

# WEIGHTED STRICHARTZ ESTIMATES AND GLOBAL EXISTENCE FOR SEMILINEAR WAVE EQUATIONS

VLADIMIR GEORGIEV, HANS LINDBLAD AND CHRISTOPHER D. SOGGE

## 1. Main results

The purpose of this paper is to prove sharp global existence theorems in all dimensions for small-amplitude wave equations with power-type nonlinearities. For a given “power”  $p > 1$ , we shall therefore consider nonlinear terms  $F_p$  satisfying

$$(1.1) \quad |(\partial/\partial u)^j F_p(u)| \leq C_j |u|^{p-j}, \quad j = 0, 1.$$

The model case, of course, is  $F_p(u) = |u|^p$ . If  $\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , and if  $f, g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  are fixed, we shall consider Cauchy problems of the form

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \square u = F_p(u), & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{1+n} \\ u(0, x) = \varepsilon f(x), \quad \partial_t u(0, x) = \varepsilon g(x), \end{cases}$$

where  $\square = \partial^2/\partial t^2 - \Delta_x$  denotes the D’Alembertian. Our chief goal then is to find, for a given  $n$ , the sharp range of powers for which one always has a global weak solution of (1.2) if  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small enough.

Note that, even in the linear case, where one solves an inhomogeneous equation with a Lipschitz forcing term, in general one can only obtain weak solutions. An interesting problem would be to find out to what degree the regularity assumptions on the data can be relaxed in the spirit of [8]; however, we shall not go into that here.

Let us now give a bit of historical background. In 1979, John [6] showed that when  $n = 3$  global solutions always exist if  $p > 1 + \sqrt{2}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small. He also showed that the power  $1 + \sqrt{2}$  is critical in the sense that no such result can hold if  $p < 1 + \sqrt{2}$  and  $F_p(u) = |u|^p$ . It was shown sometime later by Schaeffer [12] that there can also be blowup for arbitrarily small data in  $(1 + 3)$ -dimensions when  $p = 1 + \sqrt{2}$ .

The number  $1 + \sqrt{2}$  appears to have first arisen in Strauss’ work [21] on scattering for small-amplitude semilinear Schrödinger equations. Based on this, he

---

The first author was partially supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and contract MM-516 with the Bulgarian Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. The last two authors were supported in part by the National Science Foundation.

made the insightful conjecture in [22] that when  $n \geq 2$  global solutions of (1.2) should always exist if  $\varepsilon$  is small and  $p$  is greater than a critical power which is the solution of the quadratic equation

$$(1.3) \quad (n-1)p_c^2 - (n+1)p_c - 2 = 0, \quad p_c > 1.$$

This conjecture was shortly verified when  $n = 2$  by Glassey [3]. John's blowup results were then extended by Sideris [15], showing that, for all  $n$ , there can be blowup for arbitrarily small data if  $p < p_c$ . In the other direction, Zhou [26] showed that when  $n = 4$ , in which case  $p_c = 2$ , there is always global existence for small data if  $p > p_c$ . This result has recently been extended to dimensions  $n \leq 8$  in Lindblad and Sogge [9]. Here it was also shown that, under the assumption of spherical symmetry, for arbitrary  $n \geq 3$  global solutions of (1.2) exist if  $p > p_c$  and  $\varepsilon$  is small enough. For odd spatial dimensions, the last result was obtained independently by Kubo [7].

In this paper we shall show that the assumption of spherical symmetry can be removed. Specifically, we have the following

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $n \geq 3$  and assume that  $F_p$  satisfying (1.1) is fixed with  $p_c < p \leq (n+3)/(n-1)$ . Then if  $\varepsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small (1.2) has a unique (weak) global solution  $u$  verifying*

$$(1.4) \quad (1 + |t^2 - |x|^2|)^\gamma u \in L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n}),$$

for some  $\gamma$  satisfying

$$(1.5) \quad 1/p(p+1) < \gamma < ((n-1)p - (n+1))/2(p+1).$$

Note that our condition on  $\gamma$  only makes sense if  $p > p_c$ . For, by (1.3),  $1/p(p+1) < ((n-1)p - (n+1))/2(p+1)$  if and only if  $p > p_c$ .

In Theorem 1.1 we have only considered powers smaller than the conformally invariant power  $p_{\text{conf}} = (n+3)/(n-1)$  since it was already known that there is global existence for powers larger than  $p_{\text{conf}}$ . See, e.g., [8].

We shall prove Theorem 1.1 using certain "weighted Strichartz estimates" for the solution of the linear inhomogeneous wave equation

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \square w(t, x) = F(t, x), & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{1+n} \\ 0 = w(0, \cdot) = \partial_t w(0, \cdot). \end{cases}$$

This idea was initiated by Georgiev [2].

Before stating our new estimates, though, let us recall the approach that John [6] used to show that there is global existence for (1.2) when  $n = 3$ ,  $p > 1 + \sqrt{2}$  and  $\varepsilon$  is small. The main step in his proof of this half of his theorem was to establish certain pointwise estimates for the solution of (1.6). Specifically, he proved an inequality which is equivalent to the following:

$$\|t(t - |x|)^{p-2} w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+3})} \leq C_p \|t^p (t - |x|)^{p(p-2)} F\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+3})},$$

$$\text{if } F(t, x) = 0, \quad t - |x| \leq 1, \quad \text{and } 1 + \sqrt{2} < p \leq 3.$$

Since the powers of the weights behave well with respect to iteration, it is easy to show that this inequality implies that global solutions of (1.2) exist when  $n = 3$  if the data is small and  $1 + \sqrt{2} < p \leq 3$  (cf. Lemma 1.3 below).

Unfortunately, no such pointwise estimate can hold in higher dimensions due to the fact that fundamental solutions for  $\square$  are no longer measures when  $n \geq 4$ . Despite this, it turns out that certain estimates, involving simpler weights which are invariant under Lorentz rotations, hold if one is willing to consider dual spaces. Specifically, we have the following

**Theorem 1.2.** *Suppose that  $n \geq 2$  and that  $w$  solves the linear inhomogeneous wave equation (1.6) where the forcing term is assumed to satisfy  $F(t, x) = 0$  if  $t - |x| \leq 1$ . Then*

$$(1.7) \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{\gamma_1} w\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} \leq C_{q,\gamma} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{\gamma_2} F\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})},$$

provided that  $2 \leq q \leq 2(n+1)/(n-1)$  and

$$(1.8) \quad \gamma_1 < n(1/2 - 1/q) - 1/2, \text{ and } \gamma_2 > 1/q.$$

As we said earlier, one should think of (1.7) as a weighted version of estimates of Strichartz [23] for (1.6):

$$(1.9) \quad \|w\|_{L^{2(n+1)/(n-1)}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} \leq C \|F\|_{L^{2(n+1)/(n+3)}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})}.$$

If one interpolates between this inequality and (1.7) one finds that the latter holds for a larger range of weights (see also our remarks for the radial case below). However, for the sake of simplicity, we have only stated the ones that will be used in our proof of Theorem 1.1.

Having stated our main results, let us now give the simple argument showing how they imply Theorem 1.1. To do so let us first notice that by shifting the time variable by  $R > 0$  they yield

$$(1.7') \quad \begin{aligned} \|(t+R)^2 - |x|^2)^{\gamma_1} w\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} &\leq C \|(t+R)^2 - |x|^2)^{\gamma_2} F\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})}, \\ &\text{if } F(t, x) = 0, \quad |x| \geq t + R - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $q$  and the  $\gamma_j$  are as in (1.7).

It is more convenient to use this equivalent version of (1.7) in proving Theorem 1.1. The key step will be to use it to establish the following

**Lemma 1.3.** *Let  $u_{-1} \equiv 0$ , and for  $m = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $u_m$  be defined recursively by requiring*

$$\begin{cases} \square u_m = F_p(u_{m-1}) \\ u_m(0, x) = \varepsilon f(x), \quad \partial_t u_m(0, x) = \varepsilon g(x), \end{cases}$$

where  $f, g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  vanishing outside the ball of radius  $R - 1$  centered at the origin are fixed. Then if  $p_c < p \leq (n + 3)/(n - 1)$ , fix  $\gamma$  satisfying

$$1/p(p + 1) < \gamma < ((n - 1)p - (n + 1))/2(p + 1)$$

and set

$$\begin{aligned} A_m &= \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma u_m\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} \\ B_m &= \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma (u_m - u_{m-1})\|_{L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there is an  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ , depending on  $p, F_p, \gamma$  and the data  $(f, g)$  so that for  $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$(1.10) \quad A_m \leq 2A_0 \text{ and } 2B_{m+1} \leq B_m, \text{ if } \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0.$$

*Proof.* Because of the support assumptions on the data, domain of dependence considerations imply that  $u_m$ , and hence  $F_p(u_m)$ , must vanish if  $|x| > t + R - 1$ . It is also standard that the solution  $u_0$  of the free wave equation  $\square u_0 = 0$  with the above data satisfies  $u_0 = O(\varepsilon(1 + t)^{-(n-1)/2}(1 + |t - |x||)^{-(n-1)/2})$ . Using this one finds that

$$A_0 \leq C_0 \varepsilon,$$

for some uniform constant  $C_0$ .

To complete the induction argument let us first notice that for  $j, m \geq 0$ ,  $u_{m+1} - u_{j+1}$  has zero Cauchy data at  $t = 0$  and  $\square(u_{m+1} - u_{j+1}) = V_p(u_m, u_j)(u_m - u_j)$ , where by (1.1),

$$V_p(u_m, u_j) = O((|u_m| + |u_j|)^{p-1}).$$

Since we are assuming that

$$\gamma < n(1/2 - 1/q) - 1/2, \text{ and } p\gamma > 1/q, \quad q = p + 1,$$

if we apply (1.7') and Hölder's inequality we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma (u_{m+1} - u_{j+1})\|_{L^{p+1}} \\ & \leq C_1 \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^{p\gamma} V_p(u_m, u_j)(u_m - u_j)\|_{L^{(p+1)/p}} \\ & \leq C_1 \left( C_2 (\|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma u_m\|_{L^{p+1}} + \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma u_j\|_{L^{p+1}}) \right)^{p-1} \\ & \quad \times \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma (u_m - u_j)\|_{L^{p+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

for certain constants  $C_j$  which are uniform if above  $p, \gamma$  and  $F_p$  are fixed. Based on this we conclude that

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma (u_{m+1} - u_{j+1})\|_{L^{p+1}} \\ & \leq C_1 (C_2 (A_m + A_j))^{p-1} \|((t + R)^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma (u_m - u_j)\|_{L^{p+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $j = -1$ , then  $A_j = 0$  and hence we conclude that

$$A_{m+1} \leq A_0 + A_m/2 \quad \text{if } C_1(C_2A_m)^{p-1} \leq 1/2.$$

By the earlier bound for  $A_0$ , this yields the first part of (1.10) if  $C_1(2C_2C_0\varepsilon_0)^{p-1} < 1/2$ . If we take  $j = m - 1$  in (1.11), we also obtain the other half of (1.10) if this condition is satisfied, which completes the proof.  $\square$

Using the lemma we easily get the existence part of Theorem 1.1. If  $\varepsilon > 0$  in (1.2) is small and if  $u_m$  are as above we notice from the second half of (1.10) that  $u_m$  converges to a limit  $u$  in  $L^{p+1}$  and hence in the sense of distributions. Since (1.1) and the bounds for  $B_{m+1}$  yield

$$\|F_p(u_{m+1}) - F_p(u_m)\|_{L^{(p+1)/p}} = O(2^{-m}),$$

and hence  $F_p(u_m) \rightarrow F_p(u)$  in  $L^{(p+1)/p}$ , we conclude that  $u$  must converge to a weak solution of (1.2) which must satisfy (1.4) by the bounds for  $A_m$ . Since the proof of the bound for  $B_{m+1}$  yields the uniqueness part, this completes our argument showing that the weighted Strichartz estimates imply Theorem 1.1.

The rest of the paper will be concerned with the proof of Theorem 1.1. We first notice, after applying Stein's analytic interpolation theorem [20], that to prove (1.7) it suffices to establish the bounds in the two extreme cases where  $q = 2(n+1)/(n-1)$  or  $q = 2$ . Specifically, under our assumption that  $F(t, x) = 0$  when  $t - |x| < 1$ , we must show that for  $n \geq 2$

$$(1.12) \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{\gamma_1} w\|_{L^{2(n+1)/(n-1)}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} \leq C_\gamma \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{\gamma_2} F\|_{L^{2(n+1)/(n+3)}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})},$$

if  $\gamma_1 < (n-1)/2(n+1) < \gamma_2$ ,

and that

$$(1.13) \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{-\gamma} w\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} \leq C_\gamma \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^\gamma F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})}, \quad \text{if } \gamma > 1/2.$$

Most of the rest of the paper will be devoted to the proof of (1.12). The  $L^2$ -estimate is much easier, following essentially from a twofold application of the Sobolev trace theorem.

In proving the weighted Strichartz inequality (1.12) we shall of course exploit our support assumption and the favorable condition on the weights. Indeed since  $t^2 - |x|^2 \geq t$  on the supports of  $w$  and  $F$ , we shall see right away that it suffices to prove a variant of (1.12) where we assume in the left that the norm is taken over a dyadic strip where  $T/2 \leq t \leq T$  for  $T$  large. Assuming this, our estimate naturally splits into two pieces. The easiest half involves estimating the contribution to  $w$  of the part of  $F(t, x)$  where, say,  $t \geq T/10$ . Here, using elementary geometry and exploiting the Lorentz-invariance of the weights, it turns out that we can reduce matters to an estimate which follows from the usual  $L^2$ -calculus of Fourier integral operators. The analysis of the relatively small-time contributions of  $F$ ,

though, is harder since the resulting Fourier integral operators that arise become increasingly degenerate in places as  $T \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence, as in the preceding case, we cannot hope to appeal to Hörmander's  $L^2$ -theorem. Fortunately, though, these sorts of degenerate Fourier integral operators have been studied before, for instance in Sogge and Stein [19], and the weights in the inequalities that arise compensate for the degeneracy of the operators, allowing the estimates to hold. It turns out, though, that the techniques from [19] can only be used to handle the high-frequency parts of the Fourier integrals that arise. This in part accounts for the fact that the second step in the proof of (1.12) is much harder than the first. Fortunately, though, we can handle the low frequency part using stationary phase and elementary geometric facts which are somewhat similar to the ones mentioned before. The two geometrical facts that we use, which are based on properties of the intersection of essentially externally and internally tangent spheres, have widely been used in harmonic analysis, especially in the study of circular maximal inequalities (see [1], [16], [25]).

Before turning to the details, we thought it might be well to see how under the assumption of spherical symmetry it is easy to prove Theorem 1.2. It turns out that under this assumption we can also prove a stronger estimate which probably involves the optimal range of weights. For brevity, we shall only consider odd spatial dimensions for the radial case. The argument for even  $n$  is a bit more technical, due to the lack of strong Huygen's principal; however, using techniques from [9] one could adapt the proof to handle even  $n$ .

With this in mind, let us close this section with the following

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $n$  be odd and assume that  $F$  is spherically symmetric and supported in the forward light cone  $\{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+n} : |x| \leq t\}$ . Then if  $w$  solves (1.6) and if  $2 < q \leq 2(n+1)/(n-1)$*

$$(1.14) \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{-\alpha} w\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} \leq C_\gamma \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^\beta F\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})},$$

if  $\beta < 1/q$ ,  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 2/q$ , where  $\gamma = (n-1)(1/2 - 1/q)$ .

*Proof.* For odd  $n$  we have the formula

$$w(t, r) = \frac{1}{r^{(n-1)/2}} \int_0^t \int_{|t-r-s|}^{t+r-s} P_m(\mu) F(s, \rho) \rho^{(n-1)/2} d\rho ds,$$

where  $P_m(\mu)$  are Legendre polynomials of degree  $m = (n-3)/2$  and  $\mu = (r^2 + \rho^2 - (t-s)^2)/2r\rho$  satisfies  $-1 \leq \mu \leq 1$  in the domain of integration. (See e.g. (3.2') and the formula after (3.11) in [9].) Multiplying by  $K(t, r)(t^2 - r^2)^{-\alpha}$  and integrating with respect to  $dxdt = c_n r^{n-1} dr dt$ , we see that we must show that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^t \int_{|t-r-s|}^{t+r-s} \frac{|K(t, r)| r^{(n-1)/p} (s^2 - \rho^2)^\beta |F(s, \rho)| \rho^{(n-1)/p}}{(r\rho)^\gamma (s^2 - \rho^2)^\beta (t^2 - r^2)^\alpha} d\rho ds dr dt,$$

is bounded by a constant times  $\|K\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}} \cdot \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^\beta F\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}$ , if  $\gamma = (n-1)/2 - (n-1)/q$  and the norms are with respect to  $dxdt = c_n r^{n-1} dr dt$ . To do this it

is convenient to introduce  $u = t+r$ ,  $v = t-r$ ,  $\xi = s+\rho$  and  $\eta = s-\rho$  as new variables and let  $G(\xi, \eta) = (s^2 - \rho^2)^\beta |F(s, \rho)| \rho^{(n-1)/p}$  and  $H(u, v) = |K(t, r)| r^{(n-1)/p}$ ,  $p = q/(q-1)$ . We then must show that

$$(1.15) \quad \iiint\limits_{0 \leq \eta \leq v \leq \xi \leq u} \frac{G(\xi, \eta) H(u, v)}{|u-v|^\gamma |\xi-\eta|^\gamma |\xi\eta|^\beta |uv|^\alpha} d\xi d\eta du dv \leq C \|G\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}} \|H\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.$$

In the domain of integration the kernel is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{|u-\xi|^\gamma |\xi|^\beta |u|^\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{|v-\eta|^\gamma |\eta|^\beta |v|^\alpha}$$

and (1.15) now follows from two applications of the inequality

$$(1.16) \quad \|f\|_{L^q[0, \infty]} \leq C \|g\|_{L^p[0, \infty]}, \quad \text{if } f(u) = \int_0^u \frac{g(\xi) d\xi}{|u-\xi|^\gamma |\xi|^\beta |u|^\alpha},$$

where

$$1 < p < q < \infty, \quad \alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1 - (1/p - 1/q), \quad \alpha + \beta \geq 0, \quad \text{and } \alpha + \gamma > 1/q.$$

Notice that, for dual exponents  $q$  and  $p = q/(q-1)$ ,  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 2/q$ . Therefore,  $\alpha + \beta \geq 0$  is equivalent to  $\gamma = (n-1)(1/2 - 1/q) \leq 2/q$  which holds if and only if  $q \leq 2(n+1)/(n-1)$ . In proving (1.16) we may assume that  $g(\xi) \geq 0$ . Since  $\alpha + \beta \geq 0$  we have  $f(u) \leq C f_1(u) + C f_2(u)$  where

$$f_1(u) = \frac{1}{|u|^{\gamma+\alpha}} \int_0^{u/2} \frac{g(\xi) d\xi}{|\xi|^\beta}, \quad f_2(u) = \int_{-u/2}^{+\infty} \frac{g(\xi) d\xi}{|u-\xi|^{\gamma+\alpha+\beta}}.$$

That  $\|f_2\|_{L^q} \leq C \|g\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}$  is just Hardy-Littlewood's inequality for fractional integrals. Dividing the integral  $f_1(u)$  further into  $0 \leq \xi \leq u/4$  and  $u/4 \leq \xi \leq u/2$ , we see that  $f_1(u) \leq 2^{-(\alpha+\gamma)} f_1(u/2) + C f_2(u)$  and hence

$$\|f_1\|_{L^q} \leq 2^{1/q - (\alpha+\gamma)} \|f_1\|_{L^q} + C' \|g\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.$$

Now  $1/q - (\alpha+\gamma) < 0$ , by assumption, so this gives the desired *a priori* inequality for  $f_1$  and hence for  $f$ . Clearly,  $f \in L^q$ , when  $\alpha + \gamma > 1/q$ , if  $g$  is bounded and compactly supported, so (1.16) follows.  $\square$

As a side remark, we note that we can use (1.14) to give an elementary proof of John's existence theorem for  $n = 3$ . Indeed since the mapping from  $F$  to  $w$  is a positive operator when  $n = 3$ , (1.14) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (t^2 - |x|^2)^{-\alpha} \sup_{\theta \in S^2} |w(t, r\theta)| \right\|_{L^q(r^2 dr dt)} \\ & \leq C \left\| (t^2 - |x|^2)^\beta \sup_{\theta \in S^2} |F(t, r\theta)| \right\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(r^2 dr dt)}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $2 < q \leq 4$  and  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  as in (1.14). Since this is stronger than the estimates employed in the proof of Lemma 1.3 for  $n = 3$ , we conclude that in this case one always has global small-amplitude solutions of (1.2) if  $p > 1 + \sqrt{2}$ .

