' \end{aligned}$$

The check-space representation of (3.65) is

$$(3.69) \quad \begin{aligned} \check{G}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t', u_1, u_2, q_1, q_2) &= \epsilon^{-1/2} \int_{t''=0}^{t'} \int_w e^{iw \cdot (q_1 - q_2)} e^{-i(t'-t'')w \cdot (u_1 - u_2)} \hat{\phi}(w) \\ &\sigma \int_w \check{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', u_1 + \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}, u_2 - \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}, q_1 - (t' - t'')u_1, q_2 - (t' - t'')u_2) dw dt'' \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.69) into (3.68), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IV}(t) &= \epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{t''=0}^{t'} \int_{u_1, u_2, w, q_1, q_2} \check{\mathcal{J}}(t-t', u_1, q_1+q_2) (\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \hat{\phi}(w) \\ &\quad e^{\frac{1}{2}i\epsilon(q_2-q_1)\cdot u_1} e^{-i\epsilon(q_1+q_2)\cdot u_2} e^{iw\cdot(q_1-q_2)} e^{2i(t-t'')w\cdot u_2} \\ &\quad \check{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2 + \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}, \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2 - \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}, \\ &\quad q_1 - (t' - t'')(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2), q_2 - (t' - t'')(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2)) \\ &\quad dw du_1 du_2 dq_1 dq_2 dt'' dt' \end{aligned}$$

Replace $u_2 \mapsto u_2 + \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IV}(t) &= \epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{t''=0}^{t'} \int_{u_1, u_2, w, q_1, q_2} \check{\mathcal{J}}(t-t', u_1, q_1+q_2) (\phi(q_2) - \phi(q_1)) \hat{\phi}(w) \\ &\quad e^{\frac{1}{2}i\epsilon u_1\cdot(q_2-q_1)} e^{-i\epsilon u_2\cdot(q_1+q_2)} e^{iw\cdot[(1-\sigma)q_1 - (1+\sigma)q_2]} e^{2i(t-t'')w\cdot(u_2 + \sigma w/\epsilon)} \\ &\quad \check{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2, \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2, \\ &\quad q_1 - (t' - t'')(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2 - \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}), q_2 - (t' - t'')(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2 + \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon})) \\ &\quad dw du_1 du_2 dq_1 dq_2 dt'' dt' \end{aligned}$$

Convert to the \wedge side by replacing the $\check{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$ term with

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{w_1, w_2} \hat{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2, \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2, w_1, w_2) \\ &\quad e^{iw_1\cdot[q_1 - (t' - t'')(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2 - \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon})]} e^{iw_2\cdot[q_2 - (t' - t'')(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2 + \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon})]} dw_1 dw_2 \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} &H(t-t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) \\ &= \epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{t'=t''}^t \int_{q_1, q_2, w} \check{\mathcal{J}}(t-t', u_1, q_1+q_2) (\phi(q_1) - \phi(q_2)) \hat{\phi}(w) \\ &\quad e^{\frac{1}{2}i\epsilon u_1\cdot(q_2-q_1)} e^{-i\epsilon u_2\cdot(q_1+q_2)} e^{iw\cdot[(1-\sigma)q_1 - (1+\sigma)q_2]} e^{iw_1\cdot q_1} e^{iw_2\cdot q_2} \\ &\quad e^{i(t'-t'')[2w\cdot u_2 - w_1(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2) - w_2(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2)]} e^{i(t'-t'')(2w+w_1-w_2)\cdot \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}} dw dq_1 dq_2 dt' \end{aligned}$$

Bring the t' integration to the inside, we obtain

$$(3.70) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{IV}(t) &= \int_{t''=0}^t \int_{u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2} H(t, t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) \\ &\quad \hat{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2, \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2, w_1, w_2) du_1 du_2 dw_1 dw_2 dt'' dt' \end{aligned}$$

To evaluate H , substitute

$$\check{\mathcal{J}}(t-t', u_1, q_1+q_2) = \int_{v_1} e^{iv_1\cdot(q_1+q_2)} e^{i(t-t')u_1\cdot v_1} e^{i(t-t')\epsilon|u_1|^2} \hat{J}(u_1, v_1) dv_1$$

which then allows the evaluation of the q_1 and q_2 integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} H(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) = & \epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{t'=t''}^t \int_{w, v_1} \hat{J}(u_1, v_1) \hat{\phi}(w) \\ & (\hat{\phi} \otimes \delta - \delta \otimes \hat{\phi})(-v_1 + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon u_1 + \epsilon u_2 - w(1 - \sigma) - w_1, \\ & -v_1 - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon u_1 + \epsilon u_2 + w(1 + \sigma) - w_2) \\ & e^{i(t-t')u_1 \cdot v_1} e^{i(t-t')\epsilon|u_1|^2} e^{i(t'-t'')[2w \cdot u_2 - w_1(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2) - w_2(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2)]} \\ & e^{i(t'-t'')(2w + w_1 - w_2) \cdot \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}} dw dv_1 \end{aligned}$$

Using the delta functions to evaluate in v_1 and appealing to radially of ϕ gives

$$\begin{aligned} H(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) = & \epsilon^{-1} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_{t'=t''}^t \int_w \left[\hat{J}(u_1, v_1) e^{i(t-t')u_1 \cdot v_1} \right]_{v_1=\frac{1}{2}\epsilon u_1 + \epsilon u_2 - (1-\sigma)w - w_1}^{v_1=-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon u_1 + \epsilon u_2 + (1+\sigma)w - w_2} \\ & \hat{\phi}(\epsilon u_1 + 2w + w_2 - w_1) \hat{\phi}(w) e^{i(t-t')\epsilon|u_1|^2} \\ & e^{i(t'-t'')[2w \cdot u_2 - w_1(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2) - w_2(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2)]} e^{i(t'-t'')(2w + w_1 - w_2) \cdot \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon}} dw \end{aligned}$$

where the notation $h(v_1) \Big|_{v_1=a}^{v_1=b} = h(b) - h(a)$. Integration in t' is just integration of imaginary exponentials:

$$\epsilon^{-1} \int_{t'=t''}^t e^{i(t-t')r_1} e^{i(t'-t'')r_2} dt' = \frac{e^{i(t-t'')r_2} - e^{i(t-t')r_1}}{i\epsilon(r_2 - r_1)}$$

Applying this, with

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= u_1 \cdot v_1 + \epsilon|u_1|^2 \\ r_2 &= 2w \cdot u_2 - w_1(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2) - w_2(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2) + (2w + w_1 - w_2) \cdot \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) &= \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sigma \int_w \left[\hat{J}(u_1, v_1) \frac{e^{i(t-t'')r_2} - e^{i(t-t')r_1}}{i\epsilon(r_2 - r_1)} \right]_{v_1=\frac{1}{2}\epsilon u_1 + \epsilon u_2 - (1-\sigma)w - w_1}^{v_1=-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon u_1 + \epsilon u_2 + (1+\sigma)w - w_2} \\ & \hat{\phi}(\epsilon u_1 + 2w + w_2 - w_1) \hat{\phi}(w) dw \end{aligned}$$

This can be written more compactly as

$$\begin{aligned} H(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) &= \sum_{\sigma, \alpha \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \int_w \hat{J}(u_1, v_1) \frac{e^{i(t-t'')r_2} - e^{i(t-t')r_1}}{i\epsilon\sigma(r_2 - r_1)} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon u_1 + 2w + w_2 - w_1) \hat{\phi}(w) dw \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= -\frac{1}{2}\alpha\epsilon u_1 + \epsilon u_2 + w(\alpha + \sigma) - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)w_2 - \frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha)w_1 \\ r_1 &= u_1 \cdot v_1 + \epsilon|u_1|^2 \\ r_2 &= 2w \cdot u_2 - w_1(\frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2) - w_2(\frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2) + (2w + w_1 - w_2) \cdot \frac{\sigma w}{\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the denominator is

$$i\epsilon\sigma(r_2 - r_1) = i(2w + w_1 - w_2) \cdot w + O(\epsilon)$$

The two vectors in the dot product on the main term, $2w + w_1 - w_2$ and w , also appear inside $\hat{\phi}$, and moreover we assume that $\hat{\phi}(0) = 0$. Thus vanishing denominators can be suitably compensated, and overall the size of H is $O(1)$. This can be proved by working in spherical coordinates for $w + \frac{w_1 - w_2}{4}$. In order to gain ϵ^{0+} , we will need to split up H , and, correspondingly $IV(t)$ given by (3.70) as

$$H = H_2 - H_1, \quad IV(t) = IV_1(t) - IV_2(t)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_j(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) \\ = \sum_{\sigma, \alpha \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \int_w \hat{J}(u_1, v_1) \frac{e^{i(t-t'')r_j}}{i\epsilon\sigma(r_2 - r_1)} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon u_1 + 2w + w_2 - w_1) \hat{\phi}(w) dw \end{aligned}$$

Since r_2 is oscillatory, an additional integration by parts can be employed for H_2 inside $IV_2(t)$. For H_1 , we will employ a near-symmetry. Let

$$H_3(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) = H_1(t - t'', u_1, -u_2, w_2, w_1) + H_1(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2)$$

Then $H_3 = O(\epsilon)$ (in a certain precise sense). This allows us to reexpress $IV_1(t)$ in order to invoke a symmetry assumption on $\hat{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}$. Writing $H_1 = \frac{1}{2}H_1 + \frac{1}{2}H_1$, and for the second copy of H_1 , substituting the symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) &= \frac{1}{2}H_1(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) + \frac{1}{2}H_1(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}H_1(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) - \frac{1}{2}H_1(t - t'', u_1, -u_2, w_2, w_1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}H_3(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) \end{aligned}$$

When substituted into the expression for $IV_1(t)$, in the second term, we change variable $(u_2, w_1, w_2) \mapsto (-u_2, w_2, w_1)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} IV_1(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{t''=0}^t \int_{u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2} H_1(t, t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) [\hat{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2, \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2, w_1, w_2) \\ &\quad - \hat{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2, \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2, w_2, w_1)] du_1 du_2 dw_1 dw_2 dt'' dt' \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t''=0}^t \int_{u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2} H_3(t, t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2) \\ &\quad \hat{g}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(t'', \frac{1}{2}u_1 - u_2, \frac{1}{2}u_1 + u_2, w_1, w_2) du_1 du_2 dw_1 dw_2 dt'' dt' \end{aligned}$$

In this first term, we use the symmetry assumption, and in the second term, the smallness of H_3 . All H_j satisfy

$$|H_j(t - t'', u_1, u_2, w_1, w_2)| \lesssim_n \langle u_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle w_1 \rangle^{-n} \langle w_2 \rangle^{-n}$$

(note the absence of $\langle w_1 \rangle^{-n}$). □

4. COMPACTNESS OF THE BBGKY FAMILY

In this section, we use the estimates in §3 to prove a compactness property of solutions to the quantum BBGKY hierarchy.

Fix $\delta > 0$, sufficiently small. Let the operator $P_N^{(k)}$, acting on k -densities, cutoff all components of \mathbf{x}_k and \mathbf{v}_k to both spatial radius and frequency radius $\epsilon^{-\delta}$ (in other words, it cuts off all of $\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \mathbf{v}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k$ to inside radius $\epsilon^{-\delta}$) Note that the radius is expanding (both in space and frequency) as $N \rightarrow \infty$, so it in the limit it becomes the identity. Given a hierarchy $f_N = \{f_N^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^N$, let $P_N f_N = \{P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^N$ be the cut-off hierarchy. Given a collection $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N\}_N$ of hierarchies $f_N = \{f_N^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^N$, let $P\mathcal{F} = \{P f_N\}_N$ be the corresponding collection of cut-off hierarchies.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $C \geq 2$. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N\}_N$ is a collection of hierarchies $f_N = \{f_N^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^N$ such that each $f_N^{(k)}$ admits a decomposition*

$$f_N^{(k)} = \sum_{\pi \in S_k} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$$

and

(a) *Each component $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$ satisfies the uniform-in- N bound*

$$(4.1) \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad \|f_N^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)\|_{C([0,T]; X_\pi^{(k)})} \leq 2^{-k} C^k$$

(b) *Each $f_N = \{f_N^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^N$ satisfies the quantum BBGKY hierarchy (3.1).*

Then $P\mathcal{F}$ is precompact in the metric space $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^, \rho))$, where the metric space (Λ^*, ρ) is defined below.*

The metric space Λ^* , defined below, is $H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}$ on each k density with the weak-* topology. The family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N\}_N$ is not bounded in Λ^* . In fact, the assumption (4.1) only establishes that

$$\|f_N^{(k)}\|_{C([0,T]; L_{\mathbf{x}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2)} \leq 2^{-k} C^k k!$$

Due to the fact that the $X_\pi^{(k)}$ norms involve an ϵ -dependent conversion of variables, as soon as derivatives are added, this upper bound gains factors of ϵ^{-1} and thus diverges as $N \rightarrow \infty$. With the projections $P_N^{(k)}$, however, we are able to recover

$$\|P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}\|_{C([0,T]; H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})} \leq 2^{-k} C^k \left(1 + \sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_k \\ \pi \neq I}} \epsilon^{(\ell(\pi) - m(\pi))/2}\right)$$

by Lemma 4.3 below and thus any limit point f of $P\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $f^{(k)} \in C([0, T]; (H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})_{\text{wk}^*})$ and

$$\|f^{(k)}\|_{L_{[0,T]}^\infty H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}} \leq 2^{-k} C^k$$

In §5, we will prove that every limit point of $P\mathcal{F}$ in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$ satisfies the quantum Boltzmann hierarchy. By the uniqueness of solutions to the quantum Boltzmann hierarchy, proved in §6, it follows that there is only one limit point of $P\mathcal{F}$ in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$, which then implies that $P_N f_N \rightarrow f$ in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where f is the solution

to the quantum Boltzmann hierarchy. At the end of §5, we explain that $P_N f_N \rightarrow f$ in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$ implies that $f_N^{(k)} \rightarrow f^{(k)}$ in $C([0, T]; (L_{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k}^2)_{\text{wk}^*})$. This of course raises the question of why we do not instead define Λ^* to be $L_{\mathbf{x}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2$ on each k density with the weak- $*$ topology. The reason is that, in the proof of Theorem 5.1, starting from a test function $J(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)$ (in the space of k -densities), a test function $H(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{v}_{k+1})$ (in the space of $k+1$ densities) emerges (5.12), built from J and the adjoint of the kernel of the collision operators. These test functions must lie in Λ . The test function H only belongs to $H_{\mathbf{x}_{k+1}}^{-\frac{3}{4}-} L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+1}}^{-2, \frac{1}{2}-}$, as proved below (5.12). Since H does not belong to $L_{\mathbf{x}_{k+1}}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+1}}^2$, we cannot define Λ^* to be $L_{\mathbf{x}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2$, and in fact the weakest space Λ^* that could be used is $H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{\frac{3}{4}+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}$ for each k density. Fortunately, the inclusion of the cutoff operator $P_N^{(k)}$ does not complicate any of the weak limit analysis, since $P_N^{(k)}$ can be transferred to the test function.

Now we define the space (Λ^*, ρ) . (For the moment, think of t as absent or fixed). We start by defining the space Λ of all $J = (J^{(k)})_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfying $J^{(k)} \in H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{-1-} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, -\frac{1}{2}-}$ and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C^k \|J^{(k)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{-1-} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, -\frac{1}{2}-}} = 0$$

where C is as in (4.1).³⁸ The set Λ is a Banach space with the norm

$$\|J\|_\Lambda = \sup_k C^k \|J^{(k)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{-1-} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, -\frac{1}{2}-}}$$

The dual space Λ^* consists of all $f = (f^{(k)})_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfying $f^{(k)} \in H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}$ with norm

$$(4.2) \quad \|f\|_{\Lambda^*} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty C^{-k} \|f^{(k)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}}$$

The space Λ is separable; in fact, there is a countable dense set $\{J_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \Lambda$ that can be selected so that for each i and each k , $J_i^{(k)}$ is Schwartz class in $\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k$, and for each i , the function $J_i^{(k)} = 0$ except for $1 \leq k \leq K(i)$. Put a metric on the space Λ^* , as follows:

$$(4.3) \quad \rho(f, g) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty 2^{-i} \min \left(1, \left| \sum_{k=1}^{K(i)} \int_{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k} \overline{J_i^{(k)}} (f^{(k)} - g^{(k)}) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k \right| \right)$$

Then, as topological spaces, $(\Lambda^*, \rho) = (\Lambda^*, \text{wk}^*)$.

Consider now time dependent hierarchies and the space $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$ which has metric $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \rho(f(t), g(t))$. We would like to show that our collection of BBGKY hierarchy solutions $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N\}_N$ is a precompact set in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$. Clearly for each $t \in [0, T]$, $\mathcal{F}_t = \{f_N(t)\}_N$ is contained in the unit ball of Λ^* by assumption (4.1) and (4.2). Ascoli's theorem states that if \mathcal{F} is equicontinuous under ρ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, the set $\mathcal{F}_t = \{f_N(t)\}_N$ has compact closure in (Λ^*, ρ) , then \mathcal{F} is contained in a compact subset of $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$. The fact that for each $t \in [0, T]$, the set $\mathcal{F}_t = \{f_N(t)\}_N$ has compact closure in (Λ^*, ρ) follows from the weak- $*$ compactness of the closed unit ball in Λ^* , and the fact that ρ induces the

³⁸Although the definition of our space Λ depends on C , we have suppressed this in the notation, and just write Λ instead of the clumsier Λ_C .

weak-* topology. The following elementary lemma gives the equicontinuity criterion that we will employ.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that the following holds: for all $i \geq 1$, for all $1 \leq k \leq K(i)$, and for all N , there exists constants $C_{i,k} > 0$ such that*

$$(4.4) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k} \overline{J_i^{(k)}}(f_N^{(k)}(t) - f_N^{(k)}(s)) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k \right| \leq C_{i,k} |t - s|^\alpha$$

where $C_{i,k}$ is independent of N . Then $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N\}_N$ is equicontinuous in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$, meaning that for each $\mu > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all N

$$\forall 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T, \quad t - s \leq \delta \implies \rho(f_N^{(k)}(t), f_N^{(k)}(s)) \leq \mu$$

Proof. Let $I(\mu)$ be chosen sufficiently large so that $2^{-I+1} \leq \mu$. Then from (4.3) and (4.4),

$$\rho_N(f_N^{(k)}(t), f_N^{(k)}(s)) \leq \frac{1}{2}\mu + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{I(\mu)} \sum_{k=1}^{K(i)} C_{i,k} \right) |t - s|^\alpha$$

For $\mu > 0$, the function $\mu \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{I(\mu)} \sum_{k=1}^{K(i)} C_{i,k}$ is finite (although its rate of growth as $\mu \searrow 0$ is unknown). Therefore, it suffices to take

$$\delta = \left(\frac{\mu}{2 \sum_{i=1}^{I(\mu)} \sum_{k=1}^{K(i)} C_{i,k}} \right)^{1/\alpha}$$

□

The cutoff $P_N^{(k)}$ allows for control of the $\pi \neq \text{Id}$ terms using the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that $\pi \neq \text{Id}$ and $f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = g_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{q}_k)$, where $(\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{q}_k) = (\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi)$ are the transformed coordinates (3.40). Then*

$$(4.5) \quad \|\tilde{P}_N^{(k)} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} H_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^{\frac{1}{2}+}} \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\ell-m)-} \|\tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{p}_k}^{\frac{1}{2}+} H_{\mathbf{q}_k}^{\frac{1}{2}+}}$$

where ℓ is the sum of the lengths of all nontrivial disjoint cycles in π and m is the number of such cycles.

