

ON FOURIER RESTRICTION FOR FINITE-TYPE PERTURBATIONS OF THE HYPERBOLIC PARABOLOID

STEFAN BUSCHENHENKE, DETLEF MÜLLER, AND ANA VARGAS

ABSTRACT. In this note, we continue our research on Fourier restriction for hyperbolic surfaces, by studying local perturbations of the hyperbolic paraboloid $z = xy$, which are of the form $z = xy + h(y)$, where $h(y)$ is a smooth function of finite type. Our results build on previous joint work in which we have studied the case $h(y) = y^3/3$ by means of the bilinear method. As it turns out, the understanding of that special case becomes also crucial for the treatment of arbitrary finite type perturbation terms $h(y)$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Reduction to perturbations of cubic type	3
3. Transversality conditions and admissible pairs of sets	4
3.1. Admissible pairs of sets U_1, U_2 on which transversalities are of a fixed size: an informal discussion	5
3.2. Precise definition of admissible pairs within $Q \times Q$	9
4. The bilinear estimates	12
4.1. A prototypical admissible pair in the curved box case and the crucial scaling transformation	12
4.2. Reduction to the prototypical case	14
5. The Whitney-decomposition and passage to linear restriction estimates: proof of Theorem 1.1	17
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

Our aim in this note is to provide another step in our program towards gaining an understanding of Fourier restriction for general hyperbolic surfaces.

Fourier restriction for hypersurfaces with non-negative principal curvatures has been studied intensively by many authors (see, e.g., [Bo91], [Bo95a], [Bo95b],[MVV96], [MVV99], [TVI00], [TVII00], [W01], [T01], [IKM10], [LV10], [IM11], [BoG11], [IM15], [BMV16], [Gu16],

2010 *Mathematical Subject Classification.* 42B25.

Key words and phrases. hyperbolic hypersurface, Fourier restriction.

The first author was partially supported by the ERC grant 307617.

The first two authors were partially supported by the DFG grant MU 761/ 11-2.

The third author was partially supported by grants MTM2013-40945 (MINECO) and MTM2016-76566-P (Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades), Spain.

[Gu17], [Sto17a]). For the case of hypersurfaces of non-vanishing Gaussian curvature but principal curvatures of different signs, besides Tomas-Stein type Fourier restriction estimates (see, e.g., [To75],[Str77], [Gr81],[St86], [IKM10], [IM11], [IM15]), until recently the only case which had been studied successfully was the case of the hyperbolic paraboloid (or "saddle") in \mathbb{R}^3 : in 2015, independently S. Lee [L05] and A. Vargas [V05] established results analogous to Tao's theorem [T03] on elliptic surfaces (such as the 2-sphere), with the exception of the end-point, by means of the bilinear method. Recently, B. Stovall [Sto17b] was able to include also the end-point case. Moreover, C. H. Cho and J. Lee [ChL17], and J. Kim [K17], improved the range by adapting ideas by Guth [Gu16], [Gu17] which are based on the polynomial partitioning method. For further information on the history of the restriction problem, we refer the interested reader to our previous paper [BMV17].

We shall here study surfaces S which are local perturbations of the hyperbolic paraboloid $z = xy$, which are given as the graph of a function $\phi(x, y) := xy + h(y)$, where the function h is smooth and of finite type at the origin, i.e.,

$$(1.1) \quad S := \{(x, y, xy + h(y)) : (x, y) \in \Omega\},$$

where Ω is a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin, and $h(y) = y^{m+2}a(y)$, with $a(0, 0) \neq 0$ and $m \geq 1$. The Fourier restriction problem, introduced by E. M. Stein in the seventies (for general submanifolds), asks for the range of exponents \tilde{p} and \tilde{q} for which an a priori estimate of the form

$$\left(\int_S |\widehat{f}|^{\tilde{q}} d\sigma \right)^{1/\tilde{q}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^{\tilde{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

holds true for every Schwartz function $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, with a constant C independent of f . Here, $d\sigma$ denotes the surface measure on S .

As usual, it will be more convenient to use duality and work in the adjoint setting. If \mathcal{R} denotes the Fourier restriction operator $g \mapsto \mathcal{R}g := \widehat{g}|_S$ to the surface S , its adjoint operator \mathcal{R}^* is given by $\mathcal{R}^*f(\xi) = \mathcal{E}f(-\xi)$, where \mathcal{E} denotes the "Fourier extension" operator given by

$$\mathcal{E}f(\xi) := \widehat{f d\sigma}(\xi) = \int_S f(x) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} d\sigma(x),$$

with $f \in L^q(S, \sigma)$. The restriction problem is therefore equivalent to the question of finding the appropriate range of exponents for which the estimate

$$\|\mathcal{E}f\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q(S, d\sigma)}$$

holds true with a constant C independent of the function $f \in L^q(S, d\sigma)$.

By identifying a point $(x, y) \in \Omega$ with the corresponding point $(x, y, \phi(x, y))$ on S , we may regard our Fourier extension operator \mathcal{E} as well as an operator mapping functions on Ω to functions on \mathbb{R}^3 , which in terms of our phase function $\phi(x, y) = xy + h(y)$ can be expressed more explicitly in the form

$$\mathcal{E}f(\xi) = \int_{\Omega} f(x, y) e^{-i(\xi_1 x + \xi_2 y + \xi_3 \phi(x, y))} \eta(x, y) dx dy,$$

if $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, with a suitable smooth density η .

Our main result, which generalizes Theorem 1.1 in [BMV17], is the following

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $r > 10/3$ and $1/q' > 2/r$, and let \mathcal{E} denote the Fourier extension operator associated to the graph S in (1.1) of the above phase function $\phi(x, y) := xy + h(y)$, where the function h is smooth and of finite type at the origin. Then, if Ω is a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin,*

$$\|\mathcal{E}f\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_{r,q} \|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$$

for all $f \in L^q(\Omega)$.

For the proof of this result, we shall strongly build on the approach devised for the special case where $h(y) = y^3/3$. In many arguments, we shall be able to basically follow [BMV17]. Therefore, we shall concentrate on explaining the new ideas and modifications that are needed to handle more general finite type perturbations.

CONVENTION: Unless stated otherwise, $C > 0$ will stand for an absolute constant whose value may vary from occurrence to occurrence. We will use the notation $A \sim_C B$ to express that $\frac{1}{C}A \leq B \leq CA$. In some contexts where the size of C is irrelevant we shall drop the index C and simply write $A \sim B$. Similarly, $A \lesssim B$ will express the fact that there is a constant C (which does not depend on the relevant quantities in the estimate) such that $A \leq CB$, and we write $A \ll B$, if the constant C is sufficiently small.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the referee for many valuable suggestions which have greatly helped to improve the presentation of the material in this article.

2. REDUCTION TO PERTURBATIONS OF CUBIC TYPE

Recall that we are assuming that

$$(2.1) \quad \phi(x, y) = xy + y^{m+2}a(y), \quad \text{where } a(0) \neq 0, m \geq 1.$$

We may assume without loss of generality that Ω is a square, and then decompose the domain Ω dyadically with respect to the y -variable into rectangular boxes

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{\pm} \bigcup_{i \geq i_0} \Omega_{2^{-i}}^{\pm},$$

where for any $\kappa = 2^{-i}$ we have $\Omega_{\kappa}^- = -\Omega_{\kappa}^+$, and $\kappa \leq y \leq 2\kappa$ on Ω_{κ}^+ . Note that we may assume that $i_0 \gg 1$ is sufficiently large, by choosing Ω sufficiently small. By

$$\mathcal{E}_{\kappa}^{\pm} f(\xi) = \int_{\Omega_{\kappa}^{\pm}} f(x, y) e^{-i(\xi_1 x + \xi_2 y + \xi_3 \phi(x, y))} \eta(x, y) dx dy$$

we denote the contribution of Ω_{κ}^{\pm} to $\mathcal{E}f$.

Let us fix one of these subsets, say Ω_{κ}^+ . We then apply an affine change of variables to pass to the phase

$$\phi_{\kappa}(x, y) := \frac{1}{\kappa} \phi(x, \kappa(1+y)) = x(1+y) + \kappa^{m+1}(1+y)^{m+2}a(\kappa(1+y)),$$

where $0 \leq y \leq 1$. Actually, by taking, say, 1000 subdomains, we may even assume that $0 \leq y \leq 1/1000$. Let us put

$$H_{\kappa}(y) := (1+y)^{m+2}a(\kappa(1+y)).$$

Then

$$\phi_\kappa(x, y) = x(1 + y) + \kappa^{m+1}H_\kappa(y) = x + xy + \kappa^{m+1}P_2(\kappa, y) + \kappa^{m+1}h_\kappa(y),$$

where $P_2(\kappa, y)$ denotes the Taylor polynomial of $H_\kappa(y)$ of degree 2 centered at $y = 0$. As in our previous paper [BMV17], we may then write

$$\begin{aligned} x + xy + \kappa^{m+1}P_2(\kappa, y) &= xy + c_\kappa y^2 + \text{affine linear terms} \\ &= (x + c_\kappa y)y + \text{affine linear terms.} \end{aligned}$$

The linear change of variables $x \mapsto x + c_\kappa y$ then allows to reduce to the phase function

$$\tilde{\phi}_\kappa(x, y) := xy + \kappa^{m+1}h_\kappa(y),$$

for (x, y) in a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin which can be chosen independently of κ . Note that

$$(2.2) \quad h_\kappa(0) = h'_\kappa(0) = h''_\kappa(0).$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that for κ sufficiently small (depending on m , $a(0) \neq 0$, $\|a'\|_\infty$, $\|a''\|_\infty$ and $\|a'''\|_\infty$), we have

$$(2.3) \quad |h'''_\kappa(y)| \geq \frac{(m+2)(m+1)m}{2}|a(0)| \geq C_3 > 0.$$

A similar reasoning shows that

$$(2.4) \quad |h'''_\kappa(y)| \leq 4C_3, \quad \text{and} \quad |h^{(l)}_\kappa(y)| \leq C_l \quad \text{for all } |y| \leq 1/1000, l \geq 4,$$

with constants C_l which are independent of κ .

Similar arguments apply to Ω_κ^- . We consider next the Fourier extension operator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\kappa^\pm f(\xi) = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_\kappa^\pm} f(x, y) e^{-i(\xi_1 x + \xi_2 y + \xi_3 (xy + \kappa^{m+1}h_\kappa(y)))} \tilde{\eta}_\kappa(x, y) dx dy,$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_\kappa(x, y) = \eta(x, \kappa(1 + y))$, which corresponds to the operator \mathcal{E}_κ^\pm in the new coordinates. Then an easily scaling argument shows that the following estimates for \mathcal{E}_κ^\pm and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\kappa^\pm$ are equivalent:

$$(2.5) \quad \|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\kappa^\pm f\|_{L^r} \leq C \|f\|_{L^q};$$

$$(2.6) \quad \|\mathcal{E}_\kappa^\pm g\|_{L^r} \leq C \kappa^{1-2/r-1/q} \|g\|_{L^q}$$

for all g with $\text{supp } g \subset \{|y - \kappa| \leq \kappa/1000\}$ (and support in x sufficiently small).

