

HIGHER DECAY INEQUALITIES FOR MULTILINEAR OSCILLATORY INTEGRALS

MAXIM GILULA, PHILIP T. GRESSMAN, AND LECHAO XIAO

ABSTRACT. In this paper we establish sharp estimates (up to logarithmic losses) for the multilinear oscillatory integral operator studied by Phong, Stein, and Sturm [14] and Carbery and Wright [2] on any product $\prod_{j=1}^d L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})$ with each $p_j \geq 2$, expanding the known results for this operator well outside the previous range $\sum_{j=1}^d p_j^{-1} = d - 1$. Our theorem assumes second-order nondegeneracy condition of Varchenko type, and as a corollary reproduces Varchenko's theorem and implies Fourier decay estimates for measures of smooth density on degenerate hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^d .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ be real analytic in some neighborhood of $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix a smooth cutoff function χ supported near the origin, and consider the multilinear functional

$$(1.1) \quad \Lambda(\mathbf{f}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\lambda\phi(\mathbf{x})} \chi(\mathbf{x}) \prod_{j=1}^d f_j(x_j) d\mathbf{x},$$

where $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_d)$ is any d -tuple of locally integrable functions on \mathbb{R} . The purpose of this article is to study the asymptotic behavior in the real parameter λ as $|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty$ of the norm of Λ when viewed as a linear functional on $\prod_{j=1}^d L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})$.

Bilinear variants of this form have a long history in harmonic analysis in connection with the study of Fourier integral operators and Radon-like transforms (see, e.g., Greenleaf and Uhlmann [9] and Seeger [16]). In the 1990s, Phong and Stein initiated the study of these oscillatory integrals as a subject in its own right [10]. Their program focused primarily on $L^2 \times L^2$ estimates of weighted and unweighted varieties [11–13], as this particular case was most directly connected to the earlier FIO roots. In this setting, the undamped bilinear case with real analytic phase was ultimately settled in [13], with the transition to C^∞ phases being later accomplished by Rychkov [15] and Greenblatt [6]. These works demonstrated the primary role of the (reduced) Newton polyhedron of the phase ϕ , which had also been identified as a key object in Varchenko's study of scalar oscillatory integrals some twenty years earlier [17]. To define the Newton polyhedron, first expand $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \mathbf{x}^{\alpha}$ near the origin, where $\mathbf{x}^{\alpha} = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_d^{\alpha_d}$, and define the Taylor

Date: October 16, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 42B20.

Key words and phrases. Newton Polyhedron, multilinear oscillatory integral forms.

The second author is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1361697 and an Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellowship.

support of ϕ by $\text{supp}(\phi) = \{\alpha : c_\alpha \neq 0\}$. Let \mathbb{R}_\geq denote the nonnegative real numbers. The Newton polyhedron of ϕ , denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$, is defined to be the convex hull of

$$\bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\phi)} \alpha + \mathbb{R}_\geq^d,$$

and the Newton distance d_ϕ of ϕ is defined to be the minimum over all t such that $(t, \dots, t) \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)$. In the specific case of the form (1.1), modulating each function f_j by a function of the form $e^{-i\lambda\phi_j(x_j)}$, it can be easily seen that terms in the power series of ϕ which depend on only one coordinate function do not affect the norm of Λ on $\prod_{j=1}^d L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R})$, so it will be assumed without loss of generality that every $\alpha \in \text{supp}(\phi)$ has at least two strictly positive components. After removing all single-variable terms in the Taylor support of ϕ , the resulting Newton polyhedron corresponds to the object known as the reduced Newton polyhedron in other contexts.

The success of the program of Phong and Stein to establish $L^2 \times L^2$ estimates for (1.1) prompted generalizations and extensions to a variety of higher-dimensional settings, including results of Carbery, Christ, and Wright [1] as well as Carbery and Wright [2]. The most natural extension of the work of Phong and Stein to higher dimensions turned out to be (1.1) itself, which was studied by Phong, Stein, and Sturm [14] as well as Carbery and Wright [2]. The main theorem of Phong, Stein, and Sturm which is most closely related to the present work is as follows:

Theorem B ([14]). *Let $\alpha^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(K)} \in \mathbb{N}^d \setminus \{0\}$ be K given vertices, and let $S \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ be any polynomial of degree n_S . Set*

$$D(\alpha^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(K)}) = \left\{ x \in U : |S^{(\alpha^{(k)})}(x)| > 1, \quad 1 \leq k \leq K \right\}.$$

Let $N^(\alpha^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(K)})$ be the reduced Newton polyhedron generated by the vertices $\alpha^{(k)}$, i.e., the Newton polyhedron generated by those vertices $\alpha^{(k)}$ with at least two strictly positive components. Then for any algebraic domain $D \subset D(\alpha^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(K)})$ and any $\alpha \in N^*(\alpha^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(K)})$, we have*

$$(1.2) \quad |\Lambda(\mathbf{f})| \leq C |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{|\alpha|}} \ln^{d-\frac{1}{2}}(2 + |\lambda|) \prod_{j=1}^d \|f_j\|_{p_j}, \quad d \geq 2.$$

Here $\lambda \neq 0$ is any number, and $\frac{1}{p_j} = 1 - \frac{1}{p_j} = \frac{\alpha_j}{|\alpha|}$. The constant C depends only on n_S , $|\alpha|$, and the type r, n, d, w of D .

Phong, Stein, and Sturm's purpose in proving Theorem B was to establish a robust stability result for the multilinear form (1.1), focusing on the role of the Newton polyhedron. In the present paper, we focus on a somewhat different question following naturally from Theorem B, namely, the possible range of exponents p_j . Generally speaking, the cases of most interest will occur when the exponents p_j are large, since in the opposite extreme, when $p_j = 1$ for one or more indices j , standard scaling arguments reduce the question of boundedness to a uniform estimate *a la* Phong, Stein, and Sturm which must be valid over a family of multilinear forms exhibiting a lower degree of multilinearity.

In the large-exponent regime we study here, the decay in λ of the form (1.1) is generally of a higher order than in the inequality (1.2). This extra decay brings with it additional difficulties not encountered in [14], which make it necessary to

introduce certain auxiliary assumptions not found there. The formulation we have chosen is essentially a higher-order version of the so-called Varchenko hypothesis [17]. Let $\mathcal{F}(\phi)$ denote the set of compact faces of $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$. In particular, the set of zero dimensional faces $\mathcal{V}(\phi) \subset \mathcal{F}(\phi)$ is the collection of vertices of $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$. The Varchenko-type nondegeneracy condition we assume is: for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(\phi)$,

$$(1.3) \quad \bigcap_{i \neq j} \{\mathbf{x} : \partial_i \partial_j \phi_F(\mathbf{x}) = 0\} \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \{\mathbf{x} : x_j = 0\}.$$

In words, we assume that any point at which all off-diagonal terms of the Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 \phi_F$ simultaneously vanish for all faces F must belong to a coordinate hyperplane. Our principal result is

Theorem 1.1. *Let ϕ be real analytic and satisfying (1.3). Let $p_j \in [2, \infty]$ for $1 \leq j \leq d$. If the support of χ is contained in a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\mathbf{0}$, then for any real number $\nu > 2$,*

$$(1.4) \quad |\Lambda(\mathbf{f})| \lesssim |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \log^m(2 + |\lambda|) \prod_{j=1}^d \|f_j\|_{p_j}$$

for some implicit constant independent of \mathbf{f} and some $m \geq 0$ if and only if

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\mathbf{p}'} = \left(\frac{\nu}{p'_1}, \dots, \frac{\nu}{p'_d} \right) \in \mathcal{N}(\phi),$$

where \mathbf{p}' denotes the conjugate of \mathbf{p} .

For readers interested in the exponent of the logarithmic factor, our proof provides a value of m which can be calculated easily from the geometry of the Newton polyhedron: $m = 0$ if $\frac{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\mathbf{p}'}$ is an interior point of $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$, and $m = d - \ell$ if the face of lowest dimension containing $\frac{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\mathbf{p}'}$ itself has dimension $(\ell - 1)$. The value of m may not be sharp in general, but is sharp when all $p_j = \infty$. In particular, Theorem 1.1 recovers the classical result of Varchenko under the somewhat milder hypothesis (1.3), where in this case $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)$:

Corollary 1.2. *Let ϕ be the same as above and let $(\ell - 1)$ denote the smallest dimension over all faces of $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$ containing $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, where $\boldsymbol{\nu} = d_\phi$ is the Newton distance of ϕ . Then*

$$|\Lambda(\mathbf{f})| \lesssim |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \log^{d-\ell}(2 + |\lambda|) \prod_{j=1}^d \|f_j\|_\infty.$$

When $\chi(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$, the power of the log term is also sharp.

The usefulness of this functional variant of Varchenko's theorem is even more apparent when the functions f_j are taken to be complex exponentials. Taking $f_j(x_j) = e^{i\xi_j x_j}$ and setting $\lambda = \xi_{d+1}$, the above corollary together with standard nonstationary phase estimates implies sharp estimates for the Fourier decay of measures of smooth density on the surface $(\mathbf{x}, \phi(\mathbf{x}))$; that is, for $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$,

$$\left| \int e^{i\boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot (\mathbf{x}, \phi(\mathbf{x}))} \chi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right| \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_2^{-\frac{1}{d_\phi}} \log^{d-\ell}(2 + |\xi_{d+1}|).$$

One can compare our methods for proving Lemma 2.1 with the more typical resolution of singularities methods of, for example, Greenblatt [7, 8], Collins, Greenleaf,

and Pramanik [3], or Xiao [18]. Lemma 2.1 allows us to avoid more algebraic considerations by carefully studying the various nonisotropic scalings which make the Taylor polynomials associated to compact faces of the Newton polyhedron homogeneous.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Given two vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d), \mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and a scalar $c > 0$, we define

- $\mathbf{xy} = (x_1y_1, \dots, x_dy_d)$,
- $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{y}} = x_1^{y_1} \cdots x_d^{y_d}$,
- $\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{x}} = (c^{x_1}, \dots, c^{x_d})$,
- $\mathbf{c} = (c, \dots, c)$,
- $\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{y}} = \left(\frac{x_1}{y_1}, \dots, \frac{x_d}{y_d}\right)$ if each $y_i \neq 0$, and
- $\partial_{\mathbf{x}}^{\alpha} = \prod_{j=1}^d \partial_{x_j}^{\alpha_j} = \prod_{j=1}^d \partial_j^{\alpha_j}$.

Let $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_d)$, where each ϵ_j is a positive dyadic number. We use Q_{ϵ} to denote the box

$$Q_{\epsilon} = \prod_{j=1}^d [\epsilon_j, 8\epsilon_j].$$

To fully exploit the nondegeneracy condition (1.3), we define the following quantity: for any subset S of \mathbb{R}^d , let

$$\|\phi\|_{V(S)} = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in S} \max_{i \neq j} |x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x})|.$$

The following lemma is key to establishing Theorem 1.1. It asserts that under the nondegeneracy condition (1.3), one can control the absolute value of some mixed partials of ϕ from below in each box Q_{ϵ} . The proof can be found in Section 3.

Lemma 2.1. *Let ϕ be real analytic, satisfying (1.3). Then there is a neighborhood U of $\mathbf{0}$ and a positive constant K such that for all $Q_{\epsilon} \subset U$*

$$(2.6) \quad \|\phi\|_{V(Q_{\epsilon})} \geq K \epsilon^{\alpha}, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{V}(\phi).$$

We also need control of the absolute value of mixed derivatives of ϕ from above:

Lemma 2.2. *There is a neighborhood U of $\mathbf{0}$ and a constant K' such that for all $\mathbf{a} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^d$ and all $Q_{\epsilon} \subset U$,*

$$(2.7) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in Q_{\epsilon}} |\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} \partial_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{a}} \phi(\mathbf{x})| \leq K' \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{V}(\phi)} \epsilon^{\alpha}.$$

The proof of this lemma follows directly from the analyticity of the function ϕ and the fact that all α in the Taylor support of ϕ are either convex combinations of vertices or correspond to terms of higher order than any such convex combination. Now let U be as in Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2. By coupling these two lemmas with the Mean Value Theorem, one can prove a slightly stronger version of Lemma 2.1:

Corollary 2.3. *There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on K, K' and ϕ , such that the following holds. Each $Q_{\epsilon} \subset U$ can be dyadically decomposed into a collection of 2^{dN} congruent boxes $Q_{\epsilon,l}$ for $1 \leq l \leq 2^{dN}$ such that for each $Q_{\epsilon,l}$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{V}(\phi)$, there is a fixed pair (i, j) such that*

$$(2.8) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in 2Q_{\epsilon,l}} |x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x})| \geq \frac{K}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha}.$$

We only outline the proof of this corollary here and leave the details to the interested reader. Decompose Q_ϵ into 2^{dN} congruent boxes $Q_{\epsilon,l}$ of dimensions $2^{-N}\epsilon$, with N to be determined momentarily. For each l , by Lemma 2.1, there exist $\mathbf{x} \in Q_{\epsilon,l}$ and a pair (i, j) , such that $|x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x})| \geq K\epsilon^\alpha$, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{V}(\phi)$. By choosing N large enough (independent of ϵ), (2.8) is a consequence of this estimate, Lemma 2.2, line integrals, and the Mean Value Theorem.

The main analytic tool to be employed is the following operator van der Corput lemma due to Phong and Stein [11, 12]. The proof can be found throughout the literature; see, for example, [5].

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\chi(x, y)$ be a smooth function supported in a box with dimensions $\delta_1 \times \delta_2$ such that $|\partial_y^l \chi(x, y)| \leq C_1 \delta_2^{-l}$ for $l = 0, 1, 2$ and some $C_1 > 0$. Let $\mu > 0$ and $S(x, y)$ be a smooth function s.t. for all (x, y) in the support of χ ,*

$$C_2 \mu \leq |\partial_x \partial_y S(x, y)| \leq C_3 \mu \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_x \partial_y^l S(x, y)| \leq C_3 \frac{\mu}{\delta_2^l} \quad \text{for } l = 1, 2.$$

Then the operator defined by

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

satisfies

$$(2.9) \quad \|T_\lambda f\|_2 \leq C |\lambda \mu|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f\|_2,$$

where the constant C depends on C_1, C_2 , and C_3 , but is independent of μ, λ and other information of the phase S .

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Lemma 2.1 is proved in Section 3. Estimates of $\Lambda(\mathbf{f})$ are established first for a single box in Section 4. The main tool used to sum over all boxes is Lemma 5.1, which is proved in Section 5. The main theorem will be established in Section 6.

3. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.1

The methods below are very similar to those in the first author's thesis [4]. For the rest of the section, we write $\phi = P_m + R_m$, where P_m is the Taylor polynomial at the origin of ϕ of degree at most m and R_m is the remainder. The integer m is chosen so that $\mathcal{N}(\phi) = \mathcal{N}(P_m)$; m always exists because the Newton polyhedron has finitely many extreme points. Write $P_m(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} c_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$ and $R_m(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} h_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x}^\alpha$ for some real analytic functions h_α . For each $1 \leq i \neq j \leq d$ we can write $x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x})$ as

$$(3.10) \quad x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} c'_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha + \sum_{|\alpha|=m} h'_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x}^\alpha,$$

where $c'_\alpha = \alpha_i \alpha_j c_\alpha$, and h'_α depends on i and j . For each compact $F \subset \mathcal{N}(\phi)$, we can write the polynomial $x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j P_m(\mathbf{x})$ in (3.10) as

$$(3.11) \quad \sum_{\alpha \in F} c'_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha \notin F} c'_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha.$$

The goal is to show for all \mathbf{x} small enough, one may choose F and $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ so that (3.10) is dominated by the sum over $\alpha \in F$ and all remaining terms are of a perturbative quality.

3.1. Supporting hyperplanes of $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$ and scaling. The difficulty of dividing the sum (3.10) into finitely many terms on a compact face F of $N(\phi)$ and a remainder term of sufficiently small magnitude comes when on some box Q_ϵ , there are many choices of $\alpha \in N(\phi)$ such that ϵ^α are of roughly the same magnitude as $\epsilon^\beta = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)} \epsilon^\alpha$ which do not belong to the face F itself. To simplify the computations, we will associate faces F with affine hypersurfaces H in the natural way, i.e., F and H are associated to one another when $F = H \cap N(\phi)$. In this hyperplane language, the following proposition describes how to adjust a candidate “dominant hyperplane” when there are corresponding remainder terms which are not small enough for our purposes. Below, one should think of $\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^n$ as vertices of a compact face of a Newton polyhedron with ϵ^{α^i} very close or equal to $\epsilon^\beta = \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)} \epsilon^\alpha$ in the sense that there is some $K > 0$ such that $K\epsilon^\beta \leq \epsilon^{\alpha^i} \leq \epsilon^\beta$. For instance, the hyperplane under consideration could contain $\beta, \alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^{n-1}$, but not α^n . In this case we can move to a hyperplane that contains all $(n+1)$ points, at the cost of moving to a larger face $F' \supseteq F$ (and later analyzing ϕ over a bigger box than Q_ϵ and possibly changing the indices i and j).

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)^d$ and let $\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be linearly independent. Assume for all $1 \leq k \leq n$ there is a positive $K < 1$ such that $K\epsilon^\beta \leq \epsilon^{\alpha^k} \leq \epsilon^\beta$ for some multiindex β . There is some $b \in (0, 1)$ depending only on $\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^n$ and K such that for some $\mathbf{y} \in [b, b^{-1}]^d$ and all $1 \leq k \leq n$ we have*

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbf{y}^{\alpha^k} = \epsilon^{\alpha^k - \beta}.$$

Moreover, if $\alpha = \sum_k \lambda_k \alpha^k$ for $\sum_k \lambda_k = 1$, then

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbf{y}^\alpha = \epsilon^{\alpha - \beta}.$$

Proof. Let A be the $n \times d$ matrix with rows $\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^n$. Without loss of generality, assume that the first n columns of A are linearly independent. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vector defined componentwise by $v_k = \log_2(\epsilon^{\alpha^k - \beta})$. Consider the equation $\tilde{A}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$, where $\tilde{A} = (\alpha_i^j)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$. Since \tilde{A} has full rank, we can invert \tilde{A} and write $\mathbf{u} = \tilde{A}^{-1}\mathbf{v}$. Fixing $\rho = \|\tilde{A}^{-1}\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty}$, we have that

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \leq \rho \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty.$$

Therefore $-\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \rho \leq u_k \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \rho$ for all k . However, $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq |\log K|$, so

$$K^\rho \leq 2^{-\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \rho} \leq 2^{u_k} \leq 2^{\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \rho} \leq K^{-\rho}.$$

Hence, letting $b = K^\rho \in (0, 1)$, we see that the vector $\mathbf{y} \in [b, b^{-1}]^d$ defined by $y_k = 2^{u_k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $y_k = 1$ otherwise satisfies the system of equations (3.12). Finally, (3.13) follows from rewriting $\alpha - \beta = \sum_k \lambda_k (\alpha^k - \beta)$. \square

The last part of the proposition will be useful shortly because $F \cap \text{supp}(P_m)$ might not be a linearly independent set, but it is always contained in the affine hull of $(\dim(F) + 1)$ many linearly independent vectors contained in F .

3.2. The main result required for Lemma 2.1. Suppose $K_0, \dots, K_{d-1} \in (0, 1)$ are fixed constants (to be determined later) and any d -tuple of dyadic numbers ϵ . We will call ϵ n -dominated when there is a n -dimensional compact face $F \subset \mathcal{N}(P_m)$ such that for all β and β' in F and all $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(P_m) \setminus F$,

$$\epsilon^\beta = \epsilon^{\beta'} \text{ and } \epsilon^\alpha \leq K_n \epsilon^\beta.$$

The property of n -domination is extremely useful because when estimating (3.11) on the box Q_ϵ , it allows a favorable pointwise upper bound of those terms not belonging to the face F . Unfortunately, not all dyadic d -tuples ϵ are n -dominated for some n . However, by Proposition 3.1, if for any given ϵ , there is an n -dimensional face F in $\mathcal{N}(P_m)$ of “dominant terms,” i.e., such that $\epsilon^\beta = \epsilon^{\beta'}$ for all β and β' in F and $\epsilon^\alpha \leq \epsilon^\beta$ for all $\alpha \notin F$, then either ϵ is n -dominated, or the nearby dyadic d -tuple $\mathbf{y}^{-1}\epsilon$ has an even higher-dimensional face of dominant terms (in applying Proposition 3.1, simply fix β to be any vertex in $\mathcal{V}(P_m)$ which maximizes ϵ^β and take $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ to be all other vertices which maximize $\beta \mapsto \epsilon^\beta$ together with any other vertices which, while not maximizing $\beta \mapsto \epsilon^\beta$ are in the forbidden range $\epsilon^\alpha \geq K_n \epsilon^\beta$). Finally, note that when the face F of dominant terms associated to an ϵ is $(d-1)$ -dimensional, then automatically ϵ is $(d-1)$ -dominated when ϵ is sufficiently small because there are only finitely many one-dimensional curves in \mathbb{R}_\geq^d on which ϵ must lie to be $(d-1)$ -dominated (i.e., curves defined by those nonisotropic scalings of \mathbb{R}^d which make ϕ_F homogeneous for some $(d-1)$ -dimensional face F). Therefore, by induction, we can say that for any dyadic d -tuple ϵ which is sufficiently small (depending on K_0, \dots, K_{d-1}), there is some $\epsilon' \in (0, 1)^d$ such that ϵ' is n -dominated for some n and $\epsilon'\epsilon^{-1}$ has components bounded above and below by constants depending only on $\mathcal{N}(P_m)$ and K_0, \dots, K_{n-1} .

We can now finish the proof of the main lemma. Consider once again the sums (3.10) and (3.11). Fix any dyadic d -tuple ϵ and let ϵ' be the n -dominated d -tuple identified above which is close to ϵ . Let β be any vertex in the dominant face F associated to ϵ' . If we define coordinates $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ so that $\mathbf{x} = \epsilon'\mathbf{z}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in Q_\epsilon$, then

$$\left| x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x}) - \epsilon'^\beta \sum_{\alpha \in F} c'_\alpha z^\alpha \right| \leq K_n \epsilon'^\beta \sum_{\alpha \notin F} |c'_\alpha z^\alpha| + C \sum_{|\alpha|=m} |\epsilon'^\alpha z^\alpha|$$

where the constant C depends only on the functions h_α . If we assume that ϵ is sufficiently small (or equivalently, that the cutoff function χ of (1.1) is supported sufficiently near the origin) depending on K_0, \dots, K_{n-1} and ϕ , we may assume that

$$C \sum_{|\alpha|=m} |\epsilon'^\alpha z^\alpha| \leq \frac{1}{3} \max_{i \neq j} \left| \epsilon'^\beta \sum_{\alpha \in F} c'_\alpha z^\alpha \right|$$

for every \mathbf{z} such that $\epsilon'\mathbf{z} \in Q_\epsilon$ since by induction the coordinates of \mathbf{z} are bounded away from 0 and ∞ , which means by the nondegeneracy hypothesis (1.3) that

$$\max_{i \neq j} \left| \sum_{\alpha \in F} c'_\alpha z^\alpha \right|$$

is bounded below uniformly in ϵ and \mathbf{z} by a constant that depends only on ϕ and K_0, \dots, K_{n-1} . Likewise, if K_n is chosen sufficiently small depending on K_0, \dots, K_{n-1} and ϕ , we may also assume that

$$K_n \sum_{\alpha \notin F} |c'_\alpha z^\alpha| \leq \frac{1}{3} \max_{i \neq j} \left| \sum_{\alpha \in F} c'_\alpha z^\alpha \right|,$$

which finally implies that

$$\max_{i \neq j} |x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x})| \geq \frac{1}{3} \epsilon^\beta \left| \sum_{\alpha \in F} c'_\alpha z^\alpha \right| \geq C_n \epsilon^\beta$$

uniformly for all $\mathbf{x} \in Q_\epsilon$ with some constant that depends on ϕ as well as the choice of K_0, \dots, K_n . Since ϵ'^β dominates ϵ^α for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{V}(\phi)$ and the coordinates of $\epsilon'^{-1} \epsilon$ are bounded above and below, Lemma 2.1 follows.

4. SINGLE BOX ESTIMATES

Let Q_ϵ be a fixed box and χ_ϵ be a smooth function supported in Q_ϵ with

$$(4.14) \quad |\partial_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{k}} \chi_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon^{-|\mathbf{k}|}, \quad \forall \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d.$$

The goal of this section is to obtain estimates of the multilinear form $\Lambda(\mathbf{f})$ when the support of \mathbf{f} is restricted to a single box Q_ϵ in the first orthant. This is achieved by coupling Corollary 2.3 with Lemma 2.4; this goal is stated below:

Lemma 4.1. *Let Q_ϵ as in Corollary 2.3. For all $(p_1, \dots, p_d) \in [2, \infty]^d$, there holds*

$$(4.15) \quad |\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_\epsilon)| \lesssim \min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)} \{ |\lambda \epsilon^\alpha|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{p'}} \} \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} \|f_j\|_{p_j}.$$

Let $\beta \in \mathcal{V}(\phi)$ be such that $\epsilon^\beta \geq \epsilon^\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)$. It suffices to show

$$(4.16) \quad |\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_\epsilon)| \lesssim \min \{ |\lambda \epsilon^\beta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{p'}} \} \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} \|f_j\|_{p_j}.$$

To prove this, let $\{Q_{\epsilon,l}\}_{1 \leq l \leq 2^{Nd}}$ be the corresponding sub-decomposition as in Corollary 2.3. Apply again a smooth partition to χ_ϵ and write it as the sum of $\chi_{\epsilon,l}$, with each $\chi_{\epsilon,l}$ supported in $2Q_{\epsilon,l}$ and satisfying estimates similar to (6.27). For each $Q_{\epsilon,l}$, there is a fixed pair (i, j) such that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in 2Q_{\epsilon,l}} |x_i x_j \partial_i \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x})| \geq \frac{K}{2} \epsilon^\beta.$$

Notice also for all $\mathbf{x} \in 2Q_{\epsilon,l}$ and for $b = 1, 2, 3$,

$$|x_i x_j^b \partial_i \partial_j^b \phi(\mathbf{x})| \leq K_2 \epsilon^\beta$$

for some constant K_2 independent of ϵ . In the above two estimates, we have applied Lemma 2.2 and Corollary 2.3. Using Fubini's Theorem,

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_{\epsilon,l}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i\lambda\phi(\mathbf{x})} f_i(x_i) f_j(x_j) \chi_{\epsilon,l}(\mathbf{x}) dx_i dx_j \right) \prod_{k \neq i,j} f_k(x_k) dx_k.$$

Applying Lemma 2.4 to the inner integral and then L^1 norms to other functions yields

$$(4.17) \quad |\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_{\epsilon,l})| \lesssim |\lambda \epsilon^\beta \epsilon_i^{-1} \epsilon_j^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f_i\|_2 \|f_j\|_2 \prod_{k \neq i,j} \|f_k\|_1.$$

Hölder's inequality and the lower bounds $p_j \geq 2$ give

$$|\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_{\epsilon,l})| \lesssim |\lambda \epsilon^\beta \epsilon_i^{-1} \epsilon_j^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\epsilon_i|^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_i}} \|f_i\|_{p_i} |\epsilon_j|^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p_j}} \|f_j\|_{p_j} \prod_{k \neq i,j} |\epsilon_k|^{1 - \frac{1}{p_k}} \|f_k\|_{p_k},$$

that is,

$$(4.18) \quad |\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_{\epsilon,l})| \lesssim |\lambda\epsilon^\beta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq d} |\epsilon_k|^{1-\frac{1}{p_k}} \|f_k\|_{p_k}.$$

The first estimate in (4.16) follows by summing over $1 \leq l \leq 2^{dN}$. Inserting the absolute value into the integral $|\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_\epsilon)|$ and employing Hölder's inequality yields

$$(4.19) \quad |\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi_\epsilon)| \lesssim \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} |\epsilon_j|^{1-\frac{1}{p_j}} \|f_j\|_{p_j},$$

which is the second estimate of (4.16).

5. SUMMING OVER ALL BOXES

To estimate the multilinear form $\Lambda(\mathbf{f})$, we need to sum (4.15) over all Q_ϵ , which is achieved by the following lemma:

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ have positive components and assume $F \subset \mathcal{N}(\phi)$ of dimension $(\ell-1)$ is the lowest dimensional face containing $\gamma = \nu\mathbf{z}$ for some unique $\nu > 2$. Then the following is true for $\lambda \geq 2$:*

$$\sum_{j_1, \dots, j_d=0}^{\infty} \min_{\substack{N \in \{0,1/2\}, \\ \alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)}} \{\lambda^{-N} 2^{\langle N\alpha - \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{j} \rangle}\} \lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \log^{d-\ell}(\lambda).$$

Choosing $N = 0$ we see that for any index j_i ,

$$\sum_{j_1=0}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{j_i=\log(\lambda)/\gamma_i}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{j_d=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{j} \rangle} \lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{z_i}{\gamma_i}} = \lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}}.$$

Hence, it is enough to obtain the bound

$$(5.20) \quad \sum_{j_1=0}^{\log(\lambda)/\gamma_1} \dots \sum_{j_d=0}^{\log(\lambda)/\gamma_d} \min_{\substack{N \in \{0,1/2\}, \\ \alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)}} \{\lambda^{-N} 2^{\langle N\alpha - \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{j} \rangle}\} \lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \log^{d-\ell}(\lambda)$$

Here it is more natural to work in a continuous setting: the sum in (5.20) may be bounded above by a uniform constant times

$$(5.21) \quad \int_0^{\log(\lambda)/\gamma_1} \dots \int_0^{\log(\lambda)/\gamma_d} \min_{\substack{N \in \{0,1/2\}, \\ \alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)}} \{\lambda^{-N} e^{\langle N\alpha - \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}\} d\mathbf{x}.$$

Since $F \ni \gamma$ is dimension $(\ell-1)$ and is not contained in a coordinate hyperplane, there are linearly independent $\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^\ell \in F$ whose convex hull contains γ , so write

$$(5.22) \quad \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \lambda_i \alpha^i.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ let $\theta_i = 2\frac{\lambda_i}{\nu}$ and $\theta_0 = 1 - \frac{2}{\nu}$. All θ_i are positive and their sum is 1 by the restriction placed on ν . Moreover, we can check

$$(5.23) \quad \theta_0(-\mathbf{z}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \theta_i \left(\frac{\alpha^i}{2} - \mathbf{z} \right) = \mathbf{0}.$$

The integral (5.21) can be bounded above by

$$(5.24) \quad \int_0^{\log(\lambda)/\gamma_1} \cdots \int_0^{\log(\lambda)/\gamma_d} \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \{e^{-\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}, \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\langle \frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x} \rangle}\} d\mathbf{x}.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\ell, \mathbf{e}_{\ell+1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_d$ are linearly independent and define the invertible matrix A by

$$A\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i = \mathbf{e}_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq \ell,$$

and

$$A\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{e}_i \text{ for } \ell < i \leq d.$$

Note that $\langle A^T \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^i \rangle = x_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Let $R = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : 0 \leq \langle A^T \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{e}_j \rangle \leq \log(\lambda)/\gamma_j \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq d\}$. Applying the change of variables $\mathbf{x} = A^T \mathbf{y}$, up to a factor depending only on A the integral (5.24) equals

$$(5.25) \quad \int_R \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \{e^{-\langle A\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} \rangle}, \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\langle A(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y} \rangle}\} d\mathbf{y}.$$

First integrating over directions $\ell < i \leq d$,

$$\int_{0 \leq \langle A^T \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{e}_i \rangle \leq \log(\lambda)/\gamma_i, \ell < i \leq d} dy_{\ell+1} \cdots dy_d \lesssim \log^{d-\ell}(\lambda).$$

We can therefore bound (5.25) above by

$$(5.26) \quad \log^{d-\ell}(\lambda) \int_{\mathbb{R}^\ell} \left| \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \{e^{-\langle A\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} \rangle}, \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\langle A(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y} \rangle}\} \right| dy_1 \cdots dy_\ell.$$

Since $A\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i = \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \lambda_i = 1$, we see

$$\langle A\mathbf{z}, \log(\lambda)\mathbf{1} \rangle = \frac{1}{\nu} \log(\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^\ell \lambda_i \langle A\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i, \mathbf{1} \rangle = \frac{1}{\nu} \log(\lambda).$$

Exponentiating, we obtain $e^{-\langle A\mathbf{z}, \log(\lambda)\mathbf{1} \rangle} = \lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}}$. This calculation inspires the change of variables $y \rightarrow y + \log(\lambda)\mathbf{1}$, after which we factor out $\lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}}$ and bound (5.26) above by $\lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \log^{d-\ell}(\lambda)$ times

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^\ell} \left| \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \{e^{-\langle A\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} \rangle}, e^{\langle A(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y} \rangle}\} \right| dy_1 \cdots dy_\ell.$$

Note the factor $\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{\log(\lambda)}{2}} = 1$ from the change of variables above. By (5.23),

$$\mathbf{0} = -\theta_0 A\mathbf{z} + \sum_{i=1}^\ell \theta_i A\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z}\right).$$

Since $A(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z})$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ are linearly independent,

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{y}\|_2=1} \min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \{-\langle A\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} \rangle, \langle A(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y} \rangle\} < 0.$$

By homogeneity, there is a constant $c = c(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\ell, \mathbf{z}) > 0$ such that

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \{-\langle A\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y} \rangle, \langle A(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}{2} - \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y} \rangle\} < -c\|\mathbf{y}\|_2.$$

After a polar change of variables, we can bound (5.26) by a constant independent of λ times

$$\lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \log^{d-\ell}(\lambda) \int_0^\infty e^{-cr} dr \lesssim \lambda^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} \log^{d-\ell}(\lambda).$$

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Theorem 1.1 will be a direct consequence of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 5.1. Write

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\text{sign} \in \{+, -\}^d} \chi_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for all } \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} x_j \neq 0,$$

where χ_{sign} is the restriction of χ to the orthant corresponding to $\text{sign} \in \{+, -\}^d$. By the triangle inequality, it suffices to prove (1.4) for each χ_{sign} . Without loss of generality, we will prove the case when χ is restricted to the first orthant. Let $\chi^+ = \chi_{\text{sign}}$ with $\text{sign} = +^d$. By applying a smooth partition, one can write

$$\chi^+(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\epsilon} \chi_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where each χ_{ϵ} is a smooth function supported in a dyadic box Q_{ϵ} with

$$(6.27) \quad |\partial_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{k}} \chi_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon^{-|\mathbf{k}|}, \quad \forall \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^d.$$

Let $\mathbf{p} \in [2, \infty]^d$. By the triangle inequality and Lemma 4.1, $|\Lambda(\mathbf{f}\chi^+)|$ can be controlled above by a positive constant times

$$\sum_{\epsilon=2^{-j}, j \in \mathbb{N}^d} \min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)} \{ |\lambda \epsilon^{\alpha}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}'}} , \quad \epsilon^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}'}} \} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq d} \|f_k\|_{p_k}.$$

Note that all components of $\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}'}$ are positive. If $\nu > 2$ is such that $\nu \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}'} = \frac{\nu}{\mathbf{p}'} \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)$, then (1.4) follows from the above estimate and Lemma 5.1. In particular, when $\nu > 2$ one can take $m = 0$ in (1.4) if $\frac{\nu}{\mathbf{p}'}$ is an interior point of $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$ and $m = d - \ell$ if the face of lowest dimension containing $\frac{\nu}{\mathbf{p}'}$ itself has dimension $(\ell - 1)$.

It remains to show that the estimate (1.4) is sharp up to a logarithmic factor. For convenience, let us define the dual polyhedron of $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$ to be the subset of \mathbb{R}_{\geq}^d such that

$$(6.28) \quad \mathcal{N}(\phi)^* = \{ \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}^d : \langle \alpha, \mathbf{w} \rangle \geq 1, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\phi) \}.$$

By a similar construction, the double dual $\mathcal{N}(\phi)^{**}$ can easily be checked to equal $\mathcal{N}(\phi)$. Likewise, it is not difficult to see that there is a constant $\delta > 0$, depending on ϕ but independent of λ , such that $|\lambda \phi(\delta |\lambda|^{-\mathbf{w}})| \leq 10^{-10}$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)^*$ and all $|\lambda|$ sufficiently large. If \mathbf{f} is the characteristic function of the box $|x_j| \leq \delta |\lambda|^{-w_j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq d$, then

$$|\Lambda(\mathbf{f})| \sim \|\mathbf{f}\|_1 = 2^d \delta^d |\lambda|^{-\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} \sim |\lambda|^{-\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{w} \rangle}.$$

Then the estimate (1.4) implies

$$|\lambda|^{-\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{w} \rangle} \lesssim \log^m (2 + |\lambda|) |\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{\nu}} |\lambda|^{-\langle \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}'}, \mathbf{w} \rangle}.$$

Letting $|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty$ implies

$$\left\langle \frac{\nu}{\mathbf{p}'}, \mathbf{w} \right\rangle \geq 1$$

for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)^*$. Consequently, $\frac{\nu}{\mathbf{p}'} \in \mathcal{N}(\phi)^{**} = \mathcal{N}(\phi)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Carbery, M. Christ, and J. Wright, *Multidimensional van der Corput and sublevel set estimates*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1999), no. 4, 981–1015. MR1683156 (2000h:42010)
- [2] A. Carbery and J. Wright, *What is van der Corput's lemma in higher dimensions?*, Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Harmonic Analysis and Partial Differential Equations (El Escorial, 2000), 2002, pp. 13–26. MR1964813 (2004a:42016)
- [3] T. C. Collins, A. Greenleaf, and M. Pramanik, *A multi-dimensional resolution of singularities with applications to analysis*, Amer. J. Math. **135** (2013), no. 5, 1179–1252. MR3117305
- [4] M. Gilula, *A real analytic approach to estimating oscillatory integrals*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 2016. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1811452762?ac-countid=35915>.
- [5] M. Greenblatt, *A direct resolution of singularities for functions of two variables with applications to analysis*, J. Anal. Math. **92** (2004), 233–257. MR2072748 (2005f:42021)
- [6] ———, *Sharp L^2 estimates for one-dimensional oscillatory integral operators with C^∞ phase*, Amer. J. Math. **127** (2005), no. 3, 659–695. MR2141648 (2006e:42028)
- [7] ———, *Oscillatory integral decay, sublevel set growth, and the Newton polyhedron*, Math. Ann. **346** (2010), no. 4, 857–895. MR2587095 (2011f:58043)
- [8] ———, *Maximal averages over hypersurfaces and the Newton polyhedron*, J. Funct. Anal. **262** (2012), no. 5, 2314–2348. MR2876407 (2012m:42027)
- [9] A. Greenleaf and G. Uhlmann, *Composition of some singular Fourier integral operators and estimates for restricted X-ray transforms*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **40** (1990), no. 2, 443–466. MR1070835
- [10] D. H. Phong and E. M. Stein, *Oscillatory integrals with polynomial phases*, Invent. Math. **110** (1992), no. 1, 39–62.
- [11] ———, *Models of degenerate Fourier integral operators and Radon transforms*, Ann. of Math. (2) **140** (1994), no. 3, 703–722. MR1307901 (96c:35206)
- [12] ———, *Operator versions of the van der Corput lemma and Fourier integral operators*, Math. Res. Lett. **1** (1994), no. 1, 27–33. MR1258486 (94k:35347)
- [13] ———, *The Newton polyhedron and oscillatory integral operators*, Acta Math. **179** (1997), no. 1, 105–152. MR1484770 (98j:42009)
- [14] D. H. Phong, E. M. Stein, and J. Sturm, *Multilinear level set operators, oscillatory integral operators, and Newton polyhedra*, Math. Ann. **319** (2001), no. 3, 573–596. MR1819885 (2002f:42019)
- [15] V. S. Rychkov, *Sharp L^2 bounds for oscillatory integral operators with C^∞ phases*, Math. Z. **236** (2001), no. 3, 461–489.
- [16] A. Seeger, *Radon transforms and finite type conditions*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **11** (1998), no. 4, 869–897.
- [17] A. N. Varčenko, *Newton polyhedra and estimates of oscillatory integrals*, Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen. **10** (1976), no. 3, 13–38. MR0422257 (54 #10248)
- [18] L. Xiao, *Sharp estimates for trilinear oscillatory integrals and an algorithm of two-dimensional resolution of singularities*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.3725 (2013).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, MICHIGAN, MI 48824, USA
E-mail address: `gilulama@math.msu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104, USA
E-mail address: `gressman@math.upenn.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104, USA
E-mail address: `xle@math.upenn.edu`