The authors would like to thank S. Klainerman for his support and encouragement throughout this project.

## 2. Lorentz invariance and bounds for relatively small times

In proving our weighted Strichartz inequality (1.12), we shall see that, because the weights in the left are smaller than those in the right, we can easily reduce matters to proving estimates where in the left the norms are taken over sets where  $t$  and  $t - |x|$  belong to dyadic intervals. Let us first handle the case where  $T/2 \leq t \leq T$ , for some  $T \geq 2$ , and  $(t, x)$  belongs to the “middle part” of the light cone, that is,  $|x| \leq t/2$ . This is the model case. It turns out to be the easiest to handle, and, using Lorentz rotations as in [10], we shall reduce much of our task to this one. Unfortunately, as we shall see, part of the weighted estimate cannot be handled in this manner. However, in the next section we shall show that the remaining cases can be handled using estimates for degenerate Fourier integrals in the spirit of [19].

With this in mind, our first task then is to establish the following result, which, among other things, ensures that the variant of (1.12) holds where the norm in the left is taken over all  $(t, x)$  with  $|x| \leq t/2$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $q = 2(n+1)/(n-1)$ , and assume that  $F(t, x) = 0$  if  $t^2 - |x|^2 \leq 1$ . Then if  $w$  is the solution of the inhomogeneous wave equation  $\square w = F$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n}$  with zero Cauchy data at  $t = 0$ ,*

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} w\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): |x| \leq t/2, T/2 \leq t \leq T\})} \\ \leq C(\log T)^{1/q} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} F\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}, \quad T \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  depends only on the dimension.

*Proof.* Let  $w_T(t, x) = w(Tt, Tx)$  and  $F_T(t, x) = T^2 F(Tt, Tx)$ , so that  $\square w_T = F_T$ . Then the first step is to notice that (2.1) is equivalent to

$$(2.1') \quad \|w_T\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): |x| \leq t/2, 1/2 \leq t \leq 1\})} \leq C(\log T)^{1/q} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} F_T\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.$$

Note that  $F_T = 0$  if  $t^2 - |x|^2 \leq 1/T^2$ . Taking into account the domain of dependence, we may also assume that  $F_T(t, x) = 0$  if  $t < 1/4$  if the spatial dimension  $n$  is odd. It is not difficult to make a similar reduction in even spatial dimensions. To see this, we need to recall that in any dimension  $w_T = E_+ * F_T$ , where  $E_+(t, x) = \pi^{(1-n)/2}/2 \cdot \chi_+^{-(n-1)/2}(t^2 - |x|^2)$ , if  $t \geq 0$  and 0 otherwise.<sup>1</sup> Because of this, we can assume that  $F_T$  vanishes when  $t < 1/8$  if we use Hölder’s inequality, since if  $1/2 \leq t \leq 1$  and  $|x| \leq t/2$

$$\|E_+(t - s, x - y) (s^2 - |y|^2)^{-1/q}\|_{L^q(\{(s,y): s^2 - |y|^2 \geq 1/T^2, 1/T \leq s \leq 1/8\})} \leq C(\log T)^{1/q}.$$

To prove this one just uses the fact that the  $E_+$  term is bounded because of our assumptions on  $(t, x)$  and  $(s, y)$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Here  $\chi^z(t^2 - |x|^2)$  denotes the pullback of the distribution  $(\Gamma(z))^{-1} x_{\mp}^z$  via the Lorentz form  $t^2 - |x|^2$ .



Because of these considerations, we conclude that in proving (2.1') it suffices to assume that  $F_T$  vanishes if  $t^2 - |x|^2 \leq 1/T^2$  or  $t \leq 1/8$ . The difficulty then occurs because of the fact that the weights on the right side of the inequality are small if  $(t, x)$  is near the null cone. Indeed, if, say,  $t - |x| \geq 1/8$  on the support of  $F_T$ , then the estimate follows from the well known unweighted version of Strichartz [23]. Thus, we can further assume in proving (2.1) that

$$(2.2) \quad F_T(t, x) = 0 \text{ if } t \leq 1/8, \text{ or } t^2 - |x|^2 \leq 1/T^2, \text{ or } t - |x| \geq 1/8.$$

We have made this last assumption to ensure that  $t - s$  is bounded from below when  $t \geq s$ ,  $(s, y) \in \text{supp } F_T$ , and  $(t, x)$  is as in the left side of (2.1').

Having set things up, we are finally ready to prove the main part of our estimate. Recall that, if  $\hat{F}(s, \xi)$  denotes the spatial Fourier transform, then

$$w_T(t, x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} |\xi|^{-1} \sin((t-s)|\xi|) \hat{F}_T(s, \xi) d\xi ds.$$

Therefore, if we let

$$(W^z F_T)(t, x) = (z - (n+1)/2) e^{z^2} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} |\xi|^{-z} \sin((t-s)|\xi|) \hat{F}_T(s, \xi) d\xi ds,$$

by complex interpolation, it suffices to show that

$$(2.3) \quad \|W^z F_T\|_{L^\infty(|x| \leq t/2, 1/2 \leq t \leq 1)} \leq C \|F_T\|_{L^1}, \quad \text{Re } z = (n+1)/2,$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad \|W^z F_T\|_{L^2(|x| \leq t/2, 1/2 \leq t \leq 1)} \leq C (\log T)^{1/2} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/2} F_T\|_{L^2}, \quad \text{Re } z = 0.$$

Since  $t - s$  is bounded from below, because of our assumptions, (2.3) follows from the well known stationary phase estimate

$$(2.3') \quad \left| \int y e^{-y^2} \int e^{ix \cdot \xi + it|\xi|} |\xi|^{-(n+1)/2 + iy} d\xi \right| \leq C_n t^{-(n-1)/2}.$$

To prove the  $L^2$  estimates we note that  $W^z = (W_+^z + W_-^z)/2i$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} (W_\pm^z F)(t, x) &= (z - (n+1)/2) e^{z^2} \iiint e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi \pm i(t-s)|\xi|} F_T(s, y) |\xi|^{-z} d\xi dy ds \\ &= (z - (n+1)/2) e^{z^2} \int_{1/T}^{1/8} \iint e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi \pm i(t-\tau-|y|)|\xi|} F_T(|y| + \tau, y) |\xi|^{-z} d\xi dy d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Here we are assuming that  $(t, x)$  is as in the left side of (2.4) so that  $s$  is smaller than  $t$  in the support of the first integrand. Note that, by Hölder's inequality, the last quantity is dominated by  $(\log T)^{1/2}$  times

$$\left( \int \left| \tau^{1/2} (z - (n+1)/2) e^{z^2} \iint e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi \pm i(t-\tau-|y||\xi|)} F_T(|y|+\tau, y) |\xi|^{-z} d\xi dy \right|^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2}.$$

Since  $\tau = s - |y|$  when  $s = \tau + |y|$ , we conclude that it suffices to show that for  $\tau \leq 1/8$  and  $1/2 \leq t \leq 1$  we have the uniform bounds

$$(2.4') \quad \|\tilde{W}_{\pm}^z f(t - \tau, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\{x: |x| \leq t/2\})} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \operatorname{Re} z = 0, \quad \operatorname{supp} f \subset \{y: 1/8 \leq |y| < t - \tau\},$$

if

$$(\tilde{W}_{\pm}^z f)(t - \tau, x) = (z - (n+1)/2) e^{z^2} \iint e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi \pm i(t-\tau-|y||\xi|)} f(y) |\xi|^{-z} d\xi dy.$$

We should emphasize that this estimate would not hold if in the left the norm were taken over all of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Because of our localization, though, the bound follows from Hörmander's theorem [4] regarding  $L^2$  bounds for Fourier integrals since the symbols involved belong to a bounded subset of zero-order symbols and since the operator has a canonical relation which is a canonical graph in  $T^*\mathbb{R}^n \times T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ . Indeed, if

$$\varphi_{\pm} = (x - y) \cdot \xi \pm (t - \tau - |y||\xi|),$$

is the phase, the last condition is equivalent to the statement that for  $\xi \neq 0$

$$\det \partial^2 \varphi_{\pm} / \partial y_j \partial \xi_k \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_y \varphi_{\pm} \neq 0, \quad \text{if} \quad \nabla_{\xi} \varphi_{\pm} = 0.$$

(See, e.g. [17, p. 174].) However, since this Hessian determinant is just  $-1 \mp \langle y/|y|, \xi/|\xi| \rangle$  and since  $\nabla_y \varphi_{\pm} = -\xi \mp |\xi| \cdot y/|y|$ , this condition is met since  $\nabla_{\xi} \varphi_{\pm}$  does not vanish in a conic neighborhood of  $\mp y/|y|$  if  $|x| \leq t/2$ . For instance, if  $x = 0$  one must have  $\xi/|\xi| = \pm y/|y|$  if the  $\xi$ -gradient vanishes since, by assumption,  $t - \tau - |y| > 0$ .

Since we have argued that the remaining estimate (2.4') follows from the usual  $L^2$  Fourier integral calculus, the proof is complete.  $\square$

Let us now see that we can use (2.1) to estimate  $w$  if the norm is taken over a set where  $T/2 \leq t \leq T$  and  $F(t, x)$  vanishes when  $t$  is smaller than a fixed multiple of  $T$ , if, as in Theorem 1.2, we also assume that  $|x| < t - 1$  in the support of  $F$ . To be more specific, if we let  $w = w^1 + w^0$ , where  $\square w^1 = F^1$  with zero data and if  $F^1(t, x) = F(t, x)$  for  $t \geq T/10$ , but zero otherwise then we claim that, for  $q = 2(n+1)/(n-1)$ ,

$$(2.5) \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q-\varepsilon} w^1\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T\})} \leq CT^{-2\varepsilon} (\log T)^{2/q} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q+\varepsilon} F^1\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.$$

Note that  $w^1$  and  $F^1$ , like  $w$  and  $F$ , vanish when  $t - |x| \leq 1$ .

The next step is to also break things up with respect to the  $t - |x|$  variable. Specifically, we note that (2.5) follows from the further localized bounds

$$(2.5') \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} w^1\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, 2^{k-1} \leq t - |x| \leq 2^k\})} \\ \leq C(\log T)^{1/q} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} F^1\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.$$

Clearly in what follows we may assume that  $2^k \leq 4T$ , since otherwise the condition in the left will not be satisfied. Also, if we set  $T_k = T/2^k$  and let  $w_k^1(t, x) = w^1(2^k t, 2^k x)$  and  $F_k^1(t, x) = 2^{2k} F^1(2^k t, 2^k x)$ , then our task is equivalent to showing that

$$(2.5'') \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} w_k^1\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T_k/2 \leq t \leq T_k, 1/2 \leq t - |x| \leq 1\})} \\ \leq C(\log T)^{1/q} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} F_k^1\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.$$

Note that  $(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/2} \geq 2^{-k}$  and  $t \geq T_k/10$  on the support of  $F_k^1$ .

To use all of this we shall need the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $E_+$  be the forward fundamental solution for  $\square$ . If  $0 \leq t - |x| \leq 1$ ,  $t/10 \leq s \leq t$ , and  $s - 1 \leq |y| \leq s$ , then*

$$|x/|x| - y/|y|| \leq C/\sqrt{t} \text{ if } (t, x, s, y) \in \text{supp } E_+(t - s, x - y),$$

for some uniform constant  $C$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Suppose that  $K(x, y)$  is a measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$  and set*

$$Tf(x) = \int K(x, y) f(y) dy.$$

*Suppose further that we can write  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as disjoint unions  $\mathbb{R}^m = \cup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} A_j$  and  $\mathbb{R}^n = \cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} B_k$ , where if  $x \in A_j$ , then  $K(x, y) = 0$  when  $y \in B_k$  with  $|j - k| \geq C$ , for some uniform constant  $C$ . Then, if we let  $T_{jk}$  denote the integral operator with kernel  $K_{jk}$ , where  $K_{jk}(x, y) = K(x, y)$  if  $(x, y) \in A_j \times B_k$  and zero otherwise,*

$$\|T\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^q} \leq (2C + 1)^d \cdot \sup_{j,k} \|T_{jk}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^q},$$

provided that  $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ .

Using these two lemmas it is easy to obtain (2.5'') from (2.1). We first notice that it is enough to prove the variant of (2.5'') where in the left we also assume that  $|x/|x| - \nu| \leq C/\sqrt{T_k}$  for some  $\nu \in S^{n-1}$ . Next, we let  $\omega = (t, x)/\sqrt{t^2 - |x|^2}$  denote the projection of  $(t, x)$  onto the unit hyperboloid  $\mathbb{H}^n$ , we notice that if  $(t_j, x_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$  are two points in the set where  $T_k/2 \leq t \leq T_k$ ,  $1/2 \leq t - |x| \leq 1$ ,  $|x/|x| - \nu| \leq C/\sqrt{T_k}$ , then we must have  $\text{dist}(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leq C_0$ , for some uniform

constant with  $\text{dist}$  denoting the distance on  $\mathbb{H}^n$  with respect to the restriction of the Lorentz metric  $dx^2 - dt^2$  to the hyperboloid. Hence, after making a Lorentz rotation which sends this set to the “middle” of the light cone, we see that the remaining estimate would follow from

$$\begin{aligned} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} w\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): |x| \leq t/2, T_k^{1/2}/2 \leq t \leq T_k^{1/2}\})} \\ \leq C(\log T)^{1/q} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} F\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}, \end{aligned}$$

if  $\square w = F$  with zero data and  $F(t, x) = 0$  if  $(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/2} \leq 2^{-k}$ , as before. This in turn follows from (2.1) if we rescale since  $T_k = T/2^k$  and  $2^k \leq 4T$ .

Thus our proof of (2.5) will be complete once we have established the above elementary lemmas.

The first one is quite standard and relies on a geometric fact that has been used extensively in the study of circular maximal operators and related topics. See, e.g., [1], [16] and [25].

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.* The conclusion trivially holds for a large constant  $C$  if  $t$  is small, so in what follows we shall assume, say,  $t \geq 20$ , so that our assumptions then give  $2|y| \geq s$ . We then need to use the following version of Huygen’s principle:

$$E_+(t - s, x - y) = 0, \quad \text{if } |x - y| > t - s.$$

Using the identity

$$|x - y|^2 = (|x| - |y|)^2 + 2(|x||y| - x \cdot y) = (|x| - |y|)^2 + |x||y||x/|x| - y/|y||^2,$$

we see that  $|x - y|^2 \leq (t - s)^2$  is equivalent to

$$\left| \frac{x}{|x|} - \frac{y}{|y|} \right|^2 \leq \frac{(t - s)^2 - (|x| - |y|)^2}{|x||y|} = \frac{(t - |x| - (s - |y|))(t + |x| - (s + |y|))}{|x||y|}.$$

Since  $|y| \leq s$  the right side is  $\leq (t - |x|)(t + |x|)/|x||y|$ , which in turn is  $O(t^{-1})$  if the assumptions are fulfilled.  $\square$

Notice how the lower bound for  $s$  is essential. It is for this reason that we must use different techniques to estimate the norm of  $w$  over  $T/2 \leq t \leq T$  if  $F$  is supported in a region where  $t$  is much smaller than  $T$ .

We still must handle the last lemma:

*Proof of Lemma 2.3.* Let us assume that  $q < \infty$ , since the proof for  $q = \infty$  is similar. We first notice that Hölder’s inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int |Tf(x)|^q dx &= \sum_j \int_{A_j} |Tf(x)|^q dx \\ &\leq (2C + 1)^{(q-1)d} \sum_{\{(j,k): |j-k| \leq C\}} \int |T_{jk} f_k(x)|^q dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_k(y) = f(y)$  if  $y \in B_k$  and zero otherwise. This in turn is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (2C+1)^{(q-1)d} \sup \|T_{jk}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^q}^q \cdot \sum_{\{(j,k): |j-k| \leq C\}} \left( \int |f_k(y)|^p dy \right)^{q/p} \\
&\leq (2C+1)^{qd} \sup \|T_{jk}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^q}^q \cdot \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \|f_k\|_{L^p}^q \\
&\leq (2C+1)^{qd} \sup \|T_{jk}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^q}^q \cdot \|f\|_{L^p}^q,
\end{aligned}$$

using our assumption that  $p \leq q$  in the last step.  $\square$

### 3. Degenerate Fourier integrals and bounds for relatively large times

To finish our proof of (1.12) we have to estimate  $w_0$  which involves the contributions to  $w$  from relatively small-time parts of  $F$ . Specifically, if  $T \geq 10$ , and if we set  $F^0(t, x) = F(t, x)$  if  $t \leq T/10$  and 0 otherwise and if  $w^0$  is the solution of  $\square w^0 = F^0$  with zero data then it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.1) \quad &\|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q-\varepsilon} w^0\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T\})} \\
&\leq CT^{-\varepsilon/4} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q+\varepsilon} F^0\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

As before,  $q = 2(n+1)/(n-1)$ . Note that  $F^0$  and  $w^0$ , like  $F$  and  $w$  in (1.12), vanish if  $t - |x| \leq 1$ . Clearly since  $w = w^0 + w^1$ , this inequality along with (2.5) yields (1.12).

The proof of (3.1) is in many ways opposite to that of (2.5). Instead of relying on  $L^2$  estimates for “non-degenerate” Fourier integrals, the main part here rests on weighted  $L^2$  estimates for the degenerate Fourier integral operators which arise in the study of the characteristic Cauchy problem. Also, the main reduction now will rely on the geometry of internally tangent spheres, rather than externally tangent ones as in the earlier estimate.

To set up the main estimate, let us make a couple of reductions which exploit the fact that the weights in (3.1) scale favorably because of the  $\varepsilon$  parts. First, if we assume additionally that  $F^0$  vanishes for  $t \notin [T_0, 2T_0]$ , then it suffices to show that the variant of (3.1) holds where  $T^{-\varepsilon/4}$  is replaced by  $(TT_0)^{-\varepsilon/4}$  in the right. If we assume further that  $F^0$  also vanishes if  $t - |x| \notin [\delta_0 T_0, 2\delta_0 T_0]$  then it suffices to show that the inequality holds with operator norm  $O(T^{-\varepsilon/4} T_0^{-\varepsilon/2})$ . Since by domain of dependence considerations,  $w^0$  will then vanish if  $t - |x| \leq \delta_0 T_0$ , we conclude that this in turn would follow from showing that for  $\delta \geq \delta_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.1') \quad &\|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q-\varepsilon} w^0\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, \delta T_0 \leq t - |x| \leq 2\delta T_0\})} \\
&\leq C(TT_0)^{-\varepsilon/2} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q+\varepsilon} F^0\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}},
\end{aligned}$$

assuming as we are now that

$$F^0(t, x) = 0 \text{ if } t \notin [T_0, 2T_0], \text{ or } t - |x| \notin [\delta_0 T_0, 2\delta_0 T_0].$$

Note that we must have  $\delta_0 \geq 1/T_0$ .

One advantage of this inequality is that in both sides the weights are essentially constant on the supports. Specifically, our task amounts to showing that

$$\begin{aligned} (TT_0\delta)^{1/q-\varepsilon} \|w^0\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, \delta T_0 \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta T_0\})} \\ \leq C(TT_0)^{-\varepsilon/2} (T_0^2\delta_0)^{1/q+\varepsilon} \|F^0\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $1/T_0 \leq \delta_0 \leq \delta$ , by rearranging terms, this in turn would follow from

$$\begin{aligned} (T/T_0)^{1/q-\varepsilon/2} \delta^{1/q+\varepsilon/2} \|w^0\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, \delta T_0 \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta T_0\})} \\ \leq C\delta_0^{1/q} \|F^0\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if we let  $G(t, x) = T_0^2 F^0(T_0 t, T_0 x)$  and  $v(t, x) = w^0(T_0 t, T_0 x)$  so that

$$\square v = G, \quad v(0, \cdot) = \partial_t v(0, \cdot) = 0,$$

and

$$\text{supp } G \subset \{(t, x) : 1 \leq t \leq 2, \delta_0 \leq t - |x| \leq 2\delta_0\},$$

then, if we abuse notation and let  $T$  now denote  $T/T_0$ , the last inequality is in turn equivalent to

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} T^{1/q-\varepsilon/2} \delta^{1/q+\varepsilon/2} \|v\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, \delta \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta\})} \\ \leq C\delta_0^{1/q} \|G\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we can assume that  $\delta_0 \leq \delta$ , and, since we have replaced  $T/T_0$  by  $T$ , our assumption on  $T$  is now that  $T \geq 10$ .

It is easy to handle the extreme cases of this inequality where, say,  $\delta_0 \leq \delta \leq 10\delta_0$ , or  $\delta \geq 10$ .

For the first case, a stronger version would say that, for  $T \geq 10$ ,

$$T^{1/q} \|v\|_{L^q(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T\})} \leq C \|G\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}, \quad \text{if } G(t, x) = 0, \quad t \notin [1, 2].$$

But if we use a routine freezing argument (see, e.g. [17, §0.3]), we see that this follows from the following estimates of Strichartz [23]

$$\|u(t-s, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C |t-s|^{-2/q} \|g\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where

$$u(t, x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{ix \cdot \xi} \sin(t|\xi|) \hat{g}(\xi) d\xi / |\xi|.$$

This inequality implies the preceding one since if we let  $K(t, s) = |t-s|^{-2/q}$ , when  $(t, s) \in [T/2, T] \times [1, 2]$  and 0 otherwise then, by Hölder's inequality, the associated integral operator sends  $L^{q/(q-1)}(\mathbb{R})$  to  $L^q(\mathbb{R})$  with norm  $O(T^{-1/q})$ .

The case where, in (3.2),  $\delta \geq 10$  is even easier to handle. Indeed, since the forward fundamental solution  $E_+(t, x)$  vanishes for  $t < 0$  and for  $t \geq 0$  is a multiple of  $\chi_+^{-(n-1)/2}(t^2 - |x|^2)$ , a calculation shows that for  $1 \leq s \leq 2$ ,  $|y| \leq s$ , and  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\int_{T/2}^T \int_{t-|x| \geq 10} |(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/q} E_+(t-s, x-y)|^q dt dx = O(1),$$

if as above  $q = 2(n+1)/(n-1)$ . This just follows from the fact that the  $E_+$  term is  $O((t(t-|x|))^{-(n-1)/2})$  because of our assumptions. If we use Hölder's inequality as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we conclude that, as claimed, (3.2) must hold when  $t - |x| \geq 10$ .

To handle the remaining cases where  $10\delta_0 \leq \delta \leq 10$ , first notice that if we use Hölder's inequality, as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, then we find that  $v$  in (3.2) is dominated by  $\delta_0^{1/q}$  times

$$\left( \int_{\delta_0}^{2\delta_0} \left| \iint e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} |\xi|^{-1} \sin((t-\tau-|y|)|\xi|) G(\tau+|y|, y) d\xi dy \right|^{q/(q-1)} d\tau \right)^{(q-1)/q}.$$

Therefore, since we are assuming that  $\delta \geq 10\delta_0$ , if we replace  $t$  by  $t-\tau$ , we conclude that the remaining cases of (3.2) would be a consequence of the following

**Proposition 3.1.** *For  $n \geq 2$  set*

$$(Tg)(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n: 1 \leq |y| \leq 2\}} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi - i(t-|y|)|\xi|} g(y) dy d\xi / |\xi|.$$

Then, if  $q = 2(n+1)/(n-1)$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $t > 5$  and  $\delta < 10$

$$(3.3) \quad \|Tg(t, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\{x: \delta \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta\})} \leq Ct^{\varepsilon-2/q} \delta^{-\varepsilon-1/q} \|g\|_{L^{q/(q-1)}}.$$

As before, we shall prove this using complex interpolation. To this end, let us set

$$(T_z g)(t, x) = (z - (n+1)/2) e^{z^2} \iint_{1 \leq |y| \leq 2} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi - i(t-|y|)|\xi|} |\xi|^{-z} g(y) dy d\xi,$$

so that  $T_1$  is a multiple of  $T$ . Therefore, if we apply complex interpolation we conclude that (3.3) would be a consequence of

$$(3.4) \quad \|T_z g(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq Ct^{-(n-1)/2} \|g\|_{L^1}, \quad \operatorname{Re} z = (n+1)/2,$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad \|T_z g(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\{x: \delta \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta\})} \leq Ct^{\varepsilon/2} \delta^{-\varepsilon-1/2} \|g\|_{L^2}, \quad \operatorname{Re} z = 0.$$

Inequality (3.4) is a simple consequence of (2.3') and our assumption that  $t \geq 5$ . The  $L^2$  estimate is more delicate. For it, we shall need to use a bit of microlocal

analysis. These techniques will only work for large frequencies  $\xi$ , depending on the scales  $\delta$  and  $t$ . Fortunately, it is easy to deal with the part of our operator coming from small  $\xi$  using the Sobolev trace theorem.

Let us be more specific. To simplify the notation to follow, let us set

$$\alpha = 1 + \varepsilon/2.$$

If we then fix  $\rho \in C^\infty$  satisfying  $\rho(\xi) = 0$  for  $|\xi| \leq 1$  and  $\rho = 1$  for  $|\xi| \geq 2$  we claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & (R_z g)(t, x) \\ &= (z - (n+1)/2)e^{z^2} \iint_{1 \leq |y| \leq 2} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi - i(t-|y||\xi|)|\xi|} |\xi|^{-z} (1 - \rho(t^{1-\alpha} \delta^\alpha \xi)) g(y) dy d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

satisfies

$$(3.6) \quad \|R_z g(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C t^{(\alpha-1)/2} \delta^{-\alpha/2} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \text{Re } z = 0.$$

But this follows by duality from the special case corresponding to  $T = 2$  of the following lemma which, for future use, we state in greater generality than is needed here.

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $T \geq 1$  then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int e^{ix \cdot \xi - i|x||\xi|} \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi \right\|_{L^2(T/2 \leq |x| \leq T)} \\ & \leq CT^{1/2} \left( \|\hat{f}\|_{L^2(|\xi| \leq 1)} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{k/2} \|\hat{f}\|_{L^2(2^k \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{k+1})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* If we change variables, we can write the left side as

$$T^{-n/2} \left\| \int e^{ix \cdot \xi - i|x||\xi|} \hat{f}(\xi/T) d\xi \right\|_{L^2(1/2 \leq |x| \leq 1)}.$$

If, for fixed  $1/2 \leq t \leq 1$ , we apply the the Sobolev trace theorem (see, e.g., [5, Appendix B]) to the function  $x \rightarrow \int e^{ix \cdot \xi - it|\xi|} \hat{f}(\xi/T) d\xi$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\theta \in S^{n-1}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{it\theta \cdot \xi - it|\xi|} \hat{f}(\xi/T) d\xi \right|^2 d\theta \\ & \leq C \left( \|\hat{f}(\xi/T)\|_{L^2(|\xi| \leq 1)} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{j/2} \|\hat{f}(\xi/T)\|_{L^2(2^j \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{j+1})} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$



If we now integrate over  $1/2 \leq t \leq 1$ , we conclude that the left side of the inequality in the statement of the lemma is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned} & T^{-n/2} \left( \|\hat{f}(\xi/T)\|_{L^2(|\xi| \leq 1)} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{j/2} \|\hat{f}(\xi/T)\|_{L^2(2^j \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{j+1})} \right) \\ & \leq T^{-n/2} \left( T^{1/2} \|\hat{f}(\xi/T)\|_{L^2(|\xi| \leq T)} + \sum_{2^{j-1} \geq T} 2^{j/2} \|\hat{f}(\xi/T)\|_{L^2(2^j \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{j+1})} \right) \\ & \leq 2T^{1/2} \left( \|\hat{f}\|_{L^2(|\xi| \leq 1)} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{k/2} \|\hat{f}(\xi)\|_{L^2(2^k \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{k+1})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

In view of (3.6), we conclude that (3.5) would follow if

$$(3.7) \quad \|S_z g(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\{x: \delta \leq t - |x| \leq 2\delta\})} \leq C\delta^{-1/2} \|g\|_{L^2}, \quad \operatorname{Re} z = 0,$$

if

$$(S_z g)(t, x) = e^{z^2/2} \iint_{1 \leq |y| \leq 2} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi - i(t-|y||\xi|)} |\xi|^{-z} \rho(t^{1-\alpha} \delta^\alpha \xi) g(y) dy d\xi.$$

Note that the bounds in (3.7) are stronger than those in (3.5) or (3.6); however, unlike in the preceding inequality, it is necessary to assume that  $t - |x|$  is larger than  $\delta$  in the norm on the left.

To proceed we shall require a couple of elementary lemmas. The first one is the following

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $a(\xi)$  belongs to a bounded subset of  $S^0$ , and if  $\rho \in C^\infty$  satisfies  $\rho(\xi) = 0$  for  $|\xi| \leq 1$ , and  $\rho = 1$ ,  $|\xi| \geq 2$ , then, for  $\alpha > 1$  and  $t > 1$ ,*

$$\left| \int e^{ix \cdot \xi - it|\xi|} a(\xi) \rho(t^{1-\alpha} \delta^\alpha \xi) d\xi \right| \leq C_{N,\alpha} (\delta/t)^N, \quad \text{if } ||x| - t| \geq \delta/2.$$

*Proof.* After changing scales, we may take  $t = 1$ . If we then replace  $x$ ,  $t$  and  $\delta$  by  $x/t$ , 1 and  $\delta/t$ , respectively, it suffices to show that if  $\tilde{a}(\xi) = a(\xi/t)$ , then

$$\left| \int e^{ix \cdot \xi - i|\xi|} \tilde{a}(\xi) \rho(\delta^\alpha \xi) d\xi \right| \leq C_{N,\alpha} \delta^N, \quad \text{if } ||x| - 1| \geq \delta/2.$$

It is easy to see, simply by integrating by parts, that these bounds hold if, say  $|x| \notin [1/2, 3/2]$ . Assuming that  $|x| \in [1/2, 3/2]$ , we can use polar coordinates,  $\xi = \lambda\theta$ ,  $\theta \in S^{n-1}$ , and stationary phase (see e.g. [17, Theorem 1.2.1]) to rewrite our oscillatory integral as

$$\sum_{\pm} \int_0^\infty e^{i\lambda(1 \pm |x|)} b_{\pm}(x, \lambda) \lambda^{(n-1)/2} d\lambda,$$

where, because of our assumptions on the original symbol,  $b_{\pm} = 0$  for  $\lambda \leq C\delta^{-\alpha}$ , and  $(\partial/\partial\lambda)^j b_{\pm} = O(\lambda^{-j})$ . Therefore, if we integrate by parts  $N$  times, we see that the preceding term is dominated for a given large  $N$  by

$$\int_{C\delta^{-\alpha}}^{\infty} |1 \pm |x||^{-N} \lambda^{(n-1)/2-N} d\lambda = O(\delta^{-N} \delta^{\alpha N - (n+1)/2}),$$

which gives us the desired bounds since  $\alpha > 1$ .  $\square$

To use this, let  $K_z$  denote the kernel of  $S_z$ , that is,

$$K_z(t; x, y) = e^{z^2/2} \int e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi - i(t-|y|)|\xi|} |\xi|^{-z} \rho(t^{1-\alpha} \delta^{\alpha} \xi) d\xi.$$

We then conclude that

$$(3.8) \quad K_z = O((\delta/t)^N) \forall N, \text{ if } ||x-y| - |t-|y|| \geq \delta/2.$$

To apply this we require the following

**Lemma 3.4.** *Suppose that  $t > 5$ ,  $1 \leq |y| \leq 2$  and that  $||x-y| - |t-|y|| \leq \delta/2$  and  $\delta \leq t - |x| \leq 2\delta$ . It then follows that if  $\delta$  is smaller than a fixed positive constant*

$$|y/|y| - x/|x|| \in [C_0^{-1}\delta^{1/2}, C_0\delta^{1/2}],$$

for some absolute constant  $C_0$ .

The condition  $||x-y| - |t-|y|| \leq \delta/2$  says that  $x$  is a distance  $\leq \delta/2$  from the sphere of radius  $t - |y|$  which is internally tangent at the point  $ty/|y|$  to the sphere of radius  $t$  centered at the origin. Thus, the conclusion of the lemma is that these two spheres separate of distance  $\approx \delta$  at points of angle  $\approx \delta^{1/2}$  from  $ty/|y|$ . This type of result can also be found in [1], [16] and [25]. However, for the sake of completeness, let us give the simple proof.

*Proof of Lemma 3.4.* As in the proof of Lemma 2.2 we shall use the identity

$$\left| \frac{x}{|x|} - \frac{y}{|y|} \right|^2 = \frac{|x-y|^2 - (|x|-|y|)^2}{|x||y|} = \frac{|x-y|+|x|-|y|}{|x||y|} \cdot \frac{|x-y|-(|x|-|y|)}{\delta} \cdot \delta.$$

By our assumptions the first factor on the right is bounded from above and below. Writing  $|x-y|-(|x|-|y|) = |x-y|-(t-|y|)+t-|x|$ , we reach the same conclusion for the second factor, yielding the result.  $\square$

In view of (3.8) and the overlap lemma, Lemma 2.3, we conclude from Lemma 3.4 that, for small  $\delta$ , to prove (3.7) it suffices to show that if  $\nu \in S^{n-1}$

$$(3.7') \quad \|(S_z g)(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\{x: |x/|x|-\nu| \geq \delta^{1/2}, |x| \geq 4\})} \leq C\delta^{-1/2} \|g\|_{L^2},$$

assuming that

$$g(y) = 0, \text{ if } |y/|y| - \nu| \geq c_0\delta^{1/2}, \text{ or } |y| \notin [1, 2],$$

with  $c_0 > 0$  being a fixed small constant.

Our final reduction then involves the following

**Lemma 3.5.** *Suppose that  $\psi(\tau) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  vanishes near  $\tau = 0$  and equals 1 when  $|\tau|$  is large. Then if  $\delta$  is small,  $\rho$  and  $\alpha > 1$  are as above, and  $t > 1$ ,*

$$\left| \int e^{ix \cdot \xi - it|\xi|} a(\xi) \psi(\delta^{-1/2}(x/|x| - \xi/|\xi|)) \rho(t^{1-\alpha} \delta^\alpha \xi) d\xi \right| \leq C_N (\delta/t)^N,$$

where, for a given  $N$ , the constants depend only on  $\text{dist}(0, \text{supp } \psi)$  and the size of finitely many derivatives of  $\psi$ , if  $\rho$  is fixed and  $a$  belongs to a bounded subset of  $S^0$ .

*Proof.* If we let  $y = x/t$  and  $\tilde{a}(\xi) = a(\xi/t)$ , the quantity we wish to estimate can be rewritten as

$$t^{-n} \int e^{iy \cdot \xi - i|\xi|} \tilde{a}(\xi) \psi(\delta^{-1/2}(y/|y| - \xi/|\xi|)) \rho((\delta/t)^\alpha \xi) d\xi.$$

We then note that

$$e^{iy \cdot \xi - i|\xi|} = -|y - \xi/|\xi||^{-2} \Delta_\xi e^{iy \cdot \xi - i|\xi|} - i(n-1)|\xi|^{-1} e^{iy \cdot \xi - i|\xi|}.$$

Therefore if we let

$$L(\xi, D_\xi)h(\xi) = -\Delta_\xi(|y - \xi/|\xi||^{-2}h(\xi)) - i(n-1)|\xi|^{-1}h(\xi),$$

the oscillatory integral we wish to estimate can be rewritten as

$$t^{-n} \int e^{iy \cdot \xi - i|\xi|} L^N(\tilde{a}(\xi) \psi(\delta^{-1/2}(y/|y| - \xi/|\xi|)) \rho((\delta/t)^\alpha \xi)) d\xi.$$

Note on the support of the integral  $|y - \xi/|\xi||$  is bounded below by a uniform multiple of  $\delta^{1/2}$  and so

$$|(\partial/\partial\xi)^\gamma(|y - \xi/|\xi||^{-2})| \leq C_\gamma \delta^{-1-|\gamma|/2} |\xi|^{-|\gamma|}.$$

We also clearly have

$$|(\partial/\partial\xi)^\gamma(\tilde{a}(\xi) \psi(\delta^{-1/2}(x/|x| - \xi/|\xi|)) \rho((\delta/t)^\alpha \xi))| \leq C_\gamma \delta^{-|\gamma|/2} |\xi|^{-|\gamma|}.$$

From this we conclude that

$$|L^N(\tilde{a}(\xi) \psi(\delta^{-1/2}(x/|x| - \xi/|\xi|)) \rho((\delta/t)^\alpha \xi))| \leq C_N \delta^{-N} |\xi|^{-N},$$

which implies that for a given large  $N$  the oscillatory integral is dominated by

$$t^{-n} \delta^{-N} \int_{|\xi| \geq C(\delta/t)^{-\alpha}} |\xi|^{-N} d\xi = O(t^{-n-N} \cdot (\delta/t)^{(\alpha-1)N-n\alpha}),$$

yielding the desired bounds since  $\alpha$  and  $t$  are larger than 1.  $\square$

To use this lemma, note that if  $1 \leq |y| \leq 2$ ,  $|x| \geq 4$ ,  $\nu \in S^{n-1}$  and  $|x/|x| - \nu| \geq \delta^{1/2}$  then  $|(x-y)/|x-y| - \nu| \geq \delta^{1/2}/2$  if  $\delta$  is small and  $|y/|y| - \nu| \leq c_0 \delta^{1/2}$ , with  $c_0 > 0$  being a small uniform constant. With this in mind, we conclude that, for small  $\delta$ , (3.7') (and hence (3.7)) is a consequence of the following

**Proposition 3.6.** *Suppose that*

$$f(y) = 0 \text{ if } |y| \notin [1, 2] \text{ or } |y/|y| - e_1| \geq c_0 \delta^{1/2},$$

where  $e_1 = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Then if  $c_0 > 0$  is smaller than a uniform constant which is independent of  $\delta < 1$

$$(3.9) \quad \int_{|\xi/|\xi| - e_1| \geq \delta^{1/2}} \left| \int e^{iy \cdot \xi - i|y||\xi|} f(y) dy \right|^2 d\xi \leq C \delta^{-1} \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

*Proof.* By decomposing the conic region  $\{\xi : |\xi/|\xi| - e_1| \geq \delta^{1/2}\}$  into a finite number of pieces, we see that it suffices to prove the estimate when we integrate over a convex conic subset  $\Gamma_\delta$ . Note then, for later use, that there is a uniform constant  $C_1$  so that if  $\delta < 1$

$$(3.10) \quad |\zeta'/|\zeta|| \leq C_1 \delta^{-1/2} |1 - \zeta_1/|\zeta||, \quad \zeta \in \Gamma_\delta.$$

