

# LATE-TIME TAILS AND MASS INFLATION FOR THE SPHERICALLY SYMMETRIC EINSTEIN–MAXWELL–SCALAR FIELD SYSTEM

ONYX GAUTAM

**ABSTRACT.** We establish a decay result in the black hole exterior region of spherically symmetric solutions to the Einstein–Maxwell–scalar field system arising from compactly supported admissible data. Our result allows for large initial data, and it is the first decay statement for higher order derivatives of the scalar field.

Solutions to this model generically develop a singularity in the black hole interior. Indeed, Luk–Oh [31, 32] identify a generic class of initial data that produces  $C^2$ -future-inextendible solutions. However, they leave open the question of mass inflation: does the Hawking mass become identically infinite at the Cauchy horizon? By work of Luk–Oh–Shlapentokh–Rothman [33], our decay result implies mass inflation for sufficiently regular solutions in the generic class considered by Luk–Oh [31, 32].

Together with the methods and results of Luk–Oh [29], our estimates imply a late-time tails result for the scalar field. This result provides another proof of generic mass inflation, through a result of Dafermos [10]. Another application of our late-time tails result, due to Van de Moortel [54], is the global construction of two-ended black holes that contain null and spacelike singularities.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Statement of main theorem	3
1.2. Applications and related work	4
1.2.1. Strong cosmic censorship	4
1.2.2. Mass inflation	4
1.2.3. Late-time tails	6
1.2.4. Black holes with spacelike and null singularities	6
1.3. Ideas of the proof	7
1.3.1. Use of a scaling vector field	7
1.3.2. Ingredients of the proof	7
1.3.3. Commutator vector fields	8
1.3.4. Gauge choice	9
1.3.5. Outline of the proof	9
Acknowledgements	13
2. Preliminaries	13
2.1. Einstein–Maxwell–scalar field system in spherical symmetry	13
2.1.1. Spherically symmetric solutions	13
2.1.2. Equations in spherical symmetry	14
2.2. Admissible initial data	14
2.3. Mass inflation criterion	15
2.4. Coordinate systems	15
2.5. Commutator vector fields	16
2.6. Notation	16
2.6.1. Notation for functions	16
2.6.2. Constants	16
2.6.3. Multi-index notation for derivatives	16
2.6.4. Schematic notation	17
2.6.5. $\mathcal{O}$ -notation	17
2.7. Norms and schematic geometric quantities	18

2.7.1.	Initial data norms	18
2.7.2.	Energy norms	18
2.7.3.	Pointwise norm	18
2.7.4.	Schematic geometric quantities	18
2.8.	Vector field commutator calculations	19
2.8.1.	Comparing vector fields in different coordinate systems	19
2.8.2.	Rearranging commutator vector fields	20
2.8.3.	Commuting with the wave operator	20
3.	Reduction to a characteristic problem	21
4.	Estimates for undifferentiated geometric quantities	22
5.	Boundedness of initial data	24
6.	Energy boundedness and decay	25
6.1.	Hardy inequalities	25
6.2.	Energy quantities	26
6.2.1.	Energy along piecewise null curves	26
6.2.2.	$r^p$ -weighted energy	26
6.2.3.	Bulk energy over spacetime region	27
6.3.	Vector field multiplier identities	27
6.4.	Energy boundedness estimate	30
6.5.	Boundedness of the unweighted energy $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$	34
6.6.	$r^p$ -weighted energy estimate	38
6.7.	Boundedness of the weighted energy $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,p}$	40
7.	Pointwise estimates	44
7.1.	Estimates for general functions	44
7.2.	Controlling the pointwise norm $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,p}$	46
8.	Estimates for differentiated geometric quantities	47
8.1.	Preliminary estimate for schematic geometric quantities	48
8.2.	Estimates for $\Gamma^\alpha \varpi$	50
8.3.	Estimates for $\Gamma^\alpha \kappa$	51
8.4.	Estimates for $\Gamma^\alpha(-\gamma)$	54
9.	Putting it all together: proof of theorem 3.1	58
9.1.	Control of $S^k \varphi$ along the horizon	58
9.2.	Control of $(\bar{v} \partial_{\bar{v}})^k \varphi$ along the horizon	59
10.	Late-time tails	62
10.1.	Spacetime elliptic estimate	62
10.2.	Klainerman's Sobolev-type inequality	65
10.3.	Estimates for $(r \bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field and of geometric quantities	65
10.3.1.	Estimates for $(r \bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field	66
10.3.2.	Estimates for $(r \bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of $\varpi$	70
10.3.3.	Estimates for $(r \bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of $(-\gamma)$	71
10.4.	Retrieving the assumptions of the work of Luk–Oh on late-time tails	72
10.4.1.	Notation of the work of Luk–Oh	72
10.4.2.	Global assumptions on the spacetime	73
10.4.3.	Assumptions on the metric	73
10.4.4.	Stationary estimate	74
10.4.5.	Assumptions on the initial data	74
10.4.6.	Assumptions on the scalar field	74
10.5.	Obtaining a late-time tails result from the work of Luk–Oh	75
	Appendix A. Proofs of vector field commutator calculations	76
	References	82

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Einstein–Maxwell–scalar field system models gravity in the presence of an electromagnetic field and a scalar field that do not interact except through the underlying geometry. A solution to this system is a quadruple  $(\mathcal{M}, g, \varphi, F)$  consisting of a 4-dimensional manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  with Lorentzian metric  $g$ , a real-valued scalar field  $\varphi$ , and a 2-form  $F$  (the Maxwell field) that satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \text{Ric}(g) - \frac{1}{2}gR(g) = 2(T^{(\text{sf})} + T^{(\text{em})}), \\ T_{\alpha\beta}^{(\text{sf})} = \partial_\alpha\varphi\partial_\beta\varphi - \frac{1}{2}g_{\alpha\beta}\partial^\mu\varphi\partial_\mu\varphi, \\ T_{\alpha\beta}^{(\text{em})} = F_\alpha{}^\nu F_{\beta\nu} - \frac{1}{4}g_{\alpha\beta}F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}, \\ \square_g\varphi = 0, \quad dF = 0, \quad \text{div}_gF = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here  $\text{Ric}(g)$  and  $R(g)$  are the Ricci curvature tensor and Ricci scalar curvature of the metric  $g$ , and  $\square_g$  and  $\text{div}_g$  are the Laplace–Beltrami operator and divergence operator associated to  $g$ . We consider (1.1) in spherical symmetry (see section 2.1), when  $\mathcal{M}$  admits an  $\text{SO}(3)$ -action that preserves  $g$ ,  $\varphi$ , and  $F$ .

The explicit family of Reissner–Nordström spacetimes are spherically symmetric solutions to (1.1) with vanishing scalar field: in local coordinates, the Maxwell field is  $2r^{-2}\mathbf{e}^2 dt \wedge dr$ , and the metric takes the form

$$g_{M,\mathbf{e}} = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{r^2}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{r^2}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 g_{\mathbf{S}^2}, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $M$  and  $\mathbf{e}$  are real-valued constants to be thought of as mass and charge, respectively, and  $g_{\mathbf{S}^2}$  is the round metric on the sphere of radius 1. Special cases of the Reissner–Nordström metrics include the Schwarzschild metrics ( $\mathbf{e} = 0$ ) and the flat Minkowski metric ( $M = \mathbf{e} = 0$ ). A Reissner–Nordström spacetime with  $0 < |\mathbf{e}| < M$  is said to be subextremal. We restrict our attention to solutions of (1.1) that settle down to a subextremal Reissner–Nordström spacetime (namely the so-called future-admissible solutions, which are discussed in section 2.2).

### 1.1. Statement of main theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Main theorem, rough version). *Solutions to (1.1) arising from smooth and compactly supported future-admissible spherically symmetric Cauchy data satisfy the following estimate on the event horizon:*

$$|(v\partial_v)^k\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim_{\epsilon,k,\varphi} v^{-1+\epsilon} \text{ for } \epsilon > 0 \text{ and } k \geq 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Here  $v$  is an outgoing null coordinate normalized appropriately on a curve of constant area-radius  $r$  (see section 2.4) and  $\partial_v$  is the associated coordinate derivative in  $(r, v)$  coordinates.

A precise version of theorem 1.1 is given in section 3. For a version of theorem 1.1 stated in an Eddington–Finkelstein-type gauge (where the outgoing null coordinate is normalized on the event horizon), see corollary 1.12.

*Remark 1.2* (Applications). We already mention that our main theorem implies mass inflation (see section 1.2.2). Moreover, the estimates used to prove theorem 1.1, when combined with the methods and results of Luk–Oh [29], imply a late-time tails result (see section 1.2.3), which gives another proof of mass inflation (see remark 1.16) and has a further application to the co-existence of spacelike and null singularities in the interior of dynamical spherically symmetric black holes (see section 1.2.4).

*Remark 1.3* (Coordinate derivatives associated to  $v$ ). The vector field  $\partial_v$  referenced in theorem 1.1 is tangent to surfaces of constant  $r$ . It is timelike in the exterior region and is generically not tangent to the event horizon (which is not a surface of constant  $r$  in evolution). On the other hand,  $\partial_{\bar{v}}$  is null and always tangent to the event horizon. On Reissner–Nordström,  $\partial_v$  is the stationary Killing field, which coincides with  $\partial_{\bar{v}}$  on the event horizon.

*Remark 1.4* (Large data). Our theorem does not have a smallness assumption, so we can handle large data. In the proof it is crucial to observe certain reductive structure in the error terms arising from commutation (see the discussion in section 1.3).

*Remark 1.5* (Decay in a finite- $r$  region). Our proof of theorem 1.1 in fact shows that, for arbitrarily large  $R > 0$ , we have  $|(v\partial_v)^k\varphi| \lesssim_{\epsilon,k,\varphi,R} v^{-1+\epsilon}$  in a finite- $r$  region  $\{r \leq R\}$  contained in the exterior of the black hole. This is because the scaling vector field  $S$  (see section 2.5) is equal to  $v\partial_v$  in this region. We do not expect the same result to hold if  $\partial_v$  is replaced by  $\partial_v$ .

## 1.2. Applications and related work.

1.2.1. *Strong cosmic censorship.* The Reissner–Nordström spacetimes are geodesically incomplete. In physical terms, the fate of an observer who enters the black hole region is determined only for finite time. The geodesic incompleteness of the Schwarzschild spacetimes is due to a singularity in the black hole interior (at “ $\{r = 0\}$ ” in the coordinates of (1.2)) that destroys incoming observers. Sbierski [49] rigorously established the strength of this singularity by showing that Schwarzschild is  $C^0$ -inextendible, namely that it does not isometrically embed as a proper subset of Lorentzian manifold with continuous metric. In contrast, the subextremal Reissner–Nordström spacetimes admit infinitely many inequivalent extensions across the Cauchy horizon as smooth solutions to (1.1). Physically speaking, an observer falling through a Reissner–Nordström black hole continues unimpeded, but Einstein’s equations do not uniquely specify how they continue. Penrose conjectured that examples such as Reissner–Nordström are unstable to perturbations, so that they would not appear in nature. We now state a modern formulation of this conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.6** (Strong cosmic censorship). *A generic asymptotically flat solution to the Einstein equations is future inextendible as a suitably regular Lorentzian manifold.*

The original motivation behind Conjecture 1.6 was that an observer crossing the Cauchy horizon of a Reissner–Nordström black hole would observe the outside universe shifted infinitely to the blue [42, p. 222].<sup>1</sup> At the level of linear perturbations, [50, 37, 6] argued that the blueshift effect should manifest by exponentially amplifying gravitational disturbances from the black hole exterior, and indeed [18, 30] verified that generic solutions to the linear wave equation on Reissner–Nordström remain bounded but are not in  $H_{\text{loc}}^1$  near the Cauchy horizon. See [34, 20, 17, 35] for extensions of these results to subextremal Kerr and [21] for the case of positive cosmological constant. The instability of the subextremal Kerr Cauchy horizon under the linearized Einstein vacuum equations has been established by [47] and [36]. See [53, 23] for results on Conjecture 1.6 in the context of the spherically symmetric Einstein–Maxwell–Klein Gordon system, and [45] for the case of positive cosmological constant.

We now survey the main results related to Conjecture 1.6 for the nonlinear and spherically symmetric matter model (1.1), which provide a nearly complete understanding of the problem. The strongest expectation would be that perturbations of Reissner–Nordström are  $C^0$ -inextendible, like Schwarzschild. In fact this expectation is false, but the conjecture holds in the higher regularity class of  $C^2$ .

**Theorem 1.7** (Strong cosmic censorship fails in  $C^0$ ; Dafermos [9], Dafermos–Rodnianski [13]). *Future-admissible<sup>2</sup> solutions to (1.1) with non-vanishing charge are  $C^0$ -extendible.*

Dafermos–Luk [11] showed an analogous result outside symmetry, namely that perturbations of subextremal Kerr (as solutions to the Einstein vacuum equations) remain  $C^0$ -extendible.

**Theorem 1.8** (Strong cosmic censorship holds in  $C^2$ ; Luk–Oh [31, 32]). *There is a class  $\mathcal{G}$  of future-admissible Cauchy data for (1.1) such that*

- (1)  $\mathcal{G}$  is generic, namely open (in a weighted  $C^1$  topology) and dense (in a weighted  $C^\infty$  topology),
- (2) solutions arising from data in  $\mathcal{G}$  are  $C^2$ -future-inextendible.

Sbierski [48] showed that small data solutions in the generic class  $\mathcal{G}$  of Luk–Oh are moreover  $C^{0,1}$ -inextendible.

1.2.2. *Mass inflation.* The first attempt to understand the instability of the Cauchy horizon in Reissner–Nordström for a nonlinear model was due to Hiscock [22], who considered an explicit solution to the spherically symmetric Einstein–null dust system (a simpler analogue of (1.1)) with one incoming dust. In the context of this work, the metric remains continuous at the Cauchy horizon, but its Christoffel symbols blow up in a parallelly propagated frame. In their seminal works [43, 44], Poisson–Israel considered a null dust solution with an additional, outgoing, null dust. They showed that, generically, the Hawking mass becomes infinite at the Cauchy horizon, and they named this scenario *mass inflation*. Because the Hawking mass bounds the Kretschmann scalar from below [27] (namely the full trace  $\text{Riem}_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\text{Riem}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$  of the Riemann

<sup>1</sup>Contrast this to the redshift effect by which an observer outside the event horizon receives signals from an observer crossing the event horizon as infinitely shifted to the red.

<sup>2</sup>The condition of future-admissibility ensures that the future development of the Cauchy data has the same Penrose diagram as Reissner–Nordström (see [31, Def. 3.1] for a precise definition).

curvature tensor), mass inflation immediately implies the  $C^2$  formulation of strong cosmic censorship.<sup>3</sup> Many analytic and numerical studies [41, 4, 5] have corroborated the phenomenon of mass inflation. See also [52] for a study of mass inflation for the Einstein–Maxwell–Klein Gordon system and [7, 45] for studies in the case of positive cosmological constant.

We now return to our discussion of (1.1). Mathematical results on mass inflation for the Einstein–Maxwell–scalar field system require upper bounds and generic lower bounds for the decay of the scalar field along the horizon. Dafermos [10] showed that mass inflation follows from the pointwise upper bound of Dafermos–Rodnianski [13] and a yet unproven pointwise lower bound (see theorem 1.15). Luk–Oh–Shlapentokh–Rothman showed that mass inflation follows from the integrated lower bound of [31, 32] and yet unproven integrated upper bounds (see corollary 1.12). We state these results in the following two theorems. In these theorems,  $\bar{v}$  is an (appropriately normalized) Eddington–Finkelstein type coordinate, and  $\partial_{\bar{v}}$  is the associated coordinate derivative in double null coordinates.

**Theorem 1.9** (Best known upper and lower bounds along the horizon). *The following estimates hold for future-admissible solutions to (1.1):*

- (1) (Pointwise upper bound; Dafermos–Rodnianski [13]) We have

$$|\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} + |\partial_{\bar{v}}\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim_{\epsilon, \varphi} \bar{v}^{-3+\epsilon}. \quad (1.4)$$

- (2) ( $L^2$  lower bound; Luk–Oh [31, 32]) Solutions in the generic class  $\mathcal{G}$  of theorem 1.8 satisfy

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}} \bar{v}^p (\partial_{\bar{v}}\varphi)^2 d\bar{v} = \infty \text{ for } p > 7. \quad (1.5)$$

**Theorem 1.10** (Best known (conditional) results on mass inflation). *Mass inflation holds for future-admissible solutions to (1.1) satisfying either of the following conditions:*

- (1) (Dafermos [10]) the upper bound (1.4) and a pointwise lower bound:

$$\liminf_{\bar{v} \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v}^p |\partial_{\bar{v}}\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{v}) > 0 \text{ for some } p < 9; \quad (1.6)$$

- (2) (Luk–Oh–Shlapentokh–Rothman [33]) or the lower bound (1.5) and  $L^2$  upper bounds:

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}} \bar{v}^4 (\partial_{\bar{v}}\varphi)^2 d\bar{v} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathcal{H}} \bar{v}^8 (\partial_{\bar{v}}^k \varphi)^2 d\bar{v} < \infty \text{ for some } k \geq 2. \quad (1.7)$$

*Remark 1.11.* See section 2.3 for an explanation of how to extract statement (2) from the results of [33] (which in particular states the second criterion in (1.7) only for  $k = 2$ ). Observe that the first criterion in (1.7) holds by (1.4).

We now give an application of our main theorem to mass inflation. From our main theorem (theorem 1.1), we can obtain a decay result for higher derivatives tangent to the event horizon.

**Corollary 1.12** (Translation of main theorem into an Eddington–Finkelstein-type gauge). *In the setting of theorem 1.1, we have*

$$|(\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k \varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim_{\epsilon, k, \varphi} \bar{v}^{-1+\epsilon} \text{ for } \epsilon > 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq k \leq 4, \quad (1.8)$$

where  $\bar{v}$  is an Eddington–Finkelstein-type coordinate normalized appropriately on the event horizon (see section 2.4) and  $\partial_{\bar{v}}$  is the coordinate derivative associated to  $\bar{v}$  in double null coordinates

A precise version of corollary 1.12 is given in section 3.

*Remark 1.13* (Range of  $k$  in corollary 1.12). The range of  $k$  for which corollary 1.12 holds could be increased given the analogue of theorem 1.1 with a faster decay rate (as proven in theorem 1.15). Note that  $k = 4$  is the minimal  $k$  for which the decay rate  $\bar{v}^{-1+\epsilon}$  for  $(\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k \varphi|_{\mathcal{H}}$  implies the second criterion in (1.7). However, we do not expect that  $k$  can be taken arbitrarily large in corollary 1.12, in view of the expected inverse polynomial tail of  $\partial_{\bar{v}} r|_{\mathcal{H}}$  (a consequence of the tail for  $|\partial_{\bar{v}}\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}}$  demonstrated in theorem 1.15). That is, we do not expect each null derivative along the horizon to gain a power of decay. See section 9.2 for further discussion.

<sup>3</sup>From the form of the Hawking mass, mass inflation also implies inextendibility in the class of  $C^1$  spherically symmetric Lorentzian manifolds.

Together with the already known (1.4), corollary 1.12 implies the previously unknown estimate (1.7) (with  $k = 4$ ), which implies mass inflation.

**Corollary 1.14** (Generic mass inflation). *Mass inflation holds for solutions to (1.1) arising from compactly supported Cauchy data in the generic class of Luk–Oh (see theorem 1.8).*

1.2.3. *Late-time tails.* After implementing the spacetime elliptic estimates of Luk–Oh [29, Sec. 5.3], the estimates used to prove theorem 1.1 are enough to satisfy the assumptions on the spacetime metric and the scalar field in [29, Sec. 2] and therefore prove the following sharp decay result.

**Theorem 1.15** (Sharp Price’s law result). *Solutions to (1.1) arising from smooth and compactly supported future-admissible spherically symmetric Cauchy data satisfy the following estimate on the event horizon:*

$$|(v\partial_v)^k\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} - C_k\mathfrak{L}[\varphi]v^{-3}| \lesssim v^{-3-\delta} \text{ for } k \geq 0, \quad (1.9)$$

where  $\delta > 0$  is a small constant,  $C_k \neq 0$  are explicit non-zero constants,  $\mathfrak{L}[\varphi]$  is a dynamical constant that is non-zero exactly for solutions arising from the generic class of data constructed by Luk–Oh (see theorem 1.8), and the coordinate  $v$  and coordinate derivative  $\partial_v$  are as in theorem 1.1. Moreover, we have

$$|(\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} - C_k\mathfrak{L}[\varphi]\bar{v}^{-3}| \lesssim \bar{v}^{-3-\delta} \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq 2, \quad (1.10)$$

where the Eddington–Finkelstein-type coordinate and coordinate derivative  $\bar{v}$  and  $\partial_{\bar{v}}$  are as in corollary 1.12.

For a precise version of theorem 1.15, see theorem 10.17.

*Remark 1.16* (Alternative proof of mass inflation). Observe that theorem 1.15 recovers the previously known Price’s law result (1.4) of Dafermos–Rodnianski [13] and implies the previously unknown (1.6), and these estimates together imply mass inflation by the result of Dafermos [10] (see theorem 1.10).

*Remark 1.17* (Range of  $k$ ). As in corollary 1.12, the range of  $k$  in (1.10) could be increased (up to  $k = 7$ ), but we do not expect that  $k$  can be taken arbitrarily large (see remark 1.13).

There is a vast literature on Price’s law results for linear waves on asymptotically flat spacetimes [15, 16, 51, 38, 1, 2, 19, 29], including subextremal Reissner–Nordström and Kerr. We also mention [36, 39] for Price’s law results for the Teukolsky equation on subextremal Kerr. The analogue of theorem 1.15 for linear waves on subextremal Reissner–Nordström was first established in [1]. In that setting,  $\mathfrak{L}$  is a linear form that vanishes on solutions arising from a codimension one class of data. See [46] for a late-time tails result for (1.1) for small data solutions with non-vanishing Newman–Penrose constant (note in particular that the compactly supported solutions we consider have vanishing Newman–Penrose constant).

1.2.4. *Black holes with spacelike and null singularities.* The main result of [54] is a local result [54, Thm. 2.1] in the black hole interior (near the junction between the Cauchy horizon and the spacelike singularity) providing precise asymptotics for geometric quantities and for the scalar field. This quantitative local result is combined with a gluing argument (based on [24]) to construct global two-ended spacetimes that contain both null and spacelike singularities. We summarize this construction in the following theorem, whose proof requires the decay estimates  $\partial_{\bar{v}}\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} = C\bar{v}^{-4} + o(\bar{v}^{-4})$  and  $\partial_{\bar{v}}^2\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} = O(\bar{v}^{-5})$  that are provided by theorem 1.15.

**Theorem 1.18** (Van de Moortel, [54, Thm. 2.6(ii)]). *There is a large class of two-ended asymptotically flat black hole spacetimes solving (1.1) (namely those arising from an open subset of the generic class of future-admissible Cauchy data constructed by Luk–Oh in theorem 1.8) with the Penrose diagram in fig. 1.*

*Both the Cauchy horizon  $\mathcal{CH}$  (to which  $r$  extends continuously as a strictly positive function) and the achronal singular set  $\mathcal{S}$  (to which  $r$  extends continuously to 0) are non-empty, and  $\mathcal{S}$  is spacelike in a neighbourhood of the junction between  $\mathcal{S}$  and the Cauchy horizon  $\mathcal{CH}$  (in the topology of the Penrose diagram). Moreover, there are quantitative asymptotics for geometric quantities and estimates for the scalar field towards  $\mathcal{CH}$ , as well as quantitative Kasner asymptotics towards  $\mathcal{S}$ .*




FIGURE 1. The a priori Penrose diagram for solutions to (1.1). The achronal singular set  $S$ , to which the area-radius function  $r$  extends continuously to 0, may be empty, as it is in Reissner–Nordström. This characterization is due to [8, 10, 27]. In particular, Dafermos [8] proved that  $S$  can be non-empty only for large perturbations of Reissner–Nordström.

### 1.3. Ideas of the proof.

1.3.1. *Use of a scaling vector field.* Our strategy to prove theorem 1.1 involves a scaling vector field commutator  $S$  that equals  $v\partial_v$  along the horizon (see section 1.3.3 for the definition of  $S$ ). We briefly recall the merits of such a vector field in other settings and outline the construction of the vector field in our setting.

On Minkowski, the scaling vector field takes the form  $S_m = u\partial_u + v\partial_v = t\partial_t + r\partial_r$ . It is well known that  $S_m$  is a useful vector field commutator. It is conformally Killing, and  $[S_m, \square_m] = 2\square_m$ , which means that any decay estimates for a solution  $\varphi$  to  $\square_m\varphi = 0$  also hold for  $S_m\varphi$ . Due to the  $t$ -weight in  $S_m$ , one can hope to prove better decay in time for  $\varphi$  given estimates for  $S_m\varphi$ . Indeed, control of  $S_m\varphi$  together with  $\Gamma\varphi$  for  $\Gamma$  a Killing vector field of Minkowski leads to decay by Klainerman’s Sobolev-type estimates. The use of a scaling vector field commutator on Minkowski goes back to Klainerman [25] and Klainerman–Sideris [26], and its use on black hole spacetimes appears in [28, 38, 51].

1.3.2. *Ingredients of the proof.* By the construction of the scaling vector field  $S$ , the statement of theorem 1.1 is equivalent to the following estimate along the event horizon:

$$|S^k\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim v^{-1+\epsilon}. \quad (1.11)$$

The estimate (1.11) follows from a hierarchy of  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimates (introduced in [12]) for  $S^k\varphi$  with  $p \in (0, 2)$ . To perform energy estimates for  $S^k\varphi$ , we must control the coupling between the geometry and the scalar field arising from the commutator  $[\square, S^k]$ .

Our proof uses an inductive argument, where we control derivatives of the solution assuming control only of lower-order derivatives. In particular, we do not use a bootstrap argument, which allows us to handle large data solutions. The key ingredients that let us close the induction are:

- (1) Redshift effect for a subextremal black hole, as manifested by a uniform lower bound for  $\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r$  along the horizon at late times.
- (2) Monotonicity of  $\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r$  that propagates the lower bound in (1).
- (3) Energy decay and subsequent pointwise decay derived from  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimates.
- (4) Reductive structure in the error terms arising from commutation.
- (5) Identification of weak and strong decay estimates required for geometric quantities.

The quantity  $\varpi$  we refer to is the renormalized Hawking mass,  $\mathbf{e}$  is the charge parameter, and  $r$  is the area radius function, which appears in the form of the metric in double null coordinates:

$$g = -\Omega^2 du dv + r^2 g_{\mathbb{S}^2}. \quad (1.12)$$

For further discussion of these quantities, see section 2.1.

Ingredients (1) and (2) are well-known and were used in [13]. The techniques in (3) were introduced for linear waves in [12] (and expanded in scope by [40]), but their implementation in our nonlinear spherically symmetric problem (including commutation with weighted vector fields) is novel.

The main innovation of this work, which allows us to handle large data, is ingredient (4). To capture what we call the reductive structure in (4), we introduce two unweighted vector field commutators: an ingoing null vector field  $U$  (“the global redshift vector field”), and a vector field  $V$  that is outgoing null for large  $r$ . We order products of the vector fields  $U$ ,  $V$ , and  $S$ , which we call  $\Gamma^\alpha$  for a multi-index  $\alpha$ , in such a way that  $[\square, \Gamma^\alpha]$  includes only lower order terms and terms that are either small or have a good sign due to the redshift effect (see Step 2 in section 1.3.5 as well as lemmas 2.19 and 2.20). See section 1.3.3 for an informal discussion of the “reductive structure,” and see Step 2 of section 1.3.5 for a more precise discussion.

Ingredient (5) is important because in order to establish energy estimates at order  $\alpha$  in (4), one needs control of geometric quantities of order  $\alpha$  with weights in  $r$  (what we call “weak” estimates) as well as control of geometric quantities of order  $< \alpha$  with weights in both  $r$  and a time parameter  $\tau$  (what we call “strong” estimates). In particular, one must first establish the weak geometric estimates, then establish energy estimates, and then establish the strong geometric estimates.

**1.3.3. Commutator vector fields.** We use three commutator vector fields, which we call  $U$ ,  $V$ , and  $S$ . They are defined as follows:

$$U := \frac{1}{(-\partial_u r)} \partial_u, \quad V := \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r) \underline{\partial}_v + (1 - \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r)) \bar{\partial}_r, \quad S := \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r) v \underline{\partial}_v + (1 - \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r)) (u \bar{\partial}_u + r \bar{\partial}_r).$$

Here  $\chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r)$  is a cutoff function supported in  $\{r \leq R_\bullet\}$  (for a large parameter  $R_\bullet > 0$  to be chosen in the course of the proof),  $(\underline{\partial}_r, \underline{\partial}_v)$  are the coordinate derivatives in the  $(r, v)$  coordinates, and  $(\bar{\partial}_u, \bar{\partial}_r)$  are the coordinate derivatives in the Bondi–Sachs  $(u, r)$  coordinates.

We now informally explain the “reductive structure” identified in ingredient (4) of section 1.3.2 in terms of the commutation formulas for our commutator vector fields (see Step 2 in section 1.3.5 for a more careful discussion). For this discussion we ignore the coupling between the geometry and the scalar field.

- (1) (The commutator vector field  $U$ ) We use the redshift vector field  $U$  as a global commutator (see [14] for such a use on Schwarzschild). As is well-known, one can commute with the redshift vector field even though  $[\square, U]$  contains a  $\partial U$  term, because this term comes with a good sign (which is a manifestation of the redshift effect). We can commute with the redshift vector field globally even in our nonlinear setting because in spherical symmetry, the good sign that makes the redshift vector field a useful commutator near the horizon is *propagated* globally by the equations.
- (2) (The commutator vector field  $V$ ) On Schwarzschild, our construction of  $V$  specializes to the timelike Killing vector field  $\partial_t$  in a region of finite  $r$ , and to  $\frac{1}{1-2M/r} \partial_v$  in a region of large  $r$ . The vector fields  $\underline{\partial}_v$  and  $\bar{\partial}_r$  satisfy the commutation formula

$$[\square, \underline{\partial}_v] = O(r^{-1})\square + O(r^{-1})\partial U + O(r^{-2})\partial, \quad (1.13)$$

and

$$[\square, \bar{\partial}_r] = O(r^{-1})\square + O(r^{-2})\bar{\partial}_r^2 + O(r^{-2})\partial. \quad (1.14)$$

One now computes the commutation formula for  $V$ :

$$[\square, V] = O(r^{-1})\square + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} O(r^{-2})\partial V + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq R_\bullet} \partial U + O(r^{-2})\partial \quad (1.15)$$

The structure of the second order terms is crucial. Since  $V$  is only equal to  $\underline{\partial}_v$  in a finite- $r$  region, one does not worry about the borderline  $r^{-1}$ -weight on the  $\partial U$  term in (1.13); indeed, one can absorb this term using the bulk energy associated to  $U$ , which has already been controlled. The  $\partial V$  term looks problematic, although it has a good  $r^{-2}$  weight, because a  $\partial V$  term also appears on the left side of the energy estimate associated to  $V$ . However, the  $\partial V$  error term is supported in a region of large  $r$ , and the  $r^{-2}$  weight decays faster than the  $r^{-1+\epsilon}$  weight in the bulk term on the left, so this term can be absorbed to the left of the energy estimate associated to  $V$ .

*Remark 1.19* (Alternative choices for  $V$ ). Observe that  $V$  is gauge-invariant for large  $r$ . It might seem natural to construct  $V$  such that it is equal to the gauge-invariant Kodama vector field  $T = \frac{1-\mu}{\partial_v r} \partial_v + \frac{1-\mu}{(-\partial_u r)} \partial_u$  near the horizon, rather than to our choice of  $\underline{\partial}_v = \frac{\partial_v r}{1-\mu} T$ . In fact,  $[\square, T]$  contains



a  $T^2$  term, which means that such a construction of  $V$  would produce a  $\partial V$  term in  $[\square, V]$  that is supported near the horizon, and so cannot be absorbed as above.

- (3) (The commutator vector field  $S$ ) On Schwarzschild, our construction of  $S$  specializes to  $vT$  in a finite  $r$ -region—and to  $u\bar{\partial}_u + r\bar{\partial}_r$  in a region of large  $r$ , where  $(\bar{\partial}_u, \bar{\partial}_r)$  are the coordinate derivatives in the Bondi–Sachs  $(u, r)$  coordinates. This vector field is not conformally Killing, but we schematically have

$$[\square, S] = (2 + O(r^{-1}))\square + O(r^{-1+\epsilon})\bar{\partial}_r^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq R_\bullet} \partial U + O(r^{-2+\epsilon})\partial. \quad (1.16)$$

The last two terms are associated to energies lower in the hierarchy than  $S$ , and can be dealt with as before. The  $\bar{\partial}_r^2$  term has a  $r^{-1+\epsilon}$  weight (which is too weak to be absorbed by the bulk energy, which has an  $r^{-1-\epsilon}$  weight), but we can write  $\bar{\partial}_r \psi = r^{-1}\bar{\partial}_r(r\bar{\partial}_r \psi) - r^{-1}\bar{\partial}_r \psi$ . The term left to control, then, is  $O(r^{-2+\epsilon})\bar{\partial}_r(r\bar{\partial}_r \psi)$ , which can be written in the form  $O(r^{-2+\epsilon})\bar{\partial}_r(rV\psi)$  for large  $r$ . This term can then be estimated by the  $r^p$  bulk term associated to  $V\psi$ , which has already been controlled.

1.3.4. *Gauge choice.* In theorem 1.1, we use a double null gauge  $(u, v)$  in which  $\frac{-\partial_u r}{1-\mu} = 1$  at null infinity and the quantity  $\kappa := \frac{\partial_v r}{1-\mu}$  is 1 along a curve of constant  $r$ , namely  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$ , where  $r_{\mathcal{H}} = \sup_{\mathcal{H}} r$  is the limiting value of the area radius function along the event horizon. On dynamical spacetimes, our gauge differs from the Eddington–Finkelstein-type  $(u, \bar{v})$  gauge that is more common in the literature (see for example [13, 32]), in which  $\frac{\partial_{\bar{v}} r}{1-\mu} = 1$  along the horizon.

The  $(u, v)$  gauge is adapted to our commutator vector fields  $V$  and  $S$ , in the sense that  $V\kappa$  and  $S\kappa$  vanish on  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$  (because in this region  $V$  and  $S$  are tangent to curves of constant  $r$ ). This enables an argument in which one integrates the transport equation for  $S\kappa$  to  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$  and obtains boundedness and decay for  $S\kappa$  globally (see Step 4 of section 1.3.5). On the other hand, the quantities  $\bar{S}^n \bar{\kappa}$  (where the barred quantities are those associated to the  $(u, \bar{v})$  gauge) appear to grow along the horizon for sufficiently large  $n$ .

1.3.5. *Outline of the proof.* We now describe the main estimates we establish, in terms of the following nine schematic quantities (which we define precisely in section 2.7), which are parameterized by a multi-index  $\alpha$  (see section 2.6.3 for an explanation of our multi-index notation):

- $\mathfrak{D}_N$ : a gauge invariant  $r$ -weighted  $L^\infty$  norm on characteristic initial data that controls the scalar field and its first  $N + 1$  derivatives.
- $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$ : an  $r$ -weighted  $L^\infty$  norm on characteristic initial data that controls  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi$  and its first derivatives.
- $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha$  **and**  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ : “weak” geometric quantities controlling  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \sigma$  with  $r$ -weights, where  $\sigma$  is one of  $\varpi, \gamma := \frac{\partial_u r}{1-\mu}$ , or  $\kappa := \frac{\partial_v r}{1-\mu}$ . The quantities  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha$  are shown to be bounded in the course of the proof, while the quantities  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  are only shown to grow slowly in  $r$ . Both  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  must be controlled before the order- $\alpha$  energy is controlled.
- $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$ : an  $L^2$  energy norm that is non-degenerate at the horizon and measures boundedness of a quantity  $\|r\partial\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi\|_{L^2(C)}$  on null curves  $C$ .
- $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,p}$ : an  $r^p$ -weighted  $L^2$  energy norm that controls  $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$  and captures decay in  $\tau$  (see (2.18)) of the energy along a suitable foliation. The quantity  $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,q}$  is stronger than the quantity  $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,p}$  when  $p < q$ .
- $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,p}$ : an  $L^\infty$  norm that controls  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi$  with weights in both  $r$  and  $\tau$  (where the  $\tau$  weights capture the decay that follows from  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimates), as well as derivatives  $U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi$  and  $V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi$  with weights in  $r$ . This norm includes a stronger  $r$ -weight on outgoing null derivatives  $V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi$  than on ingoing null derivatives. The quantity  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,q}$  is stronger than the quantity  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,p}$  when  $p < q$ .
- $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  **and**  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$ : geometric quantities stronger than  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ , respectively, that also include  $\tau$ -weights on geometric quantities. The quantities  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  are shown to be bounded in the course of the proof, while the quantities  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$  are only shown to grow slowly in  $r$ . Both  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$  are controlled after the order- $\alpha$  energy is controlled.

In Steps 1–5, we will show that each quantity of order  $\alpha$  above is bounded by lower order quantities and quantities of order  $\alpha$  that are higher up on the list. We remark that the proofs of Steps 1–4 are independent from one another.

*Step 0: Reduction to a characteristic problem (section 3).* We first restrict the region of interest from the future of a Cauchy surface to a characteristic rectangle, which reduces the proof of theorem 1.1 to the proof of theorem 3.1. This is possible since (1.1) is globally well posed by [27] and the data we consider is compactly supported. Moreover, the subextremality of the black hole region and monotonicity properties of (1.1) allow

us to assume that the redshift parameter  $\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r$  is uniformly positive in our characteristic rectangle. In this rectangle we work with a future-normalized double null gauge (see section 2.4).

*Step 1: Boundedness of initial data (section 5).* In this step we show

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha \leq C(\mathbf{b}_{<\alpha}, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_{<\alpha})\mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}, \quad (1.17)$$

which controls the gauge dependent data quantity  $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$  by the gauge invariant norm  $\mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}$ .

*Step 2: Energy boundedness (section 6).* The conclusion of this step is an energy boundedness statement

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha \leq C(\eta_0, \mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s}\mathbf{g}_\alpha, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0})[\mathcal{D}_\alpha + \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha, 4s}] \quad (1.18)$$

for small  $s > 0$  and a small parameter  $\eta_0 > 0$ . The constant on the right blows up as  $\eta_0$  goes to 0.

The main difficulty in establishing (1.18) is to handle the error terms arising from commutation. To illustrate how these terms are treated, we will explain how to obtain (1.18) in the case  $|\alpha| = 1$ . We specialize our discussion to an exterior region of a Schwarzschild spacetime of mass  $M$ , in the standard double null coordinates  $u = t - r_*$  and  $v = t + r_*$ , where  $r_* = r + 2M \log(r - 2M)$ . We use the following vector field multipliers to derive an energy boundedness and integrated local energy decay estimate:

$$T = \partial_u + \partial_v \quad (\text{Kodama vector field}), \quad (1.19)$$

$$X = f(r)(\partial_u - \partial_v) \quad (\text{Morawetz vector field}), \quad (1.20)$$

$$Y = \frac{\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)}{1 - 2M/r} \partial_u \quad (\text{Redshift vector field}), \quad (1.21)$$

$$Z = e^{-M(u-v)} \partial_v \quad (\text{Irregular vector field}). \quad (1.22)$$

Here  $\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)$  in the definition of  $Y$  is a cutoff function localized to the horizon. The vector fields  $T$ ,  $X$ , and  $Y$  are used in a standard way to derive an energy estimate, while the irregular vector field  $Z$  is used as in [32] to generate a good bulk term that helps control a certain quartic error term.

Let  $\varphi$  be a solution of the wave equation  $\square\varphi = 0$ , and let  $\psi$  be a general function. Consider a spacetime region  $\mathcal{R}$  with past boundary  $\Sigma_1$  and future boundary  $\Sigma_2$ . We derive an energy boundedness and integrated local energy decay estimate of the form

$$E[\psi, \Sigma_2] + E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \lesssim_{\eta_0} E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \underbrace{\iint_{\mathcal{R}} W\psi\square\psi \cdot r^2 \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) du dv}_{:=\mathcal{E}[\psi]} + \dots \quad (1.23)$$

for an energy quantity  $E[\psi, \Sigma]$  non-degenerate at the horizon whose integrand has the schematic form  $r^2(\partial\psi)^2$ , a bulk term  $E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  with the control

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R}} r^{-1+\eta_0} (\partial\psi)^2 r^2 \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) du dv \lesssim E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}], \quad (1.24)$$

where  $\eta_0 > 0$  is a small parameter, and a vector field multiplier  $W = c_T T + c_X X + c_Y Y$  for  $c_T, c_X, c_Y > 0$  and  $f(r) > 0$  in the definition of  $X$ . We have written  $\dots$  in (1.23) to denote error terms that we ignore in this discussion, since most of them can be dealt with as in [32].

Observe that the error term  $\mathcal{E}[\varphi]$  vanishes (since  $\square\varphi = 0$ ), so an energy boundedness statement and an integrated local energy decay statement for  $\varphi$  follows immediately from (1.23). We now explain how to control the error term  $\mathcal{E}[\Gamma\varphi]$  for  $\Gamma \in \{U, V, S\}$ , in order to close the energy estimate (1.23) for  $\psi = \Gamma\varphi$  and establish (1.18) in the case  $|\alpha| = 1$ .

*Step 2a: Commutation with  $U$ .* Note that the  $\partial_u$  coefficient on the vector field  $W$  appearing in (1.23) is positive, because the same is true for each of the vector fields  $T$ ,  $X$ , and  $Y$ . We now explain how this sign plays a role in our commutation scheme. Let  $U = \frac{1}{1-2M/r} \partial_u$  be the global redshift vector field. We have

$$\square U\varphi = -f_U U^2\varphi + O(r^{-2})\partial\varphi. \quad (1.25)$$

for a function  $f_U$  satisfying  $f_U > 0$  and  $f_U = O(r^{-2})$ . On Schwarzschild, the value of  $f_U$  is  $2M/r^2$ ; in the general problem,  $f_U = 2r^{-2}(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)$ , which is bounded below by a positive multiple of  $r^{-2}$  (see Step 0). We now explain how to establish energy estimates for  $U\varphi$  given energy estimates for  $\varphi$  (and control of

geometric quantities of order  $U$ ). Write  $W = W_U U + W_v \partial_v$ , so that, by (1.25), the first error term in energy estimate (1.23) applied to  $\psi = U\varphi$  is

$$\mathcal{E}[U\varphi] = \iint_{\mathcal{R}} W U \varphi \square U \varphi = - \iint_{\mathcal{R}} W_U f_U (U^2 \varphi)^2 + \iint_{\mathcal{R}} O(r^{-2}) \partial_v U \varphi U^2 \varphi + \iint_{\mathcal{R}} O(r^{-2}) \partial \varphi \partial U \varphi, \quad (1.26)$$

where we have omitted the volume form  $r^2(1 - 2M/r) du dv$ . The first term on the right has a good sign and can be neglected. One can use the wave equation to rewrite the second term into the form of the third term. The third term can be handled with Young's inequality and the bulk term in the already established energy estimate for  $\varphi$ .

*Step 2b: Commutation with  $V$ .* The vector field  $V$  is  $\bar{\partial}_r$  in Bondi–Sachs  $(u, r)$  coordinates (outgoing null) for large  $r$ , and timelike for small  $r$ . Assuming that we have controlled geometric quantities of order  $V$ , we have a commutation formula

$$\square V \varphi = \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} O(r^{-2}) \partial V \varphi + O_{R_\bullet}(r^{-2}) [\partial \varphi + \partial U \varphi], \quad (1.27)$$

where  $R_\bullet > 0$  is a parameter that can be chosen large. The term in  $\mathcal{E}[V\varphi]$  arising from the second term on the right of (1.27) can be dealt with as in Step 2a, using Young's inequality and the bulk terms associated to  $\varphi$  and  $U\varphi$ , which are considered lower order than  $V\varphi$  (and so have already been controlled by the time one seeks control of  $V\varphi$ ). The first term on the right of (1.27) is not small, so the error term it produces in  $\mathcal{E}[V\varphi]$ , namely

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R_\bullet\}} O(r^{-2}) (\partial V \varphi)^2, \quad (1.28)$$

is potentially problematic. However, the integral in (1.28) is taken only over a large- $r$  region, and the  $r$ -weight in the integrand decays faster than in the bulk energy (see (1.24)). Thus the error term (1.28) can be bounded by a small multiple of  $E_{\text{bulk}}[V\varphi, \mathcal{R}]$  by choosing  $R_\bullet$  large, and it can be absorbed into the left side of the energy estimate (1.23).

*Step 2c: Commutation with  $S$ .* At this stage of the argument we have performed energy estimates—including  $r^p$ -weighted estimates—for  $\varphi$ ,  $U\varphi$ , and  $V\varphi$ , and we have obtained control of geometric quantities associated to  $S$  in terms of lower order energies. The vector field  $S$  is  $u\bar{\partial}_u + r\bar{\partial}_r$  in Bondi–Sachs  $(u, r)$  coordinates for large  $r$  and  $v\bar{\partial}_v$  in  $(v, r)$  coordinates near the horizon. We have a commutation formula

$$\square S \varphi = \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R} O(r^{-2+s}) \partial_v (rV\varphi) + O(r^{-2+s}) [\partial \varphi + \partial U \varphi + \partial V \varphi] \quad (1.29)$$

for a large  $R > 0$  and small  $s > 0$ . The term in  $\mathcal{E}[S\varphi]$  arising from the first term on the right of (1.29) is controlled (using Young's inequality) by the  $r^p$ -weighted bulk quantity (with  $p = \eta_0$ ) associated to the lower order term  $V\varphi$ , as well as a small multiple of the bulk energy  $E_{\text{bulk}}[S\varphi, \mathcal{R}]$ . We treat the terms in  $\mathcal{E}[S\varphi]$  arising from the second term on the right of (1.29) as in Steps 2a and 2b.

*Step 3: Energy decay (section 6).* The conclusion of this step is an energy decay statement

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 2-\eta_0-C_\alpha s} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s} \mathbf{g}_\alpha, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 0}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha, \quad (1.30)$$

for  $\eta_0 > 0$  as in Step 2,  $s > 0$  small (depending on  $\alpha$ ), and explicit constants  $C_\alpha$  depending on  $\alpha$ . We adapt the method of  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimates due to Dafermos–Rodnianski [12] to establish energy decay along a suitable foliation.

We now explain why the maximum value of  $p < 2$  that we can take when controlling  $\Gamma^\alpha \varphi$  depends on  $\alpha$  (namely  $p \leq 2 - \eta_0 - C_\alpha s$ ). The  $r^p$  estimate for  $\psi$  contains an error term of the form

$$\iint_{\{r \geq R\}} r^{p+3} |\square \psi|^2 du dv \quad (1.31)$$

for a large  $R > 0$ . When  $\psi = S\varphi$ , this produces terms of the form

$$\iint_{\{r \geq R\}} r^{p-1} (S\varpi)^2 (\partial_v \varphi)^2 du dv \quad \text{and} \quad \iint_{\{r \geq R\}} r^{p-1} (rS(-\gamma))^2 (\partial_v (rV\varphi))^2 du dv. \quad (1.32)$$

At this stage of the argument, the terms  $S\varpi$  and  $rS(-\gamma)$  can only be shown to grow slowly in  $r$ , at a rate  $r^s$  (see Steps 5ab). Thus the terms above become

$$\iint_{\{r \geq R\}} r^{p-1+2s} [(\partial_v \varphi)^2 + (\partial_v (rV\varphi))^2] du dv. \quad (1.33)$$

When  $p \leq 2 - \eta_0 - 2s$ , the first term can be controlled by the Morawetz estimate corresponding to  $\varphi$ , and the second term is controlled by the bulk term in the  $r^{p+2s}$ -energy associated to  $V\varphi$ . In general, control of the  $r^p$ -energy associated to  $\Gamma^\alpha\varphi$  requires  $p \leq 2 - \eta_0 - 2s$  and control of the  $r^{p+2s}$  energy associated to  $\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi$ . An induction argument shows that, assuming the  $r^{2-\eta_0}$ -energy of  $\varphi$  is controlled, one can control the  $r^p$ -energy of  $\Gamma^\alpha\varphi$  for  $p = 2 - \eta_0 - C_\alpha s$  for a constant  $C_\alpha$  depending on  $\alpha$ .

