

POINTWISE ERGODIC THEOREMS FOR NON-CONVENTIONAL BILINEAR AVERAGES ALONG $(\lfloor n^c \rfloor, -\lfloor n^c \rfloor)$

LEONIDAS DASKALAKIS

ABSTRACT. For every $c \in (1, 23/22)$ and every probability dynamical system (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) we prove that for any $f, g \in L_\mu^\infty(X)$ the bilinear ergodic averages

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^{\lfloor n^c \rfloor} x) g(T^{-\lfloor n^c \rfloor} x) \quad \text{converge for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

In fact, we consider more general sparse orbits $(\lfloor h(n) \rfloor, -\lfloor h(n) \rfloor)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where h belongs to the class of the so-called c -regularly varying functions. This is the first pointwise result for bilinear ergodic averages taken along deterministic sparse orbits where modulation invariance is present.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1990 Bourgain [2] established that for any measure-preserving system (X, \mathcal{B}, μ, T) with finite measure and any $f, g \in L_\mu^\infty(X)$ we have that

$$(1.1) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) \quad \text{converges for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

By standard arguments relying on Hölder's inequality and the maximal ergodic theorem this result can be immediately extended to functions $f \in L_\mu^{p_1}(X)$ and $g \in L_\mu^{p_2}(X)$ where $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} \leq 1$, and by appealing to the bilinear inequality of Lacey [11] one obtains the result even for exponents satisfying $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} < 3/2$, see also Theorem 1.16 in [6].

Recently, there has been substantial progress in understanding pointwise phenomena in ergodic theory in the bilinear as well as the multilinear setting. More specifically, Krause, Tao and Mirek [6] established pointwise convergence for the following ergodic averages

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^n x) g(T^{P(n)} x),$$

where $P \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ has degree $d \geq 2$. In 2024 the first multilinear result in that direction appeared [10], and pointwise convergence was established for averages of the form

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f_1(T_1^{P_1(n)} x) \cdots f_k(T_k^{P_k(n)} x),$$

where $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ have distinct degrees and T_1, \dots, T_k are commuting invertible measure-preserving transformations.

Both results rely heavily on the fact that, loosely speaking, the orbits considered introduce a certain kind of ‘‘curvature’’; this is visible from the distinct degrees assumption.

Currently, establishing pointwise convergence for averages of the form

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^{P(n)} x) g(T^{-P(n)} x),$$

where $P \in \mathbb{Z}[n]$ has degree $d \geq 2$, seems to be out of reach, and the techniques from the aforementioned works cannot be applied since ‘‘curvature’’ is not present here. In some sense, such ergodic averages share some similarities with Bourgain’s bilinear averages 1.1, and modulation invariance phenomena ought to be handled for addressing such pointwise convergence problems.

We establish the following bilinear pointwise convergence result in the direction of 1.2, for $P(n) = \lfloor n^c \rfloor$ and $c \in (1, 23/22)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume $c \in (1, 23/22)$. Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) be a probability space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ an invertible μ -invariant transformation. Then for every $f, g \in L^\infty_\mu(X)$ we have that*

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^{\lfloor n^c \rfloor} x) g(T^{-\lfloor n^c \rfloor} x) \text{ exists for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

To the best of the author’s knowledge this is the first pointwise bilinear result with deterministic sparse orbits and with modulation invariance present. Notably, a randomized variant of fractional powers in the spirit of the theorem above has been considered in [5] and although the technical part of our argument is quite more involved we encourage the reader to compare the strategy described in subsection 2.1 of the aforementioned paper with our own described in subsection 1.1.

We derive this result as a corollary of more general theorem allowing us to replace $\lfloor n^c \rfloor$ in 1.4 with any of the following orbits

$$(1.5) \quad \lfloor n^c \log^a n \rfloor, \quad \lfloor n^c e^{a \log^b n} \rfloor, \quad \underbrace{\lfloor n^c \log \circ \dots \circ \log n \rfloor}_{k \text{ times}},$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in (0, 1)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are fixed. In fact, for $a > 0$ even the case $c = 1$ will be addressed for the sequences above. Before stating this theorem, we introduce the so-called c -regularly varying functions.

Definition 1.6 (c -regularly varying functions). Let $c \in [1, 2)$ and $x_0 \geq 1$. We define the class of c -regularly varying functions \mathcal{R}_c as the set of all functions $h \in \mathcal{C}^3([x_0, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty))$ such that the following conditions hold:

- i) $h' > 0$, $h'' > 0$ and
- ii) the function h is of the form

$$h(x) = C x^c \exp \left(\int_{x_0}^x \frac{\vartheta(t)}{t} dt \right),$$

where C is a positive constant and $\vartheta \in \mathcal{C}^3([x_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\vartheta(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad x\vartheta'(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad x^2\vartheta''(x) \rightarrow 0, \quad x^3\vartheta'''(x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

- iii) If $c = 1$, then ϑ will additionally be assumed to be positive, decreasing, and for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\vartheta(x)^{-1} \lesssim_\varepsilon x^\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x h(x)^{-1} = 0.$$

Moreover, for $c = 1$ we assume

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x\vartheta'(x)}{\vartheta(x)} = 0, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x^2\vartheta''(x)}{\vartheta(x)} = 0, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x^3\vartheta'''(x)}{\vartheta(x)} = 0.$$

The family of c -regularly varying functions has been introduced in [13] and [12] and one may think of functions in \mathcal{R}_c as appropriate perturbations of the fractional monomial x^c . Notably, there exist c -regularly varying functions which do not belong to any Hardy field.

Theorem 1.7. *Assume $c \in [1, 23/22)$ and $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$. Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) be a probability space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ an invertible μ -invariant transformation. Then for every $f, g \in L^\infty_\mu(X)$ we have that*

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^{\lfloor h(n) \rfloor} x) g(T^{-\lfloor h(n) \rfloor} x) \text{ exists for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

Moreover, we have that

$$(1.9) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^{\lfloor h(n) \rfloor} x) g(T^{-\lfloor h(n) \rfloor} x) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

The theorem above immediately implies Theorem 1.3 and establishes the analogous results corresponding to any of the orbits mentioned in 1.5 by appropriately choosing $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$. As mentioned earlier, standard arguments relying on Hölder's inequality and on the fact that the maximal function corresponding to the single averages is bounded on $L_\mu^p(X)$ for every $p \in (1, \infty]$, see [1] and [12], allow one to deduce 1.8 for $f \in L_\mu^{p_1}(X)$, $g \in L_\mu^{p_2}(X)$ with $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} < 1$ as a simple corollary of Theorem 1.7. Moreover, if $c \in (1, 30/29)$, then the maximal operator associated with the single averages along such orbits is of weak-type $(1,1)$, see [12], and with a similar argument one may cover the case $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} \leq 1$ for such c 's.