To be able to apply an integration by parts argument we need to make one further reduction. Specifically, suppose that  $0 \leq a_\delta \in C^\infty$  is supported in the set where  $1/2 \leq |y| \leq 4$  and  $|y/|y| - e_1| \leq 2c_0 \delta^{1/2}$  and satisfies the natural bounds

$$|(\partial/\partial y_1)^j (\partial/\partial y')^\alpha a_\delta(y)| \leq C_{j,\alpha} \delta^{-|\alpha|/2}, \quad \forall j, \alpha,$$

associated with this support assumption. Here  $y' = (y_2, \dots, y_n)$ . If we then set

$$(S_\delta f)(\xi) = \int e^{iy \cdot \xi - i|y||\xi|} a_\delta(y) f(y) dy,$$

then it suffices to show that

$$(3.9') \quad \delta \int_{\xi \in \Gamma_\delta} |S_\delta f(\xi)|^2 d\xi \leq C \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The dual version of this is equivalent to

$$(3.9'') \quad \delta \|S_\delta S_\delta^* h\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\delta)} \leq C \|h\|_{L^2}, \quad \text{supp } h \subset \Gamma_\delta,$$

where  $S_\delta S_\delta^*$  is the integral operator with kernel

$$K_\delta(\xi, \eta) = \int e^{i\Phi(y, \xi, \eta)} a_\delta^2(y) dy, \quad \xi, \eta \in \Gamma_\delta,$$

with the phase being

$$\Phi(y, \xi, \eta) = y \cdot (\xi - \eta) - |y| (|\xi| - |\eta|).$$

Recall that  $a_\delta(y) = 0$  if  $|y/|y| - e_1| \geq 2c_0\delta^{1/2}$ . Assuming, as we may, that  $c_0$  is small enough, we claim that there is a constant  $A$  so that, for every  $N$ ,

$$(3.11) \quad K_\delta(\xi, \eta) \leq C_N \begin{cases} \delta^{(n-1)/2}(1 + \delta|\xi_1 - \eta_1|)^{-N}, & \text{if } \delta^{1/2}|\xi_1 - \eta_1| \geq A|\xi' - \eta'| \\ \delta^{(n-1)/2-N}(\delta^{-1} + |\xi' - \eta'|^2)^{-N}, & \text{if } \delta^{1/2}|\xi_1 - \eta_1| \leq A|\xi' - \eta'|. \end{cases}$$

This yields (3.9'') by Young's inequality since for large  $N$

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta^{(n-1)/2} \int_{A|\xi' - \eta'| \leq \delta^{1/2}|\xi_1 - \eta_1|} (1 + \delta|\xi_1 - \eta_1|)^{-N} d\xi \\ & + \delta^{(n-1)/2-N} \int_{\delta^{1/2}|\xi_1 - \eta_1| \leq A|\xi' - \eta'|} (\delta^{-1} + |\xi' - \eta'|^2)^{-N} d\xi = O(\delta^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

To prove the first bound we need to integrate by parts with respect to  $y$ . To do so we note that, by the mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial\Phi/\partial y_1| &= |(\xi_1 - \eta_1) - y_1/|y| (|\xi| - |\eta|)| \\ &= |(\xi_1 - \eta_1) - y_1/|y| \cdot |\zeta|^{-1}\zeta \cdot (\xi - \eta)| \\ &\geq |\xi_1 - \eta_1| \cdot |1 - \zeta_1/|\zeta|| - ||\zeta|^{-1}\zeta' \cdot (\xi' - \eta')|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\zeta$  is a point on the line segment connecting  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ . Since we are assuming that  $\Gamma_\delta$  is convex we must have  $\zeta \in \Gamma_\delta$  and so  $|1 - \zeta_1/|\zeta|| \geq c\delta$  for some uniform  $c > 0$ . Therefore, if we let  $A = 2C_1$ , where  $C_1$  is as in (3.10), we conclude that for  $\xi, \eta \in \Gamma_\delta$  we must have

$$|\partial\Phi/\partial y_1| \geq c\delta/2 \cdot |\xi_1 - \eta_1| \text{ if } \delta^{1/2}|\xi_1 - \eta_1| \geq A|\xi' - \eta'|.$$

Notice also that, for such  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ ,

$$|(\partial/\partial y_1)^j \Phi| \leq C_j \delta |\xi - \eta| \leq C'_j \delta |\xi_1 - \eta_1|, \quad j \geq 2, \quad y \in \text{supp } a_\delta.$$

If we note that

$$e^{i\Phi} = \left(1 + \left|\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial y_1}\right|^2\right)^{-1} \left( \left(1 - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_1^2}\right) e^{i\Phi} + i \frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial y_1^2} e^{i\Phi} \right),$$

then we can integrate by parts to see that, for a given  $N$ ,  $K_\delta$  can be written as a combination of terms of the form

$$\int e^{i\Phi} \frac{(\partial/\partial y_1)^{l_1} \Phi \dots (\partial/\partial y_1)^{l_m} \Phi}{(1 + |\partial\Phi/\partial y_1|^2)^{j+k}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}\right)^{l_{m+1}} a_\delta^2(y) dy,$$

where

$$j + k = 2N, \quad 0 \leq m \leq j, \quad l_j \geq 2, \quad j \leq m.$$

From this we obtain the first bounds for  $K_\delta$  in (3.11) since  $a_\delta$  is supported in a set of measure  $O(\delta^{(n-1)/2})$ .

The argument for the other bound in (3.11) is similar except here we must use our assumption that  $a_\delta = 0$  when  $|y/|y| - e_1| \geq 2c_0\delta^{1/2}$  with  $c_0$  small. To use this, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{y'}\Phi| &\geq |\xi' - \eta'| - |y'/|y|| \cdot ||\xi| - |\eta|| \\ &\geq |\xi' - \eta'| - 2c_0\delta^{1/2}|\xi - \eta|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence if  $|\xi_1 - \eta_1| \leq A\delta^{-1/2}|\xi' - \eta'|$ , where  $A$  is the fixed constant chosen in the last step, we conclude that

$$(3.12) \quad |\nabla_{y'}\Phi| \geq |\xi' - \eta'|/2, \quad y \in \text{supp } a_\delta$$

if  $c_0$  is small. Notice also that, because of our assumptions,

$$(3.13) \quad |(\partial/\partial y')^\alpha \Phi| \leq C|\xi - \eta| \leq C'\delta^{-1/2}|\xi' - \eta'|.$$

To apply this, we first observe that

$$e^{i\Phi} = (\delta^{-1} + |\nabla_{y'}\Phi|^2)^{-1} ((\delta^{-1} - \Delta_{y'})e^{i\Phi} + i\Delta_{y'}\Phi e^{i\Phi}).$$

Consequently, if we integrate by parts using this formula, we conclude that, for a given  $N$ , we can write  $K_\delta$  as a finite combination of terms of the form

$$(3.14) \quad \int e^{i\Phi} \frac{\delta^{-l}(\partial/\partial y')^{\alpha_1}\Phi \dots (\partial/\partial y')^{\alpha_m}\Phi}{(\delta^{-1} + |\nabla_{y'}\Phi|^2)^{j+k+l}} (\partial/\partial y')^\gamma a_\delta^2 dy,$$

where  $j + k + l = 2N$ ,  $m \leq j$ , and  $|\gamma| \leq 2k$ . Using (3.12) and (3.13) we conclude that

$$(\delta^{-1} + |\nabla_{y'}\Phi|^2)^{-1} |(\partial/\partial y')^\alpha \Phi| \leq C_\alpha \delta^{-1/2} (\delta^{-1} + |\xi' - \eta'|^2)^{-1/2}.$$

Since

$$(\partial/\partial y')^\gamma a_\delta^2 = O(\delta^{-|\gamma|/2}) = O(\delta^{-k}),$$

we conclude that (3.14) is majorized by

$$\delta^{(n-1)/2} \delta^{-j/2-k-l} (\delta^{-1} + |\xi' - \eta'|^2)^{-j/2-k-l},$$

yielding the other bound for  $K_\delta$ , which finishes the proof.  $\square$

So far we have shown that (3.7) holds when  $0 < \delta < \delta_1$ , with  $\delta_1$  being a uniform small constant. The argument for the remaining case where  $\delta_1 < \delta < 10$  is easier. We note that if  $t - |x| \geq \delta_1 > 0$  then the above arguments show that if  $b \in$

$C^\infty$  vanishes near  $\xi = 0$  but equals 1 outside of a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin, then for  $\text{Re } z = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} (S_z g)(t, x) &= e^{z^2/2} \iint_{1 \leq |y| \leq 2} e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi - i(t-|y||\xi|)|\xi|^{-z}} \rho(t^{1-\alpha} \delta^\alpha \xi) b(y/|y| - \xi/|\xi|) g(y) dy d\xi \\ &+ O(t^{-N}), \end{aligned}$$

for any  $N$ . If we call  $\tilde{S}_z g$  the first term on the right, then we need only estimate it. By Plancherel's theorem

$$\|\tilde{S}_z g(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \int \left| \int_{1 \leq |y| \leq 2} e^{iy\cdot\xi - i|y||\xi|} b(y/|y| - \xi/|\xi|) g(y) dy \right|^2 d\xi.$$

Since  $\det \partial^2 \phi / \partial y_j \partial \xi_k \neq 0$  on the support of the symbol, where  $\phi = y \cdot \xi - |y||\xi|$  is the phase, we can use Hörmander's  $L^2$  theorem for Fourier integral operators to conclude that the last term is dominated by  $\|g\|_{L^2}^2$ . From this we conclude that (3.7) must hold when  $\delta > \delta_1$ , which finishes our proof.

#### 4. $L^2$ estimates

To finish matters, we still have to prove (1.13). Since it is easy to handle small times, we see that it suffices to show that if  $w$  solves the inhomogeneous wave equation  $\square w = F$  with zero data, and if  $F(t, x) = 0$  when  $t - |x| \leq 1$ , then for  $T \geq 10$ , say,

$$\|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{-1/2-\varepsilon} w\|_{L^2(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T\})} \leq CT^{-\varepsilon/4} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/2+\varepsilon} F\|_{L^2}.$$

If we split  $w$  up as before,  $w = w^0 + w^1$ , where  $\square w^1 = F^1$ , with  $F^1(t, x) = F(t, x)$  for  $t > T/10$  and 0 otherwise, then it suffices to show that for  $j = 0, 1$

$$(4.1) \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{-1/2-\varepsilon} w^j\|_{L^2(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T\})} \leq CT^{-\varepsilon/4} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/2+\varepsilon} F^j\|_{L^2}.$$

Like before, the estimate for  $j = 1$  is the easiest. If we repeat the arguments which showed how (2.1) implies (2.5), we conclude that the version of (4.1) for  $j = 1$  would be a consequence of the following variant of (2.1) where  $w$  and  $F$  are now assumed to be as in Proposition 2.1:

$$(4.2) \quad \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{-1/2} w\|_{L^2(|x| < t/2, T/2 \leq t \leq T)} \leq C(\log T)^{1/2} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{1/2} F\|_{L^2}.$$

However, since the proof of (2.4) also shows that the same estimate holds when  $\text{Re } z = 1$ , we obtain (4.2) and hence (4.1) when  $j = 1$ .