Proof. Assume that $k = r$ and $\pi = (12 \cdots r)$. Due the frequency cutoffs included in $\tilde{P}_N^{(r)}$,

$$(4.6) \quad \|\tilde{P}_N^{(r)} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}\|_{H_{\mathbf{x}_r}^{1+\delta} H_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_r}^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \lesssim \epsilon^{-\delta r(1+\delta)} \epsilon^{-\delta r(\frac{1}{2}+\delta)} \|\tilde{P}_N^{(r)} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_r}^2}$$

We will obtain two bounds:

$$(4.7) \quad \|\tilde{P}_N^{(r)} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{x}_r, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_r}^2} \lesssim \|\tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{p}_r, \mathbf{q}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{p}_r}^2 L_{\mathbf{q}_r}^2}$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad \|\tilde{P}_N^{(r)} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{x}_r, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_r}^2} \lesssim \epsilon^{3(r-1)/2} \epsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}\delta r} \|\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_r} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{q}_r} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{p}_r, \mathbf{q}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{p}_r}^2 L_{\mathbf{q}_r}^2}$$

The first estimate (4.7) just follows by dropping $\tilde{P}_N^{(r)}$ and using the fact that the Jacobian for the variable conversion $(\mathbf{x}_r, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r) \mapsto (\mathbf{p}_r, \mathbf{q}_r)$ is $O(1)$ (independent of ϵ).

The second estimate (4.8) is proved as follows. Due to the spatial cutoff in $\boldsymbol{\xi}_r$ included in $\tilde{P}_N^{(r)}$

$$(4.9) \quad \|\tilde{P}_N^{(r)} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_r}^2} \lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}\delta r} \|\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}\|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_r}^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2}$$

where at this point we discarded $\tilde{P}_N^{(r)}$. On the inside, sup out over p_2, \dots, p_r, q_1 . Let

$$\tilde{q}_j = \epsilon q_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, r$$

Then, for fixed $\boldsymbol{\xi}_r$, the mapping

$$\mathbf{x}_r \mapsto (p_1, \tilde{q}_2, \dots, \tilde{q}_r)$$

is invertible with $O(1)$ Jacobian (independent of ϵ). For fixed $\boldsymbol{\xi}_r$, implementing this change of variable gives

$$\|\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{x}_r, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2} \lesssim \|\tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{p}_r, q_1, \epsilon^{-1}\tilde{q}_2, \dots, \epsilon^{-1}\tilde{q}_r)\|_{L_{p_1}^2 L_{\tilde{q}_2 \dots \tilde{q}_r}^2 L_{p_2 \dots p_r}^\infty L_{q_1}^\infty}$$

By Sobolev embedding,

$$\|\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{x}_r, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2} \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_{p_2} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \dots \langle \nabla_{p_r} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{q_1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{p}_r, q_1, \epsilon^{-1}\tilde{q}_2, \dots, \epsilon^{-1}\tilde{q}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{p}_k}^2 L_{q_1}^2 L_{\tilde{q}_2 \dots \tilde{q}_r}^2}$$

Changing variable $\tilde{q}_j \rightarrow q_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, r$, we obtain

$$\|\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{x}_r, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2} \lesssim \epsilon^{3(r-1)/2} \|\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_r} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{q}_r} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{p}_r, \mathbf{q}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{p}_r}^2 L_{\mathbf{q}_r}^2}$$

By interpolating (4.7) and (4.8).

$$\|\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{x}_r, \boldsymbol{\xi}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_r}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_r}^2} \lesssim \epsilon^{(r-1)/2-} \|\langle \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_r} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\mathbf{q}_r} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(r)}(\mathbf{p}_r, \mathbf{q}_r)\|_{L_{\mathbf{p}_r}^2 L_{\mathbf{q}_r}^2}$$

Combining with (4.6) gives the claimed bound (4.5) in the case of one cycle of length r , so $\ell = r$ and $m = 1$. The general case follows by separately treating each collection of coordinates in a disjoint cycle. \square

With these preliminaries out of the way, we can now prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We verify the condition (4.4) in Lemma 4.2. To this end, fix $k \geq 1$, and for notational convenience we will take $s = 0$. Since the projection $P_N^{(k)}$ can just be transferred to the test function $J^{(k)}$, where it has no effect on estimates, we will drop it from the exposition. We need to show that for fixed Schwartz class $J(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)$,

$$(4.10) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k} \overline{J}^{(k)} (f_N^{(k)}(t) - f_N^{(k)}(0)) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k \right| \lesssim |t|$$

where the implicit constant can depend on k and J , but not on N .

Appealing to the second Duhamel iterate (3.7),

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} f_N^{(k)}(t) - f_N^{(k)}(0) &= [S^{(k)}(t) - I]f_N^{(k)}(0) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)} R_N^{2(k)} f_N^{(k)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)} R_N^{3(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(t) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(k)} (Q_N^{(k+1)} + R_N^{4(k+1)}) f_N^{(k+1)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)} R_N^{5(k+2)} f_N^{(k+2)}(t) \end{aligned}$$

where we adopt the notation of §3 for the Duhamel operators $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$, the collision operators $Q_N^{(k+1)}$, and the remainder operators $R_N^{2(k)}$, $R_N^{3(k+1)}$, $R_N^{4(k+1)}$, and $R_N^{5(k+2)}$. Specifically,

$$R_N^{2(k)} f_N^{(k)} = \epsilon^{-1/2} A_\epsilon^{(k)} f_N^{(k)},$$

$$R_N^{3(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)} = N \epsilon^{-1/2} B_\epsilon^{(k+1)} S^{(k+1)} f_N^{(k+1)}(0),$$

$Q_N^{(k+1)}$ is defined in (3.10), $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ is defined in (3.11), and $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ is defined in (3.9).

Each term in (4.11) is substituted into (4.10). Each of the five pieces is then estimated by Cauchy Schwarz with J in the Sobolev norm dual to the norm on the left side of needed estimate (Lemma 3.1–3.2, Proposition 3.3–3.5).

For the $S^{(k)}(t) - I$ term, we use the trivial estimate

$$\| \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_k \rangle^{-1} \langle \mathbf{v}_k \rangle^{-1} |e^{it\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k} - 1| \hat{f}^{(k)}(0) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2} \lesssim |t| \| \hat{f}^{(k)}(0) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k}^2 L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^2}$$

For the $R^{2(k)}$ term, the needed estimate follows from Lemma 3.1 with $s = \frac{1}{2}+$, and the $|t|$ factor on the right-side comes from the outer Duhamel operator. For the $R^{3(k+1)}$ term, the needed estimate follows from Lemma 3.2 with $s = \frac{1}{2}+$, combined with the straightforward estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \| e^{-t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}}} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(0, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, 0) \|_{L_t^\infty L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \\ & \lesssim \| e^{-\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}}} \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(0, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) \|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}}^\infty} \end{aligned}$$

For the $Q_N^{(k+1)}$ the needed estimate follows from Proposition 3.3. For the $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ the needed estimate follows from Proposition 3.4. For the $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ the needed estimate follows from Proposition 3.5. Note that these estimates incorporate the outer Duhamel operator, but still generate a factor of $|t|$. \square

5. CONVERGENCE TO THE BOLTZMANN HIERARCHY

Recall the definition of the Boltzmann hierarchy (2.5)

$$\partial_t f^{(k)} + \mathbf{v}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} f^{(k)} = Q^{(k+1)} f^{(k+1)}, \quad k \geq 1$$

with the collision operator given as (2.6). As we mostly work in the \vee side in this section, we also recall the \vee side collision operator given by (3.23) and (3.24).

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that $f_\infty = \{f^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is any limit point (convergence in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$) of \mathcal{PF} , where $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N\}_N$ is a collection of hierarchies satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1. Then f_∞ satisfies the Boltzmann hierarchy (2.5) with initial condition $f_\infty(0) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N(0)$ (convergence in (Λ^*, ρ)) and satisfies $f^{(k)} \in C([0, T]; (H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+})_{wk^*})$ along with the bounds*

$$\forall k \geq 1, \quad \| f^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \|_{L_{[0, T]}^\infty H_{\mathbf{x}_k}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_k}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}} \leq 2^{-k} C^k$$

Proof. It suffices to assume that f_∞ satisfies the Boltzmann hierarchy (2.5) and then prove that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \rho(P_N f_N(t), f_\infty(t)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty \text{ (along some subsequence)}$$

By the definition of ρ given in (4.3), it suffices to show for that for any Schwartz J ,

$$(5.1) \quad \left| \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k} \bar{J}^{(k)} (P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)}(t) - f^{(k)}(t)) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k \right| \lesssim \epsilon^{0+}$$

where the implicit constant can depend on k and J .

Appealing to the second Duhamel iterate (3.7),

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f_N^{(k)}(t) &= S^{(k)}(t)f_N^{(k)}(0) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{2(k)}f_N^{(k)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{3(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(t) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}(Q_N^{(k+1)} + R_N^{4(k+1)})f_N^{(k+1)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{5(k+2)}f_N^{(k+2)}(t) \end{aligned}$$

where we adopt the notation of §3 for the Duhamel operators $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$, the collision operators $Q_N^{(k+1)}$, and the remainder operators $R_N^{2(k)}$, $R_N^{3(k+1)}$, $R_N^{4(k+1)}$, and $R_N^{5(k+2)}$. Specifically,

$$R_N^{2(k)}f_N^{(k)} = \epsilon^{-1/2}A_\epsilon^{(k)}f_N^{(k)}, \quad R_N^{3(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)} = N\epsilon^{-1/2}B_\epsilon^{(k+1)}S^{(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(0),$$

$Q_N^{(k+1)}$ is defined in (3.10), $R_N^{4(k+1)}$ is defined in (3.11), and $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ is defined in (3.9).

The Duhamel representation of (3.25) is

$$(5.3) \quad f^{(k)}(t) = S^{(k)}(t)f^{(k)}(0) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}Q^{(k+1)}f^{(k+1)}(t)$$

Taking the difference of (5.2) and (5.3) gives

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &P_N^{(k)}f_N^{(k)}(t) - f^{(k)}(t) \\ &= S^{(k)}(t)[f_N^{(k)}(0) - f^{(k)}(0)] + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{2(k)}f_N^{(k)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{3(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(t) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}[Q_N^{(k+1)}P_N^{(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(t) - Q^{(k+1)}f^{(k+1)}(t)] + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{4(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(t) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}R_N^{5(k+2)}f_N^{(k+2)}(t) + (P_N^{(k)} - I)f_N^{(k)}(t) + \mathcal{D}^{(k)}Q_N^{(k+1)}(I - P_N^{(k+1)})f_N^{(k+1)}(t) \end{aligned}$$

We substitute each of the terms in (5.4) into (5.1). The terms involving $R_N^{2(k)}$, $R_N^{3(k+1)}$, $R_N^{4(k+1)}$, $R_N^{5(k+2)}$ are estimated exactly as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 by appealing to Lemma 3.1–3.2, Proposition 3.3–3.5 after Cauchy-Schwarz placing J in the corresponding dual Sobolev norm. Note that each of the estimates here yields a factor ϵ^{0+} , which are needed here although were not needed for the proof of Theorem 4.1. It is also trivial to dispose of the term $S^{(k)}(t)[f_N^{(k)}(0) - f^{(k)}(0)]$ since it is assumed that $f_N(0) \rightarrow f_\infty(0)$ in (Λ^*, ρ) . The term involving $(P_N^{(k)} - I)f_N^{(k)}(t)$ goes to zero due to the smoothness and decay of $J^{(k)}$. All cycle terms of $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}Q_N^{(k+1)}(I - P_N^{(k+1)})f_N^{(k+1)}(t)$ go to zero by the estimates of §3.9, while the core component of $f_N^{(k+1)}(t)$ is handled by transferring the collision operator onto the test function, generating a new test function in $H_{\mathbf{x}_{k+1}}^{-\frac{3}{4}-}L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+1}}^{2, -\frac{1}{2}-}$, as in the proof of (5.7) below (see (5.12)).

Thus, the crux of the proof is to handle $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}[Q_N^{(k+1)}P_N^{(k+1)}f_N^{(k+1)}(t) - Q^{(k+1)}f^{(k+1)}(t)]$. To shorten formulae will drop the $P_N^{(k+1)}$ operator from here on out. It is helpful to recall (3.14) and (3.24):

$$\begin{aligned} \check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t) &= - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{t/\epsilon} \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) \\ &\quad e^{i\alpha \xi_i(\epsilon \eta_{k+1} - y)/2} e^{i\sigma \xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s(\epsilon \eta_i - 2\epsilon \eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/2} \\ &\quad \check{f}_N^{(k+1)}(t - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s \eta_1, \dots, \\ &\quad \xi_i - s y - \epsilon s \eta_i + \epsilon s \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s \eta_{k+1}, s y - s \epsilon \eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\check{Q}_{i,k+1} \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{\infty} |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s|y|^2} \\ \check{f}^{(k+1)}(t, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_i - sy, \dots, \xi_k, sy) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds$$

The relationship $N = \epsilon^{-3}$ is always fixed; for this proof we adjust our notation for f_N to f_ϵ . Fix the test function J and let

$$I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) = \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J} \check{D}^{(k)} \check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(t) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_k d\boldsymbol{\xi}_k$$

In this notation, $\epsilon = 0$ means $Q_{i,k+1}$ (the limiting collision operator) and $\delta = 0$ means $f_\delta^{(k+1)}$ (limiting value of $f_N^{(k+1)}$).

We must show that

$$(5.5) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \epsilon}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{0,0}(t)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0$$

Before addressing (5.5), which will of course exploit cancelation between the two terms, we examine $I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)$ individually. Note that we can move the propagator in $\check{D}^{(k)}$ onto \bar{J} :

$$I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) = \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_k d\boldsymbol{\xi}_k dt'$$

With $\check{Q}_{i,k+1}^\epsilon$ written out,

$$I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) = - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{t'/\epsilon} \\ \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) e^{i\alpha\xi_i(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}-y)/2} e^{i\sigma\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s(\epsilon\eta_i - 2\epsilon\eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/2} \\ \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(t' - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s\eta_1, \dots, \\ \xi_i - sy - \epsilon s\eta_i + \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, sy - s\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds$$

This formula is also valid when $\epsilon = 0$ provided t'/ϵ is replaced by ∞ .

Our first observation is that we can discard $s \geq \epsilon^{-1/2}$. Specifically, define (note the new superscript β):

$$I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \delta, \beta}(t) = - \sum_{\alpha, \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=0}^{\beta^{-1}} \\ \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) e^{i\alpha\xi_i(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}-y)/2} e^{i\sigma\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s(\epsilon\eta_i - 2\epsilon\eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/2} \\ \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(t' - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s\eta_1, \dots, \\ \xi_i - sy - \epsilon s\eta_i + \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, sy - s\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds$$

that restricts the s integration range to $0 \leq s \leq \beta^{-1}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Uniformly in $\epsilon \geq 0$, $\delta \geq 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon, \delta, \beta}(t)| \lesssim (\epsilon\beta^{-1+} + t\beta^{0+}) \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}\|_{L_{[0,T]}^\infty L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}}^2 L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}}^2}$$

In particular, if we take $\beta = \epsilon^{1/2}$, we obtain an ϵ^{0+} prefactor.

Proof. From the definitions,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta,\beta}(t) &= - \sum_{\alpha,\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha\sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \int_{s=\beta^{-1}}^{t'/\epsilon} \\ &\hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) e^{i\alpha\xi_i(\epsilon\eta_{k+1}-y)/2} e^{i\sigma\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s(\epsilon\eta_i - 2\epsilon\eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/2} \\ &\check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(t' - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s\eta_1, \dots, \\ &\xi_i - sy - \epsilon s\eta_i + \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, sy - s\epsilon\eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta,\beta}(t)| &\lesssim \|\check{J}\|_{L_{\xi_k}^2 L_{\eta_k}^2} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{s=\beta^{-1}}^{t'/\epsilon} \left\| \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(\epsilon\eta_{k+1} - y)| |\hat{\phi}(y)| \right. \\ &|\check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(t' - \epsilon s, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s\eta_1, \dots, \\ &\xi_i - sy - \epsilon s\eta_i + \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s\eta_{k+1}, sy - s\epsilon\eta_{k+1})| dy d\eta_{k+1} \Big\|_{L_{\eta_k}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} ds \end{aligned}$$

By following the proof of Proposition 3.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta,\beta}(t)| \\ &\lesssim \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{s=\beta^{-1}}^{t'/\epsilon} s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} ds dt' \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}\|_{L_{[0,T]}^\infty L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2} \end{aligned}$$

Carrying out the s integral, we obtain

$$\int_{t'=0}^t \int_{s=\beta^{-1}}^{t'/\epsilon} s^{-1+} \langle s \rangle^{0-} ds dt' \sim \int_{t'=0}^t \langle \min(\beta^{-1}, t'/\epsilon) \rangle^{0-} dt' \leq \int_{t'=0}^t [\max(\beta, \epsilon/t')]^{0+} dt'$$

The t' integral is carried out in two pieces. First, $t' \leq \epsilon\beta^{-1}$, in which case $\max(\beta^{-1}, t'/\epsilon) = t'/\epsilon$. Second, $t' \geq \epsilon\beta^{-1}$, in which case $\max(\beta^{-1}, t'/\epsilon) = \beta^{-1}$. The evaluation of these two integrals gives the result. \square

In view of Lemma 5.2, to prove (5.5), it suffices to show

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t) - I^{0,0,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0$$

And to prove this, it suffices to prove

$$(5.6) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t) - I^{0,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t)| \lesssim \epsilon^{0+} \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_i} \rangle^{0+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}\|_{L_{[0,T]}^\infty L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2}$$

and

$$(5.7) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I_{i,k+1}^{0,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t) - I^{0,0,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0$$

We begin with the proof of (5.6). For this, we start by switching the order of t' and s integrals and shifting the t' integration

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta,\beta}(t) = & - \sum_{\alpha,\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha \sigma \int_{s=0}^{\beta^{-1}} \int_{t'=-\epsilon s}^{t-\epsilon} \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t'-\epsilon s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \int_{\eta_{k+1}} \int_y \\ & \hat{\phi}(\epsilon \eta_{k+1} - y) \hat{\phi}(y) e^{i\alpha \xi_i (\epsilon \eta_{k+1} - y)/2} e^{i\sigma \xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s (\epsilon \eta_i - 2\epsilon \eta_{k+1} + 2y)y/2} \\ & \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1 - \epsilon s \eta_1, \dots, \\ & \xi_i - s y - \epsilon s \eta_i + \epsilon s \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k - \epsilon s \eta_{k+1}, s y - s \epsilon \eta_{k+1}) d\eta_{k+1} dy ds \end{aligned}$$

This moves the s translation from the time argument of f to the test function. The rest of the proof of (5.6) is just a matter of applying the fundamental theorem of calculus:

$$I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\delta,\beta}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{0,\delta,\beta}(t) = \int_{\theta=0}^1 \frac{d}{d\theta} [I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon\theta,\delta,\beta}(t)] d\theta$$

and then carrying out, via the chain rule, the θ -derivative of (5.8) with ϵ replaced by $\epsilon\theta$ (note that δ and β are held fixed, although after the calculation is completed, we set $\delta = \epsilon$ and $\beta = \epsilon^{1/2}$). Rather than write one very long formula, we provide a table giving the result of each term generated. We have enumerated the terms in the left column for ease of reference below.