Since we work under the assumption that $1/q' > 2/r$, we thus see that by summing a geometric series it will suffice to prove the uniform estimates (2.5) in order to prove Theorem 1.1.

3. TRANSVERSALITY CONDITIONS AND ADMISSIBLE PAIRS OF SETS

In the previous section, we have seen that we may reduce to proving uniform Fourier extension estimates for phases

$$\phi(x, y) = xy + \epsilon h(y),$$

defined on a small square Q which, after a further scaling, we may assume to be the square $Q = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is assumed to be sufficiently small, and where h is a

perturbation function *of cubic type* in y of the phase xy . By this, we mean that h is smooth and satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} h(0) = h'(0) = h''(0) = 0, \\ \frac{C_3}{4} \leq |h'''(y)| \leq C_3 \quad \text{for all } |y| \leq 1, \\ |h^{(l)}(y)| \leq C_l \quad \text{for all } l \geq 4 \text{ and } |y| \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

(compare (2.2)–(2.4), where we have applied an additional scaling by a factor 1000 in y). Here, the constants C_l will be assumed to be fixed constants, with $C_3 > 0$, and our goal will be to establish uniform estimates which will depend only on these constants (in many parts actually only on C_3), but not on ϵ .

3.1. Admissible pairs of sets U_1, U_2 on which transversalities are of a fixed size: an informal discussion. Recall next that the bilinear approach is based on bilinear estimates of the form

$$(3.2) \quad \|\mathcal{E}_{U_1}(f_1) \mathcal{E}_{U_2}(f_2)\|_p \leq C(U_1, U_2) \|f_1\|_2 \|f_2\|_2.$$

Here, \mathcal{E}_{U_1} and \mathcal{E}_{U_2} are the Fourier extension operators associated to patches of sub-surfaces $S_i := \text{graph } \phi|_{U_i} \subset S$, $i = 1, 2$, with $U_i \subset \Omega$. What is crucial for obtaining useful bilinear estimates is that the two patches of surface S_1 and S_2 satisfy certain *transversality conditions*, which are stronger than just assuming that S_1 and S_2 are transversal as hypersurfaces (i.e., that all normals to S_1 are transversal to all normals to S_2). Indeed, what is needed in addition is the following (cf. [BMV17],[L05], [V05], [LV10], or [Be16]):

Denoting by $H\phi$ the Hessian of ϕ , we consider the following quantity

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_z^\phi(z_1, z_2, z'_1, z'_2) := \langle (H\phi)^{-1}(z)(\nabla\phi(z_2) - \nabla\phi(z_1)), \nabla\phi(z'_2) - \nabla\phi(z'_1) \rangle.$$

If its modulus is bounded from below by a constant $c > 0$ for all $z_i = (x_i, y_i)$, $z'_i = (x'_i, y'_i) \in U_i$, $i = 1, 2$, $z = (x, y) \in U_1 \cup U_2$, then we have (3.2) for $p > 5/3$, with a constant $C(U_1, U_2)$ that depends only on this constant c and on upper bounds for the derivatives of ϕ . If U_1 and U_2 are sufficiently small (with sizes depending on upper bounds of the first and second order derivatives of ϕ and a lower bound for the determinant of $H\phi$) this condition reduces to the estimate

$$(3.4) \quad |\Gamma_z^\phi(z_1, z_2)| \geq c,$$

for $z_i = (x_i, y_i) \in U_i$, $i = 1, 2$, $z = (x, y) \in U_1 \cup U_2$, where

$$(3.5) \quad \Gamma_z^\phi(z_1, z_2) := \langle (H\phi)^{-1}(z)(\nabla\phi(z_2) - \nabla\phi(z_1)), \nabla\phi(z_2) - \nabla\phi(z_1) \rangle.$$

It is easy to check that for $\phi(x, y) = xy + \epsilon h(y)$, we have

$$(3.6) \quad \Gamma_z^\phi(z_1, z_2) =: 2(y_2 - y_1) \tau_z(z_1, z_2),$$

where

$$(3.7) \quad \tau_z(z_1, z_2) := x_2 - x_1 + \epsilon[h'(y_2) - h'(y_1) - \frac{1}{2}h''(y)(y_2 - y_1)].$$

As in [BMV17], it will be particularly important to look at the expression (3.7) when $z = z_1 \in U_1$, and $z = z_2 \in U_2$, so that the two “transversalities”

$$(3.8) \quad \tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2) = x_2 - x_1 + \epsilon[(h'(y_2) - h'(y_1) - \frac{1}{2}h''(y_1)(y_2 - y_1))]$$

$$(3.9) \quad \tau_{z_2}(z_1, z_2) = x_2 - x_1 + \epsilon[(h'(y_2) - h'(y_1) - \frac{1}{2}h''(y_2)(y_2 - y_1))]$$

become relevant. Note the following relation between these quantities:

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2) - \tau_{z_2}(z_1, z_2)| &= \frac{\epsilon}{2}|h''(y_2) - h''(y_1)||y_2 - y_1| \sim \epsilon|h'''(\eta)|(y_2 - y_1)^2 \\ &\sim \epsilon(y_2 - y_1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where η is some intermediate point.

Following Section 2 in [BMV17], we shall try to devise neighborhoods U_1 and U_2 of two given points $z_1^0 = (x_1^0, y_1^0)$ and $z_2^0 = (x_2^0, y_2^0)$ on which these quantities are roughly constant for $z_i = (x_i, y_i) \in U_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and which are also essentially chosen as large as possible. The corresponding pair (U_1, U_2) of neighborhoods of z_1^0 respectively z_2^0 will be called an *admissible pair*.

As in [BMV17], we will present the basic motivating idea in this subsection, and give a precise definition of admissible pairs in the next subsection.

In a first step, we choose a large constant $C_0 \gg 1$, which will be made precise only later, and assume that $|y_2^0 - y_1^0| \sim C_0\rho$ for some $\rho > 0$. It is then natural to allow y_1 to vary on U_1 and y_2 on U_2 by at most ρ from y_1^0 and y_2^0 , respectively, i.e., we shall assume that

$$|y_i - y_i^0| \lesssim \rho, \quad \text{for } z_i \in U_i, i = 1, 2,$$

so that indeed

$$(3.11) \quad |y_2 - y_1| \sim C_0\rho \quad \text{for } z_i \in U_i, i = 1, 2.$$

Recall next the identity (3.10), which in particular implies that

$$(3.12) \quad |\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0) - \tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \sim C_0^2\epsilon\rho^2.$$

We begin with

Case 1: Assume that $|\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \leq |\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)|$. Let us then write

$$(3.13) \quad |\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| = \epsilon\rho^2\delta,$$

where $\delta \geq 0$. Note, however, that obviously $\epsilon\rho^2\delta \lesssim 1$. From (3.12) one then easily deduces that there are two subcases:

Subcase 1(a): (the “straight box” case), where $|\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \sim |\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)|$, or, equivalently, $\delta \gtrsim 1$. In this case, also $|\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \sim \epsilon\rho^2\delta$.

Subcase 1(b): (the “curved box” case), where $|\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \ll |\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)|$, or, equivalently, $\delta \ll 1$. In this case, $|\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \sim \epsilon\rho^2$.

Given ρ and δ , we shall then want to devise U_1 and U_2 so that the same kind of conditions hold for all $z_1 \in U_1$ and $z_2 \in U_2$, i.e.,

$$|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2)| \sim \epsilon\rho^2\delta, \quad \text{and} \quad |\tau_{z_2}(z_1, z_2)| \sim \epsilon\rho^2(1 \vee \delta).$$

Note that in view of (3.10) and (3.11) the second condition is redundant, and so the only additional condition that needs to be satisfied is that, for all $z_1 = (x_1, y_1) \in U_1$ and $z_2 = (x_2, y_2) \in U_2$, we have

$$|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2)| \sim \epsilon \rho^2 \delta.$$

The choice of the sets U_1 and U_2 becomes particularly lucid if we first assume that $z_1^0 = 0$, so let us begin by examining this case. Later we shall see that a simple change of coordinates will allow to reduce to this case for general z_1^0 .

The case $z_1^0 = 0$: We shall want to choose U_2 as large as possible w.r. to y_2 , so we assume that on U_2 we have $|y_2 - y_2^0| \lesssim \rho$. Let

$$a^0 := \tau_0(0, z_2^0),$$

so that $|a^0| \sim \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$. Then we shall assume that on U_2 we have, say, $|\tau_0(0, z_2) - a^0| \ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$.

If $z_1^0 = 0$, this means that we shall **define** U_2 by the following conditions:

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_2 - y_2^0| &\lesssim \rho, \\ |\tau_0(0, z_2) - \tau_0(0, z_2^0)| &= |x_2 + \epsilon h'(y_2) - a^0| \ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta. \end{aligned}$$

As for U_1 , given our choice of U_2 , what we still need is that $|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2) - \tau_0(0, z_2)| \ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$ for all $z_1 \in U_1$ and $z_2 \in U_2$, for then also $|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2) - \tau_0(0, z_2^0)| \ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$ for all such z_1, z_2 .

Note that, for y_2 fixed, the equation

$$0 = \tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2) - \tau_0(0, z_2) = -\left(x_1 + \epsilon[h'(y_1) + \frac{h''(y_1)}{2}(y_2 - y_1)]\right)$$

defines a curve $x_1 = \gamma(y_1)$, so that the condition $|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2) - \tau_0(0, z_2)| \ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$ determines essentially an $\epsilon \rho^2 \delta$ neighborhood of this curve, whose slope $\partial_{y_1} \gamma$ is of order $O(\epsilon)$. Moreover, since y_2 is allowed to vary within U_2 of order $O(\rho)$, and since (3.1) shows that $|\partial_{y_2}(\partial_{y_1} \gamma)| = |\epsilon h'''(y_1)/2| \sim \epsilon$, we see that the natural condition to impose for U_1 is that $\epsilon \rho |y_1 - y_1^0| = \epsilon \rho |y_1| \ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$, i.e.,

$$|y_1| \leq \rho \delta \wedge \rho = \rho(1 \wedge \delta)$$

(note here that, in Subcase 1(a), we may have $\delta \geq 1$). Moreover, by the mean value theorem and (3.1), we have $|h'(y_1)| \sim |h'''(\eta)| y_1^2 \sim C_3 y_1^2$ and $|h''(y_1)| \sim |h'''(\tilde{\eta})| y_1 \sim C_3 |y_1|$ whereas $|y_2 - y_1| \sim \rho$. Thus we see that $|\epsilon[h'(y_1) + \frac{h''(y_1)}{2}(y_2 - y_1)]| \ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$.

