

# A PHASE-SPACE APPROACH TO WEIGHTED FOURIER EXTENSION INEQUALITIES

JONATHAN BENNETT, SUSANA GUTIERREZ, SHOHEI NAKAMURA, AND ITAMAR OLIVEIRA

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to expose and investigate natural phase-space formulations of two longstanding problems in the restriction theory of the Fourier transform. These problems, often referred to as the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi conjectures, assert that Fourier extension operators associated with rather general (codimension 1) submanifolds of euclidean space, may be effectively controlled by the classical X-ray transform via weighted  $L^2$  inequalities. Our phase-space formulations, which have their origins in recent work of Dendrinos, Mustata and Vitturi, expose close connections with a conjecture of Flandrin from time-frequency analysis, and rest on the identification of an explicit “geometric” Wigner transform associated with an arbitrary (smooth strictly convex) submanifold  $S$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Our main results are certain natural “Sobolev variants” of the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi conjectures, and involve estimating the Sobolev norms of such Wigner transforms by geometric forms of classical bilinear fractional integrals. Our broad geometric framework allows us to explore the role of the curvature of the submanifold in these problems, and in particular we obtain bounds that are independent of any lower bound on the curvature; a feature that is uncommon in the wider restriction theory of the Fourier transform. Finally, we provide a further illustration of the effectiveness of our analysis by establishing a form of Flandrin’s conjecture in the plane with an  $\varepsilon$ -loss. While our perspective comes primarily from euclidean harmonic analysis, the procedure used for constructing phase-space representations of extension operators is well-known in optics.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Background	2
1.2. Phase-space formulations	3
2. The paraboloid: a quantum mechanical viewpoint	8
3. The sphere: an optical viewpoint	12
4. General submanifolds: a geometric viewpoint	15
4.1. Surface-carried Wigner transforms	16
4.2. Proof of the Sobolev–Stein inequality (Theorem 1.6)	21
4.3. Proof of the Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality (Theorem 1.7)	26
4.4. Improved Sobolev–Stein constants in the plane	26
5. Estimating distances: the proof of Proposition 4.4	27
6. Computing Jacobians: the proof of Proposition 4.5	28
6.1. Computing $J$	29
6.2. Computing $\Delta$	32
6.3. Relating $J$ and $\Delta$	33
7. Surface-carried fractional integrals	34
8. Surface-carried maximal operators	35
9. Tomographic constructions	41
10. Applications to Flandrin’s conjecture	43
11. Questions	46
References	46

*Date:* June 26, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B10, 44A12, 78A05.

*Key words and phrases.* Fourier extension operators, weighted inequalities, X-ray transforms, Wigner distributions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Background.** A central objective of modern harmonic analysis is to reach an effective quantitative understanding of Fourier transforms of measures supported on submanifolds of euclidean space, such as the sphere or paraboloid. Problems of this type are usually formulated in terms of *Fourier extension operators*: to a smooth codimension-1 submanifold  $S$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , equipped with surface measure  $d\sigma$ , we associate the extension operator

$$(1.1) \quad \widehat{gd\sigma}(x) := \int_S g(u)e^{-2\pi i x \cdot u} d\sigma(u);$$

here  $g \in L^1(d\sigma)$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . The extension operator (1.1) is often referred to as an *adjoint restriction operator*, as its adjoint restricts the  $n$ -dimensional Fourier transform of a function to the submanifold  $S$ . The estimation of extension operators in various settings is known as (Fourier) *restriction theory*. A key instance of this is the celebrated *restriction conjecture*, which concerns bounds of the form  $\|\widehat{gd\sigma}\|_q \lesssim \|g\|_p$ . Surprisingly many problems from across mathematics call for such an understanding, from dispersive PDE to analytic number theory; see [41] for a recent survey. Such connections are often quite intimate, as hopefully this paper serves to illustrate – in this case with regard to optics, or optical field propagation.

In this paper we look to estimate extension operators in the setting of  $L^2$  norms with respect to general weight functions  $w$ . This setting has been the subject of some attention since the influential work of Stein and others in the 1970s in the closely related context of Bochner–Riesz summability. At its centre is a variant of a question posed by Stein in the 1978 Williamstown conference on harmonic analysis [38] (see [9] for further historical context). In order to formulate this we let  $\text{ST}(S)$  denote the smallest constant for which the inequality

$$(1.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{gd\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq \text{ST}(S) \int_S |g(u)|^2 \sup_{v \in T_u S} Xw(N(u), v) d\sigma(u)$$

holds for all weight functions  $w$ . Here  $N : S \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is the *Gauss map*, and  $X$  denotes the classical *X-ray transform*

$$(1.3) \quad Xw(\omega, v) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(v + t\omega) dt,$$

where  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  and  $v \in \langle \omega \rangle^\perp$  together parametrise the Grassmanian manifold of lines  $\ell = \ell(\omega, v) := \langle \omega \rangle + \{v\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . This is a natural inequality for a number of reasons, and it is instructive to begin by considering the simple case where  $g$  is the indicator function of a small cap (the intersection of  $S$  with a small ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ). The key observation is that  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2$  is then bounded below on a neighbourhood of a line segment with direction normal to  $S$ , so that the left hand side of (1.2) computes a variant of the X-ray transform of the weight  $w$ . The inequality (1.2) therefore proposes that  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2$  concentrates on lines, or families of lines, rather more generally. With our formulation of (1.2), the basic question is thus: for which  $S$  is  $\text{ST}(S)$  finite? Remarkably, an affirmative answer to this direct question is only known in the case that  $S$  is a hyperplane – a fact that follows quickly from Plancherel’s theorem. However, supporting results have been obtained for restricted classes of weights – such as when  $S$  is the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  and the weights are radial [19], [4], [3] or when  $S = \mathbb{S}^1$  and the weights are supported in a neighbourhood of a large circle [9]; see [14] and [18] and the references there for some more recent results and a fuller history. Inequalities of this general type, where an operator is estimated with respect to a general weight function, are often referred to as Fefferman–Stein inequalities – see [5] for a recent example.

**Remark 1.1** (The strength of (1.2)). One of the particular motives for studying (1.2) (or a suitable variant of it) is that a finite constant would allow the restriction conjecture to follow (and almost immediately) from the *Keakeya maximal function conjecture*, the Keakeya maximal function being a close relative of

$$\sup_{v \in T_u S} Xw(N(u), v),$$

at least when  $S$  is suitably curved. We refer to [12] and the references there for further details and discussion. In the original setting proposed by Stein, this amounts to the implication of the Bochner–Riesz conjecture from the Nikodym (or Kakeya) maximal conjecture. There is a number of precedents for this sort of integro-geometric control of oscillatory integral operators – see for example [9], [6].

The Stein inequality (1.2) is manifestly related to the *Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality*

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq \text{MT}(S) \|g\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}^2 \sup_{(u,v) \in TS} Xw(N(u), v),$$

where the supremum is restricted to  $u \in \text{supp}(g)$ , as suggested by (1.2). The basic question is thus: for which  $S$  is the constant  $\text{MT}(S)$  finite? Evidently  $\text{MT}(S) \leq \text{ST}(S)$ , and it is commonly conjectured that both constants are finite when  $S$  is the sphere; see [20] and [4].

**Remark 1.2** (The strength of (1.4)). One of the motives for studying (1.4) is that it (with finite constant  $\text{MT}(S)$  for suitable  $S$ ) is known to imply the endpoint multilinear restriction conjecture of [10]; see [17] for details. A similar, yet much more elementary observation is that the finiteness of  $\text{MT}(S^2)$  implies the Stein–Tomas restriction theorem in three dimensions; see [12]. The origins of (1.4) lie in dispersive partial differential equations, where it may be seen to imply the well-posedness of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation with a rather general potential; see [4].

**Remark 1.3** (The role of curvature). Unusually in the setting of Fourier extension estimates it appears that the finiteness of either  $\text{ST}(S)$  or  $\text{MT}(S)$  should not require that  $S$  has nonvanishing (or nondegenerate) curvature; we have already noted that  $\text{ST}(S)$  is finite when  $S$  is a *hyperplane*. Related to this fact is the observation that  $\text{ST}(S)$  and  $\text{MT}(S)$  are dilation invariant, in the sense that  $\text{ST}(kS) = \text{ST}(S)$  and  $\text{MT}(kS) = \text{MT}(S)$  for all isotropic dilates  $kS$  of  $S$ ; this follows by a routine scaling argument.

**1.2. Phase-space formulations.** Recently in the setting of quadratic submanifolds, Dendrinos, Mustata and Vitturi [21] observed that the Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality (1.4) may be reformulated in terms of the classical Wigner distribution, providing it with a natural phase-space interpretation. The purpose of this paper is to establish and explore such phase-space formulations of the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities for quite general (codimension-1) submanifolds, exposing the role played by the underlying geometry. The starting point is the surprising observation that a rather general Fourier extension operator (in modulus square) has a natural and explicit *phase-space representation*, namely,

$$(1.5) \quad |\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2 = X_S^* W_S(g, g);$$

see the forthcoming Proposition 4.8. Here  $W_S(g_1, g_2) : TS \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a certain geometric (or  $S$ -carried) Wigner transform, and  $X_S$  is the pullback of the X-ray transform by the Gauss map; concretely,  $X_S w(u, v) := Xw(N(u), v)$  for  $(u, v) \in TS$ , the tangent bundle of  $S$ . Such phase-space representations have their origins in quantum mechanics in the case that  $S$  is the paraboloid – a perspective that we develop in Section 2. They are also well-known in optics, particularly when  $S$  is the paraboloid or the sphere, and we develop this perspective in Section 3. As we shall see in the later sections, identifying a suitable Wigner transform  $W_S$  *explicitly* in terms of the geometry of a *general* (strictly convex) submanifold  $S$  requires some careful geometric analysis. This is one of the main achievements of this paper, and it is hoped that it will also find some interesting applications beyond harmonic analysis. From the point of view of harmonic analysis, our treatment of these surface-carried Wigner transforms naturally involves controlling associated surface-carried singular integral and maximal averaging operators, which we hope will be of some independent interest.

By duality the representation (1.5) immediately gives rise to the phase-space formulations of the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities,

$$(1.6) \quad \int_{TS} W_S(g, g) X_S w \leq \text{ST}(S) \int_S |g(u)|^2 \sup_{v \in T_u S} X_S w(u, v) d\sigma(u)$$

and

$$(1.7) \quad \int_{TS} W_S(g, g) X_S w \leq \text{MT}(S) \|g\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}^2 \sup_{(u,v) \in TS} X_S w(u, v),$$

respectively. Here the integral on the tangent bundle  $TS$  is defined in the usual way, by first integrating with respect to Lebesgue measure on the tangent space  $T_u S$ , and then with respect to surface measure  $d\sigma(u)$  on  $S$ .

**Remark 1.4** (Connections with Flandrin’s conjecture). The phase-space formulation (1.7) of the Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality has striking similarities with a conjecture of Flandrin [25] and its variants [32] in the setting of the classical Wigner distribution  $W$ . A recent form of this conjecture states that

$$(1.8) \quad \iint_K W(g, g) \lesssim \|g\|_2^2$$

uniformly over all convex subsets  $K$  of phase-space; this was originally formulated with constant 1, although a counterexample to this stronger statement was constructed recently in [22]. The methods of this paper are also effective here, and we illustrate this in Section 10, establishing a form of this conjecture in the plane involving an  $\varepsilon$ -loss in the measure of  $K$ , and by establishing that Flandrin’s conjecture (in the form (1.8)) implies the parabolic Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality under a simple convexity assumption on the weight function  $w$ .

Evidently the phase-space formulations (1.6) and (1.7) go some way to motivate the original inequalities (1.2) and (1.4). The first remark to make is that the most naive approach to (1.6) (a similar remark applies to (1.7)) fails for any  $S$  since the  $L^1$  estimate

$$(1.9) \quad \int_{T_u S} |W_S(g, g)(u, v)| dv \lesssim |g(u)|^2,$$

is easily seen to fail, despite  $W_S(g, g)$  satisfying the marginal property

$$(1.10) \quad \int_{T_u S} W_S(g, g)(u, v) dv = |g(u)|^2$$

(possibly under some additional minor regularity assumption on  $S$ ); see Section 8 for details, along with the sense in which such pointwise identities hold. Of course if  $X_S w(u, v)$  is *independent of  $v$* , then the failure of (1.9) is of no consequence, and (1.6) follows quickly from an application of Fubini’s theorem and (1.10).

Our explicit phase-space representation (1.5) requires rather little of the submanifold  $S$ . The main assumption is that  $S$  is smooth and strictly convex in sense that its shape operator is strictly positive definite at all points. On a technical level we also assume that its set of unit normals  $N(S)$  is geodesically convex (that is, the intersection of  $N(S)$  with any great circle is connected), along with a mild additional differentiability hypothesis (see Remark 4.2), which we expect to be automatic from the smoothness of  $S$ .

For the purposes of our phase-space approach to the Stein (1.2) and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities (1.4), it will be convenient to restrict further to compact graphs. The assumption that  $S$  is a graph is a very mild assumption as the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities (and their variants) behave well under partitioning a manifold  $S$  into boundedly many pieces. This allows us to extend our results a posteriori to closed manifolds such as the sphere, for example. With this in mind we make the additional (technical) assumption that

$$(1.11) \quad N(u) \cdot N(u') \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all } u, u' \in S,$$

meaning that the normals to  $S$  lie in a cone of some fixed aperture.

As indicated in Remark 1.3, it is not anticipated that the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi constants ( $\text{ST}(S)$  and  $\text{MT}(S)$ ) depend on any lower bound on the curvature of  $S$ , and our results in this paper reflect this. Identifying this feature is one of the reasons why we have insisted on making our analysis as geometric (or parametrisation-free) as possible. Curiously, while our bounds do not depend on

the curvature of  $S$  in absolute terms, as we shall see, certain dilation-invariant curvature functionals naturally emerge. For example, for curves in the plane our Stein-type inequality may be controlled by the quantity

$$(1.12) \quad \Lambda(S) := \sup_{u, u' \in S} \left( \frac{|u' - u''|K(u)}{|N(u') \wedge N(u'')|} \right)^{1/2},$$

where  $K(u)$  denotes the Gaussian curvature of  $S$  at the point  $u$ , and  $u''$  is a certain point on  $S$  constructed geometrically from points  $u, u' \in S$  (we refer to Section 4 for details). However, in this paper we shall formulate our main results in terms of a relatively simple curvature functional related to the quasi-conformality of the shape operator of  $S$ . This has the advantage of being effective in both the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi settings, and in all dimensions. To describe this it is helpful to again begin with the case  $n = 2$ , where we shall say that a strictly convex planar curve  $S$  has *bounded curvature quotient* if there exists a finite constant  $c$  such that

$$(1.13) \quad K(u) \leq cK(u')$$

for all  $u, u' \in S$ . Let us denote by  $Q(S)$  the least such  $c$ . We extend this to higher dimensions by defining  $Q(S)$  to be the maximum ratio of the principal curvatures of  $S$ , namely the smallest constant  $c$  such that

$$(1.14) \quad \lambda_j(u) \leq c\lambda_k(u')$$

for all  $u, u' \in S$  and  $1 \leq j, k \leq n - 1$ , where  $\lambda_j(u)$  denotes the  $j$ th principal curvature of  $S$  at the point  $u$ . Evidently  $Q(kS) = Q(S)$  for all isotropic dilates  $kS$  of  $S$  – a property it shares with  $\text{ST}(S)$  and  $\text{MT}(S)$ .

**Remark 1.5** (Relation to shape quasi-conformality). The finiteness of  $Q(S)$  may be interpreted as a certain rather strong *quasi-conformality* condition on the shape operator  $dN$  of  $S$ . Indeed it quickly implies that the shape operator is  $Q(S)$ -quasi-conformal, that is

$$\|dN_u\|^{n-1} \leq Q(S)^{n-2}K(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in S;$$

see for example [1] for a treatment of quasi-conformal maps. This simply follows from the fact that the principal curvatures of  $S$  are the eigenvalues of the shape operator. Arguing very similarly we see that the finiteness of  $Q(S)$  also implies the “long range” quasi-conformality condition

$$(1.15) \quad \|dN_u\|^{n-1} \leq Q(S)^{n-1}K(u') \quad \text{for all } u, u' \in S,$$

which has the advantage of having content also when  $n = 2$ , where it reduces to (1.13). This latter condition is actually *equivalent* to  $S$  having bounded curvature quotient even in higher dimensions, since (1.15)  $\implies$  (1.14) with  $c = Q(S)^{n-1}$ .

Our main theorems are the following Sobolev variants of the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities (stated somewhat informally for the sake of exposition – see the forthcoming Theorems 4.11 and 4.13 for clarification):

**Theorem 1.6** (Sobolev–Stein inequality). *Suppose that  $S$  is a smooth strictly convex surface with curvature quotient  $Q(S)$ , and  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ . Then there is a dimensional constant  $c$  such that*

$$(1.16) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{gd\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq cQ(S)^{\frac{5n-8}{4}} \int_S I_{S,2s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)(u)^{1/2} \|X_S w(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)} d\sigma(u),$$

where  $I_{S,s}$  is a certain bilinear fractional integral on  $S$  of order  $s$ , and  $\dot{H}^s(T_u S)$  denotes the usual homogeneous  $L^2$  Sobolev space on the tangent space  $T_u S$ .

**Theorem 1.7** (Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality). *Suppose that  $S$  is a smooth strictly convex surface with curvature quotient  $Q(S)$ , and  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ . Then there is a constant  $c$ , depending on at most  $n, s$ , and the diameter of  $S$ , such that*

$$(1.17) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{gd\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq cQ(S)^{\frac{9n-12}{4}} \|g\|_{L^2(S)}^2 \sup_{u \in S} \|X_S w(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)}.$$

**Remark 1.8** (Improved constants). It is not expected that the particular powers of  $Q(S)$  featuring in Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 are best-possible, at least in dimensions  $n > 2$ . Moreover, and as we have already indicated, the curvature quotient  $Q(S)$  does not capture all of the relevant geometry of the surface  $S$ . For example, in the relatively simple two-dimensional setting our arguments reveal that the power of  $Q(S)$  in Theorem 1.6 may be replaced by the smaller quantity  $\Lambda(S)$  in (1.12). It is straightforward to see that  $\Lambda(S)$  may be finite when  $S$  has a point of vanishing curvature, such as in the case of the quartic curve  $S = \{(t, t^4) : |t| \leq 1\}$ . We refer to Section 4.4 for more on this.

**Remark 1.9** (Permissibility of signed weights). Our proofs of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 reveal that they continue to hold for *signed weights*  $w$ . This marks an essential difference between these theorems and the original Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities, since the latter require that  $w$  is non-negative in general; see [13] for an example in the context of the paraboloid.

**Remark 1.10** (The strength of Theorem 1.6). As we clarify in Section 4, Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 (when specialised to non-negative weights  $w$ ) are easily seen to be respectively weaker than similar bounds on the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi constants  $ST(S)$  and  $MT(S)$ . This follows via a standard Sobolev embedding, and as may be expected, the range  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$  is best-possible in this respect. Despite its weakness relative to the Stein inequality, the Sobolev–Stein inequality (1.16) continues to be effective in transferring estimates for the X-ray transform to Fourier extension estimates, particularly in two dimensions. To see this let  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and write

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\theta}{2}}|Eg|^2\|_2^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |Eg|^2 w,$$

where  $w = (-\Delta)^\theta |Eg|^2$ . By Theorem 1.6 (noting Remark 1.9) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\theta}{2}}|Eg|^2\|_2^2 \lesssim \|I_{S,2s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)\|_{L^1(S)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\theta}{2}} X_S((- \Delta)^\theta |Eg|^2)\|_{L^2(TS)}$$

whenever  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ . By our forthcoming bounds on  $I_{S,s}$  (see Section 7, and in particular (7.1)),

$$(1.18) \quad \|I_{S,2s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)\|_{L^1(S)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \|g\|_4^2.$$

Next, since  $S$  is strictly convex its Gauss map is injective, and hence by a change of variables followed by the isometric property of the X-ray transform,

$$\|K(u)^{\frac{1}{2}}(-\Delta_v)^{\frac{1}{4}} X_S w\|_{L^2(TS)} \leq \|(-\Delta_v)^{\frac{1}{4}} X w\|_2 = c_n \|w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Therefore, provided  $S$  has everywhere nonvanishing Gaussian curvature it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\theta}{2}} X_S((- \Delta)^\theta |Eg|^2)\|_{L^2(TS)} &= \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{4}} X_S((- \Delta)^{\theta + \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{4}} |Eg|^2)\|_{L^2(TS)} \\ &\lesssim \|K(u)^{1/2}(-\Delta)^{1/4} X_S((- \Delta)^{\theta + \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{4}} |Eg|^2)\|_{L^2(TS)} \\ &\lesssim \|(-\Delta)^{\theta + \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{4}} |Eg|^2\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\theta}{2}}|Eg|^2\|_2^2 \lesssim \|g\|_4^2 \|(-\Delta)^{\theta + \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{4}} |Eg|^2\|_2$$

whenever  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ . Setting  $\frac{\theta}{2} = \theta + \frac{s}{2} - \frac{1}{4}$ , or equivalently  $\theta = \frac{1}{2} - s$ , it follows that

$$\|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\theta}{2}}|Eg|^2\|_2 \lesssim \|g\|_4^2$$

whenever  $\theta > 1 - \frac{n}{2}$ . This Sobolev-extension estimate is reminiscent of the well-known Strichartz inequalities of Ozawa and Tsutsumi [35]; see [8] for some further contextual discussion. In particular, when  $n = 2$  this implies the classical restriction theorem for smooth compact planar curves of nonvanishing curvature, since the missing case  $\theta = 0$  is the missing (endpoint)  $L^4$  estimate in that setting. We note that curvature only plays a role in the X-ray estimate, which is structurally consistent with Stein’s inequality (1.2). This implication via (1.16) should be compared with the passage from the Keakeya maximal conjecture to the restriction conjecture implied by Stein’s inequality (1.2) outlined in Remark 1.1. Some related arguments in the setting of the paraboloid may be found in [37], [43], [7].

