

# ON SOME BILINEAR FOURIER MULTIPLIERS WITH OSCILLATING FACTORS, I

TOMOYA KATO, AKIHIKO MIYACHI, NAOTO SHIDA, AND NAOHITO TOMITA

ABSTRACT. Bilinear Fourier multipliers of the form  $e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)}\sigma(\xi, \eta)$  are considered. It is proved that if  $\sigma(\xi, \eta)$  is in the Hörmander class  $S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  with  $m = -(n+1)/2$  then the corresponding bilinear operator is bounded in  $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow bmo$ ,  $h^1 \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^1$ , and  $L^\infty \times h^1 \rightarrow L^1$ . This improves a result given by Rodríguez-López, Rule and Staubach.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, the letter  $n$  denotes the dimension of the Euclidean space that we consider. Unless further restrictions are explicitly made,  $n$  denotes an arbitrary positive integer. For other notation, see Notation 1.4 given at the end of this section.

We first recall a result for linear Fourier multipliers. Let  $\theta = \theta(\xi)$  be a measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that is locally integrable and of at most polynomial growth as  $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$ . Then the operator  $\theta(D)$  is defined by

$$\theta(D)f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} \theta(\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi) d\xi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for  $f$  in the Schwartz class  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , where  $\widehat{f}$  denotes the Fourier transform. The function  $\theta$  is called the multiplier. If  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  and  $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$  are function spaces on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and if there exists a constant  $A$  such that

$$\|\theta(D)f\|_Y \leq A\|f\|_X \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{S} \cap X,$$

then we say that  $\theta$  is a *Fourier multiplier* for  $X \rightarrow Y$  and write  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$ . (Sometimes we write  $\theta(\xi) \in \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$  to mean  $\theta(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow Y)$ .) The minimum of the constant  $A$  is denoted by  $\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow Y)}$ .

The following class is frequently used in the theory of Fourier multipliers.

**Definition 1.1.** For  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ , the class  $S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is defined to be the set of all  $C^\infty$  functions  $\sigma = \sigma(\zeta)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfy the estimate

$$|\partial_\zeta^\alpha \sigma(\zeta)| \leq C_\alpha (1 + |\zeta|)^{m-|\alpha|}$$

for all multi-indices  $\alpha$ .

The following theorem is known.

---

*Date:* December 20, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B15, 42B20.

*Key words and phrases.* Bilinear wave operators, bilinear Fourier multiplier operators, Grothendieck's inequality.

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI, Grant Numbers 23K12995 (Kato), 23K20223 (Miyachi), 23KJ1053 (Shida), and 20K03700 (Tomita).

**Theorem A** (Seeger–Sogge–Stein). *Let  $\phi$  be a real-valued smooth positively homogeneous function of degree one on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Let  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . Then for every  $\sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $m = -(n-1)|1/p - 1/2|$  the function  $e^{i\phi(\xi)}\sigma(\xi)$  is a Fourier multiplier for  $h^p \rightarrow L^p$ , where the target space  $L^p$  should be replaced by  $bmo$  when  $p = \infty$ .*

This theorem is due to Seeger–Sogge–Stein [SSS], where a more general operator (Fourier integral operator) is treated. The special case  $\phi(\xi) = |\xi|$  is treated by Peral [P] and Miyachi [M]. It is known that the number  $-(n-1)|1/p - 1/2|$  of this theorem is sharp; see S. Sjöstrand [Sj, Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 5.2]. Proof of the sharpness of the number  $-(n-1)|1/p - 1/2|$  can also be found in [St, Chapter IX, Section 6.13 (c)].

We shall be interested in bilinear versions of Theorem A.

We recall the definition of bilinear Fourier multiplier operators. Let  $\sigma = \sigma(\xi, \eta)$  be a measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  that is locally integrable and of at most polynomial growth as  $|\xi| + |\eta| \rightarrow \infty$ . Then the bilinear operator  $T_\sigma$  is defined by

$$T_\sigma(f, g)(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot (\xi + \eta)} \sigma(\xi, \eta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \widehat{g}(\eta) d\xi d\eta, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for  $f, g \in \mathcal{S}$ . If  $X, Y$ , and  $Z$  are function spaces on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  equipped with quasi-norms or seminorms  $\|\cdot\|_X$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_Y$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_Z$ , respectively, and if there exists a constant  $A$  such that

$$\|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_Z \leq A \|f\|_X \|g\|_Y \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{S} \cap X \text{ and } g \in \mathcal{S} \cap Y,$$

then we say that  $\sigma$  is a *bilinear Fourier multiplier* for  $X \times Y$  to  $Z$  and write  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(X \times Y \rightarrow Z)$ . (Sometimes we write  $\theta(\xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{M}(X \times Y \rightarrow Z)$  to mean  $\theta(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{M}(X \times Y \rightarrow Z)$ .) The minimum of the constant  $A$  is denoted by  $\|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{M}(X \times Y \rightarrow Z)}$ .

The work of Grafakos–Peloso [GrP] seems to be the first one that considered a bilinear version of Theorem A. Among general bilinear Fourier integral operators, they considered a bilinear multiplier of the form

$$(1.1) \quad e^{i(\phi_1(\xi) + \phi_2(\eta))} \sigma(\xi, \eta), \quad \sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n}),$$

where  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are real-valued smooth positively homogeneous functions of degree one on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . They proved that (1.1) is a bilinear Fourier multiplier for  $h^p \times h^q \rightarrow L^r$  if  $1 \leq p, q < 2$ ,  $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$ , and  $m = -(n-1)(1/p + 1/q - 1)$ ; see [GrP, Proposition 2.4 and Remark 6.2]. (To be precise, the result of [GrP, loc. cit.] is restricted to local estimates.)

Rodríguez–López–Rule–Staubach [RRS1] also considered bilinear Fourier multipliers of the form (1.1). Among several results concerning Fourier integral operators, they extended the result of [GrP] by proving that (1.1) is a bilinear Fourier multiplier for  $H^p \times H^q \rightarrow L^r$  if  $n \geq 2$ ,  $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ ,  $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$ , and  $m = -(n-1)(|1/p - 1/2| + |1/q - 1/2|)$ , where  $L^r$  should be replaced by  $BMO$  when  $r = \infty$ ; see [RRS1, Theorem 2.7]. (To be precise, the paper [RRS1] also concerns with Fourier integral operators and the given estimate is a local one; extension to global estimates including the multilinear case is given in the recent paper Bergfeldt–Rodríguez–López–Rule–Staubach [BRRS, Theorem 1.4 and Remark 1.5].)

Kato–Miyachi–Tomita [KMT1, KMT2] also considered bilinear Fourier multipliers of the form (1.1) and proved that the condition  $m = -(n-1)(|1/p - 1/2| + |1/q - 1/2|)$  of [RRS1] can be relaxed in the case  $p < 2 < q$  or  $q < 2 < p$ . In [KMT1], it is shown that the condition  $m = -(n-1)(|1/p - 1/2| + |1/q - 1/2|)$  is sharp in the range  $1 \leq p, q \leq 2$  or  $2 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ , but the sharp condition for the case  $1/p + 1/q = 1$  is  $m = -n|1/p - 1/2|$ .

Recently, Rodríguez-López–Rule–Staubach [RRS2] considered another bilinear version of Theorem A. They considered the bilinear multiplier of the form

$$(1.2) \quad e^{i(\phi_1(\xi)+\phi_2(\eta)+\phi_3(\xi+\eta))} \sigma(\xi, \eta), \quad \sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n}),$$

where  $\phi_1, \phi_2,$  and  $\phi_3$  are real-valued smooth positively homogeneous functions of degree one on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . In fact [RRS2] considers more general operators, the multilinear Fourier integral operators, but here we shall refer only to their result that concerns with the above simple Fourier multipliers. In [RRS2, Theorem 1.4], the following theorem is proved.

**Theorem B** (Rodríguez-López–Rule–Staubach). *Let  $n \geq 2$ . Let  $\phi_1, \phi_2,$  and  $\phi_3$  be real-valued smooth positively homogeneous functions of degree one on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Suppose  $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$  and  $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$ . Define  $m_1(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}$  by*

$$m_1(p, q) = -(n - 1)(|1/p - 1/2| + |1/q - 1/2| + |1/r - 1/2|).$$

*Then for every  $\sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  with  $m = m_1(p, q)$  the function (1.2) is a bilinear Fourier multiplier for  $h^p \times h^q \rightarrow L^r$ , where  $L^r$  should be replaced by  $bmo$  when  $r = \infty$ .*

Now the main purpose of the present paper is to show that, in the special case where  $\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \phi_3 = |\cdot|$ , the condition  $m = m_1(p, q)$  of Theorem B for  $(p, q) = (\infty, \infty), (1, \infty), (\infty, 1)$  can be relaxed.

The following is the main result of the present paper.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $n \geq 2$ . Then for every  $\sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  with  $m = -(n + 1)/2$ , the function  $e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)} \sigma(\xi, \eta)$  is a bilinear Fourier multiplier for  $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow bmo, h^1 \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^1,$  and  $L^\infty \times h^1 \rightarrow L^1$ .*

Notice that  $m_1(p, q)$  of Theorem B gives  $m_1(\infty, \infty) = m_1(1, \infty) = m_1(\infty, 1) = -3(n - 1)/2$ , which is smaller than the number  $-(n + 1)/2$  of Theorem 1.2 in the case  $n \geq 3$ .

As for the condition  $m = -(n + 1)/2$  of Theorem 1.2, the present authors do not know whether it is sharp. However, concerning this condition, we shall prove a weak result that a key inequality in our proof of Theorem 1.2 cannot be extended to the case  $m > -(n + 1)/2$ . The precise statement will be given in Proposition 5.1 in Section 5. Notice that it does not prove the sharpness of the number  $-(n + 1)/2$  of Theorem 1.2. For the condition on  $m$  in (1.2), see also Remark 1.3 (1) below.

Here are some remarks concerning the subject of this paper.