In combination, this shows that it will be natural to **define** U_1 by the following conditions:

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_1| &\lesssim \rho(1 \wedge \delta), \\ |x_1| &\ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta. \end{aligned}$$

The case of arbitrary z_1^0 : Let now $z_1^0 := (x_1^0, y_1^0)$ be arbitrary. In a first step we translate the point z_1^0 to the origin by writing $z = z_1^0 + \tilde{z}$, i.e., $x = x_1^0 + \tilde{x}, y = y_1^0 + \tilde{y}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(z) &= \phi(z_1^0 + \tilde{z}) = (x_1^0 + \tilde{x})(y_1^0 + \tilde{y}) + \epsilon h(y_1^0 + \tilde{y}) \\ &= \tilde{x} \tilde{y} + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2} (\tilde{y})^2 + \epsilon H(\tilde{y}) + \text{affine linear terms} \\ &= \left(\tilde{x} + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2} \tilde{y}\right) \tilde{y} + \epsilon H(\tilde{y}) + \text{affine linear terms}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(3.16) \quad H(\tilde{y}) = h(\tilde{y} + y_1^0) - h(y_1^0) - h'(y_1^0)\tilde{y} - \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2}(\tilde{y})^2.$$

By our assumptions (3.1) on ϕ , the error term H satisfies estimates of the form

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{cases} H(0) = H'(0) = H''(0) = 0, \\ |H'''(\tilde{y})| = |h'''(y_1^0 + \tilde{y})| \sim C_3, \\ |H^{(l)}(\tilde{y})| \leq C_l \quad \text{for all } l \geq 4, \end{cases}$$

which means that also H is of cubic type, uniformly in z_1^0 , with the same constants C_l as for h .

It is thus natural to introduce a further change of coordinates

$$(3.18) \quad x'' := \tilde{x} + \epsilon h''(y_1^0)\tilde{y} = x - x_1^0 + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2}(y - y_1^0), \quad y'' := \tilde{y} = y - y_1^0,$$

so that in these coordinates

$$(3.19) \quad \phi(z) = x''y'' + \epsilon H(y'') + \text{affine linear terms.}$$

This shows that in these coordinates (x'', y'') , the function ϕ is again a perturbation of $x''y''$ by a perturbation function $H(y'')$ of cubic type in the sense of (3.1) (up to an affine linear term, which is irrelevant), uniformly in the parameter z_1^0 .

We can now define the sets U_1 and U_2 by choosing them in terms of the coordinates (x'', y'') as in (3.15) and (3.14), only with the function h replaced by H , and then express those sets in terms of our original coordinates (x, y) . Note also that in the coordinates (x'', y'') , we have

$$(x_1'')'' = 0, (y_1'')'' = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (x_2'')'' = x_2^0 - x_1^0 + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2}(y_2^0 - y_1^0), (y_2'')'' = y_2^0 - y_1^0,$$

and $\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2) = x_2'' + \epsilon H'(y_2'')$. In combination with (3.16) this then leads to the following **choices of U_1 and U_2** :

We **define** U_1 by the conditions

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_1 - y_1^0| &\lesssim \rho(1 \wedge \delta), \\ |x_1 - x_1^0 + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2}(y_1 - y_1^0)| &\ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta, \end{aligned}$$

and U_2 by the conditions

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_2 - y_2^0| &\lesssim \rho, \\ |x_2 - x_1^0 + \epsilon [h'(y_2) - h'(y_1^0) - \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2}(y_2 - y_1^0)] - a^0| &\ll \epsilon \rho^2 \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.22) \quad a^0 := \tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)$$

is assumed to be of size $|a^0| \sim \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$.

Note: U_1 is essentially the affine image of a rectangular box of dimension $\epsilon \rho^2 \delta \times \rho(1 \wedge \delta)$. However, when $\delta \ll 1$, then U_2 is a thin curved box, namely the segment of an $\epsilon \rho^2 \delta$ -neighborhood of a curve of curvature $\sim \epsilon$ lying within the horizontal strip where $|y_2 - y_2^0| \lesssim \rho$. On the other hand, when $\delta \gtrsim 1$, then it is easily seen that U_2 is essentially a rectangular box of dimension $\epsilon \rho^2 \delta \times \rho$. This explains why we called Subcase 1(b) where $\delta \ll 1$ the ‘‘curved box case’’, and Subcase 1(a) where $\delta \gtrsim 1$ the ‘‘straight box case.’’

Case 2: Assume that $|\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \geq |\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)|$.

This case can easily be reduced to the previous one by symmetry. By (3.7), we have $\tau_z(z_1, z_2) = -\tau_z(z_2, z_1)$. Hence we just need to interchange the roles of z_1 and z_2 in the previous discussion, so that it is natural here to define \tilde{U}_1 by the conditions

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} & |y_1 - y_1^0| \lesssim \rho, \\ & |x_1 - x_2^0 + \epsilon[h'(y_1) - h'(y_2^0) - \frac{h''(y_2^0)}{2}(y_1 - y_2^0)] - a^0| \ll \epsilon\rho^2\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $a^0 = \tau_{z_2^0}(z_2^0, z_1^0) = -\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)$, and \tilde{U}_2 by the conditions

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & |y_2 - y_2^0| \lesssim \rho(1 \wedge \delta), \\ & |x_2 - x_2^0 + \epsilon\frac{h''(y_2^0)}{2}(y_2 - y_2^0)| \ll \epsilon\rho^2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

3.2. Precise definition of admissible pairs within $Q \times Q$. In view of our discussion in the previous subsection, we shall here devise more precisely certain “dyadic” subsets of $Q \times Q$ which will assume the roles of the sets U_1 , respectively U_2 , in such a way that on every pair of such sets each of our transversality functions is essentially of some fixed dyadic size, and which will moreover lead to a kind of Whitney decomposition of $Q \times Q$ (as will be shown in Section 5). Again, this mimics the approach in [BMV17], namely Section 2.2. To begin with, as before we fix a large dyadic constant $C_0 \gg 1$.

In a first step, we perform a classical **dyadic decomposition in the y -variable** which is a variation of the one in [TVV98]: For a given dyadic number $0 < \rho \lesssim 1$, we denote for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|j|\rho \leq 1$ by $I_{j,\rho}$ the dyadic interval $I_{j,\rho} := [j\rho, j\rho + \rho)$ of length ρ , and by $V_{j,\rho}$ the corresponding horizontal “strip” $V_{j,\rho} := [-1, 1] \times I_{j,\rho}$ within Q . Given two dyadic intervals J, J' of the same size, we say that they are *related* if their parents are adjacent but they are not adjacent. We divide each dyadic interval J in a disjoint union of dyadic subintervals $\{I_j^k\}_{1 \leq k \leq C_0/8}$, of length $8|J|/C_0$. Then, we define (I, I') to be an *admissible pair of dyadic intervals* if and only if there are J and J' related dyadic intervals and $1 \leq k, j \leq C_0/8$ such that $I = I_j^k$ and $I' = I_{j'}^j$.

We say that a pair of strips $(V_{j_1,\rho}, V_{j_2,\rho})$ is *admissible* and write $V_{j_1,\rho} \smile V_{j_2,\rho}$, if $(I_{j_1,\rho}, I_{j_2,\rho})$ is a pair of admissible dyadic intervals. Notice that in this case,

$$(3.25) \quad C_0/8 < |j_2 - j_1| < C_0/2.$$

One can easily see that this leads to the following disjoint decomposition of $Q \times Q$:

$$(3.26) \quad Q \times Q = \dot{\bigcup}_{\rho} \left(\dot{\bigcup}_{V_{j_1,\rho} \smile V_{j_2,\rho}} V_{j_1,\rho} \times V_{j_2,\rho} \right),$$

where the first union is meant to be over all such dyadic ρ 's.

In a second step, we perform a non-standard **Whitney type decomposition of any given admissible pair of strips**, to obtain subregions in which the transversalities are roughly constant.

To simplify notation, we fix ρ and an admissible pair $(V_{j_1, \rho}, V_{j_2, \rho})$, and simply write $I_i := I_{j_i, \rho}$, $V_i := V_{j_i, \rho}$, $i = 1, 2$, so that I_i is an interval of length ρ with left endpoint $j_i \rho$, and

$$(3.27) \quad V_1 = [-1, 1] \times I_1, \quad V_2 = [-1, 1] \times I_2,$$

are rectangles of dimension $2 \times \rho$, which are vertically separated at scale $C_0 \rho$. More precisely, for $z_1 = (x_1, y_1) \in V_1$ and $z_2 = (x_2, y_2) \in V_2$ we have $|y_2 - y_1| \in |j_2 \rho - j_1 \rho| + [-\rho, \rho]$, i.e.,

$$(3.28) \quad C_0 \rho / 2 \leq |y_2 - y_1| \leq C_0 \rho.$$

Let $0 < \delta \lesssim \epsilon^{-1} \rho^{-2}$ be a dyadic number (note that δ could be big, depending on ρ), and let \mathcal{J} be the set of points which partition the interval $[-1, 1]$ into (dyadic) intervals of the same length $\epsilon \rho^2 \delta$.