**Remark 1.11.** While the curvature quotient  $Q(S)$  is invariant under isotropic dilations of  $S$ , our Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi theorem (Theorem 1.7) is not. This stems from the fact that necessarily  $s$  is strictly less than  $\frac{n-1}{2}$  for the implicit constant to be finite, and manifests itself in the dependence on the diameter of  $S$  in the statement of Theorem 1.7. That said, it does provide a bound that is independent of any lower bound on the curvature of  $S$ .

**Remark 1.12** (Relation to the tomographic approach). The phase-space formulation (1.6) is closely related to the *tomographic formulation* in [12] (presented there in the particular case of the sphere  $S = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ ); see also [14]. In this formulation the Wigner distribution  $W_S(g, g)$  is replaced by the tomographic data

$$K(u)(-\Delta_v)^{1/2}X_S(|g\widehat{d}\sigma|^2),$$

which is also a real-valued function on the tangent bundle  $TS$ ; here  $K(u)$  denotes the Gaussian curvature of  $S$  at the point  $u$ . This relies on the classical inversion formula for the X-ray transform, and was shown in [12] to be effective in proving Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 when  $S$  is a circle in the plane. Specifically when  $n = 2$  these phase-space and tomographic formulations may be seen to coincide, allowing Wigner distributions to be constructed tomographically. We provide the details of this in Section 9.

**Remark 1.13** (Relation to the wavepacket approach). The representation (1.5) may be viewed as a certain “scale-free” (and “quadratic”) version of the *wavepacket decomposition* that has proved so effective in Fourier restriction theory. There an extension operator is expressed as a superposition of wavepackets adapted to tubes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with the tubes corresponding to a discrete set of points in the tangent bundle of  $S$ . The distinction arises from a use of a conventional windowed Fourier transform (a linear operator) in the wavepacket decomposition, rather than a Wigner distribution – the latter being a form of windowed Fourier transform where the window is the input function  $g$  itself (a quadratic operator). We refer to [18] and the references there for progress on the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi conjectures based on wavepacket analysis.

**Structure of the paper.** In Section 2 we consider the case when  $S$  is the paraboloid, motivating our perspective and results in classical quantum mechanical terms that date back to Wigner’s original work. In Section 3 we prove Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 when  $S$  is the sphere, interpreting our perspective from the point of view of optical field theory. In Section 4 we turn to the much more involved geometric analysis in the setting of general submanifolds, proving Theorems 1.6 and 1.7, although deferring the necessary analysis of Jacobians, distances and bilinear fractional integrals to Sections 6, 5 and 7 respectively. In Section 8 we establish the characteristic marginal properties of the geometric Wigner transforms via an analysis of the appropriate geometric maximal operators. In Section 9 we observe that the phase-space perspective presented here coincides with a certain tomographic perspective introduced in [12] when  $n = 2$ , highlighting a tomographic method for constructing geometric Wigner distributions. In Section 10 we illustrate the effectiveness of our basic methods by establishing a form of Flandrin’s conjecture in the plane with an  $\varepsilon$  loss. Finally, in Section 11 we pose some questions.

**Notation.** Throughout this paper, for nonnegative quantities  $A, B$  we write  $A \lesssim B$  if there exists a constant  $c$  that is independent of  $S$  such that  $A \leq cB$ . The independence of the implicit constant  $c$  of various other parameters will be clear from the context. In particular, such constants will never depend on the input function  $g$ , nor the weight function  $w$ .

**Acknowledgments.** The first and fourth authors are supported by EPSRC Grant EP/W032880/1. The third author is supported by JSPS Overseas Research Fellowship and JSPS Kakenhi grant numbers 19K03546, 19H01796 and 21K13806. The fourth author thanks the American Institute of Mathematics for supporting the *AIM Fourier restriction community*, in which he was introduced to the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture. He also thanks the Basque Center for Applied Mathematics (BCAM) for the invitation to deliver a series of lectures on the subject of this paper and for their kind hospitality. We thank José Cañizo, Tony Carbery, Mark Dennis, Michele Ferrante, Veronique Fischer, Kerr Maxwell, Søren Mikkelsen, Detlef Müller, Mateus Sousa, Amy Tierney and Gennady Uraltsev for a number of

helpful discussions. In particular, we thank Marco Vitturi for drawing our attention to the role of the classical Wigner transform in [21], which served as an important source of inspiration for this work.

## 2. THE PARABOLOID: A QUANTUM MECHANICAL VIEWPOINT

In the particular case when  $S$  is the paraboloid, the phase space representation (1.5) has a well-known quantum mechanical derivation going back to the original work of Wigner [44]. As may be expected, this involves the classical Wigner transform, and as we shall see in this section, leads to some additional insights and simplifications in our arguments. Moreover, parametrised forms of the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities (1.2) and (1.4) will emerge rather naturally from these classical considerations, permitting them some physical (or probabilistic) interpretations.

The *Wigner transform* is defined (see for example [26]) for  $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  by

$$(2.1) \quad W(g_1, g_2)(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_1\left(x + \frac{y}{2}\right) \overline{g_2\left(x - \frac{y}{2}\right)} e^{-2\pi i v \cdot y} dy.$$

For a solution  $u : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  of the Schrödinger equation

$$2\pi i \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta_x u$$

with initial data  $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , it is a classical observation dating back to Wigner [44] that

$$f(x, v, t) := W(u(\cdot, t), u(\cdot, t))(x, v)$$

satisfies the kinetic transport equation

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = 2v \cdot \nabla_x f$$

from classical mechanics. Consequently

$$f(x, v, t) = f_0(x + 2tv, v),$$

where  $f_0 = W(u_0, u_0) : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *Wigner distribution* of the initial data  $u_0$ . By the classical marginal property

$$(2.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} W(g, g)(x, v) dv = |g(x)|^2$$

of the Wigner distribution we obtain the *phase-space representation*

$$(2.3) \quad |u(x, t)|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, v, t) dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_0(x + 2tv, v) dv =: \rho(f_0)(x, t).$$

The operator  $\rho$ , which is referred to as a *velocity averaging operator* in kinetic theory, is easily seen to be a certain (parametrised) adjoint space-time X-ray transform, indeed

$$\rho^*(g)(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x - 2tv, t) dt,$$

which is of course an integral of the space-time function  $g$  along the line through the point  $(x, 0)$  with direction  $(-2v, 1)$ .

As we have indicated in the introduction, the above phase-space representation is particularly natural if one is interested in *weighted  $L^2$  norms* of  $u$ , since by duality

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) \rho^* w(x, v) dx dv.$$

We refer to [21] where this identity was recently derived directly. If the initial data  $u_0$  is a *Gaussian* then  $W(u_0, u_0)$  is also a (real) Gaussian, and being nonnegative it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) dx \right) \sup_x \rho^* w(x, v) dv \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{u}_0(v)|^2 \sup_x \rho^* w(x, v) dv, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \leq \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ v \in \text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0)}} \rho^* w(x, v) \|u_0\|_2^2.$$

Here we have used the further marginal property

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} W(g, g)(x, v) dx = |\widehat{g}(v)|^2$$

of the Wigner distribution, followed by Plancherel's theorem. It is therefore reasonably natural to ask whether

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{u}_0(v)|^2 \sup_x \rho^* w(x, v) dv,$$

and thus

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ v \in \text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0)}} \rho^* w(x, v) \|u_0\|_2^2$$

might hold for general  $u_0$ . As we clarify shortly in Remark 2.2, the inequalities (2.6) and (2.7) are parabolic forms of the Stein (1.2) and Mizohata–Takeuchi (1.4) inequalities. They are also naturally referred to as *Strichartz estimates*, being bounds on space-time norms. One might even venture that the constant could be 1 in (2.6) and (2.7), although it should be noted that a similar assertion has recently been shown to be false in the context of a closely related conjecture of Flandrin [22], [32] – see Section 10 for a further illustration of our methods in that context.

**Remark 2.1** (A quasi-probabilistic interpretation). In the phase-space formulation of quantum mechanics the Wigner distribution  $W(u_0, u_0)$  is interpreted as a (quasi-) probability distribution on position-momentum space for a quantum particle, and so the inequalities (2.6) and (2.7) are the assertions that

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbb{E}_{x,v}(\rho^* w) \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{x,v}(\|\rho^* w\|_{L_x^\infty})$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbb{E}_{x,v}(\rho^* w) \lesssim \|\rho^* w\|_\infty$$

respectively, for all nonnegative weight functions  $w$ . Here the expectation is taken with respect to the quasi-probability density  $W(u_0, u_0)$ , where of course  $\|u_0\|_2 = 1$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}_{x,v}(\|\rho^* w\|_{L_x^\infty}) = \mathbb{E}_v(\|\rho^* w\|_{L_x^\infty})$  by the marginal property (2.5), where  $\mathbb{E}_v$  is taken with respect to the probability density  $|\widehat{u}_0(v)|^2$ . The forthcoming Theorems 2.3–2.7 may be interpreted similarly. Evidently the subtleties in (2.8), (2.9) and all of these inequalities arise from the fact that the Wigner distribution typically takes both positive and negative values.

**Remark 2.2.** The conjectural inequality (2.6) may be seen as an instance of (1.2) where  $d = n - 1$  and

$$(2.10) \quad S = \mathbb{P}^d := \{u = (u', u_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} : u_{d+1} = |u'|^2\}$$

is the paraboloid. This is a consequence of a certain change-of-measure invariance property enjoyed by the general inequality (1.2): specifically, if  $d\tilde{\sigma}(u) = a(u)d\sigma(u)$  for some density  $a$  on  $S$ , then (1.2) quickly implies that

$$(2.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{gd\tilde{\sigma}}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq \text{ST}(S) \int_S |g(u)|^2 \sup_{v \in T_u S} a(u) Xw(N(u), v) d\tilde{\sigma}(S).$$

Next we define the (affine surface) measure  $d\tilde{\sigma}$  on  $\mathbb{P}^d$  by

$$(2.12) \quad \int_S \Phi d\tilde{\sigma} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi(u', |u'|^2) du',$$

so that  $a(u) = (1 + 4|u|^2)^{-1/2}$ . With these choices, a scalar change of variables reveals that

$$\sup_{v \in T_u S} a(u) Xw(N(u), v) = \sup_x \rho^* w(x, u').$$

Finally, defining  $g : S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by  $g(\cdot, |\cdot|^2) = \widehat{u}_0$ , we have that  $u(x, t) = \widehat{gd\tilde{\sigma}}(x, t)$ , from which (2.6) follows. The change-of-measure invariance property (2.11) enjoyed by (1.2) is not inherited by the corresponding Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality (1.4), meaning that there is in principle a different Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture for each density  $a$  – namely

$$(2.13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{gd\tilde{\sigma}}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq C \sup_{(u, v) \in TS} a(u) Xw(N(u), v) \|g\|_{L^2(d\tilde{\sigma})}^2,$$

where again, the supremum is restricted to  $u \in \text{supp}(g)$ . It is straightforward to verify that (2.7) coincides with (2.13) with the above choice of density  $a$  on the paraboloid. Similar change-of-measure arguments relate the paraboloid-carried Wigner distribution referred to in (1.5) to the classical Wigner distribution (2.1), reconciling (2.3) with (1.5). We clarify this in Remark 4.7 in Section 4.

Perhaps the most obvious difficulty in going beyond Gaussian initial data is that  $W(u_0, u_0)$  is everywhere nonnegative if and only if  $u_0$  is a Gaussian (this is known as Hudson’s theorem, see [26] for a treatment of this and other fundamental properties of the Wigner transform), and the inequality  $\|W(u_0, u_0)\|_1 \lesssim \|u_0\|_2^2$  fails for general  $u_0$  (see [32]). Of course the  $L^p$  estimates that *do hold* for the Wigner distribution (see [33]) yield variants of (2.7) via Hölder’s inequality, such as

$$(2.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \|\rho^* w\|_2 \|u_0\|_2^2,$$

as was observed in [21]. Here we observe that further variants arise from certain *Sobolev estimates* on the Wigner transform. For example, we have the following:

**Theorem 2.3.** *For  $s > d/2$ ,*

$$(2.15) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{I}_{2s}(|\widehat{u}_0|^2, |\widehat{u}_0|^2)(v)^{1/2} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{H_x^s} dv,$$

where

$$\tilde{I}_s(g_1, g_2)(v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{g_1\left(v + \frac{\xi}{2}\right) g_2\left(v - \frac{\xi}{2}\right)}{(1 + |\xi|^2)^{s/2}} d\xi$$

and  $H_x^s$  denotes the usual inhomogeneous  $L^2$  Sobolev space in the variable  $x$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *For  $s > d/2$ ,*

$$(2.16) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \sup_{v \in \frac{1}{2}(\text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0) + \text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0))} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{H_x^s} \|u_0\|_2^2,$$

where the implicit constant depends on at most  $d$  and  $s$ .

**Remark 2.5.** Unlike the conjectured inequalities (2.7) and (2.6), Theorems 2.4 and 2.3 require no positivity hypothesis on the weight  $w$ . This point aside, Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 are consistent with (2.6) and (2.7) thanks to the elementary Sobolev embedding  $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , which holds whenever  $s > d/2$ . It is natural to ask whether the stronger

$$(2.17) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \sup_{v \in \text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0)} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{H_x^s} \|u_0\|_2^2$$

holds, as predicted by (2.7) for positive weights.

*Proof of Theorem 2.3.* By (2.4) and an application of the duality of  $H^s$  and  $H^{-s}$  we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|W(u_0, u_0)(\cdot, v)\|_{H_x^{-s}} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{H_x^s} dv,$$

and so it remains to show that

$$(2.18) \quad \|W(u_0, u_0)(\cdot, v)\|_{H_x^{-s}}^2 = \tilde{I}_{2s}(|\widehat{u}_0|^2, |\widehat{u}_0|^2)(v).$$

To see this we recall the classical Fourier invariance property (see 1.94 of [26])

$$(2.19) \quad W(g_1, g_2)(x, v) = W(\widehat{g}_1, \widehat{g}_2)(-v, x),$$

so that

$$(2.20) \quad \mathcal{F}_x^{-1}W(g_1, g_2)(\xi, v) = \widehat{g}_1\left(-v + \frac{\xi}{2}\right) \overline{\widehat{g}_2\left(-v - \frac{\xi}{2}\right)},$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_x$  denotes the Fourier transform in  $x$ . The identity (2.18) now follows by Plancherel's theorem and the definition of the inhomogeneous Sobolev norm.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* Observe first that  $\tilde{I}_{2s}(|\widehat{u}_0|^2, |\widehat{u}_0|^2)(v) = 0$  whenever

$$v \notin \frac{1}{2}(\text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0) + \text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0)).$$

Hence, by Theorem 2.3, it suffices to show that

$$(2.21) \quad \|\tilde{I}_s(g_1, g_2)\|_{L^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|g_1\|_1 \|g_2\|_1$$

whenever  $s > d$ . The operator  $\tilde{I}_s$  is a variant (with singularity only at infinity) of the bilinear fractional integral operator

$$(2.22) \quad I_s(g_1, g_2)(v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{g_1\left(v + \frac{\xi}{2}\right) g_2\left(v - \frac{\xi}{2}\right)}{|\xi|^s} d\xi$$

treated by Kenig and Stein in [30] and Grafakos and Kalton in [29] (see also [28] for estimates above  $L^1$ ), and the bound (2.21) follows a brief inspection of their arguments.  $\square$

The inequalities (2.7) and (2.6) are both scale-invariant and Galilean invariant (that is, invariant under dilating and translating  $u_0$  respectively). As a consequence of the scale-invariance it suffices to prove them under the additional assumption that  $\widehat{u}_0$  is supported in the unit ball. In this situation Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 cease to be natural as they involve inhomogeneous Sobolev spaces, which respond to high frequencies of  $u_0$  only. The appropriate substitutes are the following, which align with our main Theorems 1.6 and 1.7:

**Theorem 2.6** (Parabolic Sobolev–Stein). *For  $s < d/2$ ,*

$$(2.23) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} I_{2s}(|\widehat{u}_0|^2, |\widehat{u}_0|^2)(v)^{1/2} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^s} dv,$$

where  $I_s(g_1, g_2)$  is given by (2.22) and  $\dot{H}_x^s$  denotes the usual homogeneous  $L^2$  Sobolev space in the variable  $x$ .

**Theorem 2.7** (Parabolic Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi). *For  $s < d/2$ ,*

$$(2.24) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \sup_{v \in \frac{1}{2}(\text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0) + \text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0))} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^s} \|u_0\|_2^2$$

whenever  $\text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0) \subseteq B(0; 1)$ . The implicit constant depends on at most  $d$  and  $s$ .

**Remark 2.8.** Theorems 2.6 and 2.7 also permit signed weights. Restricting to positive weights, Theorems 2.6 and 2.7 are also easily seen to be respectively weaker than (2.6) and (2.7) via a Sobolev embedding. Specifically, by the support hypothesis on  $\widehat{u}_0$  we may find a spatial bump function  $\Phi$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 \Phi * w(x, t) dx dt,$$

and so it suffices to observe that for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\|\rho^*(\Phi * w)(\cdot, v)\|_\infty \lesssim \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^s}$$

whenever  $s < d/2$ . This follows by Plancherel's identity and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality.

The proofs of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7 are very similar to those of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 above, the essential difference being the use of homogeneous rather than inhomogeneous Sobolev norms, and matters are reduced to an  $L^1 \times L^1 \rightarrow L^{1/2}$  bound on the bilinear operator

$$T(g_1, g_2)(v) := \int_{B(0;1)} \frac{g_1\left(v + \frac{\xi}{2}\right)g_2\left(v - \frac{\xi}{2}\right)}{|\xi|^s} d\xi.$$

This is a local form of the bilinear fractional integral operator  $I_s$  defined in (2.22), and again the required bound follows a brief inspection of the arguments in [30].

**Remark 2.9** (Discrete analogues). Somewhat unusually in the context of Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations, the Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities (2.6) and (2.7) may be seen to be equivalent to their discrete (or periodic) analogues. Specifically, (2.6) is equivalent to

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{d+1}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a_k e^{2\pi i(k \cdot x + |k|^2 t)} \right|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |a_k|^2 \sup_x \rho_{\mathbb{Z}^d}^* w(x, k),$$

where

$$\rho_{\mathbb{Z}^d}^* w(x, k) := \int_0^1 w(x - 2tk, t) dt$$

is the (normalised) geodesic X-ray transform on the space-time torus  $\mathbb{T}^{d+1}$ ; here we are identifying functions on  $\mathbb{T}^d$  with 1-periodic functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . A similar equivalence may be established at the level of the Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality. We refer to the forthcoming [13] for details and further results.

### 3. THE SPHERE: AN OPTICAL VIEWPOINT

The extension operator for the sphere

$$\widehat{g d\sigma}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \omega} g(\omega) d\sigma(\omega)$$

is of central importance in optics, providing a description of a monochromatic optical wave field as a superposition of plane waves. Of particular physical significance is  $|\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2$ , referred to as the *intensity*, or *local intensity* of the field. The Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities (1.2) and (1.4), when specialised to the sphere  $S = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , become statements about this intensity, namely

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq \text{ST}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |g(\omega)|^2 \sup_{v \in \langle \omega \rangle^\perp} Xw(\omega, v) d\sigma(\omega),$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq \text{MT}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \sup_{\omega \in \text{supp}(g)} \|Xw(\omega, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\langle \omega \rangle^\perp)} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}^2$$

respectively. These conjectural inequalities (the assertions that  $\text{ST}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}), \text{MT}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < \infty$ ) capture the expectation that the intensity  $|\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2$  concentrates on rays (lines), and as such connect physical optics to geometric optics. Accordingly they call for an optical (or spherical) analogue of the quantum-mechanical (or parabolic) phase-space perspective from Section 2. Fortunately such a perspective is well-known in modern optics (see [2]) and involves the *spherical Wigner transform* that we define next. For  $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  let

$$(3.3) \quad W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g_1, g_2)(\omega, y) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} g_1(\omega') \overline{g_2(R_\omega \omega')} e^{-2\pi i y \cdot (\omega' - R_\omega \omega')} J(\omega, \omega') d\sigma(\omega').$$

Here  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ ,  $y \in \langle \omega \rangle^\perp$ , and for a point  $\omega' \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , the point  $R_\omega \omega'$  is defined to be the unique  $\omega'' \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  for which  $\omega$  is the geodesic midpoint of  $\omega'$  and  $\omega''$ ; that is

$$(3.4) \quad R_\omega \omega' = 2(\omega \cdot \omega')\omega - \omega'.$$

The function  $J(\omega, \omega') := 2^{n-1}|\omega \cdot \omega'|^{n-2}$  (see the forthcoming Remark 4.7) is the reciprocal of the Jacobian of the mapping  $\omega \mapsto R_\omega \omega'$ , so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \Phi(R_\omega \omega') J(\omega, \omega') d\sigma(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \Phi d\sigma$$

for each  $\omega'$ ; this expression for  $J$  may be obtained by direct computation. The essential features of this construction are those described in [2]; see also [31].

Motivated by the role of the transport equation in Section 2, for  $g \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  we define the auxiliary function  $f : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f(\omega, x) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} g(\omega') \overline{g(R_\omega \omega')} e^{-2\pi i x \cdot (\omega' - R_\omega \omega')} J(\omega, \omega') d\sigma(\omega'),$$

so that  $W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g)$  is the restriction of  $f$  to the tangent bundle  $T\mathbb{S}^{n-1} := \{(\omega, y) : \omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, y \in \langle \omega \rangle^\perp\}$ . That  $f$  is real-valued follows from the fact that  $R_\omega \circ R_\omega = I$  for each  $\omega$ . Evidently  $f$  satisfies the transport equation

$$(3.5) \quad \omega \cdot \nabla_x f = 0,$$

meaning that  $f(\omega, x) = f(\omega, x_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp}) = W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g)(\omega, x_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp})$ , where  $x_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp}$  is the orthogonal projection of  $x$  onto  $\langle \omega \rangle^\perp$ . The functions  $f$  and  $W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$  have some nice features, for example we have the marginal identity

$$(3.6) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(\omega, x) d\sigma(\omega) = |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2,$$

by Fubini's theorem and the definition of  $J$ . We note in passing that we have the additional marginal property

$$\int_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g)(\omega, y) dy = |g(\omega)|^2,$$

very much as in the setting of the classical Wigner distribution; we postpone the clarification of this point to Section 4, where a more general statement is made.

