

Damping estimates for oscillatory integral operators with real-analytic phases and its applications

Zuoshunhua Shi ^{*}, Shaozhen Xu[†] and Dunyan Yan[‡]

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate sharp damping estimates for a class of one dimensional oscillatory integral operators with real-analytic phases. By establishing endpoint estimates for suitably damped oscillatory integral operators, we are able to give a new proof of the sharp L^p estimates which have been proved by Xiao in Endpoint estimates for one-dimensional oscillatory integral operators, *Advances in Mathematics*, **316**, 255-291 (2017). The damping estimates obtained in this paper are of independent interest.

Keywords: oscillatory integral operator, real-analytic phase, damped oscillatory integral operator, sharp L^p decay, Newton polyhedron, van der Corput lemma

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 42B20 47G10

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider one-dimensional oscillatory integral operators of the form

$$T_\lambda f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} \varphi(x,y) f(y) dy, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is a parameter, S is a real-analytic function near the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 , and φ is a smooth cut-off function supported in a small neighborhood of the origin. Our main goal is to determine the optimal decay of the operator norm of T_λ on L^p . It is easy to see that T_λ has no power decay property with respect to λ , if the phase function S is degenerate in the sense that it can be written as

$$S(x,y) = P(x) + Q(y) \quad (1.2)$$

for two polynomials P and Q . A natural question arises whether there is a power decay estimate if the phase S is not of the form (1.2). The answer is affirmative except the special cases $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$. We now review some well-known results in this direction. If S is nondegenerate in the sense that its Hessian S''_{xy} does not vanish in the support of φ , Hörmander [13] obtained

^{*}School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha, People's Republic of China. E-mail address: *shizsh@163.com*.

[†]School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, People's Republic of China. & Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, 61801, USA. E-mail address: *xushaozhen14b@mails.ucas.ac.cn*.

[‡]School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China. E-mail address: *ydunyan@ucas.ac.cn*.

the maximal L^2 decay $|\lambda|^{-1/2}$. For general real-analytic phases, Phong-Stein [19] proved the remarkable result that the maximal L^2 decay for T_λ is explicitly determined by the Newton polyhedron of S ; see also Greenblatt [6] for a new proof of this result. The Phong-Stein theorem was extended to the case of almost all smooth phase functions by Rychkov [25]. Its full generalization to general smooth functions was established by Greenblatt [7].

Recently, Xiao [33] has proved the sharp L^p decay estimates for T_λ . For convenience, we formulate this result in the following theorem. Another equivalent formulation in terms of the Newton polyhedron of S will be given in Section 3.

Theorem 1.1 (Xiao [33]) *Assume S is a real-analytic function near the origin in the plane. Let T_λ be the oscillatory integral operator defined by (1.1). If there exist two positive integers k, l such that $\partial_x^k \partial_y^l S(0, 0) \neq 0$, then there is a constant $C = C(S, \varphi)$ such that*

$$\|T_\lambda f\|_{L^p} \leq C |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{k+l}} \|f\|_{L^p}, \quad p = \frac{k+l}{k}, \quad (1.3)$$

provided that φ is supported in a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin.

By interpolation, one can verify that the estimate (1.3) is sharp only if (k, l) lies on the boundary of the Newton polyhedron $N(S)$. Moreover, it suffices to show that the above L^p estimates are true for extreme points $(k, l) \in N(S)$. For further results, one can see Greenleaf-Seeger [10], Yang [35, 36] and Shi-Yan [29] for earlier work. For linear and multi-linear estimates, we refer the reader to Carbery-Christ-Wright [1], Carbery-Wright [3], Phong-Stein-Sturm [22], Christ-Li-Tao-Thiele [4] and Gressman-Xiao [12]. Some work on higher dimensional oscillatory integral operators can be found in Tang [32], Greenleaf-Pramanik-Tang [9] and Xu-Yan [34]. Other results concerning regularity of Radon transforms associated with S , we refer the reader to Greenleaf-Seeger [11] and Seeger [26, 27].

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 was inspired by Xiao [33] and the recent work in [28] of the first author. It was found in [28] that some uniform damping estimates for T_λ imply sharp uniform L^p decay estimates. In this respect, damping estimates for oscillatory integral operators are of independent interest.

Let us discuss some basic facts related to damped oscillatory integral operators of the form

$$W_z f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} |D(x,y)|^z \varphi(x,y) f(y) dy, \quad (1.4)$$

where the damping factor D is determined by the Hessian S''_{xy} , and the exponent $z \in \mathbb{C}$ lies in some bounded strip $a \leq \operatorname{Re}(z) \leq b$. On the one hand, we shall give sharp L^2 decay estimates for W_z when z has real part $\operatorname{Re}(z) = b$. On the other hand, for z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) = a$, we have to establish $L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}$, $H_E^1 \rightarrow L^1$ and $L^1 \rightarrow L^1$ estimates. In the latter case, the argument is somewhat different depending on whether $\{(x, y) : D(x, y) = 0\}$ contains at least two curves. Assume $\{D = 0\}$ includes only one curve. If this curve is tangent to some straight line at the origin, then we shall define a class of variants of Hardy spaces H^1 to replace $L^1 \rightarrow L^1$ by $H_E^1 \rightarrow L^1$. This idea was explored by Phong-Stein [17], Greenleaf-Seeger [10] and Pan [14]. An interpolation of these two sharp decay estimates will lead to our desired sharp L^p estimates.

This paper will be organized as follows. Some useful lemmas will be presented in Section 2. We shall establish sharp L^2 decay estimates for a class of damped oscillatory integral operators in Section 3. In Section 4, we shall prove some endpoint estimates of form $L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}$, $H_E^1 \rightarrow L^1$ and $L^1 \rightarrow L^1$. A new proof of Theorem 1.1 will be given in Section 5. Throughout this paper, we use the notation $a \lesssim b$ to mean $a \leq Cb$ for an appropriate constant $C > 0$, and $a \approx b$ to mean $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we shall first give the concept of horizontally (vertically) convex domains which were introduced by Phong-Stein-Sturm [22]; see also Carbery-Wright [3] for some related remarks. This notion of convexity turns out to be important in this paper. In fact, the operator van der Corput lemma will be established for oscillatory integral operators supported on horizontally and vertically convex domains. Finally, we shall give a variant of Stein-Weiss interpolation with change of measures. Some related results will be also included in this section.

Definition 2.1 *Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^2 . If $(x, z), (y, z) \in \Omega$ imply $(\theta x + (1 - \theta)y, z) \in \Omega$ for all $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, then Ω is said to be horizontally convex. Similarly, a domain Ω is said to be vertically convex if $(x, y), (x, z) \in \Omega$ imply $(x, \theta y + (1 - \theta)z) \in \Omega$ for all $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$.*

It is clear that a convex domain is both horizontally convex and vertically convex. In subsequent sections, we shall use frequently a special horizontally and vertically convex domain which is known as the curved trapezoid; see Phong-Stein [19, 20] for earlier work where the curved trapezoid was used as an important domain.

Definition 2.2 *Suppose g and h are two monotone functions on $[a, b]$ such that $g(x) \leq h(x)$ for every $x \in [a, b]$. Then the following domain*

$$\Omega = \{(x, y) : a \leq x \leq b, g(x) \leq y \leq h(x)\}$$

is said to be a curved-trapezoid.

Now we recall the concept of polynomial type functions; see Phong-Stein [19, 20].

Definition 2.3 *Assume $F \in C^N$ is defined on a bounded interval J . Then F is said to be of polynomial type with order N if there exists a constant $C_F > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \in J} |F^{(N)}(x)| \leq C_F \inf_{x \in J} |F^{(N)}(x)|.$$

We use $\text{ord}(F)$ to denote the order of F .

Polynomial type functions have the following useful property; see Phong-Stein [19, 20].

Lemma 2.1 *Let J be a bounded interval. If $F \in C^N(J)$ be a polynomial type function with order N , then there is a constant $C = C(N, C_F)$ such that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^N |I^*|^k \sup_{x \in I^* \cap J} |F^{(k)}(x)| \leq C \sup_{x \in I} |F(x)|$$

is true for all subintervals $I \subseteq J$, where for each interval I we denote by I^ its double, i.e., the interval with the same center as I but with twice its length.*

Remark 2.1 *The following basic fact turns out to be useful in subsequent sections.*

- *Assume F is a real-valued polynomial type function on some bounded interval J . If there exist two constants $\mu > 0, C > 0$ such that $\mu \leq |F(x)| \leq C\mu$ on J , then $|F|^z$ also satisfies the estimate in Lemma 2.1 for all complex numbers z with a constant $C = C(\text{ord}(F), C_F, z)$.*

With the above concepts, we are able to give the operator van der Corput lemma. The following notations will be frequently used in this section. Assume Ω is a horizontally and vertically convex domain. We define the following notations associated with Ω .

- $\delta_{\Omega,h}(x)$: the length of the cross section $\{y \mid (x,y) \in \Omega\}$ with the subscript h indicating that $\delta_{\Omega,h}$ is a function of the horizontal component.
- $\delta_{\Omega,v}(y)$: the length of the interval $\{x \mid (x,y) \in \Omega\}$. The notation v means that y is the vertical component.
- $I_{\Omega,h}(x) := \{y : (x,y) \in \Omega\}$.
- $I_{\Omega,v}(y) := \{x : (x,y) \in \Omega\}$.
- $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.
- $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

For clarity, we assume that Ω is a horizontally and vertically convex domain such that its horizontal cross sections and vertical cross sections are closed intervals. Then Ω can be written as

$$\Omega = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : a \leq x \leq b, g(x) \leq y \leq h(x)\}$$

and

$$\Omega = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : c \leq y \leq d, u(y) \leq x \leq v(y)\},$$

where g, h and u, v are functions on the intervals $[a, b]$ and $[c, d]$, respectively. Before our discussion of the almost orthogonality estimate, we shall define some expanded domains for Ω .

Definition 2.4 *Assume Ω is a domain given as above. Then Ω_h^* is said to be a horizontally expanded domain for Ω if there exists a positive number ϵ and a nonnegative function α on $[c, d]$ such that*

$$\Omega_h^* = \{(x, y) : c \leq y \leq d, u(y) - \alpha(y) \leq x \leq v(y) + \alpha(y)\}$$

and

$$\delta_{\Omega_h^*,v}(y) \geq (1 + 2\epsilon)\delta_{\Omega,v}(y), \quad c \leq y \leq d,$$

i.e.

$$v(y) - u(y) + 2\alpha(y) \geq (1 + 2\epsilon)(v(y) - u(y)).$$

Similarly, we call Ω_v^* a vertical expanded domain for Ω if there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ and a nonnegative function β such that

$$\Omega_v^* = \{(x, y) : a \leq x \leq b, g(x) - \beta(x) \leq y \leq h(x) + \beta(x)\}$$

and

$$\delta_{\Omega_v^*,h}(x) \geq (1 + 2\epsilon)\delta_{\Omega,h}(x), \quad x \in [a, b].$$

Definition 2.5 *Assume Ω is a horizontally and vertically convex domain. A domain Ω^* is called an expanded domain for Ω if there exist two expanded domains Ω_h^* and Ω_v^* as in Definition 2.4 such that*

$$\Omega^* = \Omega_h^* \cup \Omega_v^*.$$

Now we shall state the almost orthogonality estimate between two oscillatory integral operators which are supported on horizontally and vertically convex domains. It should be pointed out that the same estimate had been established by Phong and Stein for oscillatory integral operators supported on curved trapezoids; see Phong-Stein [20].