Term #	θ derivative lands on	generates
1	$\bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t'-\epsilon\theta s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_k)$	$-\epsilon s \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t'-\epsilon\theta s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_k$
2	$\hat{\phi}(\epsilon\theta \eta_{k+1} - y)$	$\epsilon \nabla \hat{\phi}(\epsilon\theta \eta_{k+1} - y) \cdot \eta_{k+1}$
3	$\exp[\frac{1}{2}i\theta \epsilon (\alpha \xi_i + 2\sigma s y) \cdot \eta_{k+1}]$	$\frac{1}{2}i(\alpha \epsilon \xi_i + 2\sigma \epsilon s y) \cdot \eta_{k+1} \exp[\frac{1}{2}i \dots]$
4	$\exp[-\frac{1}{2}i\theta \epsilon \sigma s \eta_i \cdot y]$	$-\frac{1}{2}i \epsilon \sigma s \eta_i \cdot y \exp[-\frac{1}{2}i \dots]$
5	$\check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(\dots)$	$\epsilon s [-\boldsymbol{\eta}_k \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k} + \eta_{k+1} \cdot (\nabla_{\xi_i} - \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}})] \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(\dots)$

Note that in each case, a factor ϵ emerges, but in some cases this comes along with an s , which is not small, but is bounded by β^{-1} , and when $\beta = \epsilon^{-1/2}$, we have $|s\epsilon| \leq \epsilon^{1/2}$. Factors $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k$ are absorbed onto \bar{J} , as are any factors $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k$ since we can write

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_k = [\boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t'-\epsilon\theta s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_k] - [(t-t'-\epsilon\theta s)\boldsymbol{\eta}_k]$$

and the prefactor $|(t-t'-\epsilon\theta s)| \lesssim 1$. The extra y can be absorbed by $\hat{\phi}(y)$. The factor η_{k+1} must be added to the right-side, as must the ξ -derivatives on $\check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}(\dots)$ that emerge in Term 5.

The very long expression for $\frac{d}{d\theta} [I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon\theta,\delta,\beta}(t)]$, which has five copies of (5.8) with each of the term replacements as given in the table above, can be estimated by the method of proof of Proposition 3.3 to yield

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{0,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t)| \lesssim \epsilon^{1/2} \|\langle \eta_i \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}+} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{\frac{7}{4}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_i} \rangle^1 \langle \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}} \rangle^{\frac{3}{2}+} \check{f}_\delta^{(k+1)}\|_{L_{[0,T]}^\infty L_{\eta_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2}$$

This can be interpolated with the trivial bound that ignores cancelation and just estimates $I_{i,k+1}^{\epsilon,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}$ and $I^{0,\epsilon,\epsilon^{1/2}}(t)$ separately via Proposition 3.3, with no ϵ gain. The result of this interpolation leaves an ϵ^{0+} at the expense of

$$\langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{0+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_i} \rangle^{0+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_{k+1}} \rangle^{0+}$$

This completes the proof of (5.6).

Next, we prove (5.7). Both terms are expressed in terms of the limiting collision operator $Q_{i,k+1}$, and the difference can be expressed as $Q_{i,k+1}$ acting on $f_\epsilon^{(k+1)} - f^{(k+1)}$. Thus, the argument hinges upon whether the kernel of $Q_{i,k+1}$ and the outside test function J can together serve as a test function in $(k+1)$ variables, so that we can appeal to the fact that $f_\epsilon^{(k+1)} - f^{(k+1)} \rightarrow 0$ in $(H_{\mathbf{x}_{k+1}}^{1+} L_{\mathbf{v}_{k+1}}^{2,\frac{1}{2}+})_{\text{wk}^*}$.

By Lemma 5.2, we can remove the $\beta^{-1} = \epsilon^{-1/2}$ cutoff on the s -integral and thus it suffices to examine

$$\begin{aligned} I_{i,k+1}^{0,\epsilon}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{0,0}(t) &= - \sum_{\alpha,\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha\sigma \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \\ &\quad \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}} \int_y |\hat{\phi}(y)|^2 e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi_i y/2} e^{-i\sigma s|y|^2} (\check{f}_\epsilon^{(k+1)} - \check{f}^{(k+1)}) \\ &\quad (t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_i - sy, \dots, \xi_k, sy) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} dy ds \end{aligned}$$

Change variable $y \mapsto \xi_{k+1}/s$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{i,k+1}^{0,\epsilon}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{0,0}(t) &= - \sum_{\alpha,\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha\sigma \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \\ &\quad \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}} \int_{\xi_{k+1}} s^{-3} |\hat{\phi}(\xi_{k+1}/s)|^2 e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi_i \xi_{k+1}/(2s)} e^{-i\sigma |\xi_{k+1}|^2/s} (\check{f}_\epsilon^{(k+1)} - \check{f}^{(k+1)}) \\ &\quad (t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_i - \xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k, \xi_{k+1}) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} d\xi_{k+1} ds \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$(5.9) \quad h(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}) = \int_{s=0}^{\infty} s^{-3} |\hat{\phi}(\xi_{k+1}/s)|^2 e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi_i \xi_{k+1}/(2s)} e^{-i\sigma |\xi_{k+1}|^2/s} ds$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_{i,k+1}^{0,\epsilon}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{0,0}(t) &= - \sum_{\alpha,\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha\sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}} \int_{\xi_{k+1}} \bar{J}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k + (t-t')\boldsymbol{\eta}_k) \\ &\quad h(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}) (\check{f}_\epsilon^{(k+1)} - \check{f}^{(k+1)})(t', \eta_1, \dots, \eta_i - \eta_{k+1}, \dots, \eta_{k+1}, \\ &\quad \xi_1, \dots, \xi_i - \xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_k, \xi_{k+1}) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} d\xi_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Replace $\eta_i \mapsto \eta_i + \eta_{k+1}$ and $\xi_i \mapsto \xi_i + \xi_{k+1}$. The result is

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} I_{i,k+1}^{0,\epsilon}(t) - I_{i,k+1}^{0,0}(t) &= - \sum_{\alpha,\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \alpha\sigma \int_{t'=0}^t \int_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}} \\ &\quad H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) (\check{f}_\epsilon^{(k+1)} - \check{f}^{(k+1)})(t', \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} d\xi_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(5.11) \quad H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) = h(\xi_i + \xi_{k+1}, \xi_{k+1}) \bar{J}(\eta_1 \cdot, \eta_i + \eta_{k+1}, \cdot, \eta_k, \\ \xi_1 + (t - t')\eta_1 \cdot, \xi_i + \xi_{k+1} + (t - t')(\eta_i + \eta_{k+1}), \cdot, \xi_k + (t - t')\eta_k)$$

We claim that

$$(5.12) \quad H \in L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}}^{2, -\frac{3}{4}-} H_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}}^{-\frac{1}{2}-}$$

uniformly in t, t' .

First, we note that with $h(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1})$ defined by (5.9), we have

$$(5.13) \quad |h(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1})| \lesssim |\xi_{k+1}|^{-2}$$

To see that (5.13) holds, note that

$$|h(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1})| \leq \int_{s=0}^{\infty} s^{-3} |\hat{\phi}(\xi_{k+1}/s)|^2 ds$$

Break the s integral into $s \leq |\xi_{k+1}|$ and $s > |\xi_{k+1}|$. For $s < |\xi_{k+1}|$, since $|\xi_{k+1}|/s \geq 1$, we use the assumption that $\hat{\phi}(y) \lesssim |y|^{-1-}$ for $|y| \geq 1$. Then

$$\int_{s=0}^{|\xi_{k+1}|} \frac{1}{s^3} |\hat{\phi}(\frac{\xi_{k+1}}{s})|^2 ds \leq \int_{s=0}^{|\xi_{k+1}|} \frac{1}{s^3} \frac{s^{2+}}{|\xi_{k+1}|^{2+}} ds = \frac{1}{|\xi_{k+1}|^2}$$

For $s > |\xi_{k+1}|$, since $|\xi_{k+1}|/s < 1$, we just use that $|\hat{\phi}(y)| \lesssim 1$ for $|y| \leq 1$. Then

$$\int_{s=|\xi_{k+1}|}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{s^3} |\hat{\phi}(\frac{\xi_{k+1}}{s})|^2 ds \lesssim \int_{s=|\xi_{k+1}|}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{s^3} ds = \frac{1}{|\xi_{k+1}|^2}$$

This completes the proof of (5.13).

By (5.13) and the fact that $J \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$|H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})| \lesssim |\xi_{k+1}|^{-2} \langle \eta_1 \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_i + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_k \rangle^{-2} \cdots \\ \langle \xi_1 + (t - t')\eta_1 \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \xi_i + \xi_{k+1} + (t - t')(\eta_i + \eta_{k+1}) \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \xi_k + (t - t')\eta_k \rangle^{-2}$$

Hence

$$\|H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k}^2} \lesssim |\xi_{k+1}|^{-2} \langle \eta_1 \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_i + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_k \rangle^{-2}$$

By dual Sobolev embedding,

$$\|H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{k+1}| \leq 1}\|_{H_{\xi_{k+1}}^{-\frac{1}{2}-} L_{\xi_k}^2} \lesssim \|H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{k+1}| \leq 1}\|_{L_{\xi_{k+1}}^{\frac{3}{2}-} L_{\xi_k}^2} \\ \lesssim \langle \eta_1 \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_i + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_k \rangle^{-2}$$

Also,

$$\|H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{k+1}| \leq 1}\|_{H_{\xi_{k+1}}^{-\frac{1}{2}-} L_{\xi_k}^2} \lesssim \|H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}) \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{k+1}| \leq 1}\|_{L_{\xi_{k+1}}^2 L_{\xi_k}^2} \\ \lesssim \langle \eta_1 \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_i + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-2} \cdots \langle \eta_k \rangle^{-2}$$

Consequently,

$$\|H(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1})\|_{L_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1}}^{2, -\frac{3}{4}-} H_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k+1}}^{-\frac{3}{4}-}} \lesssim \left(\int_{\eta_i, \eta_{k+1}} \langle \eta_i \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} \langle \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}-} \langle \eta_i + \eta_{k+1} \rangle^{-4} d\eta_i d\eta_{k+1} \right)^{1/2} < \infty$$

completing the proof of (5.12).

This establishes that the test function in (5.10) belongs to Λ . Since (recalling ρ is the metric assigned to Λ^*)

$$\rho(f_\epsilon^{(k+1)}(t'), f^{(k+1)}(t')) \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly in t' , it follows that (5.7) holds. \square

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = \{f_N\}_N$ is a collection of hierarchies satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1 and $P_N f_N \rightarrow f_\infty$ in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$, where $f_\infty = \{f^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$. Then for all $k \geq 1$, $f_N^{(k)} \rightarrow f^{(k)}$ in $C([0, T]; (L_{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{v}_k}^2)_{wk^*})$.*

Proof. The hypotheses of Theorem 4.1 suffice to imply that

$$\|f_N^{(k)}(t)\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{v}_k}^2} \leq C^k k!$$

By density it suffices to show that for any of the test functions $J^{(k)}$ described in the construction of Λ , we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{v}_k} J^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) (f_N^{(k)} - f^{(k)})(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k \rightarrow 0$$

It suffices to show that both

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{v}_k} J^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) (f_N^{(k)} - P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)})(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k \rightarrow 0$$

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{v}_k} J^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) (P_N^{(k)} f_N^{(k)} - f^{(k)})(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{v}_k \rightarrow 0$$

The first of these holds since $\|(I - P_N^{(k)})J^{(k)}\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{v}_k}^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, while, uniformly in N , $\|f_N^{(k)}\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{v}_k}^2} \leq C^k k!$. The second statement holds since it was assumed that $P_N f_N \rightarrow f_\infty$ in $C([0, T]; (\Lambda^*, \rho))$. \square

6. UNCONDITIONAL UNIQUENESS OF THE BOLTZMANN HIERARCHY

We now turn our attention to proving Theorem 6.2 which concludes that there is only one limit point resulting from the process in §4-5.

Definition 6.1. *We say the family $\{f^{(k)}\}$ is admissible if it satisfies one of the following:*

(i) *It is a weak $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit point of $\{f_N^{(k)}\}$ which is some family of marginals of a symmetric N -body system on Ω .*

(ii) *It is a family of symmetric probability marginals.*

Theorem 6.2. *There is at most one admissible solution to the quantum Boltzmann hierarchy (2.5) in $[0, T]$ subject to the condition that, there is a $C_0 > 0$, such that*

$$(6.1) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{x_j} \rangle^{1+} \langle v_j \rangle^{0+} \right) f^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \right\|_{L_{x, v}^2} \leq C_0^k$$

$$(6.2) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{x_j} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle v_j \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \right) f^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \right\|_{L_{x, v}^2} \leq C_0^k$$

Corollary 6.3. *There is at most one $C\left([0, T], H_x^{1+} L_v^{2,0+} \cap H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+} L_v^{2,\frac{1}{2}+}\right)$ solution to the Boltzmann equation (1.9).*

Proof. This corollary follows from the proof of Theorem 6.2 without using Lemma 6.4, and hence does not need the admissibile condition. \square

The proof of Theorem 6.2 consists of 3 main ingredients: a Klainerman-Machedon (KM) combinatoric which is stated as Lemma 6.5 and proved in §6.1 to combine the factorial many terms into exponentially many terms; a Hewitt-Savage theorem,³⁹ which gives a representation as a superposition of molecular chaos for the solution and hence simplifies the proofs of the needed bilinear estimates⁴⁰; and finally, the bilinear estimates in §6.2, which will be iterated to conclude the difference of the solutions is actually zero.

We use the following version of the Hewitt-Savage theorem.

Lemma 6.4 (Hewitt-Savage). *Let $\{f_N^{(k)}\}$ be the family of marginals of a symmetric N -body system on Ω and let the family $\{f^{(k)}\}$ be a weak $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit point of $\{f_N^{(k)}\}$, then there exists a probability measure $d\mu(\rho)$ on $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, the space of probability measures on Ω , such that*

$$(6.3) \quad f^{(k)} = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} \rho^{\otimes k} d\mu(\rho).$$

Proof. There are many versions and related references for this theorem. See, for example, [3], in which a version was used to deal with the homogeneous case. The version we are using here is actually from the lecture note [79, §2]. As written in [79, (2.3) or (2.10)], in the N -body context, the version one would like to use is mostly

$$f_N^{(k)} \rightharpoonup_* \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} \rho^{\otimes k} d\mu(\rho) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

The quick argument on [79, p.29] directly near [79, (2.10)] needs compactness of Ω . It is then further investigated and a proof for the non-compact Ω case is given in [79, p.34]. \square

Under representation (6.3), we can restate the requirement (6.1)-(6.2) using the Chebyshev's inequality. In fact, if we take the $\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle v \rangle^{0+}$ part as an example, like in [19], we have for all $K > C_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu \left\{ \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) : \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle v \rangle^{0+} \rho \right\|_{L_{x,v}^2} > K \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{\left\| \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \langle \nabla_{x_j} \rangle^{1+} \langle v_j \rangle^{0+} \right) f^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \right\|_{L_{x,v}^2}}{K^k} \leq \frac{C_0^k}{K^k}, \text{ for all } k, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\mu \left\{ \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) : \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle v \rangle^{0+} \rho \right\|_{L_{x,v}^2} > K \right\} = 0.$$

³⁹ [3] also suggests the usage of this theorem.

⁴⁰As we are not at scaling critical regularity, trace type multilinear estimate, which implies the product type we use here, can be proved. But, away from requiring an even more technical analysis, it would result in a conditional uniqueness theorem which needs a rerun of Section 5 to verify the condition.

That is, μ is supported in the set of functions (not only probability measures):

$$(6.4) \quad E(C_0) = \left\{ \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) : \max \left\{ \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle v \rangle^{0+} \rho \right\|_{L^2_{x,v}}, \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle v \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \rho \right\|_{L^2_{x,v}} \right\} \leq C_0 \right\}.$$

Let $f_1^{(k)}$ and $f_2^{(k)}$ be two solutions of the quantum Boltzmann hierarchy subject to the same initial condition and (6.1)-(6.2), and $\mu_{1,t}$ and $\mu_{2,t}$ be their corresponding Hewitt-Savage measures, we would like to deduce Theorem 6.2 by proving

$$f^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = \int \rho^{\otimes k} d\mu_t(\rho) \equiv \int \rho^{\otimes k} d(\mu_{1,t} - \mu_{2,t})(\rho) = 0.$$

Here, μ_t is a signed measure, but we only need the properties that $d|\mu_t| = d\mu_{1,t} + d\mu_{2,t}$ is finite and it is supported in $E(C_0)$ defined in (6.4). It suffices to prove $f^{(1)} = 0$ as the general case follows from the same proof but with longer superscripts. Using the linearity of (2.5), we know

$$f^{(k)}(t_k, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) = \int_0^{t_k} S_{k,k+1}^{(k)} Q^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)}) dt_{k+1},$$

where we have taken up the shorthand

$$S_{i,l}^{(k)} \equiv \prod_{j=1}^k e^{-(t_i-t_l)v_j \cdot \nabla_{x_k}} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{i,l} = e^{-(t_i-t_l)v \cdot \nabla_x}$$

Iterating the hierarchy relation, we obtain the Dyson series-like interaction expansion⁴¹ of $f^{(1)}$,

$$(6.5) \quad f^{(1)}(t_1, x_1, v_1) = \int_0^{t_1} \int_0^{t_2} \dots \int_0^{t_k} D^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1})) dt_{k+1}$$

where $\underline{t}_{k+1} = (t_2, t_3, \dots, t_{k+1})$ and

$$D^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1})) = S_{1,2}^{(1)} Q^{(2)} S_{2,3}^{(2)} Q^{(3)} \dots S_{k,k+1}^{(k)} Q^{(k+1)}.$$

As $Q^{(k)}$ has k terms inside (without splitting into Q^+, Q^-), (6.5) contains $(k+1)!$ many summands. In the Lanford method, such a factorial factor is countered by a simplex integral of the time domain. In the quantum setting, there are some known combinatorics based on Feymann diagrams. But we will not use any Feymann diagrams, we use our own combinatoric, a KM board game, to reduce the number of terms by combining them.⁴²

Lemma 6.5 (Klainerman-Machedon board game). *One can group the $(k+1)!$ many summands inside (6.5) into at most 4^k classes indexed by $\mu \in m_k$, where m_k is a set of suitable permutations in the permutation group S_{k+1} satisfying $\mu(j) < j$ for $j = 2, \dots, k+1$.⁴³ For each class μ , all summands inside that class, can be summed (combined) into one integral*

$$(6.6) \quad I_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1) = \int_{T(\mu)} D_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1})) dt_{k+1}$$

⁴¹There are many names attached to such expansions. But as we are in the quantum setting, we use Dyson or Duhamel-Born here.

⁴²We are using binary trees for our algorithm, but they are not Feymann diagrams. Feymann diagrams make up a proper subset of binary trees.

⁴³ m_k is the set of upper echelon trees as we will see in the proof in §6.1.

where the time integration domain $T(\mu) \subset [0, t_1]^k$ is a union of simplexes and is explicitly determined by μ and the integrand is given by

$$D_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1})) = S_{1,2}^{(1)} Q_{\mu(2),2} S_{2,3}^{(2)} Q_{\mu(3),3} \dots S_{k,k+1}^{(k)} Q_{\mu(k+1),k+1}.$$

Proof. See §6.1. □

With Lemma 6.5, we turn our attention to the estimate of I_μ .

Proposition 6.6. *For I_μ coming from Lemma 6.5, and $f^{(k)} = \int \rho^{\otimes k} d\mu_t(\rho)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t_1 \in [0, T]} \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} (I_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \\ & \leq 2 \left(CT^{\frac{1}{2}-} \right)^{k-1} T \int \|\rho\|_{H_{x_1}^{1+} L_{v_1}^{2,0+}}^{k-2} \|\rho\|_{H_{x_1}^{\frac{1}{2}+} L_{v_1}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}}^2 d \left| \mu_{t_{k+1}} \right|(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant from Sobolev and Strichartz type inequalities and does not depend on f .

Proof. See §6.3. □

With Lemma 6.5 and Proposition 6.6, we provide the proof of Theorem 6.2 as the following.

