

KNUDSEN BOUNDARY LAYER EQUATIONS FOR FULL RANGES OF CUTOFF COLLISION KERNELS: MAXWELL REFLECTION BOUNDARY WITH ALL ACCOMMODATION COEFFICIENTS IN $[0,1]$

NING JIANG AND YI-LONG LUO*

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove the existence and uniqueness of the Knudsen layer equation imposed on Maxwell reflection boundary condition with full ranges of cutoff collision kernels and accommodation coefficients (i.e., $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$, respectively) in the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ framework. Moreover, the solution enjoys the exponential decay $\exp\{-cx^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}} - c|v|^2\}$ for some $c > 0$. We first verify a so-called Nondissipative lemma to deal with the nondissipative boundary condition. In order to study the general angular cutoff collision kernel $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, we should introduce a (x, v) -mixed weight σ . Then a so-called spatial-velocity indices iteration approach is developed to shift the higher power x -polynomial weights to $|v|$ -polynomial weights. We also find a weak macroscopic damping mechanism to avoid adding an artificial damping.

KEYWORDS. Knudsen layer equation, Maxwell reflection boundary condition, exponential decay, existence; uniqueness

MSC2020. 35Q20, 76P05, 35M32, 35B45, 35A01, 35A02

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

1.1. The description of the problem. When studying the hydrodynamic limits of the scaled Boltzmann equation in the domain with boundary, there is an essential kinetic boundary layer equation, called the Knudsen layer equation, will be generated, see [1, 9, 14, 15, 19, 20] for instance. In this paper, we consider the Knudsen layer equation over $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$ with the Maxwell boundary condition at $x = 0$:

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x f + \mathcal{L}f = S, \\ f(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)f(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w f(0, v) + f_b(v), \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{KL})$$

where $S = S(x, v) \in \text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L})$, $f_b(v) = 0$ if $v_3 < 0$. At $x = 0$, we define an external normal vector $n(0) = (0, 0, -1)$. $R_0 v = v - 2(n(0) \cdot v)n(0) = (v_1, v_2, -v_3)$ represents the specular reflection at $x = 0$. $f(0, R_0 v)$ then characterizes the specular reflection effect at the boundary $x = 0$. The operator $\mathcal{D}_w f(0, v)$ is the diffusive reflection operator, which is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_w f(0, v) = \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) f(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv'. \quad (1.1)$$

Here $M_w(v)$ is the Maxwellian of the boundary with the expression

$$M_w(v) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{T_w}} \frac{1}{(2\pi T_w)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \exp\left[-\frac{|v - u_w|^2}{2T_w}\right],$$

where $T_w > 0$ is the temperature of the boundary, and $u_w = (u_{w,1}, u_{w,2}, u_{w,3}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $u_{w,3} = 0$ is the velocity of the boundary. Remark that $M_w(v)$ satisfies

$$\int_{v_3 > 0} v_3 M_w(v) dv = 1,$$

* Corresponding author July 4, 2024.

which means that the particles absorbed by the boundary will be completely released by the way of Gaussian distribution. The constant $\alpha_* \in [0, 1]$ is the accommodation coefficient weighting the specular reflection effect and the diffusive reflection effect.

The symbol \mathcal{L} is the linearized Boltzmann collision operator $\mathcal{B}(F, F)$ around the Maxwellian

$$\mathfrak{M}(v) = \frac{\rho}{(2\pi T)^{3/2}} \exp\left[-\frac{|v-\mathbf{u}|^2}{2T}\right],$$

where $\rho, T > 0$ and $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\mathbf{u}_3 = 0$ are all constant. More precisely, the Boltzmann collision operator $\mathcal{B}(F, F)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}(F, F) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (F' F'_* - F F_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* . \quad (1.2)$$

Here $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^2$ is a unit vector, $d\omega$ is the rotationally invariant surface integral on \mathbb{S}^2 , while F'_* , F' , F_* and F are the number density $F(\cdot)$ evaluated at the velocities v'_* , v' , v_* and v respectively, i.e.,

$$F'_* = F(v'_*), \quad F' = F(v'), \quad F_* = F(v_*), \quad F = F(v).$$

Here (v'_*, v') are the velocities after an elastic binary collision between two molecules with velocities (v_*, v) before the collision, or vice versa. Since both momentum and energy are conserved during the elastic collision, v'_* and v' can be expressed in terms of v_* and v as

$$v'_* = v_* - [(v_* - v) \cdot \omega] \omega, \quad v' = v + [(v_* - v) \cdot \omega] \omega, \quad (1.3)$$

where the unit vector $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^2$ is parallel to the deflections $v'_* - v_*$ and $v' - v$, and is therefore perpendicular to the plane of reflection. In the collision term $\mathcal{B}(F, F)$, $F'_* F'$ is the gain term, while $F_* F$ is called the loss term.

By Grad's work [10], the collision kernel $b(\omega, v_* - v)$ has the factored form

$$b(\omega, v_* - v) = \tilde{b}(\theta) |v_* - v|^\gamma, \quad \cos \theta = \frac{(v_* - v) \cdot \omega}{|v_* - v|}, \quad -3 < \gamma \leq 1, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\tilde{b}(\theta)$ satisfies the small deflection cutoff condition

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \tilde{b}(\theta) d\omega = 1, \quad 0 \leq \tilde{b}(\theta) \leq \tilde{b}_0 |\cos \theta| \quad (1.5)$$

for some constant $\tilde{b}_0 > 0$. The cases $-3 < \gamma < 0$ and $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ are respectively referred to as the ‘‘soft’’ and ‘‘hard’’ potential cases. In particular, $\gamma = 0$ is the Maxwell potential case, and $\gamma = 1$ is the hard sphere case, in which $\tilde{b}(\theta) = \tilde{b}_0 |\cos \theta|$.

Considering the perturbation $F = \mathfrak{M} + \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}} f$ around \mathfrak{M} , the linearized Boltzmann collision operator \mathcal{L} is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}f &= -\mathfrak{M}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) [\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{M}, \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}} f) + \mathcal{B}(\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}} f, \mathfrak{M})] \\ &= \nu(v) f(v) - K f(v), \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

where the collision frequency $\nu(v)$ is defined by

$$\nu(v) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \mathfrak{M}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \stackrel{(1.5)}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_* - v|^\gamma \mathfrak{M}(v_*) dv_*, \quad (1.7)$$

and the operator $K f(v)$ can be decomposed into two parts:

$$K f(v) = -K_1 f(v) + K_2 f(v). \quad (1.8)$$

Here the loss term $K_1 f(v)$ is

$$K_1 f(v) = \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} f(v_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \quad (1.9)$$

and the gain term $K_2 f(v)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 f(v) &= \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} [\mathfrak{M}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v') f(v') + \mathfrak{M}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) f(v'_*)] \mathfrak{M}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \\ &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} [\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) f(v') + \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') f(v'_*)] \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

where the last equality is derived from the collisional invariant $\mathfrak{M}(v)\mathfrak{M}(v_*) = \mathfrak{M}(v')\mathfrak{M}(v'_*)$. Remark that the collision frequency is invariant under the specular reflection operator, i.e.,

$$\nu(R_0 v) = \nu(v). \quad (1.11)$$

The null space $\text{Null}(\mathcal{L})$ of the operator \mathcal{L} is spanned by the basis

$$\psi_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}, \quad \psi_i = \frac{v_i - u_i}{\sqrt{\rho T}} \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3), \quad \psi_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6\rho}} \left(\frac{|v-u|^2}{T} - 3 \right) \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}. \quad (1.12)$$

The basis is orthonormal in the Hilbert space $L^2 := L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Namely,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_i \psi_j dv = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.$$

Let $\text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L})$ be the orthogonal space of $\text{Null}(\mathcal{L})$ in L^2 , namely,

$$\text{Null}(\mathcal{L}) \oplus \text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L}) = L^2.$$

We define the projection $\mathcal{P} : L^2 \rightarrow \text{Null}(\mathcal{L})$ by

$$\mathcal{P}f = \sum_{i=0}^4 a_i(f) \psi_i, \quad a_i(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f \psi_i dv, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (1.13)$$

1.2. Overdetermined far-field condition $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0$. As inspired in Theorem 3.3 of [2], the function $f(x, v)$ solving the problem

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x f + \mathcal{L}f = S, & x > 0, \\ f(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*) f(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w f(0, v) + f_b(v) \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

will enjoy the asymptotic behavior

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = a_\infty \psi_0(v) + b_{1\infty} \psi_1(v) + b_{2\infty} \psi_2(v) + b_{3\infty} \psi_3(v) + c_\infty \psi_4(v) \quad (1.15)$$

for some constants $a_\infty, b_{1\infty}, b_{2\infty}, b_{3\infty}$ and c_∞ , where the functions $\psi_i(v)$ are given in (1.12). In other words, the far-field condition $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0$ in (KL) is overdetermined for general source terms $S \in \text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L})$ and f_b .

However, the far-field condition $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0$ is necessary in proving the hydrodynamic limits (including the compressible/incompressible limits) of the Boltzmann equation with Maxwell reflection boundary condition. In order to overcome the overdetermination of zero far-field condition, some further assumptions on the source terms $S \in \text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L})$ and f_b are required. Now we introduce a so-called *admissible sources set* ASS_{α_*} defined by

$$\text{ASS}_{\alpha_*} = \left\{ (S, f_b); S(x, v) \in \text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L}) \text{ and } f_b(v) \text{ in (1.14) such that } \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0 \right\}. \quad (1.16)$$

As shown in [6], one knows that for $\alpha_* = 0$,

$$\text{ASS}_0 = \left\{ (S, f_b); S(x, v) \in \text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L}), \int_{v_3 > 0} v_3 \psi_i(v) f_b(v) dv = 0, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 4 \right\} \neq \emptyset.$$

For the case $0 < \alpha_* \leq 1$, by employing the isotropic properties of \mathcal{L} (see Appendix B of [19] and Appendix A.2 of [20]), one can find some special expressions of $S(x, v)$ and $f_b(v)$ belonging to the so-called admissible sources set ASS_{α_*} . For example, special representations of S and f_b

can be found in Problems (106)-(109), Section 5.2 of [1], and Problems (4.16)-(4.17), Section 4 of [11]. Therefore, by summarizing above arguments, we know that for $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$,

$$\text{ASS}_{\alpha_*} \neq \emptyset. \quad (1.17)$$

From now on, we will assume $(S, f_b) \in \text{ASS}_{\alpha_*}$ such that the far-field condition

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0$$

holds.

1.3. Toolbox. In this subsection, we will collect all notations, functions spaces and energy functionals that will be utilized in whole paper.

1.3.1. Notations. We employ the symbol $A \lesssim B$ meaning that $A \leq CB$ for some harmless constant $C > 0$. Moreover, $A \sim B$ denotes by $C_1B \leq A \leq C_2B$ for some harmless constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. As inspired in [3], we introduce the following (x, v) -mixed weight

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x, v) = & 5(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}} \left[1 - \Upsilon \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma}} \right) \right] \\ & + \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{(1+|v-u|)^{1-\gamma}} + 3|v-u|^2 \right) \Upsilon \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

for small $\delta > 0$ and large $l > 0$ to be determined, where the cutoff function $\Upsilon(\cdot)$ is defined in (1.52). This weight can also be employed in the works [24, 25, 26]. For any small $\hbar > 0$ to be determined, denote by

$$f_\sigma := e^{\hbar\sigma} f \quad (\forall f = f(x, v)). \quad (1.19)$$

We also introduce a weighted function

$$w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) = (1 + |v|)^\beta e^{\vartheta|v-u|^2} \quad (1.20)$$

for the constants $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\vartheta \geq 0$. Then, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote a weight function

$$z_\alpha(v) = \begin{cases} |v_3|^\alpha, & |v_3| < 1, \\ 1, & |v_3| \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.21)$$

We remark that the weights $\sigma(x, v)$ and $w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v)$ satisfy

$$\sigma(x, R_U v) = \sigma(x, v), \quad w_{\beta, \vartheta}(R_U v) = w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v), \quad z_\alpha(R_U v) = z_\alpha(v) \quad \text{for } U = 0, A, \quad (1.22)$$

due to $u_3 = 0$. Here $R_U v = v - 2[n(U) \cdot v]n(U)$, $n(A) = (0, 0, 1)$.

We now define the numbers \mathbf{n}_γ as follows:

$$\mathbf{n}_\gamma = \begin{cases} 0, & -3 < \gamma < 1, \\ d > 1, & \gamma = 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.23)$$

Furthermore, the constant β_γ is given by

$$\beta_\gamma = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq \gamma \leq 1, \\ -\frac{\gamma}{2}, & \text{if } -3 < \gamma < 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.24)$$

Moreover, the constant β_\star is introduced by

$$\beta_\star = \beta_\gamma - m(1 - \gamma)/2 + N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}), \quad (1.25)$$

and the integer $N_0 \geq 1$ is such that

$$2\mathbf{n}_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{3-\gamma} - N_0 \leq -\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}. \quad (1.26)$$

Here $m \in \mathbb{R}$ will be determined later. At the end, we introduce

$$\mathbf{m}_\gamma = \begin{cases} \min\{-1, -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\}, & \text{for } -3 < \gamma < 1, \\ 0, & \text{for } \gamma = 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.27)$$

We remark that the above numbers will be utilized while designing the various weighted norms.

1.3.2. *Functions spaces.* Based on the above weights, we introduce the spaces $X_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}^\infty(A)$ and $Y_{m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}^\infty(A)$ over $(x, v) \in \Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$ for $m, \beta, \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23) and $0 < A \leq \infty$ with the weighted norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{A; \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} &:= \|(\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} = \sup_{(x,v) \in \Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} |(\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) f(x, v)|, \\ \llbracket f \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} &:= \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.28)$$

respectively. For simplicity, we denote by

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} := \|f\|_{\infty; \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}, \quad \llbracket f \rrbracket_{m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} := \llbracket f \rrbracket_{\infty; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} \quad (1.29)$$

On the boundary $\Sigma := \partial\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$, we introduce the spaces L_Σ^∞ , $X_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma}^\infty$ and $Y_{m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma}^\infty$ endowed with the norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L_\Sigma^\infty} &:= \sup_{(x,v) \in \Sigma} |f(x, v)|, \quad \|f\|_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} := \|w_{\beta, \vartheta} (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} f\|_{L_\Sigma^\infty}, \\ \llbracket f \rrbracket_{m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} &:= \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} f\|_{L_\Sigma^\infty}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.30)$$

respectively. Let L_x^p and L_v^p with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ be the standard L^p space over $x \in \Omega_A$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, respectively. Moreover, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_v^p(L_x^p)}$ is defined by

$$\|\cdot\|_{L_v^p(L_x^p)} = \|(\|f(\cdot, v)\|_{L_x^p})\|_{L_v^p}.$$

We also introduce the space $L_x^\infty L_v^2$ endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} = \sup_{x \in \Omega_A} \|f(x, \cdot)\|_{L_v^2}.$$

Furthermore, the space $L_{x,v}^2$ over $\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$ endows with the norm

$$\|f\|_A = \left(\iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} |f(x, v)|^2 dv dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.31)$$

If $A = \infty$, one simply denotes by

$$\|f\| := \|f\|_\infty = \left(\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |f(x, v)|^2 dv dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

One introduces the out normal vector $n(0) = (0, 0, -1)$ and $n(A) = (0, 0, 1)$ of the boundary $\partial\Omega_A$. Define

$$\Sigma_\pm = \{(x, v) \in \Sigma; \pm n(x) \cdot v > 0\}.$$

We then define the space $L_{\Sigma_\pm}^2$ over $(x, v) \in \Sigma_\pm$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L_{\Sigma_\pm}^2}^2 &= \|f\|_{L_{\Sigma_\pm^0}^2}^2 + \|f\|_{L_{\Sigma_\pm^A}^2}, \quad \|f\|_{L_{\Sigma_\pm^0}^2} = \int_{\pm v_3 < 0} |f(0, v)|^2 dv, \\ \|f\|_{L_{\Sigma_\pm^A}^2} &= \int_{\pm v_3 > 0} |f(A, v)|^2 dv. \end{aligned} \quad (1.32)$$

1.3.3. *Energy functionals.* We now introduce total energy functional as

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda^A(g) = \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g) + \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g) + \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g) + \mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g) \quad (1.33)$$

for $0 < A \leq \infty$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, where the weighted $L_{x,v}^\infty$ energy functional $\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g) = \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}, \quad (1.34)$$

the cross energy functional $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g)$ connecting the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ and $L_{x,v}^2$ estimates is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g) = \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_A + \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \partial_x g\|_A, \quad (1.35)$$

the spatial-velocity indices iteration energy functional $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g)$ is expressed by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g) = \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)} - \frac{i}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*(N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2}),\vartheta} g\|_A, \quad (1.36)$$

and the weighted $L_{x,v}^2$ energy functional $\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(g)$ is represented by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(g) &= \sqrt{1-\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} g\|_A \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]} (\|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} g\|_A + \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} g\|_A), \end{aligned} \quad (1.37)$$

Here the constants n_γ , β_γ , β_\star and N_0 are given in (1.23), (1.24), (1.25) and (1.26), respectively.

We further introduce the source energy functional $\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h)$ and the boundary source energy functional $\mathcal{B}(\varphi)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h) &= \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h) + \mathcal{A}_{2,\lambda}^A(h), \\ \mathcal{B}(\varphi) &= \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\varphi) + \mathcal{B}_2(\varphi), \end{aligned} \quad (1.38)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h) &= [\nu^{-1} h]_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h) = \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} h\|_A, \\ \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h) &= \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)} - \frac{i}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*(N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2}), \vartheta} h\|_A, \\ \mathcal{A}_{2,\lambda}^A(h) &= \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} h\|_A \\ &\quad + \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]} (\|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} h\|_A + \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} h\|_A), \end{aligned} \quad (1.39)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi) &= \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (A, \cdot) (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} \varphi\|_{L_v^\infty}, \quad \mathcal{B}_2(\varphi) = \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} \varphi \|_{L_{\Sigma_A}^2}, \\ \mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi) &= \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \varphi \|_{L_{\Sigma_A}^2}, \\ \mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\varphi) &= \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)} - \frac{i}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*(N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2}), \vartheta} \varphi \|_{L_{\Sigma_A}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.40)$$

At the end, we define the following norm associated with the boundary source term $f_b(v)$ as

$$\|f_b\|_{\mathfrak{N}} := \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \Upsilon(x) f_b) + \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \Upsilon'(x) v_3 f_b) + \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \Upsilon(x) \mathcal{L} f_b), \quad (1.41)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ are introduced in (1.33) and (1.38), respectively (taking $A = \infty$ and $\lambda = 1$), and $\Upsilon(x)$ is given in (1.52) below.

1.4. Main results.

1.4.1. Linear problem (KL). We now state the existence result on the Knudsen layer equation (KL). Before doing this, we first display the parameters assumptions occurred in $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^A(g)$ (see (1.33)) and $\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h)$, $\mathcal{B}(\varphi)$ (see (1.38)) above.

Parameters Hypotheses (PH): For the parameters $\{\gamma, \alpha_*, m, \delta, \hbar, \vartheta, l, \alpha, \beta, \rho, T, T_w, \mathbf{u}, u_w\}$, we assume that

- $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$;
- $m < \mathbf{m}_\gamma$, where \mathbf{m}_γ is defined in (1.27);
- $\delta, \hbar, \vartheta > 0$ are all sufficiently small, and $l > 1$ is large enough;
- $0 < \alpha < \mu_\gamma$, where $\mu_\gamma > 0$ is given in Lemma 2.6 below;
- $\beta \geq \beta_\star + \frac{1-\gamma}{2} + \max\{0, -\gamma\}$, where β_\star is introduced in (1.25);

- $T, T_w > 0$ satisfy

$$0 < T_w < 2T; \quad (1.42)$$

- $\rho > 0, \mathbf{u}, u_w \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\mathbf{u}_3 = u_{w,3} = 0$.

We now state the first result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let the mixed weight $\sigma(x, v)$ be given in (1.18). Assume that the parameters $\{\gamma, \alpha_*, m, \delta, \hbar, \vartheta, l, \alpha, \beta, \rho, T, T_w, \mathbf{u}, u_w\}$ satisfy the hypotheses **(PH)**, and the source terms $(S, f_b) \in \text{ASS}_{\alpha_*}$ defined in (1.16). We further assume that*

$$\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} S) < \infty, \quad \|f_b\|_{\mathfrak{N}} < \infty, \quad (1.43)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ is defined in (1.38) with $A = \infty, \lambda = 1$, and $\|f_b\|_{\mathfrak{N}}$ is given in (1.41). Then the Knudsen layer equation **(KL)** admits a unique solution $f(x, v)$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f) \leq C(\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} S) + \|f_b\|_{\mathfrak{N}}) \quad (1.44)$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Remark 1.1 (Exponential decay). *Since $\sigma(x, v) \geq c(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}$ for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, one has*

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f) \geq \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} e^{h\sigma} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \geq C' e^{\frac{1}{2}c(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} e^{\frac{1}{2}\vartheta|v|^2} |f(x, v)|$$

uniformly in $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$. Together with the bound (1.44) in Theorem 1.1, the solution $f(x, v)$ to the problem **(KL)** enjoys the pointwise decay behavior

$$|f(x, v)| \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{2}c(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\vartheta|v|^2}. \quad (1.45)$$

Remark 1.2 (Background temperature T vs boundary temperature T_w). *The assumption (1.42), i.e., $0 < T_w < 2T$, is such that the factor $\frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}}$ in the diffusive operator \mathcal{D}_w exponentially decays at $|v| \rightarrow +\infty$. Indeed,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} &= \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\rho T_w^2} \exp\left\{-\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)|v - u_w|^2 - \frac{(u_w - u) \cdot (v - u_w)}{2T} - \frac{|u_w - u|^2}{4T}\right\} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left\{-\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)^- |v - u_w|^2\right\}\right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $|v| \rightarrow +\infty$ under the assumption (1.42). This reasonable assumption is consistent with the desired exponential decay (1.45) about the Maxwell reflection boundary condition $f(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)f(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) f(0, v') \sqrt{M}(v') dv' + f_b(v)$. In other words, $\frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}}$ should enjoy the same decay behavior of the quantity $f(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} - (1 - \alpha_*)f(0, R_0 v) - f_b(v)$.

Remark 1.3 (The index $m < \mathbf{m}_\gamma$). *One of novelties of our paper is to seek a so-called weak macroscopic damping mechanism, which should sacrifice a small L^∞ -norm with x -weighted factor $(\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma}$, see Lemma 2.3 below. The assumptions $m < -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma = 0$ for $-3 < \gamma < 1$ and $m < 0$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma > 1$ for $\gamma = 1$ are such that the factor $(\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma}$ is integrable over $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The hypothesis $m < -1$ for $-3 < \gamma < 1$ is such that $(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \leq (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}$, which guarantees $\mathcal{A}_{2, \frac{1}{2}}^A[K_h(\cdot)] \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\cdot) + \mathcal{E}_{2,1}^A(\cdot)$ (see (4.21) below). This inequality is applied to extend the connection auxiliary equation **(CA-eq)** from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = 1$, see Lemma 4.1.*

1.4.2. *Application to nonlinear problem.* In this part, we will employ the linear theory constructed in Theorem 1.1 to investigate the following nonlinear problem

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x F = \mathcal{B}(F, F) + H, & x > 0, v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ F(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)F(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* M_w(v) \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) F(0, v') dv' + F_b(v), \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} F(x, v) = \mathfrak{M}(v). \end{cases} \quad (1.46)$$

Let

$$f = \frac{F - \mathfrak{M}}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}, \quad \tilde{h} = \frac{H}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}, \quad \tilde{f}_b = \frac{F_b}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}. \quad (1.47)$$

Then the problem (1.46) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x f + \mathcal{L}f = \Gamma(f, f) + \tilde{h}, & x > 0, v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ f(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)f(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w f(0, v) + \tilde{f}_b(v), \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.48)$$

where the nonlinear operator $\Gamma(f, f)$ is defined as

$$\Gamma(f, f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}} \mathcal{B}(f\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}, f\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}). \quad (1.49)$$

By the arguments in Appendix B of [19] and Appendix A.2 of [20], one knows that $\Gamma(f, f)$ enjoy the same isotropic properties as $\mathcal{L}f$. Then the far-field condition $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0$ in (1.48) will be valid if $(\tilde{h}, \tilde{f}_b) \in \text{ASS}_{\alpha_*}$ defined in (1.16). More precisely, we can establish the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let the mixed weight $\sigma(x, v)$ be given in (1.18). Assume that the parameters $\{\gamma, \alpha_*, m, \delta, \tilde{h}, \vartheta, l, \alpha, \beta, \rho, T, T_w, \mathbf{u}, u_w\}$ satisfy the hypotheses (PH), and the source terms $(\frac{H}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}, \frac{F_b}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}) \in \text{ASS}_{\alpha_*}$ defined in (1.16). Then there is a small $\varsigma_0 > 0$ such that if*

$$\varsigma := \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \frac{H}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}) + \|\frac{F_b}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}\|_{\mathfrak{M}} \leq \varsigma_0, \quad (1.50)$$

then the nonlinear problem (1.46) admits a unique solution $F(x, v)$ enjoying the bound

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \frac{F - \mathfrak{M}}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}}) \leq C\varsigma \quad (1.51)$$

for some constant $C > 0$, where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ are respectively defined in (1.33) and (1.38) with $A = \infty, \lambda = 1$, and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{M}}$ is given in (1.41).

1.5. Outline of existence of the solutions to the system (KL). We now sketch the rough process of solving the Knudsen layer equation (KL).

First, we homogenize the Maxwell reflection boundary condition in (KL). Let $\Upsilon : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth monotone function satisfying

$$\Upsilon(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{for } x \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (1.52)$$

Denote by

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, v) &= f(x, v) - \Upsilon(x)f_b(v), \\ h(x, v) &= S(x, v) - v_3 \partial_x \Upsilon(x)f_b(v) - \Upsilon(x)\mathcal{L}f_b(v). \end{aligned} \quad (1.53)$$

It is easy to see that

$$v_3 \partial_x g + \mathcal{L}g = h.$$

Recall that $f_b(v) = 0$ for $v_3 < 0$, which means that $f_b(R_0 v)|_{v_3 > 0} = 0$. Then

$$g(0, R_0 v)|_{v_3 > 0} = f(0, R_0 v)|_{v_3 > 0} - \Upsilon(0)f_b(R_0 v)|_{v_3 > 0} = f(0, R_0 v)|_{v_3 > 0}.$$

Moreover,

$$g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = f(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} - \Upsilon(0)f_b(v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (f(0, v) - f_b(v))|_{v_3 > 0},$$

where the fact $\Upsilon(0) = 1$ has been used. It is further derived that

$$g(0, v')|_{v'_3 < 0} = f(0, v')|_{v'_3 < 0} - \Upsilon(0)f_b(v')|_{v'_3 < 0} = f(0, v')|_{v'_3 < 0},$$

which infers that

$$\mathcal{D}_w g(0, v) = \mathcal{D}_w f(0, v).$$

As a result, $g(x, v)$ satisfies the boundary condition

$$g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w g(0, v).$$

Observing that $\Upsilon(x) = 0$ for $x \geq 2$, one has $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} g(x, v) = \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, v) = 0$. Therefore, $g(x, v)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g + \mathcal{L}g = h, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w g(0, v), \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} g(x, v) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{KLe})$$

where $h(x, v)$ is defined in (1.53). So, the goal of this paper is to prove the existence of (KLe).

Second, in order to prove the existence of (KLe), we consider the problem in a finite slab with Maxwell reflection condition at $x = 0$ and incoming boundary condition at $x = A$. Namely, for $(x, v) \in \Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\Omega_A = \{x; 0 < x < A\}$,

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g + \mathcal{L}g = h, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w g(0, v), \\ g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v), \end{cases} \quad (\text{Ap-eq})$$

where the assumptions on the function $\varphi_A(v)$ will be clarified later. Here the boundary condition at $x = A$ is actually the incoming data. We will prove the solution of the approximate problem (Ap-eq) converges to that of (KLe) as $A \rightarrow +\infty$.

Third, in order to construct the solutions to the approximate problem (Ap-eq), we consider the following connection auxiliary problem (in short CA-eq) over $(x, v) \in \Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$ with the parameter $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g + \nu(v)g = \lambda K g + h, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w g(0, v), \\ g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v). \end{cases} \quad (\text{CA-eq})$$

We remark that the solution to (CA-eq) with the case $\lambda = 0$ can be explicitly expressed by

$$g(x, v) = \begin{cases} G_+(h, \varphi_A)(x, v), & v_3 > 0, \\ G_-(h, \varphi_A)(x, v), & v_3 < 0, \\ \frac{1}{\nu(v)} h(x, v), & v_3 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.54)$$

where $G_-(h, \varphi_A)(x, v)$ and $G_+(h, \varphi_A)(x, v)$ are defined in (4.4) and (4.5), respectively. The detailed derivation of (1.54) can be found in Subsection 4.1 later. Then, by employing the continuous extension argument, we will show that the existence to the family of (CA-eq) can be extended from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = 1$.

1.6. Methodology and novelties. In this subsection, we methodologically sketch the proof of the main results and illustrate the novelties of this paper. As shown in the previous subsection, the core of current work is to derive the uniform estimates of the connection auxiliary equation (CA-eq) associated with the parameters $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $A > 1$. The main ideas are displayed as follows.

(I) Choice of the mixed weight $\sigma(x, v)$. The major part of the equation (KL) reads

$$v_3 \partial_x f + \nu(v)f = s.o.t. \text{ (some other terms)}. \quad (1.55)$$

For the hard sphere model $\gamma = 1$, v_3 and $\nu(v)$ have the same order as $|v| \gg 1$, i.e. $|v_3| \lesssim \nu(v)$. Roughly speaking, the x -decay can be expected from

$$\partial_x f + cf = s.o.t.,$$

which means that the expected x -decay is e^{-cx} . For example, for the hard sphere model $\gamma = 1$, there have been some related works as follows: Golse-Perthame-Sulem [6] proved the exponential decay e^{-cx} in the space $L^2(e^{cx} dx; L^2((1 + |v|)^{\frac{1}{2}} dv)) \cap L^\infty(e^{cx} dx; L^2(dv))$ for specular reflection condition ($\alpha_* = 0$); Coron-Golse-Sulem [4] verified the exponential decay

e^{-cx} in $L^\infty(e^{cx}dx; L^2(|v_3|dv))$ for general Maxwell reflection boundary condition ($0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$); Huang-Wang [13] proved the exponential decay $e^{-cx}e^{-a|v|^2}$ in $L_{x,v}^\infty$ space for diffusive reflection condition ($\alpha_* = 1$); Huang-Jiang-Wang [12] also shown the exponential decay $e^{-cx}e^{-a|v|^2}$ in $L_{x,v}^\infty$ space for specular reflection condition ($\alpha_* = 0$); He-Jiang-Wu [11] recently proved the exponential decay $e^{-cx}e^{-a|v|^2}$ in $L_{x,v}^\infty$ space for Maxwell reflection boundary condition ($0 < \alpha_* \leq 1$). All of previous works have essentially used the fact $|v_3| \lesssim \nu(v)$ which only holds for $\gamma = 1$.

For the cases $-3 < \gamma < 1$, $|v_3| \lesssim \nu(v)|v_3|^{1-\gamma}$. Note that (1.55) implies

$$\partial_x(e^{\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x}f) = s.o.t..$$

This inspires us to introduce an (x, v) -mixed weight $\sigma(x, v)$ to deal with the power $\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x$. More precisely, (1.55) reduces to

$$v_3\partial_x(e^{h\sigma}f) + (\nu(v) - \hbar v_3\sigma_x)e^{h\sigma}f = s.o.t.,$$

which inspires us to find a weight $\sigma(x, v)$ such that $v_3\sigma_x(x, v) \sim \nu(v)$. As in Chen-Liu-Yang's work [3], the weight $\sigma(x, v)$ is introduced, which satisfies

$$|v_3|\sigma_x(x, v) \lesssim \nu(v), \sigma(x, v) \geq c(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}, \sigma_x(x, v) \lesssim (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}.$$

The derivative σ_x of σ actually balances the disparity of $|v_3|$ and $\nu(v)$. We remark that the work [3] investigated the Knudsen layer equation with the nondegenerate moving boundary condition and hard potential collision kernel $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. Here we, similarly as in [3], design the mixed weight $\sigma(x, v)$ in (1.18) to verify the exponential decays both x and v variables for all cases $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$. The $\sigma(x, v)$ in [3] merely dealt with the background state $(\rho, \mathbf{u}, T) = (1, 0, 1)$. On the contrast, the mixed weight we introduced is to deal with the general background state (ρ, \mathbf{u}, T) .

(II) Weak macroscopic damping mechanism. It is well-known that the linearized Boltzmann operator \mathcal{L} does not supply the coercivity structure in the null space $\text{Null}(\mathcal{L})$, i.e., macroscopic damping effect. In the previous literature, various artificial damping quantities are introduced to obtain the macroscopic coercivity, and then remove additional damping quantities by proper ways. For example, in the works [4, 6, 11, 12, 13], the damping εf was introduced to deal with the linear Knudsen layer equation for hard sphere collision case with various boundary conditions. Then it is removed by taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ via compact arguments. Moreover, in the works [3, 24, 25, 26], the artificial damping $-\gamma P_0^+ \xi_1 f$ ($\gamma > 0$) coming from the eigenspace corresponding to positive eigenvalues of the linear operator $P_0 \xi_1 P_0$ are applied to deal with the incoming boundary conditions. In order to return the original equation, a further assumption on the incoming data $a(\xi)$ (the data $a(\xi)$ vanishes in the eigenspace corresponding to positive eigenvalues of the linear operator $P_0 \xi_1 P_0$, i.e., $P_0^+ \xi_1 P_0 a = 0$) will be imposed such that the artificial damping $-\gamma P_0^+ \xi_1 f$ vanishes by the Grönwall inequality argument.