Lemma 2.2 *Assume T_1 and T_2 are two oscillatory integral operators defined as (1.1) with a common phase S , where the cut-off functions for T_1 and T_2 are φ_1 and φ_2 , respectively. Suppose Ω_1 and Ω_2 are two horizontally and vertically convex domains such that*

$$\text{supp}(\varphi_1) \subseteq \Omega_1, \quad \text{supp}(\varphi_2) \subseteq \Omega_2.$$

If all of the following conditions hold,

- (i) *For two positive constants $\mu, A > 0$, there exist two expanded domains Ω_1^* and Ω_2^* such that $\mu \leq |S''_{xy}| \leq A\mu$ on Ω_1^* . The Hessian S''_{xy} is a polynomial type function with order $\text{ord}(S)$ in y , uniformly in x , on vertical cross sections of appropriately expanded domains Ω_1^* and Ω_2^* .*
- (ii) *For any horizontal line segment L joining a point $(x, z) \in \Omega_1^*$ and another one $(y, z) \in \Omega_2^*$, the Hessian S''_{xy} does not change sign on L and $|S''_{xy}(x, y)| \leq A\mu$ for all points $(x, y) \in L$.*
- (iii) *There exists a constant $B \geq 1$ such that $I_{\Omega_2^*, v}(y) \subseteq I_{\Omega_1^*, v}^*(y; B)$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Here the notation $I^*(B)$ denotes the interval concentric with I and having length $|I^*(B)| = B|I|$.*
- (iv) *There are two constants $M_1, M_2 > 0$ such that for all $(x, y) \in \Omega_i$*

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 (\delta_{\Omega_i, h}(x))^k \left| \partial_y^k \varphi_i(x, y) \right| \leq M_i, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

then there exists a constant $C = C(\text{ord}(S), C_{S''_{xy}}, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, A, B)$ such that

$$\|T_1 T_2^*\| \leq C M_1 M_2 |\lambda \mu|^{-1},$$

where $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$ are expanded factors (see Definition 2.4) for Ω_1^ and Ω_2^* .*

Proof. It is easy to see that the integral kernel associated with $T_1 T_2^*$ is given by

$$K(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\lambda[S(x, z) - S(y, z)]} \varphi_1(x, z) \overline{\varphi_2(y, z)} dz.$$

Define a function Φ by

$$\Phi(z) = \partial_z S(x, z) - \partial_z S(y, z)$$

and a linear differential operator \mathcal{D} by

$$\mathcal{D}f(z) = \frac{1}{i\lambda} \frac{1}{\Phi(z)} f'(z).$$

For convenience, we also define the transpose \mathcal{D}^t of \mathcal{D} as

$$\mathcal{D}^t f(z) = -\frac{1}{i\lambda} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[\frac{f(z)}{\Phi(z)} \right].$$

Since $\text{supp}(\varphi_i) \subseteq \Omega_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, we see that if $\varphi_1(x, z)\overline{\varphi_2(y, z)} \neq 0$ then $z \in I_{\Omega_1, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)$. By the assumptions (i), (ii) and (iii), there exists a constant $C = C(B)$ such that

$$|\Phi(z)| = \left| \int_y^x \partial_z \partial_u S(u, z) du \right| \geq C\mu|x - y|, \quad z \in I_{\Omega_1, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2, h}(y).$$

Combining this result, we deduce from the assumption (ii) that

$$C\mu|x - y| \leq |\Phi(z)| \leq A\mu|x - y|, \quad z \in I_{\Omega_1^*, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2^*, h}(y).$$

As assumed above, $I_{\Omega_1, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2, h}(y) \neq \emptyset$. Choose an arbitrary point a from this intersection. By Definitions 2.4 and 2.5, we see that

$$\left(a - \epsilon_1 \delta_{\Omega_1, h}(x), a + \epsilon_1 \delta_{\Omega_1, h}(x) \right) \subseteq I_{\Omega_1^*, h}(x), \quad \left(a - \epsilon_2 \delta_{\Omega_2, h}(y), a + \epsilon_2 \delta_{\Omega_2, h}(y) \right) \subseteq I_{\Omega_2^*, h}(y). \quad (2.5)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{\Omega_1^*, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2^*, h}(y)| &\geq 2 \min\{\epsilon_1 \delta_{\Omega_1, h}(x), \epsilon_2 \delta_{\Omega_2, h}(y)\} \\ &\geq 2\epsilon_1 \wedge \epsilon_2 |I_{\Omega_1, h}(x)| \wedge |I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where ϵ_1, ϵ_2 appear in the definition of Ω_1^* and Ω_2^* . By the scaling property of polynomials in Lemma 2.1, there exists a constants C depending only on $\text{ord}(S)$ and $C_{S''_{xy}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \left| \partial_z^k \Phi(z) \right| &\leq C\mu|x - y| |I_{\Omega_1^*, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2^*, h}(y)|^{-k} \\ &\leq C(\epsilon_1 \wedge \epsilon_2)^{-k} \mu|x - y| (|I_{\Omega_1^*, h}(x)| \wedge |I_{\Omega_2^*, h}(y)|)^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

By integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K(x, y) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{D}^2 \left(e^{i\lambda[S(x, z) - S(y, z)]} \right) \varphi_1(x, z) \overline{\varphi_2(y, z)} dz \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\lambda[S(x, z) - S(y, z)]} (\mathcal{D}^t)^2 \left(\varphi_1(x, z) \overline{\varphi_2(y, z)} \right) dz. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $(\mathcal{D}^t)^2 \left(\varphi_1(x, z) \overline{\varphi_2(y, z)} \right)$ is a linear combination of the following terms

$$\frac{1}{(i\lambda)^2} \frac{\partial^{k_1}}{\partial z^{k_1}} \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(z)} \right) \frac{\partial^{k_2}}{\partial z^{k_2}} \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(z)} \right) \frac{\partial^{k_3}}{\partial z^{k_3}} \varphi_1(x, z) \frac{\partial^{k_4}}{\partial z^{k_4}} \overline{\varphi_2(y, z)}$$

with k_i being nonnegative integers satisfying $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 = 2$. By induction, we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d^k}{dz^k} \left(\frac{1}{\Phi(z)} \right) \right| &\leq C(\text{ord}(S), C_{S''_{xy}}, A) (\mu|x - y|)^{-1} |I_{\Omega_1^*, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2^*, h}(y)|^{-k} \\ &\leq C(\text{ord}(S), C_{S''_{xy}}, A, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) (\mu|x - y|)^{-1} (|I_{\Omega_1, h}(x)| \wedge |I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)|)^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, by Remark 2.1, we have claimed that $(\Phi(z))^{-1}$ satisfies the estimate in Lemma 2.1 on the interval $I_{\Omega_1^*, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2^*, h}(y)$. By the assumption (iv), it is clear that

$$\left| \partial_z^k \varphi_i(u, z) \right| \leq M_i (|I_{\Omega_1, h}(x)| \wedge |I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)|)^{-k}$$

for $u \in \{x, y\}$ and $z \in I_{\Omega_1, h}(x) \cap I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)$. Combining all above estimates, we obtain

$$\left| (\mathcal{D}^t) \left(\varphi_1(x, z) \overline{\varphi_2(y, z)} \right) \right| \leq CM_1 M_2 (\mu \lambda |x - y|)^{-2} (|I_{\Omega_1, h}(x)| \wedge |I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)|)^{-2}.$$

On the other hand, if we take absolute value into the integral for K , then we find that

$$|K(x, y)| \leq CM_1 M_2 |I_{\Omega_1, h}(x)| \wedge |I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)|.$$

Hence we obtain

$$|K(x, y)| \leq CM_1 M_2 (1 + \delta_{\Omega_1, h}(x) \wedge \delta_{\Omega_2, h}(y) |\lambda| \mu |x - y|)^{-2} \cdot \delta_{\Omega_1, h}(x) \wedge \delta_{\Omega_2, h}(y).$$

Recall that $\delta_{\Omega_1, h}(x) = |I_{\Omega_1, h}(x)|$ and $\delta_{\Omega_2, h}(y) = |I_{\Omega_2, h}(y)|$. Set $a = \delta_{\Omega_1, h}(x)$ and $b = \delta_{\Omega_2, h}(y)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |K(x, y)| |f(y)| |g(x)| dx dy \\ & \leq CM_1 M_2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{a}{(1 + a\mu|\lambda||x - y|)^2} |f(y)| |g(x)| dx dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{b}{(1 + b\mu|\lambda||x - y|)^2} |f(y)| |g(x)| dx dy \right) \\ & \leq CM_1 M_2 |\lambda\mu|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(x)| \mathcal{M}f(x) dx + CM_1 M_2 |\lambda\mu|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(y)| \mathcal{M}g(y) dy \\ & \leq CM_1 M_2 |\lambda\mu|^{-1} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{M} is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator and $C = C(\text{ord}(S), C_{S''_{xy}}, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, A, B)$. Here we have used the fact that \mathcal{M} is a bounded operator on L^2 . The proof of the lemma is complete. \square

Now we shall give an interpolation lemma with change of power weights. One can compare this lemma with the well-known Stein-Weiss interpolation with change of measures; see Stein-Weiss [31]. The following lemma is an extension of Proposition 1.4 in [15]; see [29] and [28] for its proof.

Lemma 2.3 *Let dx be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . Assume T is a linear operator defined on all simple functions with respect to dx . If there exist two constants $A_1, A_2 > 0$ such that*

- (i) $\|Tf\|_{L^\infty(dx)} \leq A_1 \|f\|_{L^1(dx)}$ for all simple functions f ;
- (ii) $\| |x|^a Tf \|_{L^{p_0}(dx)} \leq A_2 \|f\|_{L^{p_0}(dx)}$ for some $1 < p_0 < +\infty$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $ap_0 \neq -1$;

then for any $\theta \in (0, 1)$ there exists a constant $C = C(a, p_0, \theta)$ such that

$$\| |x|^b Tf \|_{L^p(dx)} \leq CA_1^\theta A_2^{1-\theta} \|f\|_{L^p(dx)}$$

for all simple functions f , where b and p satisfy $b = -\theta + (1 - \theta)a$ and $\frac{1}{p} = \theta + \frac{1-\theta}{p_0}$.

We shall need a uniform estimate with non-sharp decay exponent in Section 4.

Lemma 2.4 *Assume S is a real-valued smooth function in the unit square $Q = (0, 1)^2$. Let T_λ be the oscillatory integral operator in (1.1) with phase S and cut-off function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(Q)$. If there exist two positive integers j and k such that $\partial_x^j \partial_y^k S(x, y) \geq 1$ on Q , then we have the*

following results.

(i) In the case $j = k = 1$, if in addition there exists a positive integer N such that either $\partial_x^{N+1}\partial_y S$ or $\partial_x\partial_y^{N+1}S$ is single-signed in Q , then we have

$$\|T_\lambda f\|_{L^2} \leq C(N, \varphi) |\lambda|^{-1/2} \log^{1/2}(2 + |\lambda|) \|f\|_{L^2}. \quad (2.7)$$

(ii) If either $j \geq 2$ or $k \geq 2$, then there exists a constant $C = C(j, k, \varphi)$ such that

$$\|T_\lambda f\|_{L^2} \leq C |\lambda|^{-\delta} \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \delta = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{(j \vee k) 2^{j \wedge k}}. \quad (2.8)$$

For the proof of this lemma, we refer the reader to Carbery-Christ-Wright [1] where the optimal decay exponent $\delta = \frac{1}{2(j \vee k)}$ was obtained when either j or k is equal to 1 and at least one of them is greater than 1. In the same paper [1], uniform estimates were also given for general $j \geq 2$ or $k \geq 2$ with non-sharp decay exponents. Especially, if S is a polynomial, one can see Ricci-Stein [24] for $\delta < \frac{1}{2 \deg(S)}$ and Phong-Stein-Sturm [22] for the general optimal decay exponent $\delta = \frac{1}{2(j \vee k)}$. For further related results under more general nondegenerate conditions, one can see Christ-Li-Tao-Thiele [4]; see also Greenblatt [8] for uniform multilinear decay estimates in the case of smooth phases.

Now we state the operator van der Corput lemma for nondegenerate oscillatory integral operators supported on horizontally and vertically convex domains. This lemma was established by Phong-Stein-Sturm [22]. For its proof, one can also see [22].

Lemma 2.5 *Let T_λ be defined as (1.1) with the cut-off φ supported in a curved trapezoid Ω . Assume the Hessian S''_{xy} is a polynomial type function with order $\text{ord}(S)$ in y , uniformly in x , on each vertical cross section $I_{\Omega, h}(x) = \{y : (x, y) \in \Omega\}$. If the following assumptions are true:*

- (i) *For some $\mu, A > 0$, the Hessian S''_{xy} satisfies $\mu \leq |S''_{xy}(x, y)| \leq A\mu$ for $(x, y) \in \Omega$;*
- (ii) *Let $\delta_{\Omega, h}(x)$ be the length of $I_{\Omega, h}(x)$. For some $M > 0$,*

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 \sup_{\Omega} (\delta_{\Omega, h}(x))^k |\partial_y^k \varphi(x, y)| \leq M,$$

then there exists a constant $C = C(\text{ord}(S), C_{S''_{xy}}, A)$ such that for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$

$$\|T_\lambda f\|_{L^2} \leq CM (|\lambda| \mu)^{-1/2} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

In Section 3, the following lemma will be frequently used to balance oscillation and size estimates of nondegenerate oscillatory integral operators.