Proof of Theorem 6.2. By Lemma 6.5, we have

$$\sup_{t_1 \in [0, T]} \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \check{f}^{(1)} \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \leq 4^k \sum_{\mu \in m_k} \sup_{t_1 \in [0, T]} \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} (I_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \quad \text{for all } k$$

Let $T < 1$ to be determined, use Proposition 6.6,

$$\sup_{t_1 \in [0, T]} \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \check{f}^{(1)} \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \leq 4^k C^k T^{\frac{k}{4}} \int \|\rho\|_{H_{x_1}^{1+} L_{v_1}^{2,0+}}^k \|\rho\|_{H_{x_1}^{\frac{1}{2}+} L_{v_1}^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}}^2 d \left| \mu_{t_{k+1}} \right|(\rho) \quad \text{for all } k$$

Apply the support property (6.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t_1 \in [0, T]} \left\| \check{f}^{(1)} \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} & \leq 4^k C^k T^{\frac{k}{4}} C_0^{k+1} \cdot 2 \quad \text{for all } k \\ & \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

if we select T such that $(4CC_0 T^{\frac{1}{4}}) < \frac{1}{2}$. □

6.1. Proof of the Klainerman-Machedon board game. The Klainerman-Machedon (KM) board game [67] and its extensions [34, 37], since invented, has been used in every paper in which the analysis of the Gross-Pitaevskii hierarchy is involved. Its original version in which the time integration domain was unknown, has been used without proof in [16] for the Boltzmann hierarchy. We hereby provide its full proof, for the Boltzmann hierarchy, with the time integration domain computed using the newest techniques [34]. Most of the materials in this section are a different version of [34] as well.

There are 2 key observations. One is the fact that after some suitable substitution, many summands inside $D^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})$ actually have the same integrands and hence they can be combined into the so-called upper echelon classes if we follow some rules. The other one is that, if put in tree representations, all possible cases inside an upper echelon class are actually all the possibilities in which children must carry a higher index than parents.

Recall the notation of μ in Lemma 6.5: $\{\mu\}$ is a set of maps from $\{2, \dots, k+1\}$ to $\{1, \dots, k\}$ satisfying $\mu(2) = 1$ and $\mu(l) < l$ for all l , and

$$D_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)}(t_{k+1})) = S_{1,2}^{(1)} Q_{\mu(2),2} S_{2,3}^{(2)} Q_{\mu(3),3} \dots S_{k,k+1}^{(k)} Q_{\mu(k+1),k+1}.$$

Throughout this section, we only work with $k \geq 4$, that is coupling to at least $f^{(5)}$, as it is the minimal length for the argument to have enough room to work. (We actually want $k \rightarrow \infty$ anyway.)

Example 2. An example of μ when $k = 5$ is

$$\begin{array}{c|ccccc} j & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline \mu & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{array}.$$

If μ satisfies $\mu(j) \leq \mu(j+1)$ for $2 \leq j \leq k$ in addition to $\mu(j) < j$ for all $2 \leq j \leq k+1$, then it is in *upper-echelon form* as they are called in [66]. (The word ‘‘upper echelon’’ certainly makes more sense when one uses the matrix / board game representation of $D_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})$ in [66].) Let μ be a collapsing map as defined above and σ a permutation of $\{2, \dots, k+1\}$. A *KM acceptable move*, which we denote $\text{KM}(j, j+1)$, is allowed when $\mu(j) \neq \mu(j+1)$ and $\mu(j+1) < j$, and is the following action: $(\mu', \sigma') = \text{KM}(j, j+1)(\mu, \sigma)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu' &= (j, j+1) \circ \mu \circ (j, j+1) \\ \sigma' &= (j, j+1) \circ \sigma \end{aligned}$$

The first key observation is that if $(\mu', \sigma') = \text{KM}(j, j+1)(\mu, \sigma)$ and $f^{(k+1)}$ is a symmetric density, then

$$(6.7) \quad \int D_{\mu'}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1, \sigma'^{-1}(\underline{t}_{k+1})) dt_{k+1} = \int D_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1, \sigma^{-1}(\underline{t}_{k+1})) dt_{k+1}$$

where,

$$\text{for } \underline{t}_{k+1} = (t_2, \dots, t_{k+1}) \text{ we define } \sigma^{-1}(\underline{t}_{k+1}) = (t_{\sigma^{-1}(2)}, \dots, t_{\sigma^{-1}(k+1)})$$

A simple example to see (6.7) is the following.

Example 3. The integrals

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_D S_{1,2}^{(1)} Q_{1,2} S_{2,3}^{(2)} Q_{2,3} S_{3,4}^{(3)} Q_{1,4} S_{4,5}^{(4)} Q_{4,5} (f^{(5)}) dt_{\underline{4}}, \\ I_2 &= \int_D S_{1,2}^{(1)} Q_{1,2} S_{2,3}^{(2)} Q_{1,3} S_{3,4}^{(3)} Q_{2,4} S_{4,5}^{(4)} Q_{3,5} (f^{(5)}) dt_{\underline{4}} \end{aligned}$$

with $D = \{t_1 \geq t_2 \geq t_3 \geq t_4 \geq t_5\}$, actually have the same integrand. For simplicity, plugging in $f^{(5)} = \rho^{\otimes 5}$ (the general case is the same but longer), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_D S_{1,2} Q(S_{2,4} Q(S_{4,5} \rho, S_{4,5} Q(\rho, \rho)), S_{2,3} Q(S_{3,5} \rho, S_{3,5} \rho)) dt_{\underline{4}} \\ I_2 &= \int_D S_{1,2} Q(S_{2,3} Q(S_{3,5} \rho, S_{3,5} Q(\rho, \rho)), S_{2,4} Q(S_{4,5} \rho, S_{4,5} \rho)) dt_{\underline{4}} \end{aligned}$$

Doing a $t_3 \leftrightarrow t_4$ swap in I_1 , we have

$$I_1 = \int_{D'} S_{1,2} Q(S_{2,3} Q(S_{3,5} \rho, S_{3,5} Q(\rho, \rho)), S_{2,4} Q(S_{4,5} \rho, S_{4,5} \rho)) dt_{\underline{4}}$$

where $D' = \{t_1 \geq t_2 \geq t_4 \geq t_3 \geq t_5\}$. That is, I_1 and I_2 can be combined.

For each μ and σ , we define the Duhamel integrals

$$(6.8) \quad I(\mu, \sigma, f^{(k+1)})(t_1) = \int_{t_1 \geq t_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq t_{\sigma(k+1)}} D_{\mu}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1, \underline{t}_{k+1}) dt_{k+1}$$

It follows from (6.7) that

$$I(\mu', \sigma'^{(k+1)}, f^{(k+1)}) = I(\mu, \sigma, f^{(k+1)})$$

We combine KM acceptable moves as follows: if ρ is a permutation of $\{2, \dots, k+1\}$ such that it is possible to write ρ as a composition of transpositions

$$\rho = \tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_r$$

for which each operator $\text{KM}(\tau_j)$ on the right side of the following is an acceptable action

$$\text{KM}(\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{KM}(\tau_1) \circ \dots \circ \text{KM}(\tau_r)$$

then $\text{KM}(\rho)$, defined by this composition, is acceptable as well. In this case $(\mu', \sigma') = \text{KM}(\rho)(\mu, \sigma)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu' &= \rho \circ \mu \circ \rho^{-1} \\ \sigma' &= \rho \circ \sigma \end{aligned}$$

(6.7) and (6.8) hold as well. If μ and μ' are such that there exists ρ as above for which $(\mu', \sigma') = \text{KM}(\rho)(\mu, \sigma)$ then we say that μ' and μ are *KM-relatable*. This is an equivalence relation that partitions the set of collapsing maps into equivalence classes.

In the following, we represent these actions via tree diagrams in which the effect of the actions and the “not obvious at all” time integration domain $T(\mu)$ emerge clearly. Given a μ which is also a summand inside $D^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})$, we construct a binary tree via Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1.

- (1) Set counter $j = 2$
- (2) Given j , find the next pair of indices a and b so that $a > j$, $b > j$ and


$$\mu(a) = \mu(j) \text{ and } \mu(b) = j$$

and moreover a and b are the minimal indices for which the above equalities hold. It is possible that there is no such a and/or no such b .

- (3) At the node j , put a as the left child and b as the right child (if there is no a , then the j node will be missing a left child, and if there is no b , then the j node will be missing a right child.)
- (4) If $j = k+1$, then stop, otherwise set $j = j+1$ and go to step 2.


Example 4.

Let us work with the following example




j	2	3	4	5	6
μ_{out}	1	1	1	2	3

We start with $j = 2$, and note that $\mu_{out}(2) = 1$ so need to find minimal $a > 2$, $b > 2$ such that $\mu(a) = 1$ and $\mu(b) = 2$. In this case, it is $a = 3$ and $b = 5$, so we put those as left and right children of 2, respectively, in the tree (shown at left)



Now we move to $j = 3$. Since $\mu_{out}(3) = 1$, we find minimal a and b so that $a > 3$, $b > 3$ and $\mu(a) = 1$ and $\mu(b) = 3$. We find that $a = 4$ and $b = 6$, so we put these as left and right children of 3, respectively, in the tree (shown at left). Since all indices appear in the tree, it is complete.

Definition 6.7. A binary tree is called an *admissible tree* if every child node's label is strictly larger than its parent node's label.⁴⁴ For an admissible tree, we call the graph of the tree without any labels in its nodes, the *skeleton of the tree*.



For example, the skeleton of the tree in Example 4 is shown at left.


As the trees are coming from the hierarchy, Algorithm 1, produces only admissible trees. The procedure is reversible – given an admissible binary tree, we can uniquely reconstruct the μ that generated it.

Algorithm 2.

- (1) For every right child, μ maps the child value to the parent value (i.e. if f is a right child of d , then $\mu(f) = d$). Start by filling these into the μ table.
- (2) Fill in the table using that for every left child, μ maps the child value to $\mu(\text{parent value})$.

Example 5. Suppose we are given the tree

⁴⁴This is certainly a natural requirement coming from the hierarchy.



Using that for every right child, μ maps the child value to the parent value, we fill in the following values in the μ table:

j	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
μ	1			2	3	4	6	

Now we employ the left child rule, and note that since 3 is a left child of 2 and $\mu(2) = 1$, we must have $\mu(3) = 1$, and etc. to recover

j	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
μ	1	1	1	2	3	4	6	6

One can show that, in the tree representation of μ , a KM acceptable move, is the operation which switches the labels of two nodes with consecutive labels on an admissible tree provided that the outcome is still an admissible tree by writing out the related trees. For example, interchanging the labeling of 5 and 6 in the tree in Example 4 is an acceptable move. That is, KM acceptable moves preserve the tree structures but permute the labeling under the admissibility requirement. Two collapsing maps μ and μ' are KM-relatable if and only the trees corresponding to μ and μ' have the same skeleton.

Given k , we would like to have the number of different binary tree structures of k nodes. This number is exactly one of the Catalan number as defined and is controlled by 4^k . Hence, we just provided a proof of Lemma 6.5, dropping the computation of $T(\mu)$. To this end, we need to define what is an upper echelon form. Though the requirement $\mu(j) \leq \mu(j+1)$ for $2 \leq j \leq k$ is good enough, we give an algorithm which produces the upper echelon tree given the tree structure, as the tree representation of an upper echelon form is in fact labeled in sequential order. See, for example, the tree in Example 4.

Algorithm 3.

- (1) Given a tree structure with k nodes, label the top node with 2 and set counter $j = 2$.
- (2) If $j = k + 1$, then stop, otherwise continue.
- (3) If the node labeled j has a left child, then label that left child node with $j + 1$, set counter $j = j + 1$ and go to step (2). If not, continue.
- (4) In the already labeled nodes which has an empty right child, search for the node with the smallest label. If such a node can be found, label that node's empty right child as $j + 1$, set counter $j = j + 1$, and go to step (2). If none of the labeled nodes has an empty right child, then stop.

Definition 6.8. We say μ is in upper echelon form if $\mu(j) \leq \mu(j+1)$ for $2 \leq j \leq k$ or its corresponding tree given by Algorithm 1 agrees with the tree with the same skeleton given by Algorithm 3.

We define a map T which maps an upper echelon tree to a time integration domain / a set of inequality relations by

$$(6.9) \quad T(\alpha) = \{ t_j \geq t_k : j, k \text{ are labels on nodes of } \alpha \\ \text{such that the } k \text{ node is a child of the } j \text{ node} \}$$

where α is an upper echelon tree. We then have the integration domain as follows.


Proposition 6.9. *Given a μ in upper echelon form, we have*

$$\sum_{\mu_m \sim \mu} \int_{t_1 \geq t_2 \geq t_3 \geq \dots \geq t_{k+1}} D_{\mu_m}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1, \underline{t}_{k+1}) dt_{k+1} = \int_{T(\mu)} D_{\mu}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1, \underline{t}_{k+1}) dt_{k+1}.$$

Here, $\mu_m \sim \mu$ means that μ_m is equivalent to μ under acceptable moves / the trees representing μ and μ_m have the same structure and $T(\mu)$ is the domain defined in (6.9).

Proof. We prove by an example. For the general case, one merely needs to rewrite Σ_1 and Σ_2 , to be defined in this proof. The key is the admissible condition or the simple requirement that the child must carry a larger label than the parent.

Recall the upper echelon tree in Example 4, and denote it with α . Here are all the admissible trees equivalent to α .



We first read by definition that

$$T(\alpha) = \{t_1 \geq t_2, t_2 \geq t_3, t_3 \geq t_4, t_3 \geq t_6, t_2 \geq t_5\}.$$

Let σ denote some composition of acceptable moves, we then notice the equivalence of the two sets

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1 &= \{\sigma : \sigma^{-1}(1) < \sigma^{-1}(2) < \sigma^{-1}(3) < \sigma^{-1}(4), \sigma^{-1}(2) < \sigma^{-1}(5), \sigma^{-1}(3) < \sigma^{-1}(6)\}, \\ \Sigma_2 &= \{\sigma : \sigma \text{ takes input tree to } \alpha \text{ where the input tree is admissible}\},\end{aligned}$$

both generated by the requirement that the child must carry a larger label than the parent. That is, both Σ_1 and Σ_2 classifies the whole upper echelon class represented by α .

Hence,

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma_1} \{t_1 \geq t_{\sigma(2)} \geq t_{\sigma(3)} \dots \geq t_{\sigma(6)}\} = \{t_1 \geq t_2 \geq t_3 \geq t_4, t_2 \geq t_5, t_3 \geq t_6\} = T(\alpha)$$

and we are done. \square

6.2. Bilinear estimates. If

$$\tilde{f}^{(2)}(t, x_1, x_2, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \tilde{f}(t, x_1, \xi_1) \tilde{g}(t, x_2, \xi_2),$$

we can deduce several consequences of Proposition 3.10.

Lemma 6.10 (Well-posedness and uniqueness estimate I).

$$\begin{aligned}& \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}^\pm(e^{it\nabla_x \cdot \nabla_\xi} \tilde{g}, e^{it\nabla_x \cdot \nabla_\xi} \tilde{h})\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^2} \\ & \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{h}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove this estimate inside Lemma 8.2 in the middle of the well-posedness argument. \square

Lemma 6.11 (Uniqueness estimate II).

$$\begin{aligned}& \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^{2+} L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \\ & \lesssim \begin{cases} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{h}(0, x, \xi)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} & (\text{if } h \text{ is a linear sol}) \\ \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(0, x, \xi)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} & (\text{if } g \text{ is a linear sol}) \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi) &= \int_{s=0}^\infty \int_\zeta e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi \cdot \zeta/2} e^{-2is\sigma|\zeta|^2/2} \hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta) \\ & \quad \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi - s\zeta) \tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta) ds d\zeta\end{aligned}$$

Taking the Fourier transform $x \mapsto \eta$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, \eta, \xi) &= \int_{s=0}^\infty \int_\zeta \int_u e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi \cdot \zeta/2} e^{-2is\sigma|\zeta|^2/2} \hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta) \\ & \quad \tilde{g}(t, \eta - u, \xi - s\zeta) \tilde{h}(t, u, s\zeta) ds d\zeta du\end{aligned}$$

We can estimate in the norm L_η^{3-} first, bringing it to the inside by Minkowski's integral inequality, and applying Young's inequality on the inner convolution (putting L_η^{3-} on either \check{g} or \check{h} , as desired). Then, continuing as in the proof of Proposition 3.10), we obtain

$$\|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{Q}^\pm(\check{g}, \check{h})(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi\eta}^{3-}} \lesssim \begin{cases} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{g}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^{3-}} \|\check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{(L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-}) L_\eta^1} \\ \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{g}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^1} \|\check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{(L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-}) L_\eta^{3-}} \end{cases}$$

where it is meant that either the top or the bottom expression on the right side can be used. Applying Sobolev in ξ on the \check{h} terms to convert L_ξ^{3+} to L_ξ^{3-} at the expense of adding $\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+}$ gives

$$\|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{Q}^\pm(\check{g}, \check{h})(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi\eta}^{3-}} \lesssim \begin{cases} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{g}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^1} \\ \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{g}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^1} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \end{cases}$$

The Strichartz estimate for the ‘‘kinetic’’ transport equation [75, Definition 2.1 & Theorem 2.4] with $a = 2$ applies with $L_t^q L_\xi^r L_\eta^p$ with

$$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad \frac{3}{2} < p \leq 2, \quad 2 \leq r < 3$$

where q is defined via

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r} \right)$$

for such a pair (p, r) . In the endpoint case (which is not valid, see [12]), $p = \frac{3}{2}$, $r = 3$ and $q = 2$. For (p, r) meeting the requirements above, $q > 2$. We will work with a triple $L_t^{2+} L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^{\frac{3}{2}+}$. Now writing $1 = \langle \eta \rangle^{-1-} \langle \eta \rangle^{1+}$ and applying Hölder in η ,

$$\|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^1} \lesssim \|\langle \eta \rangle^{-1-}\|_{L_\eta^{3-}} \|\langle \eta \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^{3/2+}}$$

The L_ξ^{3-} forces a specific $L_\eta^{\frac{3}{2}+}$ according to the Strichartz theory reviewed above. Since we are forced to work with a particular $\frac{3}{2}+$ in the norm $L_\eta^{\frac{3}{2}+}$, we choose the $1+$ sufficiently above 1 in the exponent $\langle \eta \rangle^{1+}$ so that the reciprocal $\langle \eta \rangle^{-1-}$ is sufficiently below -1 so that $\|\langle \eta \rangle^{-1-}\|_{L_\eta^{3-}} < \infty$. If $\check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)$ is a linear solution, then we can apply the Strichartz estimates to obtain

$$\|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_\xi^{3-} L_\eta^1} \lesssim \|\langle \eta \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(0, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{\eta\xi}^2}$$

Thus the claimed estimate follows. \square

Lemma 6.12 (Uniqueness estimate III - final estimate).

$$\|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \check{Q}^\pm(\check{g}, \check{h})\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{g}\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{h}\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_{x\xi}^2}$$

We note that the estimate is done at fixed time; the $L_{(-T, T)}^\infty$ norm is included since that is the form in which the estimate is applied.