However, in this paper, we will NOT introduce an additional damping term. One of our novelties in current work is to seek a *weak macroscopic damping mechanism* in L^2 -norm by sacrificing a small L^∞ -norm and a small L^2 -norm in $\text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L})$. More precisely, by rescaling the equation (CA-eq) by using the factor $e^{h\sigma}$, (CA-eq) can be equivalently expressed by (3.2) below, i.e.,

$$v_3\partial_x g - \hbar\sigma_x v_3 g + \nu(v)g - \lambda K_{\hbar} g = h.$$

The term $\nu(v)g - \lambda K_{\hbar} g$ supplies the coercivity structure $\|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta, \vartheta} g\|_{L_v^2}^2$ in $\text{Null}^\perp(\mathcal{L})$. By using the property of $\sigma(x, v)$, the term $-\hbar\sigma_x v_3 g$ implies the weak macroscopic damping $\hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}\|\mathcal{P} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g\|_{L_v^2}^2$ by losing two small quantities $\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta, \vartheta} g\|_{L_v^2}^2$ and $\hbar\|g\|_{A; m, n, \gamma, \beta-\beta', \vartheta}^2$ (the smallness comes from the small parameter $\hbar > 0$). To be more precise, the weak macroscopic

damping is constructed in Lemma 2.3 below, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{\beta,\vartheta}^2(-\hbar\sigma_x v_3 g) dv &\geq \mu_0 \hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \|\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta} g\|_{L_x^2}^2 - C\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta} g\|_{L_x^2}^2 \\ &\quad - C\hbar(\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma} \|g\|_{A;m,n_\gamma,\beta-\beta',\vartheta}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The factor $(\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma}$ is such that the quantity $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{\beta,\vartheta}^2(-\hbar\sigma_x v_3 g) dv$ is integrable over $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, see Remark 1.3 above. We believe that the assumption $P_0^+ \xi_1 P_0 a = 0$ on the moving boundary problems in the works [3, 24, 25, 26] can be removed by employing the weak macroscopic damping mechanism what we find.

(III) Nondissipative boundary condition. While multiplying the equation (KLe) by $g(x, v)$ and integrating the resultant equation over $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$, one can obtain the boundary L^2 energy

$$\mathcal{E}_{BC} := - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 |g(0, v)|^2 dv.$$

If the boundary condition $g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = \mathcal{K}g(0, v)$ is such that $\mathcal{E}_{BC} \geq 0$, we call that the boundary condition $g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = \mathcal{K}g(0, v)$ is *dissipative*. Otherwise, we call that the corresponding boundary is *nondissipative*. In this paper, we consider

$$\mathcal{K}g(0, v) = (1 - \alpha_*)g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) g(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv'.$$

To the best knowledge of the authors, all the known results of the boundary value problem of Boltzmann equation studied the dissipative boundary case. For instance, Guo [8] studied the Boltzmann equation in three dimensional bounded domain with in-flow, bounce-back, specular reflection ($\alpha_* = 0$) and diffusive reflection ($\alpha_* = 1$) boundary conditions associated with the global Maxwellian $M_w(v) = \mathfrak{M}(v) = e^{-\frac{|v|^2}{2}}$. We remark that the in-flow boundary condition responds to the case $\mathcal{K} = 0$ by homogenizing the boundary condition as the similar operations as in Subsection 1.5 above. Li-Lu-Sun [18] investigated one dimensional half-space linear steady Boltzmann equation with general dissipative boundary condition. Moreover, the all hard sphere model $\gamma = 1$ mentioned in Part (I) of this subsection studied the dissipative Maxwell type boundary conditions.

We now consider the Maxwell reflection boundary condition (KLe) considered in our paper. Actually, under the boundary condition in (KLe),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{BC} &= 2\alpha_*(1 - \alpha_*) \left[\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g^2(0, v) dv - \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \frac{M_w}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}}} g(0, v) dv \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g(0, v) \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)} dv \right] \\ &\quad + \alpha_*^2 \left[\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g^2(0, v) dv - \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \frac{M_w^2}{\mathfrak{M}} dv \left(\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g(0, v) \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)} dv \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha_* = 0$, $\mathcal{E}_{BC} = 0$, which means that the specular reflection boundary condition is dissipative. If $0 < \alpha_* \leq 1$, the fact $\mathcal{E}_{BC} \geq 0$ for any $g(0, v)$ is equivalent to dissipative condition

$$\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \frac{M_w^2}{\mathfrak{M}} dv \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \mathfrak{M} dv \leq 1. \quad (1.56)$$

However, the general parameters $(T, T_w, \mathbf{u}, u_w)$ given in the hypotheses (PH) above do not meet the dissipative condition (1.56). It is easy to check that (1.56) will hold by setting $T = T_w$ and $\mathbf{u} = u_w$. In the works [4, 6, 8, 11, 13], the special case $(\mathbf{u}, T) = (u_w, T_w) = (\vec{0}, 1)$, which subjected to the dissipative condition (1.56), was considered.

In our work, we focus on the general case WITHOUT the dissipative condition (1.56). The nondissipation of \mathcal{E}_{BC} comes from the integral form $\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g(0, v) \mathfrak{w}(v) dv$ for some exponential decay function $\mathfrak{w}(v)$. In order to dominate the previous integral form, in the so-called

nondissipative boundary lemma (see Lemma 3.2 below), we subtly construct a useful nondissipative boundary inequality

$$\left| \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \mathfrak{w}(v) g_\sigma(0, v) dv \right| \lesssim \tau_* a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A + \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A + \dots$$

for any $\tau_*, a, b > 0$ and $\mathfrak{z} > \frac{1}{2}$. By taking proper $\tau_*, a, b > 0$ and $\mathfrak{z} > \frac{1}{2}$ such that the coefficients $\tau_* a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ and $\sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}}$ are both sufficiently small. Then the integral form $\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g(0, v) \mathfrak{w}(v) dv$ can be successfully dominated. As a result, the boundary energy \mathcal{E}_{BC} has a lower bound

$$\mathcal{E}_{BC} \geq [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g^2(0, v) dv - \alpha_* \times (\text{some controllable quantities}),$$

see Boundary energy lemma, i.e., Lemma 3.3 below. We believe that our approach/ideas about the nondissipative boundary condition can be applied to the general Boltzmann equation theory.

(IV) Designing the uniform norms of (CA-eq). Now we illustrate the process of deriving the uniform bounds of the problem (3.2) below (equivalently (CA-eq)). Due to the complication of deriving the uniform bounds, the following sketch map will be initially drawn for the sake of readers' intuition (see Figure 1 below).


Based on the Figure 1, we now illustrate the main ideas. We mainly want to control the weighted $L_{x,v}^\infty$ quantity $\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma)$. However, the operator K is not compact in the weighted $L_{x,v}^\infty$ spaces, which fails to obtain a closed estimate in the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ framework. By applying the property of K in Lemma 2.5, the quantity $\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma)$ can be bounded by the norm $\|z_\alpha \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}$, see Lemma 3.4. In this step, the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ bounds for the operators Y_A, Z, U defined in (2.3)-(2.4)-(2.5) are important, see Lemma 2.2. By Lemma 3.5, the quantity $\|z_\alpha \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}$ is thereby dominated by $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma)$. It is actually the Sobolev type interpolation in one dimensional space with different weights. Due to the structure of the equation, the singular weight $z_{-\alpha}(v)$ is unavoidable.

By Lemma 3.6, the quantity $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma)$ can be bounded by the norm $\|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A$, which can be further dominated by $\mathcal{E}_{\text{iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$, see (3.63). The main goal of this step is to control the (x, v) -mixed polynomial type weight $\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)$ and the singular weight $z_{-\alpha}(v)$ involved in $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma)$. The (x, v) -mixed weight $\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)$ can be controlled by x -polynomial and $|v|$ -polynomial weights. The difficult is to deal with the singular weight $z_{-\alpha}(v)$ associated with the operator K . Thanks to Lemma 2.6, the weight $z_{-\alpha}(v)$ is successfully removed, in which the key is to obtain the estimate $\mathfrak{h}(v_*) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) |v - v_*|^\gamma \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{8}}(v) dv \lesssim (1 + |v_*|)^\gamma$, see (8.65) below. Note that the quantity $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma)$ is considered in the $L_{x,v}^2$ framework. The Nondissipative boundary lemma (Lemma 3.2) is therefore required to deal with the weighted boundary energy as stated in Part (III) above.

In the norm $\|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A$, the power of the spatial polynomial weight $(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}$ is too large to be controlled. We then develop a so-called *spatial-velocity indices iteration approach* to overcome this difficulty. The ideas is to shift the spatial polynomial weight to the velocity one in the $L_{x,v}^2$ framework. As in Lemma 3.7, together with the Nondissipative boundary lemma, the following spatial-velocity indices iteration form are found:

$$\psi_{\mathfrak{q}, \beta_\sharp} \lesssim \delta \psi_{\mathfrak{q}-1, \beta_\sharp + \beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}} + \text{some controllable terms},$$

where $\psi_{\mathfrak{q}, \beta_\sharp}$ is defined in (3.54). This means that once an x -polynomial weight $\sqrt{\delta x + l}$ is reduced, a $|v|$ -polynomial weight $(1 + |v|)^{\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}}$ will be increased. Based on the spatial-velocity indices iteration form, we carefully design the iteration energy functional $\mathcal{E}_{\text{iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$, which can dominate the norm $\|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A$. By Lemma 3.8, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$ can



SVII: Spatial-velocity indices iteration, see Lemma 3.7

NDBL: Nondissipative boundary lemma, see Lemma 3.2

$\boxed{A} \rightarrow \boxed{B}$: $A \lesssim B + \text{some known quantities}$

$\boxed{C} \rightarrow \boxed{D}$: $D - C \geq c_0 D$ for some positive constant $c_0 > 0$, i.e., C can be absorbed by D

FIGURE 1. Derivation of uniform bounds for the connection auxiliary equation (CA-eq). Here we denote by $g_\sigma = e^{\hbar \sigma} g$.

be bounded by the quantity $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta + \beta_\star, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A$, where the factor $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ can be taken sufficiently small.

By (3.74), $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta + \beta_\star, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A$ can be bounded by the quantity $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g_\sigma)$. Together with the Nondissipative boundary lemma, $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g_\sigma)$ can be controlled by $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$, see Lemma 3.9. In this step, the weak macroscopic damping mechanism in Lemma 2.3 is essential. At the end, by taking $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} l^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ both small enough, $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$ can be absorbed by $\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$. Therefore, we obtain the uniform a priori estimates for (CA-eq) in Lemma 3.1.

(V) Advantage of incoming data approximation. While investigating the problem (KLe) over half-space $x \in (0, \infty)$, we will consider the approximate problem in a finite slab $x \in (0, A)$. Then the boundary condition at $x = A$ should be imposed. In the works [11, 12, 13] about the hard sphere model ($\gamma = 1$) with Maxwell reflection type boundary

conditions, the specular reflection boundary condition $g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = g(A, R_A v)$ at $x = A$ was imposed. Taking the work [12] (setting $\alpha_* = 0$) as an example, the auxiliary connection problem (corresponding to the problem (CA-eq) in this work) became

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g + \varepsilon g + \nu(v)g = \lambda K g + h, & 0 < x < A, v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \frac{1}{n})g(0, R_0 v), & g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = (1 - \frac{1}{n})g(A, R_A v). \end{cases} \quad (1.57)$$

In order to justify the existence of the above problem for the case $\lambda = 0$, they had to apply the following iterative approximate which was the boundary problem with incoming data:

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g^{i+1} + \varepsilon g^{i+1} + \nu(v)g^{i+1} = h, & 0 < x < A, v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ g^{i+1}(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \frac{1}{n})g^i(0, R_0 v), & g^{i+1}(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = (1 - \frac{1}{n})g^i(A, R_A v), \end{cases} \quad (1.58)$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $g^0 \equiv 0$. They first passed limit $i \rightarrow +\infty$ in (1.58) by compact arguments to obtain the existence of (1.57) for the case $\lambda = 0$. Then they took limits $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (1.57). The works [11] and [13] had the similar treatments.

However, we employ the incoming data approximation at $x = A$, i.e., imposing the boundary condition $g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v)$, where $\varphi_A(v)$ is any fixed function with $\mathcal{B}(e^{h\sigma(A, \cdot)}\varphi_A) < \infty$ which means $\varphi_A(v) \rightarrow 0$ as $A \rightarrow +\infty$. The *rationality* of the incoming data approximation at $x = A$ can be illustrated that the far field condition $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} g(x, v) = 0$ is closer to the incoming data approximation $g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v)$ with $\varphi_A(v) \rightarrow 0$ as $A \rightarrow +\infty$ than the specular reflection approximation $g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = g_A(R_A, v)$. Actually, we will take $\varphi_A(v) \equiv 0$. But we still employ the general $\varphi_A(v)$ which will be used to study the uniqueness of the problem (KL). Moreover, the *advantage* of the incoming data approximation at $x = A$ is to simplify the proof process relative to the works [11, 12, 13]. In our approximation, the solution to (CA-eq) with the case $\lambda = 0$ can be explicitly expressed by (1.54). Furthermore, it also obeys the estimate constructed in Lemma 3.1. This directly gives the existence of the problem (CA-eq) with $\lambda = 0$, where the limits process $i \rightarrow +\infty$ and $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in (1.57)-(1.58) are not required. Additionally, the weak macroscopic damping mechanism constructed in Lemma 2.3 is such that the artificial damping εg is not necessary, where we do not need to investigate the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (removing the damping εg).

(VI) Existence of the equations (KLe) and (1.46). Based on the uniform a priori estimates on the connection auxiliary problem (CA-eq) in Lemma 3.1, we first sketch the proof of existence to the linear problem (KL) (equivalently (KLe)).

The first step is to prove the existence of the approximate problem (Ap-eq), i.e., (CA-eq) with $\lambda = 1$. The explicit expression (1.54) and Lemma 3.1 show us that the solution to (CA-eq) with $\lambda = 0$ exists and belongs to the space \mathbb{B}_0 defined in (4.6). By Lemma 3.1, we then can extend the existence of (CA-eq) from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ in the space \mathbb{B}_0 by the contraction arguments. Moreover, Lemma 3.1 tells us that the solution to (CA-eq) with $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ also belongs to the space \mathbb{B}_1 given in (4.6). Based on Lemma 3.1, one can extend the existence of (CA-eq) from $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ to $\lambda = 1$ in the space \mathbb{B}_1 by the contraction arguments. Then the existence of the approximate problem (Ap-eq) holds, see Lemma 4.1.

The second step is to justify the existence of (KLe) by using Lemma 4.1. By taking $\varphi_A(v) = 0$ and assuming $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}h) < \infty$, the solution $g^A(x, v)$ constructed in Lemma 4.1 obeys the uniform-in- A bound $\mathcal{E}_1^A(e^{h\sigma}g^A) \lesssim \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}h)$. Note that g^A is defined on $(x, v) \in (0, A) \times \mathbb{R}^3$. We extend $g^A(x, v)$ to $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$ as $\tilde{g}^A(x, v) = \mathbf{1}_{x \in (0, A)}g^A(x, v)$, which, together the bound of g^A , is uniformly bounded in the space \mathbb{B}_∞^h defined in (4.23). Moreover, we can prove that $\tilde{g}^A(x, v)$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{B}_∞^h for any fixed $\tilde{h}' \in (0, \tilde{h})$. Then we can show that the limit of $\tilde{g}^A(x, v)$ is the unique solution to (KLe). The result on Theorem 1.1 is thereby obtained.

At the end, we focus on the nonlinear problem (1.46), which can be equivalently represented by (1.48). The key point of studying the nonlinear problem is to obtain nonlinear estimate

$$\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g)) \lesssim \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}f)\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}g)$$

given in Lemma 5.1. Then by employing the linear theory constructed in Theorem 1.1, the iterative scheme (5.3) is contraction under the small data assumption (1.50). Then the limit of the iterative scheme (5.3) exactly solves the nonlinear problem (1.48). The result on Theorem 1.2 is therefore constructed.

1.7. Historical remarks. The known results on Knudsen layer equation with Maxwell type boundary condition has been listed in Subsection 1.6 above, hence, [4, 6, 11, 12, 13], which all considered the hard sphere model ($\gamma = 1$). For the incoming data boundary conditions with angular cutoff collisional kernel cases, there have been many results. The incoming data involves two cases: fixed boundary and moving boundary. For the fixed boundary case, Bardos-Caffisch-Nicolaenko [2] proved the exponential decay e^{-cx} in $L^\infty(dx; L^2((1 + |v|)dv))$ for hard sphere model $\gamma = 1$, and Golse-Poupaud [7] then proved superalgebraic $O(x^{-\infty})$ in $L^\infty(dx; L^2(|v_3|dv))$ space for $-2 \leq \gamma < 1$. The results on moving boundary case are listed as follows. Coron-Golse-Sulem [4] studied the exponential decay e^{-cx} in $L^\infty(e^{cx}dx; L^2(|v_3 + u|dv))$ space for $\gamma = 1$, both degenerate and nondegenerate moving velocities. Ukai-Yang-Yu [22] investigated the exponential decay e^{-cx} in x and algebraic decay $(1 + |v|)^{-\beta}$ in v in $L_{x,v}^\infty$ space for $\gamma = 1$ and nondegenerate moving velocity. Then Golse [5] proved the same result for the degenerate moving velocity as in [22]. Chen-Liu-Yang [3] justified the exponential decay $e^{-cx \frac{2}{3-\gamma}}$ in x and algebraic decay $(1 + |v|)^{-\beta}$ in v in $L_{x,v}^\infty$ space for $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and nondegenerate moving velocity. Wang-Yang-Yang [25] proved the same decay results of [3] for $-2 < \gamma \leq 0$ and nondegenerate moving velocity. Yang [27] verified the superalgebraic decay $O(x^{-\infty})$ and $O(|v|^{-\infty})$ in $L_{x,v}^\infty$ for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, both degenerate and nondegenerate moving velocities. There also were some nonlinear stability results on the Knudsen boundary layer equation with incoming data, see [23, 24, 26]. We remark that there is no any result about the Knudsen boundary layer problems with noncutoff angular for all types of boundary conditions.

1.8. Organization of current paper. In the next section, we give some preliminaries will be frequently used later. Section 3 aims at deriving the uniform estimates for the connection auxiliary equation (CA-eq). In Section 4, the existence and uniqueness of the linear problem (KL) is proved, i.e., Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, we justify the existence and uniqueness of the nonlinear problem (1.46), hence, Theorem 1.2. The $L_{x,v}^\infty$ bounds for the operators Y_A, Z, U are studied in Section 6, i.e., proving Lemma 2.2. In Section 7, the weak macroscopic damping mechanism is constructed, i.e., verifying Lemma 2.3. We finally study the properties of the operator K , namely, to prove Lemma 2.4-2.5-2.6 in Section 8.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Properties of the (x, v) -mixed weights $\sigma(x, v)$. From the works [3, 24, 25, 26], the weight $\sigma(x, v)$ admits the following properties.

Lemma 2.1. *For $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, some large constant $l > 0$ and small constant $\delta > 0$, there are some positive constants c, c_1, c_2 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x, v) &\geq c(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}, \quad |\sigma(x, v) - \sigma(x, v_*)| \leq c||v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2|, \\ 0 &< c_1 \min \left\{ (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}, (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma} \right\} \leq \sigma_x(x, v) \leq c_2(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \leq c_2 l^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}, \\ |\sigma_x(x, v)v_3| &\leq c\nu(v), \quad |\sigma_{xx}(x, v)v_3| \leq \delta\sigma_x\nu(v). \end{aligned}$$

2.2. The operators Y_A, Z and U . We introduce the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(x, v) &= \int_0^x \left[-\frac{m\sigma_{xx}(y, v)}{2\sigma_x(y, v)} - \hbar\sigma_x(y, v) + \frac{\nu(y)}{v_3} \right] dy, \\ \kappa_{n_\gamma}(x) &= n_\gamma \ln \frac{l}{\delta x + l}, \quad \tilde{\kappa}(x, v) = \kappa(x, v) + \kappa_{n_\gamma}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, denote by

$$\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v) = \mathfrak{M}(v)e^{-2h\sigma(0,v)}. \quad (2.2)$$

We then define the following linear operators

$$Y_A(f) = \begin{cases} (1 - \alpha_*)e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, R_0v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} f(A, R_0v) \\ + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} \\ \times e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v') - \tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} f(A, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv', & \text{if } v_3 > 0, \\ e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} f(A, v), & \text{if } v_3 < 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$Z(f) = \begin{cases} (1 - \alpha_*) \int_0^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', R_0v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} f(x', R_0v) dx' \\ - \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} \int_0^A (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v')]} \\ \times \frac{1}{v'_3} f(x', v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dx' dv', & \text{if } v_3 > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } v_3 < 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$U(f) = \begin{cases} \int_0^x e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} f(x', v) dx', & \text{if } v_3 > 0, \\ - \int_x^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} f(x', v) dx', & \text{if } v_3 < 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

These operators will play an essential role in estimating the weighted $L_{x,v}^\infty$ norms of the Knudsen layer equations (KLe). More precisely, they obey the following estimates.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $l \geq 1$, $m, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $A > 0$, $\vartheta > 0$ and $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ be given in (1.23). Then, for sufficiently small $\hbar, \delta > 0$, there are some positive constant $C > 0$, independent of l, δ, \hbar and A , such that*

(1) $Y_A(f)$ subjects to the estimate

$$\|Y_A(f)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq C \|f(A, \cdot)\|_{L_v^\infty}; \quad (2.6)$$

(2) $Z(f)$ enjoys the bound

$$\|Z(f)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq C \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}; \quad (2.7)$$

(3) $U(f)$ obeys the bound

$$\|U(f)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq C \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}. \quad (2.8)$$

The proof of Lemma 2.2 will be given in Section 6 later.

2.3. Weak macroscopic damping mechanism. It is well-known that the linearized Boltzmann operator \mathcal{L} does not support the coercivity structure of positive functions invariant, i.e., macroscopic damping effect. In the previous literature, various additional damping quantities are introduced to obtain the macroscopic coercivity, and then remove additional damping quantities by proper ways. However, in this paper, we will NOT introduce an additional damping term. One of our novelties in current work is to seek a *weak macroscopic damping mechanism* in L^2 -norm by sacrificing a small L^∞ -norm. More precisely, the result on the weak macroscopic damping mechanism is stated as follows.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $l > 1$ be sufficiently large, $\hbar > 0, \vartheta \geq 0$ be both small enough, $\delta > 0, \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{R}, m < 0$ and $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$. Then there are $\mu_0, C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{\beta, \vartheta}^2 g(-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 g) dv &\geq \mu_0 \hbar (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv \\ &\quad - C \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) |\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv \\ &\quad - C \hbar (\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - \mathfrak{n}_\gamma} \|g\|_{A; m, \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, \beta - \beta', \vartheta}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where $\mathfrak{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ is given in (1.23).

The proof of Lemma 2.3 will be given in Section 7 later.

2.4. Properties of the operator K . In this subsection, the goal is to derive some useful properties of the operator K defined in (1.8)-(1.9)-(1.10). It then is focused on the following decay results of the operator K .

Lemma 2.4. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1, A > 0, m, \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$ with $\delta_0 := \frac{1}{4} - T(c\hbar + \vartheta) > 0$, where $c > 0$ is given in Lemma 2.1. Then there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of A, \hbar , such that*

$$\|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} e^{\hbar \sigma} K f\|_{A; \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} \leq C \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} e^{\hbar \sigma} f\|_{A; \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, \beta + \gamma - 1, \vartheta}. \quad (2.10)$$

where $\mathfrak{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ is given in (1.23), and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{A; \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}$ is defined in (1.28).

The proof of Lemma 2.4 will be given in Subsection 8.1 later.

Next we prove the boundedness of the operator K_h from $Y_{m, \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}^\infty(A) \cap L_x^\infty L_v^2$ to $Y_{m, \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, -\gamma, \vartheta}^\infty(A)$. Here the operator K_h is defined as

$$K_h g_\sigma = e^{\hbar \sigma} K(e^{-\hbar \sigma} g_\sigma). \quad (2.11)$$

More precisely, the following results hold.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1, A > 0, m \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$ sufficiently small. Then for any $\eta_1 > 0$, there is a $C_{\eta_1} > 0$, independent of A, \hbar , such that*

$$\|\nu^{-1} K_h g\|_{A; m, \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \leq \eta_1 \|g\|_{A; m, \mathfrak{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_{\eta_1} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\mathfrak{n}_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}. \quad (2.12)$$

Here the weight $z_{\alpha'}$ is given in (1.21), and $\mathfrak{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ is given in (1.23)..

The proof of Lemma 2.5 will be given in Subsection 8.2 later.

Next we show the boundedness of the operator K_h in the weighted L_v^2 space. More precisely, the following conclusions hold.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1, m, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$ be sufficiently small. Define two nonempty sets*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_\gamma &:= \{b_0 \in \mathbb{R} | b_0 < 2, 0 \leq b_0 \leq 1 - \gamma, b_0 + \gamma + 1 > 0\}, \\ \mathcal{T}_\gamma &:= \{b_1 \in \mathbb{R} | b_1 < 3, 0 \leq b_1 \leq 1 - \gamma, b_1 + \gamma > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\mu_\gamma := \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\gamma+3}{2}, \frac{b_0+\gamma+1}{2}, \frac{b_1+\gamma}{2}\} > 0$ with $b_0 \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma$ and $b_1 \in \mathcal{T}_\gamma$. Let $0 \leq \alpha < \mu_\gamma$. Then there is a positive constant $C > 0$, independent of \hbar , such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2} z_{-\alpha}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_h g(x, v)|^2 dv \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv. \quad (2.13)$$

The proof of Lemma 2.6 will be given in Subsection 8.3 later.

3. UNIFORM ESTIMATES FOR THE CONNECTION AUXILIARY PROBLEM (CA-eq)

In this section, we mainly derive the a priori estimates for the connection auxiliary problem (CA-eq), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g + \nu(v)g = \lambda K g + h, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w g(0, v), \\ g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v). \end{cases}$$

uniformly in the parameters $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $A > 1$ on the functional \mathcal{E}_λ^A given in (1.33). It is the core of the current work.

3.1. Statements of the uniform results. For any given $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we define an operator \mathcal{L}_λ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_\lambda g := v_3 \partial_x g + \nu(v)g - \lambda K g = h, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) g(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv', \\ g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v). \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

For notation convenience, let $g = \mathcal{L}_\lambda^{-1}(h)$ be the solution to the problem (3.1). First, we given the following a priori estimates for the operator $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{-1}(h)$ uniformly in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Let $g_\sigma = e^{h\sigma} g$. (3.1) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\lambda, h} g_\sigma := v_3 \partial_x g_\sigma + [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] g_\sigma - \lambda K_h g_\sigma = h_\sigma, \\ g_\sigma(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g_\sigma(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) g_\sigma(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv', \\ g_\sigma(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v), \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where K_h is defined in (2.11), and $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)$ is given in (2.2), i.e., $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v) = \frac{\mathfrak{M}(v)}{e^{2\hbar\sigma(0, v)}}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x (\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n\gamma} g_\sigma) + \partial_x \tilde{\kappa}(x, v) (\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n\gamma} g_\sigma) \\ = \frac{1}{v_3} \underbrace{(\lambda \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n\gamma} K_h g_\sigma + \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n\gamma} h_\sigma)}_{:= H(x, v)}, \end{aligned}$$

which means

$$\partial_x [e^{\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n\gamma} g_\sigma(x, v)] = e^{\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} \frac{1}{v_3} H(x, v). \quad (3.3)$$

If $v_3 < 0$, by integrating (3.3) from x to A , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n\gamma} g_\sigma(x, v) \\ = e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (A, v) (\delta A + l)^{n\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v) - \int_x^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x, v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} H(x', v) dx'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

If $v_3 > 0$, integrating (3.3) from 0 to x and together with the specular reflection boundary condition in (3.2), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n\gamma} g_\sigma(x, v) \\ = e^{-\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (0, v) l^{n\gamma} g_\sigma(0, v) + \int_0^x e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x, v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} H(x', v) dx'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

By the boundary conditions in (3.2), one has

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (0, v) l^{n\gamma} g_\sigma(0, v) \\ = (1 - \alpha_*) e^{-\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (0, R_0 v) l^{n\gamma} g_\sigma(0, R_0 v) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \alpha_* e^{-\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v') l^{n_\gamma} g_\sigma(0,v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv'. \quad (3.6)$$

Here we have utilized the fact $\sigma_x(0, R_0 v) = \sigma_x(0, v)$ by (1.22). Note that (3.3) indicates

$$\partial_x [e^{\tilde{\kappa}(x, R_0 v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} g_\sigma(x, R_0 v) (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma}] = e^{\tilde{\kappa}(x, R_0 v)} \frac{1}{(R_0 v)_3} H(x, R_0 v). \quad (3.7)$$

Due to $(R_0 v)_3 = -v_3 < 0$, together with the boundary condition in (3.2), integrating (3.7) from 0 to A implies

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, R_0 v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A, R_0 v) (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(R_0 v) - \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, R_0 v) l^{n_\gamma} g_\sigma(0, R_0 v) \\ &= \int_0^A e^{\tilde{\kappa}(x', R_0 v)} \frac{1}{-v_3} H(x', R_0 v) dx', \end{aligned}$$

which means that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, R_0 v) l^{n_\gamma} g_\sigma(0, R_0 v) \\ &= e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, R_0 v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A, R_0 v) (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(R_0 v) \\ & \quad + \int_0^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', R_0 v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} H(x', R_0 v) dx'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Furthermore, (3.4) shows that for $v'_3 < 0$,

$$\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v') l^{n_\gamma} g_\sigma(0, v') = e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v')} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A, v') (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v') - \int_0^A e^{\tilde{\kappa}(x', v')} \frac{1}{v'_3} H(x', v') dx'.$$

It thereby holds

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v') l^{n_\gamma} g_\sigma(0,v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv' \\ &= \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v') - \tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A, v') (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv' \\ & \quad - \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} \int_0^A (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v')]} \frac{1}{v'_3} H(x', v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dx' dv'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

It is thus derived from collecting the equations (3.5), (3.6), (3.8) and (3.9) that for $v_3 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g_\sigma(x, v) \\ &= (1 - \alpha_*) e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, R_0 v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A, R_0 v) (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(R_0 v) \\ & \quad + (1 - \alpha_*) \int_0^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', R_0 v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} H(x', R_0 v) dx' \\ & \quad + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v') - \tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} \\ & \quad \quad \quad \times \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A, v') (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv' \\ & \quad - \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} \int_0^A (-v'_3) \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v')]} \frac{1}{v'_3} H(x', v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dx' dv' \\ & \quad + \int_0^x e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x', v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} H(x', v) dx'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Summarily, the equations (3.4) and (3.10) indicate that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g_\sigma &= Y_A(\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}) \\ & \quad + Z(\lambda \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} K_h g_\sigma + \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} f(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} h_\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ U(\lambda \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma + \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} h_\sigma), \quad (3.11)$$

where the operators $Y_A(\cdot)$, $Z(\cdot)$ and $U(\cdot)$ are introduced in (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5), respectively.

Then we can establish the uniform a priori estimates for the problem (CA-eq) (or equivalently (3.2)) in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 (Uniform a priori estimates for (3.2)). *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $n_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23), $m < -\frac{2}{1-\gamma} < 0$ for $-3 < \gamma < 1$ and $m < 0$ for $\gamma = 1$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, sufficiently small $\delta, \hbar, \vartheta > 0$, large enough $A, l > 1$, integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$ and $0 < \alpha < \mu_\gamma$, where $\mu_\gamma > 0$ is given in Lemma 2.6. Assume that the source term h_σ and the boundary source term $\varphi_{A,\sigma}$ of the system (3.2) satisfy*

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h_\sigma), \mathcal{B}(\varphi_{A,\sigma}) < \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Let $g_\sigma = g_\sigma(x, v)$ be the solution to (3.2). Then there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of λ , A , \hbar and δ , such that g_σ obeying the following bounds:

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda^A(g_\sigma) \leq C(\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}(\varphi_{A,\sigma})). \quad (3.13)$$

Moreover, let $g_{\sigma i} = g_{\sigma i}(x, v)$ be the solutions with respect to the source terms $h_{\sigma i}$ ($i = 1, 2$), where $\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h_{\sigma i}) < \infty$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $g_{\sigma 2} - g_{\sigma 1}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda^A(g_{\sigma 2} - g_{\sigma 1}) \leq C\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h_{\sigma 2} - h_{\sigma 1}). \quad (3.14)$$

Here the functionals $\mathcal{E}_\lambda^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ are defined in (1.33) and (1.38).

The proof of Lemma 3.1 will be completed in Subsection 3.8 later.

3.2. Nondissipative boundary energy. In this paper, we consider the nondissipative Maxwell reflection boundary condition as stated in Subsection 1.6 before. We now establish the following key lemma to deal with the nondissipative boundary condition.

Lemma 3.2 (Nondissipative boundary lemma). *Let $\mathfrak{w}(v)$ exponentially decay at $|v| \rightarrow +\infty$. Assume that $g_\sigma(x, v)$ is a solution to (3.2). Then for any $\tau_*, a, b > 0$ and $\mathfrak{z} > \frac{1}{2}$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \mathfrak{w}(v) g_\sigma(0, v) dv \right| &\leq C\tau_* a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A + C\sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A \\ &+ C\sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A + \left| \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v) dv \right| \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of $\tau_*, a, b, \mathfrak{z}, \lambda, A, \hbar, l$.

Proof. Note that g_σ solves (3.2), i.e.,

$$\partial_x(v_3 g_\sigma) = [\hbar \sigma_x v_3 - \nu(v)] g_\sigma + \lambda K_{\hbar} g_\sigma + h_\sigma.$$

We multiply the above equation by the factor $e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p}$, where the constants $\tau_*, a, b, p > 0$ will be determined later. It thereby holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_x(e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} v_3 g_\sigma) \\ &= -p\tau_* a(ax+b)^{p-1} e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} v_3 g_\sigma + [\hbar \sigma_x v_3 - \nu(v)] e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} g_\sigma \\ &\quad + \lambda e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma + e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} h_\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

We integrate the equation (3.16) over $(x, v) \in (0, A) \times \{v_3 < 0\}$. Together with the boundary condition $g_\sigma(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &-e^{-\tau_* b^p} \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 g_\sigma(0, v) dv \\ &= -p\tau_* a \underbrace{\int_0^A \int_{v_3 < 0} (ax+b)^{p-1} e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 g_\sigma(x, v) dv dx}_{:= \mathfrak{A}_1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \underbrace{\int_0^A \int_{v_3 < 0} [\hbar \sigma_x v_3 - \nu(v)] e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \mathfrak{w}(v) g_\sigma(x, v) dv dx}_{:= \mathfrak{A}_2} \\
 & + \lambda \underbrace{\int_0^A \int_{v_3 < 0} e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \mathfrak{w}(v) K_{\hbar} g_\sigma(x, v) dv dx}_{:= \mathfrak{A}_3} \\
 & + \underbrace{\int_0^A \int_{v_3 < 0} e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \mathfrak{w}(v) h_\sigma(x, v) dx dv}_{:= \mathfrak{A}_4} - \underbrace{e^{-\tau_*(aA+b)^p} \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v) dv}_{:= \mathfrak{A}_5}, \quad (3.17)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the weight function $\mathfrak{w}(v)$ is given in Lemma 3.2.