1.1. Strategy. We wish to give a brief description of the strategy of our proof here. In Section 2, we split our averaging operator to two pieces: a main term, which converges to the same limit as Bourgain's averages, see 1.1, and an error term. More specifically, we consider our ergodic averages in the following form

$$B_N(f, g)(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [1, N]|} \sum_{n \in [1, N]} 1_{\mathbb{N}_h}(n) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x),$$

where $\mathbb{N}_h := \{\lfloor h(n) \rfloor : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. After exploiting the following formula $1_{\mathbb{N}_h}(n) = \lfloor -\varphi(n) \rfloor - \lfloor -\varphi(n+1) \rfloor$, where φ is the compositional inverse of h , we may write

$$1_{\mathbb{N}_h}(n) = (\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) + (\Phi(-\varphi(n+1)) - \Phi(-\varphi(n))),$$

where $\Phi(x) = \{x\} - 1/2$. This decomposes our averages to $B_N(f, g)(x) = M_N(f, g)(x) + E_N(f, g)(x)$, where

$$M_N(f, g)(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [1, N]|} \sum_{n \in [1, N]} (\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x),$$

and

$$E_N(f, g)(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [1, N]|} \sum_{n \in [1, N]} (\Phi(-\varphi(n+1)) - \Phi(-\varphi(n))) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x).$$

The fact that the weights in the averaging operator M_N are appropriately well-behaving allows us to prove that such averages must converge to the same limit as Bourgain's.

It remains to address the error term, namely, to establish that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_N(f, g)(x) = 0$ for μ -a.e. $x \in X$. We begin by exploiting a famous truncated Fourier series expansion for Φ with uniform bounds on its tail, see Lemma 2.3. This approximation of Φ induces a decomposition for E_N and we focus on each piece separately. The operator induced by the tail of the Fourier expansion can be treated straightforwardly, while the other requires a significant amount of work. Specifically, certain cancellation in the kernel defining the operator at hand ought to be exploited. This will be done in Section 3 by certain Gowers norm-type bounds. After considering our averages on the integer shift system, we establish that our operator is controlled essentially by the U^3 -norm of the kernel, and we prove that this norm has appropriate decay. This is done using Fourier-analytic methods since we may view the U^3 -norm of our kernel as averages of U^2 -norms of appropriate expressions, and we can immediately use the inverse theorem for the U^2 -norm. The task of estimating the U^3 -norm of our kernel reduces to the study of certain exponential sums. Finally, in Section 4, we discuss how such estimates over the integers allow us to conclude.

1.2. Notation. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we use the standard notation

$$\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \leq x\}, \quad \{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor, \quad \|x\| = \min\{|x - n| : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

If A, B are two nonnegative quantities, we write $A \lesssim B$ or $B \gtrsim A$ to denote that there exists a positive constant C such that $A \leq CB$. Whenever $A \lesssim B$ and $A \gtrsim B$, we write $A \simeq B$. Throughout the paper all the implicit constants appearing may depend on a fixed choice of $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$. We denote $e^{2\pi i x}$ by $e(x)$.

For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $\mathbb{N}_{\geq N} := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq N\}$ and $[N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Let us note that $h(x)$ is not defined for $x < x_0$ but we abuse notation; we can let $h(x)$ take arbitrary values for $x \in [1, x_0]$ and all our results and estimates remain the same. Given a measurable space (X, \mathcal{B}) , we call a function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ 1-bounded if f is measurable and $|f| \leq 1$. For every function $f: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $h_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define the difference function $\Delta_{h_1} f(x) = f(x) \overline{f(x + h_1)}$, and for every $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_1, \dots, h_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $\Delta_{h_1, \dots, h_s} f(x) = \Delta_{h_1} \dots \Delta_{h_s} f(x)$. For every $s \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and every finitely supported $f: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we define the Gowers U^s -norm by

$$\|f\|_{U^s} = \left(\sum_{x, h_1, \dots, h_s \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, \dots, h_s} f(x) \right)^{1/2^s}.$$

Finally, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\mu_N(n) = \frac{|\{(h_1, h_2) \in [N] : h_1 - h_2 = n\}|}{N^2},$$

and we note that $\mu_N(n) \lesssim N^{-1} 1_{[-N, N]}(n)$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Ben Krause, Michael Lacey and Christoph Thiele for several insightful conversations as well as Nikos Frantzikinakis and Borys Kuca for helpful comments and feedback. I would also like to thank Mariusz Mirek for useful discussions and for his constant support and encouragement.

2. MAIN REDUCTION

We fix $c \in [1, 23/22)$ and $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$, and all implied constants may depend on these choices. We denote by φ the compositional inverse of h , and we remind the reader that $\mathbb{N}_h = \{\lfloor h(n) \rfloor : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We note that we use the basic properties of h and φ as described in Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.14 from [13]. Before performing our main reduction, we collect some standard useful results for handling fractional powers and for the sake of clarity we state Toeplitz theorem, a standard result which allows us to change weights in our averaging operators.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume $c \in [1, 2)$, $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$ and φ is its compositional inverse. Then there exists a positive constant $C = C(h)$ such that*

$$(2.2) \quad 1_{\mathbb{N}_h}(n) = \lfloor -\varphi(n) \rfloor - \lfloor -\varphi(n+1) \rfloor \quad \text{for all } n \geq C.$$

Proof. The proof is standard, see for example Lemma 2.12 [13]. □

Lemma 2.3. *For every $M \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ we have that*

$$(2.4) \quad \Phi(x) := \{x\} - 1/2 = \sum_{0 < |m| \leq M} \frac{1}{2\pi i m} e(-mx) + g_M(x),$$

with $g_M(x) = O\left(\min\left\{1, \frac{1}{M\|x\|}\right\}\right)$. We also have that

$$(2.5) \quad \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{M\|x\|}\right\} = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} b_m e(mx),$$

where $|b_m| \lesssim \min\left\{\frac{\log M}{M}, \frac{1}{|m|}, \frac{M}{|m|^2}\right\}$, and all the implied constants are absolute.