These observations lead to the desired spherical analogue of (2.3):

**Proposition 3.1** (Spherical phase-space representation).

$$|\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2 = X^* W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g).$$

*Proof.* By (3.6), (3.5) and Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(\omega, x) d\sigma(\omega) w(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} f(\omega, x_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp}) \left( \int_{\langle \omega \rangle} w(x_{\langle \omega \rangle} + x_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp}) dx_{\langle \omega \rangle} \right) dx_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} d\sigma(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g)(\omega, y) X w(\omega, y) dy d\sigma(\omega) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} X^* W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g)(x) w(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

for all test functions  $w$ . □

As we have already indicated, Proposition 3.1 is well-known in some form in optics (at least in low dimensions) where it provides a representation of the intensity of an optical field as a linear superposition of light rays – a useful and explicit connection between physical and geometric optics; see Alonso [2]. As should be expected from the discussion in Section 2, Proposition 3.1 does not yield (3.1) and (3.2), at least directly, since the spherical Wigner distribution, like the classical one, takes both positive and negative values in general. However, Proposition 3.1 we may be used to prove the following spherical versions of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7:

**Theorem 3.2** (Spherical Sobolev–Stein). *For  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ , there exists a dimensional constant  $c$  such that*

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g\mathcal{D}\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq c \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} I_{2s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)(\omega)^{1/2} \|Xw(\omega, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(\langle \omega \rangle^\perp)} d\sigma(\omega),$$

where

$$I_s(g_1, g_2)(\omega) := \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{g_1(\omega') g_2(R_\omega \omega')}{|\omega' - R_\omega \omega'|^s} |\omega \cdot \omega'|^{n-2} d\sigma(\omega').$$

**Remark 3.3.** The hypothesis  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$  in the statement of Theorem 3.2 serves only to ensure that the kernel of the fractional integral operator  $I_s$  is locally integrable, giving meaning to  $I_s$ . The corresponding Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi theorem that follows rests on the availability of suitable bounds on  $I_s$ , and so involves a constant that also depends on  $s$ .

**Theorem 3.4** (Spherical Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi). *For  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ ,*

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g\mathcal{D}\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \lesssim \sup_{\omega \in \text{supp}^*(g)} \|Xw(\omega, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(\langle \omega \rangle^\perp)} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}^2,$$

where  $\text{supp}^*(g)$  is the set of all geodesic midpoints of pairs of points from  $\text{supp}(g)$ . The implicit constant depends on at most  $n$  and  $s$ .

**Remark 3.5.** Theorems 3.2 and 3.4 may be seen to follow from Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 respectively. This involves partitioning the sphere into suitable geodesically convex patches as alluded to in the introduction, and indeed this is how our proof below begins. Accordingly, there is no nonnegativity hypothesis on the weight  $w$  in any of these statements.

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* By Proposition 3.1 and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality it suffices to show that

$$(3.9) \quad \|W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g)(\omega, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}(\langle \omega \rangle^\perp)}^2 \lesssim I_{S,s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)(\omega)$$

for some implicit constant depending only on  $n$ . By partitioning  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  into boundedly many (depending only on  $n$ ) geodesically convex subsets (caps), we may reduce to the situation where  $g$  is supported in a cap  $S$  satisfying  $\omega \cdot \omega' \geq \frac{1}{2}$  for all points  $\omega, \omega' \in S$  (in line with (1.11)). Next, for fixed  $\omega \in S$  we make the change of variables  $\xi = \omega' - R_\omega \omega'$ , which maps  $S$  bijectively to a subset  $U$  of  $\langle \omega \rangle^\perp$ . Defining  $\omega' : U \rightarrow S$  by  $\xi = \omega'(\xi) - R_\omega \omega'(\xi)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_S(g_1, g_2)(\omega, v) &:= \int_S g_1(\omega') \overline{g_2(R_\omega \omega')} e^{iy \cdot (\omega' - R_\omega \omega')} J(\omega, \omega') d\sigma(\omega') \\ &= \int_U g_1(\omega'(\xi)) \overline{g_2(R_\omega \omega'(\xi))} e^{iy \cdot \xi} \frac{J(\omega, \omega'(\xi))}{\tilde{J}(\omega, \omega'(\xi))} d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where  $W_S(g_1, g_2) := W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g_1 \mathbb{1}_S, g_2 \mathbb{1}_S)$  and  $\tilde{J}(\omega, \omega') = 2^{n-1} \omega \cdot \omega' \sim 1$  is the Jacobian of the change of variables. Hence

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{F}_v W_S(g_1, g_2)(\omega, \xi) = g_1(\omega'(\xi)) \overline{g_2(R_\omega \omega'(\xi))} \frac{J(\omega, \omega'(\xi))}{\tilde{J}(\omega, \omega'(\xi))} \mathbb{1}_U(\xi),$$

and so by Plancherel's theorem on  $\langle \omega \rangle^\perp$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.11) \quad \|W_S(g_1, g_2)(\omega, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}(\langle \omega \rangle^\perp)}^2 &= \int_U \left| |\xi|^{-s} g_1(\omega'(\xi)) \overline{g_2(R_\omega \omega'(\xi))} \frac{J(\omega, \omega'(\xi))}{\tilde{J}(\omega, \omega'(\xi))} \right|^2 d\xi \\
 &= \int_S |\omega' - R_\omega \omega'|^{-2s} |g_1(\omega')|^2 |g_2(R_\omega \omega')|^2 \frac{J(\omega, \omega')^2}{\tilde{J}(\omega, \omega')} d\sigma(\omega') \\
 &\lesssim \int_S |\omega' - R_\omega \omega'|^{-2s} |g_1(\omega')|^2 |g_2(R_\omega \omega')|^2 |\omega \cdot \omega'|^{n-2} d\sigma(\omega') \\
 &\lesssim I_{2s}(|g_1|^2, |g_2|^2)(\omega),
 \end{aligned}$$

from which (3.9) follows.  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** The reader may be puzzled by the retention of the specific factor  $|\omega \cdot \omega'|^{n-2}$  in the third line of (3.11), and its inclusion in the definition of  $I_s$ . This is significant as it is (up to a constant factor) the Jacobian  $J(\omega, \omega')$ , which is natural as it ensures that  $I_s$  is symmetric, and enjoys the appropriate Lebesgue space bounds. This feature will become clearer in Section 4 in the context of more general submanifolds  $S$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* We begin by recalling the definition of the spherical cap  $S$  in the proof of Theorem 3.2, and observing that  $I_{2s}(|g_1|^2, |g_2|^2)(\omega) = 0$  if  $\omega \notin \text{supp}^*(g)$ . Hence by (3.11),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \lesssim \sup_{\omega \in \text{supp}^*(g)} \|Xw(\omega, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(\langle \omega \rangle^\perp)} \|I_{S, 2s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)\|_{L^2(S)}^{1/2},$$

where

$$(3.12) \quad I_{S, s}(g_1, g_2)(\omega) := \int_S \frac{g_1(\omega') g_2(R_\omega \omega')}{|\omega' - R_\omega \omega'|^s} |\omega \cdot \omega'|^{n-2} d\sigma(\omega').$$

It therefore suffices to show that  $I_{S, s}$  is bounded from  $L^1 \times L^1$  into  $L^{1/2}$  whenever  $s < n - 1$ . This will be established in Section 7, where more general surface-carried bilinear fractional integral operators are estimated.  $\square$

**Remark 3.7** (A tomographic interpretation). Proposition 3.1 is a variant of the tomographic identity

$$(3.13) \quad |\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2 = c_n X^*(-\Delta_y)^{1/2} X(|\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2)$$

that follows for some constant  $c_n$  using the classical inversion formula for the X-ray transform. This is easily seen to be justified for  $n \geq 3$  since  $|\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  whenever  $g \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$  by the Stein–Tomas restriction theorem. It continues to hold (for  $g \in L^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ ) when  $n = 2$  since the domain of the composition  $(-\Delta_y)^{1/2} X$  may be suitably extended beyond that of  $X$  in this setting. It was essentially pointed out in [12] that

$$c_n (-\Delta_y)^{1/2} X(|\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2) = W_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(g, g)$$

when  $n = 2$ , allowing the spherical Wigner distribution to be generated tomographically in that case. We refer to Section 9 for further discussion of this perspective.

#### 4. GENERAL SUBMANIFOLDS: A GEOMETRIC VIEWPOINT

As we shall see, identifying a phase-space representation of  $|\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2$  that is explicit enough to establish Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 requires some careful geometric analysis, beginning with the identification of a suitable generalised Wigner distribution (or transform). We present this for general smooth submanifolds of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that are strictly convex in the sense that their shape operators  $dN_u$  are positive definite at all points  $u \in S$ .

**4.1. Surface-carried Wigner transforms.** The general procedure for constructing a suitable Wigner transform on a submanifold of euclidean space is again well-known in optics [2], [36]; see for example [27] for related intrinsic constructions in quantum physics. As is pointed out in [2], for  $n \geq 3$  matters are considerably more involved as there is some choice to be exercised.

For compactly supported function  $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(S)$  let

$$(4.1) \quad W_S(g_1, g_2)(u, y) = \int_S g_1(u') \overline{g_2(R_u u')} e^{-2\pi i y \cdot (u' - R_u u')} J(u, u') d\sigma(u').$$

Here  $u \in S$ ,  $y \in T_u S$ , and we define, for  $u' \neq u$ ,  $R_u u'$  to be the unique point  $u'' \in S$  such that

$$(4.2) \quad (u' - u'') \cdot N(u) = 0$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad N(u) \wedge N(u') \wedge N(u'') = 0.$$

Define  $R_u u := u$  for all  $u \in S$ . Condition (4.2) stipulates that  $u' - u'' \in T_u S$ , which as we shall see, is necessary for the phase-space representation (1.5); see Figure 1. Condition (4.3), which stipulates that  $N(u), N(u'), N(u'')$  lie on a great circle, is where we have exercised some choice. This appears to be physically significant, and is at least implicitly referred to in the optics literature; see for example [2] (Page 346) in the context of the sphere. Moreover, the appropriateness of (4.3) is particularly apparent when  $S$  is the paraboloid, as we clarify in the forthcoming Remark 4.7. In (4.1) the function  $J(u, u')$  is the reciprocal of the Jacobian of the mapping  $u \mapsto R_u u'$ , so that

$$\int_S \Phi(R_u u') J(u, u') d\sigma(u) = \int_S \Phi d\sigma$$

for each  $u' \in S$ . The required bijectivity here follows from the assumed geodesic convexity of  $N(S)$  referred to in Section 1. We refer to  $W_S(g_1, g_2)$  as the *Wigner transform on  $S$* , and  $W_S(g, g)$  as the *Wigner distribution on  $S$* . As we shall see shortly, the Jacobian  $J$  is a bounded function on compact subsets of  $S \times S$ , allowing  $W_S(g_1, g_2)$  to be defined as a Lebesgue integral.




FIGURE 1. A depiction of the choice of  $u''$  via the conditions (4.2) and (4.3).

The point  $u''$  may seem rather difficult to identify at first sight, although it has a simple alternative description that is *constructive*. This is shown in Figure 2, and will play an important role in our analysis.




FIGURE 2. The construction of  $u''$  via parallel supporting hyperplanes in  $T_u S + \{u'\}$ .

**Remark 4.1** (Existence of  $u''$ ). There is a technical point that we have glossed over in the above definition of  $W_S$  and Figures 1 and 2. For given  $u, u' \in S$  our hypotheses do not guarantee the existence of such a point  $u'' := R_u u'$ , unless  $S$  is closed (the boundary of a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ). One way to remedy this might be to continue  $S$  to a closed submanifold, upon which  $R_u u'$  may always be defined, and observe that the resulting function  $W_S(g_1, g_2)$  is independent of the choice of extension since  $g_2$  is supported on  $S$ . In any event, the integral in (4.1) should be interpreted as taken over

$$\{u' \in S : (u' - u'') \cdot N(u) = 0 \text{ and } N(u) \wedge N(u') \wedge N(u'') = 0 \text{ for some } u'' \in S\}.$$

**Remark 4.2** (Differentiability of  $u''$ ). We expect that the maps  $u \mapsto R_u u'$  and  $u' \mapsto R_u u'$  are differentiable away from  $u = u'$ , and that this should follow from (4.2) and (4.3) by a suitable application of the implicit function theorem; see Figure 2. This smoothness is of course clear when  $S$  is the sphere thanks to the explicit formula (3.4), and is assumed to be true of the submanifolds  $S$  considered here.

**Remark 4.3** (Rationale for the choice of third point  $u''$ ). As is pointed out in [2] and [36], for  $n \geq 3$  there are many possible ways of defining the third point  $u''$  in terms of  $u'$  and  $u$ , although for the purposes of proving Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 there are a number of natural requirements that significantly constrain this choice. First of all, the choice should be “nondegenerate” in the sense that the distances  $|u' - u|$  and  $|u' - u''|$  should be comparable (suitably uniformly in terms of the geometry of  $S$ ), it should be symmetric so that the resulting Wigner distribution is real-valued (and the Wigner transform is conjugate symmetric), and it should be geometrically/physically natural, so that the Jacobian  $J$  may be expressed in terms of the Gauss map  $N$  and its derivative  $dN$  (the shape operator). The forthcoming Propositions 4.4 and 4.5 show that our choice of  $u''$  has these features. As we shall see, the coplanarity condition (4.3) is natural as it allows the mapping  $u \mapsto R_u u'$  to be transformed to a relatively simple “outward vector field” on the tangent space  $T_{u'} S$ . This involves parametrising  $S$  using the Gauss map followed by stereographic projection (a composition that may also be found in the theory of minimal surfaces).

It will be important for us to understand how the distances between the three points  $u, u', u''$  relate to each other. This is provided by the following proposition, whose proof is deferred to Section 5. In particular it tells us that the function  $\rho(u, u') := |u' - R_u u'|$  on  $S \times S$  is a *quasi-distance*, as we clarify in Section 8.

**Proposition 4.4** (Distance estimates). *For all  $u, u', u'' \in S$  with  $u'' = R_u u'$ ,*

$$(4.4) \quad |u' - u''| \lesssim Q(S)^{1/2} |u - u'|$$

and

$$(4.5) \quad |u' - u''| \gtrsim \frac{1}{Q(S)} |u - u'|.$$

We now turn from the metric properties to the measure-theoretic properties of the map  $R_u$ , and a host of explicit identities satisfied by the Wigner transform  $W_S$ .

To see that  $W_S$  is conjugate-symmetric, which in particular implies that the Wigner distribution  $W_S(g, g)$  is real-valued, already appears to require some work. For fixed  $u \in S$  observe first that if  $u'' = R_u u'$  then  $u' = R_u u''$ , and so by a change of variables,

$$W_S(g_1, g_2)(u, y) = \int_S g_1(R_u u'') \overline{g_2(u'')} e^{-2\pi i y \cdot (R_u u'' - u'')} J(u, R_u u'') \Delta(u, u'') d\sigma(u''),$$

where  $\Delta(u, u'')$  is the Jacobian of the change of variables  $u' = R_u u''$ . It therefore remains to show that

$$J(u, u') \Delta(u, u'') = J(u, u'').$$

Fortunately we have explicit formulae for the Jacobians  $J$  and  $\Delta$  from which this quickly follows. In the following proposition we denote by  $K(u)$  the Gaussian curvature of  $S$  at the point  $u$ , recalling that  $K(u)$  is the determinant of the shape operator  $dN_u$ . Further, we denote by  $P_W v$  the orthogonal projection of a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  onto a subspace  $W$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Proposition 4.5** (Jacobian identities). *For all  $u, u', u'' \in S$  with  $u'' = R_u u'$ ,*

$$(4.6) \quad J(u, u') = \left( \frac{|N(u') \wedge N(u'')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|} \right)^{n-2} \left| \frac{\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u''} S} N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''} S} N(u)) \rangle} \right| \frac{K(u)}{K(u'')},$$

$$(4.7) \quad \Delta(u, u') = \left( \frac{|N(u) \wedge N(u'')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|} \right)^{n-1} \frac{|\langle P_{T_{u'} S} N(u), (dN_{u'})^{-1}(P_{T_{u'} S} N(u)) \rangle|}{|\langle P_{T_{u''} S} N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''} S} N(u)) \rangle|} \frac{K(u)}{K(u'')}$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad J(u, u') \Delta(u, u'') = J(u, u'').$$

We defer the proof of Proposition 4.5 to Section 6.

**Remark 4.6** (Interpreting  $J$ ). The expression for  $J$  in Proposition (4.5), while seemingly rather complicated, may be understood in somewhat simple geometric terms. In particular:

(i) Matters are much simpler when  $n = 2$ , where we may write

$$\begin{aligned} J(u, u') &= \left| \frac{\langle u'' - u', P_{T_u S} N(u'') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u''} S} N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''} S} N(u)) \rangle} \right| \frac{K(u)}{K(u'')} \\ &= \frac{|u'' - u'| \cdot |N(u) \wedge N(u'')|}{|P_{T_{u''} S} N(u)|^2} K(u) \\ &= \frac{|u'' - u'|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u'')|} K(u). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the (two-dimensional) formula

$$\langle P_{T_{u''} S} N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''} S} N(u)) \rangle = \frac{1}{K(u'')} |P_{T_{u''} S} N(u)|^2,$$

along with the elementary identities  $|P_{T_{u''} S} N(u)| = |P_{T_u S} N(u'')| = |N(u) \wedge N(u'')|$ .

(ii) The factor

$$(4.9) \quad \langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle^{-1}$$

is bounded above by  $\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), dN_{u''}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle$  by the harmonic-arithmetic mean inequality. This bound is (up to a suitable normalisation factor) the directional curvature of  $S$  at the point  $u''$  in the direction  $P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)$ . One might therefore interpret the factor (4.9) as a certain “harmonic directional curvature”.

(iii) The factor

$$\frac{|N(u') \wedge N(u'')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|}$$

quantifies (in relative terms) the transversality of the tangent spaces to  $S$  at the points  $u, u', u''$ , and is therefore also a manifestation of the curvature profile of  $S$ ; see Figure 1.

(iv) The factor  $\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle$  is different in nature as it explicitly relates to the *positions* of the points  $u', u''$ . It is instructive to use the fact that  $u' - u'' \in T_u S$  to write this as

$$\langle u'' - u', P_{T_u S}N(u'') \rangle = |N(u) \wedge N(u'')| |u'' - u'| \left\langle \frac{u'' - u'}{|u'' - u'|}, \frac{P_{T_u S}N(u'')}{|P_{T_u S}N(u'')|} \right\rangle.$$

We observe that the inner product in the final expression above quantifies the extent to which  $u''$  is displaced from the line through  $u'$  in the direction  $P_{T_u S}N(u'')$ ; see Figure 2.

(v) The Jacobian  $J$  is scale-invariant in the sense that an isotropic scaling of  $S$  leaves  $J$  unchanged. This is apparent from the definition of  $J$ , but is also manifest in the formula (4.6).

**Remark 4.7** (Examples). Proposition 4.5 is easily applied to examples.

(i) If  $S = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ , the paraboloid (2.10), then a careful calculation using Proposition 4.5 reveals that

$$J(u, u') = 2^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 + 4|x''|^2}{1 + 4|x|^2} \right)^{1/2},$$

where we are writing  $u = (x, |x|^2)$ ,  $u' = (x', |x'|^2)$ ,  $u'' := R_u u' = (x'', |x''|^2)$ . As should be expected from our analysis in Section 2, the parabolic Wigner distribution  $W_{\mathbb{P}^{n-1}}$  may be pulled back to the classical Wigner distribution via a suitable map  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow T\mathbb{P}^d$ ; in this case  $\Phi(x, v) = ((x, |x|^2), P_{T_{(x, |x|^2)}\mathbb{P}^d}(v, 0))$ . This uses the simple geometric fact that the coplanarity condition (4.3) transforms to a *colinearity* condition in parameter space. More specifically, if for a function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  we let  $Lg(x, |x|^2) = (1 + 4|x|^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}g(x)$ , and for a function  $h : T\mathbb{P}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  we let  $Uh(x, v) = (1 + 4|x|^2)^{1/2}h(\Phi(x, v))$ , then

$$UW_{\mathbb{P}^d}(Lg, Lg) = W(g, g).$$

Moreover,  $X_{\mathbb{P}^d}^* h = \rho(Uh)$ , allowing one to deduce the quantum-mechanical phase-space representation (2.3) from the forthcoming Proposition 4.8. We refer to [2] (Page 353) for a similar remark.

(ii) If  $S = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , evidently  $K \equiv 1$  and  $N(\omega) = \omega$ , and to be consistent with Section 3 we use  $\omega$  rather than  $u$  to represent a point. We may use the explicit formula (3.4) to write

$$\frac{|N(\omega') \wedge N(\omega'')|}{|N(\omega) \wedge N(\omega')|} = \frac{(1 - (\omega' \cdot \omega'')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(1 - (\omega \cdot \omega')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{|P_{\langle \omega' \rangle^\perp} \omega''|}{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega'|} = 2|\omega \cdot \omega'|.$$

On the other hand, since  $\langle \omega'' - \omega', N(\omega'') \rangle = \langle \omega'' - \omega', P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega'' \rangle$ , projecting both sides of (3.4) to  $\langle \omega \rangle^\perp$  yields

$$\left| \frac{\langle \omega'' - \omega', N(\omega'') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{\omega''}S}N(\omega), (dN_{\omega''})^{-1}(P_{T_{\omega''}S}N(\omega)) \rangle} \right| = \frac{|\langle \omega'' - \omega', \omega' \rangle|}{|1 - (\omega \cdot \omega'')^2|} = \frac{|1 - (\omega' \cdot \omega'')|}{|1 - (\omega \cdot \omega')^2|} = 2,$$

since  $\omega \cdot \omega'' = \omega \cdot \omega'$  and  $\omega' \cdot \omega'' = 2(\omega \cdot \omega')^2 - 1$ . Altogether we conclude that

$$J(\omega, \omega') = 2^{n-1} |\omega \cdot \omega'|^{n-2},$$

as appears in (3.3).