Step 1. Control of the quantity \mathfrak{A}_1 .

The Hölder inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\mathfrak{A}_1| & \leq p \tau_* a \int_0^A (ax+b)^{p-1} e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \left(\int_{v_3 < 0} \nu^{-1} |v_3|^2 \mathfrak{w}^2(v) dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{v_3 < 0} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma(x, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\
 & \leq C p \tau_* a \left(\int_0^A (ax+b)^{2p-2} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have utilized the fact $\left(\int_{v_3 < 0} \nu^{-1} |v_3|^2 \mathfrak{w}^2(v) dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C$ owing to the exponential decay of $\mathfrak{w}(v)$ at $|v| \rightarrow +\infty$. A direct calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_0^A (ax+b)^{2p-2} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} dx \\
 & = \frac{1}{a(2p-1)} (ax+b)^{2p-1} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \Big|_0^A + \frac{2\tau_* p}{2p-1} \int_0^A (ax+b)^{3p-2} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumptions $a, p, \tau_* > 0$ and $2p-1 < 0$, one has

$$\int_0^A (ax+b)^{2p-2} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} dx \leq \frac{b^{2p-1}}{a(1-2p)} (e^{-\tau_* b^p})^2.$$

Collecting the above estimates, one knows

$$|\mathfrak{A}_1| \leq C \tau_* p \frac{a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{p-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{1-2p}} (e^{-\tau_* b^p}) \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A.$$

Step 2. Control of the quantity \mathfrak{A}_2 . It is derived from the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\mathfrak{A}_2| & \leq \int_0^A (ax+b)^{-\mathfrak{z}} e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \left(\int_{v_3 < 0} \nu^{-1} |\hbar \sigma_x v_3 - \nu(v)|^2 \mathfrak{w}^2(v) dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \quad \times \left(\int_{v_3 < 0} |(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma(x, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $\mathfrak{z} > 0$ is to be determined later. Lemma 2.1 indicates that $|v_3| \sigma_x(x, v) \leq c\nu(v)$. Then

$$\int_{v_3 < 0} \nu^{-1} |\hbar \sigma_x v_3 - \nu(v)|^2 \mathfrak{w}^2(v) dv \leq C \int_{v_3 < 0} \nu \mathfrak{w}^2(v) dv \leq C$$

by using the exponential decay of $\mathfrak{w}(v)$ at $|v| \rightarrow +\infty$. It therefore holds

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\mathfrak{A}_2| & \leq C \int_0^A (ax+b)^{-\mathfrak{z}} e^{-\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \left(\int_{v_3 < 0} |(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma(x, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\
 & \leq C \left(\int_0^A (ax+b)^{-2\mathfrak{z}} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A.
 \end{aligned}$$

A straightforward computation shows

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^A (ax+b)^{-2\mathfrak{z}} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)} (ax+b)^{1-2\mathfrak{z}} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} \Big|_0^A - \frac{2\tau_*p}{2\mathfrak{z}-1} \int_0^A (ax+b)^{p-2\mathfrak{z}} e^{-2\tau_*(ax+b)^p} dx \\ &\leq \frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)} (e^{-\tau_*b^p})^2 \end{aligned}$$

under the assumptions $a, p, \tau_*, \mathfrak{z} > 0$ and $2\mathfrak{z} - 1 > 0$. As a result,

$$|\mathfrak{A}_2| \leq C \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} (e^{-\tau_*b^p}) \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A.$$

Step 3. Control of the quantity \mathfrak{A}_3 . Following the similar arguments of $|\mathfrak{A}_2|$ and employing the fact $(\int_{v_3 < 0} \nu \mathfrak{w}^2(v) dv)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C$, one has

$$|\mathfrak{A}_3| \leq C \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} (e^{-\tau_*b^p}) \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_h g_\sigma\|_A$$

under the assumptions $a, p, \tau_*, \mathfrak{z} > 0$ and $2\mathfrak{z} - 1 > 0$. By employing Lemma 2.6 with $\alpha = m = \beta = \vartheta = 0$, one obtains $\|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_h g_\sigma\|_A \leq C \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A$. Consequently,

$$|\mathfrak{A}_3| \leq C \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} (e^{-\tau_*b^p}) \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A.$$

Step 4. Control of the quantity \mathfrak{A}_4 . It infers from the similar arguments of $|\mathfrak{A}_3|$ that

$$|\mathfrak{A}_4| \leq C \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} (e^{-\tau_*b^p}) \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A$$

under the assumptions $a, p, \tau_*, \mathfrak{z} > 0$ and $2\mathfrak{z} - 1 > 0$.

Step 5. Control of the quantity \mathfrak{A}_5 . Note that

$$|\mathfrak{A}_5| = e^{-\tau_*b^p} e^{-\tau_*(aA+b)^p + \tau_*b^p} \left| \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v) dv \right|.$$

Observe that $e^{-\tau_*(aA+b)^p + \tau_*b^p} \leq 1$ for $\tau_*, a, b, p > 0$. Then

$$|\mathfrak{A}_5| \leq e^{-\tau_*b^p} \left| \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v) dv \right|.$$

Collecting the all above estimates on $|\mathfrak{A}_i|$ ($1 \leq i \leq 5$) and the all assumptions on $\tau_*, a, b, p, \mathfrak{z}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 g_\sigma(0, v) dv \right| &\leq C \tau_* p \frac{a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{p-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{1-2p}} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A + C \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A \\ &\quad + C \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} \|(ax+b)^{\mathfrak{z}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A + \left| \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v) dv \right| \end{aligned}$$

with the assumptions $a, b, p, \tau_*, \mathfrak{z} > 0$, $2p - 1 < 0$ and $2\mathfrak{z} - 1 > 0$. For any fixed $\tau_*, a, b > 0$ and $\mathfrak{z} > \frac{1}{2}$, we take $p = \frac{1}{4}$. Then one has $\tau_* p \frac{a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{p-\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{1-2p}} = \frac{\tau_* a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{-\frac{1}{4}}}{2\sqrt{2}}$. The inequality (3.15) thus holds. Consequently, the proof of Lemma 3.2 is finished. \square

Based on the Nondissipative boundary lemma (Lemma 3.2) above, we will deal with the boundary energy with the form $-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv$, where the weight $w_*(v)$ is to be determined later.

Lemma 3.3 (Boundary energy lemma). *Let $l \geq 1$, $\Lambda \geq 0$, $\delta > 0$. Assume that (1.42) holds, i.e., $0 < T_w < 2T$. We further assume that the weight $w_*(v)$ satisfies*

$$w_*(R_0 v) = w_*(v), \quad 0 \leq w_*(v) \lesssim e^{\frac{1}{8}(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T})|v-u|^2}, \quad (3.18)$$

and the small $h > 0$ is such that

$$e^{h\sigma(0,v)} \lesssim e^{C_{T,T_w}|v-u|^2}. \quad (3.19)$$

where $C_{T,T_w} = \min\{\frac{1}{8T}, \frac{1}{8}(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T})\} > 0$. Let $g_\sigma(x, v)$ be a solution to (3.2). Then

$$\begin{aligned} -l^{2\Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv &\geq [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] l^{2\Lambda} \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \\ &\quad - C_0 \alpha_* l^{-1} (\|(\delta x + l)^\Lambda \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A^2 + \|(\delta x + l)^\Lambda \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A^2) \\ &\quad - C_0 \alpha_* \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^\Lambda \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$ independent of l, δ, A, λ .

Proof. Observe that the solution $g_\sigma(x, v)$ satisfies the boundary condition

$$g_\sigma(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*) g_\sigma(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) g_\sigma(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv',$$

where \mathfrak{M}_σ is defined in (2.2). It then follows from a direct calculation that

$$\begin{aligned} &-l^{2\Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \\ &= l^{2\Lambda} \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv - l^{2\Lambda} \int_{v_3 > 0} |v_3| w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \\ &= [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] l^{2\Lambda} \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \\ &\quad - \alpha_*^2 l^{2\Lambda} \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) \frac{M_w^2(v)}{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} dv \left(\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g_\sigma(0, v) \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} dv \right)^2 \\ &\quad - 2\alpha_* (1 - \alpha_*) l^{2\Lambda} \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} g_\sigma(0, v) dv \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| g_\sigma(0, v) \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} dv, \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

where we have utilized the facts

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{v_3 > 0} |v_3| w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, R_0 v) dv &= \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv, \\ \int_{v_3 > 0} |v_3| w_*(v) \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} g_\sigma(0, R_0 v) dv &= \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} g_\sigma(0, v) dv, \\ \int_{v_3 > 0} |v_3| w_*(v) \frac{M_w^2(v)}{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} dv &= \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) \frac{M_w^2(v)}{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} dv. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} &= \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\rho T_w^2} \exp\left\{-\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - \frac{1}{T_w}(\mathbf{u} - u_w) \cdot (v - \mathbf{u}) - \frac{|\mathbf{u} - u_w|^2}{2T_w}\right\} \\ &\leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)|v - \mathbf{u}|^2\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with the assumptions (3.18)-(3.19) and the definition of $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)$ in (2.2), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} w_*(v) \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} &\leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)|v - \mathbf{u}|^2\right\}, \\ w_*(v) \frac{M_w^2(v)}{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} &\leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{5}{8}\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)|v - \mathbf{u}|^2\right\}, \\ \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} &\leq C \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{8T}|v - \mathbf{u}|^2\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

who all exponentially decay at $|v| \rightarrow +\infty$ under the assumption $0 < T_w < 2T$.

We now take $\mathfrak{m}(v) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}$ or $w_*(v) \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}}$ in Lemma 3.2. Then the inequality (3.15) tells us

$$\left| l^\Lambda \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \mathfrak{m}(v) g_\sigma(0, v) dv \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C\tau_* a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{-\frac{1}{4}} l^\Lambda \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A + C\sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} l^\Lambda \|(ax+b)^\mathfrak{z} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A \\ &\quad + C\sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} l^\Lambda \|(ax+b)^\mathfrak{z} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A + \left| l^\Lambda \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v) dv \right| \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

for any $\tau_*, a, b > 0$ and $\mathfrak{z} > \frac{1}{2}$. We take $a = \delta$, $b = l$ and $z = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{l^2}{2\delta}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} l^\Lambda \|(ax+b)^\mathfrak{z} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \|l^{\Lambda-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{l^2}{2\delta}} (\delta x + l)^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{l^2}{2\delta}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \|(\delta x + l)^\Lambda \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

and similarly,

$$\sqrt{\frac{b^{1-2\mathfrak{z}}}{a(2\mathfrak{z}-1)}} l^\Lambda \|(ax+b)^\mathfrak{z} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \|(\delta x + l)^\Lambda \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A. \quad (3.24)$$

We further take $\tau_* = \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} l^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. It thereby follows that

$$\tau_* a^{\frac{1}{2}} b^{-\frac{1}{4}} l^\Lambda \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \|l^\Lambda \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}} \|(\delta x + l)^\Lambda \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A. \quad (3.25)$$

Moreover, the Hölder inequality implies

$$\left| l^\Lambda \int_{v_3 < 0} \mathfrak{w}(v) v_3 \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v) dv \right| \leq C \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^\Lambda \varphi_{A,\sigma} \|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_-}} \quad (3.26)$$

for $\mathfrak{w}(v) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}$ or $w_*(v) \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}}$. From substituting the bounds (3.23), (3.24), (3.25) and (3.26) into (3.22), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| l^\Lambda \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| \mathfrak{w}(v) g_\sigma(0, v) dv \right| \\ &\leq Cl^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\delta x + l)^\Lambda \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A + Cl^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\delta x + l)^\Lambda \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A + C \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^\Lambda \varphi_{A,\sigma} \|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_-}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

for $\mathfrak{w}(v) = \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}$ or $w_*(v) \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}}$. Furthermore, one has

$$\int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| w_*(v) \frac{M_w^2(v)}{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)} dv \leq C \int_{v_3 < 0} \exp\left\{-\frac{5}{8}\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)|v - \mathbf{u}|^2\right\} dv \leq C. \quad (3.28)$$

As a consequence, the equality (3.21) and the bounds (3.27)-(3.28) conclude the estimate (3.20). The proof of Lemma 3.3 is therefore completed. \square

3.3. Weighted $L_{x,v}^\infty$ estimates in $Y_{m,n,\gamma,\beta,\vartheta}^\infty(A)$ space. In this subsection, we aim at controlling the norm $\llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A;m,n,\gamma,\beta,\vartheta}$ with respect to the space $Y_{m,n,\gamma,\beta,\vartheta}^\infty(A)$. Moreover, we will also investigate the continuous dependence of g_σ with respect to the source term h_σ . Set $g_{\sigma i} = \mathcal{L}_{\lambda,h}^{-1}(h_{\sigma i})$ ($i = 1, 2$) for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and sufficiently small $\hbar \geq 0$. Then the difference $\Delta g_\sigma := g_{\sigma 2} - g_{\sigma 1}$ subjects to

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x (\Delta g_\sigma) + [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] (\Delta g_\sigma) - \lambda K_\hbar (\Delta g_\sigma) = \Delta h_\sigma, \\ (\Delta g_\sigma)(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*) (\Delta g_\sigma)(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) (\Delta g_\sigma)(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv', \\ (\Delta g_\sigma)(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.29)$$

where $\Delta h_\sigma := h_{\sigma 2} - h_{\sigma 1}$.

More precisely, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $A > 1$, $0 \leq \frac{1}{2} - \mu_\gamma < \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23) and the integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$, where the constant $\mu_\gamma > 0$ is given in Lemma 2.6. Then for sufficiently small $\vartheta, \hbar \geq 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of A, λ and \hbar , such that*

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m,\mathbf{n}_\gamma,\beta,\vartheta,\Sigma} \leq C \|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{\beta,\vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} + C (\mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A,\sigma})), \quad (3.30)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{A}_\infty^A(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\infty(\cdot)$ are defined in (1.34), (1.39) and (1.40), respectively. Moreover, $\Delta g_\sigma(x, v)$ satisfying (3.29) enjoys the bound

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(\Delta g_\sigma) + \llbracket \Delta g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} \leq C \|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} \Delta g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} + C \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(\Delta h_\sigma). \quad (3.31)$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, the equation (3.11) shows

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} \\ &= \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_\Sigma^\infty} \\ &\leq \|w_{\beta, \vartheta} Y_A(\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma})\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\Xi \in \{Z, U\}} \|w_{\beta, \vartheta} \Xi(\lambda \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma + \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} h_\sigma)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \\ &\leq \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) + C \|\nu^{-1}(\lambda \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma + \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} h_\sigma)\|_{A; n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} \\ &\leq \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) + C(\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} + \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

By Lemma 2.4, one has $\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} \leq C \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta-1, \vartheta}$. It therefore infers that

$$\llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} \leq C \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta-1, \vartheta} + C \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma}).$$

Inductively, for any given integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$, it follows that

$$\llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} \leq C \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C(\mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma})), \quad (3.33)$$

where we have utilized $\llbracket \nu^{-1} h_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, i, \vartheta} \leq C \llbracket \nu^{-1} h_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}$ for $0 \leq i \leq \beta$.

It remains to dominate the quantity $\llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}$. Together with (3.11), the similar arguments in (3.32) indicate that

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta, \Sigma} \\ &\leq C \llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C(\llbracket \nu^{-1} h_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A, \cdot)(\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{0, \vartheta} \varphi_{A, \sigma}\|_{L_v^\infty}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemmas 2.5 show that

$$\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{\hbar} g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \leq \eta_1 \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_{\eta_1} \|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}$$

for any small $\eta_1 > 0$. Taking $\eta_1 > 0$ such that $C_{\eta_1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta, \Sigma} \\ &\leq C \|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} + C(\mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma})) \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

for integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$ and $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$. Then (3.33) and (3.34) imply the bound (3.30) for integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$, $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $0 \leq \frac{1}{2} - \mu_\gamma < \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$ and sufficiently small $\vartheta, \hbar \geq 0$.

By the virtue of the similar arguments in (3.30), Δg_σ subjecting to the equation (3.29) satisfies the bound (3.31). Then the proof of Lemma 3.4 is finished. \square

3.4. Estimate for $L_x^\infty L_v^2$ norm with weight $z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta}$. In this subsection, we will control the norm $\|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}$ appeared in the right hand side of (3.30), Lemma 3.4. More precisely, the follow lemma holds.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $A > 1$, $0 \leq \hbar, \vartheta \ll 1$, $n_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23), the integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha'$, where α' is given in Lemma 3.4. Then there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of A, λ and \hbar , such that*

$$\|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \leq C \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma), \quad (3.35)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(\cdot)$ is given in (1.35). Moreover, one similarly has

$$\|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} \Delta g_\sigma\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \leq C \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(\Delta g_\sigma). \quad (3.36)$$

Proof. Denote by

$$\phi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma(x, v)|^2 dv, \quad \bar{\phi}(x, v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} |z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma|^2(x, v).$$

Then for any $x, y \in \bar{\Omega}_A$,

$$\phi(x) - \phi(y) = \int_y^x \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \bar{\phi}(x', v) dv dx'. \quad (3.37)$$

We claim that

$$\|\bar{\phi}\|_{L_{x,v}^1} \leq C \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma). \quad (3.38)$$

Indeed, a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\phi}\|_{L_{x,v}^1} &\leq 2 \underbrace{\int_0^A \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma| \cdot |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{\beta, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma| dv dx}_{:= \mathfrak{M}_1} \\ &\quad + m \underbrace{\int_0^A \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma| \cdot |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}-1} \sigma_{xx} z_{\alpha'} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma| dv dx}_{:= \mathfrak{M}_2} \\ &\quad + \delta n_\gamma \underbrace{\int_0^A \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma| \cdot |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma-1} z_{\alpha'} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma| dv dx}_{:= \mathfrak{M}_3}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

By the virtue of $|z_1 \sigma_{xx}| \leq |v_3 \sigma_{xx}| \leq \delta \nu(v) \sigma_x$ derived from Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_2 &\leq \delta |m| \int_0^A \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) \sigma_x^m(x, v) (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{2\alpha'-1} w_{\beta, \vartheta}^2(v) g_\sigma^2(x, v) dv dx \\ &= \delta |m| \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

where the fact $z_{2\alpha'-1} = z_{-2\alpha} = z_{-\alpha}^2$ with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha'$ has been used. For the quantity \mathfrak{M}_3 , one has

$$\mathfrak{M}_3 = \delta n_\gamma \|t(x, v) \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2,$$

where $t(x, v) = \frac{\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{\alpha+\alpha'}(v)}{(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1}{2}} (1+|v|)^{\beta_\gamma}}$. The relation $\alpha + \alpha' = \frac{1}{2}$ and the definition of $z_{\frac{1}{2}}(v)$ given

in (1.21) tell us that $z_{\alpha+\alpha'}(v) \leq 1$. The definition of β_γ in (1.24) gives $\frac{\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{(1+|v|)^{\beta_\gamma}} \leq C$. Then $t(x, v) \leq C$ uniformly in (x, v) . It thereby holds

$$\mathfrak{M}_3 \leq C \delta n_\gamma \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2. \quad (3.41)$$

Furthermore, the relation $z_{2\alpha'-1} = z_{-\alpha}^2$ also implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_1 &= 2 \int_0^A \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma| \cdot |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma| dv dx \\ &\leq 2 \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma\|_A \\ &\leq \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 + \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma\|_A^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

By using $w_{\beta, \vartheta} \leq w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}$, one can conclude the claim (3.38) from (3.39)-(3.40)-(3.41)-(3.42).

Since the claim (3.38) holds with the finite value in the right hand side of (3.38), the relation (3.37) tells us that $\phi \in C(\bar{\Omega}_A)$. Let $M_\phi = \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}_A} \phi(x) \geq 0$ and $m_\phi = \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}_A} \phi(x) \geq 0$. Then there are two points $x_M, x_m \in \bar{\Omega}_A$ such that

$$0 \leq M_\phi - m_\phi = \phi(x_M) - \phi(x_m) = \int_{x_m}^{x_M} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \bar{\phi}(x, v) dv dx \leq \|\bar{\phi}\|_{L_{x,v}^1}.$$

If $M_\phi \geq \frac{3}{2}m_\phi$, one has $M_\phi \leq \frac{2}{3}M_\phi + \|\bar{\phi}\|_{L^1_{x,v}}$, which means that

$$M_\phi \leq 3\|\bar{\phi}\|_{L^1_{x,v}}. \quad (3.43)$$

If $M_\phi < \frac{3}{2}m_\phi$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} M_\phi < \frac{3}{2}m_\phi &\leq \frac{3}{2A} \int_0^A \phi(x) dx = \frac{3}{2A} \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_\alpha z_{\alpha'} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 \\ &\leq C \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

where the last inequality is derived from $A^{-1} < 1$ for $A > 1$ and $\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_\alpha z_{\alpha'} w_{\beta, \vartheta} \leq C w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta}$. We remark that the index β_γ given in (1.24) is required here. Consequently, (3.38), (3.43) and (3.44) indicate that

$$\|z_{\alpha'} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_v} = M_\phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma).$$

Namely, the bound (3.35). Furthermore, the estimate of the bound (3.36) is similar to that of (3.35). Thus the proof of Lemma 3.5 is completed. \square

3.5. Estimate for $L^2_{x,v}$ with weight $\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta}$. In this subsection, we will dominate the quantity $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma) = \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma\|_A + \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A$ in the right hand side of (3.35).

Lemma 3.6. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$, $m < 0$, $A > 1$, $0 \leq \hbar, \vartheta \ll 1$, the integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$, $n_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23) and $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha'$, where α' is given in Lemma 3.4. Moreover, $l \geq l_0$ for some constant $l_0 \geq 1$ independent of $A, \lambda, \delta, \hbar$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of A, λ, δ and \hbar , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &[1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma^0_+}}^2 \\ &+ \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_+}}^2 + [\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 \\ &\leq C \| (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma - m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 + C [\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C [\mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi_{A, \sigma})]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\cdot)$ are introduced in (1.35), (1.39) and (1.40), respectively. Similarly, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} &[1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \Delta g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma^0_+}}^2 \\ &+ \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \Delta g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_+}}^2 + [\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(\Delta g_\sigma)]^2 \\ &\leq C \| (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma - m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} \Delta g_\sigma \|_A^2 + C [\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(\Delta h_\sigma)]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

Proof. For $0 \leq \alpha < \mu_\gamma$ with $\mu_\gamma > 0$ given in Lemma 2.6, multiplying (3.2) by $\sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha}^2 w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma$ and integrating by parts over $(x, v) \in \Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \partial_x \left(\frac{1}{2} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 \right) dv dx \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} m v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_{xx} \sigma_x^{m-1} (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \\ &- \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \delta n_\gamma v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma - 1} w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \\ &+ \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha}^2 w_{\beta + \beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} K_h g_\sigma \cdot \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha}^2 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \\
& = \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_\sigma \cdot \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha}^2 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that by Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha}^2 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \\
& \geq c_h \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

where $c_h = 1 - c\hbar > 0$ for sufficiently small $\hbar \geq 0$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \partial_x \left(\frac{1}{2} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 \right) dv dx \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta A + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) dv \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} l^{2n_\gamma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m(0, v) w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv.
\end{aligned}$$

By the boundary conditions in (3.2), it infers that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta A + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) dv \\
& = \int_{v_3 > 0} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta A + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) dv + \int_{v_3 < 0} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta A + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) dv \\
& = \int_{v_3 > 0} |v_3| z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta A + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) dv \\
& \quad - \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta A + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 \varphi_{A, \sigma}^2(A, v) dv \\
& = \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_+}}^2 - \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \varphi_{A, \sigma}\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_-}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we choose $\Lambda = 2n_\gamma$ and $w_*(v) = z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m(0, v) w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2(v)$ in Lemma 3.3. Then estimate (3.20) thereby reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& -l^{2n_\gamma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m(0, v) w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \\
& \geq [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] l^{2n_\gamma} \int_{v_3 < 0} |v_3| z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m(0, v) w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2(v) g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \\
& \quad - C_0 \alpha_* l^{-1} (\|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A^2 + \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma\|_A^2) - C_0 \alpha_* \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} \varphi_{A, \sigma}\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_-}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $1 \leq \sqrt{C_1} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}$ for some universal constant $C_1 > 0$. As a result, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \partial_x \left(\frac{1}{2} v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 \right) dv dx \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] l^{2n_\gamma} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^0_+}}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A_+}}^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} C_0 C_1 \alpha_* l^{-1} \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma\|_A^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -\frac{1}{2}C_0C_1\alpha_*l^{-1}\|(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h_\sigma\|_A^2 \\
 & -\frac{1}{2}(1+C_0C_1\alpha_*)\| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta A+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}\varphi_{A,\sigma}\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^A}}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1, $|v_3\sigma_{xx}| \leq \delta\sigma_x\nu(v)$. Then it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} m v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_{xx} \sigma_x^{m-1} (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \right| \\
 & \leq C\delta \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 \leq \frac{c_h}{16} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta > 0$ is taken small enough such that $C\delta \leq \frac{c_h}{16}$. Note that $|v_3| \leq |v| \leq C\nu(v)$ for $\gamma = 1$, and $n_\gamma = 0$ for $-3 < \gamma < 1$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| - \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \delta n_\gamma v_3 z_{-\alpha}^2 \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma-1} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \right| \\
 & \leq C\delta \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 \leq \frac{c_h}{16} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2
 \end{aligned}$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, where $\delta > 0$ is taken small enough such that $C\delta \leq \frac{c_h}{16}$. Moreover, the Hölder inequality shows

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_\sigma \cdot \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha}^2 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \right| \\
 & \leq \frac{c_h}{8} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}h_\sigma\|_A^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} K_h g_\sigma \cdot \sigma_x^m (\delta x + l)^{2n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha}^2 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dv dx \right| \\
 & \leq \frac{c_h}{4} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}K_h g_\sigma\|_A^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

We thereby establish

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}z_{-\alpha}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^+}}^2 \\
 & + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta A+l)^{n_\gamma}z_{-\alpha}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_{L^2_{\Sigma^+}}^2 + \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 \\
 & \leq C \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}K_h g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C[\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2. \tag{3.49}
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.6 show that for $0 \leq \alpha < \mu_\gamma$ and $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$,

$$\|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}K_h g_\sigma\|_A^2 \lesssim \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2. \tag{3.50}$$

It follow from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) & \lesssim \max\{(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}, (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2}}\} \\
 & \lesssim (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2}}
 \end{aligned}$$

for $m < 0$. It thereby infers

$$\|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A \lesssim \|(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2,\vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A.$$

As a result, after taking large $l \geq 1$ such that $\frac{1}{2}C_0C_1\alpha_*l^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{2}c\hbar$ in (3.48), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2\right] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^0}}^2 \\ & + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^A}}^2 + \| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

$$\leq C \| (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma - m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 + C [\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C [\mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2$$

for $m < 0$ and $0 \leq \alpha < \mu_\gamma$. Here the constant $C > 0$ is independent of A , \hbar and λ .

Recalling (3.2), one has $\partial_x g_\sigma = -[\hbar \sigma_x + \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}] g_\sigma + \lambda \frac{1}{v_3} K_h g_\sigma + \frac{1}{v_3} h_\sigma$, which means

$$\begin{aligned} & | \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma | \\ & \leq C (\hbar \nu^{-1} z_1 \sigma_x + \frac{z_1}{|v_3|}) | \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma | \\ & + C | \frac{z_1}{|v_3|} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} K_h g_\sigma | + C | \frac{z_1}{|v_3|} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} h_\sigma |. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $|\frac{z_1}{|v_3|}| \leq 1$, and $\sigma_x \leq c \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|}$ by Lemma 2.1, which imply $\hbar \nu^{-1} z_1 \sigma_x + \frac{z_1}{|v_3|} \leq c\hbar + 1$. It therefore follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma \|_A^2 & \leq C \| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 \\ & + C \| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} K_h g_\sigma \|_A^2 + C [\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.6 reads that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} K_h g_\sigma|^2 dv \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma|^2 dv$. Then, together with (3.51), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_1 w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} \partial_x g_\sigma \|_A^2 \\ & \leq C \| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 + C \| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{-\alpha} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta} h_\sigma \|_A^2 \quad (3.52) \\ & \leq C \| (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma - m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 + C [\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C [\mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then the bounds (3.51) and (3.52) conclude the estimate (3.45).

Furthermore, as the similar arguments in (3.51) and (3.52), one can easily know that Δg_σ obeying the equation (3.29) satisfies the bound (3.46). Consequently, the proof of Lemma 3.6 is completed. \square

3.6. Spatial-velocity indices iteration approach. In this subsection, the majority is to control the norm $\| (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma - m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2$ in the right-hand side of (3.45) by developing a so-called *spatial-velocity indices iteration approach*. We remark that the power of spatial polynomial weight $(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}$ is actually too large to be dominated. In fact, we will assume

$$\begin{cases} m < -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}, \mathbf{n}_\gamma = 0, & \text{for } -3 < \gamma < 1, \\ m < 0, \mathbf{n}_\gamma > 1, & \text{for } \gamma = 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.53)$$

which is such that the power $\mathbf{n}_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}$ is large. In order to control the large power of the spatial polynomial weight, we will develop the so-called spatial-velocity indices iteration approach, the key of which is to shift the spatial polynomial weight to the velocity one.

For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the spatial-velocity indices functions as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{a,b} & := \| (\delta x + l)^{\frac{a}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{b, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2, \\ y_{a,b} & := \| (\delta x + l)^{\frac{a}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{b, \vartheta} h_\sigma \|_A^2 + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{\frac{a}{2}} w_{b, \vartheta} \varphi_{A,\sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^A}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.54)$$

Here a is the spatial polynomial weighted index, and b stands for the velocity polynomial weighed index.

First, we establish the following spatial-velocity indices iteration lemma.

Lemma 3.7 (Spatial-velocity indices iteration form). *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$, $\beta_\sharp, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}$, $A > 1$, $0 < \delta \ll 1$ and sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$. There are constants $l_0 \geq 1$ and $C > 0$, independent of A, λ, δ and \hbar , such that if $l \geq l_0$, then*

$$\psi_{\mathbf{q}, \beta_\sharp} \leq C\delta\psi_{\mathbf{q}-1, \beta_\sharp+\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2}} + Cy_{\mathbf{q}, \beta_\sharp} + C\alpha_* \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}<0}(l^{-1}\psi_{0,0} + y_{0,0}), \quad (3.55)$$

where β_γ is given in (1.24).

Proof. From multiplying (3.2) by $(\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \partial_x \left(\frac{1}{2} v_3 (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 \right) dx dv - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{q} \delta \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} v_3 (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}-1} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dx dv \\ & + \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dx dv \\ & = \lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} K_h g_\sigma \cdot (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dx dv + \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_\sigma \cdot (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dx dv. \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

By the same arguments in (3.47), one has

$$\iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 dx dv \geq c_h \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2. \quad (3.57)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \partial_x \left(\frac{1}{2} v_3 (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 \right) dx dv \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 (\delta A + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) dv - \frac{1}{2} l^{\mathbf{q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the boundary condition in (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 (\delta A + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) dv \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^A}^2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_-^A}^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbf{q} \geq 0$, Lemma 3.3 (or similar arguments in (3.48)) indicates that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2} l^{\mathbf{q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \\ & \geq [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^0}^2}^2 - C\alpha_* l^{-1} \| (\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 \\ & \quad - C\alpha_* \left(\| (\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} h_\sigma \|_A^2 + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_-^A}^2}^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbf{q} < 0$, one derives from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2} l^{\mathbf{q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(0, v) dv \geq [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^0}^2}^2 \\ & \quad - C\alpha_* l^{-1} \| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma \|_A^2 - C\alpha_* \left(\| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma \|_A^2 + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_-^A}^2}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

In summary, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \partial_x \left(\frac{1}{2} v_3 (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2 \right) dx dv \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^0}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}}{2}} w_{\beta_\sharp, \vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L_{\Sigma_+^A}^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - C\alpha_* l^{-1} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q} \geq 0} \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q} < 0} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2) \\
& - C\alpha_* \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q} \geq 0} (\|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} h_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta A + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_{\underline{A}}}^2}^2) \\
& - C\alpha_* \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q} < 0} (\|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_{\underline{A}}}^2}^2). \tag{3.58}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|v_3| \lesssim \frac{\nu(v)|v-u|}{(1+|v-u|)^{\gamma}} \lesssim \nu(v)(1+|v-u|)^{2\beta_{\gamma}+1}$, where β_{γ} is given in (1.24). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{q} \delta \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} v_3 (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}-1} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta}^2 g_{\sigma}^2 dv dx \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{q}| \delta \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} |v_3| (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}-1} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta}^2 g_{\sigma}^2 dv dx \\
& \leq C \delta \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) (1+|v-u|)^{2\beta_{\gamma}+1} (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}-1} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta}^2 g_{\sigma}^2 dv dx \\
& = C \delta \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}-1}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp} + \beta_{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2. \tag{3.59}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the Hölder inequality shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda \left| \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} K_{\hbar} g_{\sigma} \cdot (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta}^2 g_{\sigma} dv dx \right| \\
& \leq \frac{c_{\hbar}}{8} \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + C \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} K_{\hbar} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Following the similar arguments in [17], one knows that the operator $\nu^{-1} K_{\hbar}$ is compact on $L_v^2(\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta})$ for sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$. This means that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} K_{\hbar} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 \leq \epsilon \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2.$$

It thereby holds that

$$C \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} K_{\hbar} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 \leq C \epsilon \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 = \frac{c_{\hbar}}{4} \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2$$

by taking small $\epsilon > 0$ such that $C\epsilon = \frac{c_{\hbar}}{4}$. Consequently, for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\lambda \left| \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} K_{\hbar} g_{\sigma} \cdot (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta}^2 g_{\sigma} dv dx \right| \leq \frac{3c_{\hbar}}{8} \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2. \tag{3.60}$$

Furthermore, it follow from the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_{\sigma} \cdot (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{q}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta}^2 g_{\sigma} dv dx \right| \\
& \leq \frac{c_{\hbar}}{8} \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + C \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} h_{\sigma}\|_A^2. \tag{3.61}
\end{aligned}$$

We now take $l \geq l_0 \geq 1$ such that $C\alpha_* l^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ in (3.58). Then collecting the estimates (3.56), (3.57), (3.58), (3.59), (3.60) and (3.61) can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_{\underline{A}}}^2}^2 \\
& + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_{\underline{A}}}^2}^2 + \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 \\
& \leq C \delta \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{\mathbf{q}-1}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp} + \beta_{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2}, \vartheta} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 \\
& + C (\|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} h_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{\frac{q}{2}} w_{\beta_{\sharp}, \vartheta} \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_{\underline{A}}}^2}^2) \\
& + C\alpha_* \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q} < 0} (l^{-1} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_{\sigma}\|_A^2 + \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_{A, \sigma} \|_{L_{\Sigma_{\underline{A}}}^2}^2). \tag{3.62}
\end{aligned}$$

Together with (3.54), the bound (3.62) complete the proof of Lemma 3.7. \square

Now, based on the spatial-velocity indices iteration form (3.55) in Lemma 3.7, we will establish the following lemma to control the quantity $\|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A$. By using the relation (1.25), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A \\ & = \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*-N_0(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2}), \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A \leq \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (3.63)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$ is given in (1.36).