Proof. See Section 2 in [3], or page 260 in [12]. □

Theorem 2.6 (Toeplitz theorem). *For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let $(c_{N,k})_{k \in [N]}$ be real numbers. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

- (i) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} c_{N,k} = 0$,
- (ii) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^N c_{N,k} = 1$,

$$(iii) \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N |c_{N,k}| < \infty.$$

Then for any sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = a \in \mathbb{C}$, we have that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^N c_{N,k} a_k = a$.

Proof. This result is standard; see for example pages 42-48 in [7]. \square

We define

$$(2.7) \quad B_N(f, g)(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} 1_{\mathbb{N}_h}(n) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x),$$

$$A_N(f, g) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x),$$

$$E_N(f, g)(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} (\Phi(-\varphi(n+1)) - \Phi(-\varphi(n))) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x).$$

Bourgain's result together with the first lemma and Toeplitz theorem allows us to prove the following.

Proposition 2.8. *Assume $c \in [1, 2)$ and $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$. Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) be a probability space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ an invertible μ -invariant transformation. Then for every $f, g \in L_\mu^\infty(X)$ we have that*

$$(2.9) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} |B_N(f, g)(x) - A_N(f, g)(x)| \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} |E_N(f, g)(x)| \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that f, g are 1-bounded. By Lemma 2.1 we get

$$(2.10) \quad B_N(f, g)(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} 1_{\mathbb{N}_h}(n) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} (\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} (\Phi(-\varphi(n+1)) - \Phi(-\varphi(n))) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) + O(\varphi(N)^{-1}),$$

where Φ is defined in 2.4. Let

$$M_N(f, g)(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} (\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x),$$

and note that to obtain 2.9 it suffices to prove that

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} M_N(f, g)(x) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} A_N(f, g)(x) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

For μ -a.e. $x \in X$ we know that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} A_N(f, g)(x) = L_x$ exists by [2], so let us fix such an x . Summation by parts yields

$$(2.12) \quad |\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]| M_N(f, g)(x) = \left(\sum_{n=1}^N f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) \right) (\varphi(N+1) - \varphi(N))$$

$$- \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n f(T^k x) g(T^{-k} x) \right) \left((\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1)) - (\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) \right),$$

and thus

$$(2.13) \quad M_N(f, g)(x) = \frac{N(\varphi(N+1) - \varphi(N))}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) \right)$$

$$- \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(T^k x) g(T^{-k} x) \right) n \left((\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1)) - (\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) \right).$$

For the first summand note that

$$(2.14) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(\varphi(N+1) - \varphi(N))}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(\varphi(N+1) - \varphi(N))}{\varphi(N)} = 1/c,$$

To see this, let $\gamma = 1/c$, and note that by Lemma 2.6 in [13], there exists a function θ such that $t\varphi'(t) = \varphi(t)(\gamma + \theta(t))$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta(t) = 0$. By the Mean Value Theorem for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\xi_N \in (N, N+1)$ and $\zeta_N \in (N, \xi_N)$ such that

$$\frac{N(\varphi(N+1) - \varphi(N))}{\varphi(N)} = \frac{N\varphi'(\xi_N)}{\varphi(N)} = \frac{N\varphi'(N)}{\varphi(N)} + \frac{N(\varphi'(\xi_N) - \varphi'(N))}{\varphi(N)} = \gamma + \theta(N) + \frac{N(\xi_N - N)\varphi''(\zeta_N)}{\varphi(N)}.$$

The form of φ'' in Lemma 2.14 in [13] implies that $|x^2\varphi''(x)| \lesssim \varphi(x)$, which together with the fact that $\varphi(2x) \lesssim \varphi(x)$ yields

$$\left| \frac{N(\xi_N - N)\varphi''(\zeta_N)}{\varphi(N)} \right| \lesssim N^{-1},$$

justifying 2.14, and establishing that the first summand of 2.13 converges to γL_x .

By letting $a_n = A_n(f, g)(x)$, the second summand becomes

$$\frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} a_n n \left((\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) - (\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1)) \right).$$

We wish to apply Theorem 2.6. We let

$$\tilde{c}_{N,n} = 1_{[N-1]}(n) \frac{n \left((\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) - (\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1)) \right)}{[\varphi(N)]},$$

and we firstly prove that

$$(2.15) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{c}_{N,n} = 1 - \gamma.$$

Let $s(x) = \varphi(x+1) - \varphi(x)$, and by the Mean Valued Theorem there exists $\xi_n \in (n, n+1)$ and $\rho_n \in (\xi_n, \xi_n + 1) \subseteq (n, n+2)$ such that

$$s(n+1) - s(n) = s'(\xi_n) = \varphi'(\xi_n + 1) - \varphi'(\xi_n) = \varphi''(\rho_n)$$

and thus

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{c}_{N,n} = \frac{1}{[\varphi(N)]} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (-n\varphi''(\rho_n)).$$

By the Mean Value Theorem there exists $\tau_n \in (n, n+2)$ such that

$$(2.16) \quad \left| \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (-n\varphi''(\rho_n)) - \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (-n\varphi''(n)) \right| \lesssim \sum_{n=1}^N |n\varphi'''(\tau_n)| \lesssim \sum_{n=1}^N n^{-1} \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \lesssim \log N,$$

where for the last estimates we have used the fact that $|x^3\varphi'''(x)| \lesssim \varphi(x)$, as well as the fact that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1}\varphi(x) = 0$ which follow from Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.14 in [13]. Thus, provided that the limit in the right-hand side below exists, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{c}_{N,n} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(N)} \sum_{n=1}^N (-n\varphi''(n)), \quad \text{since} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log N}{\varphi(N)} = 0.$$

To calculate this limit, we compare with its continuous counterpart, which we can compute as follows

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(N)} \int_1^N (-x\varphi''(x))dx = \frac{-N\varphi'(N)}{\varphi(N)} + \frac{\varphi(N)}{\varphi(N)} + O(\varphi(N)^{-1}),$$

and using the same argument as in 2.14, we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(N)} \int_1^N (-x\varphi''(x))dx = -\gamma + 1.$$

We now prove that

$$(2.17) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(N)} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N (-n\varphi''(n)) - \int_1^N (-x\varphi''(x))dx \right| = 0.$$

To see this note that by the Mean Value Theorem

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N (-n\varphi''(n)) - \int_1^N (-x\varphi''(x))dx \right| &\leq \sum_{n=2}^N \int_{n-1}^n |n\varphi''(n) - x\varphi''(x)|dx + O(1) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=2}^N \int_{n-1}^n (|n(\varphi''(n) - \varphi''(x))| + |(n-x)\varphi''(x)|)dx + O(1) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=2}^N (n|\varphi'''(\xi_{x,n})| + n^{-2}\varphi(n)) + O(1) \lesssim \sum_{n=2}^N n^{-2}\varphi(n) + O(1) \lesssim \log N, \end{aligned}$$

where the last estimate is established as in 2.16, and 2.17 immediately follows. Thus 2.15 is established.

