

THE VLASOV-POISSON SYSTEM WITH A PERFECTLY CONDUCTING WALL: CONVEX DOMAINS.

WENRUI HUANG, BENOIT PAUSADER, AND MASAHIRO SUZUKI

ABSTRACT. We consider the Vlasov–Poisson system in a C^3 convex domain D with a perfectly conducting wall. We introduce the asymptotic domain D_∞ for the domain D . Then under acceptable assumptions on D , we show that for localized initial data, the velocity of particles is asymptotically supported in the (closure of the) asymptotic domain $\overline{D_\infty}$ and the solutions exhibit the asymptotics of modified scattering.

1. INTRODUCTION

The interaction of plasma with boundary is a central question in plasma physics, since it occurs in many applications of plasma such as neon lamps, microfabrication of semiconductor, and nuclear fusion. In this work, we investigate the asymptotic behavior of solutions to the Vlasov-Poisson system in the simplest case of a perfectly conducting wall for a rarefied plasma.

1.1. The Vlasov-Poisson system with a perfectly conducting wall. We consider the Vlasov-Poisson system inside a convex domain D with a perfectly conducting wall ∂D :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{\mu} + \{\tilde{\mu}, \mathcal{H}\} &= 0, \quad \mathcal{H} := \frac{|v|^2}{2} + \lambda \phi \text{ in } D \times \mathbb{R}^3, \\ \tilde{\mu} &= \tilde{\mu}_0 \text{ at } t = 0, \quad \tilde{\mu} = 0 \text{ when } x \in \partial D \text{ and } \mathbf{n} \cdot v \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathbf{n} is the inward normal vector, $\tilde{\mu}(x, v, t) : D \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the particle distribution function, the electrostatic potential $\phi(x, t) : D \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\Delta_x \phi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\mu}^2(x, v, t) dv \text{ in } D, \quad \phi = 0 \text{ on } \partial D, \quad \phi \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.2)$$

and we use the Poisson bracket

$$\{f, g\} = \nabla_x f \cdot \nabla_v g - \nabla_v f \cdot \nabla_x g.$$

We focus on the *plasma* case when $\lambda < 0$. Although we are considering solutions close to vacuum, this distinction will be important in the analysis.

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an acceptable convex domain (see Definition 2.1 below). There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if the initial data $\tilde{\mu}_0 \in C_{x,v}^1(\overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfies the compatibility conditions of the zeroth and first orders as well as*

$$\|\langle x \rangle^4 \langle v \rangle^4 \tilde{\mu}_0\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \|\nabla_{x,v} \tilde{\mu}_0\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq \varepsilon,$$

then there exists a unique global classical solution $\tilde{\mu} \in C_{x,v,t}^1(D \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ of the problem (1.1). Besides the electrostatic potential ϕ decays at the optimal rate

$$\sqrt{1 + |x|^2 + t^2} |\phi(x, t)| + [1 + |x|^2 + t^2] |\nabla_x \phi(x, t)| \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \quad \text{for } x \in D, \quad t > 0.$$

Date: December 19, 2024.

In addition, we have modified scattering in the following sense: there exist an asymptotic domain $D_\infty \subset D$ and a limiting distribution $\mu_\infty \in L^2_{x,v} \cap L^\infty_{x,v} \cap C^0_{x,v}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty)$ such that¹

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(x, v, t) &\rightarrow \mu_\infty(x - tv - \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(v), v) \quad \text{a.e. } (x, v) \in D \times D_\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty, \\ \|\tilde{\mu}\|_{L^2_{x,v}(D \times D_\infty)} &\leq \varepsilon(t)^{-1/4} \quad \text{for } t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where E_∞ is defined by the distribution μ_∞ and the Dirichlet Green function G_∞ of the domain D_∞ as

$$E_\infty^j(a) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty} \partial_{a_j} G_\infty(a, w) \mu_\infty^2(y, w) dy dw \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3.$$

1.2. Prior works and general comments.

1.2.1. *Prior works.* The literature of broadly related results is too vast to be surveyed here, so we will focus on a selection of more directly related results.

- In the whole space case, we refer to earlier works [1, 17, 21, 24] for references on global wellposedness and dispersion, and to recent works [5, 19, 20] for references on the symplectic approach to the study of asymptotics. We also refer to [2, 11, 16] for references on the study of asymptotics of some other Vlasov equations.
- In the presence of boundary, the work [10] studied the simple case of a half line where the boundary is just a point. It constructed singular and regular solutions for different boundary conditions. The method there was then adapted in [9, 12, 13, 14] to study three space dimensions. We also refer to [3, 4] for more recent works on global existence of solutions, also in a more general context. However, none of these studied the asymptotics.
- In slightly different contexts, the studies [22, 23] focus on plasma sheaths by considering different conditions at infinity and on the boundary. When the plasma contacts with a wall, there appears a non-neutral potential region between the wall and plasma, and a nontrivial steady state is achieved. This non-neutral region is referred to as a *sheath*. For more detailed discussion on the plasma sheath, see the references in [22, 23]. The study [22] classifies for all possible cases whether or not the steady state exists over the half line. In addition, the study [23] investigates the conditional stability of the steady states.

As a consequence of these work, one knows that solutions are global in large generality, and the main novelty of Theorem 1.1 concerns the study of asymptotics. Our goal here is to introduce robust methods and exhibit the important structural objects that are relevant in this study, and we hope in other generalizations of this problem such as the problems we mention at the end of the introduction. These include the asymptotic domain D_∞ and the grazing function g in Section 2.2.2.

1.2.2. *Assumptions on the domain.* A half-space is certainly the most important example of a convex domain. In view of applications, it is also natural to consider general smooth convex domains (see Section 2.2). Analytically, considering a convex domain has a number of technical advantages, including the fact that the Dirichlet Green function is slightly better behaved (see [6]), that we have a natural foliation of the exterior of the domain (related to the function b from (2.2)), which is useful to extend the domain, and that there is a simple blow-down analysis in the sense that rescaling of the domains D_t form a monotone family (2.10).

The case of a general convex domain would be interesting, especially if the boundary has limited regularity. As a first step, it is natural to consider the case of a corner $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^1 > 0, x^2 > 0\}$, since we can write explicitly the Dirichlet Green function. However, in this case, the crucial estimate (2.13) is false and our method leads to worse estimates on the derivative. For more details, see subsection A.4.

Considering non-convex domains would also be interesting. In this case, the blow-down analysis giving the asymptotic domain can be quite rich, and it is not clear which general class of domains would be most natural. We expect our analysis to be stable under appropriate small perturbations of smooth convex domains.

¹The first line means that for any compact set $K \subset D \times D_\infty$, $\|\tilde{\mu}(x, v, t) - \mu_\infty(x - tv - \lambda(\ln(t))E_\infty(v), v)\|_{L^\infty(K)} \rightarrow 0$.

1.2.3. *Boundary conditions.* We note an interesting consequence of our analysis which holds for general convex domains: if the asymptotic domain D_∞ is empty, the asymptotic behavior of the plasma is trivial in the sense that $\iint_{D \times \mathbb{R}^3} \mu^2(x, v, t) dx dv \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (see Corollary 3.3). This is intuitively clear: almost every particles will hit the boundary in finite time, at which point it will be absorbed into the wall and disappear.

This is a clear difference with other natural boundary conditions for the Vlasov field, such as specular reflexion, in which case the billiard dynamic is much more interesting. Such problems also occur in application and would be very interesting to consider.

1.3. **A problem on the whole space.** One of the difficulties of the analysis of the initial–boundary value problem (1.1) is that it has characteristic boundary conditions if $x \in \partial D$ and $\mathbf{n} \cdot v = 0$. To avoid the characteristic boundary condition, we begin with replacing the problem (1.1) with a Cauchy problem, where particles in $D^c := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus D$ do not contribute. To this end, we use an extension map

$$\phi \in C_t(\mathbb{R}_+; W_x^{2,\infty}(D)) \mapsto \psi \in C_t(\mathbb{R}_+; W_x^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3))$$

such that the following properties (1)–(3) hold:

- (1) a linear relation in the domain

$$\psi(x, t) = \phi(x, t) := \iint_{D \times \mathbb{R}^3} G_D(x, y) \mu^2(y, v, t) dy dv \text{ for } x \in \overline{D}, \quad (1.3)$$

where G_D denotes the Green function for the Dirichlet Laplacian on D ;

- (2) an invariant domain condition in the exterior of the domain

$$\{v \cdot \nabla b(x), \mathcal{H}\} \leq 0 \text{ for } (x, v, t) \in D^c \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{H} := \frac{|v|^2}{2} + \lambda \psi(x, t), \quad (1.4)$$

where $\nabla b(x)$ is a suitable extension of the normal vector in D^c such that $\nabla b(x) = \mathbf{n}$ on ∂D (for more details, see (2.2) and Lemma A.3).

- (3) a bounded condition

$$\|\nabla \psi(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\nabla \phi(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} + \varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{-2}, \quad (1.5)$$

$$\|\nabla^2 \psi(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\nabla \phi(t)\|_{W_x^{1,\infty}(D)} + \varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{-2}, \quad (1.6)$$

where $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ is a constant to be determined according to the size of the initial data μ_0 . More precisely, ε_1 is the same as in (3.1), and eventually we choose $\varepsilon_1 = 10\varepsilon$ for ε in Theorem 1.1.

We claim that an extension map with (1.3)–(1.6) exists if D is a C^3 convex domain with (2.12). We will prove the claim in Lemma A.1 in Appendix A. In the proof of the claim, the following consequence of the Hopf maximum principle plays a key role:

$$\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x \phi(x) < 0 \text{ whenever } x \in \partial D. \quad (1.7)$$

In the rest of the paper, we denote the force field by

$$F(x, t) := \nabla_x \psi(x, t), \quad E(x, t) := \nabla_x \phi(x, t), \quad (1.8)$$

where $F(x, t) = E(x, t)$ holds when $x \in \overline{D}$.

From now on we focus on the following related Cauchy problem:

$$\partial_t \mu + \{\mu, \mathcal{H}\} = 0, \quad \mathcal{H} := \frac{|v|^2}{2} + \lambda \psi \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_x^3 \times \mathbb{R}_v^3, \quad \mu = \mu_0 \text{ at } t = 0 \quad (1.9)$$

for $\mu : \mathbb{R}_x^3 \times \mathbb{R}_v^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We note that ϕ satisfies (1.2) with $\tilde{\mu} = \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in D\}} \mu$. Furthermore, the restriction $\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in D\}} \mu$ of the solution μ of (1.9) solves the original problem (1.1). This is summarized in the next lemma.

Lemma 1.2. *Let D be a convex domain with the extension map satisfying (1.3) and (1.4). Assume that $\mu(x, v, t)$ is a continuous solution of the related Cauchy problem (1.9) with the initial data μ_0 such that $\mu_0 = 0$ on $\mathcal{S}_{in} := \{(x, v) : x \in D^c, v \cdot \nabla b(x) \geq 0\}$, then $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}_{in}} \mu \equiv 0$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in D\}} \mu(x, v, t)$ is a solution of the original problem (1.1).*

Before proving Lemma 1.2, we state our main theorem for the related Cauchy problem (1.9).

Theorem 1.3. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an acceptable convex domain (see Definition 2.1). There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that if the initial data $\mu_0 \in C_{x,v}^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0 &= 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_{in} = \{(x, v) : x \in D^c, v \cdot \nabla b(x) \geq 0\}, \\ \|\langle x \rangle^4 \langle v \rangle^4 \mu_0\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \|\nabla_{x,v} \mu_0\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \varepsilon_0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

then there exists a global strong solution $\mu \in C_t([0, \infty); L_{x,v}^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L_t^\infty([0, \infty); W_{x,v}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap W_t^{1,\infty}([0, \infty); L_{x,v}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3))$ of the related Cauchy problem (1.9). It satisfies the bounds: for $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle x - tv \rangle^4 \langle v \rangle^4 \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\lesssim \varepsilon_0 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^8, \\ \|\nabla_x \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \langle t \rangle^{-1} \|\nabla_v \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\lesssim \varepsilon_0 \langle t \rangle^{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0}}, \\ [1+t^2] [\|F(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} + \|\nabla_x F(t)\|] &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

Besides inside the domain, $\mu \in C_{x,v,t}^1(D \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ and also there hold the stronger bounds: for $x \in D$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_x \mu(x, v, t)| &\leq 2\varepsilon_0, \\ |(t\nabla_x + \nabla_v)\mu(x, v, t)| &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C\varepsilon_0^3 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{10}, \\ [1+|x|^2+t^2] |E(x, t)| &\leq \varepsilon_0^2, \\ [1+t^2]^{3/2} |\nabla_x E(x, t)| &\leq \varepsilon_0^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^9. \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

In addition, there exist an asymptotic domain D_∞ and a limit distribution $\mu_\infty \in L_{x,v}^2 \cap L_{x,v}^\infty \cap C_{x,v}^0(\mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x + tv + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(v), v, t) &\rightarrow \mu_\infty(x, v) \quad \text{a.e } (x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty, \\ \|\mu\|_{L_{x,v}^2(D \times D_\infty)} &\leq \varepsilon \langle t \rangle^{-1/4} \text{ for } t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the asymptotic electric field E_∞ is given by the distribution μ_∞ and the Dirichlet Green function G_∞ of the domain D_∞ as

$$E_\infty^j(a) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty} \partial_{a^j} G_\infty(a, w) \mu_\infty^2(z, w) dz dw \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3.$$

Remark 1.4. With our extension, we only have $\nabla^2 \psi \in L^\infty$, but it will be discontinuous. As a result, we are only able to obtain strong (Lipshitz) solutions of the related Cauchy problem (1.9). On the other hand, we can recover classical solutions inside the domain D as stated in Theorem 1.3.

Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 will be proved in Section 7. In order to illustrate the use of the Poisson bracket, we present the simple proof of Lemma 1.2.

Proof of Lemma 1.2. We compute that for $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ and $\chi_{>}, \chi_{<}$ defined in (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \iint \mu^2(x, v, t) \chi_{<}(\theta_1^{-1}b(x)) \chi_{>}(\theta_2^{-1}v \cdot \nabla b(x)) dx dv \\ &= \iint \mu^2 \{ \chi_{<}(\theta_1^{-1}b(x)) \chi_{>}(\theta_2^{-1}v \cdot \nabla b(x)), \mathcal{H} \} dx dv \\ &= \iint \mu^2 \left[\theta_1^{-1}(v \cdot \nabla b(x)) \chi'_{<}(\theta_1^{-1}b(x)) \chi_{>}(\theta_2^{-1}v \cdot \nabla b(x)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \theta_2^{-1} \chi_{<}(\theta_1^{-1}b(x)) \chi'_{>}(\theta_2^{-1}v \cdot \nabla b(x)) \{ v \cdot \nabla_x b(x), \mathcal{H} \} \right] dx dv \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (1.4), $\chi'_{<} \leq 0$, and $\chi_{<}, \chi_{>}, \chi'_{>} \geq 0$ in deriving the inequality. Integrating this and letting $\theta_1, \theta_2 \rightarrow 0$, we see that $\mu(x, v, t) = 0$ on $\text{Int}\mathcal{S}_{in}$ for any $t > 0$. Since $\mu \in C_{x,v,t}^0$, this fact means that $\mu = 0$ for all times on $\{x \in \partial D, v \cdot \mathbf{n} \geq 0\}$. Thus $\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in D\}} \mu$ is a solution of (1.1). \square

1.4. Open problems. We highlight a few interesting open problems in rough order of (expected) difficulty:

- (1) Consider the cases of exterior of smooth convex domains.
- (2) Extend the present analysis to the case where the boundary is perturbed by a small, rapidly decaying function, making the domain non-convex, but preserving the smoothness and the nature of the asymptotic domain D_∞ .
- (3) Consider the cases of general convex domains, in particular a corner $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0\}$.
- (4) Consider the case of a general wall, curved and when D is not convex.
- (5) Consider other forms of boundary conditions. A natural choice is the case of specular reflexion for the particles on the wall, and insulating condition for the electric field:

$$\mu(x, v, t) = \mu(x, v - 2v \cdot \mathbf{n}, t), \quad \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x \phi(x, t) = 0 \quad \text{when } x \in \partial D.$$

- (6) Consider the stability of the plasma sheath. In [23], the stability is conditionally shown. It is assumed that the support of initial perturbations is located in $\{v^1 < 0\}$, where v_1 is the vertical velocity for the boundary and the particles with $v_1 < 0$ goes to the boundary. It would be interesting to study the stability for more general initial perturbations by applying the techniques in this paper.

2. NOTATIONS, HYPOTHESES, AND PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. We define a partition of unity subordinate to the covers $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, -1) \cup (-2, 2) \cup (1, \infty)$, and $\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\} = \cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (2^{k-1}, 2^{k+1})$. Namely, let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(1/4, 4)$ such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi(2^{-k}x) \equiv 1$ a.e. We also let

$$\varphi_k(x) := \varphi(2^{-k}x), \quad \varphi_{\leq 0} := \sum_{k \leq 0} \varphi_k(x), \quad \varphi_{> 0}(x) := \sum_{k > 0} \varphi_k(x)$$

and set

$$\chi_{>}(x) := \varphi_{> 0}(x), \quad \chi_{<}(x) := \chi_{>}(-x), \quad \chi_0(x) := \varphi_{\leq 0}(|x|) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.1)$$

2.2. Domain hypothesis. Let us list the assumptions on the domain and their consequences.

2.2.1. Domain geometry. Let D be a convex domain (not necessarily C^3). Without loss of generality, we assume that the origin is on the wall $0 \in \partial D$, and the wall is differentiable with normal unit vector $\mathbf{n} = (0, 0, 1)$ at the origin. We define the extended distance

$$b(x) := \begin{cases} -d(x, D) & \text{when } x \in D^c \\ d(x, D^c) & \text{when } x \in D, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes a standard distance function. We observe that b is a nice boundary function, and in particular, $b(0) = 0$ and $\nabla b(0) = \mathbf{e}_3$.