Proof. We start by applying the estimate $\|\hat{F}\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|F\|_{L^{p'}}$ where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$ and $p \geq 2$. This estimate is applied in η , so the left side is in the “check space” and the right side is in “tilde space”.

$$\|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_\xi^{3-} L_x^{3+}}$$

Recall

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi) &= \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \int_{\zeta} e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi\cdot\zeta/2} e^{-2is\sigma|\zeta|^2/2} \hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta) \\ &\quad \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi - s\zeta) \tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta) ds d\zeta \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 3.10, we can effectively move the $\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+}$ operator to act directly on \tilde{g} , although for the gain term this also generates a power of ζ (which is easily absorbed by the $\hat{\phi}$ terms). We indicate this with the \approx symbol, since it must be properly justified with Littlewood-Paley theory:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi) &\approx \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \int_{\zeta} e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi\cdot\zeta/2} e^{-2is\sigma|\zeta|^2/2} \hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta) \\ &\quad \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi - s\zeta) \tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta) ds d\zeta \end{aligned}$$

Bring the $L_x^{3/2+}$ norm inside by the Minkowski integral inequality, and Hölder between the \tilde{g} and \tilde{h} terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_x^{3/2+}} &\lesssim \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \int_{\zeta} |\hat{\phi}(-\zeta)| |\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \\ &\quad \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi - s\zeta)\|_{L_x^{3+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta)\|_{L_x^{3+}} ds d\zeta \end{aligned}$$

Now apply the L_ξ^{3-} norm and bring it inside the right side by the Minkowski integral inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} (6.10) \quad \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_x^{3/2+}} &\lesssim \int_{s=0}^{\infty} \int_{\zeta} |\hat{\phi}(-\zeta)| |\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \\ &\quad \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta)\|_{L_x^{3+}} ds d\zeta \end{aligned}$$

Split the s integration in (6.10) into $0 < s < 1$ and $1 < s < +\infty$. For $0 < s < 1$, apply Hölder in ζ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{s=0}^1 \int_{\zeta} |\hat{\phi}(-\zeta)| |\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta)\|_{L_x^{3+}} ds d\zeta \\ &\lesssim \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \int_{s=0}^1 \|\hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta)\|_{L_\zeta^{3/2-}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta)\|_{L_\zeta^{3+} L_x^{3+}} ds \end{aligned}$$

Scaling out the s inside the L_ζ^{3+} norm gives s^{-1+} :

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\hat{\phi}\|_{L^{3-}}^2 \int_{s=0}^1 s^{-1+} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \zeta)\|_{L_\zeta^{3+} L_x^{3+}} ds \\ &\lesssim \|\hat{\phi}\|_{L^{3-}}^2 \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \zeta)\|_{L_\zeta^{3+} L_x^{3+}} \end{aligned}$$

For $s > 1$ in (6.10), apply Hölder in ζ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{s=1}^{+\infty} \int_{\zeta} |\hat{\phi}(-\zeta)| |\hat{\phi}(\zeta)| \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta)\|_{L_x^{3+}} ds d\zeta \\ & \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \int_{s=1}^{+\infty} \|\hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta)\|_{L_{\zeta}^{3/2+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta)\|_{L_{\zeta}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} ds \end{aligned}$$

Scaling out the s inside the L_{ζ}^{3-} norm gives s^{-1-} :

$$\begin{aligned} & \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\hat{\phi}\|_{L^{3+}}^2 \int_{s=1}^{+\infty} s^{-1-} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \zeta)\|_{L_{\zeta}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} ds \\ & \lesssim \|\hat{\phi}\|_{L^{3+}}^2 \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \zeta)\|_{L_{\zeta}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \end{aligned}$$

Putting the $0 < s < 1$ and $1 < s < +\infty$ cases together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha, \sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi}^{3-} L_x^{3/2+}} \\ & \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{\xi}^{3-} L_x^{3+}} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{(L_{\xi}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi}^{3-}) L_x^{3+}} \\ & \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

6.3. Iteration of bilinear estimates. We need 3 estimates from §6.2, in which

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}^{\pm}(e^{it\nabla_x \cdot \nabla_{\xi}} \tilde{g}, e^{it\nabla_x \cdot \nabla_{\xi}} \tilde{h})\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^2} \\ & \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{h}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \check{Q}^{\pm}(\check{g}, \check{h})(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{\xi\eta}^{3-}} \\ & \lesssim \begin{cases} \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \check{g}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{\infty} L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(0, x, \xi)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} & (\text{if } h \text{ is a linear sol}) \\ \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \check{g}(0, x, \xi)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \check{h}(t, \eta, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{\infty} L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} & (\text{if } g \text{ is a linear sol}) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

are of Strichartz type (integrating in time is necessary for them to hold.) and will be used iteratively, and

$$(6.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{0+} \check{Q}^{\pm}(\check{g}, \check{h})\|_{L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} \\ & \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{g}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \check{h}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \end{aligned}$$

which is a fixed time estimate and will be used only once. We illustrate by the following example on how to use them to estimate $I_{\mu}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1)$. As the role of the collision operator here is to couple to the next level, we will call the collision operator $Q_{\mu^{(j)}, j}^{\pm}$ the $(j-1)$ th coupling to be clear.

Example 6. Consider the summand

$$I = \int S_{1,2}^{(1)} Q_{1,2}^{+} S_{2,3}^{(2)} Q_{1,3}^{-} S_{3,4}^{(3)} Q_{3,4}^{-} f^{(4)}(t_4) dt_4$$

in $I_\mu^{(4)}(f^{(4)})(t_1)$. Plugging in (6.3), it reads

$$I = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d\mu_{t_4}(\rho) \int S_{1,2}^{(1)} Q_{1,2}^+ S_{2,3}^{(2)} Q_{1,3}^- S_{3,4}^{(3)} Q_{3,4}^- (\rho^{\otimes 4}) dt_2 dt_3 dt_4$$

where interchanging integration order is allowed as all measures are finite. Expanding it out, we have

$$= \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d\mu_{t_4}(\rho) \int S_{1,2} Q^+(S_{2,3} Q^-(S_{3,4} \rho, S_{3,4} Q^-(\rho, \rho)), S_{2,4} \rho) dt_2 dt_3 dt_4$$

Notice that, away from the most inner (the 3rd) coupling, every coupling takes the form $Q^\pm(Sf, Sg)$. For the estimates, put I in the (η, ξ) -side and apply the $L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}$ norm to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \check{I}\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d|\mu_{t_4}|(\rho) \int_{[0, T]^3} \left\| (\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} Q^+(S_{2,3} Q^-(S_{3,4} \rho, S_{3,4} Q^-(\rho, \rho)), S_{2,4} \rho))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} dt_2 dt_3 dt_4 \end{aligned}$$

For the first coupling, Cauchy-Schwarz in t_2 , and apply (6.12) to the first coupling, with the bilinear variable which contains the 3rd coupling put in $L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \check{I}\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} & \leq CT^{\frac{1}{2}-} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d|\mu_{t_4}|(\rho) \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{\rho}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \\ & \quad \times \int_{[0, T]^2} \left\| (\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} Q^-(S_{3,4} \rho, S_{3,4} Q^-(\rho, \rho)))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} dt_3 dt_4 \end{aligned}$$

Doing the same thing for the 2nd coupling,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \check{I}\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} & \leq \left(CT^{\frac{1}{2}-}\right)^2 \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d|\mu_{t_4}|(\rho) \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{\rho}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 \\ & \quad \times \int_{[0, T]} \left\| (\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} Q^-(\rho, \rho))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta\xi}^{3-}} dt_4 \end{aligned}$$

Apply (6.13) to the 3rd coupling, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \check{I}\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \\ & \leq \left(CT^{\frac{1}{2}-}\right)^2 \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d|\mu_{t_4}|(\rho) \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{0+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{\rho}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{\rho}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 \int_{[0, T]} dt_4 \\ & \leq \left(CT^{\frac{1}{2}-}\right)^2 T \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{\rho}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{\rho}\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 d|\mu_{t_4}|(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

as needed.

6.3.1. *Estimate for the general cases.* We handle the general cases by the following algorithm.

Step 1 Put $I_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1)$ in the $L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}$ norm on the (η, ξ) -side with $\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+}$ applied.

Step 2 Pay a price of 2^k to expand all the Q inside $I_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1)$ into Q^\pm so that there is at most one $Q^\pm(\rho, \rho)$ at the k -th coupling in each summand denoted by $I_{\mu, \text{sgn}}^{(k+1)}$, where sgn means signed. That is

$$\left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} (I_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \leq 4^k \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} (I_{\mu, \text{sgn}}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}}$$

Step 3 Set counter $j = 1$, use Minkowski's inequality to put the $L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}$ norm inside the $dt_{k+1} d|\mu_{t_{k+1}}|$ integrals and expand the time integration domain to $[0, T]^k$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} (I_{\mu, \text{sgn}}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d|\mu_{t_{k+1}}|(\rho) \int_{[0, T]^3} \left\| (\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} Q^\pm(\dots))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} dt_{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

Step 4 If $j < k$, go to Step 5, otherwise go to Step 8.

Step 5 If the j -th coupling contains the k -th coupling in one of its two bilinear variables (there can be at most one), then Cauchy-Schwarz in t_{j+1} and apply estimate (6.12) to the j -th coupling such that the bilinear variable carrying the k -th coupling is put in $L_{\eta \xi}^{3-}$ and go to Step 7. If not, go to Step 6.

Step 6 Cauchy-Schwarz in t_{j+1} and apply estimate (6.11) to the j -th coupling.

Step 7 $j = j + 1$ and go to Step 4.

Step 8 Apply estimate (6.13) to the k -th coupling, we would have deduced that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} (I_{\mu, \text{sgn}}^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \\ & \leq \left(CT^{\frac{1}{2}-} \right)^{k-1} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} d|\mu_{t_{k+1}}|(\rho) \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{0+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{\rho} \right\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^{k-2} \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{\rho} \right\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 \int_{[0, T]} dt_{k+1} \\ & \leq \left(CT^{\frac{1}{2}-} \right)^{k-1} T \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{\rho} \right\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^{k-2} \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{\rho} \right\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 d|\mu_{t_{k+1}}|(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} (I_\mu^{(k+1)}(f^{(k+1)})(t_1))^\vee \right\|_{L_{\eta_1 \xi_1}^{3-}} \\ & \leq 2 \left(CT^{\frac{1}{2}-} \right)^{k-1} T \int_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)} \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{\rho} \right\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^{k-2} \left\| \langle \nabla_x \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+} \tilde{\rho} \right\|_{L_{x\xi}^2}^2 d|\mu_{t_{k+1}}|(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed in Proposition 6.6.

7. JUSTIFICATION OF PHYSICALITY: REGULARITY FROM THE LOCAL MAXWELLIAN VIEWPOINT

The calculations in this section are not rigorous. However, the content of this section is not needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1. This section is only intended to motivate the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1.

In this section, we give a construction of an N -body solution converging to a local Maxwellian. A simple tensor product of local Maxwellians is not qualified to be $f_N^{(k)}$; this

format can only be achieved in the limit $f^{(k)}$. By appealing to the law of large numbers to obtain a representative form of $f_N^{(k)}$, we find that $f_N^{(k)}$ must consist not only of the tensor product of local Maxwellians that persist in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, but also additional quasi-free terms that should, in some sense, vanish as $N \rightarrow \infty$ while preventing one from closing the BBGKY hierarchy estimates with only a single Duhamel iterate.⁴⁵ The quasi-free terms, when measured in the standard Sobolev norms in the $(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ reference frame, have growth as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In this sense, these terms are irregular (or more precisely, sort of regular in their own way) and must be isolated in the decomposition of $f_N^{(k)}$ and represented in their own natural reference frame so that they can be estimated separately in the BBGKY hierarchy.

7.1. A N -body construction of the local Maxwellian. Let $Y = O(1)$ in spatial \mathbb{R}^3 and $W = O(1)$ in frequency \mathbb{R}^3 . Let χ be a Schwartz class function on \mathbb{R}^3 . A wave packet

$$u(y, 0) = \chi\left(\frac{y - Y}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right)e^{iy \cdot W/\epsilon}$$

is spatially centered at position Y with spatial width $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$, and is frequency centered at W/ϵ with frequency width $\epsilon^{-1/2}$. Under the evolution $(i\epsilon\partial_t + \epsilon^2\Delta)u = 0$ on a unit time scale, $u(y, t)$ will be spatially centered at position $Y - 2Wt$ with spatial width $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ and frequency centered at W/ϵ with frequency width $O(\epsilon^{-1/2})$:

$$u(y, t) = \chi_t\left(\frac{y - Y - 2Wt}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right)e^{iy \cdot W/\epsilon}$$

where $\chi_t(y) = e^{it\Delta}\chi(y)$. In particular, on a unit time scale, not much decoherence will take place, and this is why we have chosen spatial width $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$.⁴⁶ Note that

$$\text{cov}(W, Y + 2tW) = 2t \text{cov}(W, W) = 2t$$

and thus the frequency shift and positional shift, if initially independent, will have a linearly evolving covariance. It seems reasonable that upon a collision, this covariance could shift and thus an interacting multiparticle ansatz should incorporate a shift in time t_j associated with the j th particle.

Let $Y_1, \dots, Y_N, W_1, \dots, W_N$ be an independent sample from the standard normal distribution and consider the wave function

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_N(\mathbf{y}_N) = & \kappa \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \chi_{\sigma(1)}\left(\frac{y_1 - Y_{\sigma(1)} - 2t_{\sigma(1)}W_{\sigma(1)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right)e^{iy_1 \cdot W_{\sigma(1)}/\epsilon} \\ & \cdots \chi_{\sigma(N)}\left(\frac{y_N - Y_{\sigma(N)} - 2t_{\sigma(N)}W_{\sigma(N)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right)e^{iy_N \cdot W_{\sigma(N)}/\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

where κ is a suitable normalization, determined below. Note that we have applied the permutation σ to the spatial center indices Y_\bullet , the frequency center indices W_\bullet , and the

⁴⁵This is actually conjectured in [8, p.11].

⁴⁶One way to see the lack of decoherence is to let $v(y, t) = u(\epsilon^{1/2}y, t)$. Then $(i\partial_t + \Delta)v = 0$ with $v(y, 0) = \chi(y - \epsilon^{-1/2}Y)e^{iy \cdot W/\epsilon^{1/2}}$. So the transformed initial condition $v(y, 0)$ solves the normalized Schrödinger equation with $O(1)$ width initial condition on a unit time scale; the oscillatory phase factor is handled by Galilean invariance.

profile indices χ_\bullet . The time shifts t_\bullet allow us to consider a wave-form in which the (Y_\bullet, W_\bullet) pair covariances vary.

When the wave function (7.1) is taken as the initial condition, the solution along the N -body *free* linear flow (no interaction) is of a similar form with the Y 's suitably translated.

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_N(\mathbf{y}_N, t) = \kappa \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \chi_{\sigma(1), t} \left(\frac{y_1 - Y_{\sigma(1)} - 2(t - t_{\sigma(1)})W_{\sigma(1)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{iy_1 \cdot W_{\sigma(1)}/\epsilon} \\ \cdots \chi_{\sigma(N), t} \left(\frac{y_N - Y_{\sigma(N)} - 2(t - t_{\sigma(N)})W_{\sigma(N)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{iy_N \cdot W_{\sigma(N)}/\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi_{j,t}(x) = e^{it\Delta}\chi_j(x)$ (the $\epsilon = 1$ free linear Schrödinger propagator). Thus the covariances of the (Y_\bullet, W_\bullet) pairs evolve linearly from their respective initial values t_\bullet .

In a collisional model, collisions are expected to occur on average every ϵ increment of time. Although the effect of collisions is weak, their expected impact over $O(1)$ time is $O(1)$. Upon collision, the phase/velocity W_\bullet will shift giving rise to a shift in the (Y_\bullet, W_\bullet) pair covariance. Thus (7.1) seems to be a reasonable model of the functional form of the solution at an arbitrary time and we will perform computations using the form (7.1).

From (7.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_N(\mathbf{y}_N, \mathbf{y}'_N) &= \Psi_N(\mathbf{y}_N) \bar{\Psi}_N(\mathbf{y}'_N) \\ &= \kappa^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_N \\ \sigma' \in S_N}} \chi_{\sigma(1)} \left(\frac{y_1 - Y_{\sigma(1)} - 2t_{\sigma(1)}W_{\sigma(1)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_{\sigma'(1)} \left(\frac{y'_1 - Y_{\sigma'(1)} - 2t_{\sigma'(1)}W_{\sigma'(1)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{i(y_1 \cdot W_{\sigma(1)} - y'_1 \cdot W_{\sigma'(1)})/\epsilon} \\ &\quad \cdots \chi_{\sigma(N)} \left(\frac{y_N - Y_{\sigma(N)} - 2t_{\sigma(N)}W_{\sigma(N)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_{\sigma'(N)} \left(\frac{y'_N - Y_{\sigma'(N)} - 2t_{\sigma'(N)}W_{\sigma'(N)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{i(y_N \cdot W_{\sigma(N)} - y'_N \cdot W_{\sigma'(N)})/\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

Upon setting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_N = \mathbf{x}_N + \epsilon \boldsymbol{\xi}_N & & \mathbf{x}_N = \mathbf{y}_N + \mathbf{y}'_N \\ \mathbf{y}'_N = \mathbf{x}_N - \epsilon \boldsymbol{\xi}_N & \iff & \boldsymbol{\xi}_N = \frac{\mathbf{y}_N - \mathbf{y}'_N}{\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\tilde{f}_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \boldsymbol{\xi}_N) = \gamma_N(\mathbf{y}_N, \mathbf{y}'_N)$$

this takes the form

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \boldsymbol{\xi}_N) = \kappa^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_N \\ \sigma' \in S_N}} \prod_{j=1}^N \chi_{\sigma(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma(j)} - 2t_{\sigma(j)}W_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} + \epsilon^{1/2}\xi_j \right) e^{ix_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} - W_{\sigma'(j)})/\epsilon} \\ \bar{\chi}_{\sigma'(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma'(j)} - 2t_{\sigma'(j)}W_{\sigma'(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} - \epsilon^{1/2}\xi_j \right) e^{i\xi_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} + W_{\sigma'(j)})} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 7.1. *The constant κ needed to achieve the normalization $\mathbb{E}\|\Psi_N\|_{L^2}^2 = 1$, where Ψ_N is defined by (7.1), is*

$$(7.4) \quad \kappa^2 \sim \frac{1}{N! \epsilon^{3N/2}}$$

Proof. We assume that $\chi_j = \chi$ and all time shifts $t_j = 0$ (the general case is similar). We have

$$(7.5) \quad \|\Psi_N\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} \tilde{f}_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{0}) d\mathbf{x}_N = \kappa^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_N \\ \sigma' \in S_N}} I_{\sigma, \sigma'}$$

where

$$I_{\sigma, \sigma'} = \prod_{j=1}^N \int_{x_j} \chi\left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \bar{\chi}\left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma'(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) e^{ix_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} - W_{\sigma'(j)})/\epsilon} dx_j$$

The condition $\mathbb{E}\|\Psi_N\|_{L^2}^2 = 1$ determines the normalization constant κ . We consider the value of $I_{\sigma, \sigma'}$ in various settings, but first let us examine two representative cases.

Case 1. All $\sigma'(j) = \sigma(j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq N$. This case gives the largest expected value. In this case,

$$I_{\sigma, \sigma} = \prod_{j=1}^N \int_{x_j} \left| \chi\left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \right|^2 dx_j = \epsilon^{3N/2} \left(\int |\chi|^2 \right)^N$$

We did not even need to take the expectation; it is constant on the probability space Ω .