For $c > 1$, we get that $\gamma < 1$, and we may apply Theorem 2.6 for $c_{N,n} = \frac{\tilde{c}_{N,n}}{1-\gamma}$. The first condition of Theorem 2.6 is clearly satisfied and the second condition implies the third since $c_{N,n} \geq 0$ for every $n \gtrsim 1$. In view of 2.15 it is clear that the second condition also holds and we may apply Theorem 2.6 to conclude that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N c_{N,n}a_n = L_x$, and thus

$$(2.19) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} a_n n \left((\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) - (\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1)) \right) = (1-\gamma)L_x.$$

For $c = 1$, we note that by taking into account the fact that $|a_n| = |A_n(f, g)(x)| \leq 1$ the second summand may be estimated as follows

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \left| \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} a_n n \left((\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) - (\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1)) \right) \right| \\ \lesssim \frac{1}{[\varphi(N)]} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n |(\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) - (\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1))| \lesssim \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{c}_{n,N} + O(\varphi(N)^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

since $\tilde{c}_{N,n} \geq 0$ for every $n \gtrsim 1$. By 2.15 together with the estimate above we get

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} a_n n \left((\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n)) - (\varphi(n+2) - \varphi(n+1)) \right) = 0,$$

and thus 2.19 holds even for $c = 1$.

We have calculated the limit of both summands in 2.13, and thus

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} M_N(f, g)(x) = \gamma L_x + (1-\gamma)L_x = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} A_N(f, g)(x) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X,$$

as desired. This concludes the proof of 2.11, which, in turn, concludes the proof of Proposition 2.8. \square

By taking into account Proposition 2.8, we note that Theorem 1.7 will easily follow once we prove that for $c \in [1, 23/22)$ and for every $\lambda \in (1, 2]$ we have

$$(2.21) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

We decompose the error term using Lemma 2.3 for a carefully chosen truncation at $M = M(N)$. For the sake of concreteness, we begin by fixing certain parameters:

$$(2.22) \quad \varepsilon_0 := \frac{23 - 22c}{40c}, \quad \sigma_0 := 1 - \frac{1}{c} + \varepsilon_0, \quad M := \lfloor N^{\sigma_0} \rfloor.$$

Note that $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, since $c < 23/22$. We apply 2.4 for such an M from the aforementioned lemma to obtain

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} E_N(f, g)(x) &= \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} (\Phi(-\varphi(n+1)) - \Phi(-\varphi(n))) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} \left(\sum_{0 < |m| \leq M} \frac{e(m\varphi(n+1)) - e(m\varphi(n))}{2\pi i m} \right) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} (g_M(-\varphi(n+1)) - g_M(-\varphi(n))) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) =: E_N^{(1)}(f, g)(x) + E_N^{(2)}(f, g)(x). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.7 will be easily derived once we prove the following.

Proposition 2.24. *Assume $c \in [1, 23/22)$ and $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$. Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) be a probability space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ an invertible μ -invariant transformation. Let f, g be 1-bounded functions on X . Then the following hold:*

- (i) *For every $\lambda \in (1, 2]$ we have that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x) = 0$ for μ -a.e. $x \in X$.*
- (ii) *$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_N^{(2)}(f, g)(x) = 0$ for μ -a.e. $x \in X$.*

The second assertion above is substantially easier than the first and we immediately establish it below.

Proof of Proposition 2.24(ii). For every pair of 1-bounded functions f, g , and for μ -a.e. $x \in X$, we have

$$(2.25) \quad \begin{aligned} |E_N^{(2)}(f, g)(x)| &= \left| \frac{1}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{n \in [N]} (g_M(-\varphi(n+1)) - g_M(-\varphi(n))) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\lfloor \varphi(N) \rfloor} \sum_{n \in [N]} (|g_M(-\varphi(n+1))| + |g_M(-\varphi(n))|) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\varphi(N)} \sum_{n \in [N]} \left(\min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{M \|\varphi(n+1)\|} \right\} + \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{M \|\varphi(n)\|} \right\} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.3. We may use the following lemma to conclude. Let us mention that if $c = 1$, then we fix σ as in Lemma 2.14 in [13], otherwise we let σ be the constant function 1.

Lemma 2.26. *Let $c \in [1, 4/3)$ and $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$ with φ its compositional inverse. Then there exists a positive constant $C = C(h)$ such that for all $N, M \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $q \in \{0, 1\}$ we have*

$$\sum_{n \in [N]} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{M \|\varphi(n+q)\|} \right\} \lesssim \frac{N \log M}{M} + \frac{NM^{1/2} \log N}{(\varphi(N)\sigma(N))^{1/2}}.$$

Proof. By 2.5 we may estimate as follows

$$(2.27) \quad \sum_{n \in [N]} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{M \|\varphi(n+q)\|} \right\} = \sum_{n \in [N]} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} b_m e(m\varphi(n+q)) \leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} |b_m| \left| \sum_{n \in [N]} e(m\varphi(n+q)) \right|$$

$$\lesssim |b_0|N + \sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq M} |b_m| \left| \sum_{n \in [N]} e(m\varphi(n+q)) \right| + \sum_{|m| \geq M+1} |b_m| \left| \sum_{n \in [N]} e(m\varphi(n+q)) \right|.$$

By Lemma 3.6 in [12], which is a straightforward application of van der Corput lemma (see Corollary 8.13, page 208 in [9]), we get that for every $1 \leq P \leq P' \leq 2P$ we have

$$\left| \sum_{P \leq n \leq P'} e(m\varphi(n+q)) \right| \lesssim |m|^{1/2} P (\varphi(P)\sigma(P))^{-1/2},$$

which is eventually increasing in P , and thus

$$\left| \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} e(m\varphi(n+q)) \right| \lesssim \log(N) |m|^{1/2} N (\varphi(N)\sigma(N))^{-1/2}.$$

Therefore, by also taking into account the estimate $|b_m| \lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{\log M}{M}, \frac{1}{|m|}, \frac{M}{|m|^2} \right\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (2.28) \quad & \sum_{n \in [N]} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{M \|\varphi(n+q)\|} \right\} \\ & \lesssim \frac{N \log M}{M} + \sum_{1 \leq |m| \leq M} \frac{1}{|m|} \left(\log(N) |m|^{1/2} N (\varphi(N)\sigma(N))^{-1/2} \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{|m| \geq M+1} \frac{M}{|m|^2} \left(\log(N) |m|^{1/2} N (\varphi(N)\sigma(N))^{-1/2} \right) \\ & \lesssim NM^{-1} \log(M) + \log(N) N (\varphi(N)\sigma(N))^{-1/2} M^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. \square

Returning to the last line of 2.25, we see that an application of our lemma yields

$$(2.29) \quad |E_N^{(2)}(f, g)(x)| \lesssim \frac{\log(M)N}{M\varphi(N)} + \frac{\log(N)NM^{1/2}}{\varphi(N)^{3/2}\sigma(N)^{1/2}}.$$

By taking into account the choice of M , see 2.22, one can immediately check that the right-hand side converges to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, concluding the proof of Proposition 2.24(ii). Nevertheless, let us briefly elaborate here.