Similarly, for $i = 1, 2$, we choose a finite equidistant partition \mathcal{I}_i of width $\rho(1 \wedge \delta)$ of the interval I_i by points $y_i^0 \in \mathcal{I}_i$. Note: if $\delta > 1$, then $\rho(1 \wedge \delta) = \rho$, and we can choose for \mathcal{I}_i just the singleton $\mathcal{I}_i = \{y_i^0\}$, where y_i^0 is the left endpoint of I_i . In view of (3.20), (3.21) and in analogy with [BMV17], we then define:

Definition 3.1. For any parameters $x_1^0, t_2^0 \in \mathcal{J}$, $y_1^0 \in \mathcal{I}_1$ defined in the previous lines and y_2^0 the left endpoint of I_2 , we define the sets

$$(3.29) \quad U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta} := \{(x_1, y_1) : 0 \leq y_1 - y_1^0 < \rho(1 \wedge \delta), 0 \leq x_1 - x_1^0 + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2} (y_1 - y_1^0) < \epsilon \rho^2 \delta\},$$

$$U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta} := \{(x_2, y_2) : 0 \leq y_2 - y_2^0 < \rho, \\ 0 \leq x_2 - t_2^0 + \epsilon [h'(y_2) - h'(y_1^0) - \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2} (y_2 - y_1^0)] < \epsilon \rho^2 \delta\},$$

and the points

$$(3.30) \quad z_1^0 = (x_1^0, y_1^0), \quad z_2^0 = (x_2^0, y_2^0)$$

where

$$x_2^0 := t_2^0 - \epsilon [h'(y_2^0) - h'(y_1^0) - \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2} (y_2^0 - y_1^0)].$$

Observe that then

$$z_1^0 \in U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta} \subset V_1 \quad \text{and} \quad z_2^0 \in U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta} \subset V_2.$$

Indeed, z_i^0 is in some sense the “lower left” vertex of U_i , and the horizontal projection of $U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}$ equals I_2 . Moreover, if we define a^0 by (3.22), we have that $x_1^0 + a^0 = t_2^0$, so that our definitions of the sets $U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta}$ and $U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}$ are very close to the ones for the sets U_1 and U_2 (cf. (3.20), (3.21)) in the previous subsection. Notice also that we may re-write

$$(3.31) \quad U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta} = \{z_2 = (x_2, y_2) : 0 \leq \tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2) - a^0 < \epsilon \rho^2 \delta, 0 \leq y_2 - y_2^0 < \rho\}.$$

In particular, $U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta}$ is again essentially a parallelepiped of sidelengths $\sim \epsilon \rho^2 \delta \times \rho(1 \wedge \delta)$, containing the point (x_1^0, y_1^0) , whose longer side has slope y_1^0 with respect to the y -axis. Similarly, if $\delta \ll 1$, then $U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}$ is a thin curved box of width $\sim \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$ and length $\sim \rho$, contained in a rectangle of dimension $\sim \rho^2 \times \rho$ whose axes are parallel to the coordinate axes (namely the part of a $\rho^2 \delta$ -neighborhood of a parabola of curvature $\sim \epsilon$ containing the point

(x_1^0, y_1^0) which lies within the horizontal strip V_2). If $\delta \gtrsim 1$, then $U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}$ is essentially a rectangular box of dimension $\sim \epsilon \rho^2 \delta \times \rho$ lying in the same horizontal strip.

Note also that we have chosen to use the parameter t_2^0 in place of using x_2^0 here, since with this choice by (3.7) the identity

$$(3.32) \quad \tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0) = t_2^0 - x_1^0$$

holds true, which will become quite useful in the sequel. We next have to relate the parameters $x_1^0, t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0$ in order to give a precise definition of an admissible pair.

Here, and in the sequel, we shall always assume that the points z_1^0, z_2^0 associated to these parameters are given by (3.30).

Definition 3.2. *Let us call a pair $(U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta}, U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta})$ an admissible pair of type 1 (at scales δ, ρ and contained in $V_1 \times V_2$), if the following two conditions hold true:*

$$(3.33) \quad \frac{C_0^2}{4} \epsilon \rho^2 \delta \leq |\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| = |t_2^0 - x_1^0| < 4 C_0^2 \epsilon \rho^2 \delta,$$

$$(3.34) \quad \frac{C_0^2}{512} \epsilon \rho^2 (1 \vee \delta) \leq |\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| < 5 C_0^2 \epsilon \rho^2 (1 \vee \delta).$$

By \mathcal{P}^δ we shall denote the set of all admissible pairs of type 1 at scale δ (and ρ , contained in $V_1 \times V_2$), and by \mathcal{P} the corresponding union over all dyadic scales δ .

Observe that, by (3.10), we have $\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0) - \tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0) \sim \epsilon (y_2^0 - y_1^0)^2$. In view of (3.33) and (3.28) this shows that condition (3.34) is automatically satisfied, unless $\delta \sim 1$.

We remark that it would indeed be more appropriate to denote the sets \mathcal{P}^δ by $\mathcal{P}_{V_1 \times V_2}^\delta$, but we want to simplify the notation. In all instances in the rest of the paper \mathcal{P}^δ will be associated to a fixed admissible pair of strips (V_1, V_2) , so that our imprecision will not cause any ambiguity. The next lemma can be proved by closely following the arguments in the proof of the corresponding Lemma 2.1 in [BMV17]:

Lemma 3.1. *If $(U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta}, U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta})$ is an admissible pair of type 1, then for all $(z_1, z_2) \in (U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta}, U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta})$,*

$$|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2)| \sim_8 C_0^2 \epsilon \rho^2 \delta \text{ and } |\tau_{z_2}(z_1, z_2)| \sim_{1000} C_0^2 \epsilon \rho^2 (1 \vee \delta).$$

Up to now we focused on the case $|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2)| \lesssim |\tau_{z_2}(z_1, z_2)|$. For the symmetric case, corresponding to the situation where $|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2)| \gtrsim |\tau_{z_2}(z_1, z_2)|$, by interchanging the roles of z_1 and z_2 we define accordingly for any $t_1^0, x_2^0 \in \mathcal{J}$, y_1^0 the left endpoint of I_1 and $y_2^0 \in \mathcal{I}_2$ the sets $\tilde{U}_1^{t_1^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}$ and $\tilde{U}_2^{x_2^0, y_2^0, \delta}$ in analogy with our discussion in [BMV17], and denote the corresponding admissible pairs $(\tilde{U}_1^{t_1^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}, \tilde{U}_2^{x_2^0, y_2^0, \delta})$ as *admissible pairs of type 2*. We shall skip the details.

By $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^\delta$, we shall denote the set of all admissible pairs of type 2 at scale δ (and ρ , contained in $V_1 \times V_2$), and by $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ the corresponding unions over all dyadic scales δ .

In analogy with Lemma 3.1, we have

Lemma 3.2. *If $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2) = (\tilde{U}_1^{t_1^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}, \tilde{U}_2^{x_2^0, y_2^0, \delta}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^\delta$ is an admissible pair of type 2, then for all $(z_1, z_2) \in (\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2)$ we have*

$$|\tau_{z_1}(z_1, z_2)| \sim_{1000} C_0^2 \epsilon \rho^2 (1 \vee \delta) \text{ and } |\tau_{z_2}(z_1, z_2)| \sim_8 C_0^2 \epsilon \rho^2 \delta.$$

4. THE BILINEAR ESTIMATES

4.1. A prototypical admissible pair in the curved box case and the crucial scaling transformation. In this section we shall present a ‘‘prototypical’’ case where U_1 and U_2 will form an admissible pair of type 1 centered at $z_1^0 = 0 \in U_1$ and $z_2^0 \in U_2$, with $\epsilon \sim 1, \rho \sim 1$ and $\delta \ll 1$, i.e., $|y_1^0 - y_2^0| \sim 1$, and $|\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \sim 1$ but $|\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)| \sim \delta \ll 1$. This means that we shall be in the curved box case. As we will show in Subsection 4.2 in detail, we can always reduce to this particular situation when the two transversalities $\tau_{z_2^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)$ and $\tau_{z_1^0}(z_1^0, z_2^0)$ are of quite different sizes.

Fix a small number $0 < c_0 \ll 1$ ($c_0 = 10^{-10}$ will, for instance, work). Assume that $0 < \delta \leq 1/10$, and put

$$(4.1) \quad U_1 := [0, c_0^2 \delta] \times [0, c_0 \delta]$$

$$(4.2) \quad U_2 := \{(x_2, y_2) : 0 \leq y_2 - b < c_0, 0 \leq x_2 + F'(y_2) - a < c_0^2 \delta\},$$

where $|b| \sim_2 1$, $|a| \sim_4 \delta$ and F is a function of cubic type in the sense of (3.1), i.e.,

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} F(0) = F'(0) = F''(0) = 0, \\ |F'''(y')| \sim C_3, \\ |F^{(l)}(y')| \leq C_l \text{ for all } l \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

Remark. Note that in the case $\epsilon = 1$, if we set $C_0 = 1/c_0$, $\rho = c_0$, then any admissible pair $(U_1, U_2) = (U_1^{0,0,\delta}, U_2^{a,0,b,\delta})$, as in (3.29), would satisfy (4.1) and (4.2) with the above conditions on a and b and suitable F .

Our bilinear result in this prototypical case is as follows:

Theorem 4.1 (prototypical case). *Let $p > 5/3$, and let U_1, U_2 be as in (4.1), (4.2). Assume further that $\phi(x, y) = xy + F(y)$, where F is a real-valued smooth perturbation function of cubic type, i.e., satisfying estimates (4.3), and denote by*

$$\mathcal{E}_{U_i} f(\xi) = \int_{U_i} f(x, y) e^{-i(\xi_1 x + \xi_2 y + \xi_3 \phi(x, y))} \eta(x, y) dx dy, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

the corresponding Fourier extension operators. Then, if the constants c_0 and $\delta \ll 1$ in (4.1), (4.2) are sufficiently small,

$$(4.4) \quad \|\mathcal{E}_{U_1}(f_1), \mathcal{E}_{U_2}(f_2)\|_p \leq C_p \delta^{\frac{7}{2} - \frac{6}{p}} \|f_1\|_2 \|f_2\|_2$$

for every $f_1 \in L^2(U_1)$ and every $f_2 \in L^2(U_2)$, where the constant C_p will only depend on p and the constants C_l in (4.3).

As in [BMV17], it turns out that one cannot directly reduce the bilinear Fourier extension estimates in (4.4) to Lee’s Theorem 1.1 in [L05], since that would not give us the optimal dependence on δ . We shall therefore have to be more precise about the required transversality conditions. However, once we have established the correct transversality conditions in Lemma 4.2 below (which is the direct analogue of Lemma 2.3 in [BMV17]), we can indeed apply our

arguments from the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [BMV17] also in the present situation and arrive at the desired bilinear estimates (4.4).

The crucial step will again consist in the following scaling: we introduce new coordinates (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) by writing $x = \delta\bar{x}, y = \bar{y}$, and then re-scale the phase function ϕ by putting

$$\phi^s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) := \frac{1}{\delta}\phi(\delta\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \bar{x}\bar{y} + \frac{F(\bar{y})}{\delta}.$$

Denote by U_i^s the corresponding re-scaled domains, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} U_1^s &= \{(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1) : 0 \leq \bar{x}_1 < c_0^2, 0 \leq \bar{y}_1 < c_0\delta\}, \\ U_2^s &= \{(\bar{x}_2, \bar{y}_2) : 0 \leq \bar{x}_2 + \frac{F'(\bar{y}_2)}{\delta} - \bar{a} < c_0^2, 0 \leq \bar{y}_2 - \bar{b} < c_0\delta\}, \end{aligned}$$

where c_0 is small and $|\bar{a}| = |a/\delta| \sim 1$ and $\bar{b} = b \sim 1$. By $S_i^s, i = 1, 2$, we denote the corresponding scaled surface patches

$$S_i^s := \{(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \phi^s(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) : (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in U_i^s\}.$$

Observe that

$$\nabla\phi^s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = (\bar{y}, \bar{x} + F'(\bar{y})/\delta),$$

and

$$H\phi^s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & F''(\bar{y})/\delta \end{pmatrix},$$

so that in particular

$$(4.5) \quad |\nabla\phi^s(\bar{z})| \lesssim 1$$

for all $\bar{z} \in U_1^s \cup U_2^s$.