**Remark 1.3.** (1) It should be an interesting problem to find sharp condition on  $m$  for which the multiplier (1.2) be a bilinear Fourier multiplier for  $h^p \times h^q \rightarrow L^r$  or  $bmo$ . Observe that  $m_1(p, q)$  of Theorem B is equal to  $-(n - 1)/2$  if  $2 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ . In [RRS2, Section 4, p. 17], it is shown that  $m = -(n - 1)/2$  is the sharp condition in the case  $p = q = 4$  and  $r = 2$ . In [BRRS, the end of Section 3, p. 15], it is shown that  $m = -(n - 1)/2$  is also sharp in the case  $2 \leq p, q \leq \infty$  and  $r = 2$ . If we combine these results with a simple argument using interpolation and duality, we see that for every  $(p, q, r)$  satisfying  $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$  and  $1/p + 1/q = 1/r$  the condition  $m \leq -(n - 1)/2$  is necessary for all the multipliers (1.2) to be bilinear Fourier multipliers for  $h^p \times h^q \rightarrow L^r$ , where  $L^r$  should be replaced by  $BMO$  when  $r = \infty$ .

(2) It may be an interesting problem to generalize Theorem 1.2 to the multipliers of the form (1.2) with  $\phi_\ell$  being general homogeneous functions of degree one. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on the estimate of the function  $(e^{i|\xi|\theta(2^{-j}\xi)})^\vee(x)$  for  $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , in particular the

estimate of the  $L^\infty$ -norm of this function is crucial in our proof. But the  $L^\infty$ -estimate cannot be extended to  $(e^{i\phi(\xi)}\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x)$  with  $\phi$  being a general positively homogeneous function on degree one (see Remark 3.5 (2)).

In the forthcoming article [KMST], the same authors will consider bilinear Fourier multipliers of the form

$$e^{i(|\xi|^s+|\eta|^s+|\xi+\eta|^s)}\sigma(\xi,\eta), \quad s > 0, \quad s \neq 1.$$

It uses several ideas used in the present paper, but the results are independent.

The contents of the rest of the paper are as follows. In Section 2, we shall give some preliminary argument for the multipliers of the form (1.2). In Section 3, we give estimates for functions of the form  $(e^{i|\xi|\theta(2^{-j}\xi)})^\vee(x)$ , which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.2. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 5, the last section, we give the proposition concerning the condition  $m = -(n+1)/2$  as mentioned above.

We end this section by introducing some notations used throughout the paper.

**Notation 1.4.** The letter  $\mathbb{N}$  denotes the set of positive integers. For  $E, F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we write  $E + F = \{x + y \mid x \in E, y \in F\}$  and  $v + F = \{v\} + F$ . We write the ball of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as  $B(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |x - y| < r\}$ . A subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of the form  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid a < |x| < b\}$  with  $0 < a < b < \infty$  will be called an annulus.

The Fourier transform and the inverse Fourier transform on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are defined by

$$\widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i\xi \cdot x} f(x) dx, \quad (g)^\vee(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi \cdot x} g(\xi) d\xi.$$

Sometimes we use rude expressions  $(f(x))^\wedge$  or  $(g(\xi))^\vee$  to denote  $(f(\cdot))^\wedge$  or  $(g(\cdot))^\vee$ , respectively.

We use the usual dyadic partition of unity, which is defined as follows. We take a function  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $\text{supp } \psi \subset \{2^{-1} \leq |\xi| \leq 2\}$  and  $\sum_{j=-\infty}^\infty \psi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1$  for all  $\xi \neq 0$ . We define functions  $\zeta$  and  $\varphi$  by  $\zeta(\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \psi(2^{-j}\xi)$  and  $\varphi(\xi) = 1 - \zeta(\xi)$ . Thus  $\zeta(\xi) = 0$  for  $|\xi| \leq 1$ ,  $\zeta(\xi) = 1$  for  $|\xi| \geq 2$ ,  $\varphi(\xi) = 1$  for  $|\xi| \leq 1$ , and  $\varphi(\xi) = 0$  for  $|\xi| \geq 2$ . For  $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , we write

$$\psi_j(\xi) = \begin{cases} \psi(2^{-j}\xi) & \text{if } j \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \varphi(\xi) & \text{if } j = 0. \end{cases}$$

Observe the following equality:

$$(1.3) \quad \sum_{j=0}^k \psi_j(\xi) = \varphi(2^{-k}\xi), \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Notice, however, that we sometimes use the letter  $\psi$  to denote other functions.

For a smooth function  $\theta$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and for a nonnegative integer  $M$ , we write  $\|\theta\|_{C^M} = \max_{|\alpha| \leq M} \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\partial_\xi^\alpha \theta(\xi)|$ . For  $0 < p \leq \infty$ ,  $H^p$  denotes the usual Hardy space and  $h^p$  denotes the local Hardy space. The space of bounded mean oscillation is denoted by  $BMO$ , which is the dual of  $H^1$ . The local version of  $BMO$  is denoted by  $bmo$ , which is the dual space of  $h^1$ . We use the convention that  $H^p = h^p = L^p$  if  $1 < p \leq \infty$ . For  $H^p$  and  $BMO$ , see Stein [St, Chapters III and IV]. For  $h^p$  and  $bmo$ , see Goldberg [Go].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we shall give a preliminary argument to reduce the claim

$$(2.1) \quad e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)}\sigma(\xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{M}(X \times Y \rightarrow Z) \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$$

to simple inequalities. We shall also consider the necessary condition for the above claim. In this section,  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $Z$  denote general function spaces on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**2.1. Reduction of the proof of the claim (2.1).** In this subsection, we shall recall the argument to reduce the proof of the claim (2.1) to the case where  $\sigma$  is a sum of functions of product form. In fact, this argument is well-known. The idea goes back to Coifman and Meyer [CM1, Chapter II, Lemma 4, p. 46; Chapter II, Section 13, pp. 54–58]; a clear presentation can also be found in [Gr2, Section 7.5.2]. We shall briefly recall the argument.

Suppose a function  $\sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  is given.

Using the functions  $\psi_j$  of Notation 1.4, we decompose  $\sigma$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\xi, \eta) &= \sum_{j,k} \sigma(\xi, \eta) \psi_j(\xi) \psi_k(\eta) \\ &= \sum_{j-k \geq 3} + \sum_{j-k \leq -3} + \sum_{-2 \leq j-k \leq 2} \\ &= \sigma_{\text{I}}(\xi, \eta) + \sigma_{\text{II}}(\xi, \eta) + \sigma_{\text{III}}(\xi, \eta), \end{aligned}$$

where the indices  $j$  and  $k$  run over nonnegative integers.

Consider  $\sigma_{\text{I}}$ . By (1.3), this is written as

$$\sigma_{\text{I}}(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{j-3} \sigma(\xi, \eta) \psi_j(\xi) \psi_k(\eta) = \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} \sigma(\xi, \eta) \psi(2^{-j}\xi) \varphi(2^{-j+3}\eta).$$

The assumption  $\sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  gives the estimate

$$|\partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} \partial_{\eta}^{\beta} \sigma(\xi, \eta)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} 2^{j(m-|\alpha|-|\beta|)}$$

in a neighborhood of the support of the function  $\psi(2^{-j}\xi) \varphi(2^{-j+3}\eta)$ . Hence using the Fourier series expansion of period  $2\pi \cdot 2^j \mathbb{Z}^n \times 2\pi \cdot 2^{j-3} \mathbb{Z}^n$  we see that  $\sigma_{\text{I}}$  is written as

$$\sigma_{\text{I}}(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} \sum_{a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^n} c_{\text{I},j}(a, b) e^{ia \cdot 2^{-j}\xi} e^{ib \cdot 2^{-j+3}\eta} \psi(2^{-j}\xi) \varphi(2^{-j+3}\eta)$$

with the coefficient  $c_{\text{I},j}(a, b)$  satisfying the estimate

$$(2.2) \quad |c_{\text{I},j}(a, b)| \lesssim 2^{jm} (1 + |a|)^{-L} (1 + |b|)^{-L}$$

for any  $L > 0$ .

Similarly,  $\sigma_{\text{II}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{III}}$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\text{II}}(\xi, \eta) &= \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} \sum_{a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^n} c_{\text{II},j}(a, b) e^{ia \cdot 2^{-j+3}\xi} e^{ib \cdot 2^{-j}\eta} \varphi(2^{-j+3}\xi) \psi(2^{-j}\eta), \\ \sigma_{\text{III}}(\xi, \eta) &= \sum_{\ell=-2}^2 \sum_{j=\max\{0, \ell\}}^{\infty} \sum_{a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^n} c_{\text{III},j,\ell}(a, b) e^{ia \cdot 2^{-j}\xi} e^{ib \cdot 2^{-j+\ell}\eta} \psi(2^{-j}\xi) \psi(2^{-j+\ell}\eta), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\psi(2^{-j}\xi)$  and  $\psi(2^{-j+\ell}\eta)$  in  $\sigma_{\text{III}}(\xi, \eta)$  should be replaced by  $\varphi(\xi)$  or  $\varphi(\eta)$  if  $j = 0$  or  $j - \ell = 0$ , respectively, and the coefficients  $c_{\text{II},j}(a, b)$  and  $c_{\text{III},j,\ell}(a, b)$  satisfy the same estimates as (2.2).

Now, in view of the above decomposition of the functions of  $S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ , we see that in order to prove the claim (2.1) it is sufficient to show the estimate

$$(2.3) \quad \left\| e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)} \sigma(\xi, \eta) \right\|_{\mathcal{M}(X \times Y \rightarrow Z)} \leq c \|\theta_1\|_{C^M} \|\theta_2\|_{C^M},$$

with  $c = c(n, m, X, Y, Z, \text{supp } \theta_1, \text{supp } \theta_2)$  and  $M = M(n, m, X, Y, Z)$ , in the following two cases. Case 1:  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  are functions in  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  for which at least two of the sets  $\text{supp } \theta_1$ ,  $\text{supp } \theta_2$ , and  $\text{supp } \theta_1 + \text{supp } \theta_2$  are included in an annulus and  $\sigma$  is defined by

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \theta_1(2^{-j}\xi) \theta_2(2^{-j}\eta)$$

with complex numbers  $c_j$  satisfying  $|c_j| \leq 2^{jm}$ . Case 2:  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\sigma(\xi, \eta) = \theta_1(\xi) \theta_2(\eta)$ .