For the first summand, assuming that $M = \lfloor N^{\sigma_0} \rfloor$, note that it suffices to have that

$$1 - \sigma_0 - \frac{1}{c} < 0 \iff \sigma_0 > 1 - \frac{1}{c},$$

and for the second summand, it suffices to have

$$1 + \frac{\sigma_0}{2} - \frac{3}{2c} < 0 \iff \sigma_0 < \frac{3}{c} - 2,$$

where for the case $c = 1$ we took into account that $\sigma(x)^{-1} \lesssim_\delta x^\delta$ for all $\delta > 0$, see Lemma 2.14 in [13]. Any choice $\sigma_0 \in (1 - \frac{1}{c}, \frac{3}{c} - 2)$ is admissible for the present argument to work, and the concrete choice

$$\sigma_0 := 1 - \frac{1}{c} + \frac{23 - 22c}{40c}, \quad \text{see 2.22,}$$

works here since $\sigma_0 > 1 - 1/c$ and $\sigma_0 < 3/c - 2$, because

$$\frac{23 - 22c}{40c} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \frac{1}{c} + \frac{23 - 22c}{40c} < \frac{3}{c} - 2 \iff c < \frac{137}{98}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

It remains to establish Proposition 2.24(i), and here a more delicate approach is needed. In the following section we collect some useful intermediate results, and in the final section we provide its proof. Finally, we show that Proposition 2.24 together with Proposition 2.8 immediately yield Theorem 1.7.

3. GOWERS NORM BOUNDS

Keeping in mind the choices in 2.22, let us define

$$K_N(n) := \frac{1_{[N]}(n)}{|\mathbb{N}_h \cap [N]|} \sum_{0 < |m| \leq M} \frac{e(m\varphi(n+1)) - e(m\varphi(n))}{2\pi im} = \frac{1_{[N]}(n)}{[\varphi(N)]} \sum_{0 < |m| \leq M} \frac{e(m\varphi(n))\psi_m(n)}{2\pi im},$$

where $\psi_m(n) = e(m(\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n))) - 1$, so that

$$E_N^{(1)}(f, g)(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} K_N(n) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x).$$

Proposition 2.24(i) will be derived by exploiting appropriate bounds for $\|E_N^{(1)}(f, g)\|_{L^1_\mu(X)}$, see Section 4. A key ingredient for establishing these L^1 -bounds is the following proposition, the proof of which is the content of this section.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume $c \in [1, 23/22)$ and $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$. Let $S \geq 1$ and $f_0, f_1, f_2: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be 1-bounded functions with supports contained in $[-SN, SN]$. Then there exist positive constants $C = C(h, S)$ and $\chi = \chi(h)$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$(3.2) \quad \left| \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(m) f_1(m-n) f_2(m+n) K_N(n) \right| \leq CN^{1-\chi}.$$

The proof relies on two lemmata. The first one is a simple instance of the fact that difference functions control linear configurations.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $S \geq 1$ and $f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be 1-bounded functions with supports contained in $[-SN, SN]$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(S)$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$(3.4) \quad \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) f_3(n) \right|^8 \leq CN^{13} \sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} f_3(n).$$

Proof. The proof is standard and relies on repeated applications of Cauchy-Schwarz, together with van der Corput inequality, see Section 3 in [14]. For the sake of completeness we provide some details. We have

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) f_3(n) \right|^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |f_0(x)|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) f_3(n) \right|^2 \right) \\ & \lesssim N \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} N \sum_{h_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_1) \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) f_3(n) \overline{f_1(x-n-h_1) f_2(x+n+h_1) f_3(n+h_1)} \\ & \lesssim N^2 \sum_{h_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_1) \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} f_1(y) f_2(y+2n) f_3(n) \overline{f_1(y-h_1) f_2(y+2n+h_1) f_3(n+h_1)} \\ & \lesssim N^2 \sum_{h_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_1) \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{-h_1} f_1(y) \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} \Delta_{h_1} f_2(y+2n) \Delta_{h_1} f_3(n), \end{aligned}$$

where for the second estimate we have used van der Corput inequality, see Lemma 3.1 in [15] or Lemma 3.1 in [14], and where $J(h_1) := [N] \cap ([N] - h_1)$. We repeat the procedure

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.6) \quad & \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) f_3(n) \right|^4 \\
 & \lesssim N^4 \left| \sum_{h_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_1) \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{-h_1} f_1(y) \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} \Delta_{h_1} f_2(y+2n) \Delta_{h_1} f_3(n) \right|^2 \\
 & \lesssim N^4 \left(\sum_{h_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_1)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \left| \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{-h_1} f_1(y) \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} \Delta_{h_1} f_2(y+2n) \Delta_{h_1} f_3(n) \right|^2 \right) \\
 & \lesssim N^3 \sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \left| \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{-h_1} f_1(y) \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} \Delta_{h_1} f_2(y+2n) \Delta_{h_1} f_3(n) \right|^2 \\
 & \lesssim N^3 \sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} |\Delta_{-h_1} f_1(y)|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} \Delta_{h_1} f_2(y+2n) \Delta_{h_1} f_3(n) \right|^2 \right) \\
 & \lesssim N^4 \sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{n \in J(h_1)} \Delta_{h_1} f_2(y+2n) \Delta_{h_1} f_3(n) \right|^2 \\
 & \lesssim N^5 \sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_2) \sum_{n \in J(h_1, h_2)} \Delta_{h_1, h_2} f_3(n) \cdot \\
 & \quad \cdot f_2(y+2n) \overline{f_2(y+2n+h_1) f_2(y+2n+2h_2) f_2(y+2n+2h_2+h_1)} \\
 & \lesssim N^5 \sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_2) \sum_{n \in J(h_1, h_2)} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2} f_3(n) \Delta_{h_1, 2h_2} f_2(x),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $J(h_1, h_2) = J(h_1) \cap (J(h_1) - h_2)$. We repeat one final time