Assume next that $\bar{z}_1 \in U_1^s$ and $\bar{z}_2 \in U_2^s$. Since $|\bar{y}_1| \leq c_0\delta, |\bar{y}_2| \sim 1$, we see that

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} |F'(\bar{y}_1)/\delta| \sim \frac{|F'''(\eta_1)\bar{y}_1^2|}{\delta} \lesssim C_3c_0^2\frac{\delta^2}{\delta} = c_0^2C_3\delta, & |F''(\bar{y}_1)/\delta| \sim \frac{|F'''(\tilde{\eta}_1)\bar{y}_1|}{\delta} \lesssim c_0C_3, \\ |F'(\bar{y}_2)/\delta| \sim \frac{|F'''(\eta_2)\bar{y}_2^2|}{\delta} \sim \frac{C_3}{\delta}, & |F''(\bar{y}_2)/\delta| \sim \frac{|F'''(\tilde{\eta}_2)\bar{y}_2|}{\delta} \sim \frac{C_3}{\delta} \end{cases}$$

(for suitable choices of intermediate points $\eta_i, \tilde{\eta}_i$). Moreover, we then also see that

$$(4.7) \quad \nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_2) - \nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_1) = (\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1, \bar{x}_2 + \frac{F'(\bar{y}_2)}{\delta} - (\bar{x}_1 + \frac{F'(\bar{y}_1)}{\delta})) = (\bar{b}, \bar{a}) + \mathcal{O}(c_0).$$

Following further on the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [BMV17], assume that we translate the two patches of surface S_1^s and S_2^s in such a way that the two points \bar{z}_1 and \bar{z}_2 coincide after translation, and assume that the vector $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is tangent to the corresponding intersection curve $\gamma(t)$ at this point. Then (4.7) shows that we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\omega = (-\bar{a}, \bar{b}) + \mathcal{O}(c_0).$$

In combination with (4.6) this implies that

$$H\phi^s(\bar{z}_i) \cdot {}^t\omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & F''(\bar{y}_i)/\delta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\bar{a} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \\ \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, if $i = 1$, then by (4.6),

$$(4.8) \quad H\phi^s(\bar{z}_1) \cdot {}^t\omega = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \\ -\bar{a} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad |H\phi^s(\bar{z}_1) \cdot {}^t\omega| \sim 1,$$

and if $i = 2$, then

$$(4.9) \quad H\phi^s(\bar{z}_2) \cdot {}^t\omega = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \\ -\bar{a} + \bar{b}F''(\bar{y}_2)/\delta + \mathcal{O}(c_0)/\delta \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad |H\phi^s(\bar{z}_2) \cdot {}^t\omega| \sim 1/\delta,$$

if $\delta \ll 1$ is sufficiently small.

Following [BMV17], the refined transversalities that we need to control are given by

$$(4.10) \quad |TV_i^s(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)| := \left| \frac{\det({}^t(\nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_1) - \nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_2)), H\phi^s(\bar{z}_i) \cdot {}^t\omega)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_1)|^2} \sqrt{1 + |\nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_2)|^2} |H\phi^s(\bar{z}_i) \cdot {}^t\omega|} \right|, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

But, if $i = 1$, then by (4.7), (4.9), (4.5) and (4.6) we see that

$$|\det({}^t(\nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_1) - \nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_2)), H\phi^s(\bar{z}_1) \cdot {}^t\omega)| = \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) & \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \\ \bar{a} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) & -\bar{a} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \end{pmatrix} \right| \sim 1,$$

hence $|TV_1^s(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)| \sim 1$.

And, if $i = 2$, then by (4.7), (4.8), (4.5) and (4.6) we have

$$|\det({}^t(\nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_1) - \nabla\phi^s(\bar{z}_2)), H\phi^s(\bar{z}_2) \cdot {}^t\omega)| = \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) & \bar{b} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) \\ \bar{a} + \mathcal{O}(c_0) & -\bar{a} + \bar{b}F''(\bar{y}_2)/\delta + \mathcal{O}(c_0)/\delta \end{pmatrix} \right|,$$

hence also $|TV_2^s(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)| \sim (1/\delta)/(1/\delta) \sim 1$, provided δ and c_0 are sufficiently small.

We have thus proved the following lemma, from which Theorem 4.1 can easily be derived, as explained before, by applying the arguments from [BMV17]:

Lemma 4.2. *The transversalities for the scaled patches of surface S_i^s , $i = 1, 2$, satisfy*

$$|TV_i^s(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)| \sim 1, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

We should again like to mention that estimate (4.4) could alternatively also be deduced from Candy's Theorem 1.4 in [Can17], after applying the crucial scaling in x that we used in the first step of our proof.

4.2. Reduction to the prototypical case. Our next goal will be to establish the following analogues of the bilinear Fourier extension estimates in Theorem 3.1 of [BMV17]:

Theorem 4.3. *Let $p > 5/3$, $q \geq 2$. Then, for every admissible pair $(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}^\delta$ at scale δ , the following bilinear estimates hold true: If $\delta > 1$ and $\epsilon\delta\rho^2 \leq 1$, then*

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{U_1}(f)\mathcal{E}_{U_2}(g)\|_p \leq C_{p,q}(\epsilon\delta\rho^3)^{2(1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \|f\|_q \|g\|_q.$$

If $\delta \leq 1$, then

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{U_1}(f)\mathcal{E}_{U_2}(g)\|_p \leq C_{p,q}(\epsilon\rho^3)^{2(1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \delta^{5-\frac{3}{q}-\frac{6}{p}} \|f\|_q \|g\|_q.$$

The constants in these estimates are independent of the given admissible pair, of ϵ, ρ and of δ . The same estimates are valid for admissible pairs $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^\delta$ of type 2.

Fix $p > 5/3$ and $q \geq 2$, and assume that $U_1 = U_1^{x_1^0, y_1^0, \delta}$ and $U_2 = U_2^{t_2^0, y_1^0, y_2^0, \delta}$ form an admissible pair of type 1. We shall only discuss the case of admissible pairs of type 1; the type 2 case can be handled in the same way by symmetry.

We shall see that the bilinear estimates associated to the sets U_1, U_2 can easily be reduced by means of a suitable affine-linear transformation to either the classical bilinear estimate in [L05], when $\delta \geq 1/10$, or to the estimate for the special ‘‘prototype’’ situation given in Subsection 4.1, when $\delta \leq 1/10$.

We first change to the coordinates (x'', y'') introduced in (3.18), which allows to reduce to the case where $(z_1^0)'' = 0$ and $(z_2^0)'' = (x_2^0 - x_1^0 + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2}(y_2^0 - y_1^0), y_2^0 - y_1^0)$. Recall, however, that we need here to replace our original perturbation $h(y)$ by the cubic type perturbation $H(y'')$ (compare (3.17)). In these coordinates, U_1 corresponds to the set

$$U_1'' := \{(x_1'', y_1'') : 0 \leq y_1'' < \rho(1 \wedge \delta), 0 \leq x_1'' < \epsilon \rho^2 \delta\},$$

and U_2 to the set

$$U_2'' = \{(x_2'', y_2'') : 0 \leq x_2'' + \epsilon H'(y_2'') - a^0 < \epsilon \rho^2 \delta, 0 \leq y_2'' - (y_2'')^0 < \rho\},$$

where $a^0 := t_2^0 - x_1^0$ and $(y_2'')^0 := y_2^0 - y_1^0 \sim C_0 \rho$ (compare (3.31) and (3.28), and note that $\tau_0(0, z_2'') = x_2'' + \epsilon H'(y_2'')$ in the coordinates (x'', y'')). Recall also from (3.33) that $|a^0| \sim C_0^2 \epsilon \rho^2 \delta$.

This suggests to apply the following **scaling**: we change to yet other coordinates $z' = (x', y')$ by writing

$$(4.11) \quad y'' = \rho y', \quad x'' = \epsilon \rho^2 (1 \vee \delta) x'.$$

Let us accordingly introduce the function

$$(4.12) \quad F(y') := \frac{H(\rho y')}{\rho^3},$$

and note that the crucial phase function $x'' y'' + \epsilon H(y'')$ that arose from ϕ in (3.19) after the change to the coordinates (x'', y'') assumes the following form in the coordinates (x', y') :

$$(4.13) \quad x'' y'' + \epsilon H(y'') = \epsilon \rho^3 (1 \vee \delta) \left(x' y' + \frac{F(y')}{1 \vee \delta} \right) =: \epsilon \rho^3 (1 \vee \delta) \phi_\delta(x', y').$$

Observe that also the function F is a perturbation function of cubic type, uniformly also in ϵ and ρ . Indeed, the following holds true:

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{cases} F(0) = F'(0) = F''(0) = 0, \\ |F'''(y')| = |H'''(\rho y')| \sim C_3, \\ |F^{(l)}(y')| = |\rho^{l-3} H^{(l)}(\rho y')| \leq C_l \quad \text{for all } l \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

Thus, altogether we define a change of coordinates $z' = T(z)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} x' &:= \epsilon^{-1} (1 \vee \delta)^{-1} \rho^{-2} (x - x_1^0 + \epsilon \frac{h''(y_1^0)}{2} (y - y_1^0)), \\ y' &:= \rho^{-1} (y - y_1^0). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the following lemma, in the case $\delta \leq 1/10$, corresponds to the prototypical setup up to another harmless scaling $(x', y') = (C_0^2 x''', C_0 y''')$.

Lemma 4.4. *We have*

$$(4.15) \quad \phi(z) = \epsilon \rho^3 (1 \vee \delta) \phi_\delta(Tz) + L(z),$$

where L is an affine-linear map. Moreover, in these new coordinates, U_1, U_2 correspond to the sets

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} U'_1 &:= \{(x'_1, y'_1) : 0 \leq y'_1 < 1 \wedge \delta, 0 \leq x'_1 < 1 \wedge \delta\} = [0, 1 \wedge \delta]^2, \\ U'_2 &= \{(x'_2, y'_2) : 0 \leq x'_2 + \frac{F'(y'_2)}{1 \vee \delta} - a < 1 \wedge \delta, 0 \leq y'_2 - b < 1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $|b| := |\rho^{-1}(y_2^0 - y_1^0)| \sim_2 C_0$ and $|a| := |\epsilon^{-1} \rho^{-2} (1 \vee \delta)^{-1} (t_2^0 - x_1^0)| \sim_4 C_0^2 \frac{\delta}{1 \vee \delta} = C_0^2 (1 \wedge \delta)$. Moreover, for Lee's transversality expression Γ^{ϕ_δ} in (3.3) for ϕ_δ , we have that

$$(4.17) \quad |\Gamma_{\tilde{z}'_1}^{\phi_\delta}(z'_1, z'_2)| \sim C_0^3 (1 \wedge \delta) \quad \text{for all } \tilde{z}'_1 \in U'_1, \quad |\Gamma_{\tilde{z}'_2}^{\phi_\delta}(z'_1, z'_2)| \sim C_0^3 \quad \text{for all } \tilde{z}'_2 \in U'_2,$$

for every $z'_1 \in U'_1$ and every $z'_2 \in U'_2$. Also, for $\delta \geq 1/10$, the derivatives of ϕ_δ can be uniformly (independently of δ) bounded from above.