In fact, if (2.3) is proved for Case 1, then, applying it to the case of functions  $\theta_1(\xi) = e^{ia \cdot \xi} \psi(\xi)$  and  $\theta_2(\eta) = e^{ib \cdot 2^3 \eta} \varphi(2^3 \eta)$ , and to the coefficients  $c_j = c_{\text{I},j}(a, b) (1 + |a|)^L (1 + |b|)^L$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)} \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} c_{\text{I},j}(a, b) e^{ia \cdot 2^{-j}\xi} e^{ib \cdot 2^{-j+3}\eta} \psi(2^{-j}\xi) \varphi(2^{-j+3}\eta) \right\|_{\mathcal{M}(X \times Y \rightarrow Z)} \\ & \lesssim (1 + |a|)^{-L+M} (1 + |b|)^{-L+M} \end{aligned}$$

and hence taking  $L$  sufficiently large and taking sum over  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}$ , we see that  $e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)} \sigma_{\text{I}}(\xi, \eta)$  is a bilinear Fourier multiplier for  $X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ . Similar argument applies to  $\sigma_{\text{II}}$  and to the sum of the terms of  $\sigma_{\text{III}}$  corresponding to  $j \geq 3$ . The sum of the terms of  $\sigma_{\text{III}}$  corresponding to  $j \leq 2$  can be handled by Case 2.

**2.2. Use of duality.** We shall observe the dual form of the inequality (2.3).

Suppose we have a function space  $(Z', \|\cdot\|_{Z'})$  such that the duality relation

$$(2.5) \quad \|F\|_Z \approx \sup \left\{ \left| \int F(x) h(x) dx \right| \mid h \in \mathcal{S}, \|h\|_{Z'} \leq 1 \right\}$$

holds at least for all bounded continuous functions  $F$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Suppose  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfy the condition

$$(2.6) \quad \theta_3(-\zeta) = 1 \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \text{supp } \theta_1 + \text{supp } \theta_2.$$

Observe that if  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$  satisfy the condition (2.6) then the following identity holds for all  $f, g, h \in \mathcal{S}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \int T_{e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)} \theta_1(2^{-j}\xi) \theta_2(2^{-j}\eta)}(f, g)(x) h(x) dx \\ & = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \iint e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)} \theta_1(2^{-j}\xi) \theta_2(2^{-j}\eta) \theta_3(2^{-j}(-\xi - \eta)) \widehat{f}(\xi) \widehat{g}(\eta) \widehat{h}(-\xi - \eta) d\xi d\eta \\ & = \int e^{i|D|} \theta_1(2^{-j}D) f(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_2(2^{-j}D) g(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_3(2^{-j}D) h(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

From this identity and from the duality relation (2.5), we see the following: the inequality (2.3) holds for all  $\sigma$  defined by (2.4) with  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying  $|c_j| \leq 2^{jm}$  if and only if the inequality

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jm} \left| \int e^{i|D|} \theta_1(2^{-j}D) f(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_2(2^{-j}D) g(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_3(2^{-j}D) h(x) dx \right| \leq c' \|\theta_1\|_{C^M} \|\theta_2\|_{C^M} \|f\|_X \|g\|_Y \|h\|_{Z'}$$

holds; and (2.3) holds for  $\sigma(\xi, \eta) = \theta_1(\xi)\theta_2(\eta)$  if and only if the inequality

$$(2.8) \quad \left| \int e^{i|D|} \theta_1(D) f(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_2(D) g(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_3(D) h(x) dx \right| \leq c' \|\theta_1\|_{C^M} \|\theta_2\|_{C^M} \|f\|_X \|g\|_Y \|h\|_{Z'}$$

holds (the constant  $c$  in (2.3) and the constant  $c'$  in (2.7) or (2.8) may not be the same).

Notice that if  $\theta_1, \theta_2$  satisfy the condition of Case 1 of Subsection 2.1 then we can take  $\theta_3 \in C_0^\infty$  so that the condition (2.6) is satisfied and at least two of the sets  $\text{supp } \theta_1$ ,  $\text{supp } \theta_2$ , and  $\text{supp } \theta_3$  are included in an annulus.

**2.3. Necessary conditions.** Here we shall see that the estimates (2.7) is also necessary for the claim (2.1) to hold.

Assume that the claim (2.1) holds and assume  $Z'$  is a function space that satisfies the duality relation (2.5). Also assume  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$  are functions in  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that satisfy (2.6) and assume that either  $\theta_1$  or  $\theta_2$  has its support included in an annulus.

Let  $(c_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of complex numbers such that  $|c_j| \leq 2^{jm}$  and consider the multiplier  $\sigma$  defined by (2.4). Then, since either  $\text{supp } \theta_1$  or  $\text{supp } \theta_2$  is included in an annulus, the support of the function  $\theta_1(2^{-j}\xi)\theta_2(2^{-j}\eta)$  is included in the set  $\{a2^j \leq |\xi| + |\eta| \leq b2^j\}$  for some  $0 < a < b < \infty$ . From this we see that  $\sigma$  belongs to the class  $S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$  and moreover the inequality

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_\eta^\beta \sigma(\xi, \eta)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \|\theta_1\|_{C^{|\alpha|}} \|\theta_2\|_{C^{|\beta|}} (1 + |\xi| + |\eta|)^{m-|\alpha|-|\beta|}$$

holds with  $C_{\alpha,\beta}$  depending only on  $\alpha, \beta, n, m, a$ , and  $b$ . Hence, from the claim (2.1) and from the uniform boundedness principle, it follows that  $\sigma$  satisfies the inequality (2.3) with  $c$  depending only on  $n, m, X, Y, Z, a$ , and  $b$ , and with  $M$  depending only on  $n, m, X, Y$ , and  $Z$ . Hence, by the duality argument given in Subsection 2.2, it follows that inequality (2.7) holds with  $c'$  depending only on  $n, m, X, Y, Z, Z', a$ , and  $b$ . Thus (2.7) is a necessary condition for (2.1).

In particular, the inequality

$$2^{jm} \left| \int e^{i|D|} \theta_1(2^{-j}D) f(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_2(2^{-j}D) g(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta_3(2^{-j}D) h(x) dx \right| \leq c \|\theta_1\|_{C^M} \|\theta_2\|_{C^M} \|f\|_X \|g\|_Y \|h\|_{Z'}$$

with  $c$  independent of  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  is a necessary condition for (2.1).

### 3. ESTIMATES FOR KERNELS

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose  $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\text{supp } \psi \subset \{a \leq |\xi| \leq b\}$  with some  $0 < a < b < \infty$ . Then for every  $N > 0$  there exist  $c \in (0, \infty)$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $n, a, b$ , and  $N$*

such that

$$|(e^{i|\xi|}\psi(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x)| \leq c\|\psi\|_{C^M} 2^{j(n+1)/2} (1 + 2^j|1 - |x||)^{-N}$$

for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* We write

$$f_j(x) = (e^{i|\xi|}\psi(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} e^{i|\xi|} \psi(2^{-j}\xi) d\xi, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The proof is easy in the case  $n = 1$ . In fact, if  $n = 1$  and if we write  $\psi_1(\xi) = \psi(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{\{\xi > 0\}}$  and  $\psi_2(\xi) = \psi(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{\{\xi < 0\}}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} f_j(x) &= (e^{i\xi}\psi_1(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x) + (e^{-i\xi}\psi_2(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x) \\ &= 2^j(\psi_1)^\vee(2^j(x+1)) + 2^j(\psi_2)^\vee(2^j(x-1)). \end{aligned}$$

Both  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  are functions in the class  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  and their inverse Fourier transforms are functions in the Schwartz class, and thus

$$|f_j(x)| \lesssim 2^j(1 + 2^j|x+1|)^{-N} + 2^j(1 + 2^j|x-1|)^{-N} \approx 2^j(1 + 2^j|1 - |x||)^{-N}.$$

In the rest of the argument, we assume  $n \geq 2$ .

To estimate  $f_j(x)$ , we recall the analysis of Seeger–Sogge–Stein [SSS]. For  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , take points  $\{\xi_j^\nu\}_\nu$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j^\nu &\in S^{n-1} = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\xi| = 1\}, \\ \nu \neq \nu' &\Rightarrow |\xi_j^\nu - \xi_j^{\nu'}| \geq 2^{-j/2}, \\ S^{n-1} &= \bigcup_{\nu} \{\xi \in S^{n-1} \mid |\xi - \xi_j^\nu| < 2^{-j/2}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and take functions  $\{\chi_j^\nu\}_\nu$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_j^\nu &\text{ is a smooth positively homogeneous function of degree 0 on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \\ \chi_j^\nu(\xi) \neq 0 &\Rightarrow \left| \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \xi_j^\nu \right| < 2 \cdot 2^{-j/2}, \\ |\partial_\xi^\alpha \chi_j^\nu(\xi)| &\leq C_\alpha (2^{j/2})^{|\alpha|} |\xi|^{-|\alpha|}, \\ \sum_{\nu} \chi_j^\nu(\xi) &= 1 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The index  $\nu$  runs over an index set of cardinality  $\approx (2^{j/2})^{n-1}$ . Using this partition of unity  $\{\chi_j^\nu\}_\nu$ , we decompose  $f_j(x)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} f_j(x) &= \sum_{\nu} f_j^\nu(x), \\ f_j^\nu(x) &= (e^{i|\xi|}\psi(2^{-j}\xi)\chi_j^\nu(\xi))^\vee(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(\xi \cdot x + |\xi|)} \psi(2^{-j}\xi) \chi_j^\nu(\xi) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

We write the phase function of the oscillating factor  $e^{i(\xi \cdot x + |\xi|)}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \cdot x + |\xi| &= \xi \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu) + h_j^\nu(\xi), \\ h_j^\nu(\xi) &= \xi \cdot \left( \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \xi_j^\nu \right), \end{aligned}$$



and write  $f_j^\nu(x)$  as

$$f_j^\nu(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i\xi \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu)} \psi(2^{-j}\xi) \chi_j^\nu(\xi) e^{ih_j^\nu(\xi)} d\xi.$$

The integrand on the right hand side has support included in the set

$$E_j^\nu = \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 2^j a \leq |\xi| \leq 2^j b, \quad \left| \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} - \xi_j^\nu \right| \leq 2 \cdot 2^{-j/2} \right\}.$$

The following estimates hold for  $\xi \in E_j^\nu$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\xi^\alpha [\psi(2^{-j}\xi) \chi_j^\nu(\xi) e^{ih_j^\nu(\xi)}]| &\leq c_\alpha \|\psi\|_{C^{|\alpha|}} (2^{j/2})^{-|\alpha|}, \\ |(\xi_j^\nu \cdot \nabla_\xi)^k [\psi(2^{-j}\xi) \chi_j^\nu(\xi) e^{ih_j^\nu(\xi)}]| &\leq c_k \|\psi\|_{C^k} (2^j)^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

The Lebesgue measure of  $E_j^\nu$  satisfies  $|E_j^\nu| \approx (2^j)^{\frac{n+1}{2}}$ . Hence by integration by parts we obtain the following two estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} |f_j^\nu(x)| &\leq c_L \|\psi\|_{C^L} (2^j)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} (1 + 2^{j/2} |x + \xi_j^\nu|)^{-L}, \\ |f_j^\nu(x)| &\leq c_L \|\psi\|_{C^L} (2^j)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} (1 + 2^j |\xi_j^\nu \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu)|)^{-L}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  can be taken arbitrarily large. Putting the above two estimates together, we write

$$|f_j^\nu(x)| \leq c_L \|\psi\|_{C^L} (2^j)^{\frac{n+1}{2}} g_j^\nu(x)$$

with

$$g_j^\nu(x) = \min \left\{ (1 + 2^{j/2} |x + \xi_j^\nu|)^{-L}, (1 + 2^j |\xi_j^\nu \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu)|)^{-L} \right\}.$$

Remember that  $g_j^\nu(x)$  depends on  $L$ . As for details of the above argument and its generalization to the case where  $|\xi|$  is replaced by a general homogeneous function  $\phi(\xi)$ , see [SSS] or [St, Chapter IX, Section 4].