*Step 4: Pointwise estimates (section 7).* In this step we control a pointwise norm of the scalar field by data and the  $r^p$ -weighted energy norm:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,p} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s}\mathbf{g}_\alpha)(\mathcal{D}_\alpha + \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,p}) \quad (1.34)$$

for small  $s > 0$  (depending on  $\alpha$ ). The redshift effect plays a role in this section.

*Step 5: Estimates for geometric quantities (section 8).* This is the most technical step of the proof. We show that

$$\mathbf{b}_\alpha \leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_{<\alpha}, \mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s}\mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1+\eta_0}), \quad (1.35)$$

$$\mathfrak{B}_\alpha \leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s}\mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1}), \quad (1.36)$$

$$r^{-s}\mathbf{g}_\alpha \leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s}\mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}), \quad (1.37)$$

$$r^{-s}\mathfrak{G}_\alpha \leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s}\mathbf{g}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s}\mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}). \quad (1.38)$$

See section 2.7.4 for the definitions of the schematic geometric quantities. In this section we do not discuss the estimates for  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$ , as they are simpler than the estimates for  $\mathbf{b}_\alpha$  and  $\mathbf{g}_\alpha$ .

*Step 5a: Estimates for  $S\varpi$ .* Write  $\varpi$  for the renormalized Hawking mass (see (2.8)). We explain why  $S\varpi$  is in  $\mathbf{g}_S$  and not  $\mathbf{b}_S$ , namely why we can only show that  $S\varpi$  grows slowly in  $r$  (and not that it is bounded). We have

$$|S\varpi| \lesssim v|V\varpi| + \tau|U\varpi|, \quad (1.39)$$

where  $\tau = u$  for large  $r$  and  $\tau \sim v$  for small  $r$ . When  $r \leq \tau/2$ , the transport equations for  $\varpi$  in the  $u$ - and  $v$ -directions yield

$$v|V\varpi| + \tau|U\varpi| \lesssim r^2\tau(D\varphi)^2, \quad (1.40)$$

where we have written  $D$  to stand for  $U$  or  $V$ . Control of the pointwise norm of  $D\varphi$  (which comes from Step 4 and ultimately from the  $r^p$ -estimates of Step 3) gives just under  $3/2$  powers of decay, namely  $\mathcal{P}_{2-s}^2[D\varphi] \leq \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s}^2$  controls  $r\tau^{2-s}|D\varphi|^2$  and  $r^2\tau^{1-s-\eta_0}$ . By interpolation,  $\mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s}^2$  controls  $r^{2-s-\eta_0}\tau$ . This shows that  $|S\varpi| \lesssim r^{s+\eta_0}\mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s}$ .

*Step 5b: Estimates for  $S(-\gamma)$ .* Write  $(-\gamma) := \frac{\partial_u r}{1-2m/r}$  (see section 2.1.2 for the definition of the Hawking mass  $m$ ). We now explain why  $rS(-\gamma)$  is in  $\mathbf{g}_S$  and not  $\mathbf{b}_S$ , namely why we can only show that  $rS(-\gamma)$  grows slowly in  $r$  (and not that it is bounded) before controlling the energy associated to  $S\varphi$ .

As in Step 5a, we have

$$|S \log(-\gamma)| \lesssim v|V \log(-\gamma)| + \tau|U \log(-\gamma)|. \quad (1.41)$$

The second term can be controlled by the estimate  $r\tau|U \log(-\gamma)| \lesssim 1$  contained in the boundedness of the lower order quantity  $\mathfrak{B}_U$ . For the first term, we use the  $\partial_v$ -transport equation for  $\log(-\gamma)$  to find that, in the region  $r \gg 1$ ,

$$v|V \log(-\gamma)| \lesssim rv(\partial_v \varphi)^2. \quad (1.42)$$

In the region  $r \leq \tau/2$ , we have  $\tau \sim v$ , so this term can be handled exactly as in Step 5a. In the region  $r \geq \tau/2$ , we have  $r \sim v$ , so this term is handled using the fact that  $\partial_v$ -derivatives decay with two powers of  $r$  (namely  $r^2|\partial_v \varphi| \leq \mathcal{P}_{0,0}$ ).

*Step 5c: Estimates for  $\Gamma^\alpha\kappa$ .* Write  $\kappa := \frac{\partial_v r}{1-2m/r}$  (see section 2.1.2 for the definition of the Hawking mass  $m$ ). We will explain how to show that  $S\kappa$  is bounded (given control of lower order energies and geometric quantities).

The gauge condition on the coordinate  $v$  fixes  $\kappa|_{\{r=r_{\mathcal{H}}\}} = 1$ , where  $r_{\mathcal{H}} := \sup_{\mathcal{H}} r$  is the limiting value of the area radius along the horizon. We will explain how to obtain a boundedness estimate for  $S \log \kappa$  from control of lower order quantities. Assume that the area radius  $r$  of the point at which we want to estimate  $S \log \kappa$  satisfies  $r \geq r_{\mathcal{H}}$  (the case  $r \leq r_{\mathcal{H}}$  is similar). Ignoring error terms arising from commuting  $S$  past  $U$ , we use the transport equation  $U \log \kappa = -r(U\varphi)^2$  to obtain

$$|US \log \kappa| \lesssim r|U\varphi||US\varphi| \lesssim rv|U\varphi|(|UV\varphi| + |UU\varphi|), \quad (1.43)$$

where we have used a statement  $|S\psi| \lesssim v(|U\psi| + |V\psi|)$ . Integrating (1.43) to the constant- $r$  curve  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$  (noting that  $U = -\partial_r$  in  $(r, v)$  coordinates and  $S \log \kappa|_{\{r=r_{\mathcal{H}}\}} = 0$ ), one obtains

$$|S \log \kappa|(r) \lesssim v \int_{r_{\mathcal{H}}}^r r' |U\varphi| |UD\varphi| dr', \quad (1.44)$$

where we write  $D$  for either  $U$  or  $V$ . One establishes

$$\int_{r_{\mathcal{H}}}^r r' (U\psi)^2 dr' \lesssim v^{-1} \mathcal{E}_1[\psi], \quad (1.45)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_1$  is an  $r^p$ -weighted energy norm with  $p = 1$  (see lemma 8.7). The method is to split the integral into the regions where  $\{r \leq v/2\}$  and  $\{r \geq v/2\}$ . For the first term one uses the decay captured by the  $r^p$ -weighted energy quantity. The second term is integrated over a region where  $r \sim v$ , so one can use the  $r^2$ -weight in the energy quantity  $E[\psi]$  controlled in Step 2, which is one power stronger than the  $r$ -weight in (1.45). Now the integral in (1.44) can be controlled using Cauchy–Schwarz and (1.45), which leads to

$$|S \log \kappa|(r) \lesssim \mathcal{E}_1[\varphi] + \mathcal{E}_1[D\varphi]. \quad (1.46)$$

In this way one obtains boundedness of  $S \log \kappa$  from boundedness of lower order energies.

*Step 6: Putting it all together (section 9).* Together with certain zeroth order estimates (see section 4), an induction argument involving the results of Steps 1–5 shows that all our schematic quantities of order  $\alpha$  are controlled by the gauge invariant initial data norm  $\mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}$ . In particular, the control in the pointwise norm  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 2-2\epsilon}$  (for  $\alpha = kS$ ) gives the desired (1.11).

*Step 7: Late-time tails (section 10).* To prove the late-time tails result in theorem 1.15, we appeal to [29, Main Theorem 4]. Section 10 is dedicated to satisfying the assumptions of [29]. The additional ingredient (on top of the estimates obtained in Step 6) is control of  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field and the geometry. The observation of [29] (see also [26]) is that a linear combination of the wave operator  $\square_g$  and powers of the scaling vector field  $S$  is elliptic, which allows one to obtain  $L^2$ -control of  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field from  $L^2$ -control of  $S$ -derivatives of the scalar field. To upgrade this to  $L^\infty$  control, we use the Klainerman’s Sobolev type estimate in [29, Sec. 5.4]. These estimates are coupled to weak estimates for the geometric quantities. Once we obtain control of  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field in  $L^\infty$ , we establish stronger estimates, including asymptotics, for geometric quantities.

**Acknowledgements.** The author thanks their advisor Jonathan Luk for introducing them to the problem and for many useful discussions and comments on the manuscript. The author also thanks Maxime Van de Moortel for his interest in this work. This project began as the author’s undergraduate thesis at Stanford University, and much of the early work was carried out at the SURIM program. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE-2039656.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

### 2.1. Einstein–Maxwell–scalar field system in spherical symmetry.

2.1.1. *Spherically symmetric solutions.* A 4-dimensional Lorentzian manifold  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  is called a spherically symmetric spacetime if  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{Q} \times S^2$  for a 2-dimensional Lorentzian manifold with boundary  $(\mathcal{Q}, g_{\mathcal{Q}})$  that has a global chart  $(u, v)$  of “double null coordinates,” in which its metric takes the form

$$g_{\mathcal{Q}} = -\Omega^2 du dv, \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$g = g_{\mathcal{Q}} + r^2 g_{S^2}. \quad (2.2)$$

Here  $g_{S^2}$  is the round metric on the unit sphere  $r : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is the area-radius function, defined so that if  $\pi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  is the quotient map, then  $\pi^{-1}(p) \subset \mathcal{M}$  has area equal to that of a round sphere of radius  $r(p)$ . Observe that a spherically symmetric spacetime admits an action of  $\text{SO}(3)$  by isometries.

A solution  $(\mathcal{M}, g, \varphi, F)$  to (1.1) is called spherically symmetric if  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  is a spherically symmetric spacetime,  $\varphi$  is invariant under the  $\text{SO}(3)$  action,  $F$  is invariant under pullback by the  $\text{SO}(3)$  action, and there exists  $\mathbf{e} : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  such that

$$F = \frac{\mathbf{e}}{2(\pi^*r)^2} \pi^*(\Omega^2 du \wedge dv). \quad (2.3)$$

The equations imply that  $\mathbf{e}$  is a constant (see [9, §2]).

2.1.2. *Equations in spherical symmetry.* Let  $(u, v)$  be a double null coordinate system on  $\mathcal{Q}$ . In spherical symmetry, the Einstein–Maxwell–scalar field system becomes a system of wave equations for  $(r, \varphi, \Omega)$ :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_u \partial_v r &= -\frac{\Omega^2}{4r} - \frac{\partial_{ur} \partial_v r}{r} + \frac{\Omega^2 \mathbf{e}^2}{4r^3}, \\ \partial_u \partial_v \varphi &= -\frac{\partial_v r \partial_u \varphi}{r} - \frac{\partial_u r \partial_v \varphi}{r}, \\ \partial_u \partial_v \log \Omega &= -2\partial_u \varphi \partial_v \varphi - \frac{\Omega^2 \mathbf{e}^2}{r^4} + \frac{\Omega^2}{2r^2} + \frac{2\partial_{ur} \partial_v r}{r^2}. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

We also have the following Raychaudhuri equations:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_v \left( \frac{\partial_v r}{\Omega^2} \right) &= -\frac{r(\partial_v \varphi)^2}{\Omega^2}, \\ \partial_u \left( \frac{\partial_u r}{\Omega^2} \right) &= -\frac{r(\partial_u \varphi)^2}{\Omega^2}. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

We will work with a different set of equations written in terms of the Hawking mass. Introduce the following notation for null derivatives of  $r$ :

$$\lambda := \partial_v r \quad \nu := \partial_u r. \quad (2.6)$$

Define the Hawking mass  $m : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  by

$$m := \frac{r}{2}(1 - g_{\mathcal{Q}}(\nabla r, \nabla r)) = \frac{r}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{4\lambda\nu}{\Omega^2} \right), \quad (2.7)$$

as well as the renormalized Hawking mass

$$\varpi := m + \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{2r}. \quad (2.8)$$

The wave operator  $\square := -4\square_g$  takes the form

$$\square = \frac{1 - \mu}{\lambda(-\nu)} \left( \partial_u \partial_v + \frac{\lambda}{r} \partial_u + \frac{\nu}{r} \partial_v \right). \quad (2.9)$$

Define

$$\mu := \frac{2m}{r} = \frac{2\varpi}{r} - \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{r^2} \quad (2.10)$$

and set

$$\kappa := \frac{\lambda}{1 - \mu} \quad \gamma := \frac{\nu}{1 - \mu}. \quad (2.11)$$

When  $1 - \mu \neq 0$ , a spherically symmetric solution satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_u \partial_v r &= \partial_u \lambda = \partial_v \nu = \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} \frac{\lambda\nu}{1 - \mu} \\ \square \varphi &= 0, \\ \partial_u \varpi &= -\frac{r^2}{2(-\gamma)} (\partial_u \varphi)^2, \\ \partial_v \varpi &= \frac{r^2}{2\kappa} (\partial_v \varphi)^2, \end{cases} \quad (2.12)$$

as well as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_u \kappa &= -\frac{r}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \varphi)^2 \kappa \\ \partial_v (-\gamma) &= \frac{r}{\lambda} (\partial_v \varphi)^2 (-\gamma). \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

2.2. **Admissible initial data.** See [31, §2] for the definition of (asymptotically flat) future admissible data that we use.

**2.3. Mass inflation criterion.** We now explain how to obtain the criterion (1.7) for mass inflation from the work of Luk–Oh–Shlapentokh–Rothman [33].

*Proof of (1.7) from [33].* Fix a solution to (1.1) arising from admissible data and let  $I_{p,k}$  be the statement that

$$\int_{\mathcal{H} \cap \{v \geq 1\}} v^p (\partial_v^k \varphi)^2 < \infty. \quad (2.14)$$

Our goal is to show the statement in (1.7), namely that (1.5) together with  $I_{4,1}$  and  $I_{8,k}$  for some  $k \geq 2$  implies mass inflation. Inspecting the proof of [33, Thm. 7.8] (in particular the role of [33, Cor. 7.2] in establishing [33, Thm. 7.14]) and noting [33, Rem. 4.3] shows that mass inflation holds whenever (1.5) does if one of the following statements holds:

- (1)  $I_{6,1}$  is false, but  $I_{4,1}$  is true, and  $I_{6,k}$  is true for some  $k \geq 2$ ,
- (2) or  $I_{6,1}$  is true and  $I_{8,k}$  is true for some  $k \geq 2$ .

Hence the statement in (1.7) holds, since  $I_{4,1}$  and  $I_{8,k}$  for some  $k \geq 2$  imply one of the above statements (regardless of the truth of  $I_{6,1}$ ).  $\square$

*Remark 2.1.* In fact  $I_{6,1}$  is true, in view of the late-time tails result in theorem 1.15, but we provide this proof to emphasize that the non-sharp decay established by theorem 1.1 suffices to establish mass inflation.

**2.4. Coordinate systems.** We will use four coordinate systems on  $\mathcal{Q}$ :

**Double null gauge normalized on a curve of constant  $r$ :** The double null coordinates  $(u, v)$  defined by the normalizations  $\frac{(-\partial_u r)}{1-\mu}|_{\mathcal{I}} = \frac{\partial_v r}{1-\mu}|_{\{r=r_{\mathcal{H}}\}} = 1$  (where  $r_{\mathcal{H}} := \sup_{\mathcal{H}} r$ ), as well as  $u \equiv 1$  on  $C^{\text{out}}$  and  $v \equiv 1$  on  $C^{\text{in}}$ . We write  $(\partial_u, \partial_v)$  for the coordinate derivatives.

**Double null gauge normalized at the horizon (Eddington–Finkelstein-type):** The double null coordinates  $(u, \bar{v})$ , where  $u$  is defined as in the previous gauge and  $v$  is defined by  $\frac{\partial_v r}{1-\mu}|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$  and  $v \equiv 1$  on  $C^{\text{in}}$ . We write  $(\partial_u, \partial_{\bar{v}})$  for the coordinate derivatives. In terms of the  $(u, v)$  gauge, we have  $\partial_{\bar{v}}|_{(u,v)} = \kappa^{-1}|_{\mathcal{H}}(v)\partial_v|_{(u,v)}$ .

**$\mathcal{I}$ -gauge:** The  $(u, r)$ -coordinates, with coordinate derivatives  $(\bar{\partial}_u, \bar{\partial}_r)$ . In terms of the  $(u, v)$  gauge, we have  $\bar{\partial}_u = \partial_u + \frac{(-\nu)}{\lambda}\partial_v$  and  $\bar{\partial}_r = \frac{1}{\lambda}\partial_v$ .

**$\mathcal{H}$ -gauge:** The  $(r, v)$ -coordinates, with coordinate derivatives  $(\underline{\partial}_r, \underline{\partial}_v)$ . In terms of the  $(u, v)$  gauge, we have  $\underline{\partial}_r = \frac{1}{\nu}\partial_u$  and  $\underline{\partial}_v = \partial_v + \frac{\lambda}{(-\nu)}\partial_u$ .

*Remark 2.2.* The Eddington–Finkelstein-type gauge normalized so that  $\frac{\partial_v r}{1-\mu}|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$  is more common in the literature (see for instance [13, 32]) than the gauge normalized on a curve of constant  $r$ . We remark that a double null gauge normalized on a curve of constant  $r$  is used in the recent work [3].

The wave operator in these coordinates takes the following forms:

**Lemma 2.3.** *In a double null gauge, we have*

$$\square = \frac{1}{\kappa(-\nu)} \left( \partial_u \partial_v + \frac{\lambda}{r} \partial_u + \frac{\nu}{r} \partial_v \right). \quad (2.15)$$

*In the  $\mathcal{I}$ -gauge, we have*

$$\square = -(1-\mu)\bar{\partial}_r^2 + \frac{1}{(-\gamma)}\bar{\partial}_r\bar{\partial}_u - \left( \frac{2}{r} - \frac{2\varpi}{r^2} \right)\bar{\partial}_r + \frac{1}{r} \frac{1}{(-\gamma)}\bar{\partial}_u. \quad (2.16)$$

*In the  $\mathcal{H}$ -gauge, we have*

$$\square = -(1-\mu)\underline{\partial}_r^2 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\underline{\partial}_r\underline{\partial}_v - \left( \frac{2}{r} - \frac{2\varpi}{r^2} \right)\underline{\partial}_r - \frac{1}{r} \frac{1}{\kappa}\underline{\partial}_v. \quad (2.17)$$

We introduce a “time” parameter  $\tau$  defined by

$$\tau(u, v) := \begin{cases} u_{R_0}(v) & r(u, v) \leq R_0 \\ u & r(u, v) \geq R_0. \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

Here  $u_{R_0}(v)$  is the  $u$ -value such that  $r(u = u_{R_0}(v), v) = R_0$ , and  $R_0$  is a quantity determined from characteristic initial data by

$$R_0 := r(1, 1) = r|_{C^{\text{in}} \cap C^{\text{out}}} = \sup_{C^{\text{in}}} r. \quad (2.19)$$

Since the coordinates  $u, v$  are normalized so that  $u, v \geq 1$  in the future of  $C^{\text{in}} \cup C^{\text{out}}$ , we have  $\tau \geq 1$ . The weight  $\tau$  will be used to quantify decay of energy along a suitable foliation (section 2.7.2), of pointwise norms of the scalar field (section 2.7.3), and of pointwise norms of the scalar field (section 2.7.3).

**2.5. Commutator vector fields.** Let  $R_\bullet > 0$ . The value of  $R_\bullet$  will be fixed to be large in section 6. Let  $\chi = \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a smooth non-increasing function that equals 1 in  $\{r \leq R_\bullet\}$  and 0 in  $\{r \geq 2R_\bullet\}$  such that  $|\chi^{(n)}(r)| \leq C_n r^{-n}$ .

Define the commutator vector fields

$$U := \frac{1}{(-\partial_u r)} \partial_u \quad V := \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r) \underline{\partial}_v + (1 - \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r)) \bar{\partial}_r \quad S := \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r) v \underline{\partial}_v + (1 - \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r)) (u \bar{\partial}_u + r \bar{\partial}_r). \quad (2.20)$$

It is immediate that

$$Ur = -1 \quad Vr = (1 - \chi(r)) \quad Sr = r(1 - \chi(r)). \quad (2.21)$$

## 2.6. Notation.

**2.6.1. Notation for functions.** From this point on, fix a spherically symmetric solution  $(\mathcal{M}, g, \varphi, F)$ . We will write  $\psi$  for a general sufficiently regular function and write  $\varphi$  for the scalar field in the solution.

**2.6.2. Constants.** We write  $C$  for a large constant which can change from line to line. Constants depend only on the following quantities that can be determined from initial data: the initial mass  $\varpi_i$ , the minimum radius  $r_{\min}$ , and the redshift constant  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ . In view of the subextremality of the horizon (i.e.  $|\mathbf{e}| < \varpi_f$  for  $\varpi_f = \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \varpi|_{\mathcal{H}}(v)$  the final mass) and the monotonicity properties of the mass (i.e.  $\varpi_f \leq \varpi_i$ ), it follows that  $|\mathbf{e}| \leq C$ . We will not track the dependence of constants on  $R_0$ , but we will ensure that  $R_0$  depends only on  $\varpi_i$  (see proposition 4.1).

Here are the global constants that we use:

$\varpi_i$	initial mass of the spacetime (see section 3)
$c_{\mathcal{H}}$	redshift constant (see section 3)
$\eta_0$	global small constant (see section 6.2.3)
$r_{\min}$	minimum radius achieved on the initial data hypersurface
$R_0 \gg \varpi_i$	radius of the vertex of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ (see section 2.4), fixed in proposition 4.1
$R_\bullet \gg R_0$	radius at which commutator vector fields $V$ and $S$ change from being adapted to the horizon to being adapted to null infinity, fixed in section 6

The main role of  $\eta_0$  is in the degeneration of the Morawetz estimate as the weight in the bulk term approaches  $r^{-1}$  and in the degeneration of the  $r^p$  estimates as  $p$  approaches 2. In section 9, the constant  $\eta_0$  will be fixed based on the multi-index  $\alpha$  that counts how many times we have commuted. The constant  $R_\bullet$  will be chosen large based on the schematic geometric quantities  $\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  (see section 2.7.4) as well as the multi-index  $\alpha$ .

The notation  $A \lesssim B$  means that  $A \leq CB$  for some positive constant  $C > 0$ . We do not require  $A$  or  $B$  to have a sign.

**2.6.3. Multi-index notation for derivatives.** Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in \mathbf{Z}^3$  be a triple of integers. We write  $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$ . We introduce a total order on  $\mathbf{Z}^3$  such that  $\alpha < \alpha'$  if either  $|\alpha| < |\alpha'|$  or  $\alpha_i < \alpha'_i$  for the largest  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  such that  $\alpha_i \neq \alpha'_i$ . Here are some examples of this ordering:

$$(1, 0, 0) < (0, 1, 0) < (0, 0, 1) \quad (0, 2, 0) < (1, 0, 1) \quad (0, 1, 5) < (7, 0, 0) \quad (0, 0, 1) < (-1, 0, 2). \quad (2.22)$$

We will use the commutator vector fields  $U$ ,  $V$ , and  $S$ , which were defined in section 2.5. For this reason, we will often label the components of a multi-index  $\alpha$  as  $\alpha = (\alpha_U, \alpha_V, \alpha_S)$ . When performing index arithmetic, we will identify  $U$  with  $(1, 0, 0)$ ,  $V$  with  $(0, 1, 0)$ , and  $S$  with  $(0, 0, 1)$ . For example,  $\alpha + U$  has components  $(\alpha_U + 1, \alpha_V, \alpha_S)$ .

*Remark 2.4.* We will only write down multi-indices with non-negative entries (i.e.  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^3$ ), but our formalism is such that a multi-index with negative entries may arise as the difference of two non-negative multi-indices.



2.6.4. *Schematic notation.* We use the symbol  $=_s$  to indicate that an equation is to be understood schematically,<sup>4</sup> in the sense that we adopt the following conventions:

**Numerical constants:** Constants on the left side of a schematic equation are exact. On the other hand, each term on the right side of a schematic equation can be multiplied by an implicit constant (which may be zero). For example, the equation  $\partial_v \varphi = r^{-1} \partial_v(r\varphi) - r^{-1}(\partial_v r)\varphi$  can be schematically written  $\partial_v \varphi =_s r^{-1} \partial_v(r\varphi) + r^{-1}(\partial_v r)\varphi + r^{-3}$ . Another example is that  $1 - \mu = 1 - 2\varpi/r + \mathbf{e}^2/r^2$  can be written  $1 - \mu =_s 1 + r^{-1}\varpi + r^{-2}$ , since  $\mathbf{e}^2$  is a constant (bounded by  $\varpi_i$ ).

**Particular expressions on the left:** When an expression such as  $\Gamma^\alpha$  appears on the left side of a schematic identity, it stands for a particular  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ ; on the right side,  $\Gamma^\alpha$  stands for a sum over all  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ .

**Distributivity over square brackets:** Schematic expressions involving square brackets should be fully expanded before being parsed. For example, the schematic expression  $\lambda[(1-r) + r]$  involves  $\lambda(1-r)$  and  $\lambda r$ , and it is not schematically equal to  $\lambda$  (but it is schematically equal to  $\lambda + \lambda r$ ). We will use round brackets to preserve information about the grouping of terms. For example,  $\lambda(5-r+r) =_s \lambda$ .

**Curly braces notation:** Curly braces are an alternative to the square bracket notation. For example, we may write  $\lambda\{\kappa, (-\gamma)\}$  in place of  $\lambda[\kappa + (-\gamma)]$ .

**Derivatives ( $\Gamma^\alpha$  notation):** If  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^3$ , then  $\Gamma^\alpha$  denotes a product of  $\alpha_1$  many  $U$ 's,  $\alpha_2$  many  $V$ 's, and  $\alpha_3$  many  $S$ 's, in any order. If  $\alpha_i < 0$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , then we set  $\Gamma^\alpha = 0$ . If  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , then we schematically write  $\Gamma^n$  for any  $\Gamma^\alpha$ , where  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^3$  with  $|\alpha| = n$ . We write  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}$  to stand in for  $\Gamma^\beta$ , where  $\beta$  is a multi-index with  $\beta \leq \alpha$ , and we similarly define  $\Gamma^{< \alpha}$ . When such an expression appears on the right of  $=_s$ , it stands for a sum over all possible differential operators it could represent. For example, if  $\alpha = (1, 1, 0)$ , then  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}$  on the right of  $=_s$  stands for the schematic expression  $\{1, U, V, UV, VU\}$ .

**Derivatives ( $D^\alpha$  notation):** When considering only  $U$  and  $V$ , we will use the symbol  $D$  in place of  $\Gamma$ , and the same notational conventions apply. For example,  $D^2 S$  stands schematically for any of the terms  $U^2 S, UVS, VUS, \text{ or } V^2 S$ .

It will be convenient to abuse notation and write  $\Gamma^\alpha$  not only for a particular instance of a product of vector fields, but also for the set of such products of vector fields. For example, we may write  $VUV \in \Gamma^{(1,2,0)}$  or consider the quantity  $\sum_{L \in \Gamma^\alpha} |Lf|$  for some function  $f$ .

Observe that we can differentiate schematic equations.

2.6.5.  *$\mathcal{O}$ -notation.* We use expressions  $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$  as an even coarser form of schematic notation. We write  $\mathcal{O}(a_1, \dots, a_k)$  to denote an expression of the form  $f(r, a_1, \dots, a_k)$  for a smooth function  $f: [r_{\min}, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  such that

$$|\partial_1^n \partial_{>1}^m f(t, \{b_i\})| \leq C(f, n, m, \max_i |b_i|) t^{-n}. \quad (2.23)$$

Any further parameters on which the expression depends should be notated with a subscript. For example, the cutoff function  $\chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}$  with support in  $\{r \leq 2R_\bullet\}$  (defined in section 2.5) satisfies  $\chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r) = \mathcal{O}(1)$  and  $r^k \chi_{r \lesssim R_\bullet}(r) = \mathcal{O}_{k, R_\bullet}(1)$ . We now discuss some features of this notation.

**Order of growth:** The quantitative dependence on parameters can be quite poor. For example,  $\exp \exp \kappa = \mathcal{O}(\kappa)$ .

**Negative powers of  $r$ :** This notation does not keep track of negative powers of  $r$ , since  $r^{-n} = \mathcal{O}_n(1)$ . For example, the equation  $\mu = 2\varpi/r - \mathbf{e}^2/r^2$  implies  $1 - \mu = \mathcal{O}(\varpi)$  and  $\mu = r^{-1} \mathcal{O}(\varpi)$ .

**Specifying the support in  $r$ :** We write  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R} \mathcal{O}(\{a_i\})$  when the corresponding smooth function given by  $f(\cdot, \{b_i\})$  is supported in  $\{r \geq R\}$  for all arguments  $b_i$ . Similarly, we write  $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{1}_{r \leq R} a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  when  $f(r, a_1, \dots, a_n) = f(r, 0, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  for  $r > R$ . Similarly we define  $\mathbf{1}_{r \leq R} g$  in place of  $\mathbf{1}_{r \leq R} \mathcal{O}(1)g$ . Under this convention, we have  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R} \mathcal{O}(\{a_i\}) = \mathcal{O}(\{\mathbf{1}_{r \leq R} a_i\})$ .

**Algebra of  $\mathcal{O}$ -notation:** We have  $\mathcal{O}(\{a_i\}) + \mathcal{O}(\{b_j\}), \mathcal{O}(\{a_i\})\mathcal{O}(\{b_j\}) =_s \mathcal{O}(\{a_i, \{b_j\}\})$ .

**Differentiating  $\mathcal{O}$ -notation:** Let  $\Gamma$  be one of  $U, V, \text{ or } S$ . If the  $a_i$  are smooth, then we have  $\Gamma \mathcal{O}(\{a_i\}) = \mathcal{O}(\{a_i, \{\Gamma a_i\}, r^{-1} \Gamma r\})$  by the chain rule and (2.23). Since  $\Gamma r = r \mathcal{O}(1)$  (see (2.21)), we have  $\Gamma^\alpha \mathcal{O}(\{a_i\}) = \mathcal{O}(\{\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} a_i\})$ .

<sup>4</sup>A similar schematic notation is used in [11].

## 2.7. Norms and schematic geometric quantities.

2.7.1. *Initial data norms.* For an integer  $n \geq 0$ , define the following gauge invariant norm for characteristic initial data:

$$\mathfrak{D}_n[\psi] := \sup_{C_{\text{in}}^{\leq n+1}} |U^{\leq n+1} \psi| + \sup_{C_{\text{out}}^{\leq 1}} |(r^2 \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq 1} (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} (r\psi)|. \quad (2.24)$$

Write  $\mathfrak{D}_n := \mathfrak{D}_n[\varphi]$ . Define

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha := \mathfrak{D}_0[\Gamma^\alpha \psi]. \quad (2.25)$$

2.7.2. *Energy norms.* Let  $p \geq 0$ . For a spacetime region  $\mathcal{R}$ , we define the  $r^p$ -weighted bulk energy quantity

$$E_{p,\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] := \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R_0\}} \frac{r^{p-1}}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 (-\nu) du dv. \quad (2.26)$$

Let  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  be the future development of the characteristic data. We define a norm  $\mathcal{E}_p[\psi]$  that has weights in  $\tau$  (see (2.18)):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_p[\psi]^2 := & \sup_{u,v \in [1,\infty)} \tau^p(u,v) \int_u^\infty \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u',v) du' + \sup_{u,v \in [1,\infty)} \tau^p(u,v) \int_v^\infty \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2(u,v') dv' \\ & + \mathbf{1}_{p>0} E_{p,\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}] + \mathbf{1}_{p \geq 1 + \eta_0} \sup_{u \in [1,\infty)} \tau^{p-1-\eta_0}(u, v_{R_0}(u)) \int_{v_{R_0}(u)}^\infty \frac{r^{1+\eta_0}}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 dv'. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{E}_0[\psi]$  does not include a bulk term. We allow ourselves to write  $\mathcal{E}[\psi]$  in place of  $\mathcal{E}_0[\psi]$ :

$$\mathcal{E}[\psi]^2 := \mathcal{E}_0[\psi] = \sup_{v \in [1,\infty)} \int_1^\infty \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u,v) du + \sup_{u \in [1,\infty)} \int_1^\infty \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2(u,v) dv. \quad (2.28)$$

For  $\Gamma^\alpha \varphi$ , we define the following norms:

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha := \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \mathcal{E}[\Gamma^\beta \varphi], \quad \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,p} := \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \mathcal{E}_p[\Gamma^\beta \varphi]. \quad (2.29)$$

2.7.3. *Pointwise norm.* For  $p \geq 0$ , define a pointwise norm  $\mathcal{P}_p[\psi]$ :

$$\mathcal{P}_p[\psi] := \|r\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|rU\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|r^2 \partial_v \psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|r^{1/2} \tau^{p/2} \psi\|_{L^\infty} + \mathbf{1}_{p \geq 1 + \eta_0} \|r \tau^{p/2-1/2-\eta_0/2} \psi\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (2.30)$$

where we write  $L^\infty = L^\infty(\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}})$ .

*Remark 2.5.* By interpolation (splitting into regions  $r \leq \tau$  and  $r \geq \tau$ ),  $\mathcal{P}_p[\psi]$  for  $p > 0$  controls the quantity  $\|r^\rho \tau^{p/2+1/2-\rho-\eta_0/2} \psi\|_{L^\infty}$  for  $\rho \in [1/2, 1]$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{P}_{2-s}[\psi]^2$  controls  $\|r^{2-s-\eta_0} \tau \psi^2\|_{L^\infty}$  (take  $\rho = 1 - s/2 - \eta_0/2$ ).

For  $\Gamma^\alpha \varphi$ , we define the following norm:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,p} := \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \mathcal{P}_p[\Gamma^\beta \varphi]. \quad (2.31)$$

2.7.4. *Schematic geometric quantities.* We first define a quantity  $G$  in terms of which we can compare the double null coordinates  $u$  and  $v$  with the radius  $r$  and the time  $\tau$  (see lemma 4.3).

**Lemma 2.6** (Comparison of coordinates). *For each characteristic data set and each  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , there is  $C_\epsilon > 0$  depending on  $\epsilon$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta_0}$ ,  $\eta_0$  and  $R_\bullet$  such that*

$$C_\epsilon^{-1} \leq G_\epsilon \leq C_\epsilon, \quad (2.32)$$

where  $G_\epsilon$  is the following quantity computed from the future development  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  of the characteristic data:

$$G_\epsilon := \sup_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}} [r/v + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} u/v + (\mathbf{1}_{r \leq \epsilon^{-1} R_\bullet} + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq (1-\epsilon)v}) v/u]. \quad (2.33)$$

The proof will be given in section 4 (see (4.17)).

With the notation introduced in sections 2.6.4 and 2.6.5 in mind, we define the following schematic geometric quantities:

$$\mathbf{b}_0 := \mathcal{O}_{\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}, R_0, \eta_0}(1, \kappa, \kappa^{-1}, r^{-1}\varpi, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}\{(-\gamma), (-\gamma)^{-1}, (1-\mu)^{-1}\}), \quad (2.34)$$

$$\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ := \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{b}_0, \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}u, v\}\{(1-\kappa), (1-\kappa^{-1}), \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}\{(1-(-\gamma)), (1-(-\gamma)^{-1})\}\}), \quad (2.35)$$

$$\mathfrak{B}_0 := \mathcal{O}_{G_{\eta_0}, G_{\eta_0}^{-1}, R_\bullet}(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet}(v-u-r)), \quad (2.36)$$

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 := \mathbf{b}_0\{1, \varpi\}, \quad (2.37)$$

$$\mathfrak{G}_0 := \mathfrak{g}_0. \quad (2.38)$$

For  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , define

$$\mathbf{b}_\alpha := \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \mathfrak{B}_{\beta'}|_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}, r^{-1}\Gamma^\alpha \varpi, \Gamma^\alpha \kappa, \mathbf{1}_{\alpha U > 0} r \Gamma^\alpha \kappa, \Gamma^\alpha(-\gamma)), \quad (2.39)$$

$$\mathfrak{B}_\alpha := \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \mathbf{b}_{\beta'}|_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}, \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}u, v\}\Gamma^\alpha \kappa, r\Gamma^{\alpha+U} \kappa, \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}ru, v\}\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}\Gamma^\alpha(-\gamma)), \quad (2.40)$$

$$\mathfrak{g}_\alpha := \mathbf{b}_\alpha\{1, \Gamma^\beta \mathfrak{G}_{\beta'}|_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}, \Gamma^\alpha \varpi, r\Gamma^\alpha(-\gamma)\}, \quad (2.41)$$

$$\mathfrak{G}_\alpha := \mathfrak{B}_\alpha\{1, \Gamma^\beta \mathfrak{g}_{\beta'}|_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}, \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}ru, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet}v\}\mathbf{1}_{\alpha U > 0}\Gamma^\alpha \kappa\}. \quad (2.42)$$

Define

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha := \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_\alpha, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_\alpha). \quad (2.43)$$

The quantities  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  appear in the computation of the commutators  $[U, S]$  and  $[V, S]$  (see lemma 2.15). Observe that  $\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha} =_s \mathbf{b}_\alpha$ . Finally, define

$$\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s} := \mathcal{O}_s(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s}\mathfrak{g}_\alpha). \quad (2.44)$$

The quantities  $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}$  appear in pointwise bounds for  $\square \Gamma^\alpha \varphi$ .

*Remark 2.7* (Boundedness and growth of schematic geometric quantities). We will show in our proof that the quantities  $\mathbf{b}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  are bounded, but we only show that the  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$  terms grow at a slow rate (namely  $r^{C_\alpha \eta_0}$  for some sequence of constants  $C_\alpha$  that is increasing in  $\alpha$ ). Observe that the quantities  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  are stronger than the quantities  $\mathbf{b}_\alpha$ , and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$  is stronger than  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ .

*Remark 2.8* (Relation of schematic geometric quantities to the energy). The weak geometric quantities  $\mathbf{b}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  must be controlled before the order- $\alpha$  energy  $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$  is, because these quantities appear in the commutator  $\square \Gamma^\alpha \varphi$  that arises as an error term in the energy estimate. Once  $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$  is controlled, we control the strong geometric quantities  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$  and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$ .

*Remark 2.9* (Algebra of schematic geometric quantities). We have arranged that  $\mathbf{b}_\alpha =_s \mathfrak{B}_\alpha =_s \mathfrak{G}_\alpha$  and  $\mathbf{b}_\alpha \equiv_s \mathfrak{g}_\alpha =_s \mathfrak{G}_\alpha$ . Moreover, the quantities become stronger as  $\alpha$  increases, in the sense that, for example,  $\mathbf{b}_\beta =_s \mathbf{b}_\alpha$  whenever  $\beta \leq \alpha$ . Finally, the quantities are compatible with differentiation by the vector fields  $\Gamma$ , in the sense that  $\Gamma^\alpha \mathbf{b}_{\alpha'} =_s \mathbf{b}_{\alpha+\alpha'}$  (and similarly for the other quantities).

**2.8. Vector field commutator calculations.** In this section we collect useful calculations related to our vector field commutators. We relegate the proofs to appendix A.

2.8.1. *Comparing vector fields in different coordinate systems.*

**Lemma 2.10** (Coordinate change associated to  $U$ ).

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} U =_s \mathbf{b}_0 \partial_u \quad (2.45)$$

**Lemma 2.11** (Coordinate change associated to  $V$ ). *We have*

$$V =_s \mathbf{b}_0 [\partial_v + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} U], \quad (2.46)$$

$$V - \bar{\partial}_r =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathbf{b}_0 [\bar{\partial}_r + U], \quad (2.47)$$

$$\partial_v =_s \mathbf{b}_0 [V + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} U]. \quad (2.48)$$

**Lemma 2.12** (Coordinate change associated to  $S$ ). *We have*

$$S =_s \mathbf{b}_0 [\{\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v\} U + \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, v\} V] \quad (2.49)$$

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} (S - r \bar{\partial}_r) =_s \{1, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathbf{b}_0 v\} \bar{\partial}_u. \quad (2.50)$$

2.8.2. *Rearranging commutator vector fields.*

**Lemma 2.13** (Commuting with  $\bar{\partial}_r$ ). *We have*

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} [\bar{\partial}_r, U] =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} r^{-2} \mathfrak{g}_0 [\bar{\partial}_r + U], \quad (2.51)$$

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} [\bar{\partial}_r, V] =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_0 \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{b}_V [\bar{\partial}_r + U], \quad (2.52)$$

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} [\bar{\partial}_r, S] =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} \bar{\partial}_r + \mathbf{1}_{R_0 \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_V [\bar{\partial}_r + U]. \quad (2.53)$$

**Lemma 2.14** (Commuting with one commutator vector field). *We have*

$$[U, V] =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} r^{-2} \mathfrak{g}_0 D, \quad (2.54)$$

$$[U, S] =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} U + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_U D, \quad (2.55)$$

$$[V, S] =_s V + \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_V D. \quad (2.56)$$

**Lemma 2.15** (Commuting with a product of commutator vector fields). *Let  $\alpha \geq 0$  and let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . We have*

$$[U, L] =_s \mathcal{C}_{<\alpha} [U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S} + r^{-2} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S}], \quad (2.57)$$

$$[V, L] =_s V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S} + \mathcal{C}_{<\alpha} r^{-2} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U}, \quad (2.58)$$

$$[D, L] =_s \mathcal{C}_{<\alpha} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U}. \quad (2.59)$$

Moreover, we have

$$[V^2, L] =_s V^2 \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S} + \mathcal{C}_{<\alpha+V} r^{-2} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U + V}. \quad (2.60)$$

**Lemma 2.16** (Bringing  $U$  to the front). *Fix  $\alpha \geq 1$  such that  $\alpha_U > 0$ . Let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . Then there is  $L' \in \Gamma^{\alpha-U}$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} L - UL' &= \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-U-S+V}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S}) [U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U - V} + r^{-2} \mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-U-V} V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U - V} + r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S} V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U - S}] \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{<\alpha} [U \Gamma^{<\alpha} + r^{-2} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha} V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U - V} + r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha} V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U - S}] \end{aligned} \quad (2.61)$$

**Lemma 2.17** (Rearrangement formula). *Let  $\alpha \geq 0$ , and let  $L, L' \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . We have*

$$L - L' =_s \mathcal{C}_{\leq \alpha - S} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U - V}. \quad (2.62)$$

2.8.3. *Commuting with the wave operator.*

**Lemma 2.18** (Wave equations for commutator vector fields). *We have*

$$UV, VU =_s \mathfrak{b}_0 [\square + r^{-1} D + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} U^2] \quad (2.63)$$

and

$$\partial_v U =_s \mathfrak{b}_0 [\square + r^{-1} D]. \quad (2.64)$$

**Lemma 2.19** (Commutators of vector field with  $\square$ ). *The following commutation formulas hold for  $R_\bullet$  large enough depending on  $\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ$ :*

$$[\square, U] + f_U U^2 =_s \mathfrak{b}_U [\square + r^{-2} V + r^{-2} U], \quad (2.65)$$

$$[\square, V] + f_V V^2 =_s \mathfrak{b}_V [\square + r^{-2} \mathfrak{g}_V V + r^{-2} U + r^{-2} U^2], \quad (2.66)$$

$$[\square, S] =_s \mathfrak{b}_S [\square + r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_S V^2 + r^{-2} \mathfrak{g}_S V + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} r^{-2} U U^{\leq 1}]. \quad (2.67)$$

where

$$0 \leq f_U = \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} =_s r^{-2} \mathfrak{g}_0 \quad f_V =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} r^{-2} \mathfrak{B}_0^\circ \mathfrak{g}_0 \quad (2.68)$$

**Lemma 2.20** (Main formula for commutation with  $\square$ ). *Let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . For  $R_\bullet$  large enough depending on  $\mathcal{G}_0^\circ$ , we have*

$$[\square, L] + \alpha_U f_U UL + \alpha_V f_V VL =_s \mathbf{b}_\alpha [\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \square + r^{-1} \mathbf{g}_\alpha V^2 \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} + r^{-2} \mathbf{g}_\alpha V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} + r^{-2} \mathbf{g}_\alpha U \Gamma^{< \alpha}]. \quad (2.69)$$

for  $f_U$  and  $f_V$  as in lemma 2.19.

In the following pointwise estimate (2.71), we make crucial use of the good sign  $f_U \geq 0$  (see lemma 2.19).

**Corollary 2.21.** *Let  $|\alpha| \geq 0$  and let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . We have*

$$\begin{aligned} r^{2-s} |\square L \varphi| &\leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathbf{g}_0, \alpha) [\alpha_V |\partial_v L \varphi| + \alpha_U |UL \varphi|] \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) [\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |\partial_v (r \Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi)| + |\partial_v \Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| + |U \Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.70)$$

Moreover, we have

$$r^{2-s} UL \varphi \square L \varphi \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) (|UL \varphi| + |\partial_v L \varphi|) (|U \Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| + |\partial_v \Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |\partial_v (r \Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi)|), \quad (2.71)$$

and

$$r^{2-s} |\partial_v L \varphi| |\square L \varphi| \leq \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} C(\mathcal{B}_0^\circ, \mathbf{g}_0, \alpha) |\partial_v L \varphi| (|UL \varphi| + |\partial_v L \varphi|) + (\text{RHS of (2.71)}). \quad (2.72)$$

### 3. REDUCTION TO A CHARACTERISTIC PROBLEM

For the rest of the paper, we study a characteristic problem.

**Theorem 3.1** (Decay for characteristic problem). *Consider characteristic data on  $C^{\text{in}} \cup C^{\text{out}}$  with future  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ . Assume the following:*

- (1) *The initial data norm  $\mathfrak{D}_k[\varphi]$  defined on  $C^{\text{in}} \cup C^{\text{out}}$  is finite.*
- (2) *The data vanishes on a neighbourhood of the outgoing null hypersurface  $C^{\text{out}}$  (in particular on a portion of  $C^{\text{in}}$  near the vertex).*
- (3) *There exists a double null gauge  $(u, v)$  in which  $C^{\text{in}} = [1, \infty)_u \times \{1\}_v$  and  $C^{\text{out}} = \{1\}_u \times [1, \infty)_v$  (so  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  is given by  $[1, \infty) \times [1, \infty)$ ) and is normalized such that  $\frac{\partial_u r}{1-\mu}|_{\{r=r_{\mathcal{H}}\}} = 1$ , where  $r_{\mathcal{H}} = \sup_{\mathcal{H}} r$ , and  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\partial_u r}{1-\mu}(u, v) = 1$  for each  $u$ .*
- (4) *We have  $\partial_u r < 0$  and  $\partial_v r \geq 0$  in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  (note this is gauge independent).*
- (5) *We have  $\varpi \leq \varpi_i$  in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ .*
- (6) *There is  $c_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$  such that  $\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r \geq c_{\mathcal{H}}$  in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ .*
- (7) *There is  $r_{\min} > 0$  such that  $r \geq r_{\min}$  in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ .*
- (8) *The value  $R_0 = r|_{C^{\text{in}} \cap C^{\text{out}}}$ , is sufficiently large based on  $\varpi_i$  (as specified in proposition 4.1).*

Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  and integer  $k \geq 0$  there is  $C = C(\epsilon, k, \varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}, \mathfrak{D}_k[\varphi]) > 0$  such that

$$|(v \partial_v)^k \varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C \mathfrak{D}_k[\varphi] v^{-1+\epsilon}. \quad (3.1)$$

For  $0 \leq k \leq 4$ , the same estimate holds with  $v \partial_v$  replaced by  $\bar{v} \partial_{\bar{v}}$ .

**Remark 3.2.** We have  $r_{\mathcal{H}} =: \sup_{\mathcal{H}} r \leq C(\varpi_i)$ , since by [31, Lem. A.2], we have  $r_{\mathcal{H}} = \varpi_{\mathcal{H}} + \sqrt{\varpi_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{e}^2} \leq 2\varpi_i$ , where  $\varpi_{\mathcal{H}} := \sup_{\mathcal{H}} \varpi$ .

We note that it is enough to consider only one of the ends of the spacetime; the argument is the same for the other end. We now show that the future of compactly supported future-admissible Cauchy data contains a characteristic rectangle satisfying the assumptions of theorem 3.1, thus reducing the proof of theorem 1.1 to establishing theorem 3.1.