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.7) \quad & \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) f_3(n) \right|^8 \\
 & \lesssim N^{10} \left| \sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_2) \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, 2h_2} f_2(x) \sum_{n \in J(h_1, h_2)} \Delta_{h_1, h_2} f_3(n) \right|^2 \\
 & \lesssim N^{10} \left(\sum_{h_1 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_2)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, 2h_2} f_2(x) \sum_{n \in J(h_1, h_2)} \Delta_{h_1, h_2} f_3(n) \right|^2 \right) \\
 & \lesssim N^{12} \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \left| \sum_{n \in J(h_1, h_2)} \Delta_{h_1, h_2} f_3(n) \right|^2 \\
 & \lesssim N^{13} \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \sum_{n \in J(h_1, h_2, h_3)} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} f_3(n),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $J(h_1, h_2, h_3) = J(h_1, h_2) \cap (J(h_1, h_2) - h_3)$. Taking into account the support of $\Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} f_3(n)$, the restriction in the final summation can be discarded. Thus, we get

$$\left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) f_3(n) \right|^8 \leq CN^{13} \sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} f_3(n), \text{ as desired.}$$

□

The second lemma will ultimately allow us to establish Proposition 3.1 by essentially providing a bound for the U^3 -norm of a dyadic variant of our kernel. For every $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$K_{N, l}(n) = 1_{[2^l, \min(2^{l+1}, N+1))}(n) K_N(n).$$

We remind the reader that M is defined in 2.22.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $c \in [1, 23/22)$, $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. Then there exists a positive constant $C = C(h, \kappa)$ such that for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \in [0, \log_2(N+1)] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} K_{N, l}(n) \leq C \left(N^2 \varphi(N)^{-8+\kappa} + N \varphi(N)^{-8} 2^{-\frac{4l}{3}} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{10-2\kappa}{3}} M^{\frac{16}{3}} \right).$$

Proof. It will be more convenient to work with an unnormalized kernel, so let us define

$$(3.9) \quad L_{N, l}(n) = \lfloor \varphi(N) \rfloor K_{N, l}(n) = \mathbf{1}_{[2^l, \min(2^{l+1}, N+1))}(n) \sum_{0 < |m| \leq M} \frac{e(m\varphi(n+1)) - e(m\varphi(n))}{2\pi i m}.$$

By Lemma 2.3 we get that $|L_{N, l}(n)| \lesssim 1$, and the implied constant is absolute. For any $h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\sum_{|h_1|, |h_2| \leq N} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} K_{N, l}(n) = \sum_{x, h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2} (\Delta_{h_3} K_{N, l})(x) = \|\Delta_{h_3} K_{N, l}\|_{U^2}^4 = \lfloor \varphi(N) \rfloor^{-8} \|\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}\|_{U^2}^4.$$

By the inverse theorem for the U^2 -norm, see Lemma A.1 in [14], there exists $\xi_{h_3, N, l} \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\|\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}\|_{U^2}^4 \lesssim N \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}(x)) e(x\xi_{h_3, N, l}) \right|^2, \quad \text{where we have used that } |L_{N, l}(n)| \lesssim 1.$$

We have shown that for each $h_3 \in [-N, N]$ and $l \in [0, \log_2(N+1)] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ there exists $\xi_{h_3, N, l} \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} K_{N, l}(n) \lesssim \varphi(N)^{-8} N \sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}(x)) e(x\xi_{h_3, N, l}) \right|^2,$$

and it will suffice to appropriately bound $\sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}(x)) e(x\xi) \right|$ for most h_3 's. More precisely, we establish the following to conclude.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $c \in [1, 23/22)$, $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. Then there exists a positive constant $C = C(h, \kappa)$ such that for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in [0, \log_2(N+1)] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ and $h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|h_3| \geq \varphi(2^l)^\kappa$, we get*

$$\left\| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}(x)) e(x\xi) \right\|_{L_{d\xi}^\infty(\mathbb{T})} \leq C 2^{-\frac{2l}{3}} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{5-\kappa}{3}} M^{\frac{8}{3}}.$$

Proof. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{T}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, $l \in [0, \log_2(N+1)] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ and assume that $h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|h_3| \geq \varphi(2^l)^\kappa$. Note that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}(n)) e(n\xi) &= L_{N, l}(n) \overline{L_{N, l}(n+h_3)} e(n\xi) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{2^l \leq n, n+h_3 < \min(2^{l+1}, N+1)} \sum_{0 < |m_1| \leq M} \frac{e(m_1\varphi(n)) \psi_{m_1}(n)}{2\pi i m_1} \sum_{0 < |m_2| \leq M} \frac{e(-m_2\varphi(n+h_3)) \overline{\psi_{m_2}(n+h_3)}}{-2\pi i m_2} e(n\xi) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{2^l \leq n, n+h_3 < \min(2^{l+1}, N+1)} \sum_{0 < |m_1|, |m_2| \leq M} \frac{e(m_1\varphi(n) - m_2\varphi(n+h_3) + n\xi) \psi_{m_1}(n) \overline{\psi_{m_2}(n+h_3)}}{4\pi^2 m_1 m_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_m(n) = e(m(\varphi(n+1) - \varphi(n))) - 1$. Thus we get

$$(3.13) \quad \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N, l}(n)) e(n\xi) \right| \lesssim \sum_{0 < |m_1|, |m_2| \leq M} \frac{1}{|m_1 m_2|} \left| \sum_{n, n+h_3 \in [2^l, \min(2^{l+1}, N+1))} e(m_1\varphi(n) - m_2\varphi(n+h_3) + n\xi) \psi_{m_1}(n) \overline{\psi_{m_2}(n+h_3)} \right|.$$