Lemma 2.6 *For arbitrary $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and $M > 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(\epsilon, M) > 0$ such that for all $A, B > 0$,*

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \min \{A\epsilon^k, BM^k\} \leq C \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\min \{A\epsilon^k, BM^k\} \right).$$

As a consequence, if $\theta \in (0, 1)$ satisfies $\epsilon^\theta M^{1-\theta} = 1$, then

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \min \{A\epsilon^k, BM^k\} \leq CA^\theta B^{1-\theta}.$$

Proof. Since $\{A\epsilon^k\}$ is strictly decreasing and $\{BM^k\}$ is strictly increasing, there exists a unique $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A\epsilon^{k_0} \geq BM^{k_0}$ and $A\epsilon^{k_0+1} < BM^{k_0+1}$. For this k_0 , it is easy to see that $A\epsilon^{k_0}$ and BM^{k_0} are comparable up to constants depending only on ϵ and M . Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \min \{A\epsilon^k, BM^k\} &= \sum_{k \leq k_0} BM^k + \sum_{k > k_0} A\epsilon^k \\ &\leq C(\epsilon, M) \min \{A\epsilon^{k_0}, BM^{k_0}\} \\ &\leq CA^\theta B^{1-\theta} \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\epsilon^\theta M^{1-\theta} = 1$. The proof is complete. \square

Now we give the well-known Puiseux factorization theorem for real-analytic functions (also for formal power series in \mathbb{R}^2). Assume n is a positive integer. Let $\mathbb{C}[[x^{1/n}]]$ be the ring of formal fractional power series in $x^{1/n}$ with complex coefficients. For each $r \in \mathbb{C}[[x^{1/n}]]$, i.e., $r(x) = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i x^{i/n}$, the series $\sigma_\epsilon(r)(x) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \epsilon^i a_i x^{i/n}$ will be called the conjugate series of r for all n -th roots ϵ of the unit. For the concept of Puiseux series and its polydromy order n , one can see Casas-Alvero [2].

Theorem 2.7 ([2], p32, Theorem 1.8.3) *Let S be a real-analytic function near the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 . Then there exists a non-vanishing real-analytic function U and finitely many Puiseux series $r_\nu(x)$, both defined in a small neighborhood of the origin, such that*

$$S(x, y) = U(x, y) \prod_{\nu} (y - r_\nu(x)). \quad (2.9)$$

Moreover, for each root r_ν , all of its conjugate series also appear in the above decomposition with the same multiplicity.

3 L^2 Damping Decay Estimates

Assume S is a real-valued analytic function near the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 . Now we only consider the degenerate case $S''_{xy}(0, 0) = 0$. By Taylor's expansion, we can write $S(x, y) = \sum_{k, l \geq 0} a_{k, l} x^k y^l$ in a small neighborhood of the origin. Then the Newton polyhedron $N(S)$ is defined by

$$N(S) := \text{Convex hull of } \left(\bigcup_{a_{k, l} \neq 0} \{(x, y) : x \geq k, y \geq l\} \right) \quad (3.10)$$

with the union taken over all $k, l \geq 0$ for which $a_{k, l} \neq 0$.

By the Puiseux expansion theorem (see Casas-Alvero [2] for example), the Hessian S''_{xy} can be decomposed as the following form:

$$S''_{xy}(x, y) = U(x, y) x^m y^s \prod_{\nu} (y - r_\nu(x)), \quad (3.11)$$

where U is a nonvanishing smooth factor near the origin, m and s are nonnegative integers, and r_ν are nontrivial roots which can be written as Puiseux series. To establish the desired damping estimates, we need a complete classification of the roots r_ν . The classification method due to Phong-Stein [19] will be used in this section.

We order the leading exponents of all roots r_ν as follows:

$$0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_l < a_{l+1} < \cdots < a_n < +\infty.$$

Denote by $\Psi [l]$ the cluster of nonzero roots r_ν in (3.11) of form

$$r_\nu(x) = C_l^\alpha x^{a_l} + o(x^{a_l}), \quad x \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.12)$$

where C_l^α is a nonzero complex number. In this cluster, each root is repeated according to its multiplicity. Hence the number of nontrivial roots is counted with the multiplicity of each root.

To distinguish the roots with the same leading exponent a_l , we consider the set of all distinct coefficients C_l^α of x^{a_l} . Here l is the index for the leading exponents a_l , and α is the index for the coefficients of x^{a_l} . Then we can see

$$\Psi \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] = \bigcup_{\alpha} \Psi \left[\begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ l \end{array} \right],$$

where each root in $\Psi \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right]$ is of the form (3.12) for fixed C_l^α . If we continue this process, a complete classification of all roots can be obtained. Indeed, we have

$$\Psi \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \alpha_1, & \cdots, & \alpha_{N-1}, & \cdot \\ l_1, & \cdots, & l_{N-1}, & l_N \end{array} \right] = \bigcup_{\alpha_N} \Psi \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \alpha_1, & \cdots, & \alpha_{N-1}, & \alpha_N \\ l_1, & \cdots, & l_{N-1}, & l_N \end{array} \right],$$

where the cluster $\Psi \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \alpha_1, & \cdots, & \alpha_{N-1}, & \alpha_N \\ l_1, & \cdots, & l_{N-1}, & l_N \end{array} \right]$ consists of all roots r_ν of form

$$r_\nu(x) = C_{l_1}^{\alpha_1} x^{a_{l_1}} + C_{l_1, l_2}^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} x^{a_{l_1, l_2}^{\alpha_1}} + \cdots + C_{l_1, \dots, l_N}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} x^{a_{l_1, \dots, l_N}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N}} + o(x^{a_{l_1, \dots, l_N}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N}}).$$

To make precisely the number of nonzero roots in the above clusters, we use the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \alpha_1, & \cdots, & \alpha_{k-1}, & \cdot \\ l_1, & \cdots, & l_{k-1}, & l_k \end{array} \right] &= \# \text{ roots in } \Psi \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \alpha_1, & \cdots, & \alpha_{k-1}, & \cdot \\ l_1, & \cdots, & l_{k-1}, & l_k \end{array} \right], \\ \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \alpha_1, & \cdots, & \alpha_{k-1}, & \alpha_k \\ l_1, & \cdots, & l_{k-1}, & l_k \end{array} \right] &= \# \text{ roots in } \Psi \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \alpha_1, & \cdots, & \alpha_{k-1}, & \alpha_k \\ l_1, & \cdots, & l_{k-1}, & l_k \end{array} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\#A$ means the cardinality of the set A . Sometimes, we also use the notation N to denote the number of nontrivial roots of S''_{xy} , counting with multiplicities. In other words,

$$N = \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] = \sum_{l=1}^n \# \text{ roots in } \Psi \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right]. \quad (3.13)$$

Assume $(A_0, B_0), (A_1, B_1), \dots, (A_n, B_n)$ are vertices of the Newton polyhedron of S''_{xy} . For clarity, we also assume $A_0 < A_1 < \cdots < A_n$ and $B_0 > B_1 > \cdots > B_n$. One can verify that

$$A_0 = m, \quad B_0 = s + \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right], \quad (3.14)$$

and for each $1 \leq r \leq n$,

$$A_r = m + \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] a_l, \quad B_r = s + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right]. \quad (3.15)$$

With the above notations, we can give an equivalent formulation of Theorem 1.1 in terms of the vertices of $N(S)$.

Theorem 3.1 *Assume S is a real-valued analytic function near the origin and T_λ is defined as (1.1). Then there exists a constant C , independent of λ and f , such that*

$$\|T_\lambda f\|_{L^{p_r}} \leq C |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{A_r+B_r+2}} \|f\|_{L^{p_r}}, \quad p_r = \frac{A_r + B_r + 2}{A_r + 1} \quad (3.16)$$

for all $0 \leq r \leq n$.

To prove the estimate (3.16), we shall consider a family of damped oscillatory integral operators

$$W_z f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} |D(x,y)|^z \varphi(x,y) f(y) dy \quad (3.17)$$

with the damping factor D defined by

$$D(x,y) = x^m \prod_{l=1}^r \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[l]} (y - r_\nu(x)). \quad (3.18)$$

Then we have the following L^2 decay estimate.

Theorem 3.2 *Assume W_z is defined as above. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with real part*

$$\operatorname{Re}(z) = \frac{A_r - B_r}{2A_r} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + B_r}, \quad (3.19)$$

there exists a constant $C = C(S, \varphi)$ such that

$$\|W_z f\|_{L^2} \leq C(1 + |z|^2) |\lambda|^{-\sigma} \|f\|_{L^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{2(1 + B_r)}. \quad (3.20)$$

Remark 3.1 *By Theorem 2.7, each product $\prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[l]} (y - r_\nu(x))$ in (3.18) is conjugation invariant and hence D is a real-analytic function (Lemma 1.2.1 in [2]). Since S is real valued, $S(x, r_\nu(x)) \equiv 0$ if and only if $S(x, \bar{r}_\nu(x)) \equiv 0$. This implies that D is also real valued.*

Proof. Choose a cut-off function $\Phi \in C_0^\infty$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(\Phi) \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}, 2]$ and $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \Phi(\frac{x}{2^j}) = 1$ for all $x > 0$. Write $W_z = \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 = \pm} W_z^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}$ and $W_z^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} = \sum_{j,k} W_{j,k}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}$ with

$$W_{j,k}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} |D(x,y)|^z \Phi\left(\sigma_1 \frac{x}{2^j}\right) \Phi\left(\sigma_2 \frac{y}{2^k}\right) \varphi(x,y) f(y) dy. \quad (3.21)$$

In what follows, it will be shown that the estimate (3.20) is true with W_z replaced by $W_z^{+,+}$. Other operators $W_z^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}$ can be treated similarly. For convenience, we shall still write W_z instead of $W_z^{+,+}$.

Case (i) $k \gg a_1 j$.

The notation $k \gg a_1 j$ means that $k \geq a_1 j + N_0$ for some large $N_0 > 0$. Then both the Hessian S''_{xy} and D have sizes equivalent to two positive constants, up to a multiplicative constant.

Assume first $m > 0$. Since $W_{j,k} W_{j',k'}^* = 0$ for $|k - k'| \geq 2$, we assume $|k - k'| \leq 1$. Then by Lemma 2.2,

$$\|W_{j,k} W_{j',k'}^*\| \leq C \left[|\lambda| 2^{mj} 2^{k(N+s)} \right]^{-1} \left[2^{mj} 2^{k \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right]^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} \left[2^{mj'} 2^{k' \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right]^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} \quad j \geq j',$$

where N is given by (3.13).

By the size estimate, the L^2 operator norm $\|W_{j,k}W_{j',k'}^*\|$ is bounded by

$$\|W_{j,k}\| \|W_{j',k'}^*\| \leq C \left[2^{mj} 2^{k \cdot \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right]^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} \left[2^{mj'} 2^{k' \cdot \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right]^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{j/2} 2^{k/2} 2^{j'/2} 2^{k'/2}.$$

Put $\theta = (1 + B_r)^{-1}$. Taking a convex combination of the above two estimates, we see that $\|W_{j,k}W_{j',k'}^*\|$ is bounded by a constant multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[|\lambda| 2^{mj} 2^{k(N+s)} \right]^\theta \left[2^{mj} 2^{k \cdot \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right]^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} \left[2^{mj'} 2^{k' \cdot \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right]^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} \left(2^{j/2} 2^{k/2} \right)^{1-\theta} \left(2^{j'/2} 2^{k'/2} \right)^{1-\theta} \\ & \leq C |\lambda|^{-\theta} 2^{-|j-j'|\gamma}, \quad \gamma = m \operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1-\theta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

By direct calculation, we see that the sum of the exponents of 2^k and $2^{k'}$ is equal to, using $2 \operatorname{Re}(z) = \left(1 - \frac{B_r}{A_r}\right) \theta$ and $1 - \theta = B_r \theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} -(N+s)\theta + 2 \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] \operatorname{Re}(z) + 1 - \theta &= -(N+s)\theta + \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] \left(1 - \frac{B_r}{A_r} \right) \theta + B_r \theta \\ &= - \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] \frac{B_r}{A_r} \theta \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In view of $k \gg a_1 j$, we have

$$2^{-k \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] B_r \theta / A_r} \leq C 2^{-a_1 j \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] B_r \theta / A_r} \leq C 2^{-j(A_r - m) B_r \theta / A_r}.$$

If we add this new exponent and the original one of 2^j , we obtain the resulting exponent

$$\begin{aligned} & -m\theta + m \operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1-\theta}{2} - (A_r - m) B_r \theta / A_r \\ &= -m\theta + m(1 - B_r/A_r)\theta/2 + B_r\theta/2 - (B_r - B_r m/A_r)\theta \\ &= -m \operatorname{Re}(z) - (1 - \theta)/2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain the desired almost orthogonality estimate. It should be pointed out that the exponent $\gamma := m \operatorname{Re}(z) + (1 - \theta)/2$ is positive. Indeed if $\gamma = 0$ then $A_r = B_r = 0$ which implies that T_λ is nondegenerate. A similar estimate is also true for $W_{j,k}^* W_{j',k'}$.