The proof, if not clear from our previous discussions, is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4 in [BMV17], so we will skip the details.

Reduction of Theorem 4.3 to Theorem 4.1. Consider the scaled sets U'_1, U'_2 from Lemma 4.4.

The case $\delta > 1/10$.¹ In this case, we see that, U'_1 and U'_2 are squares of small side length $2c_0$, separated by a distance of size 1, and moreover (4.17) shows that all relevant transversalities are of size 1. Therefore we see that the conditions of Lee's Theorem 1.1 in [L05] are satisfied for the patches of surface S'_1 and S'_2 which are the graphs of ϕ_δ (defined in (4.13)) over the sets U'_1 and U'_2 . This implies that for these patches of surface, we obtain uniform bilinear Fourier extension estimates when $p > 5/3$ and $q \geq 2$, of the form

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{U'_1}(\tilde{f}) \mathcal{E}_{U'_2}(\tilde{g})\|_p \leq C_{p,q} \|\tilde{f}\|_q \|\tilde{g}\|_q,$$

with a constant $C_{p,q}$ which is independent of the choice of $x_1^0, y_1^0, t_2^0, y_2^0, \epsilon, \rho$ and δ . By scaling back to our original coordinates, we thus arrive at the estimate in the first case of Theorem 4.3 (compare with the scaling argument in Sections 2.5 and 3 of [BMV17]).

The case $\delta \leq 1/10$. By a harmless scaling $(x', y') = (C_0^2 x, C_0 y)$, the sets U'_1 and U'_2 given by (4.16) transform to

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} U_1 &= \{(x_1, y_1) : 0 \leq x_1 < c_0^2 \delta, 0 \leq y_1 < c_0 \delta\} = [0, c_0^2 \delta] \times [0, c_0 \delta], \\ U_2 &= \{(x_2, y_2) : 0 \leq x_2 + c_0^2 F'(\frac{y_2}{c_0}) - a < c_0^2 \delta, 0 \leq y_2 - b < c_0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0 = C_0^{-1}$ is small and $|a| \sim \delta$ and $b \sim 1$. Recall also that $c_0^3 F(\frac{y_2}{c_0})$ satisfies the cubic type estimates (4.14). For the sake of simplicity, let us denote this perturbation of cubic type again by F , so that in this case the phase ϕ_δ , given by (4.13), can be written as

$$\phi_\delta(x', y') = x' y' + F(y').$$

¹We don't need to distinguish precisely the two cases $\delta > 1$ and $\delta \leq 1$ from the Theorem, since the desired bounds are comparable for $\delta \sim 1$.

This means that we are in the prototypical situation. The claimed estimates for Case 2 in Theorem 4.3 will now follow directly from Theorem 4.1 for the prototypical case in combination with Hölder's inequality (to pass from L^2 -norms to L^q -norms), if we again scale back to our original coordinates. \square

5. THE WHITNEY-DECOMPOSITION AND PASSAGE TO LINEAR RESTRICTION ESTIMATES:
PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, let us finally briefly sketch how to pass from the bilinear estimates in Theorem 4.1 to the crucial linear estimate in (2.5). Again we shall closely follow our approach in [BMV17] and only indicate the necessary changes. Let (V_1, V_2) be an admissible pair of strips as defined in Subsection 3.2. Recall the definition of admissible pairs of sets from the same subsection, and that we had also introduced there the sets \mathcal{P}^δ respectively $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^\delta$ of admissible pairs of type 1 respectively type 2 at scale δ , and by \mathcal{P} respectively $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ we had denoted the corresponding unions over all dyadic scales δ . The next lemma is in direct analogy to Lemma 4.1 in [BMV17] and can be proved in a similar fashion.

Lemma 5.1. *The following covering and overlapping properties hold true:*

- (i) *For fixed dyadic scale δ , the subsets $U_1 \times U_2$, $(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}^\delta$, of $V_1 \times V_2 \subset Q \times Q$ are pairwise disjoint, as likewise are the subsets $\tilde{U}_1 \times \tilde{U}_2$, $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^\delta$.*
- (ii) *If δ and δ' are dyadic scales, and if $(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}^\delta$ and $(U'_1, U'_2) \in \mathcal{P}^{\delta'}$, then the sets $U_1 \times U_2$ and $U'_1 \times U'_2$ can only intersect if $\delta/\delta' \sim_{2^7} 1$. In the latter case, there is only bounded overlap. I.e., there is a constant $M \leq 2^6$ such that for every $(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}^\delta$ there are at most M pairs $(U'_1, U'_2) \in \mathcal{P}^{\delta'}$ such that $(U_1 \times U_2) \cap (U'_1 \times U'_2) \neq \emptyset$, and vice versa. The analogous statements apply to admissible pairs in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.*
- (iii) *If $(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}^\delta$ and $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\delta'}$, then $U_1 \times U_2$ and $\tilde{U}_1 \times \tilde{U}_2$ are disjoint too, except possibly when both $\delta, \delta' \geq 1/800$ and $\delta \sim_{2^{10}} \delta'$. In the latter case, there is only bounded overlap. I.e., there is a constant $N = \mathcal{O}(C_0)$ such that for every $(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}^\delta$ there are at most N pairs $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\delta'}$ such that $(U_1 \times U_2) \cap (\tilde{U}_1 \times \tilde{U}_2) \neq \emptyset$, and vice versa.*
- (iv) *The product sets associated to all admissible pairs cover $V_1 \times V_2$ up to a set of measure 0, i.e.,*

$$V_1 \times V_2 = \left(\bigcup_{(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}} U_1 \times U_2 \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}} \tilde{U}_1 \times \tilde{U}_2 \right)$$

in measure.

To handle the bounded overlap between the sets $U_1 \times U_2$ for pairs of admissible sets $(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}$ of type 1 in Lemma 5.1, we define for $\nu = 0, \dots, 9$ the subset $\mathcal{P}_\nu := \bigcup_j \mathcal{P}^{2^{10j+\nu}}$ of \mathcal{P} . To these, we associate the subsets

$$A_\nu := \bigcup_{(U_1, U_2) \in \mathcal{P}_\nu} U_1 \times U_2, \quad \nu = 0, \dots, 9,$$

and likewise introduce the corresponding subsets \tilde{A}_ν associated to admissible pairs of type 2. Then we may argue as in [BMV17] to show that it will suffice to prove restriction estimates over these sets A_ν , respectively \tilde{A}_ν , over which we have “decoupled” the overlaps. Let us just look at the sets A_ν in the sequel.

To prove Theorem 1.1, assume that $r > 10/3$ and $1/q' > 2/r$, and put $p := r/2$, so that $p > 5/3$, $1/q' > 1/p$. By interpolation with the trivial estimate for $r = \infty, q = 1$, it is enough to prove the result for r close to $10/3$ and q close to $5/2$, i.e., p close to $5/3$ and q close to $5/2$. Hence, we may assume that $p < 2$, $p < q < 2p$. Also, we can assume that $\text{supp } f \subset \{(x, y) \in Q : y \geq 0\}$.

As in [BMV17], we easily see that it will suffice to prove the following: assume a scale ρ is fixed, and that $V_1 \sim V_2$ is an admissible pair of strips at scale ρ (as defined in (3.27) of Subsection 3.2). Then the following holds true:

Lemma 5.2. *If $V_1 \sim V_2$ form an admissible pair of “strips” $V_i = V_{j_i, \rho} = [-1, 1] \times I_{j_i, \rho}$, $i = 1, 2$, at scale ρ within Q , and if $f \in L^q(V_1)$ and $g \in L^q(V_2)$, then for $5/3 < p < 2$, $p < q < 2p$ we have*

$$(5.1) \quad \|\mathcal{E}_{V_1}(f)\mathcal{E}_{V_2}(g)\|_p \lesssim C_{p,q} \rho^{2(1-1/p-1/q)} \|f\|_q \|g\|_q \text{ for all } f \in L^q(V_1), g \in L^q(V_2).$$

We remark that, eventually, we shall choose $f = g$, but for the arguments to follow it is helpful to distinguish between f and g .

To prove this lemma, observe first that by means of an affine linear transformation we may “move the strips V_1, V_2 vertically” so that $j_1 = 0$, which means that V_1 contains the origin and, by (3.25), $j_2 \sim C_0$. This we shall assume throughout the proof.

As mentioned before, it will suffice to estimate $E((f \otimes g)\chi_{A_\nu})$ in place of $\mathcal{E}_{V_1}(f)\mathcal{E}_{V_2}(g)$, and the same arguments as in [BMV17] then show that we may decompose

$$(f \otimes g)\chi_{A_\nu} = \sum_{\delta} \sum_{i, i', j} f_{i,j}^{\delta} \otimes g_{i',j}^{\delta},$$

where

$$f_{i,j}^{\delta} = f \chi_{U_1^{i\epsilon\rho^2\delta, j\rho(1\wedge\delta), \delta}}, \quad g_{i',j}^{\delta} = g \chi_{U_2^{i'\epsilon\rho^2\delta, j\rho(1\wedge\delta), j_2\rho, \delta}},$$

and where each $(U_1^{i\epsilon\rho^2\delta, j\rho(1\wedge\delta), \delta}, U_2^{i'\epsilon\rho^2\delta, j\rho(1\wedge\delta), j_2\rho, \delta})$ forms an admissible pair, i.e., (3.33), (3.34) are satisfied. This means in particular that $|i - i'| \sim C_0^2$. The summation in δ is here meant as summation over all dyadic δ such that $\delta \lesssim (\epsilon\rho^2)^{-1}$.

We may and shall also assume that f and g are supported on the set $\{y \geq 0\}$. Then

$$(5.2) \quad E((f \otimes g)\chi_{A_\nu}) = \sum_{\delta \gtrsim 1} \sum_{i, i'} \widehat{f_i^{\delta}} \widehat{g_{i',j}^{\delta}} + \sum_{\delta \ll 1} \sum_{i, i', j} \widehat{f_{i,j}^{\delta}} \widehat{g_{i',j}^{\delta}} d\sigma.$$

The first sum can be treated by more classical arguments (compare, e.g., [L05] or [V05]), which in view of the first estimate in Proposition 4.3 then leads to a bound for the contribution of that sum to $\|\mathcal{E}_{V_1}(f)\mathcal{E}_{V_2}(g)\|_p$ in (5.1) of the order

$$\sum_{1 \lesssim \delta \lesssim (\epsilon\rho^2)^{-1}} C_{p,q} (\delta\epsilon\rho^3)^{2(1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \|f\|_q \|g\|_q \lesssim \rho^{2(1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \|f\|_q \|g\|_q,$$

as required. We leave the details to the interested reader. Note that for this first sum, there is no gain when $\epsilon > 0$ is getting small (which is to be expected), in contrast to what will happen for the second sum.