Case 2. All $\sigma'(j) = \sigma(j)$ for $k+1 \leq j \leq N$ but all $\sigma'(j) \neq \sigma(j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. In this case, by independence, the expectation is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}I_{\sigma, \sigma'} &= \prod_{j=1}^k \int_{x_j} \int_{y_{\sigma(j)}, y_{\sigma'(j)}, w_{\sigma(j)}, w_{\sigma'(j)}} \chi\left(\frac{x_j - y_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \bar{\chi}\left(\frac{x_j - y_{\sigma'(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) e^{ix_j \cdot (w_{\sigma(j)} - w_{\sigma'(j)})/\epsilon} \\ &\quad g(y_{\sigma(j)}) g(y_{\sigma'(j)}) g(w_{\sigma(j)}) g(w_{\sigma'(j)}) dx_j dy_{\sigma(j)} dy_{\sigma'(j)} dw_{\sigma(j)} dw_{\sigma'(j)} \\ &\quad \prod_{j=k+1}^N \int_{y_{\sigma(j)}} \int_{x_j} \left| \chi\left(\frac{x_j - y_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \right|^2 g(y_{\sigma(j)}) dx_j dy_{\sigma(j)} \end{aligned}$$

The last $N - k$ factors yield $\epsilon^{3(N-k)/2}$, as before. In the first k factors, it is easiest to start by carrying out the integrals over $w_{\sigma(j)}$ and $w_{\sigma'(j)}$ which are just Fourier transforms of g evaluated at $-x_j/\epsilon$ and x_j/ϵ respectively. Since we take $g(w) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} e^{-w^2/2}$, the standard normal distribution, each integral contributes $e^{-|x_j|^2/2\epsilon^2}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}I_{\sigma, \sigma'} &= \epsilon^{3(N-k)/2} \prod_{j=1}^k \int_{x_j} \int_{y_{\sigma(j)}, y_{\sigma'(j)}} \chi\left(\frac{x_j - y_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \bar{\chi}\left(\frac{x_j - y_{\sigma'(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) e^{-|x_j|^2/\epsilon^2} \\ &\quad e^{-|y_{\sigma(j)}|^2/2} e^{-|y_{\sigma'(j)}|^2/2} dx_j dy_{\sigma(j)} dy_{\sigma'(j)} \end{aligned}$$

The integral over x_j yields a factor ϵ^3 , and the $y_{\sigma(j)}$ and $y_{\sigma'(j)}$ integrals yield $\epsilon^{3/2} \int \chi$ and $\epsilon^{3/2} \int \bar{\chi}$, respectively. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}I_{\sigma,\sigma'} = \epsilon^{3(N-k)/2} \epsilon^{6k} |\hat{\chi}(0)|^{2k} \left(\int |\chi|^2 \right)^{N-k}$$

This is much smaller than Case 1, although the terms in Case 2 occur more frequently in the sum over permutations.

Now let us return to (7.5). Suppose that we fix a permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, N\}$. In terms of σ , we will categorize the set of all permutations σ' of $\{1, \dots, N\}$. Specifically, decompose the set of all σ' into a disjoint union $E_0 \cup \dots \cup E_N$, where E_k is the set of all σ' for which the set S of indices $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ for which $\sigma(j) = \sigma'(j)$ has cardinality $N - k$. The set E_0 has cardinality 1, since $\sigma = \sigma'$ on all of $\{1, \dots, N\}$. To determine the cardinality of E_k , note first that there are $\binom{N}{k}$ different ways to select the set S . Once S has been selected, the value of σ' on S is determined ($\sigma' = \sigma$ on S). On S^c (which has cardinality k), we need to determine the number of possible different selections for the values of σ' . To do this, consider that for any such σ' , $\nu = \sigma^{-1} \circ \sigma'$ will have the property that

- for each $j \in S$, $\nu(j) = j$ (in other words, ν fixes S). From this we conclude that $\nu : S^c \rightarrow S^c$.
- for each $j \in S^c$, $\nu(j) \neq j$, but $\nu(j)$ is otherwise undetermined.

Thus $\nu|_{S^c}$ is a permutation of S^c with no fixed points, and this type of permutation is called a *derangement*⁴⁷. The number of derangements of a set of cardinality k is the integer closest of $k!/e$. We can thus generate all σ' by allowing ν to range through all derangements of S^c and for each ν take $\sigma' = \sigma \circ \nu$.

$$\begin{aligned} |E_k| &= (\text{number of ways to select } S)(\text{number of derangements on } k \text{ elements}) \\ &= \binom{N}{k} \left[\frac{k!}{e} \right] \leq \frac{N!}{(N-k)!} \end{aligned}$$

where the brackets denote “integer nearest to”. From (7.5),

$$\mathbb{E}\|\Psi_N\|_{L^2}^2 = M + R, \text{ where } M = \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \mathbb{E}I_{\sigma,\sigma} \text{ and } R = \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\sigma' \in E_k} \mathbb{E}I_{\sigma,\sigma'}$$

Taking all the χ related integrals to be 1 for expository convenience, M is just determined from Case 1 to be

$$M = N! \kappa^2 \epsilon^{3N/2}$$

For R , there are $N!$ choices for σ and for each σ , there the set E_k has cardinality $|E_k| \leq \frac{N!}{(N-k)!}$. Thus from Case 2,

$$|R| \leq N! \kappa^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{N!}{(N-k)!} \epsilon^{3(N-k)/2} \epsilon^{6k}$$

⁴⁷See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Derangement>

Using the crude bound $\frac{N!}{(N-k)!} \leq N^k = \epsilon^{-3k}$,

$$|R| \leq N! \kappa^2 \epsilon^{3N/2} \sum_{k=1}^N \epsilon^{3k/2} \leq M \frac{\epsilon^{3/2}}{1 - \epsilon^{3/2}}$$

Thus $|R|$ is negligible in comparison to M . To achieve normalization, we set

$$1 = \mathbb{E} \|\Psi_N\|_{L^2}^2 \sim N! \kappa^2 \epsilon^{3N/2}$$

from which it follows that (7.4) holds. \square

7.2. The structure of marginals $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$. The following gives the decomposition of $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$ into a *core* term plus additional quasi-free terms.

Calculation 1. Let U_k be the set of all subsets of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of cardinality k . Let S_k denote the set of permutations on $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Then $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$ admits a decomposition

$$(7.6) \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$$

where

$$(7.7) \quad \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \frac{1}{\binom{N}{k}} \sum_{\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k)\} \in U_k} \epsilon^{-3k/2} \tilde{f}_{N,\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$$

and

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &= \prod_{j=1}^k \chi_{\sigma(j)} \left(\frac{x_j + \epsilon \xi_j - Y_{\sigma(j)} - 2t_{\sigma(j)} W_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{ix_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} - W_{\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(j)})/\epsilon} \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_{\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - \epsilon \xi_j - Y_{\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(j)} - 2t_{\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(j)} W_{\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{i\xi_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} + W_{\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(j)})} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The marginals are given by

$$\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \int \tilde{f}_N(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_{N-k}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \mathbf{0}) d\mathbf{x}_{N-k}$$

By (7.3),

$$(7.9) \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \kappa^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_N \\ \sigma' \in S_N}} I_{\sigma, \sigma'}^{N-k} \tilde{f}_{N, \sigma, \sigma'}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\sigma, \sigma'}^{N-k} &= \prod_{j=k+1}^N \int_{x_j} \chi_{\sigma(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma(j)} - 2t_{\sigma(j)} W_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_{\sigma'(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma'(j)} - 2t_{\sigma'(j)} W_{\sigma'(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{ix_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} - W_{\sigma'(j)})/\epsilon} dx_j \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\sigma,\sigma'}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &= \prod_{j=1}^k \chi_{\sigma(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma(j)} - 2t_{\sigma(j)} W_{\sigma(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} + \epsilon^{1/2} \xi_j \right) e^{ix_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} - W_{\sigma'(j)})/\epsilon} \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_{\sigma(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - Y_{\sigma'(j)} - 2t_{\sigma'(j)} W_{\sigma'(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} - \epsilon^{1/2} \xi_j \right) e^{i\xi_j \cdot (W_{\sigma(j)} + W_{\sigma'(j)})} \end{aligned}$$

In the sum (7.9), both factors $I_{\sigma,\sigma'}^{N-k}$ and $\tilde{f}_{N,\sigma,\sigma'}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ are random variables, and for each (σ, σ') , these two factors are independent. By the arguments in §7.1, $I_{\sigma,\sigma'}^{N-k}$ is dominated by the case in which $\sigma|_{k+1,\dots,N} = \sigma'|_{k+1,\dots,N}$, explicitly

$$\sigma(j) = \sigma'(j) \text{ for } j = k+1, \dots, N$$

and in this case, $I_{\sigma,\sigma'}^{N-k}$ is a non-random variable that takes the value $\epsilon^{3(N-k)/2}$. Thus we reduce our study to

$$(7.10) \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \kappa^2 \epsilon^{3(N-k)/2} \sum_{\substack{\sigma, \sigma' \in S_N \\ \sigma|_{k+1,\dots,N} = \sigma'|_{k+1,\dots,N}}} \tilde{f}_{N,\sigma,\sigma'}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$$

Now, if $\sigma|_{k+1,\dots,N} = \sigma'|_{k+1,\dots,N}$, then let $\pi = (\sigma')^{-1} \circ \sigma$, so that $\pi(j) = j$ for all $j \in \{k+1, \dots, N\}$ and can thus be regarded as an element of S_k . Replacing $\sigma' = \sigma \circ \pi^{-1}$, (7.10) becomes

$$(7.11) \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \frac{1}{N! \epsilon^{3k/2}} \sum_{\sigma \in S_N, \pi \in S_k} \tilde{f}_{N,\sigma,\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$$

where we have substituted (7.4). For each $\sigma \in S_N$ and $\pi \in S_k$, the definition of $\tilde{f}_{N,\sigma,\sigma \circ \pi^{-1}}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ depends only on $\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k)\}$, which is some subset of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of cardinality k . Let U_k be the set of all subsets of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of cardinality k . Then, of course, $|U_k| = \binom{N}{k}$, so for a fixed value of $\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(k)\}$, there are $N!/\binom{N}{k}$ terms in the above sum. Thus we obtain (7.6), (7.7). \square

Calculation 2. By (7.7), (7.8) and the law of large numbers

$$(7.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^k \epsilon^{-3/2} \chi_j \left(\frac{x_j + \epsilon \xi_j - Y_j - 2t_j W_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{ix_j \cdot (W_j - W_{\pi^{-1}(j)})/\epsilon} \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_{\pi^{-1}(j)} \left(\frac{x_j - \epsilon \xi_j - Y_{\pi^{-1}(j)} - 2t_{\pi^{-1}(j)} W_{\pi^{-1}(j)}}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{i\xi_j \cdot (W_j + W_{\pi^{-1}(j)})} \end{aligned}$$

By reindexing the product and using the independence of $\{(Y_1, W_1), \dots, (Y_N, W_N)\}$ to bring the expectation inside the product:

$$(7.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \prod_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E} \epsilon^{-3/2} \chi_j \left(\frac{x_j + \epsilon \xi_j - Y_j - 2t_j W_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{i(x_j - x_{\pi(j)}) \cdot W_j/\epsilon} \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_j \left(\frac{x_{\pi(j)} - \epsilon \xi_{\pi(j)} - Y_j - 2t_j W_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{i(\xi_j + \xi_{\pi(j)}) \cdot W_j} \end{aligned}$$

Let $G_Y(y)$ and $G_W(w)$ be the pdfs of Y and W , which we take to be standard normal. Then the expectation in (7.13) can be evaluated to give

$$(7.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + 4t_j^2)^{-3/2} \left(\int |\chi_j|^2 \right) \hat{G}_W \left(\frac{2q_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}} \right) \\ &G_Y \left(\frac{p_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}} \right) \exp \left(-4it_j \frac{q_j \cdot p_j}{1 + 4t_j^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p_j = \frac{1}{2}(x_j + x_{\pi(j)}) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(\xi_j - \xi_{\pi(j)}), \quad q_j = \frac{1}{2}(\xi_j + \xi_{\pi(j)}) + \frac{1}{2}(x_j - x_{\pi(j)})/\epsilon$$

Remark 7.2. The core term occurs when $\pi = \text{Identity}$ and in this case, $p_j = x_j$ and $q_j = \xi_j$, and (7.14) becomes

$$(7.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + 4t_j^2)^{-3/2} \left(\int |\chi_j|^2 \right) \hat{G}_W \left(\frac{2\xi_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}} \right) \\ &G_Y \left(\frac{x_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}} \right) \exp \left(-4it_j \frac{\xi_j \cdot x_j}{1 + 4t_j^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Upon taking the Fourier transform $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_k$, we obtain

$$f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \sim \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\int |\chi_j|^2 \right) G_Y \left(\frac{x_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}} \right) G_W \left[\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2} \left(\frac{v_j}{2} - \frac{2t_j x_j}{1 + 4t_j^2} \right) \right]$$

After completing the square, we obtain

$$f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \sim \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\int |\chi_j|^2 \right) e^{-(x_j - v_j t_j)^2 / 2} e^{-v_j^2 / 8}$$

which is the standard form of the local Maxwellian.

Remark 7.3. At this point, we recall Example 1 in particular (3.43), which shows that when $k = 2$, $\pi = (12)$, even in the ideal situation of assuming localization in $\boldsymbol{\xi}_2$, the function $\tilde{f}_{N,(12)}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}_2, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2)$ given by (7.15) only satisfies uniform bounds in N in the space $H_{\mathbf{x}_2}^s$ for $s \leq \frac{3}{4}$. From this point of view, such terms are irregular when measured in the $(\mathbf{x}_2, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2)$ coordinate frame, since the convergence, compactness, and even the well-posedness of the limit equation, reside in $H_{\mathbf{x}_2}^{1+}$.

Proof of Calculation 2. Carrying out the expectation in (7.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \prod_{j=1}^k \int_{y_j, w_j} \epsilon^{-3/2} \chi_j \left(\frac{x_j + \epsilon \xi_j - y_j - 2t_j w_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\bar{\chi}_j \left(\frac{x_{\pi(j)} - \epsilon \xi_{\pi(j)} - y_j - 2t_j w_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{2iq_j \cdot w_j} G_Y(y_j) G_W(w_j) dy_j dw_j \end{aligned}$$

Shift $y_j \mapsto y_j + 2t_j w_j$ and substitute

$$G_Y(y_j + 2t_j w_j) G_W(w_j) = G_Y\left(\frac{y_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) G_W\left[\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2} \left(w_j + \frac{2t_j y_j}{1 + 4t_j^2}\right)\right]$$

Then replace $w_j \mapsto w_j - \frac{2t_j y_j}{1 + 4t_j^2}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \prod_{j=1}^k \int_{y_j, w_j} \epsilon^{-3/2} \chi_j\left(\frac{x_j + \epsilon \xi_j - y_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \bar{\chi}_j\left(\frac{x_{\pi(j)} - \epsilon \xi_{\pi(j)} - y_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \\ &\quad \exp\left(-4it_j \frac{q_j \cdot y_j}{1 + 4t_j^2}\right) G_Y\left(\frac{y_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) e^{2iq_j \cdot w_j} G_W\left[w_j \sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}\right] dy_j dw_j \end{aligned}$$

Carrying out the w_j integral gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + 4t_j^2)^{-3/2} \hat{G}_W\left(\frac{2q_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) \int_{y_j} \epsilon^{-3/2} \chi_j\left(\frac{x_j + \epsilon \xi_j - y_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \\ &\quad \bar{\chi}_j\left(\frac{x_{\pi(j)} - \epsilon \xi_{\pi(j)} - y_j}{\epsilon^{1/2}}\right) \exp\left(-4it_j \frac{q_j \cdot y_j}{1 + 4t_j^2}\right) G_Y\left(\frac{y_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) dy_j \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $y_j = p_j + \epsilon^{1/2} z_j$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &\sim \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + 4t_j^2)^{-3/2} \hat{G}_W\left(\frac{2q_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) \int_{z_j} \chi_j(\epsilon^{1/2} q_j - z_j) \bar{\chi}_j(-\epsilon^{1/2} q_j - z_j) \\ &\quad \exp\left(-4it_j \frac{q_j \cdot (p_j + \epsilon^{1/2} z_j)}{1 + 4t_j^2}\right) G_Y\left(\frac{p_j + \epsilon^{1/2} z_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) dz_j \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the approximation (7.14) □

7.3. Effect of collisions. If initial condition (7.1) with all $t_j = 0$ evolves *without* interaction ($\phi = 0$), the result is (7.2), leading to (7.14):

$$(7.16) \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_k, \boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \sum_{\pi \in S_k} \tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{p}_k^\pi, \mathbf{q}_k^\pi)$$

where

$$(7.17) \quad \tilde{g}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{q}_k) \sim \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + 4t_j^2)^{-3/2} \hat{G}_W\left(\frac{2q_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) G_Y\left(\frac{p_j}{\sqrt{1 + 4t_j^2}}\right) \exp\left(-4it \frac{q_j \cdot p_j}{1 + 4t_j^2}\right)$$

In the collisionless case, (7.16) satisfies the linear BBGKY hierarchy (with $A = 0$, $B = 0$).

$$i\partial_t \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} = 0$$

This hierarchy decouples in k and for each k , it is just linear transport.

We now look for an indication of how the evolution of $\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}(t, \mathbf{p}_k, \mathbf{q}_k)$ in time will be altered by $\phi \neq 0$. We know that $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$ satisfies the BBGKY hierarchy (where now $A \neq 0$ and $B \neq 0$) as given by (3.1).

$$(7.18) \quad i\partial_t \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} = \epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{A}_\epsilon^{(k)} \tilde{f}_N^{(k)} + N\epsilon^{-1/2} \tilde{B}_\epsilon^{(k+1)} \tilde{f}_N^{(k+1)}$$

We anticipate that as $N \rightarrow \infty$, all $\pi \neq \text{Id}$ terms in (7.16) vanish, leaving only the core term with $\pi = \text{Id}$. Furthermore, the anticipated limiting form of BBGKY is the Boltzmann hierarchy, in which only the composition of B and A in the Duhamel expansion survive to give the collision operator:

$$(7.19) \quad i\partial_t \tilde{f}^{(k)} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \tilde{f}^{(k)} = \tilde{Q}^{(k+1)} \tilde{f}^{(k+1)}$$

where $\tilde{Q}^{(k+1)}$ is given by (3.26). Using the limiting form (7.19) of the equation (7.18) on the finite N functional form of $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$ as given by (7.16), we deduce a type of ‘‘linearization’’ for the dynamics of $\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}$ for a fixed $\pi \in S^k$, as follows. Assuming that $\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}$ only interacts with the core term, and the core term can be approximated by its $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit $\tilde{f}^{(k)}$, we can write, for fixed $\pi \in S^k$:

$$\tilde{f}_N^{(k)} = \tilde{f}^{(k)} + \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}, \quad \tilde{f}_N^{(k+1)} = \tilde{f}^{(k+1)} + \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)} \otimes \tilde{f}^{(1)}$$

This leads to the perturbative equation

$$(7.20) \quad i\partial_t \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)} + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k} \tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)} = \tilde{Q}^{(k+1)} (\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)} \otimes \tilde{f}^{(1)})$$

Since the limiting collision operator is explicitly given by (3.26) and the form of the local Maxwellian is explicitly given by (7.15), we can compute that the effect of the Duhamel operator of the right-side of (7.20) on the dynamics of $\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$. Written in $(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k)$ coordinates, the first-order Duhamel expression is

$$(7.21) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) &= e^{-t\mathbf{v}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k}} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(0) \\ &+ \int_0^t e^{-(t-t')\mathbf{v}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k}} Q^{(k+1)}(e^{-t'\mathbf{v}_k \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_k}} f_{N,\pi}^{(k)}(0) \otimes f^{(1)}(t')) dt' \end{aligned}$$

This expression is computable since its components consist of Gaussians. We are more interested here however in explaining the origin of fluctuations in the dynamics that give rise to perturbations of the symmetry in coordinates in $\tilde{f}_{N,\pi}^{(k)}$. Suppose that instead of substituting (7.15) into the Duhamel term, we use (7.7)-(7.8) for $k = 1$, $\pi = I$ (before the application of averaging in Calculation 2). In the case $k = 1$, $\pi = I$, (7.7)-(7.8) reduce to the following

$$(7.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_N^{(1)}(t', x_1, \xi_1) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\sigma=1}^N \epsilon^{-3/2} \chi_\sigma \left(\frac{x_1 + \epsilon \xi_1 - Y_\sigma - 2t_\sigma W_\sigma}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\bar{\chi}_\sigma \left(\frac{x_1 - \epsilon \xi_1 - Y_\sigma - 2t_\sigma W_\sigma}{\epsilon^{1/2}} \right) e^{2i\xi_j W_\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}t_\sigma = t'$. The process is deterministic, however, we are interested in averages (expected values) which are more easily extracted from a (pseudo-)random model. Since the Duhamel term in (7.21) involves a linear transport propagator, the path of the integral in time will meet the collection of wave packets in (7.22) centered at $Y_\sigma + 2t_\sigma W_\sigma$ as σ ranges over the

full collection $\{1, \dots, N\}$, the j th particle ($1 \leq j \leq k$) will undergo collisions according to a Poisson process with rate $1/\epsilon$ along its linear path. For expositional simplicity, let us assume these collisions occur at regularly spaced times – every ϵ unit of time. Writing in terms of characteristics, the linear path of the j th particle, $1 \leq j \leq k$, without perturbation is $x_j(t) = x_j(0) + 2tv_j(0)$, but with the perturbation (Duhamel term), the path is perturbed. Let us assume that the effect of each collision on $x_j(t)$ is to randomly either raise or lower the distance of $x_j(t)$ from $x_j(0) + 2tv_j(0)$, measured orthogonal to $v_j(0)$, by ϵ . Let

$$S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n U_k$$

where $\{U_k\}$ is a collection of independent standard normal random variables so S_n is a random walk with Gaussian increments. Our model is

$$|x_j(t) - x_j(0) - 2tv_j(0)| = |\epsilon S_{\lfloor t/\epsilon \rfloor}|$$

Then

$$\text{var } |x_j(t) - x_j(0) - 2tv_j(0)| = \epsilon^2 \lfloor t/\epsilon \rfloor \approx \epsilon t$$

and thus the standard deviation of these fluctuations, or effective width of the values around a pure linear trajectory, is $\sqrt{\epsilon t}$.