We firstly assume that $h_3 > 0$. We apply Corollary 3.12 from [12], which yields the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.14) \quad & \left| \sum_{n, n+h_3 \in [2^l, \min(2^{l+1}, N+1))} e(m_1 \varphi(n) - m_2 \varphi(n+h_3) + n\xi) \psi_{m_1}(n) \overline{\psi_{m_2}(n+h_3)} \right| \\
& \lesssim \max\{|m_1|, |m_2|\}^{2/3} 2^{4l/3} \sigma(2^l)^{-1/3} \varphi(2^l)^{-(1+\kappa)/3} \left(|m_1 m_2| \varphi(2^l)^2 2^{-2l} + 2^l |m_1 m_2| \varphi(2^l)^2 2^{-3l} \right) \\
& = |m_1 m_2| \max\{|m_1|, |m_2|\}^{2/3} 2^{-2l/3} \sigma(2^l)^{-1/3} \varphi(2^l)^{(5-\kappa)/3},
\end{aligned}$$

where the bound can be derived through standard estimates for ψ_m , see page 37 in [4] for detailed calculations. Returning to 3.13 we get

$$(3.15) \quad \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N,l}(n)) e(n\xi) \right| \lesssim \sum_{0 < |m_1|, |m_2| \leq M} \max\{|m_1|, |m_2|\}^{2/3} 2^{-2l/3} \sigma(2^l)^{-1/3} \varphi(2^l)^{(5-\kappa)/3}.$$

We note that for $h_3 < 0$ we may perform a change of variables in 3.13 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.16) \quad & \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N,l}(n)) e(n\xi) \right| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{0 < |m_1|, |m_2| \leq M} \frac{1}{|m_1| |m_2|} \left| \sum_{k, k-h_3 \in [2^l, \min(2^{l+1}, N+1))} e(m_1 \varphi(k-h_3) - m_2 \varphi(k) + n\xi) \psi_{m_1}(k-h_3) \overline{\psi_{m_2}(k)} \right|,
\end{aligned}$$

and one may apply the same argument as before with h_3 replaced by $-h_3 > 0$, resulting in the same bound 3.15. Now we may estimate as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.17) \quad & \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N,l}(n)) e(n\xi) \right| \lesssim 2^{-2l/3} \sigma(2^l)^{-1/3} \varphi(2^l)^{(5-\kappa)/3} \sum_{0 < |m_1|, |m_2| \leq M} \max\{|m_1|, |m_2|\}^{2/3} \\
& \lesssim 2^{-\frac{2l}{3}} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{5-\kappa}{3}} M^{\frac{8}{3}},
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. \square

Returning back to 3.10, one concludes as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.18) \quad & \sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} K_{N,l}(n) \lesssim \frac{N}{\varphi(N)^8} \sum_{h_3 \in [-N, N]} \mu_N(h_3) \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N,l}(x)) e(x\xi_{h_3, N, l}) \right|^2 \\
& \leq N \varphi(N)^{-8} \sum_{h_3 \in [-\varphi(2^l)^\kappa, \varphi(2^l)^\kappa]} \mu_N(h_3) \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N,l}(x)) e(x\xi_{h_3, N, l}) \right|^2 \\
& \quad + N \varphi(N)^{-8} \sum_{|h_3| \in (\varphi(2^l)^\kappa, N]} \mu_N(h_3) \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} (\Delta_{h_3} L_{N,l}(x)) e(x\xi_{h_3, N, l}) \right|^2 \\
& \lesssim N \varphi(N)^{-8} \varphi(N)^\kappa N^{-1} N^2 + N \varphi(N)^{-8} 2^{-\frac{4l}{3}} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{10-2\kappa}{3}} M^{\frac{16}{3}} \\
& \quad N^2 \varphi(N)^{-8+\kappa} + N \varphi(N)^{-8} 2^{-\frac{4l}{3}} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{10-2\kappa}{3}} M^{\frac{16}{3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.8. \square

We now are ready to prove Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.8 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.19) \quad & \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) K_N(n) \right| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} \left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) (K_N(n) 1_{[2^l, \min(2^{l+1}, N+1))}(n)) \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} N^{\frac{13}{8}} \left(\sum_{h_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_N(h_3) \sum_{h_1, h_2 \in [-N, N]} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_{h_1, h_2, h_3} K_{N, l}(n) \right)^{\frac{1}{8}} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} N^{\frac{13}{8}} \left(N^{\frac{2}{8}} \varphi(N)^{-1 + \frac{\kappa}{8}} + N^{\frac{1}{8}} \varphi(N)^{-1} 2^{-\frac{l}{6}} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{1}{12}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{5-\kappa}{12}} M^{\frac{2}{3}} \right) \\
&\lesssim \log(N) N^{\frac{15}{8}} \varphi(N)^{-1 + \frac{\kappa}{8}} + \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} N^{\frac{14}{8}} \varphi(N)^{-1} 2^{-\frac{l}{6}} \sigma(2^l)^{-1/12} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{5-\kappa}{12}} M^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\lesssim N \left(\log(N) N^{\frac{7}{8}} \varphi(N)^{-1 + \frac{\kappa}{8}} \right) + N^{\frac{7}{4}} \varphi(N)^{-1} M^{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{1}{12}} 2^{-\frac{l}{6}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{5-\kappa}{12}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We choose $\kappa := \frac{9c-6}{5}$, note that this is possible since $\frac{9c-6}{5} < 1 \iff c < 11/9$. For the first summand above we note that

$$\frac{7}{8} - \frac{1}{c} + \frac{\kappa}{8c} = \frac{22c - 23}{20c} < 0,$$

since $c < 23/22$ and thus $N(\log(N) N^{\frac{7}{8}} \varphi(N)^{-1 + \frac{\kappa}{8}}) \lesssim N^{1-\chi}$ for some $\chi = \chi(c) > 0$. For the second summand firstly note that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.20) \quad &\sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{1}{12}} 2^{-\frac{l}{6}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{5-\kappa}{12}} \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} 2^{l\varepsilon} 2^{-\frac{l}{6}} ((2^l)^{\frac{1}{c} + \varepsilon})^{\frac{5-\kappa}{12}} \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} 2^{l(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{6} + (\frac{1}{c} + \varepsilon)(\frac{5-\kappa}{12}))} \lesssim N^{(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{6} + (\frac{1}{c} + \varepsilon)(\frac{5-\kappa}{12}))} \lesssim N^{-\frac{1}{6} + \frac{5}{12c} - \frac{\kappa}{12c} + 2\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the penultimate estimate holds since

$$(3.21) \quad -\frac{1}{6} + \frac{5}{12c} - \frac{\kappa}{12c} = \frac{-19c + 31}{60c} > 0,$$

since $c < 31/19$. Thus applying the above estimate for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/12$ yields the following bounds for the second summand in the last line of 3.19

