

# OFF-DIAGONAL ESTIMATES FOR THE HELICAL MAXIMAL FUNCTION

DAVID BELTRAN, JENNIFER DUNCAN, AND JONATHAN HICKMAN

ABSTRACT. The optimal  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  mapping properties for the (local) helical maximal function are obtained, except for endpoints. The proof relies on tools from multilinear harmonic analysis and, in particular, a localised version of the Bennett–Carbery–Tao restriction theorem.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Main results.** Let  $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth curve, where  $I := [-1, 1]$ , which is *non-degenerate* in the sense that there is a constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that

$$|\det(\gamma^{(1)}(s), \gamma^{(2)}(s), \gamma^{(3)}(s))| \geq c_0 \quad \text{for all } s \in I. \quad (1.1)$$

This is equivalent to saying that  $\gamma$  has non-vanishing curvature and torsion. Prototypical examples are the helix  $\gamma(s) = (\cos(2\pi s), \sin(2\pi s), s)$  or the moment curve  $\gamma(s) = (s, s^2/2, s^3/6)$ . Given  $t > 0$ , consider the averaging operator

$$A_t f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x - t\gamma(s)) \chi(s) ds,$$

defined initially for Schwartz functions  $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , where  $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  is a bump function supported on the interior of  $I$ . Furthermore, define the associated local maximal function

$$M_\gamma f(x) := \sup_{1 \leq t \leq 2} |A_t f(x)|.$$

Here we are interested in determining the sharp range of  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  estimates for  $M_\gamma$ . To describe the results, let

$$\mathcal{T} := \overline{\text{conv}\{(0, 0), (1/3, 1/3), (1/4, 1/6)\}} \setminus \{(1/3, 1/3)\},$$

so that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a closed triangle (formed by the closed convex hull of three points) with one vertex removed. We let  $\text{int}(\mathcal{T})$  denote the interior of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the intersection of  $\mathcal{T}$  with the diagonal: see Figure 1. Standard examples show that  $M_\gamma$  fails to be  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  bounded whenever  $(1/p, 1/q) \notin \mathcal{T}$ : see §9. The following theorem therefore characterises the type set of  $M_\gamma$ , up to endpoints.

**Theorem 1.1.** *For all  $(1/p, 1/q) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{T}) \cup \mathcal{L}$ , there exists a constant  $C_{\gamma,p,q} \geq 1$  such that the a priori estimate*

$$\|M_\gamma f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_{\gamma,p,q} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

*holds for all  $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ .*

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B25, 42B20.

*Key words and phrases.* Helical maximal function,  $L^p - L^q$  local smoothing estimates.

D.B. supported by the AEI grant RYC2020-029151-I.

J.D. partially supported by ERC grant 834728 and Severo Ochoa grant CEX2019-000904-S.




FIGURE 1. The known range of  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  boundedness for the helical maximal function. In [2] and [18], boundedness was shown on the half-open line segment  $\mathcal{L}$  connecting  $(0,0)$  and  $(1/3, 1/3)$ . By Theorem 1.1, the operator is bounded whenever  $(1/p, 1/q) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{T})$ , the interior of the triangle with vertices  $(0,0)$ ,  $(1/3, 1/3)$  and  $(1/4, 1/6)$ . Frequency localised estimates are obtained at the critical vertex  $(1/4, 1/6)$  by interpolating multilinear inequalities at  $(1/2, 1/3)$ ,  $(1/12, 1/12)$  and  $(1/2, 0)$ ; see §3.5 below.

For the diagonal case (that is,  $(1/p, 1/q) \in \mathcal{L}$ ), the sharp range of estimates was established in [2] and [18], building on earlier work of [21]. Hence, our main result is to push the range of boundedness to the region  $\text{int}(\mathcal{T})$ . As a consequence of Theorem 1.1 (or, more precisely, Theorem 3.1 below) and [4, Theorem 1.4],  $(p, q)$ -sparse bounds for the full maximal operator  $M_\gamma^{\text{full}} f(x) := \sup_{t>0} |A_t f(x)|$  follow for  $(1/p, 1/q) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{T}) \cup \mathcal{L}$ . We omit the details and refer to [4] for the precise statements.

**1.2. Methodology.** Here we provide a brief overview of the ingredients of the proof of Theorem 1.1 and the novel features of the argument. For fixed  $t$ , the averaging operators  $A_t$  correspond to convolution with an appropriate measure  $\mu_t$  on the  $t$ -dilate of  $\gamma$ . It is therefore natural to study these objects via the Fourier transform, which leads us to consider the multiplier

$$\hat{\mu}_t(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\langle \gamma(s), \xi \rangle} \chi(s) ds.$$

Stationary phase can be used to compute the decay rate of this function in different directions in the frequency space. This involves analysing the vanishing of

$s$ -derivatives of the phase function  $\phi(\xi, s) := \langle \gamma(s), \xi \rangle$ . Following earlier work on the circular maximal function [20], it is also useful to study the Fourier transform of  $A_t f(x)$  in *both* the  $x$  and the  $t$  variables. This leads us to consider the 4-dimensional  $(\xi, \tau)$  frequency space.

Broadly speaking, this approach was taken in both works [18] and [2] to study the  $L^p \rightarrow L^p$  mapping properties of  $M_\gamma$ . However, these papers focused on different geometrical aspects of the problem. In very rough terms, the analysis of [18] centres around a 3-dimensional cone  $\Gamma_3$  in  $(\xi, \tau)$ -space arising from the equations  $\partial_s \phi(\xi, s) = 0$ ,  $\tau = \phi(\xi, s)$ . On the other hand, the analysis of [2] centres around a 2-dimensional cone  $\Gamma_2$  in the  $(\xi, \tau)$ -space arising from the system of equations  $\partial_s \phi(\xi, s) = \partial_s^2 \phi(\xi, s) = 0$ ,  $\tau = \phi(\xi, s)$ .

It seems difficult to obtain almost optimal  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  estimates using either the approach of [18] or of [2] in isolation; rather, it appears necessary to incorporate both geometries into the analysis. In order to do this, we apply a recent observation of Bejenaru [1], which provides a localised variant of the Bennett–Carbery–Tao multilinear restriction theorem [7]. We describe the relevant setup in detail in §2 below; moreover, in the appendix we relate the required localised estimates to the theory of Kakeya–Brascamp–Lieb inequalities from [6]. The local multilinear restriction estimate allows us to work simultaneously with the  $\Gamma_2$  and  $\Gamma_3$  geometries, by considering the embedded cone  $\Gamma_2$  as a localised portion of  $\Gamma_3$ . See Proposition 3.5 below.

On the other hand, the geometries of both  $\Gamma_2$  and  $\Gamma_3$  were previously exploited in a non-trivial manner in [19] and [3] using the decoupling inequalities from [10]. This approach is inspired by earlier work of Pramanik–Seeger [21]. Decoupling is effective for proving  $L^p \rightarrow L^p$  bounds for large  $p$ ; here it is used to provide a counterpoint for interpolation with the estimates obtained via local multilinear restriction. See Proposition 3.6 below.

**1.3. Notational conventions.** Throughout the paper,  $I$  denotes the interval  $[-1, 1]$ .

We let  $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$  denote the *frequency domain*, which is the Pontryagin dual group of  $\mathbb{R}$  understood here as simply a copy of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Given  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $g \in L^1(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$  we define the Fourier transform and inverse Fourier transform by

$$\hat{f}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i\langle x, \xi \rangle} f(x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \check{g}(x) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d} e^{i\langle x, \xi \rangle} g(\xi) d\xi,$$

respectively. For  $m \in L^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d)$  we define the multiplier operator  $m(D)$  which acts initially on Schwartz functions by

$$m(D)f(x) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d} e^{i\langle x, \xi \rangle} m(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi.$$

Given a list of objects  $L$  and real numbers  $A, B \geq 0$ , we write  $A \lesssim_L B$  or  $B \gtrsim_L A$  to indicate  $A \leq C_L B$  for some constant  $C_L$  which depends only on items in the list  $L$  and our choice of underlying non-degenerate curve  $\gamma$ . We write  $A \sim_L B$  to indicate  $A \lesssim_L B$  and  $B \lesssim_L A$ .

**1.4. Organisation of the paper.**

- In §2 we present the key localised trilinear restriction estimate.
- In §3 we describe a reduction of Theorem 1.1 to three local-smoothing-type estimates: trilinear  $L^2 \rightarrow L^3$ , linear  $L^{12} \rightarrow L^{12}$  and trivial  $L^2 \rightarrow L^\infty$ .

- In §4 we describe the basic properties of our operators and prove the trivial  $L^2 \rightarrow L^\infty$  estimate.
- In §5 we prove the trilinear  $L^2 \rightarrow L^3$  estimate using the trilinear restriction theorem from §2.
- In §6 we prove the linear  $L^{12} \rightarrow L^{12}$  estimate using decoupling.
- In §7 we bound a non-degenerate portion of the operator.
- In §8 we carry out the reduction described in §3 and thereby bound the remaining degenerate portion of the operator.
- In §9 we demonstrate the sharpness of the range  $\mathcal{T}$ .
- Finally, in Appendix A we present a proof of the localised trilinear restriction theorem from §2.

**Acknowledgements.** The first and third authors would like to thank Shaoming Guo and Andreas Seeger for discussions related to the topic of this paper over the years.

## 2. LOCALISED TRILINEAR RESTRICTION

The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a localised trilinear Fourier restriction estimate. Here we describe the particular setup for our problem. As in [18], it is necessary to work with functions with a limited degree of regularity.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$  and  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be an open set. We say a function  $Q: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is of class  $C^{1,\alpha}(U)$  if it is continuously differentiable on  $U$  and, moreover, the partial derivatives satisfy the  $\alpha$ -Hölder condition

$$\sup_{\substack{\xi_1, \xi_2 \in U \\ \xi_1 \neq \xi_2}} \frac{|\nabla Q(\xi_1) - \nabla Q(\xi_2)|}{|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^\alpha} < \infty.$$

Consider an ensemble  $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, Q_2, Q_3)$  of maps  $Q_j: U_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of class  $C^{1,1/2}(U_j)$  where  $U_j \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3$  is an open domain<sup>1</sup> for  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ . The graphs

$$\Sigma_j := \{(\xi, Q_j(\xi)) : \xi \in U_j\}$$

are hypersurfaces in  $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^4$ , with some limited regularity. Each  $\Sigma_j$  has a Gauss map given by

$$\nu_j: U_j \rightarrow S^3, \quad \nu_j(\xi) := \frac{1}{(1 + |\nabla Q_j(\xi)|^2)^{1/2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\nabla Q_j(\xi) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for all } \xi \in U_j.$$

We further fix a smooth function  $u: U_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $|\nabla u(\xi)| > c_0 > 0$  for all  $\xi \in U_3$ . This implicitly defines a smooth surface  $Z_3 := \{\xi \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 : u(\xi) = 0\}$ , which we lift to

$$\Sigma'_3 := \{(\xi, Q_3(\xi)) : \xi \in Z_3\}.$$

Thus,  $\Sigma'_3$  is a codimension 1 submanifold of  $\Sigma_3$ , which is embedded in  $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^4$ . Defining

$$\nu'_3: Z_3 \rightarrow S^3, \quad \nu'_3(\xi) := \frac{1}{|\nabla u(\xi)|} \begin{pmatrix} \nabla u(\xi) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for all } \xi \in Z_3,$$

it follows that  $\{\nu_3(\xi), \nu'_3(\xi)\}$  forms a basis of the normal space to  $\Sigma'_3$  at  $(\xi, Q_3(\xi))$  for all  $\xi \in Z_3$ .

<sup>1</sup>Here an *open domain* in  $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$  is an open, bounded, connected subset of  $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^d$ .

We now fix  $a_j \in C_c(U_j)$  with  $\|a_j\|_{L^\infty(U_j)} \leq 1$  for  $1 \leq j \leq 3$  and we assume the *transversality hypothesis*

$$\left| \det \begin{pmatrix} \nabla Q_1(\xi_1) & \nabla Q_2(\xi_2) & \nabla Q_3(\xi_3) & \nabla u(\xi_3) \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| > c_{\text{trans}} > 0 \quad (2.1)$$

for all  $\xi_j \in \text{supp } a_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ . Furthermore, given  $0 < \mu < 1$ , we assume the additional *localisation hypothesis*

$$|u(\xi)| < \mu \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp } a_3. \quad (2.2)$$

Finally, we define the *extension operators*

$$E_j f(x, t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{i\langle x, \xi \rangle + tQ_j(\xi)} a_j(\xi) f(\xi) \, d\xi \quad \text{for } f \in L^1(U_j), 1 \leq j \leq 3.$$

The key localised trilinear estimate is as follows.

**Theorem 2.2** (Localised trilinear restriction). *With the above setup, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and all  $R \geq 1$  we have*

$$\left\| \prod_{j=1}^3 |E_j f_j|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^3(B(0, R))} \lesssim_{\mathbf{Q}, \varepsilon} R^\varepsilon \mu^{1/6} \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_j\|_{L^2(U_j)}^{1/3}$$

for all  $f_j \in L^1(U_j)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ .

Here the implied constant depends on the choice of maps  $Q_j$  and, in particular, the lower bound in (2.1), but is (crucially) independent of the choice of parameter  $\mu$  in (2.2) and the choice of scale  $R$ .

If we consider smooth hypersurfaces rather than the  $C^{1,1/2}$  class, then Theorem 2.2 is a special case of [1, Theorem 1.3]. We expect that the arguments of [1] can be generalised to treat  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity for all  $\alpha > 0$ . However, in Appendix A we observe that Theorem 2.2 is a rather direct consequence of the Keakeya–Brascamp–Lieb inequalities from [6] (see also [24, 25]).

### 3. INITIAL REDUCTIONS

**3.1. Local smoothing estimates.** The multipliers of interest are of the following form. For  $I := [-1, 1]$ , let  $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth curve and fix  $\rho \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  supported in the interior  $[1/2, 4]$ . Given a symbol  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ , we define

$$m_\gamma[a](\xi; t) \equiv m[a](\xi; t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\langle \gamma(s), \xi \rangle} a(\xi; t; s) \psi_I(s) \rho(t) \, ds, \quad (3.1)$$

for some  $\psi_I \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  with support lying in  $I$ . Fix  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  non-negative, even and such that

$$\eta(r) = 1 \quad \text{if } r \in I \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp } \eta \subseteq [-2, 2]$$

and define  $\beta, \beta^k \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  by

$$\beta(r) := \eta(r) - \eta(2r) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^k(r) := \beta(2^{-k}r) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.2)$$

By an abuse of notation, we also write  $\eta(\xi) := \eta(|\xi|)$  and  $\beta^k(\xi) := \beta^k(|\xi|)$  for  $\xi \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3$ .

For  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  as above, we form a dyadic decomposition by writing

$$a = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \quad \text{where} \quad a_k(\xi; t; s) := \begin{cases} a(\xi; t; s) \beta^k(\xi) & \text{for } k \geq 1 \\ a(\xi; t; s) \eta(\xi) & \text{for } k = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (3.3)$$

With the above definitions, our main result is as follows.

**Theorem 3.1** ( $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  local smoothing). *Let  $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth curve and suppose  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  satisfies the symbol condition*

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_t^i \partial_s^j a(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_{\alpha, i, j} |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3 \text{ and } i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad (3.4)$$

and that

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 |\langle \gamma^{(j)}(s), \xi \rangle| \gtrsim |\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; s) \in \text{supp}_\xi a \times I. \quad (3.5)$$

Then for all  $(1/p, 1/q) \in \text{int}(\mathcal{T})$  there exists some  $\varepsilon(p, q) > 0$  such that

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_k](D; t) f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)}^q dt \right)^{1/q} \lesssim_{p, q} 2^{-k/q - \varepsilon(p, q)k} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

holds for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , where  $a_k$  is defined as in (3.3).

The desired maximal bound follows from Theorem 3.1 using a standard Sobolev embedding argument; we omit the details but refer the reader to [23, Chapter XI, §3], [21, §6] or [2, §2] for similar arguments.

By results of [2], Theorem 3.1 is known to hold along the diagonal line  $\mathcal{L}$ . By interpolation, it therefore suffices to prove an estimate at the critical vertex  $(1/4, 1/6)$  in the Riesz diagram (see Figure 1).

**Proposition 3.2.** *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_k](D; t) f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^6 dt \right)^{1/6} \lesssim_\varepsilon 2^{-k/6 + \varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \quad (3.6)$$

By the preceding discussion, our main theorem follows from Proposition 3.2. Henceforth, we focus on the proof of this critical estimate.

**3.2. Trilinear reduction.** If the hypothesis (3.5) is strengthened to

$$|\langle \gamma'(s), \xi \rangle| + |\langle \gamma''(s), \xi \rangle| \gtrsim |\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; s) \in \text{supp}_\xi a \times I, \quad (3.7)$$

then one can deduce the critical estimate (3.6) as a consequence of known local smoothing inequalities from [21] (see Theorem 6.8 below) and the Stein–Tomas Fourier restriction inequality. Given a small number  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we perform this analysis on the symbols

$$a_{k,0}(\xi; t; s) := a_k(\xi; t; s) (1 - \eta(2^{-k} \delta^{-20} G_2(s; \xi))) \quad (3.8)$$

where  $G_2(s; \xi) := \sum_{j=1}^2 |\langle \gamma^{(j)}(s), \xi \rangle|$ ; note that  $a_{k,0}$  satisfies (3.7) with an implicit constant depending on  $\delta$ . We discuss this case in detail in §7.

The main difficulty is then to get to grips with the degenerate portion of the multiplier. For the above choice of  $0 < \delta < 1$ , this corresponds to the condition

$$|\langle \gamma'(s), \xi \rangle| + |\langle \gamma''(s), \xi \rangle| \lesssim \delta^{20} |\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; s) \in \text{supp}_\xi a \times I; \quad (3.9)$$

note that this is satisfied on the support of  $\mathbf{a}_k := a_k - a_{k,0}$ . To control the degenerate part, we work with a trilinear variant of Proposition 3.2, from which we deduce the corresponding linear estimate (3.6) via a standard application of the *broad-narrow* method from [11] (see also [16]).

To describe the trilinear setup, we introduce some notation. For  $0 < \delta < 1$  as above, let  $\mathfrak{J}(\delta)$  denote a covering of  $I$  by essentially disjoint intervals of length  $\delta$ . Let  $\mathfrak{J}^{3,\text{sep}}(\delta)$  denote the collection of all triples  $\mathbf{J} = \{J_1, J_2, J_3\} \subset \mathfrak{J}(\delta)$  which satisfy the separation condition  $\text{dist}(J_i, J_j) \geq 10\delta$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ . Given a bounded

interval  $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , we let  $\psi_J \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  satisfy  $\text{supp } \psi_J \subseteq J$  and  $|\partial_s^N \psi_J(s)| \lesssim_N |J|^{-N}$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Similarly to (3.1), given a symbol  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ , we define the multipliers adapted to an interval  $J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)$  by

$$m_\gamma^J[a](\xi; t) \equiv m^J[a](\xi; t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\langle \gamma(s), \xi \rangle} a(\xi; t; s) \psi_J(s) \rho(t) ds.$$

With this setup, we prove the following estimate.

**Proposition 3.3** ( $L^4 \rightarrow L^6$  trilinear local smoothing). *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 and further assuming (3.9), we have*

$$\left( \int_1^2 \left\| \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |m^J[a_k](D; t) f_J|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^6 dt \right)^{1/6} \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{-O(1)} 2^{-k/6 + \varepsilon k} \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} \|f_J\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/3}$$

whenever  $\mathbf{J} \in \mathfrak{J}^{3, \text{sep}}(\delta)$  and  $f_J \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $J \in \mathbf{J}$ .

Here we use the notation  $O(1)$  to denote an unspecified absolute constant. In applications, we work with relatively large values of  $\delta$  (namely,  $\delta \sim_\varepsilon 1$ ) and accordingly there is no need to precisely track the  $\delta$  dependence. We will also assume without loss of generality that  $0 < \delta < c$  where  $c > 0$  is a small absolute constant, chosen to satisfy the forthcoming requirements of the argument, and  $k$  is sufficiently large depending on  $\delta^{-1}$ .

As mentioned above, the (ostensibly weaker) trilinear estimate in Proposition 3.3 implies the linear estimate in Proposition 3.2 (under the additional assumption (3.9)) using a variant of the procedure introduced in [11]. We postpone the details of this reduction to §8 below.

**3.3. Reduction to perturbations of the moment curve.** At small scales, any non-degenerate curve can be thought of as a perturbation of an affine image of the moment curve  $\gamma_\circ(s) := (s, s^2/2, s^3/6)$ . We refer to [2, §4] for details (which involve the affine rescalings described in §4.2 below), and just record here that it suffices to consider curves in the class  $\mathfrak{G}(\delta_0)$  defined below for  $0 < \delta_0 < 1$  sufficiently small.

**Definition 3.4.** Given  $0 < \delta_0 < 1$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathfrak{G}(\delta_0, M)$  denote the class of all smooth curves  $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  that satisfy the following conditions:

- i)  $\gamma(0) = 0$  and  $\gamma^{(j)}(0) = \vec{e}_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ ;
- ii)  $\|\gamma - \gamma_\circ\|_{C^M(I)} \leq \delta_0$  for all  $0 \leq j \leq M$ .

Here  $\vec{e}_j$  denotes the  $j$ th standard Euclidean basis vector and

$$\|\gamma\|_{C^M(I)} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq M} \sup_{s \in I} |\gamma^{(j)}(s)| \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in C^M(I; \mathbb{R}^3).$$

If  $M = 4$ , then we will simply write  $\mathfrak{G}(\delta_0)$  for  $\mathfrak{G}(\delta_0, 4)$

Henceforth we will always assume that  $\gamma \in \mathfrak{G}(\delta_0)$  for  $\delta_0 := 10^{-10}$ .

**3.4. Microlocal decomposition.** Under the assumption (3.9), the non-degeneracy condition (1.1) ensures that

$$|\langle \gamma'''(s), \xi \rangle| \gtrsim |\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; t; s) \in \text{supp } a; \quad (3.10)$$

indeed, for  $\gamma \in \mathfrak{G}(\delta_0)$  this condition holds for all  $(\xi; t; s) \in \text{supp}_\xi a \times \mathbb{R} \times I$ . We can then assume that  $s \mapsto \langle \gamma'''(s), \xi \rangle$  has constant sign and henceforth we assume that  $\xi_3 > 0$ . Following [2, §6], let  $\theta_2: \text{supp}_\xi a \rightarrow I$  be the smooth mapping such that

$$\langle \gamma'' \circ \theta_2(\xi), \xi \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a.$$

It is clear that  $\theta_2$  is homogeneous of degree 0. Let

$$u(\xi) := \langle \gamma' \circ \theta_2(\xi), \xi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a. \quad (3.11)$$

Since (3.10) is satisfied on the support of each

$$\mathbf{a}_k := a_k - a_{k,0}, \quad (3.12)$$

we decompose each of these pieces with respect to the size of  $|u(\xi)|$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < \delta < 1$ , we write

$$a_k = a_{k,0} + \sum_{\ell \in \Lambda(k)} a_{k,\ell} + a_{k,k/3} \quad (3.13)$$

where  $a_{k,0}$  is as in (3.8) and

$$a_{k,\ell}(\xi; t; s) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}_k(\xi; t; s) \beta(2^{-k+2\ell}u(\xi)) & \text{if } \ell \in \Lambda(k), \\ \mathbf{a}_k(\xi; t; s) \eta(2^{-k+2\lfloor(1-2\varepsilon)k/3\rfloor}u(\xi)) & \text{if } \ell = k/3 \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

for

$$\Lambda(k) := \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : \lceil \log_2(\delta^{-8}) \rceil < \ell < \lfloor (1-2\varepsilon)k/3 \rfloor \}. \quad (3.15)$$

Here we assume that  $k$  is large enough so that the decomposition (3.13) makes sense; note that Theorem 3.1 trivially holds for small values of  $k$ . In particular, we concern ourselves with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $k \geq 4 \log_2(\delta^{-8})$ . In the definition (3.15), for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we let  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  denote the largest integer less or equal than  $x$  and  $\lceil x \rceil$  denote the smallest integer greater or equal than  $x$ . It will also be useful to introduce the notation

$$\bar{\Lambda}(k) := \Lambda(k) \cup \{k/3\}.$$

Note that the indexing set  $\Lambda(k)$  depends on the chosen  $\delta$  and  $\varepsilon$ , but we do not record this dependence for notational convenience. We also note that here the function  $\beta$  should be defined slightly differently compared with (3.2); in particular, here  $\beta(r) := \eta(2^{-2}r) - \eta(r)$  (we ignore this minor change in the notation).

As mentioned in §3.2, for the extreme case  $\ell = 0$  we have the non-degeneracy condition (3.7) (with an implied constant depending on  $\delta$ ). This situation is easy to handle using known estimates: see §7 below. On the other hand, for  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$ , the multipliers  $m[a_{k,\ell}]$  are degenerate in the sense that (3.9) now holds. A key aspect of this decomposition is that for  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ , Taylor series expansion shows that

$$|\langle \gamma'(s), \xi \rangle| + 2^{-\ell} |\langle \gamma''(s), \xi \rangle| \gtrsim 2^{k-2\ell} \quad \text{for all } (\xi, s) \in \text{supp } a_{k,\ell}(\cdot; t; \cdot); \quad (3.16)$$

see, for example [3, (5.15)] for a detailed derivation. The weak non-degeneracy condition (3.16) will allow for improved estimates depending on the value of  $\ell$ . Bounding these pieces, and the piece for  $\ell = k/3$ , is the difficult part of the argument and is the focus of §§5–6 below.

**3.5. Microlocalised estimates.** Throughout this section we work under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 and, in addition, assume (3.9) holds for a specified value of  $\delta$ . That is, we let  $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth curve and suppose  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}^3} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  satisfies (3.4), (3.5) and (3.9). Furthermore, we define the symbols  $a_{k,\ell}$  as in (3.14).

The key ingredient in the proof of Proposition 3.3 is a trilinear estimate for the multipliers associated to the localised symbols  $a_{k,\ell}$ . To describe this result, we work with a triple of integers  $\ell_{\mathbf{J}} = (\ell_J)_{J \in \mathbf{J}}$  indexed by  $\mathbf{J} \in \mathfrak{J}^{3,\text{sep}}(\delta)$  and write  $|\ell_{\mathbf{J}}| := \sum_{J \in \mathbf{J}} \ell_J$ .



**Proposition 3.5** ( $L^2 \rightarrow L^3$  trilinear local smoothing). *For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < \delta < 1$ , we have*

$$\left( \int_1^2 \left\| \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |m^J[a_{k, \ell_J}](D; t) f_J|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)}^3 dt \right)^{1/3} \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{-O(1)} 2^{-k/3 + |\ell_{\mathbf{J}}|/18 + \varepsilon k} \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_J\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/3}$$

whenever  $\mathbf{J} \in \mathfrak{J}^{3, \text{sep}}(\delta)$ ,  $\ell_{\mathbf{J}} = (\ell_J)_{J \in \mathbf{J}}$  with  $\ell_J \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$  and  $f_J \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $J \in \mathbf{J}$ .

Proposition 3.5 is a fairly direct consequence of Theorem 2.2; we describe the proof in §5 below. To deduce the critical  $L^4 \rightarrow L^6$  estimate stated in Proposition 3.3, we interpolate Proposition 3.5 with the following linear inequalities.

**Proposition 3.6** ( $L^{12} \rightarrow L^{12}$  local smoothing). *For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$ , we have*

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_{k, \ell}](D; t) f\|_{L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{12} dt \right)^{1/12} \lesssim_\varepsilon 2^{-k/6 - \ell/12 + \varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

**Lemma 3.7** ( $L^2 \rightarrow L^\infty$  estimate). *For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$ , we have*

$$\sup_{1 \leq t \leq 2} \|m[a_{k, \ell}](D; t) f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim 2^{k - \ell/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

We remark that  $0 < \delta < 1$  plays no significant rôle in the proofs of Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 and it is used only to set up the underlying decomposition in the  $a_{k, \ell}$ . Similarly,  $\varepsilon > 0$  plays no significant rôle in Lemma 3.7.

Proposition 3.6 is a minor variant of estimates which have appeared in, for instance, [19] and [3]. The result is highly non-trivial, and relies on the  $\ell^p$  decoupling inequality for the moment curve from [10]. We discuss the details in §6.

Lemma 3.7, on the other hand, is elementary. It follows from basic pointwise estimates for the multipliers  $a_{k, \ell}$ , obtained via stationary phase. We discuss the details in §4.1.

Given the preceding results, the key trilinear  $L^4 \rightarrow L^6$  local smoothing estimate is immediate.

*Proof (of Proposition 3.3).* By multilinear Hölder's inequality, Propositions 3.6 and 3.7 imply their trilinear counterparts. Since

$$\left( \frac{1}{4} \right) = \frac{3}{5} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{12} \right) + \frac{7}{20} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{20} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{0} \right),$$

interpolation of the three estimates immediately gives

$$\left( \int_1^2 \left\| \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |m^J[a_{k, \ell_J}](D; t) f|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^6 dt \right)^{1/6} \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{-O(1)} 2^{-k/6 - |\ell_{\mathbf{J}}|/180 + \varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for  $\ell_{\mathbf{J}} = (\ell_J)_{J \in \mathbf{J}}$  with  $0 \leq \ell_J \leq k/3$ ; see Figure 1. Here we carry out the interpolation using a multilinear variant of the Riesz–Thorin theorem: see, for instance, [8, §4.4].<sup>2</sup> Using the geometric decay in  $2^{-\ell_J}$  for each  $J \in \mathbf{J}$ , we sum these bounds to deduce the desired result.  $\square$

To prove Proposition 3.3, it therefore remains to establish Proposition 3.5, Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 3.7. We carry this out in §§4–6 below.

<sup>2</sup>Alternatively, a suitable multilinear interpolation theorem can be proved by directly adapting the argument used to prove the classical Riesz–Thorin theorem.

## 4. BASIC PROPERTIES OF THE MULTIPLIERS

**4.1. Elementary estimates for the multiplier.** Using stationary phase arguments, we can immediately deduce Lemma 3.7.

*Proof (of Lemma 3.7).* By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have the elementary inequality

$$\|m(D)f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|m\|_{L^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}^3})} |\text{supp } m|^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Fixing  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , in view of the above it suffices to show

$$\|m[a_{k,\ell}](\cdot, t)\|_\infty \lesssim 2^{-(k-\ell)/2}, \quad |\text{supp } m[a_{k,\ell}](\cdot; t)| \lesssim 2^{3k-2\ell}.$$

Since  $\nabla u(\xi) = \gamma' \circ \theta_2(\xi)$  is bounded away from zero, the latter estimate is clear. On the other hand, the former estimate is a consequence of a simple stationary phase analysis. Indeed, for  $\ell = k/3$  we apply van der Corput’s inequality with third order derivatives. For  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ , we apply van der Corput’s inequality with either first or second order derivatives, using the lower bound (3.16). For further details see, for example, [21, Lemma 3.3], [3, (5.15)] or Lemma 4.3 below.  $\square$

**4.2. Scaling of the multiplier.** Let  $\sigma \in I$ ,  $0 < \lambda < 1$  be such that  $[\sigma - \lambda, \sigma + \lambda] \subseteq I$ . Denote by  $[\gamma]_\sigma$  the  $3 \times 3$  matrix

$$[\gamma]_\sigma := [\gamma^{(1)}(\sigma) \quad \gamma^{(2)}(\sigma) \quad \gamma^{(3)}(\sigma)],$$

where the vectors  $\gamma^{(j)}(\sigma)$  are understood to be column vectors. Note that this matrix is invertible due to the non-degeneracy hypothesis (1.1). It is also convenient to let  $[\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda}$  denote the  $3 \times 3$  matrix

$$[\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda} := [\gamma]_\sigma \cdot D_\lambda \tag{4.1}$$

where  $D_\lambda := \text{diag}(\lambda, \lambda^2, \lambda^3)$  is the diagonal matrix with eigenvalues  $\lambda, \lambda^2, \lambda^3$ . With this data, define the  $(\sigma, \lambda)$ -rescaling of  $\gamma$  as the curve  $\gamma_{\sigma,\lambda} \in C^\infty(I; \mathbb{R}^3)$  given by

$$\gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}(s) := [\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda}^{-1} (\gamma(\sigma + \lambda s) - \gamma(\sigma)). \tag{4.2}$$

A simple computation shows

$$\det[\gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}]_s = \frac{\det([\gamma]_{\sigma+\lambda s})}{\det([\gamma]_\sigma)},$$

and therefore  $\gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}$  is also a non-degenerate curve. Furthermore, the rescaled curve satisfies the relations

$$\langle \gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}^{(j)}(s), \xi \rangle = \lambda^j \langle \gamma^{(j)}(\sigma + \lambda s), ([\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda})^{-\top} \xi \rangle \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1. \tag{4.3}$$

Combining this with the fact that  $\gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}$  is non-degenerate, we have

$$|\xi| \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^3 |\langle \gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}^{(j)}(s), \xi \rangle| \lesssim \lambda^3 |([\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda})^{-\top} \xi| \lesssim |\xi|; \tag{4.4}$$

here the last inequality is a simple consequence of the definition (4.1).

Defining the rescaled symbol

$$a_{\sigma,\lambda}(\xi; t; s) := a([\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda})^{-\top} \xi; t; \sigma + \lambda s, \tag{4.5}$$

a change of variables immediately yields

$$m_\gamma[a](D; t)f(x) = \lambda m_{\gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}}[a_{\sigma,\lambda}](D; t)f_{\sigma,\lambda}([\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda}^{-1}(x - t\gamma(\sigma))) \tag{4.6}$$

where  $f_{\sigma,\lambda} := f \circ [\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda}$ . In particular, by scaling,

$$\|m_\gamma[a](D; \cdot) f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^q(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim \delta^{1+6(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1}{p})} \|m_{\gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}}[a_{\sigma,\lambda}](D; \cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^q(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}. \quad (4.7)$$

Finally, we observe that if the original symbol satisfies the condition

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha a(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_\alpha |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3, \quad (4.8)$$

then so too does the rescaled symbol  $a_{\sigma,\lambda}$ . Indeed, by the definitions (4.5) and (4.1), we have

$$|(\partial_\xi^\alpha a_{\sigma,\lambda})(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_\alpha \lambda^{-3|\alpha|} |(\partial_\xi^\alpha a)(([\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda})^{-\top} \xi; t; \sigma + \lambda s)|.$$

In view of the hypothesis (4.8) and (4.4), it follows that

$$|(\partial_\xi^\alpha a_{\sigma,\lambda})(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_\alpha \lambda^{-3|\alpha|} |([\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda})^{-\top} \xi|^{-|\alpha|} \lesssim_\alpha |\xi|^{-|\alpha|},$$

as required.

**4.3. Critical points.** We next describe the critical points of the phase function  $s \mapsto \langle \gamma(s), \xi \rangle$  which, under the setup of §3.4, depend on the sign of the quantity  $u(\xi)$  introduced in (3.11).

**Lemma 4.1** ([2, Lemma 6.2]). *Let  $\xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a$  and consider the equation*

$$\langle \gamma'(s), \xi \rangle = 0. \quad (4.9)$$

- i) If  $u(\xi) > 0$ , then the equation (4.9) has no solution on  $I$ .*
- ii) If  $u(\xi) = 0$ , then the equation (4.9) has only the solution  $s = \theta_2(\xi)$  on  $I$ .*
- iii) If  $u(\xi) < 0$ , then the equation (4.9) has precisely two solutions on  $I$ .*

Following [2, §6], we can use Lemma 4.1 to construct a (unique) pair of smooth mappings

$$\theta_1^\pm : \{\xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a : u(\xi) < 0\} \rightarrow I$$

with  $\theta_1^-(\xi) \leq \theta_1^+(\xi)$  which satisfies

$$\langle \gamma' \circ \theta_1^\pm(\xi), \xi \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a \text{ with } u(\xi) < 0.$$

Define the functions

$$v^\pm(\xi) := \langle \gamma'' \circ \theta_1^\pm(\xi), \xi \rangle \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a \text{ with } u(\xi) < 0.$$

Taylor expansion yields the following.

**Lemma 4.2** ([2, Lemma 6.3]). *Let  $\xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a$  with  $u(\xi) < 0$ . Then*

$$|v^\pm(\frac{\xi}{|\xi|})| \sim |\theta_1^\pm(\xi) - \theta_2(\xi)| \sim |\theta_1^+(\xi) - \theta_1^-(\xi)| \sim |u(\frac{\xi}{|\xi|})|^{1/2}.$$

**4.4. Stationary phase.** We next use the approach in [18] and apply stationary phase to express the multipliers  $m^J[a_{k,\ell}]$  as a product of a symbol and an oscillatory term. In what follows, we let

$$q_2(\xi) := \langle \gamma \circ \theta_2(\xi), \xi \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad q_1^\pm(\xi) := \langle \gamma \circ \theta_1^\pm(\xi), \xi \rangle$$

for any value of  $\xi$  such that the expression is well-defined. Our analysis leads to various rapidly decreasing error terms. Given  $R \geq 1$ , we let  $\text{RapDec}(R)$  denote the class of functions  $e \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \times \mathbb{R})$  which satisfy  $|e(\xi; t)| \lesssim_N R^{-N}$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)$ .*

i) For some  $e_{k,k/3} \in \text{RapDec}(2^k)$ , we may write

$$m^J[a_{k,k/3}](\xi; t) = 2^{-k/3} e^{-itq_2(\xi)} b_{k,k/3}^J(2^{-k}\xi; t) + e_{k,k/3}(\xi; t) \quad (4.10)$$

where  $b_{k,k/3}^J \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})$  is supported in  $B(0, 10)$ , satisfies  $|u(\xi)| \lesssim 2^{-2k/3+4\epsilon k/3}$  and  $\text{dist}(\theta_2(\xi), J) < \delta$  for  $\xi \in \text{supp}_\xi b_{k,k/3}^J$  and

$$|\partial_t^N b_{k,k/3}^J(2^{-k}\xi; t)| \lesssim_N 2^{3k\epsilon N + \epsilon k} \quad \text{for all } (\xi; t) \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} \text{ and all } N \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (4.11)$$

ii) For  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$  and some  $e_{k,\ell} \in \text{RapDec}(2^k)$ , we may write

$$m^J[a_{k,\ell}](\xi; t) = 2^{-(k-\ell)/2} \sum_{\pm} e^{-itq_1^\pm(\xi)} b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(2^{-k}\xi; t) + e_{k,\ell}(\xi; t) \quad (4.12)$$

where the  $b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})$  are supported in  $B(0, 10)$ , satisfy  $|u(\xi)| \sim 2^{-2\ell}$  and  $\text{dist}(\theta_2(\xi), J) < \delta$  for  $\xi \in \text{supp}_\xi b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$  and

$$|\partial_t^N b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(2^{-k}\xi; t)| \lesssim_N 1 \quad \text{for all } (\xi; t) \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} \text{ and all } N \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (4.13)$$

**Remark 4.4.** In part ii) of the lemma,  $u(\xi) < 0$  always holds on the support of the  $b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$  and therefore, by Lemma 4.1, the functions  $\theta_1^\pm(\xi)$  are well-defined. The portion of the multiplier supported on the set where  $u(\xi) > 0$  is incorporated into the error term  $e_{k,\ell}$ .

*Proof.* i) By a change of variables,

$$m^J[a_{k,k/3}](\xi; t) = 2^{-k/3} e^{-itq_2(\xi)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\Phi_k(\xi;s)} \alpha_k^J(\xi; t; 2^{-k/3}s) ds$$

where:

- The symbol  $\alpha_k^J \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  satisfies
 
$$|u(\xi)| \lesssim 2^{k/3+4\epsilon k/3}, \quad |\xi| \leq 2^{k+1}, \quad |t| \leq 4 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_2(\xi) + 2^{-k/3}s \in J \quad (4.14)$$
 for  $(\xi; t; 2^{-k/3}s) \in \text{supp } \alpha_k^J$  and  $|\partial_t^N \partial_s^M \alpha_k^J(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_{M,N} 1$  for all  $M, N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ;
- The phase  $\Phi_k$  is given by

$$\Phi_k(\xi; s) := \langle \gamma(\theta_2(\xi) + 2^{-k/3}s), \xi \rangle - \langle \gamma \circ \theta_2(\xi), \xi \rangle.$$

If  $|s| \geq 2^{\epsilon k}$  and  $k$  is sufficiently large then, by combining (4.14) with a simple Taylor expansion argument, we see that  $|\partial_s \Phi_k(\xi; s)| \gtrsim 2^{k\epsilon}$ . Therefore, by repeated integration-by-parts, we obtain (4.10) for

$$b_{k,k/3}^J(2^{-k}\xi; t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it\Phi_k(\xi;s)} \alpha_k^J(\xi; t; 2^{-k/3}s) \eta(2^{-\epsilon k}s) ds$$

and some  $e_{k,k/3} \in \text{RapDec}(2^k)$ .

By (4.14), we have  $\text{dist}(\theta_2(\xi), J) \lesssim 2^{-k/3+\epsilon k} < \delta^2$  for  $\xi \in \text{supp}_\xi b_{k,k/3}^J$ . On the other hand, (4.11) now immediately follows for  $N = 0$ , using the triangle inequality. For larger values of  $N$ , the bounds follow from the estimate

$$|\Phi_k(\xi; s)| \lesssim 2^{3k\epsilon} \quad \text{for all } (\xi, t; s) \in \text{supp } \alpha_k^J \text{ with } |s| \lesssim 2^{\epsilon k}.$$

which is again a consequence of (4.14) and Taylor expansion.

ii) If  $u(\xi) > 0$ , we know from Lemma 4.1 that the phase function  $s \mapsto \langle \gamma(s), \xi \rangle$  has no critical points, and one can therefore obtain rapid decay of the portion of the multiplier where this condition holds; see [2, Lemma 8.1] for similar arguments. We

thus focus on the portion of the multiplier where  $u(\xi) < 0$ . Arguing analogously to the proof of part i), for a given  $\rho > 0$  we may define

$$b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(2^{-k}\xi; t) := 2^{(k-\ell)/2} 2^{-\ell} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it2^{k-3\ell}\Phi_{k,\ell}^{\pm}(\xi;s)} \alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(\xi; t; 2^{-\ell}s) \eta(\rho^{-1}s) ds$$

where:

- The symbols  $\alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm} \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}^3} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  satisfy

$$|u(\xi)| \sim 2^{k-2\ell}, \quad |v^\pm(\xi)| \sim 2^{k-\ell}, \quad |\xi| \leq 2^{k+1}, \quad |t| \leq 4, \quad \theta_1^\pm(\xi) + 2^{-\ell}s \in J$$

for  $(\xi; t; 2^{-\ell}s) \in \text{supp } \alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$  and  $|\partial_t^N \partial_s^M \alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_{M,N} 1$  for all  $M, N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ;

- The phase  $\Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm$  is given by

$$\Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm(\xi; s) := 2^{-(k-3\ell)} \langle \gamma(\theta_1^\pm(\xi) + 2^{-\ell}s) - \gamma \circ \theta_1^\pm(\xi), \xi \rangle.$$

Moreover,  $s = 0$  is the only critical point of  $s \mapsto \Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm(\xi; s)$  on the support of  $\alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$  if  $|s| \leq \rho$  for  $\rho > 0$  sufficiently small.

An integration-by-parts argument similar to that in [2, Lemma 8.1] then shows (4.12) holds for some  $e_{k,\ell} \in \text{RapDec}(2^k)$ .

By the support properties of the  $\alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$  and Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\text{dist}(\theta_2(\xi), J) \leq |\theta_2(\xi) - \theta_1^\pm(\xi)| + \text{dist}(\theta_1^\pm(\xi), J) \lesssim 2^{-\ell} < \delta^2 \quad \text{for } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$$

and  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ . On the other hand, (4.13) for  $N = 0$  follows from van der Corput's lemma, since  $|\partial_{ss}^2 \Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm(\xi; 0)| = 2^{-k+\ell} |v^\pm(\xi)| \sim 1$  on  $\text{supp } \alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$ . For  $N > 0$ , it suffices to show that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-it2^{k-3\ell}\Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm(\xi;s)} (2^{k-3\ell}\Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm(\xi;s))^N \alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(\xi; t; 2^{-\ell}s) ds \right| \lesssim 2^{-(k-3\ell)/2}. \quad (4.15)$$

By Taylor expansion, we have

$$\Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm(\xi; s) = \frac{s^2}{2} [2^{-k+\ell} v^\pm(\xi) + 2^{-k} \omega(\xi; s)] \quad (4.16)$$

where  $|\omega(\xi; s)| \lesssim 2^k$  for all  $(\xi; t; s) \in \text{supp } \alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$ ; in particular,  $|\Phi_{k,\ell}^\pm(\xi; s)| \lesssim 1$  in the support of  $\alpha_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$ . In view of the factor  $s^2$  in (4.16), the bound (4.15) is again a consequence of van der Corput's lemma with second-order derivatives (in the specific form of, for example, [22, Lemma 1.1.2]).  $\square$

## 5. PROOF OF THE $L^2 \rightarrow L^3$ TRILINEAR ESTIMATE

In this section we prove the key trilinear estimate from Proposition 3.5. After massaging the operator into a suitable form, this is a consequence the localised multilinear restriction inequality from Theorem 2.2.

**5.1. Reduction to multilinear restriction.** Define the Fourier integral operators

$$U_{k,k/3}^J f(x, t) := \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3} e^{i\langle x, \xi \rangle - tq_2(\xi)} b_{k,k/3}^J(2^{-k}\xi, t) \hat{f}(\xi) \, d\xi$$

and

$$U_{k,\ell}^J f(x, t) := \sum_{\pm} \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3} e^{i\langle x, \xi \rangle - tq_1^\pm(\xi)} b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(2^{-k}\xi, t) \hat{f}(\xi) \, d\xi$$

for  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ . Let  $\mathbf{J} \in \mathfrak{J}^{3,\text{sep}}(\delta)$  and  $\ell_{\mathbf{J}} = (\ell_J)_{J \in \mathbf{J}}$  with  $\ell_J \in \overline{\Lambda}(k)$ . In light of Lemma 4.3, to prove Proposition 3.5, it suffices to show

$$\left\| \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |U_J f_J|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^3(B^{3+1}(0,1))} \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \delta^{-O(1)} 2^{k/6 - |\ell_{\mathbf{J}}|/9 + \varepsilon k} \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} \|f_J\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/3} \quad (5.1)$$

for  $U_J := U_{k,\ell_J}^J$  and  $f_J \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $J \in \mathbf{J}$ . This reduction follows from a standard localisation argument since the kernels  $K_{k,\ell}^J$  associated to the propagators  $U_{k,\ell}^J$  satisfy the bounds

$$|K_{k,\ell}^J(x, t)| \lesssim_N 2^{k(d-N)} |x|^{-N} \quad \text{for all } |x| \gtrsim 1, N > 0,$$

via an integration-by-parts argument.

We may remove the  $t$ -dependence from the symbols  $b_{k,k/3}^J$  and  $b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$  using a standard Fourier series expansion argument. Owing to the  $L^2$ -norm on the right-hand side of (5.1), we may also freely exchange  $f$  and  $\hat{f}$ . Thus, after rescaling, we are led to consider operators of the form

$$T_{k,k/3}^J g(x, t) := \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3} e^{i\langle x, \xi \rangle - tq_2(\xi)} b_{k,k/3}^J(\xi) g(\xi) \, d\xi$$

and

$$T_{k,\ell}^J g(x, t) := \sum_{\pm} \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3} e^{i\langle x, \xi \rangle - tq_1^\pm(\xi)} b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}(\xi) g(\xi) \, d\xi$$

for  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ , where the symbols  $b_k^J, b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm} \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3)$  are bounded in absolute value by 1 and further satisfy

$$\text{supp } b_{k,k/3}^J \subseteq \{\xi \in B^3(0, 10) : \text{dist}(\theta_2(\xi), J) < \delta \text{ and } |u(\xi)| \lesssim 2^{-2k/3 + 4\varepsilon k/3}\} \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\text{supp } b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm} \subseteq \{\xi \in B^3(0, 10) : \text{dist}(\theta_2(\xi), J) < \delta \text{ and } |u(\xi)| \sim 2^{-2\ell}\} \quad (5.3)$$

for  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ . In particular, to prove the desired estimate (5.1), it suffices to show

$$\left\| \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |T_J g_J|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^3(B^{3+1}(0, 2^k))} \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \delta^{-O(1)} 2^{-|\ell_{\mathbf{J}}|/9 + \varepsilon k} \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} \|g_J\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/3} \quad (5.4)$$

for  $T_J := T_{k,\ell_J}^J$  and  $g_J \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$  for  $J \in \mathbf{J}$  and  $\ell_{\mathbf{J}} = (\ell_J)_{J \in \mathbf{J}}$  with  $\ell_J \in \overline{\Lambda}(k)$ .

**5.2. Verifying the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2.** Enumerate the intervals in  $\mathbf{J}$  as  $J_1, J_2, J_3$  so that, writing  $\ell_i := \ell_{J_i}$  and  $T_i := T_{J_i}$ , we have  $0 < \ell_1 \leq \ell_2 \leq \ell_3 \leq k/3$ ,  $\ell_i \in \overline{\Lambda}(k)$ . The trilinear estimate (5.4) is a consequence of Theorem 2.2 where we exploit the additional localisation of the symbol of  $T_3$  to the set  $|u(\xi)| \lesssim 2^{-2\ell_3}$ .<sup>3</sup> In order to apply Theorem 2.2, we must verify the regularity and transversality hypotheses.

<sup>3</sup>Or the slightly larger set  $|u(\xi)| \lesssim 2^{-2k/3 + 4\varepsilon k/3}$  in the case  $\ell_3 = k/3$ .

We begin by noting, as a consequence of the definition of the functions  $\theta_2$  and  $\theta_1^\pm$ , that

$$\nabla q_2(\xi) = \gamma \circ \theta_2(\xi) + u(\xi) \nabla \theta_2(\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla q_1^\pm(\xi) = \gamma \circ \theta_1^\pm(\xi). \quad (5.5)$$

*Regularity hypothesis.* We first show that the functions  $q_2$  and  $q_1^\pm$  all satisfy (at least) the  $C^{1,1/2}$  condition. It is easy to see that the function  $q_2$  is  $C^{1,1}$  in the sense that

$$|\nabla q_2(\xi_1) - \nabla q_2(\xi_2)| \lesssim |\xi_1 - \xi_2| \quad \text{for all } \xi_1, \xi_2 \in \text{supp } b_{k,k/3}^J.$$

On the other hand, the functions  $q_1^\pm$  are less regular and only satisfy a  $C^{1,1/2}$  condition, as first observed in [18, Lemma 3.5].

**Lemma 5.1.** *For  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ , we have*

$$|\nabla q_1^\pm(\xi_1) - \nabla q_1^\pm(\xi_2)| \lesssim \min \{2^{-\ell}, 2^\ell |\xi_1 - \xi_2|\} + |\xi_1 - \xi_2| \lesssim |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{1/2}$$

for all  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \text{supp } b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \text{supp } b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$ . In view of (5.5), it suffices to show

$$|\theta_1^\pm(\xi_1) - \theta_1^\pm(\xi_2)| \lesssim |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{1/2}. \quad (5.6)$$

By differentiating the defining function for  $\theta_1^\pm$ , we see that

$$|\nabla \theta_1^\pm(\xi)| = \frac{|\gamma' \circ \theta_1^\pm(\xi)|}{|v^\pm(\xi)|} \sim 2^\ell \quad \text{for } \xi \in \text{supp } b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}.$$

Thus, the fundamental theorem of calculus implies<sup>4</sup>

$$|\theta_1^\pm(\xi_1) - \theta_1^\pm(\xi_2)| \lesssim 2^\ell |\xi_1 - \xi_2|. \quad (5.7)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_1^\pm(\xi_1) - \theta_1^\pm(\xi_2)| &\leq |\theta_1^\pm(\xi_1) - \theta_2(\xi_1)| + |\theta_2(\xi_1) - \theta_2(\xi_2)| + |\theta_2(\xi_2) - \theta_1^\pm(\xi_2)| \\ &\lesssim |\xi_1 - \xi_2| + 2^{-\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Combining (5.7) and (5.8), we deduce that

$$|\theta_1^\pm(\xi_1) - \theta_1^\pm(\xi_2)| \lesssim \min \{2^{-\ell}, 2^\ell |\xi_1 - \xi_2|\} + |\xi_1 - \xi_2|$$

which is precisely the first inequality in (5.6). Furthermore,

$$\min \{2^{-\ell}, 2^\ell |\xi_1 - \xi_2|\} = \min \{2^{-\ell} |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{-1/2}, 2^\ell |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{1/2}\} |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{1/2} \leq |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{1/2},$$

and, since  $|\xi_j| \lesssim 1$  for  $\xi_j \in \text{supp } b_{k,\ell}^{J,\pm}$ , the second inequality in (5.6) immediately follows.  $\square$

---

<sup>4</sup>Here we must be a little careful in applying the fundamental theorem of calculus because the crucial condition  $|u(\xi)| \sim 2^{-2\ell}$  does not hold on a convex set. If  $|\xi_1 - \xi_2| \ll 2^{-2\ell}$ , then this presents no problem. However, if  $|\xi_1 - \xi_2| \gtrsim 2^{-2\ell}$ , then to apply the the fundamental theorem of calculus we construct a continuous, piecewise smooth curve connecting  $\xi_1$  to  $\xi_2$  which consists of two linear segments of length  $O(2^{-2\ell})$  and a curve of length  $O(|\xi_1 - \xi_2|)$  which traverses the level set  $\{\xi \in B(0, 10) : u(\xi) = 2^{-2\ell}\}$ .

*Transversality hypothesis.* We now turn to verify the transversality hypothesis from (2.1). This involves estimating expressions of the form

$$\left| \det \begin{pmatrix} \nabla Q_1(\xi_1) & \nabla Q_2(\xi_2) & \nabla Q_3(\xi_3) & \nabla u(\xi_3) \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|$$

where each  $Q_j$  is either of the functions  $q_2$  or  $q_1^\pm$ . The columns where  $Q_j = q_2$  are slightly more complicated since the formula for  $\nabla q_2(\xi)$  in (5.5) involves multiple terms. However, we can always treat the second term as an error and effectively ignore it. Indeed, if  $Q_j = q_2$ , then we must have  $\ell_j = k/3$  and so we consider  $\xi \in \text{supp } b_{k,k/3}^J$ . In this case,  $|u(\xi)| \lesssim 2^{-2k/3+4\epsilon k/3}$  and, by differentiating the defining equation for  $\theta_2$ , we also have  $|\nabla \theta_2(\xi)| \lesssim 1$ . Since  $k$  is large, we can therefore think of  $\nabla q_2(\xi)$  as a tiny perturbation of  $\gamma \circ \theta_2(\xi)$  on  $\text{supp } b_{k,k/3}^J$ . On the other hand, for the final column we have

$$\nabla u(\xi) = \gamma' \circ \theta_2(\xi). \quad (5.9)$$

In view of the support conditions (5.2) and (5.3) and the derivative formulæ (5.5) and (5.9), the transversality hypothesis would follow from the bound

$$\left| \det \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(s_1) & \gamma(s_2) & \gamma(s_3) & \gamma'(s_3) \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| \gtrsim |V(s_1, s_2, s_3)| |s_1 - s_3| |s_2 - s_3| \quad (5.10)$$

for all  $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in I$ , where here and below

$$V(t_1, \dots, t_m) := \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (t_i - t_j)$$

denotes the Vandermonde determinant in the variables  $t_1, \dots, t_m \in \mathbb{R}$ . In order to make this reduction, we use the bound  $|\theta_2(\xi) - \theta_1^\pm(\xi)| \lesssim 2^{-\ell} < \delta^8$  from Lemma 4.2. For  $\ell_3 \in \Lambda(k)$ , we can think of  $\theta_2(\xi)$  and  $\theta_1^\pm(\xi)$  as approximately equal; this allows us to reduce to a situation involving only three variables  $s_1, s_2, s_3$ . Here we use the fact that the right-hand side of (5.10) is bounded below by (a constant multiple of)  $\delta^5$  for  $s_i \in I$  with  $\text{dist}(s_i, J_i) < 2\delta$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  and  $\mathbf{J} = (J_1, J_2, J_3) \in \hat{\mathfrak{J}}^{3, \text{sep}}(\delta)$ .

By repeated application of the fundamental theorem of calculus, we may express the left-hand determinant in (5.10) as

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{s_2}^{s_3} \int_{t_2}^{t_3} \int_{t_3}^{s_3} \int_{u_3}^{u_4} \det \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(s_1) & \gamma'(t_2) & \gamma''(u_3) & \gamma'''(v_4) \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} dv_4 du_4 du_3 dt_3 dt_2.$$

By continuity and the reductions in §3.3, the inner determinant is single-signed and bounded below in absolute value by some constant.

By the observations of the previous paragraph, the left-hand side of (5.10) is comparable to the same expression but with  $\gamma$  replaced by the moment curve  $\gamma \circ (s) := (s, s^2/2, s^3/6)$ . Consequently, it suffices to prove (5.10) for this particular curve. However, in this case the left-hand side of (5.10) corresponds to (the absolute value of a scalar multiple of)  $\partial_t V(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_3 + t)|_{t=0}$ . A simple calculus exercise shows this agrees with the expression appearing in the right-hand side of (5.10), as required. For similar arguments, see [14, 18].



6.  $L^{12}$ -LOCAL SMOOTHING

In this section we upgrade the  $L^p$ -local smoothing estimates of [21] for  $p \geq 12$  by exploiting the localisation of the spatio-temporal Fourier transform of  $m[a_{k,\ell}](D; t)f$  with respect to the 2-dimensional cone  $\Gamma_2$  in  $(\xi, \tau)$ -space from the introduction. The arguments are similar to those of [19] and [3]. Crucially, we apply a decoupling inequality from [3], which is a conic variant of the celebrated decoupling inequality for non-degenerate curves [10, 15]. After this step, the remainder of the argument is similar to that of [21].<sup>5</sup>

**6.1. Decomposition along the curve.** Fix  $\zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\text{supp } \zeta \subseteq I$  such that  $\sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \zeta(\cdot - \mu) \equiv 1$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$ , we write

$$a_{k,\ell}(\xi; t; s) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{k,\ell}(\xi; t; s) \zeta(2^\ell \theta_2(\xi) - \mu).$$

Using stationary phase arguments, as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we may localise  $s$  to lie in a neighbourhood of  $\theta_2(\xi)$ . Let  $\rho > 0$  be a small ‘fine tuning’ constant chosen to satisfy the requirements of the forthcoming argument; for instance, we may take  $\rho := 10^{-6}$ . We then define

$$\begin{aligned} a_{k,\ell}^\mu(\xi; t; s) &:= a_{k,\ell}(\xi; t; s) \zeta(2^\ell \theta_2(\xi) - \mu) \eta(\rho 2^\ell (s - \theta_2(\xi))) \quad \text{for } \ell \in \Lambda(k), \\ a_{k,k/3}^\mu(\xi; t; s) &:= a_{k,\ell}(\xi; t; s) \zeta(2^{k/3} \theta_2(\xi) - \mu) \eta(\rho 2^{k/3 - \varepsilon k} (s - \theta_2(\xi))) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $2 \leq p < \infty$ . For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$ , we have*

$$\left\| m \left[ a_{k,\ell} - \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{k,\ell}^\mu \right] (D; \cdot) f \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim_{N,\varepsilon,p} 2^{-kN} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \text{for all } N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By Lemma 4.2, if  $|s - \theta_2(\xi)| \gg 2^{-\ell}$ , then  $s$  is far from any roots  $\theta_1^\pm(\xi)$  of the phase function. Hence Lemma 6.1 follows from non-stationary phase, as in the analysis of the error term in Lemma 4.3 ii). Moreover, the proof is very similar to that of [2, Lemma 8.1] and we therefore omit the precise details.<sup>6</sup>

The support properties of the symbols  $a_{k,\ell}^\mu$  are best understood in terms of the *Frenet frame*. Recall, given a smooth non-degenerate curve  $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , the Frenet frame is the orthonormal basis  $\{\mathbf{e}_1(s), \dots, \mathbf{e}_d(s)\}$  resulting from applying the Gram–Schmidt process to the vectors  $\{\gamma'(s), \dots, \gamma^{(d)}(s)\}$ . With this setup, given  $0 < r \leq 1$  and  $s \in I$ , recall the definition of the  $(1, r)$ -Frenet boxes  $\pi_1(s; r)$  introduced in [2]; namely,

$$\pi_1(s; r) := \{\xi \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 : |\langle \mathbf{e}_j(s), \xi \rangle| \lesssim r^{3-j} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \quad |\langle \mathbf{e}_3(s), \xi \rangle| \sim 1\}.$$

We have the following support property.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then*

$$\text{supp}_\xi a_{k,\ell}^\mu \subseteq 2^k \cdot \pi_1(s_\mu; 2^{-\ell}).$$

The proof is similar to that of [2, Lemma 8.2, (a)], so we omit the details.

<sup>5</sup>Decoupling is also used in [21], but only with respect to a cone in  $\xi$ -space, leading to non-sharp regularity estimates.

<sup>6</sup>The argument is in fact entirely the same as the proof of the case  $[k/3]_\varepsilon \leq \ell \leq [k/3]$  from [2, Lemma 8.1].

**6.2. Spatio-temporal localisation.** The symbols are further localised with respect to the Fourier transform of the  $t$ -variable. In particular, define the homogeneous phase function  $q_2(\xi) := \langle \gamma \circ \theta_2(\xi), \xi \rangle$  as in Lemma 4.3 and let

$$\chi_{k,\ell}(\xi, \tau) := \eta(2^{-(k-3\ell)-4\epsilon k}(\tau + q_2(\xi))) \quad \text{for } \ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k).$$

We introduce the localised multipliers  $m_{k,\ell}^\mu$ , defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_t[m_{k,\ell}^\mu(\xi; \cdot)](\tau) := \chi_{k,\ell}(\xi, \tau) \mathcal{F}_t[m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](\xi; \cdot)](\tau).$$

Here  $\mathcal{F}_t$  denotes the Fourier transform acting in the  $t$  variable. A stationary phase argument allows us to pass from  $m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu]$  to  $m_{k,\ell}^\mu$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $2 \leq p < \infty$ . For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have*

$$\|(m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu] - m_{k,\ell}^\mu)(D; \cdot)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim_{N,\epsilon} 2^{-kN} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \text{for all } N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The proof, which is based on a fairly straightforward integration-by-parts argument, is similar to that of [2, Lemma 8.3] and we omit the details.

To understand the support properties of the multipliers  $m_{k,\ell}^\mu$ , we introduce the primitive curve

$$\bar{\gamma}: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4, \quad \bar{\gamma}: s \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \int_0^s \gamma \\ s \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here  $\int_0^s \gamma$  denotes the vector in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with  $i$ th component  $\int_0^s \gamma_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Note that  $\bar{\gamma}$  is a non-degenerate curve in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  and, in particular,

$$|\det(\bar{\gamma}^{(1)}(s) \ \cdots \ \bar{\gamma}^{(4)}(s))| = |\det(\gamma^{(1)}(s) \ \cdots \ \gamma^{(3)}(s))| \quad \text{for all } s \in I.$$

Let  $(\bar{\mathbf{e}}_j(s))_{j=1}^4$  denote the Frenet frame associated to  $\bar{\gamma}$  and consider the  $(2, r)$ -Frenet boxes for  $\bar{\gamma}$

$$\pi_{2,\bar{\gamma}}(s; r) := \{\Xi = (\xi, \tau) \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \times \widehat{\mathbb{R}} : |\langle \bar{\mathbf{e}}_j(s), \Xi \rangle| \lesssim r^{4-j} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq 3, |\langle \bar{\mathbf{e}}_4(s), \Xi \rangle| \sim 1\},$$

as introduced in [2].

**Lemma 6.4.** *For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$  with  $\ell \geq [4\epsilon k]$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have*

$$\text{supp } \mathcal{F}_t[m_{k,\ell}^\mu] \subseteq 2^k \cdot \pi_{2,\bar{\gamma}}(s_\mu; 2^{4\epsilon k} 2^{-\ell}),$$

where  $s_\mu := 2^{-\ell} \mu$  and  $\mathcal{F}_t$  denotes the Fourier transform in the  $t$ -variable.

The proof, which is based on a fairly straightforward integration-by-parts argument, is similar to that of [2, Lemma 8.4] and we omit the details.

**6.3. A decoupling inequality.** With the above observations, we can immediately apply the decoupling inequalities in [3, Theorem 4.4] associated to the primitive curve  $\bar{\gamma}$  to isolate the contributions from the individual  $m_{k,\ell}^\mu(D; \cdot)$ .

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $p \geq 12$ . For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$ , we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} m_{k,\ell}^\mu(D; \cdot) f \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim_\epsilon 2^{O(\epsilon k)} 2^{\ell(1-\frac{7}{p})} \left( \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \|m_{k,\ell}^\mu(D; \cdot) f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

*Proof.* If  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$  satisfies  $\ell \leq [4\epsilon k]$ , then we bound the left-hand side trivially using the triangle and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities. For the case  $\ell > [4\epsilon k]$ , we partition the family of sets  $\pi_{2,\bar{\gamma}}(s_\mu; 2^{4\epsilon k} 2^{-\ell})$  for  $|\mu| \leq 2^\ell$  into  $O(2^{4\epsilon k})$  subfamilies, each forming a  $(2, 2^{4\epsilon k} 2^{-\ell})$ -Frenet box decomposition in the language of [3, §4]. In view of Lemma 6.4 and after a simple rescaling, the result now follows from [3, Theorem 4.4] applied with  $d = 3$ ,  $n = 4$  to the primitive curve  $\bar{\gamma}$ .  $\square$

**6.4. Localising the input function.** The Fourier multipliers  $m_{k,\ell}^\mu(D;t)$  induce a localisation on the input function  $f$ . We recall the setup from [2, §8.6]. Given  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$  and  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  define

$$\Delta_{k,\ell}(m) := \{\xi \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 : |\xi_2 - \xi_3 2^{-\ell} m| \leq C 2^{-\ell} \xi_3 \text{ and } C^{-1} 2^k \leq \xi_3 \leq C 2^k\},$$

where  $C \geq 1$  is an absolute constant, chosen sufficiently large so that the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 6.6** ([2, Lemma 8.8]). *If  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then there exists some  $m(\mu) \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that*

$$2^k \cdot \pi_1(s_\mu; 2^{-\ell}) \subseteq \Delta_{k,\ell}(m(\mu)).$$

*Furthermore, for each fixed  $k$  and  $\ell$ , given  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  there are only  $O(1)$  values of  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $m = m(\mu)$ .*

For each  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$  define the smooth cutoff function

$$\chi_{k,\ell}^\mu(\xi_2, \xi_3) := \eta(C^{-1}(2^\ell \xi_2 / \xi_3 - m(\mu))) (\eta(C^{-1} 2^{-k} \xi_3) - \eta(2C^{-1} 2^{-k} \xi_3)).$$

If  $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \text{supp}_\xi a_{k,\ell}^\mu$ , then Lemmas 6.2 and 6.6 imply  $\chi_{k,\ell}^\mu(\xi_2, \xi_3) = 1$ . Thus, if we define the corresponding frequency projection

$$f_{k,\ell}^\mu := \chi_{k,\ell}^\mu(D)f,$$

it follows that

$$m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](D; \cdot)f = m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](D; \cdot)f_{k,\ell}^\mu. \quad (6.1)$$

**Lemma 6.7.** *For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$ , we have*

$$\left( \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_{k,\ell}^\mu\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}^p \right)^{1/p} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

*Proof.* The case  $p = 2$  follows from Plancherel's theorem via Lemma 6.6 and the finite overlapping of the sectors  $\Delta_{k,\ell}(m(\mu))$ . For  $p = \infty$ , it is easy to see that  $\sup_\mu \|\mathcal{F}_{\xi_2, \xi_3}^{-1}[\chi_{k,\ell}^\mu]\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim 1$ ; indeed this is immediate for  $k = \ell = 0$  and the general case follows since  $\chi_{k,\ell}^\mu(\xi_2, \xi_3) = \chi_{0,0}^\mu(2^{\ell-k} \xi_2, 2^{-k} \xi_3)$ . Interpolating these two cases, using mixed-norm interpolation (see, for instance, [8, §5.6]) concludes the proof.  $\square$

**6.5. Local smoothing for the  $m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](D,t)$ .** We recall the following result, which follows from [21, Theorem 4.1] when combined with the main result from [9].

**Theorem 6.8** ([21, Theorem 4.1]). *Let  $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth curve and suppose that  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  satisfies the symbol conditions*

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_t^i \partial_s^j a(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_{\alpha,i,j} |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3 \text{ and } i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

*and that*

$$|\langle \gamma'(s), \xi \rangle| + |\langle \gamma''(s), \xi \rangle| \gtrsim |\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; s) \in \text{supp}_\xi a \times I.$$

*Let  $p \geq 6$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $k \geq 1$ . If  $a_k$  is defined as in (3.3), then*

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_k](D;t)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}^p dt \right)^{1/p} \lesssim_{\varepsilon,p} 2^{-2k/p+\varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

By combining Theorem 6.8 with the rescaling from §4.2 we obtain the following bound for our multipliers  $m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu]$ .

**Proposition 6.9.** *Let  $p \geq 6$ . For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell \in \bar{\Lambda}(k)$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have*

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](D;t)f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}^p dt \right)^{1/p} \lesssim_\varepsilon 2^{O(\varepsilon k)} 2^{-2(k-3\ell)/p-\ell} \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \quad (6.2)$$

*Proof.* The argument is essentially the same proof as that of [21, Proposition 5.1]. We distinguish two cases:

Case:  $\ell = k/3$ . The result follows from interpolation between the elementary estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|m[a_{k,k/3}^\mu](\cdot; t)\|_{M^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\lesssim 2^{-k/3+O(\varepsilon k)}, \\ \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|m[a_{k,k/3}^\mu](\cdot; t)\|_{M^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\lesssim 2^{-k/3+O(\varepsilon k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Both these inequalities are consequences of the size of the  $s$  support of  $a_{k,k/3}^\mu$ . The first is trivial. The second can be deduced, for instance, by adapting arguments from [3, §5.6].

Case:  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ . Fix  $\ell \in \Lambda(k)$ ,  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$  and set  $\sigma := s_\mu$  and  $\lambda := 2^{-\ell}$ . With the notation from §4.2, we define

$$\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma_{\sigma,\lambda}, \quad \tilde{a} := (a_{k,\ell}^\mu)_{\sigma,\lambda}, \quad \tilde{f} := f_{\sigma,\lambda}, \quad \tilde{M} := ([\gamma]_{\sigma,\lambda})^{-\top}.$$

Thus, in view of (4.6), we have

$$m_\gamma[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](D;t)f(x) = \lambda(m_{\tilde{\gamma}}[\tilde{a}](D;t)\tilde{f})(\tilde{M}^\top x - t\gamma(\sigma)). \quad (6.3)$$

We claim  $\tilde{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{a}$  satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 6.8. By (4.4), we have

$$|\xi| \sim 2^{k-3\ell} \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi \tilde{a}. \quad (6.4)$$

Combining this with (4.3) and (3.16), we have

$$|\langle \tilde{\gamma}'(s), \xi \rangle| + |\langle \tilde{\gamma}''(s), \xi \rangle| \gtrsim |\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; t; s) \in \text{supp } \tilde{a}. \quad (6.5)$$

On the other hand, let  $\tilde{\theta}_2$  and  $\tilde{u}$  be the functions defined in §3.4, but now with respect to the curve  $\tilde{\gamma}$ . It follows that

$$\sigma + \lambda \tilde{\theta}_2(\xi) = \theta_2 \circ \tilde{M}(\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}(\xi) = \lambda u \circ \tilde{M}(\xi)$$

and so

$$\tilde{a}(\xi; t; s) = (a_k)_{\sigma,\lambda}(\xi; t; s) \beta(2^{-k+3\ell} \tilde{u}(\xi)) \zeta(\tilde{\theta}_2(\xi) - \sigma - \mu) \eta(\rho(s - \tilde{\theta}_2(\xi))).$$

Using the fact that  $|\langle \tilde{\gamma}^{(3)} \circ \tilde{\theta}_2(\xi), \xi \rangle| \sim 2^{k-3\ell} \sim |\xi|$  on the support of  $\tilde{a}$ , it is a straightforward exercise to show that

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \tilde{\theta}_2(\xi)| \lesssim_\alpha |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad \text{and} \quad 2^{-k+3\ell} |\partial_\xi^\alpha \tilde{u}(\xi)| \lesssim_\alpha |\xi|^{-|\alpha|}$$

hold for all  $\xi \in \text{supp}_\xi \tilde{a}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$ . The derivative bounds

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_t^i \partial_s^j \tilde{a}(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_{\alpha,i,j} |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3 \text{ and } i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad (6.6)$$

then easily follow, noting that the derivatives of  $(a_k)_{\sigma,\lambda}$  can be controlled following the discussion at the end of §4.2.

As a consequence of (6.4), we may write  $\tilde{a} = \sum_{j=0}^\infty \tilde{a}_j$  where each  $\tilde{a}_j$  is a localised symbol as defined in (3.3) and the only non-zero terms of the sum correspond to

values of  $j$  satisfying  $2^j \sim 2^{k-3\ell}$ . In view of (6.5) and (6.6), for  $p \geq 6$  we can apply Theorem 6.8 to obtain

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m_{\tilde{\gamma}}[\tilde{a}](D; t)\tilde{f}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}^p dt \right)^{1/p} \lesssim_\varepsilon 2^{O(\varepsilon k)} 2^{-2(k-3\ell)/p} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

This, together with (6.3) and an affine transformation in the spatial variables, gives the desired inequality (6.2).  $\square$

**6.6. Putting everything together.** With the above ingredients, we can now conclude the proof of the  $L^{12}$  local smoothing estimate.

*Proof of Proposition 3.6.* By successively applying Lemma 6.1, Lemma 6.3, Proposition 6.5 and a second application of Lemma 6.3, we obtain

$$\|m[a_{k,\ell}](D; \cdot)f\|_{L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim_{\varepsilon, N} 2^{\varepsilon k/2} 2^{5\ell/12} \left( \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \|m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](D; \cdot)f\|_{L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}^{12} \right)^{1/12} + 2^{-kN} \|f\|_{L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for any  $N > 0$ . By the localisation (6.1) and Proposition 6.9 we have

$$\left( \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \|m[a_{k,\ell}^\mu](D; \cdot)f\|_{L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}^{12} \right)^{1/12} \lesssim 2^{\varepsilon k/2} 2^{-(k-3\ell)/6-\ell} \left( \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_{k,\ell}^\mu\|_{L^{12}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{12} \right)^{1/12}.$$

Combining the above observations with an application of Lemma 6.7 concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 7. THE NON-DEGENERATE CASE

In the non-degenerate case  $\ell = 0$  we appeal to the classical (linear) Stein–Tomas restriction estimate, rather than the trilinear theory from §5.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let  $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth curve and suppose that  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}^3} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  satisfies the symbol conditions*

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_t^i \partial_s^j a(\xi; t; s)| \lesssim_{\alpha, i, j} |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3 \text{ and } i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

and that

$$|\langle \gamma'(s), \xi \rangle| + |\langle \gamma''(s), \xi \rangle| \gtrsim |\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; s) \in \text{supp}_\xi a \times I. \quad (7.1)$$

Let  $k \geq 1$ . If  $a_k$  is defined as in (3.3), then

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_k](D; t)f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^6 dt \right)^{1/6} \lesssim 2^{k/3} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

*Proof.* Decomposing the symbol  $a$  into sufficiently many pieces with small  $\xi$  and  $s$  support, the non-degeneracy condition (7.1) can be strengthened to the following: there exists  $B > 1$  such that

$$B^{-1}|\xi| \leq |\langle \gamma''(s), \xi \rangle| \leq B|\xi| \quad \text{for all } (\xi; s) \in \text{supp}_\xi a \times I \quad (7.2)$$

and there exists  $s_* \in I$  such that

$$|\langle \gamma'(s_*), \xi \rangle| \leq 10^{-10} B|\xi| \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a; \quad (7.3)$$

see, for instance, [21, §4] or [12, Chapter 2] for details of this type of reduction, which relies on the fact that the oscillatory integral  $m[a_k]$  is rapidly decreasing if

the phase function  $s \mapsto \langle \gamma(s), \xi \rangle$  has no critical points. Under conditions (7.2) and (7.3), there exists a unique smooth mapping  $\theta_1 : \text{supp}_\xi a \rightarrow I$  such that

$$\langle \gamma' \circ \theta_1(\xi), \xi \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp}_\xi a. \quad (7.4)$$

Let  $q_1(\xi) := \langle \gamma \circ \theta_1(\xi), \xi \rangle$ . Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we may use (7.2) and van der Corput's lemma with second-order derivatives to write

$$m[a_k](\xi; t) = 2^{-k/2} e^{-itq_1(\xi)} b_k(2^{-k}\xi; t)(\xi; t)$$

where  $b_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})$  is supported in  $B(0, 10)$  and satisfies

$$|\partial_t^N b_k(2^{-k}\xi; t)| \lesssim_N 1 \quad \text{for all } (\xi; t) \in \mathbb{R}^{3+1} \text{ and all } N \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Following the reductions of §5.1, we consider an operator  $T$  of the form

$$Tg(x, t) := \int_{B^3(0,1)} e^{i(\langle x, \xi \rangle - tq_1(\xi))} b(\xi) g(\xi) d\xi$$

for  $b \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3)$  bounded in absolute value by 1 which, by (7.2), satisfies

$$\text{supp } b \subseteq \{\xi \in B^3(0, 1) : |v(\xi)| \sim 1\} \quad \text{where} \quad v(\xi) := \langle \gamma'' \circ \theta_1(\xi), \xi \rangle.$$

In particular, to prove the lemma, with the above setup it suffices to show

$$\|Tg\|_{L^6(B^{3+1}(0, 2^k))} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \quad (7.5)$$

The inequality (7.5) follows from a generalisation of the classical Stein–Tomas restriction theorem due to Greenleaf [13] (see also [23, Chapter VIII, §5 C.]). To apply this result, we need to show that  $q_1$  is smooth over the support of  $b$  and satisfies certain curvature conditions.

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we see that  $|\nabla \theta_1(\xi)| \sim 1$  on  $\text{supp } b$  and, furthermore, the function  $q_1$  is easily seen to be smooth with bounded derivatives over this set. A simple computation shows that the hessian  $\partial_{\xi\xi}^2 q_1(\xi)$  is the rank 1 matrix formed by the outer product of the vectors  $\nabla \theta_1(\xi)$  and  $\gamma' \circ \theta_1(\xi)$ . By elementary properties of rank 1 matrices,  $\partial_{\xi\xi}^2 q_1(\xi)$  therefore has a unique non-zero eigenvalue given by

$$\kappa(\xi) := \langle \gamma' \circ \theta_1(\xi), \nabla \theta_1(\xi) \rangle.$$

We claim that

$$|\kappa(\xi)| \sim 1 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \text{supp } b; \quad (7.6)$$

geometrically, this means that the surface formed by taking the graph of  $q_1$  over some open neighbourhood of  $\text{supp } b$  has precisely one non-vanishing principal curvature. This is precisely the geometric condition needed to apply the result of [13] in order to deduce (7.5). To see (7.6) holds, we take the  $\xi$ -gradient of the defining equation (7.4) for  $\theta_1$  and then form the inner product with  $\nabla \theta_1(\xi)$  to deduce that

$$0 = \langle \gamma' \circ \theta_1(\xi), \nabla \theta_1(\xi) \rangle + \langle \gamma'' \circ \theta_1(\xi), \xi \rangle |\nabla \theta_1(\xi)|^2 = \kappa(\xi) + v(\xi) |\nabla \theta_1(\xi)|^2.$$

Since  $|v(\xi)| \sim |\nabla \theta_1(\xi)| \sim 1$  on  $\text{supp } b$ , the claim follows.  $\square$

One can interpolate Proposition 7.1 with the diagonal  $L^6 \rightarrow L^6$  local smoothing result of Pramanik–Seeger [21] (see Theorem 6.8 above) to directly deduce the desired  $L^4 \rightarrow L^6$  estimate for the non-degenerate piece  $a_{k,0}$  introduced in (3.8).

**Lemma 7.2.** *For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_{k,0}](D, t)f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^6 dt \right)^{1/6} \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{-O(1)} 2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

This lemma reduces the proof of Proposition 3.2 to establishing the  $L^4 \rightarrow L^6$  bound in (3.6) with  $a_k$  replaced with the localised symbol  $\mathbf{a}_k := a_k - a_{k,0}$ .

## 8. CONCLUDING THE ARGUMENT

Here we conclude the proof of Proposition 3.2 and, in particular, present the details of the trilinear reduction discussed in §3.2.

*Proof (of Proposition 3.2).* Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $M_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_\varepsilon \geq 1$  be constants, depending only on  $\varepsilon$ , and chosen to satisfy the forthcoming requirements of the proof. We proceed by inducting on the parameter  $k$ . For  $0 \leq k \leq \delta^{-100}$ , the result is trivial and this serves as the base case. We fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $k > \delta^{-100}$  and assume that for  $0 \leq n \leq k-1$  the result holds in the following quantified sense.

**Induction hypothesis.** Let  $\gamma \in \mathfrak{G}(\delta_0, M_\varepsilon)$  and suppose  $a \in C^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  satisfies the symbol condition

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_t^i \partial_s^j a(\xi; t; s)| \leq |\xi|^{-|\alpha|} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^3 \text{ and } i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ with } |\alpha|, i, j \leq M_\varepsilon. \quad (8.1)$$

For all  $0 \leq n \leq k-1$ , we have

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[a_n](D; t)f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^6 dt \right)^{1/6} \leq \mathbf{C}_\varepsilon 2^{-n/6+\varepsilon n} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

We remark that if  $M_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  is chosen sufficiently large, then all the estimates proved in this paper are uniform over all curves belonging to the class  $\mathfrak{G}(\delta_0, M_\varepsilon)$ .

We now turn to the inductive step. Fix  $\gamma \in \mathfrak{G}(\delta_0, M_\varepsilon)$  and  $a$  satisfying (8.1) and suppose  $a_{k,0}$  is defined as in (3.8). Provided  $\mathbf{C}_\varepsilon$  is chosen sufficiently large in terms of  $\delta$ , we may apply Lemma 7.2 to deduce a favourable bound for the corresponding multiplier  $m[a_{k,0}]$ . It remains to show

$$\left( \int_1^2 \|m[\mathbf{a}_k](D; t)f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^6 dt \right)^{1/6} \leq (\mathbf{C}_\varepsilon/2) 2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}$$

for the  $\mathbf{a}_k$  symbols as defined in (3.12).

For convenience, write

$$U_k f(x, t) := m[\mathbf{a}_k](D, t)f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad U_k^J f(x, t) := m^J[\mathbf{a}_k](D, t)f(x) \quad \text{for } J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta).$$

By fixing an appropriate partition of unity,

$$U_k f = \sum_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} U_k^J f.$$

By an elementary argument (see, for instance, [18, Lemma 4.1]), we have a pointwise bound

$$|U_k f(z)| \lesssim \max_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} |U_k^J f(z)| + \delta^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{J} \in \mathfrak{J}^{3, \text{sep}}(\delta)} \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |U_k^J f(z)|^{1/3}. \quad (8.2)$$

Taking  $L^6$ -norms on both sides of (8.2), we deduce that

$$\|U_k f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim \left( \sum_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} \|U_k^J f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}^6 \right)^{1/6} + \delta^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{J} \in \mathfrak{J}^{3, \text{sep}}(\delta)} \left\| \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |U_k^J f|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}. \quad (8.3)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (8.3) can be estimated using a combination of rescaling and the induction hypothesis. To this end, let  $\tilde{\beta} \in C_c^\infty(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3)$  be a non-negative function satisfying  $\beta \tilde{\beta} = \beta$  and  $|\xi| \sim 1$  for  $\xi \in \text{supp } \tilde{\beta}$ , and define

$\tilde{\beta}^k(\xi) := \tilde{\beta}(2^{-k}\xi)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . For  $J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)$  fix  $\tilde{\psi}_J \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $\text{supp } \tilde{\psi}_J \subseteq 4 \cdot J$ ,  $\tilde{\psi}_J(r) = 1$  for  $r \in 2 \cdot J$  and  $|\partial_r^N \tilde{\psi}_J(r)| \lesssim_N |J|^{-N}$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . We define the Fourier projection  $f_J$  of  $f$  by

$$\hat{f}_J(\xi) := \chi_J(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi) \quad \text{where} \quad \chi_J(\xi) := \tilde{\beta}^k(\xi) \tilde{\psi}_J \circ \theta_2(\xi).$$

By stationary phase arguments, similar to the proof of Lemma 6.1, we then have

$$\|U_k^J f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim \|U_k^J f_J\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} + 2^{-10k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad \text{for each } J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta).$$

Fix  $J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)$  with centre  $c_J$ . By the scaling relation (4.7), we have

$$\|U_k^J\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim \delta^{1/2} \|\tilde{U}_k\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}$$

where  $\tilde{U}_k$  is the rescaled operator

$$\tilde{U}_k f(x, t) := m_{\tilde{\gamma}}[\tilde{a}](D, t) f(x) \quad \text{for} \quad \tilde{\gamma} := \gamma_{c_J, \delta/2}, \quad \tilde{a} := (\mathbf{a}_k \cdot \psi_J)_{c_J, \delta/2},$$

with the rescalings as defined in (4.2) and (4.5). Note that  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathfrak{G}(\delta_0, M_\varepsilon)$  and, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 6.9, the symbol  $\tilde{a}$  satisfies (8.1) (perhaps with a slightly larger constant, but this can be factored out of the symbol). Furthermore, in view of (4.4), the symbol  $\tilde{a}$  satisfies

$$\text{supp}_\xi \tilde{a} \subset \{\xi \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^3 : |\xi| \sim \delta^3 2^k\}.$$

In particular, we can write  $\tilde{a} = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \tilde{a}_n$  where each  $\tilde{a}_n$  is a localised symbol as in (3.3) and the only non-zero terms of this sum correspond to values of  $n$  satisfying  $2^n \sim \delta^3 2^k$ . Thus, by the induction hypothesis,

$$\|\tilde{U}_k\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim \mathbf{C}_\varepsilon (\delta^3 2^k)^{-1/6+\varepsilon} = \mathbf{C}_\varepsilon \delta^{-1/2+3\varepsilon} 2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k}.$$

Combining these observations,

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \sum_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} \|U_k^J f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})}^6 \right)^{1/6} &\lesssim \mathbf{C}_\varepsilon \delta^{3\varepsilon} 2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k} \left( \sum_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} \|f_J\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}^4 \right)^{1/4} \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{C}_\varepsilon \delta^{3\varepsilon} 2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.4)$$

where the final estimate follows from the orthogonality of the  $f_J$  via a standard argument.<sup>7</sup>

On the other hand, each summand in the second term on the right-hand side of (8.3) can be estimated using Proposition 3.3. In particular, for each fixed  $\mathbf{J} \in \mathfrak{J}^{3, \text{sep}}(\delta)$  we have

$$\left\| \prod_{J \in \mathbf{J}} |U_k^J f|^{1/3} \right\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{-E} 2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)} \quad (8.5)$$

for some absolute constant  $E \geq 1$ .

Combining (8.3), (8.4) and (8.5), we deduce that

$$\|U_k f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \leq C_\varepsilon (\mathbf{C}_\varepsilon \delta^{3\varepsilon} + \delta^{-E-4}) 2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k} \|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

<sup>7</sup>Indeed, by interpolation it suffices to show

$$\sum_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} \|f_J\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} \|f_J\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

The former follows from Plancherel's theorem and the finite overlap of the Fourier supports of the  $f_J$ . For the latter, it suffices to show the kernel estimate  $\sup_{J \in \mathfrak{J}(\delta)} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi_J\|_1 \lesssim 1$ . To see this, we apply a rescaling as in the proof of Proposition 6.9, which transforms  $\chi_J$  into a function with favourable derivative bounds.



where the constant  $C_\varepsilon \geq 1$  is an amalgamation of the various implied constants appearing in the preceding argument. Now suppose  $\delta > 0$  and  $\mathbf{C}_\varepsilon$  have been chosen from the outset so as to satisfy  $C_\varepsilon \delta^{3\varepsilon} \leq 1/4$  and  $\mathbf{C}_\varepsilon \geq 4C_\varepsilon \delta^{-E-4}$ . It then follows that

$$\|U_k f\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^{3+1})} \leq (\mathbf{C}_\varepsilon/2)2^{-k/6+\varepsilon k}\|f\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

which closes the induction and completes the proof.  $\square$

## 9. NECESSARY CONDITIONS

In this section we provide the examples that show that  $M_\gamma$  fails to be bounded from  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  whenever  $(1/p, 1/q) \notin \mathcal{T}$ . By a classical result of Hörmander [17],  $M_\gamma$  cannot map  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  for any  $p > q$ . Failure at the point  $(1/3, 1/3)$  was already shown in [18] via a modification of the standard Stein-type example for the circular maximal function. The line joining  $(1/3, 1/3)$  and  $(1/4, 1/6)$  is critical via a Knapp-type example, whilst the line joining  $(0, 0)$  and  $(1/4, 1/6)$  is critical from the standard example for fixed time averages.

**9.1. The Knapp example.** By an affine rescaling (as in §4.2), we may assume  $\gamma^{(j)}(0) = e_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq 3$ , where  $e_j$  denotes the standard basis vector. Thus, if  $\gamma_\circ$  denotes the moment curve as in §4.2, then  $\gamma(s) = \gamma(0) + \gamma_\circ(s) + O(s^4)$  for  $s \in I$ . Furthermore, we may assume without loss of generality that  $a := \gamma_3(0) > 0$ . Given  $\delta > 0$ , let  $f_\delta := \mathbb{1}_{R_\delta}$  where

$$R_\delta := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |y_j| < \delta^j, 1 \leq j \leq 3\}.$$

Clearly,  $\|f_\delta\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \delta^{6/p}$ . Consider the domain

$$E_\delta := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x_j - x_3 \gamma_j(0)/a| < \delta^j/2, j = 1, 2, a \leq x_3 \leq 2a\}.$$

By the moment curve approximation, there exists a constant  $c_\gamma > 0$  such that if  $|s| < c_\gamma \delta$ , then the following holds. If  $x \in E_\delta$  and  $t(x) := x_3/a$ , then

$$|x_j - t(x)\gamma_j(s)| \leq |x_j - t(x)\gamma_j(0)| + |t(x)||\gamma_j(0) - \gamma_j(s)| < \delta^j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2$$

and

$$|x_3 - t(x)\gamma_3(s)| = |t(x)||\gamma_3(0) - \gamma_3(s)| < \delta^3.$$

Thus, we conclude that  $x - t(x)\gamma(s) \in R_\delta$  for all  $|s| < c_\gamma \delta$  and therefore

$$\|M_\gamma f_\delta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} \gtrsim \delta |E_\delta|^{1/q} \gtrsim \delta^{1+3/q}.$$

The bound  $\|M_\gamma f_\delta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|f_\delta\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}$  therefore implies  $\delta^{1+3/q} \lesssim \delta^{6/p}$ ; letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , this can only hold if  $1 + \frac{3}{q} \geq \frac{6}{p}$ . This gives rise to the line joining  $(1/3, 1/3)$  and  $(1/4, 1/6)$  in Figure 1.

**9.2. Dimensional constraint.** This is the standard example for  $L^p \rightarrow L^q$  boundedness for the fixed time averages. Given  $0 < \delta < 1$ , consider  $g_\delta = \mathbb{1}_{N_\delta(\gamma)}$  where

$$N_\delta(\gamma) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x + \gamma(s)| \leq \delta \text{ for some } s \in I\}.$$

Clearly,  $\|g_\delta\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \delta^{2/p}$ . Furthermore,  $x - \gamma(s) \in N_\delta(\gamma)$  for all  $|x| \leq \delta$ . This readily implies  $M_\gamma g_\delta(x) \geq A_1 g_\delta(x) \geq 1$  for  $|x| \leq \delta$ , and consequently,  $\|M_\gamma g_\delta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} \gtrsim \delta^{3/q}$ . The bound  $\|M_\gamma g_\delta\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim \|g_\delta\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)}$  implies  $\delta^{3/q} \lesssim \delta^{2/p}$ ; letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , this can only hold if  $\frac{3}{q} \geq \frac{2}{p}$ . This gives rise to the line joining  $(0, 0)$  and  $(1/4, 1/6)$  in Figure 1.

## APPENDIX A. LOCALISED MULTILINEAR RESTRICTION ESTIMATES

Here we present the proof of Theorem 2.2. We use a simple Fubini argument to essentially reduce the problem to particular cases of the multilinear restriction inequalities from [6, Theorem 1.3] and [7, Theorem 5.1]. More precisely, we require low-regularity versions of these results which apply to  $C^{1,1/2}$ -hypersurfaces. However, the arguments of [6] and [7] extend to cover the  $C^{1,\alpha}$ -class for any  $\alpha > 0$  by incorporating minor modifications to the induction-on-scale scheme as in the proof of [18, Theorem 3.6]; we omit the details.

*Proof (of Theorem 2.2).* Let  $\delta > 0$  be a small constant, which is independent of  $\mu$  and  $R$  and chosen to satisfy the forthcoming requirements of the proof. We may assume without loss of generality that  $0 < \mu < \delta$ , since otherwise the desired estimate follows from the  $C^{1,1/2}$  extension of the Bennett–Carbery–Tao multilinear inequality [7, Theorem 5.1].

By localising the operators and applying a suitable rotation to the coordinate domain, we may assume that there exists an open domain  $U'_3 \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^2$  and a smooth map  $\gamma: U'_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\{\xi \in \text{supp } a_3 : u(\xi) = 0\} = \{(s, \gamma(s)) : s \in U'_3\}$$

and, moreover,

$$\text{supp } a_3 \subseteq \{(s, \gamma(s) + r) : s \in U'_3 \text{ and } |r| < \mu\}.$$

By differentiating the defining identity for  $\gamma$ , we observe that

$$(\partial_{\xi_j} u)(s, \gamma(s)) + (\partial_{s_j} \gamma)(s)(\partial_{\xi_3} u)(s, \gamma(s)) = 0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

By a change of variables, we may write

$$E_3 f_3(x, t) = \int_{-\mu}^{\mu} e^{irx_3} E_{3,r} f_{3,r}(x, t) \, dr$$

where  $f_{3,r}(s) := f_3(s, \gamma(s) + r)$  and

$$E_{3,r} g(x, t) := \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^2} e^{i(\langle \Gamma(s), x \rangle + tQ_3(s, \gamma(s) + r))} a_{3,r}(s) g(s) \, ds$$

for  $\Gamma(s) := (s, \gamma(s))$  and  $a_{3,r}(s) := a_3(s, \gamma(s) + r)$ . For each fixed  $|r| < \mu$ , the operator  $E_{3,r}$  is the extension operator associated to the 2-surface

$$\Sigma'_{3,r} := \{(s, \gamma(s), Q_3(s, \gamma(s) + r)) : s \in U'_3\}.$$

When  $r = 0$ , it follows from (A.1) that

$$\text{span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -\nabla Q_3 \circ \Gamma(s) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \nabla u \circ \Gamma(s) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} = N_{\xi} \Sigma'_{3,0} \quad \text{for } \xi := (\Gamma(s), Q_3 \circ \Gamma(s)); \quad (\text{A.2})$$

that is, the span of the two vectors is equal to the normal space to  $\Sigma'_{3,0}$  at  $\xi$ .

After applying a simple Fubini–Tonelli argument, the problem is reduced to showing

$$\int_{-\mu}^{\mu} \int_{B(0,R)} \prod_{j=1}^2 |E_j f_j(x, t)| |E_{3,r} f_{3,r}(x, t)| \, dx dt dr \lesssim_{\mathbf{Q}, \varepsilon} R^{\varepsilon} \mu^{1/2} \prod_{j=1}^3 \|f_j\|_{L^2(U_j)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The key claim is that for each  $|r| < \mu$ , the trio of extension operators  $(E_1, E_2, E_{3,r})$  satisfy the hypothesis of [6, Theorem 1.3]. In particular, provided  $\delta > 0$  is chosen

sufficiently small, our transversality hypothesis (2.1) implies that the normal spaces to the submanifolds  $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_{3,r}$  factorise the space  $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}^4$  in the sense that

$$N_{\xi_1}\Sigma_1 \oplus N_{\xi_2}\Sigma_2 \oplus N_{\xi_3}\Sigma'_{3,r} = \widehat{\mathbb{R}}^4$$

for all  $|r| < \mu$  and all choices of  $\xi_1 \in \Sigma_1, \xi_2 \in \Sigma_2, \xi_3 \in \Sigma'_{3,r}$ . To see this, we first prove the  $r = 0$  case by combining (A.2) and (2.1), and then extend to all  $|r| < \mu < \delta$  using continuity. Consequently, we can use the formula proved in [5, Proposition 1.2] together with (2.1) to conclude that the Brascamp–Lieb constant associated to the orthogonal projections onto the tangent spaces  $T_{\xi_1}\Sigma_1, T_{\xi_2}\Sigma_2, T_{\xi_3}\Sigma_{3,r}$  (with Lebesgue exponents  $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 1/2$ ) is uniformly bounded. We refer to [5, 6] for the relevant definitions. This is precisely the hypothesis of [6, Theorem 1.3] and invoking (a suitable  $C^{1,1/2}$  generalisation of) this result we obtain

$$\int_{B(0,R)} \prod_{j=1}^2 |E_j f_j(x,t)| |E_{3,r} f_{3,r}(x,t)| \, dx dt \lesssim_{\mathbf{Q},\varepsilon} R^\varepsilon \prod_{j=1}^2 \|f_j\|_{L^2(U_j)} \|f_{3,r}\|_{L^2(U'_3)}$$

uniformly over all  $|r| < \mu$ . We integrate both sides of this inequality with respect to  $r$  and apply the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\mu}^{\mu} \int_{B(0,R)} \prod_{j=1}^2 |E_j f_j(x,t)| |E_{3,r} f_{3,r}(x,t)| \, dx dt dr \\ \lesssim_{\mathbf{Q},\varepsilon} R^\varepsilon \mu^{1/2} \prod_{j=1}^2 \|f_j\|_{L^2(U_j)} \left( \int_{-\mu}^{\mu} \|f_{3,r}\|_{L^2(U'_3)}^2 \, dr \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired estimate (A.3) now follows by reversing the original change of variables.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ioan Bejenaru, *The multilinear restriction estimate: almost optimality and localization*, Math. Res. Lett. **29** (2022), no. 3, 599–630. MR 4516033
- [2] David Beltran, Shaoming Guo, Jonathan Hickman, and Andreas Seeger, *Sharp  $L^p$  bounds for the helical maximal function*, Am. J. Math., to appear. Preprint: [arxiv.org/abs/2102.08272](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.08272).
- [3] ———, *Sobolev improving for averages over curves in  $\mathbb{R}^4$* , Adv. Math. **393** (2021), Paper No. 108089, 85. MR 4340226
- [4] David Beltran, Joris Roos, and Andreas Seeger, *Multi-scale sparse domination*, To appear in Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., arXiv:2009.000227, 2020.
- [5] Jonathan Bennett and Neal Bez, *Some nonlinear brascamp–lieb inequalities and applications to harmonic analysis*, Journal of Functional Analysis **259** (2010), no. 10, 2520–2556.
- [6] Jonathan Bennett, Neal Bez, Taryn C. Flock, and Sanghyuk Lee, *Stability of the Brascamp–Lieb constant and applications*, Amer. J. Math. **140** (2018), no. 2, 543–569. MR 3783217
- [7] Jonathan Bennett, Anthony Carbery, and Terence Tao, *On the multilinear restriction and Kakeya conjectures*, Acta Math. **196** (2006), no. 2, 261–302. MR 2275834
- [8] Jöran Bergh and Jörgen Löfström, *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976. MR 0482275
- [9] Jean Bourgain and Ciprian Demeter, *The proof of the  $l^2$  decoupling conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **182** (2015), no. 1, 351–389. MR 3374964
- [10] Jean Bourgain, Ciprian Demeter, and Larry Guth, *Proof of the main conjecture in Vinogradov’s mean value theorem for degrees higher than three*, Ann. of Math. (2) **184** (2016), no. 2, 633–682. MR 3548534
- [11] Jean Bourgain and Larry Guth, *Bounds on oscillatory integral operators based on multilinear estimates*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 6, 1239–1295. MR 2860188

- [12] Aswin Govindan Sheri, *On certain geometric maximal functions in harmonic analysis*, PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh (2023).
- [13] Allan Greenleaf, *Principal curvature and harmonic analysis*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **30** (1981), no. 4, 519–537. MR 620265
- [14] Philip T. Gressman, Shaoming Guo, Lillian B. Pierce, Joris Roos, and Po-Lam Yung, *Reversing a philosophy: from counting to square functions and decoupling*, J. Geom. Anal. **31** (2021), no. 7, 7075–7095. MR 4289255
- [15] Shaoming Guo, Zane Kun Li, Po-Lam Yung, and Pavel Zorin-Kranich, *A short proof of  $\ell^2$  decoupling for the moment curve*, Preprint: [arXiv:1912.09798](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.09798).
- [16] Seheon Ham and Sanghyuk Lee, *Restriction estimates for space curves with respect to general measures*, Adv. Math. **254** (2014), 251–279. MR 3161099
- [17] Lars Hörmander, *Estimates for translation invariant operators in  $L^p$  spaces*, Acta Math. **104** (1960), 93–140. MR 121655
- [18] Hyerim Ko, Sanghyuk Lee, and Sewook Oh, *Maximal estimates for averages over space curves*, Invent. Math. **228** (2022), no. 2, 991–1035. MR 4411734
- [19] ———, *Sharp smoothing properties of averages over curves*, Forum Math. Pi **11** (2023), Paper No. e4, 33. MR 4549710
- [20] Gerd Mockenhaupt, Andreas Seeger, and Christopher D. Sogge, *Wave front sets, local smoothing and Bourgain’s circular maximal theorem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **136** (1992), no. 1, 207–218. MR 1173929
- [21] Malabika Pramanik and Andreas Seeger,  *$L^p$  regularity of averages over curves and bounds for associated maximal operators*, Amer. J. Math. **129** (2007), no. 1, 61–103. MR 2288738
- [22] Christopher D. Sogge, *Fourier integrals in classical analysis*, second ed., Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 210, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017. MR 3645429
- [23] Elias M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 43, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III. MR 1232192
- [24] Ruixiang Zhang, *The endpoint perturbed Brascamp-Lieb inequalities with examples*, Anal. PDE **11** (2018), no. 3, 555–581. MR 3738255
- [25] Pavel Zorin-Kranich, *Kekeya-Brascamp-Lieb inequalities*, Collect. Math. **71** (2020), no. 3, 471–492. MR 4129538

DAVID BELTRAN: DEPARTAMENT D’ANÀLISI MATEMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA, DR. MOLINER 50, 46100 BURJASSOT, SPAIN

*Email address:* [david.beltran@uv.es](mailto:david.beltran@uv.es)

JENNIFER DUNCAN: ICMAT, C. DE NICOLAS CABRERA 13-15, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN

*Email address:* [jennifer.duncan@icmat.es](mailto:jennifer.duncan@icmat.es)

JONATHAN HICKMAN: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, JAMES CLERK MAXWELL BUILDING, THE KING’S BUILDINGS, PETER GUTHRIE TAIT ROAD, EDINBURGH, EH9 3FD, UK.

*Email address:* [jonathan.hickman@ed.ac.uk](mailto:jonathan.hickman@ed.ac.uk)