*Constructing a characteristic rectangle as in theorem 3.1 in the setting of theorem 1.1.* By the global well-posedness of (1.1) (see [27] or [31, Thm. 4.1]), we can first choose a characteristic rectangle in the exterior region—where assumption (4) is satisfied (see [27], or [31, Lem. A.1])—and then construct the gauge in assumption (2) once  $R_0$  is chosen as in assumption (8). Since the Cauchy data is compactly supported, we can ensure that the data vanishes on a neighbourhood of  $C^{\text{out}}$ , which in particular implies assumptions (1) and (2) (together with the global well-posedness of the system). By assumption (4) and (2.12) and (2.13), we can




FIGURE 2. The characteristic rectangle  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  depicted on the Penrose diagram of a general solution to (1.1). Note that the achronal singular set  $\mathcal{S}$  may be empty, as is the case in Reissner–Nordström. The statement that the diagram looks as depicted is due to [8, 27].

take  $\varpi_i$  in assumption (4) to be the supremum of  $\varpi$  on the Cauchy data. The future admissibility condition on the data implies that the event horizon is eventually subextremal by [27] (see also [31, Lem. A.2]), so if we write  $\varpi_{\mathcal{H}}(v) := \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \varpi(u, v)$  and  $r_{\mathcal{H}}(v) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} r(u, v)$ , then there is  $c_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$  such that  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} (\varpi_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{e}^2/r_{\mathcal{H}})(v) = 2c_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ . In particular, there is  $v_* \geq 1$  such that  $(\varpi_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{e}^2/r_{\mathcal{H}})(v_*) \geq c_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ . The monotonicity properties of (3) together with the equations (2.12) and (2.13) imply that  $(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)(u, v) \geq (\varpi_{\mathcal{H}} - \mathbf{e}^2/r_{\mathcal{H}})(v_*)$  for  $u \geq 1$  and  $v \geq v_*$ . After using the translation symmetry in the gauge, we can assume  $v_* = 1$ . This settles assumption (6). Assumption (7) holds since  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  is in the exterior region. Finally, since  $r \rightarrow \infty$  along  $C^{\text{out}}$ , we can translate  $C^{\text{in}}$  towards the future to satisfy assumption (8).  $\square$

*Remark 3.3* (Compact support of data). The assumption that the data is compactly supported in theorem 1.1 is only used to reduce to a characteristic problem (in particular to ensure that we can choose a characteristic rectangle for which  $\mathfrak{D}_k[\varphi]$  is finite).

From now on, we work in the region  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  and pursue the proof of theorem 3.1.

#### 4. ESTIMATES FOR UNDIFFERENTIATED GEOMETRIC QUANTITIES

From now on, fix the value of  $R_0$  large enough that the estimates of proposition 4.1 hold and such that  $R_0 \geq C(\varpi_i) \geq r_{\mathcal{H}}$  (see remark 3.2).

**Proposition 4.1** (Estimates for undifferentiated geometric quantities). *Let  $\eta > 0$ . Let  $R \geq R_0 \geq 1$ . If  $R_0$  is sufficiently large (depending only on  $\varpi_i$ ), then the following estimates hold (where we allow all constants to depend on  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $r_{\min}$ ,  $\varpi_i$ , and  $R$  in addition to any named parameters):*

(1) *Globally, we have*

$$\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r \geq c_{\mathcal{H}} > 0, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\varpi \leq \varpi_i, \quad (4.2)$$

$$0 \leq 1 - \mu \leq C, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\kappa > 0, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\log(-\gamma) \leq 0, \quad (4.5)$$

$$|\log \kappa| \leq C\mathcal{E}_0^2, \quad (4.6)$$

$$|\log \kappa| \leq C(\mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta}, \eta)\mathcal{E}_{0,1}^2 v^{-1}, \quad (4.7)$$

$$0 \leq \lambda \leq C \exp(C\mathcal{E}_0^2), \quad (4.8)$$

$$0 \leq (-\nu) \leq C. \quad (4.9)$$

(2) *Away from the horizon, we have*

$$|\log(-\gamma)| \leq Cr^{-1}\tau^{-p}\mathcal{E}_{0,p}^2 \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R\}, \quad (4.10)$$

$$|\log(-\nu)| \leq Cr^{-1} \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R\}, \quad (4.11)$$

$$1 - \mu \geq 1/2 \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R\}, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\lambda \geq C \exp(-C\mathcal{E}_0^2) \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R\}, \quad (4.13)$$

$$(-\nu) \geq 1/2 \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R\}. \quad (4.14)$$

(3) *Near the horizon, there are constants  $c_\nu, c'_\nu, C > 0$  (where  $c'_\nu$  depends on  $\mathcal{E}_0$  and is independent of  $R$  and the other constants depend on  $\eta$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta}$ ) such that*

$$C^{-1} \exp(-c'_\nu(u-v)) \leq (-\nu) \leq C \exp(-c_\nu(u-v)) \quad \text{in } \{r \leq R\}. \quad (4.15)$$

(4) *We have*

$$|v - u - r| \leq C(\mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta}, \eta) \log r \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R\}. \quad (4.16)$$

(5) *Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ . For  $G_\epsilon$  as defined in lemma 2.6, there is  $C > 0$  depending on  $\mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta}$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\epsilon$ , and  $R_\bullet$  such that*

$$C^{-1} \leq G_\epsilon \leq C \quad (4.17)$$

*Proof.* The estimates (4.1) to (4.10) and (4.12) to (4.15) follow as in the proof of [32, Prop. 5.12]. Although [32] uses the  $(u, \tilde{v})$  gauge, the relevant arguments go through in the  $(u, v)$  gauge. We now show the remaining estimates (4.11), (4.16) and (4.17).

First, (4.11) follows from the  $\partial_v$ -transport equation for  $(-\nu)$  and  $(-\nu)|_{\mathcal{I}} = 1$  (which follows from  $(-\nu) = (1 - \mu)(-\gamma)$ , the gauge condition  $(-\gamma)|_{\mathcal{I}} = 1$ , and  $1 - \mu = 1 + O(r^{-1})$ ).

The estimate (4.16) follows from (4.11) (which implies  $|1 + \nu| \leq Cr^{-1}$ ) and an argument as in the proof of [32, Prop. 5.12].

Finally, we establish (4.17). For the remainder of the proof, we allow the symbol  $\lesssim$  to include dependence on  $C(\mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta}, \eta)$  as in (4.16), as well as  $\epsilon$  and  $R_\bullet$ . It is enough to show

$$r \lesssim v, \quad (4.18)$$

$$u \lesssim v \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R_0\}, \quad (4.19)$$

$$v \lesssim u \quad \text{in } \{r \leq \epsilon^{-1}R_\bullet\} \cup \{r \leq (1 - \epsilon)v\}. \quad (4.20)$$

Indeed, (4.18)–(4.20) imply the upper bound in (4.17), and the lower bound  $G_\epsilon \geq 1$  is clear. In  $\{r \geq R_0\}$ , we have  $r - R_0 \leq v/2$  by (4.13). Thus  $r \leq (R_0 + 1/2)v$ , which establishes (4.18). In  $\{r \geq R_0\}$ , by (4.16), we have  $u \lesssim v + r + \log r \lesssim v$ , which establishes (4.19). If  $r \leq \epsilon^{-1}R_\bullet$ , then  $v \lesssim u + \epsilon^{-1}R_\bullet + \log(\epsilon^{-1}R_\bullet)$  by lemma 4.3, so  $v \lesssim u$  in this region. If  $r \leq (1 - \epsilon)v$ , then  $v = u + r + O(\log r) \leq u + (1 - \epsilon)v + O(\log v)$ , so for  $v \geq v_*$  and  $v_*$  large enough we have  $v \leq 2\epsilon^{-1}u$ . For  $v \leq v_*$  we have  $v \leq v_*u$  since  $u \geq 1$ . Thus  $v \leq \max(2\epsilon^{-1}, v_*)u$  in this region.  $\square$

As an immediate corollary of proposition 4.1, we control the zeroth order schematic geometric quantities.

**Corollary 4.2** (Estimates for zeroth order schematic geometric quantities). *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} C(\mathfrak{b}_0) &\leq C(\mathcal{E}_0, \varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}, R_0, \eta_0), \\ C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ) &\leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0, \mathcal{E}_{0,1}), \\ C(\mathfrak{B}_0) &\leq C(R_\bullet, \mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta_0}), \\ C(\mathfrak{g}_0) &\leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0), \\ C(\mathfrak{G}_0) &\leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

We now use lemma 4.3 to compare the variables  $r$ ,  $u$ ,  $v$ , and  $\tau$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *The following estimates hold for  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ :*

$$r + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} u \leq G_\epsilon v, \quad (4.22)$$

$$v \leq G_\epsilon u, \quad \text{in } \{r \leq \epsilon^{-1} R_\bullet\} \cup \{r \leq (1 - \epsilon)v\} \quad (4.23)$$

$$v \leq (G_\epsilon + \epsilon^{-1})(u + r). \quad (4.24)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_\epsilon^{-1} v \leq \tau \leq G_\epsilon v & \quad \text{in } \{r \leq \epsilon^{-1} R_\bullet\} \cup \{r \leq (1 - \epsilon)v\} \\ \tau = u & \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R_0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

*Proof.* The definition of  $G$  implies (4.22), as well as (4.23) in the region  $\{r \geq R_0\}$ . To extend (4.23) to the region  $\{r \leq R_0\}$ , note that if  $r(u, v) \leq R_0$ , then  $u \geq u_{R_0}(v)$ , and so  $v \leq Gu_{R_0}(v) \leq Gu$ . Next, (4.24) follows from (4.23), because

$$v \leq \mathbf{1}_{r \leq (1 - \epsilon)v} v + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq (1 - \epsilon)v} v \leq G_\epsilon u + (1 - \epsilon)^{-1} r. \quad (4.26)$$

By (4.22) and (4.23), we have

$$G_\epsilon^{-1} v \leq u \leq G_\epsilon v \quad \text{in } (\{r \leq \epsilon^{-1} R_\bullet\} \cup \{r \leq (1 - \epsilon)v\}) \cap \{r \geq R_0\}. \quad (4.27)$$

The estimates in (4.25) now follow from the definition of  $\tau$  (see (2.18)).  $\square$

## 5. BOUNDEDNESS OF INITIAL DATA

In this section we explain how the initial data norm  $\mathcal{D}_\alpha = \mathcal{D}[\Gamma^\alpha \varphi]$  (which is not gauge invariant) is controlled by the gauge invariant initial data norm  $\mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}$ . See section 2.7 for definitions of these quantities.

**Proposition 5.1** (Boundedness of initial data). *If the data vanishes in a neighbourhood of  $C^{\text{out}}$ , then we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathfrak{D}_0. \quad (5.1)$$

and for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  we have

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{<\alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_{<\alpha}) \mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}. \quad (5.2)$$

*Remark 5.2.* The restriction that the solution vanish in a neighbourhood of the outgoing null part of the data hypersurface can be removed, but for the simplicity of the argument we only give the proof in this case. Indeed, we have reduced to this case in section 3 using the compact support of the Cauchy data.

*Proof.* First, (5.1) is trivial. Define

$$\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[\psi] := \sup_{C^{\text{in}}} |U^{\leq n+1} \psi| \quad \mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{out}}[\psi] := \sup_{C^{\text{out}}} |(r^2 \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq 1} (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} (r \psi)|, \quad (5.3)$$

so that

$$\mathfrak{D}_n[\psi] = \mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[\psi] + \mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{out}}[\psi]. \quad (5.4)$$

The vanishing assumption on the data implies by the domain of dependence property that the solution vanishes in a neighbourhood of  $C^{\text{out}}$ , and so  $\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{out}}[\Gamma^\alpha \varphi] = 0$ . In particular, it is enough to estimate  $\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[\Gamma^\alpha \varphi]$ . The desired estimate (5.2) follows from the  $n = 0$  case of (5.5):

$$\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[\Gamma^\alpha \varphi] \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha-1+nU}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha-1+nU}) \mathfrak{D}_{n+|\alpha|}^{\text{in}}[\varphi]. \quad (5.5)$$

We now prove (5.5).

*Step 1: Reduction to (5.8).* By induction, (5.5) follows from

$$\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[\Gamma^\alpha \varphi] \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha-1+nU}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha-1+nU}) \mathfrak{D}_{n+1}^{\text{in}}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \varphi]. \quad (5.6)$$

Since  $v \equiv 1$  on  $C^{\text{in}}$  and  $Uv = 0$ , we have  $S = V$ , and so we can assume  $\alpha_S = 0$ . Moreover,  $U$  commutes with  $V$  on  $C^{\text{in}} \subset \{r \leq R_\bullet\}$ . Clearly we have

$$\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[U\Gamma^\alpha \varphi] \leq \mathfrak{D}_{n+1}^{\text{in}}[\Gamma^\alpha \varphi], \quad (5.7)$$

so it is enough to show that

$$\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[V\Gamma^\alpha \varphi] \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha+nU}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+nU}) \mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[U\Gamma^\alpha \varphi]. \quad (5.8)$$



Step 2: Proof of (5.8). Use (2.63) and lemma 2.20 and an induction argument to compute

$$UV\Gamma^\alpha\varphi =_s \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_\alpha)[V\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi + U^{\leq 2}\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi] \quad (5.9)$$

It follows from an induction argument that

$$|U^n UV\Gamma^\alpha\varphi| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_{\alpha+nU}, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_{\alpha+nU})[|V\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi| + |U^{\leq n+1}\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|] \leq C(\mathbf{b}_{\alpha+nU}, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_{\alpha+nU})[|V\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi| + \mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[\Gamma^\alpha\varphi]]. \quad (5.10)$$

Integrate (5.10) for  $n = 0$  to  $C^{\text{in}} \cap C^{\text{out}}$  (where the data vanishes) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |V\Gamma^\alpha\varphi|_{v=1}(r) &\leq |V\Gamma^\alpha\varphi|_{v=1}(r = R_0) + \int_r^{R_0} |UV\Gamma^\alpha\varphi| dr' \\ &\leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_\alpha)\mathfrak{D}_0^{\text{in}}[U\Gamma^\alpha\varphi] + C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_\alpha) \int_r^{R_0} |V\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi| dr'. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Grönwall's inequality and the finite  $r$ -range on  $C^{\text{in}}$  gives

$$\sup_{C^{\text{in}}} |V\Gamma^\alpha\varphi| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_\alpha)\mathfrak{D}_0^{\text{in}}[U\Gamma^\alpha\varphi]. \quad (5.12)$$

Substitute (5.12) into (5.10) and use (5.7) to obtain

$$\sup_{C^{\text{in}}} |U^n UV\Gamma^\alpha\varphi| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_{\alpha+nU}, r^{-1}\mathbf{g}_{\alpha+nU})\mathfrak{D}_n^{\text{in}}[U\Gamma^\alpha\varphi]. \quad (5.13)$$

Now (5.12) and (5.13) imply (5.8).  $\square$

## 6. ENERGY BOUNDEDNESS AND DECAY

The goal of this section is to show the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.1** (Estimates for unweighted and weighted energy norms). *We have*

$$\mathcal{E}_0 \leq C(\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min})\mathcal{D}_0. \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{0,2-\eta_0} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, \mathbf{g}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0})\mathcal{D}_0. \quad (6.2)$$

Let  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ . If  $R_\bullet \geq C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\alpha, \mathbf{g}_0, \alpha)$ , then for  $s \geq \eta_0$  sufficiently small (depending on a numerical constant), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha \leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s}\mathbf{g}_\alpha, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1+\eta_0})[\mathcal{D}_\alpha + \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,4s}], \quad (6.3)$$

and when  $s$  is moreover small depending on  $\alpha$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,2-\eta_0-C_\alpha s} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s}\mathbf{g}_\alpha, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,0}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1+\eta_0})\mathcal{D}_\alpha \quad (6.4)$$

for explicit constants  $C_\alpha$  depending only on  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* The zeroth order estimate (6.1) follows from remark 6.4, lemma 6.5, and (6.44) from lemma 6.15. The higher order estimate (6.3) is established in corollary 6.23. The boundedness statements (6.2) and (6.4) for the weighted energy are proved in lemma 6.28.  $\square$

**6.1. Hardy inequalities.** Both of these lemmas and their proofs can be found in [31, §8.8].

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $a \in \mathbf{R}$ ,  $1 \leq u_1 < u_2$ , and  $1 \leq v_1 < v_2$ . For any  $C^1$  function  $f$  on  $\{(u, v) : v \in [v_1, v_2]\}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &a \int_{v_1}^{v_2} r^a \lambda f^2(u, v) dv + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \frac{r^a}{\lambda} (\partial_v(rf))^2(u, v) dv + r^{1+a} f^2(u, v_1) \\ &= \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \frac{r^{2+a}}{\lambda} (\partial_v f)^2(u, v) dv + r^{1+a} f^2(u, v_2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

For any  $C^1$  function  $f$  on  $\{(u, v) : u \in [u_1, u_2]\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &a \int_{u_1}^{u_2} r^a (-\nu) f^2(u, v) du + \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \frac{r^a}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u(rf))^2(u, v) du + r^{1+a} f^2(u_2, v) \\ &= \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \frac{r^{2+a}}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u f)^2(u, v) du + r^{1+a} f^2(u_1, v). \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $a \in \mathbf{R}$ ,  $1 \leq u_1 < u_2$ , and  $1 \leq v_1 < v_2$ . For any  $C^1$  function  $f$  on  $\{(u, v) : v \in [v_1, v_2]\}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(a+1)^2}{4} \int_{v_1}^{v_2} r^a \lambda f^2(u, v) dv + \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \frac{r^a}{\lambda} \left( r \partial_v f + \frac{a+1}{2} \lambda f \right)^2(u, v) dv + \frac{a+1}{2} r^{1+a} f^2(u, v_1) \\ &= \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \frac{r^{2+a}}{\lambda} (\partial_v f)^2(u, v) dv + \frac{a+1}{2} r^{1+a} f^2(u, v_2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

For any  $C^1$  function  $f$  on  $\{(u, v) : u \in [u_1, u_2]\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(a+1)^2}{4} \int_{u_1}^{u_2} r^a (-\nu) f^2(u, v) du + \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \frac{r^a}{(-\nu)} \left( r \partial_u f + \frac{a+1}{2} (-\nu) f \right)^2(u, v) du + \frac{a+1}{2} r^{1+a} f^2(u_2, v) \\ &= \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \frac{r^{2+a}}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u f)^2(u, v) du + \frac{a+1}{2} r^{1+a} f^2(u_1, v). \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

**6.2. Energy quantities.** In order to state the energy boundedness estimate, we introduce notation for energy quantities along null curves and over spacetime regions.

6.2.1. *Energy along piecewise null curves.* For  $\Sigma$  a null curve, we define

$$E[\psi, \Sigma] := \begin{cases} \int_{\Sigma} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2 dv & \text{if } u \text{ is constant on } \Sigma, \\ \int_{\Sigma} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2 du & \text{if } v \text{ is constant on } \Sigma. \end{cases} \quad (6.9)$$

We extend the definition to piecewise null curves  $\Sigma$  in the natural way: if  $\Sigma = \bigcup_i \Sigma_i$  for null curves  $\Sigma_i$  such that  $\Sigma_i \cap \Sigma_j$  consists of at most one point when  $i \neq j$ , then we set

$$E[\psi, \Sigma] := \sum_i E[\psi, \Sigma_i]. \quad (6.10)$$

*Remark 6.4.* The energy norm  $\mathcal{E}[\psi]$  defined in section 2.7.2 is related to  $E[\psi, \Sigma]$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}[\psi]^2 = \sup_{\Sigma} E[\psi, \Sigma], \quad (6.11)$$

where the supremum is taken over all null curves  $\Sigma \subset \{u, v \geq 1\}$ .

**Lemma 6.5** (Energy on initial data). *Let  $p \in C^{\text{in}} \cup C^{\text{out}}$ . Then*

$$E[\psi, C^{\text{in}} \cup C^{\text{out}}] + r\psi^2(p) \leq C(r_{\min}, \varpi_i, R_0) \mathfrak{D}_0[\psi]^2. \quad (6.12)$$

*Proof.* The proof is immediate by the definitions, (4.3), and a change of variables.  $\square$

6.2.2.  *$r^p$ -weighted energy.* For  $\tau_0 \geq 1$ , define the level set  $\Sigma_{\tau_0} := \{p : \tau(p) = \tau_0\}$ , where  $\tau$  was defined in (2.18). Then  $\Sigma_{\tau}$  is piecewise null, with null pieces

$$\Sigma_{\tau}^{\text{in}} := \Sigma_{\tau} \cap \{r \leq R_0\} = \{(u, v_{R_0}(u)) : u \geq \tau\} \quad \Sigma_{\tau}^{\text{out}} := \Sigma_{\tau} \cap \{r \geq R_0\} = \{(\tau, v) : v \geq v_{R_0}(\tau)\}. \quad (6.13)$$

We introduce the  $r^p$ -weighted energy flux associated to the foliation  $\Sigma_{\tau}$ :

$$E_p[\psi](\tau) := \int_{\Sigma_{\tau}^{\text{in}}} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2 du + \int_{\Sigma_{\tau}^{\text{out}}} \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v (r\psi))^2 dv + |\psi|^2(\tau, v_{R_0}(\tau)). \quad (6.14)$$

We have the following preliminary estimate comparing  $E_p[\psi](\tau)$  and the energy quantities  $E[\psi, \Sigma_{\tau}]$  (defined in section 6.4).

**Lemma 6.6.** *For any  $p \geq 0$  and  $1 \geq \tau$ , we have*

$$E[\psi, \Sigma_{\tau}] \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) E_p[\psi](\tau). \quad (6.15)$$




FIGURE 3. The foliation  $\Sigma_\tau$ .

*Proof.* It is enough to consider the case  $p = 0$ , which is an immediate consequence of a Hardy type inequality (lemma 6.2 with  $a = 0$  and  $v_1 = v_{R_0}(\tau)$  in the limit  $v_2 \rightarrow \infty$ ).  $\square$

**Lemma 6.7.** *For  $p < 3$ , we have*

$$E_p[\psi](1) \leq C(p, R_0) \mathfrak{D}_0[\psi]^2. \quad (6.16)$$

*Proof.* This is immediate from the definitions and a change of variables:

$$E_p[\psi](1) = \int_{\tau_{\min}}^{R_0} r^2 (U\psi)^2 dr + \int_{R_0}^{\infty} r^p (\bar{\partial}_r(r\psi))^2 dr + |\psi|^2(1, 1) \leq R_0^2 \mathfrak{D}_0[\psi]^2 + \mathfrak{D}_0[\psi]^2 + \mathfrak{D}_0[\psi]^2 \int_{R_0}^{\infty} r^{p-4} dr. \quad (6.17)$$

The condition  $p < 3$  is used to ensure that the final integral is finite.  $\square$

6.2.3. *Bulk energy over spacetime region.* Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a spacetime region. Define a bulk energy quantity:

$$E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] := \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\eta_0}} \left[ \frac{1}{(-\nu)^2} (\partial_u \psi)^2 + \frac{1}{\kappa^2} (\partial_v \psi)^2 + \frac{\psi^2}{r^2} \right] r^2 \kappa(-\nu) du dv + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_0\}} e^{-c'_\nu(u-v)} (\partial_v \psi)^2 du dv, \quad (6.18)$$

where  $\eta_0$  is our global small constant (see section 2.6.2) and  $c'_\nu$  is as in (4.15).

**6.3. Vector field multiplier identities.** In this section we record the vector field multiplier identities used to derive an energy estimate in section 6. We introduce the notation

$$D_u = U = \frac{1}{(-\nu)} \partial_u \quad D_v = \frac{1}{\kappa} \partial_v. \quad (6.19)$$

The vector field multipliers we use are

$$T = (1 - \mu) D_u + D_v, \quad (\text{Kodama vector field}) \quad (6.20)$$

$$X = f(r) ((1 - \mu) D_u - D_v), \quad (\text{Morawetz vector field}) \quad (6.21)$$

$$Y = \chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r) D_u, \quad (\text{Redshift vector field}) \quad (6.22)$$

$$Z = g(u, v) \partial_v. \quad (\text{Irregular vector field}) \quad (6.23)$$

**Lemma 6.8** (Vector field multiplier identity). *Let  $W = W^u D_u + W^v D_v = (-\nu)^{-1} W^u \partial_u + \kappa^{-1} W^v \partial_v$ . Then*

$$\partial_u(W^v(D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa) + \partial_v(W^u(D_u\psi)^2 r^2(-\nu)) = [2W\psi\Box\psi + K^W[\psi]]r^2\kappa(-\nu), \quad (6.24)$$

where

$$K^W[\psi] := (-\nu)D_v((-\nu)^{-1}W^u)(D_u\psi)^2 + \kappa D_u(\kappa^{-1}W^v)(D_v\psi)^2 + \frac{2}{r}(-W^u + (1-\mu)W^v)D_u\psi D_v\psi. \quad (6.25)$$

*Proof.* Note that  $W = \widetilde{W}^u \partial_u + \widetilde{W}^v \partial_v$  for  $(\widetilde{W}^u, \widetilde{W}^v) = ((-\nu)^{-1}W^u, \kappa^{-1}W^v)$ . Use the wave equation in double null coordinates to compute

$$\begin{aligned} r^2\kappa(-\nu)\partial_u\psi\Box\psi &= r^2\partial_u\psi\left(\partial_u\partial_v\psi + \frac{\partial_v r}{r}\partial_u\psi + \frac{\partial_u r}{r}\partial_v\psi\right) = r^2\partial_u\psi\partial_v\partial_u\psi + r\partial_v r(\partial_u\psi)^2 + r\partial_u r\partial_u\psi\partial_v\psi \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_v(r^2(\partial_u\psi)^2) + r\partial_u r\partial_u\psi\partial_v\psi. \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

Multiply by  $\widetilde{W}^u$  and commute  $W^u$  past  $\partial_v$  to arrive at

$$r^2\kappa(-\nu)\widetilde{W}^u\partial_u\psi\Box\psi = \frac{1}{2}\partial_v(\widetilde{W}^u r^2(\partial_u\psi)^2) - \frac{1}{2}\partial_v\widetilde{W}^u r^2(\partial_u\psi)^2 + r\widetilde{W}^u\partial_u r\partial_u\psi\partial_v\psi. \quad (6.27)$$

Add (6.27) to the result of exchanging  $u$  and  $v$  in (6.27) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r^2\kappa(-\nu)W\psi\Box\psi &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_v(\widetilde{W}^u r^2(\partial_u\psi)^2) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_u(\widetilde{W}^v r^2(\partial_v\psi)^2) - \frac{1}{2}\partial_u\widetilde{W}^v r^2(\partial_v\psi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\partial_v\widetilde{W}^u r^2(\partial_u\psi)^2 \\ &\quad + (r\widetilde{W}^v\partial_v r + r\widetilde{W}^u\partial_u r)\partial_u\psi\partial_v\psi. \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

Express (6.28) in terms of  $D_u$  and  $D_v$ , then rearrange to obtain the desired result.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.9** (Kodama vector field identity). *Let  $T = (1-\mu)D_u + D_v$ . We have*

$$\partial_u((D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa) + \partial_v((1-\mu)(D_u\psi)^2 r^2(-\nu)) = 2T\psi\Box\psi r^2 \kappa(-\nu) + r[-(D_u\psi)^2(D_v\varphi)^2 + (D_u\varphi)^2(D_v\psi)^2]r^2 \kappa(-\nu), \quad (6.29)$$

*Proof.* Use lemma 6.8 with  $(T^u, T^v) = (1-\mu, 1)$ . In particular we use the transport equations

$$D_v(-\gamma)^{-1} = -(-\nu)^{-1}r(D_v\varphi)^2 \quad D_u\kappa^{-1} = \kappa^{-1}r(D_u\varphi)^2 \quad (6.30)$$

to compute

$$K^T[\psi] = (-\nu)D_v((-\gamma)^{-1})(D_u\psi)^2 + \kappa D_u(\kappa^{-1})(D_v\psi)^2 = r[-(D_u\psi)^2(D_v\varphi)^2 + (D_u\varphi)^2(D_v\psi)^2]. \quad (6.31)$$

$\square$

**Lemma 6.10** (Morawetz vector field). *Let  $f : (0, \infty)_r \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be a  $C^2$  function. Let  $X = (1-\mu)f(r)D_u - f(r)D_v$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &-f'(r)[(1-\mu)^2(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2]r^2\kappa(-\nu) + 4\frac{f(r)}{r}(1-\mu)D_u\psi D_v\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu) \\ &\leq \partial_u(f(r)(D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa) - \partial_v(f(r)(1-\mu)(D_u\psi)^2 r^2(-\nu)) + 2X\psi\Box\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} &-f'(r)[(1-\mu)^2(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2]r^2\kappa(-\nu) + 4\frac{f(r)}{r}\mu D_u\psi D_v\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu) \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{2}{1-\mu}\frac{f''(r)}{r} + (f'(r)r - f(r))\frac{4(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^4}\right]\psi^2 r^2\kappa(-\nu) \\ &\leq \partial_u(f(r)(D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa) - 2f'(r)r\lambda\psi^2 + f(r)r\psi^2 - \partial_v(f(r)(1-\mu)(D_u\psi)^2 r^2(-\nu)) + 2f'(r)r\nu\psi^2 - f(r)r\psi^2 \\ &\quad + \left(2X\psi + 4f(r)\frac{\psi}{r}\right)\Box\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (6.33)$$

*Proof.* Use lemma 6.8 with  $(X^u, X^v) = ((1 - \mu)f(r), -f(r))$  to obtain

$$K^{-X}[\psi]r^2\kappa(-\nu) = \partial_u(f(r)(D_v\psi)^2r^2\kappa) - \partial_v(f(r)(1 - \mu)(D_u\psi)^2r^2(-\nu)) + 2X\psi\Box\psi. \quad (6.34)$$

From (6.30) we can compute

$$-(-\nu)D_v(f(r)(-\gamma)^{-1}) = f(r)r(D_v\varphi)^2 - f'(r)(1 - \mu)^2 \quad \kappa D_u(f(r)\kappa^{-1}) = f(r)r(D_u\varphi)^2 - f'(r), \quad (6.35)$$

and then obtain

$$K^{-X}[\psi] = [f(r)r(D_v\varphi)^2 - f'(r)(1 - \mu)^2](D_u\psi)^2 + [f(r)r(D_u\varphi)^2 - f'(r)](D_v\psi)^2 + \frac{4f(r)}{r}(1 - \mu)D_u\psi D_v\psi. \quad (6.36)$$

Neglecting the terms with a positive sign, we arrive at

$$K^{-X}[\psi] \geq -f'(r)[(1 - \mu)^2(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2] + 4\frac{f(r)}{r}(1 - \mu)D_u\psi D_v\psi. \quad (6.37)$$

To obtain (6.32), use the wave equation for  $r$  to rewrite the last term on the left of (6.32):

$$\begin{aligned} 4\frac{f}{r}(1 - \mu)D_u\psi D_v\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu) &= 4fr\partial_u\psi\partial_v\psi - 4\frac{f}{r}\mu D_u\psi D_v\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu) \\ &= \partial_u(-2f'r\lambda\psi^2 + fr\psi^2) + \partial_v(-2f'r\nu\psi^2 + fr\psi^2) \\ &\quad + \left[-\frac{4f}{r}\psi\Box\psi + \frac{2}{1 - \mu}\frac{f''}{r}\psi^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ (f'r - f)\frac{4(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^4}\psi^2 + 4\frac{f}{r}\mu D_u\psi D_v\psi\right]r^2\kappa(-\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (6.38)$$

□

**Lemma 6.11** (Morawetz vector field with  $f(r) = -1$ ). *Let  $\tilde{X} = -(1 - \mu)D_u + D_v$ . We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u((D_v\psi)^2r^2\kappa + r\psi^2) - \partial_v((1 - \mu)(D_u\psi)^2r^2(-\nu) + r\psi^2) &+ \frac{4(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^4}\psi^2r^2\kappa(-\nu) \\ \leq \left(2\tilde{X}\psi - 4\frac{\psi}{r}\right)\Box\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu) &+ \frac{4(2\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}D_u\psi D_v\psi r^2\kappa(-\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (6.39)$$

*Proof.* Set  $f(r) = -1$  in (6.33) and rearrange. □

**Lemma 6.12** (Redshift vector field identity). *Let  $\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)$  be a  $C^1$  function, and write  $Y = \chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)D_u$ . We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_v(\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)(D_u\psi)^2r^2(-\nu)) &+ \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)(D_u\psi)^2r^2\kappa(-\nu) \\ &= \left[2Y\psi\Box\psi + (1 - \mu)\chi'_{\mathcal{H}}(r)(D_u\psi)^2 - \frac{2\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)}{r}D_u\psi D_v\psi\right]r^2\kappa(-\nu), \end{aligned} \quad (6.40)$$

*Proof.* Set  $(Y^u, Y^v) = (\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r), 0)$ . Compute

$$K^Y[\psi] = (-\nu)D_v((-\nu)^{-1}\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r))(D_u\psi)^2 - \frac{2\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)}{r}D_u\psi D_v\psi. \quad (6.41)$$

Use the equation for  $\partial_v(-\nu)$  to compute

$$(-\nu)D_v((-\nu)^{-1}\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)) = -\frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r) + (1 - \mu)\chi'_{\mathcal{H}}(r). \quad (6.42)$$

Substitute (6.42) into (6.41) to get □

**Lemma 6.13** (Irregular vector field identity). *Let  $g = (u, v)$  be a  $C^1$  function. Then*

$$(-\partial_u g)(\partial_v\psi)^2r^2 = -\partial_u(g(\partial_v\psi)^2r^2) + \left[2\kappa g\partial_v\psi\Box\psi + \frac{2}{r}\lambda g D_u\psi D_v\psi\right]r^2\kappa(-\nu). \quad (6.43)$$

*Proof.* Apply lemma 6.8 with  $(W^u, W^v) = (0, \kappa g)$ . □

**6.4. Energy boundedness estimate.** We say  $\mathcal{R}$  is an *admissible spacetime region* if the past and future boundaries of  $\mathcal{R}$  are each connected and piecewise null.

*Remark 6.14.* We apply the energy estimate to characteristic rectangles and regions of the form  $\bigcup_{\tau \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]} \Sigma_\tau$ , which are both clearly admissible.

Recall the notations  $D_u$  and  $D_v$  introduced in (6.19). See section 6.3 for the vector field multipliers and associated identities used in the proof of lemma 6.15.

**Lemma 6.15** (Energy estimate). *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be an admissible spacetime region with past boundary  $\Sigma_1$  and future boundary  $\Sigma_2$ . We have*

$$E[\varphi, \Sigma_2] \leq C(\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}) E[\varphi, \Sigma_1]. \quad (6.44)$$

Let  $p_{\text{fut}}$  be the future endpoint of  $\Sigma_1$ . Then

$$E[\psi, \Sigma_2] + E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0) [E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + r|\psi|^2(p_{\text{fut}})] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \quad (6.45)$$

for an error term that admits a decomposition

$$\text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \leq \text{Err}_U[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + C(\mathbf{b}_0) (\text{Err}_v[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + \mathbf{1}_{\psi \neq \varphi} \text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + \text{Err}_{\text{zo}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]), \quad (6.46)$$

where

$$\text{Err}_U[\psi, \mathcal{R}] = \iint_{\mathcal{R}} w_U D_u \psi \square \psi \quad (6.47)$$

for a non-negative weight  $w_U$  satisfying  $0 < C(\varpi_i, r_{\min}) \leq w_U \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)$ , and

$$\text{Err}_v[\psi, \mathcal{R}] := \iint_{\mathcal{R}} |D_v \psi| |\square \psi|, \quad (6.48)$$

$$\text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] := \iint_{\mathcal{R}} r |D_u \varphi|^2 |D_v \psi|^2, \quad (6.49)$$

$$\text{Err}_{\text{zo}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] := \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{|\psi|}{r} |\square \psi|. \quad (6.50)$$

*Remark 6.16* (Structure of error terms). Observe that the error terms composing  $\text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  are non-negative, except for  $\text{Err}_U[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$ , which does not have a sign. The positivity of the weight  $w_U$  is crucial for closing the energy estimates. This is because commutation produces a  $D_u \psi$  term with a negative coefficient (see lemma 6.19). In the absence of this good sign, we would not be able to control this term, since there is no smallness to exploit.

*Proof.* We follow the proof of [32, Lem. 8.35]. We do not mention uses of proposition 4.1 to estimate zeroth order geometric quantities after Step 1. To simplify the notation, we omit the volume form  $r^2 \kappa(-\nu) du dv$  when integrating over spacetime regions.

*Step 1: Energy estimate with a weaker bulk term and proof of (6.44).* Define the energy quantity

$$E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] := \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{1}{r^4} [(D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2]. \quad (6.51)$$

Compared to the bulk term  $E_{\text{bulk}}$  that we wish to control,  $E_{\text{weak}}$  lacks a zeroth order term, does not capture improved integrated local energy decay near the horizon, and has weaker  $r$ -weights. We will show that

$$E[\psi, \Sigma_2] + E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \lesssim E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}], \quad (6.52)$$

where the constant implied by  $\lesssim$  is positive and depends only on  $\varpi_i$ ,  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $r_{\min}$ . Since  $\text{Err}[\varphi, \mathcal{R}] = 0$ , we obtain (6.44) as an immediate corollary of (6.52).

*Step 1a: Outline of proof.* The proof is a standard application of the vector field multiplier method, using the Kodama vector field  $T$ , the Morawetz vector field  $X$ , and the redshift vector field  $Y$ . We will give a careful proof, in order to emphasize the structure of the right side, in particular the parameters on which the constants depend and the positivity of the weight  $w_U$ .

We will show the following three estimates:

$$\int_{\Sigma_2^y} (D_v \psi)^2 + \int_{\Sigma_2^y} (1 - \mu)(D_u \psi)^2 \lesssim \iint_{\mathcal{R}} T \psi \square \psi + E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \mathbf{1}_{\psi \neq \varphi} \text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}], \quad (6.53)$$

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{1}{r^{3+\eta_0}} \left[ (1 - \mu)^2 (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2 \right] \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{R}} X \psi \square \psi + (\text{RHS of (6.53)}), \quad (6.54)$$

$$\int_{\Sigma_2^y \cap \{r \leq R\}} (D_u \psi)^2 + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{1}{r^4} (D_u \psi)^2 \lesssim \iint_{\mathcal{R}} Y \psi \square \psi + E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + (\text{RHS of (6.54)}), \quad (6.55)$$

where

$$T = (1 - \mu)U + \frac{1}{\kappa} \partial_v, \quad X = r^{-3}(1 - \mu)U - r^{-3} \frac{1}{\kappa} \partial_v, \quad Y = \chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)U, \quad (6.56)$$

and the implicit constants depend only on  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $\varpi_i$ , and  $r_{\min}$ . Observe that the left sides of (6.53) and (6.54) bound the left side of (6.51) from above in a region  $\{r \geq R\}$  for  $R \geq C(\varpi_i, r_{\min})$  (in view of (4.12)), and (6.55) gives the control in the remaining region  $\{r \leq R\}$ . Thus (6.53)–(6.55) together give

$$E[\psi, \Sigma_2] + E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \leq \iint_{\mathcal{R}} W \psi \square \psi + CE[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \mathbf{1}_{\psi \neq \varphi} C \text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}], \quad (6.57)$$

for a vector field

$$W = C_T T + C_X X + C_Y Y, \quad (6.58)$$

where the constants  $C, C_T, C_X, C_Y$  are positive and depend only on  $\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $r_{\min}$ . In view of (6.56), the coefficients of  $W$  are smooth and of size  $C(\mathbf{b}_0)$ , and the  $U$ -coefficient is bounded below by a positive constant. In particular, we have

$$W \psi = w_U U \psi + w_v \partial_v \psi, \quad 1 \lesssim w_U, \quad |w_v| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0), \quad (6.59)$$

and so

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R}} W \psi \square \psi \leq \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}], \quad (6.60)$$

which completes the proof of (6.51) when substituted into (6.57).

*Step 1b: Almost conservation law: proof of (6.53).* Integrate the  $T$ -identity in lemma 6.9 over  $\mathcal{R}$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_2^y} (D_v \psi)^2 + \int_{\Sigma_2^y} (1 - \mu)(D_u \psi)^2 &= 2 \iint_{\mathcal{R}} T \psi \square \psi + \int_{\Sigma_1^y} (D_v \psi)^2 + \int_{\Sigma_1^y} (1 - \mu)(D_u \psi)^2 \\ &\quad + \iint_{\mathcal{R}} r [-(D_u \psi)^2 (D_v \varphi)^2 + (D_u \varphi)^2 (D_v \psi)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.61)$$

Since  $1 - \mu \leq C(\varpi_i, r_{\min})$ , the boundary terms on  $\Sigma_1$  are controlled by  $E[\psi, \Sigma_1]$ . The final term vanishes if  $\psi = \varphi$  and is equal to  $\text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  otherwise.

*Step 1c: Weak integrated local energy decay estimate: proof of (6.54).* Let  $f(r) = r^{-3}$ , so that

$$-f'(r) - 2f(r)/r = r^{-4}. \quad (6.62)$$

By Young's inequality we have

$$r^{-4} [(1 - \mu)^2 (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2] \leq -f'(r) [(1 - \mu)^2 (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2] + 4 \frac{f(r)}{r} (1 - \mu) D_u \psi D_v \psi = (\text{LHS of (6.32)}). \quad (6.63)$$

The estimate follows from integrating (6.32) with  $f(r) = r^{-3}$ ; of the four boundary terms generated, we can neglect two on account of their sign, and control the other two using Step 1a.

*Step 1d: Redshift estimate: proof of (6.55).* Let  $\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)$  be a positive cutoff function that is 1 in  $\{r \leq R\}$  and 0 in  $\{r \geq 2R\}$ . Recall that  $\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r \geq c_{\mathcal{H}}$  and apply Young's inequality in the form

$$\left| \frac{2\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)}{r} D_u \psi D_v \psi \right| \leq c_{\mathcal{H}} \frac{\chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)}{r^2} (D_u \psi)^2 + c_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R} (D_v \psi)^2. \quad (6.64)$$

after integrating the identity in lemma 6.12 and noting the support properties of  $\chi_{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $\chi'_{\mathcal{H}}$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_2^u} \chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)(D_u\psi)^2 + c_{\mathcal{H}}r_{\min}^2 \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)\frac{1}{r^4}(D_u\psi)^2 &\lesssim \iint_{\mathcal{R}} Y\psi\Box\psi + \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{R\leq r\leq 2R\}} (1-\mu)(D_u\psi)^2 \\ &\quad + c_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{r\leq 2R\}} (D_v\psi)^2 + \int_{\Sigma_1^u} \chi_{\mathcal{H}}(r)(D_u\psi)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.65)$$

When  $R \geq C(\varpi_i, r_{\min})$ , we have  $1 - \mu \geq 1/2$  by (4.12), and so the second term can be controlled by Step 1b (up to a multiple of  $R^4$ ), as can the third term. The final term is controlled by data.

*Step 2: Control of zeroth order term away from the horizon.* The goal of this step is to show that for  $R_1 \geq R_0$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{r\geq 2R_1\}} \frac{\psi^2}{r^4} &\leq \epsilon^{1-\eta_0} C(\mathbf{b}_0, R_1) \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{\epsilon^{-1}R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\eta_0}} [(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2] \\ &\quad + C(\mathbf{b}_0, R_1, \epsilon)(E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})). \end{aligned} \quad (6.66)$$

We multiply (6.39) by a non-decreasing cutoff function  $\chi_{R_1}(r)$  that is 0 in  $\{r \leq R_1\}$  and 1 in  $\{r \geq 2R_1\}$  and integrate by parts. We illustrate how to handle the first term on the left side of (6.39):

$$\begin{aligned} &\iint_{\mathcal{R}} \chi_{R_1}(r)\partial_u((D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa + r\psi^2) du dv \\ &= \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \chi'_{R_1}(r)(-\nu)((D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa + r\psi^2) du dv + \int_{\Sigma_1^{\text{out}}} \chi_{R_1}(r)((D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa + r\psi^2) dv \\ &\quad - \int_{\Sigma_2^{\text{out}}} \chi_{R_1}(r)((D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa + r\psi^2) dv \\ &\geq - \int_{\Sigma_2^{\text{out}}} ((D_v\psi)^2 r^2 \kappa + r\psi^2) dv \\ &\geq -C(\mathbf{b}_0)(E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})). \end{aligned} \quad (6.67)$$

The first terms on the second line have a good sign, and the term on the third line is estimated by Step 1 and multiple uses of Hardy's inequality in both the  $u$ - and  $v$ -directions (it is here that we use the assumption that the past/future boundary of  $\mathcal{R}$  is connected). One similarly obtains the analogous estimate for the second term on the left of (6.39). In view of the above estimates and (4.1), we obtain

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{r\geq 2R_1\}} \frac{\psi^2}{r^4} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)(E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})) + \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{r\geq R_1\}} (\text{RHS of (6.39)}). \quad (6.68)$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{r\geq R_1\}} (\text{RHS of (6.39)}) &\leq C \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{X}\psi\Box\psi + C(\mathbf{b}_0) \iint_{\{r\geq R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^2} [(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2] \\ &\quad + C(E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})). \end{aligned} \quad (6.69)$$

Although the first term on the right of (6.69) has a bad sign in front of the  $U\psi\Box\psi$  term (recall that  $\text{Err}_U$  has a positive weight), by Step 1 we can add a multiple of the non-negative quantity  $E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  (where the constant depends on  $R_1$ ) to both sides of (6.69) and (in conjunction with (6.68)) obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{r\geq 2R_1\}} \frac{\psi^2}{r^4} &\leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, R_1) \iint_{\{r\geq R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^2} [(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2] \\ &\quad C(\mathbf{b}_0, R_1)(E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})). \end{aligned} \quad (6.70)$$

To complete the proof, note that the first term on the right of (6.70) is bounded by  $C(R_1, \epsilon)E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  in the region  $\{R_1 \leq r \leq \epsilon^{-1}R_1\}$ , and in the remaining region we have

$$\iint_{\{r\geq \epsilon^{-1}R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^2} [(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2] \leq \epsilon^{1-\eta_0} \iint_{\mathcal{R}\cap\{r\geq \epsilon^{-1}R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\eta_0}} [(D_u\psi)^2 + (D_v\psi)^2]. \quad (6.71)$$



*Step 3: Improved integrated local energy decay away from the horizon.* In this step we show that for  $R_1 = \max(2, 2R_0, \eta_0^{-1})$ , we have

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\eta_0}} \left[ (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2 + \frac{\psi^2}{r^2} \right] \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0) (E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}}) + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]). \quad (6.72)$$

We will track the dependence of constants on  $\eta_0$ . Begin by writing

$$(\text{LHS of (6.33)}) = [(\text{I}) + (\text{II}) + (\text{III})] r^2 \kappa(-\nu) \quad (6.73)$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{I}) &= -f'(r) [(1-\mu)^2 (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2], \\ (\text{II}) &= 4 \frac{f(r)}{r} \mu D_u \psi D_v \psi, \\ (\text{III}) &= \left[ \frac{2}{1-\mu} f''(r) r + (f'(r) r - f(r)) \frac{4(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^4} \right] \psi^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.74)$$

Now (4.12) and the choice of  $R_1$  imply that for  $f(r) = r^{-\eta_0}$  and  $r \geq R_1$ , we have

$$\frac{\eta_0}{r^{1+\eta_0}} [(D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2] \lesssim (\text{I}), \quad |(\text{II})| \lesssim \frac{1}{r^{2+\eta_0}} D_u \psi D_v \psi \lesssim r^{-1} (\text{I}), \quad \frac{\eta_0}{r^{3+\eta_0}} \lesssim (\text{III}). \quad (6.75)$$

We can therefore multiply (6.73) by a cutoff  $\chi(r)$  that is 0 in  $\{r \leq R_1/2\}$  and 1 in  $\{r \geq R_1\}$ , and integrate over  $\mathcal{R}$  to get

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\eta_0}} \left[ (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2 + \frac{\psi^2}{r^2} \right] \lesssim \eta_0^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R_1/2\}} \chi_{R_1}(r) (\text{RHS of (6.33)}) \, du \, dv. \quad (6.76)$$

Now we integrate by parts on the right side. Using Hardy's inequality in both the  $u$ - and  $v$ -directions and Step 1, one can estimate the boundary terms by  $E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})$ . The bulk term involving  $\square \psi$  is bounded by  $\text{Err}_U[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  and  $\text{Err}_v[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  and  $\text{Err}_{\text{zo}}[\psi, \mathcal{R} \cap \{R_1/2\}]$ . In view of Steps 1 and 2 (applied with  $R_1/2$  in place of  $R_1$ ), the support properties of  $\chi_{R_1}$ , and proposition 4.1, the bulk terms arising from integration by parts are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & C(R_1) \eta_0^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{R_1/2 \leq r \leq R_1\}} \frac{1}{r^4} \left[ (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2 + \psi^2 \right] \\ & \leq \epsilon^{1-\eta_0} C(\mathbf{b}_0, R_1, \eta_0) \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq \epsilon^{-1} R_1/2\}} \frac{1}{r^{1+\eta_0}} \left[ (D_u \psi)^2 + (D_v \psi)^2 \right] \\ & \quad + C(\mathbf{b}_0, R_1, \epsilon, \eta_0) (E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})). \end{aligned} \quad (6.77)$$

To conclude the proof, choose  $\epsilon$  small enough to absorb the first term on the right of (6.77) to the left of (6.76).