Since D is convex, we can define the projection $\pi_b : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \overline{D}$, and we define the reflection of a point $x \in D^c$ across ∂D as

$$D^c \ni x \mapsto \rho(x) := 2\pi_b(x) - x. \quad (2.3)$$

For the case of acceptable convex domains, we can see more detailed properties on the domain geometry. See Appendix A.2.

2.2.2. *Asymptotic domain.* We also let $x_0 = (0, 0, 1)$ be a reference point in the domain: $b(x_0) > 0$. We define the gauge of D at $x \in D$ to be

$$j_x(v) := \inf\{r > 0 : x + r^{-1}v \in D\}. \quad (2.4)$$

This is also (the inverse of) the time of escape of D for (x, v) . Note that j_x is subadditive and positively homogeneous. In the following, we fix an arbitrary point $x_0 \in D$, and sometimes abbreviate $j_{x_0}(v)$ as $j(v)$.

The asymptotic domain can be defined in several different ways. We note that $j_x^{-1}(\{0\})$ is independent of $x \in D$, and we define $D_\infty = \text{Int}(j_{x_0}^{-1}(\{0\}))$ to be its interior. In the following, we will assume that $D_\infty \neq \emptyset$ (else the asymptotic analysis is trivial and we simply define $E_\infty = 0$).

If $D_\infty \neq \emptyset$, we note that $\overline{D_\infty} = j_{x_0}^{-1}(\{0\})$ is the maximal (solid) convex cone contained in \overline{D} with vertex at the origin (see also (2.10) for another definition). Let $C_\infty := \partial D_\infty$ be its boundary. In the rest of the paper, we call D_∞ the *asymptotic domain* and C_∞ the *asymptotic cone*.

The wall can be represented as the graph of a function $C_\infty \ni x \mapsto \mathbf{w}_{C_\infty}(x) \in \partial D$, which is increasing along rays, and whose radial derivative is decreasing almost everywhere. We set

$$\mathfrak{W}(r) := \sup_{x \in C_\infty, r/2 \leq |x| \leq 2r} |\mathbf{w}_{C_\infty}(x) - x|,$$

and then assume that

$$\mathfrak{W}(r) \lesssim 1. \quad (2.5)$$

Since D_∞ is convex, we can define π_∞ the projection onto $\overline{D_\infty}$. We define $S_{C_\infty} = C_\infty \cap \{|x| = 1\}$. It follows from inspecting the triangle joining 0, x , and $\pi_\infty(x)$ that

$$d\left(\frac{x}{|x|}, S_{C_\infty}\right) \lesssim \frac{\mathfrak{W}(|x|)}{|x|} \quad \text{for } x \in D \cap D_\infty^c. \quad (2.6)$$

Let $\mathcal{I}(x, v) = \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R} : b(x + tv) \leq 0\}$ be the impact time of (x, v) . We employ the grazing function:

$$g(x, v) := \inf_{s \leq \mathcal{I}(x, v)} v \cdot \nabla b(x + sv). \quad (2.7)$$

Since D_∞ is open, we have that $\mathcal{I}(x, v) < +\infty$ whenever $v \in D_\infty$. In this case, using (A.8), we can write $g(x, v) = v \cdot \mathbf{n}(y)$ for a certain $y = x + \mathcal{I}(x, v)v \in \partial D \cap (x + \mathbb{R}v)$ and in particular $g(x, v) > 0$.

For any $v \in \{j_{x_0} > 0\}$, we see that $z := x_0 + (1/j_{x_0}(v))v \in \partial D$, and so we can define $\nu(v) \in \partial b(z)$ to be an inward unit normal vector, as well as $\alpha(v) = z \cdot \nu$, $\theta(v) = v \cdot \nu(v) < 0$, and $\mathcal{H}_{t, v} := \{x : x \cdot \nu(v) > t\}$. It is clear that²

$$D = \cap_{\{v : j_{x_0}(v) > 0\}} \mathcal{H}_{\alpha(v), v}.$$

This allows to control the trajectories which stay in D for a long time. It is summarized in Lemma A.4. We will also assume a quantitative bound on the vanishing of j and g at the grazing set:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^3} |J_\alpha(z) \cap \{|w| = 1\}| &\lesssim \alpha, & \sup_{x, z \in \mathbb{R}^3} |J_\alpha(z) \cap \{|w - x| \leq r\}| &\lesssim \alpha r^3, \\ J_\alpha(z) &:= \{w \in \mathbb{R}^3 : z \in D^c, g(z, w) < \alpha|w|\} \cup \{w \in \mathbb{R}^3 : z \in D, j(w) < \alpha|w|\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

2.2.3. *Green functions.* For a convex domain, we have the following bounds for the Dirichlet Green function: for $x, y \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned} |x - y| \cdot |G(x, y)| &\lesssim \min\{1, |b(x)||x - y|^{-1}, b(y)|x - y|^{-1}, b(x)b(y)|x - y|^{-2}\}, \\ |x - y|^2 \cdot |\nabla_x G(x, y)| &\lesssim \min\{1, b(y)|x - y|^{-1}\}, \\ |x - y|^2 \cdot |\nabla_y G(x, y)| &\lesssim \min\{1, |b(x)||x - y|^{-1}\}, \\ |x - y|^3 \cdot |\nabla_x \nabla_y G(x, y)| &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

²This and (2.10) illustrate the role of the flat wall as a model case.




FIGURE 1. An illustration of the domain geometry

These are shown in [7, Proposition 2.3]. For $t > 0$, we introduce the rescaled domain $D_t := \{x : tx \in D\}$, which is a decreasing sequence:

$$D_\infty = \cap_{t>0} D_t \subset D_t \subset D_0 = \cup_{t>0} D_t = \{x^3 > 0\}. \quad (2.10)$$

We will also use rescalings of the Green function and we set for $t > 0$

$$G_t(x, y) := tG(tx, ty).$$

We note that $G_t(x, y)$ is the Green function of D_t when $x, y \in D_t$. Indeed, letting \mathcal{G}_t be the Green function of D_t , we see that the function $x \mapsto H_t(x, y) := G_t(x, y) - \mathcal{G}_t(x, y)$ is harmonic and vanishes on the boundary and thus $\mathcal{G}_t = G_t$ holds. The family of green functions G_t is increasing in the sense that if $0 \leq s \leq t \leq \infty$ and $x \neq y \in D_t$, then

$$G_0(x, y) \leq G_s(x, y) \leq G_t(x, y) \leq 0, \quad (2.11)$$

since $x \mapsto H_{s,t}(x, y) := G_s(x, y) - G_t(x, y)$ is harmonic on D_t and negative on the boundary.

2.2.4. Acceptable domain. All the assumptions in subsections 2.2.1–2.2.3 are (2.5), (2.8), and the convexity of D . We will need the following stronger analytical properties of the Green function.

$$|x - y|^3 \cdot [|\nabla_x^2 G(x, y)| + |\nabla_y^2 G(x, y)|] \lesssim 1. \quad (2.12)$$

$$\left| \int_{R=0}^1 \nabla^2 u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} \right| \lesssim 1, \quad u_R(x) := \int_D \varphi(R^{-1}(x - y)) G(x, y) dy, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\sup_{x \in D, b(x) \leq 1} \|[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \|_{L_y^1(D \cap \{|x-y| \leq L\})} \lesssim b(x) \ln(L+1), \quad (2.14)$$

$$\sup_{x \in D, b(x) \leq 1} \|[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \|_{L_y^\infty(D \cap \{|x-y| \geq L\})} \lesssim b(x) L^{-3} \text{ for } L \geq 1.$$

Definition 2.1. We say that D is an acceptable convex domain if D is a C^3 convex domain with (2.5), (2.8), and (2.12).

Remark 2.2. We note that the inequalities (2.12)–(2.14) play a key role in the proof of our main theorem. The bound (2.12) holds for all C^3 convex domains when $|x - y| \leq 1$. Using an adapted modification of the double layer potential, we will show in Appendix A.5 that the Dirichlet Green function satisfies (2.13) for all C^3 domains and (2.14) for all $C^{2,\alpha}$ domains with (2.12).

We also note that the half-space case is a fundamental example of the acceptable domain. In this case, it is clear that the assumptions (2.5) and (2.8) hold. We will confirm in Appendix A.3 that the inequalities (2.12)–(2.14) hold for the case of a half-space.

3. PROPAGATION OF THE BOOTSTRAPS

3.1. Bootstrap 1: global existence using only moments. First, assuming only moment bounds, we obtain global existence of weak solutions and decay of the electric unknowns. Our first bootstrap assumption is as follows: for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle x - tv \rangle^4 \langle v \rangle^4 \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \varepsilon_1 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{10}, \\ [1+t^2] \|F(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} &\leq \varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{10}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where F is defined in (1.8). We claim that this bootstrap can be closed.

Proposition 3.1. *Let D be a convex domain with (1.4), (1.5), (2.5), (2.8), and (2.12). Assume that μ solves (1.9) in the weak sense for $0 \leq t \leq T$, and also satisfies the bootstrap assumptions (3.1) and the initial bounds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle x \rangle^4 \langle v \rangle^4 \mu(t=0)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \varepsilon_0, \\ \mu(t=0) &= 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{S}_{in}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Then μ satisfies the stronger bounds for $0 \leq t \leq T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle x - tv \rangle^4 \langle v \rangle^4 \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_1 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^8, \\ [1+t^2] \|F(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Furthermore, inside the domain D , there holds that for $x \in D$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{1+t^2 + |x|^2} |\phi(x, t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2, \\ [1+t^2 + |x|^2] |E(x, t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. The bounds (3.4) follow from Corollary 4.3; The bound for F in (3.3) follows from (1.5) and (3.4); The bound for the moment in (3.3) follows from Proposition 5.1. \square

Remark 3.2. We observe that this limited bootstrap is enough to show, in a large generality (of convex domain and initial data) that weak solutions with finite moments have decreasing electrostatic potential and field. For instance, the corner $\Omega := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0\}$ satisfies all the conditions (1.4), (1.5), (2.5), (2.8), and (2.12). On the other hand, in order to upgrade this analysis to strong solutions and asymptotic behavior, we also need control of derivatives, and hence the stronger bootstrap (3.5). This comes at the cost of more stringent assumptions on the domain.

Based only on control of moments, we can ascertain that the asymptotic data is supported on $v \in \overline{D_\infty}$.

Corollary 3.3. *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 3.1, there holds that*

$$\iint_{D \times (\overline{D_\infty})^c} \mu^2(x, v, t) dx dv \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \langle t \rangle^{-3/4} \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{20}.$$

Proof. We recall that $v \in (\overline{D_\infty})^c$ is equivalent to $j(v) > 0$. For any $\kappa > 0$, we observe by using Lemma A.4 that for $t \geq C\kappa^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\{x \in D, j(v) > \kappa\}} \mu^2(x, v, t) dx dv &\leq \iint_{\{x \in D, j(v) > \kappa\}} \langle x - tv \rangle^{-4} \langle v \rangle^{-4} dx dv \cdot \|\langle x - tv \rangle^2 \langle v \rangle^2 \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}^2 \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \iint_{\{|y| \gtrsim \kappa t\}} \langle y \rangle^{-4} \langle v \rangle^{-4} dx dv \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{20} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \langle \kappa t \rangle^{-3} \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{20}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, passing to polar coordinates in v , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\{x \in D, 0 < j(v) < \kappa\}} \mu^2(x, v, t) dx dv &\leq \iint_{\{0 < j(v) < \kappa\}} \langle v \rangle^{-4} \langle x - tv \rangle^{-4} dx dv \cdot \|\langle v \rangle^2 \langle x - tv \rangle^2 \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}^2 \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \cdot \{\|v\| = 1, 0 < j(v) < \kappa\} \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{20} \lesssim \varepsilon_0^2 \kappa \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{20}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.8). Choosing $\kappa = \langle t \rangle^{-3/4}$, we obtain the desired result. \square

3.2. Bootstrap 2: control of derivatives and asymptotic behavior. Our second bootstrap assumption is as follows: for $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_x \mu(x, v, t)| &\leq \varepsilon_1 [1 + \mathbf{1}_{\{b(x) \leq 0\}} \langle t \rangle^{\delta_1}], \\ |(t\nabla_x + \nabla_v) \mu(x, v, t)| &\leq \varepsilon_1 \langle t \rangle^{\delta_1} [1 + \langle t \rangle \mathbf{1}_{\{b(x) \leq 0\}}], \\ [1 + t^2]^{3/2} \|\nabla_x E(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{1/10}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $\delta_1 \in (0, \frac{1}{10})$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an acceptable convex domain (see Definition 2.1). Assume that μ solves (1.9) for $0 \leq t \leq T$ in the strong sense, and satisfies the bootstrap assumptions (3.1) and (3.5) as well as the initial bounds (3.2) and*

$$\|\nabla_{x,v} \mu(t=0)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq \varepsilon_0. \tag{3.6}$$

Then μ satisfies the stronger bounds for $0 \leq t \leq T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_x \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C \delta_1^{-1} \varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{\delta_1}, \\ \|(t\nabla_x + \nabla_v) \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C \varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{\delta_1+1}, \\ [1 + t^2] \cdot \|\nabla F(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Furthermore, inside the domain D , there holds that for $x \in D$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_x \mu(x, v, t)| &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1^2, \\ |(t\nabla_x \mu + \nabla_v \mu)(x, v, t)| &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{12}, \\ [1 + t^2 + |x|^2] |E(x, t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2, \\ [1 + t^2]^{3/2} |\nabla E(x, t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{11}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. The optimal bound for the electric field E in (3.8) follows from Corollary 4.3; The bound for the derivative of E in (3.8) follow from Proposition 4.4; The bound for ∇F in (3.7) follows from (1.6) and the bounds for E in (3.8); The bounds for the derivatives of μ in (3.7) follow from Proposition 5.2 with the bounds for ∇F in (3.7); The precise bounds for the derivatives of μ in (3.8) follow from Proposition 5.3. \square

3.3. Renormalization. In order to obtain a fixed measure, we conjugate by the linear flow and define

$$\gamma(x, v, t) := \mu(x + tv, v, t),$$

which satisfies

$$\partial_t \gamma + \{\gamma, \Phi\} = 0, \quad \Phi(x, v, t) := \lambda \psi(x + tv, t). \tag{3.9}$$

This is the equation we will work on for most of the analysis.

4. CONTROL OF THE ELECTRIC FIELD

We now propagate the control of the electric field. This will require controls on the density γ . We set

$$N_1 := \|\langle z \rangle^4 \langle w \rangle^4 \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2.$$

4.1. Bounds on electric unknowns.

4.1.1. *Decomposition along scales.* We decompose the electric potential and field along scales instead of using the level sets of the convolution kernel:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x, t) &= \int_{R=0}^{\infty} \phi_R(x, t) \frac{dR}{R^2}, \quad \phi_R(x, t) := R \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{b(y)>0\}} \varphi(R^{-1}(x-y)) G(x, y) \mu^2(y, w, t) dy dw, \\ E(x, t) &= \int_{R=0}^{\infty} E_R(x, t) \frac{dR}{R^3}, \quad E_R^j(x, t) := R^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{b(y)>0\}} \partial_{x^j} \{ \varphi(R^{-1}(x-y)) G(x, y) \} \mu^2(y, w, t) dy dw.\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

Using the linear flow factorization, we can rewrite ϕ_R and its approximation $\phi_r^0(a, t) \simeq \phi_{tr}(ta, t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_R(x, t) &= R \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \varphi(R^{-1}(x-z-tw)) G(x, z+tw) \gamma^2(z, w, t) dz dw, \\ \phi_r^0(a, t) &:= r \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w) \gamma^2(z, w, t) dz dw.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}E_R^j(x, t) &= R^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \partial_{x^j} [\varphi(R^{-1}(x-z-tw)) G(x, z+tw)] \gamma^2(z, w, t) dz dw, \\ E_r^{0,j}(a, t) &:= r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] \gamma^2(z, w, t) dz dw.\end{aligned}$$

We also define the effective unknowns $\phi^0(a, t)$ and $E^{0,j}(a, t)$ which play a key role in asymptotic:

$$\phi^0(a, t) := \frac{1}{t} \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \phi_r^0(a, t) \frac{dr}{r^2}, \quad E^{0,j}(a, t) := \frac{1}{t^2} \int_{t=0}^{\infty} E_r^{0,j}(a, t) \frac{dr}{r^3}.$$

These decompositions are relevant to prove almost optimal bounds for ϕ and E as well as improved bounds for $|\phi - \phi^0|$ and $|E - E^0|$.