Lemma 3.8. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $A > 1$, $0 < \delta \ll 1$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $0 \leq \hbar, \vartheta \ll 1$, $n_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23), the integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$ and $l \geq l_1$, where $l_1 \gg 1$ is independent of $A, \lambda, \hbar, \delta$. Then*

$$[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 \leq C\delta[\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2, \quad (3.64)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\cdot)$ are defined in (1.36), (1.37), (1.39) and (1.40), respectively. Here the constant $C > 0$ is given in Lemma 3.7. Furthermore, one similarly has

$$[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\Delta g_\sigma)]^2 \leq C\delta[\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(\Delta g_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\Delta h_\sigma)]^2. \quad (3.65)$$

Proof. From iteration form (3.55) in Lemma 3.7, it is easy to see that for any integer $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\mathbf{q}-i, \beta_\sharp+i(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} & \leq C\delta\psi_{\mathbf{q}-i-1, \beta_\sharp+(i+1)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} + C y_{\mathbf{q}-i, \beta_\sharp+i(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} \\ & \quad + C\alpha_* \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}-i < 0} (l^{-1}\psi_{0,0} + y_{0,0}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

for $i = 0, 1, \dots, N_0 - 1$, where the integer $N_0 \geq 1$ is given in (1.26). Summing up (3.66) for $i = 0, 1, \dots, N_0 - 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \psi_{\mathbf{q}-i, \beta_\sharp+i(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} & \leq C\delta \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \psi_{\mathbf{q}-i-1, \beta_\sharp+(i+1)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} + C \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} y_{\mathbf{q}-i, \beta_\sharp+i(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} \\ & \quad + C\alpha_* \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}-i < 0} (l^{-1}\psi_{0,0} + y_{0,0}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \psi_{\mathbf{q}-i-1, \beta_\sharp+(i+1)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_0-1} \psi_{\mathbf{q}-i, \beta_\sharp+i(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} + \psi_{\mathbf{q}-N_0, \beta_\sharp+N_0(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})}. \quad (3.68)$$

Then for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, the relations (3.67) and (3.68) indicate that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \psi_{\mathbf{q}-i, \beta_\sharp+i(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} & \leq C\delta\psi_{\mathbf{q}-N_0, \beta_\sharp+N_0(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} + C \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} y_{\mathbf{q}-i, \beta_\sharp+i(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} \\ & \quad + C\alpha_* \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}-i < 0} (l^{-1}\psi_{0,0} + y_{0,0}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.69)$$

We now take

$$\mathbf{q} = m_\gamma := 2n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{3-\gamma}, \quad \beta_\sharp = \beta + \beta_* - N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}) = \beta + \beta_\gamma - m(1-\gamma)/2$$

for $m \in \mathbb{R}$. One then has

$$C\alpha_* \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}-i < 0} (l^{-1}\psi_{0,0} + y_{0,0}) \leq C'(l^{-1}\psi_{m_\gamma, \beta+\beta_*-N_0(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} + y_{m_\gamma, \beta+\beta_*-N_0(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})}).$$

We now take l large enough such that $C'l^{-1}$ is sufficiently small. It is then implied by (3.69) that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \psi_{m_\gamma-i, \beta+\beta_*(N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})} \leq C\delta\psi_{m_\gamma-N_0, \beta+\beta_*} + C \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} y_{m_\gamma-i, \beta+\beta_*(N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})}. \quad (3.70)$$

In other words, together with (3.54), the bound (3.70) shows that

$$[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 \leq C\delta\|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{m_\gamma-N_0}{2}}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2. \quad (3.71)$$

By (1.26), one has $m_\gamma - N_0 \leq -\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}$, which indicates that

$$\|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{m_\gamma-N_0}{2}}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta_{m,\gamma}+N_0(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2}), \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 \leq \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2. \quad (3.72)$$

In summary, (3.71) and (3.72) read

$$[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 \leq C\delta\|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2. \quad (3.73)$$

Due to $(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \lesssim 1$ uniformly in $x \geq 0$ and $\|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{P}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A \lesssim \|\mathcal{P}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A$, one easily knows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}}\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 &\leq C(1-\lambda)\mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 \\ &\quad + C\lambda\mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]} (\|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}}\mathcal{P}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2 + \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_A^2) \\ &\leq C[\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(g_\sigma)]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.74)$$

Plugging (3.74) into (3.73), one immediately concludes (3.64). The estimate (3.65) for the difference Δg_σ can be derived as similarly as in (3.64). The proof of Lemma 3.8 is therefore finished. \square

3.7. $w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}$ -weighted $L_{x,v}^2$ estimates. In this subsection, the majority is to control the quantity $[\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(g_\sigma)]^2$ appeared in the right-hand side of (3.64) in Lemma 3.8 by employing the weighted $L_{x,v}^2$ energy method. More precisely, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $0 \leq \alpha_* \leq 1$, $A > 1$, $l \gg 1$, $0 < \delta \ll 1$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, the integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$, $0 \leq \hbar, \vartheta \ll 1$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23) and $\beta_* > 0$ be given in (1.25) in Lemma 3.8. Moreover, the number $m < 0$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} m < -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}, \mathbf{n}_\gamma = 0, & \text{for } -3 < \gamma < 1, \\ m < 0, \mathbf{n}_\gamma > 1, & \text{for } \gamma = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.75)$$

Then there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of A, λ, δ and \hbar , such that

$$\begin{aligned} &[1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_{L_{\Sigma_+^0}}^2 + \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}g_\sigma\|_{L_{\Sigma_+^A}}^2 + [\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 \\ &\leq \lambda C \hbar [\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma)]^2 + C\alpha_* l^{-1} [\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 \\ &\quad + C[\mathcal{A}_{2,\lambda}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C\alpha_* [\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{B}_2(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.76)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{A}_{2,\lambda}^A(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}_2(\cdot)$ are defined in (1.34), (1.36), (1.37), (1.39) and (1.40), respectively. Moreover, the difference Δg_σ enjoys the bound

$$\begin{aligned} &[1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}\Delta g_\sigma\|_{L_{\Sigma_+^0}}^2 + \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}\Delta g_\sigma\|_{L_{\Sigma_+^A}}^2 + [\mathcal{E}_{2,\lambda}^A(\Delta g_\sigma)]^2 \\ &\leq \lambda C \hbar [\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(\Delta g_\sigma)]^2 + C\alpha_* l^{-1} [\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\Delta g_\sigma)]^2 + C[\mathcal{A}_{2,\lambda}^A(\Delta h_\sigma)]^2 + C\alpha_* [\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\Delta h_\sigma)]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.77)$$

Remark 3.1. *The assumptions on m and \mathbf{n}_γ in (3.75) are required to control the quantity $U(x) := C\hbar(\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}-\mathbf{n}_\gamma} \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A;m,\mathbf{n}_\gamma,\beta,\vartheta}^2$. To be more precise, the uniform-in- A integrability of the quantity $U(x)$ over $\Omega_A = [0, A]$ is essentially needed, since the limit $A \rightarrow +\infty$ will be also investigated to achieve our goal of this paper. The details of assumptions on \mathbf{n}_γ and m can be found in (3.79) later.*

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Multiplying (3.2) by $w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma$ and integrating by parts over $(x, v) \in \Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3$, we have

$$\iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} v_3 \partial_x g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx + \mathscr{W}_\lambda(g_\sigma) = \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx,$$

where

$$\mathscr{W}_\lambda(g_\sigma) = \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx - \lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} K_\hbar g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx.$$

Note that

$$\iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} v_3 \partial_x g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) \, dv - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(0, v) \, dv.$$

The boundary condition in (3.2) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(A, v) \, dv = \frac{1}{2} \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_+^A}}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta} \varphi_{A,\sigma} \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_-^A}}^2.$$

Moreover, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} v_3 w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma^2(0, v) \, dv &\geq \frac{1}{2} [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_+^0}}^2 \\ &\quad - C\alpha_* l^{-1} \| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma \|_A^2 - C\alpha_* \| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma \|_A^2 - C\alpha_* \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_{A,\sigma} \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_-^A}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $\| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} g_\sigma \|_A^2 \leq C[\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)]^2$, $\| \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_\sigma \|_A^2 \leq C[\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2$ and $\| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_{A,\sigma} \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_-^A}}^2 \leq C[\mathcal{B}_2(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2$. As a consequence, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} v_3 \partial_x g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} [1 - (1 - \alpha_*)^2] \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_+^0}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta} g_\sigma \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_+^A}}^2 \\ &\quad - C\alpha_* l^{-1} [\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 - C\alpha_* [\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma)]^2 - C[\mathcal{B}_2(\varphi_{A,\sigma})]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.78)$$

Recalling $\mathcal{L}_\hbar g_\sigma = \nu(v) g_\sigma - K_\hbar g_\sigma$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{W}_\lambda(g_\sigma) &= (1 - \lambda) \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx + \lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{L}_\hbar g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx \\ &\quad + \lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} (-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 g_\sigma) w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx. \end{aligned}$$

From replacing β and β' in Lemma 2.3 by $\beta + \beta_\star$ and β_\star , respectively, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} (-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 g_\sigma) w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta}^2 g_\sigma \, dv dx \\ &\geq \lambda \mu_0 \hbar \| (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 - \lambda C \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \| \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_\star,\vartheta} g_\sigma \|_A^2 \\ &\quad - \lambda C \hbar \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{A;m,\mathbf{n}_\gamma,\beta,\vartheta}^2 \int_{\Omega_A} (\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}-\mathbf{n}_\gamma} \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Because the limit $A \rightarrow +\infty$ will be focused later, we require here

$$\int_{\Omega_A} (\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma} dx \leq C < +\infty$$

uniform in A . It is equivalent to

$$-3 < \gamma < 1, m < -\frac{2}{1-\gamma} < 0, \text{ and } n_\gamma > 1, \gamma = 1. \quad (3.79)$$

As a result, under the assumption (3.79),

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} (-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 g_\sigma) w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dv dx \\ & \geq \lambda \mu_0 \hbar \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 - \lambda C \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 - \lambda C \hbar \|g_\sigma\|_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 2.2 of [3] (or Lemma 2.4 of [25]) and the similar arguments in Corollary 1 of [21], it infers that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{L}_\hbar g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dv dx & \geq \lambda \mu_2 \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 \\ & \quad - \lambda C \hbar^2 \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $\mu_2 > 0$. Lemma 2.1 indicates that $|\sigma_x v_3| \leq c\nu(v)$, which means that

$$(1 - \lambda) \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] g_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dv dx \geq (1 - \lambda) c_\hbar \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2,$$

where $c_\hbar = 1 - c\hbar > 0$ for sufficiently small $\hbar \geq 0$. Take small $\hbar \geq 0$ such that $\mu_2 - C\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\mu_2$ and $\mu_0 - C\hbar \geq \frac{1}{2}\mu_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_\lambda(g_\sigma) & \geq (1 - \lambda) c_\hbar \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \mu_2 \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \mu_0 \hbar \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 - \lambda C \hbar \|g_\sigma\|_{A; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}^2 \\ & \geq c_0 [\mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 - \lambda C \hbar [\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma)]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.80)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(\cdot)$ are given in (1.34) and (1.37), respectively.

We then control the quantity $\iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dv dx$. If $\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, one has $1 - \lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dv dx & \leq \frac{1}{2} c_0 \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} h_\sigma\|_A^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{2} c_0 \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} [\mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 + C \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} [\mathcal{A}_{2, \lambda}^A(h_\sigma)]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.81)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{A}_{2, \lambda}^A(\cdot)$ is defined in (1.39). If $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} h_\sigma \cdot w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}^2 g_\sigma dv dx \\ & = \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} h_\sigma \cdot \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma dv dx + \iint_{\Omega_A \times \mathbb{R}^3} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} h_\sigma \cdot \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma dv dx \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} c_0 \|(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} h_\sigma\|_A^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} c_0 \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A^2 + C \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} h_\sigma\|_A^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{2} c_0 \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]} [\mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g_\sigma)]^2 + C \mathbf{1}_{\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]} [\mathcal{A}_{2, \lambda}^A(h_\sigma)]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.82)$$

Collecting the all above estimates (3.78), (3.80), (3.81) and (3.82), one concludes the bound (3.76). Moreover, as similar arguments as in (3.76), the difference $\Delta g_\sigma := g_{\sigma 2} - g_{\sigma 1}$ enjoys the estimate (3.77). Therefore, the proof of Lemma 3.9 is completed. \square

3.8. Close the uniform estimates: Proof of Lemma 3.1. In this subsection, based on Lemma 3.4-3.9, we will close the required uniform a priori estimate in Lemma 3.1.

First, it follows from the inequalities (3.30) in Lemma 3.4 and (3.35) in Lemma 3.5 that

$$\mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma}). \quad (3.83)$$

Together with (3.45) in Lemma 3.6 and (3.83), one then gains

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} + \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma) \\ & \lesssim \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A \\ & \quad + \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) + \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.84)$$

Observe that $\|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma-m(1-\gamma)/2, \vartheta} g_\sigma\|_A \leq \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma)$. Combining with the bounds (3.84) and (3.64) in Lemma 3.8, one easily sees that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} + \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma) \\ & \lesssim \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) + \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.85)$$

Furthermore, the estimates (3.85) and (3.76) in Lemma 3.9 show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \llbracket g_\sigma \rrbracket_{m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta, \Sigma} + \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{E}_{2, \lambda}^A(g_\sigma) \\ & \lesssim \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \alpha_* \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{A}_{2, \lambda}^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_2(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) + \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) \\ & = \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_\sigma) + \alpha_* \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} l^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_\sigma) + \mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}(\varphi_{A, \sigma}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.86)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{A}_\lambda^A(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ are defined in (1.38). By taking $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\alpha_* \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} l^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ small enough, (3.86) concludes the uniform estimate (3.13). Moreover, by the similar arguments in (3.86), we can also easily prove the bound (3.14) for the difference Δg_σ . Therefore, the proof of Lemma 3.1 is finished.

4. EXISTENCE OF LINEAR PROBLEM (KLe): PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

4.1. Existence of (CA-eq) with $\lambda = 0$. Note that the equation (CA-eq) with $\lambda = 0$ reads

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g + \nu(v) g = h, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*) g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w g(0, v), \\ g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v). \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

If $v_3 = 0$, one obviously has

$$g(x, v) = \frac{1}{\nu(v)} h(x, v). \quad (4.2)$$

If $v_3 \neq 0$, the equation (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$\partial_x \left[e^{\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x} g(x, v) \right] = \frac{1}{v_3} e^{\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x} h(x, v). \quad (4.3)$$

For $v_3 < 0$, it follows from integrating the differential equation (4.3) over (x, A) and using the boundary condition $g(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_A(v)$ that

$$g(x, v) = G_-(h, \varphi_A)(x, v) := e^{\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (A-x)} \varphi_A(v) - \int_x^A \frac{1}{v_3} e^{\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x'-x)} h(x', v) dx'. \quad (4.4)$$

For $v_3 > 0$, we integrate the equation (4.3) over $(0, x)$. Together with the boundary condition of $g(0, v)|_{v_3 < 0}$ in (4.1), one then has

$$g(x, v) = e^{-\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x} \left[(1 - \alpha_*) g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w g(0, v) \right] + \int_0^x \frac{1}{v_3} e^{-\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x')} h(x', v) dx'.$$

Moreover, the relation (4.4) tells us $\mathcal{D}_w g(0, v) = \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) G_-(h, \varphi)(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv'$ and $g(0, R_0 v) = G_-(h, \varphi)(0, R_0 v)$. As a result, for $v_3 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, v) &= G_+(h, \varphi)(x, v) \\ &:= \int_0^x \frac{1}{v_3} e^{-\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}(x-x')} h(x', v) dx' \\ &\quad + (1 - \alpha_*) e^{-\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x} \left[e^{\frac{\nu(R_0 v)}{(R_0 v)_3} A} \varphi_A(R_0 v) - \int_0^A \frac{1}{(R_0 v)_3} e^{\frac{\nu(R_0 v)}{(R_0 v)_3} x'} h(x', R_0 v) dx' \right] \\ &\quad + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \left[e^{\frac{\nu(v')}{v'_3} A} \varphi_A(v') - \int_0^A \frac{1}{v'_3} e^{\frac{\nu(v')}{v'_3} x'} h(x', v') dx' \right] \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv'. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Summarily, the relations (4.2), (4.4) and (4.5) give the explicit expression (1.54), i.e.,

$$g(x, v) = \begin{cases} G_+(h, \varphi_A)(x, v), & v_3 > 0, \\ G_-(h, \varphi_A)(x, v), & v_3 < 0, \\ \frac{1}{\nu(v)} h(x, v), & v_3 = 0, \end{cases}$$

4.2. Existence of (Ap-eq): Extend the existence of (CA-eq) from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = 1$. In this subsection, based on Lemma 3.1, we will prove the existence and uniqueness of (CA-eq) (or equivalently (3.2)) for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ by a contraction arguments. First we define two Banach spaces \mathbb{B}_i ($i = 0, 1$) as

$$\mathbb{B}_i := \{f = f(x, v) : \mathcal{E}_i^A(f) < \infty\},$$

which are endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{B}_i} := \mathcal{E}_i^A(f) \tag{4.6}$$

for $i = 0, 1$. Here the functionals $\mathcal{E}_i^A(f)$ ($i = 0, 1$) are defined in (1.33) with $\lambda = i$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23), sufficiently small $\delta, \hbar, \vartheta > 0$, large enough $A, l > 1$, $m < \mathbf{m}_\gamma$ given in (1.27), integer $\beta \geq \max\{0, -\gamma\}$ and $0 < \alpha < \mu_\gamma$, where $\mu_\gamma > 0$ is given in Lemma 2.6. Assume that the source term $h(x, v) = e^{-\hbar\sigma(x, v)} h_\sigma(x, v)$ and the boundary source term $\varphi_A(v) = e^{-\hbar\sigma(A, v)} \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v)$ satisfy (3.12) with $\lambda = 1$, i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{A}_1^A(h_\sigma), \mathcal{B}(\varphi_{A, \sigma}) < \infty.$$

Then the problem (Ap-eq) admits a unique mild solution $g = g(x, v)$ satisfying $g_\sigma(x, v) = g(x, v) e^{\hbar\sigma(x, v)} \in \mathbb{B}_1$ with the bound

$$\mathcal{E}_1^A(g_\sigma) \leq C(\mathcal{A}_1^A(h_\sigma) + \mathcal{B}(\varphi_{A, \sigma})). \tag{4.7}$$

Here the constant $C > 0$ is independent of A, δ, \hbar , and the all functionals are defined in Subsection 1.3.3.

Remark 4.1. *The assumption $m < -1$ for the case $-3 < \gamma < 1$ is such that*

$$(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \leq (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}.$$

The assumption $m < -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma = 0$ ($-3 < \gamma < 1$) and $\mathbf{n}_\gamma > 1, m < 0$ ($\gamma = 1$) are required to guarantee the integrability of $\int_0^A (\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma - (1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} dx$ uniform in $A > 1$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We will focus on the equivalent problem (3.2) of the connection auxiliary equation (CA-eq), in which the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \hbar}$ is introduced. The conclusion of this lemma is equivalent to the existence of the inverse operator $\mathcal{L}_{1, \hbar}^{-1}$.

We will employ the contraction arguments to extend the existence of $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,h}^{-1}(h_\sigma)$ from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ in the space \mathbb{B}_0 , provided that h_σ satisfies (3.12). By Lemma 3.1, one knows that $\mathcal{L}_{\frac{1}{2},h}^{-1}(h_\sigma) \in \mathbb{B}_0 \cap \mathbb{B}_1$. Then we extend the existence of $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,h}^{-1}(h_\sigma)$ from $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ to $\lambda = 1$ in the space \mathbb{B}_1 , which complete the proof of Lemma 4.1.

Step 1. Extension from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$.

The explicit solution (1.54) to (CA-eq) with $\lambda = 0$ and Lemma 3.1 guarantee the existence of $\mathcal{L}_{0,h}^{-1}$. Now we define the operator

$$\mathcal{T}_\lambda g := \mathcal{L}_{0,h}^{-1}(\lambda K_h g + h_\sigma).$$

For any $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{B}_0$ and $\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, it follows from the inequality of (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_0^A(\mathcal{T}_\lambda g_1 - \mathcal{T}_\lambda g_2) &= \mathcal{E}_0^A[\mathcal{L}_{0,h}^{-1}(\lambda K_h g_1 + h_\sigma) - \mathcal{L}_{0,h}^{-1}(\lambda K_h g_2 + h_\sigma)] \\ &\leq C \mathcal{A}_0^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Recalling (1.38), one has

$$\mathcal{A}_0^A(\cdot) = \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(\cdot) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(\cdot) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h) + \mathcal{A}_{2,0}^A(\cdot). \quad (4.9)$$

Step 1.1. Estimate of $\mathcal{A}_\infty^A(\cdot)$. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}_\infty^A(\cdot)$ in (1.39),

$$\mathcal{A}_\infty^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq \lambda \llbracket \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_h(g_1 - g_2) \rrbracket_{A;m,n,\gamma,\beta,\vartheta}.$$

It infers by Lemma 2.4 that

$$\llbracket \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_h(g_1 - g_2) \rrbracket_{A;m,n,\gamma,\beta,\vartheta} \leq C \llbracket g_1 - g_2 \rrbracket_{A;m,n,\gamma,\beta,\vartheta}.$$

Consequently, there holds

$$\mathcal{A}_\infty^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq C \lambda \llbracket g_1 - g_2 \rrbracket_{A;m,n,\gamma,\beta,\vartheta} = C \lambda \mathcal{E}_\infty^A(g_1 - g_2), \quad (4.10)$$

where the functional \mathcal{E}_∞^A is defined in (1.34), and $C > 0$ is independent of λ, A, δ and \hbar .

Step 1.2. Estimate of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(\cdot)$. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(\cdot)$ in (1.39), one has

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq \lambda \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta} K_h(g_1 - g_2)\|_A.$$

It is further implied by Lemma 2.6 that

$$\|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta} K_h(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \leq C \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta} (g_1 - g_2)\|_A.$$

In summary, one establishes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] &\leq C \lambda \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta} (g_1 - g_2)\|_A \\ &\leq C \lambda \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A(g_1 - g_2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A$ is defined in (1.35), and $C > 0$ is independent of λ, A, δ and \hbar .

Step 1.3. Estimate of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\cdot)$. From the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(\cdot)$ in (1.39), it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq \lambda \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)} - \frac{i}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - (N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}),\vartheta} K_h(g_1 - g_2)\|_A.$$

Lemma 2.6 tells us

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)} - \frac{i}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - (N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}),\vartheta} K_h(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)} - \frac{i}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - (N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}),\vartheta} (g_1 - g_2)\|_A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] &\leq C\lambda \sum_{i=0}^{N_0-1} \|(\delta x + l)^{n\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)} - \frac{i}{2}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*,\vartheta}^{(N_0-i)(\beta_\gamma+\frac{1}{2})}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \\ &= C\lambda \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_1 - g_2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A$ is defined in (1.36), and $C > 0$ is independent of λ, A, δ and \hbar .

Step 1.4. Estimate of $\mathcal{A}_{2,0}^A(\cdot)$. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{2,0}^A(\cdot)$ in (1.39), one knows that

$$\mathcal{A}_{2,0}^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq \lambda \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*,\vartheta} K_h(g_1 - g_2)\|_A.$$

Then, from the similar arguments in (4.12), one derives that

$$\mathcal{A}_{2,0}^A[\lambda K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq C\lambda \mathcal{E}_{2,0}^A(g_1 - g_2), \quad (4.13)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{E}_{2,0}^A$ is defined in (1.37), and $C > 0$ is independent of λ, A, δ and \hbar .

Consequently, by substituting (4.9), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12) and (4.13) into (4.8), it is implied that $\mathcal{E}_0^A(\mathcal{T}_\lambda g_1 - \mathcal{T}_\lambda g_2) \leq C\lambda \mathcal{E}_0^A(g_1 - g_2)$. Together with the definition of the Banach space \mathbb{B}_0 in (4.6), one has

$$\|\mathcal{T}_\lambda g_1 - \mathcal{T}_\lambda g_2\|_{\mathbb{B}_0} \leq C\lambda \|g_1 - g_2\|_{\mathbb{B}_0}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $\lambda, A, \delta, \hbar$.

We now take a sufficiently small $\lambda_{*0} > 0$ such that $C\lambda_{*0} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\mathcal{T}_\lambda : \mathbb{B}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_0$ is a contraction map for all $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_{*0}]$, which admits a fixed point $g^\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_0$ such that

$$g^\lambda = \mathcal{T}_\lambda g^\lambda = \mathcal{L}_{0,\hbar}^{-1}(\lambda K_h g^\lambda + h_\sigma).$$

Namely, for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_{*0}]$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\lambda,\hbar} g^\lambda := v_3 \partial_x g^\lambda + [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] g^\lambda - \lambda K_h g^\lambda = h_\sigma, \\ g^\lambda(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*) g^\lambda(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) g^\lambda(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv', \\ g^\lambda(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_{A,\sigma}(v). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the existence of $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,\hbar}^{-1}$ for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_{*0}]$ has been obtained. Moreover, the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,\hbar}^{-1}$ satisfies the estimates (3.13) in Lemma 3.1, which are uniform in $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_{*0}] \subseteq [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Next we introduce the operator

$$\mathcal{T}_{\lambda_{*0}+\lambda} g := \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_{*0},\hbar}^{-1}(\lambda K_h g + h_\sigma).$$

Since the estimates for $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda,\hbar}^{-1}$ in Lemma 3.1 is uniform in λ , it can be followed from the estimates (3.13) and the similar arguments of \mathcal{T}_λ as in (4.14) that $\mathcal{T}_{\lambda_{*0}+\lambda} : \mathbb{B}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_0$ is a contraction map for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_{*0}]$. Then the existence of the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_{*0}+\lambda,\hbar}^{-1}$ with the estimates (3.13) can be obtained. Consequently, repeating the previous process for finite times can conclude that there is a $g^{\frac{1}{2}} = \mathcal{L}_{\frac{1}{2},\hbar}^{-1}(h_\sigma) \in \mathbb{B}_0$ with the bounds (3.13).

Step 2. Extension from $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ to $\lambda = 1$.

Note that Lemma 3.1 shows $g^{\frac{1}{2}} = \mathcal{L}_{\frac{1}{2},\hbar}^{-1}(h_\sigma) \in \mathbb{B}_1$. We now define an operator $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\lambda : \mathbb{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_1$ by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\lambda g = \mathcal{L}_{\frac{1}{2},\hbar}^{-1}(\tilde{\lambda} K_h g + h_\sigma),$$

where $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda - \frac{1}{2}$ for $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Following the similar arguments in (4.8), one has

$$\mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{2}}^A(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\lambda g_1 - \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\lambda g_2) \leq C \mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{2}}^A[\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)], \quad (4.15)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{2}}^A(\cdot) = \mathcal{A}_\infty^A(\cdot) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A(\cdot) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A(h) + \mathcal{A}_{2,\frac{1}{2}}^A(\cdot). \quad (4.16)$$

The similar estimates in (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) give us

$$\sum_{\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathcal{A}_\infty^A, \mathcal{A}_{\text{cro}}^A, \mathcal{A}_{\text{Iter}}^A\}} \mathcal{X} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq C \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{\mathcal{Y} \in \{\mathcal{E}_\infty^A, \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A, \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A\}} \mathcal{Y}(g_1 - g_2), \quad (4.17)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda - \frac{1}{2}$, A , δ , \hbar . It remains to control $\mathcal{A}_{2, \frac{1}{2}}^A [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]$, where the functional $\mathcal{A}_{2, \frac{1}{2}}^A$ is defined in (1.39). More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{A}_{2, \frac{1}{2}}^A [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \\ &= \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A + \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A \\ & \quad + \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A \\ & \leq C \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A + \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A \leq \tilde{\lambda} \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} K_h(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \leq C \tilde{\lambda} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A,$$

where the last inequality is derived from Lemma 2.6. Note that

$$\|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \leq \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A + \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A & \leq C \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}), \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \\ & \leq C \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}), \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \\ & \leq C \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_1 - g_2) \end{aligned}$$

for $m < -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}$ with $-3 < \gamma < 1$ and $m < 0$ with $\gamma = 1$. It thereby holds

$$\|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \leq C \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_1 - g_2) + C \mathcal{E}_{2,1}^A(g_1 - g_2).$$

As a result,

$$\|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A \leq C \tilde{\lambda} \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_1 - g_2) + C \tilde{\lambda} \mathcal{E}_{2,1}^A(g_1 - g_2). \quad (4.19)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A \\ & \leq C \tilde{\lambda} \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}), \vartheta} K_h(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \\ & \leq C \tilde{\lambda} \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}), \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is derived from Lemma 2.6. If we further assume $-m > 1$ for $-3 < \gamma < 1$ and $m < 0$ for $\gamma = 1$, we have $(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \leq (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}$, which means that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}), \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \\ & \leq \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_\star - N_0(\beta_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}), \vartheta}(g_1 - g_2)\|_A \leq \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_1 - g_2). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\|(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2(3-\gamma)}} \mathcal{P} w_{\beta+\beta_\star, \vartheta} [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)]\|_A \leq C \tilde{\lambda} \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_1 - g_2) \quad (4.20)$$

for $m < \min\{-1, -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\}$ with $-3 < \gamma < 1$ and $m < 0$ with $\gamma = 1$. From plugging (4.19) and (4.20) into (4.18), one derives

$$\mathcal{A}_{2, \frac{1}{2}}^A [\tilde{\lambda} K_h(g_1 - g_2)] \leq C \tilde{\lambda} \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A(g_1 - g_2) + C \tilde{\lambda} \mathcal{E}_{2,1}^A(g_1 - g_2) \quad (4.21)$$

for $m < \min\{-1, -\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\}$ with $-3 < \gamma < 1$ and $m < 0$ with $\gamma = 1$. Therefore, (4.15) and (4.21) indicate that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda g_1 - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda g_2\|_{\mathbb{B}_1} &\leq \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{2}}^A(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda g_1 - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda g_2) \\ &\leq C\tilde{\lambda} \sum_{\mathcal{Y} \in \{\mathcal{E}_\infty^A, \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^A, \mathcal{E}_{\text{Iter}}^A, \mathcal{E}_{2,1}^A\}} \mathcal{Y}(g_1 - g_2) = C\tilde{\lambda}\|g_1 - g_2\|_{\mathbb{B}_1} \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

for all $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{B}_1$, where $C > 0$ is independent of $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda - \frac{1}{2}$, A , δ , \hbar .

We take a small enough $\lambda_{*1} > 0$ such that $C\lambda_{*1} < \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda : \mathbb{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_1$ is a contraction map for all $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \lambda_{*1}]$, which admits a fixed point $\tilde{g}^\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_1$ such that

$$\tilde{g}^\lambda = \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_\lambda \tilde{g}^\lambda = \mathcal{L}_{\frac{1}{2}, \hbar}^{-1}(\tilde{\lambda} K_h \tilde{g}^\lambda + h_\sigma).$$

That is, for $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \lambda_{*1}]$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \hbar} \tilde{g}^\lambda := v_3 \partial_x \tilde{g}^\lambda + [-\hbar \sigma_x v_3 + \nu(v)] \tilde{g}^\lambda - \lambda K_h \tilde{g}^\lambda = h_\sigma, \\ \tilde{g}^\lambda(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*) \tilde{g}^\lambda(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \tilde{g}^\lambda(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv', \\ \tilde{g}^\lambda(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_{A, \sigma}(v). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the existence of $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \hbar}^{-1}$ for $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \lambda_{*1}]$ has been obtained. Moreover, the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \hbar}^{-1}$ satisfies the estimates (3.13) in Lemma 3.1, which are uniform in $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} + \lambda_{*1}] \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Then, repeating the previous process for finite times can conclude that there is a $g^1 = \mathcal{L}_{1, \hbar}^{-1}(h_\sigma) \in \mathbb{B}_1$ with the bounds (3.13). Furthermore, the uniqueness can be derived from the bounds (3.14) in Lemma 3.1. Then the proof of Lemma 4.1 is finished. \square

4.3. Limits from (Ap-eq) to (KLe): Proof of Theorem 1.1. In this section, based on Lemma 4.1, we will construct the existence of the problem (KLe) by taking limit $A \rightarrow +\infty$ in the equation (Ap-eq).

For small $\hbar > 0$ given in Lemma 4.1, we initially define a Banach space

$$\mathbb{B}_\infty^h := \{f(x, v); \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f) < \infty\} \quad (4.23)$$

with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} = \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f), \quad (4.24)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ is given in (1.33) with $A = \infty$ and $\lambda = 1$.