Now, to prove Lemma 3.1, it is sufficient to show that if  $N > 0$  is given then we can take  $L = L(n, N)$  sufficiently large so that we have

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_\nu g_j^\nu(x) \leq c_N (1 + 2^j |1 - |x||)^{-N}.$$

If  $|x| \geq \frac{1}{10}$ , then  $|x + \xi_j^\nu| \approx |x|$  for all  $\xi_j^\nu$  and hence

$$g_j^\nu(x) \leq (1 + 2^{j/2} |x + \xi_j^\nu|)^{-L} \approx (2^{j/2} |x|)^{-L}.$$

Taking sum over  $\nu$ 's of cardinality  $\approx (2^{j/2})^{n-1}$ , we obtain

$$\sum_\nu g_j^\nu(x) \lesssim (2^{j/2})^{-L+n-1} |x|^{-L},$$

which implies (3.1) if  $L$  is chosen sufficiently large.

If  $|x| \leq \frac{9}{10}$ , then  $|x + \xi_j^\nu| \approx 1$  for all  $\xi_j^\nu$  and hence

$$g_j^\nu(x) \leq (1 + 2^{j/2} |x + \xi_j^\nu|)^{-L} \approx (2^{j/2})^{-L}.$$

Taking sum over  $\nu$ , we have

$$\sum_\nu g_j^\nu(x) \lesssim (2^{j/2})^{-L+n-1},$$

which implies (3.1) if  $L$  is chosen sufficiently large.

In the rest of the argument, we assume  $\frac{9}{10} < |x| < \frac{11}{10}$ . To simplify notation, we write

$$|x| = 1 \pm \delta, \quad 0 \leq \delta < \frac{1}{10},$$

$$\theta_j^\nu = (\text{the angle between } -x \text{ and } \xi_j^\nu), \quad 0 \leq \theta_j^\nu \leq \pi.$$

If  $\theta_j^\nu \geq 1$ , then, for  $x$  satisfying  $\frac{9}{10} < |x| < \frac{11}{10}$ , we have  $|x + \xi_j^\nu| \approx 1$  and hence

$$g_j^\nu(x) \leq (1 + 2^{j/2}|x + \xi_j^\nu|)^{-L} \approx (2^{j/2})^{-L}.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{\nu: \theta_j^\nu \geq 1} g_j^\nu(x) \lesssim (2^{j/2})^{-L+n-1},$$

which satisfies the bound of (3.1) if  $L$  is sufficiently large. Thus in the rest of the argument we shall consider  $\nu$ 's that satisfy  $\theta_j^\nu < 1$ .

Observe that

$$(3.2) \quad |x + \xi_j^\nu| = (1 + 2x \cdot \xi_j^\nu + |x|^2)^{1/2} = \{(1 - |x|)^2 + 2|x|(1 - \cos \theta_j^\nu)\}^{1/2} \approx \delta + \theta_j^\nu.$$

On the other hand we have

$$(3.3) \quad \mp \delta + \frac{1}{3}(\theta_j^\nu)^2 \leq \xi_j^\nu \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu) \leq \mp \delta + \frac{2}{3}(\theta_j^\nu)^2.$$

To see this, observe that Taylor expansion gives

$$\cos \theta_j^\nu = 1 - \frac{(\theta_j^\nu)^2}{2} + R_4(\theta_j^\nu)$$

with

$$|R_4(\theta_j^\nu)| \leq \frac{(\theta_j^\nu)^4}{4!} + \frac{(\theta_j^\nu)^6}{6!} + \cdots \leq \frac{1}{12}(\theta_j^\nu)^2 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \theta_j^\nu < 1.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j^\nu \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu) &= 1 - |x| \cos \theta_j^\nu = 1 - (1 \pm \delta) \left( 1 - \frac{(\theta_j^\nu)^2}{2} + R_4(\theta_j^\nu) \right) \\ &= \mp \delta + \frac{(\theta_j^\nu)^2}{2} \pm \delta \frac{(\theta_j^\nu)^2}{2} - (1 \pm \delta) R_4(\theta_j^\nu) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left| \pm \delta \frac{(\theta_j^\nu)^2}{2} - (1 \pm \delta) R_4(\theta_j^\nu) \right| \leq \frac{1}{10} \cdot \frac{1}{2}(\theta_j^\nu)^2 + \frac{11}{10} \cdot \frac{1}{12}(\theta_j^\nu)^2 \leq \frac{1}{6}(\theta_j^\nu)^2,$$

from which (3.3) follows.

From (3.3), we see that

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \leq \delta < \frac{1}{10}, \quad 0 \leq \theta_j^\nu < 1, \quad \theta_j^\nu \leq \delta^{1/2} \Rightarrow |\xi_j^\nu \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu)| \approx \delta.$$

Now, to estimate  $\sum_{\nu: \theta_j^\nu < 1} g_j^\nu(x)$ , we divide  $\nu$ 's into two sets:  $\theta_j^\nu > \delta^{1/2}$  and  $\theta_j^\nu \leq \delta^{1/2}$ .

Firstly consider  $\nu$ 's that satisfy  $\theta_j^\nu > \delta^{1/2}$ . For these  $\nu$ , we use (3.2) to see that

$$g_j^\nu(x) \leq (1 + 2^{j/2}|x + \xi_j^\nu|)^{-L} \approx (1 + 2^{j/2}(\theta_j^\nu + \delta))^{-L} \approx (1 + 2^{j/2}\theta_j^\nu)^{-L}.$$

To compute the sum of the last quantity, we classify  $\nu$ 's by the inequality

$$2^{-j/2}(m-1) \leq \theta_j^\nu < 2^{-j/2}m, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since we are considering  $\nu$ 's satisfying  $\theta_j^\nu > \delta^{1/2}$ , we need only  $m$  that satisfy  $m > 2^{j/2}\delta^{1/2}$ . Since the points  $\xi_j^\nu$  are on the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere  $S^{n-1}$  and they are  $2^{-j/2}$ -separated, we have

$$\text{card} \{ \nu \mid 2^{-j/2}(m-1) \leq \theta_j^\nu < 2^{-j/2}m \} \lesssim \frac{(2^{-j/2}m)^{n-2}2^{-j/2}}{(2^{-j/2})^{n-1}} = m^{n-2}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu: 1 > \theta_j^\nu > \delta^{1/2}} g_j^\nu(x) &\lesssim \sum_{\nu: 1 > \theta_j^\nu > \delta^{1/2}} (1 + 2^{j/2}\theta_j^\nu)^{-L} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}, m > 2^{j/2}\delta^{1/2}} \sum_{\nu: 2^{-j/2}(m-1) \leq \theta_j^\nu < 2^{-j/2}m} m^{-L} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}, m > 2^{j/2}\delta^{1/2}} m^{-L} m^{n-2} \approx (1 + 2^{j/2}\delta^{1/2})^{-L+n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This satisfies the bound of (3.1) if  $L$  is chosen sufficiently large.

Next consider  $\nu$ 's that satisfy  $\theta_j^\nu \leq \delta^{1/2}$ . For these  $\nu$ 's, we use (3.4) to see that

$$g_j^\nu(x) \leq (1 + 2^j |\xi_j^\nu \cdot (x + \xi_j^\nu)|)^{-L} \approx (1 + 2^j \delta)^{-L}.$$

Since the points  $\xi_j^\nu$  are on  $S^{n-1}$  and  $2^{-j/2}$ -separated, we have

$$\text{card} \{ \nu \mid \theta_j^\nu \leq \delta^{1/2} \} \lesssim \frac{(\delta^{1/2})^{n-1}}{(2^{-j/2})^{n-1}} = (2^{j/2}\delta^{1/2})^{n-1}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu: \theta_j^\nu \leq \delta^{1/2}} g_j^\nu(x) &\lesssim \sum_{\nu: \theta_j^\nu \leq \delta^{1/2}} (1 + 2^j \delta)^{-L} \\ &\lesssim (1 + 2^j \delta)^{-L} (2^{j/2}\delta^{1/2})^{n-1} < (1 + 2^j \delta)^{-L+(n-1)/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which satisfies the bound of (3.1) if  $L$  is chosen sufficiently large. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose  $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\text{supp } \theta \subset \{|\xi| \leq a\}$  with  $a \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $\zeta$  be the function of Notation 1.4. Then for every  $N > 0$  there exist  $c \in (0, \infty)$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $n, a$ , and  $N$  such that*

$$|(e^{i|\xi|}\zeta(\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x)| \leq c\|\theta\|_{C^M} \begin{cases} |x|^{-N} & \text{if } |x| > 2, \\ 2^{j(n+1)/2}(1 + 2^j|1 - |x||)^{-(n+1)/2} & \text{if } |x| \leq 2, \end{cases}$$

for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* Take a nonnegative integer  $j_0$  such that  $a \leq 2^{j_0}$ . Then we have

$$\zeta(\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi) = \sum_{k=1}^{j+j_0} \psi(2^{-k}\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi)$$

and hence

$$(e^{i|\xi|}\zeta(\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{j+j_0} (e^{i|\xi|}\psi(2^{-k}\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x).$$