Proposition 4.1. *Under the same assumption as in Proposition 3.1, there holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}|\phi_R(x, t)| + |E_R(x, t)| &\lesssim \min\{1, (R/\langle t \rangle)^3\} N_1, \\ |\phi_r^0(x, t)| + |E_r^0(x, t)| &\lesssim \min\{1, r^3\} N_1\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq |a|/10\}} [\langle a \rangle |\phi_r^0(a, t)| + \langle a \rangle^2 |E_r^0(a, t)|] \lesssim r^3 N_1.\tag{4.4}$$

In addition, there holds that for $x \in D$ and $t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{1+t^2+|x|^2} |\phi(x, t) - \phi^0(\pi_\infty(x/t), t)| &\lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{20}} N_1, \\ [1+t^2+|x|^2] |E(x, t) - E^0(\pi_\infty(x/t), t)| &\lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{20}} N_1.\end{aligned}\tag{4.5}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We treat only the bounds on E , the bounds on ϕ are similar (easier). We start with the bounds (4.3) and (4.4). Using (2.9) and (2.12), we observe that, on the support of integration,

$$|G(x, y)| + R |\partial_x G(x, y)| + R^2 |\partial_{x^j} \partial_{x^k} G(x, y)| \lesssim R^{-1}, \quad |G(x, y)| + R |\partial_x G(x, y)| \lesssim R^{-2} |y|.\tag{4.6}$$

For $p = 0, 1, 2$, a crude estimate gives the simple bounds

$$\begin{aligned}|E_R(x, t)| + |E_r^0(x, t)| &\lesssim \|\gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^2}^2 \lesssim N_1, \\ |E_R(x, t)| &\lesssim R^{-1} [\|\langle z \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^2}^2 + \langle t \rangle \|\langle w \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^2}^2] \lesssim R^{-1} \langle t \rangle N_1, \\ \mathbf{1}_{\{R \leq |x|/10\}} \langle x \rangle^p |E_R(x, t)| &\lesssim \|\langle z \rangle^{\frac{p}{2}} \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^2}^2 + \langle t \rangle^p \|\langle w \rangle^{\frac{p}{2}} \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^2}^2 \lesssim \langle t \rangle^p N_1, \\ \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq |a|/10\}} \langle a \rangle^p |E_r^0(a, t)| &\lesssim \|\langle w \rangle^{\frac{p}{2}} \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^2}^2 \lesssim N_1.\end{aligned}\tag{4.7}$$

Independently, another crude estimate gives the simple bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
|E_R(x, t)| &\lesssim \min\{R^3\|\langle w \rangle^2 \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2, (R/t)^3\|\langle z \rangle^2 \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2\} \lesssim (R/\langle t \rangle)^3 N_1, \\
\mathbf{1}_{\{R \leq |x|/10\}} \langle x \rangle^p |E_R(x, t)| &\lesssim (R/\langle t \rangle)^3 [\|\langle z \rangle^{2+\frac{p}{2}} \langle w \rangle^2 \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2 + \langle t \rangle^p \|\langle z \rangle^2 \langle w \rangle^{2+\frac{p}{2}} \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2] \\
&\lesssim (R/\langle t \rangle)^3 \langle t \rangle^p N_1, \\
|E_r^0(x, t)| &\lesssim r^3 \|\langle z \rangle^2 \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2 \lesssim r^3 N_1, \\
\mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq |a|/10\}} \langle a \rangle^p |E_r^0(a, t)| &\lesssim r^3 \|\langle z \rangle^2 \langle w \rangle^{\frac{p}{2}} \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2 \lesssim r^3 N_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

From these, we deduce the estimate on E in (4.3) and (4.4).

We now turn to (4.5). We first show that the electric field is well approximated by its value in $\overline{D_\infty}$:

$$\sup_{x \in D \setminus \overline{D_\infty}} [1 + t^2 + |x|^2] |E(x, t) - E(\pi_\infty(x), t)| \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{10}} N_1. \tag{4.9}$$

We see from (4.6) that

$$[1 + |x|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{R \leq |x|/10\}}] \cdot |E_R(x, t) - E_R(\pi_\infty(x), t)| \lesssim (|x - \pi_\infty(x)|/R) \cdot \min\{1, (R/\langle t \rangle)^3\} N_1.$$

In the case $|x| \leq \langle t \rangle^{\frac{6}{5}}$, we use the simple bounds (4.7)–(4.8) for the small and large scales to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|E(x, t) - E(\pi_\infty(x), t)| &\lesssim N_1 \left[\int_{R=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle t \rangle^{-3} R^3 \cdot \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^2}^{\infty} \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}}^{\langle t \rangle^2} \langle t \rangle^{-3} R^2 |x - \pi_\infty(x)| \frac{dR}{R^3} \right] \\
&\lesssim N_1 \langle t \rangle^{-2} \left[\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \langle t \rangle^{-1} \ln \langle t \rangle \cdot |x - \pi_\infty(x)| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In another case $|x| \geq \langle t \rangle^{\frac{6}{5}}$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&|x|^2 |E(x, t) - E(\pi_\infty(x), t)| \\
&\lesssim N_1 \left[\int_{R=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}} \langle t \rangle^{-1} R^3 \cdot \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^{\frac{6}{5}/10}}^{|x|/10} \langle t \rangle^2 \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}}^{\langle t \rangle^{\frac{6}{5}/10}} \langle t \rangle^{-1} R^2 |x - \pi_\infty(x)| \frac{dR}{R^3} \right] \\
&\quad + |x|^2 \langle t \rangle N_1 \int_{R=|x|/10}^{\infty} \frac{dR}{R^4} \\
&\lesssim N_1 \left[\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{5}} + \langle t \rangle^{-1} \ln \langle t \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

These give the bound (4.9).

We set $D_{\infty,t} := \{\frac{x}{t} \in D_\infty : d(\frac{x}{t}, C_\infty) \geq \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}\}$ and also denote by $\pi_{\infty,t}$ the projection onto $D_{\infty,t}$. For $\frac{x}{t} \in \overline{D_\infty} \setminus D_{\infty,t}$, there exists $\frac{y}{t} \in \{\frac{x}{t} \in D_\infty : d(\frac{x}{t}, C_\infty) = \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}\}$ such that $\pi_{\infty,t}(\frac{x}{t}) = \frac{y}{t}$ and $|\frac{x}{t} - \pi_{\infty,t}(\frac{x}{t})| \leq \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}$. We claim that

$$\sup_{\frac{x}{t} \in \overline{D_\infty} \setminus D_{\infty,t}} [1 + t^2 + |x|^2] |E(x, t) - E(t\pi_{\infty,t}(x/t), t)| \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{20}} N_1. \tag{4.10}$$

We can show this claim as follows. It is seen from (4.6) and $y = t\pi_{\infty,t}(\frac{x}{t})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
[1 + |x|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{R \leq |x|/10\}}] \cdot |E_R(x, t) - E_R(y, t)| &\lesssim (t|x - y|/tR) \cdot \min\{1, (R/\langle t \rangle)^3\} N_1 \\
&\lesssim (\langle t \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}}/R) \cdot \min\{1, (R/\langle t \rangle)^3\} N_1.
\end{aligned}$$

In the case $|x| \leq \langle t \rangle^{\frac{17}{16}}$, we use the simple bounds (4.7)–(4.8) for the small and large scales to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|E(x, t) - E(y, t)| &\lesssim N_1 \left[\int_{R=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{-1}} \langle t \rangle^{-3} R^3 \cdot \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^2}^{\infty} \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^{-1}}^{\langle t \rangle^2} \langle t \rangle^{-3} R^2 \langle t \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{dR}{R^3} \right] \\
&\lesssim N_1 \langle t \rangle^{-2} \left[\langle t \rangle^{-2} + \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln \langle t \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In another case $|x| \geq \langle t \rangle^{\frac{17}{16}}$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & |x|^2 |E(x, t) - E(y, t)| \\ & \lesssim N_1 \left[\int_{R=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{-1}} \langle t \rangle^{-1} R^3 \cdot \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^{\frac{17}{16}/10}}^{|x|/10} \langle t \rangle^2 \frac{dR}{R^3} + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^{-1}}^{\langle t \rangle^{\frac{17}{16}/10}} \langle t \rangle^{-1} R^2 \langle t \rangle^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{dR}{R^3} \right] \\ & \quad + |x|^2 \langle t \rangle N_1 \int_{R=|x|/10}^{\infty} \frac{dR}{R^4} \\ & \lesssim N_1 \left[\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{16}} + \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln \langle t \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

These give (4.10).

We can now assume that $x \in \overline{D_\infty}$ and $\frac{x}{t} \in D_{\infty, t}$. Let us replace $E^{0, j}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} E^{1, j}(a, t) &:= \frac{1}{t^2} \int_{r=0}^{\infty} E_r^{1, j}(a, t) \frac{dr}{r^3}, \\ E_r^{1, j}(a, t) &:= r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_t(a, w)] \gamma^2(z, w, t) dz dw. \end{aligned}$$

More precisely, we show that

$$[1 + t^2 + |x|^2] \left| E^{0, j}\left(\frac{x}{t}, t\right) - E^{1, j}\left(\frac{x}{t}, t\right) \right| \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{20}} N_1 \quad \text{for } \frac{x}{t} \in D_{\infty, t}, \quad t \geq 1. \quad (4.11)$$

We set $H(a, w) := |\partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) (G_\infty(a, w) - G_t(a, w))]|$ and observe that

$$[1 + \langle a \rangle^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq \langle a \rangle / 10\}}] |E_r^{0, j}(a, t) - E_r^{1, j}(a, t)| \leq r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} H(a, w) \langle w \rangle^2 \gamma^2(z, w, t) dz dw. \quad (4.12)$$

Let us first estimate $H(a, w)$. For $a \in \overline{D_\infty}$ and $y \in C_\infty$, using the mean value theorem and the first line in (2.9), we have

$$|G_\infty(a, y) - G_t(a, y)| = |tG(ta, ty)| = |t[G(ta, \mathbf{w}_{C_\infty}(ty)) - G(ta, ty)]| \lesssim \frac{|ty - \mathbf{w}_{C_\infty}(ty)|}{t|a - y|^2} \lesssim \frac{\mathfrak{M}(t|a|)}{td(a, C_\infty)^2},$$

where the last bound follows after considering the case $|y| \leq 2|a|$ and the case $|y| \geq 2|a|$ separately. If $a \in D_{\infty, t}$, using (2.5) and the maximum principle, we deduce that

$$|G_\infty(a, w) - G_t(a, w)| \lesssim \frac{1}{td(a, C_\infty)^2} \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Similarly, it follows from the second line in (2.9) that

$$|\nabla_a [G_\infty(a, w) - G_t(a, w)]| \lesssim \frac{1}{td(a, C_\infty)^3} \lesssim \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

These lead to

$$H(a, w) \lesssim r^{-1} \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

On the other hand, we observe on the support of integration that

$$H(a, w) \lesssim r^{-3} |w|.$$

From (4.12) and the estimate of $H(a, w)$, it holds that

$$[1 + \langle a \rangle^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq \langle a \rangle / 10\}}] |E_r^{0, j}(a, t) - E_r^{1, j}(a, t)| \lesssim \min\{r \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} + r^2 \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}, r^{-1}\} N_1.$$

Integrating this in r , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& t^2 \langle a \rangle^2 |E^{0,j}(a, t) - E^{1,j}(a, t)| \\
& \lesssim N_1 \left[1 + t^{\frac{1}{6}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\langle a \rangle < t^{\frac{1}{12}}\}} \right] \cdot \left[\int_{r=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}} r^3 \frac{dr}{r^3} + \int_{r=\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}}}^{\langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{4}}} \left[r \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} + r^2 \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{4}} \right] \frac{dr}{r^3} + \int_{r=\langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{4}}}^{\infty} \frac{dr}{r^3} \right] \\
& \quad + N_1 \langle a \rangle^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\langle a \rangle \geq t^{\frac{1}{12}}\}} \int_{r=\langle a \rangle/10}^{\infty} \frac{dr}{r^4} \\
& \lesssim N_1 \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{20}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this and letting $x = ta$, we arrive at the bound (4.11).

We complete the estimate on E in (4.5) by estimating $E - E^1$ when $x \in \overline{D_\infty}$. Using Lemma A.4, we see that

$$|\mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw) > 0\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}}| = \mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw) > 0\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\overline{j(w)} > 0\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw) \leq 0\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \lesssim \mathbf{1}_{J_\alpha} + \left(\frac{\langle z \rangle}{\alpha |w| t} \right)^2, \quad (4.13)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{10})$ are constants to be determined later. We observe from $G_t(x, y) = tG(tx, ty)$ that $\partial_{x^j} G_t(x, y) = t^2 (\partial_{x^j} G)(tx, ty)$. Using (4.13) and letting $\tilde{H}(a, b) = \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-b))G_t(a, b)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{d}_r^j & := [1 + \langle a \rangle^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{r \leq \langle a \rangle/10\}}] |E_{rt}^j(ta, t) - E_r^{1,j}(a, t)| \\
& \lesssim r^2 \iint \left[\langle w \rangle + \frac{\langle z \rangle}{t} \right]^2 \gamma^2(z, w, t) \left[\frac{\langle z \rangle^2}{\alpha^2 t^2 |w|^2} + \frac{\langle z \rangle^2}{r^2 t^2} \right] \cdot \left[|\tilde{H}(a, w)| + |\tilde{H}(a, w + \frac{z}{t})| \right] dw dz \\
& \quad + r^2 \iint_{\{|z| \leq rt/10\}} \langle w \rangle^2 \gamma^2(z, w, t) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{J_\alpha} \cdot |\tilde{H}(a, w)| dw dz \\
& \quad + r^2 \iint_{\{|z| \leq rt/10\}} \langle w \rangle^2 \gamma^2(z, w, t) \left| \tilde{H}(a, w) - \tilde{H}(a, w + \frac{z}{t}) \right| dw dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate the terms on the right hand side one by one. The first term is estimated by using (2.9) as

$$(\text{1st term}) \lesssim (\alpha t)^{-2} \min\{1, r\} \left[\|\langle z \rangle^4 \langle w \rangle^3 \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2 + \|\langle z \rangle^2 \langle w \rangle \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^2}^2 \right] \lesssim (\alpha t)^{-2} \min\{1, r\} N_1.$$

Using (2.8), we can estimate the second term as

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{2nd term}) & \leq r^2 \iint_{J_\alpha} \langle w \rangle^2 \gamma^2(z, w, t) \cdot |\tilde{H}(a, w)| dw dz \\
& \leq \|\langle z \rangle^2 \langle w \rangle^4 \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty}^2 \iint_{J_\alpha \cap \{|w-a| \leq 10r\}} \frac{dw}{\langle w \rangle^4} \frac{dz}{\langle z \rangle^4} \lesssim \min\{1, r^3\} \alpha N_1.
\end{aligned}$$

The third term can be handled by the mean value theorem and (2.9) as

$$(\text{3rd term}) \lesssim \frac{1}{rt} \iint_{\{|a-w| \leq 10r\}} \langle z \rangle \langle w \rangle^2 \gamma^2(z, w, t) dw dz \lesssim \min\{r^{-1}, r^2\} t^{-1} N_1.$$

Choosing $\alpha = \frac{1}{10} \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}}$, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{d}_r^j \lesssim \min\{1, r\} t^{-\frac{2}{3}} N_1.$$

Combining with the simple bounds $\mathfrak{d}_r^j \lesssim \min\{1, r^3\} N_1$ and plugging in (4.2) with $x = ta$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& [1 + t^2 + |x|^2] \left| E(x, t) - E^1\left(\frac{x}{t}, t\right) \right| \\
& \lesssim N_1 \left[\int_{r=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}}} r^3 \frac{dr}{r^3} + \int_{r=\langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}}}^{\langle y \rangle/10} r \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \frac{dr}{r^3} + \langle y \rangle^2 \int_{r=\langle y \rangle/10}^{\infty} \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{2}{3}} \frac{dr}{r^3} \right] \lesssim N_1 \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we arrive at (4.5). \square

4.2. Convergence to asymptotic quantities. We can improve some of the previous bounds by appealing to the evolution equation of γ .

Proposition 4.2. *Under the same assumption as in Proposition 3.1, there holds that for $a \in D_\infty$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a \rangle |\partial_t \phi_r^0(a, t)| &\lesssim \min\{1, r^2\} \|F(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} N_1, \\ \langle a \rangle^2 |\partial_t E_r^0(a, t)| &\lesssim r \min\{1, r\} \|F(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} N_1 \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

and in particular, we have the uniform in time bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a \rangle |\phi_r^0(a, t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \min\{1, r^2\}, \\ \langle a \rangle^2 |E_r^0(a, t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 r \min\{1, r\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

In addition, if the same assumption in Proposition 3.4 holds, then for $a \in D_\infty$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, and $r \leq 1$,

$$\langle a \rangle^2 |\partial_t E_r^{0,j}(a, t)| \lesssim r^3 [\|E(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} + t \|\nabla E(t)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)}] \left[N_1^{1/2} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \nabla_w \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty} + N_1 \right], \quad (4.16)$$

and in particular, we have the uniform in time bound:

$$\langle a \rangle^2 |E_r^0(a, t)| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 r^3. \quad (4.17)$$

Proof of Proposition 4.2. We only detail the bounds on E , since the bounds on ϕ follow similarly. We start with the bound (4.14). From (2.9), we observe on the support of integration that

$$|G_\infty(a, w)| + R |\partial_a G_\infty(a, w)| + R^2 |\partial_{a^j} \partial_{w^k} G_\infty(a, w)| \lesssim R^{-1}.$$

Since $G_\infty(a, w)$ and $\partial_{a^j} G_\infty(a, w)$ vanish when $w \in C_\infty$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t E_r^{0,j}(a, t) &= r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] \partial_t (\gamma^2) dz dw \\ &= r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] \{\gamma^2, \Phi\} dz dw \\ &= r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \gamma^2 \{\Phi, \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)]\} dz dw \\ &= r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \gamma^2 \lambda F(z+tw, t) \cdot \nabla_w \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] dz dw. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

From this, we arrive at (4.14). We now deduce (4.15) by integrating (4.14) and the bootstrap assumptions (3.1) to bound $\|F(t)\|_{L_x^\infty}$.

In order to prove (4.16), we need to use the derivative control on γ , but it is used only in the domain $D = \{b > 0\}$. Proceeding as in (4.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t E_r^{0,j}(a, t) &= r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] \{\gamma^2, \Phi\} dz dw \\ &= -2\lambda r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] \gamma F \cdot \nabla_w \gamma dz dw \\ &\quad + \lambda t r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] F \cdot \nabla_z \gamma^2 dz dw \\ &= -2\lambda r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] \gamma E \cdot \nabla_w \gamma dz dw \\ &\quad - \lambda r^2 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \partial_{a^j} [\varphi(r^{-1}(a-w)) G_\infty(a, w)] \operatorname{div}_z (tE) \cdot \gamma^2 dz dw, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 1.2 to insert the additional characteristic function³ and also replaced F by E . From this, we arrive at (4.16). We now deduce (4.17) by integrating (4.16) and using the bootstrap assumptions (3.1) and (3.5). \square

Corollary 4.3. *Under the same assumption as in Proposition 3.1, there holds that for $x \in D$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{1+t^2+|x|^2}|\phi(x,t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2, \\ [1+t^2+|x|^2]|E(x,t)| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

In addition, if the same assumption in Proposition 3.4 holds, then the optimal bound holds:

$$[1+t^2+|x|^2]|E(x,t)| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2. \quad (4.20)$$

Proof of Proposition 4.3. We treat only the bounds on E , since it is easier to obtain the bounds on ϕ . This is clear if $|x|+t \leq 1$. We suppose that $|x|+t \geq 1$. Owing to (4.5), it suffices to get control on E^0 in the case $x \in D_\infty$. Using (4.15) for small scales and (4.4) for the other scale, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [t^2+|x|^2]|E^0(x/t,t)| &= \int_{r=0}^{\infty} [1+|x/t|^2]|E_r^0((x/t),t)| \frac{dr}{r^3} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \int_{r=\rho}^{\infty} \min\{1,r\} \frac{dr}{r^2} + \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{10} \int_{r=0}^{\rho} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\rho = \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{-100}$ gives (4.19). Proceeding similarly with (4.17), we deduce the optimal bound (4.20). \square

4.2.1. *Derivative of the Electric field.* In the case that $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is an acceptable convex domain, we can control the derivative of the electrostatic potential. As in the previous sections, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_k} E^j(x,t) &=: M^{jk}(x,t) = \int_{R=0}^{\infty} M_R^{jk}(x,t) \frac{dR}{R^4}, \\ M_R^{jk}(x,t) &:= R^3 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{b(y)>0\}} \partial_{x^j} \partial_{x^k} [\varphi(R^{-1}(x-y))G(x,y)] \mu^2(y,w,t) dy dw. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

The thing to note here is that we use μ not γ , because it is easy to use the coordinate so that the boundary ∂D is fixed in the proof of (4.22), where the distance $b(x)$ from ∂D appear.

Proposition 4.4. *Under the same assumption as in Proposition 3.4, there holds that for $x \in D$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,*

$$|M_R(x,t)| \lesssim \min\{1, (R/\langle t \rangle)^3\} N_1. \quad (4.22)$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\langle t \rangle^3 |\nabla E(x,t)| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{11}.$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. It is straightforward to get (4.22) by using (2.9) and (2.12). We use the formula (4.21) and the definition in (2.13), and then remove the constant to get

$$\begin{aligned} M_R^{jk}(x,t) &= R^3 \iint \mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \partial_{x^j} \partial_{x^k} [\varphi(R^{-1}(x-y))G(x,y)] [\mu^2(y,v,t) - \mu^2(x,v,t)] dy dv \\ &\quad + R^3 n(x,t) \partial_{x^j} \partial_{x^k} u_R(x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$n(x,t) := \int \mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \mu^2(x,v,t) dv.$$

The first term can be estimated by using the mean-value theorem, (2.9), and (2.12) as

$$(\text{1st term}) \lesssim R^4 N_1^{1/2} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \nabla_x \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}.$$

³Since on the support of integration, when $x = z + tw \in D^c$, then $w \cdot \nabla_x b(x) \geq g(x,w) > 0$.

For the bound for $\nabla E(x, t)$, using (2.13) we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle t \rangle^3 |\nabla E(x, t)| &\lesssim N_1^{1/2} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \nabla_x \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \langle t \rangle^3 \int_{R=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{-3}} R^4 \frac{dR}{R^4} \\ &\quad + N_1 \left[\left| \int_{R=0}^{\langle t \rangle^{-3}} \nabla_x^2 u_R \frac{dR}{R} \right| + \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^{-3}}^{\langle t \rangle^3} R^3 \frac{dR}{R^4} + \langle t \rangle^3 \int_{R=\langle t \rangle^3}^\infty \frac{dR}{R^4} \right] \\ &\lesssim N_1^{1/2} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \nabla_x \mu(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + N_1 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This with the bootstrap assumptions (3.1) and (3.5) gives the desired estimate. \square

5. MOMENTS AND DERIVATIVE ESTIMATES

5.1. Control of the moments. In this subsection, assuming good control on the electric field, we propagate control of the moments. Given a weight $\langle x - tv \rangle^a \langle v \rangle^b$ and a solution $\mu(t)$, we define the corresponding moment:

$$S_{a,b}(t) := \|\langle x - tv \rangle^a \langle v \rangle^b \mu(x, v, t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \quad \text{for } a, b \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that the same assumption as in Proposition 3.1 holds, and the force field F satisfy the decay condition*

$$[1 + t^2] |F(x, t)| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle. \quad (5.1)$$

Then there holds that for $a, b = 0, 1, \dots, 4$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$S_{a,b}(t) \leq \varepsilon_0 + C\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_1 \langle \ln(t+2) \rangle^{2a}. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof of Proposition 5.1. It is seen from (1.9) that

$$\partial_t(\omega\mu) + \{(\omega\mu), \mathcal{H}\} = \mu[\partial_t\omega + \{\omega, \mathcal{H}\}] = \mu[\partial_t\omega + v \cdot \nabla_x \omega + \lambda \nabla_x \psi \cdot \nabla_v \omega],$$

where $\omega = \langle x - tv \rangle^a \langle v \rangle^b$. Integrating this along the flow, we have

$$S_{a,b}(t) \leq S_{a,b}(0) + \int_{s=0}^t \|F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty} [s a S_{a-1,b} + b S_{a,b-1}] ds.$$

We note that $S_{0,0}$ is conserved. Therefore, using (5.1) and inducting on a and b , we obtain (5.2). \square

5.2. Control of the derivatives. We recall that

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_z \gamma)(z, w, t) &= (\nabla_x \mu)(z + tw, w, t), \\ (\nabla_v \gamma)(z, w, t) &= (t \nabla_x \mu)(z + tw, w, t) + (\nabla_v \mu)(z + tw, w, t). \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the supremum of the following Z and W :

$$Z(x, v, t) := (\nabla_x \mu)(x, v, t), \quad W(x, v, t) := (t \nabla_x \mu + \nabla_v \mu)(x, v, t).$$

It is straightforward to see from (1.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t Z + \{Z, \mathcal{H}\} + \lambda \nabla_x F(W - tZ) &= 0, \\ \partial_t W + \{W, \mathcal{H}\} + \lambda t \nabla_x F(W - tZ) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

5.2.1. Control of derivatives for the related Cauchy problem. We estimate the estimate of Z and W in a whole space.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that the same assumption as in Proposition 3.4 holds, and the force field F satisfy the decay condition*

$$[1 + t^2] |\nabla F(x, t)| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^3, t > 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Then there holds that for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\|Z(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq \varepsilon_0 + C\delta_1^{-1} \varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{\delta_1}, \quad \|W(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \leq \varepsilon_0 + C\varepsilon_1^2 \langle t \rangle^{1+\delta_1}. \quad (5.5)$$

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Integrating (5.3) along the flow, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\|Z(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \|Z(0)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \int_{s=0}^t \|\nabla_x F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty} \left[s\|Z(s)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \|W(s)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \right] ds, \\ \|W(t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} &\leq \|W(0)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + \int_{s=0}^t \|\nabla_x F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty} \left[s^2\|Z(s)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} + s\|W(s)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty} \right] ds.\end{aligned}$$

These with the assumptions (3.5) and (5.4) immediately give (5.5). \square

While these bounds are strong enough to ensure the existence of a global strong solution, we will show refined estimates in the domain D .

5.2.2. *Refined control inside the domain.* We refine the estimate of Z and W inside the domain D . To do so, we set

$$S_Z(t) := \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b(x)>0\}} Z(x, v, t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}, \quad S_W(t) := \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b(x)>0\}} W(x, v, t)\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty}.$$

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that the same assumption as in Proposition 3.4 holds, and the force field F satisfy the decay condition*

$$[1 + t^2]^{3/2} |\nabla E(x, t)| \lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2 + t) \rangle^p, \quad (5.6)$$

where $p \geq 1$. Assume as well that the derivatives are bounded initially:

$$S_Z(0) + S_W(0) \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Then there holds that for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}S_Z(t) &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_1^2, \\ S_W(t) &\leq \varepsilon_0 + C\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_1^2 \langle \ln(2 + t) \rangle^{p+1}.\end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Proof of Proposition 5.3. The proof is a simple variation on Gronwall lemma adapted to use the fact that trajectory just outside the domain are only outgoing. We give the details for the convenience of the reader.

For given nonnegative Lipschitz functions $A = A(t)$ and $\varphi = \varphi(\xi) := (\xi)_+$ as well as a given constant B , we define

$$0 \leq \tilde{Z}(x, v, t) = \langle (x - tv) \rangle^{-4} \langle v \rangle^{-4} \sum_{j=1}^3 \varphi(Z^j(x, v, t) - B - A(t)) \in C_t^0 L_{x,v}^2,$$

which satisfies

$$\partial_t \tilde{Z} + \{\tilde{Z}, \mathcal{H}\} = R,$$

$$R := \langle (x - tv) \rangle^{-4} \langle v \rangle^{-4} \sum_{j=1}^3 \varphi' \cdot [-(\lambda \nabla_x F(W - tZ))^j - A'(t)] + \lambda \frac{F \cdot \nabla_v \{ \langle (x - tv) \rangle^{-4} \langle v \rangle^{-4} \}}{\langle (x - tv) \rangle^{-4} \langle v \rangle^{-4}} \tilde{Z}.$$

We can integrate this in the region $D_a := \{b(x) > a\}$ for $-1 \leq a < 0$ to get

$$\iint_{D_a} \tilde{Z}(t) dx dv - \int_{s=0}^t \int_{\{b(x)=a\}} \tilde{Z} v \cdot \mathbf{n} d\sigma dv ds = \iint_{D_a} \tilde{Z}(0) dx dv + \int_{s=0}^t \iint_{D_a} R dx dv ds.$$

Now, in the boundary $\{b = a\}$, we have that $v \cdot \mathbf{n} = v \cdot \nabla b$ is nonpositive on the support of μ by Lemma 1.2 and we deduce that

$$\iint_{D_a} \tilde{Z}(t) dx dv \leq \iint_{D_a} \tilde{Z}(0) dx dv + \int_{s=0}^t \iint_{D_a} R dx dv ds.$$

Letting $a \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\iint_D \tilde{Z}(t) dx dv \leq \iint_D \tilde{Z}(0) dx dv + \int_{s=0}^t \iint_D R dx dv ds.$$

Now choosing A and B such that

$$A(t) = \int_{s=0}^t \|\nabla_x F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} [S_W(s) + sS_Z(s)] ds, \quad B = \varepsilon_0 \geq S_Z(0),$$

we get for any fixed t ,

$$\iint_D \tilde{Z}(t) dx dv \lesssim \int_{s=0}^t \|\langle s \rangle F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} \iint_D \tilde{Z} dx dv ds.$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality, we see that $\tilde{Z}(x, v, t) = 0$ and so $(Z^j - \varepsilon_0 - A(t))_+ = 0$ holds if $x \in D$. Thus

$$\|Z\|_{L_{x,v}^\infty(\{b>0\})} \leq \varepsilon_0 + \int_{s=0}^t \|\nabla_x F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} [S_W(s) + sS_Z(s)] ds.$$

Proceeding similarly for S_W , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} S_Z(t) &\leq \varepsilon_0 + \int_{s=0}^t \|\nabla_x F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} [S_W(s) + sS_Z(s)] ds, \\ S_W(t) &\leq \varepsilon_0 + \int_{s=0}^t s \|\nabla_x F(s)\|_{L_x^\infty(D)} [S_W(s) + sS_Z(s)] ds. \end{aligned}$$

From these and (5.6), we conclude (5.7). \square

6. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR

We are now ready to extract the asymptotic behavior of solutions. We start by obtaining a limit for the acceleration:

Lemma 6.1. *Under the same assumption as in Proposition 3.4, there exists an asymptotic profile $E_\infty \in L^2 \cap L^\infty \cap C^0(D_\infty)$ such that for $x \in D$ and sufficiently large $t \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle a \rangle^2 (t^2 E^0(a, t) - E_\infty(a))\|_{L_a^\infty(D_\infty)} &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 t^{-\frac{3}{4}}, \\ [1 + t^2 + |x|^2] |E(x, t) - t^{-2} E_\infty(\pi_\infty(x/t))| &\lesssim \varepsilon_1^2 t^{-\frac{1}{50}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows from (3.1), (3.5), (4.14), and (4.16) that

$$\langle a \rangle^2 |\partial_t E_r^0(a, t)| \lesssim t^{-\frac{7}{4}} \varepsilon_1^3 \min\{r^3, r\}.$$

From this, there exists $E_\infty \in L_a^\infty$ such that

$$t^2 E^0(a, t) = \int_{s=1}^t \int_{r=0}^\infty \partial_t E_r^0(a, s) dr ds + E^0(a, t=1) \rightarrow E_\infty(a) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

This gives the first desired inequality and $E_\infty \in L^2 \cap L^\infty \cap C^0(D_\infty)$. The second desired inequality also follows from (4.5). \square

By Corollary 3.3, it makes sense to consider the asymptotic behavior only in the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3, v \in D_\infty\}$. For $w \in D_\infty$, we define

$$\sigma(z, w, t) := \gamma(z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), w, t). \quad (6.1)$$

We have pointwise convergence for $\sigma(z, w, t)$.

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose that the same assumption as in Proposition 3.4 holds. Then there exists a limit $\sigma_\infty \in L_{z,w}^2 \cap L_{z,w}^\infty \cap C_{z,w}^0(\mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty)$ such that for sufficiently large $t \geq 1$,*

$$\|\sigma(z, w, t) - \sigma_\infty(z, w)\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty \cap \{g(z,w) > t^{-\frac{1}{4}}, |z| \leq t^{\frac{1}{100}}\})} \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{100}}. \quad (6.2)$$

In addition, σ_∞ is a distribution for E_∞ in Lemma 6.1 in the sense that

$$E_\infty(a) = \iint_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} G_\infty(a, w) \sigma_\infty^2(z, w) dz dw. \quad (6.3)$$

Proof. First we show (6.2). For $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$, we define the set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2} := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty : g(z, w) > \kappa_1^{-1}, |z| \leq \kappa_2\},$$

where g is defined in (2.7). Since $g(z, w) > 0$ for all $(z, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty$, we see that $\cup_{\kappa_1 > 0, \kappa_2 > 0} \mathcal{S}_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2} = \mathbb{R}^3 \times D_\infty$. In addition, for given any $(z, w) \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2}$, it is seen from Lemma A.4 (ii) that $z + tw \in D$ and $z + tw + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w) \in D$ for sufficiently large t with $t \geq 2(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2)^3 + 10|\lambda| \|\ln t\| \|E_\infty\|_{L^\infty} + 1$. On the other hand, it holds that for sufficiently large t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \sigma(z, w, t) &= \frac{\lambda}{t} [E_\infty(w) - t^2 E(z + tw, t)] \cdot \nabla_z \gamma(z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), w, t) \\ &\quad - t\lambda [E(z + tw + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), t) - E(z + tw, t)] \cdot \nabla_z \gamma(z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), w, t) \\ &\quad - \lambda E(z + tw + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), t) \cdot \nabla_w \gamma(z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), w, t). \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\infty(w) - t^2 E(z + tw, t) \\ = E_\infty(w) - t^2 E^0(w, t) + t^2 E^0(w, t) - t^2 E(tw, t) + t^2 E(tw, t) - t^2 E(z + tw, t). \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.1), (3.5), (4.5), Lemma 6.1 and the mean value theorem, we estimate $\partial_t \sigma$ as

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_t \sigma| &\lesssim t^{-1-\frac{1}{50}} \langle z \rangle \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \nabla_z \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty} \\ &\quad + t(\ln t) \|\nabla E(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \nabla_z \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty} + \|E(t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{b(z+tw)>0\}} \nabla_w \gamma\|_{L_{z,w}^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \langle z \rangle t^{-1-\frac{1}{50}}. \end{aligned}$$

This allows to define σ_∞ for any $(z, w) \in \mathcal{S}_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{100}}$, and also gives (6.2). In addition, Fatou's lemma ensures that $\sigma_\infty \in L_{z,w}^2 \cap L_{z,w}^\infty$. It also follows from $\sigma(t) \in W_{z,w}^{1,\infty} \subset C_{z,w}^0$ that $\sigma_\infty \in C_{z,w}^0$.

In order to prove (6.3), it suffices to show the convergence

$$\begin{aligned} t^2 E^0(a, t) &= \iint_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} G_\infty(a, w) \gamma^2(z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), w, t) dz dw \\ &\rightarrow \iint_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \partial_{a^j} G_\infty(a, w) \sigma_\infty^2(z, w) dz dw \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

We observe from $\{|z| \geq t^{\frac{1}{1000}}\} \supset \{|z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w)| \geq t^{\frac{1}{2000}}\}$ that

$$\left| \iint_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|z| \geq t^{\frac{1}{1000}}\}} \partial_{a^j} G_\infty(a, w) \gamma^2(z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), w, t) dz dw \right| \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{1000}} N_1.$$

Using (2.8) and passing to spherical coordinates in w , we have

$$\left| \iint_{\{w \in D_\infty\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < g(z, w) \leq t^{-\frac{1}{4}}\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|z| \leq t^{\frac{1}{1000}}\}} \partial_{a^j} G_\infty(a, w) \gamma^2(z + \lambda(\ln t)E_\infty(w), w, t) dz dw \right| \lesssim t^{-\frac{1}{4}} N_1.$$

Using these inequalities and (6.2), we conclude the above convergence. Thus (6.3) holds. \square

7. REGULARITY IN THE DOMAIN AND PROOFS OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

7.1. Regularity in the domain. We study the regularity in the domain D assuming that the strong solution of (1.9) exists. By the uniqueness, the strong solution can be written as

$$\mu(x, v, t) := \mu_0(X(x, v, 0, t), V(x, v, 0, t)),$$

where the characteristics are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} X(x, v, s, t) &:= x - (t - s)v + \int_{\tau=s}^t (\tau - s) F(X(x, v, \tau, t), \tau) d\tau, \\ V(x, v, s, t) &:= v - \int_{\tau=s}^t F(X(x, v, \tau, t), \tau) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

It will be only Lipschitz⁴ in (x, v) due to the limited regularity $F \in C_x^{0,1}$. This does not enable us to obtain a classical regularity of μ for all $(x, v, t) \in \mathbb{R}_x^3 \times \mathbb{R}_v^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+$. On the other hand, if $\mu_0 = 0$ holds on $\mathcal{S}_{in} = \{(x, v) : x \in D^c, v \cdot \nabla b(x) \geq 0\}$, we can expect a classical regularity of μ in the domain D since $F = E \in C_x^1$ holds there. To show this expectation, we start with the following lemma.

Lemma 7.1. *Assume that $b(X(x, v, s, t)) = 0$ for some $0 \leq s \leq t$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) *If $V(x, v, s, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(X(x, v, s, t)) > 0$ and $\text{supp}(\mu_0) \subset \mathcal{S}_{in}^c$, then $\mu_0(X(x, v, 0, t), V(x, v, 0, t)) \equiv 0$ in a neighborhood of (x, v) ;*
- (2) *If $V(x, v, s, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(X(x, v, s, t)) \leq 0$, then $b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) < 0$ for all $s < \sigma \leq t$.*

Proof of Lemma 7.1. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 1.2. We note that

$$\frac{d}{d\sigma} b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) = V(x, v, \sigma, t) \cdot \nabla b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)), \quad (7.1)$$

which coincides with $V \cdot \mathbf{n}$ when $\sigma = s$, i.e. $b(X) = 0$. In addition, the case that $\{b(X(x, v, s, t)) \leq 0\}$ and $b(X) \in W_\sigma^{2,\infty}$, we can bound the second derivative using (1.4) as

$$\frac{d^2}{d\sigma^2} b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) = \{v \cdot \nabla b, \mathcal{H}\}(X, V) \leq 0. \quad (7.2)$$

If $s > 0$, $b(X(x, v, s, t)) = 0$, and $V(x, v, s, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(X(x, v, s, t)) > 0$, we see from (7.1) and (7.2) that

$$b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) < 0, \quad V(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) \cdot \nabla b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \sigma < s.$$

Then plugging $\sigma = 0$, we deduce from $\text{supp}(\mu_0) \subset \mathcal{S}_{in}^c$ that $(X(x, v, 0, t), V(x, v, 0, t)) \in (\text{supp}(\mu_0))^c$. This holds in the case $s = 0$ as well. Thus the assertion (1) holds. If $V(x, v, s, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(X(x, v, s, t)) < 0$, using (7.1) and (7.2), we have $b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) < 0$ for $s < \sigma \leq t$. Finally, if $V(x, v, s, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(X(x, v, s, t)) = 0$, it follows from (A.8) and (1.7) that

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{d\sigma^2} b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) \right|_{\sigma=s} \leq E(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) \cdot \nabla b(X(x, v, \sigma, t))|_{\sigma=s} < 0.$$

For $\sigma < s$ close to s , it holds that $b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) < 0$ and $V(x, v, \sigma, t) \cdot \nabla_x b(X(x, v, \sigma, t)) < 0$. Now we can proceed as the case $V(x, v, s, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(X(x, v, s, t)) < 0$. Thus the assertion (2) holds. \square

Proposition 7.2. *Let μ be the strong solution of (1.9). Assume that E and ∇E belong to $L^\infty \cap C^0(D \times [0, \infty))$ as well as the initial data μ_0 satisfies the condition $\mu_0 = 0$ on \mathcal{S}_{in} . Then $\mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}}\mu \in C_{x,v,t}^1$.*

Proof. First we consider the case $\text{supp}(\mu_0) \subset \mathcal{S}_{in}^c$. Owing to Lemma 7.1, if $x \in D$, the characteristic $(X(x, v, \sigma, t), V(x, v, \sigma, t))$ starting from (x, v) at time t satisfies either $b(X(x, v, s, t)) > 0$ or $(X(x, v, s, t), V(x, v, s, t)) \in (\text{supp}(\mu_0))^c$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t$. Therefore we can use the derivative formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{x^j} \mu(x, v, t) \\ &= (\partial_{x^k} \mu_0)(X(x, v, 0, t), V(x, v, 0, t)) \left[\delta_{jk} + \int_{\tau=s}^t (\tau - s) \nabla E^k(X(x, v, \tau, t), \tau) \cdot \partial_{x^j} X(x, v, \tau, t) d\tau \right] \\ & \quad - (\partial_{v^k} \mu_0)(X(x, v, 0, t), V(x, v, 0, t)) \int_{\tau=s}^t \nabla E^k(X(x, v, \tau, t), \tau) \cdot \partial_{x^j} X(x, v, \tau, t) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to $\partial_{x^j} \mu \in C_{x,v,t}^0$. Similarly, $\partial_{v^j} \mu \in C_{x,v,t}^0$ holds.

Next we consider the case $\mu_0 = 0$ on \mathcal{S}_{in} . We can find a sequence μ_0^j such that $\text{supp} \mu_0^j \subset \mathcal{S}_{in}^c$ and $\mu_0^j \rightarrow \mu_0$ in $C^1(K)$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathcal{S}_{in}^c$. It is seen from the first case that $\mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \mu^j \in C_{x,v,t}^1$, where $\mu^j(x, v, t) := \mu_0^j(X(x, v, 0, t), V(x, v, 0, t))$. For any $K \subset D \times \mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathcal{S}_{in}^c$, it is seen that $\mu^j \rightarrow \mu$ in $C^0(K)$ and μ^j is a Cauchy sequence in $C^1(K)$. From these, it follows that $\mu \in C^1(K)$. Consequently, $\mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \mu \in C_{x,v,t}^1$ holds. \square

⁴This is a priori best possible as can be seen by considering the solutions of $\dot{x} = |x|$.

7.2. Proofs of the main theorems. We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Using a classical method, we have a time-local solution $\mu \in C_t([0, T]; L_{x,v}^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^\infty([0, T]; W_{x,v}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap W^{1,\infty}([0, T]; L_{x,v}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3))$ that satisfies the bootstrap assumptions (3.1) and (3.5) on $[0, T]$. In addition, we have a blow-up criterion in the sense that if $\|F(x, t)\|_{L_t^1([0, T]; W_x^{1,\infty})} < \infty$, the solution can be extended beyond T . We can now use Propositions 3.1 and 3.4 to obtain a global strong solution satisfying (1.11) and (1.12). Proposition 7.2 ensures that the global strong solution has a classical regularity in the domain D . Finally, the statement on the asymptotic behavior follows from Proposition 6.2. We note that $\sigma_\infty \in C_{x,v}^0$ follows from (6.2) and the classical regularity of σ in the domain D . \square

We are now ready to prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We extend the initial data $\tilde{\mu}_0$ to $\mu_0 \in C_{x,v}^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, and then apply Theorem 1.3. Using Lemma 1.2, we see that $\tilde{\mu} := \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in D\}} \mu$ is the desired solution. \square

APPENDIX A.

A.1. Extension of the electrostatic potential. In this subsection, we suppose that D is an acceptable convex domain and then find an extension map of the electrostatic potential ϕ , which satisfies (1.3)–(1.7). To this end, we first extend the Green function $G(x, y)$. If D is a half-space, we can use an odd extension for the outside D^c , else we use a similar idea in (A.3).

Let us consider the case that D is a C^3 -domain. We may suppose that the extended distance b is C^3 on $\{-1 < b < 1\}$. Using the reflexion

$$D^c \ni x \mapsto \rho(x) := 2\pi_b(x) - x, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

we define the extended domain

$$D^{ext} := \{x \in D^c : \rho(x) \in D\}.$$

We set

$$\delta^{ext} := \min\{1, d(D, (D^{ext} \cup \overline{D})^c)\} > 0.$$

The thing to note is that $\pi_b(x) = x - b(x)\nabla b(x)$ (for more details, see the proof of Lemma A.3). Therefore it holds that

$$\rho(x) = x - 2b(x)\nabla b(x) \text{ for } x \in D^{ext}, \quad D\rho = Id - 2\nabla b \otimes \nabla b - 2b\nabla^2 b. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We extend the Green function $G(x, y)$ for $y \in D$ and $x \in D^{ext}$ using the reflexion (A.1) as

$$G(x, y) := -G(\rho(x), y). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Now we can extend the electric potential as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^0(x, t) &= \iint G(x, y) \mu^2(y, v, t) dy dv, \\ \psi(x, t) &:= \chi_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \phi^0(x, t) + A_1(t) V_*(b(x)) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^3, t > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the function V_* and the constant δ_* are defined by

$$V_*(a) := \begin{cases} 0 & a \geq 0, \\ \int_0^a \frac{s}{1+s^4} ds & a < 0, \end{cases} \quad \delta_* := \delta^{ext} + 2.$$

The properties of the extension are summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. *Assume that D is a C^3 convex domain, and μ satisfies the bootstrap assumptions (3.1). Then there exists sufficiently large $C_* > 0$ such that if $A_1(t) = C_* \langle t \rangle^{-2}$, then the extension ψ in (A.4) satisfies (1.3)–(1.7).*

Proof of Lemma A.1. It is clear that (1.3), since $\psi(x, t) = \phi^0(x, t) = \phi(x, t)$ for $x \in D$. The Hopf maximum principle immediately gives (1.7).

To show (1.4), we use the fact that $\nabla^2 b \leq 0$ when $b(x) < 0$, which follows from (A.8). We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{v \cdot \nabla b(x), \mathcal{H}\} \\ &= v^j v^k \partial_{x^j} \partial_{x^k} b(x) - \chi_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \lambda \nabla b(x) \cdot \nabla \phi^0(x) - |\nabla b(x)|^2 [\chi'_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \phi^0 + A_1 V'_*(b)] \\ &\leq -\chi_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \lambda \nabla b(x) \cdot \nabla_x \phi^0(x) - A_1 |b(x)| [1 + |b(x)|^4]^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that the right hand side is nonpositive for $A_1(t) = C_* \langle t \rangle^{-2}$ with sufficiently large $C_* > 0$. It is sufficient to show that

$$\nabla b(x) \cdot \nabla \phi^0(x, t) \lesssim |b(x)| \langle t \rangle^{-3} \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{40} \quad \text{for } x \in D^{ext}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

From (A.2), (A.3), and (A.7), it follows that

$$\nabla b(x) \cdot \nabla G(x, y) = \nabla b(\rho(x)) \cdot (\nabla_x G)(\rho(x), y) \quad \text{for } x \in D^{ext}.$$

Therefore it suffices to estimate $\nabla b(x) \cdot \nabla \phi(x, t)$ for $x \in D$. To this end, we decompose as

$$\nabla \phi(x, t) = (\nabla \phi)_{\leq L}(x, t) + (\nabla \phi)_{\geq L}(x, t),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla \phi)_{\leq L}(x, t) &:= \iint \nabla_x G(x, y) \varphi_{\leq L}(x-y) \mu^2(y, v, t) dy dv, \\ (\nabla \phi)_{\geq L}(x, t) &:= \iint \nabla_x G(x, y) \varphi_{\geq L}(x-y) \mu^2(y, v, t) dy dv. \end{aligned}$$

Then we use (2.14) with $L = \langle t \rangle^3$ and (3.1) to estimate

$$\|[\nabla b(x) \cdot (\nabla \phi)_{\leq L}(x, t)]_+\| \lesssim \|n(x, t)\|_{L_x^\infty} \|[\nabla b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \varphi_{\leq L}(x-y)\|_{L_y^1} \lesssim |b(x)| \langle t \rangle^{-3} \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{21},$$

where $n(x, t) := \int \mathbf{1}_{\{b>0\}} \mu^2(x, v, t) dv$. On the other hand, a crude estimate gives

$$\|[\nabla b(x) \cdot (\nabla \phi)_{\geq L}(x, t)]_+\| \lesssim \|\mu\|_{L_{x,v}^2} \|[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \varphi_{\geq L}(x-y)\|_{L_y^\infty} \lesssim |b(x)| \langle t \rangle^{-3} \langle \ln(2+t) \rangle^{20}.$$

From these, we deduce (A.5) and hence (1.4).

Let us show the inequalities (1.5) and (1.6). It is seen by a direct computation that for $x \in D^c$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x^j} \psi(x, t) &= -\chi_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \partial_{x^j} \rho^p(x) \partial_{x^p} \phi(\rho(x), t) + \chi'_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \phi(\rho(x), t) \partial_{x^j} b(x) \\ &\quad + A_1(t) V'_*(b(x)) \partial_{x^j} b(x) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} \psi(x, t) &= \chi_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) [\partial_{x^j} \rho^p(x) \partial_{x^i} \rho^q(x) \partial_{x^q} \partial_{x^p} \phi(\rho(x), t) + \partial_{x^j} \partial_{x^i} \rho^p(x) \partial_{x^p} \phi(\rho(x), t)] \\ &\quad + [\chi''_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \partial_{x^i} b(x) \partial_{x^j} b(x) + \chi'_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} b(x)] \phi(\rho(x), t) \\ &\quad + \chi'_{>}(b(x) + \delta_*) \partial_{x^i} \rho^p(x) \partial_{x^p} \phi(\rho(x), t) \partial_{x^j} b(x) \\ &\quad + A_1(t) V'_*(b(x)) \partial_{x^j} \partial_{x^i} b(x) + A_1(t) V''_*(b(x)) \partial_{x^i} b(x) \partial_{x^j} b(x). \end{aligned}$$

From these, $b \in C^3$, and the fact $\phi = 0$ on $\{b = 0\}$, we arrive at (1.5) and (1.6). The proof is complete. \square

Remark A.2. To minimize the smoothness requirement on b , we could have chosen to extend the electric field in the simpler way

$$\tilde{F}^j(x, t) = E^j(\rho(x), t) + A_1(t) V'_*(b(x)) \nabla b(x).$$

However, \tilde{F} cannot, in general, be written by a gradient of a certain potential, so we lose the symplectic structure (1.9).

A.2. Domain geometry. In this subsection, we consider the geometry of the domain. For a point x on the boundary ∂D , we have the outward normal vector $\mathbf{n}(x)$ and then take an orthogonal frame $(\tau_1(x), \tau_2(x), \mathbf{n}(x))$. Using a translation and/or a rotation, we have a coordinate system so that $x = 0$ and $\mathbf{n}(x) = (0, 0, -1)$. Let us fix it and then the domain is of the form $D = \{y : y^3 > w_x(y^1, y^2)\}$, where $w_x : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a C^3 -function as well as $w_x(0) = 0$ and $\nabla w_x(0) = 0$ hold. There exists an orthogonal matrix P such that

$$P(x)\tau_1(x) = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad P(x)\tau_2(x) = \mathbf{e}_2, \quad P(x)\mathbf{n}(x) = -\mathbf{e}_3,$$

where $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$ is the standard basis in the y -coordinate.

We define *II* and *III* by

$$II(x) = \nabla_y^2 w_x(0), \quad III(x) = \nabla_y^3 w_x(0).$$

For a point $x_0 \in D$ close enough to the boundary ∂D , we can define uniquely its orthogonal projection $\pi(x)$ onto the boundary. We can then extend the orthogonal frames defined above by setting $\tau_j(x) = \tau_j(\pi(x))$ and $\mathbf{n}(x) = \mathbf{n}(\pi(x))$. We use the following 3×3 matrix M by

$$M(x) := \begin{bmatrix} [Id_2 - b(x)\nabla_{y^1, y^2}^2 w_{\pi(x)}(0)]^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, for tangent vectors $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ at x with $\theta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \vartheta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} II(x)[\theta, \vartheta] &:= {}^t [M(x)P(\pi(x))\theta] II(\pi(x)) [M(x)P(\pi(x))\vartheta], \\ III(x)[\tau, \theta, \vartheta] &:= {}^t [M(x)P(\pi(x))\theta] III(\pi(x)) [P(\pi(x))\tau] [M(x)P(\pi(x))\vartheta]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.3. *Suppose that D is a C^3 convex domain. We have the following useful identities and properties for $\pi(x)$ and $b(x)$:*

(1) *The boundary projection $x \mapsto \pi(x)$ is twice differentiable and*

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau \cdot \nabla_x)\pi(x) &= {}^t [P(\pi(x)) \cdot] M(x) [P(\pi(x))\tau], \quad (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)\pi(x) = 0, \\ \tau^c \theta^a \vartheta^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} \pi^c(x) &= b(x) III(x) [\tau, \theta, \vartheta], \quad \mathbf{n}^c \theta^a \vartheta^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} \pi^c(x) = II(x) [\theta, \vartheta], \\ \theta^c \tau^a \mathbf{n}^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} \pi^c(x) &= II(x) [\tau, \theta], \quad \mathbf{n}^c \tau^a \mathbf{n}^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} \pi^c(x) = 0, \quad \mathbf{n}^a \mathbf{n}^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} \pi(x) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $a, b, c = 1, 2, 3$ and τ, θ, ϑ are tangent vectors at x with $\tau \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \theta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \vartheta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0$.

(2) *The function b is Lipschitz in \mathbb{R}^3 , and C^1 in D^c with $\nabla_x b(x) = \mathbf{n}(x)$ on $\partial D = \{b = 0\}$ and*

$$\nabla b(x) = \nabla b(\rho(x)) \quad \text{for } \rho(x) \in D, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where ρ is defined in (A.1). In addition, it is concave and nondegenerate in the sense that

$$0 \leq b(x)\nabla^2 b(x) \leq Id \quad \text{uniformly when } b(x) \leq 0. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

It also holds that $\nabla^2 b(x) \cdot \nabla b(x) = 0$.

Proof. First we show the assertion (1). We fix a point $x \in D$ close enough to the boundary ∂D , and we choose a coordinate chart as above, where $x = (0, 0, b(x))$ and $\pi(x) = 0$. We can compute the (squared) distance d between a point $\tilde{x} = (p^1, p^2, q) \in D$ and a boundary point $(v^1, v^2, w(v)) \in \partial D$:

$$d = \frac{1}{2} [|v - p|^2 + (w(v) - q)^2],$$

where $w(v) = w_{\pi(x)}(v)$. At a critical point, we obtain the implicit relation

$$p = v + (w(v) - q)\nabla_v w(v) = v - q\nabla_v w(v) + \nabla_v \left(\frac{w^2(v)}{2} \right).$$

This gives

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial p} = \widetilde{M} := \left[Id_2 - q\nabla_v^2 w(v) + \nabla_v^2 \frac{w^2(v)}{2} \right]^{-1}, \quad \partial_q v^j = \partial_j w(v).$$

Similarly we can compute the second derivative as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial p^2} &= \widetilde{M} \cdot [[q\nabla_v^3 w(v) - \nabla_v^3(w^2/2)(v)]\nabla_p v] \cdot \widetilde{M}, & \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^2} &= \nabla_v^2 w(v)\nabla_v w(v), \\ \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial p \partial q} &= \widetilde{M} \cdot [\nabla_v^2 w(v) + [q\nabla_v^3 w(v) - \nabla_v^3(w^2/2)(v)]\nabla_v w(v)] \cdot \widetilde{M}.\end{aligned}$$

Evaluating these at $p = 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{M}_0 &= [Id_2 - b(x_0)\nabla_v^2 \omega(0)]^{-1}, & \frac{\partial v}{\partial p} &= \widetilde{M}_0, & \partial_q v &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial p^2} &= q\widetilde{M}_0\nabla_v^3 \omega(0)\widetilde{M}_0, & \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial p \partial q} &= \widetilde{M}_0\nabla_v^2 \omega(0)\widetilde{M}_0, & \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial q^2} &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, evaluating at x_0 , we find

$$\frac{\partial[w(v)]}{\partial(p, q)} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2[w(v)]}{\partial p^2} = \widetilde{M}_0\nabla_v^2 \omega(0)\widetilde{M}_0, \quad \frac{\partial^2[w(v)]}{\partial p \partial q} = \frac{\partial^2[w(v)]}{\partial q^2} = 0.$$

From these, we arrive at the assertion (1).

For the proof of the assertion (2), it is easy to see that (A.7) holds. Indeed, it is clear that for $x \in D^c$,

$$b(x) = -|x - \pi_b(x)|, \quad \nabla b(x) = -\frac{x - \pi_b(x)}{|x - \pi_b(x)|} = \mathbf{n}(\pi_b(x)).$$

On the other hand, for $\rho(x) \in D$,

$$b(\rho(x)) = |\rho(x) - \pi_b(x)|, \quad \nabla b(x) = -\frac{x - \pi_b(x)}{|x - \pi_b(x)|} = \frac{\rho(x) - \pi_b(x)}{|\rho(x) - \pi_b(x)|} = \nabla b(\rho(x)).$$

Thus (A.7) holds. Furthermore, we can compute the Hessian of $b(x)$:

$$b(x)\nabla^2 b(x) = Id - \nabla \pi_b(x) - \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n}.$$

By the first line of (A.6), where the equalities also hold outside of the domain, we can easily see that (A.8) holds. We also see that $|\nabla b| = 1$ and thus ∇b is in the null space of $\nabla^2 b$. \square

The next lemma provides properties of $j_v(x)$ and $g(x, v)$ defined in (2.4) and (2.7).

Lemma A.4. *Suppose that D is a convex domain. Let $x_0 \in D$ be fixed.*

(i) *Let $v \in (\overline{D_\infty})^c$ and assume that $x + tv \in D$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $t \geq 0$. Then*

$$|x - x_0| \geq \frac{1}{2}tj_{x_0}(v) \cdot d(x_0, \partial D) \quad \text{for } t \geq 2/j_{x_0}(v).$$

(ii) *Let $v \in D_\infty$ and assume that $x + tv \notin D$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $t \geq 0$. Then*

$$|x - x_0| \geq tg(x, v).$$

Proof. (i) It follows from $x + tv \in D$ that $(x + tv) \cdot \nu(v) > \alpha(v) = (x_0 + (1/j_{x_0}(v))v) \cdot \nu(v)$. This gives

$$(x - x_0) \cdot \nu(v) > (t - 1/j_{x_0}(v))(-v \cdot \nu(v)) \geq (t/2)(-v \cdot \nu(v)).$$

By definition of z , we see that

$$-v \cdot \nu(v) = j_{x_0}(v) \cdot [\alpha(v) - x_0 \cdot \nu(v)] = j_{x_0}(v) \cdot [x_1 \cdot \nu(v) - x_0 \cdot \nu(v)] \geq j_{x_0}(v)\text{dist}(x_0, \partial D),$$

where x_1 is the orthogonal projection of x_0 onto $\{x \cdot \nu(v) = \alpha(v)\} \subset D^c$. From these, we arrive at the desired inequality.

(ii) We note that $x + sv \notin D$ for $0 \leq s \leq t$ and

$$d(x, x_0) \geq -b(x) = -b(x + tv) + \int_{s=0}^t v \cdot \nabla b(x + sv) ds.$$

Using (2.7), we see that the integrand is lower bounded by $g(x, v)$. Thus the desired inequality holds. \square

In the case of a half-space with $x_0 = (0, 0, 1)$, $j(v) = -v^3$, and $g(x, v) = v^3$, we have the following inequality for cases (i) and (ii) in Lemma A.4:

$$\begin{aligned} |x - x_0| &\geq -tv^3 - 1 \geq -\frac{1}{2}tv^3, \quad \text{for } v^3 < 0, x + tv \in D, t \geq -2/v^3, \\ |x - x_0| &\geq tv^3 + 1, \quad \text{for } v^3 > 0, x + tv \notin D. \end{aligned}$$

A.3. Green function estimates for a half-space. In the case of the half-space $\{x^3 > 0\}$, we show (2.12)–(2.14). The extended distance b and the Green function G are given by

$$\begin{aligned} b(x) &:= x^3, \quad G(x, y) := -\frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{|x - y|} + H(x, y), \\ H(x, y) &:= \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{|\sigma(x) - y|}, \quad \sigma(x^1, x^2, x^3) := (x^1, x^2, -x^3). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously (2.12) holds. In addition, a direct computation gives

$$\partial_{x^3}^2 G(x, y) + \partial_{y^3}^2 G(x, y) = 0, \quad \partial_{y^3}^2 G(x, y) \lesssim \frac{b(x)}{|x - y|^4}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Let us show (2.14). It is seen that when $x^3, y^3 \geq 0$,

$$\partial_{x^3} G(x, y) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{x^3 - y^3}{|x - y|^3} \mathbf{1}_{\{y^3 \geq x^3\}} - \frac{x^3 + y^3}{|\sigma(x) - y|^3} \right) + \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{x^3 - y^3}{|\sigma(x) - y|^3} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq y^3 \leq x^3\}}.$$

The first term on the right hand side is nonpositive and so negligible, while the second term satisfies (2.14). Thus we have (2.14).

Finally, we show (2.13). It is clear that $u_R(x)$ depends only on x_1 , and so we need only to estimate of the second derivative in x^3 . We decompose as

$$\int_{R=0}^{\infty} \partial_{x^3}^2 u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} = \int_{R=0}^{b(x)/10} \partial_{x^3}^2 u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} + \int_{R=b(x)/10}^1 \partial_{x^3}^2 u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R}.$$

To estimate the first term on the right hand side, we observe by using integration by parts that for $0 < R < b(x)/10$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_{x^3}^2 u_R(x) \\ &= \int_D [\partial_{x^3}^2 G(x, y) \varphi(R^{-1}(x - y)) + 2\partial_{x^3} G(x, y) \partial_{x^3} (\varphi(R^{-1}(x - y))) + G(x, y) \partial_{x^3}^2 (\varphi(R^{-1}(x - y)))] dy \\ &= \int_D [\partial_{x^3}^2 H(x, y) \varphi(R^{-1}(x - y)) + 2\partial_{x^3} H(x, y) \partial_{x^3} (\varphi(R^{-1}(x - y))) + H(x, y) \partial_{x^3}^2 (\varphi(R^{-1}(x - y)))] dy. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, a direct computation gives

$$|\partial_{x^3}^k H(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|\sigma(x) - y|^{-1-k}} \text{ for } k = 0, 1, 2.$$

From these, we can arrive at

$$\left| \int_{R=0}^{b(x)/10} \partial_{x^3}^2 u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} \right| \leq \int_{R=0}^{b(x)} \frac{R}{b(x)} \frac{dR}{R} \lesssim 1.$$

What is left is to show

$$\left| \int_{R=b(x)/10}^1 \partial_{x^3}^2 u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} \right| \lesssim 1. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

To this end, we define

$$v_{A,B}(x) = \int_D G(x, y) \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x - y) dy, \quad \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(z) := \varphi_{\leq B}(z) \varphi_{\geq A}(z) = \sum_{A \leq N \leq B} \varphi_N(z),$$

where $\varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}$ is a generalized function of $\int_{R=A}^B \varphi(R^{-1}(x-y)) \frac{dR}{R}$. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{x^3}^2 v_{A,B}(x) \\ &= \int_D [\partial_{x^3}^2 G(x,y) \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x-y) + 2\partial_{x^3} G(x,y) \partial_{x^3} \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x-y) + G(x,y) \partial_{x^3}^2 \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x-y)] dy. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side is acceptable by taking $A = b(x)/10$ and using (A.9) as

$$\int_D |\partial_{x^3}^2 G(x,y) \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x-y)| dy \lesssim \frac{b(x)}{A} \lesssim 1.$$

To estimate the other terms, we use the multiplicative property:

$$\varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x) = \varphi_{\geq A}(x) \varphi_{\leq B}(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \partial_{x^3} \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x) = \partial_{x^3} \varphi_{\geq A}(x) + \partial_{x^3} \varphi_{\leq B}(x).$$

Taking advantage of this, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| 2 \int_D \partial_{x^3} G(x,y) \partial_{x^3} \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x-y) dy \right| &= \left| 2 \int_{\{y^3 > 0\}} \partial_{x^3} G(x,y) [\partial_{x^3} \varphi_{\geq A}(x-y) + \partial_{x^3} \varphi_{\leq B}(x-y)] dy \right| \\ &\lesssim \sup_R R^{-1} \int_{\{y^3 > 0\}} \partial_{x^3} G(x,y) \mathbf{1}_{\{R/4 \leq |x-y| \leq 4R\}} dy \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_D G(x,y) \partial_{x^3}^2 \varphi_{A \leq \cdot \leq B}(x-y) dy \right| &= \left| \int_D G(x,y) [\partial_{x^3}^2 \varphi_{\geq A}(x-y) + \partial_{x^3}^2 \varphi_{\leq B}(x-y)] dy \right| \\ &\lesssim \sup_R R^{-2} \int |G(x,y)| \mathbf{1}_{\{R/4 \leq |x-y| \leq 4R\}} dy \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

These bounds imply (A.10). Thus (2.13) holds.

A.4. Green function estimates for a corner. In the case of the corner $D = \{x^1 > 0, x^2 > 0\}$, the extended distance b and the Green function G are given by

$$b(x) = \begin{cases} \min\{x^1, x^2\} & \text{if } x \in D \text{ or } x^1 x^2 \leq 0, \\ -\sqrt{(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2} & \text{if } x^1 < 0 \text{ and } x^2 < 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$G(x,y) := -\frac{1}{4\pi} \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|} - \frac{1}{|\sigma_1(x)-y|} - \frac{1}{|\sigma_2(x)-y|} + \frac{1}{|\sigma_1\sigma_2(x)-y|} \right], \quad \sigma_j x^p = x^p - 2\delta_j^p x^p.$$

It seems possible to show (2.14). On the other hand, (2.13) no longer holds and in fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{R=0}^1 \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} \right| &\lesssim 1, \quad \{i,j\} \neq \{1,2\}, \\ \left| \int_{R=0}^1 \partial_{x^1} \partial_{x^2} u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} \right| &\gtrsim \ln(2 + 1/c(x)), \quad c(x) := \sqrt{(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

where $c(x)$ denotes the distance to the corner.

We start by remarking that, in the same spirit of the half-space case, one can easily show that

$$\left| \int_{R=0}^{b(x)/10} \partial_{x^1} \partial_{x^2} u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} \right| \lesssim 1,$$

so that it only remains to consider the integral over the interval $[b(x)/10, 1]$.

Let us show the first line of (A.11). For the case $i = j \in \{1, 2\}$, by direct computations, we have

$$|\partial_{x^j}^2 G(x,y)| \lesssim \frac{b(x)}{|x-y|^4}.$$

This gives us the desired bounds for iterated derivatives. For the case $i = 3$ or $j = 3$, it follows from using $(\partial_{x^3} + \partial_{y^3})G(x, y) = 0$ and integration by parts that $\partial_{x^3}\partial_{x^j}u_R(x) = 0$. Thus the first line of (A.11) holds.

We now turn to the second line. Using integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{x^1}\partial_{x^2}u_R(x) \\ &= \int_D (\partial_{x^1} + \partial_{y^1})(\partial_{x^2} + \partial_{y^2})G(x, y)\varphi_R(x - y)dy \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_D \partial_{y^1}\partial_{y^2} \left(\frac{1}{|\sigma_1\sigma_2(x) - y|} \right) \varphi_R(x - y)dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_D \partial_{y^2} \left(\frac{1}{|\sigma_1\sigma_2(x) - y|} \right) (\partial_{y^1}\varphi_R)(x - y)dy - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\{y^1=0, y^2>0\}} \frac{1}{|\sigma_1\sigma_2(x) - y|} (\partial_{y^2}\varphi_R)(x - y)dS \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\{y^1=0, y^2=0\}} \frac{1}{|\sigma_1\sigma_2(x) - y|} \varphi_R(x - y)dy^3. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying this by R^{-1} and integrating from $b(x)/10$ to 1, we see that the first two terms are bounded uniformly in $c(x)$. The third term is estimated from below as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{R=b(x)/10}^1 \int_{\{y^1=0, y^2=0\}} \frac{1}{|\sigma_1\sigma_2(x) - y|} \varphi_R(x - y)dy^3 \frac{dR}{R} &\gtrsim \int_{R=b(x)/10}^1 \int_{y^3=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_R(x^1, x^2, y^3)}{R} dy^3 \frac{dR}{R} \\ &\gtrsim \int_{R=c(x)/10}^1 \frac{dR}{R} = \ln \left(\frac{10}{c(x)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $c(x) \leq 1$. Thus the second line of (A.11) holds. Therefore, when x is close to the corner, (2.13) is false.

A.5. Green function estimates for C^3 convex domains. The bound (2.9) holds for any convex domain, see [7, Proposition 2.3]. In the case of the C^3 convex domains, we show (2.13) and (2.14) concerning the the Green function G . To this end, we need to employ the approximate Green function G_W discussed below.

A.5.1. Approximate Green Function. Given $x \in D$ near the boundary ∂D , denote the orthogonal projection onto the boundary ∂D and the reflection to the exterior D^c by $\pi(x)$ and $\sigma(x) := 2\pi(x) - x$, respectively. We define the approximate Green function G_W by

$$G_W(x, y) := -\frac{1}{4\pi} \left[\frac{1}{|x - y|} - \frac{1}{|\sigma(x) - y|} \right],$$

and the correction by

$$H(x, y) := G(x, y) - G_W(x, y). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

We note that H is a harmonic function in y . In order to estimate H , it is convenient to use the acceptable upper bound

$$M_x(y) := \frac{1}{|\sigma(x) - y|} + \mathbf{n}(x) \cdot F(\sigma(x) - y), \quad \text{where } F(p) := \frac{p}{|p|^3} \text{ for } p \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\mathbf{n}(x)$ is defined in subsection A.2. This is a nonnegative harmonic function in y , and we can easily compute its boundary value. Indeed, it is seen for the case $x = (0, 0, b(x))$ and $y = (v, w(v))$ that

$$M_x(y) = \frac{1}{[|v|^2 + (b(x) + w(v))^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left[1 + \frac{b(x) + w(v)}{|v|^2 + (b(x) + w(v))^2} \right]. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

For the approximate Green function G_W , the following lemma holds:

Lemma A.5. *If $\tau \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \theta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \vartheta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0$, $|y| \geq 2|x|$, and $b(x) \leq 10$, then there holds that*

$$|\tau \cdot (\nabla_x + \nabla_y) \nabla_x G_W(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x - y|^2} + \frac{b(x)}{|x - y|^3},$$

while

$$|\mathbf{n}^i(x) \mathbf{n}^j(x) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} G_W(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{b(x)}{|x - y|^4}, \quad |\theta^i \vartheta^j \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} G_W(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|x - y|^2} + \frac{b(x)}{|x - y|^3} + \frac{b(x)}{|x - y|^4}.$$

Proof. We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x^i} G_W(x, y) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} [F_i(x - y) - \partial_{x^i} \sigma^k(x) F^k(\sigma(x) - y)], \\ \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} G_W(x, y) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} [A_{ij}(x - y) - \partial_{x^i} \sigma^k(x) \partial_{x^j} \sigma^l(x) A_{kl}(\sigma(x) - y) - \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} \sigma^k(x) F^k(\sigma(x) - y)], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_{ab}(x) := \partial_{x^a} F^b(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^3} \left[\delta_{ab} - 3 \frac{x^a x^b}{|x|^2} \right] \text{ for } a, b = 1, 2, 3.$$

From (A.6) and the formula $\sigma(x) = 2\pi(x) - x$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{n}(x) \cdot \nabla_x \sigma^k = -\mathbf{n}^k(x), \quad \mathbf{n}^a(x) \mathbf{n}^b(x) \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} \sigma(x) = 0, \quad \tau \cdot \nabla_x (u^k \sigma^k) = u^k \tau^k + 2u^a N_{ab}(x) \tau^b,$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $N(x) := {}^t P(\pi(x)) [M(x) - Id_3] P(\pi(x))$. Therefore we deduce that

$$\mathbf{n}^i \mathbf{n}^j \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} G_W(x, y) = \frac{1}{4\pi} [A_{ab}(x - y) - A_{ab}(\sigma(x) - y)] \mathbf{n}^a \mathbf{n}^b, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{n}^i \tau^j \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} G_W(x, y) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} [A_{ab}(x - y) + A_{ab}(\sigma(x) - y)] \mathbf{n}^a \tau^b \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{2\pi} \frac{\langle \sigma(x) - y, N(x) \tau \rangle \langle \sigma(x) - y, \mathbf{n} \rangle}{|\sigma(x) - y|^5} - \frac{1}{2\pi} II(x) [\tau, F(\sigma(x) - y)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^i \vartheta^j \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} G_W(x, y) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} [A_{ab}(x - y) - A_{ab}(\sigma(x) - y)] \theta^a \vartheta^b \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi} A_{ab}(\sigma(x) - y) [((Id + 2N)\theta)^a ((Id + 2N)\vartheta)^b - \theta^a \vartheta^b] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi} II(x) [\theta, \vartheta] \mathbf{n}^k F^k(\sigma(x) - y) - \frac{b(x)}{4\pi} III(x) [\theta, \vartheta, \tau] \tau^k F^k(\sigma(x) - y), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where τ, θ, ϑ are tangent vectors at x with $\tau \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \theta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \vartheta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0$. These give the desired estimates. \square

To estimate correction H , we often use the following maximum principle:

Lemma A.6. *Let $H_p = H_p(y)$ be a nonnegative harmonic function. Assume that $f = f(y)$ is a harmonic function in D and satisfies the following for $y \in \partial D$:*

$$|f(y)| \leq H_p(y). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Then (A.18) holds for all $y \in D$.

For pure tangential and normal derivatives, we have the next lemma.

Lemma A.7. *If $\theta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \vartheta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0$ and $b(x) \leq 10$, then there holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x) H(x, y)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{|\sigma(x) - y|} \text{ for } y \in \partial D, \\ |\mathbf{n}^i(x) \mathbf{n}^j(x) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} H(x, y)| + |\theta^i \vartheta^j \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} H(x, y)| &\lesssim M_x(y) \text{ for } y \in \partial D. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)H(x, y)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{|x-y|} \text{ for } y \in D, \\ |\mathbf{n}^i(x)\mathbf{n}^j(x)\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}H(x, y)| + |\theta^i\vartheta^j\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}H(x, y)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{|x-y|} + \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} \text{ for } y \in D. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Proof. First we show the bound (A.19), but we treat only the second inequality, since the first one can be obtained similarly. We note that $\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}H|_{y \in \partial D} = -\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}G_W|_{y \in \partial D}$ holds. Using a translation and/or a rotation, we may suppose that $\pi(x) = 0$, $x = (0, 0, b(x))$, $y = (v, w(v))$, $\omega(0) = 0$, and $\nabla\omega(0) = 0$. In the case $|x-y| \geq 1$, it is obvious that the second inequality in (A.19) holds. We treat another case $|x-y| \leq 1$, where $w(v) \lesssim |v|^2$ holds due to $\omega(0) = 0$ and $\nabla\omega(0) = 0$. Using (A.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{n}^i\mathbf{n}^j\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}G_W(x, y)| &\lesssim \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^3} - \frac{1}{|\sigma(x)-y|^3} \right] + \left[\frac{1}{|x-y|^5} - \frac{1}{|\sigma(x)-y|^5} \right] \cdot |(\sigma(x)-y) \cdot \mathbf{n}|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{|((x-y) \cdot \mathbf{n})^2 - ((\sigma(x)-y) \cdot \mathbf{n})^2|}{|x-y|^5} \\ &\lesssim \frac{b(x)w(v)}{|x-y|^5} \lesssim M_x(y). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, it follows from (A.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta^i\vartheta^j\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}G_W(x, y)| &\lesssim \frac{b(x)w(v)}{|x-y|^5} + \frac{|v|^2b(x)w(v)}{|x-y|^7} + \frac{b(x)}{|\sigma(x)-y|^3} + M_x(y) + \frac{b(x)}{|\sigma(x)-y|^2} \\ &\lesssim M_x(y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (A.19) holds.

We next show (A.20). Recall that $M_x(y)$ is positive and harmonic in y as well as $\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}H$ is also harmonic in y . Hence, the bound (A.20) immediately follows from (A.13) and (A.19) with the aid of Lemma A.6 with $H_p = M_x$, $|\sigma(x) - \cdot|^{-1}$. \square

We now estimate the normal and tangential derivatives of the correction $H(x, y) = G(x, y) - G_W(x, y)$ in (A.12). Given $x \in D$, a tangent vector τ at x with $\tau \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0$, $y \in D$, and $(z, \beta(z)) \in \partial D$, where $\beta(0) = \nabla\beta(0) = 0$ holds, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_x(y) &:= \frac{1}{2\pi} II(x)[\tau, \cdot] \frac{1}{|\sigma(x)-y|} + \frac{\mathbf{n}^3(x)}{4\pi|\sigma(x)-y|} \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_z^2\beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tau, \\ q(x, y) &:= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\mathbf{n}(x) \cdot (\pi(x) - y)}{|\sigma(x) - y|^3}, \\ \mathcal{D}_\tau[q] &:= \tau^1\partial_{y^1}q(z, \beta(z)) + \tau^2\partial_{y^2}q(z, \beta(z)) + \tau^1[\partial_{z^1}\beta][\partial_{y^3}q(z, \beta(z))] + \tau^2[\partial_{z^2}\beta][\partial_{y^3}q(z, \beta(z))] \\ &= [\tau^i\partial_{y^i}q(y) + [\tau \cdot \nabla_y(\beta(y^1, y^2) - y^3)]\partial_{y^3}q(y)]_{y=(z, \beta(z))}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

We note that \mathbf{V}_x^k and $\text{div}_y[\mathbf{V}_x]$ are harmonic in y . We decompose the normal and tangential derivatives of H by using these functions. Then we show in the following lemma that all the terms are acceptable except $\mathcal{D}_\tau[q]$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{D}_\tau[q]$ will be handled later by using a harmonic extension defined in subsection A.5.2.

Lemma A.8. *If $b(x) \leq 10$, then there holds that for $y \in \partial D$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{V}_x(y)| + |\tau^i\mathbf{n}^j(x)\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}H(x, y) - \text{div}_y[\mathbf{V}_x] - \mathcal{D}_\tau[q]| &\lesssim M_x(y), \\ |\mathbf{n}_k(y)\mathbf{V}_x^k(y)| &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Proof of Lemma A.8. First we estimate \mathbf{V}_x in (A.22) following the proof of Lemma A.7. It is clear that $|\mathbf{V}_x(y)| \lesssim M_x(y)$. Furthermore, we observe that when $x = (0, 0, b(x))$ and $y = (v, w(v)) \in \partial D$,

$$|\mathbf{n}_k(y)\mathbf{V}_x^k(y)| \lesssim \left| \frac{\nabla_v w(v)}{[|v|^2 + (b(x) + w(v))^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right| \lesssim 1.$$

Thus the second inequality in (A.22) also holds.

It remains to handle the second term on the left hand side of (A.22). From $\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}H|_{y \in \partial D} = -\partial_{x^i}\partial_{x^j}G_W|_{y \in \partial D}$ and (A.16), it holds that for $y \in \partial D$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau^i \mathbf{n}^j(x) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} H(x, y) - \operatorname{div}_y [\mathbf{V}_x] - \mathcal{D}_\tau [q] \\ &= -\frac{1}{4\pi} [A_{ij}(x-y) + A_{ij}(\sigma(x)-y)] \mathbf{n}^j \tau^i - \tau^i \partial_{y^i} q \\ & \quad + \frac{3}{2\pi} \frac{\langle \sigma(x) - y, N(x) \tau \rangle \langle \sigma(x) - y, \mathbf{n} \rangle}{|\sigma(x) - y|^5} \\ & \quad - [\tau \cdot \nabla_y (\beta(y^1, y^2) - y^3)] \partial_{y^3} q - \operatorname{div}_y \left[\frac{\mathbf{n}^3(x)}{4\pi |\sigma(x) - y|} \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_z^2 \beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tau \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

We can simplify the first two terms on the right hand side as

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{frist two terms}) &= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \left[A_{ij}(x-y) + A_{ij}(\sigma(x)-y) + 6 \frac{(\pi(x)-y)^j (\sigma(x)-y)^i}{|\sigma(x)-y|^5} \right] \mathbf{n}^j \tau^i \\ &= -3\tau^i (\sigma(x)-y)^i \mathbf{n}^j(x) \left[\frac{(x-y)^j}{|x-y|^5} + \frac{(\sigma(x)-y)^j}{|\sigma(x)-y|^5} - \frac{2(\pi(x)-y)^j}{|\sigma(x)-y|^5} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms can be written by using $\tau \cdot \nabla_y (\beta(y^1, y^2) - y^3)|_{y=\pi(x)} = 0$ and $\sigma(x) = 2\pi(x) - x$ as

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{last two terms}) &= -\tau \cdot [\nabla_y \beta(y^1, y^2) - \nabla_y \beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x))] \partial_{y^3} q + \tau^j \partial_{y^j y^i} \beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x)) [\sigma(x) - y]^i \frac{\mathbf{n}^3(x)}{4\pi |\sigma(x) - y|^3} \\ &= -\tau \cdot [\nabla_y \beta(y^1, y^2) - \nabla_y \beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x))] \frac{\mathbf{n}(x) \cdot (\pi(x) - y)}{2\pi} \partial_{y^3} \left[\frac{1}{|\sigma(x) - y|^3} \right] \\ & \quad + \tau^j \left[\partial_{y^j} \beta(y^1, y^2) - \partial_{y^j} \beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x)) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_{y^j y^i} \beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x)) [y - \pi(x)]^i \right] \frac{\mathbf{n}^3(x)}{2\pi |\sigma(x) - y|^3} \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \tau^j \partial_{y^j y^i} \beta(\pi^1(x), \pi^2(x)) [x - \pi(x)]^i \frac{\mathbf{n}^3(x)}{2\pi |\sigma(x) - y|^3}. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way as in the proof of Lemma A.7, we can estimate the right hand side of (A.23) by $M_x(y)$. Thus (A.22) holds. \square

A.5.2. Harmonic extensions. For any harmonic functions f , we can reconstruct f from its boundary value. Given a function $f = f(x, y)$ defined on ∂D , we define $f^H = f^H(x, y)$ by solving the Dirichlet problem

$$\Delta_y f^H = 0, \quad y \in D, \quad f^H = f \quad \text{on } \partial D. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

We call the mapping from the boundary data f to the solution f^H of (A.24) a *harmonic extension*.

We define an approximate solution to the Dirichlet problem (A.24). Fix $L \in (0, 1)$ and $y_0 \in \partial D$. We introduce a coordinate $y = (z, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $y_0 = 0$ and $\partial D = \{(z, t) : t = \beta(z)\}$, where β satisfies $\beta(0) = \nabla \beta(0) = 0$. Given a vector $\underline{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and a function g defined on \mathbb{R}^2 , we define $\underline{f}(z)$ by

$$\underline{f}(z) := \underline{\tau} \cdot \nabla_z [g(z)], \quad (\text{A.25})$$

where g satisfies

$$[L + |z|]^{1+|\alpha|} |\partial_z^\alpha g(z)| \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Now we define f^b by solving another Dirichlet problem

$$\Delta_y f^b(z, t) = 0, \quad (z, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-L^2, \infty), \quad f^b(z, -L^2) = \underline{f}(z) = \underline{\tau} \cdot \nabla_z [g(z)]. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Since the boundary is flat, thanks to the Poisson kernel, we can explicitly solve the Dirichlet problem (A.27):

$$f^b(z, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{L^2+t}(z-a) \underline{f}(a) da, \quad P_{L^2+t}(z-a) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{L^2+t}{[|z-a|^2 + (L^2+t)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Proposition A.9. *Let $0 < L \leq 1$, and consider the boundary data \underline{f} defined in (A.25) and the solution f^H of (A.24) with $f = \underline{f}$. Then there holds that for $y = (z, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |f^b(y)| &\lesssim [L + |y|]^{-1} + [L + |y|]^{-2}, \\ |f^H(y) - f^b(y)| &\lesssim [L + |y|]^{-1} + [L + |y|]^{-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.28}$$

Proof. We start with estimating f^b . Given $\Lambda := L + |z|$, we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} f^b(z, t) &= A + B, \quad A := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{L^2+t}(z-a) \underline{f}(a) \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z-a|) da, \\ B &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{L^2+t}(z-a) \underline{f}(a) [1 - \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z-a|)] da, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\chi(s) = 1$ if $s \leq \frac{1}{4}$, and $\chi(s) = 0$ if $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$. By a direct computation, it is seen that

$$|A| \lesssim [L^2 + |z|^2]^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{L^2+t}{[|z-a|^2 + (L^2+t)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z-a|) da \lesssim [L^2 + |z|^2 + t^2]^{-1}.$$

To handle B , we take advantage of the derivative structure as

$$B = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(a) \underline{\tau} \cdot \nabla_a \left[\frac{L^2+t}{[|z-a|^2 + (L^2+t)^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} [1 - \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z-a|)] \right] da.$$

Using this and dividing into two cases $t \geq |a|$ and $t \leq |a|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B| &\lesssim (L^2+t) \int_{\{|z-a| \geq \frac{1}{4}(L+|z|)\}} \frac{1}{L+|a|} \left[\frac{1}{[|z-a|^2 + t^2]^2} + \frac{1}{[|z-a|^2 + t^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right] da \\ &\lesssim [L^2 + |z|^2 + t^2]^{-1} + [L^2 + |z|^2 + t^2]^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

These estimates lead to the first line of (A.28).