Now we state the existence result on the problem (KLe) as follows.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ given in (1.23), $m < \mathbf{m}_\gamma$ given in (1.27), sufficiently small $\delta, \hbar, \vartheta > 0$, large enough $l > 1$, $0 < \alpha < \mu_\gamma$ and integer $\beta \geq \beta_* + \frac{1-\gamma}{2} + \max\{0, -\gamma\}$, where $\mu_\gamma > 0$ is given in Lemma 2.6 and β_* is mentioned in (1.25). Assume that the source term $h(x, v)$ satisfies*

$$\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} h) < \infty, \quad (4.25)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ is defined in (1.38) with $A = \infty$ and $\lambda = 1$. Then the problem (KLe) admits a unique solution $g = g(x, v) \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^h$ such that

$$\|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} \leq C \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} h) \quad (4.26)$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Theorem 1.1 is a corollary of Lemma 4.2. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.2. We now give a family of functions $\{\varphi_A(v)\}_{A>1}$ satisfying

$$\sup_{A>1} \mathcal{B}(e^{h\sigma} \varphi_A) < \infty, \quad (4.27)$$

where the functional $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ is defined in (1.38). The assumptions (4.27) and (4.25) tell us that for any $1 < A < \infty$,

$$\mathcal{A}_1^A(e^{h\sigma} h) + \mathcal{B}(e^{h\sigma} \varphi_A) \leq \mathfrak{C}_b := \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} h) + \sup_{A>1} \mathcal{B}(e^{h\sigma} \varphi_A) < \infty \quad (4.28)$$

Then Lemma 4.1 indicates that there is a unique solution $g^A = g^A(x, v)$, $(x, v) \in (0, A) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{E}_1^A(e^{h\sigma} g^A) \leq C(\mathcal{A}_1^A(e^{h\sigma} h) + \mathcal{B}(e^{h\sigma} \varphi_A)) \leq C\mathfrak{C}_b, \quad (4.29)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $A > 1$ and the functional $\mathcal{E}_1^A(\cdot)$ is given in (1.33) with $\lambda = 1$.

We now extend $g^A(x, v)$ as follows

$$\tilde{g}^A(x, v) = \mathbf{1}_{x \in (0, A)} g^A(x, v), \quad (x, v) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (4.30)$$

It is easy to see that $\tilde{g}^A(x, v) \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^h$ with

$$\|\tilde{g}^A\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} = \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \tilde{g}^A) \leq C\mathfrak{C}_b. \quad (4.31)$$

Then there is a $g' = g'(x, v) \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^h$ such that

$$\tilde{g}^A(x, v) \rightarrow g'(x, v) \quad \text{weakly in } \mathbb{B}_\infty^h \quad (4.32)$$

as $A \rightarrow +\infty$ (in the sense of subsequence, if necessary). Moreover, $g'(x, v)$ obeys

$$\|g'\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} = \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} g') \leq C\mathfrak{C}_b. \quad (4.33)$$

For any $1 < A_1 < A_2 < +\infty$, let $g^{A_i}(x, v)$ ($i = 1, 2$) be the solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x g^{A_i} + \mathcal{L}g^{A_i} = h, & x \in (0, A_i), \\ g^{A_i}(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)g^{A_i}(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) g^{A_i}(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv', \\ g^{A_i}(A_i, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_{A_i}(v), \end{cases}$$

constructed in Lemma 4.1. Then $g^{A_i}(x, v)$ ($i = 1, 2$) subject to the estimates

$$\mathcal{E}_1^{A_i}(e^{h\sigma} g^{A_i}) \leq C(\mathcal{A}_1^{A_i}(e^{h\sigma} h) + \mathcal{B}(\varphi_{A_i, \sigma})) \leq C\mathfrak{C}_b. \quad (4.34)$$

Let \tilde{g}^{A_i} be the extension of g^{A_i} as given in (4.30). Then

$$(\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2})(x, v) = \mathbf{1}_{x \in (0, A_1)}(g^{A_1} - g^{A_2})(x, v) - \mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]} g^{A_2}(x, v). \quad (4.35)$$

It is easy to see that $g^{A_1} - g^{A_2}$ obeys

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x (\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2}) + \mathcal{L}(\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2}) = 0, & 0 < x < A_1, \\ (\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2})(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)(\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2})(0, R_0 v) \\ \quad + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) (\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2})(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv', \\ (\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2})(A_1, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \varphi_{A_1}(v) - g^{A_2}(A_1, v). \end{cases}$$

It thereby follows from the similar arguments in Lemma 4.1 that for any fixed $h' \in (0, h)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1^{A_1}(e^{h'\sigma}(g^{A_1} - g^{A_2})) &\leq C\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)}(\varphi_{A_1}(v) - g^{A_2}(A_1, v))) \\ &\leq C\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)}\varphi_{A_1}(v)) + C\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)}g^{A_2}(A_1, v)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ given in (1.38), one has

$$\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)}\varphi_{A_1}(v)) \leq \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{-(h-h')\sigma(A_1, v)} \mathcal{B}(e^{h\sigma(A_1, v)}\varphi_{A_1}(v)) \leq \mathfrak{C}_b \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{-(h-h')\sigma(A_1, v)}.$$

Lemma 2.1 shows that $\sigma(A_1, v) \geq c(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, which indicates that

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{-(h-h')\sigma(A_1, v)} \leq e^{-c(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}. \quad (4.37)$$

Then

$$\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} \varphi_{A_1}(v)) \leq \mathfrak{C}_b e^{-c(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}. \quad (4.38)$$

In the following, we focus on controlling the quantity $\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} g^{A_2}(A_1, v))$. Recalling (1.38), one has

$$\mathcal{B}(\cdot) = \mathcal{B}_\infty(\cdot) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(\cdot) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(\cdot) + \mathcal{B}_2(\cdot). \quad (4.39)$$

Case 1. Control of $\mathcal{B}_\infty(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} g^{A_2}(A_1, v))$.

By the definition of $\mathcal{B}_\infty(\cdot)$ in (1.40), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B}_\infty(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} g^{A_2}(A_1, v)) \\ &= \|e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A_1, v) (\delta A_1 + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) g^{A_2}(A_1, v)\|_{L_\infty^\varnothing} \\ &\leq \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{-(h-h')\sigma(A_1, v)} \|e^{h\sigma(A_1, v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A_1, v) (\delta A_1 + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) g^{A_2}(A_1, v)\|_{L_\infty^\varnothing} \\ &\leq e^{-c(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \llbracket e^{h\sigma} g^{A_2} \rrbracket_{A_2; m, n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} \\ &= e^{-c(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \mathcal{E}_\infty^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma} g^{A_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

where the inequality (4.37) is utilized, and $\mathcal{E}_\infty^{A_2}(\cdot)$ is defined in (1.34).

Case 2. Control of $\mathcal{B}_2(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} g^{A_2}(A_1, v))$.

By the definition of $\mathcal{B}_2(\cdot)$ in (1.40), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B}_2(e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} g^{A_2}(A_1, v)) \\ &= \| |v_3|^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta} e^{h'\sigma(A_1, v)} g^{A_2}(A_1, v) \|_{L^2_{\Sigma_+^{A_1}}} \\ &= \left(\int_{v_3 > 0} |v_3| w_{\beta+\beta_*, \vartheta}^2 e^{2h'\sigma(A_1, v)} |g^{A_2}(A_1, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left(\int_{v_3 > 0} \Phi(A_1, v) |z_{\alpha'}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A_1, v) (\delta A_1 + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) e^{h\sigma(A_1, v)} g^{A_2}(A_1, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha' \in (\frac{1}{2} - \mu_\gamma, \frac{1}{2})$ is given in Lemma 3.4 below, and

$$\Phi(A_1, v) = |v_3| z_{-\alpha'}^2(v) (1 + |v|)^{2\beta_*} \sigma_x^{-m}(A_1, v) (\delta A_1 + l)^{-2n_\gamma} e^{-2(h-h')\sigma(A_1, v)}.$$

Lemma 2.1 implies that

$$\sigma_x^{-m}(A_1, v) \leq C(\delta A_1 + l)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{3-\gamma}} (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-m(1-\gamma)}. \quad (4.41)$$

It is also easy to verify that $\sigma(A_1, v) \geq c'(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|^2)$ for some constant $c' > 0$, which means that

$$e^{-(h-h')\sigma(A_1, v)} \leq e^{-c'(h-h')} e^{-c'(h-h')|v-\mathbf{u}|^2} \leq e^{-c'(h-h')|v-\mathbf{u}|^2}. \quad (4.42)$$

Then the bounds (4.37), (4.41) and (4.42) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(A_1, v) &\leq C |v_3| z_{-\alpha'}^2(v) (1 + |v|)^{2\beta_* - m(1-\gamma)} e^{-c'(h-h')|v-\mathbf{u}|^2} \\ &\quad \times (\delta A_1 + l)^{-2n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{3-\gamma}} e^{-c(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \\ &\leq C e^{-\frac{c}{2}(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. It therefore follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B}_2(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v)) \\ & \leq C e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \left(\int_{v_3>0} |z_{\alpha'}(v)\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(A_1,v)(\delta A_1+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta,\vartheta}(v)e^{h\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \|z_{\alpha'}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta,\vartheta}e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.5 below, it is derived that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|z_{\alpha'}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta,\vartheta}e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \\ & \leq C \|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}z_1w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}\partial_x(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2})\|_{A_2} + C \|\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}z_{-\alpha}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta+\beta_\gamma,\vartheta}e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}\|_{A_2} \\ & = C \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the functional $\mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^{A_2}(\cdot)$ is defined in (1.35). Then there hold

$$\mathcal{B}_2(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v)) \leq C e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}). \quad (4.43)$$

Case 3. Control of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v)) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v))$.

By employing the similar arguments of controlling the quantity $\mathcal{B}_2(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v))$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B}_{\text{cro}}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v)) + \mathcal{B}_{\text{Iter}}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v)) \\ & \leq C e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \|z_{\alpha'}\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}w_{\beta,\vartheta}e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \\ & \leq C e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

As a consequence, the relations (4.39), (4.40), (4.43) and (4.44) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A_1,v)}g^{A_2}(A_1,v)) & \leq C e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} (\mathcal{E}_{\infty}^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}) + \mathcal{E}_{\text{cro}}^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2})) \\ & \leq C e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \mathcal{E}_1^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}) \leq C \mathfrak{C}_b e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

where the last inequality is derived from the bound (4.34). Collecting the estimates (4.36), (4.38) and (4.45), one gains

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\mathbf{1}_{x \in (0, A_1)}e^{h'\sigma}(g^{A_1} - g^{A_2})) = \mathcal{E}_1^{A_1}(e^{h'\sigma}(g^{A_1} - g^{A_2})) \leq C \mathfrak{C}_b e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1+l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \quad (4.46)$$

for any $h' \in (0, h)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{h'\sigma}g^{A_2}) & = \mathcal{E}_1^{A_2}(\mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{h'\sigma}g^{A_2}) \\ & \leq \mathcal{E}_1^{A_2}(e^{h\sigma}g^{A_2}) \sup_{x>0, v \in \mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{-(h-h')\sigma(x,v)} \\ & \leq C \mathfrak{C}_b \sup_{x>0, v \in \mathbb{R}^3} \mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{-(h-h')\sigma(x,v)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is deduced from (4.34). Since $\sigma(x, v) \geq c(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}$ by Lemma 2.1, one has $\mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{-(h-h')\sigma(x,v)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{-c(h-h')(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \leq e^{-c(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}$ uniformly in x and v . Then

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{h'\sigma}g^{A_2}) \leq C \mathfrak{C}_b e^{-c(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}}. \quad (4.47)$$

Therefore, the decomposition (4.35) and the estimates (4.46)-(4.47) imply that for any fixed $1 < A_1 < A_2 < \infty$ and $h' \in (0, h)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h'\sigma}(\tilde{g}^{A_1} - \tilde{g}^{A_2})) & \leq \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\mathbf{1}_{x \in (0, A_1)}e^{h'\sigma}(g^{A_1} - g^{A_2})) + \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\mathbf{1}_{x \in [A_1, A_2]}e^{h'\sigma}g^{A_2}) \\ & \leq C \mathfrak{C}_b e^{-\frac{c}{4}(h-h')(\delta A_1 + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

as $A_1 \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, by (4.31),

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h'\sigma}\tilde{g}^A) \leq \|\tilde{g}^A\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} = \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}\tilde{g}^A) \leq C\mathfrak{E}_b, \quad (4.49)$$

for any $h' \in (0, h)$.

Denote by $\mathbb{B}_\infty^{h'}$ be a Banach space defined as the same way of \mathbb{B}_∞^h in (4.23)-(4.24). It is easy to see that $\mathbb{B}_\infty^h \subseteq \mathbb{B}_\infty^{h'}$, i.e., $\|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^{h'}} \leq \|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h}$. Then the estimates (4.48) and (4.49) tell us that $\{\tilde{g}^A\}_{A>1}$ is a bounded Cauchy sequence in $\mathbb{B}_\infty^{h'}$. As a result, there is a unique $g = g(x, v) \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^{h'}$ such that

$$\tilde{g}^A(x, v) \rightarrow g(x, v) \quad \text{strongly in } \mathbb{B}_\infty^{h'} \quad (4.50)$$

as $A \rightarrow +\infty$. Combining with the convergences (4.32) and (4.50), the uniqueness of the limit shows that $g(x, v) = g'(x, v)$. Moreover, the bound (4.33) infers that $g(x, v)$ satisfies the bound

$$\|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} \leq C\mathfrak{E}_b. \quad (4.51)$$

Taking limit $A \rightarrow +\infty$ in the mild solution form of (Ap-eq), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} v_3 \partial_x \tilde{g}^A + \mathcal{L} \tilde{g}^A &= h, \quad 0 < x < A, \\ \tilde{g}^A(0, v)|_{v_3>0} &= (1 - \alpha_*) \tilde{g}^A(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) \tilde{g}^A(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv', \end{aligned}$$

we easily know that the limit $g(x, v)$ of $\tilde{g}^A(x, v)$ subjects to

$$\begin{aligned} v_3 \partial_x g + \mathcal{L} g &= h, \quad x > 0, \\ g(0, v)|_{v_3>0} &= (1 - \alpha_*) g(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) g(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv' \end{aligned} \quad (4.52)$$

in the sense of mild solution. Furthermore, the bounds (4.41) and (4.51) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |g(x, v)| &\leq e^{-h\sigma(x, v)} \sigma_x^{-\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) (\delta x + l)^{-n_\gamma} w_{\beta, \vartheta}^{-1}(v) \|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} \\ &\leq C\mathfrak{E}_b e^{-ch(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \cdot C(\delta x + l)^{-n_\gamma - \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}} (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-m(1-\gamma)} w_{\beta, \vartheta}^{-1}(v) \\ &\leq C'\mathfrak{E}_b e^{-\frac{c}{2}h(\delta x + l)^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.53)$$

as $x \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} g(x, v) = 0$. Therefore, the function $g(x, v)$ solves the problem (KLe). Note that we should take the approximate incoming data $\varphi_A(v)$ merely satisfying (4.27), namely, $\sup_{A>1} \mathcal{B}(e^{h\sigma}\varphi_A) < \infty$. Without loss of generality, we can take $\varphi_A(v) \equiv 0$, whose corresponding solution $g(x, v)$ subjects to the estimate

$$\|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_\infty^h} \leq C\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}h) < \infty. \quad (4.54)$$

At the end, we justify the uniqueness. Assume that $g_i(x, v)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are both the solutions to the problem (KLe) enjoying the bound (4.54). Then, for any fixed $A > 1$, the difference $g_1 - g_2$ obeys

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x (g_1 - g_2) + \mathcal{L}(g_1 - g_2) = 0, \quad 0 < x < A, \\ (g_1 - g_2)(0, v)|_{v_3>0} = (1 - \alpha_*) (g_1 - g_2)(0, R_0 v) \\ \quad + \alpha_* \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} (-v'_3) (g_1 - g_2)(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}(v')} dv', \\ (g_1 - g_2)(A, v)|_{v_3 < 0} = \phi_A(v) := \mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0} (g_1 - g_2)(A, v). \end{cases}$$

Following the similar arguments in Lemma 4.1, one knows that

$$\mathcal{E}_1^A(e^{h'\sigma}(g_1 - g_2)) \leq C\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A, v)}\phi_A(v)) = C\mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A, v)}\mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0}(g_1 - g_2)(A, v))$$

for any fixed $h' \in (0, h)$. By employing the same arguments of (4.45), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(e^{h'\sigma(A,v)} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0}(g_1 - g_2)(A, v)) &\leq C e^{-\frac{\varsigma}{4}(h-h')(\delta A+l)} \sum_{i=1,2} \mathcal{E}_1^A(e^{h\sigma} g_i) \\ &\leq C \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} h) e^{-\frac{\varsigma}{4}(h-h')(\delta A+l)} \frac{2}{3-\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is derived from (4.54). As a result,

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h'\sigma}(g_1 - g_2)) = \lim_{A \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{E}_1^A(e^{h'\sigma}(g_1 - g_2)) \leq \lim_{A \rightarrow +\infty} [C \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} h) e^{-\frac{\varsigma}{4}(h-h')(\delta A+l)} \frac{2}{3-\gamma}] = 0,$$

which means that $g_1 = g_2$. Therefore, the uniqueness holds. The proof of Lemma 4.2 is finished. \square

5. NONLINEAR PROBLEM (1.46): PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we devote to investigating the nonlinear problem (1.46) near the Maxwellian $\mathfrak{M}(v)$ by employing the linear theory constructed in Theorem 1.1. It is equivalent to study the equation (1.48). The key point is to dominate the quantity $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g))$, where the functional $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ is given in (1.38).

Notice that $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g))$ is composed of the weighted $L_{x,v}^\infty$ -norms and $L_{x,v}^2$ -norms of $e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g)$. Concerning the weights involved in $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g))$, one has

$$e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g) = e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(e^{-h\sigma}e^{h\sigma}f, e^{-h\sigma}e^{h\sigma}g). \quad (5.1)$$

By the properties of σ in Lemma 2.1, it holds $e^{h\sigma} \geq e^{c(\delta x+l)} \frac{2}{3-\gamma} e^{c|v|^2}$. As shown in (5.1), loosely speaking, one of $e^{-h\sigma}$ can absorb the factor $e^{h\sigma}$ out of Γ , and the other decay factor $e^{-h\sigma} \leq e^{-c(\delta x+l)} \frac{2}{3-\gamma} e^{-c|v|^2}$ can be used to adjust the required weights.

It is easy to see that $\Gamma(f, g)$ can be pointwise bounded by the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ -norms of f and g . By the similar arguments in Lemma 3 of [21], the weighted $L_{x,v}^2$ -norms of $e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g)$ can be bounded by the quantity with form $\|w_1 e^{h\sigma} f\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \|w_2 e^{h\sigma} g\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \|w_1 e^{h\sigma} g\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \|w_2 e^{h\sigma} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}$, where w_1, w_2 are some required weights. As a result, we can establish the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *For any fixed functions $f(x, v)$ and $g(x, v)$, there holds*

$$\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f, g)) \leq C \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}f) \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}g), \quad (5.2)$$

where the functionals $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{A}_1^\infty(\cdot)$ are defined in (1.33) and (1.38), respectively.

The proof of Lemma 5.1 can be finished by applying the properties of the weight $\sigma(x, v)$ and employing the similar arguments in Lemma 3 of [21]. For simplicity, we omit the details here.

Based on Lemma 5.1, we will study the nonlinear problem (1.48) (equivalently (1.46)) by employing the iterative approach, hence, prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We design the following iteration scheme

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x f^{i+1} + \mathcal{L} f^{i+1} = \Gamma(f^i, f^i) + \tilde{h}, & x > 0, v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ f^{i+1}(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*) f^{i+1}(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w f^{i+1}(0, v) + \tilde{f}_b(v), \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f^{i+1}(x, v) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

which starts from $f^0(x, v) \equiv 0$. By Theorem 1.1, one has

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^{i+1}) \leq C_0 \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma}\Gamma(f^i, f^i)) + C_0 \varsigma$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$, where the quantity ς is defined in (1.50). Together with (5.2), it infers that

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^{i+1}) \leq C [\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^i)]^2 + C_0 \varsigma. \quad (5.4)$$

Now we assert that there is a small $\varsigma_0 > 0$ such that if $\varsigma \leq \varsigma_0$, then for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^{i+1}) \leq 2C_0\varsigma. \quad (5.5)$$

Note that $f^0 \equiv 0$. (5.4) shows that $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^1) \leq C_0\varsigma < 2C_0\varsigma$, i.e., the claim (5.5) holds for $i = 1$. Assume that the claim (5.5) holds for $1, 2, \dots, i$. Then the case $i + 1$ can be carried out by (5.4) that $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^{i+1}) \leq C(2C_0\varsigma)^2 + C_0\varsigma = (4CC_0\varsigma + 1)C_0\varsigma$. Take $\varsigma_0 > 0$ small such that $4CC_0\varsigma_0 \leq 1$. Then if $\varsigma \leq \varsigma_0$, one has $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^{i+1}) \leq (4CC_0\varsigma + 1)C_0\varsigma \leq 2C_0\varsigma$. Therefore, the Induction Principle concludes the claim (5.5), which indicates that $\{f^i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is bounded in the Banach space \mathbb{B}_h^∞ defined in (4.23).

Next we will show that $\{f^i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{B}_h^∞ . Observe that $f^{i+1} - f^i$ subjects to

$$\begin{cases} v_3 \partial_x (f^{i+1} - f^i) + \mathcal{L}(f^{i+1} - f^i) = \Gamma(f^i - f^{i-1}, f^i) + \Gamma(f^{i-1}, f^i - f^{i-1}), & x > 0, v \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ (f^{i+1} - f^i)(0, v)|_{v_3 > 0} = (1 - \alpha_*)(f^{i+1} - f^i)(0, R_0 v) + \alpha_* \mathcal{D}_w (f^{i+1} - f^i)(0, v), \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} (f^{i+1} - f^i)(x, v) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.1 reduces to

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} (f^{i+1} - f^i)) \leq C_0 \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \Gamma(f^i - f^{i-1}, f^i)) + C_0 \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \Gamma(f^{i-1}, f^i - f^{i-1})).$$

By (5.2) and (5.5), one obtains that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \Gamma(f^i - f^{i-1}, f^i)) + \mathcal{A}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} \Gamma(f^{i-1}, f^i - f^{i-1})) \\ & \leq C [\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^i) + \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^{i-1})] \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} (f^i - f^{i-1})) \leq 4CC_0\varsigma \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} (f^i - f^{i-1})). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} (f^{i+1} - f^i)) \leq 4CC_0^2\varsigma \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} (f^i - f^{i-1})) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} (f^i - f^{i-1})) \quad (5.6)$$

by further taking small $\varsigma_0 > 0$ such that $4CC_0^2\varsigma \leq 4CC_0^2\varsigma_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Note that $f^0 \equiv 0$. It follows from iterating (5.6) and employing (5.5) that

$$\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} (f^{i+1} - f^i)) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^i \mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f^1) \leq 2C_0\varsigma \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^i \rightarrow 0 \quad (5.7)$$

as $i \rightarrow +\infty$. Consequently, (5.5) and (5.7) tell us that $\{f^i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is a bounded Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{B}_h^∞ . Then there is a unique $f(x, v) \in \mathbb{B}_h^\infty$ such that

$$f^i(x, v) \rightarrow f(x, v) \quad \text{strongly in } \mathbb{B}_h^\infty.$$

Passing the limit, $i \rightarrow +\infty$, in the mild formation of the iterative scheme (5.3), one knows that $f(x, v)$ solves the nonlinear problem (1.48). Moreover, $f(x, v)$ enjoys the estimate $\mathcal{E}_1^\infty(e^{h\sigma} f) \leq 2C_0\varsigma$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is therefore finished. \square

6. BOUNDS FOR OPERATORS Y_A , Z AND U : PROOF OF LEMMA 2.2

In this section, we mainly aim at verifying the proof of Lemma 2.2.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. The proof of this lemma will be divided into three steps as follows.

Step 1. $L_{x,v}^\infty$ bound for the operator Y_A .

We now show the inequality (2.6).

If $v_3 > 0$, Lemma 2.1 indicates that $0 < v_3 \sigma_x \leq c\nu(v)$ and $|\sigma_{xx} v_3| \leq \delta \sigma_x \nu(v)$, which mean that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(x, v) &= \int_0^x \left[-\frac{m\sigma_{xx}(y, v)}{2\sigma_x(y, v)} - \hbar \sigma_x(y, v) + \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} \right] dy \\ &\geq \int_0^x \left(1 - c\hbar - \frac{|m|}{2} \delta \right) \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} dy = \left(1 - c\hbar - \frac{|m|}{2} \delta \right) \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

provided that $c_{\hbar,\delta} := 1 - c\hbar - \frac{|m|}{2}\delta > 0$. Actually, one can take sufficiently small $\hbar, \delta > 0$ such that $c_{\hbar,\delta} > \frac{1}{2}$. Then one has

$$e^{-\kappa(x,v)} \leq 1 \quad (6.2)$$

for $1 - c\hbar - \frac{|m|}{2}\delta > 0$. Moreover, $(R_0v)_3 = -v_3 < 0$, one similarly knows that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(A, R_0v) &= \int_0^A \left[-\frac{m\sigma_{xx}(y, R_0v)}{2\sigma_x(y, R_0v)} - \hbar\sigma_x(y, R_0v) + \frac{\nu(R_0v)}{(R_0v)_3} \right] dy \\ &\leq -\int_0^A \left(1 - c\hbar - \frac{|m|}{2}\delta \right) \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} dy = -(1 - c\hbar - \frac{|m|}{2}\delta) \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} A \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

which means that $e^{\kappa(A, R_0v)} \leq 1$. Recalling the definition of $\kappa_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma}(x)$ in (2.1), one has

$$e^{\kappa_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma}(A) - \kappa_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma}(x)} = e^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma \ln \frac{l}{\delta A + l} - \mathbf{n}_\gamma \ln \frac{l}{\delta x + l}} = \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{\delta A + l} \right)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} \leq 1 \quad (6.4)$$

for $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ and $0 \leq x \leq A$. As a result, for $v_3 > 0$,

$$e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, R_0v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} = e^{-\kappa(x, v)} e^{\kappa(A, R_0v)} e^{\kappa_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma}(A) - \kappa_{\mathbf{n}_\gamma}(x)} \leq 1. \quad (6.5)$$

Here $\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)$ is defined in (2.1). It thereby holds

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, R_0v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} f(A, R_0v)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq \|f(A, \cdot)\|_{L_v^\infty}. \quad (6.6)$$

Moreover, by the similar arguments in (6.5), one easily obtains $e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v') - \tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} \leq 1$ for $v'_3 < 0$ and $v_3 > 0$. Recall the definition of M_σ in (2.2), i.e., $\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v) = \mathfrak{M}(v)e^{-2h\sigma(0,v)}$. Based on Lemma 2.1, it is easy to verify that

$$|v'_3| \sigma_x^{-\frac{m}{2}}(0, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} \leq C \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v')$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$. Now we deal with the factor $\frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v)$. Lemma 2.1 tells us

$$0 \leq \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v) e^{h\sigma(0,v)} \leq c_1 (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{(1-\gamma)|m|} e^{C\hbar|v-\mathbf{u}|^2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v) &= \frac{\sqrt{2\pi T}^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\rho T_w^2} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v) e^{h\sigma(0,v)} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left\{ -\left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right) |v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - \frac{1}{T_w} (\mathbf{u} - u_w) \cdot (v - \mathbf{u}) - \frac{|u - u_w|^2}{2T_w} \right\} \\ &\leq C (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{(1-\gamma)|m|} e^{c_1\hbar|v-\mathbf{u}|^2} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right) |v - \mathbf{u}|^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

with the assumption (1.42), i.e., $0 < T_w < 2T$. By taking small $\hbar > 0$ such that $c_1\hbar < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2T_w} - \frac{1}{4T}\right)$, it thereby infers $\frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v) \leq C$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We then have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0, v')} e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A, v') - \tilde{\kappa}(x, v)} f(A, v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dv'\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \\ &\leq C \left\| \int_{v'_3 < 0} |f(A, v')| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v') dv' \right\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq C \|f(A, \cdot)\|_{L_v^\infty}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

where the fact $\int_{v'_3 < 0} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v') dv' \leq C$ has been used.

If $v_3 < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(A, v) - \kappa(x, v) &= \int_x^A \left[-\frac{m\sigma_{xx}(y, v)}{2\sigma_x(y, v)} - \hbar\sigma_x(y, v) - \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|} \right] dy \\ &\leq -(1 - c\hbar - \frac{m}{2}\delta) \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|} (A - x) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

which means that

$$e^{\kappa(A, v) - \kappa(x, v)} \leq e^{-(1 - c\hbar - \frac{m}{2}\delta) \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|} (A - x)} \leq 1. \quad (6.9)$$

Together with (6.4), one has

$$e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A,v)-\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} = e^{\kappa(A,v)-\kappa(x,v)} e^{\kappa_{n_\gamma}(A)-\kappa_{n_\gamma}(x)} \leq 1. \quad (6.10)$$

Consequently, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0} e^{\tilde{\kappa}(A,v)-\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} f(A, v)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq \|f(A, \cdot)\|_{L_v^\infty}. \quad (6.11)$$

Recalling the definition of the operator $Y_A(f)$ in (2.3), the estimates (6.6), (6.7) and (6.11) infer that

$$\|Y_A(f)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq C \|f(A, \cdot)\|_{L_v^\infty}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of A, \hbar . Namely the bound (2.6) holds.

Step 2. $L_{x,v}^\infty$ bound for the operator Z .

Now we prove the inequalities (2.7).

If $v_3 > 0$, then (1.11) and $\sigma_x > 0$ derived from Lemma 2.1 show that for $v_3 > 0$,

$$\kappa(x', R_0 v) = \int_0^{x'} \left[-\frac{m\sigma_{xx}(y, R_0 v)}{2\sigma_x(y, R_0 v)} - \hbar\sigma_x(y, R_0 v) + \frac{\nu(R_0 v)}{(R_0 v)_3} \right] dy \leq -(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}) \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x' < 0. \quad (6.12)$$

Together with (6.1), one has $e^{-\kappa(x,v)+\kappa(x',R_0v)} \leq e^{-c\hbar,\delta\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x} e^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'}$ for $v_3 > 0$. By (6.4), one has $e^{-\kappa_{n_\gamma}(x)+\kappa_{n_\gamma}(x')} = \frac{(\delta x'+l)^{n_\gamma}}{(\delta x+l)^{n_\gamma}}$. Recall the definition of $\tilde{\kappa}(x, v) = \kappa(x, v) + \kappa_{n_\gamma}(x)$ in (2.1). Then there hold

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \left| \int_0^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)-\tilde{\kappa}(x',R_0v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} f(x', R_0 v) dx' \right| \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-c\hbar,\delta\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x} (\delta x + l)^{-n_\gamma} \\ & \quad \times \int_0^A e^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} |\nu^{-1}(v)(\delta x' + l)^{n_\gamma} f(x', R_0 v)| dx' \end{aligned}$$

for small $\hbar > 0$ and $n_\gamma \geq 0$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} (\delta x' + l)^{n_\gamma} / (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} & = e^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} (\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x' \cdot \frac{v_3}{\nu(v)} + l)^{n_\gamma} / (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} \\ & \leq l^{-n_\gamma} (l + \frac{v_3}{\nu(v)})^{n_\gamma} e^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} (\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x' + 1)^{n_\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $\gamma = 1$, one easily has $|\frac{v_3}{\nu(v)}| \leq C \frac{|v|}{\nu(v)} \leq C$ uniformly in v , which means that $l^{-n_\gamma} (l + \frac{v_3}{\nu(v)})^{n_\gamma} \leq C$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $l \geq 1$. Moreover, for $v_3 > 0$, $e^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} (\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x' + l)^{n_\gamma} \leq C$ uniformly in x' and v . Then $e^{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} (\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x' + 1)^{n_\gamma} \leq C e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'}$ for $\gamma = 1$. Recall that $n_\gamma > 1$ for $\gamma = 1$ and $n_\gamma = 0$ for $-3 < \gamma < 1$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \left| \int_0^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)-\tilde{\kappa}(x',R_0v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} f(x', R_0 v) dx' \right| \\ & \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-c\hbar,\delta\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x} \int_0^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} |\nu^{-1}(v) f(x', R_0 v)| dx' \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

for small $\hbar > 0$. Note that the right-hand side of the bound (6.13) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \int_0^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{\delta}{2})\frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x'} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} dx' \|\nu^{-1}(v) f(x, R_0 v)\|_{L_x^\infty} \\ & = 2(1 - \frac{\delta}{2})^{-1} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \nu^{-1}(v) \|f(\cdot, R_0 v)\|_{L_x^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \left\| \int_0^A e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)-\tilde{\kappa}(x',R_0v)]} \frac{1}{v_3} f(x', R_0 v) dx' \right\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq 2(1 - \frac{\delta}{2})^{-1} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}. \quad (6.14)$$

Now we control the quantity

$$\mathfrak{Q}(f) = \frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \int_{v'_3 < 0} \int_0^A (-v'_3)^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x',v')]} \frac{1}{v'_3} f(x', v') \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} dx' dv'.$$

The inequality (6.1) implies $\mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-\kappa(x,v)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\kappa_{n\gamma}(x)} &= \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{l} \right)^{n_\gamma} = \left(\frac{\delta \frac{v_3}{\nu(v)} \cdot \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x + l}{l} \right)^{n_\gamma} \\ &\leq C \left(l^{-1} \frac{v_3}{\nu(v)} + 1 \right)^{n_\gamma} \left(\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x + 1 \right)^{n_\gamma} \leq C \left(\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x + 1 \right)^{n_\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the facts $l \geq 1$ and $\frac{|v_3|}{\nu(v)} \leq C$ for $\gamma = 1$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-\tilde{\kappa}(x,v)} &= \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-\kappa(x,v)} e^{-\kappa_{n\gamma}(x)} \leq C \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} \left(\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x + 1 \right)^{n_\gamma} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x} \\ &\leq C e^{-\frac{1}{2} c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} x} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

By the similar arguments in (6.3), one has $\mathbf{1}_{v'_3 < 0} e^{\kappa(x',v')} \leq \mathbf{1}_{v'_3 < 0} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v')}{|v'_3|} x'}$. Observe that $e^{\kappa_{n\gamma}(x')} = \left(\frac{l}{\delta x' + l} \right)^{n_\gamma} \leq 1$. One then obtains $\mathbf{1}_{v'_3 < 0} e^{\tilde{\kappa}(x',v')} = \mathbf{1}_{v'_3 < 0} e^{\kappa(x',v')} e^{\kappa_{n\gamma}(x')} \leq \mathbf{1}_{v'_3 < 0} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v')}{|v'_3|} x'}$. It also follows from the similar arguments of (6.7) that

$$\frac{M_w(v)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v)}} \frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v)}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(0,v')} \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_\sigma(v')} \leq C \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v')$$

uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ for sufficiently small $\hbar > 0$, where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of A, n, \hbar, l and δ . As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{Q}(f)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq C \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \int_{v'_3 < 0} \int_0^A \frac{\nu(v')}{|v'_3|} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v')}{|v'_3|} x'} |v'_3| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v') dx' dv' \\ &= \frac{C}{c_{h,\delta}} \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \int_{v'_3 < 0} \left(-e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v')}{|v'_3|} x'} \right) \Big|_0^A |v'_3| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v') dv' \\ &\leq \frac{C}{c_{h,\delta}} \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \int_{v'_3 < 0} |v'_3| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v') dv' \leq C \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

with small $\hbar > 0$ and assumption (1.42). Therefore, plugging the estimates (6.14) and (6.15) into the expression (2.4) of the operator $Z(f)$, one gains

$$\|Z(f)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq C \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty},$$

hence the bound (2.7) holds.

Step 3. $L_{x,v}^\infty$ bound for the operator U .

We now justify the bound (2.8). By the definition of $\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)$ in (2.1), one has

$$\mathbf{1}_{x' \in (0,x)} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x',v)]} = \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{\delta x' + l} \right)^{n_\gamma} e^{-\int_{x'}^x \left[-\frac{m\sigma_x(y,v)}{2\sigma_x(y,v)} - \hbar \sigma_x(y,v) + \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} \right] dy}.$$

By the similar arguments in (6.1), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{x' \in (0,x)} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x',v)]} &\leq \mathbf{1}_{x' \in (0,x)} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{\delta x' + l} \right)^{n_\gamma} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x')} \\ &= \left(\frac{\delta(x-x') + \delta x' + l}{\delta x' + l} \right)^{n_\gamma} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x')} \leq [\delta(x-x') + 1]^{n_\gamma} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x')} \\ &\leq C [\delta \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x') + 1]^{n_\gamma} \left(\frac{|v_3|}{\nu(v)} + 1 \right)^{n_\gamma} e^{-c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x')} \leq C e^{-\frac{1}{2} c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x')}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with the definition of the operator U in (2.5), it infers that

$$|\mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} U(f)| \leq C \int_0^x \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} e^{-\frac{1}{2} c_{h,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} (x-x')} |\nu^{-1} f(x'v)| dx'$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \int_0^x \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3} e^{-\frac{1}{2}c_{\hbar,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}(x-x')} dx' \\
&= \frac{2C}{c_{\hbar,\delta}} \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}c_{\hbar,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{v_3}x}) \leq \frac{2C}{c_{\hbar,\delta}} \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}. \tag{6.16}
\end{aligned}$$

We then consider the case $v_3 < 0$. Combining with the definition of $\tilde{\kappa}(x, v)$ in (2.1) and the inequality (6.8), one derives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}_{x' \in (x,A)} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0} e^{-[\tilde{\kappa}(x,v) - \tilde{\kappa}(x',v)]} &= \mathbf{1}_{x' \in (x,A)} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0} \left(\frac{\delta x + l}{\delta x' + l} \right)^{n_\gamma} e^{\int_x^{x'} \left[-\frac{m\sigma_x(x,y,v)}{2\sigma_x(y,v)} - \hbar\sigma_x(y,v) - \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|} \right] dy} \\
&\leq \mathbf{1}_{x' \in (x,A)} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0} e^{-c_{\hbar,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|}(x'-x)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0} U(f)| &\leq \int_x^A e^{-c_{\hbar,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|}(x'-x)} \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|} |\nu^{-1}(v) f(x', v)| dx' \\
&\leq \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \int_x^A e^{-c_{\hbar,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|}(x'-x)} \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|} dx' \\
&= \frac{1}{c_{\hbar,\delta}} \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} (1 - e^{-c_{\hbar,\delta} \frac{\nu(v)}{|v_3|}(A-x)}) \leq \frac{1}{c_{\hbar,\delta}} \|\nu^{-1} f\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}. \tag{6.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Then the bounds (6.16) and (6.17) conclude the estimate (2.8). The proof of Lemma 2.2 is therefore completed. \square

7. WEAK MACROSCOPIC DAMPING MECHANISM: PROOF OF LEMMA 2.3

The goal of this section is to construct the so-called macroscopic damping structure, hence, to prove Lemma 2.3.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. We first decompose the left quantity in (2.9) as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{\beta,\vartheta}^2 g(-\hbar\sigma_x v_3 g) dv = D_0 + D_1 + D_2, \tag{7.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D_0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} [-\hbar\sigma_x v_3 (\mathcal{P} w_{\beta,\vartheta} g)^2] dv, \quad D_1 = -\hbar \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sigma_x v_3 (\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta} g)^2 dv, \\
D_2 &= -2\hbar \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \sigma_x v_3 \mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta} g \cdot \mathcal{P} w_{\beta,\vartheta} g dv. \tag{7.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $|v_3 \sigma_x| \leq c\nu(v)$ as in Lemma 2.1, the quantity D_1 can be bounded by

$$|D_1| \leq c\hbar \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) |\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta} g|^2 dv, \tag{7.3}$$

and D_2 can be dominated by

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_2| &\leq c\hbar \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\sigma_x v_3| |\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta} g| |\mathcal{P} w_{\beta,\vartheta} g| dv \\
&\leq c\hbar^{\frac{3}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3 \sigma_x| |\mathcal{P} w_{\beta,\vartheta} g|^2 dv + c\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) |\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta} g|^2 dv.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, one has

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3 \sigma_x| |\mathcal{P} w_{\beta,\vartheta} g|^2 dv = \underbrace{\int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} (\dots) dv}_{:=D_{21}} + \underbrace{\int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l} (\dots) dv}_{:=D_{22}}.$$

By (8.1)-(8.2) below, if $2(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l$, it follows that $\sigma_x = \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}$. Furthermore, the definition of $\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g$ in (1.13) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g = \sum_{j=0}^4 a_j \psi_j, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_i(v) \psi_j(v) dv = \delta_{ij} \quad (0 \leq i, j \leq 4), \quad (7.4)$$

which means that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv = \sum_{j=0}^4 a_j^2. \quad (7.5)$$

It is easy to see that ψ_j satisfy

$$\sum_{j=0}^4 |\psi_j(v)| \leq c'' e^{-c'|v-\mathbf{u}|^2} \quad (7.6)$$

for some $c', c'' > 0$. Then D_{21} can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{21} &\leq C(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-\mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} |v_3| e^{-c'|v-\mathbf{u}|^2} dv \sum_{j=0}^4 a_j^2 \\ &\leq C(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $|v_3 \sigma_x| \leq c\nu(v)$ in Lemma 2.1 and the relations (7.4)-(7.5)-(7.6), D_{22} can be controlled by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{22} &\leq C \int_{2(1+|v-\mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l} \nu(v) e^{-c'|v-\mathbf{u}|^2} dv \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv \\ &\leq C e^{-\frac{c'}{8}(\frac{\delta x + l}{2})^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) e^{-\frac{c'}{2}|v-\mathbf{u}|^2} dv \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv \leq C(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact $|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}(\frac{\delta x + l}{2})^{\frac{2}{3-\gamma}}$ derived from $2(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l$ when $l \geq 2^{4-\gamma}$. Then one has $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3 \sigma_x| |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv \leq C(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv$, which yields that

$$|D_2| \leq C \hbar^{\frac{3}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv + C \hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) |\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv. \quad (7.7)$$

It turns to control the quantity D_0 in (7.2). Observe that

$$D_0 = E + G, \quad (7.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{\beta,\vartheta}g [\tau(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \mathcal{P} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} v_3 \mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g - \hbar \mathcal{P} \sigma_x v_3 \mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g] dv, \\ G &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tau(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} w_{\beta,\vartheta}g (\mathcal{P} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} v_3 \mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g) dv. \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

Here the constant $\tau = \tau_0 \hbar$ for large $\tau_0 > 0$ to be determined later.

We split the quantity E as

$$E = \int_{2(1+|v-\mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} (\dots) dv + \int_{2(1+|v-\mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l} (\dots) dv := E_1 + E_2. \quad (7.10)$$

By (8.1), if $2(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l$, one has $\sigma_x = \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}$. Then, by taking $\tau = \tau_0 \hbar$ with $\tau_0 > \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}$,

$$E_1 = (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-\mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} (\tau \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} - \frac{10\delta \hbar}{3-\gamma}) v_3 (\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g)^2 dv$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\tau - \frac{10\delta\hbar}{3-\gamma})(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} \mathbf{1}_{v_3 > 0} v_3 (\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g)^2 dv \\
&\quad + \frac{10\delta\hbar}{3-\gamma} (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} -\mathbf{1}_{v_3 < 0} v_3 (\mathcal{P}g)^2 dv \\
&\geq C\hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} |v_3| (\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g)^2 dv,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C = \min\{\tau_0 - \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}, \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}\} > 0$. Observe that $\{v \in \mathbb{R}^3; 2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l\} \supseteq \mathcal{V} := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^3; 2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} \leq l\}$. Together with (7.4), it infers that

$$\int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} \leq \delta x + l} |v_3| (\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g)^2 dv \geq \int_{\mathcal{V}} |v_3| (\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g)^2 dv = \sum_{i,j=0}^4 a_i a_j \int_{\mathcal{V}} |v_3| \psi_i \psi_j dv > 0$$

for any $\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g \neq 0$. Namely, the symmetric quadratic form $\sum_{i,j=0}^4 a_i a_j \int_{\mathcal{V}} |v_3| \psi_i \psi_j dv$ is positive definite. Then there is a constant $\mu' > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^4 a_i a_j \int_{\mathcal{V}} |v_3| \psi_i \psi_j dv \geq \mu' \sum_{i=0}^4 a_i^2 = \mu' \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv.$$

Consequently, it holds

$$E_1 \geq 5\mu_0 \hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv, \tag{7.11}$$

where $\mu_0 = \frac{1}{5}C\mu' > 0$. By (7.4)-(7.5)-(7.6), the quantity E_2 can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
|E_2| &\leq C\hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l} |v_3| (\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g)^2 dv \\
&\leq C\hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l} |v_3| \sum_{i=0}^4 a_i^2 \psi_i^2 dv \\
&\leq C\hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l} |v_3| e^{-2c'|v-u|^2} dv \sum_{i=0}^4 a_i^2 \\
&\leq C e^{-c'[(l/2)^{\frac{1}{3-\gamma}} - 1]^2} \hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{2(1+|v-u|)^{3-\gamma} > \delta x + l} |v_3| e^{-c'|v-u|^2} dv \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv \\
&\leq C e^{-c'[(l/2)^{\frac{1}{3-\gamma}} - 1]^2} \hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing large $l > 0$ such that $C e^{-c'[(l/2)^{\frac{1}{3-\gamma}} - 1]^2} \leq \mu_0$, it follows that

$$|E_2| \leq \mu_0 \hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv. \tag{7.12}$$

Then (7.10), (7.11) and (7.12) show that

$$E \geq E_1 - |E_2| \geq 4\mu_0 \hbar(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g|^2 dv. \tag{7.13}$$

We then control the quantity G . Note that by (7.4)-(7.6),

$$\mathcal{P}w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v) = \sum_{j=0}^4 \psi_j(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_j(\tilde{v}) w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, \tilde{v}) d\tilde{v},$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |G| &\leq 2\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3| (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} (\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g)^2 dv \\
 &= 2\tau (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3| \left(\sum_{j=0}^4 \psi_j(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_j(\tilde{v}) w_{\beta,\vartheta} g(x, \tilde{v}) d\tilde{v} \right)^2 dv \\
 &\leq 2\tau \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A;m,n_\gamma,\beta-\beta',\vartheta}^2 (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma} \\
 &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3| \left(\sum_{j=0}^4 \psi_j(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\psi_j(\tilde{v})| (1 + |\tilde{v}|)^{|\beta'|} \sigma_x^{-\frac{m}{2}}(x, \tilde{v}) d\tilde{v} \right)^2 dv.
 \end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

Lemma 2.1 shows that for $m < 0$, $\sigma_x^{-\frac{m}{2}}(x, \tilde{v}) \leq C(\delta x + l)^{\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2(3-\gamma)}}$ uniformly in $\tilde{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Then the quantity G can be further bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
 |G| &\leq C\hbar \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A;m,n_\gamma,\beta-\beta',\vartheta}^2 (\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma} \\
 &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3| \left(\sum_{j=0}^4 \psi_j(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\psi_j(\tilde{v})| (1 + |\tilde{v}|)^{|\beta'|} d\tilde{v} \right)^2 dv \\
 &\leq C\hbar (\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A;m,n_\gamma,\beta-\beta',\vartheta}^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

where we have utilized the fact $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_3| \left(\sum_{j=0}^4 \psi_j(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\psi_j(\tilde{v})| (1 + |\tilde{v}|)^{|\beta'|} d\tilde{v} \right)^2 dv \leq C$. It then follows from (7.8), (7.13) and (7.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_0 \geq E - |G| &\geq 2\mu_0\hbar (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\mathcal{P}w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv \\
 &\quad - C\hbar \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu(v) |\mathcal{P}^\perp w_{\beta,\vartheta}g|^2 dv - C\hbar (\delta x + l)^{-(1-m)\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma} - n_\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A;m,n_\gamma,\beta-\beta',\vartheta}^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{7.16}$$

Then, by taking $\hbar > 0$ small enough such that $C\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu_0$, the bounds (7.3), (7.7) and (7.16) conclude the results in Lemma 2.3, and the proof is finished. \square

8. PROPERTIES OF THE OPERATOR K : PROOF OF LEMMA 2.4-2.5-2.6

In this section, we aim at investigating the properties of the operator K .

8.1. $L_{x,v}^\infty$ **property of K : Proof of Lemma 2.4.** In this subsection, we will prove the $L_{x,v}^\infty$ property of K , i.e., proof of Lemma 2.4.

Before proving Lemma 2.4, we need to analyze the factor σ_x in the bound (2.10). By the definition of σ in (1.18), it infers

$$\sigma_x(x, v) = \begin{cases} \delta(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}, & (x, v) \in \Omega_1, \\ \delta(c_1(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma} + c_2(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}), & (x, v) \in \Omega_2, \\ \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}, & (x, v) \in \Omega_3, \end{cases} \tag{8.1}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are positive functions depending on (x, v) and Υ with $c_1 + c_2$ admitting a uniform lower bound. Also Ω_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Omega_1 &= \{(x, v) : \delta x + l \leq (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma}\}, \\
 \Omega_2 &= \{(x, v) : (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma} < \delta x + l < 2(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma}\}, \\
 \Omega_3 &= \{(x, v) : \delta x + l \geq 2(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma}\}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

Lemma 8.1. *Let $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$. Denote by*

$$P_\sigma = \frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)}, \quad P_v = \frac{(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}}{(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}}. \tag{8.3}$$

Then the following results hold:

$\begin{matrix} P_\sigma & (x, v) \\ (x, v_*) \end{matrix}$	Ω_1	Ω_2	Ω_3
Ω_1	$P_\sigma = P_v$	$P_\sigma \sim P_v$	$1 \lesssim P_\sigma \lesssim P_v$
Ω_2	$P_\sigma \sim P_v$	$P_\sigma \sim P_v$	$P_\sigma \sim 1$
Ω_3	$P_v \lesssim P_\sigma \lesssim 1$	$P_\sigma \sim 1$	$P_\sigma = 1$

Proof. Based on the expression σ_x in (8.1) and the definitions of Ω_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) in (8.2), the results in Lemma 8.1 will be proved case by case.

Case 1. $(x, v) \in \Omega_1, (x, v_*) \in \Omega_1$.

By (8.1), one has $\sigma_x(x, v) = \delta(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}$ and $\sigma_x(x, v_*) = \delta(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}$. Then

$$P_\sigma = \frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} = \frac{(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}}{(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}} = P_v.$$

Case 2. $(x, v) \in \Omega_1, (x, v_*) \in \Omega_2$.

Due to $(x, v_*) \in \Omega_2$, Lemma 2.1 and the definition of Ω_2 in (8.2) show that

$$\sigma_x(x, v_*) \sim (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \sim (1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}.$$

Together $\sigma_x(x, v) = \delta(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}$, it follows that

$$P_\sigma = \frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} \sim \frac{(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}}{(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}} = P_v.$$

Case 3. $(x, v) \in \Omega_1, (x, v_*) \in \Omega_3$.

By (8.1), one has $\sigma_x(x, v_*) = \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}$. Then

$$\frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} = \frac{3-\gamma}{10}(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}.$$

In Ω_1 , one has $\delta x + l \leq (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma}$. Then

$$\frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} \leq \frac{3-\gamma}{10}(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{1-\gamma} = \frac{3-\gamma}{10}.$$

In Ω_3 , one has $\delta x + l \geq 2(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{3-\gamma}$. Then

$$\frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} \geq 2^{\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \frac{3-\gamma}{10}(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{1-\gamma} = 2^{\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \frac{3-\gamma}{10} P_v.$$

In summary, $2^{\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \frac{3-\gamma}{10} P_v \leq P_\sigma = \frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} \leq \frac{3-\gamma}{10}$, i.e., $P_v \lesssim P_\sigma \lesssim 1$.

Case 4. $(x, v) \in \Omega_2, (x, v_*) \in \Omega_1$.

By the similar arguments in *Case 2*, there hold

$$\sigma_x(x, v) \sim (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \sim (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}, \quad \sigma_x(x, v_*) = (1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma},$$

which implies $P_\sigma \sim P_v$.

Case 5. $(x, v) \in \Omega_2, (x, v_*) \in \Omega_2$.

By the arguments in *Case 2* and *Case 3*, one knows

$$\sigma_x(x, v) \sim (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}, \quad \sigma_x(x, v_*) \sim (1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma},$$

which means $P_\sigma \sim P_v$.

Case 6. $(x, v) \in \Omega_2, (x, v_*) \in \Omega_3$.

In Ω_2 , $\sigma_x(x, v) \sim (1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma} \sim (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}$. In Ω_3 , $\sigma_x(x, v_*) = \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}$. It thereby infers that $P_\sigma \sim 1$.

Case 7. $(x, v) \in \Omega_3, (x, v_*) \in \Omega_1$.

For $(x, v) \in \Omega_3$, one has

$$\sigma_x(x, v) = \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \leq \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}2^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}.$$

For $(x, v_*) \in \Omega_1$, it is easy to see that $\sigma_x(x, v_*) = \delta(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma} \leq \delta(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}$. Then there hold

$$\frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} = \frac{10}{3-\gamma} \frac{(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}}{(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}} \leq \frac{10}{3-\gamma} 2^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \frac{(1 + |v - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}}{(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}},$$

and

$$\frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} = \frac{10}{3-\gamma} \frac{(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}}{(1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma}} \geq \frac{10}{3-\gamma} \frac{(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}}{(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}} = \frac{10}{3-\gamma}.$$

As a result, one has $1 \lesssim P_\sigma \lesssim P_v$.

Case 8. $(x, v) \in \Omega_3$, $(x, v_*) \in \Omega_2$.

For $(x, v) \in \Omega_3$ and $(x, v_*) \in \Omega_2$,

$$\sigma_x(x, v) = \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}, \quad \sigma_x(x, v_*) \sim (\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}} \sim (1 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|)^{-1+\gamma},$$

which shows that $P_\sigma = \frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} \sim 1$.

Case 9. $(x, v) \in \Omega_3$, $(x, v_*) \in \Omega_3$.

In this case, one has $\sigma_x(x, v) = \sigma_x(x, v_*) = \frac{10\delta}{3-\gamma}(\delta x + l)^{-\frac{1-\gamma}{3-\gamma}}$, which means that $P_\sigma = \frac{\sigma_x(x, v)}{\sigma_x(x, v_*)} = 1$.

The proof of Lemma 8.1 is therefore completed. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.4. For the simplicity of notations, we denote by

$$\mathbf{p}(x, v) = \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)e^{h\sigma(x, v)}w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v). \quad (8.4)$$

By the definition of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta}$ in (1.28), one knows that

$$\|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}e^{h\sigma}Kf\|_{A; n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} = \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma}\mathbf{p}Kf\|_{L_{x, v}^\infty}. \quad (8.5)$$

Let $\tilde{f}(x, v) = (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma}\mathbf{p}f(x, v)$ and $K_{\mathbf{p}}(\cdot) = \mathbf{p}K(\mathbf{p}^{-1}\cdot)$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}e^{h\sigma}Kf\|_{A; n_\gamma, \beta, \vartheta} &= \|(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma}\mathbf{p}Kf\|_{L_{x, v}^\infty} = \|K_{\mathbf{p}}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x, v}^\infty}, \\ \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}e^{h\sigma}f\|_{A; n_\gamma, \beta + \gamma - 1, \vartheta} &= \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x, v}^\infty}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

It thereby suffices to prove

$$\|K_{\mathbf{p}}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x, v}^\infty} \leq C\|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x, v}^\infty}. \quad (8.7)$$

Let $\chi(r)$ be a smooth monotone function satisfying $\chi(r) = 0$ for $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $\chi(r) = 1$ for $r \geq 2$. Then, together with (1.8)-(1.9)-(1.10), the operator $K_{\mathbf{p}}$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$K_{\mathbf{p}}\tilde{f}(x, v) = -K_{1\mathbf{p}}\tilde{f}(x, v) + K_{2\mathbf{p}}^{1-\chi}\tilde{f}(x, v) + K_{2\mathbf{p}}^\chi\tilde{f}(x, v), \quad (8.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_{1\mathbf{p}}\tilde{f}(x, v) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\mathbf{p}(x, v)}{\mathbf{p}(x, v_*)}|v - v_*|^\gamma \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v)\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*)\tilde{f}(x, v_*)dv_*, \\ K_{2\mathbf{p}}^{1-\chi}\tilde{f}(x, v) &= \mathbf{p}(x, v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi)(|v_* - v|) [\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*)\frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathbf{p}}(x, v') + \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v')\frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathbf{p}}(x, v'_*)] \\ &\quad \times \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*)b(\omega, v_* - v)d\omega dv_*, \\ K_{2\mathbf{p}}^\chi\tilde{f}(x, v) &= \mathbf{p}(x, v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \chi(|v_* - v|) [\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*)\frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathbf{p}}(x, v') + \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v')\frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathbf{p}}(x, v'_*)] \\ &\quad \times \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*)b(\omega, v_* - v)d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned} \quad (8.9)$$

Step 1. Estimate of $\frac{\mathfrak{p}(x,v)}{\mathfrak{p}(x,v_*)}$.

By (8.4), one has $\frac{\mathfrak{p}(x,v)}{\mathfrak{p}(x,v_*)} = \left[\frac{\sigma_x(x,v)}{\sigma_x(x,v_*)} \right]^{\frac{m}{2}} \frac{(1+|v|)^\beta}{(1+|v_*|)^\beta} e^{h[\sigma(x,v)-\sigma(x,v_*)]} e^{\vartheta(|v-\mathbf{u}|^2-|v_*-\mathbf{u}|^2)}$. By Lemma 2.1, it follows $|\sigma(x,v) - \sigma(x,v_*)| \leq c|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2$.

We claim that for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{(1+|v|)^\beta}{(1+|v_*|)^\beta} \leq (1 + |v - v_*|)^{|\beta|}. \quad (8.10)$$

Indeed, if $\beta \geq 0$,

$$(1 + |v|)^\beta \leq (1 + |v_*| + |v - v_*|)^\beta \leq (1 + |v_*|)^\beta (1 + |v - v_*|)^\beta,$$

namely, $\frac{(1+|v|)^\beta}{(1+|v_*|)^\beta} \leq (1 + |v - v_*|)^\beta$. If $\beta < 0$,

$$(1 + |v_*|)^{-\beta} \leq (1 + |v_*|)^{-\beta} (1 + |v - v_*|)^{-\beta} = (1 + |v_*|)^{-\beta} (1 + |v - v_*|)^{|\beta|},$$

which means that $\frac{(1+|v|)^\beta}{(1+|v_*|)^\beta} \leq (1 + |v - v_*|)^{|\beta|}$. As a result, the claim (8.10) holds. Moreover, Lemma 8.1 and similar arguments in (8.10) indicate that for any $m \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left[\frac{\sigma_x(x,v)}{\sigma_x(x,v_*)} \right]^{\frac{m}{2}} \leq C_{m,\gamma} \left(1 + \frac{(1+|v-\mathbf{u}|)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2}}}{(1+|v_*-\mathbf{u}|)^{-\frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2}}} \right) \leq C_{m,\gamma} (1 + |v - v_*|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}}. \quad (8.11)$$

In summary, one derives that

$$\frac{\mathfrak{p}(x,v)}{\mathfrak{p}(x,v_*)} \leq C(1 + |v - v_*|)^k \exp[(c\hbar + \vartheta)|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2], \quad (8.12)$$

where $k = |\beta| + |m|(1 - \gamma)/2 \geq 0$.

Step 2. Estimate of $K_{1\mathfrak{p}}\tilde{f}(x, v)$.

By the definition of $K_{1\mathfrak{p}}\tilde{f}(x, v)$ in (8.9) and the bound (8.12), it is easy to see

$$|K_{1\mathfrak{p}}\tilde{f}(x, v)| \leq C \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_* - v|^\gamma (1 + |v_* - v|)^k [\mathfrak{M}(v)\mathfrak{M}(v_*)]^{2\delta_0} |\tilde{f}(x, v_*)| dv_*}_{:=A^-}, \quad (8.13)$$

where $\delta_0 = \frac{1}{4} - T(c\hbar + \vartheta) > 0$ by the assumptions in Lemma 2.4. Due to $|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}|v - v_*|^2$,

$$\mathfrak{M}(v)\mathfrak{M}(v_*) \leq \left[\frac{\rho}{(2\pi T)^{3/2}} \right]^2 \exp\left[-\frac{|v-v_*|^2}{4T}\right]. \quad (8.14)$$

Together with $[\mathfrak{M}(v)\mathfrak{M}(v_*)]^{\delta_0} \leq C(1 + |v_*|)^{\gamma-1}$, it infers that

$$\begin{aligned} A^- &\leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{\tilde{x},v}^\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_* - v|^\gamma (1 + |v_* - v|)^k \exp\left[-\frac{\delta_0|v-v_*|^2}{4T}\right] dv_* \\ &\leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{\tilde{x},v}^\infty}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.15)$$

where the last inequality is followed from the convergence of the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_* - v|^\gamma (1 + |v_* - v|)^k \exp\left[-\frac{\delta_0|v-v_*|^2}{4T}\right] dv_* < \infty,$$

which holds if and only if $\gamma > -3$.

Therefore, the relations (8.13) and (8.15) indicate that

$$|K_{1\mathfrak{p}}\tilde{f}(x, v)| \leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{\tilde{x},v}^\infty} \quad (8.16)$$

for $\gamma > -3$, $\beta, m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\vartheta \geq 0$ sufficiently small.

Step 3. Estimate of $K_{2\mathfrak{p}}^{1-\chi}\tilde{f}(x, v)$.

First, we assert that

$$\mathfrak{M}(v_*) \leq C\mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v), \quad \mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \leq C\mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v'), \quad \mathfrak{M}(v') \leq C\mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v'_*), \quad (8.17)$$

provided that $|v_* - v| = |v'_* - v'| \leq 2$, where $\delta_0 \in (0, 1/4)$ is given in Lemma 2.4. Indeed, if $|v_* - v| \leq 2$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |v - \mathbf{u}|^2 &= |v - v_* + v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2 = |v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2 + 2(v - v_*) \cdot (v_* - \mathbf{u}) + |v - v_*|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \frac{\delta_0}{1-\delta_0})|v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2 + (1 + \frac{1-\delta_0}{\delta_0})|v - v_*|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1-\delta_0}|v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2 + \frac{4}{\delta_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there hold

$$\mathfrak{M}(v) = \frac{\rho}{(2\pi T)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \exp\left(-\frac{|v-\mathbf{u}|^2}{2T}\right) \geq \frac{\rho}{(2\pi T)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \exp\left[-\frac{|v_*-\mathbf{u}|^2}{2T(1-\delta_0)} - \frac{2}{\delta_0 T}\right] \geq C\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_0}}(v_*),$$

which concludes the first inequality in (8.17). Moreover, the same arguments imply the last two bounds in (8.17).

By (8.17) and the definition of $K_{2\mathfrak{p}}^{1-\chi}\tilde{f}(x, v)$ in (8.9), it is easy to obtain

$$|K_{2\mathfrak{p}}^{1-\chi}\tilde{f}(x, v)| \leq C(\Pi' + \Pi'_*),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi' &= \mathfrak{p}(x, v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi)(|v_* - v|) \left| \frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathfrak{p}}(x, v') \right| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \\ \Pi'_* &= \mathfrak{p}(x, v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi)(|v_* - v|) \left| \frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathfrak{p}}(x, v'_*) \right| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

Now we focus on dominating the quantity Π' . By (8.12), one observes that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathfrak{p}(x, v)}{\mathfrak{p}(x, v')} &\leq C(1 + |v - v'|)^k \exp[(c\hbar + \vartheta)|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v' - \mathbf{u}|^2] \\ &\leq C(1 + |v - v'|)^k [\mathfrak{M}(v)\mathfrak{M}(v')]^{-2T(c\hbar + \vartheta)} = C(1 + |v - v'|)^k [\mathfrak{M}(v)\mathfrak{M}(v')]^{2\delta_0 - \frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the quantity Π' can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi' &\leq C \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi)(|v_* - v|) |\tilde{f}(x, v')| (1 + |v - v'|)^k \mathfrak{M}^{2\delta_0 - \frac{1}{2}}(v) \\ &\quad \times \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta_0}{4(1-\delta_0)}}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{2}\delta_0}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{\delta_0}{4(1-\delta_0)}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \\ &\leq C \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi)(|v_* - v|) |\tilde{f}(x, v')| (1 + |v - v'|)^k \\ &\quad \times \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{4}\delta_0}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{2}\delta_0}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{\delta_0}{4(1-\delta_0)}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is followed from the bound $\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta_0}{4(1-\delta_0)}}(v_*) \leq C\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{4}\delta_0}(v)$ by (8.17).

It is derived from (8.14) that $\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{8}\delta_0}(v)\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{8}\delta_0}(v') \leq C\exp(-\frac{\delta_0|v-v'|^2}{20T})$. Together with $\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{\delta_0}{4}}(v') \leq C(1 + |v'|)^{\gamma-1}$, the quantity Π' can be further bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi' &\leq C\|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi)(|v_* - v|) (1 + |v - v'|)^k \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{8}\delta_0}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{8}\delta_0}(v') \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_0|v-v'|^2}{20T}\right) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{\delta_0}{4(1-\delta_0)}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \\ &\leq C\|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the estimates $(1 + |v - v'|)^k \exp(-\frac{\delta_0|v-v'|^2}{20T}) \leq C$ and

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi)(|v_* - v|) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{8}\delta_0}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{8}\delta_0}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{\delta_0}{4(1-\delta_0)}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \leq C\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{5}{8}\delta_0}(v) \nu(v) \leq C.$$

Similarly, the quantity Π'_* can be bounded by $\Pi'_* \leq C\|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}$ for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and sufficiently small $\vartheta \geq 0$. Consequently, it concludes that

$$|K_{2\mathfrak{p}}^{1-\chi}\tilde{f}(x, v)| \leq C\|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1}\tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \quad (8.18)$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and sufficiently small $\vartheta \geq 0$.