Moreover, a straightforward calculation shows that the expected number of zero crossings of S_n is, asymptotically $\sim 2\sqrt{n}/\pi$.⁴⁸ With $n = \lfloor t/\epsilon \rfloor$, this is $\sim \epsilon^{-1/2}$ over a unit time interval. Said differently, the time steps are of size ϵ , although we cross over 0 on average every $\sim \epsilon^{1/2}$ units of time.

In this model, the j th particle position-velocity covariance fluctuates around the value $-2t$ with effective width $O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$, but revisits the exact value $-2t$ every $O(\epsilon^{1/2})$ time. Recall that the time shifts t_j were inserted into (7.1) to allow the model to reflect deviations from $C_j(t) = -2t$ that could vary from one particle to the next. Although the appeal to the law of large numbers in Calculation 2, (7.12) should average over the values of t_j , we need to account for the fact that the process is *dynamical*. We can interpret the role of randomness in the particle positions Y_j and velocities W_j to mean that they are randomly selected (sampled) initially (say at time 0), and the collection will then evolve in time deterministically starting from this initial, randomly selected configuration. Then, evolving forward deterministically in time, each particle suffers collisions according to a pseudo-random process, such as the simplified one described above. Thus we have left the t_j 's in (7.14) rather than replace them with an expectation and offer the model above as a way to suggest that the proper physics could be captured, at the level of particle densities $\tilde{f}_N^{(k)}$, by supposing that, for most times t , the time offsets satisfy $|t_i - t_j| = O(\epsilon^{1/2})$, but for a set of times t of negligible measure we in fact have $t_i = t_j$. Moreover, this set of times of negligible measure is $\epsilon^{1/2}$ dense on the timeline. Hence, we conclude condition (1.20), along with everything else in §1.1.

Looking backwards into the proof of Theorem 1.1, the above discussion might be a reason of the emergence of time irreversibility after everything is finally well-defined and physical.

⁴⁸See the answer to Question #1338097 on <https://math.stackexchange.com/>, for the calculation.

When the whole particle system returns to its initial state (recurrence) at t_r , then, as indication, it is a quasi free symmetry event and $t_r \notin E_\varepsilon$ and (1.20) does not happen (though this is not true the other way around), but as ε tends to zero, the “jitter” set E_ε becomes dense and the whole time line are symmetry strengthening events,⁴⁹ hence no recurrences. Thus, the quantum model (dice) has indeed helped the time irreversibility and matches [9, Vol. III, paper 119]. (Of course, this needs more explanation and investigation.)

8. PROOF OF OPTIMALITY: WELL/ILL-POSEDNESS SEPARATION OF THE LIMIT EQUATION

Theorem 8.1. *The quantum Boltzmann equation (1.9) is locally well-posed in $H_x^s L_v^{2,0+}$ for $s > 1$, and ill-posed in $H_x^s L_v^{2,0+}$ for $s < 1$. Moreover, the solution constructed in $H_x^s L_v^{2,0+}$, for $s > 1$, is nonnegative and in L_{xv}^1 if the initial datum has the property.*

8.1. Well-posedness. We prove a $C([0, T]; H_x^{1+} H_\xi^{0+})$ local well-posedness theory for (1.9) on the (x, ξ) side which is a $C([0, T]; H_x^{1+} L_v^{2,0+})$ theory for (1.9) on the (x, v) side. That is, we construct a unique solution to (1.9) in the format of

$$i\partial_t \tilde{f} + \nabla_x \cdot \nabla_\xi \tilde{f} = \sum_{\pm} \pm \tilde{Q}^{\pm}(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f})$$

in the space $C([-T, T]; H_x^{1+} H_\xi^{0+})$ on a time interval whose length depends on the size of $\|\tilde{f}(0)\|_{H_x^{1+} H_\xi^{0+}}$.

Lemma 8.2. *For given \tilde{g}, \tilde{h} , consider \tilde{f} solving*

$$i\partial_t \tilde{f} + \nabla_x \cdot \nabla_\xi \tilde{f} = \sum_{\pm} \pm \tilde{Q}^{\pm}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})$$

with initial condition $\tilde{f}(0)$. Then

$$(8.1) \quad \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{f}\|_{C([-T, T]; L_{x\xi}^2) \cap L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^{3-}} \lesssim \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{f}(0)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \\ + T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_{x\xi}^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^{3-}}$$

More precisely, given a choice of $\delta > 0$ in the operator $\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+\delta} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^\delta$ on the left side, it is possible to select $\delta' > 0$, $\delta'' > 0$ so that the estimate holds with every instance of $L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^{3-}$ taken to be $L_{(-T, T)}^{2+\delta''} L_{x\xi}^{3-\delta'}$ and every instance of the operator $\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+}$ on the right side is $\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+\delta} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^\delta$ (exactly the same $\delta > 0$ as on the left side). Moreover the pair $(2 + \delta'', 3 - \delta')$ is Strichartz admissible.

Proof. The Duhamel form is

$$\tilde{f}(t, x, \xi) = \sum_{\pm} \pm \int_0^t e^{i(t-t') \nabla_x \cdot \nabla_\xi} \tilde{Q}^{\pm}(\tilde{g}(t'), \tilde{h}(t')) dt'$$

⁴⁹In EE, jitters are phase noises in the synchronizing clock, that is exactly the cause of the E_ε set here. Moreover, jitters in EE indeed match the prediction here that they never go away, and increases as particle number increase. (This is one of the reasons for better photolithography.) One can always observe them directly on oscilloscopes as proof.

By the Strichartz estimate,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{f}\|_{C([-T, T]; L_{x\xi}^2) \cap L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^{3-}} &\lesssim \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{f}(0)\|_{L_{x\xi}^2} \\ &+ \sum_{\pm} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^1 L_{x\xi}^2} \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.10,

$$\lesssim T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_{x_1} \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x_1, \xi_1) \tilde{h}(t, x_1, \xi_2)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x_1}^2 (L_{\xi_2}^{3+} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3-}) L_{\xi_1}^2}$$

Recall that from the proof of Proposition 3.10, we have the flexibility to use $L_{\xi_2}^{3+\omega} \cap L_{\xi_2}^{3-\omega'}$ for any $\omega > 0$ and $\omega' > 0$ arbitrarily small (as long as they are both strictly positive). By the fractional Leibniz rule in x ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_x^2 L_\xi^2} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_x^\infty (L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-})} \\ &+ T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_x^6 L_\xi^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_x^{3-} (L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-})} \end{aligned}$$

For the two terms $\|\tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_x^\infty (L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-})}$ and $\|\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_x^6 L_\xi^2}$, we bring the x -norm to the inside via Minkowski's integral inequality, and then apply Sobolev in x :

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_x^2 L_\xi^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} (L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-}) L_x^{3-}} \\ &+ T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_x^2 L_\xi^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_x^{3-} (L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-})} \end{aligned}$$

In the argument above, the Hölder exponent of L_x^{3-} is chosen to match exactly the Hölder exponent of L_ξ^{3-} . The L_ξ^{3+} norms are converted to the same L_ξ^{3-} at the expense of $\langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+}$ via Sobolev.

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_x^2 L_\xi^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^{3-}} \\ &+ T^{1/2+} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^\infty L_x^2 L_\xi^2} \|\langle \nabla_x \rangle^{1+} \langle \nabla_\xi \rangle^{0+} \tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_{(-T, T)}^{2+} L_{x\xi}^{3-}} \end{aligned}$$

□

Local well-posedness, namely, existence, uniqueness, and uniform continuity of the datum to solution map, now follows from Lemma 8.2 by the standard contraction argument. The solution we constructed is also a strong solution as it is in $C([0, T]; H_x^{1+} L_v^{2,0+})$ and is nonnegative and in L_{xv}^1 if the initial datum has the property as we will prove in §8.1.1. However, it only solves (1.9) almost everywhere in time in the sense that the nonlinearity is defined a.e. in time. (An additional $H_x^{\frac{1}{2}+} L_v^{2, \frac{1}{2}+}$ condition will make the solution an everywhere in time solution.)

8.1.1. Nonnegativity and persistence of L_{xv}^1 .

Lemma 8.3 (persistence of $H_x^2 H_\xi^2$). *Suppose that the initial condition $\tilde{f} \in H_x^2 H_\xi^2$. Then the unique solution constructed above in $C([-T, T]; H_x^{1+} H_\xi^{0+})$, where $T > 0$ depends on the size of $\|\tilde{f}(0)\|_{H_x^{1+} H_\xi^{0+}}$, in fact belongs also to $C([-T, T]; H_x^2 H_\xi^2)$ and this norm is controlled by the corresponding norm of the initial condition.*

Proof. This follows using the same estimates after derivatives are added to the equation. \square

Lemma 8.4 (nonnegativity of high regularity solutions). *If $f(0) \in H_x^2 L_v^{2,2}$ and $f(0) \geq 0$ pointwise, then the corresponding solution satisfies $f(t) \geq 0$ pointwise for all t .*

Proof. This one follows from the same argument in [18]. \square

Lemma 8.5 (L_{xv}^1 bounds of high regularity solutions). *If $f(0) \in H_x^2 L_v^{2,2} \cap L_{x,v}^1$, then the corresponding solution satisfies $f \in L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{x,v}^1$.*

Proof. This proof does not need the nonnegativity. We will estimate the solution $f(t)$ in the Duhamel form.

$$f(t) = S(t)f(0) + \sum_{\pm} \pm \int_0^t S(t-t')Q^\pm(f(t'), f(t')) dt'$$

Applying the L_{xv}^1 norm, and using that this is preserved by the linear propagator,

$$\|f(t)\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{xv}^1} \lesssim \|f(0)\|_{L_{xv}^1} + \sum_{\pm} T \|Q^\pm(f(t), f(t))\|_{L_{xv}^1}$$

Thus, it suffices to estimate $\|Q^\pm(f, f)\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{xv}^1}$. To this end, first note that

$$(8.2) \quad \|Q^\pm(f, f)\|_{L_v^1} \lesssim \|Q^\pm(f, f)\|_{L_v^{2,2}} = \|\tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f})\|_{H_\xi^2}$$

Recall

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi) &= \int_{s=0}^\infty \int_{\zeta} e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi \cdot \zeta/2} e^{-2is\sigma|\zeta|^2/2} \hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta) \\ &\quad \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi - s\zeta) \tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta) ds d\zeta \end{aligned}$$

Applying the operator $(1 - \Delta_\xi)$ and differentiating under the integral sign gives

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \Delta_\xi) \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,\sigma}(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi) &= \int_{s=0}^\infty \int_{\zeta} e^{i(\sigma-\alpha)\xi \cdot \zeta/2} e^{-2is\sigma|\zeta|^2/2} \hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta) \\ &\quad (1 + \frac{1}{4}(\sigma - \alpha)^2 |\zeta|^2 - 2(\sigma - \alpha)\zeta \cdot \nabla_\xi - \Delta_\xi) \tilde{g}(t, x, \xi - s\zeta) \tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta) ds d\zeta \end{aligned}$$

All of the extra powers of ζ that have been produced can be absorbed by $\hat{\phi}$. Thus, Minkowski, we have

$$\|(1 - \Delta_\xi) \tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^2} \lesssim \|\tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{H_\xi^2} \int_{s=0}^\infty \int_{\zeta} \left| \langle \zeta \rangle^2 \hat{\phi}(-\zeta) \hat{\phi}(\zeta) \right| \left| \tilde{h}(t, x, s\zeta) \right| ds d\zeta$$

Hölder in ζ like in the proof of Lemma 6.12,

$$\|(1 - \Delta_\xi) \tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^2} \lesssim \|\langle \zeta \rangle^2 \hat{\phi}(\zeta)\|_{L^{3+} \cap L^{3-}} \|\tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{H_\xi^2} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_\xi^{3+} \cap L_\xi^{3-}}$$

Applying the L_x^1 norm and using Cauchy-Schwarz in x ,

$$\|\tilde{Q}^\pm(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h})(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_x^1 H_\xi^2} \lesssim \|\tilde{g}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_x^2 H_\xi^2} \|\tilde{h}(t, x, \xi)\|_{L_x^2 H_\xi^2}$$

where we have now absorbed $\|\langle \zeta \rangle^2 \hat{\phi}(\zeta)\|_{L^{3+} \cap L^{3-}}$ into the implicit constant. Returning to (8.2),

$$\|Q^\pm(f, f)(t, x, v)\|_{L_x^1 L_v^1} \lesssim \|f(t, x, v)\|_{L_x^2 L_v^{2,2}} \|f(t, x, v)\|_{L_x^2 L_v^{2,2}}$$

□

Combining Lemmas 8.4, 8.5, we obtain

Corollary 8.6. *Suppose that $f(0) \in H_x^2 L_v^{2,2} \cap L_{x,v}^1$ and $f(0) \geq 0$. Then the corresponding solution satisfies $f \in L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{x,v}^1$, $f(t) \geq 0$, and*

$$(8.3) \quad \int_{x,v} f(t, x, v) dx dv = \int_{x,v} f(0, x, v) dx dv$$

so that the $L_{x,v}^1$ norm is in fact preserved in time.

Proof. Since the quantity $\iint_{x,v} f(t, x, v) dx dv$ is defined for all time by Lemma 8.5, it is meaningful to compute

$$\partial_t \iint_{x,v} f(t, x, v) dx dv = 0$$

by substituting the equation and using that the integral of the gain term matches the integral of the loss term. Thus (8.3) holds. □

Now we can use the continuity of the data-to-solution map and Lemma 8.3 as follows: Suppose that $f(0) \in H_x^{1+} L_v^{2,0+} \cap L_{x,v}^1$ and $f(0) \geq 0$. Approximate this initial condition in the space $H_x^{1+} L_v^{2,0+} \cap L_{x,v}^1$ by a sequence such that for each n , $f_n(0) \in H_x^2 L_v^{2,2}$ and $f_n(0) \geq 0$. The continuity of the data-to-solution map implies that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $C([-T, T]; H_x^{1+} L_v^{2,0+})$. By Corollary 8.6, applied to each f_n , we have each $f_n(t) \geq 0$ and

$$\forall n, \quad \|f_n\|_{L_{(-T,T)}^\infty L_{x,v}^1} = \|f_n(0)\|_{L_{x,v}^1} \lesssim \|f(0)\|_{L_{x,v}^1}$$

Now $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $C([-T, T]; H_x^{1+} L_v^{2,0+})$ implies that for each t , $f_n(t) \rightarrow f(t)$ in $L_{x,v}^2$, from which it follows that there is a subsequence (depending on t , although this is not a problem) such that $f_{n_k}(t, x, v) \rightarrow f(t, x, v)$ for pointwise a.e. $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^6$. Since this is a nonnegative sequence, it follows from Fatou's lemma that

$$\iint_{x,v} f(t) dx dv \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{x,v} f_{n_k}(t) dx dv \lesssim \iint_{x,v} f(0) dx dv$$

8.2. Ill-posedness. We actually find the following result of ill-posedness.

Lemma 8.7. *Given any $s_1 > 0$ and $s < 1$, the quantum Boltzmann equation (1.9) is ill-posed in $H_x^s L_v^{2,s_1}$ i.e. as long as the x -derivative is below 1, ill-posedness persists even with high v -weights.*

The mechanism of Lemma 8.7 was first discovered in [36]. It can be described as the following. While it is universally known that the gain term is better than the loss term, it was unknown that there is a regularity gap between the optimal estimates on the gain term and the loss term such that the gain term cannot cancel the loss term at all. The “bad” solutions we consider are mainly maximizers of estimate (8.1) in the loss term of the collision operator, while other parts – the gain term and the free term – in estimate (8.1) in fact satisfy better estimates with lower regularity. That is, in a Duhamel iteration, the loss term applied to the “bad” solutions will stay around the same size while the gain term applied to the “bad” solutions will become smaller. Hence, putting in the maximizers of the

loss term is like solving (1.9) with only the loss term which drives down the amplitude of the solution exponentially fast, and hence creates ill-posedness, in the sense that, there is a family of norm deflation solutions and thus the datum to solution map is not uniformly continuous.

We provide a construction of the approximate “bad” solution f_a and a formal calculation demonstrating the ill-posedness. For the remaining perturbation argument proving that a small correction f_c exists such that $f = f_a + f_c$ exactly solves (1.9) and still exhibits ill-posedness behavior, we refer readers to [36, 40].

Fix a s with $s < 1$. Let the dyadic parameters satisfy the relationship.

$$0 < N \ll \max(M_1, M_2)^{-1} \ll 1, \quad M_1 \geq 1, \quad M_2 \gg 1$$

We will consider $|\eta_2| \sim M_2$ and $|v_2| \sim N_2$, with $M_2 \gg 1$ and $N_2 \gg 1$ dyadic. On the unit sphere, lay down a grid of $J \sim M_2^2 N_2^2$ points $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^J$, where the points e_j are roughly equally spaced and each have their own neighborhood of unit-sphere surface area $\sim M_2^{-1} N_2^{-1}$. Let P_{e_j} denote the orthogonal projection onto the 1D subspace spanned by e_j and $P_{e_j}^\perp$ denote the orthogonal projection onto the 2D subspace $\text{span}\{e_j\}^\perp$. We write

$$f(x, v, t) \approx \frac{M_1^{\frac{3}{2}-s}}{N^{3/2}} \chi(M_1 x) \hat{\chi}\left(\frac{v}{N}\right)$$

and

$$g(x, v_2, t) \approx \frac{M_2^{1-s}}{N_2^{2+s_1}} \sum_{j=1}^J \chi(M_2 P_{e_j}^\perp x) \chi\left(\frac{P_{e_j} x}{N_2}\right) \hat{\chi}(M_2 P_{e_j}^\perp v_2) \hat{\chi}\left(\frac{P_{e_j} v_2}{N_2}\right)$$

whose $H_x^s L_v^{2, s_1}$ norms are $O(1)$ and where the v_2 in the definition of g is to remind us the v integration in the loss term. In the j -sum over $J \sim M_2^2 N_2^2$ terms inside g , the velocity supports are almost disjoint and the square of the sum is approximately the sum of the squares. As mentioned before, f and g are actually maximizers for the loss term bilinear estimate at critical regularity while the gain term satisfies better estimates. So we expect a small gain term minus a large loss term behavior.