To handle the case where  $j = 0$ , notice first that the arguments from the preceding section imply that the remaining case of (4.1) would follow from showing that if

$$\text{supp } G \subset \{ (t, x) : 1 \leq t \leq 2, \delta_0 \leq t - |x| \leq 2\delta_0 \},$$

and if  $\square v = G$  with zero data, then for  $T \geq 10$  and  $\delta \geq \delta_0$

$$(4.3) \quad T^{-1/2-\varepsilon/2} \delta^{-1/2+\varepsilon/2} \|v\|_{L^2(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, \delta \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta\})} \leq C \delta_0^{1/2} \|G\|_{L^2}.$$

As in §3, the case where  $t - |x| > 10$  is easy to handle using pointwise estimates for  $E_+(t-s, x-y)$  for such  $(t, x)$  if  $(s, y) \in \text{supp } G$ . So in what follows we shall assume that  $\delta_0 \leq \delta \leq 10$ .

To prove (4.3) for  $t - |x| \leq 10$ , it is convenient to split  $v$  into a low and high frequency part. To this end, fix  $\beta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfying  $\beta = 1$  near the origin. If we then let  $v = v_0 + v_1$ , where

$$v_0 = \iint e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} \beta(\delta \xi) \sin((t-s)|\xi|) G(s, y) ds dy d\xi / |\xi|,$$

then it suffices to show that (4.3) holds when  $v$  is replaced by  $v_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ . Since

$$(1 - \beta(\delta \xi)) / |\xi| = O(\delta),$$

the bound for the high frequency part follows from Schwarz's inequality and the variant of (3.5) where  $|\xi|^{-z}$ ,  $\text{Re } z = 0$ , is replaced by  $\delta^{-1}(1 - \beta(\delta \xi)) / |\xi|$ . Since this inequality follows from the proof of (3.5), we are left with estimating  $v_0$ .

For this piece, let us notice that

$$\int_{|\xi| \leq 1} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} \beta(\delta \xi) \sin((t-s)|\xi|) d\xi / |\xi| = O((1 + |x-y|)^{-(n-1)/2}).$$

Based on this, we conclude that the variant of (4.3) holds if we replace  $v$  by

$$\iint_{|\xi| \leq 1} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} \beta(\delta \xi) \sin((t-s)|\xi|) G(s, y) ds dy d\xi / |\xi|.$$

Consequently, our proof of (4.3) and hence (1.13) would be complete if we could show that when

$$\tilde{v}(t, x) = \iint_{|\xi| \geq 1} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi + i(t-s)|\xi|} |\xi|^{-1} \beta(\delta \xi) G(s, y) ds dy d\xi,$$

we have

$$(4.4) \quad T^{-1/2} \delta^{-1/2} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, \delta \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta\})} \leq C(1 + |\log \delta|) \delta_0^{1/2} \|G\|_{L^2}.$$

Here we are assuming that  $G$  is above. Also, notice that the bounds here are stronger than those in (4.3).

The first step in proving (4.4) is to notice that the Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & T^{-1/2} \delta^{-1/2} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2(\{(t,x): T/2 \leq t \leq T, \delta \leq t-|x| \leq 2\delta\})} \\ & \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \int \left| \iint_{2^k \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{k+1}} e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi - is|\xi|} |\xi|^{-1/2} \beta(\delta \xi) G(s, y) d\xi ds dy \right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$



Next, if we recall the support properties of  $G$  and use Schwarz's inequality as before we find that the right side is dominated by  $\delta_0^{1/2}$  times

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \iint \left| \iint_{2^k \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{k+1}} e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi - i(\tau+|y||\xi|)|\xi|} |\xi|^{-1/2} \beta(\delta\xi) G(\tau+|y|, y) d\xi dy \right|^2 dx d\tau \right)^{1/2}.$$

Notice that the  $k$ -th summand vanishes if  $k$  is larger than a fixed multiple of  $(1 + |\log \delta|)$  since  $\beta \in C_0^\infty$ . Therefore, if we now apply the dual version of Lemma 3.2, we obtain (4.4).

This completes the proof of (1.13).  $\square$

### Related Estimates.

The above arguments can also be used to prove weighted  $L^2$  estimates for operators which are similar to the solution operator for the inhomogeneous wave equation with zero Cauchy data  $\square w = F$ . As noted before, this equation is solved via  $w = E_+ * F$ , where  $E_+(t, x) = \pi^{(1-n)/2}/2 \cdot \chi_+^{-(n-1)/2}(t^2 - |x|^2)$  for  $t \geq 0$  and 0 otherwise.

We could also, as in [24], consider the related analytic family of operators

$$(T^z F)(t, x) = e^{z^2} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi_+^z((t-s)^2 - |x-y|^2) F(s, y) dy ds,$$

where the convolution is interpreted in the sense of distributions. If  $\text{Re } z \geq -(n+1)/2$ , recall that  $T^z : L_{\text{comp}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n}) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})$ . As a key step in the proof of his estimates, Strichartz [24] showed that for the critical values  $\text{Re } z = -(n+1)/2$ ,  $T^z : L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})$ .

The above arguments show that a weighted version of this estimate holds under our support assumptions. Specifically, if we assume that  $F(t, x) = 0$  when  $t - |x| \leq 0$  or  $t < 0$  and if  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{-\varepsilon + ((n+1)/2 + \sigma)/2} T^z F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})} \\ \leq C \|(t^2 - |x|^2)^{\varepsilon - ((n+1)/2 + \sigma)/2} F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^{1+n})}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that

$$-(n+1)/2 \leq \sigma = \text{Re } z \leq -(n-1)/2.$$

Georgiev [2] showed how this estimate along with a natural extension of John's [6]  $L^\infty$  estimates can be used to prove non-trivial weighted estimates off of the line of duality. Further details will be given later.

By Stein's analytic interpolation theorem, to prove (4.5), it suffices to handle the extreme cases where  $\text{Re } z = -(n-1)/2$  or  $-(n+1)/2$ . The first case of course follows from the arguments given in this section since, as we noted before,  $T^z F$  behaves essentially like the solution of the inhomogeneous wave equation when  $\text{Re } z = -(n-1)/2$ . Also, since  $T^{(n+1)/2+z}$  essentially agrees with the operator  $W^z$  in (2.4), our arguments also yield (4.5) for the other extreme case where  $\text{Re } z = -(n+1)/2$ .

## REFERENCES

1. J. Bourgain, *Averages in the plane over convex curves and maximal operators*, J. Analyse Math. **47** (1986), 69–85.
2. V. Georgiev, *Weighted estimate for the wave equation*, Nonlinear Waves, Proceedings of the Fourth MSJ International Research Institute, vol. 1, Hokkaido Univ., 1996, pp. 71–80.
3. R. Glassey, *Existence in the large for  $\square u = F(u)$  in two dimensions*, Math. Z. **178** (1981), 233–261.
4. L. Hörmander, *Fourier integrals I*, Acta Math. **127** (1971), 79–183.
5. L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators III-IV*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
6. F. John, *Blow-up of solutions of nonlinear wave equations in three space dimensions*, Manuscripta Math. **28** (1979), 235–265.
7. H. Kubo, *On the critical decay and power for semilinear wave equations in odd space dimensions*, preprint.
8. H. Lindblad and C. D. Sogge, *On existence and scattering with minimal regularity for semilinear wave equations*, J. Funct. Anal. **130** (1995), 357–426.
9. ———, *Long-time existence for small amplitude semilinear wave equations*, Amer. J. Math. (to appear).
10. ———, *Restriction theorems and semilinear wave equations in  $(1+3)$ -dimensions*, Duke Math. J. (to appear).
11. M. A. Rammaha, *Finite-time blow-up for nonlinear wave equations in high dimensions*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equations **12** (1987), 677–700.
12. J. Schaeffer, *The equation  $\square u = |u|^p$  for the critical value of  $p$* , Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh **101** (1985), 31–44.
13. A. Seeger, C. D. Sogge and E. M. Stein, *Regularity properties of Fourier integrals*, Annals of Math. **134** (1991), 231–251.
14. I. Segal, *Space-time decay for solutions of wave equations*, Adv. Math. **22** (1976), 305–311.
15. T. Sideris, *Nonexistence of global solutions to semilinear wave equations in high dimensions*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equations **12** (1987), 378–406.
16. C. D. Sogge, *Propagation of singularities and maximal functions in the plane*, Invent. Math. **104** (1991), 349–376.
17. ———, *Fourier integrals in classical analysis*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993.
18. ———, *Lectures on nonlinear wave equations*, International Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.
19. C. D. Sogge and E. M. Stein, *Averages of functions over hypersurfaces: Smoothness of generalized Radon transforms*, J. Analyse Math. **54** (1990), 165–188.
20. E. M. Stein, *Interpolation of linear operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **83** (1956), 482–492.
21. W. Strauss, *Nonlinear scattering theory*, Scattering theory in mathematical physics, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1979, pp. 53–79.
22. ———, *Nonlinear scattering at low energy*, J. Funct. Anal. **41** (1981), 110–133.
23. R. Strichartz, *A priori estimates for the wave equation and some applications*, J. Funct. Analysis **5** (1970), 218–235.
24. ———, *Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations*, Duke Math. J. **44** (1977), 705–714.
25. T. Wolff, *A sharp  $L^3$  estimate via incidence geometry*, preprint.
26. Y. Zhou, *Cauchy problem for semilinear wave equations with small data in four space dimensions*, J. Diff. Equations **8** (1995), 135–144.

BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES