

# ON ALMOST EVERYWHERE CONVERGENCE OF PLANAR BOCHNER-RIESZ MEAN

XIAOCHUN LI AND SHUKUN WU

ABSTRACT. We demonstrate that the almost everywhere convergence of the planar Bochner-Riesz means for  $L^p$  functions in the optimal range when  $5/3 \leq p \leq 2$ . This is achieved by establishing a sharp  $L^{5/3}$  estimate for a maximal operator closely associated with the Bochner-Riesz multiplier operator. The estimate depends on a novel refined  $L^2$  estimate, which may be of independent interest.

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Creating large regular subsets and the refined $L^2$ estimates	9
2.1.	Algorithms for discovering extensive regular subsets	9
2.2.	Refined $L^2$ estimates for a $\kappa$ -regular set	11
2.3.	Proof of Proposition 1.11	14
3.	Exploring the maximal operator $T_*^\lambda$ : Initial insights	14
3.1.	Reduction and linearization for the maximal operator	15
3.2.	An $L^2$ estimate localized to a single ball	16
3.3.	$L^4$ orthogonality	19
4.	Analyzing the model operator: A thorough investigation	21
4.1.	The broad-narrow analysis	22
4.2.	The preliminary reduction for the model operator	23
4.3.	Refinement of the reduction process for the model operator	24
5.	Technical estimates and wrapping up the proof	25
5.1.	An application of the refined $L^2$ estimates for the regular set	26
5.2.	$L^2$ estimates via the local $L^2$ conclusion and Kakeya-type results	27
5.3.	$L^4$ -estimates for the dual operator	29
5.4.	Completing the proof of Proposition 4.6	36
6.	Ending remark: Ruling out Tao's example	37
	References	39

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For any Schwartz function  $f$ , the  $n$ -dimensional Bochner-Riesz mean  $T_t^\lambda f$  is defined as

$$(1.1) \quad T_t^\lambda f(x) := (2\pi)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(1 - \frac{|\xi|^2}{t^2}\right)_+^\lambda \widehat{f}(\xi) e^{ix \cdot \xi} d\xi.$$

It can be extended to a multiplier operator with the Fourier multiplier  $(1 - |\cdot|^2/t^2)_+^\lambda$ . Analogous to the Gauss mean (where the multiplier is replaced by  $e^{-|\cdot|^2/t}$ ) or the Able mean (where the multiplier is replaced by  $e^{-|\cdot|/t}$ ), the Bochner-Riesz mean is a summation method that was introduced to study the radial convergence of Fourier transform. The issue of almost everywhere convergence concerning the Bochner-Riesz mean stands out as one of the most intriguing and significant problems in modern analysis. It can be precisely formulated as follows:

**Question 1.1.** *For any  $L^p$  function  $f$ , what is the optimal regularity  $\lambda$  required for the Bochner-Riesz mean  $T_t^\lambda f$  to converge to  $f$  almost everywhere?*

In the higher range  $p \geq 2$ , the almost-everywhere convergence problem is completely solved in [CRdFV88]. However, the lower range  $p < 2$  poses significantly greater challenges. It is worth noting that, when  $p < 2$ , Stein's maximal principle suggests that the following two claims are equivalent:

- i)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} T_t^\lambda f(x) = f(x)$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and every  $L^p$  function  $f$ .
- ii) The maximal Bochner-Riesz operator  $T_*^\lambda$  is bounded in  $L^p$ .

Here the maximal operator  $T_*^\lambda$  is defined as

$$(1.2) \quad T_*^\lambda f(x) := \sup_{t>0} |T_t^\lambda f(x)|.$$

In his investigation into weak-type  $L^p$ -estimates for maximal operators, Tao put forth an insightful conjecture concerning the maximal operator  $T_*^\lambda$ . This conjecture, outlined in his cited work [Tao98], offers a compelling speculation on the operational dynamics and possible constraints of  $T_*^\lambda$ . Allow us to articulate this conjecture herein.

**Conjecture 1.2.** *For any  $1 \leq p < 2$ , the maximal Bochner-Riesz operator  $T_*^\lambda$  extends to a bounded operator in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$  when  $\lambda > \max\{0, \frac{2n-1}{2p} - \frac{n}{2}\}$ , that is,*

$$(1.3) \quad \|T_*^\lambda f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

The conjecture has remained remarkably intriguing and challenging, with very limited progress made over the years. Its motivation lies in the pointwise convergence of circular Fourier partial sums, rendering the scenarios most compelling and challenging as  $\lambda$  approaches zero. Prior to our work, there had been no positive conclusion for  $\lambda$  near zero. Additionally, for higher dimensional cases when  $n \geq 4$ , no affirmative (non-trivial) result has been reached even when  $\lambda$  is away from zero. In the planar case, we are positioned to offer a partial resolution of this conjecture, marking a notable improvement over previous research, particularly as it's the first instance of attaining sharp and non-trivial conclusions for  $p < 2$  and  $\lambda$  near zero. Our approach significantly diverges from prior studies. Primarily, it revolves around a quantitative version of localized  $L^2$  estimates concentrating on some unit balls. These refined  $L^2$  estimates not only deepen our understanding of the conjecture but also may pave the way for future investigations and improvements in this field. Moreover, they extend beyond addressing the maximal Bochner-Riesz operators, such as the reverse square function inequality in the plane, suggesting broader applications for the quantitative local  $L^2$  inequalities. It is reasonable to anticipate further applications stemming from these insights. We now state our main result as follows.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Conjecture 1.2 is true when  $n = 2$  and  $5/3 \leq p \leq 2$ .*




FIGURE 1.

As a direct implication of Theorem 1.3, within the range  $5/3 \leq p \leq 2$ , the Bochner-Riesz mean  $T_t^\lambda f$  converges to  $f$  for any  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$  if  $\lambda > 0$ . However, the assertion does not hold when  $\lambda = 0$ , as demonstrated by Fefferman's renowned example [Fef71]. Theorem 1.3 encompassed all prior findings in the plane from [Tao02, LW20, GW24], and [Kim24] which collectively affirm the pointwise convergence conclusion for  $(1/p, \lambda)$  within the quadrilateral region  $C$  depicted in Figure 1. Theorem 1.3 extends its coverage to a significantly larger area, specifically, the triangular region defined by three points:  $(1/2, 0)$ ,  $(3/5, 0)$  and  $(1, 1/2)$ . Region  $B$  remains open, while Region  $A$  is invalidated by Tao's example, where  $f(x_1, x_2) = a(R^{-1/2}x_1)a(x_2)e^{ix_1}$  is set in (1.6) for a standard bump function  $a$ .

Our main theorem, Theorem 1.3, is established through  $L^p$  estimates of a specific maximal operator, which bears relevance to the classical Bochner-Riesz multiplier. Before proceeding, let's introduce the definition of this maximal operator. For  $t \in [1, 2]$  and any positive real number  $R$ , define  $S_{t,R}$  by

$$(1.4) \quad \widehat{S_{t,R}f}(\xi) = a(R(t - |\xi|))\widehat{f}(\xi)$$

for any  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and any Schwartz function  $f$ , where the function  $a$  represents a standard bump function on  $[-1, 1]$ . The multiplier  $a(R(t - |\xi|))$  here is a bump function supported on the annulus  $A_{t,R} := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t - R^{-1} \leq |\xi| \leq t + R^{-1}\}$ . We

define the corresponding maximal operator  $S_R^*$  by,

$$(1.5) \quad S_R^* f(x) = \sup_{t \in [1, 2]} |S_{t, R} f(x)|,$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .

By means of particular simplifications detailed in Section 3, establishing Theorem 1.3 can be accomplished by focusing solely on the following  $L^p$ -estimates of the maximal operator, which formulates our central theorem in this article.

**Theorem 1.4.** *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $5/3 \leq p \leq 2$ , there is a constant  $C_\varepsilon$  such that*

$$(1.6) \quad \|S_R^* f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_\varepsilon R^\varepsilon \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

for any Schwartz function  $f$  and any  $R \geq 1$ .

In the planar case, Tao's conjecture can be comprehensively addressed upon solving the conjecture stated below.

**Conjecture 1.5.** *The  $L^p$ -estimate (1.6) holds for  $p = 3/2$ .*

One of the main challenges posed by Conjecture 1.2 arises from the absence of orthogonality in the radial direction. Research by [KS19] demonstrates that substituting the  $L_x^p L_t^\infty$  norm in (1.3) with a larger  $L_x^p L_t^{p'}$  norm ( $1/p + 1/p' = 1$ ) leads to the breakdown of Conjecture 1.2 within the entire isosceles right triangular area illustrated in Figure 1. This essentially means that an interpolation between the established outcomes at the endpoints  $L_x^1 L_t^\infty$  and  $L_x^2 L_t^2$  offers an almost sharp bound for the  $L_x^p L_t^{p'}$  norm. To extend the results for the maximal problem beyond this interpolation line, it becomes imperative to establish a certain level of radial orthogonality. As we'll explain shortly, this is largely achieved implicitly through the consideration of specific weighted estimates.

**Remark 1.6.** Surprisingly, Tao's example  $f(x_1, x_2) = a(R^{-1/2}x_1)a(x_2)e^{ix_1}$ , among some reductions, also serves as a sharp example of this  $L_x^p L_t^{p'}$  problem. In Section 6, we will briefly explain how our approach in this paper can, to some extent, rule out Tao's example for Conjecture 1.2.

By employing certain reductions (refer to Section 3), demonstrating Theorem 1.4 can be narrowed down to primarily examining the  $L^p$  estimates for the following model operator:

$$(1.7) \quad \sum_j S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j},$$

where  $F_j$ 's are disjoint sets in an  $R$ -ball  $B_R$  in the plane, each of them is a collection of unit balls,  $\mathbf{1}_{F_j}$  represents the indicator function of  $F_j$ , and  $S_j$  is a multiplier operator given by  $\widehat{S_j f}(\xi) = a(R(t_j - |\xi|))\widehat{f}(\xi)$  for some  $t_j \in [1, 2]$ . Notice that the operator  $S_j$  depends on both  $j$  and  $R$ , yet we abstain from explicitly including  $R$  in the notation  $S_j$ .

More precisely, it suffices to establish that

$$(1.8) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j} \right\|_p \lesssim_\epsilon R^\epsilon \|f\|_p,$$

for one endpoint with  $p = 5/3$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , as the  $L^p$  estimates (1.6) can then be derived through interpolation with the other known endpoint at  $p = 2$ . This observation leads us to explore the weighted  $L^p$ -norm  $\|S_j f\|_{L^p(\mathbf{1}_{F_j})}$  for any fixed  $j$ . Given that each  $S_j$  behaves similarly to the spherical multiplier operator  $S := S_{1,R}$ , we are interested in analyzing the  $L^p$ -norm restricted to a subset  $F \subset B_R$ , that is,

$$(1.9) \quad \|Sf \mathbf{1}_F\|_p.$$

Decoupling inequalities have been utilized as a method in previous studies aiming towards (1.9). In [Tao02, LW20], (1.9) is bounded by a decoupling norm, albeit without incorporating the information from the weight  $\mathbf{1}_F$ . In a more recent paper [GW24], the authors proposed to bound this weighted  $L^p$ -norm using a decoupling norm with a saving term expressed as

$$(1.10) \quad \left( \frac{|F|}{R^n} \right)^\alpha$$

for some  $\alpha > 0$ . Such decoupling inequalities have contributed to advancements regarding Conjecture 1.2 in dimensions two and three. However, for the maximal Bochner-Riesz problem, the decoupling norm might not be the most suitable choice. One reason is that decoupling inequalities are powerful tools primarily aimed at analyzing constructive interference, which is often the main challenge in  $L^p$ -problems when  $p > 2$ . However, in Conjecture 1.2, we are required to consider  $L^p$  functions in the lower range of  $p$ , where the constructive interference might not be the main obstacle.

We naturally anticipate the gain (1.10) for the weighted  $L^2$ -norm of  $Sf$ . Unfortunately, the Knapp example  $f(x) = e^{itx_n} a(R^{-1/2}\bar{x})a(R^{-1}x_n)$  with  $(\bar{x}, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$  demonstrates that we cannot generally expect a weighted inequality in the form

$$(1.11) \quad \|Sf \mathbf{1}_F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \left( \frac{|F|}{R^n} \right)^\alpha \|Sf\|_2.$$

However, if we replace the operator  $S$  with its multilinear analog  $\text{Mul}_n(S)$ , the Bennett-Carbery-Tao multilinear restriction theorem [BCT06] indicates that

$$(1.12) \quad \|\text{Mul}_n(S)f \mathbf{1}_F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \left( \frac{|F|}{R^n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2n}} \|Sf\|_2.$$

The multilinear weighted  $L^2$  estimate (1.12) is sharp, by testing  $F = B_r$  for any  $1 \leq r \leq R$ . Nevertheless, these are essentially the only sharp examples.

This observation suggests that if  $S$  could be substituted freely with its multilinear analog, then (1.12) would prove quite useful for the lower range  $p < 2$ . To see why, we first assume

$$(1.13) \quad (\#j)|F_j| \sim R^2,$$

which can be achieved by pigeonholing. Henceforth, on the one hand, we have from the weighted  $L^2$  estimate (1.12) and the assumption (1.13),

$$(1.14) \quad \sum_j \|S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j}\|_2^2 \lesssim \sum_j \|\text{Bil}(S_j) f \mathbf{1}_{F_j}\|_2^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{|F_j|}{R^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_j \|S_j f\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{(\#j)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|f\|_2^2.$$

On the other hand, invoke the sharp  $L^{4/3}$  estimate for the Bochner-Riesz operator to get

$$(1.15) \quad \sum_j \|S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j}\|_{4/3}^{4/3} \lesssim \sum_j \|f\|_{4/3}^{4/3} \lesssim (\#j) \|f\|_{4/3}^{4/3}.$$

An interpolation between the above two estimates gives

$$(1.16) \quad \sum_j \|S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j}\|_p^p \lesssim \|f\|_p^p$$

for  $p = 16/9$ , which proves Conjecture 1.2 when  $n = 2$  and  $16/9 \leq p \leq 2$ .

The first obstacle we encounter is how to transition from the linear operator to the bilinear one. Typically, the Bourgain-Guth broad-narrow method (see [BG11]) is a standard tool for this purpose. However, given the intricacy of our problem, we need to utilize more nuanced concepts of broadness, akin to those introduced by Guth in [Gut18].

**Definition 1.7.** We call an interval  $\tau \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  a  $\rho$ -**cap** if the Lebesgue measure of the cap  $\tau$  is  $\sim \rho$ . We also define

$$(1.17) \quad C_\tau := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \xi/|\xi| \in \tau\}$$

as the conic region determined by  $\tau$ .

For any cap  $\tau$ ,  $S_\tau f$  denotes the smooth Fourier restriction of  $Sf$  in  $\tau$ , that is,  $\widehat{S_\tau f} = a_\tau \widehat{Sf}$ . Here  $a_\tau$  is a smooth bump function on the conic region  $C_\tau$ .

**Definition 1.8.** Suppose  $\Sigma = \{\sigma\}$  is a collection of finitely overlapping  $(\log R)^{-1}$ -caps. Let  $M$  be a large number. For any function  $f$  and any set  $E \subset B_R$ , define the **broad norm**  $\|Sf\|_{L_{\text{br}_M}^2(E)}$  as

$$(1.18) \quad \|Sf\|_{L_{\text{br}_M}^2(E)} := \max_{\substack{\Sigma' \subset \Sigma, \\ \#\Sigma' = M}} \min_{\sigma \in \Sigma'} \{\|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(E)}\}.$$

The quantity  $\|Sf\|_{L_{\text{br}_M}^2(E)}$  is determined by the cap  $\sigma$  such that  $\|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(E)}$  is the  $M$ -th largest element among the family  $\{\|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(E)}\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$ . When  $E$  is a unit ball, the definition coincides with the one introduced in [Gut18]. Compared to the usual one  $\|Sf\|_{L^2(E)}$  or its bilinear analog  $\|\text{Bil}(S)f\|_{L^2(E)}$ , the broad norm  $\|Sf\|_{L_{\text{br}_M}^2(E)}$  possesses a stronger directional non-concentration property.

To establish an analog of the inequality (1.12), we find ourselves needing certain refined  $L^2$  estimates associated with the broad norm, which are the cornerstone of our proof of Theorem 1.4. To elucidate our new refined  $L^2$  results, we first need to introduce some definitions. We denote the  $\rho$ -neighborhood of a set  $E$  by  $N_\rho(E)$  and the Lebesgue measure of  $E$  by  $|E|$ . Moreover,  $A \gg B$  signifies that the number  $A$  is much greater than the number  $B$ , and  $\#S$  represents the number of elements in a (finite) set  $S$ .

**Definition 1.9.** Let  $\kappa \in [r^{-1/2}, 1]$  for some given real number  $r \geq 1$ . A subset  $E$  of an  $r$ -ball (or cube)  $B_r$  in the plane is called  $\kappa$  **regular** in  $B_r$  if

(1) For any  $r^{1/2} \times r$ -tube  $T$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ,

$$(1.19) \quad |N_{r^{1/2}}(E) \cap T| \lesssim \kappa |T|.$$

(2) There exists a collection  $\mathbb{T}_\kappa$  of  $r^{1/2} \times r$  tubes with  $\#\mathbb{T}_\kappa \lesssim |N_{r^{1/2}}(E)| / (\kappa r^{3/2})$  so that  $E \subset \bigcup_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\kappa} T$ .

**Definition 1.10.** Given a large number  $R \gg K \gg 1$  with  $K = R^{2^{-n}}$ , let  $r_1 < \dots < r_n$  be scales such that  $r_n = R$ ,  $r_k = r_{k+1}^{1/2}$  for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ . We say a set  $E$  is **regular with factors**  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$  if for every  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , there exists  $\kappa_{r_k} \in [r_k^{-1/2}, 1]$  such that

(1)  $E$  is  $\kappa_{r_k}$  regular in an  $r_k$ -ball (or cube)  $B_{r_k}$  whenever  $B_{r_k} \cap E \neq \emptyset$ .

(2)  $|N_{r_{k-1}}(E) \cap Q_{r_k}|$ , for every dyadic  $r_k$ -cubes of  $Q_{r_k}$  intersecting with  $N_{r_{k-1}}(E)$ , is the same up to a constant multiple which may depend on  $k$ . Note that it is equivalent to

$$(1.20) \quad \frac{|N_{r_{k-1}}(E) \cap Q_{r_k}|}{|Q_{r_k}|} \sim \frac{|N_{r_{k-1}}(E)|}{|N_{r_k}(E)|},$$

since  $\sum_{Q_{r_k}: Q_{r_k} \cap N_{r_{k-1}}(E) \neq \emptyset} |N_{r_{k-1}}(E) \cap Q_{r_k}| = |N_{r_{k-1}}(E)|$  and  $|N_{r_k}(E)| \sim |Q_{r_k}| \#\{Q_{r_k} : Q_{r_k} \cap N_{r_{k-1}}(E) \neq \emptyset\}$ .

**Proposition 1.11.** Let  $R \gg K \gg 1$ . Suppose  $F$ , a union of  $K$ -balls (or cubes)  $B$ 's, is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$  and  $M \geq 3n$ . Then for any function  $f \in L^2$ , we have

$$(1.21) \quad \sum_{B \subset F} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}M}(B)}^2 \lesssim (\log R)^{5n} \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^{-1} \left( \frac{|F|}{R^2} \right) \|Sf\|_2^2.$$

and

$$(1.22) \quad \|Sf\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k} \|Sf\|_2^2.$$

In particular, the geometric mean of (1.21) and (1.22) yields that

$$(1.23) \quad \sum_{B \subset F} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}M}(B)}^2 \lesssim (\log R)^{5n} \left( \frac{|F|}{R^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|Sf\|_2^2.$$

Here  $\sum_{B \subset F}$  denotes a summation over all  $K$ -balls (or cubes) contained within  $F$ .

**Remark 1.12.** Although Proposition 1.11 is stated with  $Sf$  being the smooth Fourier restriction of  $f$  on the  $R^{-1}$ -neighborhood of the unit circle, it is also valid when the unit circle is replaced by a  $C^2$  curve with nonzero curvature.

Proposition 1.11 enables us to derive the following refinement of (1.12) in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ : for any  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$  functions  $f_1, f_2$ , we have

$$(1.24) \quad \|\text{Bil}(S)f_1 \mathbf{1}_F\|_2 \|Sf_2 \mathbf{1}_F\|_2 \lesssim \left( \frac{|F|}{R^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f_1\|_2 \|f_2\|_2.$$

This improvement over (1.12) is notable since it eliminates the requirement for a multilinear structure in the second term  $\|Sf_2 \mathbf{1}_F\|_2$  on the left side. Consequently,

we can derive an  $L^{5/3}$  estimate rather than an  $L^{16/9}$  estimate. The method developed to prove Proposition 1.11 may be of independent interest. Additionally, we anticipate further applications of the refined  $L^2$  estimates and its analogs. For instance, at a cost of  $R^\varepsilon$ , we can reprove the reverse square function estimate in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  by solely working in the  $L^2$  space and using  $L^2$  orthogonality. The transition from  $L^4$  space to  $L^2$  space is facilitated by Hölder's inequality and the examination of level sets. This approach circumvents the reliance on the algebraic property of the number 4, namely,  $4 = 2 \times 2$ , which was pivotal in its original proof in [Cór77]. Below, we will outline a sketch of its proof using refined  $L^2$  estimates. It is our aspiration that this perspective will shed lights on  $L^p$ -problems in harmonic analysis.

*Sketch for the reverse square function estimate.* By employing the standard broad-narrow argument, we identify a dyadic number  $\alpha \in [R^{-1/2}, 1]$  along with the corresponding  $\alpha$ -caps  $\tau$  such that

$$(1.25) \quad \|Sf\|_4^4 \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(B_R)}}^4.$$

Choosing  $K = (\log R)^C$ , for each  $\tau$ , via pigeonholing, we find a dyadic number  $\lambda$  and a set  $E_{\lambda}$  of unit balls such that for any unit ball  $B \subset E_{\lambda}$ , we have  $\|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(B)}}^4 \sim \lambda$ . Furthermore,

$$(1.26) \quad \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(B_R)}}^4 \lesssim (\log R)^C \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(E_{\lambda})}}^4.$$

Dividing  $B_R$  into  $R\alpha \times R$ -rectangles  $T$  with direction  $\tau$ , we have

$$(1.27) \quad \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(E_{\lambda})}}^4 = \sum_T \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(E_{\lambda} \cap T)}}^4.$$

Inside each  $E_{\lambda} \cap T$ , by reverse Hölder's inequality, we get

$$(1.28) \quad \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(E_{\lambda} \cap T)}}^4 \lesssim \frac{1}{|E_{\lambda} \cap T|} \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^2_{\text{br}(E_{\lambda} \cap T)}}^4.$$

Applying a rescaled version of (1.23) through parabolic rescaling, at a cost of  $K^{O(1)} \lesssim 1$ , we see that

$$(1.29) \quad \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^2_{\text{br}(E_{\lambda} \cap T)}}^4 \lesssim \frac{|E_{\lambda} \cap T|}{|T|} \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^2(T)}^4 \lesssim \frac{|E_{\lambda} \cap T|}{|T|} \left( \int_T \sum_{\theta \subset \tau} |S_{\theta}f|^2 \right)^2$$

by  $L^2$ -orthogonality. Utilizing Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and combining the above two estimates yield

$$(1.30) \quad \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(E_{\lambda} \cap T)}}^4 \lesssim \int_T \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau} |S_{\theta}f|^2 \right)^2.$$

Consequently, from (1.25) and (1.30), we obtain

$$(1.31) \quad \|Sf\|_4^4 \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \|S_{\tau}f\|_{L^4_{\text{br}(B_R)}}^4 \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \int \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau} |S_{\theta}f|^2 \right)^2 \lesssim \int \left( \sum_{\theta} |S_{\theta}f|^2 \right)^2,$$

which precisely corresponds to the reverse square function estimate.  $\square$

**Notations:**



- We denote  $A \lesssim B$  to signify that  $A \leq CB$  for some constant  $C$ , and  $A \lesssim\lesssim B$  to indicate that  $A \leq C_\varepsilon R^\varepsilon B$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We define  $A \sim B$  if  $A \lesssim B$  and  $B \lesssim A$ .
- In the paper, we consider a large number  $R \gg 1$ . Another large number, denoted as  $K$ , satisfies  $K \sim \exp(\log R / \log \log R) \lesssim\lesssim 1$ . The value of  $K$  remains fixed starting from equation (4.21).
- $\theta$  (or  $\theta'$ ) always represents an  $R^{-1/2}$ -cap.
- $B_r$  stands for a ball (or cube) in the plane with radius (or side length)  $r > 0$ .

**Acknowledgment.** The first author is supported by Simons collaboration grants. The second author thanks Shengwen Gan for some helpful conversation regarding the appendix.

## 2. CREATING LARGE REGULAR SUBSETS AND THE REFINED $L^2$ ESTIMATES

In this section, our attention is directed towards investigating the weighted  $L^2$  estimate  $\|Sf\|_{L^2(E)}$ , where  $E$  represents a subset of an  $R$ -ball (or cube), denoted as  $B_R$ . Our aim is to provide a demonstration for Proposition 1.11. The demonstration relies on the construction of sizable regular subsets based on a greedy algorithm.

**2.1. Algorithms for discovering extensive regular subsets.** Let us first state a lemma on finding significant regular subsets in a single scale. We will use this lemma repeatedly to obtain large regular subsets in multi-scales in the next lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose  $E \subset B_r$  is a union of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls (or cubes). Then there exists a factor  $\kappa$  and a union of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls (or cubes)  $E_\kappa \subset E$  with  $|E_\kappa| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1}|E|$  and such that  $E_\kappa$  is  $\kappa$  regular in  $B_r$ .*

*Proof.* We present a greedy algorithm described as follows. The algorithm is designed to finding a subset  $F$  of  $B_r$  consisting of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls and a union of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls  $\overline{E}$ . Once the algorithm stops, a subset  $E_\kappa$  of  $\overline{E}$  is the large regular set as desired in the lemma.

First, let us see how to make initial selections for  $F$  and  $\overline{E}$ . We initiate  $F := E$ . Define

$$(2.1) \quad \kappa_F^* = \max_{T \text{ any } r^{1/2} \times r \text{ tube}} |F \cap T|/|T|.$$

It is easy to see that  $\kappa_F^* \in [r^{-1/2}, 1]$ . Take  $\kappa_F \in [r^{-1/2}, 1]$  to be the maximal dyadic number  $\kappa \in [r^{-1/2}, 1]$  with  $2\kappa_F^* \geq \kappa \geq \kappa_F^*/4$ . We now choose an  $r^{1/2} \times r$ -tube  $T$  that maximizes  $|F \cap T|$ . Then we see that

$$(2.2) \quad \kappa_F \sim |F \cap T|/|T|.$$

For the chosen tube  $T$ , let  $\mathcal{Q}_F(T)$  be the collection of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls (or cubes) such that  $Q \subset F$  and  $Q \cap T \neq \emptyset$ . Define  $\mathbf{Q}_T \subset F$  as

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbf{Q}_T = \bigcup_{Q \subset \mathcal{Q}_F(T)} Q.$$

Then  $|\mathbf{Q}_T|/|T| \sim \kappa_F$  since the chosen tube  $T$  maximizes  $|F \cap T|$ . We now initiate  $\overline{E} := \{\mathbf{Q}_T\}$ , which consists of some  $r^{1/2}$ -balls from the chosen tube  $T$ .

Update  $F$  by removing the union of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls  $\mathbf{Q}_T$ , i.e., set  $F := F \setminus \mathbf{Q}_T$ . Then repeat the previous process for the updated  $F$  to continue the updating procedure by setting  $\overline{E} := \overline{E} \cup \mathbf{Q}_T$ , where  $T$  represents the chosen tube associate to the updated  $F$ . We terminate the algorithm until  $|F| \leq |E|/2$ . Since at each step we remove at least one  $r^{1/2}$ -ball from  $F$ , a termination will inevitably occur after a finite number of steps.

When the algorithm stops, after grouping together those subsets of  $\overline{E}$  generated by those  $F$ 's with the same dyadic number  $\kappa_F = \kappa$ , we obtain a collection of disjoint sets  $\{E_\kappa\}_\kappa$ , where  $\kappa$  ranges over certain dyadic numbers in  $[r^{-1/2}, 1]$ , to form a partition of the set  $\overline{E}$  acquired at the end of the algorithm. Because  $|\overline{E}| \geq |E|/2$ , we see that

$$\sum_{\kappa} |E_\kappa| \geq |E|/2.$$

Additionally, each  $E_\kappa$  obeys  $E_\kappa = \bigsqcup_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\kappa} \mathbf{Q}_T$  and  $|\mathbf{Q}_T|/|T| \sim \kappa$  for any tube  $T \in \mathbb{T}_\kappa$ . Here  $\mathbb{T}_\kappa$  is a collection of  $r^{1/2} \times r$ -tubes. Moreover, since  $E_\kappa$  is contained in an  $F$  with  $\kappa_F = \kappa$ , we have that for any  $r^{1/2} \times r$ -tube  $T$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad |N_{r^{1/2}}(E_\kappa) \cap T| \lesssim |F \cap T| \lesssim \kappa|T|.$$

By pigeonholing, there exists a  $\kappa$  such that  $|E_\kappa| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1}|E|$ . This yields  $\#\mathbb{T}_\kappa \lesssim |E_\kappa|/(\kappa r^{3/2})$  since  $E_\kappa = \bigsqcup_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\kappa} \mathbf{Q}_T$  is a disjoint union and  $|\mathbf{Q}_T| \sim \kappa|T|$  for any  $T \in \mathbb{T}_\kappa$ . Finally, because  $\mathbf{Q}_T \subset 2T$ , we can enlarge the tube set  $\mathbb{T}_\kappa$  so that the estimate  $\#\mathbb{T}_\kappa \lesssim |E_\kappa|/(\kappa r^{3/2})$  remains valid, and simultaneously,  $E_\kappa \subset \bigcup_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\kappa} T$ . Therefore, by Definition 1.9, we see that  $E_\kappa$  is  $\kappa$ -regular in  $B_r$  with  $|E_\kappa| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1}|E|$  as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $R \gg K \gg 1$  with  $K = R^{2^{-n}}$ . Let  $r_1 < \dots < r_n$  be scales such that  $r_n = R$ ,  $r_k = r_{k+1}^{1/2}$  for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Suppose that  $E \subset B_R$  is a union of  $K$ -balls (or cubes). Then there exists a collection of factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$  with each  $\kappa_{r_k} \in [r_k^{-1/2}, 1]$  and a union of  $K$ -balls (or cubes)  $E' \subset E$  with  $|E'| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-3n}|E|$  such that  $E'$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$ .*

*Proof.* We create the set  $E'$  inductively from the smallest scale  $r_1 = K^2$  to the largest one  $r_n = R$ . Let  $E_0 = E$  and  $r_0 = K$ . The algorithm starts at scale  $r_1$ , where Lemma 2.1 starts to kick in. Let  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . At beginning of the  $k$ -th step of the algorithm, there is a union of  $r_{k-1}$ -balls  $E_{k-1}$  such that  $E_{k-1}$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_{k-1}})$  and  $|E_{k-1}| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-3(k-1)}|E|$ .

If  $k = n$  then the algorithm terminates. Otherwise, we use dyadic cubes  $Q$  of dimensions  $r_k \times r_k$  to partition the plane, and then consider each dyadic  $r_k$ -cube  $Q$  that  $E_{k-1} \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ . Apply Lemma 2.1 to the pair  $(E_{k-1} \cap Q, Q)$  so that there exists a factor  $\kappa_Q$  and a union of  $r_{k-1}$ -balls (or cubes)  $E_{\kappa_Q} \subset E_{k-1} \cap Q$  such that

- (1)  $|E_{\kappa_Q}| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1}|E_{k-1} \cap Q|$
- (2)  $E_{\kappa_Q}$  is  $\kappa_Q$  regular in  $Q$ .

By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists a collection of dyadic  $r_k$ -cube  $\mathcal{Q}$  such that

- (1)  $\kappa_Q$  are the same for all  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ .
- (2)  $|N_{r_{k-1}}(E_{\kappa_Q}) \cap Q|$  are the same for all  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$  up to a constant multiple. (Hence (1.20) holds).
- (3)  $|E_{k-1} \cap \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} Q| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-2}|E_{k-1}|$ .

We define

$$(2.5) \quad E_k := \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} E_{\kappa_Q}$$

Then it is easy to see that  $|E_k| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-3} |E_{k-1}|$ , which yields  $|E_k| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-3k} |E|$ , through the inductive hypothesis.  $E_k$  is  $\kappa_B$ -regular in  $B_{r_k}$  whenever  $B_{r_k} \cap E_k \neq \emptyset$ . Hence  $E_k$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_k})$  and  $|E_k| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-3k} |E|$ .

When the algorithm stops, we obtain set  $E_n$  with  $|E_n| \gtrsim (\log R)^{-3n} |E|$  such that  $E_n$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$ . Take  $E' = E_n$  and then we finish the proof.  $\square$

**2.2. Refined  $L^2$  estimates for a  $\kappa$ -regular set.** We now provide a quantitative characterization of the local  $L^2$  norm of  $Sf \mathbf{1}_F$  where  $F$  is a  $\kappa$ -regular set. The demonstration hinges on a combinatorial approach, employing multiple applications of the pigeonhole principle.

For a ball (or cube)  $B$ , we define the weight function  $w_B$  to be

$$(2.6) \quad w_B(x) = \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\text{dist}(x, B)}{r(B)}\right)^L},$$

where  $r(B)$  is the radius of the ball  $B$ ,  $\text{dist}(x, B)$  represents the distance between  $x$  and  $B$ , and  $L$  is sufficiently large constant. The weighted norm  $\|f\|_{L^2(w(B))}$  is expressed as

$$(2.7) \quad \|f\|_{L^2(w(B))} = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f|^2 w_B dx \right)^{1/2}.$$

Similarly the weighted broad norm  $\|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(E)}$  is defined by substituting the corresponding  $L^2(E)$ -norm with the weighted norm  $L^2(w(E))$  when  $E$  is a ball or a cube. The weight function  $w_B$  is specifically crafted to address contributions from Schwartz tails. Essentially, it can be regarded as the indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_B$ , since the primary contribution arises from  $B$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $F$ , a union of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls (or cubes)  $\{B\}$ , is  $\kappa_r$  regular in  $B_r$ . Then for any function  $f \in L^2$ , we have*

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{B \subset F} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \lesssim (\log R)^5 \left( \frac{|F|}{\kappa_r |B_r|} \right) \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_{M-2}}(w(B_r))}^2$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \|Sf\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \lesssim \kappa_r \|Sf\|_{L^2(w(B_r))}^2.$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $d(\tau)$  the diameter (length) of a cap  $\tau$  and by  $\mathbb{T}_r$  the collection of  $r^{1/2} \times r$  tubes intersecting  $B_r$ . By Definition 1.9 and  $L^2$ -orthogonality, we have

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|Sf\|_{L^2(F)}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{Q \subset F} \sum_{\tau: d(\tau)=r^{-1/2}} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\tau} \int_Q |S_\tau f|^2 \mathbf{1}_T \\ &\lesssim \kappa_r \sum_{\tau, d(\tau)=r^{-1/2}} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\tau} \int |S_\tau f|^2 \mathbf{1}_T \leq \kappa_r \|Sf\|_{L^2(w(B_r))}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (2.9). Here  $Q$  ranges over all dyadic  $r^{1/2}$ -cubes in  $F$ .

Next, let us prove (2.8). Since  $F$  is  $\kappa$  regular, there is a collection  $\mathbb{T}_{\kappa_r}$  of  $r^{1/2} \times r$ -tubes such that  $\#\mathbb{T}_{\kappa_r} \lesssim |N_{r^{1/2}}(F)|/(\kappa r^{3/2}) \sim |F|/(\kappa r^{3/2})$  and

$$(2.11) \quad \sum_{B \subset F} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\kappa_r}} \sum_{B \subset F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2.$$

By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists a  $\mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\kappa_r}$ , such that

$$(1) \quad \sum_{B \subset F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \text{ are the same up to a constant multiple, for all } T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}.$$

$$(2) \quad \text{We have}$$

$$(2.12) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}} \sum_{B \subset F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\kappa_r}} \sum_{B \subset F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2.$$

Fix an  $r^{1/2} \times r$  tube  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\kappa_r}$ . By dyadic pigeonholing again, there exists a collection of  $r^{1/2}$ -balls  $\mathcal{B}(T)$  such that

- $\|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2$  are the same up to a constant multiple, for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$ .
- We have

$$(2.13) \quad \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(T)} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1} \sum_{B \subset F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2.$$

Denote by  $\tau_T \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  the directional cap associated to  $T$ , so  $|\tau_T| \sim r^{-1/2}$ . Recall the definition of the broad norm in Definition 1.8. For each  $B \subset T$ , let  $\Sigma(B)$  be the collection of  $(\log R)^{-1}$ -caps such that  $\#\Sigma(B) = M$  and for any  $\sigma \in \Sigma(B)$ ,

$$(2.14) \quad \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \lesssim \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(B)}^2.$$

For each  $(\log R)^{-1}$ -cap  $\sigma$  and each  $r^{-1/2}$ -cap  $\tau$ , define a collection of  $r^{1/2} \times r$ -tubes  $\mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}$  as

$$(2.15) \quad \mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau} := \{T : \tau_T = \tau \subset \sigma\},$$

and  $\mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}(B)$  as

$$(2.16) \quad \mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}(B) := \{T \subset B_r : T \cap 2B \neq \emptyset, T \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}\}.$$

Then by  $L^2$ -orthogonality,

$$(2.17) \quad \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\tau \subset \sigma} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}(B)} \|S_\tau f \mathbf{1}_T\|_{L^2(2B)}^2$$

$$(2.18) \quad \lesssim r^{-1/2} \sum_{\tau \subset \sigma} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}(B)} \|S_\tau f \mathbf{1}_T\|_2^2.$$

Denote by  $\Sigma_T(B) \subset \Sigma(B)$  the collection of  $(\log R)^{-1}$ -caps  $\sigma$  obeying  $\angle(\theta_T, \sigma) \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1}$ . Then  $\#\Sigma_T(B) \geq M - 2$ . Let us consider the pairs  $(\sigma, B) \in \Sigma \times \mathcal{B}(T)$ . Note that

$$(2.19) \quad \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(T)} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma \in \Sigma_T(B)\}} \geq (M - 2) \#\mathcal{B}(T).$$

Since  $\#\Sigma \lesssim \log R$ , we have

$$(2.20) \quad (2.19) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(T)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma \in \Sigma_T(B)\}} \lesssim (\log R) \#\mathcal{B}(T).$$

Therefore, since for any  $\sigma$ ,  $\#\{B \in \mathcal{B}(T) : \sigma \in \Sigma_T(B)\} \leq \#\mathcal{B}(T)$ , there exists a set  $\Sigma(T) \subset \Sigma$  such that

- $\#\Sigma(T) \geq M - 2$ .
- For any  $\sigma \in \Sigma(T)$ ,

$$(2.21) \quad \#\{B \in \mathcal{B}(T) : \sigma \in \Sigma_T(B)\} \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1} \#\mathcal{B}(T).$$

Since  $\|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$ , for any  $\sigma \in \Sigma(T)$ , from (2.13), it follows that

$$(2.22) \quad \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(T) : \sigma \in \Sigma_T(B)} \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \gtrsim (\log R)^{-2} \sum_{B \in F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2.$$

Since  $\angle(\theta(T), \sigma) \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1}$ , we see that any tube  $T' \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}$  is transversal to the tube  $T$ . Thus, there are at most  $O(\log R)$  many  $r^{1/2}$ -balls (or cubes)  $B$  belonging to  $\mathcal{B}(T) \cap T'$ . Henceforth, from (2.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(T) : \sigma \in \Sigma_T(B)} \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(B)}^2 &\lesssim r^{-1/2} \sum_{\tau \subset \sigma} \sum_{T' \in \mathbb{T}_{\sigma, \tau}} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(T) \cap T'} \|S_\tau f \mathbf{1}_{T'}\|_{L^2(B_r)}^2 \\ &\lesssim (\log R) r^{-1/2} \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(w(B_r))}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that for any  $\sigma \in \Sigma(T)$ ,

$$(2.23) \quad \sum_{B \in F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \lesssim (\log R)^3 r^{-1/2} \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(w(B_r))}^2.$$

Finally, consider the pairs  $(\sigma, T) \in \Sigma \times \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}$ . Since  $\#\Sigma(T) \geq M - 2$  for any  $T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}$ , similarly, by pigeonholing, there exists a set  $\Sigma(B_r) \subset \Sigma$  so that

- $\#\Sigma(B_r) \geq M - 2$ .
- For any  $\sigma \in \Sigma(B_r)$ ,

$$(2.24) \quad \#\{T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r} : \sigma \in \Sigma(T)\} \gtrsim (\log R)^{-1} \#\mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}.$$

Since  $\sum_{B \in F \cap T} \|Sf_1\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}$ , by (2.12) and (2.23), we end up with, for any  $\sigma \in \Sigma(B_r)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}} \sum_{B \in F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 &\lesssim (\log R)^2 \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r} \\ \sigma \in \Sigma(T)}} \sum_{B \in F \cap T} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \\ &\lesssim (\log R)^5 r^{-1/2} (\#\mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r}) \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(w(B_r))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.11) and  $\#\mathbb{T}'_{\kappa_r} \lesssim |N_{r^{1/2}}(E)|/(\kappa r^{3/2})$ , we can finally conclude from the above estimate that for any  $\sigma \in \Sigma(B_r)$ ,

$$(2.25) \quad \sum_{B \in F} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \lesssim (\log R)^5 \left( \frac{|F|}{\kappa r^2} \right) \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2(w(B_r))}^2,$$

which yields that

$$(2.26) \quad \sum_{B \in F} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \lesssim (\log R)^5 \left( \frac{|F|}{\kappa |B_r|} \right) \|S_\sigma f\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_{M-2}}(w(B_r))}^2.$$

Lemma 2.3 now follows from (2.10) and (2.26).  $\square$

**2.3. Proof of Proposition 1.11.** We will use Lemma 2.3 at each scale, from the smallest one  $r_1$  to the biggest one  $r_n$ . We can assume the weighted norm associated to  $w(B)$  in (2.8) and (2.9) to be the norm associated to  $B$ , because the weighted function  $w_B$  can be viewed essentially as  $\mathbf{1}_B$ .

Denote  $N_{r_k}(F)$  by  $F_k$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Since  $F$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$ , for each  $k$  we have

$$(2.27) \quad \frac{|F_{k-1} \cap Q_{r_k}|}{|Q_{r_k}|} \sim \frac{|F_{k-1}|}{|F_k|}.$$

for every dyadic  $r_k$ -cube  $Q_{r_k}$  with  $F_{k-1} \cap Q_{r_k} \neq \emptyset$ .

At the  $k$ -th scale, apply (2.8) for each dyadic  $r_k$ -cube  $Q_{r_k}$  and the set  $F_{k-1} \cap Q_{r_k}$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q_{r_{k-1}} \subset F_{k-1} \cap Q_{r_k}} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}^{M-2k+2}}(Q_{r_{k-1}})}^2 &\lesssim (\log R)^5 \left( \frac{|F_{k-1} \cap Q_{r_k}|}{\kappa_{r_k} |Q_{r_k}|} \right) \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}^{M-2k}}(Q_{r_k})}^2 \\ &\lesssim (\log R)^5 \left( \frac{|F_{k-1}|}{\kappa_{r_k} |F_k|} \right) \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}^{M-2k}}(Q_{r_k})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Sum up all dyadic cubes  $Q_{r_k}$ 's in  $F_k$  so that

$$\sum_{Q_{r_{k-1}} \subset F_{k-1}} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}^{M-2k+2}}(Q_{r_{k-1}})}^2 \lesssim (\log R)^5 \left( \frac{|F_{k-1}|}{\kappa_{r_k} |F_k|} \right) \sum_{Q_{r_k} \subset F_k} \|Sf\|_{L^2_{\text{br}^{M-2k}}(Q_{r_k})}^2,$$

for every  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Multiplying these inequalities together results in obtaining (1.21) as desired.

Similarly, apply (2.9) for each  $Q_{r_k}$  to get

$$(2.28) \quad \|Sf\|_{L^2(F_{k-1} \cap Q_{r_k})}^2 \lesssim \kappa_{r_k} \|Sf\|_{L^2(Q_{r_k})}^2.$$

Sum up all  $Q_{r_k}$  in  $N_{r_k}(F)$  so that

$$(2.29) \quad \|Sf\|_{L^2(F_{k-1})}^2 \lesssim \kappa_{r_k} \|Sf\|_{L^2(F_k)}^2,$$

for every  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Consequently, (1.22) follows by taking product of these inequalities. Therefore, we complete the proof.

### 3. EXPLORING THE MAXIMAL OPERATOR $T_*^\lambda$ : INITIAL INSIGHTS

We are interested in the maximal operator  $T_*^\lambda$  defined as in (1.1). It is clearly connected with the Fourier multiplier

$$m_t^\lambda(\xi) := (2\pi)^{-n} (1 - |\xi|^2/t^2)_+^\lambda,$$

for  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Going forward, we concentrate on the planar case with  $n = 2$ , while noting that many conclusions in this section remain applicable to higher-dimensional Euclidean spaces.

**3.1. Reduction and linearization for the maximal operator.** We perform a standard frequency decomposition to the Fourier multiplier  $m_t^\lambda$  by localizing the frequency space via a smooth partitioning of unity. In fact, let  $\eta_0$  be a bump function of a small ball, say,  $B_{1/2}$ , and  $\eta_k$  be a bump function of the annulus  $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 - 2^{-k} \leq |\xi| \leq 1 - 2^{-k-1}\}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta_k = 1$  on the unit ball. We now define

$$(3.1) \quad m_{k,t}^\lambda(\xi) = m_t^\lambda(\xi)\eta_k(\xi/t),$$

for any  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . It is clear that  $m_t^\lambda = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m_{k,t}^\lambda$ . Let  $K_{k,t}^\lambda$  to denote the inverse Fourier transform of  $m_{k,t}^\lambda$ , i.e.,

$$(3.2) \quad \widehat{K_{k,t}^\lambda} = m_{k,t}^\lambda.$$

By the triangle inequality, to prove Theorem 1.3, it suffices to prove that for each  $k \geq 0$ ,

$$(3.3) \quad \left\| \sup_{t>0} |K_{k,t}^\lambda * f| \right\|_p \lesssim_\varepsilon 2^{k\varepsilon} 2^{-k\lambda} \|f\|_p$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $5/3 \leq p \leq 2$ . To further localize the variable  $t$ , we need the following proposition proved by Tao [Tao98]. A heuristic proof is presented in [Tao02], Section 4. For a detailed exposition, see also the appendix of [LW20].

**Proposition 3.1.** *Fix any  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\lambda > 0$ . Suppose that*

$$(3.4) \quad \left\| \sup_{t \in [1/2, 1]} |K_{k,t}^\lambda * f| \right\|_{L^p(B_{2^k})}^p \lesssim_\varepsilon 2^{k\varepsilon} 2^{-k\lambda} \|f\|_p^p$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $f \in L^p$ . Then (3.3) is true.

For a fixed  $k$ , let  $R = 2^k$ . Observe that

$$\widehat{K_{k,t}^\lambda} \sim 2^{-k\lambda} a(R(t - |\xi|)),$$

for some bump function on the annulus  $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t - R^{-1} \leq |\xi| \leq t + R^{-1}\}$ . Consequently, from the definition of  $S_R^*$  in (1.5) and Proposition 3.1, we deduce that (3.3) is equivalent to

$$(3.5) \quad \|S_R^* f\|_{L^p(B_R)} \lesssim \|f\|_p,$$

for  $5/3 \leq p \leq 2$ , which precisely corresponds to (1.6) stated in Theorem 1.4.

Next, we are going to linearize the maximal function  $S_R^* f$ . Let  $\{t_j\}_{j=1}^{[R]}$  be a collection of  $R^{-1}$ -separated points in  $[1, 2]$ . For  $1 \leq t_j \leq 2$ , recall that  $A_{t_j, R}$  is defined in Section 1 as the annulus with radius  $t_j$  and thickness  $R^{-1}$  given as follows:

$$(3.6) \quad A_{t_j, R} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t_j - R^{-1} \leq |\xi| \leq t_j + R^{-1}\}.$$

As in Section 1,  $S_j (= S_{t_j, R})$  is defined as

$$(3.7) \quad \widehat{S_j f}(\xi) = a(R(t_j - |\xi|)) \widehat{f}(\xi).$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *For any  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ , there exists a collection of disjoint sets  $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^{[R]}$ , where each  $F_j \subset B_R$  is a union of unit balls, such that*

$$(3.8) \quad \|S_R^* f\|_p \lesssim \left\| \sum_j S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j} \right\|_p.$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $S_R^* f = \sup_{t \in [1,2]} |S_{t,R} f|$ . Consider  $S_{t,R} f(x)$  as a function of  $(x, t)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ . Then its Fourier transform on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$  equals to  $e^{-i\tau|\xi|} \widehat{f}(\xi) \widehat{a}(\tau/R) \mathbf{1}_{B_2}(\xi)$ , a function of  $(\xi, \tau)$  that is essentially supported in the region  $B_2 \times [-R, R]$ . Thus, as a function of  $(x, t)$ ,  $|S_{t,R} f|$  is essentially constant in  $B \times I$ , where  $B \subset B_R$  is any unit ball and  $I \subset [1, 2]$  is any  $R^{-1}$  interval. Henceforth,

$$(3.9) \quad \int \sup_{t \in I} |S_{t,R} f|^p \mathbf{1}_B \sim \sup_{t \in I} \int |S_{t,R} f|^p \mathbf{1}_B \lesssim \int |S_j f|^p \mathbf{1}_B,$$

whenever  $t_j \in I$ . Moreover,

$$(3.10) \quad \int \sup_{t \in [1,2]} |S_{t,R} f|^p \mathbf{1}_B \sim \sup_{I \subset [1,2]} \int \sup_{t \in I} |S_{t,R} f|^p \mathbf{1}_B.$$

For each unit ball  $B$ , define  $j_B$  as the minimal choice of  $j \in \{1, \dots, [R]\}$  such that

$$(3.11) \quad t_j \in I \text{ and } \sup_{t \in I} \int |S_{t,R} f|^p \mathbf{1}_B \sim \int \sup_{t \in [1,2]} |S_{t,R} f|^p \mathbf{1}_B.$$

Now define  $F_j$  as a union of unit balls  $B$  with  $j_B = j$ . This gives

$$\int \sup_{t \in [1,2]} |S_{t,R} f|^p \lesssim \int \sum_j |S_j f|^p \mathbf{1}_{F_j},$$

as desired.  $\square$

**3.2. An  $L^2$  estimate localized to a single ball.** We aim to present a local  $L^2$ -estimate associated with a single ball. Before stating it, let us introduce some notations. We use  $\Gamma$  to denote the circle  $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |\xi| = 1\}$  and  $N : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$  to represent its Gauss map. Recall that  $\tau$  stands for a cap defined as in Definition 1.7. Let  $\varphi_\tau$  be a bump function of the interval

$$\{\xi_1 \in \mathbb{R} : N(\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \tau \text{ for } (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \Gamma\}.$$

We define  $S_{\tau,j}$  by

$$(3.12) \quad \widehat{S_{\tau,j} f}(\xi) = \widehat{S_j f}(\xi) \varphi_\tau(\xi_1),$$

for  $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$ . The function  $\varphi_\tau$  helps localizing smoothly the operator  $S_j f$  on the cap  $\tau$  in the frequency space. Thus, the Fourier transform of  $S_{\tau,j} f$  is supported around a  $1/R$ -neighborhood of the cap  $\tau$ . The operator  $S_{\tau,j}$  may vary from line to line depending on the change of the bump functions  $a$  and  $\varphi_\tau$ , but such variation is harmless to our argument. For a ball (or cube)  $B$  in the plane, let  $\psi_B$  be a bump function on  $2B$  so that  $\psi_B(x) \sim 1$  for  $x \in B$  and  $|\psi_B^{(k)}| \lesssim_k (d(B))^{-k}$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $d(B)$  stands for the diameter of  $B$ .

We need to figure out what happens when the function  $f$  is localized on a single ball (or cube). This scenario can be addressed by the following lemmas, the first of which is essentially the local  $L^2$  estimate proved in [Tao02].

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $B$  be an  $R\alpha$ -ball with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ . For any positive integer  $j$  and  $f_j \in L^2$ ,*

$$(3.13) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_j(f_j) \psi_B \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha \left\| \sum_j |f_j| \right\|_2^2.$$



*Proof.* We will utilize the  $TT^*$ -method to prove Lemma 3.3. Via the method of stationary phase, the kernel of the operator  $S_j$ , denoted by  $K_j$ , exhibits the following asymptotic behavior (see for instance [Ste93] Chapter IX)

$$(3.14) \quad K_j(x) \approx \varphi(R^{-1}x)R^{-1}|x|^{-1/2} \left( e^{it_j|x|} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j|x|^{-j} + e^{-it_j|x|} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j|x|^{-j} \right),$$

where  $\varphi$  is a smooth function,  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  are constants depending on  $j$ . The principal contribution arises from the first term when  $j = 0$ . Henceforth, we only need to prove that

$$(3.15) \quad \left\| \sum_j S'_j(f_j)\psi_B \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha \left\| \sum_j |f_j| \right\|_2^2,$$

where  $S'_j f = K'_j * f$  with

$$K'_j(x) = \varphi(R^{-1}x)R^{-1}|x|^{-1/2} e^{it_j|x|}.$$

For a dyadic number  $1 \leq r \lesssim R$ , let  $\eta_r(x)$  be a bump function of the dyadic annulus  $\{x : |x| \sim r\}$ , and let  $\eta_0$  be a bump function of the unit ball so that

$$(3.16) \quad K'_j = \eta_0 K'_j + \sum_r \eta_r K'_j.$$

For each  $r$ , define

$$(3.17) \quad K_{j,r}(x) := \eta_r(x) K'_j(x),$$

which is clearly  $\sim R^{-1}r^{-1/2}\eta_r(x)e^{it_j|x|}$ . Moreover, we define  $S_{j,r}f := K_{j,r} * f$ . Since  $K_{j,r}$  is supported in  $x : |x| \sim r$ , by a standard localization argument (see, for example, [Wu23] Lemma 2.2), it suffices to prove that for any  $r$ -ball  $B_r$ ,

$$(3.18) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_{j,r}(f_j \mathbf{1}_{B_r})\psi_B \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha \left\| \sum_j |f_j| \mathbf{1}_{B_r} \right\|_2^2.$$

Without loss of generality, we can confine the variable  $x$  in (3.17) to the conic direction  $\{x : 0 \leq x/|x| \leq \pi/4\}$ . For any  $y_1 \in [-R, R]$ , we define  $g_j(\cdot) = |f_j(y_1, \cdot)| \mathbf{1}_{B_r}(y_1, \cdot)$ . Hence, by freezing the first variable  $y_1$  and Cauchy-Schwarz, it suffices to prove that

$$(3.19) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau,j}(g_j)\psi_B \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha r^{-1} \left\| \sum_j g_j \right\|_2^2.$$

Apply (3.17) so that the left-hand side of (3.19) equals to

$$\sum_{j_1, j_2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{j_1}(z_1) g_{j_2}(z_2) K_{\tau, j_1, j_2}(z_1, z_2) dz_1 dz_2,$$

where  $K_{\tau, j_1, j_2}(z_1, z_2)$  is defined by

$$(3.20) \quad K_{\tau, j_1, j_2}(z_1, z_2) := \frac{1}{rR^2} \int e^{i(t_{j_1}|x-z_1| - t_{j_2}|x-z_2|)} \psi_B^2(x) a_{\tau, j_1, j_2}(x, z_1, z_2) dx.$$

Since  $\nabla_x(t_{j_1}|x-z_1|-t_{j_2}|x-z_2|) \gtrsim r^{-1}|z_1-z_2|$  due to some elementary geometry, from the integration by parts, we end up with that

$$\begin{aligned} |K_{\tau,j_1,j_2}(z_1, z_2)| &\lesssim_N \frac{1}{rR^2} \min\{|B|, r^2\} (1 + r^{-1}|B|^{1/2}|z_1 - z_2|)^{-N} \\ &= \min\left\{\frac{\alpha^2}{r}, \frac{r}{R^2}\right\} (1 + \alpha(R/r)|z_1 - z_2|)^{-N}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields  $\int |K_{\tau,j_1,j_2}(z_1, z_2)| dz_1, \int |K_{\tau,j_1,j_2}(z_1, z_2)| dz_2 \lesssim \min\{\frac{\alpha}{R}, \frac{1}{\alpha R^3}\}$ , which concludes (3.19) by Schur's test since  $r \leq R$ . This establishes (3.18) and consequently (3.13), as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\alpha \in [R^{-1/2}, 1]$ . Suppose that  $B$  is an  $R\alpha$ -ball and  $\{\tau\}$  is a collection of finitely overlapping  $\alpha$ -caps. Additionally, assume that  $\{E_{\tau,j}\}_{\tau,j}$  is a collection of disjoint sets in the plane. Then*

$$(3.21) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_j \|S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_B)\mathbf{1}_{E_{\tau,j}}\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha \|f\mathbf{1}_B\|_2^2.$$

*Proof.* By duality, it suffices to show that, for any  $f \in L^2$ ,

$$(3.22) \quad \left\| \sum_{\tau} \sum_j S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{E_{\tau,j}}) \right\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \lesssim \alpha \sum_{\tau} \sum_j \|f\mathbf{1}_{E_{\tau,j}}\|_2^2.$$

Since  $\alpha \geq R^{-1/2}$ , by  $L^2$  orthogonality,

$$(3.23) \quad \left\| \sum_{\tau} \sum_j S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{E_{\tau,j}}) \right\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{E_{\tau,j}}) \right\|_{L^2(B)}^2.$$

Hence, to prove (3.22), we only need to prove for a single  $\tau$ ,

$$(3.24) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{E_j}) \right\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \lesssim \alpha \sum_j \|f\mathbf{1}_{E_j}\|_2^2,$$

where  $\{E_j\}_j$  is a collection of disjoint sets. It is more convenient to replace  $\mathbf{1}_B$  by a smooth cut-off  $\psi_B$ , so we will demonstrate the following slightly stronger inequality:

$$(3.25) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau,j}(f_j)\psi_B \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha \sum_j \|f_j\|_2^2,$$

where  $f_j \in L^2$  and the supports of  $f_j$ 's are disjoint.

Observe that

$$(3.26) \quad S_{\tau,j}f = S_j(\tilde{S}_{\tau,j}f),$$

where  $\tilde{S}_{\tau,j}f$  can be represented as  $\tilde{K}_{\tau,j} * f$  such that the Fourier transform of the kernel  $\tilde{K}_{\tau,j}$  is a smooth bump function supported in an  $2\alpha$ -ball containing the cap  $\tau$ . Thus, the kernel  $\tilde{K}_{\tau,j}$  obeys the decaying estimate,

$$(3.27) \quad |\tilde{K}_{\tau,j}(x)| \lesssim_N \alpha^2 (1 + \alpha|x|)^{-N},$$

which yields that  $\sup_{\tau,j} |\tilde{K}_{\tau,j}| \in L^1$ .

Plugging  $f_j = \tilde{S}_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{E_j})$  in (3.13), we have

$$(3.28) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{E_j})\psi_B \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha \left\| \sum_j \tilde{S}_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{E_j}) \right\|_2^2.$$

Thus, to prove (3.25), we only need to show

$$(3.29) \quad \left\| \sum_j |\tilde{S}_{\tau,j}(f_j)| \right\|_2^2 \lesssim \sum_j \|f_j\|_2^2,$$

for  $f_j$ 's with disjoint supports. In fact, because  $\sup_{\tau,j} |\tilde{K}_{\tau,j}|$  is integrable via (3.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_j |\tilde{S}_{\tau,j}(f_j)| \right\|_2^2 &\lesssim \left\| \left( \sup_{\tau,j} |\tilde{K}_{\tau,j}| \right) * \sum_j |f_j| \right\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \left\| \sum_j |f_j| \right\|_2^2 = \sum_j \|f_j\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we use the fact that the supports of  $f_j$ 's are disjoint. This gives (3.25), and therefore we complete the proof of Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** Another approach to prove (3.25) is as follows: We first derive the explicit expression of the kernel of  $S_{\tau,j}$  using the method of stationary phase. Then, we conclude (3.25) via a similar idea in [Tao02]. However, the explicit expression of the kernel of  $S_{\tau,j}$  is not straightforward since it depends on the bump function  $\varphi_\tau$ . We anticipate that proving (3.25) by using this method would require more effort.

**3.3.  $L^4$  orthogonality.** In this subsection, we examine the orthogonality in  $L^4$  concerning functions whose Fourier transforms are distributed around a neighborhood of the circle  $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |\xi| = 1\}$ . Recall that  $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{[R]}\}$  is a collection of  $1/R$ -separated real numbers in  $[1, 2]$ . For given  $j \in [1, R] \cap \mathbb{Z}$  and a cap  $\tau$ , let  $f_{\tau,j}$  be a function whose Fourier transform is supported in  $C_\tau \cap A_{t_j,R}$ , where  $C_\tau$  is the conic region of the cap  $\tau$  defined as in (1.17) and  $A_{t_j,R}$  is the annulus given by (3.6). We use  $\mathcal{J}_\tau$  to denote a subset of  $[1, R] \cap \mathbb{Z}$  which may depend on  $\tau$ . For any interval  $I$  in  $[1/2, 2]$  and any cap  $\tau$ , we define

$$(3.30) \quad \mathcal{J}_{\tau,I} = \{j \in \mathcal{J}_\tau : t_j \in I\}.$$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\alpha < \beta$  be two numbers in  $[R^{-1/2}, 1]$ , and  $\tau_0, \tau'_0$  be two  $\beta$ -caps with  $\text{dist}(\tau_0, \tau'_0) \lesssim \beta$ . Given an  $R\alpha$ -ball  $B$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_B, \mathcal{T}'_B$  be two collections of finitely overlapping  $\alpha$ -caps with  $\#\mathcal{T}_B, \#\mathcal{T}'_B \lesssim \mu_1$  such that  $\tau \subset \tau_0, \tau' \subset \tau'_0$  for any  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_B, \tau' \in \mathcal{T}'_B$ . Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{I\}$  be a finitely overlapping  $\alpha\beta^{-1}$ -intervals in  $[1/2, 2]$ . Suppose also that there is a number  $\mu_2$  such that for each  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_B \cup \mathcal{T}'_B$ ,  $\#\{I \in \mathcal{I} : \mathcal{J}_{\tau,I} \neq \emptyset\} \sim \mu_2$ . Then*

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_B \left| \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_B} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_\tau} f_{\tau,j} \right|^2 \left| \sum_{\tau' \in \mathcal{T}'_B} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau'}} f_{\tau',j'} \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \mu_1 \mu_2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_B} \sum_{\tau' \in \mathcal{T}'_B} \sum_{I, I' \in \mathcal{I}} \int_{2B} \left| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau,I}} f_{\tau,j} \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau',I'}} f_{\tau',j'} \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let us define  $F_{\tau,I}$  as

$$(3.32) \quad F_{\tau,I} := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau,I}} f_{\tau,j}.$$

Henceforth, it suffices to show that

$$(3.33) \quad \int_B \left| \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_B} \sum_I F_{\tau, I} \right|^2 \left| \sum_{\tau' \in \mathcal{T}'_B} \sum_{I'} F_{\tau', I'} \right|^2 \lesssim \mu_1 \mu_2 \sum_{\tau, \tau'} \sum_{I, I'} \int_{2B} |F_{\tau, I}|^2 |F_{\tau', I'}|^2.$$

Observe that  $F_{\tau, I}$  has its Fourier support in  $C_\tau \cap \bigcup_{j \in I} A_{t_j, R}$ , which is a subset of an  $\alpha\beta^{-1} \times \alpha$ -rectangle, denoted by  $R_{\tau, I}$ .

Let  $\psi_B$  be a Schwartz function such that its Fourier transform is essentially supported on an  $(R\alpha)^{-1}$ -ball centered at the origin and  $1 \leq \psi_B(x)$  for any  $x \in B$ . Then the left hand side of (3.33) obeys

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L.H.S. (3.33)} &\lesssim \int \left| \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_B} \sum_I F_{\tau, I} \psi_B \right|^2 \left| \sum_{\tau' \in \mathcal{T}'_B} \sum_{I'} F_{\tau', I'} \psi_B \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau'_1, \tau'_2} \sum_{I_1, I_2, I'_1, I'_2} \int (\widehat{F}_{\tau_1, I_1} * \widehat{\psi}_B) * \overline{(\widehat{F}_{\tau'_1, I'_1} * \widehat{\psi}_B)} \cdot \overline{(\widehat{F}_{\tau_2, I_2} * \widehat{\psi}_B)} * (\widehat{F}_{\tau'_2, I'_2} * \widehat{\psi}_B), \end{aligned}$$

where the sum is taken over all  $(\tau_1, I_1), (\tau'_1, I'_1), (\tau_2, I_2), (\tau'_2, I'_2)$  such that

$$(3.34) \quad (R_{\tau_1, I_1} + R_{\tau'_1, I'_1}) \cap (R_{\tau_2, I_2} + R_{\tau'_2, I'_2}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus, by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.33) &\lesssim \sum_{\tau_1, I_1, \tau'_1, I'_1} \left( \int |(\widehat{F}_{\tau_1, I_1} * \widehat{\psi}_B) * \overline{(\widehat{F}_{\tau'_1, I'_1} * \widehat{\psi}_B)}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \sum_{\tau_2, I_2, \tau'_2, I'_2} \left( \int |(\widehat{F}_{\tau_2, I_2} * \widehat{\psi}_B) * \overline{(\widehat{F}_{\tau'_2, I'_2} * \widehat{\psi}_B)}|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the sum of  $(\tau_2, I_2, \tau'_2, I'_2)$  is taken under (3.34). Because each  $\tau$  and  $\tau'$  lie in a  $O(R^\varepsilon\beta)$ -conic region for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , those rectangles  $R_{\tau_1, I_1}, R_{\tau'_1, I'_1}, R_{\tau_2, I_2}, R_{\tau'_2, I'_2}$  can be essentially viewed as rectangles pointing to one direction. Hence, we see that for a fixed quadruple  $(\tau_1, \tau'_1, I_1, I'_1)$ , there are  $\lesssim \mu_1 \mu_2$  quadruples  $(\tau_2, \tau'_2, I_2, I'_2)$  such that (3.34) holds. Therefore, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L.H.S. (3.33)} &\lesssim \mu_1 \mu_2 \sum_{\tau, I, \tau', I'} \int |(\widehat{F}_{\tau, I} * \widehat{\psi}_B) * \overline{(\widehat{F}_{\tau', I'} * \widehat{\psi}_B)}|^2 \\ &\lesssim \mu_1 \mu_2 \sum_{\tau, \tau'} \sum_{I, I'} \int_{2B} |F_{\tau, I}|^2 |F_{\tau', I'}|^2, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

The foundation of the other lemma relies on a straightforward geometric insight as stated in [Car83]. An analogous outcome can also be discovered in Section 10 of [GJW21].

**Lemma 3.7.** *Given  $\alpha \in [R^{-1/2}, 1]$ , let  $\tau, \tau'$  be two  $\alpha$ -caps and  $j, j' \in [1, R] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ . Then*

$$(3.35) \quad \int |f_{\tau, j}|^2 |f_{\tau', j'}|^2 dx \lesssim \sum_{\theta \subset \tau} \sum_{\theta' \subset \tau'} \int |f_{\theta, j}|^2 |f_{\theta', j'}|^2 dx.$$

Here  $\theta$  and  $\theta'$  are  $R^{-1/2}$ -caps forming partitions for  $\tau$  and  $\tau'$ , respectively.

*Proof.* We represent

$$(3.36) \quad f_{\tau,j} = \sum_{\theta} f_{\theta,j} \quad \text{and} \quad f_{\tau',j'} = \sum_{\theta'} f_{\theta',j'}.$$

By the Plancherel theorem, we have

$$(3.37) \quad \int |f_{\tau,j}|^2 |f_{\tau',j'}|^2 dx = \sum_{\theta_1, \theta'_1, \theta_2, \theta'_2} \int \widehat{f_{\theta_1,j}} * \widehat{f_{\theta'_1,j'}} \widehat{f_{\theta_2,j}} * \widehat{f_{\theta'_2,j'}},$$

where  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \subset \tau$  and  $\theta'_1, \theta'_2 \subset \tau'$  are  $R^{-1/2}$ -caps. For  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , the function  $\widehat{f_{\theta_k,j}} * \widehat{f_{\theta'_k,j'}}$  is supported in

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{f_{\theta_k,j}}) + \text{supp}(\widehat{f_{\theta'_k,j'}}).$$

Note that  $f_{\theta,j}$  has its Fourier transform supported in  $C_{\tau} \cap A_{t_j, R}$ , which is essentially a rectangle of dimensions  $R^{-1} \times R^{-1/2}$ . The key geometric observation is that the sets  $\text{supp}(\widehat{f_{\theta_k,j}}) + \text{supp}(\widehat{f_{\theta'_k,j'}})$  are finitely overlapped for all  $\theta_k \subset \tau$  and all  $\theta'_k \subset \tau'$ . Consequently, combining this geometric observation with (3.37), we derive that

$$\int |f_{\tau,j}|^2 |f_{\tau',j'}|^2 dx \lesssim \int \sup_{\theta, \theta'} |\widehat{f_{\theta,j}} * \widehat{f_{\theta',j'}}|^2,$$

which is bounded above by

$$\sum_{\theta, \theta'} \int |\widehat{f_{\theta,j}} * \widehat{f_{\theta',j'}}|^2 = \sum_{\theta, \theta'} \int |f_{\theta,j}|^2 |f_{\theta',j'}|^2 dx,$$

as desired.  $\square$

#### 4. ANALYZING THE MODEL OPERATOR: A THOROUGH INVESTIGATION

Lemma 3.2 clarifies that our focus can be narrowed down to examining the model operator defined as

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_j S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j},$$

with  $S_j = S_{t_j, R}$ ,  $\{F_j\}$  comprising disjoint subsets in the plane, and  $F_j \subset B_R$  forming unions of unit balls. To validate Theorem 1.4, it suffices to demonstrate that

**Theorem 4.1.** *For  $p = 5/3$  and any  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , we have*

$$(4.2) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j} \right\|_p \lesssim \|f\|_p.$$

Theorem 1.3 can be derived from Theorem 1.4 via Proposition 3.1. Consequently, our focus now shifts to establishing Theorem 4.1.

We initiate the proof of Theorem 4.1 by employing a broad-narrow reduction technique on our model operator (4.1), reminiscent of the broad-narrow analysis method used in the work of Bourgain and Guth in [BG11] and Guth in [Gut18].

#### 4.1. The broad-narrow analysis.

**Definition 4.2.** For any  $\rho$ -cap  $\tau$ , we define  $\tau^*$  to be the  $2(\log R)\rho$ -cap that is concentric with  $\tau$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** Fix  $j$ . For each  $x \in F_j$ , either one of the following statements is true.

- $x$  is  **$\alpha$ -broad** for some dyadic number  $R^{-1/2} < \alpha \leq 1$ . This means that there exist an  $\alpha$ -cap  $\tau$  and at least  $10 \log \log R$  many  $\alpha$ -caps  $\tau'$  contained in  $\tau^*$  such that

$$(4.3) \quad |S_{\tau',j}f(x)| \gtrsim |S_{\tau,j}f(x)| \gtrsim |S_jf(x)|.$$

- $x$  is **narrow**. This means that there exists an  $R^{-1/2}$ -cap  $\theta$  so that

$$(4.4) \quad |S_{\theta,j}f(x)| \gtrsim |S_jf(x)|.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\log R$  is a dyadic number. Let us introduce  $\lesssim \log R / \log \log R$  many scales  $\rho_0, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_n$ , where  $\rho_k = (\log R)^{-k}$  for  $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$  and  $\rho_n \approx R^{-1/2}$ . For each  $\rho_k$ , partition the unit circle into disjoint  $\rho_k$ -caps  $\{\omega_k\}$ . We establish the lemma by running the following algorithm.

First we define  $S_{\omega_0,j}f = S_jf$ . The algorithm starts from the first scale  $\rho_1$ , which we designate as the first step. In the  $k$ -th step, there is a function  $S_{\omega_{k-1},j}f$  from the  $(k-1)$ -th step whose Fourier transform is supported in  $A_{t_j,R} \cap C_{\omega_{k-1}}$ . We partition the multiplier operator  $S_{\omega_{k-1},j}$  using  $\rho_k$ -caps  $\{\omega_k\}$  so that

$$(4.5) \quad S_{\omega_{k-1},j}f = \sum_{\omega_k \subset \omega_{k-1}} S_{\omega_k,j}f.$$

If there exists a  $\rho_k$ -cap  $\omega_k$  and at least  $10 \log \log R$  many  $\rho_k$ -caps  $\omega'_k$ 's contained in  $\omega_k^*$  such that

$$(4.6) \quad |S_{\omega'_k,j}f(x)| \gtrsim |S_{\omega_k,j}f(x)| \geq (10 \log R)^{-1} |S_{\omega_{k-1},j}f(x)|,$$

then we terminate the algorithm by setting  $\alpha = \rho_k$ ,  $\tau' = \omega'_k$ , and  $\tau = \omega_k$ .

Otherwise, by the triangle inequality and pigeonholing, there exists a  $\rho_k$ -cap  $\omega_k$  satisfying

$$(4.7) \quad |S_{\omega_k,j}f(x)| \gtrsim (\log \log R)^{-1} |S_{\omega_{k-1},j}f(x)|.$$

We then proceed with the algorithm to the  $(k+1)$ -step.

If the algorithm halts at some  $k < n$ , then (4.6) satisfies the first part of the lemma, as  $k < n \lesssim \log R / \log \log R$  and due to (4.7), confirming the  $\alpha$ -broadness of  $x$ . Otherwise, for a similar rationale, there exists an  $R^{-1/2}$ -cap  $\theta$  such that

$$(4.8) \quad |S_{\theta,j}f(x)| \gtrsim |S_jf(x)|,$$

which fulfills the second part of the lemma and hence indicates the narrowness.  $\square$

**4.2. The preliminary reduction for the model operator.** Using Lemma 4.3, we partition  $F_j$  as

$$(4.9) \quad F_j = \left( \bigcup_{\alpha} E_{\alpha,j} \right) \cup E_{R^{-1/2},j},$$

where  $E_{\alpha,j}$  is a collection of the  $\alpha$ -broad points in  $F_j$ , and  $E_{R^{-1/2},j}$  is a collection of the narrow points in  $F_j$ . By pigeonholing, there exists an  $\alpha \in [R^{-1/2}, 1]$  so that

$$(4.10) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_j f \mathbf{1}_{F_j} \right\|_p^p \lesssim \left\| \sum_j S_j f \mathbf{1}_{E_{\alpha,j}} \right\|_p^p \lesssim \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau(x),j} f \mathbf{1}_{E_{\alpha,j}} \right\|_p^p,$$

where  $\tau(x)$  is an  $\alpha$ -cap depending on the variable  $x$ . Hence there exists a collection of disjoint sets  $\{F_{\tau,j}\}_{\tau,j}$  with  $F_{\tau,j} \subset E_{\alpha,j}$  so that

$$(4.11) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau(x),j} f \mathbf{1}_{E_{\alpha,j}} \right\|_p^p = \sum_{\tau} \left\| \sum_j S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{F_{\tau,j}} \right\|_p^p = \sum_{\tau} \sum_j \left\| S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{F_{\tau,j}} \right\|_p^p,$$

where  $\tau$  ranges over all  $\alpha$ -caps. For each  $\alpha$ -cap  $\tau$ , we denote the normal vector of the cap  $\tau$  at its center by  $e(\tau)$ . Divide  $B_R$  into parallel tubes of dimensions  $R\alpha \times R$ , oriented in the direction of  $e(\tau)$ . We denote the collection of these tubes as  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau}$  and let  $\mathbb{T} := \bigcup_{\tau} \mathbb{T}_{\tau}$  where  $\tau$  ranges over all  $\alpha$ -caps. For each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau}$ , let  $T_j := F_{\tau,j} \cap T$ . It is important to notice that  $\{T_j\}_{T,j}$  are disjoint. Since  $S_{\tau,j} f$  is supported in a unit ball in the frequency space,  $T_j$  can be chosen as a collection of unit balls in the physical space. For dyadic numbers  $\lambda \in [1, \alpha R^2]$  and  $\nu \in [1, R]$ , let  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu} \subset \mathbb{T}$  denote the collection of tubes  $T$  in  $\mathbb{T}$  satisfying  $\#\{j : T_j \neq \emptyset\} \sim \nu$  and  $|T_j| \sim \lambda$  for each  $j \in \{j : T_j \neq \emptyset\}$ . Since  $\{T_j\}_j$  are disjoint, it is easy to see that

$$(4.12) \quad \lambda\nu \leq \alpha R^2.$$

By pigeonholing, there exist  $\lambda, \nu$  and a set  $\mathcal{J}_T$  defined for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  so that  $|\mathcal{J}_T| \sim \nu$  and

$$(4.13) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_j \left\| S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{F_{\tau,j}} \right\|_p^p \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau} \cap \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \left\| S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j} \right\|_p^p.$$

We use  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}$  to denote  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau} \cap \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$ . This finishes our broad-narrow reduction. Henceforth, Theorem 4.1 boils down to the estimate

$$(4.14) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \left\| S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j} \right\|_p^p \lesssim \|f\|_p^p$$

for  $p = 5/3$ .

Let  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu} = \bigcup_{\tau} \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}$ . We observe that the collection  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  of  $R\alpha \times R$  tubes obeys certain non-concentration properties. To elucidate this, we utilize the language associated with Wolff's axiom.

**Definition 4.4** (Wolff's axiom with factor  $M$ ). *Let  $\rho_1 \leq \rho_2$  be two positive numbers. We say  $\mathbb{T}$ , a collection of,  $\rho_1 \times \rho_2$  tubes obeys Wolff's axiom with factor  $M$ , if any  $\rho \times \rho_2$ -tube, where  $\rho_1 \leq \rho \leq \rho_2$ , contains  $\leq M(\rho/\rho_1)$  tubes in  $\mathbb{T}$ .*

**Lemma 4.5.**  *$\mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  is a collection of  $R\alpha \times R$  tubes that obeys Wolff's axiom with a factor  $\lesssim R^2\alpha/(\lambda\nu)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $r \in [R\alpha, R]$ . Let  $\bar{T}$  be an arbitrary  $r \times R$  tube, and define  $\mathbb{T}(\bar{T}) := \{T \in \mathbb{T} : T \subset \bar{T}\}$ . It suffices to prove that  $\#\mathbb{T}(\bar{T}) \lesssim \frac{R^2\alpha}{\lambda\nu} \frac{r}{R\alpha}$ .

Notice that

$$(4.15) \quad \bar{T} \supset \bigcup_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\bar{T})} \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} T_j$$

since  $T_j$ 's are disjoint when  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$ . Thus, we see that

$$(4.16) \quad rR \sim |\bar{T}| \geq \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}(\bar{T})} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} |T_j|.$$

Since  $|T_j| \sim \lambda$ ,  $\#\mathcal{J}(T) \sim \nu$ , we obtain

$$(4.17) \quad rR \gtrsim \#\mathbb{T}(\bar{T})\lambda\nu,$$

which is exactly what we want.  $\square$

**4.3. Refinement of the reduction process for the model operator.** We now make a further reduction on the left-hand side of (4.14). By dyadic pigeonholings, for each  $\alpha$ -cap  $\tau$ , there exist a set  $\mathbb{T}'_{\tau, \lambda, \nu} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$  and a union of unit balls  $\tilde{T}_j$  for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\tau}$  and each  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$  such that

- (1)  $\tilde{T}_j \subset T_j$ , and  $|\tilde{T}_j|$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $T \in \bigcup_{\tau} \mathbb{T}'_{\tau}$  and each  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$ .
- (2)  $|S_{\tau, j} f(x) \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{T}_j}(x)|$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $x \in \tilde{T}_j$ .
- (3) We have

$$(4.18) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j} f \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{T}_j}\|_p^p \gtrsim \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p.$$

To simplify notation, we continue to denote  $\mathbb{T}'_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$  by  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ , and represent  $\tilde{T}_j$  as  $T_j$ . Therefore, we have  $|T_j| \lesssim \lambda$  for all  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda} = \bigcup_{\nu} \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$ .

Now, we shift our focus to a particular  $T_j$  and  $\|S_{\tau, j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p$ . Through a linear transformation, let's assume, without loss of generality, that  $\tau$  represents the cap  $\{e \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \text{dist}(e, e_2) \leq \alpha\}$ , where  $e_2 = (0, 1)$  denotes the vertical unit vector. Under this assumption, the Fourier transform of  $S_{\tau, j} f$  is essentially contained in the set

$$(4.19) \quad \{(\xi_1, \xi_2) : |\xi_2 - (1 - \xi_1^2)^{1/2}| \leq R^{-1} \text{ and } |\xi_1| \lesssim \alpha\}.$$

Define  $\mathcal{L}$  to be the parabolic rescaling (depending on  $T$ )

$$(4.20) \quad \mathcal{L}(x_1, x_2) = ((\alpha \log R)x_1, (\alpha \log R)^2 x_2).$$

Then, for some  $C^\infty$  function  $\phi$  with  $|\phi''| \sim 1$ , the Fourier transform of  $S_{\tau, j} f \circ \mathcal{L}$  is contained in the set

$$(4.21) \quad \{(\xi_1, \xi_2) : |\xi_2 - \phi(\xi_1)| \lesssim (\alpha \log R)^{-2} R^{-1} \text{ and } |\xi_1| \lesssim 1\}.$$

Fix  $K$  with  $K \sim \exp(\log R / \log \log R) \lesssim 1$  such that  $K^n = R(\alpha \log R)^2$  for some  $n \leq \log \log R$ . In particular,  $(\log R)^{O(n)} \lesssim 1$ . Let us define  $E_1 := \mathcal{L}(T_j)$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}(T_j)$  is contained in an  $R(\alpha \log R)^2$ -ball. Since  $|S_{\tau, j} f(x) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}(x)|$  are the same up to a constant multiple,  $|(S_{\tau, j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}) \circ \mathcal{L}(x)|$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $x \in E_1$ . By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists a set  $E_2 \subset E_1$  such that

- (1)  $|E_2| \gtrsim |E_1|$



- (2)  $|B \cap E_2|$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $K$ -balls  $B \subset \mathcal{L}(T)$ , if  $B \cap E_2 \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $E_3 := N_K(E_2)$ . By Lemma 2.2, there exists a union of  $K$ -balls  $E_4 \subset E_3$  with  $|E_4| \gtrsim |E_3|$  such that  $E_4$  is regular with some factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$ , where  $r_1 = K, r_n = R\alpha^2$ . Denote by  $E'_2 = E_2 \cap E_4$ . Since  $|B \cap E_2|$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $K$ -balls  $B \subset \mathcal{L}(T)$  if  $B \cap E_2 \neq \emptyset$  and since  $|E_4| \gtrsim |E_3|$ , we have  $|E'_2| \gtrsim |E_2|$  and hence  $|E'_2| \gtrsim |E_1|$ .

Let  $T'_j := \mathcal{L}^{-1}(E'_2)$ . Since  $|E'_2| \gtrsim |E_1|$ ,

$$(4.22) \quad \|S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T'_j}\|_p^p \gtrsim \|S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p.$$

To ease notation, let us still use  $T_j$  to denote  $T'_j$ .

Refer back to equations (4.14) and (4.18). Therefore, after another dyadic pigeonholing on  $T_j$  about the factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$ , demonstrating Theorem 4.1 boils down to showing

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $p = 5/3$  and let  $\alpha \in [R^{-1/2}, 1]$ ,  $\lambda \in [1, \alpha R^2]$  and  $\nu \in [1, R]$  be dyadic numbers obeying (4.12). Suppose  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu} = \bigcup_{\tau} \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}$ , where  $\tau$  ranges over all  $\alpha$ -caps, is a collection of  $R\alpha \times R$  tubes such that*

- (1) for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$ , there is a set  $\mathcal{J}_T$  with  $|\mathcal{J}_T| \sim \nu$ ;
- (2) for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  and each  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$ , there is a subset  $T_j$  of  $T$  such that  $T_j$  is a union of unit balls and  $|T_j| \lesssim \lambda$ . Moreover, for all  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$ ,  $T_j$ 's are pairwise disjoint and  $|T_j|$ 's are the same up to a constant multiple;
- (3) if  $\alpha > R^{-1/2}$ , then any  $x \in T_j$  is  $\alpha$ -broad whenever  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$ ;
- (4)  $|S_{\tau,j} f(x) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}(x)|$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all  $x \in T_j$ ;
- (5)  $N_K(\mathcal{L}(T_j))$  is regular with some uniform factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$  for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}_T$ , where  $r_1 = K, r_n = R\alpha^2$ .

Then we have

$$(4.23) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p \lesssim \|f\|_p^p.$$

## 5. TECHNICAL ESTIMATES AND WRAPPING UP THE PROOF

In this section, we provide a proof of Proposition 4.6. We'll derive certain  $L^2$ -estimates and  $L^{4/3}$ -estimates, followed by employing interpolation to complete the proof.

Before stating the first  $L^2$  estimate, we recall that the parabolic rescaling mapping  $\mathcal{L}$  defined in (4.20) transforms the image of a  $R\alpha \times R$  tube  $T \in \mathbb{T}$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{L}(T)$ , into a rectangle of dimensions  $R(\alpha \log R)^2 \times R\alpha^2 \log R$ , which is contained in an  $R(\alpha \log R)^2$ -ball.

**Definition 5.1.** *Let  $r \leq R(\alpha \log R)$ . For a given  $R\alpha \times R$  tube  $T$ , we call an  $r \times r(\alpha \log R)^{-1}$  tube  $Q$  an  $r$ -pseudo ball, if  $\mathcal{L}(Q) \subset \mathcal{L}(T)$  is an  $r(\alpha \log R)$ -ball.*

Initially, we establish a basic yet useful lemma regarding the  $r$ -pseudo ball.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$  and  $\tilde{T}$  be an  $R^{1/2} \times R$  tube contained in  $T$ . Then*

$$(5.1) \quad \#\{Q : Q \cap \tilde{T} \cap T_j \neq \emptyset\} \lesssim \kappa_n(\alpha \log R) R^{1/2},$$

where  $Q$  denotes an  $R^{1/2}$ -pseudo ball and  $T_j$  is given as in Proposition 4.6.

*Proof.* Observe that  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{T})$  becomes an  $R^{1/2}(\alpha \log R) \times R(\alpha \log R)^2$  tube. Since  $N_K(\mathcal{L}(T_j))$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$ , we have

$$(5.2) \quad \#\{\mathcal{L}(Q) : \mathcal{L}(Q) \cap \mathcal{L}(\tilde{T}) \cap \mathcal{L}(T_j) \neq \emptyset\} \lesssim \kappa_n(\alpha \log R)R^{1/2},$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ , an  $R^{1/2}(\alpha \log R)$ -ball, is the image set of an  $R^{1/2}$ -pseudo ball  $Q$ . Clearly, (5.1) follows from (5.2).  $\square$

**5.1. An application of the refined  $L^2$  estimates for the regular set.** The subsequent lemma emerges as a corollary of Proposition 1.11, presenting refined  $L^2$ -estimates for the regular set.

**Lemma 5.3.** *With the same assumption as Proposition 4.6, we have*

$$(5.3) \quad \|S_{\tau,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_2^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^{-1} \left( \frac{\lambda}{R^2\alpha} \right) \|S_{\tau^*,j}f\|_2^2,$$

and

$$(5.4) \quad \|S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{T_j})\|_2^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k} \|f\mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_2^2.$$

In addition, if  $Q \subset T$  is an  $R^{1/2}$ -pseudo ball, then

$$(5.5) \quad \|S_{\tau,j}(f\mathbf{1}_{T_j}\mathbf{1}_Q)\|_2^2 \lesssim (R^{-1/2}\alpha^{-1}) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \kappa_{r_k} \|f\mathbf{1}_{T_j}\mathbf{1}_Q\|_2^2.$$

*Proof.* Define  $E_5 := \mathcal{L}(T_j)$ . By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists a set  $E_6 \subset E_5$  such that

- (1)  $|E_6| \gtrsim |E_5| = |\mathcal{L}(T_j)|$ .
- (2)  $|B \cap E_6|$  are the same up to a constant multiple for all dyadic unit cubes  $B \subset \mathcal{L}(T)$ , if  $B \cap E_6 \neq \emptyset$ .
- (3)  $\|S_{\tau,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_2 \lesssim \|S_{\tau,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_{\mathcal{L}^{-1}(E_6)}$ .

Let  $T'_j := \mathcal{L}^{-1}(E_6)$ . Thus, we have

$$(5.6) \quad \|S_{\tau,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_2^2 \lesssim \|S_{\tau,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T'_j}\|_2^2,$$

and that for any dyadic unit cube  $B$  with  $B \cap E_6 \neq \emptyset$ ,

$$\frac{|B \cap E_6|}{|B|} \sim \frac{|E_6|}{|N_1(E_6)|}.$$

Let  $B$  be a dyadic unit cube with  $B \cap E_6 \neq \emptyset$ . Since any  $x \in T'_j$  is a broad point, there exists a set of finitely overlapping  $\alpha$ -caps  $\{\sigma\}$  with  $\#\{\sigma\} \geq 10 \log \log R$  such that

$$|S_{\sigma,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T'_j} \circ \mathcal{L}| \gtrsim |S_{\tau,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T'_j} \circ \mathcal{L}|$$

in  $E_6 \cap B$  for any  $\sigma$ . Since  $S_{\tau,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T'_j} \circ \mathcal{L}$ ,  $S_{\sigma,j}f\mathbf{1}_{T'_j} \circ \mathcal{L}$  are essentially constant on a unit cube (or ball), we have any  $\sigma$ ,

$$(5.7) \quad \|S_{\sigma,j}f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \gtrsim \|S_{\tau,j}f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \sim \frac{|N_1(E_6)|}{|E_6|} \|S_{\tau,j}f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2(E_6 \cap B)}^2.$$

Thus, by taking  $M = 10 \log \log R$  in the broad norm as given in Definition 1.8,

$$(5.8) \quad \|S_{\tau,j}f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \lesssim \|S_{\tau^*,j}f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2_{\text{br}M}(B)}^2.$$

Applying (5.7) and (5.8) and summing up all dyadic unit cubes  $B$  with  $B \cap E_6 \neq \emptyset$ , we get

$$(5.9) \quad \|S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T'_j} \circ \mathcal{L}\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{|E_6|}{|N_1(E_6)|} \sum_{B, B \cap E_6 \neq \emptyset} \|S_{\tau^*,j} f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2.$$

Let  $F := N_K(E_6)$ , which is also a union of  $K$ -balls  $\{B_K\}$ . Then

$$(5.10) \quad \sum_{B, B \cap E_6 \neq \emptyset} \|S_{\tau^*,j} f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B)}^2 \lesssim K^2 \sum_{B_K \subset F} \|S_{\tau^*,j} f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B_K)}^2.$$

Apply (1.21) in Proposition 1.11 (see also Remark 1.12) so that

$$(5.11) \quad \sum_{B_K \subset F} \|S_{\tau^*,j} f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_{L^2_{\text{br}_M}(B_K)}^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^{-1} \left( \frac{|F|}{R^2(\alpha \log R)^4} \right) \|S_{\tau^*,j} f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_2^2.$$

Note that  $|F| \lesssim K^2 |N_1(E_6)| \lesssim |N_1(E_6)|$ . From (5.6), (5.9), (5.10) and (5.11), it follows that

$$(5.12) \quad \|S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j} \circ \mathcal{L}\|_2^2 \lesssim \|S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T'_j} \circ \mathcal{L}\|_2^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^{-1} \left( \frac{|E_6|}{R^2(\alpha \log R)^4} \right) \|S_{\tau^*,j} f \circ \mathcal{L}\|_2^2.$$

Recall that  $|E_5| \geq |E_6| \gtrsim |E_5| = |\mathcal{L}(T_j)| = (\alpha \log R)^3 |T_j|$  and  $|T_j| \lesssim \lambda$ . Plug these to the above estimate and rescale to obtain (5.3).

The proof for (5.4) and (5.5) essentially follows the same logic. Here, we'll solely focus on verifying (5.5). Employing duality, it's enough to establish, for an  $L^2$  function  $g$ :

$$(5.13) \quad \|S_{\tau,j} g\|_{L^2(T_j \cap Q)}^2 \lesssim (R^{-1/2} \alpha^{-1}) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \kappa_{r_k} \|S_{\tau,j} g\|_2^2.$$

Since  $\mathcal{L}(T_j)$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_n})$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{L}(T_j \cap Q)$  is regular with factors  $(\kappa_{r_1}, \dots, \kappa_{r_{n-1}}, R^{-1/2}(\alpha \log R)^{-1})$ . By applying (1.22) from Proposition 1.11, we obtain (5.3), as desired.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.4.** *We have the following  $L^2$  estimate*

$$(5.14) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau,j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_2^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^{-1} \left( \frac{\lambda}{R^2 \alpha} \right) \|f\|_2^2.$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\{\tau^*\}_{\tau}$  are log  $R$ -overlapping. (5.14) follows from summing up (5.3) for all possible  $j, T, \tau$  and then employing Plancherel's theorem.  $\square$

## 5.2. $L^2$ estimates via the local $L^2$ conclusion and Kakeya-type results.

We need one more quantitative version of the  $L^2$  estimates. To achieve that, let us make further reductions on the left-hand side of (4.23).

Partition  $B_R$  into  $R\alpha$ -cubes  $B$ 's. By pigeonholing, we can find a collection of  $R\alpha$ -cubes, denoted by  $\mathcal{B}$ , and a subset  $\mathbb{T}'_{\tau,\lambda,\nu} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}$  so that

- (1)  $\|f \mathbf{1}_B\|_p$ , for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , are the same up to a constant multiple;

(2) for all  $T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ ,

$$(5.15) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p$$

are the same up to a constant multiple;

(3) we have

$$(5.16) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p.$$

To simplify notation, we continue to use  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$  to represent  $\mathbb{T}'_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}$  to represent  $\bigcup_{\tau} \mathbb{T}'_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}_{\beta} \subset \mathcal{B}$  be the collection of  $R\alpha$ -cubes such that  $2B$  intersects  $\sim \beta$   $R\alpha \times R$ -tubes in  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}$  for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}$ . By dyadic pigeonholings, we can find a dyadic number  $\beta$  and a collection of tubes  $\mathbb{T}_{\beta} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}$  so that

(1)  $|\mathbb{T}_{\beta}| \gtrsim |\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}|$ .

(2) For each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\beta}$ , we have

$$(5.17) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p \lesssim \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p.$$

(3) For each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\beta}$ ,  $\#\{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta} : B \subset T\}$  are the same up to a constant multiple.

Denote  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau, \beta} = \mathbb{T}_{\beta} \cap \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ . As a result, we have

$$(5.18) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \beta}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p.$$

Our second proposition in this section is the following  $L^2$  estimate.

**Proposition 5.5.** *For a fixed  $\beta$ , we have*

$$(5.19) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \beta}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_2^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{R^2 \alpha}{\lambda \nu}\right) \beta^{-1} \|f\|_2^2.$$

The proposition is built on Lemma 3.4, a local  $L^2$ -estimate associated a single ball (or cube), and the following Keakeya-type lemma.

**Lemma 5.6.** *For fixed  $\beta$ , we have*

$$(5.20) \quad (\#\mathcal{B}_{\beta})/(\#\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}) \lesssim [(R^2 \alpha)/(\lambda \nu)] \cdot (\alpha \beta^2)^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* This follows from Keakeya estimates in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Indeed, by the definition of  $\mathcal{B}_{\beta}$ ,

$$(5.21) \quad \beta^2 |B| (\#\mathcal{B}_{\beta}) \lesssim \int \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}} \mathbf{1}_T \right)^2 \lesssim \sum_{T_1 \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}} \sum_{T_2 \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}} |T_1 \cap T_2|.$$

By Lemma 4.5, we see that  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}$  is a collection of  $R\alpha \times R$ -tubes obeying Wolff's axiom with factor  $R^2 \alpha / (\lambda \nu)$ . Henceforth, we have

$$(5.22) \quad \sum_{T_2 \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}} |T_1 \cap T_2| \lesssim R^2 \alpha / (\lambda \nu) |T_1|.$$

From (5.21) and (5.22), it follows that

$$\beta^2 |B| (\#\mathcal{B}_{\beta}) \lesssim R^2 \alpha / (\lambda \nu) |T| (\#\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}),$$

which proves the lemma since  $|B| \sim \alpha|T|$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.5.* Note that the kernel of  $S_{\tau,j}$  decays rapidly outside an  $R\alpha \times R$  tube, centered at the origin, with the direction  $e(\tau)$ . By the triangle inequality, for a fixed  $R\alpha \times R$  tube  $T \in \bigcup_{\tau} \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\beta}$ , we have

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int \left| S_{\tau,j} \left( \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B \right) \mathbf{1}_{T_j} \right|^2 \lesssim \#\{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta : B \subset T\} \sum_{B \subset T} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int |S_{\tau,j}(f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}|^2.$$

Recall that  $\#\{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta : B \subset T\}$ , for all  $T \in \mathbb{T}_\beta$ , are the same up to a constant multiple. Hence

$$(5.23) \quad \#\{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta : B \subset T\} \lesssim \beta(\#\mathcal{B}_\beta)/(\#\mathbb{T}_\beta),$$

and we have

$$(5.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\beta}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \left\| S_{\tau,j} \left( \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B \right) \mathbf{1}_{T_j} \right\|_2^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\beta}} \#\{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta : B \subset T\} \sum_{B \subset T} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int |S_{\tau,j}(f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}|^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{\beta(\#\mathcal{B}_\beta)}{\#\mathbb{T}_\beta} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} \sum_{\tau} \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\beta} \\ T \supset B}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int |S_{\tau,j}(f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for fixed  $\tau$ , there are only  $O(1)$   $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\beta}$  such that  $B \subset 2T$ . Invoke Lemma 3.4 so that

$$(5.25) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\beta} \\ T \supset B}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int |S_{\tau,j}(f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}|^2 \lesssim \alpha \|f \mathbf{1}_B\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, combining (5.24) and (5.25), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\beta}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \left\| S_{\tau,j} \left( \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B \right) \mathbf{1}_{T_j} \right\|_2^2 & \lesssim \alpha \beta (\#\mathcal{B}_\beta) / (\#\mathbb{T}_\beta) \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} \|f \mathbf{1}_B\|_2^2 \\ & \lesssim \alpha \beta (\#\mathcal{B}_\beta) / (\#\mathbb{T}_\beta) \|f\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

and the proposition follows from Lemma 5.6 since  $\#\mathbb{T}_\beta \gtrsim \#\mathbb{T}_{\lambda,\nu}$ .  $\square$

**5.3.  $L^4$ -estimates for the dual operator.** The ultimate proposition in this section offers an  $L^{4/3}$  estimate, which we will establish by examining its dual form in  $L^4$ .

**Proposition 5.7.** *Fix  $\beta$ . We have the  $L^{4/3}$  estimate*

$$(5.26) \quad \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int |S_{\tau,j} \left( \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B \right) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}|^{4/3} \lesssim \beta^{1/3} \nu^{2/3} \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_k^{2/3} \|f\|_{4/3}^{4/3}.$$

*Proof.* Using the duality between  $L^{4/3}$  and  $L^4$ , it suffices to prove that

$$(5.27) \quad \int \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,\lambda,\nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} S_{\tau,j} \left( \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B \right) f_{T_j} \lesssim \beta^{1/4} \nu^{1/2} \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_k^{1/2} \|f\|_{4/3} \| \{f_{T_j}\} \|_{L^4(\ell^4)},$$

where  $\|\{f_{T_j}\}\|_{L^4(\ell^4)}$  denotes

$$\left( \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int |f_{T_j}|^4 \right)^{1/4},$$

and  $f_{T_j}$  is a function supported on  $T_j$ . Note that

$$\int \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} S_{\tau, j} \left( \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} f \mathbf{1}_B \right) f_{T_j} = \int f \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B.$$

Hence by Hölder's inequality, it suffices to prove that

$$(5.28) \quad \int \left| \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B \right|^4 \lesssim \beta \nu^2 \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_k^2 \|\{f_{T_j}\}\|_{L^4(\ell^4)}^4.$$

We will investigate the integrand of the above estimate, that is,

$$(5.29) \quad \left| \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B(x) \right|.$$

In parallel with the broad-to-narrow reduction outlined in Lemma 4.3, for every point  $x$  within  $B_R$ , one of the following statements holds concerning (5.29):

**A:**  $x$  is  $\alpha_1$ -**broad** for some dyadic number  $R^{-1/2} < \alpha_1 \leq 1$ . This means that there exist two caps  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau'_1$  with  $(\log R)\alpha_1 \gtrsim \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \gtrsim \alpha_1$ , and  $|\tau_1|, |\tau'_1| \sim \alpha_1$ , such that one of the following conditions holds:

(1) If  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha$ , then for  $\omega \in \{\tau_1, \tau'_1\}$ ,

$$(5.30) \quad (5.29) \lesssim \left| \sum_{\tau \subset \omega} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B(x) \right|.$$

(2) If  $\alpha_1 < \alpha$ , then there exists an  $\alpha$ -cap  $\tau$  such that  $\tau_1, \tau'_1 \subset \tau$ , and for  $\omega \in \{\tau_1, \tau'_1\}$ , we have

$$(5.31) \quad (5.29) \lesssim \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} S_{\omega, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B(x) \right|.$$

**B:**  $x$  is **narrow**. This means that there exists an  $R^{-1/2}$ -cap  $\theta$  and an  $\alpha_1$ -cap  $\tau$  such that  $\theta \subset \tau$  and

$$(5.32) \quad (5.29) \lesssim \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B(x) \right|.$$

The proof of this dichotomy is almost identical to the one in Lemma 4.3. More precisely, this broad-narrow process can be carried out through an iteration commencing with the initial scale for  $\alpha_1$  approximately equal to 1. It concludes when reaching the scale of  $R^{-1/2}$ . We omit its details here.

Hence we see that there is a dyadic number  $\alpha_1 \in [R^{-1/2}, 1]$  such that

$$(5.33) \quad \int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \int_{E_{\alpha_1}} \left| \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta}} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B \right|^4,$$

where  $E_{\alpha_1}$  refers to the set of  $\alpha_1$ -broad points if  $\alpha_1$  falls within the interval  $(R^{-1/2}, 1]$ , and it signifies the set of narrow points if  $\alpha_1 = R^{-1/2}$ .

Let's examine two distinct scenarios based on the magnitude of  $\alpha_1$ :

- Case I, where  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha$ ;
- Case II, where  $\alpha_1 < \alpha$ .

**Case I**, where  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha$ . Partition the interval  $[1/2, 2]$  into  $\alpha\alpha_1^{-1}$ -intervals  $\{I\}$ . For each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ , decompose  $\mathcal{J}_T$  as a union of  $\mathcal{J}_T(I)$ , where  $\mathcal{J}_T(I) = \{j \in \mathcal{J}_T : t_j \in I\}$ . By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists a dyadic number  $\mu$ , a tube set  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}$ , and an index set  $\mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}$  for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}$  such that

- (1)  $\#\mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}(I) \sim \mu$  whenever  $\mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}(I) = \{j \in \mathcal{J}_{T, \mu} : t_j \in I\} \neq \emptyset$ .
- (2) We have

$$(5.34) \quad \int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \int_{E_{\alpha_1}} \left| \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \mathbf{1}_B \right|^4.$$

Note that for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ ,  $\#\mathcal{J}_T \sim \nu$ . Thus we have

$$(5.35) \quad \#\{I : \mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}(I) \neq \emptyset\} \lesssim \nu/\mu.$$

We provide proof details exclusively for the scenario where  $\alpha_1 > R^{-1/2}$ , as the narrow case can be addressed in a similar manner. By the definition of  $\alpha_1$ -broad, we see that

$$\int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \sum_{\tau_1} \sum_{\substack{\tau'_1 \\ \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1}} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} \mathfrak{S}_{\tau_1, \tau'_1, B},$$

where  $\tau_1, \tau'_1$  are  $\alpha_1$ -caps and  $\mathfrak{S}_{\tau_1, \tau'_1, B}$  is defined as

$$(5.36) \quad \int_B \left| \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \right|^2 \left| \sum_{\tau' \subset \tau'_1} \sum_{T' \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau', \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J}_{T', \mu}} S_{\tau', j'}(f_{T'_{j'}}) \right|^2.$$

Here  $\tau, \tau'$  are  $\alpha$ -caps. Apply Lemma 3.6 to (5.36) so that

$$(5.36) \lesssim \beta(\nu/\mu) \cdot \sum_{\substack{\tau \subset \tau_1 \\ \tau' \subset \tau'_1}} \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu} \\ T' \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau', \lambda, \mu, \nu}}} \sum_{I, I'} \int_{2B} \left| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}(I)} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J}_{T', \mu}(I')} S_{\tau', j'}(f_{T'_{j'}}) \right|^2.$$

Summing up all  $\tau_1, \tau'_1$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int |(5.29)|^4 \\ & \lesssim \beta(\nu/\mu) \sum_{\substack{\tau_1, \tau'_1 \\ \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1}} \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{I, I'} \int \left| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}(I)} S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j}) \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J}_{T', \mu}(I')} S_{\tau', j'}(f_{T'_{j'}}) \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the index sets  $\mathcal{J}_{T, \mu}(I)$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{T', \mu}(I')$ , then invoke Lemma 3.7. Consequently, we arrive at

$$\int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \beta \nu \mu \sum_{\substack{\tau_1, \tau'_1 \\ \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1}} \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{\substack{\theta \subset \tau' \\ \theta' \subset \tau'}} \int |S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j})|^2 |S_{\theta', j'}(f_{T'_{j'}})|^2.$$

For each  $\tau_1$ , partition  $B_R$  into  $R\alpha_1 \times R$ -rectangles  $\{T_{\tau_1}\}$ , pointing the direction  $e(\tau_1)$ . Since for  $\theta \subset \tau_1 \cup \tau'_1$ , the kernel of  $S_{\theta,j}$  decays rapidly outside an  $R\alpha_1 \times R$ -rectangle, centered at the origin, with the direction  $e(\tau_1)$ . Thus we have

(5.37)

$$\int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \beta\nu\mu \cdot \sum_{\tau_1, T_{\tau_1}} \sum_{\substack{\tau'_1 \\ \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1}} \sum_{\substack{\tau \subset \tau_1 \\ \tau' \subset \tau'_1}} \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu} \\ T' \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau', \lambda, \mu, \nu}}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{\substack{\theta \subset \tau \\ \theta' \subset \tau'}} \int |S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})|^2 |S_{\theta',j'}(f_{T'_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})|^2.$$

Given that  $|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})|$  remains nearly constant within any  $R^{1/2} \times R$ -tube oriented along  $e(\theta)$ , and considering the bilinear condition  $\text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \gtrsim \alpha_1$ , it becomes evident that

(5.38)

$$\int |S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})|^2 |S_{\theta',j'}(f_{T'_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})|^2 \lesssim R^{-2} \alpha_1^{-1} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})\|_2^2 \|S_{\theta',j'}(f_{T'_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})\|_2^2.$$

In the specific scenario where  $\alpha_1 = R^{-1/2}$ , it's worth mentioning that (5.38) remains valid even without relying on the bilinear structure.

Note that  $\#\{\tau'_1, \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1\} \lesssim 1$ . We can thus sum up all  $\tau \subset \tau_1, \theta, T, j$  and their minors in (5.37) to get

$$\int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \beta\nu\mu R^{-2} \alpha_1^{-1} \sum_{\tau_1} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \left( \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})\|_2^2 \right)^2.$$

Invoke (5.4) to obtain

$$(5.39) \quad \|S_{\tau,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})\|_2^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k} \|f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}}\|_2^2,$$

which yields

(5.40)

$$\int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \beta\nu\mu \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^2 R^{-2} \alpha_1^{-1} \sum_{\tau_1} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \left( \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}}\|_2^2 \right)^2.$$

Because the supports of  $f_{T_j}$ 's are disjoint, employing the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}}\|_2^2 \right)^2 &= \left\| \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}} \right\|_2^4 \\ &\lesssim R^2 \alpha_1 \left\| \sum_{\tau \subset \tau_1} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \mu, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}} \right\|_4^4. \end{aligned}$$

By summing up all  $T_{\tau_1}$  for  $\tau_1$ , and observing that  $\mu \lesssim \nu$ , we ultimately obtain

$$(5.41) \quad \int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \beta\nu^2 \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^2 \|\{f_{T_j}\}\|_{L^4(\ell^4)}^4.$$



This leads to (5.28) and completes the discussion for the case where  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha$ .

**Case II**, where  $\alpha_1 < \alpha$ . Let us assume  $\alpha_1 > R^{-1/2}$ . The narrow case  $\alpha_1 = R^{-1/2}$  can be proved similarly. Since  $\alpha_1 < \alpha$ , there is only one  $\tau$  making contribution in (5.29), so we may discard the information from  $\mathcal{B}_\beta$ . By the definition of  $\alpha_1$ -broad, we have

$$\int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{\substack{\tau'_1 \\ \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1}} \int \left| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} S_{\tau_1, j}(f_{T_j}) \right|^2 \left| \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J}_T} S_{\tau'_1, j'}(f_{T_{j'}}) \right|^2.$$

Apply Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and then Lemma 3.7 on the  $L^4$  orthogonality to get

$$(5.42) \quad \int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{\substack{\tau'_1 \\ \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{J}_T \\ \theta \subset \tau_1}} \sum_{\substack{j' \in \mathcal{J}_T \\ \theta' \subset \tau'_1}} \nu^2 \int |S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j})|^2 |S_{\theta', j'}(f_{T_{j'}})|^2.$$

For every  $\tau_1$  and each tube  $T$  with dimensions  $R\alpha \times R$ , divide  $T$  into  $R\alpha_1 \times R$  rectangles  $\{T_{\tau_1}\}$ , oriented in the direction of  $e(\tau_1)$ . Using the decay property of the kernel  $S_{\theta, j}$ , analogous to our approach in the first scenario, we obtain that

$$(5.43) \quad \int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \nu^2 \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{\substack{\tau'_1 \\ \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{j' \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{T_{\tau_1} \subset T} \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1} \sum_{\theta' \subset \tau'_1} \int_{T_{\tau_1}} |S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})|^2 |S_{\theta', j'}(f_{T_{j'}} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})|^2.$$

Since  $|S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})|$  is essentially constant on any  $R^{1/2} \times R$ -tube with the direction of  $e(\theta)$  and since  $\text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \gtrsim \alpha_1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{T_{\tau_1}} |S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})|^2 |S_{\theta', j'}(f_{T_{j'}} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})|^2 \\ & \lesssim R^{-2} \alpha_1^{-1} \|S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \|S_{\theta', j'}(f_{T_{j'}} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up all  $\theta, j$  and their minors and noting  $\#\{\tau'_1, \text{dist}(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \approx \alpha_1\} \lesssim 1$ , we have

$$(5.44) \quad \int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \frac{\nu^2}{R^2 \alpha_1} \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{\substack{\tau_1 \subset \tau \\ T_{\tau_1} \subset T}} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \right)^2.$$

Let us fix a  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ . Partition the  $T$  into  $R^{1/2}$ -pseudo balls  $\{Q\}$ . Since  $T_j$  is a regular set with factors  $(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n)$ , we see that  $\#\{Q : Q \cap \tilde{T} \cap T_j \neq \emptyset\} \lesssim \kappa_n \alpha R^{1/2}$  for any  $R^{1/2} \times R$  tube  $\tilde{T}$  by (5.1) in Lemma 5.2. Let  $\{\tilde{T}\}$  be a collection of  $R^{1/2} \times R$  tubes with direction  $e(\theta)$  that form a finitely overlapping partition of the  $R\alpha \times R$  tube  $T$ . Since the kernel of  $S_{\theta, j}$  decays rapidly outside an  $R^{1/2} \times R$  tube, centered at the origin, with the direction of  $e(\theta)$ , we have

$$(5.45) \quad \|S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\tilde{T}} \|S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{T}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2.$$

From Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and estimate (5.1) in Lemma 5.2, it follows that

$$(5.46) \quad \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{T}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \lesssim \kappa_n \alpha R^{1/2} \sum_{Q \subset \tilde{T}} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2.$$

Combining (5.45) and (5.46), we end up with

$$(5.47) \quad \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \lesssim \kappa_n \alpha R^{1/2} \sum_{Q \subset T} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2.$$

Let  $\{Y\}$  be a cover of the  $R\alpha \times R$ -tube  $T$  using  $R\alpha \times R^{1/2}(\alpha \log R)^{-1}$ -rectangles, whose longer side is parallel to the shorter side of  $T$ . Then each  $Y$  is quantitatively transverse to  $T$  and any  $T_{\tau_1}$ . From (5.47), we get

$$(5.48) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \kappa_n^2 \alpha^2 R \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{Y \subset T} \sum_{Q \subset Y} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \kappa_n^2 \alpha^3 R^{3/2} \sum_{Y \subset T} \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{Q \subset Y} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

via Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality. Let us fix an  $R\alpha \times R^{1/2}(\alpha \log R)^{-1}$ -rectangle  $Y$  now. Partition  $Y$  further into  $R\alpha_1 \times R^{1/2}(\alpha \log R)^{-1}$ -rectangles  $Y'$  (see Figure 2) so that

$$(5.49) \quad \sum_{Q \subset Y} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 = \sum_{\substack{Y' \subset Y, \\ Y' \cap T_{\tau_1} \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{Q \subset Y'} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2.$$

Since  $Y$  is quantitatively transverse to  $T_{\tau_1}$ , there are  $O(1)$   $Y' \subset Y$  such that  $Y' \cap T_{\tau_1} \neq \emptyset$ . From this observation and (5.49), we see that

$$(5.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{Q \subset Y} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \sum_{\substack{Y' \subset Y, \\ Y' \cap T_{\tau_1} \neq \emptyset}} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{Q \subset Y'} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_{2T_{\tau_1}})\|_{L^2(T_{\tau_1})}^2 \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{T_{\tau_1}} \sum_{\substack{Y' \subset Y, \\ Y' \cap T_{\tau_1} \neq \emptyset}} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{Q \subset Y'} \|S_{\theta,j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q)\|_2^2 \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we use that the kernel of  $S_{\theta,j}$  decays rapidly outside the  $R\alpha_1 \times R$  tube, centered at the origin, with the direction of  $e(\tau_1)$ . Again, since there are  $O(1)$  many  $Y' \subset Y$  such that  $Y' \cap T_{\tau_1} \neq \emptyset$ , the double sum of (5.50) on




FIGURE 2.

$(T_{\tau_1}, Y')$  can be bounded by a single sum of  $Y'$ . Henceforth, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.50) &\lesssim \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{Y' \subset Y} \left( \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \sum_{Q \subset Y'} \|S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q)\|_2^2 \right)^2 \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{Y' \subset Y} \left( \sum_{\tau_1 \subset \tau} \sum_{\theta \subset \tau_1 \cap \tau} \sum_{Q \subset Y'} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\theta, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q)\|_2^2 \right)^2 \\
 (5.51) &\lesssim \sum_{Y' \subset Y} \left( \sum_{Q \subset Y'} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q)\|_2^2 \right)^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

For each  $\|S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q)\|_2^2$ , (5.5) gives

$$(5.52) \quad \|S_{\tau, j}(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q)\|_2^2 \lesssim \alpha^{-1} R^{-1/2} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \kappa_{r_k} \|f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q\|_2^2.$$

Plug this back to (5.51) so that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.50) &\lesssim \alpha^{-2} R^{-1} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \kappa_{r_k}^2 \sum_{Y' \subset Y} \left( \sum_{Q \subset Y'} \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_2^2 \right)^2 \\
 &\lesssim \alpha^{-2} R^{-1} (R^{3/2} \alpha_1 \alpha^{-1}) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \kappa_{r_k}^2 \sum_{Y' \subset Y} \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{Y'} \right\|_4^4 \\
 &\lesssim (\alpha^{-3} R^{1/2} \alpha_1) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \kappa_{r_k}^2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Y\|_4^4
 \end{aligned}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality. Putting this back into (5.48), and subsequently into (5.44), we arrive at

$$\int |(5.29)|^4 \lesssim \nu^2 \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^2 \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{Y \subset T} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_Y\|_4^4 \lesssim \nu^2 \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^2 \|\{f_{T_j}\}\|_{L^4(\ell^4)}^4.$$

Since  $\beta \geq 1$ , this gives (5.28) when  $\alpha_1 < \alpha$ . Therefore, we conclude the proposition.  $\square$

**5.4. Completing the proof of Proposition 4.6.** Let's establish Proposition 4.6 by utilizing Propositions 5.4, 5.5, and 5.7. Define

$$(5.53) \quad I_p(f)^p := \sum_{\tau} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_{\tau, j} f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p.$$

First, Proposition 5.4 yields

$$(5.54) \quad I_2(f)^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^{-1} \left( \frac{\lambda}{R^2 \alpha} \right) \|f\|_2^2.$$

Subsequently, utilizing (5.18), Proposition 5.5, and Propositions 5.7, we obtain

$$(5.55) \quad I_2(f)^2 \lesssim \left( \frac{R^2 \alpha}{\lambda \nu} \right) \beta^{-1} \|f\|_2^2$$

and (since  $\mathbb{T}_{\tau, \beta} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\tau, \lambda, \nu}$ )

$$(5.56) \quad I_{4/3}(f)^{4/3} \lesssim \beta^{1/3} \nu^{2/3} \prod_{k=1}^n \kappa_{r_k}^{2/3} \|f\|_{4/3}^{4/3}$$

respectively.

Given that the Fourier multiplier of  $S_{\tau, j}$  is confined within a unit ball, we may assume that  $\widehat{f}$  is supported in  $B^2(0, 2)$ , a ball centered at the origin with radius 2, implying that  $|f|$  is essentially constant within any unit ball. Furthermore, as the kernel of  $S_{\tau, j}$  exhibits rapid decay beyond the  $R$ -ball centered at the origin, we can infer that  $f$  is also supported in an  $R$ -ball. Additionally, considering the homogeneity of (4.23) in Proposition 4.6, we can assume  $|f| \leq 1$  and  $\sup |f| \sim 1$ . Consequently,  $\|f\|_{5/3} \gtrsim 1$ , as  $|f|$  essentially remains constant within any unit ball, notably within the unit ball containing  $x$  where  $|f(x)| \sim 1$ . We partition  $f$  as

$$(5.57) \quad f = \sum_{k \geq 0} f_k$$

where  $|f_k| \sim 2^{-k}$  behaves essentially like a characteristic function.

Let's tackle each  $f_k$ . Multiplying the square of (5.54) with (5.55) and the cubic of (5.56), we obtain

$$(5.58) \quad I_2(f_k)^6 I_{4/3}(f_k)^4 \lesssim \left( \frac{\lambda \nu}{R^2 \alpha} \right) \|f_k\|_2^6 \|f_k\|_{4/3}^4 \leq \|f_k\|_{5/3}^{10},$$

since  $\lambda \nu \lesssim R^2 \alpha$  by (4.12). Employing Hölder's inequality and (5.58), we derive

$$(5.59) \quad I_{5/3}(f_k) \leq I_2(f_k)^{3/5} I_{4/3}(f_k)^{2/5} \lesssim \|f_k\|_{5/3}.$$

If  $2^k \geq R^{10}$ , given that  $f$  is supported in an  $R$ -ball, we have  $\|f_k\|_{5/3} \lesssim 2^{-k/2} \|f\|_{5/3}$ . Hence, by (5.59),

$$\begin{aligned} I_{5/3}(f) &\leq \sum_{k \geq 0} I_{5/3}(f_k) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor 10 \log R \rfloor} I_{5/3}(f_k) + \sum_{k \geq 10 \log R} 2^{-k/2} \|f\|_{5/3} \\ &\lesssim (\log R) \|f\|_{5/3} \lesssim \|f\|_{5/3}. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes Proposition 4.6 and consequently our main theorem, Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

### 6. ENDING REMARK: RULING OUT TAO'S EXAMPLE

Tao's example  $f(x_1, x_2) = a(R^{-1/2}x_1)a(x_2)e^{ix_1}$  can be illustrated by Figure 3: On the frequency side,  $\widehat{f}$  appears as a bump function supported on an  $R^{-1/2} \times 1$  vertical rectangle (depicted as the shaded region in Figure 3) away from the origin. The intersection of this rectangle with any  $R^{-1}$ -annulus  $A_j$  of radius  $t_j \sim 1$  essentially forms an  $R^{-1/2} \times R^{-1}$  rectangular cap  $\theta_j$ . Specifically, if  $\text{dist}(\theta_j, \theta_k) \gtrsim R^{-1/2}$ , then  $\theta_j, \theta_k$  correspond to different directions. For example,  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$  in Figure 3 give distinct directions.




FIGURE 3.

To exclude Tao's example, one may pose the following question: If the frequency of the function  $f$  is well-localized in a horizontal  $R^{-1/2} \times 1$ -rectangle away from the origin, can we verify Conjecture 1.2? We will demonstrate that our approach can address this inquiry.

Let  $\varphi(x_1, x_2) = a(R^{-1/2}x_1)a(x_2)e^{ix_1}$  be a bump function. Define a family of frequency-localized (with respect to the horizontal rectangle given by  $\varphi$ ) operators

$$(6.1) \quad S_j^\varphi f := S_j(\varphi * f), \quad 1 \leq j \leq R.$$

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\{F_j\}_j$  be a family of disjoint subsets of  $B_R$  that each  $F_j$  is a union of unit balls. For  $p = 3/2$  and any  $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , we have*

$$(6.2) \quad \left\| \sum_j S_j^\varphi f \mathbf{1}_{F_j} \right\|_p \lesssim \|f\|_p.$$

*Sketch of proof.* Notice that the Fourier transform of the kernel of  $S_j^\varphi$  is supported in an  $R^{-1/2} \times R^{-1}$ -rectangular cap  $\theta_j$ . Hence the kernel of  $S_j^\varphi$  is essentially supported on a  $R^{1/2} \times R$ -tube with the direction  $e(\theta_j)$  centered at the origin. For a fixed  $j$ , partition  $B_R$  into finitely overlapping  $R^{1/2} \times R$ -tubes with the direction  $e(\theta_j)$ . Denote this family of  $R^{1/2} \times R$ -tubes by  $\mathbb{T}_{\theta_j}$ . For each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_{\theta_j}$ , define

$$(6.3) \quad T_j := T \cap F_j.$$

Note that the definition of  $T_j$  here agrees with the one in Section 4.

By pigeonholing, there exists a subset  $\mathbb{T}'_{\theta_j} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\theta_j}$  for any  $j$  and two numbers  $\lambda, \nu$  such that

- (1)  $|T_j| \sim \lambda$  for any  $T \in \bigcup_j \mathbb{T}'_{\theta_j}$  and any  $j$ .
- (2) For a fixed  $T \in \bigcup_j \mathbb{T}'_{\theta_j}$ ,  $\#\mathcal{J}_T \sim \nu$ , where  $\mathcal{J}_T := \{j : |T_j| \sim \lambda\}$ .
- (3)  $\|\sum_j S_j^\varphi f \mathbf{1}_{F_j}\|_p \lesssim \|\sum_j \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}'_{\theta_j}} S_j^\varphi f \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p$ .
- (4)  $\lambda \nu \lesssim R^{3/2}$ .

Let  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu} = \bigcup_j \mathbb{T}'_{\theta_j}$ . Similar to Section 5.2, there exists a factor  $R^{1/2} \gtrsim \beta \geq 1$ , a set of  $R^{1/2}$ -balls  $\mathcal{B}_\beta$ , and a tube set  $\mathbb{T}_\beta \subset \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}$  such that

- (1)  $2B$  intersects  $\sim \beta$   $R^{1/2} \times R$ -tubes in  $\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}$  for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta$ .
- (2)  $|\mathbb{T}_\beta| \gtrsim |\mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}|$
- (3) For each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_\beta$ , we have

$$(6.4) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_j^\varphi(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p \lesssim \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_j^\varphi(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_p^p.$$

- (4) For each  $T \in \mathbb{T}_\beta$ ,  $\#\{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta : B \subset T\}$  are the same up to a constant multiple.

Therefore, Proposition 5.5 implies that

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_\beta} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \|S_j^\varphi(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}\|_2^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{R^{3/2}}{\lambda \nu}\right) \beta^{-1} \|f\|_2^2.$$

On the other hand, we claim that

$$(6.6) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\lambda, \nu}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_T} \int |S_j^\varphi(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\beta} f \mathbf{1}_B) \mathbf{1}_{T_j}|^{4/3} \lesssim \beta^{1/3} \nu^{2/3} \lambda^{2/3} R^{-1} \|f\|_{4/3}^{4/3}.$$

To prove (6.6), we follow the proof of Proposition 5.7 until (5.39), with the left-hand side of (5.26) being replaced by the left-hand side of (6.6). Since for any function  $g$ ,  $S_j^\varphi g$  is essentially constant on any  $R^{1/2} \times R$ -tube in the direction of  $e(\theta_j)$ , we obtain the following stronger bound in place of (5.39):

$$(6.7) \quad \|S_j^\varphi(f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}})\|_2^2 \lesssim \lambda R^{-3/2} \|f_{T_j} \mathbf{1}_{T_{\tau_1}}\|_2^2.$$

Then, we continue following the proof of Proposition 5.7 to conclude (6.6).

Similar to the argument in Section 5.4, (6.5) and (6.6) together yield (6.2) for  $p = 3/2$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [BCT06] Jonathan Bennett, Anthony Carbery, and Terence Tao. On the multilinear restriction and keakeya conjectures. *Acta Math.*, 196(2):261–302, 2006.
- [BG11] Jean Bourgain and Larry Guth. Bounds on oscillatory integral operators based on multilinear estimates. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 21(6):1239–1295, 2011.
- [Car83] Anthony Carbery. The boundedness of the maximal Bochner-Riesz operator on  $L^4(\mathbf{R}^2)$ . *Duke Math. J.*, 50(2):409–416, 1983.
- [Cór77] Antonio Córdoba. The Keakeya maximal function and the spherical summation multipliers. *Amer. J. Math.*, 99(1):1–22, 1977.
- [CRdFV88] Anthony Carbery, José L. Rubio de Francia, and Luis Vega. Almost everywhere summability of Fourier integrals. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 38(3):513–524, 1988.
- [Fef71] Charles Fefferman. The multiplier problem for the ball. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 94:330–336, 1971.
- [GJW21] Shengwen Gan, Yifan Jing, and Shukun Wu. New bounds for Stein’s square function in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *preprint*, arXiv:2104.14731, 2021.
- [Gut18] Larry Guth. Restriction estimates using polynomial partitioning II. *Acta Math.*, 221(1):81–142, 2018.
- [GW24] Shengwen Gan and Shukun Wu. A weighted decoupling inequality and its application to the maximal Bochner-Riesz problem. *preprint*, arXiv:2403.05017, 2024.
- [Kim24] Jongchon Kim. Weighted decoupling estimates and the Bochner-Riesz means. *preprint*, arXiv:2406.03741, 2024.
- [KS19] Jongchon Kim and Andreas Seeger. Riesz means of Fourier series and integrals: strong summability at the critical index. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 372(4):2959–2999, 2019.
- [LW20] Xiaochun Li and Shukun Wu. New estimates of the maximal Bochner-Riesz operator in the plane. *Math. Ann.*, 378(3-4):873–890, 2020.
- [Ste93] Elias M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, volume 43 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.
- [Tao98] Terence Tao. The weak-type endpoint Bochner-Riesz conjecture and related topics. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 47(3):1097–1124, 1998.
- [Tao02] Terence Tao. On the maximal Bochner-Riesz conjecture in the plane for  $p < 2$ . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 354(5):1947–1959, 2002.
- [Wu23] Shukun Wu. On the Bochner-Riesz operator in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *J. Anal. Math.*, 149(2):677–718, 2023.

XIAOCHUN LI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, USA

*Email address:* `xcli@illinois.edu`

SHUKUN WU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON, USA

*Email address:* `shukwu@iu.edu`