We shall now concentrate on the second sum in (5.2) where $\delta \ll 1$. Here, the admissibility conditions reduce to $|i - i'| \sim C_0^2$, $j_2 \sim C_0$.

We fix δ , and simplify notation by writing $f_{i,j} := f_{i,j}^\delta$, $g_{i,j} := g_{i,j}^\delta$, and $U_{1,i,j} := U_1^{i\epsilon\rho^2\delta,j\rho(1\wedge\delta),\delta}$, $U_{2,i',j} := U_2^{i'\epsilon\rho^2\delta,j\rho(1\wedge\delta),j2\rho,\delta}$.

As a first step in proving estimate (5.1), we exploit some almost orthogonality with respect to the x -coordinate, following a classical approach (compare, e.g., [MVV96], [MVV99]).

Lemma 5.3. *For $1 \leq p \leq 2$, we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{i, |i-i'| \sim C_0^2, j} \widehat{f_{i,j} d\sigma} \widehat{g_{i',j} d\sigma} \right\|_p^p \lesssim \sum_{N=0}^{(\epsilon\rho^2)^{-1}} \left\| \sum_{\substack{i \in [N\delta^{-1}, (N+1)\delta^{-1}], \\ |i-i'| \sim C_0^2, j}} \widehat{f_{i,j} d\sigma} \widehat{g_{i',j} d\sigma} \right\|_p^p.$$

Proof. Assume that $i \in [N\delta^{-1}, (N+1)\delta^{-1}]$, and that $z_1 = (x_1, y_1) \in U_{1,i,j}$ and $z_2 = (x_2, y_2) \in U_{2,i',j}$, where $|i - i'| \sim C_0^2$, which means that $(U_{1,i,j}, U_{2,i',j}) \in \mathcal{P}^\delta$ is an admissible pair. Then, in a similar way as in the proof of the corresponding lemma in [BMV17], by means of Taylor expansions (where we only need to make use of the estimates for third derivatives of h) one sees that $|x_2 - x_1| \lesssim CC_0^2\epsilon\rho^2$. This implies that $x_1 + x_2 = 2N\epsilon\rho^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon\rho^2)$, where the constant in the error term is of order C_0^2 , hence

$$U_{1,i,j} + U_{2,i',j} \subset [2N\epsilon\rho^2 - CC_0^2\epsilon\rho^2, 2N\epsilon\rho^2 + CC_0^2\epsilon\rho^2] \times [0, 2C_0\rho].$$

These statements become even more lucid if we first apply the scaling $y = \rho y'$, $x = \epsilon\rho^2 x'$, that we had already introduced in (4.11), for then we may assume that in our definition of the sets $U_{1,i,j}, U_{2,i',j}$ we have $\epsilon = 1$ and $\rho = 1$. We also remark that the constant C will depend here only on the constant C_3 which controls third derivatives of h in (3.1).

Notice that the family of intervals $\{[2N\epsilon\rho^2 - CC_0^2\epsilon\rho^2, 2N\epsilon\rho^2 + CC_0^2\epsilon\rho^2]\}_{N=0}^{(\epsilon\rho^2)^{-1}}$ is almost pairwise disjoint. Therefore we may argue as in the proof of Lemma 6.1 in [TVV98] in order to derive the desired estimate. \square

We proceed in analogy with [BMV17]: $U_{1,i,j}$ is a rectangular box, now of dimension $\epsilon\rho^2\delta \times \rho\delta$, and we shall further decompose the curved box $U_{2,i',j}$ into essentially rectangular boxes of the same dimensions $\epsilon\rho^2\delta \times \rho\delta$, by decomposing them in the y -coordinate into $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta)$ intervals of length $\rho\delta$. I.e., we shall put

$$U_{2,i',j}^k := \{(x, y) \in U_{2,i',j} : 0 \leq y - k\rho\delta < \rho\delta\}.$$

Then

$$U_{2,i',j} = \bigcup_k U_{2,i',j}^k,$$

where the union is over a set of $\mathcal{O}(1/\delta)$ indices k . Accordingly, we decompose $g_{i',j} = \sum_k g_{i',j}^k$, where $g_{i',j}^k := g\chi_{U_{2,i',j}^k}$. Then we have the following uniform square function estimate:

Lemma 5.4. *For $1 < p \leq 2$ there exists a constant $C_p > 0$ such that for every $N = 0, \dots, (\epsilon\rho^2)^{-1}$ we have*

$$(5.3) \quad \left\| \sum_{\substack{i \in [N\delta^{-1}, (N+1)\delta^{-1}], \\ |i-i'| \sim C_0^2, j}} \widehat{f_{i,j} d\sigma} \widehat{g_{i',j} d\sigma} \right\|_p \leq C_p \left\| \left(\sum_{\substack{i \in [N\delta^{-1}, (N+1)\delta^{-1}], \\ |i-i'| \sim C_0^2, j, k}} |\widehat{f_{i,j} d\sigma} \widehat{g_{i',j}^k d\sigma}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_p.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.4: Notice first that a translation in x by $N\rho^2$ allows to reduce to the case $N = 0$, which we shall thus assume. Then the relevant sets $U_{1,i,j}$ and $U_{2,i',j}$ will all have their x -coordinates in the interval $[0, \epsilon\rho^2]$.

For i, i', j, k as above, set $S_{1,i,j} := \{(\xi, \phi(\xi)) : \xi \in U_{1,i,j}\}$, $S_{2,i',j}^k := \{(\xi, \phi(\xi)) : \xi \in U_{2,i',j}^k\}$, and denote by $(x', y') = D_{\epsilon,\rho}(x, y) := (\epsilon\rho^2x, \rho y)$ the scaling transformation which changes coordinates from $z = (x, y)$ to $z' = (x', y')$. The key to the square function estimate (5.3) is the following almost orthogonality lemma:

Lemma 5.5. *Assume $N = 0$, and denote by $\tilde{D}_{\epsilon,\rho} > 0$, the scaling transformation on the ambient space \mathbb{R}^3 which is given by $\tilde{D}_{\epsilon,\rho}(x, y, w) := (\epsilon\rho^2x, \rho y, \epsilon\rho^3w)$. Then there is a family of cubes $\{Q_{i,i',j}^k\}_{i \in [0, \delta^{-1}], |i-i'| \sim C_0^2, j, k}$ in \mathbb{R}^3 with bounded overlap, whose sides are parallel to the coordinate axes and of length $\sim \delta$, such that $S_{1,i,j} + S_{2,i',j}^k \subset \tilde{D}_{\epsilon,\rho}(Q_{i,i',j}^k)$.*

We remark that the amount of the overlap is in fact entirely controlled by the size of the constant C_3 in (3.1) (and on our choice of C_0), but not on the constants C_l for $l \geq 4$ in (3.1).

Proof of Lemma 5.5: Note first that by our assumptions we have $V_1, V_2 \subset [0, 1] \times [0, 2C_0\rho]$. Since

$$\tilde{D}_{\epsilon,\rho}^{-1}(D_{\epsilon,\rho}(z'), \phi(D_{\epsilon,\rho}(z'))) = (x', y', x'y' + F(y'))$$

(compare Subsection 4.2), we may apply this scaling in order to reduce our considerations to the case where $\epsilon = \rho = 1$, if we replace the perturbation term h by the function F which, according to (4.14), shares the same type of estimates as h . Notice also that, after scaling, the sets corresponding to V_1, V_2 in the new coordinates then satisfy $V_1, V_2 \subset [0, (\epsilon\rho^2)^{-1}] \times [0, 2C_0]$.

Therefore, from now on we shall work under these assumptions, denoting the new coordinates again by (x, y) in place of (x', y') , in order to defray the notation.

Notice also that if $i \in [0, \delta^{-1}], |i - i'| \sim C_0^2$, then the corresponding patches of surface $S_{1,i,j}$ and $S_{2,i',j}^k$ are contained in boxes of side length, say, 2δ , and sides parallel to the axes, whose projections to the x -axis lie within the unit interval $[0, 1]$. Therefore we can choose for $Q_{i,i',j}^k$ a square of side length 4δ , with sides parallel to the axes, with the property that $S_{1,i,j} + S_{2,i',j}^k \subset Q_{i,i',j}^k$. We shall prove that the overlap is bounded, with a bound depending only on C_0 and the constant C_3 in (3.1).

Note that, if $(x_1, y_1) \in U_{1,i,j}$ and $(x_2, y_2) \in U_{2,i',j}^k$ with $|i - i'| \sim C_0^2$, then, by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$|x_2 - x_1 + F'(y_2) - F'(y_1) - \frac{1}{2}F''(y_1)(y_2 - y_1)| \sim C_0^2\delta.$$

It suffices to prove the following: if $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ and $(x'_1, y'_1), (x'_2, y'_2)$ are so that each coordinate of these points is bounded by a large multiple of C_0 , the y -coordinates are positive and satisfy $y_2 - y_1 \gtrsim C_0, y'_2 - y'_1 \gtrsim C_0$ (by the y -separation (3.28)), and

$$\begin{aligned} x_2 - x_1 + F'(y_2) - F'(y_1) - \frac{1}{2}F''(y_1)(y_2 - y_1) &\sim C_0^2\delta, \\ x'_2 - x'_1 + F'(y'_2) - F'(y'_1) - \frac{1}{2}F''(y'_1)(y'_2 - y'_1) &\sim C_0^2\delta, \\ x_1 + x_2 &= x'_1 + x'_2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \\ y_1 + y_2 &= y'_1 + y'_2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \\ x_1y_1 + F(y_1) + x_2y_2 + F(y_2) &= x'_1y'_1 + F(y'_1) + x'_2y'_2 + F(y'_2) + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$(5.4) \quad x'_1 = x_1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad y'_1 = y_1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad x'_2 = x_2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad y'_2 = y_2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta).$$

To prove this, set

$$a := x_1 + x_2, \quad b := y_1 + y_2, \quad a' := x'_1 + x'_2, \quad b' := y'_1 + y'_2,$$

and

$$t_1 := x_1 y_1 + F(y_1), \quad t_2 := x_2 y_2 + F(y_2).$$

The analogous quantities defined by $(x'_1, y'_1), (x'_2, y'_2)$ are denoted by t'_1 and t'_2 . Notice that by our assumptions, a and b only vary of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ if we replace $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ by $(x'_1, y'_1), (x'_2, y'_2)$. Then,

$$t_1 + t_2 = 2x_1 y_1 - b x_1 - a y_1 + ab + F(y_1) + F(b - y_1).$$

We next choose c with $|c| \sim C_0^2$, such that $x_2 - x_1 + F'(y_2) - F'(y_1) - \frac{1}{2}F''(y_1)(y_2 - y_1) = c\delta$. Then we may re-write

$$x_1 = (a - c\delta + F'(b - y_1) - F'(y_1) - \frac{1}{2}F''(y_1)(b - 2y_1))/2,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 + t_2 &= \left(y_1 - \frac{b}{2}\right) \left(a - c\delta + F'(b - y_1) - F'(y_1) - F''(y_1)\left(\frac{b}{2} - y_1\right)\right) \\ &\quad - a y_1 + ab + F(y_1) + F(b - y_1) \\ &= ab/2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta) + \psi(y_1), \end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$\psi(y) := \left(y - \frac{b}{2}\right) [F'(b - y) - F'(y) + \left(y - \frac{b}{2}\right) F''(y)] + F(y) + F(b - y).$$

We compute that the derivative of ψ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(y) &= \left(y - \frac{b}{2}\right) [F''(y) - F''(b - y) + \left(y - \frac{b}{2}\right) F'''(y)] \\ (5.5) \quad &= \left(y - \frac{b}{2}\right)^2 [2F'''(\eta) + F'''(y)], \end{aligned}$$

where η is some intermediate point between y and $b - y$.