*Step 4: Control of zeroth order term near the horizon.* Here we upgrade the control of the zeroth order term in (6.72) from Step 3 to

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{\psi^2}{r^{3+\eta_0}} \leq (\text{RHS of (6.72)}). \quad (6.78)$$

Let  $R > 0$ . Use Hardy's inequality in the  $u$ -direction to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{\psi^2}{r^{3+\eta_0}} r^2 \kappa(-\nu) \, du \, dv & \lesssim \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R\}} (-\nu) \chi^2 \psi^2 \, du \, dv \\ & \leq \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2 \, du \, dv + \int_{\Sigma_1^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R\}} r \psi^2 \, dv \\ & \quad + \int_{v_1(R)}^{v_2(R)} r \psi^2(u_R(v), v) \, dv. \end{aligned} \quad (6.79)$$

Integrate (6.79) over  $R \in [R_1, R_1 + 1]$ , note the monotonicity in  $R$  of the first term on the left and first two terms on the right, and change variables in the integration of the third term on the right to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_1\}} \frac{\psi^2}{r^{3+\eta_0}} r^2 \kappa(-\nu) du dv \\
& \leq \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_*\}} \frac{\psi^2}{r^{3+\eta_0}} r^2 \kappa(-\nu) du dv \\
& \leq \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_1+1\}} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2 du dv + \int_{\Sigma_1^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R_1+1\}} r \psi^2 dv + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{R_1 \leq r \leq R_1+1\}} (-\nu) r \psi^2(u_R(v), v) du dv.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.80}$$

We are done by a Hardy inequality argument as in Step 2 that controls the term on  $\Sigma_1^{\text{out}}$ , together with the results of Steps 2–3 and (4.4) and (4.6).

*Step 5: Improved integrated local energy decay near the horizon.* We now control the final term in the definition of  $E_{\text{bulk}}$  by showing that

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_0\}} e^{-c'_\nu(u-v)} (\partial_v \psi)^2 du dv \lesssim E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + \text{Err}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]. \tag{6.81}$$

Let  $g(u, v) = \chi(r(u, v))h(u, v)$  for a cutoff function  $\chi$  satisfying  $\chi(r) = 1$  in  $\{r \leq R_0\}$  and  $\chi(r) = 0$  in  $\{r \geq 2R_0\}$  and  $h(u, v) = e^{-c'_\nu(u-v)}$ , where  $c'_\nu > 0$  is as in (4.15). Observe that  $h \geq 0$  and  $-\partial_u h \geq 0$ , and  $h \lesssim 1$  in  $\{r \leq 2R_0\}$  by (4.15). Integrating (6.43) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_0\}} (-\partial_u h) (\partial_v \psi)^2 r^2 du dv & \leq \int_{\Sigma_1^{\text{out}}} g(D_v \psi) r^2 \kappa dv + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq 2R_0\}} 2h D_v \psi \square \psi \\
& \quad + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq 2R_0\}} \frac{2}{r} (1 - \mu) h |D_u \psi| |D_v \psi| \\
& \lesssim E[\psi, \Sigma_1] + \text{Err}_v[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}].
\end{aligned} \tag{6.82}$$

We are done after computing

$$-\partial_u h = -(-\nu) \chi'_R e^{-c'_\nu(u-v)} + c_{\mathcal{H}} \chi_R e^{-c'_\nu(u-v)} \tag{6.83}$$

and estimating the bulk term arising from the first term on the right of (6.83) by  $E_{\text{weak}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$ .  $\square$

**6.5. Boundedness of the unweighted energy  $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$ .** The goal of this section is to prove corollary 6.23.

**Lemma 6.17.** *Let  $\alpha \geq 0$  and let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . For  $0 < s < 1/4$ , we have*

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R}} r^{1+2s} |\square L \varphi|^2 \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \tag{6.84}$$

*Proof.* This follows from the pointwise estimate (2.70) and the definitions of the energy quantities involved.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.18** (Estimate for zeroth order error term). *Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . For  $s \in [\eta_0, 1/4]$ , we have*

$$\text{Err}_{\text{zo}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \leq \epsilon E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \epsilon) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}]] \tag{6.85}$$

*Proof.* We omit the volume form  $r^2 \kappa(-\nu) du dv$ . Introduce a small  $\delta > 0$  and large  $R > 0$  to be chosen in the course of the proof. Use an  $r$ -weighted Young's inequality to decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Err}_{\text{zo}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] & = \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{|L\varphi|}{r} |\square L\varphi| + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R\}} \frac{|L\varphi|}{r} |\square L\varphi| \\
& \leq \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{|L\varphi|}{r} |\square L\varphi| + \delta \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R\}} r^{1+2s} |\square L\varphi|^2 + \delta^{-1} \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R\}} r^{-s} \frac{1}{r^{1+s}} \frac{|L\varphi|^2}{r^2} \\
& := \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.86}$$

To estimate term (I), we use the structure of  $\square L\varphi$ . In particular,  $\square L\varphi$  contains a top order term only when  $L$  contains a  $U$  or a  $V$ , in which case we can bring this vector field to the front of  $L$  and treat the corresponding term as the derivative of a lower order term. That is, we write  $\alpha_X |L\varphi| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}, \alpha) |D\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi|$  for  $X \in \{U, V\}$ . By lemmas 2.11 and 2.17, we have

$$\alpha_U |L\varphi| |UL\varphi| + \alpha_V |L\varphi| |\partial_v L\varphi| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}) (|\partial_v L\varphi| + |UL\varphi|) (|\partial_v \Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi| + |U\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi|). \quad (6.87)$$

By (2.70) and (6.87) and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|L\varphi|}{r} |\square L\varphi| &\leq r^{-3+s} C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) \left[ \alpha_V |L\varphi| |\partial_v L\varphi| + \alpha_U |L\varphi| |UL\varphi| \right] \\ &\quad + r^{-3+s} C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) |L\varphi| [\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |\partial_v (r\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi)| + |\partial_v \Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi| + |U\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi|] \\ &\leq \delta r^{-3+s} [|\partial_v L\varphi|^2 + |UL\varphi|^2] \\ &\quad + r^{-3+s} C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \delta) (|\partial_v \Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi|^2 + |U\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi|^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |\partial_v (r\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi)|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6.88)$$

Since  $s < 1$ , integrating (6.88) with the volume form  $r^2 \kappa(-\nu) du dv$  gives

$$(I) \leq \delta E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, R, \delta) (E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{s,\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]). \quad (6.89)$$

Next, lemma 6.17 implies that

$$(II) \leq \delta C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s,\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \quad (6.90)$$

Finally, use  $s \geq \eta_0$  to estimate

$$(III) \leq \delta^{-1} R^{-\eta_0} E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}]. \quad (6.91)$$

Substitute (6.89)–(6.91) into (6.86) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_{\text{zo}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] &\leq (\delta + \delta^{-1} R^{-\eta_0}) C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, R, \delta) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s,\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.92)$$

To conclude, choose  $\delta$  small based on  $\epsilon$  and  $C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha)$ , then choose  $R$  large depending on  $\eta_0$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\epsilon$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.19** (Estimate for  $U$ - and  $v$ -error terms). *Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_U[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] &\leq (\epsilon + R_\bullet^{-1+2s}) C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \epsilon) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{3s,\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.93)$$

*The same estimate holds with  $\text{Err}_v[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}]$  on the left side.*

*Proof.* In what follows, we will freely use the bounds  $(-\nu), \kappa, \kappa^{-1}, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R} \lambda^{-1}, r_{\min} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0)$ . Use the positivity of  $w_U, \kappa$ , and  $(-\nu)$ , the bound  $|w_U| \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0)$ , the estimates for  $UL\varphi \square L\varphi$  in (2.71), and an  $r$ -weighted Young's inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w_U UL\varphi \square L\varphi r^2 \kappa(-\nu) &\leq r^s C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) (|UL\varphi| + |\partial_v L\varphi|) (|U\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi| + |\partial_v \Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi| + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |\partial_v (r\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi)|) \kappa(-\nu) \\ &\leq \epsilon r^{1-s} (|UL\varphi|^2 + |\partial_v L\varphi|^2) \kappa(-\nu) \\ &\quad + r^{-1+3s} C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \epsilon) (|U\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi|^2 + |\partial_v \Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi|) \kappa(-\nu) \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \epsilon) r^{-1+3s} \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |\partial_v (r\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi)|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.94)$$

Integrate (noting that  $s \geq \eta_0$ ) to obtain

$$\text{Err}_U[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \leq \epsilon E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \epsilon) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{3s,\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \quad (6.95)$$

Using the estimate for  $\partial_v L\varphi \square L\varphi$  in (2.72), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_v L\varphi| |\square L\varphi| r^2 \kappa(-\nu) &\leq \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) r^s |\partial_v L\varphi| (|UL\varphi| + |\partial_v L\varphi|) + (\text{RHS of (6.94)}) \\ &\leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) R_\bullet^{-1+2s} r^{1-s} (|\partial_v L\varphi|^2 + |UL\varphi|^2) + (\text{RHS of (6.94)}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.96)$$

Integrate to obtain

$$\text{Err}_v[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \leq R_\bullet^{-1+2s} C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + (\text{RHS of (6.95)}) \quad (6.97)$$

Combine (6.95) and (6.97) to complete the proof.  $\square$

For the next two lemmas we introduce the following notation:

- $C^{\text{out}}(u)$  for the constant- $u$  curve  $\{(u', v') \in \mathcal{R} : u' = u\}$ ,
- $v_1(u)$  and  $v_2(u)$  for the past and future endpoints of  $C^{\text{out}}(u)$  (the assumption that  $\mathcal{R}$  is an admissible spacetime region ensures that  $C^{\text{out}}(u)$  is connected),
- $u_1$  and  $u_2$  for the smallest and largest  $u$ -values attained in  $\mathcal{R}$ .

**Lemma 6.20** (Estimate for quartic error term). *Let  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  and  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . There is  $c_\nu > 0$  such that for  $p \geq 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] &\leq \epsilon \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, p}^2 E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \\ &\quad + C(\mathfrak{B}_0, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, p}, \epsilon) \left[ E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + \int_{u_1}^{u_2} (u^{-p} + e^{-c_\nu u}) E[L\varphi, C^{\text{out}}(u)] du \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.98)$$

*Proof.* In Step 1 (see (6.99)), we prove the estimate for  $\alpha = U$ , and Step 2 (see (6.102)) implies the estimate for  $\alpha > U$ .

*Step 1: Estimate for  $\text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[U\varphi, \mathcal{R}]$ .* We start by showing that

$$\text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[U\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) \mathcal{P}_{0,0}^2 E_{\text{bulk}}[\varphi, \mathcal{R}]. \quad (6.99)$$

By (2.64), we have

$$(\partial_v U\varphi)^2 \leq r^{-2} C(\mathfrak{b}_0) [(\partial_v \varphi)^2 + (U\varphi)^2] \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) \mathcal{P}_{0,0}^2. \quad (6.100)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[U\varphi, \mathcal{R}] &\leq \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{r}{\kappa} (U\varphi)^2 (\partial_v U\varphi)^2 (-\nu) du dv \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) \mathcal{P}_{0,0}^2 \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{r^{-1}}{\kappa} (U\varphi)^2 (-\nu) du dv \\ &\leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) \mathcal{P}_{0,0}^2 E_{\text{bulk}}[\varphi, \mathcal{R}], \end{aligned} \quad (6.101)$$

which proves (6.99).

*Step 2: Estimate for  $\text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]$  in terms of norms of  $U\varphi$ .* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $p \geq 1$ . We claim that

$$\text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \leq \epsilon \mathcal{P}_{U,p}^2 E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] + \mathcal{P}_{U,p}^2 C(\mathfrak{B}_0, \epsilon) \int_{u_1}^{u_2} (u^{-p} + e^{-c_\nu u}) E[\psi, C_{v_1, v_2}^{\text{out}}(u)] du. \quad (6.102)$$

Since  $r_{\min}^{-1} \leq C$ , we immediately obtain

$$\text{Err}_{\text{quartic}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \leq C \mathcal{P}_{U,p}^2 \iint_{\mathcal{R}} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} \tau^{-p} (\partial_v \psi)^2 (-\nu) du dv. \quad (6.103)$$

Split the integral in (6.103) as

$$\iint_{\mathcal{R}} = \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_0\} \cap \{\tau \geq \epsilon^{-1}\}} + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \leq R_0\} \cap \{\tau \leq \epsilon^{-1}\}} + \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R_0\}} := \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)}. \quad (6.104)$$

To handle term (I), let  $c_\nu > 0$  be as in (4.15) and control  $(-\nu)$  with (4.15), use the smallness of  $\tau^{-1}$  and the near-horizon term in  $E_{\text{bulk}}$  (see section 6.2.3):

$$\text{(I)} \leq C\epsilon \iint_{\mathcal{R} \cap \{r \geq R_0\}} e^{-c_\nu(u-v)} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2 du dv \leq C\epsilon E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}]. \quad (6.105)$$

Now we treat term (II). Recall the notation introduced before the statement of this lemma. By lemma 4.3, in the region  $\{r \leq R_0\} \cap \{\tau \leq \epsilon^{-1}\}$  we have  $v \leq v_*$  for some  $v_* \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0, \epsilon)$ . Since  $\tau \geq 1$ , the bound on  $(-\nu)$  in  $\{r \leq R_0\}$  from (4.15) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(II)} &\leq C \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \int_{v_1(u)}^{\min(v_2(u), v_{R_0}(u), v_*)} e^{-c_\nu(u-v)} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2(u, v) dv du \\ &\leq C e^{c_\nu v_*} \int_{u_1}^{u_2} e^{-c_\nu u} \int_{v_1}^{v_2} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2(u, v) dv du = C(\mathfrak{B}_0, \epsilon) \int_{u_1}^{u_2} e^{-c_\nu u} E[\psi, C^{\text{out}}(u)] du. \end{aligned} \quad (6.106)$$

Finally, we handle term (III). We have  $(-\nu) \leq C$  by (4.9), and  $\tau = u$  in  $\{r \geq R_0\}$  by definition, so

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(III)} &= \int_{u_1}^{u_2} \int_{\max(v_1(u), v_{R_0}(u))}^{v_2(u)} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} \tau^{-p} (\partial_v \psi)^2 (-\nu)(u, v) \, dv \, du \\ &\leq C \int_{u_1}^{u_2} u^{-p} \int_{\max(v_1(u), v_{R_0}(u))}^{v_2(u)} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2(u, v) \, dv \, du \leq C \int_{u_1}^{u_2} u^{-p} E[\psi, C^{\text{out}}(u)] \, du. \end{aligned} \quad (6.107)$$

We conclude (6.102) by substituting (6.105)–(6.107) into (6.103) and (6.104).  $\square$

**Lemma 6.21.** *Let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . For  $R_\bullet$  sufficiently large depending on  $C(\mathcal{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha)$  and  $s \geq \eta_0$  sufficiently small, we have*

$$E[L\varphi, \Sigma_2] + E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}) [E[\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi, \Sigma_1] + r|\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|^2(p_{\text{fut}}) + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \quad (6.108)$$

*Proof.* We induct on  $\alpha$ . The base case  $\alpha = 0$  follows from (6.45), since  $\text{Err}[\varphi, \mathcal{R}]$  vanishes. It is therefore enough to show that

$$E[L\varphi, \Sigma_2] + E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, p}) [E[L\varphi, \Sigma_1] + r|L\varphi|^2(u_1, v_2) + E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \quad (6.109)$$

Let  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 > 0$ . Combining lemmas 6.18 to 6.20 (and using  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  so that  $\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s})$ ) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] &\leq (\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3 \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}^2 + R_\bullet^{-1+2s}) C(\mathcal{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha) E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]] \\ &\quad + \int_{u_1}^{u_2} (u^{-1-\eta_0} + e^{-c_\nu u}) E[L\varphi, C^{\text{out}}(u)] \, du. \end{aligned} \quad (6.110)$$

One can choose  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2$ , and  $\epsilon_3$  small based on  $C(\mathcal{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}, \alpha)$  and  $R_\bullet$  large based on  $C(\mathcal{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha)$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] &\leq \frac{1}{2} E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]] \\ &\quad + \int_{u_1}^{u_2} (u^{-p} + e^{-c_\nu u}) E[L\varphi, C^{\text{out}}(u)] \, du. \end{aligned} \quad (6.111)$$

Now return to (6.45) and absorb the  $E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}]$  term on the right of (6.111) to the left, and then apply the same analysis to the subregion  $\mathcal{R}(u_*) := \mathcal{R} \cap \{u \leq u_*\}$  for  $u_* \in [u_1, u_2]$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E[L\varphi, \Sigma_2(u_*)] + E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}(u_*)] &\leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}) [E[L\varphi, \Sigma_1] + r|L\varphi|^2(u_1, v_2) + E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]] \\ &\quad + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + \int_{u_1}^{u_*} (u^{-1-\eta_0} + e^{-c_\nu u}) E[L\varphi, C^{\text{out}}(u)] \, du, \end{aligned} \quad (6.112)$$

where we have written  $\Sigma_2(u_*)$  for the future boundary of  $\mathcal{R}(u_*)$ . Since  $E[L\varphi, C^{\text{out}}(u_*)] \leq E[L\varphi, \Sigma_2(u_*)]$ , we can use Grönwall's inequality in (6.112) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u \in [u_1, u_*]} E[L\varphi, C^{\text{out}}(u)] &\leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, p}) [E[L\varphi, \Sigma_1] + r|L\varphi|^2(u_1, v_2)] \\ &\quad + E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}] + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.113)$$

Combine (6.112) and (6.113) and take  $u_* = u_2$  to conclude (6.109).  $\square$

From now on, we fix  $R_\bullet$  large enough that lemma 6.21 holds.

**Lemma 6.22** (Energy boundedness estimate on characteristic rectangles). *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a characteristic rectangle with past  $\Sigma_1$ . For any null curve  $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{R}$ , when  $s \geq \eta_0$  is sufficiently small we have*

$$E[L\varphi, \Sigma] + E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}] \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}) [E[\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi, \Sigma_1] + r|\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|^2(p_{\text{fut}}) + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi, \mathcal{R}]]. \quad (6.114)$$

*Proof.* A null curve  $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{R}$  can be extended to a piecewise null curve  $\Sigma_2$  so that  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are the past and future boundaries of a rectangular region  $\mathcal{R}' \subset \mathcal{R}$ . Apply lemma 6.21 for the region  $\mathcal{R}'$ , and take a supremum over null curves  $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{R}$  (and hence  $\mathcal{R}' \subset \mathcal{R}$ ).  $\square$

**Corollary 6.23** (Estimate for unweighted energy norm). *When  $s \geq \eta_0$  is sufficiently small, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha^2 + E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}] \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1+\eta_0})[\mathcal{D}_\alpha^2 + \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,4s}^2]. \quad (6.115)$$

*Proof.* Apply lemma 6.22 to a characteristic rectangle  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$  whose past  $\Sigma_1$  is contained in the past of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ . Since  $\Sigma_1$  and  $p_{\text{fut}}$  are contained in the data surface  $C^{\text{in}} \cup C^{\text{out}}$ , the energy  $E[\psi, \Sigma_1]$  and the value  $r\psi^2(p_{\text{fut}})$  are controlled by data (see lemma 6.5). Take a supremum over  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ .  $\square$

**6.6.  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimate.** We now adapt the work of Dafermos–Rodnianski [12] to derive an  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimate. Recall the weighted energy quantity  $E_p$  defined in section 6.2.2.

**Lemma 6.24** (Preliminary estimate for the quantity  $E_p$ ). *Suppose that  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r\psi^2(u, v) = 0$  for each  $u \geq 1$ . Then for any  $p \geq 0$  and  $R \geq R_0 + 1$  and  $\tau \geq 1$ , we have*

$$E_p[\psi](\tau) \leq \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \geq R\}} \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 dv + C(\mathbf{b}_0, R, p)E[\psi, \Sigma_\tau], \quad (6.116)$$

and for  $1 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2$  we have

$$\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_p[\psi](\tau) \leq \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \left( \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \geq R\}} \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 dv \right) d\tau + C(\mathbf{b}_0, R, p)E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)], \quad (6.117)$$

*Proof.* Introduce the following energy quantity that is localized to the region  $\{r \leq R\}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\leq R}^\circ[\psi](\tau) &:= \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{in}}} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2 du + \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2 dv + \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{R-1 \leq r \leq R\}} \lambda r \psi^2 dv \\ &= E[\psi, \Sigma_\tau \cap \{r \geq R\}] + \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{R-1 \leq r \leq R\}} \lambda r \psi^2 dv. \end{aligned} \quad (6.118)$$

Observe that the desired (6.116) and (6.117) are a consequence of the following three estimates:

$$E_p[\psi](\tau) \leq \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \geq R\}} \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 dv + C(\mathbf{b}_0, R, p)E_{\leq R}^\circ(\tau) \quad (6.119)$$

$$E_{\leq R}^\circ(\tau) \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)[E[\psi, \Sigma_\tau \cap \{r \geq R\}] + \limsup_{v \rightarrow \infty} r\psi^2|_{u=\tau}(v)] \quad (6.120)$$

$$\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E[\psi, \Sigma_\tau \cap \{r \leq R\}] d\tau \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, R)E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]. \quad (6.121)$$

We now prove (6.119)–(6.121) one by one.

*Step 1: Proof of (6.119).* By the definitions of  $E_p$  and  $E_{\leq R}^\circ$ , it is enough to show that

$$\int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 dv + |\psi|^2(\tau, v_{R_0}(\tau)) \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, R, p)E_{\leq R}^\circ[\psi](\tau). \quad (6.122)$$

To prove (6.122), we start with the following pointwise estimate on  $\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R\} \subset \{R_0 \leq r \leq R\}$ :

$$\frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 \leq R^p[\lambda^2 \psi^2 + \frac{r^2}{\lambda} (\partial_v \psi)^2] \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, R, p)[\lambda r \psi^2 + \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2]. \quad (6.123)$$

Integrate (6.123) over  $v \in [v_{R_0}(\tau), v_R(\tau)]$  and add  $R_0|\psi|^2(\tau, v_{R_0}(\tau))$  to both sides to get

$$(\text{LHS of (6.122)}) \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, R, p) \left[ \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \lambda r \psi^2 dv + R_0|\psi|^2(\tau, v_{R_0}(\tau)) + \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2 dv \right]. \quad (6.124)$$

For any  $R' \in [R-1, R]$ , we can control the first two terms on the right side of (6.124) using Hardy's inequality (lemma 6.3 with  $a = 0$ ) and arrive at

$$(\text{LHS of (6.122)}) \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, R, p) \left[ R' |\psi|^2(\tau, v_{R'}(\tau)) + \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq R\}} \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2 dv \right]. \quad (6.125)$$

Averaging over  $R' \in [R-1, R]$  yields (6.122).

*Step 2: Proof of (6.120).* It is enough to prove (6.120) with the left side replaced by  $\int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{R-1 \leq r \leq R\}} \lambda r \psi^2 dv$ ; this estimate is a consequence of Hardy's inequality (lemma 6.3 with  $a = 0$  in the limit  $v_2 \rightarrow \infty$ ).

*Step 3: Proof of (6.121).* Recall from (2.18) that  $\tau$  is a function of  $v$  in  $\{r \leq R_0\}$  (with  $r(\tau, v) = R_0$ ) and a function of  $u$  in  $\{r \geq R_0\}$  (with  $\tau = u$ ). Thus (6.121) follows from changing variables with the following computation,

$$\frac{d\tau}{dv}(u, v) = \frac{\kappa}{(-\gamma)}(u_{R_0}(v), v) \quad \text{in } \{r \leq R_0\}, \quad \frac{d\tau}{du}(u, v) = 1 \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R_0\}. \quad (6.126)$$

□

**Lemma 6.25.** *Let  $p \in \mathbf{R}$ . We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_u \left( \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 \right) + \partial_v \left( \frac{r^p}{\lambda} \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{r} (r\psi)^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \left( p(-\nu) - \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r} (-\gamma) \right) \frac{r^{p-1}}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 + (3-p)r^{p-4}r^2(-\partial_u \partial_v r)(r\psi)^2 \\ & = 2 \frac{r^{p+1}}{\lambda} \partial_v(r\psi) \kappa(-\nu) \square \psi + r^{p-3} \partial_v \left( r^2 \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{\lambda} \right) \psi^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.127)$$

*Proof.* We refer to [32, Lem. 8.52] for details of the computation. □

**Lemma 6.26** ( $r^p$ -weighted energy estimate). *Suppose that  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r\psi^2(u, v) = 0$  for each  $u \geq 1$ . Then for  $1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$  and  $p \in (0, 3)$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & E_p[\psi](\tau_2) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_{p-1}[\psi](\tau) d\tau \\ & \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0}, p) \left[ E_p[\psi](\tau_1) + \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} r^{p+3} |\square \psi|^2 \kappa(-\nu) du dv + E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)] + E[\psi, \Sigma_{\tau_2}] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.128)$$

*Proof.* Introduce the notation  $\Psi := r\psi$ . By lemma 6.24, it is enough to show that for  $R = C(\mathbf{b}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0}, p)$ , we have

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\tau_2}^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \geq R\}} \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \left( \int_{\Gamma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \geq R\}} \frac{r^{p-1}}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv \right) d\tau \leq (\text{RHS of (6.128)}). \quad (6.129)$$

To show (6.129), let  $\chi_R(r)$  be a smooth non-decreasing function such that  $\chi_R \equiv 1$  on  $\{r \geq R\}$  and  $\chi_R \equiv 0$  on  $\{r \leq R/2\}$ . To begin, let  $R \geq 3R_0$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(I)} & := \chi_R(r) \partial_u \left( \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 \right) + \chi_R(r) \partial_v \left( \frac{r^p}{\lambda} \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{r} \Psi^2 \right), \\ \text{(II)} & := \chi_R(r) \left[ p(-\nu) - \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r} (-\gamma) \right] \frac{r^{p-1}}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 + \chi_R(r) 2(3-p)r^{p-4}(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)\lambda(-\gamma)\Psi^2, \\ \text{(III)} & := \chi_R(r) \left[ 2 \frac{r^{p+1}}{\lambda} \partial_v \Psi r \square \psi + r^{p-3} \partial_v \left( r^2 \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{\lambda} \right) \psi^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6.130)$$

so that the result of multiplying the statement of lemma 6.25 by  $\chi_R(r)$  reads (I) + (II) = (III). By (4.12)–(4.14), for  $R \geq C(\mathbf{b}_0, p, \varpi_i, r_{\min})$  and  $c = c(c_{\mathcal{H}})$ , the square bracketed term in (I) is positive, and we have

$$\text{(II)} \geq \chi_R(r) c p \frac{r^{p-1}}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 + \chi_R(r) c (3-p) r^{p-4} \Psi^2. \quad (6.131)$$

Since  $p \in (0, 3)$ , the right side of (6.131) is positive. Since

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \left| \partial_v \left( r^2 \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{\lambda} \right) \right| = \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \left| \partial_v (2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)(-\gamma)) \right| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0}) r^{-2}, \quad (6.132)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{III})| &\leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)(\text{RHS of (6.131)})^{1/2} \cdot (r^{p+3}|\square\psi|^2)^{1/2} + r^{-1}C(\mathbf{b}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0})(\text{RHS of (6.131)}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(\text{II}) + C(\mathbf{b}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0})r^{p+3}|\square\psi|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.133)$$

Integrate by parts, using  $R \geq 3R_0$  to note that  $\text{supp } \chi_R$  is disjoint from  $\Gamma_\tau^{\text{in}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} (\text{I}) &= \int_{\Gamma_{\tau_2}^{\text{out}}} \chi_R(r) \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv - \int_{\Gamma_{\tau_1}^{\text{out}}} \chi_R(r) \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv \\ &\quad - \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \chi'_R(r) \left[ \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 + \frac{r^p}{\lambda} \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{r} \Psi^2 \right] du dv. \end{aligned} \quad (6.134)$$

Integrating the identity (I) + (II) = (III) and using (6.131) and (6.133) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Gamma_{\tau_2}^{\text{out}}} \chi_R(r) \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \int_{\Gamma_\tau^{\text{out}}} \chi_R(r) \frac{r^{p-1}}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv d\tau \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Gamma_{\tau_1}^{\text{out}}} \chi_R(r) \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv + \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \chi'_R(r) \left[ \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 + \frac{r^p}{\lambda} \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{r} \Psi^2 \right] du dv \\ &\quad + \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \chi_R(r) r^{p+3} |\square\psi|^2 du dv \\ &\lesssim (\text{RHS of (6.128)}) + \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} \chi'_R(r) \frac{r^p}{\lambda} \frac{(-\partial_u \partial_v r)}{r} \Psi^2 du dv, \end{aligned} \quad (6.135)$$

where the implied constant is  $C(\mathbf{b}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0}, p)$ . Since  $\chi'_R$  is supported in a finite- $r$  region, the last term on the right is controlled by  $E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]$ . For the remaining parts of  $E_p[\psi]$  on the left of (6.128), we have

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\tau_2}^{\text{in}}} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \varphi)^2 du + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \int_{\Gamma_\tau^{\text{in}}} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \varphi)^2 du d\tau \lesssim_{R_0} E[\psi, \Sigma_{\tau_2}] + E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]. \quad (6.136)$$

An argument using Hardy's inequality allows us to estimate

$$\int_{\Gamma_\tau^{\text{out}} \cap \{R_0 \leq r \leq R\}} \frac{r^p}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv + \int_{\Gamma_\tau^{\text{in}} \cap \{R_0 \leq r \leq R\}} \frac{r^{p-1}}{\lambda} (\partial_v \Psi)^2 dv \lesssim_{R, \mathbf{b}_0} E[\psi, \Sigma_\tau] + E_{\text{bulk}}[\psi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]. \quad (6.137)$$

Add (6.135)–(6.137) to complete the proof.  $\square$

**6.7. Boundedness of the weighted energy  $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, p}$ .** In this section, we complete the proof of proposition 6.1 by controlling the  $p$ -weighted energy (for  $p$  close to 2) by initial data, as well as geometric quantities, unweighted pointwise norms, and lower order weighted pointwise norms. To this end, we first formulate the pigeonhole argument of [12] by which one obtains pointwise decay from  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimates.

**Lemma 6.27** (Pigeonhole argument). *Suppose  $F_p : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a family of non-negative functions defined for  $p \in \mathbf{R}$  such that*

- (1)  $F_p(\tau) \lesssim_{p, p'} F_{p'}(\tau)$  whenever  $p \leq p'$ ,
- (2) and there are  $q \geq 0$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $A \geq 0$  such that for any  $p \in (0, 2 - \epsilon]$  and  $1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$ , we have

$$F_p(\tau_2) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} F_{p-1}(\tau) d\tau \lesssim_p F_p(\tau_1) + A\tau_1^{p-q}. \quad (6.138)$$

Then

$$F_{2-\epsilon}(\tau) \lesssim F_{2-\epsilon}(1) + A, \quad (6.139)$$

$$F_{1-\epsilon}(\tau) \lesssim \tau^{-1}(F_{2-\epsilon}(1) + A \max(1, \tau^{2-\epsilon-q})), \quad (6.140)$$

$$\int_{\tau/2}^{\tau} F_{-\epsilon}(\tau') d\tau' \lesssim \tau^{-1}(F_{2-\epsilon}(1) + A \max(1, \tau^{2-\epsilon-q})) \quad (6.141)$$

for  $\tau \geq 1$ , with implicit constants depending on  $\epsilon$ .



*Proof.* We do not track the dependence of implicit constants on  $\epsilon$  (that arises from the use of (6.138) for fixed values of  $p$  that depend on  $\epsilon$ ).

*Step 1: Proof of (6.139) and proof of (6.140) and (6.141) for  $\tau \in [1, 2]$ .* First, (6.139) follows from (6.138) for  $p = 2 - \epsilon$  and  $\tau_1 = 1$  (since the  $F_p$  are non-negative). Next, suppose  $1 \leq \tau \leq 2$ . Start with (6.138) for  $p = 1 - \epsilon$  over the interval  $[1, \tau]$ , and then use the consequence  $F_{1-\epsilon}(1) \lesssim F_{2-\epsilon}(1)$  of the monotonicity assumption (1) to get

$$F_{1-\epsilon}(\tau) + \int_1^\tau F_{-\epsilon}(\tau') d\tau' \lesssim F_{1-\epsilon}(1) + A \lesssim F_{2-\epsilon}(1) + A. \quad (6.142)$$

This implies (6.140) and (6.141) when  $\tau \in [1, 2]$ . We can therefore suppose for the rest of the proof that  $\tau \geq 2$ .

*Step 2: Proof of (6.140) for  $\tau \geq 2$ .* The estimate (6.138) for  $p = 2 - \epsilon$  and the non-negativity of the  $F_p$  give

$$\int_{\tau/2}^\tau F_{1-\epsilon}(\tau') d\tau' \lesssim F_{2-\epsilon}(\tau/2) + A\tau^{2-\epsilon-q}. \quad (6.143)$$

There is  $\bar{\tau} \in [\tau/2, \tau]$  at which  $F_{1-\epsilon}$  is bounded by its average value over the interval (“the pigeonhole principle”). Combine this observation with (6.143) and (6.139) to arrive at

$$F_{1-\epsilon}(\bar{\tau}) \leq 2\tau^{-1} \int_{\tau/2}^\tau F_{1-\epsilon}(\tau') d\tau' \lesssim \tau^{-1}(F_{2-\epsilon}(1) + A \max(1, \tau^{2-\epsilon-q})). \quad (6.144)$$

Conclude (6.140) by substituting (6.144) into (6.138) with  $p = 1 - \epsilon$  over the interval  $[\bar{\tau}, \tau]$ .

*Step 3: Proof of (6.141) for  $\tau \geq 2$ .* Start with (6.138) for  $p = 1 - \epsilon$  over the interval  $[\tau/2, \tau]$ , and then use the just established (6.140) and the non-negativity of  $F_p$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.28** (Estimate for weighted energy norm). *There are explicit constants  $C_\alpha$  depending only on  $\alpha$  such that for  $s \geq \eta_0$  sufficiently small (depending on a numerical constant), we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 2-\eta_0-C_\alpha s} \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 0}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}, s) \mathcal{D}_\alpha. \quad (6.145)$$

*Proof.* We use the notation  $\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2) := \bigcup_{\tau_1 \leq \tau \leq \tau_2} \Sigma_\tau$ . Write  $A_{\alpha, s} := C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 0}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}, s)$ .

*Step 1:  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimate and energy boundedness for the foliation  $\Sigma_\tau$ .* Let  $1 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2$ . In this step we show that for  $p \in (0, 2 - 4B_\alpha s - \eta_0]$ , we have

$$E[L\varphi, \Sigma_{\tau_2}] + E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)] \leq C(A_{\alpha, s}, s)[E[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma_{\tau_1}] + E_{4B_\alpha s}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1)], \quad (6.146)$$

$$E_p[L\varphi](\tau_2) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_{p-1}[L\varphi](\tau) d\tau \leq C(A_{\alpha, s}, p, s)[E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1) + E_{p+4B_\alpha s}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1)], \quad (6.147)$$

where  $B_\alpha = \#\{\beta : 0 \leq \beta < \alpha\}$  is the number of multi-indices less than  $\alpha$ . These follow from Steps 2abc below (see (6.148), (6.149) and (6.152)).

*Step 1a: Energy boundedness.* We begin by showing that

$$E[L\varphi, \Sigma_{\tau_2}] + E_{\text{bulk}}[L\varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)] \leq C(A_{\alpha, s}, s)[E[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma_{\tau_1}] + E_{4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]]. \quad (6.148)$$

In fact, this is a consequence of lemma 6.21 applied to the region  $\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ . The limiting boundary terms on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  can be controlled by another application of lemma 6.21 to the region  $\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ . We can neglect the  $p_{\text{fut}}$  term because  $\Sigma_{\tau_1}$  extends to  $v = \infty$  and we can assume  $\limsup_{v \rightarrow \infty} r|\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2(\tau_1, v) = 0$  by including  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 0}$  in the constant on the right (since the limit supremum vanishes if  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 0}$  is finite).

*Step 1b: Controlling the error terms in the  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimate.* Let  $p \in (0, 2 - 4s - \eta_0]$ . We show that

$$E_p[L\varphi](\tau_2) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_{p-1}[L\varphi](\tau) d\tau \leq C(A_{\alpha, s}, p)[E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1) + E_{p+4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]]. \quad (6.149)$$

Since  $p \leq 2 - 2s - \eta_0$ , (2.70) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} r^{p+3} |\square L\varphi|^2 \kappa(-\nu) \, du \, dv \\ & \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) \iint_{\mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)} r^{p-1+2s} [|\partial_v \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 + |U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |\partial_v(r\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi)|^2] \kappa(-\nu) \, du \, dv \\ & \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) [E_{\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)] + E_{p+2s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.150)$$

Substitute (6.148) and (6.150) into the  $r^p$ -weighted energy estimate (6.128) (noting as in Step 1a that we can assume  $\limsup_{v \rightarrow \infty} r |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2(\tau, v) = 0$  for all  $\tau \geq 1$  by including  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 0}$  in the constant on the right) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E_p[L\varphi](\tau_2) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_{p-1}[L\varphi](\tau) \, d\tau & \leq C(A_{\alpha, s}, p) [E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1) + E[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma_{\tau_1}] \\ & \quad + E_{\max(p+2s, 4s), \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.151)$$

To complete the proof, use  $\max(p + 2s, 4s) \leq p + 4s$  and control  $E[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma_{\tau_1}]$  by  $E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1)$  using lemma 6.6.

*Step 1c: Estimate for  $r^p$ -weighted bulk term.* We claim that for  $\tau \geq 1$  and  $p \in (0, 2 - 4B_\alpha s - \eta_0]$ , we have

$$E_{p, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau, \infty)] \leq C(A_{\alpha, s}, p) [E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) + E_{p+4B_\alpha s}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi](\tau)], \quad (6.152)$$

where  $B_\alpha = \#\{\beta : 0 \leq \beta < \alpha\}$  is the number of multi-indices smaller than  $\alpha$ . Indeed, Step 1b (see (6.149)) implies

$$\begin{aligned} E_{p, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)] & \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0) \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_{p-1}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) \, d\tau \\ & \leq C(A_{\alpha, s}) [E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1) + E_{p+4s, \text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau_1, \tau_2)]]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.153)$$

An induction argument establishes (6.152).

*Step 2: Interpolation.* Observe that for any  $\tau \geq 1$  and  $\epsilon \geq 0$  and  $q \geq -\epsilon$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_q[\psi](\tau) & \leq \int_{\Sigma_\tau^{\text{in}}} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2 \, du + r |\psi|^2(\tau, v_{R_0}(\tau)) \\ & \quad + \tau^{q+\epsilon} \int_{\Sigma_{\tau^\epsilon}^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \leq \tau\}} \frac{r^{-\epsilon}}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 \, dv + \tau^{q-1+\epsilon} \int_{\Sigma_{\tau^\epsilon}^{\text{out}} \cap \{r \geq \tau\}} \frac{r^{1-\epsilon}}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 \, dv \\ & \leq \tau^{q+\epsilon} E_{-\epsilon}[\psi](\tau) + \tau^{q-1+\epsilon} E_{1-\epsilon}[\psi](\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (6.154)$$

We have bounded the first two terms on the right in the first line by  $E_{-\epsilon}[\psi](\tau)$ .

*Step 3: Energy decay through the foliation  $\Sigma_\tau$ .* We will prove inductively that for  $p \in (0, 2 - 4B_\alpha s - \eta_0]$  we have

$$E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) \leq \tau^{p-q_\alpha} C(A_{\alpha, s}, p) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2, \quad (6.155)$$

where  $q_\alpha = 2 - \eta_0 - 4\tilde{B}_\alpha s$  for  $\tilde{B}_\alpha := \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} B_\beta$ .

We first show that (6.155) holds for  $\alpha = 0$  with  $q_0 = 2 - \eta_0$ . By (6.147), we have

$$E_p[\varphi](\tau_2) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_{p-1}[\varphi](\tau) \, d\tau \leq C(A_{0, s}, p) E_p[\varphi](\tau_1) \quad (6.156)$$

for  $p \in (0, 2 - \eta_0]$  and  $1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$ . Now lemma 6.27 implies that

$$E_{1-\eta_0}[\varphi](\tau) + \int_{\tau/2}^{\tau} E_{-\eta_0}[\varphi](\tau') \, d\tau' \lesssim \tau^{-1} E_{2-\eta_0}[\varphi](1) \leq \tau^{-1} C(A_{0, s}) \mathcal{D}_0^2, \quad (6.157)$$

where we used lemma 6.7 to control  $E_{2-\eta_0}[\varphi](1)$  by initial data. Interpolate using (6.154) to obtain

$$E_p[\varphi](\tau) \leq \tau^{p+\eta_0} E_{-\eta_0}[\varphi](\tau) + \tau^{p-1+\eta_0} E_{1-\eta_0}[\varphi](\tau). \quad (6.158)$$

A pigeonhole argument applies to (6.157) implies that there is  $\bar{\tau} \in [\tau/2, \tau]$  such that

$$E_{-\eta_0}[\varphi](\bar{\tau}) \leq \frac{2}{\tau} \int_{\tau/2}^{\tau} E_{-\eta_0}[\varphi](\tau') \, d\tau' \leq \tau^{-2} C(A_{0, s}) \mathcal{D}_0^2. \quad (6.159)$$

Substitute (6.157) and (6.159) into (6.158) to get

$$E_p[\varphi](\bar{\tau}) \leq \tau^{p-2+\eta_0} C(A_{0,s}) \mathcal{D}_0^2. \quad (6.160)$$

Use (6.160) and (6.156) over the interval  $[\bar{\tau}, \tau]$  to obtain

$$E_p[\varphi](\tau) \leq C(A_{0,s}, p) E_p[\varphi](\bar{\tau}) \leq \tau^{p-2+\eta_0} C(A_{0,s}, p) \mathcal{D}_0^2. \quad (6.161)$$

Now we show the inductive step. Suppose (6.155) holds for multi-indices  $< \alpha$ . Then (6.147) and the induction hypothesis give

$$E_p[L\varphi](\tau_2) + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} E_{p-1}[L\varphi](\tau) d\tau \leq C(A_{\alpha,s}, p) [E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau_1) + \tau_1^{p+4B_\alpha s - q < \alpha} A_{\alpha,s} \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2] \quad (6.162)$$

for  $1 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$ . Sum over  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$  and use lemma 6.27 to get

$$E_{1-\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) + \int_{\tau/2}^{\tau} E_{-\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau') d\tau' \lesssim \tau^{1-\eta_0 - q < \alpha + 4B_\alpha s} C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2, \quad (6.163)$$

We have used lemma 6.7 to control  $E_{2-\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](1)$ . By a pigeonhole argument, there is  $\bar{\tau} \in [\tau/2, \tau]$  such that

$$E_{-\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\bar{\tau}) \leq \frac{2}{\tau} \int_{\tau/2}^{\tau} E_{-\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau') d\tau' \lesssim \tau^{-\eta_0 - q < \alpha + 4B_\alpha s} C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2. \quad (6.164)$$

Interpolate using (6.154) and then use (6.163) and (6.164) to get

$$E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\bar{\tau}) \leq \tau^{p+\eta_0} E_{-\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\bar{\tau}) + \tau^{p-1+\eta_0} E_{1-\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\bar{\tau}) \leq \tau^{p-q < \alpha + 4B_\alpha s} C(A_{\alpha,s}, p) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2. \quad (6.165)$$

Apply (6.162) over the interval  $[\bar{\tau}, \tau]$  to obtain

$$E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) \leq C(A_{\alpha,s}, p) [E_p[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\bar{\tau}) + \bar{\tau}^{p+4B_\alpha s - q < \alpha} A_{\alpha,s} \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2] \leq \tau^{p-(q < \alpha - 4B_\alpha s)} C(A_{\alpha,s}, p) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2. \quad (6.166)$$

This completes the inductive proof of (6.155).

*Step 4: Completing the proof of (6.145).* Write  $p_{\max} := 2 - \eta_0 - 4(B_\alpha + 1)s - 4\tilde{B}_\alpha s$ , so that it is enough to show that

$$\mathcal{E}_{p_{\max}}^2 \leq C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2, \quad (6.167)$$

For  $\tau \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{S}_\tau$  be the collection of null curves whose past endpoint lies in  $\Sigma_\tau$ . Then

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,p}^2 \leq \sup_{\tau \geq 1} \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_\tau} \tau^p E[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma] + \sup_{\tau \geq 1} \tau^{p-1-\eta_0} E_{1+\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma_\tau] + E_{p,\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(1, \infty)]. \quad (6.168)$$

Fix a null curve  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_\tau$ , so that  $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{R}(\tau, \infty)$ . Apply the energy boundedness statement of lemma 6.22 to obtain

$$E[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma] \leq C(A_{\alpha,s}) [E[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \Sigma_\tau] + E_{4s,\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau, \infty)]]. \quad (6.169)$$

The  $p_{\text{fit}}$  term vanishes because  $r \rightarrow \infty$  along  $\Sigma_\tau$  and the pointwise norm  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,0}$  appears on the right. By lemma 6.6 and (6.152) and (6.155), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[L\varphi, \Sigma] &\leq C(A_{\alpha,s}) [E_{4s}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) + E_{4(B_\alpha+1)s}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau)] \leq C(A_{\alpha,s}) E_{4(B_\alpha+1)s}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) \\ &\leq \tau^{-2+\eta_0+4(B_\alpha+1)s+4\tilde{B}_\alpha s} C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2 = \tau^{-p_{\max}} C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6.170)$$

By (6.155), we have

$$E_{1+\eta_0}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) \leq \tau^{1+\eta_0-2+\eta_0+4\tilde{B}_\alpha s} C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2 \leq \tau^{1+\eta_0-p_{\max}} C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2. \quad (6.171)$$

Finally, (6.152) and (6.155) gives

$$E_{p_{\max},\text{bulk}}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi, \mathcal{R}(\tau, \infty)] \leq C(A_{\alpha,s}) E_{p_{\max}+4B_\alpha s}[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi](\tau) \leq \tau^{-4(B_\alpha+1)s} C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2 \leq C(A_{\alpha,s}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha^2. \quad (6.172)$$

Combine (6.168) and (6.170) to (6.172) to obtain the desired (6.167).  $\square$

## 7. POINTWISE ESTIMATES

In section 7.1, we estimate weighted  $L^\infty$ -norms similar to  $P_p[\psi]$  in terms of  $\square\psi$ , the initial data norm  $D[\psi]$ , and the energy norms  $\mathcal{E}[\psi]$  and  $\mathcal{E}_p[\psi]$ . In section 7.2, we specialize the estimates in section 7.1 to functions of the form  $\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi$ . This requires an understanding of  $\square\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi$ , as obtained in section 2.8.3, and culminates in a proof of the following result:

**Proposition 7.1** (Estimate for pointwise norm). *Let  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $p \geq 0$ . When  $s > 0$  is sufficiently small depending on  $\alpha$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,p} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s} \mathbf{g}_\alpha)(\mathcal{D}_\alpha + \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,p}). \quad (7.1)$$

*Proof.* Combine lemmas 7.4, 7.5, 7.8 and 7.9. □

### 7.1. Estimates for general functions.

**Lemma 7.2.** *We have*

$$\|r^{1/2}\psi\|_{L^\infty} \leq \mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi]. \quad (7.2)$$

*Proof.* We use the fundamental theorem of calculus along a constant- $v$  curve from  $(u, v)$  to  $(1, v) \in C^{\text{in}}$ , and then apply Cauchy-Schwarz, the assumption  $\min_{v \in [1, \infty)} r(1, v) \geq 1$ , the change of variables  $dr = (-\nu) du$ , and the monotonicity  $r(u, v) \leq r(1, v)$ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi|(u, v) &\leq |\psi|(1, v) + \int_1^u |\partial_u \psi|(u', v) du' \leq r^{-1}(1, v) D[\psi] \\ &\quad + \left( \int_1^u r^{-2}(u', v) (-\nu) du' \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_1^u \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u', v) du' \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq r^{-1/2}(1, v) \mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \left( \int_{r(u,v)}^{r(1,v)} r^{-2} dr \right)^{1/2} \mathcal{E}[\psi] \leq r^{-1/2}(u, v) (\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi]). \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

□

**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $s > 1$ . Then*

$$\|r\psi\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, s)(\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi] + \|r^s \partial_v(r\psi)\|_{L^\infty}). \quad (7.4)$$

*Proof.* Fix  $R \geq R_0$ . We integrate  $\partial_v(r\psi)$  in the  $v$ -direction from  $(u, v_R(u)) \in \{r = R\}$  to  $(u, v)$ . To control the boundary term at  $\{r = R\}$ , we use lemma 7.2, and we estimate the integral using the hypothesis, a change of variables, and the fact that  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \lambda^{-1} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)$ . Writing  $A := \|r^s \partial_v(r\psi)\|_{L^\infty}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} r|\psi|(u, v) &\leq R|\psi|(u, v_R(u)) + \int_{v_R(u)}^v |\partial_v(r\psi)|(u, v') dv' \leq R^{1/2}(\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi]) + A \int_{v_R(u)}^v r^{-s}(u, v') dv' \\ &\leq R^{1/2}(\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi]) + C(\mathbf{b}_0)A \int_R^{r(u,v)} r^{-s} dr \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0, s)(\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi] + A). \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

□

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $p \geq 0$ . If  $\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] < \infty$ , then*

$$\|r^{1/2} \tau^{p/2} \psi\|_{L^\infty} \leq 3\mathcal{E}_p[\psi]. \quad (7.6)$$

*Proof.* We first consider the case where  $r(u, v) \geq R_0$ , and then the case where  $r(u, v) \leq R_0$ . We can assume that  $\mathcal{E}[\psi] < \infty$ , as otherwise (7.6) is trivial since the right side is infinite.

