

ASYMPTOTIC COMPLETENESS OF A SCALAR QUASILINEAR WAVE EQUATION SATISFYING THE WEAK NULL CONDITION

DONGXIAO YU

ABSTRACT. We prove an asymptotic completeness result for a scalar quasilinear wave equation satisfying the weak null condition. This is accomplished in three steps. First, we derive a new reduced asymptotic system for the quasilinear wave equation by modifying Hörmander's method. Next, we construct an approximate solution, by solving our new reduced system given some scattering data at infinite time. Finally, we prove that the quasilinear wave equation has a global solution which agrees with the approximate solution at infinite time.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	7
3. The Derivation of the Asymptotic Equations	11
4. The Asymptotic Profile and the Approximate Solution	16
5. Energy estimates and Poincare's lemma	29
6. Continuity Argument	36
7. Limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$	46
References	49

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is devoted to the study of the long time dynamics of a scalar quasilinear wave equation in $\mathbb{R}_{t,x}^{1+3}$, of the form

$$(1.1) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta u = 0.$$

Here we use the Einstein summation convention with the sum taken over $\alpha, \beta = 0, 1, 2, 3$ with $\partial_0 = \partial_t$, $\partial_i = \partial_{x_i}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. We assume that $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)$ are smooth functions of u , such that $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{g}^{\beta\alpha}$ and $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(0)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta = \square = \partial_t^2 - \Delta_x$.

The study on global well-posedness theory of (1.1) started with Lindblad's paper [16]. Given the initial data

$$(1.2) \quad u(0) = \varepsilon u_0, \quad \partial_t u(0) = \varepsilon u_1, \quad \text{where } u_1, u_2 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ small enough,}$$

Lindblad conjectured that (1.1) has a global solution if ε is sufficiently small. In the same paper, he proved the small data global existence for a special case

$$(1.3) \quad \partial_t^2 u - c(u)^2 \Delta_x u = 0, \quad \text{where } c(0) = 1$$

for radially symmetric data. Later, Alinhac [1] generalized the result to general initial data for (1.3). The small data global existence result to the general case (1.1) was finally proved by Lindblad in [17].

In this paper, we study the asymptotic completeness of (1.1), which is closely related to the global well-posedness theory. Precisely, our goal is two-fold. First, we seek to identify a good notion of *asymptotic profile* for this problem, and an associated notion of *scattering data*. Then, for this asymptotic profile, we find a matching solution.

We start our paper with the derivation of a new reduced system of (1.1). We modify Hörmander's method and use the ansatz $u \approx \varepsilon r^{-1}U(s, q, \omega)$ where $s = \varepsilon \ln t$, $r = |x|$, $\omega = x/r$ and $q = q(t, r, \omega)$ is a solution to the eikonal equation corresponding with the metric $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)$. By introducing the auxiliary variable $\mu = q_t - q_r$, we are able to derive a system of asymptotic equations for μ and U_q in the coordinate set (s, q, ω) . See (1.11).

To solve the reduced system explicitly, we need to assign the initial data at $s = 0$. We set $\mu|_{s=0} = -2$ and $U_q(0, q, \omega) = A(q, \omega)$ for an arbitrary $A(q, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$. Here $A(q, \omega)$ is defined as the scattering data for our asymptotic completeness result. We can then recover $U(s, q, \omega)$ from U_q along with the restriction $\lim_{q \rightarrow -\infty} U(s, q, \omega) = 0$.

Next, we construct an approximate solution to (1.1). For any small $\varepsilon > 0$, we construct an approximate solution $q(t, r, \omega)$ to the eikonal equation by solving

$$q_t - q_r = \mu(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega), \quad q(t, 0, \omega) = -t.$$

Here $\delta > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant depending only on the scattering data. We then define the approximate solution $u_{app}(t, x)$ which is in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for each fixed t , such that

$$u_{app}(t, r\omega) = \varepsilon r^{-1}U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega)$$

near the light cone $\{t = r\}$ for sufficiently large t . It can be proved that u_{app} is an approximate solution to (1.1).

Finally, we show that there is an exact solution to (1.1) which behaves asymptotically the same as u_{app} as time goes to infinity. Fixing a large time $T > 0$, we solve a backward Cauchy problem for $v = u - u_{app}$ with zero data for $t \geq 2T$, such that $v + u_{app}$ solves (1.1) for $t \leq T$. We then prove that $v = v^T$ converges to some function v^∞ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and $u^\infty = v^\infty + u_{app}$ is a solution to (1.1) such that $(\partial_t - \partial_r)u^\infty(t, x) \approx -2\varepsilon r^{-1}A(q(t, r, \omega), \omega)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This is the asymptotic completeness result we want.

1.1. Background. The equation (1.1) is a special case for a general scalar nonlinear wave equation in $\mathbb{R}_{t,x}^{1+3}$

$$(1.4) \quad \square u = F(u, \partial u, \partial^2 u).$$

Here

$$(1.5) \quad F(u, \partial u, \partial^2 u) = \sum a_{\alpha\beta} \partial^\alpha u \partial^\beta u + O(|u|^3 + |\partial u|^3 + |\partial^2 u|^3).$$

The sum in (1.5) is taken over all multiindices α, β with $|\alpha| \leq |\beta| \leq 2$, $|\beta| \geq 1$ and $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq 3$.

Since 1980s, there have been many results on the lifespan of the solutions to the Cauchy problem (1.4) with initial data (1.2). In [9, 10], John proved that (1.4) does not necessarily have a global solution for all $t \geq 0$: any nontrivial solution to $\square u = u_t \Delta u$ or $\square u = u_t^2$ blows up in finite time. In contrast, (1.4) in \mathbb{R}^{1+d} for $d \geq 4$ has small data global existence, proved by Hörmander in [7]. For arbitrary nonlinearities in three space dimensions, the

best result on the lifespan is the almost global existence: the solution exists for $t \leq e^{c/\varepsilon}$, for sufficiently small ε and some constant $c > 0$. The almost global existence of (1.4) was proved by Lindblad in [15]. We also refer to John and Klainerman [11], Klainerman [13], and Hörmander [6, 8] for some earlier work on the almost global existence.

In contrast to the finite-time blowup in John's examples, it was proved by Klainerman in [14] and by Christodoulou in [3] that if the null condition is satisfied, then (1.4) has the small data global existence. The null condition was first introduced by Klainerman in [12]. It states that for each $0 \leq m \leq n \leq 2$ with $m + n \leq 3$, we have

$$(1.6) \quad A_{mn}(\omega) := \sum_{|\alpha|=m, |\beta|=n} a_{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\omega}^\alpha \widehat{\omega}^\beta = 0, \quad \text{for all } \widehat{\omega} = (-1, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2.$$

Note that the null condition is sufficient but not necessary for the small data global existence. For example, the null condition fails for (1.1), but (1.1) still has the small data global existence.

Later, in [18, 19], Lindblad and Rodnianski introduced the weak null condition. To state the weak null condition, we start with the asymptotic equations first introduced by Hörmander in [6–8]. We make the ansatz

$$(1.7) \quad u(t, x) \approx \frac{\varepsilon}{r} U(s, q, \omega), \quad r = |x|, \quad \omega_i = x_i/r, \quad s = \varepsilon \ln(t), \quad q = r - t.$$

Plug this ansatz into (1.4) and we can derive the following asymptotic PDE for $U(s, q, \omega)$

$$(1.8) \quad 2\partial_s \partial_q U + \sum A_{mn}(\omega) \partial_q^m U \partial_q^n U = 0.$$

Here A_{mn} is defined in (1.6) and the sum is taken over $0 \leq m \leq n \leq 2$ with $m + n \leq 3$. We say that the weak null condition is satisfied if (1.8) has a global solution for all $s \geq 0$ and if the solution and all its derivatives grow at most exponentially in s , provided that the initial data decay sufficiently fast in q . In the same papers, Lindblad and Rodnianski made a conjecture that the weak null condition is sufficient for small data global existence. To the author's knowledge, this conjecture remains open until today.

There are two remarks about the weak null condition and the corresponding conjecture. First, the weak null condition is weaker than the null condition. In fact, if the null condition is satisfied, then (1.8) becomes $\partial_s \partial_q U = 0$. In addition, though the conjecture above remains open, there are many examples of (1.4) satisfying the weak null condition and admitting small data global existence at the same time. The equation (1.1) is one of several such examples: the small data global existence of (1.1) has been proved by Lindblad in [17]; meanwhile, the asymptotic equation (1.8) now becomes

$$(1.9) \quad 2\partial_s \partial_q U = G(\omega) U \partial_q^2 U,$$

where

$$G(\omega) := g^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\omega}_\alpha \widehat{\omega}_\beta, \quad g^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{d}{du} \widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)|_{u=0}, \quad \widehat{\omega} = (-1, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2,$$

whose solutions exist globally in s and satisfy the decay requirements, so (1.1) satisfies the weak null condition. There are also many examples violating the weak null condition and admitting finite-time blowup at the same time. $\square u = u_t \Delta u$ and $\square u = u_t^2$ are two of such examples: the corresponding asymptotic equations are $(2\partial_s - U_q \partial_q) U_q = 0$ (Burger's equation) and $\partial_s U_q = U_q^2$, respectively, whose solutions are known to blow up in finite time.

1.2. Asymptotic equations. Instead of working with Hörmander's asymptotic system (1.9) directly, in this paper we will construct a new system of asymptotic equations. Our analysis starts as in Hörmander's derivation in [6–8], but diverges at a key point: the choice of q is different. One may contend from the paper that this new system is more accurate than (1.9), in that it both describes the long time evolution and contains full information about it. In addition, if we choose the initial data appropriately, our reduced system will reduce to linear first order ODEs on μ and U_q , so it is easier to solve it than to solve (1.9).

To derive the new equations, we still make the ansatz (1.7), but now we replace $q = r - t$ with a solution $q(t, r, \omega)$ to the eikonal equation related to (1.1)

$$(1.10) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)\partial_\alpha q\partial_\beta q = 0.$$

In other words, $q(t, r, \omega)$ is an optical function. There are two reasons why we choose q in this way. First, if we plug $u = \varepsilon r^{-1}U(s, q, \omega)$ in (1.1) where $q(t, r, \omega)$ is an arbitrary function, we get two terms in the expansion

$$\varepsilon r^{-1}\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_{\alpha\beta}U_q + \varepsilon r^{-1}\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta U_{qq}.$$

All the other terms either decay faster than $\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}$ for $t \approx r \rightarrow \infty$, or do not contain U itself (but may contain U_q, U_{qq}, U_{sq} and etc.). If q satisfies the eikonal equation, then the second term vanishes. From the eikonal equation, we can also prove that the first term is approximately equal to a function depending on U_q but not on U . Thus, in contrast to the second-order PDE (1.9) on U , we expect to get a first-order ODE on U_q which is simpler.

Second, the eikonal equations have been used in the previous works on the small data global existence of (1.1). In [1], Alinhac followed the method used in Christodoulou and Klainerman [4], and adapted the vector fields to the characteristic surfaces, i.e. the level surfaces of solutions to the eikonal equations. In [17], Lindblad considered the radial eikonal equations when he derived the pointwise bounds of solutions to (1.1). When they derived the energy estimates, both Alinhac and Lindblad considered a weight $w(q)$ where q is an approximate solution to the eikonal equation. Their works give us a hint that the eikonal equation may play an important role in long time behavior of solutions to (1.1).

Since u is unknown, it is difficult to solve (1.10) directly. Instead, we introduce a new auxiliary function $\mu = \mu(s, q, \omega)$ such that $q_t - q_r = \mu$. From (1.10), we can express $q_t + q_r$ in terms of μ and U , and thus solve for all partial derivatives of q , assuming that all the angular derivatives are negligible. Then from (1.1), we can derive the following asymptotic equations for $\mu(s, q, \omega)$ and $U(s, q, \omega)$:

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{cases} \mu_s = -\frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu^2 U_q, \\ \partial_s U_q = \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu U_q^2. \end{cases}$$

The derivation of these two equations is given in Section 3.

To solve (1.11) explicitly, we need to assign the initial data at $s = 0$. Note that if $q_t - q_r = \mu$ and if $\tilde{q} = F(q, \omega)$, then we have $\tilde{q}_t - \tilde{q}_r = (\partial_q F)\mu$. Thus, by choosing the function F appropriately, we can prescribe $\mu|_{s=0}$ freely. We set $\mu|_{s=0} = -2$, since we expect $q \approx r - t$. The initial data of U_q can be chosen arbitrarily, so we set $U_q(0, q, \omega) = A(q, \omega)$ for an arbitrary $A(q, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$. Here $A(q, \omega)$ is defined as the *scattering data* for our asymptotic completeness result. We also assume that $\lim_{q \rightarrow -\infty} U(s, q, \omega) = 0$, which allows us to solve $U(s, q, \omega)$ uniquely from U_q .

To construct an approximate solution, we make a change of coordinate. For a small $\varepsilon > 0$, we set $s = \varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta$, where $\delta > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant to be chosen. We remark that this choice of s is related to the almost global existence, since now $s = 0$ if and only if $t = e^{\delta/\varepsilon}$. Let $q(t, r, \omega)$ be the solution to

$$q_t - q_r = \mu(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega), \quad q(t, 0, \omega) = -t.$$

Then, any function on (s, q, ω) induces a new function on (t, r, ω) . With an abuse of notation, we set

$$U(t, r, \omega) = U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega).$$

Here $U(t, r, \omega)$ is the *asymptotic profile* for our asymptotic completeness result. We can prove that, near the light cone $\{t = r\}$, $\varepsilon r^{-1}U(t, r, \omega)$ is an approximate solution to (1.1), and $q(t, r, \omega)$ is an approximate optical function, i.e. an approximate solution to the eikonal equation corresponding with the metric $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)$. See Section 4 for the explicit formulas and the estimates of q and U .

1.3. The main result. Given the asymptotic equations (1.11), we can now ask the following two questions. First, as time goes to infinity, can any small global solution to the Cauchy problem (1.1) with (1.2) be well approximated by a solution to our reduced system (1.11)? For example, can we recover the scattering data $A(q, \omega)$, approximate optical function $q(t, r, \omega)$ and asymptotic profile $U(t, r, \omega)$ from an exact solution? Second, given a scattering data $A(q, \omega)$, can we use (1.11) to construct an exact solution to (1.1) which has this scattering data at infinite time? In scattering theory, the first problem is the existence of the wave operator, and the second one is the asymptotic completeness.

There are some previous results on these two questions. In [5], Deng and Pusateri used the original Hörmander's asymptotic system (1.9) and proved a partial existence result of wave operator for (1.1). In [20], Lindblad and Schlue proved the asymptotic completeness for the semilinear models of Einstein's equations. To the author's knowledge, there is no previous result on the asymptotic completeness of (1.1).

In this paper, we will answer the second question, i.e. concerning asymptotic completeness. Let Z be one of the commuting vector fields: translations ∂_α , scaling $t\partial_t + r\partial_r$, rotations $x_i\partial_j - x_j\partial_i$ and Lorentz boosts $x_i\partial_t + t\partial_i$. Our main theorem is the following.

Theorem 1. *Consider a scattering data $A(q, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$ where $\text{supp}(A) \subset [-R, R] \times \mathbb{S}^2$ for some $R \geq 1$. Fix an integer $N \geq 2$ and any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ depending on A and N . Let $q(t, r, \omega)$ and $U(t, r, \omega)$ be the associated approximate optical function and asymptotic profile. Then, there is a C^N solution u to (1.1) for $t \geq 0$ with the following properties:*

- (i) *The solution vanishes for $|x| = r \leq t - R$.*
- (ii) *The solution satisfies the energy bounds: for all $|I| \leq N - 1$ and all $t \gg_R 1$, we have*

$$\|\partial Z^I(u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t)\|_{L^2(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3: |x| \leq 5t/4\})} + \|\partial Z^I u(t)\|_{L^2(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3: |x| \geq 5t/4\})} \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-1/2+C_I\varepsilon}.$$

- (iii) *The solution satisfies the pointwise bounds: for all (t, r, ω) with $t \gg_R 1$, we have*

$$|(\partial_t - \partial_r)u + 2\varepsilon r^{-1}A(q(t, r, \omega), \omega)| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, for all $|I| \leq N - 1$ and all (t, x) with $t \gg_R 1$,

$$|\partial Z^I(u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t, x)|_{\chi_{|x| \leq 5t/4}} + |\partial Z^I u(t, x)|_{\chi_{|x| \geq 5t/4}} \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-1/2+C_I\varepsilon} \langle t+r \rangle^{-1} \langle t-r \rangle^{-1/2},$$

$$|Z^I(u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t, x)|_{\chi_{|x| \leq 5t/4}} + |Z^I u(t, x)|_{\chi_{|x| \geq 5t/4}} \lesssim_I \min\{\varepsilon t^{-1+C_I\varepsilon}, \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C_I\varepsilon} \langle r-t \rangle\}.$$

We have two remarks on the main theorem. First, the solution in the main theorem is unique in the following sense. Suppose $N \geq 7$. Suppose u_1, u_2 are two C^N solutions to (1.1), such that both of them satisfy the energy bounds and pointwise bounds in the main theorem. Then, we have $u_1 = u_2$, assuming $\varepsilon \ll 1$. We also remark that u does not depend on the value $5/4$ in the estimates: for each fixed $\kappa > 1$, if u_κ is a solution satisfying all the estimates above with $5/4$ replaced by κ , then $u = u_\kappa$ for $\varepsilon \ll_\kappa 1$, where u is the unique solution from the main theorem. We will prove these statements after the proof of the main theorem.

In addition, in Theorem 1, we have the pointwise bounds for $t = r$:

$$|\partial Z^I(u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t, x)| \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}$$

and

$$|Z^I(u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t, x)| \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-1+C_I\varepsilon}.$$

If we consider the forward Cauchy problem $\square u = 0$, then from Theorem 6.2.1 in [8], we get similar pointwise bounds with $-3/2$ and -1 replaced by -2 . This is not surprising. For $\square u = 0$, if we also assume $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(q, \omega) dq = 0$, then our construction also gives t^{-2} on the right hand side in the pointwise bounds. In fact, $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(q, \omega) dq = 0$ implies that U , i.e. the Friedlander radiation field for $\square u = 0$, is compactly supported for fixed time. This method cannot be applied in the general case (1.1). The dependence on $s = \varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta$ of U prevents us from making $U(t, \cdot)$ compactly supported for all t by only putting restrictions on $A(q, \omega)$. To resolve this problem, we introduce a cutoff function $\psi(r/t)$ which causes the loss of power of t .

There is another remark on our future work. This paper can be viewed as a preparation of the study on scattering of the forward Cauchy problem (1.1) and (1.2). To achieve this goal, we should consider whether the setting in this paper fits in a forward Cauchy problem. For example, in a forward Cauchy problem, given an arbitrary approximate optical function q , we usually do not have the equality $q_t - q_r = -2$ everywhere for a fixed time corresponding with $s = 0$. Thus, we need to explain why we can set $\mu|_{s=0} = -2$ in the asymptotic completeness problem. For the same reason, we set $s = \varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta$ instead of $\varepsilon \ln(t)$ or $\varepsilon \ln(t+1)$, since now $s = 0$ corresponds with the time $T_\varepsilon = \exp(\delta/\varepsilon)$. Such a T_ε also appears in the almost global existence result. In fact, in a forward Cauchy problem (1.1), we expect the solution u constructed in Lindblad [17] to behave as a solution to a linear wave equation for $t \leq T_\varepsilon$.

1.4. Idea of the proof. Here we outline the main idea of the construction of u in Theorem 1. First, we construct an approximate solution to (1.1). Let $q(t, r, \omega)$ and $U(t, r, \omega)$ be the approximate optical function and asymptotic profile associated to some scattering data $A(q, \omega)$. We set

$$(1.12) \quad u_{app}(t, x) = \varepsilon r^{-1} \eta(t) \psi(r/t) U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega)$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Here $\psi \equiv 1$ when $|r-t| \leq t/4$ and $\psi \equiv 0$ when $|r-t| \geq t/2$, which is used to localize $\varepsilon r^{-1}U$ near the light cone $\{r=t\}$; η is a cutoff function such that $\eta \equiv 0$ for $t \leq 2R$, which is used to remove the singularity at $|x|=0$ and $t=0$. We can check that u_{app} is a good approximate solution to (1.1) in the sense that

$$\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app}) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app} = O(\varepsilon t^{-3+C\varepsilon}), \quad t \gg_R 1.$$

Next we seek to construct an exact solution matching u_{app} at infinite time. Fixing a large time T , we consider the following equation

$$(1.13) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app} + v)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta v = -\chi(t/T)\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app} + v)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta u_{app}, \quad t > 0; \quad v \equiv 0, \quad t \geq 2T.$$

Here $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\chi(t/T) = 1$ for $t \leq T$ and $\chi(t/T) = 0$ for $t \geq 2T$. Note that $u_{app} + v$ is now an exact solution to (1.1) for $t \leq T$. In Section 6 we prove that, if ε is sufficiently small, then (1.13) has a solution $v = v^T$ for all $t \geq 0$ which satisfies some decay in energy as $t \rightarrow \infty$. To prove this, we use a continuity argument. The proof relies on the energy estimates and Poincaré's lemma, which are established in Section 5. Note that the small constant $\delta > 0$ is not chosen until the proof of Poincaré's lemma, and we remark that δ depends only on the scattering data $A(q, \omega)$. We also remark that the energy estimates and Poincaré's lemma in our paper are closely related to those in [1, 17].

Finally we prove in Section 7 that v^T does converge to some v^∞ in suitable function spaces, as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we obtain a global solution $u_{app} + v^\infty$ to (1.1) for $t \geq 0$, such that it "agrees with" u_{app} at infinite time, in the sense that the energy of v^∞ tends to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By the Klainerman-Sobolev inequality, we can derive the pointwise bounds in the main theorem from the estimates on the energy of v^∞ .

Note that to obtain a candidate for v^∞ , we have a more natural choice of PDE than (1.13). We may consider the Cauchy problem (1.1) for $t \leq T$ with initial data $(u_{app}(T), \partial_t u_{app}(T))$. The problem with such a choice is that for u_{app} constructed above, $Z^I(u - u_{app})(T)$ does not seem to have a good decay in T if Z^I only contains the scaling $S = t\partial_t + r\partial_r$ and Lorentz boosts $\Omega_{0i} = t\partial_i + x_i\partial_t$. For example, we can consider the linear wave equation $\square u = 0$. We set $v = u - u_{app}$, then $v = v_t = 0$ at $t = T$. Then, at $t = T$ we have $S^2 v = t^2 v_{tt} = -t^2 \square u_{app}$. However, in the linear case, $u_{app} = \varepsilon r^{-1} F_0(r - t, \omega)$ for $t \approx r$ and thus $\square u_{app} = O(\varepsilon r^{-3})$. The power -3 cannot be improved, so we can only get $S^2 v = O(\varepsilon r^{-1})$ for $t \approx r$, while we expect $S^2 v = O(\varepsilon r^{-3/2+C\varepsilon})$ for $t \approx r$ from Theorem 1. Similarly, the same applies for $S^k v$ if $k \geq 3$. In the linear case, one possible way to deal with this difficulty is to consider more terms in the asymptotic expansion of the solutions, say take

$$u_{app} = \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\varepsilon}{r^{n+1}} F_n(r - t, \omega)$$

where F_0 is the usual Friedlander radiation field, and F_n satisfies some PDE based on F_{n-1} . However, this method does not seem to work in the quasilinear case (1.1). Such a difficulty does not appear in (1.13), since $v \equiv 0$ for all $t \geq 2T$.

1.5. Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank his advisor, Daniel Tataru, for suggesting this problem and for many helpful discussions.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notations. We use C to denote universal positive constants. We write $A \lesssim B$ or $A = O(B)$ if $|A| \leq CB$ for some $C > 0$. We write $A \sim B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. We use C_v or \lesssim_v if we want to emphasize that the constant depends on a parameter v . The values of all constants in this paper may vary from line to line.

In this paper, R is reserved for the radius of the scattering data in q , i.e. $A(q, \omega) = 0$ unless $|q| \leq R$. We always assume that $t \geq T_R > 0$ for some sufficiently large constant T_R depending on R (denoted by $T_R \gg 1$, or $t \gg_R 1$). We also assume $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small

(denoted by $\varepsilon \ll 1$). T_R and ε are allowed to depend on all other constants, and ε can also depend on T_R .

We always assume that the latin indices $i, j, l = 1, 2, 3$ and the greek indices $\alpha, \beta = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We use subscript to denote partial derivatives, unless specified otherwise. For example, $u_\alpha = \partial_\alpha u$, $q_r = \partial_r q = \sum_i \omega_i \partial_i q$, $A_q = \partial_q A$ and etc. For a fixed integer $k \geq 0$, we use ∂^k to denote either a specific k -th partial derivative, or the collection of all k -th partial derivatives.

To prevent confusion, we will only use ∂_ω to denote the angular derivatives under the coordinate (s, q, ω) , and will never use it under the coordinate (t, r, ω) . We use ∂_ω^c to denote $\partial_{\omega_1}^{c_1} \partial_{\omega_2}^{c_2} \partial_{\omega_3}^{c_3}$ for a multiindex $c = (c_1, c_2, c_3)$.

2.2. Commuting vector fields. Let Z be any of the following vector fields:

$$(2.1) \quad \partial_\alpha, \quad S = t\partial_t + r\partial_r, \quad \Omega_{ij} = x_j\partial_i - x_i\partial_j, \quad \Omega_{0i} = x_i\partial_t + t\partial_i.$$

For any multiindex I with length $|I|$, let Z^I denote the product of $|I|$ such vector fields. Then we have Leibniz's rule

$$(2.2) \quad Z^I(fg) = \sum_{|J|+|K|=|I|} C_{JK}^I Z^J f Z^K g, \quad \text{where } C_{JK}^I \text{ are constants.}$$

The vector fields Z have many good properties. First, we have the commutation properties.

$$(2.3) \quad [S, \square] = -2\square, \quad [Z, \square] = 0 \text{ for other } Z;$$

$$(2.4) \quad [Z_1, Z_2] = \sum_{|I|=1} C_{Z_1, Z_2, I} Z^I, \quad \text{where } C_{Z_1, Z_2, I} \text{ are constants;}$$

$$(2.5) \quad [Z, \partial_\alpha] = \sum_\beta C_{Z, \alpha\beta} \partial_\beta, \quad \text{where } C_{Z, \alpha\beta} \text{ are constants.}$$

2.3. Several pointwise bounds. We have the pointwise estimates on partial derivatives.

Lemma 2.1. *For any function ϕ , we have*

$$(2.6) \quad |\partial\phi| \leq C(1 + |t - r|)^{-1} \sum_{|I|=1} |Z^I\phi|$$

and

$$(2.7) \quad |(\partial_t + \partial_r)\phi| + |(\partial_i - \omega_i\partial_r)\phi| \leq C(1 + t + r)^{-1} \sum_{|I|=1} |Z^I\phi|.$$

Finally, we have the Klainerman-Sobolev inequality.

Proposition 2.2. *For $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{1+3})$ which vanishes for large $|x|$, we have*

$$(2.8) \quad (1 + t + |x|)(1 + |t - |x||)^{1/2} |\phi(t, x)| \leq C \sum_{|I| \leq 2} \|Z^I\phi(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

We also state the Gronwall's inequality.

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose A, E, r are bounded functions from $[a, b]$ to $[0, \infty)$. Suppose that E is increasing. If*

$$A(t) \leq E(t) + \int_a^b r(s)A(s) ds, \quad \forall t \in [a, b],$$

then

$$A(t) \leq E(t) \exp\left(\int_a^t r(s) ds\right), \quad \forall t \in [a, b].$$

The proofs of these results are standard. See, for example, [8, 17, 21] for the proofs.

We also need the following lemma, which can be viewed as the estimates on Taylor's series adapted to Z vector fields.

Lemma 2.4. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, an integer $k \geq 0$ and a multiindex I . Suppose there are two functions u, v on (t, x) such that $|u| + |v| \leq 1$ for all (t, x) . Suppose $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $f(0) = f'(0) = 0$. Then, for all (t, x) , we have*

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\partial^k Z^I(f(u+v) - f(u))| \\ & \lesssim_{k,I} \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2 \leq k, \\ |I_1|+|I_2| \leq |I|}} p_{k,I} |\partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1} v(t, x)| (|\partial^{k_2} Z^{I_2} v(t, x)| + |\partial^{k_2} Z^{I_2} u(t, x)|). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p_{k,I}(t, x) = 1 + \max_{k_1+|J| \leq (k+|I|)/2} (|\partial^{k_1} Z^J u(t, x)| + |\partial^{k_1} Z^J v(t, x)|)^{k+|I|}.$$

Proof. By the chain rule and Leibniz's rule, $\partial^k Z^I(f(u))$ can be written as a sum of terms of the form

$$f^{(l)}(u) \partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1} u \partial^{k_2} Z^{I_2} u \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l} u$$

where $l \leq k+|I|$, $k_i+|I_i| > 0$ for each i and $\sum_i k_i = k$, $\sum_i I_i = I$. Thus, $\partial^k Z^I(f(u+v) - f(u))$ can be written as a sum of terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & f^{(l)}(u+v) \partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1}(u+v) \partial^{k_2} Z^{I_2}(u+v) \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l}(u+v) - f^{(l)}(u) \partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1} u \partial^{k_2} Z^{I_2} u \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l} u \\ & = (f^{(l)}(u+v) - f^{(l)}(u)) \partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1}(u+v) \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l}(u+v) \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^l f^{(l)}(u) \partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1} u \cdots \partial^{k_{j-1}} Z^{I_{j-1}} u \cdot \partial^{k_j} Z^{I_j} v \cdot \partial^{k_{j+1}} Z^{I_{j+1}}(u+v) \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l}(u+v) \end{aligned}$$

where $k_i + |I_i| > 0$ for each i and $\sum_i k_i = k$, $\sum_i I_i = I$. When $l = 0$, we must have $k = |I| = 0$, so (2.9) follows from

$$|f(u+v) - f(u)| \leq \sup_{\beta \in [0,1]} |f'(u+\beta v)| |v| \leq \sup_{|z| \leq 1} |f''(z)| \cdot \sup_{\beta \in [0,1]} |u+\beta v| \cdot |v| \leq C(|u| + |v|)|v|.$$

Note that now $p_{0,0} = 2$. When $l \geq 1$, since $k_i + |I_i| > (k + |I|)/2 > 0$ for at most one i and since the product of all other terms of the form $\partial_{k_i} Z^{I_i}(u+v)$ can be controlled by $p_{k,I}$, we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(f^{(l)}(u+v) - f^{(l)}(u))\partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1}(u+v) \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l}(u+v)| \\
& \leq \sup_{\beta \in [0,1]} |f^{(l+1)}(u+\beta v)| |v \cdot \partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1}(u+v) \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l}(u+v)| \\
& \leq C_{k,I} p_{k,I} |v| \sum_{k_1 \leq k, |J| \leq |I|} (|\partial^{k_1} Z^J u| + |\partial^{k_1} Z^J v|).
\end{aligned}$$

When $l = 1$, we have

$$|f'(u)\partial^k Z^I v| \leq C|u| |\partial^k Z^I v|.$$

When $l \geq 2$, since $k_i + |I_i| > (k + |I|)/2$ for at most one i and since the product of all other terms of the form $\partial_{k_i} Z^{I_i}(u+v)$ or $\partial_{k_i} Z^{I_i} u$ can be controlled by $p_{k,I}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |f^{(l)}(u)\partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1} u \cdots \partial^{k_{j-1}} Z^{I_{j-1}} u \cdot \partial^{k_j} Z^{I_j} v \cdot \partial^{k_{j+1}} Z^{I_{j+1}}(u+v) \cdots \partial^{k_l} Z^{I_l}(u+v)| \\
& \leq C_{k,I} p_{k,I} \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq k, |I_1|+|I_2| \leq |I|} |\partial^{k_1} Z^{I_1} v| (|\partial^{k_2} Z^{I_2} u| + |\partial^{k_2} Z^{I_2} v|).
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.4. A function space. Suppose $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Let \mathcal{D} be a region in $\mathbb{R}_{t,x}^{1+3}$. We assume that $\mathcal{D} \subset \{t \geq T_R, -R \leq r-t \lesssim t^{C\varepsilon}\}$ where $T_R \gg 1$. We introduce the following definition based on \mathcal{D} , which is useful in Section 4.2.

Definition. For any smooth function $F = F(t, r, \omega)$, we say $F \in S^m = S_{\mathcal{D}}^m$ for a fixed $m \in \mathbb{R}$ if $|Z^I F| \lesssim_I t^{m+C_I \varepsilon}$ for any multiindex I and $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$. Here Z^I is a product of $|I|$ vector fields in (2.1). We also set $\varepsilon^n S^m = \{\varepsilon^n F : F \in S^m\}$ for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. We allow F to depend on ε , so $\varepsilon^{n_1} S^m \subset \varepsilon^{n_2} S^m$ if $n_1 \geq n_2$.

For example, we have $t^m, r^m \in S^m$, $\partial^m \omega_i \in S^{-m}$ and $r-t \in S^0$.

We have the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.5. S^m has the following properties.

- (a) For any $F_1 \in S^{m_1}$ and $F_2 \in S^{m_2}$, we have $F_1 + F_2 \in S^{\max\{m_1, m_2\}}$ and $F_1 F_2 \in S^{m_1+m_2}$.
- (b) For any $F \in S^m$, we have $ZF \in S^m$, $(\partial_t + \partial_r)F \in S^{m-1}$ and $(\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)F \in S^{m-1}$.

Proof. Note that (a) and $ZF \in S^m$ in (b) are obvious from the definition and the Leibniz's rule. It remains to prove $(\partial_t + \partial_r)F \in S^{m-1}$ and $(\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)F \in S^{m-1}$.

Note that

$$\partial_t + \partial_r = \frac{\sum_i \omega_i \Omega_{0i} + S}{r+t}, \quad \partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r = \frac{\Omega_{0i} + (t-r)\omega_i \partial_t}{t} - \frac{\sum_j \omega_j \omega_i \Omega_{0j} + \omega_i S}{r+t}.$$

Let f_{-1} be any element in S^{-1} and we allow f_{-1} to vary from line to line. Since $r-t, Z^I \omega_i \in S^0$ and $t^{-1}, (r+t)^{-1} \in S^{-1}$, by applying (a) of this lemma, we can write $\partial_t + \partial_r$ and $\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r$ as $\sum_{|J|=1} f_{-1} Z^J$. We claim that for each I

$$Z^I (\partial_t + \partial_r)F = (\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^I F + \sum_{|J| \leq |I|} f_{-1} Z^J F.$$

We can induct on $|I|$. If $|I| = 0$, there is nothing to prove. If this equality holds for all $|I| < k$, then for $|I| = k$, by writing $Z^I = ZZ^{I'}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& Z^I(\partial_t + \partial_r)F \\
&= Z(\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^{I'}F + \sum_{|J|<k} Z(f_{-1}Z^JF) \\
&= (\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^I F + [Z, \partial_t + \partial_r]Z^{I'}F + \sum_{|J|<k} ((Zf_{-1})Z^JF + f_{-1}ZZ^JF) \\
&= (\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^I F + \sum_{|K|=1} ((Zf_{-1})Z^K + f_{-1}[Z, Z^K])Z^{I'}F + \sum_{|J|<k} (f_{-1}Z^JF + f_{-1}ZZ^JF) \\
&= (\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^I F + \sum_{|J|\leq k} f_{-1}Z^JF.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $F \in S^m$, we have $f_{-1}Z^JF \in S^{m-1}$ for all $|J| \leq |I|$ by (a). Since by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$|(\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^I F| \lesssim \langle t+r \rangle^{-1} \sum_{|J|\leq|I|+1} |Z^J F|,$$

we conclude that for each I , in \mathcal{D} we have

$$|Z^I(\partial_t + \partial_r)F| \lesssim_I t^{m-1+C_I\varepsilon}.$$

Thus $(\partial_t + \partial_r)F \in S^{m-1}$. Following the same proof, we can also show $(\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)F \in S^{m-1}$. \square

Lemma 2.6. *If $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $f(0) = f'(0) = 0$, and if $u, v \in \varepsilon^n S^{-m}$ with $n, m \geq 1$, $\varepsilon \ll 1$, and $T_R \gg 1$ in \mathcal{D} , then $f(u) - f(v) \in \varepsilon^{2n} S^{-2m}$.*

Proof. Since $n, m \geq 1$, we have $|u| + |v| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon}$, so when $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $t \geq T_R \gg 1$, we have $|u| + |v| \leq 1$. Note that here ε and T_R do not depend on I . Now we can apply Lemma 2.4 to $Z^I(f(u) - f(v))$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{0,I}(t, x) &= 1 + \max_{|J|\leq|I|/2} (|Z^J u(t, x)| + |Z^J v(t, x)|)^{|I|} \\
&\leq 1 + (C_I \varepsilon^n t^{-m+C_I\varepsilon})^{|I|} \\
&\leq 1 + C_I^{|I|} \varepsilon^{n|I|} t^{-m|I|} t^{C_I|I|\varepsilon} \\
&\leq (1 + C_I)^{|I|} t^{C_I|I|\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds since $n, m \geq 1$. Thus, we have

$$|Z^I(f(u) - f(v))| \lesssim_I t^{C_I\varepsilon} \sum_{|I_1|+|I_2|\leq|I|} |Z^{I_1} v| (|Z^{I_2} u| + |Z^{I_2} v|) \lesssim_I \varepsilon^{2n} t^{-2m+C_I\varepsilon}.$$

We are done. \square

3. THE DERIVATION OF THE ASYMPTOTIC EQUATIONS

3.1. The asymptotic equations for (1.1). Let u be a global solution to (1.1). Let $q(t, r, \omega)$ be a solution of the eikonal equation (1.10) related to (1.1), and let $\mu = q_t - q_r$. Suppose u has the form

$$(3.1) \quad u(t, x) \approx \frac{\varepsilon}{r} U(s, q, \omega)$$

where $\omega_i = x_i/r$, $s = \varepsilon \ln(t)$ and $q = q(t, r, \omega)$. Our goal in this section is to derive the asymptotic equations for (μ, U) .

We make the following assumptions:

- (1) Every function is smooth.
- (2) There is a diffeomorphism between two coordinates (t, r, ω) and (s, q, ω) , so any function F can be written as $F(t, r, \omega)$ and $F(s, q, \omega)$ at the same time.
- (3) $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, $t, r > 0$ are both sufficiently large with $t \approx r$.
- (4) All the angular derivatives are negligible. In particular, $\partial_i \approx \omega_i \partial_r$.
- (5) $\mu, U \sim 1$ and $\nu \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1}$, where $\nu := q_t + q_r$. The same estimates hold if we apply Z^I or $\partial_s^a \partial_q^b \partial_\omega^c$ to the left hand sides.

Here are two useful remarks. First, the solutions (μ, U) to the reduced system may not exactly satisfy the assumptions listed above. They only satisfy some weaker versions of those assumptions. For example, instead of $\mu \sim 1$, we may only get $t^{-C\varepsilon} \lesssim |\mu| \lesssim t^{C\varepsilon}$; by solving $q_t - q_r = \mu$, instead of an exact optical function, i.e. a solution to (1.10), we may only get an approximate optical function q in the sense that $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta = O(t^{-2+C\varepsilon})$. Such differences are usually negligible, so our assumptions at the beginning make sense.

Second, it may seem strange that we ignore the angular derivatives of q which is $\lesssim t^{-1}$ but keep $\nu \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1}$. This, however, is reasonable according to the form of (1.1) and (1.10). For example, if we expand the eikonal equation, we get (3.3) below. The angular derivatives are either squared or multiplied by $\varepsilon r^{-1}U$, while the major terms in (3.3) are of the order εt^{-1} . On the other hand, ν is not negligible since there is a term $\mu\nu$ in the expansion.

Recall that

$$\square u = r^{-1}((\partial_t - \partial_r)(\partial_t + \partial_r) - r^{-2}\Delta_\omega)ru$$

where $\Delta_\omega = \sum_{i < j} \Omega_{ij}^2$ is the Laplacian on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . By chain rule we have

$$\partial_t = \varepsilon t^{-1} \partial_s + q_t \partial_q, \quad \partial_r = q_r \partial_q.$$

By the assumptions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \square u &\approx \varepsilon r^{-1}(\partial_t - \partial_r)(\partial_t + \partial_r)U \approx \varepsilon r^{-1} \mu \partial_q(\varepsilon t^{-1}U_s + \nu U_q) \\ &\approx \varepsilon^2 (tr)^{-1} \mu U_{sq} + \varepsilon r^{-1} \mu \nu_q U_q + \varepsilon r^{-1} \mu \nu U_{qq}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} q_t &= \frac{1}{2}(\mu + \nu) \approx \frac{1}{2}\mu, & q_i &\approx \omega_i q_r \approx \frac{\omega_i}{2}(\nu - \mu) \approx -\frac{1}{2}\omega_i \mu, \\ q_{tt} &\approx \frac{1}{2}\mu_t \approx \frac{1}{2}\mu_q q_t \approx \frac{1}{4}\mu \mu_q, & q_{it} &\approx \frac{1}{2}\mu_i \approx \frac{1}{2}\mu_q q_i \approx -\frac{1}{4}\omega_i \mu \mu_q, \\ q_{ij} &\approx -\frac{1}{2}\omega_i \mu_j \approx -\frac{1}{2}\omega_i \mu_q q_j \approx \frac{1}{4}\omega_i \omega_j \mu_q \mu, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$g^{\alpha\beta} q_\alpha q_\beta \approx \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu^2, \quad g^{\alpha\beta} q_\alpha \mu \mu_q \approx \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu \mu_q,$$

where

$$G(\omega) = g^{\alpha\beta} \hat{\omega}_\alpha \hat{\omega}_\beta, \quad g^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{d}{du} \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)|_{u=0}, \quad \hat{\omega} = (-1, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2.$$

And since

$$U_{tt} \approx U_{qq} q_{tt} + U_q q_t^2, \quad U_{it} \approx U_{qq} q_i q_t + U_q q_{it}, \quad U_{ij} \approx U_{qq} q_i q_j + U_q q_{ij},$$

we have from (1.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.2) \quad 0 &= \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta u \approx \square u + g^{\alpha\beta}u\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta u \\
&\approx \varepsilon^2(tr)^{-1}\mu U_{sq} + \varepsilon r^{-1}\mu\nu_q U_q + \varepsilon r^{-1}\mu\nu U_{qq} + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2}g^{\alpha\beta}U(U_q q_{\alpha\beta} + U_{qq}q_\alpha q_\beta) \\
&\approx \varepsilon^2(tr)^{-1}\mu U_{sq} + \varepsilon r^{-1}\mu\nu_q U_q + \varepsilon r^{-1}\mu\nu U_{qq} + \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}(\mu\mu_q U U_q + \mu^2 U U_{qq}).
\end{aligned}$$

By the eikonal equation, we have

$$(3.3) \quad 0 = \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta \approx q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2 + \varepsilon r^{-1}g^{\alpha\beta}U q_\alpha q_\beta \approx \mu\nu + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon r^{-1}G(\omega)\mu^2 U,$$

so we conclude that

$$\nu \approx -\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon r^{-1}G(\omega)\mu U, \quad \nu_q \approx -\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon r^{-1}G(\omega)(\mu_q U + \mu U_q).$$

Plug everything back in (3.2). We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\approx \varepsilon^2(tr)^{-1}\mu U_{sq} - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}G(\omega)(\mu_q U + \mu U_q)\mu U_q \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}G(\omega)\mu^2 U U_{qq} + \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}(\mu\mu_q U U_q + \mu^2 U U_{qq}) \\
&= \varepsilon^2(tr)^{-1}\mu U_{sq} - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}G(\omega)\mu^2 U_q^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Assuming that $t = r$, we get the first asymptotic equation

$$U_{sq} = \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu U_q^2.$$

Meanwhile, note that from $(\partial_t - \partial_r)\nu = (\partial_t + \partial_r)\mu$, we have

$$\nu_q \mu \approx \nu_q \mu + \varepsilon t^{-1}\nu_s = \mu_q \nu + \varepsilon t^{-1}\mu_s$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_s &\approx t\varepsilon^{-1}(\nu_q \mu - \mu_q \nu) \approx t\varepsilon^{-1}\left(-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon r^{-1}G(\omega)(\mu_q U + \mu U_q)\mu + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon r^{-1}G(\omega)\mu U \mu_q\right) \\
&\approx -\frac{t}{4r}G(\omega)\mu^2 U_q.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, assuming that $t = r$, we get the second asymptotic equation

$$\mu_s = -\frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu^2 U_q.$$

In conclusion, our system of asymptotic equations is

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_s \mu = -\frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu^2 U_q, \\ \partial_s U_q = \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu U_q^2. \end{cases}$$

Now we can solve (3.4) if we assign some reasonable initial data. Since we expect $q \approx r - t$ and since $(\partial_t - \partial_r)(r - t) = -2$, we choose $\mu|_{s=0} = -2$. Since there is no restriction on U_q , we

choose arbitrarily $U|_{s=0} = A(q, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$. Note that the two asymptotic equations imply that $(\mu U_q)_s = \mu_s U_q + \mu U_{sq} = 0$, so we have $\mu U_q = -2A$. Thus, we get two ODEs

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_s \mu = \frac{1}{2} G(\omega) A(q, \omega) \mu, \\ \partial_s U_q = -\frac{1}{2} G(\omega) A(q, \omega) U_q. \end{cases}$$

Then we can solve μ and U_q easily. See (4.2) and (4.4) in Section 4 for the explicit formulas.

We can compare our system (3.4) with Hörmander's system

$$2\partial_s \partial_q U = G(\omega) U \partial_q^2 U.$$

One advantage of our system is that it reduces to a linear first-order ODE (3.5) after we choose the appropriate initial data. The solution to (3.4) is thus of the simpler form than the solution to Hörmander's system.

3.2. Asymptotic equations for general case. Though (3.5) is already enough for this paper, let's also do the computation in a more general case. Instead of the fully nonlinear wave equation (1.4), we consider the following quasilinear wave equation

$$(3.6) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u, \partial u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u = f(u, \partial u).$$

Assume that we have Taylor expansions

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u, \partial u) &= -m^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\alpha\beta} u + g^{\alpha\beta\lambda} \partial_\lambda u + O(|u|^2 + |\partial u|^2), \\ f(u, \partial u) &= f_0 u^2 + f^\alpha u \partial_\alpha u + f^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha u \partial_\beta u + O(|u|^3 + |\partial u|^3). \end{aligned}$$

Here $m^{\alpha\beta}, g^*, f_0, f^*$ are all real constants.

We still make the ansatz (3.1) with the same s, ω, r , assuming that q is now the solution to the eikonal equation

$$(3.7) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u, \partial u) \partial_\alpha q \partial_\beta q = 0.$$

Again, we take $\mu = q_t - q_r$ and $\nu = q_t + q_r$.

From (3.1) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\approx \varepsilon^2 (tr)^{-1} \mu U_{sq} + \varepsilon r^{-1} \mu \nu_q U_q + \varepsilon r^{-1} \mu \nu U_{qq} + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} g^{\alpha\beta} U U_{\alpha\beta} + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} g^{\alpha\beta\lambda} U_\lambda U_{\alpha\beta} \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} f_0 U^2 - \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} f^\alpha U U_\alpha - \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} f^{\alpha\beta} U_\alpha U_\beta \\ &\approx \varepsilon^2 (tr)^{-1} \mu U_{sq} + \varepsilon r^{-1} \mu \nu_q U_q + \varepsilon r^{-1} \mu \nu U_{qq} + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} g^{\alpha\beta} U (U_{qq} q_\alpha q_\beta + U_q q_{\alpha\beta}) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} g^{\alpha\beta\lambda} U_q q_\lambda (U_{qq} q_\alpha q_\beta + U_q q_{\alpha\beta}) - \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} f_0 U^2 - \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} f^\alpha U U_q q_\alpha - \varepsilon^2 r^{-2} f^{\alpha\beta} U_q^2 q_\alpha q_\beta. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.7) and computation in the previous subsection, we have

$$0 \approx \mu \nu + \varepsilon r^{-1} g^{\alpha\beta} U q_\alpha q_\beta + \varepsilon r^{-1} g^{\alpha\beta\lambda} U_q q_\alpha q_\beta q_\lambda \approx \mu \nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{4r} G_2(\omega) \mu^2 U - \frac{\varepsilon}{8r} G_3(\omega) \mu^3 U_q,$$

where $G_2(\omega) = g^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\omega}_\alpha \widehat{\omega}_\beta$ and $G_3(\omega) = g^{\alpha\beta\lambda} \widehat{\omega}_\alpha \widehat{\omega}_\beta \widehat{\omega}_\lambda$ for $\widehat{\omega} = (-1, \omega)$. Similarly we can define $F_1(\omega) = f^\alpha \widehat{\omega}_\alpha$ and $F_2(\omega) = f^{\alpha\beta} \widehat{\omega}_\alpha \widehat{\omega}_\beta$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &\approx -\frac{\varepsilon}{4r} G_2(\omega) \mu U + \frac{\varepsilon}{8r} G_3(\omega) \mu^2 U_q, \\ \nu_q &\approx -\frac{\varepsilon}{4r} G_2(\omega) (\mu_q U + \mu U_q) + \frac{\varepsilon}{8r} G_3(\omega) (\mu^2 U_{qq} + 2\mu \mu_q U_q). \end{aligned}$$

By letting $t \approx r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\approx \mu U_{sq} + \mu \left(-\frac{1}{4} G_2(\omega) (\mu_q U + \mu U_q) + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) (\mu^2 U_{qq} + 2\mu \mu_q U_q) \right) U_q \\
&\quad + g^{\alpha\beta} U U_q q_{\alpha\beta} + g^{\alpha\beta\lambda} U_q q_{\lambda} U_q q_{\alpha\beta} - f_0 U^2 - f^\alpha U U_q q_\alpha - f^{\alpha\beta} U_q^2 q_{\alpha\beta} \\
&\approx \mu U_{sq} - \frac{1}{4} G_2(\omega) \mu^2 U_q^2 + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^3 U_{qq} U_q + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^2 \mu_q U_q^2 \\
&\quad - f_0 U^2 + \frac{1}{2} F_1(\omega) \mu U U_q - \frac{1}{4} F_2(\omega) \mu^2 U_q^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Besides, since $\nu_q \mu + \varepsilon t^{-1} \nu_s = \mu_q \nu + \varepsilon t^{-1} \mu_s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_s &\approx t \varepsilon^{-1} (\nu_q \mu - \mu_q \nu) \\
&\approx \mu \left(-\frac{1}{4} G_2(\omega) (\mu_q U + \mu U_q) + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) (\mu^2 U_{qq} + 2\mu \mu_q U_q) \right) \\
&\quad - \mu_q \left(-\frac{1}{4} G_2(\omega) \mu U + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^2 U_q \right) \\
&\approx -\frac{1}{4} G_2(\omega) \mu^2 U_q + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^3 U_{qq} + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^2 \mu_q U_q.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that now

$$(\mu U_q)_s \approx f_0 U^2 - \frac{1}{2} F_1(\omega) \mu U U_q + \frac{1}{4} F_2(\omega) \mu^2 U_q^2.$$

Definition. We define the following reduced system of (3.6) for $(\mu, U)(s, q, \omega)$

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} (\mu U_q)_s = f_0 U^2 - \frac{1}{2} F_1(\omega) \mu U U_q + \frac{1}{4} F_2(\omega) \mu^2 U_q^2 \\ \mu_s = -\frac{1}{4} G_2(\omega) \mu^2 U_q + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^3 U_{qq} + \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^2 \mu_q U_q \end{cases}.$$

Remark. It is unclear to the author whether the lifespan of this new reduced system is the same as that of (1.8). In the special case $f \equiv 0$ and $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u, \partial u) = \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(\partial u)$, the answer is yes. Now $G_2(\omega) \equiv 0$ and $(\mu U_q)_s \equiv 0$, and our new reduced system admits a finite-time blowup in s , unless the null condition holds, i.e. $G_3(\omega) \equiv 0$. In fact, since $(\mu U_q)_s = 0$, with the same choice of initial data $\mu|_{s=0} = -2$ and $U_q|_{s=0} = A \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$, we have $\mu U_q = -2A$ for all s . Thus,

$$\mu_s = \frac{1}{8} G_3(\omega) \mu^2 (\mu U_q)_q = -\frac{1}{4} G_3(\omega) A_q(q, \omega) \mu^2, \quad \mu(0, q, \omega) = -2,$$

whose solution is

$$\mu(s, q, \omega) = \left(\frac{1}{4} G_3(\omega) A_q(q, \omega) s - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1}.$$

If $G_3(\omega) \not\equiv 0$ and $A(q, \omega) \not\equiv 0$, we can choose (q, ω) such that $G_3(\omega) A_q(q, \omega) > 0$. We are able to do this because $A(q, \omega)$ has a compact support. This would lead to a blowup at $s = 2/(G_3(\omega) A_q(q, \omega))$. Such a blowup can be related to the blowup of Hörmander's approximate equation (1.8), which is now a Burgers' equation. We refer to Lemma 6.5.4 in [6]. This result implies that our new reduced system may work in a more general case than (1.1).

4. THE ASYMPTOTIC PROFILE AND THE APPROXIMATE SOLUTION

Our main goal in this section is to construct an approximate solution u_{app} to (1.1). Fix a scattering data $A(q, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $\text{supp}(A) \subset [-R, R] \times \mathbb{S}^2$ for some $R \geq 1$. Fix a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sufficiently large $T_R > 0$, both depending on $A(q, \omega)$. Let $(\mu, U)(s, q, \omega)$ be the solution to (3.4) with $(\mu, U_q)|_{s=0} = (-2, A)$ and $\lim_{q \rightarrow -\infty} U(s, q, \omega) = 0$. Let $q(t, r, \omega)$ be the solution to the ODE

$$(\partial_t - \partial_r)q(t, r, \omega) = \mu(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega), \quad q(t, 0, \omega) = -t$$

and set

$$U(t, r, \omega) = U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega).$$

Here $\delta > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant depending only on the scattering data. Note that near the light cone $\{t = r + R\}$, $\varepsilon r^{-1}U(t, r, \omega)$ and $q(t, r, \omega)$ are the approximate solution to (1.1) and the approximate optical function, respectively, in the sense that for all (t, r, ω) with $t \geq T_R$ and $|q(t, r, \omega)| \leq R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) &= O(\varepsilon t^{-3+C\varepsilon}), \\ \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)q_\alpha q_\beta &= O(t^{-2+C\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

For all $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we set

$$u_{app}(t, x) = \varepsilon r^{-1}\eta(t)\psi(r/t)U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega).$$

Here $\psi \equiv 1$ when $|r - t| \leq t/4$ and $\psi \equiv 0$ when $|r - t| \geq t/2$, which is used to localize $\varepsilon r^{-1}U$ near the light cone $\{r = t\}$; η is a cutoff function such that $\eta \equiv 0$ when $t \leq 2R$. The definitions of ψ and η will be given later.

Our main proposition in this section is the following.

Proposition 4.1. *Fix a scattering data $A(q, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $\text{supp}(A) \subset [-R, R] \times \mathbb{S}^2$ for some $R \geq 1$. Fix a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ depending on $A(q, \omega)$. Let u_{app} be the function defined as above. Then, for all (t, x) with $t \geq T_R$, we have*

$$|\partial u_{app}(t, x)| \lesssim \varepsilon(1+t)^{-1}.$$

Moreover, for all multiindices I and for all (t, x) with $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Z^I u_{app}(t, x)| &\lesssim_I \varepsilon(1+t)^{-1+C_I\varepsilon}, \\ |Z^I(\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app})\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta u_{app})(t, x)| &\lesssim_I \varepsilon(1+t)^{-3+C_I\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark. If we have $0 < \delta < 1$, then all the constants involved in this section are uniform in δ . Thus, it would not impact any result in this section if we do not choose the value of δ until the proof of Poincaré's lemma in the next section.

This proposition is proved in three steps. First, in Section 4.1, we construct $q(t, r, \omega)$ and $U(t, r, \omega)$ for all (t, x) with $t > 0$, by solving the reduced system (3.4) and $q_t - q_r = \mu$ explicitly. Next, in Section 4.2, we prove that $\varepsilon r^{-1}U(t, r, \omega)$ is an approximate solution to (1.1) near the light cone $\{t = r + R\}$ when t is sufficiently large. To achieve this goal we prove several estimates on q and U when $|q(t, r, \omega)| \leq R$. Finally, in Section 4.3, we define u_{app} and prove the pointwise bounds for large t . To define u_{app} , we use cutoff functions to restrict $\varepsilon r^{-1}U$ in a conical neighborhood of $\{t = r\}$ and remove the singularities at $|x| = 0$ or $t = 0$.

4.1. **Construction of q and U .** Fix a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Fix a scattering data $A(q, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2)$ with $A(q, \omega) = 0$ for $|q| > R \geq 1$. Also fix $0 < \delta < 1$ depending on $A(q, \omega)$ but not on ε . Its value will be chosen in Section 5.

Suppose the Taylor expansion of $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}$ at 0 is

$$\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u) = -m^{\alpha\beta} + \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) = -m^{\alpha\beta} + g^{\alpha\beta}u + O(|u|^2), \quad \text{with } (m^{\alpha\beta}) = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1).$$

We define $q(t, r, \omega)$ by solving

$$(4.1) \quad (\partial_t - \partial_r)q(t, r, \omega) = \mu(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega), \quad q(t, 0, \omega) = -t,$$

where

$$(4.2) \quad \mu(s, q, \omega) := -2 \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}G(\omega)A(q, \omega)s\right),$$

where

$$G(\omega) := g^{\alpha\beta}\widehat{\omega}_\alpha\widehat{\omega}_\beta, \quad \widehat{\omega} := (-1, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2.$$

Note that (4.1) has a solution $q(t, r, \omega)$ for all $t > 0$. In fact, if we apply method of characteristics, for $z(\tau) = q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega)$ and $s(\tau) = \ln(\tau)$ we have an autonomous system of ODEs

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}(\tau) = \mu(\varepsilon s(\tau) - \delta, z(\tau), \omega) \\ \dot{s}(\tau) = \exp(-s(\tau)) \end{cases}$$

with initial data $(z, s)(r + t) = (-r - t, \ln(r + t))$. Note that whenever $|z(\tau)| \geq R$, we have $\dot{z}(\tau) = -2$ because of the support of $A(q, \omega)$. Thus, $|z(\tau)|$ cannot blow up when $\tau > 0$. Neither can $|s(\tau)|$ since $s(\tau) = \ln(\tau)$. We are thus able to solve this system of ODEs for all $\tau > 0$ by Picard's theorem.

We have

$$(4.3) \quad q(t, r, \omega) = -(r + t) - \int_t^{r+t} \mu(\varepsilon \ln(\tau) - \delta, q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega), \omega) d\tau.$$

Note that if $G(\omega) \equiv 0$, we have $\mu \equiv -2$ and thus $q = r - t$, which coincides with the choice of q in Hörmander's setting.

We also define $U(s, q, \omega)$ by solving the following equation

$$(4.4) \quad (\partial_q U)(s, q, \omega) = A(q, \omega) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}G(\omega)A(q, \omega)s\right), \quad \lim_{q \rightarrow -\infty} U(s, q, \omega) = 0.$$

The equation (4.4) has a solution $U(s, q, \omega)$ for all s , which comes from taking the following integral:

$$(4.5) \quad U(s, q, \omega) = \int_{-\infty}^q A(p, \omega) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}G(\omega)A(p, \omega)s\right) dp.$$

It is clear that $U(s, q, \omega) = 0$ unless $q \geq -R$ and $U(s, q, \omega) = U(s, R, \omega)$ for $q \geq R$. Also note that U and all its derivatives are $\leq Ce^{Cs}$. Here C is uniform for all $(s, q, \omega) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2$.

From now on, we use U to denote the function on (t, r, ω) :

$$(4.6) \quad U = U(t, r, \omega) = U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega).$$

Such a U is the asymptotic profile used in this paper. Note that

$$(\partial_t - \partial_r)U = \mu U_q + \varepsilon t^{-1}U_s = -2A + O(\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon}).$$

This explains the meaning of $A(q, \omega)$ in our construction.

4.2. **Estimates on q and U .** Define

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{D} := \{(t, r, \omega) : t \geq T_R, |q(t, r, \omega)| \leq R\},$$

for some constant $T_R \geq 1$ to be chosen. Here we always assume that T_R is sufficiently large and depends only on $A(q, \omega)$. Our main goal now is to prove that $\varepsilon r^{-1}U(t, r, \omega) \in \varepsilon S^{-1}$ and $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) \in \varepsilon S^{-3}$, where εS^{-1} and εS^{-3} are defined in Section 2. In other word, $\varepsilon r^{-1}U$ has some good pointwise bounds and is an approximate solution to (1.1) in \mathcal{D} .

We start with a more precise description of the region \mathcal{D} . From Lemma 4.2, we can see that \mathcal{D} is contained in a conical neighborhood of the light cone $\{t = r\}$ when $t \gg_R 1$.

Lemma 4.2. *For all (t, r, ω) with $t \geq T_R$, there exist $0 < t_0 < t_1 = (t + r + R)/2$ such that*

$$(4.8) \quad |q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega)| \leq R \iff \tau \in [t_0, t_1];$$

$$(4.9) \quad q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega) = R + 2(t_0 - \tau), \quad \forall \tau \leq t_0;$$

$$(4.10) \quad q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega) = r + t - 2\tau, \quad \forall \tau \geq t_1.$$

We also have

$$(4.11) \quad t_1 - t_0 = O((t + r)^{C\varepsilon}),$$

$$(4.12) \quad q(t, r, \omega) - (r - t) = O((t + r)^{C\varepsilon}).$$

When $r \leq t - R$, we have $q = r - t$.

In addition, for $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $t_0 \leq t \leq t_1$ and

$$(4.13) \quad -R \leq r - t \lesssim t^{C\varepsilon}$$

which implies that $t \sim r$ in \mathcal{D} .

Proof. Note that $\mu \equiv -2$ for $|q| \geq R$ and $-2e^{Cs} \leq \mu \leq -2e^{-Cs}$ for all (s, q, ω) . Then the existence of t_0, t_1 and the estimates related to τ directly follow from (4.3). We also have $q = r - t$ if $r \leq t - R$. Now we can assume $r \geq t - R$ i.e. $t \leq t_1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |q(t, r, \omega) - (r - t)| &= \left| \int_t^{r+t} (\mu(\varepsilon \ln(\tau) - \delta, q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega), \omega) + 2) d\tau \right| \\ &\leq \int_{[t, r+t] \cap [t_0, t_1]} |\mu(\varepsilon \ln(\tau) - \delta, q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega), \omega)| + 2 d\tau \\ &= \int_{[t, r+t] \cap [t_0, t_1]} -\mu(\varepsilon \ln(\tau) - \delta, q(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega), \omega) + 2 d\tau \\ &\leq 2R + 2(t_1 - \max\{t_0, t\}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$-2R = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mu(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega) d\tau \leq -2e^{-C\delta} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \tau^{-C\varepsilon} d\tau \leq -2e^{-C}(t_1 - t_0)t_1^{-C\varepsilon}.$$

It follows that

$$t_1 - \max\{t, t_0\} \leq t_1 - t_0 \lesssim t_1^{C\varepsilon} \lesssim_R (t + r)^{C\varepsilon}$$

and thus

$$|q(t, r, \omega) - (r - t)| \leq 2R + C_R(t + r)^{C\varepsilon} \lesssim_R (t + r)^{C\varepsilon}.$$

Here we use $t + r + R \leq 2(t + r)$ if $t \geq T_R \geq R$.

When $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$, it is clear that $t_0 \leq t \leq t_1$. Thus,

$$\frac{r-t+R}{2} = t_1 - t \lesssim_R (r+t)^{C\varepsilon}$$

By choosing T_R in (4.7) sufficiently large (e.g. $T_R \geq 2 + 2R$) and ε sufficiently small (e.g. $C\varepsilon \leq 1/4$), we have

$$\frac{r}{t} - 1 \leq \frac{r-t+R}{t} \lesssim_R t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (1 + \frac{r}{t})^{C\varepsilon} \lesssim_R (1 + \frac{r}{t})^{1/2}.$$

This forces $r/t \leq C'_R$ for some constant C'_R , which implies that

$$|q - (r-t)| \lesssim_R (t + C'_R t)^{C\varepsilon} \lesssim_R t^{C\varepsilon}$$

and

$$|r-t| \leq |q| + O(t^{C\varepsilon}) \leq R + Ct^{C\varepsilon} \lesssim t^{C\varepsilon}.$$

Finally, note that $r-t < -R$ implies $q < -R$. We are done. \square

We now move on to estimates on ∂q . In Lemma 4.3, we give the pointwise bounds on $\nu = q_t + q_r$ and $\lambda_i = q_i - \omega_i q_r$. In Lemma 4.4, we find the first terms in the asymptotic expansion of ν and ν_q in \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 4.3. *For $t \geq T_R$,*

$$(4.14) \quad \nu(t, r, \omega) := (\partial_t + \partial_r)q = O(\varepsilon(t+r)^{-1+C\varepsilon}).$$

$$(4.15) \quad \lambda_i(t, r, \omega) := (\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)q = O((t+r)^{-1+C\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. Fix (t, r, ω) . We have

$$(4.16) \quad (\partial_t - \partial_r)\nu = (\partial_t + \partial_r)\mu = (\partial_q \mu)\nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} G(\omega) A \mu.$$

By Lemma 4.2, for all $t > T_R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^{r+t} |\partial_q \mu| d\tau &= \int_{[t_0, t_1] \cap [t, r+t]} \frac{1}{2} |G(\omega) \partial_q A| \cdot |\varepsilon \ln(\tau) - \delta| \cdot |\mu| d\tau \\ &\lesssim (\varepsilon \ln(t+r) + 1) \int_{[t_0, t_1] \cap [t, r+t]} |\mu| d\tau \\ &\lesssim (\varepsilon \ln(t+r) + 1) |q(t_1, r+t-t_1, \omega) - q(t_0, r+t-t_0, \omega)| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon \ln(t+r) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here the integral is taken along the characteristic $(\tau, r+t-\tau, \omega)$ for $\tau \geq T_R$, as in (4.3). Similarly, we have

$$\int_t^{r+t} |G(\omega) A \mu \frac{\varepsilon}{2\tau}| d\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{t_0} \int_{[t_0, t_1] \cap [t, r+t]} |\mu| d\tau \lesssim \varepsilon(t+r)^{-1}.$$

Here we use the fact that for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $t \geq T_R \gg_R 1$, we have

$$t_0 \geq t_1 - |t_0 - t_1| \geq \frac{t+r+R}{2} - C(t+r)^{C\varepsilon} \geq \frac{r+t}{4}.$$

Now, we integrate (4.16) along the characteristic and then apply Gronwall's inequality. Note that the initial value of $(\partial_t + \partial_r)q$ is 0 as $q = r - t$ for $r \leq t - R$, by Lemma 4.2. So we conclude (4.14). The proof for (4.15) is similar. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\partial_t - \partial_r)\lambda_i &= (\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)\mu + r^{-1}\lambda_i \\
(4.17) \quad &= (\mu_q + r^{-1})\lambda_i + \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta) \sum_l \partial_{\omega_l}(GA) \cdot \frac{\delta_{il} - \omega_i \omega_l}{r} \mu \\
&= (\mu_q + r^{-1})\lambda_i + O(r^{-1}|\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta| \cdot |\mu|)\chi_{|q| \leq R}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\chi_{|q| \leq R} = 1$ if $|q(t, r, \omega)| \leq R$ and $\chi_{|q| \leq R} = 0$ if $|q(t, r, \omega)| > R$. This term exists in (4.17) since $A \equiv 0$ if $|q| > R$. Note that $\lambda_i \equiv 0$ when $r < t - R$ and that for $0 < t - R \leq r$, we have

$$0 \leq \int_t^{t_1} (r + t - \tau)^{-1} d\tau = \ln \frac{2r}{r + t - R} \leq \ln 2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{t_1} (r + t - \tau)^{-1} |\varepsilon \ln(\tau) - \delta| |\mu| \chi_{|q| \leq R} d\tau &\leq \int_{[t, t_1] \cap [t_0, t_1]} (r + t - \tau)^{-1} (\varepsilon \ln(\tau) + 1) \cdot |\mu| d\tau \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon \ln(t + r) + 1}{r + t - t_1} \cdot 2R \lesssim (t + r)^{-1 + C\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Apply Gronwall's inequality again and we are done. \square

Remark. Since $|\mu| \geq 2ct^{-C\varepsilon}$ for some small constant $c > 0$, we conclude that $q_t, q_r \neq 0$ for all $t \geq T_R$ if ε is small enough. In particular, for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $t \gg_R 1$,

$$q_r = \frac{-\mu + \nu}{2} \geq ct^{-C\varepsilon} - C\varepsilon(t + r)^{-1 + C\varepsilon} \geq \frac{c}{2}t^{-C\varepsilon}.$$

So for each fixed $t \geq T_R$, $r \mapsto q(t, r, \omega)$ is strictly increasing and continuous for each fixed t , and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} q(t, r, \omega) = \infty$. This implies that for each t and $q_0 \geq -t$, there exists a unique r such that $q(t, r, \omega) = q_0$. So $(t, r, \omega) \mapsto (\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega)$ has an inverse map $(s, q, \omega) \mapsto (e^{(s+\delta)/\varepsilon}, r(s, q, \omega), \omega)$. By inverse function theorem, the map $(t, r, \omega) \mapsto (s, q, \omega)$ is a diffeomorphism.

From now on, any function V can be written as both $V(t, r, \omega)$ and $V(s, q, \omega)$ at the same time. Thus, for any function V on (t, r, ω) , we can define $\partial_s^a \partial_q^b \partial_\omega^c V$ using the chain rule and Leibniz's rule. Note that in this paper, ∂_ω will only be used under the coordinate (s, q, ω) and will never be used under the coordinate (t, r, ω) .

Lemma 4.4. For $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$(4.18) \quad \nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U = O(\varepsilon t^{-2 + C\varepsilon}),$$

$$(4.19) \quad \nu_q + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu_q U + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U_q = O(\varepsilon t^{-2 + C\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. We have

(4.20)

$$\begin{aligned}
(\partial_t - \partial_r)(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U) &= (\partial_t + \partial_r)\mu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}(\partial_t - \partial_r)(\mu U) - \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t^2} \mu U \\
&= \mu_q \nu + \mu_s \frac{\varepsilon}{t} + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}(\partial_q(\mu U)\mu + \partial_s(\mu U)\frac{\varepsilon}{t}) - \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t^2} \mu U \\
&= \mu_q(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U) + \frac{\varepsilon^2 G(\omega)}{4t^2}(U_s + \frac{1}{2}G(\omega)AU)\mu - \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t^2} \mu U.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, note that $\mu_s + \varepsilon G(\omega)\mu^2 U_q/4 = 0$.

Fix $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$, so now we have $t \sim r$. Integrate this equation along the characteristic $(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega)$. Note that U vanishes if $\tau \geq t_1$ and $U, U_s = O(t^{C\varepsilon})$. We have

$$\int_t^{r+t} \frac{\varepsilon |G(\omega)|}{4\tau^2} |\mu U| d\tau \leq \int_t^{t_1} \frac{C\varepsilon(t+r)^{C\varepsilon}}{4t^2} |\mu| d\tau \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-2+C\varepsilon}$$

and

$$\int_t^{r+t} \left| \frac{\varepsilon^2 G(\omega)}{4\tau^2} (U_s + \frac{1}{2}G(\omega)AU)\mu \right| d\tau \leq C\varepsilon^2 \int_t^{t_1} \frac{(t+r)^{C\varepsilon}}{t^2} |\mu| d\tau \lesssim \varepsilon^2 t^{-2+C\varepsilon}.$$

Finally, since $\int_t^{r+t} |\mu_q| d\tau \lesssim \varepsilon \ln(t+r) + 1 \lesssim \varepsilon \ln(t) + 1$ and since $\nu = U = 0$ at $\tau = r + t$, by Gronwall's inequality we conclude (4.18).

To prove (4.19), we first prove it with ∂_q replaced by ∂_r . By (4.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\partial_t - \partial_r)\partial_r(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U) &= \partial_r(\partial_t - \partial_r)(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U) \\
(4.21) \quad &= \mu_q \partial_r(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U) + q_r \mu_{qq}(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U) \\
&\quad - \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t^2} (\mu U)_q q_r + \frac{\varepsilon^2 G(\omega)}{4t^2} \partial_q((U_s + \frac{1}{2}G(\omega)AU)\mu) q_r.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, by integrating along the characteristic, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{r+t} |q_r \mu_{qq}(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4\tau} \mu U)| d\tau &\lesssim \int_{[t, r+t] \cap [t_0, t_1]} (|\nu| + |\mu|) |\mu| \varepsilon \tau^{-2+C\varepsilon} d\tau \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon t_0^{-2+C\varepsilon} \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-2+C\varepsilon}, \\
\int_t^{r+t} \left| \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4\tau^2} (\mu U)_q q_r \right| d\tau &\lesssim \int_{[t, r+t] \cap [t_0, t_1]} \varepsilon \tau^{-2} (|A| + |\mu_q U|) (|\mu| + |\nu|) d\tau \\
&\lesssim \int_{[t, r+t] \cap [t_0, t_1]} \varepsilon \tau^{-2+C\varepsilon} |\mu| d\tau + \int_{[t, r+t] \cap [t_0, t_1]} \varepsilon^2 \tau^{-3+C\varepsilon} d\tau \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon t_0^{-2+C\varepsilon} \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-2+C\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^{r+t} \left| \frac{\varepsilon^2 G(\omega)}{4\tau^2} \partial_q((U_s + \frac{1}{2}G(\omega)AU)\mu) q_r \right| d\tau &\lesssim \int_{[t, r+t] \cap [t_0, t_1]} \varepsilon^2 \tau^{-2+C\varepsilon} |\mu| d\tau \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon^2 t_0^{-2+C\varepsilon} \lesssim \varepsilon^2 t^{-2+C\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, since $\int_t^{r+t} |\mu_q| d\tau \lesssim \varepsilon \ln(t+r) + 1$, $\nu = U = 0$ at $\tau = r+t$ and $\partial_r = q_r \partial_q$ with

$$|q_r| = \frac{|\nu - \mu|}{2} \geq \frac{|\mu|}{2} - \frac{|\nu|}{2} \gtrsim t^{-C\varepsilon} - C\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} \gtrsim t^{-C\varepsilon}, \quad \text{if } \varepsilon \ll 1,$$

by Gronwall's inequality we conclude (4.19). □

Remark. The proof of (4.19) actually gives an estimate not just in \mathcal{D} . For $t \geq t_1$, everything in (4.19) is 0. For $t_0 \leq t \leq t_1$, we have $t \sim r$. For $t \leq t_0$, we have proved in Lemma 4.3 that $t_0 \gtrsim t+r$. By applying Gronwall's inequality, we thus have

$$(4.22) \quad \nu_q + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu_q U + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U_q = O(\varepsilon(t+r)^{-2+C\varepsilon} t^{C\varepsilon}) = O(\varepsilon(t+r)^{-2+C\varepsilon})$$

for all $t \geq T_R \gg 1$.

Most of the estimates in the previous three lemmas will still hold in \mathcal{D} , if Z^I is applied to the left hand sides for each multiindex I .

Lemma 4.5. *We have $q \in S^0$. In other word, for all $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$ and I ,*

$$(4.23) \quad |Z^I q(t, r, \omega)| \lesssim_I t^{C_I \varepsilon}.$$

Similarly, we have $\partial_s^a \partial_q^b \partial_\omega^c (\mu, U, A) \in S^0$ for all a, b, c . We also have $\nu \in \varepsilon S^{-1}$, $\lambda_i \in S^{-1}$, and

$$\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U \in \varepsilon S^{-2}, \quad \nu_q + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu_q U + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U_q \in \varepsilon S^{-2}.$$

Proof. We use f_0 to denote any element in S^0 which is defined in Section 2. For example, f_0 can be a finite sum of terms of the form

$$C Z^{I_1} \omega_{i_1} Z^{I_2} \omega_{i_2} \cdots Z^{I_p} \omega_{i_p}.$$

We allow f_0 to vary from line to line. By Lemma 2.5, we have $Z f_0 = f_0$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} [Z, \partial_t - \partial_r] &= [Z, \partial_t] + \sum_i ([Z, \omega_i] \partial_i + \omega_i [Z, \partial_i]) = f_0 \partial, \\ \partial_\alpha &= f_0 (\partial_t - \partial_r) + f_0 (\partial_t + \partial_r) + \sum_i f_0 (\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that for all multiindices I , we have

$$(4.24) \quad (\partial_t - \partial_r) Z^I q = Z^I \mu + \sum_{|J| < |I|} f_0 Z^J \mu + \sum_{|J| < |I|} [f_0 (\partial_t + \partial_r) Z^J q + \sum_i f_0 (\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r) Z^J q].$$

To see this, we first prove that

$$(4.25) \quad (\partial_t - \partial_r) Z^I q = Z^I \mu + \sum_{|J| < |I|} f_0 \partial Z^J q.$$

We can prove this by induction on $|I|$. For $|I| = 0$, (4.25) is (4.1). In general, by writing $Z^I = ZZ^{I'}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \partial_r)Z^I q &= Z(\partial_t - \partial_r)Z^{I'} q + [\partial_t - \partial_r, Z]Z^{I'} q \\ &= ZZ^{I'} \mu + \sum_{|J| < |I'|} Z(f_0 \partial Z^J q) + f_0 \partial Z^{I'} q \\ &= Z^I \mu + \sum_{|J| < |I|} f_0 \partial Z^J q. \end{aligned}$$

We use the induction hypothesis on the second line. Moreover, for each I we have

$$\partial Z^I q = f_0(\partial_t - \partial_r)Z^I q + f_0(\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^I q + \sum_i f_0(\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)Z^I q.$$

It follows from (4.25) that

$$(\partial_t - \partial_r)Z^I q = Z^I \mu + \sum_{|J| < |I|} [f_0(\partial_t - \partial_r)Z^J q + f_0(\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^J q + \sum_i f_0(\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)Z^J q].$$

Then (4.24) follows by induction.

Now we prove (4.23) by induction on $|I|$. The case $|I| = 0$ is obvious since $|q| \leq R$ in \mathcal{D} . Suppose (4.23) holds for all $|I| \leq k$ and fix $|I| = k + 1$. By the chain rule and Leibniz's rule, $Z^I \mu$ can be expressed as a sum of terms of the form

$$(4.26) \quad f_0 \cdot \partial_q^a \partial_s^b \partial_\omega^c \mu \cdot Z^{I_1} q \cdots Z^{I_a} q Z^{J_1} (\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta) \cdots Z^{J_b} (\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta) \prod_l Z^{K_{l,1}} \omega_l \cdots Z^{K_{l,c_l}} \omega_l$$

where all $|I_*|, |J_*|, |K_{*,*}|$ are nonzero, and the sum of them is $k + 1$. The only term with some $|I_*| > k$ is $\mu_q Z^I q$; all the other terms are controlled by $t^{C\varepsilon} |\mu|$, by induction hypotheses and (4.2). For the same reason, if $|J| \leq k$, we have $Z^J \mu = O(t^{C\varepsilon} |\mu|)$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$|(\partial_t + \partial_r)Z^J q| + \sum_i |(\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)Z^J q| \lesssim (1 + t + r)^{-1} \sum_{|K|=1} |Z^K Z^J q|.$$

In conclusion, if we integrate (4.24) along the characteristic and take the sum over all $|I| = k + 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{|I|=k+1} |Z^I q(t_1, r + t - t_1, \omega) - Z^I q(t, r, \omega)| \\ & \lesssim \int_t^{t_1} (|\mu_q| + (1 + t + r)^{-1}) \sum_{|I|=k+1} |Z^I q| + \tau^{C\varepsilon} |\mu| + \tau^{-1+C\varepsilon} d\tau \\ & \lesssim \int_t^{t_1} (|\mu_q| + (1 + t + r)^{-1}) \sum_{|I|=k+1} |Z^I q| d\tau + 2Rt^{C\varepsilon} + t^{-1+C\varepsilon}(t_1 - t). \end{aligned}$$

Also note that $Z^I q(t_1, t + r - t_1, \omega) = O(1)$, since $Z(r - t) = O(1)$ when $r = t - R$ and $t \gg_R 1$. Thus we are done if we apply Gronwall's inequality and Lemma 4.2.

Now we finish the proof on the remaining statements. By the chain rule and Leibniz's rule, we can expand $Z^I U$ as a sum of terms of the form (4.26) with μ there replaced by

U . We then get $U \in S^0$ from $q \in S^0$. Similarly, we can show $\partial_s^a \partial_q^b \partial_\omega^c (\mu, U, A) \in S^0$ for all (a, b, c) .

In addition, since $\lambda_i = (\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r)q$ with $q \in S^0$, by Lemma 2.5 we have $\lambda_i \in S^{-1}$. To prove

$$\nu \in \varepsilon S^{-1}, \nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U \in \varepsilon S^{-2}, \nu_q + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu_q U + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U_q \in \varepsilon S^{-2},$$

we only need to prove the second estimate on $\nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U$. If we get the second estimate, the first estimate follows from $\frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U \in \varepsilon S^{-1}$, and the third estimate follows from $\partial_q = q_r^{-1} \partial_r$ and $q_r^{-1} \in S^0$. Here $q_r^{-1} \in S^0$ since $q_r \in S^0$ and $|q_r| \gtrsim t^{-C\varepsilon}$ as proved in Lemma 4.4.

To prove the second estimate, we start with (4.20). If we let f_m denote any element in S^m where f_m is allowed to vary from line to line, we have

$$(\partial_t - \partial_r)V = \mu_q V + \varepsilon f_{-2} \mu$$

where

$$V = \nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U.$$

We can prove by induction that for each I ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \partial_r)Z^I V &= \mu_q Z^I V + \sum_{|J| < |I|} f_0 Z^J V + \varepsilon \sum_{|J| \leq |I|} f_{-2} Z^J \mu \\ &+ \sum_{|J| < |I|} (f_0 (\partial_t + \partial_r) Z^J V + \sum_i f_0 (\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r) Z^J V). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can induct on $|I|$ and conclude $|Z^I V| \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-2+C_I \varepsilon}$ by applying Gronwall's inequality. The proof here is very similar to that of q . □

The next lemma can be viewed as a direct application of Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.6. *In \mathcal{D} we have*

$$(4.27) \quad g^{\alpha\beta} q_\alpha q_\beta - \frac{1}{4} G(\omega) \mu^2 \in S^{-1},$$

$$(4.28) \quad q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2 - \mu \nu \in S^{-2}.$$

Then we have

$$(4.29) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) q_\alpha q_\beta \in S^{-2}.$$

In other words, q is an approximate optical function in \mathcal{D} .

Moreover,

$$(4.30) \quad g^{\alpha\beta} q_\alpha \mu - \frac{1}{4} G(\omega) \mu_q \mu \in S^{-1},$$

$$(4.31) \quad \square q - \left(\frac{1}{2} (\mu_q \nu + \nu_q \mu) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \mu_s + r^{-1} \mu \right) \in S^{-2}.$$

Proof. Since $q_t = (\mu + \nu)/2$ and $q_i = \lambda_i + \omega_i(\nu - \mu)/2$, by applying Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& g^{\alpha\beta} q_\alpha q_\beta \\
&= g^{00} \left(\frac{\mu + \nu}{2}\right)^2 + 2g^{0i} \left(\frac{\mu + \nu}{2}\right) \left(\lambda_i + \frac{\omega_i(\nu - \mu)}{2}\right) + g^{ij} \left(\lambda_i + \frac{\omega_i(\nu - \mu)}{2}\right) \left(\lambda_j + \frac{\omega_j(\nu - \mu)}{2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} G(\omega) \mu^2 + \frac{1}{2} (g^{00} - g^{ij} \omega_i \omega_j) \mu \nu + (g^{0i} - g^{ij} \omega_j) \mu \lambda_i + \frac{1}{4} g^{00} \nu^2 + \frac{1}{2} g^{0i} \nu (2\lambda_i + \omega_i \nu) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4} g^{ij} (2\lambda_i + \omega_i \nu) (2\lambda_j + \omega_j \nu) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} G(\omega) \mu^2 \pmod{S^{-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Replace $g^{\alpha\beta}$ with $-m^{\alpha\beta}$, and note that $\sum_i \omega_i \lambda_i = \sum_i \omega_i \partial_i - \omega_i^2 \partial_r = 0$. Thus,

$$q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2 = \mu\nu - \sum_i \lambda_i^2 = \mu\nu \pmod{S^{-2}}.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) q_\alpha q_\beta &= q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2 + \gamma^{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) q_\alpha q_\beta \\
&= \mu\nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{4r} G(\omega) \mu^2 U - \sum_i \lambda_i^2 + (\gamma^{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) - g^{\alpha\beta} \varepsilon r^{-1} U) q_\alpha q_\beta \\
&= \mu \left(\nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{4t} G(\omega) \mu U \right) + \frac{t-r}{4tr} \mu^2 U \pmod{S^{-2}} \in S^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have $(\gamma^{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) - g^{\alpha\beta} \varepsilon r^{-1} U) \in \varepsilon^2 S^{-2}$ by Lemma 2.6.

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon t^{-1} \nu_s &= \nu_t - q_t \nu_q = (\nu_t + \nu_r) - \nu \nu_q, \\
\sum_l \partial_i \omega_l \nu_{\omega_l} &= \nu_i - q_i \nu_q = (\nu_i - \omega_i \nu_r) - \lambda_i \nu_q.
\end{aligned}$$

Both of these two terms are in εS^{-2} by Lemma 2.5. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{tt} &= \partial_t \left(\frac{\mu + \nu}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{4} \mu_q (\mu + \nu) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \mu_s + \frac{1}{4} \nu_q (\mu + \nu) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \nu_s \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \mu_q \mu + \frac{1}{4} \mu_q \nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \mu_s + \frac{1}{4} \nu_q \mu \quad \text{mod } \varepsilon S^{-2}, \\
q_{ti} &= \partial_i \left(\frac{\mu + \nu}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} (\mu_q + \nu_q) \left(\lambda_i + \frac{\omega_i (\nu - \mu)}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_l (\mu_{\omega_l} + \nu_{\omega_l}) \partial_i \omega_l \\
&= -\frac{1}{4} \omega_i \mu_q \mu \quad \text{mod } S^{-1}, \\
q_{ij} &= \partial_i \left(\lambda_j + \frac{\omega_j (\nu - \mu)}{2} \right) \\
&= \partial_i \lambda_j + \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \omega_j (\nu - \mu) + \frac{1}{2} \omega_j (\nu_q - \mu_q) \left(\lambda_i + \frac{\omega_i (\nu - \mu)}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \omega_j \sum_l (\mu_{\omega_l} + \nu_{\omega_l}) \partial_i \omega_l \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \omega_i \omega_j \mu \mu_q + \partial_i \lambda_j - \frac{1}{2} \mu \partial_i \omega_j - \frac{1}{4} \omega_j \mu_q (2\lambda_i + \omega_i \nu) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4} \omega_j \nu_q \omega_i \mu + \frac{1}{2} \omega_j \sum_l \mu_{\omega_l} \partial_i \omega_l \quad \text{mod } \varepsilon S^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$g^{\alpha\beta} q_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{4} G(\omega) \mu_q \mu \quad \text{mod } S^{-1}.$$

Replace $g^{\alpha\beta}$ with $-m^{\alpha\beta}$, and note that $\sum_i \omega_i \partial_i \omega_j = \sum_i \omega_i \lambda_i = 0$, $\sum_i \partial_i \omega_i = 2/r$, $\sum_i \omega_i \partial_r \lambda_i = \partial_r (\sum_i \omega_i \lambda_i) = 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Box q &= - \sum_i \left(\frac{1}{4} \omega_i^2 \mu \mu_q + \partial_i \lambda_i - \frac{1}{2} \mu \partial_i \omega_i - \frac{1}{4} \omega_i \mu_q (2\lambda_i + \omega_i \nu) - \frac{1}{4} \omega_i^2 \nu_q \mu + \frac{1}{2} \omega_i \sum_l \mu_{\omega_l} \partial_i \omega_l \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4} \mu_q \mu + \frac{1}{4} \mu_q \nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \mu_s + \frac{1}{4} \nu_q \mu \quad \text{mod } S^{-2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mu_q \nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \mu_s + \frac{1}{2} \nu_q \mu + r^{-1} \mu - \sum_i (\partial_i - \omega_i \partial_r) \lambda_i \quad \text{mod } S^{-2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mu_q \nu + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \mu_s + \frac{1}{2} \nu_q \mu + r^{-1} \mu \quad \text{mod } S^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Finally we prove that $\varepsilon r^{-1} U$ has good pointwise bounds and is an approximate solution to (1.1) in \mathcal{D} .

Proposition 4.7. *We have*

$$(4.32) \quad \varepsilon r^{-1} U \in \varepsilon S^{-1}, \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) \in \varepsilon S^{-3}.$$

In other word, for $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$(4.33) \quad |Z^I (\varepsilon r^{-1} U)| \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-1+C_I \varepsilon},$$

$$(4.34) \quad |Z^I (\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} (\varepsilon r^{-1} U) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta (\varepsilon r^{-1} U))| \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-3+C_I \varepsilon}.$$

Note that we have a better bound for $\partial(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)$: for all $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$(4.35) \quad |\partial(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1}.$$

Proof. Since $r^{-1} \in S^{-1}$ and $U \in S^0$ which is proved in Lemma 4.5, we have $\varepsilon r^{-1}U \in \varepsilon S^{-1}$ by Lemma 2.5. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) &= \varepsilon r^{-1}(U_q q_t + U_s \varepsilon t^{-1}), \\ \partial_i(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) &= \varepsilon r^{-2} \omega_i U + \varepsilon r^{-1}(U_q q_i + \sum_j U_{\omega_j} \partial_i \omega_j). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $2U_q q_t = U_q(\mu + \nu) = -2A + O(\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon})$ and $2U_q q_i = U_q(\nu - \mu)\omega_i + 2U_q \lambda_i = 2A + O(t^{-1+C\varepsilon})$. Thus, $|\partial(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1}$.

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{tt} &= -U_s \varepsilon t^{-2} + 2U_{sq} q_t \varepsilon t^{-1} + U_{ss} \varepsilon^2 t^{-2} + q_{tt} U_q + q_t^2 U_{qq} \\ &= U_q q_{tt} + U_{qq} q_t^2 \quad \text{mod } S^{-1}, \\ U_{it} &= U_{qq} q_t q_i + U_{\omega_l q} q_t \partial_i \omega_l + U_q q_{it} + U_{sq} q_i \varepsilon t^{-1} + \sum_l U_{s\omega_l} \partial_i \omega_l \varepsilon t^{-1} \\ &= U_{qq} q_t q_i + U_q q_{it} \quad \text{mod } S^{-1}, \\ U_{ij} &= U_{qq} q_i q_j + \sum_l U_{q\omega_l} (q_i \partial_j \omega_l + U_{q\omega_l} q_j \partial_i \omega_l) + U_q q_{ij} + \sum_{l,l'} U_{\omega_l \omega_{l'}} \partial_i \omega_l \partial_j \omega_{l'} \\ &= U_{qq} q_i q_j + U_q q_{ij} \quad \text{mod } S^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \square U &= -U_s \varepsilon t^{-2} + 2U_{sq} q_t \varepsilon t^{-1} + U_{ss} \varepsilon^2 t^{-2} + q_{tt} U_q + q_t^2 U_{qq} \\ &\quad - \sum_i (U_{qq} q_i^2 + \sum_l 2U_{q\omega_l} q_i \partial_i \omega_l + U_q q_{ii} + \sum_{l,l'} U_{\omega_l \omega_{l'}} \partial_i \omega_l \partial_i \omega_{l'}) \\ &= U_{qq} (q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2) + U_q \square q + 2U_{sq} q_t \varepsilon t^{-1} - \sum_{i,l} 2U_{q\omega_l} q_i \partial_i \omega_l \quad \text{mod } S^{-2} \\ &= U_{qq} \mu \nu + U_q \left(\frac{1}{2} (\mu_q \nu + \nu_q \mu) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t} \mu_s + r^{-1} \mu \right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{t} \mu U_{sq} \quad \text{mod } S^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last line holds by Lemma 4.6 and

$$\sum_i q_i \partial_i \omega_l = \sum_i \lambda_i \partial_i \omega_l + \sum_i \omega_i q_r \partial_i \omega_l = \sum_i \lambda_i \partial_i \omega_l \in S^{-2}.$$

By Lemma 4.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Box U &= -U_{qq}\mu \cdot \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}\mu U - \frac{1}{2}U_q\mu_q \cdot \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}\mu U - \frac{1}{2}U_q\mu \cdot \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}\mu U_q - \frac{1}{2}U_q\mu \cdot \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}\mu_q U \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2t}\mu_s U_q + r^{-1}\mu U_q + \frac{\varepsilon}{t}\mu U_{sq} \pmod{S^{-2}} \\
&= (2A_q + \mu_q U_q) \cdot \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}\mu U - \frac{1}{2}U_q\mu_q \cdot \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}\mu U - \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{2t}A^2 + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}A\mu_q U \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{4t}GA\mu U_q - 2Ar^{-1} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2t}GA\mu U_q \pmod{S^{-2}} \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{2t}A_q\mu U - 2Ar^{-1} \pmod{S^{-2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Besides, by Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) - g^{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon r^{-1}U \in \varepsilon^2 S^{-2}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) \\
&= \Box(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) + \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)_{\alpha\beta} \\
&= \varepsilon r^{-1}\Box U + 2\varepsilon r^{-2}\omega_i U_i + g^{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}UU_{\alpha\beta} - 2g^{i\beta}\varepsilon^2 r^{-3}\omega_i UU_\beta \\
&\quad + g^{ij}\varepsilon^2 r^{-4}U^2(3\omega_i\omega_j - \delta_{ij}) + (\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U) - g^{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon r^{-1}U)(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)_{\alpha\beta} \\
&= \varepsilon r^{-1}\Box U + 2\varepsilon r^{-2}U_q q_r + g^{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}UU_{\alpha\beta} \pmod{\varepsilon^2 S^{-3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon r^{-1}\Box U + 2\varepsilon r^{-2}U_q q_r + g^{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon^2 r^{-2}UU_{\alpha\beta} \\
&= \varepsilon r^{-1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{2t}A_q\mu U - 2Ar^{-1}\right) - \varepsilon r^{-2}\mu U_q + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2}U(U_{qq}g^{\alpha\beta}q_\alpha q_\beta + U_q g^{\alpha\beta}q_{\alpha\beta}) \pmod{\varepsilon S^{-3}} \\
&= \varepsilon r^{-1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{2t}A_q\mu U - 2Ar^{-1}\right) + 2\varepsilon r^{-2}A \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2}U(U_{qq} \cdot \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu^2 + U_q \cdot \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu\mu_q) \pmod{\varepsilon S^{-3}} \\
&= \varepsilon r^{-1}\frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{2t}A_q\mu U + \varepsilon^2 r^{-2}U(-2A_q + \mu_q U_q)\frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu + U_q \cdot \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu\mu_q \pmod{\varepsilon S^{-3}} \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon^2(r-t)}{2r^2t}A_q\mu U \pmod{\varepsilon S^{-3}} \in \varepsilon S^{-3}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds since $r - t \in S^0$. Done. □

4.3. Approximate solution u_{app} . Let T_R be the constant used in the definition of \mathcal{D} , such that all the estimates in Section 4.2 hold for $t \geq T_R$. Choose $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on $[2T_R, \infty)$ and $\eta \equiv 0$ on $(-\infty, T_R]$. In addition, choose $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\psi \equiv 1$ on $[3/4, 5/4]$ and $\psi \equiv 0$ outside $[1/2, 3/2]$.

We now define the approximate solution u_{app} by

$$(4.36) \quad u_{app}(t, x) := \varepsilon r^{-1}\eta(t)\psi(r/t)U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, q(t, r, \omega), \omega), \quad r = |x|, \omega_i = x_i/r.$$

Note that $u_{app}(t, x)$ is defined for all $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^3$. If $t \leq T_R$, then we have $u_{app} \equiv 0$. If $t \geq T_R \geq 2R$, since $U \equiv 0$ for $r \leq t - R$, u_{app} has no singularity at $|x| = 0$. Moreover, since $\psi \equiv 1$ when $|t - r| < t/4$, we have $\psi \equiv 1$ in \mathcal{D} if $t \geq T_R \gg 1$; since $\psi \equiv 0$ when $|t - r| > t/2$, we have $u_{app} \equiv 0$ unless $t \sim r$.

We now prove the estimates on u_{app} in Proposition 4.1. The estimates are in fact the same as those in Proposition 4.7. However, note that in Proposition 4.7 we assume that $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$ while here we only assume $t \geq 0$.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. When $t \leq T_R$, we have $u_{app} \equiv 0$. When $T_R \leq t \leq 2T_R$, we have $Z^I u_{app} = O_R(\varepsilon)$. This is because the support of u_{app} lies in $|x| \sim_R 1$, and because U, η, ψ and all their derivatives are $O(1)$. Also note that $\varepsilon \leq (2T_R)^M \varepsilon t^{-M}$ for each M and all $t \leq 2T_R$.

Suppose $t \geq 2T_R$. Now η plays no role since $\eta(t) = 1$ for all $t \geq 2T_R \gg 1$. For $(t, r, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}$, all the estimates follow directly from Proposition 4.7. If $q(t, r, \omega) \leq -R$ i.e. $r - t \leq -R$, or if $r > 3t/2$, then $u_{app} \equiv 0$ so there is nothing to prove. So now we can assume $t \geq 2T_R$, $q(t, r, \omega) \geq R$ and $t - R \leq r \leq 3t/2$. By construction, we now have $U(t, r, \omega) = U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, R, \omega)$. By applying chain rule and Leibniz's rule, for all k and I , we have $\partial^k Z^I U = O(t^{-k+C\varepsilon})$. Since $\partial^k Z^I(r/t) = O(t^{-k})$ for $t \sim r$ and $r > t - R \gg 1$, we have $\partial^k Z^I(\psi(r/t)) = O(t^{-k})$ for all $t \geq T_R$. In particular, we have $\partial(\psi(r/t)) = \psi' \partial(r/t) = O(t^{-1})$. In addition, $\partial^k Z^I r^{-1} = O(t^{-1-k})$ for $t \sim r$. Now all the estimates follow directly from the Leibniz's rule. □

5. ENERGY ESTIMATES AND POINCARÉ'S LEMMA

We now derive the energy estimates and Poincaré's lemma, which are the main tools in the proof of our main theorem. The results in this section were essentially proved in [1, 17].

5.1. Setup. Suppose $t \geq T_R \gg 1$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Assume that u is a solution of (1.1) vanishing for $r \leq t - R$ and satisfying the pointwise estimates: for all $t \geq T_R \gg 1$ we have

$$(5.1) \quad |u| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon}, \quad |\partial u(t, x)| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1};$$

if $q(t, r, \omega) \leq t^{1/4}$ and $t \geq T_R$, we have

$$(5.2) \quad |u - \varepsilon r^{-1} U| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-5/4+C\varepsilon}.$$

Recall that $U = U(t, r, \omega)$ is the asymptotic profile defined in (4.6). In Section 6 we will check these estimates when we apply the energy estimates.

We first prove the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $t \geq T_R$. Then*

$$(5.3) \quad q_t = \frac{\mu + \nu}{2} = \frac{\mu}{2} + O(\varepsilon(t+r)^{-1+C\varepsilon}),$$

$$(5.4) \quad q_i = \lambda_i + \frac{\omega_i(\nu - \mu)}{2} = -\frac{\omega_i \mu}{2} + O((t+r)^{-1+C\varepsilon}),$$

$$(5.5) \quad q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2 = \mu\nu - \sum_i \lambda_i^2 = \mu\nu + O((t+r)^{-2+C\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. Note that (5.3) and (5.4) follow directly from Lemma 4.3, and (5.5) follows from the proof of Lemma 4.6. Note that these three inequalities hold for all (t, r, ω) with $t \geq T_R$, not just in \mathcal{D} . \square

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $t \geq T_R$ and $-R \leq q(t, r, \omega) \leq t^{1/4}$. Then,*

$$(5.6) \quad -R \leq r - t \lesssim t^{1/4},$$

$$(5.7) \quad \nu + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t} \mu U = O(\varepsilon t^{-7/4+C\varepsilon}),$$

$$(5.8) \quad g^{\alpha\beta} q_\alpha q_\beta = \frac{1}{4} G(\omega) \mu^2 + O(t^{-1+C\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, we have

$$|r - t| \leq |q| + C(t + r)^{C\varepsilon} \lesssim t^{1/4} + (t + r)^{C\varepsilon}.$$

This implies that

$$0 < r/t \lesssim 1 + t^{-3/4} + t^{-1+C\varepsilon}(1 + r/t)^{C\varepsilon} \lesssim 1 + (1 + r/t)^{C\varepsilon}.$$

Thus we have $r/t \lesssim 1$ and then we conclude (5.6).

The proof of (5.7) is essentially the same as that of (4.18). The only difference is that we have

$$\int_t^{t_1} |\mu(\tau, r + t - \tau, \omega)| d\tau = R + q(t, r, \omega) \leq R + t^{1/4},$$

while we put $2R$ on the right hand side in Lemma 4.4.

The estimate (5.8) follows from the computations in Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.3. \square

5.2. Energy estimates. Fix a smooth function $\phi(t, x)$ with $\phi(t) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for each $t \geq T_R$ and ϕ is supported in $r \geq t - R$. We define the energy

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} E_u(\phi)(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(t, x) (2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha}(u) \phi_t \phi_\alpha - \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u) \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta)(t, x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(t, x) (|\partial\phi|^2 + 2\gamma^{0\alpha}(u) \phi_t \phi_\alpha - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta)(t, x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

The weight function w is defined by

$$(5.10) \quad w(t, x) = \exp(c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t) \cdot \sigma(q(t, r, \omega)))$$

with

$$\sigma(q) = (R + q + 1)^{-1/16}.$$

Here $q(t, r, \omega)$ is defined in Section 4; $c_0 > 0$ is a large constant to be chosen, which depends only on the scattering data A . Note that $\phi \equiv 0$ unless $r \geq t - R$, and $q(t, r, \omega) \geq -R$ when $r \geq t - R$. So $w(t, x)$ is well-defined in the support of ϕ .

We remark that the exact value of the power in σ is not important. We can replace $-1/16$ with any fixed constant $\lambda \in (-1/8, 0)$.

We also remark that this type of the weight w was already used in the previous work on small data global existence by Lindblad [17] and Alinhac [1]. It can be viewed as an extended version of the method of ghost weight introduced by Alinhac. See [2].

Our goal is to prove the following energy estimates.

Proposition 5.3. *For $1 \ll T_R \leq t \leq T$, we have*

(5.11)

$$E_u(\phi)(t) \leq E_u(\phi)(T) + \int_t^T 2 \|\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \phi(\tau)\|_{L^2(w)} \|\partial\phi(\tau)\|_{L^2(w)} + C\varepsilon\tau^{-1} \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(w)}^2 d\tau.$$

Here $\|f\|_{L^2(w)}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |f|^2 w dx$ and $C > 0$ is a constant (may depend on $u, \partial u$).

The proof starts with a computation of $\frac{d}{dt} E_u(\phi)(t)$. For simplicity, we write $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} = \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)$. Then, by applying integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} E_u(\phi)(t) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_t (2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_t \phi_\alpha - \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta) \\ & \quad + w (2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_{tt} \phi_\alpha + 2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_t \phi_{\alpha t} + 2\partial_t \tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_t \phi_\alpha - 2\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_{\alpha t} \phi_\beta - \partial_t \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_t (2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_t \phi_\alpha - \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta) + w (2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_{\alpha t} \phi_t - 2\tilde{g}^{i\beta} \phi_{it} \phi_\beta + 2\partial_t \tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_t \phi_\alpha - \partial_t \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_t (2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_t \phi_\alpha - \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta) + 2w_i \tilde{g}^{i\beta} \phi_t \phi_\beta \\ & \quad + w (2\tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_{\alpha t} \phi_t + 2\tilde{g}^{i\beta} \phi_t \phi_{i\beta} + 2\partial_t \tilde{g}^{0\alpha} \phi_t \phi_\alpha + 2\partial_i \tilde{g}^{i\beta} \phi_t \phi_\beta - \partial_t \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} -w_t \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta + w (2\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_{\alpha\beta} \phi_t + 2\partial_\alpha \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_t \phi_\beta - \partial_t \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta) + 2w_\alpha \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_t \phi_\beta dx. \end{aligned}$$

By setting $T_\alpha := q_t \partial_\alpha - q_\alpha \partial_t$, we have $\phi_\alpha = q_t^{-1} (T_\alpha \phi + q_\alpha \phi_t)$. Note that

$$w_t = c_0 (\varepsilon t^{-1} \sigma(q) + \varepsilon \ln(t) \sigma'(q) q_t) w, \quad w_i = c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t) \sigma'(q) q_i w.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta q_t + 2\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_t \phi_\beta q_\alpha &= -\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_t^{-1} (T_\alpha \phi + q_\alpha \phi_t) (T_\beta \phi + q_\beta \phi_t) + 2\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_\alpha \phi_t q_t^{-1} (T_\beta \phi + q_\beta \phi_t) \\ &= -\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_t^{-1} T_\alpha \phi T_\beta \phi + \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_t^{-1} q_\alpha q_\beta \phi_t^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -w_t \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_\alpha \phi_\beta + 2w_\alpha \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} \phi_t \phi_\beta &= c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t) \sigma'(q) w (-\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_t^{-1} T_\alpha \phi T_\beta \phi + \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_t^{-1} q_\alpha q_\beta \phi_t^2) \\ & \quad + c_0 \varepsilon t^{-1} \sigma(q) w (\tilde{g}^{00} \phi_t^2 - \tilde{g}^{ij} \phi_i \phi_j). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $T_0 = 0$, $(-\tilde{g}^{ij}) = (\delta_{ij} + O(\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon}))$ is positive definite for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $t \geq T_R \gg 1$; $\sigma'(q) = -\frac{1}{16}(R+q+1)^{-17/16} < 0$; by Lemma 4.3 we have

$$q_t = (\mu + \nu)/2 \leq -ct^{-C\varepsilon} + C\varepsilon(t+r)^{-1+C\varepsilon} < 0.$$

We conclude that

$$-c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t) \sigma'(q) w \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_t^{-1} T_\alpha \phi T_\beta \phi \geq 0.$$

In addition, we claim that

$$(5.12) \quad |c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t) \sigma'(q) w \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} q_t^{-1} q_\alpha q_\beta \phi_t^2| \leq C c_0 \varepsilon t^{-1} \sigma(q) w \phi_t^2.$$

Case 1. Suppose $q(t, r, \omega) \leq t^{1/4}$. By Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta &= q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2 + \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U)q_\alpha q_\beta + (\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(\varepsilon r^{-1}U))q_\alpha q_\beta \\
&= \mu\nu - \sum_i \lambda_i^2 + g^{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon r^{-1}Uq_\alpha q_\beta + g^{\alpha\beta}(u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)q_\alpha q_\beta + O(\varepsilon^2 t^{-2+C\varepsilon}) \\
&= -\frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4t}\mu^2 U + \frac{\varepsilon G(\omega)}{4r}\mu^2 U + \frac{1}{4}G(\omega)\mu^2(u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U) + O(t^{-2+C\varepsilon}) \\
&= O(t^{-5/4+C\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we use the assumption $u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U = O(\varepsilon t^{-5/4+C\varepsilon})$ in the last inequality. Since $\frac{1}{16}\ln(t) \leq t^{1/16}$ and $|q_t| \geq |\mu|/2 - |\nu|/2 \gtrsim t^{-C\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|c_0\varepsilon \ln(t)\sigma'(q)w\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}q_t^{-1}q_\alpha q_\beta \phi_t^2| &= c_0\varepsilon \ln(t) \cdot \frac{1}{16}(q + R + 1)^{-17/16}w|q_t^{-1}\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta|\phi_t^2 \\
&\leq c_0\varepsilon t^{1/16}\sigma(q)(q + R + 1)^{-1} \cdot Ct^{-5/4+C\varepsilon}w\phi_t^2 \\
&\leq Cc_0\varepsilon\sigma(q)t^{-1}w\phi_t^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. Suppose $q(t, r, \omega) \geq t^{1/4}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(q + R + 1)^{-1}|\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta| &= (q + R + 1)^{-1}|q_t^2 - \sum_i q_i^2 + \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta| \\
&\lesssim t^{-1/4}(|\mu\nu| + \sum_i \lambda_i^2 + O(|u||\partial q|^2)) \\
&\lesssim t^{-5/4+C\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use (5.1) and Lemma 5.1. So we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
|c_0\varepsilon \ln(t)\sigma'(q)w\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}q_t^{-1}q_\alpha q_\beta \phi_t^2| &= c_0\varepsilon \ln(t) \cdot \frac{1}{16}(q + R + 1)^{-17/16}w|q_t^{-1}\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta|\phi_t^2 \\
&\leq c_0\varepsilon t^{1/16}\sigma(q)(q + R + 1)^{-1}|q_t^{-1}\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)q_\alpha q_\beta|w\phi_t^2 \\
&\leq Cc_0\varepsilon t^{-1}\sigma(q)w\phi_t^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we finish the proof of (5.12).

Since

$$\tilde{g}^{00}\phi_t^2 - \tilde{g}^{ij}\phi_i\phi_j = |\partial\phi|^2 + O(|u||\partial\phi|^2) \sim |\partial\phi|^2,$$

we have

$$-\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\phi_\alpha\phi_\beta w_t + 2\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\phi_t\phi_\beta w_\alpha \geq -Cc_0\varepsilon t^{-1}\sigma(q)w|\partial\phi|^2.$$

In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}E_u(\phi)(t) &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(2\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\phi_{\alpha\beta}\phi_t + 2\partial_\alpha\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\phi_t\phi_\beta - \partial_t\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\phi_\alpha\phi_\beta) - Cc_0\varepsilon t^{-1}\sigma(q)w|\partial\phi|^2 dx \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} -2w|\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\phi_{\alpha\beta}||\phi_t| - C\varepsilon t^{-1}w|\partial\phi|^2 dx \\
&\geq -2\|\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\phi_{\alpha\beta}\|_{L^2(w)}\|\phi_t\|_{L^2(w)} - C\varepsilon t^{-1}\|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(w)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrate this inequality with respect to t on $[t, T]$ and we conclude (5.11).

5.3. Poincaré's lemma. Fix a smooth function $\phi(t, x)$ with $\phi(t) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for each $t \geq T_R$ and ϕ is supported in $r \geq t - R$. As in the previous sections, we shall assume that $t \geq T_R \gg 1$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$.

Lemma 5.4. *For ϕ as above, we have*

$$(5.13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle t - r \rangle^{-2} |\phi|^2 dx \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\partial\phi|^2 dx.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \langle t - r \rangle^{-2} |\phi|^2 dx &\lesssim_R \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty (r - t + R + 1)^{-2} |\phi|^2 r^2 dr dS_\omega \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty |\phi|^2 r^2 \partial_r (-(r - t + R + 1)^{-1}) dr dS_\omega \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty \partial_r (|\phi|^2 r^2) (r - t + R + 1)^{-1} dr dS_\omega \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty (2|\phi|^2 r + 2\phi\phi_r r^2) (r - t + R + 1)^{-1} dr dS_\omega \\ &\lesssim_R \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty 2|\phi r^{-1} + \phi_r| \cdot |\phi| \langle t - r \rangle^{-1} r^2 dr dS_\omega \\ &\lesssim \left(\int \langle t - r \rangle^{-2} |\phi|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int |\phi r^{-1} + \phi_r|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int 2\phi\phi_r r^{-1} dx = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty \partial_r (\phi^2) r dr dS_\omega = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty -\phi^2 dr dS_\omega = - \int \phi^2 r^{-2} dx,$$

we have

$$\int |\phi r^{-1} + \phi_r|^2 dx = \int \phi_r^2 dx.$$

We then conclude (5.13). □

We can also prove a weighted version of Poincaré's lemma. Note that the value of δ in $s = \varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta$ is chosen in the proof of this lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *For ϕ as above, we have*

$$(5.14) \quad \int \phi^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w dx \lesssim \int |\partial\phi|^2 w dx.$$

Proof. Note that $\langle q \rangle \sim (q + R + 1)$ since ϕ is supported in $q \geq -R$.

If $|q| \leq R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_q(q_r)w + q_r w_q \\
&= w(\partial_q(q_r) - q_r c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t)) \cdot \frac{1}{16}(q + R + 1)^{-17/16} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}w(\nu_q - \mu_q - c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t)) \cdot \frac{1}{16}(q + R + 1)^{-17/16}(\nu - \mu) \\
&\leq -\frac{w}{2}\left(-\frac{1}{2}G(\omega)A_q(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta) + \frac{c_0 \varepsilon}{16} \ln(t) \cdot (q + R + 1)^{-17/16}\right)|\mu| + O(\varepsilon t^{-1+C_\varepsilon} w) \\
&\leq (C(\varepsilon \ln(t) + \delta) - \frac{c_0 \varepsilon}{16}(2R + 1)^{-17/16} \ln(t))w|\mu| + C\varepsilon t^{-1+C_\varepsilon} w \\
&\leq C\delta w q_r + \varepsilon(C \ln(t)|\mu| - c_0 C^{-1} \ln(t)|\mu| + Ct^{-1+C_\varepsilon})w \\
&\leq C\delta w q_r.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because if $c_0 \gg_R 1$, the second term is negative. Also note that $|\mu| \gg t^{-1+C_\varepsilon}$.

If $q > R$, then $\mu \equiv -2$, so $q_r = (\nu - \mu)/2 = 1 + O(\varepsilon(t+r)^{-1+C_\varepsilon}) \in (1/2, 2)$ by (4.14), and $\partial_q(q_r) = \nu_q/2 = O(\varepsilon(t+r)^{-2+C_\varepsilon})$ by (4.22). Besides, by Lemma 4.2, we have

$$2R + 1 < q + R + 1 = r - t + R + 1 + O((r+t)^{C_\varepsilon}) \leq 2(r+t).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_q(q_r)w + q_r w_q \\
&= w(\partial_q(q_r) - q_r c_0 \varepsilon \ln(t)) \cdot \frac{1}{16}(q + R + 1)^{-17/16} \\
&\leq w(C\varepsilon(t+r)^{-2+C_\varepsilon} - \frac{c_0}{32}\varepsilon \ln(t) \cdot (q + R + 1)^{-17/16}) \\
&\leq w(C\varepsilon(t+r)^{-2+C_\varepsilon} - \frac{c_0}{64}\varepsilon \ln(t) \cdot (t+r)^{-17/16}) \\
&\leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds if we have $\varepsilon \ll 1$, $t \geq T_R \gg 1$ and $c_0 \gg_R 1$.

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int |\phi|^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w \, dx \\
& \lesssim_R \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty |\phi(t, r\omega)|^2 r^2 q_r^2 (q + R + 1)^{-2} w \, dr dS_\omega \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty (q + R + 1)^{-1} \partial_r (\phi^2 r^2 q_r w) \, dr dS_\omega \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty (q + R + 1)^{-1} [2\phi\phi_r r^2 w + 2\phi^2 r w + \phi^2 r^2 \partial_q (q_r) w + \phi^2 r^2 q_r w_q] q_r \, dr dS_\omega \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty (q + R + 1)^{-1} (2\phi\phi_r + 2\phi^2 r^{-1}) r^2 q_r w \, dr dS_\omega \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \int_0^\infty (q + R + 1)^{-1} \phi^2 r^2 \cdot C \delta q_r w \chi_{|q| \leq R} \cdot q_r \, dr dS_\omega \\
& \leq 4 \left(\int (|\phi_r|^2 + r^{-2} |\phi|^2) w \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left(\int \phi^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} q_r^2 w \, dx \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad + C_R \delta \int \langle q \rangle^{-2} \phi^2 q_r^2 w \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact that $\langle q \rangle \sim_R 1$ when $|q| \leq R$. Here C_R in the second term only depends on R and on the scattering data, and in particular it does not depend on ε , t or T_R . Thus, by choosing $\delta := \frac{1}{4C_R}$, we conclude that

$$\int |\phi|^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w \, dx \lesssim_R \int (|\phi_r|^2 + r^{-2} |\phi|^2) w \, dx.$$

Now recall that $r \geq t - R$ when $\phi \neq 0$. If $q \leq t^{1/2}$ we have $\langle q \rangle^2 \leq Ct$ and $q_r \geq C^{-1} t^{-C\varepsilon}$, as proved before. Thus, if $t \geq T_R \gg 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{q \leq t^{1/2}} r^{-2} \phi^2 w \, dx & \lesssim (t - R)^{-2} \cdot C t^{C\varepsilon} \cdot C t \int \phi^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w \, dx \\
& \lesssim_R t^{-1+C\varepsilon} \int \phi^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

If $q \geq t^{1/2}$, we have $w(q) \leq \exp(Cc_0\varepsilon \ln(t) \cdot t^{-1/32}) \leq C$ for $t \gg_R 1$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Besides, we also have $w \geq 1$. Thus, by Hardy's inequality,

$$\int_{q \geq t^{1/2}} r^{-2} \phi^2 w \, dx \lesssim \int r^{-2} \phi^2 \, dx \lesssim \int |\partial\phi|^2 \, dx \lesssim \int |\partial\phi|^2 w \, dx.$$

By choosing $T_R \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int |\phi|^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w \, dx & \leq C_R \int |\phi_r|^2 w \, dx + C_R \int_{q \geq t^{1/2}} r^{-2} |\phi|^2 w \, dx + C_R \int_{q < t^{1/2}} r^{-2} |\phi|^2 w \, dx \\
& \leq C_R \int |\partial\phi|^2 w \, dx + C_R t^{-1+C\varepsilon} \int \phi^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w \, dx \\
& \leq C_R \int |\partial\phi|^2 w \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \int \phi^2 q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} w \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose ϕ is supported in $|x| - t \geq -R$ and $\phi(t) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for each t . Let $F := g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}$ where u_{app} is defined in (4.36). Then for $t \geq T_R \gg 1$, we have*

$$\|\phi F\|_{L^2(w)} \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1} \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(w)}.$$

Proof. Write $F = \frac{\varepsilon}{4r} G(\omega) q_r A_q + F_2$. By the weighted Poincaré's lemma, i.e. Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\|\varepsilon r^{-1} G(\omega) q_r A_q \phi\|_{L^2(w)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 (t - R)^{-2} \int q_r^2 \langle q \rangle^{-2} \phi^2 w \, dx \lesssim \varepsilon^2 t^{-2} \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(w)}^2.$$

For $|q| \leq R$, $u_{app} = \varepsilon r^{-1} U$. Following the proof of Proposition 4.7, we can show

$$F = \frac{\varepsilon}{4r} G(\omega) (\mu^2 U_{qq} + \mu \mu_q U_q) + O(\varepsilon t^{-2+C\varepsilon}) = \frac{\varepsilon}{4r} G(\omega) q_r A_q + O(\varepsilon t^{-2+C\varepsilon}),$$

so we have $F_2 = O(\varepsilon t^{-2+C\varepsilon})$ in \mathcal{D} . For $|q| \geq R$, note that u_{app} is only supported for $t \sim r$, we have $F_2 = F = O(\varepsilon t^{-3+C\varepsilon})$ outside \mathcal{D} by Proposition 4.1. Since $1 \leq w \leq C t^{C\varepsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi F_2\|_{L^2(w)}^2 &= \|\phi F_2 \chi_{|q| \leq R}\|_{L^2(w)}^2 + \|\phi F_2 \chi_{|q| \geq R}\|_{L^2(w)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \int_{|q| \leq R} \varepsilon^2 t^{-4+C\varepsilon} |\phi|^2 \, dx + \int_{q > R, r \lesssim t} \varepsilon^2 t^{-6+C\varepsilon} |\phi|^2 \, dx \\ &\lesssim \int \varepsilon^2 t^{-2} \langle t - r \rangle^{-2} \phi^2 \, dx \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^2 t^{-2} \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 t^{-2} \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(w)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the Poincaré's lemma, i.e. Lemma 5.4. We are done. \square

6. CONTINUITY ARGUMENT

6.1. Setup. Fix $\chi(s) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\chi \in [0, 1]$ for all s , $\chi \equiv 1$ for $|s| \leq 1$ and $\chi \equiv 0$ for $|s| \geq 2$. Also fix a large time $T > 0$. Consider the equation of $v = v^T(t, x)$

$$(6.1) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} (u_{app} + v) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v = -\chi(t/T) \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} (u_{app} + v) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}, \quad t > 0; \quad v \equiv 0, \quad t \geq 2T.$$

We have the following results.

- (a) By the local existence theory of quasilinear wave equations, we can find a local smooth solution to (6.1) near $t = 2T$.
- (b) The solution on $[T_1, \infty)$ can be extended to $[T_1 - \epsilon, \infty)$ for some small $\epsilon > 0$ if

$$\|\partial^k v\|_{L^\infty([T_1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^3)} < \infty, \quad \text{for all } k \leq 4.$$

- (c) The solution to (6.1) has a finite speed of propagation: $v^T(t, x) = 0$ if $r + t > 6T$ or $r < t - R$, so $Z^1(t/T) = O(1)$ when $T/2 \leq t \leq 2T$.
- (d) If the solution exists for $t \leq T$, we have $\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} (u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u = 0$ for $t \leq T$ and $u = u_{app} + v$.

The proofs of these statements are standard. We refer to [21] for the proofs of (a) and (b). In this section, our goal is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 6.1. *Fix an integer $N \geq 6$. Then there exist constants $\varepsilon_N > 0$ which depend on N and R , such that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_N$, (6.1) has a solution $v = v^T(t, x)$ for all $t \geq 0$. In addition, $v \equiv 0$ if $r < t - R$; for all $|I| \leq N$, we have*

$$(6.2) \quad \|\partial Z^I v(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim_I \varepsilon (1+t)^{-1/2+C_I \varepsilon}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Recall that we choose R based on the support of our scattering data $A(q, \omega)$.

It should be pointed out that the N in this proposition is different from the N in the main theorem.

We use a continuity argument to prove this proposition. From now on we assume $\varepsilon \ll 1$, which means ε is arbitrary in $(0, \varepsilon_N)$ for some fixed small constant ε_N depending on N . First we prove the result for $t \geq T_{N,R}$, where $T_{N,R} \gg_{N,R} 1$ is a sufficiently large constant depending on N . We start with a solution $v(t, x)$ for $t \geq T_1$ such that for all $t \geq T_1 \geq T_{N,R}$ and $k+i \leq N$,

$$(6.3) \quad E_{k,i}(t) := \sum_{l \leq k, |I| \leq i} E_u(\partial^l Z^I v)(t) \leq B_{k,i} \varepsilon^2 t^{-1+C_{k,i} \varepsilon},$$

$$(6.4) \quad |u| \leq B_0 \varepsilon t^{-1+C_{0,2\varepsilon/2}}, \quad |\partial u| \leq B_1 \varepsilon t^{-1}.$$

Here $u := v + u_{app}$ and E_u is defined in (5.9). We remark that $C_{k,i}, B_{k,i}$ depend on k, i but not on N . Our goal is to prove that (6.3) and (6.4) hold with $B_{k,i}, B_0, B_1$ replaced by smaller constants $B'_{k,i}, B'_0, B'_1$, and with $C_{k,i}$ unchanged, assuming that $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $T_{N,R} \gg 1$. To achieve this goal, we first induct on i , and then we induct on k for each fixed i . For each (k, i) , we want to prove the following inequality

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{l \leq k, |I| \leq i} \|\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \partial^l Z^I v\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,i}(t)^{1/2} \\ &+ C_N \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (E_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + E_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}) \\ &+ C \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $E_{-1,\cdot} = E_{\cdot,-1} = 0$, and C, C_N are constants whose meanings will be explained later. We then combine (6.5) with the energy estimates (5.11) to derive an inequality on $E_{k,i}(t)$.

We remark that the proof in this section is closely related to that of the energy estimates in Section 9 of Lindblad [17].

In the following computation, let C denote a universal constant or a constant from the previous estimates on q and u_{app} (e.g. from Proposition 4.1). Here C is allowed to depend on (k, i) or N , but we will never write it as $C_{k,i}$ or C_N . We will choose the constants in the following order:

$$\begin{aligned} C &\rightarrow C_{0,0}, B_{0,0} \rightarrow C_{1,0}, B_{1,0} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow C_{N,0}, B_{N,0} \\ &\rightarrow C_{0,1}, B_{0,1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow C_{N-1,1}, B_{N-1,1} \\ &\rightarrow C_{0,2}, B_{0,2} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow C_{N-2,2}, B_{N-2,2} \\ &\dots \\ &\rightarrow C_{0,N}, B_{0,N} \\ &\rightarrow B_0, B_1 \rightarrow C_N \rightarrow T_{N,R} \rightarrow \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if a constant A appears before a constant B , then A cannot depend on B .

In addition, since $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $T_{N,R} \gg 1$ are chosen at the end, we can control terms like $C_N \varepsilon$ and $C_N T_{N,R}^{-\gamma+C_N \varepsilon}$ for $\gamma > 0$ for any k, i by a universal constant, e.g. 1.

To end the setup, we derive a differential equation on $Z^I v$ from (6.1). If we commute (6.1) with Z^I , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta Z^I v \\
(6.6) \quad &= [\square, Z^I] v + [\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u), Z^I] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v + \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) [\partial_\alpha \partial_\beta, Z^I] v \\
&\quad - Z^I (\chi(t/T) (\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app})) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}) - Z^I (\chi(t/T) \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app}) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}) \\
&=: R_1 + R_2 + R_3 + R_4 + R_5
\end{aligned}$$

with $Z^I v \equiv 0$ for $t \geq 2T$.

6.2. Pointwise bounds (6.4). In the next few subsections, we always assume $t \geq T_{N,R} \gg 1$. Since $1 \leq w \leq Ct^{C\varepsilon}$, by (6.4) and (5.9) we have

$$(6.7) \quad C^{-1} \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(w)} \sim E_u(\phi)^{1/2} \leq Ct^{C\varepsilon} \|\partial\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Here we can choose $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $T_{N,R} \gg 1$ so that all constants in this inequality are universal. If we combine this inequality with (6.3), we have

$$\|\partial Z^I v(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \leq CE_u(Z^I v)(t) \leq CB_{0,i} \varepsilon^2 t^{-1+C_{0,i}\varepsilon}, \quad |I| = i \leq N,$$

so by the Klainerman-Sobolev inequality, we have

$$(6.8) \quad |\partial Z^I v(t)| \leq CB_{0,i+2}^{1/2} \varepsilon t^{-1/2+C_{0,i+2}\varepsilon/2} (1+t+r)^{-1} \langle t-r \rangle^{-1/2}, \quad |I| = i \leq N-2.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{2t} (1+t+\rho)^{-1} \langle t-\rho \rangle^{-1/2} d\rho &\leq (1+t)^{-1} \int_0^{2t} \langle t-\rho \rangle^{-1/2} d\rho \\
&\leq 2(1+t)^{-1} \int_0^t (1+\rho)^{-1/2} d\rho \\
&\lesssim (1+t)^{-1/2}, \\
\int_{2t}^\infty (1+t+\rho)^{-1} \langle t-\rho \rangle^{-1/2} d\rho &\lesssim \int_{2t}^\infty (1+\rho)^{-3/2} d\rho \lesssim (1+t)^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by integrating $\partial_r Z^I v(t, \rho\omega)$ from $\rho = t - R$ to $\rho = r$, we conclude that

$$(6.9) \quad |Z^I v(t)| \leq CB_{0,i+2}^{1/2} \varepsilon t^{-1+C_{0,i+2}\varepsilon/2}, \quad |I| = i \leq N-2.$$

If we let $I = 0$ in (6.8) and (6.9), we have

$$|\partial v| \leq CB_{0,2}^{1/2} \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C_{0,2}\varepsilon/2}, \quad |v| \leq CB_{0,2}^{1/2} \varepsilon t^{-1+C_{0,2}\varepsilon/2}.$$

Note that $|u_{app}| \leq C\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon}$ and $|\partial u_{app}| \leq C\varepsilon t^{-1}$. This allows us to replace B_0, B_1 with $B_0/2, B_1/2$ in (6.4) as long as we choose $T_{N,R}, B_0, B_1$ sufficiently large and ε sufficiently small (e.g. $CB_{0,2}^{1/2} < B_0/4, C < B_0/4$; same for $B_1; T_{N,R} > 10; C_{0,2}\varepsilon < 1/4$).

In the following computation, we will use (6.8) and (6.9) directly instead of (6.4) for the pointwise bounds, so the choice of $C_{k,i}, B_{k,i}$ will be independent of B_0, B_1 .

We remark that if $N \geq 6$, (6.8) and (6.9) allow us to extend the solution $v(t, x)$ of (6.1) below $t = T_1$, by the local existence theory of quasilinear wave equations. Moreover, these

two pointwise bounds, together with $Z^I u_{app} = O(\varepsilon(1+t)^{-1+C\varepsilon})$, allow us to use Lemma 2.4 freely, as long as $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $T_{N,R} \gg 1$.

6.3. Energy estimate (6.3) with $k = i = 0$. Let $k = i = 0$ and fix $T_1 \leq t \leq 2T$. Now $R_1 = R_2 = R_3 = 0$ in (6.6).

For R_4 , since $|\chi(t/T)| \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_4\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq \|g^{\alpha\beta} v \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}\|_{L^2(w)} + C \| |v| (|u_{app}| + |v|) |\partial^2 u_{app}| \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon t^{-1} \|\partial v\|_{L^2(w)} + C_N \varepsilon^2 t^{-2+C_N\varepsilon} \| |v| \langle t-r \rangle^{-1} \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon t^{-1} E_u(v)(t)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we apply Lemma 2.4 in the first inequality, Lemma 5.6 in the second inequality, Lemma 5.4 and (6.7) in the third inequality.

For R_5 , since u_{app} is supported in the ball centered at origin with radius $2t$, by Proposition 4.1 we have

$$\|R_5\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C\varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}.$$

Thus, by (5.11), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} E_u(v)(t) &\leq \int_t^{2T} C_N \varepsilon \tau^{-1} E_u(v)(\tau) + C\varepsilon \tau^{-3/2+C\varepsilon} E_u(v)(\tau)^{1/2} d\tau \\ &\leq \int_t^{2T} C_N B_{0,0} \varepsilon^3 \tau^{-2+C_{0,0}\varepsilon} + C B_{0,0}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 \tau^{-2+(C+C_{0,0}/2)\varepsilon} d\tau \\ &\leq C C_N B_{0,0} \varepsilon^3 t^{-1+C_{0,0}\varepsilon} + C B_{0,0}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 t^{-1+(C+C_{0,0}/2)\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the constants C do not depend on C_N or $C_{k,i}, B_{k,i}$ in (6.3). If $\varepsilon \ll 1$ (say $C C_N \varepsilon \leq 1/4$) and $C_{0,0}, B_{0,0}$ are large enough (say $C_{0,0}/2 + C < C_{0,0}, C\sqrt{B_{0,0}} < B_{0,0}/4$), we obtain (6.3) with $B_{0,0}$ replaced by $B_{0,0}/2$.

6.4. Energy estimate (6.3) with $i = 0$ and $k > 0$. Let $i = 0$ and $k > 0$ and fix $T_1 \leq t \leq 2T$. Now $R_1 = R_3 = 0$.

For R_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_2\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq \| [g^{\alpha\beta} u, \partial^k] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v \|_{L^2(w)} + \| [\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) - g^{\alpha\beta} u, \partial^k] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq k, k_1 > 0} \| |\partial^{k_1} u| |\partial^{k_2+2} v| \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\quad + C \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3 \leq k, k_3 < k} \| |\partial^{k_1} u| |\partial^{k_2} u| |\partial^{k_3+2} v| \|_{L^2(w)}. \end{aligned}$$

The second sum comes from Lemma 2.4. By writing $u = v + u_{app}$, we have the following terms in the sums:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| |\partial u_{app}| |\partial^{k_2+2} v| \right\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2}, \quad k_2 < k; \\
& \left\| |\partial^{k_1} u_{app}| |\partial^{k_2+2} v| \right\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{k-1,0}(t)^{1/2}, \quad k_1 + k_2 \leq k, k_1 > 1; \\
& \left\| |\partial^{k_1} v| |\partial^{k_2+2} v| \right\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C_N\varepsilon} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2}, \quad k_1 + k_2 \leq k, k_1 > 0; \\
& \left\| |\partial^{k_1} u_{app}| |\partial^{k_2} u_{app}| |\partial^{k_3+2} v| \right\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon^2 t^{-2+C\varepsilon} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2}, \quad k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq k, k_3 < k; \\
& \left\| |\partial^{k_1} u_{app}| |\partial^{k_2} v| |\partial^{k_3+2} v| \right\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^2 t^{-2+C_N\varepsilon} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2}, \quad k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq k, k_3 < k; \\
& \left\| |\partial^{k_1} v| |\partial^{k_2} v| |\partial^{k_3+2} v| \right\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^2 t^{-2+C_N\varepsilon} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2}, \quad k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \leq k, k_3 < k.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use Proposition 4.1, (6.8) and (6.9). We take $L^2(w)$ norm on the derivative of v with the highest order, and apply pointwise bounds on the derivatives of u_{app} or derivatives of v with lower orders. Here we need $N/2 + 1 \leq N - 2$, i.e. $N \geq 6$, to apply the pointwise bounds. Thus, we have

$$\|R_2\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2} + C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{k-1,0}(t)^{1/2}.$$

The constants here are universal, as long as we choose $\varepsilon \ll 1$ (say $C_N \varepsilon < 1$) and $T_{N,R}$ sufficiently large (say $C_N / \sqrt{T_{N,R}} \leq 1$).

For R_4 , since $\partial^l(\chi(t/T)) = O(1)$ for all l , by Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_4\|_{L^2(w)} & \leq C \sum_{k_1 \leq k} \left\| g^{\alpha\beta} \partial^{k_1} v \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app} \right\|_{L^2(w)} + C \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq k, k_2 > 0} \left\| |\partial^{k_1} v| |\partial^{k_2+2} u_{app}| \right\|_{L^2(w)} \\
& \quad + C \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3 \leq k} \left\| |\partial^{k_1} v| (|\partial^{k_2} u_{app}| + |\partial^{k_2} v|) |\partial^{k_3+2} u_{app}| \right\|_{L^2(w)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.6, the first sum has an upper bound

$$C \varepsilon t^{-1} \sum_{k_1 \leq k} \left\| \partial \partial^{k_1} v \right\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2}.$$

By Lemma 5.4, the second sum has an upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} \sum_{k_1 < k} \left\| \partial^{k_1} v \langle t - r \rangle^{-2} \right\|_{L^2(w)} & \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} \sum_{k_1 < k} \left\| \partial \partial^{k_1} v \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\
& \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{k-1,0}(t)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The third sum is controlled by the second one, because $|\partial^{k_2} u_{app}| \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} \leq 1$, and at least one of $|\partial^{k_1} v|$ and $|\partial^{k_2} v|$ is $\leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-1+C_N\varepsilon} \leq 1$ (since $\min\{k_1, k_2\} \leq k/2 \leq N - 2$). In conclusion,

$$\|R_4\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,0}(t)^{1/2} + C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{k-1,0}(t)^{1/2}.$$

The constants here are again universal.

For R_5 , we have

$$\|R_5\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}.$$

Thus, by (5.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{k,0}(t) &\leq \int_t^{2T} C_N \varepsilon (1+\tau)^{-1} E_{k,0}(\tau) + C_N \varepsilon \tau^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{k-1,0}(\tau)^{1/2} E_{k,0}(\tau)^{1/2} \\
&\quad + C \varepsilon \tau^{-3/2+C\varepsilon} E_{k,0}(\tau)^{1/2} d\tau \\
&\leq \int_t^{2T} C_N B_{k,0} \varepsilon^3 \tau^{-2+C_{k,0}\varepsilon} + C_N B_{k,0} \varepsilon^3 \tau^{-2+(C+C_{k,0}/2+C_{k-1,0}/2)\varepsilon} \\
&\quad + C B_{k,0}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 \tau^{-2+(C+C_{k,0}/2)\varepsilon} d\tau \\
&\leq C C_N B_{k,0} \varepsilon^3 t^{-1+C_{k,0}\varepsilon} + C C_N B_{k,0} \varepsilon^3 t^{-1+(C+C_{k,0}/2+C_{k-1,0}/2)\varepsilon} \\
&\quad + C B_{k,0}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 t^{-1+(C+C_{k,0}/2)\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can prove (6.3) with $B_{k,0}$ replaced by $B_{k,0}/2$, if we assume that $B_{k,0}, C_{k,0}$ are large enough and $\varepsilon \ll 1$ (say $C C_N \varepsilon < 1/8$, $C_{k,0} \geq C_{k-1,0}$, $C \sqrt{B_{k,0}} \leq B_{k,0}/8$).

6.5. Energy estimate (6.3) with $k = 0$ and $i > 0$. Let $k = 0$ and $i > 0$ and fix $T_1 \leq t \leq 2T$. Also fix Z^I with $|I| = i$.

For R_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_2\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq \| [g^{\alpha\beta} u, Z^I] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v \|_{L^2(w)} + \| [\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) - g^{\alpha\beta} u, Z^I] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v \|_{L^2(w)} \\
&\leq C \sum_{|J_1|+|J_2| \leq i, |J_1| > 0} \| |Z^{J_1} u| |\partial^2 Z^{J_2} v| \|_{L^2(w)} \\
&\quad + C \sum_{|J_1|+|J_2|+|J_3| \leq i, |J_3| < i} \| |Z^{J_1} u Z^{J_2} u \partial^2 Z^{J_3} v| \|_{L^2(w)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second sum comes from Lemma 2.4. Note that the second sum is controlled by the first sum. In fact, since $|J_1|, |J_2|$ cannot be greater than $i/2$ at the same time, without loss of generality we assume $|J_1| \leq i/2 \leq N-2$. Thus $|Z^{J_1} u| \leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-1+C_N \varepsilon} \leq 1$ by (6.9) if we choose $\varepsilon \ll 1$. For the first sum, by writing $u = v + u_{app}$, we have the following terms in the sum:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| |Z^{J_1} u_{app}| |\partial^2 Z^{J_2} v| \|_{L^2(w)}, \quad |J_1| + |J_2| \leq i, |J_1| > 0; \\
&\| |Z^{J_1} v| |\partial^2 Z^{J_2} v| \|_{L^2(w)}, \quad |J_1| + |J_2| \leq i, |J_1| > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term has an upper bound

$$C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}.$$

By Lemma 2.1, we can see that the second term is controlled by

$$C \| |\langle t-r \rangle^{-1} Z^{J_1} v| |\partial Z Z^{J_2} v| \|_{L^2(w)}, \quad |J_2| < i.$$

If $|J_1| \leq N-2$, then by (6.8) we have

$$|\langle t-r \rangle^{-1} Z^{J_1} v| \leq \langle t-r \rangle^{-1} \int_{t-R}^r |\partial_\rho Z^{J_1}(t, \rho \omega)| d\rho \leq C \| \partial Z^{J_1} v(t) \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C_N \varepsilon},$$

which implies that

$$C \| |\langle t-r \rangle^{-1} Z^{J_1} v| |\partial Z Z^{J_2} v| \|_{L^2(w)} \leq C C_N t^{-3/2+C_N \varepsilon} E_{0,i}(t)^{1/2}.$$

If $|J_1| \geq N - 1$, then $|J_2| \leq 1$. In this case, by (6.8), (6.7) and Lemma 5.4, we have

$$|\partial Z Z^{J_2} v| \leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C_N \varepsilon},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle t-r \rangle^{-1} Z^{J_1} v\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq C t^{C\varepsilon} \|\langle t-r \rangle^{-1} Z^{J_1} v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C t^{C\varepsilon} \|\partial Z^{J_1} v\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \\ &\leq C t^{C\varepsilon} E_{0,i}(t)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the term above is controlled by

$$C C_N \varepsilon t^{-3/2+(C_N+C)\varepsilon} E_{0,i}(t)^{1/2}.$$

For R_3 , following the same discussion as above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_3\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq C \sum_{|J|<i} \| |u| |\partial^2 Z^J v| \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} \sum_{|J|<i} \|\partial^2 Z^J v\|_{L^2(w)} + C \sum_{|J|<i} \| |v| |\partial^2 Z^J v| \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{1,i-1}(t)^{1/2} + C C_N \varepsilon t^{-3/2+(C_N+C)\varepsilon} E_{0,i}(t)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

For R_4 , since $Z^J(\chi(t/T)) = O(1)$ for all J by finite speed of propagation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_4\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq C \sum_{|J|\leq i} \|g^{\alpha\beta} Z^J v \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}\|_{L^2(w)} + C \sum_{|J_1|+|J_2|\leq i, |J_2|>0} \| |Z^{J_1} v| |\partial^2 Z^{J_2} u_{app}| \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\quad + C \sum_{|J_1|+|J_2|+|J_3|\leq i} \| |Z^{J_1} v| (|Z^{J_2} v| + |Z^{J_2} u_{app}|) |\partial^2 Z^{J_3} u_{app}| \|_{L^2(w)} \\ &\leq C \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{0,i}(t)^{1/2} + C \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{0,i-1}(t)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is very similar to the proof on estimate of R_4 in the case $i = 0$ and $k > 0$.

For R_5 , again we have

$$\|R_5\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}.$$

For R_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |[\square, Z^I]v| &\lesssim \sum_{|J_1|+|J_2|<i} |Z^{J_1} \square Z^{J_2} v| \lesssim \sum_{|J|<i} |Z^J \square v| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|J|<i} |Z^J(\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v)| + |Z^J(\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{|J|<i} |Z^J(\chi(t/T) \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app})| + |Z^J(\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v)|. \end{aligned}$$

Here all the constants are universal which depend only on i, N . The first term is simply $R_4 + R_5$ with a lower order I . The second term can be controlled in the same way as we

control R_2, R_3 . In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{0,i}(t) &\leq \int_t^{2T} CC_N \varepsilon \tau^{-1} E_{0,i}(\tau) + CC_N \varepsilon \tau^{-1+C\varepsilon} E_{1,i-1}(\tau)^{1/2} E_{0,i}(\tau)^{1/2} \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon \tau^{-3/2+C\varepsilon} E_{0,i}(\tau)^{1/2} d\tau \\
&\leq \int_t^{2T} CC_N B_{0,i} \varepsilon^3 \tau^{-2+C_{0,i}\varepsilon} + CC_N B_{0,i} \varepsilon^3 \tau^{-2+(C+C_{1,i-1}/2+C_{0,i}/2)\varepsilon} \\
&\quad + CB_{0,i}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 \tau^{-2+(C+C_{0,i}/2)\varepsilon} d\tau \\
&\leq CC_N B_{0,i} \varepsilon^3 t^{-1+C_{0,i}\varepsilon} + CC_N B_{0,i} \varepsilon^3 t^{-1+(C+C_{0,i}/2+C_{1,i-1}/2)\varepsilon} \\
&\quad + CB_{0,i}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 t^{-1+(C+C_{0,i}/2)\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, we can choose $B_{0,i}, C_{0,i}$ sufficiently large such that (6.3) holds with $B_{0,i}$ replaced by $B_{0,i}/2$. Note that $B_{1,i-1}, C_{1,i-1}$ are already chosen when we consider the case $k=0, i>0$.

6.6. Energy estimate (6.3) with $k, i > 0$. Let $k, i > 0$ and fix $T_1 \leq t \leq 2T$. Also fix Z^I with $|I| = i$. This case can be viewed as a combination of the case $k=0, i>0$ and the case $i=0, k>0$.

For R_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_2\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq \|[g^{\alpha\beta}u, \partial^k Z^I] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v\|_{L^2(w)} + \|[\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u) - g^{\alpha\beta}u, \partial^k Z^I] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v\|_{L^2(w)} \\
&\leq C \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq k, |J_1|+|J_2| \leq i, k_1+|J_1| > 0} \|\partial^{k_1} Z^{J_1} u\| \|\partial^{2+k_2} Z^{J_2} v\|_{L^2(w)} \\
&\quad + C \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3 \leq k \\ |J_1|+|J_2|+|J_3| \leq i \\ k_3+|J_3| < k+i}} \|\partial^{k_1} Z^{J_1} u \partial^{k_2} Z^{J_2} u \partial^{2+k_3} Z^{J_3} v\|_{L^2(w)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second sum is again easy to handle. For the first sum, we consider the following three cases: $k_1=0$ and $|J_1|>0$; $k_1=1$ and $|J_1|=0$; all the remaining choices of (k, J_1) . For the first case, we apply Proposition 4.1, Lemma 2.1 to obtain a factor $\langle t-r \rangle^{-1}$ with one ∂ replaced by Z ; for the second case, we use $|\partial u| \leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-1}$; for the third, we use (6.8) directly. The proof here is very similar to the proof in the previous cases. We thus have

$$\|R_2\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,i}(t)^{1/2} + C_N \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (E_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + E_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}).$$

For R_3 , we have

$$\|R_3\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \sum_{k_1 \leq k, |J| < i} \| |u| \partial^{k_1+2} Z^J v \|_{L^2(w)}.$$

We can use Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 2.1 to obtain

$$\|R_3\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,i}(t)^{1/2} + C_N \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (E_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + E_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}).$$

For R_4 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_4\|_{L^2(w)} &\leq C \sum_{k_1 \leq k, |J| \leq i} \|g^{\alpha\beta} \partial^{k_1} Z^J v \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}\|_{L^2(w)} \\
&+ C \sum_{k_1+k_2 \leq k, |J_1|+|J_2| \leq i, k_2+|J_2|>0} \|\partial^{k_1} Z^{J_1} v\| \|\partial^{k_2+2} Z^{J_2} u_{app}\|_{L^2(w)} \\
&+ C \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2+k_3 \leq k \\ |J_1|+|J_2|+|J_3| \leq i \\ k_3+|J_3| < k+i}} \|\partial^{k_1} Z^{J_1} v\| (\|\partial^{k_2} Z^{J_2} v\| + \|\partial^{k_2} Z^{J_2} u_{app}\|) \|\partial^{k_3+2} Z^{J_3} u_{app}\|_{L^2(w)} \\
&\leq C_N \varepsilon t^{-1} E_{k,i}(t)^{1/2} + C_N \varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (E_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + E_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

This can be handled in the same way as we handle R_4 in the case $k=0, i>0$ or $i=0, k>0$.

For R_5 , again we have

$$\|R_5\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}.$$

For R_1 , since $[\square, \partial^k Z^I] = \partial^k [\square, Z^I]$, we can conclude that the $L^2(w)$ norm of R_1 can be controlled by the bounds of the $L^2(w)$ norms of all other R_i .

In conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{k,i}(t) &\leq \int_t^{2T} CC_N \varepsilon \tau^{-1} E_{k,i}(\tau) + CC_N \varepsilon \tau^{-1+C\varepsilon} (E_{k-1,i}(\tau)^{1/2} + E_{k+1,i-1}(\tau)^{1/2}) E_{k,i}(\tau)^{1/2} \\
&+ C \varepsilon \tau^{-3/2+C\varepsilon} E_{k,i}(\tau)^{1/2} d\tau \\
&\leq \int_t^{2T} CC_N B_{k,i} \varepsilon^3 \tau^{-2+C_{k,i}\varepsilon} + CC_N B_{k,i} \varepsilon^3 \tau^{-2+(C+C_{k+1,i-1}/2+C_{k-1,i}/2+C_{k,i}/2)\varepsilon} \\
&+ C B_{k,i}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 \tau^{-2+(C+C_{k,i}/2)\varepsilon} d\tau \\
&\leq CC_N B_{k,i} \varepsilon^3 t^{-1+C_{k,i}\varepsilon} + CC_N B_{k,i} \varepsilon^3 t^{-1+(C+C_{k+1,i-1}/2+C_{k-1,i}/2+C_{k,i}/2)\varepsilon} \\
&+ C B_{k,i}^{1/2} \varepsilon^2 t^{-1+(C+C_{k,i}/2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, we can choose $B_{k,i}, C_{k,i}$ sufficiently large such that (6.3) holds with $B_{k,i}$ replaced by $B_{k,i}/2$. Note that $B_{k+1,i-1}, C_{k+1,i-1}, B_{k-1,i}, C_{k-1,i}$ are already chosen when we consider the case $k, i > 0$.

6.7. Existence for $0 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}$. In the previous subsections, we prove that there exists a solution v to (6.1) for all $t \geq T_{N,R}$ with (6.2) hold for all $|I| \leq N$ and $t \geq T_{N,R}$. Now we finish the proof of Proposition 6.1 by extending the solution to all $t \geq 0$. At a small time, u_{app} does not approximate u well, but u_{app} and all its derivatives stay bounded for all (t, x) with $0 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}$. See Proposition 4.1. So, it is better to use (1.1) to control u directly instead of using (6.1).

Fix $N \geq 6$. By using the pointwise bounds in Proposition 4.1 and the support of u_{app} , we have

$$\|Z^I u_{app}(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim_{I,N,R} \varepsilon, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}.$$

Thus, it suffices to prove that the solution u to (1.1) with $u = v + u_{app}$ for $t \geq T_{N,R}$ exists for $0 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}$, with

$$\|\partial Z^I u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim_{I,N,R} \varepsilon, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}, \quad |I| \leq N.$$

If we apply Z^I to (1.1), we have

$$(6.10) \quad \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta Z^I u = [\square, Z^I]u + [\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u), Z^I]\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta u + \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u)[\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta, Z^I]u.$$

We can now set up the continuity argument. Suppose that we have a solution u to (1.1) for $T_1 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}$ for some $0 \leq T_1 \leq T_{N,R}$, such that

$$(6.11) \quad \|\partial Z^I u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq B\varepsilon, \quad |I| \leq N, T_1 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}.$$

Here $B = B_N$ depends on N . We remark that (6.11) implies (6.2) for $t \leq T_{N,R}$, where the power is the same but the constant in \lesssim_I now depends on N . This is because $1 \lesssim_N t^{-1/2+C_I\varepsilon}$ for $t \leq T_{N,R}$, assuming $\varepsilon \ll 1$.

By Klainerman-Sobolev inequality, we conclude that for $t \geq T_1$

$$|\partial Z^I u(t, x)| \leq CB\varepsilon(1+t+r)^{-1}\langle t-r \rangle^{-1/2}, \quad |I| \leq N-2$$

and

$$|Z^I u(t, x)| \leq CB\varepsilon(1+t)^{-1/2}, \quad |I| \leq N-2.$$

The proof of the second estimate is similar to that of (6.9). Thus, assuming $\varepsilon \ll 1$, from (6.10) we have for $|I| \leq N$

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u)\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta Z^I u| &\leq C \sum_{|J|+|K|\leq|I|, |K|<|I|} |Z^J u| |\partial^2 Z^K u| \\ &\leq C \sum_{|J|+|K|\leq|I|, |K|<|I|} \langle t-r \rangle^{-1} |Z^J u| |\partial Z Z^K u| \\ &\leq C_N \varepsilon \sum_{|J|\leq|I|} (|\partial Z^J u| + \langle t-r \rangle^{-1} |Z^J u|). \end{aligned}$$

Here we apply Lemma 2.4 in the first inequality and the pointwise bounds in the third one. Note that if $|J| + |K| \leq |I|$ and $|K| < |I|$, then $\min\{|J|, |K| + 1\} \leq N/2 + 1 \leq N - 2$ when $N \geq 6$.

Now we can use the standard energy estimates, say Proposition 2.1 in Chapter I in Sogge [21] or Proposition 6.3.2 in Hörmander [8]. We apply Poincaré's lemma, i.e. Lemma 5.4, to $\langle t-r \rangle^{-1} |Z^J u|$, so its $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ norm is controlled by the that of $|\partial Z^J u|$. By setting

$$E_N(t) = \sum_{|I|\leq N} \|\partial Z^I v(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2,$$

for small $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_N(t)^{1/2} &\leq 2(E_N(T_{N,R})^{1/2} + C_N \varepsilon \int_t^{T_{N,R}} E_N(\tau)^{1/2} d\tau) \exp\left(\int_t^{T_{N,R}} C_N \varepsilon d\tau\right) \\ &\leq C_N \varepsilon + C_N B^{1/2} \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then by choosing ε small enough and B large enough, both depending on N , we can replace B with $B/2$ in (6.11). We are done.

Finally, we remark that for each $|I| \leq N$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we can apply Proposition 6.1 with N replaced by $N' = \max\{6, |I|\} \leq N$. Note that when $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_N \leq \varepsilon_{N'}$ and $T > T_{N,R} \geq T_{N',R}$, the solution for N and the solution for N' are exactly the same. But the constants in (6.2) now depend on $\max\{6, |I|\}$ instead of N . This allows us to remove the dependence of N in the coefficients of (6.2).

7. LIMIT AS $T \rightarrow \infty$

Our goal for this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 7.1. *Fix $N \geq 6$. Then for the same ε_N in Proposition 6.1 and for $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_N$, there is a solution u to (1.1) in C^{N-4} for all $t \geq 0$, such that for all $|I| \leq N - 5$*

$$(7.1) \quad \|\partial Z^I(u - u_{app})(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim_I \varepsilon(1+t)^{-1/2+C_I\varepsilon}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Besides, for all $|I| \leq N - 5$ and $t \gg_R 1$,

$$(7.2) \quad |\partial Z^I(u - u_{app})(t, x)| \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-1/2+C_I\varepsilon} \langle r+t \rangle^{-1} \langle t-r \rangle^{-1/2},$$

$$(7.3) \quad |Z^I(u - u_{app})(t, x)| \lesssim_I \min\{\varepsilon t^{-1+C_I\varepsilon}, \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C_I\varepsilon} \langle r-t \rangle\}.$$

It should be pointed out that the value of “ N ” in the main theorem is equal to $N - 4$ for the N in this proposition.

From now on, the constant C is allowed to depend on all the constants in the previous sections (say $C_{k,i}, B_{k,i}, N$), but it must be independent of ε and T .

7.1. Existence of the limit. Fix $N \geq 6$ and $T_2 > T_1 \gg 1$. By Proposition 6.1, for each $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_N$, we get two corresponding solutions $v_1 = v^{T_1}$ and $v_2 = v^{T_2}$ which exist for all $t \geq 0$. Our goal now is to prove that $v_1 - v_2$ tends to 0 in some Banach space as $T_2 > T_1 \rightarrow \infty$.

Recall that $\varepsilon_N, T_{N,R}$ are independent of the choice of T , as long as $T > T_{N,R}$. In addition, v_1 and v_2 satisfy (6.2), (6.3), (6.4), (6.8) and (6.9), as shown in the continuity argument, for $t \geq T_{N,R}$, and they satisfy (6.11) along with the pointwise bounds for $0 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}$. All the constants involved in these estimates are independent of T . We define $u_1 = v^{T_1} + u_{app}$, $u_2 = v^{T_2} + u_{app}$ and $\tilde{v} = v^{T_2} - v^{T_1}$. Then, for $t \geq T_1$ and $|I| \leq N$, by (6.2), we have

$$\|\partial Z^I \tilde{v}(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|\partial Z^I v_1(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} + \|\partial Z^I v_2(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C\varepsilon^2 T_1^{-1+C\varepsilon}.$$

In addition, for $t \leq T_1$ (now $\chi(t/T_1) = \chi(t/T_2) = 1$) and for each $|I| \leq N$, we have

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_1) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta Z^I \tilde{v} &= [\square, Z^I] \tilde{v} + [\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_1), Z^I] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \tilde{v} + [\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_2) - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_1), Z^I] \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v_2 \\ &\quad + \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_1) [\partial_\alpha \partial_\beta, Z^I] \tilde{v} + (\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_2) - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_1)) [\partial_\alpha \partial_\beta, Z^I] v_2 \\ &\quad - Z^I ((\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_2) - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_1)) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app}) - (\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_2) - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_1)) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta Z^I v_2. \end{aligned}$$

Define a new energy

$$\tilde{E}_{k,i}(t) := \sum_{l \leq k, |I| \leq i} E_{u_1}(\partial^l Z^I \tilde{v})(t).$$

Here E_{u_1} is defined in (5.9) with u replaced by u_1 . For $k + i \leq N - 3$ with $|I| = i$, and for $t \geq T_{N,R}$ we have

$$(7.5) \quad \|\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_1) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \partial^k Z^I \tilde{v}\|_{L^2(w)} \leq C\varepsilon t^{-1} \tilde{E}_{k,i}(t)^{1/2} + C\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (\tilde{E}_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + \tilde{E}_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2})$$

with $\tilde{E}_{-1,\cdot} = \tilde{E}_{\cdot,-1} = 0$. This is a simple application of Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.4 and the estimates on u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 . We skip the detail of the proof here, since it is very similar to the proof of (6.5) on $E_{k,i}$. However, we should always put $L^2(w)$ norm on the terms involving \tilde{v} and put L^∞ norm on terms involving u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 . The pointwise bounds only holds for $|I| \leq N - 2$, as seen in (6.8) and (6.9), so we need to assume $k + i \leq N - 3$ instead of

$k+i \leq N$ above. Besides, there is no term like R_5 in the previous section, so we expect $\tilde{E}_{k,i}$ to have a better decay than $E_{k,i}$.

Since (6.8) and (6.9) hold for v_1 , we can apply energy estimate (5.11) on E_{u_1} . Thus, for all $T_{N,R} \leq t \leq T_1$ and for $k+i \leq N-3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{k,i}(t) &\leq C\varepsilon^2 T_1^{-1+C\varepsilon} + B \int_t^{T_1} \varepsilon \tau^{-1} \tilde{E}_{k,i}(\tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + C\varepsilon \int_t^{T_1} \tau^{-1+C\varepsilon} (\tilde{E}_{k-1,i}(\tau)^{1/2} + \tilde{E}_{k+1,i-1}(\tau)^{1/2}) \tilde{E}_{k,i}(\tau)^{1/2} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Using this estimate, we claim that $\tilde{E}_{k,i}(t) \leq C\varepsilon^2 T_1^{-1+C\varepsilon}$ for all $k+i \leq N-3$. Here C may depend on k, i . To prove this claim, we first induct on $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$ and then on $k = 0, \dots, N-3-i$ for each fixed i . If we fix (k, i) and let $V(t) = V_{k,i}(t)$ be the right hand side, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} dV/dt &= -B\varepsilon t^{-1} \tilde{E}_{k,i}(t) - C\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (\tilde{E}_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + \tilde{E}_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}) \tilde{E}_{k,i}(t)^{1/2} \\ &\geq -B\varepsilon t^{-1} V(t) - C\varepsilon t^{-1+C\varepsilon} (\tilde{E}_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + \tilde{E}_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}) V(t)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(t^{B\varepsilon/2} \sqrt{V}) &= \frac{1}{2} B\varepsilon t^{-1+B\varepsilon/2} \sqrt{V} + t^{B\varepsilon/2} \frac{dV/dt}{2\sqrt{V}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{V}} t^{B\varepsilon/2} (B\varepsilon t^{-1} V + dV/dt) \\ &\geq -C\varepsilon t^{-1+(C+B/2)\varepsilon} (\tilde{E}_{k-1,i}(t)^{1/2} + \tilde{E}_{k+1,i-1}(t)^{1/2}) \\ &\geq -C\varepsilon^2 t^{-1+C\varepsilon} T_1^{-1+C\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

The last line holds by induction hypothesis. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} t^{B\varepsilon/2} \sqrt{V(t)} &\leq T_1^{B\varepsilon/2} \sqrt{V(T_1)} + \int_t^{T_1} C\varepsilon^2 \tau^{-1+C\varepsilon} T_1^{-1/2+C\varepsilon} d\tau \\ &\leq C\varepsilon T_1^{-1/2+C\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus for all $t \geq T_{N,R}$, we have

$$\tilde{E}_{k,i}(t) \leq V(t) \leq t^{B\varepsilon} V(t) \leq C\varepsilon^2 T_1^{-1+C\varepsilon}.$$

Here C in different places may denote different values.

For $0 \leq t \leq T_{N,R}$, we can also prove that

$$\|\partial Z^I(v_2 - v_1)(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^2 T_1^{-1+C_N \varepsilon}.$$

The proof is very similar to the proof in Section 6. We can use the equation

$$\tilde{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}(u_1) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta (u_2 - u_1) = -(\gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_2) - \gamma^{\alpha\beta}(u_1)) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_2$$

and apply the standard energy estimates to establish the continuity argument. Again, we can remove the dependence of N in the constants, using the same argument in Section 6.

By (6.7), for each $|I| \leq N-3$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$, we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\partial Z^I(v_2 - v_1)(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C\varepsilon T_1^{-1/2+C\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$$

as $T_2 > T_1 \rightarrow \infty$. By Klainerman-Sobolev inequality and

$$\int_0^\infty (1+t+\rho)^{-1} \langle t-\rho \rangle^{-1/2} d\rho \lesssim (1+t)^{-1/2},$$

for all $|I| \leq N-5$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^3} |\partial Z^I(v_2 - v_1)(t, x)| &\leq C_\varepsilon T_1^{-1/2+C_\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0 \\ \sup_{t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^3} |Z^I(v_2 - v_1)(t, x)| &\leq C_\varepsilon T_1^{-1/2+C_\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $T_2 > T_1 \rightarrow \infty$. Then, there is $v^\infty \in C^{N-4}(\{(t, x) : t \geq 0\})$, such that $\partial Z^I v^T \rightarrow \partial Z^I v^\infty$ and $Z^I v^T \rightarrow Z^I v^\infty$ pointwisely for $t \geq 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, for each $|I| \leq N-5$. It is clear that the pointwise bounds (6.8) and (6.9) also hold for v^∞ for $|I| \leq N-5$. By Fatou's lemma, for each $|I| \leq N-5$ we have

$$(7.6) \quad \|\partial Z^I v^\infty(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \|\partial Z^I v^T(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C_I \varepsilon (1+t)^{-1/2+C_I \varepsilon}.$$

Meanwhile, if $N \geq 6$, then by taking $T \rightarrow \infty$ in

$$\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app} + v^T) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta v^T = -\chi(t/T) \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(u_{app} + v^T) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta u_{app},$$

we conclude that $u^\infty := v^\infty + u_{app}$ is a solution to (1.1) for $t \geq 0$.

7.2. End of the proof of Theorem 1. If $t \gg_R 1$ and $t \sim r$, we have $U(t, r, \omega) = U(\varepsilon \ln(t) - \delta, R, \omega)$, so $\partial^k U = O(t^{-k})$; besides, $\partial^k(\psi(r/t)) = O(t^{-k})$. Thus, for $t \gg_R 1$ and for each I , we have

$$|\partial Z^I(u_{app} - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t, x)| \chi_{|x| \leq 3t/2} \lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-2+C_I \varepsilon}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial Z^I(u_{app} - \varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t)\|_{L^2(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x| \leq 3t/2\})} \\ &= \|\partial Z^I((1 - \psi(r/t))\varepsilon r^{-1}U)(t)\|_{L^2(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 5t/4 \leq |x| \leq 3t/2\})} \\ &\lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-2+C_I \varepsilon} \cdot |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 5t/4 \leq |x| \leq 3t/2\}|^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim_I \varepsilon t^{-1/2+C_I \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

These two bounds allows us to get the estimates in the main theorem from (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3), since

$$u - u_{app} = (u - \varepsilon r^{-1}U) \chi_{|x| \leq 3t/2} - (u_{app} - \varepsilon r^{-1}U) \chi_{|x| \leq 3t/2} + u \chi_{|x| > 3t/2}.$$

We also remark that starting from the estimates in the main theorem, we can also derive (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3), using the essentially same derivation here.

By (7.6), for $t \gg_R 1$, we have

$$|(\partial_t - \partial_r)(u^\infty - u_{app})(t, x)| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-1/2+C_I \varepsilon} (1+t+r)^{-1}.$$

Since $\psi \equiv 0$ unless $t \sim r$, for $t \gg_R 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \partial_r)u_{app} &= (\partial_t - \partial_r)(\varepsilon r^{-1}\psi(r/t)U) \\ &= -\varepsilon r^{-2}\psi U + \varepsilon r^{-1}\psi \mu U_q + \varepsilon^2 r^{-1}t^{-1}\psi U_s \\ &\quad + \varepsilon r^{-1}t^{-2}(t-r)\psi' U \\ &= -2\varepsilon r^{-1}\psi A + O(\varepsilon t^{-2+C_\varepsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that for all $t \gg_R 1$ we have

$$(7.7) \quad |(\partial_t - \partial_r)u^\infty + \frac{2\varepsilon}{r}A(q(t, r, \omega), \omega)| \lesssim \varepsilon t^{-3/2+C\varepsilon}.$$

Note that $A(q(t, r, \omega), \omega) = 0$ unless $\psi(r/t) = 1$ for $t \gg_R 1$, so we do not have $\psi(r/t)$. So we get the last estimates in the main theorem.

7.3. Uniqueness. Now we give a brief proof of the uniqueness statement given in the remark of Theorem 1. It suffices to prove the uniqueness of Proposition 7.1, assuming $N \geq 11$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$. This is because (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3) are equivalent to the estimates in the main theorem, even if we replace $5/4$ with a fixed constant $\kappa > 1$. We refer to Section 7.2 for the proof.

Now, suppose we have two C^{N-4} solutions u_1, u_2 constructed in Proposition 7.1. Fix $T \gg 1$. We can prove that $\|\partial Z^I(u_1 - u_2)(t)\| \lesssim \varepsilon T^{-1/2+C\varepsilon}$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $|I| \leq N - 10$. Here the constants are independent of T . The proof is essentially the same as that in Section 7.1. Let $T \rightarrow \infty$ and we get $u_1 \equiv u_2$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Serge Alinhac. An example of blowup at infinity for a quasilinear wave equation. *Astérisque*, 283:1–91, 2003.
- [2] Serge Alinhac. *Geometric analysis of hyperbolic differential equations: an introduction*, volume 374. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [3] Demetrios Christodoulou. Global solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic equations for small initial data. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 39(2):267–282, 1986.
- [4] Demetrios Christodoulou and Sergiu Klainerman. *The global nonlinear stability of the Minkowski space*, volume 41 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.
- [5] Yu Deng and Fabio Pusateri. On the global behavior of weak null quasilinear wave equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05107*, 2018.
- [6] Lars Hörmander. The lifespan of classical solutions of non-linear hyperbolic equations. In *Pseudo-Differential Operators*, pages 214–280. Springer, 1987.
- [7] Lars Hörmander. On the fully nonlinear Cauchy problem with small data. II. In *Microlocal analysis and nonlinear waves (Minneapolis, MN, 1988–1989)*, volume 30 of *IMA Vol. Math. Appl.*, pages 51–81. Springer, New York, 1991.
- [8] Lars Hörmander. *Lectures on nonlinear hyperbolic differential equations*, volume 26. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997.
- [9] Fritz John. Blow-up for quasi-linear wave equations in three space dimensions. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 34(1):29–51, 1981.
- [10] Fritz John. Blow-up of radial solutions of $u_{tt} = c^2(u_t)\Delta u$ in three space dimensions. *Mat. Apl. Comput.*, 4(1):3–18, 1985.
- [11] Fritz John and Sergiu Klainerman. Almost global existence to nonlinear wave equations in three space dimensions. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 37(4):443–455, 1984.
- [12] Sergiu Klainerman. Long time behaviour of solutions to nonlinear wave equations. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Warsaw, 1983)*, pages 1209–1215. PWN, Warsaw, 1984.
- [13] Sergiu Klainerman. Uniform decay estimates and the Lorentz invariance of the classical wave equation. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 38(3):321–332, 1985.
- [14] Sergiu Klainerman. The null condition and global existence to nonlinear wave equations. In *Nonlinear systems of partial differential equations in applied mathematics, Part 1 (Santa Fe, N.M., 1984)*, volume 23 of *Lectures in Appl. Math.*, pages 293–326. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986.
- [15] Hans Lindblad. On the lifespan of solutions of nonlinear wave equations with small initial data. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 43(4):445–472, 1990.

- [16] Hans Lindblad. Global solutions of nonlinear wave equations. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 45(9):1063–1096, 1992.
- [17] Hans Lindblad. Global solutions of quasilinear wave equations. *American journal of mathematics*, 130(1):115–157, 2008.
- [18] Hans Lindblad and Igor Rodnianski. The weak null condition for Einstein’s equations. *Comptes rendus - Mathematique*, 336(11):901–906, 2003.
- [19] Hans Lindblad and Igor Rodnianski. Global existence for the Einstein vacuum equations in wave coordinates. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 256(1):43–110, 2005.
- [20] Hans Lindblad and Volker Schlue. Scattering from infinity for semilinear models of Einstein’s equations satisfying the weak null condition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00822*, 2017.
- [21] Christopher Donald Sogge. *Lectures on non-linear wave equations*, volume 2. International Press Boston, MA, 1995.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY
E-mail address: yudx@math.berkeley.edu