Step 4. Estimate of $K_{2p}^\chi \tilde{f}(x, v)$. By letting $V = v_* - v$, $V_{\parallel} = (V \cdot \omega)\omega$, $V_{\perp} = V - V_{\parallel}$ and $\omega = \frac{v' - v}{|v' - v|}$, one has $d\omega dv_* = 2|V_{\parallel}|^{-2} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}$, see Section 2 of [10]. Moreover, $v' = v + V_{\parallel}$, $v'_* = v + V_{\perp}$, $v_* = v + V$. Then, by (8.9), one has

$$K_{2p}^\chi \tilde{f}(x, v) = \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 &= 2\mathbf{p}(x, v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} |V_{\parallel}|^{-2} \chi(|V|) \frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathbf{p}}(x, v + V_{\parallel}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v + V_{\perp}) \\ &\quad \times \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v + V) b(\omega, V) dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}, \\ \Lambda_2 &= 2\mathbf{p}(x, v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} |V_{\parallel}|^{-2} \chi(|V|) \frac{\tilde{f}}{\mathbf{p}}(v + V_{\perp}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(x, v + V_{\parallel}) \\ &\quad \times \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v + V) b(\omega, V) dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.19)$$

Step 4.1. Control of $|\Lambda_1|$. Set

$$\zeta = v + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}, \quad \zeta_{\parallel} = [(\zeta - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \omega]\omega, \quad \zeta_{\perp} = (\zeta - \mathbf{u}) - \zeta_{\parallel}. \quad (8.20)$$

A direct calculation implies

$$\begin{aligned} & - \frac{|v + V_{\perp} - \mathbf{u}|^2 + |v + V - \mathbf{u}|^2}{4T} = - \frac{|v + V_{\perp} - \mathbf{u}|^2 + |v + V_{\perp} - \mathbf{u} + V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T} \\ &= - \frac{|\zeta - \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel} + V_{\perp} - \mathbf{u}|^2 + |\zeta + V_{\perp} - \mathbf{u} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T} = - \frac{|\zeta - \mathbf{u} + V_{\perp}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|V_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} \\ &= - \frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|V_{\parallel}|^2}{2T}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.21)$$

which yields

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v + V_{\perp}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v + V) = \frac{\rho}{(2\pi T)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \exp\left[-\frac{|V_{\parallel}|^2}{8T} - \frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} - \frac{|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{2T}\right]. \quad (8.22)$$

Moreover, (1.4) and (1.5) imply that

$$|b(\omega, V)| \leq \tilde{b}_0 \frac{|V \cdot \omega|}{|V|} |V|^{\gamma} = \frac{\tilde{b}_0 |V_{\parallel}|}{|V|^{1-\gamma}}. \quad (8.23)$$

It also follows from (8.12) that $\frac{\mathbf{p}(x, v)}{\mathbf{p}(x, v + V_{\parallel})} \leq C(1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^k \exp\left[\frac{(1-4\delta_0)}{4T} |v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v + V_{\parallel} - \mathbf{u}|^2\right]$, where $\delta_0 = \frac{1}{4} - T(c\hbar + \vartheta) > 0$ has been used. Note that

$$|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v + V_{\parallel} - \mathbf{u}|^2 = -V_{\parallel} \cdot [2(v - \mathbf{u}) + V_{\parallel}] = -V_{\parallel} \cdot (2\zeta_{\perp} + 2\zeta_{\parallel}) = -2V_{\parallel} \cdot \zeta_{\parallel}, \quad (8.24)$$

which infers

$$\frac{\mathbf{p}(x, v)}{\mathbf{p}(x, v + V_{\parallel})} \leq C(1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^k \exp\left[\frac{(1-4\delta_0)}{2T} |V_{\parallel} \cdot \zeta_{\parallel}|\right]. \quad (8.25)$$

Plugging (8.22)-(8.23)-(8.25) into the expression of Λ_1 in (8.19), one has

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda_1| &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} (1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^k \exp\left[-\frac{|V_{\parallel}|^2}{8T} - \frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} + \frac{(1-4\delta_0)}{2T} |V_{\parallel} \cdot \zeta_{\parallel}|\right] \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(-\frac{|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{2T}\right) \frac{\chi(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} |\tilde{f}(x, v + V_{\parallel})| dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.26)$$

It is easy to see that by $-\frac{|V_{\parallel}|^2}{8T} - \frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} + \frac{(1-4\delta_0)}{2T} |V_{\parallel} \cdot \zeta_{\parallel}| \leq -\frac{\delta_0 |V_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} - \frac{2\delta_0 |\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda_1| &\leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} (1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^k (1 + |v + V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma} \exp\left[-\frac{\delta_0 |V_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} - \frac{2\delta_0 |\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{T}\right] \\ &\quad \times \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} \exp\left(-\frac{|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{2T}\right) \frac{\chi(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $v + V_{\parallel} = \zeta_{\parallel} + \zeta_{\perp} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel} + \mathbf{u}$, it holds $|v + V_{\parallel}| \leq C(1 + |\zeta_{\parallel}| + |\zeta_{\perp}| + |V_{\parallel}|)$, which means $(1 + |v + V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma} \leq C(1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma} (1 + |\zeta_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma} (1 + |\zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}$. Observe that

$(1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^{k+1-\gamma}(1 + |\zeta_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma} \exp\left[-\frac{\delta|V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T} - \frac{\delta|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{T}\right] \leq C$ and $\frac{\chi(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} \leq \frac{C}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|^2+|V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}}$. Then the quantity Λ_1 can be further bounded by

$$|\Lambda_1| \leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} \exp\left[-\frac{\delta|V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T} - \frac{\delta|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{T}\right] \\ \times \underbrace{\int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} \exp\left(-\frac{|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{2T}\right) \frac{(1+|\zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|^2+|V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}}_{:=U}.$$

It turns to show that the quantity U is uniformly bounded in V_{\parallel} and ζ_{\perp} . Let

$$I_1 = \{V_{\perp}; V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}, |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| > \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|\}, \quad I_2 = \{V_{\perp}; V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}, |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|\}.$$

Then

$$U = \int_{I_1} (\dots) dV_{\perp} + \int_{I_2} (\dots) dV_{\perp} := U_1 + U_2.$$

If $|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| > \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|$, one has $\frac{(1+|\zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|^2+|V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} \leq C \exp\left(\frac{|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T}\right)$. Then U_1 can be bounded by

$$U_1 \leq C \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} \exp\left(-\frac{|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T}\right) dV_{\perp} \leq C.$$

If $|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|$, it holds $|V_{\perp}| \geq |\zeta_{\perp}| - |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|$, which implies $\frac{(1+|\zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|^2+|V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} \leq \frac{(1+|\zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+\frac{1}{4}|\zeta_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} \leq C$. Then U_2 can be dominated by

$$U_2 \leq C \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} \exp\left(-\frac{|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{2T}\right) dV_{\perp} \leq C.$$

It therefore follows that $U = U_1 + U_2 \leq C$, which implies

$$|\Lambda_1| \leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} \exp\left[-\frac{\delta|V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T} - \frac{\delta|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2}{T}\right] dV_{\parallel} \\ \leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}}, \quad (8.27)$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and sufficiently small $\vartheta \geq 0$.

Step 4.2. Control of $|\Lambda_2|$. Recalling the definition (8.20), a direct computation implies

$$-\frac{|v+V_{\parallel}-\mathbf{u}|^2+|v+V_{\perp}-\mathbf{u}|^2}{4T} = -\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}+\frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} - \frac{|\zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T} - \frac{|V_{\perp}+\zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T}, \quad (8.28)$$

which yields

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v + V_{\parallel}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v + V) = \frac{\rho}{(2\pi T)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \exp\left[-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}+\frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} - \frac{|\zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T} - \frac{|V_{\perp}+\zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T}\right]. \quad (8.29)$$

By (8.12), there holds $\frac{\mathfrak{p}(x,v)}{\mathfrak{p}(x,v+V_{\perp})} \leq C(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^k \exp\left[\frac{1-4\delta_0}{4T} (|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v + V_{\perp} - \mathbf{u}|^2)\right]$. By (8.20), it follows

$$|v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v + V_{\perp} - \mathbf{u}|^2 = -|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |\zeta_{\perp}|^2. \quad (8.30)$$

Moreover, $(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^k \leq (1 + |\zeta_{\perp}|)^k (1 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|)^k$. Then

$$\frac{\mathfrak{p}(x,v)}{\mathfrak{p}(x,v+V_{\perp})} \leq C(1 + |\zeta_{\perp}|)^k (1 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|)^k \exp\left[\frac{1-4\delta_0}{4T} (|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |\zeta_{\perp}|^2)\right]. \quad (8.31)$$

Substituting (8.23), (8.29) and (8.31) into the expression of Λ_2 in (8.19), it follows that

$$|\Lambda_2| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} (1 + |\zeta_{\perp}|)^k \exp\left(-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}+\frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{2T} - \frac{\delta_0|\zeta_{\perp}|^2}{T}\right) \\ \times \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} (1 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|)^k \frac{\chi(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} |\tilde{f}(x, v + V_{\perp})| \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_0|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{T}\right) dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}. \quad (8.32)$$

Notice that $\frac{\chi(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} \leq \frac{C}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|^2+|V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} \leq \frac{C}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{f}(x, v + V_{\perp})| &\leq \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}} (1 + |v + V_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma} \\ &\leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}} (1 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma} (1 + |\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma} (1 + |\zeta_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where the relation $v + V_{\perp} = \mathbf{u} + \zeta_{\parallel} + \zeta_{\perp} - \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel} + V_{\perp}$ has been utilized. Moreover,

$$(1 + |\zeta_{\perp}|)^k (1 + |\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_0|\zeta_{\perp}|^2}{T} - \frac{|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T}\right) \leq C.$$

Then the quantity Λ_2 can be further bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda_2| &\leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} \frac{(1+|\zeta_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}} \exp\left(-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T}\right) \\ &\quad \times \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} (1 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|)^{k+1-\gamma} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_0|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{T}\right) dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel} \\ &\leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}} \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} \frac{(1+|\zeta_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}} \exp\left(-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T}\right) dV_{\parallel}}_{:=W}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $I_1 = \{V_{\parallel}; |\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}| > \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\parallel}|\}$, $I_2 = \{V_{\parallel}; |\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\parallel}|\}$. The quantity W can thereby be decomposed as

$$W = \int_{I_1} (\dots) dV_{\parallel} + \int_{I_2} (\dots) dV_{\parallel} := W_1 + W_2.$$

If $|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}| > \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\parallel}|$, one has $\frac{(1+|\zeta_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}} \exp\left(-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{8T}\right) \leq C$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{8T}\right) dV_{\parallel} \\ &\leq C \int_{|V_{\parallel}| \leq 1} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} dV_{\parallel} + C \int_{|V_{\parallel}| > 1} \exp\left(-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{8T}\right) dV_{\parallel} \leq C. \end{aligned} \tag{8.33}$$

If $|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\parallel}|$, it follows $\frac{1}{2}|V_{\parallel}| \geq |\zeta_{\parallel}| - |\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\parallel}|$, i.e., $|V_{\parallel}| \geq |\zeta_{\parallel}|$, which infers that $\frac{(1+|\zeta_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1+|V_{\parallel}|)^{1-\gamma}} \leq 1$. As a result,

$$W_2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2}{4T}\right) dV_{\parallel} \leq C. \tag{8.34}$$

It thereby holds $W = W_1 + W_2 \leq C$, which shows

$$|\Lambda_2| \leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}}. \tag{8.35}$$

By (8.27) and (8.35), one establishes that for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$,

$$|K_{2p}^{\chi} \tilde{f}(x, v)| \leq |\Lambda_1| + |\Lambda_2| \leq C \|(1 + |v|)^{\gamma-1} \tilde{f}\|_{L_{x,v}^{\infty}}. \tag{8.36}$$

Finally, by plugging the estimates (8.16), (8.18) and (8.36) into (8.8), one knows that the bound (8.7) holds. The proof of Lemma 2.4 is therefore completed. \square

8.2. $L_x^{\infty} L_v^2$ - $L_{x,v}^{\infty}$ property of K : Proof of Lemma 2.5. In this subsection, we will justify the property that the weighted $L_x^{\infty} L_v^2$ norm can be bounded by the weighted $L_{x,v}^{\infty}$ norm, i.e., proof of Lemma 2.5.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Let $\chi_{\varepsilon}(r)$ be a smooth monotone function satisfying $\chi_{\varepsilon}(r) = 0$ for $0 \leq r \leq \varepsilon$ and $\chi_{\varepsilon}(r) = 1$ for $r \geq 2\varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is small to be determined. By (1.8)-(1.9)-(1.10), one has

$$K_{h2} g(x, v) = -K_{h1} g(x, v) + K_{h2}^{1-\chi_{\varepsilon}} g(x, v) + K_{h2}^{\chi_{\varepsilon}} g(x, v), \tag{8.37}$$

where for $\Gamma = \chi_\varepsilon$ and $1 - \chi_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{h1}g(x, v) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{h\sigma(x, v) - h\sigma(x, v_*)} |v - v_*|^\gamma \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v_*) dv_*, \\ K_{h2}^\Gamma g(x, v) &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \Gamma(|v - v_*|) e^{h\sigma(x, v) - h\sigma(x, v')} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v') b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \\ &\quad + \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \Gamma(|v - v_*|) e^{h\sigma(x, v) - h\sigma(x, v'_*)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v'_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned} \quad (8.38)$$

Observe that $\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{hg} \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} = \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} K_{hg}\|_{L_{x, v}^\infty}$.

Step 1. Control the quantity $\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{h1}g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}$.

By splitting

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) K_{h1}g(x, v) &= \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) \int_{|v - v_*| \leq \varepsilon} (\dots) dv_* \\ &\quad + \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) \int_{|v - v_*| > \varepsilon} (\dots) dv_* \\ &= I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the bound (8.12) with $\beta = 0$, one has

$$\frac{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) w_{0, \vartheta}(v) e^{h\sigma(x, v)}}{\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v_*) w_{0, \vartheta}(v_*) e^{h\sigma(x, v_*)}} \leq C(1 + |v - v_*|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch + \vartheta)|v - u|^2 - |v_* - u|^2} \quad (8.39)$$

for sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$. It therefore holds

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq C \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} (1 + |v|)^{-\gamma} \int_{|v - v_*| \leq \varepsilon} |v - v_*|^\gamma (1 + |v - v_*|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} \\ &\quad \times e^{-[\frac{T}{4} - (ch + \vartheta)](|v - u|^2 + |v_* - u|^2)} dv_* \\ &\leq C \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \int_{|v - v_*| \leq \varepsilon} |v - v_*|^\gamma e^{-[\frac{T}{8} - (ch + \vartheta)](|v - u|^2 + |v_* - u|^2)} dv_* \leq C \varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$ are both sufficiently small and $\gamma > -3$.

By Lemma 2.1 and (8.11), one easily knows that

$$w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) \sigma_x^{-\frac{m}{2}}(x, v_*) e^{h\sigma(x, v) - h\sigma(x, v_*)} |v - v_*|^\gamma \mathbf{1}_{|v - v_*| > \varepsilon} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) \leq C_\varepsilon$$

uniformly in (x, v, v_*) , provided that $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$ are small enough. Then the quantity I_2 can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq C_\varepsilon \int_{|v - v_*| > \varepsilon} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v_*) (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} |g(x, v_*)| dv_* \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \left(\int_{|v - v_*| > \varepsilon} z_{-\alpha'}^2(v_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) dv_* \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \leq C_\varepsilon \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is derived from $0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$. Here $z_{\alpha'}$ is defined in (1.21). Consequently, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) K_{h1}g(x, v)| &\leq |I_1| + |I_2| \\ &\leq C \varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_\varepsilon \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that

$$\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{h1}g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \leq C \varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_\varepsilon \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \quad (8.40)$$

for $0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$, $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$, sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$, and small $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined.

Step 2. Control the quantity $\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{\hbar^2}^{1-\chi_\varepsilon} g \rrbracket_{m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}$.

Recalling the definition of $K_{\hbar^2}^{1-\chi_\varepsilon} g(x, v)$ in (8.38), we decompose $K_{\hbar^2}^{1-\chi_\varepsilon} g(x, v) = II_1 + II_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi_\varepsilon)(|v - v_*|) e^{i\hbar\sigma(x, v) - i\hbar\sigma(x, v')} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v') b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \\ II_2 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi_\varepsilon)(|v - v_*|) e^{i\hbar\sigma(x, v) - i\hbar\sigma(x, v'_*)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v'_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $|v - v_*| \leq 2\varepsilon \leq 2$, it follows from (8.17) that $\mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \leq C\mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}$ and $\mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \leq C\mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v')$ for $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$. Together with (8.39) (replacing v_* by v'), it infers that for sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$,

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) II_1| \leq C II_1^-, \quad (8.41)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} II_1^- &= (1 + |v|)^{-\gamma} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |v - v'|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v) |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{0, \vartheta} g(x, v')| \\ &\quad \times (1 - \chi_\varepsilon)(|v - v_*|) e^{i\hbar(c\hbar + \vartheta)(|v - u|^2 + |v' - u|^2)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

For the quantity II_1^- , one easily has

$$\begin{aligned} II_1^- &\leq C \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} (1 + |v|)^{-\gamma} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 - \chi_\varepsilon)(|v - v_*|) (1 + |v - v'|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v) \\ &\quad \times e^{i\hbar(c\hbar + \vartheta)(|v - u|^2 + |v' - u|^2)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \\ &\leq C \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1 - \chi_\varepsilon)(|v - v_*|) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{8}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) |v - v_*|^\gamma dv_* \\ &\leq C \varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.42)$$

Then the bounds (8.41) and (8.42) indicate that

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) II_1| \leq C \varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \quad (8.43)$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ and sufficiently small $\vartheta, \hbar \geq 0$.

Similarly in (8.43), there holds

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{\mathbf{n}_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) II_2| \leq C \varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \quad (8.44)$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ and sufficiently small $\vartheta, \hbar \geq 0$. Then, by (8.43) and (8.44), one has

$$\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{\hbar^2}^{1-\chi_\varepsilon} g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \leq C \varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \quad (8.45)$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{n}_\gamma \geq 0$ and sufficiently small $\vartheta, \hbar \geq 0$.

Step 3. Control the quantity $\llbracket \nu^{-1} K_{\hbar^2}^{\chi_\varepsilon} g \rrbracket_{A; m, \mathbf{n}_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}$.

Recalling (8.38), we split $K_{\hbar^2}^{\chi_\varepsilon} g(x, v) = III_1 + III_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} III_1 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \chi_\varepsilon(|v - v_*|) e^{i\hbar\sigma(x, v) - i\hbar\sigma(x, v')} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v') b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \\ III_2 &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \chi_\varepsilon(|v - v_*|) e^{i\hbar\sigma(x, v) - i\hbar\sigma(x, v'_*)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v'_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned} \quad (8.46)$$

Step 3.1. Estimate of $[\nu^{-1}III_1]_{A;m,n,\gamma,0,\vartheta}$. We first divide the quantity III_1 into two parts:

$$III_1 = \underbrace{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v'-v| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_*-v|\}}(\cdots) d\omega dv_*}_{:=III_{11}} + \underbrace{\iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v'-v| > \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_*-v|\}}(v')(\cdots) d\omega dv_*}_{:=III_{12}}, \quad (8.47)$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ is small enough to be determined.

Step 3.1.1. Estimate the quantity $|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{11}|$. If $|v' - v| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_* - v|$, one has

$$b(\omega, v_* - v) \leq C|v_* - v|^\gamma \frac{|v'-v|}{|v_*-v|} \leq C\tilde{\varepsilon}|v_* - v|^\gamma.$$

Together with (8.39) (replacing v_* by v'), it is easy to derive that

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{11}| \leq C\tilde{\varepsilon} \widetilde{III}_{11} [g]_{A;m,n,\gamma,0,\vartheta}, \quad (8.48)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{III}_{11} = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} & \frac{\chi_\varepsilon(|v_*-v|)}{|v_*-v|^{-\gamma}} (1+|v|)^{-\gamma} (1+|v'-v|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch+\vartheta)|v-u|^2-|v'-u|^2} \\ & \times e^{-\frac{1}{4T}(|v_*-u|^2+|v'_-u|^2)} d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned} \quad (8.49)$$

Note that $\frac{\chi_\varepsilon(|v_*-v|)}{|v_*-v|^{-\gamma}} (1+|v|)^{-\gamma} \leq C_\varepsilon (1+|v_*-u|)^{|\gamma|}$, which means that $\frac{\chi_\varepsilon(|v_*-v|)}{|v_*-v|^{-\gamma} (1+|v|)^\gamma} e^{-\frac{|v_*-u|^2}{8T}} \leq C_\varepsilon$. Then

$$\widetilde{III}_{11} \leq C_\varepsilon \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1+|v'-v|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch+\vartheta)|v-u|^2-|v'-u|^2} e^{-\frac{1}{8T}(|v_*-u|^2+|v'_-u|^2)} d\omega dv_*. \quad (8.50)$$

By letting $V = v_* - v$, $V_{||} = (V \cdot \omega)\omega$, $V_\perp = V - V_{||}$ and $\omega = \frac{v'-v}{|v'-v|}$, one has $d\omega dv_* = 2|V_{||}|^{-2} dV_\perp dV_{||}$, see Section 2 of [10]. Moreover, $v' = v + V_{||}$, $v'_* = v + V_\perp$, $v_* = v + V$. Recall (8.20), hence, $\zeta = v + \frac{1}{2}V_{||}$, $\zeta_{||} = [(\zeta - u) \cdot \omega]\omega$, $\zeta_\perp = (\zeta - u) - \zeta_{||}$. Combining with (8.21) and (8.24), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{III}_{11} & \leq 2C_\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_\perp \perp V_{||}} |V_{||}|^{-2} (1+|V_{||}|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4T}(|\zeta_{||}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|V_{||}|^2) + 2(ch+\vartheta)|V_{||} \cdot \zeta_{||}|} e^{-\frac{|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2}{4T}} dV_\perp dV_{||} \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

provided that $h, \vartheta \geq 0$ are both sufficiently small. It therefore follows that

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{11}| \leq C_\varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} [g]_{A;m,n,\gamma,0,\vartheta}. \quad (8.51)$$

Step 3.1.2. Estimate the quantity $|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{12}|$. It easily follows from (8.11) that $\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) \sigma_x^{-\frac{m}{2}}(x, v') \leq C(1+|v-v'|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}}$. Then by Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} |III_{12}| & \leq C \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \chi_\varepsilon(|v_* - v|) e^{ch|v-u|^2-|v'-u|^2} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v') (\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} |g(x, v')| \\ & \quad \times (1+|v-v'|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v'-v| > \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_*-v|\}} |v_* - v|^\gamma \frac{|v'-v|}{|v_*-v|} d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) \leq C(1+|v_*-u|)^{|\gamma|} e^{2\vartheta|v_*-u|^2} \cdot (1+|v_*-v|)^{|\gamma|} e^{2\vartheta|v_*-v|^2}$, which means that

$$w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) \leq C(1+|v_*-v|)^{|\gamma|} e^{2\vartheta|v_*-v|^2}$$

for sufficiently small $\vartheta \geq 0$. Moreover, one has $\frac{\chi_\varepsilon}{|v_* - v|^{1-\gamma}} \leq C_\varepsilon(1 + |v_* - v|)^{\gamma-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{12}| \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} |v' - v|(1 + |v - v'|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} (1 + |v_* - v|)^{|\gamma|+\gamma-1} e^{2\vartheta|v_* - v|^2} \\ & \quad \times e^{c\hbar|v-u|^2 - |v'-u|^2} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v')(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} |g(x, v')| e^{-\frac{1}{8T}(|v'_* - u|^2 + |v_* - u|^2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v' - v| > \varepsilon|v_* - v|\}} d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

By employing the change variables $(\omega, v_*) \mapsto (V_\perp, V_\parallel)$, one gains

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{12}| \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} |V_\parallel|^{-1} (1 + |V_\parallel|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} (1 + |V|)^{|\gamma|+\gamma-1} e^{2\vartheta|V|^2} e^{2c\hbar|V_\parallel \cdot \zeta_\parallel|} \\ & \quad \times |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v + V_\parallel)| e^{-\frac{\frac{1}{4}|V_\parallel|^2 + |\zeta_\parallel|^2 + |V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2}{4T}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_\parallel| > \varepsilon|V|\}} dV_\perp V_\parallel. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for sufficiently small $\hbar \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\frac{\frac{1}{4}|V_\parallel|^2 + |\zeta_\parallel|^2 + |V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2}{4T} + 2c\hbar|V_\parallel \cdot \zeta_\parallel|} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_\parallel| > \varepsilon|V|\}} \\ & \leq e^{-C_0(|V_\parallel|^2 + |\zeta_\parallel|^2 + |V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_\parallel| > \varepsilon|V|\}} \leq e^{-\frac{C_0 \varepsilon^2}{2}|V|^2} e^{-\frac{C_0}{2}|V_\parallel|^2} e^{-C_0|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and $(1 + |V|)^{|\gamma|+\gamma-1} e^{-\frac{C_0 \varepsilon^2}{2}|V|^2} \leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}}, \int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} e^{-C_0|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2} dV_\parallel \leq C$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{12}| \\ & \leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_\parallel|^{-1} (1 + |V_\parallel|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{-\frac{C_0}{2}|V_\parallel|^2} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v + V_\parallel)| dV_\parallel \\ & \leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{\alpha'}^2(v + V_\parallel) |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v + V_\parallel)|^2 dV_\parallel \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad \times \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_\parallel|^{-2} (1 + |V_\parallel|)^{|m|(1-\gamma)} z_{-\alpha'}^2(v + V_\parallel) e^{-C_0|V_\parallel|^2} dV_\parallel \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_\parallel|^{-2} (1 + |V_\parallel|)^{|m|(1-\gamma)} z_{-\alpha'}^2(v + V_\parallel) e^{-C_0|V_\parallel|^2} dV_\parallel \leq C$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ whence $0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$. It thereby infers that for $0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{12}| \leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2}. \quad (8.52)$$

Then (8.51) and (8.52) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_1| \\ & \leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} [g]_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \end{aligned} \quad (8.53)$$

for $0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$, $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$, where $\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ are both small to be determined later.

Step 3.2. Estimate of $[[\nu^{-1} III_2]_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}$. Recalling the definition of III_2 in (8.46), we decompose it as

$$III_2 = III_{21} + III_{22}, \quad (8.54)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} III_{21} = & \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \chi_\varepsilon(|v - v_*|) e^{h\sigma(x, v) - \hbar\sigma(x, v_*)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v_*) \\ & \times \mathbf{1}_{\{|v'_* - v| \leq \varepsilon|v_* - v|\}} b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \end{aligned} \quad (8.55)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} III_{22} &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \chi_\varepsilon(|v - v_*|) e^{\hbar\sigma(x,v) - \hbar\sigma(x,v'_*)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) g(x, v'_*) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{\{|v'_* - v| > \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_* - v|\}} b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned} \quad (8.56)$$

Step 3.2.1. Control the quantity $|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{21}|$. By $b(\omega, v_* - v) \leq C|v_* - v|^\gamma \frac{|v' - v|}{|v_* - v|} \leq C|v_* - v|^\gamma$ and $\frac{\chi_\varepsilon(|v_* - v|)(1 + |v|)^{-\gamma}}{|v_* - v|^{-\gamma}} \leq C_\varepsilon(1 + |v_*|)^{|\gamma|}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{21}| \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \frac{e^{\hbar\sigma(x,v)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) w_{0, \vartheta}(v)}{e^{\hbar\sigma(x, v'_*)} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v'_*) w_{0, \vartheta}(v'_*)} (1 + |v_*|)^{|\gamma|} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v'_* - v| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_* - v|\}} \\ &\quad \times |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v'_*)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{0, \vartheta}(v'_*) g(x, v'_*)| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) d\omega dv_* \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \widetilde{III}_{21}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widetilde{III}_{21} = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |v'_* - v|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch+\vartheta)|v-u|^2 - |v'_* - u|^2} e^{-\frac{|v_* - u|^2 + |v' - u|^2}{8T}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v'_* - v| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_* - v|\}} d\omega dv_*.$$

Here we have used the bound $(1 + |v_*|)^{|\gamma|} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) \leq C e^{-\frac{|v_* - u|^2 + |v' - u|^2}{8T}}$ and the inequality (8.39) (replacing v_* by v'_*). By employing the change variables $(\omega, v_*) \mapsto (V_\parallel, V_\perp)$ and combining with the relations (8.28)-(8.30), it holds that for sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{III}_{21} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} (1 + |V_\perp|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch+\vartheta)|-|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2 + |\zeta_\perp|^2|} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_\perp| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}|V_\parallel|\}} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\frac{|\zeta_\parallel + \frac{1}{2}V_\parallel|^2}{4T} - \frac{|\zeta_\perp|^2}{8T} - \frac{|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2}{8T}} \cdot 2|V_\parallel|^{-2} dV_\perp dV_\parallel \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} (1 + |V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} (1 + |\zeta_\perp|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} |V_\parallel|^{-2} \\ &\quad \times e^{-C_1(|\zeta_\parallel + \frac{1}{2}V_\parallel|^2 + |\zeta_\perp|^2 + |V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_\perp| \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{1-\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}}|V_\parallel|\}} dV_\perp dV_\parallel \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_\parallel|^{-2} e^{-C_1|\zeta_\parallel + \frac{1}{2}V_\parallel|^2} \int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_\perp| \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{1-\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}}|V_\parallel|\}} e^{-\frac{C_1}{2}|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2} dV_\perp dV_\parallel. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $\int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} e^{-\frac{C_1}{2}|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2} dV_\perp \leq C < +\infty$ uniformly in $V_\parallel \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we know that for any $\hat{\varepsilon} > 0$ there is a $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}} > 0$ such that for any $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}}$, $\int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_\perp| \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{1-\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}}|V_\parallel|\}} e^{-\frac{C_1}{2}|V_\perp + \zeta_\perp|^2} dV_\perp \leq \hat{\varepsilon}$.

Then the quantity \widetilde{III}_{21} can be bounded by $\widetilde{III}_{21} \leq C\hat{\varepsilon}$, which means that

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{21}| \leq C_\varepsilon \hat{\varepsilon} \llbracket g \rrbracket_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} \quad (8.57)$$

for any $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}}$.

Step 3.2.2. Control the quantity $|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{22}|$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) &\leq C(1 + |v_* - v|)^{|\gamma|} e^{2\vartheta|v_* - v|^2} e^{-\frac{1}{8T}(|v' - u|^2 + |v_* - u|^2)}, \\ \chi_\varepsilon(|v_* - v|) b(\omega, v_* - v) &\leq C_\varepsilon |v' - v| (1 + |v_* - v|)^{\gamma-1}, \\ \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) \sigma_x^{-\frac{m}{2}}(x, v'_*) e^{\hbar\sigma(x,v) - \hbar\sigma(x,v'_*)} &\leq C(1 + |v - v'_*|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{ch|v-u|^2 - |v'_* - u|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{22}|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C_\varepsilon \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} |v' - v| (1 + |v - v'_*|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} (1 + |v_* - v|)^{|\gamma| + \gamma - 1} e^{2\vartheta|v_* - v|^2} \\ &\quad \times e^{ch||v - u|^2 - |v'_* - u|^2} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v'_*)| e^{-\frac{1}{8T}(|v' - u|^2 + |v_* - u|^2)} \mathbf{1}_{|v'_* - v| > \tilde{\varepsilon}|v_* - v|} d\omega dv_* . \end{aligned}$$

By employing the change variables $(\omega, v_*) \mapsto (V_{\parallel}, V_{\perp})$ and the similar computations of \widetilde{III}_{21} , one has

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{22}| &\leq C_\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} e^{-C_2|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} (1 + |V|)^{|\gamma| + \gamma - 1} e^{2\vartheta|V|^2} \\ &\quad \times |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v + V_{\perp})| \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_{\perp}| > \tilde{\varepsilon}|V|\}} (1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{-C_2(|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2)} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel} . \end{aligned}$$

If $|V_{\perp}| > \tilde{\varepsilon}|V|$, there holds $|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2 \geq |V_{\perp}|^2 > \tilde{\varepsilon}^2|V|^2$. Together with $(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{\frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{-\frac{C_2}{4}(|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2)} \leq C$ and $(1 + |V|)^{|\gamma| + \gamma - 1} e^{-(\frac{C_2}{2}\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 - 2\vartheta)|V|^2} \leq C_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}$ under $0 \leq \vartheta < \frac{C_2}{4}\tilde{\varepsilon}^2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{22}| \\ &\leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} e^{-C_2|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v + V_{\perp})| e^{-\frac{C_2}{4}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel} \\ &= C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v + V_{\perp})| e^{-\frac{C_2}{4}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} e^{-C_2|\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2} dV_{\parallel} dV_{\perp} \\ &\leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} g(x, v + V_{\perp})| e^{-\frac{C_2}{4}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2} dV_{\perp} . \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha'}^2(v + V_{\perp}) e^{-\frac{C_2}{2}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2} dV_{\perp} \leq C$ uniformly in $v, \zeta_{\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ whence $0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain

$$|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_{22}| \leq C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} . \quad (8.58)$$

Then (8.57) and (8.58) indicate that for any $\hat{\varepsilon} > 0$ there is an $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}} > 0$ such that for all $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}})$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v)(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta}(v) III_2| \\ &\leq C_{\varepsilon} \hat{\varepsilon} \|g\|_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} , \end{aligned} \quad (8.59)$$

provided that $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$ are both small enough. It therefore follows from (8.53) and (8.59) that for any fixed $\varepsilon, \hat{\varepsilon} > 0$, $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $n_\gamma \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \alpha' < \frac{1}{2}$

$$\|[\nu^{-1} K_{\hbar 2}^{\chi_\varepsilon} g]_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}\| \leq C_\varepsilon (\tilde{\varepsilon} + \hat{\varepsilon}) \|g\|_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} \quad (8.60)$$

for all $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}})$, provided that $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$ are both small enough. Consequently, (8.40), (8.45) and (8.60) show that

$$\|[\nu^{-1} K_{\hbar} g]_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta}\| \leq [C\varepsilon^{3+\gamma} + C_\varepsilon(\hat{\varepsilon} + \tilde{\varepsilon})] \|g\|_{A; m, n_\gamma, 0, \vartheta} + C_{\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}} \|\sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(\delta x + l)^{n_\gamma} z_{\alpha'} w_{-\gamma, \vartheta} g\|_{L_x^\infty L_v^2} .$$

For any fixed $\eta_1 > 0$, we first take $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $C\varepsilon^{3+\gamma} \leq \frac{\eta_1}{3}$ and fixed. Then we take $\hat{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that $C_\varepsilon \hat{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\eta_1}{3}$ and fixed. At the end, we choose $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}})$ such that $C_{\varepsilon} \tilde{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\eta_1}{3}$ and fixed. Therefore, the above inequality finish the proof of Lemma 2.5. \square

8.3. Weighted $L_{x,v}^2$ property of K : Proof of Lemma 2.6.

In this section,

Proof of Lemma 2.6. By (1.8)-(1.9)-(1.10), one knows that

$$K_{\hbar} g = -K_{\hbar 1} g + K_{\hbar 2} g + K_{\hbar 3} g ,$$

where

$$K_{\hbar 1} g(x, v) = e^{\hbar \sigma(x, v)} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\hbar \sigma(x, v_*)} g(x, v_*) |v - v_*|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) dv_* , \quad (8.61)$$

$$K_{h2}g(x, v) = e^{h\sigma(x, v)} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} e^{-h\sigma(x, v')} g(x, v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \quad (8.62)$$

$$K_{h3}g(x, v) = e^{h\sigma(x, v)} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} e^{-h\sigma(x, v')} g(x, v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \quad (8.63)$$

Step 1. Estimates for K_{h1} part.

Claim that for $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\gamma+3}{2}\}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h1}g(x, v)|^2 dv \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv. \quad (8.64)$$

Indeed, we rewrite

$$\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h1}g(x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathfrak{k}_{h1}(x, v, v_*) \hat{g}(x, v_*) dv_*,$$

where $\hat{g} := \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g$, and

$$\mathfrak{k}_{h1}(x, v, v_*) = z_{-\alpha}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) \frac{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) e^{h\sigma(x, v)}}{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v_*) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v_*) e^{h\sigma(x, v_*)}} |v - v_*|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*).$$

By (8.12), one has

$$\frac{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) e^{h\sigma(x, v)}}{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v_*) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v_*) e^{h\sigma(x, v_*)}} \lesssim (1 + |v - v_*|)^{|\beta| + \frac{m(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(c\hbar + \vartheta)|v-u|^2 - |v_*-u|^2}.$$

Then for sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$, $\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) \frac{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) e^{h\sigma(x, v)}}{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v_*) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v_*) e^{h\sigma(x, v_*)}} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) \lesssim 1$

uniformly in x, v and v_* , which yields that $|\mathfrak{k}_{h1}(x, v, v_*)| \lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) |v - v_*|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*)$ uniformly in x . Then

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h1}g(x, v)|^2 dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathfrak{k}_{h1}(x, v, v_*) \hat{g}(x, v_*) dv_* \right|^2 dv \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}(v) |v - v_*|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) |\hat{g}(x, v_*)| dv_* \right)^2 dv \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) |v_* - v|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) dv_* \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v_* - v|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) |\hat{g}(x, v_*)|^2 dv_* \right) dv. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Lemma 2.3 of [17], $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v - v_*|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) dv_* \lesssim (1 + |v|)^{\gamma}$, which means that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) |v_* - v|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) dv_* \lesssim z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) (1 + |v|)^{\gamma} \lesssim z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{8}}(v).$$

It thereby holds

$$I \lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{8}}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) |v - v_*|^{\gamma} |\hat{g}(x, v_*)|^2 dv_* dv = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) |\hat{g}(x, v_*)|^2 \mathfrak{h}(v_*) dv_*,$$

where

$$\mathfrak{h}(v_*) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) |v - v_*|^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{8}}(v) dv.$$

One asserts that

$$\mathfrak{h}(v_*) \lesssim (1 + |v_*|)^{\gamma} \quad (8.65)$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\gamma+3}{3}\}$. Once the assertion (8.65) holds, one has

$$I \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1 + |v_*|)^{\gamma} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) |\hat{g}(x, v_*)|^2 dv_* \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\hat{g}(x, v_*)|^2 dv_*,$$

which means the claim (8.64) holds.