*Step 1:*  $r(u, v) \geq R_0$ . Suppose that  $r(u, v) \geq R_0$ . Since  $r(u, v') \rightarrow \infty$  as  $v' \rightarrow \infty$ , lemma 7.2 implies that  $|\psi|(u, v') \rightarrow 0$  as  $v' \rightarrow \infty$ . We can therefore use the fundamental theorem of calculus in  $v$  from  $(u, v)$  to  $(u, \infty)$ , then use Cauchy-Schwarz and the lower bound  $1 - \mu \geq 1/2$  in  $\{r \geq R_0\}$  from (4.12) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi|(u, v) &\leq \int_v^\infty |\partial_v \psi|(u, v') dv' \leq \left( \int_v^\infty r^{-2} \kappa dv' \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_v^\infty \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \psi)^2(u, v') dv' \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{r(u, v)}^\infty r^{-2} (1 - \mu)^{-1} dr \right)^{1/2} \tau^{-p/2} \mathcal{E}_p \leq 2r^{-1} \tau^{-p/2} \mathcal{E}_p[\psi]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

*Step 2:*  $r(u, v) \leq R_0$ . If  $r(u, v) \leq R_0$ , then we integrate on a constant- $v$  curve from  $(u_{R_0}(v), v)$  to  $(u, v)$  and use Cauchy-Schwarz and a change of variables as before. The boundary term on  $\{r = R_0\}$  is controlled by Step 1, and the integral decays in  $\tau$ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi|(u, v) &\leq |\psi|(u_{R_0}(v), v) + \int_{u_{R_0}(v)}^u |\partial_u \psi|(u', v) du' \\ &\leq 2R_0^{-1/2} \tau^{-p/2} (u_{R_0}(v), v) \mathcal{E}_p[\psi] + \left( \int_{r(u, v)}^{R_0} r^{-2} dr \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{u_{R_0}(v)}^u \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u', v) du' \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 3r^{-1/2} \tau^{-p/2} \mathcal{E}_p[\psi]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

In the last line we have used  $\tau(u, v) = \tau(u_{R_0}(v), v)$  for  $r(u, v) \leq R_0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.5.** *Let  $p \geq 1 + \eta_0$ . If  $\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] < \infty$ , then*

$$\|r\tau^{p/2-1/2-\eta_0/2}\psi\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\varpi_i, \eta_0) \mathcal{E}_p[\psi]. \quad (7.9)$$

*Proof.* In view of the previous lemma and  $\tau \geq 1$ , it is enough to obtain the result in  $\{r \geq R_0\}$ . As in the previous lemma, we integrate  $\partial_v(r\psi)$  in the  $v$ -direction from  $(u, v_{R_0}(u)) \in \{r = R_0\}$  to  $(u, v)$ . This time, we estimate the integral using the  $p$ -weighted energy. We get

$$\begin{aligned} r|\psi|(u, v) &\leq R_0|\psi|(u, v_{R_0}(u)) + \int_{v_{R_0}(u)}^v |\partial_v(r\psi)|(u, v') dv' \\ &\leq R_0^{1/2} \tau^{-p/2} C(\mathbf{b}_0) \mathcal{E}_p[\psi] + \left( \int_{v_{R_0}(u)}^v r^{-1-\eta_0} dr \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{v_{R_0}(u)}^v \frac{r^{1+\eta_0}}{\lambda} (\partial_v(r\psi))^2 dv' \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \tau^{-p/2} C(\varpi_i) \mathcal{E}_p[\psi] + C(\eta_0) \tau^{-p/2+1/2+\eta_0/2} \mathcal{E}_p[\psi]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

In passing to the last line, we used  $R_0 \leq C(\varpi_i)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.6.** *Let  $s \in [0, 1]$ . We have*

$$|\partial_v(r\psi)| \leq r^{-3/2} C(\mathbf{b}_0) (\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi]) + \int_1^u r\kappa(-\nu) |\square\psi|(u', v) du'. \quad (7.11)$$

*Proof.* The wave equation (2.15) implies

$$\partial_u \partial_v(r\psi) = r\kappa(-\nu) \square\psi + (\partial_u \partial_v r)\psi = r\kappa(-\nu) \square\psi - \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} \kappa(-\nu)\psi. \quad (7.12)$$

Integrate (7.12) in  $u$  to get

$$|\partial_v(r\psi)|(u, v) \leq \underbrace{|\partial_v(r\psi)|(1, v)}_{:=\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{\int_1^u \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} \kappa(-\nu) |\psi|(u', v) du'}_{:=\text{(II)}} + \int_1^u r\kappa(-\nu) |\square\psi|(u', v) du'. \quad (7.13)$$

For term (I), use the monotonicity  $r(1, v) \geq r(u, v)$  and the fact that  $r$  has a global lower bound to estimate  $r^{-2}(1, v)$  in terms of  $r^{-3/2}(u, v)$ . We also use the fact that  $\lambda \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)$  on  $C^{\text{out}}$ . For term (II), use  $\kappa, \varpi =_s \mathbf{b}_0$ ,

change variables  $(-\nu) du = dr$ , and use lemma 7.2. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} &\leq r^{-2}(1, v)\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + C(\mathbf{b}_0)\|r^{1/2}\psi\|_{L^\infty} \int_1^u r^{-1-3/2}(-\nu) du' \\ &\leq r^{-3/2}(u, v)C(\mathbf{b}_0)(\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi] + \mathcal{E}[\psi]). \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

Substitute (7.14) into (7.13) to get the result.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.7.** *We have*

$$\frac{1}{2}r^2|U\psi|^2(u, v) + \int_1^v c_{\mathcal{H}}(U\psi)^2(u, v') dv' \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)(\mathfrak{D}_0[\psi]^2 + \mathcal{E}[\psi]^2) + 2 \int_1^v r^2\kappa U\psi\Box\psi(u, v') dv'. \quad (7.15)$$

*Proof.* It is enough to show the pointwise inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_v(rU\psi)^2 + c_{\mathcal{H}}(U\psi)^2 \leq 2r^2\kappa U\psi\Box\psi + C(\mathbf{b}_0)\frac{r^2}{\kappa}(\partial_v\psi)^2. \quad (7.16)$$

Indeed, lemma 7.7 follows immediately from (7.16) after recalling the definitions of  $[\psi]$  and  $\mathcal{E}[\psi]$ .

We now show (7.16). Apply the redshift inequality  $\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r \geq c_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$  (see (4.1)) to the wave equation to compute

$$\partial_v(rU\psi) = r\kappa\Box\psi + \partial_v\psi - \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}\kappa rU\psi \leq r\kappa\Box\psi + \partial_v\psi - 2c_{\mathcal{H}}\kappa r^{-1}U\psi. \quad (7.17)$$

To conclude (7.16), multiply both sides by  $rU\psi$ , use Young's inequality for the term  $r\partial_v\psi U\psi$ , and apply  $\kappa^{-1}, c_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)$ .  $\square$

## 7.2. Controlling the pointwise norm $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, p}$ .

**Lemma 7.8.** *For  $\alpha \geq 0$ , let  $B_\alpha := \#\{\beta : 0 \leq \beta < \alpha\}$  be the number of multi-indices smaller than  $\alpha$ . For  $s > 0$  small enough depending on  $\alpha$ , we have*

$$\|r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi\|_{L^\infty} + \|r^2\partial_v\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi\|_{L^\infty} + \|r^{3/2-B_\alpha s}\partial_v(r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s})(\mathcal{D}_\alpha + \mathcal{E}_\alpha). \quad (7.18)$$

*Proof.* It is enough to establish that

$$\|r^{3/2-B_\alpha s}\partial_v(r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s})(\mathcal{D}_\alpha + \mathcal{E}_\alpha). \quad (7.19)$$

Indeed, the estimate for  $\|r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi\|_{L^\infty}$  follows from lemma 7.3 and (7.19). Moreover, the estimate for  $\|r^2\partial_v\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi\|$  follows from

$$r^2\partial_v\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi \leq r\partial_v(r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi) - \lambda r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi \quad (7.20)$$

and  $\lambda \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)$ . Note that here we use the smallness of  $s$  with respect to  $\alpha$  to conclude that  $3/2 - B_\alpha s > 1$ .

We prove (7.19) by induction on  $\alpha$ . When  $\alpha = 0$ , (7.19) is an immediate consequence of lemma 7.6 applied to  $\varphi$ . Now suppose that  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  and (7.19) holds for multi-indices  $< \alpha$  with the exponent  $B_\alpha = B_{<\alpha} + 1$ . We want to show that (7.19) holds for the multi-index  $\alpha$ .

Fix a point  $(u, v)$  at which we want to estimate  $|\partial_v(rL\varphi)|$ . By lemmas 7.2 and 7.6, we have

$$|\partial_v(rL\varphi)| \leq r^{-3/2}C(\mathbf{b}_0)(\mathcal{D}_\alpha + \mathcal{E}_\alpha) + \int_1^u r\kappa(-\nu)|\Box\psi|(u', v) du'. \quad (7.21)$$

The estimate for  $|\Box L\varphi|$  in corollary 2.21 and the inequality  $\kappa \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^u r\kappa(-\nu)|\Box\psi|(u', v) du' &\leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) \underbrace{\int_1^u r^{-1+s}|U\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|(-\nu)(u', v) du'}_{:=\text{(I)}} \\ &+ C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) \underbrace{\int_1^u r^{-1+s}[|\partial_v(r\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi)| + |\partial_v\Gamma^{<\alpha}\varphi| + |\partial_v L\varphi|](-\nu)(u', v) du'}_{:=\text{(II)}} \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

Since  $r(u, v) \leq r(u', v)$  for all  $u' \in [1, u]$ , we have

$$(I) \leq \left( \int_{r(u,v)}^{r(1,v)} r^{-4+2s} dr \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_1^u r^2 (U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi)^2 (-\nu)(u', v) du' \right)^{1/2} \leq r^{-3/2+s}(u, v) \mathcal{E}_\alpha. \quad (7.23)$$

We now turn to term (II). Use  $|\partial_v \psi| \leq r^{-1} |\partial_v(r\psi)| + r^{-1} \lambda |\psi|$ , the induction hypothesis, and lemma 7.2 to get

$$\begin{aligned} (II) &\leq \int_1^u [r^{-1+s} |\partial_v(r\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi)| + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi| + r^{-2+s} |\partial_v(rL\varphi)|] (-\nu)(u', v) du' \\ &\leq \int_1^u [r^{-1-3/2+(B_{<\alpha}+1)s} C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha) + r^{-2+s} |\partial_v(rL\varphi)|] (-\nu)(u', v) du' \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha) r^{-3/2+(B_{<\alpha}+1)s}(u, v) + \int_1^u r^{-2+s} |\partial_v(rL\varphi)| (-\nu)(u', v) du'. \end{aligned} \quad (7.24)$$

By (7.21)–(7.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_v(rL\varphi)|(u, v) &\leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha) r^{-3/2+(B_{<\alpha}+1)s}(u, v) \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) \int_1^u r^{-2+2\eta_0} |\partial_v(rL\varphi)| (-\nu)(u', v) du'. \end{aligned} \quad (7.25)$$

Since  $r^{-3/2+(B_{<\alpha}+1)}(\cdot, v)$  is non-decreasing (in  $u$ ), Grönwall's inequality implies (7.19) with  $B_\alpha = B_{<\alpha} + 1$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.9.** *Let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \geq 0$ . For  $s > 0$  small enough depending on  $\alpha$ , we have*

$$\|rUL\varphi\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}) (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha). \quad (7.26)$$

*Proof. Step 1: Preliminary observation.* Observe that lemma 7.8 implies that for  $s$  small enough depending on  $\alpha$ , we have

$$r^{2s} |\partial_v(r\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi)|^2 \leq r^{-2} C(\mathfrak{b}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_{<\alpha}) (\mathfrak{D}_{<\alpha}^2 + \mathfrak{E}_{<\alpha}^2). \quad (7.27)$$

*Step 2.* We prove lemma 7.9 by induction on  $\alpha$ . When  $\alpha = 0$ , lemma 7.7 follows from lemma 7.9 (for  $\psi = \varphi$ ). Now suppose inductively that  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  and lemma 7.9 holds for all multi-indices  $< \alpha$ . Use lemma 7.7 (for  $\psi = L\varphi$ ), the estimate for  $UL\varphi \square L\varphi$  in (2.71), an  $r$ -weighted Young's inequality with  $\epsilon$ , the fact that  $\kappa, \kappa^{-1}, c_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}, r^{-1} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0)$ , the induction hypothesis, and (7.27) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &r^2 |UL\varphi|^2(u, v) + \int_1^v 2c_{\mathcal{H}} (UL\varphi)^2(u, v') dv' \\ &\leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha^2 + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha^2) + \epsilon \int_1^v (UL\varphi)^2(u, v') dv' \\ &\quad + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \epsilon) \int_1^v \left[ \frac{r^2}{\kappa} |\partial_v \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} r^{2s} |\partial_v(r\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi)|^2 + r^{2s} |U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 \right] dv' \\ &\leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha^2 + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha^2) + \epsilon \int_1^v (UL\varphi)^2(u, v') dv' + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \epsilon) \int_1^v \left[ \frac{r^2}{\kappa} |\partial_v \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-2+2s} (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha^2 + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha^2) \right] dv' \\ &\leq \epsilon \int_1^v (UL\varphi)^2(u, v') dv' + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}, \epsilon) (\mathfrak{D}_\alpha^2 + \mathfrak{E}_\alpha^2). \end{aligned} \quad (7.28)$$

To conclude, absorb the first term on the right to the left by taking  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough depending on  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ .  $\square$

## 8. ESTIMATES FOR DIFFERENTIATED GEOMETRIC QUANTITIES

The goal of this section is to establish the following result:

**Proposition 8.1** (Estimates for higher order geometric quantities). *For  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  and  $s > 0$  sufficiently small, we have*

$$C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_0, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}), \quad (8.1)$$

$$C(\mathfrak{B}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_0, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}), \quad (8.2)$$

$$C(r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_0, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}), \quad (8.3)$$

$$C(r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_0, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}). \quad (8.4)$$

*Proof.* Lemma 8.2 and propositions 8.4, 8.8 and 8.13 imply that for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  we have

$$C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_0, \mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1+\eta_0}), \quad (8.5)$$

$$C(\mathfrak{B}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,1}), \quad (8.6)$$

$$C(r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}), \quad (8.7)$$

$$C(r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_\alpha) \leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,2-s+\eta_0}). \quad (8.8)$$

Substitute (8.5) into (8.6) and substitute (8.6) and (8.7) into (8.8) and induct on  $\alpha$  to obtain (8.1)–(8.4).  $\square$

**8.1. Preliminary estimate for schematic geometric quantities.** To estimate the geometric quantities  $\mathbf{b}_\alpha$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}_\alpha$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ , and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$ , it is enough to estimate the zeroth order geometric quantities (which has been done in section 4) and estimate derivatives of  $\varpi$ ,  $\log \kappa$ , and  $\log(-\gamma)$ .

**Lemma 8.2.** *For  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha) &\leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_0, \mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, r^{-1} \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \varpi, \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log \kappa, \mathbf{1}_{\beta_U > 0} r \Gamma^\beta \log \kappa|_{\beta \leq \alpha}, \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log(-\gamma)), \\ C(\mathfrak{B}_\alpha) &\leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_0, \mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, v \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log \kappa, r \Gamma^{\leq\alpha+U} \log \kappa, r \tau \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log(-\gamma)), \\ C(r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha) &\leq C(\alpha, \mathbf{b}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \varpi, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} r^{1-s} \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log(-\gamma)), \\ C(r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_\alpha) &\leq C(\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_{\leq\alpha}, r^{-s} \Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \varpi, r^{1-s} \tau \mathbf{1}_{\beta_U > 0} \Gamma^\beta \log \kappa|_{\beta \leq \alpha}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.9)$$

The proof is provided at the end of the section.

**Lemma 8.3.** *Let  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , and let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . We have*

$$Lr =_s \mathcal{O}(1)r, \quad (8.10)$$

$$Lv - \mathbf{1}_{|\alpha|=\alpha_S} v =_s (\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1} \mathfrak{B}_0)[1 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_S > 0} (-v + u + r)], \quad (8.11)$$

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} Lu =_s (\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1} \mathfrak{B}_0)[1 + \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_S > 0} \{\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v\}], \quad (8.12)$$

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} L(-v + u + r) =_s \Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1} \mathfrak{B}_0. \quad (8.13)$$

*Proof.* First, (8.10) follows from the calculation (2.21). For the remaining estimates, we use an inductive argument.

*Step 1: The case  $|\alpha| = 1$ .* We first establish (8.11)–(8.13) for the case  $|\alpha| = 1$ .

*Step 1a: Proof of (8.11) when  $|\alpha| = 1$ .* We need to control  $Uv$ ,  $Vv$ , and  $Sv - v$ . A computation reveals

$$Uv = 0 \quad Vv = \chi + (1 - \chi)\lambda^{-1} \quad Sv - v = (1 - \chi)((-v + u + r) - r(1 - \lambda^{-1}) - \frac{u}{\kappa}(\kappa - (-\gamma))). \quad (8.14)$$

It follows that

$$Dv =_s \mathbf{b}_0 \quad Sv - v =_s \mathfrak{B}_0[1 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} (-v + u + r)]. \quad (8.15)$$

*Step 1b: Proof of (8.12) when  $|\alpha| = 1$ .* We need to control  $Uu$ ,  $Vu$ , and  $Su$ . We compute

$$Uu = \frac{1}{(-v)} \quad Vu = \chi \frac{\kappa}{(-\gamma)} \quad Su = \chi v \frac{\kappa}{(-\gamma)} + (1 - \chi)u \quad (8.16)$$

It follows that

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} Du =_s \mathbf{b}_0 \quad \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} Su =_s \mathbf{b}_0 \{\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v\}. \quad (8.17)$$



*Step 1c: Proof of (8.13) when  $|\alpha| = 1$ .* By (8.15) and (8.17) and  $Ur, Vr =_s \mathcal{O}(1)$  we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} D(-v + u - r) =_s \mathfrak{b}_0. \quad (8.18)$$

From (8.15) and the discussion that follows in Step 1a, we can express

$$Sv = v + (1 - \chi)(-v + u + r) + \mathcal{E} = \chi v + (1 - \chi)r + (1 - \chi)u + \mathcal{E} \quad (8.19)$$

for  $\mathcal{E} =_s \mathfrak{B}_0$ . Together with (8.17) and  $Sr = (1 - \chi)r$ , we compute

$$S(-v + u + r) = \frac{\chi v}{(-\gamma)}(\kappa - (-\gamma)) - \mathcal{E}. \quad (8.20)$$

It follows as in Step 1a that  $v(\kappa - (-\gamma)) =_s \mathfrak{B}_0$ . Since  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}(-\gamma)^{-1} =_s \mathfrak{b}_0$ , we get

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} S(-v + r + r) =_s \mathfrak{B}_0. \quad (8.21)$$

We conclude from (8.18) and (8.21) that (8.13) holds when  $|\alpha| = 1$ .

*Step 2: Inductive step.* Let  $|\alpha_1|, |\alpha_2| \geq 1$ , and let  $L_i \in \Gamma^{\alpha_i}$ . Write  $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ . Suppose that (8.11)–(8.13) hold for multi-indices  $\beta$  with  $1 \leq |\beta| < |\alpha|$ . We will show that they hold for  $L_1 L_2 \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . Recall that by definition  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \mathfrak{B}_0 =_s \mathfrak{B}_\alpha$ . Differentiating (8.11) for the multi-index  $\alpha_2$  by  $L_1 \in \Gamma^{\alpha_1}$  and using (8.11) for multi-indices  $\leq |\alpha_1|$  gives

$$L_1 L_2 v - \mathbf{1}_{(\alpha_2)_S = |\alpha_2|} L_1 v =_s (\Gamma^{\leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - 1} \mathfrak{B}_0)[1 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_S > 0}(-v + u + r)]. \quad (8.22)$$

Use (8.11) for  $L_1 \in \Gamma^{\alpha_1}$  to handle the second term on the left and use  $\mathbf{1}_{(\alpha_2)_S = |\alpha_2|} \mathbf{1}_{(\alpha_1)_S = |\alpha_1|} v = \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_S = |\alpha|}$  to conclude (8.11) for the multi-index  $\alpha$ . A consequence of (8.11) for the multi-index  $\alpha$  and the fact that  $r^{-1} =_s \mathcal{O}(1)$  is that

$$Lv =_s (\Gamma^{\leq \alpha - 1} \mathfrak{B}_0)\{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} u, v\}. \quad (8.23)$$

Differentiate (8.11) for the multi-index  $\alpha_2$  by  $L_1 \in \Gamma^{\alpha_1}$  and use (8.12) and (8.23) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha_1$  to conclude (8.12) for the multi-index  $\alpha$ . Finally, it is clear how to prove (8.13) inductively.  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 8.2.* Define

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_0 := \mathfrak{b}_0, \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_0 := \mathfrak{B}_0, \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_0 := \mathfrak{g}_0, \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_0 := \mathfrak{G}_0, \quad (8.24)$$

and for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , define the following schematic quantities that capture the top order terms in  $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha, \mathfrak{B}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ , and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$ :

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_\alpha := \mathcal{O}_\alpha(r^{-1} \Gamma^\alpha \varpi, \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa, \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_U > 0} r \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa, \Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)), \quad (8.25)$$

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_\alpha := \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} u, v\} \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa, r \Gamma^{\alpha+U} \log \kappa, \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} r u, v\} \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)), \quad (8.26)$$

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\alpha := \mathfrak{b}_\alpha \{1, \Gamma^\alpha \varpi, r \Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)\}, \quad (8.27)$$

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_\alpha := \mathfrak{B}_\alpha \{1, \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} r u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_*} v\} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_U > 0} \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa\}. \quad (8.28)$$

*Step 1: Relating the original schematic geometric quantities to the ones with tildes.* Observe that for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}_\alpha &= \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}, \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}, r^{-1} \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}, r^{-1} \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}), \\ \mathfrak{B}_\alpha &= \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}, \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}, r^{-1} \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}, r^{-1} \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}), \\ \mathfrak{g}_\alpha &= \mathfrak{b}_\alpha \{1, \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}, \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{\beta+\beta' < \alpha}\}, \\ \mathfrak{G}_\alpha &= \mathfrak{B}_\alpha \{1, \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}, \Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.29)$$

This can be seen from the definitions of the original and tilded quantities and the consequence of the chain rule that  $\Gamma^\alpha f =_s \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log f, f, f^{-1})$  for any positive function  $f$ .

*Step 2.* We claim that

$$\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha} =_s \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{\leq \alpha}), \quad (8.30)$$

$$\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha} =_s \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}), \quad (8.31)$$

$$\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha} =_s \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}_{\leq \alpha}) \{1, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\leq \alpha}\}, \quad (8.32)$$

$$\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{\beta'} |_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha} =_s \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}) \{1, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{\leq \alpha}\}. \quad (8.33)$$

*Step 2a: Proof of (8.30) and (8.32).* This follows from (8.10) and differentiating  $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_0 = \mathbf{b}_0$  (see (2.34)) in the case  $\beta' = 0$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\beta'}$  (see (8.25)) in the case  $|\beta'| > 0$ . The proof of (8.32) is similar.

*Step 2b: Proof of (8.31) and (8.33).* Differentiate  $\mathfrak{B}_0$  from (2.36) use (8.11)–(8.13) to control the differentiated weights  $r$ ,  $u$ , and  $v$ , and use (8.30) to arrive at

$$\Gamma^\alpha \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_0 =_s \Gamma^\alpha \mathfrak{B}_0 =_s \mathcal{O}(\Gamma^\alpha \mathbf{b}_0, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \mathfrak{B}_0, \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}) =_s \mathcal{O}(\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \mathfrak{B}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}) \quad (8.34)$$

Differentiate (8.26) and use (8.11)–(8.13) to get

$$\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\beta'}|_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha, |\beta'| > 0} =_s \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \mathfrak{B}_0, \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}). \quad (8.35)$$

Combine (8.34) and (8.35) with (8.30) for  $\beta' = 0$  to conclude

$$\Gamma^\beta \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\beta'}|_{\beta+\beta' \leq \alpha} =_s \mathcal{O}(\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \mathfrak{B}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}). \quad (8.36)$$

To prove (8.31), induct on  $\alpha$  with trivial base case  $\alpha = 0$  and inductive step given by (8.36). The proof of (8.33) is similar.

*Step 3: Completing the proof.* The results of Steps 1 and 2 imply that for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_\alpha &= \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{< \alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}), \\ \mathfrak{B}_\alpha &= \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}), \\ \mathfrak{g}_\alpha &= \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\leq \alpha}) \{1, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{< \alpha}\}, \\ \mathfrak{G}_\alpha &= \mathcal{O}_\alpha(\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_{\leq \alpha}) \{1, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\leq \alpha}, \tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_{\leq \alpha}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.37)$$

It is immediate from (8.25) and (8.27) that for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_\alpha) &\leq C(r^{-1} \Gamma^\alpha \varpi, \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa, \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_U > 0} r \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa, \Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)), \\ C(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\alpha) &\leq C(\mathbf{b}_\alpha)(1 + |\Gamma^\alpha \varpi| + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} |r \Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)|), \end{aligned} \quad (8.38)$$

Since  $\eta_0 < 1/2$  and  $G_{\eta_0} \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0)$ , applying lemma 4.3 to (8.26) and (8.28) implies that for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(\tilde{\mathfrak{B}}_\alpha) &\leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0, v \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa, r \Gamma^{\alpha+U} \log \kappa, r \tau \Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)), \\ C(\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}_\alpha) &\leq C(\mathfrak{B}_\alpha)(1 + |r \tau \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_U > 0} \Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa|). \end{aligned} \quad (8.39)$$

To complete the proof of lemma 8.2, combine (8.37) with (8.38) and (8.39).  $\square$

## 8.2. Estimates for $\Gamma^\alpha \varpi$ .

**Proposition 8.4** (Estimate for  $\Gamma^\alpha \varpi$ ). *For  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\max(r^{-s-\eta_0}, \tau^{-s-\eta_0}) |\Gamma^\alpha \varpi| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_{< \alpha}) \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2. \quad (8.40)$$

*Proof. Step 1: Formula for  $\Gamma^\alpha \varpi$ .* Let  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ . We begin by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^\alpha \varpi &= \mathbf{b}_{\leq \alpha-1} [r^2 D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \varphi D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \varphi + r^2 \{1, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v, v/r\} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi \\ &\quad + r^2 \{1, r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, v\} V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.41)$$

*Step 1a:  $|\alpha| = 1$ .* In this step we compute  $U\varpi$ ,  $V\varpi$ , and  $S\varpi$ . Use the transport equation for  $\varpi$  in the  $u$ -direction (see (2.12)) to get

$$U\varpi = \mathbf{b}_0 r^2 (U\varphi)^2. \quad (8.42)$$

The transport equation for  $\varpi$  in the  $v$ -direction (see (2.12)) and the identities in lemma 2.11 relating the  $(U, \partial_v)$  derivatives and the  $(U, V)$  derivatives give

$$V\varpi = \mathbf{b}_0 [r^2 (V\varphi)^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} r^2 V\varphi U\varphi + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} r^2 (U\varphi)^2]. \quad (8.43)$$

Finally, we express  $S$  in terms of  $U$  and  $V$  using (2.49), and then use (8.42) and (8.43) to compute

$$\begin{aligned} S\varpi &= \mathbf{b}_0 [\{1, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v\} U\varpi + \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, v\} V\varpi] \\ &= \mathbf{b}_0 [r^2 \{1, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v\} D\varphi D\varphi + r^2 \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, v\} (V\varphi)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.44)$$

Combining (8.42)–(8.44) gives (8.41) for  $|\alpha| = 1$ .

*Step 1b:*  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ . The following consequences of lemma 8.3 hold for all  $|\beta| \geq 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^\beta \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, v\} &= {}_s \mathfrak{B}_{\leq \beta-1} \{r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, v\}, \\ \Gamma^\beta \{\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v\} &= {}_s \mathfrak{B}_{\leq \beta-1} \{1, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v\}, \\ \Gamma^\beta (v/r) &= {}_s \mathfrak{B}_{\leq \beta-1} \{1, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u/r, v/r\}.\end{aligned}\tag{8.45}$$

Indeed, the first two lines follow directly from lemma 8.3, and the third line follows from the first. Differentiate (8.41) for a multi-index  $\alpha_2$  of size 1 by  $\Gamma^{\alpha_1}$ , and then use (8.45) and the commutation formulas (2.58) and (2.59) to conclude (8.41) for the multi-index  $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ . By induction, we have established (8.41) for all  $\alpha \geq 1$ . The reason for the weight  $v/r$  in front of general derivatives of  $\varpi$  (which does not appear when  $\alpha = 1$ ) is because the weight  $v$  appears in front of derivatives starting with  $V$ , and commuting  $\Gamma^\alpha$  past  $V$  (in the third term) can produce derivatives starting with  $U$ , but only with an  $r$ -weight that decays faster than  $r^{-1}$ .

*Step 2: Completing the proof.* It follows from lemma 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}\{1, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} v, v/r\} &\lesssim \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq v/2} v \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0)\tau, \\ \{1, r, \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} u, v\} &\leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0)v.\end{aligned}\tag{8.46}$$

Applying (8.46) to (8.41) (and noting  $\alpha > 0$ ) gives

$$|\Gamma^\alpha \varpi| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_{< \alpha}) [r^2 |D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-1} \varphi|^2 + r^2 \tau |D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi|^2 + r^2 v |V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi|^2].\tag{8.47}$$

To complete the proof, note that the first term of (8.47) appears in  $\mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2$ . Control the  $v$ -weight on the final term by  $\tau + r$  (see lemma 4.3). This produces a term in the form of the second term and a new term  $r^3 |V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi|^2$  that is controlled by  $C(R_\bullet, \mathbf{b}_0) \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2 \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0) \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2$ . The remaining term  $r^2 \tau |D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi|^2$  is of the form  $r^2 \tau |\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2$ , which is controlled by  $r^{s+\eta_0} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2$ , or by  $\tau^{s+\eta_0} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2$ .  $\square$

**8.3. Estimates for  $\Gamma^\alpha \kappa$ .** The main result of this section is proposition 8.8, whose proof we now outline. The gauge condition on  $v$  normalizes  $\log \kappa = 0$  on the curve  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$ . In particular, derivatives of  $\kappa$  involving only  $V$  or  $S$  vanish on this curve, since in the region  $\{r \leq r_{\mathcal{H}} \leq R_\bullet\}$ , the vector fields  $V$  and  $S$  are tangent to curves of constant  $r$ . We estimate  $\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa$  by computing  $U\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa$  with the  $U$ -transport equation for  $\log \kappa$  in lemma 8.6 and integrating towards  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$  in proposition 8.8. In the case where  $\alpha_U > 0$ , we can rearrange  $\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa = U\Gamma^{\alpha-U} \log \kappa$  and use the  $U$ -transport equation directly, without integrating it.

**Lemma 8.5.** *We have*

$$|S\psi| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0)(\tau|U\psi| + v|V\psi|)\tag{8.48}$$

and

$$|V\psi| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0)(v^{-1}|S\psi| + |U\psi|).\tag{8.49}$$

*Proof.* We omit the computation.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.6** (Estimates for  $U\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa$ ). *Let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$  for  $|\alpha| \geq 0$ . For sufficiently small  $s > 0$ , we have*

$$|UL \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [r |U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-2} \tau^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 1}^2 + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa|],\tag{8.50}$$

and if  $\alpha_V + \alpha_S > 0$ , then

$$|UL \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [rv |U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-3} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 1}^2 + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa|].\tag{8.51}$$

*Proof. Step 0: Controlling the commutator  $[U, L]\psi$ .* Let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . We claim that

$$|[U, L]f| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [|U\Gamma^{< \alpha} f| + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} f|].\tag{8.52}$$

By (2.57), we have

$$|[U, L]f| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [|U\Gamma^{< \alpha} f| + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} f| + r^{-1+s} |V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} f|].\tag{8.53}$$

Use (8.49) and lemma 4.3 to control the last term by the first two terms.

*Step 1: Preliminary estimate for  $|UL \log \kappa|$ .* We show by induction on  $\alpha$  that

$$|UL \log \kappa| \leq r |LU\varphi| |U\varphi| + C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [r |U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-3+2s} |\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa|].\tag{8.54}$$

When  $\alpha = 0$ , (8.54) follows from the equation  $U \log \kappa = -r(U\varphi)^2$ . For the inductive step, use (8.52), the equation for  $U\kappa$ , the estimate  $|\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} r| \leq C_\alpha r$ , and (8.50) for multi-indices  $< \alpha$  to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |UL \log \kappa| &\leq |LU \log \kappa| + |[U, L] \log \kappa| \leq |L(r(U\varphi)^2)| + C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha})[|U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \log \kappa| + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa|] \\ &\leq (\text{RHS of (8.54)}). \end{aligned} \tag{8.55}$$

*Step 2: Proof of (8.50).* Use Young's inequality and (8.52) on the first term in (8.54), and control the term involving  $|\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2$  using the pointwise norm defined in section 2.7.

*Step 3: Proof of (8.51).* In Steps 3ab we show that if  $\alpha_V + \alpha_S > 0$ , we have

$$|LU\varphi| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha})[v|U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| + r^{-2+s} v|\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| + |V\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|]. \tag{8.56}$$

In Step 3c we deduce (8.51) from (8.56).

*Step 3a: Proof of (8.56) when  $\alpha_V > 0$ .* Use lemma 2.17 to bring  $V$  to the end of  $L$ , then use the wave equation (2.63) and the commutation formulas (2.57) and (2.59) to get

$$LU\varphi =_s \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} VU\varphi =_s \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} (\mathfrak{b}_0[D\varphi + U^2\varphi]) + \mathcal{C}_{< \alpha} D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} \varphi =_s \mathcal{C}_{< \alpha} [U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi + V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} \varphi]. \tag{8.57}$$

*Step 3b: Proof of (8.56) when  $\alpha_S > 0$ .* First, (8.52) implies that

$$V\Gamma^{\alpha - S} U\varphi =_s \Gamma^{< \alpha} U\varphi =_s C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha})[U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi + r^{-2+s} \Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi], \tag{8.58}$$

Now use lemma 2.17 to bring  $S$  to the front of  $L$ , (8.48) to rewrite  $S$  in terms of  $U$  and  $V$ , and (8.58) to rewrite  $V\Gamma^{\alpha - S} U\varphi$ , and hence obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |LU\varphi| &\leq |S\Gamma^{\alpha - S} U\varphi| + C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha})|D\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha})[\tau|U\Gamma^{\alpha - S} U\varphi| + v|V\Gamma^{\alpha - S} U\varphi| + |D\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|] \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha})[v|U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| + r^{-2+s} v|\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi| + |V\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|]. \end{aligned} \tag{8.59}$$

*Step 3c: Deducing (8.51) from (8.56).* First, (8.56) and Young's inequality imply

$$r|LU\varphi||U\varphi| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha})[rv|U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-3+2s} v|\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r|V\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2]. \tag{8.60}$$

Combine (8.54) and (8.60) to get

$$|UL \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha})[rv|U\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-3+2s} v|\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r|V\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa|]. \tag{8.61}$$

We have the pointwise estimates

$$r^{-3+2s} v|\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 \leq \mathbf{1}_{r \leq v/2} r^{-4+2s} \tau^{-1} v \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 1}^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq v/2} r^{-5+2s} v \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2 \leq C(\mathcal{B}_0) r^{-4+2s} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 1}^2 \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}) r^{-3} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 1}^2, \tag{8.62}$$

where we used lemma 4.3 and  $s < 1/2$ , and

$$r|V\Gamma^{< \alpha} \varphi|^2 \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0, R_\bullet) r^{-3} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2 \leq C(\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha}) r^{-3} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 1}^2. \tag{8.63}$$

Substitute (8.62) and (8.63) into (8.61) to obtain (8.51).  $\square$

Before we integrate lemma 8.6 towards  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$ , we introduce an integration lemma.

**Lemma 8.7.** *We have*

$$\int_u^\infty \frac{r}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u', v) du' \leq v^{-1} C(\mathfrak{B}_0) \mathcal{E}_1[\psi]^2. \tag{8.64}$$

*Proof.* Fix  $(u, v)$ . Define  $u_* \in [u, \infty)$  so that  $r(u_*, v) = v/2$  if such a  $u_*$  exists, and otherwise set  $u_* = u$ . Split the integration range as  $[u, \infty) = [u, u_*] \cup [u_*, \infty)$ . The  $r$ -weight in the energy  $\mathcal{E}[\psi]^2$  is one power stronger than in the integral on the left of (8.64), so by the monotonicity of  $r$  we gain one power of decay in  $r(u_*, v)$  when integrating over  $[u, u_*]$ . The energy  $\mathcal{E}_p[\psi]^2$  controls the integral over  $[u_*, \infty)$  with a weight  $\tau(u_*, v)$ , which is comparable to  $v$  by lemma 4.3. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_u^\infty \frac{r}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u', v) du' &= r^{-1}(u_*, v) \int_u^{u_*} \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u', v) du' + r_{\min}^{-1} \int_{u_*}^\infty \frac{r^2}{(-\nu)} (\partial_u \psi)^2(u', v) du' \\ &\leq 2v^{-1} \mathcal{E}[\psi]^2 + r_{\min}^{-1} \tau^{-1}(u_*, v) E_1[\psi]^2 \leq v^{-1} C(\mathfrak{B}_0) \mathcal{E}_1[\psi]^2. \end{aligned} \tag{8.65}$$

$\square$

**Proposition 8.8** (Estimates for  $\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa$ ). *Let  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , and let  $s > 0$  be sufficiently small. We have decay estimates for order- $\alpha$  derivatives of  $\log \kappa$  when norms of  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi$  are bounded:*

$$v|\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})(\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,1}^2), \quad (8.66)$$

$$r^{1-s-\eta_0} \tau |\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})(\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,2-s}^2) \quad \text{if } \alpha_U > 0, \quad (8.67)$$

$$r|\Gamma^{\alpha+U} \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})(\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,1}^2), \quad (8.68)$$

Moreover, order- $\alpha$  derivatives of  $\log \kappa$  are bounded if lower order derivatives of  $\varphi$  are:

$$|\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})(\mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1}^2). \quad (8.69)$$

$$r|\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})(\mathcal{E}_{<\alpha,1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1}^2) \quad \text{if } \alpha_U > 0. \quad (8.70)$$

*Proof.* In Step 1, we establish a preliminary estimate. In Step 2, we use Step 1 and lemma 8.6 to show (8.66). In Step 3, we prove (8.69). In Step 4 we use the results of the previous steps to show (8.67), (8.68) and (8.70).

*Step 1: Estimate for  $\Gamma^{\alpha+U} \log \kappa$  in terms of  $\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa$ .* Use lemma 2.16 to move the  $U$  in  $\Gamma^{\alpha+U}$  to the front, and then use (8.50) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma^{\alpha+U} \log \kappa| &\leq C(\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})[|U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa| + r^{-1+s}|V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-V} \log \kappa|] \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})[r|U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-2}\tau^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,1}^2 + r^{-1+s}|\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa|]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.71)$$

*Step 2: Proof of (8.66).* We will write, for example,  $(8.66)_{\leq \alpha}$  to mean the collection of statements  $(8.66)_\beta$  for multi-indices  $\beta$  such that  $\beta \leq \alpha$  and  $|\beta| \geq 1$ . In Step 2a, we show that Step 1 reduces us to estimating  $U \log \kappa$  and  $\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa$  for  $\alpha_U = 0$ . The first case (Step 2b) is easy, and in the second case (Step 2c), we can integrate lemma 8.6 to  $\{r = R_0\}$ , since  $\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa$  vanishes there when  $\alpha_U = 0$ .

*Step 2a: Proof that  $(8.66)_{\leq \alpha}$  implies  $(8.66)_{\leq \alpha+nU}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ .* By induction on  $n$ , it is enough to obtain the conclusion  $(8.66)_{\leq \alpha+U}$ . Since  $\beta \leq \alpha + U$  if and only if  $\beta = \alpha$  or  $\beta = \beta' + U$  for some  $\beta' \leq \alpha$ , we reduce to showing that  $(8.66)_{\leq \alpha}$  implies  $(8.66)_{\alpha+U}$ . This follows from substituting  $(8.66)_{\leq \alpha}$  into (8.71) and using

$$r|U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 \leq \mathbf{1}_{r \leq v/2} \tau^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha+U,1}^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq v/2} r^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,0}^2 \leq v^{-1} C(\mathfrak{B}_0) \mathcal{P}_{\alpha+U,1}^2. \quad (8.72)$$

and lemma 4.3 and  $s < 1$ .

*Step 2b: Proof of  $(8.66)_\alpha$  for  $\alpha = U$ .* The transport equation for  $\log \kappa$  is  $U \log \kappa = -r(U\varphi)^2$ . To complete the proof, control the right side by  $v^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{U,1}^2$  as in (8.72).

*Step 2c: Proof of  $(8.66)_\alpha$  if  $\alpha_U = 0$ .* Fix  $(u, v)$ . Write  $r_0 = r(u, v)$ . Integrate (8.50) to  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$ , noting that  $L \log \kappa|_{\{r=r_{\mathcal{H}}\}} = 0$  because  $\alpha_U = 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |L \log \kappa|(r = r_0, v) &\leq C(\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}) \left[ \underbrace{\int_{\min(r_0, r_{\mathcal{H}})}^{\max(r_0, r_{\mathcal{H}})} r |U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 dr}_{:=\text{(I)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \underbrace{\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,1}^2 \int_{r_{\mathcal{H}}}^{r_0} r^{-2} \tau^{-1} dr}_{:=\text{(II)}} + \int_{\min(r_0, r_{\mathcal{H}})}^{\max(r_0, r_{\mathcal{H}})} r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa| dr \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.73)$$

Terms (I) and (II) decay like  $v^{-1}$ . Indeed, for term (I), use lemma 8.7, and for term (II), split the integral into the regions  $r \leq v/2$  and  $r \geq v/2$  and use lemma 4.3. Thus

$$|L \log \kappa|(r = r_0, v) \leq v^{-1} C(\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha})(\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha,1}^2) + C(\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}) \int_{\min(r_0, r_{\mathcal{H}})}^{\max(r_0, r_{\mathcal{H}})} r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log \kappa| dr. \quad (8.74)$$

Sum over  $L \in \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}$  and apply Grönwall's inequality (noting that  $s < 1$ ) and recall the definition of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  (see (2.43)) to complete the proof.

*Step 2d: Completing the proof by induction.* Let  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , and suppose we have shown  $(8.66)_{<\alpha}$ . Write  $\alpha = \beta + nU$  for  $|\beta| \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 0$  maximal. Then either  $\beta = U$  or  $\beta_U = 0$ , so by Step 2b or Step 2c

we obtain (8.66)<sub>β</sub>. Together with the induction hypothesis, this implies (8.66)<sub>≤β</sub>, so Step 2a now implies (8.66)<sub>≤β+nU</sub> = (8.66)<sub>≤α</sub>, which completes the induction.

*Step 3: Proof of (8.69).* Follow Step 2, but instead integrate (8.51) (which contains only lower order norms on the right side, as opposed to (8.50)) as in Step 2c. We omit the details.

*Step 4: Proof of (8.67), (8.68) and (8.70) from (8.66) and (8.69).* Let  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  satisfy  $\alpha_U > 0$ . Start with (8.71) to obtain

$$|\Gamma^\alpha \log \kappa| \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{<\alpha})[r|U\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-U}\varphi|^2 + r^{-2}\tau^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{<\alpha,1} + r^{-1+s}|\Gamma^{<\alpha} \log \kappa|]. \quad (8.75)$$

To show (8.67) estimate

$$|U\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-U}\varphi|^2 \leq |\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|^2 \leq r^{-2+s+\eta_0}\tau^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,2-s}^2 \quad (8.76)$$

and use (8.66) to control  $|\Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log \kappa|$ . The same argument establishes (8.68) and (8.70), but we estimate  $|U\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|$  (resp.  $U\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-U}$ ) by  $r^{-1}\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,0}$  instead.  $\square$

**8.4. Estimates for  $\Gamma^\alpha(-\gamma)$ .** The main result of this section is proposition 8.13. The gauge condition on  $u$  normalizes  $\log(-\gamma) = 0$  on  $\mathcal{I}$ . In fact,  $\Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma) = 0$  on  $\mathcal{I}$  for all  $\alpha$ , which we establish as part of the proof of proposition 8.13. To complete estimates in which we integrate the transport equation for  $\Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)$  (see lemma 8.10) to  $\mathcal{I}$ , we first formulate a variant of Grönwall's inequality.

**Lemma 8.9** (Grönwall inequality on half-infinite interval). *Let  $I = [t_0, \infty)$ . Suppose  $f, g, h : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  are continuous functions such that  $f$  is bounded,  $g$  is non-increasing,  $h$  is non-negative and integrable on  $I$ , and*

$$f(t) \leq g(t) + \int_t^\infty h(s)f(s) \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in I. \quad (8.77)$$

Then

$$f(t) \leq g(t) \exp\left(\int_t^\infty h(s) \, ds\right) \quad \text{for } t \in I. \quad (8.78)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $h \in L^1$  and  $f \in L^\infty$ , we have  $hf \in L^1$ , so there is  $T > t_0$  such that  $|\int_T^\infty hf| \leq \epsilon$ . The assumption now implies

$$f(t) \leq (g(t) + \epsilon) + \int_t^T h(s)f(s) \, ds \quad (8.79)$$

for  $t \in [t_0, T]$ . The usual Grönwall inequality (after a change of variables  $t \mapsto T - t$ ) and the non-negativity of  $h$  give

$$f(t) \leq (g(t) + \epsilon) \exp\left(\int_t^T h(s) \, ds\right) \leq (g(t) + \epsilon) \exp\left(\int_t^\infty h(s) \, ds\right). \quad (8.80)$$

We are done since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.10** (Estimate for  $\bar{\partial}_r L \log(-\gamma)$ ). *Let  $|\alpha| \geq 0$  and let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . We have*

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} |\bar{\partial}_r L \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s})[r|\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|^2 + r^{-3+2s}|\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi|^2 + r^{-2+s}|\Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log(-\gamma)|]. \quad (8.81)$$

*Proof. Step 1: Computing the commutator  $[\bar{\partial}_r, L]$ .* We have

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} [\bar{\partial}_r, L] = {}_s\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{b}_\alpha, r^{-s}\mathbf{g}_{<\alpha})[\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{<\alpha} + r^{-2+s}\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}] \quad (8.82)$$

We omit the proof, but the argument is an induction with base case lemma 2.13. A similar argument is done in detail in the proof of (A.27).