Now we consider the case $m = 0$. We shall study $W_k = \sum_j W_{j,k}$ with the summation taken over all j satisfying $a_1 j \ll k$. The treatment is somewhat different depending on whether $D(x, y)$ is equal to S''_{xy} up to a non-vanishing factor U in (3.11). Assume first S''_{xy} is not equal to the Hessian $U(x, y)D(x, y)$. Then by the operator van der Corput Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\|W_k\| \leq C \left[|\lambda| 2^{k \cdot \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} 2^{ks} \right]^{-1/2} \left(2^{k \cdot \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right)^{\operatorname{Re}(z)}.$$

The size estimate for W_k is

$$\|W_k\| \leq C \left(2^{k \cdot \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]} \right)^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{k/2} 2^{k/(2a_1)}.$$

In the oscillation estimate, the exponent of 2^k is

$$\begin{aligned}
& - (s + N) / 2 + \left(\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \operatorname{Re}(z) \\
& = - \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] / 2 - B_r / 2 + \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{B_r}{2A_r} \right) \frac{1}{1 + B_r} \\
& = - \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \frac{B_r}{2(1 + B_r)} - \frac{B_r}{2} - \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \frac{1}{2A_r} \cdot \frac{B_r}{1 + B_r} < 0
\end{aligned}$$

since the fact $S''_{xy}(x, y) \neq U(x, y)D(x, y)$ implies $B_r > 0$. It is clear that the exponent of 2^k is positive in the above size estimate. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi) \subset [-1/2, 1/2]^2$. It follows that $W_{j,k} = 0$ if $j \geq 0$ or $k \geq 0$. For this reason, we may assume $k \leq 0$ from now on. Replacing the exponent $\frac{1}{a_1}$ by the smaller one $\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} [i] / A_r$, we obtain the following size estimate,

$$\|W_k\| \leq C 2^{k \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} [i] \operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{k/2} 2^{\frac{k}{A_r} \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} [i]}.$$

Taking the absolute value into the summation $\sum_{k \leq 0} W_k$, we can deduce from Lemma 2.6 that

$$\sum_{k \leq 0} \|W_k\| \leq C |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2(1+B_r)}}.$$

Here the convex combination, with $\theta = \frac{1}{1+B_r}$, of the above oscillation and size estimates annihilates the exponent of 2^k . In fact, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \theta(s + N) / 2 + \left(\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{A_r} \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) (1 - \theta) \\
& = - \left(\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \cdot \frac{1}{2(1 + B_r)} - \frac{B_r}{2(1 + B_r)} + \left(\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{B_r}{2A_r} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{1 + B_r} + \\
& \quad \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{A_r} \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \cdot \frac{B_r}{1 + B_r} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to consider the special case $S''_{xy}(x, y) = U(x, y)D(x, y)$ for some nonvanishing factor U . The optimal decay $|\lambda|^{-1/2}$ had been established by Phong-Stein [20]. In this case, we must explore the almost orthogonality between W_k and $W_{k'}$. Observe that $W_k W_{k'}^* = 0$ for $|k - k'| \geq 2$. It suffices to estimate $W_k^* W_{k'}$. Assume $k \geq k'$. By Remark 2.1, it is easily verified that $|D(x, y)|^z$ is, uniformly in y , a polynomial type function with respect to x on the interval $|x| \leq 2^{(k - N_0)/a_1}$. By Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$\|W_k^* W_{k'}\| \leq C \left[|\lambda| 2^{k \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{N} [i]} \right]^{-1} \left(2^{k \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{N} [i]} \right)^{1/2} \left(2^{k' \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{N} [i]} \right)^{1/2} \leq C |\lambda|^{-1} 2^{-|k - k'| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{N} [i]}.$$

This implies the desired estimate (3.20).

Case (ii) $k \ll a_n j$.

On the support of $W_{j,k}$, we have

$$|D(x, y)| \approx 2^{jm} 2^j \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]_{a_l} = 2^{jA_r}, \quad |S''_{xy}(x, y)| \approx 2^{jm} 2^{ks} 2^j \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{N}[l]_{a_l}.$$

Assume first $s > 0$, $j \geq j'$ and $|k - k'| \leq 1$. The oscillation estimate is

$$\|W_{j,k} W_{j',k'}^*\| \leq C \left[|\lambda| 2^{jm} 2^{ks} 2^j \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{N}[l]_{a_l} \right]^{-1} 2^{jA_r \operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{j'A_r \operatorname{Re}(z)}.$$

The size estimate is

$$\|W_{j,k} W_{j',k'}^*\| \leq C 2^{jA_r \operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{j'A_r \operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{j/2} 2^{k/2} 2^{j'/2} 2^{k'/2}.$$

Taking a convex combination of the above two estimates yields the following terms and their corresponding exponents:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^j &: - \left(A_r + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right]_{a_l} \right) \theta + A_r \operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \theta); \\ 2^{j'} &: A_r \operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \theta); \\ 2^k &: -\theta s + B_r \theta = \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] \theta, \end{aligned}$$

where we identify k' with k . By the assumption $k' \ll a_n j$, we have

$$2^{k \cdot \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N}[\cdot]_{a_l} \theta} \lesssim 2^{j' \cdot \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N}[\cdot]_{a_l} a_n \theta}.$$

Then the resulting exponent of $2^{j'}$ becomes

$$A_r \operatorname{Re}(z) + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] a_n \theta + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \theta).$$

To prove the desired estimate

$$\|W_{j,k} W_{j',k'}^*\| \leq C |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{1+B_r}} 2^{-|j-j'|\delta}$$

for some $\delta > 0$, it suffices to show that the sum of the exponents of 2^j and $2^{j'}$ is nonnegative. Indeed, it is easily verified that

$$- \left(A_r + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right]_{a_l} \right) \theta + 2A_r \operatorname{Re}(z) + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ l \end{array} \right] a_n \theta + (1 - \theta)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -A_r\theta - \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_l\theta + (A_r - B_r)\theta + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_n\theta + B_r\theta \\
&= \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] (a_n - a_l)\theta \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have established our claim. By the same argument as above, we can prove that $W_{j,k}^* W_{j',k'}$ satisfies a similar estimate.

Consider the case $s = 0$. Now define the operator W_j by $W_j = \sum_k W_{j,k}$ with the summation taken over $k \ll a_n j$ for fixed j . Similarly, the oscillation estimate and the size estimate are given by

$$\|W_j W_{j'}^*\| \leq C \left[|\lambda| 2^{jm} 2^j \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right]^{a_l} \right]^{-1} 2^{j A_r \operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{j' A_r \operatorname{Re}(z)}, \quad j \geq j',$$

and

$$\|W_j W_{j'}^*\| \leq C 2^{j A_r \operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{j' A_r \operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{j/2} 2^{a_n j/2} 2^{j'/2} 2^{a_n j'/2}.$$

A convex combination gives $\|W_j W_{j'}^*\| \leq C |\lambda|^{-\theta} 2^{-|j-j'|\delta}$ with some $\delta > 0$. Indeed, the corresponding terms and their exponents here are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
2^j : & - \left(A_r + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_l \right) \theta + A_r \operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1+a_n}{2}(1-\theta); \\
2^{j'} : & A_r \operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1+a_n}{2}(1-\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

The sum of these two exponents equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left(A_r + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_l \right) \theta + 2A_r \operatorname{Re}(z) + (1+a_n)(1-\theta) \\
&= - \left(A_r + \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_l \right) \theta + (A_r - B_r)\theta + (1+a_n)B_r\theta \\
&= \sum_{l=r+1}^n \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right] (a_n - a_l)\theta \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining all above results, we have obtained the desired estimate in Case (ii).

Case (iii) $k = a_{t_1} j + O(1)$, i.e., $|k - a_{t_1} j| \leq N_0$ for some $t_1 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

In what follows, our proof will be divided into two subcases $t_1 > r$ and $1 \leq t_1 \leq r$.

Subcase (iii-1) $t_1 > r$.

On the support of $W_{j,k}$, $|D(x, y)| \approx 2^{jm} 2^j \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right]^{a_l} = 2^{j A_r}$. By the decomposition procedure described as above, we shall obtain $W_{j,k} = \sum W_{j,k,\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N}$, where each operator in this summation is nondegenerate.

Assume μ_N lies in the range $a_{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{N+1}+1}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} j \ll \mu_N \ll a_{t_1, \dots, t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} j$. We can see that the size of S''_{xy} is comparable to

$$\begin{aligned} |S''_{xy}(x, y)| &\approx 2^{jm} 2^{ks} \prod_{a=1}^N \left(\prod_{t < t_a} 2^{j\mathbf{N}} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{a-1}, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_{a-1}, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, \dots, t_{a-1}, t}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{a-1}} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{t > t_a} 2^{\mu_{a-1}\mathbf{N}} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{a-1}, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_{a-1}, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \\ &\quad \left(\prod_{\alpha < \alpha_a} 2^{\mu_{a-1}\mathbf{N}} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{a-1}, \alpha \\ t_1, \dots, t_{a-1}, t_a \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{\alpha > \alpha_a} 2^{j\mathbf{N}} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{a-1}, \alpha \\ t_1, \dots, t_{a-1}, t_a \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, \dots, t_{a-1}, t_a}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{a-1}} \right) \\ &\quad \left(\prod_{t \leq t_{N+1}} 2^{j\mathbf{N}} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, \dots, t_N, t}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{t > t_{N+1}} 2^{\mu_N\mathbf{N}} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the operator van der Corput Lemma 2.5, we get

$$\left\| W_{j, k, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N} \right\| \leq C \left(|\lambda| \inf |S''_{xy}(x, y)| \right)^{-1/2} (2^{jA_r})^{\operatorname{Re}(z)}$$

with the infimum taken over the support of $W_{j, k, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N}$. The size estimate gives

$$\left\| W_{j, k, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N} \right\| \leq (2^{jA_r})^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{\mu_N/2} \left(2^{\mu_N} 2^{-j(a_{t_1}-1)} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Let $\theta = (1 + B_r)^{-1}$. If we take a convex combination of the above two estimates, we see that the exponent of 2^{μ_N} is

$$-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t \geq t_{N+1}} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \theta + 1 - \theta \geq -\frac{1}{2} B_r \theta + B_r \theta \geq 0.$$

Since $a_{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{N+1}+1}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} j \ll \mu_N \ll a_{t_1, \dots, t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} j \leq 0$, we can apply Lemma 2.6 to the summation $W_{j, k} = \sum_{\mu_N} W_{j, k, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N}$. Therefore it suffices to show that each term of the convex combination is bounded by a constant multiple of $|\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2(1+B_r)}}$. In fact, by the fact $\mu_N \leq \mu_1 \wedge \mu_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \mu_{N-1} + O(1)$, the L^2 operator norm $\|W_{j, k, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N}\|$ is bounded by a constant multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\left(|\lambda| \inf |S''_{xy}(x, y)| \right)^{-1/2} (2^{jA_r})^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} \right]^\theta \left[(2^{jA_r})^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} 2^{\mu_N/2} \left(2^{\mu_N} 2^{-j(a_{t_1}-1)} \right)^{1/2} \right]^{1-\theta} \\ &\leq C \left(|\lambda| 2^{\mu_N(A_r/a_{t_1 \dots t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N} + B_r)} \right)^{-\theta/2} \left(2^{\mu_N A_r/a_{t_1 \dots t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N}} \right)^{\operatorname{Re}(z)} \left(2^{\mu_N/2} 2^{\mu_N A_r/2a_{t_1 \dots t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N}} \right)^{1-\theta} \\ &\leq C |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2(1+B_r)}} \end{aligned}$$

since the exponent of 2^{μ_N} in the last inequality is equal to

$$-\frac{A_r}{a_{t_1 \dots t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N}} \cdot \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{B_r \theta}{2} + \frac{1}{a_{t_1 \dots t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N}} (A_r - B_r) \cdot \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{B_r \theta}{2} + \frac{B_r \theta}{2a_{t_1 \dots t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N}} = 0.$$

The above argument applies without essential change for other ranges of μ_N .

Subcase (iii-2) $1 \leq t_1 \leq r$.

The argument is more delicate in this subcase. In what follows, our treatment is somewhat different depending on whether $a_{t_1} \geq 1$ or not.

Assume now $a_{t_1} \geq 1$. We first insert $\Phi(\sigma_1(y - C_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} x^{a_{t_1}})/2^{\mu_1})$ into $W_{j,k}$ and then obtain smaller pieces $W_{j,k,\mu_1}^{\sigma_1}$. If μ_1 satisfies $\mu_1 \geq k - N_0$ for some large positive integer N_0 , then we choose an arbitrary $\alpha'_1 \neq \alpha_1$ and further decompose $W_{j,k,\mu_1}^{\sigma_1}$ into smaller pieces $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\mu_2}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2}$ by insertion of $\Phi(\sigma_2(y - C_{t_1}^{\alpha'_1} x^{a_{t_1}})/2^{\mu_2})$ into $W_{j,k,\mu_1}^{\sigma_1}$. Without loss of generality, we only consider $\mu_1 \ll k$ such that on the support of $W_{j,k,\mu_1}^{\sigma_1}$, $|y - C_{t_1}^{\alpha} x^{a_{t_1}}| \approx 2^k$ for $\alpha \neq \alpha_1$. Note that $\mu_1 \ll k$ also implies $C_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} \in \mathbb{R}$ if N_0 is sufficiently large. Now there are four different ranges for μ_1 :

- (i) $a_{t_1,1}^{\alpha_1} j \ll \mu_1 \ll a_{t_1} j$;
- (ii) $a_{t_1,t+1}^{\alpha_1} j \ll \mu_1 \ll a_{t_1,t}^{\alpha_1} j$, $1 \leq t \leq \mathbf{N} \left[\frac{\alpha_1}{t_1} \right] - 1$;
- (iii) $\mu_1 \ll a_{t_1,t}^{\alpha_1} j$ with $t = \mathbf{N} \left[\frac{\alpha_1}{t_1} \right]$;
- (iv) $\mu_1 = a_{t_1,t}^{\alpha_1} j + O(1)$ for some $1 \leq t \leq \mathbf{N} \left[\frac{\alpha_1}{t_1} \right]$.