Similarly, $t'_1 + t'_2 = a'b'/2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta) + \psi(y'_1)$. Since $a = a' + \mathcal{O}(\delta), b = b' + \mathcal{O}(\delta)$, hence $ab = a'b' + \mathcal{O}(\delta)$. By our assumption, $t_1 + t_2 = t'_1 + t'_2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)$, we conclude that

$$(5.6) \quad \psi(y_1) = \psi(y'_1) + \mathcal{O}(\delta).$$

Here, the implicit constant in $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ depends so far only on C_0 . But, because of the y -separation (3.28), we have $|y_2 - y_1| \gtrsim C_0$, and since $b = y_2 + y_1$, we see that $|y_1 - b/2| \sim C_0$. Moreover, since $|F'''| \sim C_3$, so that F''' in particular does not change sign, we deduce from (5.5) that for all relevant y 's we have

$$|\psi'(y)| \sim C_3 |y - b/2|^2 \sim C_3 C_0^2 \gg 1,$$

if we choose C_0 sufficiently large.

In combination with (5.6) this shows that we must have $y'_1 = y_1 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)$, where the implicit constant in $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$ depends only on C_3 and C_0 , hence also $y'_2 = y_2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta)$, and then our first three assumptions imply also the remaining assertions in (5.4).

This finishes the proof of the almost orthogonality Lemma 5.5. \square

By means of the preceding lemmas and Rubio de Francia's estimate [RdF83] (see also [Car67], [Co81]) we can now argue in almost exactly the same way as in [BMV17] in order to estimate the contribution of the second sum $\sum_{\delta \ll 1} \sum_{i,i',j} \widehat{f_{i,j}^\delta} \widehat{d\sigma g_{i',j}^\delta} d\sigma$ in (5.2) to $\|\mathcal{E}_{V_1}(f)\mathcal{E}_{V_2}(g)\|_p$ in (5.1). In this way, we see that it is of the order

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\delta \ll 1} C_{p,q} \epsilon^{2(1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \delta^{5-2/q-7/p} \rho^{6(1-1/p-1/q)} \|f\|_q \|g\|_q \\ & \lesssim C_{p,q} \epsilon^{2(1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \rho^{6(1-1/p-1/q)} \|f\|_q \|g\|_q. \end{aligned}$$

This estimate is even stronger than the required estimate in (5.1). Notice that the additional factor $\epsilon^{2(1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})}$ appears here, due to the estimate in Theorem 4.3 for Case 2, which was not present in [BMV17] (where we had $\epsilon = 1$). Also, the power of ρ is better than needed, but these gains do not help for the total estimate of $\|\mathcal{E}_{V_1}(f)\mathcal{E}_{V_2}(g)\|_p$, because of the presence of first sum in (5.2), in which $\delta \gtrsim 1$. We leave the details to the interested reader.

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.2. \square

By means of Lemma 5.2, we may finally argue as in the last part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [BMV17] in order to sum the contributions by all admissible pairs of “horizontal strips” $V_1 \sim V_2$ and arrive at the estimate (2.5), thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

REFERENCES

- [Be16] Bejenaru, I., Optimal bilinear restriction estimates for general hypersurfaces and the role of the shape operator. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2017), no. 23, 7109–7147.
- [Bo91] Bourgain, J., Besicovitch-type maximal operators and applications to Fourier analysis. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 22 (1991), 147–187.
- [Bo95a] Bourgain, J., Some new estimates on oscillatory integrals. *Essays in Fourier Analysis in honor of E. M. Stein*. Princeton Math. Ser. 42, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ 1995, 83–112.
- [Bo95b] Bourgain, J., Estimates for cone multipliers. *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.* 77 (1995), 1–16.
- [BoG11] Bourgain, J., Guth, L., Bounds on oscillatory integral operators based on multilinear estimates. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, Vol.21 (2011) 1239–1295.
- [BMV16] Buschenhenke, S., Müller, D., Vargas, A., A Fourier restriction theorem for a two-dimensional surface of finite type. *Anal. PDE* 10-4 (2017), 817–891.
- [BMV17] Buschenhenke, S., Müller, D., Vargas, A., A Fourier restriction theorem for a perturbed hyperboloid. arXiv:1803.02711v2; to appear in *Proc. London Math. Soc.*
- [Can17] Candy, T., Multi-scale bilinear restriction estimates for general phases. *Math. Annalen*; <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-019-01841-4>.
- [Car67] Carleson, L., On the Littlewood-Paley theorem. Report, Mittag-Leffler Inst., Djursholm, 1967.
- [ChL17] Cho, C.-H., Lee, J., Improved restriction estimate for hyperbolic surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 . *J. Funct. Anal.* 273 (2017), no. 3, 917–945.
- [Co81] Córdoba, A., Some remarks on the Littlewood-Paley theory. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo Ser II* 1(1981), Supplemento, 75–80.
- [Gr81] Greenleaf, A., Principal Curvature and Harmonic Analysis. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* Vol. 30, No. 4 (1981).
- [Gu16] Guth, L. A restriction estimate using polynomial partitioning. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 29 (2016), no. 2, 371–413.
- [Gu17] Guth, L., Restriction estimates using polynomial partitioning II. *Acta Math.* Vol. 221, No. 1 (2016), 81–142.

- [IKM10] Ikromov, I. A., Kempe, M., Müller, D., Estimates for maximal functions associated with hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 and related problems in harmonic analysis. *Acta Math.* 204 (2010), 151–271.
- [IM11] Ikromov, I. A., Müller, D., Uniform estimates for the Fourier transform of surface carried measures in \mathbb{R}^3 and an application to Fourier restriction. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 17 (2011), no. 6, 1292–1332.
- [IM15] Ikromov, I. A., Müller, D., Fourier restriction for hypersurfaces in three dimensions and Newton polyhedra. *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, 194. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2016.
- [K17] Kim, J., Some remarks on Fourier restriction estimates. preprint 2017, arXiv:1702.01231.
- [L05] Lee, S., Bilinear restriction estimates for surfaces with curvatures of different signs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 358, No. 8, 3511–2533, 2005.
- [LV10] Lee, S., Vargas, A., Restriction estimates for some surfaces with vanishing curvatures. *J. Funct. Anal.* 258 (2010), no. 9, 2884–2909.
- [MVV96] Moyua, A., Vargas, A., Vega, L., Schrödinger maximal function and restriction properties of the Fourier transform. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 16 (1996), 793–815.
- [MVV99] Moyua, A., Vargas, A., Vega, L., Restriction theorems and maximal operators related to oscillatory integrals in \mathbb{R}^3 . *Duke Math. J.*, 96 (3), (1999), 547–574.
- [RdF83] Rubio de Francia, J. L., Estimates for some square functions of Littlewood-Paley type. *Publ. Sec. Mat. Univ. Autónoma Barcelona* 27 (1983), no. 2, 81–108.
- [St86] Stein, E.M., *Oscillatory Integrals in Fourier Analysis*. Beijing Lectures in Harmonic Analysis. Princeton Univ. Press 1986.
- [Sto17a] Stovall, B., Linear and bilinear restriction to certain rotationally symmetric hypersurfaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 369 (2017), no. 6, 4093–4117.
- [Sto17b] Stovall, B., Scale invariant Fourier restriction to a hyperbolic surface. *Anal. PDE* 12 (2019), no. 5, 1215–1224.
- [Str77] Strichartz, R. S., Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations. *Duke Math. J.* 44 (1977), no. 3, 705–714.
- [T01] Tao, T., Endpoint bilinear restriction theorems for the cone, and some sharp null-form estimates. *Math. Z.* 238 (2001), 215–268.
- [T03] Tao, T., A Sharp bilinear restriction estimate for paraboloids. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 13, 1359–1384, 2003.
- [To75] Tomas, P. A., A restriction theorem for the Fourier transform. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 81 (1975), 477–478.
- [TVI00] Tao, T., Vargas, A., A bilinear approach to cone multipliers I. Restriction estimates. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 10, 185–215, 2000.
- [TVII00] Tao, T., Vargas, A., A bilinear approach to cone multipliers II. Applications. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 10, 216–258, 2000.
- [TVV98] Tao, T., Vargas, A., Vega, L., A bilinear approach to the restriction and Keakeya conjectures. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 11 (1998) no. 4, 967–1000.
- [V05] Vargas, A., Restriction theorems for a surface with negative curvature. *Math. Z.* 249, 97–111 (2005).
- [W01] Wolff, T., A Sharp Bilinear Cone Restriction Estimate. *Ann. of Math.*, Second Series, Vol. 153, No. 3, 661–698, 2001.

S. BUSCHENHENKE: MATHEMATISCHES SEMINAR, C.A.-UNIVERSITÄT KIEL, LUDEWIG-MEYN-STRASSE 4, D-24118 KIEL, GERMANY

E-mail address: buschenhenke@math.uni-kiel.de

URL: <http://analysis.math.uni-kiel.de/buschenhenke/>

D. MÜLLER: MATHEMATISCHES SEMINAR, C.A.-UNIVERSITÄT KIEL, LUDEWIG-MEYN-STRASSE 4, D-24118 KIEL, GERMANY

E-mail address: mueller@math.uni-kiel.de

URL: <http://analysis.math.uni-kiel.de/mueller/>

A. VARGAS: DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN

E-mail address: ana.vargas@uam.es

URL: <http://matematicas.uam.es/~AFA/>