*Step 2: Proof of the desired lemma 8.10.* It is enough to show

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \bar{\partial}_r L \log(-\gamma) = {}_s\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}[r\{\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi, r^{-2+s}\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi\}^2 + r^{-2+s}\Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log(-\gamma)]. \quad (8.83)$$

When  $|\alpha| = 0$ , (8.83) follows from the equation  $\bar{\partial}_r \log(-\gamma) = r(\bar{\partial}_r \varphi)^2$ . From this equation and (8.82), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_r L \log(-\gamma) &= L\bar{\partial}_r \log(-\gamma) + [\bar{\partial}_r, L] \log(-\gamma) \\ &= {}_s\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s}[r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\bar{\partial}_r \varphi \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\bar{\partial}_r \varphi + \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{<\alpha} \log(-\gamma) + r^{-2+s}\Gamma^{\leq\alpha} \log(-\gamma)]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.84)$$

To complete the inductive proof of (8.83) for  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ , use (8.82) for the first term on the right of (8.84) and for the second term use (8.83) for multi-indices  $< \alpha$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.11** (Estimate for  $\partial_u^n \log(-\gamma)$ ). *Let  $n \geq 0$ . We have*

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} |\partial_u^n \log(-\gamma)| \leq r^{-2} C(\mathbf{b}_{U < n}) \mathcal{P}_{U < n, 0}^2. \quad (8.85)$$

*Proof. Step 1: Computing  $\partial_v \partial_u^n \varphi$ .* We claim that for  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\partial_v \partial_u^n \varphi =_s r^{-1} \mathcal{O}(\partial_u^{\leq n} \lambda, \partial_u^{\leq n} (-\nu)) [\partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n} \varphi + \partial_v \varphi]. \quad (8.86)$$

When  $n = 1$ , this follows from the wave equation,

$$\partial_v \partial_u \varphi = \kappa(-\nu) \square \varphi + r^{-1} (-\lambda \partial_u \varphi + (-\nu) \partial_v \varphi) = r^{-1} (-\lambda \partial_u \varphi + (-\nu) \partial_v \varphi), \quad (8.87)$$

and the inductive step follows since  $\partial_u r^{-1} = r^{-1} \cdot r^{-1} (-\nu)$ .

*Step 2: Estimating  $\partial_v \partial_u^n \log(-\gamma)$ .* We show that for  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} |\partial_v \partial_u^n \log(-\gamma)| \leq r^{-3} C(\mathbf{b}_{U < n}) \mathcal{P}_{U < n, 0}^2. \quad (8.88)$$

We first show that

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \partial_v \partial_u^n \log(-\gamma) =_s \mathbf{b}_{U < n} [r^{-1} \partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n} \varphi \partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n} \varphi + \partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n} \varphi \partial_v \varphi + (\partial_v \varphi)^2]. \quad (8.89)$$

For the case  $n = 1$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u \partial_v \log(-\gamma) &= \partial_u (\lambda^{-1} r (\partial_v \varphi)^2) \\ &= (-\nu) \lambda^{-1} (\partial_v \varphi)^2 - 2r^{-1} \lambda^{-1} \kappa(-\nu) (\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r) (\partial_v \varphi)^2 + \partial_u \varphi \partial_v \varphi + (-\nu) \lambda^{-1} (\partial_v \varphi)^2 \\ &= {}_s \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}, (-\nu), \kappa, r^{-1} \varpi) [\partial_u \varphi \partial_v \varphi + (\partial_v \varphi)^2], \end{aligned} \quad (8.90)$$

so that

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \partial_u \partial_v \log(-\gamma) =_s \mathbf{b}_0 [\partial_u \varphi \partial_v \varphi + (\partial_v \varphi)^2]. \quad (8.91)$$

For the inductive step, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \partial_v \partial_u \log(-\gamma) &= {}_s \partial_u^{\leq 1} \mathbf{b}_{U < n} [r^{-1} \partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n+1} \varphi \partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n+1} \varphi + \partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n+1} \varphi \partial_v \varphi \\ &\quad + (\partial_v \varphi)^2 + \partial_u \partial_u^{\leq n+1} \varphi \partial_u \partial_v \varphi + \partial_u \partial_v \varphi \partial_v \varphi]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.92)$$

The first three terms are of the desired form. For the last two terms, use the wave equation (8.87). Since  $\partial_u = (-\nu)U$ , the statement (8.89) follows.

The statements

$$\partial_u^n =_s \mathcal{O}(U^{<n}(-\nu)) U U^{<n} \quad \lambda, (-\nu), \partial_u \lambda =_s \mathcal{O}(r^{-1} \varpi, \kappa, (-\gamma)) \quad (8.93)$$

follow from an induction argument starting from  $\partial_u = (-\nu)U$  and from the equation for  $\partial_u \lambda$ , respectively. Apply (8.93) to (8.89) to get

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \partial_v \partial_u^n \log(-\gamma) =_s \mathbf{b}_{U < n} [r^{-1} U U^{<n} \varphi U U^{<n} \varphi + U U^{<n} \varphi \partial_v \varphi + (\partial_v \varphi)^2]. \quad (8.94)$$

The desired (8.88) now follows from the definition of the pointwise norm.

*Step 3: Showing  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \partial_u^n \log(-\gamma)(u, v) = 0$ .* Let  $n \geq 1$ . We show that a boundedness statement  $C(\mathbf{b}_{U < n}) \mathcal{P}_{U < n, 0}^2 < \infty$  implies the qualitative result  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \partial_u^{\leq n} \log(-\gamma)(u, v) = 0$ . The hypothesis together with Step 2 implies that  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} |\partial_v \partial_u^{\leq n} \log(-\gamma)|$  is integrable in  $v$  towards infinity (uniformly on compact subsets of  $u$ ), and so  $\partial_u^{\leq n} \log(-\gamma)(u, v)$  converges uniformly as  $v \rightarrow \infty$  on compact subsets of  $u$ . A basic fact from real analysis is that if  $f : \mathbf{R}_{u, v}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is such that  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} f(u, v)$  exists and  $(\partial_u f)(u, v)$  converges uniformly as  $v \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\partial_u \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} f(u, v)$  exists and is equal to  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \partial_u f(u, v)$ . Since  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \log(-\gamma)(u, v) = 0$ , an induction argument completes the proof.

*Step 4: Completing the proof of lemma 8.11.* Let  $r(u, v) \geq R_0$ . Integrate (8.88) in  $v$  on  $[v, \infty)$ . The boundary term at infinity vanishes by Step 3c, so we conclude lemma 8.11.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.12.** *For  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} L =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{b}_{<\alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{<\alpha}) [\partial_u^{\leq |\alpha|} + \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S}] \quad (8.95)$$

*Proof.* We will in fact show that for a multi-index  $\alpha$  and a non-negative integer  $k$ , we can rewrite  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} L = \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) [\partial_u^{\leq k} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU} + \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S}]. \quad (8.96)$$

Schematically write  $\text{good}_{\alpha, k}$  for terms appearing on the right of (8.96) for the pair  $(\alpha, k)$ . The strategy is to induct on the pair  $(\alpha, k)$ .

*Step 1: Preliminary observations and base case.* Observe that (8.96) for  $(\alpha, 0)$  is trivial. Moreover, since  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU} = \{0\}$  when  $k \geq |\alpha|$ , we know (8.96) for  $(\alpha, |\alpha|)$  implies (8.96) for  $(\alpha, k)$  whenever  $k \geq |\alpha|$ .

We now prove (8.96) for pairs  $(\alpha, 1)$ . Let  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . Since  $L$  begins with either  $U$ ,  $V$ , or  $S$ , we have

$$L = {}_s U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U} + V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S}. \quad (8.97)$$

After rewriting the first derivative that makes up  $L$  using (2.45), (2.47) and (2.49), we get

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} L = {}_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathfrak{b}_0 [\partial_u \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U} + \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S}] = \text{good}_{\alpha, 1}. \quad (8.98)$$

as desired. We have used  $|\alpha| \geq 1$  to conclude  $\mathfrak{b}_0 = {}_s \mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}$ .

*Step 2: Inductive step.* Now suppose  $|\alpha| \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq k < |\alpha|$  and (8.96) holds for pairs  $(\beta, j)$  such that  $\beta < \alpha$  or such that  $\beta = \alpha$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k$ . We will show that (8.96) holds for the pair  $(\alpha, k+1)$ . First, (8.96) for the pair  $(\alpha, k)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} L &= {}_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) [\partial_u^{\leq k} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU} + \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - S}] \\ &= {}_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) \partial_u^{\leq k} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU} + \text{good}_{\alpha, k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.99)$$

Now use (8.96) for the pair  $(\alpha - kU, 1)$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} L &= {}_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) \\ &\quad \partial_u^{\leq k} [\mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - (k+1)U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - (k+1)U}) [\partial_u^{\leq 1} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - (k+1)U} + \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - V} + S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - S}]] \\ &\quad + \text{good}_{\alpha, k+1} \\ &= {}_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) (\partial_u^{\leq k} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - (k+1)U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - (k+1)U})) [\partial_u^{\leq k+1} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - (k+1)U} \\ &\quad + \partial_u^{\leq k} \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - V} + \partial_u^{\leq k} S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - S}] + \text{good}_{\alpha, k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.100)$$

Apply  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \partial_u^k = {}_s \mathfrak{b}_{U < k} U^{\leq k}$  (see (8.93)) and  $\mathfrak{b}_{U < k} = {}_s \mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}$  (which holds since  $k < |\alpha|$ ) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} L &= {}_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) [U^{\leq k} \bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - V} + U^{\leq k} S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - S}] + \text{good}_{\alpha, k+1} \\ &= {}_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) [[\bar{\partial}_r, U^{\leq k}] \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - V} + [S, U^{\leq k}] \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - S}] + \text{good}_{\alpha, k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.101)$$

We now compute the commutator terms associated to  $\bar{\partial}_r$  and to  $S$ . By (8.82), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} [\bar{\partial}_r, U^{\leq k}] \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - V} &= \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{kU}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_{< kU}) [\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) [\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - V} + \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}] = {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha, k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.102)$$

We can pass to the second line because  $kU \leq \alpha - U$  (since  $|\alpha| \geq k+1$  and  $(k+1)U$  is the smallest multi-index of order  $k+1$ ). In the final identity we used (8.96) for pairs  $(\alpha, k+1)$ .

Next, one can easily prove by induction on  $k$ , with base case  $k=1$  given by (2.55), that

$$[S, U^k] = {}_s \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq kU}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq kU}) \Gamma^{\leq (k-1)U + V}. \quad (8.103)$$

It follows that

$$[S, U^k] \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - kU - S} = {}_s \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq kU}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq kU}) \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - U - S + V} = {}_s \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{b}_{\leq \alpha - U}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\leq \alpha - U}) \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} = {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha, k+1}. \quad (8.104)$$

In the second last identity we used  $\alpha \geq kU$  (since  $|\alpha| \geq k+1$ ). In the final identity we used (8.96) for pairs  $(\alpha, k+1)$ .

Substitute (8.102) and (8.104) into (8.101) to establish (8.96) for  $(\alpha, k+1)$  and hence complete the induction.  $\square$

**Proposition 8.13** (Estimates for  $\Gamma^\alpha \log(-\gamma)$ ). *Let  $|\alpha| \geq 0$ . For  $s > 0$  sufficiently small, we have*

$$r\tau |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_\alpha, r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha) [\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 1}^2] \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R_0\}, \quad (8.105)$$

$$r^{1-s-\eta_0} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{< \alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [\mathcal{E}_{< \alpha, 1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2] \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R_0\}. \quad (8.106)$$



*Proof.* We first explain the logic of the proof. Consider the following auxiliary qualitative decay statement for a multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| \geq 0$ :

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} L \log(-\gamma)(u, v) = 0 \text{ for } L \in \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \text{ and } u \in [1, \infty). \quad (8.107)$$

To prove the quantitative decay estimates (8.105) and (8.106), we establish the following implications:

$$(8.107)_{< \alpha} \implies (8.105)_{< \alpha} \implies (8.106)_{\alpha} \implies (8.107)_{\alpha}.$$

That is, (8.107) for multi-indices  $< \alpha$  implies (8.105) for the multi-index  $\alpha$ , and so on. Since (8.107) holds when  $\alpha = 0$  by the normalization at  $\mathcal{I}$  of the  $u$ -coordinate, an induction argument establishes (8.105) and (8.106) for all multi-indices  $\alpha$ . The final implication is clear, so we prove the first two implications.

*Step 1: Proof that (8.107) $_{\alpha}$  implies (8.105) $_{\alpha}$ .* Let  $|\alpha| \geq 0$  and let  $L \in \Gamma^{\alpha}$ . By lemma 8.10 and the definition of the pointwise norm, we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} |\bar{\partial}_r L \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) [r |\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 + r^{-2} \tau^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 1}^2 + r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|]. \quad (8.108)$$

Fix  $(u, v)$  such that  $r(u, v) \geq R_0$  and integrate (8.108) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |L \log(-\gamma)|(u, v) &\leq \limsup_{v' \rightarrow \infty} |L \log(-\gamma)|(u, v') + \int_v^{\infty} |\bar{\partial}_r L \log(-\gamma)|(u, v') dv' \\ &\leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) \left[ \int_v^{\infty} r |\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2(u, v') dv' + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 1}^2 \int_v^{\infty} r^{-2} \tau^{-1}(u, v') dv' \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_v^{\infty} r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|(u, v') dv' \right] \\ &\leq r^{-1} \tau^{-1}(u, v) C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) (\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 1}^2) + C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) \int_v^{\infty} r^{-2+s} |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|(u, v') dv'. \end{aligned} \quad (8.109)$$

Sum over  $L \in \Gamma^{\alpha}$ , take  $s < 1$ , and use the Grönwall inequality in lemma 8.9 (which applies because of the assumed (8.107) $_{\alpha}$ ) to conclude

$$r \tau |L \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, s}) (\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 1}^2). \quad (8.110)$$

*Step 2: Proof that (8.105) $_{< \alpha}$  implies (8.106) $_{\alpha}$ .* To ease the notation, all estimates in this section will be done in the region  $\{r \geq R_0\}$ ; that is, all estimates should be understood to have an implicit  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}$  at the front of each term. It is enough to prove that

$$|L \log(-\gamma)| \leq r^{-1+s+\eta_0} C(\mathbf{b}_{< \alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [\mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2 + r \tau |\Gamma^{< \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|], \quad (8.111)$$

since the final term can be handled with (8.105) $_{< \alpha}$ . First, lemma 8.12 implies

$$|L \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_{< \alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha}) [|\partial_u^{\leq |\alpha|} \log(-\gamma)| + |\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-V} \log(-\gamma)| + |S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \log(-\gamma)|]. \quad (8.112)$$

Observe that the following three estimates together with (8.112) imply (8.111):

$$|\partial_u^{\leq |\alpha|} \log(-\gamma)| \leq r^{-2} C(\mathbf{b}_{< \alpha}) \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2 \quad (8.113)$$

$$|\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-V}| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_{< \alpha}) [r^{-3} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2 + r^{-2} \tau^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 1}^2 + r^{-2} |\Gamma^{< \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|] \quad (8.114)$$

$$|S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(\mathbf{b}_{< \alpha}) [r^{-1+s+\eta_0} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2 + \tau |\Gamma^{< \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|]. \quad (8.115)$$

Now (8.113) and (8.114) follow from lemma 8.11 and lemma 8.10, respectively. We now establish (8.115). Rewrite  $S$  in  $\{r \geq R_0\}$  using lemma 4.3 and (2.47) and (2.49), and then use lemma 8.10:

$$\begin{aligned} |S \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \log(-\gamma)| &\leq C(\mathbf{b}_0) [v |\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \log(-\gamma)| + \tau |U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \log(-\gamma)|] \\ &\leq C(\mathbf{b}_{< \alpha}) [r v |\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi|^2 + r^{-3+2s} v |\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi|^2 + \tau |\Gamma^{< \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|] \\ &\leq C(\mathbf{b}_{< \alpha}) [r^{-1+s+\eta_0} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2 + \tau |\Gamma^{< \alpha} \log(-\gamma)|]. \end{aligned} \quad (8.116)$$

In the last line, we used  $|\bar{\partial}_r \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} \varphi|^2 \leq \mathbf{1}_{r \leq v/2} r^{-2+s+\eta_0} \tau^{-1} v \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 2-s}^2 + \mathbf{1}_{r \geq v/2} r^{-4} \mathcal{P}_{< \alpha, 0}^2$ .  $\square$

## 9. PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER: PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

Our main theorem (theorem 3.1, see also the rough versions theorem 1.1 and corollary 1.12) follows immediately from propositions 9.1 and 9.2.

### 9.1. Control of $S^k\varphi$ along the horizon.

**Proposition 9.1.** *For  $N \geq 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$|S^N \varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(\epsilon, N, \mathfrak{D}_N, \varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}) \mathfrak{D}_N v^{-1+\epsilon}. \quad (9.1)$$

*Proof.* In view of lemma 4.3, it is enough to show that

$$\mathcal{P}_{NS, 2-C'_N \eta_0} \leq C(N, \eta_0, \mathfrak{D}_N, \varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}) \mathfrak{D}_N \quad (9.2)$$

when  $\eta_0$  is sufficiently small based on  $N$  and then fix  $\eta_0$  small based on  $\epsilon$  and  $C'_{NS} = C(N)$ .

We now establish (9.2). The results of propositions 5.1, 6.1, 7.1 and 8.1 imply that we can fix  $R_{\bullet} \geq C(\mathfrak{B}_0^{\circ}, \mathfrak{g}_0, N)$  large enough that for  $|\alpha| \leq N$  and  $s$  sufficiently small depending on  $N$ , we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\alpha} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{<\alpha}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_{<\alpha}) \mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}, \quad (9.3)$$

$$C(\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha}) \leq C(N, \mathfrak{B}_0, \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha, 1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 2-s+\eta_0}), \quad (9.4)$$

$$C(r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}) \leq C(N, \mathfrak{B}_0, \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha, 1}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 2-s+\eta_0}), \quad (9.5)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}) [\mathcal{D}_{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha, 4s}], \quad (9.6)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha, p} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}) (\mathcal{D}_{\alpha} + \mathcal{E}_{\alpha, p}) \quad (9.7)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 2-\eta_0-C_{\alpha} s} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha}, r^{-s} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}, \mathcal{P}_{\alpha, 0}, \mathcal{P}_{<\alpha, 1+\eta_0}) \mathcal{D}_{\alpha} \quad (9.8)$$

for explicit constants  $C_{\alpha}$ . In particular, the above equations imply

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 2-\eta_0-C_{\alpha}(s+\eta_0)} \leq C(N, \mathfrak{D}_N, \mathfrak{B}_0, \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{<\alpha, 2-s}) \mathfrak{D}_N \quad (9.9)$$

for  $|\alpha| \leq N$ . By an induction argument (starting with  $s = \eta_0$  when  $\alpha = 0$ ), there are constants  $C'_{\alpha}$  depending only on  $\alpha$  such that if  $\eta_0$  is small enough depending on  $N$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, 2-C'_{\alpha} \eta_0} \leq C(N, \mathfrak{D}_N, \mathfrak{B}_0, \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{0, 2-\eta_0}) \mathfrak{D}_N \quad (9.10)$$

Substituting (9.10) into the above equations (and performing another induction argument) gives

$$\mathcal{P}_{NS, 2-C'_{NS} \eta_0} \leq C(N, \mathfrak{D}_N, \mathfrak{B}_0, \mathfrak{G}_0, \mathcal{E}_{0, 2-\eta_0}) \mathfrak{D}_N. \quad (9.11)$$

The zeroth order estimates, due to corollary 4.2 and propositions 5.1, 6.1, 7.1 and 8.1, are

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathfrak{D}_0, \quad (9.12)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_0 \leq C(\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}) \mathfrak{D}_0, \quad (9.13)$$

$$\mathfrak{b}_0 \leq C(\mathcal{E}_0, \varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}, R_0, \eta_0), \quad (9.14)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,0} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) [\mathcal{D}_0 + \mathcal{E}_0], \quad (9.15)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{0, 2-\eta_0} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0, \mathcal{P}_{0,0}) \mathfrak{D}_0, \quad (9.16)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{0, 2-2\eta_0} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) [\mathcal{D}_0 + \mathcal{E}_{0, 2-2\eta_0}], \quad (9.17)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_0^{\circ} \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0, \mathcal{E}_{0,1}), \quad (9.18)$$

$$\mathfrak{B}_0 \leq C(R_{\bullet}, \mathfrak{B}_0^{\circ}, \mathcal{E}_{0,1+\eta_0}), \quad (9.19)$$

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0), \quad (9.20)$$

$$\mathfrak{G}_0 \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0). \quad (9.21)$$

Noting the value of  $R_{\bullet}$  that we have fixed and the value of  $R_0 = R_0(\varpi_i)$  that we have fixed (in proposition 4.1), chaining the zeroth order estimates with (9.11) (for  $\alpha = NS$ ) gives (9.2). Another induction argument in fact shows that all the schematic quantities are controlled by  $C(\epsilon, N, \mathfrak{D}_N, \varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min})$ .  $\square$

**9.2. Control of  $(\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k\varphi$  along the horizon.** The goal of this section is to establish the following result comparing  $S^k$  (in the constant- $r$  normalized gauge) and  $(\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k$  (in the Eddington–Finkelstein-type gauge normalized on the horizon).

**Proposition 9.2.** *For  $0 \leq k \leq 4$ , we have*

$$|S^k\varphi - (\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k\varphi| \leq C(\epsilon, k, \varpi_i, r_{\min}, c_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathfrak{D}_k)v^{-1+\epsilon}. \quad (9.22)$$

In this section, we allow all constants to depend on  $\varpi_i$ ,  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $r_{\min}$ . We will also freely apply the results obtained in (the proof of) proposition 9.1, namely that our schematic energy and geometric quantities of order  $|\alpha| = k$  are controlled by the data quantity  $\mathfrak{D}_k$ . We first introduce an integration lemma.

**Lemma 9.3.** *For  $\alpha \geq 0$ ,  $c > 0$ , and  $v \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\int_v^\infty e^{-c(v'-v)}v'^{-\alpha} dv' \leq c^{-1}v^{-\alpha}. \quad (9.23)$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\int_v^\infty e^{-c(v'-v)}v'^{-\alpha} dv' \leq v^{-\alpha} \int_v^\infty e^{-c(v'-v)} dv' = c^{-1}v^{-\alpha}. \quad (9.24)$$

□

To estimate  $\lambda$  along the horizon, we use an ODE argument similar to the one used in [31, Prop. B.1] (albeit in a different gauge).

**Lemma 9.4** (Decay of  $\lambda$  along the horizon). *We have*

$$\lambda|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(\epsilon, \varpi_i, r_{\min}, c_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathfrak{D}_1)v^{-4+\epsilon}. \quad (9.25)$$

*Proof.* Since  $\lambda = \kappa(1 - \mu) \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0)(1 - \mu)$ , it is enough to obtain the claimed estimate for  $(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}$  in place of  $\lambda|_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

*Step 1: Estimate for  $(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}$ .* The goal of this step is to use the transport equation for  $1 - \mu$  along the horizon to obtain

$$(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) \leq \int_v^\infty e^{-c_*(v'-v)}r(\partial_v\varphi)^2(v') dv' \quad (9.26)$$

for a constant  $c_* > 0$ . The equation for  $(1 - \mu)$  (see (2.10) and (2.12)) gives

$$\partial_v(1 - \mu) - \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}\kappa(1 - \mu) = -\frac{r}{\kappa}(\partial_v\varphi)^2. \quad (9.27)$$

The method of integrating factors now gives

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) &= \lim_{v' \rightarrow \infty} \exp\left(\int_v^{v'} -\frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}\kappa dv''\right)(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}(v') \\ &\quad + \int_v^\infty \exp\left(-\int_v^{v'} \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}\kappa dv''\right)r(\partial_v\varphi)^2(v') dv'. \end{aligned} \quad (9.28)$$

By (4.1) and (4.6), we have

$$\exp\left(-\int_v^{v'} \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2}\kappa dv''\right) \leq e^{c_*(v'-v)}, \quad (9.29)$$

where  $c_*$  is a constant depending on  $\varpi_i$ ,  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_0$ . Since  $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty}(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) = 0$  (see [31, Prop. B.1]), it follows from (9.29) that the first term on the right side of (9.28) vanishes. Noting this observation and (9.29), return to (9.28) to conclude the proof of (9.26).

*Step 2: Preliminary decay for  $(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}$ .* In this step we show that

$$(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) \leq C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_0)v^{-2+\epsilon}. \quad (9.30)$$

Control the exponential in (9.26) by 1 and use the decay of the energy to obtain

$$(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) \leq \int_v^\infty r(\partial_v \varphi)^2(v') dv' \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0) \int_v^\infty \frac{r^2}{\kappa} (\partial_v \varphi)^2(v') dv' \leq \tau^{-p}(\infty, v) C(\mathbf{b}_0) \mathcal{E}_{0,p} \leq C(p, \mathfrak{D}_0) v^{-p} \quad (9.31)$$

for  $p < 2$ .

*Step 3: Strong decay for  $(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}$ .* We now show that

$$(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) \leq C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_1) v^{-4+\epsilon}. \quad (9.32)$$

Use  $S = v\partial_v + v\lambda U$  and (9.30) to obtain

$$|\partial_v \varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq v^{-1} |S\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} + \kappa(1 - \mu)|_{\mathcal{H}} |U\varphi|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathcal{P}_{S,2-\epsilon} v^{-2+\epsilon} + C(\epsilon, \mathbf{b}_0) \mathcal{P}_{U,2-\epsilon} v^{-3+\epsilon} \leq C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_1) v^{-2+\epsilon}. \quad (9.33)$$

Substitute (9.33) into (9.26) and use lemma 9.3 to conclude the proof.  $\square$

To estimate  $S^n \lambda$  along the horizon, we use the relation  $\lambda = \kappa(1 - \mu)$  and estimate separately  $S^n \kappa$  and  $S^n \mu$ .

**Lemma 9.5** (Decay for  $S^n \lambda$  along the horizon). *Let  $n \geq 1$ . We have*

$$|S^n \lambda|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(\epsilon, \varpi_i, r_{\min}, c_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathfrak{D}_n) v^{-3+\epsilon}. \quad (9.34)$$

*Proof.* Suppose for the sake of induction that the lemma has been proven for  $0 \leq m < n$ . This holds for  $n = 1$  by lemma 9.4.

*Step 1: Decay for  $(S^n \kappa)|_{\mathcal{H}}$ .* We first show that for  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$|S^n \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_n) v^{-5+\epsilon}. \quad (9.35)$$

Write  $r_{\mathcal{H}}(v) := r(u = \infty, v)$  (so that  $r_{\mathcal{H}} = r_{\mathcal{H}}(\infty)$ ). The strategy is to integrate the equation for  $US^n \log \kappa$  to  $\{r = r_{\mathcal{H}}\}$  and use the decay of  $|r_{\mathcal{H}} - r_{\mathcal{H}}(v)|$ .

*Step 1a: Decay of  $|r_{\mathcal{H}} - r_{\mathcal{H}}(v)|$ .* By lemma 9.4, we have

$$|r_{\mathcal{H}} - r_{\mathcal{H}}(v)| = \int_v^\infty \partial_v r dv \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_1) \int_v^\infty v^{-4+\epsilon} dv \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_1) v^{-3+\epsilon}. \quad (9.36)$$

*Step 1b: Decay of  $S^n \kappa$ .* By a computation using the chain rule,  $S^n \log \kappa - \kappa^{-1} S^n \kappa$  is a polynomial in  $\kappa^{-1} S^i \kappa$  for  $1 \leq i < n$  with no constant term, so it is enough to obtain decay for  $S^n \log \kappa$ . Since  $U$  and  $S$  commute near the horizon, we have

$$US^n \log \kappa = S^n U \log \kappa = S^n (r(U\varphi)^2) =_s rUS^{\leq n} \varphi US^{< n} \varphi, \quad (9.37)$$

for  $n \geq 0$  and so

$$\sup_{r \in [r_{\mathcal{H}}(v), r_{\mathcal{H}}]} |US^n \log \kappa|(r, v) \leq C(\mathbf{b}_0) v^{-2+\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_{nS,2-\epsilon}^2 \leq C(\mathfrak{D}_n) v^{-2+\epsilon}. \quad (9.38)$$

Since  $S^n \log \kappa|_{\{r=r_{\mathcal{H}}\}} = 0$ , we can integrate (9.37) to get

$$S^n \log \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) \leq |r_{\mathcal{H}} - r_{\mathcal{H}}(v)| \sup_{r \in [r_{\mathcal{H}}(v), r_{\mathcal{H}}]} |US^n \log \kappa|(r, v) \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_n) v^{-5+\epsilon} \quad (9.39)$$

for  $n \geq 0$ .

*Step 2: Decay for  $S^n \mu$ .* In this step we show that for  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$|S^n \mu|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_n) v^{-3+\epsilon}, \quad (9.40)$$

By (2.10) and  $Sr = 0$  near the horizon, we have  $S\mu = 2r^{-1}S\varpi$  near the horizon, so it is enough to prove the estimate for  $S\varpi$ . Using the transport equation for  $\varpi$ , we compute

$$S\varpi = \frac{1}{2} r^2 v \left[ \frac{1}{\kappa} (\partial_v \varphi)^2 + \lambda(1 - \mu)(U\varphi)^2 \right] =_s r^2 v \mathbf{b}_0 [\{v^{-1} S\varphi, \lambda U\varphi\}^2]. \quad (9.41)$$

For  $n \geq 1$ , it follows that

$$S^n \varpi =_s r^2 v \mathbf{b}_{(n-1)S} \{v^{-1} S^{\leq n} \varphi, S^{< n} \lambda U S^{< n} \varphi\}^2. \quad (9.42)$$

By the inductive hypothesis and the control on the geometric and pointwise quantities, we have

$$|S^n \varpi|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_n) v^{-3+\epsilon}, \quad (9.43)$$

and so

*Step 3: Closing the induction.* We are done by the relation  $\lambda = \kappa(1 - \mu)$ , the results of Steps 1 and 2, and the product rule.  $\square$

*Proof of proposition 9.2.* The claim follows from (9.45)–(9.48) below together with (9.61), lemmas 9.4 and 9.5, and proposition 9.1.

*Step 1: Schematic expressions for  $S^k - (\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k$  for  $1 \leq k \leq 4$ .* Define a function of  $v$  alone by

$$\rho := 1 - \frac{\bar{v}}{v} \frac{1}{\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}}. \quad (9.44)$$

We show that

$$S - \bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}} = \rho S + (1 - \rho)v\lambda U, \quad (9.45)$$

$$S^2 - (\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^2 =_s (S^{\leq 1}\rho)^{\leq 1} (S^{\leq 1}(v\lambda))^{\leq 1} (v\lambda U(v\lambda))^{\leq 1} \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 2}, \quad (9.46)$$

$$S^3 - (\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^3 =_s (S^{\leq 2}\rho)^{\leq 3} (S^{\leq 2}(v\lambda))^{\leq 2} (S^{\leq 1}(v\lambda)S^{\leq 1}U(v\lambda))^{\leq 1} (v\lambda(U^{\leq 2}(v\lambda))^{\leq 2})^{\leq 2} \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 3}, \quad (9.47)$$

$$S^4 - (\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^4 =_s (S^{\leq 3}\rho)^{\leq 4} (S^{\leq 3}(v\lambda))^{\leq 3} (S^{\leq 2}(v\lambda)(S^{\leq 2}U(v\lambda))^{\leq 2})^{\leq 2} \\ (v\lambda(S^{\leq a}U^{\leq b}(v\lambda))^{\leq 3})^{\leq 3} |_{a \leq 2, b \leq 3, a+b \leq 4} \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 4}. \quad (9.48)$$

Indeed, we have

$$S = v\partial_v + v\lambda U, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}} = \frac{\bar{v}}{\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}} \partial_v. \quad (9.49)$$

It follows that

$$S - \bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}} = \left(v - \frac{\bar{v}}{\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}}\right) \partial_v + v\lambda U = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{v}}{v} \frac{1}{\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}}\right) (S - v\lambda U) + v\lambda U = \rho S + (1 - \rho)v\lambda U, \quad (9.50)$$

which is (9.45). We now explain how to compute (9.46). From (9.50), one obtains

$$S^2 - S(\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}}) =_s \sum_{\substack{a, b \leq 1 \\ a+b \geq 1}} (S^{\leq 1}\rho)^a (S^{\leq 1}(v\lambda))^b \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 2} \quad (9.51)$$

and

$$S(\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}}) - (\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^2 =_s (\rho S + (1 - \rho)v\lambda U)((1 - \rho)S + (1 - \rho)v\lambda U) \\ =_s \sum_{\substack{a \leq 2, b, c \leq 1 \\ a+b+c \geq 1}} (S^{\leq 1}\rho)^a (S^{\leq 1}(v\lambda))^b (v\lambda U(v\lambda))^c \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 2}, \quad (9.52)$$

where in (9.52) we used the already computed expression for  $S - \bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}}$ . Adding (9.50) and (9.52) gives (9.46). One computes (9.47) and (9.48) similarly.

*Step 2: Estimate for  $S^k(\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}})$  when  $1 \leq k \leq 3$ .* We show that

$$S^k \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_3) v^{-2+\epsilon} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq 3. \quad (9.53)$$

This follows from (9.54) to (9.56), (9.58) and (9.60), which are proven below.

*Step 2a: Schematic expressions for  $S^k(\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}})$  and  $1 \leq k \leq 3$ .* Since  $\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}$  is a function of  $v$  alone, we have  $U(\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}) = 0$ . It follows that

$$S^k(\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}) = (v\partial_v)^k \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}} = ((v\partial_v)^k \kappa)|_{\mathcal{H}} = ((S - v\lambda U)^k \kappa)|_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (9.54)$$

We compute

$$(S - v\lambda U)^2 = S^2 + S(v\lambda)U + v\lambda S U + (v\lambda)^2 U^2 + v\lambda U(v\lambda)U =_s (S^{\leq 1}(v\lambda))^{\leq 2} (v\lambda U(v\lambda))^{\leq 1} \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 2} \quad (9.55)$$

and

$$(S - v\lambda U)^3 =_s (S^{\leq 2}(v\lambda))^{\leq 3} (S^{\leq 1}(v\lambda)(S^{\leq 1}U^{\leq 2}(v\lambda))^{\leq 2})^{\leq 2} \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 3}. \quad (9.56)$$

*Step 2b: Estimate for derivatives of  $\lambda$ .* The transport equation for  $\lambda$  is

$$U\lambda = \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} \kappa =_s \mathfrak{b}_0. \quad (9.57)$$

Using lemmas 9.4 and 9.5 for the  $b = 0$  case, it follows that

$$|S^a U^b \lambda| \leq C(\mathfrak{D}_{a+b}). \quad (9.58)$$

*Step 2c: Estimate for derivatives of  $\kappa$  along the horizon.* It is easy to compute from the transport equation for  $\kappa$  that for  $b \geq 1$  one has

$$S^a U^b \log \kappa =_s r^{\leq 1} S^{\leq a} U^{\leq b} \varphi S^{\leq a} U^{\leq b} \varphi. \quad (9.59)$$

Together with (9.35) for the case  $b = 0$  (and a chain rule argument), we obtain (for  $a, b \geq 0$  and  $a + b \geq 1$ )

$$|S^a U^b \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_{a+b}) v^{-2+\epsilon}. \quad (9.60)$$

*Step 3: Estimate for  $S^k \rho$ .* We claim that

$$|S^k \rho| \leq v^{-1} C(k, \mathfrak{D}_k) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq 3. \quad (9.61)$$

We first consider the case  $k = 0$ . Observe that

$$\rho = v^{-1}(v - \bar{v}) + \frac{\bar{v}}{v}(1 - 1/\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}). \quad (9.62)$$

Since  $|1 - 1/\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}| \lesssim \log \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C(\mathfrak{D}_0) v^{-4}$  by Step 1b of lemma 9.5, it is enough to show that  $\bar{v}(v) = v + C(\mathfrak{D}_0)$ . From  $\frac{d\bar{v}}{dv}(v) = \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}(v)$  and  $\bar{v}(v = 1) = 1$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{v}(v) - v| &\leq \left| 1 - v + \int_1^v \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}(v') dv' \right| \leq \int_1^v |\kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}(v') - 1| dv' \leq C(\mathfrak{b}_0) \int_1^v \log \kappa dv' \\ &\leq C(\mathfrak{D}_0) \int_1^v v^{-4} dv' \leq C(\mathfrak{D}_0). \end{aligned} \quad (9.63)$$

This establishes the cases  $k = 0$ . We now show that for  $k \geq 1$  we have

$$S^k \rho =_s \sum_{\substack{a+b \geq 1 \\ a \leq 1, b \leq k}} \rho^a (S^{\leq k} \log \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}})^b \quad (9.64)$$

Indeed, in the case  $k = 1$ , one computes explicitly

$$S\rho = -\rho - \rho S \log \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}} + S \log \kappa|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (9.65)$$

and the general case follows by an easy induction. Now (9.53) and (9.64) and the case  $k = 0$  together establish (9.61).  $\square$

## 10. LATE-TIME TAILS

The goal of this section is to prove theorem 10.17 (the precise version of theorem 1.15), as an application of [29, Main Theorem 4]. The estimates we have already obtained do not suffice to satisfy the assumptions of [29]. In particular, we require additional control of  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field and of geometric quantities, together with precise asymptotics for geometric quantities in the region  $\{u \lesssim r\}$ . We prove such estimates in section 10.3. The estimates for  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field are coupled to the corresponding estimates for the geometry. To obtain such estimates from control of  $S$ -derivatives of the scalar field and the geometry (which has been done in the preceding sections), we introduce the spacetime elliptic estimates (see section 10.1) and Klainerman's Sobolev-type inequality (see section 10.2) used in [29].

In this section we will freely use the results of section 9, namely that our schematic quantities of order  $\alpha$  (see section 2.7.4) are controlled by data  $\mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}$ . We also allow our constants to depend on  $\varpi_i$ ,  $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $r_{\min}$ .

**10.1. Spacetime elliptic estimate.** We first formulate an abstract second order weighted elliptic estimate in two dimensions.

**Lemma 10.1** (Abstract weighted elliptic estimate). *Let  $U := (0, \infty)_{x_1} \times (0, \infty)_{x_2} \subset \mathbf{R}_{x_1, x_2}^2$ . Fix a point  $\bar{x} \in U$ . For  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , write  $\mathcal{R}_\theta = \mathcal{R}_\theta(\bar{x}) := \{x \in U : |x_i - \bar{x}_i| < \theta \bar{x}_i \text{ for } i = 1, 2\}$ . Fix  $\theta, \theta' \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\theta < \theta'$ . Let  $L$  be a differential operator on  $\mathcal{R}_{\theta'}$  of the form*

$$L\psi = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 w_{ij} \partial_{ij}^2 \psi + \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i \partial_i \psi \quad (10.1)$$

for smooth coefficients  $w_{ij}, w_i$  satisfying  $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$ . Suppose that there are  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $A \geq 1$  such that the following conditions hold on  $\mathcal{R}_{\theta'}$ :

$$w_{ii} > 0 \quad (10.2)$$

$$|w_{12}|^2 \leq (1 - \delta)w_{11}w_{22}, \quad (10.3)$$

$$|\partial_i w_{ij}|^2 + |x_i^{-1} w_{ij}|^2 \leq A^2 w_{jj} \quad (10.4)$$

$$|w_i|^2 \leq A^2 w_{ii} \quad (10.5)$$

$$w_{jj} |\partial_j w_{ii}|^2 \leq A^2 w_{ii}^2. \quad (10.6)$$

Then

$$\sum_i \|w_{ii}^{1/2} \partial_i \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} + \sum_{i,j} \|w_{ii}^{1/2} w_{jj}^{1/2} \partial_{ij}^2 \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} \lesssim_{\theta, \theta'} A (\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'})} + \|L\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'})}). \quad (10.7)$$

*Remark 10.2.* Observe that conditions (10.4)–(10.6) “scale correctly,” in the sense that the indices  $i$  and  $j$  appear the same number of times on each side when counted with multiplicity, where a derivative counts with multiplicity  $-1$ .

*Proof.* The result follows from (10.9) and (10.13) below. For ease of notation, we will assume  $\theta' = 4\theta$ . Let  $\chi$  be a smooth function satisfying

$$0 \leq \chi \leq 1, \quad \chi \equiv 1 \text{ on } \mathcal{R}_\theta, \quad \text{supp } \chi \subset \mathcal{R}_{2\theta}, \quad |\partial_i \chi| \leq C\theta^{-1} \bar{x}_i^{-1} \leq C\theta^{-1} x_i^{-1} \text{ on } \mathcal{R}_{2\theta}. \quad (10.8)$$

*Step 1: Estimate for first order derivatives.* We first show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \|w_{ii}^{1/2} \partial_i \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} \leq CA\theta^{-1} \delta^{-2} (\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{2\theta})} + \|L\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{2\theta})}). \quad (10.9)$$

Multiply (10.1) by  $\chi^2 \psi$  and rewrite and rearrange (“integrate by parts”) to get

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^2 \chi^2 w_{ij} \partial_i \psi \partial_j \psi = -\chi^2 \psi L\psi + \sum_i \chi^2 w_i \psi \partial_i \psi + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 [\partial_i (\chi^2 w_{ij} \psi \partial_j \psi) - 2\chi \partial_i \chi w_{ij} \psi \partial_j \psi - \chi^2 \partial_i w_{ij} \psi \partial_j \psi]. \quad (10.10)$$

The ellipticity condition (10.3) and Young’s inequality imply

$$\delta \sum_i \chi^2 w_{ii} (\partial_i \psi)^2 \leq (\text{LHS of (10.10)}). \quad (10.11)$$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Use Young’s inequality and then the conditions (10.4) and (10.5) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{RHS of (10.10)}) &\leq \epsilon \sum_i \chi^2 w_{ii} (\partial_i \psi)^2 + C\epsilon^{-1} (|\psi|^2 + |L\psi|^2) + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 [\partial_i (\chi^2 w_{ij} \psi \partial_j \psi) \\ &\quad + C\epsilon^{-1} \psi^2 \sum_{i,j} [\chi^2 w_{jj}^{-1} w_j^2 + w_{jj}^{-1} |\partial_i \chi w_{ij}|^2 + w_{jj}^{-1} |\partial_i w_{ij}|] \\ &\leq \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^2 \chi^2 w_{ii} (\partial_i \psi)^2 + \sum_{i,j} \partial_i (\chi^2 w_{ij} \psi \partial_j \psi) + CA\theta^{-1} \epsilon^{-1} (|\psi|^2 + |L\psi|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (10.12)$$

Take  $\epsilon < \delta/4$  to absorb the first term on the right of (10.12) to the left side of (10.11). Integrate over  $\mathcal{R}_{2\theta}$ , noting that the total derivative term has vanishing integral, to conclude (10.9).

*Step 2: Estimate for second order derivatives.* We now show that

$$\sum_{i,j} \|w_{ij} \partial_{ij}^2 \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} + \sum_{i \neq j} \|w_{ii}^{1/2} w_{jj}^{1/2} \partial_{ij}^2 \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} \leq CA\theta^{-1} \delta^{-1} (\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{4\theta})} + \|L\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{4\theta})}) \quad (10.13)$$

Begin by computing

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \sum_{i \neq j} w_{ij}^2 (\partial_{ij}^2 \psi)^2 + \sum_{i,j} w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_{jj}^2 \psi &= (L\psi)^2 - \underbrace{\sum_{i \neq j} 2w_{ii} w_{ij} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_{ij}^2 \psi}_{(I)} \\
&\quad - 2 \underbrace{\sum_{i,j,k} w_{ij} w_k \partial_{ij}^2 \psi \partial_k \psi}_{(II)} - \underbrace{\sum_{i,j} w_i w_j \partial_i \psi \partial_j \psi}_{(III)}. \tag{10.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Treat term (I) using (10.3) and Young's inequality. Terms (II) and (III) can be handled with Young's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
|(I)| &\leq 2w_{ii} w_{ii}^{1/2} w_{jj}^{1/2} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_{ij}^2 \psi \leq (1-\delta) w_{ii}^2 (\partial_{ii} \psi)^2 + (1-\delta) w_{ii} w_{jj} (\partial_{ij} \psi)^2 \\
(II) + (III) &\leq \epsilon \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} (\partial_{ij} \psi)^2 + C\epsilon^{-1} \sum_i w_i (\partial_i \psi)^2. \tag{10.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Substitute (10.15) into (10.14), take  $\epsilon = \delta/2$  and absorb the  $\epsilon$ -term to the left to get

$$\frac{\delta}{2} \sum_{i,j} w_{ij}^2 (\partial_{ij}^2 \psi)^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_{jj}^2 \psi \leq (L\psi)^2 + C\delta^{-1} \sum_i w_i^2 (\partial_i \psi)^2 \tag{10.16}$$

We now multiply by  $\chi^2$  and integrate the second term on the left by parts twice:

$$\chi^2 w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_{jj}^2 \psi = \chi^2 w_{ii} w_{jj} (\partial_{ij} \psi)^2 - \partial_i (\chi^2 w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ji}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi) + \partial_j (\chi^2 w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi) + \mathcal{E}_{ij}, \tag{10.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{ij} &:= 2\chi \partial_i \chi w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ij}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi + \chi^2 \partial_i w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ij}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi + \chi^2 w_{ii} \partial_i w_{jj} \partial_{ij}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi \\
&\quad - 2\chi \partial_j \chi w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi - \chi^2 \partial_j w_{ii} w_{jj} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi - \chi^2 w_{ii} \partial_j w_{jj} \partial_{ii}^2 \psi \partial_j \psi. \tag{10.18}
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate the terms in (10.18) using Young's inequality (10.4) and (10.6):

$$|\mathcal{E}_{ij}| \leq C\epsilon \chi^2 w_{ii} w_{jj} (\partial_{ij} \psi)^2 + C\epsilon \chi^2 w_{ii}^2 (\partial_{ii}^2 \psi)^2 + CA^2 \theta^{-2} \epsilon^{-1} w_{jj} (\partial_j \psi)^2. \tag{10.19}$$

Substitute (10.18) and (10.19) into (10.17) and move all terms but  $\chi^2 w_{ii} w_{jj} (\partial_{ij} \psi)^2$  to the right side of (10.16). Take  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough based on  $\delta$  to absorb the  $\epsilon$ -weighted terms to the left, integrate over  $\mathcal{R}_{2\theta}$ , and use (10.9) (with  $2\theta$  in place of  $\theta$ ) to conclude (10.13).  $\square$

Now we construct elliptic operators involving  $S$ ,  $S^2$ , and  $\square$  to which we apply lemma 10.1.

**Lemma 10.3.** *Fix  $0 < \theta < \theta' < 1$ . Let  $U_0$  be sufficiently large depending on  $\mathfrak{D}_1$ . Fix a point  $(u_0, r_0) \in \{r \geq R_\bullet\} \cap \{u \geq U_0\}$ . Write  $\mathcal{R}_\theta := \mathcal{R}_\theta(u_0, r_0)$ . We have*

$$\sum_{i+j \leq 2} \|(u \bar{\partial}_u)^i (r \bar{\partial}_r)^j \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} \lesssim_{\theta, \theta'} \|S^{\leq 2} \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'})} + r_0 \min(u_0, r_0) \|\square \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'})}. \tag{10.20}$$

*Proof. Step 1: Elliptic operator in the region  $\{R_\bullet \leq r \leq \epsilon u\}$ .* We show that there is  $\epsilon > 0$  (depending on  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and  $G_{\eta_0}$ ) such that

$$\sum_{i+j \leq 2} u^i r^j \|\bar{\partial}_u^i \bar{\partial}_r^j \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta(u,r))} \lesssim_{\theta, \theta'} \|S^{\leq 2} \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'}(u,r))} + ur \|\square \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'}(u,r))} \quad \text{in } \{R_\bullet \leq r \leq \epsilon u\}, \tag{10.21}$$

Write  $\chi = \chi_{\lesssim R_\bullet}(r)$ . Compute

$$\begin{aligned}
S^2 - S &= (u + \chi \cdot (v - u))^2 \bar{\partial}_u^2 + r^2 \bar{\partial}_r^2 + 2r(u + \chi \cdot (v - u)) \bar{\partial}_u \bar{\partial}_r \\
&\quad + r(\chi'(v - u) + \lambda^{-1} \chi) \partial_u - u\chi(1 - (-\gamma)/\kappa) \bar{\partial}_r. \tag{10.22}
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $B > 0$  be a constant to be chosen. Now (10.22)  $- Br^2 \cdot$  (2.16) is

$$\begin{aligned}
S^2 - S - Br^2 \square &= (u + \chi \cdot (v - u))^2 \bar{\partial}_u^2 + (1 + B(1 - \mu)) r^2 \bar{\partial}_r + (2r(u + \chi \cdot (v - u)) - Br^2(-\gamma)^{-1}) \bar{\partial}_u \bar{\partial}_r \\
&\quad + r(\chi' \cdot (v - u) + \lambda^{-1} \chi + B(2 - 2\varpi/r)) \bar{\partial}_r - (u\chi(1 - (-\gamma)/\kappa) + Br(-\gamma)^{-1}) \bar{\partial}_u. \tag{10.23}
\end{aligned}$$



We now verify conditions (10.2)–(10.6) of lemma 10.1. In  $\{r \leq \eta_0 u\}$  we have

$$w_{uu} = u^2 + O(1)ur \quad w_{rr} = (1 + B(1 - \mu))r^2 \quad w_{ur} = (2ur + (BO(1)) + O(1))r^2, \quad (10.24)$$

where we write  $O(1)$  for a term controlled by  $\mathfrak{B}_0$  and  $G_{\eta_0}$ . Now let  $\epsilon < \eta_0$ . It follows that in  $\{r \leq \epsilon u\}$  for  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small depending on  $\mathcal{G}_0$ ,  $G_{1/2}$ , and  $B$ , we have

$$|w_{uu}| \geq \frac{1}{2}u^2 \quad w_{rr} = (1 + B(1 - \mu))r^2 \quad |w_{ur}| \leq 3ur. \quad (10.25)$$

Since  $1 - \mu \geq 1/2$  in  $\{r \geq R_0\}$ , it follows that in  $\{R_0 \leq r \leq \epsilon u\}$ , (10.2) and (10.3) are satisfied for  $B = 36$  (with  $\delta > 0$  an explicit numerical constant). Conditions (10.4)–(10.6) follow from computations involving  $\mathfrak{B}_V$  and  $G_{\eta_0}$ .