We now turn to the difference between f^H and f^b . We begin with estimating it on the boundary $\{t = \beta(z)\}$ in the case $|z| \leq 1$. Since the Poisson kernel is normalized and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (z-a) h(|z-a|) da = 0$ holds for any function h , we observe that

$$f^H(z, \beta(z)) - f^b(z, \beta(z)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{L^2+\beta(z)}(z-a) [\underline{f}(z) - \underline{f}(a)] da = D_1 + D_2 + D_3,$$

where $\Lambda := L + |z|/10$ and

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{L^2+\beta(z)}(z-a) [\underline{f}(z) - \underline{f}(a) - (z-a) \cdot \nabla_z \underline{f}(z)] \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z-a|) da, \\ D_2 &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{L^2+\beta(z)}(z-a) \underline{f}(z) [1 - \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z-a|)] da, \\ D_3 &:= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} P_{L^2+\beta(z)}(z-a) \underline{f}(a) [1 - \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z-a|)] da. \end{aligned}$$

We can estimate D_1 , D_2 , and D_3 as follows. From $\beta(0) = \nabla\beta(0) = 0$ and $|z| \leq 1$, it holds that $\beta(z) \lesssim |z|^2$. We observe that

$$|D_1| \lesssim \int_{\{|z-a| \leq \frac{1}{2}\Lambda\}} \frac{L^2 + \beta(z)}{[|z-a|^2 + (L^2 + \beta(z))^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{|z-a|^2}{[L^2 + |z|^2]^2} da \lesssim [L + |z|]^{-1}.$$

A direct computation yeilds

$$|D_2| \lesssim |f(z, \beta(z))| \cdot [L^2 + \beta(z)]/\Lambda \lesssim \Lambda^{-1} \lesssim [L + |z|]^{-1}.$$

Using the fact that $f(a, \beta(a)) = \underline{\tau} \cdot \nabla_a [g(a)]$, we rewrite D_3 as

$$D_3 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(a) \underline{\tau} \cdot \nabla_a \left[[1 - \chi(\Lambda^{-1}|z - a|)] \cdot P_{L^2 + \beta(z)}(z - a) \right] da,$$

which gives

$$|D_3| \lesssim [L + |z|]^{-1}.$$

As a result we see that, for $y \in \partial D$,

$$|f^H(y) - f^b(y)| \lesssim M_{x_0}(y), \quad x_0 := (0, 0, -L).$$

This inequality is obviously true even in the case $|z| \geq 1$. Recall all the functions f^H , f^b , and M_{x_0} are harmonic in D . So we can also extend this inequality inside by Lemma A.6 with $H_p = M_{x_0}$. Thus we obtain the second inequality in (A.28). \square

A.6. Proofs of (2.13) and (2.14). Now we are ready to prove (2.13) and (2.14).

Proposition A.10. *Assume the domain D is C^3 . Then (2.13) holds.*

Proof. First we consider the interval $0 < R \leq b(x)/10$. We introduce a harmonic function

$$K(x, y) := G(x, y) + \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{|x - y|}.$$

It is seen that

$$\nabla_x u_R(x) = \nabla_x \left(\int_{y \in D} \varphi(R^{-1}(x - y)) K(x, y) dy \right), \quad |\nabla_x^\alpha K(x, y)| \lesssim [b(x)]^{-1 - |\alpha|},$$

where we have used the maximum principle in deriving the second inequality. From these, we have

$$\int_0^{b(x)/10} |\nabla^2 u_R(x)| \frac{dR}{R} \lesssim \int_0^{b(x)/10} \frac{R}{b(x)} \frac{dR}{R} \lesssim 1.$$

Next we consider the interval $b(x)/10 \leq R \leq 1$ and we show

$$\left| \int_{R=b(x)/10}^1 \nabla^2 u_R(x) \frac{dR}{R} \right| \lesssim 1.$$

Fixed $x \in D$, we can decompose Hessian into tangential and normal derivatives. Let θ , τ , and ϑ be tangent vectors such that $\theta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \vartheta \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = \tau \cdot \mathbf{n}(x) = 0$. We divide the proof into three cases as below.

Case I (two normal derivatives): Taking two normal derivatives, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{n}^a \mathbf{n}^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} u_R(x) &= \int_D [\mathbf{n}^a \mathbf{n}^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} G(x, y)] \varphi_R(x - y) dy + 2 \int_D [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x) G(x, y)] (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x) \varphi_R(x - y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_D G(x, y) \mathbf{n}^a \mathbf{n}^b \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} (\varphi_R(x - y)) dy \\ &=: I_R^1 + I_R^2 + I_R^3. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemmas A.5 and A.7, we observe on the support of integration that

$$|\mathbf{n}^a(x) \mathbf{n}^b(x) \partial_{x^a} \partial_{x^b} G(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{R} + \frac{1}{R^2} + \frac{b(x)}{R^4}.$$

Then the first term I_R^1 can be estimated as

$$\left| \int_{R=b(x)/10}^1 I_R^1 \frac{dR}{R} \right| \lesssim 1.$$

To estimate the second term I_R^2 , we use the following equality as long as derivatives hit φ_R :

$$\nabla_x[\varphi(R^{-1}(x-y))] = -R\partial_R[\varphi(R^{-1}(x-y))]\frac{x-y}{|x-y|^2}.$$

Applying integration by parts in R , we find

$$\left| \int_{b(x)/10}^1 I_R^2 \frac{dR}{R} \right| = \left| \int_D \frac{\mathbf{n} \cdot (x-y)}{|x-y|^2} (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x) G(x, y) \cdot [\varphi(x-y) - \varphi(10b(x)^{-1}(x-y))] dy \right| \lesssim 1.$$

Similarly, one can handle the third term I_R^3 . Thus the desired bound holds.

Case II (two tangential derivatives): In the case of two tangential derivatives, we observe on the support of integration using Lemmas A.5 and A.7 that

$$|\theta^i \vartheta^j \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} G(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{R} + \frac{1}{R^2} + \frac{b(x)}{R^3} + \frac{b(x)}{R^4}.$$

Then following the proof of Case I, we can get the desired bound.

Case III (one tangential derivative and one normal derivative): Taking one tangential derivative and one normal derivative and using integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)(\tau \cdot \nabla_x) u_R(x) &= \int_D [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)[(\tau \cdot \nabla_x) + (\tau \cdot \nabla_y)] G(x, y)] \varphi_R(x-y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_D [[(\tau \cdot \nabla_x) + (\tau \cdot \nabla_y)] G(x, y)] (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)(\varphi_R(x-y)) dy. \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be handled by the same technique as in Case I. Let us estimate the first term. To this end, we decompose $G = G_W + H$. Using Lemma A.5, we observe on the support of integration that

$$|(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)[(\tau \cdot \nabla_x) + (\tau \cdot \nabla_y)] G_W(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{R^2} + \frac{b(x)}{R^3}.$$

Multiplying this by $R^{-1}\varphi_R$ and integrating the result in y and R , we have an acceptable bound.

It remains to estimate the correction H . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_D [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)[(\tau \cdot \nabla_x) + (\tau \cdot \nabla_y)] H(x, y)] \varphi_R(x-y) dy \\ &= \int_D [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)(\tau \cdot \nabla_x) H(x, y)] \varphi_R(x-y) dy + \int_D [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)(\tau \cdot \nabla_y) H(x, y)] \varphi_R(x-y) dy. \end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

To estimate the first term on the right hand side of (A.29), we decompose the second-order derivatives in x of the correction H into several components as

$$\tau^i \mathbf{n}^j(x) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} H(x, y) = [\tau^i \mathbf{n}^j(x) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} H(x, y) - \operatorname{div}_y[\mathbf{V}_x] - (\mathcal{D}_\tau q)^H] + \operatorname{div}_y[\mathbf{V}_x] + (\mathcal{D}_\tau q)^H, \tag{A.30}$$

where \mathbf{V}_x , q , and \mathcal{D}_τ are defined in (A.21), and $(\cdot)^H$ denotes the harmonic extension defined in (A.24). Now we claim that

$$|\tau^i \mathbf{n}^j(x) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} H(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{R} + \frac{1}{R^2}. \tag{A.31}$$

Indeed, it is easy to estimate the first term on the right hand of (A.30) by Lemmas A.6 and A.8. Furthermore, we can handle the second term by using integration by parts and Lemma A.8. For the last term $(\mathcal{D}_\tau q)^H$, it follows from Proposition A.9 that on the support of integration

$$|(\mathcal{D}_\tau q)^H| \lesssim \frac{1}{R} + \frac{1}{R^2}.$$

Thus (A.31) is valid. Multiplying (A.31) by $R^{-1}\varphi_R$ and integrating the result in y and R , we have an acceptable bound.

Finally we handle the second term on the right hand side of (A.29). It can be written as

$$(2\text{nd term}) = - \int_{\partial D} [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x) H(x, y)] \varphi_R(x-y) (\tau \cdot \mathbf{n}(y)) dS - \int_D [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x) H(x, y)] (\tau \cdot \nabla_y) \varphi_R(x-y) dy.$$

Then Lemma A.7 gives

$$\left| \int_D [(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)(\tau \cdot \nabla_y)H(x, y)] \varphi_R(x - y) dy \right| \lesssim R.$$

Dividing this by R and integrating the result in R , we have an acceptable bound. Thus we arrive at the desired bound of $(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla_x)(\tau \cdot \nabla_x)u_R(x)$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition A.11. *Assume the domain D is $C^{2,\alpha}$, and the Green function G satisfies (2.12). Then (2.14) holds.*

Proof. Assume $L > 1$. We will consider the contribution of various dyadic shells around x . For small scales $0 \leq R \leq 10b(x)$ we can use a crude estimate

$$\|[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \varphi_R(x - y)\|_{L_y^1} \lesssim \|\nabla_x G(x, y)\|_{L^1(\{R/4 \leq |x-y| \leq 4R\})} \lesssim R. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Let us next treat large scales $1/10 \leq R \leq L$. Using the Hopf maximum principle, we have

$$[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \leq [\nabla_x b(x) \cdot [\nabla_x G(x, y) - \nabla_x G(\pi_b(x), y)]]_+. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

From this, (2.12), and the mean value theorem, it is seen that

$$\|[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \varphi_R(x - y)\|_{L_y^1} \lesssim b(x) \quad (\text{A.34})$$

and that, when $R \geq L$,

$$\|[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \varphi_{\geq L}(x - y)\|_{L_y^\infty} \lesssim b(x)L^{-3}.$$

It remains to consider middle scales $10b(x) \leq R \leq 1/10$. We approximate the Green function by G_W :

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ &= [\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x H(x, y) + \nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G_W(x, y)]_+ \\ &\leq [\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x H(x, y)]_+ + [\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G_W(x, y)]_+. \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be treated similarly as in the case of the half-space. We consider the correction term H . By direct computations, we find that when $y = (p, w(p)) \in \partial D$,

$$\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x H(\pi_b(x), y) = -\frac{w(p)}{4\pi} \left[\frac{1}{[(b(x) - w(p))^2 + |p|^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{1}{[(b(x) + w(p))^2 + |p|^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right] \leq 0.$$

And thus the above is true for $y \in D$ by maximum principle. For the first term, using Lemma A.7 with $\nabla_x b(x) = \mathbf{n}(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x H(x, y)]_+ &\leq [\nabla_x b(x) \cdot [\nabla_x H(x, y) - \nabla_x H(\pi_b(x), y)]]_+ \\ &\leq b(x) \sup_{\theta \in [0,1]} |\mathbf{n}^i(x) \mathbf{n}^j(x) \partial_{x^i} \partial_{x^j} H(\theta x + (1 - \theta)\pi_b(x), y)| \\ &\lesssim \frac{b(x)}{R} + \frac{b(x)}{R^2} + \frac{b(x)^2}{R^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.35})$$

From (A.32), (A.34), and (A.35), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{R=0}^{10L} \|[\nabla_x b(x) \cdot \nabla_x G(x, y)]_+ \varphi_R(x - y)\|_{L_y^1} \frac{dR}{R} \\ &\lesssim \int_{R=0}^{10b(x)} R \frac{dR}{R} + \int_{R=10b(x)}^{1/10} (b(x)R^2 + b(x)R + b(x)^2) \frac{dR}{R} + \int_{R=1/10}^{10L} b(x) \frac{dR}{R} \lesssim b(x) \ln(L + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (2.14) holds. \square

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Hongjie Dong for interesting discussions on analysis of the Green function. B.P. thanks the hospitality of the E. Schrödinger Institute in Vienna where this paper was finalized. B.P. and W.H. were partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2154162. B.P. and M.S. were partially supported by the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, an International Joint Usage/Research Center located in Kyoto University. M. S. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 21K03308.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bardos and P. Degond, Global existence for the Vlasov-Poisson equation in 3 space variables with small initial data. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **2** (1985), no. 2, 101–118.
- [2] L. Bigorgne, Global existence and modified scattering for the small data solutions to the Vlasov-Maxwell system. Preprint (2022), [arXiv:2208.08360](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.08360).
- [3] L. Cesbron and M. Iacobelli, Global well-posedness of Vlasov–Poisson-type systems in bounded domains, *Analysis & PDE* **16** (10), 2465–2494.
- [4] X. Fernandez-Real, The Lagrangian structure of the Vlasov-Poisson system in domains with specular reflection, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **364** (2018), 1327–1406.
- [5] P. Flynn, Z. Ouyang, B. Pausader, and K. Widmayer, Scattering map for the Vlasov-Poisson system. Preprint (2021), [arXiv:2101.01390](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.01390).
- [6] S. J. Fromm, Potential Space estimates for Green potentials in convex domains. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* (1993)
- [7] S. J. Fromm, Ph.D. Thesis, MIT.
- [8] M. Gruther and K-O Widman, The Green function for uniformly elliptic equations *Manuscript Mathematica*. (1982)
- [9] Y. Guo, Regularity for the Vlasov equations in a half-space, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **43** (1994), 255-320.
- [10] Y. Guo, Singular solutions for the Vlasov–Maxwell system on a half line, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **131** (1995), 241-304
- [11] W. Huang and H. Kwon, Scattering of the Vlasov–Riesz system in the three dimensions, Preprint (2024), [arXiv:2407.16919](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.16919)
- [12] H. J. Hwang, Regularity for the Vlasov–Poisson system in a convex domain, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **36** (2004), 121-171.
- [13] H. J. Hwang and J. J. Velázquez, On global existence for the Vlasov–Poisson system in a half space, *J. Differential Equations*, **247** (2009), 1915-1948.
- [14] H. J. Hwang and J. J. Velázquez, Global existence for the Vlasov-Poisson System in bounded domains, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **195** (2010), 763-796.
- [15] D. Han-Kwan, T. Nguyen and F. Rousset, Asymptotic stability of equilibria for screened Vlasov-Poisson systems via pointwise dispersive estimates, *Ann. PDE* **7**, 18 (2021).
- [16] M. Iacobelli, S. Rossi and K. Widmayer, On the stability of vacuum in the screened Vlasov-Poisson equation, Preprint (2024), [arXiv: 2410.17978](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.17978)
- [17] A. D. Ionescu, B. Pausader, X. Wang, and K. Widmayer, On the asymptotic behavior of solutions to the Vlasov-Poisson system. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **2022** (2022), no. 12, 8865–8889.
- [18] A. D. Ionescu, B. Pausader, X. Wang, and K. Widmayer, Nonlinear Landau damping for the Vlasov-Poisson system in \mathbb{R}^3 : the Poisson equilibrium. *Ann. PDE* **10** (2024), no. 1, Paper No. 2, 78 pp.
- [19] B. Pausader and K. Widmayer, Stability of a point charge for the Vlasov-Poisson system: the radial case. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **385** (2021), no. 3, 1741–1769.
- [20] B. Pausader, K. Widmayer and J. Yang, Stability of a point charge for the repulsive Vlasov-Poisson system. Preprint (2022), [arXiv:2207.05644](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05644).
- [21] J. Smulevici, Small data solutions of the Vlasov-Poisson system and the vector field method. *Ann. PDE* **2** (2016), no. 2, Art. 11, 55 pp.
- [22] M. Suzuki and M. Takayama, The Kinetic and Hydrodynamic Bohm Criteria for Plasma Sheath Formation, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **247** (2023), 86.
- [23] M. Suzuki, M. Takayama and K. Z. Zhang, Nonlinear Stability and Instability of Plasma Boundary Layers, [arXiv:2208.07326](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.07326).
- [24] X. Wang, Decay estimates for the 3D relativistic and non-relativistic Vlasov-Poisson systems. *Kinet. Relat. Models* **16** (2023), no. 1, 1-19.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Email address: wenrui_huang@brown.edu

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Email address: benoit_pausader@brown.edu

NAGOYA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Email address: masahiro@nitech.ac.jp