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.22) \quad &N^{\frac{7}{4}} \varphi(N)^{-1} M^{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq \log_2(N+1)} \sigma(2^l)^{-\frac{1}{12}} 2^{-\frac{l}{6}} \varphi(2^l)^{\frac{5-\kappa}{12}} \lesssim N^{\frac{7}{4}} N^{-\frac{1}{c} + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{6}} N^{\frac{2}{3} - \frac{2}{3c} + \frac{2\varepsilon_0}{3}} N^{-\frac{1}{6} + \frac{5}{12c} - \frac{\kappa}{12c} + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{6}} \\
&= NN^{\frac{22c-23}{20c} + \varepsilon_0} = NN^{\frac{44c-46}{40c} + \frac{23-22c}{40c}} = NN^{\frac{22c-23}{40c}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{22c-23}{40c} < 0$, combining the estimates for both summands in the last line of 3.19 we get that there exists $\chi = \chi(c) > 0$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} f_0(x) f_1(x-n) f_2(x+n) K_N(n) \right| \lesssim N^{1-\chi},$$

as desired, and the proof is complete. \square

4. CONCLUDING THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

Here we explain how to use Proposition 3.1 to establish the first assertion of Proposition 2.24 and conclude the proof of Theorem 1.7. Bounds of the form 3.2 immediately yield the L^1 -bound in 4.2, which, in turn, will yield the desired result. The following proposition should be understood as a simple instance of Calderón's transference principle utilizing Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume $c \in [1, 23/22)$ and $h \in \mathcal{R}_c$. Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) be a probability space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ an invertible μ -invariant transformation. Let $f, g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be 1-bounded functions. Then there exist positive constants $C = C(h)$ and $\chi = \chi(h)$ such that*

$$(4.2) \quad \|E_N^{(1)}(f, g)\|_{L^1_\mu(X)} \leq CN^{-\chi}.$$

Proof. By duality and μ -invariance there exists a 1-bounded function l such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.3) \quad \|E_N^{(1)}(f, g)\|_{L_\mu^1(X)} &= \int_X l(x) E_N^{(1)}(f, g)(x) d\mu(x) = \int_X l(x) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} K_N(n) f(T^n x) g(T^{-n} x) d\mu(x) \\
 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m \in [N]} \int_X l(T^m x) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} K_N(n) f(T^{n+m} x) g(T^{-n+m} x) d\mu(x) \\
 &\leq \int_X \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (l(T^m x) 1_{[N]}(m)) (f(T^{n+m} x) 1_{[-2N, 2N]}(n+m)) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \cdot (g(T^{m-n} x) 1_{[-2N, 2N]}(m-n)) K_N(n) \right| d\mu(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

For every fixed $x \in X$, we apply Proposition 3.1 to the obvious functions to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.4) \quad \int_X \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (l(T^m x) 1_{[N]}(m)) (f(T^{n+m} x) 1_{[-2N, 2N]}(n+m)) \right. \\
 \left. \cdot (g(T^{m-n} x) 1_{[-2N, 2N]}(m-n)) K_N(n) \right| d\mu(x) \lesssim N^{-\chi},
 \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. \square

Finally, we explain how to use Proposition 4.1 to prove Proposition 2.24(i), as well as how to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Proposition 2.24(i). Fix $\lambda \in (1, 2]$; using Proposition 4.1 it is easy to see that

$$\left\| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} |E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}^{(1)}(f, g)| \right\|_{L_\mu^1(X)} \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}^{(1)}(f, g)\|_{L_\mu^1(X)} \lesssim \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \lambda^{-\chi k} < \infty,$$

and thus $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} |E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x)| < \infty$ for μ -a.e. $x \in X$, which, in turn, implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X, \text{ as desired.}$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. It suffices to prove that for every $\lambda \in (1, 2]$ we have

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} B_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X.$$

We note that the argument in the proof of Proposition 2.8 together with Proposition 2.24 yield that for μ -a.e. $x \in X$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.6) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |B_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x) - A_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x)| &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}(f, g)(x)| \\
 &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}^{(1)}(f, g)(x)| + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |E_{\lfloor \lambda^k \rfloor}^{(2)}(f, g)(x)| = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

and thus 4.5 is established and the proof of Theorem 1.7 is complete. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Boshernitzan, M. Wierdl, *Ergodic theorems along sequences and Hardy fields*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **93** (1996), pp. 8205–8207. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.93.16.8205>.
- [2] J. Bourgain, *Double recurrence and almost sure convergence*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 404 (1990), 140–161.
- [3] D. Heath-Brown, *The Pjateckii–Sapiro prime number theorem*. J. Number Theory 16 (1983), 242–266.
- [4] L. Daskalakis, *Weak-type (1,1) inequality for discrete maximal functions and pointwise ergodic theorems along thin arithmetic sets*. J Fourier Anal Appl 30, 37 (2024).
- [5] N. Frantzikinakis, E. Lesigne, M. Wierdl, *Random sequences and pointwise convergence of multiple ergodic averages*. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 61(2):585–617, 2012.

- [6] B. Krause, M. Mirek, T. Tao, *Pointwise ergodic theorems for non-conventional bilinear polynomial averages*. Ann. of Math. 195 (2022), no. 3, pp. 997–1109.
- [7] G. H. Hardy, *Divergent Series*. (1949) Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [8] A. Iosevich, B. Langowski, M. Mirek, T. Z. Szarek, *Lattice points problem, equidistribution and ergodic theorems for certain arithmetic spheres*. Mathematische Annalen 388, (2024), pp. 2041–2120.
- [9] H. Iwaniec, E. Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*. Vol. 53, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications, Providence RI, (2004).
- [10] D. Kosz, M. Mirek, S. Peluse, J. Wright, *The multilinear circle method and a question of Bergelson*. arXiv:2411.09478.
- [11] M. Lacey, *The bilinear maximal functions map into L^p for $2/3 < p \leq 1$* . Ann. of Math. 151 (2000), no. 1, pp. 35–57.
- [12] M. Mirek, *Weak type $(1, 1)$ inequalities for discrete rough maximal functions*. J. Anal. Mat. 127 (2015), 303–337.
- [13] M. Mirek, *Roth’s Theorem in the Piatetski–Shapiro primes*. Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 31 (2015), no. 2, 617–656.
- [14] S. Peluse, S. Prendiville, *Quantitative bounds in the nonlinear Roth theorem*. Invent. math. 238, 865–903 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-024-01293-x>
- [15] S. Prendiville, *Quantitative bounds in the polynomial Szemerédi theorem: the homogeneous case*. Discrete Anal., pages 34, Paper No. 5, 2017.

(Leonidas Daskalakis) INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-656 WARSZAWA, POLAND

Email address: ldaskalakis@impan.pl