It remains to show the assertion (8.65). Note that

$$\mathfrak{h}(v_*) = \underbrace{\int_{|v-v_*| \leq 1} (\cdots) dv}_{:=\mathfrak{h}_1(v_*)} + \underbrace{\int_{|v-v_*| > 1} (\cdots) dv}_{:=\mathfrak{h}_2(v_*)}.$$

Recalling the definition of $z_{-\alpha}$ in (1.21), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}_1(v_*) &\lesssim \int_{|v-v_*| \leq 1} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) |v - v_*|^\gamma dv \\ &= \int_{|v-v_*| \leq 1, |v_3| \leq 1} |v_3|^{-2\alpha} |v - v_*|^\gamma dv + \int_{|v-v_*| \leq 1, |v_3| > 1} |v - v_*|^\gamma dv \\ &\lesssim \int_{|v-v_*| \leq 1} |v_3|^{-2\alpha} |v - v_*|^\gamma dv + \int_{|v-v_*| \leq 1} |v - v_*|^\gamma dv. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $v_1 - v_{*1} = r \sin \varphi \cos \theta$, $v_2 - v_{*2} = r \sin \varphi \sin \theta$, $v_3 - v_{*3} = r \cos \varphi$ with $0 \leq r \leq 1$, $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$ and $0 \leq \varphi \leq \pi$, a direct computation shows

$$\mathfrak{h}_1(v_*) \lesssim 2\pi \int_0^1 r^{2+\gamma-2\alpha} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} (|\cos \varphi + \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r}|^{-2\alpha} + |\cos \varphi - \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r}|^{-2\alpha}) \sin \varphi d\varphi dr + \frac{4\pi}{3+\gamma}.$$

Observe that for $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} (|\cos \varphi + \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r}|^{-2\alpha} + |\cos \varphi - \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r}|^{-2\alpha}) \sin \varphi d\varphi \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-2\alpha} [(\frac{|v_{*3}|}{r} + 1)^{1-2\alpha} - (\frac{|v_{*3}|}{r} - 1)^{1-2\alpha}], & \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r} \geq 1 \\ \frac{1}{1-2\alpha} [(1 + \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r})^{1-2\alpha} - (1 - \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r})^{1-2\alpha}], & 0 \leq \frac{|v_{*3}|}{r} < 1 \end{cases} \leq C_\alpha < \infty \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $\frac{|v_{*3}|}{r} \geq 0$, which implies that

$$\mathfrak{h}_1(v_*) \lesssim 2\pi C_\alpha \int_0^1 r^{2+\gamma-2\alpha} dr + \frac{4\pi}{3+\gamma} = \frac{2\pi C_\alpha}{3+\gamma-2\alpha} + \frac{4\pi}{3+\gamma} < \infty, \quad (8.66)$$

provided that $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3+\gamma}{2}\}$.

For the case $|v - v_*| > 1$, one can assert that $|v - v_*|^\gamma \lesssim (1 + |v|)^{|\gamma|} (1 + |v_*|)^\gamma$ for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$. Indeed, if $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, the bound $|v - v_*| \leq (1 + |v|)(1 + |v_*|)$ implies the assertion for the case $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$. If $-3 < \gamma < 0$, one has $1 + |v_*| \leq (1 + |v|)(1 + |v - v_*|) \leq 2(1 + |v|)|v - v_*|$, hence, $|v - v_*|^{-1} \leq 2(1 + |v|)(1 + |v_*|)^{-1}$, which infers the assertion for the case $-3 < \gamma < 0$. Then it follows

$$\mathfrak{h}_2(v_*) \lesssim \int_{|v-v_*| > 1} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) (1 + |v|)^{|\gamma|} (1 + |v_*|)^\gamma \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{8}}(v) dv \lesssim (1 + |v_*|)^\gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) dv.$$

Thanks to $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, one has $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v) dv \lesssim 1$, which implies

$$\mathfrak{h}_2(v_*) \lesssim (1 + |v_*|)^\gamma. \quad (8.67)$$

Then the bounds (8.66) and (8.67) conclude the assertion (8.65).

Step 2. Estimates for K_{h2} part.

One asserts that for $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_0+\gamma+1}{2}\}$ with $b_0 \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma$ given in Lemma 2.6,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h2} g(x, v)|^2 dv \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv. \quad (8.68)$$

Indeed, let $\chi(r)$ be a smooth monotone function satisfying $\chi(r) = 0$ for $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $\chi(r) = 1$ for $r \geq 2$. Then the operator in (8.62) can be decomposed as follows:

$$K_{h2} g(x, v) = K_{h2}^\chi g(x, v) + K_{h2}^{1-\chi} g(x, v), \quad (8.69)$$

where for $a = \chi$ or $1 - \chi$

$$K_{h2}^a g(x, v) = e^{h\sigma(x, v)} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} e^{-h\sigma(x, v')} a(|v - v_*|) g(x, v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*.$$

Step 2.1. Control of K_{h2}^χ .

Denote by

$$\tilde{K}_{h2}^\chi g(x, v) = z_{-\alpha}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) K_{h2}^\chi g(x, v).$$

By (8.12),

$$\frac{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) e^{h\sigma(x, v)}}{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v') \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v') e^{h\sigma(x, v')}} \lesssim (1 + |v - v'|)^{|\beta| + \frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch+\vartheta)\|v-u\|^2 - |v'-u|^2}. \quad (8.70)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{K}_{h2}^\chi g(x, v)| &\lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |v - v'|)^{|\beta| + \frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch+\vartheta)\|v-u\|^2 - |v'-u|^2} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v') \\ &\quad \times |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} g(x, v')| \chi(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*, \end{aligned}$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{K}_{h2}^\chi g(x, v) \cdot h(x, v) dv \right| \\ & \lesssim \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} z_{-\alpha}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v') (1 + |v - v'|)^{|\beta| + \frac{|m|(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch+\vartheta)\|v-u\|^2 - |v'-u|^2} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v')| \\ & \quad \times |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h(x, v)| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) \chi(|v_* - v|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv \\ & \lesssim \sqrt{I_1 I_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_1 = \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} h(x, v)|^2 \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 = \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} & z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \nu^{-1}(v') (1 + |v - v'|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{2(ch+\vartheta)\|v-u\|^2 - |v'-u|^2} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v')|^2 \\ & \times \mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{4}}(v_*) \chi^2(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $\iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* \lesssim \nu(v)$ derived from Lemma 2.1 of [17], the factor I_1 can be bounded by

$$I_1 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |h(x, v)|^2 dv. \quad (8.71)$$

Now we estimate the second factor I_2 . Note that

$$\nu^{-1}(v') \sim (1 + |v'|)^{-\gamma} \lesssim (1 + |v'_*|)^{|\gamma|} (1 + |v' - v'_*|)^{-\gamma} \lesssim \mathfrak{M}^{-\frac{1}{4}}(v'_*) (1 + |v' - v'_*|)^{-\gamma}$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$. Moreover, the measure $\chi^2(|v_* - v|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv$ is invariant under the transform $(v, v_*) \mapsto (v', v'_*)$. Then

$$I_2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 i_2(v) dv,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} i_2(v) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} & z_{-\alpha}^2(v') (1 + |v - v_*|)^{-\gamma} (1 + |v - v'|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{2(ch+\vartheta)\|v-u\|^2 - |v'-u|^2} \\ & \times \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{4}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{4}}(v_*) \chi^2(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

Let $V = v_* - v$, $V_{\parallel} = (V \cdot \omega)\omega$, $V_{\perp} = V - V_{\parallel}$. Then $d\omega dv_* = 2|V_{\parallel}|^{-2}dV_{\perp}dV_{\parallel}$, $v' = v + V_{\parallel}$, $v'_* = v + V_{\perp}$, $v_* = v + V$. By (8.21) and (8.24), one has

$$-\frac{|v'_* - \mathbf{u}|^2 + |v_* - \mathbf{u}|^2}{2T} = -\frac{|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{T}, \quad |v - \mathbf{u}|^2 - |v' - \mathbf{u}|^2 = -2V_{\parallel} \cdot \zeta_{\parallel},$$

where $\zeta = v + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}$, $\zeta_{\parallel} = [(\zeta - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \omega]\omega$, $\zeta_{\perp} = (\zeta - \mathbf{u}) - \zeta_{\parallel}$. Recall that

$$b(\omega, v_* - v) = |v - v_*|^{\gamma} \tilde{b}(\cos \theta) \leq C|v - v_*|^{\gamma} |\cos \theta| = \frac{C|V_{\parallel}|}{|V|^{1-\gamma}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{i}_2(v) &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_{\parallel})(1 + |V|)^{-\gamma}(1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{4(ch+\vartheta)|V_{\parallel} \cdot \zeta_{\parallel}|} \\ &\quad \times e^{-\frac{3}{4T}(|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2)} \frac{|V_{\parallel}| \chi^2(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} 2|V_{\parallel}|^{-2} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(1 + |V|)^{-\gamma} \lesssim (1 + |V_{\parallel}|)^{|\gamma|} (1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{-\gamma}$. Then, for sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{i}_2(v) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_{\parallel}) |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} e^{-c(|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2)} (1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{-\gamma} \frac{\chi^2(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}$$

for some positive constant $c > 0$. Observe that $\frac{\chi^2(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} \lesssim (1 + |V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}$. If $|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| > \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|$, one has $|V_{\perp}| \leq |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| + |\zeta_{\perp}| < 3|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|$. Then $(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{-\gamma} \frac{\chi^2(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} \lesssim e^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}$. If $|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|$, it holds $|V_{\perp}| \geq |\zeta_{\perp}| - |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\zeta_{\perp}|$ and $(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{-\gamma} \leq (1 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|)^{|\gamma|} (1 + |\zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}$, which imply that

$$(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{-\gamma} \frac{\chi^2(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} \lesssim \frac{(1 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|)^{|\gamma|} (1 + |\zeta_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}}{(1 + |V_{\parallel}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|\zeta_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} \lesssim e^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}.$$

In summary, the inequality $(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{-\gamma} \frac{\chi^2(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} \lesssim e^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}$ holds. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{i}_2(v) &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_{\parallel}) e^{-c(|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\parallel}|^2)} \left(\int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}|V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2} dV_{\perp} \right) dV_{\parallel} \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_{\parallel}) e^{-c|V_{\parallel}|^2} dV_{\parallel}. \end{aligned}$$

By the similar arguments in (8.66), $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_{\parallel}) e^{-c|V_{\parallel}|^2} dV_{\parallel} \lesssim 1$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, provided that $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. Then one has proved that $\mathbf{i}_2(v) \lesssim 1$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. It therefore infers that

$$I_2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv,$$

which, together with (8.71), implies that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{K}_{h2}^{\chi} g(x, v) \cdot h(x, v) dv \right| \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |h(x, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By letting $h(x, v) = \tilde{K}_{h2}^{\chi} g(x, v)$, one concludes that for $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h2}^{\chi} g(x, v)|^2 dv \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv. \quad (8.72)$$

Step 2.2. Control of $K_{h2}^{1-\chi}$.

Since $|v - v_*| \leq 2$ in $K_{h^2}^{1-\chi}$, the claim (8.17) shows $\mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \lesssim \mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v')$, $\mathfrak{M}(v_*) \lesssim \mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v)$ for any fixed $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h^2}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)| \\ & \lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} \frac{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) e^{h\sigma(x, v)}}{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v') \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v') e^{h\sigma(x, v')}} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v') \\ & \quad \times (1 - \chi)(|v - v_*|) |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v')| b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

By (8.12) and taking $\delta_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v) \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v) e^{h\sigma(x, v)}}{w_{\beta, \vartheta}(v') \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}}(x, v') e^{h\sigma(x, v')}} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1-\delta_0}{4}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v') \\ & \lesssim [\mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}(v') \mathfrak{M}(v)]^{\frac{1}{16}} \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small $h, \vartheta \geq 0$. It thereby holds

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h^2}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)| \\ & \lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v')| z_{-\alpha}(v) [\mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}(v') \mathfrak{M}(v)]^{\frac{1}{16}} b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned} \quad (8.73)$$

Let $V = v_* - v$, $V_{\parallel} = (V \cdot \omega)\omega$, $V_{\perp} = V - V_{\parallel}$, $\zeta = v + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}$, $\zeta_{\parallel} = [(\zeta - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \omega]\omega$, $\zeta_{\perp} = (\zeta - \mathbf{u}) - \zeta_{\parallel}$. Then $d\omega dv_* = 2|V_{\parallel}|^{-2} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel}$, $v' = v + V_{\parallel}$, $v'_* = v + V_{\perp}$, $v_* = v + V$. Denote by $\tilde{g}(x, v') = \nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v')$. It then follows from (1.4)-(1.5)-(8.21) and $|v + V_{\parallel} - \mathbf{u}|^2 = |\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h^2}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)| \\ & \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} z_{-\alpha}(v) \tilde{g}(x, v + V_{\parallel}) [\mathfrak{M}(v + V_{\perp}) \mathfrak{M}(v + V) \mathfrak{M}(v + V_{\parallel}) \mathfrak{M}(v)]^{\frac{1}{16}} \\ & \quad \times (1 - \chi)(|V|) b(\omega, V) \cdot 2|V_{\parallel}|^{-2} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel} \\ & \lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{16}}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} \tilde{g}(v + V_{\parallel}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v + V_{\parallel}) \\ & \quad \times e^{-\frac{1}{32T}(|\zeta_{\parallel}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |\zeta_{\parallel} + \frac{1}{2}V_{\parallel}|^2)} \frac{|V_{\parallel}|^{-1}(1-\chi)(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel} \quad (8.74) \\ & \lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{16}}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} \tilde{g}(x, v + V_{\parallel}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v + V_{\parallel}) \\ & \quad \times e^{-\frac{1}{32T}(\frac{1}{4}|V_{\parallel}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|V_{\perp}|^2)} \frac{|V_{\parallel}|^{-1}}{(|V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} dV_{\perp} dV_{\parallel} \\ & = z_{-\alpha}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{16}}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{g}(x, v + V_{\parallel}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v + V_{\parallel}) |V_{\parallel}|^{-1} e^{-\frac{|V_{\parallel}|^2}{128T}} \Phi(V_{\parallel}) dV_{\parallel}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Phi(V_{\parallel}) = \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} (|V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} e^{-\frac{|V_{\perp}|^2}{64T}} dV_{\perp}.$$

By Lemma 2.3 of [16], $(|V_{\parallel}|^2 + |V_{\perp}|^2)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} |V_{\perp}|^{b_0} \lesssim |V_{\parallel}|^{b_0+\gamma-1}$ holds for any fixed $b_0 \in [0, 1 - \gamma]$. Then, if $0 \leq b_0 \leq 1 - \gamma$ and $b_0 < 2$,

$$\Phi(|V_{\parallel}|) \lesssim |V_{\parallel}|^{b_0+\gamma-1} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{\parallel}} |V_{\perp}|^{-b_0} e^{-\frac{|V_{\perp}|^2}{64T}} dV_{\perp} \lesssim |V_{\parallel}|^{b_0+\gamma-1}.$$

It therefore infers that

$$|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h^2}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{g}(x, v + V_{\parallel}) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v + V_{\parallel}) |V_{\parallel}|^{b_0 + \gamma - 2} e^{-\frac{|V_{\parallel}|^2}{128T}} dV_{\parallel} \\
&= z_{-\alpha}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{g}(x, \xi) \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) d\xi,
\end{aligned} \tag{8.75}$$

where $\xi = v + V_{\parallel}$ has been used, and

$$\mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) = [\mathfrak{M}(v) \mathfrak{M}(\xi)]^{\frac{1}{32}} |v - \xi|^{b_0 + \gamma - 2} e^{-\frac{|v - \xi|^2}{128T}}$$

with $b_0 < 2$ and $0 \leq b_0 \leq 1 - \gamma$. We further require $b_0 + \gamma - 2 > -3$ such that the kernel $\mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi)$ is integrable on the variables both ξ and v . More precisely, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) d\xi &= \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v - \xi|^{b_0 + \gamma - 2} e^{-\frac{|v - \xi|^2}{128T}} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(\xi) d\xi \\
&\lesssim (1 + |v|)^{b_0 + \gamma - 2} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v) \lesssim 1
\end{aligned} \tag{8.76}$$

uniformly in v by Lemma 2.1 of [17]. Furthermore, by (8.65)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) dv &= \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(\xi) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) |v - \xi|^{b_0 + \gamma - 2} e^{-\frac{|v - \xi|^2}{128T}} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v) d\xi \\
&\lesssim \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(\xi) (1 + |\xi|)^{b_0 + \gamma - 2} \lesssim 1
\end{aligned} \tag{8.77}$$

uniformly in ξ , provided that $b_0 + \gamma - 2 > -3$ and $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_0 + \gamma + 1}{2}\}$ with $b_0 \in S_{\gamma}$. It thereby follows from (8.76)-(8.77) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h2}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)|^2 dv \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) (\tilde{g}(x, \xi) \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) d\xi)^2 dv \\
&\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) d\xi \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{g}(x, \xi)|^2 \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) d\xi \right) dv \\
&\stackrel{\text{Fubini Theorem}}{\lesssim} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) d\xi \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{k}_{b_0}(v, \xi) d\xi \right) |\tilde{g}(x, \xi)|^2 d\xi \\
&\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{g}(x, \xi)|^2 d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv
\end{aligned} \tag{8.78}$$

for $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_0 + \gamma + 1}{2}\}$ with $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $b_0 \in S_{\gamma}$. Therefore, the bounds (8.72) and (8.78) conclude the claim (8.68).

Step 3. Estimates for K_{h3} part.

The goal is to show that for $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_1 + \gamma}{2}\}$ with $b_1 \in T_{\gamma}$ given in Lemma 2.6,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3} g(x, v)|^2 dv \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv. \tag{8.79}$$

As similar as in (8.69), $K_{h3} g(x, v)$ can be split as

$$K_{h3} g(x, v) = K_{h3}^{\chi} g(x, v) + K_{h3}^{1-\chi} g(x, v),$$

where for $a = \chi$ or $1 - \chi$

$$K_{h3}^a g(x, v) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} e^{h\sigma(x, v) - h\sigma(x, v'_*)} a(|v - v'_*|) g(x, v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*.$$

Step 3.1. Control of K_{h3}^{χ} .

By (8.70) with v' replaced by v'_* , one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3} g(x, v)| \\
&\lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} (1 + |v - v'_*|)^{|\beta| + \frac{1+m(1-\gamma)}{2}} e^{(ch + \vartheta) |v - u|^2 - |v'_* - u|^2} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v'_*) \\
&\quad \times |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v'_*)| \chi(|v - v'_*|) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that by the Hölder inequality

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h^3}^\chi g(x, v) \cdot h(x, v) dv \right| \lesssim \sqrt{II_1 II_2},$$

where

$$II_1 = \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v) h(x, v)|^2 \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{4}}(v_*) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 = & \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \nu^{-1}(v'_*) (1 + |v - v'_*|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{2(ch+\vartheta)|v-u|^2 - |v'_*-u|^2} \\ & \times |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v'_*)|^2 \mathfrak{M}(v') \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{4}}(v_*) \chi^2(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv. \end{aligned}$$

By (8.71), one has

$$II_1 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |h(x, v)|^2 dv. \quad (8.80)$$

From changing the variables $(v, v') \mapsto (v_*, v'_*)$ and employing the Fubini Theorem, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 = & \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} z_{-\alpha}^2(v_*) \nu^{-1}(v') (1 + |v_* - v'|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{2(ch+\vartheta)|v_*-u|^2 - |v'-u|^2} \\ & \times |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v')|^2 \mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{4}}(v) \chi^2(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that the measure $\chi^2(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv$ is invariant under the previous changing variables. Further by changing variables $(v, v_*) \mapsto (v', v'_*)$ and the corresponding invariant of $\chi^2(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv$, one has

$$II_2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 j_2(v) dv,$$

where the kernel

$$\begin{aligned} j_2(v) = & \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} z_{-\alpha}^2(v'_*) \nu^{-1}(v) (1 + |v'_* - v|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{2(ch+\vartheta)|v'_*-u|^2 - |v-u|^2} \\ & \times \mathfrak{M}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{4}}(v') \chi^2(|v - v_*|) b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_* dv. \end{aligned}$$

We now want to show that $j_2(v) \lesssim 1$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Let $V = v_* - v$, $V_{||} = (V \cdot \omega)\omega$, $V_{\perp} = V - V_{||}$, $\zeta = v + \frac{1}{2}V_{||}$, $\zeta_{||} = [(\zeta - u) \cdot \omega]\omega$, $\zeta_{\perp} = (\zeta - u) - \zeta_{||}$. Then $d\omega dv_* = 2|V_{||}|^{-2} dV_{\perp} dV_{||}$, $v' = v + V_{||}$, $v'_* = v + V_{\perp}$, $v_* = v + V$. Note that

$$-\frac{|v'-u|^2 + |v_*-u|^2}{2T} = -\frac{2|\zeta_{||} + \frac{1}{2}V_{||}|^2 + |\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{2T}, \quad |v - u|^2 - |v'_* - u|^2 = |\zeta_{\perp}|^2 - |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2.$$

Moreover, $\nu^{-1}(v) \sim (1 + |v|)^{-\gamma} \lesssim (1 + |v'|)^{|\gamma|} (1 + |v - v'|)^{-\gamma}$ for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, which means that $\nu^{-1}(v) \mathfrak{M}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{3}{4}}(v') \lesssim (1 + |V_{||}|)^{-\gamma} e^{-\frac{|v'-u|^2 + |v_*-u|^2}{4T}}$. Together with (1.4)-(1.5), one has

$$\begin{aligned} j_2(v) \lesssim & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{||}} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_{\perp}) (1 + |V_{||}|)^{-\gamma} (1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{2(ch+\vartheta)|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 - |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2} \\ & \times e^{-\frac{2|\zeta_{||} + \frac{1}{2}V_{||}|^2 + |\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T}} \frac{\chi^2(|V|)|V_{||}|^{-1}}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} dV_{\perp} dV_{||}. \end{aligned}$$

For sufficiently small $\hbar \geq 0$, there is a $c' > 0$ such that

$$(1 + |V_{\perp}|)^{2|\beta| + |m|(1-\gamma)} e^{2(ch+\vartheta)|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 - |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2} e^{-\frac{|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp} + \zeta_{\perp}|^2}{4T}} \lesssim e^{-c'(|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp}|^2)}.$$

It also holds $\frac{(1 + |V_{||}|)^{-\gamma} \chi^2(|V|)}{|V|^{1-\gamma}} \lesssim \frac{(1 + |V_{||}|)^{-\gamma}}{(1 + |V_{||}| + |V_{\perp}|)^{1-\gamma}} \lesssim 1$ for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$. Then

$$j_2(v) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_{||}|^{-1} e^{-\frac{|\zeta_{||} + \frac{1}{2}V_{||}|^2}{2T}} \left(\int_{V_{\perp} \perp V_{||}} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_{\perp}) e^{-c'(|\zeta_{\perp}|^2 + |V_{\perp}|^2)} dV_{\perp} \right) dV_{||}.$$

Observe that for $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, $\int_{V_\perp \perp V_\parallel} z_{-\alpha}^2(v + V_\perp) e^{-c'(|\zeta_\perp|^2 + |V_\perp|^2)} dV_\perp \lesssim 1$ uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Then $j_2(v) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |V_\parallel|^{-1} e^{-\frac{|\zeta_\parallel + \frac{1}{2}V_\parallel|^2}{2T}} dV_\parallel \lesssim 1$, where the last inequality is derived from (8.33)-(8.34). It thereby follows

$$II_2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv. \quad (8.81)$$

As a result, (8.80) and (8.81) indicate that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3}^\chi g(x, v) \cdot h(x, v) dv \right| \\ & \lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |h(x, v)|^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which, by taking $h(x, v) = \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3}^\chi g(x, v)$, implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3}^\chi g(x, v)|^2 dv \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv \quad (8.82)$$

for $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$.

Step 3.2. Control of $K_{h3}^{1-\chi}$.

Due to $|v - v_*| \leq 2$ in $K_{h3}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)$, the claim (8.17) reads $\mathfrak{M}(v') \lesssim \mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v'_*)$ and $\mathfrak{M}(v_*) \lesssim \mathfrak{M}^{1-\delta_0}(v)$ for any fixed $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$. From the similar arguments in (8.73), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)| \\ & \lesssim \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v'_*)| z_{-\alpha}(v) [\mathfrak{M}(v'_*) \mathfrak{M}(v_*) \mathfrak{M}(v') \mathfrak{M}(v)]^{\frac{1}{16}} b(\omega, v_* - v) d\omega dv_*. \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small $\hbar, \vartheta \geq 0$. Let $V = v_* - v$, $V_\parallel = (V \cdot \omega)\omega$, $V_\perp = V - V_\parallel$, $\zeta = v + \frac{1}{2}V_\parallel$, $\zeta_\parallel = [(\zeta - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \omega]\omega$, $\zeta_\perp = (\zeta - \mathbf{u}) - \zeta_\parallel$. Then one has $d\omega dv_* = 2|V_\perp|^{-2} dV_\parallel dV_\perp$. We remark that the derivation of the previous relation is similar to that of $d\omega dv_* = 2|V_\parallel|^{-2} dV_\perp dV_\parallel$ given in (38), Page 35 of [10]. It therefore infers from the similar arguments in (8.74) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)| \\ & \lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{16}}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v + V_\perp)| \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{16}}(v + V_\perp) |V_\perp|^{-2} e^{-\frac{|V_\perp|^2}{64T}} \Psi(V_\perp) dV_\perp, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Psi(V_\perp) = \int_{V_\parallel \perp V_\perp} e^{-\frac{1}{32T}(|\zeta_\parallel|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|V_\parallel|^2)} \frac{|V_\parallel|(1-\chi)(|V|)}{(|V_\parallel|^2 + |V_\perp|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} dV_\parallel.$$

By Lemma 2.3 of [16], $(|V_\parallel|^2 + |V_\perp|^2)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} |V_\parallel|^{b_1} \lesssim |V_\perp|^{b_1 + \gamma - 1}$ holds for any fixed $b_1 \in [0, 1 - \gamma]$. Then

$$\Psi(V_\perp) \lesssim |V_\perp|^{b_1 + \gamma - 1} \int_{V_\parallel \perp V_\perp} e^{-\frac{|V_\parallel|^2}{128T}} |V_\parallel|^{1-b_1} dV_\parallel \lesssim |V_\perp|^{b_1 + \gamma - 1}$$

under the further constraint $b_1 < 3$. It thereby follows from the same arguments in (8.75) that

$$|\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h3}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)| \lesssim z_{-\alpha}(v) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, \varpi)| \mathfrak{k}_{b_1}(v, \varpi) d\varpi,$$

where $\mathfrak{k}_{b_1}(v, \varpi) = [\mathfrak{M}(v) \mathfrak{M}(\varpi)]^{\frac{1}{32}} |v - \varpi|^{b_1 + \gamma - 3} e^{-\frac{|v - \varpi|^2}{128T}}$ with $b_1 < 3$ and $0 \leq b_1 \leq 1 - \gamma$. We further assume that $b_1 + \gamma - 3 > -3$. As similar as in (8.76)-(8.77), one has

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \mathfrak{k}_{b_1}(v, \varpi) d\varpi \lesssim (1 + |v|)^{b_1 + \gamma - 3} \mathfrak{M}^{\frac{1}{32}}(v) \lesssim 1$$

uniformly in $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} z_{-\alpha}^2(v) \mathfrak{k}_{b_1}(v, \varpi) dv \lesssim (1 + |\varpi|)^{b_1 + \gamma - 3} \mathfrak{M}_{32}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\varpi) \lesssim 1$$

uniformly in $\varpi \in \mathbb{R}^3$, provided that $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_1 + \gamma}{2}\}$ with $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $b_1 \in \mathcal{T}_\gamma$. Then the similar arguments in (8.78) shows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}} z_{-\alpha} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} K_{h_3}^{1-\chi} g(x, v)|^2 dv \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_x^{\frac{m}{2}} w_{\beta, \vartheta} g(x, v)|^2 dv \quad (8.83)$$

for $0 \leq \alpha < \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_1 + \gamma}{2}\}$ with $-3 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $b_1 \in \mathcal{T}_\gamma$. As a result, the bounds (8.82) and (8.82) imply the claim (8.79).

Finally, the inequalities (8.64), (8.68) and (8.79) conclude the bound (2.13). Then the proof of Lemma 2.6 is completed. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by National Key R&D Program of China under the grant 2023YFA1010300. The author N. Jiang is supported by the grants from the National Natural Foundation of China under contract Nos. 11971360, 12371224 and 12221001. The author Y.-L. Luo is supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China under contract No. 12201220, the Guang Dong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation under contract No. 2021A1515110210 and 2024A1515012358.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Aoki, C. Baranger, M. Hattori, S. Kosuge, G. Martalò, J. Mathiaud and L. Mieussens. Slip boundary conditions for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **169** (2017), no. 4, 744-781.
- [2] C. Bardos, R. E. Caflisch and B. Nicolaenko. The Milne and Kramers problems for the Boltzmann equation of a hard sphere gas. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **39** (1986), no. 3, 323-352.
- [3] C.-C. Chen, T.-P. Liu and T. Yang. Existence of boundary layer solutions to the Boltzmann equation. *Anal. Appl. (Singap.)* **2** (2004), no. 4, 337-363.
- [4] F. Coron, F. Golse and C. Sulem. A classification of well-posed kinetic layer problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **41** (1988), no. 4, 409-435.
- [5] F. Golse. Analysis of the boundary layer equation in the kinetic theory of gases. *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.)* **3** (2008), no. 1, 211-242.
- [6] F. Golse, B. Perthame and C. Sulem. On a boundary layer problem for the nonlinear Boltzmann equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **103** (1988), no. 1, 81-96.
- [7] F. Golse and F. Poupaud. Stationary solutions of the linearized Boltzmann equation in a half-space. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **11** (1989), no. 4, 483-502.
- [8] Y. Guo. Decay and continuity of the Boltzmann equation in bounded domains. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **197** (2010), no. 2, 713-809.
- [9] Y. Guo, F.M. Huang and Y. Wang. Hilbert expansion of the Boltzmann equation with specular boundary condition in half-space. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **241** (2021), no. 1, 231-309.
- [10] H. Grad. Asymptotic theory of the Boltzmann equation. II. *Rarefied Gas Dynamics* (Proc. 3rd Internat. Sympos., Palais de l'UNESCO, Paris, 1962), Vol. I (1963) pp. 26-59, Academic Press, New York.
- [11] L.-B. He, N. Jiang and Y.L. Wu. Boundary layer solution of the Boltzmann equation for Maxwell reflection boundary condition. 2024, *preprint*.
- [12] F.M. Huang, Z.-H. Jiang and Y. Wang. Boundary layer solution of the Boltzmann equation for specular boundary condition. *Acta Math. Appl. Sin. Engl. Ser.*, **39** (2023), no. 1, 65-94.
- [13] F.M. Huang and Y. Wang. Boundary layer solution of the Boltzmann equation for diffusive reflection boundary conditions in half-space. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **54** (2022), no. 3, 3480-3534.
- [14] N. Jiang, Y.-L. Luo and S.J. Tang. Compressible Euler limit from Boltzmann equation with complete diffusive boundary condition in half-space. *arXiv:2104.11964 [math.AP]*, 2021.
- [15] N. Jiang, Y.-L. Luo and S.J. Tang. Compressible Euler limit from Boltzmann equation with Maxwell reflection boundary condition in half-space. *arXiv:2101.11199 [math.AP]*, 2021.
- [16] N. Jiang, Y.-L. Luo and S.J. Tang. Grad-Caffisch type decay estimates of pseudo-inverse of linearized Boltzmann operator and application to Hilbert expansion of compressible Euler scaling. *arXiv:2206.02677 [math.AP]*, 2022.
- [17] C.D. Levermore and W.R. Sun. Compactness of the gain parts of the linearized Boltzmann operator with weakly cutoff kernels. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **3** (2010), no. 2, 335-351.

- [18] Q. Li, J.F. Lu and W.R. Sun. Half-space kinetic equations with general boundary conditions. *Math. Comp.* **86** (2017), no. 305, 1269-1301.
- [19] Y. Sone. *Kinetic theory and fluid dynamics*. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2002.
- [20] Y. Sone. *Molecular gas dynamics. Theory, techniques, and applications*. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007.
- [21] R. M. Strain and Y. Guo. Exponential decay for soft potentials near Maxwellian. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **187** (2008), no. 2, 287-339.
- [22] S. Ukai, T. Yang and S.-H. Yu. Nonlinear boundary layers of the Boltzmann equation. I. Existence. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **236** (2003), no. 3, 373-393.
- [23] S. Ukai, T. Yang and S.-H. Yu. Nonlinear stability of boundary layers of the Boltzmann equation. I. The case $\mathcal{M}^\infty < -1$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **244** (2004), no. 1, 99-109.
- [24] W.K. Wang, T. Yang and X.F. Yang. Nonlinear stability of boundary layers of the Boltzmann equation for cutoff hard potentials. *J. Math. Phys.* **47** (2006), no. 8, 083301, 15 pp.
- [25] W.K. Wang, T. Yang and X.F. Yang. Existence of boundary layers to the Boltzmann equation with cutoff soft potentials. *J. Math. Phys.* **48** (2007), no. 7, 073304, 21 pp.
- [26] X.F. Yang. Nonlinear stability of boundary layers for the Boltzmann equation with cutoff soft potentials. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **345** (2008), no. 2, 941-953.
- [27] X.F. Yang. The solutions for the boundary layer problem of Boltzmann equation in a half-space. *J. Stat. Phys.* **143** (2011), no. 1, 168-196.

(Ning Jiang)

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, 430072, P. R. CHINA

Email address: njjiang@whu.edu.cn

(Yi-Long Luo)

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTH CHINA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, GUANGZHOU, 510641, P. R. CHINA

Email address: luoylmath@scut.edu.cn