For each term on the right hand side, we use Lemma 3.1 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} |(e^{i|\xi|}\psi(2^{-k}\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x)| &\lesssim \|\psi(\cdot)\theta(2^{k-j}\cdot)\|_{C^M} 2^{k(n+1)/2} (1+2^k|1-|x||)^{-L} \\ &\lesssim \|\theta\|_{C^M} 2^{k(n+1)/2} (1+2^k|1-|x||)^{-L}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second  $\lesssim$  holds because  $k \leq j + j_0$ , and  $L$  can be taken arbitrarily large. Taking  $L$  sufficiently large and taking sum over  $k = 1, \dots, j + j_0$ , we obtain the desired estimate.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and let  $\varphi$  be the function of Notation 1.4. Then there exist  $c \in (0, \infty)$  depending only on  $n$  such that*

$$|(e^{i|\xi|}\varphi(\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x)| \leq c\|\theta\|_{C^{n+2}}(1+|x|)^{-n-1}$$

for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* Consider in general a function  $\tilde{\theta} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $\text{supp } \tilde{\theta} \subset \{|\xi| \leq 2\}$ . Then we have

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha [(e^{i|\xi|} - 1)\tilde{\theta}(\xi)]| \lesssim \|\tilde{\theta}\|_{C^{|\alpha|}} |\xi|^{1-|\alpha|}.$$

Hence, if  $\psi$  is the function of Notation 1.4, then

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha [(e^{i|\xi|} - 1)\tilde{\theta}(\xi)\psi(2^{-k}\xi)]| \lesssim \|\tilde{\theta}\|_{C^{|\alpha|}} (2^k)^{1-|\alpha|}$$

for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  satisfying  $k \leq 1$ . Taking inverse Fourier transform, we see that

$$|[(e^{i|\xi|} - 1)\tilde{\theta}(\xi)\psi(2^{-k}\xi)]^\vee(x)| \lesssim \|\tilde{\theta}\|_{C^N} 2^{k(1+n)} (1+2^k|x|)^{-N}.$$

Taking  $N = n + 2$  and taking sum over  $k \leq 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |((e^{i|\xi|} - 1)\tilde{\theta}(\xi))^\vee(x)| &\lesssim \sum_{k=-\infty}^1 \|\tilde{\theta}\|_{C^{n+2}} 2^{k(1+n)} (1+2^k|x|)^{-n-2} \\ &\approx \|\tilde{\theta}\|_{C^{n+2}} (1+|x|)^{-n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$(\tilde{\theta}(\xi))^\vee(x) \lesssim \|\tilde{\theta}\|_{C^{n+1}} (1+|x|)^{-n-1}.$$

Combining the two inequalities, we have

$$|(e^{i|\xi|}\tilde{\theta}(\xi))^\vee(x)| \lesssim \|\tilde{\theta}\|_{C^{n+2}} (1+|x|)^{-n-1}.$$

Applying the last inequality to  $\tilde{\theta}(\xi) = \varphi(\xi)\theta(2^{-j}\xi)$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain the desired inequality since  $\|\varphi(\cdot)\theta(2^{-j}\cdot)\|_{C^M} \lesssim \|\theta\|_{C^M}$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and suppose  $\text{supp } \theta \subset \{|\xi| \leq a\}$  with  $a \in (0, \infty)$ . If  $n = 1$  and  $1 < p \leq \infty$ , or if  $n \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , then there exist  $c \in (0, \infty)$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $n$ ,  $a$ , and  $p$  such that*

$$\|(e^{i|\xi|}\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee\|_{L^p} \leq c\|\theta\|_{C^M} 2^{j((n+1)/2-1/p)}$$

for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* This can be seen from the inequalities of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 by simple integration.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** (1) The inequality of Lemma 3.4 does not hold in the case  $n = p = 1$ . This can be seen from the fact that in the 1-dimensional case  $(e^{i|\xi|})^\vee$  is not a finite complex measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

(2) If we replace the function  $|\xi|$  by a function  $\phi(\xi)$  which is real-valued, positively homogeneous of degree one, and  $C^\infty$  away from the origin, then the claim of Lemma 3.4 still holds if  $n = 1$  and  $1 < p \leq \infty$  or if  $n \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq p \leq 2$ , but it does not hold in general for  $n \geq 2$  and  $2 < p \leq \infty$ . In fact, in the extreme case  $\phi(\xi) \equiv 0$ , we have  $(e^{i\phi(\xi)}\theta(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x) = 2^{jn}(\theta)^\vee(2^jx)$ , whose  $L^p$ -norm is  $\approx 2^{j(n-n/p)}$ , except for the trivial  $\theta$ , and  $n - n/p > (n + 1)/2 - 1/p$  if  $n \geq 2$  and  $2 < p \leq \infty$ .

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 1.2. Throughout this section, we assume  $n \geq 2$  and  $m = -(n + 1)/2$ .

**4.1. Scheme of the proof.** In order to prove Theorem 1.2, we shall prove the following two inequalities for all  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ :

$$(4.1) \quad \left| \int e^{i|D|}\theta_1(D)f(x) \cdot e^{i|D|}\theta_2(D)g(x) \cdot e^{i|D|}\theta_3(D)h(x) dx \right| \\ \leq c\|\theta_1\|_{C^M}\|\theta_2\|_{C^M}\|\theta_3\|_{C^M}\|f\|_{L^\infty}\|g\|_{L^\infty}\|h\|_{h^1},$$

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jm} \left| \int e^{i|D|}\theta_1(2^{-j}D)f(x) \cdot e^{i|D|}\theta_2(2^{-j}D)g(x) \cdot e^{i|D|}\theta_3(2^{-j}D)h(x) dx \right| \\ \leq c\|\theta_1\|_{C^M}\|\theta_2\|_{C^M}\|\theta_3\|_{C^M}\|f\|_{L^\infty}\|g\|_{L^\infty}\|h\|_{h^1}.$$

In both inequalities,  $M$  is a positive integer depending only on  $n$ , and  $c$  is a positive constant depending only on  $n$ ,  $\text{supp } \theta_1$ ,  $\text{supp } \theta_2$ , and  $\text{supp } \theta_3$ . Observe that, by virtue of the arguments of Subsections 2.1 and 2.2, the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 for all three cases,  $L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow bmo$ ,  $h^1 \times L^\infty \rightarrow L^1$ , and  $L^\infty \times h^1 \rightarrow L^1$ , follow from these two inequalities.

As for the inequality (4.2), according to the argument of Subsections 2.1 and 2.2, it is sufficient to show it under the assumption that at least two of the functions  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$  have their supports included in an annulus. But in our proof of Theorem 1.2 we don't use this additional assumption.

We shall simplify notation. We take a sufficiently large  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ . By homogeneity, we may assume  $\|\theta_1\|_{C^M} = \|\theta_2\|_{C^M} = \|\theta_3\|_{C^M} = 1$ . For  $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , we write

$$S_j^w f = e^{i|D|}\theta_1(2^{-j}D)f, \quad S_j^w g = e^{i|D|}\theta_2(2^{-j}D)g, \quad S_j^w h = e^{i|D|}\theta_3(2^{-j}D)h.$$

Notice that the above operators  $S_j^w$  are not the same one; we did not distinguish  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_2$ , and  $\theta_3$ . We shall use this rough notation since it will cause no significant confusion in our argument. Thus our task is to prove the inequalities

$$\left| \int S_0^w f(x) \cdot S_0^w g(x) \cdot S_0^w h(x) dx \right| \leq c\|f\|_{L^\infty}\|g\|_{L^\infty}\|h\|_{h^1}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jm} \left| \int S_j^w f(x) \cdot S_j^w g(x) \cdot S_j^w h(x) dx \right| \leq c\|f\|_{L^\infty}\|g\|_{L^\infty}\|h\|_{h^1}.$$

Now, instead of proving the above inequalities, we shall prove the stronger inequalities

$$\|S_0^w f \cdot S_0^w g \cdot S_0^w h\|_{L^1} \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{h^1}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jm} \|S_j^w f \cdot S_j^w g \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1} \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{h^1},$$

which certainly imply the desired inequalities for the integrals  $\int S_j^w f \cdot S_j^w g \cdot S_j^w h \, dx$ .

We make another reduction. By virtue of the atomic decomposition of  $h^1$  and translation invariance of the situation, it is sufficient to prove the above  $L^1$ -norm inequalities in the case where  $h$  is an  $h^1$ -atom supported on a ball centered at the origin (as for the atomic decomposition of  $h^1$ , see Goldberg [Go]). Hence we assume  $h$  satisfies the following condition:

$$\begin{cases} h \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \\ \text{supp } h \subset \{|x| \leq r\} \text{ with some } r \in (0, 1], \\ \|h\|_{L^\infty} \leq r^{-n}, \\ \int h(x) \, dx = 0 \text{ if } r < 1. \end{cases}$$

Under the above assumptions, our goal is to prove the inequalities

$$(4.3) \quad \|S_0^w f \cdot S_0^w g \cdot S_0^w h\|_{L^1} \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jm} \|S_j^w f \cdot S_j^w g \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1} \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

To prove (4.3) and (4.4), we will use the kernels of the operators  $S_j^w$ . We write

$$K_j^w(x) = (e^{i|\xi|} \theta_\ell(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x), \quad \ell = 1, 2, 3.$$

Thus  $S_j^w F = K_j^w * F$ . Notice that here again our notation is rough; we did not distinguish the three functions  $\theta_\ell$ ,  $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ . But the above notation will cause no confusion. The estimates of the kernel  $K_j^w$  are given in Section 3.

**4.2. Proof of (4.3).** By Lemma 3.4, we have  $\|K_0^w\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_0^w f\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|K_0^w\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \\ \|S_0^w g\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \|K_0^w\|_{L^1} \|g\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^\infty}, \\ \|S_0^w h\|_{L^1} &\leq \|K_0^w\|_{L^1} \|h\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|h\|_{L^1} \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence Hölder's inequality gives

$$\|S_0^w f \cdot S_0^w g \cdot S_0^w h\|_{L^1} \leq \|S_0^w f\|_{L^\infty} \|S_0^w g\|_{L^\infty} \|S_0^w h\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Thus (4.3) is proved.