For the loss term, we compute $Q^-(f, g)$ for which we use the $1/\langle u \rangle$ approximation,

$$Q^-(f, g) \approx f \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{g(x, v_2, t)}{\langle v - v_2 \rangle} dv_2$$

Notice that f 's v support is of size N which is small and hence, $\langle v - v_2 \rangle \sim N_2$. Carrying out the integral for the bump functions,

$$\begin{aligned} Q^-(f, g) &\approx f \sum_{j=1}^J \chi(M_2 P_{e_j}^\perp x) \chi\left(\frac{P_{e_j} x}{N_2}\right) \frac{M_2^{1-s}}{N_2^{2+s_1}} \frac{1}{N_2} \frac{N_2}{M_2^2} \\ &= f \frac{1}{M_2^{1+s} N_2^{2+s_1}} \sum_{j=1}^J \chi(M_2 P_{e_j}^\perp x) \chi\left(\frac{P_{e_j} x}{N_2}\right) \\ &= f M_2^{1-s} N_2^{-s_1} \chi(M_2 x) \end{aligned}$$

A prototype approximate solution suggested by the formal Duhamel iteration of $f + g$ is then

$$f_a(x, v, t) \approx \exp(-M_2^{1-s} N_2^{-s_1} \chi(M_2 x) t) \cdot f + g$$

which is just $f + g$ above with f preceded by an exponentially decaying factor in time. For a fixed s_1 and $M_1 \gg N_2$, when $s < 1$, the size of the exponential term changes substantially on the short time scale $\sim M_2^{s-1} N_2^{s_1^{-1}} \ll 1$.

Let us now set

$$M = M_1 = M_2 \gg 1, \quad N = M^{-1} \ll 1$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} f_a(x, v, t) &= M^{3-s} \chi(Mx) \hat{\chi}(Mv) \exp(-M^{1-s} N_2^{-s_1} \chi(Mx) t) \\ &\quad + \frac{M^{1-s}}{N_2^{2+s_1}} \sum_{j=1}^J \chi(M P_{e_j}^\perp x) \chi\left(\frac{P_{e_j} x}{N_2}\right) \hat{\chi}(M P_{e_j}^\perp v) \hat{\chi}\left(\frac{P_{e_j} v}{N_2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

whose $L_v^{2,s_1} H_x^{s_0}$ norm for any $0 < s \leq 1$, $s_0 \geq 0$ is

$$(8.4) \quad \|f_a\|_{L_v^{2,s_1} H_x^{s_0}} \sim M^{s_0-s} \exp[-M^{1-s} N_2^{-s_1} t] \langle M^{1-s} N_2^{-s_1} t \rangle^{s_0} + M^{s_0-s}$$

Thus, if we let

$$(8.5) \quad 0 < s < 1, \quad s_0 = s - \frac{\ln \ln M}{\ln M}, \quad T_* = -\frac{\delta}{M^{1-s} N_2^{-s_1}} \ln M \leq t \leq 0$$

then at the endpoints of the interval $[T_*, 0]$:

$$\|f_a(T_*)\|_{L_v^{2,s_1} H_x^{s_0}} \sim M^\delta \gg 1, \quad \|f_a(0)\|_{L_v^{2,s_1} H_x^{s_0}} \leq \frac{1}{\ln M} \ll 1,$$

Note that, as $M \nearrow \infty$, $s_0 \nearrow s$, and this approximate solution, in $L_v^{2,s_1} H_x^{s_0}$, starts very small in $L_v^{2,s_1} H_x^{s_0}$ at time 0, and rapidly inflates at time $T_* < 0$ to large size in $L_v^{2,s_1} H_x^{s_0}$ backwards in time. By considering the same approximate solution starting at $T_* < 0$ and evolving forward to time 0, we have an approximate solution that starts large and deflates to a small size in a very short period of time.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Alexandre, Y. Morimoto, S. Ukai, C.-J. Xu & T. Yang, *Global existence and full regularity of the Boltzmann equation without angular cutoff*, Commun. Math. Phys. **304** (2011) 513–581.
- [2] V. Ardourel, *Irreversibility in the Derivation of the Boltzmann Equation*, Found. Phys. **47** (2017), 471–489.
- [3] L. Arkeryd, S. Caprino & N. Ianiro, *The Homogeneous Boltzmann Hierarchy and Statistical Solutions to the Homogeneous Boltzmann Equation*, J. Stat. Phys. **63** (1991), 345–361.
- [4] D. Arsenio, *On the global existence of mild solutions to the Boltzmann equation for small data in L^D* , Commun. Math. Phys. **302** (2011), 453–476.
- [5] M. Beals, *Self-spreading and strength of singularities for solutions to semilinear wave equations*, Ann. of Math. (2) **118** (1983), 187–214.
- [6] D. Benedetto, F. Castella, R. Esposito, and M. Pulvirenti, *Some considerations on the derivation of the nonlinear quantum boltzmann equation*, J. Stat. Phys. **116** (2004), 381–410.

- [7] D. Benedetto, F. Castella, R. Esposito, and M. Pulvirenti, *On the weak-coupling limit for bosons and fermions*, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci. **15** (2005), 1811–1843.
- [8] D. Benedetto, F. Castella, R. Esposito, and M. Pulvirenti, *From the N -body Schrödinger equation to the quantum Boltzmann equation: a term-by-term convergence result in the weak coupling regime*, Commun. Math. Phys. **277** (2008), 1–44.
- [9] L. Boltzmann, *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen Vol. I, II, and III*. F. Hasenöhr (ed.) Leipzig 1909. Reissued New York: Chelsea, 1969.
- [10] M. Born, *Zur Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge*, Zeitschrift für Physik **37** (1926), 863–867.
- [11] J. Bourgain, *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations*, Parts I, II, Geometric and Funct. Anal. **3** (1993), 107–156, 209–262.
- [12] J. Bennett, N. Bez, S. Gutiérrez, & S. Lee, *On the Strichartz estimates for the kinetic transport equation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **39** (2014), 1821–1826.
- [13] N. Bournaveas & B. Perthame, *Averages over spheres for kinetic transport equations; hyperbolic Sobolev spaces and Strichartz inequalities*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **80** (2001), 517–534.
- [14] E. Cárdenas & T. Chen, *Quantum Boltzmann dynamics and bosonized particle-hole interactions in fermion gases*, arXiv:2306.03300, 70pp.
- [15] C. Cercignani, R. Illner, & M. Pulvirenti, *The Mathematical Theory of Dilute Gases*, Applied Mathematical Sciences (AMS, volume 106).
- [16] T. Chen, R. Denlinger, & N. Pavlović, *Local well-posedness for Boltzmann’s equation and the Boltzmann hierarchy via Wigner transform*, Comm. Math. Phys. **368** (2019), 427–465.
- [17] T. Chen, R. Denlinger, & N. Pavlović, *Moments and regularity for a Boltzmann equation via Wigner transform*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **39** (2019), 4979–5015.
- [18] T. Chen, R. Denlinger, & N. Pavlović, *Small data global well-posedness for a Boltzmann equation via bilinear spacetime estimates*. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **240** (2021), 327–381.
- [19] T. Chen, C. Hainzl, N. Pavlović, & R. Seiringer, *Unconditional Uniqueness for the Cubic Gross-Pitaevskii Hierarchy via Quantum de Finetti*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **68** (2015), 1845–1884.
- [20] T. Chen & M. Hott, *On the emergence of quantum Boltzmann fluctuation dynamics near a Bose-Einstein condensate*, J. Stat. Phys. **190** (2023), 85.
- [21] T. Chen & N. Pavlović, *The Quintic NLS as the Mean Field Limit of a Boson Gas with Three-Body Interactions*, J. Funct. Anal. **260** (2011), 959–997.
- [22] T. Chen & N. Pavlović, *Derivation of the cubic NLS and Gross-Pitaevskii hierarchy from manybody dynamics in $d = 3$ based on spacetime norms*, Ann. H. Poincaré, **15** (2014), 543 - 588.
- [23] X. Chen, *Collapsing Estimates and the Rigorous Derivation of the 2d Cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation with Anisotropic Switchable Quadratic Traps*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **98** (2012), 450–478.
- [24] X. Chen, *On the Rigorous Derivation of the 3D Cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation with A Quadratic Trap*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **210** (2013), 365–408.
- [25] X. Chen & Y. Guo, *On the Weak Coupling Limit of Quantum Many-body Dynamics and the Quantum Boltzmann Equation*, Kinet. Relat. Models **8** (2015), 443–465.
- [26] X. Chen & L. He, *The longtime dynamics of the quantum Boltzmann Equation*, in preparation.
- [27] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *On the Rigorous Derivation of the 2D Cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation from 3D Quantum Many-Body Dynamics*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **210** (2013), 909–954.
- [28] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *On the Klainerman-Machedon Conjecture of the Quantum BBGKY Hierarchy with Self-interaction*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **18** (2016), 1161–1200.
- [29] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *Focusing Quantum Many-body Dynamics: The Rigorous Derivation of the 1D Focusing Cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **221** (2016), 631–676.
- [30] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *Focusing Quantum Many-body Dynamics II: The Rigorous Derivation of the 1D Focusing Cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation from 3D*, Analysis & PDE **10** (2017), 589–633.
- [31] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *Correlation structures, Many-body Scattering Processes and the Derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii Hierarchy*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **2016**, 3051–3110.

- [32] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *The Rigorous Derivation of the 2D Cubic Focusing NLS from Quantum Many-body Evolution*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **2017**, 4173–4216.
- [33] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *The Derivation of the Energy-critical NLS from Quantum Many-body Dynamics*, Invent. Math. **217** (2019), 433–547.
- [34] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *The Unconditional Uniqueness for the Energy-critical Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation on \mathbb{T}^4* , Forum Math. Pi. **10** (2022), e3 1–49.
- [35] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *Quantitative Derivation and Scattering of the 3D Cubic NLS in the Energy Space*, Ann. PDE **8** (2022) Article 11 1–39.
- [36] X. Chen & J. Holmer, *Well/ill-posedness bifurcation for the Boltzmann equation with constant collision kernel*, arXiv:2206.11931, 31pp.
- [37] X. Chen, S. Shen, & Z. Zhang, *The Unconditional Uniqueness for the Energy-supercritical NLS*, Ann. PDE **8** (2022) Article 14 1–82.
- [38] X. Chen, S. Shen, & Z. Zhang, *Quantitative derivation of the Euler-Poisson equation from quantum many-body dynamics*, Peking Mathematical Journal, 69pp. DOI: 10.1007/s42543-023-00065-5.
- [39] X. Chen, S. Shen, & Z. Zhang, *On the mean-field and semiclassical limit from quantum N -body dynamics*, arXiv:2304.03447,40pp.
- [40] X. Chen, S. Shen, & Z. Zhang, *Well/Ill-posedness of the Boltzmann Equation with Soft Potential*, arXiv:2310.05042, 47pp.
- [41] X. Chen, S. Shen, & Z. Zhang, *Sharp Global Well-posedness and Scattering of the Boltzmann Equation*, arXiv:2311.02008, 42pp.
- [42] X. Chen, S. Shen, J. Wu, & Z. Zhang, *The derivation of the compressible Euler equation from quantum many-body dynamics*, Peking Mathematical Journal, 56pp. DOI: 10.1007/s42543-023-00066-4.
- [43] X. Chen & P. Smith, *On the Unconditional Uniqueness of Solutions to the Infinite Radial Chern-Simons-Schrödinger Hierarchy*, Analysis & PDE **7** (2014), 1683–1712.
- [44] R. DiPerna & P.-L. Lions, *On the Cauchy problem for Boltzmann equations: global existence and weak stability*, Ann. of Math. (2) **130** (1989), 321–366.
- [45] R. Duan, F. Huang, Y. Wang & T. Yang, *Global well-posedness of the Boltzmann equation with large amplitude initial data*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **225** (2017), 375–424.
- [46] R. Duan, S. Liu, & J. Xu, *Global Well-Posedness in Spatially Critical Besov Space for the Boltzmann Equation*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **220** (2016) 711–745.
- [47] L. Erdős, M. Salmhofer and H. T. Yau, *On the quantum Boltzmann equation*, J. Stat. Phys. **116** (2004) 367–380. MR2083147
- [48] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, and H. T. Yau, *Derivation of the Cubic non-linear Schrödinger Equation from Quantum Dynamics of Many-body Systems*, Invent. Math. **167** (2007), 515–614.
- [49] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, and H. T. Yau, *Rigorous Derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii Equation with a Large Interaction Potential*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (2009), 1099–1156.
- [50] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, and H. T. Yau, *Derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii Equation for the Dynamics of Bose-Einstein Condensate*, Annals Math. **172** (2010), 291–370.
- [51] R. Esposito, R. Marra, H. T. Yau, *Navier-Stokes equations for stochastic particle systems on the lattice*, Comm. Math. Phys. **182** (1996), 395–456.
- [52] I. Gallagher, L. Saint-Raymond, and B. Texier, *“From Newton to Boltzmann: Hard Spheres and Short-range Potentials”*, Zürich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2013. xii+137 pp. MR3157048
- [53] P. Gressman, V. Sohinger, & G. Staffilani, *On the Uniqueness of Solutions to the Periodic 3D Gross-Pitaevskii Hierarchy*, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), 4705–4764.
- [54] S. R. de Groot & P. Mazur, *Non-equilibrium thermodynamics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland 1961.
- [55] L. He & J. Jiang, *On the Cauchy problem for the cutoff Boltzmann equation with small initial data*, arXiv:2203.10756, 25pp.

- [56] L. He, X. Lu, M. Pulvirenti, & Y. Zhou, *On semi-classical limit of spatially homogeneous quantum Boltzmann equation: asymptotic expansion*, arXiv:2309.00891, 32pp.
- [57] S. Herr & V. Sohinger, *The Gross-Pitaevskii Hierarchy on General Rectangular Tori*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **220** (2016), 1119-1158.
- [58] S. Herr & V. Sohinger, *Unconditional Uniqueness Results for the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **21** (2019), 1850058.
- [59] Y. Hong, K. Taliaferro, Z. Xie, *Uniqueness of solutions to the 3D quintic Gross-Pitaevskii hierarchy*, J. Functional Analysis **270** (2016), no. 1, 34–67.
- [60] W. Huang & W. Zhang, *Nonperturbative renormalization of quantum thermodynamics from weak to strong couplings*, Phys. Rev. Research **4** (2022), 023141.
- [61] N. M. Hugenholtz, *Derivation of the Boltzmann Equation for a Fermi Gas*, J. Stat. Phys. **32** (1983), 231–254.
- [62] T. Kato, *On nonlinear Schrödinger equations. II. H^s -solutions and unconditional well-posedness*, J. Anal. Math. **67** (1995), 281–306.
- [63] M. Keel & T. Tao, *Endpoint Strichartz estimates*, Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), 955–980.
- [64] K. Kirkpatrick, B. Schlein and G. Staffilani, *Derivation of the Two Dimensional Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation from Many Body Quantum Dynamics*, Amer. J. Math. **133** (2011), 91-130.
- [65] S. Klainerman & M. Machedon, *Remark on Strichartz-type inequalities (Appendices by J. Bourgain and D. Tataru)*, IMRN, **1996**, 201–220.
- [66] S. Klainerman & M. Machedon, *Space-time estimates for null forms and the local existence theorem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993), 1221–1268.
- [67] S. Klainerman & M. Machedon, *On the Uniqueness of Solutions to the Gross-Pitaevskii Hierarchy*, Commun. Math. Phys. **279** (2008), 169-185.
- [68] O. E. Lanford III, *Time Evolution of Large Classical Systems*, Lecture Notes in Physics, **38** (1975), 1–111. MR0479206
- [69] L.D. Landau & E.M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics* 3rd Edition, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann 1987.
- [70] J. L. Lebowitz, *Statistical mechanics: A selective review of two central issues*. Reviews of Modern Physics, **71** (1999), S346–S357.
- [71] Y. Morimoto & S. Sakamoto, *Global solutions in the critical Besov space for the non-cutoff Boltzmann equation*, J. Differ. Equ. **261** (2016) 4073-4134.
- [72] P. Gressman & R. Strain, *Global classical solutions of the Boltzmann equation without angular cut-off*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **24** (2011), 771–847.
- [73] F. Golse and T. Paul, *Mean-field and classical limit for the N-body quantum dynamics with Coulomb interaction*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 2021.
- [74] Y. Guo, *Classical solutions to the Boltzmann equation for molecules with an angular cutoff*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **169** (2003), 305–353.
- [75] E. Y. Ovcharov, *Strichartz estimates for the kinetic transport equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **43** (2011), 1282–1310.
- [76] S. Olla, S. R. S. Varadhan & H. T. Yau, *Hydrodynamical limit for a Hamiltonian system with weak noise*, Comm. Math. Phys. **155** (1993), 523–560.
- [77] J. Quastel & H.-T. Yau, *Lattice gases, large deviations, and the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations*, Ann. Math. **148** (1998) 51–108.
- [78] G. W. Richmann, *Physics Proceedings Moscow, 1956*, pp. 69–571.
- [79] N. Rourgerie, *De Finetti Theorems, Mean-field Limits and Bose-Einstein Condensation*, arXiv:1506.05263.
- [80] J. Rauch & M. Reed *Nonlinear microlocal analysis of semilinear hyperbolic systems in one space dimension*. Duke Math. J. **49** (1982), 397–475.
- [81] L. Saint-Raymond, *Hydrodynamic limits of the Boltzmann equation*, volume 1971 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.

- [82] V. Sohinger, *A Rigorous Derivation of the Defocusing Cubic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation on \mathbb{T}^3 from the Dynamics of Many-body Quantum Systems*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **32** (2015), 1337–1365.
- [83] V. Sohinger & R. Strain, *The Boltzmann equation, Besov spaces, and optimal time decay rates in \mathbb{R}_x^n* , Adv. Math. **261** (2014) 274–332.
- [84] E. M. Stein, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [85] G. Toscani, *Global solution of the initial value problem for the Boltzmann equation near a local Maxwellian*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **102** (1988), 231–241.
- [86] E. A. Uehling and G. E. Uhlenbeck, *Transport phenomena in Einstein–Bose and Fermi–Dirac gases*, Phys. Rev. **43** (1933) 552–561.
- [87] J. Uffink & G. Valente, *Lanford’s Theorem and the Emergence of Irreversibility*, Found. Phys. **45** (2015), 404–438.
- [88] S. Ukai, *On the existence of global solutions of mixed problem for the non-linear Boltzmann equation*. Proc. Jpn. Acad. **50** (1974), 179–184.
- [89] W. Zhang, P. Lo, H. Xiong, M. Tu, & F. Nori, *General Non-Markovian Dynamics of Open Quantum Systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012), 170402.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER, ROCHESTER, NY 14627

Email address: `xuwenmath@gmail.com`

URL: <http://www.math.rochester.edu/people/faculty/xchen84/>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BROWN UNIVERSITY, 151 THAYER STREET, PROVIDENCE, RI 02912

Email address: `justin_holmer@brown.edu`

URL: <https://www.math.brown.edu/jholmer/>