In the previous three cases, each operator $W_{j,k,\mu_1}^{\sigma_1}$ is nondegenerate and our resolution of singularities is complete. Hence we need only consider the case (iv). More precisely, we assume $|\mu_1 - a_{t_1,t_2}^{\alpha_1} j| \lesssim 1$. Then we further insert $\Phi(\sigma_2(y - C_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} x^{a_{t_1}} - C_{t_1,t_2}^{\alpha_1,\alpha_2} x^{a_{t_1,t_2}})/2^{\mu_2})$ into $W_{j,k,\mu_1}^{\sigma_1}$ and denote this new operator by $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\mu_2}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2}$. For the same reason as for μ_1 , we may assume $\mu_2 \ll \mu_1$ such that for $\alpha \neq \alpha_2$, $|y - C_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} x^{a_{t_1}} - C_{t_1,t_2}^{\alpha_1,\alpha} x^{a_{t_1,t_2}}| \approx 2^{\mu_1}$ in the support of $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\mu_2}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2}$.

Generally, if $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_p}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\dots,\sigma_p}$ has been defined and μ_p lies in the range $\mu_p = a_{t_1,\dots,t_{p+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_p} j + O(1)$, we choose an index α_{p+1} and insert $\Phi\left(\sigma_{p+1}(y - \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} C_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_i} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{i-1}}})/2^{\mu_{p+1}}\right)$ into $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_p}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_p}$. In this way, we obtain a new operator $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_{p+1}}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_{p+1}}$. Similar to our discussion for μ_1 , there are also four possible ranges for μ_{p+1} .

Now we assume the decomposition process stops in the N -th step. Then μ_N must satisfy one of the following restrictions:

- (i) $a_{t_1,\dots,t_N,1}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j \ll \mu_N \ll \mu_{N-1} j$;
- (ii) $a_{t_1,\dots,t_N,t_{N+1}+1}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j \ll \mu_N \ll a_{t_1,\dots,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j$ for some $1 \leq t_{N+1} \leq \mathbf{N} \left[\frac{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N}{t_1,\dots,t_N} \right] - 1$ and $1 \leq \alpha_N \leq \mathbf{N} \left[\frac{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{N-1}}{t_1,\dots,t_{N-1},t_N} \right]$;
- (iii) $\mu_N \ll a_{t_1,\dots,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j$ with $t_{N+1} = \mathbf{N} \left[\frac{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N}{t_1,\dots,t_N} \right]$;
- (iv) For some t we have $\mu_N = a_{t_1,\dots,t_N,t}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j + O(1)$, and for all α

$$\left| y - \sum_{i=1}^N C_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_i} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{i-1}}} - C_{t_1,\dots,t_N,t}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N,\alpha} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_N,t}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N}} \right| \approx 2^{\mu_N}, \quad (x, y) \in \text{supp}(W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}).$$

By our assumption, $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$ is nondegenerate such that both the Hessian S''_{xy} and the damping factor D are bounded from below and above by positive constants.

Now we are going to prove the desired L^2 decay estimate for $\sum W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$ with the summation taken over the above range (ii). Other cases can be treated in the same way. Before our

application of the almost orthogonality estimate in Lemma 2.2, we shall verify all assumptions there for $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$ and $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu'_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$. Consider the domain $\Omega_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$ which consists of all points (x, y) satisfying

$$2^{j-1} \leq x \leq 2^{j+1}, \quad 2^{k-1} \leq y \leq 2^{k+1}, \quad 2^{\mu_t-1} \leq \sigma_t \left(y - \sum_{i=1}^t C_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_i} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{i-1}}} \right) \leq 2^{\mu_t+1}$$

for $1 \leq t \leq N$. It is easy to see that this domain is horizontally and vertically convex. We also define its expanded domain by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N *} : & \quad 2^{j-1} - \epsilon 2^j \leq x \leq 2^{j+1} + \epsilon 2^j, \quad 2^{k-1} - \epsilon 2^k \leq y \leq 2^{k+1} + \epsilon 2^k, \\ & \quad 2^{\mu_t-1} - \epsilon 2^{\mu_t} \leq \sigma_t \left(y - \sum_{i=1}^t C_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_i} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{i-1}}} \right) \leq 2^{\mu_t+1} + \epsilon 2^{\mu_t} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq t \leq N \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. By direct verification as in (2.5) and (2.6), one can see that $\Omega_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N *}$ satisfies all assumptions in Definitions 2.4 and 2.5 and hence it becomes an expanded domain for $\Omega_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$. For sufficiently small ϵ , all assumptions in Lemma 2.2 are also true for the above expanded domain.

By Lemma 2.2, the L^2 operator norm of $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N} W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu'_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N *}$ is bounded by a constant multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[|\lambda| 2^{jA_{t_1-1}} 2^{kB_{t_1}} \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_1} 2^{kN} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ t_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \prod_{l < t_2} 2^{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, l}^{\alpha_1} \prod_{l > t_2} 2^{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \mu_1 \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_2} 2^{\mu_1 N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \alpha \\ t_1, t_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \dots \\ & \prod_{l \leq t_{N+1}} 2^{jN} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, \dots, t_N, l}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} \prod_{l > t_{N+1}} 2^{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \mu_N \right]^{-1} \left[2^{jm} 2^{l \sum_{i < t_1} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{ij} \right. \\ & \left. 2^{k \sum_{r \geq l > t_1} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right] \cdot \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_1} 2^{kN} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ t_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \prod_{l < t_2} 2^{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, l}^{\alpha_1} 2^{l \sum_{i > t_2} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \mu_1 \cdot \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_2} 2^{\mu_1 N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \alpha \\ t_1, t_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \dots \dots \\ & \left. \prod_{l \leq t_{N+1}} 2^{jN} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, \dots, t_N, l}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} \prod_{l > t_{N+1}} 2^{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \frac{\mu_N + \mu'_N}{2} \right]^{2 \operatorname{Re}(z)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

The size estimate gives us the following bound of the operator norm of $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N} W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu'_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N *}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & C \left[2^{mj} 2^{l \sum_{i < t_1} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{ij} 2^{k \sum_{r \geq l > t_1} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right] \cdot \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_1} 2^{kN} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ t_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] 2^{l \sum_{i < t_2} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, l}^{\alpha_1} 2^{l \sum_{i > t_2} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \mu_1 \right. \\ & \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_2} 2^{\mu_1 N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \alpha \\ t_1, t_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \dots \dots \prod_{l \leq t_N} 2^{jN} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, l}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}} 2^{\mu_{N-1} \sum_{l > t_N} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \\ & \left. \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_N} 2^{\mu_{N-1} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, t_N \end{smallmatrix} \right] 2^{j \sum_{l \leq t_{N+1}} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1, \dots, t_N, l}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} 2^{l \sum_{i \geq t_{N+1}+1} N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \frac{\mu_N + \mu'_N}{2} \right]^{2 \operatorname{Re}(z)} \\ & 2^{\mu_N/2} \left(2^{\mu_N} 2^{-j(a_{t_1}-1)} \right)^{1/2} \cdot 2^{\mu'_N/2} \left(2^{\mu'_N} 2^{-j(a_{t_1}-1)} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

By a convex combination, we see that the L^2 operator norm of $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N} W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu'_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N *}$ is bounded by a constant multiple of the product of terms $2^{-j\delta_j}$, $2^{-k\delta_k}$, $2^{-\mu_1\delta_{\mu_1}}$, \dots , $2^{-\mu_N\delta_{\mu_N}}$ and $2^{-\mu_{N'}\delta_{\mu_{N'}}$. Since $a_{t_1} \geq 1$, it is clear that $\delta_j \geq 0$. Then it follows that $2^{-j\delta_j}$ is bounded by a constant multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(2^{-k\frac{A_{t_1-1}}{a_{t_1}}} 2^{-\mu_1 \sum_{l < t_2} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right] \frac{a_{t_1}^{\alpha_1}}{a_{t_1, t_2}^{\alpha_1}}} \dots 2^{-\mu_N \sum_{t \leq t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \frac{a_{t_1, \dots, t_N}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N}}{a_{t_1, \dots, t_N, t}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N}}} \right)^{\frac{B_r \theta}{A_r}} 2^{-k B_r \theta} 2^{\frac{k}{a_{t_1}} B_r \theta} \\ & \leq C \left(2^{-\mu_N \frac{A_{t_1-1}}{a_{t_1}} - \mu_N \sum_{l < t_2} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, l \end{smallmatrix} \right]} \dots 2^{-\mu_N \sum_{t \leq t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, l \end{smallmatrix} \right]} \right)^{\frac{B_r \theta}{A_r}} 2^{-\mu_N B_r \theta} 2^{\frac{\mu_N}{a_{t_1}} B_r \theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

Similarly, we can give an upper bound for $2^{-k\delta_k}$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-k\delta_k} & \leq C 2^{-\mu_N B_r \theta} 2^{-\mu_N \left(\sum_{t=t_1+1}^r \mathbf{N} [i] + \sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha_1} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ t_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) (\theta - 2 \operatorname{Re}(z))} \\ & \leq C 2^{-\mu_N B_r \theta} 2^{-\mu_N \left(\sum_{t=t_1+1}^r \mathbf{N} [i] + \sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha_1} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ t_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \frac{B_r \theta}{A_r}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

It is easy to see that $\delta_{\mu_t} \geq 0$ for $1 \leq t \leq N-1$. The above decomposition procedure implies $\mu_p \leq \mu_1 \wedge \mu_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \mu_{p-1} + O(1)$. Hence $2^{-\mu_t \delta_{\mu_t}} \lesssim 2^{-\mu_N \delta_{\mu_t}}$. Combining this estimate with (3.24) and (3.25), we see that the sum of the exponents of 2^{μ_N} is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left[\left(m + \sum_{t < t_1} \mathbf{N} [i] a_l \right) / a_{t_1} + \sum_{t < t_2} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \cdot \\ t_1, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] + \dots + \sum_{t \leq t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1 \dots t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right] \frac{B_r \theta}{A_r} - B_r \theta + \frac{1}{a_{t_1}} B_r \theta - \\ & B_r \theta - \left(\sum_{t=t_1+1}^r \mathbf{N} [i] + \sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha_1} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ t_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) \frac{B_r \theta}{A_r} - \dots - \sum_{t > t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1 \dots t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \operatorname{Re}(z) + 1 - \theta \\ & = - \left[\left(m + \sum_{t < t_1} \mathbf{N} [i] a_l \right) / a_{t_1} + \sum_{t=t_1}^r \mathbf{N} [i] \right] \frac{B_r \theta}{A_r} - B_r \theta + \frac{1}{a_{t_1}} B_r \theta - \sum_{t > t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1 \dots t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \operatorname{Re}(z) \\ & \geq - \frac{A_r}{a_{t_1}} \cdot \frac{B_r \theta}{A_r} - B_r \theta + \frac{1}{a_{t_1}} B_r \theta - \sum_{t > t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1 \dots t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \operatorname{Re}(z) \\ & = -(1 - \theta) - \sum_{t > t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1 \dots t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \operatorname{Re}(z). \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have

$$\left\| W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N} W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu'_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N *} \right\| \leq C |\lambda|^{-\theta} 2^{-|\mu_N - \mu'_N| \delta} \quad (3.26)$$

with δ given by

$$\delta = \sum_{t > t_{N+1}} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \operatorname{Re}(z) + (1 - \theta) > 0.$$

A similar estimate is also true for $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N} W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu'_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N *}$.

It remains to treat the case $0 < a_{t_1} < 1$. The above argument, with $a_{t_1} \geq 1$, does not apply here and some modifications are needed. In fact, the above size estimate produces a

term $2^{-j(a_{t_1}-1)}$ and the exponent of 2^j , appearing in the convex combination of the oscillation estimate (3.22) and the size estimate (3.23), may not be negative for $0 < a_{t_1} < 1$. Hence the estimate (3.24) is not generally true. Since S is a real-analytic function near the origin, there exists a non-vanishing real-analytic function V such that

$$\prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ t_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right]} (y - r_\nu(x)) = V(x, y) \prod (x - h(y)), \quad (3.27)$$

where $h(y)$ is a Puiseux series in y of form

$$h(y) = d_{l_1}^{\alpha_1} y^{b_{l_1}} + d_{l_1, l_2}^{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} y^{b_{l_1, l_2}^{\alpha_1}} + \dots + d_{l_1, \dots, l_N}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} y^{b_{l_1, \dots, l_N}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}}} + o(y^{b_{l_1, \dots, l_N}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}}}), \quad b_{l_1} = \frac{1}{a_{t_1}}.$$

Now we shall prove this equality. By Theorem 2.7, the left side of the equality is conjugation invariant in x . Hence the left side is a real-analytic function near the origin; see Lemma 1.2.1 (p18) in [2] and Remark 3.1. Now it is clear that the equality is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.7 with the roles of x and y changed. Moreover, by the Newton-Puiseux algorithm in the proof of the Puiseux theorem (see [2]), we also have $b_{l_1} = \frac{1}{a_{t_1}}$.

