

POINTWISE CONVERGENCE OF THE KLEIN-GORDON FLOW

RENATO LUCÀ AND PABLO MERINO

ABSTRACT. We consider the PDEs version of the Carleson problem in the context of the cubic nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation. This means that we aim to establish the lowest regularity class for which one has almost everywhere pointwise convergence of the solutions to the initial data, as $t \rightarrow 0$. We prove sharp results for initial data in Sobolev spaces and for their randomized counterparts.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Notations	3
3. Strategy of the proof	4
4. The Cowling convergence theorem	6
5. The Maximal approach to nonlinear pointwise convergence	6
6. Deterministic preliminaries	8
7. Proof of Theorem 1.1	13
8. Probabilistic preliminaries	14
9. Proof of Theorem 1.2	21
Acknowledgments	23
References	24

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the Cauchy problem associated to the 3d periodic Klein-Gordon equation with a cubic nonlinearity, that is

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{tt}u - \Delta u + u \pm u^3 = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad \partial_t u(x, 0) = u_1(x). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Here the solution is a real valued periodic function $u : \mathbb{T}^3 \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the initial datum is assigned at the time $t = 0$. Our results will be independent on the focusing or defocusing nature of the model. We are interested in the pointwise behavior of the solutions and, more precisely, we will address the following question: which is the minimal regularity s such that

$$u(t, x) \rightarrow u_0(x) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35L05, 35R60.

Key words and phrases. Wave equation, Maximal estimates, Random Fourier series.

for (Lebesgue) almost every $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$ and for all $(u_0, u_1) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$? Moreover, we will show that improved (pointwise) convergence results are available if we consider a suitable randomization of the initial datum.

Before stating our results, we do a brief excursus on the pointwise convergence problem in the context of dispersive PDEs. This problematic was introduced by Carleson [6] in the 80s, for the linear Schrödinger equation. He was interested in identifying the minimal Sobolev regularity of initial data $f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which one has $e^{it\Delta} f(x) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} f(x)$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The 1d problem was solved by Carleson [6] and Dalhberg-Kenig [10]. The higher dimensional case, on the other hand, has been only recently solved in [4, 13, 12] and the final solution required very deep harmonic analysis techniques. We refer to [26, 32, 1, 24, 29, 30, 27, 18, 3, 20, 21, 22, 11, 14] and the references therein for intermediate results on this matter. It is also worth to point out that the periodic problem is still open (in any dimension) and we refer to [25, 34, 15] for the most recent results. In the case of the Schrödinger operator, the nonlinear version of the pointwise convergence problem (as well as its probabilistic counterparts) has been studied by the first author, E. Compagnon and G. Staffilani in [7].

As mentioned, the goal of this paper is to develop a nonlinear pointwise convergence theory in the case of the Klein-Gordon equation. To fix the ideas and avoid unimportant technicalities, we will focus on the 3d cubic model 1, that contains all of the interesting features of the problem. We will also focus on the periodic case that, unlike the Schrödinger case, does not present extra difficulties compared with the continuous one (the problems are basically equivalent). This is essentially due to the finite speed of propagation. In the linear setting, it was proved in [9, 8, 33] that one has $e^{it(D)} f(x) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} f(x)$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ if and only if $s > 1/2$ (in any dimension). Our first objective is to prove a nonlinear counterpart of this result

Theorem 1.1. *Let $s > 1/2$ and $(u_0, u_1) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$. Let u the (local in time) solution of the Cauchy problem 1. We have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |u(t, x) - u_0(x)| = 0, \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \mathbb{T}^3.$$

The statement is optimal for the following (two different) reasons. First, if $s < 1/2$ we do not have local well-posedness for the Cauchy problem 1; [5]. Second, when $s \leq 1/2$ the a.e. pointwise convergence of the solutions to the linearized problem to their initial data fails too; [33].

In the second part of the paper we aim to lower the regularity assumption essentially up to $s > 0$. As observed, this is impossible in the deterministic setting, since the statement is sharp. However, we will see that this is possible considering a suitable randomization of the initial data, in the spirit of [5]. Thus, given $(u_0, u_1) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ we randomize the Fourier coefficients as follows

$$u_0^w = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3} h_n^w \hat{u}_0(n) e^{in \cdot x}, \quad u_1^w = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3} l_n^w \hat{u}_1(n) e^{in \cdot x}, \quad (2)$$

where $(h_n^w)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3}$, $(l_n^w)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3}$ are two sequences of identically distributed pairwise independent sub-Gaussian random variables. One can prove (see [5]) that w -almost surely the following holds: $(u_0^w, u_1^w) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ but

$(u_0^w, u_1^w) \notin H^{s+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^{s-1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ (for all $\varepsilon > 0$). Moreover, for all $s' < s$ one has $(u_0^w, u_1^w) \in C^{s'}(\mathbb{T}^3) \times C^{s'-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$, again w -almost surely. Loosely speaking, the randomization improves the integrability but does not improve the regularity of the original functions.

In [5] the authors proved that the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{tt}u^w - \Delta u^w + u^w \pm (u^w)^3 = 0, \\ u^w(x, 0) = u_0^w(x), \quad \partial_t u^w(x, 0) = u_1^w(x). \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

is w -almost surely locally well posed, for all $s > 0$. This is particularly interesting since one can not establish any deterministic local well-posedness result at this level of regularity (indeed one must require $s \geq 1/2$). A natural question is thus to establish whether for these solutions we have almost everywhere pointwise convergence to the initial data. This is proved in our second main result, namely Theorem 1.2, that extends Theorem 1.1 in the probabilistic sense, to the whole range of regularity $s > 0$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $s > 0$ and (u_0^w, u_1^w) as in (2). For w -almost every initial datum (u_0^w, u_1^w) we have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |u^w(t, x) - u_0^w(x)| = 0, \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \mathbb{T}^3,$$

where u^w is the solution of the Cauchy problem 3 constructed in [5].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 3 we describe informally the strategy of the proofs of our main theorems. In Section 4 we recall the Cowling theorem for the a.e. pointwise convergence of the half wave operator $e^{it\langle D \rangle}$. This linear result will be also fundamental in the nonlinear analysis. In Section 5 we adapt the Maximal estimates method (from the linear) to the nonlinear framework. This is the main idea behind the proofs and it is indeed worth to stress out that maximal estimates are the strongest tool at our disposal to deduce pointwise almost everywhere convergence. In Section 6 we recollect some preliminary results of the local well posedness that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1, that is done in Section 7. In Section 8 we recollect some preliminary results of the local well posedness that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.2, that is done in Section 9.

2. NOTATIONS

- Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we abbreviate $\langle x \rangle := (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}$. We will denote with $\langle D \rangle$ the Fourier multiplier with symbol $\langle \xi \rangle$, i.e. $\langle D \rangle = \sqrt{1 - \Delta}$.
- We abbreviate $L_\delta^p L^q = L_t^p([0, \delta], L_x^q(\mathbb{T}^3))$.
- Given X and Y two Banach spaces with norms $\|\cdot\|_X$ and $\|\cdot\|_Y$ respectively, we endow the product space $X \times Y$ with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{X \times Y} = \|\cdot\|_X + \|\cdot\|_Y$.
- Given $R > 0$, we denote $B(0, R)$ the balls centered in 0 with radius R within the space $X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}$, and $B_\pm(0, R)$ the balls centered in 0 with radius R within the space $X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}$.
- $P_{\leq N}$ will be the frequency projection on the ball of radius N , centered in the origin; as well as $P_N = P_{\leq N} - P_{\leq N/2}$ and $P_{> N} = Id - P_{\leq N}$. In this sense, when nothing else is said, N will denote

an arbitrary element of a nonnegative increasing sequence diverging to ∞ .

- When we apply a sup or a $|\cdot|$ to a vector of functions, we are applying it componentwise. For instance, for functions $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\sup_{x \in A} |(f(x), g(x))| = (\sup_{x \in A} |f(x)|, \sup_{x \in A} |g(x)|).$$

The same will be considered with projection operators from the previous point.

3. STRATEGY OF THE PROOF

Assume, to fix the ideas, that we are in the focusing case. We will actually rewrite the cubic Klein-Gordon equation (1) as

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t \pm i\langle D \rangle) u_{\pm} = \pm i\langle D \rangle^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{u_+ + u_-}{2} \right)^3 \right), \\ u_{\pm}(x, 0) = u_{0,\pm}(x), \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where

$$u_{\pm} = u \pm i\langle D \rangle^{-1} \partial_t u, \quad u_{0,\pm} = u_0(x) \pm i\langle D \rangle^{-1} u_1(x). \quad (5)$$

In practice, we will actually work with the corresponding Duhamel formulation of the problem

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_+(t, x) \\ u_-(t, x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-it\langle D \rangle} u_{0,+} + i \int_0^t \frac{e^{-i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{u_+(\tau) + u_-(\tau)}{2} \right)^3 d\tau \\ e^{it\langle D \rangle} u_{0,-} - i \int_0^t \frac{e^{i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{u_+(\tau) + u_-(\tau)}{2} \right)^3 d\tau \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Note that $(u_0, u_1) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ if and only if $u_{0,\pm} \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$, thus we have reduced Theorem 1.1 to the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $s > 1/2$ and $(u_{0,+}, u_{0,-}) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$. We have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |u_{\pm}(x, t) - u_{0,\pm}(x)| = 0, \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \mathbb{T}^3. \quad (7)$$

In the linear setting, the most powerful tool to prove almost everywhere pointwise convergence is the maximal estimate approach. More precisely, one can deduce (this is classic)

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |e^{it\langle D \rangle} f(x) - f(x)| = 0, \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \mathbb{T}^3 \text{ and for all } f \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$$

from the maximal estimate

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta} |e^{it\langle D \rangle} f(\cdot) - f(\cdot)| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \quad \delta > 0. \quad (8)$$

Proving such a maximal estimate is more amenable than attacking the pointwise convergence problem directly. The estimate is actually known to be true for $s > 1/2$ (see [9]), setting $\delta = 1$. However, we are allowed to assume that the constant $\delta > 0$ in (8) may depend on f .

One would be then tempted to deduce the (nonlinear) pointwise convergence result (7) by an analogous (nonlinear maximal estimate)

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta} |u_{\pm}(\cdot, t)| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \|u_{\pm,0}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}. \quad (9)$$

This is not quite true, since the problem that we are studying is nonlinear. However, a rigorous nonlinear analogous of (8) can be established and one can use it to deduce (7) (see Lemma (5.1)).

The key idea is to use the fact that the restriction spaces $X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}$ (see Definition 13) are embedded into the maximal space $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3; L^\infty(0, \delta))$ as long as $s > 1/2$ and $b > 1/2$. Thus, using an inequality like

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta} |u_{\pm}(\cdot, t)| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \|u_{\pm}\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}}, \quad s, b > 1/2,$$

we may deduce the desired pointwise convergence essentially from the local well-posedness theory (in the restriction spaces framework). This heuristic is formalized in Section 7.

Regarding the probabilistic improvement, the strategy starts with a split between homogeneous (linear flow) and non-homogeneous (Duhamel formula) terms for the solution, in the spirit of [5]. Namely,

$$(\partial_t \pm i\langle D \rangle) z_{\pm}^w = 0, \quad z_{\pm}^w(x, 0) = u_{0,\pm}^w(x), \quad (10)$$

$$(\partial_t \pm i\langle D \rangle) v_{\pm} = \pm i\langle D \rangle^{-1} \left(\frac{z^w + v}{2} \right)^3, \quad v_{\pm}(x, 0) = 0, \quad (11)$$

where $v = v_+ + v_-$ and $z^w = z_+^w + z_-^w$, and where initial datum $(u_{0,+}, u_{0,-})$ before randomization is in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)$, for some $\sigma > 0$.

Then we perform a direct analysis to show that ω -almost surely the linear part of the flow converges to the initial datum almost everywhere (in fact everywhere and uniformly). This only requires to take advantage of the sub-Gaussian nature of the randomization. Regarding the nonlinear contribution, we will reduce to prove, as before, a suitable rigorous version of the informal maximal bound¹

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta_w} |v_{\pm}| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \|v_{\pm}\|_{X_{\delta_w,\pm}^{s,b}}, \quad s, b > 1/2.$$

Now the important point is that the above inequality requires $s > 1/2$ regularity (in the scale of the restriction spaces), while we are working with initial data that are, w -almost surely, just in H^σ and we only assumed $\sigma > 0$. Here we must crucially use the fact that, w -almost surely, the Duhamel contribution v_{\pm} exhibits a $\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$ smoothing (again in the scale of the restriction spaces) for $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small. To do so we will adapt to the restriction space setting the argument from [5]. This will allow us to work just above the L^2 level (recall $\sigma > 0$).

¹Note that v_{\pm} depends on w even if we are not stressing this out in the notation.

4. THE COWLING CONVERGENCE THEOREM

We include now a result of M. G. Cowling [9, 8]. We will state and use a less general form of his theorem, so we also provide a sketch of the proof for the reader convenience.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $s > 1/2$. Then*

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < 1} |e^{it\langle D \rangle} f(\cdot)| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \leq C_s \|f(\cdot)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Invoking the Littlewood-Paley decomposition, it is sufficient to prove

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < 1} |e^{it\langle D \rangle} f(\cdot)| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim N^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)},$$

for all 2π -periodic function f with $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset [-N, N]^d$.

After frequency rescaling this is equivalent to show

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < N} |e^{it\langle D \rangle} f(\cdot)| \right\|_{L^2(N\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim N^{\frac{1}{2}} \|f(\cdot)\|_{L^2(N\mathbb{T}^d)},$$

for all $2\pi N$ -periodic function f with $\text{supp } \widehat{f} \subset [-1, 1]^d$.

Now we can apply an anisotropic version of the Bernstein inequality to show that

$$\left\| \sup_{0 < t < N} |e^{it\langle D \rangle} f(\cdot)| \right\|_{L^2(N\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim \left\| e^{it\langle D \rangle} f(\cdot) \right\|_{L^2([0, N] \times N\mathbb{T}^d)}.$$

Thus the statement follows by conservation of the $L^2(N\mathbb{T}^d)$ norm under $e^{it\langle D \rangle}$. \square

5. THE MAXIMAL APPROACH TO NONLINEAR POINTWISE CONVERGENCE

In this section we provide the framework to study the pointwise convergence problem in the nonlinear setting. The goal of this section is to show how the bound (16)

- is sufficient to deduce almost everywhere pointwise convergence to the initial datum;
- can be deduced by an appropriate bound in the restriction spaces.

In Lemma (5.1) we will see that (16) is the rigorous counterpart of the informal maximal estimate (9).

We denote with $X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}$ the restriction space adapted to the linear flows $e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle}$. We thus define

$$\|F\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} = \inf_{G=F \text{ on } t \in [0, \delta]} \|G\|_{X_{\pm}^{s,b}}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\|F\|_{X_{\pm}^{s,b}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \langle \tau \pm \langle n \rangle \rangle^{2b} \langle n \rangle^{2s} |\widetilde{F}(\tau, n)|^2 d\tau,$$

and \tilde{F} is the space-time Fourier transform of F . There is a useful way of characterizing this restriction space norms through mixed Sobolev norms, since

$$\|F\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} = \|e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} F\|_{H_x^s(\mathbb{T}^d)H_t^b(\mathbb{R})}. \quad (14)$$

Let $u_0 = (u_{0,+}, u_{0,-}) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$. We denote with $\Phi_t^N u_0 = (\Phi_t^{N,+} u_{0,+}, \Phi_t^{N,-} u_{0,-})$ the flow Φ_t^N applied on u_0 , and associated to the (frequency) truncated Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t \pm i\langle D \rangle)u_{\pm} = \pm iP_{\leq N}\langle D \rangle^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{u_+ + u_-}{2} \right)^3 \right), \\ u_{\pm}(x, 0) = P_{\leq N}u_{0,\pm}(x). \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

We also use the notation $\Phi_t u_0 := \Phi_t^{\infty} u_0$ for the actual (non truncated) flow Φ_t applied on u_0 . We will now show how to deduce pointwise convergence from a suitable nonlinear maximal estimate.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $s \geq 0$, $f = (f_+, f_-) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$. If for some $\delta > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta} |\Phi_t f - \Phi_t^N f| \right\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{T}^3) \times L_x^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} = 0, \quad (16)$$

then $\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} f_{\pm}$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$.

Proof. It suffices to prove it componentwise. First of all, we decompose

$$|\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm} - f_{\pm}| \leq |P_{>N} f_{\pm}| + |\Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_{\pm} - P_{\leq N} f_{\pm}| + |\Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_{\pm} - \Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm}|.$$

The second term in the RHS converges to 0 for any $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$, since $P_{\leq N} f$ belongs to $H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$ for any s , from which it is easy to prove that $\Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_{\pm} \rightarrow P_{\leq N} f_{\pm}$ as $t \downarrow 0$ uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$.

Then, applying triangle and Markov inequalities, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\{x \in \mathbb{T}^3 : \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} |\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm} - f_{\pm}| > \lambda\}| \\ & \leq |\{x \in \mathbb{T}^3 : \sup_{0 < t < \delta} |\Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_{\pm} - \Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm}| > \lambda\}| + |\{x \in \mathbb{T}^3 : |P_{>N} f_{\pm}| > \lambda\}| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(\left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta} |\Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_{\pm} - \Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm}| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \|P_{>N} f_{\pm}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. We can now take the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ of this inequality getting, for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{T}^3 : \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} |\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm} - f_{\pm}| > \lambda\}| = 0.$$

Choosing $\lambda = 1/n$ and considering the measure of the union over $n \in \mathbb{N}$ of the above sets the statement follows. \square

Rather than proving (16) directly, we will use the fact that a suitable restriction space is embedded into the maximal space. This is proved via the usual transference principle, which proof can be adapted from the one in [28].

Lemma 5.2. *Let $b > \frac{1}{2}$ and let Y be a Banach space of functions $F : (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{C}$. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume*

$$\|e^{i\alpha t} e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f(x)\|_Y \leq C \|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent on $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any $F \in Y$,

$$\|F\|_Y \leq C \|F\|_{X_{\mp}^{s,b}}.$$

Recalling the linear maximal estimate from (12), valid for $s > 1/2$, we can use Lemma 5.2 with $Y = L^2(\mathbb{T}^3; L^\infty(0, \delta))$, so that we deduce

$$\left\| \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} |\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm - \Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_\pm| \right\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leq C_s \|\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm - \Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_\pm\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}}, \quad (b, s > 1/2, \delta > 0). \quad (17)$$

Note that, doing so, we have reduced the problem of pointwise convergence to prove a suitable inequality in restriction spaces, that is something definitely more amenable in the nonlinear setting.

6. DETERMINISTIC PRELIMINARIES

In this section we collect and prove some results on the local well-posedness of (4) in the framework of the restriction spaces (13). These results will be used in Section 7 in order to prove our first main Theorem 1.1.

First, we recall the (local in time version of the) Strichartz estimate [17].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $2 < p \leq \infty$ and q such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2}$, $f \in H^{2/p}(\mathbb{T}^3)$. Then,*

$$\|e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f\|_{L_1^p L^q} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{2/p}(\mathbb{T}^3)}. \quad (18)$$

Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Following [5], we consider the generalized Strichartz spaces

$$X_\delta^s = C([0, \delta], H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)) \cap \left(\bigcap_{(p,q) \text{ s-admissible}} L_\delta^p L^q \right) \quad (19)$$

for $s \in (0, 1)$, and where (p, q) , $\frac{2}{s} \leq p \leq \infty$, is a s-admissible pair of exponents if and only if

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{3}{q} = \frac{3}{2} - s.$$

The norm is taken as the supremum of all norms involved in the intersection (19). The dual space of X_δ^s will be denoted by Y_δ^s , and given by

$$Y_\delta^s = \bigcup_{(p,q) \text{ s-admissible}} L_\delta^{p'} L^{q'}. \quad (20)$$

Analogously to (19), its norm is taken as the infimum of all the norms involved in the union (20).

From (18), Sobolev embedding and H^s conservation we deduce (check [17] for details)

$$\|e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f\|_{X_\delta^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \quad s \in (0, 1). \quad (21)$$

Thus the transference lemma (5.2) implies

$$\|F\|_{X_\delta^s} \lesssim \|F\|_{X_{\pm}^{s,b}}, \quad (22)$$

for any $F : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ in $X^{s,b}$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $s \in (0, 1)$ and $b > \frac{1}{2}$. By duality and recalling (20), this is equivalent to

$$\|F\|_{X_{\pm}^{-s,-b}} \lesssim \|F\|_{Y_\delta^s}, \quad (23)$$

for the same values of δ , s and b . It is clear that the same inequalities can be stated with the localized spaces $X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}$ and $X_{\delta,\pm}^{-s,-b}$.

Hereafter η will be a smooth, compactly supported, non negative cut-off of $[0, 1]$. We recollect some well known facts about restriction spaces (see for instance [16]).

Lemma 6.2.

$$\|\eta(t)e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f\|_{X_{\mp}^{s,b}} \lesssim_{\eta} \|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let $b > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$.*

$$\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\pm i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (F(\tau)) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta,\mp}^{s,b}} \lesssim \|F\|_{X_{\delta,\mp}^{s-1,b-1}}.$$

Proof. From (14),

$$\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (F(\tau)) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \|\eta(t) \int_0^t \|e^{\pm i\tau\langle D \rangle} (F(\tau))\|_{H_x^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)} d\tau\|_{H_t^b(\mathbb{R})}.$$

The rest of the proof can be found in lemma 3.12 of [16]. \square

We provide now some additional estimates on restriction spaces $X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}$ that are proved using the generalized Strichartz spaces (19).

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$. Then*

$$\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (F(\tau)) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \|F\|_{L_\delta^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}}.$$

Proof. We define

$$TF = \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (F(\tau)) d\tau.$$

By lemma (6.3) we deduce

$$\|TF\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \|F\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s-1,b-1}} = (*).$$

Observe that we cannot apply (23) directly, given that $b-1 > -\frac{1}{2}$. Note that the inclusion $\iota_1 : L_\delta^2 L^2 \mapsto X_{\delta,\pm}^{0,0}$ is an isometry due to Plancherel theorem.

On the other hand, the inclusion $\iota_2 : L_\delta^{\frac{8(1-s)}{3}} L^{\frac{8(1-s)}{7-8s}} \mapsto X_{\delta,\pm}^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{s-b}{2(1-s)}}$ is continuous due to (23), since the exponents of the pair $(\frac{8(1-s)}{3}, \frac{8(1-s)}{7-8s})$ are the conjugates of the exponents of a $\frac{1}{2}$ -admissible pair, and since $s > b$ and

$s < 1$. Thus, through Riesz-Thorin interpolation we obtain, for $\theta \in [0, 1]$, that the inclusion

$$\iota : L_\delta^{p\theta} L^{q\theta} \mapsto X_{\delta, \pm}^{s-1, b-1}$$

is continuous, where

$$\begin{aligned} s-1 &= -\theta \frac{1}{2}, & b-1 &= \theta \left(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{s-b}{2(1-s)} \right), \\ \frac{1}{p\theta} &= \frac{3\theta}{8(1-s)} + \frac{1-\theta}{2}, & \frac{1}{q\theta} &= \frac{(7-8s)\theta}{8(1-s)} + \frac{1-\theta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\theta = 2 - 2s$ we deduce

$$(*) \lesssim \|F\|_{L_\delta^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}}.$$

□

Remark. We highlight two reasons for considering $s \leq 5/8$ instead of $s < 1$ in this procedure. Firstly, the resulting estimate (23) after the previous interpolation implies a reduction in the allowed regularity s to $(1/2, 3/4)$. And secondly, admissible values of the exponents in the nontrivial endpoint inclusion ι_2 (see (20)) drives us to exclude $s \in (5/8, 1)$.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$ and $j \in \{+, -\}$. Then,*

$$\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (u^3(\tau)) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{X_{\delta, j}^{s, b}}^3. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, given $\tilde{u} = (u_+, u_-) \in X_{\delta, +}^{s, b} \times X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}$, we have

$$\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (u_+ + u_-)^3 d\tau\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_{\delta, +}^{s, b} \times X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}}^3.$$

Proof. By lemma (6.4), maintaining the same notation,

$$\|T(u^3)\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} \lesssim \|u^3\|_{L_\delta^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}} = \|u\|_{L_\delta^{\frac{12}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^3 \leq \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{L_\delta^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^3 \leq \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{X_\delta^s}^3,$$

where the penultimate inequality follows by Hölder inequality in time and the last inequality follows by the fact that the pair $(4, \frac{12}{5-4s})$ is s -admissible. Recalling (22), we have proved the inequality (24).

Regarding the second inequality, repeating the same estimates,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (u_+ + u_-)^3 d\tau\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u_+ + u_-\|_{L_\delta^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^3 \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|u_+\|_{L_\delta^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}} + \|u_-\|_{L_\delta^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}} \right)^3 \\ &\lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} (\|u_+\|_{X_{\delta, +}^{s, b}} + \|u_-\|_{X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}})^3 = \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_{\delta, +}^{s, b} \times X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}}^3. \end{aligned}$$

□

As an intermediate step of this lemma (6.5), we have proved the following corollary that will be useful later.

Corollary 6.6. *Let $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$. Then*

$$\|u^3\|_{L^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}} \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{X_\delta^s}^3.$$

The same argument leads to the following lemma. Recall that $B(0, R)$ is the ball centered in 0 with radius R within the space $X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}$.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $R > 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$. Then, for any $j \in \{+, -\}$ and $u, v \in B_j(0, R)$,*

$$\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (u^3(\tau) - v^3(\tau)) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim R^2 \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u - v\|_{X_{\delta,j}^{s,b}},$$

Moreover, given $\tilde{u} = (u_+, u_-), \tilde{v} = (v_+, v_-) \in B(0, R)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} ((u_+(\tau) + u_-(\tau))^3 - (v_+(\tau) + v_-(\tau))^3) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \\ & \lesssim R^2 \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{v}\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. With the same notation from (6.4) for the operator T , and applying results (6.3) and (6.4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T(u^3) - T(v^3)\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \\ & \lesssim \|u^3 - v^3\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s-1,b-1}} \lesssim \|(u-v)(u^2 + uv + v^2)\|_{L^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}} \lesssim \|u-v\|_{L^{\frac{12}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}} \\ & \times (\|u\|_{L^{\frac{12}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2 + \|v\|_{L^{\frac{12}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2) = (*), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Hölder inequality. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (*) & \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u-v\|_{L^{\frac{4}{\delta}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}} (\|u\|_{L^{\frac{4}{\delta}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2 + \|v\|_{L^{\frac{4}{\delta}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2) \\ & \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u-v\|_{X_\delta^s} (\|u\|_{X_\delta^s}^2 + \|v\|_{X_\delta^s}^2) = (**). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we used Hölder inequality in time and the fact that $(4, \frac{12}{5-4s})$ is s -admissible. Thus the first inequality of the statement follows by (22).

Regarding the second inequality, we proceed as before by substituting u and v by $u_+ + u_-$ and $v_+ + v_-$. Recalling again (22) we can bound the first factor in (**) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(u_+ + u_-) - (v_+ + v_-)\|_{X_\delta^s} \leq \|u_+ - v_+\|_{X_\delta^s} + \|u_- - v_-\|_{X_\delta^s} \\ & \lesssim \|u_+ - v_+\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b}} + \|u_- - v_-\|_{X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}} = \|\tilde{u} - \tilde{v}\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}. \end{aligned}$$

and the second factor in (**) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_+ + u_-\|_{X_\delta^s} \|v_+ + v_-\|_{X_\delta^s} \leq (\|u_+\|_{X_\delta^s} + \|u_-\|_{X_\delta^s})(\|v_+\|_{X_\delta^s} + \|v_-\|_{X_\delta^s}) \\ & \lesssim (\|u_+\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b}} + \|u_-\|_{X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}})(\|v_+\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b}} + \|v_-\|_{X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}) \\ & = \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}} \|\tilde{v}\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}, \end{aligned}$$

that concludes the proof. \square

The following corollary follows from (a small modification of) the intermediate steps of the proof above.

Corollary 6.8. *Let $R > 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$.*

$$\|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} P_{\leq N}(u^3(\tau) - v^3(\tau)) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} M(u, v) \|u - v\|_{L_{\delta}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}.$$

where

$$M(u, v) := \|u\|_{L_{\delta}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2 + \|v\|_{L_{\delta}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2$$

One can prove using generalized Strichartz estimates that (1) is locally well-posed for any $(u_0, u_1) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ if $s \geq 1/2$ (the case $s \geq 1$ is elementary). However, for our purposes, it will be important to develop a local well-posedness theory in restriction spaces. This is certainly a well known fact, however we will give all the details for the reader convenience.

Proposition 6.9 (Deterministic local well-posedness). *Let $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$, $f_{\pm} \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and $\Lambda = \max\{\|f_+\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \|f_-\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\}$. Then, there exists $B > 0$, $C > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, B\Lambda^{-2/(s-\frac{1}{2})})$ the Cauchy problem*

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + i\langle D \rangle)u_+ = i\langle D \rangle^{-1} \left(\frac{u_+ + u_-}{2}\right)^3, & u_+(x, 0) = f_+(x) \\ (\partial_t - i\langle D \rangle)u_- = -i\langle D \rangle^{-1} \left(\frac{u_+ + u_-}{2}\right)^3, & u_-(x, 0) = f_-(x) \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

admits a unique solution $(u_+, u_-) \in B(0, C\Lambda)$.

Proof. The proof is done by Banach fixed point. We consider $f = (f_+, f_-) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$, and the map $\Gamma_f : X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b} \mapsto X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}$ defined by

$$\Gamma_f(u) := \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{f,+}(u) \\ \Gamma_{f,-}(u) \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \eta(t)e^{-it\langle D \rangle} f_+ + i\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{-i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{u_+ + u_-}{2}\right)^3 d\tau \\ \eta(t)e^{it\langle D \rangle} f_- - i\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{u_+ + u_-}{2}\right)^3 d\tau \end{pmatrix}$$

for any $u = (u_+, u_-) \in X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}$. We must show that Γ_f is a contraction.

First, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_{f,\pm}(u)\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} &\leq \|\eta(t)e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} + \|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{u_+ + u_-}{2}\right)^3 d\tau\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \\ &\lesssim \|f_{\pm}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} + (*), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used lemma (6.2). For the second term, we apply the second inequality of lemma (6.5), so that

$$(*) \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}^3.$$

Given $u \in B(0, 2\Lambda)$ we get

$$\|\Gamma_f(u)\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}} \lesssim \Lambda + \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda^3. \quad (27)$$

For the contractive property, it is enough to use the second inequality from lemma (6.7), in a way such that, component by component and considering $u, v \in B(0, 2\Lambda)$,

$$\|\Gamma_{f,\pm}(u) - \Gamma_{f,\pm}(v)\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \Lambda^2 \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|u - v\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}. \quad (28)$$

Taking $\delta \in (0, B\Lambda^{-2/(s-\frac{1}{2})})$ and $B > 0$ sufficiently small we have

$$\Lambda + \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda^3 \leq 2\Lambda, \quad \Lambda^2 \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

That concludes the proof. \square

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We are now ready to prove our first main result, namely Theorem 1.1. We are interested in the (local) flow associated to the equations in (4), namely

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_t^+ f_+(x) \\ \Phi_t^- f_-(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta(t) e^{-it\langle D \rangle} u_{0,+} + i\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{-i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{\Phi_\tau^+ f_+(x) + \Phi_\tau^- f_-(x)}{2} \right)^3 d\tau \\ \eta(t) e^{it\langle D \rangle} u_{0,-} - i\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{\Phi_\tau^+ f_+(x) + \Phi_\tau^- f_-(x)}{2} \right)^3 d\tau \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

where $(f_+, f_-) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$. We have observed, in Section 3, that Theorem 1.1 can be rewritten in the following way.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $s > 1/2$ and $f = (f_+, f_-) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$. Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm(x) - f_\pm(x)| = 0 \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \mathbb{T}^3.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we can restrict to consider $s \in (0, 5/8]$. It suffices to prove the convergence for each component of (29). From the embedding lemma (5.2) and the maximal estimate from lemma (12), we have that

$$\left\| \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} |\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm(x) - \Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_\pm(x)| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \left\| \Phi_t^\pm f_\pm(x) - \Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_\pm(x) \right\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}}, \quad (30)$$

for any $\delta > 0$, and $s > 1/2$, $b > 1/2$. In particular, we take $s > b$ so that we can apply the preliminary results.

Invoking Lemma 5.1, in order to prove the statement it suffices to prove that the right hand side of (30) converges to 0 when $N \rightarrow \infty$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_t^\pm f_\pm(x) - \Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_\pm(x) \\ &= \eta(t) P_{>N} e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_\pm(x) \pm i\eta(t) P_{>N} \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} g(x, \tau)^3 d\tau \\ & \pm i\eta(t) P_{\leq N} \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (g(x, \tau)^3 - g_N(x, \tau)^3) d\tau = (i) + (ii) + (iii), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where

$$g_N(x, \tau) = \left(\frac{\Phi_\tau^{N,+} f_+(x) + \Phi_\tau^{N,-} f_-(x)}{2} \right), \quad g(x, \tau) = \left(\frac{\Phi_\tau^+ f_+(x) + \Phi_\tau^- f_-(x)}{2} \right).$$

For (i), thanks to lemma (6.2) and dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\|\eta(t)P_{>N}e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_\pm(x)\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \|P_{>N}f_\pm\|_{H^s} \rightarrow 0, \text{ for } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

For (ii), thanks to the second inequality of lemma (6.5), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \eta(t)P_{>N} \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} g(x, \tau)^3 d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \leq \left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} g(x, \tau)^3 d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \\ & \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\Phi_t^+ f_+, \Phi_t^- f_-)\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}^3. \end{aligned}$$

Then, domination of the first integral is guaranteed since, from result (6.9),

$$\|(\Phi_t^+ f_+, \Phi_t^- f_-)\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}^3 \leq C \max\{\|f_+\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \|f_-\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\}^3. \quad (32)$$

On the other hand, if we consider the element

$$h = \pm i\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} g(x, \tau)^3 d\tau,$$

we deduce that $\langle \xi \rangle^{2s} \langle s \pm \langle \xi \rangle \rangle^{2b} \tilde{h}(\xi, s)$ is an element of $L_{\xi,s}^2$. Thus, in particular, it is almost everywhere finite. This implies the a.e. pointwise convergence of $\chi_{\{|\xi|>N\}} \langle \xi \rangle^{2s} \langle s \pm \langle \xi \rangle \rangle^{2b} \tilde{h}(\xi, s)$ to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the dominated convergence theorem concludes that (ii) converges to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For (iii), we apply lemma (6.7). Since $(\Phi_t^+ f_+, \Phi_t^- f_-) \in B(0, C\lambda)$ (recall that this is the ball in the $X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}$ space) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\eta(t)P_{>N} \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (g(x, \tau)^3 - g_N(x, \tau)^3) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} \\ & \lesssim \Lambda^2 \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\Phi_t f - \Phi_t^N f\|_{X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus taking δ sufficiently small we can absorb (iii) in the LHS. This concludes the proof. \square

8. PROBABILISTIC PRELIMINARIES

In this section we collect some probabilistic results that will be used in Section 9 in order to prove our second main Theorem 1.2. In particular, we adapt the construction of solutions from randomized initial data of [5] to the restriction spaces framework.

We will consider initial data of the form

$$f^w = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3} g_n^w \hat{f}(n) e^{inx}, \quad (33)$$

where $f \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)$, $\sigma > 0$, and $(g_n^w)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3}$ is a sequence of pairwise independent complex sub-Gaussian random variables on a probability space

$(\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{G})$. The sub-Gaussian variables will be of 0-mean and unitary variance. We recall that, given a 0-mean random variable X , we say that X is sub-Gaussian (more precisely, b -sub-Gaussian) if

$$\mathbb{E}e^{tX} \leq e^{b^2 t^2/2}, \quad b > 0. \quad (34)$$

This is equivalent to the existence of some $c > 0$ such that, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| > \lambda) \leq 2e^{-c\lambda^2}; \quad (35)$$

and to the existence of some $C > 0$ such that, for any $r \geq 1$,

$$\|X\|_{L_w^r(\Omega)} = (\mathbb{E}|X|^r)^{1/r} \leq C\sqrt{r}b. \quad (36)$$

In our case b will be the same for all the considered sub-Gaussian variables, thus we will not refer to it anymore.

We will need the following.

Lemma 8.1 ([5]). *Let $(a_n) \in l^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and (g_n^w) a sequence of complex, pairwise independent, random sub-Gaussian variables. Then, the random variable*

$$w \mapsto \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a_n g_n^w \quad (37)$$

is sub-Gaussian. In particular, there exists $C > 0$ such that, for every $r \geq 1$,

$$\left\| \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a_n g_n^w \right\|_{L^r} \leq C\sqrt{r} \|(a_n)\|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)}. \quad (38)$$

Now we provide improved dispersive estimates for the linear flow evolving by randomized initial data. These results are standard, however we sketch the proof for the reader convenience. We recall the Bernstein inequality on \mathbb{T}^d :

$$\|\langle D \rangle^s P_N f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^d)} \lesssim N^{s+d(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q})} \|P_N f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty. \quad (39)$$

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\lambda, \sigma, s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for all $\rho > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}[\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \lambda] \lesssim e^{-c\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2}.$$

$$\mathbb{P}[\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \lambda] \lesssim e^{-c\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)-\rho} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2},$$

for some $c > 0$. In other words, given $\beta \in (0, 1)$ we have that

$$\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim (-\log(\beta))^{1/2} N^{s-\sigma} \|f\|_{H^\sigma},$$

$$\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim (-\log(\beta))^{1/2} N^{s-\sigma+\frac{\rho}{2}} \|f\|_{H^\sigma}$$

with a probability of $1 - \beta$.

Proof. We prove it on \mathbb{T}^d . Note that $P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w$ is of the form

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a_n g_n^w \chi_N(n),$$

with

$$a_n = \hat{f}(n) \langle n \rangle^s e^{inx \pm it|n|},$$

where χ_N is the characteristic function of the set $\{n \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \frac{N}{2} \leq |n| \leq N\}$ in the frequencies space. Take any $r \geq p$. By Minkowski inequality and lemma (8.1)

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^d)}\|_{L_w^r(\Omega)} \leq \|\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_w^r(\Omega)}\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} \\ & \lesssim \sqrt{r} \|(a_n)\|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)} = \sqrt{r} \left(\sum_{\frac{N}{2} \leq |n| \leq N} \langle n \rangle^{2s} |\hat{f}(n)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & = \sqrt{r} \left(\sum_{\frac{N}{2} \leq |n| \leq N} \langle n \rangle^{2(s-\sigma)} \langle n \rangle^{2\sigma} |\hat{f}(n)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \sqrt{r} N^{-(\sigma-s)} \|f\|_{H^\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

We have just proved that

$$w \mapsto P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w$$

is a sub-Gaussian random variable satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}[\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^d)} > \lambda] \lesssim e^{-\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)} / (2\|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2)}.$$

By Bernstein's inequality (39), considering any $R > 1$ such that $r \geq R$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)}\|_{L_w^r(\Omega)} \leq N^{d/R} \|\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^R(\mathbb{T}^d)}\|_{L_w^r(\Omega)} \\ & \lesssim N^{d/R} \sqrt{r} N^{-(\sigma-s)} \|f\|_{H^\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}[\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)} > \lambda] \lesssim e^{-\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s) - \frac{2d}{R}} / (2\|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2)},$$

where R is as large as desired (from which we obtain the stated ρ). For the last part, regarding the $p < \infty$ case, it suffices to take

$$\beta = e^{-\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)} / (2\|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2)} \iff \lambda = (-2 \log(\beta))^{1/2} N^{s-\sigma} \|f\|_{H^\sigma},$$

and regarding $p = \infty$,

$$\beta = e^{-\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s) - \frac{2d}{R}} / (2\|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2)} \iff \lambda = (-2 \log(\beta))^{1/2} N^{s-\sigma + \frac{d}{R}} \|f\|_{H^\sigma}.$$

□

In an almost identical way, we provide probabilistic Strichartz estimates.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $\lambda, \sigma, s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for all $\rho > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_{t,x}^p([0,1] \times \mathbb{T}^3)} > \lambda] \lesssim e^{-c\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2}, \\ & \mathbb{P}[\|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty([0,1] \times \mathbb{T}^3)} > \lambda] \lesssim e^{-c\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s) - \rho} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for some $c > 0$. In other words, given $\beta \in (0, 1)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_{t,x}^p([0,1] \times \mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim (-\log(\beta))^{1/2} N^{s-\sigma} \|f\|_{H^\sigma}, \\ & \|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty([0,1] \times \mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim (-\log(\beta))^{1/2} N^{s-\sigma + \frac{\rho}{2}} \|f\|_{H^\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

with a probability of $1 - \beta$.

A first consequence of lemmata (8.3) and (8.2) is that, as long as $s < \sigma$, then $e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w \in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$. To see this, consider N to be dyadic scales, then for any $p \in [1, \infty)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{W^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}^3)} &\leq \sum_N \|P_N \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{H^\sigma} (-\log(\beta))^{1/2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-k(\sigma-s)} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^\sigma} (-\log(\beta))^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

with probability $1 - \beta$. Since the sum converges we have w -almost surely

$$f^w \in \bigcap_{s < \sigma} W^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}^3).$$

Similarly, using the L^∞ estimate from lemma (8.2) we have, w -almost surely

$$f^w \in \bigcap_{s < \sigma} C^s(\mathbb{T}^3).$$

We also state some additional bounds that will be useful later

$$\|P_{>N}(\cdot)\|_Z \leq \sum_{M>N} \|P_M(\cdot)\|_Z$$

for any normed space Z ; then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|P_{>N} \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \lambda] &\leq \sum_{M>N} \mathbb{P}[\|P_M \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \lambda] \\ &\lesssim \sum_{M>N} e^{-c\lambda^2 M^{2(\sigma-s)} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2} = e^{-c\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2} \left(\sum_{M>N} e^{-c\lambda^2 (M^{2(\sigma-s)} - N^{2(\sigma-s)}) / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2} \right) \\ &\lesssim e^{-c\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where the sum in parenthesis converges due to its geometric nature, and the facts that $M > N$ and $\sigma > s$. As before, applying Bernstein's inequality (39),

$$\mathbb{P}[\|P_{>N} \langle D \rangle^s e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \lambda] \lesssim e^{-c\lambda^2 N^{2(\sigma-s)-\rho} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2}, \quad (42)$$

where $\rho > 0$ is as small as desired.

The next result provides w -a.s. uniform convergence for the linear flow.

Lemma 8.4 (Uniform convergence a.s. for the linear Klein-Gordon equation in \mathbb{T}^3). *Let $\sigma > 0$ and f^w the randomized initial datum from (33), given $f \in H^\sigma$. Then, w -almost surely*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}^3} |e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w(x) - f^w(x)| \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and define the event

$$A_k = \left\{ w \in \Omega : \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f^w - f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \frac{1}{k} \right\}.$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_k) = 0 \quad (43)$$

means that there exists $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any $k \geq K_0$ and \mathbb{P} -a.s.,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w - f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leq \frac{1}{k},$$

which is the goal of this proof. Then, it suffices to show (43). Invoking Borel-Cantelli, it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(A_k) < \infty. \quad (44)$$

If we find a summable sequence $(\gamma_k) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(A_k) \leq \gamma_k$ for any k , then we are done. Decompose

$$|e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w - f^w| \leq |P_{>N} f^w| + |P_{>N} e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w| + |P_{\leq N} (e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w - f^w)|.$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For the first two terms, by (42), we can take both L_x^∞ norms less or equal than $1/4k$, i.e. $\lambda = 1/4k$ with previous notation, and that would hold true with a probability $1 - e^{-c\tilde{\gamma}_k}$ for some $c > 0$, where

$$e^{-c\tilde{\gamma}_k} = e^{-c(\frac{1}{4k})^2 N_k^{2\sigma-\rho} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2} \implies \tilde{\gamma}_k = \left(\frac{1}{4k}\right)^2 \frac{N_k^{2\sigma-\rho}}{\|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2},$$

where N_k is still to be determined, and $\rho > 0$ is arbitrarily small. Consider $\tilde{\gamma}_k = k$, for which we impose $N_k = (16k^3 \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2)^{1/(2\sigma-\rho)}$. This yields the following:

$$\|P_{>N_k} e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \|P_{>N_k} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leq \frac{1}{2k}$$

with a probability $1 - e^{-ck}$.

For the last term, and given that we selected $N = N_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\leq N_k} (e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w - f^w)\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} &= \left\| \sum_{|n| \leq N_k} (e^{\pm it|n|} - 1) e^{inx} \widehat{f^w}(n) \frac{\langle n \rangle^{s^*}}{\langle n \rangle^{s^*}} \right\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\leq \sup_{|n| \leq N_k} |e^{\pm it|n|} - 1| \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \langle n \rangle^{-2s^*} \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{|n| \leq N_k} \langle n \rangle^{2s^*} |\widehat{f^w}(n)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim_{s^*} |t| N_k^{s^*+1} \|P_{\leq N_k} f^w\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where we applied Cauchy-Schwarz in the first inequality, the mean value theorem in the second one, and we took $s^* > 3/2$ in order to have convergence of the series of general term $\langle n \rangle^{-2s^*}$. By an argument similar to (40) for $s = 0$ and $t = 0$,

$$\|P_{\leq N_k} f^w\|_{L_x^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \frac{1}{2k}$$

for w outside an exceptional set of probability $e^{-c(\frac{1}{2k})^2 N_k^{2\sigma} / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2}$, which is smaller or equal than e^{-ck} i.e., than the probability's upper bound for the first two terms. All in all, t small enough so that $|t| N_k^{s^*+1} \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w - f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \frac{1}{k}] &\leq \mathbb{P}[\|P_{\leq N} (e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w - f^w)\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \frac{1}{2k}] \\ &+ \mathbb{P}[\|P_{>N} e^{\pm it \langle D \rangle} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \|P_{>N} f^w\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \frac{1}{2k}] \leq 2e^{-ck}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we found the summable sequence $\gamma_k = 2e^{-ck}$ for which (44) holds. \square

Remark. All the linear results that we have stated work in the exact same way if we replace \mathbb{T}^3 with \mathbb{T}^d .

We now construct solutions with initial data randomized as in (33), starting by initial data in $H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)$, with $\sigma > 0$. Thus we adapt the result from [5] to the restriction space framework.

Theorem 8.5. *Let $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$, $\sigma \in (0, s)$ and $f = (f_+, f_-) \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)$. We denote with $f^w = (f_+^w, f_-^w)$ the corresponding randomization defined as in (33). Then the Cauchy problem*

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t + i\langle D \rangle)u_+^w = i\langle D \rangle^{-1} \left(\frac{u_+^w + u_-^w}{2} \right)^3, & u_+^w(x, 0) = f_+^w(x) \\ (\partial_t - i\langle D \rangle)u_-^w = -i\langle D \rangle^{-1} \left(\frac{u_+^w + u_-^w}{2} \right)^3, & u_-^w(x, 0) = f_-^w(x) \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

admits, w -almost surely, a $\delta \in (0, 1]$ such that a unique solution (u_+^w, u_-^w) exists in the Banach space $Y_{\delta,+}^{s,b,\sigma} \times Y_{\delta,-}^{s,b,\sigma}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b,\sigma} &= \{e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f^w + h : h \in X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}\}, \\ \|e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f^w + h\|_{Y_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}} &= \|h\|_{X_{\delta,\pm}^{s,b}}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Quantitatively, given $\delta \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, the above statement holds with a probability $1 - e^{-a\Lambda^{-2}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{1}{2}-s)}$ for some $a > 0$. Here $\Lambda = \max\{\|f_+\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \|f_-\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)}\}$.

Proof. Following [5], letting

$$u_j^w = z_j^w + v_j, \quad j \in \{+, -\},$$

we rewrite (46) as

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t \pm i\langle D \rangle)z_\pm^w &= 0, \\ (z_+^w(x, 0), z_-^w(x, 0)) &= (f_+^w(x), f_-^w(x)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t \pm i\langle D \rangle)v_\pm &= \pm i\langle D \rangle \left(\frac{(z_+^w + v_+) + (z_-^w + v_-)}{2} \right)^3, \\ (v_+(x, 0), v_-(x, 0)) &= (0, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $v = (v_+, v_-)$, the proof reduces to proving that the map Γ_{f^w} defined by

$$\Gamma_{f^w}(v) := \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{f^w,+}(v) \\ \Gamma_{f^w,-}(v) \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} i\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{-i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{(z_+^w + v_+) + (z_-^w + v_-)}{2} \right)^3 d\tau \\ -i\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\frac{(z_+^w + v_+) + (z_-^w + v_-)}{2} \right)^3 d\tau \end{pmatrix}$$

is a contraction on $X_{\delta,+}^{s,b} \times X_{\delta,-}^{s,b}$ (here $\delta \in (0, 1)$) except for initial data in an exceptional set of measure $\leq e^{-a\Lambda^{-2}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{1}{2}-s)}$. This would provide the existence of a unique solution of the form

$$(u_+^w, u_-^w) = (z_+^w + v_+, z_-^w + v_-).$$

Applying lemma (6.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_{f^w, \pm}(v)\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} &\lesssim \|(z_+^w + v_+ + z_-^w + v_-)^3\|_{L_{\delta}^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}} \lesssim \|z_+^w + z_-^w\|_{L_{\delta}^{\frac{12}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^3 \\ &+ \|(v_+ + v_-)^3\|_{L_{\delta}^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}} = (i) + (ii). \end{aligned}$$

For (i), denoting $l_s = \max\{\frac{12}{4s+1}, \frac{12}{5-4s}\}$ and using (40) we get

$$\begin{aligned} (i) &\lesssim \|z_+^w + z_-^w\|_{L_{\delta}^{l_s} L^{l_s}}^3 \lesssim (\|f_+\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)}^3 + \|f_-\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)}^3)(-\log(\beta))^{3/2} \\ &\leq \Lambda^3(-\log(\beta))^{3/2} =: \lambda^3 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

with probability $1 - \beta$, for $\beta \in (0, 1)$ (we are interested in small values of β).

For (ii), we apply the corollary (6.6)

$$\|(v_+ + v_-)^3\|_{L_{\delta}^{\frac{4}{4s+1}} L^{\frac{4}{5-4s}}} \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|v_+ + v_-\|_{X_{\delta}^s}^3,$$

Thus, by (22),

$$(ii) \lesssim \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} (\|v_+\|_{X_{\delta, +}^{s, b}} + \|v_-\|_{X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}})^3 = \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{X_{\delta, +}^{s, b} \times X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}}^3.$$

This implies that

$$\|\Gamma_{f^w, \pm}(v)\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} \leq C(\lambda^3 + \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} R^3) \quad (49)$$

as long as $v \in B(0, R)$ (recall that this is the ball in $X_{\delta, +}^{s, b} \times X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}$).

For the contractive property, we consider $v_1 = (v_{1, +}, v_{1, -})$ and $v_2 = (v_{2, +}, v_{2, -})$ in $B(0, R)$ and do

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_{f^w, \pm}(v_1) - \Gamma_{f^w, \pm}(v_2)\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} &= \left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} \left(\left(\frac{g_1^w}{2} \right)^3 - \left(\frac{g_2^w}{2} \right)^3 \right) d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta, \pm}^{s, b}} \\ &= (iii), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g_i^w = z_+^w + v_{i, +} + z_-^w + v_{i, -}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Recalling that $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$, we can apply lemma (6.7):

$$(iii) \leq C\delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} R^2 \|v_1 - v_2\|_{X_{\delta, +}^{s, b} \times X_{\delta, -}^{s, b}}. \quad (50)$$

Thus the map is a contraction over $B(0, R)$ if

(1) Recall (49) :

$$C(\lambda^3 + \delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} R^3) \leq R.$$

(2) Recall (50) :

$$C(\delta^{s-\frac{1}{2}} R^2) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Recalling $\Lambda^3(-\log(\beta))^{3/2} =: \lambda^3$ and letting $R = c\lambda^3$ for some suitable $c > 0$, we see that if we choose

$$\lambda = A\delta^{\frac{1}{6}(\frac{1}{2}-s)} \quad (\text{for some suitable constant } A > 0)$$

the conditions are satisfied for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ as long as the initial data are outside an exceptional set of measure $\leq \beta = e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{\Lambda^2}} = e^{-A^2 \Lambda^{-2} \delta^{\frac{1}{3}(\frac{1}{2}-s)}}$, that completes the proof. \square

9. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We are now ready to prove our second main result, namely Theorem 1.2. This will require a combination of the nonlinear smoothing effect of the Duhamel integral from Section 6 and of the probabilistic Strichartz estimates from Section 8. The maximal estimates framework developed in Section 5 is crucial in order to minimize the amount of nonlinear smoothing that is necessary in order to prove the theorem with minimal regularity. In the same spirit of the deterministic case, we rewrite Theorem 1.2 as follows

Theorem 9.1. *Let $\sigma > 0$ and $f = (f_+, f_-) \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3) \times H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^3)$. Then, using the same notation than Theorem (8.5),*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm^w(t, x) - f_\pm^w(x)| = 0, \quad \text{for almost every } x \in \mathbb{T}^3,$$

w-almost surely.

Thus we will focus on the proof of this last result.

Proof. From (8.5), we know that w -almost surely we can select a $\delta_w \in (0, 1]$ such that the Cauchy problem (46) admits a unique solution $\Phi_t f^w$ in $Y_{\delta_w, +}^{s, b, \sigma} \times Y_{\delta_w, -}^{s, b, \sigma}$. Moreover, from now on we fix $\frac{1}{2} < b < s \leq \frac{5}{8}$. Strictly speaking, this is not enough to prove the statement in full generality. However the low regularity case (s close to $1/2$) is the hardest and more interesting, thus in order to avoid making the presentation too technical we will only focus on it.

Invoking Lemma (5.1) we have reduced the problem to prove the validity of

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta_w} |\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm^w - \Phi_t^{N, \pm} f_\pm^w| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} = 0,$$

w -almost surely. We decompose the difference as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm^w - \Phi_t^{N, \pm} f_\pm^w| &\leq |P_{>N} e^{\mp it \langle D \rangle} f_\pm^w| \\ &+ |(\Phi_t^\pm f_\pm^w - e^{\mp it \langle D \rangle} f_\pm^w) - (\Phi_t^{N, \pm} f_\pm^w - P_{\leq N} e^{\mp it \langle D \rangle} f_\pm^w)|. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Using (42) with $\lambda = \frac{1}{k}$ and $\rho = \sigma$, we proved that

$$\|P_{>N} e^{\mp it \langle D \rangle} f_\pm^w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} > \frac{1}{k}, \quad \text{with probability } \leq e^{-c \frac{1}{k^2} N^\sigma / \|f\|_{H^\sigma}^2}.$$

Using this and Borel Cantelli's lemma it is easy to show that, w -almost surely

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{>N} e^{\mp it \langle D \rangle} f_\pm^w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)} = 0. \quad (52)$$

Thus we have reduced to prove that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sup_{0 < t < \delta_w} |v_\pm - v_{N, \pm}| \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} = 0$$

where

$$v_{N,\pm} = \Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_{\pm}^w - P_{\leq N} e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w, \quad v_{\pm} = v_{\infty,\pm}.$$

Recall that we are considering $s > \frac{1}{2}$ and $b > \frac{1}{2}$, thus the embedding (17) reduces further the problem to show

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|v_{\pm} - v_{N,\pm}\|_{X_{\delta_w,\pm}^{s,b}} = 0$$

w -almost surely.

To prove so, we decompose:

$$v_{\pm} - v_{N,\pm} = \pm i \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} ((\Phi_{\tau}^{\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3 - P_{\leq N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{N,\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3) d\tau \quad (53)$$

and we further decompose

$$(\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3 - P_{\leq N}(\Phi_t^{N,\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3 = I_{N,\pm}(t) + R_{N,\pm}(t),$$

where

$$I_{N,\pm}(t) := P_{\leq N} \left((P_{\leq N} e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{\pm})^3 - (P_{\leq N} e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{N,\pm})^3 \right) \quad (54)$$

and

$$R_{N,\pm}(t) := P_{\leq N} \left((e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{\pm})^3 - (P_{\leq N} e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{\pm})^3 \right) + P_{> N}(\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3. \quad (55)$$

Regarding the contribution of $P_{> N}(\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3$ to (53), we note that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (P_{> N}(\Phi_{\tau}^{\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3) d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta_w,\pm}^{s,b}} = 0$$

by dominated convergence since

$$\left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} ((\Phi_{\tau}^{\pm} f_{\pm}^w)^3) d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta_w,\pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \delta_w^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|\Phi_t^{\pm} f_{\pm}^w\|_{X_{\delta_w,\pm}^{s,b}}^3;$$

and the right hand side is w -almost surely finite (see Theorem (8.5)).

For the contribution of $R_{N,\pm}$ to (53), we apply corollary (6.8):

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} P_{\leq N} \left((e^{\mp i\tau\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{\pm})^3 - (P_{\leq N} e^{\mp i\tau\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{\pm})^3 \right) d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta_w,\pm}^{s,b}} \\ & \lesssim R_w^2 \delta_w^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|P_{> N} e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w\|_{L_{\delta_w}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where

$$R_w^2 := \|e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w\|_{L_{\delta_w}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2 + \|v_{\pm}\|_{L_{\delta_w}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2.$$

In the same way that we proved (52) (but using Lemma 8.3 instead of Lemma 8.2) we can prove that w -almost surely

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{> N} e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w\|_{L_{\delta_w}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}} = 0.$$

At the same time, invoking Lemma 8.3 again we have that

$$\|e^{\pm it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w\|_{L_{\delta_w}^4 L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}$$

is w -almost surely finite. Moreover, by the embedding (22) we have

$$\|v_{\pm}\|_{L^4_{\delta_w} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}} \lesssim \delta_w^{\frac{1}{3}(s-\frac{1}{2})} \|v_{\pm}\|_{X_{\delta_w, \pm}^{s,b}}.$$

and the right hand side is w -almost surely finite by Theorem 8.5. Thus R_w is w -almost surely finite and (56) goes to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$, w -almost surely.

In conclusion, we have proved that w -almost surely

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|R_{N, \pm}(t)\|_{X_{\delta_w, \pm}^{s,b}} = 0.$$

Thus, taking $X_{\delta_w, \pm}^{s,b}$ norm of (53) we arrive to

$$\|v_{\pm} - v_{N, \pm}\|_{X_{\delta_w, \pm}^{s,b}} \lesssim \|\eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} I_{N, \pm}(\tau) d\tau\|_{X_{\delta_w, \pm}^{s,b}} + o(N). \quad (57)$$

We will show that the first term on the right hand side can be absorbed into the left hand side, so the proof is concluded. In order to do so we apply Corollary 6.8 again

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} (I_{N, \pm})(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta_w, \pm}^{s,b}} \\ &= \left\| \eta(t) \int_0^t \frac{e^{\mp i(t-\tau)\langle D \rangle}}{\langle D \rangle} P_{\leq N} \left((P_{\leq N} e^{\mp i\tau\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{\pm})^3 - (P_{\leq N} e^{\mp i\tau\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w + v_{N, \pm})^3 \right) d\tau \right\|_{X_{\delta_w, \pm}^{s,b}} \\ &\leq C(R_{w,1}^2 + R_{w,2}^2) \delta_w^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \|v_{\pm} - v_{N, \pm}\|_{L^4_{\delta_w} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_{w,1}^2 := \|e^{\mp it\langle D \rangle} f_{\pm}^w\|_{L^4_{\delta_w} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2, \quad R_{w,2}^2 := \|v_{N, \pm}\|_{L^4_{\delta_w} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2 + \|v_{\pm}\|_{L^4_{\delta_w} L^{\frac{12}{5-4s}}}^2.$$

Now, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 8.5 we see that w -almost surely we have $C R_{w,2}^2 \delta_w^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1/4$ for all δ_w small enough. Thus, recalling (40), it is easy to see that w -almost surely we can produce a (small) δ_w such that

$$C(R_{w,1}^2 + R_{w,2}^2) \delta_w^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1/2,$$

that concludes the proof. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are supported by the Basque Government through the program BERC 2022-2025 (BCAM), by the project PID2021-123034NB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the Severo Ochoa accreditation CEX2021-001142-S (BCAM). RL is also supported by the Ramon y Cajal fellowship RYC2021-031981-I. PM is also supported by the predoctoral program of the Education Department of the Basque Government.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain. A remark on Schrödinger operators. *Israel J. Math.*, 77(1-2):1–16, 1992.
- [2] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. I. Schrödinger equations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 3(2):107–156, 1993.
- [3] J. Bourgain. On the Schrödinger maximal function in higher dimension. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 280(Ortogonal'nye Ryady, Teoriya Priblizheniï i Smezhnye Voprosy):53–66, 2013.
- [4] J. Bourgain. A note on the Schrödinger maximal function. *J. Anal. Math.*, 130:393–396, 2016.
- [5] N. Burq and N. Tzvetkov. Random data Cauchy theory for supercritical wave equations. I. Local theory. *Invent. Math.*, 173(3):449–475, 2008.
- [6] L. Carleson. Some analytic problems related to statistical mechanics. In *Euclidean harmonic analysis (Proc. Sem., Univ. Maryland, College Park, Md., 1979)*, volume 779 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 5–45. Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [7] E. Compaan, R. Lucà, G. Staffilani. Pointwise Convergence of the Schrödinger Flow. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 1, 596–647, 2021.
- [8] M. G. Cowling. Harmonic Analysis on Semigroups. In volume 117(2) of *Ann. of Math. (2)*, pages 267–283, 1983.
- [9] M. G. Cowling. Pointwise behavior of solutions to Schrödinger equations. In *Harmonic analysis (Cortona, 1982)*, volume 992 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 83–90. Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [10] B. E. J. Dahlberg and C. E. Kenig. A note on the almost everywhere behavior of solutions to the Schrödinger equation. In *Harmonic analysis (Minneapolis, Minn., 1981)*, volume 908 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 205–209. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1982.
- [11] C. Demeter and S. Guo. Schrödinger maximal function estimates via the pseudoconformal transformation, 2016. Preprint on arXiv:1608.07640.
- [12] X. Du and R. Zhang. Sharp l^2 estimates of the Schrödinger maximal function in higher dimensions. *Ann. of Math.*, 189(3):837, 2019.
- [13] X. Du, L. Guth, and X. Li. A sharp Schrödinger maximal estimate in \mathbb{R}^2 . *Ann. of Math.*, 186(2):607–640, 2017.
- [14] X. Du, L. Guth, X. Li, and R. Zhang. Pointwise convergence of Schrödinger solutions and multilinear refined Strichartz estimates. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 6:e14, 18, 2018.
- [15] D. Eceizabarrena and R. Lucà. Convergence over fractals for the periodic Schrödinger equation. *Anal. PDE*, 15(7):1775–1805, 2022.
- [16] M. B. Erdoğan and N. Tzirakis. *Dispersive Partial Differential Equations: Wellposedness and Applications.* London Mathematical Society Student Texts. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [17] M. Gubinelli, P. E. Souganidis, and N. Tzvetkov. In *Singular random dynamics (Cetraro, 2016)*. *Lecture Notes in Math.*, CIME Foundation Subseries, pages 221–313. Springer, 2019.
- [18] S. Lee. On pointwise convergence of the solutions to Schrödinger equations in \mathbb{R}^2 . *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, pages Art. ID 32597, 21, 2006.
- [19] R. Lucà and F. Ponce-Vanegas. Convergence over fractals for the Schrödinger equation. To appear on *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*. Preprint on arXiv: 2101.02495.
- [20] R. Lucà and K. M. Rogers. Average decay of the fourier transform of measures with applications. *J. Eur. Math. Soc (JEMS)*, 21(2):465–506, Oct. 2018.
- [21] R. Lucà and K. M. Rogers. Coherence on fractals versus pointwise convergence for the Schrödinger equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 351(1):341–359, 2017.
- [22] R. Lucà and K. M. Rogers. A note on pointwise convergence for the Schrödinger equation. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 166(2):209–218, 2019.
- [23] J. Lührmann and D. Mendelson. Random data Cauchy theory for nonlinear wave equations of power-type on \mathbb{R}^3 . *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 39(12):2262–2283, 2014.

- [24] A. Moyua, A. Vargas, and L. Vega. Restriction theorems and maximal operators related to oscillatory integrals in \mathbf{R}^3 . *Duke Math. J.*, 96(3):547–574, 1999.
- [25] A. Moyua and L. Vega. Bounds for the maximal function associated to periodic solutions of one-dimensional dispersive equations. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 40(1):117–128, 2008.
- [26] P. Sjölin. Regularity of solutions to the Schrödinger equation. *Duke Math. J.*, 55(3):699–715, 1987.
- [27] T. Tao. A sharp bilinear restrictions estimate for paraboloids. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 13(6):1359–1384, 2003.
- [28] T. Tao and C. B. of the Mathematical Sciences. *Nonlinear Dispersive Equations: Local and Global Analysis*. Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences. Regional conference series in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2006.
- [29] T. Tao and A. Vargas. A bilinear approach to cone multipliers. I. Restriction estimates. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(1):185–215, 2000.
- [30] T. Tao and A. Vargas. A bilinear approach to cone multipliers. II. Applications. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(1):216–258, 2000.
- [31] L. Thomann and N. Tzvetkov. Gibbs measure for the periodic derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Nonlinearity* 23(11), 2771–2791, 2010.
- [32] L. Vega. Schrödinger equations: pointwise convergence to the initial data. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 102(4):874–878, 1988.
- [33] B. G. Walther, Some $L^p(L^\infty)$ and $L^2(L^2)$ -estimates for oscillatory Fourier transforms, in Analysis of divergence (Orono, MA, 1997), 213–231, *Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal.*, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA.
- [34] X. Wang and C. Zhang. Pointwise convergence of solutions to the Schrödinger equation on manifolds. *Canad. J. Math.*, 71(4):983–995, 2019.

(R. Lucà) BASQUE CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BILBAO, BASQUE COUNTRY 48009 AND IKERBASQUE, BASQUE FOUNDATION FOR SCIENCE, 48011 BILBAO, BASQUE COUNTRY

(P. Merino) BASQUE CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BILBAO, BASQUE COUNTRY 48009