*Step 2: Elliptic operator in the region  $\{r \geq \epsilon u\}$ .* Let  $\epsilon$  be as in Step 1. In fact, the value of  $\epsilon$  does not play a role in the elliptic estimate for this region. We show that for  $u$  large depending on  $C(\mathfrak{D}_2)$ , we have

$$\sum_{i+j \leq 2} u^i r^j \|\bar{\partial}_u^i \bar{\partial}_r^j \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_\theta(u,r))} \lesssim_{\theta, \theta'} \|S^{\leq 2} \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'}(u,r))} + ur \|\square \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'}(u,r))} \quad \text{in } \{r \geq \epsilon u\}. \quad (10.26)$$

For  $u \geq \epsilon^{-1} R_\bullet$ , we have  $r \geq R_\bullet$ , so

$$S^2 - S = u^2 \bar{\partial}_u^2 + r^2 \bar{\partial}_r^2 + 2ur \bar{\partial}_u \bar{\partial}_r. \quad (10.27)$$

Now (10.27)  $- 2ur \cdot$  (2.16) is

$$S^2 - S - 2ur \square = u^2 \bar{\partial}_u^2 + (r^2 + 2ur) \bar{\partial}_r^2 + 2ur \left(1 - \frac{1}{(-\gamma)}\right) \bar{\partial}_u \bar{\partial}_r + 4u(1 - \varpi/r) \bar{\partial}_u - u \frac{2}{(-\gamma)} \bar{\partial}_r. \quad (10.28)$$

To apply lemma 10.1 and obtain (10.26), we need to check that this operator satisfies the conditions (10.2) and (10.4) to (10.6). Clearly (10.2) is satisfied. Since  $|1 - 1/(-\gamma)| \leq r^{-1} u^{-1} C(\mathfrak{B}_0)$ , (10.3) is satisfied for  $u$  large enough depending on  $\mathfrak{B}_0$ . Since  $|\bar{\partial}(-\gamma)| \leq r^{-1} u^{-1} C(\mathfrak{B}_V)$ , (10.4) is satisfied for  $u$  large enough. Since  $u \lesssim r$ , (10.5) and (10.6) are satisfied.  $\square$

**10.2. Klainerman's Sobolev-type inequality.** In this section we upgrade the  $L^2$  estimates in section 10.1 to  $L^2$ – $L^\infty$  Sobolev inequalities.

**Lemma 10.4.** *Let  $c > 1$ . Let  $Q := Q_{\ell_1, \ell_2} \subset \mathbf{R}^2$  be a rectangle of side lengths  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$ . We have*

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \lesssim_c \ell_1^{-1/2} \ell_2^{-1/2} \sum_{i+j \leq 2} \|(\ell_1 \partial_{x^1})^i (\ell_2 \partial_{x^2})^j f\|_{L^2(cQ)} \quad (10.29)$$

*Proof.* Apply the usual Sobolev embedding on a unit rectangle to the rescaled function  $f(\ell_1 x^1, \ell_2 x^2)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 10.5** (Weighted  $L^2$ – $L^\infty$  estimate). *Fix  $0 < \theta < \theta' < 1$ . Fix a point  $(u_0, r_0) \in \{r \geq 5R_\bullet\} \cap \{u \geq U_0\}$  for  $U_0$  as in lemma 10.3. Write  $\mathcal{R}_\theta := \mathcal{R}_\theta(u_0, r_0)$  as in lemma 10.1. We have*

$$u_0^{1/2} r_0^{1/2} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} \lesssim_{\theta, \theta'} \|S^{\leq 2} \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'})} + \|r^2 \square \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'})}. \quad (10.30)$$

*Proof.* Combine lemma 10.3 with lemma 10.4, noting that  $\mathcal{R}_\theta$  is a rectangle with side lengths proportional to  $u_0$  and  $r_0$  and that the coordinates  $u$  and  $r$  are comparable to  $u_0$  and  $r_0$  in  $\mathcal{R}_\theta(u_0, r_0)$ .  $\square$

**10.3. Estimates for  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field and of geometric quantities.**

10.3.1. *Estimates for  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of the scalar field.*

**Lemma 10.6** (Commutation formula for  $r\bar{\partial}_r$  and  $S$ ). *For  $n \geq 0$  and  $m \geq 0$  and  $n + m \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\square, (r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m] \\
&=_{\text{s}} \sum_{\substack{a+b \leq m-1 \\ i+j+k \leq n}} \{1, 1 + (r\bar{\partial}_r)^i \log(-\gamma)\}^{\leq 1} \{1, (r\bar{\partial}_r)^j S^{1+a} \log(-\gamma)\}^{\leq 1} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^k S^b \square \\
&+ \frac{1}{r^2} \mathbf{1}_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{a+b+c \leq m \\ i+j+k \leq n \\ c \leq m-1}} \{O_\infty(1), r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)^i S^a \varpi\} \{(r\bar{\partial}_r)^j S^b \log(-\gamma)\}^{\leq 1} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^k (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq 1+k} S^c \\
&+ \frac{1}{r^2} \mathbf{1}_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{a+b+c \leq m \\ i+j+k+\ell \leq n+1 \\ \ell \geq 1}} (1 + (r\bar{\partial}_r)^i \log(-\gamma))^{\leq 1} \{O_\infty(1), r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)^j S^a \varpi\} \{(r\bar{\partial}_r)^k S^b \log(-\gamma)\}^{\leq 1} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^\ell S^c,
\end{aligned} \tag{10.31}$$

where we write  $O_\infty(1)$  for a constant-coefficient polynomial in  $r^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* The lemma follows from (10.33) and (10.35), which we prove below.

*Step 1: Commutation formula for  $r\bar{\partial}_r$ .* A computation reveals that

$$\begin{aligned}
[\square, r\bar{\partial}_r] &= (1 + r\bar{\partial}_r \log(-\gamma))\square + \frac{1}{r^2} \left[ -1 + \frac{4\varpi}{r} - \frac{3e^2}{r^2} \right] (r\bar{\partial}_r)^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{r^2} \left[ -1 + \frac{3e^2}{r^2} - \frac{2}{r} r\bar{\partial}_r \varpi + \left( 2 - \frac{2\varpi}{r} \right) r\bar{\partial}_r \log(-\gamma) \right] r\bar{\partial}_r \\
&=_{\text{s}} (1 + r\bar{\partial}_r \log(-\gamma))\square + \frac{1}{r^2} [O_\infty(1) + r^{-1}\varpi] (r\bar{\partial}_r)^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{r^2} [O_\infty(1) + r^{-1}r\bar{\partial}_r \varpi + \{1, r^{-1}\varpi\} r\bar{\partial}_r \log(-\gamma)] r\bar{\partial}_r.
\end{aligned} \tag{10.32}$$

It follows by induction that for  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[\square, (r\bar{\partial}_r)^n] &=_{\text{s}} \sum_{i+j \leq n-1} (1 + (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{1+i} \log(-\gamma)) (r\bar{\partial}_r)^j \square \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{i+j+k \leq n+1 \\ k \geq 1}} \frac{1}{r^2} \{O_\infty(1), r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)^i \varpi\} \{(r\bar{\partial}_r)^j \log(-\gamma)\}^{\leq 1} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^k
\end{aligned} \tag{10.33}$$

*Step 2: Commutation formula for  $S$ .* In the region  $\{r \geq 5R_\bullet\}$  of interest, where  $S = r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u$ , the computation (A.49) gives

$$[\square, S] =_{\text{s}} (2 + S \log(-\gamma))\square + \frac{1}{r^2} [O_\infty(1) + \{O_\infty(1), r^{-1}\varpi\} S \log(-\gamma) + r^{-1} S^{\leq 1} \varpi] (r\bar{\partial}_r) (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq 1}. \tag{10.34}$$

It follows by induction that for  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[\square, S^n] &=_{\text{s}} \sum_{a+b \leq n-1} \{1, S^{1+a} \log(-\gamma)\} S^b \square \\
&+ \sum_{a+b+c \leq n-1} \frac{1}{r^2} [O_\infty(1) + \{O_\infty(1), r^{-1} S^a \varpi\} S^{1+b} \log(-\gamma) + r^{-1} S^{\leq 1+a} \varpi] (r\bar{\partial}_r) (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq 1} S^c.
\end{aligned} \tag{10.35}$$

□

**Lemma 10.7.** *Fix  $0 < \theta < \theta' < 1/2$ . Fix a point  $(u_0, r_0) \in \{r \geq 5R_\bullet\} \cap \{u \geq U_0\}$  for  $U_0$  as in lemma 10.3. Write  $\mathcal{R}_\theta := \mathcal{R}_\theta(u_0, r_0)$  as in lemma 10.1. For  $n, m \geq 0$ , we have*

$$\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}_\theta)} \lesssim C(n, m, \theta, \theta', \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2}) \|S^{\leq n+m+3} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}_{\theta'})}. \tag{10.36}$$

**Corollary 10.8.** *Let  $n, m \geq 0$  and let  $\epsilon > 0$ . In the region  $\{r \geq 5R_\bullet\}$ , we have*

$$(r^{1/2}\tau^{1-\epsilon} + r\tau^{1/2-\epsilon})|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi| \leq C(\epsilon, n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+3}). \quad (10.37)$$

*Proof.* In the region  $\{u \geq U_0\}$ , this is an immediate consequence of lemma 10.7, the definition of the pointwise norm (see section 2.7.3), and the results of section 9. In the region  $\{u \leq U_0\}$ , we can write  $r\bar{\partial}_r = S - u\bar{\partial}_u$  to reduce to estimating expressions of the form  $(u\bar{\partial}_u)^{n'} S^{m'} \varphi$  for  $n' + m' = n + m$ . From the calculation  $(u\bar{\partial}_u)^n =_s u^{\leq n} \bar{\partial}_u^{1 \leq n} =_s u^{\leq n} C(\mathfrak{b}_{nV}) D^{1 \leq n}$  and the boundedness of  $u$ , we have

$$|(u\bar{\partial}_u)^{n'} S^{m'} \varphi| \lesssim_{U_0} C(\mathfrak{D}_n) |D^{\leq n'} S^{\leq m'} \varphi|, \quad (10.38)$$

which we can estimate with the pointwise norm. Recalling that  $U_0$  depends only on  $\mathfrak{D}_1$  completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 10.7.* Let  $c > 1$  be a parameter that will be chosen in the proof. We allow all estimates to depend on  $n, m, \theta, \theta'$ , and  $c$ . The desired estimate follows from (10.52), after choosing  $c > 1$  so that  $c^{n+m+3}\theta \leq \theta'$ . The restriction  $\theta' < 1/2$  ensures that  $r > 2R_\bullet$  in the region  $\mathcal{R}_{\theta'}$  (and so  $S = r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u$ ). In this proof, we write  $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$  in place of  $\mathcal{R}_\theta$ . The right sides of our equations are to be understood schematically, as in section 2.6.4.

*Step 1:  $L^2$  estimate for the commutator.* We claim that for  $n \geq 0$  and  $m \geq 0$  and  $n + m \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|r^2 \square (r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \\ & \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))}, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))}) \\ & \quad [ \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} + \mathbf{1}_{m \geq 1} \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+2} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} ]. \end{aligned} \quad (10.39)$$

The idea is to use the transport equation for  $(-\gamma)$  and  $\varpi$  to express the coefficients in (10.31) in terms of the scalar field, and then put the top order terms in  $L^2$  and the lower order terms in  $L^\infty$ .

*Step 1a: Estimate for derivatives of  $(-\gamma)$ .* When  $n = 0$ , we can estimate

$$|S^m \log(-\gamma)| \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m) \quad (10.40)$$

by the results of section 9. When  $n \geq 1$ , differentiating the transport equation  $(r\bar{\partial}_r) \log(-\gamma) = ((r\bar{\partial}_r)\varphi)^2$  gives

$$|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \log(-\gamma)| \lesssim C(\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|) |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m} \varphi| \quad (10.41)$$

*Step 1b: Estimate for derivatives of  $\varpi$ .* When  $n = 0$ , we can estimate

$$|S^m \varpi| \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m) \quad (10.42)$$

by the results of section 9. When  $n \geq 1$ , we claim

$$r^{-1} |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varpi| \leq C(\mathfrak{D}_m, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|) |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m} \varphi|. \quad (10.43)$$

The transport equation for  $\varpi$  is

$$r^{-1} (r\bar{\partial}_r) \varpi = \frac{1}{2} (1 - \mu) ((r\bar{\partial}_r)\varphi)^2 =_s \mathcal{O}(1, r^{-1}\varpi) ((r\bar{\partial}_r)\varphi)^2. \quad (10.44)$$

Differentiate to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-1} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varpi =_s & \mathcal{O}(1, r^{-1} S^{\leq m} \varpi, r^{-1} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{1 \leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varpi) ((r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m} \varphi) \\ & \{ (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varphi, (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi \}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.45)$$

Now (10.43) follows from an induction argument and the  $n = 0$  case.

*Step 1c: Completing the proof of (10.39).* Substitute (10.40)–(10.43) into (10.31) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|r^2 \square (r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi| &\lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m, |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varphi|, |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi|) \\
&\left[ \mathbf{1}_{m \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{a+b+c \leq m \\ i+j+k \leq n \\ c \leq m-1}} (1 + |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq i} S^{\leq a} \varphi|)(1 + |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq j} S^{\leq b} \varphi|)(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq k+2} S^c \varphi \right. \\
&\left. \mathbf{1}_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{a+b+c \leq m \\ i+j+k+\ell \leq n+1 \\ \ell \geq 1}} (1 + |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq i} \varphi|)(1 + |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq j} S^{\leq a} \varphi|)(1 + |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq k} S^{\leq b} \varphi|)(r\bar{\partial}_r)^\ell S^c \varphi \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{10.46}$$

To obtain (10.39), put the top order terms in  $L^2$  and absorb the lower order terms into the constant.

*Step 2: Basic estimates for the scalar field.* It is an immediate consequence of lemma 10.3 that for  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n-\min(2,n)} S^{\leq m+2} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} + \|r^2 \square (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n-\min(2,n)} S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}. \tag{10.47}$$

It follows from (10.39) and (10.47) that, for  $n \geq 3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \\
&\lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-3} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-2} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}) \\
&\quad [ \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n-2} S^{\leq m+2} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} + \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} + \mathbf{1}_{m \geq 1} \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} ].
\end{aligned} \tag{10.48}$$

Finally, it follows from lemma 10.5 and (10.39) that, for  $n, m \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_0^{1/2} r_0^{1/2} \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \\
&\lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}) \\
&\quad [ \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^{\leq m+2} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} + \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1} S^{\leq m} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} + \mathbf{1}_{m \geq 1} \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+2} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} ].
\end{aligned} \tag{10.49}$$

*Step 3: Completing the proof.* For  $n, m \geq 0$ , we will show the  $L^2$ – $L^2$  estimate

$$\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m}) \|S^{\leq n+m+1} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c^{n+m+1}\theta))} \tag{10.50}$$

and the  $L^2$ – $L^\infty$  estimate

$$u_0^{1/2} r_0^{1/2} \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2}) \|S^{\leq n+m+3} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c^{n+m+3}\theta))}. \tag{10.51}$$

Note that (10.51) implies the desired  $L^\infty$ – $L^\infty$  estimate

$$\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2}) \|S^{\leq n+m+3} \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c^{n+m+3}\theta))} \tag{10.52}$$

by the Hölder's inequality  $\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim u_0^{1/2} r_0^{1/2} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))}$ .

*Step 3a: The base case (10.50) for  $n \leq 2$  and  $m \geq 0$ .* First, (10.50) is trivial when  $n = 0$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . For the case  $1 \leq n \leq 2$ , we claim that, for  $m \geq 0$ ,

$$\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq 2} S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m) \|S^{\leq m+2} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c^{m+1}\theta))}. \tag{10.53}$$

An induction argument using lemma 10.3 and (10.35) shows that, for  $m \geq 0$ ,

$$\|r^2 \square S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m) \|S^{\leq m+1} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c^m\theta))}. \tag{10.54}$$

Conclude the desired (10.53) using (10.47) and (10.54).

*Step 3b: The base case (10.51) for  $n = 0$  and  $m \geq 0$ .* Lemma 10.5 and (10.54) imply that

$$u_0^{1/2} r_0^{1/2} \|S^m \varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim \|S^{\leq m+2} \psi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} + \|r^2 \square S^m \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m) \|S^{\leq m+2} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c^{m+1}\theta))}. \tag{10.55}$$

*Step 3c: The inductive step.* Let  $n \geq 1$  and  $m \geq 0$ . Suppose that (10.50) holds for pairs  $(\leq n+1, k)$  and (10.51) holds for pairs  $(\leq n-1, k)$  for all  $k \geq 0$  as well as for pairs  $(n, \leq m-1)$  (this latter condition is

vacuous when  $m = 0$ ). We will show that (10.50) holds for the pair  $(n+2, m)$  and (10.51) holds for the pair  $(n, m)$ . In view of the base cases established in Steps 3ab, this inductive step establishes (10.50) and (10.51).

We first claim that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n+2}S^m\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} &\lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_m, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1}S^{\leq m}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}, \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n}S^{\leq m-1}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}) \\ &[\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^nS^{\leq m+2}\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))} + \|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1}S^{\leq m}\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c\theta))}]. \end{aligned} \quad (10.56)$$

Indeed, this follows from (10.48) (since the last term in square brackets in that estimate can be removed by induction). Next, use (10.56) to control the last term in square brackets in the estimate (10.49) and obtain

$$u_0^{1/2}r_0^{1/2}\|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^nS^m\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(\theta))} \lesssim (\text{LHS of (10.56)}). \quad (10.57)$$

By the inductive hypotheses, we have

$$(\text{LHS of (10.56)}) \lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m+1}, \|S^{n+m+2}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c^{n+m+3}\theta))}) \cdot C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2})\|S^{\leq n+m+3}\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathcal{R}(c^{n+m+3}\theta))}. \quad (10.58)$$

To conclude the proof, control  $\|S^{n+m+2}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{R}(c^{n+m+3}\theta))} \leq C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2})$  and combine (10.56)–(10.58).  $\square$

**Lemma 10.9.** *Let  $n, m \geq 0$  and let  $0 \leq k \leq 2$ . We have*

$$|(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)^k(r\bar{\partial}_r)^nS^m\varphi| \leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5}) \quad \text{in } \{r \geq 5R_\bullet\} \cap \{r \geq u\}. \quad (10.59)$$

*Proof.* The cases  $k = 0, 1$  follow from corollary 10.8, so we focus on the case  $k = 2$ .

Suppose for the sake of induction that we have already shown lemma 10.9 for  $k = 2$  and pairs  $(n', m')$  with  $m' < m$  or  $m = m'$  and  $n' < n$ . Set  $\psi_0 = (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n+1}S^m\varphi$ . By lemmas 10.6, 10.11 and 10.13 and the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} |r^3\Box\psi_0| &\leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+4})[r|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+3}S^{\leq m-1}\varphi| + r|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+2}S^{\leq m}\varphi|] \\ &\leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})[r^{-1}|(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)^2(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1}S^{\leq m-1}\varphi| + r^{-1}|(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)^2(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n}S^{\leq m}\varphi|] \\ &\leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})[r^{-1} + r^{-1}|(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)^2(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n}S^{\leq m}\varphi|], \end{aligned} \quad (10.60)$$

and by corollary 10.8, we have

$$|(r\bar{\partial}_r)\psi_0| \leq r^{-1}C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+4}). \quad (10.61)$$

A computation (starting from (7.12)) for general  $\psi$  shows that

$$\partial_u((r^2\bar{\partial}_r)(r\psi)) = r^3(-\gamma)\Box\psi + 2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)(-\gamma)(r\bar{\partial}_r)\psi - \frac{2}{r}(-\nu)(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)(r\psi). \quad (10.62)$$

Specialize this equation to  $\psi = \psi_0$ , integrate to  $C^{\text{out}}$ , where the data for  $\psi_0$  vanishes, and use (10.60) and (10.61) and the inductive hypothesis to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)^2(r\bar{\partial}_r)^nS^m\varphi(u, v)| &= |(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n+1}S^m\varphi(u, v)| \\ &\leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})\left[\int_1^u r^{-1}(u', v) du' + \int_1^u r^{-1}|(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)^2(r\bar{\partial}_r)^nS^m\varphi|(u', v) du'\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10.63)$$

Grönwall's inequality, the monotonicity  $r^{-1}(u', v) \leq r^{-1}(u, v)$  for  $u' \in [1, u]$ , and the estimate  $ur^{-1} \leq 1$  in the region of interest give

$$|(r^2\bar{\partial}_r)^2(r\bar{\partial}_r)^nS^m\varphi(u, v)| \leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})ur^{-1} \exp(C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})ur^{-1}) \leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})ur^{-1}, \quad (10.64)$$

This concludes the proof of lemma 10.9 for  $k = 2$  and the pair  $(n, m)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 10.10.** *We have*

$$|U(r\bar{\partial}_r)^nS^m\varphi| \lesssim C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2})[|US^m\varphi| + r^{-1}|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1}S^{\leq m-1}\varphi| + r^{-1}|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n}S^{\leq m}\varphi|]. \quad (10.65)$$

*Proof.* Compute the wave equation (in the region  $\{r \geq 2R_\bullet\}$ )

$$U(r\bar{\partial}_r) = \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}\varpi, (-\gamma))[r\Box + U + r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)] \quad (10.66)$$

It follows that, for  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$U(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m = \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}\varpi, (-\gamma))[r\Box(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n-1}S^m + U(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n-1}S^m + r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m]. \quad (10.67)$$

It follows from (10.46) and corollary 10.8 that (in the region  $\{r \geq 5R_\bullet\}$ )

$$|r^2\Box(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi| \lesssim C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+3})[|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+2} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi| + |(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1} S^{\leq m} \varphi|]. \quad (10.68)$$

Now (10.67) and (10.68) imply

$$|U(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varphi| \lesssim C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2})[r^{-1}|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi| + r^{-1}|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m} \varphi| + |U(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{n-1} S^m \varphi|] \quad (10.69)$$

We obtain lemma 10.10 from (10.69) by induction on  $n$ .  $\square$

10.3.2. *Estimates for  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of  $\varpi$ .*

**Lemma 10.11.** *For  $n \geq 1$  and  $m \geq 0$ , we have*

$$r\tau^{1-\epsilon}|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varpi| \leq C(\epsilon, n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+3}) \quad \text{in } \{r \geq 5R_\bullet\}. \quad (10.70)$$

For  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , we have

$$\tau^{1-\epsilon}|\Gamma^\alpha \varpi| \leq C(\epsilon, |\alpha|, \mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|}) \quad \text{in } \{r \leq 5R_\bullet\}. \quad (10.71)$$

For  $m \geq 1$ , we have

$$\tau^{1-\epsilon}|S^m \varpi| \leq C(\epsilon, n, m) \quad \text{in } \{r \geq 5R_\bullet\}. \quad (10.72)$$

*Proof.* The transport equation for  $\varpi$  is

$$r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)\varpi = \frac{1}{2}(1-\mu)((r\bar{\partial}_r)\varphi)^2 =_s \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}\varpi)((r\bar{\partial}_r)\varphi)^2. \quad (10.73)$$

An induction argument implies that for  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \varpi =_s \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}S^{\leq m}\varpi, r^{-1}(r\bar{\partial}_r)^{1 \leq n-1} S^{\leq m}\varphi)((r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m}\varphi)^2. \quad (10.74)$$

Now (10.70) follows from proposition 8.4 and corollary 10.8.

For (10.71), specialize (8.47) to the region  $\{r \leq 5R_\bullet\}$  for  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ ,

$$|\Gamma^\alpha \varpi| \leq \tau C(\mathfrak{B}_{<\alpha})|\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \varphi|^2 \leq C(\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|})\tau^{-1+\epsilon}. \quad (10.75)$$

It follows that, in the region  $\{r \geq 5R_\bullet\}$ , for  $m \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |S^m \varpi|(u, r) &\leq |S^m \varpi|(u, 5R_\bullet) + \int_{5R_\bullet}^r |\bar{\partial}_r S^m \varpi|(u, r') \, dr' \\ &\leq C(R_\bullet)|S^m \varpi|(u, 5R_\bullet) + \int_{5R_\bullet}^r \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}S^{\leq m}\varpi)|(r\bar{\partial}_r)S^{\leq m}\varphi|^2(u, r') \, dr' \\ &\leq C(\mathfrak{D}_m)\tau^{-1+\epsilon} + C(\mathfrak{D}_{m+3}) \int_{5R_\bullet}^r r^{-2}\tau^{-1+\epsilon} \, dr' \\ &\leq C(\mathfrak{D}_{m+3})\tau^{-1+\epsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (10.76)$$

which is (10.72).  $\square$

**Lemma 10.12** (Asymptotic expansion of  $\varpi$ ). *In  $\{r \geq 5R_\bullet\} \cap \{r \geq u\}$ , we have*

$$\varpi(u, r) = \varpi|_{\mathcal{I}}(u) + \mathcal{E}_\varpi(u, r), \quad (10.77)$$

where  $\varpi|_{\mathcal{I}}$  satisfies

$$|(u\bar{\partial}_u)^m \varpi|_{\mathcal{I}}(u)| \lesssim C(\epsilon, m, \mathfrak{D}_m) \min(r^\epsilon, u^\epsilon), \quad (10.78)$$

and the error  $\mathcal{E}_\varpi$  satisfies

$$|(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n (u\bar{\partial}_u)^m \mathcal{E}_\varpi| \lesssim C(\epsilon, n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})r^{-1} \min(r^\epsilon, u^\epsilon). \quad (10.79)$$

*Proof. Step 1: Proof of (10.79).* Define

$$\mathcal{E}_\varpi(u, r) := - \int_r^\infty \bar{\partial}_r \varpi(u, r') dr' = - \int_r^\infty r'^{-2} (r'^2 \bar{\partial}_r) \varpi(u, r') dr' = - \int_r^\infty \frac{1}{2} r'^{-2} (1 - \mu) ((r'^2 \bar{\partial}_r) \varphi)^2(u, r') dr', \quad (10.80)$$

so that (10.77) holds with  $\varpi_{\mathcal{I}}(u) := \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \varpi(u, r)$ . It follows from lemmas 10.9 and 10.11 (after replacing instances of  $u \bar{\partial}_u$  with  $S - r \bar{\partial}_r$ ) that, for  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |(r \bar{\partial}_r)^n (u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \mathcal{E}_\varpi| &\lesssim r^{-2} |(r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} (u \bar{\partial}_u)^{\leq m} (1 - \mu) | (r^2 \bar{\partial}_r) (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n-1} (u \bar{\partial}_u)^{\leq m} \varphi|^2 \\ &\lesssim C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+4}) r^{-2}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.81)$$

When  $n = 0$ , we differentiate under the integral sign and use lemmas 10.9 and 10.11 and proposition 8.4 (after replacing instances of  $u \bar{\partial}_u$  with  $S - r \bar{\partial}_r$ ) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |(u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \mathcal{E}_\varpi| &\lesssim \int_r^\infty r'^{-2} |(u \bar{\partial}_u)^{\leq m} (1 - \mu) | (r'^2 \bar{\partial}_r) (u \bar{\partial}_u)^{\leq m} \varphi|^2(u, r') dr' \\ &\lesssim C(\epsilon, n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5}) \int_r^\infty r'^{-2} \min(r^\epsilon, u^\epsilon) dr' \lesssim C(\epsilon, n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5}) r^{-1} \min(r^\epsilon, u^\epsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (10.82)$$

Use (10.81) and (10.82) to conclude (10.79).

*Step 2: Proof of (10.78).* By similar arguments to those in lemma 10.11, one can use lemma 10.9 to obtain  $|(r^2 \bar{\partial}_r) (u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \varpi| \lesssim C(m, \mathfrak{D}_{m+5})$ . This shows that  $(u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \varpi$  is integrable in  $r$  towards  $\mathcal{I}$ , uniformly on compact subsets of  $u$ . It follows from a fact in real analysis (as in the proof of lemma 8.11) that  $(u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \varpi|_{\mathcal{I}}(u) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} ((u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \varpi)(u, r)$ . Then (10.78) follows from lemma 10.11 and proposition 8.4 (after replacing instances of  $u \bar{\partial}_u$  with  $S - r \bar{\partial}_r$ ).  $\square$

### 10.3.3. Estimates for $(r \bar{\partial}_r)$ -derivatives of $(-\gamma)$ .

**Lemma 10.13.** *For  $n, m \geq 0$ , we have*

$$r\tau |U^{\leq 1} (r \bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \log(-\gamma)| \leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+3}) \quad \text{in } \{r \geq 5R_\bullet\}. \quad (10.83)$$

*Proof.* When  $n = 0$ , this follows from proposition 8.13. When  $n \geq 1$ , the transport equation for  $\log(-\gamma)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} |U^{\leq 1} (r \bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \log(-\gamma)| &= U^{\leq 1} (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{n-1} S^m (r \bar{\partial}_r) \log(-\gamma) = |U^{\leq 1} (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{n-1} S^m ((r \bar{\partial}_r) \varphi)^2| \\ &\lesssim |(r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m} \varphi|^2 + |U (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq n} \varphi|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (10.84)$$

Use lemma 10.10 and corollary 10.8, and the definition of the pointwise norm  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha,1} \leq C(|\alpha|, \mathfrak{D}_{|\alpha|})$  to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |U^{\leq 1} (r \bar{\partial}_r)^n S^m \log(-\gamma)| &\lesssim C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m+2}) [| (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} S^{\leq m} \varphi|^2 + | (r \bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n+1} S^{\leq m-1} \varphi|^2 + |U S^m \varphi|^2] \\ &\lesssim C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+3}) r^{-1} \tau^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.85)$$

$\square$

**Lemma 10.14** (Asymptotic expansion of  $(-\gamma)$ ). *In  $\{r \geq 5R_\bullet\} \cap \{r \geq u\}$ , we have*

$$(-\gamma)(u, r) = 1 + r^{-2} \mathcal{F}_{(-\gamma)}(u) + \mathcal{E}_{(-\gamma)}(u, r), \quad (10.86)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{(-\gamma)}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{(-\gamma)}$  satisfy

$$|(u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \mathcal{F}_{(-\gamma)}| \leq C(m, \mathfrak{D}_{m+5}) \quad (10.87)$$

and

$$|(r \bar{\partial}_r)^n (u \bar{\partial}_u)^m \mathcal{E}_{(-\gamma)}| \leq C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5}) r^{-3} \quad (10.88)$$

*Proof. Step 1: Preliminary computations and the derivation of (10.86).* Write  $K = r^2 \bar{\partial}_r$ . Compute

$$K(-\gamma) = r^{-1}(K\varphi)^2(-\gamma) \quad (10.89)$$

$$K^2(-\gamma) = -(K\varphi)^2(-\gamma) + r^{-1}K^2\varphi \cdot K\varphi(-\gamma) + r^{-2}(K\varphi)^4(-\gamma) \quad (10.90)$$

$$\begin{aligned} K^3(-\gamma) &= -3K^2\varphi \cdot K\varphi(-\gamma) - 3r^{-1}(K\varphi)^4(-\gamma) + r^{-1}(K^2\varphi)^2(-\gamma) + 5r^{-2}K^2\varphi \cdot (K\varphi)^3(-\gamma) \\ &\quad + r^{-3}(K\varphi)^6(-\gamma) + (r\bar{\partial}_r)K^2\varphi \cdot K\varphi(-\gamma) \end{aligned} \quad (10.91)$$

Next, define

$$\mathcal{E}_{(-\gamma)}(u, r) := \int_r^\infty \rho^{-2} \int_\rho^\infty \rho'^{-2} \int_{\rho'}^\infty \rho''^{-2} K^3(-\gamma)(u, \rho'') \, d\rho'' \, d\rho' \, d\rho, \quad (10.92)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - (-\gamma)(u, r) &= \int_r^\infty \rho^{-2} K(-\gamma)(u, \rho) \, d\rho = -r^{-1} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K(-\gamma)(u, r) - \int_r^\infty \rho^{-2} \int_\rho^\infty \rho'^{-2} K^2(-\gamma)(u, \rho') \, d\rho' \, d\rho \\ &= -r^{-1} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K(-\gamma)(u, r) - 2r^{-2} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K^2(-\gamma)(u, r) - \mathcal{E}_{(-\gamma)}(u, r). \end{aligned} \quad (10.93)$$

From (10.89) and (10.90), the boundedness statement of lemma 10.9, and the gauge condition  $(-\gamma)|_{\mathcal{I}} = 1$ , we see that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K(-\gamma)(u, r) = 0, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K^2(-\gamma)(u, r) = - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (K\varphi)^2(u, r) \quad (10.94)$$

It follows that (10.86) holds for  $\mathcal{F}_{(-\gamma)}(u) = -2 \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (K\varphi)^2(u, r)$ .

*Step 2: Proof of (10.87).* This is proved with a similar method to (10.78). The important points are that, by lemma 10.9,  $K(K\varphi)^2$  is bounded (which provides the integrability in  $r$  towards infinity, uniformly on compact subsets of  $u$ ), and  $K(u\bar{\partial}_u)^{\leq m}\varphi$  is bounded (since we can replace instances of  $u\bar{\partial}_u$  by  $S - r\bar{\partial}_r$ ).

*Step 3: Proof of (10.88).* All terms on the right side of (10.91) are bounded by  $C(n, m, \mathfrak{D}_{n+m+5})$  after applications of  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n(u\bar{\partial}_u)^m$ , by lemma 10.9 (since we can replace instances of  $u\bar{\partial}_u$  by  $S - r\bar{\partial}_r$ ). It follows that all terms in  $(r\bar{\partial}_r)^n(u\bar{\partial}_u)^m \mathcal{E}_{(-\gamma)}$  are bounded by  $r^{-3}$  (with the constant just mentioned).  $\square$

#### 10.4. Retrieving the assumptions of the work of Luk–Oh on late-time tails.

10.4.1. *Notation of the work of Luk–Oh.* We define notation as in [29, Sec. 2.1.1–2.1.3]. Define the following parameters:

- $R_{\text{far}} = 5R_\bullet$ ,
- $M_c \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ,
- $\delta_c = 1/2$
- $J_c = 3$ ,
- $K_c = 0$ ,
- $\eta_c = 1$ ,
- $M_0 \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ,
- $A_0 = C(\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\text{min}}, M_0, \mathfrak{D}_{M_0+5})$ ,
- $\alpha_0 = 3/4$ ,
- $\nu_0 = 1/4$ ,
- $D = C(\mathfrak{D}_{M_0})$ ,
- $\alpha_d = 4$ ,
- $\delta_d \in (0, 1]$ ,
- $J_d = 3$ ,
- $K_d = 0$ ,
- $\eta_d = 1$ ,

Let  $\mathbf{g} = g$  be the spacetime metric on  $\mathcal{M}$ . We now define Cartesian coordinates on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $(\theta, \phi)$  be the standard local coordinate system on  $S^2$ . Set

$$x^0 = \chi(r)(2v - r) + (1 - \chi(r))(2u + r) \quad (10.95)$$

and  $x^1 = r \sin \theta \cos \phi$ ,  $x^2 = r \sin \theta \sin \phi$ , and  $x^3 = r \cos \theta$ . Set

$$\mathbf{T} := \partial_{x^0}, \quad (10.96)$$



where  $\partial_{x^0}$  is defined with respect to the coordinates  $(x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3)$ . Define

$$\bar{u} := x^0 - r + 3R_{\text{far}} \quad \bar{\tau} := x^0 - \chi_{>4R_{\text{far}}}(r)(r - 3R_{\text{far}}) \quad (10.97)$$

for a cutoff function  $\chi_{>4R_{\text{far}}}(r)$  that is 0 when  $r \leq 2R_{\text{far}}$  and 1 when  $r \geq 4R_{\text{far}}$ . In particular, observe that

$$\bar{u} = 2u + 3R_{\text{far}} \quad \text{in } \{r \geq R_{\text{far}}\}, \quad (10.98)$$

and

$$\mathbf{T}\bar{\tau} = 1, \quad \text{and } \bar{\tau} = \begin{cases} x^0, & \text{in } \{r \leq 2R_{\text{far}}\}, \\ \bar{u}, & \text{in } \{r \geq 4R_{\text{far}}\}. \end{cases} \quad (10.99)$$

Write  $(\partial_r^{(\tau)}, \partial_r^{(\bar{\tau})})$  for the coordinate derivatives in the  $(\tau, r)$  coordinate system and  $(\partial_{\bar{u}}, \partial_r)$  for the coordinate derivatives in  $(\bar{u}, r)$ -coordinates. We will write  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{near}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{med}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{wave}}$  for

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\text{near}} &:= \{(u, r) \in \mathcal{M} : r \leq 2R_{\text{far}}, \bar{\tau} \geq 1\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{\text{med}} &:= \{(u, r) \in \mathcal{M} : R_{\text{far}} \leq r \leq 400\bar{u}, \bar{\tau} \geq 1\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{\text{wave}} &:= \{(u, r) \in \mathcal{M} : r \geq 4\bar{u}, \bar{\tau} \geq 1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.100)$$

and write  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{far}} := \mathcal{M}_{\text{med}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{wave}}$ .

10.4.2. *Global assumptions on the spacetime.* Assumption (G1) is clearly satisfied. Assumption (G2) is satisfied, since the only boundary component of  $\mathcal{M}$  is the null event horizon. Finally, it is easy to check the causality condition (G3) based on the definition of  $x^0$ .

10.4.3. *Assumptions on the metric.* Define the absolute value of a  $(2,0)$ -tensor as in [29, Sec. 2.1.4]. A tedious but straightforward computation involving the expression for a Lie derivative in local coordinates, the chain rule, the definitions of our schematic geometric quantities, and the results of section 9 yields the following expression for these absolute values in terms of components in  $(u, r)$  and  $(r, v)$ -coordinates.

**Lemma 10.15.** *Fix a function  $m(\bar{\tau}, r)$ . Let  $\mathbf{a}$  be  $(2,0)$ -tensor*

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}^{ur}(\partial_u \otimes \partial_r + \partial_r \otimes \partial_u) + \mathbf{a}^{rr}\partial_r \otimes \partial_r + r^{-2}\mathfrak{a} \quad (10.101)$$

for  $\mathfrak{a}^{AB}$  a  $(2,0)$ -tensor on  $S^2$ . Then in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{far}}$  we have

$$|\mathcal{L}_{\tau\mathbf{T}}^n \mathcal{L}_{(r)\partial_r^{(\tau)}}^m \mathbf{a}| \lesssim_{n,m} C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m}) [|(u\bar{\partial}_u)^{\leq m} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} \mathbf{a}^{ur}| + |(u\bar{\partial}_u)^{\leq m} (r\bar{\partial}_r)^{\leq n} \mathbf{a}^{rr}| + r^{-2}|\mathfrak{a}^{AB}|]. \quad (10.102)$$

Similarly, if  $\mathbf{b}$  takes the form

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}^{vr}(\partial_v \otimes \partial_r + \partial_r \otimes \partial_v) + \mathbf{b}^{rr}\partial_r \otimes \partial_r + r^{-2}\mathfrak{b}, \quad (10.103)$$

then in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{near}}$  we have

$$|\mathcal{L}_{\tau\mathbf{T}}^n \mathcal{L}_{(r)\partial_r^{(\tau)}}^m \mathbf{b}| \lesssim_{n,m} C(\mathfrak{D}_{n+m}) \sum_{\substack{n', m' \geq 0 \\ n' + m' = n + m}} [ |S^{\leq m'} D^{\leq n'} \mathbf{b}^{vr}| + |S^{\leq m'} D^{\leq n'} \mathbf{b}^{rr}| + r^{-2}|\mathfrak{b}^{AB}| ]. \quad (10.104)$$

Finally, if  $a$  is a spherically symmetric smooth function, such that

$$\sum_{m+n \leq N} |S^m (r\bar{\partial}_r)^n a| \lesssim m(\bar{\tau}, r) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}_{\text{far}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{m+n \leq N} |S^m D^n a| \lesssim m(\tau, r) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}_{\text{near}}, \quad (10.105)$$

then

$$a = O_{\mathbf{T}}^N(m(\tau, r)), \quad (10.106)$$

where the  $O_{\mathbf{T}}$  notation is defined as in [29, Sec. 2.1.4].

One computes

$$\mathbf{g}^{-1} = -\frac{1}{(-\gamma)}(\partial_{\bar{u}} \otimes \partial_r + \partial_r \otimes \partial_{\bar{u}}) + (1 - \mu)\partial_r \otimes \partial_r + r^{-2}\overset{\circ}{\gamma}^{-1} \quad (10.107)$$

and

$$\mathbf{g}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\kappa}(\partial_r \otimes \partial_v + \partial_v \otimes \partial_r) + (1 - \mu)\partial_r \otimes \partial_r + r^{-2}\overset{\circ}{\gamma}^{-1}. \quad (10.108)$$

for  $\overset{\circ}{\gamma}$  the round metric on the unit sphere.

In  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{near}}$ , by proposition 8.8, (10.108), and lemma 10.15, we have

$$\mathbf{g}^{-1} = O_{\mathbf{T}}^{M_c}(1), \quad (10.109)$$

which satisfies assumption **(gBV1)**.

For  $\mathbf{m}^{-1}$  the inverse Minkowski metric, we have

$$\mathbf{g}^{-1} - \mathbf{m}^{-1} = (1 - (-\gamma)^{-1})(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{u}} \otimes \bar{\partial}_r + \bar{\partial}_r \otimes \bar{\partial}_{\bar{u}}) - \left( \frac{2\varpi}{r} - \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{r^2} \right) \bar{\partial}_r \otimes \bar{\partial}_r \quad (10.110)$$

By lemmas 10.12, 10.14 and 10.15 and (10.107), and a Taylor expansion, we have

$$\mathbf{g}^{-1} - \mathbf{m}^{-1} = O_{\Gamma}^{M_c}(r^{-1+\epsilon}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}_{\text{med}}, \quad (10.111)$$

where the implicit constant depends on  $\epsilon$ ,  $M_c$ , and  $\mathfrak{D}_{M_c+5}$ . This satisfies assumption **(gBV2)** (with  $\delta_c = 1/2$ ).

By lemmas 10.12 and 10.14 and Taylor expansion, in  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{wave}}$  we have the asymptotics

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}^{\bar{u}r} &= -1 + r^{-2} \mathring{\mathbf{h}}_{2,0}^{\bar{u}r}(u) + \varrho_3[\mathbf{h}^{\bar{u}r}], \\ \mathbf{g}^{rr} &= r^{-1} \mathring{\mathbf{h}}_{1,0}^{rr}(u) + \varrho_2[\mathbf{h}^{rr}], \\ r^2 \mathbf{g}^{AB} &= \mathring{\gamma}^{AB}, \end{aligned} \quad (10.112)$$

where the unlisted components vanish, and where, in the notation of [29, Sec. 2.1.4],

$$\mathring{\mathbf{h}}_{2,0}^{\bar{u}r} = O_{\Gamma^{M_c}}(1), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathring{\mathbf{h}}_{1,0}^{rr} = 2\varpi|_{\mathcal{I}}(u) = O_{\Gamma}(u^\epsilon), \quad (10.113)$$

and

$$\varrho_3[\mathbf{h}^{\bar{u}r}] = O_{\Gamma}^{M_c}(r^{-3}), \quad \text{and} \quad \varrho_2[\mathbf{h}^{rr}] = \mathcal{E}_{\varpi} + r^{-2} \mathbf{e}^2 = O_{\Gamma}^{M_c}(r^{-2} u^\epsilon). \quad (10.114)$$

This satisfies assumption **(gBV3)** (with  $\eta_c = 1$  and  $\delta_c = 1/2$ ).

10.4.4. *Stationary estimate.* The assumption **(SE1)** is trivially satisfied, since  $\mathcal{M}$  has no timelike boundary components.

Define the inverse metric

$${}^{(\infty)}\mathbf{g}^{-1} := -(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{u}} \otimes \bar{\partial}_r + \bar{\partial}_r \otimes \bar{\partial}_{\bar{u}}) + \left( 1 - \frac{\varpi_f}{r} + \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{r^2} \right) \bar{\partial}_r \otimes \bar{\partial}_r + r^{-2} \mathring{\gamma}^{-1} \quad (10.115)$$

in  $(\bar{u}, r)$ -coordinates. Since  $\mathbf{T}r = 0$ , we have the stationarity property  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{T}}({}^{(\infty)}\mathbf{g}) = 0$ . The stationary estimate for the Reissner–Nordström metric  ${}^{(\infty)}\mathbf{g}$  (with mass  $\varpi_f$  and charge  $\mathbf{e}$ ) follows from the methods in [2, Sec. 7] (see also the discussion in [29, Ex. 3.6]). As for the convergence of  $\mathbf{g}^{-1}$  to  ${}^{(\infty)}\mathbf{g}^{-1}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{g} - {}^{(\infty)}\mathbf{g}^{-1} := (1 - (-\gamma)^{-1})(\bar{\partial}_{\bar{u}} \otimes \bar{\partial}_r + \bar{\partial}_r \otimes \bar{\partial}_{\bar{u}}) + \frac{\varpi - \varpi_f}{r} \bar{\partial}_r \otimes \bar{\partial}_r. \quad (10.116)$$

On  $\Sigma_{\bar{r}} \cap \{r \geq R_{\text{far}}\}$  (where  $\Sigma_{\bar{r}}$  is defined as in [29, Sec. 2.1.3]), the assumption **(SE2)** (with  $\delta_c = 1/2$ ) follows from lemmas 10.11 and 10.13 (and an easy decay estimate for  $\varpi - \varpi_f$  that follows from the energy decay established in section 6). The verification of assumption **(SE2)** in the region  $\Sigma_{\bar{r}} \cap \{r \leq R_{\text{far}}\}$  is done in  $(v, r)$ -coordinates, and it is similar (but uses proposition 8.8). Thus assumption **(SE2)** holds.

10.4.5. *Assumptions on the initial data.* The assumption **(D $_{\Sigma_1}$ )** on the initial data is satisfied for our compactly supported data (with  $D = C(\mathfrak{D}_{M_0})$ ), for any  $\alpha_d \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $\delta_d \in (0, 1]$ . Note that, although the data hypersurface  $\Sigma_1$  leaves the region  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}$ , the scalar field vanishes in the region  $\Sigma_1 \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{char}}^c$ .