With the equality (3.27), in the case $|k - a_{t_1}j| \lesssim 1$ considered above, we have $|j - k/a_{t_1}| \lesssim 1$. The argument in this case is the same as that of the case $a_{t_1} \geq 1$ with the roles of x and y interchanged. Thus we can also obtain the desired L^2 decay estimate. Therefore the proof of Theorem 3.2 is complete. \square

4 Damped Oscillatory Integral Operators with Critical Negative Exponents

Consider the following damped oscillatory integral operator

$$W_z f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\lambda S(x, y)} |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^z \varphi(x, y) f(y) dy, \quad (4.28)$$

where \tilde{D} is slightly different from D in (3.18), depending on whether D is of the form

$$D(x, y) = (y - r_\nu(x))^d \quad (4.29)$$

where $r_\nu(x) = C_1 x + o(x)$ for some $C_1 \neq 0$.

As in Section 3, we shall decompose W_z into smaller pieces $W_{j, k}$ by insertion of $\Phi(\frac{x}{2^j})\Phi(\frac{y}{2^k})$ into W_z . Here, we need only consider W_z in the first quadrant since the same argument applies without essential change in other quadrants.

For clarity, we assume φ is supported in the unit square $[-1/2, 1/2]^2$. Hence $W_{j, k} = 0$ for $j \geq 0$ or $k \geq 0$. Recall that $W_{j, k}$ is defined by

$$W_{j, k} f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\lambda S(x, y)} |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^z \Phi\left(\frac{x}{2^j}\right) \Phi\left(\frac{y}{2^k}\right) \varphi(x, y) f(y) dy, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = -\frac{1}{A_r}. \quad (4.30)$$

Consider first the simplest case $r = 0$. Then $D(x, y) = x^m$ and $A_r = m$. In this case, let $\tilde{D}(x, y) = D(x, y)$. It is clear that $|W_z f(x)| \leq C|x|^{-1} \|f\|_{L^1}$. Hence W_z is bounded from L^1 into $L^{1, \infty}$. As we shall see in Section 5, we can deduce the desired L^p estimate by Lemma 2.3.

Now assume $r \geq 1$ throughout the rest of this section. In what follows, we will decompose W_z as three parts $W_z^{(1)}$, $W_z^{(2)}$ and $W_z^{(3)}$ as follows.

$$W_z^{(1)} = \sum_{k \leq a_r j - N_0} W_{j,k}, \quad W_z^{(2)} = \sum_{a_r j - N_0 < k < a_1 j + N_0} W_{j,k}, \quad W_z^{(3)} = \sum_{k \geq a_1 j + N_0} W_{j,k},$$

where N_0 is a large positive integer. Our choice of damping factors in $W_z^{(i)}$ may be different, depending on whether D is of the form (4.29). More precisely, for $W_z^{(1)}$ and $W_z^{(3)}$, we always define

$$\tilde{D}(x, y) = D(x, y) = x^m \prod_{l=1}^r \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[\dot{i}]} (y - r_\nu(x)).$$

For $W_z^{(2)}$, if D is not of the form (4.29) then set $\tilde{D}(x, y) = D(x, y)$ as above; otherwise, we shall define

$$\tilde{D}(x, y) = \left(|\lambda| 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-\frac{\mathbf{N}[\dot{i}]}{\mathbf{N}[\dot{i}]^2 + 2}} + \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[\dot{i}]} |y - r_\nu(x)| \quad (4.31)$$

and introduce a variant H_E^1 of the Hardy space H^1 to establish the $H_E^1 \rightarrow L^1$ estimate. In the definition of H_E^1 , we shall need a relevant fact. Recall that D is a real-analytic function, as pointed out in Remark 3.1. If D is of the form (4.29), then r_ν is a power series with real coefficients since D is real-valued.

Definition 4.1 Let $I_k := [2^{k-1}, 2^{k+1}]$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. We say that a measurable function a is an $H_E^1(I_k)$ atom associated with the phase λS if there exists an interval $I \subseteq I_k$ such that (i) $\text{supp}(a) \subseteq I$; (ii) $\|a\|_{L^\infty} \leq |I|^{-1}$; (iii) $\int_I e^{i\lambda S(r_\nu^{-1}(e_I), y)} a(y) dy = 0$ for some root r_ν in $\Psi[\dot{i}]$, where r_ν^{-1} is the inverse of the root r_ν on a small neighborhood of the origin.

The space $H_E^1(I_k)$ is the set of all functions $f \in L^1$, supported in I_k , which can be written as

$$f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda_j a_j, \quad (4.32)$$

where each a_j is an $H_E^1(I_k)$ atom. The norm in H_E^1 is defined to be

$$\|f\|_{H_E^1} = \inf \left\{ \sum_j |\lambda_j| : f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j \right\}$$

with the infimum taken over all sequences $\{\lambda_j\}$ such that (4.32) holds.

With the above preliminaries, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1 Assume $W_z^{(i)}$ are defined as above with $z \in \mathbb{C}$ having real part $\text{Re}(z) = -\frac{1}{A_r}$. Then there exists a constant C such that

$$\|W_z^{(1)} f\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^1}, \quad \|W_z^{(3)} f\|_{L^1} \leq C \|f\|_{L^1}.$$

If D is not of the form (4.29), then $W_z^{(2)}$ is bounded from L^1 into itself with the operator norm independent of λ ; otherwise, it is true that

$$\|W_z^{(2)} f\|_{L^1} \leq C \|f\|_{H_E^1(I_k)}.$$

Proof. It is more convenient to divide the argument into several cases.

Case (i) $\mathbf{k} \ll \mathbf{a}_r \mathbf{j}$.

It is clear that $|\tilde{D}(x, y)| \approx |x|^{A_r}$ for $(x, y) \in \text{supp}(W_z^{(1)})$. Hence $W_z^{(1)}$ is bounded from L^1 into $L^{1, \infty}$.

Case (ii) $\mathbf{k} \gg \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{j}$.

On the support of the operator $W_z^{(3)}$, one has $|\tilde{D}(x, y)| \approx x^m y^{\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]}$. For $|y| \leq 1$,

$$\int_{|y| \gg |x|^{a_1}} |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^{-\frac{1}{A_r}} dx \lesssim y^{-\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]/A_r} y^{\frac{1}{a_1}(1-\frac{m}{A_r})} \lesssim 1,$$

where we have used the fact $-\sum_{l=1}^r \mathbf{N}[l]/A_r + 1/a_1(1 - m/A_r) \geq 0$. By Fubini's theorem, we see that $W_z^{(3)}$ is bounded on L^1 .

Case (iii) $\mathbf{a}_{t_0+1} \mathbf{j} \ll \mathbf{k} \ll \mathbf{a}_{t_0} \mathbf{j}$ for some $1 \leq t_0 \leq r-1$.

Define $W_{\mathbf{a}_{t_0+1} \mathbf{j} \ll \mathbf{k} \ll \mathbf{a}_{t_0} \mathbf{j}}$ by taking the summation $\sum W_{j,k}$ over all of the above integers j, k . In this case,

$$|\tilde{D}(x, y)| \approx x^{A_{t_0}} \prod_{t=t_0+1}^r y^{\mathbf{N}[t]}.$$

Then we have, for $|y| \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x|^{a_{t_0+1}} \ll |y| \ll |x|^{a_{t_0}}} |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^{-\frac{1}{A_r}} dx &\lesssim \int_{|x|^{a_{t_0+1}} \ll |y| \ll |x|^{a_{t_0}}} \left(x^{A_{t_0}} \prod_{t=t_0+1}^r y^{\mathbf{N}[t]} \right)^{-\frac{1}{A_r}} dx \\ &\lesssim \prod_{t=t_0+1}^r y^{-\mathbf{N}[t]/A_r} y^{\frac{1}{a_{t_0+1}} \left(1 - \frac{A_{t_0}}{A_r}\right)} \lesssim 1 \end{aligned}$$

since

$$-\sum_{t=t_0+1}^r \frac{\mathbf{N}[t]}{A_r} + \frac{1}{a_{t_0+1}} \left(1 - \frac{A_{t_0}}{A_r}\right) = \frac{1}{a_{t_0+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{A_r} \left(A_r - A_{t_0} - \sum_{t=t_0+1}^r \mathbf{N}[t] a_{t_0+1}\right) \geq 0.$$

Case (iv) $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{a}_{t_0} \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{O}(1)$ for some $1 \leq t_0 \leq r$.

We shall break this case into several subcases for convenience.

Subcase (a) $\mathbf{m} > 0$ or $\mathbf{r} \geq 2$.

If we first integrate $|\tilde{D}(x, y)|^{-\frac{1}{A_r}}$ with respect to x , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{|x| \approx |y|^{\frac{1}{a_{t_0}}}} |x|^{-\frac{m}{A_r}} \prod_{l=1}^r \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[l]} |y - r_\nu(x)|^{-\frac{1}{A_r}} dx \\ &\lesssim \prod_{t=t_0+1}^r y^{-\mathbf{N}[t]/A_r} \int_{|x| \approx |y|^{\frac{1}{a_{t_0}}}} |x|^{-\frac{m}{A_r}} \prod_{l=1}^{t_0} \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[l]} |y - r_\nu(x)|^{-\frac{1}{A_r}} dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \prod_{t=t_0+1}^r y^{-\mathbf{N}[\dot{i}]/A_r} |y|^{-\frac{A_{t_0-1}}{a_{t_0} A_r}} \int_{|x| \approx |y|^{\frac{1}{a_{t_0}}}} \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[\dot{t}_0]} |y - r_\nu(x)|^{-\frac{1}{A_r}} dx.$$

By a change of variables, we have

$$\int_{|x| \approx |y|^{\frac{1}{a_{t_0}}}} \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[\dot{t}_0]} |y - r_\nu(x)|^{-\frac{1}{A_r}} dx \lesssim |y|^{1/a_{t_0} - \mathbf{N}[\dot{t}_0]/A_r}.$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$-\frac{A_{t_0-1}}{a_{t_0} A_r} - \sum_{t=t_0}^r \mathbf{N}[\dot{t}]/A_r + \frac{1}{a_{t_0}} \geq -\frac{1}{a_{t_0}} \cdot \frac{1}{A_r} \cdot A_r + \frac{1}{a_{t_0}} = 0.$$

This implies that the operator $\sum_{k=a_{t_0}j+O(1)} W_{j,k}$ is bounded on L^1 .

Subcase (b) $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{1}$.

As classified in Section 3, all of the roots $r_\nu \in \Psi[\dot{i}]$ are of form $r_\nu(x) = C_1^\alpha x^{a_1} + o(x^{a_1})$. Recall that we have pointed out that two roots r_ν and $r_{\nu'}$ may be different even though their leading coefficients C_1^α and $C_1^{\alpha'}$ are the same.

If the leading exponent $a_1 < 1$, then there exist at least two different coefficients C_1^α of the leading term x^{a_1} . The reason is that the product $\prod_\alpha (y - C_1^\alpha x^{a_1})$ is just the polynomial associated with the edge E on the boundary $\partial N(S)$ of $N(S)$ with slope $-1/a_1$. In this case, all roots r_ν have the same order x^{a_1} , and two different roots have also distance of order x^{a_1} . By a similar argument as in **Subcase (a)**, we can prove that the integral of $|\tilde{D}(x, y)|^{-1/A_1}$ over $|x| \approx |y|^{1/a_1}$, with respect to x , is bounded by a constant independent of y .

For $a_1 > 1$, by a simple change of variables, one can see that, for each root r_ν ,

$$\sup_{|y| \leq 1} \int_{|x| \approx |y|^{1/a_1}} |y - r_\nu(x)|^{-1/a_1} dx < +\infty$$

with the bound independent of y . By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\sup_{|y| \leq 1} \int \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[\dot{i}]} |y - r_\nu(x)|^{-1/A_1} dx \leq \prod_{r_\nu \in \Psi[\dot{i}]} \left(\sup_{|y| \leq 1} \int |y - r_\nu(x)|^{-1/a_1} dx \right)^{a_1/A_1} < +\infty,$$

where both integrals are taken over $|x| \approx |y|^{1/a_1}$.

Now we deal with the case $a_1 = 1$. By our resolution of roots in Section 3, we can decompose $W_{j,k}$ into smaller pieces of nondegenerate operators, i.e., $W_{j,k} = \sum W_{j,k,\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N}$. On the support of these operators, the size of S''_{xy} is bounded from both above and below by positive constants.

- If the cluster $\Psi[\dot{t}_1, \dots, \dot{t}_{N-1}, \dot{t}_N]$ contains at least two different roots, then $W_{j,k,\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N}$ is defined as $W_{j,k}$ with insertion of the following cut-off function

$$\prod_{i=1}^N \Phi \left(\sigma_i \left(y - C_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} x^{a_{t_1}} - \dots - C_{t_1, \dots, t_i}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_i} x^{a_{t_1, \dots, t_i}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}}} \right) / 2^{\mu_i} \right).$$

- Otherwise if the cluster $\Psi \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \alpha_N \\ t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, t_N \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ includes only one root with its multiplicity, then $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$ is obtained by insertion of the following cut-off function into $W_{j,k}$:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \Phi \left(\sigma_t \left(y - C_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} x^{a_{t_1}} - \dots - C_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_i} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{i-1}}} \right) / 2^{\mu_i} \right) \cdot \Phi \left(\sigma_N \left(y - r_\nu(x) \right) / 2^{\mu_N} \right),$$

where r_ν is the root (with its multiplicity) in the cluster $\Psi \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \alpha_N \\ t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, t_N \end{smallmatrix} \right]$.

In the first case, we must have one of the following statements.

- (α) $\mu_N \gg a_{t_1,\dots,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j$ with $t_{N+1} = 1$ or $\mu_N \ll a_{t_1,\dots,t_N,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N}$ with $t_{N+1} = \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N \\ t_1, \dots, t_N \end{smallmatrix} \right]$.
- (β) $a_{t_1,\dots,t_{N+1}+1}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j \ll \mu_N \ll a_{t_1,\dots,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j$ for some $1 \leq t_{N+1} \leq \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N \\ t_1, \dots, t_N \end{smallmatrix} \right] - 1$.
- (γ) $\mu_N = a_{t_1,\dots,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N} j + O(1)$ and on the support of $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_N}$ it is true that for all α

$$\left| y - \sum_{i=1}^N C_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_i} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_i}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{i-1}}} - C_{t_1,\dots,t_N,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N,\alpha} x^{a_{t_1,\dots,t_N,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N}} \right| \approx 2^{\mu_N}.$$

Note that $a_{t_1} = t_1 = 1$ here and we do not write it explicitly to lighten the notation.

Assume we are in the case (β). On the support of $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\mu_2,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\dots,\sigma_N}$, the size of \tilde{D} (equal to D) is equivalent to

$$\prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_1} 2^{k\mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right]} \prod_{t < t_2} 2^{j\mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \cdot \\ t_1 \ t \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1,t}^{\alpha_1}} \prod_{t > t_2} 2^{\mu_1 \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \cdot \\ t_1 \ t \end{smallmatrix} \right]} \prod_{\alpha \neq \alpha_2} 2^{\mu_1 \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \ \alpha \\ t_1 \ t_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right]} \dots \\ \prod_{t \leq t_{N+1}} 2^{j\mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \ \alpha_2 \ \dots \ \alpha_N \cdot \\ t_1 \ t_2 \ \cdot \ t_N \ t \end{smallmatrix} \right] a_{t_1,t_2,\dots,t_N,t}^{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\dots,\alpha_N}} \prod_{t > t_{N+1}} 2^{\mu_N \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1 \ \alpha_2 \ \dots \ \alpha_N \cdot \\ t_1 \ t_2 \ \cdot \ t_N \ t \end{smallmatrix} \right]}.$$

On the other hand, by our resolution of roots, one has

$$2^k \approx 2^{ja_{t_1}}, \quad 2^{\mu_1} \approx 2^{ja_{t_1,t_2}^{\alpha_1}}, \dots, \quad 2^{\mu_{N-1}} \approx 2^{ja_{t_1,t_2,\dots,t_N}^{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\dots,\alpha_{N-1}}}. \quad (4.33)$$

Hence the size of \tilde{D} is not less than a constant multiple of

$$2^{ja_{t_1,t_2,\dots,t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\dots,\alpha_N}} \left(\mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] - \sum_{t > t_N} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right] \right) 2^{\mu_N \sum_{t > t_N} \mathbf{N} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, \cdot \\ t_1, \dots, t_N, t \end{smallmatrix} \right]}.$$

By the size estimate, the horizontal cross sections of the support of $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\mu_2,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\dots,\sigma_N}$ have size $\lesssim 2^{\mu_N}$. Hence

$$\sum_{\mu_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| W_{j,k,\mu_1,\mu_2,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\dots,\sigma_N} f(x) \right| dx \lesssim \sum_{\mu_N} \int_{\mathbb{R}} 2^{\mu_N} \sup \left(|\tilde{D}(x,y)|^{-\frac{1}{A_1}} \right) |f(y)| dy \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(y)| dy, \quad (4.34)$$

where the above summations are taken over μ_N in the range (β). Note that the number of μ_1, \dots, μ_{N-1} is bounded by a constant independent of j, k . Therefore $W_{j,k}$ is bounded on L^1 .

Now we assume the cluster $\Psi \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{N-1}, \alpha_N \\ t_1, \dots, t_{N-1}, t_N \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ contains only one root with certain multiplicity. It suffices to study μ_N in the range $\mu_N \ll a_{t_1, \dots, t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} j$. In fact, by our assumption, there is only one leading exponent $a_{t_1, \dots, t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N}$. Hence the case $\mu_N \geq a_{t_1, \dots, t_{N+1}}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N} j - K$ is essentially the same as (α) discussed above. Since D is not of the form $(y - r_\nu(x))^d$ for some root $r_\nu(x) = C_1 x + o(x)$, we can repeat the above argument step by step to prove that $W_{j,k}$ is bounded on L^1 .

Combining all above results, we have completed the proof of L^1 boundedness for $W_{j,k,\mu_1,\mu_2,\dots,\mu_N}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\dots,\sigma_N}$ when the damping function D is not of the form $(y - r_\nu(x))^d$.

It remains to consider the case $D(x, y) = (y - r_\nu(x))^d$ with $r_\nu(x) = C_1 x + o(x)$. Here $C_1 \neq 0$ is a real number. By dilation, we may assume $C_1 = 1$. Each root r_ν in $\Psi \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \end{smallmatrix} \right]$ is a real Puiseux series. In a small neighborhood of the origin, $r'_\nu(x)$ is bounded from above and below by fixed positive constants. Hence the inverse r_ν^{-1} is well defined. Now we are going to prove that

$$\|W_{j,k} f\|_{L^1} \leq C \|f\|_{H_E^1(I_k)}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = -\frac{1}{A_1} \quad (4.35)$$

for each pair $(j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying $j - N_0 \leq k \leq j + N_0$. Here N_0 denotes a large positive integer.

To prove the above $H_E^1 \rightarrow L^1$ estimate, we first need the following L^2 estimate

$$\|W_{j,k} f\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad j - N_0 \leq k \leq j + N_0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = -\frac{1}{A_1}.$$

Define $W_{j,k,l}^\sigma$ by inserting $\Phi \left(\sigma \frac{y - r_\nu(x)}{2^l} \right)$ into $W_{j,k}$. Then $W_{j,k} = \sum_l \sum_{\sigma=\pm} W_{j,k,l}^\sigma$. By the Schur test, it suffices to consider those $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$2^{lN} [\mathbf{i}] \geq \left(|\lambda| 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-\frac{N[\mathbf{i}]}{N[\mathbf{i}]^2+2}}. \quad (4.36)$$

By Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\|W_{j,k,l}^\sigma\| \leq C \left(|\lambda| 2^{lN} [\mathbf{i}] 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{-l}.$$

Hence we have

$$\left\| \sum_l W_{j,k,l}^\sigma \right\| \leq C \sum_l \left(|\lambda| 2^{lN} [\mathbf{i}] 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{-l} \leq C,$$

where the summation is taken over all l satisfying (4.36). Hence the above L^2 estimate is true.

In what follows, it will be shown that $\|W_{j,k} a\|_{L^1} \leq C \|a\|_{H_E^1(I_k)}$ for all $H_E^1(I_k)$ atoms a . Assume a is an $H_E^1(I_k)$ atom. Then there exists an interval $I \subseteq I_k$ for which we have (i) $\operatorname{supp}(a) \subset I$; (ii) $\|a\|_{L^\infty} \leq |I|^{-1}$; (iii) $\int_I e^{i\lambda S(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I), y)} a(y) dy = 0$.

Write $I = (c_I - \delta, c_I + \delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$. Now we define an interval J associated with I . If $|I| \geq \left(|\lambda| 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{N[\mathbf{i}]^2+2}}$, then set $J = (r_\nu^{-1}(c_I) - 2\delta, r_\nu^{-1}(c_I) + 2\delta)$. Otherwise we define J as

$$J = \left(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I) - 2 \left(|\lambda| 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{N[\mathbf{i}]^2+2}}, r_\nu^{-1}(c_I) + 2 \left(|\lambda| 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-\frac{1}{N[\mathbf{i}]^2+2}} \right).$$

For the interval J , we claim that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|W_{j,k}a\|_{L^1(J)} \leq C\|a\|_{H_E^1(I_k)}$$

for all $H_E^1(I_k)$ atoms a . In fact, by Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we have

$$\|W_{j,k}a\|_{L^1(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)-2\delta, r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)+2\delta)} \leq (4\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|W_{j,k}a\|_{L^2} \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\|a\|_{L^2} \leq C.$$

On the other hand, we also claim that there exists a constant C such that

$$\|W_{j,k}a\|_{L^1(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)-2\tilde{\delta}, r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)+2\tilde{\delta})} \leq C,$$

with $\tilde{\delta} = (|\lambda|2^{kB_1})^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{i}]^2}}$. Consider the integral kernel $K(x, y) = |D(x, y)|^{-\frac{1}{A_1}} \chi_J(x)\chi_I(y)$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_x \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(x, y)| dy &\leq C \left(|\lambda|2^{kB_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{i}]^2}} |I|, \\ \sup_y \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(x, y)| dx &\leq C \left(|\lambda|2^{kB_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{i}]^2}} \left(|\lambda|2^{kB_1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}[\mathbf{i}]^2}} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

By the Schur test, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_{j,k}a\|_{L^1(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)-2\tilde{\delta}, r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)+2\tilde{\delta})} &\leq C\sqrt{\tilde{\delta}}\|W_{j,k}a\|_{L^2(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)-2\tilde{\delta}, r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)+2\tilde{\delta})} \\ &\leq C\sqrt{\tilde{\delta}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{\delta}}}|I|^{\frac{1}{2}}|I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Thus our above claim is true. Now it remains to show that $\|W_{j,k}a\|_{L^1(J^c)} \leq C$. We need the following inequality.

$$\sup_{y \in I} \int_{J^c} \left| \Phi\left(\frac{x}{2^j}\right) \Phi\left(\frac{y}{2^k}\right) |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^z \varphi(x, y) - \Phi\left(\frac{x}{2^j}\right) \Phi\left(\frac{c_I}{2^k}\right) |\tilde{D}(x, c_I)|^z \varphi(x, c_I) \right| dx \leq C.$$

Define $M_{j,k}(x, y) = \Phi\left(\frac{x}{2^j}\right) \Phi\left(\frac{y}{2^k}\right) \varphi(x, y)$. By the mean value theorem, it follows immediately from $k \geq 0$ that

$$|M_{j,k}(x, y) - M_{j,k}(x, c_I)| \leq \|\Phi\|_\infty \|\Phi'\|_\infty \frac{|I|}{2^k} \|\varphi\|_\infty + \|\Phi\|_\infty^2 \|\partial_y \varphi\|_\infty |I| \leq C|I|/2^k.$$

Observe that for $x \in J^c$, $\Phi(x/2^j) \neq 0$, $y \in I$, it is true that $|y - r_\nu(x)| \approx |r_\nu^{-1}(y) - x| \geq C|I|$. Also, for $y \in I$ and $x \in J^c$, $\left| |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^z - |\tilde{D}(x, c_I)|^z \right| \leq C|I||x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^{-2}$. It is clear that for $x \in J^c$ we have $\left| |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^z \right| \leq |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^{-1}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{J^c \cap I_j} \left| M_{j,k}(x, y) |\tilde{D}(x, y)|^z - M_{j,k}(x, c_I) |\tilde{D}(x, c_I)|^z \right| dx \\ &\leq C \int_{|I| \leq |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| \leq C2^j} \frac{|I|}{2^k} |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^{-1} dx + \int_{|x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| \geq |I|} \frac{|I|}{|x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^2} dx \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