4.3. **Reduction of the proof of (4.4).** To prove (4.4), we decompose the  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -norm as

$$\|\dots\|_{L^1} = \|\dots\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \|\dots\|_{L^1(E_k)},$$

with

$$E_k = B(0, 2^{k+1}) \setminus B(0, 2^k) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1}\}.$$

We shall prove

$$(4.5) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2^{jm} \|S_j^w f \cdot S_j^w g \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}$$

and

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{jm} \|S_j^w f \cdot S_j^w g \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

4.4. **Proof of (4.5).** For  $k \geq 2$ , we decompose  $f$  and  $g$  as

$$\begin{aligned} f &= f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10 \cdot 2^k)} + f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10 \cdot 2^k)^c} = f_k^0 + f_k^1, \\ g &= g \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10 \cdot 2^k)} + g \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10 \cdot 2^k)^c} = g_k^0 + g_k^1, \end{aligned}$$

and we shall prove

$$(4.7) \quad \|S_j^w f_k^1 \cdot S_j^w g_k^1 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} \lesssim 2^{-3k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty},$$

$$(4.8) \quad \|S_j^w f_k^1 \cdot S_j^w g_k^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} \lesssim 2^{-2k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty},$$

$$(4.9) \quad \|S_j^w f_k^0 \cdot S_j^w g_k^1 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} \lesssim 2^{-2k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty},$$

$$(4.10) \quad \|S_j^w f_k^0 \cdot S_j^w g_k^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} \lesssim 2^{-k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

If these are proved, then taking sum over  $k$  and  $j$  we obtain (4.5).

*Proof of (4.7).* By Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we have

$$(4.11) \quad |K_j^w(x)| \lesssim |x|^{-n-1} \quad \text{for } |x| > 2.$$

From this inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} &= \int_{2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1}} \left| \int_{|y| \leq r} K_j^w(x-y) h(y) dy \right| dx \\ &\lesssim \iint_{\substack{2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1} \\ |y| \leq r}} |x-y|^{-n-1} r^{-n} dy dx \approx 2^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using the same inequality (4.11), we have

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f_k^1\|_{L^\infty(E_k)} &= \sup_{2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1}} \left| \int_{|y| \geq 10 \cdot 2^k} K_j^w(x-y) f(y) dy \right| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1}} \int_{|y| \geq 10 \cdot 2^k} |x-y|^{-n-1} \|f\|_{L^\infty} dy \approx 2^{-k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\|S_j^w g_k^1\|_{L^\infty(E_k)} \lesssim 2^{-k} \|g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

From the above inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f_k^1 \cdot S_j^w g_k^1 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} &\leq \|S_j^w f_k^1\|_{L^\infty(E_k)} \|S_j^w g_k^1\|_{L^\infty(E_k)} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-3k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.7) is proved.

*Proof of (4.8).* From (4.11), we have

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^2(E_k)} &= \left\| \int_{|y| \leq r} K_j^w(x-y) h(y) dy \right\|_{L^2(2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1})} \\ &\lesssim \left\| \int_{|y| \leq r} |x-y|^{-n-1} r^{-n} dy \right\|_{L^2(2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1})} \approx (2^k)^{-n-1} 2^{kn/2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since the multiplier  $e^{i|\xi|} \theta_\ell(2^{-j}\xi)$  is bounded, Plancherel's theorem gives the  $L^2$ -estimate  $\|S_j^w\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \lesssim 1$ . Hence

$$(4.14) \quad \|S_j^w g_k^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|g_k^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{kn/2} \|g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

By (4.13), (4.14), and (4.12), and by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f_k^1 \cdot S_j^w g_k^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} &\leq \|S_j^w f_k^1\|_{L^\infty(E_k)} \|S_j^w g_k^0\|_{L^2} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^2(E_k)} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} 2^{kn/2} \|g\|_{L^\infty} (2^k)^{-n-1} 2^{kn/2} = 2^{-2k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.8) is proved.

*Proof of (4.9).* This is the same as (4.8) by symmetry.

*Proof of (4.10).* Using the estimate (4.11), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^\infty(E_k)} &= \sup_{2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1}} \left| \int_{|y| \leq r} K_j^w(x-y) h(y) dy \right| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{2^k \leq |x| < 2^{k+1}} \int_{|y| \leq r} |x-y|^{-n-1} r^{-n} dy \approx (2^k)^{-n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By the same reason as (4.14), we have

$$\|S_j^w f_k^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{kn/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \|S_j^w g_k^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{kn/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty}.$$

From these estimates, using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f_k^0 \cdot S_j^w g_k^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(E_k)} &\leq \|S_j^w f_k^0\|_{L^2} \|S_j^w g_k^0\|_{L^2} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^\infty(E_k)} \\ &\lesssim 2^{kn/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty} 2^{kn/2} \|g\|_{L^\infty} (2^k)^{-n-1} = 2^{-k} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.10) is proved and the proof of (4.5) is complete.

**4.5. Proof of (4.6).** To prove (4.6), we decompose  $f$  and  $g$  as

$$\begin{aligned} f &= f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10)} + f \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10)^c} = f^0 + f^1, \\ g &= g \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10)} + g \mathbf{1}_{B(0,10)^c} = g^0 + g^1. \end{aligned}$$

We shall prove

$$(4.15) \quad \|S_j^w f^1 \cdot S_j^w g^1 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} \lesssim 2^{j(n-1)/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty},$$

$$(4.16) \quad \|S_j^w f^1 \cdot S_j^w g^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} \lesssim 2^{jn/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty},$$



$$(4.17) \quad \|S_j^w f^0 \cdot S_j^w g^1 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} \lesssim 2^{jn/2} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty},$$

$$(4.18) \quad \|S_j^w f^0 \cdot S_j^w g^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} \lesssim 2^{j(n+1)/2} \min\{2^j r, (2^j r)^{-1}\} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty},$$

If these are proved, then multiplying them by  $2^{jm} = 2^{-j(n+1)/2}$  and taking sum over  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain (4.6).

*Proof of (4.15).* By Lemma 3.4 we have  $\|K_j^w\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{j(n-1)/2}$  and hence

$$\|S_j^w h\|_{L^1} \leq \|K_j^w\|_{L^1} \|h\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{j(n-1)/2}.$$

On the other hand, using the kernel estimate (4.11), we see that

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f^1\|_{L^\infty(B(0,4))} &= \sup_{|x|<4} \left| \int_{|y|\geq 10} K_j^w(x-y) f(y) dy \right| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{|x|<4} \int_{|y|\geq 10} |x-y|^{-n-1} \|f\|_{L^\infty} dy \approx \|f\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have  $\|S_j^w g^1\|_{L^\infty(B(0,4))} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^\infty}$ . From these inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f^1 \cdot S_j^w g^1 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} &\leq \|S_j^w f^1\|_{L^\infty(B(0,4))} \|S_j^w g^1\|_{L^\infty(B(0,4))} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^1} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty} 2^{j(n-1)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.15) is proved.

*Proof of (4.16).* Lemma 3.4 or Plancherel's theorem yields  $\|K_j^w\|_{L^2} \lesssim 2^{jn/2}$  and hence

$$(4.20) \quad \|S_j^w h\|_{L^2} \leq \|K_j^w\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{jn/2}.$$

By the same reason as in (4.14), we have the  $L^2$ -estimate

$$(4.21) \quad \|S_j^w g^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|g^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Using (4.20), (4.21), and (4.19), and using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f^1 \cdot S_j^w g^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} &\leq \|S_j^w f^1\|_{L^\infty(B(0,4))} \|S_j^w g^0\|_{L^2} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty} 2^{jn/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.16) is proved.

*Proof of (4.17).* This is the same as (4.16) by symmetry.

*Proof of (4.18).* Recall that Lemma 3.4 give the estimate  $\|K_j^w\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{j(n+1)/2}$ , which implies the estimate

$$\|S_j^w h\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|K_j^w\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{j(n+1)/2}.$$

In order to prove (4.18), we shall improve this estimate to the following one:

$$(4.22) \quad \|S_j^w h\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{j(n+1)/2} \min\{2^j r, (2^j r)^{-1}\}.$$

If this is proved, then we can prove (4.18) as follows. By the same reason as (4.21), we have

$$\|S_j^w f^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \|S_j^w g^0\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^\infty};$$

thus using (4.22) and using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_j^w f^0 \cdot S_j^w g^0 \cdot S_j^w h\|_{L^1(B(0,4))} &\leq \|S_j^w f^0\|_{L^2} \|S_j^w g^0\|_{L^2} \|S_j^w h\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty} 2^{j(n+1)/2} \min\{2^j r, (2^j r)^{-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it is sufficient to prove (4.22).

To prove (4.22), first consider the case  $2^j r \leq 1$ . Then, since  $r \leq 2^{-j} < 1$ , the  $h^1$ -atom  $h$  satisfies the moment condition  $\int h(y) dy = 0$ . Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_j^w h(x) &= \int (K_j^w(x-y) - K_j^w(x)) h(y) dy \\ &= \iint_{\substack{0 < t < 1 \\ |y| \leq r}} \text{grad } K_j^w(x-ty) \cdot (-y) h(y) dt dy. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{grad } K_j^w(z)| &= |(e^{i|\xi|} \theta_3(2^{-j}\xi) \xi)^\vee(z)| \\ &= |2^j (e^{i|\xi|} \theta_3(2^{-j}\xi) 2^{-j}\xi)^\vee(z)| \lesssim 2^j 2^{j(n+1)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |S_j^w h(x)| &\lesssim \iint_{\substack{0 < t < 1 \\ |y| \leq r}} |\text{grad } K_j^w(x-ty)| |y| |h(y)| dt dy \\ &\lesssim 2^j 2^{j(n+1)/2} r. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.22) in the case  $2^j r \leq 1$ .

Next consider the case  $2^j r > 1$ . From the assumptions on  $h$ , we have

$$(4.23) \quad |S_j^w h(x)| = |K_j^w * h(x)| \leq \int_{|x-y| \leq r} |K_j^w(y)| r^{-n} dy =: (*).$$

We shall prove  $(*) \lesssim 2^{j(n+1)/2} (2^j r)^{-1}$ . Notice that Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 give the following estimate

$$(4.24) \quad |K_j^w(y)| \lesssim \begin{cases} |y|^{-n-1} & \text{if } |y| > 2, \\ 2^{j(n+1)/2} (1 + 2^j |1 - |y||)^{-(n+1)/2} & \text{if } |y| \leq 2. \end{cases}$$

We shall consider several situations separately.

Firstly, suppose  $1/10 < r \leq 1$ . In this case, we have

$$(*) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |K_j^w(y)| dy \lesssim 2^{j(n+1)/2} 2^{-j} \approx 2^{j(n+1)/2} (2^j r)^{-1},$$

where the second  $\lesssim$  follows from (4.24) (or it is also given in Lemma 3.4).