10.4.6. *Assumptions on the scalar field.* By the results of section 9 and lemma 10.15, we have

$$|S^m D^n \varphi| \lesssim v^{-1+\epsilon} \implies \varphi = O_{\Gamma}^{M_0}(A_0 \bar{\tau}^{-1+\epsilon}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}_{\text{near}}. \quad (10.117)$$

By corollary 10.8 and lemma 10.15, we have

$$|S^m (r \bar{\partial}_r)^n \varphi| \lesssim u^{-1+\epsilon} \implies \varphi = O_{\Gamma}^{M_0}(A_0 \bar{u}^{-1+\epsilon}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}_{\text{med}}. \quad (10.118)$$

By corollary 10.8 and lemma 10.15, we have

$$|S^m (r \bar{\partial}_r)^n \varphi| \lesssim r^{-1/2-\epsilon} u^{-1+2\epsilon} \implies \varphi = O_{\Gamma}^{M_0}(A_0 r^{-1/2-\epsilon} \bar{u}^{-1+2\epsilon}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}_{\text{wave}}. \quad (10.119)$$

Taking  $\epsilon = 1/4$ , the above three implications show that assumption **(S)** is satisfied with  $\alpha_0 = 3/4$  and  $\nu_0 = 1/4$ .

10.5. **Obtaining a late-time tails result from the work of Luk–Oh.** We begin by showing that the first higher radiation field vanishes (i.e. the radiation field  $\Phi$  has no  $r^{-1}$  term in its expansion).

**Lemma 10.16.** *In the notation of [29, Sec. 2.3], we have*

$$\mathring{\Phi}_{1,0}(u) \equiv 0. \quad (10.120)$$

*Proof.* Define  $\Phi := r\varphi$ . From (7.12), we have

$$\partial_u \partial_v \Phi = -\frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^3} \kappa(-\nu) \Phi \implies \partial_u (r^3 \partial_v \Phi) + \frac{3}{r} (-\nu) r^3 \partial_v \Phi = -2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r) \kappa(-\nu) \Phi = O(u^{-1/2+\epsilon}). \quad (10.121)$$

By Grönwall's inequality and the vanishing of the data on  $C^{\text{out}}$ , we have

$$|r^3 \partial_v \Phi| \lesssim u^{1/2+\epsilon} e^{Cu/r}. \quad (10.122)$$

In particular, if we define  $\mathring{\Phi}_0(u) := \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(u, v)$ , then (for  $r(u, v) \geq u$ ) we have

$$|\Phi(u, v) - \mathring{\Phi}_0(u)| \leq \int_v^\infty |\partial_v \Phi(u, v')| dv' \lesssim r^{-2} u^{1/2+\epsilon}. \quad (10.123)$$

In particular, it follows that

$$\mathring{\Phi}_{1,0}(u) := \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} r(u, v) (\Phi(u, v) - \mathring{\Phi}_0(u)) \equiv 0, \quad (10.124)$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem 10.17** (Sharp Price's law result). *There exists a universal large constant  $N \geq 0$  and small constants  $\epsilon, \delta > 0$  such that for every  $k \geq 0$ , we have the following asymptotic along the event horizon*

$$|(v \underline{\partial}_v)^k \varphi|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) - C_k \mathfrak{L} v^{-3} = O(v^{-3-\delta}), \quad (10.125)$$

where the implicit constant depends on  $\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}, k$ , and  $\mathfrak{D}_{\max(N, \epsilon^{-1}k)}$ . Moreover, for  $0 \leq k \leq 2$ , we have

$$|(\bar{v} \partial_{\bar{v}})^k \varphi|_{\mathcal{H}}(v) - C_k \mathfrak{L} \bar{v}^{-3} = O(\bar{v}^{-3-\delta}), \quad (10.126)$$

where  $\bar{v}$  and  $\partial_{\bar{v}}$  are the coordinate and associated derivative in the Eddington–Finkelstein-type gauge (see section 2.4), and where the implied constant depends on the same parameters as in (10.125).

*Proof.* Define  $J_{\mathfrak{f}} := 2$  and  $\alpha_{\mathfrak{f}} := 3$ . Then [29, Eq. (2.83)] holds. Evidently, the asymptotic spatial profile defined in [29, Eq. (2.90)] is identically equal to 1. In spherical symmetry and with  $K_1 = 0$ , we have

$$\mathring{\Phi}_{(0)1,0}(u) = \mathring{\Phi}_{1,0}(u) = \mathring{\Phi}_{1,0}(u), \quad (10.127)$$

so lemma 10.16 implies [29, Eq. (2.73)]. In the previous section we showed that all the main assumptions of [29] are satisfied. An appeal to [29, Main Theorem 4] shows that there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  small,  $M \geq 0$  large, and an explicit constant  $C \neq 0$  such that for  $M_0, M_c \geq M$  and  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small, we have

$$\varphi(\bar{\tau}, r) = C \mathfrak{L} \bar{\tau}^{-3} + O_{\Gamma}^{[\epsilon M]}((D + A_0) \bar{\tau}^{-3-\delta}) \quad \text{in } \{r \leq \bar{\tau}^{1-2\delta}\}, \quad (10.128)$$

where  $\mathfrak{L} = \int_{\mathcal{I}} 2\varpi|_{\mathcal{I}}(u) \varphi(u) du$  is non-zero for solutions arising from generic Cauchy data, by [32, Thm. 4.3] (to relate this expression for  $\mathfrak{L}$  to the notion of final asymptotic charge in [29, Sec. 2.r5], one integrates the recurrence equations in [29, Sec. 2.3]). Specializing to a region  $\{r \leq R_0\}$ , where  $\bar{\tau} = 2v - r$ , and performing a Taylor expansion, we get

$$\varphi(r, v) = C \mathfrak{L} v^{-3} + O_{\Gamma}^{[\epsilon M]}(v^{-3-\delta}), \quad (10.129)$$

where the implicit constant depends on  $\varpi_i, c_{\mathcal{H}}, r_{\min}$ , and  $\mathfrak{D}_M$ . Differentiating this asymptotic yields (10.125).

For the result in the Eddington–Finkelstein-type gauge, one notes that the argument of proposition 9.2 (see also lemmas 9.4 and 9.5) provides, on the event horizon,

$$\begin{aligned} S - \bar{v} \partial_{\bar{v}} S &= \rho S + (1 - \rho) v \lambda U \\ S^2 - (\bar{v} \partial_{\bar{v}})^2 S &= \sum_{\substack{a, b, c \leq 1 \\ a+b+c \geq 1}} (S^{\leq 1} \rho)^a (S^{\leq 1} (v \lambda))^b (v \lambda U (v \lambda))^c \{U, S\}^{1 \leq 2}, \end{aligned} \quad (10.130)$$

for some quantity  $\rho$ , together with the estimates

$$|S^{\leq 1}\rho| \lesssim v^{-1}, \quad |S^{\leq 1}(v\lambda)| \lesssim v^{-1}, \quad |v\lambda U(v\lambda)| \lesssim v^{-1}. \quad (10.131)$$

The upshot is that for  $0 \leq k \leq 2$ ,

$$|S^k\varphi - (\bar{v}\partial_{\bar{v}})^k\varphi| \lesssim v^{-1}|\{U, S\}^{1 \leq 2}\varphi| \lesssim v^{-4}, \quad (10.132)$$

where the final estimate is due to (10.129). Noting that  $S = v\partial_v$  on the horizon, (10.126) now follows from the above equation and (10.125).  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF VECTOR FIELD COMMUTATOR CALCULATIONS

*Proof of lemma 2.11.* From

$$V = (\chi + \lambda^{-1}(1 - \chi))\partial_v + \chi\lambda U, \quad (A.1)$$

we obtain (2.46) and

$$V - \bar{\partial}_r = \chi(\lambda - 1)\bar{\partial}_r + \chi\lambda U, \quad (A.2)$$

which gives (2.47). From (A.1), one obtains (2.48):

$$\partial_v = F^{-1}V - F^{-1}\chi\lambda U \quad \text{for } F = (\chi + (1 - \chi)/\lambda) =_s \mathbf{b}_0. \quad (A.3)$$

$\square$

*Proof of (2.49).* One obtains (2.49) by computing

$$S = \chi(v\partial_v + v\lambda U) + (1 - \chi)((r + u(-\nu))\bar{\partial}_r + u(-\nu)U) \quad (A.4)$$

and using (2.48).  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.13.* Use the transport equations for  $(-\nu)$  and  $\lambda$  to compute

$$[\bar{\partial}_r, U] =_s r^{-2}\{1, \varpi, (1 - \mu)^{-1}\}[\bar{\partial}_r + U], \quad (A.5)$$

and then use  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}(1 - \mu)^{-1} =_s \mathbf{b}_0$  and  $\varpi =_s \mathbf{g}_0$  to get (2.51).

We have

$$[\bar{\partial}_r, \underline{\partial}_v] = [\bar{\partial}_r, \partial_v] + [\bar{\partial}_r, \lambda U] = \lambda^{-2}\partial_v\lambda\partial_v + \lambda^{-1}\partial_v\lambda U + \lambda[\partial_r, U]. \quad (A.6)$$

It follows that

$$[\bar{\partial}_r, V] = \chi'(\underline{\partial}_v - \bar{\partial}_r) + \chi\lambda^{-2}\partial_v\lambda\partial_v + \chi\lambda^{-1}\partial_v\lambda U + \chi\lambda[\bar{\partial}_r, U]. \quad (A.7)$$

Now use (2.48), write  $\underline{\partial}_v = \lambda[\bar{\partial}_r + U]$ , and use (2.51) to obtain (2.52).

Now we compute  $[\bar{\partial}_r, S]$ . First, compute

$$\begin{aligned} [\bar{\partial}_r, S] &= \chi'(v\underline{\partial}_v - (r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u)) + \chi[\bar{\partial}_r, v\underline{\partial}_v] + (1 - \chi)\bar{\partial}_r \\ &= \underbrace{\chi'(v\underline{\partial}_v - (r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u))}_{:=\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{\chi v\bar{\partial}_r\left(\frac{\kappa}{(-\gamma)}\right)\underline{\partial}_v + (1 - \chi)\bar{\partial}_r}_{:=\text{(II)}} \end{aligned} \quad (A.8)$$

We now treat term (I). Observe that

$$\bar{\partial}_r = \lambda^{-1}\underline{\partial}_v - U \quad \bar{\partial}_u = \frac{(-\gamma)}{\kappa}\underline{\partial}_v. \quad (A.9)$$

From this we claim that

$$\text{(I)} =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_0 D \quad (A.10)$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(I)} &= \chi' \left( v - u \frac{(-\gamma)}{\kappa} - \frac{r}{\lambda} \right) \underline{\partial}_v + \chi' r U \\ &= \chi'(v - u - r)\underline{\partial}_v + \chi' \left( \frac{u}{\kappa}(\kappa - (-\gamma)) + r(1 - \lambda^{-1}) \right) + \chi' r U \\ &=_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_0 \underline{\partial}_v + \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} U, \end{aligned} \quad (A.11)$$

and using  $\underline{\partial}_v = \partial_v + \lambda U$  and (2.48) gives (A.10). For term (II), write

$$\text{(II)} = \chi v \bar{\partial}_r \left( \frac{\kappa}{(-\gamma)} \right) \underline{\partial}_v =_s \mathbf{b}_0 (\chi(-\gamma)^{-1} v D \kappa + \chi \kappa (-\gamma)^{-2} v D (-\gamma)) D, \quad (A.12)$$

so that

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0}(\text{II}) =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_0 \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_V D. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Combine (A.10) and (A.13) with (A.8) to conclude (2.53).  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.14.* First we compute  $[U, V]$ . Since  $U$  and  $\underline{\partial}_v$  commute, we have

$$[U, V] = \chi'(\bar{\partial}_r - \underline{\partial}_v) + (1 - \chi)[U, \bar{\partial}_r]. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Use (2.48) and (2.51) to conclude.

Next, we compute  $[U, S]$ . Since  $U$  and  $v\underline{\partial}_v$  commute, we have

$$[U, S] = -\chi'(v\underline{\partial}_v - (r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u)) + (1 - \chi)[U, r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u]. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

As shown in (A.10), the first term is of the schematic form  $\mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_0 D$ . To treat the second term, we compute using (A.9) that

$$[U, \bar{\partial}_r] = -\frac{U\lambda}{\lambda^2} \underline{\partial}_v =_s r^{-2} \{1, \varpi, (1 - \mu)^{-1}\} \underline{\partial}_v, \quad [U, \bar{\partial}_u] = U \left( \frac{(-\gamma)}{\kappa} \right) \underline{\partial}_v, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

which implies

$$[U, r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u] = -\bar{\partial}_r + \frac{1}{(-\nu)} \bar{\partial}_u + \left( -r \frac{U\lambda}{\lambda^2} + uU \left( \frac{(-\gamma)}{\kappa} \right) \right) \underline{\partial}_v. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Since  $-\bar{\partial}_r + (-\nu)^{-1} \bar{\partial}_u = U$  and the coefficient of the final term consists has the structure  $r^{-1} \mathfrak{g}_0 + r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_U$ , the desired (2.55) follows from (A.15).

Now we compute  $[V, S]$ . Use (A.9) to obtain the following identities:

$$[\underline{\partial}_v, v\underline{\partial}_v] = \underline{\partial}_v, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

$$[\underline{\partial}_v, r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u] = \left( r\underline{\partial}_v \lambda^{-1} + u\underline{\partial}_v \left( \frac{(-\gamma)}{\kappa} \right) + 1 \right) \underline{\partial}_v, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$[\bar{\partial}_r, v\underline{\partial}_v] = v\bar{\partial}_r \left( \frac{\kappa}{(-\gamma)} \right) \bar{\partial}_u, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

$$[\bar{\partial}_r, r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u] = \bar{\partial}_r. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

It follows that

$$\chi[\underline{\partial}_v, S] - \chi^2 \underline{\partial}_v = \chi(1 - \chi) \left( r\underline{\partial}_v \lambda^{-1} + u\underline{\partial}_v \left( \frac{(-\gamma)}{\kappa} \right) + 1 \right) \underline{\partial}_v =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_V D. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

and

$$(1 - \chi)[\bar{\partial}_r, S] - (1 - \chi)^2 \bar{\partial}_r = \chi'(1 - \chi)(v\underline{\partial}_v - (r\bar{\partial}_r + u\bar{\partial}_u)) + \chi(1 - \chi)v\bar{\partial}_r \left( \frac{\kappa}{(-\gamma)} \right) \bar{\partial}_u =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_V D \quad (\text{A.23})$$

To conclude, note that

$$[V, S] - \chi^2 \underline{\partial}_v - (1 - \chi)^2 \bar{\partial}_r =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{b}_0 D. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

and

$$\chi^2 \underline{\partial}_v + (1 - \chi)^2 \bar{\partial}_r - V =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{b}_0 D. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

$\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.15.* The strategy is to use an induction argument to simultaneously prove the following two estimates

$$[U, L] =_s \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-S+V}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S+U}) [U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} + r^{-2} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha-V} D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-V} + r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S+U} D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S}] \quad (\text{A.26})$$

$$[V, L] =_s V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} + \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-S+V}, r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S+U}) r^{-2} D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U}. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

We then prove (2.60) assuming (A.26) and (A.27). Observe that (2.57)–(2.59) follow immediately from (A.26) and (A.27) and the definition of  $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$  (see (2.43)). To streamline the notation, we schematically write “good $^U_\beta$ ” (resp. “good $^V_\beta$ ” and “good $^{V^2}_\beta$ ”) for terms appearing on the right side of (A.26) (resp. (2.60) and (A.27)) for the multi-index  $\beta$ . Observe that good $^U_\beta =_s$  good $^U_\alpha$  whenever  $\beta \leq \alpha$  (and the analogous statements hold for the schematic quantities “good $^V_\beta$ ” and “good $^{V^2}_\beta$ ”).

*Step 1: Proof of (A.26) and (A.27).* Both sides of both equations vanish when  $|\alpha| = 0$ . when  $|\alpha| = 1$ , both statements follow from lemma 2.14.

Now suppose inductively that (A.26) and (A.27) hold for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha$  and  $\leq \alpha'$  (with  $|\alpha|, |\alpha'| \geq 1$ ). We will show that they hold for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha + \alpha'$ . Before proceeding, we note that (A.26) and (A.27) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha$  imply

$$[D, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}] =_s \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-S+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S+U})D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U}. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

*Step 1a: Proof of (A.26).* The induction hypothesis for (A.26) with multi-indices  $\leq \alpha$  implies

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+U})[U, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}]\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'} =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}^U \quad (\text{A.29})$$

We now use (A.26) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha'$  to compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}[U, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha'}] &= \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+U})[\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-S} + r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'-V}\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-V} \\ &\quad + r^{-1}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+U}\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-S}] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+U})[[U, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}]\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-S} + r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'-V}[D, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}]\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-V} \\ &\quad + r^{-1}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+U}[D, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}]\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-S}] + \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}^U \\ &= \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}^U. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

In passing to the last line, we noted that the first term in square brackets on the second line is good by (A.29), and the other two terms are good by (A.28). Summing (A.29) and (A.30) concludes the proof of (A.26) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha + \alpha'$ .

*Step 1b: Proof of (A.27).* The induction hypothesis for (A.27) with multi-indices  $\leq \alpha$  implies

$$[V, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}]\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'} =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}^V. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

We now use (A.27) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha'$  and (A.28) and (A.31) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha$  to compute

$$\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}[V, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha'}] =_s \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-S} + \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha+\alpha'-S+U})r^{-2}\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-U} =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}^V. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

In passing to the final equality we used (A.28) and (A.31). Add (A.31) and (A.32) to establish (A.27) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha + \alpha'$ .

*Step 2: Proof of (2.60) given (A.26) and (A.27).* We now show that (2.60) holds for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha$  if (A.26) and (A.27) do.

$$\begin{aligned} V[V, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}] &= V^2\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S} + \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-S+V+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S+U+V})r^{-2}VD\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U} \\ &= \text{good}_{\alpha}^{V^2} + \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-S+V+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S+U+V})r^{-2}[D, V]\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U} \\ &= \text{good}_{\alpha}^{V^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

To pass to the last line we used (2.54) and absorbed the  $r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_0$  term into the  $\mathcal{O}$  term. Use (A.33) to establish

$$[V, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha}]V =_s V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S}V + \text{good}_{\alpha}^{V^2} =_s V[V, \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-S}] + \text{good}_{\alpha}^{V^2} \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Sum (A.33) and (A.34) to conclude (2.60) for multi-indices  $\leq \alpha$ .  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.16.* Write  $L = L_1UL_2$  for  $L_i \in \Gamma^{\alpha_i}$  and  $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + U$ , where  $\alpha_i \geq 0$ . Set  $L' = L_1L_2$ , and use (A.26) to compute  $L - UL' = -[U, L_1]L_2$ , noting that  $L_1 \in \Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} L - UL' &= \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-U-S+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S})[U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U-S} + r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha-U-V}D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U-V} + r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S}D\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U-S}] \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{B}_{\alpha-U-S+V}, r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S})[U\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U-V} + r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha-U-V}V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U-V} + r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha-S}V\Gamma^{\leq \alpha-U-S}] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.35})$$

$\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.17.* If  $|\alpha| \leq 1$ , then this is immediate because  $L = L'$ . The operators  $L$  and  $L'$  are made up of the same vector fields, but in possibly different orders. We can reorder  $L$  into  $L'$  by performing finitely many swaps of two adjacent vector fields. It is therefore enough to consider  $L = L_1\Gamma_1\Gamma_2L_2$  and  $L' = L_1\Gamma_2\Gamma_1L_2$ , where  $L_i \in \Gamma^{\alpha_i}$  and  $\Gamma_i \in \Gamma^{\beta_i}$  for  $|\beta_i| = 1$  and  $\alpha_i \geq 0$  and  $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \beta_1 + \beta_2$ . Inspecting lemma 2.14 shows that

$$[\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2] =_s [1 + r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_{\beta_1+\beta_2-U-V} + r^{-1}\mathfrak{G}_{\beta_1+\beta_2-S} + \mathfrak{B}_{\beta_1+\beta_2-S}]D =_s \mathcal{C}_{\leq \beta_1+\beta_2-S}D, \quad (\text{A.36})$$

and so

$$L - L' = L_1[\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2]L_2 =_s \mathcal{C}_{\leq \alpha_1 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 - s} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha_1} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha_2} =_s \mathcal{C}_{\leq \alpha - s} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha_1 + \alpha_2} =_s \mathcal{C}_{\leq \alpha - s} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha - \beta_1 - \beta_2}. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

In the final equality we used the consequence  $[D, \Gamma^\beta] =_s \mathcal{C}_{< \beta} D \Gamma^{\leq \beta - 1}$  of lemma 2.15. If  $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ , then  $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2$ , so  $L - L' = 0$ . We can therefore suppose  $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ , in which case  $\beta_1 + \beta_2 \geq U + V$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.18.* We first prove (2.64). Use (2.15) to compute

$$\partial_v U = \partial_v (-\nu)^{-1} \partial_u + (-\nu)^{-1} \partial_u \partial_v = \kappa \square + \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} \kappa U - r^{-1} (\lambda U - \partial_v) \quad (\text{A.38})$$

and use (2.48) to conclude.

Now we prove (2.63). We first prove the formula with  $VU$  on the left side. By (2.17) and  $U = -\underline{\partial}_r$ , we have

$$\underline{\partial}_v U = \kappa \square + \kappa(1 - \mu)U^2 - r^{-1} \kappa(2 - 2r^{-1}\varpi)U + r^{-1} \underline{\partial}_v =_s \mathbf{b}_0[\square + r^{-1}D + U^2]. \quad (\text{A.39})$$

By (2.64), we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_0} \bar{\partial}_r U =_s \mathbf{b}_0[\square + r^{-1}D]. \quad (\text{A.40})$$

The claim with  $UV$  on the left now follows from (A.39) and (A.40) and the expression  $V = \chi \underline{\partial}_v + (1 - \chi) \bar{\partial}_r$ . To complete the proof, note that  $[U, V] =_s \mathbf{b}_0 r^{-1} D$  by (A.14).  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.19.* A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} [\square, U] + \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} U^2 &= \frac{U\kappa}{\kappa} \square + \frac{2}{r^2} \left[ -1 + \frac{2\varpi}{r} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{rU\kappa}{\kappa} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{r^2}\right) \right] U + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{1}{\kappa} \underline{\partial}_v \\ &= \mathbf{b}_U[\square + r^{-2}V + r^{-2}U], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.41})$$

which is (2.65).

A similar computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi[\square, \underline{\partial}_v] &= \frac{\chi \underline{\partial}_v \kappa}{\kappa} \square + \frac{\chi \underline{\partial}_v \lambda}{\kappa} U^2 - \frac{2}{r} \left[ -r^{-1} \chi \underline{\partial}_v \varpi + \frac{\chi \underline{\partial}_v \kappa}{\kappa} (1 - \varpi/r) \right] U \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathbf{b}_V[\square + r^{-2}V + r^{-2}U + U^2] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.42})$$

where we used the fact that  $\mathbf{b}_V$  can depend on  $R_\bullet$ . Similarly, one computes

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \chi)[\square, \bar{\partial}_r] - (1 - \chi) \frac{2(\varpi - \mathbf{e}^2/r)}{r^2} \bar{\partial}_r^2 &= \frac{(1 - \chi) \bar{\partial}_r (-\gamma)}{(-\gamma)} \square + \frac{2}{r^2} \left[ -1 + \frac{2\varpi}{r} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{r \bar{\partial}_r (-\gamma)}{(-\gamma)} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{e}^2}{r^2}\right) \right] (1 - \chi) \bar{\partial}_r \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{1}{(-\gamma)} (1 - \chi) \bar{\partial}_u \\ &= \mathbf{b}_V[\square + r^{-2} \mathbf{g}_V V + r^{-2}U]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.43})$$

A direct computation shows that

$$G \bar{\partial}_r^2 = V^2 + \mathcal{E} \quad (\text{A.44})$$

for  $G = (1 + 2\chi(\lambda - 1) + \chi^2(\lambda - 1)^2)$  and  $\mathcal{E} =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathbf{b}_V[D + U^2]$ . Since  $r(\lambda - 1) =_s \mathfrak{B}_0^\circ$ , we find that  $G$  does not vanish and  $(1 - \chi)G^{-1} =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_0^\circ$  when  $R_\bullet$  is large enough depending on  $\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ$ . We next compute

$$[\square, V] = \chi[\square, \underline{\partial}_v] + (1 - \chi)[\square, \bar{\partial}_r] + [\square, \chi](\underline{\partial}_v - \bar{\partial}_r) \quad (\text{A.45})$$

and

$$[\square, \chi] =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_0^\circ[1 + D] \quad (\text{A.46})$$

for  $R_\bullet$  large enough depending on  $\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ$  (due to the occurrence of  $F^{-1}$  for  $F =_s \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} (1 + \chi(1 - \lambda)^{-1})$ ). Since  $\mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} (\underline{\partial}_v - \bar{\partial}_r) =_s \mathbf{b}_0 D$ , we can use (2.63) to compute

$$[\square, \chi](\underline{\partial}_v - \bar{\partial}_r) =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathfrak{B}_0^\circ[V^2 + D + U^2] \quad (\text{A.47})$$

Combine (A.42)–(A.47) to obtain (2.66).

Write  $\underline{S} := v \underline{\partial}_v$  and  $\bar{S} := r \bar{\partial}_r + u \bar{\partial}_u$ . One computes explicitly

$$[\square, \underline{S}] = \left(1 + \frac{S\kappa}{\kappa}\right) \square - \frac{2}{r^2} \left[ -\underline{S}\varpi + \left(1 + \frac{S\kappa}{\kappa}\right) (r - \varpi) \right] U + \frac{1}{\kappa} (\underline{S}\lambda + \lambda) U^2. \quad (\text{A.48})$$

and

$$[\square, \bar{S}] = \left(2 + \frac{\bar{S}(-\gamma)}{(-\gamma)}\right)\square + \frac{\bar{S}(-\nu)}{(-\gamma)}\bar{\partial}_r^2 + \frac{2}{r^2}\left[\varpi - \bar{S}\varpi + \frac{r\bar{S}(-\gamma)}{(-\gamma)}(1 - r^{-1}\varpi)\right]\bar{\partial}_r. \quad (\text{A.49})$$

Since

$$[\square, S] = \chi[\square, \underline{S}] + (1 - \chi)[\square, \bar{S}] + [\square, \chi](\underline{S} - \bar{S}), \quad (\text{A.50})$$

and

$$\underline{S} - \bar{S} =_s \mathbf{1}_{R_\bullet \leq r \leq 2R_\bullet} \mathbf{b}_S DD^{\leq 1}, \quad (\text{A.51})$$

we conclude (2.67) using similar arguments to those used in the computation of  $[\square, V]$ .  $\square$

*Proof of lemma 2.19.* Schematically write “good $_\alpha$ ” for terms appearing on the right side of (2.69) when  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ . With this notation, (2.69) reads

$$[\square, L] + \alpha_U f_U UL + \alpha_V f_V VL =_s \text{good}_\alpha. \quad (\text{A.52})$$

Let  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  be multi-indices with  $|\alpha|, |\alpha'| \geq 1$ . Suppose that (2.69) holds for all operators in  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha}$  and in  $\Gamma^{\leq \alpha'}$ . We will show that if  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$  and  $L' \in \Gamma^{\alpha'}$ , then (2.69) holds for  $LL' \in \Gamma^{\alpha+\alpha'}$ .

*Step 0: The base cases  $|\alpha| \leq 1$ .* If  $|\alpha| = 0$ , then  $L = 1$ , so both sides of (2.69) vanish. If  $|\alpha| = 1$ , then  $L \in \{U, V, S\}$ , and so (2.69) follows from inspection of lemma 2.19. From now on we can suppose that  $|\alpha|, |\alpha'| \geq 1$ .

*Step 1: Differentiating the right side of (2.69).* We will use lemma 2.15 to show that

$$\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \text{good}_{\alpha'} =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}. \quad (\text{A.53})$$

To start, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \text{good}_{\alpha'} =_s & \mathbf{b}_{\alpha+\alpha'} \left[ \underbrace{\Gamma^{\leq \alpha} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-1} \square}_{\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{r^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} V^2 \Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-S}}_{\text{(II)}} \right. \\ & \left. + \underbrace{r^{-2} \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha'-1}}_{\text{(III)}} + \underbrace{r^{-2} \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} \Gamma^{\leq \alpha} U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha'}}_{\text{(IV)}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.54})$$

We handle the terms in the square brackets one by one. Clearly

$$\text{(I)} =_s \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-1} \square =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}. \quad (\text{A.55})$$

We now develop term (II) using lemma 2.15:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(II)} & =_s r^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} [V^2 \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-S} + \mathcal{C}_{< \alpha+V} r^{-2} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-U-S+V}] \\ & =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'} + r^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{\alpha+\alpha'} \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} r^{-2} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-1} =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.56})$$

To pass to the second line we used the fact that term (II) vanishes unless  $\alpha'_S > 0$ , so

$$\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha+V} =_s \mathcal{C}_{< \alpha+\alpha'-S+V} = \mathcal{C}_{< \alpha+\alpha'} =_s \mathbf{b}_{\alpha+\alpha'}. \quad (\text{A.57})$$

From lemma 2.15, we handle term (III):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(III)} & =_s r^{-2} \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} [V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-1} + \mathcal{C}_{< \alpha} r^{-2} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-U-1}] \\ & =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'} + r^{-2} \mathbf{b}_\alpha \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-U-1} =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.58})$$

where in passing to the second line we recalled that  $\mathcal{C}_{< \alpha} =_s \mathbf{b}_\alpha$  (see (2.39) and (2.43)). We handle term (IV) similarly using lemma 2.15:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(IV)} & =_s r^{-2} \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} [U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'} + \mathcal{C}_{< \alpha} [U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-S} + r^{-2} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-V} + r^{-1} \mathfrak{G}_{< \alpha} D \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-S}]] \\ & =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'} + r^{-2} \mathbf{b}_\alpha \mathbf{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'} [U \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'} + V \Gamma^{\leq \alpha+\alpha'-1}] =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.59})$$

Substitute (A.55), (A.56), (A.58) and (A.59) into (A.54) to obtain (A.53).

*Step 2: Differentiating (2.69).* In this step we show that

$$L[\square, L'] + \alpha'_U f_U ULL' + \alpha'_V f_V VLL' =_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}. \quad (\text{A.60})$$



Let  $X \in \{U, V\}$ . Since  $f_U, f_V \in r^{-2}\mathfrak{B}_0\mathfrak{g}_0$ , we have  $\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}f_X =_s r^{-2}\mathfrak{B}_\alpha\mathfrak{g}_\alpha =_s r^{-2}\mathfrak{G}_\alpha$ . Use this to compute

$$\begin{aligned}
[\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}, f_X X] &= {}_s [\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}, f_X]X + f_X[\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}, X] = {}_s \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1+\alpha_2\leq\alpha \\ |\alpha_1|\geq 1}} (\Gamma^{\alpha_1}f_X)\Gamma^{\alpha_2}X + f_X[\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}, X] \\
&= {}_s \sum_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2\leq\alpha} (\Gamma^{\alpha_1}f_X)[X, \Gamma^{\alpha_2}] + \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1+\alpha_2\leq\alpha \\ |\alpha_1|\geq 1}} (\Gamma^{\alpha_1}f_X)X\Gamma^{\alpha_2} \\
&= {}_s (\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}f_X)[X\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1} + [X, \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}]] = {}_s r^{-2}\mathfrak{G}_\alpha[X\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1} + [X, \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}]].
\end{aligned} \tag{A.61}$$

Using (A.61) and lemma 2.15 and  $\mathfrak{G}_\alpha =_s \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'}$  (since  $|\alpha'| > 1$  implies  $\alpha < \alpha + \alpha'$ ), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&L(\alpha'_U f_U U L' + \alpha'_V f_V V L') - \alpha'_U f_U U L L' - \alpha'_V f_V V L L' \\
&= {}_s \alpha'_U [L, f_U U]L' + \alpha'_V [L, f_V V]L' = {}_s [L, f_D D]L' \\
&= {}_s r^{-2}\mathfrak{G}_\alpha[X\Gamma^{\leq\alpha+\alpha'-1} + [X, \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}]L'] \\
&= {}_s r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'}[X\Gamma^{\leq\alpha+\alpha'-1} + [X, \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}]L'] \\
&= {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'} + r^{-2}\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\alpha'}\mathcal{C}_{<\alpha}D\Gamma^{\leq\alpha+\alpha'-U} = {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.62}$$

To complete the proof of (A.60), combine (2.69) for the multi-index  $\alpha$  with (A.62), and then apply (A.53), recalling that  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
L[\square, L'] + \alpha'_U f_U U L L' + \alpha'_V f_V V L L' &= L([\square, L'] + \alpha'_U f_U U L' + \alpha'_V f_V V L') \\
&\quad - (L(\alpha'_U f_U U L' + \alpha'_V f_V V L') - \alpha'_U f_U U L L' - \alpha'_V f_V V L L') \\
&= {}_s L(\text{good}_{\alpha'}) + \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'} = {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.63}$$

*Step 3: Acting on (2.69) from the right.* We now show that

$$[\square, L]L' + \alpha_U f_U U L L' + \alpha_V f_V V L L' = {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}. \tag{A.64}$$

Act on both sides of (2.69) for  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$  with  $L' \in \Gamma^{\alpha'}$  on the right to get

$$[\square, L]L' + \alpha_U f_U U L L' + \alpha_V f_V V L L' = {}_s \mathfrak{b}_\alpha \Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1} \square L' + \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'} = {}_s \mathfrak{b}_\alpha \Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1} [\square, L'] + \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}. \tag{A.65}$$

By (A.60) and lemma 2.15 and the inductive hypothesis, we have  $\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-1}[\square, L'] = {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}$ , and substituting this into (A.65) proves (A.64).

*Step 4: Completing the induction.* Add (A.60) and (A.64) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
[\square, LL'] + (\alpha_U + \alpha'_U) f_U U L L' + (\alpha_V + \alpha'_V) f_V V L L' &= L[\square, L'] + \alpha'_U f_U U L L' + \alpha'_V f_V V L L' \\
&\quad + [\square, L]L' + \alpha_U f_U U L L' + \alpha_V f_V V L L' \\
&= {}_s \text{good}_{\alpha+\alpha'}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.66}$$

We have now shown that (2.69) for  $L \in \Gamma^\alpha$  and  $L' \in \Gamma^\alpha$  implies (2.69) for  $LL' \in \Gamma^{\alpha+\alpha'}$ . Since we established (2.69) for  $|\alpha| \leq 1$  in Step 0, an induction argument concludes (2.69) for all  $\alpha$ .  $\square$

*Proof of corollary 2.21.* We can assume  $|\alpha| \geq 1$ , since the case  $\alpha = 0$  is trivial.

*Step 1: Proof of (2.70).* Observe that (2.70) is a consequence of lemmas 2.11 and 2.20 and the following two identities:

$$V = {}_s \mathfrak{b}_0 [\partial_v + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} U], \tag{A.67}$$

$$rV^2\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-S} = {}_s \mathfrak{B}_0 [\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} \partial_v (r\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi) + \partial_v \Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi + \mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} U\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}\varphi]. \tag{A.68}$$

First, recall that (A.67) was proved in lemma 2.11. To prove (A.68), it is enough to consider the quantity  $\mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} rV^2\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-S}$ , since  $\mathbf{1}_{r \leq 2R_\bullet} rV^2\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-S} = {}_s \mathfrak{B}_0 V\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-S+V} = {}_s \mathfrak{B}_0 V\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}$  is handled by (A.67). Use (A.67) to rewrite the first  $V$  in terms of  $\partial_v$  and  $U$ , then use  $\partial_v r = \lambda = {}_s \mathfrak{b}_0$  to commute  $r$  past  $\partial_v$ , and note that the term beginning with  $U$  is supported in  $\{r \leq 2R_\bullet\}$ .

Step 2: Proof of (2.71). By the good sign  $f_U \geq 0$  and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r^{2-s}UL\varphi\Box L\varphi &= -\alpha_U r^{2-s}f_U(UL\varphi)^2 - \alpha_V r^{2-s}f_V UL\varphi VL\varphi \\ &\quad + r^{2-s}(UL\varphi)(\Box L\varphi + \alpha_U f_U UL\varphi + \alpha_V f_V VL\varphi) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\alpha_V |r^{2-s}f_V| |UL\varphi| |VL\varphi|}_{:=\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{r^{2-s}|UL\varphi| |\Box L\varphi + \alpha_U f_U UL\varphi + \alpha_V f_V VL\varphi|}_{:=\text{(II)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.69}$$

Term (I) vanishes unless  $\alpha_V > 0$ , namely unless  $L$  contains a  $V$ . In this case, use lemma 2.17 and the wave equation (2.63) to rewrite

$$\mathbf{1}_{\alpha_V > 0} UL\varphi =_s \mathbf{b}_\alpha [\Box \Gamma^{<\alpha} \varphi + D\Gamma^{<\alpha}]. \tag{A.70}$$

Control term (I) using lemma 2.20 and (A.67) and (A.70) and  $|r^{2-s}f_V| \leq C(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,s})$ . For term (II), use lemma 2.20 and (2.70) and (A.70).

Step 3: Proof of (2.72). By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r^{2-s}|\partial_v L\varphi| |\Box L\varphi| &\leq \underbrace{\alpha_U |r^{2-s}f_U| |UL\varphi| |\partial_v L\varphi|}_{:=\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{r^{2-s}|\partial_v L\varphi| |\Box L\varphi + \alpha_U f_U UL\varphi + \alpha_V f_V VL\varphi|}_{:=\text{(II)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\alpha_V |r^{2-s}f_V| |\partial_v L\varphi| |VL\varphi|}_{:=\text{(III)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.71}$$

Handle terms (I) and (II) as in Step 2. In particular, for term (I) we bring the  $U$  that  $L$  contains to the front using lemma 2.17, and then use the wave equation  $\partial_v U =_s \mathbf{b}_0[\Box + r^{-1}D]$  from (2.64). It is important here that  $\partial_v U$  produces a wave equation with no  $U^2$ -term; such a term would produce  $U^2\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-U} =_s U\Gamma^{\leq\alpha}$ , and this top-order term is not admissible. The analogous term in Step 2 was  $U^2\Gamma^{\leq\alpha-V} =_s U\Gamma^{<\alpha}$ , which is a lower order term. For term (III), use (A.67) and  $|r^{2-s}f_V| \leq C(\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0)$  to get

$$\text{(III)} \leq \mathbf{1}_{r \geq R_\bullet} C((\mathfrak{B}_0^\circ, \mathfrak{g}_0, \alpha)) |\partial_v L\varphi| (|UL\varphi| + |\partial_v L\varphi|). \tag{A.72}$$

□

## REFERENCES

- [1] Yannis Angelopoulos, Stefanos Aretakis, and Dejan Gajic. “Late-time asymptotics for the wave equation on spherically symmetric, stationary spacetimes”. In: *Adv. Math.* 323 (2018), pp. 529–621.
- [2] Yannis Angelopoulos, Stefanos Aretakis, and Dejan Gajic. “Late-time tails and mode coupling of linear waves on Kerr spacetimes”. In: *Adv. Math.* 417 (2023), p. 108939. ISSN: 0001-8708.
- [3] Yannis Angelopoulos, Christoph Kehle, and Ryan Unger. *Nonlinear stability of extremal Reissner-Nordström black holes in spherical symmetry*. 2024. arXiv: 2410.16234 [gr-qc].
- [4] A. Bonanno et al. “Structure of the Charged Spherical Black Hole Interior”. In: *Proceedings: Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 450.1940 (1995), pp. 553–567.
- [5] Patrick R. Brady and John D. Smith. “Black Hole Singularities: A Numerical Approach”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 75.7 (Aug. 1995), pp. 1256–1259.
- [6] Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar and James B. Hartle. “On crossing the Cauchy horizon of a Reissner-Nordström black-hole”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 384 (1982), pp. 301–315.
- [7] João L. Costa et al. “On the Global Uniqueness for the Einstein–Maxwell-Scalar Field System with a Cosmological Constant: Part 3. Mass Inflation and Extendibility of the Solutions”. In: *Annals of PDE* 3.1 (Mar. 2017).
- [8] Mihalis Dafermos. “Black Holes Without Spacelike Singularities”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 332.2 (May 2014), pp. 729–757.
- [9] Mihalis Dafermos. “Stability and Instability of the Cauchy Horizon for the Spherically Symmetric Einstein-Maxwell-Scalar Field Equations”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 158.3 (2003), pp. 875–928.
- [10] Mihalis Dafermos. “The interior of charged black holes and the problem of uniqueness in general relativity”. In: *Comm. Pure and Appl. Math* 58.4 (2005), pp. 445–504.
- [11] Mihalis Dafermos and Jonathan Luk. *The Interior of Dynamical Vacuum Black Holes I: the  $C^0$ -stability of the Kerr Cauchy Horizon*. 2017. arXiv: 1710.01722 [gr-qc].

- [12] Mihalis Dafermos and Igor Rodnianski. “A new physical-space approach to decay for the wave equation with applications to black hole spacetimes”. In: *XVIIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics* (2009), pp. 421–433.
- [13] Mihalis Dafermos and Igor Rodnianski. “A proof of Price’s law for the collapse of a self-gravitating scalar field”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 162.2 (Nov. 2005), pp. 381–457.
- [14] Mihalis Dafermos and Igor Rodnianski. “Lectures on black holes and linear waves”. In: *Evolution equations*. Vol. 17. Clay Math. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 97–205.
- [15] Roland Donniger, Wilhelm Schlag, and Avy Soffer. “A proof of Price’s Law on Schwarzschild black hole manifolds for all angular momenta”. In: *Adv. Math.* 226.1 (Jan. 2011), pp. 484–540.
- [16] Roland Donniger, Wilhelm Schlag, and Avy Soffer. “On pointwise decay of linear waves on a Schwarzschild black hole background”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 309 (2012), pp. 51–86. eprint: 0911.3179.
- [17] Anne T. Franzen. “Boundedness of Massless Scalar Waves on Kerr Interior Backgrounds”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 21.4 (Feb. 2020), pp. 1045–1111.
- [18] Anne T. Franzen. “Boundedness of Massless Scalar Waves on Reissner-Nordström Interior Backgrounds”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 343 (2016), pp. 601–650.
- [19] Peter Hintz. “A sharp version of Price’s law for wave decay on asymptotically flat spacetimes”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 389.1 (2022), pp. 491–542.
- [20] Peter Hintz. “Boundedness and decay of scalar waves at the Cauchy horizon of the Kerr spacetime”. In: *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici* 92.4 (Oct. 2017), pp. 801–837.
- [21] Peter Hintz and András Vasy. “Analysis of linear waves near the Cauchy horizon of cosmological black holes”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 58.8 (Aug. 2017).
- [22] William A. Hiscock. “Evolution of the interior of a charged black hole”. In: *Phys. Lett. A* 83.3 (1981), pp. 110–112.
- [23] Christoph Kehle and Maxime Van de Moortel. *Strong Cosmic Censorship in the presence of matter: the decisive effect of horizon oscillations on the black hole interior geometry*. 2022. arXiv: 2105.04604 [gr-qc].
- [24] Christoph Kehle and Ryan Unger. *Gravitational collapse to extremal black holes and the third law of black hole thermodynamics*. 2022. arXiv: 2211.15742 [gr-qc].
- [25] Sergiu Klainerman. “Uniform decay estimates and the Lorentz invariance of the classical wave equation”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 38.3 (1985), pp. 321–332.
- [26] Sergiu Klainerman and Thomas C. Sideris. “On almost global existence for nonrelativistic wave equations in 3D”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 49.3 (1996), pp. 307–321.
- [27] Jonathan Kommemi. “The Global Structure of Spherically Symmetric Charged Scalar Field Spacetimes”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 323 (2013), pp. 35–106.
- [28] Jonathan Luk. “Improved Decay for Solutions to the Linear Wave Equation on a Schwarzschild Black Hole”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 11.5 (Oct. 2010), pp. 805–880.
- [29] Jonathan Luk and Sung-Jin Oh. *Late time tail of waves on dynamic asymptotically flat spacetimes of odd space dimensions*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.02220 [gr-qc].
- [30] Jonathan Luk and Sung-Jin Oh. “Proof of linear instability of the Reissner–Nordström Cauchy horizon under scalar perturbations”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 166.3 (Feb. 2017).
- [31] Jonathan Luk and Sung-Jin Oh. “Strong cosmic censorship in spherical symmetry for two-ended asymptotically flat initial data I. The interior of the black hole region”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 190.1 (2019), pp. 1–111.
- [32] Jonathan Luk and Sung-Jin Oh. “Strong Cosmic Censorship in Spherical Symmetry for Two-Ended Asymptotically Flat Initial Data II: The Exterior of the Black Hole Region”. In: *Annals of PDE* 5.1 (Mar. 2019), p. 6.
- [33] Jonathan Luk, Sung-Jin Oh, and Yakov Shlapentokh-Rothman. “A Scattering Theory Approach to Cauchy Horizon Instability and Applications to Mass Inflation”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* 24.2 (July 2022), pp. 363–411.
- [34] Jonathan Luk and Jan Sbierski. “Instability results for the wave equation in the interior of Kerr black holes”. English. In: *Journal of functional analysis* 271.7 (Oct. 2016), pp. 1948–1995. ISSN: 0022-1236.
- [35] Siyuan Ma and Lin Zhang. “Precise late-time asymptotics of scalar field in the interior of a subextreme Kerr black hole and its application in Strong Cosmic Censorship conjecture”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 376 (2023), pp. 7815–7856.

- [36] Siyuan Ma and Lin Zhang. “Sharp Decay for Teukolsky Equation in Kerr Spacetimes”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 401.1 (Feb. 2023), pp. 333–434.
- [37] John Michael McNamara. “Instability of black hole inner horizons”. In: *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* 358 (1978), pp. 499–517.
- [38] Jason Metcalfe, Daniel Tataru, and Mihai Tohaneanu. “Price’s law on nonstationary space-times”. In: *Adv. Math.* 230.3 (2012), pp. 995–1028.
- [39] Pascal Millet. *Optimal decay for solutions of the Teukolsky equation on the Kerr metric for the full subextremal range  $|a| < M$* . 2023. arXiv: 2302.06946.
- [40] Georgios Moschidis. “The  $r^p$ -weighted energy method of Dafermos and Rodnianski in general asymptotically flat spacetimes and applications”. In: *Annals of PDE* 2.6 (2016), pp. 1–194.
- [41] Amos Ori. “Inner structure of a charged black hole: an exact mass-inflation solution”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 67.7 (1991), pp. 789–792.
- [42] Roger Penrose. “Structure of space-time”. In: *Battelle Rencontres* (Jan. 1968). Ed. by C.M. de Witt and J.A. Wheeler, pp. 121–235.
- [43] Eric Poisson and Werner Israel. “Inner-horizon instability and mass inflation in black holes”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 63 (16 Oct. 1989), pp. 1663–1666.
- [44] Eric Poisson and Werner Israel. “Internal structure of black holes”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 41 (6 Mar. 1990), pp. 1796–1809.
- [45] Flavio Rossetti. “Strong cosmic censorship for the spherically symmetric Einstein-Maxwell-charged-Klein-Gordon system with positive  $\Lambda$ : stability of the Cauchy horizon and  $H^1$  extensions”. In: *Annales Henri Poincaré* (June 2024).
- [46] Quinten Rutgers. “Price’s law for spherically symmetric charged black holes”. In preparation. 2024+.
- [47] Jan Sbierski. “Instability of the Kerr Cauchy horizon under linearised gravitational perturbations”. In: *Annals of PDE* 9.7 (2023).
- [48] Jan Sbierski. “On holonomy singularities in general relativity and the  $C_{\text{loc}}^{0,1}$ -inextendibility of spacetimes”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 171.14 (2022), pp. 2881–2942.
- [49] Jan Sbierski. “The  $C^0$ -inextendibility of the Schwarzschild spacetime and the spacelike diameter in Lorentzian geometry”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 108.2 (2018), pp. 319–378.
- [50] Michael Simpson and Roger Penrose. “Internal instability in a Reissner–Nordström black hole”. In: *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 7.3 (Apr. 1973), pp. 183–197.
- [51] Daniel Tataru. “Local decay of waves on asymptotically flat stationary space-times”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 135.2 (2013), pp. 361–401.
- [52] Maxime Van de Moortel. “Mass inflation and the  $C^2$ -inextendibility of spherically symmetric charged scalar field dynamical black holes”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 382.2 (2021), pp. 1263–1341.
- [53] Maxime Van de Moortel. “Stability and Instability of the Sub-extremal Reissner–Nordström Black Hole Interior for the Einstein–Maxwell–Klein–Gordon Equations in Spherical Symmetry”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 360.1 (Jan. 2018), pp. 103–168.
- [54] Maxime Van de Moortel. “The coexistence of null and spacelike singularities inside spherically symmetric black holes”. In preparation. 2024+.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
 Email address: gm9165@princeton.edu