We now come to the phase space representation of  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2$ , and we begin by defining an auxiliary function  $f : S \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f(u, x) = \int_S g(u') \overline{g(R_u u')} e^{-2\pi i x \cdot (u' - R_u u')} J(u, u') d\sigma(u'),$$

so that  $W_S(g, g)$  is the restriction of  $f$  to the tangent bundle  $TS := \{(u, y) : u \in S, y \in T_u S\}$ . As in the spherical case, we continue to have the marginal identity

$$(4.10) \quad \int_S f(u, x) d\sigma(u) = |\widehat{gd\sigma}(x)|^2$$

by Fubini's theorem and the definition of  $J$ . While we shall not need to use it, it is pertinent to also note the second marginal property

$$(4.11) \quad \int_{T_u S} W_S(g, g)(u, y) dy = |g(u)|^2$$

here (possibly subject to an additional regularity assumption on  $S$ ) referred to in the introduction; we refer to Section 8 for clarification of this, along with the sense in which it holds as a pointwise identity. Another key property is that  $f$  satisfies the transport equation

$$(4.12) \quad N(u) \cdot \nabla_x f = 0,$$

meaning that  $f(u, x) = W_S(g, g)(u, P_{T_u S} x)$ , where  $P_{T_u S} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T_u S$  is the orthogonal projection onto  $T_u S$ .

**Proposition 4.8** (General phase-space representation).

$$(4.13) \quad |\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2 = X_S^* W_S(g, g)$$

where  $X_S w(u, y) := Xw(N(u), y)$ , the pullback of  $Xw$  under the Gauss map

$$TS \ni (u, y) \mapsto (N(u), y) \in T\mathbb{S}^{d-1}.$$

We note that for a phase-space function  $h : TS \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  we have the explicit expression

$$X_S^* h(x) = \int_S h(u, P_{T_u S} x) d\sigma(u).$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.8.* By (4.10), (4.12) and Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{gd\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_S f(u, x) d\sigma(u) w(x) dx \\ &= \int_S \int_{T_u S} f(u, y) \left( \int_{(T_u S)^\perp} w(y+z) dz \right) dy d\sigma(u) \\ &= \int_S \int_{T_u S} W_S(g, g)(u, y) Xw(N(u), y) dy d\sigma(u) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} X_S^* W_S(g, g)(x) w(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

for all test functions  $w$ . □

**Remark 4.9** (A polarised form). The polarised form

$$\widehat{g_1 d\sigma} \overline{\widehat{g_2 d\sigma}} = X_S^* W_S(g_1, g_2)$$

of (4.13) may be established similarly, and indeed may be deduced directly from (4.13).

**Remark 4.10.** There is a point of contact here with [14], where among other things it is shown that the classical Radon transform fails to distinguish  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2$  from  $X_S^* \nu$  for a large class of distributions  $\nu$  on  $TS$ , provided a suitable transversality condition is satisfied. Perhaps unsurprisingly,  $W_S(g, g)$  is easily seen to be an example of such a distribution.

We are now ready to state our main theorems (Theorems 1.6 and 1.7) in full.

**Theorem 4.11** ( *$L^2$  Sobolev–Stein inequality*). *Suppose that  $S$  is a smooth strictly convex surface with curvature quotient  $Q(S)$ , and  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ . Then there is a dimensional constant  $c$  such that*

$$(4.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq cQ(S)^{\frac{5n-8}{4}} \int_S I_{S,2s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)(u)^{1/2} \|X_S w(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)} d\sigma(u),$$

where

$$(4.15) \quad I_{S,s}(g_1, g_2)(u) := \int_S \frac{g_1(u') g_2(R_u u')}{|u' - R_u u'|^s} J(u, u') d\sigma(u').$$

**Remark 4.12.** The  $S$ -carried fractional integral  $I_{S,s}$  is natural for a number of reasons relating to the presence of the Jacobian factor  $J$ . In particular, it is symmetric thanks to (4.8) (a property that is analogous to the conjugate symmetry of the Wigner transform  $W_S$ ), and as we shall see in Section 7, its Lebesgue space bounds do not depend on any lower bound on the curvature of  $S$ . The restriction  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$  ensures that the kernel of  $I_{S,s}$  is locally integrable.

**Theorem 4.13** ( *$L^2$  Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality*). *Suppose that  $S$  is a smooth strictly convex surface with curvature quotient  $Q(S)$ , and  $s < \frac{n-1}{2}$ . Then there exists a constant  $c$ , depending on at most  $n, s$ , and the diameter of  $S$ , such that*

$$(4.16) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq cQ(S)^{\frac{9n-12}{4}} \sup_{u \in \text{supp}^*(g)} \|X_S w(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)} \|g\|_{L^2(S)}^2,$$

where  $\text{supp}^*(g) := \{u \in S : R_u u' \in \text{supp}(g) \text{ for some } u' \in \text{supp}(g)\}$ .

**Remark 4.14.** We remark that  $\text{supp}(g) \subseteq \text{supp}^*(g)$ , and often this containment is strict. When  $S$  is the sphere,  $\text{supp}^*(g)$  is the “support midpoint set”, consisting of all geodesic midpoints of pairs of points from the support of  $g$ . Hence  $\text{supp}^*(g) \subseteq \text{cvx supp}(g)$  in this case, where  $\text{cvx}$  forms the geodesic convex hull. More generally,  $\text{supp}^*(g) \subseteq N^{-1} \text{cvx}(N(\text{supp}(g)))$ , so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq cQ(S)^{\frac{9n-12}{4}} \sup_{\omega \in \text{cvx}(N(\text{supp}(g)))} \|X w(\omega, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)} \|g\|_{L^2(S)}^2.$$

**Remark 4.15.** While we expect that the power of  $Q(S)$  in the statement of Theorem 4.11 is sharp when  $n = 2$ , it seems unlikely that it is in higher dimensions. The power of  $Q(S)$  in the statement of Theorem 4.13 is of course larger still, incurring extra factors from the bounds on the bilinear fractional integrals  $I_{S,s}$  in Section 7.

**4.2. Proof of the Sobolev–Stein inequality (Theorem 1.6).** In this section we prove Theorem 1.6, or more specifically, Theorem 4.11. We begin with an application of Proposition 4.8 and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to write

$$(4.17) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2 w \leq \int_S \|W_S(g, g)(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}(T_u S)} \|X_S w(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)} d\sigma(u)$$

for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . In order to estimate the Sobolev norm of the Wigner distribution above we fix  $u \in S$  and make the change of variables

$$(4.18) \quad \xi = u' - R_u u'.$$

As we shall see shortly, the map  $u' \mapsto \xi$  is a bijection from  $S$  to a subset  $U$  of  $T_u S$ , and so

$$\|W_S(g, g)(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}(T_u S)}^2 = \int_{T_u S} \left| \int_U g(u'(\xi)) \overline{g(R_u u'(\xi))} |\xi|^{-s} e^{-2\pi i y \cdot \xi} J(u, u'(\xi)) \frac{d\xi}{\tilde{J}(u, u'(\xi))} \right|^2 dy,$$

where  $\tilde{J}(u, u')$  is the Jacobian of the map  $u' \mapsto \xi$ . Hence by Plancherel's theorem on  $T_u S$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_S(g, g)(u, \cdot)\|_{H^{-s}(T_u S)}^2 &= \int_U \left| g(u'(\xi)) \overline{g(R_u u'(\xi))} |\xi|^{-s} \frac{J(u, u'(\xi))}{\tilde{J}(u, u'(\xi))} \right|^2 d\xi \\ &= \int_S \frac{|g(u')|^2 |g(R_u u')|^2 J(u, u')^2}{|u' - R_u u'|^{2s} \tilde{J}(u, u')} d\sigma(u'). \end{aligned}$$

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 4.11 it therefore suffices to prove that

$$(4.19) \quad \frac{J(u, u')}{\tilde{J}(u, u')} \lesssim Q(S)^{\frac{5n-8}{2}}$$

with implicit constant depending only on the dimension. We do this in two steps.

*Step 1: Bounding  $\tilde{J}(u, u')$ .* The goal here is to obtain a suitable lower bound for  $\tilde{J}(u, u')$ .

**Proposition 4.16.** *We have that*

$$(4.20) \quad \tilde{J}(u, u') \geq (1 + \Delta(u, u')^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all  $u, u' \in S$ .

*Proof.* Let  $u \in S$  be fixed. The Jacobian  $\tilde{J}$  of the change of variables

$$\xi(u') = u' - R_u u',$$

may be expressed as

$$(4.21) \quad \tilde{J}(u, u') = \frac{|(d\xi)_{u'}(v_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (d\xi)_{u'}(v_{n-1})|}{|v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{n-1}|},$$

where  $v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}$  is a basis for  $T_{u'} S$ . We remark that

$$(d\xi)_{u'}(v_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (d\xi)_{u'}(v_{n-1}) \in \Lambda^{n-1}(T_{u''} S) \quad \text{and} \quad v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{n-1} \in \Lambda^{n-1}(T_{u'} S),$$

and we identify the exterior algebras  $\Lambda^{n-1}(T_{u'} S)$  and  $\Lambda^{n-1}(T_{u''} S)$  with subspaces of  $\Lambda^{n-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  via the natural embedding induced by the inclusions  $T_{u'} S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $T_{u''} S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , respectively.

It will be convenient to fix  $u'$  and express (4.21) in terms of unit velocities of trajectories along smooth curves in  $S$  emanating from  $u'$ . In what follows  $c : I \rightarrow S$  will denote the arc-length parametrisation of such a curve, where  $I$  is an open interval containing 0 such that  $c(0) = u'$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  denotes the set of all such mappings  $c$ , then evidently

$$T_{u'} S = \langle \{\dot{c}(0) : c \in \mathcal{C}\} \rangle.$$

By the strict convexity of  $S$ , the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional spaces  $T_{u'} S$  and  $T_u S$  intersect in an  $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace  $\mathcal{H}$ . We then pick curves  $c_1, \dots, c_{n-2} \in \mathcal{C}$  such that

$$\mathcal{H} = \langle \dot{c}_1(0), \dots, \dot{c}_{n-2}(0) \rangle,$$

and the set  $\{\dot{c}_i(0)\}_{1 \leq i \leq n-2}$  is orthonormal. To obtain an orthonormal basis for  $T_{u'} S$ , we simply take any other curve  $c_{n-1} \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \in \mathcal{H}^\perp \cap T_{u'} S$ . There is one more degree of freedom in choosing  $c_{n-1}$ , and we assume without loss of generality that  $\dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \cdot N(u) \geq 0$ . This gives

$$T_{u'} S = \langle \dot{c}_1(0), \dots, \dot{c}_{n-2}(0), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle.$$

Since

$$(d\xi)_{u'}(\dot{c}_i(0)) = (\xi \circ c_i)'(0) = \dot{c}_i(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_i(0)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1,$$

then

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{J}(u, u') &= |(d\xi)_{u'}(\dot{c}_1(0)) \wedge \cdots \wedge (d\xi)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))| \\ &= |(\dot{c}_1(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_1(0))) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\dot{c}_{n-1}(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)))|. \end{aligned}$$

The next claim collects a few useful facts about the action of  $(dR_u)_{u'}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Claim 4.17.** *The following hold:*

(1) The subspace  $\mathcal{H}$  generated by the set of vectors  $\{\dot{c}_1(0), \dots, \dot{c}_{n-2}(0)\}$  is invariant under the map  $(dR_u)_{u'}$ . Moreover,  $(dR_u)_{u'}|_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is an isomorphism. Equivalently,

$$(4.23) \quad \mathcal{H} = \langle \dot{c}_1(0), \dots, \dot{c}_{n-2}(0) \rangle = \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_1(0)), \dots, (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-2}(0)) \rangle.$$

(2) Let  $M_{u,u'} := (dR_u)_{u'}|_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  denote the restriction of  $(dR_u)_{u'}$  to the invariant subspace  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $I - M_{u,u'} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  satisfies

$$(4.24) \quad \det(I - M_{u,u'}) \geq 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\omega := N(u)$ . Notice that the coplanarity condition (4.3) implies that

$$(4.25) \quad v_1 := \frac{P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} N(u')}{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} N(u')|} = -\frac{P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} N(u'')}{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} N(u'')|} =: -v_2.$$

On the other hand,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are the outward normal vectors (in  $T_u S$ ) of the convex submanifold

$$(4.26) \quad \mathcal{S}_{u,u'} := S \cap (T_u S + u')$$

at  $u'$  and  $u''$  respectively, hence

$$T_{u'} \mathcal{S}_{u,u'} = T_{u''} \mathcal{S}_{u,u'},$$

from which (4.23) follows; see Figure 2. Observe also that on  $\mathcal{S}_{u,u'}$  we have

$$(4.27) \quad R_u u' = \tilde{N}^{-1}(-\tilde{N}(u')),$$

where  $\tilde{N} : \mathcal{S}_{u,u'} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-2}$  is the Gauss map of  $\mathcal{S}_{u,u'} \subset u' + T_u S$ . Computing derivatives,  $(dR_u)_{u'}|_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  satisfies

$$(dR_u)_{u'} = -d\tilde{N}_{-\tilde{N}(u')}^{-1} \circ d\tilde{N}_{u'}.$$

Finally, since  $d\tilde{N}_{-\tilde{N}(u')}^{-1}$  and  $d\tilde{N}_{u'}$  are positive definite the product  $d\tilde{N}_{-\tilde{N}(u')}^{-1} \circ d\tilde{N}_{u'}$  has positive eigenvalues, therefore

$$\det(I - M_{u,u'}) = \det(I + d\tilde{N}_{-\tilde{N}(u')}^{-1} \circ d\tilde{N}_{u'}) \geq 1.$$

□

Returning to (4.22),

$$\tilde{J}(u, u') = |W_1 - W_2|,$$

where

$$W_1 := (\dot{c}_1(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_1(0))) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\dot{c}_{n-2}(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-2}(0))) \wedge \dot{c}_{n-1}(0),$$

$$W_2 := (\dot{c}_1(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_1(0))) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\dot{c}_{n-2}(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-2}(0))) \wedge (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)),$$

since  $|\dot{c}_1(0) \wedge \cdots \wedge \dot{c}_{n-1}(0)| = 1$  by orthonormality of the chosen basis of  $T_{u'} S$ . The next claim contains three key identities involving  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ .

**Claim 4.18.** *The following identities hold:*

$$\langle W_1, W_1 \rangle = \det(I - M_{u,u'})^2,$$

$$\langle W_1, W_2 \rangle = \det(I - M_{u,u'})^2 \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle$$

$$\langle W_2, W_2 \rangle = \Delta(u, u')^2 \det(M_{u,u'}^{-1} - I)^2.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{0}_{1 \times (n-2)}$  is the  $1 \times (n-2)$  zero row and let  $\mathbf{X}_{u,u'}$  be the  $(n-2) \times (n-2)$  matrix whose  $(i, j)$  entry is given by

$$(\mathbf{X}_{u,u'})_{i,j} := \langle \dot{c}_i(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_i(0)), \dot{c}_j(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_j(0)) \rangle.$$

Observe that

$$\langle W_1, W_1 \rangle = \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{u,u'} & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (n-2)} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (n-2)} & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \det(\mathbf{X}_{u,u'}) = \det(I - M_{u,u'})^2,$$

where we used the facts that  $\mathcal{H}$  is invariant under  $(dR_u)_{u'}$  (as verified in Claim 4.17) and that  $\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)$  is orthogonal to  $\mathcal{H}$ . Now let  $\mathbf{Y}_{u,u'}$  be the  $(n-2) \times (n-2)$  matrix whose  $(i, j)$  entry is given by

$$(\mathbf{Y}_{u,u'})_{i,j} := \langle (dR_u)_{u'}^{-1}(\dot{c}_i(0)) - \dot{c}_i(0), (dR_u)_{u'}^{-1}(\dot{c}_j(0)) - \dot{c}_j(0) \rangle.$$

Analogously,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W_2, W_2 \rangle &= |(\dot{c}_1(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_1(0))) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\dot{c}_{n-2}(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-2}(0))) \wedge (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))|^2 \\ &= \Delta(u, u')^2 |(dR_u)_{u'}^{-1}[\dot{c}_1(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_1(0))] \wedge \cdots \wedge (dR_u)_{u'}^{-1}[\dot{c}_{n-2}(0) - (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-2}(0))] \wedge \dot{c}_{n-1}(0)|^2 \\ &= \Delta(u, u')^2 |[(dR_u)_{u'}^{-1} - I](\dot{c}_1(0)) \wedge \cdots \wedge [(dR_u)_{u'}^{-1} - I](\dot{c}_{n-2}(0)) \wedge \dot{c}_{n-1}(0)|^2 \\ &= \Delta(u, u')^2 \det(\mathbf{Y}_{u,u'}) \\ &= \Delta(u, u')^2 \det(M_{u,u'}^{-1} - I)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W_1, W_2 \rangle &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{u,u'} & A_{(n-2) \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (n-2)} & \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \det(I - M_{u,u'})^2 \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_{(n-2) \times 1}$  is a  $(n-2) \times 1$  column that does not feature in the final expression.  $\square$

Expanding  $|W_1 - W_2|^2$  using the standard scalar product on the exterior algebra  $\Lambda^{n-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |W_1 - W_2|^2 &= \langle W_1, W_1 \rangle - 2\langle W_1, W_2 \rangle + \langle W_2, W_2 \rangle \\ (4.28) \quad &= \det(I - M_{u,u'})^2 - 2\det(I - M_{u,u'})^2 \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle \\ &\quad + \Delta(u, u')^2 \det(M_{u,u'}^{-1} - I)^2, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to Claim 4.18. We continue with the following key observation:

**Claim 4.19.** *It holds that*

$$\langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle < 0.$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \cdot N(u) > 0$  by assumption, therefore differentiating at  $t = 0$  the identity

$$\langle R_u(c_{n-1}(t)) - c_{n-1}(t), N(u) \rangle = 0$$

gives  $\langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), N(u) \rangle > 0$ . Next, observe that  $N(u'), N(u), N(u'')$  and  $\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)$  are in  $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ , the (two-dimensional) orthogonal complement of  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Since  $N(p) \cdot N(q) \geq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $p, q \in S$  by assumption, the angles  $\alpha_1$  (between  $N(u')$  and  $N(u)$ ) and  $\alpha_2$  (between  $N(u)$  and  $N(u'')$ ) are such that  $0 < \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 < \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Since  $N(u) \in \mathcal{H}^\perp$ , we have by the self-adjointness of the projection operator  $P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp}$ ,

$$0 < \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), N(u) \rangle = \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} N(u) \rangle = \langle P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))], N(u) \rangle,$$

which implies that  $P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))]$  is in the upper-half space of  $\mathcal{H}^\perp$  (here we are assuming without loss of generality that  $N(u) = e_2$ , the second canonical vector of  $\mathcal{H}^\perp \cong \mathbb{R}^2$ ). On the other hand,  $(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)) \in T_{u''}S$ , hence  $\langle P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))], N(u'') \rangle = 0$ , i.e. the angle between  $N(u'')$  and  $P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))]$  is  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ . Since  $\theta := \frac{\pi}{2} - (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$  is strictly positive, the angle  $\gamma := \frac{\pi}{2} + \theta$  between  $P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))]$  and  $\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)$  is strictly larger than  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  (see Figure 3), which implies that

$$\langle P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))], \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle < 0.$$

Finally, again by the self-adjointness of  $P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle &= \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)] \rangle \\ &= \langle P_{\mathcal{H}^\perp} [(dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0))], \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle \\ &< 0, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of the claim.  $\square$




FIGURE 3. A graphical representation of the proof of Claim 4.19.

Returning to (4.28),

$$\begin{aligned}
 |W_1 - W_2|^2 &= \det(I - M_{u,u'})^2 - 2 \det(I - M_{u,u'})^2 \langle (dR_u)_{u'}(\dot{c}_{n-1}(0)), \dot{c}_{n-1}(0) \rangle \\
 (4.29) \quad &+ \Delta(u, u')^2 \det(M_{u,u'}^{-1} - I)^2 \\
 &\geq 1 + \Delta(u, u')^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

by (4.24) and Claim 4.19, which concludes the proof of Proposition 4.16.  $\square$

*Step 2: Bounding  $J/\tilde{J}$ .* Let  $\lambda_1(p) \leq \lambda_2(p) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{n-1}(p)$  be the eigenvalues of the shape operator  $dN$  at  $p$ . Since  $u'' - u' \in \langle \omega \rangle^\perp$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \frac{\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle} \right| &= \left| \frac{\langle u'' - u', N(u'') - N(u) \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle} \right| \\
 &\leq \lambda_{n-1}(u'') \frac{|\langle u'' - u', N(u'') - N(u) \rangle|}{|P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)|^2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $|P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)| = |N(u'') \wedge N(u)| \approx |N(u'') - N(u)|$ , which follows from (1.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(u, u') &= \left( \frac{|N(u') \wedge N(u'')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|} \right)^{n-2} \left| \frac{\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle} \right| \frac{K(u)}{K(u'')} \\
 &\lesssim \left( \frac{|N(u') - N(u'')|}{|N(u) - N(u')|} \right)^{n-2} \frac{|\langle u'' - u', N(u'') - N(u) \rangle|}{|P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)|^2} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j(u)}{\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j(u'')} \lambda_{n-1}(u'') \\
 &\lesssim \left( \frac{|u' - u''|}{|u - u'|} \right)^{n-2} \left( \frac{\sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p)}{\inf_p \lambda_1(p)} \right)^{n-2} \frac{|u'' - u'| \cdot |N(u'') - N(u)|}{|N(u'') - N(u)|^2} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{n-2} \lambda_j(u)}{\prod_{j=1}^{n-2} \lambda_j(u'')} \lambda_{n-1}(u) \\
 &\lesssim \left( \frac{|u' - u''|}{|u - u'|} \right)^{n-2} \frac{|u'' - u'|}{|N(u'') - N(u)|} Q(S)^{2(n-2)} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p).
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (4.4) and the fact that  $\tilde{J}(u, u') \geq 1$  (see Proposition 4.16),

$$(4.30) \quad \frac{J(u, u')}{\tilde{J}(u, u')} \lesssim Q(S)^{\frac{5(n-2)}{2}} \frac{|u'' - u'|}{|N(u'') - N(u)|} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p).$$

On the other hand, using the fact that  $\tilde{J}(u, u') \geq \Delta(u, u')$ , which also follows from Proposition 4.16,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{J(u, u')}{\tilde{J}(u, u')} &\leq \frac{J(u, u')}{\Delta(u, u')} = J(u, u'') \lesssim \left( \frac{|u' - u''|}{|u - u''|} \right)^{n-2} \frac{|u'' - u'|}{|N(u') - N(u)|} Q(S)^{2(n-2)} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p) \\ &\lesssim Q(S)^{\frac{5(n-2)}{2}} \frac{|u'' - u'|}{|N(u') - N(u)|} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p), \end{aligned}$$

by the distance estimate (4.4) and (4.8). Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{J(u, u')}{\tilde{J}(u, u')} &\lesssim |u'' - u'| Q(S)^{\frac{5(n-2)}{2}} \frac{1}{\max\{|N(u'') - N(u)|, |N(u') - N(u)|\}} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p) \\ &\lesssim |u'' - u'| Q(S)^{\frac{5(n-2)}{2}} \frac{1}{|N(u'') - N(u)| + |N(u') - N(u)|} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p) \\ (4.31) \quad &\lesssim \frac{|u'' - u'|}{|N(u'') - N(u')|} Q(S)^{\frac{5(n-2)}{2}} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\inf_p \lambda_1(p)} Q(S)^{\frac{5(n-2)}{2}} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p) \\ &\lesssim Q(S)^{\frac{5n-8}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

by the mean-value inequality applied to the Gauss map  $N$ . This implies (4.19), completing the proof of Theorem 1.6 (Theorem 4.11).

**4.3. Proof of the Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality (Theorem 1.7).** In this section we prove Theorem 1.7, or more specifically, Theorem 4.13. We begin by observing that if  $u \notin \text{supp}^*(g)$  and  $u' \in S$  then either  $u' \notin \text{supp}(g)$  or  $R_u u' \notin \text{supp}(g)$ , meaning that  $I_{S,s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)(u) = 0$ . Consequently, by Theorem 4.11,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\widehat{g d\sigma}|^2 w \leq c Q(S)^{\frac{5n-8}{4}} \sup_{u \in \text{supp}^*(g)} \|X_S w(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)} \int_S I_{S,s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)(u)^{1/2} d\sigma(u),$$

and so we are reduced to proving a suitable  $L^1(S) \times L^1(S) \rightarrow L^{1/2}(S)$  estimate on the bilinear operator

$$(4.32) \quad I_{S,s}(g_1, g_2)(u) := \int_S \frac{g_1(u') g_2(R_u u')}{|u' - R_u u'|^s} J(u, u') d\sigma(u')$$

whenever  $s < n - 1$ . This follows by a direct application of the forthcoming Theorem 7.2.

**4.4. Improved Sobolev–Stein constants in the plane.** Our proof of Theorem 1.6 identifies  $\|J/\tilde{J}\|_\infty^{1/2}$  as the naturally occurring dilation-invariant functional on the surface  $S$ , rather than the power of the curvature quotient  $Q(S)$  that we use to bound it. In two dimensions our expression for  $J$ , being relatively simple, permits the bound  $\|J/\tilde{J}\|_\infty^{1/2} \lesssim \Lambda(S)$ , where  $\Lambda(S)$  is defined in (1.12). To see this we argue as in (4.31), using Propositions 4.5 and 4.16 to write

$$\frac{J(u, u')}{\tilde{J}(u, u')} \leq \min\{J(u, u'), J(u, u'')\} = |u' - u''| K(u) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{|N(u) \wedge N(u'')|}, \frac{1}{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|} \right\} \lesssim \Lambda(S).$$

The two-dimensional case of Theorem 1.6 may then be strengthened to the following:

**Theorem 4.20** (Improved Sobolev–Stein in the plane). *Suppose that  $s < \frac{1}{2}$ . There is an absolute constant  $c$  such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\widehat{g d\sigma}(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leq c \Lambda(S) \int_S I_{S,2s}(|g|^2, |g|^2)(u)^{1/2} \|X_S w(u, \cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^s(T_u S)} d\sigma(u).$$

A similar, although potentially rather more complicated statement is possible in higher dimensions, and is left to the interested reader.

## 5. ESTIMATING DISTANCES: THE PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.4

We begin with (4.4), and the elementary observation that if  $\pi$  is 2-plane that is normal to  $S$  at a point  $u$ , then by (1.11), it must be close to normal at all points of intersection with  $S$ . More specifically, for  $\tilde{u} \in S$  we have

$$|P_\pi N(\tilde{u})| \geq |P_{(T_u S)^\perp} N(\tilde{u})| = N(u) \cdot N(\tilde{u}) \geq 1/2.$$

It follows by Meusnier's theorem that for such a  $\pi$ , the curvature of the curve  $S \cap \pi$  at a point is comparable to a normal curvature of  $S$  at that same point. This allows us to transfer the curvature quotient of  $S$  to such curves, and we shall appeal to this momentarily.

Now let  $\pi'$  and  $\pi''$  be the normal 2-planes at the point  $u$  that pass through the points  $u'$  and  $u''$  respectively. Let  $x$  be the orthogonal projection of  $u$  onto the plane  $T_u S + \{u'\}$ , and note that  $\{u, u', x\}$  and  $\{u, u'', x\}$  are the vertices of right angled triangles in the 2-planes  $\pi'$  and  $\pi''$  respectively. Next observe that by the triangle inequality and Pythagoras' theorem, it is enough to show that

$$(5.1) \quad |x - u''| \lesssim Q(S)^{1/2} |x - u'|.$$

To see this we write  $S$  as a graph over  $T_u S + \{u'\}$  as follows: let  $\phi_u : T_u S + \{u'\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $x' \mapsto x' + \phi_u(x')N(u)$  is a bijective map from a subset  $U \subset T_u S$  into  $S$ ; see Figure 1. That this is possible, and indeed that  $\phi_u$  is uniquely defined, follows from (1.11) (a point that is elaborated in [14]). Notice that

$$(5.2) \quad \phi_u(u') = 0, \phi_u(x) = |x - u| \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \phi_u(x) = 0,$$

by construction. Assuming that  $N(u) = e_n$ , as we may, the graph condition (1.11) implies that the normal vector  $(\nabla \phi_u, -1)$  lies in some fixed (proper) vertical cone, and so in particular we also have

$$(5.3) \quad |\nabla \phi_u| \lesssim 1.$$

We now apply Taylor's theorem on the line segment  $[x, u']$ , along with (5.2), to obtain

$$|x - u| = \phi_u(x) - \phi_u(u') = \frac{1}{2} k'(u, u') |x - u'|^2,$$

where  $k'(u, u')$  is a quantity comparable to some normal curvature of  $S$  at some point. Here we have used (5.3) along with our initial observation via Meusnier's theorem. By symmetry a similar statement may be made with  $u''$  in place of  $u'$ , from which we deduce that

$$k'(u, u') |x - u'|^2 = k''(u, u'') |x - u''|^2.$$

The inequality (5.1) now follows from the definition of  $Q(S)$  and taking square roots.

Turning to (4.5), we fix  $u$  and exploit the properties of the map  $H := H_\omega = N^{-1} \circ \Phi_\omega$  from Section 6. By the mean value theorem and Claim 6.4,

$$|u - u'| = |H(0) - H(x')| \leq \sup_\theta \|dH_\theta\| \cdot |x'| \leq \sup_\theta \|dH_\theta\| \cdot \frac{|(1 - \tilde{\eta}(x'))x'|}{|1 - \tilde{\eta}(x')|} = \sup_\theta \|dH_\theta\| \cdot \frac{|x' - x''|}{|1 - \tilde{\eta}(x')|},$$

where  $x''$  is such that  $H(x'') = u''$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |u - u'| &\leq \sup_\theta \|dH_\theta\| \cdot \frac{|H^{-1}(H(x')) - H^{-1}(H(x''))|}{|1 - \tilde{\eta}(x')|} \\ &\leq \sup_\theta \|dH_\theta\| \cdot \sup_{\tilde{\theta}} \|dH_{\tilde{\theta}}^{-1}\| \cdot \frac{|H(x') - H(x'')|}{|1 - \tilde{\eta}(x')|} \\ &= \sup_\theta \|dH_\theta\| \cdot \sup_{\tilde{\theta}} \|dH_{\tilde{\theta}}^{-1}\| \cdot \frac{|u' - u''|}{|1 - \tilde{\eta}(x')|}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$|u' - u''| \geq \frac{|1 - \tilde{\eta}(x')|}{\sup_\theta \|dH_\theta\| \cdot \sup_{\tilde{\theta}} \|dH_{\tilde{\theta}}^{-1}\|} \cdot |u - u'|.$$

We also have, for a fixed  $\theta$ ,

$$\|dH_\theta\| \leq \|dN_{\Phi(\theta)}^{-1}\| \cdot \|d\Phi_\theta\| \leq \frac{1}{\inf_{p \in S} \lambda_1(p)} \cdot \|d\Phi_\theta\|_{L^\infty},$$

where  $\inf_{p \in S} \lambda_1(p)$  is the infimum over  $p \in S$  of the smallest eigenvalue  $\lambda_1(p)$  of the shape operator  $dN_p$ . Similarly,

$$\|dH_\theta^{-1}\| \leq \|d\Phi_\theta^{-1}\| \cdot \|dN_{\Phi(\theta)}\| \leq \|d\Phi_\theta^{-1}\|_{L^\infty} \cdot \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p),$$

where  $\sup_{p \in S} \lambda_{n-1}(p)$  is the supremum over  $p \in S$  of the largest eigenvalue  $\lambda_{n-1}(p)$ . Consequently,

$$(5.4) \quad |u' - u''| \gtrsim |1 - \tilde{\eta}(x')| \cdot \frac{\inf_{p \in S} \lambda_1(p)}{\sup_{p \in S} \lambda_{n-1}(p)} \cdot |u - u'| \gtrsim \frac{1}{Q(S)} \cdot |u - u'|,$$

since  $\tilde{\eta} < 0$  by the strict convexity of  $S$ .

## 6. COMPUTING JACOBIANS: THE PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.5

In this section we provide detailed proofs of (4.6), (4.7) and (4.8). The key idea is that the maps  $u \mapsto R_u u'$  and  $u' \mapsto R_u u'$  may be transformed into *outward vector fields* on Euclidean spaces (specifically  $T_{u'} S$  and  $T_u S$  respectively) by conjugating them with a composition of the Gauss map and a suitable stereographic projection. The derivatives of such vector fields have only two eigenspaces, allowing the computation of their Jacobians to be reduced to the identification of just two eigenvalues, one of which has multiplicity  $n - 2$  (see the forthcoming Lemma 6.2). This is manifested in the factor raised to the power  $n - 2$  in the formula (4.6) for  $J$ . We begin by recalling and introducing the notation and geometric objects that will feature in our computations of  $J$  and  $\Delta$ .

- $N : S \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is the Gauss map,  $dN_u : T_u S \rightarrow T_{N(u)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is the shape operator (recall that  $T_u S = T_{N(u)} \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ ), and  $K(u) = \det(dN_u)$  is the Gaussian curvature at  $u \in S$ .
- The formulas of this section will be written in terms of the parameters  $u$ ,  $u'$  and  $u'' = R_u u'$ , which are points on  $S$ . We will denote their images via the Gauss map by  $\omega$ ,  $\omega'$  and  $\omega''$ , respectively.
- For a fixed  $\omega' \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ ,  $\Phi_{\omega'} : \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  denotes the *inverse* of the stereographic projection map with respect to  $-\omega'$ . Explicitly

$$(6.1) \quad \Phi_{\omega'}(x) = \left( \frac{2x}{1 + |x|^2}, \frac{1 - |x|^2}{1 + |x|^2} \right)$$

via the identification  $\mathbb{R}^n = \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp \times \langle \omega' \rangle$ . If  $\omega = \Phi_{\omega'}(x)$ , it follows that

$$(6.2) \quad x = \frac{\omega - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega'}{1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle}.$$

The differential  $(d\Phi_{\omega'})_x : \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp \rightarrow \langle \omega \rangle^\perp$  satisfies

$$(6.3) \quad (d\Phi_{\omega'})_x(x) = \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega - \omega'.$$

The determinants of  $(d\Phi_{\omega'})_x$  and its inverse are, respectively,

$$(6.4) \quad \det((d\Phi_{\omega'})_x) = \left( \frac{2}{1 + |x|^2} \right)^{n-1} = (1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle)^{n-1}$$

and

$$(6.5) \quad \det((d\Phi_{\omega'}^{-1})_\omega) = \left( \frac{1}{1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle} \right)^{n-1}.$$

We refer the reader to Chapter 4 of [34] for further discussion on the properties of these maps.

- For  $\omega$  fixed, set

$$H_\omega = N^{-1} \circ \Phi_\omega.$$

$H_\omega$  will play a crucial role in this section. As we shall see, it allows us to reduce the computations of  $J$  and  $\Delta$  to certain euclidean analogues with simple spectral structure (outward vector fields, as discussed above and alluded to in Remark 4.3).

We are now ready to prove (4.6), (4.7) and (4.8).

**6.1. Computing  $J$ .** The parameter  $u' \in S$  is fixed in this subsection, therefore  $\omega'$  will also be fixed, and we write  $H_{\omega'} = H$  to simplify notation. Define the map  $\Psi_{\omega'} : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  by

$$(6.6) \quad \Psi_{\omega'}(\omega) = N(R_{N^{-1}(\omega)}N^{-1}(\omega')).$$

The parameter  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  will be a variable and we will use  $x \in \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp$  to represent its preimage by the map  $\Phi_{\omega'}$ . Explicitly,

$$x \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\omega'}} \omega \xrightarrow{N^{-1}} u.$$

By (6.6) and the definition of  $J(u, u')$ , along with the fact that the Gaussian curvature  $K(u)$  is the determinant of the shape operator  $dN_u$ , we have

$$(6.7) \quad J(u, u') = \left| \det(d\Psi_{N(u')}N(u)) \right| \frac{K(u)}{K(u')}.$$

The next step is to reduce the computation of the Jacobian determinant  $\det(d\Psi_{N(u')}N(u))$  to one of a much simpler outward vector field  $\varphi$  on the tangent space at  $u'$  (see Lemma 6.2 below). This will be achieved by combining properties of the inverse stereographic projection map  $\Phi_{\omega'}$  with the geometric condition (4.3). To this end we define the map  $\varphi : \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp \rightarrow \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp$  by

$$\varphi(x) := \Phi_{\omega'}^{-1} \circ \Psi_{\omega'} \circ \Phi_{\omega'}(x).$$

**Claim 6.1.** *The vector field  $\varphi : \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp \rightarrow \langle \omega' \rangle^\perp$  is given by*

$$(6.8) \quad \varphi(x) = \eta(x)x,$$

where

$$(6.9) \quad \eta(x) = \frac{\langle x, H_{\omega'}^{-1}(R_{H_{\omega'}(x)}H_{\omega'}(0)) \rangle}{|x|^2} = \frac{\langle x, \Phi_{\omega'}^{-1}(\omega'') \rangle}{|x|^2}.$$

*Proof of Claim 6.1.* By definition of the map  $R_{(\cdot), u'}$ , the normals  $\omega$ ,  $\omega'$  and  $\omega''$  are coplanar, therefore they lie on a great circle. This implies that

$$\varphi(x) = \mu(x)x$$

for some  $\mu(x)$ , which we conclude to be equal to  $\eta(x)$  by taking scalar products with  $x$  on both sides of the equation above.  $\square$

By the chain rule,

$$\det(d\varphi(x)) = \det((d\Phi_{\omega'}^{-1})(\omega'')) \det((d\Psi_{\omega'})(\omega)) \det((d\Phi_{\omega'})(x)),$$

hence

$$\det((d\Psi_{\omega'})(\omega)) = \frac{\det(d\varphi(x))}{\det((d\Phi_{\omega'}^{-1})(\omega'')) \det((d\Phi_{\omega'})(x))}.$$

This implies, by (6.7),

$$(6.10) \quad J(u, u') = \frac{|\det(d\varphi(x))|}{|\det((d\Phi_{\omega'}^{-1})(\omega''))| |\det((d\Phi_{\omega'})(x))|} \frac{K(u)}{K(u')}.$$

We are now in a position to invoke the following elementary lemma, whose proof is left to the reader:

**Lemma 6.2** (Differential structure of an outward vector field). *Let  $\eta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^1$  function and let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  given by*

$$(6.11) \quad \varphi(x) = \eta(x)x.$$

The linear map

$$d\varphi(x) = x(\nabla\eta(x))^\top + \eta(x)I_d$$

has eigenvalues  $\lambda_1(x) = \eta(x)$  and  $\lambda_2(x) = \langle \nabla\eta(x), x \rangle + \eta(x)$  of multiplicity  $(d-1)$  and  $1$ , respectively. The eigenspaces associated to these eigenvalues are

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\lambda_1(x)} &:= \langle \nabla\eta(x) \rangle^\perp, \\ E_{\lambda_2(x)} &:= \langle x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$(6.12) \quad \det(d\varphi(x)) = [\eta(x)]^{d-1} (\langle \nabla\eta(x), x \rangle + \eta(x)).$$

Let us use (6.12) to compute  $\det(d\varphi(x))$ . The eigenvalue  $\lambda_1(x)$  of  $d\varphi(x)$  is

$$\lambda_1(x) = \eta(x) = \frac{\langle x, H^{-1}(R_{H(x)}H(0)) \rangle}{|x|^2},$$

hence, by (6.12), all there is left to do is to compute the eigenvalue  $\lambda_2(x)$  of  $d\varphi(x)$ . By definition of the map  $R_{(\cdot)}u'$ , the vector  $R_u u' - u'$  is in the tangent space of  $S$  at  $u$ . In short,

$$\langle R_u u' - u', N(u) \rangle = 0.$$

Equivalently,

$$(6.13) \quad \langle H(\eta(x)x) - H(0), N(H(x)) \rangle = 0.$$

Differentiating both sides of (6.13) with respect to  $x$ ,

$$0 = d(N \circ H)_x^\top (H(\eta(x)x) - H(0)) + (x \cdot \nabla\eta(x)^\top + \eta(x)I_{n-1})^\top \circ dH_{\eta(x)x}^\top (N \circ H(x)).$$

Taking scalar products on both sides with  $x$  and using that  $N \circ H = \Phi_{\omega'}$ , we have

$$0 = \langle H(\eta(x)x) - H(0), (d\Phi_{\omega'})_x(x) \rangle + \langle dH_{\eta(x)x}^\top (\Phi_{\omega'}(x)), (x \cdot \nabla\eta(x)^\top + \eta(x)I_{n-1})(x) \rangle.$$

By Lemma 6.2,

$$(x \cdot \nabla\eta(x)^\top + \eta(x)I_{n-1})(x) = (\langle \nabla\eta(x), x \rangle + \eta(x))x,$$

and hence

$$\lambda_2(x) = \langle \nabla\eta(x), x \rangle + \eta(x) = -\frac{\langle H(\eta(x)x) - H(0), (d\Phi_{\omega'})_x(x) \rangle}{\langle dH_{\eta(x)x}^\top (\Phi_{\omega'}(x)), x \rangle}.$$

By Lemma 6.2 again,

$$\det(d\varphi(x)) = -[\eta(x)]^{n-2} \frac{\langle H(\eta(x)x) - H(0), (d\Phi_{\omega'})_x(x) \rangle}{\langle dH_{\eta(x)x}^\top (\Phi_{\omega'}(x)), x \rangle}.$$

By (6.10),

$$(6.14) \quad J(u, u') = |\eta(x)|^{n-2} \frac{1}{|\langle dH_{\eta(x)x}^\top (\Phi_{\omega'}(x)), x \rangle|} \frac{|\langle H(\eta(x)x) - H(0), (d\Phi_{\omega'})_x(x) \rangle|}{|\det((d\Phi_{\omega'}^{-1})(\omega''))| |\det((d\Phi_{\omega'})(x))|} \frac{K(u)}{K(u')}.$$

To proceed, we need to understand each factor in the formula above, which is the content of the next claim.

**Claim 6.3.** *The following identities hold:*

$$(6.15) \quad |\eta(x)| = \left| \frac{\langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle}{(1 + \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle)(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle)} \right|;$$

$$(6.16) \quad \langle H(\eta(x)x) - H(0), (d\Phi_{\omega'})_x(x) \rangle = \langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle;$$

$$(6.17) \quad \langle dH_{\eta(x)x}^\top (\Phi_{\omega'}(x)), x \rangle = \frac{1}{\eta(x)} \langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'' - \omega') \rangle.$$

Let us assume Claim 6.3 for the moment and complete the proof of the proposition. By the claim, (6.4) and (6.5),

$$(6.18) \quad \begin{aligned} J(u, u') &= \left| \frac{\langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle}{(1 + \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle)(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle)} \right|^{n-1} \frac{|\langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle|}{|\langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'' - \omega') \rangle|} \frac{|1 + \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle|^{n-1}}{|1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle|^{n-1}} \frac{K(u)}{K(u')} \\ &= \left| \frac{\langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle}{1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle^2} \right|^{n-1} \frac{|\langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle|}{|\langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'' - \omega') \rangle|} \frac{K(u)}{K(u')} \\ &= \left( \frac{(1 - \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)^{n-1} \frac{|\langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle|}{|\langle P_{T_{u''}S} N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'' - \omega') \rangle|} \frac{K(u)}{K(u')}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the facts that  $\langle \omega, v \rangle = \langle P_{T_{u''}S} N(u), v \rangle$  for every  $v \in T_{u''}S$ , and that three coplanar vectors  $\omega, \omega'$  and  $\omega''$  on the sphere satisfy

$$\langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle = (1 - \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We exploit the coplanarity of  $\omega, \omega'$  and  $\omega''$  twice more. First, it implies the existence of  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$(6.19) \quad \omega'' = a\omega + b\omega'.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{|\langle u'' - u', \omega'' \rangle|}{|\langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle|} = \frac{|\langle u'' - u', a\omega + b\omega' \rangle|}{|\langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle|} = |b|,$$

since  $u'' - u'$  is perpendicular to  $N(u) = \omega$ . On the other hand, projecting both sides of (6.19) to  $\langle \omega \rangle^\perp$  gives

$$P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega'' = b P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega' \implies |b| = \frac{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega''|}{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega'|},$$

which in turn implies

$$(6.20) \quad \frac{|\langle u'' - u', \omega'' \rangle|}{|\langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle|} = \frac{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega''|}{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp} \omega'|} \implies |\langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle| = \frac{(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(1 - \langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} |\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle|.$$

Second, the fact that  $\omega, \omega'$  and  $\omega''$  are coplanar also gives us that  $P_{\langle \omega'' \rangle^\perp} \omega'$  and  $P_{\langle \omega'' \rangle^\perp} \omega$  are parallel, therefore

$$(6.21) \quad \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'' - \omega' = P_{\langle \omega'' \rangle^\perp} \omega' = \frac{|P_{\langle \omega'' \rangle^\perp} \omega'|}{|P_{\langle \omega'' \rangle^\perp} \omega|} P_{\langle \omega'' \rangle^\perp} \omega = \frac{(1 - \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(1 - \langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} P_{T_{u''}S} N(u).$$

Likewise, or by symmetry,

$$(6.22) \quad \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega' - \omega'' = P_{\langle \omega' \rangle^\perp} \omega'' = \frac{|P_{\langle \omega' \rangle^\perp} \omega''|}{|P_{\langle \omega' \rangle^\perp} \omega|} P_{\langle \omega' \rangle^\perp} \omega = \frac{(1 - \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} P_{T_{u'}S} N(u).$$

Using (6.20) and (6.21) in (6.18) gives (4.6). We now move to the final part of the argument.

*Proof of Claim 6.3.* By (6.9) and (6.2),

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta(x)| &= \left| \left\langle \frac{\omega - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega'}{1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle}, \frac{\omega'' - \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'}{1 + \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle} \right\rangle \right| \frac{|1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle|^2}{|\omega - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega'|^2} \\ &= \left| \frac{\langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle}{(1 + \langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle)(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle)} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

which verifies (6.15). To establish (6.16), we simply observe that  $H(\eta(x)x) - H(0) = u'' - u'$ , and this together with (6.3) implies that

$$\langle H(\eta(x)x) - H(0), (d\Phi_{\omega'})_x(x) \rangle = \langle u'' - u', \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega - \omega' \rangle = \langle u'' - u', \omega' \rangle,$$

since  $u'' - u'$  is perpendicular to  $\omega$  by definition of  $u''$ . Finally, notice that  $\Phi_{\omega'}(\eta(x)x) = \omega''$  and that a direct computation gives

$$(6.23) \quad (d\Phi_{\omega'})_{\eta(x)x}(x) = \frac{1}{\eta(x)} (\langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'' - \omega').$$

Therefore by definition of  $H$ , the chain rule and (6.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle dH_{\eta(x)x}^\top(\Phi_{\omega'}(x)), x \rangle &= \langle \omega, dH_{\eta(x)x}(x) \rangle \\ &= \langle \omega, dN_{\Phi_{\omega'}(\eta(x)x)}^{-1} \circ (d\Phi_{\omega'})_{\eta(x)x}(x) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\eta(x)} \langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega' \rangle \omega'' - \omega') \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of Claim 6.3.  $\square$

**6.2. Computing  $\Delta$ .** The parameter  $u \in S$  is fixed in this subsection (and therefore so is  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ ), so we lighten notation by writing  $H_\omega = H$ . Arguing as in Section 6.1, define  $\tilde{\Psi}_\omega : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  by

$$(6.24) \quad \tilde{\Psi}_\omega(\omega') = N(R_{N^{-1}(\omega)}N^{-1}(\omega')).$$

Thus,

$$(6.25) \quad \Delta(u, u') = \left| \det \left( d\tilde{\Psi}_{N(u)}(N(u')) \right) \right| \frac{K(u')}{K(u'')}.$$

Recall that  $\omega' \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is a variable now. We will use  $x' \in \langle \omega \rangle^\perp$  to represent its preimage by the map  $\Phi_\omega$ :

$$x' \xrightarrow{\Phi_\omega} \omega' \xrightarrow{N^{-1}} u'.$$

Once more we reduce the computation of  $\det \left( d\tilde{\Psi}_{N(u)}(N(u')) \right)$  to an application of Lemma 6.2. Define  $\tilde{\varphi} : \langle \omega \rangle^\perp \rightarrow \langle \omega \rangle^\perp$  by

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x') := \Phi_\omega^{-1} \circ \tilde{\Psi}_\omega \circ \Phi_\omega(x').$$

**Claim 6.4.**  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is given by

$$(6.26) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(x') = \tilde{\eta}(x')x',$$

where

$$(6.27) \quad \tilde{\eta}(x') = \frac{\langle x', H_\omega^{-1}(R_{H_\omega(0)}H_\omega(x')) \rangle}{|x'|^2} = \frac{\langle x', \Phi_\omega^{-1}(\omega'') \rangle}{|x'|^2}.$$

The proof of Claim 6.4 is similar to the one of Claim 6.1. By the chain rule,

$$\det(d\tilde{\varphi}(x')) = \det((d\Phi_\omega^{-1})(\omega'')) \det((d\tilde{\Psi}_\omega)(\omega')) \det((d\Phi_\omega)(x')),$$

hence

$$\det((d\tilde{\Psi}_\omega)(\omega')) = \frac{\det(d\tilde{\varphi}(x'))}{\det((d\Phi_\omega^{-1})(\omega'')) \det((d\Phi_\omega)(x'))}.$$

This implies, by (6.25), that

$$(6.28) \quad \Delta(u, u') = \frac{|\det(d\tilde{\varphi}(x'))|}{|\det((d\Phi_\omega^{-1})(\omega''))| |\det((d\Phi_\omega)(x'))|} \frac{K(u')}{K(u'')}.$$

We may again compute  $\det(d\tilde{\varphi}(x'))$  using Lemma 6.2. The eigenvalue  $\tilde{\lambda}_1(x')$  of  $d\tilde{\varphi}(x')$  is

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1(x') = \tilde{\eta}(x') = \frac{\langle x', H_\omega^{-1}(R_{H_\omega(0)}H_\omega(x')) \rangle}{|x'|^2},$$

hence we just have to compute the eigenvalue  $\tilde{\lambda}_2(x')$  of  $d\tilde{\varphi}(x')$  and use (6.12). Recall that

$$\langle R_u u' - u', N(u) \rangle = 0.$$

Equivalently,

$$(6.29) \quad \langle H(\tilde{\eta}(x')x') - H(x'), N(H(0)) \rangle = 0.$$

Differentiating both sides of (6.29) with respect to  $x'$  and taking scalar products with  $x'$  as well gives

$$\langle (dH_{\tilde{\varphi}(x')} \circ d\varphi_{x'})^\top(\Phi_\omega(0)), x' \rangle = \langle \omega, dH_{x'}(x') \rangle,$$

which in turn implies that

$$\langle (dH_{\tilde{\varphi}(x')})^\top(\omega), (d\tilde{\varphi}_{x'})(x') \rangle = \langle (dH_{x'})^\top \omega, (x') \rangle = \langle \omega, dH_{x'}(x') \rangle.$$

Using the fact that  $x'$  is an eigenvector of  $d\tilde{\varphi}(x')$  with eigenvalue  $\tilde{\lambda}_2(x')$  and that  $H = N^{-1} \circ \Phi_\omega$  yields

$$\tilde{\lambda}_2(x') = \frac{\langle \omega, dN_{\omega'}^{-1} \circ (d\Phi_\omega)_{x'}(x') \rangle}{\langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1} \circ (d\Phi_\omega)_{\tilde{\eta}(x')x'}(x') \rangle} = \tilde{\eta}(x') \frac{\langle \omega, dN_{\omega'}^{-1}(\langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega' - \omega) \rangle}{\langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega \rangle \omega'' - \omega) \rangle}.$$

By Lemma 6.2 once more,

$$\det(d\tilde{\varphi}(x')) = [\tilde{\eta}(x')]^{n-1} \frac{\langle \omega, dN_{\omega'}^{-1}(\langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega' - \omega) \rangle}{\langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega \rangle \omega'' - \omega) \rangle}.$$

By (6.28),

$$\Delta(u, u') = \frac{1}{|\det((d\Phi_\omega^{-1})(\omega''))| |\det((d\Phi_\omega)(x'))|} |\tilde{\eta}(x')|^{n-1} \frac{|\langle \omega, dN_{\omega'}^{-1}(\langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega' - \omega) \rangle|}{|\langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega \rangle \omega'' - \omega) \rangle|} \frac{K(u')}{K(u'')}.$$

By (6.27),

$$(6.30) \quad \begin{aligned} |\tilde{\eta}(x')| &= \left| \left\langle \frac{\omega' - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega}{1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle}, \frac{\omega'' - \langle \omega'', \omega \rangle \omega}{1 + \langle \omega'', \omega \rangle} \right\rangle \right| \frac{|1 + \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle|^2}{|\omega' - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega|^2} \\ &= \left| \frac{\langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle}{(1 + \langle \omega'', \omega \rangle)(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By (6.4), (6.5), and (6.30),

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(u, u') &= \frac{|\langle \omega', \omega'' \rangle - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle|^{n-1} \left| \frac{1 + \langle \omega'', \omega \rangle}{1 + \langle \omega', \omega \rangle} \right|^{n-1} \frac{|\langle \omega, dN_{\omega'}^{-1}(\langle \omega, \omega' \rangle \omega' - \omega) \rangle|}{|\langle \omega, dN_{\omega''}^{-1}(\langle \omega'', \omega \rangle \omega'' - \omega) \rangle|} \frac{K(u')}{K(u'')}}{\left( \frac{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u'')|} \right)^{n-1} \frac{|\langle P_{T_{u'}S}N(u), (dN_{u'})^{-1}(P_{T_{u'}S}N(u)) \rangle|}{|\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle|} \frac{K(u')}{K(u'')}}} \\ &= \left( \frac{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u'')|} \right)^{n-1} \frac{|\langle P_{T_{u'}S}N(u), (dN_{u'})^{-1}(P_{T_{u'}S}N(u)) \rangle|}{|\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle|} \frac{K(u')}{K(u'')}} \end{aligned}$$

by (6.21), (6.22) and by similar geometric considerations to those in Section 6.1. This establishes (4.7).

**6.3. Relating  $J$  and  $\Delta$ .** Here we establish (4.8), the “switching property” of  $\Delta$ . By (4.6) we have

$$\frac{J(u, u')}{J(u, u'')} = \left( \frac{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u'')|} \right)^{n-2} \frac{|\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle|}{|\langle P_{T_{u'}S}N(u), (dN_{u'})^{-1}(P_{T_{u'}S}N(u)) \rangle|} \frac{|\langle u'' - u', N(u') \rangle|}{|\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle|} \frac{K(u'')}{K(u')}.$$

Using the coplanarity condition (4.3), an elementary argument similar to that leading to (6.20) reveals that

$$\frac{|\langle u'' - u', N(u') \rangle|}{|\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle|} = \frac{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp}N(u')|}{|P_{\langle \omega \rangle^\perp}N(u'')} = \frac{(1 - \langle \omega, \omega' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(1 - \langle \omega, \omega'' \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{|N(u) \wedge N(u')|}{|N(u) \wedge N(u'')|},$$

from which (4.8) follows.

## 7. SURFACE-CARRIED FRACTIONAL INTEGRALS

In this section we establish Lebesgue space bounds on the classical bilinear fractional integrals

$$I_{S,s}(g_1, g_2)(u) := \int_S \frac{g_1(u')g_2(R_u u')}{|u' - R_u u'|^s} J(u, u') d\sigma(u')$$

arising in Section 4.

**Remark 7.1** (Relation to classical fractional integral operators). This is a surface-carried variant of the bilinear fractional integral operator

$$I_s(f_1, f_2)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f_1(x + \frac{y}{2}) f_2(x - \frac{y}{2})}{|y|^s} dy$$

that naturally arises when  $S$  is the paraboloid (see Section 2), and has been studied by several authors; we refer to [28] and [30].

As indicated in Section 4, the presence of the factor  $J$  in the kernel implies that this operator is symmetric – that is,  $I_{S,s}(g_1, g_2) = I_{S,s}(g_2, g_1)$ . It is also natural for geometric reasons, allowing for bounds that are independent of any lower bounds on the curvature of  $S$ . For example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{S,s}(f_1, f_2)\|_1 &= \int_S \int_S \frac{f_1(u')f_2(R_u u')}{|u' - R_u u'|^s} J(u, u') d\sigma(u) d\sigma(u') \\ (7.1) \quad &= \int_S \int_S \frac{f_1(u')f_2(u'')}{|u' - u''|^s} d\sigma(u') d\sigma(u'') \\ &\leq C_s \|f_1\|_2 \|f_2\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_s := \sup_{u \in S} \int_S \frac{d\sigma(u')}{|u - u'|^s}.$$

Evidently  $C_s$  does not depend on any lower bound on the curvature of  $S$ . More generally we have the following:

**Theorem 7.2.** *Let  $0 < s < n - 1$ ,  $q \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , and  $S$  be as above. Then*

$$\|I_{S,s}(g_1, g_2)\|_{L^q(S)} \lesssim Q(S)^{2(n-1)} \|g_1\|_{L^{2q}(S)} \|g_2\|_{L^{2q}(S)},$$

where the implicit constant depends on  $n, s, q$  and the diameter of  $S$ .

In order to prove Theorem 7.2 we adapt the argument of Kenig and Stein [30] from the euclidean setting.

*Proof of Theorem 7.2.* For each dyadic scale  $\lambda \lesssim \text{diam}(S)$  we decompose  $S$  into a collection  $\Theta_\lambda$  of  $\lambda$ -caps  $\theta$ , noting that  $|\theta| \sim \lambda^{n-1}$  for such a cap. Performing a dyadic decomposition and using the embedding  $\ell^q \subset \ell^1$ , for  $q \leq 1$ , we have that (recall that  $u'' = R_u u'$ )

$$\int_S I_{S,s}(g_1, g_2)^q d\sigma(u) \lesssim \sum_{0 < \lambda \lesssim \text{diam}(S)} \lambda^{-qs} \int_S \left( \int_{u' \in S: |u' - u''| \sim \lambda} g_1(u') g_2(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \right)^q d\sigma(u).$$

Next, we fix an arbitrary dyadic scale  $\lambda$  and decompose

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_S \left( \int_{u' \in S: |u' - u''| \sim \lambda} g_1(u') g_2(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \right)^q d\sigma(u) \\ &= \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \int_\theta \left( \int_{u' \in S: |u' - u''| \sim \lambda} g_1(u') g_2(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \right)^q d\sigma(u) \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{(n-1)(1-q)} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \left( \int_\theta \int_{u' \in S: |u' - u''| \sim \lambda} g_1(u') g_2(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') d\sigma(u) \right)^q. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that  $0 < q \leq 1$  once more. Recall that  $|u - u'| \lesssim Q(S)|u' - u''|$  for all  $u, u' \in S$  by Proposition 4.4. Thus if  $u \in \theta \in \Theta_\lambda$  and  $|u' - u''| \sim \lambda$ , then  $|u - u'| \lesssim Q(S)\lambda$  which means that  $u' \in \theta^*$ , where  $\theta^*$  is an  $O(Q(S))$  dilate of  $\theta$ . Similarly,  $u'' \in \theta^*$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_S \left( \int_{u' \in S: |u' - u''| \sim \lambda} g_1(u') g_2(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \right)^q d\sigma(u) \\ & \lesssim \lambda^{(n-1)(1-q)} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \left( \int_S \int_S g_1 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}(u') g_2 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') d\sigma(u'') \right)^q \\ & = \lambda^{(n-1)(1-q)} \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \|g_1 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}\|_{L^1(S)}^q \|g_2 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}\|_{L^1(S)}^q \\ & \lesssim \lambda^{(n-1)(1-q)} \left( \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \|g_1 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}\|_{L^1(S)}^{2q} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \|g_2 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}\|_{L^1(S)}^{2q} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \lambda^{(n-1)(1-q)} (Q(S)\lambda)^{(n-1)\frac{2q}{p}} \left( \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \|g_1 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}\|_{L^p(S)}^{2q} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_\lambda} \|g_2 \mathbb{1}_{\theta^*}\|_{L^p(S)}^{2q} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $p \geq 1$ , where we have used that

$$\int_S \int_S f(u) g(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u) d\sigma(u') = \|f\|_{L^1(S)} \|g\|_{L^1(S)}.$$

Since  $q \geq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $p = 2q$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_S \left( \int_{u' \in S: |u' - u''| \sim \lambda} g_1(u') g_2(u'') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \right)^q d\sigma(u) \\ & \lesssim \lambda^{(n-1)(1-q)} (Q(S)\lambda)^{(n-1)\frac{2q}{p}} Q(S)^{n-1} \|g_1\|_{L^p(S)}^q \|g_2\|_{L^p(S)}^q \\ & = \lambda^{(n-1)(1-q) + (n-1)\frac{2q}{p}} Q(S)^{2q(n-1)} \|g_1\|_{L^p(S)}^q \|g_2\|_{L^p(S)}^q, \end{aligned}$$

since the set of dilated caps  $\{\theta^* : \theta \in \Theta_\lambda\}$  covers  $S$  with a  $Q(S)^{n-1}$  overlap factor. The geometric series converges as long as  $-qs + (n-1)(1-q + \frac{2q}{p}) > 0$ . Since  $p = 2q$ , this is equivalent to  $s < n-1$ .  $\square$

## 8. SURFACE-CARRIED MAXIMAL OPERATORS

Recall from Section 4 that the geometric Wigner distribution  $W_S(g, g)$  possesses the marginal properties (4.10) and (4.11). In the (superficially) more general polarised form these are the identities

$$(8.1) \quad \int_S W_S(g_1, g_2)(u, P_{T_u S} x) d\sigma(u) = \widehat{g_1 d\sigma}(x) \overline{\widehat{g_2 d\sigma}(x)}$$

and

$$(8.2) \quad \int_{T_u S} W_S(g_1, g_2)(u, y) dy = g_1(u) \overline{g_2(u)}$$

respectively. While (8.1) is an elementary consequence of Fubini's theorem and the definition of the Jacobian  $J$ , the property (8.2) appears to be a little more delicate in general. In particular, for  $g_1, g_2$  merely in  $L^2$ , the integral in identity (8.2) should be interpreted as a suitable pointwise limit – see the forthcoming Proposition 8.4. As may be expected, a maximal analogue of the bilinear fractional integral operator  $I_{S,s}$  of Section 7 naturally arises in our analysis. For locally integrable functions  $f_1, f_2 : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $0 < \delta < 1$  we define the “averaging” operator

$$A_{S,\delta}(f_1, f_2)(u) = \delta^{-(n-1)} \int_{|u' - R_u u'| < \delta} f_1(u') f_2(R_u u') J(u, u') d\sigma(u'),$$

and maximal operator

$$M_S(f_1, f_2)(u) = \sup_{0 < \delta < 1} A_{S, \delta}(f_1, f_2)(u).$$

**Remark 8.1** (Relation to classical maximal operators). The operator  $M_S$  is a surface-carried variant of the classical bi(sub)-linear Hardy–Littlewood maximal operator

$$M(f_1, f_2)(x) = \sup_{\delta > 0} \frac{1}{|B(0, \delta)|} \int_{B(0, \delta)} f_1\left(x + \frac{y}{2}\right) f_2\left(x - \frac{y}{2}\right) dy$$

on a Euclidean space.

We shall need the following estimate:

**Theorem 8.2.** *If  $S$  is smooth, strictly convex and has finite curvature quotient  $Q(S)$ , then*

$$(8.3) \quad M_S : L^2(S) \times L^2(S) \rightarrow L^{1, \infty}(S).$$

*Proof.* We begin by using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to write

$$\begin{aligned} A_{S, \delta}(f_1, f_2)(u) &\leq \left( \delta^{-(n-1)} \int_{|u' - R_u u'| < \delta} f_1(u')^2 J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left( \delta^{-(n-1)} \int_{|u' - R_u u'| < \delta} f_2(R_u u')^2 J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Making the change of variables  $R_u u' = u''$  in the second factor above, using Proposition 4.5, and the fact that  $R_u u'' = u'$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|u' - R_u u'| < \delta} f_2(R_u u')^2 J(u, u') d\sigma(u') &= \int_{|u'' - R_u u''| < \delta} f_2(u'')^2 J(u, u') \Delta(u, u'') d\sigma(u'') \\ &= \int_{|u'' - R_u u''| < \delta} f_2(u'')^2 J(u, u'') d\sigma(u'') \\ &= \int_{|u' - R_u u'| < \delta} f_2(u')^2 J(u, u') d\sigma(u'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$M_S(f_1, f_2)(u) \leq M_S^1(f_1^2)(u)^{1/2} M_S^1(f_2^2)(u)^{1/2},$$

where

$$M_S^1(f)(u) := \sup_{0 < \delta < 1} \delta^{-(n-1)} \int_{|u' - R_u u'| < \delta} f(u') J(u, u') d\sigma(u').$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda |\{u \in S : M_S(f_1, f_2)(u) > \lambda\}| &\leq \lambda |\{u \in S : M_S^1(f_1^2)(u) M_S^1(f_2^2)(u) > \lambda^2\}| \\ &\leq \lambda |\{u \in S : M_S^1(f_1^2)(u) > \varepsilon \lambda\}| \\ &\quad + \lambda |\{u \in S : M_S^1(f_2^2)(u) > \varepsilon^{-1} \lambda\}| \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We claim that the sublinear operator  $M_S^1$  is of weak-type 1-1, and assuming this momentarily we have

$$\lambda |\{u \in S : M_S(f_1, f_2)(u) > \lambda\}| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \|f_1\|_2^2 + \varepsilon \|f_2\|_2^2$$

uniformly in  $\varepsilon$ . Optimising in  $\varepsilon$  now yields the claimed weak-type bound on the bi-sublinear operator  $M_S$ . A similar argument in a Euclidean context may be found in [28].

It remains to establish that  $M_S^1 : L^1(S) \rightarrow L^{1, \infty}$ , and we do this by applying the well-known abstract form of the classical Hardy–Littlewood maximal theorem presented in [39]. To this end we let  $B_\delta(u) = \{u' \in S : \rho(u, u') < \delta\}$ , the ball in  $S$  centred at  $u$  with respect to the function  $\rho(u, u') := |u' - R_u u'|$ . By Proposition 4.4 it follows that  $\rho$  is a quasi-distance, as defined in [39] (Page 10). Specifically, we may quickly verify that (i)  $\rho(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y$ , (ii)  $\rho(x, y) \leq c\rho(y, x)$ , and

(iii)  $\rho(x, y) \leq c(\rho(x, z) + \rho(y, z))$ , for some positive constant  $c$  depending on  $Q(S)$ . By the change of variables (4.18) and an application of Proposition 4.16,

$$(8.4) \quad |B_\delta(u)| = \int_{|\xi| \leq \delta} \tilde{J}(u, u'(\xi))^{-1} d\xi \leq \delta^{n-1},$$

so that

$$M_S^1 f(u) \leq \sup_{0 < \delta < 1} \frac{1}{|B_\delta(u)|} \int_{B_\delta(u)} f(u') J(u, u') d\sigma(u').$$

Arguing as in the proof of (4.30), we have

$$J(u, u') \lesssim Q(S)^{\frac{5(n-2)}{2}} \frac{|u'' - u'|}{|N(u'') - N(u)|} \sup_p \lambda_{n-1}(p),$$

which by a further use of Proposition 4.4 and the mean value theorem applied to the Gauss map, shows that  $J(u, u')$  is, up to a dimensional constant, bounded from above by a power of  $Q(S)$ . Consequently,

$$M_S^1 f(u) \lesssim \sup_{0 < \delta < 1} \frac{1}{|B_\delta(u)|} \int_{B_\delta(u)} f(u') d\sigma(u'),$$

where the implicit constant is permitted to depend on  $Q(S)$ . It remains to show that the surface measure on  $S$  is doubling with respect to the family of balls  $B_\delta(u)$ , as we may then apply the abstract Hardy–Littlewood maximal theorem of [39] (see Page 37). By (8.4) it suffices to show that  $|B_\delta(u)| \geq cQ(S)^{n-1}\delta^{n-1}$ , for some dimensional constant  $c$ . However, this follows from Proposition 4.4 since

$$B_\delta(u) \supseteq \{u' \in S : |u' - u| \lesssim Q(S)\delta\}.$$

□

**Remark 8.3** ( $L^p$  estimates for  $M_S$ ). A minor modification of the arguments in the proof of Theorem 8.2 (a use of Hölder’s inequality in place of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality) show that  $M_S : L^{p_1}(S) \times L^{p_2}(S) \rightarrow L^q(S)$  whenever  $p_1, p_2, q > 1$  and  $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{q}$ . Implicitly, and as in the statement of Theorem 8.2, the bounds here depend on the dimension and  $Q(S)$ .

Equipped with the above maximal theorem we may now clarify the marginal property (8.2). While we expect that (8.2) (suitably interpreted) holds for all of the submanifolds  $S$  that we consider in this paper, our approach seems to require the additional assumption that

$$(8.5) \quad \lim_{u' \rightarrow u} (dR_u)_{u'} \text{ exists.}$$

We note that (8.5) requires some interpretation since for each  $u' \neq u$ , the map  $(dR_u)_{u'} : T_{u'}S \rightarrow T_{u''}S$ , and the limit should be interpreted as a linear transformation of  $T_uS$ . One way to do this is to parametrise  $S$  by  $T_uS$ , upon which the map  $R_u$  may be parametrised by a map  $y_u$  on the fixed domain  $T_uS$ . We clarify this technical point in the arguments that follow. The local statement (8.5) appears to be an extremely mild assumption. It is straightforward to verify for parabolic  $S$ , and since a smooth strictly convex surface is locally parabolic (by Taylor’s theorem), one might reasonably expect it to be verifiable in general.

**Proposition 8.4.** *Let  $S$  be smooth and strictly convex. Suppose  $\chi$  is a Schwartz function on  $T_uS$  with  $\chi(0) = 1$ , and  $\chi_r(y) = \chi(y/r)$  for each  $r > 0$ . Then for compactly supported  $g_1, g_2 \in L^2(S)$ ,*

$$\int_{T_uS} W_S(g_1, g_2)(u, y) \chi_r(y) dy \rightarrow g_1(u) \overline{g_2(u)}$$

as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  for almost every  $u \in S$ . Moreover, if  $g_1, g_2$  are continuous then this convergence holds at all points  $u$ .

Before we turn to the proof of Proposition 8.4, we state a lemma whose (somewhat technical) proof we leave to the end of the section.

**Lemma 8.5.** *If the limit (8.5) exists then for each  $u \in S$ ,*

$$\lim_{u' \rightarrow u} \tilde{J}(u, u') = 2^{n-1}$$

and

$$\lim_{\substack{u' \rightarrow u \\ u' - u'' \in \langle \omega \rangle}} J(u, u') = 2^{n-1}$$

for each  $\omega \in T_u S \setminus \{0\}$ .

*Proof of Proposition 8.4.* We begin by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T_u S} W_S(g_1, g_2)(u, y) \chi_r(y) dy &= \int_{T_u S} \int_S g_1(u') \overline{g_2(R_u u')} e^{-2\pi i y \cdot (u' - R_u u')} J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \chi_r(y) dy \\ (8.6) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \int_S g_1(u') \overline{g_2(R_u u')} \hat{\chi}_r(u' - R_u u') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \\ &=: \mathcal{A}_{S,r}(g_1, g_2)(u). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\hat{\chi}$  is a bump function, it follows that  $\mathcal{M}_S(g_1, g_2)(u) \lesssim M_S(|g_1|, |g_2|)(u)$  where

$$\mathcal{M}_S(g_1, g_2)(u) := \sup_{r>1} |\mathcal{A}_{S,r}(g_1, g_2)(u)|.$$

Consequently

$$(8.7) \qquad \qquad \qquad \mathcal{M}_S : L^2(S) \times L^2(S) \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}(S),$$

by Theorem 8.2. Proposition 8.4 requires us to show that

$$(8.8) \qquad \qquad \qquad \mathcal{A}_{S,r}(g_1, g_2)(u) \rightarrow g_1(u) \overline{g_2(u)} \text{ for almost every } u \in S.$$

The first step, which uses a minor variant of a standard argument in the setting of sublinear maximal operators (see for example [40]), is to use the maximal estimate (8.7) to reduce to the case of continuous  $g_1, g_2$ . We leave this classical exercise to the reader. Suppose now that  $g_1, g_2$  are continuous functions. It suffices to show that

$$(8.9) \qquad \qquad \qquad \mathcal{A}_{S,r}(1, 1)(u) := \int_S \hat{\chi}_r(u' - R_u u') J(u, u') d\sigma(u') \rightarrow 1.$$

Invoking the change of variables (4.18) and using polar coordinates in  $T_u S$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{S,r}(1, 1)(u) &= \int_{T_u S} \hat{\chi}_r(\xi) \frac{J(u, u'(\xi))}{\tilde{J}(u, u'(\xi))} d\xi \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-2}(T_u S)} r^{n-1} \hat{\chi}(rt\omega) \frac{J(u, u'(t\omega))}{\tilde{J}(u, u'(t\omega))} d\sigma(\omega) t^{n-2} dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-2}(T_u S)} \hat{\chi}(s\omega) \frac{J(u, u'(r^{-1}s\omega))}{\tilde{J}(u, u'(r^{-1}s\omega))} d\sigma(\omega) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{S}^{n-2}(T_u S)$  denotes the unit sphere in  $T_u S$ . The limit (8.9) now follows by Lemma 8.5 since  $u'(r^{-1}s\omega) \rightarrow u$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , while  $u'(r^{-1}s\omega) - R_u u'(r^{-1}s\omega) = r^{-1}s\omega \in \langle \omega \rangle$ .  $\square$

It remains to prove Lemma 8.5.

*Proof of Lemma 8.5.* We begin by clarifying the hypothesis (8.5), and showing that this limit must actually equal  $-I$ , where  $I$  denotes the identity on  $T_u S$ . This reflects a crucial “limiting symmetry” of the configuration of points  $u, u', u''$  as  $u' \rightarrow u$ . By translation and rotation invariance we may suppose that  $u = 0$  and  $S = \{(x', \phi(x')) : x' \in X\}$ , for some smooth real-valued function  $\phi$  on a subset  $X$  of  $T_u S$  satisfying  $\nabla\phi(0) = 0$  and  $\text{Hess}(\phi)(x') \succ_{pd} 0$  for all  $x'$ . The map  $R := R_u$  then takes the form  $R(x', \phi(x')) = (x'', \phi(x''))$ , for some unique  $x'' \in T_u S$  satisfying

$$(8.10) \qquad \qquad \qquad \phi(x'') = \phi(x')$$

and

$$(8.11) \quad \frac{\nabla\phi(x'')}{|\nabla\phi(x'')|} = -\frac{\nabla\phi(x')}{|\nabla\phi(x')|}.$$

Observe that (8.10) follows by (4.2) and (8.11) is a consequence of (4.27). Writing  $x'' = y(x')$  allows us to interpret (8.5) as the existence of the limit  $dy_0 := \lim_{x' \rightarrow 0} dy_{x'} : T_u S \rightarrow T_u S$ . In order to show that  $dy_0 = -I$ , we fix  $v \in T_u S$  and let  $x'_k \rightarrow 0$  be a sequence in  $T_u S$  satisfying

$$\frac{\nabla\phi(y(x'_k))}{|\nabla\phi(y(x'_k))|} = v$$

for all  $k$ . This sequence exists as the Gauss maps  $\tilde{N}$  of the sections  $\mathcal{S}_{u,u'}$  (see (4.26)) are bijections. Differentiating (8.10) at the points of this sequence, we have

$$dy(x'_k)^\top (\nabla\phi(y(x'_k))) = \nabla\phi(x').$$

Using (8.11),

$$dy(x'_k)^\top \left( \frac{\nabla\phi(x'_k)}{|\nabla\phi(x'_k)|} \right) = -\frac{|\nabla\phi(x'_k)|}{|\nabla\phi(y(x'_k))|} \frac{\nabla\phi(x'_k)}{|\nabla\phi(x'_k)|},$$

which implies

$$(8.12) \quad dy(x'_k)^\top (v) = -\frac{|\nabla\phi(x'_k)|}{|\nabla\phi(y(x'_k))|} v$$

for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By the mean-value inequality,

$$\frac{|\nabla\phi(x'_k)|}{|\nabla\phi(y(x'_k))|} \leq \frac{\sup \|\text{Hess } \phi\|_\infty}{\inf \|\text{Hess } \phi\|_\infty} \frac{|x'_k|}{|y(x'_k)|} \leq \frac{\sup \|\text{Hess } \phi\|_\infty}{\inf \|\text{Hess } \phi\|_\infty} \frac{1}{\|dy(c_k)\|_\infty}$$

for some  $c_k$  with  $c_k \rightarrow 0$ . On the other hand,  $y(y(x'_k)) = x'_k$  (recall that  $R_u(R_u u') = u'$ ), hence  $dy(y(x'_k)) \circ dy(x'_k) = I$ , which gives  $dy_0^2 = I$ , therefore  $\|dy(c_k)\|_\infty$  does not approach 0 and the sequence

$$\frac{|\nabla\phi(x'_k)|}{|\nabla\phi(y(x'_k))|}$$

is bounded. By passing to a subsequence and by taking limits, we conclude from (8.12) that

$$dy_0^\top (v) = -Lv$$

for some positive real number  $L$  and for all  $v \in T_u S$ . On the other hand, since  $dy_0^2 = I$ , the only possible eigenvalues of  $dy_0$  are  $\pm 1$ , hence  $dy_0 = -I$ . Finally, taking the limit as  $u' \rightarrow u$  in the first identity of (4.29) gives

$$(8.13) \quad \lim_{u' \rightarrow u} \tilde{J}(u, u') = 2^{n-1}.$$

Turning to the limiting identity for  $J$ , we first establish some bounds relating to the limiting arrangements of the points  $u, u', u''$  and their normals  $N(u), N(u'), N(u'')$ , beginning with

$$(8.14) \quad u' + u'' - 2u = o(|u - u'|).$$

To see this (recalling that we are supposing  $u = 0$ ) observe that  $u' + u'' = (x' + y(x'), 2\phi(x'))$ , and since  $\phi(x') = O(|x'|^2)$ , it remains to show that  $h(x') := x' + y(x') = o(|x'|)$ . By the mean value theorem it suffices to observe that  $dh_{x'} = I + dy_{x'} = o(1)$  as  $x' \rightarrow 0$ , since  $dy_{x'} \rightarrow -I$ . A similar, albeit lengthier argument reveals that

$$(8.15) \quad N(u') + N(u'') - 2N(u) = o(|u - u'|).$$

Recalling the formula for  $J(u, u')$ , we observe first that the factor

$$\frac{|N(u') \wedge N(u'')|}{|N(u') \wedge N(u)|} = \frac{2|N(u') \wedge N(u)| + o(|u' - u|)}{|N(u') \wedge N(u)|} \rightarrow 2$$

as  $u' \rightarrow u$ . Here we are also using (1.11), which tells us that  $|N(u') \wedge N(u)| \sim |u' - u|$ . It remains to show that for each unit vector  $\omega \in T_u S$ ,

$$(8.16) \quad \left| \frac{\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}(P_{T_{u''}S}N(u)) \rangle} \right| \rightarrow 2$$

as  $u' \rightarrow u$  with  $u' - u'' \in \langle \omega \rangle$ . Noting that  $\langle u'' - u', N(u'') \rangle = \langle u'' - u', P_{T_{u''}S}N(u'') \rangle$ , by (8.14) we are reduced to showing that

$$\lim_{\substack{u' \rightarrow u \\ u' - u'' \in \langle \omega \rangle}} \frac{\langle u'' - u, P_{T_{u''}S}N(u'') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u''}S}N(u), (dN_{u''})^{-1}P_{T_{u''}S}N(u) \rangle} = 1.$$

By symmetry, we may replace  $u''$  by  $u'$  here, so that the objective is to show that

$$(8.17) \quad \lim_{\substack{u' \rightarrow u \\ u' - u'' \in \langle \omega \rangle}} \frac{\langle u' - u, P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u'}S}N(u), (dN_{u'})^{-1}P_{T_{u'}S}N(u) \rangle} = 1.$$

To this end we Taylor expand  $N(u')$  about 0 via the parametrisation  $u' = (x', \phi(x')) =: \Phi(x')$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N(u') &= N \circ \Phi(x') = N \circ \Phi(0) + d(N \circ \Phi)_0 x' + O(|x'|^2) \\ &= N(u) + (dN)_u \circ (d\Phi)_0 x' + O(|x'|^2) \\ &= N(u) + (dN)_u x' + O(|x'|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $(d\Phi)_{x'} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \nabla_{n-1}\phi(x') & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\nabla\phi(0) = 0$ . Thus, in view of the fact that  $|x'| = O(|u' - u|)$  we have

$$x' = (dN)_u^{-1}(N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)).$$

The numerator of (8.17) now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u' - u, P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') \rangle &= \langle P_{T_{u'}S}(u' - u), P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') \rangle \\ &= \langle x', P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') \rangle \\ &= \langle (dN)_u^{-1}(N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)), P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') = N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2),$$

and so

$$\langle u' - u, P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') \rangle = \langle (dN)_u^{-1}(N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)), (N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)) \rangle.$$

This is now similar to the denominator of (8.17). In fact,

$$P_{T_{u'}S}N(u) = -(N(u') - N(u)) + O(|u' - u|^2),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\langle u' - u, P_{T_{u'}S}N(u') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u'}S}N(u), (dN_{u'})^{-1}P_{T_{u'}S}N(u) \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\langle (dN)_u^{-1}(N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)), (N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)) \rangle}{\langle (dN)_{u'}^{-1}(N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)), (N(u') - N(u) + O(|u' - u|^2)) \rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, from (8.15) we have

$$N(u') - N(u) = \frac{1}{2}(N(u') - N(u'')) + o(|u - u'|),$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\langle u' - u, P_{T_u S} N(u') \rangle}{\langle P_{T_{u'} S} N(u), (dN_{u'})^{-1} P_{T_{u'} S} N(u) \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\langle (dN_u)^{-1} (N(u') - N(u'')) + o(|u' - u|), (N(u') - N(u'')) + o(|u' - u|) \rangle}{\langle (dN_{u'})^{-1} (N(u') - N(u'')) + o(|u' - u|), (N(u') - N(u'')) + o(|u' - u|) \rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if

$$\lim_{\substack{u' \rightarrow u \\ u' - u'' \in \langle \omega \rangle}} \frac{N(u') - N(u'')}{|N(u') - N(u'')|}$$

exists, then (8.17) follows. Here we have also appealed to the fact that

$$|N(u') - N(u'')| = |(dN)_u(u' - u'') + O(|u - u'|^2)| \gtrsim |u - u'|.$$

Arguing similarly using Taylor's theorem, we also have

$$N(u'') - N(u) = (dN)_u x'' + O(|x''|^2),$$

from which it follows that

$$N(u') - N(u'') = (dN)_u x' - (dN)_u x'' + O(|x'|^2) + O(|x''|^2) = (dN)_u(u' - u'') + O(|u - u'|^2),$$

and so

$$\frac{N(u') - N(u'')}{|N(u') - N(u'')|} = \frac{(dN)_u(u' - u'') + O(|u - u'|^2)}{|(dN)_u(u' - u'')| + O(|u - u'|^2)} = \frac{(dN)_u(\omega) + O(|u - u'|)}{|(dN)_u(\omega)| + O(|u - u'|)},$$

which converges (to  $(dN)_u \omega / |(dN)_u \omega|$ ) as  $u' \rightarrow u$  with  $u' - u'' \in \langle \omega \rangle$ , as required.  $\square$

## 9. TOMOGRAPHIC CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section we show that the explicit geometric Wigner distributions from Section 4 may be constructed *tomographically* from the corresponding extension operators, at least when  $n = 2$ . For the submanifolds  $S$  considered in Section 4, we saw that the natural tomographic transform is the  $S$ -parametrised X-ray transform  $X_S f(u, y) := X f(N(u), y)$ . Here  $X$  denotes the standard X-ray transform and  $N$  the Gauss map of  $S$ . We remark that if the Gauss map is bijective, such as when  $S$  is strictly convex and closed, the operator  $X_S$  is easily seen to inherit the inversion formula

$$c_n X_S^* K(-\Delta_y)^{1/2} X_S f = f$$

from the classical inversion formula for  $X$ , where  $K(u)$  is the Gaussian curvature of  $S$  at a point  $u$  (acting here multiplicatively). This suggests the following:

**Proposition 9.1.** *If  $S$  is a strictly convex smooth curve in the plane then*

$$K(u)(-\Delta_y)^{1/2} X_S(|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2)(u, y) = W_S(g, g)(u, y).$$

**Remark 9.2** (Phase-space tomographic methods in optics). This spatial tomographic construction, which in the particular case of the circle is somewhat implicit in [14], appears to be quite different from the *phase-space* tomographic constructions of Wigner distributions that have proved effective in optics. There it is observed that the phase-space X-ray transform applied to the Wigner distribution (referred to as the Radon–Wigner transform) identifies its marginal distributions in all directions, and that these marginals are natural hybrids of the coordinate marginals, involving the fractional Fourier transform. The Wigner distribution is then (re)constructed by an application of the classical (left) inverse X-ray transform; see for example [16], [2].

**Remark 9.3.** There is a subtlety that we have glossed over in the statement of Proposition 9.1. In general  $X_S(|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2)$  is not well defined for  $g \in L^2(S)$  when  $n = 2$ , either in a pointwise sense (unless there is a suitable transversality property satisfied – see [14]), or as an element of  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . This may already be seen when  $S = \mathbb{S}^1$  and  $g \equiv 1$ , as then  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}(x)|^2$  is comparable to  $(1 + |x|)^{-1}$  on sufficiently large portions of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . However, as we shall see in the proof of Proposition 9.1, the

composition  $(\Delta_y)^{1/2}X_S(|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2)$  may be seen to be well defined (thanks to the strict convexity of  $S$ ) via the defining property

$$(9.1) \quad \mathcal{F}_y((-\Delta_y)^{1/2}X_S f)(u, \xi) = |\xi| \widehat{f}(\xi); \quad \xi \in T_u S.$$

For  $n \geq 3$ , this subtlety disappears as  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by the Stein–Tomas restriction theorem provided  $K$  is nonvanishing. However, the identity in Proposition 9.1 fails to hold, and so the tomographic data  $K(u)(-\Delta_y)^{1/2}X_S(|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2)$  gives rise to an *alternative* representation of  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2$  via  $X_S^*$ . As will become apparent in the proof of Proposition 9.1, this tomographic data may be interpreted as an “average” over all possible Wigner distributions of  $g$  – see Remark 9.4.

*Proof.* A routine (distributional) argument using (9.1) and the strict convexity of  $S$  reveals that

$$(9.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (-\Delta_y)^{1/2}X_S(|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2)(u, y) &= \int_{T_u S} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot y} \mathcal{F}_y((-\Delta_y)^{1/2}X_S(|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2))(u, \xi) d\xi \\ &= \int_{T_u S} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot y} |\xi| (gd\sigma) * (\widehat{gd\sigma})(\xi) d\xi \\ &= \int_S \int_S g(u') \overline{g(u'')} e^{2\pi i (u' - u'') \cdot y} |u' - u''| \delta((u' - u'') \cdot N(u)) d\sigma(u'') d\sigma(u'), \end{aligned}$$

which is well-defined as  $S$  has nonvanishing Gaussian curvature (it being compact and strictly convex). Now, for fixed  $u, u'$  the function  $u'' \mapsto (u' - u'') \cdot N(u)$  vanishes if and only if either  $u'' = u'$  or  $u'' = R_u u'$ , as defined in Section 4, and so it remains to establish the formula

$$(9.3) \quad \int_S |u' - u''| \delta((u' - u'') \cdot N(u)) d\sigma(u'') = \frac{|u' - R_u u'|}{|N(u) \wedge N(R_u u')|}$$

whenever  $u' \neq u$ ; see Remark 4.6. Making the change of variables  $u''' = u'' - R_u u'$ , and using  $\mathcal{H}^1$  to denote 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure in the plane, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_S |u' - u''| \delta((u' - u'') \cdot N(u)) d\sigma(u'') \\ &= \int_{S - \{R_u u'\}} |u' - R_u u' - u''| \delta(u'' \cdot N(u)) d\mathcal{H}^1(u''') \\ &= |u' - R_u u'| \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \mathcal{H}^1(\{u''' \in (S - \{R_u u'\}) : |u''' \cdot N(u)| < \varepsilon\}), \end{aligned}$$

from which (9.3) follows from the smoothness of  $S$  by elementary geometric considerations.  $\square$

**Remark 9.4** (Higher dimensions). Recall from Section 4 that for  $n \geq 3$  there are many different  $S$ -carried Wigner distributions that one may define for the purposes of the phase-space representation (1.5) – the point  $R_u u' \in S$  may be defined in many ways. Further, since  $X_S^*$  is linear, any (additive) average of such distributions also gives rise to a phase-space representation of  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2$ . With this in mind, the expression (9.2) for the tomographic data may be interpreted as an average over all possible Wigner distributions of  $g$ . This average is poorly behaved relative to our preferred Wigner distribution in some important respects. In particular,  $(-\Delta_y)^{1/2}X_S(|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2)(u, \cdot) \in \dot{H}^{-s}(T_u S)$  for a smaller range of exponents  $s$  than is true for  $W_S(g, g)$ , and so our approach to Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 fails when  $n \geq 3$  if the Wigner distribution is switched for the tomographic data; see [12] for an explicit counterexample in the setting of the sphere. This reflects an important nondegeneracy in our specific choice of the point  $R_u u'$  in Section 4 (see Remark 4.3). In contrast, the tomographic data may be used effectively in contexts where it seems to be difficult to define a Wigner distribution, such as when the surface  $S$  is replaced with a fractal set – see [24].

**Remark 9.5** (Stein’s inequality as a lower bound on the X-ray transform). Stein’s inequality (1.2) may of course be interpreted as a certain *lower bound* on the X-ray transform  $X_S$ . Here we make

some contextual remarks relating to this in the setting of the paraboloid, where the corresponding conjectural inequality (2.6) takes the form

$$(9.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\widehat{u}_0(v)|^2 dv.$$

Somewhat similar-looking lower bounds may be obtained from the *adjoint Loomis–Whitney inequality* introduced in [15]. Arguing as in [15] (Section 8) it follows that

$$(9.5) \quad C(|\widehat{u}_0|^2) \|w\|_{L^p_{x,t}} \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}^r |\widehat{u}_0(v)|^2 dv \right)^{1/r}$$

whenever  $0 < p, q \leq 1$ ,  $r > 0$  and  $\frac{1}{d+1} \left( \frac{1}{q} - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{d} \left( \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right)$ . Here

$$C(|\widehat{u}_0|^2) := \left( \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d+1}} \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ v_1 & \cdots & v_{d+1} \end{pmatrix} \right|^{r \left( \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right)} |\widehat{u}_0(v_1)|^2 \cdots |\widehat{u}_0(v_{d+1})|^2 dv \right)^{1/r}.$$

Of course (9.5), while superficially similar, is numerologically very different from (9.4), and also phenomenologically:  $L^p$  norms below  $L^1$  capture spread rather than concentration. It was observed in [11] (see also [14]) that the expression  $C(|\widehat{u}_0|^2)$  has a space-time formulation in terms of  $u$ . This further emphasises the parallels between (9.4) and (9.5). For example, raising (9.5) to the  $r$ th power, setting  $r = q$  and taking a limit as  $p \rightarrow 0$  one obtains

$$(9.6) \quad \left( \int \left| \bigwedge_{j=1}^{d+1} \nabla u(x_j, t_j) \right|^2 d\lambda(x, t) \right)^{1/(d+1)} |\text{supp } w|^{\frac{d}{d+1}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\text{supp } \rho^* w(\cdot, v)| |\widehat{u}_0(v)|^2 dv.$$

Here  $d\lambda$  denotes Lebesgue measure on the subspace  $(x_1, t_1) + \cdots + (x_{d+1}, t_{d+1}) = 0$  of  $(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})^{d+1}$ . The factor  $|\text{supp } \rho^* w(\cdot, v)|$  is a measure of the visibility of  $w$  in the space-time direction  $(-v, 1)$ , making (9.6) a certain “visibility” version of (9.4). We note that the estimate (9.5) requires that  $w$  be nonnegative (see Remark 8.4 of [15]), revealing another point of contact with Stein’s conjecture (which also requires nonnegativity; see [13]). Similar remarks may be made for more general surfaces  $S$  and are left to the interested reader.

## 10. APPLICATIONS TO FLANDRIN’S CONJECTURE

The phase-space formulation of the parabolic Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture (2.7) (see also [21]), namely

$$(10.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) \rho^* w(x, v) dx dv \lesssim \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ v \in \text{supp } (\widehat{u}_0)}} \rho^* w(x, v) \|u_0\|_2^2,$$

is closely related to a conjecture of Flandrin [25] from time-frequency analysis. A recent formulation of this conjecture states that

$$(10.2) \quad \iint_K W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) dx dv \lesssim \|u_0\|_2^2$$

uniformly over all convex subsets  $K$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . This is a weakened form of the original conjecture that was made with constant 1, following a recent counterexample in [22]; we refer to [32] for this and related conjectural inequalities for the classical Wigner distribution, along with a number of supporting results.

In this section we show that the basic methods of this paper are effective towards Flandrin’s conjecture (in the form (10.2)) by establishing a version of it in the plane involving an arbitrarily small loss in terms of the Lebesgue measure of  $K$ . We then show how Flandrin’s conjecture (in the form (10.2)) implies a special case of the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture for the paraboloid.

**Theorem 10.1.** *For each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a constant  $C_\varepsilon < \infty$  such that*

$$(10.3) \quad \iint_K W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) dx dv \leq C_\varepsilon |K|^\varepsilon \|u_0\|_2^2$$

for all convex subsets  $K$  of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

*Proof.* Arguing as in Section 2, and indeed Sections 3 and 4, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the duality of the homogeneous Sobolev spaces  $\dot{H}^s$  and  $\dot{H}^{-s}$ , we have

$$(10.4) \quad \iint_K W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) dx dv \leq \int_{\pi_2(K)} \|W(u_0, u_0)(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^{-s}} \|\mathbb{1}_K(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^s} dv,$$

for each  $s < \frac{1}{2}$ , where  $\pi_2(K) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is the projection of  $K$  onto the  $v$ -axis. We now compute both of these Sobolev norms explicitly.

To compute the  $\dot{H}_x^s$  norm, we fix  $v$  and observe that by the convexity of  $K$ ,

$$\mathbb{1}_K(\cdot, v) = \mathbb{1}_{[a, b]}$$

almost everywhere for some real numbers  $a, b$ . Since

$$|\widehat{\mathbb{1}}_{[a, b]}(\xi)| = \left| \frac{\sin(\pi(b-a)\xi)}{\pi\xi} \right|,$$

$$\|\mathbb{1}_K(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^s}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\xi|^{2s} \left( \frac{\sin(\pi(b-a)\xi)}{\pi\xi} \right)^2 d\xi = (b-a)^{1-2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\xi|^{2s} \left( \frac{\sin(\pi\xi)}{\pi\xi} \right)^2 d\xi \leq c_s \text{diam}_1(K)^{1-2s},$$

with finite constant  $c_s$  since  $s < \frac{1}{2}$ . Here  $\text{diam}_1(K)$  is the diameter of  $K$  in the first coordinate direction.

To compute the  $\dot{H}_x^{-s}$  norm we argue as in Section 2, and indeed Sections 3 and 4, to write

$$\|W(u_0, u_0)(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^{-s}} = I_{2s}(|\widehat{u}_0|^2, |\widehat{u}_0|^2)(v)^{1/2},$$

where  $I_s$  is given by (2.22). We estimate this term further by applying the weak-type estimate

$$(10.5) \quad \|I_s(g, g)\|_{L^{q, \infty}(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^2,$$

from [30] (see also [29]), which holds whenever  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $\frac{1}{q} = 1 + s$ . In particular, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and writing  $s_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$ , we have

$$\|I_{2s_\varepsilon}(g, g)^{1/2}\|_{L^{q_\varepsilon, \infty}(\mathbb{R})} = \|I_{2s_\varepsilon}(g, g)\|_{L^{q_\varepsilon/2, \infty}(\mathbb{R})}^{1/2} \leq C_\varepsilon \|g\|_1, \quad q_\varepsilon := \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

With this in mind, we apply the Lorentz–Hölder inequality in (10.4) to write

$$\iint_K W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) dx dv \leq \|I_{2s_\varepsilon}(|\widehat{u}_0|^2, |\widehat{u}_0|^2)^{1/2}\|_{L^{q_\varepsilon, \infty}(\mathbb{R})} \|\|\mathbb{1}_K(x, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^{s_\varepsilon}}\|_{L^{q'_\varepsilon, 1}(\pi_2(K))},$$

where  $\pi_2(K)$  is the projection of  $K$  onto the  $v$ -axis. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_K W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) dx dv &\leq C_\varepsilon \|\widehat{u}_0\|_1 \|\|\mathbb{1}_K(x, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^{s_\varepsilon}}\|_{L^{q'_\varepsilon, 1}(\pi_2(K))} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \|\widehat{u}_0\|_1 \|\|\mathbb{1}_K(x, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^{s_\varepsilon}}\|_{L^\infty} |\pi_2(K)|^{\frac{1}{q'_\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon c_{s_\varepsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{diam}_1(K)^{\frac{1-2s_\varepsilon}{2}} |\pi_2(K)|^{\frac{1}{q'_\varepsilon}} \|u_0\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

It remains to observe that

$$\frac{1 - 2s_\varepsilon}{2} = \frac{1}{q'_\varepsilon} = \varepsilon,$$

and appeal to the fact that  $\text{diam}_1(K)$  is comparable to the average diameter  $|K|/|\pi_2(K)|$  uniformly over all convex bodies  $K$  by an application of Brunn’s theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 10.2** (Higher dimensions). Our proof of Theorem 10.1 does not extend to higher dimensions, at least readily. This may already be seen if  $K$  is the Euclidean unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ , since its  $d$ -dimensional sections, also being Euclidean balls, fail to belong to  $\dot{H}^s$  whenever  $s \geq 1/2$ ; see [39]. Evidently, a routine extension of our argument would require such control for all  $s < d/2$ . For further discussion of Sobolev norms of indicator functions we refer to [23].

**Remark 10.3** (Inequalities of Flandrin type for surface-carried Wigner distributions). Our proof of Theorem 10.1 reveals that the convexity hypothesis on  $K$  may be weakened to the requirement that the sections  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : (x, v) \in K\}$  are intervals for each  $v \in \mathbb{R}$ , provided we replace the measure of  $K$  with the diameter of  $K$  in (10.3). As such our argument should extend to Flandrin-type inequalities of the form

$$\iint_K W_S(g, g) \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2(S)}^2$$

for the surface-carried Wigner distributions  $W_S$  of Section 4, on the assumption that  $K \subseteq TS$  is such that  $\{v \in T_u S : (u, v) \in K\}$  is an interval for each  $u \in S$ . This would require a weak-type addition to Theorem 7.2, analogous to Theorem 1(b) in [30], and would introduce some dependence on the curvature quotient  $Q(S)$ .

We conclude this section by establishing a simple direct connection between the Mizohata–Takeuchi and Flandrin conjectures, although with one caveat: that the support condition on the right hand side of the parabolic Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture (2.7) (or equivalently (10.1)) is dropped. This leads to the weaker “undirected” Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture

$$(10.6) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \|\rho^* w\|_\infty \|u_0\|_2^2.$$

**Proposition 10.4.** *If Flandrin’s conjecture (in the form (10.2)) is true then the undirected Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture (10.6) is true for space-time weight functions  $w$  that are convex in the spatial variable.*

*Proof.* We begin by observing that if  $w$  is a convex function in the spatial variable then  $\rho^* w$  is a convex function. This is immediate since whenever  $(x_\lambda, v_\lambda) = \lambda(x_1, v_1) + (1 - \lambda)(x_2, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^* w(x_\lambda, v_\lambda) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} w(\lambda(x_1 - 2tv_1) + (1 - \lambda)(x_2 - 2tv_2), t) dt \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\lambda w(x_1 - 2tv_1, t) + (1 - \lambda)w(x_2 - 2tv_2, t)) dt \\ &= \lambda \rho^* w(x_1, v_1) + (1 - \lambda) \rho^* w(x_2, v_2) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $0 < \lambda < 1$ . Applying the layer-cake representation,

$$(10.7) \quad \rho^* w(x, v) = \int_0^{\|\rho^* w\|_\infty} \mathbb{1}_{K(s)}(x, v) ds,$$

where  $K(s) = \{(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d : \rho^* w(x, v) \geq s\}$ , it follows from the convexity of  $K(s)$  for each  $s$ , Fubini’s theorem and Flandrin’s conjecture (10.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) \rho^* w(x, v) dx dv \\ &= \int_0^{\|\rho^* w\|_\infty} \left( \iint_{K(s)} W(u_0, u_0)(x, v) dx dv \right) ds \\ &\lesssim \|\rho^* w\|_\infty \|u_0\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 11. QUESTIONS

Here we collect a number of questions, some concrete and some more speculative.

**Question 11.1** (Bilinear restriction theorems from Mizohata–Takeuchi). Recall from Remark 1.2 that the finiteness of  $\text{MT}(S)$  for suitable  $S$  may be seen to imply both the (endpoint)  $L^2 \rightarrow L^4$  linear restriction theorem (the Stein–Tomas restriction theorem) and the (endpoint)  $L^2 \times L^2 \times L^2 \rightarrow L^1$  trilinear restriction conjecture in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Does it similarly imply the (endpoint)  $L^2 \times L^2 \rightarrow L^{5/3}$  bilinear restriction conjecture in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ? See [42].

**Question 11.2** (Strengthening the parabolic Sobolev–Mizohata–Takeuchi inequality). For nonnegative weights  $w$ , can one strengthen (2.24) to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}} |u(x, t)|^2 w(x, t) dx dt \lesssim \sup_{v \in \text{supp}(\widehat{u}_0)} \|\rho^* w(\cdot, v)\|_{\dot{H}_x^s} \|u_0\|_2^2,$$

as predicted by (2.7)? See [13] for a discussion of the role of positivity in relation to the support of  $\widehat{u}_0$ .

**Question 11.3** (Tomographic constructions of Wigner distributions in higher dimensions). In Section 9 we saw that geometric Wigner distributions may be constructed tomographically from  $|\widehat{gd\sigma}|^2$  when  $n = 2$  using the X-ray transform. Might there be a similar tomographic construction of a Wigner distribution that functions in all dimensions, perhaps involving the Radon transform?

**Question 11.4** (Fractional Stein and Mizohata–Takeuchi inequalities). Are there interesting fractional forms of the inequalities (2.6) or (2.7) obtained by considering an oblique phase-space marginal of the Wigner distribution in place of (2.2)? See Remark 9.2 on phase-space tomography.

**Question 11.5** (Flandrin’s conjecture with an  $\varepsilon$ -loss in higher dimensions). May the statement of Theorem 10.1 be extended to dimensions  $d > 1$ ?

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. V. Ahlfors, *Lectures on quasiconformal mappings*, second edition, American Mathematical Society University Lecture Series Volume 38, (2006).
- [2] M. A. Alonso, *Wigner functions in optics: describing beams as ray bundles and pulses as particle ensembles*, *Advances in Optics and Photonics* Vol. 3, Issue 4, 272–365 (2011).
- [3] J. A. Barceló, J. Bennett, A. Carbery, *A note on localised weighted estimates for the extension operator*, *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* **84** (2008), 289–299.
- [4] J. A. Barceló, A. Ruiz, L. Vega, *Weighted estimates for the Helmholtz equation and consequences*, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, Vol. **150** (1997), 356–382.
- [5] D. Beltran, *A Fefferman–Stein inequality for the Carleson operator*, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **34** (2018), 221–244.
- [6] D. Beltran, J. Bennett, *Subdyadic square functions and applications to weighted harmonic analysis*, *Adv. Math.* **307** (2017), 72–99.
- [7] D. Beltran, L. Vega *Bilinear identities involving the  $k$ -plane transform and Fourier extension operators*, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **150** (2020), 3349–3377.
- [8] J. Bennett, N. Bez, C. Jeavons, N. Pattakos, *On sharp bilinear Strichartz estimates of Ozawa–Tsutsumi type*, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **69**, **2** (2017), 1–18.
- [9] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, F. Soria, A. Vargas, *A Stein conjecture for the circle*, *Math. Ann.* **336** (2006), 671–695.
- [10] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, T. Tao, *On the multilinear restriction and Keakeya conjectures*, *Acta Math.* **196** (2006), 261–302.
- [11] J. Bennett, M. Iliopoulou, *A multilinear extension identity on  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , *Math. Res. Lett.* **25** (2018), 1089–1108.
- [12] J. Bennett, S. Nakamura, *Tomography bounds for the Fourier extension operator and applications*, *Math. Ann.* **380** (2021), 119–159.
- [13] J. Bennett, S. Nakamura, I. Oliveira, *Weighted Strichartz estimates for the Schrödinger equation: euclidean versus periodic*, in preparation.
- [14] J. Bennett, S. Nakamura, S. Shiraki, *Tomographic Fourier extension identities for submanifolds of  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , to appear in *Selecta Math.*
- [15] J. Bennett, T. Tao, *Adjoint Brascamp–Lieb inequalities*, preprint 2023.
- [16] J. Bertrand, P. Bertrand, *A tomographic approach to Wigner’s function*, *Found. Phys.* **17**, 397–405 (1987).

- [17] A. Carbery, T. Hanninen, S. Valdimarsson, *Disentanglement, Multilinear Duality and Factorisation for non-positive operators*, to appear in Analysis and PDE.
- [18] A. Carbery, M. Iliopoulou, H. Wang, *Some sharp inequalities of Mizohata–Takeuchi-type*, to appear in Rev. Mat. Iberoam.
- [19] A. Carbery, E. Romera, F. Soria, *Radial weights and mixed norm estimates for the disc multiplier*, J. Funct. Anal. **109**, 52–75 (1992).
- [20] A. Carbery, F. Soria, *Pointwise Fourier inversion and localisation in  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **3** (special issue), 847–858 (1997).
- [21] S. Dendrinos, A. Mustata, M. Vitturi, *A restricted 2-plane transform related to Fourier Restriction for surfaces of codimension 2*, to appear in Analysis and PDE.
- [22] B. Delourme, T. Duyckaerts, N. Lerner, *On Integrals Over a Convex Set of the Wigner Distribution*, J. Four. Anal. Appl. **26** (2020).
- [23] D. Faraco, K. Rogers, *The Sobolev norm of characteristic functions with applications to the Calderón inverse problem*, Q. J. Math. **64** (2013), 133–147.
- [24] M. Ferrante, Different perspectives on the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture, University of Birmingham PhD thesis, in preparation.
- [25] P. Flandrin, *Maximum signal energy concentration in a time-frequency domain*, Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust. **4** (1988), 2176–2179.
- [26] G. B. Folland, Harmonic Analysis in Phase Space, Annals of Mathematics Studies Volume 122, 1989.
- [27] C. Gneiting, T. Fischer, K. Hornberger, *Quantum phase-space representation for curved configuration spaces*, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 062117 – Published 30 December 2013; Erratum Phys. Rev. A **106**, 069904 (2022).
- [28] L. Grafakos, *On multilinear fractional integrals*, Stud. Math. **102** (1992), 49–56.
- [29] L. Grafakos, N. Kalton, *Some remarks on multilinear maps and interpolation*, Math. Ann. **319** (2001), 151–180.
- [30] C. Kenig, E. M. Stein, *Multilinear estimates and fractional integration*, Math. Res. Lett. **6** (1999), 1–15.
- [31] K. Kowalski and K. Lawniczak, *Wigner function for the quantum mechanics on a sphere*, Ann. Phys. **457** (2023).
- [32] N. Lerner, *Integrating the Wigner distribution on subsets of the phase space*, Mem. Eur. Math. Soc. **12** (2024).
- [33] E. Lieb, *Integral bounds for radar ambiguity functions and Wigner distributions*, J. Math. Phys. **31**, 594–599 (1990).
- [34] E. H. Lieb, M. Loss, Analysis, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **14**, American Mathematical Society 2001.
- [35] T. Ozawa, Y. Tsutsumi, *Space-time estimates for null gauge forms and nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Differential Integral Equations **11** (1998), 201–222.
- [36] J.C. Petrucci, M.A. Alonso, *The Wigner function in optics*, The Optics Encyclopedia (Wiley VCH, 2015).
- [37] F. Planchon, L. Vega, *Bilinear virial identities and applications*, Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup., **42** (2009), 263–292.
- [38] E. M. Stein, *Some problems in harmonic analysis*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Williamstown, Mass., (1978), 3–20.
- [39] E. M. Stein, Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals, Princeton University Press 1993.
- [40] E. M. Stein, G. Weiss, An Introduction to Fourier Analysis on Euclidean Spaces, Princeton University Press 1971.
- [41] B. Stovall, *Waves, Spheres, and Tubes. A Selection of Fourier Restriction Problems, Methods, and Applications*, Not. Amer. Math. Soc., **66** (2019), 1013–1022.
- [42] T. Tao, *A sharp bilinear restriction estimate for paraboloids*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **13** (2003), 1359–1384.
- [43] L. Vega, *Bilinear virial identities and oscillatory integrals*, Harmonic analysis and partial differential equations, 219–232, Contemp. Math., 505, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [44] E. Wigner, *On the Quantum Correction For Thermodynamic Equilibrium*, Phys. Rev. **40**, 749–759 (1932).

(Jonathan Bennett) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE WATSON BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM, EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM, B15 2TT, ENGLAND.

*Email address:* J.Bennett@bham.ac.uk

(Susana Gutiérrez) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE WATSON BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM, EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM, B15 2TT, ENGLAND.

*Email address:* S.Gutierrez@bham.ac.uk

(Shohei Nakamura) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, TOYONAKA, OSAKA 560-0043, JAPAN.

*Email address:* srmkn@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp

(Itamar Oliveira) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE WATSON BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM, EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM, B15 2TT, ENGLAND.

*Email address:* i.oliveira@bham.ac.uk, oliveira.itamar.w@gmail.com