By the cancellation property of a , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_I e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} a(y) dy \right| &= \left| \int_I \left[e^{i\lambda(S(x,y)-S(x,c_I))} - e^{i\lambda(S(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I),y)-S(r_\nu^{-1}(c_I),c_I))} \right] a(y) dy \right| \\ &\leq C |\lambda| |I| |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^{\mathbf{N}[i]+1} 2^{kB_1}, \quad x \in J^c \cap I_j. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{x \in J^c: |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| \leq \eta} \left| \int_I e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} a(y) dy \right| \left| M_{j,k}(x, c_I) |\tilde{D}(x, c_I)|^z \right| dx \\ &\leq C \int_{x \in J^c: |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| \leq \eta} |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^{-1} \left| \int_I e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} a(y) dy \right| dx \\ &\leq C \int_{x \in J^c: |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| \leq \eta} |\lambda| |I| |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^{\mathbf{N}[i]} 2^{kB_1} dx \\ &\leq C |\lambda| |I| \eta^{\mathbf{N}[i]+1} 2^{kB_1} \end{aligned}$$

Choose $\eta > 0$ such that $|\lambda| |I| \eta^{\mathbf{N}[i]+1} 2^{kB_1} = 1$. Let $\mu = \max\{\eta, |I|\} = \max\{\eta, 2\delta\}$. Then we have proved $\|W_{j,k} a\|_{L^1(|x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| \leq \mu)} \leq C$. For $x \in [2^{j-1}, 2^{j+1}]$ and $|x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| > \mu$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mu \leq 2^l \lesssim 2^j} \int_{2^{l-1} \leq |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)| \leq 2^{l+1}} |x - r_\nu^{-1}(c_I)|^{-1} \left| \int_I e^{i\lambda S(x,y)} a(y) dy \right| dx \\ &\leq C \sum_{\mu \leq 2^l \lesssim 2^j} \int_{\frac{1}{2} \leq |x| \leq 2} \left| \int_{[-1,1]} e^{i\lambda S(2^l x + r_\nu^{-1}(c_I), \delta y + c_I)} \delta a(\delta y + c_I) dy \right| dx \\ &\leq C \sum_{\mu \leq 2^l \lesssim 2^j} \left(|\lambda| \delta 2^{l(\mathbf{N}[i]+1)} 2^{kB_1} \right)^{-1/2} < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all above results, we obtain the $H_E^1 \rightarrow L^1$ boundedness for $W_{j,k}$. Hence the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 1 by interpolating the damping estimates in Sections 3 and 4.

Proof. By a duality argument, we can assume $A_r \geq B_r$ in Theorem 3.1. Hence it suffices to establish the L^p estimate (3.16) for $A_r \geq B_r$.

We first consider the case when the damping factor D in (3.18) is not of the form (4.29). As in Section 4, it is more convenient to consider the following four cases separately.

Case (i) $k \gg a_1 j$

In this case, we define $\tilde{D}(x, y) = D(x, y)$ and $W_z^{(3)} = \sum_{j,k} W_{j,k}$ with the summation taken over all above j, k . By Theorems 3.2 and 4.1, we have the L^2 decay estimate

$$\|W_z^{(3)} f\|_{L^2} \leq C(1 + |z|^2) |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2(1+B_r)}} \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = \frac{A_r - B_r}{2A_r} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + B_r} \quad (5.37)$$

and the $L^1 \rightarrow L^1$ estimate

$$\|W_z^{(3)}f\|_{L^1} \leq C\|f\|_{L^1}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = -\frac{1}{A_r}, \quad (5.38)$$

where the above constants C are independent of λ and f . We shall point out that the L^2 decay estimate in Theorem 3.2 is also true for the three different parts $W_z^{(1)}$, $W_z^{(2)}$ and $W_z^{(3)}$, as defined in Section 4. In the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have decomposed W_z suitably into different parts and then proved L^2 desired estimate for each of those parts. Hence the above L^2 estimate (5.37) for $W_z^{(3)}$ also holds.

By Stein's complex interpolation (see Stein [30]), we see that

$$\|W_z^{(3)}f\|_{L^{p_r}} \leq C|\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{A_r+B_r+2}}\|f\|_{L^{p_r}}, \quad p_r = \frac{A_r+B_r+2}{A_r+1}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = 0. \quad (5.39)$$

Case (ii) $k \ll a_r j$

In this case, we shall modify our definition \tilde{D} in Section 4. Indeed, let $\tilde{D}(x, y) = |x|^{A_r}$ and $W_z^{(1)} = \sum W_{j,k}$ with the summation taken over all j, k satisfying $k \ll a_r j$. It is easy to see that $|D(x, y)| \approx |x|^{A_r}$ in the support of $W_z^{(1)}$. With the same argument as in Section 3, one can show that the L^2 decay estimate (5.37) is also true for $W_z^{(1)}$. But $W_z^{(1)}$ does **not** satisfy the $L^1 \rightarrow L^1$ estimate (5.38). However, we can replace (5.38) by the following $L^1 \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}$ estimate:

$$\|W_z^{(1)}f\|_{L^{1,\infty}} \leq C\|f\|_{L^1}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = -\frac{1}{A_r}. \quad (5.40)$$

Using the interpolation technique in Lemma 2.3, we obtain the desired estimate (5.39) for $W_z^{(1)}$.

Case (iii) $a_{t+1}j \ll k \ll a_t j$ for some $1 \leq t \leq r-1$.

We define $W_z^{(2)} = \sum W_{j,k}$ with the summation taken over all above j, k . In this case, $\tilde{D}(x, y) = D(x, y)$. As shown in Sections 3 and 4, we see that the same estimates as in Case (i) are also true for $W_z^{(2)}$. An interpolation yields the desired L^p estimate.

Case (iv) $k = a_t j + O(1)$ for some $1 \leq t \leq r$.

Since we have assumed that D is not of the form (4.29), all estimates in Case (i) are true in this case. The desired L^p decay estimate follows immediately.

Now we turn to the case in which $D(x, y) = (y - r_\nu(x))^d$ for some positive integer d and a nontrivial root $r_\nu(x) = C_1 x + o(x)$. Here C_1 is a nonzero real number. In this case, we need only take care of **Case (iv)** as above since other cases can be treated in the same way.

Now we assume $|j - k| \leq N_0$ for some large $N_0 > 0$. Let the damping factor \tilde{D} be defined as in (4.31). Similarly, we use $W_z^{(2)}$ to denote the summation $\sum_{|j-k| \leq N_0} W_{j,k}$. Then $W_z^{(2)}$ still satisfies (5.37). In Theorem 4.1, we have the following appropriate substitute of the L^1 estimate (5.38):

$$\|W_z^{(2)}f\|_{L^1} \leq C\|f\|_{H_E^1(I_k)}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) = -\frac{1}{N[\cdot]}. \quad (5.41)$$

It should be pointed out that $A_1 = N[\cdot]$ in this case. Using the Fefferman-Stein sharp function in [5] (see also [17] for a variant of this function), we see that an interpolation between $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$

and $H_E^1 \rightarrow L^1$ yields the desired estimate (5.39).

Combining all above results, we have completed the proof of Theorem 3.1. By interpolation, one can see that the decay estimate (1.3) is sharp only if (k, l) is a vertex of $N(S)$. Hence Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 3.1. \square

Acknowledgements. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11701573. We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Xiaochun Li for his valuable comments and warm encouragement.

References

- [1] Carbery, A., Christ, M., Wright, J.: Multidimensional van der Corput and sublevel estimates. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **12**, 981-1015 (1999)
- [2] Casas-Alvero, E., Singularities of plane curves. Vol. 276. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [3] Carbery, A., Wright, J. “What is van der Corput’s lemma in higher dimensions?” *Publicacions Matemàtiques*, 13-26 (2002)
- [4] Christ M., Li X., Tao T., Thiele, C.: On multilinear oscillatory integrals, nonsingular and singular. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, **130**, 321-351 (2005)
- [5] Fefferman, C., Stein, E.M.: H^p spaces of several variables. *Acta Math.*, **129**, 137-193 (1972)
- [6] Greenblatt, M.: A direct resolution of singularities for functions of two variables with applications to analysis. *J. Anal. Math.*, **92**, 233-257 (2004)
- [7] Greenblatt, M.: Sharp L^2 estimates for one-dimensional oscillatory integral operators with C^∞ phase. *Amer. J. Math.*, **127**, 659-695 (2005)
- [8] Greenblatt, M.: Simply nondegenerate multilinear oscillatory integral operators with smooth phase. *Math. Res. Lett.*, **15**, 653-660 (2008)
- [9] Greenleaf, A., Pramanik, M., Tang, W.: Oscillatory integral operators with homogeneous polynomial phases in several variables. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **244**, 444-487 (2007)
- [10] Greenleaf, A., Seeger, A.: Oscillatory and Fourier integral operators with folding canonical relations. *Studia Math.*, **132**, 125-139 (1999)
- [11] Greenleaf, A., Seeger, A.: Oscillatory and Fourier integral operators with degenerate canonical relations. *Publ. Mat* **93** (2002): 141.
- [12] Gressman, P.T., Xiao, L. Maximal decay inequalities for trilinear oscillatory integrals of convolution type. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **271**, 3695-3726 (2016)
- [13] Hörmander, L.: Oscillatory integrals and multipliers on FL^p . *Ark. Maht.* **11**, 1-11 (1973)
- [14] Pan, Y.: Hardy spaces and oscillatory singular integrals. *Rev. Mat. Ibero.*, **7**, 55–64 (1991)
- [15] Pan, Y., Sampson, G., Szeptycki, P.: L^2 and L^p estimates for oscillatory integrals and their extended domains. *Studia Math*, **122**, 201-224 (1997)
- [16] Pramanik, M., Yang, C.W., L^p decay estimates for weighted oscillatory integral operators on \mathbb{R} . *Rev. Mat. Ibero.*, **21**, 1071-1095 (2005)

- [17] Phong, D.H., Stein, E.M.: Hilbert integrals, singular integrals, and Radon transforms I. *Acta Math.*, **157**, 99-157 (1986)
- [18] Phong, D.H., Stein, E.M.: Models of degenerate Fourier integral operators and Radon transforms. *Ann. of Math.*, **140**, 703-722 (1994)
- [19] Phong, D.H., Stein, E.M.: The Newton polyhedron and oscillatory integral operators. *Acta Math.*, **179**, 105-152 (1997)
- [20] Phong, D.H., Stein, E.M.: Damped oscillatory integral operators with analytic phases. *Adv. in Math.*, **134**, 146-177 (1998)
- [21] Phong, D.H., Stein, E.M., Sturm, J.A.: On the growth and stability of real-analytic functions. *American Journal of Mathematics*, **121**, 519-554 (1999)
- [22] Phong, D.H., Stein, E.M., Sturm, J.A.: Multilinear level set operators, oscillatory integral operators, and Newton polyhedra. *Mathematische Annalen*, **319**, 573-596 (2001)
- [23] Phong, D.H., Sturm, J.A.: Algebraic estimates, stability of local zeta functions, and uniform estimates for distribution functions. *Annals of mathematics*, **152**, 277-329 (2000)
- [24] Ricci, F., Stein, E.M.: Harmonic analysis on nilpotent groups and singular integrals I: oscillatory integrals. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **73**, 179-194 (1987)
- [25] Rychkov, V.S.: Sharp L^2 bounds for oscillatory integral operators with C^∞ phases. *Math. Z.*, **236**, 461-489 (2001)
- [26] Seeger, A.: Degenerate Fourier integral operators in the plane. *Duke Math. J.*, **71**, 685-745 (1993)
- [27] Seeger, A.: Radon transforms and finite type conditions. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **11**, 869-897 (1998)
- [28] Shi, Z.S.H.: Uniform estimates for oscillatory integral operators with polynomial phases. preprint
- [29] Shi Z.S.H., Yan D.Y.: Sharp L^p -boundedness of oscillatory integral operators with polynomial phases. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, **286**, 1277-1302 (2017)
- [30] Stein, E.M.: Harmonic Analysis: Real variable methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory integrals. Princeton Univ. Press, 1993. MR 95c:42002.
- [31] Stein E.M., Weiss G. Interpolation of operators with change of measures. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **87**, 159-172 (1958)
- [32] Tang W., Decay rates of oscillatory integral operators in $1+2$ dimensions. *Forum Mathematicum*, **18**, 427-444 (2006)
- [33] Xiao L., Endpoint estimates for one-dimensional oscillatory integral operators. *Advances in Mathematics*, **316**, 255-291 (2017)
- [34] Xu S.Z., Yan D.Y.: Sharp L^p decay of oscillatory integral operators with certain homogeneous polynomial phases in several variables. To appear in *Science China Mathematics*.
- [35] Yang, C.W.: Sharp estimates for some oscillatory integral operators on \mathbb{R}^1 . *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, **48**, 1093-1103 (2004)
- [36] Yang, C.W.: L^p improving estimates for some classes of Radon transforms. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **357**, 3887-3903 (2005)
- [37] Varchenko, A.: Newton polyhedra and estimations of oscillatory integrals. *Functional Anal. Appl.*, **18**, 175-196 (1976)