Secondly, suppose  $0 < r \leq 1/10$  and suppose  $|x| \leq 1/2$  or  $|x| \geq 3/2$ . In this case, using (4.24), we see that

$$|x-y| \leq r \Rightarrow |y| \leq 1/2 + 1/10 \text{ or } |y| \geq 3/2 - 1/10 \Rightarrow |K_j^w(y)| \lesssim 1.$$

Hence

$$(*) \lesssim \int_{|x-y| \leq r} r^{-n} dy \approx 1 < 2^{j(n+1)/2} (2^j r)^{-1}.$$

Finally, suppose  $0 < r \leq 1/10$  and  $1/2 < |x| < 3/2$ . In this case,

$$|x-y| \leq r \Rightarrow |x| - r \leq |y| \leq |x| + r \text{ and } \left| \frac{x}{|x|} - \frac{y}{|y|} \right| \lesssim r.$$

Hence, using (4.24) and using polar coordinate, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (*) &\lesssim \int_{\substack{|x|-r \leq |y| \leq |x|+r \\ |x/|x|-y/|y| \lesssim r}} 2^{j(n+1)/2} (1 + 2^j |1 - |y||)^{-(n+1)/2} r^{-n} dy \\
 &\approx 2^{j(n+1)/2} r^{-n} r^{n-1} \int_{|x|-r}^{|x|+r} (1 + 2^j |1 - t|)^{-(n+1)/2} dt \\
 &\leq 2^{j(n+1)/2} r^{-n} r^{n-1} \int_{1-r}^{1+r} (1 + 2^j |1 - t|)^{-(n+1)/2} dt \\
 &\approx 2^{j(n+1)/2} r^{-1} 2^{-j},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last  $\approx$  holds because  $(n+1)/2 > 1$ . Thus we have proved (4.22) in the case  $2^j r > 1$  as well. Now (4.18) is proved and the proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete.

### 5. A REMARK ON THE CONDITION $m = -(n+1)/2$ IN THEOREM 1.2

Let  $\tilde{\psi}, \theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$  be such that

$$\text{supp } \tilde{\psi} \subset \{1/3 \leq |\xi| \leq 3\}, \quad \tilde{\psi}(\xi) = 1 \text{ for } 1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2,$$

and

$$\text{supp } \theta \subset \{|\xi| \leq 10\}, \quad \theta(\xi) = 1 \text{ for } |\xi| \leq 6.$$

As we have seen in Subsection 2.3, if the claim

$$e^{i(|\xi|+|\eta|+|\xi+\eta|)} \sigma(\xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{M}(L^\infty \times L^\infty \rightarrow BMO) \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in S_{1,0}^m(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$$

holds, then the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 &2^{jm} \left| \int e^{i|D|} \tilde{\psi}(2^{-j}D) f(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \tilde{\psi}(2^{-j}D) g(x) \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta(2^{-j}D) h(x) dx \right| \\
 &\leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{H^1}
 \end{aligned}$$

must hold with  $c$  independent of  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . In the proof of Theorem 1.2, in Section 4, we have proved that the stronger inequality

$$(5.1) \quad 2^{jm} \left\| e^{i|D|} \tilde{\psi}(2^{-j}D) f \cdot e^{i|D|} \tilde{\psi}(2^{-j}D) g \cdot e^{i|D|} \theta(2^{-j}D) h \right\|_{L^1} \leq c \|f\|_{L^\infty} \|g\|_{L^\infty} \|h\|_{H^1}$$

holds for  $m = -(n+1)/2$ . In this section, we shall prove that the  $L^1$ -inequality (5.1) cannot be extended to the case  $m > -(n+1)/2$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $n \geq 2$ . Then the estimate (5.1) holds only if  $m \leq -(n+1)/2$ .*

To prove this proposition, we use the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.2** ([KMT1, Lemma 5.2]). *Let  $\psi$  be function in  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that is radial, supported on  $\{1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2\}$ , nonnegative, and not identically equal to 0. Set*

$$G_j(x) = (e^{i|\xi|} \psi(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x).$$

*Then there exist  $\delta, c_0 \in (0, \infty)$  and  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , depending only on  $n$  and  $\psi$ , such that*

$$\left| e^{-i\omega_n} 2^{-j(n+1)/2} G_j(x) - c_0 \right| \leq \frac{c_0}{10} \quad \text{if } 1 - \delta 2^{-j} < |x| < 1 + \delta 2^{-j} \text{ and } j > j_0,$$

where  $\omega_n = (n-1)\pi/4$ .

We also use the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3** (Grothendieck's inequality). *Let  $I$  be a finite index set and let  $a_{i,j}$  ( $i, j \in I$ ) be complex numbers. Let  $A \in (0, \infty)$  and suppose the inequality*

$$\left| \sum_{i,j \in I} a_{i,j} x_i y_j \right| \leq A \sup |x_i| \cdot \sup |y_j|$$

*holds for all complex sequences  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  and  $(y_j)_{j \in I}$ . Then for any complex Hilbert space  $H$  and for any sequences  $(u_i)_{i \in I}$  and  $(v_j)_{j \in I}$  of vectors in  $H$ , the inequality*

$$\left| \sum_{i,j \in I} a_{i,j} \langle u_i, v_j \rangle \right| \leq CA \sup \|u_i\|_H \cdot \sup \|v_j\|_H$$

*holds, where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the inner product in  $H$  and  $C$  is a universal constant (independent of  $I$ ,  $(a_{i,j})$ ,  $A$ , and  $H$ ).*

A proof of this lemma can be found, *e.g.*, in [Ga, Section 18.2].

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* Let  $\psi$  and  $G_j$  be the functions of Lemma 5.2. In the following argument,  $\delta$  and  $j_0$  are the numbers given in Lemma 5.2 and the letter  $j$  denotes positive integers satisfying  $j > j_0$ . We set

$$F_j(x) = (\psi(2^{-j}\xi))^\vee(x).$$

We take a sufficiently small number  $\delta' > 0$  and write

$$v_\mu = \delta' 2^{-j} \mu, \quad \mu \in \mathbb{Z}^n,$$

and

$$I = \{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid 1/2 < |v_\mu| < 3/2\}.$$

Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_\lambda)_{\lambda \in I}$  and  $\beta = (\beta_\mu)_{\mu \in I}$  be sequences of complex numbers. We shall test the inequality (5.1) to the following functions:

$$f(x) = \sum_{\lambda \in I} \alpha_\lambda F_j(x - v_\lambda),$$

$$g(x) = \sum_{\mu \in I} \beta_\mu F_j(x - v_\mu),$$

$$h(x) = F_j(x).$$

Since  $F_j(x) = 2^{jn}(\psi^\vee)(2^j x)$  is a bump function and since the points  $(v_\mu)_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^n}$  are separated by  $2^{-j}$ , we have

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{jn} \|\alpha\|_{\ell^\infty}, \quad \|g\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{jn} \|\beta\|_{\ell^\infty}$$

(see [KMT1, (5.13)]). Also notice that

$$\|h\|_{H^1} = \|F_j\|_{H^1} = \|(\psi)^\vee\|_{H^1} < \infty$$

for all  $j$ . From the choice of  $\tilde{\psi}$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\psi$ , we have

$$e^{i|D|} \tilde{\psi}(2^{-j} D) F_j = e^{i|D|} \theta(2^{-j} D) F_j = (e^{i|\xi|} \psi(2^{-j} \xi))^\vee = G_j$$

and hence

$$e^{i|D|} \tilde{\psi}(2^{-j} D) f = \sum_{\lambda \in I} \alpha_\lambda G_j(x - v_\lambda),$$

$$e^{i|D|}\tilde{\psi}(2^{-j}D)g = \sum_{\mu \in I} \beta_{\mu} G_j(x - v_{\mu}),$$

$$e^{i|D|}\theta(2^{-j}D)h = G_j.$$

Thus (5.1) implies

$$(5.2) \quad \left\| \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in I} \alpha_{\lambda} \beta_{\mu} G_j(x - v_{\lambda}) G_j(x - v_{\mu}) G_j(x) \right\|_{L_x^1} \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)} \|\alpha\|_{\ell^{\infty}} \|\beta\|_{\ell^{\infty}}.$$

We define the cube  $Q_{\nu}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by

$$Q_{\nu} = v_{\nu} + (0, \delta' 2^{-j}]^n, \quad \nu \in I.$$

Let  $\gamma = (\gamma_{\nu})_{\nu \in I}$  be a sequence of complex numbers. Then, since the cubes  $Q_{\nu}$  are mutually disjoint, the inequality (5.2) implies

$$(5.3) \quad \left| \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \nu \in I} \alpha_{\lambda} \beta_{\mu} \gamma_{\nu} \int_{Q_{\nu}} G_j(x - v_{\lambda}) G_j(x - v_{\mu}) G_j(x) dx \right| \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)} \|\alpha\|_{\ell^{\infty}} \|\beta\|_{\ell^{\infty}} \|\gamma\|_{\ell^{\infty}}.$$

Hereafter we shall write

$$\int_{Q_{\nu}} G_j(x - v_{\lambda}) G_j(x - v_{\mu}) G_j(x) dx = H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu), \quad \lambda, \mu, \nu \in I.$$

We now apply Grothendieck's inequality (Lemma 5.3) to the bilinear form

$$(\beta, \gamma) \mapsto \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \nu \in I} \alpha_{\lambda} \beta_{\mu} \gamma_{\nu} H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu).$$

Then from (5.3) it follows that for any Hilbert space  $H$  and for any sequences  $(b_{\mu})_{\mu \in I}$  and  $(c_{\nu})_{\nu \in I}$  of vectors in  $H$  we have

$$\left| \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \nu \in I} \alpha_{\lambda} \langle b_{\mu}, c_{\nu} \rangle H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right| \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)} \|\alpha\|_{\ell^{\infty}} \sup_{\mu \in I} \|b_{\mu}\|_H \cdot \sup_{\nu \in I} \|c_{\nu}\|_H.$$

By duality between  $\ell^{\infty}$  and  $\ell^1$ , this inequality is equivalent to

$$(5.4) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in I} \left| \sum_{\mu, \nu \in I} \langle b_{\mu}, c_{\nu} \rangle H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right| \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)} \sup_{\mu \in I} \|b_{\mu}\|_H \cdot \sup_{\nu \in I} \|c_{\nu}\|_H.$$

We take  $H$ ,  $b = (b_{\mu})$ , and  $c = (c_{\nu})$  as follows. We take  $H = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with the usual inner product. We write

$$V_j = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 1 - \delta 2^{-j} < |x| < 1 + \delta 2^{-j}\},$$

$$V'_j = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} 2^{-j} < |x| < 1 + \frac{\delta}{2} 2^{-j}\}.$$

For  $\mu \in I$ , we define

$$E_{\mu} = V'_j \cap (v_{\mu} + V'_j),$$

$$b_{\mu} = 2^j \mathbf{1}_{E_{\mu}} \in H = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

We take a sequence  $(\epsilon_{\nu})_{\nu \in I}$  consisting of  $\pm 1$  and define

$$c_{\nu} = \epsilon_{\nu} 2^{jn/2} \mathbf{1}_{Q_{\nu}} \in H = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \nu \in I.$$

We have

$$(5.5) \quad |E_\mu| \approx 2^{-2j} \quad \text{for } \mu \in I.$$

This can be seen from the fact that for  $\mu \in I$  the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |x| = 1, |x - v_\mu| = 1\}$  is a  $(n-2)$ -dimensional sphere of radius  $\approx 1$  and  $E_\mu$  is nearly equal to the  $(\delta/2)2^{-j}$ -neighborhood of this set. Hence

$$\|b_\mu\|_{L^2} = 2^j |E_\mu|^{1/2} \approx 1, \quad \mu \in I.$$

We also have

$$\|c_\nu\|_{L^2} = 2^{jn/2} |Q_\nu|^{1/2} \approx 1, \quad \nu \in I.$$

Thus, with the above  $H$ ,  $(b_\mu)$ , and  $(c_\nu)$ , the inequality (5.4) gives

$$(5.6) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in I} \left| \sum_{\mu, \nu \in I} \epsilon_\nu 2^{j(1+n/2)} \langle \mathbf{1}_{E_\mu}, \mathbf{1}_{Q_\nu} \rangle H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right| \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)}.$$

We take the average of (5.6) over all choices of  $\epsilon_\nu = \pm 1$ . Then Khintchine's inequality gives

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in I} \left\| \sum_{\mu \in I} 2^{j(1+n/2)} \langle \mathbf{1}_{E_\mu}, \mathbf{1}_{Q_\nu} \rangle H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right\|_{\ell_v^2(I)} \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)}.$$

We shall estimate the left hand side of (5.7) from below. For this, observe the following facts.

- (1)  $\langle \mathbf{1}_{E_\mu}, \mathbf{1}_{Q_\nu} \rangle \geq 0$ .
- (2) If  $\langle \mathbf{1}_{E_\mu}, \mathbf{1}_{Q_\nu} \rangle \neq 0$ , then  $Q_\nu \subset V_j$  and  $Q_\nu - v_\mu \subset V_j$  (so far as  $\delta'$  is taken sufficiently small compared with  $\delta$ ). If in addition  $Q_\nu - v_\lambda \subset V_j$ , then from Lemma 5.2 it follows that

$$\operatorname{Re} (e^{-3i\omega_n} G_j(x - v_\lambda) G_j(x - v_\mu) G_j(x)) \gtrsim (2^{j(n+1)/2})^3 \quad \text{for all } x \in Q_\nu,$$

and hence

$$\operatorname{Re} (e^{-3i\omega_n} H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu)) \gtrsim (2^{j(n+1)/2})^3 2^{-jn},$$

and in particular the left hand side of the last inequality is positive.

- (3) If  $Q_\nu \subset V'_j$ , then

$$\operatorname{card} \{\mu \in I \mid E_\mu \supset Q_\nu\} = \operatorname{card} \{\mu \in I \mid v_\mu + V'_j \supset Q_\nu\} \approx 2^{j(n-1)}.$$

- (4) For each  $\lambda \in I$ ,

$$\operatorname{card} \{\nu \in I \mid Q_\nu \subset V'_j, Q_\nu - v_\lambda \subset V_j\} \approx 2^{j(n-2)}$$

by the same reason as (5.5).

Now using the above facts, we shall estimate the left hand side of (5.7) from below. Here we use the letters  $\lambda, \mu, \nu$  to denote elements of  $I$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\lambda} \left\| \sum_{\mu} 2^{j(1+n/2)} \langle \mathbf{1}_{E_\mu}, \mathbf{1}_{Q_\nu} \rangle H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right\|_{\ell_v^2} \\ & \geq \sum_{\lambda} \left\| \sum_{\mu} 2^{j(1+n/2)} \langle \mathbf{1}_{E_\mu}, \mathbf{1}_{Q_\nu} \rangle \operatorname{Re} (e^{-3i\omega_n} H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu)) \right\|_{\ell_v^2(Q_\nu \subset V'_j, Q_\nu - v_\lambda \subset V_j)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\geq \sum_{\lambda} \left\| \sum_{\mu: E_{\mu} \supset Q_{\nu}} 2^{j(1+n/2)} \langle \mathbf{1}_{E_{\mu}}, \mathbf{1}_{Q_{\nu}} \rangle \operatorname{Re} \left( e^{-3i\omega_n} H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right) \right\|_{\ell_v^2(Q_{\nu} \subset V'_j, Q_{\nu} - v_{\lambda} \subset V_j)} \\
 &\gtrsim \sum_{\lambda} \left\| \sum_{\mu: E_{\mu} \supset Q_{\nu}} 2^{j(1+n/2)} 2^{-jn} \left( 2^{j(n+1)/2} \right)^3 2^{-jn} \right\|_{\ell_v^2(Q_{\nu} \subset V'_j, Q_{\nu} - v_{\lambda} \subset V_j)} \\
 &\approx 2^{jn} 2^{j(n-2)/2} 2^{j(n-1)} 2^{j(1+n/2)} 2^{-jn} \left( 2^{j(n+1)/2} \right)^3 2^{-jn} = 2^{j(5n/2+1/2)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus (5.7) implies  $2^{j(5n/2+1/2)} \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)}$ , which is possible only when  $m \leq -(n+1)/2$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1.  $\square$

**Remark 5.4.** Here is a comment on the use of Grothendieck's inequality in the above proof, which the reader may think quite technical. In the proof, we want to estimate the left-hand side of (5.3) from below. We know that the integral  $H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  has estimate from below if

$$(5.8) \quad Q_{\nu} - v_{\lambda} \subset V_j, \quad Q_{\nu} - v_{\mu} \subset V_j, \quad Q_{\nu} \subset V_j.$$

The problem is that we cannot simply restrict the coefficients  $\alpha_{\lambda}, \beta_{\mu}, \gamma_{\nu}$  so that only the terms satisfying (5.8) appear. A way to treat this situation is the following: first write (5.3) in the dual form as

$$(5.9) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in I} \left| \sum_{\mu, \nu \in I} \beta_{\mu} \gamma_{\nu} H_j(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right| \lesssim 2^{j(-m+2n)} \|\beta\|_{\ell^{\infty}} \|\gamma\|_{\ell^{\infty}},$$

and then setting  $\beta_{\mu} = \pm 1, \gamma_{\nu} = \pm 1$ , take average over  $\pm 1$  and use Khintchine's inequality twice. This procedure gives the condition  $m \leq -n/2$ . If we use Grothendieck's inequality and use (5.4) instead of (5.9), then we have more freedom to choose  $b_{\mu}, c_{\nu} \in H$ , in fact we can have  $\langle b_{\mu}, c_{\nu} \rangle = 0$  with  $b_{\mu}, c_{\nu} \neq 0$ . Our choice of  $H, b_{\mu}$ , and  $c_{\nu}$  as given in the proof of Proposition 5.1 enabled us to reduce the use of Khintchine's inequality and gave stronger condition  $m \leq -(n+1)/2$ .

## REFERENCES

- [BRRS] A. Bergfeldt, S. Rodríguez-López, D. Rule, and W. Staubach, Multilinear oscillatory integrals and estimates for coupled systems of dispersive PDEs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **376** (2023), 7555–7601.
- [CM1] R. Coifman and Y. Meyer, Au delà des opérateurs pseudo-différentiels, *Astérisque* **57** (1978), 1–199.
- [Ga] D. J. H. Garling, *Inequalities: A Journey into Linear Analysis*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.
- [Go] D. Goldberg, A local version of real Hardy spaces, *Duke Math. J.* **46** (1979), 27–42.
- [Gr2] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier Analysis*, 3rd edition, Graduate Texts in Math. 250, Springer, 2014.
- [GrP] L. Grafakos and M. M. Peloso, Bilinear Fourier integral operators, *J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl.* (2010) 1:161–182, DOI 10.1007/s11868-010-0011-4
- [KMST] T. Kato, A. Miyachi, N. Shida, and N. Tomita, On some bilinear Fourier multipliers with oscillating factors, II, in preparation.
- [KMT1] T. Kato, A. Miyachi, and N. Tomita, Estimates for some bilinear wave operators, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **40** (2024), 1571–1608.
- [KMT2] T. Kato, A. Miyachi, and N. Tomita, Estimates for a certain bilinear Fourier integral operators, *J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl.* (2024) 15:59, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11868-024-00631-0>
- [M] A. Miyachi, On some estimates for the wave equations in  $L^p$  and in  $HP$ , *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sect. IA Math.* **27** (1980), 331–354.
- [P] J. C. Peral,  $L^p$  estimates for the wave equation, *J. Functional Analysis* **36** (1980), no. 1, 114–145. MR568979 (81k:35089)
- [RRS1] S. Rodríguez-López, D. Rule, and W. Staubach, A Seeger–Sogge–Stein theorem for bilinear Fourier integral operators, *Adv. Math.* **264** (2014), 1–54.

- [RRS2] S. Rodríguez-López, D. Rule, and W. Staubach, Global boundedness of a class of multilinear Fourier integral operators, *Forum Math., Sigma* **9:e14** (2021), 1–45.
- [SSS] A. Seeger, C. D. Sogge, and E. M. Stein, Regularity properties of Fourier integral operators, *Ann. of Math.* **134**(2) (1991), 231–251.
- [Sj] S. Sjöstrand, On the Riesz means of the solutions of the Schrödinger equation, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa* **24** (1970), 331–348.
- [St] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

(T. Kato) FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, GIFU UNIVERSITY, GIFU 501-1193, JAPAN

(A. Miyachi) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TOKYO WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY, ZEMPUKUJI, SUGINAMI-KU, TOKYO 167-8585, JAPAN

(N. Shida) GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, FUROCHO, CHIKUSA-KU, NAGOYA 464-8602, JAPAN

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

*Email address*, T. Kato: `kato.tomoya.s3@f.gifu-u.ac.jp`

*Email address*, A. Miyachi: `miyachi@lab.twcu.ac.jp`

*Email address*, N. Shida: `naoto.shida.c3@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp`

*Email address*, N. Tomita: `tomita@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp`